

---

TITLE An Investigation into the Problem of Prayers of Affirmation

Master's [ ] Prize Essay [ ]

- Note: The Library shall respect restrictions placed on theses or prize essays for a period of no more than ten years.

3. The Library may sell photocopies of my thesis.       $\frac{x}{\text{yes}}$        $\frac{\quad}{\text{no}}$

*M. S. Shetty*  
Signature of Author

Microfilmed 10/29/77  
Date

Melina Steiner  
Signature of Library Staff Member

AN INVESTIGATION INTO THE PROBLEM OF  
PRAYERS OF AFFIRMATION

by

Michael Charney

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for Ordination  
Hebrew Union College - Jewish  
Institute of Religion  
June, 1977  
Dr. Jakob J. Petuchowski

TO MY WIFE, ANNE,  
AND MY SONS, ADAM AND BRETT

B'ahavah

Acknowledgments:

I would like to thank my thesis advisor, Dr. Jakob J. Petuchowski, for his help, his guidance, and his patience in working with me to complete my thesis.

I would like to thank my parents, Rabbi and Mrs. Lawrence H. Charney, for instilling within me the desire and dedication to become a Rabbi.

I would like to thank my good friend, Mrs. Bessie Schneider, may she rest in peace, for her help in translating the German sources used in this paper.

Finally, I would like to thank Ms. Judith Meserve for the excellent job she did typing this paper.

## DIGEST

The late Professor Leon J. Liebreich, in an article entitled "Aspects of the New Year Liturgy", (Hebrew Union College Annual, Vol. XXXIV, 1963) proposed the existence of a category of prayers of affirmation which begin with the word אָמֵן. The prayers in this category, according to Liebreich, when taken together, add up to a creed. Liebreich informed Joseph Heinemann, while Heinemann was writing his book, Prayer in the Period of the Tanna'im and the Amora'im, (Magnes Press, Jerusalem, 1964) of his proposed category. Although Heinemann mentioned Liebreich's contention in a footnote to his book, he did not agree that these prayers formed a distinct category. The purpose of this work was to identify the אָמֵן prayers, examine them individually and together, and determine whether or not they do form a distinct category of prayers.

Only obligatory prayers which begin with אָמֵן were considered in this study. Hence, fifteen prayers were identified as being suitable to examine. Nine of these fifteen prayers are clearly of Babylonian origin, and thirteen (possibly fourteen) of these prayers are found (or were at one time found) within the rubric of the 'amidah. Furthermore, it was shown in this study that one of these prayers influenced the development and/or usage of twelve of the remaining prayers.

These fifteen אָמֵן prayers do form a creed, but not one which is unique to this group of prayers alone. Rather, any randomly chosen group of prayers forms the same type of creed. Furthermore, there are no



other stylistic similarities among these fifteen prayers other than the fact that they all begin with  $\mathfrak{N}^1C$ .

Therefore, although there are similarities among these fifteen prayers, I agree with Heinemann that they do not form a distinct category.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter One	Introduction	1
Chapter Two	<u>Qedushath Hayom</u>	9
Chapter Three	<u>Gebhuroth, Qedushath Ha-shem</u> and <u>Binah</u>	25
Chapter Four	The <u>Rosh Hashanah Musaph</u> <u>'Amidah</u>	39
Chapter Five	The Remaining <u>Shema</u> Prayers	49
Chapter Six	Style, Usage and Motifs	57
Chapter Seven	Conclusion	67
Bibliography		74

## CHAPTER ONE

### Introduction

Prior to the birth of the scientific approach to studying Judaism, liturgists were basically concerned with only the halakhic aspects of the prayer service and the bases of the prayers in the Bible, Talmud and Midrash. With the nineteenth century development of the Wissenschaft des Judentums, however, the scope and major concerns of those who devoted their lives to the study of Jewish worship expanded drastically. Scholars now felt that they possessed the methods and the know-how to trace the historical development of the existing modern-day prayers. They were confident that they could successfully date the individual prayers, identify the original texts of these prayers, and reconstruct the original form of the prayer service which was practiced by our ancestors. Although many scholars invented and utilized their own methods for studying liturgy, the approach that became the most popular and widespread has been named the Classical Philological approach. Scholars who adhered to this approach accepted the following assumptions about Jewish prayer:<sup>1</sup>

1. Given two prayers of the same general contents, one simple and the other more elaborate, it is assumed that the simple version must have been the original, and the elaborate version a late refinement.
2. Prayers which come down to us in only one version must be older than prayers which have been transmitted in several versions.
3. Modern scholars should be able to reconstruct the original Jewish worship service on the basis of textual comparison.
4. Modern scholars can follow up, step by step, through various editions and elaborations, the different stages in the evolution of Jewish liturgy.

A classical example of a modern-day scholar who utilized the Philological approach to Jewish liturgy is Dr. Louis Finkelstein. In one of his most important studies, "The Development of the 'amidah'", Dr. Finkelstein attempted to reconstruct and date the original form of what the Talmud often refers to as  $\int \text{ע'פ'פ'}$  - "the prayer" par excellence. In this study, Finkelstein compared the different names of God found in the individual benedictions of the 'amidah', examined the subject matter of each benediction, and reconstructed what he postulated to be the original form of the 'amidah' by assuming that each benediction originally consisted of a "seven-word formula" plus the hathimah.<sup>2</sup>

In the past few decades, however, a new method of studying Jewish liturgy was founded by Arthur Spanier and is being continued by his successor, Joseph Heinemann. This method is known as the "form-critical" approach.

The form-critical approach disagrees with the major premise of Classical Philology in that the latter approach assumes that the prayers were originally fixed, recorded and passed down in the form of written documents. In contrast, Heinemann and adherents to form-criticism believe that up until Talmudic times the liturgy was transmitted orally. Therefore, while the Classical Philological approach may be extremely valuable when dealing with written documents, it has almost no value when one attempts to study the early liturgy of the Jews which was passed down orally.<sup>3</sup>

According to form-criticism there are no original texts of the

prayers. Rather, there are different "patterns" and "forms" which the various versions of the prayers followed. These forms and patterns fall into five major categories: 1. Prayers of Temple origin; 2. Prayers of synagogue origin; 3. Prayers with the form-patterns of the law courts; 4. Prayers originating in private devotions; and, 5. Prayers of Beth Hamidrash origin.<sup>4</sup> Rather than attempting to date, identify or reconstruct the original versions of the prayers, form criticism is interested in determining the origin and nature of the different patterns of prayer which went into the making of the traditional Jewish liturgy. To do this, form-critics accept the following premises:

1. Until a comparatively late period, Jewish prayers were not committed to writing.
2. A variety of versions of a given prayer do not testify to its late origin.
3. A shorter version of a prayer is not necessarily the earlier one.
4. Prayers were created by the people, and not by the Sages who engaged in academic discussion.
5. Halachah was fixed after a number of versions had become current - not vice versa.
6. The task of the Sages was to select the version of prayer considered most suitable, not to create versions themselves.<sup>5</sup>

The theories postulated by form-criticism have not only reaffirmed the belief that the prayers were originally spontaneous, but have also demonstrated how fixed prayers came into being. As long as Hebrew remained the vernacular language of the Jews, there were overall set patterns for the prayer service, but the wording of the individual prayers was left open to the discretion of the worshipper. To better understand this concept an analogy can be drawn between these spontaneous prayers

and an English composition written by a college student. The student has a set outline to follow in the writing of this composition, but he is free to word the composition in his own manner. Likewise, the individual worshipper had a set pattern to follow in his formation of prayers, but he was free to word his prayers in a manner meaningful to himself.

After the destruction of the First Temple, most of the Jews were exiled to Babylon where they adopted Aramaic as their spoken language. However, it was important to these Aramaic-speaking Jews to retain Hebrew as the language of prayer. Therefore, they began the process of standardization of the prayers out of the fear that they would no longer be able to spontaneously pray in Hebrew. That is why the Palestinian rite - the prayer service adopted by the Jews who were not exiled to Babylon - has always been marked by a greater freedom and variety than the Babylonian rite - the prayer service formed by the Jews who were exiled to Babylon.<sup>6</sup>

Once the basic premises of form-criticism are adopted, there are only two areas open for discussion; correctly identifying the different categories of prayers, and correctly analyzing the characteristics of these categories. This brings us to the purpose of this work.

The late Professor Leon J. Liebreich, "one of the few specialists in Jewish Liturgy active in the United States",<sup>7</sup> in an article discussing the Rosh Hashanah Musaph 'amidah, proposed the existence of a category of prayers beginning with the word אמן. According to Liebreich, these prayers constitute a category of prayers of affirmation:





Furthermore, none of these scholars quoted above mentions the two  
 /c17 771c prayers. Liebreich, himself, did not publish a list of  
 prayers which he felt constituted his category of "prayers of affirmation  
 beginning with 771c." Therefore, when attempting to study this  
 proposed category, all of the prayers beginning with 771c must be  
 examined.

Before Heinemann published his book, 771772 771772  
771772772772 771772772,<sup>13</sup> Liebreich informed him of his pro-  
 posed category of prayers beginning with 771c. Although Heinemann  
 did not agree that these prayers form a special category, he did make  
 mention of Liebreich's suggestions:

"Professor L. Liebreich remarked to me about the  
 special nature of those blessings which begin with  
 the word 771c. It is his opinion that the  
 majority of these prayers are 'declarations of faith,'  
 and that, when combined, their contents clearly  
 form 'the major beliefs of the prayer book.'"<sup>14</sup>

This work will examine these prayers beginning with the word  
 771c in an attempt to determine whether or not they do form a  
 separate category. As such, it will take into account both the assump-  
 tions proposed by Professor Liebreich as well as Heinemann's form-  
 critical approach.

In any work of this magnitude, the first problem is how to group  
 the individual prayers for discussion. In the next four chapters, the  
 prayers are grouped according to their usage within the overall prayer  
 service. Chapter Two deals with those prayers which are used as the  
Qedushath Hayom benediction of the Sabbath and holy day 'amidoth.



Chapter Three deals with the first three benedictions of the weekday 'amidah, all of which begin with the word שְׁמִי. Chapter Four looks at the three intermediate benedictions of the Rosh Hashanah Musaph 'amidah. Finally, Chapter Five deals with the three שְׁמִי prayers found in the various 'amidoth of the Yom Kippur liturgy. For the sake of convenience, the remaining two שְׁמִי prayers will also be discussed in Chapter Five.

The next chapter, Chapter Six, will present an overview of the style, usage, and motifs found in all of the שְׁמִי prayers. Finally, Chapter Seven will contain the overall conclusions of this study, and state whether or not these "prayers of affirmation beginning with שְׁמִי" form a separate and distinct category of prayers.

## FOOTNOTES - CHAPTER ONE

1. Jakob J. Petuchowski, "A New Approach to Jewish Liturgy", in Judaism, Vol. 15, No. 1, Winter, 1966, pp. 114-120.
2. Louis Finkelstein, "The Development of the Amidah", in Jakob J. Petuchowski, ed., Contributions to the Scientific Study of Jewish Liturgy, New York, Ktav, 1970, pp. 91-177.
3. Joseph Heinemann, Prayer in the Period of the Tanna'im and the Amora'im, (Hebrew), Jerusalem, Magnes Press, 1964, p. 12.
4. Jakob J. Petuchowski, op. cit.
5. Ibid.
6. Joseph Heinemann, Prayer in the Period of the Tanna'im and the Amora'im, (Hebrew), Jerusalem, Magnes Press, 1964, p. 182.
7. Jakob J. Petuchowski, ed., Contributions to the Scientific Study of Jewish Liturgy, New York, Ktav, 1970, p. XVII.
8. Leon J. Liebreich, "Aspects of the New Year Liturgy", in Hebrew Union College Annual, Volume XXXIV, Cincinnati, 1963, pp. 160-161.
9. Ibid., p. 160, footnote 102.
10. Ze'ev Jawitz, נדרים וקריאת שמע, Berlin, 1910, pp. 13-14.
11. A. Berliner, Randbemerkungen zum täglichen Gebetbuche, II, Berlin, 1912, p. 60.
12. Louis Ginzberg, Commentary on the Palestinian Talmud, III, New York, 1941, p. 346.
13. Joseph Heinemann, Prayer in the Period of the Tanna'im and the Amora'im, (Hebrew), Jerusalem, Magnes Press, 1964.
14. Ibid., p. 26, footnote 16.

## CHAPTER TWO

Qedushath Hayom

It is interesting to note that of our fifteen קדושה prayers, six are used as introductions to the Qedushath Hayom benedictions of the Sabbath and holy day 'amidoth. Included in these six are:<sup>1</sup>

קדושת שבת : found in the Ma'arybh 'amidah for Shabbath.

קדושת מנחה : found in the Minhah 'amidah for Shabbath.

קדושת מוסף : found in the Shaharyth and Musaph 'amidoth for the three festivals; Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur.

קדושת מוסף : found in the Musaph 'amidah for Shabbath Rosh Hodesh.

This chapter will examine these Qedushath Hayom benedictions to see if there is any apparent relationship among them, or if it is simply a coincidence that more than one-third of our קדושה prayers are used in this matter.

The Development of the Qedushath Hayom.

The normal weekday 'amidah consisted originally of eighteen (now nineteen) benedictions. These benedictions fall into three groups:

1. Three opening blessings of "Praise".
2. Twelve (now thirteen) intermediate "Petitionary" blessings.
3. Three concluding benedictions of "Thanksgiving".

Traditionally, it was simply accepted that, as is stated in the Talmud, the entire 'amidah, as well as other major portions of the

liturgy, were ordained by the men of the Great Assembly, a scholarly and legislative body believed to have been functioning in Palestine from the Fifth through the Third centuries:

מכאן ואילך כנסת הגדולה תיקנו להם  
 ש'עשרה גזירות ותכילות קדושות  
 והגדלות

"Did not the men of the Great Assembly ordain  
 for Israel the blessings, 'amidoth, sanctifications,  
 and Habhdaloth?"<sup>2</sup>

Even the apparent Talmudic contradiction which ascribes the 'amidah to Simeon Ha-Pakoli (First Century C.E.)<sup>3</sup> did not alter this traditional belief.<sup>4</sup>

In the last century, however, many of these "simply-accepted" traditional theories have undergone intense investigations. Dr. Kaufmann Kohler questions whether or not there ever was a "Great Assembly".<sup>5</sup> Elbogen is of the opinion that the 'amidah, as we know it, was not developed as a single unit. Rather, he argues that the first and last sections are much older than the middle section:

"The outward pieces are as old as the oldest traditions concerning the Tefilla; the middle sections, or body of the prayer, were long in the making, their number increasing with time, their contents swelling in size, and the last finishing stage being attained only after a long period of development."<sup>6</sup>

Although Elbogen does not try to pinpoint the exact dates of development for the different sections, he does point out that the first and last sections of the 'amidah did appear in their final form as early as the days of Beth Shammai and Beth Hillel, while the middle section did not resemble its

present form until about the year 100 C.E.<sup>7</sup>

Not only do the middle petitionary blessings appear to have been developed later than the other two sections of the 'amidah', but unlike the other two sections, this section is not constant. Rather, these blessings are only found in the normal weekday 'amidah'. On the Sabbath and holy days these thirteen intermediary blessings are replaced by a single benediction known as the Qedushath Hayom (the sanctification of the day). Thus, on Sabbath and holy days the 'amidah' consists of seven benedictions:<sup>8</sup> the three opening blessings of praise, the three concluding blessings of thanksgiving and the middle Qedushath Hayom benediction.

Originally it was believed that the Qedushath Hayom benediction was substituted on the Sabbath and holy days for the intermediate petitionary blessings in accordance with the Talmudic teaching:

אָפּען אַלעס וואָס איז צו אונזערע  
נאָדערן אָפּען אַלעס וואָס איז צו אונזערע

"It is forbidden for a man to demand for his own needs on the Sabbath."<sup>9</sup>

However, now it is generally accepted that the Sabbath and holy day 'amidah' developed independently from the weekday 'amidah'. Joseph Heinemann explains for us:

"It is clear that the seven berahoth for Sabbath and festivals are not an abbreviation of the eighteen berahoth, but are rather another (independent) tradition of an 'order of prayers'."<sup>10</sup>

The facts seem to coincide with this opinion. The seven-blessing 'amidah' for Sabbath and holy days is mentioned as early as the time of the Hillelites and Shammaites.<sup>11</sup> Although we know that there was also a

weekday 'amidah during this period, the middle petitions were not yet fixed.<sup>12</sup> Therefore, it seems very unlikely that the earlier fixed tradition of having seven berahoth on the Sabbath and holy days developed as a substitute for the later tradition of eighteen berahoth on weekdays. Rather, it would appear that Heinemann is correct when he theorizes that there were a "number of different 'orders of prayers' . . . which all had some subjects and some features in common with one another and with the 'amidah as we know it,"<sup>13</sup>

### The Sabbath Qedushath Hayom.

There are many different explanations showing the link between the three different Qedushath Hayom benedictions used today on the Sabbath. For example, by studying the context of each Berahah, Franz Rosenzweig shows how the themes of each blessing follow historically one after the other. The Friday evening benediction, ברכה בראשית, is about "Creation", the Saturday morning benediction, ברכה נאמן, is about the "Revelation" at Sinai, and the Saturday afternoon benediction, ברכה אחרית, is about the future "Redemption" of the Jews.<sup>14</sup>

Baer shows the link among these three benedictions by using the first important word of each. He draws the analogy to a wedding where the Sabbath is the bride and God is the groom. ברכה בראשית of Friday night represents the קידושין which takes place between the bride and the groom. ברכה נאמן of Saturday morning is the "rejoicing" that the bride and groom feel at the wedding ceremony. And, ברכה אחרית of Saturday afternoon is the "uniting" of the bride and groom.<sup>15</sup>



Although both of these explanations show a definite relationship among the three Qedushath Hayom benedictions now in use on the Sabbath, it is rather doubtful that they had any bearing on the composition of the individual prayers. Rather, it appears that these explanations were developed in the true Midrashic fashion of showing a relationship among already independently existing entities.

Further research indicated that this assumption is valid. Neither the שחרית prayer for Ma'arybh, nor the ערבית prayer for Minhah were the original prayers used during these 'amidoth. In both cases, other prayers existed which were more preferred.

שחרית ערבית.

Another accepted prayer for Qedushath Hayom benediction of the Shabbath Ma'arybh service read as follows:

וּמֵאֲהַבְתָּךְ ה' אֱלֹהֵינוּ שֶׁאָהַבְתָּ אֶת יִשְׂרָאֵל  
עִמָּךְ וּמֵחַמְלֶתְךָ מֵחַמְלֶת עָלֵינוּ גְּדֻלַּת גְּבוּרַתְךָ  
עָלֵינוּ ה' אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֶת יוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת הַזֶּה וְהַקָּדוֹשׁ הַזֶּה  
בְּאֲהָבָה עֲדֻלָּה וְעֲדֻלָּה לְקַדְּשׁ וּלְחַנּוּךְ עַצְמוֹ  
וְלִבְנוֹתָ לְעָמוֹת וְלָעָרִים וְלְתַפְאֻרָתָ. וְלֵתֵת עָלֵינוּ  
בְּרָכָה וְשָׁלוֹם מִאֲתֶיךָ.

"With Your love, O Lord our God, with which You have loved Your nation Israel, and with Your compassion, our King, which You have bestowed upon the children of Your covenant, You gave us, O Lord our God, this great and holy seventh day in love - for greatness and for strength, for sanctification and for rest, for worship and for rendering thanks. (It is) a sign and a covenant, and a glorification, and it gives us blessing and peace from You." <sup>16</sup>

This is definitely a later rendition of the prayer said by R. Zadok on Friday evening. <sup>17</sup> Because this prayer is mentioned in the Tosephta,

Eliezer Levi argued that it was the desired passage.<sup>18</sup>

Scholars agree that this prayer is probably of Palestinian origin and earlier than the  $\text{אֱלֹהֵינוּ}$ . Abrahams agrees with Zunz that even though the text of  $\text{אֱלֹהֵינוּ}$  is not cited in the Talmud, it originated in the Talmudic period.<sup>19</sup> Idelsohn tells us that  $\text{אֱלֹהֵינוּ}$  is the earlier Palestinian prayer while  $\text{אֱלֹהֵינוּ}$  is the later Babylonian rite.<sup>20</sup> And, Jacob Mann has shown through Genizah fragments that  $\text{אֱלֹהֵינוּ}$  was the accepted prayer in the Palestinian rite.<sup>21</sup>

We do know that even though  $\text{אֱלֹהֵינוּ}$  was the preferred prayer,  $\text{אֱלֹהֵינוּ}$  was used in France and Provence.<sup>22</sup> As time went on, and the prayerbook began to take on its present form, the  $\text{אֱלֹהֵינוּ}$  benediction became more and more widespread, so that today, every rite uses this Babylonian prayer. What is of interest to us in this study is that nowhere is a reason given why this less-preferred prayer became so generally and totally accepted. Could it perhaps have anything to do with the fact that this prayer begins with the word  $\text{אֱלֹהֵינוּ}$ ? I shall return to this question at the end of this chapter.

$\text{אֱלֹהֵינוּ}$   $\text{אֱלֹהֵינוּ}$ .

A Palestinian version of the Qedushath Hayom benediction for the Shabbath Minhah service reads:

הַיְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ כִּי אַתָּה אֱלֹהֵינוּ  
וְאַתָּה יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ מְהֵרָה כִּי אַתָּה יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ  
שֶׁמֶת הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה הַזֶּה וְהַיּוֹם הַזֶּה שְׁלֵמָה  
עַל יְהוּדָה עַל יִשְׂרָאֵל וְעַל כָּל הָעָם הַזֶּה הַזֶּה



והקדוש היה. כי יום שבת וקדוש הוא מאד  
 גשיות הן וינחמו כבוד רבונך. ואף תבא  
 מנוחתנו מנוחת אברהם ויצחק מנוחת שלום  
 השקט והטוב. מנוחת אמת ורצון מנוחת  
 שלמה שאמר כופה זה. וכיון ויצאו קנים  
 כי מאתך היא מנוחתם ואף מנוחתם יקדים  
 אות שמך כרצונך.  
 "Cause us to rest, O Lord our God, for You are  
 our Father and may You rule over us speedily;  
 for You formed us for the sake of Your name -  
 God who is the great, mighty, and awe-inspiring  
 King - who calls Israel His people and this seventh  
 day great and holy. For it is a great and holy day  
 before You, on which we abstain from work and rest  
 according to the commandments of Your will. Cause  
 our rest to be one of love and dedication, a rest of  
 peace, quiet, and security, a rest of truth and  
 willingness, a full rest according to Your desires.  
 Then Your children will recognize and know that  
 their rest is from You and through Your rest will  
 they sanctify Your name according to Your will."<sup>23</sup>

Both 'Amram and Sa'adyah have various versions of this prayer in  
 their respective Siddurim, and both agree that it is preferred over the  
 אלהיך ברכה benediction.<sup>24</sup>

However, in contrast to the אלהיך ברכה benediction of Friday  
 night, we do know why the less preferred אלהיך ברכה prayer became  
 the accepted version. Apparently its usage became widespread because  
 of a popular Midrash found quoted in the Tosaphoth.<sup>25</sup> This Midrash ex-  
 plains for us that the אלהיך ברכה prayer proves how God, Israel and  
 the Sabbath all testify to the uniqueness of one another. Israel and God  
 testify that the Sabbath is the day of rest. Israel and the Sabbath testify  
 that God is One. And, God and the Sabbath testify that Israel is chosen  
 among the nations. Therefore, the Tosaphoth explains, אלהיך ברכה

became the accepted prayer even though it does not speak of the importance of the day. The Mahzor Vitry further tells us that even the "early sages" said אֵלֶּה הַפְּסָקִים because of this Midrash.<sup>26</sup>

Zunz states that the אֵלֶּה הַפְּסָקִים prayer was added after the redaction of the Babylonian Talmud.<sup>27</sup> Still, though, many themes of this prayer find their origin in Talmudic tradition. For example, the line

אֵלֶּה הַפְּסָקִים follows the Talmudic and Rabbinic tradition that the Patriarchs observed the Sabbath.<sup>28</sup>

It is clear that like the אֵלֶּה הַפְּסָקִים prayer, the אֵלֶּה הַפְּסָקִים benediction is also of Babylonian origin. Furthermore, neither of these prayers is mentioned in the Talmud. Is it merely coincidence, or is there an underlying relationship between the two? Again, this question will be examined at the end of this chapter.

אֵלֶּה הַפְּסָקִים .

Only when the Sabbath is also Rosh Hodesh do we find an אֵלֶּה הַפְּסָקִים prayer as the introduction to the Qedushath Hayom benediction of the Musaph 'amidah. We know from the Tosephta that there was a special prayer said during the Qedushath Hayom benediction for Musaph Shabbath Rosh Hodesh.<sup>29</sup> However, we do not know the exact version of this prayer which they said.

Similar versions to our present-day אֵלֶּה הַפְּסָקִים prayer are cited in all other rituals. It therefore appears that perhaps an earlier version of this prayer was always said both in the Palestinian and the Babylonian rites. However, the possibility still remains that as more

fragments are identified and interpreted, a variant Palestinian version of this prayer may be discovered.

אתה החרתנו.

The Qedushath Hayom benediction for all of the festival and high holiday 'amidoth begins with the אתה החרתנו prayer:

אתה החרתנו מכל העמים ייבחרתנו  
 אלהינו ונצית גן. ורוממתנו מכל  
 כל שניות וקדשתנו גמלותיך וקדשתנו  
 מלכנו עזרתך ושמך בארץ וקדוּס  
 עז'נו קדוּס.

"You chose us from all the nations, You loved us and delighted in us. You exalted us above all tongues by making us holy in Your commandments. You have drawn us near, O our King, to Your worship and called us by Your great and holy name."

Unlike the Sabbath Qedushath Hayom benedictions, all of which deal with some particular important feature of the Sabbath day, this benediction deals with a general theme; Israel as the "Chosen People" of God. Hertz offers this comment about the אתה החרתנו prayer:

"Nowhere is the idea of Israel's Selection so clearly and jubilantly expressed as in this anthem. Recurring in the Amidahs of all the Festivals, it expresses an axiomatic conviction that Israel is the Chosen People, called in a special degree to God's service."<sup>30</sup>

Actually, though, it is questionable whether or not this prayer should be called a Qedushath Hayom benediction, because it does not really deal with the "holiness of the day". Rashi, in a discussion about this very issue, tells us that the term Qedushath Hayom applies specifically to the

prayer beginning  $\text{אֱלֹהֵינוּ}$ , one which does deal with the importance of the holiday.<sup>31</sup>

In the Talmud, we find mention of the  $\text{אֱלֹהֵינוּ}$  prayer being used as the beginning of the Yom Kippur Ne'ilah service.<sup>32</sup> However, we find no specific reference in the Talmud to this prayer being used as the Qedushath Hayom benediction. Yet, all of the sources agree that this prayer was always used for this purpose.

This brings us to a very interesting theory, one which was first stated by Elbogen, and later supported by Kaufmann Kohler.<sup>33</sup> Both of these scholars contend that the Qedushath Hayom benediction for both the Sabbath and festival 'amidoth had originally the same construction, and possibly originally began  $\text{אֱלֹהֵינוּ}$ . In other words, the introduction to every Qedushath Hayom benediction, whether on the Sabbath or on a holy day, was the  $\text{אֱלֹהֵינוּ}$  prayer which is now used on all the festivals.

To offer proof for this theory, Elbogen points out that the  $\text{אֱלֹהֵינוּ}$  prayer, because it has pure Hebrew diction, must be older than the Sabbath Qedushath Hayom benediction.<sup>34</sup> Zunz also feels that this is the case. He argues that the  $\text{אֱלֹהֵינוּ}$  prayer is of ancient Hasi-dean composition, while the three Sabbath prayers are the product of the Babylonian Amora'im.<sup>35</sup>

If this is the case, then it is quite possible that the  $\text{אֱלֹהֵינוּ}$  was used in all the Qedushath Hayom benedictions, for we already know that such a benediction existed in the time of the Hillelites and Shammaites.

The logical evolutionary pattern of history also offers proof for this theory. Throughout history it has normally been the pattern to begin with a general concept, and then to move toward the specifics. In Judaism, a good example of this would be the way in which our Halakhah was developed. We started with the general laws stated in the Bible. From here, the Rabbis and scholars expounded on these laws to make them applicable to specific cases. True, there are cases where a specific law in the Bible has been expanded into a general rule. However, these cases are the exception, and the natural order is to move from the general concept to the specific. For example, the Bible tells us in very general terms that anyone connected with our household, including ourselves, should refrain from work on the Sabbath.<sup>36</sup> After expounding on this principle, the Rabbis and scholars developed thirty-nine specific categories of work from which we should refrain on the Sabbath.

This could also very easily be the case in liturgy. The early "orders of prayer" could have had a general Qedushath Hayom benediction dealing with the "Chosen People" concept, whose wording was not restricted to any one festival. This prayer could then have been followed by another prayer mentioning the individual holiday (possibly the אמנו ליו prayer which follows the אמנו ליו on all festivals today).

As the liturgy developed and became more sophisticated, it could have then been decided that the Sabbath, both because of its importance and because of its frequency, was in need of a more specific prayer in place of the אמנו ליו. However, the אמנו ליו was



retained for festivals and holy days because they were less frequent during the year.

Of course, we know that the development and evolution of our liturgy did not occur due to a snap decision such as the one hypothesized above. Rather, it was a long and very much localized process. Perhaps, though, that is why different places developed different prayers to be said during the Sabbath 'amidoth. Once the tradition was started that אמרת did not necessarily have to be the Qedushath Hayom benediction on the Sabbath, the forces of human nature took over, and different places developed different favorite prayers which they used in its place. This could be why the Babylonian and Palestinian rites differ as to what prayer was said.

What is of interest to us in this study is that both the אמרת קדש of Friday night and the אמרת קדש of Saturday afternoon are products of the Babylonian Rabbis. Could it be possible, following the form-critical approach developed by Heinemann, that the form of both of these prayers was influenced by the form of the אמרת קדש? In other words, could the Babylonian Amora'im have begun both of these prayers with the word אמרת because the original prayer which they were replacing also began with אמרת?

If this is the case, then a definite relationship can be established among all of our Qedushath Hayom benedictions which begin with the word אמרת. They all begin that way because they were based on the form of the אמרת קדש prayer. With any postulated theory, how-

ever, there is always a difficulty. In this case it is the fact that the Saturday morning Qedushath Hayom benediction does not begin with  $\text{קדוש}$ , but rather  $\text{הן הנה}$ .

According to the Talmud, this prayer did not always begin  $\text{הנה}$   $\text{הן}$ , but rather originally began  $\text{קדוש קדוש}$ .<sup>37</sup> Kohler argues that this prayer is the earliest of our three existing Qedushath Hayom benedictions for the Sabbath.<sup>38</sup> If this is the case, then our form-critical approach to  $\text{קדוש קדוש}$  and  $\text{קדוש קדוש}$  could still be valid.  $\text{הן הנה}$  could have already been part of the liturgy before the composition of our two  $\text{קדוש}$  prayers under consideration.

Now we are ready to answer the question raised at the beginning of this chapter; is it merely a coincidence that more than one-third of our prayers are used as Qedushath Hayom benedictions? Possibly it is merely a coincidence. But, if one accepts the fact that both  $\text{קדוש קדוש}$  and  $\text{קדוש קדוש}$  are products of the Babylonian Amora'im, and the assumption that  $\text{קדוש קדוש}$  is the oldest Qedushath Hayom benediction and quite possibly was used on the Sabbath as well as on the holy days, then a definite relationship can be established among these prayers by using Heinemann's form-critical approach.

## FOOTNOTES - CHAPTER TWO

1. תפילין and שופר which are used as the introductions to the Zikhronoth and Shopharoth sections of the Musaph 'amidah for Rosh Hashanah respectively, are included in the six but will be discussed in Chapter Four.
  2. B. Berakhoth 33a.
  3. B. Berakhoth 28b: תפילין ששון הפקודי הסדיר שניהם  
אשרה ברכות לפני רבן אמאי על הסדר ג' תפילין.
  4. According to Dr. Petuchowski: "the operative word here is 'arranged' (hisdir), and not 'ordained' or 'instituted' - which, of course, left open the exegetical possibility of arguing that the prayers of the Men of the Great Assembly had been forgotten in the interim, and that Simeon Ha-Pakoli restored them to public knowledge - an exegetical possibility which, in fact, did not escape the Talmud. (b. Megillah 18a)."
- See: Jakob J. Petuchowski, ed., Contributions to the Scientific Study of Jewish Liturgy, New York, Ktav, 1970, p. XII.
5. K. Kohler, "The Origin and Composition of the Eighteen Benedictions with a Translation of the Corresponding Essene Prayers in the Apostolic Constitutions", in Jakob J. Petuchowski, ed., Contributions to the Scientific Study of Jewish Liturgy, New York, Ktav, 1970, pp. 52-55.
  6. I. Elbogen, "Studies in the Jewish Liturgy", in Jakob J. Petuchowski, ed., Contributions to the Scientific Study of Jewish Liturgy, New York, Ktav, 1970, p. 46.
  7. Ibid.
  8. The exception to this is the Rosh Hashanah Musaph 'amidah which consists of nine benedictions. This 'amidah will be discussed in detail in Chapter Four.
  9. Y. Shabbath, XV, 3, Krotoshin ed., p. 15b.
  10. Joseph Heinemann, Prayer in the Period of the Tanna'im and the Amora'im, (Hebrew), Jerusalem, Magnes Press, 1964, p. 143.
  11. Tosephta Berakhoth 3.12, Lieberman ed., Vol. 1, p. 15.
  12. B. Berakhoth 34a: 730 תפילין / ע"פ מ"א 311



13. Heinemann, op. cit., pp. 139-140.
14. Franz Rosenzweig, Der Stern der Erlösung, Book III, Berlin, 1930, pp. 65-67.
15. S. Baer, Seder Abhodath Yisrael, Rödelheim, 1868, p. 262.
16. Seder Rabh 'Amram Gaon, Goldschmidt ed., Jerusalem, 1971, p. 63.
17. Tosephta Berakhoth 3.7, Lieberman ed., pp. 13-14.  
אמר ר' אלעזר בר צדוק אבא הוה מתפלל בתפילה  
קצרה קצרה שבת מואהתק ה' אצילן שאהיה את ושב  
עמך ומחמתק מלכנו שחמלת על בני בריתך ונתת לנו  
ה' אצילן את יום הוהדיע' הגדול והקדוש הגהה האהבה.
18. Eliezer Levi, התפילה סיומת, Tel-Aviv, Abraham  
Zioni Publishing House, 1954, p. 193.
19. Israel Abrahams, A Companion to the Authorized Daily Prayerbook,  
New York, Hermon Press, 1966, p. 130.
20. A. Z. Idelsohn, Jewish Liturgy and its Development, New York,  
Schocken Books, 1967, p. 132.
21. Jacob Mann, "Genizah Fragments of the Palestinian Order of  
Service", in Jakob J. Petuchowski, ed., Contributions to the  
Scientific Study of Jewish Liturgy, New York, Ktav, 1970, p. 422.
22. Sepher Hammanhig, Sabbath 5, Berlin, Kornegg, 1855.
23. Abraham I. Schechter, Studies in Jewish Liturgy, Philadelphia,  
Dropsie College, 1930, p. 114.
24. Seder Rabh 'Amram Hashalem, op. cit., p. 79.  
Seder Rabh Sa'adyah Gaon, Davidson, Assaf & Joel ed., Jerusalem,  
1941, p. 113.
25. Tosaphoth to b. Hagiyyah 3b, ואמר כעמך 'שכאן.
26. Mahzor Vitry, S. Hurwitz ed., Berlin, 1893, pp. 138-139.
27. A. Z. Idelsohn, op. cit., p. 32.
28. B. Yoma 21b and 28b,  
Berashiyt Rabbah II, 7-9, Raam ed., Jerusalem, 1970, Vol. 1,  
pp. 28b-29a.

29. Tosephta Berakhoth 3.11, Lieberman ed., Vol. 1, p. 15.
30. Joseph H. Hertz, The Authorized Daily Prayer Book, New York, Bloch Publishing Company, 1946, p. 798.
31. Rashi to b. Betzah 17a.
32. B. Yoma 86b: "אין ארבעה עשרה ימים, ארבעה עשרה ימים, ארבעה עשרה ימים, ארבעה עשרה ימים"
33. K. Kohler, op. cit., p. 73.  
 also: Isamar Elbogen, Der judische Gottesdienst in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung, Leipzig, 1913, p. 110.
34. Isamar Elbogen, op. cit.
35. K. Kohler, op. cit.
36. Exodus 20:8-11,  
 Deuteronomy 5:12-15.
37. B. Pesahim 117b.
38. K. Kohler, op. cit., p. 74.

## CHAPTER THREE

Gebhuroth, Qedushath Ha-shem and Binah

The second, third and fourth blessings of the weekday 'amidah all begin with the word יְהוָה. As we have noted in the previous chapter, the second and third blessings are opening blessings of "Praise", and constitute the oldest benedictions of the 'amidah. The fourth blessing, the blessing for wisdom, is the first of the intermediate "Petitionary" blessings. As in the last chapter, we shall examine each of these blessings individually, and then together to see if there is a relationship in the fact that they all begin with the word יְהוָה.

יְהוָה יְהוָה

The Gebhuroth blessing, the second benediction of every 'amidah, is most often referred to as a description of "the God of Nature". As such, it deals with the "powers" of God, including His rule over the natural laws of the earth. Hertz offers this general description of the Gebhuroth blessing:

"The appeal to History (referring to the Abhoth blessing), the sphere of God's supreme revelation, is now reinforced by an appeal to Nature as displaying the power and goodness of God. From the distant past, the worshipper turns to the distant future, and hails God as the King who alone is mighty to save. The God of the Past and Future is also the God who lovingly sustains the living in all the vicissitudes of earthly existence, and Whose infinite faithfulness remembers and redeems them that sleep in the dust."<sup>1</sup>

Thematically, our present day Gebhuroth benediction deals with a multitude of "powers" of God, most of which can be traced directly to

Biblical verses. For example, "supporting the fallen" comes from

Psalms 145.14: "וְיִגְדֹּל לְכָל הַכַּשְׁוִּים" "freeing the captives" is from Psalms 146.7: "עֲשֵׂה מֵשֶׁטַע לְעֹשֵׂי רָעָה וְלֹא יִתֵּן לָהֶם לֶחֶם"

"לֶחֶם" and the theme of resurrection is found in I Samuel 2.6: "וְיָשׁוּעַ מֵאֲדָמָה מִמָּוֶת"

Other themes found in this blessing include "healing the sick" - "וְיִרְפֶּה"

"וְיִרְפֶּה" , "being gracious to the living" - "וְיִרְפֶּה חַיִּים"

and "uplifting the downtrodden" - "וְיִרְפֶּה אֶת הַדֹּחֵק"

It appears that these various themes might be somewhat unrelated, but Baer explains for us that they all deal with various "powers" (gebhuroth) of God.<sup>2</sup> Hence, this prayer is called the Gebhuroth benediction. The relationship between God's various powers discussed in this blessing is found in the Rabbinic sources as well. In the Jerusalem Talmud we find:<sup>3</sup>

וְכֵן שֶׁחַיִּית הַמַּתִּים חַיִּים לְעוֹלָם כֵּן  
וְכֵן שֶׁחַיִּים חַיִּים לְעוֹלָם. דֵּכֵן מִלְּכִירִים  
בֵּית הַמַּתִּים בְּגִדְרָתָא

Just as the Resurrection of the Dead means life for the world, so too "causing rain to fall" means life for the world. Therefore, we mention the insert about rain in this blessing.

And, the Babylonian Talmud reads:<sup>4</sup>

מִהַ לְדַגְרוּתָא? לְמַדּוּם שִׁינְדִּים בְּגִדְרָתָא

What are Powers? Rain that falls by God's might.

As any student of liturgy knows, the theme expressed in the Hathimah, the final blessing of a benediction, is usually the most important theme of that benediction. In this case, however, because the Gebhuroth benediction is one of the oldest congregational prayers, we are able to trace

how, as the main theme of this prayer changed, so did the Hathimah.

Louis Ginzberg argues that the theme of resurrection, the current theme found in this prayer's Hathimah is a later insertion. Originally, he states, the theme of this prayer was that God, the Mighty One, would save Israel, through his mighty Power, from her enemies. Gebhurah, the original name of this prayer, was a synonym for God and represented this omnipotent power with which He would save Israel.<sup>5</sup> Finkelstein supports this opinion by arguing that the emphasis on resurrection in this prayer is probably due to the controversy between the Sadducees and the Pharisees; a period which occurred after the original formation of this prayer.

According to Finkelstein, the mention of resurrection can only be taken as a confession of faith in Pharisaism as opposed to Sadduceeism.<sup>6</sup> Because this confession of faith had political as well as religious significance, it was deemed important enough to change the Hathimah to its present form:

הַיְּהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ הוּא הַיּוֹשֵׁב הַגָּבוֹה. However, since resurrection was a theme which was later inserted into this important prayer, the preferred name of this prayer became Gebhuroth; in order to imply that resurrection is merely one of the many powers of God.<sup>7</sup>

Two variant Palestinian versions of this benediction are known.

They read as follows:<sup>8</sup>

version a: אַתָּה גָּבוֹר מְשַׁלֵּם לְאֹיִב חַיִּים  
וּמַדִּין עֲרִיצִים וְתִי עֲרִיצִים מִקִּיָּם מִתִּיב מִשֵּׁי הַדָּרוֹם  
וּמִזֵּרֵי הַסֶּלַע מִכָּל כֶּף חַיִּים מִחַיֵּה הַמֵּתִים  
כְּהוֹלֵץ עֵין יְשׁוּעָה לְכָל תַּצְמִיחַ הַדָּרוֹם אַתָּה  
הוּא מִחַיֵּה הַמֵּתִים

You are Mighty, bringing low the haughty, strong,  
bringing judgment to the tyrants, eternally alive,



raising the dead, causing the wind to blow and the dew to fall, sustaining the living, resurrecting the dead, at the wink of an eye You bring forth our salvation. Praised are You, O Lord, who gives life to the dead.

version b:   
 עוֹתֵה לְרוּחַ אֶת־כָּל־חַיִּים וְלִדְמָתָא  
 מְחַיֵּה הַמֵּתִים וְלִמְחֵי הַחַיִּים  
 מְחַיֵּה הַמֵּתִים

You are Mighty, and there is none like You, strong, and there is none besides You. You cause the wind to blow and the rain to fall. You sustain the living and give life to the dead. You are mighty to save. Praised are You, O Lord, who gives life to the dead.

What is of major interest to us in this study is that both of these versions begin with the word עוֹתֵה. It appears then, that in all rites, the Gebhuroth benediction was a very early עוֹתֵה prayer, which later dealt primarily with the theme of resurrection.

עוֹתֵה קְדוּשָׁה

The Qedushath Ha-shem benediction, the third benediction of every 'amidah throughout the year, speaks of the holiness of God and His holy name. He is the God over a holy people who praise Him daily.

This benediction presents a number of interesting insights for our study, for two Babylonian as well as two Palestinian versions of this prayer are known. The two Babylonian versions are cited in Seder R. Amram and Seder R. Sa'adyah Gaon. Amram's version reads:

לְרוּחַ וְלִדְמָתָא כִּי הוּא לְעוֹלָם מְרוּם  
 וְקָדוֹם וְשֶׁהָקֵם אֶת־כָּל־חַיִּים וְלִמְחֵי הַחַיִּים  
 וְלִמְחֵי הַמֵּתִים וְלִמְחֵי הַחַיִּים  
 הוּא הַקָּדוֹם

Unto all generations they proclaimed God as King, for He alone is exalted and holy. Your praise, O our God, shall never depart from our mouths for

You are a great and holy King. Praised are You,  
O Lord, the holy God.<sup>9</sup>

And, Sa'adyah's version is:

אֱלֹהֵי קִדְשׁ אֱמֶת קִדְשׁ וְיִתְרוֹ קִדְשׁ אֲכַסְיָא  
קִדְשׁ וְקִדְשֵׁימָא בְּכֹל יוֹם יִתְפַּלֵּל סֵלָה בְּרוּךְ אַתָּה  
יְיָ הֵאָלֹהִי בְּקִדְשׁ

You are holy and Your name is holy. Your title is  
holy and Your throne is holy. Holy beings praise  
You every day. Selah. Praised are You, O Lord,  
the holy God.<sup>10</sup>

All other Babylonian rituals have one or the other of these forms.

For example, the Rambam quotes Sa'adyah's version while Mahzor Romah  
follows Amram's. According to Baer, the Ashkenazim follow a variant of  
Sa'adyah's version, while the Sephardim add the line.

בִּי אֵל מִלֵּךְ  
יִתְפַּלֵּל  
אֱלֹהֵי קִדְשׁ וְקִדְשֵׁימָא taken from Amram's version after the words  
סֵלָה , of Sa'adyah's.<sup>11</sup>

According to Finkelstein, the text cited by R. Sa'adyah Gaon is an  
expression of mystic doctrines. He states that "the statement 'and Holy  
beings praise Thee daily,' is a declaration of faith in angeology."<sup>12</sup> Even  
though Amram's version is not viewed mystically, both versions seem to  
imply the existence of the mystical Qedushah. The form קִדְשׁ וְקִדְשֵׁימָא is  
obviously a response to the last verse of the Qedushah, while the form

אֱלֹהֵי קִדְשׁ has the same mystic implications found in the Qedushah.<sup>13</sup>

The best known Palestinian version of the Qedushath Ha-shem  
benediction is cited for us by Schechter:<sup>14</sup>

קִדְשׁ אַתָּה וְשִׁמְךָ אֱמֶת וְיִתְרוֹ אֱמֶת וְיִתְרוֹ אֱמֶת  
בְּרוּךְ אַתָּה יְיָ הֵאָלֹהִי בְּקִדְשׁ

You are holy and Your name is awesome. There is

no God besides You. Praised are You, O Lord,  
the holy God.

Finkelstein, in commenting on this version of the Palestinian Qedushath Ha-shem benediction, concludes that, like the Gebhuroth benediction, this benediction is also a confession of faith in Pharisaic Judaism. He contends, however, that it was not directed against the Sadducees, as is the case of the Gebhuroth benediction, but rather against the Christians:

"The statement 'There is no God besides Thee,' seems to leave no doubt as to that matter; and the emphasis on the holiness of God and the awe-inspiring character of His Name probably is intended to call attention to what the Pharisee regarded as sacrilegious in Christian teachings."<sup>15</sup>

It is interesting to note that this version of the Palestinian Qedushath Ha-shem is preserved for us in the present-day Rosh Hashanah liturgy. In fact, Seder R. Amram, whose normal weekday Qedushath Ha-shem begins וְיִשְׂרָאֵל אֱלֹהֵינוּ, cites an expanded version of this Palestinian version to be said on Rosh Hashanah:

וְיִשְׂרָאֵל אֱלֹהֵינוּ וְיִשְׂרָאֵל אֱלֹהֵינוּ  
וְיִשְׂרָאֵל אֱלֹהֵינוּ וְיִשְׂרָאֵל אֱלֹהֵינוּ  
וְיִשְׂרָאֵל אֱלֹהֵינוּ וְיִשְׂרָאֵל אֱלֹהֵינוּ  
You are holy and Your name is awesome. There  
is no God besides You, as it is written: "The Lord  
of hosts is exalted in justice, the holy King is  
sanctified in righteousness." Praised are You,  
O Lord, the holy King.<sup>16</sup>

The compiler of the Siphre knew this Palestinian version as the normal benediction said every day:<sup>17</sup>

Even the "Eighteen Benedictions", which the early sages ordained in order that Israel should pray them,



did not begin to state the needs of Israel until after the praises of God, as it is written, "The great, mighty, and awe-inspiring God. You are holy and Your name is awesome."

Based on this passage in the Siphre, Baer concluded that this version of the Qedushath Ha-shem was used also on weekdays.<sup>18</sup>

The second Palestinian version of the Qedushath Ha-shem benediction known to us reads:<sup>19</sup>

אֱלֹהֵינוּ קָדוֹם וְאֵמֶן קָדוֹשׁ וְיִשְׂרָאֵל קָדוֹשׁ  
קָדוֹשׁ בְּרוּךְ אַתָּה ה' הָאֵל הַקָּדוֹשׁ

You are holy and Your name is holy. To You the holy ones proclaim, "holy". Praised are You, O Lord, the holy God.

According to Elbogen, this second Palestinian version of the Qedushath Ha-shem benediction corresponds to version "a" of the Palestinian Gebhuroth benediction (see page 27 above).<sup>21</sup>

What is of obvious interest to this study is the fact that this second Palestinian Qedushath Ha-shem benediction begins with the word אֱלֹהֵינוּ. Thus, we can see that both the Babylonians and the Palestinians had a version of the 'amidah which contained a Qedushath Ha-shem benediction beginning with the word אֱלֹהֵינוּ. However, both also had a version of the benediction which began with a word other than אֱלֹהֵינוּ.

אֱלֹהֵינוּ חַי וְקַי

The first intermediate "petitionary" blessing of the weekday 'amidah is the blessing for wisdom, which reads:

אֱלֹהֵינוּ חַי וְקַי וְאֵמֶן קָדוֹשׁ וְיִשְׂרָאֵל קָדוֹשׁ  
קָדוֹשׁ בְּרוּךְ אַתָּה ה' הָאֵל הַקָּדוֹשׁ  
ה' חַי וְקַי וְאֵמֶן קָדוֹשׁ וְיִשְׂרָאֵל קָדוֹשׁ

You favor man with wisdom and teach humans understanding. Favor us with knowledge, understanding, and discernment from You. Praised are You, O Lord, gracious giver of knowledge.

There are many different reasons stated to justify why this "blessing for wisdom" should rightfully be the first intermediate benediction.

Although the Talmud states that there is no specific order to the intermediate benedictions,<sup>22</sup> it does state that the "blessing for wisdom" is the most important petition and should therefore follow directly after the Qedushath Ha-shem. In Berakhoth we read:<sup>23</sup>

Rav Ami said: Wisdom is so great that the request for it has been placed at the beginning of the week-day blessings.

And, in Megillah we find:<sup>24</sup>

And why did they see fit to say "Binah" after Qedushah? Because it is written: "And they sanctified the Holy One of Jacob, and the God of Israel they praised." And close to it, it is written: "They also that err in spirit shall come to understanding."

The Jerusalem Talmud also cites the prayer for wisdom as the first intermediate petition:<sup>25</sup>

Those who ordained this prayer ordained it according to an "order". Three opening blessings and three concluding blessings - Praises of God - and the intermediary blessings - petitions of man - "Bestow upon us wisdom . . ."

Finally, Judah Halevy, in stating a popular viewpoint of his time, argues that ללמוד תורה should be the first petition because through wisdom and understanding man makes himself close to God.<sup>26</sup>

In the corresponding Palestinian version of this blessing, the first

sentence is omitted leaving only the petition grouped into two parallel members:<sup>27</sup>

חַיְנוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ דְּיָדְךָ מֵאֵתְךָ וּדְיָדְךָ וְנִסְכְּךָ  
מִתּוֹרַתְךָ גְּרוֹן אֱמֶת ה' חַיְנוּ הַדָּת

Favor us, O our Father, with wisdom from You, and understanding and discernment from Your Torah. Praised are You, O Lord, gracious giver of knowledge.

Levi holds the opinion that this is the version of the prayer referred to in the quote cited above from the Jerusalem Talmud.<sup>28</sup> If that is the case, then it appears that the חַיְנוּ אֱמֶת line of this benediction was developed for use solely in Babylon.<sup>29</sup>

It must not escape our attention that the חַיְנוּ אֱמֶת benediction is the only daily intermediate petition which begins with the word אֱמֶת. There is, however, an אֱמֶת prayer which is inserted into the חַיְנוּ benediction at the conclusion of the Sabbath and festivals. This prayer reads as follows:

אֱמֶת חַיְנוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ לְמַעַן תַּעֲזֹרֵנוּ וְתַלְמִידֵינוּ לְעֹשֵׂי  
הַקִּי רְצוֹן וְתַגְדֹּל ה' אֱלֹהֵינוּ בֵּין קֹדֶשׁ לְחֹל  
בֵּין אֱמֶת לְחֹשֶׁךְ בֵּין יִשְׂרָאֵל לְעַמִּים בֵּין יוֹם  
הַשַּׁבָּת לְעַמִּים יְמֵי הַמַּעֲשֶׂה אֱמֶת מִלְכֵנוּ  
הַחַי עֲלֵינוּ הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה וְלִקְרֹאֵתָנוּ לְשֵׁלוֹם  
הַשׁוֹכִים מִכָּל חַטָּא וּמִתּוֹקִים יִמְכַּח עוֹן וְהַדְּבָרִים גִּדְּלוּ  
You have favored us with knowledge of Your law, and have taught us to perform the statutes of Your will. You have made a distinction, O Lord our God, between holy and profane, between light and darkness, between Israel and the other nations, between the seventh day and the six working days. O our Father, our King, let the days which are approaching us begin for us in peace. Let us be withheld from all sin, cleansed from all iniquity, and attached to Your commandments.

Ginzberg argues that the appearance of this prayer in the Motze'i

Shabbath service resulted in the  $\int\int\int\int$   $\text{הַשְׁמֵךְ}$  benediction being used during the daily 'amidah.<sup>30</sup> If this is the case, then it is very possible that this prayer begins with the word  $\text{הַשְׁמֵךְ}$  simply because it was written as a substitute for  $\int\int\int\int$   $\text{הַשְׁמֵךְ}$ . In any case, of all the daily thirteen intermediate petitions,  $\int\int\int\int$   $\text{הַשְׁמֵךְ}$  is the only one which begins with the word  $\text{הַשְׁמֵךְ}$ . It must also not escape our attention that this benediction follows immediately after two other  $\text{הַשְׁמֵךְ}$  benedictions -  $\text{הַשְׁמֵךְ}$   $\text{הַשְׁמֵךְ}$  and  $\text{הַשְׁמֵךְ}$   $\text{הַשְׁמֵךְ}$ .

We have already seen why the  $\int\int\int\int$   $\text{הַשְׁמֵךְ}$  benediction became the first of the intermediate petitions. However, we do not know why in Babylon it was decided that this prayer alone, of all the intermediate blessings, should be reworded in the  $\text{הַשְׁמֵךְ}$  style. Could it be possible that it was worded this way because it did follow after two  $\text{הַשְׁמֵךְ}$  prayers?

We know that in many instances authors of the liturgy would utilize different devices to help the people remember their prayers. For example, a favorite device found in many of the Piyyutim was to begin every line with a different letter of the alphabet, either forwards or backwards, following the order of the alphabet. In that way, the person had only to remember the word corresponding to the correct letter of the alphabet to know the order of each line of the prayer.

Maybe the fact that each of these three benedictions begins with the word  $\text{הַשְׁמֵךְ}$  was the same type of device. Using the accepted Gebhuroth and Qedushath Ha-shem benedictions of their time, the Babylonian leaders wanted to help the people remember which was the first intermediate

blessings. Therefore, they rewrote this blessing following the style of עֲרֵךְ הַיּוֹם and וְיִשְׁלַח הַיּוֹם.

Another form comparison can be made if we remember the discussion at the end of the last chapter. There it was theorized that the Qedushath Hayom benedictions in the Babylonian Sabbath 'amidoth could have been patterned after the הַיּוֹם of the וְיִשְׁלַח הַיּוֹם benediction. These הַיּוֹם benedictions also follow directly after the עֲרֵךְ הַיּוֹם blessing. Could it be possible that there is a relationship among all of these הַיּוֹם blessings which follow after the עֲרֵךְ הַיּוֹם blessing?

Although there is no proof for such a contention, there are many facts which lead to this conclusion. First of all, the וְיִשְׁלַח הַיּוֹם version of the "blessing for wisdom" and all of the Sabbath Qedushath Hayom benedictions which begin with the word הַיּוֹם are clearly of Babylonian origin. Secondly, all of these הַיּוֹם benedictions follow immediately after the עֲרֵךְ הַיּוֹם benediction, which in turn, follows after the וְיִשְׁלַח הַיּוֹם benediction. And, finally, these הַיּוֹם benedictions, together with the וְיִשְׁלַח הַיּוֹם, the עֲרֵךְ הַיּוֹם, and the הַיּוֹם benedictions of the Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur 'amidoth (discussed in the next two chapters) constitute the only הַיּוֹם prayers found in any version of the 'amidah.

Following this logic, we might also be able to determine why the present-day עֲרֵךְ הַיּוֹם prayer was preferred over the other known Qedushath Ha-shem benedictions. It stands to reason that if the fourth benediction was being reworded into the הַיּוֹם style, then the existing

אותה version of this prayer became preferred.<sup>31</sup>

Thus, we can see that there might very well be a definite relationship among all of the אותה benedictions discussed in the last two chapters. The ייין אותה benediction, as well as all of the Qedushath Hayom benedictions which begin with אותה could have easily been fashioned after the אותה form of the existing ייין אותה and יין אותה benedictions. Also, our present-day עין אותה benediction was preferred because it did begin with the word אותה .



# FOOTNOTES - CHAPTER THREE

1. Joseph H. Hertz, The Authorized Daily Prayer Book, New York, Bloch Publishing Company, 1946, p. 133.
2. S. Baer, Seder Abhodath Yisrael, "Rödelheim, 1868, p. 89.
3. Y. Berakhoth V, 2, Krotoshin ed., p. 92.
4. B. Ta'aniyth 2a.
5. Louis Ginzberg, Commentary on the Palestinian Talmud, New York, Vol. IV, 1941, pp. 164-196.
6. Louis Finkelstein, "The Development of the Amidah" in Jewish Quarterly Review, New Series, Vol. 16, 1925/26, p. 22.
7. In the entire Mishnah this benediction is only referred to once as גְּבִהוּרוֹת (Mishnah Berakhoth 5:2), while every other time it is called Gebhuroth.
8. Jacob Mann, "Genizah Fragments of the Palestinian Order of Service", in Jakob J. Petuchowski ed., Contributions to the Scientific Study of Jewish Liturgy, New York, Ktav, 1970, p. 416.
9. Seder Rabh Amram Hashalem, Goldschmidt ed., Jerusalem, 1971, p. 24.
10. Seder Rabh Sa'adyah Gaon, Davidson, Assaf & Joel ed., Jerusalem, 1941, p. 18.
11. S. Baer, op. cit., p. 89.
12. Louis Finkelstein, "The Development of the Amidah", in Jakob J. Petuchowski ed., Contributions to the Scientific Study of Jewish Liturgy, New York, Ktav, 1970, pp. 119-120.
13. Ibid., pp. 120-121.
14. S. Schechter, "Genizah Specimens", in Jewish Quarterly Review, Old Series, Vol. 10, 1898, pp. 656-657.
15. Louis Finkelstein, op. cit., p. 119.
16. Seder Rabh Amram Hashalem, op. cit., p. 136.
17. Siphre Deuteronomy #343, Friedmann ed., p. 142b.

18. S. Baer, op. cit., p. 89.
19. Fragment T-S, H9, No. 39 in Cambridge, quoted by I. Elbogen, "Studies in the Jewish Liturgy", in Jakob J. Petuchowski ed., Contributions to the Scientific Study of Jewish Liturgy, New York, Ktav, 1970, p. 49.
20. It appears that Finkelstein was unaware of this version when he wrote his study on the development of the 'amidah. See: Louis Finkelstein, op. cit., p. 119.
21. I. Elbogen, "Studies in the Jewish Liturgy", in Jakob J. Petuchowski ed., Contributions to the Scientific Study of Jewish Liturgy, New York, Ktav, 1970, p. 49.
22. B. Berakhoth 34a:      אמרינו ארבעה עשר      אין פה      אין      אין
23. B. Berakhoth 33a.
24. B. Megillah 17b.
25. Y. Berakhoth 11, 4, Krotoshin ed., p. 4d.
26.      אין פה      אין      אין, Judah Halevy,      אין פה      אין      אין.
27. S. Schechter, op. cit., p. 657.
28. See page 32 above.  
Eliezer Levi, אין פה      אין, Tel Aviv, Abraham Zioni Publishing House, 1954, p. 158.
29. Ginzberg offers support for this position when he states:  
   אין פה      אין      אין  
see: Louis Ginzberg, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 346.
30. Ibid.
31. One must not ignore the possibility that the prayer      אין פה      אין could have been simply reserved for certain special days. Either theory makes sense.

## CHAPTER FOUR

The Rosh Hashanah Musaph 'amidah

The Rosh Hashanah Musaph 'amidah is the one exception to the general form found throughout the festival and Sabbath 'amidoth. Instead of containing seven berakhoth, as on the Sabbath and other festivals, this 'amidah contains nine. They are: the three opening blessings of praise, the three concluding benedictions of thanksgiving, the Qedushath Hayom benediction expanded by the addition of the Malkhuyoth section, and two extra blessings known as Zikhronoth and Shopharoth. The first prayer of this expanded Qedushath Hayom section is the familiar וְיִתְּנֵנוּ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ benediction found in every festival 'amidah.<sup>1</sup> This prayer is followed by a special version of the וְיִתְּנֵנוּ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ, specifically describing the Rosh Hashanah holiday, and the 'Aleynu prayer; the introduction to the Malkhuyoth verses. The two remaining sections of this 'amidah each have וְיִתְּנֵנוּ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ prayers as their introductions. They are: וְיִתְּנֵנוּ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ for the Zikhronoth section and וְיִתְּנֵנוּ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ for the Shopharoth section. This chapter will examine the relationship among the three וְיִתְּנֵנוּ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ prayers found in this 'amidah, and attempt to show a relationship among these prayers and the וְיִתְּנֵנוּ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ prayers already discussed in the previous chapters.

The Development of the Nine berakhoth.

We know that the Malkhuyoth, Zikhronoth and Shopharoth sections of this 'amidah are quite old, for mention of them is found both in the Mishnah and in the Tosephta.

In the Mishnah, the order of berakhoth for the Rosh Hashanah 'amidah is listed mentioning these sections by name:<sup>2</sup>

The order of blessings: One says: Abhoth, Gebhuroth, and Qedushath Ha-shem, includes Malkhuyoth with it (i. e. Qedushath Ha-shem) and does not sound the shophar, Qedushath Hayom and sounds the shophar, Zikhronoth and sounds the shophar, Shopharoth and sounds the shophar. Then one says 'abhodah, hodaah, and Birkhath Kohanim. This is the opinion of R. Yohanan.

The Malkhuyoth, Zikhronoth and Shopharoth sections mentioned here, however, were much more simplified than those found in our Mahzorim today. They consisted simply of the ten Biblical verses relating to each subject plus a Hathimah for the Shopharoth and Zikhronoth sections.<sup>3</sup>

One must not have less than ten Malkhuyoth (verses), ten Zikhronoth (verses), and ten Shopharoth (verses). R. Yohanan b. Nurey says: If one says three (verses from each of the) three (sections of the Bible) for each (Malkhuyoth, Zikhronoth, and Shopharoth), then he has fulfilled his obligation.

The Tosephta explains where these ten verses are from: three from Torah, three from Prophets, three from Writings, and a final verse from Torah:<sup>4</sup>

One begins with Torah and concludes with Torah.  
One says those (verses) from Prophets and Writings in the middle.

The Talmud accepted the strange form of this 'amidah with no questions asked. It treated this nine-blessing 'amidah in the same way that it treated all of the other 'amidoth.<sup>5</sup>

ה' תשס"ב כ"ד ניסן

In fact, the only problem which this 'amidah presented for the early Rabbis was where to place the Malkhuyoth section. This problem is first discussed in the Mishnah when Rabbi Akiva objects to R. Yohanan's order of blessings (see page 40 above):<sup>6</sup>

R. Akiva said to him (R. Yohanan): If we do not sound the shophar for Malkhuyoth, then why is it mentioned? Rather, we should say Abhoth, Gebhuroth, Qedushath Ha-shem, include Malkhuyoth with Qedushath Hayom, then sound the shophar, Zikhronoth and sound the shophar, Shopharoth and sound the shophar . . .

R. Yohanan combined the Malkhuyoth verses with the Qedushath Ha-shem benediction. Rabbi Akiva's suggestion, given at the end of the Mishnah, was to combine the Malkhuyoth verses with the Qedushath Hayom benediction as is the custom today.

In the Gemara a third alternative is suggested by Rabbi Shimeon ben Gamliel. This alternative is that the Qedushath Hayom benediction should be combined with the Zikhronoth section.<sup>7</sup>

Where is the Qedushath Hayom to be said? It has been taught: Rabbi says, It should be said with the Malkhuyoth. For just as on every other occasion we find it fourth (in the order of blessings) so here too it should come fourth. Rabban Shimeon b. Gamliel says: It should be said with the Zikhronoth. Just as we find on all other occasions (that) it is said in the middle, so here too it should be in the middle.

By tracing this matter through the codes, we find that the suggestion originally raised in the Mishnah by Rabbi Akiva and supported by a baraita quoted in the Gemara by Rabbi, to combine the Qedushath Hayom benediction with the Malkhuyoth verses, became the accepted practice.<sup>8</sup>



Thus, we see that the Malkhuyoth verses were linked to the already-existing Qedushath Hayom benediction. In order to then fulfill the requirement of having nine benedictions in this 'amidah, two more berakhoth needed to be added. They were ה' אלהינו ה' אחד for the Zikhronoth section and ה' אלהינו ה' אחד for the Shopharoth section.

The nine benedictions, then, which constituted the Rosh Hashanah 'amidah were: the three opening blessings of praise, the Qedushath Hayom blessing, the two blessings at the end of the Zikhronoth and Shopharoth sections respectively, and the three concluding blessings of thanksgiving. The Malkhuyoth section did not contain its own berakhah, but, rather was included in the Qedushath Hayom benediction.

#### Rav's Additions to the Musaph 'amidah of Rosh Hashanah.

According to Liebreich, this was the version of the Rosh Hashanah 'amidah which later became used exclusively for Musaph, and which the Amora Rav had before him when he came to the Babylonian academy at Sura.

"Rav had before him the Rosh ha-Shanah 'Amidah of Musaf which consisted of malkhuyyoth verses, with their corresponding epilogue appended to qedushath ha-yom, and zikhronoth and shofaroth verses with their respective epilogues, each closing with a benediction."<sup>9</sup>

It is theorized by Liebreich that Rav then took this version of the 'amidah and composed prologues to the Zikhronoth and Shopharoth sections.<sup>10</sup> These prologues are our present-day ה' אחד ה' אחד prayer for the Zikh-



ronoth section and the תפלה prayer for the Shopharoth section; referred to in the rabbinic sources as תפלה,<sup>11</sup> and תפלה.<sup>12</sup>

Liebreich backed this theory by deducing from a section of the Jerusalem Talmud that Rav was the author of the תפלה prayer. In discussing תפלה the Jerusalem Talmud cites an exact section of this prayer:<sup>13</sup>

We are taught in a Baraitha that the New Years prayers composed by Rav included: "this day, which marks the beginning of Your work, is a memorial of the first day. It is a statute for Israel, an ordinance of the God of Jacob. On this day it is decreed which states are destined for the sword and which for peace, which for famine and which for plenty. On this day every creature stands in judgment and is recorded for life or for death."<sup>14</sup>

Then Liebreich made a comparative study of the style and form of the תפלה and the תפלה benedictions. Both, he states, contain lofty diction and were composed in the style of biblical poetry, utilizing the characteristic of parallelism. Furthermore, both derive their main theme from the Torah verses of their respective sections, and both incorporate the use of Talmudic and Midrashic concepts into this theme.<sup>15</sup> Liebreich thus concluded that Rav composed both of these prayers. Furthermore, he theorized that Rav patterned these two prayers after the תפלה Qedushath Hayom benediction which was already linked to the Malkhuyoth verses.<sup>16</sup>

Liebreich's theory rests on the premise that the liturgical status of the Zikhronoth and Shopharoth sections is equal to that of the Qedushath

Hayom. He bases this premise on the dual character of Rosh Hashanah as  
 /וְהָיָה בְּיוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי וְהָיָה בְּיוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי and וְהָיָה בְּיוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי from the biblical verse: <sup>17</sup>

Speak to the children of Israel and say: On the seventh month, the first day of that month, you shall have a memorial day of complete rest with the sounding of the shofar and a holy assembly.

"A liturgical status was thus accorded to zikhronoth and shofaroth equal to that of qedushath ha-yom. It follows, therefore, that these three liturgical equals should follow the same pattern. This, however, was not the case in the New Year 'Amidah of Musaf before Rav's time. The zikhronoth and shofaroth lacked one vital element characteristic of qedushath ha-yom."<sup>18</sup>

The vital element lacking in these two sections to which Liebreich is alluding was a prayer of affirmation beginning with the word וְהָיָה.

"Purely liturgical considerations motivated Rav in the composition of these prologues. He was not concerned with malkhuyyoth, which had no independent benediction in the 'Amidah. His concern was with zikhronoth and shofaroth, the two distinctive elements of the Rosh Ha-Shannah liturgy, distinctive in the sense that each of these not only had its own miscellany of scriptural verses, but, what is more, its independent prayer of supplication, or epilogue, closing with its own benediction. As he viewed the zikhronoth and shofaroth verses with their corresponding epilogues and compared them with qedushath ha-yom, he realized that the former lacked prayers of affirmation commencing with וְהָיָה. In order, therefore, to confer upon zikhronoth and shofaroth equal liturgical status with qedushath ha-yom, he conceived the idea of composing two prologues, one to zikhronoth, and the other to shofaroth, each to be a prayer of affirmation beginning with וְהָיָה."<sup>19</sup>

That the וְהָיָה וְהָיָה and the וְהָיָה וְהָיָה prayers were composed at the same time and by the same author seems to be quite evident.

In fact, some scholars believe that Rav also composed the וְהָיָה.

which acts as the prologue to the Malkhuyoth section.<sup>20</sup> Liebreich, however, agrees with Heinemann who states that the " יְיָ שְׁמִי is a prayer which was already old and hallowed when תְּהִי עֲלֵינוּ was composed."<sup>21</sup>

To summarize Liebreich's conclusions, it is clear that he believes that both the יְיָ שְׁמִי and the יְיָ שְׁמִי prayers were composed by the Amora Rav at about the same time, and that he patterned these prayers after the יְיָ שְׁמִי style of the יְיָ שְׁמִי Qedushath Hayom benediction.

In relation to this study, Liebreich's conclusions present some very interesting concepts. First, he was the one who assumed the existence of an יְיָ שְׁמִי category of prayers. This category, he described, as prayers of affirmation beginning with the word יְיָ שְׁמִי. A prayer of affirmation is a prayer "in which the worshipper addresses God, affirming his belief in the validity of the ideas expressed therein."<sup>22</sup>

Second, Liebreich's conclusions support the contention that the authors of prayers would sometimes formulate these prayers based on the form of already existing prayers.

Finally, Liebreich shows that one such existing prayer which was used as a pattern for later prayers was the יְיָ שְׁמִי Qedushath Hayom benediction. It is only a short step from Liebreich's theory to postulate that the Qedushath Hayom prayers of the Sabbath 'amidoth were likewise based on the form of the יְיָ שְׁמִי benediction. Although this would not show a direct connection between the prologues of the Rosh

Hashanah Zikhronoth and Shopharoth sections and the Qedushath Hayom benedictions of the Sabbath 'amidoth, it does show a definite similarity. All of these prayers were patterned after the existing Qedushath Hayom benediction, and all begin with the word Qados because of the Qados at the beginning of Qados.

It is clear that of all the Qados prayers so far discussed, the most direct relationship can be drawn between the Qados and the Qados prayers. Both were composed by the same author to be used for the same purpose. Perhaps it is only a coincidence that these two prayers both begin with the word Qados. Or, perhaps the use of this word was a favorite style of Rav and had nothing to do with the fact that the already existing Qedushath Hayom benediction also began with Qados. If, however, Liebreich's contention is valid, then a definite relationship can be established among all of the Qados prayers so far discussed. I will return to an in-depth discussion of this matter after a look at the remaining Qados prayers.

## FOOTNOTES - CHAPTER FOUR

1. See above, Chapter Two, p. 17f.
2. Mishnah Rosh Hashanah 4:5.
3. Ibid. 4:6.
4. Tosephta Rosh Hashanah 2:2, Lieberman ed., Vol. II, p. 317.
5. B. Berakhoth 29a.
6. Mishnah Rosh Hashanah 4:5.
7. B. Rosh Hashanah 32a.
8. Maimonides, Mishnah Torah, Hilkhoth Shophar, 3:7.  
Sepher Mitzvoth Gadol, Positive Commandments, #42.  
Tur and Shulhan 'Arukh, Orah Hayyim, 592:1.
9. Leon J. Liebreich, "Aspects of the New Year Liturgy", in Hebrew Union College Annual, Vol. XXXIV, Cincinnati, 1963, pp. 159-160.
10. Ibid., p. 154.
11. Y. Rosh Hashanah 1:3, Krotoshin ed., p. 57a.  
Pesiqta deRabh Kahana, Buber ed., New York, 1949, p. 150a.  
Wa-Yiqra Rabbah 29:1, Raam ed., Vol. II, Jerusalem, 1970, p. 42a.
12. Y. 'Abhodah Zarah 1:2, Krotoshin ed., p. 39c.
13. Y. Rosh Hashanah 1:3, Krotoshin ed., p. 57a.
14. Note: Heinemann offers another possible meaning of the phrase " לְרַחֵם אֶת יִשְׂרָאֵל " According to Heinemann, " לְרַחֵם אֶת יִשְׂרָאֵל " could refer to all three sections: Malkhuyoth, Zikhronoth and Shopharoth, which the Rav had before him, and not specifically to the וְיִשְׁמַח בְּרַחֲמָיו benediction. See: Joseph Heinemann, Prayer in the Period of the Tanna'im and the Amora'im, (Hebrew), Jerusalem, Magnes Press, 1964, p. 174.
15. Leon J. Liebreich, op. cit., p. 163 and 167.
16. Ibid., p. 159.
17. Leviticus 23:24.

18. Leon J. Liebreich, op. cit., p. 160.
19. Ibid., p. 161.
20. Ismar Elbogen, Der Jüdische Gottesdienst in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung, Leipzig, 1913, p. 133.
21. Joseph Heinemann, "Prayers of Beth Midrash Origin", in Journal of Semitic Studies, Vol. 5, Manchester University Press, 1960, p. 278.  
Also see: Leon J. Liebreich, op. cit., p. 168.
22. Ibid., p. 160.



## CHAPTER FIVE

The Remaining Amidah Prayers

Of the five remaining Amidah prayers, three of them are found only in the Yom Kippur liturgy. The most common of these, אונ' ד' ז' פ' י' ח' ט' י"א follows the אונ' ד' ז' פ' י' ח' ט' י"א and proceeds the אונ' ד' ז' פ' י' ח' ט' י"א confessionals in every Yom Kippur service with the exception of Ne'ilah.<sup>1</sup> The remaining two Yom Kippur Amidah prayers which are found exclusively in the Ne'ilah service also follow the אונ' ד' ז' פ' י' ח' ט' י"א prayer - אונ' ד' ז' פ' י' ח' ט' י"א and אונ' ד' ז' פ' י' ח' ט' י"א. Not only are all three of these prayers found in the liturgy after the אונ' ד' ז' פ' י' ח' ט' י"א confessional, but like the rest of the Amidah prayers thus far discussed, all three of these Amidah prayers are contained within an 'amidah. This chapter will examine these three Yom Kippur Amidah prayers and discuss this as well as other similarities among these prayers and the Amidah prayers thus far discussed. Then, at the end of this chapter, the two אונ' ד' ז' פ' י' ח' ט' י"א prayers; the final prayers to be considered in this study, will be discussed.

The Influence of אונ' ד' ז' פ' י' ח' ט' י"א.

The Talmud cites the prayer אונ' ד' ז' פ' י' ח' ט' י"א in connection with Rav:<sup>2</sup>

אונ' ד' ז' פ' י' ח' ט' י"א אונ' ד' ז' פ' י' ח' ט' י"א אונ' ד' ז' פ' י' ח' ט' י"א

What should he say (for the confessional)? Rav said: "You know the secrets of eternity."

Therefore, it is often referred to as the confessional of Rav. However, Abrahams is quick to point out that this does not necessarily mean

that Rav was the author of the *עירובין* prayer. Rather, he argues, this prayer was an alternative form of confessional before the fixing of the liturgy.<sup>3</sup>

The two Ne'ilah *עירובין* prayers; *עירובין* *עירובין* and *עירובין* *עירובין* take the place of the *עירובין* paragraph. Both of these prayers are composites of various confessional prayers found in the Talmud. The portion of the *עירובין* *עירובין* prayer which begins *אנחנו* *אנחנו* is attributed to the third century Babylonian Amora, Samuel.<sup>4</sup> Maimonides leaves out the *עירובין* portion of this prayer and begins with the *אנחנו* version attributed to Samuel.<sup>5</sup> The Yeminite and Sephardic rituals follow Maimonides' version, while the Ashkenazik and Italian rites begin with *עירובין* *עירובין* as is stated by Amram.<sup>6</sup>

What is of definite interest to us in this study is the fact that not only is the usage of these prayers similar to the previously discussed

*עירובין* benedictions (i. e. all are found in various 'amidoth'), but that like the *עירובין* prayers of the previous chapters, these prayers can also in some way be connected with the familiar *עירובין* *עירובין* Qedushath Hayom benediction.

According to the Talmud, Rabbah began the Ne'ilah service with *עירובין* *עירובין*, and he concluded it with the *אנחנו* version of the *עירובין* *עירובין* prayer.<sup>7</sup>

עירובין *עירובין* *עירובין* *עירובין*  
 עירובין *עירובין* *עירובין* *עירובין*  
 עירובין *עירובין* *עירובין* *עירובין*

Ulla b. Rab came down (to the reader's desk) before Raba. He began (the Ne'ilah) with "You have chosen us", and concluded with "What are we, what is our life?", and he praised him.

It should not escape our attention that not only is this the single mention of the אמנת אחרית prayer in the Talmud, but that it is also linked to the אמנת אחרית prayer of Ne'ilah. אמנת אחרית follows directly after אמנת אחרית, which, as we have already shown, follows the אמנת אחרית confessional. It is not difficult for one to see the similarities between these two אמנת אחרית prayers; both as confessionals, and in placement in the service (after the אמנת אחרית) with the אמנת אחרית benediction.

Furthermore, we must not overlook the fact that like the אמנת אחרית prayers of the Rosh Hashanah Musaph 'amidah (Chapter Four above), the אמנת אחרית prayer is also attributed to Rav.<sup>8</sup> If the former prayers were patterned after the אמנת אחרית benediction, as was theorized by Liebreich (see above, page 42f), then it would not be difficult to theorize that the אמנת אחרית prayer may have also influenced the formation of the אמנת אחרית benediction.

In essence, of all the אמנת אחרית prayers thus far discussed, the most difficult link to prove is the connection between the three Yom Kippur

אמנת אחרית prayers and the rest. True, all of these אמנת אחרית prayers are found within the 'amidah rubric, but there are a far greater number of non-אמנת אחרית prayers found also contained within this rubric. It is also true that a possible connection can be shown between the אמנת אחרית

Qedushath Hayom benediction and all of the rest of our הַשְׁמִינָה prayers thus far discussed. However, one can also show how these twelve הַשְׁמִינָה prayers came into usage in a manner independent of the הַשְׁמִינָה הַשְׁמִינָה. For example, our link between the three Yom Kippur הַשְׁמִינָה prayers and the הַשְׁמִינָה הַשְׁמִינָה benediction is that both the הַשְׁמִינָה הַשְׁמִינָה paragraph and the הַשְׁמִינָה הַשְׁמִינָה and הַשְׁמִינָה הַשְׁמִינָה prayers of Rosh Hashanah are all attributed to Rav. Who is to say that even if Rav did pattern the two Rosh Hashanah prayers after הַשְׁמִינָה הַשְׁמִינָה (see above, page 43f), he did the same with הַשְׁמִינָה הַשְׁמִינָה? Maybe הַשְׁמִינָה הַשְׁמִינָה הַשְׁמִינָה was the only version of this prayer known to Rav. Or, just as possible, perhaps Rav simply liked to be direct in his prayers and begin them by talking directly to God - " הַשְׁמִינָה".<sup>9</sup> הַשְׁמִינָה הַשְׁמִינָה הַשְׁמִינָה may have been an already existing prayer which Rav had come across in his travels and adopted for usage because it did begin with הַשְׁמִינָה.

There is, though, one further reason for continuing to consider all of the similarities among the above הַשְׁמִינָה prayers. Although Liebreich was the only scholar who "observed the specific nature of this genre of prayers",<sup>10</sup> Ze'ev Jawitz does list together the thirteen prayers thus far discussed.<sup>11</sup> Although Jawitz was only concerned with the fact that all of these prayers began with הַשְׁמִינָה, maybe by listing them together, he was alluding to their other similarities. This, of course, brings us to consideration of the two prayers not yet discussed, and which are not included in the list provided by Jawitz.

לכבוד ה' .

There are two benedictions found in the standard liturgy which begin with לכבוד ה' . The first of these, לכבוד ה' אלהינו ends with the hathimah: יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ. The second לכבוד ה' אלהינו benediction begins יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ, and has no hathimah. יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ directly follows the לכבוד ה' אלהינו prayer, which, in turn, follows the שמונה עשרה and שמונה עשרה of the Birkhoth Hashahar.

When I first began researching and writing this work, I questioned whether or not these two לכבוד ה' אלהינו benedictions should be included within the confines of this study. The reason for my questioning was that not until fairly late in the history of the evolution of our current liturgy did the Birkhoth Hashahar section become part of the daily congregational worship service. Before that time, this section, as well as the selection of Preliminary Psalms which follow, were said silently in individual worship before the beginning of the public prayer service. As such, neither of these two sections is classified as part of the obligatory prayer service. My question was whether I should omit these two prayers for the same reason that Piyyutim, which begin with לכבוד ה' אלהינו have been omitted.<sup>12</sup>

Other factors also added to my doubts about including these two benedictions. First of all, these are the only two לכבוד ה' אלהינו prayers of our group which are not found in the rubric of the 'amidah. Second, these are the only two לכבוד ה' אלהינו prayers which cannot in some way be connected with the שמונה עשרה Qedushath Hayom prayer. Finally, these are the only two לכבוד ה' אלהינו prayers not contained in the list given by Jawitz.



It appears, then, that if I were to omit these two *שמונה עשרה* prayers from this study, the evidence thus far would strongly suggest a close relationship among the remaining thirteen *שמונה עשרה* benedictions (i. e. all part of the 'amidah' rubric, all connected to *שמונה עשרה*, and all contained in the list provided by Jawitz). Furthermore, it can be easily argued that these two *שמונה עשרה* benedictions should not be included in this study because they are not part of the obligatory prayer service.

It is evident, however, that like the previously discussed *שמונה עשרה* prayers, both of these *שמונה עשרה* benedictions are also products of the Rabbinic period. Furthermore, the liturgical composition of a prayer has absolutely nothing to do with the later halakhic ruling about whether or not a prayer should be obligatory. Therefore, these two *שמונה עשרה* benedictions must be included in this study and considered as important as any of the previously discussed *שמונה עשרה* prayers.

The *שמונה עשרה* *שמונה עשרה* benediction is described in the Yalquth as a eulogy spoken by the heavenly hosts.<sup>13</sup> Supposedly, God is ready to destroy the whole world because the people of the earth are indulging in their own pleasures while the sanctuary is destroyed. When, however, Israel proclaims the Shema', the angels respond with *שמונה עשרה* *שמונה עשרה*. These two prayers pleased God, and He decided not to destroy the world.<sup>14</sup>

The *שמונה עשרה* *שמונה עשרה* benediction is primarily a compilation of biblical verses, embellishing upon the themes introduced in the *שמונה עשרה* *שמונה עשרה* benediction.<sup>15</sup> If we accept the theory proposed by the



Yalquth that לְאֵלֵינוּ שֶׁ לִפְנֵי דְּנֹחַ was uttered by the angels, then this prayer could be seen as mans' reiteration of these same themes.

It is interesting to note that the content of the לִפְנֵי דְּנֹחַ לְאֵלֵינוּ שֶׁ closely resembles the עֲלֵנוּ עֲלֵנוּ עֲלֵנוּ of the morning Shaharith service. Both are viewed as doxologies uttered by the "heavenly hosts". Furthermore, both these prayers are found in close proximity to the שְׁמֵה - לְאֵלֵינוּ שֶׁ לִפְנֵי דְּנֹחַ directly follows the שְׁמֵה of the Birkhoth Hashaher, while the Shaharith עֲלֵנוּ עֲלֵנוּ עֲלֵנוּ precedes the two Berakhoth before the שְׁמֵה, and is considered to be part of the שְׁמֵה rubric.

It should also not escape our attention that the עֲלֵנוּ עֲלֵנוּ עֲלֵנוּ doxology is also part of the Qedushah found in the repetition of every morning, afternoon and Musaph 'amidah, and that in the Musaph Qedushah, this line is again in close proximity to the שְׁמֵה. Perhaps, then, at one time the לְאֵלֵינוּ שֶׁ לִפְנֵי דְּנֹחַ benediction was a substitute for this standard line making it, too, part of the 'amidah rubric.

All of the נְדָח prayers have now been discussed. It is now time to turn our attention to an in-depth study of the similarities and differences in style, usage and motifs of these benedictions. That study is the subject matter of the following chapter.

## FOOTNOTES - CHAPTER FIVE

1. Note that there is no לגן פס confessional in the Ne'ilah service as well.
2. B. Yoma 87b.
3. Israel Abrahams, A Companion to the Authorized Daily Prayer-book, New York, Hermon Press, 1966, p. 201.
4. B. Yoma, 87b.
5. Maimonides, Mishnah Torah, Vol. 1, New York, Shulsinger Bros., page 78a.
6. Seder Rabh Amram Hashalem, Goldschmidt ed., Jerusalem, 1971, p. 170.
7. B. Yoma 87b.
8. Even if Abrahams (op. cit.) is correct in that Rav is not the author of פס לגן פס לגן, this prayer is still cited in his name.
9. This matter will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter Six.
10. See Chapter One, page 5 above.
11. See Chapter One, page 5 above. Also, Ze'ev Jawitz, לגן פס לגן, Berlin, 1910, pp. 13-14.
12. לגן was a natural word with which to begin the " לג " line of those Piyyutim written as forward alphabetical acrostics. Since Piyyutim are not considered to be obligatory in nature, they were not included in this study.
13. The Midrash Yalquth (Numbers #836) quotes the לגן פס לגן as a eulogy spoken by the heavenly hosts. This prayer is also found in the Jerusalem Talmud (Berakhoth 9.3), but is not cited in the Krotoshin edition.
14. Ibid.
15. See: Jeremiah 14:22, Isaiah 44:6, 11:12, II Kings 19:15. Also: the phrase לגן פס לגן is found in Mishnah Avoth 5.23 and b. Sotah 49b.

## CHAPTER SIX

Style, Usage and Motifs

The most obvious stylistic similarity common to all fifteen of our תורת prayers is that they all begin with the same word; הוה . In fact, it was this similarity which prompted Jawitz to list thirteen of our fifteen prayers together.<sup>1</sup>

It is not difficult to understand why the second-person-singular pronoun - הוה - became a common word in Jewish liturgy. The Jews have always viewed prayer as a means of direct communication with God. Therefore, they chose to word some of their prayers in such a way as to reflect this direct approach. "You, (O Lord), are . . .", or "You, (O Lord), have . . .", are much more direct than prayers which are written in the third person.

However, aside from the fact that all of these prayers begin with הוה , they have no other stylistic similarities in common. If we were to list the second word of each prayer, for example, we would find that three of them are adjectives describing God: גדול, קדוש, ארוך ; ten are action verbs: חיו, חיו, חיו, חיו, חיו, חיו, חיו, חיו, חיו, חיו ; and two have the pronoun הוה .

Also, there is no set length either to the sentences within the prayers or to the prayers themselves. The shortest prayer is the הוה קדוש , which contains fourteen words (including the Hathimah). The longest prayer is difficult to determine because some of our prayers continue with many different paragraphs before reaching a Hathimah.<sup>2</sup>



The Hathimah for the שחרית prayer of Rosh Hashanah concludes the Shopharoth section of the Musaph 'amidah, and therefore, it deals with the subject matter of Shopharoth: ברוך אתה ה' מלך עולם קול תרועת  
שופר אשר אנו שומעים. Finally, we should note that none of the Yom Kippur  
שחרית prayers contain Hathimoth when their respective 'amidoth are said silently, but all three are followed by the same Hathimah as the  
שחרית שחרית for Yom Kippur when their 'amidoth are repeated.<sup>4</sup>

To summarize, then, the only real stylistic similarity common to all fifteen prayers in this study is the fact that they all begin with the word אשר. Although upon first glance this similarity appears to be significant, we must remember that many other prayers which do not begin with אשר are still written in the same direct style implied by this word.

### Usage.

It has been shown throughout this paper that thirteen of our fifteen שחרית prayers are found within the rubric of the 'amidah. This, by itself, might seem to be a significant similarity until we stop to examine the 'amidah. First of all, it should be noted that the 'amidah rubric is very abundant in prayers. Secondly, this is the rubric of the service which changes according to the special nature of the day. In contrast to this, the שחרית rubric remains relatively the same for all days.<sup>5</sup> Furthermore, as was pointed out in the last chapter, there are more prayers within the 'amidah rubric which do not begin with אשר than there are that begin with אשר.<sup>6</sup>



There is, though, one other point of usage which should be identified. Of our fifteen *ḥalil* prayers, only four of them are said every day of the year: *ḥalil* *ḥalil*, *ḥalil* *ḥalil* and the two *ḥalil* *ḥalil* prayers. Of the remaining eleven, nine are said on holidays, one is said only Mot-zae Shabbat, and one is said only during regular daily services (i. e. when there is no holiday). This means that two-thirds (ten out of fifteen) of our *ḥalil* prayers were composed for only special occasions.

### Motifs.

In theorizing the existence of a category of prayers beginning with *ḥalil*, Professor Liebreich stated that this category consists of "prayers of affirmation" which, taken together, "add up to a creed."<sup>7</sup> It should be noted, though, that not only did Professor Liebreich never offer a complete list of these *ḥalil* prayers, but he also never elaborated on this creed. Probably, this is due to the many difficulties which arise when one tries to verify his statement. Nevertheless, this section will investigate the motifs of each of these prayers to see if they do, in fact, add up to a creed.

The first problem encountered in this task is to determine exactly what is the main theme of each prayer. The reason that this is a problem is because sometimes, due to the changing nature of our liturgy, later inserted themes have replaced or overshadowed the original theme of a prayer. Such is the case with the Gebhuroth benediction. Originally, this prayer dealt primarily with the omnipotent powers of God. However, due to the political controversy between the Sadducees and the Pharisees,



resurrection became a major theme within this prayer. This blessing, though, still retained the name Gebhuroth, and resurrection can be viewed as one of the many "powers" of God.<sup>8</sup>

In the case of other prayers, such as the Qedushath Ha-shem, it is relatively easy to determine the major theme. עֲדֵיךָ יְיָ is simply a prayer of praise describing the holiness of God and His holy name.

Still other prayers, though, contain two or more major themes.

The following chart, prepared by Dr. Petuchowski, lists the major themes highlighted in each of our YK prayers:

attah hu 'ad shello nibhra

Eternity of God,  
World-to-Come,  
Holiness of God,  
Israel's kiddush hashem.

attah hu adonai elohenu

Eternity of God,  
Creation,  
Uniqueness of God,  
Messianic Redemption.

attah gibbor

God's omnipotence,  
God's control of Nature,  
Salvation (= Redemption),  
Resurrection.

attah qadosh

Holiness of God.

attah honen

God, the Giver of knowledge.

attah honantanu

Revelation,  
Election of Israel,  
Sabbath and festivals.

attah qiddashta

Creation,  
Sabbath.

attah yazarta

Creation,  
Election of Israel,  
Sabbath,  
New Moon,  
Sacrificial Cult,  
Atonement,  
Exile because of sins,  
Messianic Redemption.

attah ehad

Uniqueness of God,  
 Uniqueness of Israel,  
 Sabbath,  
 Messianic Redemption  
 (indicated by opening words,  
 based on Zech. 14:9, and by  
 concluding words that all men  
 will recognize God),  
Kiddush hashem.

attah nigletha

Revelation,  
 Messianic Redemption.

attah yode'a

God's knowledge.

attah bhehartanu

Election of Israel,  
 Holiness through mizwoth  
 (= Revelation).

attah zokher

Creation,  
 Judgment,  
 Covenant.

attah nothen

Repentance,  
 Divine Forgiveness.

attah hibhdalta

Repentance,  
 Divine Forgiveness.

It is at this point, though, where the real problem arises concerning Liebreich's statement about "a creed". One of the reasons that Judaism has been able to survive for over 5,000 years is the fact that throughout history, Judaism has always attempted to maintain some semblance of flexibility. Furthermore, one method that Judaism has utilized in its attempt to remain flexible is to never adopt a universal Jewish creed. Although numerous attempts have been made at forming such a creed, these attempts have never met with complete Jewish acceptance. According to Dr. Emil G. Hirsch:

"In the same sense as Christianity or Islam, Judaism can not be credited with the possession of Articles of Faith. Many attempts have indeed been made at systematizing and reducing to a fixed phraseology and sequence the contents of the Jewish religion. But these have always lacked the one essential element: authoritative sanction on the part of a supreme ecclesiastical body. And for this reason they have not been recog-

nized as final or regarded as of universally binding force."<sup>9</sup>

Nevertheless, from Talmudic times to the present day, Jews have never ceased in their efforts to develop a simple, yet concise, Jewish creed.<sup>10</sup> Maimonides viewed this creed in terms of his "thirteen articles of faith". Solomon Schechter, on the other hand, saw this creed simply as the acceptance of faith and hope.<sup>11</sup>

With all of the different attempts that have been made to develop a Jewish creed, we must not overlook the possibility that perhaps Liebreich was correct in attempting to find this long sought after creed in the field of liturgy. The prayerbook is universally accepted as part of our Jewish heritage. Also, it can be safely assumed that at one time in his life, every Jew has prayed. Perhaps the only real place to find this Jewish creed is in the prayerbook.

Liebreich was correct when he hypothesized that the אמנות prayers do form a creed. When these prayers are combined, they assert that God is all-powerful ( אֱלֹהֵינוּ ), holy ( קדוש ), all-knowing ( יודע ) and נצח ), and the eternal King ( מלך ). Furthermore, there is only One God ( אֵלֹהֵינוּ ) who, among other things, is the source of all knowledge, wisdom and understanding ( אֱלֹהֵינוּ חֹכְמָה וּבִינָה ).

We also learn from these prayers that God separated Israel from among the other nations and made her His chosen people ( עַמּוּת ), אֱלֹהֵינוּ,<sup>12</sup> אֱלֹהֵינוּ, and אֱלֹהֵינוּ ). One method by which He did this was to reveal Himself to her at Mount Sinai ( אֱלֹהֵינוּ ). Because of this special status, however, Israel is expected to

observe certain holidays. The Sabbath is to be a holy day of rest ( שבת and יום טוב ). Rosh Hashanah is the Day of Judgment ( יום הדין ), on which we should never lose hope, no matter how bad the situation, for eternal redemption ( גאולה ).<sup>13</sup> And, Yom Kippur is a day of atonement on which we should repent our sins ( יום כיפור and יום רצון ).

However, the Jews have sinned and made God angry. Therefore, the Temple was destroyed and the Jews were exiled from their land ( גלות ). With continued repentance, though, and if the Jews change their sinful ways, there is always the hope that God may return the Jews to their land and rebuild the Temple in Jerusalem.

The problem which I see with Liebreich's hypothesis about a creed is that I do not think that these fifteen verses prayers are unique in the creed they form. In other words, it is my contention that almost any group of prayers chosen at random from the liturgy would form the same type of creed. Furthermore, it is even possible to find a common feature, such as beginning with the word יהוה, in all of these prayers.

To illustrate this point, I have randomly chosen ten prayers, all of which begin with the letter "ע", or a word derived from the letter "ע" (i.e. ענין הנה is from the word נהנה ). The following table lists these prayers are their major themes:

ענין ענין

peace  
Giver of Torah  
Benevolent God

ענין ענין ענין ענין ענין ענין ענין ענין ענין ענין

Repentance  
Torah  
Sacrifice

שָׁלוֹם שְׁלֵמָה

peace

שְׁמַע יְיָ תְּפִלָּה

Hear our prayers  
Mercy

(שָׁלוֹם) שְׁמֵרָה

Peace  
Israel's guardian

(תְּהִלָּה) תְּהִלַּת

Praise God's name  
Miracles of God

(הַרְוֵה) הַשָּׁבָת הַזֶּה

Revelation  
Sabbath

יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בֶּן יְהוֹנָתָן

Davidic Dynasty  
Messianic redemption

יְהוָה יְחִיד

Monotheism  
Guardian of Israel  
Unity of God's name

(אֱלֹהֵינוּ) יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ

God is King  
God is Benevolent  
God is just

The themes found in our fifteen שְׁמַע יְיָ prayers are not unique to these prayers alone. Rather, they are themes which are repeated over and over again throughout the liturgy. For that reason, the fact that, when combined, these prayers do form a creed, is not enough to justify Liebreich's contention that these prayers form a separate category of prayers.

## FOOTNOTES - CHAPTER SIX

1. See Chapter One, page 5 above.
2. Jawitz (note 1 above) states that the thirteen prayers in his list all end in a Hathimah. However, many of these Hathimoth are not included in the same paragraph as what we might consider to be the prayer itself.
3. See Chapter Three, page 25f above.
4. Note that in the Ne'ilah service the paragraph containing this Hathimah follows after the second Shema prayer and not after each prayer individually.
5. Of course there is a difference between the Shema rubric for the morning and the Shema rubric for the evening. Every morning service is relatively the same, however, as is every evening service. (An extra prayer may be added for the Sabbath or holidays, but none of the basic prayers are deleted.)
6. See Chapter Five, page 51 above.
7. Leon J. Liebreich, "Aspects of the New Year Liturgy", in Hebrew Union College Annual, Vol. XXXIV, Cincinnati, 1963, p. 161.
8. See Chapter Three, page 27 above.
9. Dr. Emil G. Hirsch, "Articles of Faith", in The Jewish Encyclopedia, Vol. II, New York & London, Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1902, p. 148.
10. In-depth studies into different attempts to formulate Jewish creeds can be found in:  
David Neumark, "The Principles of Judaism in Historical Outline", in Journal of Jewish Lore and Philosophy, Cincinnati, Ark Publishing Company, 1919, pp. 1-46.  
S. Schechter, "The Dogmas of Judaism", in The Jewish Quarterly Review, Old Series, London, 1898, pp. 48-61, 115-127.
11. S. Schachter, op. cit., p. 51.
12. The chosen people concept is implied in the berachah by the words: וְיִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׁמְחוּ בְּיְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיהֶם.
13. Just as God revealed His law to us at Mount Sinai, He will bring about eternal redemption - וְיִשְׁמְחוּ בְּיְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיהֶם.



## CHAPTER SEVEN

Conclusion

When Professor Liebreich first proposed the existence of a special category of prayers, he characterized this category by stating that (1) all of the prayers in this category begin with the word  $\text{יְהוָה}$ , and (2) all of the prayers in this category are prayers of affirmation which, when taken together, add up to a creed.<sup>1</sup>

It is true that all fifteen of our prayers begin with  $\text{יְהוָה}$ . It is also true that these  $\text{יְהוָה}$  prayers do form a creed. As I demonstrated at the end of the last chapter, however, the creed formed by these  $\text{יְהוָה}$  prayers is not unique. Almost any randomly chosen group of prayers will form the same type of creed. Furthermore, it is possible to choose such a group with some feature in common (such as beginning with the word  $\text{יְהוָה}$ ) which form the same type of creed.<sup>2</sup>

For this reason, I hold the opinion that the fact that these prayers do all begin with  $\text{יְהוָה}$  and do, when combined, form a creed, does not justify their classification into a distinct category of prayers.

There are, though, many other factors which should be taken into consideration before deciding whether or not these fifteen prayers do form a category. For example, thirteen of our fifteen prayers are all used within the same rubric of the worship service, the 'amidah. Furthermore, although there is no concrete evidence to support this assumption, it is possible that at one time one of the two remaining prayers,  $\text{יְהוָה יְהוָה}$   $\text{יְהוָה יְהוָה}$ , was a substitute for the  $\text{יְהוָה יְהוָה יְהוָה}$  found in

the Qedushah.<sup>3</sup> If this possibility is true, then all but one of our אמנות prayers were at one time part of the 'amidah rubric.

Another factor which should be taken into consideration is the origin of these אמנות prayers. In Chapter Two it was concluded that both of the Sabbath Qedushath Hayom אמנות benedictions, אשר אמנות and אשר אמנות, were of Babylonian origin. Furthermore, the content of the אשר אמנות Qedushath Hayom benediction, recited during the Musaph 'amidah on Shabbath Rosh Hodesh, clearly proves this prayer to be also of Babylonian origin.<sup>4</sup>

Although the prayer for wisdom, the fourth benediction of the week-day 'amidah, did appear in a variant form in Palestine, both Ginzberg and Levi hold the opinion that the first line of this prayer; אשר אמנות אשר אמנות אשר אמנות, is clearly Babylonian.<sup>5</sup> Ginzberg also argues that the אשר אמנות insert into this prayer was probably a substitute for אשר אמנות. Because this insert directly follows the Babylonian portion of this prayer, and because it, too, is written in the אמנות style, we can assume that it is a product of Babylon also.<sup>6</sup>

According to Liebreich, both of the Rosh Hashanah אמנות prayers, אשר אמנות and אשר אמנות, were composed by Rav, clearly making them Babylonian in origin.<sup>7</sup> The אשר אמנות benediction found throughout the Yom Kippur liturgy is also attributed to Rav, while the אשר אמנות portion of the אשר אמנות Ne'ilah prayer is attributed to the third century Babylonian, Samuel.<sup>8</sup> The direct relationship which exists between

אשר אמנות and אשר אמנות leads us to conclude that

אבות אבות was also compiled by the Jews in Babylon.

Not enough is known about the two אבות אבות prayers to determine their origin. As for the remaining אבות prayers; אבות אבות, אבות אבות, and אבות אבות, all are much too old to be Babylonian. We do know, however, that all were used as part of the Babylonian rite.

Thus, it is clear that of our fifteen אבות prayers, nine are clearly Babylonian in origin.

Aside from the fact that all fifteen of these prayers begin with אבות, there are no other stylistic similarities among them. There is, however, one further overall factor which should be considered before passing final judgment of this proposed category; the influence of the אבות אבות.

In Chapter Two it was explained that Elbogen and Kohler both hold the opinion that the אבות אבות was originally used as the Qedushath Hayom benediction for the Sabbath as well as the holy days.<sup>9</sup>

From this we concluded that the composition of אבות אבות and אבות אבות were both probably based on the אבות style of the אבות אבות. Chapter Four explained Liebreich's theory that אבות אבות and אבות אבות were patterned directly after the אבות אבות prayer in order to give the Zikhronoth and Shopharoth sections of the Rosh Hashanah 'amidah the same liturgical status as the Qedushath Hayom.<sup>10</sup>

Although none of these scholars searched further into the matter to

see what other prayers may have been patterned after the אֱלֹהֵינוּ, it is not difficult to make further assumptions along this line. Like the אֱלֹהֵינוּ and the אֱלֹהֵינוּ, the אֱלֹהֵינוּ Yom Kippur benediction is also attributed to Rav. Since the former two prayers were patterned after the אֱלֹהֵינוּ, the latter prayer may have also been influenced in the same way. Furthermore, a definite link can be shown between the אֱלֹהֵינוּ and the two Ne'ilah אֱלֹהֵינוּ benedictions; all three follow the אֱלֹהֵינוּ; all three are confessionals; and all three lead into the same Hathimah.<sup>11</sup>

This led to the conclusion in Chapter Five that perhaps the אֱלֹהֵינוּ prayers found in the Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur liturgies, as well as the two Sabbath Qedushath Hayom אֱלֹהֵינוּ prayers were all patterned after the אֱלֹהֵינוּ.<sup>12</sup> אֱלֹהֵינוּ can also be added to this list if we assume that the אֱלֹהֵינוּ was at one time the introduction to the Qedushath Hayom benediction for Musaph Shabbath Rosh Hodesh as well.

Our study of the אֱלֹהֵינוּ prayer in Chapter Three led us to believe that the אֱלֹהֵינוּ line of this prayer could have also been influenced by the אֱלֹהֵינוּ of אֱלֹהֵינוּ.<sup>13</sup> From here it is only a small step to make the same assumption about אֱלֹהֵינוּ.

Therefore, we can see that all nine prayers which were classified as being of Babylonian origin were most likely patterned after the אֱלֹהֵינוּ benediction. Furthermore, it was also shown in Chapter Two that our present-day אֱלֹהֵינוּ and אֱלֹהֵינוּ benedictions could have become the preferred prayers for Gebhuroth and Qedushath

Ha-shem respectively, because they too were influenced by the אמת style of אמת גחלתו.<sup>14</sup> Hence, if we exclude the two אמת דא benedictions, the remaining twelve אמת prayers could all have been influenced by אמת גחלתו.

Although we have negated Liebreich's contention that these prayers should constitute a separate category simply because, when combined, they do form a creed; we have shown other significant similarities among these prayers of affirmation beginning with אמת. If we exclude the two אמת דא benedictions for a moment, we can see that the remaining אמת prayers were all in some way influenced by the אמת גחלתו. Also, all of these prayers are found within the rubric of the 'amidah. Furthermore, all thirteen of these אמת prayers were part of the Babylonian rite with nine of them definitely being of Babylonian origin. Finally, it should be remembered that Jawitz listed all thirteen of these prayers together.

Throughout this entire study, I have constantly tried to remain objective. I have raised many questions which I cannot answer, and made many assumptions which I cannot definitely support. Never once did I try to judge who is the most prestigious scholar, Leon Liebreich or Joseph Heinemann. Nor did I begin this study with any preconceived notions. I explained the facts as my research indicated, never once discarding any point which seemed to contradict or change the direction which this work was taking. The אמת דא benedictions were included in this study even though they do not seem to fit in with the rest of the prayers; Jawitz's



list, the 'amidah rubric, and the fact that all the remaining prayers can be linked to the  $\text{אמנה ברכה}$ .<sup>15</sup>

Also, I have tried to remember that the study of Jewish liturgy is a prestigious and scientifically-based field. One should not jump to conclusions simply to sensationalize a study. Nor should one base a conclusion on pure assumptions, no matter how logical, if they cannot be factually verified.

Therefore, I have come to the conclusion that there is no such category of prayers beginning with the word  $\text{אמנה}$ . Rather, I will argue, that there are three definite similarities among all of these  $\text{אמנה}$  prayers. First, they were all used in the Babylonian rite. Second, it is possible that all of these benedictions, with the exception of  $\text{אמנה ברכה 'סוף היום}$ , were at one time part of the 'amidah rubric. And, finally, with the exception of the two  $\text{אמנה ברכה}$  prayers, about which we do not yet have enough information, all of these  $\text{אמנה}$  prayers were in some way influenced by the  $\text{אמנה ברכה Qedushath Hayom}$  benediction.

It is easy to understand, after recognizing these three similarities, why Liebreich assumed that the  $\text{אמנה}$  prayers constituted a special category. I am certain that if Liebreich would have continued with an in-depth examination of this alleged category, he, too, would have reached the same conclusion. However, similarities among prayers do not make them into a distinct category. That is why I do not find that these fifteen

$\text{אמנה}$  prayers (or even the thirteen prayers if the two  $\text{אמנה ברכה}$  prayers are excluded) form such a category.



# FOOTNOTES - CHAPTER SEVEN

1. Leon J. Liebreich, "Aspects of the New Year Liturgy", in Hebrew Union College Annual, Vol. XXXIV, Cincinnati, 1963, pp. 160-161.
2. See Chapter Six, page 64f above.
3. See Chapter Five, page 55 above.
4. This prayer discusses the destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem and the exile of the Jews to Babylon.
5. See Chapter Three, page 33 above. Also, notes #28 and 29, page 38 above.
6. See Chapter Three, page 33f above. Also, note #30, page 38 above.
7. See Chapter Four, page 42 above.
8. See Chapter Five, page 50 above.
9. See Chapter Two, page 18 above.
10. See Chapter Four, page 42f above.
11. See Chapter Five, page 49f above.
12. Ibid.
13. See Chapter Three, page 35 above.
14. Ibid.
15. See Chapter Five, page 53f above.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### I. PRIMARY SOURCES

- Babylonian Talmud, Vilna ed., 1897.
- Seligmann Baer, Seder Abhodath Yisrael, Rödelheim, 1868.
- The Hebrew Bible.
- Mahzor Vitry, S. Hurwitz ed., Berlin, 1893.
- Midrash Rabbah, 2 Volumes, Raam ed., Jerusalem, 1970.
- The Mishnah, W. H. Lowe ed., Cambridge, 1883.
- Palestinian Talmud, Krotoshin ed., Jerusalem, 1969.
- Pesiqta deRabh Kahana, Buber ed., New York, 1949.
- Seder Rabh 'Amram Gaon, Goldschmidt ed., Jerusalem, 1971.
- Seder Rabh Sa'adyah Gaon, Davidson, Assaf & Joel ed., Jerusalem, 1941.
- Siphre, Friedmann ed., Vienna, 1864.
- Tosaphoth to Babylonian Talmud, Vilna ed., 1897.
- Tosephta, Lieberman ed., 1955.
- Wa-Yiqra Rabbah, Margulies ed., Jerusalem, 1960.
- Yalquth, Frankfurt a. m., 1687.

### II. SECONDARY SOURCES

- Israel Abrahams, A Companion to the Authorized Daily Prayerbook, New York, Hermon Press, 1966.
- A. Berliner, Randbemerkungen zum täglichen Gebetbuche, II, Berlin, 1912.
- Isamar Elbogen, Der jüdische Gottesdienst in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung, Leipzig, 1913.
- I. Elbogen, "Studies in the Jewish Liturgy", in Jakob J. Petuchowski ed., Contributions to the Scientific Study of Jewish Liturgy, New York, Ktav, 1970, pp. 1-51.

Louis Finkelstein, "The Development of the Amidah", in Jakob J. Petuchowski ed., Contributions to the Scientific Study of Jewish Liturgy, New York, Ktav, 1970, pp. 91-177.

Louis Ginzberg, Commentary on the Palestinian Talmud, New York, 1941.

Judah Halevy, הקדמה לדברי, Sluzki ed., Leipzig, 1864.

Joseph Heinemann, Prayer in the Period of the Tanna'im and the Amora'im, (Hebrew), Jerusalem, Magnes Press, 1964.

Joseph H. Hertz, The Authorized Daily Prayer Book, New York, Bloch Publishing Company, 1946.

Emil G. Hirsch, "Articles of Faith", in The Jewish Encyclopedia, Vol. II, New York and London, Funk & Wagnells Company, 1902, pp. 148-151.

A. Z. Idelsohn, Jewish Liturgy and its Development, New York, Schocken Books, 1967.

Ze'ev Jawitz, התפילה במקרא, Berlin, 1910.

Kaufmann Kohler, "The Origin and Composition of the Eighteen Benedictions with a Translation of the Corresponding Essene Prayers in the Apostolic Constitutions", in Jakob J. Petuchowski ed., Contributions to the Scientific Study of Jewish Liturgy, New York, Ktav, 1970, pp. 52-90.

Eliezer Levi, התפילה במקרא, Tel Aviv, Abraham Zioni Publishing House, 1954.

Leon J. Liebreich, "Aspects of the New Year Liturgy", in Hebrew Union College Annual, Vol. XXXIV, Cincinnati, 1963, pp. 125-176.

Jacob Mann, "Genizah Fragments of the Palestinian Order of Service", in Jakob J. Petuchowski ed., Contributions to the Scientific Study of Jewish Liturgy, New York, Ktav, 1970, pp. 379-448.

David Neumark, "The Principles of Judaism in Historical Outline", in Journal of Jewish Lore and Philosophy, Cincinnati, Ark Publishing Company, 1919, pp. 1-46.

Jakob J. Petuchowski, "A New Approach to Jewish Liturgy", in Judaism, Vol. 15, #1, Winter, 1966, pp. 114-120.

Jakob J. Petuchowski ed., "Introduction", Contributions to the Scientific Study of Jewish Liturgy, New York, Ktav, 1970, pp. IX-XXVIII.

Franz Rosenzweig, Der Stern der Erlösung, Book III, Berlin, 1930.

Abraham I. Schechter, Studies in Jewish Liturgy, Philadelphia, Dropsie College, 1930.

S. Schechter, "The Dogmas of Judaism", in The Jewish Quarterly Review, Old Series, London, 1898, pp. 48-61, 115-127.

Solomon Schechter, "Genizah Specimens", in Jakob J. Petuchowski ed., Contributions to the Scientific Study of Jewish Liturgy, New York, Ktav, 1970, pp. 373-378.

Sepher Hammanhig, Berlin, Kornegg, 1855.