CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE HISTORY AND EVOLUTION OF THE KADDISH SUBSEQUENT TO THE PUBLICATION OF DAVID DE SOLA POOL'S WORK ON THE SUBJECT

BARRY R. FRIEDMAN

Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of Requirements for the Master of Arts in Hebrew Literature Degree and Ordination

Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion
New York, N. Y.

March 15, 1966

Advisor: Professor Leon Liebreich

HEBREW UNION COLLEGE
JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION
LIBRARY

I would like to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to Rabbis Paul Steinberg and Martin Cohen for their understanding and guidance, and to Rabbi Borowitz and Dr. Olinsky for their patience. I am deeply indebted to these professors for their interest and helpful suggestions.

I wish to express my sincerest gratitude to Dr. Leon Liebreich whose help, encouragement, critical comments, and constant reviewing of the material enabled this thesis to be written. He has not only taught me a great deal about the Kaddish but has truly been my Rav U-Moreh ba-Yisrael.

To my wife, Irene, I can only express my heartfelt thanks.

Table of Contents

To the modern Jew the Kaddish has lost all relevance to life and has been relegated to a position of nothing more than a superstitious utterance.

While the components of the prayer we now call The Kaddish are ancient the importance given them by the Rabbis are not hidden in antiquity. They attributed great merit to the sanctification of God's Name and the Yitgadal with the congregational response Yehay Shemay Rabbah fulfilled this obligation.

The Zohar states that by the merits of the Kaddish the glory of God is more highly exalted than through any other prayer. (1).

Although the name "Kaddish" does not appear in Talmudic and Midrashic literature there are ample references to Yehay Shemay Rabbah. The Rabbis felt that anyone who responds "Amen, Yehay Shemay Rabbah" with complete sincerity would cause any evil decree against him to be abolished.

The Shulhan Arukh instructs us that if a person can respond to either the Kaddish or the Kedushah he is to respond to the Kaddish (2). We are even told, by a minority opinion in Berakhot 21b, that a person may interrupt the Amidah to respond to the Kaddish

The Kaddish is a declaration of faith. It is a sanctification of God's Name and can only be recited with a deep sense of personal involvement. It was for these reasons that the prayer has retained its position of importance in our liturgy.

Chapter I

Rabbi David de Sola Pool maintains in his work "The Kaddish" that the oldest known version of this prayer is that of Rav Amram Gaon, 860 C.E. Pool further maintains that the Kaddish is an eclectic prayer, and identifies its various forms utilizing the Yemenite, Persian, Abudraham and Maimonidean rites, as well as that of Saadia (1).

יתגדל ויתקדש שמה רבא בעלמא דברא כרעותה וימלך מלכותה
בחייכון וביומיכון ובחיי דכל בית ישראל בעגלא ובזמן
קריב אמן. יהא שמה רבא מברך לעלם ולעלמי עלמיא יתברך
אמן. וישתבח ויתפאר ויתרמם ויתנשא ויתהדר ויתעלה
ויתקלס שמה דקדשא בריך הוא לעלא מכל ברכתא שירתא תשבחתא
ונחמתא דאמירן בעלמא ואמרו אמן.

תתקבל צלותהון ובעותהון דכל ישראל קדם אבוהון דבשמיא
ואמרו אמן.

יהא שלמא רבא מן שמיא וחיים (ושבע וישועה ונחמה וצלה לכל)
(על כל) ישראל ואמרו אמן.

עושה שלום במרומיו הוא יעשה שלום על כל ישראל.

יתגדל ויתקדש שמה רבא בעלמא דהוא עתיד לחדתא ולאחאה
מיתיא ולמבני קרתא דירושלם ולשכללא היכלא ולמעקר
פולחנא נזכראה מארעא ולאתבא פולחנא קדישא דשמיא לאתרה
וימלך קודשא בריך הוא מלכותה ויקרה בחייכון וביומיכון
ובחיי דכל בית ישראל בעגלא ובזמן קריב אמן.

By clearly illustrating the development of the liturgy Pool shows how and why the Kaddish came into the prayer service. The initial reason which caused for the intro-

duction of the Kaddish was the reading of the Prophets, held regularly on Sabbaths and Festivals, and often every morning. This led to the Aggadic discourses, concluding with various formulae which eventually became specific, fixed prayers (2). Pool finds that

> "One such doxology that came into regular use is the first paragraph of the Kaddish with the response of the congregation." (3)

Pool makes no chronological distinction between the origin of the Yitgadal paragraph and the Yehay Shemay Rabbah but does illustrate his thesis from various passages in which Israel's reply is Yehay Shemay Rabbah mevorakh (4).

In light of these passages Pool dates the first paragraph of the Kaddish. He primarily utilizes the legend dealing with Rabbi Jose b. Halafta:

> "A heavenly voice (bat kol) cries out from a ruin to Rabbi Jose b. Halafta (2nd century) in comfort for the Hadrianic persecution. When Israel perform the will of Heaven by gathering in the synagogues and study houses and respond 'Yehay Shemay Rabbah mevorakh' the Holy One, blessed be He, shakes His head and says.. 'Happy is the King to Whom such praises are offered in His house." (5)

Pool also discusses the legend which deals with Zerubbabel b. Shealtiel, found in the Yalkut (II 428 to Isa 26):

> "And when he closes his Aggadic address, Zerubbabel b. Shealtiel stands up and says... 'Yitgadal ve-yitkadash' to which all answer, 'Amen."

This specific mention of Yitgadal ve-yitkadash is attributed to Resh Lakish of the 3rd century C.E. (6).

The following paragraph Yitbarakh, according to Pool, is of later origin than that preceding it (7). He therefore dates it somewhere between the 2nd and 4th centuries C.E. (8).

The wording of the Titkabal paragraph leads Pool to the assumption that with the exception of Yehay Shemay it is probably the oldest paragraph of the Kaddish. This paragraph existed independently of and antedated the Kaddish. It was merged with it and was utilized as a formula indicating the conclusion of the service (9).

The Oseh shalom is generally accepted as late. Pool maintains that this sentence is based on the half verse in Job 25:2b, oseh shalom bimromav, which was interpreted as referring to peace between the angels. The oseh shalom transposes the idea of peace amongst the angels to peace amongst men. This concept, which is not unique to the Kaddish, is included in the Grace after Meals, the Shemoneh Esre and the Kedushah as well as the Kaddish. According to Pool oseh shalom was added to the Kaddish when the character of yehay shelamah as a prayer for peace was obscured. The oseh shalom is not, however, original to the Kaddish, having first been introduced into the Shemoneh Esre and later carried over to the Kaddish with the insertion of

the word ve-imru (10).

The use of Aramaic in the first paragraph and in the response is clear, because a response in the vernacular logically closes a discourse rendered in the vernacular (11).

Pool is not vitally concerned with the Al Hakol version of the Kaddish found in Massekhet Soferim 14:12. He states that the Al Hakol "Kaddish" is

> "clearly an expanded Hebrew version of a formula similar to the Kaddish, in style later than the more simple and direct language of the Kaddish." (12)

He disregards the opinion of Meir Friedmann that the Kaddish was originally composed in Hebrew and then later translated into Aramaic because of Friedmann's early dating of the prayer (13). Pool contends that this dating is probably the copyist's, and feels that the compilation of the Midrash should be assigned to the 5th or 6th centuries. He states clearly that any Hebrew version of the Kaddish is the later rendition of an originally Aramaic Aggadic doxology (14). Pool concludes that the Al Hakol "Kaddish" is then a prayer which is strictly parallel to the Kaddish (15).

The Kaddish is assumed to be based on a formula predating Christian times.

"The Paternoster implies that a Kaddish-like prayer was

in existence at the period of the rise of Christianity." (16)

Pool is of the opinion that even though John the Baptist was not a regular Essene, he at least belonged to the same ascetic school as the Essenes. Frequent prayers, especially those for the advent of the Kingdom of Heaven, were as characteristic of John and his disciples as the regular Essenes. The connection between John and Jesus certainly played an important role in the latter's development. There is no doubt that John's prayers in the disciple's questions, such as

> "voluntary poverty, discountenancing marriage, the neglect of provision for earthly food and drink, the importance attached to lustrations, communistic means and manner of life, healing the sick, the gift of prophecy, aversion to taking an oath, the prominence given eschatological ideas and speculations.." (17)

point to the fact that the answers given are ultimately to be traced back to Essenic circles (18).

It may be stated that the early Church derived its prayers from the Essenes and not from the Pharasaic synagogues. It has been historically proven that one segment of the Essenes attached itself to early Christianity and the other segment was absorbed into Pharasaic Judaism. Thus as Pool points out:

> "To the former we would owe the Paternoster, to the latter the Kaddish." (19)

There is no question as to the Messianic notions of the opening paragraph of the Kaddish. Still another legend bears on this notion..

When the wars between Gog and Magog are fought there will be an ushering in of the Messianic era. When victory is attained over the godless nations, God's Name is hallowed (yitkadash Shemay Rabbah be-alma) and the fulfillment of God's Will (kirutay) is the revelation of His Kingship (ye-yamlikh malkhutay) (20).

The Messianic doctrine in the opening paragraph of the Kaddish is derived from a verse in Ezekiel 38:23

Ve-hitgadilti ve-hitkadishti ve-nodati le-aynay goyim rabbim ve-yadu ki Ani Adonai

Therefore any reference to a personal Messiah, such as is contained in the words of one of the eclectic forms of the Kaddish, ve-yatzmah purkanay vi-yekarev meshihay, is a later addition, since the popular belief in a personal Messiah dates only from the time of Herod (22).

On the basis of the interpretation of Deut 32:3, "Ki Shem Adonai ekra, havu godel le-Elohaynu", it became customary to respond with praises each time the Name of God was mentioned (23). It is into this pattern that the Yehay Shemay Rabbah falls. This response seems to have applied to the Aggadic discourse as well. In our Kaddish, even though there is no mention of God's Name other than Shemay Rabbah, the emphasis is on this magnifying and hallowing of the Name through the redemption of Israel (24).

Chapter II

Zvi Karl begins his study of the Kaddish by making us aware that the development of our ancient prayers is wrapped in mystery and that we really know nothing about their evolution. Our tradition furnishes us with no answer as to when, how or why these prayers were written. The Talmud merely declares that the Men of the Great Assembly fixed benedictions and prayers (1). But we have no indication as to which benedictions they formulated. It is Karl's thesis that the Kaddish suffered the same fate. He is of the opinion that these prayers did not become part of the service by the decision of any official committee, but rather that various Shelihe Zibbur composed them of their own initiative and recited them on various occasions. Later, others used their patterns and eventually people customarily recited these prayers until in due course they were regarded as obligatory. Because the adoption of these prayers by the community was not bound up with any official decision, the names of the authors were forgotten, along with the reason why the prayers were composed, the time of their composition and the way in which they developed (2).

It is Karl's contention that the "Short Kaddish" consists of two parts. The first part begins with Yitgadal and ends with Ba-agalah u-vi-zeman kariv ve-imru amen. The second part consists of Yehay Shemay Rabbah (3). These parts were originally independent of each other. This is evident from the fact that the author finds in Massekhet Soferim the Yitgadal paragraph

of the Kaddish without the Y.S.R. Here the Yitgadal concludes with the words ve-imru amen. We can deduce from the amen of the Yitgadal paragraph that the prayer had been completed, for in every instance in the Psalms amen indicates a conclusion (4).

Karl bolsters his argument with the words ve-imru amen which informed the congregation when to respond amen. It is Karl's assumption that this indicates the lack of knowledge on the part of the congregation. It is then doubtful whether such a congregation was called upon to recite the Y.S.R. by heart. Wherever it was thought that a congregation was composed of ignorant people, they were not called upon to respond with more than amen. Massekhet Sukkah 51b informs us of such a case in Alexandria, Egypt (5).

However, we know that the Y.S.R. was not always the response of the congregation. In Sifre (Ha-azinu), Finkelstein edition, p. 342, we find that the Yehay Shemo ha-Gadol mevorakh evoked the response L-olam ul-olmay olamim but was not itself a response (6). But since the Y.S.R. in the Kaddish is a response, we must assume it was also originally independent of the Kaddish (7).

Karl holds the view that the Y.S.R. had already been in use during the time the Jerusalem Temple existed, whereas the Yitgadal paragraph originated after the destruction of the

Temple. This is deduced from a baraita in Berakhot 3a:

> "When Israel enters into synagogues and houses of study and proclaims, 'May His great Name be blessed,' the Holy One, blessed be He, shakes His head and says 'Happy the King who is thus praised in His house. What moved a Father to send His children into exile, etc."

Rashi interpreted the words, "Happy the King Who is thus praised in His house," as, "Happy, so long as this praise occurred in the Temple." Rashi, according to Karl, is correct in interpreting "What moved a Father to send His children into Exile" that were it not for the Exile, He would enjoy this praise in His house.

> "Hence, we conclude that the prayer Y.S.R. was recited in the Temple at a time when the prayer Yitgadal had not yet been composed." (8)

The idea contained in the prayer Y.S.R. was phrased in different forms before it became stereotyped (9).

The opening words of this prayer, namely, Y.S.R. reflect a conscious effort not to mention the Ineffable Name. So that if we compare Yehi Shem Adonai mevorakh me-attah ve-ad olam with Yehay Shemay ha-Gadol mevorakh we see that they are structurally identical, but Shem Adonai mevorakh has become Shemo ha-Gadol. It was finally determined that Barukh Shem kevod malkhuto le-olam va-ed which was one of the ancient responses to the Barekhu would be used as the response during the Sacrificial service of the Day of Atonement (the Avodah) as well as between the Shema

and ve-ahavtah verses in the Recital of the Shema. Y.S.R. which was also an ancient response to the Barekhu was now reserved for the Kaddish (10).

Karl, in attempting to explain the merger of the Yitgadal and Y.S.R. finds it necessary to first examine the contents of the Yitgadal. Here he concentrates the bulk of his analysis on the Al Hakol "Kaddish."

In Massekhet Soferim it is stated that the Maftir recites:

על הכל יתגדל ויתקדש ויתפאר ויתרומם ויתנשא ויתעלה ויתהדר
ויתקלס הנכבד והנורא שמו של מלך מלכי המלכים הקב"ה בעולמות
שברא העולם הזה והעולם הבא כרצונו וכרצון כל עמו בית ישראל.

(In the Mueller edition and the Mahzor Vitry the words

(וכרצון כל עמו are added to וכרצון כל יראיו

תגלה ותראה מלכותו עלינו במהרה ובזמן קרוב. והוא יבנה
ביתו בימינו ויחון פלטתו ופלטת עמו ישראל ברחמיו וברוב
חסדיו בשלום ובחן ובחסד וברחמים המקום הוא יעשה עמנו
בעבור שמו הגדול (ואמרו אמן) (1$).

If we compare the preceding prayer with:

יתגדל ויתקדש שמיה רבא בעלמא די ברא כרעותיה וימליך
מלכותיה .... ויפרוק עמיה בחייכון וביומיכון ובחייהון
דכל בית ישראל בעגלא ובזמן קריב

we see that the contents of both are identical. In a slightly different version, the passage from Yitgadal to Kirutay inclusive resembles, almost word for word, the first part of Al Hakol concluding with the words bet Yisrael. The words veyamlikh malkhutay u-ve-hayekhon u-ve-hayay dekhol bet Yisrael ba-agalah u-vi-zeman kariv are the same as Tiggaleh ve-tayraeh malkhuto alaynu bi-mehayrah u-vi-zeman karov. It would seem that in due course the words ve-khirtzon kol amo bet Yisrael (from the Al Hakol) were understood as if they were connected with what immediately follows, namely, Tiggaleh ve-tayraeh malkhuto alaynu. When they introduced it into the formulation of Yitgadal, they introduced, instead of the word kirtzon the word be-hayay. In this manner u-ve-hayay dekhol bet Yisrael evolved (12).

Karl continues to point out the similarities between the two versions, and then states:

"The difference between the two prayers lies only in this: Al Hakol speaks of two worlds, whereas Yitgadal speaks of only one." (13)

על הכל יתגדל וישתבח ויתפאר ויתרומם ויתנשא שמו של מלך
מלכי המלכים הקב"ה בעולמות שברא העולם הזה והעולם הבא
כרצונו וכרצון כל עמו ישראל. צור העולמים אדון כל
הבריות אלוה כל נפשות היושב במרחבי מרום השוכן בשמי
שמי קדם קדושתו על כסא הכבוד וקדושתו על החיות. וככן
יתקדש שמו בנו לעיני כל חי ונאמר לפניו שיר חדש ככתוב
שירו לה' שיר חדש כי נפלאות עשה. ונאמר שירו לאלהים
זמרו שמו סולו לרוכב בערבות ביה שמו. ונראהו עין בעין
בשובו אל נוהו כמו שנאמר: כי עין בעין יראו בשוב ה'
ציון ונגלה כבוד ה' וראו כל בשר יחדיו כי פי ה' דבר.

Though there is a resemblance between these two Al Hakol Kaddeshim and the customary Kaddish, at the same time there is a distinct difference. Basically the contents of both versions of the Al Hakol "Kaddish" are the same and differ only in style (14) The writer of the Rav Amram Gaon version based his text on the Scriptural writings. It is Karl's contention that the Al Hakol "Kaddish" in the Seder Rav Amram Goan is nothing more than a commentary upon the Kedushah of the Amidah as the following tabulation indicates:

Rav Amram Gaon Al Hakol "Kaddish"	Massekhet Soferim Kaddish	Musaf Kedushah Sabbath	Shahrit Kedushah Sabbath	Kedushah For Weekdays
1) קדושתו על כסא הכבוד 2) וקדושתו על החיות 3) ובכן יתקדש שמו לעיני כל חי To correspond to the Thrice-Holy		קדוש קדוש קדוש ה' צבאות מלא כל הארץ כבודו (Isaiah 6:3)	קדוש קדוש קדוש ה' צבאות מלא כל הארץ כבודו (Isaiah 6:3)	קדוש קדוש קדוש ה' צבאות מלא כל הארץ כבודו (Isaiah 6:3)
		כבודו מלא עולם משרתיו שואלים זה לזה איה מקום כבודו לעמתם ברוך יאמרו Introduction to following	אז בקול רעש גדול אדיר ואזק משמיעים קול מתנשאים לעמת שרפים לעמתם ברוך יאמרו Introduction to following	לעמתם ברוך יאמרו Introduction to following
ונגלה כבוד ה' וראו כל בשר יחדו (Isaiah 40:5) ונאמר לפניו שיר חדש		ברוך כבוד ה' ממקומו (Ezek. 3:12)	ברוך כבוד ה' ממקומו (Ezek. 3:12)	ברוך כבוד ה' ממקומו (Ezek. 3:12)
ונראתה עין בעין בשובו אל ציון (Isaiah 52:8) ונגלה כבוד ה'	חגלה ותראה מלכותו עלינו. במהרה ובזמן קרוב. והוא יבנה ביתו בימינו. ויחון פלטתו ופלטת עמו ישראל ברחמיו וברוב חסדיו בשלום ובחן ובחסד וברחמים המקום הוא יעשה עמנו בעבור שמו הגדול	ממקומו הוא יפן ברחמים ויחון עם המיחדים שמו ערב ובקר בכל יום תמיד פעמים באהבה שמע אומרים	ממקומך מלכנו תופיע ותמלוך עלינו כי מחכים אנחנו לך מתי תמלוך בציון בקרוב בימינו לעולם ועד תשכון תתגדל ותתקדש בתוך ירושלים עירך לדור ודור ולנצח נצחים ועיניינו תראינה מלכותך כדבר האמור בשירי עזך על ידי דוד משיח צדקך	ובדברי קדשך כתוב לאמר Introduction to following
		שמע ישראל ה' אלהינו ה' אחד (Deut. 6:5) אחד הוא אלהינו הוא אבינו הוא מלכנו הוא מושיענו והוא ישמיענו ברחמיו שנית לעיני כל חי להיות לכם לאלהים אני ה' אלהיכם		
		ובדברי קדשך כתוב לאמר Introduction to following		
		ימלך ה' לעולם אלהיך ציון לדור ודור הללויה (Psalms 146:10)	ימלך ה' לעולם אלהיך ציון לדור ודור הללויה (Psalms 146:10)	ימלך ה' לעולם אלהיך ציון לדור ודור הללויה (Psalms 146:10)

The Al Hakol "Kaddish" is recited after the Shemoneh Esre and the reading of the Torah so that those who had not heard the Kedushah might hear it (15). This was the purpose of the Maftir reciting the Kaddish after the Haftarah. The Al Hakol Yitgadal (Massekhet Soferim), recited after the reading of the Torah, undoubtedly served as a Kaddish for those entering and leaving, without any mention of the recitation of Y.S.R. (16).

The Y.S.R. was originally a prayer separate from the Kaddish and antedated it, according to Karl, and this is the only explanation for the addition of the words ve-yitaleh, ve-yithadar ve-yitkales. The latter were added to the Al Hakol "Kaddish" to make known that the Holy One, praised be He, is now magnified in His world and that the angels are enveloping Him in majesty and glory because Israel had just recited Y.S.R. before the Al Hakol. The word ve-yitkales was added due to Y.S.R. preceding the Al Hakol. It is stated in the Midrash, "Happy is the King Who is thus praised (she-mekalsin oto kakh) in His Temple." (17). Hence the yitkales in the Al Hakol "Kaddish" is a direct reference to the praise of God contained in the Y.S.R.

Although the Y.S.R. is older than the Yitgadal paragraph, it nevertheless follows it in the order of the service. We do not know when this "un-chronological" ordering took place or why (18). But when Y.S.R. came to occupy its new position it was merged

with the first paragraph of the Kaddish (19). It had been the custom that whenever an Aggadic discourse was delivered, it was concluded with the response Y.S.R. When the Y.S.R. and the Kaddish became one, Yitgadal was also recited after the discourse (20). This is what Karl calls the "Kaddish Following An Aggadic Discourse." Rabbinic expositions were delivered in the vernacular. This led to the change of Yehay Shemo ha-Gadol mevorakh from the Hebrew to the Aramaic (21). The change in language took place very slowly, through evolution rather than by a conscious effort. It is clear that be-hayaykhon u-ve-yomaykhon came in when the Kaddish was said after the discourse. These words refer to the person delivering the discourse and his interpreter or to the other scholars in attendance. Accordingly, u-ve-hayay dekhol bet Yisrael had to be said immediately after it. The word u-ve-yomaykhon belongs only in the Kaddish which follows the Aggadic discourse; and yet, it remained even in the Kaddish of the prayer service (22).

It would seem that the redactors divided the two worlds mentioned in the Al Hakol "Kaddish": 1. the Kaddish of the Tefillah, and 2. the Kaddish of the study of the Torah. They introduced the words be-alma de-atid le-haddeta into the Kaddish of the Aggadic exposition. They thus made reference to this world and the world to come (23).

The prayers following the first two paragraphs of the Kaddish

(i.e. Titkabel, Al Rabbanan, Yehay Shelama and Oseh Shalom) eventually were attached to the Kaddish. It is evident that these prayers, originally composed in Hebrew, were translated into Aramaic (24). This change took place very slowly and helps to explain why the Oseh Shalom, which was appropriated from the Amidah, did not have to be translated (25).

Karl also comments on the Kaddish after burial. He states that the Kaddish with the Y.S.R. has a connection with a person's death. This becomes evident when we recall the words of Job after hearing of the death of his sons, namely, "Adonai natan va-Adonai lakah yehi Shem Adonai mevorakh." (26).

The custom of reciting the Kaddish was already observed in the period of the Gaonim. In the Seder Rav Amram Gaon we find that after the mourner recites the Tzidduk ha-Din, the Reader recites Yitgadal.

The act of vindicating God's attribute of justice is ascribed to the Kaddish after burial, since mention is made there of the revival of the dead. This reference to Tzidduk ha-Din is not to be found in the Kaddish of the Tefillah (27).

The Kaddish after burial was eventually recited also upon returning from the cemetery. According to Rav Amram Gaon and the Mahzor Vitry the Kaddish after burial was recited by the

Sheliah Tzibbur and not by the mourner (28).

The Kaddish recited in memory of the deceased has no connection with the Orphan's Kaddish. Karl quotes Rabbi Isaac of Vienna and the Mahzor Vitry who state that in reference to the recitation of the Kaddish it did not matter whether it was an orphan boy or a boy whose father was living (29). The author of the "Rokeah" (Rabbi Eliezer of Worms) writes that preference was given to the orphan because a child who recites Yitgadal rescues his father from disaster (30). It was believed that the departed soul condemned to Gehinnom could be released by the recitation of the Yitgadal.

It is Karl's opinion that the source for this custom may be found in Massekhet Soferim where it is related that the Kaddish Batra (the last Kaddish of the service) was recited after the worshippers met the mourners. At times this Kaddish was recited by one of the worshippers and the Sheliah Tzibbur who normally officiated at the Musaf service. Gradually preference was given to the mourner since the essential vindication of God's justice was deemed to be his task. When this custom reached Germany, there was another rite in existence there: that the Sabbath Kaddish Batra was recited after En Kelohaynu. The orphaned boys would say it and the custom developed that the boy reciting the Kaddish Batra should be a mourner, or at least an orphan of more than an eleven month duration (31). In ancient times a

few people fasted on the anniversary of the death of their father or mother. In the course of time it was believed that this fast benefited the departed soul. Therefore they were of the opinion that the Kaddish too was for the benefit of the departed soul and thus it was also said on the day a father or mother died (32).

Karl is convinced that the oldest Kaddish is that found in Seder Rav Amram Gaon where it is referred to as the Kaddish for the individual (Kaddish le-yahid). The latest Kaddish is the current Yitgadal prayer which is now recited regularly as the Kaddish (33).

> "In general we can posit that prayers in Aramaic are from a later period, as most prayers from ancient times were composed in Hebrew." (34)

It is clear that one of the two versions of the Al Hakol "Kaddish" served as an inspiration for the writer of the second version. It is impossible to assume that the version found in Massekhet Soferim preceded the version of Rav Amram Gaon. The writer of the latter based his text in general on Scriptural verses. These verses are the sole source of his prayer. On the other hand, it is evident that the writer of the Massekhet Soferim version sought to comment upon what was not so obvious in the version of Rav Amram Gaon. So it is Karl's opinion that the version of Massekhet Soferim is later than the version of Rav Amram Gaon.

מסכת סופרים	רב עמרם גאון
תגלה ותראה מלכותו עלינו	ונגלה כבוד ה' וראו כל בשר יחדו.
מלכותו	כבוד ה'
במהרה ובזמן קרוב	בנו
הוא יעשה עמנו בעבור שמו הגדול	יתקדש שמו בנו
הוא יבנה ביתו בימנו	בשוב ה' ציון

It is evident that "May He establish His kingdom... even speedily and at a near time" in the Yitgadal prayer comes from the phrase "May His kingdom be revealed and shown to us even speedily and at a near time" by changing the words Tiggaleh ve-tayraeh alaynu to the word ve-yamlikh and not the contrary. Tiggaleh is derived from Isaiah 40:5, "And the glory of God shall be revealed and .... shall see." Because of this evidence Karl concludes that the Aramaic version of the Kaddish is later than the other two versions (35).

Chapter III

Professor Samuel Krauss begins his essay on the Kaddish by stating that the popular, contemporary notions regarding the Kaddish bear no similarities to those held during the period of the Talmud and Midrash. In the latter works there is no mention of an Orphan's Kaddish nor is there any connection of the Kaddish with burial or with souls of the departed. The word Kaddish, as a technical term, does not appear in the Talmud. It is obvious that its derivation is Aramaic and has the same meaning as the Hebrew word Kadosh. This word is found three times in the Kedushah de-Sidra, namely, Kadosh, Kadosh, Kadosh Adonai tzevaot melo kol ha-aretz ke-vodo. It was rendered in the Aramaic as Kaddish... Kaddish... Kaddish... It is stated in Sotah 49b that the world rests upon two liturgical practices: 1. the Kedushah de-Sidra and 2. the Y.S.R. of the Aggadic discourse. From the words found in Sotah we may infer several things of both a positive and a negative nature, namely, 1. the language of the Kedushah de-Sidra and the Y.S.R. is Aramaic; 2. there is no name other than Y.S.R. for the response to the Aggadic discourse; 3. the wording of one resembles that of the other, and 4. in as much as it was designated as Y.S.R. de-Aggadeta, we gain an insight to its nature, namely, that it followed an Aggadic discourse.

The view is generally held that the Kaddish was written in Aramaic, so that even the untutored would be able to understand

it. Krauss does not accept this view and he raises the question that if this was the case why was not the Shemoneh Esre written in Aramaic. He rejects the argument that Shemoneh Esre was composed when Hebrew was the vernacular, because Aramaic was already the spoken language. In this connection Krauss makes the point that the Kaddish is not a prayer with pleas to God. It is only a concluding utterance, an addendum, at the end of an instruction period for the people. It was composed to praise the Creator and to sanctify His Name publicly. Krauss deduces this from a sentence in the Kaddish itself, namely, Brikh Hu le-ayla min kol birkhata ve-shirata tushbehata ve-nehemata. The Kaddish was so formulated as to heap up praises to God and not to heap up prayers to Him. For there is no hint of prayer in the Kaddish (1).

According to modern scholars the nehemata is appropriate for the ending of an Aggadic discourse, as it was the custom to conclude with words of comfort. This is what Elbogen calls "Eschatological Schluss." It is a conclusion that refers to the world to come. This is in complete agreement with the contents of the Kaddish, for many of its phrases allude to the idea of a world to come, i.e. le-alam ul-almay almaya and be-alma di hu atid le-ithadta ul-ahyaa. It was actually recited in this manner after the study of Midrash and Aggadah. It is to be noted that there is no reference in this form of the Kaddish to Tzidduk ha-Din (2).

The ideas regarding God's greatness over all the nations and His killing human beings and bringing them back to life by his judgment are not foreign to the Bible. In Ezekiel 38:23 God is portrayed as saying in that far-off day, Hitgadilti ve-hitkadishti and in Daniel 2:20 we find le-hevay Shemay di-Elaha mevarakh min alma vead alma (3). The reference in Daniel, which is practically identical with Yehay Shemay Rabbah mevarakh le-alam ul-almay almaya, resembles the phraseology in the Targum Yerushalmi Genesis 49;4 Yehay Shemay Rabbah mevarakh le-olmay olamin. We find similar expressions in the Talmud and Midrash. Krauss draws attention to the rather important fact that Y.S.R. was never intended as a supplication to God but was an utterance of praise to Him in connection with an Aggadic discourse.

According to Elbogen people frequently recited the Kaddish in the service because the sentence min kol birkhata ve-shirata tushbehata ve-nehemata seemed to suggest prayer. Its direct association with mourning was due to the eschatological idea contained within the word nehemata.

Krauss disagrees with Elbogen, for the phrase le-ayla min kol tzelota is not to be found in that sentence and the mere mention of the revival of the dead does not necessarily lead to thoughts of mourning. Krauss' evidence for this is the second benediction of the Shemoneh Esre which clearly states that God "will faithfully revive the dead" and concludes with

the public declaration "Blessed art Thou O Lord who revivest the dead." This benediction was not uprooted from its place to serve as a comfort for mourners. Krauss maintains that the Kaddish became part of the service because the pattern of Jewish prayer is two-fold, namely, supplicatory prayer and the reading of the Torah. Once it is realized that the reading of the Torah is an integral part of the worship, then a discourse in the vernacular was called for. This Aggadic discourse was followed by the Kaddish. The entire service was a learning process and there was no division between the reading of the Torah, the Aggadic discourse and the prayer proper, just as there is no distinction in essence between the synagogue and the house of study. This has remained the pattern of Jewish prayer to this day. By its frequent occurrence in the service the Kaddish was shortened and it acquired the names Kaddish ad-le-ayla, Kaddish Zuta, Kaddish Katzar and Hatzi Kaddish.

Krauss now attempts to offer suggestions as to the reasons why there is a Kaddish de-Rabbanan, an Orphans' Kaddish and a Mourners' Kaddish. The mourner, according to Krauss, had remained in his home during Shiva and could not enter the house of study to recite or even listen to the Kaddish de-Rabbanan. Not being able to perform this mitzvah distressed him. And so the custom arose to recite the Kaddish with feeling and emphasis in the house of the mourner to lighten his sufferings and give him comfort. The text was changed somewhat by removing the

reference to Rabbanan, the house of study and the Aggadic discourse. It was thus shortened to what we now know as the Orphans' Kaddish (or Kaddish Na'ar) because it constitutes a redemption that comes to the deceased through the mourner, particularly to a father through his son. This is an atonement for the soul of the deceased. There are those who maintain that the Kaddish, as an instrument of redemption, is a verbal expression of the passage Ani kaparat nafsho found in Kiddushin 31b.

Many people are of the opinion, according to Krauss, that the source of the Orphans' Kaddish is found in the story of Rabbi Akiba's encounter with the woodchopper. In this Midrash a man is condemned to Gehinnom and is redeemed only when Rabbi Akiba taught the man's son the Barekhu (4).

Louis Ginzberg maintains that the Ahronim saw in this story the origin of the Orphans' Kaddish, but he points out there is no mention of the Kaddish, only Barekhu. Krauss takes issue with Ginzberg's citation from the Sifre (ha-Azinu): "Ki Shem Adonai ekra havu godel le-Elohaynu. Rabbi Jose says, 'How do we know that in the synagogue when a person recites Barekhu et Adonai hamevorakh, those present should respond Barukh Adonai hamevorakh le-olam va-ed? Because of the verse Ki Shem Adonai ekra havu godel le-Elohaynu..."

Ginzberg is of the opinion that this Barekhu refers to the

person called to the Torah and not to the Cantor. Krauss disagrees, stating that the passage from Sifre makes no specific mention of Koray ba-Torah but rather indicates that it applies to the prayer service (5). We find in Sifre (ibid.), "Where do we learn that after Y.S.R. is recited the congregation responds with le-olam ul-olmay olamim? From the verse Ki Shem Adonai ekra havu godel le-Elohaynu." It is possible, that since Sifre is a reliable ancient source, this order of the recitation and response was a custom which is no longer observed. The change in our service however is slight, for the congregation replies with the complete sentence Yehay Shemay Rabbah mevarakh le-alam ul-almay almaya. This parallels the response le-olam va-ed to the recitation of Barukh Adonai ha-mevorakh or to the response le-olam va-ed to the phrase Barukh Shem kevod malkhuto.

The Al Hakol, according to Krauss, is a type of Kaddish. He maintains that Al hakol yitgadal ... yitnasay ... Shemo shel melekh malkhay ha-melakhim ha-Kadosh barukh Hu parallels Y.S.R. Ba-olamot shebara ha-olam hazeh ve-ha-olam haba parallels le-alam ul-almay almaya and kirtzono resembles di-alma di-vera khirutay.

Krauss is of the opinion that the Al Hakol was written in a style enabling the Cantor to recite one sentence and the congregation to respond with the second. Later, Krauss continues, the congregation grew lazy and the prayer was no longer recited

in accordance with the intentions of the author. However, there is nothing present in the Al Hakol which would enable us to understand how it could have become the Orphans' Kaddish.

Krauss relates a custom mentioned in Massekhet Soferim, namely, that the Kaddish was not recited by a mourner but by the Sheliah Tzibbur. After the Jerusalem Temple was destroyed it was decided that bridegrooms and mourners should come to the synagogue to enable the congregation to perform acts of lovingkindness. After the Cantor finished the Musaf service of the Sabbath he pronounced a benediction over the mourners and then recited the Kaddish. However the words be-alma de-atid le-hadta were not mentioned.

The redemption of a soul through the recitation of the Kaddish is based upon the utterance of the word Amen. This word indicates a keeping of religious faith and an acceptance of the yoke of the kingdom of heaven (6). So much is implied in this word, and yet it is simple enough to be recited by the smallest child.

The Orphans' Kaddish, when recited as sympathetic magic, cannot redeem a soul. It should be said as a request or supplication.

Krauss concludes by stating that it is not proper to make of Judaism a cult of the dead and to place reverence for our ancestors above all else. According to the true spirit of our

religion the synagogue should be a place of song and praise to God. Our early sages spoke of the joy of fulfilling the mitzvot and wherever possible they removed from communal life sadness and mourning relegating them only to the home of the individual.

Evelyn Garfiel in her book "The Service of the Heart - A Guide to the Jewish Prayer Book", expresses her indebtedness to Professor Shalom Spiegel for his guidance "in helping to unravel the many intertwining strands in the history of the Kaddish." (7)

She states that originally the Kaddish was a hymn to the greatness and holiness of God's Name, recited after an Aggadic discourse or at the close of a service.

The author traces the evolution of the Kaddish from a response to an Aggadic discourse to a mourners' prayer.

The key to the problem, according to the author, lies in the two-fold idea involved in the Kaddish, namely, 1. the central role of the Torah in Jewish spiritual life and 2. the great worth attached by the Rabbis to the recital of a formula that constituted Kiddush ha-Shem. Kaddish offered such an opportunity, as it enabled the congregation to respond Y.S.R.

At one time, Aggadic discourses were delivered in the house of mourning during the week after the death of a learned man as

a way of honoring his memory; later the lectures were continued for an entire year. At the end of each discourse the lecturer closed with the Kaddish and those in the house responded with Y.S.R. In order not to shame anyone, this way of honoring the memory of the learned was extended to include everyone. "This was perhaps the beginning of the association of the Kaddish with paying respect to the memory of the dead." (8)

Garfiel cites a Midrash to indicate the development of the Kaddish. When a father dies, says the Midrash, his influence lives on in his son, and by looking at the son one can determine what manner of man the father was. If he recites some Torah he learned from his father, he thereby honors his father's memory. After this discussion of Torah he would recite the Kaddish and those present would respond Y.S.R. In the course of time the custom of studying Torah in honor of the dead disappeared, and only the recitation of the Kaddish by the orphaned son remained as an expression of his respect. By the recitation of the Kaddish the son was able to fulfill the mitzvah of Kiddush ha-Shem. And so when the son recites Kaddish he causes God's Name to be sanctified by the congregation, and he thus recalls to himself and to others the father who taught him Torah and mitzvot (9).

Garfiel informs us that the first mention of the Kaddish as a Mourners' prayer is found in the Mahzor Vitry, 13th century. It is therefore called the Orphans' Kaddish, which marks it as

a relatively late institution. In the Middle Ages it gained a strong hold on the people, and became completely a prayer for the dead. "This was no doubt in part due to the fact that masses for the souls of the departed were so much part of the religion of the people around them and that Judaism had no equivalent institution." (10)

The Rabbis struggled against the popular idea that the Kaddish possessed some intercessionary value to the dead. Rabbi Abraham Hurwitz, 16th century, wrote "Let the son keep a particular Mitzvah which his father commanded him to hold to and if he carries it out, it is accounted more than the Kaddish. The same is true also of daughters. For the Kaddish is not a prayer that the son should say for the father before God that He may raise him from Sheol but it is merit... for the (name of) the dead when his son sanctifies the Name and (causes) the congregation to respond after him, Amen, Y.S.R., Amen. May his great Name be blessed forever and ever." (11)

Rabbi Shemaryahu Leib Hurwitz, in his popular work "Sefer Hakadish" deals with the origin, development, significance, style as well as the different versions, laws and customs of the Kaddish.

Following are the themes that are dealt with:

1. The Kaddish in Israel

2. The Kaddish Shalem
3. Deep Thoughts Contained in the Kaddish
4. The Orphans' Kaddish
5. The Language of the Kaddish and Its Source
6. The Holiness of the Kaddish
7. Allusions to the Kaddish in the Torah
8. Kaddish of the High Holy Days
9. The Congregation and the Kaddish
10. Renditions of the Kaddish
11. Kaddish de-Rabbanan
12. The Kaddish of the Sheliah Tzibbur
13. The Kaddish of the Deceased
14. The Origins of the Kaddish
15. Stories Relating to the Kaddish
16. Kaddish of the Yahrzeit
17. Customs and Laws Relating to the Kaddish
18. Melodies of the Kaddish
19. Laws Relating to the Orphans' Kaddish
20. Kaddish in the Vernacular (12).

Chapter IV

Rabbi David de Sola Pool, in agreement with Zunz, shows that the Kaddish was originally recited at the conclusion of an Aggadic discourse and that this prayer contained no reference to the dead. Unlike Zvi Karl, Pool argues that the Yitgadal paragraph together with Y.S.R. in their present wording came into use at one and the same time. In order to prove this and to date these first two paragraphs he utilizes several Midrashim which make reference to the recitation of these sections (1).

Citing a Midrash in which a Bat Kol speaks to Rabbi Jose b. Halafta, Pool dates the Kaddish in the 2nd century C.E. While it is true that the words Y.S.R. are mentioned, this usage of the Midrash immediately poses the question; may not a late Midrash contain material that is older than the date of its redaction? Dr. Martin A. Cohen cautions the historian in the determination of the validity of a text by stating that he must beware of the "belief that passages committed to writing at a late date cannot contain material as early as the time of the events which they narrate." (2). Moreover there is no reference to Yitgadal in this Midrash. In his dating of the Yitgadal, Pool cites a legend specifically attributed to Resh Lakish of the 3rd century C.E. (3). This legend, in which Zerubbabel b. Shealtiel closes his Aggadic address and says "Yitgadal ve-yitkadash" leaves no doubt that by the 3rd century C.E. the Yitgadal was recited at the conclusion of an Aggadic discourse. However, we have no proof that the Yitgadal motivated the recit-

ing of Y.S.R. The only response mentioned in this specific legend is Amen. All that Pool has really proved is that the Yitgadal was recited as early as the 3rd century C.E. His arguments for the date of Y.S.R., and for an organic connection between the Yitgadal and Y.S.R. are not convincing.

He also maintains that the Kaddish was written in Aramaic and that any Hebrew versions are later than the original Aramaic. Concerning Yehay Shemo ha-Gadol mevorakh le-olam ul-olmay olamim which is found in Ecclesiastes Rabbah, Pool says "this cannot be urged as a proof of the existence of the Kaddish in a Hebrew version." (4). While Zunz, Rapoport and Bacher date the above in the 10th century C.E., Pool argues that "this date...is probably far too late, it being perhaps that of the copyist, and the compilation of the Midrash should perhaps be assigned to the 5th or 6th century." (5). Again Dr. Cohen's admonition needs to be recalled, namely, that this material may be much earlier than the Midrash.

The Al Hakol "Kaddish", written in Hebrew, is according to Pool a much later version of the Kaddish and is a parallel to the original Aramaic (6).

Concerning the possibility of Christian authorship of Jewish prayers Pool claims that the Kaddish reflects an early Essenic influence. As for the Paternoster this he shows is predated by

the Kaddish. In response Dr. Max L. Margolis contends "We know precious little about the Essenes; and why we should be compelled to go outside the main body of Judaism for all that is high and lofty and spiritual in the development of Jewish worship, I fail to understand." (7)

Zvi Karl's contention that the first two paragraphs of the Kaddish were originally two separate "prayers" makes sense in view of the evidence he adduces (8). For example, the Talmud (Berakhot 3a) does seem to suggest that "Y.S.R. was recited in the Temple at a time when Yitgadal had not yet been composed." (9). Thus Karl gives an earlier date to Y.S.R. than Pool, recognizing in the above baraita material which is much older than the baraita itself. In this he shows a sensitivity to the problem of dating, carefully analyzing and evaluating each of his sources. His analysis leaves no doubt that the Y.S.R. was an ancient response to the Barekhu, and was set aside and reserved specifically for the Kaddish (10).

Moreover, he is firmly convinced that the Hebrew is older than the Aramaic, devoting the bulk of his book to the Al Hakol "Kadeshim." (11).

Of the two versions of the Al Hakol "Kaddish", namely, that found in Massekhet Soferim and that of Seder Rav Amram Gaon, Karl proves rather convincingly that the one found in Seder

Rav Amram Gaon is nothing more than a commentary upon the Kedushah of the Amidah. He offers ample evidence, but would have saved the reader much time and made his point with greater cogency had he tabulated his findings and presented them in chart form. This, however, in no way detracts from the validity of his arguments.

Karl makes no attempt to explain every aspect of the Kaddish, as for example, why the older Y.S.R. follows Yitgadal in the service. It was Y.S.R. whhh was recited after the Aggadic discourse, but when this was merged with Yitgadal they were recited as one response.

He offers a detailed description of the development of the various Kadeshim. By citing a reference in Massekhet Soferim, he substantiates an opinion of Rabbi Eliezer of Worms, namely, that preference was given to the orphan boy in the recitation of the Kaddish, for in this way he could redeem his father from Gehinnom (12). Every detail is thus documented.

The question of which of the two Al Hakol "Kadeshim" is older is answered by a careful comparison of both texts. Karl concludes that the version in Massekhet Soferim is the later of the two.

Such emphasis upon the Al Hakol "Kadeshim" is invaluable as

for an understanding of the evolution of the Kaddish.

Karl, in his lengthy explanation regarding the Kaddish as a commentary on the Kedushah, does not mention the reasons for the insertion of the Shema into the Kedushah. However, this is more than capably dealt with by Jacob Mann in the Hebrew Union College Annual:

> "This insertion of Shema into the Kedushah formed the subject of a discussion already in the early Gaonic period. Rabbi Yehudai, Gaon of Sura (c. 760 C.E.) is the earliest authority mentioned who traced it to a persecution in Palestine in the course of which both the Shema and the daily Teffillah were proscribed by the government. The Jews were only permitted to assemble in their synagogues on Sabbath morning to recite and to intone the Sabbath Amidah with the Piyyutim connected therewith. As a subterfuge the Shema was inserted into the Kedushah, viz. the Hazzan would intone the beginning and the end of the Shema in such a manner as not to be noticeable to the officials watching the service." (13).

The insertion of Hu Elohaynu, Hu Avinu, Hu Malkaynu, ve-Hu Moshiaynu was no doubt a polemical emphasis against Christianity (14).

This paragraph of the Kedushah concludes with the words Ani Adonai Elohaykhem thus fulfilling the requirements of the recitation of the Shema.

Like Karl, Professor Samuel Krauss maintains that the Hebrew version of the Kaddish is the earlier. He rejects the idea that

the Kaddish was originally written in Aramaic so that even the untutored could understand it, basing his argument on the fact that the Shemoneh Esre was written in Hebrew at a time when Aramaic was the vernacular. There is a logical consistency and detailed analysis in Karl and Krauss which one misses in the theorizing of Pool.

Krauss' explanation concerning the origin of the Orphans' Kaddish, while perfectly logical, omits a crucial point. He states that during the period of Shivah, the mourner could not enter the house of study "to recite or even listen to the Kaddish de Rabbanan." As a result, people went to the home of the mourner to recite this Kaddish, thereby giving him comfort. Subsequently, the text was changed, removing references to Rabbanan, the house of study, and the Aggadic discourse. But Krauss fails to ask why they did not study in the house of the mourner, so that the Kaddish de Rabbanan could be recited. Had the prior study disappeared by this time?

The Al Hakol according to Krauss, is a type of Kaddish and he shows parallels between it and Y.S.R. In his attempt to show that the Al Hakol was written in the form of a responsive reading which enabled the Cantor to recite one sentence and the congregation to respond with the second, Krauss states that in the course of time the congregation grew lazy and the prayer was not recited in accordance with the intentions of the

author. We are not told when or why the congregation grew lazy and the author does not inform us of any other prayers where the congregation reacted in a similar way.

One of the main problems encountered in Dr. Evelyn Garfiel's book is that it is impossible to know what material is hers and what is Professor Shalom Spiegel's (15).

Moreover, although she wrote this book primarily for high school students, there is still a noticeable absence of footnotes and citations in the section pertaining to the Kaddish.

Garfiel expands the explanation of Krauss regarding the evolution of the Kaddish from a prayer concluding an Aggadic discourse to the present Orphans' Kaddish. In her view, Aggadic discourses took place in the house of mourners during the week after the death of a learned man, as a way of honoring his memory. Subsequently these lectures were continued for an entire year. At the conclusion of each discourse, the lecturer closed with the Kaddish and those present responded with Y.S.R. "But in order not to shame anyone, this way of honoring the memory of the learned was extended to include everyone." (16) This according to Garfiel, was the origin of the Kaddish as a mourner's prayer.

She utilizes a Midrash to support her argument concerning

the importance of the two-fold idea involved in the Kaddish, namely, 1. the central role of the Torah in Jewish spiritual life and 2. the great worth attached by the Rabbis to the recital of a formula that constituted Kiddush ha-Shem (17). This Midrash explains, according to Garfiel, the appearance of the Mourners' Kaddish, for with the disappearance of the study of Torah in the house of the mourner the Kaddish was retained.

Garfiel concludes by citing Rabbinic injunctions against a popular idea that the Kaddish was of some intercessionary value to the dead (18).

Footnotes - Preface

1. Zohar, Parashat Terumah 129B
2. Orekh Ḥaim, 56

Footnotes - Chapter One

1. David de Sola Pool, The Kaddish, New York, (1964), p. XII
2. Ibid., p. 6
3. Ibid., p. 8
4. Ibid., p. 8f
5. Ibid., p. 8
6. Ibid., p. 9, note 43
7. Ibid., p. 54
8. Ibid., p. 55
9. Ibid., p. 66
10. Ibid., p. 76
11. Ibid., p. 11
12. Ibid., p. 19
13. Ibid., p. 19
14. Ibid., p. 19
15. Ibid., p. 80
16. Ibid., p. 21 (see p. 27f and p. 111 for similarities to Paternoster)

17. Ibid., p. 22
18. Ibid., p. 22
19. Ibid., p. 23
20. Ibid., p. 27
21. Ezekiel 38:23
22. David de Sela Pool, The Kaddish, p. 39
23. Ibid., p. 47
24. Ibid., p. 50

Footnotes - Chapter Two

1. Berakhot, 32a, Talmud Bavli
2. Zvi Karl, The Kaddish, Lwow, (1935), p. 10
3. The Yehay Shemay Rabbah will from this point on be abbreviated Y.S.R.
4. Zvi Karl, The Kaddish, p. 14
5. In the Basilica Synagogue of Alexandria, Egypt, when the congregation was to respond Amen one of the officials waved a scarf and at that signal all responded Amen. We are not told that a scarf was waved to signal the recitation of any other response.
6. This reading is in accordance with the Finkelstein critical edition of the Sifre and not the older Friedmann edition which Karl (p. 16) and Pool (p. 50) followed.
7. Zvi Karl, The Kaddish, p. 16

8. Ibid., p. 18
9. Ibid., p. 18
10. Ibid., p. 22f
11. Ibid., p. 25f. It should be noted that Mueller and Higger editions provide the words ve-imru amen. Karl, in his text, omits these words. See Karl, p. 26.
12. Ibid., p. 27
13. Ibid., p. 28
14. Ibid., p. 29
15. Ibid., p. 48
16. Ibid., p. 54
17. Ibid., p. 55
18. Ibid., p. 55f
19. Ibid., p. 62
20. Ibid., p. 62
21. Ibid., p. 63
22. Ibid., p. 65
23. Ibid., p. 66
24. Ibid., p. 69
25. Ibid., p. 69
26. Ibid., p. 71
27. Ibid., p. 74
28. Ibid., p. 76
29. Ibid., p. 80
30. Ibid., p. 80
31. Ibid., p. 84

32. Ibid., p. 88
33. Ibid., p. 29
34. Ibid., p. 29
35. Ibid., p. 31

Footnotes - Chapter Three

1. Samuel Krauss, Mehut Ha-Kaddish, Mekorotav Ve-Korotav, Bitzaron, New York, (November, 1939), p. 127, Vol. I, Number 2
2. Ibid., p. 128
3. Ibid., p. 128
4. Ibid., p. 130f
5. Ibid., p. 131
6. Ibid., p. 133
7. Evelyn Garfiel, The Service of the Heart - A Guide to the Jewish Prayer Book, New York, (1958), p. 241, note 2 on Chapter 8
8. Ibid., p. 112
9. Ibid., p. 113
10. Ibid., p. 114
11. Ibid., p. 114
12. Shemaryahu Leib Hurwitz, Sefer Hakadish, New York, (1925), Table of Contents

Footnotes - Chapter Four

1. David de Sola Pool, The Kaddish, New York, (1964), p. 8f.
2. Martin A. Cohen, HUCA, Vol. 32, (1965), p. 60
3. David de Sola Pool, The Kaddish, p. 9, note 43
4. Ibid., p. 19
5. Ibid., p. 19
6. Ibid., p. 80
7. Max L. Margolis, JQR (N.S.), II (1911-1912), p. 283
8. Zvi Karl, The Kaddish, Lwow, (1935), p. 10ff
9. Ibid., p. 18
10. Ibid., p. 22f
11. Ibid., p. 29
12. Ibid., p. 80
13. Jacob Mann, HUCA, Vol. 4, (1927), p. 252
14. Ibid., p. 251, footnote 12a
15. Evelyn Garfiel, The Service of the Heart - A Guide to the Jewish Prayer Book, New York, (1958), p. 241, note 2 on Chapter 8
16. Ibid., p. 112
17. Ibid., p. 112
18. Ibid., p. 114

Bibliography

Pool, David de Sola. The Kaddish, New York, (1964)

Karl, Zvi. Ha-Kaddish, Lwow, (1935)

Garfiel, Evelyn. The Service of the Heart - A Guide to the Jewish Prayer Book, New York, (1958)

Krauss, Samuel. Mehut Ha-Kaddish, Mekorotav Ve-Korotav, Bitzaron, Volume 1, November 2, (1939)

Hurwitz, Shemaryahu Leib. Sefer Hakadish, New York, (1925)

Cohen, Martin A. Hebrew Union College Annual, Volume 32, (1965)

Margolis, Max L. Jewish Quarterly Review (New Series), II, (1911-1912)

Mann, Jacob. Hebrew Union College Annual, Volume 4, (1927)

Masechet Soferim, Mueller, J. (ed.), Leipzig, 1878

Massekhet Soferim, Higger, M. (ed.), New York, (1937)

Seder Rav Amram Gaon, Edition, Warsaw, (1865)

Seder Rav Amram Gaon, Edition, Aryeh Leib Frumkin, Jerusalem, (1912)

Luban, Marvin. The Kaddish, New York, (1962)

Kohler, Kaufmann. Jewish Encyclopedia, Volume 7, p. 401f

Eisenstein, J.D. Jewish Encyclopedia, Volume 7, p. 402f

Levy, Eliezer, Yesodot Ha-Tefillah, Tel Aviv, (1958)

Pool, David de Sola. Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, Volume 7, p. 273ff

HEBREW UNION COLLEGE
JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION
LIBRARY