HEBREW UNION COLLEGE - JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION
NEW YORK SCHOOL

INSTRUCTIONS FROM AUTHOR TO LIBRARY FOR THESES

AUTHOR JUDITH S. LEWIS

TITLE THE KEDUSHOT IN THE LITURGY:
THEIR ORIGIN, DEVELOPMENT AND FUNCTION

TYPE OF THESIS: D.H.L. ( ) Rabbinic (X)

Master's ( )

1. May circulate (X)

2. Is restricted ( ) for ____ years.

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

I understand that the Library may make a photocopy of my thesis for security purposes.

3. The Library may sell photocopies of my thesis. X yes ___ no

March 25, 1980
Date

Judith S. Lewis
Signature of Author

Library Record

Microfilmed
Date

Signature of Library Staff Member

113080

THE KEDUSHOT IN THE LITURGY:
THEIR ORIGIN, DEVELOPMENT AND FUNCTION

JUDITH S. LEWIS

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for Ordination

Hebrew Union College - Jewish Institute of Religion
New York, New York

1980

Referee: Professor Lawrence A. Hoffman

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to thank Dr. Lawrence A. Hoffman for his friendship and guidance. Choosing a thesis advisor from a faculty I had studied with for only one semester was made easier by his warmth and accessability. I also wish to express my appreciation to Dr. David Sperling who, first as teacher and then as husband, has been a constant source of intellectual stimulation and emotional support. Finally, I am grateful to Vivian Mendeles, whose patience in arranging her schedule and skill in typing enabled me to complete this thesis.

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

"The origin of the kedushah is exceedingly obscure,"[1] and the paths of its development are equally elusive. We do know, however, that by the thirteenth century the kedushah was being recited thirty times a week, at least in the liturgical rite familiar to the editor of Midrash Hagadol (I, 278).[2]

The purpose of this paper is to examine existing theories concerning the origin and development of the kedushah, reevaluating them in light of the sources currently available, and to suggest conclusions concerning the function of the kedushah in the liturgy at various stages of its development.

The defining element of a kedushah is the juxtaposition of the biblical phrases Isaiah 6:3b and Ezekiel 3:12b. Both of these phrases are the words of praise of God proclaimed by heavenly creatures in the visions of the two prophets. It is the verse from Isaiah which is responsible for the title "kedushah" (or in some sources simply "kadosh"). This verse segment appears actually to be some sort of liturgical formulation in its original context:

> Ch. 6 [1]In the year the King Uzziah died, I beheld my Lord seated on a high and lofty throne; and the skirts of His robe filled the Temple. [2]Seraphs stood in attendance on Him. Each of them had six wings; with two he covered his face, with two he covered his legs, and with two he would fly.
>
> [3]And one would call to the other,
> "Holy, holy, holy!
> The Lord of Hosts!
> His presence fills all the earth!"[3]

Although Ezekiel's vision does not include mention of the Temple, he too describes a lofty throne, and the common vocabulary of the two

visions makes them logical companions in a liturgical setting. Ezekiel himself, however, may not have been quoting heavenly creatures saying "Blessed is the presence of the Lord, in His place." The text most likely suffered an early corruption from ברוך to ברוך.[4]

By the end of the Geonic period, this juxtaposition of verses was being used regularly in three distinct liturgical settings: 1) as part of the yotser benediction preceding the shema in the morning service; 2) in the third benediction (kedushat hashem) of the public repetition of the amidah; and 3) as part of the uva letsion passage read at the conclusion of morning services on weekdays and mincha and havdalah services on Shabbat. Reciting the yotser benediction daily, two repetitions of the amidah daily plus an additional repetition on Shabbat, and eight uva letsion passages weekly accounts for the thirty kedushot mentioned above.

The kedushah in the yotser benediction has the fewest additions and insertions of all the kedushot. Its introduction, however, expands upon the heavenly visions of Isaiah and Ezekiel with a particularly distinctive style and vocabulary:

תתברך צורנו מלכנו וגואלנו בורא קדושים
ישתבח שמך לעד מלכנו יוצר משרתים
ואשר משרתיו כלם עומדים ברום עולם
ומשמיעים ביראה יחד בקול דברי אלהים חיים ומלך עולם
כלם אהובים כלם ברורים כולם גבורים
וכלם עושים באימה וביראה רצון קונם
וכלם פותחים את פיהם בקדשה ובטהרה בשירה ובזמרה
ומברכים ומשבחים ומפארים ומעריצים ומקדישים וממליכים
את שם האל המלך הגדול הגבור והנורא קדוש הוא
וכלם מקבלים עליהם על מלכות שמים זה מזה ונותנים רשות זה לזה
להקדיש ליוצרם בנחת רוח בשפה ברורה ובנעימה קדשה
כולם כאחד עונים ואומרים ביראה
קדוש קדוש קדוש יי צבאות מלא כל הארץ כבודו
והאופנים וחיות הקדש ברעש גדול מתנשאים לעמת שרפים
לעמתם משבחים ואומרים
ברוך כבוד יי ממקומו[5]

Aside from minor variations in phrase order and numbers of synonymous adjectives and verbs, this is the basic wording and content of the section of the yotser benediction introducing the kedushah for weekday morning services in all the major rites. On Shabbat the yotser benediction itself is expanded while the kedushah section remains unchanged. One exception to this is the Roumanian rite which records as "a custom of some congregations"[6] the insertion of the following paragraph before the recitation of Isaiah 6:3:

אלהי עולם יהוה היושב כבודו על כסא רם ונשא
יתגדל ויתקדש שמו במקהלות ישראל עמו
כמו שרפי מעלה העומדים באימה וביראה
ומעריצים ומקדישים שם כביד מלכותו לעולם ועד
וזה מזה מקבלים ואמרים
קדוש קדוש קדוש...

By including a reference to the congregations of Israel praising God's name as the heavenly creatures are doing, this passage transforms the usual function of the kedushah in the yotser benediction from a description of the heavenly praise of God to an imitation of the song of praise of the heavenly creatures by Israel. The theme of Israel participating in the heavenly praise is, in most cases, foreign to the kedushah of the yotser, though it plays an integral role in the kedushah found in the amidah.

The third benediction of the silent amidah in most rituals is:

> atah kadosh veshimcha kadosh ukedoshim bechol yom yehalelucha selah. Baruch atah adonai hael hakadosh.[7]

During the repetition of the amidah of the shacharit and mincha services, however, this benediction is replaced by a kedushah containing, in addition to the Isaiah and Ezekiel verses, the last verse of Psalm 146. In the weekday amidot in the Ashkenazic ritual, the kedushah is introduced by a passage stating explicitly the parallel praise of God

by the earthly congregation and the heavenly creatures: "we shall sanctify Your name on earth as they sanctify it in the heavens above as it is written in the prophets."[8] The introduction then includes the first segment of Isaiah 6:3 "vekara zeh el zeh veamar" and the rest of the verse follows as a response. Machzor Vitry also uses this introduction to the kedushah of the weekday amidah, but other rites such as the Sephardic and Roumanian use introductions beginning with the words na'artisach venakdishach[9] or nakdishcha vena'aritscha.[10] Though these texts vary, all include the idea that those reciting the kedushah are "thrice sanctifying" God as the heavenly council does, "as it is written in the prophets."

The na'arits venakdish introductions utilize language found extensively in Isaiah and Psalms which may reflect ancient liturgical patterns. The point of variance of all of these introductions is their allusion to the heavenly council. The Sephardic ritual refers to the song of the heavenly chorus as kenoam siach sod sarfei kodesh[11] while Machzor Roumania has kesod eilei kodesh[12] and Machzor Vitry, which uses this introduction for Shabbat morning services only, refers to kesod shekol siach sarfei kodesh.[13] The emphasis of the Sephardic and Machzor Vitry versions seems to be the rhythmic alliteration, while the Roumanian phrase stresses simple meaning. Like the minor variations found in the introduction to the kedushah of the yotser benediction, these introductions are identical in content. This phenomenon of variety in language but consistency of meaning may suggest certain patterns of development in the liturgy.[14]

One additional introduction to the kedushah of the weekday amidah appears in the Italian ritual, beginning with the words keter yitnu

lecha.[15] Similar introductions are used in the Sephardic rite, Machzor Roumania and Machzor Vitry, but in these rites the keter yitnu lecha opening is used only for the kedushah in the amidah of the musaf service. Minhag B'nei Roma apparently used this introduction for all the kedushot of the amidah.[16] All the major rites except Machzor Vitry use the same introduction to the kedushah of the shacharit amidah for both weekdays and Shabbat.

In all the major rituals there is a brief connecting phrase inserted between the Isaiah 6:3 response and the Ezekiel verse. Those rites which use the nekadesh introduction have leumatam baruch yomeru as the connecting phrase while all other versions use the connecting phrase found in the kedushah of the yotser: leumatam meshabchim veomrim. Both of these versions are expanded on Shabbat, using imagery based on Ezekiel's version:

אז בקול רעש גדול אדיר וחזק משמיעים קול
מתנשאים לעמת שרפים לעמתם ברוך יאמרו

Following the Ezekiel verse all the rituals have uvedivrei kodshecha katuv lemor for weekdays, and for Shabbat a longer paragraph expressing messianic hopes, beginning mimkocha malkenu tofia:

> From your place, our King, appear and rule over us for we await you. When will you rule in Zion, soon and in our time, may you forever dwell there. May you be magnified and sanctified within Jerusalem your city, forever and ever, and may our eyes behold your dominion according to the words of the songs of your might by David, your righteous anointed one.

There are two basic closing paragraphs of the kedushah d'amidah of shacharit services for both weekdays and Shabbat. The Ashkenazic rite has

לדור ודור נגיד גדלך ולנצח נצחים קדושתך נקדיש
ושבחך אלהינו מפינו לא ימוש לעולם ועד
כי אל מלך גדול וקדוש אתה ברוך אתה יי האל הקדוש

The Sephardic ritual, however, uses the kedushat hashem benediction of the silent recitation of the amidah. Minhag B'nei Roma uses the Ashkenazic ledor vador, with minor variations.[17]

The kedushot d'amidah of the mincha service are identical with the kedushot recited in the amidah of the shacharit service in each rite. However, the kedushot used in the musaf service of Shabbat bear little relation to those used in other amidot in any particular rite. The kedushah d'amidah of musaf, in all the major rites, includes the shema along with additional connecting material. No two rites have precisely the same wording for either the introduction or the connecting phrase following the shema, yet there is a great deal of consistency in the structure of the rest of the kedushah.

Introductions:

Ashkenazic: Na'aritsecha venakdishcha kesod siach sarfei kodesh hamekadeshim shimcha bakodesh kakatuv al yad neviecha...

Sephardic: Keter yitnu lecha adonai eloheinu melachim hamonei ma'alah im amcha yisrael kevutsei matah yachad kulam kedushah lecha yeshaleshu kadavar ha'amur al yad neviecha...

Roumanian: Keter yitnu lecha adonai eloheinu melachim hamonei ma'alah im amcha yisrael kevutsei matah yachad kulum kedushah lecha yeshaleshu veshivchach bechol yom tamid yechadshu kadavar ha'amur al yad neviecha...

M. Vitry: Keter leadon nachtir uveracha lebaruch nevarech umeluchah lamelech namlich veshem hameyuchad neyached yachad im kevutsei ma'alah kedushah lekadosh neshalesh kakatuv al yad neviecha...

All Rites:

Isaiah 6:3 (complete verse)

Connecting Phrase: (all rites, with minor variations)

Kevodo male olam
meshartav shoalim zeh lazeh
ayeh mekom kevodo
leumatam baruch yomeru...

All Rites:

Ezekiel 3:12b

Connecting Phrase: (all but Roumanian)

Mimekomo hu yifen berachamim
veyachon am hameyachadim shemo
erev vavoker bechol yom tamid
pa'amayim beahavah shema omrim...

All Rites:

Deuteronomy 6:4 (Shema)

Connecting Phrases:

Ashkenazic: Hu eloheinu hu avinu hu malkenu hu moshiyenu
vehu yashmiyenu berachamav shenit le'einei kol chai

Sephardic: Hu eloheinu hu avinu hu malkenu vehu yoshiyenu
veyigalenu shenit veyashmiyenu berachamav shenit
le'einei kol chai lemor hen ge'alti etchem acherit
kereshit

M. Vitry: Echad hu eloheinu hu avinu hu malkenu hu moshiyenu
vehu yoshiya et she'eritenu vehu yitaeinu va'erets
zevat chalav udevash
veyashmiyenu berachamav shenit le'einei kol chai

All Rites:

Numbers 15:41 (concluding verse of Shema)

Connecting Phrase: (Machzor Vitry only)

Adir adirenu adonai ma adir shimcha bechol ha'arets ka'amur
vehaya adonai lamelech al kol ha'arets
bayom hahu yehiyeh adonai echad ushemo echad

All Rites: Uvedivrei kodshecha katuv lemor...

All Rites:

Psalm 146:10

Concluding Phrase: (all rites)

Ledor vador -- as in shacharit kedushah

While the kedushot of all the amidot exhibit a great deal of variety in language, all share the explicit statement of intent to praise God along with or in imitation of the heavenly chorus described by the prophetic visions. Furthermore, all the kedushot of the amidah are recited in the form of responses, the sheliach tsibur chanting the introductions and the connecting phrases while the congregation responds with the biblical verses. The kedushot of the amidot in the Shabbat services also have in common the expression of a messianic hope. Aside from those rites following Maimonides, all include the shema in the kedushah of the musaf amidah, and of these all but the Roumanian rite introduce it with a reference to reciting the shema "twice daily with love."

The third type of kedushah found in the daily liturgy is known as the kedushah desidra. It occurs after tachanun in the daily shacharit service, and after the Torah reading on Mondays and Thursdays. On Shabbat it is not recited until the mincha service, where it occurs at the beginning following the ashrei. The kedushah desidra is also repeated, though without the two introductory verses, Isaiah 59:20,21, in the order of prayers before havdalah, after the weekday evening service has been recited. If a festival occurs during the same week, however, this repetition of the kedushah desidra is omitted.

The kedushah desidra is unique in many respects. It consists of the same two prophetic verses found in all kedushot, but in this case they are quoted in full, and accompanied by their targumic translations. In addition, instead of Psalm 146:10 in the kedushah d'amidah,

the kedushah desidra uses Exodus 15:18 (adonai yimloch leolam vaed) along with its targum. This verse, like Isaiah 6:3, is liturgical in its original setting, the "song of the sea" and is, in fact used in juxtaposition to Exodus 15:11 in the geulah benediction after the recitation of the shema.

The three biblical verses of the kedushah desidra, with their targumic paraphrases, are introduced by the last two verses of Isaiah 59, and by Psalm 22:4. In the final recitation of the kedushah desidra on Shabbat the two Isaiah verses are not used, and the kedushah is introduced by the Psalm verse alone. The kedushah itself is followed by a collection of verses from the Prophets and the Writings. Unlike the kedushot of the yotser and amidah benedictions, there are no connecting verses between the biblical quotations of the kedushah desidra, and only Machzor Vitry instructs the sheliach tsibur "to recite these three verses individually, one by one and the congregation should respond after him to each verse, one by one."[18] For the actual verses of the kedushah with their targumic paraphrases, the sheliach tsibur is instructed to recite the verse first aloud, and then to whisper the rest with the congregation.[19] This custom does not seem to have been preserved in contemporary rites.

The lectionary of verses following the kedushah itself concludes with what seems to be a Torah blessing, or a compilation of several blessings. This section of the kedushah desidra reiterates some of the themes found in the selection of biblical verses and some of the prevalent ideas of rabbinic thought such as God's choice of Israel, eternal life, the significance of Oral Law, and aspirations for the messianic age.[20]

The terms kedushah desidra and uva letsion seem to be interchangeable as names for this section of the liturgy in some sources, while in others the name kedushah desidra refers only to the actual kedushah section of uva letsion. The kedushah desidra is the most standardized of all the kedushot occurring without significant variations in all the major rites.

The diffusion and variety of the kedushot in the liturgy have provoked several questions concerning their origin, development, and function. Some of these questions, specifically the reason for the shema in some of the kedushot d'amidah and the origin of the kedushah desidra, were already topics of investigation as early as the beginning of the geonic period. One area of research, the concern with the chronological and geographic development of the kedushah, is relatively recent.

The literature concerning the various forms of the kedushah spans a period of time of a little over a millenium. The rabbis of the Tannaitic and Amoraic periods were often concerned with specific liturgical problems: the correct formulation of a berachah, or the proper time for the recitation of particular prayers.[21] It was not until the Geonic period, however, that the desire to standardize and regulate synagogue practices necessitated a more systematic approach to the liturgy. The compilation of Rav Amram's Siddur in the second half of the ninth century was the first such systematic liturgical effort, but the concern with this desire for liturgical conformity can be seen in the responsa of earlier Geonic authorities such as Natronai and Sar Shalom. Some contend that even as early as Yehudai (757) liturgical standardization was becoming an important concern.[22]

The post-geonic period saw a continuation of interest in liturgical matters, with such results as Siddur Rashi, Machzor Vitry, and various comments and references by the Tosafists, to name only a few examples. It was not, however, until the nineteenth century that the methods of liturgical research changed considerably. In addition to the significant intellectual advances of the period, Schechter's discovery of the Cairo Genizah yet a century later facilitated more new approaches to liturgical scholarship.

Few of the questions which were of concern to the geonim have yet to be solved definitively, and new critical methods of investigation develop almost daily. Therefore, in order to examine the issues involved in the history of the kedushah in the liturgy, this thesis will be divided into two sections. The first section will provide a historical survey of the theories concerning three central issues in the development of the kedushah; the date and location of the earliest type of kedushah in the liturgy; the reason for the presence of a shema in the musaf kedushah d'amidah; and the origin of the kedushah desidra.

The second section of the thesis will examine some of the weaknesses and unsolved problems of the previous material in the light of more recent discoveries and theories. This section will also deal with subjects which are related, directly or indirectly, to the history of the kedushot such as the influence of merkabah mysticism and the development of piyyutim.

A concluding chapter will concentrate on the function of the kedushah in the liturgy, utilizing the conclusions arrived at in the two preceding sections. The overall purpose of this thesis is to pre-

sent the development of the kedushah as a paradigm of certain trends in liturgical development in order to enhance our understanding of the function of our own worship and liturgy.

Footnotes

CHAPTER I

1. Ismar Elbogen, Hatefillah Behitpatchutah Hahistorit, p. 48.
2. Louis Ginzberg, Geonica II, p. 130, n. 3.
3. Jewish Publication Society translation, 1978.
4. Ibid.
5. Philip Birnbaum, Hasiddur Hashalem (Ashkenazic), pp. 71-73.
6. Daniel Bomberg, Siddur Tefillot Hashanah Leminhag Kehilot Romania, p. 31a.
7. Birnbaum, Hasiddur (Ash.), p. 85.
8. Ibid., p. 83.
9. Birnbaum, Hasiddur Hashalem (Sephardic), p. 89.
10. Bomberg, Siddur Romania, p. 3b.
11. Birnbaum, Siddur (Seph.), p. 89.
12. Bomberg, Siddur, p. 3b.
13. Machzor Vitry, Solomon Hurwitz, ed., p. 155.
14. Some of the particular linguistic characteristics of the yorde merkabah literature, and of the piyyutim which utilize mystic elements will be discussed in Chapter III. See also the unpublished manuscript of Lawrence Hoffman, "Censoring In and Censoring Out: A Function of Liturgical Language," p. 11ff.
15. Samuel David Luzzatto, Mavo Leminhag B'nei Roma (Israel, 1966), p. 98.
16. Ibid.
17. Ibid.
18. Machzor Vitry, p. 74.
19. Ibid.
20. Joseph Heinemann, Prayer in the Talmud, p. 34.
21. Jacob Neusner, A History of the Jews in Babylonia, Vol. III, pp. 158ff.
22. See below, Chapter II:ii.

Chapter II:i

THE CHRONOLOGICAL AND GEOGRAPHIC DEVELOPMENT OF THE KEDUSHAH

The Wissenschaft des Judentums movement of the nineteenth century transformed Jewish scholarship into a modern endeavor with "scientific" legitimacy.[1] Motivated by the results of the Wissenschaft perspective when applied to other areas of Jewish culture and history, scholars began to apply the same methodology to liturgy. Leopold Zunz, the pioneer of Jewish liturgical "science," began sorting through manuscripts of various rites in the search for an Urtext -- an original formulation -- for each prayer.[2] In the past century and a half, therefore, followers of Zunz's methodology have continued the search for the date, locale, and form of the "original" kedushah.[3] Although more recent scholarship has brought into question the validity of this approach in general, the work and theories of these Wissenschaft scholars cannot be overlooked.

There are, of course, three possible candidates for the earliest type of kedushah in the liturgy: the kedushah d'amidah, the kedushah d'yotser, and the kedushah desidra. Since the very inception of the Wissenschaft movement, the priority of the kedushah d'amidah or the kedushah d'yotser has been a popular subject of debate. The kedushah desidra, however, poses a unique set of problems because of its style and position in the liturgy. Its origins will therefore be discussed separately.

Chief among Zunz's continuors in the field of liturgy was Ismar Elbogen, whose contributions to the scientific study of the liturgy remain the basis of most current investigations.[4] He judged that the kedushah found in the yotser benediction could not have entered the

liturgy before the closing of the Talmud, and that the kedushah d'amidah was, therefore, the earlier of the two kedushot.[5]

According to Elbogen, the theme of angelic praise in the kedushah d'yotser introduction was not an integral part of the literary composition of the yotser benediction. This theme had been recognized as a late addition by Zunz; and denoted a product of mystical influence by Bloch in 1893;[6] and part of Elbogen's conclusion was based on the regnant theory that merkabah mysticism and its imagery were products of the geonic period in Babylonia. He was aware of the significance of the kedushah for the yorde merkabah from fragments of mystical literature which had already been published, but he contended that these were completely foreign to Palestine. In support of this view, he cited fragments of yotser benedictions which did not, in fact, contain a kedushah.[7]

The early Palestinian rite, according to Elbogen, knew only of the kedushah d'amidah.[8] This conclusion was reached on the basis of a reference in the Yerushalmi (Berachot v9c) to a certain Batitei who was leading the services (over lifnei hatevah). Batitei stopped when he came to the word ofanim. Because the technical expression over lifnei hatevah is used, Elbogen assumed that this passage could only refer to the kedushah d'amidah. Therefore, some form of the kedushah d'amidah including the word ofanim must have existed in Palestine before the closing of the Palestinian Talmud, even though no such version has been discovered.[9] The kedushah d'yotser, in Elbogen's opinion, was probably inserted into the Palestinian yotser benediction some time in the middle of the eighth century when the effects of the mystical movement of Babylonia had spread to Palestine.[10]

Elbogen suggested that the original formulation of the kedushat hashem benediction of the tefillah consisted of the kadosh atah venora shimcha phrase, probably with the biblical verse of Isaiah 6:3 added as a proof-text, although this is, admittedly, speculation. From this short benediction to the expanded, responsive kedushah was a logical step for those engaged in mystical pursuits, as he demonstrates by comparing the later kedushah to a passage in III Enoch (39:12) which uses the juxtaposition of Isaiah 6:3 and Ezekiel 3:12 in the setting of the heavenly chorus. Elbogen contends that the last of the three biblical verses (Psalm 146:10) was a later addition, but he does not explain its origin.[11]

Writing in the first two decades of this century, Elbogen did not have access to many of the texts and studies which were subsequently to weaken the suppositions upon which he based his conclusions. Yet Ginzberg, a contemporary of Elbogen, questioned his conclusions on the basis of different interpretations of the same sources. He maintained that the absence of a kedushah in the yotser benediction of a fragment which he identified as part of Saadia's siddur, did not imply that this was the older form. Rather, he cites the dictum against reciting the kedushah without a minyan as the reason for the shortened yotser text.[12] In his opinion, the kedushah of the yotser benediction was distinctly Palestinian while it was the kedushah d'amidah which originated with the Babylonian mystics. He suggested that the kedushah d'yotser may have been implemented by the Essenes in early Palestine;[13] a view held also by Kohler who was among the first Jewish scholars to examine the evidence of contemporaneous Christian liturgical parallels.[14]

Ginzberg concurred with Elbogen on the earliest formulation of the kedushat hashem benediction of the tefillah, but suggested that it "received sanction and character as an independent prayer only under the influence of the Babylonian mystics."[15] According to Ginzberg, these mystics had been responsible for the keter version of the kedushah d'amidah, and the Babylonians residing in Palestine during the geonic period succeeded in inserting this version of the kedushah into the Shabbat musaf service there. His view of the relationship between the Palestinian and Babylonian Jews of this period reveals some of the reasoning behind his reconstruction of certain liturgical developments:

> In geonic times the Babylonian Jews living in Palestine played pretty much the same part as the Polish Jews in Germany during the last three centuries. Fault was found with them on all sides, but after all, they were "the scholars," and, do what one would, their authority compelled recognition.[16]

Thus, although the Palestinian Jewish community resisted the increased use of the kedushah, they finally yielded to pressure from the Babylonians who had moved there, and accepted the daily use of the kedushah d'amidah, though they removed most of the mystical allusions and "fitted it into the Yoser-Kedushah."[17]

While Ginzberg's presumption of an anti-mystical attitude in Palestine during the geonic period may not be warranted, both his and Kohler's speculations about the influence of early Palestinian mysticism have been largely corroborated by scholars such as Scholem[18] and Weinfeld.[19]

Scholem's work in the area of merkabah mysticism was the decisive development in the determination of the age of the kedushah in the yotser benediction. It had previously been assumed that the yorde

merkabah were members of a Babylonian Jewish mystical element, influenced by the surrounding religious atmosphere of the early geonic period. Scholem's first incursion into this established theory only suggested that this mystical element may have had antecedents in Palestine some centuries earlier:

> Since the "Greater Hekhaloth" contain Palestinian as well as Babylonian elements -- the earliest chapters in particular bear unmistakable traces, in their subject matter as well as their style, of Palestinian influence -- it is not inconceivable that the organization of these groups did indeed take place in late Talmudic times (4th or 5th century) on Palestinian soil. As a matter of ascertained fact, however, we only know of their existence in Babylonia, from where practically all mystical tracts of this particular variety made their way to Italy and Germany.[20]

Twenty years later, however, after new manuscripts had come to light and more research had been completed, Scholem was to make an even more radical dating:

> When I enlarged upon the nature and importance of these [hekhalot] hymns in Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism, I still did not have the courage to date them earlier than the fifth century; although I was naturally well aware that hymns of the angels before the throne, and especially those of the Hayyoth, the bearers of the throne, were an authentic motif of the esotericism of the Jewish apocalypticists....I have been able to discover definite proof that hymns of the type preserved in the Greater Hekhaloth were surely known in the third century C.E.[21]

Scholem not only pushed the date of portions of the mystical litterature back to the very beginning of the Talmudic period, he also demonstrated that the fundamental concepts of the yorde merkabah were well known to some of the rabbis of the rabbinic tradition. For example, in Avodah Zarah 24b a hechalot type hymn is attributed to Rabbi Isaac Napaha, who also seems to be familiar with "the idea of heavenly songs to which only the initiate could listen without endangering his life " (Sanhedrin 95b).[22]

Of particular significance for our study of the kedushah is the presence of a large number of "kedushah hymns" among the hechalot literature. These hymns are most similar to the kedushah d'yotser since they share the feature of long strings of synonymous, rhythmic adjectives and the characteristic setting of the heavenly chorus.[23] Since the origin of these hymns need no longer be assumed late and and Babylonian the early dating of the kedushah d'yotser in Palestine meets with no fundamental obstacles.

More recent liturgical scholars have been able to utilize the results of Scholem's research in tracing the history of the various kedushot. Heinemann, for example, has reevaluated the theories concerning the origin of the kedushah d'yotser and has concluded that Ginzberg was accurate in his contention that it "is quite ancient and was widely known in Palestine from the Tannaitic period onward."[24] Heinemann has also taken into consideration the implications of the parallels in Christian sources, as well as the evidence which recent studies of the development of piyyutim have revealed.[25]

While Heinemann accepts the early Palestinian origin of the kedushah d'yotser, he maintains Elbogen's assumption that the kedushah d'amidah was known in Palestine during the Talmudic period as well, based on the reference to Batitei cited above.[26]

Perhaps Heinemann's major contribution to the study of liturgy was his challenge to the Zunz-Elbogen tradition of attempting to isolate the "original wording" of each prayer. Rather than the classical philological approach to the study of Jewish liturgy, Heinemann applies the form-critical method to Jewish prayer with the result that the "original wording" of a particular prayer is no longer assumed to

have ever existed. "With regard to the confusing problem of the history of the Qeduššāh, it would seem that most problems can be solved by assuming the simultaneous existence of diverse traditions of prayers in different localities, particularly during the earliest phase of liturgical development."[27]

Footnotes

CHAPTER II:i

1. Lawrence Hoffman, The Canonization of the Synagogue Service, pp.1-3.
2. Ibid., p. 2.
3. Elbogen, Hatefillah, p. 49, for example, speaks of "hatsurah ha'atikah beyoter."
4. Heinemann, Prayer, pp. 4-6.
5. Elbogen, Hatefillah, pp. 48, 51.
6. Ibid., pp. 14, 51, and Hoffman, "Censoring In," pp. 1, 7.
7. Elbogen, Hatefillah, pp. 14-15.
8. Ibid., p. 8.
9. Ibid.
10. Ibid., p. 49.
11. Ibid.
12. Ginzberg, Geonica II, pp. 129-130.
13. Ibid., p. 130.
14. Kaufman Kohler, "The Composition of the Eighteen Benedictions," HUCA I (1924). Kohler compared aspects of the tefillah with what he identified as an early Essene version preserved in Book VII of the Apostolic Constitutions. We shall see in Chapter II:ii that the full implications of Kohler's suggestion have not yet been recognized.
15. Ginzberg, Geonica II, p. 132.
16. Ibid.
17. Ibid., p. 133.
18. Gershom Scholem, Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism, Chapter 2, and Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Traditions.

19. Moshe Weinfeld, "Traces of the Kedushat Yotser and Pesukei Dezimra in the Qumran Scrolls and the Book of Ben Sira," Tarbits 45 (1976):15-26. Weinfeld has attempted to demonstrate the integrity of the yotser benediction including the kedushah on the basis of prayers from the Qumran scrolls. While his study does not contain any direct evidence of a kedushah per se, he does present a convincing argument that the introduction of the theme of angelic praise does not imply a late date of composition (cf. p. 15, n. 3).

20. Scholem, Major Trends, p. 47.

21. Idem, Jewish Gnosticism, p. 47.

22. Ibid., p. 27.

23. Alexander Altmann, "Shirei-Kedushah Besifrut-Hahechalot Hakedumah." Altmann has argued that the kedushah hymns are a combination of the yotser and amidah kedushot but in either case their date is much earlier than previously assumed. (See below, Chapter II:iii).

24. Heinemann, Prayer, p. 232, n. 34.

25. Ibid., p. 231.

26. Ibid.

27. Ibid., p. 233.

Chapter II:ii

THE SHEMA IN THE MUSAF KEDUSHAH D'AMIDAH

The presence of the shema in the kedushah of the musaf amidah is a phenomenon which has perplexed both geonic authorities and more recent liturgical scholars alike. In addition to the usual biblical verses of the weekday kedushah d'amidah, most of the post-geonic rituals include the first and last verses of the shema (Deut. 6:4 and Numbers 15:41) for the musaf kedushah of Shabbat and festivals. Moreover, at least during part of the geonic period, the Palestinian rite apparently included the shema in the kedushah d'amidah of the shacharit service on Shabbat and festivals. Various theories have been proposed to explain this inclusion of the shema in certain kedushot.

The primary sources of information on this subject are geonic responsa of the eigth and ninth centuries. The earliest authority cited is Yehudai Gaon of Sura (mid-eighth century).[1] He is quoted by Pirkoi Ben Baboi, a scholar of at least one generation later, and an ardent defender of Babylonian Talmudic authority.[2] Ben Baboi was concerned with demonstrating the impropriety of certain Palestinian customs, especially liturgical, and his references to the inclusion of the shema in certain amidot are as follows:

> Mar Yehudai stated that they decreed a persecution against the Palestinian Jews forbidding them to say the shema and to pray [the tefillah] but they allowed them to gather on Shabbat mornings lomar ulezamer ma'amadot. So at shacharit they would say the ma'amad and the kadosh and shema at musaf, but they did these things under duress and now that God has destroyed the reign of Edom and annulled their decress, and the Ishmaelites have come and allowed them to engage in Torah and say the shema and pray, it is forbidden to say anything out of its proper place...

> This practice of saying shema between kadosh and yimloch, which is not its proper place or time as the sages ordained, for the sages ordained that the shema is recited only morning and evening, from Mishnah and Talmud...
>
> Moreover, this practice of saying pa'amayim beahava is affrontery before God...
>
> Let it be known to you that it is thus: it is an accommodation because of persecution that one only says shema between kadosh and yimloch in the shacharit service of Shabbat and that during musaf and mincha and on weekdays it is not said. Until now in Palestine they only said kadosh and shema on Shabbat and festivals during shacharit, except for Jerusalem and the areas where there are Babylonians who struggled until the Palestinians agreed to say the kedushah every day, but in the rest of Palestine where there are no Babylonians, they only say kadosh on Shabbat and festivals.[3]

In addition to these scattered references in the rather lengthy fragments of Ben Baboi's communications which have been collected by genizah scholars, we also find two responsa included by Amram in his siddur in reference to this question of the shema in the kedushah. Sar Shalom, Gaon of Sura approximately a century after Yehudai, explains the origin of the shema in the musaf service in Babylonia:

> Saying "pa'amayim" in the shacharit amidah of Shabbat and festivals and Yom Kippur is not the Babylonian custom. Rather, it is only said in the amidah of musaf and on Yom Kippur and Neilah because when Israel's enemies decreed that they could not say the shema the leader would say it surreptitiously in the amidah of every shacharit service -- weekday or Shabbat -- but when the decree was annulled the shema was returned to its place, but the sages of that generation decided to put it in the musaf service which does not have a shema of its own in order to publicize the miracle for all generations.[4]

Amram also quotes Natronai, his own predecessor and Sar Shalom's successor at Sura, who reiterates the previous position, but with additional information concerning Rosh Hodesh and Chol Hamoed, and specifying the form of the kedushah:

> It is the custom of both yeshivot to say at the kedusha keter and veaz bekol ra'ash gadol, and mimekomecha malkenu,

> and at musaf of Shabbat and festivals and Yom Kippur and Neilah we say pa'amayim and lehiyot lachem le'elohim, but we don't say that on Rosh Hodesh or Chol Hamoed, and those who do otherwise do not do the correct thing.[5]

The information from all this geonic evidence is at best confusing. Ben Baboi clearly refers to a persecution in Palestine and seems to object only to the shema in the kedushah d'amidah of shacharit. Sar Shalom seems to be speaking of a persecution in Babylonia and uses it specifically to explain the propriety of the shema in the musaf service. Natronai seems to be consistent with Sar Shalom but notes that there is some difference of opinion in the matter.

Since the publication of these fragments, scholars have been attempting to reconcile the various accounts contained in them. Jacob Mann concluded that the sources actually reflected parallel responses to two distinct persecutions, the first in Babylonia under Yezdegerd II (454-5), and the second, under the Byzantine authorities in Palestine when Heraclius reconquered the land from the Persians (629).[6] The persecution under Yezdegerd is well attested in several geonic sources, most notably in Sherira's letter.[7] The evidence for the Heraclian persecution, however, is based on the reconstruction of the events of the period by Graetz.[8] Mann concludes that the stratagem of concealing the shema in the kedushah was used first by the Babylonian during every service. When the Palestinian community was faced with a similar prohibition, they utilized the same technique, though only in the shacharit service of Shabbat and festivals.[9]

In contrast to Mann, Ginzberg did not attempt to establish the historical veracity of the traditions preserved in the geonic literature. He did, however, reinterpret his own, and Mann's, understanding of Ben Baboi's record. Mann had accepted Ginzberg's initial interpreta-

tion of the first section of Ben Baboi's responsum: at shacharit they would say the ma'amad and the kadosh and the shema in addition (rather than at musaf).[10] Ginzberg later retracted this reading of the text in favor of the usual understanding of the term musaf. His reevaluation was motivated by the discovery of a report from a twelfth century apostate describing what was done in times of persecution. The language in this later record is almost identical to that used by Ben Baboi, and implies that the kedushah, along with the shema, was concealed in the musaf service where observers would not expect it. Thus, when the persecution ended in Palestine, the kedushah with the shema was returned to the shacharit service.[11]

Ginzberg's analysis seems to indicate that the presence of a shema in the kedushah preceded any prohibitions or persecution.[12] Furthermore, he interprets the dispute concerning the propriety of this practice not simply as a Palestinian and Babylonian difference of opinion, but as a conflict between the competitive academies of Sura and Pumbedita.[13]

The attribution of specific liturgical practices to periods of persecution has been questioned by several scholars.[14] As has been demonstrated in several cases, many geonic accounts often fit more precisely into the category of midrash than history.[15] Furthermore, there is simply a lack of contemporaneous historical material with which to verify the traditions recorded by the geonim. As can be seen from Ginzberg's investigations, persecutions may have had some effect on the development of the kedushah, but are not a sufficient explanation for the presence of the shema in the kedushah.

More recently, Heinemann has challenged explanations which

appeal to liturgical prohibitions from another perspective. He suggests that the question of why the shema was included in the kedushah is fundamentally an artificial one. Instead, he suggests that the kedushah of the musaf amidah is directly parallel to the kedushah d'yotser - shema - geulah - malchut structure of the shacharit service.[16] In fact, the addition of a third biblical verse to the basic kedushah may have resulted from the need to conclude the recitation of the shema with the theme of malchut.[17] Thus, according to Heinemann, the kedushah of the musaf service is not an "expanded" kedushah d'amidah, but a unique construction in its own right, designed to perform a specific liturgical function.

Heinemann derives his theory from a thematic analysis of the musaf kedushah d'amidah. While this method does introduce a new criterion for identifying the purpose of the shema in the kedushah, it is not capable of addressing the historical questions of where and when this form of kedushah developed. On the other hand, Eric Werner, who does not address the issue of the presence of a shema in the kedushah at all may, indirectly, shed a great deal of light on these historical problems.

Werner's study deals with the function of the doxology in synagogue liturgy.[18] His work is related to two different aspects of the development of the kedushah: the technical structure of the "Great Kedushah" (which contains the shema), and the personality of Yehudai Gaon -- the earliest authority cited in the controversy over the shema in the kedushah.

Werner's study traces the use of doxologies within the Christian and Jewish liturgies. While he concludes that the synagogue preferred

the "direct address of the Berakah to the more impersonal, formal, praying type of doxology,"[19] he nevertheless identifies "four or five individual doxologies of great dogmatic significance"[20] which became standard elements of the liturgy. The kedushah and kaddish are two primary examples of this phenomenon.

Furthermore, Werner distinguishes between the function of the doxologies and that of berachot:

> Whereas the form of the Berakah is but a frame into which the different contents have to be fitted with reference to each occasion, the form of the doxology has but one content: the objective exultant, absolutely impersonal praise of God's glory in infinity.[21]

We have already discussed briefly the connection between merkabah mysticism and the kedushah. What should be noted here, however, is that the linguistic function of a doxology in the synagogue liturgy as Werner describes it bears a striking resemblance to the use of the kedushah in the hechalot literature. Furthermore, several Talmudic passages attribute to the recitation of the shema the same significance that the yorde merkabah attributed to the kedushah.[22] This development will be discussed more fully in our chapter on merkabah mysticism. For the time being we should note that Heinemann's suggestion that the shema was an integral part of the musaf kedushah d'amidah accords well with Werner's characterization of the kedushah as a standardized synagogue doxology, and that both of these perspectives may bear some relationship to the influence of merkabah mysticism on the kedushah.

The second aspect of the development of the kedushah touched upon by Werner is the personality of Yehudai Gaon. In Werner's opinion, Yehudai's influence on the organization and direction of musical traditions within Jewish liturgical practices has been greatly

underestimated. Although "Yehudai Gaon was an ardent champion of genuine tradition and was accordingly averse to new customs,"[23] he was also "the guiding spirit in the development of Hazanut."[24] Yehudai's preoccupation with the position of the shema in the kedushah may, therefore, have reflected not only a liturgical concern, but some kind of musical sensitivities as well. Werner demonstrates that the "Great Kedushah" -- which contains the first and last verse of the shema -- is constructed on an ancient piyyut form.[25] He further suggests that it could have already been in use, in a musical rendition, in the early centuries of this era.[26] Thus, Yehudai's objections to the Palestinian kedushah may have involved a more general issue of the use of music, or piyyutim perhaps. The presence of the shema in the kedushah may have been the result of these liturgical practices, rather than a liturgical innovation in and of itself.

Our survey of the attempts to explain the origin of the shema in the kedushah d'amidah of the musaf service has shown that liturgical scholarship has progressed from a straightforward effort to reconcile conflicting rabbinic sources to a more involved process of analyzing the complicated trends of liturgical development. Some of the issues raised in this chapter will be reevaluated in the light of additional material in the second half of the paper, with the objective of outlining a hypothetical map of the history of the various kedushot.

Footnotes

CHAPTER II:ii

1. Jacob Mann, "Changes in the Divine Service Due to Religious Persecutions," p. 252.

2. Josef Horovitz, "Pirkoi ben Baboi," Encyclopaedia Judaica, Vol. 23, p. 559.

3. Louis Ginzberg, Ginze Schechter II, pp. 551-556.

4. Seder Rav Amram Gaon, ed. Daniel Goldschmidt, p. 30.

5. Ibid.

6. Mann, "Changes," p. 258. Mann notes that the practice of interfering with synagogue worship in Palestine had begun before 629, and suggests that the kedushah with the shema may have already become part of the piyyutim which were used to avoid the restrictions of the authorities. The relationship between the early piyyutim and various forms of the kedushah may in fact shed much light on the development of the kedushah in general, as we will see in Chapter II:iii.

7. Ibid., p. 257.

8. Ibid., p. 254.

9. Ibid., p. 258.

10. Ginzberg, Geonica II, p. 48.

11. Ginzberg, Ginze Schechter II, p. 525.

12. Ibid., p. 527.

13. Ibid., p. 525.

14. Elbogen, Hatefillah, p. 400, n. 22, where Heinemann cites in particular Bergman, MGWJ 72 (1928):449.

15. Ibid.

16. Joseph Heinemann, "Kedushah Umalchut shel Kriyat Shema Ukedushah D'amidah," p. 116.

17. Ibid., p. 112.

18. Eric Werner, "The Doxology in Synagogue and Church," p. 292.

19. Ibid., p. 321.

20. Ibid., p. 320.

21. Ibid., p. 322.

22. E.g., Hullin 91b. See below Chapter II:ii.

23. Werner, "Doxology," p. 23.

24. Ibid.

25. Ibid., p. 305.

26. Ibid.

Chapter II:iii

THE ORIGIN OF THE KEDUSHAH DESIDRA

The history of the kedushah desidra has been another concern of scholars since the geonic period. The term kedushah desidra is used to refer both to the entire uva letsion section of the liturgy as a whole, and to the kedushah (according to our definition) which is contained in it. The kedushah in this case consists of Isaiah 6:3 and Ezekiel 3:12, and a third biblical verse, Exodus 15:18. Each verse is followed by its targumic paraphrase. The kedushah desidra, including the uva letsion introduction, is recited at weekday shacharit services following tachanun, and at minchah on Shabbat. An additional recitation occurs in connection with the havdalah service on motsa'ei Shabbat, but in this instance the two verses from Isaiah (59:20,21) which precede it are omitted.

The location and nature of the kedushah desidra raise several issues. It is the only example in the liturgy of a prayer composed of Hebrew biblical verses with Aramaic translations. It has the basic structure of the kedushah, but no connecting phrases. Furthermore, the targumic verses contribute significantly novel interpretations of the biblical passages. The relationship between the Aramaic and Hebrew versions of Isaiah 6:3 is especially interesting in light of the use of the trishagion in the Christian liturgy.[1]

Of considerable importance to those who have investigated the development of the kedushah desidra is the fact that it alone seems to be mentioned in the Talmud by name:

אמר רבא בכל יום ויום מרובה קללתו משל
חבירו שנאמר בבקר תאמר מי יתן ערב ובערב

תאמר מי יתן בקר הי בקר איליבא בקר דלמחר מי
ידע מאי הוי אלא דחליף ואלא עלמא אמאי קא מקיים
אקדושה דסידרה ואיהא שמיה רבא דאגדתא.
(סוטה מ"ט.)

As with the inclusion of the shema in the kedushah d'amidah, there is a series of geonic responsa which offer varying explanations of the origin of the kedushah desidra. Two of these sources are roughly contemporary, though one is from a Suran while the other is from Pumbedita. Natronai, Gaon of Sura in the middle of the ninth century, gives the following account of the origin of the kedushah desidra:

> Concerning the question of why we read and translate vekara zeh el zeh veamar and vatesaeni ruach and why the sages fixed them in the seder kedushah, this was the custom of the early authorities. Wherever there were students, when they would pray and say tachanun, and makdishin, after they responded amen yehe shme, etc., they would bring the book of Prophets and read about ten verses and translate them, and afterwards say Isaiah 6:3 and translate it just as they translated the same section of Prophets, and Ezekiel 3:12 and translate, so that they would end with praise of God, and afterward they would makdishin and study (those who wished -- Mishnah, and those who wished -- Talmud). But when the burden of existence increased, and students had to work; so they left aside Prophets and Mishnah and concentrated on Talmud, and no longer continued to read from Prophets after daily services, except that they preserved the reading of those same two verses, and they are still an established custom. And why did they not discontinue those as well? Because the kedushah triples the kadosh, kadosh, kadosh, so they triple the kedushah in the service.[2]

Another responsum, however, attributed to Tsemach b. Paltoi, Gaon of Pumbedita (872-890), gives the following explanation:

> Concerning the question of reciting the kedushah desidra: once the evil government decreed that Israel should not say kadosh, and they would send representatives to sit through the service. But after they left, they would enter the synagogues and begin reciting geulah and then recite verses of rachamim, including the kedushah in the middle so that they would not forget it.[3]

In his siddur, Amram refers to the above-quoted passage in Sotah 49a as the reason for reciting the kedushah desidra.[4] He cites also an additional remark by Tsemach concerning the propriety of the individual reciting the kedushah desidra without a minyan.[5] It seems that there still existed the alternative of studying a passage from either Talmud or Scriptures containing a kedushah, so that Tsemach must also have been aware of the connection between study and the kedushah desidra.

As with the inclusion of the shema in the kedushah d'amidah, scholars have attempted to explain the origin of the kedushah desidra in light of seemingly conflicting geonic accounts. Before proceeding with these considerations, however, some attention must be paid to the targumic version of Isaiah 6:3. Some of the scholars who have addressed the issue of the origin of the kedushah desidra base their arguments on the supposedly polemic nature of this targum. Mann and Werner, especially, find significance in the anti-trinitarian nature of the Aramaic version.

Mann notes the prominent role of the trishagion in the Eastern liturgies in particular. He posits a causal connection between the Christian formulation of the trishagion "Holy God, holy strong, holy immortal, have mercy upon us"[6] and the targumic version of Isaiah 6:3. The targum interprets the three holies as "holy in the heavens above the place of His dwelling, holy on earth the work of His power, and holy for ever and ever." Mann sees the latter two attributes as directly countering the "power" and "everlastingness" of the Christian version.[7] He therefore sees the targumic paraphrase as a polemic against the Christian concept of the trinity. Yet he notes also the Christian use of "heaven and earth" to translate the second half of

Isaiah 6:3 in another context.[8] Mann explains this rendering of kol ha'arets as reflecting a time "when Christianity was not yet triumphant in the Roman Empire so that 'the whole earth' could not yet be full of Jesus' glory."[9] Thus, Mann concludes that at least the Isaiah verse of the kedushah, with its targum, was used in the synagogue liturgy by the time the idea of the trinity was first becoming widespread.[10]

Werner contributes more substantial evidence to Mann's earlier reconstruction. He clarifies the polemical nature of the targumic verse by citing a midrash which seems to be a response to a Christian challenge, bringing Isaiah 6:3 as testimony to the unity of God.[11] Werner demonstrates that the change from "the fullness of the whole earth" to "the heaven and earth" took place in the church between 80 and 280 C.E. and that the use of "heaven and earth" is also attested in midrashic sources in the name of well-known tannaim.[12]

With regard to the broader consideration of the development of the kedushah desidra in the liturgy, then, Mann suggests that the term referred originally to a Palestinian ceremony surrounding the taking out of the Torah scroll on Sabbath mornings.[13] "That the weekly portion of the Torah in the Triennial Cycle prevalent in Palestine was known as sidra is well established."[14] Based on sources in Masechet Soferim (14:8-11), Mann reconstructs what he thinks was the early ceremony accompanying hotsa'at sefer Torah. The shema was recited, followed by the trishagion with its polemical targumic paraphrase "to bring emphatically the basic principle of Judaism to the notice of the worshippers assembled for the divine service on Sabbath morning."[15] The Torah reading, with Targum, and a prophetic lesson with an aggadic paraphrase also in Aramaic, followed, and the ceremony then concluded

with preaching usually alluding to redemption.[16]

Mann, therefore, accepts Tsemach's explanation of the origin of the kedushah desidra, and concludes that it was only the trishagion with its polemical targum which was restricted by the Byzantine authorities.[17] The kedushah itself could not raise objections since it was an important element in the Christian liturgy as well. Thus, the shema of the Torah ceremony was hidden in the kedushah d'amidah, while the trishagion went into the uva letsion which had been instituted for Sabbath minchah which had been considered inoffensive by the authorities.[18] This Palestinian custom of reciting uva letsion in the minchah service of Shabbat later found its way, according to Mann, into the Babylonian ritual, and because of the desire to recite the kedushah three times daily, eventually became a daily institution.[19]

In light of this proposed scenario, Mann interprets the Talmudic reference to the kedushah desidra and the yehe shme rabah as a later, Saboraic insertion. By the Saboraic period, Babylonia had experienced the persecution to which Rava's statement referred.[20] Because of the various obstacles to the free pursuit of Jewish knowledge, the liturgical response after sermons was declared to be the preserving force of the Jewish world. "These sanctifications kept alive in the hearts of the people the principle of monotheism and the hope of the Redemption."[21]

Elbogen, in contrast, gives more credence to Natronai's explanation of the origin of the kedushah desidra.[22] He notes that the title itself clearly identifies it as something which follows the public study of Torah. Rather than having been part of a ritual surrounding the taking out of the scroll, as Mann suggests, Elbogen accepts

Natronai's view that it was a remnant of the expositions on the readings from the rest of Scripture, which were translated into Aramaic as well.[23] He finds support for this view in the fact that every instance of the kedushah desidra in the liturgy follows either exposition or readings from Prophets or Writings. Elbogen also notes the inclusion of the baruch eloheinu shebaranu blessing in the uva letsion, following a series of biblical verses. He sees this as a clear indication that Torah study preceded the kedushah desidra originally.[24] Finally, he points to the fact that the two verses from Isaiah which usually precede the kedushah desidra, and which are of a distinctly messianic nature, were favorite concluding verses among the homilists.[25]

Liebreich goes into even further detail concerning the connection between a tradition of public reading and study after services and the development of the kedushah desidra.[26] He analyzes the structure of the uva letsion section, and divides it into five constituent parts, each preserving either "the memory of the custom of reading from the Prophets after the conclusion of the daily morning service and before the Sabbath afternoon service" or "the period of study following the reading from the Prophets."[27] Liebreich utilizes a system of identifying parts of phrases with matching themes or vocabulary to explain the structure of particular components of the liturgy. He thus demonstrates that the baruch eloheinu shebaranu benediction following the verses after the kedushah in uva letsion is actually a composite of two standard Torah blessings, but without the statutory formulation of a berachah. Liebreich concludes that this formulation was adopted in order to make the blessing suitable for uses other than the public reading of the Torah, while preserving the basic substance of the Torah

benedictions. It was, therefore, a suitable conclusion either for scriptural selections or rabbinic lessons.[28]

Concerning the kedushah specifically, Liebreich notes that it is preceded by Isaiah 59:20-21 in those locations where it may originally have followed a reading from the Prophets, and that those verses are omitted when it follows readings from the hagiographa (Saturday night after Psalm 90 and 91, after the Megillah, and after Eichah).[29] Liebreich notes that the purpose of reading Prophets after tachanun had originally been to offer consolation. Thus, when the practice was discontinued, Isaiah 59:20-21 was added as a permanent part of the section "serving as an appropriate specimen of the type of prohetic reading which was once in vogue."[30]

Thus, Liebreich demonstrates that the entire uva letsion section of the service preserves reminiscences of the very customs of reading from Prophets and rabbinic exposition recorded in Natronai's responsum.

More recently, Heinemann has contributed a new perspective to the history of the kedushah desidra, based on the identification of various categories of prayer-types: the statutory prayer of the synagogue, the spontaneous prayer of the individual, and the prayer which originates in the bet midrash or schoolhouse. The primary identifying characteristic of these schoolhouse prayers is their association with the public reading, study and exposition of the Torah. These "brief words of praise, thanks, and request, incidental to the exposition of the Torah" were in abundant use as early as the Tannaitic period, though the entrance of those which came to be repeated frequently into the siddur may not have taken place until centuries later.[31]

In addition to their association with the Torah reading and exposition, these prayers share certain other features. They rarely use the formal berachah structure, often address God in the third person, and may make use of Aramaic, either exclusively or partially.[32] Furthermore, they tend to emphasize certain ideological claims such as the significance of the Oral Law, or the belief in eternal life.[33] Clearly, the uva letsion section of the liturgy fits these criteria, especially in light of the traditions referred to by Natronai. Heinemann points out that, according to this understanding of certain prayers, Liebreich's explanation of the formulation of the baruch shebaranu blessing is superfluous.[34] No conscious decision was necessary to alter the structure or content of this blessing because of its position in the liturgy. It was simply consistent with that style which arose in the bet midrash rather than in the synagogue. Further attention, however, must be paid to the nature of the influence of bet midrash practices on the synagogue liturgy.

In summary, all scholars agree that the kedushah desidra was originally associated with the public reading and study of Torah. Whether the use of the trishagion was prohibited because of the polemical overtones of its targumic paraphrase, and therefore placed in a less conspicuous portion of the service, or whether it was in its entirety a remnant of an additional period of study at the conclusion of services, it is of a very different nature than the kedushot of the yotser and amidah.

Footnotes

CHAPTER II:iii

1. The use of the trishagion to represent the trinity is well attested in Christian liturgy and literature. Mann and Werner cite some of the significant sources (see below), and Revelation 4, which imitates the vision of Isaiah, also uses the trishagion with the conclusion "who was and is and is to come."

2. Ginzberg, Ginze Schechter II, p. 106.

3. Cited by mann, p. 268. Also note Ginzberg, Geonica II, p. 322 where the practice of reading maftir in the minchah service of Shabbat would end with nechamot shebeYeshiyahu, and a tradition is preserved that the Persians forbade this.

4. Seder Rav Amram Gaon, pp. 38-9.

5. Ibid.

6. Mann, p. 263.

7. Ibid., p. 266.

8. Ibid., p. 264.

9. Ibid.

10. Ibid., p. 266.

11. Werner, p. 295.

12. Ibid., p. 298.

13. Mann, p. 273.

14. Ibid., p. 270.

15. Ibid.

16. Ibid.

17. Ibid., p. 272.

18. Ibid., pp. 272-3.

19. Ibid., p. 274.

20. Ibid., p. 276.

21. Ibid., pp. 276-7.

22. Elbogen, Hatefillah, p. 62.

23. Ibid.

24. Ibid.

25. Ibid., pp. 62-3.

26. Leon Liebreich, "An Analysis of Uba Le-Ziyyon in the Liturgy," pp. 175-209.

27. Ibid., pp. 208-9.

28. Ibid., p. 185.

29. Ibid., p. 203.

30. Ibid., pp. 204-5.

31. Heinemann, Prayer, p. 251.

32. Ibid., p. 257.

33. Ibid., p. 34.

34. Ibid., p. 263, n. 28.

Chapter III:i

TRADITIONAL SOURCES DEALING WITH THE KEDUSHAH

If the history of the kedushah may be taken as a model, it would seem that the amount of secondary literature written on a given liturgical question is inversely proportional to the amount of primary information available in rabbinic sources. The one conclusive fact which rabbinic evidence supports is that the origin of the various kedushot is still a matter open to debate.

The few early rabbinic sources which do exist do not greatly clarify matters. There are no mishnaic references to the kedushah itself, though the Mishnah does contain several details about the liturgy during the Tannaitic period.[1] The only specific Tannaitic reference to the juxtaposition of Isaiah 6:3 and Ezekiel 3:12 is found in the Tosfta, Berachot 1:9, in a discussion of benedictions which open with baruch. There it is reported that "Rabbi Yehudah used to respond with the mevarech, kadosh, kadosh, kadosh, etc; and baruch, etc." Unfortunately, however, it is impossible to determine whether this is said in reference to the kedushah d'yotser or the kedushah d'amidah. The term mevarech could be used to refer to the one who leads the tefillah (though hayored or haover lifne hatevah is the usual expression).[2] Since both the kedushah d'yotser and the kedushah d'amidah occur as part of benedictions, the context of the passage gives no indication of which kedushah is being discussed. The most that can be concluded from this passage is that we have evidence demonstrating the use of a kedushah in some type of responsive setting in the Tannaitic period in Palestine.

Talmudic references are only a little more promising. In the

Yerushalmi (Berachot v9c), the question is where the one who replaces Batitei (who stopped when he got to the ofanim) should resume leading the prayer. Because the technical term over lifne hatevah is used, most scholars (e.g., Elbogen and Heinemann[3]) have assumed that this passage refers to the kedushah of the amidah. However, no versions of a kedushah d'amidah containing the word ofanim have been discovered as yet. Furthermore, some of the traditional commentators have understood this passage to refer to the kedushah of the yotser benediction.[4]

This Yerushalmi passage is cited in the name of Rabbi Abun who reasons that, since one who responds with the kedushah (קדושת א) is like one who begins a berachah, the one who takes the place of Batitei should begin where he stopped. The language and content of the question are similar to the Tosefta passage, and it would seem that no need was felt to specify the kedushah under discussion. One might infer from this that only one kedushah was recited in Palestine at the time. Alternatively, one could argue that if this passage did in fact refer to the kedushah of the amidah, why would the replacement not begin at the first berachah, since if one makes a mistake in one of the first three benedictions, one is supposed to return to the beginning. Thus, the Yerushalmi, like the Tosefta, attests to the use of the kedushah in Palestine, but gives no clear indication of its location in the liturgy.

Interestingly, another Palestinian reference to kedushot is attributed to Rabbi Abun. In Vayikra Rabbah 24:8, Rabbi Abun compares the three repetitions of kedoshim in Leviticus 18 to the kedushot of the liturgy: "Thus, every day the heavenly creatures crown God with three kedushot. What does God do with them? He places one on his head

and places the other two on the head of Israel."[5]

If this is the correct understanding of the midrashic passage, one could infer that Palestine had, by Rabbi Abun's time, both the kedushah d'yotser (the heavenly kedushah) and the kedushah d'amidah of the shacharit and mincha services. We shall see, in our discussion of merkabah mysticism, that Rabbi Abun was a contemporary of several significant literary and liturgical events which may clarify the origin of the kedushot.[6]

The Babylonian Talmud is a bit more specific about the kedushot. In Berachot 21b there is an argument between Rav Huna and Rabbi Joshua ben Levi as to whether someone who enters the synagogue late should begin praying if he can finish before the sheliach tsibur reaches the modim or the kedushah. The difference of opinion hinges on whether one is permitted to recite the kedushah individually or not. There is no question in this case that the kedushah d'amidah is meant.

Another reference, Megillah 17b, cites proof-texts for each of the eighteen benedictions. In response to the question of why we say kedushot, Pslam 29:1 (Havu ladonai b'nei elim kavod vaoz) is quoted. This is clearly an appropriate proof-text for the theme of the kedushah. The Gemara continues, however, and asks why the binah benediction follows the kedushah. Here Isaiah 29:23 is cited, a logical choice considering the references to binah in verse 24. The striking feature of this verse (23) is the use of the words hikdishu and ya'aritsu -- the two words which introduce the Palestinian kedushah d'amidah as attested in Soferim. Strangely, Amram, in referring to the Gemara to explain the recitation of the kedushat hashem omits reference to the verse from Psalm 29, and cites only the Isaiah verse[7] -- yet his siddur does not contain nakdishecha vena'aritsecha as an introduction

to the kedushah. It would seem that there might be some connection between the citation of Isaiah 29:23 as an additional proof-text for the kedushah (none of the other benedictions has two verses quoted) and the Palestinian introduction to the kedushah d'amidah, yet the nature of this relationship is totally speculative.

Information concerning the Palestinian rite comes, in large part, from the mid-eighth century minor tractate of Soferim.[8] As mentioned above, it gives the na'aritsecha venakdishecha introduction for the kedushah d'amidah (16:12) and contains evidence that the kedushah was being recited three times daily (14:10). Furthermore, it states that the kedushah was recited only on days which has musaf services (and Chanukah). The composition of Masechet Soferim is probably roughly contemporary to Yehudai's geonate, and is at any rate consistent with the rite to which Yehudai apparently objected. Though some have cautioned that Soferim is not a reliable source for the pure Palestinian rite,[9] it does preserve differences in practice regarding the kedushah in Palestine and Babylonia during the early geonic period.

By the time Rav Amram compiled the first systematic account of the Babylonian liturgical rite, the kedushah had reached its final stage of diffusion.[10] Although Saadia differs on certain specific practices, no significantly new characteristics of kedushot are found in his siddur.[11] One additional source may reflect the Palestinian rite contemporaneous with the compilation of Amram's siddur. According to Strack,[12] the editor of Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer -- probably in the beginning of the ninth century in Palestine -- began putting sentences from the eighteen benedictions at the ends of his chapters. Thus we find at the end of chapter four:

זה עונה וזה קורא ואומרים "ק'ק'ק'
והחיות עומדות אצל כבודו ואינן יודעות מקום כבודו
עונות ואומרות בכל מקום שכבודו שם "ב'כ'ה'מ"
וישראל גוי אחד בארץ שהם מיחדים שמו תמיד בכל יום
עונים ואומרים "שמע ישראל" והוא משיב לעמו ישראל
"אני ה' אלהכם" המצילו אתכם מכל צרה.

This passage is set in typically mystical language, and the inclusion of the shema in this context is particularly fitting -- as will be discussed in the following chapter.

Clearly the rabbinic sources do not provide a complete answer concerning the origin and development of the kedushot in the liturgy. The absence of such information in the Mishnah and Talmud could imply any number of situations. It might be inferred that at least one of the kedushot had been an integral part of the liturgy since ancient times and therefore required no discussion.[14] Alternatively, the kedushot as we have identified them may have been known in different categories or by different labels. A third possibility, however, is that the rabbis of the Mishnah and Talmud were simply either not aware or not concerned with innovations in the synagogue liturgy. It may well be that it was the geonic period which first saw systematic scholarly concern about synagogue practices.

The earlier texts attest to knowledge of at least one kedushah as a liturgical element, though it is not certain which. By the geonic period all three types are firmly established in the liturgy, though their formulations still vary. Unfortunately, however, rabbinic sources are silent concerning the intervening centuries, and we must look elsewhere for contemporaneous accounts which reveal Jewish liturgical activity during that period.

Footnotes

CHAPTER III:i

1. E.g., Rosh Hashanah 4:5, Berachot 1:4, 2:2 and see reference above (Chapter I, fn. 21) to Neusner.

2. Mishnaic references to over lifne hatevah: Berachot 5:3,4; Eruvin 3:9; Rosh Hashanah 4:7; Ta'anit 1:2. Talmudic references:

3. Elbogen, Hatefillah, p. 48; Heinemann, Prayer, p. 233; the verb levarech is used to refer to the leader of the yotser benediction in Mishnah Rosh Hashanah 4:9.

4. P'nei Moshe and Ba'al Sefer Charedim to Berachot 5, Halacha 3 end.

5. Cf. Targum Sheni of Esther Chapter 5:1 and Hagigah 13b.

6. See below, Chapter III:iii.

7. Seder Rav Amram Gaon, 56.

8. Some of the details have been corroborated in addition, in such studies as Ezra Fleischer's Letefutsatan shel Kedushot Ha'amidah Vehayotser Beminhagot Hatefillah shel Benei Erets Yisrael, pp. 255-284.

9. Ibid., p. 257.

10. Seder Rav Amram Gaon, pp. 20, 56, 57, 65.

11. Seder Rav Amram Gaon, pp. 36-37, 39-40. Saadia also includes the order of prayers for the individual for shacharit and omits the kedushah from the yotser benediction (p. 13), and includes only the baruch eloheinu shebaranu section of the kedushah desidra (p. 25). He states specifically that the kedushah is to be added to the public service because it is chovat hatsibbur. His version of the kedushah d'amidah begins nakdishecha vena'aritsecha veneshalesh lecha kedushah meshuleshet.

12. Hermann Strack, Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash (New York, 1963), pp. 225-6.

13. Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer, end Chapter 4.

14. Werner, pp. 298-9.

Chapter III:ii

MYSTICISM AND THE LITURGY

Prior to Scholem's work on merkabah mysticism, the definitive view of yorde merkabah influence on the liturgy had been presented by Phillipp Bloch.[1] Bloch identified a particular style of prayer as reflective of mystical language and thought -- of which style the kedushah is exemplary.

Bloch's conclusions had served as presuppositions for succeeding liturgical scholars inquiring into the origins of the various kedushot. Since Bloch had identified the sphere of influence of these mystics as Babylonia in the geonic period, liturgists identified the origin of the kedushah as geonic Babylonia. Scholem's work did not radically alter Bloch's fundamental conclusions. On the contrary, modern scholarship has simply "moved his dating back to Tannaitic times and placed the merkabah tradition within so-called normative Judaism itself."[2] Bloch's liturgical observations were largely confirmed. Yet the change in opinion concerning the date and location of merkabah mysticism and its influence has necessitated an entire reevaluation of the development of the kedushah in the liturgy.

Now that Jewish mystical influences have been recognized as early as the first three centuries of this era, several centuries of liturgical creativity must be accounted for between the earliest kedushah of the yotser and the various expanded kedushot of the geonic amidot. Furthermore, Bloch's conclusions had provided a convenient explanation for the Palestinian resistance to the daily use of the kedushah. A new understanding of the dynamics operating in Palestine to restrict the use of the kedushah must also be acquired.

Ginzberg and Kohler had recognized an early Palestinian mystical origin of the kedushah d'yotser, but were not forced to connect the nature of these mystics in any detail. They had identified the Essenes as the source of influence,[3] and had in fact concluded that the kedushah d'yotser was used during the Second Temple period.[4] Scholem has demonstrated convincingly, however, that the mystical influence was not from a sectarian group, but from the very sages known to us through rabbinic sources.[5] Thus, we are left with the question of why there are so few clear references to this mystical trend, if in fact it was a legitimate aspect of Tannaitic Judaism.

Various attempts have been made to explain the rabbinic silence about mystical practices. According to Scholem, "it is a well-known fact that the editor of the Mishnah, the patriarch Jehudah the Saint, a pronounced rationalist, did all he could to exclude references to the Merkabah, the angelology, etc."[6] Shalom Speigel has expanded upon this presumption by demonstrating the different attitudes preserved in the Mishnah and Babylonian Talmud in contrast to the Tosefta and Palestinian Talmud.[7] He shows that a well-known tradition about a teacher of ma'aseh merkabah is transmitted in four separate versions, differing according to the predilections of the various editors.[8]

Scholars such as Heinemann[9] and Greenwald[10] have accepted this explanation, and applied it to the question of resistance against the daily use of the kedushah in Palestine with the conclusion that there was some form of liturgical editorializing as well. Heinemann, for example, suggests that "the Talmudic Sages, it would seem, did not favor the infiltration of mystical elements into the public statutory liturgy, not so much out of opposition to the mystical doctrines them-

selves, but out of their conviction that such esoteric matters should not be popularized."[11]

This view presupposes, first, that it was the Talmudic Sages who resisted the use of the kedushah in the liturgy. Moreover, it assumes that resistance to the repetition of a particular prayer implies a desire to preserve some elitist aspect of it. One might question this second assumption in light of the adamant objection on the part of the Babylonian geonic to the inappropriate use of the shema in the liturgy. Surely this was not a result of some desire to prevent the shema's popularization.

Modern liturgists have been able to accept the relatively radical conclusions offered to them by recent historians, yet they have often failed to revise some of their operative assumptions in relation to the new historical perspectives. As Hoffman remarked in reference to mystical influences on the liturgy, "Modern scholarship has made a quantum leap in its ability to accept merkabah prayer as common and acceptable within the bounds of so-called normative Jewish society in the second century. We have, however, barely even questioned the century-old paradigm of the function liturgy played in that society."[12] In order to arrive at an accurate picture of the development of the kedushot in the liturgy, this is the question to which we must turn our attention.

In order to understand the relationship between mystical trends in society and mystical elements in the liturgy, one must examine mystical characteristics as they are preserved within the Jewish tradition as well as their parallels in the surrounding cultures. The latter of these two considerations is not within the scope of this

paper, but some mention must be made of the potential insights to be gained in this area.

Jewish liturgical scholars have long recognized the significance of certain parallels in the Apostolic Constitutions.[13] Unfortunately, however, as Scholem has noted, Jewish historians have paid too little attention to the document itself.[14] It is attributed to the fourth century eastern church, and preserves several prayers which have been identified as from Jewish mystical sources.[15] Yet the historical reliability of the Apostolic Constitutions has not been thoroughly analyzed. As early as 1906 the classic philological methods were revealing various interpolations and editorial redactions.[16] The details which are significant for our purposes are the contents of the seventh and eighth books. According to one early scholar, parts of this material were contributed by a Syrian editor who "drew much of his additional matter from the liturgy with which he was familiar."[17] The Jewish elements in this liturgy are, therefore, not surprising, particularly since this editor may have been a contemporary and even neighbor of John Chrysostom in Antioch, and the interaction between Jews and Christians has been attested in religious matters as a source of concern to him.[18] Another contemporary of the Apostolic Constitutions and its Syrian editor may have been Rabbi Abun who, as we have seen, was particularly concerned with liturgical matters relating to the kedushah. Another passage concerning Rabbi Abun claims that he eventually moved to Babylonia because of gezerot in Palestine.[19]

Though our knowledge of the period would certainly benefit from further investigations into the Jewish influences on the Apostolic Constitutions, it is clear that by the end of the fourth century cer-

tain mystical elements had permeated both the Christian and Jewish liturgies, and may even have spread to Babylonia.

The effects of this cross-cultural mystical influence, and its Jewish form, merkabah mysticism, were not limited to individual prayers in "mainstream" Christian and Jewish texts, or esoteric allusions in rabbinic literature. Merkabah mysticism produced a vast literature of its own which has become increasingly available to scholars through the efforts of Scholem, Altmann, Greenwald, and others. A thorough discussion of these texts would, and has, filled several books. For our purposes, though, certain details will be mentioned as representative of the function of the kedushah among the yorde merkabah.

A comparison of three different texts should suffice to describe the basic style of merkabah literature, especially as it utilizes the kedushah. In a text which Scholem published for the first time on Jewish Gnosticism, Rabbi Akiva's ascent through the hechalot is recorded. After stating the numbers of blazing flames and other assorted conflagrations at each heaven, Akiva repeats what these flaming creatures recited to each other. At the first hechal the merkabot shel eish say: "Kadosh kadosh kadosh adonai tsevaot, melo kol ha'arets kevodo" and the shelheviyot respond in kind. At each succeeding hechal the pattern is repeated, but the doxology of the creatures is different. The second through fifth hechalot respond with the following statements:

2) Baruch kevod adonai mimekomo

3) Baruch shem kavod malchuto leolam vaed mimekom bet shechinto

4) Baruch adonai chai vekayam leolam ulealmei olamim adir al kol hamerkabah

5) Baruch kedushat malchuto mimekom bet shechinto.[20]

The sixth and seventh responses are combinations of the preceding phrases. It should be noted that the responses of the kedushah (hechalot 1 and 2) are not differentiated from the responses of the succeeding hechalot. Furthermore, the linguistic function spoken of by Werner can be easily recognized in this passage. The sole purpose of these phrases is the praise of God. Similar settings are described in 3 Enoch. In chapter 39, for example, Rabbi Ishmael describes his experience in the last heaven:

> Metatron, the Angel, the Prince of the Presence said to me: when the ministering angels utter the "holy" then all the explicit names that are graven with a flaming style on the Throne of Glory fly off like eagles, with sixteen wings. And they surround the Holy One, blessed be He, on the four sides of the place of his Shekina. And the angels of the host, and the flaming Servants, and the mighty Ophanim, and the Kerubim of the Shekina and the Holy Chayyoth...fall upon their faces three times saying: "Blessed be the name of His glorious kingdom for ever and ever."[21]

Baruch kavod adonai mimekomo is also attested to in 3 Enoch as a response to the "kadosh."[22] Here the pattern of the kedushah as it appears in the yotser benediction is duplicated exactly.

In a third example of the hechalot literature, a significant development becomes apparent. This text reflects a more "mainstream" rabbinic conception:

> When the time arrives to recite the Shema, the chief honored, and awesome attendant stands at the windows of the lower heavens to hear the praises and songs which rise from the land, from the synagogues and study houses, to transmit it to the higher creatures. When they hear the Shema they begin to recite kadosh kadosh kadosh, and announce to the heaven above them that Israel is saying the Shema.[23]

This last example clearly differs from the two preceding texts. Here Israel has become a partner in the praise of God. No mention is made

of the individual ascending through the heavens. Furthermore, it is the shema which is Israel's doxology, and the kadosh which is the privilege of the heavenly creatures. This stream of imagery is prevalent in the Talmud, in Hullin 91b, for example, where the shema is also referred to as Israel's parallel to the heavenly songs of praise. The end of chapter four from Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer, cited above, is perfectly consistent with both the later hechalot literature, and the Talmudic conception.

While the dating of the hechalot literature is a complex matter, it is clear that its roots extend back at least as far as the end of the third or beginning of the fourth century, and that by the fifth century its central themes have found a legitimate place in "mainstream" rabbinic literature (i.e., Midrash, Talmud).[24] It can also be seen that the introduction of the shema as one of the phrases of heavenly praise was a logical development. It may be that as hechalot speculation waned as a mystical pursuit (in the sense of being restricted to initiates), it gained popularity in a wider circle as an attractive complement to existing liturgical themes. The rabbis may even have had a particular agenda in inserting the shema as one of the doxological responses -- whether we interpret it as polemical or perhaps as the censoring in or out process discussed by Hoffman.[25]

The yorde merkabah used phrases which were already standard elements of the synagogue liturgy in their texts. The liturgy then seems to assimilate the use made by the mystics back into the synagogue rite. Precisely how this later development was accomplished is uncertain. Yet an answer to this problem might reveal the nature of liturgical creativity in the very centuries unaccounted for with the early dating of

merkabah influence.

Several scholars have suggested that piyyutim served as the vehicle of liturgical developments during this period (roughly the late third to early seventh centuries).[26] The kedushah was an important object of payyetanic embellishment, and it has also been suggested that certain payyetanim were influenced by merkabah mysticism.[27] These factors point to piyyutim as a possible source for additional information about the development of the kedushah in the liturgy, as will be seen in the following chapter.

Footnotes

CHAPTER III:ii

1. Hoffman, "Censoring In," p. 1.
2. Ibid., p. 3.
3. Ginzberg, Geonica II, p. 130; Kohler, "The Eighteen Benedictions," p. 397.
4. Ibid.
5. See above, Chapter I.
6. Scholem, Major Trends, p. 42.
7. Shalom Spiegel, "Ezekiel," Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. LIV (1935), part III:164-165.
8. Hagigah 13a, cf. Hagigah 2:1 (Mishnah), Hagigah 2:1, 77a (Palestinian Talmud).
9. Heinemann, Prayer, p. 232.
10. Ithamar Greenwald, "Piyyutei Yannai Vesifrut Yordei Merkavah," pp. 257-278.
11. Heinemann, Prayer, p. 232.
12. Hoffman, "Censoring In," pp. 4-5.
13. E.g., Kohler, Werner.
14. Scholem, Jewish Gnosticism, p. 5.
15. Rev. deLacy O'leary, The Apostolical Constitutions, p. 73. (This work is most likely not representative of the current state of scholarship on early church documents. It is, however, a thorough examination of the Apostolical Constitutions according to the Wellhausen method of textual analysis. While more recent discoveries may have rendered some of Rev. O'Leary's conclusions inaccurate, his methodology reveals the major textual problems which involve our consideration of Christian parallels to the kedushah of the liturgy.
16. Ibid., p. 59.
17. Ibid., pp. 72-3.
18. Robert Wilken, "The Jews of Antioch," SBL Seminar Papers, 1976 (Missoula: Scholars Press), pp. 74-74.

19. Aaron Hyman, Toldoth Tannaim ve'amoraim, Vol. I (Jerusalem, 1964), p. 92.

20. Scholem, Jewish Gnosticism, p. 106. (Note the use of makom bet shechinto which appears in the kedushah desidra as well.)

21. Hugo Odeberg (trans. & ed.), 3 Enoch, pp. 123-5.

22. Ibid., p. 184 (cf. 39:2, 48:12).

23. Adolph Jellinek, Bet Hamidrash (Berlin, 1853), Vol. III, p. 161.

24. Although Scholem's conclusions have received widespread acceptance, there are those such as Ephraim Urbach who would qualify the application of Scholem's perspective. See "Hamesorot Al Torat Hasod Betekufat Hatannaim," Studies in Mysticism and Religion Presented to Gershom Scholem (Jerusalem, 1967).

25. Hoffman, "Censoring In," p. 6.

26. E.g., Fleischer in "Letefutsatan shel Kedushot."

27. Altmann, "Shirei-Kedushah," and Greenwald, "Piyyutei Yannai."

Chapter III:iii

THE DEVELOPMENT OF PIYYUTIM CONTAINING KEDUSHOT

Unfortunately, the history of piyyutim "whose origins are enshrouded in mist"[1] is almost as problematic as the history of the kedushah itself. Significantly, the early traditions concerning the development of piyyutim bear a striking resemblance to those traditions explaining the presence of the shema in the kedushah and the origin of the kedushah desidra. Both attribute liturgical developments either to persecution and interference with the synagogue rite, or the decline in leisure time and study.

In a statement from Sepher ha-Pardes, attributed to Joseph Ibn Plat, a tradition is preserved about piyyutim taking the place of midrash at a time when learning was on the decline.[2] Alternatively, R. Judah B. Barzillai Albargeloni of Sepher ha-Ittim states that

> There was a time...when the Jews were forbidden by their oppressors to engage in the study of the Law. The learned men among them, therefore, introduced the custom of mentioning in the course of the prayers the laws of the festivals and the laws of the Sabbath and religious observance and exhorting the common people in regard to them, by means of hymns, thanksgivings, rimes, and Piyyutim.[3]

Davidson attributes a certain kernel of credibility to the second of these sources by comparing the style of piyyutim to the cryptic language of certain aggadic passages where messages were supposedly sent "across enemy lines" in code.[4]

The significance of piyyutim for the study of the kedushah consists in the development of a particular form of piyyut known as the kerovah. One form of kerovah came to be known as the kedushta, which was inserted into the first three benedictions of the tefillah, and

concluded with a kedushah. If we can determine when, and how these kedushtaot took their place in the liturgy, we might then infer something about the history of the kedushah d'amidah. The sources available to us concerning the origin of piyyutim in general, however, offer no reliable information about the date of their development. The Palestinian origin of piyyutim has been well attested,[5] but the time of their origin remains a matter of dispute.

There are two basic views in regard to the date of the earliest piyyutim. Ezra Fleischer "maintains that the payyetanim did not begin their work until after the majority of the standard prayers had already crystallized; and that...would get us, according to Fleischer, at the earliest, to the fifth century."[6] If this is the case, then some form of the kedushah d'amidah must have existed as an independent prayer before it became the object of payyetanistic creativity. Jefim Schirmann, however, holds a more radical view. He thinks that some form of piyyut existed already in the second century, and that in fact "in the oldest standard prayers there may be found an embryo of the kind of rhyme which later on was to become a characteristic feature of the piyyut."[7] In this view, the kedushah d'amidah as it appears in geonic liturgy may represent piyyutim which gradually became standard segments of the liturgy. This might also account for the variation in forms of the kedushot of the tefillah.

It has been suggested that the kedushah itself may have been responsible for the entire genre of piyyutim. Zulay thinks that the kedushah was the kernel of the development of an entirely independent form -- the kedushah hymn -- as found in the hechalot texts.[8] These then became the basis for the kedushtaot of the synagogue, and event-

ually the highly developed category of keravot in general.

Altmann also addressed the question of the relationship between the kedushah of the hechalot hymns and the liturgy.[9] He attempted to demonstrate that the kedushah hymns were actually a combination of both the yotser and amidah type of kedushot. Heinemann has challenged some of Altmann's conclusions on the grounds that Altmann mistakenly placed too much emphasis on the berachah formula of the hymns, and that the progression from a mere description of the angelic kedushah to the kedushah of the amidah with its parallel recitation implies nothing about the historical development of the kedushot, though it may be accurate from a logical or descriptive point of view.[10] Altmann's assertion, however, that the kedushah of the amidah was not fixed as a part of the liturgy until the sixth century[11] has significant implications for the function of the payyetanim in introducing the theme of parallel recitation into the kedushah of the synagogue liturgy.

The evidence seems to indicate that over a period of time, the kedushat hashem benediction of the tefillah was recognized as a suitable position for the interjection of kedushah hymns. The Palestinian Jews were much more flexible with their liturgy,[12] yet at the same time used the kedushah very sparingly. This may have been directly related to the significance of the kedushah in merkabah mysticism, and the function of prayer in that community.

Scholars have disagreed about the extent of mystical influence on the development of piyyutim. Rabinowitz[13] and Wacholder,[14] for example, contend that the sources of piyyutim (using Yannai as the standard of classical piyyut) were strictly aggadic and halachic material. Scholem[15] and Greenwald,[16] on the other hand, recognize a

distinct mystical influence on some of the piyyutim. The difference, as Greenwald points out, is not dependent on whether the payyetan used midrashic material as his source, or whether he used hechalot texts, but rather whether the rabbinic sources used were dependent on merkabah literature or not. "An examination of the mystical sources of Hebrew piyyut reveal that sometimes the mystical sources are found among rabbinic midrash, sometimes in yorde merkabah literature, and sometimes both."[17] In other words, the evidence form the piyyutim supports and is consistent with the presence of yorde merkabah enthusiasts within "mainstream" rabbinic circles. Considering the significance of the kedushah among those individuals, it is not surprising to find it as a central feature of a new form of synagogue literature, as Hoffman has argued.[18] If Yannai represents the classical state of this poetry, and he can be dated somewhere toward the end of the sixth or beginning of the seventh centuries,[19] we can assume the existence of these creative practices at least in the centuries immediately preceding his work.

Fleischer has suggested that, since the genizah has not revealed any form of kedushah of a Palestinian amidah without piyyut, perhaps the connecting phrases of the plain kedushah were so simple that they were simply memorized by the people.[20] He has identified certain key words of extant kedushtaot which may hint at an original, simple form of a kedushah. Such words as le'umatam and pa'amayim appear in a regular pattern almost independently of the structure of the piyyut.[21] It would seem, then, that the simple kedushah was so well established before any piyyutim embellished it that the congregation could be counted on to respond to certain cue words when the hazzan did create

piyyutim containing the kedushah. Again we see a situation compatible with Werner's conclusions concerning synagogal response patterns and the development of certain liturgical forms, and we have already noted the similarity between mystical pursuits and Werner's characterization of the purpose of a doxology.[22]

Various conclusions emerge from the above data. People affected by the cross-cultural environment of mysticism, or more specifically its Jewish form as merkabah mysticism, were also at the same time in the "mainstream" of Jewish creativity. These individuals adapted well-known liturgical elements to their own pursuit of the merkabah in the hechalot literature. This literature in turn influenced the very liturgical elements which had previously inspired its creation. Out of the kedushah hymns of the hechalot texts, certain synagogue poets in the earliest period of piyyutim began to embellish the kedushat hashem benediction of the tefillah. Through the use of certain key words and phrases, the hazzan, who was most likely the author of the piyyut as well, could signal the appropriate response on the part of the congregation.

Potentially, this style of communal worship was extremely flexible. While there is no way to determine the historicity of the legends associating the piyyutim either to persecution or a decline in learning, the coincidence of these explanations may reveal certain trends. A variety of piyyutim seems to have developed according to the particular inclinations of the poets and the needs of the congregations. The liturgy in Palestine remained capable of assimilating a wide variety of styles. It was only during the consolidation of liturgical control in geonic Babylonia that standardization became desirable. At that

point Yehudai's interest in the habits of the Palestinian payyetanim may have reflected a conscious desire to control the use of these forms in the liturgy. There was a need to unify the practices, and to make them consistent with the Talmudic tradition as it had developed in Babylonia. Conflicts such as the casual interjection of the shema into a prayer which was not its statutory location could no longer be tolerated. On the other hand, the kedushah had ritualistic rather than halachic significance and thus its diffusion in the liturgy presented no threat to authority.

Footnotes

CHAPTER III:iii

1. Heinemann, Prayer, p. 149.
2. Israel Davidson, Machzor Yannai, p. xvi.
3. Ibid., p. xvii.
4. Ibid., p. xix-xx.
5. Joseph Heinemann and Jakob Petuchowski, Literature of the Synagogue, p. 208.
6. Ibid.
7. Jefim Schirmann, "Hebrew Liturgical Poetry and Christian Hymnology," Jewish Quarterly Review 44 (1953):134.
8. Ibid., p. 139.
9. Altmann, "Shirei-Kedushah," pp. 4-5.
10. Heinemann, Prayer, p. 233.
11. Altmann, "Shirei-Kedushah," p. 9.
12. Heinemann and Petuchowski, Literature, p. 217.
13. Cited by Greenwald, "Piyyutei Yannai," p. 257.
14. Ben-Zion Wacholder, Prolegomenon to The Bible as Read and Preached in the Old Synagogue, p. xl.
15. Scholem, Major Trends, p. 57.
16. Greenwald, "Piyyutei Yannai," p. 257.
17. Ibid., p. 258.
18. Hoffman, "Censoring In," pp. 8-12.
19. Wacholder, Prolegomenon, p. xl.
20. Ezra Fleischer, "Lenuscha Hakedumah shel Kedushat Ha'amidah," p. 229.
21. Ibid., pp. 231-2.
22. See above, Chapter II:ii.

Chapter III;iv

AN INTERPRETATION OF THE HISTORY OF THE KEDUSHAH DESIDRA

The history of the kedushah desidra is perhaps the most elusive of all the kedushot. As we have seen, there are basically three views of its origin. Mann contends that it was originally an element of the liturgy surrounding the Torah reading in the synagogue, while Elbogen and Liebreich give more credence to the responsum from Natronai recording a period of study after the tefillah; and Heinemann applies his perspective of prayers of bet midrash origin to the uva letsion section of the service, claiming that it was not originally an alement of the synagogue practice at all.

Each of these scholars notes the fact that the kedushah desidra alone is mentioned by name in the Talmud. Yet this assumption is not necessarily as certain as it appears. Sotah 49a attributes to Rava the statement that "the world is sustained by the kedushah desidra and the yehe shme rabah of the aggadah."

Although the origins of the kaddish are also open to question, there is certainly an ample collection of references to it, and to its central response, yehe shme rabah or yehi shmo hagadol in the Talmud.[1] It is well attested that scholars were in the habit of responding with this "doxology" to an aggadic discourse, and that this practice dates back to Tannaitic times.[2]

Thus, it has been assumed that the kedushah desidra refers to a similar practice, the response of the kedushah to the public sidrah. The denotations of each of these terms, however, requires further consideration.

The word kedushah in this particular form, refers nowhere else

in the Babylonian Talmud to the liturgical kedushah. It may refer to the kiddush,[3] the kaddish,[4] the concept of holiness,[5] or the specific status of kedushah in relation to the Temple.[6] When the kedushah as a liturgical element is mentioned, it is called either kedushat hashem[7] or simply kadosh[8] -- or, in the Palestinian Talmud, kedushta.[9]

Nevertheless, assuming for the moment that the reference is to some response similar to the kaddish, possibly containing the trishagion of Isaiah 6:3, to what is it a response?

There are three possible understandings of the word sidrah. Among its later meanings is parashah, or the weekly Torah selection.[10] Mann bases his theory on this understanding, and sees the kedushah desidra therefore, as an early Palestinian custom of reciting the kedushah during the seder kriyat haTorah. There are several contradictions in this interpretation. First of all, Wacholder has contended that sidrah did not refer to the Torah portion until late in the Talmudic period at the earliest.[11] Furthermore, if it was in fact the Palestinian term for parashat hashavuah, why would Rava, a Babylonian, use this term instead of the Babylonian equivalent (parshata, perhaps).[12] Finally, assuming that it did refer to the weekly Torah selection, why was the kedushah desidra incorporated on a daily basis?

These factors would seem to militate against Mann's understanding of the term kedushah desidra. The word sidrah occurs several times in the Babylonian Talmud, usually in the context of "so and so pasak sidrah before so and so" (usually the names of two well known rabbis).[13] On the basis of the Talmudic evidence, Bacher explains the term as the practice of translating selections from either Prophets or Writings line by line, equivalent to the Palestinian practice of pashat kera.[14]

This would seem to be compatible with the kedushah desidra as it appears in the liturgy, and consistent with Natronai's reminiscence of the manner of studying. There is, however, a minor contradiction here as well. We do not find Talmudic evidence of this practice taking place in the context of public worship. On the contrary, it seems to be a relatively elitist activity, something which was done in the academy, or disciple circle, or wherever scholarly pursuits took place.

This observation is supported by other statements attributed to Rava,[15] as well as what we know from other Talmudic sources about the rabbis' general attitudes toward public worship.[16] That Rava would have attributed the survival of the world to a practice engaged in by the common masses in their synagogues seems most unlikely. On the other hand, it would be entirely consistent with the personality which emerged of Rava, for him to have staked the world's future on the habits of the scholarly class.[17]

In my opinion, Sota 49a passage should be interpreted to mean that Rava saw the survival of the world as dependent on the spontaneous activities of the scholars in response to a clever aggadah or a nicely turned sidrah: this does not, in fact, reflect a practice of studying in the synagogue at all. The question, therefore, remains as to how the kedushah desidra came to be a part of the synagogue liturgy.

Attention must be turned to the structure of the kedushah desidra as it appears in the geonic liturgy. The actual phrases of the kedushah are preceded by two messianic verses from Isaiah -- favorite nehemta conclusions among the rabbis of the Midrash,[18] and even used by Paul in Romans 11, a chapter which uses classic midrashic elements. Psalm 22:4 then serves as the transition to the kedushah

verses themselves. Its similarity to the kedushat hashem makes it a particularly appropriate verse. The Isaiah and Ezekiel verses of the standard kedushah then follow, with their targumic paraphrases. As has been discussed, the use of the targum may have had polemical implications, though unfortunately, the age and origin of the targumim is so uncertain as to offer us no additional information on locating the origin of the use in the kedushah.[19] Both targumic paraphrases do, however, bring in reference to the shechina, or "the place of the shechina" -- a phrase which we also encountered in the hechalot literature in one of the doxologies used by the yorde merkabah.[20] The third verse of the kedushah desidra is Adonai yimloch leolam vaed, rather than the yimloch Adonai of the kedushah d'amidah. Elbogen suggested that the change was due to the lack of an official targum to Writings at the time of the composition of the kedushah desidra.[21] However, there may be an alternative explanation, supposing that both targumim were available at the time. The targum to yimloch Adonai is a literal, word for word translation (which may in fact reflect its late composition), while the targum to Adonai yimloch sounds much more like the doxologies of the other bet midrash prayers identified by Heinemann, most notably the kaddish responses.[22]

After the kedushah itself, a series of messianic verses follows, and the kedushah desidra concludes with a rather unique Torah blessing. The baruch eloheinu shebaranu seems to be a compilation of a string of Torah blessings. Several themes are repeated, including the emphasis on eternal life and appealing to the proper study of Torah to sustain the individual on the correct path.

While it is impossible to determine whether the origin of the

kedushah desidra as it appears in the geonic liturgy was of Palestinian or Babylonian origin, several elements would make it consistent with Palestinian practices. It would seem to be appropriate in a Christian cultural background, especially if the targum is indeed used polemically, and it could be that the uva letsion conclusion had specific implications in the Christian world. We also know of the significance of the kedushah among the early Palestinian mystics, and even the concluding benediction could be interpreted as expressing the central themes and though patterns of the mystically inclined rabbis.[23] While an early Palestinian origin of the kedushah desidra is pure speculation, there seems to be no evidence that it would have been incompatible with that environment.

Although it is impossible to determine where or how the composition of the uva letsion passage as a whole came about, it would seem that by the time of the geonim there were two separate traditions concerning its place in the liturgy. It is certainly likely that the geonim were aware of the passage in Sotah. And it seems that the entire kedushah desidra was already a firmly established element in the liturgy, though it was recognized as a later element with unusual origins. Furthermore, another factor should be taken into account. The geonim may have interpreted history to comply with their own situation, whether consciously or unintentionally. Goodblatt has recently demonstrated how Sherira transformed the implication of the word sidra, in particular, to fit his own situation.[24] During the period of liturgical standardization, the same process may have taken place in regard to the kedushah desidra. The reference in the Talmud was known, and the uva letsion composition may have existed in some form.

Sidra was known as the scholarly style of scriptural reading and interpretation, and there may have been a motivation to make that the property of the public in the form of the daily liturgy. Thus, the kedushah desidra as it appears in the geonic liturgies may have been the result of a consolidation of practices from the bet midrash, or academy, and from the synagogue, in a format which conveniently fit the Talmudic reference.

Footnotes

CHAPTER III:iv

1. E.g., Shabbat 119b; Berachot 3a, 21b; Sukah 39a.
2. David de Sola Pool, The Kaddish, p. 8.
3. Berachot 27b; Shabbat 24a.
4. Temurah 9b.
5. Shekalim 2b.
6. Eruvin 2a, 36a.
7. Berachot 33a.
8. See references to Soferim, above (Chapter III:i).
9. Palestinian Talmud Berachot v9c.
10. Mann, "Changes," p. 270.
11. Wacholder, Prolegomenon, p. xviii.
12. See Aruch Hashalem, Vol. , p. 453.
13. Ibid., p. 28.
14. Wilhelm Bacher, Archei Midrash:Amoraim, pp. 240241.
15. Shabbat 10a; Sotah 4b, 21a.
16. Neusner, A History, Vol. III, pp. 164-5.
17. Ibid., p. 234.
18. See Torah Haketuvah Vehamesurah under Isaiah 59:20. (E.g., Baba Metsia 85a.)
19. Encyclopaedia Judaica, "Targum."
20. Scholem, Jewish Gnosticism, p. 106.
21. Elbogen, Hatefillah, p. 49. Heinemann adds that it may also have been from the Rosh Hashanah liturgy, or as a result of the desire to include kingship in the kedushah. The latter suggestion is expanded in his article "Kedushah Umalchut."
22. Heinemann, Prayer, p. 233.

23. Scholem, Jewish Gnosticism, pp. 12-13 explains that perfect knowledge of Torah became an important aspect of merkabah mysticism, and that the mystics favored the biblical blessing from the Psalms concluding with lamdeini chukecha. In fact, Torah study became a means of ascent in some cases. The blessing of uva letsion when read with this background in mind, sounds strikingly congruous with the merkabah pursuits. De Sola Pool had noted the similarity already in The Kaddish, p. 6.

24. David Goodblatt, Rabbinic Instruction in Sasanian Babylonia, pp. 41-63.

Chapter IV

CONCLUSION

While it is impossible to trace precisely the development of the kedushah because of a scarcity of explicit sources, the following reconstruction of the history of the kedushot in the Jewish liturgy might be inferred from the material we have examined.

The use of Isaiah 6:3 in a liturgical setting may be as ancient as the book of Isaiah itself. From the little we know of the Temple liturgy, a doxological response such as Ezekiel 3:12 or Baruch shem kavod...could also have been used before the Tannaitic period.

The kedushah as we know it in its distinctive setting as part of the yotser benediction probably developed in the early centuries of this era in Palestine, under the influence of the earliest merkabah mysticism. By the third century, some of the rabbis at least were familiar with merkabah mysticism and may even have been among the yorde merkabah. The transmission of merkabah mysticism to Babylonia could have begun to take place, at least on a small scale, by the third or fourth century. However, the main sphere of mystical activity seems to have remained in the west.

The kedushah d'amidah may not have entered the liturgy until a later period. If we accept Heinemann's view that the greatest variety exists in the early stages of development, the variety of kedushot d'amidah preserved from as late as the ninth century would imply that the kedushah d'amidah seems to have entered the liturgy through the innovations of synagogue poetry. A simple kedushah may have been introduced into the Babylonian tefillah independently. For example, it is not unknown that a benediction or prayer was repeated or delayed to

accommodate latecomers to the synagogue. As the popularity of the kedushah grew, such a demand might very well have presented itself. If the kedushat hashem benediction did in fact originally contain Isaiah 6:3, the expansion to a full-fledged kedushah would not have been controversial. No discussion other than the proper conduct in terms of interrupting one's prayer to respond, or the propriety of reciting the kedushah alone would have been evoked. Furthermore, if synagogue practice was relatively independent of scholarly control or concern, the congregation's familiarity with the kedushah d'yotser would make its insertion into the amidah almost inevitable. No direct merkabah mysticism influence was necessary to produce such a development. It may simply have been a natural progression within a liturgical rite.

In Palestine, however, the influence of merkabah mysticism (in whatever form it took in later centuries) was felt in the liturgy through the development of piyyutim. As the Palestinian liturgy remained more flexible, it became the arena for an intermingling of mystical and aggadic themes -- according to the skills and persuasions of the synagogue poets and prayer leaders. Furthermore, since Palestine was the center of the origins of merkabah mysticism, the kedushah in the liturgy may have had a stronger impact on the worshippers. This may have been the reason for their reluctance to use the kedushah daily (if in fact we can really determine that there was a reluctance). Rather, the Palestinian Jewish community may have reserved the kedushah for days which had a greater degree of "sanctity" because of the significance attached to the kedushah in Palestine. Babylonia may not have developed similar sensitivities to the use of

the kedushah, though it seems that they did exhibit these sensitivities in regard to the shema.

Mystical influences continued to travel to Babylonia, transmitted perhaps by people such as Rabbi Abun. In fact, the tradition citing gezerot as Abun's reason for leaving Israel may be connected, indirectly, with the traditions of sha'at shmad associated with various aspects of the kedushah.

Specific references to clear cases of persecution are rare in the rabbinic literature. However, intimations and general references to gezerot, or shmad, are numerous. Scholars have approached these records in two ways. Some (e.g., Mann) have attempted to identify the particular instance of persecution, while others have dismissed them as legendary accounts for otherwise unexplained traditions. The truth may lie somewhere in the middle.

Mention of prohibitions or restrictions may actually reflect any number of oppressive situations. This may be a stylized rabbinic reference to social, political, or economic hardships or other types of subtle discrimination rather than outright religious hostility. Waves of immigration are often caused by such factors, and attributing new practices to persecutions or decrees may simply have been the rabbinic response to the transmission of foreign customs into Babylonia. The shema in the kedushah may have been part of such a transmission, especially if it was originally part of the innovations in piyyutim to include the shema in the kedushah. If this custom gradually became known in Babylonia it would certainly have required some justification.

Thus, while references to sh'at shmad or gezerot need not be

taken literally, they may be understood to reflect real periods of hardship which motivated exchanges of population and, therefore, of custom.

Similarly, the identification of polemical statements in the liturgy requires further evaluation. Mann contended that the liturgy of the synagogue became fixed during periods of pressure exerted by Christianity and Zoroastrianism and that the traditions surrounding the development of such elements as the shema in the kedushah and the kedushah desidra were results of hostility and religious intolerance toward the Jews.

Alternatively, Scholem has demonstrated that merkabah mysticism came out of a general cultural background where there must have been close contact between gnostics of various groups. Others have also shown that close contact between Jews and Christians continued into a later period. Rather than assuming that the crystallization of the liturgy came about as a reaction to outside pressure which was hostile it seems that there may have been an inner motivation to identify the Jewish rite as distinct from other rites which produced such developments as the shema in the kedushah or the "polemical" targum of the kedushah desidra.

Therefore, elements which may at first appear to have a polemical nature about them should be reevaluated in light of the historical evidence regarding the actual status of relationships between Jews and non-Jews. By this method we may gain additional insight about the nature of liturgical development.

Another aspect of the history of liturgy which bears further consideration is the relationship between the rites of the scholars

and the rites of the average worshipper. It seems, at least in Babylonia, that the two may have worshipped quite differently and independently until the geonic period, at which time a confusion in practices may have occurred in the attempt to combine aspects from the scholarly circle with the public liturgy which had become established. Ginzberg's work, for example, reveals a recognition of this process in identifying certain liturgical disputes as matters between Pumbedita and Sura rather than simply Palestine and Babylonia. The centralization of authority necessitated the standardization of liturgical custom. Since the practices of rabbis outside the central circle of power would have been most threatening to the geonim, there may have been an attempt to appropriate their customs into the synagogue so that they could not compete with the efforts of centralization. Something of this nature may have taken place in the history of the kedushah desidra.

Some additional hypotheses which suggest themselves from a survey of the development of the kedushah may bear further consideration. Jakob Petuchowski once stated as a law of liturgical development, the tendency to add an additional prayer, when in doubt, but never to diminish the length of the liturgy. It might be added that doubt enters into liturgical development at the point when the original inspiration of a particular prayer is no longer understood or recognized. The kedushah enjoyed a flexible and creative history as long as the imagery behind it was alive in the minds of the worshippers. Once that imagery had become less significant, the kedushah and the practices surrounding it became standardized, statutory, and repetitious.

A further observation may be stated. The popularity of the kedushah seems in part to be due to its self-descriptive nature. The kedushah describes, explicitly, the act of prayer. In the tefillah, especially, the worshipper's role in the act of prayer becomes elevated to parallel that of the heavenly creatures. Thus, the kedushah serves not only as a statement of praise to God, but also as a sort of encouragement and support of the action in which the worshippers are engaged. We might look to various other prayers as parallel examples of this self-descriptive style. The abundance of Torah benedictions scattered throughout the liturgy, for example, demonstrates a similar element. By reciting a Torah blessing one thereby becomes a receiver of Torah.

Though we may never be able to determine precisely the origin and development of the kedushot in the liturgy, their function should be the subject of ongoing investigation. A comment is preserved in Siddur Rashi (p. 48) noting that nowhere in the tradition do we find any legal obligation to recite the kedushah, yet special provisions are made to enable every worshipper to recite it with a minyan every day because it is so dear to the congregation. Thus, as long as the kedushah remains dear to the congregation, its liturgical function will evolve according to the inclinations and backgrounds of the worshippers who recite it.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Altmann, Alexander. "Shirei Kedushah Besifrut Hechalot Hadadumah." Melilah 8. 1951.

Bacher, Wilhelm. Archei Midrash. Budapest, 1899.

Baumstark, Anton. Comparative Liturgy. Oxford: Mabray & Co., 1958.

Birnbaum, Philip, ed. Hasiddur Hashalem. New York: Hebrew Publishing Co., 1949 (Ashkenazic).

_____. Hasiddur Hashalem. New York: Hebrew Publishing Co., 1969 (Sephardic).

Davidson, Israel. Mahzor Yannai. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1919.

Elbogen, Ismar. Hatefillah Beyisrael Behitpatchutah Hahistorit. Tel Aviv: Dvir, 1972 (translation by Yehoshua Amir).

Fleischer, Ezra. "Lenuscha Hakadumah Shel Kedushat Ha'amidah." Sinai 63, 1968.

_____. "Letefutsatan Shel Kedushot Ha'amidah Vehayotser Beminhagot Hatefillah Shel Benei Erets Yisrael." Tarbits 38, 1967.

Ginzberg, Louis. Geonica, Vol. 2, 1909.

_____. Ginzei Schechter, Vol. 2, 1929. Reprint, New York: Herman Press, 1969.

Goodblatt, David. Rabbinic Instruction in Sasanian Babylonia. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1975.

Greenwald, Ithamar. "Piyyutei Yannai Vesifrut Yordei Merkavah." Tarbiz 36, 1966-7.

Heinemann, Joseph. Prayer in the Talmud. Berlin: deGruyter, 1977.

_____. "Kedushah U'Malchut Shel Kriyat Shema Ukedushah De'amidah." Shai LeHeiman. Jerusalem, 1977.

_____, and Petuchowski, Jakob. Literature of the Synagogue. New York: Behrman House, 1975.

Hoffman, Lawrence. The Canonization of the Synagogue Service. Indiana: Notre Dame, 1979.

Idelsohn, Abraham. Jewish Liturgy and Its Development. 1932. Reprint, New York: Schocken, 1967.

Kohler, Kaufman. "The Origin and the Composition of the Eighteen Benedictions." HUCA I, 1924.

Leibreich, Leon. "An Analysis of U-Ba Le Ziyyon in the Liturgy." HUCA 21, 1924.

_____. "Hashabbat besiddur Hatefillah." Sefer Hayovel Shel Hadoar. New York, 1952.

Machzor Vitry. Simon Halevi Hurwitz, ed. Nuremberg: Mekitsei Nirdamim, 1923.

Mann, Jacob. "Changes in the Divine Service of the Synagogue Due to Religious Persecutions." HUCA 4, 1927.

Neusner, Jacob. A History of the Jews in Babylonia. Vol. III. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1968.

Odeberg, Hugo. 3 Enoch. New York: Ktav (The Library of Biblical Studies, Orlinsky, ed.), 1973.

O'Leary, Rev. deLacy. The Apostolical Constitutions. London, 1906.

Pool, David de Sola. The Old Jewish Aramaic Prayer: The Kaddish. Leipzig, 1909.

Schirmann, Jefim. "Hebrew Liturgical Poetry and Christian Hymnology." Jewish Quarterly Review 44, 1953.

Scholem, Gershom. Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism and Talmudic Tradition. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1960.

_____. Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism. New York: Schocken, 1946.

Seder Rav Amram Gaon. Edited by Daniel Goldschmidt. Jerusalem: Mosad Harav Kook, 1971.

Siddur Rashi. Edited by Solomon Buber, 1911. Reprint, Jerusalem: Kiryah Ne'emanah, 1963.

Siddur Rav Saadia Gaon. Edited by Simcha Assaf, Israel Davidson, and Issachar Joel. Second edition. Jerusalem: Mekitsei Nirdamim, 1963.

Teshuvot Hageonim [Lyck]. Edited by Jacob Musafiya, 1864. Reprint, Jerusalem: 1967.

Urbach, E.E. "Hamesorot Al Torat Hasod Bitekufat Hatanaim." Studies in Mysticism and Religion. Presented to Gershom Scholem. Werblowsky and Wirszubski, eds. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1967.

Wacholder, Ben Zion, ed. Jacob Mann's The Bible as Read and Preached in the Old Synagogue. New York: Ktav, 1971.

Werner, Eric. "The Doxology in Synagogue and Church." HUCA 19, 1942.