

שמונה עשרה-תפלת שחרית-Tefila 101

קדושה Lesson 18-Introduction To

Source 1

תוספתא מסכת ברכות (ליברמן) פרק א' הלכה ט'-אילו ברכות שפותחין בהן בברוך כל הברכות כלן פותחין בברוך חוץ מברכה הסמוכה לשמע וברכה הסמוכה לברכה אחרת שאין פותחין בהן בברוך. ואין עונין עם המברך; ר' יהודה היה עונה עם המברך ק' ק' ו' ו' וברוך וגו' כל אילו היה קורא ר' יהודה עם המברך.

Translation: These are the Brachot which begin with the word Baruch: all the Brachot begin with the word Baruch except for the Bracha that is connected to Shema and any other Bracha which is connected to another Bracha which does not begin with the word: Baruch. We do not recite a Bracha on our own after a person recites a Bracha on our behalf. Rav Yehudah says: I would repeat what the prayer leader recited after the prayer leader recited the words: Kadosh, Kadosh, Kadosh and Baruch Kvod. Those two verses Rav Yehudah would recite after the prayer leader recited them.

Source 2

עננו, ה', עננו, ביום צום תעניתנו, כי בצרה גדולה אנחנו. אל תפן אל רשענו, ואל תסתר פניך ממנו, ואל תתעלם מתחנונו. היה נא קרוב לשועתנו, יהי נא חסדך לנחמנו, טרם נקרא אליך עננו, כדבר שנאמר: והיה טרם יקראו ואני אענה, עוד הם מדברים ואני אשמע. כי אתה, ה', העונה בעת צרה, פודה ומציל בכל עת צרה וצוקה. ברוך אתה, ה', העונה בעת צרה.)

Source 3

(**בתשעה באב:** נחם, ה' א-להינו, את אבלי ציון, ואת אבלי ירושלים, ואת העיר האבלה והחרבה והבזויה והשוממה. האבלה מבלי בניה, והחרבה ממעונותיה, והבזויה מכבודה, והשוממה מאין יושב. והיא יושבת וראשה חפוי, כאשה עקרה שלא ילדה. ויבלעוה לגיונות, ויירשוה עובדי זרים, ויטילו את עמך ישראל לחרב, ויהרגו בזדון חסידי עליון. על כן ציון במר תבכה, וירושלים תתן קולה. לבי לבי על חלליהם, מעי מעי על חלליהם. כי אתה ה' באש הצתה, ובאש אתה עתיד לבנותה, כאמור: ואני אהיה לה, נאם ה', חומת אש סביב, ולכבוד אהיה בתוכה. ברוך אתה, ה', מנחם ציון ובונה ירושלים.)

Source 4

משנה מסכת ראש השנה פרק ד', משנה ו'- אין פותחין מעשרה מלכיות, מעשרה זכרונות, מעשרה שופרות. רבי יוחנן בן נורי אומר, אם אמר שלש שלש מכולן, יצא. אין מזכירין זכרון מלכות ושופר של פורענות. מתחיל בתורה ומשלים בנביא. רבי יוסי אומר, אם השלים בתורה, יצא:

Mishnah. There should be recited not less than ten kingship verses, ten remembrance verses, and ten shofar verses. R. Yohanan b. Nuri said: if the reader says three from each set he has fulfilled his obligation.

Source 5

תשובות פרקי בן אבוי a student of רב יהודאי גאון: עד עכשו אין אומרים בארץ ישראל קדיש ושמע אלא בשבת או בימים טובים בלבד בשחרית בלבד חוץ מירושלים ובכל מדינה

שמונה עשרה-תפלת שחרית-101 Tefila

שיש בה בבליאין שעשו מריבה ומחלוקת עד שקבלו עליהם לומר קדושה בכל יום אבל בשאר מדינות ועיירות שבארץ ישראל שאין בהם בבליאין אין אומרים קדוש אלא בשבת ובימים טובים בלבד.

Translation: Until now it was not the custom in Israel to recite Kedushah and a verse from Kriyat Shema in Kedushah except on Shabbat and on Yom Tovim and only in Schacharit. Kedushah was recited everyday in Yerushalayim and any part of the country where Jews of Babylonian descent lived who caused infighting and disagreement until the residents of that area agreed to recite Kedushah every day. But in other parts of Israel and in cities where Jews of Babylonian descent did not live, the residents of those areas did not recite Kedushah except on Shabbat and on Yomim Tovim.

Source 6

תוספות-מסכת סנהדרין דף לו' עמ' ב'-מכנף הארץ זמירות שמענו - כתוב בתשובת הגאונים שאין בני ארץ ישראל אומרים קדושה אלא בשבת דכתיב (ישעיה ו') גבי חיות שש כנפים לאחד, וכל כנף הוא אומר שירה אחת ביום בששת ימי החול. וכשיגיע שבת אומרים החיות לפני המקום רבוננו של עולם אין לנו עוד כנף. והקב"ה משיב להם: יש לי עוד כנף אחד שאומר לפני שירה שנאמר מכנף הארץ זמירות שמענו.

Translation: It is written in the Responsa of the Gaonim that the residents of Eretz Yisroel did not recite Kedushah except on Shabbat. They followed that custom based on a verse in Yishayahu, Chapter 6. The verse relates to us that the angels had six wings. With each wing the angels would recite one song each day of the regular days of the week. When Shabbat came, the angels asked G-d: G-d, we do not have any more wings with which to sing. G-d answered them: I have one more wing (the Jewish people) who will recite Shira for Me on Shabbat as the verse says: (Yishayahu 24, 16): From the uttermost parts of the Earth have we heard songs.

Source 7

תלמוד בבלי מסכת חולין דף צא' עמ' ב'-הארץ אשר אתה שוכב עליה וגו' - מאי רבותיה? אמר רבי יצחק: מלמד שקפלה הקדוש ברוך הוא לכל ארץ ישראל והניחה תחת יעקב אבינו, שתהא נוחה ליכבש לבניו. ויאמר שלחני כי עלה השחר, אמר לו: גנב אתה, או קוביוסטוס אתה, שמתירא מן השחר? אמר לו: מלאך אני, ומיום שנבראתי לא הגיע זמני לומר שירה עד עכשיו. מסייע ליה לרב חננאל אמר רב, דאמר רב חננאל אמר רב: שלש כתות של מלאכי השרת אומרות שירה בכל יום, אחת אומרת קדוש, ואחת אומרת קדוש, ואחת אומרת קדוש ה' צבאות. מיתבי: חביבין ישראל לפני הקדוש ברוך הוא יותר ממלאכי השרת, שישראל אומרים שירה - בכל שעה, ומלאכי השרת אין אומרים שירה אלא - פעם אחת ביום, ואמרי לה - פעם אחת בשבת, ואמרי לה - פעם אחת בחודש, ואמרי לה - פעם אחת בשנה, ואמרי לה - פעם אחת בשבוע, ואמרי לה - פעם אחת ביובל, ואמרי לה - פעם אחת בעולם; וישראל מזכירין את השם אחר שתי תיבות, שנאמר: שמע ישראל ה' וגו', ומלאכי השרת אין מזכירין את השם אלא לאחר ג' תיבות, כדכתיב: קדוש קדוש קדוש ה' צבאות; ואין מה"ש אומרים שירה למעלה, עד שיאמרו ישראל למטה, שנאמר: ברוך יחד כוכבי בקר, והדר: ויריעו כל בני אלהים!

שמונה עשרה-תפלת שחרית-101 Tefila

Translation: And he said: Let me go, for daylight is breaking. Jacob said to him, 'Are you a thief or a rogue that you are afraid of the morning?' He replied: 'I am an angel, and from the day that I was created my time to sing praises to the Lord had not come until now'. This supports the statement of R. Hananel in the name of Rab. For R. Hananel said in the name of Rab: Three divisions of ministering angels sing praises to the Lord daily; one proclaims: Holy, the other proclaims: Holy, and the third proclaims: Holy is the Lord of hosts. An objection was raised: Israel are dearer to the Holy One, blessed be He, than the ministering angels, for Israel sing praises to the Lord every hour, whereas the ministering angels sing praises but once a day. Others say: Once a week; and others say: Once a month; and others say: Once a year; and others say: Once in seven years; and others say: Once in a jubilee; and others say: Once in eternity. And whereas Israel mention the name of G-d after two words, as it is said: Hear, Israel, the Lord etc., the ministering angels only mention the name of G-d after three words, as it is written: Holy, holy, holy, the Lord of hosts. Moreover, the ministering angels do not begin to sing praises in heaven until Israel have sung below on earth, for it is said: When the morning stars sang together, then all the sons of God shouted for joy! The opinion of R. Hananel is therefore refuted. — It must be this: One division of angels says: Holy; the other says: Holy, holy; and the third says: Holy, holy, holy, the Lord of hosts. But is there not the praise of 'Blessed'?— 'Blessed' is recited by the Ophanim. Or you may say: Since permission has once been granted it is granted. And G-d's nation, Israel crowns G-d as King by reciting: G-d will live forever.

Source 8

תלמוד בבלי מסכת סוטה דף מט' עמ' א'— אמר רבא: בכל יום ויום מרובה קללתו משל חבירו, שנאמר: (דברים כח) בבקר תאמר מי יתן ערב, ובערב תאמר מי יתן בקר; הי בקר? אילימא בקר דלמחר, מי ידע מאי הוי? אלא דחליף. ואלא עלמא אמאי קא מקיים? אקדושה דסידרא ואיהא שמיה רבא דאגדתא, שנא': (איוב י') ארץ עפתה כמו אופל צלמות ולא סדרים, הא יש סדרים – תופיע מאופל.

Translation: Rabba said: And the curse of each day is severer than that of the preceding day, as it is stated: In the morning you shall say: If only it were possible that G-d advance the time so that it be evening! And at evening you shall say: If only it were possible that G-d advance the time so that it be morning. Which morning are they longing for? If you say it is the morning of tomorrow, does anyone know that it will not present an even more difficult circumstance? Therefore it must be that they were longing for the morning of the day before. In that case, why does G-d allow the world to endure? Because of the recital of the words of Kedushah and their Aramaic translation at the end of the prayer service and the Kaddish that is recited after the Scriptural reading, and the response of 'May His great Name be blessed' which is uttered in the Kaddish after studying Midrash; as it is stated: A land of thick darkness, as darkness itself, a land of the shadow of death, without any order. Hence if there are Scriptural readings, the readings bring light to the thick darkness.

Source 9

וקרא זה אל זה ואמר, קדוש | קדוש קדוש ה צב-אות, מלא כל הארץ כבודו. ומקבלין דין מן דין, ואמרינן, קדיש בשמי מרומא עלאה בית שכינתה, קדיש על ארעא עובד גבורתה, קדיש לעלם ולעלמי עלמא, ה צבאות, מליא כל ארעא זיו יקרה.

The Koren Siddur translates the Aramaic Targum to the פסוק as follows:

שמונה עשרה-תפלת שחרית-101 Tefila

Translation: And they receive permission from one another, saying: Holy in the highest heavens, home of His presence; holy on earth, the work of His strength; holy for ever and all time is the Lord of hosts; the whole earth is full of His radiant glory.

Source 10

In Christian theology, the appearance of the word קדוש three times (Trisagion) by the angels in heaven confirms the existence of the Trinity. Below is a part of the prayer they recite. Notice how they interpret each reference to the word: קדוש:

Holy God

Holy and Mighty

Holy Immortal One

Have mercy, have mercy on us.

Source 10

With One Voice: Elements Of Acclimation In Early Jewish Liturgical Poetry by Laura S. Lieber, HTR 111:3 (2108) 401-424

p. 422-As these examples illustrate, Yose's poetry plays with a specific, recurring form: structural elements that include acrostics, fixed words, refrains, and marked rhythms. Within each poem, once the pattern is discerned, the format becomes quite regular and predictable, and congregational participation begins to seem natural. The affinity of these structures for acclamations, once noticed, becomes self-evident; for a community accustomed to participating in acclamations in other venues, the idea of joining in to single-word or even more elaborate congregational refrains would be organic. In the Shofar service poems, the fixed-word refrains are repeated forty-six times, while in the penitential hymn, "Once You Set Us at the Head," the refrain "we have sinned" would have occurred at least eleven times (if the poem were complete); the more elaborate alternating refrains in "Truly Our Sins" are still less elaborate than many attested acclamations, and each occurs eleven times. The audience would have had ample opportunity to discern the structures and understand their role; the consistent overall rhythm would have provided a common baseline for formal comprehension, while the variations in acrostics, line breaks, and fixed words would have added variety to keep listeners engaged.

It is not simply the ease with which congregations may have participated in simple refrains that aligns them with acclamations, however. There is, first of all, the sense of communal identity these texts cultivate, particularly through refrains such as "we have sinned" and references to "us" and "ours." The use of the first person plural strongly underscores the group identity of the speakers and, when spoken in the refrains, it translates idea into action. Furthermore, just as acclamations addressed the powerful—whether the emperor or a lesser magistrate—these poems explicitly address God directly, as "You." Even the more complicated refrains of "Truly Our Sins" could be quickly learned, as they rework familiar phrases (with rich biblical

resonances) that appear elsewhere in the liturgy. For example, the phrase “to defer anger” from the first refrain echoes Exod 34:6, the Thirteen Attributes of God, and its biblical reworking in Isa 48:9; and the first line of the second refrain (“For Your sake, O our God, act, and not for us”) recalls Psa 115:1 (“not for us, O Lord, not for us, but for Your Name . . .”). The refrain is constructed out of language that is not only familiar but also highly evocative, and the charge of its message amplified through the articulation of many voices in unison. The act of speaking the highly repetitive fixed-word “voice” yields an experience that is not only heard but felt: individually, in the sensation of one’s mouth forming the word, and communally, in the tangible encounter with other speaking bodies and the vibrations of their speech.

In concrete ways, these poems translate and even subvert non-Jewish sources of authority even as they employ the rhetorical techniques which were commonly used to affirm it. For example, Pliny the Younger records how he and his fellow senators hailed Trajan: “One and all and all alike we acclaim his good fortune, and with it our own, and beg him to “do thus” or again “hear thus,” as if forming our requests in the sure knowledge that he will grant these.” Pliny and his colleagues here praise the emperor because he has the power to hear and to do: Trajan could receive their petitions, delivered via unified acclamation, and make them reality. Such a dynamic—even the language of hearing and doing—translates seamlessly to the language and understanding of synagogue prayer. Trajan was merely an emperor (and Pliny takes pains to make clear that the emperor is *dominus* but not *deus*), a pale shadow in the rabbinic mind of the God who created the world. Furthermore, acclamation could occur whenever a critical mass gathered but seems to have been especially likely on occasions when the ruling authority was present, fostering a sense (or illusion) of intimacy even as it offered a very real opportunity to make voices heard, such as the games and specific holidays and festivals. These occasions were regarded as proper and propitious times for popular petition, complaint, and thanksgiving. The parallels with liturgical prayer, and especially the High Holy Day liturgy, are easy to draw: the people assemble to address God at a moment when God is not only present but primed to act beneficently and expecting to hear. The unified voice of his subjects in acclamation carried greater weight with an emperor or magistrate than many individual voices, and so, too, did the voice of God’s people possess greater power when assembled together and underscoring the prayer-leader’s voice than many voices in personal petition. As Williams notes, “A crowd that acted together, and in the process showed its strength, was not to be argued with, and it represented much that mattered in Roman politics and religion: unity, common identity, consensus, and ultimately, authority and legitimacy.” A congregation participating in a performance of Yose’s poetry was not striving to coerce God as a plebian crowd might attempt to intimidate a magistrate or, in Williams’ case, a bishop; but the desire to appear before God as a unified community, possessing legitimacy and dignity, might certainly have appealed instinctively as constituting a kind of persuasive power.

On a conceptual level, Jewish prayer not only asserts and embodies unity, it creates it. In terms of body language, the congregation's physical orientation towards Jerusalem fosters a sense of common Jewish identity not only within but across communities. Individual Jews direct themselves physically and mentally, knowing that they are part of a vast, diffuse diaspora that does so, as well. As Uri Ehrlich writes, "Prayer toward a single center strengthens national-religious identity, creating unity in the context of religious activity." Liturgical language and rhetoric reinforce the sense of commonality and shared identity through their routine preference for the first-person common plurals "we," "us," and "our," as God is addressed both indirectly ("He") and directly ("You"). Yose's poetry overlays acclamatory participation onto this already complex set of conceptual and performative dynamics: the dialogue between prayer-leader and congregation mimics to some extent the performance of acclamation from other venues, but the deity is the recipient of acclaim, not the prayer-leader. If anything, the prayer leader functions more as a *claque*, or a liturgical version of the actor, dancer, or gladiator whose performance provides the pretext for the dialogue between ruler and subjects. The prayer-leader orchestrates the venue and creates the setting in which the people's voices are heard.

Conclusions

It is hardly a poetic accident that the third poem of Yose's Shofar service, on the sound of the shofar itself, has "voice" (קול) as its theme word. In discussions of acclaim, the idea of "one voice" (*una voce*) had particular significance. In his discussion of the performance of Psalms in the liturgy, Ambrose wrote: A psalm joins those with differences, unites those at odds, and reconciles those who have suffered offense, for who will not concede to him with whom he sings to God with a single voice (*cum quo unam ad deum vocem miserit*)? Certainly it is a great bond of unity for the whole body of the people to come together in one chorus. The strings of the cithara are all different, but they bring about harmony. Such holds true for the communal performance of a hymn, or the refrain of a hymn, as much as for a psalm. But whereas it was Ambrose's ecclesial authority and legitimacy that were founded on popular acclaim—support manifested in the performance of Ambrose's hymns as a kind of acclamation—in a liturgical setting, it is God's authority that is called forth, praised, and petitioned. If public acclamation enabled the people to speak to those who possessed near totalitarian power, the liturgy and its poetry enabled the congregation to speak to the One who held ultimate and total power. In Yose's hymns, we find a poetic device (the fixed word) that has long been recognized as a kind of refrain. By analyzing refrains within the context of the practice of acclamation, new elements of their performative significance become audible: the voice of the people joins with the voice of the shofar to provide an irresistible, unmistakable call to the all-knowing, but also all-hearing, divine. But where public acclaim—whether civically or religiously motivated—could foster discord and instigate riots, liturgical unison yielded a distinctive and fully-audible harmony.

In writing about the performance of liturgical song in Milan, Augustine describes the innovative singing of hymns and psalms "in the eastern style" (*Confessions* 7.15). Paulinus'

biography of Ambrose indicates that what Augustine understands as the “eastern mode” refers to the singing of antiphons, hymns, and vigils—precisely the kind of acclamatory poetry that was emerging in the Eastern Mediterranean and Mesopotamia in the fourth century, as dramatically recorded by Sozomen and Socrates Scholasticus in their accounts of Chrysostom versus the Arians. On the one hand, this Levantine style of liturgical performance seems to be bound up with the influence of acclamation on hymnography, and the transformation of liturgical poetry into a distinctive variety of acclaim. On the other hand, it also represents a new emphasis on preexisting (biblical) structures which became fruitful precisely because they suited the new aesthetic style. In short, it represents an adaptation of something very “Eastern” (biblical, Jewish) to a “Roman” (and eventually Christian) style of public experience, but also something very “Roman” to an “Eastern” liturgical sphere: a translation from East to West to East and back again.

Yose ben Yose’s poems are not conventional acclamations, neither in their structure nor their use. The liturgy embellished by these compositions celebrate the deity whose presence is assumed but not manifest, and their purpose is more existential than tangible. There is not, as would be the case with an emperor, even a pretext of egalitarianism or populist power, but there is a sense of access and audibility. We have no evidence that these poems ever migrated out of the synagogue liturgy and into the world, reversing as it were the journey of acclamations from the world of theater and politics as Ambrose’s hymns, so influential in ecclesial politics, did. And yet Jewish liturgical poetry such as Yose’s, with its strong rhythms and cadences, unifying theme-words and refrains, and dynamic (if religiously imagined) dialogical engagement with a singular figure of significant power, strongly resembles acclamation in key ways. Reading hymns as shaped by the larger culture of acclamation helps us to understand how liturgical poetry emerged within the performative world of Late Antiquity spectacle and why it appeared simultaneously across multiple religious communities, but in distinctive ways. At the same time, this acclamatory lens helps modern readers recognize that Jews were fully a part of the broader society of Late Antiquity. Yose’s poems are, without a doubt, distinctly and explicitly Jewish; they would never be mistaken for a plebian acclamation at the races, for an Ambrosian hymn, or for a component of an anti-Arian hymnic duel. Their language (Hebrew), their performative context (the synagogue), and their frame of reference (Jewish history, texts, and traditions) single them out as uniquely Jewish works. But just as biblical Psalms resonate with ancient Near Eastern and Egyptian poetry and modern day liturgical music is colored by the 1960s folk revival, liturgical poetry in Late Antiquity drew upon the aesthetics of the surrounding culture for its sense of what was pleasing, what was effective, and what seemed (intuitively) “right.” In the case of Yose ben Yose—and other poets of his age and era, including Ephrem and Marqah, and Ambrose and Chrysostom, as well as later poets such as Narsai, Yannai, Eleazar ha-Qallir, and Romanos the Melodist—that context consisted, in part, of the culture of acclamation.