

Orthodox rabbis, who served as a rabbi both in Germany and in Paris.⁶⁹ He wrote a commentary to the prayer book, first published in German (1938), which became very popular and was translated into French, English and Hebrew. In his attempt to reconcile these blessings with the intellectual demands of modernity he addressed the underlying theology rather than the text of the blessings. He justified the blessing about not being a gentile by remarking that Jews had always suffered and been downtrodden among the gentiles and that this blessing was necessary to strengthen the Jewish self image. Although he did not draw this parallel, one is reminded of the *Kuzari* of R. Judah Halevi, which was written in an attempt to encourage an oppressed people. Munk realized that although his apologetics might justify the idea of the blessing, it did not justify a negative form of the blessing. He therefore pointed out that many halakhic authorities had approved the positive form of the blessing.

Turning to the blessing about not being a woman, Munk had a more difficult task. Again, he did not discuss the form of the blessing but the underlying idea – the inferiority of women implied by the fact that they were not required to keep as many of the commandments as men were. Here he suggested that women should see their release from many of the obligations as a sign of the trust that God had in them that they would fulfill their divine mission on the basis of their own internal inclinations and understanding – without its being necessary to impose upon them the severe regime imposed upon men! Munk castigated the Reform movement for eliminating these blessings from the prayer book since, according to Munk, these blessings had never caused the Jews to denigrate women. On the contrary, their unique status as the mistress of the home was the basis for the strength of Jewish family life throughout the generations. Munk was a commentator and not one to introduce change to the prayer book. His explanation of the superior spiritual status of women in Judaism follows that of R. Samson Raphael Hirsch in his commentary to Leviticus (23:43) with which, it is reasonable to assume, Munk was familiar.⁷⁰ Munk did not take into consideration the fact

69 [Editor], "Munk", *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Jerusalem 1972, Vol.12, p. 524.

70 This idea has already been mentioned by the Maharal of Prague. In his *Derush 'al Hatorah* to Exodus 19:3 he explains that women were mentioned first because they are more easily able to reach those heights of spirituality which a man is able to reach only through intense study of Torah, and that woman will also receive a greater reward than men. The

complained that men who were much inferior to her would thank God that they were not made a woman and she would have to answer *amen* to their blessing! Her husband replied that the man's blessing did not apply to women as a category, but only to his own wife – that he was glad that their positions were not reversed. R. Baruch Epstein, who reported this story, did not think that this explanation had any validity but it was given only to appease his wife's anger.⁶⁶

However, most exegetical efforts were turned to explanations of the men's blessings. R. Ze'ev Yavetz (1847–1924),⁶⁷ a scholar who wrote an “orthodox” history of the Jews, also published a *siddur* with a commentary. In his commentary, he quoted biblical passages in explication of these blessings and he totally ignored the talmudic reasonings for these blessings. The blessing about not being a gentile was elucidated, not by a passage which denigrates gentiles, but by a passage from Deuteronomy (4:19–20) which says that God has taken the Jews to be his nation. Even the blessing about not being a slave had its meaning changed by quoting the passage from Leviticus (26:3) which refers to the redemption of Israel from slavery in Egypt. Most instructive is his commentary to the blessing about women. Here he points out that women are more susceptible to suffering than men and he quotes God's statement to Eve: “I will make most severe your pangs in childbearing” (Genesis 3:16).⁶⁸ In more modern terms we might say that this blessing is meant to recognize that women are discriminated against, whether by God or by man. Thus, this blessing might be considered the beginning of a search for equality for women, since the first step in that search is the recognition that there is discrimination. Note that Yavetz has totally abandoned the talmudic rationale for these blessings in his attempt to retain these blessings in a spirit conformable to modernity.

A different approach was taken by Elie Munk, scion of a family of German

66 B. Epstein, *Maqor Baruch*, New York: H"IL, 1954, 3, p. 981.

67 Benzion Dinur, “Jawitz, Ze'ev”, *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Jerusalem 1972, Vol. 9, pp. 1303–1304.

68 Ze'ev Yawitz, *Siddur Avodat ha-levavot*, Jerusalem 1966 (repr. of Berlin 1922), pp. 8–9. Similar in intent is the remark of the HID Azulai that the blessing refers to men's gratitude at not having to suffer the menstrual cycle – although he gives this cycle a kabbalistic explanation based on the fact that menstrual blood is a sign of a high degree of impurity (*Petah Eynayim* on Sotah 11b; quoted by Shimon Hirari [below n. 63], pp. 234–235).

his explanation as an expression of his own discomfort with the relegation of women to an inferior status. It might be relevant to note here that the Maharsha and his numerous disciples were supported by his mother-in-law from 1585 until her death twenty years later. In fact, his very name, Edels, is a reference to his mother-in-law, Edel – as if to say he is Rabbi Shmuel who belongs to Edel.

One of the more remarkable exegetical efforts⁶⁴ was that of R. Yaakov Meshulam Orenstein, Rabbi of Lemberg in the early 18th century. He did not discuss these blessings themselves, but he offered a novel interpretation of the woman's blessing. In his commentary on the *Shulchan Aruch*, R. Orenstein construes the blessing “Who has made me according to his will” to mean that women were actually superior to men. Men had been created by God only after He had conferred with the angels, while woman was created according to God's will alone.⁶⁵

Of anecdotal quality is the response attributed to R. J. L. Diskin, who lived in Jerusalem at the end of the 19th century. It is reported that his wife

64 Exegesis is an ancient device used to reconcile old texts with new ideas and it may be found also in other contexts. In modern times we may include in this category those statements appended to many editions of halakhic works that the references to nations of the world refer only to ancient nations who had not seen the light of monotheism and modern culture. One may quote, in this context, Jacob Tugenhold, who used this method in his work as censor. Thus, for example, among the notes he added to a haggadah printed in 1820 he stated that the statement “now we are slaves” means that we are slaves of material possessions and the prayer that we shall be free means that we hope to be free from subjugation to the frivolities of this world (see Chaim Lieberman, *Ohel Rahel*, 3, 1984, pp. 642–646).

65 The passage is cited in G. Ellinson, *Ha-isha ve-ha-mitzvot*³, Jerusalem 1977, p. 110. There have been further modern attempts to explain that these blessings actually imply the superiority of women. For an example I cite the following exchange which appeared in the mail-Jewish discussion list. “For that matter, how come we don't all say, She Asani Kirtzono, since all of us, and all our souls, are different, and some men's souls are better than some women's and the other way round as well, and this would cover everyone. A man cannot say ‘he made me according to his will’, because when a Jewish boy is born, he is ‘unfinished’ until the bris milah. But a girl is complete at birth, already made according to Ha-Shem's will” (Neil Parks <nparks@torah.org>; Date: Tue, 10 Nov 98 13:13:41 EDT). A similar thought is found in the writings of R. Z.Y. Kuk. He wrote that women are more divine than men and thus more like the will of God. Thus, it is appropriate for them to say that they were created according to His will (Z.Y. Kuk, *Sihot Harav Zvi Yehudah Kuk...Shemot*, ed. Shlomo Hayyim Aviner, Jerusalem: Sifriyat Havah, Bet El, 1998, p. 380).

We may now turn to the exegetic attempts to deal with these blessings. In spite of the fact that orthodox Jewry did not feel itself competent to effect changes in the liturgy, many of its adherents felt uncomfortable with the idea that this blessing implied that women were inferior to men and they tried to solve this problem with exegesis.

It would seem that the first attempt to deal with this problem exegetically was that of R. Shmuel Edels (Maharsha; Krakow, 1555–1631) in his commentary to the Talmud. He explains that men and women each have relative advantages. While men may receive additional rewards for doing those things that they are obligated to do, they will receive more severe punishment if they do not do what they are required to do. Although women do not have the same obligations as men, this is compensated for by the fact that they do not bear such severe responsibility. The boor, on the other hand, bore the full responsibility for keeping the commandments, but was not capable of fulfilling his duties. Thus, he would carry the full burden of punishment. The context of this statement was his attempt to explain the talmudic argument that there was no place to offer thanksgiving for not being a boor. Since one had already thanked God for not being a woman, one could not offer an additional thanksgiving for not being a boor – less than a woman. In the context of this explanation, it was not necessary to give women any sort of equality to men. On the contrary, his explanation of women's status tended to weaken the force of the thanksgiving for not having been created a woman – the status of men was not that much better! Therefore, I tend to see

loud. It is instructive to note that the idea of reciting a blessing silently in order not to slight the feelings of others is also found in *Haredi* circles – but in another context. Some people did not make a blessing on tefillin during the intermediary days of the holiday (for a discussion of this see יעקב כץ, "תפילין בחול המועד – חילוקי דעות ומחלוקות ציבוריות בהשפעת הקבלה", קעמ"ז, כרך ג, עמ' 191–213 [=הג"ל, הלכה וקבלה: מחקרים בתולדות דת ישראל על מדוריה [124–102 עמ' ד, עמ' 102–124]). In order not to set them apart, those who did say the blessing were required to recite the blessing silently (see ישראל טויסיג, דינים ומנהגים). An opposite example of vocalizing a prayer as a sign of emphasis was reported by Prof. Dan Mechman. He was told that the ultra-Orthodox council (*moezet gedolei ha-torah*) ruled, after the Holocaust, that the phrases referring to those who had been burned and slaughtered for the sanctity of God's name in the ancient *avinu malkeinu* prayer should be recited out loud. See Dan Mechman, in J. Guttman (ed.), *Temurot yesod ba-am ha-yehudi be'ikvot ha-shoah*, Jerusalem 1996, p. 630. I am grateful to Mr. Mordechai Meir who brought this source to my attention.

Sanhedrin.⁵⁹ Rabbi Aaron ruled that the three blessings should be said silently, in order not to insult those who were sensitive to the contents of the blessings. It would seem that his main concern was with the gentiles and not with the women. It has been said of him that he ruled in a speech that the laws applying to heathens do not apply to French Christians. In his commentary to tractate Sanhedrin he explained that R. Yohanan's injunction against gentiles learning Torah only prohibits their dealing in *pilpul*, but learning Torah according to the *peshat* is permissible.⁶⁰ As far as women are concerned, several lines before the above ruling, in his explanation of the blessing “Who hast made me according to His will”, he states that it was the will of God that women should be subservient to their husbands so that the male might devote himself to the worship of his creator and his work.

There is no evidence that the ruling of R. Aaron Worms was ever accepted in any synagogue. J. Wolowelsky, in a journal of modern Orthodoxy, attempted to revive this ruling out of consideration for the feelings of women,⁶¹ whose attendance rate at synagogues is today greater than ever – and still growing.⁶² However, his attempt was rejected by the editor of the journal in an article published in the same issue.⁶³

59 On this personality see Moses Qatan, “Rabbi Aaron Worms and his Disciple Eliakim Carmoly” [Hebrew], *Areshet*, 2 (1960), pp. 190–193; Jay R. Berkovitz, “Rabbinic Scholarship in Revolutionary France: Rabbi Aaron Worms’ Me’orei Or”, *Tenth World Congress of Jewish Studies*, B/II, Jerusalem 1990, pp. 251–258.

60 The passage is cited by M. Yashar, “Birkat ‘shelo asani goy’”, *Sinai*, 51 (1962), pp. 50–59.

61 Joel Wolowelsky, “‘Who Has Not Made Me A Woman’: A Quiet Berakha”, *Tradition*, 29/4 (1995), pp. 61–68.

62 David Casutto, renowned as a synagogue architect, informed me that when he was younger the rule of thumb was that one place should be assigned to the women's section of the synagogue for every three places in the men's section. However, today, in planning a synagogue for a modern Orthodox community, he finds it necessary to assign the seats equally between the men's and women's sections.

63 Emanuel Feldman, “An Articulate Berakha”, op. cit., pp. 69–74; see also Marcy Serkin and others, op. cit., 31:3 (1997), p. 111 ff. The idea that this blessing should be said silently, at least when women are present, was independently suggested by a Sephardic rabbi in Israel, who actually insisted on it in order to refrain from the serious issue of embarrassing the women (Shimon Hirary, *Responsa Yismah Libenu*, Tel Aviv 1993, no. 33, p. 231. I am grateful to Dr. Aharon Arend who brought this responsum to my attention). I am told that an Orthodox school in Cleveland adopted a different solution. After the male precentor said the blessings, he paused for a moment and one of the girls recited the feminine blessing out

liturgy, Abraham Berliner (1833–1915).⁵⁶ The main thrust of his argument was connected with the blessing of not being a gentile. Berliner discussed the variant version of “Who hast not made me a gentile”, – “Who has made me an Israelite (or a Jew)”, which is found in many manuscripts of the *siddur* and in printed editions of the Talmud. Berliner was a philologist, and he well knew that the positive form of this blessing was instituted as a result of Christian censorship. However, he thought that it was a good idea anyway and he also thought, apparently, that since this change had been in existence for hundreds of years,⁵⁷ it had some claim to being traditional. He invoked also the authority of the Vilna Gaon, who seems to have thought that the texts with this version were valid textual traditions. Berliner stated that if his suggestion was adopted, there would be a welcome by-product in that the blessings “Who has not made me a woman” and “Who hast not made me a slave” would automatically be eliminated from the *siddur* as there would no longer be any point to them. Thus, he said, we would no longer be required to justify these blessings in any way.⁵⁸

A more limited attempt to change the liturgy in order to take into consideration the feelings of women was that of R. Aaron Worms, the head of a yeshiva in Metz in the late 18th century and a member of the Napoleonic

56 Alexander Carlebach, “Berliner, Abraham”, *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, CD Rom Edition.

57 He mentioned that it was found in the *siddurim* printed in Mantua 1548, Tübingen 1560, Prague 1566, Venice 1566 and 1572, Dührenfort 1694. We may add that it is also found in mss. *siddurim*, such as the Parma ms. written for a woman. Here, the words “not a gentile” have been heavily crossed out and “Jewess” has been added to the text. The fact that this version was a result of censorship was already pointed out by R. Yom Tov Lipman Heller in his *Malbushei Yom Tov* (see Shimon Hirari [below, n. 63], p. 229). An interesting sidelight on this censorship is that the *Malbushei Yom Tov* refers it to the “*Yishmae'lim*” and it seems obvious that he really meant the Christians. It is unclear whether the use of “*Yishmae'lim*” for “Christians” is in itself a result of censorship or whether it is a case of internal censorship.

58 Abraham Berliner, *Ketavim Nivharim* (translated from German), Jerusalem: Mosad ha-Rav Kuk, 1969, Vol. 1, pp. 21–22. This suggestion was again raised in an article written for a volume on halakhic feminism (“שלא עשני אשה ו'שעשני כרצוננו': הצעה לברכה אחת”), גילי זיוון, (נשים בדיון ההלכתי (בעריכת מיכה ד' הלפרן וחנה ספראי), ירושלים: אורים תשנ”ח, עמ' ה–כה), and it was scathingly criticised as “antagonistic” to “the integrity of the rabbinic spirit” (Aharon Feldman, *Tradition*, 33/2 [Winter 1999], pp. 66). For a discussion of whether the positive blessing would obviate the others see Shimon Hirari, *Yismah Libenu* (below, n. 63), p. 227–229.

D. Into Modernity and the Response of Men

We may now turn to the third period in the history of these blessings, which is exemplified by a growing awareness of men to the problems involved in the blessings for women. The sensitivity to this blessing was of two types. On the one hand, there were those who felt that there was something inherently wrong in the blessing because it implied that women were inferior beings. On the other hand, there were those who felt that the statement of the blessing was actually true, but that the fact that women feel insulted by this has to be taken into consideration. There were two methods for dealing with this: either by advocating a change in the liturgy; or by explaining these blessings in a way that would reduce the problem. Rather than present the material chronologically, we will discuss first the limited attempts to change the liturgy and then turn to the more predominant use of exegesis as a method of dealing with this problem.

It was the Reform movement and its adherents who attempted to change the liturgy of these three blessings. We will just point out that A. Geiger, in the *siddur* that he published in 1854, substituted for these three blessings “Who has created me to worship him”. In the modern American Conservative movement we find that the blessing about women has been replaced by “Who has created me in His image”.⁵⁵ This prayer book also uses positive forms for the other two blessings: “Who hast made me an Israelite”, rather than the negative “Who hast not made me a gentile”; “Who hast made me free” rather than “Who hast not made me a slave”. Although the expression of gratitude for having been created an Israelite would seem to obviate the other two blessings (see the statement of A. Berliner below), the desire to retain the trifold structure was more important. In order to retain a logical structure, the order of the blessings was reversed: first thanking God for being created in His image; then thanking Him for being created a free man; and finally thanking Him for having been created an Israelite.

However, Orthodox Judaism found only one proponent for a change in the

undertake additional religious obligations to which they had not been accustomed in earlier periods.

55 See, for example, *Sabbath and Festival Prayer Book with a new translation*, The Rabbinical Assembly of America and the United Synagogue of America, 1953 (reprint of 1946 copyright), pp. 45–46. Cf. Robert Gordis, “‘In His Image’: A New Blessing, an Old Truth”, *Conservative Judaism*, 40/1 (1987), pp. 81–85.

classical tradition but the assumption that the mother of R. Isserlein was influenced by classical literature is unlikely. However, we have already seen that this blessing has been found in early Italian manuscripts and it is likely that the tradition of this blessing was known also in Germany – even if it was not actually used. R. Asher ben Shaul, who lived in Lunel in the late 12th and the early 13th century, reports that some people ask why they do not thank God for not having been created animals. His answer is that thanks for this has already been given in the *asher yazar* blessing.⁵² Thus, when women looked for a third blessing to complete the triad, gratitude for not having been created an animal was a likely choice.⁵³

Thus, the second period in the history of these blessings, as far as women are concerned, shows that women took upon themselves greater liturgical obligations than they had been accustomed to in the past, and they found their own methods by which they amended the liturgy to their needs. This is definitely true of the Spanish blessing as it is presented by the Tur as the custom of women. It is less obvious for the German version, but it is instructive to note that the rabbinical discussion of this point refers back to the custom of a famous woman for its authority. As far as the Provençal version is concerned, there is no real evidence that their solution was devised by women but we do not find any mention of this solution in the works of any rabbinic authority. The uniqueness of women's prayers is also evidenced by the fact that many of these women prayed in the vernacular, while men were expected to pray in Hebrew. It is of interest to note that women had a knowledge of Hebrew letters, although they did not necessarily understand the language. It would also be reasonable to presume, based on the fact that their vernacular was written in Hebrew letters rather than in the local written language, that they could not read the local written language.⁵⁴

52 *Sefer ha-Minhagot*, p. 141 (published by Simha Asaf, *Mitoratam shel Rishonim*).

53 A similar renaissance, in Provence, of the blessing about not being a boor has been postulated. See Zvi Groner, "A Blessing That was Forgotten and Revived" [Hebrew], *Bar-Ilan*, 14/15 (1974), pp. 94–97. Taylor, in a summary of the classical sources, suggested that the original thanksgiving for not having been created a boor was possibly a replacement for the classical thanksgiving at not having been created an animal. He refers to the parallelism of boor and beast in Psalms 73:22 (Charles Taylor, *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers Comprising Pirke Aboth in Hebrew and English*², Cambridge 1897 [photographic reprint Ktav, New York 1969], p. 139f.).

54 I leave to social historians the question of the spirit of the times which caused women to

pride in being a woman, and this blessing appears also in Hebrew, in at least two prayer books copied by Abraham Farisol, between 1470 and 1480, according to the Italian rite.⁴⁹ In both of these manuscripts, the form is actually “who has made me a woman and not a man”! However, one may question whether this form of the blessing was actually adopted out of a sense of pride in being a woman. It may well be that this was just a mechanical adjustment. The masculine form in the Italian rite was “who has made me a man and not a woman” and the form adopted by women, or for women, was simply the reverse image of this blessing.

The third region where a special blessing for women has been found is in Germany. R. Joseph b. Moshe, the student of R. Israel Isserlein (1390–1460), collected his master's customs in the work known as “*Leqet Yosher*”. He reported that R. Isserlein said that women say “Who has not made me a brute” instead of “Who has not made me a woman”. R. Joseph himself reported that he had heard from a woman(!) that she said “Who has made me according to his will” which, as we have seen, was the form used in Spain. However, R. Joseph adds that the mother of R. Isserlein, who had given up her life as a martyr in Austria,⁵⁰ had been accustomed to saying “Who has not made me an animal”.⁵¹ The choice of this blessing as a substitute for the blessing “Who has not made me a woman” is particularly edifying. We have seen that gratitude for not being an animal had already been expressed in the

49 JTS ms. MIC 8255, copied by Abraham Farisol in 1471 (comp. David Ruderman, *The World of a Renaissance Jew: The Life and Thought of Abraham ben Mordecai Farisol*, Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College, 1981, p. 158, # 13; my thanks to Dr. Joel Kahn who brought this manuscript to my attention and to Dr. Ruth Langer who showed it to me in the JTS library); Jerusalem, JNUL, Ms. Heb 8° 5492, written in Mantua in 1480 (this ms. was mentioned by Shalom Sabar, “Bride, Heroine...”, Proceedings of the 10th World Congress of Jewish Studies, D/2, Jerusalem, 1990, p. 68). One wonders whether Farisol had not carried this version with him from his home town in Provence, Avignon. For the general relationship of women to prayer in Italy at this time see Howard Adelman, “Rabbis and Reality: Public Activities of Jewish Women in Italy During the Renaissance and Catholic Restoration”, *Jewish History*, 5/1 (Spring 1991), pp. 30–32.

50 It would seem reasonable to assume that the reference is to the pogroms of 1420. However, it seems strange that R. Isserlein, who was accustomed to talking about these pogroms on Tish'a be'Ab, did not seem to mention that his mother had given up her life at that time (see Shlomo Eidelberg, *Jewish Life in Austria in the XVth Century*, Philadelphia 1962, p. 18, n. 18).

51 Joseph b. Mose, *Leket Joscher* (ed. J. Freimann), Berlin 1903, p. 7.

volintady sua”, also in Hebrew characters, is found in a prayer book for a woman written according to the Italian rite.⁴⁶ These manuscripts also show adaptation to feminine characteristics in the other blessings by using the feminine form “maid servant” (*servanta*), rather than male slave, and “goya”(!).⁴⁷

A second region in which we find a special blessing for women is in Provence. Here we find a prayer book written for a woman in the 14th or 15th centuries. The book was written in Shuadit, the Jewish-French patois of the area, in Hebrew letters. As we shall see, the contents of the prayer book show that it was meant for a woman but this is also superficially evident. The first page of the book is decorated with the phrase “my sister, be the mother of thousands of ten thousands”.⁴⁸ The three blessings which are the subject of our discussion all have a special form. The first two follow the pattern of feminizing their forms which we have found in Spain, using “goya” and maid-servant. However, the third blessing is entirely different: “Who has made me a woman” (קי פיס מי פנה)! Here we find a positive expression of

the prayers were translated by the scribe for a particular woman (Introduction, pp. xx–xxi). Lazar enumerates 11 manuscripts of prayer books translated into Romance languages: seven in Judeo-Italian (in Hebrew letters), two in Catalan (in Latin letters), one in Shuadit (Judeo-Provençal) and one in Ladino. I wish to thank Mr. Joel Kahn for bringing Lazar’s publications to my attention. Mr. Kahn has also kindly informed me that this version also appears in early printed *siddurim* in Ladino: *Siddur Tefillot* [Ladino *siddur* in Hebrew characters, for a woman, pre-1492) fol. 3v: and in two Latin-character Ladino *siddurim* published in Ferrara for the use of repentant apostates: *Libro de Oracyones* [1552] and a *Ladino mahzor* [1553]. The text of the second publication reads: “Benedich tu Adonay nuestro Dio, Rey del mundo, que no me hizo gentio....que no me hizo sieruo...que no me hizo muger. Y siendo muger, dira: ...que me hizo como su voluntad”.

46 Ms. of The Jewish Theological Seminary, Mic. 4076; Acc. 01207. The text in Hebrew characters reads קי פיצ מי קומי לבוליתטי סואה.

47 R. Shabtai Sofer rejected the use of the feminine form, *shifha*, instead of the male form *eved*, basing himself on his understanding of the Talmud (see above, n. 14) that women are maid-servants to their husbands (*Siddur...Shabtai Ha-sofer* [ed. Yitzchak Satz and David Yitzchaki], Baltimore 1994, p. 16).

48 The verse is taken from Genesis 24:60 but the plural of the Bible has been changed into singular. My attention was first drawn to this *siddur* by the article of George Jochnowitz, “... Who Made Me a Woman”, *Commentary*, 71/4 (1981), pp. 63–64. A 17th-century traveler reported that in Avignon there was a separate service conducted for women, in Hebrew mixed with the vernacular, conducted by a blind rabbi (see Carol Herselle Krinsky, *Synagogues of Europe*, Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1985, p. 239).

younger contemporary.⁴⁴ Their testimony about the form of the blessing is supported by manuscript evidence. A *siddur* written in Ladino presents this blessing in Hebrew characters, here transcribed into Latin characters: “*que me fizo como su voluntad*”,⁴⁵ and a similar version, “*que fizi me comy la*

womb – although originally conceived as a male. He ends his lament with the statement that he recites the blessing for not having been made a woman in a low voice, accepting it as an articulation of his acceptance of his unhappy lot. This lament appears in his satirical-humorous work, *Even Bohan*, and has been reprinted in H. Schirmann, *Ha-shirah ha-ivrit bisfarad uviprovens* (Jerusalem–Tel-Aviv 1972², 2/2, pp. 504–505). This passage has also been used by Yael Levin-Katz as a preface to her book *Tehinat ha-nashim levinyan ha-miqdash* (Eked: Jerusalem 1996). Cf. Tova Rosen, “Circumcised Cinderella: The Fantasies of a Fourteenth-Century Jewish Author”, *Prooftexts*, 20/1–2 (Winter/Spring 2000), pp: 87–110.

44 *Abudarham Ha-Shalem*, Jerusalem 1963, pp. 39–40. There is some doubt about the proper pronunciation of this name and I follow the use of the *Encyclopaedia Judaica*. For his dates see Zvi Avneri, “Abudarham, David ben Joseph”, *EJ*, Jerusalem 1972, Vol. 2, pp. 181–182. Abudarham appends to this that women are comparable to a person who cultivates another's fields without the knowledge of the owner. According to Jewish law, such a person is entitled to reward for the work that he did although his reward is not equal to that of the person who cultivated another's field at the request of the owner. Thus, women are entitled to reward if they fulfill the commandments which they are not required to fulfill. The history of this parable is informative. We find it first in the commentary of Menahem Meiri (Provence, 1249–1361) to a passage in BT (*Avodah Zarah* 3a) which states that gentiles who study Torah (voluntarily) are not entitled to the same reward as Jews who study Torah because they are commanded to do so, but they are, nevertheless, entitled to some reward. Meiri reports that the Palestinian Talmud uses the analogy to a person who cultivates another's field without his knowledge (*Beth ha-Behira al Masechet Avodah Zarah*² [ed. A. Sofer], Jerusalem 1965, p. 5; Sofer mentions that he could not find this source). This analogy appears in the context of the morning blessings in the work of Abraham Ha-Yarchi (*Sefer Hamanhig: Rulings and Customs of R. Abraham ben Nathan of Lunel* [ed. Yitzchak Raphael], Jerusalem 1978, p. 38). Ha-Yarchi applies the analogy both to slaves and women and he does not mention any specific blessing for women. His use of the analogy shows that he did not intend to provide an explanation for the special blessing of women, but rather as an attempt to clarify their status vis-a-vis the commandments. I tend to think that this was what was meant by Abudarham, and his quoting the analogy would seem to show that he felt that some explanation was necessary for the fact that women were excluded from some of the *mitzvot*.

45 Moshe Lazar, *Siddur Tefillot: A Woman's Ladino Prayer Book* [Paris B.N., Esp. 668; 15th C.], Labyrinthos: Lancaster, CA, 1995, pp. 4–5. Lazar states that the manuscript is in pocket format (11x8.7 cm). The scribe changed verbs from masculine form to feminine and from plural to singular. According to Lazar, there was no traditional translation of the prayers, but

obligation in other liturgical acts, such as the obligation to recite these three blessings.⁴⁰ Nobody, apparently, was concerned over the fact that women could not recite one of these blessings, and it would thus seem that they did not recite any of them.

C. Women's Response in Medieval Times

We may now turn to the medieval period or, to be more exact, to the evidence of the 12th to 15th centuries. In different areas of the world we now find women who recited these blessings and found substitutes for the blessing: "Who has not made me a woman". The best known is the one testified to by R. Jacob ben Asher (Spain, 1270?–1340).⁴¹ He reports that women were accustomed to saying a blessing "Who has made me according to his will".⁴² This is presented as a female custom and R. Jacob does not claim that this was a rabbinical suggestion. He explains that this blessing does not express pride but is rather an expression of resignation to their lot, similar to the praise of God expressed by someone who has borne the loss of a close relative.⁴³ This report is also found in the work of David Abudarham, a

40 This point has already been made by I. Singer, in the *Authorized Prayer Book*. For a discussion of the history of women's obligation to pray see Judith Hauptman, "Women and Prayer: An Attempt to Dispel Some Fallacies", *Judaism*, 42 (1993), pp. 94–103; Michael J. Broyde, Joel B. Wolowelsky, *ibid.*, pp. 387–395; J. Hauptman, *ibid.*, pp. 396–413. It may be significant that the obligation of women to pray refers to the *amidah*, which was considered public prayer. The benedictions of self-identity were not part of the public prayer. It is somewhat contradictory to the presumed status of women that they were required to pray the *amidah* but they were exempt from the private blessings.

41 Ephraim Kupfer, "Jacob ben Asher", *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Jerusalem 1972, Vol. 9, pp. 1214–1215.

42 Tur, *Orah Hayyim* 46. The source of this blessing is unknown. Israel Abrahams (*Annotated edition of the authorised daily prayer book with historical and explanatory notes, and additional matter, compiled in accordance with the plans of the Rev. S. Singer*, by Israel Abrahams, London, 1914, pp. xvi–xvii) has pointed out that there is a similar phrase in Ben Sira, who says that God has made man "according to his will" (50:22, ed. M. Z. Segal, Jerusalem 1959, p. 342. Segal also points out the similarity of Ben Sira to this blessing), but it would seem highly unlikely to find influence of the Hebrew Ben Sira in medieval Spain.

43 It is worthwhile noting that a contemporary of R. Jacob, Kalonymus ben Kalonymus (1286–?), used the same idea in connection with the male blessing. After extolling the situation of women in his time, he laments the fact that he was created a man and had not been fortunate enough to be like Dinah, the daughter of Leah, who had been turned into a female in the

third-century sources expressed gratitude to Hormiz: “O Creator, I thank Thee for that Thou hast made me an Iranian, and of the true religion..., Thanks to Thee, O Creator, for this, that Thou hast made me of the race of men; ...for this, that Thou hast created me free and not a slave; for this, that Thou hast created me a man and not a woman”.³⁶ Darmestedter wished to show that the Iranian prayer had been influenced by Jewish sources, just as, in his opinion, there were other Jewish influences on Iranian religion.³⁷ It is significant to note here that the Iranian content of the three questions was identical (*mutis mutandis*) with the one that appeared in Babylonian sources, rather than with the tannaitic form. Darmestedter's publication aroused controversy among scholars who suggested that the Iranian position had been influenced by Greek sources rather than by Jewish ones.³⁸ The discussion of the relationship of the Jewish blessings to Greek sources was taken up, following Darmestedter's publication, by David Kaufmann, in an article published in 1893. Kaufmann accepted the idea that the Jewish tradition was influenced by Greek mores.³⁹

If we turn now to the major theme of our study, the status of women as reflected in these blessings, we may notice that, although it was recognized that there had to be [a minimum of] three blessings, no discussion is found of what women should say in place of the blessing “Who has not made me a woman”. It is simplistic to say that women did not pray, for tannaitic sources consider women obligated to pray the *amidah* (*Mishna Berakhot* 3:3) and it is reasonable to assume that they did indeed recite this prayer. We find that a Babylonian *amora* rejects a Palestinian tradition about the blessing to be recited over the New Moon with the statement that that blessing is said by our women – with the implication that men would say something more sophisticated (*Sanhedrin* 42a). So women did pray, but they did not recite all the prayers offered by men. One could only say that women were not of equal

36 This quote is taken from “Philology Notes” (see above).

37 See the discussion of this point by J. Murray Mitchell, *op. cit.*, 41 [1051] (June 25, 1892), pp. 616–617; T.K. Cheyne, *op. cit.*, 42 [1052] (July 2, 1892), p. 14.

38 See prior note.

39 David Kaufmann, “Das Alter der drei Benedictionen von Israel, vom Freien, und vom Mann”, *MGWJ*, 37 (1893), pp. 14–18. Greek influence has also been accepted by M. D. Herr [above, n. 34]. It is of interest to note that Louis Feldman, in his comprehensive study entitled *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993) does not mention this example of Greek or Hellenistic influence on Judaism.

rather insignificant and his main interest in referring to it is to point out how unfounded it is to make generalizations about what is to be considered as truly Semitic.³²

At about the same time that Joël was working on his thesis, we find Isaac Hirsch Weiss (1815–1905) addressing the same issue. In the second volume of his well known history of the oral law, *Dor Dor ve-Dorshav*, first published in 1876, Weiss referred to Socrates' custom of giving thanks that he was created man and not animal, male and not female, Greek and not barbarian, in a list of items in which he tried to show the depth of Greek influence on Judaism.³³ He repeated this idea in his discussion of the life of R. Meir. Here he pointed out that R. Meir was the student of R. Aqiva, who gave his life in devotion to the study of Torah. Nevertheless, R. Meir “was a true scholar” who tried to learn everything from everyone. The institution of these three blessings is cited as an example of R. Meir's openness to non-Jewish sources and his willingness to adopt into Judaism customs found in other cultures.³⁴ Weiss' agenda is clear at this point, and he does not discuss whether this adoption was wise or not.

A further parallel to these blessings in antiquity was found by James Darmestedter who, in the 1880s, reported that these expressions of thanksgiving were found in Iranian sources.³⁵ An Iranian prayer in second- or

32 *Blicke in Der Religions-Geschichte zu anfang des zweiten christlichen Jahrhunderts*, Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1971 [photographic repr. of the 1880 edition published in Breslau], pp. 119–120.

33 Isaac Hirsch Weiss, *Dor Dor ve-Dorshav*, 2, Vienna 1876, p. 19, cf. p. 147; Ziv: Jerusalem – Tel Aviv [no date, reprint of 1903 edition], vol. 2, p. 27.

34 *Ibid.*, p. 132. M. D. Herr accepted the attribution of this statement to R. Judah, as reported in the *Tosefta*, mentioning that R. Judah had a positive attitude to the Roman government (– מ"ד הר, "השפעות חיצוניות בעולמם של חכמים בארץ-ישראל – קליטה ודחייה", התבוללות וטמיעה – המשכיות ותמורה בתרבות העמים ובישראל (בעריכת י" קפלן ומ' שטרן), ירושלים תשמ"ט, עמ' 86–87. On the other hand, it has been suggested that R. Meir was a first-generation descendant of converts from Phrygia. See בצלאל בר-כוכבא, "על חג הפורים ועל מקצת ממנהגי חג הסוכות בימי בצלאל בר-כוכבא", *JJS*, 23 (1972), pp. 51–59.

35 James Darmestedter, *Une prière judéo-persane*, Paris: Cerf, 1891. I have not been able to find a copy of the original publication. Its contents were summarized in “Philology Notes”, *The Academy*, 40 [1021] (Nov. 28, 1891), p. 483 (I wish to express my thanks to my colleague, Dr. Stefan Reif, who provided me with a copy of this publication).

Scholarly discussion of the relationship of the Jewish blessings to other traditions tended not to be judgmental but, rather, was interested in the question of cross-cultural influences. The first scholar to notice the correlation between the Greek and Jewish sources was, apparently, the philosopher Arthur Schopenhauer. He maintained that “theism” was introduced into Greek philosophy by Jewish influence. The earlier Iranic philosophy was not “theistic”. In the third edition of his work, published in 1859, he brought a “remarkable corroboration” (“*sonderbare Bestätigung*”) of his thesis. He mentioned Plutarch’s report that Plato had thanked the Fates for being born a human being rather than an animal, Greek rather than barbarian, and that he lived in the time of Socrates.²⁸ Schopenhauer found three similar blessings in a German translation of the Jewish prayer book²⁹ and found in this evidence that Plato had been influenced by Judaism.³⁰ Schopenhauer was not really interested in the attitude towards women displayed in these blessings; considering his own attitude to women, he would indeed have considered it a great misfortune had he been created a woman.³¹ His interest was limited to showing the direction of cultural influence.

Schopenhauer's theme was further developed by other 19th-century scholars – although in the other direction. In 1880, Manuel Joël published an extensive work on the influence of Greek language and culture on Judaism at the beginning of the second century CE. The main thrust of his argument about these blessings, which he considered incidental to his main theme on the influence of Platonic-Pythagorean ideas on tannaitic Judaism, was that the negative attitude towards women expressed in these blessings originated in Greek sources rather than being of Semitic origin. He considers this point

other passage cites this list in emphasizing that all who fulfill Divine commands will be rewarded by God (p. 188; the passage does not appear in the mss. of *Tana Debe Eliyahu* but it has been added by Ish-Shalom to his edition from the Yalkut Shimoni, Lech Lecha 76). Note the use in these passages of two types of servants, both male and female.

28 *The Life of Gaius Marcius*, Loeb Classical Library, Vol. 9, p. 595.

29 Euchel's *Gebeten der Juden*, Second edition, 1799, p. 7.

30 Arthur Schopenhauer, *Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung*, Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1859, I, pp. 577–588 (I wish to thank Dr. Stefan Reif for sending me a facsimile of these pages); München: Georg Müller, 1912, I, pp. 559–560, 709–710.

31 See his essay “On Women”, which appeared in *Parerga and Paralipomena*. An English translation appeared in *Schopenhauer: Selections* (ed. DeWitt H. Parker), The Modern Student's Library: Scribner's 1928, pp. 434–447.

the frame of reference and they are replaced by slaves. One wonders whether this difference reflects a variant tradition, or whether perhaps Paul changed another tradition because the possibility of being an animal was not relevant to the subject under discussion: the nature of Christian society. We may once again notice that the division implicit in Paul's writings follows the one adopted in the Babylonian Talmud rather than the division presented by the Palestinian *tannaim*, returning us to our speculation about the origins of the Babylonian pattern.²⁶ An interesting parallel to Paul's theme is found in *Seder Eliyahu* which states, in connection with the judgeship of Deborah, that "I call heaven and earth to witness that whether it be a heathen or a Jew, whether it be a man or a woman, a manservant or a maidservant, the holy spirit will suffuse each of them in keeping with the deeds he or she performs".²⁷

26 In a similar vein he writes to the Colossians (3:11) that "there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcised nor uncircumcised, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free". The categories of Barbarian and Scythian are a merism which includes the whole non-Jewish world. Cf. David M. Goldenberg, "Scythian-Barbarian: The Permutations of a Classical Topos in Jewish and Christian Texts of Late Antiquity", *Journal of Jewish Studies* (Oxford) 49/1 (Spring, 1998), pp. 87–102, esp. pp. 96–97. Thus, these terms would seem to be an expansion of the term "uncircumcised" – which would mean that this statement also has the threefold form. In a similar passage Paul declares that all were baptized into one body "Jews or Greeks, bond or free" (1 Corinthians 12:13). Only in his letter to the Galatians does he refer to the equality of men and women and this may be considered "a rhetorical outburst" (see Shaye J. D. Cohen [above, n. 25], p. 567). In the "mail-Jewish" list discussion on the internet, it has been suggested that the pattern adopted in the Babylonian Talmud is actually a reaction to Paul's statement. Chronologically, this is possible but it does not seem likely for two reasons. One is that the Babylonian Talmud presents the critical reason for adopting this pattern and it has nothing to do with theology. Secondly, although Paul's statement was made to a non-Palestinian community, Christianity was not a major concern of the Jews in Babylon and there is very little reaction to Christianity, if any, to be found in this Talmud.

27 *Tana Debe Eliyahu*, translated by William G. Braude and Israel J. Kapstein, Philadelphia 1982, pp. 152–153. This passage is quoted, in a slightly different translation, by Joseph H. Hertz, *The Authorized Daily Prayer Book*, New York 1965 (12th printing), p. 21, in connection with the morning blessings. This list appears in two other passages in *Tana Debe Eliyahu*. One passage states that anyone – whether gentile or Israel, whether man or woman, whether slave or maidservant – who reads a certain verse connected with sacrifices, will remind God of the binding of Isaac (*Tana Debe Eliyahu*, p. 124; this passage also appears in *Midrash Vayikra Rabbah* 2:11 [p. 51] where it seems to have been added from *Tana Debe Eliyahu* [see Margoliot's note in his edition of *Vayikra Rabbah*, p. 46]). The

Thales, who lived some hundred years earlier. Whoever it was, he was reputed to have said that “there were three blessings for which he was grateful to Fortune: ‘first, that I was born a human being and not one of the brutes; next that I was born a man and not a woman; thirdly a Greek and not a Barbarian’”. In the vein of tradition history, we might assume that the ancients connected with either Thales or Socrates a trifold²³ thanksgiving which was reworked by Plato. Plato wished to express his gratitude to the Fates for being born in the time of Socrates but, in order to retain the trifold formula, he eliminated the reference to not being a woman. It is instructive of the nature of tradition that Lactantius, a North African Christian writer who lived at the beginning of the fourth century CE, gives a conflated version of this thanksgiving. According to him, Plato was grateful that he was a human rather than an animal, a man rather than a woman, a Greek rather than a barbarian. He was additionally grateful that he was an Athenian and that he lived in the time of Socrates.²⁴ The structure of his report would seem to verify our conjecture about the identity of the original triad – human, male and Greek – with the reference to Socrates and another motif, that of being an Athenian, being considered as later additions.

A triad of a similar division of society appears in Christian sources. Paul, in his letter to the Galatians (3:28), declares that under Christ, “There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female”.²⁵ Although the general structure of the division is similar to that found in the Greek sources, it is noteworthy that animals are not included in

23 Note the trifold structure of the Pharisaic prayer in Luke (above note 5), with the addition of the publican. This does not imply that he thought that men and women were actually equal. For a discussion of this see: Kathleen O’Brien Wicker, “First Century Marriage Ethics: A Comparative Study of the Household Codes and Plutarch’s Conjugal Precepts”, *No Famine in the Land: Studies in Honor of John L. McKenzie* (eds. J.W. Flanagan and A.W. Robinson), Missoula, MT.: Scholars Press, 1975, pp. 141–153 and especially p. 149.

24 *Divine Institutes*, 3:19:17.

25 Paul’s attitude towards women is complex. Although he seems to call for equality between men and women, in his liturgical instructions to the Corinthians he calls upon women to be silent in church (1 Corinthians 14:33–36). For a discussion on this point see Peter J. Tomson, *Paul and the Jewish Law: Halakha in the Letters of the Apostle to the Gentiles*, *Compendium Rerum Iudicarum ad Novum Testamentum*, 1990, iii/1 pp. 131–139. See also Shaye J. D. Cohen, “Why Aren’t Jewish Women Circumcised?”, *Gender and History*, 9 (Nov. 1997), pp. 566–567.

and one found in Turin, both well known representatives of the Palestinian ritual tradition.¹⁹

Nineteenth-century scholars were the first to point out that these blessings were found not only in Jewish sources, but they, or similar concepts, were found also in Greek and Iranian sources. Plutarch reports that Plato, before his death, thanked the Fates that he had been born a human being rather than an animal,²⁰ Greek rather than barbarian, and that he lived in the time of Socrates.²¹ We may doubt the historical accuracy of the attribution to Plato,²² which would place these themes several hundred years before R. Judah, but Plutarch himself was contemporaneous with R. Aqiva, an important teacher of R. Judah, and thus presents an earlier source for these themes than is found in Jewish sources. It is of interest to note that Plutarch's tradition does not include thanks for not having been created a woman. This lack is made up for in a report of a variant tradition by a later scholar, Diogenes Laertius, who lived in the first half of the third century. He was thus presumably somewhat younger than the redactor of the Mishna, R. Judah the Prince, who was a student, inter alia, of R. Judah. Although later than Plutarch, his report claims to present an earlier tradition. He was apparently aware of a tradition which reputed the thanksgiving motif to Socrates himself, who lived in the fifth century BCE, although he remarks that Hermippus attributed this motif to

19 (מאן, עמ' 277, אסף, ספר דינבורג, עמ' 121) בא"י אמ"ה אשר בראת אותי אדם ולא בהמה איש ולא אשה (זכר ולא נקבה) ישראל ולא גוי מל ולא ערל חפשי ולא עבד (טהור ולא טמא) המוסגר נמצא אצל אסף בלבד; ראה עוד ש' ליברמן, תוספתא כפשוטה, ח"א, עמ' 120; (כ"י פרמה 887) שעשיתני איש ולא אשה, אד' ולא בהמ', ישר' ולא ישמעאל; (כ"י פרמה 67) שעשיתני איש ולא אשה, אדם ולא בה', מל ולא ערל, שלא שמתני עבד; (כ"י טורין, עמ' 89) שלא עשיתני גוי [עובד ע"ז] כגוי הארצות; מל ולא ערל; שלא עשיתני עבד לבריות; שלא עשיתני אשה; שלא עשיתני בהמה. (See Naftali Wieder, "About the Blessings Goy, Slave-Woman, Brute, and Boor", *Sinai*, 85 [1979], pp. 97–115.) David M. Goldenberg (below, n. 26, Appendix III, pp. 100–101) has pointed out that the existence of the circumcised/uncircumcised dichotomy in early Christian sources shows that this item in these versions may not be late – as assumed by Mann, Assaf, Lieberman and Wieder.

20 The possibility of having been created an animal may be connected to the theory of reincarnation or metempsychosis. In later Jewish literature a similar theory was used to justify the everyday recital of thanks for not having been created a gentile. It was thought that when the soul returns to the body after sleep, there was a chance that it would enter the body of a gentile.

21 *The Life of Gaius Marcius*, LCL, Vol. 9, p. 595.

22 Prof. Hallamish has pointed out that gratitude for not having been created as an animal is consistent with Plato's belief in metempsychosis.

about the attitude of R. Aha bar Yaakov himself. The three blessings were of tannaitic origin and we find no tanna who disagreed with them. Why did R. Aha bar Yaakov express his objection only in response to hearing his son? Was he himself not accustomed to reciting these blessings? Or did he, perhaps, recite another form of these three blessings which had already been accepted in his milieu?¹⁶ Had his son been studying the tradition with a teacher who was heir to the tannaitic tradition of R. Judah, as opposed to a different tradition which was common in Babylon? These questions cannot be answered, but they should be asked, and this may help us to be aware of the limitations of our knowledge. We may sum up this section with the conclusion that the threefold blessing was well founded in Babylon, but this did not prevent scholars from reformulating these blessings in accordance with their conceptions.¹⁷

Palestinian tradition would have had no problem finding an alternate blessing – if they had decided to replace one of the original three. Many early *siddurim* and Genizah fragments, presumably of Palestinian origin, contain an expanded series of blessings which express the pride of the blesser in the status which had been granted to him by God.¹⁸ A number of manuscripts include gratitude to God for not having been created an animal. Two manuscripts from the Cairo Genizah, published by J. Mann and S. Asaf, thank God for having created the blesser “man and not brute, male and not female, Israelite and not gentile, circumcised and not uncircumcised, freeman and not slave”. Similar blessings are found in two manuscripts, one found in Parma

16 This question has been raised by I. Lévy, who thought that R. Aha bar Yaakov’s suggestion was based on a Hellenistic prototype (Isidore Lévy, *La Légende du Pythagore de Grèce en Palestine*, Paris 1927, p. 262, note 3).

17 Kaufmann has suggested that the blessing about not being a slave belonged to the earliest tradition of these blessings. According to him, it was R. Judah who substituted the boor for the slave and R. Aha bar Yaakov was only reinstating the original form which had been retained in Babylonia (Kaufmann, *op. cit.*, p. 15).

18 According to the Meiri, in his commentary to the Babylonian Talmud (*Berakhot* 60b), in Provence they used to recite all four blessings in his time. See Groner (below, n. 55). For additional references to *siddurim* which included this blessing see Moshe Hallamish, “Rare Blessings Included in the Morning Blessings” [Hebrew], *Yeda ‘-‘am*, 26 [59–60] (1995), p. 11.

This explanation assumes that the frame of reference is the relationship to God's commandments. Since the status of a woman and a slave were equal as far as the commandments were considered, both being free of time-linked commandments, once a person had expressed his gratitude for being commanded to observe the time-linked commandments (not being a slave), there would be no point in reciting a blessing for not being a woman since there was no difference between a slave and a woman in this matter.¹⁴ Rashi explained that this objection was rejected based on the consideration that women were of a higher social status than slaves, and it was thus appropriate to give separate thanks for not being a slave and for not being a woman.¹⁵ It is appropriate to point out in this context that the blessings now changed their point of reference. Although the early tradition looked at all the blessings from one perspective, the relationship to God, the new statement about not being a slave was not based on the slave's inferior status in relation to the commandments, but rather on his inferior social status.

In discussing the history of tradition, it is appropriate to speculate here

- 14 This is according to the second explanation given by Rashi to this passage. According to his first explanation, the status of a woman vis-a-vis her husband is no different than that of a slave to his master. Thus, a man who had already thanked God for not being a slave could not add thanks for not being a woman, as a woman is also a slave. The response to this is that one must keep the traditional number of blessings even though only one of them is necessary. This is the explanation of the passage given in the commentary of R. Gershom in the BT, loc. cit.
- 15 An assumption of this passage is that the blessings were arranged in a hierarchy: non-Jew, boor or slave, woman. R. Abraham Gombiner ruled that if one had inadvertently recited the blessing about not being a woman before the blessing about not being a slave, one should not recite the blessing about not being a slave since one had already expressed gratitude for not being in a higher status – that of a woman (*Mogen Avraham, Orach Chaim*, 46:9). However, the printed editions of the Rambam stated that the order of the blessings was: non-Jew, woman, slave (*Laws of Prayer*, 7:6; for the correct reading see Joseph Kafah's edition of the *Yad Hachazakah*). Since it was obvious that women were of a higher social status than slaves, the only recourse was to go back to the original concept, that the blessings referred to the status concerning commandments, and find a commandment which women were not commanded to fulfill while slaves were. Such a commandment was that of circumcision (see R. Yaakov Kaminetzky, "About the Blessing Who Has not made me a Non-Jew" [Hebrew], *Yeshurun*, i [1996], pp. 96–100) and thus the earlier understanding of the significance of these blessings was restored, that they were all based on the relative obligation to keep the commandments, despite the fact that the Talmud seemed to reject this understanding.

point is his son's reaction. His son asked his father what blessing he should recite instead. From this question we may learn that, at this point of tradition, it was accepted that one should recite a threefold blessing but, if the text was not appropriate, it could be changed – provided that one kept to the threefold division. The conclusion of the Talmud was that gratitude for not being a boor should be replaced by gratitude for not being a slave. This conclusion was objected to since the status of women and slaves (non-Jewish slaves; Jewish slaves were not considered as slaves) was considered equal. However, the frame of reference for their equality is not clear. Rashi gives two explanations. One explanation is that women are subservient to their husbands, as slaves are subservient to their masters. Thus, once one has praised God for not being placed in a subservient situation, there is no place for a second blessing of this type. The response to this is that one should nevertheless recite this blessing, apparently just to retain the number of three blessings.¹³ Rashi's second explanation is more consistent with the context.

passage. The Maharsha thought that there was nothing wrong with the blessing itself and the objection relates to the order of the blessings. According to him, there is no point in reciting the blessing for not being a woman after one had already expressed his gratitude that he was not a boor, as being a boor is worse than being a woman. A woman will not be punished for not fulfilling positive commandments – as she is not commanded to fulfill them. A boor, on the other hand, will be punished because he is commanded to fulfill these obligations, but he does not know how to do so. An alternative possibility is that R. Aha bar Yaakov's objection to giving thanks for not being a boor is that not being a boor is not a gift of God but is due to human activity. People are born "boors", in the sense of the Hebrew word בור which comes from a root describing an uncultivated field. It is possible that in the time of the Mishna the term "boor" was used to describe a person who was felt to be natively uncultured, with no possibility of change – very much as the Greeks thought of barbarians. This word appears twice in the Mishna: *Abot* (2:8) and *Mikvaot* (9:6). In the second case the reference is clearly to an uncultured person who does not take care of his clothes (see S. Lieberman, "Perushim bemishnayot", *Tarbiz*, repr. in *Studies in Palestinian Literature*, Jerusalem 1991, pp. 7–8). The first case states that a boor does not fear sin and it is not clear whether being a boor is an innate quality or if it reflects a lack of education. However, in the *tosefta* it appears a number of times as an epithet for one who recites blessings in forms which have been rejected by the rabbis (*Berakhot* 1:6, 6:20). Here it is clear that the boor is an uneducated person and this meaning is very obviously the one thought of by the Babylonian *amoraim* in b. *Sotah* 22a. It may be that R. Aha bar Yaakov's objection is based on a changed meaning of the term "boor".

13 The commentary of R. Gershom to this passage adds that reciting an additional blessing is an insignificant matter.

Isaiah 40:17, which states “All nations are naught in his sight”. Continuing this line of thinking, it follows that women are also inferior to men as far as their relationship to God is concerned, since women have not been commanded to bear the full load of commandments. They do not have to keep those commandments whose fulfillment is prescribed at a specific time. The disadvantage in being a boor is that a boor does not fear sin. The *Tosefta* adds a parable to explain the relevance of this statement. The situation of a boor is comparable to that of a servant who is asked to prepare a meal for his master, but who doesn't know how to cook. The implication is that the boor should have prepared himself for the task which he had reason to assume would be demanded from him. It is important to note that the status of the boor is significantly different than that of the gentile or woman. The boor's status is not innate. One might think that the perception of ancient times was that a boor is born – not made. But the parable of the servant implies that the boor had the opportunity to learn what was required of him. He had the choice not to be a boor but, through his laziness or apathy to learning, he chose to be a boor. Thus, the real impact of this blessing, according to the *Tosefta*, is not so much one of thanksgiving as of self-education to the importance of the study of Torah.¹¹

Although scholarship often looks askance at reasons for laws given in the sources, frequently considering these reasons as having been created after the fact and not really reflecting the rationale of the early law, it is clear that these reasons were accepted by the *amoraim* and served as a basis for their discussions. The point in question is a story told in the Babylonian Talmud (*Menahot* 43b – 44a) of R. Aha bar Yaakov who heard his son reciting these blessings and objected to his son's thanking God for not being a boor. The reason for his objection is not entirely clear. He may have been objecting to his son's assumption that he was not a boor. On the other hand, he may have felt that there was no reason to give thanks for not being a boor as a boor is obligated to keep all the commandments.¹² Be that as it may, the important

11 Yonah Frankel, *Darkhei ha-aggadah*, p. 361. In a similar vein, Judith Hauptman has suggested that the thanksgiving for not being a woman may have been meant to strengthen male ego, “to comfort the men... for the large number of ritual demands placed upon them” (*Rereading the Rabbis: A Woman's Voice*, Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1998, p. 237).

12 The rationale for the rejection of the statement about not being a boor is not clear. The two explanations that I have mentioned in the text have been offered by Rashi and *tosafot* to this

tradition, as reported in the *Tosefta* (*Berakhot*, 6:16, Lieberman, p. 38), in the Palestinian Talmud (*Berakhot* 9:1, 63 b) and in the Babylonian Talmud (*Menahot* 43b – 44a),¹⁰ does not include thanks for not having been created a slave. The three blessings for which gratitude is expressed are for not having been created a “gentile, boor, or woman”. The *Tosefta* explains that the satisfaction in being neither “gentile, boor, or woman” is that a man bears the full load of God's commandments and, presumably, is equipped to fulfill them. The proof-text used to explain the advantage in not being a gentile is

10 The printed editions of the Babylonian Talmud have “Who has made me an Israelite” rather than “Who has not made me a non-Jew”. According to Rabinovitz (R. N. N. Rabinovitz, *Dikdukei Soferim* [Munich 1881, photographic reprint in 1960], p. 108), this change was first introduced in the Basel edition of the Talmud, in which many changes were made under the supervision of Marco Marino Fabrix (R.N.N. Rabinovitz, *Ma'amar 'al Hadpasat ha-Talmud*, Jerusalem 1952, pp. 74–79). However, tractate *Menahot* of this edition was printed in 1570 (Rabinovitz, op. cit, p. 74) and we find evidence of changes in the version of this blessing in prayer books which were printed earlier than this in Italy. In the copy of the Italian rite printed in Fano in 1504 found in the JNUL, the word *goy* has been replaced by *yehudi* and the word *shelo* has been replaced by the letter *shin*. In the copy of the fourth edition of this rite (Soncino 1521; see Y.Y. Cohen) found in the JNUL, we find that this blessing, together with some surrounding text, has been cut(!) out of the *siddur*. On a paste-in, in handwriting, has been added (בא"י אמ"ה כותי!). Although these changes cannot be accurately dated, they show the activity of the Italian censorship which flourished after the burning of the Talmud in 1559. However, Jewish sensitivity to this issue was apparently earlier than this. The earliest printed evidence of the changed version is apparently that of the Italian rite printed in Rimini in 1521, which reads “that You(!) have made me an Israelite” (see M. Benayahu, *Copyright, Authorization and Imprimatur for Hebrew Books Printed in Venice* [Hebrew], Jerusalem 1971, p. 170). The use of the second person in referring to the Deity may show that they adopted an ancient Palestinian form, which may still have been known in Italy (see below, note 19). However, later editions amended the changed form to the third person so that it was stylistically in line with the other benedictions. After this time, the use of the twice amended form became common. Evidence of Italian influence in this change is shown by the fact that the Ashkenazic *mahzor* printed in Salonika in 1548 retains the *shelo asani goy* while the edition of this *mahzor* printed in Savionetta-Cremona in 1558(?), which was copied from the Salonika edition (see M. Benayahu, *Hebrew Printing at Cremona: Its History and Bibliography*, Jerusalem 1971, pp. 139–178 and especially p. 168), has the newer form of this benediction. It is of interest to note that the 1541 Bologna edition of the Italian rite contains the newest form but the commentary attached to this edition, by Yohanan Trevits, reflects the original version. In the copy found in the JNUL, the three appearances of the word *goy* in this commentary have been cut out of the text, leaving little holes.

been taken at the priests who thank God “Who has sanctified me with the sanctity of Aaron”. According to rabbinic tradition, this phrase was included by the priests in any blessing made before fulfilling a priestly function. One may wonder how non-priests would have felt if the formulation of the priestly blessing took the form of thanking God for not being ordinary Jews.⁷ The intent of this paper is to show how the changing status of women within traditional Judaism is reflected in the halakhic discussions about this blessing and the changing methods of “orthodoxy” in relating to change. The parameters suggested by the discussions about these blessings lead us to divide our own discussion into three periods: antiquity, medieval times, and the modern era.

B. The Blessings in Antiquity

When we turn to antiquity, we find that the tradition of men thanking God for not having been created gentiles, slaves, or women goes back to the time of R. Judah,⁸ who is reported as having stated that one is required to recite these three blessings daily,⁹ and who may be presumed to have been the one who promulgated this series of blessings. In reality, the earliest form of this

He has not made me straight” (*Maariv; Tarbut*, p. 11). This was written in an attempt to explain that many gays are happy about being gay. I am not aware that anyone has complained about her denigration of “straights”.

- 7 This fact was brought up in the context of the morning blessings by Joseph H. Hertz, as part of his apologetic defense of these blessings (see below, n. 27). Hertz did not dwell on the difference between the priest’s positive blessing and the male’s negative formulation.
- 8 The printed editions of the Babylonian Talmud report this in the name of R. Meir, but the Vatican ms. has R. Judah. From a philological standpoint, R. Judah is probably the correct version. The talmudic text was probably corrupted to R. Meir as a statement about blessings attributed to R. Meri appears immediately before it. It is also true that R. Judah may have been more receptive to Hellenistic influence (see W. Bacher, *Agada der Tanaiten*, 2, p. 202, n. 2; Kauffmann [note 39], p. 18, n. 1; הך [below, n. 34]. The Hellenistic origin of these blessings will be discussed further on). The statement of R. Judah is presented in the BT (*Menahot* 43 b) as being in apparent contradiction with the statement of R. Meir, which immediately follows it, according to which one is required to recite one hundred blessings daily.
- 9 The use of three as a natural grouping is well known. It is a cliché in the Israeli army that everything can be divided into three parts. For the use of threes in antiquity see Shama Friedman, “Some Structural Patterns of Talmudic *Sugiot*” [Hebrew], *Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies*, 3, Jerusalem 1977, pp. 391, notes 7–12.

These three blessings are commonly referred to as the blessings of “non-Jew, slave and woman” by their collective content, but they have also been called “the negative blessings”,² based on the fact that they are all phrased in a negative fashion. One thanks God not for being what one is but rather for what one isn't. One may describe this, in a certain sense, as being a form of “there, but for the grace of God, go I”.³ However, these statements, implying that it is unfortunate to be a non-Jew, a slave, or a woman, have also been considered as being negative blessings in the sense that their content implies disdainfulness and haughtiness towards other groups. Especially in modern times, both the expression of gratitude at not having been created a non-Jew and the expression of gratitude at not having been created a woman have served as a source for the claim that traditional Judaism considers gentiles and women as inferior beings.⁴ There is a fine line to be drawn between statements about pride in belonging to a particular group, meant to encourage *esprit de corps*, such as “thank God that I'm an American” [or English or French or Chinese], which many consider legitimate, and statements which encourage pride by denigration of other groups, which are considered illegitimate.⁵ Thus, many modern women substitute an expression of gratitude to God for having created them as women, without considering this denigrating to men.⁶ It is for this reason, perhaps, that no umbrage has ever

2 *Encyclopedia Talmudit*, Vol. 4, Jerusalem 1956, p. 371.

3 The son of Maimonides maintained that these blessings were to be recited only when one saw the people mentioned in the blessing (Rabbi Abraham Ben Moshe ben Maimon, *Sefer Ha-maspik le'ovdey Hashem / Kitab Kifayat al-'abidin* (Part Two, Volume Two; ed. and translated by Nissim Dana), Ramat Gan 1989, p. 247; cf. Mordechai A. Friedman, “Notes by a Disciple in Maimonide's Academy Pertaining to Beliefs and Concepts and Halakha” [Hebrew], *Tarbiz*, 62 (1993), pp. 563–569. Alex Haley, in his portrayal of the difficult conditions of the American black slaves in the 18th century, mentions that when they saw the poor whites, they would say “Not po' white, please, O Lawd, fer I'd ruther be a nigger” (*Roots: The Saga of an American Family*, New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1977, p. 316).

4 Although there may seem to be a basic difference between the way of relating to a more dominant group (non-Jews) and the way of relating to a subordinate group, this was not considered a material difference.

5 It is instructive to note here that Jesus denigrated the Pharisee who prayed while standing next to a publican (tax collector): “God, I thank thee, that I am not as other men are, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as this publican” (Luke 18:11). The implication is that this prayer was obnoxious only because the pray-er was standing next to the publican.

6 In a review of “The Last Gold”, Amalia Ziv writes that many “gays” thank God daily “that

The Benedictions of Self-Identity and The Changing Status of Women and of Orthodoxy

JOSEPH TABORY

A. Introduction

For many generations Jewish liturgy has included three benedictions or blessings which may be described as an attempt to create an awareness of self and one's position in the world. These blessings are an expression of gratitude to God for not having been created as a gentile,¹ as a slave, or as a woman.

* This article is based on a lecture given at the World Congress for Jewish Studies held in Jerusalem in 1997. I am grateful to the following people who have read this paper and offered helpful comments: Prof. Shaye J. D. Cohen, Prof. Moshe Hallamish, Prof. Susan Sered, Dr. Zvi Stone, my brothers, Rabbi Benjamin Tabory and Dr. Ephraim Tabory. But mostly I am grateful to Judy Tabory who, besides reading this paper, has increased my awareness of the issues involved.

1 The Hebrew word used in this context, גוי, is used in biblical Hebrew in the sense of "nation" or a member of a nation. The Jewish people are also called גוי and Abraham was promised that he would be a great גוי. It is only in rabbinic Hebrew that the word is used in opposition to the Children of Israel, in the sense of a non-Jew (cf. *Tosefta* Peah 2:9, p. 47). A similar development occurred in the Latin "gens" which originally meant people who were connected to each other by birth, but eventually was used by Romans to mean non-Romans and by Christians to mean pagans (cf. C.T. Lewis & C. Short, *A Latin Dictionary*, Oxford: Clarendon Press 1969, pp. 808–809; Elieser Ben Iehuda, *Thesaurus Totius Hebraicitatis*, Jerusalem, 2:718–719). Some later scholars objected to the use of this term in the blessing, claiming that it was ambiguous as Jews were also numbered among the גוים. One solution offered was to add to the blessing כגויי הארצות (Hizkiyahu Medini, *Sedeh Hemed, Aseifat ha-dinim, Ma'arekhet kherufin*, he; New York: Abraham Isaac Friedman, n.d., p. 174).

above, of the interchange of expressions between the first and third blessings to enhance their symmetry.

Leon Liebreich comes closer to finding a precedent for the triad in the liturgy in Neh. 9:6–11.³⁵⁷ Here God is celebrated as creator (of the world), chooser (of Abraham), and redeemer (of Israel). This section also became the liturgical prolegomenon to the Shema' liturgy in the morning service when it served as the conclusion of the biblical selections of *Pesukei De-Zimra* prior to the interpolation of the Song of Moses.³⁵⁸ Still, the case for Nehemiah 9 exemplifying the triad of creation, revelation, and redemption is considerably weakened by having the second part mention only the election of Abraham and not of all Israel at Sinai.

In general, biblical liturgy more often revolves around the axes of creation, election, and divine power,³⁵⁹ not creation, revelation, and redemption. There is also a case of Jeremiah (32:17–21) linking creation with the Exodus in a prayer, but makes no mention of revelation or of future redemption. In any case, redemption is only one expression of divine power.

On the one hand, it could be argued that the prayer of the Sabbath New Moon *Musaf* service – *Attah Yasarta* – with its expressions “You created Your world”, “You chose us from among the nations”, and “You will bring us back to our land” (*Seder Rav Amram Gaon*, p. 90), adheres to a creation, revelation/election, and redemption pattern as does the similarly worded second request of *Siddur Rav Sa'adyah Gaon*, p. 65. On the other hand, the structure might just be following the biblical order of events, not an independent organizing structure.

In sum, since the motifs of creation, revelation, and redemption do not coalesce with sufficient frequency to qualify as a major organizing pattern of classical Judaism in general or of the liturgy in particular, there is no presumptive warrant for assuming the pattern is informing the structure of the Shema' liturgy. Indeed, such an assumption exemplifies precisely the type of mistake that can arise when literary analysis is divorced from historical analysis, i.e., when synthetic constructions of meaning are oblivious of diachronic development.

357 “The Impact of Nehemiah 9:5–37...”, *HUCA* 32 (1961), p. 231.

358 See Fleischer, *Eretz-Israel Prayer and Prayer Rituals as Portrayed in the Geniza Documents* [above, n. 119], p. 90.

359 See Moshe Weinfeld, “The Biblical Roots of the Standing Prayer on the Sabbath and Festivals” [Hebrew], *Tarbiz* 5 (1996), p. 547f.

convincing than the thesis of Mirsky³⁵¹ that they are the organizing pattern of Psalm 19 and thus of the Shema' liturgy. Psalm 19's last line, "O Lord, my rock and my redeemer", is simply inadequate for evoking the Exodus motif of the third blessing, referring as it does to the plight of the individual and not to that of the nation. In actuality, the triad no more unlocks the structure of Psalm 19 than it unlocks that of the Shema'.

Support for the thesis based upon the correlation of the three Sabbath 'Amidot with the motifs of creation, revelation, and redemption³⁵² is stronger but of limited value since the three Sabbath 'Amidot reflect only the later medieval rite and not the classical rabbinic one.³⁵³ As noted, for the Bible, the liturgy, and rabbinic literature, the generative idea of the Sabbath is that of divine sovereignty.

It could be argued that the three motifs coalesce in the first and third blessings of the Shema' through the three divine epithets, צורנו מלכנו גואלנו ["our Rock/Creator, our King, our Redeemer"] (*Seder Rav Amram Gaon*, p. 20, l. 1f.), on the assumption that יוצרנו = צורנו. Such an equivalency is supported by sources elsewhere³⁵⁴ and argued for by Jonah Ibn Janah;³⁵⁵ and N. Aloni.³⁵⁶ Nonetheless, all three epithets do not appear in *Siddur Rav Sa'adya Gaon*, p. 36. Moreover, גואלנו in the first blessing neither fits the context nor the poetic parallelism of the succeeding strophe. It is clearly an interpolation, for without it the parallelism is near perfect (see *Seder Rav Amram Gaon*, p. 13, l. 8ff.) as can be seen from what follows:

תתברך	צורנו	מלכנו	בורא	קדושים
ישתבח	שמך לעד	מלכנו	יוצר	משרתים

Indeed, *The Persian Jewish Prayer Book*, p. 30, reads בוראנו ("our Creator") for the third epithet. Apparently, the triad in some versions of the first blessing is a secondary accretion. Its inclusion follows the pattern, noted

351 *Ha'Piyut* [above, n. 88], pp. 11–17.

352 As noted by *Sefer Ha-Manhig* [above, n. 17], 1:150, n. 74; and Rosenzweig [above, n. 348], pp. 312–315.

353 See Fleischer, *The Yozer* [above, n. 60], p. 45, n. 26.

354 *Sifre Deut.* 32, ed. Finkelstein, p. 344; *B. Berakhot* 10a; *Menahot* 29b; *Sanhedrin* 91a.

355 *Sefer Shorashim*, Berlin, 1896, p. 426; see Abraham Epstein, *Me-Qadmoniot Ha-Yehudim*, ed. A. Haberman, Jerusalem: Mossad Harav Kook, 1965, p. 190.

356 *Temirin*, ed. Y. Weinstock, p. 81, n. 12.

methods can function to legitimate new liturgical formulae.

This suggestion would explain the absence of any mention of kingship in the response of the *kaddish*, which may be dated to Temple times, to which it was equivalent. The subsequent prominence of the kingship motif in the Shema' and in the rabbinic blessing formulary reflects a post-Temple reality.³⁴⁷

To sum up appendices A and B: both the communal ceremony of פורסים את שמע, i.e., the dividing of the Shema' verse, and the interpolation of ברוך שם כבוד מלכותו לעולם ועד, serve to underscore the conceptualization of the recitation of the verse as an act of realizing divine sovereignty. Since they overlap in function, the latter may have been initially reserved for individual recitation as the former was for communal recitation. Alternatively, the latter was introduced when the former was no longer practiced.

Appendix C

Creation, Revelation, and Redemption

(extension of n. 286)

The evidence for the thesis that the structure of classical Judaism revolves around the axes of creation, revelation, and redemption is scanty despite the prodigious efforts of Franz Rosenzweig³⁴⁸ to prove otherwise.

According to Sarah Wilensky, Isaac Arama's presentation of the Sabbath in terms of creation, Torah study, and perfection of the soul is predicated on the triad of creation, revelation, and redemption.³⁴⁹ Arama, however, neither states this nor alludes to it from rabbinic or biblical sources.

The thesis of Weinfeld,³⁵⁰ that the triad of creation, revelation, and redemption lies behind a biblical pattern of shofar blowing, is no more

347 See Wiesenberg [above, n. 65], pp. 1–56; idem, “Gleanings of the Liturgical Term Melekh Ha-‘olam”, *JJS* 17 (1966), pp. 47–72; and Kimelman, “Blessing Formulae...” [above, n. 265].

348 *The Star of Redemption*, Boston: Beacon, Part 2, and *passim*; see Nathan Rotenstreich, *Jewish Philosophy in Modern Times from Mendelsohn to Rosenzweig*, New York: Holt, Rhinehart and Winston, 1966, pp. 187–207.

349 *The Philosophy of Isaac Arama in the Framework of Platonic Philosophy* [Hebrew], Jerusalem: Dvir, 1956, pp. 91, 189.

350 Justice and Righteousness in Israel and the Nations [above, n. 26], p. 122.

formulation was aimed at the Hasmoneans, especially Alexander Jannai, or the Sadducees or Herod³⁴² or any other political target, for that matter, is all the more unlikely in the light of its absence elsewhere. It is of course possible that the motif of kingship was limited to the Sabbath or to the Temple, i.e., to the holy, either in time – as in Qumran, or in space – as in the Temple. Such a limitation, however, lacks any other evidence. In any case, the only extant example of a blessing containing both “name” and “kingship” is the rabbinic claim of Second Temple practice.³⁴³

In the absence of any corroborating evidence for the response *ברוך שם כבוד* *ברוך שם כבודו לעולם ועד*, the Temple response may have been just *ברוך שם כבודו לעולם ועד* based on Ps. 72:10 or Neh. 9:5. Such a response is apropos of hearing the *name* of God.³⁴⁴ Indeed, in place of the talmudic *ברוך שם כבוד מלכותו לעולם ועד* *Targum Jonathan* to Deut. 6:5 has *ברוך שם יקריה לעלמי עלמין* which is virtually the *Targum* to Ps. 72:10 – *ברוך שם יקריה לעלמא*!

Apparently, when the recitation of the Shema' verse became an act of realization of divine sovereignty, Ps. 72:10 was accordingly adapted by expanding *כבודו* into *כבוד מלכותו* to guarantee that all would understand the Shema' as such.³⁴⁵ Note that in Nehemiah a form of *ברוך שם כבודו* is juxtaposed to the following verse which begins “You are the Lord, You alone” (Neh. 9:6) which in substance parallels the meaning of the Shema' verse before it became understood as an act of realization of divine sovereignty.³⁴⁶ Subsequently, the better known rabbinic formulation was retrojected back to the Temple, or projected on to the heavenly hosts. Both

342 See Aptowitzer, “בשכמל”ו = Geschichte einer liturgischen Formel” [above, n. 223], pp. 102–110; and *Sifre Deut.*, ed. Friedmann, pp. 72b–73a.

343 The alleged Christian parallels are all post-70 CE (see Eric Werner, “The Doxology in Synagogue and Church: A Liturgico-Musical Study”, *HUCA* 19 [1945/46], p. 288f.) as are all those of the *Heikhalot* literature (see, e.g., Schäfer, *Synopse* [above, n. 176], # 553, 555, 571).

344 As noted by Wiesenberg [above, n. 65], p. 26f.

345 See Finkelstein, “The Meaning of the Word *Pores...*” [above, n. 296], pp. 36–38. The Genizah blessing [above, n. 81] serves a similar purpose. Also since the Sabbath is the day of divine sovereignty par excellence, its psalm, Psalm 92, which makes no mention of the motif, was coupled with Psalm 93 which begins with it – “The Lord has reigned”; see Kimelman, *The Mystical Meaning of Qabbalat Shabbat and Lekhah Dodi* [above, n. 151], chap. 1, n. 58.

346 See above, n. 255.

"Bless the Lord of righteousness and exalt the king of the ages", and 13:10 states: "bless the king of the ages". The Qumran *4QTobit* (4Q200), frg. 7, reads: ברוך אלהים חי אשר לכול עולמים היאה מלכותו. *I Enoch* 22:14 reads: "Blessed be my Lord, the Lord of righteousness who rules forever/over the world", and 84:2 reads "Blessed are You, O great king ... king of kings and God of the whole world". *Enoch* 27:3 and 81:3 speak about blessing the Lord of Glory, the king of ages, but provide no blessing). *Psalms of Solomon* 5:19 reads: "Blessed be the glory of God, for He is our king". (The other references to God as eternal king there [17:1, 46] are not blessing formulae). *The Song of the Three Jews* reads: "Blessed are You on the throne of Your kingdom" (1:33). At Qumran, 4Q511, frgs. 52–59, 3:4 read: ברוך [את]ה אלי מלך הכב[ו]ן, and 4Q403, frg. 1, 1:28 may read: ברוך [ה]אד[ו]ן [מלך]ה [כול]. 4Q405, frg. 14 + 15, 1:3 includes a call for blessing: ברוך למלך מרוממים, but lacks any blessing formula.³³⁹

There is so far no evidence from the literature of the Second Temple period of a blessing that includes both name and kingship. Had the Temple response, which begins with "blessed", already made mention of sovereignty, its virtual absence in the blessing formulations throughout the Temple period would be inexplicable. After all, no liturgy would be better known or more imitated than that of the Temple. Since no single element of ברוך שם כבוד מלכותו is unique nor any element specifically linked to the Temple, there is no reason to assume that in combination it was limited to the Temple. The Qumran *Daily Prayers* (4Q503) alone contains some 30 blessing formulae without a mention of kingship.³⁴⁰ The infrequency of the mention of kingship in the blessing formulae of the liturgy with the greatest affinity to post-Temple rabbinic liturgy shows how rare it was.³⁴¹ The thesis that the

339 See Eileen Schuller, "Some Observations on Blessing of God in Texts from Qumran", eds. H. Attridge et al., *Of Scribes and Scrolls*, Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1990, p. 138.

340 See Falk, ...*Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls* [above, n. 100], p. 37.

341 On the otherwise considerable commonality between rabbinic and Qumran liturgical expressions, see Lawrence Schiffman, "From Temple to Torah: Rabbinic Judaism in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls", *Shofar* 10 (1992), p. 10; and Shemaryahu Talmon, "The Emergence of Institutionalized Prayer in Israel in Light of Qumran Literature", *The World of Qumran from Within: Collected Studies*, Jerusalem-Leiden: Magnes Press-Brill, 1989, pp. 200–243; Esther Chazon, "Prayers from Qumran and their Historical Implications", *Dead Sea Discoveries*, 1/3 (1994), pp. 265–284.

begins: “Blessed are You, O Lord, God of our ancestors and worthy of praise and glorious is Your name forever” (1:3). *The Song of the Three Jews* repeats 1:3 and adds: “And blessed is Your glorious holy name, and to be highly praised and highly exalted forever” (1:30). Similarly, *1 Enoch* says: “Blessed are You, and blessed is the name of the Lord of the spirits forever and ever” (39:14), and “Blessed is He, and blessed is the name of the Lord of the spirits forever and ever” (61:11). At Qumran, there are two examples of all three elements: *4QBer^a 7:7* [ולברך את שם כבודכה בכול קיציע] [על] [מיים] [אמן] [אמן] and *4Q510–511, frg. 63, 4:2*. שמכה לעלמי עד אמן אמן

The blessing of God's name forever also became a response. The response in the Qumran version of Psalm 145 is: ברוך הוא וברוך שמו לעולם ועד. In tannaitic liturgy it is ברוך ה' [=שם] המבורך לעולם ועד. In the *Kaddish* it is: יהא שמיה רבא מברך. ³³⁵ This last response, despite the absence of “kingship”, was considered equivalent to ברוך שם כבוד מלכותו לעולם ועד, since it substitutes for it in the targumic version of Jacob's response to his sons' saying of the Shema' verse. ³³⁶ The one case that does mention kingship is *Targum Neofiti* to Gen. 49:2 – בריך שמיה כבודיה דמלכותיה לעלמי עלמין. ³³⁷ The retaining of the Hebrew כבודיה, which is otherwise unattested to in *Targum Neofiti*, ³³⁸ instead of the Aramaic יקריה, however, testifies to the artificiality of the effort to render ברוך שם כבוד מלכותו לעולם ועד into Aramaic and not an independent tradition. In doing so, it underscores the difficulty of translating two consecutive construct forms such as שם כבוד מלכותו, requiring the insertion of the genitive ד after the second (מלכותיה). Similarly, R. Sa'adya Gaon, in his *The Book of Beliefs and Opinions*, after referring to this formula as “praises applied to the attribute of the attribute of an attribute” renders the formula into Arabic as if it read “blessed be the name of the glory of His kingdom” (2:13). Thus two major cognate languages of Hebrew, Arabic and Aramaic, testify to the difficulty in translating the formula as is.

Several Second Temple blessing formulae contain references to kingship but without mention of “name”. *Tobit* 13:1 reads: “Blessed be God, who lives forever, for His kingdom lasts throughout all ages”. *Tobit* 13:6 also states:

335 See Kimelman, “Psalm 145” [above, n. 173], p. 56; *M. Berakhot* 7:3; and *Sifre Deut.* 306.

336 *Jerusalem Targum*, Gen. 49:1-2, Deut. 6:4; *Neofiti*, Deut. 6:4; see Heinemann, *Prayer in the Period of the Tannaim and Amoraim* [above, n. 286], p. 86, n. 38.

337 Courtesy of Professor Avigdor Shinan of the Hebrew University.

338 Nor in *Targum Jonathan* and *Onqelos*, according to their concordances.

blessing formula except for the mention of מלכות. MaHaRSHA derives מלכותו from שם כבוד ומרום, thereby making שם כבוד ומרום of the verse the source of שם כבוד of the blessing formula.³³³ Although a form of מרום is sometimes associated with מלכות,³³⁴ the identification is not convincing. Based on the cited verse, the response should have been just ברוך שם כבודך (“Blessed be Your glorious name”) just as the invitation to “Bless the Lord your God who is from eternity to eternity” (Neh. 9:5) was implemented by “And they blessed the name of your glory” (ibid.) probably by saying the same ברוך שם כבודך or “Blessed be the Lord, God of Israel (or: our God) from eternity to eternity” (1 Chron. 16:36).

The blessing of God's name was a standard way of beginning a prayer in Second Temple times. The elements of such blessings consisted of “blessing”, “name”, and “forever”. There is no mention of kingship. Such is the case in the aforementioned Neh. 9:5, and Dan. 2:20, which reads: “May the name of God be blessed forever and ever.” Even Psalm 145, the only biblical psalm to call “my God the king”, mentions these three elements without mentioning kingship in the blessing of God's name. After the strophe: “I extol You, my God, the king”, it continues only with “and bless Your name forever and ever. Every day I bless You and praise Your name forever and ever” (1–2). Similarly, Ps. 113:2 states: “Let the name of the Lord be blessed now and forever”. The two cases of actual blessing formulae in the Psalter that contain “name” simply state: “Blessed be His glorious name forever” (72:19) and “Blessed be the name of the Lord from now and for evermore” (113:2). Psalm 17 does mention “king” (“Lord, You are our king forever and ever”), but does not begin with “blessed” nor contain “name”.

The blessing formulae of extra-biblical literature follow the same pattern of mentioning “blessing”, “name”, and “forever”. *Tobit* 3:11–15 begins: “Blessed are You, merciful God. Blessed is Your name forever”; 8:5–7 begins: “Blessed are You, O God of our ancestors, and blessed is Your name in all generations forever”; 11:14 begins: “Blessed be God and blessed be His great name”; and 13:17 ends “Blessed be the God of Israel and the blessed will bless the holy name forever and ever”. *The Prayer of Azariah* also

333 At *B. Sotah* 40b, a suggestion entertained by Lieberman, *Tosefta Ki-fshutah* [above, n.14] 1:124, l. 102.

334 As in Ps. 145:1 and Dan. 4:34.

amoraic literature it served as the response to Israel's recitation of the Shema' verse by the angels³²⁸ (a notion that may account for the claim that Moses heard it from the angels upon arriving on high),³²⁹ by Moses (*Deut. Rabbah* 2, 31), or by Jacob.³³⁰ It also functioned to compensate for reciting an unnecessary blessing (see *J. Berakhot* 6:1, 10a). The formula is widely attested to in *Heikhalot* literature frequently as part of angelic liturgies in response to the *Qedushah*, to various divine names, or just as a conclusion.³³¹ In so far as it has a setting, it is as a response either of the Temple of tannaitic literature, or of the Shema' and/or angels primarily of amoraic and *Heikhalot* literature. The exception is the tannaitic *Sifre* which lines up with amoraic literature. This is not so surprising since that part, being anonymous, may actually be amoraic.

The existence of this blessing formula, with its mention of name (שם) and sovereignty (מלכות), and its function as a liturgical response in the Second Temple is open to question since these two elements do not appear together in any other extant Second Temple blessing formula. According to the *Tosefta*³³² the response is based on Neh. 9:5: ברכו את ה' אלהיכם מן העולם עד העולם ויברכו שם כבודך ומרומם על כל ברכה ותהלה

chapter 4, *parsha* 4, ed. Weiss, pp. 80d, 82a; see Jacob N. Epstein, *Mavo Le-Nusah Ha-Mishnah*, 2 vols., Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1964, 2:972.

327 See *T. Ta'anivot* 1:11–13, ed. Lieberman, p. 326f., with parallels; and *Sifre Deut.* 306, ed. Finkelstein, p. 342, l. 10, which should be corrected to match *Mekhilta Pasha*, ed. Lauterbach, 1:138, l. 137. For the use of "amen" in Qumran and elsewhere, see Charlesworth, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* [above, n. 279], 4A:49, n. 23.

328 See *Gen. Rabbah* 65, 21, ed. Theodor-Albeck, p. 739 with notes; *Deut. Rabbah*, ed. Lieberman, p. 68; and *Shir Ha-Shirim Zuta*, ed. Buber, p. 8.

329 See *Deut. Rabbah* 2, 35; *ibid.*, ed. Lieberman, pp. 68, 69, n. 2; and *Yalqut Shimoni*, 1:836, ed. Heiman-Shiloni, *Devarim*, p. 108, n. 6.

330 See *Sifre Deut.* 31, 323, ed. Finkelstein, pp. 53, 372; *Gen. Rabbah* 96, ed. Theodor-Albeck, p. 1202 and 98, 3, p. 1252; *B. Pesahim* 56a; *Deut. Rabbah* 2, 35; *Genizah Studies* [above, n. 137] 1:44, l. 22; and the *targumim* cited below. *Deut. Rabbah*, ed. Lieberman, p. 67 lacks this response by Jacob perhaps because on the next page it attributes the response to the angels. According to Urbach (*The Sages* [above, n. 252], p. 350, n. 14), the function of the versions of *Gen. Rabbah* 96, *Deut. Rabbah* 2, 35, and *Genizah Studies* is to justify the practice of whispering it.

331 See Peter Schäfer, *Konkordanz zur Hekhalot-Literatur*, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1988: 2:416c-417a.

332 *Ta'anivot* 1:10, ed. Lieberman, p. 326f. and parallels.

act of testimony than one of acclamation.³¹⁷ This fits the development of the recitation of the Shema' as an act of testimony,³¹⁸ and concomitantly as a text for martyrdom, a phenomenon paralleled in Christianity and Islam.³¹⁹

In almost all cases the communal recitation of the Shema' retained a distinctive performance mode throughout such as being sung in unison,³²⁰ chorally,³²¹ aloud,³²² or cantillated.³²³ In all cases, it was not to be repeated.³²⁴ Finally, even the individual recitation acquired its own modality of enunciation.³²⁵

Appendix B

“Blessed be the Name of His glorious sovereignty forever and ever”

ברוך שם כבוד מלכותו לעולם ועד

(extension of n. 224)

The meaning and origin of this blessing formula is unclear. According to tannaitic literature, it functioned in the Second Temple either as a response to the pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton by the High Priest on the Day of Atonement,³²⁶ or as the “amen” after a blessing.³²⁷ According to the *Sifre* and

317 See Lieberman, *Tosefta Ki-fshutah* [above, n. 14] 3:263, l. 88; the refrain of the *piyyut*, *Kol bru'ei ma'alah*; *Ba'al Ha-Turim* to Deut 6:4; and Sperber [above, n. 243], 2:81f., n. 8.

318 See Sperber, *ibid.*, p. 262, last line; and Abudarham [above, n. 95], p. 80.

319 See Y. Liebes, “De Natura Dei – Al Ha-Mitos Ha-Yehudi Ve-Gilgulo”, *Massu'ot: Studies in Kabbalistic Literature and Jewish Philosophy in Memory of Prof. Ephraim Gottlieb* (eds. M. Oron and A. Goldreich), Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1994, p. 263, n. 44.

320 *ARNB* 44, ed. S. Schechter, p. 124; *Song of Songs Rabbah* 8:13.2, 8:14.2; Ginzberg, *Genizah Studies* [above, n. 137], 1:120; *Sefer Ha-Eshkol* [above, n. 18], p. 15; and *Tur Orah Hayyim* near the end of 61.

321 See Benveniste b. Avraham Gatigno and Eliezer de Mordo, *Sefer Qeri'at Shema'*, Salonica, 1754/55, p. 21a, cited by Edith Gerson-Kiwi, “Vocal Folk-Polyphonies of the Western Orient in Jewish Tradition”, *Yuval* 1 (1968), p. 193, n. 32.

322 See Zimmer, “Tenuhot U-Tenuot” [above, n. 313], pp. 363–367.

323 See Abudarham [above, n. 95], p. 397b; and Rabinovitz, *The Liturgical Poems* [above, n. 46] 2:141.

324 See Lieberman, *Hilkhot Ha-Yerushalmi* [above, n. 233], p. 20, n. 19.

325 See Mark Verman, *The History and Varieties of Jewish Meditation*, Northvale, New Jersey: Jason Aronson, 1996, pp. 151–157.

326 *M. Yoma* 3:8, 4:1-2, 6:2, *T. Kippurim* 2:1; *Sifra*, *Ahare mot*, chapter 1, *parsha* 2, and

practice or poetic license. There is a similar difficulty with regard to the Sabbath table hymn attributed to Judah Halevy, “*Yom shabbaton 'ain lishkoah*”, where the third stanza states:

Then they all came together in a covenant, “We will do and we will obey” (Ex. 24:7) they said as one. And they opened and responded: “The Lord is One”.

By linking the Shema' verse with the covenant at Sinai the hymn seems to echo the comment of R. Pinhas b. Hama, cited above in section III. Alternatively, “The Lord is One” is simply a truncation of “the Lord our God, the Lord is One” in order to conform to the metrical restraints of the line.³¹²

The synagogal ritual of dividing the Shema' probably fell into desuetude in the Byzantine period when it no longer evoked a contemporaneous mode of royal acclamation. The change may be reflected in the complaint of R. Levi (circa 300 CE) that when some recite the Shema' from the beginning and others from the end they appear divided. Instead they should coordinate it and recite in unison the whole verse,³¹³ as mentioned above.

Another distinguishing mark of Palestinian practice was standing for the Shema', a practice traceable to the third-century amora R. Yohanan.³¹⁴ The practice of standing fits the perception of the recitation of the Shema' as an act of acclamation as opposed to an act of study. This correlates well with the ancient Palestinian practice of standing for the angelic coronation of the first blessing,³¹⁵ a practice that survived in medieval Europe.³¹⁶ As the Greco-Roman background was forgotten, standing came to signify more an

312 See *Zemiroth Sabbath Songs* [above, n. 309], p. 198.

313 *Genizah Studies*, ed. Ginzberg [above, n. 137], 1:120.

314 See Ginzberg, *Commentary* 1:146f.; Wieder, “The Controversy about the Liturgical Composition ‘*Yismah Moshe*’ – Opposition and Defence” [above, n. 199], p. 96, n. 49; *Midrash Ha-Gadol Numbers*, ed. Rabinowitz, p. 439 with n. 14; Sperber, *Minhagei Yisrael* [above, n. 243] 2:80–83; and especially Yitshaq Zimmer, “Tenuhot U-Tenu'ot Be-Sha'at Qeri'at Shema'”, *Asufot* 8 (1994), pp. 344–349.

315 See Fleischer, *Eretz-Israel Prayer and Prayer Rituals...* [above, n. 119], p. 218, n. 19. They also stood during the post-*haftarah* blessings when saying: “You are faithful.... May You always reign over us forever” (*Massekhet Sofrim*, 13:9, ed. Higger, p. 245).

316 See Eleazar b. Judah of Worms, *Perushei Siddur Ha-Tefillah La-Roqueah* [above, n. 72], 1:329, n. 101; and *Siddur of R. Shabbatai Sofer*, 2 vols., ed. Y. Satz, Baltimore, 1994, 1:116.

mistakenly attributes to me the position that "The cantor recited the words ascribed to God, 'Hear O Israel I am YHVH', etc.". My position is that the precentor only said, "Hear O Israel", whereas the phrase, "I am the Lord, your God", was understood by the congregation, to which they responded (along with the precentor) with "the Lord our God, the Lord is one".

According to Albeck, the precentor said, "Hear O Israel, the Lord our God" and the congregation responded "the Lord is one".³⁰⁷ Albeck provides no explanation for such a division. It is clear from the midrashic tradition that the response was: "The Lord our God, The Lord is One".³⁰⁸ Accordingly, the *piyyut*, *Shomer yisrael*, divides up the two by allocating the first stanza to those who say, "Hear O Israel", and the second to those who say, "The Lord our God, the Lord is one". Also the *piyyut*, *Kol bru'ei ma'alah*, attributed to Solomon ibn Gabirol, contains the refrain "All shall testify and declare together as one: 'The Lord our God, the Lord is One'".³⁰⁹ A similar confession emphasizing the communal response, "The Lord our God, the Lord is One" is found in *The Arabic Commentary of Yefet Ben Ali the Karaite on the Book of Hosea*, ed. P. Birnbaum, Philadelphia, 1942, p. 52. This division between the second and third word is supported by the traditional cantillation, the *Tosafot* (*Menahot* 71a, s.v., *ve-korkhin*), and other commentators.³¹⁰

Nonetheless, a response consisting of just "the Lord is One", may be attested to by several *piyyutim* – two of which appear in the Musaf service of Rosh Hashanah. The first, *Ha-omrim ehad*, opens with "Those who say: 'the Lord is our God'", and closes with "Those who respond, 'the Lord is one'". The second, *Ha-ma'amirim be-'emah*, also opens with "the Lord is our God", and closes with "the Lord is one".³¹¹ A third, *Yereseh Som Amkha*, attributed to the eleventh-century poet Isaac b. Reuven Barceloni, which appears in the Selikhot service of the day before Yom Kippur, also states: "And those who say: 'the Lord is one'". It is, however, difficult to determine whether these reflect liturgical

306 *Deuteronomy 1–11* [above, n. 10], p. 261.

307 *Shishah Sidre Mishnah*, to *Megillah* 4:3, Jerusalem: Dvir, 1968, p. 365. He is followed by Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1–11* [above, n. 10], p. 353.

308 See *Sifre Deut.* 31, p. 53; *Deut. Rabbah*, 2:31, with ed. Lieberman, p. 67f.; and Al-Nakawa, *Menorat Ha-Maor* [above, n. 81], 2:96.

309 See *Zemiroth Sabbath Songs*, ed. Scherman, Brooklyn: Mesorah, 1979, pp. 296–299.

310 See Kasher, *Sefer Shema' Yisrael* [above, n. 36], pp. 353–359.

311 Daniel Goldschmidt [above, n. 230], 2:421–422.

Judah says: 'They did make [such a] break but did not say ברוך שם כבוד מלכותו לעולם ועד'.

When by gaonic times²⁹⁸ the dividing of the Shema' verse had long fallen out of use, the expression *pores 'et Shema'* became *pores 'al Shema'* as it came to denote the whole Shema' and its blessings along with the antiphonal response of the *barekhu*.²⁹⁹

How is the Shema' to be divided to form an antiphony? The suggestion of Fleischer and subsequently Heinemann³⁰⁰ that the response was ברוך שם כבוד מלכותו לעולם ועד fails to meet the two criteria of an antiphonal acclamation, being neither a verse nor divided. Knohl recognized the royal acclamation setting, but not that *pores* indicates a division.³⁰¹ Influenced by Finkelstein, he states "that the reader would *pores 'al Shema'*, i.e. one person would recite it for the whole community" (English summary, p. 10). Elbogen's position "that the reader began with *Shema' Yisrael*, the congregation repeated these words and completed the verse",³⁰² meets both criteria, but is unnecessarily complicated. In fact, it reflects the position of R. Eleazar b. Taddai as recorded in both *Mekhiltot* (eds., Horowitz and Rabin, p. 119; eds. Epstein and Melamed, p. 72) and not that of R. Nehemiah (above, n. 185). This version of Elbogen's position also appears in his *Jewish Liturgy*,³⁰³ whereas in the notes, p. 393, he states: "We [i.e., he and Bacher] all agree that the term refers to the three passages of the Shema' together with the benedictions, and that the Shema' was recited verse by verse antiphonally". Kaufmann Kohler,³⁰⁴ however, understood Elbogen to mean that "The Reader is thus supposed to have first recited the *two* words: *Shema' Yisroel*, to which the Congregation responds by reciting the next *four* words" which is precisely my position as well as, I subsequently found out, that of Kadushin.³⁰⁵ Weinfeld³⁰⁶

298 See Finkelstein, *ibid.*, p. 35f.

299 See Finkelstein, *ibid.*, p. 394f.; Maimonides, "Laws of Prayer", 8:5 and *idem*, *Commentary to the Mishnah ad M. Megillah* 4:3, ed. Kafah, 1:236.

300 See Fleischer [above, n. 288]; and Heinemann, *The Literature of the Synagogue*, New York: Behrman House, 1975, p. 16f.

301 "A Parsha ..." [above, n. 290], pp. 12, 14, n. 13.

302 "Studies in the Jewish Liturgy" [above, n. 185], p. 594.

303 Above, n. 62, p. 24 (Hebrew: p. 19).

304 "Shema' Yisroel: Origin and Purpose of its Daily Recital", *Journal of Jewish Lore and Philosophy*, 1 (1919), p. 259.

305 *Worship and Ethics* [above, n. 147], p. 259, n. 159.

recitation is *בפיה אחד, בקול אחד, בנעימה אחת*.²⁹² Similarly, in the angelic liturgy the participants served *בדבור אחד, בדעת אחד, ובנעימה אחת* or *בקול אחד* or *ברז אחד, בעיצה אחת, בקול אחד*.²⁹³ Since it had to be recited aloud in unison and in consonance, it had to be coordinated (*בעיצה אחת*). These directives were all intended to assure that the acclamation of God as sovereign follow procedures appropriate for liturgical acclamation rites.²⁹⁴

Much of the opposition to understanding *pores* as “dividing” is based on the assumption that the original expression was *pores 'al Shema'*. Even Heinemann's objection to Fleischer's suggestion that the response was a single strophe relies on the expression *pores 'al Shema'*.²⁹⁵ Medieval authorities, perplexed by the halakhic expression *pores 'et/ 'al Shema'*, which has no clear referent, devised various explanations for the term – none of which commanded wide assent.²⁹⁶ Once it is realized that the original expression was *pores 'et Shema'*,²⁹⁷ it is clear that the Shema' verse is the direct object of the verb *pores*, “divide”. Since the Shema' verse itself is to be divided, the antonymic expression *korekh 'et Shema'* implies that the verse was recited without any break. Thus the *Tosefta* (*Pisha* 3:19, ed. Lieberman, 2:157) should be rendered as follows: “How did they *korekh 'et Shema'*? They said: *אחד שמע ישראל ה' אלהינו ה'* but made no break [between *ישראל* and *ה'*]. R.

292 *Song of Songs Rabbah* 8:13,2; 8:14,2 (R. Zera). Similarly, according to *Siddur Rabbenu Shelomoh b. R. Natan* [above, n. 67], the acclamation of God as king, in the third blessing of the evening service, is to be declaimed *יחד כלם בקול אחד* (“all together in one voice”) (p. 22).

293 See *Genizah Studies*, ed. Ginzberg [above, n. 137], 1:120; Rabinovitz, *The Liturgical Poems of Rabbi Yannai* [above, n. 46], 2:141, l. 38 and Schäfer, *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literature* [above, n. 176], p. 209, #553, l. 29, p. 80, #185, ll. 37f.

294 As Gikatila says with regard to the Qedushah: *כי זהו אחד מדרכי הייחוד*, כולם מתכוונים לגמרה ביחד, – “Everybody aims to finish it together, for it is one of the modes of the great unification” (i.e., acclamation [see above, n. 257]) (*Sha'are Orah* [above n. 188] 1:240). See Moshe Weinfeld, “The Heavenly Praise in Unison”, *Meqor Hajjim: Festschrift für Georg Molin zum 75 Geburtstag*, Graz, Austria, 1983, pp. 428–431.

295 *Studies in Jewish Liturgy* [above, n. 119], p. 16, n. 20.

296 See Louis Finkelstein, “The Meaning of the word *Pores* ...”, *JQR*, 32 (1941/42), p. 389 with notes; Samuel K. Mirsky, “Sources of Halakha in Midrashic Literature” [Hebrew], *Talpiot* 1 (1944), pp. 519–523; H. Guggenheimer, “*Pores 'Al Shema'*”, *Moriah* 13:5–6 (Sivan, 5744), p. 89.

297 See Finkelstein, op. cit., p. 388, idem, *JQR*, 33 (1942/43), pp. 29–36; and Lieberman, *Tosefta Ki-fshutah* [above, n. 14], 5:1207, 1209.

aesthetics, the combined study of history, aesthetics, and ideology redounds to the benefit of all three.

VII. Appendices

Appendix A

Pores 'et Shema'

(extension of n. 184)

The literature on *pores* with regard to the Shema' is extensive and complicated.²⁸⁸ The complexity is in part due to the unwarranted mixing of individual and communal norms for the recitation of the Shema'. As a ceremony requiring a quorum of ten, "*pores* the Shema'" refers to its communal recitation.²⁸⁹ Only as a communal recitation does the Shema' constitute an enthronement ceremony. As such, it adheres to contemporaneous Greco-Roman norms for royal acclamation.²⁹⁰ Roman royal acclamations were unanimous and unisonous, *vox omnibus una, mens eadem*.²⁹¹ Similarly, the Midrash praises Israel when it enters the synagogue and recites the Shema' בקול אחד, בדעה וטעם אחד, as opposed to reciting it בטרופן הדעת, זה מקדים וזה מאחר. Another way of stating its proper

288 See Ezra Fleischer, "Toward a Clarification of the Expression 'Pores 'al Shema'" [Hebrew], *Tarbiz*, 41 (1972), pp. 133–144; and A. M. Habermann, *Ketav Lashon Va-Sefer: Reflections on Books, Dead Sea Scrolls, Language and Folklore* [Hebrew], Jerusalem: Reuven Mass, 1973, pp. 222–226.

289 See *M. Megillah* 4:3; and *Massekhet Sofrim* 10:6, ed. Higger, pp. 212–214, with n. 26. R. Nehemiah [above, n. 185] refers to the division of the Shema' specifically as a synagogue practice.

290 See Israel Knohl, "A Parsha Concerned with Accepting the Kingdom of Heaven" [Hebrew], *Tarbiz* 53 (1984), p. 2, who refers to Pauly-Wissowa, 'acclamatio', *Realencyclopädie* I:147–150.

291 See Corippus, *In laudem Justini*, 1:353–355, cited by Sabine MacCormack, *Art and Ceremony in Late Antiquity*, Berkeley: University of California, 1981, pp. 310, 371, who translates: "all with one voice and one mind acclaim him: the one name pleases all" (p. 249).

Shema' liturgy as organized around the three axes of creation, revelation, and redemption.²⁸⁶ Were the liturgy predicated on these three axes they could account for it in its entirety. In actuality, the theme of divine sovereignty alone has the explanatory power to account for the whole liturgical narrative. Only it explains the presence of acclamation rites in the first and third blessings, whether angelic or Israelite. Only it explains the supplanting of the Decalogue by the rabbinic understanding of the Shema'; only it explains the applicability of the term *pores* to the Shema' in emulation of Roman acclamation rites; and only it explains the insertion of "Blessed be the name of His glorious sovereignty for ever and ever" after the Shema' verse. The motifs of creation and redemption are enlisted in its service and not vice versa. In other words, God is not sovereign because He creates and redeems, rather, because He is sovereign He creates and redeems.²⁸⁷ The centrality of the theme of divine sovereignty explains why it permeates the whole piece, whereas the creation motif is limited to the first blessing as the redemption motif is limited to the third except for the aforementioned easily recognizable accretions in the first two blessings.

In sum: the Shema' verse, by virtue of being understood as the text for the realization of divine sovereignty, becomes in the liturgy the covenantal substitute for the Decalogue as well as the theological and literary center of an entire composition on the realization of divine sovereignty. This composition is best titled "The Shema' Liturgy".

VI. Epilogue

Methodological postscript: By complementing historical-critical analysis with literary analysis we were able to disclose the ideology of the liturgy of the Shema' by uncovering its history and revealing its structure. We were also able to unlock its history through the keys of the literary structure and theological agendum. Since historiography can mediate between ideology and

286 As does, inter alios, Joseph Heinemann, *Prayer in the Period of the Tanna'im and Amora'im* [Hebrew], Jerusalem: Magnes Press², 1966, p. 26f. See Appendix C.

287 Indeed, the Palestinian rite incorporated the theme of sovereignty right into the peroration of the blessing on redemption by blessing God as "sovereign of Israel and its redeemer" (בא"י מלך ישראל וגואלו); see Naftali Wieder, "Peraqim Be-Toledot Ha-Tefillah Ve-Ha-Berakhot", *Sinai* 77 (1975), p. 119.

in the *Similitudes*.²⁸⁴

The rabbinic Shema' liturgy was clearly not composed *ex nihilo*. Most of its elements can be accounted for by a combination of Qumran and Temple liturgies. The exception is its generative theme of divine sovereignty. The recognition of the redactional structure hence rounds out the theological argument. A straight linear reading generates the assumption that the temporal integration is predicated on a memory of the past, a perception of the present, and an expectation of the future. It assumes that the unit as a whole is trying to get the reader, in the words of one literary theorist, "to experience that concordance of beginning, middle, and end which is the essence of explanatory fictions".²⁸⁵

In contrast, the chiasmic structure shows how both creation and redemption are adduced as evidence of divine sovereignty. Indeed, it could be argued that the realization of divine sovereignty in the present is what lets the past and future become creation and redemption. Buber showed his appreciation of this connection by noting that "both creation and redemption are true only on the premise that revelation is a present experience". Thus, the liturgy presents a scenario of beginnings getting perceived as creation and endings as redemption by virtue of Israel's response to revelation. Moreover, once the event of revelation gets constructed as an act of realization of divine sovereignty, creation and redemption become understood also as acts that attest to divine sovereignty.

It is thus misleading both historically and conceptually to present the

heavenly realm. This is also the case of *Tobit* 8:15. *The Apocalypse of Abraham* 17–18 and the *Testament of Job* 48 do seem to imitate something heavenly, but they are post-70 CE, as are *Revelation* 4:8 and *Luke* 2:14 which describe angelic praise but no human praise.

283 For example, prayers of *Ma'aseh Merkavah* are arranged to "stress the correspondence of the angelic praise with that of the human worshipper" so that the worshipper will also "recite God's glory or pronounce the name of God" (Michael D. Swartz, "Patterns of Mystical Prayer in Ancient Judaism: Progression of Themes in Ma'aseh Merkavah", ed. P. Fleisher, *New Perspectives on Ancient Judaism*, Vol. 6, Lanham: University Press of America, 1989, p. 177). For the literature that links the Qumran *Qedushah* with *Heikhalot* literature, see Chazon, "The *Qedushah* Liturgy and its History in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls" [above, n. 9], p. 9, n. 6.

284 See, e.g., *I Enoch* 39, 61, 71.

285 Kermode, *The Sense of an Ending* [above, n. 260], p. 35f.

4Q503 and probably those of 4Q408 now provide solid evidence for joint human-angelic praise in the context of blessings for the daily renewal of the heavenly lights".²⁸⁰ The Sabbath Songs (4QShirot 'Olat Ha-Shabbat) are also "in large measure an implicit call to imitate the angels: the community should, in so far as this is possible, reproduce in its liturgical life the liturgical activities around the throne of God".²⁸¹ This linkage between Qumran and the Shema' liturgy is of special import since joint human-angelic praise is prominent elsewhere²⁸² only in *Heikhalot*²⁸³ and Enochic literature, especially

"Blessed".

Also ענו ואמרו, especially in a liturgical context, functions as a hendiadys meaning "they responded by saying", and not "recite and say", as noted by Lieberman, *Studies in Palestinian Talmudic Literature* (above, n. 164), p. 192f. Accordingly, ענה ואמר is used regularly to introduce blessing in liturgical texts from Qumran (see *Discoveries in the Judean Desert* 7:331, index, s.v. ענה; and 4Q266 10, ii 2 with Joseph Baumgarten, "A New Qumran Substitute for the Divine Name and Mishnah Sukkah 4:5", *JQR*, 83 [1992], p. 2). Thus the statements of the War Scroll: "ברוך שמך אל אלים..." (IQM 18:6-6), and "וברכו על עומדם את אל ישראל ואת שם... וענו ואמרו: ברוך אל ישראל..." (IQM 13:1-2, see IQM 14:3-4), should all be rendered as "They blessed ... and responded by saying: Barukh ...". Similarly, the aforesaid *I Enoch* 22:14 should not be translated as "I bless the Lord of Glory and I said 'Blessed be my Lord'" (Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* [above, n. 178], 1:25), but as "I bless the Lord of Glory by saying, 'Barukh my Lord ...'". The introductory formula ענה וענה ואמר occurs with some frequency at Qumran (see IQM 15:7; 16:5; 4Q491 10 ii 14; 11 ii 12; 15 5 with Falk, op. cit., n. 15)) introducing a liturgical address as part of the blessing formula such as: "ברוך אתה: אל ישראל", except it should not be translated "then he shall answer and say, blessed are You, the God of Israel" (Martin G. Abegg, Jr., "Messianic Hope and 4Q285: A Reassessment", *JBL* 113 [1994], p. 83), but rather as "then he shall respond by saying, 'Barukh are You God of Israel'". See Haran, "The Four Blessings and the Five Books in the Book of Psalms" [above, n. 20], p. 11.

280 Chazon, "The *Qedushah* Liturgy and its History in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls" [above, n. 9], p. 14; see Falk, ... *Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls* [above, n. 100], pp. 49-56; idem, "Qumran Prayer Texts and the Temple" [above, n. 211], pp. 95-105; and Moshe Weinfeld, "The Angelic Song Over the Luminaries in the Qumran Texts", eds. D. Dimant and L. Schiffman, *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness*, Leiden: Brill, 1995, pp. 131-157. Both Falk and Weinfeld underscore the considerable commonality of expression between the Shema's first blessing and liturgical expressions at Qumran.

281 Dale C. Allison, Jr. "The Silence of Angels: Reflections of the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice", *RQ* 13 (1988), p. 192.

282 In the Bible, the liturgic emulation of the angels is only indicated in Ps. 103:20-22. Psalm 148 calls on all aspects of creation to praise God, but does not indicate any imitation of the

The first blessing added to introduce the covenantal core also has Qumran parallels. As it blesses God at the daily interchange of the luminaries, so *The Rule of the Community* blesses God “At the beginning of the rule of light in its time, and ... at the beginning of the watches of darkness ...”.²⁷⁸ Also the Qumran *Daily Prayers* contain the refrain: “When the sun goes forth to illumine the earth they shall bless by responding through saying ‘Blessed be the God of Israel’”²⁷⁹ In addition, *11QPS^a* as well as “The Daily Prayers of

278 *1QS* 10:1–2; see Nitzan (above, n. 23), pp. 52–56. Upon seeing the sun rising the Therapeutae would “stretch their hands up to heaven and pray for bright days and knowledge of the truth and the power of keen sighted thinking” (Philo, *The Contemplative Life* 89). This may correspond, “to the two Benedictions preceding the Shema, the one thanking for the light of day, the other for the Torah” (Kaufmann Kohler, “Shema‘ Yisroel: Origin and Purpose of its Daily Recital”, *Journal of Jewish Lore and Philosophy* 1 [1919], p. 260f).

279 *4Q503* 3:12 – *Discoveries in the Judean Desert*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982, 7:105ff.). The common translation as “When the sun goes forth to illumine the earth they shall bless, recite [or answer] and say: Blessed be the God of Israel ...” (see, e.g., James H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Pseudepigraphic and Non-Masoretic Psalms and Prayers*, Vol. 4A. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1997, p. 241) is both infelicitous, unclear (how does one bless, recite/answer, and say something?), and oblivious of Hebrew idiom. Aware of this awkwardness, Florentino Martinez makes a slight improvement by translating: “At the rising of the sun ... they shall bless. Starting to speak [they shall say:] Blessed be the God [of Israel...]” (*The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated*, Leiden: Brill, 1992, p. 407). In actuality, *יברכו* in a liturgical context does not mean “they will bless”, but “uttering a locution beginning with the vocative ‘Barukh!’” (José Faur, “Delocutive Expressions in the Hebrew Liturgy”, *JANES [Ancient Studies in Memory of Elias Bickerman]* 16–17 [1984–1985], p. 51) which is precisely why the line continues *ברוך אל ישראל*. (On *יברך* as a Qumran prescription for reciting a blessing, see Falk, ...*Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls* [above, n. 100], p. 23, n. 14). Thus the demand of Neh. 9:5 to “bless” (*ברכו*) the Lord is implemented by responding with statements that begin with the word *ברוך* in *T. Ta’anivot* 1:11; see ed. Lieberman, *Mo‘ed*, p. 327, n. 55. Similarly, an invitation to bless such as “Bless the Lord your God who is from eternity to eternity” (Neh. 9:5) can be implemented by “Blessed is the Lord, God of Israel (or: our God) from eternity to eternity” (1 Chron. 16:36). On the emended text, see H. G. M. Williamson, “Structure and Historiography in Nehemiah”, *Proceedings of the Ninth World Congress of Jewish Studies*, Panel Sessions, Bible Studies, Jerusalem, 1988, pp. 117–131. Similarly, *1 Enoch* says: “I bless the Lord of Glory [of righteousness who rules forever] by saying: ‘Blessed be my Lord, the Lord of righteousness who rules forever’” (22:14). In all these, “bless the Lord” is a performative as is “hail the king”. One hails the king by saying, “Hail”; one blesses the Lord by saying,

lectionaries beginning with the Decalogue. In the absence of the Decalogue, it was undoubtedly adapted to the needs of introducing the Shema' directly.²⁷⁴

Such a practice of beginning the morning service with a Torah-centered or election-centered blessing is paralleled by the Qumran liturgy, *Daily Prayers*. There the response to the sun shining over the earth is “*Barukh* God of Israel who chose us from among all the nations”.²⁷⁵ The same terminology, “who chose us among all the nations” characterizes the opening rabbinic blessing of biblical lectionary readings, a blessing considered on a par with the second blessing of the Shema'.²⁷⁶ Also, the motifs of the hymn of *The Rule of the Community* that starts: “With the coming of the day and night I will enter the covenant of God, and when evening and morning depart I will recite His ordinances” correlates exactly with the covenantal core of the Shema', particularly the second blessing and the second section. Indeed, it goes on to say, “As soon as I stretch out my hand or my foot I will bless His name”.²⁷⁷

274 See Ginzberg, *Commentary* 1:226. Similar themes will frequently have alternative liturgical formulations. For example, the prayer of R. Zadoq: “R. Eleazar b. R. Zadoq said: ‘My father used to recite a short prayer on the eve of the Sabbath: And on account of the love, Lord our God, with which You have loved Your people Israel, and on account of the compassion, our King, which You have bestowed on the members of Your covenant, You have given us, Lord our God, this great and holy seventh day with love’” (*T. Berakhot* 3:7). The prayer appears in several versions; see Wieder, “The Controversy about the Liturgical Composition ‘Yismah Moshe’ – Opposition and Defence” [above, n. 197], p. 96f.; Abramson, “Le-Toledot Ha-Siddur” [above, n. 95], p. 217; and Heinemann, *Studies in Jewish Liturgy* [above, n. 119], pp. 38–40. Depending on which R. Eleazar b. R. Zadoq is meant, the prayer is either early second century or mid-first century CE. The latter becomes more plausible in the light of the parallels at Qumran in the *Words of the Luminaries*; see Falk, ...*Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls* [above, n. 100], p. 155.

275 4Q503 24–25, 4–5; see Lawrence Schiffman, “Liturgical Texts from Qumran Cave IV”, *Proceedings of the Ninth World Congress of Jewish Studies*, I, Jerusalem, 1986, pp. 183–190; Baumgarten, “4Q503 (Daily Prayers) and the Lunar Calendar” [above, n. 238].

276 See *B. Berakhot* 11b, R. Hamnunah; and *Massekhet Sofrim* 9, ed. Higger, p. 50.

277 1QS 10:13b; see Falk [above n. 211], p. 116. The opening chapter there is also redolent of the first section especially of Deut. 6:5; see Moshe Weinfeld, “Prayer and Liturgical Practice in the Qumran Sect”, eds. D. Dimant and U. Rappaport, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*, Leiden: Brill, 1992, p. 243; idem, “‘They Should Bring all of Their Mind, all of Their Strength and all of Their Wealth into the Community of God’ (1QS 1:12)” [Hebrew], *Te‘udah, Biblical Studies*, 2 (1982), pp. 37–41; Licht, *The Rule Scroll* [above, n. 84], p. 217, ll. 13–14.

the latter only a conceptual one. This is of major significance in determining the purpose behind the rabbinic Shema' liturgy and its chiasmic structure.

In addition to supporting the theological agenda of the whole liturgical composition, the chiasmic construction helps identify the blessing which preceded the lectionary readings in the Temple²⁷¹ as well as indicate how the liturgy of the Shema' and its blessings emerged out of the Temple service. As noted, the Temple readings consisted of the Decalogue and the sections which came to comprise the Shema', followed by *'emet ve-yasiv, et al.* Originally, the Shema' liturgy was composed of a covenantal core, namely, B1, B2, and C. Consisting totally of Deuteronomic material and motifs, it adhered to ancient treaty-covenantal models. It also corresponded to the Temple service *sans* Decalogue. By subsequently prefixing to the core A1 with its motif of creation and suffixing A2 with its motif of redemption, a Deuteronomy-based covenantal ceremony became flanked by the themes of Genesis and Exodus. As similar functioning accretions to an original covenant ceremony, A1 and A2 both contain a coronation ceremony – the first by angels, the second by ancient Israel. Both draw upon past events – Creation or the Exodus – to affirm divine sovereignty in the present. In contrast, B¹ and B² lack a coronation ceremony (their Deuteronomic bent would preclude any angelology)²⁷² as well as the rabbinic blessing formulary since both were already in use before its formulation.²⁷³ Moreover B¹ differs widely in structure and content from A¹, as noted above at the end of the section on the second blessing (D,2).

Both literary structure and theological analysis converge to indicate that the original blessing was a Torah-centered one on the order of the second blessing rather than a creation-centered one on the order of the first. Such a Torah-centered blessing originally served to introduce the series of biblical

271 The identity of the blessing has been debated from the third century (*B. Berakhot* 11b; cf. *J. Berakhot* 1:8, 3c) to the twentieth (Finkelstein, "La kedouscha" [above, n. 239], pp. 17–19; and Ginzberg, *Commentary*, 1:165; see Joseph Tabory, "The Prayer Book [Siddur] as an Anthology of Judaism", *Prooftexts* 17/2 [1997], pp. 124, 131, n. 53).

272 See Moshe Weinfeld, *From Joshua to Josiah: Turning Points in the History of Israel from the Conquest of the Land until the Fall of Judah* [Hebrew], Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1992, pp. 141f., 218; and Tigay, *Deuteronomy* [above, n. 35], p. 57.

273 See Elbogen, "Studies in the Jewish Liturgy" [above, n. 185], pp. 245–247; and Lieberman, *Tosefta Ki-fshutah* [above, n. 14] 1:10f., l.39.

According to the Rabbis, there are other relevant links between the Shema' and the Decalogue. For them, the concluding words of the third section – “I am the Lord your [plural] God” – indicate the sovereignty of God,²⁶⁶ and correspond to the opening of the Decalogue, “I am the Lord your [singular] God”.²⁶⁷ Moreover, the penultimate thought of the third section, “that you not go astray after your heart and eyes after which you lust”, refers, as noted above, “to heretical and idolatrous thoughts”. It thus matches the second saying of the Decalogue and the aforementioned rabbinic understanding of the end of the Shema' verse, “the Lord is One”.²⁶⁸ With this ending and the Shema's beginning, the three sections comprise a liturgical construct based on an envelope figure which begins and ends on the two concomitant themes of divine sovereignty and the rejection of idolatry/polytheism.

Similarly, the lectionary readings of the Temple service, by opening with the first verse of the Decalogue and closing with the last verse of the third section of the Shema', also form such a literary inclusion.²⁶⁹ The Decalogue begins: “I am the Lord your God who took you out of the Land of Egypt ...” (Ex. 20:2), and the third section ends: “I am the Lord your God, who took you out of the land of Egypt, to be your God. I am the Lord your God” (Num. 15:41). The result conforms to a familiar principle of liturgical composition of beginning and ending on the same theme.²⁷⁰

The difference between the Temple lectionary unit and the rabbinic one is that the inclusion of the former consists of a verbal tabulation, whereas that of

sovereignty theme (see R. Judah Hanasi at *T. Berakhot* 2:1). For the development of the sovereignty theme in rabbinic liturgy, see Reuven Kimelman, “Blessing Formulae and Divine Sovereignty in Rabbinic Liturgy”, *Memorial Volume in Memory of Jakob Petuchowski*, eds. S. Fine and R. Langer (forthcoming).

266 See *Sifre Numbers*, *Be-Ha'alotkha* 77, p. 71; and *B. Rosh Hashanah* 32a.

267 Jacob Mann, *The Bible as Read and Preached in the Old Synagogue*, 2 vols. New York: Ktav, 1971, 2:110 (R. Levi).

268 As pointed out to me by Dr. Aharon Shemesh of Bar-Ilan University.

269 As noted by Reuven Hammer, “What Did They Bless?”, *JQR* 81 (1991), pp. 305–324, and Naomi Cohen, *Philo Judaeus: His Universe of Discourse*, Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1995, p. 176. This would argue for the third blessing being generated by the third section, not vice versa. On the issue of priority, see Cohen, *ibid.*, pp. 167–176.

270 חתימתן מעין פתיחתן (*B. Pesahim* 104a). For this phenomenon, see Kimelman, “Psalm 145” [above, n. 173], p. 47, n. 48.

literary as well as the theological apex of the unit:

C: Shema'	
B ¹ : "With Eternal Love"	B ² : "True and Firm"
A ¹ : Creation and Angelic Acclamation	A ² : Redemption and Israelite Acclamation

The core composed of B¹, C, and B² constitutes a covenantal ceremony.²⁶⁴ Since the core does not exhaust the unit, it is clear that there is present more than a biblical-type covenantal ceremony. By incorporating the events of creation and redemption along with their heavenly and historical coronation ceremonies respectively, the appending of A¹ and A² transform an ancient pact form into a comprehensive rite for the realization of divine sovereignty. The result is that the biblical understanding of covenant is updated terminologically and conceptually to the rabbinic understanding of the acceptance of divine sovereignty. What the covenant is to biblical theology, the realization of divine sovereignty is to rabbinic theology.²⁶⁵

264 If C is a single unit, it serves as the apex of the pyramidal structure. If C consists of the original first two paragraphs, the classic chiasmic structure of A1 B1 C1 – C2 B2 A2 emerges. An instructive parallel is found in the structure of the *Sabbath Shirot* from Qumran Cave 4. According to Carol Newsom, the thirteen *Sabbath Shirot* are "constructed ... as a pyramidal structure" ("He Has established For Himself Priests': Human and Angelic Priesthood in the Qumran Sabbath Shirot", ed. L. Schiffman, *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990, p. 102) with six on each side, the seventh being the apex. She also notes that "the sixth through the eighth songs form a distinctive central structure, the top of the pyramid, so to speak, for the Sabbath Shirot" (p. 109). Similarly, the common elements, especially the numerous lexical links between B1 and B2 as well as with C, form a distinctive central structure to top off the pyramid; see Liebreich, "The Benediction Immediately Preceding..." [above, n. 122], pp. 157–165. It should be noted in this regard that the covenant ceremony of Deut. 29:9–14 is also structured chiastically with the central focal point being the verse: "That He may establish you as His people and be your God" (29:12); see Tigay, *Deuteronomy* [above, n. 35], p. 277.

265 Thus *The Rule of the Community* at Qumran alludes to the Shema' by saying: "With the coming of the day and night I shall enter the covenant of God" (*IQS* 10:10) whereas the Rabbis designated it as the acceptance of divine sovereignty. Similarly, the *'emet ve-yasiv* which was part of the Temple liturgy has, as noted above, expressions redolent of covenant confirming ceremonies was rabbinized through the incorporation of the

literature²⁶¹ as well as the second blessing of the Shema' and liturgical poetry.²⁶² The chiasmus, named after the Greek letter *chi* (x), indicates a “criss-cross” arrangement in which the order of the first column is reversed in the second, as in an abcba structure. In chiastic structures the elements form a thematic symmetry. Such organizational devices prove to be more than literary artifice. In making the middle the literary center, the chiasmus empties the ending of any privileged control over sense. Endings remain endings, not culminations.

By balancing the second part with the first part through inversion, the chiasmus of the Shema' liturgy accounts for all the parts while underscoring the centrality of the Shema' as the spatial and ideological fulcrum of the whole structure.²⁶³ Viewing the Shema' and its blessings through its lens produces the following diagram:

A¹ – Blessing for Creation and the Angelic Acclamation of God

B¹ – Blessing for Torah: “With Eternal Love”

C – Shema' (all three biblical sections)

B² – Covenantal Pledge: “True and Firm”

A² – Blessing for Redemption and the Israelite Acclamation of God

Structuring the liturgy as a pyramid makes it obvious that the Shema' is the

261 For antiquity in general, see H.W. Welch (ed.), *Chiasmus in Antiquity*, Hildersheim, 1981. For biblical literature, see Isaac M. Kikawada and Arthur Quinn, *Before Abraham Was: The Unity of Genesis 1–11*, Nashville: Abingdon, 1985, *passim*; Gary A. Rendsburg, *The Redaction of Genesis*, Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1986, pp. 99–106. For the Christian Scriptures, see Nils W. Lund, *Chiasmus in the New Testament*, Chapel Hill: UNCP, 1942, p. 296, and idem, “The Influence of Chiasmus upon the Structure of the Gospels”, *HTR* 13 (1931), pp. 27–48. For rabbinic literature, see Jonah Frankel, “Chiasm in Talmudic-Aggadic Narrative”, in Welch, *op. cit.*, pp. 183–197; and idem, “Structures of Talmudic Legends” [Hebrew], *Studies in Aggadah and Jewish Folklore*, eds. I. Ben-Ami and J. Dan, *Folklore Research Center Studies*, Vol. 7, Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1983, pp. 80–94.

262 See Hayyim Hamiel, “*Ahavah Rabbah*”, *Ma'ayanot*, Vol. 8, Jerusalem: Department for Torah Education and Culture in the Diaspora, 1964, p. 130; and Aharon Mirsky, “Melisat Ha-Miqra Shel Yannai”, ed. B. Luria, *Sefer HM"Y Gevaryahu*, Jerusalem: Kiryat Sefer, 1989, p. 317.

263 As in *IQH* 7:26–33, where it has been noted that “The theology of the psalm is enhanced by the recognition of the chiastic arrangement” (Bonnie Kittel, *The Hymns of Qumran: Translation and Commentary*, SBL Dissertation Series 50, Scholars Press, 1981, p. 108).

liturgy incorporating all mentions of redemption, we would find in it “a figure for the integration of past, present and future which defies successive time”. We would sense with regard to redemption something like what Thomas Mann noted when he said, “in their beginning exists their middle and their end, their past invades the present, and even the most extreme attention to the present is invaded by concern for the future”.²⁶⁰ Moreover, with redemption as the *telos*, it could be argued that from the perspective of the consciousness of the worshiper the unit as a whole makes the point that as ancient Israel acknowledged divine sovereignty and was redeemed so contemporary Israel should do so to be redeemed.

Notwithstanding the lure of this reading and its applicability elsewhere, it does violence to the original order of the events of the Exodus where redemption preceded revelation, and fails to give the theme of divine sovereignty its due. Moreover, while such a reading can account for that part of the composition that forms a path from creation to redemption via the Shema', it cannot account for the inclusion of the pre-Shema' passage, 'ahavat 'olam/'ahavat rabbah, on God's love, and the post-Shema' passage, 'emet ve-yasiv, on the affirmation of the covenant. There is need then for a reading with a more comprehensive interpretive strategy, a strategy that can account for all of the components. Such a reading needs to resist identifying the purpose or *telos* of the composition with its end.

If the Shema' verse is not just the middle, but also the generative center of the whole liturgy, the structure should adhere to an organizational pattern that underscores the verse not just as middle, but as center or pivot. Such a pattern is available through the literary form of the chiasmus. This ancient literary figure for structuring narratives pervades biblical, Christian, and rabbinic

[above, n. 95], pp. 55–57. Sa'adya Gaon's opposition to their inclusion is based on the ideational integrity of each blessing and not on any historical development; see Yosef Tobi, “Sa'adiyah Gaon's Attitude towards *Piyyut*” [Hebrew], eds. S. Elizur et al., *Knesset Ezra: Literature and Life in the Synagogue, Studies Presented to Ezra Fleischer*, Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben Zvi, 1994, p. 246, n. 40; and Fleischer, *The Yozer* [above, n. 60], p. 36, n. 9. His opposition, however, apparently failed to sway his own academy at Sura; see *Siddur Rabbenu Shelomoh b. R. Natan* [above, n. 67], p. 258, n. 23.

260 Both citations are from Frank Kermode, *The Sense of an Ending*, London: Oxford University Press, 1975, p. 71f.

sovereignty in all of reality in order to get Israel to acclaim it as well.²⁵⁶

It is clear from this summary that the Shema' verse is not just the middle, but the generative center of a whole composition on divine sovereignty.²⁵⁷ This has to be emphasized lest one adopt an interpretive strategy that reads the composition only linearly, from beginning to end. Such a reading following the temporal flow is likely to conclude that the beginning point is creation, the midpoint the Shema', and the endpoint redemption. The trouble is that ends easily elide into conclusions if not actual climaxes. As goals give meaning to processes so do literary endings control understandings. Since understanding so often turns out to be a "teleological process" whereby "a sense of totality is the end which governs the process",²⁵⁸ it is imperative to bear in mind which *telos* is controlling the reading.

A linear reading which ends on the motif of redemption can unduly privilege the theme of redemption. This is not to gainsay the significance of the redemptive motif, only its primacy. The hopes for redemption inserted in some rites in the first blessing, and their connection with the realization of divine sovereignty in the second blessing, attest to the resiliency of the motif.²⁵⁹ Indeed, were we to undertake a phenomenological analysis of the

256 See Heinemann, *Studies in Jewish Liturgy* [above, n. 119], p. 14f.

257 Even the second blessing on revelation was formulated to affirm the thesis of divine sovereignty. Both versions of the blessing found in *Seder Rav Amram Gaon* and *Siddur Rav Sa'adyah Gaon* contain requests for the extension of divine sovereignty, the former with ותמלוך עלינו (p. 14, l. 26) and the latter with ומלוך עלינו (p. 14, l. 4). Even those versions that focus only on the unity and acknowledgment of God implicitly confirm the thesis, for "to unify" or "to acknowledge" God serves as the liturgical equivalent of realizing His sovereignty (compare the paytanic expression אייחודך להכתיריך [Shulamit Elizur, *The Piyyutim of Rabbi El'azar Birabbi Qillar* (Hebrew), Jerusalem: Magnes, 1988, p. 236, *me'orah*, l. 2]), as noted by Maimonides (*Sefer Ha-Mitsvot*, positive mitsvot, no. 2) and subsequently by Kadushin (*Worship and Ethics* [above, n. 147], pp. 90, 185; *The Rabbinic Mind*, New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1952, pp. 343–347). Moreover, as noted, the acceptance of the Torah was the primary expression for the acceptance of divine sovereignty. Indeed, the two appear as parallel strophes of the following *piyyut*: נחם ליראיך על מלכותך / בכשרון ששים ושמים קבלו תורתך (published by D. Goldschmidt, *Kobes 'Al Yad* 8 [1975] p. 232).

258 Jonathan Culler, *Structuralist Poetics*, Ithaca: Cornell University, 1975, p. 171.

259 See *Midrash Ps.* 99:1; and Liebreich, "The Benediction Immediately Preceding ..." [above, n. 122], p. 160f. It is unclear when the request for redemption became integral to these blessings; see Ginzberg, *Geonica* [above, n. 62], 1:128; and *Seder Hibbur Berakot*

use of the Song at the Sea in the morning lectionaries before the Shema'.²⁵³ The point is that the redemption of Israel, prefiguring the redemption of humanity, culminates in the universal acknowledgment of divine sovereignty.²⁵⁴

V. The Rhetorical Structure

The linkage of the Shema' verse with the motifs of creation, revelation, and redemption caps the whole liturgical composition as a rhetorical success. All three motifs are enlisted in the service of the theme of divine sovereignty. The oneness, or better – exclusivity,²⁵⁵ of God is supported by re-presenting creation as an expression of divine wisdom, by re-presenting revelation through the antiphonal mode of reciting the Shema', and by prefiguring redemption through the call for God to be One for all. Through the orchestration of all three, the liturgy discloses the evidence for divine

253 See ms. of *Seder Rav Amram Gaon*, p. 9.

254 See Kimelman, "The Literary Structure of the Amidah and the Rhetoric of Redemption" [above, n. 119], p. 212.

255 The concluding words of the Shema' verse, יה' אחד can mean "the Lord is one", as well as "the Lord alone"; see Tigay, *Deuteronomy* [above, n. 35], pp. 65, 438f. The "alone" rendition has been the preferred understanding since Zechariah (14:9). RaShBaM and Ibn Ezra, ad loc., take it as "He alone" as does apparently *J. Berakhot* 3:3, 6c, and the 'emet ve-yasiv prayer by its expression אין זולתך/זולתו ("[There is none but You/but Him]") which adheres to the formulations in Isa. 45:5, 21 as noted by *Mark* 12:32. With regard to creation the point is clearly that God alone is creator. Even the statement, "Whoever declares God's name 'one' acknowledges that He created His world" (*Midrash Leqah Tov*, Gen. 1, 5, ed. Buber, p. 5a), understands "one" as alone. Similarly, the first blessing of the Shema', on creation, refers to God as מלך לבדו ("King alone") in the first part and הוא לבדו ("He alone") in the final part. As beginning and ending, they frame the theme of the blessing. The link between divine singularity and creation undergirds the declaration of Isaiah – "You alone (לבדך) are God of all the kingdoms of the earth. You made the heavens and the earth" (37:16), and that of Nehemiah – "You alone (לבדך) are the Lord. You made the heavens, the highest heaven and all their hosts, the earth and everything upon it, the seas and everything in them" (9:6). Indeed, this link explains the choice of the latter as part of the service that introduces the Shema' liturgy in the morning service. The beginning of the historical recital of *Fourth Ezra* 3:4 also follows on the same lines. On the addition of the word הוא in the version of the Nash Papyrus, see Burkitt, "The Hebrew Papyrus of the Ten Commandments", *JQR* (OS) 15 (1903), pp. 399, 406–408.

loyalty oaths sworn to the sovereign and emperor in the ancient world.²⁴⁶

This link with the Shema' is even more obvious in the extant evening version. That version constitutes an oath²⁴⁷ to accept the Shema', saying: "He is the Lord our God and there is none other and we are Israel His people",²⁴⁸ which reformulates the Shema' verse in reverse order.²⁴⁹

In sum: the retention of the *'emet ve-yasiv* prayer in the rabbinic liturgy, despite it being distinct from the redemption theme of the blessing, attests to the link between the recitation of the Shema' and ancient loyalty pacts.²⁵⁰ The Shema'-Decalogue connection may also have spawned the Shema'-redemption connection. As the covenant at Sinai was grounded in the Exodus – "I am the Lord your God who brought you out of the Land of Egypt" – so the covenantal ceremony of the Shema' came to invoke the Exodus.²⁵¹

Once past redemption is evoked, hope for future redemption cannot be far behind. Accordingly, another Midrash takes the words "the Lord is one" to mean the Lord is one for all. The expectation is that all humanity will accept God as sovereign, as it says, "The Lord shall be king over all the earth. In that day shall the Lord be one and His name one" (Zech. 14:9).²⁵² This type of association accounts for the later appending of the same verse to the liturgical

246 "The Loyalty Oath" [above, n. 142], English Summary, p. xxii. Weinfeld's observation, "This prayer actually constitutes a pledge to take upon oneself the 'yoke of the kingdom of God'", is in line with that of medieval Italian authorities; see *Sefer Ha-Eshkol* [above, n. 18], p. 12f.; *Shibolei Ha-Leqet Ha-Shalem* [above, n. 18], p. 180; and Reif, "Liturgical Difficulties and Geniza Manuscripts" [above, n. 153], pp. 121–122. For the parallels between the *'emet ve-yasiv* prayer and the vassal treaties of Esarhaddon, see Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy* [above, n. 10], p. 353f.

247 קים עלינו. For this rendering, see Saul Lieberman, "The Discipline in the So-Called Dead Sea Manual of Discipline", *JBL* 71 (1952), p. 200, n. 14.

248 *Seder Rav Amram Gaon*, p. 52, l. 16.

249

<u>שמע</u>	<u>אמת ואמונה</u>
.2 יי אלהינו	.1 הוא יי אלהינו
.3 יי אחד	.2 ואין זולתו
.1 שמע ישראל	.3 ואנחנו ישראל עמו

250 By asserting the biblical warrant for *'emet ve-yasiv*, the Talmud (*B. Berakhot* 21a) implicitly confirms its Deuteronomic character.

251 See Soloveitchik, *Shi'urim Le-Zekher Abba Mori Z"L* [above, n. 48], p. 11.

252 *Sifre Deut.* 31, p. 54, l. 5; see Ephraim Urbach, *The Sages: Their Concepts and Beliefs* [Hebrew], Jerusalem: Magnes, 1969, p. 16, n. 7.

Shema' was the need to choose between competing material to prevent the service from unduly burdening the congregation. Accordingly, the effort to introduce the section of Balak/Balaam in the Shema' liturgy was thwarted.²⁴⁴ Only in later amoraic times did the practice of including both liturgical options come into vogue.²⁴⁵

There are several considerations for preferring the Shema' over the Decalogue as the text for proclaiming the authority of divine sovereignty and that of the commandments. The Shema' verse cannot be limited to those who experienced the Exodus. It affirms that our God is the one and only (see below) God who, according to rabbinic interpretation, is to become the God of all. It also establishes the relationship with God on love. Finally, the commitment embraces all of the commandments, not just those of the Decalogue.

It is only because of the tenuous status of the Decalogue to begin with that it could become vulnerable to excision by virtue of external caviling. With the Decalogue gone, the Shema' alone served as the biblical lectionary of the liturgical covenant ceremony.

The fact that the *'emet ve-yasiv* prayer is recited right after the Shema' sections also bespeaks of the liturgy grasping the Shema', *sans* Decalogue, as a covenantal ceremony. This function of the *'emet ve-yasiv* prayer is spelled out by Moshe Weinfeld in the conclusion to his study of ancient fealty oaths:

Just as the treaties of the ancient Near East have their corresponding parallel in the Biblical Covenant so the fealty oath finds its parallel in the Israelite confession of faith as has been crystallized in Jewish liturgy, viz. the *'emet ve-yasiv* prayer. This prayer actually constitutes a pledge to take upon oneself the "yoke of the kingdom of God", and is formulated like the

244 *B. Berakhot* 12b; *J. Berakhot* 1:8, 3c. What marked it for inclusion was Num. 24:9, whose mention of lying and rising evoked the recitation of the Shema'; see *Tanhuma, Balaq* 14, (ed. Buber, 23); and *Num. Rabbah* 20, 20 along with Ginzberg, *Commentary* 1:167, and Joseph Tabory, "Mishlei Balaam U-Qeriat Shema'", *Daf Shevui*, Bar-Ilan, *Parshat Balaq*, 5750, pp. 1–4.

245 A position identified with the fourth-century Babylonian amora R. Pappa; see Meir Bar-Ilan, *The Mysteries of Jewish Prayer and Hekhalot* [Hebrew], Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University, 1987, p. 167, n. 43; and Sperber, *Minhagei Yisrael* [above, n. 243], 2:23f., n. 1.

of a solemn binding of Israel to the service of God alone and obedience to His commandments.²⁴¹

The significance of this replacement of the Decalogue by the Shema' lies in the fact that the Decalogue is a biblical unit whereas the Shema' is a liturgical-ritual construct. The mishnaic understanding of the contiguity of the sections of the Shema' in terms of a two-tiered realization of divine sovereignty culminates the process of the Shema' assuming the role of the Decalogue, thereby vitiating the liturgical function of the Decalogue. As the liturgical correlate, if not surrogate, of the Decalogue, the Shema's recital mode emulates models of covenantal renewal rites in order to evoke Sinai in a manner recalling the original covenant²⁴² just as the Decalogue had done. Bereft of a distinctive covenantal role, the Decalogue fell out of the covenantal ceremony of the Shema'.²⁴³

An additional consideration for not retaining the Decalogue along with the

241 For the biblical connection between covenant and commandment, see Ernest W. Nicholson, *God and His People* [above, n. 142], pp. 210–215. “For the point that the kingdom implies the commandments as its consequence”, see E.P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*, London: SCM Press, p. 85f. For the argument that the love of God focuses primarily on loyalty and obedience, see Robert A. Bascom, “Adaptable for Translation: Deuteronomy 6.5 in the Synoptic Gospels and Beyond”, *A Gift of God in Due Season: Essays on Scripture and Community in Honor of James A. Sanders* (eds. R. Weis and D. Carr), *JSOT Supplement Series 225*, Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1996, pp. 166–183.

242 For the equivalency between acceptance of divine kingship and covenant renewal, see E. P. Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986, p. 141.

243 Even if Fleischer (*Eretz-Israel Prayer* [above, n. 41], p. 271f.) is correct that the Genizah attestations to recitations of the Decalogue as part of, or after, the *Pesuke Dezimra* are traceable back to talmudic times, they no longer constitute, as he notes, part of the covenantal ceremony of the Shema' and its blessings, which, as R. Shelomoh Luria emphasized, is precisely the place from which they were excluded; see Daniel Sperber, *Minhagei Yisrael: Meqorot Ve-Toledot*, 5 vols., Jerusalem: Mossad Harav Kook, 1989–1995, 2:110; and Meir Raffeld, “The Ten Commandments in Prayer, Tradition, Halakhah, and Qabbalah” [Hebrew], *Daat* 42 (1999), p. 90. Were the cavil applicable to the presence of the Decalogue in Jewish prayer it would have been applicable wherever it appeared in the liturgy. Yet it was reintroduced in the biblical lectionaries preceding the Shema' liturgy. Its presence was only problematic as part of the Shema' liturgy. That being the case, its absence has to be explained primarily by its function, or lack of function as the case may be, in the Shema' liturgy and not by any outside caviling.

corresponding statement of the Decalogue while reciting the Shema'. Expanding upon this, Yehudah Ashkenazi advocated that when saying the "the Lord our God" one should commit one's self to "I am the Lord your God", and when saying "the Lord is one" one should commit one's self to "there should be no other gods before me", etc.²³⁸ In sum, as a late Zoharic passage states: "The early *hasidim* instituted the recitation of the Shema' as compensatory for [*ke-neged*] the Decalogue".²³⁹

The relationship between the first Shema' section and the Decalogue has been pointed out by medievals and moderns alike.²⁴⁰ Their equivalency, in general, is supported by the fact that the acceptance of divine sovereignty as well as the biblical covenantal idea both view the love of God as comprised

238 See *Ba'er Hetev, Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim*, 61:1.

239 *Zohar Hadash, Midrash Ruth*, ed. Margoliot, p. 77d; see Menahem Recanati, *Commentary on the Torah* [Hebrew], Jerusalem, 1961, p. 83b. This vitiates any speculation on its replacement; cf. Louis Finkelstein, "La kedouscha et les benedictions du schema", *REJ* 92 (1932), p. 15, n. 4.

240 Gerald J. Janzen, "On the Most Important Word in the Shema' (Deuteronomy VI 4–5)", *VT* 37 (1987), p. 295, makes the case for the Shema' and the opening line of the Decalogue being "cotexts" by noting how "the Shema' is seen to parallel the covenantal formulary as exemplified in the Decalogue". Abudarham [above, n. 95], p. 84, argues for the Shema' as Moses' response to Israel after they heard the Decalogue from God. William Moran, "The Ancient Near Eastern Background of the Love of God in Deuteronomy", *CBQ* 25 (1963), pp. 85–87, observing that "and you shall love the Lord your God,..." in 6:5 presupposes "those who love Me" in 5:10 (Ex. 20:6) argues that the injunction to love the Lord and keep His commandments likely refers to the Decalogue. Ibn Ezra, ad loc., cites an opinion that holds "these words which I command you this day" (Deut. 6:6) to be referring to the Decalogue. And *Midrash Leqah Tov*, ad loc., ed. Buber, p. 11a, takes the phrase to mean "that they be each and every day as new in your eyes as if you had received them today from Mount Sinai". The linkage between the two is furthered by the claim that the Decalogue can be detected in smaller and smaller parts of the Shema'. According to the *Zohar* (3:268a) and RYBA, "in the first section alone there is allusion to the (whole) Decalogue" (cited by Abudarham [above, n. 95], p. 84); whereas, according to Sefer RAVYaH [above, n. 70], 1:20, #33, "in the Shema' verse is contained the [whole] Decalogue". According to *The Prayer of R. Simeon b. Yohai*, the signet (חותמת) of the two tablets of stone in the ark is "Shema' Yisrael", implying that "the intention of the Decalogue is the acceptance of divine sovereignty" (Yehuda Even-Shmuel, *Midreshei Geullah*, Jerusalem: Mossad Bialik, 1954, p. 280).

the redundancy is reflected in the statement: "The sages sought to insert the Decalogue into the recitation of the Shema', but did not because they are all already included".²³³

In later midrashic works, the thematic overlap between the Shema' and the Decalogue is complemented by a chronological one. Thus, "When did Israel say 'Shema'?" the moment that the Holy One, blessed be He, came to Sinai",²³⁴ or more expansively, "From Mt. Sinai [Israel] got to recite the Shema'...[God said] 'I am the Lord your God'. At that moment, they acclaimed the sovereignty of the Holy One, blessed be He, and said to each other, 'Hear O Israel'".²³⁵ Once synchrony is established, it can be averred that, "Anyone who fulfills the Shema' is as if he fulfilled the Decalogue since at the time of the recitation of the Shema' the Decalogue was given".²³⁶

By implying that the recitation of the Shema' obviates the need for the recitation of the Decalogue, these amoraic statements explain the absence of any replacement for it. Medieval authorities made this substitution explicit. Abraham b. Nathan of Lunel argues that the attentive recitation of the three sections of the Shema' is on a par with the recitation of the Decalogue.²³⁷ A generation or so later, *Sefer Kol-Bo*, 10, recommended reflecting on the

233 *Bet Ha-Midrash* [above, n. 194], 6:41.

234 Ginzberg, *Genizah Studies* [above, n. 137], 1:124; *Yalqut Ha-Makhiri* Ps. 44:11, ed. Buber, p. 250.

235 *Deut. Rabbah*, ed. Lieberman, p. 68, see n. 1. R. Levi's comment is here reconstructed by omitting the interpolation of R. Ammi. The explanation of "Hear O Israel" as Israel addressing one another reverberates in the comments of Abudarham [above, n. 95], p. 80, and Judah b. Yaqar, *Perush Ha-Tefillot Ve-Ha-Berakhot* [above, n. 127] 1:30.

236 *Bet Ha-Midrash* [above, n. 194] 6:41, attributed to R. Levi's contemporary, R. Hiyya b. Abba. The comment glosses Ex. 19:16, which marks the day of revelation, with "as morning dawned", thereby establishing the chronological link between the Decalogue and the Shema'. Both *Siddur of R. Solomon* [above, n. 18], p. 166, and Judah b. Yaqar, *Perush Ha-Tefillot Ve-Ha-Berakhot* [above, n. 128], 1:104, correlate the theme of the Sabbath morning service of Moses receiving the Torah with the Torah being given in the morning on the Sabbath. Later on, Moses Makhir, *Seder Ha-Yom*, Jerusalem: Hamesorah, 1978, p. 119, ascribes the idea of Sabbath morning revelation to *B. Shabbat* 86a. The recurring formula for morning prayers at Qumran also intimates dawn as the time of revelation: "Separating light from darkness, He established the dawn through the knowledge of His heart... for He showed them that which they knew not" (*11QPs^a* XXVI, 2-5); see Joseph M. Baumgarten, "4 Q 503 (Daily Prayers) and the Lunar Calendar", *RQ* 12 (1986), p. 403.

237 *Sefer Ha-Manhig* [above, n. 17], 1:86.

mishnaic condoning of interruptions between the sections of the Shema' and between the blessings, R. Judah prohibits such a break between the Shema' and *'emet ve-yasiv* ("True and firm").²²⁷ This prohibition not only allows for the forging of an unbreakable bond between the Shema' and the upcoming theme of the Exodus,²²⁸ but, more importantly, guarantees an uninterrupted link between the recital of the text of the covenant and its affirmation of acceptance. Strictly speaking, the Exodus is not part of the *'emet ve-yasiv*, but of the upcoming *'ezrat 'avotenu* ("Help of our fathers") blessing. In fact, the subsequent requirement of mentioning the motifs of Exodus, divine kingship, the crossing of the Sea, and the slaying of the firstborn in the combined *'emet ve-yasiv – 'ezrat 'avotenu* blessing,²²⁹ bespeaks an original without them.²³⁰

By amoraic times the usurpation of the role of the Decalogue by the Shema' made any recitation of the Decalogue superfluous. R. Levi justified its absence through a point-by-point correspondence to show how the Decalogue is incorporated in the Shema'. For example, "I am the Lord your God" corresponds to "Hear O Israel the Lord our God", and "You shall have no other gods before Me", corresponds to "the Lord is One".²³¹ Similarly, R. Ba saw the Decalogue as the essentials of the Shema'.²³² The awareness of

alone is mentioned in *T. Sotah* 7:7 and *J. Sotah* 7:1, 21b. The notion that a Hebrew recitation is evocative of Sinai is noted by R. Hannanel to *B. Berakhot* 13a (*Perushei Rabbenu Hannanel bar Hushiel La-Talmud*, ed. D. Metzger, Jerusalem: Makhon Lev Sameah, 1990, p. 25). The idea that covenant renewal ceremonies should be performed in their original language accounts for the opinion of R. Simeon b. Eleazar that the curses in the lectionary before Shavu'ot and Rosh Hashanah are to be read in Hebrew (*B. Megillah* 31b); see Meir Bar-Ilan, "Berakhot U-Qellalot Niqra'ot Lifnei Rosh Hashanah", *Sinai* 110 (1992), pp. 33–35.

227 *M. Berakhot* 2:1–2, a point underscored by *Siddur Rav Sa'adya Gaon*, p. 15, l. 17 and p. 27, l. 3.

228 The explanation based on Jer. 10:10 in *B. Berakhot* 14b is homiletical.

229 *T. Berakhot* 2:1 and parallel.

230 For such a minimalist version, see *B. Berakhot* 14b. For the later incorporation of kingship into *'emet ve-yasiv*, see E. D. Goldschmidt, *Mahzor Le-Yamim Ha-Nora'im*, 2 vols., Jerusalem: Koren, 1970, 1:23f.

231 R. Levi, *J. Berakhot* 1:8, 3c. See Ginzberg, *Commentary* 1:162; and Saul Lieberman, *Hilkhot Ha-Yerushalmi*, New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1947, p. 21, note ז, for variants and parallels; and *Rabbenu Bahya*, Deut. 6:5, ed. Chavel, p. 275, with notes.

232 *J. Berakhot* 1:8, 3c.

Shema' verse itself constitutes the acceptance of divine sovereignty. The only additional requirement was mention of the Exodus.²²⁰ In the same vein, the Shema', as noted, is epitomized in the *Qedushah/Sanctus* of the Sabbath *Musaf* by the Shema' verse followed by a call for redemption.

The common terminology for the Shema' verse and the opening line of the Decalogue identifies them as functional equivalents.²²¹ Indeed, tannaitic opinion deemed the Shema' verse unique due to its combining of the acceptance of divine sovereignty with the exclusion of idolatry on the model of the first two sayings of the Decalogue.²²² The trouble is that the verse does not contain an explicit term for sovereignty. Thus, in order to guarantee the understanding of the Shema' verse as an expression of the realization of divine sovereignty, the rabbis inserted right after it the formula, "Blessed be the name of His glorious sovereignty forever and ever".²²³

The formula itself resulted from interpolating the term "sovereignty" into the verse – "Blessed be His glorious name forever" (Ps. 72:19).²²⁴ The interpolation is easily detected by the fact that the result *שם כבוד מלכותו* defies smooth translation. Nonetheless, it is noteworthy that the expression "glorious sovereignty" (*כבוד מלכותו*) matches that of the central verse (v. 11) of Psalm 145, the very psalm dubbed the Shema' of the Psalter.²²⁵

By requiring the recitation of the Shema' verse in Hebrew, audibly, clearly, and sequentially, Rabbi Judah assures that the confirmation of the covenant conforms to its perceived original modality.²²⁶ Similarly, despite the

Prayerbook" [Hebrew], *Tarbiz* 63 [1994], p. 395); see *Mahzor Vitry*, p. 459 [above, n. 67]; *Sefer Ha-Manhig* [above, n. 17] 2:419; and Fleischer, *Eretz-Israel Prayer* [above, n. 41], p. 307, n. 59.

220 *B. Berakhot* 13b, see also R. Meir there.

221 See Yeruham Perla, *Sefer Ha-Mitzvot Le-Rabbenu Sa'adyah*, 3 vols., Jerusalem: Keset, 1973, 1:73d.

222 *Sifre Num.* 115, ed. Horovitz, p. 126, l. 7. According to R. Ishmael (*Sifre Num.* 112, p. 121, ll. 9–10) the first saying of the Decalogue is comprised of both themes; cf. *B. Horayot* 8a, and *Makkot* 24a.

223 As noted by Rabbenu Bahya to Deut. 5:4, ed. Chavel, 3:277, l. 6f.; and Joshua Ibn Shu'eib, *Derashot Ibn Shu'eib*, ed. Sh. Abramson, Jerusalem: Maqor, 1969, p. 19b; see Appendix B.

224 See Appendix B.

225 See Kimelman, "Psalm 145" [above, n. 174], p. 58, n. 115.

226 *M. Berakhot* 2:3; *B. Berakhot* 13a; *Megillah* 17a; *Sotah* 32b. The Hebrew requirement

theory that the acceptance of God's sovereignty precedes the acceptance of His commandments.²¹⁵ He understood the words "I am the Lord your God" (of the Decalogue as well as those of Lev. 18:2) to mean, "Am I not He whose *sovereignty you have accepted* at Sinai?" When the Israelites replied, 'Yes', [God continued] 'As you accepted My sovereignty accept My decrees – You shall have no other gods besides Me'".²¹⁶

The thesis which argues for the logical priority of the acceptance of God's sovereignty over that of the commandments was applied by R. Simeon's younger contemporary, R. Joshua b. Korha, to the order of the Shema',²¹⁷ in contrast to R. Simeon's aforementioned functional explanation of the sequence of the two sections.²¹⁸

By including in the Mishnah R. Joshua's theological account for the sequence of the Shema', as opposed to R. Simeon's, R. Judah Hanasi confirmed the Shema' as the Decalogue's replacement. This shift from the Decalogue to the Shema' is confirmed by two other statements that attest to his understanding of the Sinaitic revelation and the recitation of the Shema' as equivalents. In the first, he says, "When they all stood before Mt. Sinai to receive the Torah they all made up their minds as one *to accept divine sovereignty*" (emphasis added),²¹⁹ whereas in the second he holds that the

215 *Mekhilta, Ba-Hodesh, Parsha 6*, ed. Horovitz-Rabin, p. 222f. R. Eleazar Ha-Qallir integrated the two in saying: "When my servants accepted the yoke of my kingdom, I commanded: You shall have no other gods besides Me" (cited by Mirsky, *Ha'Piyut* [above, n. 88], p. 125).

216 For this reading see *Mekhilta, Ba-Hodesh, Parsha 6*, p. 222, n. 6 (ed. Lauterbach, p. 238); *Sifra, Ahare Mot, Pereq 13:3*, ed. Weiss, p. 85b; and Adolph Büchler, *Studies in Sin and Atonement in the Rabbinic Literature of the First Century*, New York: KTAV, 1967, p. 39f. Also Nahmanides to Deut. 22:6, ed. Chavel, 2:451, reads: "The Holy One, blessed be He, said: 'You accepted my sovereignty – I am the Lord your God, accept My decrees – You shall no other gods besides Me'". On the biblical image of God as king at Sinai, see Weinfeld, *Justice and Righteousness in Israel and the Nations* [Hebrew], Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1985, pp. 109–112, 139–141.

217 *M. Berakhot 2:2*

218 *Sifre Num.* 115, p. 126; *B. Berakhot 14b*; see Kadushin, *Worship and Ethics* [above, n. 147], p. 80.

219 *Mekhilta, Ba-Hodesh, Parsha 5*, p. 219. In the same vein, the *piyyut* בגלל אבות בנים גידל, states: "God said to His people: 'I am the Lord Your God who took you out of Egypt, out of the house of bondage' (Ex. 20:2). Everyone opened their mouth and said: 'May the Lord reign forever and ever'" (Yerahmiel Brody, "The Conclusion of Sa'adya Gaon's

attributing such serious surgery of the liturgy to such a cavil alone. It is difficult to understand how the recitation of the Decalogue along with the three sections of the Shema', with their emphasis on compliance with all the commandments, supports the charge that only the Decalogue is Sinaitic. Surely, the multiple references to commandments therein cannot pertain to the Decalogue alone. Had the Decalogue been recited alone the charge would have had more cogency, but such was not the case. Moreover, it is hard to accept that such cavils would lead to the excision here if trinitarian explanations for the *Qeddushah/Sanctus* or the Shema' verse elsewhere did not.²¹⁴

It is preferable to ascribe the absence of the Decalogue to its role having been assumed by the Shema'. This is evident from the tannaitic discussion of the internal logic of their respective sequences. According to R. Simeon b. Yohai, the sequence of the first two sayings of the Decalogue adheres to the

people made the calf and served idols... So then the Law is easy and light.... But when the people denied God... He bound them with the Second Legislation (218–222)". This points to a group that limited the Sinaitic revelation to the Decalogue and the judgments. The judgments are apparently referring to the laws of Exodus noted in Ex. 21:1, which, as the Decalogue, appear before the golden calf episode of Exodus 32. Since the *Didascalia Apostolorum* is dated at the earliest to third century Syria, it could easily be the position referred to as "the carping of the *minim*" by the Palestinian Talmud. (On *minim* as Jewish Christians in Palestinian texts, see Reuven Kimelman, "Birkat Ha-Minim and the Lack of Evidence for an Anti-Christian Jewish Prayer in Late Antiquity", eds. E. P. Sanders et al., *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981, pp. 228–232.) This of course is long after the Decalogue fell out. Apparently after the Shema' superceded the Decalogue, as we have explained, third- and fourth-century Palestinian amoraim accounted for its absence by pointing out the correspondence between the Decalogue and the Shema' and by attributing its excision to the carping of the *minim*, a claim that had contemporary resonance. While the cavil of the *minim* fails to explain the excision of the Decalogue historically, it does explain why it was not reintroduced. Excision, however, requires a stronger reason than maintenance. This context explains why the Babylonian Talmud (*B. Berakhot* 12b) is unaware of the content of the cavil of the *minim*.

214 See David Berger, *The Jewish-Christian Debate in the High Middle Ages: A Critical Edition of the Nizzahon Vetus*, Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1979, p. 265; Leon Feldman, *Commentary on the Legends in the Talmud by R. Solomon Ben Abraham Ben Aderet* [Hebrew], Jerusalem: Mossad Harav Kook, 1991, p. 144; and Yehudah Liebes, "Christian Influences in the Zohar" [Hebrew], *Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Thought* 2 (1982/83) p. 44, n. 2.

alone is alluded to in *The Rule of the Community*²¹¹ and in *Pseudo-Aristeas*.²¹² By the time of *M. Berakhot* and the formalization of the liturgy, the Shema' reigns supreme.

In the tannaitic period the Decalogue no longer appears in the liturgy, purportedly because a group of *minim* made the heretical claim that the Decalogue alone was given at Sinai.²¹³ There are major difficulties to

is insufficiently specific to qualify as a reference to the Shema'. The speculations of Birger Gerhardsson reflected in the title of his book, *The Shema in the New Testament: Deut 6:4–5 in Significant Passages* (Lund: Novapress, 1996), remain just that.

210 On the other hand, there are Qumran tefillin containing the Decalogue but without the Shema'; see Yigal Yadin, "Tefillin (Phylacteries) from Qumran (*X Q Phyl 104*)", *Eretz Israel* 9 (1969), pp. 60–85; and O. Keel, "Zeichen der Verbundenheit", *Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis* 38 (1981), pp. 169–171.

211 "With the coming of day and night I enter the covenant of God / And when evening and morning depart I shall recite His laws" (*IQS 10:10*). Daniel Falk's ("Qumran Prayer Texts and the Temple", eds. D. Falk et al., *Sapiential, Liturgical, and Poetical Texts from Qumran*, Leiden: Brill, 2000, p. 116) claim that "His laws" alludes to the Decalogue which was recited together with the Shema' is unlikely since the passage refers also to evening which is an unattested time for the recitation of the Decalogue. Indeed, no reference to the law is made three lines later where it says, "As soon as [I] go out or come in, to sit down or rise up, and while I recline on my couch, I will cry out to Him".

212 *Letter of Aristeas* (160): "He [God] commands that 'on going to bed and rising' men should meditate on the ordinances of God".

213 See *J. Berakhot* 1:8, 3c. Even those who accept this explanation for the excision of the Decalogue cannot agree on the identity of the heretics or when the excision took place; see Abraham Joshua Heschel, *Theology of Ancient Judaism* [Hebrew], 3 vols., 1–2, London: Soncino Press, 1962–65; Vol. 3, New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1995, 2:108–110; and Ephraim Urbach, "The Place of the Ten Commandments in Ritual and Prayer [Hebrew]", ed. B. Z. Segal, *The Ten Commandments as Reflected in Tradition and Literature Throughout the Ages*, Jerusalem: Magnes, 1985, pp. 132f., 138. The source (*Yalqut Shimoni* 1:752, ed. Heiman-Shiloni, *Numbers*, p. 327) that both Heschel and Urbach cite about the extra-Decalogue commandments being mediated through Moses may be taking its cue from our case and not vice-versa as it is extant only in an early medieval source. With regard to the claim itself, it has been argued that when James refers to the "whole law", and cites only the Decalogue (*James* 2:11–12), that he identifies the law with the Decalogue. James, however, is just illustrating the Law's prohibitions by noting murder and adultery and not making a statement about the nature of the whole law. On the other hand, the *Didascalia Apostolorum Syriacae*, Ch. 16, does reflect a position close to that which holds that the Decalogue alone was given at Sinai when it states: "The Law then consists of the Ten Words and the Judgements which God spoke before the

M. Tamid of the morning Temple service,²⁰⁴ albeit not in early Christianity.²⁰⁵ In Exodus 34, of the two, the Decalogue alone represents the covenant. In Deuteronomy, the Decalogue, though associated with the Shema', retains its place as the document of the Sinaitic covenant.²⁰⁶ The alleged allusion to the Shema' in the Psalms adds to the early evidence for the association of the Shema' with the Decalogue. In the Nash Papyrus, in ancient tefillin, and in *M. Tamid* the two are cotexts. Also, the Septuagint distinguishes the Shema' by adding the same introduction that appears in the Nash Papyrus: "These are the statutes and the laws which the Lord [Nash Papyrus: Moses] commanded the Israelites in the wilderness when they went out of Egypt".

The victory, as it were, of the Shema' over the Decalogue is reflected in the liturgical canonization of the Shema' and the concomitant excision of the Decalogue. This change of status is reflected in the explanation of *Sifre Deut.* for the absence of the Decalogue from the daily recitation and from the tefillin as opposed to the presence of the Shema' in both.²⁰⁷ The result is that the Shema' alone is debated by the Houses of Hillel and Shammai.²⁰⁸ It alone is mentioned in *The Gospel of Mark*, though never explicitly in the Pauline corpus.²⁰⁹ It alone appears in the tefillin of the caves of Murabba'at.²¹⁰ And it

op. cit., p. 122f. For the non-rabbinic tefillin that retained the Decalogue, see Jerome's commentary to *Matthew* 23:6 (Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, 26:174) and to Ezek. 24:15 (ibid., 25:230, top) along with Mann, "Changes in the Divine Service of the Synagogue" [above, n. 48], p. 290f; and A. Haberman, "Tefillin in Ancient Times" [Hebrew], *Eretz Israel* 3 (1954), p. 175.

203 *IQS* 10:10; see Falk, ...*Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls* [above, n. 100], pp. 113–116.

204 *M. Tamid* 5:1. For the placing of this document within first-century polemics, see Meir Bar-Ilan, "Are the Tractates *Tamid* and *Middoth* Polemical?" [Hebrew], *Sidra* 5 (1989), pp. 27–40.

205 The only clear reference to the whole Decalogue in early Christianity is that of Irenaeus (*Against Heresies* 15:1; 16:3,4) which lacks any reference to current usage; see Reuven Kimelman, "A Note on Weinfeld's 'Grace After Meals in Qumran'", *JBL* 112 (1993), p. 695f.

206 See, for example, Deut. 4:13; 5:3; 9:9,11; and the discussion in Arie Toeg, *Lawgiving at Sinai* [Hebrew], Jerusalem: Magnes, 1977, p. 64ff.

207 *Sifre Deut.* 34–35, ed. Finkelstein, pp. 60–63.

208 *M. Berakhot* 1:3.

209 *Mark* 12:29–30. David Flusser (*Jewish Sources In Early Christianity* [Hebrew], Israel: Sifriat Ha-Po'alim, 1979, p. 31) accordingly dates Mark after 70 CE. *Matthew* 22:34–40 and *Luke* 10:25–28 lack the Shema' verse. Paul's statement that God is one (Romans 3:30)

historical and cosmic, as it were, ramifications of what they are doing by participating, however vicariously, in both the liturgy of the celestials and that of their progenitors. This linkage with both horizontal and vertical vectors of significance validates the ceremony as well as inspiring Israel to join in by realizing for itself divine sovereignty. Understanding the Shema' verse as the *telos* of the whole unit, as will be shown in part V, confirms this construal of the liturgy.¹⁹⁹

IV. The Shema' and the Decalogue

The coupling of the Shema' and the Decalogue harks back to the Bible. It appears in Deuteronomy 5–6, possibly Psalms 51 and 80,²⁰⁰ the Nash Papyrus,²⁰¹ Qumran tefillin,²⁰² possibly Qumran liturgy,²⁰³ and the report in

Sabbath and holiday liturgy (see Fleischer, "The Diffusion of the Qedushot of the 'Amidah and the *Yozer* in the Palestinian Jewish Ritual" [above, n. 169], pp. 266, 274). This coheres with the idea of the Sabbath as the day of divine sovereignty par excellence in the Bible (see M. Weinfeld, "Sabbath, Temple and the Enthronement of the Lord – The Problem of the Sitz im Leben of Genesis 1:1–23", *Alter Orient und Altes Testament* 212 [=Melange bibliques et orientaux en l'honneur de M. Henri Cazelles] 1981, p. 508f.) at Qumran, especially in the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* (see Anna Schwemer, "Gott als König und seine Königsherrschaft in der Sabbatlieder aus Qumran", *Königsherrschaft Gottes und himmlischer Kult in Judentum, Urchristentum und in der hellenistischen Welt* [eds. M. Hengel and A. Schwemer], Tübingen: Mohr, 1991, pp. 64–76, 117), and in rabbinic literature (see L.J. Liebreich, "The Sabbath in the Prayerbook" [Hebrew], *Do'ar Jubilee Volume in Honor of Its Thirtieth Anniversary* [1952], pp. 255–262; *B. Rosh Hashanah* 31a; the addition of the Cambridge ms. to *M. Tamid* 8:4; and *Avot De-Rabbi Natan*, ed. Schechter, p. 152, l. 9).

199 For the change of the public liturgical use of the Shema' from an acclamation to a testimony, see the end of Appendix A.

200 See Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy* [above, n. 10], pp. 257–262.

201 For recent literature on the Nash Papyrus and doubts about its liturgical use, see E. Fleischer, *Eretz-Israel Prayer* [above, n. 41], p. 259, n. 1. Still, as E.P. Sanders says, the fact that it is "a single sheet, not part of a scroll ... makes it likely that it was used for devotional or educational purposes" (*Jewish Law from Jesus to the Mishnah*, London: SCM Press, 1990, p. 68). According to Esther Eshel, "The similarity between the form in which the Decalogue was written in the Nash Papyrus and the various tefillin or mezuzah found at Qumran apparently indicates that the Nash Papyrus served as a tefillin or mezuzah" ("4QDeutn – A Text that Has Undergone Harmonistic Editing", *HUCA* 72 [1991], p. 123, n. 36).

202 See *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* VI, Qumran Grotte 4, II:52, 59–62, 74f; and Eshel,

the heavenly acclamation of God as sovereign.

The link among the three is strengthened through the appellative for beloved – 'ahuvim. In the first blessing, 'ahuvim refers to the beloved angels singing God's praises as part of, or as prelude to, the realization of divine sovereignty;¹⁹⁵ in the third blessing, 'ahuvim refers to beloved, ancient Israel doing so;¹⁹⁶ and in the second blessing, beloved Israel is called upon to follow suit.¹⁹⁷ In each case, it is the beloved who realize divine sovereignty, thereby calling attention to the overlap between divine rule and divine love.

By consciously patterning the ceremony for the realization of divine sovereignty as well as that of ancient Israel and the angels on a common model, the liturgy generates a convergence among worshipers, predecessors, and angels.¹⁹⁸ The convergence induces the worshipers to believe in both the

195 כולם מקבלים עליהם עול מלכות שמים... כולם אהובים (Seder Rav Amram Gaon, p. 13, ll. 10–13).

196 שבו אהובים... והודאות למלך... הודו והמליכו (Seder Rav Amram Gaon, p. 20, ll. 13–18). The reference to Israel as 'ahuvim lacks an explicit biblical reference. (For postbiblical references to Israel as 'ahuvim, see Louis Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews*, 7 vols., Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1968, 5:207f.) The version זרע אהובים (Mann, "Genizah Fragments" [above, n. 67], p. 295) can be derived by combining Isa. 41:8 and 2 Chron. 20:7, as 'ahuvim itself may be derived from Isa. 63:9 ("Out of His love and pity He redeemed them"). The application of 'ahuvim to Israel here, however, likely echoes its usage with regard to the angels; see משרחי אהובים (Schäfer, *Synopse* [above, n. 176], #160). The linkage between Israel and the angels is tightened in the version אהובים לאל (J. Sermonetta, "The Liturgy of the Jews of Sicily" [Hebrew], *The Jews of Italy: Studies*, Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1988, p. 165) which echoes the angels שרי רומי of the first blessing (Seder Rav Amram Gaon, p. 13, l. 2).

197 See Malachi 1:2. A *piyyut* and some versions (see *The Persian Jewish Prayer Book* [above, n. 67], p. 68, l. 8 and note) contain the line, "... on Mt. Sinai, [Moses] received the Torah and gave [it] to *yedidim*"; see N. Wieder, "The Controversy about the Liturgical Composition 'Yismah Moshe' – Opposition and Defence", *Studies in Aggadah, Targum and Jewish Liturgy in Memory of Joseph Heinemann* (eds. J. Petuchowski and E. Fleischer), Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1981, p. 93f. The term of endearment, *yedidim*, is used in Ps. 60:7 = 108:7, 127:2, and Jer. 11:15. In the *Hodayot Manuscript* (4Q427 7 i 13), the term appears as a vocative summoning angels or humans to render praise to God; see E. Schuller, "A Hymn from a Cave Four Hodayot Manuscript: 4Q427 7 i + ii", *JBL* 112 (1993), p. 614. *B. Menahot* 53b identifies *yedidim* with Israel. The related term *dodim* is also used to designate beloved Israel; see, e.g., the *Yoser* of Yose b. Nissan [Joseph Alberdani] for the seventh day of Passover in Israel Davidson, *Genizah Studies III*, New York: Hermon Press, 1969, p. 96, l. 10.

198 It seems that in the Palestinian rite, the angelic acclamation originally appeared only in the

God, the Lord is One”, by explaining its origins as a response to the opening of the Decalogue, “*I am the Lord your God*”.¹⁹²

This understanding of the recitation of the Shema’ verse as an antiphon parallels the liturgical recitation of the Song at the Sea and the angelic *Qedushah*. It is possible that eventually the Shema’ was sung by the congregation in choral fashion as were the antiphons of the first and the third blessing.¹⁹³ In any case, the ancient synagogal recitation of the Shema’ verse serves to reenact Israel’s acceptance at Sinai of God as sovereign.¹⁹⁴

The result is that all three events which mark the realization of divine sovereignty are enacted liturgically through an antiphonal performance: the Shema’ actualizes the Sinaitic encounter; the Song at the Sea reenacts ancient Israel’s realization of divine sovereignty; and the angelic *Qedushah* presents

192 According to the version of a synagogue of Fostat the blessing says אמר לעמו אנכי יי אלהיך כול (Cambridge ms. TS H 12/11[a] a photostat of which appears in Ezra Fleischer, *Eretz-Israel Prayer* [above, n. 119], after p. 320, the last two lines). For the possibility of this liturgy reflecting ancient Palestinian practice, see Ezra Fleischer, “Le-Sidrei Ha-Tefillah Be-Veit Ha-Keneset” [above, n. 128], p. 218f.; and Mordechai Friedman, “A Controversy for the Sake of Heaven: Studies in the Liturgical Polemics of Abraham Maimonides and his Contemporaries” [Hebrew], *Te’udah* 10 (1996), p. 250.

193 See Fleischer, *The Yozer* [above, n. 60], p. 37.

194 Similarly the public reading of the Torah was supposed to take its cue from Sinai (*J. Megillah* 4:1 74d; see end of *Deut. Rabbah* 7, 8). Subsequently, the standing during the reading was explained in terms of such a reenactment (*Mishnah Berurah* to *Shulkhan Arukh*, *Orah Hayyim*, 146:4, n. 19, a practice which allegedly harks back to R. Meir of Rothenburg) as was the annual reading of the Decalogue (*Pesikta De-Rav Kahana*, ed. Mandelbaum, 12, p. 204; *Bet Ha-Midrash*, ed. Jellinek, 6:40), indeed its special cantillation on Shavu’ot was meant to exemplify the original revelation (דומגת מתן תורה [Hizkuni at Ex. 20:14]). Its daily recitation could also evoke Sinai (*Bet Yosef* to *Tur Orah Hayyim* 1, s.v. *ve-tov*). For the *Zohar* (2:206/a) not only does the public lectionary reenact Sinai, but also “Anyone involved in [the study of] Torah is as if he stands each day on Mt. Sinai and receives the Torah” (3:179b); see Eleazar Azikri, *Sefer Haredim*, Jerusalem, 1958, p. 154. Based on Deut. 4:9–10, Maimonides (*The Epistle to Yemen*, chap. 1) deemed it mandatory to bear Sinai constantly in mind, an opinion apparently held also by Nahmanides; see *Talmudic Encyclopedia* [above, n. 22], 12:212. Medieval Ashkenaz designed ceremonies for the induction of children into the study of Torah whose purpose was to evoke the giving of the Torah at Sinai; see Ivan Marcus, *Rituals of Childhood: Jewish Acculturation in Medieval Europe*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996, pp. 15–29, 32, 46, 80, 82, 97f.

As the biblical example for the realization of divine sovereignty, the Song at the Sea serves as the paradigm for the synagogal realization of divine sovereignty. In saying, "This is my God", Israel acclaimed God sovereign at the sea:

When the Holy One, blessed be He, revealed Himself at the Sea, not one of them had to ask: Which one is the king? On the contrary, as soon as they saw Him, they recognized Him, and all of them loudly acclaimed, "This is my God".¹⁸⁹

Those Genizah versions of the third blessing that replace "This is my God" by "The Lord is our King", or some such variant, make this linkage explicit.¹⁹⁰

In addition to the Song at the Sea, the Sinaitic revelation served as a model for the synagogal realization of divine sovereignty. According to the Midrash, the antiphonal recitation of the Shema' verse imitates the Sinaitic experience. After concluding that "The Lord our God, the Lord is One", constitutes the formula for the realization of divine sovereignty, the Midrash asks:

How did Israel get to recite the Shema'? R. Pinhas b. Hama said: Israel got to recite the Shema' from the Revelation of Sinai. How is this so? You find that it was with this word [Shema'] that God opened at Sinai. He said to them: "Hear O Israel, I am the Lord your God". They responded saying: "The Lord our God, the Lord is One".¹⁹¹

R. Pinhas accounts for the practice of the synagogue response, "The Lord our

Jewish Thought 6/1–2, 1987, pp. 223–226; and Joseph Gikatila, *Sha'are Orah*, 2 vols., Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1970, 1:240). The modality of two voices responding to each other followed by them in unison is precisely how Yannai presents the recitation of the Shema' saying: זה לזה משמיעים ויחד משמיעים (Rabinovitz, *The Liturgical Poems of Yannai* [above, n. 46] 2:141, l. 38).

189 *Mekhilta, Shir[a]ta*, 3, ed. Horovitz-Rabin, p. 127, translated by Goldin, *The Song at the Sea* [above, n. 170], p. 115; see *Pesiqta Rabbati* 10, ed. Friedmann, p. 39b with discussion of parallels.

190 See Schechter, "Genizah Specimens" [above, n. 67], p. 656; Mann, "Genizah Fragments" [above, n. 67], pp. 294f., 307, 320f.; Elbogen, "Studies in the Jewish Liturgy" [above, n. 185], p. 247; and Fleischer, *The Yozer* [above, n. 60], pp. 5, 52, 161f., 354, and 361.

191 *Deut. Rabbah* 1:31. Note that the section immediately preceding the Decalogue begins, "Moses called to all of Israel and said to them, 'Hear O Israel'..." (Deut. 5:1). This was brought to my attention by Dr. Arnold Wieder of Boston Hebrew College.

Shema' is stated by R. Nehemiah:

They recited [the Song at the Sea] as people recite the Shema' in the synagogue as its says, "*And they said saying*" (Ex. 15:1) – This teaches that Moses initially opened the matter and Israel responded and finished with him. Moses said, "*Then sang Moses*", and Israel said, "*I will sing unto the Lord*". Moses said, "*The Lord is my strength and might*", and Israel said, "*This is my God and I will glorify Him*".¹⁸⁵

According to R. Nehemiah, since the double reference to "saying" ("*and they said saying*") indicates two voices,¹⁸⁶ the Song is to be recited antiphonally as is the Shema' in the synagogue. In the Talmud, the same R. Nehemiah is recorded as saying: "The precentor divides (*pores*) the Shema', he initiates and they respond after him".¹⁸⁷ The leader says, "Hear O Israel", and the congregation responds, "The Lord our God, the Lord is One". Just as one party did not intone the whole Song at the Sea or one set of angels utter the whole *Qedushah* verse, so no one party declaimed the whole Shema' verse.¹⁸⁸

185 *T. Sotah* 6:3, ed. Lieberman, p. 183f. ll. 31f.; see *M. Sotah* 3:4; and *J. Sotah* 5:6, 20c, along with the analysis of Ismar Elbogen, *Studien zur Geschichte des jüdischen Gottesdienstes*, Berlin: Mayer und Muller, 1907, p. 7; and idem, "Studies in the Jewish Liturgy", *JQR*, 18 (1906), pp. 591–594.

186 See Eleazar b. Judah of Worms, *Perushei Siddur Ha-Tefillah La-Roqeah* [above, n. 72], 1:214, n. 16.

187 *B. Sotah* 30b. On *pores*, see Appendix A.

188 Similarly, the Midrash splits up each verse from Ps. 118:25–28 between the Jerusalemites and Judeans, but with regard to the final verse (119) says: "The Jerusalemites and Judeans open their mouths and praise together the Holy One, blessed be He: 'O give thanks to the Lord, for He is good, for His mercy endures forever'" (*Midrash Ps. 118:22 with Yalqut Ha-Makhiri*, Ps. 118:49). A Midrash also divides up the *Qedushah* in the form of an acclamation with one voice declaiming one verse, the other the second verse, and both declaiming in unison the third: "When Moses went up on high he found one group saying: 'Holy, Holy, Holy is the Lord of hosts the whole earth is full of His glory'. And one group saying: 'Blessed is the glory of God from its place'. They all responded in unison saying: 'The Lord shall reign forever; your God, Zion, for all generations. Halleluyah'" (as cited by Eleazar b. Judah of Worms, *Ha-Roqeah Ha-Gadol*, 362, ed. B. Schneerson, Jerusalem: Osar Haposqim, 1967, p. 250; see idem, *Sodei Razaya*, ed. Sh. Weiss, Jerusalem: Sha'are Ziv, 1988, p. 89; *Pesiqta Rabbati*, 20, ed. Friedmann, p. 97a; *Beit Ha-Midrash*, ed. Jellinek, 1:59, 2:39, 5:165 with Meir Bar-Ilan, "The Idea of Crowning God in Hekhalot Mysticism and the Karaitic Polemic", *Early Jewish Mysticism, Jerusalem Studies in*

in the Shema' by interpolating "*Blessed be the name of His glorious sovereignty for ever and ever*" after the "One" of the Shema' verse (see below). All three converge to create a threefold link between divine oneness and sovereignty.

Each of the participants in this symphony of divine oneness and sovereignty realize one of the links in their own way. Ancient Israel realizes it through intoning the Song at the Sea, the supernal angels realize it through chanting the *Qedushah*,¹⁸² whereas worshipping Israel realizes it through reciting the Shema' verse, as will be discussed below.¹⁸³ In each case the recitation is as performative as it is descriptive. It seeks to extend divine sovereignty by hailing God as monarch. Through praying the total composition, divine sovereignty is realized in the past, in heaven, and on earth. By responding to the three events through which it was made manifest, namely, creation, Sinai, and the Exodus, the worshiper is primed to realize it in the present. In this manner, the Shema' and its blessings form a tapestry through which are woven three double strands for the realization of God's singular sovereignty.

III. The Shema' Verse

Just as the angelic *Qedushah* and the Song at the Sea consist of a verse or verses divided and recited antiphonally, so does the liturgical performance of the Shema' verse. This performance mode is rooted in ancient models of royal acclamation.¹⁸⁴ The commonality between the Song at the Sea and the

literature, its presence here evokes the parallel in the first blessing as does the divine name מלך אל חי וקיים. Both reinforce the commonality between the first and third blessings by underscoring the symmetry between the praise of the angels and that of ancient Israel.

182 This understanding of the *Qedushah* verse obviates any need for including Ezek. 3:12. The reason for its inclusion will be dealt with in my aforementioned study of the *Qedushah*.

183 Heinemann, *Studies in Jewish Liturgy* [above, n. 119], p. 14, underscored the thematic linkage between the three. This triangle, as it were, composed of ancient Israel, of worshipping Israel, and of the angels may have a precedent in Qumran, where, as Wacholder notes, the most important organizing idea used by the compiler in assembling *11QPs^a* is "that both men and angels join in pronouncing *hodus* and *halleluyahs* that are modelled after the Song at the Sea" ("David's Eschatological Psalter *11Q Psalms^a*", *HUCA* 59 [1988], p. 45). Joint human and angelic choirs appear also in *The Thanksgiving Hymns (1QH)* 11:14, and 26 and in the *Sabbath Shirot (4Q400)* 2:6–8.

184 See Appendix A.

crown God ... saying ‘Holy, Holy, Holy’”.¹⁷⁷ There is even the idea that each “holy” adds a crown to the angels: “For those that say ‘holy’ there are three crowns: one for saying ‘holy’, one for saying ‘holy, holy’, and one for saying ‘Holy, holy holy is the Lord of Hosts’”.¹⁷⁸ Whatever the case, the insertion of this celestial acclamation of divine sovereignty before the Shema‘ serves to induce Israel to follow suit.¹⁷⁹

Throughout, the emphasis is on the One God as mon-arch. The first and third blessings as well as the Shema‘ all associate God's incomparability with God's monarchy in order to underscore the infrangible connection between divine oneness/uniqueness and divine sovereignty.¹⁸⁰ The first blessing makes the point of divine uniqueness through citing the verse “Holy, holy, holy ...”, whereas the third – through citing the verse “Who is like You ...”. Parallel terminology for the what and why of extolling God's monarchy also appear in both.¹⁸¹ The linkage between divine oneness and sovereignty is made explicit

177 *Lev. Rabbah* 24:8, ed. Margulies, p. 564. See *Sefer Ha-Bahir* 127 with *Pesiqta Rabbati*, ed. Friedman, 20, p. 97a; and Eleazar b. Judah of Worms, *Perushei Siddur Ha-Tefillah La-Roqeah* 1:263. For comprehensive discussions of the *Qedushah*, see Elijah, “From Earthly Temple to Heavenly Shrines” [above, n. 9]; Chazon [above, n. 9], Nitzan [above, n. 23], pp. 277–281; and Ezra Fleischer, “The *Qedusha* of the Amidah (and other *Qedushot*): Historical, Liturgical and Ideological Aspects” [Hebrew], *Tarbiz* 67 (1998), pp. 301–350.

178 *3 Enoch* 40:2, see *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 2 vols., ed. J. Charlesworth, Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983-1985, 1:291b, note d.

179 A similar logic may lay behind those medieval rites in which the Song at the Sea serves as the segue into the Shema‘ and its blessings; see *Sefer Ha-Manhig* [above, n. 17], 1:54, n. 42; and Avraham Grossman, *The Early Sages of Ashkenaz* [Hebrew], Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1981, p. 33f., n. 31.

180 For this linkage in the Bible, see the Song at the Sea (Ex. 15:11 and 18), 2 Sam. 7:22, and Ps. 86:8–9. For the Shema‘ liturgy, note the expression אֵין זולתך מלכנו (*Seder Rav Amram Gaon*, p. 71, ll. 8–9). Divine oneness and sovereignty also appear in parallel expressions such as יחד שמך בעולמך יחד מלכותך בעולמך “Assert the unity of Your name in the world; assert the unity of Your kingship in Your World” (ibid., p. 28, l. 3, variant), and וימליכוך נצח, תקרא – “And they will install You king for eternity, You will be called One for ever” (Schäfer [above, n. 176], #418, p. 178). On the issue as a whole, see Solomon Schechter, *Aspects of Rabbinic Theology*, New York: Schocken, 1961, pp. 66f., 93–96.

181 Compare *Seder Rav Amram Gaon*, p. 13, ll. 16b-18, of the first blessing with p. 20, ll. 13a–15, of the the third blessing, or p. 12, para. 20, l. 2 of the first blessing where God is למלך רם ונשא... והמתנשא, with p. 20, l. 16 of the third blessing which reads למלך רם ונשא. Although רם ונשא occurs in Isa. 67:15, in *B. Haggigah* 13a, and often in *Heikhalot*

Preface	Reenactment
1. His children saw His power	1A. Your children saw His sovereignty ¹⁷³
2. They praised and acknowledged His name	2B. This is my God", they responded ¹⁷⁴
3. They willingly realized His sovereignty	3C. and said, "May the Lord reign forever".

In addition to the precedent of ancient Israel realizing divine sovereignty in the third blessing, there is the model of the celestial angels realizing divine sovereignty in the first blessing. As ancient Israel's acceptance of divine sovereignty links the third blessing with the Shema', so does the angelic acceptance through the *Qedushah* verse – "*Holy, Holy, Holy is the Lord of Hosts; the whole earth is full of His glory*" (Isa. 6:3) – link the first blessing with the Shema'.

Consistent with the liturgical depiction of the angels involved in an act of accepting divine sovereignty, the Talmud portrays them as dividing the *Qedushah* verse and intoning it antiphonally. There are two suggestions for its orchestration.¹⁷⁵ According to the initial suggestion, Isaiah's description of the angels "calling out to each other" indicates the presence of three sets of angels calling out "Holy" seriatim: "One group of angels said, 'Holy', another said 'Holy', whereas the third said, 'Holy is the Lord of Hosts....'"¹⁷⁶ The second suggestion has the first group saying "Holy", the second – "Holy, holy"; and the third – "Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of Hosts...". In either case, the angels are crowning God, as the Midrash says: "Every day the angels

173 On sovereignty as the consummate expression of power, see Reuven Kimelman, "Psalm 145: Theme, Structure, and Impact", *JBL* 113 (1994), p. 41.

174 See above, n. 164, and below, n. 279.

175 *B. Hullin* 91b; see MaHaRSHA and *Es Yosef*, in Jacob Ibn Habib's *Ein Yaakov*, Vilna 1874, ad loc.

176 This suggestion also appears in *Heikhalot* literature (Peter Schäfer, *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literature*, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1981, #197, #818) as do two other possibilities: the first group says "holy", the second "holy", and the third, "holy holy holy is the Lord of Hosts..." (ibid. #798); each group says: "holy, holy, holy" with the third adding "is the Lord of Hosts..." (ibid. #188).

According to both tannaitic Midrash¹⁷⁰ and Philo,¹⁷¹ the Song at the Sea was intoned by male and female choirs who then joined together to reproduce the scene at the Sea. Assuming that their exegesis reflected practice,¹⁷² we can surmise that both rabbinic and Jewish-Hellenistic liturgies featured the performance of the Song in two-part harmony followed by an acclamation in unison. Such a performance was intended to reenact ancient Israel's acceptance of divine sovereignty.

This emphasis on the reenactment of an acclamation scene explains the details of the liturgical rendition of the Song at the Sea which re-presents how “They willingly realized His sovereignty” – the statement of its preface. To underscore this element, what the preface states in prose is so paralleled by what the reenactment repeats in poetry that it can be charted in two parallel columns:

Reenactment	Preface
א. מלכותו ראו בניך	1. וראו בניו גבורתו
ב. “זה אלי”, ענו	2. שבחו והודו לשמו
ג. ואמרו: “ה’ ימלך לעולם ועד”	3. מלכותו ברצון קבלו עליהם

persecution in Babylon/Persia or Palestine (see Ezra Fleischer, “The Diffusion of the Qedushot of the ‘Amidah and the *Yozer* in the Palestinian Jewish Ritual” [Hebrew], *Tarbiz* 38 [1969], p. 256, n. 6). Those moderns who locate it in Palestine disagree both on its date and on its content (see Mirsky and Finkelstein, op. cit.; Elbogen, *Jewish Liturgy* [above, n. 62], p. 401f., n. 11 [Hebrew: p. 400]; Irving Jacobs, “Kingship and Holiness in the Third Benediction of the Amidah and in the *Yozer*”, *JJS* 41 [1990], p. 63, n. 6). In view of the weakness of the persecution theory, it is not surprising that several problems in liturgical history are resolved by ascribing the persecution theory to Babylonian polemics or popular historiography rather than to Palestinian reality; see Jacobs, *ibid.*, p. 72f; and Meir Bar-Ilan, “The Changes in the Prayers of *Mishnah Rosh Hashanah* 4,7” [Hebrew], *Sidra* 13 (1997), p. 30, n. 11.

170 *Mekhilta, Shir[a]ta*, 3, ed. Horovitz-Rabin, p. 152; see Judah Goldin, *The Song at the Sea*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1971, pp. 3, 247f.

171 *Moses*, 1.180, 2.256; *The Contemplative Life*, 11. 87; *On Agriculture*, 17.79–81.

172 Note that it was chanted in the Odes of the Byzantine Church at least by the year 550. After the precentor chanted each verse, the congregation responded with “Let us sing unto the Lord, for He has triumphed gloriously”; see Egon A. Wellesz, *A History of Byzantine Music and Hymnography*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962, pp. 33f., 363. This practice conforms to the opinion of R. Akiba in *B. Sotah* 39b; see Goldin, *The Song at the Sea* [above, n. 170], p. 78.

Lord shall reign for ever and ever" (Ex. 15:18).

The import of saying, "This is my God" is spelled out in the reenactment of the choral response of the Song in the morning service:

The redeemed sung [this] new song to Your name at the seashore [antiphonally], but all together acclaimed Your sovereignty by saying, "*The Lord shall reign for ever and ever*" (Ex. 15:18).¹⁶⁷

By citing both the initial response of Israel of the Song at the Sea from Ex. 15:2 – "This is my God", and the final one sung in unison from Ex. 15:18 – "The Lord shall reign for ever and ever" – the whole Song is epitomized in this divine acclamation of sovereignty.¹⁶⁸ This technique of epitomizing a whole unit through the citation of its beginning and end parallels that of the *Qedushah/Sanctus* of the Sabbath *Musaf*. There the whole Shema' is summarized through the citation of its opening verse, "Hear O Israel, the Lord our God, the Lord is One" (Deut. 6:4), and its closing verse, "I am the Lord your God" (Num. 15:41).¹⁶⁹

167 *Siddur Rav Sa'adyah Gaon* adds the antiphonal direction "And they [the congregation] responded" (p. 38); see Fleischer, *The Yozer* [above, n. 60], p. 161f. For the translation of שָׁבוּחַ as "sang", see Daniel Boyarin, "*Ha-Shir Ve-Ha-Shevah: Du-Mashma'ut Ve-'Amanut Ha-Shir Be-Tefillot Ha-Qeva*", *Eshel Be'er Sheva* 3 (1986), pp. 91–99.

168 According to *Mekhilta De-Rabbi Simeon b. Yohai*, ed. Epstein-Melamed, p. 74, l. 6, the verse, "This is my God and I will glorify Him", epitomizes the whole Song.

169 *Seder Rav Amram Gaon*, p. 78. The Shema' verse was a staple of the Palestinian *Qedushah/Sanctus*; see Ginzberg, *Genizah Studies* [above, n. 137] 2:223–27. For the idea of citing the beginning and ending of the Shema' see *Seder Rav Sa'adyah Gaon*, p. 121, ll. 10–11; *Sefer Ha-Miqso'ot* as cited in Isaac b. Moses of Vienna, *Or Zarua'*, 2, sect. 50; *Orhot Hayyim Le-Rabbenu Aharon Ha-Kohen Me-Lunel*, ed. Klein, Jerusalem, 1996, l. 292; and Abudarham [above, n. 95], p. 176. The Shema's presence in the *Musaf Qedushah* is integral to the coronation nature of the *Qedushah* and appears throughout the Palestinian rite (see Heinemann, *Studies in Jewish Liturgy* [above, n. 46], p. 20, and n. 43). The historical explanation (see *Shibolei Ha-Leqet Ha-Shalem* [above, n. 18], ed. Mirsky, p. 252; Jacob Mann, "Changes in the Divine Service Due to Religious Persecutions", *HUCA* 4 [1927], pp. 251–259; Louis Finkelstein, "The Origin and Development of the *Qedushah*", ed. A. Chiel, *Perspectives on Jews and Judaism: Essays in Honor of Wolfe Kelman*, New York: The Rabbinical Assembly, 1978, p. 70) that it was inserted stealthily to circumvent the prohibition against saying the Shema' enacted at a time of persecution is doubtful. This persecution theory is plagued by the absence of any agreement on its locale, its date, and its content. Neither medievals nor moderns can agree on whether to locate the

4. The First and Third Blessings

To further link the blessings on creation and redemption to the realization of divine sovereignty, the liturgy provides both a precedent and a model for such. The precedent, incorporated into the third blessing, is the terrestrial song of ancient Israel's salvation intoned after crossing the Re[e]d Sea.¹⁶³ The model, incorporated in the first blessing, is the celestial song of the angels.

First the precedent: In the third blessing, the verses cited from the Song at the Sea seek to engender an identification between the redeemed of the past and the not-yet-redeemed of the present. The participants in the liturgy echo the words of those redeemed of the Song at the Sea, saying:

Moses and Israel sang the Song [at the Sea] antiphonally¹⁶⁴ to You with great joy, but all together said, "*Who is like You O Lord among the celestials? Who is like You mighty in holiness*" (Ex. 15:11).¹⁶⁵

After the rendering of the first half of the Song at the Sea antiphonally, Ex. 15:11 is sung in unison as the finale of the part of the Song that deals with the fate of the Egyptians. The enactment, in the evening Ashkenazic rite,¹⁶⁶ then says:

Your children beholding Your sovereignty as You divided the sea before Moses, responded saying "*This is my God*" (Ex. 15:2). And they said, "*The*

163 Modern scholars refer to *yam suf* as the Reed Sea even though, according to Bernard F. Batto, it never referred to a body of water other than the Red Sea ("The Reed Sea: REQUIESCAT IN PACE", *JBL* 102 [1983], pp. 27–35).

164 In biblical Hebrew *'anu* can denote song or response; see Ex. 15:21, 32:18; Num. 21:17; 1 Sam. 18:7; Isa. 27:2; and Ps. 88:1. In the context of praise, *'anu*, in rabbinic Hebrew, refers to the second voice of a two-part praise; see Saul Lieberman, *Studies in Palestinian Talmudic Literature* [Hebrew], ed. D. Rosenthal, Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1991, p. 192f. On antiphonal patterns in rabbinic literature, see James Kugel, *The Idea of Biblical Poetry: Parallelism and Its History*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981, pp. 116–119.

165 For the problems of translating this verse, see Baruch A. Levine, "The Language of Holiness: Perceptions of the Sacred in the Hebrew Bible", eds. M. O'Connor and D. Freedman, *Backgrounds for the Bible*, Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1987, p. 251.

166 *Mahzor Vitry*, 101, p. 79, *Etz Hayyim*, p. 87, *Siddur of R. Solomon*, p. 134; Judah b. Yaqar, *Perush Ha-Tefillot Ve-Ha-Berakhot* 1:84; and Baer, *Seder 'Avodat Yisrael* [above, n. 72], p. 167. Despite some variants, by citing Ex. 15:2 all adhere to the midrashic understanding of the Song as an acclamation of divine sovereignty; see below.

and You are the last ...; [and] You have redeemed us from Egypt ...".¹⁶¹ Reinforcing the confessional nature of the material, the beginning of the second unit, *'ezrat 'avotenu*, which appears between the second and third "true" assertions, states that as God delivered in the past so will He in the future. It goes on to proclaim that as we and our ancestors pledged allegiance to divine sovereignty so will our progeny. And even though God resides in the heights of the universe, His righteousness extends throughout the world. Thus divine sovereignty is presented as pervading time and space, throughout the generations, in heaven and on earth. All the asseverations are professed in the context of "the supporting structures of collective memory".¹⁶² The goal of intoning this catechism as praise is to bring about a commitment to God such that the worshiper will assume the yoke of divine sovereignty.

In sum: the first blessing serves as the liturgical overture to the opening verse of the Shema'. It links up creation with God's exclusive sovereignty to make the point that the creator God is the one God. By portraying God's love as inspiring human love and compliance, the second blessing serves as the prelude to the continuation of the first section ("And you shall love the Lord your God ...") as well as to the second section ("And if you heed my commandments ...") of the Shema'. The third blessing with its theme of redemption corresponds to the third section ("And He said...") of the Shema'. The full correspondence emerges as follows:

Blessing	Shema'	Blessing
1. Creator of lights	"Hear ... One"	
2. Lover of Israel	"Love ... Heed ..."	
3.	"And He said..."	Who Redeemed

Although the linkage of the "Love" and "Heed" units precludes an exact correspondence between the three blessings and the three Shema' sections, the second blessing's use of the love motif to encourage Israel to reciprocate divine love and to heed the commandments allows for them being grasped as two poles of the same continuum.

161 See Arthur Spanier, "Zur Formengeschichte des altjüdischen Gebetes", *MGWJ* 78 (1934), p. 446ff.

162 Patrick Hutton, *History as an Art of Memory*, Hanover: University Press of New England, 1993, p. 89.

There follows a series of five asseverations, introduced by the word “true”. They add up to a credo. The creed is rattled off staccato-like as follows:

True! the God of the world/eternity is our king ...¹⁵⁸
 True! You are the Lord our God and God of our fathers
 True! You are the lord of Your people ...
 True! You are the first and You are the last ...
 True! You have redeemed us from Egypt ...¹⁵⁹

These asseverations correspond to the three sections of the Shema'. The first four correspond to the first two sections, whereas the fifth corresponds to the third.¹⁶⁰ He is “our king”, “our God”, “lord of Your people” who “redeemed us”. Save for the first, where God is acclaimed “our king”, they are all formulated in the language of direct address: “You are the Lord our God and God of our fathers ...; You are the lord of Your people ...; You are the first

of prayer; see Matthias Klinghardt, “Prayer Formularies for Public Recitation: Their Use and Function in Ancient Religion”, *Numen* 46 (1999), pp. 14–18.

158 In seeking to extend the affirmation to subsequent generations, this asseveration also explicates several of the aforementioned 16 terms such as נחמד, נאמן, נכון, קיים, אמת.

159 *Seder Rav Amram Gaon*, p. 19f. See Naftali Wieder, “An Unknown Ancient Version of the Haftarah Benedictions – The Use of 'emet to Affirm Important Religious Principles” [Hebrew], eds. S. Elizur et al., *Knesset Ezra: Literature and Life in the Synagogue, Studies Presented to Ezra Fleischer*, Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben Zvi, 1994, p. 41; and Halevi, *Kuzari*, 3:17, ed. Even Shmuel, p. 113.

160 See *Osar Ha-Gaonim, Berakhot, Ha-Teshuvot*, #299, p. 108. Those versions that add “True” to “Happy is the person who heeds Your commandments and takes to heart the words of Your Torah” (see Abudarham [above, n. 95], p. 88, sixth line from bottom; Al-Nakawa, *Menorat Ha-Maor* [above, n. 81], 2:105; and apparently the *Zohar* [2:217/a (see *Nitsosei Or*, ad loc., n. 2)]) contain an additional correspondence to the second section. Its lack of symmetry with the others, however, attests to this “true” being a later accretion. It may have been added to arrive at a sixth “true”, to match the number of its alleged allusions in the Creation narrative; see *Sefer Hasidim*, ed. R. Margoliot, 258, ed. J. Wistinetzki, 497; Eleazar b. Judah of Worms, *Perushei Siddur Ha-Tefillah La-Roqeah* [above, n. 72], 1:301; *Siddur of R. Solomon ben Samson of Garmaise* [above, n. 17], p. 97; Judah b. Yaqar, *Perush Ha-Tefillot Ve-Ha-Berakhot* [above, n. 128], 1:321; and Al-Nakawa, op. cit. The *Zohar* (2:217/a) requires eight mentions of “true”, four before *ezrat avotenu* and four within, corresponding to the four exiles and the four redemptions.

("true") which weaves its way through both. The first unit opens with a list of sixteen terms,¹⁵¹ which divide into eight sets of synonyms.¹⁵² Each extols the subject of the Shema'.¹⁵³ Many of them are legal terms for validating contracts or treaties and figure prominently in ancient loyalty oaths.¹⁵⁴ The first set, *'emet ve-yasiv* ("true and firm"), which gave the section its title,¹⁵⁵ affirms the provisions of the Shema'. The penultimate set avers that the text of the Shema' was articulated properly and in proper order (*metuqan*)¹⁵⁶ and thus is acceptable (*mequbal*).¹⁵⁷ The final two (*tov* and *yafeh*) confirm its validity.

- 151 By excluding the initial *'emet*, classical commentators focused on the various correspondences between the number 15 and the liturgy, the Bible, the Temple, et al. Such a "code" approach is rarely helpful to the literary understanding of the classical liturgy even though it is the key to Kabbalistic liturgy (see Kimelman, "The Literary Structure of the Amidah" [above, n. 119], p. 176; and idem, "A Prolegomenon to 'Lekhah Dodi' and *Qabbalat Shabbat*" [Hebrew], in A. Ravitsky [ed.], *Memorial Volume for Professor Joseph Baruch Sermonetta, Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Thought* 14 [1998], pp. 393–454 [English summary, pp. xx–xxi]); a much expanded version is soon to appear in Kimelman, *The Mystical Meaning of Qabbalat Shabbat and Lekhah Dodi* [Hebrew], Magnes Press.
- 152 *Seder Rav Amram Gaon*, p. 19. *Siddur Rav Sa'adyah Gaon*, p. 15, also lists 16 though the second is asyndetic, others are in reverse order, and one is different. There are early Palestinian versions with only the following seven: אמח ויצייב ונכוון וקיים וישר ונאמן וטוב (Schechter, "Genizah Specimens" [above, n. 67], p. 656; Fleischer, "Qeta'im" [above, n. 6], p. 146). These versions lack the least legal sounding middle six terms which themselves form three couplets based on meaning and assonance, i.e., ונחמד / וחביב / ואהוב ומתוקן ומקובל / ונורא ואדיר / ונעים. Apparently, after their interpolation, יפה was added along with מתוקן ומקובל to create eight sets of synonyms as follows: / ואהוב וחביב / וישר ונאמן / ונכוון וקיים / ונחמד ונעים / ומתוקן ומקובל / ונורא ואדיר / ונעים ויפה.
- 153 See *Shibolei Ha-Leqet Ha-Shalem* [above, n. 18], p. 180, third section; *Sefer Ha-Minhagot* [above, n. 37], p. 134; Ginzberg, *Commentary* 1:211, 215; and Stefan C. Reif, "Liturgical Difficulties and Geniza Manuscripts", eds. S. Morag et al., *Studies in Judaism and Islam Presented to S. D. Goitein*, Jerusalem, 1981, pp. 104–114.
- 154 See Weinfeld, "The Loyalty Oath" [above, n. 142], pp. 82–85; and below, end of part IV.
- 155 In Palestine, this obtains for both morning and evening versions; see *J. Berakhot* 1:1, 2d; *Ex. Rabbah* 22:3; and Mann, "Genizah Fragments" [above, n. 67], p. 303. In Babylon, following Rav's ruling (*B. Berakhot* 12a), the evening version was changed to *'emet ve-'emunah*.
- 156 As in לקרוח ק"ש כחקנה (*Tanhuma*, Qedoshim 6 [R. Ammi]); see Lieberman, *Tosefta Ki-fshutah* 4:801.81–82.
- 157 In the Greco-Roman world, proper pronunciation was a prerequisite for the acceptability

transpire simultaneously: Memory is reconstructed so as to quicken the hope in the future while future hope itself becomes the stimulus for the reconstruction of the past. The result is a remembering forward as well as backward.¹⁴⁹

Past memory oozes so smoothly into future hope that the border between the recall of the past and the expectation of the future becomes blurry. When the blessing records how “the redeemed intoned a new song of praise”, it refers to what they did as well as to what the worshiper is called upon to do. By adducing testimony from the mouth of the redeemed, the breach between past reality and present narrative is closed. At that moment, the tension between memory and expectation bursts out in song. In recalling the song of their redemption, we sing our song of redemption.¹⁵⁰ Indeed, recapitulation of past exultation so elides into present anticipation that their climax, “The Lord shall reign forever”, becomes ours.

Although, as noted, each blessing is implicitly involved in persuading the worshiper of its theological grounding, the third blessing's involvement in such persuasion is explicit. The blessing is composed of two units: *'emet ve-yasiv* (“true and firm”) and *'ezrat 'avotenu* (“help of our fathers”). The former relates back to the Shema, the latter to the upcoming motif of redemption. In its present form, they are welded together by the word *'emet*

149 This understanding of the narrative mode of consciousness corresponds to that of Fredric Jameson's notion of narratological causality, which, in the words of White, is: “...a mode of causality that consists in a seizing of the past by consciousness in such a way as to make of the present a fulfillment of the former's promise rather than merely an effect of some prior (mechanistic, expressive, or structural) cause. The seizure by consciousness of a past in such a way as to define the present as a fulfillment rather than as an effect is precisely what is represented in a narrativization of a sequence of historical events so as to reveal every thing early in it as a prefiguration of a project to be realized in some future” (Hayden White, *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987, p. 149). This notion itself follows Dilthey's understanding of meaning in history. For its use here, see Victor Turner, *The Anthropology of Performance*, New York: PAJ Publications, 1988, p. 97. See also Jacob Neusner, “Why Rabbinic-Paradigmatic Succeeded Biblical-Historical Thinking in Judaism”, pp. 170–174, in his “Why No History in Rabbinic Judaism? Yerushalmi's Zakhor Revisited”, *Annual of Rabbinic Judaism* 1 (1998), pp. 153–174.

150 One version makes this explicit: ונשיר לך שיר כשוררו לך אבותינו על שפת הים (And we shall sing to You a [the?] song as our forefathers sang to You at the seashore) (Oxford ms. 2729/4 – cited by Fleischer, *The Yozer* [above, n. 60], p. 160).

passage will be transformed from a narrative into a vivid actuality",¹⁴⁶ and is applied to the liturgy by Kadushin:

In the berakah after the Shema', the redemption from Egypt is felt to be an event which took place in the individual's own day, and not only an event of the remote past. "True it is", the individual says, "that Thou art indeed the Lord our God, and the God of our fathers, our King, King of our fathers, our Redeemer, the Redeemer of our fathers". In the text as given in *Siddur Rav Sa'adia*, there is almost a demarcation between the event as an experience of the present and the event as a happening in the past: וגואלינו וגואלינו וגאל את אבותינו [= Who redeems us and redeemed our forefathers]. There is indeed so strong an awareness of the redemption, so poignant a sense of the event as a present actuality, that in the evening berakah references to details of the Exodus are couched in the present tense: העושה לנו ניסים וכו' [= Who performs for us miracles etc.].¹⁴⁷

For the blessing, past is only prologue, a promise of the future. The present proves to be merely the moment where the memory of past redemption is refigured into an expectation of future redemption. By viewing the past with anticipation of the future, its "allusiveness introjects the past, and projects the future, but at the paradoxical cost of the present".¹⁴⁸ By joining in the chorus of past redemption (see below), the worshiper is found praying for, if not actually announcing, the future redemption. Thus the recall of the past is reconstructed with anticipation of the future. Indeed, the meaning of the past is precisely in its becoming the cocoon of the future. The future is not just the past's terminus but also its *telos*. It is not so much that the past determines the future as the past makes the future possible. This means that having once been redeemed, we can again be redeemed. This phenomenon underscores the fundamental ambiguity in the recollection of redemption. The past is not recalled so much for its own sake as for that of the future. Two processes

146 Longinus, *On the Sublime* 25. This observation would be all the more pertinent were it to be confirmed that Longinus was a Jew who flourished at the time of the formalizing of the liturgy; see Menahem Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*, 3 vols., Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1974–1984, 1:361–363.

147 Max Kadushin, *Worship and Ethics, A Study in Rabbinic Judaism*, n.p., Northwestern University Press, 1964, p. 93f.; see also Rashi, *B. Berakhot* 12a, near end.

148 Harold Bloom, *A Map of Misreading*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1975, p. 132.