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1. Introduction

Over the course of approximately the past decade the subject of Aramaic in piyyut has received a certain amount of scholarly attention. By way of introduction to the text that is edited below, I would like to provide some essential background, and then to speculate with regard to a number of potential interim results.

First, let us consider piyyut,1 which is a kind of poetic literature whose existence is intimately tied to the rabbinic Jewish liturgy that emerged in Roman and Late Antiquity and continues in use to this day in various geographically-defined rites.2 For the present purposes, the fundamental tectonic principle of Jewish liturgy may be described as the stringing together of various liturgical benedictions (berakhot, sing. beraha), such that a specific sequence of benedictions represents a given prayer. I will focus here on the Prayer par excellence, known as the amida (pl. amidot) which essentially defines a statutory liturgical occasion—i.e., the Jewish liturgical day may be meaningfully described in terms of the amidot that are recited over its course.3

The benediction, which is the fundamental building block of the amida, has an internal articulation of its own. In a string of benedictions, the first opens with a formula whose most standard form is: ...ברוך אתה יי אלהינו מלך העולם אשר... 'Blessed are you O Lord, our God, King of the Universe, who...' This formulaic opening is followed by the body of the benediction, which is introduced in the form of a relative clause dependent on אשר. The body is composed in prose

---

1 I would like to record my gratitude to my teacher Shulamit Elizur and to Ya’akov Setel, both of whom kindly read and commented on an early version of this article, especially the commentary to the piyyut edited below.


4 The other core Jewish prayer, which I will not discuss here, is the Shema, which is centered on the recitation of the verse ‘Hear, O Israel...’ (Deut. 6:4). See Elbogen, Liturgy, pp. 16-24.
that provides its specific content, i.e., various forms of praise and supplication addressed to God. The prose body is followed in turn by an abbreviated concluding formula, which summarizes its theme: ..."Blessed are You, O Lord..." Thereupon follow all subsequent benedictions in the chain, with the exception that, unlike the first benediction, they dispense with the opening formula, beginning directly with the body. According to the ancient rite of Palestine, in the context of which πiyyut arose and developed in its initial phases, the weekday amida contains 18 benedictions. However, in all of the rites currently in use, which are ultimately rooted in the rite of Babylon, the number has gone up to 19. In all rites, the amida for Sabbaths and Festivals contains only seven benedictions.

The Jewish liturgical calendar is founded on the simultaneous operation of two cycles: the cycle of the Sabbaths, at the basis of which lies the sequential weekly reading of Pentateuchal lections, each of which is associated with a fixed Prophetic lection (haftara); and the cycle of Festivals and special Sabbaths. The periodicity of the first cycle depends on the number of lections into which the Pentateuch is divided. Thus, in the Palestinian rite, the entire Pentateuch was read over the course of approximately three and a half years, while the Babylonian rite the reading was completed in one year. The festival cycle is annual and begins with Passover.

Returning now to the structure of the amida, it is evident that the string of benediction formulas constitutes the skeletal structure of the prayer, with specific content being supplied by the body of each benediction. Strictly speaking, from the point of view of Jewish law, only the sequence of fixed benediction formulas is obligatory, while the specific content of each benediction may be freely composed. This is where πiyyut comes in. In essence, πiyyut composition functions by replacing the prose, statutory body of the benediction by a poetic formulation. However, since only the body of the benediction is replaced whereas the sting of benediction formulas remains in place, the poetic amida—i.e., one in which the bodies of the sequenced benedictions have been systematically replaced with units of poetry—is a string of poetic units that is rigidly organized by means of the skeletal structure of the benediction formulas to which they are attached, in principle on a one-to-one basis. Piyyut is therefore, in the strict sense, poetic prayer, and it is firmly anchored, structurally as well as notionally, in public, statutory Jewish liturgy. The fundamental compositional principle of πiyyut may in turn be expressed as the one-to-one relationship between units of poetry and liturgical fixed-points.5

In practice, the emergence of πiyyut as an integral part of public Jewish prayer was facilitated by the fact that in the majority of cases the amida is recited silently by each member of the congregation and then publically repeated out-loud by the precentor (hazzan). The precentor’s repetition may take the form of the text that has been recited silently by each individual, with additions as ritually appropriate to a public—rather than a private—prayer. However, instead of duplicating the statutory text, the precentor’s repetition may retain only its skeletal structure of benediction formulas, around which is organized an alternative, poetic composition. The genre-term for a πiyyut composition that accompanies the precentor’s recitation of the amida is qerova.

---

4 Cf., for example, the concluding formula of the first benediction of the amida, which praises God as the God of the Patriarchs and the Redeemer of Israel: ברכך אֲמֹתֵנוּ מֵאֲבֹתֵינוּ וְאֵת נַפְּלֵי הָעַמּוֹד. "Blessed are You, O Lord, Shield of Abraham". For an in-depth study of the development of the liturgical benediction see Heinemann, Prayer, pp. 77-103.

5 The most common type of liturgical fixed-point is the benediction formula, which is mentioned above. However, other elements in the text of the statutory liturgy may serve the same function.
The genre is further divided into sub-types in accordance with the different possible sorts of configurations, each one being a function of the specific liturgical occasion—e.g., an *amida* of 18 benedictions on weekdays versus an *amida* of seven benedictions on Sabbaths and festivals.

The structural principles that are adumbrated here are mostly relevant to the Classical period of *piyyut* literature. It is impossible to be precise in delimiting this period, but one may say with confidence that Classical *piyyut* is to be placed in Palestine in Late Antique and early Muslim times. The Classical period is characterized especially by the use of rhyme and the concomitant predominance of strophic patterning, as well as the use of acrostic signatures in which the poets (payyetanim, sing. *payyetan*) indicate their names, and occasionally other bits of biographical information. The most prominent genre of the Classical period is the *q eduhta*, which is a sub-type of *ger ova* (see also below).

In addition to statutory prayer, the synagogue liturgy of Sabbaths and Festivals includes a second basic component—the Scriptural lection. As mentioned above, the cycle of Pentateuchal and Prophetic lections is one of the two fundamental parameters of the Jewish liturgical cycle. During the period in question, two additional aspects of the synagogue liturgy were organized around the reading of Scripture: the Targum, i.e., the translation of the biblical text into Aramaic, which served as the vernacular of Palestinian Jews before its replacement by Arabic; and the sermon. Both of these served one way or another as expositions of the Scriptural reading. Finally, Jewish liturgy in the broad sense includes prayers recited outside of the synagogue, such as the Grace after Meals (*Birkat ha-Mazon*) or various funerary texts.

Given the above sketch, it is not difficult to see how *piyyut*, which we may define for the moment as Hebrew liturgical poetry (but see below), fits into the liturgical scheme of the synagogue—it is attached directly to the skeletal structure of the fundamental prayers, and serves as a replacement for their statutory (prose) contents. However, together with Hebrew, Jewish poetic production during the period in question proceeded along a parallel, Aramaic track. This fact is entirely consonant with the general trajectory of Jewish literary activity in Hellenistic/Roman Palestine, which indicates essentially that Jews have been composing poetry in Aramaic for as long as they have been composing literature in that language. Thus, poetry is attested already in the Biblical Aramaic corpus, as well as among the Aramaic documents of the Dead Sea Scrolls. In the Late Antique period, Jewish Aramaic poetry, which in terms of

---

6 The periodization of *piyyut* literature is treated extensively in Fleischer.  
7 In the Classical Period, at least two full cycles of *gedushtot* were composed to accompany the weekly Scriptural readings of the Palestinian triennial lectionary cycle, by the *payyetanim* Yannai and Shim’on bar Megas.  
quantity as well as quality is undeniably the poor cousin of Hebrew, is divisible into three categories, each of which is associated with a certain liturgical locus. Each locus, in turn, may be defined in terms of the broad structure of Jewish liturgy as outlined above.\(^9\) The first category is Targum poetry, which is a diffuse corpus of poetic material that is associated in various ways with the Aramaic translation of the Scriptural lections.\(^10\) The second category consists of poems that are intended for incorporation into the actual prayer component of the liturgy. In principle, Aramaic *piyyutim* belonging to this category are directly equivalent to their Hebrew counterparts. In reality, however, no such parity exists, since—as far as can be ascertained on the basis of our present knowledge—this category is restricted to one, relatively minor genre: *qinot* for the Ninth of Av, i.e., dirges mourning the destruction of the Temple.\(^11\) The third category of Aramaic poems consists of those that are intended for para-liturgical occasions: wedding poems and

---


11 See M. Rand, ‘Observations on the Relationship between JPA Poetry and the Hebrew Piyyut Tradition – The Case of the Kinot’, in A. Gerhards and C. Leonhard (eds.), *Jewish and Christian Liturgy and Worship: New Insights into its History and Interaction* (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2007) pp. 127-144. It is important to note in this context that the *qina* genre is quintessentially Palestinian. The *qinot* do not partake of the structural principle outlined above, whereby a *piyyut* composition is built up out of units of poetry all of which are anchored in strict sequence to liturgical fixed-points such as the concluding benediction formulas. In this sense, a *qina* is an independent *piyyut*, not a *piyyut* composition. On the other hand, just as *piyyutim* are strung together within a single *piyyut* composition, so *qinot* are also strung together, the string being inserted at the appropriate point in the liturgy of the Ninth of Av.
funeral dirges. Poems in this category partially overlap in terms of function with their Hebrew counterparts (see below, end of Section 2).

Together with these three basic types of Jewish Aramaic liturgical poetry, there exists Aramaic material incorporated into *piyyut* proper. This is the material that is of interest at present, and to it I now turn. The *piyyut* literature is composed in a specialized Hebrew idiom whose hallmarks are well known and have been investigated in a number of studies. This idiom comprises certain distinctive features—morphological, syntactic, lexical and semantic—which remain reasonably stable throughout the history of *piyyut* composition in the East as well as in Europe. As indicated, the *piyyut* idiom is a form of Hebrew. For analytical purposes, it can be resolved into three components: Biblical Hebrew—i.e., linguistic material drawn from the Hebrew Bible; Rabbinic Hebrew—i.e., linguistic material drawn from Tannaitic and Amoraic writings; and *piyyut* Hebrew—i.e., the remainder, that which cannot be traced back to either of the two preceding categories and is therefore taken to constitute *piyyut*-language *par excellence*. On occasion, the idiom in which *piyyut* is composed incorporates Aramaic elements. However, until recently, this phenomenon has not been accorded much attention. The first study to treat the subject in a sustained manner is an article published in 2009 by Shulamit Elizur: יעריך ישולוב של סימות
Andreĭ Sholovov, "A Qedeshta for Parashat Zakhor in a Mixed Hebrew-Aramaic Idiom." This article contains a critical edition of the *piyyut* composition that is composed in an idiom in which Hebrew and Aramaic are at times so tightly intertwined that it is no longer accurate to speak of the incorporation of Aramaic into a Hebrew matrix, but one must rather see the text as integrating the two into a new, mixed linguistic entity. On the basis of this observation, I suggested there that the concept/definition of the *piyyut* idiom be expanded somewhat to encompass two components, a Hebrew and an Aramaic, the former predominating massively from the quantitative point of view. In my article, I also reviewed the evidence for the use of Aramaic in previously published Classical *piyyut* material, noting that it is attested in the corpora of the two most famous Classical *payyetanim*, Yannai (ca. 6th century) and Eleazar be-rabbi Qillir (ca. 7th century), along with a *payyetan* whose acrostic signature is מילוי הרוח. The material that I investigated differs from the material

---

12 A number of such poems are published in Yahalom and Sokoloff, *Encyclopedia of Hebrew Language and Linguistics* (Leiden/Boston, Brill, 2013) pp. 3.55-60.


14 As is apparent from the title, Elizur’s analysis operates on the notion of a foreign, Aramaic element being incorporated into a Hebrew matrix. Such a notion is, in fact, reasonable, given what has been said above regarding the *piyyut* idiom. In accordance with it, Aramaic elements drawn either from the Aramaic portions of Scripture (Biblical Aramaic [BA]) or from the Aramaic vernacular of Byzantine-era Palestine, i.e., the language of Palestinian Targum and midrash (JPA), are incorporated into a *piyyut* text, either directly in their original form or in various Hebraized forms—calques, Hebrew conjugations of Aramaic roots, etc. In the wake of Elizur, I published my own contribution to the subject: יעריך ישולוב של סימות
Andreĭ Sholovov, "A Qedeshta for Parashat Zakhor in a Mixed Hebrew-Aramaic Idiom." This article contains a critical edition of the *piyyut* composition that is composed in an idiom in which Hebrew and Aramaic are at times so tightly intertwined that it is no longer accurate to speak of the incorporation of Aramaic into a Hebrew matrix, but one must rather see the text as integrating the two into a new, mixed linguistic entity. On the basis of this observation, I suggested there that the concept/definition of the *piyyut* idiom be expanded somewhat to encompass two components, a Hebrew and an Aramaic, the former predominating massively from the quantitative point of view. In my article, I also reviewed the evidence for the use of Aramaic in previously published Classical *piyyut* material, noting that it is attested in the corpora of the two most famous Classical *payyetanim*, Yannai (ca. 6th century) and Eleazar be-rabbi Qillir (ca. 7th century), along with a *payyetan* whose acrostic signature is מילוי הרוח. The material that I investigated differs from the material

---

15 A number of such poems are published in Yahalom and Sokoloff, *Encyclopedia of Hebrew Language and Linguistics* (Leiden/Boston, Brill, 2013) pp. 3.55-60.


17 As is apparent from the title, Elizur’s analysis operates on the notion of a foreign, Aramaic element being incorporated into a Hebrew matrix. Such a notion is, in fact, reasonable, given what has been said above regarding the *piyyut* idiom. In accordance with it, Aramaic elements drawn either from the Aramaic portions of Scripture (Biblical Aramaic [BA]) or from the Aramaic vernacular of Byzantine-era Palestine, i.e., the language of Palestinian Targum and midrash (JPA), are incorporated into a *piyyut* text, either directly in their original form or in various Hebraized forms—calques, Hebrew conjugations of Aramaic roots, etc. In the wake of Elizur, I published my own contribution to the subject: יעריך ישולוב של סימות
Andreĭ Sholovov, "A Qedeshta for Parashat Zakhor in a Mixed Hebrew-Aramaic Idiom." This article contains a critical edition of the *piyyut* composition that is composed in an idiom in which Hebrew and Aramaic are at times so tightly intertwined that it is no longer accurate to speak of the incorporation of Aramaic into a Hebrew matrix, but one must rather see the text as integrating the two into a new, mixed linguistic entity. On the basis of this observation, I suggested there that the concept/definition of the *piyyut* idiom be expanded somewhat to encompass two components, a Hebrew and an Aramaic, the former predominating massively from the quantitative point of view. In my article, I also reviewed the evidence for the use of Aramaic in previously published Classical *piyyut* material, noting that it is attested in the corpora of the two most famous Classical *payyetanim*, Yannai (ca. 6th century) and Eleazar be-rabbi Qillir (ca. 7th century), along with a *payyetan* whose acrostic signature is מילוי הרוח. The material that I investigated differs from the material
treated by Elizur in that it consists of cases of sustained presence of Aramaic, either over the course of a large portion (perhaps even the majority) of an entire composition, as in the case of the *gedushta* for Parashat Zakhor that I published, or within a limited stretch of text that is incorporated into the Hebrew framework of the *piyyut* composition in which it appears, as in the other cases that I studied. Elizur, on the other hand, examined cases of local incorporation of individual Aramaic elements (words, phrases, sentences) into the Hebrew context. In view of this distinction in the data, the slight difference in our conclusions is not surprising.

2. Aramaic Texts in *Piyyutim*

On the basis of an analysis of the corpus that I assembled, I was able to make two generalizations about the use/status of Aramaic in the *piyyut* idiom. First, the integration of Aramaic and Hebrew within a *piyyut* idiom that can truly be considered mixed is (so far) unique to the *gedushta* הגדושה. In the other cases, the linguistic borders between Hebrew and Aramaic areas of a given *piyyut* text are easily discerned. Second, in the majority of cases, the Aramaic that is employed in *piyyut* is of the BA type, the use of JPA being less common. Different degrees of mixture of the two dialects within a given Aramaic *piyyut* text are, moreover, attested: predominantly BA, mixed BA/JPA, and predominantly JPA.

I have now identified an additional instance of the use of Aramaic in Classical *piyyut*. In view of the relative rarity of Aramaic within the Classical *piyyut* corpus, this example is worthy of attention, and an edition of the *piyyut* in which it is found is provided below. The Aramaic text in question, lines 26-35 in the edition, confirms the findings summarized above. It is embedded within a Hebrew *piyyut*, and its beginning and end are clearly delimited. In one instance, Hebrew and Aramaic are mixed in a single sentence: הַקָּדְשָׁה יִרְצָה מֵאַרְעַי. ‘And He will exterminate the horn that is eager [to speak] arrogantly’ (line 34). The verb הַרְצָה is Hebrew, both lexically as well as morphologically, whereas the rest of the sentence is Aramaic. In an apparent second case: הֲכָבָּהוּ הַוָּלוֹת וְאָסָרְתָּהוּ בָּשָׁם ‘Now [the fourth beast] will sprout a small, evil horn’ (l. 26), the spelling with יוד characterizes the verb הַרְצָה as Hebrew *Hifil* rather than Aramaic *Afel*.16 However the reading הַרְצָה הַרְצָה appears to be attested in a parallel source (see the apparatus of variants, *ad loc.*), so that the Hebrew form may be the product of a scribal slip. In the majority of cases, the Aramaic employed in the text is BA. However, a number of instances of the use of JPA are also attested. The following is an outright lexical JPA usage: נַחַתְשַׁה ‘struggling’ (l. 29).17 A number of cases are also found in which a given root is attested in BA, but the form that is found in our text is lacking there, whereas it is attested in JPA: נִחַלְתָּה ‘He will be revealed’ (l. 32),18 נִדָּרְשָׁה ‘holiness’ (l. 33).19 The same is apparently the case with לִבְּכָּמֵשָׁה ‘to do evil’ (line 34).

Kippur. The *silluq* is yet unpublished, but the Aramaic section has appeared twice: E. Fleischer, *Kobez al Yad* 7 (17) (1968), pp. 1-79 (79); Sokoloff and Yahalom, *Le'avaz he-hazan* includes an Aramaic section, beginning with the *silluq* of his *gedushta* for 18 benedictions preceding the apparatus of variants, for the New Moon of Kislev—see E. Fleischer, *Le'avaz he-hazan*.*Kobez al Yad* 9 (19) (1979), pp. 25-127 (86).


18 See Sokoloff, *Dictionary*, pp. 129-130. In BA, the verb יד ‘to reveal’ is attested in in the *Peal* and *Peil* stems.

19 See Sokoloff, *Dictionary*, pp. 476-477. In BA, the root is attested exclusively in the adjectival form נידרשה.
30), where the *Afel* infinitive takes the JPA form.\(^{20}\) However, the variant reading is attested (see the apparatus of variants, *ad loc.*), in which the corresponding BA form of the infinitive, with prefixed *he*, is employed. Finally, our text employs a collocation, a prepositional phrase, that is lacking in BA but attested in JPA: יָשָׂר ‘from the beginning, of old’ (l. 35).\(^{21}\)

The result, therefore comports well with the general picture referred to above—the Aramaic employed in Classical *piyyut* is predominantly of the BA type, with the possibility of some JPA admixtures.

In light of the data reviewed here, I may venture a number of tentative observations. The *piyyut* that is published below was composed by Yohanan ha-Kohen, a Classical *payyetan* in whom we may roughly see the contemporary of Eleazar be-rabbi Qillir (see above). It is therefore evident that an Aramaic component is attested in the corpora a number of prominent Classical *payyetanim*: Yannai, Qillir, and Yoḥanan. To these may be added the Hebrew-Aramaic *gedushta* אגג אמר הצדה, which also falls squarely within the Classical *piyyut* tradition. Finally, an Aramaic component is attested in the work of Le’azar he-hazan. Le’azar’s dates are even more obscure than those of the three *payyetanim* named above, but his compositions are based on norms that are appropriate to Classical *piyyut*, and he is perhaps to be seen as a relatively late exponent of this period. Taking this information together with the three categories of Aramaic poetry proper that were outlined above, we may surmise that beginning with the period represented by the book of Daniel, poetic expression among Jews proceeded in Hebrew and Aramaic. The Hebrew variety was dominant, owing to the depth and richness of the Hebrew literary tradition, but in terms of basic poetic form, the two are substantially equivalent—late biblical poetry as well as poetry in the Dead Sea Scrolls in both Hebrew and Aramaic exhibits to one degree or another the forms of *parallelismus membrorum*. This basic formal parity continues to characterize the relationship between Hebrew and Aramaic poetry in Late Antiquity—in both the biblical *parallelismus membrorum* is replaced by new forms of organization: acrostic, rhyme, strophic patterning, and other structural devices. The Hebrew branch of this development came to be known as *piyyut*, and from its inception was intimately connected to the actual texts of Jewish prayer. With the benefit of hindsight, this association seems entirely natural, as the language of statutory Jewish prayer is Hebrew.\(^{22}\)

However, according to the evidence of the Aramaic *qinot* (see above, note 11), tentative efforts were apparently also made to attach Aramaic poetry to statutory prayer. However, these seem to have proved largely unsuccessful—Hebrew *piyyut* was too well entrenched in this locus. In any case, the result of these efforts seems to have been the incorporation of Aramaic into Hebrew *piyyut*. As we have seen, according to the evidence at our disposal, in the Classical period (i.e., the apogee of *piyyut* composition in the East) such incorporation took a number of forms: the inclusion of individual Aramaic elements within a

---


\(^{22}\) Aramaic is not employed in the statutory liturgy. However, it is well attested in a liturgical category that Heinemann defines as ‘prayers of Bet Midrash origin’, i.e., one that ‘came into being in conjunction with the public reading, study and exposition of the Tôrâh’—see Heinemann, Prayer, pp. 251-275 (the quote is from p. 251). Heinemann writes (pp. 265-266): ‘The comparative frequency of Aramaic in these prayers is not really surprising since, in part, they came into being in the wake of the Aramaic translation which was somewhat in the nature of a midrashic exposition; also the sermon itself was mostly delivered in the Aramaic vernacular. Moreover, the preachers presumably preferred to bless the congregation in the language easily intelligible to them’. See also below.
Hebrew matrix, the inclusion of relatively short Aramaic texts within longer Hebrew piyyut compositions, or outright composition of piyyut in a mixed Hebrew-Aramaic idiom. The latter option, to date attested in the unique case of the qedushta, in fact seems to represent a kind of distant echo of the initial impulse to compose in Aramaic piyyut that would be a direct analogue of the Hebrew variety.

The fact that Hebrew piyyut came to overwhelmingly predominate within the field of statutory prayer to the detriment of Aramaic composition, in addition to being reflected in the incorporation of the latter within the former, also had the effect of stimulating the development of Aramaic poetry within a specialized niche—that of the Targum (cf. also above, note 22). In other words, the more vigorous Hebrew forced Aramaic to seek refuge in this less central, though by no means marginal, liturgical locus. Again, in hindsight, the association of Aramaic poetry with Aramaic Targum seems as natural as that of the Hebrew piyyut with the Hebrew statutory liturgy. In any case, Targum proved a sure refuge for Aramaic poetry, in the context of which it was able to thrive well beyond the temporal and spatial confines of Classical piyyut.23

Finally, I have also mentioned that Hebrew and Aramaic poems are associated with various para-liturgical occasions. With the exception of the Grace after Meals, however, which is governed by the same sort of strict legal regulations that govern the statutory prayers of the synagogue, these are marginal areas of the liturgy in which Hebrew and Aramaic were allowed to subsist together. The poetic Grace after Meals, on the other hand, has evolved as an inseparable part of Hebrew piyyut, and is fully subject to its main compositional principle, which specifies the relationship between units of poetry and liturgical fixed-points.

3. The Qedushta for Shabbat Shim’u by Yoḥanan ha-Kohen

The Aramaic fragment here is part of a liturgical composition called a qedushta.24 The qedushta is composed of component piyyutim, the last of which is called the silluq. Within the liturgical framework, the silluq is immediately followed by the recitation of the first verse of the qedushta (i.e., the liturgical risagion): ‘קדוש קדוש קדוש’ (Isa. 3:3).25 Our fragment appears in the silluq. The qedushta in question, וַאֲנִי שְׁמַע מִבֵּרָב, was composed by the Classical payyetan Yoḥanan ha-Kohen, who seems to have lived in Palestine or its environs around the time of the change in hegemony over the region between the Byzantine and the Arab-Muslim empires.26 The qedushta was composed for recitation on Shabbat Shim’u,

23 For examples of post-Classical Targum poetry in the East, see note 10. Aramaic poems also accompany the reading of Scripture on the Seventh Day of Passover and Shavuot in the Ashkenazic rite: see the materials published in Y. Frenkel (Jerusalem: Koren, 1993) pp. 608-658; idem, מחזור שבטי נבות (Jerusalem: Koren, 2000) pp. 385-593. The most famous of these is the poem אצים שמע.espresso by Meir bar Yiṣḥaq, recited after Exod. 19:1, the first verse of the Pentateuchal lection for Shavuot (idem, שבטי נבות, pp. 385-395).

24 The structure of the Classical qedushta for Sabbaths is described extensively in Fleischer, שעשרת ע垛ות (Jerusalem: Keter, 2000) pp. 138-164. No full English-language treatment exists, but one may profitably consult L. Lieber, Yannai on Genesis – An Invitation to Piyyut (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 2010) pp. 36-64.

25 In some qedushaot the silluq may be followed by another series of piyyutim, which are interspersed between the verses of the qedushta. These are not attested consistently, however.

26 As mentioned above, Yoḥanan and Qillir are roughly contemporaries. The piyyutim of Yoḥanan ha-Kohen have been edited by N. Weissenstern, פיוטי יוחנן הכהן (Hebrew University PhD thesis, 1983). Our qedushta is found on pp. 66-78. For the time and place of the payyetan, see pp. 67–70, together with J. Yahalom, פיוטי מציאת, חלקה השנייה (Tel Aviv: Hakibbutz Hameuchad, 1999) pp. 84-87.
one of the three Sabbaths of Rebuke that precede the fast of the Ninth of Av, the day on which the destruction of the Temple is commemorated.\textsuperscript{27} The seven Sabbaths that follow the fast day are in turn known as the Sabbaths of Consolation. Liturgically, these special Sabbaths are all characterized by the reading of special Prophetic lections that focus on the themes of rebuke and consolation, respectively. The custom of reading special Prophetic lections on these Sabbaths is originally Palestinian, but it was eventually adopted into the Babylonian liturgical rite as well, whence it has spread to all Jewish rites.\textsuperscript{28} The liturgical importance of the Sabbaths of Rebuke during the Classical period may be gauged by the fact that they were adorned by at least two cycles of qedushot, composed by the payyetanim Yannai and Yehudah.\textsuperscript{29}

The Prophetic lection for Shabbat Shim‘u, from which it derives its name, begins with שמעי דבר ‘Hear the word of the Lord, House of Israel’ (Jer. 2:4). Hence, the theme of hearing, and with it the root שמע as well as other roots belonging to this semantic field, is prominent in the piyyutim for this occasion, mostly in the sense of Israel’s not hearkening to God’s commandments and His rebukes. In accordance with an ancient liturgical custom, the qedusha for Shabbat Shim‘u treats not only the theme or rebuke, but also, towards its end, the opposite theme of consolation, i.e., the restoration of Israel their land and the destruction of their enemies at the end of days. It is the latter theme that is treated in the sillationים, within which our fragment is found.\textsuperscript{30} The sillation was published previously in ed. Weissenstern (see note 26). However, the text given there is truncated, and more than half of the sillation, including the Aramaic portion, is missing.\textsuperscript{31} The present edition is based on four manuscript sources, including the single source employed by Weissenstern. The three additional sources employed here contain a fuller form of the sillation, though it is possible that the original, complete text has yet to be established (see below, note 38). The first 22 lines of the sillation are subject to a straight alphabetic acrostic, which does not affect the overall structuring of the piyyut into rhyme-units: the rhyme unit לישון, with which the sillation opens and within which the acrostic appears, continues past the end of the acrostic, terminating only at line 39. In other words, the acrostic structure is not coterminous with the rhyme structure.


\textsuperscript{28} See Fleischer, Shemita–Hakadush, p. 37.


\textsuperscript{30} The same is true of the sillation לישון from the qedusha אוחוד of Shim‘u for Shabbat Shim‘u by Yehuda—see M. Rand, ‘חומר חזותי של ניסוח ממידיה אשメール מהמצדו השני של השמימיה: המפקד של החוזה אליעזר ביבי’, Tarbiz 82 (2014), pp. 529-547 (542-545). For relatively rare midrashic material shared by the two silluqim, see the commentary to lines 38-42 in the edition below.

\textsuperscript{31} The text given ed. Weissenstern comprises lines 1-22 of the present edition—i.e., the lines containing the alphabetic acrostic—followed by a four-line segment that serves as a thematic transition to the recitation of the qedusha. This segment is most likely not original, its purpose being to bridge the thematic discontinuity between the piyyut and the qedusha, created as a result of the truncation of the former. It is printed in small font in the Hebrew critical edition below.
One of the manuscript sources for our text, ms. ENA 3443/2 (ב), is of particular codicological interest with regard to its copyist. This single leaf is presently catalogued adjacent to another leaf belonging to the same copy: ENA 3443/1. These two leaves, which most likely originally belong to a single bi-folio, are not consecutive. They contain the text of a gedusha for Shabbat Shim‘u that comprises piyyutim by various payyetanim. Our silluaq is copied on the verso of the second leaf, up to line 46, which is followed by three additional lines unattested elsewhere (see below), at which point the text breaks off. The bi-folio was produced by a prolific copyist employing a highly characteristic, and therefore easily-recognizable, hand. Dozens of leaves produced by this copyist have survived in the Genizah, bearing witness to an attempt to produce a poetic-liturgical program encompassing what may well have been the entire liturgical year.\(^{32}\) The copyist employs a wide range of piyyutim composed by various payyetanim from the Classical period and beyond. Among the piyyut compositions preserved in the materials produced by the copyist in question, one finds compositions in which three names, signed in the acrostic, appear to cluster: יוהושע חָבֶר, יֵילוֹ, רב (“יוהושע חָבֶר, יֵילוֹ, רב” sometimes found together in a single acrostic: יוהושע חָבֶר and רב יוהושע חָבֶר). In one case, a relationship is indicated between the named individuals: יֵילוֹ, חָבֶר יוהoshע. The frequency and clustering of these names led Fleischer to surmise that they represent members of a single group or family, one of whom is also our copyist.\(^{33}\) Furthermore, on the basis of the identification of אל‘לדקי, יוהושע חָבֶר (i.e., יוהושע חָבֶר, יוהושע אל‘לדקי, from Latakia in Syria) with יוהושע חָבֶר אל‘לדקי, who is known to have had a poetic exchange with a certain resident in Syria around the year 1015, Fleischer determined that the poets represented by the names are to be placed in Syria-Palestine at around the end of the 10th or the beginning of the 11th centuries.\(^{34}\) He also mentioned in passing that a family whose members bear the names in question is attested in the documentary Genizah.\(^{35}\)

Our silluaq, in addition to being copied in four sources, is mentioned in a fifth: ms. Frankfurt 152 (Schocken Institute photostat).\(^{36}\) This manuscript, which was likely produced by a synagogue precentor for his own use, contains piyyutim that constitute part of a liturgical program for Shabbat Shim‘u. Among these, we find our silluaq, which (as opposed the other piyyutim) is not copied in full, but rather simply mentioned by name, a complete copy apparently being easily available to the copyist: שִׁירִים נִנְחֹכָם לְלַיְוָשָׁע (יהוד), who mentions פְּנֵיה יֵילוֹ מַבֵּר (‘Silluaq: שִׁירִים נִנְחֹכָם לְלַיְוָשָׁע פְּנֵיה יֵילוֹ מַבֵּר’) is copied on the verso of the second leaf. It[s text] is properly established in the version of Eli ben Yehoshua he-

\(^{32}\) I am currently in the early stages of a research project whose aim is to gather, reconstruct and analyze those materials produced by the copyist in question that have been preserved in the Genizah. It is already clear on the basis of my work that these materials represent more than a single codex.

\(^{33}\) See E. Fleischer, יוהoshע חָבֶר, יוהoshע חָבֶר (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1984) pp. 454-456. In his discussion, Fleischer concentrates specifically on the name Dosa, since this is the name that is numerically predominant in the material, but given what he writes about the impossibility of determining the exact nature of the relationship between the individuals behind the names, this point is immaterial for his argument. Fleischer also discusses the matter in a later publication: idem, ‘חדותה’, Italia 13-15 (2001), pp. 9-30 (13-14). Here, he suggests that the copyist may have been Dosa’s secretary.

\(^{34}\) Fleischer, יוהoshע חָבֶר, p. 456. Fragments of the poems exchanged between the two are published in J. Schirmann, שִׁירִים נִנְחֹכָם לְלַיְוָשָׁע (Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1965) p. 56. Biographical data on יוהoshע חָבֶר are given there on p. 54. The identification is not specifically repeated in Fleischer, ‘חדותה’, but there is no reason to think that he had in the meantime rejected it.

\(^{35}\) Fleischer, יוהoshע חָבֶר, p. 456 note 13; idem, ‘חדותה’, pp. 13-14 notes 22-23.

\(^{36}\) For the Frankfurt Genizah fragments, see B. Richler, Guide to Hebrew Manuscript Collections (Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 2014) p. 72.
Haver’. The names mentioned in this source tally with the names that are attested in the leaves under consideration here, together with the title haver of Yehoshua. 37 Furthermore, the writer of the note in ms. Frankfurt indicates that Eli ben Yehoshua he-Haver had produced a manuscript containing piyyutim, of unknown extent, our silluq among them. This tallies with the suggestion already made by Fleischer that Dosa, Eli and/or Yehoshua are connected to the production of the manuscript material that contains the piyyutim bearing their names.

One may perhaps point to a further piece of evidence strengthening the identification of Eli ben Yehoshua he-Haver with the copyist of source ב (together with the other material produced by him). Sources ב and ג provide the full text of the silluq as given in the present edition: lines 1-65. Source ב is truncated before the end of the silluq: it contains lines 1-46. Line 46 is the last line of the rhyme-unit הש-ה. In ב and ג it is followed by line 47, which opens a new rhyme-unit: יז-יה. In ב, on the other hand, line 46 is followed by three lines (unnumbered in the present edition) that constituting an additional rhyme-unit, צ-ו. This rhyme-unit is unattested in ב and ג. It may be therefore that the comment made in ms. Frankfurt to the effect that the text of the silluq is ‘properly established in the version of Eli ben Yehoshua he-Haver’ refers to the presence of the rhyme-unit צ-ו in the pristine manuscript now represented by source ב. 38

The evidence provided by ms. Frankfurt seems to indicate that the hand that copied source ב along with all the other leaves bearing the same handwriting that are scattered in the Genizah is that of Eli ben Yehoshua he-Haver. This is presumably the same Eli whose name appears in the acrostic signatures of numerous piyyutim that are copied in these materials. The father of this Eli was Yehoshua he-Haver, whose name is also attested in the acrostic signatures of poems copied therein. Before becoming a haver, this Yehoshua, (whose family was) originally from Latakia, had been aḥazzan. As we have seen, the acrostics in question also explicitly indicate the existence of a familial relationship between two of the three names: והשויה בAJOR ותא. 39 According to this signature, Dosa was also aḥazzan, as his father had been. We have also seen that in some cases, Dosa appears together with Eli in the same acrostic: ורוש ועד. 40 Taken together, these data seem to indicate that the two were brothers.

The above surmises can now be confirmed with a reasonable degree of certainty from the documentary Genizah. The most important relevant document is preserved in ms. T-S 13J 23.5, a letter written around the middle of the 11th century to Dosa ben Yehoshua he-Haver al-Ladhiqi in Fustat by his mother in Raqqa in Syria. 41 From another letter, preserved in ms. T-S 24.59, and

---

37 The title indicates that Yehoshua was an official member (haver) of the Palestinian Yeshiva. Previous to having acquired this title, he had been known as a precentor (ḥazzan).

38 If this argument is accepted, we have before us a medieval witness to the fact that the rhyme-unit צ-ו, currently represented by these three lines in source ב, is original to the silluq, making it quite likely that the complete text of this piyyut has yet to be restored.


40 Thus, for example, in the pizmon יברח הלוחות from the qedushta for Parashat בעלת, copied in ms. Kaufmann 71 (=cat. Widder 29).

41 See M. Gil, מבחר המסויים של כתבי יד אדריכים (Publications of the Diaspora Research Institute, 117; Tel-Aviv/Jerusalem: Tel Aviv University/Bialik/Ministry of Defense, 1997) vol. 1, pp. 1.512-513. Gil writes there that ‘the al-Ladhiqi family is settled in Raqqa... The males in the family all emigrated to Egypt’ (translations from this source mine). The text of the letter is edited in vol. 2, pp. 236-240.
also apparently written in the middle of the 11th century, we read of Eli Ben Yehoshua, a permanent hazzan and communal official in Raqqā (l. 26: הפבעוה והו חזאן פמ אלרקה מקדם אלבלד). Eli’s position as hazzan obviously tallies with his activities as a copyist of liturgical material.

In view of the evidence adduced here, it now seems that the materials in question, including ms. ENA 3443/2, were copied around the middle of the 11th century by one Eli ben Yehoshua. This Eli was settled in Raqqā, whereas his brother Dosa was resident in Fustat. All three individuals belonged to the al-Ladhiqi family, and all were called hazzan. The father Yehoshua also held the title of haver from the Palestinian Yeshiva.

4. Edition of the Silluq

Editorial Sigla: = doubtful reading; [א] = lacuna or editor’s emendation; [<<א>>] = scribal omission

[Note to the typesetter: In the case of the hollow letters, only the letter itself ought to be hollow. The associated vocalization sign(s) ought to be normal.]

42 Gil, מלכות ישמעאל, vol. 1, p. 513. Gil surmises that the Eli mentioned here was ‘perhaps the brother of the abovementioned Dosa’ (i.e., the Dosa mentioned in ms. T-S 13J 23.5). In light of the evidence adduced here, this conclusion seems nearly certain. The letter in which Eli is mentioned, mc. T-S 24.59, is published in idem, ארץ-ישראל בתקופה המוסלמית הראשונה (Publications of the Diaspora Research Institute, 57; Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University/Bialik/Ministry of Defense, 1983) vol. 2, pp. 356-359. For other references to Dosa, see the index, vol. 3, p. 666 (s.v. דוסא השר הנכבד בן יהושע החבר, אלל אד'קי).
גַבְהוּת לְעַצְמוֹ לְדָרְשָה
מַלְכוּת עוֹלָם עֲבוּר לְיָרְשָה
וְתַצְמִיחُ קֶרֶן זְעֵירָה וּבִישָה
תַצְמִיחُ קרן גרַבֵּה וּרְעה
cכָל אַרְעָא רָפְסָה וְדָיְשָה
cכָל הארץ רומסת
לַהּ עַיְנִין כְעַיְנֵי אֲנָשָא
לַהּ עַיְנִין כְעַיְנֵי אֲנָשָא
עִם קַדִישִין מִתְכַתְשָא
עִם קַדִישִין מִתְכַתְשָא
וְיַצְמִי קֶרֶן רַבְרְבִין מַרְגְשָא
וְיַצְמִי קֶרֶן רַבְרְבִין מַרְגְשָא
לְדָוִד מִן רֵאשֵּׁמֶשָא שֵימָה שְלוֹשָה
וְרְשֵׁעָה שְלוֹשָה
בְכֵן תַשְמִיעַ קֹלוֹת שְלוֹשָה
בְשַאַגֵּי שְוָפָרָה שְלוֹשָה
לְהַרְעִיש דוֹק וָחֶלֶד בְאֶחָד
לֶאֱסוֹף נְדוּחִים בְאֶחָד
לְהַנְּעוֹרֵר מֵתִים בְאֶחָד
לְהַשְּמִיעַ יְשֻׁעָה לְגוֹי אֶחָד
לְגַלּוֹת שִמְּיֻיחָד
לְאוֹמְרֵי יי יְחִד
 לְגַלּוֹת שִמְּיֻיחָד
לְאוֹמְרֵי יי יְחִד
בֶאֱדוֹם הַגְּבִירָה
הַגָּדוֹל וְהַנּוֹרָא
וְתוֹדִיעַ לְעַם יְבָרָא
כִּי לְךָ נֵזֶר וְגְבוּרָה וְתִפְאָרָה
וִיחַדְשוּ לְךָ שִׁירָה
לְךָ זְרוֹעַ עִם גְבוּרָה
וְנָאֶה לְךָ זֵר וַעֲטָרָה
לְהַנְּחִיל שִבְּטֵי שְחוֹרָה
מַלְכוּת לָעַד שְמוּרָה
וְקוֹל לָעִיר יִקְרָא
קוּמִי רֹנִי עֲקָרָה
אַנְחָתֵךָ כְבָר עָבְרָה
וְצָמְחָה אוֹרָה
הִנֵה יְסַדְתִיךָ בְטָהֳרָה
בַסַפִּיר וּבְאֶבֶן יְקָרָה
וְנַקְדִישְךָ נוֹרָא
כְזֶה אֶל זֶה קָרָא
ככ<תוב וקרא זה אל זה ואמר קדוש קדוש קדוש יי צבאות מלא כל הארץ כבודו> (יש' ו, ג)

ככ<תוב וקרא זה אל זה ואמר קדוש קדוש קדוש יי צבאות מלא כל הארץ כבודו> (יש' ו, ג)
Translation

And so: A qedusha will ascend to you for You are our God

1 You’ll proclaim consolation to Laish, / A proclamation of a new covenant, / A healing of the sore wound; / The one thrice called ‘mountain’, / 5 Zion, ploughed like a field, / Scattered and abandoned on the mountains – / Clothing her in strength and splendor, / Announcing ‘Cast up, Cast up [a highway]!’ to her people, / Bringing her scattered in a throng. / 10 That she not be uprooted from her land, / To give her ease in quiet rest. / For her raw [wound] has been bound – / Your holy right hand / will establish Your Tower in holiness. / 15 She will be called I-delight-in-her, Sought One, / the Lofty Habitation, destined for [God’s] holy abode, / ‘And He will produce the capstone’. / Make Mt. Seir and Edom a possession, / May [Your] word hasten quickly to Asshur, / 20 threshing the godless nation with the rod of Your anger. / And so He will announce a harsh vision, / indeed will arrive to overwhelm. / For His counsel is profound and firm – / seeking elevation for Himself, / 25 so as to inherit eternal kingship. / Now [the fourth beast] will sprout a small, evil horn, / stamping and treading down the whole earth. / It has eyes like the eyes of man, / [And] strives with the saints. / 30 It will overpower them with evil-doing, / but will be cast in a flaming fire. / Then the Watchful and Holy One will be revealed, / all the holy people with Him. / And He’ll exterminate the horn that is eager [to speak] arrogantly, / 35 Made plain to David of old, / called by three names, / inscribed with three ciphers. / Then You’ll bring forth three sounds, / with the roaring of three horns –

40 One waking the dead, / One gathering the scattered, / One shaking heaven and earth – / To bring the One Shepherd, / proclaim salvation to the One Nation, / 45 reveal Your unique Name / to those who say ‘The Lord is One’.

Ms. N only:
And when You proclaim tidings / I’ll raise the cup of salvation / that You look to me / […]

And You’ll don ten garments / to wreak vengeance on Lady Edom, / 49-50 discomfit her on the great and terrible day of furious anger. / And You’ll make known to the Created People / that crown, glory and splendor are Yours, / And they’ll sing You a new song. / Yours are might and glory, / 55 chaplet and crown befit You – / To bequeath the tribes of the Black Woman / a kingdom preserved forever. / And a voice will cry out to the City, / ‘Arise, shout, Barren One!’ / 60 Your groaning has now passed, / And the light has flourished. / Behold, I Have laid your foundation in purity, / in sapphire and precious stone. / And we’ll sanctify You, Awesome [God] / 65 Like the [angels] calling out to one another.

As it is written: And one called to the other, ‘Holy, holy, holy! The Lord of Hosts! His glory fills all the earth!'
The collocation is based on

A healing of the sore wound: The collocation is based on (Jer. 15.18).

The one thrice called 'mountain': The poet is apparently hinting at a midrash that enumerates three cases in Scripture of the use of the word רָעָה as a reference to Jerusalem, but I have been unable to locate such a one in the sources. For a midrash that enumerates more than three instances, see (Jer. 50.17).

This reference contains a Muslim

The lexical pair is based on Gen.

The locution is in a throng: Similar to {Ps. 55.15}.

The root תָּשָׁבָת is employed in the Targums as a translation of biblical וּתָּשֶׁב, and it is attested in this sense also in Rabbinic Hebrew – see Moreshet, Lexicon, p. 345 (s.v. דִּאָרְשׁ). The root תָּשֶׁב is read as תָּשְׁבָּת, and it is attested in this sense also in Rabbinic Hebrew.

The lexical pair is based on Deut. 29.27, etc.

The lexical pair is based on Lev. 24.12.

The lexical pair is based on Num. 24.18.

The reference is to the Isainiac prophesy that is referred to in the first line of the sillation—Isa. 10.24 foll.

The lexical pair is based on (Isa. 5.19).

I will thresh the godless nation with the rod of Your anger: Cf. (Isa. 10:6; the enemies of Israel are meant.

The collocation is based on (Isa. 10:5).

And so He will announce a harsh vision: Ms. י reads differently:

This reading contains a reference to Arab-Muslim rule (א, based on Gen. 16.12). However, it does not seem to be original; the reading of the base text is attested in mss.
His counsel is profound: The collocation is based on (Isa. 29.15). 24 make your elevation for Himself: Cf. (Isa. 2.11) and also verse 17. 25 eternal kingship: Cf. Based on (Ps. 145.13). 26 Now [the fourth beast] will sprout a small, evil horn: See the comment to line 26. 27 to all ten garments ... will wear all ten garments (Dan. 7.8 [and cf. also 7.20]). 28 and eyes like the eyes of man: See the comment to line 26. 29 strives with the saints. It will overpower them: Based on (Dan. 7:21). 30 evil-doing: This is the JPA form of the infinitive; in ms. the corresponding BA form is attested: רועה אחד ... will be cast in a flaming fire: Based on (Dan. 7.11). 31 the Watchful and Holy One: Based on (Dan. 4.10, 20). In Daniel, the reference is to some sort of angelic being, whereas a plain sense reading of the present context seems to indicate that the reference here is to God Himself. However, it is possible that the payyetan had in mind an angel sent to redeem Israel. 32 eager [to speak] arrogantly: Based on (Ps. 17.29). 33 Made plain to David of old: Referring to the (typological) wicked kingdom that oppresses Israel, foreseen by David—see (1 Chron. 27.23), p. 544). See also Elizur and Rand, Qillir RH, pp. 152-154. 34 called by three names: The allusion is to the Christian kingdom, which is known by the names Mary and (see line 18). 35 inscribed with three ciphers: The reference is apparently to (Hosea 11.2; see verses 38-42). 36 Then You'll bring forth three sounds ... Someone shaking heaven and earth: The payyetan enumerates the three shofarot that will be sounded in the future. Cf. (Isa. 63.10). 37 and minor variations in Arugat ha-Bosem 3, pp. 472-473). See also Setel, Three Shofar Blasts. This midrash is attested also in the sillum of the qedusha for Shabbat Shim’u by Yehuda: (Mahzor Vitry, par. [p. 371]; and with minor variations in Arugat ha-Bosem 3, pp. 472-473). See also Elizur and Rand, Qillir RH, pp. 152-154. 38 And epithet for the Messiah son of David, based on (Ezek. 34.23, and see also 37.24). 39 One Nation: An epithet for Israel, based on (2 Sam. 7.23 [=1 Chron. 17.21]) and (Ezek. 37.22). 40 ‘The Lord is One’: To those who say ‘Hear, O Israel...’ (Deut. 6.4). 41 I’ll raise the cup of salvation: Based on (Ps. 116.13). 42 And You’ll don ten garments to wreak vengeance on Lady Edom: A reference to God’s ten garments; see the comment to line 26. 43 Shabbat Sh'mitah ... deah organ (PDRK 22.5 [pp. 329-330]). In the present case, however, God will wear all ten garments at the time of His vengeance on Edom. 44 discomfit her: In the parallel BH form the mem is doubled by means of a dagesh; (Deut. 2:15; Est. 9.24).
terrible day of furious anger: Based on Ps. 102.19.

Yours are might and glory: Ps. 89.14.

Behold, I have laid your foundation in purity, in sapphire and precious stone

Sources

Base text: ENA 351/10-11 (lines 1-65; א); ENA 3443/2 (lines 1-46 + the three unnumbered lines after line 46; ב); T-S NS 208.18 (lines 2 ז[19]–65; ג); Ox. Hev. f. 36, fol. 6-7 (=part of cat. Neubauer 2738/1; lines 1-22 + end version in כ). The text is also mentioned in ms. Frankfurt 152 (Schocken Institute photostat): סלק. {

Variant Readings


The Black Woman: An epithet for Israel, based on Ps. 102.19. 54 Yours are might and glory: Ps. 89.14.

And a voice will cry out to the City: Based on Lam. 2.19 and Jer. 14.21 (Isa. 54.1). 62-63

Behold, I have laid your foundation in purity, in sapphire and precious stone: Based on the Created People: For the lexical pair cf. Ps. 102.19.
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