

A Response to Yehoshua Granat

Michael Rand

Item 1:

Granat's reading and interpretation of l. 32 are to be preferred to those given in my article. However, the reading חשקו in l. 33 suggested by him is impossible, since there is an unambiguous and consistent difference between *qof* and *tav* in the manuscript (the bottom stroke of the former points more or less directly downwards, while the left leg of the latter curves leftwards and upwards); the reading is clearly חשתו (*apud* Grant's claim in note 13). One might suggest, therefore, in light of Granat's likely interpretation of טעם as referring to Torah, that חשתו be understood as a transitive verb (i.e., as החשתו), so that טעם חשתו זירזת ועודדת את חברי (l. 34) would be interpreted as: הסנהדרין (ואת כל ישראל איתם) לשאוב דברי תורה ("טעם") בעת שמחת בית השואבה.

Item 2:

The distinction made by Granat between the pre-modern meaning of קצב, "measure" (i.e., synonymous with מדה, שיעור) and the modern meaning, "pace," is unnecessary in the present context, since "pace" (in everyday usage, at least) expresses the *measure* of the speed of a given process, and the interpretation offered in my commentary refers to the *measure*, or degree, of the Tree's ability to nurture the world; thus far for the question of the semantics of the word קצב. The real distinction, therefore, between my interpretation and Granat's is rooted in the question of what exactly is being measured. Granat suggests that the measurement refers to the depth of the Tree's roots, which reach to the primordial waters. However, the midrashic description of the Tree in which the line in question is rooted clearly indicates that the measurement it offers refers

to the Tree's girth, not the depth of its roots, which is not mentioned at all: עץ חיים מהלך חמש מאות שנה. אמ' ר' יהודה ביר' אלעאי. לא סוף דבר נופו אלא אפילו כורתו (PT *Ber.* 1:1 [2c]; cf. also *Ber. Rab.* 15:6 [ed. Theodor-Albeck, p. 138]). This description of the Tree's circumference (rather than the depth of its roots) is reflected in the Qillirian *silluq* for Sukkot cited by Granat, which relies directly on the midrashic source quoted above: חמש מאות שנה הליכותיו עלות / עבי כרתו (1. 47 [ed. Goldschmidt-Frenkel, p.130]). In the *silluq*, the word קצב appears in the following line, which describes the extent of the Tree's branches: אבל מנין [נ"א קצב] ענפיו אין במדה להעלות (1. 48 [ibid.]). It is therefore evident that the question of the depth of the Tree's roots is treated neither in the midrashic source, nor in the Qillirian poetic tradition that directly relies on it. On the other hand, in the *silluq* for Sukkot, Qillir develops the midrashic source by referring to the extent of the Tree's branches. This specifically poetic development is quite likely rooted in the description found in the book of Daniel (4:9–10): עפיה שפיר ואנבה שגיא ומזון לכלא בה... ומנה יתזין כל בשרא. On the basis of this scriptural source, which makes the connection between the extensive foliage of the Tree and its all-nourishing quality, it seems likely to me that the word קצב, which Qillir uses in connection with the Tree's foliage in the *silluq* for Sukkot, is employed by him in the *rahit* for Shemini Atzeret to refer to the Tree's nourishing ability. In light of this explanation, I think the words אשר הוא כעומק מים "...which is like deep waters" are best interpreted as a simile, in which water stands for nourishment and plenty. Granat's alternative explanation, according to which the poet is referring here to the actual depth of the primordial waters which the Tree's roots reach, is theoretically possible but less likely in my view, especially as he does not cite any textual (i.e., midrashic) support for such a seemingly specific cosmographic notion.¹

1 The reference to קצבי הרים in Jonah 2:7, made by Granat in note 19, does not seem to be relevant. The scriptural phrase is difficult to interpret, but in any case it is clear on the basis of the context that it is part of the description of the (metaphorical) death of the speaker and his shade-like existence in the Pit, whereas in the case under discussion, the term קצב is employed within the opposite context of life, plenty and nourishment.

Items 3, 4, 6:

Granat's interpretations, arrived at on the basis of a manuscript that I unaccountably overlooked in my edition, are to be accepted. The manuscript in question, ENA 1235.1, is actually the direct continuation of ENA 631.1, on which ll. 1–40 of my edition are based. The following is an apparatus of variant readings from the new manuscript (not including variations in *plene* versus defective orthography). The variant forms are given together with their vocalization in the manuscript. Those cases in which the alternative readings provide an obviously better text than the one I published (including those places pointed out by Granat) are marked by an asterisk.

14 צ' [...] להתיר קשר יזורמו] יזרמו מים במשמע] בשמע 49 מתגלגל ומתגבר
 55 אל יהי בל יהא יבול פועלם] כל פועל 59 כשלהבת] כשלהבת יה (ל' מתוקנת, כנראה מן ו')
 60 ממראה] ממראה כמראה* 61 ויקוקי] זיקוקי חרס] חרש כי במחזות] כבמחזית 63 ומיופה]
 ומצפה* 64 כל יבעות] לאחות בלי בעת 65 לנקבה] בנקבה* 66 כוברת בחרת כברת] כיברת
 כחשרת כברה 67 להביר להחשיר] להכביר ולהחשיר 68 ינוב] יצו 70 במו] בו 71 משלג מי
 שילוח] שלג וגשם ש[. 73 מלהתערב ומלעבור] מלהתערב בה ומילהחליף 75 ולפתוח] בם
 ליפתוח 77 אוצרים] עוצרים ומפלים] ומפילים ומקשיבים 79 וישאו] ישאו 80 רנן] רינה דיץ]
 ועמקים דיץ 82 ברדת] ברידת גביעתם] ליויית גביעתם* 85 בשוח] בשווח

I have re-edited the following lines according to MS ENA 1235.1. The vocalization is mine. A commentary is provided wherever the interpretation differs from that which I suggested in my original article.

| | |
|----|---|
| 51 | קו>ל< קורא מסוף העולם ועד סופו [...] בלי קשב |
| 52 | קשב משמיע תהום רבה לכו חזו מפעלות צור |
| 53 | צו>ר< ציווה עלי וקיבלו שרי צבאות |
| 54 | צב>אות< ברקים שרו בשורף בלי פחד |
| 57 | ע>נן< להראות קשת בכל מראיית עין |
| 58 | ע>ין< מילזון בדיקדוק תבנית דמות סכיייתה |
| 78 | ומ[בקיעים] שְׁעָרִים יַחְפִּיר בְּפֹקְדוֹ אֶרֶץ הַחַיִּים |
| 88 | אָמְנָה לְהַעִיר גְּבוּלַת הַגָּשָׁם עַל תַּחֲיִית הַמַּתִּים |

53 עלי וקיבלו: יש להעדיף את גירסת מהדורת: "עָלוּ וְקָבְלוּ". שרי צבאות: שליחי ה', היינו הגשמים (השווה בפירוש על אתר במהדורת). 54 שרו: כנראה מטפורה לרעם, היינו שיר הברקים. בשורך: כאשר ראו אותך. 57 מראיית: כמו: מראית; הניקוד על פי כתב היד. 58 עין מילזון: ראה את פירושו של גרנט. מילזון: הניקוד כבניין נפעל על פי כתב היד. 78 יחפיר: ה' הוא הנושא. 88 גבולת: יש להעדיף את גרסת מהדורת: "גְבוּרָת". תחיית: הניקוד על פי כתב היד. הצורה "תְּחִיָּה" רווחת בפיוט.

Item 5:

Granat is correct in pointing out that the metaphoric explanation offered in my commentary is rather convoluted. He is also correct in that most of the *piyyut* in question deals with natural phenomena, and does not therefore represent an obvious context for a developed metaphor relating to God's speaking. However, it should be pointed out that precisely in the lines preceding the ones in question we find a concentration of terms from the semantic field of speech: להגיד (l. 68), הגא (l. 69), באומר (l. 69). The last case is particularly significant, since it appears in the sentence באומר ירעיפו, which makes direct lexical reference to the scriptural *locus classicus* for the connection between speech and water: יערף כמטר לקחי תזל כטל אמרתי (Deuteronomy 32:2). Granat's comments notwithstanding, therefore, it seems to me unsurprising that in the next line the poet would switch from a description of the descent of water to a description of the descent of Divine speech, though I admit that the way in which I suggested understanding the metaphor is unduly complex (and therefore not entirely convincing).

The naturalistic explanation offered by Granat, moreover, also presents a number of difficulties. I am not an expert in agriculture,² but it is difficult for me to accept the notion that הגשמים מבערים את הפירות הרעים, offered by Granat

2 And neither, apparently, were the pre-classical and classical *payyetaanim*, whose knowledge of the subject was rather limited; see E. Ha-Cohen, "חלף הגשם והסתיי עבר / ובי צצו ניצנים, *Masoret ha-Piyyut* 4 (2008), pp. 61–83.

by way of explanation for the words of the *piyyuṭ*: ירעיפו לבער הרע. And even if some such thing were scientifically possible, there is no evidence in the *piyyuṭ* literature known to me that the poets thought of the rain as being detrimental to the growth of (bad) fruit. It seems, therefore, that the burden of proof is on Granat to demonstrate the existence of this idea on the basis of a text other than the difficult one that is at issue here.

The connection between the words מים/גשם and שלג in the *payyetaṅ*'s phrase טעם משלג מי שילוח (see also the variant reading to this line, given above) is quite common in Qillirian language. In addition to the pair גשם ושלג cited by Granat from the Qillirian *seḏer pesuqim* for Shemini 'Atzeret (l. 68 [ed. Goldschmidt-Frenkel, p. 424]), one may also note the following cases from the *seḏer yetsira* of the same composition: משליגת מים (l. 8 [ibid., p. 410]), שלג מים (l. 42 [ibid., p. 414]).³ On the basis of these cases, it seems reasonable to consider these combinations as expressing simply the notion of “water” or “rain.” However, the addition of the word שילוח to the phrase in question presents an interpretational difficulty. Granat suggests that the phrase be interpreted to mean: טעמם של הגשמים... הנו כטעם מי השילוח. Leaving aside the difficulty of construing the words in question in such a way as to yield this meaning, it seems to me that the very context of the *piyyuṭ*, stressed by Granat, militates against this interpretation. The *piyyuṭ* is mostly concerned with the process by which the fructifying rain is brought to earth, not with the taste of the (rain) water *qua* drinking water.⁴ From the point of view of context, therefore, the naturalistic explanation offered by Granat is at least as difficult as the

3 Cf. also M. Rand, *Introduction to the Grammar of Hebrew Poetry in Byzantine Palestine* (Piscataway, NJ 2006), p. 455 n. 739.

4 Cf. in this regard M. Rand, “Clouds, Rain and the Upper Waters: From *Bereshit Rabbah* to the *Piyyuṭim* of Eleazar be-rabbi Qillir,” *Aleph* (forthcoming). The source in *Ber. Rab.* 13:10 quoted by Granat in this connection (and cited in my commentary to ll. 34–35 of the *piyyuṭ* [p. 52*]) is therefore not relevant, since the question posed in the midrash is not so much of the taste of the water (i.e., salty or sweet) as of its status within the hydrological process (i.e., the relationship between salt and fresh water on the surface of the earth).

metaphorical one which I suggested.⁵ And since the reference to the waters of Siloam cannot reasonably be integrated into the dominant naturalistic context of the *piyyuṭ*, it seems preferable to me — given the ready-made scriptural metaphor in Isaiah 8:6 — to interpret these lines in terms of a metaphoric connection between water and speech.

Item 7:

In the following, I attempt to present my opinion with regard to the authorship of the *shiv'ata* סעד יומים. In Granat's view, the "inner-textological" reasons for thinking that the framing *shiv'ata* (as opposed to the *piyyuṭim* inserted into the second benediction, about whose Sa'adyanic authorship there is no dispute) is Sa'adyanic are as follows: (1) the *shiv'ata* is explicitly attributed to Sa'adya in the headings given in two manuscripts (one of which is lost, while the other serves as the basis of ll. 1–10 of my edition, where the heading is given); (2) the inserted *piyyuṭim* are associated with the framing *shiv'ata* in four manuscripts; (3) the fixed phrase מי מנוחות appears in the strophes of the framing *shiv'ata* as well as in the *sefer yetsira* ואחכמה (not in the *reshut* פלגים, as Granat writes).⁶

Reason No. 2 is hardly convincing, it being a near-axiom in *piyyuṭ* research that when a composition consists of a framing *qerova* (*qedushta*, *shivata*, etc.) that is expanded by means of *piyyuṭim* inserted in accordance with the requirements of a particular liturgical occasion, the inserted *piyyuṭim* could be

5 The connection suggested by Granat in note 32 between the adverbial expression בנחת found in the line in question and מי השלח ההלכים לאט (Isaiah 8:6 [the verse is cited in my commentary to that line, though with different import]) is unlikely, since בנחת seems to be a rather common adverbial usage, with no special allusive import; in addition to the cases cited by Granat, see also בנחת נהל מעגל from the same Qillirian composition (l. 69 [ed. Goldschmidt-Frenkel, p. 425]), and cf. Rand (n. 3 above), pp. 281–282. It is not even certain that Qillir would have interpreted לאט as an adverb meaning "gently, slowly"; see *Pesikta de Rav Kahana* 6:2 (ed. Mandelbaum, p. 116), where it is assumed that לאט refers to a toponym: ... מהו לאט [יש' ח, ו] בר קפרא א' חזירנו על כל המקרא ולא מצינו מקום ששמו לאט...

6 See M. Zula, האסכולה הפייטנית של רב סעדיה גאון (Jerusalem 1964), pp. 3–4.

(and were) changed at will, in accordance with the liturgical requirements and the tastes of the communities in which these compositions were employed.⁷ So if, for example, the *piyyuṭ* נר חנוכה אסור בו להשתמש, which is apparently Qillirian, appears in the *qedushta* for 18 benedictions נר אהליבה תאיר בחדריך by Pinḥas, this does not undermine the attribution of the *qedushta* to Pinḥas.⁸ Thus the fact that four manuscripts (a not particularly impressive number) make a connection between the framing *shiv'ata* and the inserted *piyyuṭim* by Sa'adya can hardly be taken as proof of the Sa'adyanic authorship of the former, if cogent reasons to think otherwise exist. It merely shows that in the liturgical practice of the communities (or community) for which these four manuscripts were produced, these Sa'adyanic *piyyuṭim* for Shemini 'Atzeret were inserted into the *shiv'ata* ארוחת סעד יומים.

Reason No. 1 is likewise unconvincing, since there is no reason why attributions made by copyists in the headings of manuscripts should be accepted

- 7 Granat seems to imply that there is something misleading in my having omitted the inserted *piyyuṭim* from my edition of the framing *shiv'ata*, but this is standard practice in the preparation of critical editions of *piyyuṭim* when the editor is convinced that some *piyyuṭim* do not belong to the composition within which they are copied. In the context of a long disquisition on the composition of the Rain *shiv'ata*, Granat stresses the fact that after its second strophe it contains a string of inserted *piyyuṭim* that precede the recitation of the second benediction of the *'amida*, and finds it surprising that in my edition I should have indicated this recitation by means of the insertion (in square brackets) of the words ב' מחיה. He apparently fails to appreciate that in my itemized list of compositions, I list simple *shiv'atot* for Shemini 'Atzeret (i.e., those that were never intended to contain inserted *piyyuṭim* for Rain) separately from Rain *shiv'atot* (i.e., those that were specifically intended to serve as framing *shiv'atot* for the inserted *piyyuṭim*, in other words, to be recited during the Additional Service of Shemini 'Atzeret), and that ארוחת סעד יומים is listed among the latter (pp. 18*–19*). This clearly indicates that my assumption is that the *shiv'ata* in question originally did contain inserted *piyyuṭim* by Qillir, but that in the available (and rather meager) textual record these *piyyuṭim* have been replaced by those of Sa'adya.
- 8 See Sh. Elizur, פיוטי רבי פינחס הכהן, (Jerusalem 2004), pp. 54–55. In the words of Elizur, the appearance of the *piyyuṭ* נר חנוכה אסור בו להשתמש in the context of the *qedushta* for 18 benedictions by Pinḥas casts doubt on the copyist (rather than on the authorship of the composition): פיוט ההרחבה שבקרובה מחשיד את המעתיק יותר מכול: ביצירת קומפוזיציה חדשה מלקט של פיוטים שונים.

when contrary evidence exists.⁹ In the present case, it is easy to suppose that a copyist attributed the entire composition to Sa'adya on account of the Sa'adyanic authorship of the inserted *piyyuṭim* (while having missed, as did a number of moderns, the acrostic signature אלעזר in the framing *shiv'ata*).

Reason No. 3 is refuted by the arguments offered by Granat himself. In trying to explain away the acrostic signature אלעזר found in the framing *shiv'ata* (see further below), he notes that במעשה, בשתי שבעות הגשם שחיבר רס"ג ניכרת למעשה, בשתי שבעות הגשם הקלירית 'אף ברי' השפעתה העזה של שבעת הגשם. Once we admit that the inserted *piyyuṭim* composed by Sa'adya for Shemini 'Atzeret are influenced by Qillirian models, it is not so difficult to imagine that in this case Sa'adya simply took a ready-made Qillirian framing *shiv'ata* and composed *piyyuṭim* for it in such a way that they could fit easily into the frame. After all, the use of a fixed phrase is a very easy structural detail to imitate, and it is quite useful in lending structural unity to a composition as a whole. In this case, one might even speculate that what caught Sa'adya's eye in this particular *shiv'ata* — which is, after all, not exceptional in terms of its literary qualities — was the use of the verb סעד in the first line, which answers so nicely to his own name.¹⁰

9 Cf. Sh. Elizur, קדושתאות ליום מתן תורה – רבי אלעזר בירבי קליר (Jerusalem 2000), p. 20, where the editor says as much with regard to the evaluation of the heading אלעזר in attempting to determine the Qillirian authorship of *piyyuṭim*: אך צריך להיזהר בכותרות מסוג זה, שכן לא אחת מצאנו אותן שגויות. (Granat himself refers to Elizur's discussion of the question of attribution in note 2.)

10 I cannot accept Granat's claim, made in note 52, that there is something particularly suggestive or diagnostic about the collocation of the verb סעד together with the word מים (or the like) in a line from the framing *shiv'ata* and two lines from the inserted *piyyuṭim*. I think it entirely banal that a verb meaning "to stay, support" should appear together with the word "water" in poetry whose basic function it is to request rain. Furthermore, in the case from l. 1 of the framing *shiv'ata*, the word מים appears in the rhyme position (i.e., it is not entirely freely selected) and in the first case from the Sa'adyanic inserted *piyyuṭim*, the word is taken from the fixed phrase מי מנוחת (i.e., it is entirely fixed in its place by means of the poetic structure). In the second case from the Sa'adyanic inserted *piyyuṭim*, the phrase מטרות ושלגים likewise appears in the rhyme position. The only thing that these examples prove is that a similarity in (liturgical) function leads to a similarity in (lexical) form (although, as stated above, I admit that Sa'adya might have had a special predilection for the verb סעד).

Leaving aside for the moment the question of language, this leaves us with a framing *shiv'ata* that is unambiguously signed אלעזר in the acrostic. True, the use of this acrostic signature alone is not enough to establish Qillirian authorship, and in such a case Elizur suggests the following procedure: ניתן יהיה להשתמש בסגנון, תבניות וכיוצא באלו כתוספת חיזוק לעידות שאינה מספקת כשהיא (של מעתיק בכותרת או של חתימת 'אלעזר' בלבד) לעצמה.¹¹ In the present case, a formal criterion is not hard to find: the distribution of the acrostic letters over the strophes of the framing *shiv'ata* parallels that found in the Qillirian Dew *shivata* (as I stated on p. 19*; Dew *shiv'atot* are structurally parallel to Rain *shiv'atot*, as a result of their functional, i.e., liturgical, parallelism). So we are faced with a choice between attributing the framing *shiv'ata* to Qillir on the basis of a typical acrostic signature or assuming that the *shiv'ata* was nevertheless composed by Sa'adya, who signed someone else's name in the acrostic. Granat opts for the second choice, arguing that Sa'adya is known to have signed names other than his own in his *piyyuṭim* — namely, שלמה במובן מסוים, פרדוקסלי קמעא, עצם הימצאותה של דויד — and that therefore חתימה אחרת בקומפוזיציה דווקא עולה בקנה אחד עם היותה מפרי עטו של רס"ג. He then goes on to suggest that Sa'adya's use of this signature in this *shiv'ata* was an act of homage by Sa'adya to Qillir: (בתור) ושמא כמנהגו זה של הקלירי (ביתור) מחווה לפייטן הנערץ (? נהג רס"ג ב'ארוחת סעד יומיים', שבעתת הגשם לשבת שחיבר according to Granat, a *shiv'ata* signed אלעזר was not written by Eleazar Qillir but by Sa'adya, who wanted to imitate Eleazar Qillir, and the very use of the signature אלעזר "paradoxically" proves that it was written by Sa'adya. In my view, paradoxical modes of argumentation are not appropriate to piyyut research in particular and or to research in the humanities in general. I believe it is much more scientifically responsible, when a particular object of study (in this case, a *shiv'ata*) appears to belong within a certain analytical category (in this case, the corpus of Qillirian *piyyuṭim*), to place it within that category,

11 See Elizur (n. 9 above), p. 20.

unless there are compelling reasons to reject the obvious classification, which appear to me to be absent in this case.

This brings us to the use of a number of words or phrases in the *shiv'ata* in question, which Granat believes betray its Sa'adyanic character. Granat himself admits that there is a distinction between the idiom of the framing *shiv'ata* and the Sa'adyanic idiom of the inserted *piyyuṭim*: לעומת צביונם הסעדיאני המופגן של האחרונים... נראות 'חטיבות המסגרת' צנועות יותר במהלכן וקרובות יותר לנוסח פייטני 'סטנדרדי'. However, he identifies the following elements that, in his view, argue for Sa'adyanic authorship: דשנת טוב (l. 4), בג (l. 2), צנתרות עריפיה (l. 22). The first is singled out because it contains an unusual feminine form of the common biblical word דשן, which is attested elsewhere in the Sa'adyanic corpus. However, unusual feminine forms are also attested in the Qillirian corpus. Take, for example the word צלמונה found in the Qillirian *sefer yetsira* for Shemini 'Atzeret (l. 18 [ed. Goldschmidt-Frenkel, p. 411]).¹² This form is not only unexpectedly feminine, but it is also a common noun derived from a toponym that is attested only twice in the Bible, therefore clearly demonstrating the quality of חיבת הבודדות והבלתי שגורות שבמקרא on the part of Qillir. I believe that this accounts for the two forms found in צנתרות עריפיה, which are both *hapax legomena*, as well as the form בג, derived from the biblical פתבג, which is attested several times, all in Daniel. One might also suggest for the sake of argument that the locutions in question were first employed in the present context by Qillir and were picked up by Sa'adya. This is, of course, just a guess, but it is not unreasonable in view of the esteem in which Sa'adya held Qillirian *piyyuṭ* specifically from the point of view of language; cf. his famous comment in the Arabic introduction to the *Egron*: ת'ם מא ראית אן אסתשהד עליה *Egron*: מן קול אלשערא אלאולין יוסי בן יוסי וינאי ואלעזר... פעלת ד'לך.¹³

On the basis of the data available through the Historical Hebrew Dictionary

12 Cf. also Rand (n. 3 above), pp. 514–515.

13 “Now [with regard to] that which I saw fit to supply with attestations from the ancient poets, Yose ben Yose and Yannai and Eleazar ... I did so.” Cf. N. Allony, כתאב – האגרון – מאת רב סעדיה גאון (Jerusalem 1969), p. 154.

project, Granat shows that all of the forms listed by him, leaving aside the *shiv'ata* in question, are attested exclusively in Sa'adya (with the exception of one case in Shmuel ha-Shelishi, whose idiom can be safely considered Sa'adyanic), and argues that this fact indicates that our *shiv'ata* too is Sa'adyanic. But this mode of argumentation is methodologically faulty, since it “stacks the deck” in favor of Sa'adya. The database of the Historical Hebrew Dictionary project is far from being complete, and significant portions of the Qillirian corpus have yet to be entered into it. If, therefore, on the basis of lexical argumentation, we were to enter the composition in question into the database as Sa'adyanic, we would thereby have distorted the number of attestations of particular lexemes in favor of Sa'adya, so that the next time we came to evaluate the possible Qillirian authorship of a composition containing the same lexemes (which, given the amount of material left to be processed, is not an unlikely scenario), we would be even less inclined to think it Qillirian since in the meantime the number of Sa'adyanic examples would have grown *at the direct expense of* Qillirian examples. In my view, in the present case it is preferable to be guided by the obvious fact that the language of *piyyut* is firmly rooted in Scripture, and to simply assume that (on principle) a *payyetan* like Qillir was just as free as a *payyetan* like Sa'adya to select certain biblical words from the available inventory, to manipulate them morphologically (e.g., by adding or removing a feminine ending), and to employ them in his composition.

Item 8:

I do not accept Granat's suggestion (and as he himself indicates, Zulay likewise was not certain that in this case the verb גער refers to roaring and the like),¹⁴

14 I do not understand why, in citing Zulay's article "נשכחות בלשון הפייטנים", Granat supplies the information that it was first published more than 65 years ago. If he means to imply that I was not aware of this article (which was published so long ago!), then he is wrong — see the bibliography in Rand (n. 3 above), p. 537. I do not think that it is my scholarly

since the line in question gives no reason to think that the *payyeṭan* is referring to sound production. The examples listed by Zulay indicate that the verb גהר “to roar” is either simply intransitive, or takes a word such as קול as an adverbial object.¹⁵ In the present case, the direct object of the verb is water — מי מנוחות גהר — which is inappropriate to the range of usages of the verb גהר “to roar.” Granat correctly points to Jeremiah 10:13 (parallel to 51:16) as appearing in the context of Rain *shiv’atot*. This verse is frequently employed by Qillir — see, for example, p. 52*, l. 34 and p. 53*, l. 42 in the material published in my previous article. However, I do not think that this verse is alluded to in the sentence under discussion, since the verse treats of the sounds accompanying rain, while the sentence under discussion does not. Granat suggests the following interpretation: השמע את קול המון המים (גְהַר) הנשמע ברדת: גשמי הברכה (מִי מְנוּחוֹת). In my view, this stretches the syntax and the semantics of the sentence beyond all likelihood. According to Zulay, גהר means “to roar.” There is no indication anywhere that it means “to utter the sound of raging waters,” as Granat would have it. Likewise, מי מנוחות means “peaceful waters” (a meaning that, by the way, is inconsonant with the image of a downpour accompanied by thunder), a noun phrase that cannot be made to serve in place of an entire subordinate clause.

responsibility to cite material that does not further the understanding of the material that I am trying to interpret, and since Zulay’s contribution in this case was the identification of the meaning “to roar, etc.” for the verb גהר, a meaning that I do not see in the present context (see above), I did not consider it necessary to refer to his discussion of the verb.

- 15 In one case, from Yosef ibn Avitur, the verb גהר does take a direct object, but there the meaning is clearly “to rebuke” (i.e., close to גער) rather than “to roar,” i.e., the stress is laid on the ethical, rather than the vocal, aspect of the verb: גוהרי מהתלות גהור: “Rebuke the mocking rebukers”. See M. Zulay, “נשכחות בלשון הפייטנים” in idem, *ארץ ישראל ופיוטיה*, (ed. E. Chazan, Jerusalem 1995), p. 446.

Item 9:

Granat's interpretation, together with the suggested emendation, should be accepted. The lexicological discussion, based on an emended form, is irrelevant.

Item 10:

This is a perfect illustration of the far-fetched results to which Granat's method of attribution leads. In the present case, in light of an explicit Qillirian acrostic signature (and in the absence of any textual or liturgical reasons to deny Qillirian authorship), his argumentation rests on a listing of phrases, etc. that are "difficult," together with a few that are "Sa'adyanic" or "late." The conclusion that he draws from this list is as follows: לעניות דעתי קשה לשלול את האפשרות כי מדובר ביצירתו של פייטן מאוחר ביחס, שניסה את כוחו בחיקוי שבעתת גשם קלירית נודעת ושאל ממנה הן את התבניות והן את חתימת שמו של הפייטן הקדום והמפורסם. So we are asked to believe that some other *payyetaṅ*, not Qillir, imitated Qillir to the extent of signing his name in the acrostic, though in regard to the difficult language his imitation was a failure, as a result of which Granat is able to identify it as such. At the very least, it should have occurred to him that the same data can be interpreted in exactly the opposite, and much more likely, fashion — i.e., that rather than being faced with a blatantly pseudepigraphic composition, we are dealing with a case of a prodigiously talented *payyetaṅ*, whose ability to write in different registers is quite well documented, composing in a style that is not *yet* (well) attested in his known corpus. In note 79, Granat mitigates his conclusion somewhat: את ליבונה הממצה של בעיית ייחוס זו ראוי אולי לדחות לשלב מתקדם יותר בחקר הפיוט הקדום בכלל ויצירתו של הקלירי בפרט. But given his methodology with regard to establishing Qillirian authorship, the results will be the same: Granat's Qillirian corpus will contain only those compositions that suit his definition of "Qillirian," and everything that does not match this ideal corpus will be excluded as imitations, or perhaps on other grounds. In short, the procedure suggested here by Granat undermines

the very foundations of modern *piyyut* research, since it prevents us from assembling the corpus on which our judgments should be based.¹⁶

With regard to the acrostic signature of the *seder yetsira*, Granat's suggested reading סעירי in l. 58 is correct (cf. his item 12). If, furthermore, one were to accept his quite reasonable suggested emendation of l. 62 to רגש טובים השנים (i.e., one letter missing from the expected מקרית, and an extra *aleph* after the word ספר). But of course this would still not yield the proper form of the name signature, as he suggests.

Items 11–15:

The readings and interpretations suggested by Granat are to be preferred to mine.

Item 16:

I wish to thank Granat for pointing out that the *reshut* [ברכות] תשקיף ממעון in MS Mosseri IV 369 is actually the first part of the *reshut* in MS Cambridge T-S NS 127.24, and that the whole is parallel to the *reshut* אמרי פי יהיו לרצון, as these facts had escaped my notice. I furthermore find convincing his suggestion that the two *reshuyot* [ברכות] תשקיף ממעון + קטנה ... were originally intended as a pair. However, I do not understand why in his view the fact that the *reshut* אמרי

16 Granat mentions a number of places in the *shiv'ata* in which reference is made to Yom Kippur — ll. 103, 201, 178 (see also notes 80, 81) — finding the presence of this theme in a composition for Shemini 'Atzeret remarkable: מהלך זה אינו אופייני לשבעות הגשם: הקדומות בכלל והקליריות בפרט should be mentioned during a festival that takes place a short while afterward; compare, for example, the opening line of the Qillirian *qedushta* for Sukkot כפור אוימתי בחיל כפור [l. 1 [ed. Goldschmidt-Frenkel, p. 98]].

17 The interpretation of the line offered in note 71 is also to be preferred. On the other hand, the vocalization suggested by him in note 81 is puzzling. My vocalization עולותם “their iniquities” is based on the Biblical עולות (Psalms 58:3; 64:7), whereas I am not aware of any ancient authority for his suggested עילותם.

and **מכאב** (attested in the classical *payyeṭan* Pinḥas), I refer the reader to my comments on Item 7 above. I believe that the structural parallels to other Qillirian compositions, taken together with the acrostic signature **לעזר**,²¹ suffice to attribute the composition to Qillir. Even if the *reshut* [ברכות] were proven to be late, this would not impugn the Qillirian authorship of the rest of the composition, since the *reshut* could very well not be original to it, as I pointed out in my original publication.

In the present context, I would like to take the opportunity to mention two corrections suggested to me by B. Loeffler. In *piyyuṭ* 14b, l. 56 the correct reading is **עוֹטָה תְּאוּמִים** (the spelling is influenced by the rhyme-word **תְּאוּמִים** in l. 58), the reference being to Levi. The variant reading of MS Firkovitch II A 236.6a, reported in the apparatus, is to be corrected to **תְּמִים**. In l. 72, the text is to be vocalized: **טִיעַת רְאִשֵׁיהֶם מְתִים יְחִהּ**. The words **רְאִשֵׁיהֶם מְתִים** serve as an epithet for Issachar (cf. I Chronicles 12:33 and the midrash in *Ber. Rab.* 72:5 [ed. Theodor-Albeck, p. 842]), so that the whole may be translated as: “May [the rain] revive the planting[s] of ‘Their heads are 200’ [=Issachar].”

The damaged *sefer pesuqim* that appears as *piyyuṭ* No. 15 in my article and that I explicitly attributed to the corpus on the basis of form alone can be considered anonymous.

Item 17:

Following up on Granat’s suggestion, one might speculate that **ברכות** functions adverbially, so that **ירידת גשמים ברכות יושאב** may be translated as: “May the descending rains be drawn [as] blessings.” Alternatively, one could adopt the variant reading **גשם** (see the apparatus *ad loc.*), so that the line would read **ירידת גשם ברכות יושאב** (i.e., **גשם** in construct with **ברכות**, as a variation on the phrase **גשמי ברכה**).

21 The *sefer pesuqim* in question is clearly signed **לעזר**, not **לעזר[א?]** as Granat suggests. The signature **לעזר** is attested in Qillirian *piyyuṭim*; cf. E. Fleischer, “עניינים קיליריים”, *Tarbiz* 50 (1980–1981), p. 283.