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The Hebrew document under consideration, Rylands Genizah Fragment 1, is written on a coarse yellowish parchment, measuring 440 x 186 mm. and containing thirty-eight lines.


The parchment has writing on both its sides, and one may conveniently give here a few details of some interest about the writing on the other side. This is a Biblical text, copied by an experienced hand, as it would appear, at a later date than that of the piyyut. It begins with והוה יכדרם (Deut. xxxi. 27) and ends with אלע תַּוַּי (ib. xxxii. 27). The first part, being prose, is set out in full lines, and the second part, which forms the beginning of twenty-seven poetical verses of the pericope תַּוַּי, is laid out in half lines, indicating parallels. There are only a few lacunae. Unlike the piyyut on its opposite side there is hardly any margin left at the bottom of the parchment. Again, the right hand has no margin at all; so much so that some thin parts of its initial letters are missing. Not so is the left hand side. Here, however, about one-third of the margin towards the top and about one-third towards the bottom are impaired in parts—apparently as a result of stitching. It seems, then, to have formed a page in a volume into which Hebrew writings were intended to be inserted. Whether or not the insertions were made with a definite scheme in view is hard to say. All told, there are forty-eight lines having no vowels nor ziyyûtnîn (crownlets required to be placed on seven letter of the alphabet in the Torah Scrolls), nor magqephs. In orthography it differs very slightly from that of the editions of the current Masoretic Texts. Thus והוה instead of והוה (Deut. xxxii. 15). רְחַוֹר (Deut. xxxii. 7) is defective, this being in conformity with the current editions of the M.T. as against Biblia Hebraica. Scribal errors are few. רבענ instead of רבענ (Deut. xxxii. 15), with feth missing. The lay-out of the parallel lines deviates in a few instances from that given, e.g. in the Biblia Hebraica, thus implying different interpretations.
lines of a liturgical poem. Atmospheric agencies have affected a large number of letters, making them difficult to decipher. The last few lines at the bottom of the page, especially on the left, are heavily mutilated. There are also a few lacunae, some of which, however, are restorable. The shape of the letters of the top two lines betrays two distinct pens; the one, used in the writing on the right of the page, which occupies about half the space of its breadth, had a broader quill-feather than that used on its left. The broad quill-feather was again used in the writing of the remainder of the thirty-six lines that follow. It is hard to conjecture a date for this slovenly-written copy, but perhaps the end of the eleventh century would not be wide of the mark. The poem, framed in the liturgical composition Kol-Nidrê—known to be recited on the night of Yom Kippur—is composed of eighteen verses each containing three rhyming lines, the first two being the composition of the paytan (= liturgical poet) and the third a Biblical passage. A double alphabetical acrostic, not taking account of the Biblical passage, runs through its eighteen verses. There is no name of the author spelt

1 Strictly speaking, there are only 37\(\frac{1}{2}\) lines, for the 38th line contains only a few words.

2 The word “pens” needs emphasis, for, though at first sight one is inclined to see two hands rather than two pens, a close examination of the palaeography of the various letters points to a common hand for the whole page.

3 The reason for the change of pen (or perhaps the position of the same pen) may be due to the desire of the copyist in the first instance to allot to each full verse one line only. On reaching the third stroke of the shin of ש, however, he apparently became aware that although half of its space had already been spent, only much less than half of the verse had been written. The pen was then changed. This was repeated in the copying of the second verse. The two verses, however, being still too long, a few of the concluding words of the first one had to be written above the end of the line and the concluding words of the second one below the end of the second line. (Moreover, some of them had even to be abridged. See pp. 493, n. 8, 494 2.) This practice was given up from the third verse onwards, where we have verses extending to more than one line.

4 However, the eighteenth verse—the first line of which is almost obliterated—is not in conformity with this scheme, as its last two lines are made up of two Biblical passages (see p. 500, notes 13 and 14). Nor are in strict conformity verses 1, 2, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, and 15, where the Biblical passages are preceded by some introductory words of the paytan. Verse 4 is anomalous, combining as it does three Biblical passages (see p. 494, n. 7).

5 Exceptions are the second line of the first verse which has a beth instead of an aleph and the second line of the eighteenth verse, which, being a Biblical
acrostically—a conspicuous feature of *piyyutim* in general. But it is possible that the name was originally embodied as a telistich in the obliterated words of the beginning of the last verse. The eighteen Biblical passages bear on the Eighteen Benedictions\(^1\) of the Morning Prayer. Thus, the first verse ends with “... I am (thy) shield” (Gen. xv.1) followed by a stroked *beth* indicating, abbreviately, the word רֹאשׁ of the first Benediction which concludes with the words “Blessed art Thou, O Lord, the shield of Abraham”. The second verse ends with “Thy dead shall live, my dead bodies shall arise” (Isa. xxvi. 19). This is again followed by the abridged word רֹאשׁ, indicating the second Benediction which concludes with the words “Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who quickenest the dead”. And so on. The *piyyut*-pieces, then, were intended to be interwoven in the Eighteen Benedictions while recited by the Reader, and we thus have here a composition known as *Qerôbhâh*.\(^2\)

What is the significance of this *Qerôbhâh*? Certainly not its contents which, by the nature of things, are somewhat lifeless, as indeed is its frame, the *Kol-Nidré*,\(^3\) to which it owes its animation; nor is it its language which, though containing a few of the general characteristic *piyyutic* elements\(^4\) which accord it some philological value, lacks the stronger and more striking ingredients peculiar to the Saadyah School\(^5\) to which one is inclined to attribute the composition.\(^6\) Its significance passage, is not in keeping with the alphabetical order and does not embody the required letter ש. (See preceding note.)

\(^1\) Not nineteen, as is customary today. This is in accordance with an old custom which prevailed in Palestine and its neighbouring countries. The Benediction שלמה נְכָרָה is here left out. Cf. the similar practice in Qelir’s *Qerôbhâh* for Purim beginning with רָבָא תְמַנ ``` *יִשְׂרָאֵל* which is framed in Est. ii. 17.

\(^2\) The origin of this word is doubtful, but M. Seidel’s suggestion (*Hiqre Lâshôn*, Jerusalem, 1942, p. 43) that the meaning of רֹאשׁ can be adduced by its parallel שָׁבָה, “we give thanks”, of Ps. lxxv. 2, is worthy of consideration.

\(^3\) Having hardly any intrinsic qualities, it nevertheless assumed value owing to its being recited on the awe-inspiring day of *Yom Kippur* as well as to its impressive melody. But this is not the place to enlarge on these matters.

\(^4\) These are (a) Prolonged inf. (line 17). (b) Anomalous use of the ל ב כ letters (lines 39, 44, and 49). (c) Emblematical terms (lines 13, 18 (two), 22, 23, 37, 38, 42(?), 72(?)). (d) Verb and noun coinages (not recorded in either the Bible or the Talmud) (lines 23 (two), 48, 58, 67, 68 and 72).

\(^5\) See Zulay, *Orlogin* 6 (Tel-Aviv, 1952).

\(^6\) See p. 493.
lies, in the first place, in its frame as such which is, as far as one is able to ascertain, unique in the paytanic literature, where *piyyuṭim* of the three primary types,\(^1\) framed in Biblical passages bearing on their subject matter are innumerable. Here the frame is not the venerated Bible but a composition of about the second half of the seventh century\(^2\) of Palestinian origin\(^3\) which was frowned upon by most of the Geonim\(^4\) and which apparently was not found fit enough—at a later date—to be adopted in the Catalonian and Algerian rituals\(^5\)—a composition which contains some mere formulae declaring null and void vows, etc., which an individual voluntarily undertook to himself.\(^6\)

Where does this composition emanate from? Before attempting an answer to this question some remarks on the wording of the frame, in addition to those given in the notes on the text, are here called for. To begin with, the version here is Hebrew and not Aramaic\(^7\) and follows with some deviations that of SAG. The following are some of its peculiarities: *חפירה,\(^8\)* which may be the equivalent of *יומילנה, of the current Aramaic version,*\(^9\) and not found in SAG, is mentioned by the Qaraite Salmon b. Yeruslim, a contemporary of Saadyah Gaon.

---

1. For forms of *piyyuṭim,* see my *Some Unpublished Piyyuṭim from the Cairo Genizah* (Manchester University, Faculty of Arts Pub. 8, 1956) pp. 3-6.

2. This is the beginning of the Geonic Period, which commences roughly after the conquest of Babylon by the Arabs.

3. See J. Mann, *Texts and Studies,* ii, Philadelphia, 1935 (= Mann), pp. 52-3. See also, however, I. Davidson, *‘Ozar ha-Shirah ve-ha-Piyyut,* ii, 480.

4. Cf. e.g. R. Amram Gaon (appointed 858, Sura): "But the Revered Academy have sent word saying that this practice (of reciting Kol-Nidre), which is one of folly, is forbidden" (*Sedher R. Amram Gaon,* Warsaw, 1865, (= SAG), p. 47). Naṭornai Gaon, who preceded Amram, speaking of absolution of vows in general, states emphatically that "It is practised neither on Yom Kippur nor on Rosh ha-Shanah in either Academies (i.e. Sura and Pumbedita) or in any other place in Babylon". Saadyah Gaon (appointed 928, Sura) was one of the very few Geonim who did not object to it under certain circumstances. See *Siddur R. Saadja Gaon,* Jerusalem, 1941, p. 31 (Assaf’s introduction).


6. Namely, vows which concern only the relations of a person to his conscience and in which no other persons or interests are involved (see, e.g. Rabbenu Asher to *Nedarim* 23b).

7. The Aramaic is the more known. As to Hebrew versions, see, in addition to SAG, p. 47. *Roma* ii, p. 232; *Roma SHaDaL* ii, p. 69.

8. Opening of verse 5.

9. See the explanation given to *יומילנה* in *Nedarim* 35a.
in his attack on the reciting of *Kol-Nidré* by the Rabbanites,\(^1\) which is here not a Hiph'îl but a Hippa'el\(^3\) with the function of the Niph'âl, corresponds well with the Ethpe'el, אֵתפָּל, of the current Aramaic version of the one hand\(^4\) and, on the other, with the Hebrew lampî of SAG and the Qaraites Sahl b. Mazliâh, another contemporary of Saadyah Gaon, and Yehudah Hadassi (twelfth century) in their quoting of the Rabbanites.\(^5\) The more arresting peculiarity, however, which makes this version unmatched amongst the various other versions, is the opening words of verse 10 which read מִיְמָה יָאָה וֹהָנָּה שֶׁנִּכְבַּר and its neighbour member,\(^6\) which should have logically read מִיְמָה יָאָה וֹהָנָּה שֶׁנִּכְבַּר. SAG and other versions, including those cited by the Qaraites, read here מִיְמָה יָאָה וֹהָנָּה שֶׁנִּכְבַּר, a wording which does not tally with a Talmudic statement implying *Rosh-ha-Shanah* rather than *Yom Kippur* for the reciting of *Kol-Nidré*.\(^7\)

Now, does our *Qerôbhâh*, which was obviously intended for the Morning-Prayer of the eve of *Rosh-ha-Shanah*, point to a practice other than the accepted one which prevailed in some

---

\(^1\) See Mann, p. 51 and Appendix ii, No. 2, p. 85.
\(^2\) Opening of verse 8.
\(^3\) See D. Yellin, *Dier Dabîr*, pp. 22-30 and cf. perhaps *Exod. xxv. 3*.
\(^5\) See Mann, p. 51, and Appendix ii, No. 3, p. 88 and *Esthkol Hakkhopher*, p. 53a, respectively.
\(^6\) Not incorporated in the frame owing apparently to the difficulty of the *paytân* to find a suitable line of his own to connect it, however slenderly, with this particular phrase.
\(^7\) Salmon b. Yeruham, though not giving the same wording, mentions that *Kol-Nidré* is recited by the Rabbanites on the 9th of Tishre (see Mann, p. 51, Appendix ii, No. 2, p. 85). Here is the place to mention that some versions have מִיְמָה יָאָה וֹהָנָּה שֶׁנִּכְבַּר, an emendation introduced by the French tosaphist R. Meir b. Samuel (1060-1135?), who argued that an *ex post facto* undertaking is meaningless, citing, in support of his emendation, *Nedarim* 23b (see *Sepher Hayyashar*, by Rabbênu Tam, Vienna, 1811, p. 17, par. 144).
\(^8\) Cf. "Whosoever etc. should say at the beginning of the year, etc." (Nedarim 23b) (see preceding note). Studiously sought-out and rather strained explanations were given for the reciting of *Kol-Nidré* on *Yom Kippur* rather than on *Rosh-ha-Shanah* by Rabbênu Tam (twelfth century) and by R. Isaiah di Trani (thirteenth century), (see *Shibbole Halleqet*, pp. 147a and 146a, respectively).
Jewish community in the Middle-East (in Egypt?) where Kol-Nidré (not necessarily along with the piyyut) was recited on the night or day of Rosh-ha-Shana? If this can be assumed, may it be further surmised that the qerôbhâh originated under the influence of Saadyah Gaon in order to defy the Qaraites in their pillorying of the Rabbanites for their reciting of piyyûtîm and especially Kol-Nidré?¹ Neither what is known about Saadyah Gaon's pungent controversies with the Qaraites, to which an outlet was given even in such an "innocent" work as his translation of the Bible,² nor the structure of the qerôbhâh, nor, for that matter, its language, though relatively colourless,³ should exclude such a surmise.⁴

The following is the qerôbhâh reconstructed, vocalized and annotated:

¹ So the leading Qaraites of the tenth century, Daniel al Qumisi, Salmon b. Yeruham and Sahl b. Maqlijah (see Mann, pp. 51-5 and appropriate Appendices).
² See, e.g. Edward Robertson, "Saadyah Gaon as Translator and Commentator" (Melilah, i, pp. 181-4).
³ Paytântâm, and Saadyah Gaon amongst them, are known to have used different styles in their different compositions. Suffice it to compare the simple style used by Saadyah in his two baqqâshôth (see Siddur Saadja Gaon, pp. 47-8) with that used by him in his 'azhârôth (ibid. pp. 185-216).
⁴ S. Krauss's propounded theory (Ju. b. Jud-Liter. Geschichte, xix(1928), pp. 85-97), that Kol-Nidrê was introduced in Palestine as a declaration against Qaraism that attacked the validity of the absolution of vows, is untenable for various reasons (see Mann, p. 53, n. 100). Our suggestion, be it noted, refers only to this particular qerôbhâh, in which the importance of Kol-Nidrê was demonstrated a few hundred years after Kol-Nidrê came into being. For a recent contribution on Kol-Nidrê in the Qaraite literature, see H. Leshem, Davar, 4.10.57.
⁵ The allusion is to הַבֵּית of Gen. xv. 6. See following three notes.
⁶ = רָעָה, "you spoke", "said", a favourite paytanitic usage. It occurs on three more occasions in the present piyyut, (see lines 39, 44 and 49). It is also used similarly in the Talmudic literature.
⁷ Viz. to Abraham.
⁸ Abb. of הַבֵּית of Gen. xv. 1.
⁹ The beth stands for יִרְדוּךָ. See p. 490.
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ןַלְכַּמּוּ מִן

1 בָּבָל קָאָשׁ לְחֹמָן

בִּקְרָת הַגְּדָרִים הַיֹּם

דֶּשֶׁל יִתְחַרְוֶךְ בֵּי לְגִבר

"ב

1 לְגָּפָרִים

אֵלָה בֶּלֶשׁ אֶשֶׁר אֵשֶׁר קָהָלוּןָהּֽו

גָּרִים בֶּלֶשׁ לְגָּפָרִים בֵּי לְגִברּוּהֽו

וַאֵין קָאָשׁ לְכָשׁ כֵּי אֵין בָּלָהּֽו

ב

1 דֶּקָשׁ, " to curve", " to wind". Here it implies "not properly done". Cf. last two words of line 2. Note the exaggerated plena orthography in the piyyut proper. This occurs even in the closing lines of each verse, which are as a rule made up of Biblical passages. Similar plena writing is common in the Genizah fragments. Other exaggerated plena writings in the present piyyut with regard to the yodh are in lines 9, 23 (see, however, p. 495, n. 5), 28, 38, 43, 44 (see p. 497, n. 2), 67, 68 and 77, where it indicates the zere; lines 13 and 14, where it indicates the seghol (the rhyme with the plural קָהָלוֹןָהּ of line 12 as well as the yodh following its taw do not bear out the customary pointing of the pausal form in the second per. masc. as illustrated in pointed piyyutim up to about 1800; see P. Kahle, The Cairo Geniza, 1941, p. 96. Cf. however, lines 47-9, where the pointing יֵשׁ holds good); lines 12, 42, 44, 67, 68, 69, 72, 74, and 78, where it indicates the hireq, as is the case in line 7; in lines 49 and 62 we find waws indicating the qibbuẓ. Of another nature is the extra yodh in line 62 which indicates the radical. The frame, however, does not follow rigidly the same plena system. Cf. line 16 (see p. 495, n. 1) and line 36 (see p. 497, n. 1). On the other hand, words in lines 51 and 61 (see p. 498, n. 11) have waws to indicate the qibbuẓ. Again, the phenomenon observed in the piyyut proper with regard to the extra yodh holds good with regard to the first word in line 41 which is non-Biblical. Cf. line 62.

2 Abb. בְּכָלָה. The last line, except for בְּכָל, is drawn from Isa. xxvi. 19.

3 See p. 490.

4 For the pointing of the suffixed-plural, cf. Num. xxx. 6.

5 For the singular, cf. Deut. xxxiii. 4.

6 Emblematical form for God. Cf. e.g. Ps. xlviii. 2.

7 וְהָדֹּד, "rejoice". Cf. Ps. xxi. 7.

8 I Sam. ii. 2.

9 See p. 490.
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1 The defective script here tallies with that which occurs in the M.T. in the plural.
2 Abb. שבט. 3 Prolonged Infinitive of the Hiph'il. Cf. TVffQVTl V» DnSTB (Cant. Rab. xlix).
5 Part of three letters damaged.
6 Emblematical expression for Israel. Cf. Cant. v. 2. According to Cant. Rab., the whole of Canticles bears on relations between God and Israel.
7 Abb. הֵינָךְ. The reading is supported by the rhyme. The Biblical passage here, then, is a combination of Ecc. vii. 12 and Isa. xi. 2 and Exod. xxviii. 3. The copyist by mistake placed here the concluding passage of verse 5. This was crossed out and above it the abbreviation was scribbled.
8 See p. 490. 9 See p. 491f.
10 V-רש, (in Post-Biblical Hebrew) "separate". Here "things set apart", as gifts, etc.
11 Here perhaps some sort of established documents.
12 Qualifying הנָזָה, which is here an emblematical term for the people of Israel. (See following note as well as p. 490, n. 4). For "people", "nation", treated as plural, cf. e.g. Jud. v. 11; 2 Sam. xviii. 7.
13 Cf. Cant. ii. 5.
14 The Hiph'il of רָפָא, "to wring out". Here "to heal". See following note.
15 (Or רָפָא, the ‘ayin with hiriq; see p. 494, n. 1). Secondary Hiph'il from נודח, "healing" (cf. Jer. xxx. 13). (V-לת). Here, a synonym of its preceding word, both of which are favourite coinages in the paytanic literature.
17 Lam. v. 21. In the manuscript a yodh smaller in shape than that of the other yodhs is superposed above the word י, a practice common in the Genizah fragments. This occurs also in lines 14, 34, 69 and 79. My pointing here and in the other instances is in keeping with the traditional pointing of liturgical texts in identical words.
18 See p. 490.
1 "And which we have banned." For the Qal, cf. Pirqē R. 'Eli’ezr 28.
2 Cf. the reversed order of Exod. xv. 2.
3 Note the crossed out ṣhv which was rewritten here by mistake.
4 The meaning of יַהַשְׁנָיָה (about its spelling, see p. 494, n. 1) here is of exegetical significance. In Ps. xxii. 25, which obviously inspired the phrase in which this word occurs, is usually translated "affliction". The difficulty of taking it in this sense in this context was rightly felt by Cheyne. Attaching the ַ of its preceding word ַדיד, dropped out by haplography, he suggests the reading (see T. K. Cheyne, J.B.L. xv. 198). Here it has the obvious meaning of prayer (uttered loudly?), the piyyut having been intended for a day when affliction is not practised (see p. 492). The Targum, the LXX and the Vulgate take it in a similar sense, and Mid. Tehillim on Ps. xxii. 25 renders by the Vulgate by . See also Rashi and Ibn Ezra. This meaning given to ṣhv becomes still clearer in line 74 (see p. 499, n. 13).
5 Num. xiv. 19.
6 See p. 490.
7 A combination of Exod. xv. 2 and Ps. xxii. 11.
8 So it appears to have been meant to be read. According to the Tiberian pointing as illustrated in the M.T. we should have here (cf. e.g. Ps. lxxxvi. 2). A similar form to that of ours is instead of (Piyyut E annai, p. 93, line 72). See the note on it by Zulay, who points out that it is not uncommon to find in a piyyut the Hiph’il imperative singular with yodh, citing (Rezeh, Grace After Meal for Sabbath).
9 There is a small lacuna in the bosom of the beth affecting its roof. The translation of the last two words is "deliver from destruction". Cf. Isa. xxxviii. 17 and note the exegetical significance of the paytaš’s phrase.
10 Cf. Isa. lviii. 6 and Ps. cxlix. 8.
11 Ps. xix. 15.
12 See p. 490.
1 = שבעה. See p. 492. The same form occurs again, in an abbreviated form, further line 76.

2 The heth is vocalized. This is the only case of vocalization in the whole of the manuscript.

3 Emblematical term for Israel. Cf. Ezechiel xvi. 7.

4 Emblematical term for God. Cf. e.g. Jos. iii. 10 and Isa. xxxvii. 4.

5 Here, "sin", "guilt".

6 See p. 490, n. 4. The sense of "אכזב" attached to the perfect is a favourite paytanic usage. See further lines 44 and 49. For similar anomalies in the Bible, cf. Esther i. 10 and 2 Chron. i. 4. 7 Hos. xiv. 5. 8 See p. 490.

9 Abb. יפהש יברק.

10 A difficult expression. But perhaps to be metaphorically understood here as "accept favourably (our) prayers" (or "pleadings"). Cf. שבעה (line 72) and see p. 499, n. 12. 11 For the last three words, cf. Cant. vii. 14.

12 There is a lacuna following the kaph. Note that the copyst uses as a rule יד to indicate the יד (see p. 494, n. 1).

13 See p. 490, n. 4. 14 Joel ii. 25. 15 See p. 494, n 1.

16 Abb. יפהש יברק . . . (see p. 492). Note that the first shin is abridged here; it contains only the right strokes. Similarly, the second shin in line 76 and the one in line 81. This is not uncommon in the Genizah material of the tenth to twelfth centuries.


18 A Pi'el, meaning here "to proclaim you mighty" (for the Qal, cf. Ps. x. 5). It occurs in the Pi'el in this sense often in paytanic literature. Cf. e.g. the gerobkhah for the pericope Pārāh, beginning with יבש , p. 490.

19 See p. 490, n. 4. 20 Mic. ii. 12. 21 See p. 490.
A noun on the *haqfel* (or *heqfel*) pattern. Similarly, perhaps, in line 8.

Cf. the Talmudic *nurim*.

2 Isa. i. 27.

3 See p. 490.

4 Abb. *wotmim*.

5 Cf. Ps. lv. 23.

6 Cf. *nwnDB nriDTm nwasn pnnx nw «iwn n"ap»n* (Yer. Pe'ah I, 16bbot.).

7 "With love." This segholite sing. form, the plural of which is found in Hos. viii. 9, is a favourite with *paytáním*.

8 A *he* seems to be superposed between the *lamedh* and the *aleph* and a *yodh* between the *beth* and the *daledh*, thus a Hiph'il instead of the Pi'el was intended.

9 Prov. xxx. 15.

10 See p. 490.

11 This uncontracted form of the suffix is found only in 2 Sam. xxvi. 6 (Jer. xv. 10 is a doubtful case; see, however, S. R. Driver, *Book of Samuel*, p. 360). It is possible, however, that we have here the influence of the Aramaic version of *Kol-Nidré* which reads pnVol. If so, the *he* will perhaps have to be pointed with *holém*. For that reason I have left part of the word unpointed.

12 The word is damaged, but the reading *nolhán* (Hoph'al of *nolh*; "to frustrate", "break"), not found in the familiar versions of *Kol-Nidré*, is fairly certain. For the somewhat peculiar shape of the *pe*, cf. that of *nólv* (line 64).

13 Isa. xii. 2.

14 See p. 490.
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1 Abb. ... לֶבֶן ... The stroked lamedh which follows is doubtful. It may stand for לָשֶׁן.

2 As far as one can ascertain, it is a newly-coined noun on the pattern of qittalôn (a favourite pattern with paytinim. See following note) from the וַנֵּת, "to quarrel". Here the reference seems to be to legal disputes—to litigations.


4 Infinitive, expressing a wish.

5 Isa. li. 3.

6 See p. 490.

7 Abb. לַעֲבָר.

8 The diffused word looks like the reading בֵּל. An א (abb. for בֵּל), however, is obviously expected here, as is evidenced from the link of the Kol-Nidre frame of its preceding verse.

9 Abb. מִלָּה לֶבֶן ...

10 In the sense given to it in the Hiph'il of Biblical Hebrew its meaning is "listen". The Qal is a favourite with paytinim. For the Niphal, cf. Ben Sira (ed. M. Z. Segal, Jerusalem, 1953), xiii, 23, p. 82).

11 = והש.

12 See p. 497, n. 10. Cf. R. Suliman's וַּיְרָאֵת וְיִתְנָחוּת הַמַּלְאָךְ (Ginzê Schechter, iii., 127, 27).

13 Ps. xxii. 25. According to the paytân,untime of this Biblical passage undoubtedly means "prayer", since it bears on the Benediction which concludes with the words וַּיְרָאֵת וְיִתְנָחוּת הַמַּלְאָךְ (see p. 490. See also p. 496, n. 4.).

14 See p. 490.
1 Abb. נָבַגְתָהּ נְבָגְתָהּ ... Note the abridged shin in the second word. (See p. 497, n. 16). For the form נְבָגְתָהּ see p. 492.
2 Mal. iii. 4.
3 See p. 490.
4 Abb. ... נָבַגְתָהּ נְבָגְתָהּ.
5 Letter diffused, but likely to be heth which stands as an abbreviation for נָבַגְתָהּ.
6 Abb. נָבַגְתָהּ. As regards the shape of shin, see p. 497, n. 16.
7 Word heavily diffused and nun damaged.
8 "In desire", "in pleasure" (cf. e.g. Keth. 111a). Cf. the Aramaic and the Syriac נָבַגְתָהּ.
9 Cf. Ps. cxlix. 4.
10 "Our perversion" (cf. Ab. v. 8) but word diffused and doubtful.
11 Ps. xcvii. 2.
12 See p. 490.
14 Ps. lxxii. 3.
15 See p. 490.