

HEBREW MS. 6 IN THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO TWO HITHERTO UNKNOWN POEMS BY YEHUDAH (HALEVI?)¹

By M. WALLENSTEIN, M.A., Ph.D.,

SENIOR LECTURER IN MEDIEVAL AND MODERN HEBREW IN THE
UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER

HEBREW MS. 6 in the John Rylands Library, which contains the famous fourteenth-century Spanish Passover Haggadah, has not as yet received the detailed treatment it so rightly deserves. The comparatively little attention it has received has been concerned almost exclusively with the illuminations it contains.² The Haggadah, however, has other distinctive features which merit study. The more arresting of these are: A. The text of the ritual, which shows variations in wording and pointing from those in other famous Haggadoth.³ B. The running commentary concerning the *Sēdher* ritual embodied in the Haggadah proper. C. The other commentary, mainly on the text of the Haggadah, attributed to Rabbi Solomon. D. The minuscular writing bearing on the Passover which adorns a number of folios on which *piyyuṭim* (liturgical poems; see below) are recorded. E. The comparatively large number of Biblical lines which are carefully set out at the top and bottom of

¹ The following abbreviations are used: B.M. I = British Museum MS. Or. 1404; B.M. II = British Museum MS. Add. 27210; Gabirol = *Shîrê Shelomo Ben Yehudah Ibn Gabirol* (4 vols.), ed. H. N. Bialik . . ., Tel-Aviv, 1928; *Kuzari* = *Sepher Ha-Kuzari*, translated by Yehudah Ibn Tibbon (Lemberg, 1866); Schirmann = *Ha-Shîrâh Hâ-'Ibhrîth Bi-Sephârad* . . . (2 vols.), by H. Schirmann, Tel-Aviv, 1954-56; *Thesaurus* = *Thesaurus of Mediaeval Hebrew Poetry*, (4 vols.), by I. Davidson, New-York, 1924-33; ZYH = *Kol Shîrê Rabbi Yehudah Halevi* (3 vols.), 2nd edn., edited I. Zmora, Tel-Aviv, 1948-1950.

² See Helen Rosenau, "Notes on the Illuminations of the Spanish Haggadah in the John Rylands Library", *BULLETIN OF THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY*, vol. 36, No. 2, March, 1954.

³ See, e.g. *Die Darmstädter Pesach-Haggadah*, ed. Bruno Italiener, pp. 71-147. See also E. D. Goldschmidt's *Die Pessach Haggada*, pp. 25-8 and especially p. 26 of the *Einleitung*.

most of the *piyyuṭ* text. F. The many *piyyuṭim*, some of which are not found elsewhere, as far as can be ascertained. The yield of desirable data should a thorough investigation be made of these subjects is self-evident.

The following, which begins with a general account of C, D, and E, and proceeds with a fuller account of F, makes special reference to two *piyyuṭim* composed by a certain Yehudah (or by certain Yehudahs), one not known to exist elsewhere, and the other known to exist only in one other manuscript, B.M. I.¹

C. At the top of fol. 20^r are recorded the following decoratively written words: [ז"ל] פִּירוּשׁ הַהֵלֵל² לִרְ[בִּי]נוּ שְׁלֹמֹה [ז"ל], set in the middle of the first line of the commentary. The remainder of the commentary is to be found on fols. 20^r (bottom)—36^v, two lines at the top and three at the bottom of each folio. It is identical in layout and handwriting with E and with Yehudah Halevi's two poems written at the top and bottom of fols. 5^v-10^r (see below p. 248), save for the vowels, which are here lacking. This commentary, attributed here to *Rabbēnū Shelômô*, by which Solomon Yiṣḥāqī (= Rashi) is most likely meant, is not so attributed in the various printed editions of the Haggadah (cf. e.g. *Haggadah shel Pesah*, Vilna, 1879, where we see Rashi's commentary, gleaned from various parts of his halakhic works, which bears no resemblance to ours). Instead, a very similar text to ours, except for substantial additional matter on the opening folios of our text,³ is attributed in printed editions to RaSHBaM (= Rabbēnū Shemū'el b. Mē'ir), the grandson and pupil of Rashi. After some examination of the RaSHBaM commentary on Pesahim, 99b to the end (121b), which includes many points dealt with in our commentary, I am inclined to

¹ See further, p. 253. I am greatly indebted to Mr. S. Lowy of Leeds University for having copied for me the B.M. I version of this poem as well as for having supplied me with valuable data concerning the whole of this manuscript, a Passover Haggadah which resembles ours in some respects and contains many *piyyuṭim* included in our Haggadah. He has also furnished me with some information concerning B.M. II, also a Passover Haggadah. Neither of these manuscripts is mentioned in the *Thesaurus*.

² Some of the letters of this word, though a little impaired, are clearly visible. The Haggadah is called here *hallēl*, since a substantial part of it is made up of Psalm chapters known by this name as well as of other passages in praise of God.

³ This additional text actually occupies fols. 20^r-27^v.

question the statement made at the opening of the latter. The attribution to Rashi of works written by other scholars is well known. Compare, for example, the commentaries on Chronicles and Bereshith Rabba. (There is also some evidence that numerous notes in the existing commentary on the Major and Minor Prophets which is ascribed to Rashi are from the pen of RaSHBaM.)

D. The minuscular writing. This is to be found on fols. 5^v-6^r; 37^v-38^r; 40^v-43^r; 47^v-48^r; 50^v-51^r. This text, set in arabesque tracteries, may well have been written by the same hand which is responsible for the other parts of the Haggadah although a first impression suggests otherwise, the writer having perhaps used here a thinner quill in order to be the more able to manipulate the characters and fashion them to his various ornamental designs.¹ For that matter, the characters are semi-cursive and of varying size. As most of the letters are minute and dot-like and the ink with which they were written pale, it is not always easy to decipher them even with a magnifying glass. On examining numerous passages, however, I found them to be drawn from the Babylonian Tractate Pesaḥim, with some variations in style.

Here are a few typical passages which will readily show why they have been included in the Haggadah of Passover: “. . . Why, then, do you not perform the search (for leavened bread) at six o'clock? . . . (because it must be) at a time when people are (usually) in their homes, and (furthermore)—when the light of the candle is bright enough to carry out the search” (Pes. 4a) (fol. 37^v). “. . . Why, then, do you not recite both blessings over one cup (of wine)? . . . because one should not group religious duties together in this wise (but pay attention to each singly)” (Pes. 102b) (fol. 50^v).

E. The Biblical texts. At the top of fol. 37^v we have an Aramaic mnemonic occupying two lines drawn from Meg. 31a, indicating the initial sentences of each of the eight pericopes read during the eight Passover-days. The order of the respective

¹ On examining an enlarged photograph of part of the minuscular writing of fol. 51^r, which the John Rylands Library has kindly prepared for me, I find this view confirmed.

eight pericopes according to the Haggadah are thus : (1) Exod. xii. 21-51 ; (2) Lev. xxii. 26-xxiii. 44 ; (3) Exod. xiii. 1-16 ; (4) Exod. xxii. 24-xxiii. 19 ; (5) Exod. xxxiv. 1-26 ; (6) Num. ix. 1-14 ; (7) Exod. xiii. 17-xv. 26 ; (8) Deut. xv. 19-xvi. 17. This agrees with the custom as practised down to the present day by both Ashkenazim and Sepharadim. On fol. 50^v we read "Should the last day of Passover occur on Sabbath the reading would start with 'assēr te'assēr" (Deut. xiv. 22). This again is in keeping with the practice of the present day.¹ In reality, however, the Haggadah records only the pericopes for the festival-days of Passover and not for its week-days, namely, 1, 2, 7, and 8.

These Biblical texts, written in small but clear characters, are to be found on fols. 37^v-53^v, each folio having at its top two lines and at its bottom three lines, except for fol. 45^v, at the top of which there is only one line and at the bottom none at all.² These lines are fully vocalized, the system of vocalization being that of Ben-Asher as found in our accepted printed Hebrew Bibles. Though the ink of the vowel-signs and accents is often pale (the colour resembling that of the minuscular decorative writing described above) and makes examination difficult, it seems to me safe to say that there are hardly any variations in the vowels. However, there are variations of some significance in Masoretic signs other than the vowel-signs. The customary diacritic point placed on the top of the right "tooth" of the *shîn* and on the top of the left "tooth" of the *sîn* as a means of distinguishing between them, is not to be found here.³ (In the Haggadah proper and in the *piyyuṭim* the *shîn* has its diacritic

¹ See Maimonides, *Sēpher ha-Maddā', Hilekhôth Tephillāh*, 13, 8 and *Haggāhōth Maimōniyyōth*, *ad hoc*.

² The reason for this is that this folio (45), was erroneously placed here. This is obvious from the fact that the continuing words, אֵל תוֹךְ הַיָּם, of וּפְרָשִׁי of Exod. xiv. 23, with which 44^v, ends, are to be found at the top of 46^r, and the continuing word, בְּשַׁעֲרֵיךָ, of אֲשֶׁר of Deut. xvi. 14, with which 53^v ends, is to be found at the top of 45^r. That the folio does not belong here is also seen from the *piyyuṭim* recorded on it. See below p. 250, n. 8.

³ The controversy about the pronunciation of these two letters in pre-Masoretic times is well known (see, e.g. M. Z. Segal, *Yesōdhē ha-Phōnetiqāh hā-'Ibhrīth*, p. 28). It is interesting to observe here that as late as the fourteenth century a Spanish scribe who generally follows the Ben-Asher system of pointing does not follow it in this particular instance.

point placed to the right of the top of the middle "tooth" and the *sîn* to the left of it). There are no *maqquphs* and, as it would appear, no *methegs*. The accents (not complete?) also differ. Orthography differs very slightly and this mainly as regards the *wāws* as vocalic letters. There are indications of *sethûmôth* and *pethûhōth*, and in the case of Exod. xv. 1-19; xv. 21, which comprise the song of Moses and Miriam respectively, there are spaces between the various members of the verses. The tetragrammaton consists of two *yôdhs* placed horizontally, above which is placed a third *yôdh* and again to the left of which is to be found a symbol which looks like an elongated *yôdh* drawn upside-down. The *lāmedhs* occurring in the top lines have their ascenders with a flourish going slightly to the right and then upwards, these ascenders being free from interference by other letters. This is also the case with some of the other *lāmedhs* in the text.

F. The *piyyuṭim*. The Hebrew-Spanish poets of the Golden Age (beginning about A.D. 950), who exhibited considerable ability in the composition of poetry of a secular nature, also made a great contribution to sacred poetry—to *piyyuṭim*. Here, to be sure, some courage was needed on the part of the poets to introduce, as they did, new types and forms in addition to the revered, well-established and well-defined types and forms which originated in Palestine from about the fifth century onwards.¹ The spirit of the Spanish poets, ever innovating, endeavoured to do away with these structurally-complicated and linguistically-difficult ancient Palestinian forms of synagogal poetry, and from the latter half of the eleventh century we see the poets replacing them gradually but steadily by a great variety of short *piyyuṭim*, simple in style and structure. In them they introduced, in addition to numerous novelties in form such as strophes and rhymes and the Arabic metre, new features in theme and context such as philosophical notions of a religious nature of Arab-Greek origin prevailing at that time in Spain. They even dared to introduce into these sacred poems secular ideas drawn from Arabic poetry.

All these new features are well represented in the many *piyyuṭim* contained in our Haggadah, *piyyuṭim* which must have

¹ See Wallenstein, *Some Unpublished Piyyuṭim*, etc., pp. 4-5; 22-5; 88-90.

12. Fol. 38^v : יושבה בגים ציץ פרחך (*Me'ôrāh*).¹ See II, *yôdh*, 2367.
 13. Fol. 38^v : ירוחם כך יתום אסיר תקוה (*Me'ôrāh*), by Yehudah Halevi. See II, *yôdh*, 3819.
 14. Fol. 38^v-39^r : יונה נכספה למצא מנוחה (*'Ahabhāh*).² See II, *yôdh*, 2052.
 15. Fol. 39^r : אזי בהגלותך לימים קדומים (*Zûlath*).³ See I, *'āleph*, 2202.
 16. Fol. 39^r-39^v : יום פדותי בעדו כל שואלי יעציבוני (*Ge'ullāh*).⁴ See II, *yôdh*, 1887.
 17. Fol. 39^v : שזופת שמש לחוצת פתרוסים (*Māghēn*).⁵ See III, *shîn*, 776.
 18. Fol. 39^v : שלח רוחך להחיות (*Meḥayyeh*).⁶ See III, *shîn*, 1350.
 19. Fol. 39^v-40^v : בטל אצור לברר וללבן (*Reshûth* for *Ṭal*). See II, *bêth*, 407.⁷
 20. Fol. 40^r : מבטח כל היצור ומעזם (*Pizmôn*). See III, *mēm*, 145.

holiness of the angels, but sometimes also God's creation. Here poets, desirous of producing a semblance of the constant sounds and vibrations brought about by the celestial beings in their fervent performance of duties, use many rhymes and a great variety of assonances and alliterations.

¹ Intended to be interwoven in one of the pieces of the *Birkhōth Yôzēr*. It owes its name to the closing word of the last sentence of this piece. It usually treats of the relationship between God and His people with the expression of hope that redemption is not far off.

² Intended to be interwoven into one of the pieces of *Birkhōth Yôzēr*. It owes its name to the closing word of the last sentence of this piece, a sentence prior to which the *'Ahabhāh* is supposed to be recited. Its theme is as a rule the love of God to Israel. Here poets introduced the ideas, motifs and phrases drawn from Canticles—an inexhaustive source for poets who followed the traditional view that the whole of Canticles is an allegory, its subject matter being presented in the guise of the love which exists between God and His people (see Mid. Cant. *passim*).

³ Borrowed from the phrase *'ên 'elôhîm zûlâtheḳhā* in the *Birkhōth Yôzēr*, after which it was intended to be recited. It treats mainly of the greatness of God as revealed in His deeds.

⁴ Borrowed from the phrase *bārûḳh . . . gā'al Yisrā'el* which occurs in the *Birkhōth Yôzēr*, intended to be recited following that phrase. Its theme is, as is that of the *Me'ôrāh*, the relationship between God and His people. It usually also treats of exile and redemption.

⁵ The first "link" in a *qerôbhāh* intended to be recited after the first of the Eighteen Benedictions. It owes its name to the phrase *māghēn 'abhrāhām* with which this benediction ends.

⁶ The second "link" in a *qerôbhāh* intended to be recited after the second of the Eighteen Benedictions. It owes its name to the phrase *meḥayyeh hammēthîm* with which this benediction ends.

⁷ This *piyyuṭ*, known to have been composed by Solomon Ibn Gabirol, is broken into three times by foreign *pizmônîm*—by 20, 21, and 22. This can be gathered from an examination of its structure and contents. For while it is faithful to its title *Reshûth* for *Ṭal*, treating of the subject of dew, it is embellished with additional subjects such as the twelve tribes of Israel and the twelve signs of the zodiac presented in a well-thought-out scheme and metre—matters absent from the *pizmônîm*.

21. Fol. 40^r-40^v: אַנא הרק ממעל עד בלי די (*Pizmôn*).¹
22. Fol. 40^v: יה מראשיתך ייטיב אחריתך (*Pizmôn*). See II, *yôdh*, 994.
23. Fol. 40^v-41^r: יום הפילי תחנתי בעד טל (*Pizmôn*). See II, *yôdh*, 1682.
24. Fol. 41^r: ידעתך בשם נשא וגאה (*Reshûth*). See II, *yôdh*, 662.
25. Fol. 41^r: שער אשר נסגר קומה פתחהו (*Reshûth*). See III, *shîn*, 2046.
26. Fol. 41^r-41^v: נשמת חוגגי חג המצות לה' (*Nishmath*). See III, *nûn*, 687.²
27. Fol. 41^v: יקרו להלל יה (*Ôphân*). See II, *yôdh*, 3668.
28. Fol. 41^v: אשפיל לך לבי ועיני (*Me'ôrâh*). See I, 'âleph, 8161.
29. Fol. 42^r: יעלת אהבים שמחי ורני (*Me'ôrâh*). See II, *yôdh*, 3198.
30. Fol. 42^r: שמעי בת ודאי למה (*Me'ôrâh*). See III, *shîn*, 1840.
31. Fol. 42^r-42^v: יבוא לחדרו הדוד (*'Ahabhâh*). See II, *yôdh*, 96.
32. Fol. 42^v: אומר לצפון תני חילי (*Zûlath*). See I, 'âleph, 1905.
33. Fol. 42^v: כל ימי צבאי אוחיל (*Ge'ullâh*). See II, *qaph*, 332.
34. Fol. 43^r: גילי זבול ראו הדרך (*Reshûth*) by Yehudah Halevi. See II, *gimel*, 159.
35. Fol. 43^r: שלום לבן דודי הצח (*Reshûth*). See III, *shîn*, 1224.
36. Fol. 43^r: שפל רוח שפל ברך (*Reshûth*). See III, *shîn*, 2103.
37. Fol. 43^r: דר חביון באפריין (*Muḥarak*). See II, *dâleth*, 334.
38. Fol. 43^r-43^v: נשמת ידידים המשכימים עם החתן (*Nishmath*).³
39. Fol. 43^v: נשמת ישראל עמך ישישו ביום מנוחה (*Nishmath*).⁴
40. Fol. 43^v: יגדל יקר נורא (*Qaddîsh*).⁵ See II, *yôdh*, 197.
41. Fol. 43^v-44^r: יוצר מסתתר ביוצרו (*Ôphân*).⁶
42. Fol. 44^r: ישן בכנפי הנדוד (*Me'ôrâh*), by Yehudah Halevi. See II, *yôdh*, 4163.
43. Fol. 44^r-44^v: יום רצון לשוב למשרה (*'Ahabhâh*).⁷
44. Fol. 44^v: יה למיחלים הרם יד ימינך (*'Ahabhâh*) by Yehudah Halevi. See II, *yôdh*, 945.
45. Fol. 44^v: ישוב צבי ישוב לחדרי (*'Ahabhâh*).⁸

¹ See further, p. 253.

² Here is an additional piece of information to that given in the *Thesaurus*. It is also found with slight variations in the following MSS.: Copenhagen 30 (67^v-68^r); B.M. I (39^v); B.M. II (57^v). It is also embodied in the Sarayevô Haggadah (see *Die Haggadah von Sarajevo* by Müller and Schlosser, Vienna, 1898, p. 60), a Haggadah which contains numerous other poems included in our Haggadah.

³ See further, p. 252.

⁴ This *Nishmath*, not recorded in the *Thesaurus*, is also included in B.M. I (47^v) and B.M. II (79^v-80^r) with some variations.

⁵ Strictly speaking, a *Reshûth* to *Qaddîsh*, which is a doxology mainly written in Aramaic, recited following the prayer termed *Pêsuqê dezimrâ*.

⁶ See further, p. 253.

⁷ See further, p. 252.

⁸ This *'Ahabhâh*, no record of which is found in the *Thesaurus*, is also found in B.M. I (43^v). It should be noted here that because of the misplaced fol. 45 (see n. 2, p. 246), the first five verses of the poem are written on fol. 44^v and its

46. Fol. 45^r-45^v: רחמי ידיד כליל הוד (*Ge'ullāh*). See III, *rêsh*, 832.
47. Fol. 45^v: יה קום וגלה צפוני זמני (*Ge'ullāh*). See II, *yôdh*, 1086.
48. Fol. 45^v: ימין עוך אי ואי חסדך (*Ge'ullāh*). See II, *yôdh*, 2966.
49. Fol. 46^r: יעלת צבי תכסוף (*'Ahabhāh*). See II, *yôdh*, 3222.
50. Fol. 46^r: חולת צבי למה לבך (*'Ahabhāh*). See II, *hêth*, 87.
51. Fol. 46^v: ארך זמני כמה וכמה (*'Ahabhāh*).¹
52. Fol. 46^v: צור המקורא בצור ישראל (*Zûlath*). See III, *zādê*, 189.
53. Fol. 46^v-47^r: ידעתי חי גואלי ואליו משפט הגאולה (*Ge'ullāh*). See II, *yôdh*, 658.
54. Fol. 47^r: נרד וכרכם צץ בגני (*Ge'ullāh*). See III, *nûn*, 602.
55. Fol. 47^r-47^v: יש ארוכה ומרפא יש צרי אל כאבי (*Ge'ullāh*) by Yehudah Halevi. See II, *yôdh*, 3934.
56. Fol. 47^v: יהמה לבבי על גודד (*Ge'ullāh*). See II, *yôdh*, 1489.
57. Fol. 47^v-48^r: אחשוק ולא אדע מקום עופר (*Ge'ullāh*). See I, *'āleph*, 2596.
58. Fol. 48^r: יקרה תהלתך גילי משוש לבי (*Reshûth*) by Yehudah Halevi. See II, *yôdh*, 3667.
59. Fol. 48^r: למתי זרוע אל יהי מאנוש פחדי (*Reshûth*) by Yehudah Halevi. See III, *lāmedh*, 1192.
60. Fol. 48^r-48^v: כל הנשמה תהלל במליה (*Muḥarak*). See II, *ḳaph*, 312.
61. Fol. 48^v: שם אל אשר אין לו ערך (*Muḥarak*). See III, *shîn*, 1415.
62. Fol. 48^v: נשמת יוצאים לאורות מחשכות (*Nishmath*). See III, *nûn*, 732.
63. Fol. 49^r: שיר יחדש במקדש (*Qaddîsh*). See III, *shîn*, 987.
64. Fol. 49^r: יחיד בגאווה וחסדו (*'Ôphān*). See II, *yôdh*, 2505.
65. Fol. 49^v: יזכרו פלאך צבא מרום (*Me'ôrāh*) by Yehudah Halevi. See II, *yôdh*, 2413.²
66. Fol. 49^v-50^r: יפה נוף רדוי נוף (*'Ahabhāh*). See II, *yôdh*, 3356.
67. Fol. 50^r: מי יתנוי כימי אלה (*'Ahabhāh*). See III, *mēm*, 1132.
68. Fol. 50^r-50^v: יום נפלא בן עמרם (*Zûlath*) by Yehudah Halevi. See II, *yôdh*, 1865.
69. Fol. 50^v: ימים רבואות וחדשים מאות (*Ge'ullāh*). See II, *yôdh*, 2954.
70. Fol. 51^r: שרש בנו ישי עד אן (*Reshûth*). See III, *shîn*, 2214.
71. Fol. 51^r: יבש בעצר מי צדקי (*Reshûth*). See II, *yôdh*, 177.
72. Fol. 51^r-51^v: אחלי לצורי אחלי בשורי (*Muḥarak*).³

remaining four verses on fol. 46^r. The word דרך with which the sixth verse begins is also recorded at the extreme left side of fol. 44^v with a few clusters of dots above it—no doubt meant to attract the reader's attention to look for its sequence elsewhere (no such catchwords are recorded on the other folios of the Haggadah; see, however, n. 3, p. 252.). If the scribe of the Haggadah was also its binder (which may well be; the Kennicott Bible, e.g., now in the Bodleian Library, Oxford, is likely to have been bound by its scribe. See C. Roth, *The Kennicott Bible*, Bod. Picture Book 11, p. 3), we can well understand his desire to rectify his mistake in this way.

¹ See further, p. 252.

² This poem was copied twice. See poem 79.

³ This poem is also included with some slight variations in B.M. 1 (42^r).

73. Fol. 51^v: אמרו בני אלהים במה (*Muḥarak*). See I, 'āleph, 5843.
 74. Fol. 51^v-52^r: נשמת הדופים דחופים לקרא (*Nishmath*). See III, nūn, 678.
 75. Fol. 52^r: אלי הלעד מעוני (*Qaddīsh*).¹
 76. Fol. 52^r: יה שכינתך בינות אנשים (*Ōphān*). See II, yōdh, 1136.
 77. Fol. 52^r-52^v: הסתו ארה ארה מעצבי (*Me'ōrāh*). See II, hē, 944.
 78. Fol. 52^v: יום תאוה יגלה יחישה (*Me'ōrāh*). See II, yōdh, 1954.
 79. Fol. 52^v: יזכרו פלאך צבא מרום (*Me'ōrāh*).²
 80. Fol. 53^r: את מחוזה הוד אל (*Me'ōrāh*). See I, 'āleph, 8559.
 81. Fol. 53^r: הידעתם ידידי הצבי ברח (*Ahabhāh*). See II, hē, 416.
 82. Fol. 53^v: נאוה בעוז התאזרי (*Ahabhāh*). See III, nūn, 20.
 83. Fol. 53^v: אחד עשר מסעות (*Zūlath*). See IV, 'āleph, 640.³

To sum up: Rylands Hebrew MS. 6 comprises eighty-three poems minus one,⁴ seventy-three of which are recorded in the *Thesaurus*, together with the identifications of most of the poets. From this it may readily be seen that the greater number of those whose share of poems in the Haggadah is relatively large⁵ flourished between A.D. 1020-1150, namely in the years when the so-called Hebrew Golden Age in Spain attained its zenith, coinciding as it did with the culturally-rich Mulūk Aṭ-Ṭawā'if and Almoravid Periods.⁶ The relatively large number of poems known to be Halevi's is seen from the particular mention of their author which I have made in the list of *piyyuṭim*. These number eleven (3, 7, 13, 34, 42, 44, 55, 59, 65, repeated in 79, 68). The poems of which there is no record in the *Thesaurus* number nine (21, 38, 39, 41, 43, 45, 51, 72, 75). Of these nine, poem 39 was found to be included in B.M. I and in B.M. II⁷ and poems

¹ See further, p. 253.

² See n. 2, p. 251.

³ The continuation of this *Zūlath* is on fol. 45^r, beginning with the word והיתה, a word which is also recorded with superposed clusters of dots on the extreme left hand side of fol. 53^v. See n. 8, p. 250.

⁴ See n. 2, p. 251.

⁵ The poets, according to the counting of the *Thesaurus*, who have a relatively large number of their poems included in the Haggadah are Yizḥaq Ibn Gayyat (11?); Yehudah Halevi (11, as already noted in the body of the article); Solomon Ibn Gabirol (8); Abraham Ibn Ezra (7); Yoseph (6). (There are also, among others, three poems by Nahum; two by Zeraḥyah Halevi and one by Mosheh Ibn Ezra).

⁶ See A. R. Nykl, *Hispano-Arabic Poetry*, chapters entitled "The Mulūk . . . Period"; "The Almoravid Period".

⁷ See n. 4, p. 250.

45 and 72 in B.M. I.¹ We are thus left with six poems (21, 38, 41, 43, 51, 75) which seem to survive in our manuscript only. In the following an attempt will be made to examine in detail two out of the nine poems—poems 41 and 45—and speculate on their possible author (or authors).²

Poem 41

Analyzing the structure and acrostic of the poem (an 'Ôphān³ of the *muwashshaḥ*⁴ type), we find that it consists of four strophes, each with a rhyme of its own in its three opening hemistichs (*delāthôth*), and again with a rhyme of its own in its three closing hemistichs (*sôgherîm*). The strophes thus have eight different rhymes.⁵ They—the strophes—are “girded” by five *muwashshaḥat*,⁶ each of which is made up of two *deleth*-and-*sôghēr* lines. The final syllable of the *deleth* of the first line of the first *muwashshaḥ*, which is *rô*, being followed by the *delāthôth* of the second to the fifth *muwashshaḥat*; and the final syllable of the *deleth* of the second line, which is *dô*, being followed by the corresponding second to the fifth *delāthôth*. This scheme is not maintained with regard to the *sôgherîm*. Here the first final syllable, which is *nô*, is followed by *all* the other *sôgherîm*. The name יהודה is spelt acrostically as follows: the *yôdh* at the beginning of the first *deleth* of the first *muwashshaḥ* and the remaining letters at the beginning of each *deleth* of the four strophes, respectively. The metre for both hemistichs of the whole poem is - ʿ - - - - -.⁷

¹ See n. 8, p. 250 and n. 3, p. 251.

² I am indebted to H. Schirrmann, A. M. Habermann and A. Mirsky for information in connection with some of the poems included in Hebrew MS. 6. I hope to deal with the other seven unpublished poems elsewhere. ³ See n. 9, p. 248.

⁴ This Arabic term, loaned from the girdling of a girdle set of diamonds, etc., may be translated as “girdle poem”. “Girdle poems” (*muwashshaḥat*) originated amongst the Arabs in Spain, who developed them with great ingenuity and skill. For recent contributions to Hebrew *muwashshaḥat*, see S. M. Stern . . . בשירת ספרד (Tarbitz, xviii. 166-86, 1946); and “Les vers finaux en espagnol dans les muwassahs hispano-hébraïques”, (*Al Andalus*, viii. 299-346), Madrid, 1948.

⁵ The common rhyme of the *sôgherîm* of the first and third strophes seems to be coincidental, brought about by the context.

⁶ The first being called *pethîhāh* and the last *hathîmāh*.

⁷ There are, however, a few variations, the poet practising, in common with other poets of the Spanish School, his poetic licence particularly with regard to the *shewā* mobile, taking it as *shewā* quiescent whenever the need arises.

The origin and place of activity of the fairly large number of poets whose poems have been assembled in our Haggadah suggest that, should we wish to consider poets bearing the name Yehudah to whom poem 41 might be ascribed, it is to the Spanish School that we must turn. Now, from the five known Yehudahs of this School, Yehudah Ibn Bil'ām (born about the middle of the eleventh century), to whom are conjecturally attributed a few liturgical poems of little poetical power embodying the acrostic Bil'ām,¹ may safely be eliminated from the start. Likewise, neither Yehudah Ibn Shabbathai nor Yehudah Al-Ḥarizi (both of the twelfth and thirteenth century) are likely to be its authors, the first being a troubadour poet, who wrote only secular poetry of the *maqama* type,² and the second mainly a *maqama*-writer,³ who composed only a comparatively small number of liturgical poems which have nothing in common with either the subject-matter or the language of our poem. There remains the possibility of its author being either Yehudah Halevi or Yehudah Ibn Gayyat, the intimate friend of Yehudah Halevi, who possessed poetical ability of no mean order. Unfortunately, however, Gayyat's extant poems are comparatively few in number (and at that mainly secular!)⁴ and consequently yield but a few features which might serve as objects of comparison with those of poem 41.

We turn, then, to Yehudah Halevi. Is our Yehudah to be identified with him? Before attempting to answer this question some comparison should be made between the pronounced features of poem 41 and those found in Halevi's known works. Beginning with the external features, we find that the 17 'Ôphannîm⁵ known to have been written by Halevi resemble in a number of their conspicuous structural characteristics those embodied in our poem, which is also an 'Ôphān. And it is as well to stress the words "a number of features", for the very term *muwash-shah*, as seen above, suggest variety. Most of these 'Ôphannîm are also made up of four strophes, each comprising three rhyming *deleth-and-sôghēr* lines. These are "girded" by five *muwash-shahat* each comprising two rhyming *deleth-and-sôghēr* lines

¹ See Schirmann, i. 296.

² Ibid. ii. 69-70.

³ Ibid. ii. 97-103.

⁴ Ibid. i. 420.

⁵ See ZYH, iii. 119-51.

with the name Yehudah spelt acrostically in the very same manner as in poem 41.

Turning to contextual features of our poem the following preliminary remarks should be noted. Since the beginning of research on Halevi's poetry, it has been recognized that a close study of the *Kuzari*, his philosophical work, would prove helpful in the elucidation of many passages in his poems¹—the *Kuzari* having been composed very late in his life, by which time most of his poetry would have been written. The two works, the poetical and the philosophical, may be shown to be parallel and at once reflecting and complementing each other. But while the first employs verse, metre and elevated style to express emotions and beliefs which worked intermittently in the course of a long stretch of years in the mind and heart of the poet-philosopher, the other uses restrained and sober prose to put forward set conceptions which crystallized during the latter days of the philosopher-poet.

Examining, then, the more salient points contained in poem 41, we see that the paradoxical feeling expressed in its first few lines, that God is at once within His creation and away from it—an antinomy frequently expressed by Halevi in many of his poems²—has its counterpart in the *Kuzari*, though here it assumes a less mystical form. Halevi, in the *Kuzari*, tries time and again to define and limit man's ability to fathom and grasp God.³ Another notion, that of the Prime Cause and the series of intellects emanating from it—a Neoplatonic notion which reached the Jews in the Middle Ages in an Arabic garb—is also referred to in the *Kuzari*, though indirectly.⁴ In our poem it is given

¹ See, e.g. S. Luzzatto, *Divan R. Yehudah Halevi* (Lyck, 1864), p. 2 (of the divan proper), n. 2; p. 13, n. 7; p. 19, n. 7. For studies illustrating the relationship between Halevi the philosopher and Halevi the poet, see I. Heinemann, "Rabbi Yehudah Halevi . . ." (*Keneseth*, vii. 261-79); "Ha-Philôsôph ha-Meshôrêr" (ibid. ix. 163-200); *Jehudah Halevi, Kuzari* . . . (Oxford, 1947).

² See further, p. 257.

³ Cf., e.g. *Kuzari*, II, 2, 4, 50; V, 25. This theme was, of course, used by many Jewish poets and thinkers of the Middle Ages (e.g. Gabirol and Mosheh Ibn Ezra). Halevi, however, seems to have cherished the theme more than others. See *Keneseth*, ix. 168 ff.

⁴ See, I. Goldziher, "Le Amr ilâhî . . . chez Juda Halévi", *Revue des Études Juives*, L, 32-41. (Paris, 1905). See, however, the concluding pages of the present article.

a fairly elaborate treatment. The intellects' existence and virtues are those of the Original Existence, proceeding as they do from Its very source. They are made up of graded groups with related functions, but in carrying out the functions they act concentrically, having the Prime Cause as their common centre whose force works in all of them in turn. The intellects, existing only in virtue of the Original Centre, thus have a drift towards, a yearning for, It and aim at Its likeness. The motion of the intellects, their awe, their deportment and the way they perform their duties, all of which is brought about by His fiat, is artistically woven into the "celestial chariots" as depicted in the first chapter of Ezekiel. Another idea, the idea that God's grace sustains, and His light permeates, all world-phenomena of which man is the elect and the Jewish people the elect of the elect, equalling heavenly beings, expressed in the last few strophes of the poem, is also in evidence at every turn in the *Kuzari*. Divine power (in our poem "His light", "His grace"; line 16),¹ according to the *Kuzari*, though obtaining its full strength of penetration only on the supreme level of the organisms of Nature's realms,² is always one and the same, and in this respect is like the sun. The sun is uniform but the bodies receiving its light react in different ways. "Those most suited to receive its 'transparent light' are the ruby and the crystal."³ The Jewish people is the most suited to receive this light, the Divine power having descended on all of them, and, "like Adam who was wrought from a substance chosen by Him in which there was no contaminated influence", it is "perfection itself", and it is thus able to enter into communication with God and spiritual beings⁴—into "the fifth realm".

Poems known to have been written by Halevi containing passages embodying ideas and idioms recalling those in our manuscript are too numerous to be given here. They abound particularly in his '*Ôphannîm*.'⁵ Here are a few examples only.

¹ Cf. in this connection, "Their (the intellects') source emanating from His holy light"; *sôghēr* of line 4.

² See *Kuzari*, I, 31 and Heinemann's *Jehudah Halevi Kuzari . . .*, p. 54, commentary thereon.

³ *Kuzari*, IV, 15.

⁴ See *Kuzari*, I, 95; II, 12.

⁵ See n. 5, p. 254.

For lines 1-2, cf. ¹עצם כבודו הכיל כל . . . לא מקום יכילהו . . .
 For line 4, cf. ²הכל רואה ומבין סתריו ואם הוא נסתר בחביון
 ; ³יסוד היסוד . . . הוא כל ומאתו כבוד הכל ואור לא נעדר
 For line 6, cf. ⁴ראש לכל סבה ועלילה
 For *sôghēr* of line 9, cf. ⁵דברך יחכו גדודי זבול ואור המאורים באוצרך
 For *sôghēr* of line 15, cf. ⁶וחין ערכם . . . ברתת . . . ומורא
 ; ⁸לך דרי אדמה הבנויים מארבע יסודות ; ⁷בגייתי ארבע יסודות
⁹כל פרודות ונצמדות הם יסודות להמה ובם יצמח כל צמח והאדם והבהמה
 There are particularly numerous passages echoing lines 19-20.
 Cf., e.g., ¹¹ותתן מהודך על עם עומד בסודך ; ¹⁰ועלי בחיריו רוח קדשו שכן
¹³הן למדוני הדמות למשרתי רב תעצומות ; ¹²קדושת אל בישראל להדמות לשרפים
¹⁵שלשו קדוש וכשרפים שמו קדשו ; ¹⁴קול מרימות להדמות לכרובים
 For the *deleth* of line 21, cf. ¹⁶מחנה ערך סביב כסאו למול מחנה
¹⁸ארבע מחנותיך . . . וכהם מחנות יעקב ; ¹⁷הנני אקדיש כסוד מחנם בסוד מחני
 The phrase *כל פעל האל למענו* of the *sôghēr* of line 21, which is
 drawn almost verbatim from Prov. xvi. 4, is repeated in different
 ways in Halevi's poems.¹⁹ For the last *sôghēr* in the poem, cf.
 ; ²⁰מקדשים ומשלשים וכתר ליוצרם נותנים
²¹יושבי גנים . . . כנגד צבאות מרומים . . . וקושרים כתרים
 Conspicuous echoes of both the ideas and language of our poem are found
 in the poem beginning with *יה אנה אמצאך*²² as well as in that
 beginning with *אלהים אל מי אמשילך*.²³

The following is the poem reconstructed, annotated and translated :

¹ ZYH, iii. 670. For the *deleth* of the first line, cf. *ibid.*, p. 695.

² *Ibid.* p. 141. *ואם* has here the sense of "although"; common in Medieval Hebrew poetry in general and in Halevi's poetry in particular. For this meaning in the Bible, cf. Jer. xv. 1 ; Ps. cxxxiii. 9.

³ ZYH, iii. 181.

⁴ *Ibid.* 661.

⁵ *Ibid.* 182.

⁶ *Ibid.* 147.

⁷ *Ibid.* 658.

⁸ *Ibid.* 439.

⁹ *Ibid.* 130.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* 125.

¹¹ *Ibid.* 252.

¹² *Ibid.* 119.

¹³ *Ibid.* 128.

¹⁴ *Ibid.* 131. For the last three examples, cf. *sôghēr* of line 7.

¹⁵ *Ibid.* 132.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁸ *Ibid.* 151. The *V hnh* is a favourite with Halevi in many of his other poems, secular inclusive.

¹⁹ Cf., e.g. ZYH, i. book 2, p. 114, where the same idea is expressed thus *ליחודו ולכבודו יצרכם* ; iii. 140, where we have again the same idea expressed thus *צרך לו כל כי הוא פעלו*. For very similar wordings to that of ours, cf. i. book 3, p. 78 ; iii. 708 ; *ibid.* p. 696. See *Keneseth*, ix. 167, n. 31.

²⁰ ZYH, iii. 131.

²¹ *Ibid.* 141.

²² *Ibid.* 121 f.

²³ *Ibid.* 303-9.

אופן

יֹצֵר ¹ מְסִתֵּר בְּיֹצְרוֹ ²	1
אֶךְ רְחוּק ³ בְּיָיִר ⁴ וּבֵינֹו ⁵	
מְלֵאָה הָאֲרֶץ כְּבוֹדוֹ ⁶	2
אֶךְ אָפֶס מְקוֹם ⁷ לְשִׁכְנוֹ ⁸	
וְהִאֲצִיל מִרוּחוֹ ⁹ שְׂכָלִים ¹⁰	3

¹ Emblematical term for the Supreme Being, used extensively in Hebrew works of a religious nature.

² A *plena* spelling of בְּיֹצְרוֹ, a practice not uncommon in unvocalized Hebrew texts throughout the ages. (It occurs also in poem 45. See n. 10, p. 268.) We thus have here a newly coined segholate noun יֹצֵר "creation". The pointing in the manuscript, however, is יֹצְרוֹ, a senseless pointing.

³ Here, as in Joshua iii. 4, it is used as a noun (in the light of what is now known from the Dead Sea Scrolls about the spelling of segholate nouns, רְחוּק of Joshua iii. 4 may well be a segholate noun; but this is not the place to enlarge on this matter).

⁴ *Pluralis excellentiae*, since the reference is to God.

⁵ For the whole line, cf. Joshua iii. 4 and note the plural in the *qerē*.

⁶ Cf. Isa. vi. 3.

⁷ For my translation of the last three words, cf. Isa. v. 8, where אָפֶס is used poetically for אֵין.

⁸ This word, which appears as a *hapax* in Deut. xii. 5, has been read by modern scholars (see, e.g. E. König, *Hebrew Grammar*, ii. 1, 21) לְשִׁכְנוֹ. This obviously does not tally with our line, where it is a noun, parallel with כְּבוֹדוֹ of the *deleth* of this line.

⁹ Cf. Num. xi. 25. אֲצִל in the Hiph'il is used extensively in medieval Hebrew philosophical and poetical works in the sense of "emanation". Cf., e.g. . . . בהאצילך על גלגל חמזלות (Gabirol, iii. 69, line 184). Cf. also *ibid.* p. 68, line 171.

¹⁰ This word, which occurs in the Bible only in the singular with the meaning of "prudence", "insight", is prevalent in various medieval Hebrew philosophical works, also in the plural, connoting "supernatural powers", "angels". Cf., e.g. "and they (the angels) have been called השכלים הנפרדים" (Maimonides, *Millôth Ha-Higgāyôn*, 14). An apt definition of these celestial powers is given by Yehudah Halevi ". . . and they are שכלים, detached from matter, but eternal like the Prime Cause and never threatened by decay" (*Kuzari*, i. 1). In the poem quoted in the following note Halevi calls these *sekhālīm* הגשמות הטהורות (ZYH, iii. 304). The expression . . . מטבע השכל הנפרד (see Ben-Yehudah, xvi. 7571a) by Abraham Ibn Ezra, a contemporary of Halevi, is of special interest here.

נְבָדָדִים עַל מַחְלָקוֹתָם ¹	
מְעֻלּוֹתָיו ² הֵמָּה עֲלוּלִים ³	4
מֵאֹר קָדְשׁוֹ ⁴ תּוֹצְאוֹתָם	
כָּל אֶחָד יֵשׁ-לוֹ פְעָלִים ⁵	5
מִמְשָׁלִים אֵל ⁶ מְעֻלּוֹתָם ⁷	
זֶה אֵל זֶה ⁸ יִשְׁלַח דְבָרוֹ	6
יִשְׁפִיעַ ⁹ אֹר מְעִינּוֹ ¹⁰	
כָּל מְעִינּוֹ בַחֲמוּדוֹ ¹¹	7

¹ For the division of angels into various groups according to their service, cf. *Kether Malkhûth*, by Solomon Ibn Gabirol (Gabirol, iii. 69-70, lines 199-215). Cf. also Halevi's poem beginning with אלהים אל מי אמשילך (ZYH, iii. 303-9). See p. 257. For a Biblical echo as to the wording, cf. 2 Chron. xxxi. 2.

² Thus in the manuscript. See following note.

³ If the pointing מְעֻלּוֹתָיו be accepted (a pointing supported by the metre) it will be taken as במעלותיו (similarly, Ezek. xli. 18, where the *bêth* which should follow the participle עשוי is implied), מעלה in post-Biblical Hebrew meaning "virtue" (cf. perhaps the Biblical מעלה in 1 Chron. xvii. 17). We will thus have here the idea of emanation so explicitly expressed in the 2nd to the 5th verses of the poem (see n. 9, p. 258). However, מְעֻלּוֹתָיו (singular עֲלָה, "a cause"; so also in Aramaic; cf. also the Arabic) will also fit well the context (though not the metre!). Moreover, עלה and עלול appear, as they do here, frequently together in medieval Hebrew philosophical works. Cf., e.g. העלה . . . קודמת . . . לעלולה (*Guide of the Perplexed*, i. 69). Cf. also *Yesôdhé ha-Tôrâh*, ii. 6, by Maimonides.

⁴ This expression, common in the Qabbalistic literature, is of special interest in this comparatively early poem.

⁵ The word פְעָל, which in the Bible means "deed", "work", assumes here a slightly extended meaning which approaches my translation.

⁶ Cf. 1 Chron. xxvi. 6.

⁷ Here: "degree", "rank". See n. 3 above.

⁸ For this phrase applied to angels, cf. Isa. vi. 3.

⁹ Often used in medieval Hebrew with regard to divine inspiration. Cf., e.g. *Guide of the Perplexed*, i. 40.

¹⁰ The manuscript reads מְעִינּוֹ.

¹¹ Cf. כל מעיניי בך (Ps. cxxxvii. 7), the more accepted translation of which is "all my springs are in Thee" (see, however, the American translation of the Bible of 1917). The *sôghêr* that follows it, however, would suggest that מעיניי be taken as "his thoughts", "his contemplation". Qimhi's rendering of Ps. cxxxvii. 7 approaches this meaning. It is thus used metaphorically in various Hebrew works (cf., e.g. Berachiah Hanakdan's *Dodi Venechdi*, ed. H. Gollanz,

קָפְצוּ הַדְּמוּתִי לְקוֹנוֹ ¹	
וּבְרוּחוֹ שְׁפָרָה שְׁחָקִים ²	8
קָצִים אֶל עֵבֶר ³ פְּנֵיהֶם ⁴	
אוֹ כְּרָאִי מוֹצֵק חֲזָקִים ⁵	9
מוֹרְאוֹ עַל לְבַבֵיהֶם ⁶	
הֵם שׂוֹאֲבִים ⁷ הִמָּה מְרִיקִים	10
וּמְרוֹצָתָם הִיא כְּלֵיהֶם ⁸	
אִם כָּל חוּג סוּבֵב בְּצִירוֹ ¹⁰	11

p. 10 Heb.). חמוד, the passive participle, which in the Bible is applied to non-sacred objects (cf., e.g. Ps. xxxix. 12; Job xx. 20) and once even to idols (Isa. xlv. 9), is used here as an epithet for God apparently through an Arabic influence (cf. the Arabic *mahmudh*, which is often used as an attribute to God).

¹ Infinitive Hithpa'el with the omission of the *lamedh*, the preformative *taw* being assimilated to the *daleth*. (For similar examples, cf. Job. v. 4 and Num. vii. 89). See following note.

² Cf. Gen. xiv. 19. Cf. also Isa. xiv. 14.

³ Cf. Job xxvi. 13a, where שפּרה, however, is pointed as a noun of the *qitlah* pattern. The difficulty of this reading is obvious (see e.g. E. K. T. Cheyne, *Jewish Quarterly*, 1897, p. 578; N. H. Tur-Sinai, *The Book of Job*, Jerusalem, 1957, pp. 383-4). In our text שפּרה (elliptical for אשר שפּרה) is used as a transitive Qal. This makes Job xxvi. 13a much smoother (though, admittedly, not Job xxvi. 13b, as it cannot easily be explained in the same vein).

⁴ The manuscript reads עֵבֶר.

⁵ Cf. Ezek. i. 9 and 12. See following note.

⁶ Cf. Job xxxvii. 18. It seems to serve here as a rendering of כעין נחשת קלל ונוצצים of Ezek. i. 7, the reference being to the creatures of the celestial chariot. Cf. also Ezek. i. 13-14.

⁷ For the form, cf. Nahum. ii. 8. For the idea of the whole line, see p. 261.

⁸ The manuscript reads שואבים with *sin*. This is senseless.

⁹ Cf. "and the living beings ran and returned as the appearance of a flash of lightning". The swift, lightning-like running hither and thither of the *hayyôth* is seen by the poet as if there is some matter being pumped out successively from vessels set in array and pumped back into other vessels. Thus there is again a reference to the notion of emanation. In this connection Gabirol's וּשׂוֹאֵב מִמְּקוֹר הָאוֹר בְּלִי דְלִי וּפּוֹעֵל הַכֹּל בְּלִי כְּלִי (Gabirol, iii. 64, line 63), referring to God's emanation of His wisdom, has more than a mere linguistic bearing on our somewhat obscure but suggestive line.

¹⁰ The manuscript reads בְּצִירוֹ. This is denied by the rhyme which should be here *rô* (see p. 253). For a Biblical echo supporting the emendation, cf. וְהִדְלַת תְּסוּבָה עַל צִירוֹ (Prov. xxvi. 14). בצירו, however, instead of צירו, is

תְּכַנִּיתָם¹ עֵמֶד׃ בְּעֵינָיו׃
 יִשְׁפֹּר עָלָיו׃ מֵעֶבְדוֹ׃ 12
 כָּל מַעֲשָׂהוֹ׃ מְרִצוֹנוֹ׃
 דְּוָמָם׃ צוּמָח וּמְרִגִּישׁ׃ 13
 יתְיַלְדוּ עַל מִשְׁפַּחֹתָם¹⁰

due to the metre which requires here a *shewā* mobile (see p. 253). The whole line in which this word is embodied is rather puzzling. It is especially difficult to explain חוג in this context. It may be the equivalent of גלגל used extensively by medieval Jewish philosophers with reference to the celestial spheres to which are attributed certain causal powers. Cf. Halevi's רק נהגם גלגל (ZYH, i. bk. 3, p. 32); הרסו אשר בנו . . . מסבת גלגלים (ZYH, ii. 98). Cf. also *ibid.* ii. 32 and 304 in both of which we have גלגל נחם. It will, however, perhaps fit more the context with reference to Ezek. i. 21, the "turning upon hinge" indicating, as it does in Prov. xxvi. 4, lack of movement (cf. ובעמדם of Ezek. i. 21). כל חוג in this case will then perhaps refer to the spheres occupied by the four companies of the celestial beings. Cf. Gabirol's poem beginning with שנאנים שאננים (Gabirol, iii. 60-1) and his *Kether Malkhūth* (*ibid.* lines 199-215).

¹ My translation of this word approaches the connotation given it in some medieval Hebrew texts. The manuscript reads first *tāw* with *pathah*.

² The manuscript reads עָמֶד. Note the masculine—poetic licence, due to the metre. Cf. however, Ezek. xxviii. 12, where מלא may be taken as the adjective of תכנייה. See n. 3, p. 262.

³ Cf. Lev. iii. 5. Here it seems to be the rendering of לא יסבו בלכתם of Ezek. i. 9.

⁴ Cf. Ps. xvi. 5.

⁵ A *hapax*; cf. Job xxxiv. 25.

⁶ Cf. Ezek. i. 16.

⁷ A notion drawn from Ezekiel's "Divine Chariot" seems to be again in evidence here as the line appears to bear on "whithersoever הרוח was to go, they (the living beings of the chariot) went" (Ezek. i. 20), הרוח being taken traditionally as referring to the fiat of God which is revered, feared and obeyed by them. (Cf., e.g. Targ. and Rashi *ad hoc*). Cf. *sôghēr* of line 9.

⁸ The manuscript reads דוּמָם, for which cf. אבן דומם (Hab. ii. 19). I have, however, followed the pointing common in the more modern Hebrew texts for this word which obviously means "inanimate". See following notes.

⁹ The various "beings" as found in the world are usually grouped into four divisions by medieval Hebrew scholars in the following order מְרִגִּישׁ. דוּמָם צוּמָח חַי וּמְדַבֵּר. Here, however, the last two seem to be included in מְרִגִּישׁ. (Cf. Qimhi's division as recorded in his commentary on Jer. x. 8, where these last two are instead included in חַי.)

¹⁰ Cf. Num. i. 8.

גוש עֶפְרַיִם לְבִיא וְלִישׁ ¹	14
תְּבַנְיָתֶם חֲתוּם בְּחֻתָּם ²	
וְצָרֹרִי עִם רְאֵמוֹת וְנִבְיִישׁ ³	15
מִיֶּסוֹד אֶרֶבַע תּוֹלְדוֹתֶם ⁴	
כָּלֶם נְזוּנִים בְּאֹרוֹ ⁵	16
וּמִכְּלָלֶם הַכֹּל בְּחֻנּוֹ	

¹ Cf. Job vii. 5. The word גוש, a *hapax* in the Bible, has been disputed by medieval Hebrew philologists (see e.g. Ibn Ezra on Job vii. 5, who alone records three different views concerning its meaning advanced by scholars). Does גוש imply here, as it does, e.g. in Bab. Mez. 101a (see *Mûsaph He-'Arûkh*, Amsterdam, 1655, v-גש), a clod of earth along with its attached *roots*, this being more in keeping with צומח of the *deleth* of line 13?

² Cf. Isa. xxx. 6. For the violation of the metre here, see n. 6, p. 267.

³ The last line is of some significance concerning the text of the Bible. The reading accepted in Ezek. xxviii. 12 is אתה חותם תבנית. The difficulty of the text is obvious. Some manuscripts give other readings. (See e.g. *Biblia Hebraica*. There is some indication that Targ. and Rashi had also a reading other than the accepted one). The text in the mind of the poet as suggested in our line might have well been חותם תבנית. For תבנית as masculine, cf. perhaps Ezek. viii. 10. See n. 2, p. 261.

⁴ For the translation, see 2 Sam. xvii. 13, but perhaps to be taken here figuratively, as the case is in Amos ix. 9, translating it "and grain of wheat", and thus bearing on צומח of line 13. See n. 9, p. 261 and n. 1 above.

⁵ This phrase drawn from Job xxviii. 18 is a favourite with Halevi. Cf., e.g. ZYH, i. bk. 3, 63, 86, 180, 363; ii. 178. In the manuscript גאביש—due to *homoioteleuton*, the copyist having in his mind's eye the word preceding it, which has an extra vocalic 'āleph. In keeping, however, with line 13 (see preceding note) in which מרגיש is embodied, one wonders whether the poet did not intend to play on ראמות, taking it as ראמים.

⁶ The four elements being earth, water, air and fire—extensively referred to by medieval writers as the main simple substances of which all material bodies are compounded.

⁷ We have here again a reference to the idea of emanation; not only are the celestial beings emanated by the light of the Prime Cause, but also all material beings. For the pointing of נזונים (Niph'al of זון), cf. the vocalic *yôdh* which frequently follows the *nûn* in this word (as well as in those of other Niph'al 'ayin *wāw* participles) in post-Biblical texts. For זון followed by *bêth*, cf. Ber. 28a.

⁸ = ומתכלל, the preformative *tāw* being assimilated to the (first) *kaph*. Similarly, Num. xxi. 27; Prov. xxvi. 26. (See n. 1, p. 260.) However, one may read here also either ומכלל, which is also a passive, parallel with נזונים of its preceding line, or ומכלל, the reference being to God, the line in which it is embodied thus reflecting מכלל חיים בחסד (second of the Eighteen Benedictions).

כָּל מִין עַל אֶרֶץ יִסְדּוּ ¹	17
גִּזְרָתָם תְּפִיל יְמִינוּ ²	
הַוַּגֵּף הַיּוֹרֵם חַי מְדַבֵּר ³	18
מִתּוֹךְ כָּל מְרַכֵּב ⁴ בְּשִׁכְלוֹ	
יֵשׁ אֶחָד חֵיל יִגְבֵּר ⁵	19
הָעַם בָּחַר נִחְלָה לוֹ ⁶	
וְקִדּוּשׁוֹת שְׁלֹשׁ יַחְבְּרֵי ⁷	20
כְּשֶׁרְפִים וְצָבָא זְבוּלוֹ ¹⁰	
מִחֲנֶה מוֹל מִחֲנֶה יִצְרוּ ¹¹	21
כָּל פְּעַל הָאֵל לְמַעַנּוֹ ¹²	
נִקְדָּשִׁים כָּלָם לְעַבְדּוֹ ¹³	22
לְתַת כְּתָר אֶל גְּאוּנוֹ ¹⁴	

¹ Namely, those included in line 13. For the last three words, cf. Amos ix. 6.

² For the wording, cf. Prov. i. 14. Here obviously a philosophical notion is implied.

³ Note the spiritual connotation given here to these words; in Exod. xxix. 26, the reference is to the waving and heaving-up of the breast-offering.

⁴ See n. 9, p. 261.

⁵ A medieval Hebrew technical term indicating the compounds of matter. Here the reference is to man's highly developed mind.

⁶ Emblematical term for Israel. Cf. 2 Sam. vii. 23.

⁷ Cf. Eccles. x. 10 and Job xxi. 7. My translation here, however, is in tone with the context.

⁸ Cf. Ps. xxxiii. 12 and note the slight deviation due to the metre. Cf. also Ps. cxxxv. 4.

⁹ The reference is to קדוש קדוש קדוש of Isa. vi. 3 incorporated in the *Qedhûshâh* (a solemn proclamation of God's holiness recited following the second Benediction of the 'Amîdhâh prayer). The wording here accords well with הַמְשַׁלְשִׁים לַךְ קְדוּשָׁה of the first paragraph of the *Qedhûshâh* according to the *Spanish rite*.

¹⁰ A common expression in Halevi's poetry. זְבוּל according to Hag. 12b is "the fourth of the seven heavens in which there are the heavenly Jerusalem . . . with the altar erected at which Michael the Great Prince stands . . .". See following notes.

¹¹ Cf. לעומתם "over against them" (third paragraph of the *Qedhûshâh*). See n. 13 below.

¹² Cf. Prov. xvi. 4.

¹³ For the last three lines, cf. *Pirqê d'R. 'Elî'ezer* (end of chap. 4): "Two seraphim one on the right . . . and one on His left (stand and) exalt and sanctify His great name . . ., saying *qādhôsh qādhôsh qādhôsh* . . . and the *hayyôth*, standing near His glory and not knowing the place of His glory, answer and say 'wherever be the place of His glory, Blessed be the glory of God', and Israel, the *one* people in the earth answer and say. . . ."

¹⁴ The mentions here of כְּתָר tallies again (see n. 9 above) with the wording

'Ôphān

- 1 The Creator is hidden in his creation,
Yet there is a distance between Him and it ;
- 2 The (whole) earth is full of His glory,
Yet there is no (confined) place for His presence.

- 3 He issues intellects out of His spirit—
(Intellects) grouped according to their service.
- 4 They are endowed with His virtues,
Their source emanating from His holy light.
- 5 Each of them has his functions—
Powers according to his rank.

- 6 One unto another sends forth His word ;
(One unto another) emits His fountain-light.
- 7 All their meditation is (focused) on Him in Whom they take delight,
Their desire (being) to be like their Owner.

- 8 And through His breath that garnishes the heavens
They (either) run straight forward,
- 9 Or (stand) firm, (shining) like a looking-glass—
His awe being upon their hearts.
- 10 They now draw, now empty ;
“ And their running is their vessels ”.

- 11 If each wheel turns upon its hinge
Their disposition remains unchanged.
- 12 Comely is their work,
His Will directing all their deeds.

- 13 Inanimate, plant and animate
Are formed into distinct families ;
- 14 Clods of earth, the lioness and the lion
Have their well-stamped pattern ;
- 15 Pebble, coral and crystal
Have their origin in the Four Elements ;

- 16 All of them are nurtured by His light—
All of them are sustained by His grace.
- 17 (It is) He that founded each kind in the earth,
His right hand determining their lot.

- 18 The speech-endowed animate has been lifted up and elevated—
Above all else it is he whose intellect is the more complex.

of the *Qedhûshāh* for the *Mûsāph* Prayer according to the *Spanish rite* which begins with כתר יתנו לך. Cf. Halevi's לבשו אימה וכתר הוד לך חבשו (ZYH, iii. 132) with regard to seraphim.

- 19 (Among the speech-endowed) there is one (people) who excels in worth—
It is the people whom He has chosen as an inheritance for himself—
20 (The people) who recites *qādhōsh* thrice repeated
In the manner of seraphim and the host of His lofty abode.
- 21 He has formed band opposite band—
All He has done being for His own sake ;
22 All of them are sanctified to worship Him—
To offer a crown to His glory.

Poem 45.

Before theorizing about the possible authorship of this poem by Halevi, the following examination of its form and context is, as was the case with poem 41, necessary. The structure of this poem—an '*Ahabhāh*'¹—resembles that of poem 41, except for the rhyme of the first *muwashshaḥ* (the *pethiḥāh*),² the first *deleth* of which, ending in *rī*, leads the remaining nine *delāthôth*, and the first *sôghēr* of which, ending in *-ar*, leads the remaining nine *sôgherîm*. It also embodies acrostically the name יהודה, and the letters of which it is made up are spelt out in the very same manner in which they are spelt out in poem 41, namely only the *yôdh*, its initial letter, makes the first letter of the first *deleth* of the opening *muwashshaḥ*, the remaining four letters being embodied respectively at the beginning of the four strophes. The metre is --ו-- / -ו-- for the *delāthôth* of both the five *muwashshaḥat* and the four strophes, and -ו-- / -ו-- for all the respective *sôgherîm*.³ We thus have here a scheme of the *kamil* type—a scheme of Arabic origin—not infrequently employed by Hebrew poets of the Spanish School in their compositions. This poem, however, has structurally less in common with the twenty-nine of Halevi's '*Ahabhōth*' (see ZYH, iii, 197-244).

The ideas and emotions expressed in the poem again reflect those of Halevi's as observed in the *Kuzari* on the one hand and in many poems known to be his on the other. The pre-eminence of the Land of Zion is one of the prime notions dominating the

¹ See n. 2, p. 249.

² See n. 6, p. 253.

³ For the violation of the accepted grammatical rules with regard to the *shewā*, see n. 7, p. 253.

Kuzari. It is the best, the most inspiring of lands. This is passionately spoken about and proved in elaborate arguments in the *Kuzari*, ii. 13-14 and referred to intermittently elsewhere.¹ As seen above, Halevi holds that Divine Light, which penetrates all the phenomena of nature, is felt the stronger in persons belonging to the highest "realm". It is to be added here that Halevi also holds that Divine Light attains its full strength only in people connected with the Holy Land where temple-cult is practised.² Here Halevi was not merely preaching. His journey to Zion, announced at the end of the *Kuzari*, which he actually undertook, defying hazards and not taking heed of the advice of friends, seems to be the logical conclusion of his way of reasoning. The suffering caused by exile ("in prison"; see *deleth* of line 17), the burning love for Zion and the longing for temple practices are expressed in abundance in our poem, as indeed they are in his other poems, notably in the ode beginning "Zion! wilt thou not ask if peace be with thy captives". The idea of the Kingdom of God and His Glory, which is also a dominant feature in the *Kuzari*³ and his poems, stands out in relief in the poem under review.

Phrases and expressions in his poems recalling those of ours are again numerous and only a small selection from them can be given here. For *deleth* of the first line, cf. ושב הצבי אל חדרך (ZYH, iii. 269); וצבי מאס בי מתי אעלהו בית אבי (ZYH, iii. 394); תשוב כאו אל בית מלוני (ZYH, iii. 174). For lines 2-3, cf. רב למשנאים בנקם לעכר (ZYH, iii. 163); . . . וצר אלי סר . . . והחריב . . . מקום מדרך . . . (ZYH, iii, 281). For lines 11-12, cf. אשמע בחצר קול למשרתי . . . (ZYH, iii. 200); . . . בעבור קול מבשרים . . . בא זמן הדרור ובהר קדשך . . . (ZYH, iii. 177); שומרי הליכות בית הודי בקדשי ישירו (ZYH, iii. 215).

For peculiar syntax recalling חשבו . . . ואשר of *deleth* of line 8, cf. ואשר לא נועדו (ZYH, iii. 123); . . . ואשר חשב (ZYH, iii. 178); ואשר בידו הצרי (ZYH, iii. 180); ואשר דברם לבי יעקב (ZYH, iii. 227); ואשר בריתך (ZYH, iii. 651).

¹ See, e.g. *Kuzari*, i, 20; ii. 12, 26; iii. 21 (end); iv. 23; v. 27.

² See *Kuzari*, ii. 26.

³ See, e.g., *Kuzari* iv (end). See also G. Sholem, *Hathḥalôth Ha-Qabbālâh, Keneseth*, x. 220-1.

The following is the poem reconstructed, annotated and translated :

אהבה

יָשׁוּב צָבִי ¹ יָשׁוּב לְחֻדְרֵי ²	1
יָשׁוּב עָלַי כֶּסֶא יִקָּר ³	
רַב מְהִיזוֹת ⁴ מֶרְמֶס חֲצֵרֵי	2
מִשְׁלַח ⁵ לְעַם נְכָרֵי חֹר ⁶	
לְהִיעִת לְךָ ⁷ לְתַמּוּד מְשֻׁנְאֵי	3
שֶׁבֶט מְלוֹכָה לְעֶצוֹר ⁸	
עָלַי וְצוֹר חֲזָקִי בְּקָרְאֵי	4
יַעִיר חֲסָדָיו לְעֶזְרוֹ ⁹	
יִדְעוּ רְחוּקִים יוֹשְׁבֵי אֵי ¹⁰	5
כִּי אֵין לְנוֹגִים ¹¹ מִעֶצוֹר	

¹ In medieval Hebrew poetry of the Spanish School—apparently under the influence of its equivalent in Arabic—“ a young beloved male ”, but here an emblematical term for God as a symbol of kingdom, צָבִי being taken allegorically as God in Cant. Rab. on Cant. ii. 9. See also Cant. viii. 14.

² The whole hemistich reflects Cant. Rab. on Cant. i. 4: “ May my beloved one (i.e. God ; see preceding note) come *legannô* ” (Cant. iv. 16)—*leginnûnô* (“ to his boldachin ”, “ to his *state room* ”).

³ The expression כֶּסֶא יִקָּר is used by Halevi in ZYH, iii. 180. For a similar adjectival idea expressed by the substantive יִקָּר in the genitive, cf. Prov. xx. 15. The Kingdom of God, a notion cherished by Halevi, is obviously implied in the last line. ⁴ Cf. Exod. ix. 28. ⁵ For linguistic echoes, cf. Isa. i. 12 and vii. 25.

⁶ The *qāmeẓ* of the *wāw*-conjunctive of this word as well as of the *wāws* of the words concluding the *sôgherîm* of lines 6, 7, and 12, is considered from the metrical point of view as a *shewā* mobile. ⁷ Cf. Haggai, i. 4.

⁸ Cf. שֶׁבֶט לְמֶשֶׁל (Ezek. xix. 4). For עֶצֶר = מֶשֶׁל, cf. 1 Sam. ix. 17, used with reference to the reigning of a king.

⁹ The peculiar syntax in the last two hemistichs is obviously due to the metre. However, for a similar anomalous *wāw*-conjunctive, cf. Amos iii. 11; for בְּקָרְאֵי not followed by an (explicit) adjective, cf. Ps. iv. 2; for V עוֹר in the Hiph'il followed by עַל, cf. Ps. lxxviii. 38; for the strange use of the infinitive לְעֶזְרוֹ, cf. the *qeré* in 2 Sam. viii. 5; cf. also 2 Chron. xix. 2. See S. R. Driver, *Books of Samuel* (2nd edn.), p. 281.

¹⁰ Cf. Ps. lxxv. 6 and Isa. lxxvi. 19. However, here we seem to have two parallel members, יִדְעוּ being implied in the second member.

¹¹ Cf. Zeph. iii. 18, where the reference is to those who “ are sorrowful for the solemn assembly ”.

לְבָנוֹת בְּיוֹם רְצוֹן גְּדֵרֵי ¹	6
אֶקְדָּח וְסוֹחֶרֶת וְדָר ²	
לְכָבוֹד שְׁמוֹ נוֹכַח דְּבִירֵי ³	
יִשְׁתַּחֲווּ מִלֶּדֶד וְשָׂר	
וְאַשֶׁר ⁴ בְּיוֹם מוֹסֵר יְדִידוֹת ⁵	8
חָשְׁבוּ לְהִפָּר הַבְּרִית ⁶	
יַעֲטוּ בְּיוֹם נִקְמָה חֲרָדוֹת ⁷	9
דִּמְעָם כְּמִי נֶחַל כְּרִית ⁸	
רָגַע וְחָשׂ לָמוֹ עֲתִידוֹת ⁹	10
וּלְפוֹעֵלֵי יֵשׁ אַחֲרֵית ¹⁰	
קָרַב ¹¹ וּמֵהָר יוֹם דְּרוֹרֵי ¹²	11
אֶשְׁמַע מִחֲצָר ¹³ בְּחֲצָר	
קִדְשֵׁי ¹⁴ וְעַל הָרֵי מְגוֹרֵי ¹⁵	12
רְנָה וְקוֹל גּוֹגֵן וְשָׂר	

¹ A combination of Mic. vii. 11 and Isa. lviii. 5. The "Good-will Day" serves as a theme in Halevi's poems. Cf., e.g. ZYH, iii. 608.

² Cf. Isa. liv. 12 and Esther i. 6.

³ A favourite phrase in Halevi's poetry. Cf., e.g. ZYH, iii. 680, 691.

⁴ Elliptical for *והאנשים אשר*. Similarly, Judges xx. 42.

⁵ Cf. *מוסר שלומנו* (Isa. liii. 5). The reference here is to God's love for Israel which has changed, suffering being now inflicted upon them as a disciplinary measure. ⁶ Cf. Ezek. xvii. 17.

⁷ Cf. Isa. xxxiv. 8 and lix. 17 and Ezek. xxvi. 16.

⁸ The brook by which Elija hid himself (see 1 Kings xvii. 3). For the attribution of tears to a river, cf. "let tears run down like a river day and night" (Lam. ii. 18). The use of *Cherith* here seems to be dictated by the rhyme as is the case with a line in Halevi's poem (ZYH, iii. 696). Cf., however, ZYH, ii. 86, where we see the rivers Pishon and Gihon and Prath (see Gen. ii. 11, 14) crying over one of the poet's friends; in this case there was no dictation by the rhyme. *דמע*, instead of *דמעה*, is common in post-Biblical Hebrew; cf., however, Exod. xxii. 28. ⁹ Cf. Deut. xxxii. 35.

¹⁰ Cf. Jer. xxxi. 17. The manuscript reads *וּלְפוֹעֵלֵי*, but it is obvious that the copyist, having apparently copied from a text using here the *plena* spelling, has ignorantly pointed it as a participle (see n. 2, p. 258).

¹¹ The manuscript reads *qôph* with *pathah*.

¹² Contrast this expression with *יום רצון* (*deleth* of line 6); *יום מוסר ידידות* (*deleth* of line 8); and *יום נקם* (*deleth* of line 9).

¹³ Cf. the *qeré* in 2 Chron. v. 13.

¹⁴ Cf. Isa. lxii. 9. The reference here is to temple practices. See 2 Chron. vii. 6 and especially *ibid.* xxix. 28. ¹⁵ For the singular, see Ps. lv. 16.

דָּרְךָ לְבֵית מְלָכִי סְלוּלָה	13
דָּרְךָ גְּאוּלִּים לְעִבּוּר ¹	
יִשְׁפַּל מְרוֹם גְּבָעָה וְצוּלָה	14
תִּתְחַרְבֵּי וְקוֹל קוֹרָא דְרוֹר	
אֶרְצֵי עַדֵּי יַם סוּף גְּבוּלָה	15
וּבָיִם פְּלִשְׁתִּים יַעֲבוּר ²	
חָבוּשׁ עָלַי רֵאשִׁי פְּאָרִי ³	16
יִקַּר כְּבוֹדִי עַל דְּבַר ⁴	
עֲמָדִי לְמַחְזִיק ⁵ בֵּית אֲסוּרִי	17
לֹא מַעֲדוּ רַגְלֵי בַצָּר ⁶	
וְהוֹכֵן לְךָ כִּסֵּא מְשִׁיחִי ⁷	18
קוּם נָא שֹׁבָה עָלָיו לְדוֹר ¹¹	
כִּי לֹא בְחִיל אֶף בְּרוּחִי ¹²	19
בְּהֶמוֹן לְאוּמִים ¹³ תַּעֲצוֹר	
עֲדָרֵי תְּנַהֵל בֵּית מְנוּחִי ¹⁴	20
מִפִּי אֲרִי תִצִּיל וְגוֹר ¹⁵	

¹ Cf. Isa. li. 10. ² Cf. Isa. xl. 4 and Jer. li. 53. ³ Cf. Isa. xlv. 27.

⁴ A combination of Isa. xl. 3 and Jer. xxxiv. 17 and Lev. xxv. 10.

⁵ Cf. "and I will set thy bounds from the Red Sea even unto the Sea of the Philistines" (Exod. xxiii. 31). See also *Kuzari*, iv. 3 (towards the end).

⁶ Cf. Ezek. xxiv. 17 (contrast Jonah ii. 6). Here the reference is obviously to some headgear of distinction. Note that in Yer. Sab. VI פֶּאֶר is taken, with reference to Ezek. xxiv. 23, as meaning "a crown". It is so rendered in Targ. to Isa. lxi. 3. For a similar expression by Halevi implying a similar idea, cf. ZYH, i, bk. 1, p. 52.

⁷ For על דבר in the sense of "because of", cf. Gen. xx. 11.

⁸ Unlike Dan. xi. 1, whence this phrase is drawn, where למחזיק is used substantively and עמדי = עמדתי with the apparent reference to Michael mentioned in its preceding verse, the reference here is to the defiance shown to the gaol-keeper, not submissively accepting the verdict of being a permanent exile. Here, then, למחזיק = . . . לנגד, for which cf. Dan. x. 13.

⁹ Cf. Ps. xviii. 37.

¹⁰ Cf. Isa. xvi. 5.

¹¹ Here = לדור ודור (or without the *wāw*-conjunctive) as it seems to be the case with that of Ps. lxxi. 18; see Targum's rendering.

¹² Cf. Zech. iv. 6.

¹³ Cf. Ps. lxxv. 8.

¹⁴ Cf. Exod. xv. 13.

¹⁵ Cf. Amos iii. 12. Note the strange syntax due to the metre. Cf. perhaps, however, Isa. xlvi. 16.

יָשׁוּב שְׁאָר עֲמִי בְּחִירִי 21
 בֵּית יַעֲקֹב יָשׁוּב שְׁאָר¹
 וּלְאַהֲבַת חֶסֶדֹוּ בְּזִכְרִי² 22
 אֶקְרָא דְרוֹר מִמְּאָסָר

'Ahabhāh

- 1 May the Beloved-one come back—come back to my chamber ;
May he again sit on (the) precious throne.
- 2 Enough for my court to be a trampling-place—
(A place) where an alien and strange people is let loose.
- 3 “ Is it time for Thee to support my adversaries—
To make them wield a regal sceptre? ”
- 4 (Surely), when I shall call to my God, the rock of my strength,
He will awaken His kindness to help.
- 5 Let them know that are far-off ; let the inhabitants of the isle (be aware)
That there be no restraint for the grieved
- 6 To (re-)build on the Good-will Day my wall
Of carbuncle and white and black marble.
- 7 (Then) to the glory of His name, facing the Temple,
Will king and ruler bow.
- 8 And those who on the day when friendship was chastised
Thought of breaking the covenant
- 9 Will on the Day of Vengeance be seized with fear,
Their tears (flowing) as (do) the waters of Cherith.
- 10 Suddenly and swiftly will come upon them the things prepared for them,
And to my work—the promised prosperity.
- 11 “ Bring near and hasten the Day of Liberation,
(So that) I may hear the clarion’s (sound) in my holy court,
- 12 And in the residence of my hill-country
(The) chanting and the voice of player and singer.”
- 13 The way to the house of my king is cast up—
A way for the redeemed to pass over.
- 14 The height of the hill will be made low and the deep
Will be made dry, and a voice will proclaim the liberation
- 15 Of my country whose bounds will reach the Red Sea
And pass along the Sea of the Philistines.

¹ For the last two hemistichs, cf. Isa. vii. 3.

² Cf. “ Yea, I have loved thee with אהבת עולם ; therefore with חסד have I drawn thee ” (Jer. xxxi. 2). The use of וּלְאַהֲבַת instead of . . . וְאֵת is dictated by the metre. Cf., however, Ps. cxlv. 14 and Ezek. xxxiv. 4. Note that we have here an allusion to the title of the poem which is here אהבה. See n. 2, p. 249.

- 16 My luxurious tire is on my head.
My honour grows because
- 17 I stood against the keeper of my prison-house ;
(Because) my feet did not slip in adversity.
- 18 —‘ The throne, O, my annointed, is set up for thee,
‘ Arise, I pray thee, sit upon it for ever,
- 19 ‘ For not by might, but by My spirit
‘ Wilt thou restrain the roaring nations,
- 20 ‘ And lead My flock into My house of rest—
‘ (The flock) thou hast rescued from the mouth of the lion and (its) whelp.’
- 21 ‘ The remnant of my chosen people will return—
‘ (To) the house of Jacob the remnant will return,
- 22 ‘ And on remembering the love of his *hesedh*
‘ I shall proclaim (his) release from prison.’

Does the detailed picture we have gained of the two poems enable us now to resolve the question of authorship propounded above? Not with full certainty. For though much data has been adduced both in the introductory remarks to the poems and in the textual notes to them, showing the affinity between them and Halevi, there are a few features in the poems which cast some doubt on this affinity. As regards poem 41 the doubt arises first and foremost from the fact that it contains systematically worked-out Neoplatonic notions. This kind of philosophy, expressed in so clear-cut a manner, seems somewhat alien to Halevi's *general* way of thinking. And though in some isolated instances it appears not to be against the letter of his *Kuzari*, it is certainly against its spirit. Another doubt stems from some linguistic phenomena. The coining of new nouns and forms of verbs and what seems like a special effort to look for, and make use of, the unusual in the language, is not a characteristic feature in the 670 or so of Yehudah Halevi's known poems. Unlike Gabirol, who in numerous of his *piyyuṭim* followed the Palestinian School of poets, liberally coining new linguistic forms, Halevi has done it very sparingly. Our poem, as will be gathered from the notes, tends to negate this impression. Then, again, some lines contain expressions which, by comparison with the generally highly refined and smoothly flowing style of writing known to have been employed by Halevi, look decidedly

unpolished. As regards poem 45—a poem in a lighter vein than poem 41—though in several ways it recalls many of Halevi's poems, it, too, contains one or two lines which have a non-Halevic ring. Line 4, *sôghēr* of line 16, *deleth* of line 17 and *sôghēr* of line 20 are examples of this; they are not sufficiently pliant for such a master of the Hebrew language as Halevi. In its content, too, the *sôghēr* of line 9, though similarly found elsewhere in Halevi's poetry, appears here, in its special context, rather affected and weak. Again, accustomed as we are to find Halevi's ideas echoing and re-echoing themselves in a variety of ways in many of his poems, we may wonder why the hemistichs which speak about the stand made against the adversary and the growth of honour resulting from it (see *sôghēr* of line 16 and line 17)—an idea which shows dignity in the down-trodden Jew of the Middle Ages—should not have found its reflection in some of his known poems.

Do we, then, have here a pre-Halevi Halevi? Were these poems composed by Halevi when he was still very young—his poetical tools inevitably lacking perfection, his language not having yet acquired its full colour and his philosophies still in their formative stage, drawing in some respects on a school of thought discarded by him at a later stage of his life? This is a tempting theory, which should prove of great interest could it be established by further research based on additional material. On the other hand, the possibility of the poems having been written by a poet (or poets) of the name Yehudah who flourished between, say, the middle of the twelfth and the end of the thirteenth century, about whom history has left no record, cannot be ruled out. It may well be that, like many known poets of Spain and Provence and beyond, they, too, were influenced by Halevi's works, following him in many ways in style and sharing much of his philosophical outlook. Be this as it may, the poet, or poets, who were given an honourable place amongst the brilliant company assembled in our Haggadah deserve full attention and study.