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ABSTRACT: The article offers an overview of the corpus of poetic disputes between the months composed in Aramaic, together with a critical edition of one such poem, איתחברו ירחית תוא, by Sahlan ben Avraham (Fustat, 11th century). The critical edition is accompanied by translations of the poem into Hebrew and English. Part of the text given in the critical edition is based on a copy found in a Genizah document copied in the 13th century by Yedutun Ha-Levi, now known as סדר פוסטאט א. The history of publication of this document is reviewed, and a description of its remaining fragments (including a new fragment identified as part of the present edition) is given.

INTRODUCTION: ARAMAIC DISPUTES BETWEEN THE MONTHS

The corpus of Late Antique Jewish Palestinian Aramaic poetry1 may be conveniently divided into three categories on the basis of the Sitz im Leben of the poems: 1) poems that are connected in one way or another to the liturgical reading of the Aramaic Targum (i.e., so-called Targum poetry), 2) poems that are intended for para-liturgical occasions, in particular wedding poems and dirges, and 3) poems that are intended for incorporation into the liturgy proper.2 Cutting across this three-way distinction on the basis of locus (i.e., appearing in all three categories) is a literary type whose position within the corpus is quite prominent: the dialogue poem. In turn, a special sub-category of this type is the dispute poem. Dialogue poems in general and dispute poems in particular are of great interest to those who wish to trace the origins and development of Jewish Aramaic poetry on account of the fact that they are well attested in the roughly contemporaneous Christian Syriac poetic culture. Taken together with additional parallels between the two traditions, this shared feature points in the direction of the existence of a Late Antique Levantine aesthetic, which finds expression in
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1 This corpus has been conveniently collected in M. Sokoloff and J. Yahalom, שירת בני מערבא (Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1999). Several of its aspects are the subject of an extensive and penetrating analysis by M. Kister, "שירת בני מערבא – היבטים בעולמה של שירה עלומה," Tarbiz 76 (2006/07), 105–84.

2 The first two categories reflect the status of Aramaic as the vernacular of Late Antique Palestine. Given the present state of our knowledge of the corpus, the third category is essentially restricted to qinot, i.e., poetic dirges composed for the liturgy of the Ninth of Av. For an analysis of this group of poems, see M. Rand, "Observations on the Relationship between JPA poetry and the Hebrew Piyut Tradition – The Case of the Kinot," in Jewish and Christian Liturgy and Worship: New Insights into Its History and Interactions, eds. A. Gerhards and C. Leonhard (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 127–44. There is no reason to suppose that a relationship of dependence exists between the Aramaic and Hebrew qinot – i.e., that the former are somehow an imitation of the latter, or vice versa. It is quite likely that at some point in Late Antiquity, Aramaic and Hebrew qinot were simply composed alongside one another, with the Hebrew qinot eventually winning out by being incorporated permanently into the liturgy (with the result that the genre was cultivated and developed by successive generations of liturgical poets) while the Aramaic qinot were discarded, to be re-discovered among the literary remains preserved in the Cairo Genizah.
the poetic corpora of the various relevant Aramaic literary cultures – Christian Syriac, Jewish Aramaic and Samaritan – and, by extension, in the traditions of Hebrew *piyyut* and Greek Church poetry, which are closely related to the Jewish and Christian corpora, respectively. In the case of dispute poems, moreover, the existence of the genre in both Jewish Palestinian Aramaic as well as Syriac is to be attributed to a common ancestry, since such poems are attested in the Mesopotamian, Sumero-Akkadian tradition, which constitutes a substratum of Aramaic literary culture.

Among the dispute poems, a coherent group is constituted by those which describe a precedence dispute between the months of the year. One such poem is attested in Syriac, and the following examples are known in Jewish Aramaic:

- *aitkannshu kol yarhayya* “All the months gathered” (2): Published in M. Klein, *Genizah Manuscripts of Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1986), 1.186-89. This poem is attested in ms. T-S NS 186.21, photographs of which are given in ibid., 2.163–64.
- *aitkannshun ka-hada kol yarhayya* “All the months gathered together” (7): Published in Sokoloff and Yahalom, *Genizah Manuscripts*, 1.201–5. This poem is attested in ms. T-S H 10.78, photographs of which are given in ibid., 2.176.

A similar list is provided in Murray, “Aramaic and Syriac Dispute-Poems,” 166–8. Murray did not have the photograph of which is given in ibid., 2.176.

5 A dispute between Passover and the Sabbath, beginning with *ai ly la-rashe yarh*.
6 A similar list is provided in Murray, “Aramaic and Syriac Dispute-Poems,” 166–8. Murray did not have the advantage of being able to refer to Sokoloff and Yahalom, as he himself notes on p. 165, note 37. In any case, the list given here updates that of Murray. Where relevant, the number of the poem in Murray’s list is indicated in parentheses immediately following the *incipit* in the list given above. Poem 6 on Murray’s list is *hachalot ha-qikkurim* (as he himself notes on p. 165, note 37). In any case, the list given here updates that of Murray. Where relevant, the number of the poem in Murray’s list is indicated in parentheses immediately following the *incipit* in the list given above. Poem 6 on Murray’s list is *hachalot ha-qikkurim* (as he himself notes on p. 165, note 37). In any case, the list given here updates that of Murray. Where relevant, the number of the poem in Murray’s list is indicated in parentheses immediately following the *incipit* in the list given above. Poem 6 on Murray’s list is *hachalot ha-qikkurim* (as he himself notes on p. 165, note 37).
addressing each of his opponents in turn and arguing for the inadmissibility of each to be the “Redeemer” month. The poem is therefore the exact opposite of a precedence debate, as each of the months (with the exception of Nisan) is (dis)qualified by reference to some negative feature. However, it shares enough features with the other items in this list to justify its inclusion (see below).

Where data are available, we see that the poetic disputes, which serve as targumic embellishments of בחדש הזה לכם ראש חדשים ראשון הוא לכם לחדשי השנה (Exod. 12:2), are cast in the same basic mold. Each begins with an introduction, in which the gathering of the months is described. The theme of gathering is given expression in the opening lines of the poems, which are essentially stereotypical:airaḥeḥov niḥam ṣeḥa, ahtarḥisn ḥatd ḥa, ahtarḥisn ḥatd ḥa. The introduction is followed by a presentation of arguments by each month in turn, beginning with Iyyar (i.e., the month immediately following Nisan). In the case of ahtarḥisn ḥatd ḥa, this feature is paralleled by the fact that Nisan begins his tirade against his opponents with Iyyar. There are several possibilities for the end of the debate. In ahtarḥeḥov niḥam ṣeḥa the closing argument is given by Nisan, with the specification that his claim rests on the “authority of the Most High” (l. 60). The victory of Nisan is therefore implied rather than asserted explicitly. In ahtarḥisn ḥatd ḥa Nisan does not present arguments. Rather God, the presiding judge, rules in favor of Nisan immediately following Adar’s arguments. In the case of ahtarḥisn ḥatd ḥa, after Nisan finishes his harangue with Adar, he pronounces himself the victor, again on God’s authority: “The Mighty One made me a redeemer for his people” (l. 44; translation mine).

In addition to the poems listed above, the following two items should also be noted:

• והוה כיון דאיתגיי יי va-hava kevan de-itege YY “And when the Lord was revealed” (1, 5): This dispute between the months is not cast in a poetic form, but rather in that of a prose targum expansion (tosefta) to Exod. 12:2. The literary structure of this expansion, however, entirely corresponds to that of the poetic disputes. It is attested in two versions, which are recensions of the same basic text. The first recension is published in M. Klein, The Fragment-Targums of the Pentateuch (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1980), 1.72–3. A translation is given in ibid., 2.37–39. An alternative translation, including suggested emendations to the Aramaic text, is provided by Brock, “Dispute of the Months,” 209–211. The second recension, beginning with והוה כד אתגיי קיריס va-hava kad itgele qiris “And when the Lord was revealed”, is published in Klein, Genizah Manuscripts, 1.194–5. It is attested in ms. Ox. Heb. e.73, photographs of which are given in ibid., 2.173–74.

• אתרהמי פולמוס itreme polemos [transcription following the vocalization in the manuscript] “A dispute arose” (4): This short targumic poem to Exod. 12:2, which at present consists of four stanzas, has been published on several occasions, the two latest being: Kister, ורבא, 115; A. Berberian, "תשבחות/תושבחות: עדויות חדשות ופשרן", Leshonenu 75 (2012), 112. It is attested in ms. Ox. Heb. e.73 (see previous item). In its present form, it appears foreshortened, with the first two stanzas describing the gathering of the months and their resolve to cast lots so as to determine which of them will be the month of

---

7 This poem is further distinguished from the other debate poems by the fact that in it the months are identified with their respective zodiac signs.

8 The latter two incipits are simply textual variants. In the case of the third incipit the word הוה is crossed out in the manuscript.
Israel’s redemption, while in the third and fourth stanzas Nisan summarily dismisses his opponents, claiming the prize for himself.

SAHLAN’S POEM

The poem את𝚁חיו יฤשי תשת מhareh shatta “The months of the year joined together” was composed by Sahlan ben Avraham, whose acrostic signature appears in the last stanza: סהלאן. Sahlan was a prominent member of the Babylonian community in Fustat, and was active in the beginning of the 11th century. His poem therefore postdates the other, Late Antique, poetic disputes listed above by some 500 years. However, its inclusion within the present corpus is amply justified on the grounds of its structural similarity to the Late Antique poems. In terms of overall structure, we have already seen that all of the poems begin with Iyyar and end with the victorious Nisan. More specifically, Sahlan’s poem contains a number of verbal parallels to the poems אתכןשו כל ירחיא itkannashu kol yarhia “All the months gathered” (see the commentary to ll. 8, 27, 53) and ... ובי סלק משה ... “... and in me Moses went up” (see the commentary to ll. 13–14, 19, 28, 29, 32, 35, 38, 48). In fact, Fleischer, who first published Sahlan’s poem (see below), noted the parallels between it and ... ובי סלק משה ... and correctly judged the latter to have served as a model for the former.

Finally, as with the Late Antique poems, Sahlan’s poem also seems to have been originally intended as a targumic embellishment of Ex. 12:2, as indicated by the fact that the targum to this verse is referred to in its last line (see the commentary, ad loc.). As a faithful imitation, therefore, Sahlan’s poem may be considered an additional witness to the essentially Late Antique genre under discussion here.

Sahlan’s poem is distinct from the Late Antique debate poems in the matter of dialect. Whereas the latter were intended for use with the Palestinian Targum and (for the most part) reflect the Jewish Palestinian Aramaic idiom in which it was composed, the former was to be employed with Targum Onqelos (see note 14), and is composed in an Aramaic that imitates that of this Targum, with occasional slips into Babylonian Aramaic:-before” (l. 12), מריא “the Lord” (l. 37), אנגר “He taught” (l. 41), and הרומא “authority, permission” (l. 60; see the commentary, ad loc.).

The poet appears to have signed his name twice. In the first case, ס is found in the partially preserved word ... סיד (l. 60), while סהלאן is derived from סהלאן בן אברהם (l. 61). In the second case, ס is once again found in ... סיד (l. 60), מ is provided by לאන ... (l. 61), ו by לאנ ... (l. 62; if my restoration is correct, see the commentary, ad loc.), and ס by ... סיד (l. 63).

11 Sahlan composed a second Aramaic poem in honor of Nisan: his name is Mighty God” – published in E. Fleischer, "חרישים שלCLUDING וו shouting," Tarbiz. 37 (1968), 269–70. This poem, however, does not belong to the dispute genre.
12 The poem also contains two morphological Hebraisms: כלן ... סל results from סל כהן (l. 51), while סל is derived from סל כהן (l. 53). In their commentary, the editors opine that the meaning of ... סל is unclear in the present context. It seems likely, however, that the correct translation is "Marheshvan spoke great things (or: spoke at length)." This interpretation is reinforced by the fact that the first line of every strophe of this poem contains some verb of speech, and line 21 is the opening line of the strophe dedicated to Heshvan.
THE FIRST ORDER OF FUSTAT

At present, Sahlan’s poem is attested within the context of a qiddush ceremony in honor of the New Moon of Nisan that was celebrated on the eve of the New Moon in the “Palestinian” synagogue of Fustat in the beginning of the 13th century. This ceremony is primarily attested in a document of central importance for the study of (the last phase of) the Palestinian liturgical ritual, the bulk of which is preserved in ms. T-S H 12.11. The document is currently known as סדר פוסטאט א, “The First Order of Fustat.” In the course of preparing an edition of Sahlan’s poem, it became evident that more fragments of this document have been preserved than has hitherto been recognized. In order to underscore this point, it is necessary to briefly review the history of its publication.

In an article entitled ראש ראשי חדשים (1968), Fleischer called attention to ms. T-S H 12.11, a liturgical document consisting of three bi-folia, which he divided into two groups of three folia each (i.e., the three bi-folia belong to the same quire, with a gap between the first three and the last three folia): 1) Purim, Parshat Parah, Parshat Ha-Hodesh, Rosh Hodesh Nisan; 2) Simhat Torah, Shabbat Ve-Zot ha-Berakha, Shabbat and Rosh Hodesh, Shabbat Parshat Yitro, Hanukkah. Fleischer later published a facsimile of this manuscript, in which the order of the two groups is reversed, so that the material for Rosh Hodesh Nisan now appears at the end of the preserved quire (rather than in the middle, at the end of the first three folia). As we will see presently, the latter is the correct order. In the same article, Fleischer announced the discovery of an additional bi-folium belonging to the same document, only the bottom halves of whose leaves are preserved: T-S 13 H 3.11. One leaf of this bi-folium contains material for Rosh Hodesh Nisan, while the other leaf contains the remains of text in the upper portion of the recto, the rest of the recto and the verso being left empty. The material for Rosh Hodesh Nisan follows the material for the same occasion contained in T-S H 12.11.

In his publication, Fleischer ignored the fact that T-S 13 H 3.11 is a bi-folium (here and in subsequent publications, he consistently refers to the manuscript as a דף, “folio”), whereas

---

14 Though the present context of the poem is liturgical, we must distinguish between the core, statutory liturgy and various liturgical occasions bearing a semi-popular character, of which the present case is one. A similar view is taken by Fleischer, ראש ראשי חדשים, 63, who refers to “the explicitly popular character” of the qiddush ceremony, calling it “a sort of spring festival” (transl. mine). The poem’s basic function as a targumic embellishment is clearly indicated by its referring to the targum in its last line (see above), together with the fact that in the manuscript (T-S 13 H 3.11) it is immediately followed by material from Targum Onqelos: Ex. 12:3 (followed by a short Aramaic litany), Ex. 12:1-3 (for the text, see Fleischer, ראש ראשי חדשים, 272–3). The view expressed here is pace Fleischer, ראש ראשי novità, 63, note 35, who argues that the poem, together with its predecessors, was composed specifically for the festive qiddush ceremony. Firstly, Fleischer admits a logical inconsistency in referring to this ceremony as being both “popular” (see above) and “official” (thus in note 35). Furthermore, it is clear that the collection of poems employed in this ceremony is highly eclectic, as noted already in ibid., 57. Sahlan’s targumic embellishment is therefore simply just another genre thrown into this eclectic mixture, and there is no particular reason to believe that it was written ab initio for the occasion. The fact that it is composed in Aramaic in no way singles it out, as other Aramaic elements not belonging to the dispute genre are also employed in the same ceremony (see for instance note 12).

15 This is the shelf-mark as it appears on the casing of the manuscript. In the publications that will be reviewed below, Fleischer refers to it mostly as T-S H 12.11a.

16 Fleischer, ראש ראשי novità, 266–7.

17 The facsimile appears at the end of E. Fleischer, תפילה ומנהגי תפילה ארץ-ישראלים בתקופת הנניזה (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1988). A facsimile of the verso of the leaf containing the material for Rosh Hodesh Nisan is also given in Klein, Genizah Manuscripts, 2.172. The image is labeled “folio 6v,” indicating that Klein also positions the leaf last in the preserved quire.
this fact actually solves the problem of the order of the two groups in the three bi-folia of T-S H 12.11. As noted above, the second leaf of T-S 13 H 3.11 is blank in the bottom of the recto and in the entire verso. The most likely assumption, therefore, is that this leaf constitutes the end of the original codex. This being the case, the only possible juxtaposition between the two manuscripts is one in which the material for Rosh Ḥodesh Nisan contained in T-S 13 H 3.11 follows the material for the same occasion contained in T-S H 12.11, while at the same time the second, partially blank, leaf of T-S 13 H 3.11 is positioned last among the leaves of the two manuscripts. These two criteria can only be satisfied if the three bi-folia of T-S H 12.11 are grouped together in one quire with the material for Rosh Ḥodesh Nisan last, while the bi-folium T-S 13 H 3.11 is positioned as the outer bi-folium of the following quire, with the leaf containing material for Rosh Ḥodesh Nisan coming first.

In his article, Fleischer published the material for Rosh Ḥodesh Nisan contained in the first leaf of T-S 13 H 3.11. At the preserved top of the recto he recognized the damaged remains of the tail end of a poem containing a dispute between the months, surmising that it might belong to the poem-elohim elaha addira shemeh. At the beginning of the corresponding verso, he identified the damaged text of the qiddush itself. As we will see presently, the end of the poem actually belongs to Sahlan's אתBehaviour ירחי שתא.

In a follow-up article, "חושתנ תּוֹנָנִי רָאָשׁ רָוָשָׁתָחָשׁ" (1981), Fleischer published ms. Mosseri VIII 394, a leaf that immediately follows the first leaf of T-S 13 H 3.11. The number of known manuscripts belonging to the First Order of Fustat thus rose to three.

In a third article on the subject, "ךֵפָר לָיָבָנִי רָאָשׁ רָוָשָׁתָחָשׁ" (1991), Fleischer identified ms. T-S NS 236.5, which does not belong to The First Order of Fustat, but also contains (poetic) material pertaining to Rosh Ḥodesh Nisan. The parallel to the First Order of Fustat was established on the basis of a poem appearing in both documents: אתBehaviour ירחי שתא elaha addira shemeh “His name is Mighty God” (see note 12). After this poem, T-S NS 236.5 contains the beginning of אתBehaviour ירחי שתא, which Fleischer published. He then published the continuation of אתBehaviour ירחי שתא on the basis of ms. T-S NS 125.96, and its direct continuation, ms. T-S NS 325.69. However, it escaped Fleischer's notice that T-S NS 325.69 is the missing upper portion of the first leaf of T-S 13 H 3.11, so that the damaged tail end of the dispute poem appearing at the top of the recto of T-S 13 H 3.11 belongs to this copy of אתBehaviour ירחי שתא.

Accordingly, the number of known manuscripts containing fragments of the First Order of Fustat is five. These constitute the remains of two adjacent quires, the latter presumably

---

18 Fleischer, "ךֵפָר לָיָבָנִי רָאָשׁ רָוָשָׁתָחָשׁ", 272, 277.
19 Fleischer, "ךֵפָר לָיָבָנִי רָאָשׁ רָוָשָׁתָחָשׁ", 274, 277.
21 Fleischer, "ךֵפָר לָיָבָנִי רָאָשׁ רָוָשָׁתָחָשׁ", 49–65.
22 Fleischer, "ךֵפָר לָיָבָנִי רָאָשׁ רָוָשָׁתָחָשׁ", 52.
23 Fleischer, "ךֵפָר לָיָבָנִי רָאָשׁ רָוָשָׁתָחָשׁ", 53–5.
24 Fleischer came tantalizingly close to recognizing that the two manuscripts represent the same source. In his discussion of אתBehaviour ירחי שתא he cites as a typological parallel the tail end of the dispute poem in T-S 13 H 3.11, again opining (this time without any hesitation) that it belongs to אתBehaviour ירחי שתא – see Fleischer, "ךֵפָר לָיָבָנִי רָאָשׁ רָוָשָׁתָחָשׁ", 56, note 17. Furthermore, he recognized that the actual qiddush ceremony described on the verso of T-S NS 325.69 is parallel to the qiddush ceremony described in the verso of the relevant leaf of T-S 13 H 3.11, without realizing that these are two halves of one and the same text – see ibid., 56 (in the notes to the transcription).
being the last of the original codex. The first quire is constituted by the three consecutive bi-folia making up T-S H 12.11, with the material for Rosh Ḥodesh Nisan coming last. The last folio of this quire is represented by the leaf preserved as T-S NS 125.96. The first folio of this quire, i.e., first leaf of the original bi-folium whose second leaf is T-S NS 125.96, is missing. (If, therefore, we assume a quire consisting of five bi-folia, it necessarily follows that a single, inner bi-folium is missing from this reconstructed quire.) The second quire, which immediately follows the first, consists of the bi-folium T-S 13 H 3.11, which constitutes its outer bi-folium. The upper portion of the first leaf of T-S 13 H 3.11 is T-S NS 325.69. This first leaf is followed by another: Mosseri VIII 394.

In a final article treating of the document under discussion here, Fleischer summarized his findings and named it סדרי פוסטאט א. In an important discovery, he also identified the compiler/copyist of this document: Yedutun Ha-Levi. Yedutun was the הazzan of the Palestinian synagogue in Fustat in the first quarter of the 13th century, a poet in his own right, whose career is chiefly identified with his unflagging and ultimately unsuccessful efforts to save the remaining vestiges of the Palestinian liturgical rite from being abrogated in favor of the triumphant Babylonian rite. The First Order of Fustat was drawn up by Yedutun as part of his campaign.

CRITICAL EDITION

Below I provide a critical edition of Sahlan’s dispute poem, on the basis of:

- T-S NS 236.5 (ll. 1–15)
- T-S NS 125.96, T-S NS 325.69/T-S 13 H 3.11 (ll. 19–63)

A composite image of T-S NS 325.69/T-S 13 H 3.11 may be viewed on the website of the Taylor-Schechter Genizah Research Unit. As the two manuscript witnesses do not overlap, restorations in square brackets are always conjectural. A Hebrew translation is provided alongside the Aramaic text. An English translation is provided in the following section.

Editorial Sigla:

- […] = less than one word missing
- […] = one word or more missing (may be repeated in order to fill out a line)
- < > = restoration of a scribal abbreviation
- נ = doubtful reading

---

27 Website: http://www.lib.cam.ac.uk/Taylor-Schechter/fofm/november-2011/index.html (Fragment of the Month, November 2011).
אחר

התרחשו ירחו והנה
ב ואח WHETHER והנה התנה
בישה מול המלך
כל אדם אחר ולא אודול

גילה אייר טעם מילולו
نعנה וחבריו למולו
והוריד לו המן ואוכלו
והלא סיון להם ענה
כראה מעשה היא וההוא נוח בו
כי לע חמשת להם
והוריד והשם הביר
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ס italia מלה אספני [מרחרש] [א]קופ הלבה אנא ואו אונביה אסטנטה
שבני הפריר [חסר]ן
גוזווב בבי תמועלי על מפלרי [מן]

פי מתכ➨בי אמד
ולוהרגי והברוויל
[...] [טיפתא של פעע[טיפתא של פעע
ומיצקמ טשרב עגעל

[...] [טקטב
וזני יבי הוהרמק האממה
[...] [גדל בי
וביסתיי גודר של המו במרהל

שבט [בודה
[ [...] [ונגל בבי התמשא
[ [...] [תסבת
שלבי באמר משלי ילמד התמורה הווה

[ [...] [ונגה והבר ולקט
[ [...] [issippi
שבבי ועל שברב שמע

[ [...] [שה ניפז [עשתו עילית
ROLS] [כוז] [,void] בכרוסו עליית
הלא איני אינ אוו אחר אונב
לע איה דרחל מפלחוכ אמי נשיא
ואור או גורל אוור הרשהוש
שלו קינא דבני חותם / על די המשה ווא[י]י.
לפיות שלש יש להשוות את המדרשים וההשכיבים הנדרשים לעם. "א" ובו [ת"א] חלחולש... עלילו
לכל בחודש, לפי בחודש, ולכל בחודש, ולכל בחודש, ולכל בחודש, ולכל בחודש, ולכל בחודש.
[ירר, "י"א], אל בחודש בחודש, והשלשה בחודש בחודש ואלא בלשון 
בחלות, בחודש בחודש, בחודש בחודש, בחודש בחודש, בחודש בחודש, בחודש בחודש.
"איתכנשו כל ירחיא" = מהד' קליין (ראה ברשימת הפיוטים בגוף המאמר
... ובי סלק" = מהד' סוקולוף ויהלום (ראה ברשימת הפיוטים בגוף המאמר
ת''א = תרגום אונקלוס
פירוש הפיוט
לחדשים... ועלה
המן
[לייוט פסיים בפג' מחמרא]
M. Sokoloff, A Dictionary of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic, Ramat Gan/Baltimore/=
London 2002
(2003) "ו"ב סלק" = מודח" סוקולוף ויהלום (רואו בפרספקט הפיסות בפג' מחמרא
)"ו"ב סלק" = חזרה לאונקלוס
פירוש הפיוט
לחדשים
8.db (2002)
לחלש א. קליין, "הגדת אמא" (ראה ברשימת הפיוטים גוף המאמר
...) והשווה: "דרכון וישבעון מן פירי עללתה" ("... ובי סלק", טור
לכנשא:
שווה: "עולמת אווה בחד יהודאי דהוה קאים רדי. געת
dבי יתנחמון וכו':
28.)
היא, המשויה ב"תו'י" שבטור הבא
הארמי "יעדי" שבטור הבא
ראה במדרש החודשים המובא לעיל.
ותתבני קריתא וכו':
29.)
15.)("...) והשווה גם "ובי עתיד למתבניא בית מקדשא קדישא" ("... ובי סלק", טור
ב막רכ.
19. השווה "נהוריה דישראל אנא שרויה" ("... ובי סלק", טור
28.
שם, טז
).)
11. הלשון על פי עזרא ד, יג;
16. והשווה גם "ובי עתיד למתבניא בית מקדשא קדישא" ("... ובי סלק", טור
ב막רכ.
19. השווה "נהוריה דישראל אנא שרויה" ("... ובי סלק", טור
28.
שם, טז
).)
11. הלשון על פי עזרא ד, יג;
16. והשווה גם "ובי עתיד למתבניא בית מקדשא קדישא" ("... ובי סלק", טור
ב막רכ.
19. השווה "נהוריה דישראל אנא שרויה" ("... ובי סלק", טור
28.
שם, טז
).)
11. הלשון על פי עזרא ד, יג;
16. והשווה גם "ובי עתיד למתבניא בית מקדשא קדישא" ("... ובי סלק", טור
ב막רכ.
19. השווה "נהוריה דישראל אנא שרויה" ("... ובי סלק", טור
28.
שם, טז
).)
11. הלשון על פי עזרא ד, יג;
16. והשווה גם "ובי עתיד למתבניא בית מקדשא קדישא" ("... ובי סלק", טור
ב막רכ.
19. השווה "נהוריה דישראל אנא שרויה" ("... ובי סלק", טור
28.
שם, טז
).)
11. הלשון על פי עזרא ד, יג;
16. והשווה גם "ובי עתיד למתבניא בית מקדשא קדישא" ("... ובי סלק", טור
ב막רכ.
19. השווה "נהוריה דישראל אנא שרויה" ("... ובי סלק", טור
28.
שם, טז
).)
11. הלשון על פי עזרא ד, יג;
16. והשווה גם "ובי עתיד למתבניא בית מקדשא קדישא" ("... ובי סלק", טור
ב막רכ.
19. השווה "נהוריה דישראל אנא שרויה" ("... ובי סלק", טור
28.
שם, טז
).)
The months of the year joined together
In the length of time, when the moment arrived.
In bandying about words
Each one said, “Preeminence is my due.”

5  
Refrain
Iyyar lay bare the meaning of his talk
And spoke, his fellows before him.
“In me the Merciful One led out the people borne by Him,
And brought down for them manna and food.”

10  
Refrain
Indeed Sivan answered them,
“As is fitting, the deed of one worthy is reckoned before the High One.
And in me Moses ascended on high
And brought down the two Tablets of the Covenant.”

15  
[Refrain]
[…]
[…]
[…]
[…]
to gather the harvest.

20  
Refrain: In bandying about
“Blessed am I,” said Av, “among all the months.”
And he esteemed himself above them, giving himself praise.
“In me the praised nation will rejoice
For in me mourners will be consoled and in me the Messiah will be born.”

25  
Refrain
When Elul heard these words,
He wearing the crown,
[He said,] “In me the heart of stone will pass from the congregation And the precious city will be rebuilt to perfection.”

30 “Who is like unto me amongst you all,” said Tishrei, For it is in me that my Lord and Master takes pleasure. His people are radiant in me, at the going out of […] And they multiply feasts in me, and my splendor waxes.”

Refrain

35 Marḥeshvan multiplied a plethora of words. He said to them, “I am he who made garments. The Lord performed miracles in me And the sons of Ḥashmonay were victorious over the kings of Greece.”

Refrain

40 Kislev opened his mouth and said, Instructing his fellows in his meaning. “The people’s prayer […] And their oppressor was smashed and disappeared.”

Refrain

45 [Ṭevet] arose […] “And as for me, in me the Merciful One saved the nation. In me […] became great, And I abrogated the decree of Haman the son of Hamdata.”

Refrain

50 Shevat […] and invented […] And he esteemed himself above them all […]. “Praise […] For in me Moses expounded the teaching of this Torah.”

Refrain

55 […] And spoke, his fellows before him. “The crown is mine […] For in me the humble one was born, with whom [God] spoke.”

Refrain

60 […] of Nisan […] by authority of the Most High. “Am I not the head and every [other] month last? Preeminence and kingship are my due, and I am the prince. My light is a great light, and I am the first month.”
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