

HEBREW UNION COLLEGE - JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION
New York School

INSTRUCTIONS TO LIBRARY

Statement
by Referee

The Senior Thesis of _____

Entitled: _____

- 1) May (with revisions) be considered for publication () ()
yes no
- 2) May be circulated () () () ()
to faculty to students to alumni no restriction
- 3) May be consulted in Library only () ()
by faculty by students
- () ()
by alumni no restriction

(date)

S. J. Newman
(signature of referee)

Statement
by Author

I hereby give permission to the Library to circulate my thesis

() (✓)
yes no

The Library may sell positive microfilm copies of my thesis

() (✓)
yes no

March 31, 1977
(date)

Saul Joseph
(signature of author)

Library
Record

The above-named thesis was microfilmed on _____
(date)

For the Library _____
(signature of staff member)

TAL AND GESHEM IN THE LITURGY:
A MYTHO-SEMANTIC ANALYSIS

PAUL JOSEPH

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of
requirements for Ordination 1977

Hebrew Union College - Jewish Institute of Religion
New York, N. Y.

Date March 31, 1977

Referee: Professor Dr. Lawrence Hoffman

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements.....	pg. 1.
Chapter I. Statement of the Problem, Methodology, and Limitations of Research.....	pg. 1
Chapter II. The Biblical Frame of Reference.....	pg. 8
Chapter III. Rain and Dew in the Tannaitic and Amoraic Eras.....	pg. 16
The Tannaitic Period.....	pg. 16
The Amoraic Period.....	pg. 36
Chapter IV. The Post-Talmudic Period.....	pg. 63
Piyyutei Yannai.....	pg. 64
"Anonymous" Compositions.....	pg. 69
Kallir.....	pg. 72
Chapter V. The Gaonic Prayer Books.....	pg. 82
Birkat Gevurot.....	pg. 82
Birkat Shanim.....	pg. 88
Chapter VI. Sephardic and Franco-Rhenish Payyetanim.....	pg. 97
Spanish Poetry.....	pg. 99
Franco-Rhenish Contributions.....	pg. 105
Chapter VII. Analytic Models and Perspectives....	pg. 114
An Epistemological Analysis.....	pg. 120
'Structural' Anthropological Analysis.....	pg. 130
A Semantic Approach.....	pg. 144
Footnotes.....	pg. 155
Bibliography.....	pg. 174

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The assistance, encouragement, and support of many people have made the accomplishment of this effort possible. Chief among them are:

Dr. Lawrence Hoffman, my thesis advisor, teacher, and model for the creative, scholarly, and reverent inquiry into the study of Jewish liturgy;

Rabbi Norman Cohen, co-advisor of this thesis, whose guidance and infectious excitement about the study of the Midrash helped to sustain my perseverance;

My teachers at the College-Institute, who uniformly promoted and abetted a commitment to objectivity, thoroughness, and diligence in the pursuit of knowledge and understanding, especially Dr. Harry M. Orlinsky and Dr. Leonard Kravitz;

Rabbi A. Stanley Dreyfus and Rabbi Elihu Schagrin, my rabbis, whose examples in wisdom, piety, and integrity have remained ever before me to sustain and motivate;

Rabbi Gunter Hirschberg, a teacher, a colleague and friend who, through his sharing, generosity, and patience, has enabled the growth and development of my professional competence;

Mrs. Marjorie L. Sachs, whose supportive and enduring friendship to me led her to undertake and accomplish the typing of this manuscript as a Mitzvah L'shem Mitzvah;

Judith Joseph, my wife and "the ally of my strength", for whose abundant love, insuperable patience, and ever-renewing encouragement it is impossible to give adequate

thanks; for all these reasons, and so many more, this work is as much her accomplishment as it is mine.

Chapter I. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM, METHODOLOGY, AND
LIMITATIONS OF RESEARCH

Even a cursory examination of Jewish liturgy as edited and accumulated to date reveals that considerable attention is paid to the expression of petitions, reminiscences, and eulogies concerning the appointment of precipitation for the world. Those which come to mind immediately are the insertions חן של ומטר לברכה and משיב הרוח ומוריד הגשם for the Second and Ninth Benedictions respectively of the Sh'moneh Esrei. Almost as familiar are the Medieval poetic compositions of Kallir, תפלה של and תפלה גשם. In addition to these basic textual insertions, there is also a body of lesser known poetic and petitionary compositions and formulae preserved in the liturgy. These may be derived from Seder Rav Amram Gaon, Siddur Rav Saadia Gaon, and collections of piyyutim, particularly (for our purposes) the Ashkenazic payyetanim. Clearly, the sources of these insertions span an enormous range of history and geography and were composed and adopted for use in a wide variety of meteorological contexts.

The earliest of such petitions, the insertions for the Sh'moneh Esrei, undoubtedly reflect the meteorological conditions operative in Palestine in the early centuries of the Common Era. (1) In general, it may be assumed that all of the compositions reflect the heart-felt awareness of people, in all times and places, of their ultimate dependency upon an uninterrupted supply of vitalizing water to nourish their

crops and, thereby, to preserve them from famine. Insofar as God was regarded as both the Author and Master of nature, petitions for the continuance of a bountiful water-supply logically are to be expected.

And yet, as sensible as our expectations might be concerning the persistence of such prayers in the liturgy as reflecting genuine local needs, many of them appear to have no objective relation to the prevailing weather conditions of the place in which they were adopted or retained in the fixed regimen of worship. Thus, whereas the weather cycle of Palestine is marked by severe seasonal variations in the fall of rain and dew⁽²⁾ as the principal source of moisture for agriculture, in Babylonia the fertile flood-plain between the Tigris and Euphrates remained rather stably irrigated by an intricate system of artificial canals.⁽³⁾ In such far-flung regions as Provence in southern France and the Rhineland completely different weather patterns prevailed. But, despite such dramatic differences of climate and precipitation cycles, over and over again we find the same liturgical vocabulary and strict adherence to formulae which seem to possess no contemporary relevance. Why should this be so?

If we were to attribute this phenomenon to the essential conservatism of liturgical literature, we would be consigning such compositions as Prayers for Rain and Dew to the category of quaint archaisms. Though they would originally have borne literal significance for the wor-

shiper in the land which inspired their composition, when transposed into an alien context they would have become only pious memorials to the life of the people in another time and place. Our case would be equivalent to the traditional Siddur's retention of פורקן יקום, a prayer for the well-being of Gaonic institutions which faded into history nearly a millenium ago. In the light of this tendency, and in consideration of the veneration in which compositions from antiquity are often held, we would not be surprised to discover many such prayers being recited in pious adherence to a tradition which had no personal significance whatsoever.

But what if we were to insist on considering mankind's penchant for reinterpreting traditional material through the eyes of its own time? We could then modify the above assumption by maintaining that certain such compositions were given renewed vitality through a later and localized allegorization of meaning. This process is no novelty to students of religion. Given the didactic, homiletic thrust of much of early Rabbinic teaching, coupled with a basically ahistorical approach to Biblical Scripture, it is especially evident in Jewish tradition. The use of four discrete Biblical verses pertaining to the observance of the Passover in the Biblical period to describe the relation of the Four Sons to the Seder's reenactment in subsequent ages gives evidence of just this sort of process. Targum Onkelos indulges in the "updating"

of meaning when he renders "יחי ראובן ואל ימות" as "יחי ראובן בחיי עלמא ומוחא תנינא לא ימות" (4). By such a process, it might be argued, liturgical compositions which appear to have only quaint memorial value could have been transmuted into statements of quite contemporary relevance.

But a third possibility exists, as well. Though the above explanations possess some measure of truth, we may yet wonder whether they account fully for the phenomena. We may ask whether these liturgical compositions had within them an underlying, though not wholly explicit significance, ultimately unrelated to the objective meteorological needs of the widely dispersed lands in which they were uttered? If this hypothetical significance were on a wholly symbolic level, then we could understand how the compositions would remain relevant, despite differences in climate and the like. Such an assumption would help to account for the composition of liturgical material employing terminology which was anachronistic or otherwise lacking in significance under local climatic conditions. This viewpoint would be different in one important respect from the "allegorical" explanation already offered. It would not limit the significance of the works to merely local interpretation. Instead, it would suggest that all of the authors and all of the audiences of such literature, regardless of variations in land of residence, lifestyle, or climate, shared

a common understanding of the symbolic substratum to which the compositions regularly referred.

The purpose of this inquiry is to investigate whether such a symbolic infrastructure did exist; if so, what its significance was; and, once identified, whether it is possible to deduce the conceptual linkages which served to bind the individual elements together.

In pursuing this inquiry, principal attention will be paid to the terms מים and שמים. We will examine the usage of these terms both as specific forms of precipitation and as generic terms for the primary sources of water in the agricultural context of ancient Palestine. The terms will be studied first within the context of Biblical literature, in the hope of determining the significance and associations they might come to possess for the authors of later Jewish liturgy. Once a portrait of the Biblical connotations has been elicited, we shall then examine the ways in which later generations elaborated upon that image, if any. How do the Tannaim of the early centuries of the Common Era deal with the subject of water in general and the forms of precipitation in particular? Do any new dimensions emerge out of their contributions to the early halakhic and aggadic literature? What additional details may have come from the Palestinian and Babylonian Amoraim, as are preserved in the Talmud and various midrashic collections? Against a background of such sources, we shall examine a sample of liturgical compositions bearing on our

study which are thought to be contemporaneous with these same post-Biblical eras. We shall try to determine whether any correspondence of ideas may be seen to occur. Based upon any elaborated portrait which may then have emerged, we will examine a selection of post-Talmudic liturgical compositions in order to discover whether any of the same associations are found to prevail. Such sources will be drawn from cultures as diverse as those of the Babylonian Geonim and the Rhenish Hassidei Ashkenaz, residing, as it were, at the polar extremes of Medieval Jewry's geographical and sociological dispersion.

If a pattern of associations possessing a symbolic character can be perceived, even amidst a temporal and geographic panorama as vast as this, that symbol system will be examined in the light of selected modern theories of religious/mythic language study. Because such theories are myriad and their assumptions are often of a tenuously hypothetical nature, I shall utilize them only to suggest some tentative insights concerning the on-going meaning and vitality which the liturgy under examination seems to have possessed.

In general, this study is not intended to be exhaustive or conclusive of the questions it raises. The sheer bulk of the sources, liturgical, midrashic, and halakhic, puts such an endeavor beyond my present capability. Therefore, I am certain to have overlooked material which bears significantly upon the focus of this study. Thus, for instance, no

close examination of all the published texts from the Cairo Genizah has been undertaken, except where such finds bear on the compositions of Yannai and Kallir. Nor has my research enabled me to explore the vast literature of Medieval European Jewry, in all its fascinating detail. For the present, I must leave to other students of liturgy the verification of the hypotheses to be offered here. At best, I shall only try to point the way to an understanding of a body of liturgical compositions which once may have been at the core of the Jewish people's constellation of eschatological hopes and expectations.

Chapter II. THE BIBLICAL FRAME OF REFERENCE

Throughout Biblical literature the phenomenon of precipitation's occurring in its due season, so as to produce its beneficial effect of watering the earth and crops, was deemed to be an expression of divine favor. The promise of Deuteronomy 28:12 makes this quite explicit:

יפתח יהוה לך את אוצרו הטוב את השמים לתת
מסר ארצך בעתו ולברך את כל מעשה ידך...

So does the prophet Ezekiel when he says:

ונתתי אותם וסביבות גבעתי ברכה והורדתי הגשם
בעתו גשמי ברכה יהיו: ונתן עץ השדה את פריו
והארץ חתן יבולה והיו על האדמה לבסח:

(5)

And the prophet Joel confirms such a notion, as well:

ובני ציון גילו ושמחו ביהוה אלהיכם כי נתן לכם את
המורה לצדקה, ויורד לכם גשם מורה ומלקוש בראשון:

(6)

This is not to suggest, however, that the giving of water was viewed as an act of gratuitous kindness on God's part. On the contrary, it was deemed to be the consequence of meritorious conduct on the part of those petitioning it. Accordingly, we read in Leviticus 26:4:

אם בחקתי תלכו ואת מצותי תשמרו ועשיתם
אותם ונתתי גשמיכם בעתם ונתנה הארץ
יבולה ועץ השדה יתן פריו:

Such a viewpoint is reinforced by the conditional words of promise contained in Deuteronomy 11:13-15:

והיה אם שמע תשמעו אל מצותי אשר אנכי מצוה
אתכם היום לאהבה את יהוה אלהיכם ולעבדו בכל
לבבכם ובכל נפשכם: ונתתי מסר ארצכם בעתו
יורה ומלקוש ואספת דגן ותירוש ויצהרית:
ונתתי עשב בשדך לבהמתך ואכלת ושבעת:

Thus, it is not surprising to find that the Biblical writers also held the converse proposition to be true. The withholding of the vitalizing waters or being stranded in a parched and arid land was synonymous with being under the shadow of divine disfavor and rejection(7). God's power in this respect is shown to be one of His most effective tools for obtaining compliance to His will and for reproofing the guilty. Amos 4:7-8 predicts that droughts can be used on a highly selective basis in the divine program of retribution. Micah lets it be known that the power of Israel's God is such as to be able to control the water resources of the entire Middle East(8) and to be able to employ drought and the desolation which follows in its wake as tokens of His displeasure anywhere within the region(9). At one time or another, a number of individual nations are singled out for punishment by being threatened with reduction to an arid wasteland. These include Egypt(10), Assyria(11), Babylon(12), and, of course, Israel(13).

Whereas this kind of punishment is visited upon the gentile kingdoms of the Middle East because of their abuse of power in general and of Israel in particular, the withholding of water from Jewish domains is always on account of a violation of a Toraitic obligation or norm. Such infractions might include anything from idolatry(14) to failure to pay the appointed tithes(15). Regardless of the cause, the effect of such a visitation was devastating for the entire community. Nobles, farmers, and herdsmen could only look

on in distress as crops withered, livestock wasted away, and the pasturage and water-holes dried up completely(16). The psalmist summarizes the role of drought in the punishment of sinners, when he says, **אך סורדים שכני צחיתה !** (17). It is no wonder that Deuteronomy 11:16-17 equates God's sending of a protracted drought with the extirpation of Israel from the land of their inheritance.

As these texts indicate, water in all its forms and sources was regarded as being a gift from God. Accordingly, we find that in the blessings which are bestowed upon various outstanding personalities guarantees of ample water resources are regularly included. Among those who are promised the bounties of the heavens above and of the depths beneath the earth are Jacob(18), Esau(19), and Joseph(20) and his tribe(21). Remnants of similar divine benefactions toward Isaac and Ishmael, entailing the giving of water, may be contained in the events depicted in Genesis 16:9-14; 21:17-20; 25:11(22). Moreover, the outstanding characteristic of the land to which God had lovingly assigned His people was its richly varied water sources:

**כי יהוה אלהיך מביאך אל ארץ טובה, ארץ
נחלי מים עינת וחתמת יצאים בבקעה ובהר:**

(23)

It is appropriate that Moses should summarize Israel's prospective living conditions with these words:

**וישכון ישראל בסח בדר עין יעקב אל ארץ דגן
ותירוש: אף שמיו יערפו סל: אשריך ישראל
מי כמוך עם נושע ביהוה. !**

(24)

In later eras, when religious spokesmen would want to extol the goodness of God, we are not surprised to find that they borrow richly from this heritage of associations:

העניינים והאביונים מבקשים מים ואין לשונם בצמא
נשחה, אני יהוה אענם אלהי ישראל לא אעזב: אפתח
על שפיים נהרות ובחור בקעות מעינות, אשים מדבר
לאגם מים וארץ ציה למוצאי מים:

(25)

As important as was water for drinking, it certainly was at least as important for assuring a rich and varied harvest. Accordingly, we find in the Biblical authors' compositions an intimate relationship between the sending of precipitation and nature's subsequent yielding of her bounty(26). More often than not, such statements of reassurance to the agriculturally dependent community were connected either to God's performance of an act of physical salvation for His destitute people or restoration of the covenantal relationship with them(27). Indeed, over time this sort of imagery was to become a central metaphorical device for expressing the nature of divine-human interaction, not only "in its season," but whenever sought.

At various points in Biblical literature we find that not only was God's nearness associated with the gathering of storm-clouds(28) or likened to some bountiful water-reserve(29), but specific acts of divine kindness towards His people were portrayed as 'precipitations' or outpourings. Such imagery is at work in the giving of manna(30), Torah(31), and the spirit of prophecy(32).

In metaphorical terms compatible with this kind of

speech, God is made to speak of the way in which He will show His kindness towards the exiles whom He will return to Zion:

לא ירעבו ולא יצמאו ולא יכס שרב ושמש,
כי מרחמם ינהגם ועל מבועי מים ינהלם:

(33).

In order to vouch for the guaranteed effectiveness of His beneficence, God is made to suggest the following parallel:

כי כאשר ירד הגשם והשלג מן השמים ושמה
לא ישוב כי אם הרוה את הארץ והולידה
והצמיחה, ונתן זרע לזרע ולחם לאכל:
כן יהיה דברי אשר יצא מפי לא ישוב
אלי ריקם...

(34).

It is not surprising to find that a person who received a full measure of God's providence and protection was likened to something saturated by abundant waters:

ונחך יהוה חמיד והשביע בצחצחות נפשך
ועצמותיך יחליץ, והיית כגן רוה
וכמוצאי מים אשר לא יכזבו מימיו:

(35).

The reliability of precipitation provided similes for God's ultimate willingness to enter into immanent relationship to His people:

ונדעה נרדפה לדעת את יהוה כשחר נכון
מצאו, ויבוא כגשם לנו כמלקוש יורה ארץ:

(36)

אהיה כסל לישראל
יפרח כשושנה, ויך שרשיו כלבנון:

(37)

Thus, as early as the Biblical period, one who pursued the nearness of God could express his search in these terms:

אלהים אלי אתה אשחרך
צמאה לך נפשי כמה לך בשרי,
בארץ ציה ועיף בלי מים:

(38).

The vivid imagery of Isaiah 44:1-4 brilliantly reflects and illuminates the way in which the terminology of the natural order could be employed metaphorically to express the dynamics of love, salvation, and restoration between the God of Israel and His chosen people:

ועתה שמע יעקב עבדי, וישראל בחרתי בו:
כה אמר יהוה עשך ויצרך מבטן יעזרך,
אל תירא עבדי יעקב וישרון בחרתי בו:
כי אצק מים על צמא ונוזלים על יבשה,
אצק רוחי על זרעך וברכתי על צאצאיך:
וצמחו בבין חציר, כערבים על יבלי מים:

Though the number of pertinent examples which could be multiplied is legion, I believe that this suffices for our present purposes. The portrait of the significance of water in general and precipitation in particular which has emerged here shows it to have been an important fixture of concern for Biblical literature and, consequently, for the culture of the people who authored and preserved that literature. Based upon the evidence cited here, I believe the following conclusions may be inferred concerning the Biblical period:

- 1) the giving of the waters of nature in virtually all of their forms was perceived as an expression of divine concern and kindness; most often, however, it was in response to the loyal or meritorious conduct of the petitioning party that the water was given; appropriately, it was regard-

ed as a tangible manifestation of divine favor

2) the good effects of water, materially speaking, were associated with the slaking of thirst, the moistening of soil and crops, and the general invigoration of nature and its inhabitants

3) the vocabulary of precipitation as it related to the vitalization of flora was often appropriated to express metaphorically the process of divine-human interaction; among such interactions were included the propagation of new life, the restoration of Jewish exiles from their places of dispersion, and the effecting of a renewed prosperity and well-being for the Jewish people upon their ancestral soil

Our next task will be to determine the ways in which this heritage of associations was appropriated by the heirs of the Biblical literature, the Sages of the Tannaitic period. Do they demonstrate an awareness of these associations? If they do, to what new uses do they put them? Living as they do amidst the same locale and climatic conditions as their Biblical forebears, are they able to add anything to our understanding of the ways in which the dynamics of nature on the 'local scene' were perceived? And, finally, do they demonstrate a creativity equivalent

to that of some of the Biblical thinkers by adapting a vocabulary descriptive of nature to the facilitation of discussion concerning matters of an altogether preternatural order? **עוּן אֵל** - - let us hear what the sources have to say!

Chapter III. RAIN AND DEW IN THE TANNAITIC AND AMORAIC ERAS

The Tannaitic Period

The material in Mishna Taanit clearly demonstrates that the Tannaim were acutely conscious of the precipitation cycle of their native Palestine. Moreover, it would appear that the Rabbis objectified their awareness of that cycle in their ordering of the rites and liturgy pertinent to petitioning rainfall. The focal point for much of their interest in this regard was the Festival of Sukkot.

From as far back as the time of the return from Babylonian Exile, the prophet Zechariah had avowed that those Israelites, even from the far-flung reaches of Egypt, who did not observe the Feast through participation in a pilgrimage to Jerusalem would receive no rain as retribution for their disloyalty(39). We also know that while the Temple still stood a special water-libation to encourage the blessing of the rains was performed during the course of the eight-day festival(40). Even the selection of the Four Species of plant life employed in the water-supplication rites of Sukkot was explicitly linked to their natural affinity for water(41), as if their mere presence might reciprocally serve to attract the autumn rains(42).

Thus, we are not surprised to find that the insertion of a 'memorial statement' into the doxology of divine powers enumerated in the Second Benediction of the Amidah, attributing mastery of the rains to God, is to be begun on the

eighth day of the Sukkot Festival(43). The wording of the memorial phrase is משיב הרוח ומוריד הגשם (44).

The actual insertion of the memorial phrase (referred to as גבורות גשמים in the Talmudic literature(45)) was to be begun in the Reader's Repetition of the Amidah for the Musaph service of Sh'mini Atzeret(46). Its inclusion in public prayer was to be maintained throughout the months to come, until the Reader's Repetition of the Amidah at the Musaph of the first day of Passover, when it was discontinued(47). The Mishna states explicitly that these particular termini for recitation were delimited in recognition of the precipitation cycle, i.e., אין שואלין את, (48). הגשמים אלא סמוך לגשמים

In addition to relating the inception of the rainy season to the Hebrew month of Tishri, the Rabbis generalized the occurrence of many beneficial events to coincide with the termini of the precipitation cycle. In Rosh Hashana 10b-11a, a listing of a number of outstanding events, which either have happened or are yet to be, is recorded:

ר' אליעזר אומר, בתשרי נברא העולם, בתשרי
נולדו אבות, בתשרי מתו אבות, בפסח נולד
יצחק, בר"ה נפקדה שרה רחל וחסה, בר"ה יצא
יוסף מבית האסורים, בר"ה בסלה עבודה מאבות-
ינו במצרים: בניסן נגאלו, בתשרי עתידין לגאול:
...ומניין שבתשרי נברא העולם, שנאמר, ויאמר אל-
הים חושש הארץ ושא עשב מזריע זרע עץ פרי;
איזהו חודש שהארץ מוציאה דשאים ואילן מלא
פירות? הוי אומר, זה תשרי ואותו הפרק זמן
רביעה היתה וירדו גשמים וצמחו, שנאמר, וא
יעלה מן הארץ:

Despite his disagreement over the month which should be designated as preeminent in producing such wonders, in

the same source as cited above Rabbi Joshua also related these occurrences to the periods in which the rains begin and end:

רבי יהושע אומר, בניסן נברא העולם, בניסן
נולדו אבות, בניסן מתו אבות, בפסח נולד
יצחק: בר"ה נפקדה שרה רחל וחסה, בר"ה
יצא יוסף מבית האסורין, בר"ה בטלה עבודה
מאבותינו במצרים; בניסן נגאלו, בניסן
עתידין ליגאל: ...מנין שבניסן נברא העולם,
שנאמר, ותוצא הארץ דשא עשב מזריע זרע ועץ
עושה פרי; איזהו חודש שהארץ מליאה דשאים
ואילן מוציא פירות? הוי אומר, זה ניסן,
ואותו הפרק זמן בהמה וחיה ועוף שמזדווגין
זה אצל זה, שנאמר, לבשו כרים הצאן... וגו':

Despite their differences, among the ingredients these models have in common are the association of Tishri and Nisan with fecundity (both agricultural and human), liberation from servitude (both penal and enslaved), and the creation of the world (perhaps both this one and a better one to come?). In any case, it seems clear that in the minds of the rabbis nature and history were in constant conspiracy with the Master of the Universe in order to effect awesome changes in the course of perennial and millennial history, in and around the months of Tishri and Nisan.

In addition to the גבורות בשמים, the other insertion pertaining to precipitation, חן טל ומטר לברכה, in the Ninth Benediction of the Amidah, was regarded as a direct petition for rain(49). That its efficacy for promoting rainfall was deemed extremely potent seems clear. It was not to be begun until after sufficient time had elapsed to enable Sukkot pilgrims to return home before the onset of the winter deluge(50).

Like the Biblical text before them, the Rabbis also related eligibility to receive the blessing of abundant rainfall to the merits of the supplicating party, as measured against the yardstick of obedience to Torah. This notion was expressed in a multiplicity of connections. The legend of Ḥoni Ha-m'agel, in Mishna Taanit 3:8, suggests that individuals of extraordinary merit were deemed capable of interceding with God for the abrogation of drought, even when they had to violate the Sabbath to do it. The equivocal reprimand which Ḥoni received from none other than Shimon ben Shetach implies that Ḥoni alone was sufficiently eligible to function on behalf of the community in this important respect.

The emphasis upon the payment of tithes as part of the quid pro quo arrangement for earning the winter rains continued to be stressed by the Rabbis:

בעון ביטול חרומות ומעשרות שמים נעצרין
מלהוריד טל ומטר, והיוקר הוה והשכר אבד
ובני אדם רצין אחר פרנסתם ואין מגיעין,
שנאמר, ציה גם חום יגזלו מימי שלג שאול
חטאו; מאי משמע? תנא דבי ר' ישמעאל
בשביל דברים שציויתי בימות החמה ולא
עשיחם, גזלו מכם מימי שלג בימות הגשמים
ואם נותנין מתברכין, שנאמר, הביאו את
כל המעשר אל בית האוצר ויהי טרף כביתי
ובחנוני נא בזאת אמר יהוה צבאות אם לא
אפתח לכם את ארובות השמים והריקותי לכם
ברכה עד בלי די: (51)

We may regard the giving of the proper tithes as presented in this and similar contexts as paradigmatic of all conduct performed in obedience to a rule of Torah.

It is perhaps because of the long-standing heritage of such associations linking rain and Torah-rectitude that some

kind of prayer for rain was included in the Temple liturgy of Yom Kippur(52). We do not know for certain to what the prayer addressed itself. But the suspension of this and other rites pertaining to precipitation which were contingent upon performance in the Temple may have been the basis for this point of view by Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel:

רבן שמעון בן גמליאל אומר משום רבי יהושע, מיום שחרב בית המקדש (53) ויש אין יום שאין בו קללה, ולא ירד הסל לברכה ונסל טעם הפירות:

The theme of sin-and-drought versus merit-and-rainfall plays out fully in the rites of Taanit (Fasting), as the ultimate measure for placating the displeased deity. The model for such an atonement practice which was placed before the afflicted Jewish community was that afforded by Ninevah in the days of Jonah the Prophet(54). The liturgy for such an occasion included the Sh'moneh Esrei and six additional benedictions(55). Two sets of such additional benedictions were proposed. One, delineated in an anonymous mishna, calls for recitation of the זכרונות ושושרות (56), while the other, propounded by Rabbi Judah, invited the reading of an alternative selection of Biblical verses which rehearse the occasions when God responded beneficently to His people in their time of dire need. The suggested hatimot for the additional readings, so as to give them the character of benedictions, simultaneously ascribe the trait of pre-eminent kindness to God while focusing attention upon the merit of Israel's ancestors throughout the generations(57). The righteous whose memories are invoked are Abraham, the

Exodus generation, Joshua, Samuel, Elijah, Jonah, and David and Solomon(58). Students of Midrash Aggadah are well-acquainted with the role played by זכות אבות in Rabbinic thinking. Via this concept it was asserted that successive generations of Jews were abetted in sustaining their unique relationship to God through a combination of their own virtues and those of their noble ancestors(59). It is not surprising to find the concept applied in relation to the earning of precipitation, as well. Thus, commenting upon the verse, ויחן לך האלהים מסל השמים , which was part of Isaac's blessing of Jacob in Genesis 27: 28, Rabbi Levi explained:

...אומה שכל טובה שהיא באה לעולם אינה באה
אלא בזכותה, הגשמים אינן יורדין אלא בזכותה,
הסללים אינם יורדין אלא בזכותה, שנאמר, ויחן
לך האלהים מסל השמים; "לך" - בזכותך ובך הדבר
תלוי:

(60).

In the light of all this emphasis upon ancestral merit, it may not be idle speculation to suggest that the choice of the Second Benediction of the Amidah as the place for inserting the memorial, גבורות גשמים , was prompted at least in part by the fact that it followed logically from the preceding benediction, the אבות . Insofar as the אבות employs reference to the three principal patriarchs and characterizes God in the role of one who is גומל זוכר חסדי אבות and חסדים טובים , among the benefits we could expect to derive from such a relationship would be God's acceptance of the consequent role of משיב הרוח ומוריד משיב הרוח .

And, finally, of course, if there were no other testimony to a connection between meritorious conduct and the giving of rain in the Rabbinic 'science' of meteorology, the formulation of the Sh'ma would be sufficient in itself. It is certain that the inclusion of the words of Deuteronomy 11:13,ff. as the second paragraph of this prayer, recited in public worship three-times daily, was already standard practice during the Second Temple(61). How could anyone fail to comprehend the mechanics of precipitation as a medium of divine-human interaction after having prayed these words even once:

והיה אם שמע תשמעו אל מצותי אשר אנכי מצוה אתכם
היום, לאהבה את יהוה אלהיכם ולעבדו בכל לבבכם
ובכל נפשכם: ונתתי מטר ארצכם בעתו יורה ומלקוש,
ואספת דגן ותירשן ויצרך: ונתתי עשב בשדך
לבהמתך, ואכלת ושבעת: השמרו לכם פן יפתה לבב-
כם, וסרתם ועבדתם אלהים אחרים והשתחוויתם להם:
וחרה אף יהוה בכם ועצר את השמים ולא יהיה מטר
והאדמה לא תתן את יבולה ואבדתם מהרה מעל הארץ
הטבה אשר יהוה נתן לכם:

The prominence of the concern with water in all its forms, both in the day to day experience of the Rabbis and in the written and oral literature of which they were the principal guardians, made it an especially apt metaphor for discussion of the Torah as being at the center of Jewish life. Rabbi Akiba(62) and Rabban Gamliel the Elder(63) each likened Israel's Talmidei Chachamim to fish of various kinds whose life habitat was the water of Torah. Rabbi Nathan interpreted a dream concerning a well in the light of two Biblical verses -

And Isaac's servants digged in the valley and found there a well of living water (Gen. 26:19)

For whoso findeth me findeth life and obtaineth favor of the Lord (Prov. 8:35)

- relating the "life/water" images to Torah in its role as a medium of divine-human interaction(64).

Such life-giving and life-sustaining properties were associated with water under other manifestations, too. On the occasion of Israel's receiving the Torah, we read that the following scenario took place:

ר' יהודה בר אלעאי אומר, לפי שהיו ישראל
משלהיבין בין אומות מחמות האש, אמר הקב"ה
לענני כבוד, הזילו טל חיים לבניי; לכך
נאמר, גשם נדבות הניף אלהים נחלתך וגו':
כיון שנתיבשה דעתם מיד קבלו התורה...

(65).

Rabbi Eleazar also employs the תורה מים חיים equals תורה construct in accounting for the apparent contradiction in the twenty-sixth chapter of Isaiah in which survival beyond death is both denied (verse 14) and affirmed (verse 19). The resolution of the conflict is achieved by attributing the fate of the former verse to the gentiles, who do not possess Torah, while the fate of the latter verse awaits Israel, who does possess Torah.

אמר ר' אלעזר, עמי הארצות אינן חיים, שנאמר, מתים
כל יחיו רפאים כל יקמו (ישעיה כו: יד); הניא נמי
הכי מתים כל יחיו, יכול לכל; ח"ל רפאים כל יקמו;
במרה עצמו מדברי תורה הכתוב מדבר... כי טל אורות
טליך וארץ רפאים תפיל (שם כו: יט); כל המשחמש באור
תורה אור תורה מחייהו וכל שאין משחמש באור תורה
אין אור תורה מחייהו:

(66).

In speaking of the Torah's revitalizing effect in this homily, Rabbi Eleazar is not referring to the mere refresh-

ment of man in the midst of daily life. Rather, he has appropriated the imagery of the natural reinvigorating property of water as a metaphor for Torah's functioning on a supernatural plane, i.e., to effect the revivification of the righteous dead. Of course, for Rabbi Eleazar to have proposed this particular reconciliation of texts he must have been presuming a certain familiarity on the part of his audience with the Rabbinic doctrine of the Resurrection of the Dead. Such an assumption on his part seemingly would have been warranted in the context of his time. The first and second centuries of the Common Era in Palestine were the occasion of lively debate and polemic on this subject. The Talmud(67), the Apocrypha(68), the Pseudepigrapha(69), the New Testament(70), and the writings of Josephus(71), all substantiate the view that there were numerous doctrines of after-life survival being promulgated at the time and that the proponents of the various views confronted one another in public debate on the subject. That the particular expression of after-life survival to which the Rabbis subscribed was the eventual physical resurrection of the dead is a certainty. Among the notables of the Tannaitic era in whose names arguments affirming resurrection are proffered are Rabban Gamliel(72), Joshua b. Ḥananiah(73), Rabbi Meir(74), Joshua b. Karkha(75), Simeon b. Yoḥai(76), and Rabbi Eleazar b. Yose(77). This would clearly demonstrate that even in chronological scope alone the issue remained of vital

concern throughout the period. The essence of concern in all these presentations, and numerous others which can be cited(78), was either or both of these points: that the divine plan for Israel entailed a physical resurrection to life after death, and that such a doctrine could be substantiated from Jewish scripture(79). That the Rabbis were not unopposed in their formulations right from within their own community is also clear from the Jewish sources themselves(80). We even know that at some point the counter-persuasiveness of an unidentified sectarian element was so strong that a change had to be made in the formula for the closing of certain blessings, lest the original form lend credence to the sectarians' cause(81). Nevertheless, by the time of the codification of the Mishna, the Rabbinic view which prevailed was:

כל ישראל יש להם חלק לעולם הבא...
ואלו שאין להם חלק לעולם הבא, האומר
אין תחייה המחים מן התורה

(82).

And, of course, the average Jew would encounter the affirmation מחייה מתים אמה in the Second Benediction of the Amidah, as he recounted the wondrous powers of God three-times per day. Clearly, Rabbi Eleazar had every reason to be confident that his listeners would know exactly what he was talking about when he said,

כל המשתמש באור תורה אור תורה מחייהו,
וכל שאין משתמש באור תורה אין אור תורה
מחייהו:

(83).

At this point, an examination of some additional statements dealing with resurrection in Rabbinic thought is in order. Rabban Gamliel, we are told, unsuccessfully attempted to persuade some sectarians that Resurrection of the Dead could be substantiated from Holy Writ. After citing a verse from the Pentateuch to no avail, he continued,

מִן הַנְּבִיאִים, דְּכָתִיב, יִחְיוּ מֵתֵיךְ נִבְלָתִי יְקוֹמֹן הַקִּיצוֹ
וְרִנְנוֹ שְׁכֵנִי עֵפֶר נִי טַל אֹרֹחַ סֶלַךְ וְאַרְץ רִפְאִים תִּפִּיל
(ישעיה כו:יט):

(84).

Though the sectarians were unwilling to accept this as proof of a future resurrection, they did relate it to the revivification of the dead depicted in Chapter Thirty-Seven of Ezekiel.

Rabbi Joshua b. Karkha employed this very explanation in his own vivid description of the resurrection process in Ezekiel:

...יָרֵד עֲלֵיהֶם תַּחֲיִית טַל מִן הַשָּׁמַיִם שֶׁהוּא נוֹבֵעַ וְמוֹצִיא
מֵיִם, כִּךְ הֵיוּ נוֹבְעִים וְעוֹלִים עֲלֵיהֶם בָּשָׂר וְעֲצָמוֹת וּגְיָדִים
...אָמַר לוֹ (הַקִּבִּי"ה), הִנֵּבֵא אֵל הָרוּחַ; בָּאוּתָּה שְׁעָה יֵצֵאוּ
אַרְבַּע רוּחוֹת הַשָּׁמַיִם וּפָתְחוּ אֶת אוֹצְרוֹת הַנִּשְׁמוֹת וְהַחֲזִיר
כָּל רוּחַ וְרוּחַ לְגוֹף בָּשָׂר אִישׁ...
...

(85).

Rabbi Joshua's presentation may be considered both as descriptive of events past and predictive of a process to come. Thus, in the aetiological developments leading to resurrection listed in Mishna Sotah 9:15, we read:

...וְרוּחַ הַקֹּדֶשׁ מְבִיאָה לְיָדֵי תַּחֲיִית הַמֵּתִים וְתַּחֲיִית
הַמֵּתִים בָּאָה עַל יָדֵי אֱלֹהֵינוּ, זְכוֹר לְטוֹב, אָמֵן:

In a discussion of resurrection between Rabbi Meir and Queen Cleopatra, we find that she has been taught to conceptualize the dead who will be revitalized as though they were like the sprouting grass of the earth(86). Rabbi Joshua b. Hanania accounts for God's ability to restore the dead to life, even after the body has long decayed, to the indestructible לול של שדרה, which nestles safely in the soil of a person's final resting place until, like a seed, it is called upon to generate the body in toto(87).

Though such limited sources do not permit us to draw any definitive conclusions, I believe a certain tendency of thought is discernable here. סל, as one of the two principal terms used generically to identify precipitation, and רוח, which was ambiguously understood as "wind", "spirit", and "breath", are recurrently associated with תחיית המתים. That סל is part of the model is largely attributable to the prominent, albeit obscure place it has in Isaiah 26:19, a text which was regarded as a proof of resurrection from Holy Writ(88). That רוח is part of the model is attributable largely to the part it plays in the paradigm of the resurrection process in Ezekiel 37, another Rabbinic proof-text. Adding to this the notion that man's potential for corporeal restoration derived from an imperishable seed, out of which, plant-like, a new body could be generated, completes a rather thorough-going agricultural metaphor for the depiction of the resurrection process.

Tenuous as this formulation may seem, it should not come

to us as a complete surprise when viewed against a background of these established Biblical and Rabbinic associations:

- water, both literally and metaphorically, was deemed to be a medium of divine-human interaction
- Torah was regarded as a medium of divine-human interaction
- water and Torah were subject to close association in Rabbinic thought, sometimes occurring interchangeably as metaphors for one another
- water in all its species was deemed to possess life-giving properties
- Torah was deemed to be a source of life to its imbibers
- the blessing of water was a reward bestowed upon the righteous
- the blessing of resurrection was a reward to be bestowed upon the righteous

Moreover, given all of the above, it may be instructive to examine certain liturgical compositions of the Tannaitic era to determine whether and how this constellation of associations was realized in the forms of prayer. In the light of our study's principal concern, we may inquire in advance whether the formulation of Rabbinic thought on resurrection reflected any tendency to correlate it with precipitation

or agriculture, either literally or metaphorically. In spite of the limited number of such sources, I believe such a tendency prevails.

The Second Benediction of the Amidah is referred to in Rabbinic literature as the תחיית המתים Benediction(89). As noted above (pp.16-17), it was into this Benediction that the memorial phrase, the גבורות גשמים , was to be inserted. The wording of this insertion,

משיב הרוח ומוריד הגשם , in consequence of its location immediately subsequent to רב להושיע , conceptually relates both precipitation and "wind" to the resurrection of the dead. We know that both of these compositions, תחיית המתים and גבורות גשמים , were fixed in their present form and place by the very same cadres of rabbis as had formalized the doctrine of resurrection as part of Jewish eschatology. It seems wholly improbable that such a juxtapositioning of phrases was anything other than an expression of an emerging theory of resurrection-mechanics, couched in some very familiar symbolism. Rabbi Eliezer must have had something of such symbolism in mind when, in debate with Rabbi Joshua over the propriety of including גבורות גשמים in the liturgy all year long in spite of the cessation of rain in the summer months, he said:

...כשם שחייית המתים מזכיר כל שנה כולה ואינה
אלא בזמנה, כך מזכירין גבורות גשמים כל שנה
כולה ואינם אלא בזמנן; לפיכך אם בא להזכיר
כל שנה כולה מזכיר:

We know from the standard wording of the Second Benediction of the Amidah that it consists of a doxology of prowesses and processes which are ascribed to God in His beneficence and majesty:

אתה גבור לעולם ה' מחיה מתים אתה רב להושיע;
 (משמיני עצרת עד מוסף של יום א' דפסא אומרים:
 משיב הרוח ומוריד הגשם:
 מכלכל חיים בחסד מחיה מתים ברחמים רבים סומך
 נופלים ורופא חולים ומחיר אסורים ומקים אמונתו
 לישיני עפר; מי כמור בעל גבורות ומי דומה לך
 מלך ממית ומחיה ומצמיח ישועה: ונאמן אתה
 להחיות מתים; ברוך אתה ה' מחיה המתים:

On the face of things, there would seem to be a gross thematic inconsistency in counting the marshaling of the wind and rain amidst such awesome saving acts as healing the sick, freeing the captives, causing salvation to spring forth, and resurrecting the dead! But on the level of symbolic language, accepting for the moment the hypothetical model outlined earlier, there is no inconsistency whatsoever; משיב הרוח ומוריד הגשם can be understood to reflect metaphorically the wondrous process of resurrection and to share semantically a kinship to the phrase מצמיח ישועה. Both are forms of terminology drawn from the agricultural/meteorological language set. Plant life sprouts under the benign influence of rain. Human life will sprout anew with the coming of those rains which signal "salvation". The language of a version of the Gevurot Benediction found by Schechter and believed by him to be the ancient Palestinian wording is even more graphic and, in some ways, clearer in syntax. Note the

more direct, straight line development of thought connecting resurrection with the "sprouting of salvation."

אתה גבור משפיל גאים חזק ומדין עריצים חי עולמים
מקים מחים משיב הרוח ומוריד הטל מכלכל תיים מחיה
המתים כהרף עין ישועה לנו תצמיח ברוך אתה ה' מחיה
המתים:

(90a)

That the announcement of the imminent fulfillment of these eschatological expectations would be counted as "good tidings" seems obvious. What may now seem equally obvious in the light of such symbolic associations is why the blessing over both בשורות טובות and גשמים should be the same:

ברוך הטוב והמטיב

(91)

There are other indications that the טוב ומטיב blessing was imbued with an "eschatological" tenor. Mishna Berachot 9:2 lists the formula ברוך ריין האמת as being the liturgical antinomy to טוב ומטיב. We know, of course, that the second blessing is associated with "bad news" and with death and dying. We may very well ask by what logic "rain" should be included on the opposite side of the equation, as a sort of bi-polar equivalent? Does it not suggest that "rain" was identified with the propagation of life?

The טוב ומטיב formula also appears as the fourth blessing of the Birkat Ha-Mazon. According to the Tradition, the occasion for the composition and in-fixing of this blessing was upon receiving word that the dead from the Battle of Betar might finally be buried, as against the

former Roman order that the carcasses be left exposed. (91a)
Once again, it appears that there was a conceptual linkage
between this blessing and the values of ancient Jewish
chthonic rites.

An additional usage of this formula occurs in a
poetic eulogy paralleling the benedictions of the Amidah
(91b). The verse connected with the Ninth Benediction
reads as follows:

תחברך טוב ומטיב לאבות ובניו
תשחבה מצמיח דשאים ופירות נכונים
מי אל כמוך משנה עמים מחליף זמנים
ברוך מברך השנים

It is true that this wording may have only a sprouting-
forth of life on the natural plane of existence in mind,
and that the coming season in which it will occur is only
springtime. On the other hand, in the light of everything
else which we have been reading, it is also possible to
appreciate this statement as a well-contrived metaphor
descriptive of what will happen to the dead in the Messianic
Age.

That the Tannaim did not concoct such associations out
of their own imaginations is also evident from the contexts
in which the shoresh בשר is found in Holy Scriptures.
Frequently, the announcement of "good tidings" meant pre-
cisely the imminent occurrence of the events identified with
salvation, eg.,

The spirit of the Lord God is upon me,
Because the Lord hath anointed me
To bring good tidings unto the humble;

underlying Rabbi Tarfon's choice of words. It is as though the drinking of water was thought to possess a magical or at least mimetic quality foreshadowing the reinvigoration process which would restore the "Dry Bones"(94) to new life.

And, finally, of course, we must consider the placement and wording of the petition for טל ומטר in the Ninth Benediction of the Amidah. Once again, it is the Mishna which prescribes that the explicit requesting of rain be done in this Benediction(95). Unfortunately, our investigation regarding the petition is hampered significantly by the fact that there are so many variant readings of this text. The form which is prescribed by contemporary liturgy is:

ברוך עלינו ה' אלהינו את השנה הזאת ואח כל מיני
חבואתה לטובה: ותן (בקץ) ברכה (בחורף, טל ומטר
לברכה) על פני האדמה ושבענו מטובה וברך שנחנו
כשנים הטובות: ברוך אתה ה' מברך השנים:

However, Marmorstein has recorded eight variations of wording from the manuscripts which were available to him more than fifty years ago(96). Of those eight, Marmorstein identified four as being of Palestinian origin and three of Babylonian composition. He stated that, "The chief difference between them is that the latter have no reference to a future redemption, the former have"(97). He felt that the "redemption" factor was consistent with the implicit agenda of all the petitionary benedictions IV - IX, namely, preparing the way for fulfillment of "the

eschatological benedictions X - XVI"(98). Indicative of a future redemption theme underlying the Ninth Benediction is the following version:

ברך עלינו ה' אלהינו את השנה הזאת לטובה טללי
ברכה בכל מיני תבואחה חקרב מהרה (שנה גאולתינו
שנה שלומים לריב ציון):

(99)

Reflecting upon this formula in the light of the eschatological associations pertaining to precipitation and agriculture demonstrated above, it is not unlikely that the employment of this terminology in the Ninth Benediction was motivated by a similar metaphorical purpose. I am not ruling out a wholly natural intention being behind the petitioning of precipitation in order to effect a rich harvest; but I also want to offer for consideration the possibility that it was a "harvest" of a supernatural kind that was really intended.

Clearly, this analysis cannot be confirmed at present because the Tannaitic authors did not generally give an objective explanation for their choice of words or ordering of texts. At the same time, the number of sample liturgical texts for this period is quite limited. Therefore, if the hypotheses suggested here are to be validated or rejected, it will be necessary to examine the literature of subsequent generations, as well. In doing this, we shall try to discover a) whether comparable symbolism is manifested in their compositions, and b) whether some direct explication of the concepts underlying such liturgi-

cal compositions was ever offered by knowledgeable parties within the originating cultures themselves. Let us, therefore, turn to the Amoraim.

The Amoraic Period

It is safe to assume that if the concepts and associations I have enumerated above were in fact well-known and, possibly, generally subscribed to by the Tannaim, then the same or similar convictions ought to reappear in the thinking of their successors, the Amoraim. According to such an assumption, we should expect to find preserved some sort of metaphorical connection between the sending of precipitation and the granting of divine blessing. Similarly, we could anticipate a continuation of the notion that receiving precipitation was a correlate of proper conduct, in terms of both the personal merit of the petitioning party and of זכות אבות. Insofar as precipitation has already been seen to be a metaphor for Torah, was such imagery preserved and to what new uses, if any, was it put? With resurrection of the dead having such a central part to play in Rabbinic theology and theodicy, would the Amoraim borrow not only the concept, but the attendant theories of process, as well? If so, would the species דביל and לול, as well as the importance ascribed to their respective months of inception (Tishri and Nisan), continue to shape the form and provide the content for Keneset Yisrael's eschatological theorizing? These questions are our guide-

posts in the examination which follows.

The Mekhilta d'Rabbi Ishmael clearly expresses the view that God's love of Israel is subject to overflowing, such that He showers His first-born with the tokens of His kindness:

(כן שעשה אב לבן) ... כך עשה הקב"ה... (הבן)
רעב האכילו לחם, שנאמר, הנני ממסיר לכם לחם
מן השמים, צמא השקהו מים, שנאמר, ויוציא
נוזלים מסלע, ואין נוזלים אלא מים חיים,
שנאמר, מעין גנים באר מים חיים ונוזלים וגו':

(100)

Indeed, Bereshit Rabbah VI counts the rains alongside of the heavenly luminaries and Torah as God's three paramount gifts to humanity. Certainly, as far as rain in all its forms was concerned, there could be no doubt that it was intended as a source of blessing:

תלמוד לומר, יורה: מה יורה לברכה אף מלקוש
לברכה וכן הוא אומר, ובני ציון גילו ושמחו
ביהוה אלהיכם כי נתן לכם את המורה לצדקה
ויורד לכם גשם מורה ומלקוש בראשון:

(101)

מה מי גשמים לברכה אף טללים לברכה וכן הוא
אומר, ויתן לך האלהים מטל השמים:

(102)

Over and again, the message of precipitation's blessedness was reiterated. We see in the following source, which draws together many of the pertinent Biblical verses familiar to us from earlier strata, the on-going association of precipitation with divine immanence:

דבר אחר, מה גשמים לברכה אף סללים לברכה
 וכן הוא אומר, ויתן לך האלהים מסל השמים,
 ואומר, יערוף כמסר לקחי, ואומר, אהיה כסל
 לישראל, ואומר, והיה שארית יעקב כסל מאת
 יהוה:

(103)

Whether spiritually or materially considered, rain was ever regarded as humanity's principal provider. Even a folk-etymology for the term מלקוש was diligent in reinforcing this attitude:

(מלקוש): דבר שממלא חבואה בקשיה:

(104)

It is no surprise that R. Hoshaya should have asserted that the power of the rain was to be reckoned the equal in its awe-inspiring wonders to the whole of creation ab origine(105). But this is not the first time that we have seen בריאת העולם and גבורות גשמים in close coordination. We recall Rabbi Eliezer's debate with Rabbi Joshua(106) over the dramatic occurrences of Tishri and Nisan. Now we can appreciate better the full scope of Rabbi Judah's associations in the following exegesis:

עשר ברכות ברך יצחק ליעקב, על מללי שמים ועל
 דגן הארץ כנגד עשרה מאמרים שבהם נברא העולם,
 שנאמר, ויתן לך האלהים מסל השמים ומשמני הארץ
 ורב דגן וחירוש:

(107)

In light of all this, it is even less surprising that Sifrei D'varim should interpret all of the agricultural and meteorological imagery in Hosea XIV as metaphorical words of consolation to a dejected Israel whom God would ultimately redeem, refresh, and recreate upon its ancestral soil:

וחזר (הושע) ואמר להם דברי נִחוּמִים, "יִלְכוּ
יוֹנְקוּתִי וִיהִי כֹזֶת הוֹדוֹ וְרִיחַ לוֹ כִּלְבָנוֹן",
ואומר, "יָשׁוּבוּ יוֹשְׁבֵי בְצִלּוֹ יִחִיו וְגֵן יִפְרָחוּ
כַּגֶּפֶן", ואומר, "אֲרַפֵּא מִשׁוּבָתָם אֶהְבֶּם גִּדְבָה,
אֵהִי כֶסֶל לְיִשְׂרָאֵל יִפְרַח כְּשׁוֹשְׁנָה:"

(108)

We soon discover that the construct of "sin-and-drought" versus "merit-and-rainfall" continued to be emphasized. One of the primary sources of merit in each generation, of course, was זְכוּת אֲבוֹת . The process of development naturally began with Abraham:

ר' יַעֲקֹב דִּכְפַּר חֲנֹן כֶּשֶׁם רִשְׁבִּ"ל, בְּשַׁעָה שַׁעָה
אֲבֵרָהֶם וְקִינָם אֶת רִצּוֹנִי נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי לוֹ שְׂאִינִי
מִזִּזְלָם סֶל מִבְּנֵי לְעוֹלָם:

(109)

As succeeding generations of patriarchs blessed their chosen offspring, the benefits prescribed for them became the inheritance of all Israel:

"מִסֵּל הַשָּׁמַיִם...וְתִירוֹשׁ" - כָּל הַבְּרִכוֹת שֶׁבִירָךְ
יִצְחָק אֶת יַעֲקֹב כִּנְגִדּוֹ בִּרְכוּ הַקֶּבֶ"ה מִלְמַעְלָה יִצְחָק
אָמַר וַיִּתֵּן לָךְ הָאֱלֹהִים מִסֵּל הַשָּׁמַיִם וְגו' וְהַקֶּבֶ"ה
בִּרְכוּ בָסֵל (וּמִטָּר), שְׁנֵאמַר, וְהִיא שְׂאֵרִית יַעֲקֹב
בְּקֶרֶב עַמִּים רַבִּים כֶּסֶל וְגו', יִצְחָק אָמַר לוֹ וּמִשְׁמֵנִי
הָאָרֶץ וְהַקֶּבֶ"ה בִּרְכוּ בְּחִבּוּאָהּ, שְׁנֵאמַר, וְנָתַן מִטָּר
זֶרַע אֲשֶׁר תִּזְרַע אֶת הָאֲדָמָה וְגו', יִצְחָק אָמַר רַב
דָּגָן וְתִירוֹשׁ וְהַקֶּבֶ"ה אָמַר לוֹ וַיַּעַן יְהוָה וַיֹּאמֶר
לַעֲמֹ הַנָּנִי שׁוֹלַח לָכֶם אֶת הַדָּגָן וְהַתִּירוֹשׁ:

(110)

"עֵין יַעֲקֹב" - בְּבִרְכָה שֶׁבִרְכַּם יַעֲקֹב אֲבִיהֶם,
שְׁנֵאמַר, וְהִיא אֱלֹהִים עִמָּכֶם: "אֵל אֶרֶץ דָּגָן
וְתִירוֹשׁ" - בְּבִרְכָה שֶׁבִרְכַּם יִצְחָק אֲבִיהֶם, שְׁנֵאמַר,
וַיִּתֵּן לָךְ הָאֱלֹהִים מִסֵּל הַשָּׁמַיִם (וּמִשְׁמֵנִי הָאָרֶץ
וְרַב דָּגָן וְתִירוֹשׁ): "אֵף שְׁמִי יִעֲרֹפוּ סֵל" -
כַּעֲנִין שְׁנֵאמַר, הֲרַעִיפוּ שָׁמַיִם מִמַּעַל (וּשְׁחָקֶם
יִזְלוּ צֶדֶק תִּפְתַּח אֶרֶץ וַיִּפְרוּ יֵשַׁע וְצֹדֶק תִּצְמִיחַ
יְחִיד אֲנִי יְהוָה בְּרִאשִׁיתוֹ):

(111)

Nevertheless, it would be inaccurate to conclude that contemporary conduct in later generations had no impact on

the answering of petitions for rain. On the contrary, the Amoraim preserved the tradition that directly connected the bringing of the tithes with the earning of rainfall. As does Taanit 5b, we quote Malachi 3:10 in order to re-establish our perspective:

הביאו את כל המעשר אל בית האוצר ויהי טרף
בביתי ובחנוני נא בזאת אמר יהוה צבאות אם
לא אפתח לכם את ארובות השמים והריקותי לכם
ברכה עד בלי די:

That the teachers (ורשנים) of this era remained vividly aware of such a principle seems apparent from these lessons:

"מי עלה שמים" - מי הוא זה שחפילתו עולה לשמים
ומורידה גשמים, זה שהוא מחלק מעשרותיו בחפניו
שהוא מוריד סל ומטר לעולם: "מי אסף רוח בחפניו
מי צר מים בשמלה מי הקים כל אפסי ארץ" - מי
הוא זה שאין תפילתו עולה לשמים ולא מורידה
את הגשמים, זה שאינו מחלק מעשרותיו בחפניו
שהוא עוצר את השמים מהוריד סל ומטר לעולם:

(112)

Like other decrees having life-and-death ramifications for humanity (eg., ונתנה חוקך), the decree determining the apportionment of rain was proclaimed during the Days of Awe:

...היו רשעים בראש השנה ונגזרו עליהם גשמים
מועטים וחזרו בהם להוסיף עליהם אי אפשר אלא
"תמיד עיני יהוה אלהיך בה", מורידם בזמנם
ומשלח בהם את הברכה ומורידם על הארץ כשהיא
צריכה להם: ...הרי שהיו צריקים בראש השנה
ונגזרו עליהם גשמים מרובים וחזרו בהם לפחות
מהם אי אפשר אלא "המביט לארץ וחרעך", מורידם
שלא בזמנם ושולח בהם את המארה ומורידם על
הארץ שאינה צריכה להם לימים ולמדברות, שנאמר,
ציה גם חום יגזלו מימי שלג שאול חסאו; מעשים
שעשיתם עמדי בימות החמה שלא הפרשתם הרומה
ומעשרות מנעו מכם את הגשמים:

(113)

In some ways, it might be interpreted that at the beginning of the year creation's lease on existence was renewed(114) and, with existence, the essential services necessary to sustain it:

"מראשית השנה ועד אחרית השנה" - מגיד שמראשית השנה נגזרו עליה כמה גשמים כמה סללים כמה חמה תזרח עליה כמה רוחות נושבות עליה:

(115)

In addition to the piety associated with the proper payment of tithes, other forms of good conduct were singled-out for praise. Among those traits associated with the earning of rainfall were:

Charitableness

ומאי סעמא קדים סלוק ענני מהך זויחא דהוות קיימא דביתחו דמר לעננא דידיה משום דאיתחא שכיחה בביתא ויהבא ריפתא לענני ומקרבא הנייחא (ואנא יהיבנא) זוזא ולא מקרבא הנייחא:

(116)

Fidelity

א"ר אמי, אין הגשמים יורדים אלא בשביל בעלי אמונה...

(117)

and Honesty

אמר ר' הונא בר אבין בשם ר' אחא, כל נסים וגבורות שהקב"ה עושה בעולם הזה בזכות תמימי דרך, שכן כתיב, התדע על מפלשי עב; מהו מפלשי עב, אפילו גבורות גשמים במשקל, ואין מפלש אלא משקל, שנאמר, פלס ומזני משפט, ומה כתיב אחריו, מפלאות תמים דעים: אמר ר' יהודה בר סימון, שהוא חמים אצל הקב"ה...

(118)

On the opposite side of the ledger, it was noted that the impious could cause the withholding of rain:

א"ר שמואל בר נחמן, בשעה שישראל באין לידי עבירות ומעשים רעים הגשמים נעצרים...

(119)

Just as we have seen above that specific forms of conduct commend themselves to acquiring the merit for rain, certain kinds of sins were regarded as more potent than others for causing a community to be deprived of it. Most notable in this respect was fraud in matters of charity:

וא"ר יוחנן, אין הגשמים נעצרין אלא בשביל פוסקי
צדקה ברבים ואין נותנין, שנאמר, נשיאים ורוח
וגשם אין איש מחלל במתח שקר:

(120)

Other moralists were less specific, but just as vehement in their assertions that Israel's sins were the cause of her misfortunes. Thus, spokesmen in both Eretz Yisrael and Babylon could teach:

אמר רבי חננאל בריה דר' חייא איש כפר עכו,
אין הגשמים נעצרין אלא אם כן נתחייבו שונאי-
הם של ישראל כליה, שנאמר, ציה גם חום יגזלו
מימי שלג שאול חסאו; א"ל זעירי מדיהבת לרבינא
אתון מהכא מתנינן לה, ועצר את השמים... ואכר-
תם מהרה וגו':

(121)

And yet, the prospect of the forgiveness of sins as part of the greater divine plan always held out hope that the evil decree might be rescinded:

אמר ר' חננאל בר חנילאי, אין גשמים יורדים
אלא אם כן נמחלו עונותיהן של ישראל, שנאמר,
רצית יהוה ארצך שבת שבוה יעקב נשאת עון
עמך כסית כל חסאות סלה: אמר ליה זעירי
מדיהבת לרבינא אתון מהכא מתנינן לה, ואחא
חשמע השמים וסלחת לחסאת וגו':

(122)

R. Ze'iri's proof-text from I Kings 8 suggests that the presumed order of divine reproof and correction was: sin-drought-contrition-confession-forgiveness-rain(123). Rain's

coming as a release from hardship and difficulty for Israel, as caused by her own stubbornness, seems to be the intent of the teaching underlying this second folk-etymology for

דבר שכל קשיותיהן של ישראל : מלקוש (124).

I would now like to suggest that the cumulative effect of all these views easily would make the imagery surrounding the earning of rain a good prospect for allegorization. Given the centrality of the reward-and-punishment theme in the lore of rain and the relating of precipitation to the resurrection of the dead, we should not be surprised if such imagery were applied to the events of Judgment Day in the Messianic Era(125). It is, of course, possible that Rabbah bar Shila only was sharing in mankind's characteristic dejection over rainy weather when he said, קשה יומא דמיטרא,

כי יומא דדינא (126); but the associations borne by the central terms of this remark certainly give credence to the possibility that something more was on his mind.

As we are well aware, Torah, too, played a prominent part in the lore concerning the judgment of the sins of men. Torah was to be the standard against which all forms of conduct would be measured. If men abided by its injunctions, then it earned them a just reward in the life of the World-to-Come; if they did not, it earned them punitive retribution and deprived them of eternal life. On the level of symbolic association such conceptions would enhance and amplify any existing tendency to relate "Rain" and "Torah" as media of divine-human interaction, of divine reward and

punishment.

By the Amoraic period there had been further refinements in the making of similes for "Rain" and "Torah".

"משעירים עלי דשא" - מה שעירים הללו יורדים
על העשבים ומעלים אותם ומגדלים אותם, כך
דברי תורה מעלים אותך ומגדלים אותך...
"וכרביבים עלי עשב" - מה רביבים הללו יורדים
על העשבים ומעדנים אותם ומפנקים אותם כך
דברי תורה מעדנים אותך ומפנקים אותך...
חלמוד לומר "חזל כסל אמרחי" - מה של כל
העולם שמחים בו כך דברי תורה כל העולם
שמחים בהם:
(דברי תורה נמחלים לטפים של טל) -... ולא
כטפים הללו של מטר שהן גדולות אלא כטפים
הללו של טל שהן קטנות:

(127).

What is most important about the foregoing statements of comparison is the developing tendency to equate the functions of Rain and Torah. Both bring growth, refreshment, and joy to those who are inundated with them. So intimate have such associations with both products of divine beneficence become, the terms are nearly interchangeable, if not indistinguishable:

אמר רב יהודה, גדול יום הגשמים כיום שניתנה
תורה, שנאמר, יערוף כמטר לקחי, ואין לקח אלא
תורה, שנאמר, כי לקח טוב נתתי לכם תורתי אל
תעזבו:

(128).

Unfortunately, the cumulative effect of all these associations does not help us to clarify the syntactical ambiguity of the following exegesis. If anything, the double-entendre of חיים לעולם only muddies the water even more. Do rain and Torah bring "life to the world," or do they bring

"eternal life"? But, then, it is also possible that it was precisely the ambiguity of the message which made the darshan's lesson so fascinating, and tantalizing, for his audience:

"יערוף כמטר לקחי" - אין לקח אלא דברי תורה...
 "כמטר" - מה מטר חיים לעולם אף דברי תורה חיים
 לעולם... חלמוד לומר "חזל כסל אמרתי", מה סל
 כל העולם שמחים בו כך דברי תורה כל העולם
 שמחים בהם:

(129).

If Judgment Day were the only eschatological association we could infer for rain, relying upon a few cryptic remarks by an occasional Talmudic teacher, then our case would be very weak, indeed. We know that the lore concerning the ימות המשיח and עקבות המשיח was extensive and that speculation concerning the conditions of existence in עולם הבא was also prevalent(130). We know that among the acts of renewal God was expected to perform in the Time-to-Come were the revitalization of Eretz Yisrael, the reinvigoration of nature, the ingathering of the exiles, the resurrection of the dead, and the establishment of His perfected rule of joy and delight(131). Accordingly, if the key terms of our study (גשם and סל) were to have acquired thorough-going eschatological significance and, perhaps, to have become symbolic code-words for eschatological hope in general, then we would expect to find them employed frequently and explicitly in such connections. Is this the case?

As we know from the chapter on Biblical background, the

prophets regularly couched their visions of salvation in agricultural terms. Sometimes their hopes were for the literal renewal of Eretz Yisrael's fecundity and the rebuilding of its waste-places. Sometimes their hopeful utterances borrowed from the imagery of the barren and desolate land to speak of the people Israel as they would be revitalized, re-established, and flourishing once again. The Talmudic teachers, in turn, borrowed from this wealth of images in order to predict the improved conditions which awaited Israel in the Time-to-Come.

The rebuilding of Jerusalem was certainly a hope identified with the Messianic Age(132). The term, "dew", was interpreted to be a reference both to Zion and Jerusalem in the exegesis of Isaac's blessing upon Jacob:

"מי טל השמים" - זו ציון, שנאמר, כטל חרמון
שירד על הררי ציון:

ד"א, "מי טל השמים" - זה ירושלים, שנאמר, כטל
חרמון שירד על הררי ציון:

(133).

Conceptually, these statements not only link together dew and Zion and Jerusalem, but further infuse all these terms with the energy of זכות אבות, in as much as the linkages occur amidst analysis of a Patriarchal blessing. In discursive form, we have something on the order of: dew falls for the sake of Jacob our father; Zion and Jerusalem exist by merit of Jacob our father; redemption of the Land and the people of Israel is earned by the merit of the Patriarchs(134). It is by this sort of process that our target

terms will be seen to acquire their multi-valent symbolic significance.

That Eretz Yisrael was the pre-eminent geographical locus of divine concern is also well-known to us. It is not to be unexpected, then, when we find a Rabbinic view(135) that Eretz Yisrael was created before the rest of the world, that it receives its water directly from God while other lands receive theirs at the hand of intermediaries, and that it is entitled to drink its fill of water first and the rest of the world only afterwards. This set of views must be considered in a common context with the notions presented earlier(136) that the world was created in either the month of Nisan or of Tishri, the inception points of the dew and rain seasons(137). Furthermore, the same source also linked those months to אתחלחא דגאולה in the Time-to-Come(138). Add to these associations the view that the resurrection of the dead would take place first in the Land of Israel(139), and only afterward throughout the world, and the inauguration of the dew and rain seasons becomes loaded with great eschatological expectancy(140).

In speaking of the Time-to-Come, Rav Hiah bar Ashi speaking in the name of Rav predicted the magnification of Eretz Yisrael's food-producing potential:

עתידין כל אילני סרק שבארץ ישראל שיטענו פירות,
שנאמר, כי עץ נשא פריו תאנה וגפן נתנו חילם:

For those who are unfamiliar with the setting of this proof-text from Joel 2:22, we would point out that it is followed by these words, which should be most familiar to us by now:

ובני ציון גילו ושמחו ביהוה אלהיכם כי נתן לכם
את המורה לצדקה ויורד לכם גשם מורה ומלקוש
בראשון:

(142)

We have seen this text employed elsewhere as a description of the state of affairs to be hoped for in the Time-to-Come.

Of course, a land so burgeoning with food and water would be pointless without a population to partake of its bounty. But, then, the restoration of exiled Israel to its heritage was also to be part of the general redemption to come. Thus, we find this association, too:

"שובה יהוה את שביחנו" - א"ר יצחק, גדול יום
הגשמים כקיבוץ גליות, שנאמר, שובה יהוה את
שביחנו כאפיקים בנגב, ואין אפיקים אלא מטר,
שנאמר, וראו אפיקי ים וגו':

(143)

But, perhaps, the single most important eschatological hope of all was for the resurrection of the dead. We have noted above how extensive was the attention paid to this facet of Pharisaic thought by the Tannaim. Interest in the subject went undiminished throughout the balance of the Talmudic era. Likewise did the Amoraim continue to ponder the mechanism by which such a nonpareil redemptive act would be achieved (144). Quite frequently, the image of

מים חיים in one or another species was employed. Among the "logical" demonstrations of the practical likelihood of

resurrection, in which a rabbi instructs a doubter as to how to convince himself that such a process is possible, one is of particular interest to us:

...עלה להר וראה שהיום אין בו חלזון אחת
(אין שם חלזון אפילו אחד - הערוך) למחר
ירדו בשמים ונתמלא כולו חלזונות(!)

(145).

If God can generate new life for snails by means of ordinary rain, certainly He can renew the lives of those who once lived by means of the supernatural rains He also has at His disposal.

That the Amoraim believed in such supernatural correlates of natural rain and dew is certain:

ואמר ר' יהושע בן לוי, כל דיבור ודיבור שיצא
מפי הקב"ה יצתה נשמתו של ישראל, שנאמר, נפשי
יצאה בדברי, ומאחר שמדיבור ראשון יצתה נשמתו
דיבור שני היאך קיבלו? הוריד סל שעתיך להחיות
בו מתים והחייה אותם, שנאמר, גשם נדבות תניף
אלהים, נחלתך ונלאה אתה כוננתה:

(146).

"ערוכות" - שבו צדק ומשפט וצדקה, גנזי חיים
וגנזי שלום וגנזי ברכה ונשמתו של צדיקים
ורוחות ונשמות שעתיך להבראות, וסל שעתיך
הקב"ה להחיות בו מתים: ... וסל שעתיך הקב"ה
להחיות בו מתים, דכתיב, גשם נדבות תניף אל-
הים, נחלתך ונלאה אתה כוננתה:

(147).

It was by means of his access to סל חחייה that Elijah was able to restore to life the son of the righteous widow of Tzarphit(148). Indeed, it is the lore of the career of Elijah (precursor of the Messiah and of Redemption) that constitutes the matrix for much of the eschatological thought of Talmudic Judaism. Of the three "keys" which Rabbi Yochanan

declared were under the exclusive control of God (the Key of the Rains, the Key of New Life, and the Key of Resurrection)(149), Elijah was thought to have at least temporarily taken control of two of them in his lifetime. Specifically, these were the Key of the Rains and of Resurrection(150). This association should come as no surprise to us, knowing as we do that more often than not it was precipitation which was thought to be the principal medium for effecting the renewal of life expired. Moreover, it should have also become clear that of all the precipitation forms thought to possess such power dew was the favorite:

ומיין שאין המתים חיים אלא בסללים, שנאמר,
 יחיו מתוך נבלתי יקומון הקיצו ורננו שוכני
 עפר כי של אורות שלך וארץ רפאים תפיל; א"ר
 תנחום אדרעייה, וארעא תפקידה תפלם:

(151).

What is more, just as Elijah was eligible to utilize של תחיה in the past to effect resurrection, it could be assumed that he would do something of the sort in the future when he would return to resurrect all the righteous from the straits of death(152).

None of this, however, is intended to disregard the importance of rain for the resurrection of the dead, as well. Though there is plenty of evidence that יורה , מטר , של

גשם , et al , מלקוש were used synonymously and interchangeably, we will differentiate the sources according to their preference for making "rain" or "dew" of principal importance. Clearly, there was a school of thought which

gave prominence to rain.

For those who have not yet intuited the reason why **גבורות גשמים** is mentioned in the benediction for **חחיית המתים**, a number of Amoras offer us instruction. Rabbi Abba b. R. Hiah suggested that the relationship was linguistic, noting that the terms "hand" and "opening" are used in connection with both rain and resurrection:

"Hand" - **היחה עלי יד-יהוה ויוציאני ברוח יהוה**
ויניחני בחור הכקעה והיא מלאה עצמות: (יתקאל לז:א)
פותח את ירך ומשביע לכל חי רצון: (תהלים קמה:יט)
 "Opening" - **יפתח יהוה לך את אוצרו הטוב...** (דברים כה:יב)
הנה אני פותח קברותיך... (יתקאל לז:יב)

(153)

Rabbi Joseph, on the other hand, says quite simply that the reason for the insertion was that the Power of the Rains was the equivalent (**שקולה**) of Resurrection of the Dead! (154).

It is only after one has been exposed to the frequency and subtlety of thought applied to this subject that one can appreciate fully the nuances of the mnemonic device encapsulating the resurrection doctrine:

צד"ק ג"ם גש"ם ק"ם

(155)

"As for the righteous, the body too shall rise."
 (156)

The same thing may be said for another of those **חיים** double-entendres, which we are now obliged to consider more carefully:

כשם שחחייה המתים חיים לעולם כך ירידת גשמים
 חיים לעולם; רבי חייא בר אבא שמע לה הדא,
 יחיינו מיומיום ביום השלישי יקימנו ונחיה
 לפניו ונדעה נרדפה לדעת את יהוה כשחר נכון
 מוצאו:

(157)

The balance of the rabbi's proof-text from Hosea 6:3 reads:

ויבוא (יהוה) כגשם לנו כמלקוש יורה הארץ:

On reflection, it hardly seems possible that R. Ḥia bar Abba is concerned with natural rainfall at all in this teaching. On the contrary, it appears that he has subsumed completely any naturalistic function of rainfall under the wholly supernaturalistic function of mediating the resurrection of the dead. This assertion is supported by Pirkei d'Rabbi Eliezer 51, where, in a discussion of how even the generation living at the time of the Eschaton will first have to die before entering the new age, the same proof-text is employed to predict revivification of the dead on the third day after their demise. In summary, I believe it is fair to say that Amoraic thinking on the subject of resurrection was saturated with משל and סל.

There can be no doubt that as a result of such purposeful associations, proposed and transmitted over a period of more than two-hundred years and in locales as diverse as Palestine and Babylonia(158), that the terms משל and סל came to bear a heavy semantic load. As a result, in virtually every sort of context the overtones of eschatological resonance would be heard at the mere pronouncement of these words. In our own culture, an analogous effect is produced

by an image of a disembodied skull, objectively harmless in itself or in pictorial representation, but everywhere symbolizing some proximate mortal danger. Few moderns have ever seen personally the skeletal remains of any part of a human cadaver. None of us lives in fear of pirates and their "Jolly Roger" emblem. And, yet, the image has retained its dynamic power. This is so because it was appropriated in our culture to signal other dangers and, eventually, to symbolize "danger" itself. Like all symbols, something of what it communicates is not reducible to discursive speech, and it elicits both a cognitive and a visceral response from its communicants(159). So, I would propose, did it happen with גשם and סל. Through consistent relating to Israel's hopes for the Messianic Age - the renewal of סדר עולם, the reinvigoration of nature, the revitalization of Eretz Yisrael, the redemption of the exiled multitudes, and the resurrection of the dead - these terms became symbols of salvation itself.

אמר ר' אושעיה, גדול יום הגשמים שאפילו ישועה
 פרה ורבה בו, שנאמר, (הרעיפו שמים ממעל ושחק-
 ים יזלו צדק) חפתח ארץ ויפרו ישע (וצדקה
 תצמיח יחד אני יהוה בראתיו:)(ישעיה מה:ח)

(160).

Let us now look at how some of these associations came to influence the recitation schedule and wording of the liturgy.

First of all, the linguistic and conceptual arguments for inserting גבורות גשמים into the Second Paragraph of

the Amidah notwithstanding, an attempt was made to justify this practice halakhically, מדאורייתא :

ומנא לן דבתפלה דתניא, לאהבה את יהוה אלהיכם
ולעבדו בכל לבבכם; איזו היא עבודה שהיא בלב?
הוי אומר זו תפילה; וכתיב בחרי, נחתי מטר ארץ-
כס בעתו יורה ומלקוש:

(161)

It is to be understood that the Amora is using "t'fillah" here as a technical term for the Sh'moneh Esrei or Amidah.

The analytical gymnastics applied in this case, of course, may only be an exercise in ingenuity which seeks retroactively to account for a practice inherited from out of the dark ages before the Anshei Keneset Hagedolah. On the other hand, recognizing the special significance גבורות

גשמים בחיית המטים had elsewhere come to acquire, this may be a case of trying to insure its loyal recitation by adding to the obligation the venerable authority of Holy Writ.

That the obligation to make the necessary insertion was of paramount importance to the rabbis is readily apparent. In their determinations they sought to account for any conceivable eventuality, ever seeking to insure that by one means or another גשמים גבורות would be recalled in the Amidah of public prayer:

...אמר ר' תנחום אמר ר' אסי, סעה ולא הזכיר
גבורות גשמים בחיית המטים מחזירין אותו;
שאלה בברכת השנים אין מחזירין אותו מפני
שיכול לאומרה בשומע תפילה:
מיתבי, סעה ולא הזכיר גבורות גשמים בחיית
המטים מחזירין אותו; שאלה בברכת השנים
מחזירין אותו; לא קשיא, הא ביחיד הא בציבור
...הא דאדכר קודם שומע תפילה הא דאדכר בתר שמע תפילה

(162)

They were just as determined that the Request for Rain in the Ninth Benediction not be overlooked:

אם לא שאל (סל ומסר) בברכת השנים או שלא הזכיר
בבורח גשמים בחחיית המחים מחזירין אותו

(163)

As late as the fifth century in Babylonia a high consciousness of the urgent need to solicit the rains was still in evidence, as demonstrated in this exchange over whether the "Short Amidah" might be recited during the rainy season:

אמר ר' ביבי בר אביי, כל השנה כולה מתפלל
אדם "הביננו" חוץ מימות הגשמים מפני צריך
לומר שאלה בברכת השנים: מהקיף לה מר וזוהרא,
ונכללה מכלל "ודשננו בנאות ארצך ותן סל
ומסר":

(164)

It should also be noted that Rav Judah speaking in the name of Rav apparently felt that some allusion to rain ought to be included in the ישתבח-נשמה doxology, which recounts God's powers and expressions of redemptive kindness:

מאי מברך? אמר רב יהודה אמר רב, "מודים אנחנו
לך ה' אלהינו על כל טיפה וטיפה שהורדת לנו"

(165)

Lest it be thought that such lively attention was purely academic, we need only remind ourselves once again of the significance of prayers which make mention of the rain. For instance, following a discourse on why it is that Elijah does not rouse the three Avot simultaneously for their daily prayers, lest they compel the coming of the Messiah before his time, the text asserts that later generations of hassidim

possess similar potential:

א"ל ויש דוגמתו בעולם הזה? א"ל איכה ר' חייא
וכניו; גזר רבי תעניתא ואחתינהו לרבי חייא ו-
בניו; אמר "משיב הרוח" ונשבה זיקא, אמר "מוריד
הגשם" ואתא מטרא, כי מטא למימר "מחיה המתים"
רגש עולמא! אמרי ברקיעה, מאן גלי רזיא בעולמא?
אמרי אליהו; אתייה לאליהו מחיה שתיין פולסי
דנורא; אתא אידמי להו כדובא דנורא על בינהו
וסרדינהו:

(166)

What is of extra significance concerning the foregoing discussions is that they were not limited in interest to the sages of Eretz Yisrael. Yet, as we established in our introduction, the literal dependence of the Babylonian community upon natural rainfall for its agronomical welfare was secondary at best. Why all the fuss, we might ask, were it not for the contention that it was a concern for precipitation of a supernatural order that actually prodded their diligence.

A b'raita dealing with benedictions to be said at a gravesite recalls this somewhat familiar bit of liturgy:

ח"ר, הרואה קברי ישראל אומר ברוך אשר יצר
אתכם בדיו וזן אתכם בדיו ועתיד להקיםכם בדיו;
מר בריה דרבינא מסיים בה משמיה דרב נחמן,
ונודע מספר כולכם והוא עתיד להחיותכם
ולקיים אתכם, ברוך מחיה המתים:

(167)

But, for our purposes, what one is supposed to say on seeing a gentile grave is far more important:

קברי עובדי כוכבים אומר, בושה אמכם מאד חרפה
יולדכם, הנה אחריה גוים מדבר ציה וערבה (ירמיה נ:יב)

(168)

For resurrection, one needs rain! The alternative is to

waste-away in the arid wilderness of Sheol, the place of estrangement from God, the מקור חיים .

We have seen that the two principal terms for precipitation, גשם and טל , each had advocates for promoting its primacy in the lore of resurrection. Until now, with the notable exception of the insertion טל ומטר into the Ninth Benediction of the Amidah, we have encountered no Tannaitic liturgy which concerns itself with dew. The Mishna is silent on the subject. It is probably fruitless to speculate on the reason for such omission, except to say that dew was, perhaps, considered a sub-species of rain and, therefore, covered in the existing liturgy. Indirect support for this inference may be derived from the debate between Rabbis Eliezer and Joshua over the remembrance of

גשמים בבורות throughout the year, and not just during the rainy season(169). If Rabbi Eliezer felt it was proper to continue the גשמים בבורות during the summer months (the "dew season"), it may have been because he regarded dew as just another form of rain(170).

Nevertheless, it appears that among the Palestinian Amoraim some kind of הזכרה for dew was known. This fact comes out in Talmud Yerushalmi, Taanit 1:1, in the midst of a discussion over when the Memorial for Rain may be inserted into the Amidah. An apparent conflict of opinion is resolved by noting that there are different rules regulating private and public recitation of the Amidah. In public worship, the insertion may not be begun until initiated by the

Shaliach Tzibur on Sh'mini Atzeret. In private recitation, it is permissible to make mention of the rain during the dew season:

יחיד אם רצה להזכיר מזכיר בטל

(171)

Moreover, in continuing the discussion of memorial prayers and prerogatives, we find:

ר' זעירה בשם ר' חנינה, היה עומד בגשם
והזכיר של טל אין מחזירין אותו

(172)

Whatever the Memorial for Dew may have been, it was fitting to recite it even during the rainy season.

This information is reassuring in that it further confirms the existence of a Memorial for Dew. However, we do not yet know anything about the content of such a liturgical composition in either the Tannaitic or Amoraic periods. Some additional information on the subject may be inferred, however, from the Talmud Bavli, where the following guidelines are recorded:

א"ר חנינה, הילכך בימות החמה אמר "משיב הרוח"
אין מחזירין אותו; אמר "מוריד הגשם" מחזירין
אותו; בימות הגשמים לא אמר "משיב הרוח" אין
מחזירין אותו; לא אמר "מוריד הגשם" מחזירין
אותו; ולא עוד אלא אפילו אמר "מעביר הרוח
ומפריח הטל" אין מחזירין אותו;

(173)

This passage suggests several points of interest: 1) the mention of the rains in public prayer was severely circumscribed to their 'proper' season; 2) dew and wind could be mentioned in any season; 3) the wording and insertion of

the Memorial for Dew was a subject of less concern to the formulators of the liturgy than the Memorial for Rain, where precision and timeliness were the order of the day. This last point is especially evident in that there appears to have been no objection even to the use of a formula which was in direct contradiction to the observed processes of nature, when it came to the petitioning of dew!

We may wonder why the Memorial for Dew was seemingly treated so lightly by the rabbis. One reason appears to be because it had not been made obligatory by the Tannaim(174).

חנא, בטל וברוחות לא חייבו חכמים להזכיר,
ואם בא להזכיר מזכיר:

(175)

And yet, the Amoraim apparently did not find this verdict intrinsically self-justifying. "For what reason?" asked Rabbi Ḥanina, who then went on to explain that, unlike rain which only comes in its season, dew is never withheld; no, not even Elijah had the power to restrain the fall of dew(176).

In Rabbi Ḥanina's answer, we have discovered the answer to one of our question, too: a Memorial for Dew could neither be barred from, nor had to be inserted into the liturgy of public worship because dewfall was uninterruptedly guaranteed by God. To prod God's attention to the performance of something which He had sworn to provide without cessation to the descendents of Abraham might have been construed by some to be an affront. Nevertheless, if an individual were motivated to take note of God's dew-and wind- generating power in the

doxology of divine powers in the Gevurot, then he was certainly free to do so. And such a memorial could be uttered in any season, since, unlike rain, the benefit of which it made mention was not seasonally bounded, i.e., Talmud Yerushalmi, Taanit 1:2 reassures us that

בסל... אם רצה להזכיר כל ימות השנה מזכיר
הסל ח'מן יפה לעולם:

It may now be worthwhile, once again, to recall these words of Rabbi Eliezer, from his debate with Rabbi Joshua over initiating the memorial for rain on the first day of Sukkot:

אמר לו ר' אליעזר, אף אני לא אמרתי לשאול
(את הגשמים) אלא להזכיר, וכשם שתחיית המתים
מזכיר כל שנה כולה ואינה אלא בזמנה כך מזכירין
גבורות גשמים כל שנה כולה ואינם אלא בזמנם:

(177)

We know, of course, that Rabbi Eliezer's view did not prevail. Memorializing and petitioning rain was strictly limited to the rainy season, beginning on Sh'mini Atzeret.

But for those unwilling to leave reference to precipitation (as a medium of divine-human interaction) out of their hopes for redemption and resurrection at any time, there remained an alternative: Dew. Like resurrection, it could be mentioned all year through. What an apt metaphor dew would then be to express Israel's hopes for the ever-present nearness of God and the coming of the redemptive, saving Day of the Lord!

א"ר ברכיה, אף כנסת ישראל שאלה שלא כהוגן
 והקב"ה השיבה כהוגן, שנאמר, ונדעה נרדפה
 לדעת את יהוה כשחר נכון מוצאו ויבוא כגשם
 לנו; אמר לה הקב"ה, בתי את שואלת דבר ש-
 פעמים מתבקש ופעמים אינו מתבקש, אבל אני
 אהיה לך דבר מתבקש לעולם, שנאמר, אהיה כסל
 לישראל יפרחו כשושנה ויך שרשיו כלבנון:

(178)

*

*

*

Summary of Data in Chapter Three

- 1) The termini of the precipitation cycle were heavily associated with cosmogeny and redemption
- 2) Like virtually every benefaction which Israel hoped to receive from God, precipitation was thought to be derived through the agency of זכות אבות
- 3) There was an explicit connection between Torah as the source of eternal life and precipitation as a source for the preservation of life
- 4) The association of dew with the resurrection process began in the Tannaitic period, was well-known to the Sages of Yavneh, and was preserved and augmented throughout the Amoraic era
- 5) The liturgy of the Tannaitic period reflects a thorough-going association of precipitation with resurrection, especially demonstrable in the Second Benediction of the Amidah
- 6) Precipitation held a central place in the

economics of reward and punishment; the withholding of precipitation foreshadowed the death of the impious both in this world and in the World-to-Come

7) In the Amoraic period, the terms for the principal precipitation forms were regularly associated with such eschatological hopes as renewal and revitalization of Eretz Yisrael, the ingathering of the exiles, the resurrection of the dead, and the coming of the Messianic Age; though by no means alien to the Babylonian Amoraim, the strongest thrust for the development of these associations came from the first three generations of Palestinian Amoraim

8) Dew, of all precipitation species, was the preferred heavenly emission to associate with resurrection, unless one were willing to limit the possibility of resurrection to the rainy season alone; not that rain would ever be dissociated fully from resurrection-mechanics in Jewish thought, but the tendency to give dew the prominent position has already been seen to have intensified under the Amoraim; in the post-Talmudic periods, we shall see that this tendency developed even more

Chapter IV THE POST-TALMUDIC PERIOD

Though I have made every effort to sustain a chronological course of inquiry in the presentation of my data, this paper is not inherently an historical study. It is not, therefore, my purpose to comment upon the accuracy of the various theories for dating the compositions or locating geographically the home bases of the payyetanim, Yannai and Kallir. Whether Yannai was of Palestinian origin or not is not precisely our problem. Though there may be reason to believe that Yannai came considerably earlier than the second half of the seventh century(179), it is sufficient for our purposes to accept Davidson's judgment that he functioned no later than then. Likewise with the career of Eleazar Kallir, who may have been a student of Yannai's and is thought to have lived not later than the mid-eighth century(180), it is not for us to decide the merits of such speculations. It is sufficient for us to be able to say that these payyetanim composed after the Talmudic period and before the compilation of liturgical material to be found in the late geonic siddurim of Amram and Saadia ben Joseph. In this respect, the works of these payyetanim may be regarded as a bridge between the two eras, over which the eschatological associations concerning rain and dew were borne.

Of course, poetic literature was not alone in providing such transmission. The contents of late collections of aggadic midrash (Tanhuma-Yelamdeinu, Pesikta Rabbati, Pirkei

d'Rabbi Eliezer, etc.) show an on-going familiarity with such associations. Again, it is not our obligation to confirm or deny the dating of any of these sources, but only to show that they knew of the pertinent eschatological lore and preserved and transmitted it. Where and when such lore was set into a new composition or merely represented the carrying forth of a received tradition matters less to us than that generations vastly far removed from the roots of such thinking continued to possess a high consciousness of it.

In this chapter we shall examine the liturgical products of the latter half of the first millenium with an eye to whether or not the symbolism now familiar to us continued to find expression.

Piyyutei Yannai

Though the liturgical works of Yannai did not enjoy the enduring popularity or wide-spread circulation given to the piyyutim of Kallir, they nevertheless have come to light in modern times, largely as a result of the finds derived from the Cairo Genizah. Once the historical identity of this payyetan had become established and his style been more or less characterized, previously known 'anonymous' compositions were able to be connected to him. As a result, an extensive liturgical collection is now thought to have been produced by him. The best-known assemblage of his works is the so-called Maḥzor Yannai (181), which has been described by Davidson as an halakhic midrash to the Pentateuch in poetic

form(182), following the Palestinian triennial Torah-reading cycle(183).

The most commonly preserved of Yannai's works are in either the kerovah or shivata forms. The kerovah is a piyyut interwoven with the verses of the first three benedictions of the Amidah of the Shaharit service(184). The shivata, on the other hand, is a piyyut interwoven with all seven of the benedictions of the Amidah for the Shabbat Musaph service(185).

In 1938, Menachem Zulay published an extensive collection of Yannai's piyyutim(186). Of the k'rovot therein contained, a small percentage suffer from lacunae in the texts of the Resurrection Benediction. Nevertheless, an outstanding statistic emerges from those which are intact: out of forty-nine extant compositions for insertion immediately prior to the hatimah, forty-five make reference to סל and four to גשם. A sampling of verses dealing with סל and three of the selections employing גשם are herewith included:

אזניך קשובות / לכל מחשבות / מטליל תחי ברוחות
נישבות: ברוך מחייה

(187)

אדם ובהמה תושיע / אל המושיע / תחי סל לנו
חשפיע: ברוך מחייה

(188)

הופיעה ממרומים / עלינו ברחמים / והטליל
תחיית רדומים: ברוך מחייה

(189)

חסד ורחמים / תל ממרומים / להחיות בטל רדומים: ב..... מ....

(190)

לבו בהתכונן / בבינת אל מכוון / סל תחי יחונן: ב.... מ....

(191)

דור לדור במעשיך / ישנח זכר ניסיך / החיינו
בסל רסיסיך: ברוך מחייה

(192)

תיגאלו חנם מעבדות / וחוק שבועות עידות /
בסללי תחיית חידות: ברוך מחייה

(193)

בארצינו ניתשב / ובה בטח נשב / ותחיית סל
לנו השב: ברוך מחייה

(194)

וגואלי חי / אמרתי בחיי / מחייה בסל רדומיי: ב.... מ....

(195)

" יקוממינו / ומעפר יקימינו / ויסליל להחיות
רדומינו: ברוך מחייה

(196)

" אלהינו / במעגלי צדק ינחנו / ובאור סל יחיינו: ב.... מ....

(197)

" אלהינו / אתה הוא חיינו / בסללי אורות החיינו: ב.... מ....

(198)

שלום תעשה לנו / חיים תוסיף לנו / וסל אורות
תזיל לנו: ברוך מחייה

(199)

אמיתך תנחמינו / ואורך ינחינו / בגשם משאול
יחיינו: ברוך מחייה

(200)

(גרסא אחרת) אמתך מעולם / חסדך מעולם ועד עולם /
החיינו בגשמך אלה עולם: ברוך מחייה

(201)

שואה ומשואה / תפיל צר לשוחה / ונחיה בגשם
ישועה: ברך מחיה

(202)

לעולם ניצב דברך / לעד דבורך / החיינו בגשמי אורך: ב... כ...

(203)

In these texts we find virtually every eschatological expectation associated with dew and dew itself overwhelmingly connected to the process of resurrection-mechanics. Hopes for salvation, ingathering of the exiles, redemption from bondage, divine immanence, and the coming of a personal redeemer are all reflected here.

Of course, temporally locating the occurrence of these compositions according to season is an impossible task, unless we assume automatically that reference to גשם was made only during the late-autumn through early-spring. Such reasoning would be consistent with the halakha governing the pronouncement of גבורות גשמים. And, in fact, all of the insertions which are explicitly designated for reading on a specific Sabbath or festival do reflect such a pattern. The kerovah connected to Parashat Shekalim (read in the month of Adar) supplies a גשם insertion(204), as does that for the Shaharit service of the First Day of Pesach(205). Similarly, the k'rovot for Shabbat Hol ha-Moed Pesach, the conclusion of Pesach, the three Sabbaths preceding Tisha B'av, the Yamim Nora'im, and the Shaharit of Sh'mini Atzeret, all associate טל with the Resurrection Benediction, as we would expect; all these occasions occur within the "dew season." And, yet,

we may remain curious as to why such a preponderance of "dew" references as compared with those for rain should have come down to us. Historical accident? Or did Yannai ignore rain altogether, except in connection with special occasions? Was reference to "dew" included in the Resurrection Benediction all year long in Yannai's environs? Or did Yannai subsume the species of rain within the species of dew as a precipitation reference, preferring dew because of its pre-eminent association with resurrection? Unfortunately, we are left with many questions, but no definitive answers.

An acrostic piyyut (חשר"ק form) and kerovah for the Second Day of Pesach show how much effort Yannai could expend on the subject:

חקומה במים	שלוש במים	רצונך במים	קולך במים
צורר כים	פלאך במים	עביר מים	סובל מים
נוטה מים	מודד מים	לא הננע מים	כונס מים
ימינך במים	של ומטר מים	חשר מים	זורק מים
ומזיל מים	הכל מים	דרכך מים	גוזר מים
ברכתך מים	אדיר במים		

מים תזיל והטל תרעיף, עתה בפללינו על מטר
לקחנו יערוף כמטר, ובשאלינו גבורות של אמר-
ותינו תזיל כשל, תפלתנו על של ומטר תברכנו
בשל ומטר, יתקדש שמך על מקדישך בשיר ושבת
בהלל והודו באמן ומודים בברוך וקדוש ככ' וקרא...

(206)

In addition to whatever merits the piece itself may possess, it is even more noteworthy to observe how many of the associations with "water" familiar to us from earlier eras are retained by the poet:

חקומה - raising up

שלוש - granting peace

- קולך - revelation
 פלאך - wonders performed
 לא חמוץ - not irrevocably withheld
 סל ומטר - synonymous with "water"
 הכל ממים - ontology
 גזר - divine judgment
 ברכתך - primary sign of blessing

"Anonymous" Compositions

In the appendix of works which cannot definitively be ascribed to Yannai, though they reflect his interests and style, Zulay includes two elaborate paeans to סל. The first is an א-ב acrostic of great intricacy, on the following pattern:

...א	/	...א	סל...א
...ב	/	...ב	סל...ב
...ג	/	...ג	סל...ג
...ד	/	...ד	סל...ד

et cetera.

The second is also an א-ב acrostic, but following this format:

סל	...א	...א	...א
סל	...ב	...ב	...ב
סל	...ג	...ג	...ג
סל	...ד	...ד	...ד

et cetera. (207)

There is also an incomplete composition in salute of נשם, built upon the חשר"ק, reverse-acrostic pattern (208).

If these works tell us nothing else, they at least confirm that new creative energies were being applied to the

topics of dew and rain for liturgical consumption during the latter-half of the first millenium. Moreover, though it is possible that they were only exercises in poetizingenuity, it seems that no insignificant effort was expended to create them. It is not unreasonable to assume, therefore, that such works were motivated by a personal devotion on each author's part to the subject with which he was dealing.

In addition to the excerpts from kerovot and piyyutim already cited, there is presented in the Genizah Studies III a group of eleven shivatot of uncertain authorship which adds important examples of the same phenomenon. These piyyutim are for use on ordinary Sabbaths and were employed in connection with the twentieth through the thirtieth sedarim of Bereishit in the triennial cycle(209). A selection of excerpts from those parts of the shivatot inserted into the Resurrection Benediction is reproduced here:

בן הלזה. עם אב שקולים זה בזה. זה שר שכירה
במחזה. וזה בהר מוריה חזה מחזה. בטל תחי
להאמין באילי זה: ברוך מחייה

(210)

בורא ארץ. ערוב משמני הארץ. היות ברכה בארץ.
ארץ חפץ בלי צוחה ופרץ. ורפאים בטל בסוף
תפיל ארץ: ברוך מחייה

(211)

בורח. ונוטה ללון כאורח. משרים לצדים הוסללה
אורח. ממרום הערה לנו רוח. מחייה בטל בידו
כל רוח: ברוך מחייה

(212)

במאמר רצונו. לשרתם באה עם צאנו. עשה חפצו
ומשאלות רצונו. כי רגע באפו וחיים ברצונו
מחייה מתים כרצונו. ובטל רצונו: ברוך מחייה

(213)

ברכה מחינה. ודברי בקשה ותחנון. עשות דבריו
 במחינה. לשמור במבקש תואנה. וברכת סל חחי
 לתם לבד נתנה: ברוך מחייה

(214)

In each of these examples we encounter references and associations familiar to us from preceding levels of investigation. In the first, it is suggested that the process of resurrection through the medium of dew was first revealed to Isaac on Mount Moriah(215). In the second, God's ontogenic power is affirmed, followed by an image of the earth giving birth to that which it harbors within, concluding with an allusion to Isaiah 26:19. In the third, it is suggested that after the outpouring of abundant precipitation God will effect the revivification of the souls which He holds in His hand by means of dew. In the fourth, we are instructed that just as God gives life as He wills, so He can renew life as He wills, utilizing the agency of dew if He so wills. And, in the fifth, we are reminded that it was to Jacob and his descendents alone that the blessing of resurrecting dew was promised.

As noted above, what is evident from all of these compositions is that the interest in disseminating such views was not confined to the aggadists and darshanim of the Talmudic period. At least in some circles, temporally far removed from the originators of "precipitation-resurrection" ideation, active propagation of the symbolism continued unabated in enthusiasm or originality.

Kallir

Though the compositions commonly designated as Tefilat Geshem and Tefilat Tal are probably the liturgical compositions of Kallir's best-known to the occasional reader of liturgy, it would be a mistake to suppose that the poet's expression of interest in the extraordinary properties of water was limited to these two poems. This becomes readily apparent upon examination of Hoshanot for Sukkot which he composed, as well as of his kerovot for various occasions in the liturgical calendar. No less a scholar than Elbogen saw fit to devote considerable attention to Kallir's "Geschem Komposition" as an explicit genre of the payyetan's work(216). Though it is beyond the scope of this paper to explore all the relevant compositions in depth, it will be useful to highlight a number of outstanding examples bearing directly upon our focus of inquiry.

It has been noted elsewhere that Kallir's compositions appear to have relied upon the conceptual associations laid down in the antecedent didactic midrash(217), and that occasionally he may be credited with having preserved traditions that otherwise might have been lost. Though it seems unlikely that the symbolic associations pertaining to rain and dew would have evaporated but for Kallir's vitalizing use of them, it is nevertheless true that at some point in his career he was motivated to set-down the following list of Biblical verses, as if for pedagogic purposes. The list contains the citations from Holy Scripture which he knew to

have particular reference to and significance for the eulogizing of precipitation:

פואסיק לגשם
 'פוח' "לך וגו' ונחת מסר ארצכם וגו' ונחת
 גשמים וגו' ונהר יוצא מעדן וגו' ואד יעלה מן ה(ארץ)
 וגו' השקיפה ממעון וגו' כי הארץ אשר "אלהיך
 נותן לך ארץ הר' ובקעות וגו' כי ה' אלהיך
 מביאך אל ארץ טובה וגו' וערף כמסר וגו' מעלה
 נשיאים מקצות וגו' גשם נדבות תניף וגו' עושה
 גדולות עד אין חקר וגו' ה' נות' מסרו' הן אל שביא
 ולא נדע מספר

(218)

Let us note that the vast majority of these verses have passed before our eyes already in this paper. We have seen them, often with multiple ramifications, employed in our midrashic citations, out of which the symbolic character of the precipitation terms emerged. Kallir seems, then, to have been more than passingly familiar with such literature and to have actually sought it out in his quest for poetic imagery.

The following Hoshanot for Hoshana Rabbah demonstrate this point. To begin with, let us examine the composition, אדון המושיע:

(12) לגיא בל חרשיע	אדון המושיע	(1)
(13) מגדים תמתיק וחשיע	בלחך אין להושיע	(2)
(14) נשיאים להסיע	גבור ומושיע	(3)
(15) שעירים להניע	דולחי ולי להושיע	(4)
(16) עננים מלהמניע	האל המושיע	(5)
(17) פוח יד ומשביע	ומציל ומושיע	(6)
(18) צמאיך חשביע	זועקיר חושיע	(7)
(19) קוראיך הושיע	חוכיך הושיע	(8)
(20) רב להושיע	סלאיך חשביע	(9)
(21) שוחריר הושיע	יבול להשפיע	(10)
(22) הושענא	כל שיח חדשא ותושיע	(11)
(23) תמימיך חושיע		
(24) הושענא		

(219)

The strength of the recurrent salvation plea in this poem seems much in excess of what one would expect from a petition for the resumption of rain as an intrinsic part of a known cycle of nature. The language, too, seems carefully chosen by the poet to partake of both the objective and symbolic nuances of the terms, allowing for interpretation and appreciation on two levels, simultaneously. In lines 2-3 there is a clear allusion to the wording of the Second Benediction of the Amidah, i.e., גבור , להושיע. In lines 10-11 there appears to be an allusion to cosmogony, on the model provided by Gen. 1:11, 2:5. With justification, we may inquire whether the use of גיא in line 12 is an allusion to the גיא צלמות of Psalm XXIII? Line 17 is based upon Psalm 145:16 which, as we have seen above, was conceptually linked to the "hand"- "opening" imagery of Ezek. 37, the vision of the resurrection of the dry bones. Line 20 reiterates the connection to the Gevurot Benediction with the words רב להושיע which, in situ, immediately follows the phrase, מחיה מתים אתה.

The second of our Hoshanot is equally suggestive, as the verses following will show:

מטרות עז לסממה	(13)	אדם ובהמה	(1)
נשיה לקימה	(14)	בשר ורוח ונשמה	(2)
שיחים לקוממה	(15)	גיד ועצם וקרמה	(3)
עדנים לעצמה	(16)	דמות וצלם ורקמה	(4)
פרחים להצימה	(17)	הוד להבל דמה	(5)
צמחים לגשמה	(18)	ונמשל כבהמות נדמה	(6)
קרים לזרמה	(19)	זיו וחרור וקומה	(7)
רביבים לשלמה	(20)	חדוש פני אדמה	(8)
שתיה לרוממה	(21)	סיעת עצי נשמה	(9)
הושענא	(22)	יקבים וקמה	(10)
תלויה על בלי מה	(23)	כרמים ושקמה	(11)
הושענא	(24)	לתבל המסימה	(12)

The vocabulary of lines 1-4 is reminiscent of that of the resurrection vision in Ezek. 37:5,6,8. Lines 5-7 should probably be read as either a genuine or rhetorical question. The thrust of the inquiry is whether man shares a common fate with the beast, going down to the grave to be seen no more. The response is not an explicit appeal for the resurrection of the dead, but a petition that the face of the earth should be revitalized. Nevertheless, in the light of our foregoing study, the appropriateness of this sort of formula should now be clear. In fact, the phrasing which Kallir employs does not radically depart from the imagery employed by Ezekiel in his resurrection vision:

...הבקעה...מלאה עצמות...והנה רבוח מאד על-פני הבקעה... (221)

If the poet did, indeed, have the Ezekiel model in mind, then it is not unlikely that the floral imagery which he employs is also metaphorical language representing the interred dead who, seed-like, are awaiting invigoration and up-lifting to a life in the visible world.

A brief look at selected verses of the composition,

אֲנִי אֶלֶּם , employed for the Seventh Circuit of Hoshana

Rabbah(222) will be equally revealing:

אֲנִי גֵּאוּל כִּנֵּת נִסְעָר: דּוֹמָה בְּטֶאֱסָאָר: וְהוֹשִׁיעָה נָא: (כֶּסֶף דּוֹד)
 אֲנִי זָכַר לִנּוּ אֵב יִדְעָר: חֶסֶד לִמּוֹ בְּהוֹדִיעָר: וְהוֹ (זָכוֹת אֲבוֹת)
 אֲנִי מֵלֵא מִשְׁאֲלוֹת עִם מְשׁוֹעָר: נֶעֱקֵד כְּמוֹ בֶּהָר מִרְ שׁוֹעָר: (תַּחֲיִית
 יִצְחָק)
 אֲנִי סִגְבִּי אֲשֶׁלִּי נִסְעָר: עֲרִיצִים בְּהִנִּיעָר: וְהוֹ (בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל נִמְ-
 שְׁלוֹ לְעִצִּים)
 אֲנִי שְׁעָרִיךָ תֵּעַל מִמְּשׁוֹאָר: תֵּל תִּלְפִּיּוֹת בְּהִשְׁיָאָר: וְהוֹ (בּוֹנֵה
 יְרוּשָׁלַּיִם)

Once again we seen paraded before us in close order drill all of the figures of eschatological expectation which have come to be associated with the outpouring of water.

The piyyut, למען תמים , for Hoshanah Rabbah(223) consists of a chronological review of the occasions when water played a part in God's career as Redeemer of His people. It ends with an explicit comparison of the people Israel to an exhausted land needing water:

...ועמך צמאים ליִשְׁעךְ כֶּאֱרֶץ עֵיפָה לִמִּים (224)

We need not insist that the figure of "the thirsty earth" always signifies Israel in Kallir's compositions. It is enough to know that at least in certain contexts it possesses this symbolic possibility and that some of its power as an image derives from its bi-valent meaning.

These examples, and numerous others which could be brought to bear, all continue to traverse the path which prior Rabbinic thought had steadily beaten. Thus, we see again that Sukkot, the major festival of the autumn season, is significant for its associations with the return of the life-giving rains and the inception of the hoped-for messianic redemption in Tishri. Even the choice of the Haftarah for the first day of the festival can be seen as reinforcing these very notions; in Zechariah 14:1-21 we find the promise of the coming Day of the Lord (vs.1), the inversion of nature (vss. 6-7), the outpouring of מים חיים (vs. 8), and the unification of the Lord's name and His kingdom (vs. 9),

with Jerusalem dwelling safely, at last (vs. 11). As if all of this were not enough, the visible sign of the Lord's hegemony over the whole earth in the time-to-come was seen to be expressed in the mandatory participation of the foreign nations in the Festival of Sukkot (vss. 16-19), upon pain of drought if they did not comply!

Another chronological review of God's saving acts, possessed of especially vigorous eschatological imagery, is the composition, **אמן ישער בא**, which is also for Hoshana Rabbah. In this piyyut there seems to be a high consciousness of the eschatological vision in Zechariah 14.

דברי הנביא

ועמדו רגליו... על הר הזיתים
ובא ה' אלהי כל קדושים עמך
...ומש חצי ההר
והיה לעת ערב יהיה אור

דברי הפייטן

לעמוד על הר הזיתים
בא ברבבות כחים... וכל קדושים עמו
ומש חצי ההר ממזרח
והיה לעת ערב יהיה אור

(225)

In addition to these parallels, the ideas of retribution against the nations and restoration of Jerusalem are present in both works. And, finally, the verse for the letter **ק** in this acrostic piyyut is most notable for once again linking rain to the resurrection of the dead:

קומו כפושי עפר: הקיצו ורננו שוכני עפר: מבשר ואומר:

Lest it be thought that the above examples are too tentative or are isolated or highly selective material, the following excerpt from a certain acrostic piyyut should help to dispel such an attitude. It clearly exhibits Kallir's conscious awareness of the "rain-resurrection-salvation" complex.

לשובב אבודי מצרים	(13)	אחר	(1)
בגשמי ישועות	(14)	אדון משמיר	(2)
אדון משמיר	(15)	למצן שמך	(3)
דרור מהר לשלח	(16)	תוריד גשמיך	(4)
לכל גלות לחלה	(17)	אזור נא גבורות	(5)
בגשמי אורות	(18)	ועורר שוכני	(6)
העלה מתחתיות בור	(19)	קברות	(7)
לכל גלות חבור	(20)	בגשמי אורות	(8)
בגשמי נדבות	(21)	בשורה נקשיב ונשור	(9)
ועורר ישועה מהרה	(22)	בשובבך אבודי אשור	(10)
לכל גלות הרה	(23)	בגשמי נדבות	(11)
בגשמי ישועות	(24)	גלה כאור צהרים	(12)

(227)

It is easy to see from the underscored words how aware was Kallir of the eschatological function to which the precipitation nomenclature could be put.

As for the major and most familiar of Kallir's precipitation compositions, Tefilat Geshem and Tefilat Tal, much analysis has already been undertaken by scholars of note(228). Though no one, to my knowledge, has undertaken a systematic examination of the eschatological symbolism which these works share with virtually the whole genre of precipitation liturgy(229), Elbogen's analysis is useful for summarizing the technical aspects of the poems' format.

Elbogen(230) divides both compositions into three parts: 1) an introduction, or reshut, 2) a rehearsal of the significance which the precipitation form has had in the work of creation and in the course of Israel's history, and 3) a projection of the importance of the precipitation form for the events in the days of the messianic redemption. Structurally, he divides the poems in this way(231):

-Section One is inserted into the end of the First Benediction of the Amidah, just before the latimah

- Sections Two and Three usually are inserted in succession into the Second Benediction, just after
 אתה גבור...רב להושיע

(It should be noted that there are prayer books which supply incomplete versions of the prayers, excising Sections One and/or Two, for reasons unknown(232.))

As far as we have been able to determine, the complete works consist of three insertions each, beginning as follows:

Section One

(גשם) אף ברי אתה שם שר מסר וגו'
 (סל) בדעחו אביעה חידות וגו'

Section Two

(גשם) יסריח לפלג מפלג גשם וגו'
 (סל) תהומות הדום לרסיסו כסופים וגו'

Section Three

(גשם) זכור אב נמשך אחריו כמים וגו'
 (סל) סל תן לרצות ארצך וגו'

(233)

The apparent inspiration verses for these piyyutim are Job 37:11 and Prov. 3:20, respectively. A final point on the matter of structure which should be pointed out is that, unlike the classic kerovah which is interwoven with the initial three benedictions of the Amidah, these works extend only to the first two.

As far as content pertinent to our study is concerned, neither Tefilat Geshem nor Tefilat Tal is extraordinary in relation to the works which we have examined already. But, this is as it should be. If anything, they contain nothing but a reiteration of the imagery with which we are now most familiar:

(פרוש) (זכות אבות) (גשמי תחייה) (זכות אבות ודורותינו) (בימות המשיח)	<u>תפלת גשם</u> אמונים גנון במ שואלי מטר להחיות מזכירים גבורות גשם בעבורו אל חמנע מים בצדקם חן חשרת מים לברכה...לחיים...לשבע
(מקור חיים/פריה ורביה) (קברות המתים) (בונה ירושלים) (קיבוץ גליות או תחיית המתים) (בימות המשיח)	<u>תפלת טל</u> אות ילדות טל להגן לתולדות וכל-נאות דשא לו נכספים... טל להחיות בו נקוקי סעיפים קומם עיר בה בחפצך: בטל עיר כסכה נותרת, שימה בידך עתה: בטל חנוניך חלץ ממסגרים לברכה...לחיים...לשבע

With regard to the wording of the latter composition, it should also be noted that it is toward the close of this work that the explicit formulation, משיב הרוח ומוריד הטל, as a variation of the Memorial for Rain, is first recorded! No liturgical, legal, or midrashic text, which can be ascertained to be chronologically earlier than this composition of Kallir's supplies a wording for the Memorial for Dew alluded to in the Talmudic sources(233a). If for no other reason than to discover this, that Kallir had a tradition which justified or permitted his use of this formula, our examination of his works has been most gratifying.

Conclusions

It appears that, without doubt, the medieval payyetanim, Yannai and Kallir, were both acutely conscious of the heritage of eschatological associations borne by the terms גשם and טל. Moreover, they not only appropriated them for use in their poetry, but promoted the continuing use of the terms in this way. There is no suggestion that they attempted to

de-mythologize the symbols or to restore them to solely natural significance. On the contrary, under their masterly management these words acquired a heightened symbolic aura, sharing with the rest of the payyetanims' obscure vocabulary a quality of suggestive mystery.

That a number of these works were then appropriated for use in the liturgical collections of Jewish communities in lands far from their geographical source of composition is also fascinating. If for no other reason than this, we are obliged to push on in order to discover whether such a shift in geography resulted in a shift in comprehension or appreciation. Did Babylonian Jewry, Iberian Jewry, and Rhenish Jewry know of and utilize such imagery themselves? If such employment can be found, is it merely poetic in nature, or did it affect the law and custom of liturgical expression, as well?

Chapter V. THE GEONIC PRAYER BOOKS

Until now, our liturgical material has been gleaned from sources which were not in themselves devised for liturgical use (with the possible exception of Maḥzor Yannai). Regardless of the fact that many of the formulae and compositions which we have examined ultimately found their way into siddurim, we have not yet seen any comprehensive collection of such material in the form of a single, orderly structure intended to guide the Jew in his daily prayers. It is this phenomenon with which the medieval compilations, Seder Rav Amram Gaon and Siddur Rav Saadia Gaon, confront us.

In approaching these works, (compiled for the most part in the ninth and tenth centuries respectively (234)), we shall want to determine whether the language of the various pertinent memorials, blessings, and insertions had become fixed or still possessed some fluidity. We may ask whether our expert and authoritative editors knew of a Memorial for Dew, as well as for rain, and, if so, what was the wording? Is there any evidence that the poetic imagination continued to be inspired by the imagery of rain and dew in connection with salvation, composing new paeans to precipitation? Moreover, as a result of examining these texts, is there anything further which we can learn about the thinking and motivation which underlay the retention and propagation of such prayers and formulae?

Birkat Gevurot

At this relatively late stage of development we might

expect to find complete consistency in the wording of the "standard" form of the second paragraph of the Sh'moneh Esrei. If variations were to occur, we might expect them to be limited to the occasional insertions. Unfortunately, it turns out that there is no "standard form" for either the basic paragraph or the insertions. Accounting for this state of affairs is not the function of this paper, but before proceeding we must take note of it and will proffer some possible alternative explanations:

- the variants may each represent an accurate transmission of a valid tradition for the "proper" wording of the benediction and have been in use concurrently
- some of the variants may constitute errors in scribal transmission or in received traditions
- the variants may reflect valid alternative traditions which were non-concurrent, but successive chronologically

We must leave to other students of liturgy the resolution of this difficulty, while yet acknowledging that it adds appreciably to our problems. By not knowing the authority of the various forms before us, we are limited in the conclusions we might wish to draw by inaccurately favoring one reading over another. All we can do here is to present all of the variants and let them "speak for themselves," as it were. Where possible, we shall offer some tentative

interpretations of the data. We shall try to discover whether their respective testimonies substantiate or detract from the record of the treatment of rain and dew which we have heard thus far.

Seder Rav Amram, Oxford Codex 1095, provides the following wording and instructions:

אתה גבור לעולם ה' מחיה מתים אחה רב להושיע:
ובימות הגשמים אומר כן, משיב הרוח ומוריד
הגשם: ובימות החמה אינו מזכיר אלא, מכלכל
חיים בחסד מחיה מתים ברחמים רבים...וגו'

(235)

This version is notable for the fact that it neither prescribes nor appears to know of any insertion as a Memorial for Dew, irrespective of season. If anything, it seems to proscribe explicitly the utterance of any form of memorial in the summer season. Of course, the editor may only have had in mind to obviate any misuse of the Memorial for Rain by carrying it beyond its terminus ad quem.

Seder Rav Amram, Sulzberger Codex, gives this alternative:

אתה גבור לעולם ה' מחיה מתים: בימות הגשמים
אומר, משיב הרוח ומוריד הגשם מכלכל חיים בחסד:
בימות החמה אינו צריך אלא אומר, מכלכל חיים
בחסד מחיה מתים ברחמים רבים...וגו'
ומי דומה לך מלך מסית ומחיה ומצמיח ישועה
בקרוב ונאמן אתה להחיות מתים: ברוך אתה ה'
מחיה המתים:

(236)

This version stands out especially for its omission of the phrase, אתה... רב להושיע, immediately following the initial mention of מחיה מתים. In contrast to the Oxford Codex,

the directions supplied here may not constitute a total proscription of the use of the memorial phrase during the summer season, since the text seems to say only that it is "not necessary" to employ it. And, finally, this version alone contains the remarkable interjection, **בקרוב** , as a modifier for **מצמיח יסועה** , thereby significantly heightening the eschatological expectancy and urgency of the entire paragraph.

Seder Rav Amram, British Museum Codex 613, supplies another version:

אחה גבור לעולם ה' מחיה מתים אחה רב להושיע
מוריד הסל: ובימות הגש(מים) אומר, משיב הרוח
ומוריד הגשם מכלכל חיים בחסד מחיה מתים ברחמים
רבים...וגו'

(237)

In certain respects, this rendering is the most provocative of all. It supplies as its standard wording the petition, **מוריד הסל**. No explanation for the inclusion of this formula is offered, from which it is possible to infer that it was not regarded as an intrusion into the standard paragraph, but an intrinsic part of it! The appropriateness of such an inference is substantiated by the fact that the Memorial for Rain is accompanied by instructions delimiting its use. Although it is possible that the instructions for using the dew-formula have been lost, it seems more likely that the editor's basic orientation was toward the "dew season" (**ימות החמה**), with the rainy season representing the exceptional situation in his mind. It is worth noting

that the tradition of reciting the Memorial for Dew during the summer months is known to us chiefly from the liturgy of the Sephardic rite(238).

It does not seem plausible to give preference to one or another of these versions without overlooking the apparent internal coherence of the alternative forms. Each reflects a completeness and sense of conscious direction, virtually eliminating the likelihood of scribal error as an explanation for the divergencies of content. The probability is that each version was "correct" for the community in which the respective scribes recorded and, possibly, made recensions of Seder Rav Amram(239).

Rav Saadia Gaon supplies the following information:

ובי"ח הפסקאות האלה יש ששה מקומות מיוחדים
לתקופות מיוחדות שבהן מוסיפים שם איזו חוספת.
הראשון מהם בפיסקא השניה. בחורף מוסיפים בה
משיב הרוח ומוריד הגשם לפני שאומרים מכלכל
חיים בחסד. וזמן החורף שבו מוסיפים את החוספת
הזאת הוא מחפלת מוסף שביום השמיני של סוכות
עד תפלת מוסף שביום הראשון של פסח.

(240)

In this instruction, the Gaon is only reconfirming the guidelines already familiar to us from the Talmud. What is significant for our purposes, however, is his omission here, among the standard modifications, of any acknowledgement of a Memorial for Dew. Nevertheless, that he deemed the Memorial for Rain as being of the utmost importance is clear from the following instructions:

ומי שהתפלל ושכח לומר, משיב הרוח ומוריד הגשם
 במקומו... ואחר כך נזכר כשהוא עורנו בתפלה
 צריך לחזור מתחילת ה' שפתי תפתח, מפני ששלוש
 הפיסקאות האלה חשובות כאחת... ומי שכח להתפלל
 בענין הגשם בזמנו ואח"כ נזכר קודם שאמר שומע
 תפלה כוללבו בשומע תפלה, ואם לא נזכר אלא אחרי
 שומע תפלה חוזר מן ברכך עלינו ואומר את התפלה
 במקומה וגומר עד סוף שמונה עשרה.

(241)

Here we see that the Memorial for Rain had extraordinary importance from Saadia's point of view. In its season, the Memorial was regarded as an intrinsic part of the opening benedictions. Omission of it required repetition of the Amidah from the invocation on. The petitionary formula of the Ninth Benediction, however, could be employed somewhat more flexibly, being enunciated either in its own setting or amidst other personal requests which an individual might append to the Sixteenth Benediction. According to his rationale for requiring complete repetition in the first instance, Saadia seems to have felt that the only place where the memorial phrase could be employed was in the Gevurot Benediction. That is also, of course, the only benediction which makes mention of God's role as resurrector of the dead. Thus, the first three benedictions constitute a unity. They are each expressions of praise for God according to His manifestations, capabilities, and potentialities. To delete even one such ascription, except as provided for by the rationalizations of halakha, would constitute the gravest breach of protocol. Hence, the relative emphasis and degree of negative reinforcement provided for an omission in the two cases.

Birkat Shanim

As for the Ninth Benediction, here too the principal extant texts provide us with considerable variety. In general, the wordings to be found in these manuscripts are lengthier than that of a contemporary siddur's.

The Oxford Codex supplies the following wording:

ברך עלינו ה' אלהינו את השנה הזאת לסובה ואת
כל מיני תבואתה: ומיום ששים של חקופת תשרי
עד חפלה מנחה וחפלה מנחה בכלל של ערב יום
טוב הראשון של פסח שואל כן, תן טל ומטר
לברכה על פני האדמה ושבע העולם מברכותיך
ורוח פני תבל מעשר מתנות יריך ושמרה והצליח
שנה זו מכל דבר רע ומיכל מיני משחית ומיכל
מיני פורענות ותהי אחריתה שובע ושלוש ותן
ברכה במעשה ידינו וברכה כשנים הסובות כי אל
טוב ומטיב וסלח אתה: ברוך אתה ה' מברך השנים:

(242)

This version is notable for three points of special interest:

- 1) unlike the versions which follow, which read הצליח (7) שנה, this one petitions 'הצליח שנה זו מכל דבר רע וגו' ; this seems to be an outright scribal error, probably deriving from confusion with the phrase, הצליחה, from Psalm 118 of the Hallel
- 2) this version includes the ascription, טוב ומטיב, which is the blessing on the occasion of seeing rain (and which, as noted above, has eschatological undertones)
- 3) in addition, this version takes note of God's role as סלח of His people, thereby incorporating the notion of "sin-and-drought"

familiar to us from above (likewise
being familiar to us from the liturgy for
the Ta'anit rites)

The Sulzberger Codex provides the following alternative:

ברך עלינו ה' אלהינו את השנה הזאת לטובה ואח
כל מיני תבואתה: ומיום ששים של חקופת חשרי עד
תפלת מנחה ותפלת המנחה בכלל של ערב יום טוב
הראשון של פסח שואל כך, ותן סל ומסר על פני
האדמה ושבע את העולם כלו מברכותיך ורוח פני
תבל מעושר מתנות ירך ושמרה והצילה לשנה זאת
מכל מיני משחית ומכל מיני פורענות ותהא אחרי-
חה שובע ושלום ותן ברכה במעשה ידינו וברכה
כשנים הטובות כי אל טוב ומטיב אתה: ברוך
אתה ה' מברך השנים:

(243)

Among its most outstanding characteristics are these:

- 1) it does not contain the phrase לברכה
in the formula תן סל ומסר () על פני האדמה
as do the other two
- 2) it does take note of God with the formula
טוב ומטיב, like the Oxford Codex
- 3) though it includes the above wording, like
the Oxford Codex, it does not refer to God
as סלח
- 4) this version petitions, הצילה לשנה זאת מכל
מיני משחית, which is a sound reading and
identical to that of the British Museum Codex
below

The British Museum Codex offers this third variation:

ברך עלינו ה' אלהינו את השנה הזאת לטובה ותן
סל ומסר לברכה על פני האדמה ורוח פני תבל
ושבע את העולם כלו מטובך ומלא ידינו מברכותך

ומעושר מתנות ידיך שמרה והצילה שנה זו מכל דבר
 רע ומכל מיני משחית ומכל מיני פורענות ועשה
 לה תקוה ואחרית שלום חוס ורחם עלינו ועל כל
 תבואתה ועל כל פרותיה וברכה כשנים הטובות
 בטללי ברכה וחיים ושובע ושלום: ברוך אתה
 ה' מברך השנים:

ומיום ששים של תקופת חשרי עד תפלת מנחה
 ותפלת מנחה בכלל של ערב יום טוב הראשון של
 פסח שואל כן, ותן טל ומטר וגו'. ומאחר תפלת
 מנחה ערבעה עשר בניסן שהוא ערב יום טוב אינו
 שואל טל ומטר בברכת השנים עד שיגיע יום ששים
 של תקופת חשרי וביום ששים גופו שואל:

(244)

This is the lengthiest and most fully developed, both in terms of the content of its request on the natural level of concern and of its eschatological allusions:

1) it contains the unique phrase, עשה לה תקוה

שלוש , a probable reference to the hope for peace for Eretz Yisrael and her inhabitants in the end of days

2) it insinuates the request for forgiveness and compassion into this setting, relying upon the established association of being free from guilt and meriting precipitation

3) it asks for a renewal of the land through the good influence of the "dews of blessing, and life, and satisfaction, and peace"; note that we have encountered all these associations before; more importantly yet, note that even though the insertion תן טל ומטר

is strictly limited in the accompanying instructions to recitation during the well-known rainy season, we are still left with

a benediction which makes perennial
mention of **טל** as the principal source
of blessing through precipitation!

Saadia's text does not add anything new to the forms
we have already seen above. He omits **לברכה** and employs
הצילה, like the Sulzberger Codex, but does not refer to
טוב ומטיב in the hatimah, as it does.

In sum, these texts demonstrate again that there was
still considerable fluidity in the wording of even the most
central prayers of the liturgical repertoire. But, more
important than the divergencies in evidence here is the fact
that each variant preserves or proffers some message of sal-
vatory expectancy in connection with precipitation. That
Rav Amram himself may have perceived the petitionary benedic-
tions of the Amidah as constituting a paradigm for the pro-
cess of salvation is indicated, at least in part, by the
'explanation' he preserved from the Talmud for the ordering
of the prayer:

ומה ראו לומר גאולה בשביעית? אמר ר' חייא בר
אבא, מחוך שישראל עתידין להגאל בשביעית,
לפיכך קבועה בשביעית: ...ומה ראו לומר רפואה
בשמינית? אמר ר' אחא ואיתימה ר' לוי, מתוך
שנתנה מילה בשמינית שצריכה רפואה, לפיכך
קבועה בשמינית; ומה ראו לומר ברכת השנים בחשי-
עית? אמר ר' אלכסנדר, כנגד מפקיעי ("profiteers")
שערים דכחיב, שבור זרוע רשע ורע תדרוש כל תמצא* (תהל. י:טו)
...ומה ראו לומר קבוץ גלויות אחר ברכת שנים? ש-
נאמר, ואחם הרי ישראל ענפיהם תתנו ופריכם תשא
לעמי ישראל כי קרבו לבוא (יחזק. לו:ח)

*(245)

(246)

In just these four explanations, we find four familiar assoc-

iations with the salvatory process:

- 1) redemption in Tishri
- 2) דם מילה (247)
- 3) superabundance in harvest
- 4) ingathering of the exiles, following upon the refoiation and reinvigoration of Eretz Yisrael; it is this connection of events which conceptually linked the Ninth Benediction to the Tenth, making the release of the rain and dew a precondition for the coming of the messianic redemption

From what we have seen of the forms preserved in Siddur Saadia, it would appear that it possessed the least familiarity with the precipitation-salvation-resurrection construct. The Second and Ninth Benedictions, as recorded, seem to know of neither an insertion for dew nor a significant association between rain/dew and imminent redemption. Of course, there is more than one explanation for this. Saadia may not have known of the vigorous efforts of liturgists and poets of other times and places to foster a high consciousness of such connections. Or, Saadia may have been aware of such tendencies and intentionally sought to suppress them. In any case, Saadia certainly had some sort of liturgical codification in mind in compiling his siddur, and his otherwise tendentious personality would not have hesitated to excise material to which he objected for one reason or another. A third possibility exists, as well. The Gaon may have been aware of the

existing tendencies of association for rain and dew, but have regarded them as tenuous, extrinsic, possibly ephemeral, but definitely of only regional interest. If that were the case, we would expect him to relegate such material to an optional 'appendix' of variant forms with which he was familiar, but which, in his estimation, lacked the universal appeal or acceptability of the 'standard' wording.

That Saadia was aware of variant forms pertinent to our study is evident from the following discussion:

...האומרים מלך מחיה כל בסל בקיץ ומלך מחיה
כל בגשם בחורף אע"פ שלשניהם אין עיקר אם
אמרום אינם מזיקים; וכן מוסיפים בשאלה הגשם
ותקרא לעמך שנת גאולה וישועה אם אמרו כך זה
מזיק, מפני שמעבירים את התפלה מענין הפרנסה
לענין הגאולה ויהיה זכר השנה דבר טפל:

(248)

This advice is exciting to read for several reasons. It demonstrates that experiments in the liturgy of dew and rain were still in practice, at least in certain regions, and that the Gaon did not proscribe such alternative forms unless they violated the established theme of a benediction, as he understood it. Here, too, we find that some community or congregation known to Saadia continued to employ a special insertion for memorializing dew in the summer months, equally important to them as the memorializing of rain in winter. More significant, however, the Gaon did not regard the Ninth Benediction as being pertinent to redemption, and he therefore opposed the above adaptation of its wording! But even

more important to us is the fact that, compatible with everything we have supposed about an association between precipitation and salvation, we are now assured that there was still a tenth century Jewish community somewhere who knew of and advocated such an association of ideas.

That Saadia himself was not averse to employing the precipitation-salvation-resurrection imagery in his own poetry is evident from these excerpts from his shivatot:

הפרוש

בצאתך לרדת על הר סיני לחת
מתנתך, עשרת הדברות, עשית
המילה בקולות וברקים ולפירי
אש ולא יכלה כנסת ישראל
לסבול אותם וענתה ואמרה
ישמיעני ה' רק קצותם, כלומר
קצות מן עשרת הדברות שהם
ספוגים ורטובים מסל תחיה.

הפיוט

בצאתך המלחה שיקי רשף למנה
ונלאהתה כלכלם נסיעת נעמנה
ישקני זו קצותם ענתה מאמנה
חשורה סל תחי עדות ה' נאמנה
ברוך... מחיה המתים:

(249)

(250)

In addition to the exegesis supplied above, there are a few other points which ought to be made explicit: precipitation as both a companion to, and metaphor for revelation is again in evidence; it is the figure of סל תחי which supplies the metaphor; and this particular message is interwoven with the Resurrection Benediction.

Let us also look at the associations present in this insertion, taken from an acrostic piyyut:

(בקשת גאולה)
(הזכרת סל תחיה)
(תחיית המתים)

דחו דחיתני מכית דבירך
הנני הדופה ביר צורריך
ועד מחי תחסה על ניני בחיריך
בסל ה' חייני כדברריך
ברוך אתה ה' מחיה המתים

(251)

And this one:

	למה בן האמה ודומה
	חשבו עלינו מזמ
	אם הרבינו אשמה
(זכות אבות ועקדה)	זכור נעקד על מזבח אדמה
	זולתך אדונים בעלוננו
	עבדים משלו בנו
(האלהים וישראל כאב לבן)	ואתה ה' אבינו
(ירידה של מקור תקוה)	מוריד סליך לך קוינו
	ברוך אתה ה' מחיה המתים:

(252)

Even these few examples should serve to dispell the notion that Saadia was either ignorant of, or ideologically averse to the employment of the established imagery and associations for precipitation in a salvatory context.

Conclusions

I believe that these texts demonstrate that there continued to be considerable flexibility in the wording of the memorials, blessings, and insertions associated with precipitation. Such diversity probably reflected the disparate interests, needs, and climatic conditions of the lands in which the communities who originated the forms were resident.

As the evidence of the Seder Rav Amram, British Museum Codex, and Saadia's record of alternative insertions for rain and dew indicate, certain anonymous communities continued to have a strong attachment to precipitation imagery in a salvatory context. Some such communities appear to have augmented the 'standard' imagery of the Second and Ninth Benedictions with special references to precipitation in

order to heighten the salvatory or eschatological vividness.

From the evidence of the piyyutim nominally attributed to Saadia's authorship, we can conclude that the imagery of precipitation-salvation-resurrection continued to enjoy some currency among those possessed of a poetic imagination. It may be significant that even though Saadia does not appear to have considered precipitation imagery intrinsic to a Jew's thinking on salvation, he did find it to be intrinsic, in its season, to the issue of resurrection. If we were to try to distinguish what difference the Gaon saw between the standard liturgy (where he avoids the precipitation-salvation connection) and his piyyutim (where he does employ such imagery), we would suggest that it lay in the fact that the latter literature was ancillary, and for optional use, whereas the wording of the Amidah was central and ought to be susceptible to universal appreciation.

As we have seen already, and shall see again, local meteorology had very little to do with most Jews' appreciation of the imagery involved in any of these insertions and compositions. It was precisely the metaphorical significance of the pertinent vocabulary and its code-like character which would continue to make it such a dynamic vehicle for discussion of the Jews' eschatological hopes and expectations, whatever their land of habitation.

Chapter VI. SEPHARDIC AND FRANCO-RHENISH PAYYETANIM

We know that following the end of the tenth century there was a steady shift in the center of Jewish life and leadership from east to west and from south to north. Concomitant with this shift was a complementary movement of the center of legal and literary creativity, as well. The four centuries which followed the permanent decline of Babylonian Jewry's hegemony in Jewish affairs saw the North African, Iberian, Provençal, and Franco-Rhenish communities accede to consecutive and occasionally overlapping periods of cultural prominence. In addition to their being tremendously creative and productive in their own right, these communities were the inheritors of the written and oral literature composed by their forebears in the various lands of the Dispersion. With great vitality the new European cultural centers both reflected and augmented the richness of their endowment, generating the super-abundance of legal codes, responsa, commentary literature, poetry, and ethical guidance with which we have come to associate this period. With some confidence, therefore, we would expect to find present in their literature evidence for the kinds of associations which we have formerly identified as belonging to precipitation in general and the species of rain and dew in particular.

Such a discovery would be of only minor importance if all we could show was that the metaphors and symbolism were

acknowledged and dutifully recorded along with other archaic lore. On the other hand, if we were to find that not only were the associations known, but that they were actively appropriated and employed, then our findings would be of great significance. Such findings would go far to confirm that our subject-terms (rain and dew) possessed a symbolic significance independent of indigenous climatic conditions and were governed by semantic strictures which still remained in force even though they had originated more than a millenium away in both time and space. What is more, the discovery that these terms continued to possess such vivid significance long after agricultural pursuits had ceased to occupy directly all but an infinitesimal portion of the Jewish community in which the literature was being composed (253) would leave us more certain than ever that the pertinent terminology had an other than nature-related ground of meaning.

There would be little point in raising the issue of whether new creative products employing our subject-terms came into being in this late age if there had been none. Even a cursory reading of the literature of the Hispano-Provençal and Franco-Rhenish liturgists and payyetanim makes the existence of such compositions abundantly clear. Indeed, it is so ubiquitous that it would be impractical for me to examine all of the relevant works here. We need merely look closely at a representative sampling of texts from each of the major spheres of influence, Spain and the Rhineland, and

leave to the reader's interest and diligence the perusal of such additional sources as are referred to in the notes.

Spanish Poetry

The so-called Golden and Silver Ages of Sephardic Jewry are notable for the richness of Jewish self-expression in virtually every area of cultural output which is reducible to writing -- Biblical commentary, secular and religious poetry, philosophy, science, medicine, and religious law. The radiance of the intellectual and devotional light which the teachers and artists of those ages generated continue to illuminate Jewish life unto our own time. Clearly, it would be impossible to reflect even a spark of that brilliance in this context, and we make no pretense at doing so.

Nevertheless, for the sake of continuity it is incumbent upon us to demonstrate, if possible, that some consciousness of the symbol system we have portrayed above was known to, and employed by that pre-eminent Jewish community. Instinctively, we turn to the works of her poets for such evidence, on the assumption that it is often the creative imagination which is deeply imbued with a sensitivity to, and intuitive appreciation of the symbolic possibilities resident even in his culture's most archaic and arcane lore.

Not surprisingly, there is some evidence of such awareness to be found in the poetic works of two of the Iberian community's most outstanding sons, Judah Ha-Levi and Abraham ibn Ezra.

In a composition for insertion into the **גאולה** ,
 Judah Ha-Levi brings together many of the associations we
 have come to describe as being of an eschatological con-
 stellation. Excerpts from this work, **אין זולחר לגאול** ,
 will satisfy our current purpose:

עמד דר שחק	ולמה במרחק (26)
ורודי רחק	ורודי רחק (27)
נשאל נשאל:	ולקיצ ימים (28)

יונח אדני	הלעולם (38)
למועדי חזיוני	והאין קצה (39)
ויפצו שטני	קומה אדני (40)
אל-היכל לפני	ושוב אל מעוני (41)
כבודך כמסיני	וגלה לעיני (42)
גמול על יגוני	והשב לשכני (43)
על ירא וחרד	ובטל-ישע רד (44)
בן-האמה מרד	ומכסאו הורד (45)
ביגון אל-שאל:	מהרה פן-ארד (46)

(254)

In line 26 God is identified as He who dwells in the storm clouds. Line 28 seeks God's coming in order to initiate the End of Days. Lines 38-40 petition God's vengeance upon Israel's oppressor (Benei Yishmael, line 45b), as predicted over and again in the various prophetic visions. Such a coming forth at the Eschaton is likened to the theophany and revelation at Sinai (line 42). The restoration of the Temple sanctuary is alluded to in line 41. The medium for the accomplishment of such demonstrations of divine immanence is to be **טל-ישע** , "the dew of salvation" (line 44). The effect of God's continued self-restraint in these matters, on the other hand, would be Israel's descent "in sorrow into Hell" (line 46).

Clearly, Ha-Levi's use of **טל-ישע** cannot be confused

with a merely agricultural petition in this context! The construct term has the character of a pure metaphor, being totally synonymous with the actualization of God's immanence for him upon whom the dew is to descend. At the same time, even though the figure occurs as we would expect in a salvational context, it seems to have lost some of its "mythopoeic" vitality. There is less "word-magic" present here and more straight forward "poet's talk." Ha-Levi appears actually to be petitioning the effluence of the divine spirit, and not dew itself, of either a natural or supernatural variety. If this is indeed the case, then some major shift of perspective would seem to have occurred between the time of the medieval payyetanim of the East and that of Ha-Levi. Whereas for the former poets, like Yannai and Kallir, one could sense a genuineness of belief in some sort of supernatural correlate of natural dew which played a critical part in the alchemy of divine-human interaction and resurrection, for Ha-Levi we infer no such mythopoeic thinking (254a). Accounting for this kind of shift must not detain us now. We shall leave speculation on such matters to a later chapter.

For now, let us examine the works of Abraham ibn Ezra to see if this phenomenon is recognizable there, as well.

In general, it may be said that the following תפלות (255) are illustrative of the author's poetic and astrological expertise (a not unlikely combination of interests which he shared with his predecessor, Solomon ibn Gabirol). Both the סדר הסל (256) and סדר

הגשם (257) compositions are elaborate paeans to the precipitation forms and the ways in which their influence, in subtle harmony with the signs of the Zodiac, come to bear upon the Jewish experience of history throughout the months of the year. The poems employ all of the major Biblical texts which refer to dew and rain as they have been connected to works of salvation or other graciousness by God. The poems link the manifestation of both species of precipitation to the entire annual calendar. This suggests to me that ibn Ezra had in mind the climatic pattern of his native Spain in composing these works, rather than the sharply defined seasonal variations in precipitation of Eretz Yisrael. Of course, an alternative or supplementary explanation is that the poems do not refer to any actual precipitation at all, but only employ our subject-terms in symbolic fashion. Characteristically, once again, the force of such terminology is to portray the dynamics of divine-human interaction.

The opening stanza of the סדר הסל is:

- (1) אלוה טובו לא נחכר
- (2) כבוד טובים בסודו תחד
- (3) במזל סלה אין פחד
- (4) זאב וסלה ירעו כאחד
- (5) אל בניסן יעלה ישא לבני
- (6) נס יהיה בנוס יגוני -
- (7) שארית בקרב מוני
- (8) כסל מאת ה' וגומר

(258)

The imagery to be found here is both informative and supportive of the existing, traditional usages. The astrological

sign of the lamb (line 3) is emblematic of the month of Nisan (and not coincidentally of the Pasch, as well). Lines 4-6 allude to the harmonious and salubrious conditions which will materialize in the Messianic Age, the inception of which will occur in Nisan. All these features are proclaimed as being for the benefit of "the remnant of Israel," which is likened to "the dew from the Lord" (Mic. 5:6) in lines 9-10.

In a brief alphabetic, acrostic composition for insertion in the **בגן** Benediction, let us examine this excerpt:

אמון מנעוריו אל אל שם לבו
אמרוחיו כסל יזל על עשבו
בסללי רצונו תחברך בקרבו
מגן הוא לכל החוסים בו

(259)

Here we have revelation represented as precipitation and the people of Israel depicted as a floral species. Divine beneficence is characterized as **סללי רצונו**. And, divine protection is presented as a corollary of divine nearness, as effected through the medium of precipitation(dew).

It should not be thought that all the emphasis was on dew, however. In a brief composition for the **מחיה** Benediction, which was for use in connection with petitioning rain, we find:

אל חי יפתח ידו לאצילים
להכין בעתם מאכלים
בצוותו עננים מים נוזלים
להחיות רוח שפלים

(260)

On the face of it, it is difficult to determine the author's

intention here. Are the "lowly" (שפלים) those spirits who require reinvigoration and are resident in the depths of Sheol, or are they the flesh-and-blood faithful of this world who are merely feeling melancholic? If the latter is the case, then why should a rainy day cheer them up? If the former is the case, then we know why this prayer is consciously reminiscent of the Gevurot Benediction, which petitions the resurrection of the dead.

The composition whose refrain is אל חי יפתח השמים / ישב (261) is a rehearsal of divine acts of compassion which have correlated with some form of water-out-pouring in the course of Jewish history. Not only is there a reference to a kindly act of God, but mention is also made of some act of tzedakah on the part of the needy who were subsequently saved. Thus, we find a renewal of the connection between the merit of the petitioner and the sending of divine relief, as mediated by an effluence of water (262). As noted above, this poem also employs the imagery of the Zodiac. With all of the foregoing in mind, we can then interpret the following stanza in accord with Ben-Menachem's commentary:

פרוש

בחורש זה, ניסן, יראה לנו
נפלאות, שיקבץ בזרועו סלאים
ויגאלם מעבדות לחרות

פיוט

אל מעלה נשיאים
להחיות לב נדכאים
בסלה יראה לנו פלאים
ובזרעו יקבץ סלאים

(263)

Undoubtedly, the possibility of drawing firm conclusions from this sparse sample of texts is limited. At times, the imagery seems to be present in its eschatological form, while

at others such a characterization does not seem wholly accurate. Let it suffice to say for now that at least there appears to be a tendency to continue the symbolic use of our subject-terms in all the contexts in which we would expect to find them. We will leave to a later analysis a final examination of the place of these works in the overall scheme of development.

Franco-Rhenish Contributions

The geneology of leadership among the Jews of north eastern France and the Rhineland shows that the transmission of attitudes and viewpoints must as often have been accomplished by word of mouth as by written record. The relationship among such renowned personages as Meshullam ben Kalonymus(264), Moses ben Kalonymus(265), Rabbenu Gershom Meor ha-Golah(266), and Simeon ben Isaac ben Abun(267) and even Rashi(268), were undoubtedly interpersonal where chronology permitted and at least intellectually penetrating where it did not. Likewise, the poskim and payyetanim of the Ḥassidei Ashkenaz of the thirteenth century were intimately bound together in a fraternity of common experience and outlook on life. This group included such notables as Daniel ben Jacob, Samuel ben Kalonymus, Judah he-Ḥasid, Berakhiah ha-Nakdan, Bezalel, and, of course, Meir ben Baruch of Rothenburg. So closely associated were these creative spirits in word and perspective that modern scholarship has not been entirely successful in sorting out the authorship of certain

poetic compositions remaining to us from their era. This is the case even with such prominent liturgical works as the Shirei ha-Yichud and the Shir ha-Kavod, as well. It is all the more difficult, then, to be confident of the identity of the author of some of the lesser-known piyyutim which also originated in that distant and often tumultuous period. Nevertheless, it is not our task to advance the cause of such identification, but merely to demonstrate that our subject-terms and the system of associations which embraced them were known to the culture which the authors inhabited. What will be important to us to discover is whether the symbolic content of precipitation liturgy was uniformly applied by them in the same sorts of connections as those established by their predecessors in such diverse settings as Palestine, Egypt, Babylonia, and Spain. Such a discovery will more than justify our efforts and minimize our disappointment over the uncertainty of a few details of authorship.

Moses bar Kalonymus

We could hardly ask for a more explicit certification of the conscious appropriation of the precipitation symbolism than this excerpt from a kerovah for the last day of Pesach:

אורח סללי תחי מנו אחחונן
 אסומים להחיות עם בצלו מחלונן
 ברוך אחה ה' מחייה המחים:

(269)

These few brief lines express such familiar associations as:

-"the dew of light" (based on Isa. 26:19; as we

recall and shall see again, "light" is
itself a metaphor for Torah)

- "the dew of revivification"

- the dead dwell in "the shadow of the Most
High"

- God will resurrect the dead

- this insertion is intended as an explication
of the Gevurot Benediction

Simeon ben Isaac ben Abun

The following excerpt from a kerovah for the seventh
day of Pesach is also for incorporation in the Gevurot
Benediction:

בעבור אוהבך שומרי בריחך
חשמרנו ותחיינו בסל תחייחך
ברוך אתה ה' מחייה המתים:

(270)

It links together salvation with covenant-fidelity and pet-
itions divine preservation and revitalization through the
agency of dew.

The following insertion for the Kedushah invokes the
imagery of God and Israel's parent-child relationship. It
reiterates, in the form of a plea for water, Israel's need
for a divine salvatory act. It also notes that it is
ruach which enables the water-miracle to occur, prompting
in turn the renewed hope for salvation:

רחם וחמול בן יקיר
רוה נפש שוקקה להקיר
ראה כי גברה יד המדקיר

רוח עריצים כורם קיר
יום יום נצפה גאלתנו

(271)

Rashi

Even the best-known of the medieval teachers abets our validation of an aspect of the symbol-system, with his note on the familiar verse from Isaiah 26:19:

"כי טל אורות טל'ך" - כי נאה לך לעשות כן
שיהא טל תורתך ומצותיך להם טל של אור:

It appears that Rashi is comfortable with these associations:

- the linking of Torah to the image of dew
- the identification of such dew as "the dew of light", presumably a source of illumination to those who dwell in the dust (and, perhaps, in the shadow of the Most High)

As we encounter the poets of the thirteenth century, we shall want to keep in mind two points of special interest concerning the history of the period: it was the age of the Second Maimonidean Controversy (272), which had as its principal focus of contention the question of the literalness of the traditional dogma of the resurrection of the dead; it was also an age of steady tyrannization and repression against the Rhineland Jewish communities who, even as they were only freshly healing from the wounds of the Crusades, were being

reduced to servi camerae by the greed and ambition of the Holy Roman Emperor. We note these facts only to demonstrate that there was a high consciousness of interest in the resurrection/after-life process for European Jewry in that era, and that the objective conditions of hardship existed which characteristically have given rise to millenarian movements among Jews. With these two thoughts in mind, let us turn to the writings of the Hassidei Ashkenaz.

Daniel ben Jacob

These excerpts from an acrostic piyyut for Sh'mini Atzeret are part of an insertion into the Geulah for the Ma'ariv Service:

שמיני אשפר לב ונפש כמים
לפני רוכב בגאותו שמים: ביום השמיני:
שמיני גזרת דה גשמים
אם רב ואם מעט נרשמים: ביום השמיני:
שמיני מזמן לעתיד לבוא
לשמח בו עם קרובו: ביום השמיני:

(273)

These verses are fraught with the kind of eschatological tension we have come to expect of the genre of poetry which deals with אחלתא דגאולה as coincidental with חקופת גשם. Thus, the image of the faithful whose blood is spilled like water is counter-balanced by the image of God as Master of the Heavens who can heal their mortal wounds with life-restoring precipitation. Again we read that the measure of the rains to fall in the coming year, with all of the life-sustaining implications which that entails, is determined in the context of the

Sukkot Festival. So, too, is the Festival deemed to be preparatory to the Redemption in the Time-to-Come.

Shir ha-Kavod (Judah he-Hasid?)

This popular piyyut for the Musaph Service contains these remarkable descriptions of the godhead:

חבש כובע ישועה בראשו : הושיעה לו ימינו וזורע קדשו :
סלי אורות ראשו נמלא : וקוצותיו רסיסי לילה :

(274)

Along with calling attention to the redemption-effecting "right hand" and outstretched "arm of holiness" previously revealed in Jewish experience, we are told here that both "salvation" and "the dew of light" are appurtenances of the mystical godhead. These latter figures occupy parallel positions in consecutive lines of the stanza, suggesting that they may be viewed as entirely synonymous.

Shir ha-Yichud

These verses from the composition designated for reading on the fourth day of the Festival are couched amidst a paeon of God's redeeming acts:

כביר כח למרגיוזי אל : גוקם : וכטל הוא לישראל :
כגשמי נדבה לנו יבא : כמלקוש וכטל לדבקים בו :

(275)

Thus, we see that in contrast to the imagery of violence which God will unleash against those who provoke him, the poet employs the imagery of the gentle rains and dew as a bi-polar opposite to describe the coming of the Lord to Israel's rescue.

In the composition of the same name for the Sabbath Day, the following events are listed among the other demonstrations of might and generosity which God has revealed to Israel in the course of their interwoven careers:

ודברת עמם מן השמים : וגם העבים נספּו מים :

(276)

Once more, we see the intimate association of revelation of the divine word with precipitation. Though this is not in itself eschatological, we know from other contexts that it has been insinuated into the complex of eschatological associations combining revelation and the transmutation of the material universe with precipitation(277).

An excerpt from a piyyut for insertion in the Yotzer of Sh'mini Atzeret(278) provides this imagery:

טוב השוכן רומה	(1)
קרב קץ נחמה	(2)
ועורר ישני אדמה	(3)
יה שוכן עליו	(4)
ורב העלילות	(5)
עתה כנס גליו	(6)

There is a subtle ambiguity presented in line 1, insofar as טוב may be either a synonym for God as the Source of Good or for "goodness" qua rain, as in the expression 'פחח ה' for "goodness" qua rain, as in the expression 'פחח ה'. Even if it is the latter meaning which is intended here, we may yet insist that in this context it is God who is being petitioned and whose nearness is being sought under the appearances of rain. Be that as it may, it is redemption and resurrection which are being called for in lines 2 and 3. Lines 4-6 further the imagery of God as

Dweller amidst the Clouds and link that description to the imminent hope for an ingathering of the exiles.

Given the weight of such associations and their currency among the religious leaders of Franco-German Jewry in the high Middle Ages, we should not be surprised to find that they were every bit as diligent in reciting the precipitation liturgy as their predecessors had been. Like the sages of the Talmud and the geonim after them, the rabbis of Europe took special precautions to insure proper attention to matters like the insertion of the Memorial for Rain. We cannot help but wonder, however, if there were not something more to their diligence than meets the eye at first glance. We are told, for instance, that on Sh'mini Atzeret R. Meir of Rothenburg repeated the formula for memorializing rain some ninety times, in contrast to the prevailing custom of reciting it only thirty times!(279). The alleged purpose of both performances was to insure that the Memorial would not be omitted from one's prayers during the coming months. Though some may be willing to accept such an explanation at face value, there is room for doubting its legitimacy. This is all the more so when it is applied to the motivation of one of the most renowned rabbinic authorities who ever lived. To us it seems more likely that the pious rabbi had something more in mind than buttressing a failing memory. The power of a "prayer in an acceptable time" was also well-known to him. What better moment might there be than the dawning of Tekufat Geshem to petition with all one's devo-

tion the coming of the kingdom and the restoration of
Israel, paradoxically, to its proper "place in the sun"?

Chapter VII. ANALYTIC MODELS AND PERSPECTIVES

Thus far, I have tried to be conservative in offering interpretations of our data, except insofar as it seemed necessary to explicate immediately an otherwise unmanageable mass of raw material. Even those analytic gestures, however, were only piecemeal efforts and did not draw together materials beyond the immediate zone of confusion. Now it is time to offer something in the way of an all-embracing analysis of these phenomena.

Before undertaking such an ambitious effort, however, a word of caution is in order here, too. Today the scope of the literature bearing on our analytic problems is almost as vast as Jewish liturgy itself! Though this may have the ring of exaggeration, the fact is that the subject of myth and religious metaphor has become grist for the mills of psychology, epistemology, cultural anthropology, semantics, philology, and literary criticism! According to one's intellectual inclinations, one may find plausible "explanations" for our data emanating from each of these disciplines. To make matters more trying, each hypothesis seems to possess a measure of explanatory efficiency, even as it disavows or ignores the significance of the alternative models vying for credibility.

The problem with all of the perspectives, as I comprehend them, lies less in the model of myth which they present than with the model of man from which they proceed. Their

shared tendency is to adopt a reductionist view of human nature(280). They are able to reach their conclusions by showing how the circumscribed data under examination correlate highly with that feature of human nature which they deem to be determinative of virtually all of human conduct.

In any case, it is not within my competence to ascertain the final merits of any particular model. My intention in this section is merely to attempt to apply a few of these analytic devices to the phenomena which have been set forth in this paper. The models to which I will devote the greatest attention are three which enjoy some broad currency and represent somewhat different approaches to the analysis of myth. Specifically, they are: 1) an epistemological view, as represented by Ernst Cassirer and his student, Suzanne K. Langer, 2) a structural anthropological approach, as represented by Claude Levi-Strauss, and 3) a semantic or linguistic analysis, as represented by Philip Wheelwright. It should be remembered that my aim is to analyze our data, and not to confirm or refute the legitimacy of the analytic tool. Accordingly, I shall merely report uncritically the hypotheses of these schools of thought and seek to interpret our data in the light of them.

Before proceeding to the application of these full-scale models, however, I would spend some time exploring a few analytical viewpoints which arise out of some of the secondary literature relating directly to much of the same

data as this study. At the same time, where appropriate, I shall interject a few interpretive remarks of my own and bring to bear some additional data supportive of the hypothesis under consideration.

August Wünsche offered some pertinent speculations, after the manner of nineteenth century scholarship, on the subject of the mythology of the "Water of Life" (Lebenswasser) (281). He perceived this theme as being a recurrent feature of ancient Near Eastern mythology, as evidenced by its appearance in such diverse works as the "Adapa Myth", the "Gilgamesh Epic", and the tale of "The Descent of Ishtar into Hell." Beyond Semitic culture, Wünsche found evidence of belief in such a supernatural analog of natural water in ancient Indian and Hellenistic mythology, as well (282). Wünsche specifically regarded the Nebel von der Erde in Genesis 2:6 as a retention in Biblical mythology of the notion that a quickening moisture was the source of all life (283). It may be noted, parenthetically, that the Hebrew Bible commentator, Sforino (16th century), in his note to the above verse, identifies the Eid min ha-Aretz as being none other than Tal Livracha which, along with the Ruach N'shamah, supplied the invigoration force for God's creation of the first human life.

Be that as it may, Wünsche also felt that the periodic Biblical allusions to life-promoting rivers of water (eg., Genesis 2:10, the rivers of Eden) and the mythological spring situated beneath the Temple foundation (eg., Ezekiel

47:1-12 and Zechariah 14:8) were further reflections of this paradigmatic myth of the Water of Life. He points out that in Babylonian lore, it was in just such a chamber beneath the Temple foundation that the soul was deemed to have its transcendent abode(284).

It seems plausible to connect some of this mythological heritage to our immediate concern, too. We have noticed elsewhere in this paper the recurrent tendency to apply a "water" metaphor to Torah, even to the extent of making water a hypostasis for Torah as the principal medium of divine-human interaction. Students of the midrash will recall that another major metaphor for Torah is "light". We have seen the convergence of both species of metaphorical terminology in the familiar but elusive imagery of Isaiah 26:19 (סללי אור סליך). Furthermore, we also know that the Tannaitic and medieval Bible exegetes took this verse to be an explicit reference to the mechanics by which the resurrection of the dead was to be effected. When we add to this complex of associations the fact that the Tradition consistently regarded the reward for leading a Torah-true existence to be the guarantee of a new life following the End of Days, we end up with this fascinating configuration:

סל-אור-תורה-מחייה המתים. Thus, we would be able to account for at least part of the Jewish mythopoeic enterprise which connected various water forms with resurrection. We would only have to consign it to a sub-heading of the "Water of Life" motif typically found in other ancient cos-

mologies. Undoubtedly, it may be possessed of some uniquely Jewish components, such as the insinuation of the figure of Torah and of moral obligation into the total complex. But the dominant image, the obtaining of life through the ingestion or immersion in Mayim Chaim, can be seen to be at the heart of the myth-making process.

Raphael Patai, who has written extensively on the subject of water in ancient Jewish life and lore(285), claims that one unusual feature of both Biblical and Rabbinic terminology for precipitation is that it is predominantly qualitative, rather than quantitative, in perspective(286). I have accumulated the following list of such terms from a variety of Rabbinic sources:

גשם ברכה	סל ילדוה	גשם נדבוח
גשם זעף	סל לברכה	גשם רצון
גשם רביעה	סללי רעוה	גשמי רעמים
	סללי אור	גשם שוטף

Clearly, whatever quantitative measures might have come to be associated with these terms in later ages, in their original formulation they were grounded in a qualitative perspective. The modifiers to which the precipitation forms were conjoined are expressive of some motive or function which the inundation was to serve, be it divine blessing, tenderness, compassion, wrath, or whatever. The cumulative effect of such speech is to make of precipitation, once again, one of the foremost media of divine-human interaction. Though notable

exceptions exist even in the small lexicon I have compiled above, we have seen from our broader study that in general the sending of precipitation, either literally or figuratively, was deemed to be an expression of divine beneficence. This is, of course, consistent with the nature of reality in an agrarian economy, where the outpourings of the heavens almost always do somebody some good. From witnessing the accomplishment of 'good' in this way on the natural plane of existence, Jewish myth-makers would seem to have passed over to an expectation of 'good' on the supernatural plane, as well.

Obviously, such a transmutation has not been an uncommon occurrence in Jewish culture. As often as it has been shown that Jews have borrowed their imagery and outward forms of religious expression from the milieux in which they dwelt, just as often can their infusion of an additional, peculiarly Jewish religio-moral dimension into the complex be demonstrated. So, here, too, can we apprehend a spiritualization of the 'reward' aspects of rain's being given as a divine gift. As natural rain was to be regarded as the reward for the observance of the mitzvot, likewise did supernatural precipitation and its good effects come to be viewed as the consequence of Torah-loyalty. As natural rain served to bring the seed of plants, and trees, and fruitful vines to the fulness of life, so would supernatural rain bring to life the seed of the faithful awaiting, in their furrowed graves, the liberating Day of the Lord.

An Epistemological Analysis

In Ernst Cassirer's view, the problem which many moderns have when they turn to an analysis of "mythic thinking", which is that thought mode which underwrites poetic and religious language, as well as myth itself, derives from a certain prejudice in the way they think concepts ought to be formulated. Cassirer explains:

According to the traditional teachings of logic, the mind forms concepts by taking a certain number of objects which have common properties, i.e., coincide in certain respects, together in thought and abstracting from their differences, so that only the similarities are retained and reflected upon, and in this way a general idea of such-and-such a class of objects is formed in consciousness. Thus the concept (notio, conceptus) is that idea which represents the totality of essential properties, i.e., the essence of the objects in question. (287)

Starting from such a viewpoint, a person would tend to be uncomfortable with any cognitive exercise which seemed to defy such efforts at clear-cut discrimination of accidents from essences, such as is encountered in mythic thinking. But Cassirer takes pains to show that the above explanation of the concept formulating process is neither the only explanation, nor necessarily the most accurate one.

In its place he proposes that the process of concept formation be viewed as a synthesizing one,

a progressive activity of relating separate notions or sense impressions with each other, and then gathering up the resultant wholes into greater complexes, until finally the union of all these separate complexes yields the coherent picture of the totality of the objects. (288)

If one were to accept Cassirer's alternative model as being the more accurate description of how concepts are generated, one would recognize that mythic thinking is not, after all, a defiance of the categories of logical thought, but only a step in an incomplete process of concept formation. It is not, therefore, to be criticized for its inaccuracy, but at most for its insufficiency. On its own level, nevertheless, it possesses complete integrity and insofar as it is a necessary step in the generation of a perfected concept of some reality it is not to be dismissed ingratically.

According to Cassirer, if there is one major flaw in mythic-linguistic thought it lies in its tendency to effect "the leveling and extinction of specific differences. Every part of a whole is the whole itself; every specimen is equivalent to the entire species." (289) Logical speech and thinking, on the other hand, has as its chief characteristic

...expansion over ever-widening spheres of perception and conception... (so that) each separate 'specimen' of a species is 'contained' in the species... (but) the ever-growing relationship which connects an individual perception with others does not cause it to become merged with the others. (290)

Thus, while mythic thinking is susceptible to the principle of pars pro toto, logical thinking knows only of relationships among discrete, but synthetically conjoined perceptions.

Nothing we have said above, however, should be taken to imply that mythic thinking is somehow or other a mode of

thought of a kind more primitive than the logical. On the contrary, in Cassirer's view the two modes are and always have been co-existent and complementary. Each in its own way serves the interpenetrating needs of human conceptualization - to express an idea with maximum fulness, and to designate with maximum specificity. The audible servants of these two cognitive exercises are labeled by Cassirer as "expressive speech" and "denotative speech", respectively. (291)

As has already been indicated, it is easy to survey the areas of culture in which the two speech forms hold dominance as a means of understanding their principal differences, while yet appreciating their respective strengths. In general, we recognize the prominence of denotative speech in the realms of science, mathematics, data-processing and retrieval, and information transmission. In these domains, the quality of language is judged in direct proportion to its specificity, its ability to set up a correspondence between the subject being discussed and the terms which are used to describe it. Such a procedure may also be described as 'objectification.' On the other hand, expressive speech is most at home in the areas of myth, poetry, certain kinds of prose writing, and in religious discourse, be it descriptive or devotional in nature. In these domains, the quality of language is judged in direct proportion to the profundity of its intense psychological stimulation, its ability to compress a host of intuitions, impressions, and

emotional associations into a single term. Such a procedure may also be described as the 'subjectification' of language. It deals simultaneously with the interior and exterior factors of cognition, and because of this the thinker (speaker) is himself a part of the idea, captivated and enthralled by it. It is out of such a process of cognition on its most elementary level, mythico-religious thought, that Cassirer claims the primary symbols of religious self-expression emerge:

When, on the one hand, the entire self is given up to a single impression, is "possessed" by it and, on the other hand, there is the utmost tension between the subject and its object, the outer world; when external reality is not merely viewed and contemplated, but overcomes a man in sheer immediacy, with emotions of fear or hope, terror or wish-fulfillment: then the spark jumps somehow across, the tension finds release, as the subjective excitement becomes objectified, and confronts the mind as a god or daemon. (292)

It is out of the encounter with such a "momentary god" (293) that the total identification of a thing's name and the thing itself can be accomplished in human thought. Thereafter, it becomes possible to employ the name as a term for the discussion of the thing in abstract discourse.

Thus, Cassirer would ground the vitality of a symbol in some hypothetical primeval experience. Such an event might be as fundamental as a thirsty person's finding water unexpectedly. In the act of articulating his experience in the moment of discovery, the term "water" would become bound up in a constellation of associations with all things

"salvationary" in nature. This process Cassirer calls the development of "teleological identity," (294) whereby terms are synthetically related according to the common function which they share. Thus, on occasion salvation might also have materialized in the form of a "rock" and "fortress" (295), "light" (296), a "spear" and battle-axe" (297), "shade" (298), and a "shield and buckler" (299). In the spontaneity of immediate perception, each phenomenon would partake of the broader ramifications of salvation associated with all the other media, as well.

This sort of conflation of imagery is evident in Psalm 36, where the following figures occur in close coordination to describe the saving nature of God:

Thy lovingkindness, O Lord, is in the heavens;
 Thy faithfulness reacheth unto the skies.
 Thy righteousness is like the mighty mountains;
 Thy judgments are like the great deep;
 Man and beast Thou preservest, O Lord.
 How precious is Thy lovingkindness, O God!
 And the children of men take refuge in the
 shadow of Thy wings,
 They are abundantly satisfied with the fat-
 ness of Thy house;
 And Thou makes them drink of the rivers of
 Thy pleasures.
 For with Thee is the fountain of life;
 In Thy light do we see light.

Such seemingly random wandering from image to image is comprehensible only when all of the figures are permitted to impact on our consciousness via their teleologically common function: rain, mountains, oceans, shade, fertile earth, rivers, fountains, and light all have had occasion to provoke the experience of some divinely authored salvation in

the life of earlier generations. In this setting, the terms are allowed interpenetrate their overtones, setting up sympathetic vibrations in one another, such that hereafter each one will be able to 'speak' with, for, and through the others.

It is this kind of process which produces the figure of speech known as the metaphor. Cassirer defines metaphor as "the conscious denotation of one thought content by the name of another which resembles the former in some respect, or is somehow analogous to it"(300). In time, if a metaphor possesses sufficient vitality and, therefore, receives broad social currency, such a metaphor may become a symbol. Symbols pass beyond both the merely denotative and metaphorical levels of cognition and speech because the ideal object which a symbol portrays "is not a substantial entity but lies rather in the relations which it establishes"(301). A symbol becomes the means by which thinking on a subject too complex for discursive language can be attained. It is, of course, true that such thinking is not denotative and, therefore, not wholly logical. Yet it is descriptive and, at its best, fully expressive of the totality of associations which it entails.

Such effective symbolism is evident in the Christian Crucifix, the Buddhist images of the Theravada Buddha, and in the Jewish Menorah. All achieve their vitality from the complex of associations (psychological, sociological, historical, and mythical) which they represent, and in which

they actually participate. So much so is this the case, that an attack on the symbol is regarded by its devotees as an attack upon the faith itself!

At this point we may ask how Cassirer's model of the genesis and etiology of mythic speech can help us to understand the phenomena of Jewish liturgy with which we have been grappling?

Our starting point must lie in the uncharted wilderness through which the Hebrew patriarchs traveled in their daily efforts to find ample food and water supplies for their flocks and herds. This hypothetical point is less a geographical reality than an experiential reality. It would be the point at which some ancestor discovered or encountered a life-saving water resource just as he and everything dear to him were on the verge of death from thirst. From that point on, in his life and lives of all with whom he had shared such "salvation", water would never be just a neutral, natural entity again. In a culture like that of the ancient Hebrew nomads, there may easily have been a high incidence of such experiences until, eventually, all the particular instances of salvation by water passed over into one conflated image of such salvation. Thus, whether achieved by means of "a fountain of water in the wilderness"(302), "a well of water"(303), "a well of living water"(304), "waters (as) a wall unto them"(305), "waters (which) were made sweet"(306), water which gushed from the rock at Horeb(307) and at Meribah(308), a well which sprang up mysteriously at Beer(309),

a river which stood up in a heap(310), an overflowing brook swelled by torrential rains(311), rains which fell only at the behest of the prophet(312), or dew which brought with it a life-sustaining food(313), over and again it was "water" which would become a primary metaphor for portraying the nature of divine-human interaction.

Out of these few examples, consciously recorded and memorialized in Jewish Scripture, it is easy to imagine water's coming to be regarded as possessing a single essence: a life-saving, life-preserving substance. By the process of mythic thinking, "water" would have been an undifferentiated total medium, with rain, dew, rivers, springs, and wells as its particular forms of manifestation. But insofar as each species shared in the essence of the general category, it also shared in the particular qualities of the other manifestations: "rain" drowned the Egyptians, "dew" slaked the peoples' thirst at Meribah, the Well of Beer became a river in the wilderness, and the springs of water poured forth from heaven. Merging and interpenetrating everywhere, "water" became the principal medium for the effecting of a divine salvation.

Even after the Jewish people had settled down to an agrarian life style, the prominence of water in the maintenance of their survival was still foremost. The cycle of nature, exhibiting periods of moisture and aridity correlating with the periods of growth and decay, was seen to be a further verification of the essentially life-prospering func-

tion of water. Out of such a vast heritage of associations, it is easy to see how the various mythological complexes as we have encountered could have developed. Let us look at some hypothetical constellations of association and attempt to experience the intuitive connections which served to bind them together:

-Death results from lack of water; withholding of water is a punishment for sin; death is a punishment for sin; salvation from drought and thirst is afforded by the giving of water; the outpouring of water effects salvation from death; salvation from death is afforded by the giving of water; salvation is the voiding of death from lack of water...

-Receiving water is an expression of divine love; divine love is essential to the preservation of life; receiving the Torah is an expression of divine love; maintenance of life entails imbibing of water; maintenance of life involves imbibing of Torah; Torah is like water; receiving of water is an expression of divine love...

-Water is a source of life; the source of life is God; God is immanent in the effluence of water; life can be petitioned in the petitioning of water; rain and dew are water; life can be petitioned in the petitioning of rain

and dew; God's nearness can be petitioned
in the petitioning of rain and dew; God
is the source of life; water is a source
of life...

And so it goes, round and round, "all the rivers run
into the sea, yet the sea is not full; unto the place
whither the rivers go, thither they go again." (314).

Clearly, no amount of discursive speaking can render
such symbols as "rain" and "dew" wholly comprehensible.
They obtain their power precisely from the fact that they
are so compressed in their meaning and that they entailed
for the one who pronounced them the energy borrowed from
absolutely every salvatory event ever effected in Jewish
history! In confrontation with such focal symbols, all
efforts at discursive expression pale in comparison. The
complexity of the truth to which such symbols point is as yet
so vast, so variegated, and so personal, that the forms of
logical discourse cannot embrace it. What is expressed in
these symbols is as much felt as known to be true. "There
is no speech, there are no words" for the fulness of this
truth, and that is why the words of the mouth must be sup-
plemented by the meditations of the heart in order to grasp
a reality which impinges on the essence of the divine itself.

So may we appreciate the symbolism of the liturgy which
has employed the imagery of rain and dew. And, yet, we may
also wonder how such magnificent vitality could have so
dissipated that in subsequent ages this whole body of liturgy

came to be regarded as little more than a quaint reflection of the meteorological needs of our hapless ancestors?

The answer to this, Cassirer would say, lies in the fact that symbols, like institutions, can die. This occurs when they can no longer produce the necessary response in the members of the community for which they were once expressive. Cassirer observes that even though the metaphors which gave birth to symbols originated on the mythic level of thought, by virtue of their living in language they also share in the realm of logic. Eventually, the mythic component dwindles, and the "words are reduced more and more to the status of mere conceptual signs"(316). As this happens, the terms, in their specificity, become the objects of literal minded thought. The extent to which they become denotative in their significance is in direct proportion to their liberation from the embrace of mood, and myth, and the momentary god which gave them birth. But by so doing, they lose their touch with the infinite and become the finite stuff of which the opaque world is made. At that point, they cease to articulate the unutterable truths of religious life and are retained, at best, in the mechanical recitations of those who will give voice to any words, as long as they are of some venerable origin.

'Structural' Anthropological Analysis

In his own way, Claude Levi-Strauss also grounds the phenomenon of human myth-making in the intellectual needs of

man. Contrary to the suppositions of such anthropologists as Levy-Bruhl, who depict ancient and primitive man's penchant for myth-making as evidence of a non-empirical and flawed trait of intellection in which fact and fantasy are poorly discriminated, Levi-Strauss regards myth-making as a 'rational' exercise from the outset. He sees it as being just one more way for the mind to organize its experiences and the myriad of sense data which co-inhabit the sensible universe with the human thinker. For this reason, Levi-Strauss rejects the notion that mythic thinking is inherently inferior to scientific thinking, or that these represent successive stages in the development of thought, understanding, and knowledge. On the contrary, in their way he regards each to be equally valid(316). We shall return shortly to this notion, but first let us look at some of the ways in which mythic and scientific thinking may be said to differ.

Levi-Strauss characterizes the primitive thinker as a bricoleur(317). The bricoleur (no precise English translation available) as thinker is a sort of intellectual handyman who, though he may lack the sophisticated tools of the specialized craftsman, will make use of whatever tools are at his disposal in order to accomplish his task. On the level of action, such a person, lacking a hammer, would use a stone, and lacking a carpet tack might use a nail. On the level of cognition, such a person would borrow the terminology of one sphere of experience and apply it, or super-

impose it, in all its ramified fulness to another sphere of experience. It is this practice which Levi-Strauss claims accounts for the apparent heterogeneity of mythical thought. It is a sort of intellectual bricolage(318). The borrowed terms occupy an intermediary position between the images or percepts of the secondary sphere in which they are applied and the concepts which eventually emerge concerning the secondary sphere(319). Thus, we are to understand that the terminology is secondary to what the terminology is actually talking about. A myth which employs the nomenclature pertinent to some aspect of nature in the myth-maker's locale may actually be a gesture at describing a process, a set of dynamics, or intuited pattern of relationships on an altogether 'non-natural' plane of experience.

In this light, mythical constructs may be viewed as having neither scientific understanding nor factual communication in mind. On the contrary, it is a gross mistake

to think that natural phenomena are what myths try to explain, when they are rather the medium through which myths try to explain facts which are themselves not of a natural but a logical order(320).

Such a form of cognition is still in evidence today, even in fields usually associated with the most advanced intellectual development. Yet, it is in precisely those areas where human imagination has reached the outer limits of its present ability to conceptualize that the practice of bricolage takes over once again. Consider Albert Camus' protest over the nuclear scientist's employment of metaphor in depict-

ing the 'fundamental reality' of the material universe:

All the knowledge on earth will give me nothing to assure me that this world is mine. You describe it to me and you teach me to classify it. You enumerate its laws and in my thirst for knowledge I admit that they are true. You take apart its mechanism and my hope increases. At the final stage you teach me that this wondrous and multicolored universe can be reduced to the atom and that the atom itself can be reduced to the electron. All this is good and I wait for you to continue. But you tell me of an invisible planetary system in which the electrons gravitate around a nucleus. You explain this world to me with an image. I realize then that you have been reduced to poetry...so that science that was to teach me everything ends up in a hypothesis, that lucidity founders in metaphor, that uncertainty is resolved in a work of art.(321)

Camus was entitled to his objection, of course, seeking as he was to demonstrate the utter absurdity of all experience. But in Levi-Strauss' model of human intellectual endeavor neither science nor mythopoeia is to be disparged for being untrue to the world's indigenous reality. Both forms of thought exist only for the purpose of making experience comprehensible and for turning the apparent chaos of raw sense impressions into a benign cosmos.

Even though they share a common function, mythical thinking differs from scientific thinking in that it is unable to break out of the restraints imposed by the particulars of the model which it employs. As a result, the object, process, or circumstances which are to be analyzed by means of a borrowed model come to share in the accidental properties of the model.

There is no separation of contingent factors from essential properties. The model is not just a superimposition upon an alien set of facts, but is actually a participant in the circumstances which it assists in describing(322); it is the skeleton over which another's flesh can be stretched, so that aside from an occasional awkwardness or lack of precise conformity it is nearly impossible to tell the organic original from its golem counterpart.

We may summarize these views, then, in the following way:

Mythical thought...is imprisoned in the events and experiences which it never tires of ordering and re-ordering in its search to find them a meaning. But it also acts as a liberator by its protest against the idea that anything can be meaningless with which science at first resigned itself to a compromise.(323)

What follows clearly from this view of myth-making is that the mythic formulation is not merely "analogy"; it is "homology" (324). When the myth-maker speaks, he is not saying, "Just as it is here, so is it like that there." Rather, he is saying, "Just as it is here, so it is there."

If we accept this alleged model-making enterprise as the cornerstone of human thought, we may yet wonder by what rules, if any, it proceeds in generating a superstructure. Levi-Strauss' answer to this question was first explicated in his 1963 publication, Totemism(325). He there observes that there is everywhere at work in primitive thought-exercises a tendency to effect "the bi-partition of the universe into two

categories"(326). Though the two categories would initially seem to produce a bifurcation of reality into opposing elements, what Levi-Strauss has attempted to demonstrate is that such an endeavor has the very opposite effect of generating an even more sophisticated harmony through a complementary dualism. He further contends that such an exercise is not taken on gratuitously, but is a necessary by-product of the way in which man actually experiences the world which comes to him through his senses.

Levi-Strauss' supposition is partially verified by the findings of modern psychology, whence we know that in the intellectual life of early infancy there is a high degree of dynamical unity, both with regard to other-self discrimination and discrimination between objects, field, and ground. In time this unity gives way to differentiation of the elements from the "all". Thereafter, intellectual life is steadily engaged in off-setting differentiation through the learned process of integration. This entire process is called by Gordon Allport, "the dialectic of dividing and uniting"(327).

Though he worked from an entirely different set of axia than Levi-Strauss, no less an authority than Emile Durkheim reached very similar conclusions about the characteristic forms of mankind's intellectual functioning. He observed:

...association by contrariety...is a universal feature of human thinking, so that we think by pairs of contrairies, upwards and downwards, strong and weak, black and white(328).

Once again, we are shown that human thought processes

inherently pursue a "cosmogonic" course of development. The implicit challenge which underwrites all bi-polar taxonomies which are employed in the description of some reality is "how to make opposition, instead of being an obstacle to integration, serve rather to produce it"(329). Furthermore, it is not necessary to reserve our search for such systems of binary opposition to the realm of "primitive" thought. Anywhere and everywhere the human mind broaches on the meta-physical such thinking is in evidence: Kant's "Antinomies of Reason", matter and energy, electron and proton, matter and anti-matter, the time-space continuum, thesis/antithesis yielding synthesis, "dialectical materialism", etc. In their fashion, these eminently rational formulations are no different than the bi-polar taxonomy which inheres in the story of creation recorded in Genesis I: Heaven and earth, light and darkness, day and night, firmament and waters, waters above and waters below, waters and dry land, grass (non-seed species) and herbs and fruit trees (seed-bearing species), lights in the firmament to produce day and night and seasons and years, creatures of the sea and creatures of the sky, cattle and creeping thing and beast of the earth and man, and male and female. Obviously, there is nothing "primitive" about the exercise at all. The only point at which the procedure becomes a problem for the rational thinker of today is when a transplanted taxonomy is erroneously construed to be describing an actual reality in its transplanted sphere of application.

It is this phenomenon which Levi-Strauss analyzes at length in Totemism. Thus, when two clans of a tribe describe the nature of their interactions as being parallel to the interactions of, say, the beaver and the otter, we may treat their theorizing as being based on analogy. But when they simultaneously claim actually to be descended from the beaver and otter, then we know that they are still thinking mythologically.

Taking all of this into account, is there some way in which to apply it to the materials with which we have been dealing from Jewish liturgy, in order to understand better how they might have come to be structured as they did? Can we discern any evidence for a binary systemization in Rabbinic thinking on matters of precipitation, resurrection, and salvation? Is there any indication of a reverberation of one bi-polar taxonomic model on some other, apparently unrelated plane of speculation? I believe that there is evidence of both of these procedures. I present the attached diagrams in support of the text which follows. (See Diagrams A. and B. on the pages immediately following)

Diagram A. presents in schematic fashion the structure of relationship between and among the various constituent elements of the precipitation-resurrection-salvation myth complex. In the unfolding of our midrashic and poetic and liturgical materials we have had occasion to witness the employment of each ingredient. At times, we actually observed them being pitted in opposition to one another, vying for

prominence and for the prerogative of being the foremost determining factor in some particular structure of comprehension. Over and over again, we have seen these components contrast, complement, and converge so as to produce a dynamic interplay of nuances of ever magnifying intensity the more they were interwoven. And there can be no doubt that this complex was of a genuinely mythological character. Rain and dew were believed to fall in response to prayer; moisture and wind were believed capable of generating life; and history itself was believed to be seasonal and, therefore, could be both the subject of reflection and of prediction, holding forth the hope of the regeneration of human life, even as the annual seasons guaranteed the restoration of vegetative life.

Diagram B. (330) attempts to depict the way in which "repercussions" can be set up across-the-board, as it were, between and among all of the species which inhabit a common plane. Though there is no ostensible relationship between "moisture" and "Israel", the mere fact that they co-exist on the plane of things "Sacred and Pure" automatically sets up a sympathetic vibration between them. The bricoleur looks for ways of utilizing the function, activity, and structural position of one for the better comprehension of the fullest ramifications of the other. What can be said of the one has some kind of repercussion for the understanding of the other. It is out of just such a "resonating", echo-chamber effect that the formulations of mythic thought

are generated.

It seems to me that one of the special strengths of Levi-Strauss' theory of the etiology of myth is that it does not devolve from some hypothetical myth-making penchant of primitive man (such an argument is tautological, at best). Rather, mythic thought is regarded as just one more tool for the "logical" conceptualization of human experience, both exogenous and intra-psychic. It can be shown to co-exist with all of the other forms of thought, right into our own stage of intellectual development. It does not treat ancient or primitive man as somehow non-empirical in his thought processes and encounters with the material world. In fact, if anything, just the opposite obtains.

Throughout our readings in the primary sources dating from the Tannaitic and Amoraic ages, we could not help but be impressed at just how empirical and factually knowledgeable those generations were about the physical milieu in which they dwelt. For them, the general concept of Seder Olam (our "natural law") was ever being filled-in anew by the vast host of phenomena, behaving in orderly, repetitive harmony with the rules by which the world was governed. In fact, it was the reliable permanence of such observable organization on the material plane which made it easy to propose the existence of compatibly reliable models on the supernatural plane, as well.

In sum, I am saying that we should not be surprised to find the Jewish bricoleur qua millennialist borrowing from his thorough-going, empirical understanding of the system of meteorology in his native Palestine in order to develop his eschatological speculations about life in the World-to-Come. We should not be surprised to find him borrowing from his thorough-going, empirical understanding of the agricultural cycle in his native Palestine in order to organize his thoughts concerning the possible parallel cycle by which man might live and die and live again.

In yet a third schematic rendering, let us note some of the parallels which come to mind upon even superficial recollection:

MODELS

<u>Agriculture</u>	<u>Meteorology</u>	<u>Human Life</u>	<u>Eschatology</u>
life from a seed (זרע)	סיפת גשם	life from a seed סיפת סרוחה	(זרע) ליוז של שדרה
floral generation (buds, shoots, stalks)	חקופת חשרי	intra- uterine gestation	sequestra- tion in the grave
wheat and barley harvest	ימות טל	death "cuts off" man's life	ingathering (harvest) of the exiles
ripening of fruits and vegetables	ימות החמה	aging	Days of the Messiah before the coming of the Eschaton
fruit and vegetable harvest	ימות גשמים	parenthood	resurrection

By this model, we can see how the observed resemblances between the "seasons" of moisture and aridity, growth and decay, birth and death, might have enabled the construction of a parallel model by which to conceptualize "metaphysical" problems: man's fate after death, the dispersion of Israel, and the desolation of God's chosen people and their sacred soil. The empirical patterns of agriculture, meteorology, and biology became the means by which the bricoleur could compose a homologue for speculating about the eschatological pattern which was yet to unfold. It might even be inferred that it was the need for symmetry in such thinking that helped to create some of the features which our "logical" minds find so bizarre, i.e., the requirement of symmetry between the original model and the sphere of its secondary application helped to generate some of the content of the secondary sphere. Thus, elements which appear in the secondary sphere which seem to us to be extraneous could actually be there only for the purpose of completing the system of binary oppositions, and not because they form an intrinsic part of the secondary sphere itself! As indicated earlier, since the entire undertaking is not for the purpose of depicting some actual reality, but for conceptualizing a non-empirical truth, the speculative model is governed more by the needs of intrapsychic form than by the accuracy of its details.

As best we can determine, it was at least at the Tannaitic level that this intellectual bricolage was begun

(though it may have come considerably earlier). We have seen how successive generations employed it with varying degrees of success and accuracy. We have also noted that there came a point when the Jewish peoples' collective nearness to the soil and direct personal dependence upon a propitious cycle of winds and rain ceased to have currency throughout virtually the whole of their dispersion. We may presume that it was also at that point that the vitality of the precipitation-resurrection-salvation imagery began to dissipate. In its place would come other models, less dependent upon a set of specifics with which the people themselves had nought but some fossilized memories. Were I prone to speculation, I might suggest that the Second Maimonidean Controversy (ca. 1230-1232), over the literalness of the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, was the public eulogy to a mythic system which was on the verge of expiration without any prospects of being brought to life again.

A Semantic Approach

Philip Wheelwright's perspective on myth and mythic language differs from the preceeding approaches which we have examined in that it is less concerned with "myth-making" per se than with the matter of communication in general. In contrast to the Cassirerite school, which views language as the tool of conception, Wheelwright is concerned with the semantic value of words and, therefore, with communication. He is less concerned with the environ-

mental givens which may have prompted the birth of certain mythic formulations ab initio, as it is Levi-Strauss' tendency to be, than with examining the ways in which mythopoeic language has served and continues to serve to effect both communication and esthetic enjoyment.

In keeping with his particular emphasis, Wheelwright is careful to make distinctions between what he regards to be the three relatively distinct forms of myth(331): 1) "primary myth", which he deems to be the "basis, and even perhaps in some instances...a prelinguistic tendency, of human envisagement"(332); 2) "romantic myth", which may be described as the esthetic creation of some human imagination in the service of some intellectual viewpoint which is to be communicated(333); 3) "consummatory myth", which is a conscious "post-romantic attempt to recapture the lost innocence of the primitive mythopoeic attitude"(334). In order to accomplish this ultimate form of expression, it is often necessary for the myth-maker or poet to break with the norms of literary formulation developed in the romantic period, which tend eventually to circumscribe the language and structures to be used in the construction of a "proper" literary product. A simple example of this difference may be seen in a comparison of virtually any work of nineteenth century drama and the revolutionary constructions of Strindberg or Ionesco. Whereas the former are rather straightforward and "classical" in their messages, the latter's works are characterized by a surreal, dreamlike

quality which consciously imitates the vague and amorphous quality of "primitive" man's mythic universe.

Wheelwright also makes a distinction between two common forms of language. They are: 1) "steno-language", which he describes as the "language of plain sense and exact denotation" (335); the meanings which appertain to steno-language are readily accessible to anyone who can use the same language (336) and for which clarification can be achieved by the giving of, if not the outright pointing to, examples (337); 2) "tensive language" (also called "open" or "expressive"), which are those terms and configurations of speech and gesture which strive toward expression of the complexities, paradoxes, and dimly perceived intuitions of relationships which man encounters in his experience of the world and his life (338). Wheelwright suggests that in some respects it is necessary for tensive language to share in, or mirror, the vague, tenuous, and paradoxical qualities of the things and experiences to which it refers. It is this sharing which gives tensive language its living quality, as it strives for, but cannot quite reach total adequacy.

Foremost among the forms of tensive speech is the metaphor. Here, too, Wheelwright has an important definition to offer. He prefers to employ this term as the equivalent in current usage to the word coined by F. Max Müller, called "diaphor." By either name, the concept it entails is "the expression of a complex idea, not by analysis, not by direct statement, but by the sudden perception of an

objective relation"(339). Wheelwright notes that even the term "metaphor" is revealing of its function, that is, to create a kind of "semantic motion"(340) which brings a term with an established denotation into a new and unusual context. Accordingly, the metaphor qua diaphor may be said to serve a "transmutative" function(341), establishing a commonality between objects and events which previously did not bear relating. Thus, Robert Burns may say, "My love is like a red, red rose," while yet another poet might say, "Love is a rose." (342) In both cases (though the former is a simile and the latter a metaphor), we can see the semantic motion: there is an attempt to explicate something which is less well-known by relating it to something which is better known. The comparisons are not intended to be precise, but only to create a "tenor", a kind of dynamical unity which is at once filled with tension; it is this blending of centrifugal and centripetal forces which gives the figure of speech its liveliness.

There is yet another mechanism which must be acknowledged in the semantic treatment of myth and religious language, and that is symbolism. In general, we may say that on the level of language a symbol is the natural, though not necessary, outgrowth of an especially vital metaphor(343). The difference between the metaphor and the symbol, however, is the difference between a one-time flash of sudden insight and a regularly repeatable implication of meaning. Thus, John Donne's provocative

metaphors, "No man is an island" and "For whom the bell tolls" only acquired their symbolic power at the hand of Ernest Hemingway who, through his fictional "histories" (our modern myths), gave them an enduring significance.

Needless to say, literary symbols are not the only kinds of symbols, nor are all symbols what we have described as "tensive." There are "steno-symbols", such as Pi and the right triangle, or any other image, figure, or form which invariably represents a fixed meaning or concept. These are the symbols out of which mathematics and the physical sciences are built. There are symbols which seem to be mid-way between tensive and steno-significance, like the Flag and the Cross. And then there are symbols with a literary background, which Wheelwright notes as possessing "ancestral vitality" (344) which can both close off and open up their tensive possibilities.

But for our purposes, it is the tensive literary symbol which must occupy our attention because it is chiefly of these that our liturgy consists. Therefore, we reiterate that the essence of the tensive symbol is its amorphousness, the multiplicity of associations which it carries, its "contextual variability" (345), and its way of dealing with the objects and ideas to which it relates in "soft focus." (346)

The final dichotomy which Wheelwright has suggested as a means to the understanding of myth and religious language is a distinction between "Statements" and "Pseudo-

statements"(347). Statements, in this system of polarity, lay claim to exact verification, as by scientific method. Pseudo-statements, however, are word patterns which look like statements, but which only serve to organize certain perspectives and attitudes in an intellectually and emotionally prepared reader. Such pseudo-statements are not amenable to judgments of truth or falsity (indeed, such judgments are totally irrelevant to them). Their merit is measured by the degree to which they succeed as a gesture at full expression of an otherwise relatively hidden truth. Such pseudo-statements, which regularly inhabit the domains of literary myth, poetry, and religious writings, do not require (and, in fact, defy) full intellectual commitment from the casual reader of such works. In place of full commitment there may be what Wheelwright calls "stylized" commitment(348). Stylized commitment is in evidence, on the simplest level, when a person replies, "Fine," to an inquiry as to how he is feeling, without absorbing regard for his literal state of composure. Poetic language requires of its readers this kind of suspension of literalness in order to effect its "magic" and its charm. But with the religious believer in confrontation with his religious literature, it is another matter altogether:

A genuine religious believer is one who gives full commitment --- not necessarily to the sentences in their literal meanings alone, but to some half-guessed, half-hidden truth which the sentences

symbolize...a typically religious believer is likely to feel some degree of commitment to the concrete vehicle (eg., the Virgin Birth, the avatars of Vishnu, the magical connection between pipe smoke and thunder clouds, etc.) as well as to the transcendental tenor (the real but hardly sayable significance of these doctrines for the serious believer). The literal meaning of the vehicle is usually clear and vivid, although perhaps shocking to everyday standards of probability; its transcendental tenor looms darkly behind the scene as something vague, inarticulate, yet firmly intuited and somehow of tremendous, even final, importance and consequentiality. (349)

Wheelwright takes pains to point out that this kind of exercise is not precisely superstitious nor allegorizing. It is a subtle mode of belief/assent/conceptualization which treads a path between these two extremes of relating to symbols. Indeed, it is the tension set up by these two co-prevailing tendencies which gives to symbols much of their inherent vitality and accounts for their survival, for however long that may be.

We may now properly ask how Wheelwright's new vocabulary, and the processes which it describes, can help us to understand better the symbolism of the precipitation-resurrection-salvation complex.

I think it is accurate to say that virtually all of the post-Biblical materials to which we have been exposed in this study are part of the domain of romantic myth. They have in common the intent of communicating a particular point of view concerning certain metaphysical truths and

eschatological expectations to which the Jewish people subscribed for nearly a millennium and a half in their intellectual history. A secondary feature of such works, be they midrash, liturgy, or poetry, was to advance that point of view in an esthetically pleasing form, according to established motifs and employing well-devised symbolic language known throughout the widely dispersed community.

Like many other compositions in this genre, the liturgy which we have examined utilizes both steno- and tensive language. The same prayer which refers to the hope for a bountiful harvest may also petition the ingathering of the exiles. The harvest of vegetation and the harvest of B'nei Yisrael is inexplicitly, yet intuitively compared, sharing in a common tenor which resonates on the pre-conscious level. There is semantic motion, as the familiar imagery of the natural event affords a means of conceptualizing an as yet only hoped for event, and dimly conceived at that. The emotional element of commitment to the doctrine of the Ingathering of the Exiles provides the impetus for leaping the gap between the vegetative and human spheres of existence. Recitation of the harvest prayer addresses the two truths of which the believer is confident: as surely as grain will grow and fruit will ripen, so as to fill the storehouses to overflowing, just as surely will Israel be revitalized and flourish and be gathered again into her ancestral home.

The Gevurot Benediction, too, utilizes both steno- and tensive language. When it enumerates the divine attributes - סומך נופלים, רופא חולים, מחיר אסורים, מקיים - there is a conscious linkage between known experiences (either actual or potential) and the identity of that which is unknown, the deity in its discrete essence. Paradoxically, when it says, מ' דומה לך, it acutally strives to produce just the opposite intuition, i.e., that every saving, liberating, life preserving experience is an analogue of divine action. The addition of משיב הרוח ומוריד הגשם (הטל) and מחיה המתים to this litany is certainly not for purposes of logical reflection. It, too, intends to express an intuited relationship between an observable cycle of birth, growth, decline, death, and re-birth for vegetative life and a piously hoped for equivalent in human life.

This effort is abetted by the ancestral vitality of such terms as "rain" and "dew", and "wind" and "water", as they were recurrently used in the Bible (the Jewish people's conduit to its reservoir of primary mythic meanings). There we saw these terms connected regularly to life-sustaining and/or purificatory occasions, both mythical and historical and ritual. We may assume that through recurrent use in these connections, they passed over from the realm of mere sign or metaphor to the realm of true symbol.

Like other symbols, these too could only have vitality for those who were devotees of the belief system. Prayers

which relate the sending of water (rain, dew) to the effecting of some aspect of salvation (resurrection, ingathering of the exiles, revitalization of the waste-places, revelation) are only able to do so for the emotionally prepared reader. On the objective level, such relationship amounts to gross absurdity. On the committed level of belief, it amounts to deep mystery. The hidden truth to which such mythic speech refers is that there is in the universe a mystical potency (force) which creates and re-creates, which gives life and restores it, and which proceeds out of the vortex of God's eternal being to touch the ephemeral soul of man.

The final question we may wish to address from Wheelwright's perspective is why such symbolism should itself decay and die? The answer which he proposes has to do with one of the chief limitations of language - it can become commonplace. There are enough examples of this process familiar to us from contemporary experience that we need not belabor the point. When, in the late 1940's, the United Nations adopted the term "genocide" to describe the Nazi destruction of European Jewry, it had every possibility of becoming a paradigmatic, if not symbolic term. However, as a result of its being appropriated by every rhetorician speaking on behalf of an oppressed or tyrannized people, regardless of whether they are being murdered en masse or not, it has lost its tensiveness and evocative power. So it can happen even with the most venerable and well-entrench-

ed symbol.

Wheelwright's explanation for why the transcendent significance of precipitation liturgy became lost and was reduced to its "steno-meaning" alone would be that over time careless or perfunctory use had dissipated its energy(350). A parallel experience may have been had by anyone who attended a school where the mandatory Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag was said as part of the daily classroom regimen. When first encountered in the juvenile years such an experience might have been a moving and inspirational practice. By adolescence, even though the same cognitive support system may still have been in vogue, it is just as possible that the vitality had gone out of the ritual as a consequence of the contempt which familiarity is often said to breed. Nevertheless, such a practice is often retained precisely because it has been institutionalized, without regard for what the institutional member feels about the practice. But, then, such a member is no longer performing the ritual and saying the formula for any intrinsic purpose. He does it as an expression of loyalty to the institution.

So, we may conclude, did it happen with regard to the prayers and memorials for rain and dew. What once constituted the foremost imagery for the expression and contemplation of the Jew's eschatological hopes and expectations eventually became nothing but quaint reminiscences of the life of his people in another time and place.

FOOTNOTES

- 1) From the Bible we know that the main season for the fall of dew was in the late spring - early summer, that is, around the time of the first harvest (Hos. 14:6-8, Prov. 19:12, Isa. 18:4, Job 29:19; Judges 6:37-38,40). That this condition has remained relatively unchanged over the intervening millenia seems apparent from the findings listed on the dew-measurement chart in the Encyclopedia Judaica, Vol. V, pp. 1601-1602, which records the annual dewfall for the years 1947-1954. This would confirm that the heaviest periods of dewfall are in the months of May through September, although measureable amounts fall throughout the balance of the year, as well.

- 2) "In effect rains fall in Israel only during the period October through May, which is called 'the rainfall season.' The three central rainy months - the 'winter' of the temperate climates, December, January, and February - contribute two-thirds to three-quarters of the annual rainfall in most regions of the country."

 "Rain - Seasonal Distribution or Regimen of Rainfall"; Encyclopedia Judaica, Vol. XIII; Jerusalem; Keter Publishing Co., Ltd.; 1972; pp. 1522-1523

- 3) "Why are the granaries of Babylonia always filled with grain? Because there is an abundance of water."
 Rabbi Oshaya
 Taanit 10a

 "Babylonia is rich because the harvest is gathered even when there is no rain."
 Rav
 Taanit 10a

Taanit 22b notes that public prayers were offered in Babylonia in order to restrain the peril of flood.

Jeremiah 51:13 addresses Babylon as "thou that dwellest upon many waters, abundant in treasures."

 In Taanit 20a we are told by R. Judah b. Ezekiel that in his day the Sassanians had excluded Jews from being canal supervisors.

- 4) Deut. 33:6
- 5) Ezek. 34:26-27
- 6) Joel 2:23

- 7) Deut. 11:16-17; 28:15, 23-24; I Kings 8:35-36; Jer. 5:23-25
- 8) Micah 7:12
- 9) Ibid. 7:12-13
- 10) Joel 4:19
- 11) Zeph. 2:13-15
- 12) Jer. 50:12-13; 51:43
- 13) Amos 1:2; Isa. 64:8-9; Jer. 4:26-27
- 14) Jer. 3:2-3
- 15) Deut. 26:12-15; Mal. 3:8-10
- 16) Joel 1:15-20; Jer. 14:1-7
- 17) Pss. 68:7c
- 18) Gen. 27:28
- 19) Ibid. 27:39
- 20) Ibid. 49:22,25
- 21) Deut. 33:13
- 22) "And the angel of the Lord said unto (Hagar): 'Return to thy mistress and submit thyself under her hands.' And the angel of the Lord said unto her: 'I will greatly multiply thy seed, that it shall not be numbered for multitude.' And the angel of the Lord said unto her: 'Behold, thou art with child and shall bear a son; and thou shalt call his name Ishmael, because the Lord hath heard thy affliction... And she called the name of the Lord that spoke unto her, Thou art a God of seeing; for she said: 'Have I even here seen Him that seeth me?' Wherefore the well was called Beer-lahai-roi."

"And God heard the voice of the lad; and the angel of God called to Hagar out of heaven and said unto her: 'What aileth thee, Hagar? fear not; for God hath heard the voice of the lad where he is. Arise, lift up the lad and hold him fast by the hand; for I will make him a great nation.' And God opened her eyes and she saw a well of water; and she went and filled the bottle with water and gave the lad to drink. And God was with the lad, and he grew..."

"And it came to pass after the death of Abraham that God blessed Isaac his son; and Isaac dwelt in Beer-lahai-roi."

- 23) Deut. 8:7
- 24) Ibid. 33:29
- 25) Isa. 41:17-18, cf., Isa. 43:19-21
- 26) Lev. 26:4; Deut. 11:10-17; 28:12; Isa. 30:23-25
- 27) Hos. 6:1-3; 14:2-9; Joel 2:18-27; Ezek. 34:24-31; 36:24-30
- 28) Judges 5:4-5; Pss. 29, passim; 68:9-10; 147:7-8
- 29) Jer. 2:13; 17:13; Isa. 55:1-2; Pss. 36:9-10
- 30) Ex. 16:4; Num. 11:9; Pss. 78:24
- 31) Deut. 32:1, ff.; Pss. 147:15-18
- 32) Joel 3:1-2
- 33) Isa. 49:10
- 34) Isa. 55:10-11
- 35) Isa. 58:11; cf., Pss. 1:3; 36:6-10; Job 29:19-20
Jer. 17:7-8
- 36) Hos. 6:3
- 37) Hos. 14:6
- 38) Pss. 63:2
- 39) Zech. 14:16-19
- 40) Rosh Hashana 16a, cf., T. Y. Rosh Hashana 27:2
- 41) Taan. 2b
- 42) For extensive discussion of these magical and symbolic implications pertaining to the palm-branch in particular, see:
Paul Romanoff; "Jewish Symbols on Ancient Jewish Coins - Palm and Palm Branch"; Jewish Quarterly Review, Vol. XXXIII (1942-1943); Philadelphia; pp. 435, ff.
- 43) Mishna Taan. 1:1
- 44) Ibid.

- 45) Op. Cit.; passim
- 46) Mishna Taan. 1:2
- 47) Ibid.
- 48) Ibid.; cf., Mishna Taan. 1:2, where Rabbi Judah and Rabbi Eliezer appear to disagree over the efficacy of pronouncing the memorial phrase in public, insofar as it suggests an outright call for the inception of the rains; if, as Eliezer holds, it is only a 'memorializing', then there is no danger of the rains coming prematurely, effecting a curse upon the festival; if, as Judah implies, the mention were indeed of no efficacy, then one might as well mention the Power of the Rains all year long; that the halakha concerning the inception of the memorial phrase restricts it to the end of the festival suggests that the mere mentioning in itself possessed efficacy for promoting rainfall.
- 49) Mishna Taan. 1:3
- 50) Ibid.
- 51) Shab. 32b
- 52) Yoma 53b
- 53) Mishna Sot. 9:12
- 54) Mishna Taan. 3:1
- 55) Ibid. 3:2
- 56) cf., Mishna Rosh Hashana 4:5-6
- 57) Mishna Taan. 3:4
- 58) Ibid.; There is a discrepancy in the text between the number of proposed benedictions (i.e., six) and the number of gedolim (i.e., seven) to which they are related.
- 59) For a full discussion of the doctrine, see: Ephraim A. Urbach; Hazal - Pirkei Emunot V'deot; Jerusalem; Hebrew University Press; 1971; pp. 440,ff.
- 60) Ber. Rab. 66
- 61) Mishna Ber. 2:2; Mishna Tam. 5:1
- 62) Ber. 61b
- 63) ARN 40

- 64) Ber. 56b
- 65) Mid. Teh. 68:7
- 66) Ket. 111b
- 67) San. 90b-91b, passim
- 68) II Macc. 7:9-11; II Esdras 2:16,45; 7:32; Wis. of Sol. 5:15,f.
- 69) Enoch 58:3; 91:10; 100:5; Apoc. of Bar. 21:22-24; 42:7-8
- 70) Matt. 22:23,ff.; Mark 12:18,ff.; Luke 20:27,ff.; Acts 4:1-2
- 71) Wars II. 8:2-14; Antiquities XVIII. 1:4,ff.
- 72) San. 90b; 91a
- 73) San. 90b; cf., Ber. Rab. 28:3; Lev. Rab. 18:1
- 74) San. 90b; 91b
- 75) PRE 33, end
- 76) San. 90b
- 77) Ibid.
- 78) San. 91a; 91b; Ket. 111a
- 79) San. 90b - 91b, passim; Mishna San. 10:1
- 80) San. 90b; cf., ARN 5 concerning Sadducean denial of the resurrection of the dead
- 81) M' shna Ber. 9:5
- 82) Mishna San. 10:1
- 83) Op. Cit.; p. 23 above
- 84) San. 90b, citing Isa. 26:19
- 85) PRE 33
- 86) San. 90b
- 87) Ber. Rab. 28:3; Lev. Rab. 18:1
- 88) Op. Cit.; R. Eliezer, p. 23, Rabban Gamliel, p. 26

- 89) Mishna Ber. 5:2
- 90) Taan. 2b
- 90a) Solomon Schechter; "Genizah Specimens"; Jewish Quarterly Review, Vol. X (Old Series), 1898; New York; KTAV Publishing Co. (1966); pp. 654-659
- 91) Mishna Ber. 9:2
- 91a) Taan. 31a; Ber. 48b; T.X. Taan. 4:5
- 91b) Arthur Marmorstein; "The Amidah of the Public Fast Days"; Contributions to the Scientific Study of Jewish Liturgy; Jakob Peteuchowski, ed.; New York; KTAV Publishing Co.; 1970; p. 451
- 91c) Isa. 61:1-3; cf., Isa. 40:9, 52:7; Pss. 96:2
- 92) Mishna Ber. 9:2 (reading with the Yerushalmi)
- 93) Mishna Ber. 6:8
- 94) Ezek. 37:4
- 95) Mishna Ber. 5:2
- 96) Arthur Marmorstein; "A Misunderstood Question in the Yerushalmi"; Jewish Quarterly Review, Vol. XX (1929-1930); Philadelphia; pp. 313-320
- 97) Ibid.; p. 319
- 98) Ibid.
- 99) Ibid.
- 100) Mekhilta, Parashat B'shalach 5
- 101. Sifrei D'varim, Piska 42:14
- 102) Ibid.; Piska 39
- 103) Ibid.; citing Gen. 27:28, Deut. 32:2, Hos. 14:6, Mic. 5:6
- 104) Taan. 6a
- 105) Ber. Rab. 13:4
- 106) Supra., pp. 17-18
- 107) PRE 32
- 108) Sifrei D'varim, Piska 33:1

- 109) T. Y. Taan. 1:1; cf., T. B. Ber. 9a
- 110) Ber. Rab. 75
- 111) Sifrei D'varim, Piska 28
- 112) PRK, Piska 1:4
- 113) Sifrei D'varim, Piska 40:12
- 114) For a full discussion of this notion, see:
Theodore Gaster; The Festivals of the Jewish Year;
New York; A Commentary Classic; 1952, 1953; pp. 109, ff.
- 115) Sifrei D'varim, Piska 40:12
- 116) Taan. 23b
- 117) Ibid., 8a
- 118) Mid. Teh. 119:1
- 119) T. Y. Taan. 1:1; cf., T. Y. Ber. 5:2
- 120) Taan. 8b
- 121) Ibid., 7b
- 122) Ibid.
- 123) "When heaven is shut up and there is no rain, when they do sin against Thee, if they pray toward this place, and confess Thy name and turn from their sin when Thou dost afflict them, then hear Thou in heaven and forgive the sin of Thy servants and of Thy people Israel, when Thou teachest them the good way wherein they should walk; and send rain upon Thy land, which Thou hast given to Thy people as an inheritance."
- 124) Taan. 6a - Rav Hanilai b. Iddi for Samuel
- 125) See Resh Lakish's notion of Judgement Day in Avodah Zarah 3b-4a
- 126) Taan. 5b
- 127) Sifrei D'varim, Piska 306:2
- 128) Taan. 7a
- 129) Sifrei D'varim, Piska 306:2
- 130) Chaim Nachman Bialik; J. Ch. Ravnitzky; Sefer Ha-aggadah;
Tel-Aviv; Dvir Press; 1956; pp. 203-215

- 131) A typical summary of these and related expectations can be found in Shemot Rabbah 15
- 132) Shem. Rab. 15
- 133) Ber. Rab. 66, citing Pss. 133:3
- 134) R. Nehemiah in Shem. Rab. 15 and Resh Lakish in Lev. Rab. 36
- 135) Taan. 10a, an anonymous B'raita
- 136) Rabbis Eliezer and Joshua; Supra.; pp. 17-18
- 137) cf., Taan. 7b, where R. Hama bar Hanina says, "Great is the day of the rains as the day in which the heavens and the earth were created", citing Isaiah 45:8 as his text
- 138) PRK 5:7, for the opinion that Nisan is to be the month of the inception of the Redemption
PRE 32 and Sotah 12b, for the view that Erev Pesach will be the inception date for the Redemption
- 139) In some opinions, only in the Land of Israel: see Rabbi Eleazar in the name of Rabbi Simon commenting on Ezek. 37:12 in the Rabbati, as well as Midrash Tanchuma, Parashat Va-Yechi 3
- 140) PRK 5:9; Of the particular seven-year period preceding the coming of the Messiah, the Rabbis taught that in the first year "...I caused it to rain upon one city, and caused it not to rain upon another city; one piece was rained upon, and the piece whereupon it rained not withered" (Amos 4:7)
- 141) Ket. 112b
- 142) Joel 2:23
- 143) Mid. Teh. 126:4, citing proof from II Sam. 22:16, f. See also, Taan. 8b where R. Yochanan gives the same exegesis
- 144) San. 90a - 92a, passim.
- 145) San. 91a
- 146) Shab. 88b
- 147) Hag. 12b
- 148) T. Y. Taan. 1:1, cf., T. Y. Ber. 5:2

- 149) Taan. 2a
- 150) San. 113, end: This aggadah and the parallel one in T. Y. Taan. 1:1 and T. Y. Ber. 5:2 are only comprehensible if it is acknowledged that the authors saw Elijah as having to rescind his vow to withhold rain and dew (I Kg. 17:1) in order to revitalize the widow's deceased son (17:21-22) through the good agency of dew; note also that in I Kg. 18:1 God does not have to make mention of releasing the dew, having already had to do so to enable the widow's son's resurrection
- 151) T. Y. Taan. 1:1; cf., T. Y. Ber. 5:2
- 152) Pes. 68a; San. 91a
- 153) Ber. Rab. 13:6
- 154) Ber. 33a; Taan. 7a; cf., R. Hia bar Abba in Ber. Rab. 13:6
- 155) San. 90b
- 156) San. 90b, Soncino Talmud translation
- 157) T. Y. Taan. 1:1; T. Y. Ber. 5:2, citing Hos. 6:3
- 158) The identifiable sources cited in this paper thus far cover a period from the era of Yavneh (ca. 70-130 C.E.) to R. Isaac (ca. 350 C.E.)
- 159) There is an apocryphal tale relating that when it was discovered that it was possible to impose a subliminal message onto the frames of a motion picture film, the director, Alfred Hitchcock, had technicians depict a death's head image upon those scenes intended to produce fear in the viewer. The image would, of course, only register in the viewer's unconscious mind, but would be all the more effective for heightening anxiety thereby.
- 160) Taan. 7b
- 161) Ibid. 2a
- 162) Ber. 29a
- 163) Ibid. 9a
- 164) Ibid. 29a
- 165) Taan. 6b
- 166) B. M. 85b
- 167) Ber. 58b

- 168) Ber. 58b
- 169) Supra., p. 29
- 170) Rabbinic nomenclature consisted of an enormous lexicon for designating "rain", eg., מטר, רביבים, מלקוש, יורה, שלג, גשם שוטף, גשם אפיל, גשם רביעה.
Why not treat טו as just another manifestation?
- 171) T. Y. Taan. 1:1
- 172) Ibid.
- 173) Taan. 3b
- 174) T. Y. Taan. 1:1
- 175) Taan. 3a-b
- 176) Ibid.
- 177) Supra., p. 29
- 178) Taan. 4a
- 179) Israel Davidson; Machzor Yanai; New York; Jewish Theological Seminary; 1919; p. xii
- 180) "Kallir, Eleazar"; Encyclopedia Judaica, Vol. X; Jerusalem; Keter Publishing House, Ltd.; 1972; pp. 713
- 181) Loc. Cit., Supra.
- 182) Ibid., p. xxi
- 183) Ibid., p. xxiii
- 184) Israel Davidson, ed.; Genizah Studies (Vol. III) Liturgical and Secular Poetry; New York; Sefer Hermon Press; 1928, 1969; p. 2
- 185) Ibid.
- 186) Menachem Zulay, ed.; Piyyutei Yannai; Berlin; Schocken Books; 1938
- 187) Ibid., p. 25
- 188) Ibid., p. 42
- 189) Ibid., p. 52
- 190) Ibid., p. 75

- 191) Ibid., p. 82
- 192) Ibid., p. 96
- 193) Ibid., p. 104
- 194) Ibid., p. 144
- 195) Ibid., p. 165
- 196) Ibid., p. 171
- 197) Ibid., p. 191
- 198) Ibid., p. 220
- 199) Ibid., p. 226
- 200) Ibid., p. 64
- 201) Ibid., p. 64
- 202) Ibid., p. 89
- 203) Ibid., p. 252
- 204) Ibid.
- 205) Menachem Zulay, Ad. Loc.
- 206) I. Davidson; Genizah III; pp. 22-23
- 207) M. Zulay, Op. Cit.; pp. 361-363
- 208) Ibid., pp. 386-387
- 209) I. Davidson, Loc. Cit.; p. 7
- 210) Ibid., p. 37
- 211) Ibid., p. 40
- 212) Ibid., p. 41
- 213) Ibid., p. 44
- 214) Ibid., p. 46
- 215) For a full discussion of the belief that Isaac was believed to have been resuscitated from death after the Akedah, see:
Shalom Spiegel; The Last Trial; Judah Goldin, trans.; New York; Schocken Books; 1950, 1969; pp. 28-37

- 216) Ismar Elbogen; "Kalir's Geschem-Komposition"; Jewish Studies in Memory of George Alexander Kohut; New York; 1935; pp. 170 - 177
- 217) "Kallir"; Encyclopedia Judaica; Op. Cit.
- 218) I. Elbogen; Loc. Cit.; p. 177
- 219) Herman Adler, Arthur Davis, ed.; Service of the Synagogue Tabernacles; London; George Routledge and Sons, Ltd.; (Fourth Edition); 1920 - 1922; p. 174
- 220) Ibid.
- 221) Ezek. 37:1-2
- 222) H. Adler, A. Davis; Loc. Cit.; pp. 177-178
- 223) Ibid., pp. 179-180
- 224) Ibid., p. 181
- 225) Ibid., p. 184
- 226) Ibid., p. 185
- 227) I. Elbogen; Loc. Cit.; pp. 170-171
- 228) I. Elbogen; Loc. Cit.
 Also see:
 I. Elbogen; "Kalir Studies"; Hebrew Union College Annual, Vol. III (1926); Cincinnati; pp. 215-224
 פליישר, עזרא; "לקדמוניות פיוטי הטל (והגשם)"; קבץ על
 יד, "ח" (י'ח); ירושלים; הוצאה מדיצי נרדמים;
 1976; עמ' צג-קלט
- 229) Elbogen, in his "Kalir Studies" (Loc. Cit., page 216), notes that no such systematic study has been done unto his time, while Fleischer (Loc. Cit., page 108) acknowledges that such symbolism exists, but makes no effort to detail his observation.
- 230) I. Elbogen; "Kalir Studies"; HUCA III; p. 216
- 231) Ibid., p. 219
- 232) eg., Adler and Davis' nachzors contain only the acrostic third sections of the piyyutin
- 233) David De Sola Pool, ed; The Traditional Prayer Book; New York; Behrman House Publishing; 1960; pp. 565 - 569, 493-495

- 233a) Though Schechter's text of the Gavurot Benediction exposed us to a similar phrasing regarding dew, the manuscript from which it is derived is from the Cairo Genizah collection and, therefore, its date of composition is uncertain. Though the tradition recorded there may be considerably older, there is no way of knowing that it antedates the ninth or tenth century. Kallir, on the other hand, certainly lived no later than the eighth, and possibly even the seventh century. For the moment, then, we are indebted to him for preserving this formula.
- 234) The texts employed in our study derive from the following published works:
- British Museum Codex 613 (14th - 15th century)
Sulzberger Codex, Jewish Theological Seminary (1516 C.E.)
Oxford Codex 1095, Bodleian Library (1426 C.E.)

These texts appear in:

David Hedegard, ed.; Seder Rav Amram Gaon; Sweden; Motala, Broderna Borgstroms AB; 1951

Our text of Siddur Saadia is that of:

Israel Davidson, Simcha Asaf, Issachar Joel, ed.; Siddur Rav Saadia Gaon; Jerusalem; M'kitzel Nirdamim Publishing; 1941

- 235) Seder Rav Amram Gaon (SRAG); pp. 34-35
- 236) Ibid.
- 237) Ibid., p. 34
- 238) Ha-Manhig XVI of R. Abraham (ca. 12th - 13th century) cites the recitation of this memorial in the summer season as a Provençal custom
- Also see:
Spanish Siddur, Xerox University Microfilm #4531, believed to date from the 15th century
- Moses Gaster, ed.; Order of Prayer According to the Rite of the London Sephardic Congregation; London; Henry Frowde, Publisher; 1901 - 1906
- 239) That there were multiple traditions for the wording of the entire Shemoneh Esrei, even as late as the era of the medieval student of liturgy, Abudraham, is indicated by his remark:

נראה לי שאין לו (לשמונה עשרה) יסוד ולא שורש כי לא חמצא מקום בעולם שאומר שמונה עשרי בענין אחד חיבה בחיבה אלא יש מוסיפין חיבות...

אבודרהם השלם; הוצאת אושא; ירושלים; תשי"ט; עמ' קה

- 240) Siddur Rav Saadia Gaon (SRS); pp. 20-21
- 241) Ibid., pp. 22-23
- 242) SRAG; pp. 35-36
- 243) Ibid.
- 244) Ibid.
- 245) The significance of this quote is that if there is an abundance of produce the profiteers will not be able to oppress the poor with high prices
- 246) SRAG; p. 40
- 247) The familiar midrash on Ezek. 16:6, where "blood" (literally, "bloods") occurs as an instrumentality to life, links the two manifestations of blood in Jewish history (dam milah and dam ha-pesach) to the obtaining of salvation; both milah and geulah, of course, are also linked to the personage of Elijah, a figure of pre-eminent eschatological significance
- 248) SRS; p. 22
- 249) Ibid., p. 185
- 250) This exegesis is supplied by the editors of SRS in a footnote to the original text
- 251) SRS; p. 380
- 252) Ibid., p. 381
- 253) "Agriculture"; Encyclopedia Judaica, Vol. III; pp. 401-403
- "...from the end of the eighth century agriculture became a marginal Jewish occupation in both Christian and Muslim lands." (p. 401)
- "...in the greater part of medieval France and Germany...the Jews who engaged in agriculture were the exception rather than the rule" (p. 403)
- 254) Heinrich Brody, ed.; Selected Poems of Judah Halevi; Philadelphia; Jewish Publication Society of America; 1924, 1974; pp. 99-102
- 254a) Undoubtedly, the opinion expressed here is based only upon my own subjective criteria. Others are welcome to their own interpretation, which might include the claim that the imagery still possessed mythopoetic vitality for both the poet and his potential audience.

255) נפתלי בן-מנחם; "תפלות של וגשם לרבי אברהם אבן עזרא";
מנחה לאברהם - ספר יובל לכבוד אברהם אלמאליח: ירושלים;
חשיט

256) Ibid., pp. 99-102

257) Ibid., pp. 105-108

258) Ibid., pp. 99-100

259) Ibid., p. 99

260) Ibid., p. 102

261) Ibid., pp. 102-108

262) It may be noted that whenever an act of "resurrection" was effected at the hands of Elijah or Elisha it was connected in the mind of the author of Pirkei D'Rabbi Eliezer to some prior act of kindness performed by the recipient (or his family) who received the miraculous intervention; presumably, this was viewed as a fulfillment of the promise, "Tzedakah tatzil mi-mavet."

263) N. Ben-Menachem; Op. Cit.; p. 105

264) Lived in the late-tenth to early eleventh centuries; center of activity in Mainz; was highly regarded as both a posek and payvetan by Rabbenu Gershom and Rashi

265) A payvetan also resident in Mainz, ca. 1020

266) His center of power was Mainz, from the mid-tenth to the early eleventh centuries

267) He dwelt in Mainz, where he was the elder colleague of Rabbenu Gershom; as a payvetan he was heavily influenced by Kallir and Moses b. Kalonymus

268) He studied in Mainz and functioned throughout the latter eleventh century

269) Herman Adler, Arthur Davis, ed.; Service of the Synagogue - Passover; London; George Routledge and Sons, Ltd.; Fourth Edition; 1920 -1922; p. 257

270) Ibid.; p. 231

271) Ibid.; p. 232

272) circa, 1230 - 1232

273) Adler and Davis; Tabernacles; pp. 234 - 235

- 274) Ibid.; p. 60
- 275) Ibid.; pp. 49 - 50
- 276) Ibid.; p. 58
- 277) For the origins of this notion see, Isaiah 65:13-25 and Zechariah 14:6-9
- 278) Adler and Davis; Tabernacles; p. 237
This piyyut is of uncertain authorship, but the opening phrase אֵל כְּאִשּׁוֹן נִצְרָה also appears in the work entitled שְׁמִינִי אֶשְׁכֵּן לֵב, which is attributed to Daniel ben Jacob (which may be found in this volume on pp. 234 - 235).
- 279) Hagahot to SeMaK 2:11; cf., Tur, Orach Chaim 114
- 280) The psychiatrist, Viktor E. Frankl, founder of the psychotherapeutic school of Logotherapy, has observed and taken issue with this tendency:

I once came across a quotation defining man as "nothing but a complex biochemical mechanism powered by a combustion system which energizes computers with prodigious storage facilities for retaining encoded information." ...The statement is erroneous only insofar as man is defined as "nothing but" a computer. Today nihilism no longer unmasks itself by speaking of "nothingness." Today nihilism is masked by speaking of the "nothing-but-ness" of man. Reductionism has become the mask of nihilism.

Viktor E. Frankl; The Will To Meaning - Foundations and Applications of Logotherapy; New York; New American Library; 1969; p. 21

- 281) August Wunsche; Die Sagen vom Lebensbaum und Lebenswasser; Leipzig; 1905
- 282) Ibid.; p. 71,f.
- 283) Ibid.; p. 74
- 284) Ibid.; pp. 74-75
- 285) Raphael Patai; "The Control of Rain in Ancient Palestine - A Study in Comparative Religion"; Hebrew Union College Annual, Vol. XIV (1939); Cincinnati; pp. 251 - 286

רפאל פטאי; הכים - מחקר לידועת הארץ ולגולגלור ארץ-
ישראל בתקופות העקרא והמסונה; הוצאת דביר; תל-אביב;
תרצו

- 286) R. Patai; "Control of Rain"; pp. 281-282
- 287) Ernst Cassirer; Language and Myth; Suzanne K. Langer, trans.; New York; Dover Books; 1946, 1953; p. 24
- 288) Ibid.; p. 26
- 289) Ibid.; pp. 91 - 92
- 290) Ibid.; p. 90
- 291) Ibid.; p. 35
- 292) Ibid.; p. 33
- 293) Ibid.
- 294) Ibid.; p. 41
- 295) Psalms 18:3,32
- 296) Psalms 27:1
- 297) Psalms 35:3
- 298) Psalms 121:5
- 299) Psalms 91:4
- 300) E. Cassirer; Op. Cit.; p. 86
- 301) Ibid.; p. 56
- 302) Gen. 16:7
- 303) Ibid.; 21:19
- 304) Ibid.; 26:19
- 305) Ex. 14:22
- 306) Ibid.; 15:25
- 307) Ibid.; 17:6
- 308) Num. 20:8
- 309) Ibid.; 21:16,ff.
- 310) Josh. 3:13,ff.
- 311) Judges 5:4,21
- 312) I Kgs. 17:1; 18:1

- 313) Ex. 16:4,14-15
- 314) Eccl. 1:7
- 315) E. Cassirer; Op. Cit.; p. 97
- 316) Claude Levi-Strauss; The Savage Mind; Chicago; University of Chicago Press; 1966, 1970; p. 22
- 317) Ibid.; pp. 16-22
- 318) Ibid.; p. 17
- 319) Ibid.; p. 18
- 320) Ibid.; p. 95
- 321) Albert Camus; The Myth of Sisyphus and Other Essays; New York; Alfred A. Knopf, Publisher; 1967; pp. 19-20
- 322) C. Levi-Strauss; Op. Cit.; p. 21
- 323) Ibid.; p. 22
- 324) Ibid.; p. 93
- 325) Claude Levi-Strauss; Totemism; Boston; Beacon Press; 1963
- 326) Ibid.; p. 41
- 327) Though I cannot recall the exact source of this quotation, I believe that it occurs in:
Gordon W. Allport; Pattern and Growth in Personality; New York; Holt, Rinehart, and Winston; 1961
- 328) As cited in C. Levi-Strauss' Totemism, page 90
- 329) C. Levi-Strauss; Totemism; p. 89
- 330) This diagram is based on a similar presentation in C. Levi-Strauss' The Savage Mind, page 93
- 331) Philip Wheelwright; "The Semantic Approach to Myth"; Myth - A Symposium; Thomas A. Sebeok, ed.; Bloomington, Indiana; Indiana University Press; 1965; pp. 154-168
- 332) Ibid.; p. 155
It should be noted that this form of myth seems to be the equivalent of what Cassirer, too, regards as the fundament of myth.
- 333) Ibid.

- 334) P. Wheelwright; Op. Cit.; p. 156
- 335) Ibid.; p. 157
- 336) Philip Wheelwright: Metaphor and Reality; Bloomington, Indiana; Indiana University Press; 1962, 1973; p. 33
- 337) Ibid.
- 338) Ibid.; pp. 45-69
- 339) This Herbert Read's definition, as cited in P. Wheelwright, "The Semantic Approach", page 158
- 340) P. Wheelwright; Metaphor; p. 71
- 341) Ibid.
- 342) These examples are Wheelwright's (Ibid.)
- 343) Ibid.; p. 93
- 344) Ibid.; p. 98
- 345) Ibid.; p. 95
- 346) Ibid.
- 347) P. Wheelwright; "The Semantic Approach"; pp. 165-167
- 348) Ibid.
- 349) Ibid.; pp. 166-167
- 350) P. Wheelwright; Metaphor; p. 47

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adler, Herman; Davis, Arthur, ed.; Service of the Synagogue - Passover : Tabernacles; London; George Routledge and Sons, Ltd.; (Fourth Edition); 1920-1922
- The Apocrypha - The Oxford Annotated Bible with the Apocrypha; New York; Oxford University Press; 1965
- Brody, Heinrich, ed.; Selected Poems of Judah Halevi; Philadelphia; Jewish Publication Society of America; 1924, 1974
- Camus, Albert; The Myth of Sisyphus and Other Essays; Justin O'Brien, trans.; New York; Alfred A. Knopf; 1967
- Cassirer, Ernst; Language and Myth; Suzanne K. Langer, trans.; New York; Dover Publications; 1946, 1953
- Davidson, Israel, ed.; Genizah Studies - Liturgical and Secular Poetry, Vol. III; New York; Sefer Hermon Press; 1928, 1959
- De Sola Pool, David, ed.; The Traditional Prayer Book; New York; Behrman House; 1960
- Elbogen, Ismar; "Kalir Studies"; Hebrew Union College Annual, Vol. III (1926); Cincinnati
- _____ ; "Kalir's Geschem-Komposition"; Jewish Studies In Memory Of George Alexander Kohut; New York; 1935
- Encyclopedia Judaica; Keter Publishing House, Ltd.; Jerusalem, Israel; 1972
- Finkelstein, Louis; "The Development of the Amidah"; Jewish Quarterly Review, Vol. XVI (1925-1926); Philadelphia
- Gaster, Theodore; The Festivals of the Jewish Year; New York; Commentary Classic; 1952, 1953
- Goodenough, Erwin E.; Jewish Symbols In The Greco-Roman Period, Vol. V; Princeton; The Bollingen Library - Princeton University Press; 1956
- Hedegard, David, ed.; Seder Rav Amram Gaon; Sweden; Motala, Broderna Borgstroms AB; 1951
- The Holy Scriptures According to the Massoretic Text; Philadelphia; Jewish Publication Society of America; 1917, 1955
- Idelsohn, A. Z.; Jewish Liturgy and Its Development; New York; Schocken Books; 1932, 1967

Josephus, Flavius; The Jewish Wars

_____ ; Antiquities of the Jews

Kohler, Kaufmann; "The Origin and Composition of the Eighteen Benedictions with a Translation of the Corresponding Essene Prayers in the Apostolic Constitutions"; Contributions to the Scientific Study of Jewish Liturgy; Jakob Peteuchowski, ed.; New York; KTAV Publishing Company; 1970

Levi-Strauss, Claude; The Savage Mind; Chicago; University of Chicago Press; 1966, 1970

_____ ; Totemism; Boston; Beacon Press; 1963

Marmorstein, Arthur; "A Misunderstood Question in the Yerushalmi"; Jewish Quarterly Review, Vol. XX (1929-1930); Philadelphia

_____ ; "Resurrection of the Dead"; Studies in Jewish Theology by Arthur Marmorstein; J. Rabinowitz, Meyer S. Lew, ed.; Oxford; Oxford University Press; 1950

_____ ; "The Amidah of the Public Fast Days"; Contributions to the Scientific Study of Jewish Liturgy; Jakob Peteuchowski, ed.; New York; KTAV Publishing Company; 1970

The New Testament - The New English Bible with the Apocrypha; New York; Oxford University Press; 1976

Patai, Raphael; "The Control of Rain in Ancient Palestine - A Study in Comparative Religion"; Hebrew Union College Annual, Vol. XIV (1939); Cincinnati

Romanoff, Paul; "Jewish Symbols on Ancient Jewish Coins"; Jewish Quarterly Review, Vol. XXXIII (1942-1943) Philadelphia

Schechter, Solomon; "Genizah Specimens"; Jewish Quarterly Review (Old Series), Vol. X (1898); New York; KTAV Publishing Company; 1966

Sebeok, Thomas A., ed.; Myth - A Symposium; Bloomington; Indiana University Press; 1965

Spanish Siddur; Xerox University Microfilms, #4531; Ann Arbor, Michigan

Spiegel, Shalom; The Last Trial; Judah Goldin, trans.; New York; Schocken Books; 1950, 1969

Wheelwright, Philip; Metaphor and Reality; Bloomington, Indiana; Indiana University Press; 1962, 1973

Wünsche, August; Die Sagen vom Lebensbaum und Lebenswasser; Leipzig; 1905

אבודרהם השלם; ירושלים; הוצאת אושא; 1959

אבן-שמואל, יהודה; מדרשי גאולה - פרקי האפוקוליפסיה היהודית
מחתימת התלמוד הבבלי ועד ראשית האלף הששי; ירושלים -
תל-אביב; מוסד ביאליק על-ידי מסדה; 1954

אורבר, אפרים א.; חז"ל - פרקי אמונות ודעות; ירושלים; אוניבר-
סיטה העברית; 1971

ביאליק, חיים נחמן יח. רבניצקי (מחברים); ספר האגדה; תל-אביב;
הוצאת דביר; 1956

בן-מנחם, נפתלי (מחבר); "תפלות סל וגשם לרבי אברהם אבן עזרא";
מנחה לאברהם - ספר יובל לכבוד אברהם אלמאליה;
ירושלים; 1951

דאווידזאן, ישראל (מחבר); מחזור ינאי - כפי מה שנמצא ממנו
בגניזה אשר במצרים בהוספת פיוטי ינאי האחרים;
ניו יורק; בית מדרש רבנים באמריקה; 1919

דודזון, ישראל; אסף, שמחה; יואל, יששכר (מחברים); סדור רב
סעדיה גאון; ירושלים; הוצאת מיקצי נרדמים; 1941

זולאי, מנחם (מחבר); פיוטי ינאי - מלוקטים מחוך כתבי הגניזה
ומקורות אחרים; בארלין; הוצאת שוכן; 1938

מדרש -

אבות דרבי נתן

בראשית רבה

דברים רבה

ויקרא רבה

ילקוט שמעוני

מדרש תהלים

מכילתא דרבי ישמעאל

ספרי על במדבר

ספרי על דברים

פסקתא דרב כהנה

פסקתא רבתי

פרקי אבות

פרקי דרבי אליעזר

קהלת רבה

שיר השירים רבה

שמות רבה

תנחומא ילמדינו

משנה (מסכתות)

- ברכות
- סוטה
- סנהדרין
- ראש השנה
- תמיד
- תענית

פסאי, רפאל; המים - מחקר לידיעת הארץ ולפולקלור ארצישראלי
 בחקופת המקרא והמשנה; תל-אביב; דביר ב"מ; חרצ"י

פליישר, עזרא; "לקדמוניות פיוטי הטל (והגשם) - קרובה קדם
 ינאית לגבורות סל"; קבץ על יד ח' (יח); ירושלים;
 מקיצי נרדמים; 1976

שירת-הקודש העברית בימי הביניים; ירושלים;
 כתר; 1975

Hebrew; "קומפוזיציות קליריות לחשעה באב";
Union College Annual, Vol. XLV (1974), Cincinnati

תלמוד בבלי (מסכתות)

- בבא מציעה
- ברכות
- חגיגה
- יומא
- כתובות
- נדרים
- סוטה
- סנהדרין
- עבודה זרה
- פסחים
- ראש השנה
- שבת
- תענית

תלמוד ירושלמי (מסכתות)

- ברכות
- ראש השנה
- תענית

תרגום אונקלוס