

Prayer and Piyyuṭ in the Worms Maḥzor

Ezra Fleischer

A. TYPOLOGY OF THE MAḤZOR

THE CODEX KNOWN as the "Worms *Maḥzor*" is one of the most impressive liturgical manuscripts to have come down to us from the legacy of mediaeval Ashkenazi Jewry. Its remarkable scope, the wealth of its contents, its imposing artistic format, its texts and vocalizations, as well as the customs reflected in it present us with a wealth of information on many aspects of the lives of our ancestors, who created it. The rite of the Codex was first described by the late Dr. Daniel Goldschmidt in an article published in *Kiryat Sefer* in 1959.¹ Since this publication there has been no detailed study of the liturgy of this *Maḥzor*,² as, at first glance, nothing in it seemed surprising in this regard. Though it pre-dates most extant liturgical manuscripts from Central Europe, its content was described as reflecting the more-or-less usual rite of western Ashkenaz. The almost final arrangement of this rite was thus shown to pre-date our Codex. However, this impression, though correct in principle, is not totally accurate. True, the Ashkenazi rite, or more precisely the rite of the Rhenish communities and of western Germany, was formulated before the writing of the Worms *Maḥzor*.³ But a closer examination of the prayers and the *piyyuṭim* included in the *Maḥzor*, of how they were copied, and of what was stressed or glossed over, reveals several interesting points. Though not necessarily exceptional in the given context, they still serve to enrich and to diversify our knowledge of the wording of the prayers and, most importantly, of the mode of prayer in the early German synagogues. Some of these modes have been described in the later *Minhagim* (=Customs) literature, but they apparently

have never been documented from early prayer books. An examination of the present Codex allows us in many cases to verify these prayer rites, to ascertain their antiquity, and to precisely and correctly explain them.

The impression that the Worms *Maḥzor* is a rather standard Ashkenazi *maḥzor* can be attributed in large measure to its internal structure. The extant mediaeval prayer books, early and late, belong to several types. There are those which can be called *siddurim*, which present mainly the texts of the regular prayers for both community and individual, for weekdays and Sabbath. These manuscripts sometimes also contain *piyyuṭim* for special Sabbaths, *halakhot* concerning prayer, commentaries on the prayers and *piyyuṭim*, laws of the Sabbath and various other items relating to daily religious life. The *maḥzorim*, which contain the holiday prayers constitute a different type. These are designed to complement the *siddurim*, and generally contain only what is added to the regular prayers on the holidays, primarily the *piyyuṭim*. Codices of this type are often divided into two parts: one contains the liturgical material for the winter season, including the High Holy Days and Sukkot, while the other is for use in the summer period, reaching from *Parashat Sheqalim* until after the Ninth of Av. These codices often differ from one another in content and scope. Some limit themselves quite strictly to the *piyyuṭim*, omitting entirely the regular prayers, the readings from the Torah and Prophets, the *megillot* read on the different holidays, and the *piyyuṭim* for special Sabbaths in each season, while others are more generous in this respect, in varying

1 E.D. Goldschmidt, "The Worms Maḥzor" [Heb.], *Kiryat Sefer*, XXXIV (1959), pp. 388–396, 513–522; reprinted in *Mehqerei Tefillah u-Piyyuṭ* (Studies in Prayer and Piyyuṭ), Jerusalem 1979, pp. 9–30.

2 On this, see E. Róth, "Das Wormser Machsor", *Udim*, XI–XII (1981–1982), pp. 219–223. The article deals at length with the illustrations of the Worms *Maḥzor*, but also refers to the regular prayers and the *piyyuṭim* in the Codex. The Worms *Maḥzor* is composed of two volumes. The volume discussed here contains only the liturgical texts for the summer season (from *Parashat Sheqalim* until the Ninth of Av). The second volume contains the material for the winter holidays. On the relationship between the two volumes, see the article by M. Beit-Arié (above, pp. 13 ff.). See also below.

3 On the rites of Ashkenaz, see, for example, the classic work of L. Zunz,

*Die Ritus des synagogalen Gottesdienstes*², Berlin 1919, pp. 66 f. On the Worms rite, see references in Zunz' index. For a general discussion of the Ashkenazi rites, see the introductions by D. Goldschmidt to his *Maḥzor for the High Holy Days*, Jerusalem 1970, and *Maḥzor for Sukkot*, Jerusalem 1981, ed. Y. Fraenkel.

The prayer rites followed in the different Ashkenazi communities were not identical, and in the course of time two major branches took shape: the western branch, based on the rite observed in the communities of the Rhineland, primarily Mainz, Worms and Speyer; and the eastern branch, used in the communities east of the Elbe River. The eastern Ashkenazi rite was also followed in the countries of East Europe, including the Bohemian, Austrian and Polish rites. See also below.

degrees.⁴ The manuscripts also differ as to the scope of the instructions provided for the worshipper,⁵ as well as in whether they were intended to serve the individual worshipper or the *hazzan*, or both. They differ as well in their objectives. Some simply present the texts as they are, and nothing else, while others seek to provide the worshipper with a better understanding of the *piyyuṭim* and the prayers through commentaries and glosses. Even these commentaries, though largely drawn from identical or similar sources, differ in scope and in wording.⁶

Ancient *maḥzorim* differ also in their treatment of the *piyyuṭim* for special Sabbaths. In the winter *maḥzorim*, this is reflected in the presence or absence of the *piyyuṭim* for the Sabbath between the New Year and the Day of Atonement (*Shabbat Shuvah*), and the *piyyuṭim* for the Sabbaths between the Day of Atonement and Sukkot, for *Shabbat Bereshit*, for the two Sabbaths during Hanukkah, and several others.⁷ In the summer *maḥzorim*, the optional material is even more extensive: it includes the two intermediate Sabbaths between the four special Sabbaths (the *piyyuṭim* for Purim appear in almost every instance), the six Sabbaths between Passover and Shavu'ot, the Sabbaths between Shavu'ot and the Ninth of Av, and the Sabbath (or Sabbaths) following the Ninth of Av.⁸ This material is not only fairly abundant, but also quite specific: even after the *piyyuṭim* for the major holidays (including the four special Sabbaths and Purim) were fixed more or less definitively, in most of the Ashkenazi communities the *piyyuṭim* for these Sabbaths remained fluid, or were fixed differently in the various communities. The special rite of the *maḥzorim* can be recognized primarily by the choice of *piyyuṭim* for these Sabbaths.⁹

The Worms *Maḥzor* is a summer *maḥzor* of the restricted type. Like most of the *maḥzorim* of this type, it too begins with *Parashat Sheqalim* and ends with the Ninth of Av, but it does not include the *piyyuṭim* for the intermediary Sabbaths before Passover (*Shabbetoth Hafsaqah*) and for all the Sabbaths between Passover and the New Year. Especially surprising is the absence of *piyyuṭim* for the Sabbaths between Passover and Shavu'ot, since prayers on these Sabbaths in the Jewish communities of

western Ashkenaz included *piyyuṭim* in memory of the victims of the Crusades and other massacres of the early Middle Ages.¹⁰ There was certainly no Ashkenazi community in the thirteenth century which did not recite *piyyuṭim* of this kind on these Sabbaths. We must therefore assume that, at the time and place of our *Maḥzor's* scribe, these *piyyuṭim* were copied in a special volume and were therefore not included in this Codex.¹¹

Even the sections which are included in our *Maḥzor* are represented relatively sparsely. As we will see below, this volume was intended explicitly for the *hazzan's* use,¹² and it lacks, as a general rule, all those passages not recited in the early Ashkenazi communities by the cantor. Thus, absent from the *Maḥzor* are the opening passages of the morning prayer,¹³ the *Pesukei de-Zimra*, the holiday Torah readings, and the like. There is not even a hint to these passages in the manuscript, except by chance. The Codex also lacks such common liturgical texts as the Passover *Haggadah* and *Pirquei Avot*.

The *Maḥzor* is also very sparing in its instructions to the worshipper: in most cases, such instructions are totally absent, clearly indicating that the copyist had in mind a learned *hazzan*, who did not require instruction in prayer. The few instructions which do surprisingly appear in the Codex may have fulfilled some artistic or calligraphic need, or some momentary caprice of the scribe.¹⁴ There are similarly no commentaries on the regular prayers and the *piyyuṭim* in the body of the manuscript. Several interpretative remarks, some of them apparently by the scribe himself, appear in the margins; but even these are few, and are additions to the manuscript, not part of it.¹⁵ According to the master plan of the copyist, the *Maḥzor* was to include only liturgical texts, and nothing more. Also relatively scarce in the manuscript, though not markedly so, are informative headings at the beginning of the *piyyuṭim*. Professional scribes were usually familiar with the *piyyuṭim* they copied, and often possessed reliable traditions regarding the authorship of the *piyyuṭim*. They used to note this information in the headings. The scribe of the present manuscript, Simḥah b. Yehudah, was an experienced scribe, and the son of a scribe.¹⁶ However, his heading-notes

4 An important place is accorded in the mediaeval prayer books to *piyyuṭim* for Sabbaths celebrating weddings and circumcisions. Sabbath prayers in which a newly-wed groom participated were embellished with a wide variety of *piyyuṭim*. These *piyyuṭim* did not have a fixed place in the codices, appearing sometimes in *siddurim*, and sometimes in *maḥzorim*.

5 Most of the Ashkenazi prayer books are sparing in instructions to the worshipper, as these books were intended for the use of learned men, who knew how to pray. Many manuscripts contain no such instructions at all; some contain a few indications which are not always clear.

6 Ashkenazi Jewry is known to have produced a rich literature of commentaries on prayers and *piyyuṭim*. For an exhaustive discussion of this literature, see E.E. Urbach, *Arugat ha-Bosem*, IV, Jerusalem 1963.

7 In the early Ashkenazi communities, *piyyuṭim* were recited also on the Sabbaths of *parashat Va-Yera*, *Be-Shallah*, and *Yitro*. The very widespread eastern practice in the ninth to eleventh centuries of reciting *yozerot* on every Sabbath was unknown in Central Europe.

8 The Sabbaths during the summer months, following Shavu'ot, on which *piyyuṭim* were recited according to the Ashkenazi rite, were: the Sabbath after Shavu'ot, the Sabbaths of *parashat Naso*, *Be-Ha'alotkha*, *Shelah Lekha*, and *Huqqat*, *Shabbat Hazon* (preceding the Ninth of Av), *Shabbat Nahamu* (following the Ninth of Av), the Sabbath of *parashat 'Ekev*, and the Sabbath preceding the New Year. Thus, almost all the Sabbaths during the summer were considered special Sabbaths. However, the *piyyuṭim* added to embellish most of these Sabbaths were generally few in number.

9 Ashkenazi *maḥzorim* also differ widely from one another in their liturgical programme for Sabbaths following a wedding. The *piyyuṭim* for these Sabbaths were fixed at a very late date, and for a long time local *payṭanim* authored new *piyyuṭim* for each such occasion.

10 On the *piyyuṭim* for these Sabbaths (mainly *zulatot*) see E. Fleischer, *The*

Yozer, Its Emergence and Development [Heb.], Jerusalem 1984, pp. 661, 697 (henceforth: Fleischer, *The Yozer*).

11 They do in fact appear separately in several later manuscripts originating in Worms. The *piyyuṭim* were also published in the two printed editions of the Worms rite, which will be discussed below. However, they are included in the Worms *Maḥzor* copied by Ya'aqov Oppenheim in 1623 (MS Oxford 1031), regarding which see also below.

12 On this matter, Róth (n.2 above) has a different view. See *Udim*, p. 231, n. 12a. However, as will be shown below, there is no doubt that the Codex was intended for the special use of the *hazzan*.

13 An attempt was apparently made at a later period to rectify this deficiency. A page from the opening of the morning benedictions, dating perhaps from the fourteenth century, is still appended to the Codex (fol. 218). But these texts were not originally included in the master plan of the *Maḥzor*.

14 Detailed instructions do appear in the *Maḥzor* in only three places: once on fol. 20b, following the *qerovah* for Purim; the copyist's note here — today almost totally obliterated — gives instructions on the reading of the Torah, the reading of the *megillah*, and the recital of the benediction *ha-rav et rivenu* following this reading. The second instance, in the section on the intermediate Sabbath of Passover (fol. 75r), is a list of the days on which the full *hallel* is read. Following the *qerovah* for the Ninth of Av (fol. 159v), we also find a note of some length referring to the continuation of the prayers, but it too is quite brief. Aside from these, the *Maḥzor* contains only the briefest indications, following the *piyyuṭim*, of the prayer or prayers to be recited at each point, generally designated by their opening words.

15 On these, see below.

16 On the scribe and his family, see the article by M. Beit-Arié (above, pp. 15 ff.).

concerning the *piyyuṭim* he transcribed are relatively few and rather routine in nature.

On the other hand, the manuscript is rich — in comparison to other *maḥzorim* of its kind — in regular prayers. To be sure, these are not complete: only those passages recited by the *ḥazzan* in accord with the prevailing rite are recorded. But those texts that do appear are cited with remarkable completeness,¹⁷ and in some cases appear in each section of the *Maḥzor*.¹⁸ Although the scribe was not completely consistent in this matter, as we shall see below, it is clear that his primary purpose was to allow the *ḥazzan* to pray from the *Maḥzor* fluently, without having to page from one section to another, and without having to refer to memory or to another book. In this, the Worms Codex is fairly unique. Most of the extant *maḥzorim*, including those much richer in content, tend to be much more sparing with regard to the regular prayer, sometimes not supplying them at all, or giving them only once.¹⁹

B. THE MASTER PLAN OF THE MAḤZOR

The early Ashkenazi *maḥzorim* are not usually noted for their strict and logical internal order. Even the largest and most elaborate of them, including those to which tremendous patience, love, and artistic talent have obviously been devoted, are often arranged with a lamentable lack of order. There are few manuscripts that can be cited as exceptions to this general rule, and the Worms *Maḥzor* is not one of them. In the colophon appended at the end of the Codex (fol. 217v), R. Simḥah the Scribe does pride himself on having arranged in the *Maḥzor* “all prayers as recited by the *ḥazzan*” from beginning to end. However, an analysis of the *Maḥzor* reveals that he did not succeed in imposing a strict order on the liturgical material. While the main sections of the

Maḥzor are properly arranged, according to the calendric order of the holidays — *Shabbat Sheqalim*, *Shabbat Zakhkor*, Purim, *Shabbat Parah*, *Shabbat ha-Ḥodesh*,²⁰ *Shabbat ha-Gadol*, Passover, Shavu'ot, and the Ninth of Av — the internal order within each section is not rigorously maintained. Already in the section devoted to the four special Sabbaths, at the very beginning of the *Maḥzor*, there is no logical order to the material as transcribed. *Shabbat Sheqalim* and *Shabbat ha-Ḥodesh*, as we know, often coincide with the New Month (Adar and Nisan, respectively), and a properly organized *maḥzor* must note this possibility, both in the *piyyuṭim* and in the regular prayers, as in both cases it involves changes: minor changes in the *piyyuṭim*, but significant changes in the *'amidot* of both the morning service and the *musaf*.²¹ Here, R. Simḥah provided only incomplete information: he totally ignored the possibility that *Shabbat Sheqalim* might coincide with the New Month of Adar.²² In *Parashat ha-Ḥodesh*, suddenly recalling this possibility, he copied the special *ofan* for Sabbath and the New Month *משרתיו עומדים*²³ (fol. 27r) noting on the *piyyuṭ* “לשבת וראש חודש”. Yet in the *'amidah* for the morning service he failed to mention the insertion of *יעלה ויבוא*. However, in the *'amidah* for *musaf* he included the special *אלהיכם* for Sabbath and the New Month, this time without any remark.²⁴ In the fourth benediction of the *musaf 'amidah* he had to include the *shiv'ata* for *Parashat ha-Ḥodesh* into two alternative texts: one for a regular Sabbath and the other for Sabbath and a New Month. Here again he failed. After copying the *qedushah*, he immediately copied the wording of the *fourth* benediction for Sabbath and a New Month (אתה יצרת) without having written down the *piyyuṭ* passage meant to embellish the *third* benediction (הנה זה בא לפרקים), and without mentioning the concluding formula of this (third) benediction (האל הקדוש). He copied אתה יצרת and concluded האל קדוש after אתה יצרת,²⁵ and

17 Of all the prayers recited by the *ḥazzan* (on which see more below), only the *shema'* is not cited even once in full in the *Maḥzor*. This is undoubtedly related to the fact that the *shema'* was also recited aloud, in unison, by the entire congregation. Moreover, all Jews knew the *shema'* by heart, and most of the scribes did not bother to record it. It goes without saying that the mode of public prayer in Ashkenaz in the early Middle Ages was similar to the Sephardi mode today, namely that the *sheliah zibbur* would recite all the prayers and *piyyuṭim* in full, from beginning to end, out loud. In most places in our *Maḥzor*, later hands noted “*ḥazzan*” towards the end of the *piyyuṭim*, indicating the part to be recited by the *sheliah zibbur*, according to the later custom.

18 This phenomenon sometimes reaches amazing dimensions in the Worms *Maḥzor*. Several of the regular prayers are repeated, one after the other, sometimes in close proximity, more than ten times. On this, see more below.

19 Thus, for example, in the Nürnberg *Maḥzor* (MS Schocken). In this *maḥzor*, which is much more complete than the Worms *Maḥzor*, the regular prayers all appear only once, at the beginning of the Codex. This is the case in other early *maḥzorim* as well, such as MS Oxford 1025, which presents a prayer rite very similar to that recorded in our manuscript. However, in many *maḥzorim*, including the second volume of the Worms *Maḥzor*, for example, none or almost none of the regular prayers are presented.

20 These Sabbaths (*Sheqalim*, *Zakhkor*, *Parah*, and *ha-Ḥodesh*), which are known as “the Four Sabbaths (or: *Parashot*)”, regularly open the summer *maḥzorim*. They precede the Passover holiday in the Hebrew calendar. *Shabbat Sheqalim* is always the Sabbath which precedes the beginning of the month of Adar (or the Sabbath which coincides with the New Month of Adar). *Shabbat Zakhkor* is the Sabbath which precedes Purim. *Shabbat Parah* is the Sabbath following Purim. *Shabbat ha-Ḥodesh* is the Sabbath preceding the beginning of the month of Nisan, or that which itself falls on the New Month of Nisan. *Shabbat ha-Gadol* is the Sabbath which precedes Passover.

21 On Sabbaths which coincide with a New Month a special passage (beginning *יעלה ויבוא*) is added to the sixth benediction of the *'amidah*. In the fourth benediction of the *musaf 'amidah*, the regular (or: *תכנת ותקנת שבת*) is replaced by a special passage beginning *אתה יצרת עלמך מקדם*.

22 The disregard of this possibility is not very surprising. Many ancient *maḥzorim* record the *piyyuṭim* for these Sabbaths with no hint of the possibility that changes could occur should any of them coincide with a New Month. However, they are generally consistent about this, dealing in the same way with both Sabbaths.

23 According to the rite of our *Maḥzor* (see below) *ofanim* were not recited on the Four Sabbaths. The “available” space was filled, when these Sabbaths coincided with a New Month, by the *ofan* which was usually said on a regular Sabbath which coincides with a New Month. This phenomenon is also discussed below.

24 The *אלהיכם* is a short *piyyuṭ* which is dovetailed into the *qedushah* of the *musaf 'amidah* between the verse *אני יי אלהיכם* and *ימלך יי לעולם*. On this genre, see E. Fleischer, *Hebrew Liturgical Poetry in the Middle Ages* [Heb.], Jerusalem 1975 [henceforth: Fleischer, *Liturgical Poetry*], pp. 448 ff. This genre apparently originated in Italy; the oldest example of it is by the ancient Italian (?) *paytan* Zevadiah. See E. Fleischer, “Aspects of the Poetry of Early Italian *Paytanim*” [Heb.], *Hasifrut*, XXX–XXXI (April 1981), pp. 161 ff. Use of these *piyyuṭim* became standard only in the communities of Ashkenaz. These communities, including the community of Worms, recited such *piyyuṭim* primarily on Sabbaths which coincided with a New Month, Sabbaths following a wedding, and Sabbaths on which there was also a circumcision.

25 Following the benediction (fol. 33r), the scribe noted something in red ink, but the inscription is entirely faded. In ultra-violet light it is perhaps possible to piece together the following note: *לשבת וראש חודש* [אומר אתה יצרת] *כבראש חודש ושבת*.

followed with *תכנת שבת*! The *Mahzor* is here in a complete disarray. Actually, the scribe himself was aware of that: he noted *הנה* after the text of the *qedushah*, while a later hand added in the margin the remark: *ואחר כך אומ' אתה יצרת*.

This confusion may have been the result of an inadvertent error. More blatant is the disorder in the section of the *piyyuṭim* for Passover: at the beginning of this section, the scribe copied the *ma'arivim* for all the festival evenings (first, second, seventh, and eighth)²⁶ together, instead of bringing each *ma'ariv* separately, together with the *piyyuṭim* of the appropriate day. In the section for the first day of the holiday, he did not copy the *hallel*, nor did he give any indication that it should be read (fol. 53v). But in the section for the second day he surprisingly wrote down the verses *והודו ליי כי טוב* and *אנא יי*, without mentioning anything. He quotes from the *hallel* in this same strange way in the section of the seventh day (fol. 88v), but for the last day of Passover (fol. 101r) even these verses are lacking.²⁷ Yet in the section for the intermediate Sabbath (fol. 75r) after having copied the *yozer*, he suddenly notes: "The following are the holidays on which the full *hallel* is recited" etc. He then copies the entire *hallel*, even though the *hallel* is read only in part on the intermediate Sabbath. Following the *hallel*, he copied again the full text of the *qedushta* for *musaf* (fol. 76r), including *אדיר אדירנו*, although this passage is not read on this Sabbath. He noted: *אין אומ' בחולו של מועד אדיר* ("one does not say 'אדיר' on the intermediate days, I nevertheless write it here").

Also the Aramaic *piyyuṭim* recorded after the section for the last day of Passover are in an almost total confusion: the section begins with two Aramaic *reshuyot* for the *targum* of the *haftarot* (*אתא דוגמא* [fol. 101v] and *אלימו כען* [fol. 102r]), followed by passages from the *targum* of the festival *haftarot* for the second day of Shavu'ot (!), the first day of Shavu'ot, and the last day of Passover. Then comes a large heading *רשות דיושע* (fol. 103v), followed by a *reshut* for the Torah reading on the seventh day of Passover. Several Aramaic *piyyuṭim* for the Song at the Red Sea follow, accompanied by the *targum* of the biblical verses, and finally, the *piyyuṭ* *יעיג פתגם* (fol. 108r), with the heading *רשות יעקב*. This poem was perhaps meant to introduce the *haftarah* for the seventh day of Passover. The *targum* of the *haftarot* for the first and second days does not appear.

In the section on Shavu'ot, the scribe abandoned the system adopted for the Passover *ma'arivim*, and instead of copying the *piyyuṭim* for both nights together, he brings them along with the *piyyuṭim* for each day (fols. 109r, 144v). However, the *piyyuṭim* for the second day precede the Aramaic *piyyuṭim* for the reading of the Ten Commandments on the first day (fols. 146r–166r). In the section for the Ninth of Av the liturgical material appears in a more orderly fashion. But even here, the *piyyuṭ* *הה הלילו* (fol. 170v), intended to be recited at the end of the *qinot*, appears in the middle.²⁸

There is no way to explain these perplexing phenomena. R.

Simḥah was an expert scribe, and his remarkable aesthetic sense is evident on every page of his manuscript. However, he apparently worked very hurriedly,²⁹ and perhaps had no time to ponder how to organize his codex. There is no doubt that R. Simḥah worked from one or several *Vorlagen*, and it may well be that these models, like many early Ashkenazi *mahzorim*, were confused. Possibly he copied them as they were.³⁰

It should be noted that R. Simḥah's haste in preparing the *Mahzor* is apparent not only in the order of the material contained in the manuscript, but also in the fact that he fairly frequently erred. Some of his errors he himself corrected, either in the margins or in some other manner; others were later corrected by the vocalizer of the manuscript; still others were corrected only in subsequent generations.³¹ Several of these errors will be discussed in detail below.

C. THE PIYYUṬIM OF THE WORMS MAḤZOR

The *piyyuṭim* contained in the Worms *Mahzor* are all known to us from the established Ashkenazi *mahzorim*, and they generally accord with the rite later fixed in the communities of the Rhine and western Ashkenaz. The material presented does nevertheless contain several distinctive elements which deserve special note.

The Days Preceding Passover

Shabbat Sheqalim, with which the *Mahzor* opens, is embellished with three sets of *piyyuṭim*, as usual. However, of the *yozer*, we find here only the *yozer* proper *אל מתנשא* (I. Davidson, *Treasury of Poetry and Piyyuṭ* [Heb.], 3853 .א; fol. 1v) and the *zulat* *אתה עמך* (8660 .א; fol. 1r; headed: "zulat"). The *ofan* which appears in the established Ashkenazi rites (*יתרום יתנשא*; 75 .ב) is lacking. The *qedushta* *אז מאז ומתה* (2149 .א; headed *קדושתא*) by R. El'azar b. R. Qilir, usually found in the Ashkenazi *mahzorim*, appears on fol. 3v. The biblical verses included in the first three parts of the composition (the *magen*, the *mehayye*, and the *meshalleh*), are present as usual in early manuscripts.³² They do not appear in the printed editions. The order of the three concluding stanzas following the *meshalleh*³³ is confused (fol. 4v): The scribe first transcribed the *second* (*תיפן באן פיד*), and only then the first (*תמדו מאז כל עדת קדושים*). A later hand noted the correct order in the margin, in large letters (ג' א' ב'). Another hand also noted at the end of the *meshalleh*: "Here say *תמדו*"; and at the end of the paragraph beginning *תמדו*: "Here say *תיפן*". A note to this effect was also recorded in the margin, but was cut off in one of the bindings. The text apparently read: *תמדו (מאז) עד* [*בסוף הקדושים*]. *ואחר כך (תיפן) באן (עד תח) ת נפשינו (ואחר כך) תזכור*. The text of the *qedushta* is complete, including all the elements

26 In the heading of the *ma'ariv* for the eighth night, the scribe wrote (fol. 46r): *מעריב לליל שישי של פסח* "Ma'ariv for the sixth night of Passover". About this heading, see below.

27 This matter will be discussed below.

28 On this matter, see below.

29 We learn this from what he noted in the colophon at the end of the Codex, namely, that he finished the writing of the *Mahzor* "in forty-four weeks". We have no way of estimating the rate of the work of early scribes, but we can presume that he would not have praised himself for this speed were it not a sign of his unusual skill.

30 We must note that the contents of many of the ancient codices, including

some which were carefully written and lavishly adorned, are not properly organized. An exception to this rule is the Nürnberg *Mahzor*, for example, which, despite its monumental scope, is organized with absolute precision.

31 Regarding these "layers" of corrections, see the article by M. Beit-Arié, on pp. 20 ff. in this volume.

32 Regarding these chains of biblical verses and their function in the first sections of the *qedushta'ot*, see Fleischer, *Liturgical Poetry*, pp. 144 ff.

33 About these strophes, which sometimes appear in ancient *qedushta'ot* of the Qilirian type, see Fleischer, *Liturgical Poetry*, loc. cit.

characteristic of the Qilirian *qedushta*: the verses ימלך יי לעולם etc. (Ps. cxlvi:10) and ואתה קדוש יושב תהילות ישראל (Ps. xx:4), and אל נא after the *meshallesh* (fol. 4v); the formula חזי וקיים נורא ומרום after the fourth *piyyut* (fol. 5r), and the prayer אל נא לעולם וקדוש (ibid.) at the end of the fifth.³⁴ The two *qadosh*-stanzas of the sixth *piyyut* are prominently placed at the beginning of the poem, as common in Central European manuscripts.³⁵ Before the *silluq*, we find the usual heading ובכן ולך תעלה קדושה כי אתה. All the *qedushta*'ot appearing in this *Mahzor* are copied in the same way.

The *musaf* *'amidah* of *Parashat Sheqalim* is embellished with the *shiv'ata* אשר כל נפש איורי תאות כל נפש (8069. א; fol. 7v), also ascribed to R. El'azar b. Qilir. This *piyyut* is headed: ולמוסף שבעתא. The *piyyut* is dovetailed with the regular wording of the *'amidah*, as usual in Ashkenazi codices.

The section for *Parashat Zakhor* is headed (in red ink): יוצר. On the following page (9v), we have the *yozer* אשר את זכור את אשר עשה (זכור) (112. ו), with its fixed word (זכור) prominently emphasized. This is followed by the *zulat* אתה מלא אתה (112. ו) — as usual in Ashkenaz: Here, too, there is no *ofan*. The Qilirian *qedushta* זכרון מעשים (2249. א) appears on fols. 11r ff. (headed קדושתא). There is no *shiv'ata* for *musaf*, though in some Ashkenazi communities this *'amidah* was embellished with a *shiv'ata* by R. Me'ir ben Yizhaq Sheliah Zibbur, the great *paytan* of Worms (רבן אומן אומנות אבות) (205. ו).

For Purim (fols. 15v ff.) we find, as usual, Qiliri's *qerova* ויאבה (197. ו). The sophisticated structure of the *piyyut* is emphasized with impressive calligraphic skill. The regular text of the *'amidah* is here again intermixed with the *piyyut*. In the benediction of זדים מכניע זדים we find the usual poetical insertions: אורה בט חוץ (fol. 17r), תמימים כרשו ארץ (17v), אותו מבהלה (18r), אמל ורבך (18v), and אספרה אל חוק (19r).

The section on *Parashat Parah* has the heading יוצר לפרשת פרה (fol. 20v). The *yozer* אשר בך רבוקה (1830. א; fol. 21r), is followed by the *zulat* אשרי כל חוסי בך (8406. א). There is no *ofan*. The *qedushta* אצולת אומן (7256. א) by Qiliri (headed קדושתא) appears on fols. 22v ff. As usual in the established Ashkenazi rite the composition contains the passage אצילי עם (fol. 24v) from Qiliri's second *qedushta* for *Parashat Parah* פליאה אחת שאלתי (7256. א). Here, again, there is no *shiv'ata* for *musaf*, although several Ashkenazi communities did include here a composition by R. Me'ir Sheliah Zibbur (אלהים אמת אלהים חיים) (4661. א).

The section for *Shabbat ha-Hodesh* is identical in structure to the section for *Shabbat Sheqalim*. Here, too, the usual *yozer* אות זה (2051. א; fol. 26v) is followed only by the *zulat* ערשה אל (3955. א; fol. 27v). There is no *ofan* in the body of the text.

However, in the margin of fol. 27r, the scribe recorded, as mentioned above, the *ofan* משרתיו עומדים by R. Me'ir b. Yizhaq (2672. מ) for Sabbath and *Rosh Hodesh*. The *piyyut* was intended to be read if *Shabbat ha-Hodesh* fell on *Rosh Hodesh* Nisan.³⁸ Beginning on fol. 28r, we have Qiliri's *qedushta* אתיית עת דודים (8904. א; headed קדושתא). Alongside the biblical verses occurring in this *qerovah*, a later hand noted, in accordance with the later custom: אין אומרם (= א"א).³⁹ The *musaf* has the *shiv'ata* ראשון אימצתה (236. ה; fol. 32r) generally ascribed to Qiliri. The *piyyut* is copied along with the regular wording of the *'amidah* as in the *shiv'ata* for *Parashat Sheqalim*. The confusion in the order of this section has already been discussed. The scribe inserted within the text of the *qedushta* (fol. 32v) a short *piyyut* of the אלהים type: יהודה חוק (4581. א; signed יהודה חוק), for *Shabbat ha-Hodesh* and *Rosh Hodesh* Nisan.

The *piyyutim* for *Shabbat ha-Gadol* are copied thereafter. At their head, the *paytan* wrote in red ink (now completely faded): אתי מלבנן יוצר לשבת הגדול מר בנימין. He then copied the *yozer* אתי מלבנן (8891. א) by R. Benjamin b. Zerah (fol. 34v). At the beginning of the *piyyut* a later hand noted: אין אומרם (= א"א). The *zulat* אומרת אני מעשי למלך (1918. א), also by R. Benjamin b. Zerah, appears on fol. 36r. The *qedushta* prescribed for *shaharit* is, as usual in the western Ashkenazi *mahzorim*, אוני פטרי רחמתים (1921. א) by Yannai.⁴⁰ The scribe deciphered the acronym "יניי" in the *meshallesh* (fol. 37v) and noted the letters with dots, however, at the beginning of the *piyyut* he wrote: קדושתא מר ינאי. The composition of the *qerovah* is similar to that found in the western Ashkenazi *mahzorim*. Yet the *silluq*, which usually opens with ובכן אין לפניך לילה (181. ב), here opens with ובכן אין לפניך לילה.

The *musaf* for *Shabbat ha-Gadol* is expanded in the fourth benediction (following למעשה בראשית) with the anonymous *piyyut* אדירדר מתוחים (1082. א; fol. 39v), which deals with the laws of Passover. This *piyyut* generally appears in the Ashkenazi *mahzorim* as an addition to the aforementioned *qedushta* by Yannai, before (or after) the *silluq*.

The Piyyutim for Passover

The section on the Passover *piyyutim* begins on fol. 41r with a heading that has faded with time: מעריב לליל ראשון של פסח מר. Within the regular wording of the evening prayer, the anonymous *ma'ariv* חצה אתו אל חצה (726. ל) is inserted. This *piyyut* was (and still is) in use in all the Ashkenazi communities (726. ל). It also appears in the Italian, Algerian and Romaniote *mahzorim* and is often to be found in *genizah* fragments; it is not by R. Me'ir Sheliah Zibbur, but rather,

34 Regarding all these details, see Fleischer, *Liturgical Poetry*, loc. cit. The phrase אל נא, which appears at the end of the *meshalleshim*, is usually copied by our scribe as a single word (אלנא), but occasionally he leaves some space between the two words.

35 Regarding the sixth *piyyutim* of the *qedushta*'ot and the *qadosh*-stanzas which accompany them (the *pizmonim*), see Fleischer, *ibid.*, p. 147. These stanzas were originally supposed to be incorporated in the *piyyutim*, following their regular strophes rather than placed before them. However, in all the Ashkenazi codices the *pizmonim* were removed from the body of the *piyyutim* and copied before them. That is also the arrangement here.

36 This inscription, which is at the bottom of the page, is now almost entirely illegible. See below regarding this ascription.

37 Regarding this, see Sh. Elizur, "אחת שאלתי" — A *Qedushta* for *Shabbat Parah* by R. El'azar b. R. Qilir" [Heb.], *Kovez 'al Yad*, X(20) (1982), p. 22.

38 This lovely *piyyut*, about which we will also speak below, does not appear in the printed version of the Ashkenazi *siddurim*. It was first published by

Eliezer Landshuth, *Amudei ha-'Avoda*, New York 1965², p. 166, then again by E. Fleischer, "Studies in the Stages of the Rise and Acceptance of the *Muwaṣṣah* in Mediaeval Hebrew Poetry" [Heb.], *Mil'et*, I, Tel-Aviv, 1983, pp. 194 ff.

39 It is interesting that no such mention occurs in the *Mahzor* before, although there can be no doubt that in Worms, too, the recital of these verses in the *qedushta*'ot was abandoned relatively early. Apparently expert *hazzanim* had no need of such notes. Similar remarks appear in our *Mahzor*, often sporadically and suddenly. We must guess that they were added to the *Mahzor* occasionally by later *hazzanim*, while preparing themselves from the *Mahzor* to lead the prayers of one holiday or another. They did not bother, of course, to record the same notes in the prayers of the other days. See also below, at the end of this paper.

40 See *Piyyute Yannai — Liturgical Poems of Yannai, Collected from Geniza-Manuscripts and Other Sources* [Heb.], ed. M. Zulay, Berlin 1938, p. 88.

apparently, by an early Eastern *paytan*. The erroneous attribution to R. Me'ir in the Worms *Mahzor* is undoubtedly due to the *bikkur* *אזכרה שנת עולמים* (2302 .א; fol. 42v) which, in accordance with the custom established in Ashkenaz, is appended to the *ma'ariv* and was in fact written by R. Me'ir.⁴¹ The *bikkur* is headed *ליל שימורים לשומר ישראל*.⁴²

Immediately after this *ma'ariv*, again in full liturgical context, appears the *ma'ariv* for the second night of Passover, beginning [ליל שימורים אור ישראל] (ל. 724); this *ma'ariv* is by R. Me'ir bar Yizhaq Sheliah Zibbur. Here, again, the text is enlarged by a *bikkur*, *אור יום הנף*, also by R. Me'ir (1958 .א; fol. 44v). Next comes the heading *מעריב ליל שביעי של פסח מר אליעזר בר נתן*, followed by the *piyyut* *אור לשביעי גש צר להחלמה* (1973 .א). The regular wording of the prayer is omitted. The *ma'ariv* *אורי ושעי על הים* (א. 2026) by R. Menahem b. Ya'aqov is copied thereafter (fol. 46r) bearing the surprising heading *מעריב ליל שיש של פסח*.⁴³ The *piyyut* appears again with the full wording of the regular prayer. The *piyyut* is closed by the *bikkur* *מתי אבא אראה* (מ. 2697; fol. 47v). The order of the *ma'ariv piyyuṭim* for the last two days of Passover is irregular, and will be discussed below in detail.

The *yozerot* for Passover begin on fol. 48r. Before the passages from the regular prayer which open this section, the scribe wrote *יוצר ליום ראשון של פסח מר שלמה*. The title is now completely faded. He then copied in full the *piyyut* *אור ישע מאורשים* by R. Shelomoh ha-Bavli (1962 .א), which serves as *yozer* for the first day of Pesah in the great majority of the Ashkenazi communities.⁴⁴ The beginning of the *silluq* *צאינה וראינה* (fol. 50r) and its different sections are emphasized by the use of large letters. After the *silluq*, we find, as usual, the *ofan* *ראשו כתם פז* (fol. 51r). The *zulat* *אהבוך* (fol. 52r) is immediately followed by the closing stanzas *נפש להך על הרי בשמים* (fol. 53r); both passages are cited *before* *עזרת אבותינו*.⁴⁵ The great composition by R. Shelomoh ha-Bavli is signed alternately with two names: "Shelomoh" and "Mordekhai".⁴⁶ Already the *silluq* has in its first part the acrostic *מרדכי שלמה הקטן יגדל יחי*,⁴⁷ and only after that *הקטן יגדל בתורה* *אמן ואמן סלה*. Both signatures are noted by

the copyist with dots, but without any remark. The *zulat* too has two parts: the first one is signed *מרדכי הקטן יגדל בתורה כהוגן* *וכשורה*, while the second, beginning *שלמה בירבי יהודה* *שחורה ונאה* has *חזק ואמץ מאד בתורה* *אמן ואמן*. Now at the end of the *zulat*'s first part (fol. 52v) the scribe noted with red ink: *עד כאן יסד ר' מרדכי בן רבינו*.⁴⁸ At the beginning of *על הרי בשמים* (53r) too, he noticed the acrostic signature as deciphered by him: *מרדכי הקטן יגדל בתורה*. The *ge'ulah* *ברח דודי* follows on fol. 53v.⁴⁹

The *musaf* of the first day has the famous Qilirian *shiv'ata* for Dew *ברעתו אביעה חידות* (ב. 162; fol. 54r). The different components of the *piyyut* are followed by groups of biblical verses, as we usually find in early manuscripts. Alongside the verses following the *reshut* *ארשה ארזש רחשן* (fol. 54v), a later hand noted *א"א* (= *אין אומרים*). There is no such remark by the other groups of verses. Also in the *seder* *ביום מחוסן* (fol. 57v), the biblical verses are transcribed in full; they are omitted, as known, in the printed editions.

The heading which begins the section for the second day (fol. 61v, bottom) notes only: *יוצר ליום שני של פסח*, yet the name of the *yozer*'s author, R. Meshullam ben R. Kalonymos, is dotted by the scribe in the acrostic of the *silluq* *צאינה וראינה* (fol. 63v) and in the *zulat* *אורך כי עניתני* (א. 7129). The *yozer* *רנן ושירים* (א. 7129) appears on fols. 62r ff., in the full liturgical context as known from the common Ashkenazi *mahzorim*. The *amidah* of the morning service is provided with the Qilirian *qedushta* *אשר בכוש* (א. 6937; fol. 66r). The *rahit* *עופר פסח*, which appears in most sources following the fifth part of the composition, before *ובכן ואמרתם זבת פסח*, is lacking here.⁵⁰

The *piyyuṭim* for the intermediate Sabbath of Passover begin on fol. 70v. On the previous page, at the bottom, after having copied the regular opening of the prayers, the scribe noted: *יוצר לחלו של מועד פסח מר שמעון בר יצחק הגדול*. The famous series of *piyyuṭim* by R. Shim'on, *אהוביך אהבוך מישרים* (א. 1387), faithfully modelled after Shelomoh ha-Bavli's *אור ישע*, is brought here in full.⁵¹ At the beginning of the *ofan* *שליט בכל מפעל* (ד. 166; fol. 73r), the

41 The fact that the ascription of this *ma'ariv* to R. Me'ir is mistaken was known in Worms in the beginning of the seventeenth century, and it is noted in the compilation of the Customs of Worms by R. Liva Kirchheim (see below) as follows: "*Ma'ariv* for the first night of Passover. One recites the *ma'ariv* *ליל שימורים* אחר אל חצה etc., even on the Sabbath. This *ma'ariv* was written by the early *Hasidim*, the sages of the Mainz academy. I found written in old books that *אזכרה שנת עולמים* [i.e. the *bikkur*] was written by R. Me'ir Sheliah Zibbur of Worms bar Yizhaq דל, and he signed the name 'Yizhaq' in honour of his father." Of course the ascription to the sages of Mainz is also a mistake, as is R. Liva's assertion that the signature of the *bikkur* is "Yizhaq", for the signature actually reads "Me'ir bar Yizhaq". However, the *ma'ariv* is erroneously ascribed to R. Me'ir Sheliah Zibbur also in the Worms *Mahzor* written by R. Ya'aqov Oppenheim (MS Oxford 1031), perhaps following the ascription in our *Mahzor*. Regarding the *bikkur* which is added to the last benediction in the Ashkenazi *ma'arivim*, see Fleischer, *Liturgical Poetry*, pp. 463 ff. Generally the *ma'arivim* were composed together with their *bikkur*, but in the case of *ליל שימורים* אחר אל חצה, R. Me'ir completed an ancient *piyyut*, customarily recited in his place, which was written without a *bikkur*.

42 The title (fol. 42v) is now faded. *לשומר ישראל* is the term with which the scribe notes the *bikkur* (see below). However, the phrase *ליל שימורים* is not by any means in place here. These words also appear in large letters on fol. 41v, preceding the passage *פסח אכלו פחחים*, also inappropriately. Apparently R. Simhah mistakenly repeated here the opening words of Sections 1, 2, 4, 5, and 6 of the *ma'ariv*. However, the third sections of the *ma'arivim* (the *zulatot*), and also the *bikkur* passages, deviate from the symmetry of the *ma'arivim* and do not repeat the patterns of the other sections. See Fleischer, *Liturgical Poetry*, p. 244.

43 The title is faded in the manuscript. As for its meaning, see below.

44 This important *piyyut* was published in a critical edition by E. Fleischer,

The Poems of Shelomo ha-Bavli [Heb.], Jerusalem 1973, pp. 190 ff. Regarding its structure and sources, see *ibid.*, Introduction, pp. 50 ff.; see also Fleischer, *The Yozer*, pp. 650 ff.

45 Regarding the problem of the liturgical placement of the *על הרי בשמים* passages, see Fleischer, *The Yozer*, pp. 696 ff.

46 On this matter see Fleischer, *Shelomo ha-Bavli*, pp. 93 ff.

47 This is the way the scribe deciphered it. He wrote the letters which form the acronym in red ink and also decorated them with dots; in fact, though, the signature there is "יעלח". See Fleischer, *Shelomo ha-Bavli*, p. 205, ll. 20–21.

48 This title also is now illegible. See below regarding the ascription.

49 Regarding the acronym derived from the passages *על הרי בשמים* and *ברח דודי*, see more below.

50 The *qerovah* is defective at this point. Perhaps the passage *שור אשר מאו* is out of place, brought here from some other Qilirian *qerovah*. According to the standard structure of Qiliri's *qedushta'ot*, we would expect here a *piyyut* made up of three-line stanzas accompanied by one or two *qadosh-strophes*. The passage *שור אשר מאו* is constructed differently (in four-line stanzas which end with consecutive biblical verses), but it concludes with a *qadosh-strophe* hanging in mid-air (*לשובע*) *סיפקם מזון* (ולא לרוחן קדש). However, the passage is found in this *qedushta* in the same place also in ancient *genizah* fragments, such as MSS Oxford 2714/9 and 2712/28. Perhaps it was omitted from our *Mahzor* in order to make the scope of the *qedushta* and its structure similar to that of Yannai's *רחמים*. The *rahit* *זבת פסח* which appears in this *qerovah* (fol. 67v), became part of the Passover *Haggadah*, together with the parallel section of Yannai's *piyyut* *הלילה*.

51 The composition was published by A.M. Habermann, *The Piyyuṭim of R. Shim'on bar Yizhaq* [Heb.], Berlin 1938 [henceforth: Habermann, *Shim'on bar Yizhaq*], pp. 27 ff.

scribe noted the signature he deciphered from the *piyyut*: [אופן] מר' שמעון בר יצחק אבונא (יזכה) הקטן יזכה לחיי עד אמן.

On fol. 77r, before the liturgical opening of the morning prayer for the seventh day of Passover, we find the heading [!] יצר ליום ש שי. A later hand corrected in the margin: של פסח מר' שמעון בר יצחק וצ"ל. There then follow the *yozer* שושני *yozer* (ג. 245), and the *zulat* אי פתרוס (א. 2628) by R. Shim'on bar Yizhaq (fol. 79r).⁵² The *ofan* שם ידועי (י. 335), which appears here in many Ashkenazi *maḥzorim*, is lacking.

At the beginning of the *'amidah* of the morning service the scribe noted, as he did on several other occasions, קדושתא. Below this he copied the impressive *qerovah* for the seventh day of Passover by R. Moshe bar Kalonymos. (א. 2979) But alongside the opening words of the *qedushta*, he noted in red ink (now obliterated): קרובתא של חנאל בר קלונימוס (fol. 80r). The note is surprising, because below, in the *piyyut* בעליו *piyyut* (fol. 82r), he noted with special emphasis the acrostic משה בירבי קלונימוס.⁵⁴

The section for the last day of Passover begins on fol. 89r, with the heading: יצר ליום אחרון של פסח מרבינו שמעון בר יצחק. This title is followed by the liturgical opening of the prayers for the day. The expected *yozer* begins on the following page with אתה הארתה (א. 8745). This *piyyut*, recited on the last day of Passover in most Ashkenazi communities, is not signed, and its attribution to R. Shim'on bar Yizhaq in our manuscript is mistaken. It also appears in the Italian and Romaniote *maḥzorim*, but we do not know its author.⁵⁵ In the margin of fol. 89r, a later hand recorded the following note: הפוך עשרים דפים: לפניך ותמצא השיך לאחרון של פסח בגירמיזא. However, the words לפניך ותמצא השיך לאחרון של פסח have been erased and the word לשבעות added below the line. Also alongside the opening of the *piyyut* on fol. 89v, a later hand wrote: אין אומרים זה בגירמיזא. These notes indicate the special practice of Worms to read on the last day of Passover the *yozer* אור ישראל אימתו (ג. 239) by R. Me'ir ben Yizhaq Sheliah Zibbur. Indeed, the alternative *piyyut* is transcribed on two separate parchment folios now inserted in our volume as fols. 219–220.⁵⁶ At the opening of this *yozer*, on fol. 219r, there is a note reading as follows: בשום פעם אין מונעין מלומר: החון זה היוצר, כי אם⁵⁷ יארע בשבת, או הוא בטל ואומר אהוביך. In Ashkenaz, the *yozer* of the last day of Passover was replaced with the *yozer* אהוביך אהוביך מישרים (usually read on the intermediate Sabbath) in the years which had no intermediate Sabbath. The

zulat אי פתרוס by R. Shim'on bar Yizhaq is copied again afterwards (91v).⁵⁸ As the *qedushta* for this day serves the great composition by the same *paytan* או ראינו (א. 2075; fol. 92r; in the common versions we find או ראינו instead).⁵⁹ The *qerovah* is brought here in full, including a passage from the *silluq* omitted in most of the printed editions for fear of censorship.⁶⁰ Before the beginning of the passage אילי הצדק ידועים החרוזות הראשונות יסר ר' איליה מפריש הזקן; he emphasized the letters איליה in the beginning of the passage, both by their size and by decorating them with dots. The legend alluded to in this note will be discussed in greater detail below.

The next section (fols. 101v ff.) contains a group of Aramaic texts which, in the rite followed in the scribe's community, were added to the festival readings in the Torah and Prophets on the seventh day of Passover and on Shavu'ot. This custom was widespread, to a varying extent, in the communities of Central Europe, and is attested in many Italian, French, and Ashkenazi *maḥzorim*. It is described in great detail in the printed edition of the *Maḥzor Vitry*.⁶¹ The practice of translating the readings into Aramaic is, of course, a very early one; in the East it was followed in all the readings from the Torah and Prophets, even on regular Sabbaths. However, in the communities of Central Europe, the custom was limited to particularly festive readings. For the Ashkenazi Jews, we have no evidence of this practice except for the *haftarot* for Pesah and Shavu'ot, and the Torah readings for the seventh day of Pesah (because of the Song at the Red Sea) and the first day of Shavu'ot (because of the Ten Commandments).⁶²

The Aramaic texts included in these sections are composed of three levels: one is the *targum* itself, whether of the Torah reading, the *haftarah*, or both. This *targum* is known in the sources as the "Yerushalmi" and its text is close, but not identical, to that of the Palestinian *targumim* of the Torah and the *targum* of the Prophets attributed to Yonatan ben 'Uziel. However, in the liturgical context, the passages of the *targum* are not only different from what appears in the printed editions of the Bible, but also greatly expanded and embellished. A second level is that of the poetic additions inserted in the *targumim*. These are genuine poems illustrating some of the readings' most important verses. Poems of this genre are to be found only in the Torah readings. A third level is that of the opening and the closing passages of the *targum*. Apparently it was customary already at a

52 The *yozer* proper and the *zulat* appear in Habermann, *Shim'on bar Yizhaq*, pp. 36 ff.

53 The composition appears in Habermann, *Shim'on bar Yizhaq*, pp. 195 ff.

54 R. Moshe bar Kalonymos signed in the fictitious concluding strophes following the *meshalleh* (fol. 81v) the names of his two sons, "Hanan'el" and "Kalonymos". The scribe noted these signatures emphatically, with red ink and with ornamentation, considering them as the signature of the *paytan*. We cannot know how he explained the signature "Moshe bar Kalonymos" in the fifth *piyyut*.

55 The mistaken ascription to R. Shim'on bar Yizhaq is undoubtedly connected to the fact that the *qedushta* which follows for this same day, *או ראינו*, is actually by R. Shim'on bar Yizhaq. The *zulat* אי פתרוס, which follows the *yozer* proper, is also by R. Shim'on, and it is signed in the last verse with his name and that of his father. Thus, the scribe applied the signature of the *paytan* which he found in these sections to the anonymous *yozer* proper.

56 Regarding this addition to our volume, see M. Beit-Arié's introduction, on p. 18 above.

57 L.e: אלא אם;

58 See Habermann, *Shim'on bar Yizhaq*, p. 38.

59 Habermann, *ibid.*, pp. 62 ff.

60 It includes a strongly-worded section denigrating Edom. In all the printed *maḥzorim* (except one single edition), the passage is deleted. See I. Davidson, *Thesaurus of Mediaeval Hebrew Poetry* (Heb.), Newark 1923,

I. p. 97; Davidson published this passage there because of its rarity. It appears in Habermann, *Shim'on bar Yizhaq*, p. 93, ll. 108–112 inclusive.

61 Ed. S. Horowitz, Berlin 1893 [henceforth: the *Maḥzor Vitry*], pp. 158–172, 305–309, 325–344, 350–354. Regarding this custom and the literature discussing it, see M.H. Schmelzer, *Perush Alephbeitan* (I.e.-R. Binyamin b. Avraham min ha-'Anavim)" (Heb.), *Texts and Studies, Analecta Judaica* (ed. H.Z. Dimitrovski), New York 1977, pp. 169 ff.

62 That is how it appears in the *Maḥzor Vitry* in the places noted above, where the *targum* of all the *haftarot* of all the days of Passover and both days of Shavu'ot appear. It also appears that way in several ancient Ashkenazi *maḥzorim*, both western and eastern. In Italy the custom of translating into Aramaic all the *haftarot* for Passover and those for the two days of Shavu'ot, was preserved until recently. Italian codices also include the *targum* of the Torah reading for the first day of Shavu'ot, with numerous poetic expansions. *Seder Hibbur Berakhot*, which is the oldest codification of the Italian custom, contains passages of *targum* for the Torah reading of the seventh day of Passover as well (*Seder Hibbur Berakhot*, which is also known as *Maḥzor Turin*, was burnt in the beginning of this century, and we have only a partial copy of it made by S. Schechter; this copy is now in the library of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America in New York). In our *Maḥzor*, this custom is represented only partially, as we shall describe below. The custom quickly disappeared entirely from the Ashkenazi synagogues, leaving behind only a small remnant.

very early period for the *meturgemanim* to open with a short prose text. Later, probably still at an early period, these introductions were shaped in poetical forms. This custom was greatly developed by subsequent generations of translators. Short closing formulas were also added to the *targum* of the *haftarah*, first in prose and later in more elaborate poetic language. In the printed *Mahzor Vitry* and other sources, several *piyyuṭim* of these types are cited, some of them very early and unrhymed, and some much later — the work of various Central European *payṭanim* — Italian, French, and German.

The Aramaic *reshuyot* to the *haftarot*, as noted, grew out of a small, simple text, which was probably recited in many places by itself; this text was later placed at the end of the long *reshuyot*.⁶³ It included an announcement of the beginning of the *targum* in order to distinguish it from the Hebrew text of the *haftarah*. This formula (אמיר דאיתמר בנבואה על די [פלוגין] נבייא [או נגידא או מלכא])⁶⁴ is cited in the *Mahzor Vitry* following all the *reshuyot* (no less than twelve in the printed edition!). This modest announcement was expanded by a brief, already rhymed, statement of permission-taking:

איסב רשות מכולכון
מן רברבניכון ומן זעיריכון
בריכון תהוון קדם אלהכון
וידרכון רגליכון על פריקת צוארי סנאיכון
יי אלהא דאבתכון יוסיף עליכון כווחתכון
אלף זמנין ויברך יתכון כמו דמליל לכון⁶⁵

This formula, with the addendum beginning אמיר דאיתמר, introduces the section of *reshuyot* to the *haftarot* in *Mahzor Vitry* (p. 158). According to the early practice, the translator would begin speaking only after the first three verses of the *haftarah* had been read in the original Hebrew. At this point, the translator would recite the *reshut*, going on to give the translation of the three verses already read. The remaining verses of the *haftarah* would then be read with their translation alternately, verse by verse.

In the Worms *Mahzor*, the Aramaic section begins with two introductory *piyyuṭim*,⁶⁶ both rhymed and late, and both known to us from the *Mahzor Vitry*. The first is אתא דוגמא (8619 .א; fol.

101v; *Mahzor Vitry*, p. 159); it is signed שמואל חוק and was written by the French *payṭan* R. Shemu'el b. Avraham of Chartres. At its conclusion (fol. 102v), the scribe noted in red ink איסב רשותא, which is the opening phrase of the short *reshut* cited above. He then transcribed the text of אמיר דאיתמר בנבואה in full, then noting: ויתחיל ההפטרות מאותו יום טוב. Immediately afterwards, he transcribed the text of איסב רשותא, previously indicated only by its opening words, this time in full, adding at the end: אמיר דאיתאמר.

The scribe then went on to cite another *reshut*,⁶⁷ אלימו כען (5130 .א; fol. 102r; *Mahzor Vitry*, p. 164); this *reshut* was also written by a French *payṭan*, R. Yizḥaq bar Shemu'el, nephew of Rabbenu Ya'aqov Tam. This *piyyuṭ*, too, is followed by the texts of איסב רשותא and אמיר דאיתאמר in full. Then follows the notation הפטרות ליום שני של שבועות accompanied by the liturgical *targum* of only the first two verses of the *haftarah*.⁶⁸ The scribe then noted the beginning of the third verse in Hebrew: אלה מתימן. He added the heading הפטרות ליום ראשון של שבועות and copied the liturgical *targum* of the first three verses of the *haftarah*, beginning with Ezekiel i:1.⁶⁹ Then follows the heading: "Haftarah for the last day of Passover", and then — the *targum* of the first three verses of the *haftarah*, from II Samuel xx:1; however, the *targum* of the third verse is interrupted in the middle.⁷⁰

We then find the Aramaic addenda for the reading of the Torah on the seventh day of Passover. In the community of R. Simḥah, the *targum* was greatly expanded, whole *piyyuṭim* being added to several verses. These are preceded by the Aramaic *reshut* אילו נימי פומי נימי (4866 .א), which is a replica written by R. Me'ir bar Yizḥaq Sheliah Zibbur, imitating an early poem of the same genre.⁷¹ This *piyyuṭ* is followed (fol. 103v) by a greatly expanded liturgical version of the *targum* to Exodus xiii:17, the first verse of the Torah reading for that day.⁷² We then find three *piyyuṭim* on the first verse of the Song at the Red Sea, (Ex. xiv: 30), viz. אית חזרתא (3195 .א; fol. 104r) by R. Me'ir b. R. El'azar, called Lombard,⁷³ אבון דבשמיא ובריי (139 .א), by R. Me'ir bar Yizḥaq Sheliah Zibbur, and the early *piyyuṭ* על ימא משה וקם על ימא (2306 .א; fol. 104v);⁷⁴ this is followed by the lemma וישע, and the full Aramaic translation of this verse. An allusion to the next verse, וירא, is then followed by the *piyyuṭ* מלקדמין אלם אלהא (4321 .א; fol. 105r), also

63 This is a well-known phenomenon in *payṭanic* poetry. Long and elaborated introductory poems do not succeed in displacing the short, archaic introductory passages, even though they were written to do so. Instead, they eventually are added to the ancient passages as an introduction or supplement to them.

64 = "The words which were said as a prophecy by X [the Prophet, the Judge, or the King], as Yonathan ben 'Uzzel explained. Thus he explained, saying". In the Italian custom, similar language (אמיר דאיתמר על די פלתי) is used as a fixed introduction to the *targum* of the *haftarah* for Passover (including the intermediate Sabbath) and Shavu'ot.

65 "I ask permission of all of you / From the great and from the small of you, / Blessed may you be before your Lord, / And may you trample underfoot the necks of your enemies, / May the Lord God of your forefathers increase you / A thousandfold and bless you as He has spoken to you" [Deut. i:11].

66 The custom of concluding the *targum* of the *haftarah* with a *piyyuṭ* is not represented in our *Mahzor* at all. This is not at all surprising, since the *targum* is reproduced only for the opening verses of the *haftarah*. See below in the text.

67 We can surmise that the two *piyyuṭim* were intended for the two days of the festival, but there is no note in the *Mahzor* indicating that.

68 Hab. iii:1-2. In some of the Ashkenazi communities, the *haftarah* for the second day of Shavu'ot was begun from Hab. ii:20: וי בהיכל קדשו חס מפני כל הארץ, but this was not the custom in most of the large communities in the Rhineland. In Worms too, the *haftarah* was begun from Hab. iii:1, as mentioned by R. Liva Kirchheim and R. Yuspa Shammash in their books of the Worms customs (about which see below).

69 The fact that the *targum* of the *haftarah* does not appear in its entirety testifies to the decline of the custom even in this early period. However, it is possible that only the beginnings of the *haftarah* were recited by the leader of the prayers (together with the *reshuyot* which preceded them), following which another reader continued them; see below about this. The wording of the *targum* is very close to that which appears in the *Mahzor Vitry*, pp. 169 ff.

70 Here too the wording is very similar to that found in the printed *Mahzor Vitry*, p. 168, except that there the *haftarah* opens with II Sam. xxi:20 (ותודי עור מלחמה בגת).

71 Regarding this *piyyuṭ*, see L. Zunz, *Literaturgeschichte der synagogalen Poesie*, Berlin 1865, p. 150 [henceforth: Zunz, *Literaturgeschichte*].

72 This also begins with וכל נימי, and it appears in the *Mahzor Vitry*, p. 100.

73 Also here the wording is nearly identical with that which appears in the similar context in the *Mahzor Vitry*, p. 305, but there the *targum* continues throughout the entire Torah reading, until the Song at the Red Sea, whereas in our *Mahzor*, as we have said, the *targum* of only the first verse appears.

74 Regarding him, see Zunz, *Literaturgeschichte*, p. 469. According to Zunz, he was active at the start of the thirteenth century, between 1200-1220. This passage also appears in Goldschmidt, *Studies in Prayer and Piyyuṭ* [Heb.], p. 13. The passages אבון דבשמיא and אלם אלהא, which are mentioned below, were also published there.

75 Regarding this *piyyuṭ*, one of the earliest and most beautiful of the surviving Aramaic *piyyuṭim*, see Y. Yahalom, "איזיל משה בפירוס", *Tarbiz*, XLVII (1978), pp. 173 ff.

by R. Me'ir bar Yizḥaq Sheliah Zibbur. Then comes the lemma by R. Me'ir bar Yizḥaq Sheliah Zibbur. Then comes the lemma *או ישיר משה* (Ex. xv:1), and the full *targum* of the verse, followed by an allusion to the verse *עני וחמרת יד* (Ex. xv:2). This last verse is then translated with a large, non-payṭanic addition.⁷⁶ There follows immediately an allusion to the verse *ה' איש מלחמה* (Ex. xv:3), with a very extended translation, once again in prose.⁷⁷ We then find the passage *ארבע כיתין איתעבדו בני ישראל* (fol. 106v), known from the *Mahzor Vitry* (p. 307), as well as from the printed edition of the *Targum Yerushalmi*.⁷⁸ Subsequently the verses of the Song at the Red Sea are cited, one by one, by their opening words, until *י ימלוך לעולם ועד* (Ex. xv:18), with the parallel liturgical translations cited in full. Then comes the passage *ארבע לילון כתיבין*, which is also to be found in the printed version of the *Mahzor Vitry* (p. 308). At the end of this section, the scribe hinted at the concluding verses of the reading, noting *כי בא סוס. עד*, but the *targum* of these verses is omitted.⁷⁹

Immediately afterwards, the scribe wrote: *רשות להפטר מרבינו*; and transcribed the well-known *reshut* (3527; fol. 108r). In the later Ashkenazi *mahzorim* this *reshut* is recited before the *haftarah* on the second day of Shavu'ot (which is no longer translated into Aramaic!). The *piyyuṭ* is signed *יעקב ברבי*, and is apparently by R. Ya'aqov Tam. The signature is marked in our manuscript in full.⁸⁰ At the conclusion of the *piyyuṭ*, the scribe again recorded, in full, the two texts *איסב רשותא* and *איסב דאיתאמר*, but in reverse order. The *reshut* was apparently meant to introduce the *haftarah* for the seventh or last day of Passover, but this fact is nowhere mentioned. After completing the text (fol. 108v), the scribe recorded a short colophon: *חוק ונתחוק, הסופר שמחה לא יחוק, לא היום ולא לעולם*; as a sign of having completed this section of the *Mahzor*.

Shavu'ot

The section containing the prayers for Shavu'ot opens without any title, with the regular wording of the evening prayer. The *ma'ariv* which appears here, *וירד אביר יעקב נורא עלילה*, (257; fol. 109a), is by the early French *payṭan* R. Yosef Bonfils (Ṭov 'Elem). This *piyyuṭ* is recited in all the Ashkenazi communities, and it also appears in the Romaniote *Mahzor* (for the second day of the festival). After noting the last benediction and hinting at the recital of the concluding *qaddish* of the evening service by the words *יתגדל ויתקדש*, the scribe wrote: *ליום ראשון של שבועות* (fol. 110r), continuing: *מציל עני מיד חוק ממנו ועני ואבין מגולו*. Afterwards, he copied the *piyyuṭ* *מי אדר והוד* (1983; מ.מ.) which was customarily recited here in Worms on the first day of Shavu'ot and on *Shabbat Bereshit*. Alongside the *piyyuṭ* a later hand noted:

ביום ראשון של שבועות אומר. The *piyyuṭ* is one of the well-known features of the Worms custom. It appears here in its entirety;⁸¹ in the later rite of Worms several of the middle stanzas were omitted.⁸² After this *piyyuṭ* the scribe copied passages from the continuation of *חי נשמת כל חי*, as he usually does throughout the *Mahzor*. The *yozer* for the first day of Shavu'ot is, as in almost all the Ashkenazi customs, the impressive composition of R. Shim'on bar Yizḥaq, ארך אמנני (484; א.א; fol. 111r).⁸³ The *piyyuṭ* appears in its entirety. The *'amidah* (fol. 113v) is headed: *קדושתא*. The *qerovah* itself, אורח חיים מוסר תוכחת (2010; א.א), which begins on fol. 114r, was written by R. Shim'on bar Yizḥaq.⁸⁴ In the long *seder* of the *qedushta*, שעשועו יום יום מראש אמנה (fols. 116v ff), the poet describes, according to an ancient Qilirian custom, God offering the Torah a matrimonial "match" with the forefathers of Israel, and the Torah refusing these offers one by one, until she finally agrees to be given to Moses. The later communities omitted the passages of the poem in which the Torah lists the deficiencies of the suggested suitors. The text in our *Mahzor* is of course complete, but a later hand noted in the margin alongside the aforementioned sections *אין אומרים בקול רם* [= א"א בקיר]. An even later hand noted simply *אין אומרים* [= א"א] (fols. 117r ff.). The series of *dibberin*, אלוף מסובל בהוד איפודים (fol. 119r; it is entitled *seder*, intending *seder dibberin*),⁸⁵ is also brought here in its entirety, with appropriate emphasis of its complicated structure. At the beginning of the *silluq* והנשמע את הנראה את הנראה (fol. 122r) the *payṭan* left out the heading which generally appears at the beginning of the *silluqim* (ולך תעלה קדושה etc.); a later hand filled in the missing title.⁸⁶ The *'amidah* of *musaf* is adorned, as usual, with the ancient *azharot*, לעמך (8788; א.א; fol. 125r), which lists the 613 commandments of the Torah. The heading *Azharot* comes at the bottom of the previous page (fol. 124v). The scribe emphasized the alphabetical acrostics of this unrhymed composition and left spaces after each group of two lines. Similarly, he was careful to begin the alternating alphabets of the poem in large letters. He wrote the ends of the alphabets in red ink. This *piyyuṭ* ends on fol. 129r. On the following page the scribe copied out in large letters the passage *אז שש מאות ושלש עשרה מצות* which normally ends the recital of the *azharot*, and completed the regular text of the *'amidah* to its end. Here, after the note *יתגדל ויתקדש*, he wrote in red ink (which can no longer be read): *ליום [שני]*. Then he copied out (fol. 130v) the *yozer* *אילת אהבים מתנת סיני* (2960; א.א), which is ascribed to Shim'on bar Yizḥaq, followed by the anonymous *ofan* אורחות (2017; א.א; fol. 131r). These two *piyyuṭim* were subsequently replaced in Worms by the *yozer* of R. Me'ir bar Yizḥaq Sheliah Zibbur, אדיר ונאה (1092; א.א), and the *ofan* *אות* (66; ב.ב);⁸⁷ a later

76 This expansion (דכר אשתעבדו בני ישראל) also appears in Goldschmidt, *Studies in Prayer and Piyyuṭ*, p. 15.

77 See Goldschmidt, *ibid.*, p. 16.

78 This passage also appears in the *Targum Yerushalmi*, MS Neofiti 1, published by A. Diez-Macho, *Neophyti I*, II, Madrid-Barcelona 1970, p. 91.

79 This is the opposite of the situation in the printed *Mahzor Vitry*, p. 309, where the Aramaic translation of all these verses appears.

80 Regarding the ascription of this *piyyuṭ* to Rabbenu Tam, see the next section below.

81 Because of the infrequent occurrence of the full wording of the *piyyuṭ*, it was published by Goldschmidt, *Studies in Prayer and Piyyuṭ*, p. 17.

82 The *piyyuṭ* was copied in this abridged version in the Worms *Mahzor* of R. Ya'aqov Oppenheim, and thus it was published in both of the editions of the Worms rite which are discussed below. However, use of this *piyyuṭ* was quite widespread in the Ashkenazi communities. It was recited also as a *piyyuṭ* for the Sabbath following a wedding, and it appears in many both early and late manuscripts, such as MSS Jewish Theological Seminary of America 4069; Oxford 1099; British Museum 658, 674, and 676; Cambridge Add. 1176; Paris 644, 645, 646, and 647.

83 See Habermann, *Shim'on bar Yizḥaq*, pp. 72 ff.

84 *Ibid.*, pp. 85 ff.

85 Regarding the structure of the *qedushta'ot* for Shavu'ot, see E. Fleischer, "On the Antiquity of the *Qedushta*" [Heb.], *Hasifrut*, II (1971), pp. 390 ff. Regarding *sidrei dibberin*, see idem, *Liturgical Poetry*, pp. 179 ff.

86 Actually, the *payṭan* misled the scribe here. The *sidrei dibberin* traditionally include a *piyyuṭ* for the verse *את הקולות את* as well, with the *silluq* and its heading *ולך תעלה קדושה* appearing only after its conclusion. R. Shim'on did not compose a *piyyuṭ* for this verse in his *dibberin*, and he began the *silluq* with *וכל העם רואים*. The scribe mistook this for a component of the *seder dibberin* and headed the passage *וכל העם רואים*. However, this is really the *silluq* of the *qedushta*, as the later correction in the margin accurately notes.

87 These two *piyyuṭim* are recited according to the Ashkenazi rites on the Sabbath following Shavu'ot. That is the way it appears in the Nürnberg *Mahzor* as well as in the book of customs of R. Isaac of Tyrnau, ed. S.Y. Spitzer, Jerusalem 1979, p. 73.

hand noted this fact just before the start of אילת אהבים [אין] אומר זה ואומרים אדיר ונאה גם אופן כבודו אות הפוך לאחור כו דפין תמצא אדיר ונאה. In our volume, the parchment folios indicated in this note are bound at the end of the *Mahzor* (fols. 221r–224r). There the *piyyuṭim* are copied out in a later hand, apparently from the fifteenth century. Next to אורחות אראלים also there is a note in small letters: [אין] אומר. By the way, most sources present this *ofan* in a fragmentary fashion (omitting the lines from *kaf* to *zade*), but here it appears in full. On fol. 131v, the anonymous *zulat* בנעדים (א. 6805) appears. This *piyyuṭ* too was later omitted in Worms, as indicated by a late hand in the margin: [אין] אומר. In Worms, no *zulat* was recited on the second day of Shavu'ot.

The *qedushta* which embellishes the 'amidah of the morning service is ארץ מטה ורעשה by R. El'azar b. R. Qilir (7694 א. fol. 132v). In the *sefer* שנה נמתקתי (133v), alongside the passages describing the faults of the forefathers a late hand noted (starting from fol. 135v): [אין] אומר. After completing this monumental *qerovah*, on fol. 141v, the scribe again copied out the regular text of the 'amidah, this time only until the end of the fourth benediction. In the 'amidah of *musaf*, the regular text of which is also copied in its entirety, the scribe included the *piyyuṭ* אזהרת ראשית (א. 2186), which is said here according to all the Ashkenazi customs. This very old passage may have served as an introduction to some ancient *azharot*, but in all the rites it is recited by itself. Scholars believe that the name of this genre of *piyyuṭ* (*azharot*) is taken from the beginning of this poem. The passage או שש מאות, already copied earlier (fol. 129v), at the end of אתה הנחלתה, is also brought here. Only after the completion of the regular text of the *musaf* 'amidah for the second day do we find the title: מעריב לליל שני של שבעות. This *ma'ariv* begins אלהים (א. 4686; fol. 144v) and was composed by R. Avraham b. Yehudah ha-Kohen, a *paytan* apparently from Mainz who was active in the second half of the eleventh century. In most Ashkenazi communities a different *piyyuṭ* was said on this occasion.⁸⁸ The regular text of the evening prayer is not copied out here, with the exception of the liturgical stop points (i.e. the benedictions and the biblical verses), and the words of transition to them; these, too, are only alluded to. At the end of the *ma'ariv* (fol. 145v) comes the heading שבעות של דברות, which refers to the section of Aramaic *piyyuṭim* beginning on the following page.

The custom of reading the Ten Commandments on the first day of Shavu'ot together with their *targum*, or preceding the *targum* with a *reshut* and adding for each commandment (or at least for some of them) an Aramaic *piyyuṭ*, parallels the custom which we already saw above in the Torah reading for the seventh day of Passover. Here, the section opens with the famous *piyyuṭ* by R. Me'ir bar Yizḥaq Sheliaḥ Zibbur, אקדמות מילין (א. 7314), which is a *reshut* for the *targum* of the festival pericope. This *piyyuṭ* (fol. 147v) is followed by the *targum* of the Torah portion for the day, from Exodus xix:1 to xix:11 inclusive. The wording of the *targum* is identical with that brought in the same context in *Mahzor Vitry* (p. 335), except that there the *targum* continues until verse 25. This verse is brought also in our *Mahzor*, but the *targum* of the intervening verses is lacking. After the heading וירד משה אל העם

ויאמר אליהם, which is the beginning of this verse in Hebrew, the ancient Aramaic *piyyuṭ* לסיני יי שמיא (א. 7648) follows. This *piyyuṭ*, which is still said in Western Ashkenazi communities, is unrhymed, and it is one of the oldest works of its sort. It apparently is intended to serve here as an expanded *targum* of the verse which is cited in its title. The *piyyuṭ* ארעא רקדא שמיא זמרו (148v) added to the following verse (Ex.xx:1) is also among the oldest samples of this kind; it appears in the printed *Mahzor Vitry* in a similar role (p. 336). Following this (fol. 149r) is the liturgical *targum* of the First Commandment, in the version which appears in the *Mahzor Vitry* (p. 637), which is the version of the Targum Yerushalmi. The *targum* of the Commandments is formulated here with great rhetorical force: before each Commandment comes a fixed opening, which reads in English translation as follows:

The first [or, the second, the third, etc.] Commandment, when it went forth from the mouth of the Holy One Blessed be He, may His Name be blessed forever, was like lightning and thunder and flames of fire. A flame of fire [stood] at its right side and a flame of fire at its left; it flew and soared in the air of the heavenly firmament, circled the tents of Israel, returned and was engraved upon the two tablets of stone. And thus [the Commandment] called out: My people, my people, the House of Israel, etc.

The *targum* of the Commandment itself, sometimes expanded and explicated, followed immediately. In the rite of our *Mahzor*, too, the pericope was meant to be read in this way, with Aramaic *piyyuṭim* following upon the Commandment, explaining or illustrating it.⁸⁹ The expansion brought in our manuscript for the First Commandment, אגא אתקינית עלמא בתבונה (א. 6237; fol. 149r), is not found in *Mahzor Vitry*, but it is quite common in other manuscripts.⁹⁰ The passage is unrhymed, has no clear-cut meter, and seems to be very ancient; it serves to deepen and complete the meaning of the first word of the Ten Commandments, אנכי. In the Bible God presents Himself as the Redeemer of His people from their Egyptian bondage; in the *piyyuṭ* God recounts His deeds from the creation until the redemption from Egypt. Every line in the poem opens with the word אגא. With the completion of this passage (fol. 149v), a title (now entirely faded) announces the reading of the Hebrew original of the Second Commandment, לא יהיה לך. This is followed by the *targum* of the Commandment, made up of two sections, as described above. As an illustration of this Commandment, the passage חנניה מישאל ועזריה (ת. 421), also printed in the *Mahzor Vitry* (p. 337), is adduced. This *piyyuṭ* has two parts; the first, which runs until the letter *lamed* of the acrostic, is unrhymed and apparently very ancient; the second, which was lost perhaps in early times, was completed by R. Me'ir bar Yizḥaq Sheliaḥ Zibbur (his composition begins from מישך שדרך תבד נגו, fol. 150v) in a form similar to the first part, but with rhymes. The *piyyuṭ* presents in bold and very sophisticated dramatic form an argument between Nebuchadnezzar and the three youths, identifying the *dramatis personae* in turn, at the end of their speeches: "said Hannaniah", "said Misha'el", "said 'Azariah" — as opposed to "said the dwarf". The "dwarf" is King Nebuchadnezzar of Babylonia, according to the *Aggadah*.⁹¹ His

88 The usual *ma'ariv* in western Germany is אל אלהים יי דיבר (א. 3423) by R. Eliezer bar Nathan (the Ra'AVan). In eastern Germany, the *piyyuṭ* וירד משה אל העם על הר סיני (א. 203), by R. Yizḥaq b. Moshe, was recited. This *ma'ariv* appears in the Nürnberg *Mahzor* for the first night of the holiday, while Yosef Bonfils' יעקב אביר יעקב appears there for the second night.

89 In the *Mahzor Vitry* (pp. 336 ff.) the expansions appear before the *targum* of the Commandments, as introductions to them.

90 It was published by P. de Haas, *Ungedruckte Stücke aus den Breslauer deutschen Machzor-Handschriften*, Berlin 1906, p. 17; and by M. Ginsburger, *Revue des études juives*, LXXIII (1921), p. 17.

91 Compare *Pesiqta de-Rav Kahana*, 13, ed. Buber, p. 112a; and *Pesiqta Rabbati*, 31, ed. M. Friedmann, p. 144a, and in the notes there.

name is mentioned in the middle of his speech, after the first of two sentences he pronounces. Two one-line refrains appear intermittently with the three-line stanzas of the *piyyuṭ*, both reporting the words of the three righteous youths: "We have a patron, 'He who does not slumber' is His Name, cried out the three of them", and "We shall not (heretically) deny 'You shall have no [other gods before you]', cried out the three of them". Following the note *לא תשא* and the *targum* of the Commandment in the form described above,⁹² comes the poem *אמנן מומי לא תשתבע* (5566 .א; fol. 151v). This passage, which discusses the punishments awaiting a person who swears falsely and lists the biblical personages who were punished for this transgression, is a rhymed acrostic. It is not found in the *Mahzor Vitry*, but it was known in the Ashkenazi communities; it was annotated by R. Benjamin min-ha-'Anavim.⁹³ After the heading *זכור את יום השבת* and the expanded *targum* of the Commandment as described above, the *piyyuṭ* *ארעא ורקיעא דבהון ושבימי* (not recorded in Davidson's *Thesaurus*) follows (fol. 152v). The poem, which speaks of the praises of the Sabbath and mentions, among other things, the well-known tale of Yosef Moqir Shabbat, is rhymed and has four-line stanzas. It has no acronym, and differs from the parallel *piyyuṭ* in the *Mahzor Vitry*.⁹⁴ The Fifth Commandment *כבד את אבך* is completed by the ancient passage *אמר יצחק לאברהם אבוהי* (5812 .א; fol. 153r), which presents with dramatic force Isaac's words to his father as they travel on the way to the Binding of Isaac. This passage, which also appears in the *Mahzor Vitry* (p. 341), is among the most beautiful of the extant Aramaic *piyyuṭim*, and it is undoubtedly also among the oldest of them. Similar to it in age and in poetic strength is the passage which illustrates the Sixth Commandment: *איתגבר בחיליה אדוניה בר חגית* (3197 .א; fol. 153v), which describes the murder of Yoav ben Zeruyah at the hand of Benayah ben Yehoyada by order of King Solomon (I Kings ii:28 ff.). The *targum* of the Seventh Commandment, *לא תנאף*, is also brought in its entirety; it is completed by the ancient *piyyuṭ* *מרתיה כד תבעתיה מרתיה* (2161 .א; fol. 154r), which describes the complaints of Potiphar's wife to her friends about Joseph's intransigent rejection of her advances. The last three Commandments are represented only by their *targum*, following the titles which note the Hebrew of the original verses; they are not accompanied by Aramaic *piyyuṭim*. Similarly, the framework of the *piyyuṭim* in the *Mahzor Vitry* is

truncated towards the end: no *piyyuṭim* appear there for the Eighth and the Ninth Commandments, but the Tenth Commandment there is accompanied by a rhymed supplement (אוי מאן דאיתתא; *Mahzor Vitry*, p. 343). This *piyyuṭ*, which disparages women, was obviously intended to accompany the Seventh Commandment.⁹⁵ The verses of the Torah-reading are translated in our *Mahzor* until the end of the reading, in wording similar to that in the printed *Mahzor Vitry*. At this point the section dealing with the prayers for Shavu'ot ends with a small colophon by the scribe (fol. 155r).

The Ninth of Av

The section for the Ninth of Av opens with the title *ליל תשעה באב* (fol. 155v); there is not even a hint that Lamentations is read. The section then continues with the heading *על אלה על אלה אני בוכיה* (modelled after Lamentations i:16), followed by the strophe *על חורבן בית המקדש כי הורס וכי הודש / אספוד בכל שנה* (ת. 410; fol. 155v), ascribed to R. El'azar b. R. Qilir. The complete text of the elegy follows immediately. Appearing after this is the well-known elegy *בליל זה יבכין וילילו בני* (721 .ב; fol. 156r). This poem too is attributed to the Qiliri⁹⁶ but was actually composed by a much later *payṭan* of the Spanish school.⁹⁷ A later hand noted by the start of this elegy: *אין אומן* (ריס). In the upper margin of fol. 156v, in later calligraphy, the strophe *בליל זה סר נגהי* was added. This short text was intended to serve as an addition to *בליל זה יבכין* in the event that the Ninth of Av falls on the night following the Sabbath.⁹⁸ A note to this effect was added at the end of *בליל זה יבכין*: *כשחל ט' באב במוצאי שבת אומר בליל זה סר נגהי יבכין* (2104 .א; fol. 156v),⁹⁹ headed by the refrain *עד אנה בכיה בעיון ומספוד בירושלם / תרחם ציון ותבנה חומות ירושלם*. At the end of the elegy the strophe *תרחם ציון כאשר אמרת* appears, accompanied by the biblical verses of consolation, Zech. i:16, 17 and Isa. li:50, as usual also in the later Ashkenazi customs.¹⁰⁰ At the end of this passage comes the instruction to read the prayer *ואתה קדוש יושב תהילות ישראל וקרא זה אל זה* and *זה ואמר*.

The section containing the elegies for the day of the Ninth of Av opens with a modest title, which is now partly undecipherable:

92 The introductory part of the Commandments is abridged in the manuscript.

93 See Schmelzer, *op. cit.* (above, n. 61), pp. 217 ff.

94 However, it appears in the Nürnberg *Mahzor*, and is commented on by R. Benjamin min ha-'Anavim; Schmelzer, *ibid.*, pp. 225 ff.

95 See Zunz, *Literaturgeschichte*, p. 78. In the commentary on the Aramaic Commandments in the *Mahzor Vitry*, p. 334, it in fact appears as an illustration of the Seventh Commandment (You shall not commit adultery). We cannot know why the section of Aramaic *piyyuṭim* was shortened at its end; maybe in order to reduce its exceeding length. In the Nürnberg *Mahzor* as well, poetic expansions appear only for the first seven Commandments. R. Benjamin min ha-'Anavim had before him expansions for all of the Ten Commandments except the last one. In the *Seder Hibbur Berakhot* (Schechter's copy, pp. 225 ff.) the *targum* of the Commandments is like that in our *Mahzor*, but there are only two poetic expansions, *איתגבר בחיליה* and *אמר יצחק לאברהם אבוהי*.

96 The attribution is apparently based on some Ashkenazi manuscript sources. It is attributed to Qiliri even in H. Brody and M. Wiener's *Anthologia Hebraica* [Heb.], Leipzig 1922², pp. 42 ff.

97 The structure of the *piyyuṭ* is classically Spanish: it begins with a monorhymed opening stanza, followed by strophes which end with a fixed rhyme. It is also metered according to the Spanish syllabic system (eight syllables in each line). R. Simḥah marked the caesura of each verse with short lines, a sign that he was aware of the metre. Since the *piyyuṭ* is quite ancient, it is problematical to presume it was written under Spanish influence in Germany.

98 The passage *בליל זה סר נגהי* is not a separate *piyyuṭ*, but rather a stanza which was modelled on the strophes of *בליל זה יבכין* in order to be added onto it. This is the reason the *payṭan* began the passage with the phrase *בליל זה יבכין* and ended it with the fixed rhyme *ני-גי*, like all the strophes of *בליל זה יבכין*. However, he expanded this passage more than the regular stanzas of the poem, and added an internal rhyme *הי-גי* in each line, alongside the caesura. He apparently also was careful to replicate the metre of the poem. This passage mentions the early Ashkenazi custom to omit *יהי נועם* (Ps. xc:17-xci:16) when the Ninth of Av falls on the night following the Sabbath. The custom of saying *בליל זה סר נגהי* as an addition to *בליל זה יבכין* on those occasions is mentioned in the *Customs* of R. Avraham Klausner, ed. Y. Dissen, Jerusalem 1978, para. 135, p. 127. The passage *בליל זה סר נגהי* (726 .ב) is attributed to R. El'azar of Worms, the author of the *Rokeah*, in MS Oxford 1025 (של הרב רבי אלעזר בר יהודה הקטן). See also Zunz, *Literaturgeschichte*, p. 319.

99 This elegy appears in the anthology of Brody and Wiener, *op. cit.* (above n. 96), p. 17. It is an excellent example of the unrhymed, pre-classical *piyyuṭ*.

100 See D. Goldschmidt, *The Qinot for the Ninth of Av* [Heb.; henceforth: Goldschmidt, *Qinot*], Jerusalem 1968, p. 31. From the structure of the text it appears that it originally constituted the conclusion of an unrhymed pre-classical *piyyuṭ*. The passage is made up of two lines of four parts each, both of them beginning with the letter *tav*.

omitted. A later hand noted alongside the elegies the model-poems according to the tunes of which the *piyyuṭim* were customarily sung in Worms.¹⁰⁸ At the end of the fifteenth elegy (הטה אלהי אונך), on fol. 170v, a later hand noted: עד כאן אומר החזן; then follows the elegy הילילו (ה. 532). We will comment on this *piyyuṭ*, apparently by Yannai, below.¹⁰⁹ At this point there is a note reading: אומי אחר העיני: עד אנא [!] בכי' כו' אז בחטאינו כו'. At the end of הילילו comes the note: This note complements the one which appears in the margin at the beginning of the *piyyuṭ*; הילילו was intended to be recited at the end of the *qinot*, following the *ziyyonim*¹¹⁰ and preceding the elegy בחטאינו,¹¹¹ which was meant to complete the order, as on the night of the Ninth of Av.

A series of *qinot* by various authors is brought afterwards in the following order: איך תנחמוני הבל (א. 2860; fol. 171r),¹¹² ascribed to R. El'azar b. R. Qilir; אבל אעורר קינים (ניא אנינות) אגור; (א. 288; fol. 171v), by R. Menahem bar Makhir, about the martyrs of the First Crusade in 1096;¹¹³ אמרתי שנו מני אמרר (א. 5971; fol. 172r), by R. Kalonymos bar Yehudah, also about the First Crusade;¹¹⁴ מה אעשה (א. 2098; fol. 173r), by the Qiliri (headed אעשה מה אעשה או בהלוך ירמיהו / גזירה היא מלפניי לכן בני / גזירה היא מלפניי), which is one of the two refrains of the elegy in the common versions; the other refrain, אם כאדם עברו או במלאות ספק; (א. 2108; fol. 173v), also by Qiliri, (beginning עיני עיני יודדה מים, a heading not found in the usual variants of the poem);¹¹⁵ ואת נר (א. 2108; fol. 173v), also by Qiliri, (beginning עיני עיני יודדה מים, a heading not found in the usual variants of the poem);¹¹⁶ חטאתי השמימה (א. 78; fol. 174r), a *qinah* which tells the famous talmudic story of the son and daughter of R. Ishma'el the High Priest, who were taken captive at the time of the Destruction and were matched by their masters for mating purposes (*TB Giṭṭin* 58a);¹¹⁷ אי לי על שברי נחלה וגברה מכתו (א. 1744; fol. 174v), by R. Ya'aqov b. R. Yizhaq ha-Levi, which describes the destruction of Worms during the First Crusade;¹¹⁸ שכורה לא מייך (א. 1758; fol. 175v), an elegy of the Spanish type, attributed to R. Shelomoh bar Yizhaq of Gerona, a disciple of Nahmanides;¹¹⁹ אש תוקד בקרבי (א. 7736; fol. 176r), an anonymous *piyyuṭ*;¹²⁰ איכה ישבה ברד ענוגה (א. 2900; fol. 176v), by R. Ephraim of Bonn, also recalling the

omitted. A later hand noted alongside the elegies the model-poems according to the tunes of which the *piyyuṭim* were customarily sung in Worms.¹⁰⁸ At the end of the fifteenth elegy (הטה אלהי אונך), on fol. 170v, a later hand noted: עד כאן אומר החזן; then follows the elegy הילילו (ה. 532). We will comment on this *piyyuṭ*, apparently by Yannai, below.¹⁰⁹ At this point there is a note reading: אומי אחר העיני: עד אנא [!] בכי' כו' אז בחטאינו כו'. At the end of הילילו comes the note: This note complements the one which appears in the margin at the beginning of the *piyyuṭ*; הילילו was intended to be recited at the end of the *qinot*, following the *ziyyonim*¹¹⁰ and preceding the elegy בחטאינו,¹¹¹ which was meant to complete the order, as on the night of the Ninth of Av.

A series of *qinot* by various authors is brought afterwards in the following order: איך תנחמוני הבל (א. 2860; fol. 171r),¹¹² ascribed to R. El'azar b. R. Qilir; אבל אעורר קינים (ניא אנינות) אגור; (א. 288; fol. 171v), by R. Menahem bar Makhir, about the martyrs of the First Crusade in 1096;¹¹³ אמרתי שנו מני אמרר (א. 5971; fol. 172r), by R. Kalonymos bar Yehudah, also about the First Crusade;¹¹⁴ מה אעשה (א. 2098; fol. 173r), by the Qiliri (headed אעשה מה אעשה או בהלוך ירמיהו / גזירה היא מלפניי לכן בני / גזירה היא מלפניי), which is one of the two refrains of the elegy in the common versions; the other refrain, אם כאדם עברו או במלאות ספק; (א. 2108; fol. 173v), also by Qiliri, (beginning עיני עיני יודדה מים, a heading not found in the usual variants of the poem);¹¹⁵ ואת נר (א. 2108; fol. 173v), also by Qiliri, (beginning עיני עיני יודדה מים, a heading not found in the usual variants of the poem);¹¹⁶ חטאתי השמימה (א. 78; fol. 174r), a *qinah* which tells the famous talmudic story of the son and daughter of R. Ishma'el the High Priest, who were taken captive at the time of the Destruction and were matched by their masters for mating purposes (*TB Giṭṭin* 58a);¹¹⁷ אי לי על שברי נחלה וגברה מכתו (א. 1744; fol. 174v), by R. Ya'aqov b. R. Yizhaq ha-Levi, which describes the destruction of Worms during the First Crusade;¹¹⁸ שכורה לא מייך (א. 1758; fol. 175v), an elegy of the Spanish type, attributed to R. Shelomoh bar Yizhaq of Gerona, a disciple of Nahmanides;¹¹⁹ אש תוקד בקרבי (א. 7736; fol. 176r), an anonymous *piyyuṭ*;¹²⁰ איכה ישבה ברד ענוגה (א. 2900; fol. 176v), by R. Ephraim of Bonn, also recalling the

101 The *qerovah* is printed and commented on in Goldschmidt, *Qinot*, pp. 124 ff.; it was recited on the Ninth of Av in the Ashkenazi communities, especially in the West.

102 Regarding this type of *qerovah*, see Fleischer, *Liturgical Poetry*, pp. 75–76. In ancient Erez Israel it was customary to say the elegies in the fourteenth benediction of the *'amidah* (the benediction *אלהי דוד ובונה ירושלים*). When this body of additional *piyyuṭim* grew exceedingly large, the communities, and eventually the *paytanim* as well, ceased to continue the poetical embellishment of the remaining benedictions of the *'amidah*. We know of five *qerovot* for the Ninth of Av by the Qiliri; four of them are *qerovot* of fourteen passages only.

103 See below.

104 In other words, the *qedushah de-sidra*, i.e. the passage *גואל לציון*.

105 The Qiliri in his compositions for the Ninth of Av used to complete the alphabets of the acrostics and the consideration of the subjects dealt with in his "abridged" fourteen-*qerovot* in a *qinah* modelled after the *qerovah* it was intended to supplement. Regarding this usage, see E. Fleischer, "On the Priestly Orders in *Piyyuṭ*" [Heb.], *Sinai*, LXII (1968), pp. 13 ff. However, the elegy which completed the *qerovah* *מבך ביום מבך* has been lost. The *qerovah* *אנו איכה*, also one of Qiliri's most sophisticated creations, is printed in Goldschmidt, *Qinot*, pp. 147 ff.

106 See Goldschmidt, *Qinot*: שבת סורו (No. 7); איכה אצת (No. 8); אודה עד (No. 9); איכה תפארת (No. 10); איכה ישבה חבצלת (No. 11); איכה אהלי אשר תאבת (No. 12); איכה אלי (No. 13); איכה אשר (No. 14); זכור את אשר עשה (No. 15); איכה את אשר (No. 16); איכה אשר תאבת (No. 17); לך יי הצדקה (No. 18); אתה אמרת (No. 19); אתה אמרת (No. 20); לך יי הצדקה (No. 21); אתה אמרת (No. 22).

107 Regarding this, see Fleischer, *Liturgical Poetry*, p. 204.

108 The "tunes" (*niggunim*) are noted by R. Yuspa Shammash in the short version of his *Worms Customs* (which is discussed below), p. 36. They are consistent with the notations in the margin of our *Mahzor*.

109 This *piyyuṭ* appears also in Goldschmidt, *Qinot*, p. 146, but it is mistakenly attributed to the Qiliri. Regarding the *qerovah* which this elegy completes, see E. Fleischer, "The *Piyyuṭ* of Yannai *Hazzan* on the Priestly Orders" [Heb.], *Sinai*, LXIV (1969), pp. 176 ff.; idem, "News on the Subject of the Priestly Orders in *Piyyuṭim*" [Heb.], *Sefer Dov Sedan*, Jerusalem 1977, pp. 279 ff.

110 The *ziyyonim* are elegies for the Ninth of Av which are modelled after the famous poem *הלא תשאלו* of R. Yehudah ha-Levi. In the later Ashkenazi order of elegies many such *piyyuṭim* were included; see Goldschmidt, *Qinot*, pp. 13 ff. and 124 ff. In our *Mahzor* there are no *ziyyonim* other than *הלא תשאלו* itself (see below also); thus, this note relates to a different, later scope of the order of elegies in Worms.

111 *אז אנה בכיה* is, as we mentioned, the opening strophe of the elegy *אז בחטאינו*, which appears in its entirety in the order for the night of the Ninth of Av, fol. 156v.

112 Goldschmidt, *Qinot*, No. 29, p. 102.

113 Goldschmidt, *ibid.*, No. 34, p. 118; A.M. Habermann, *The Gezerot of Germany and France* [Heb.], Jerusalem 1971², p. 63.

114 Goldschmidt, *Qinot*, No. 30, p. 106.

115 Goldschmidt, *ibid.*, No. 27, p. 98.

116 *Ibid.*, No. 28, p. 101.

117 *Ibid.*, No. 24, p. 88. Goldschmidt, following a manuscript, attributes the *piyyuṭ* to a *paytan* named Yehiel.

118 Published by P. de Haas, *op. cit.* (above, n. 90), p. 32. Three stanzas are missing from this *piyyuṭ* in our *Mahzor* (fol. 175r); as a result the *paytan*'s signature is also defective. The scribe sensed this omission and apologized in a marginal note: *בבאן חסיד ג חרוות ולא מצאתי כמעתיק שלי*. About this see also the article by M. Beit-Arié above, p. 22.

119 Goldschmidt, *Qinot*, No. 36, p. 122.

120 *Ibid.*, No. 32, p. 112.

persecutions of 1096;¹²¹ שומרן קול תתן (686 .ש; fol. 177v), the well-known *piyyuṭ* attributed to R. Shelomoh Ibn Gabirol;¹²² מי יתן ראשי מים (1122 .מ; fol. 178r) by R. Kalonymos bar Yehudah,¹²³ describing the events of 1096, explicitly recalling the martyrs of Speyer and Mainz (this *qinah* is completed in many codices with a passage telling of the martyrs of Worms, but it does not appear in our Codex);¹²⁴ יום אכפי הכבדתי (1605 .י; fol. 179r), the famous elegy of R. Yehudah ha-Levi about the murder of the prophet Zehariah. The bottom half of this folio was removed.¹²⁵ On the last part of this page the scribe copied out the beginning of R. Yehudah ha-Levi's elegy ציון הלא תשאל לי שלום אסיריך;¹²⁶ but only a fragment of this poem is still extant on fol. 179v. The end of the poem appears on fol. 180r. After it come the elegies אצבעותיי שפלו אצבעותיי שפלו (7244 .א) by R. Barukh of Mainz;¹²⁷ ואתאונן ואתקונן [=ואקונן] (79 .ו; fol. 181r), on the slaughter of "more than one hundred and seventy three souls" in Frankfort in 1241; למי אי ולמי אבוי ומדנים (1086 .ל; fol. 182r), the moving elegy by R. Ephraim of Bonn about the martyrs of Blois in 1171;¹²⁸ אללי כי באו רוב אלמון ושכול (5154 .א; fol. 183r), the only elegy in our *Mahzor* explicitly attributed to a particular author in its title: קינה מרבינו מנחם בר יעקב מבורמישא וצ"ל. The elegy speaks of the martyrs of Blois in 1171 and of Boppard in 1179. At the end of the *piyyuṭ*, on fol. 184r, we have the strophe תרחם ציון etc., which introduces the verses of consolation, as at the end of the order for the night of the Ninth of Av (on fol. 157r). The last line of the stanza reads here: ותשוב לירושלים. The verses themselves are not brought.

The Biblical Texts

At the end of the *Mahzor*, the volume as bound now contains a series of biblical texts. The original placement of these pages and their original scope are unclear.¹²⁹ The extant pages include Ecclesiastes, from verse i:10 until the end of the *megillah* (fols. 185r–189r), all of Job (fols. 189v–203r), Jeremiah from the beginning until verse xxiii:6 (fols. 204r–217r), and two chapters (xxxiv–xxxv) of Isaiah (fol. 217r–v). Following this section is the long colophon of the scribe Simḥah b. Yehudah, including the note of the date of the copying of the *Mahzor*. The content of this section is rather astonishing: on the one hand, Ecclesiastes, which appears here, relates to Sukkot, which is not dealt with at all in this Codex; on the other hand, the *megillot* Esther, Song of Songs, and Ruth, read on the holidays whose *piyyuṭim* are brought in

this manuscript, are omitted. The passages from Job and Jeremiah, as well as the section copied from Isaiah, were intended to be recited on the Ninth of Av, so their presence here is natural. Undoubtedly, this section is no longer before us in its original form.

The biblical selections appear in their right order and in their entirety (except for a few omissions which were corrected in the margin). In the section bringing Jeremiah, the scribe noted in the margin with the word *haftarah* the beginning of three *haftarot*: at Jer. vii:21 (עולותיכם ספרו) the *haftarah* for the pericope *Zav* (fol. 208r), at Jer. viii:13 (אסף אסיפם) the *haftarah* for the Ninth of Av (fol. 209r), and at Jer. xvi:19 (י עזי ומעזי) the *haftarah* for the pericope *Behuqotai* (fol. 213v). The fact that the *haftarot* for *Shabbat Divrei* and *Shabbat Shim'u* (the first two Sabbaths of the period between the seventeenth of Tammuz and the Ninth of Av) at Jer. i:1 and ii:1 are not noted, is surprising.¹³⁰

Alongside the biblical text at Jer. ix:24 (fol. 209v), the point at which the *haftarah* for the Ninth of Av ends, a late hand drew two hands with their fingers pointing and noted in the margin: כאן מתחילין בחרמישא בתשעה באב אחרי הקינות ואומרים עד ה' צדקינן [Jer. xxiii:6] פסוק בחליפין פסוק ואח"כ אומרים קרבו גוים [Isa. xxxiv:1] שכתוב אחר (אחר כך: read). This custom will be discussed below.

The *Mahzor*, as it is bound now, ends with several pages containing *piyyuṭim* meant to replace, according to the Worms rite, several of the *piyyuṭim* brought in the body of the *Mahzor* according to some other rite. On fol. 219v is the *piyyuṭ* וישע אור (ג. ה), by R. Me'ir bar Yizḥaq Sheliah Zibbur (239 .ה), which is intended to replace, on the last day of Passover, the *piyyuṭ* ולילה ארתה (fol. 89v). The long *piyyuṭ* אדיר ונאה, also by R. Me'ir bar Yizḥaq, starts on fol. 221r; it had to replace, on the second day of Shavu'ot, the poem מתנה סיני אילת אהבים מתנה סיני, copied in the main part of the *Mahzor* on fol. 130v. Alongside the beginning of the *piyyuṭ* אדיר ונאה a later hand wrote: יוצר ליום שני של שבועות גם אומרי האופן כבודו אות (fols. 223v ff.). It replaces the *ofan* אורחות אראלים, which appears in the *Mahzor* on fol. 131r. כבודו אות (כ. 66) is a *piyyuṭ* of the Spanish type, exhibiting quantitative meter (with a few deviations) and a sophisticated rhyming pattern. It does not contain its author's signature,¹³¹ but an ancient Ashkenazi tradition attributes it to R. Me'ir bar Yizḥaq Sheliah Zibbur.¹³²

121 Published by A.M. Habermann, "The *Piyyuṭim* of Rabbi Ephraim b. R. Ya'aqov of Bonn" [Heb.], *Studies of the Research Institute for Hebrew Poetry* [henceforth: *Studies*], VII, Jerusalem 1958, pp. 237 ff.

122 Goldschmidt, *Qinot*, No. 5, p. 28.

123 *Ibid.*, No. 26, p. 93; Habermann, *op. cit.* (above, n. 113), p. 66.

124 Zunz, *Literaturgeschichte*, p. 319, mentions the fact that the supplement is ascribed in a Parma MS to R. El'azar of Worms, the author of *Sefer Rokeah*; see also Goldschmidt, *Qinot*, p. 13. Goldschmidt finds it hard to believe that R. El'azar added such a small number of lines to the work of another *paytan*. However, we have already seen that R. El'azar did just that also in the supplement בליל זה סר נגדי which he added to זה בליל זה. The fact that the passage on Worms was not included in the *Mahzor* which in any event was used in Worms for hundreds of years does not demonstrate much at all, for the early communities insisted on preserving the original wording of the *piyyuṭim* they recited. בליל זה סר נגדי also was not included in the body of the *Mahzor*, but was only added in the margin.

125 Goldschmidt, *Qinot*, No. 35, p. 120. Judging from the size of the missing part of the page, it would seem that the elegy was copied without its final strophe (לך הטאנו); Goldschmidt, *ibid.*, p. 124). This strophe is missing in most of the Ashkenazi manuscripts. The *piyyuṭ* was published by I. Schirmann, *Hebrew Poetry in Spain and Provence* [Heb.], Jerusalem–Tel Aviv 1961², p. 462.

126 Goldschmidt, *ibid.*, No. 37, p. 124; Schirmann, *ibid.*, p. 485.

127 Goldschmidt, *ibid.*, No. 33, p. 114; A.M. Habermann, "The *Piyyuṭim* of Rabbenu Barukh bar Shemu'el of Mainz" [Heb.], *Studies*, VI, Jerusalem 1946, p. 86.

128 Habermann, *op. cit.* (above n. 113), p. 137; idem, *op. cit.* (above, n. 121), p. 270.

129 See discussion of this issue in the introduction by M. Beit-Arié, p. 17 above.

130 We have to assume that the scribe forgot to note these *haftarot*. It is impossible that in his time and place they were not part of the rite. Both are attested in the compilations of R. Liva Kirchheim and R. Yuspa Shammash in the seventeenth century.

131 Zunz, *Literaturgeschichte*, p. 90, derived from the beginning of the *piyyuṭ* the signature "אברם" and attributed the *piyyuṭ* to a *paytan* of that name. However, this combination of letters is certainly happenstance.

132 See also below. The attribution is based on its mention by the *Rokeah* in two of his books (*Sefer Hokhmat ha-Nefesh*, 33a; *Sodei Razayah*, 15), as E.E. Urbach noted in *Arugat ha-Bosem*, I, Jerusalem 1939, p. 197, n. 18. R. Avraham b. R. 'Azriel, the author of *Arugat ha-Bosem* (written about 1234), also begins his commentary of the *piyyuṭ* (ed. Urbach, *ibid.*) with an explicit attribution: "Ofan by R. Me'ir Sheliah Zibbur, one of the Mourners of Zion. Even though it is not signed, there is a tradition that he wrote it."

D. THE PAYṬANIM OF THE WORMS MAḤZOR

Ashkenazi *maḥzorim*, including the Worms *Maḥzor*, contain several layers of poetic material. The study of their contents can teach us valuable lessons in the history of the development of the Ashkenazi prayer rite. The *piyyuṭim* of our *Maḥzor* are gathered from all the corners of the payṭanic world, with virtually every period and centre and school of poetic creation represented. The *Maḥzor* is also rather comprehensive from the chronological point of view: the oldest sections found in it were composed in the prehistory of payṭanic poetry, while the latest date from only decades before the *Maḥzor* was copied. However, the editors of the *Maḥzor* did not intend to create a representative historical anthology of *piyyuṭ*. There is no way to understand the criteria of selection which dictated the content of the Ashkenazi *maḥzorim* without considering the history of Central European Jewry and its relationship with its Eastern, especially Palestinian, sources of influence.

The central core of the Central European *maḥzor* apparently took shape in Italy some time at the end of the eighth or the beginning of the ninth century. It contained primarily works of the greatest of the ancient payṭanim, R. El'azar b. R. Qilir. R. El'azar b. R. Qilir, a payṭan from Erez Israel who lived in the beginning of the seventh century,¹³³ is also the central figure of our *Maḥzor*. No other payṭan, early or late, is represented here more than he, neither in terms of absolute quantity nor, more essentially, in terms of the "area" occupied by his *piyyuṭim*. In our *Maḥzor*, as in all Ashkenazi *maḥzorim*, the Qiliri reigns with overwhelming priority in the realm of the *qerovot*: his four *qedushta'ot* stand at the centre of the *piyyuṭ* programme for the four special Sabbaths preceding Passover, while others of his *qedushta'ot* adorn the prayers for the second day of Passover¹³⁴ and the second day of Shavu'ot. Two of his *shiv'atot* are included in the *musaf* services of *Shabbat Sheqalim* and *Shabbat ha-Hodesh*, while his impressive *shiv'ata* for Dew embellishes the *musaf* of the first day of Passover. His *qerovah* for Purim, expanded by several *piyyuṭim*, adorns the prayers of this day, while another of his *qerovot* embellishes the *'amidah* for the day of the Ninth of Av. The remainder of the payṭanic programme for the Ninth of Av is also built around elegies by the Qiliri. These elegies were originally parts of the *qerovot* which the payṭan composed for the Ninth of Av, like the poems added to his *qerovah* for Purim; their appearance in our context, divorced from the original compositions, is the result of a late development.¹³⁵ The centrality of the Qiliri in our *Maḥzor* becomes even more obvious when we also consider the scope and high standard of his *piyyuṭim*. Still, it might be necessary to add to this list of compositions, which can be ascribed to the Qiliri with certainty, the *yozerot* and the *zulatot* for the four special Sabbaths, as two of them, those for *Shabbat Zakhor* and for *Shabbat Parah*, are explicitly attributed to him in our *Maḥzor* (fols. 9r and 20v).¹³⁶ If this ascription is correct, then the entire liturgical programme of the four special Sabbaths is made up exclusively of Qiliri's compositions.

The dominance of Qiliri's *piyyuṭim* in the Ashkenazi *maḥzorim* parallels their weight in the ancient Italian *maḥzor*, and there can be no doubt that these poems came to Germany from Italy. Thus, they represent the first stage in the development of the Central European *maḥzor*. One could say that in terms of liturgical poetry, Central European Jewry at the dawn of its history was almost totally under the influence of the Qiliri.

R. El'azar b. R. Qilir was the greatest representative of the classical period of Hebrew liturgical poetry. This period, which had its inception around the sixth century and continued until the end of the eighth century, saw a tremendous flowering of payṭanic creativity.¹³⁷ However, of everything created during that period in Erez Israel, nothing at all made its way into the Ashkenazi *maḥzor* save one *qedushta* of Yannai, namely the *qedushta* ארני פטר רחמתיים, which in our *Maḥzor* embellishes the *'amidah* for the morning prayers on *Shabbat ha-Gadol*. Yannai was the first poet of the classical period and, according to most scholars, the first to consciously and regularly use rhyme. Fragments of hundreds of his works were discovered in the *genizah*, remnants of an entire order of more than 150 *qedushta'ot* based on the weekly *sedarim* (i.e. Torah-portions) read on Sabbaths in his place and time according to the triennial cycle which was customary in Erez Israel.¹³⁸ The *qedushta* in our *Maḥzor* also was originally part of this great cycle of *piyyuṭim*, and it was intended not for the Sabbath before Passover, but rather for the Sabbath יהי בחצי הלילה (Ex. xii:29). The *qedushta* arrived in Central Europe by way of Italy, but it later was omitted from the Italian *maḥzor* itself together with the rest of the *qedushta'ot* which had been included in it, with the exception of the *qedushta* for the Day of Atonement. Also in the Ashkenazi communities fate was not kind to this composition: in the eastern Ashkenazi communities it was replaced by the *qedushta* בצערך אלהים by R. Yosef Bonfils. On the other hand, a section of this *qedushta*, the *rahit* אור רוב נסים הפלאת בלילה, was included in the Passover *Haggadah*, thereby achieving tremendous currency. This currency was nevertheless insufficient to maintain in the consciousness of later generations the name of the author, and modern scholars worked hard to identify him.¹³⁹

It would seem that Yannai is represented "incognito" in an additional poem included in our *Maḥzor*: namely, the *qinah* הילילו הה ליום (fol. 170v). The form in which this elegy appears in all the sources is exceedingly strange: its alphabetic acrostic begins only from the letter *samekh*, implying that it is only a fragment of a *piyyuṭ* whose beginning was cut off. In the section which remains the *piyyuṭ* lists the priestly orders who served in ancient times in the Temple, but these also are mentioned only from the fifteenth order. As research has demonstrated, this section was originally intended as a completion for the acrostic and the content of a "fourteen-*qerovah*" for the Ninth of Av. This *qerovah* was discovered in the *genizah*; the signature in its last sections reads: "Yannai *Hazzan*." There can be no doubt that the

133 Regarding this payṭan, see I. Elbogen, *Der jüdische Gottesdienst in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, Frankfurt o./M. 1931³, p. 311; E. Fleischer, "Qiliri Matters" [Heb.], *Tarbiz*, L (1981), pp. 282 ff.; idem, *The Yozer*, pp. 29 ff., 91 ff.

134 In most Ashkenazi communities, no *qedushta* was said in the morning service of the first day of Passover, because of the long *shiv'ata* for dew which was to be recited in *musaf*. Only in Mainz — according to early sources — was it customary to recite a *qedushta* on the first day of the holiday. See more about this matter below.

135 Regarding this matter, see Fleischer, *Liturgical Poetry*, pp. 204 ff.; idem,

"Qilirian Compositions for the Ninth of Av", *Hebrew Union College Annual*, XLIV (1974), Hebrew section, pp. 1 ff.

136 See more on this matter in the following section of this introduction.

137 Regarding the periodization of the history of the *piyyuṭ*, see Fleischer, *Liturgical Poetry*, pp. 10 ff. See pp. 117 ff. there about classical *piyyuṭ*.

138 The *piyyuṭim* of Yannai were collected from the *genizah* by Zulay, *op. cit.* (above, n. 40). See also Fleischer, *The Yozer*, pp. 28 ff.

139 Regarding the development of the research dealing with the *piyyuṭim* of Yannai, see M. Zula, "Yannai Studies" [Heb.], *Studies*, II, Berlin 1936, pp. 116 ff.

reference is to the ancient Yannai; the character and rhythm of our poem also testify that it is the work of the ancient *paytan*.¹⁴⁰ Even though most of the Central European *mahzor* is covered by classical, Qilirian *piyyuṭim*, it nevertheless does contain *piyyuṭim* from the pre-classical period, in which rhyme was still not used. The names of the *paytanim* of this period have not been preserved. The amount of ancient material preserved in our *Mahzor* is not large, and it is liturgically marginal. First and foremost we must note here the ancient *azharot* אתה הנחלת תורה לעמך and אוהרת ראשית, which appear in the *musaf 'amidah* of the two days of Shavu'ot, as well as their concluding passage, שש מאות ושלש עשרה.¹⁴¹ These two long *piyyuṭim* are typical of their period: the lines are long, unrhymed, and divided into four short lines, each containing approximately two heavily stressed words.¹⁴² Both are very old, and it seems reasonable to assume that both originated in Erez Israel. The *piyyuṭ* אתה הנחלת, which tallies in disconcertingly disorganized fashion the 613 commandments which according to tradition are found in the Torah, is one of the most widely disseminated compositions in the realm of Jewish prayer. Later works which were much more perfect, precise, and pretty, failed to displace it. In ancient manuscripts it is labelled אוהרות דרבנן דמתיבתא, אוהרות דרבנן and other names of esteem. Though it is ascribed in different manuscripts to various authors, its true author remains unknown.¹⁴³ The passage שש מאות ושלש עשרה, written in a grand style, may be older still. It does not exhibit the prosody which characterizes the pre-classical period of the *piyyuṭ*, and it is regularly added to all the *azharot*, even to ones much later than אתה הנחלת.

The famous elegy או בחטאינו חרב מקדש, another of the most widespread *paytan* compositions, also dates from the pre-classical period. This is a characteristic pre-classical composition in terms of both its form and its thematic pattern. It describes the destruction of the Temple as some sort of cosmic catastrophe: all the powers of nature participate in Israel's mourning and eulogize Jerusalem. The refrain which recurs throughout the poem, עד אנה בכיה בציון ומספר בירושלים, is replaced with another at the end of the poem in order to enable the *piyyuṭ* to end with a prayer for a better future. In the liturgical practice of the Central European communities this elegy was placed, due to its beauty, at the end of the *qinot*, both in the evening and in the morning. Another group of extremely ancient passages, perhaps predating *piyyuṭ*, appears in our *Mahzor* in the Aramaic section embellishing the readings from the Torah and the Prophets on the days of

Passover and Shavu'ot. The ancient Aramaic works included in our *Mahzor* are among the most beautiful of their type. They are written in magnificent, authentic Palestinian Aramaic.¹⁴⁴ The literary character of these passages has not yet been adequately defined by scholars: although their metrical system is similar to that found in pre-classical *piyyuṭim*, their poetics differ from those of ancient *paytan* poetry. Maybe they are remnants of some folkish poetry, preserving a characteristic spontaneous vivacity which is found only rarely in the regular types of *piyyuṭ*.¹⁴⁵

A later layer of *piyyuṭ* represented prominently in our *Mahzor* is that of the early Italian *paytanim*. Pre-eminent among them is R. Shelomoh ha-Bavli, who lived in the middle of the tenth century, apparently in northern Italy. His great *yozer* אור ישע מאשרים adorns in our *Mahzor* the morning prayer of the first day of Passover.¹⁴⁶ This *piyyuṭ* is among the most widespread of the *piyyuṭim* in the *mahzorim* of Central Europe, and it is one of the most important works of the Italian school of *piyyuṭ*. A new form for the *yozer* was fixed in its image in Central Europe; scores of *paytanim* imitated it. A careful imitation of it is the *piyyuṭ* אפיק רנן ושירים by R. Meshullam bar Kalonymos, which our *Mahzor* brings for the second day of Passover. An ancient Ashkenazi custom claims that this *yozer* was composed with virtuosity in a single day, modelled after אור ישע.¹⁴⁷ According to this tradition R. Meshullam bar Kalonymos was the disciple of R. Shelomoh ha-Bavli, a claim which is both chronologically and geographically feasible. Meshullam bar Kalonymos was of Italian extraction, but he spent many years in Germany. He is among those "responsible" for transferring the Italian *piyyuṭ* tradition to the Rhineland.¹⁴⁸ אפיק רנן is a work impressive for its loftiness, which, even though it is constructed after the model of Shelomoh ha-Bavli, nevertheless does not lack original details of content and form. Following the example of these two *piyyuṭim*, R. Shim'on bar Yizhaq composed the *yozer* אהובין אהבון מישירים, for the intermediate Sabbath of Passover.

The third Italian *paytan* represented in our *Mahzor* is R. Moshe b. R. Kalonymos,¹⁴⁹ who apparently also flourished during the end of the tenth century and at the beginning of the eleventh. His great *qedushta* אימת נוראותיך embellishes in our *Mahzor* the 'amidah for the morning of the seventh day of Passover. This composition, highly praised by Zunz,¹⁵⁰ is almost the only one of the works of this important poet which has survived. Besides it, we possess only a *zulat* of his, also for the seventh day of Passover,

140 See my two articles cited in note 109 above. There can be no doubt about the meaning of the signature "Yannai Ḥazzan", which appears in the last passages of the *qerovah* four times in succession. A.M. Habermann's doubts about the identity of the *paytan*, expressed in *The History of Piyyuṭ and Poetry* [Heb.], I, Ramat-Gan 1970, p. 40, are superfluous.

141 There still is no critical edition of any of these texts. Regarding *azharot* in general, see Fleischer, *Liturgical Poetry*, p. 73 and the places listed in the index there. See also E. Fleischer, "Azharot by R. Binyamin (bar Shemu'el) Paytan" [Heb.], *Kovez 'al Yad*, 11 (21), Jerusalem 1985 (in press). The three *piyyuṭim* which appear in our *Mahzor* are undoubtedly the most ancient examples of the genre.

142 Regarding the metrical system of ancient, unrhymed *piyyuṭ*, see E. Fleischer, "Remarks Concerning the Metric System of Ancient Hebrew Liturgical Poetry", *Hasifrut*, 24 (January 1977), pp. 70 ff. See also Fleischer, *Liturgical Poetry*, pp. 82 ff.

143 It is, *inter alia*, attributed by a rather puzzling Ashkenazi tradition to R. Shim'on bar Yizhaq of Mainz or his grandfather R. Abun. See A. Grossman, *The Early Sages of Ashkenaz* [Heb.], Jerusalem 1981 [henceforth: Grossman, *Sages*], pp. 87 ff. Of course, this attribution is mistaken. The *piyyuṭ* was written hundreds of years before the time of R. Shim'on.

144 The language of these *piyyuṭim* was examined by A. Tal in his work, "The Aramaic *Piyyuṭim* for Shavu'ot — An Analysis of Their Dialect and Their Contribution to the Aramaic Dictionary" [Heb.], Jerusalem 1966.

145 Regarding this matter, see Y. Heinemann, "Remnants of Ancient *Piyyuṭim* in the Palestinian *Targum* Tradition" [Heb.], *Hasifrut*, IV (1973), pp. 362 ff. (= *Studies in Jewish Liturgy* [Heb.], Jerusalem 1981, pp. 148 ff.). Most of the *piyyuṭim* considered have a high literary standard, rarely equalled in regular *paytan* poetry.

146 To be sure, Shelomoh ha-Bavli is not the first Italian *paytan*; several generations of *paytanim* were active in the South, in Puglia, before his time. However, these *paytanim* are not represented in our *Mahzor*. Regarding Shelomoh ha-Bavli and his work, see Fleischer, *Shelomo ha-Bavli*, Introduction. See also Fleischer, *The Yozer*, the places cited in the index.

147 See E.E. Urbach, *Arugat ha-Bosem*, IV, p. 60. The tradition is reported in the name of R. Barukh, the father of R. Me'ir of Rothenburg. See also Fleischer, *Shelomo ha-Bavli*, pp. 28 ff.

148 Regarding R. Meshullam bar Kalonymos and his activities in Italy and Germany, see Grossman, *Sages*, pp. 49 ff. Regarding אפיק רנן, see Fleischer, *Shelomo ha-Bavli*, pp. 56 ff.

149 Regarding him, see Grossman, *Sages*, pp. 41 ff. Grossman carefully considers the complicated chronological problems involved in attempting to fix the time of the *paytan*'s activity and that of his family in Germany.

150 See Zunz, *Literaturgeschichte*, p. 107.

in which he hints at the date of its composition.¹⁵¹ The *qedushta*, in which the *payṭan* also mentions the names of his two sons, Kalonymos and Hanan'el, has Qilirian patterns; it almost equals the great achievements of the ancient *payṭan* in terms of its beauty.

Later poets from southern Europe are not represented in the Worms *Mahzor*. The only one of them who appears here is R. Benjamin bar Zerah; two of his works, the *yozer* *אתי מלבנון* *כלה*, and the *zulat* *למלך מעשי למלך*, are inserted in the prayers for *Shabbat ha-Gadol*. Benjamin bar Zerah was active in Italy or Byzantium, apparently in the middle of the eleventh century.¹⁵² The works of this poet penetrated deeply into the Central European prayer books, especially among the *seliḥot*.

R. Shim'on bar Yizḥaq of Mainz, the first of the "genuine" German *payṭanim*, and perhaps also the greatest of them,¹⁵³ occupies an honourable place in our *Mahzor*, as, of course, in Ashkenazi *mahzorim* in general. R. Shim'on bar Yizḥaq was a younger contemporary of R. Meshullam bar Kalonymos, and it seems that he learned the poetic discipline from him. His family came from Le Mans in France, but his works speak in the name of the Italian *piyyuṭ* tradition *par excellence*, from which we can learn that in his time there was no other *piyyuṭ* tradition in Central Europe. R. Shim'on was a great and prolific poet, and many of his works have survived. The centrality of his works in the Ashkenazi *mahzorim* is a logical result of both their antiquity and their high poetic quality. From the legacy of R. Shim'on bar Yizḥaq two great *qedushta'ot* are brought in our *Mahzor*, one of them, *אותותיך אז ראינו*, for the last day of Passover, and the other, *אורח חיים מוסר תוכחת*, for the first day of Shavu'ot. These two compositions are most comprehensive, both of them following Qilirian examples. In addition to another *qedushta*, for the New Year, these are the major works of R. Shim'on bar Yizḥaq. However, R. Shim'on is also well represented in our *Mahzor* among the *yozerot*: his works of this genre occupy the appropriate sections in the prayers of the intermediate Sabbath of Passover, the seventh day of Passover and the first day of Shavu'ot. The *yozerot* of R. Shim'on brought here are of different types. *אהוביך משרים אדון* (for the intermediate Sabbath of Passover) and *אמני אור ישע* (for the first day of Shavu'ot) are modelled after *אור ישע מאשרים* by R. Shelomoh ha-Bavli. The first contains almost all the components of the classical *yozer* (the *yozer* proper, *silluq*, *ofan*, *zulat*, and *ge'ulah*),¹⁵⁴ while the second contains the three major parts (the *yozer* proper with the *silluq*, the *ofan*, and the *zulat*). *ירושע שושני פרח* (for the seventh day of Passover) is a classical *yozer* of the Eastern type, as is the *zulat* *אי פתרוס* which accompanies it. In our *Mahzor* the *yozer* *אתה הארתה יומם ולילה*

(for the last day of Passover)¹⁵⁵ is also ascribed to R. Shim'on bar Yizḥaq, but this ascription is apparently mistaken. Scholars also ascribe the *yozer* *אתה הארתה יומם ולילה* (in our *Mahzor*, for the second day of Shavu'ot) to R. Shim'on, but this too is apparently a misascription; already Zunz rejected it.¹⁵⁶ The *piyyuṭ* was erroneously included in the critical edition of the *payṭan's* poems.¹⁵⁷ This *piyyuṭ* also appears in the Italian and Byzantine *mahzorim*, and it is found in different contexts in the *genizah*.¹⁵⁸ Presumably it was composed, perhaps as a part of a *qerovah* for Shavu'ot, before the time of R. Shim'on bar Yizḥaq. Quantitatively, the *piyyuṭim* of R. Me'ir bar Yizḥaq Sheliah Zibbur, the great poet of Worms, occupy a place of prominence in our *Mahzor*. R. Me'ir bar Yizḥaq, who is also known as R. Nehorai, and also as *שליח ציבור ההגון* ("the worthy *sheliah zibbur*"),¹⁵⁹ flourished during the second half of the eleventh century, but he had already passed away by the time of the First Crusade and its atrocities, in which his son and daughter-in-law were murdered.¹⁶⁰ He was considered a prominent authority in matters of prayer and was a great and prolific poet. His work, which is important both literarily and historically, has not yet been gathered in a scholarly edition. Many of his *piyyuṭim* are included in our *Mahzor*, but they do not fill a central role in it. R. Me'ir bar Yizḥaq can already be counted among the "later" Ashkenazi *payṭanim*, who flourished after the primary consolidation of the rite. No room remained for the *piyyuṭim* of these later poets except in the liturgical programmes of the special Sabbaths and the evening prayers, and in the collections of *seliḥot* and *qinot*. Thus, even though R. Me'ir was an important poet and a revered decisor, not even one *yozer* he wrote is included in the main part of our *Mahzor*. Only in the supplements to the *Mahzor* was his *yozer* for Passover, *ירושע אור לישראל*, copied out to replace the anonymous *אתה הארתה יומם ולילה*. R. Me'ir bar Yizḥaq's *yozer* for the second day of Shavu'ot, *אדיר ונאה*, entered the *Mahzor* in a similar fashion. These two *yozerot*, written in later hands, appear on folios which are now appended to the end of the *Mahzor*. According to early and dependable authorities, R. Me'ir Sheliah Zibbur also authored the *ofan* for Shavu'ot *כבודו אור*, which appears in the appended folios. This *ofan* is a very important piece for *piyyuṭ* scholarship, and only by chance was it omitted from consideration in the discussion of the development of Ashkenazi *piyyuṭ*. This quantitatively metered *piyyuṭ* follows the structure of the famous *ofan* of R. Shelomoh Ibn Gabirol for the Day of Atonement, *שנאנים שאננים*.¹⁶¹ Thus, it testifies to the strong Spanish influence on the work of R. Me'ir. It is true that scholars have already noted the impact of Spanish prosody on R. Me'ir's poetry,¹⁶² but this impact is not found in any of his

151 "More than nine hundred" years after the destruction of the Temple, i.e. approximately the year 980. See Habermann, *Shim'on bar Yizḥaq*, p. 193.

152 Regarding him, see Zunz, *Literaturgeschichte*, pp. 120 ff., 239 ff., 615. See also Fleischer, *The Yozer*, the references noted in the index.

153 Regarding this man and his work, see Grossman, *Sages*, pp. 86 ff.

154 This composition originally included both a *me'orah* and an *ahavah*, but those sections dropped out because the early Ashkenazi communities did not customarily recite these two types of poems. R. Ephraim of Bonn quotes these passages in his *piyyuṭ* commentary. On this subject, see Fleischer, *The Yozer*, pp. 674 ff.

155 In the place where our *Mahzor* was in use, this *piyyuṭ* ceased to be recited shortly after the time it was written. It was replaced by the *piyyuṭ* *ירושע אור לישראל אימתו*, which was appended, copied on separate sheets, to our *Mahzor* (fols. 219 ff.). Zunz, *Literaturgeschichte*, p. 69, numbers this *piyyuṭ* among the anonymous *yozerot*. S.D. Luzatto already erred regarding the authorship of this *piyyuṭ* in his introduction to *Mahzor Benei Roma* [= *The Rome Mahzor*], ed. D. Goldschmidt, Jerusalem 1966, p. 50.

156 This *piyyuṭ* is also listed by Zunz, *Literaturgeschichte*, p. 69, among the anonymous works. He believed the passage was written in about the tenth century, which is reasonable. The ascription of the *piyyuṭ* to Shim'on bar Yizḥaq apparently results from the chance combination of the letters "SHIM'ON" in the *qadosh*-stanza which appears after the first and last strophes of the *piyyuṭ*.

157 Habermann, *Shim'on bar Yizḥaq*, p. 46.

158 Thus, for example, in MS Oxford 2799/2 it appears as part of a *qedushta* for Shavu'ot, while in MS T-S UCL N.S. 242.19 it appears as a *yozer* for Shavu'ot.

159 See Zunz, *Literaturgeschichte*, p. 610.

160 Regarding R. Me'ir and his work, see Grossman, *Sages*, pp. 292 ff. His numerous *piyyuṭim* are recorded by Zunz, *Literaturgeschichte*, pp. 145 ff., 248 ff. See also Fleischer, *The Yozer*, the references cited in the index.

161 Ed. D. Yarden, Jerusalem 1971, p. 89. Regarding this *ofan* and its influence on Ashkenazi *piyyuṭ*, see Fleischer, *The Yozer*, pp. 519, 670.

162 See A.M. Habermann, *The History of Piyyuṭ and Poetry* [Heb.], II, Ramat-Gan 1972, p. 184; see also Fleischer, *op. cit.* (above, n. 38), pp. 192 ff.

compositions as explicitly as in *כבודו אות*. It is interesting that R. Me'ir, even though he composed this passage following a Spanish pattern, did not completely imitate the strophic feature of his model: he eliminated its fixed *muwaššah*-like rhyme.¹⁶³ The fact that this feature is omitted in a *piyyuṭ* provided with a refrain shows just how strange this strophic pattern seemed to an Ashkenazi *payṭan*.¹⁶⁴

Another poem of R. Me'ir, which is also significant in this context, namely the *ofan משרתי עומדים* for Sabbath and Rosh Hodesh, is copied by the scribe in the margin of fol. 27r. This poem is perhaps the first sign of the acceptance of the Spanish-Hebrew *muwaššah*-form in Ashkenazi liturgical poetry.¹⁶⁵

Piyyuṭim of R. Me'ir also embellish the evening prayers of several of the holidays. His *bikkur שנת עולמים* is integrated with the ancient anonymous *ma'ariv* for the first night of Passover, ליל שימורים אור ישראל, which embellishes also the evening prayer of the second day of Passover. R. Me'ir is also represented in our *Maḥzor* by several poems in the section of Aramaic poems for the Torah reading for the seventh day of Passover and the first day of Shavu'ot. R. Me'ir bar Yizḥaq's Aramaic poems gained wide currency in the Ashkenazi communities, exciting and impressing many generations of worshippers. Among these, or primarily among them, is the most well-known of his poems, *אקדמות מילין*, an introduction to the *targum* of the Torah reading on the first day of Shavu'ot. This passage, which is recited in our day even in synagogues which do not recite any other *piyyuṭim*, became one of the distinguishing marks of the Shavu'ot holiday. Its magnificence and linguistic power, its perfected form and moving content, certainly justify its popularity.

The section of Aramaic *piyyuṭim* also contains several passages by French authors; the custom of translating the holiday readings to Aramaic was common and well-developed in the communities of France, as we can see from the printed *Maḥzor Vitry*. Among those represented in this section are R. Shemu'el b. Re'uven of Chartres¹⁶⁶ (by the *piyyuṭ* *אתא דוגמא*), R. Yizḥaq bar Shemu'el, the nephew of Rabbenu Ya'aqov Tam¹⁶⁷ (by the *piyyuṭ* *בען*), and R. Me'ir b. Eli'ezer ha-Darshan¹⁶⁸ (by the passage *אית חזותא* (דוגמא)). It is worthy of note in this context that the famous *reshut רציב פתגם*, which somehow remained part of the later Ashkenazi rites as well, already was recited in the time of our *Maḥzor*. This *piyyuṭ* is signed *יעקב ברבי מאיר*, and Zunz ascribed it to Rabbenu Tam.¹⁶⁹ Later scholars have doubted the accuracy of this ascription, since in some of the manuscript variants an addition to the signature is discernible: "ha-Levi", whereas R. Ya'aqov Tam was not a Levi.¹⁷⁰ Ernst Róth has already noted that in the version which appears in our *Maḥzor* the letters which spell out "ha-Levi"

are not part of the acrostic and that the scribe ascribed the passage in his title only to "Rabbenu Ya'aqov".¹⁷¹ There can be no doubt that Zunz is correct and that the *piyyuṭ* is actually the work of R. Ya'aqov Tam. The fact that the scribe noted the name of the author of the *piyyuṭ* with the title "Rabbenu" (=Our Teacher), unlike his practice in the identification of most of the *payṭanim*,¹⁷² also indicates that he intended a specific "Ya'aqov".

French *piyyuṭ* is also represented in our *Maḥzor* by a poem of R. Yosef Bonfils, the greatest of the early French *payṭanim*.¹⁷³ R. Yosef Bonfils was active in the region of Anjou, mostly in Limoges, around the year 1050, and he was a prolific *payṭan*. Many passages from his poems were accepted into the French *maḥzorim*, and from there they spread throughout the communities of Germany and Byzantium. In our *Maḥzor* he is only represented by the *ma'ariv* *עלילה נורא יעקב נורא* for the first day of Shavu'ot.

The rest of the poetic material included in our *Maḥzor* is shared by several early Ashkenazi *payṭanim*. These poets are represented mostly in the section of the *qinot*. Still, some of them also sign *piyyuṭim* for the holidays, namely R. Avraham bar Yehudah ha-Kohen, the author of the *ma'ariv* *מושיב יחידיים* for the second night of Shavu'ot, R. Eliezer bar Nathan (the Ra'avan), the author of the *ma'ariv* *גש צר להלחמה* for the seventh day of Passover, and Menaḥem bar Ya'aqov (b. Shelomoh b. Menaḥem) of Worms, who wrote the *ma'ariv* *אורי ושעי על הים* נגלה, which appears here for the "sixth" night of Passover. R. Avraham was the son of R. Yehudah ha-Kohen of Mainz, who was a disciple of Rabbenu Gershom Me'or ha-Golah and wrote the *Sefer ha-Dinim*. R. Avraham was active in Mainz, around 1060, and of all his *piyyuṭim* only the aforementioned *ma'ariv* is extant.¹⁷⁴ Ra'avan and R. Menaḥem bar Ya'aqov are among the most important of the later Ashkenazi *payṭanim*. Ra'avan in his youth witnessed the calamities of the First Crusade in 1096, but he lived into the second half of the twelfth century.¹⁷⁵ R. Menaḥem b. Ya'aqov died in Worms in 1203.¹⁷⁶ His poetry is represented in our *Maḥzor* by a second work, the elegy *אללי כי באו רוב אלמן ושכול*, which tells of the slaughters in Blois and Boppard in the years 1171 and 1179. In the title which heads this elegy the poet's name is recorded in its entirety: "Menaḥem bar Ya'aqov of Worms".

The section containing the elegies includes the works of several important Ashkenazi *payṭanim*. R. Menaḥem b. Makhir, the grandson of the brother of Rabbenu Gershom Me'or ha-Golah, an important and prolific *payṭan* who worked in Regensburg, is represented by a single elegy (*אבל אעורר*),¹⁷⁷ as is R. Ya'aqov, the son of R. Yizḥaq ha-Levi, Rashi's teacher, who was active in Speyer; his elegy *אוי לי על שברי* perpetuates the memory of the

163 In Ibn Gabirol's *שנאנים* each strophe ends in the rhyme *אות*, which is intended to introduce the refrain: *קדוש קדוש קדוש יי אומרים צבאות*. This system of rhyming was extremely popular in Spain, and spread from there to all the centres of *payṭanic* activity.

164 Regarding the difficulties experienced by the Ashkenazi *payṭanim* in accepting the aforementioned rhyming pattern, see also Fleischer, *The Yozer*, pp. 681 ff., 704 ff.

165 See Fleischer, *op. cit.* (above, n. 38), pp. 193 ff.

166 Regarding this *payṭan*, see Zunz, *Literaturgeschichte*, pp. 464 ff.

167 See regarding him Zunz, *ibid.*, p. 283.

168 See Zunz, *ibid.*, p. 469.

169 *Ibid.* p. 266.

170 See the note on this matter in S.H. Kook's *Collected Works, Studies and Researches* [Heb.], II, Jerusalem 1963, pp. 203 ff.

171 See Róth, *op. cit.* (above, n. 2) p. 225.

172 Authors whose names are mentioned in our *Maḥzor* appear with only the title "R." ("By R. X."). "Rabbenu" appears, in addition to the cases cited, on fol. 52v (referring to R. Shelomoh ha-Bavli), on fol. 89r (reference to

R. Shim'on bar Yizḥaq), on fol. 176v (referring to R. Ephraim of Bonn) and on fol. 183r (a reference to R. Menaḥem b. R. Ya'aqov of Worms).

173 Regarding the poetry of R. Yosef Bonfils and his time and place, see Fleischer, "Azharot by R. Binyamin", *op. cit.* (above, n. 141); *idem*, *The Yozer*, the references cited in the index.

174 Regarding him, see Zunz, *Literaturgeschichte*, pp. 152, 611 ff.; Grossman, *Sages*, pp. 178 ff.

175 Regarding the Ra'avan, who was also active in commenting on prayers and *piyyuṭim*, see Zunz, *Literaturgeschichte*, pp. 258 ff.; Habermann, *op. cit.* (above, n. 162), pp. 185 ff.; Urbach, *Arugat ha-Bosem*, IV, pp. 24 ff.; *idem*, *The Tosaphists* [Heb.], I, Jerusalem 1980², pp. 173 ff. The *piyyuṭim* of the Ra'avan have not yet been collected.

176 Regarding him, see Zunz, *Literaturgeschichte*, p. 294. There has not yet been a critical edition of the *piyyuṭim* of R. Menaḥem either.

177 Regarding R. Menaḥem b. Makhir, see Grossman, *Sages*, pp. 361 ff. R. Menaḥem was active in the Rhineland, and he eventually settled in Regensburg. Regarding his *piyyuṭim*, which have not yet been collected, see Zunz, *Literaturgeschichte*, pp. 150, 250.

martyrs of the First Crusade.¹⁷⁸ The massacres of 1096 are also recalled in the two elegies of R. Kalonymos bar Yehudah of Mainz,¹⁷⁹ *מי יתן ראשי מים* and *אמרתני שנו מני*. Of all the works of the twelfth-century Ashkenazi *payṭanim*, in our *Mahzor* there appear only *למי ארי למי אבוי* and *איכה ישבה בדד ענוגה*, by R. Ephraim of Bonn, one of the greatest of the Ashkenazi *payṭanim* of all time (born 1133; died 1196),¹⁸⁰ and *אצבעותי שפלו*, by R. Barukh of Mainz (died 1221).¹⁸¹ The last Ashkenazi *payṭanim* represented in the *Mahzor* are R. El'azar of Worms, the author of the *Rokeah*, who is represented only by the short addition to the anonymous elegy *בליל זה יבכינו*, to be recited when the night of the Ninth of Av falls immediately following the Sabbath (בליל זה סר),¹⁸² and R. Yehudah ha-Kohen bar Moshe, who dedicated his elegy *ראתאון ואתקון* to the memory of the martyrs of Frankfort in 1241.¹⁸³ Spanish *piyyuṭ* as well is represented sparsely in our *Mahzor*, also, of course, in the section of *qinot*. There we have, first of all, the popular *piyyuṭ* *שומר קול תחת* ascribed to R. Shelomoh Ibn Gabirol, who lived in Saragossa in the first half of the eleventh century. R. Yehudah ha-Levi (approximately 1075–1141) is represented by his two impressive elegies *יום אכפי הכבדתי* and *ציון וציון*, both of which became part of the Ashkenazi order of *qinot* at a very early date. Another elegy of the Spanish type which appears in our *Mahzor* is *שכורת לא מיין*, generally ascribed to Shelomoh b. Yizḥaq of Gerona, a disciple of Naḥmanides who was active from 1250–1270. The appearance of this elegy in our *Mahzor* would seem to call that ascription into question; the *piyyuṭ* is only signed “Shelomoh”, so perhaps it should be ascribed to an earlier *payṭan*.¹⁸⁴

A comprehensive survey of the *payṭanim* of the Worms *Mahzor* supports the general view of scholarship about the way in which the Ashkenazi *mahzorim* developed. Without a doubt the Ashkenazi communities from the start saw the *piyyuṭim* as a fixed element of their prayers. They never included *piyyuṭim* in their *mahzorim* with the intention to possibly replace them by others more prestigious or more suited to local taste. This attitude towards liturgical poetry was, by the way, exactly the opposite of the conception of all the other centres of mediaeval Jewry about this matter.¹⁸⁵ Accordingly, all the ancient *piyyuṭim* which came to Ashkenaz via Italy from Erez Israel at the inception of Jewish communal settlement in Central Europe remained a completely fixed element of the Ashkenazi *mahzor*. The local *payṭanim* were only expected to write *piyyuṭim* in order to embellish the prayers of those holidays and special Sabbaths for which no *piyyuṭim*

from the classical East were available. These requirements were also soon fulfilled: later *payṭanim*, including gifted poets, simply had no site in the prayers left open to them. In our *Mahzor*, as in all the Ashkenazi *mahzorim*, the major sites are indeed “occupied” by early *payṭanim*. All the later poets are forced to the sidelines.

It is true that the impression given by the Worms *Mahzor* is incomplete, since it encompasses only the main holidays. Later *payṭanim*, whose works already could not find a place in the programme of the prayers for the major holidays, could still compose *piyyuṭim* for the special Sabbaths, for wedding Sabbaths and *seliḥot* for the fast days and Days of Penitence. All this material is omitted from our *Mahzor*, so that the division of the *piyyuṭ* material in it between the central and the peripheral is especially obvious. However, in principle, the general picture is little different from what we see on a smaller scale in our *Mahzor*. These facts, of course, heavily influenced the character and history of Ashkenazi and Central European *piyyuṭ*, but that is the subject for another discussion.¹⁸⁶

E. R. SIMḤAH THE SCRIBE AND THE POETIC TRADITIONS

R. Simḥah the scribe who copied the Worms *Mahzor*, was a master calligrapher, and most certainly a professional scribe. There can be no doubt that he understood the material he was copying, so that even if he had before him other manuscript *mahzorim* from which he copied, his copying was not automatic. Some of the marginal notes which he appended to the text of the *piyyuṭim* attest to this fact, for it is unreasonable to suppose that all of these were copied from the sources lying before him.¹⁸⁷ These notes frequently relate to the text of the *piyyuṭim*, adducing textual variants. In several of them, R. Simḥah declares one or another of the variants to be preferable, while attempting to explain the variants and judge their merits.

R. Simḥah possessed some traditions touching upon the character and essence of *payṭanic* poetry, and since we are considering an early codex, a summary of his knowledge in this field is not insignificant. R. Simḥah knew the accepted names for most of the types of *piyyuṭ* which he included in the *Mahzor*, though he did not always trouble himself to note all of them consistently by

178 Regarding R. Ya'aqov bar Yizḥaq ha-Levi, see Grossman, *Sages*, pp. 272 ff., 357. Zunz omitted this *payṭan* from his *Literaturgeschichte*, apparently accidentally, but mentioned him in his *Die gottesdienstliche Vorträge*, Berlin 1832, p. 392, note d (Hebrew edition: H. Albeck, Jerusalem 1954, p. 498, n. 171). In the Hebrew version the name was also omitted from the index!

179 Regarding this *payṭan*, see Zunz, *Literaturgeschichte*, p. 164.

180 R. Ephraim of Bonn, besides being an important *payṭan*, was also very active in the field of *piyyuṭ* commentary, so that many ancient and important traditions regarding early *piyyuṭ* were preserved by him. His extant *piyyuṭim* were published by Habermann, *op. cit.* (above, n. 121), pp. 217 ff. Regarding R. Ephraim's work in *piyyuṭ* commentary, see Urbach, *Arugat ha-Bosem*, IV, pp. 39 ff.

181 For the collected *piyyuṭim* of R. Barukh of Mainz see Habermann, *op. cit.* (above, n. 127), pp. 49 ff. Regarding the *payṭan* see also there in the introduction.

182 The *piyyuṭim* of R. El'azar of Worms have not yet been published. They are listed by Zunz, *Literaturgeschichte*, pp. 317 ff. R. El'azar was among the founders of the movement of the early Hasidim of Ashkenaz, and he also dealt with the wording of the prayers and *piyyuṭ* commentary. Regarding him, see Urbach, *Arugat ha-Bosem*, IV, pp. 73 ff.

183 See Zunz, *Literaturgeschichte*, p. 478.

184 The ascription is by Zunz, *ibid.*, pp. 482–483. It is likely that he based himself on some manuscript in which the *piyyuṭ* was attributed to this *payṭan*. R. Shelomoh died apparently around 1270 (Zunz, *ibid.*), in other words, just two years before the *Mahzor* was completed. It is difficult to believe that a *piyyuṭ* written in Catalonia could have been included so fast into an Ashkenazi *mahzor*, but it is possible.

185 According to the classical view of the function of *piyyuṭ* in the prayers, the *piyyuṭim* should have been replaced by others on each liturgical occasion, or in any event — since this ideal could not be easily attained — as frequently as possible.

186 For a summary on this subject, see Fleischer, *The Yozer*, pp. 607 ff.

187 Regarding the glosses which appear in the *Mahzor*, see Beit-Arié (p. 25 above). It is not always possible to ascertain who wrote what in the margins of the pages of the *Mahzor*; there can be no doubt that many late hands used the book and added various notes into it. However, it seems reasonable to assume, for example, that a note which indicates the variant readings of “other books” without deciding which version is right did not originate from a *hazzan*, but rather from the scribe himself. The same is true of most of the other notes which are discussed below.

name.¹⁸⁸ The titles with which he sometimes headed *piyyuṭim* or groups of *piyyuṭim* demonstrates his good grasp of these matters. He very frequently labels the *qedushta'ot* קדושתא. Titles of this sort appear regularly before the *qerovot* for the four special Sabbaths and *Shabbat ha-Gadol* (fols. 3r, 11r, 22v, 28r, 37r), and twice more in the rest of the *Mahzor*.¹⁸⁹ The strange term קרובתא appears in our *Mahzor* at the start of the *qedushta* נראותיך (for the seventh day of Passover); it serves as an Aramaic equivalent of the ancient term *qerovah* which R. Simḥah never uses in this Codex. The term has not yet been mentioned in scholarship.¹⁹⁰ The two weekday *qerovot* in the *Mahzor*, ראהב אומן for Purim and אבין ביום מבך for the Ninth of Av, are not entitled.¹⁹¹ In this context it is interesting to note the heading of the regular *musaf 'amidah* for the intermediate Sabbath of Passover (fol. 76r), which is also in Aramaic: צלותא וקדושתא של מוסף. There is no way to know why R. Simḥah added this heading here, nor why he wrote it in Aramaic (mixed with Hebrew).

R. Simḥah also knew the term *shiv'ata*, and he used it to entitle Qiliri's *qerovah* for *Parashat Sheqalim*, אשכול איורי: ולמוסף (fol. 27r). At the head of the *shiv'ata* for *Parashat ha-Hodesh* and that for the Prayer for Dew no such title appears, with only the note למוסף occurring in its place (fols. 32r and 53v). More frequently R. Simḥah noted the *yozerot* by name. However, it seems that he intended the term to apply to all the components of the *yozer*: the term "ofan" occurs only twice in the *Mahzor* (fols. 73r and 131r); likewise the term "zulat" (fols. 3r and 131v). Similar to the term "yozer" in its prevalence is the term "ma'ariv". Every one of the *ma'arivim* in the *Mahzor* carries that title.

As mentioned above, most of the *ma'arivim* in our *Mahzor* are lengthened in their last section, which embellishes the blessing פורס סוכת שלום. This fact, which is typical to Ashkenazi *piyyuṭ*, is a result of the great popularity of the *ma'ariv* in the Ashkenazi communities. In none of the other *payṭanic* centres in the Middle Ages did poets expend so much creative energy on this type of *piyyuṭ* as in Ashkenaz.¹⁹² In Spain the *ma'ariv* was rather unknown, and Italian *payṭanim* also ignored it entirely. The Ashkenazim called the section which they integrated into the end of the *ma'ariv* the *bikkur*, as we have noted above.¹⁹³ This term does not appear in our *Mahzor*; instead, preceding the *bikkur* which is inserted in the *ma'ariv* ליל שימורים אותו אל חצה for the first night of Passover, the scribe noted: לשומר ישראל.¹⁹⁴ There can

be no doubt that this note is intended to designate the *bikkur*, though by a different name. This name apparently was taken from the wording of the blessing which the *piyyuṭ* adorns; its wording (on weekdays!) is שומר [עמן] ישראל [לעד]. The term is quite strange,¹⁹⁵ but its emergence is understandable: in Ashkenazi communities *piyyuṭim* were frequently referred to not by their traditional names, but rather by the location at which they were inserted into the prayers. Thus, for example, the *me'orot* were called לאור חודש, the *ahavot* were called להבחור בעמו ישראל, the *mi khamokha piyyuṭim* were called לשירה חודשה, and the *ge'ulot* were called לגאל ישראל.¹⁹⁶ The term לשומר ישראל has not yet been noted in the scholarly literature.

Two more terms which designate subsections of larger compositions appear in our *Mahzor*. One is common: "azharot", which designates the *piyyuṭ* אתה הנחלתה (fol. 124v) in the *musaf* of the first day of Shavu'ot. The other, however, is rare in European *mahzorim*, namely the term "seder", which appears here at the head of the *dibberin* of the *qedushta* מוסר תוכחת (fol. 119r). This term is an abbreviation for the compound term "seder dibberin",¹⁹⁷ which names, especially in *genizah* manuscripts, *piyyuṭim* explaining the Ten Commandments in the *qedushta'ot* of Shavu'ot. Before the *dibberin* of the *qedushta* for the second day of Shavu'ot (fol. 137r) there is no heading. Also especially noteworthy is the title דברות של שבעות, which appears on fol. 145r before the *piyyuṭ* מילין אקדמות of R. Me'ir Sheliah Zibbur, designating the order of the Aramaic *piyyuṭim* expanding upon the Ten Commandments. The term also appears in this context in the printed *Mahzor Vitry*.¹⁹⁸ In this same section the term "reshut" also appears once (for the *haftarah*; fol. 108r). In the section containing the *piyyuṭim* for the Ninth of Av, the common term "qinah" also appears twice, at random, before two *piyyuṭim* (fols. 176v and 183r).

R. Simḥah was quite familiar with the structure of the great *qedushta'ot*, and he copied them and organized their components with skill and understanding, although he never designated any of them by a particular name. The terms which very commonly appear in manuscripts to designate the major elements of the *qedushta* — *magen*, *mehayye*, *meshalleh*, *rahit*, and most common of all, *silluq*¹⁹⁹ — are not found in our *Mahzor*. Instead R. Simḥah consistently preceded every *qedushta* in the *Mahzor* with

188 The lack of consistency of the copyists, both early and late, in this matter is well known. R. Simḥah is by no means alone in this.

189 On fol. 92r, preceding אותותיך או ראיתי, and on fol. 113v, preceding אורח חיים מוסר תוכחת.

190 In ancient sources the word always appears in its Hebrew form: "qerovah". All the terms for the types of *piyyuṭ* appear in the ancient sources of the *genizah* in Hebrew. The term "qedushta" is rare in the ancient *genizah* manuscripts, with the term "qedusha" appearing regularly instead. The term "shiv'ata", which will be discussed below, also appears in the *genizah* always in the form "shiv'ah". We do not know when and why the Aramaic forms appeared on the scene. In any event, they are an absolutely fixed feature of the Ashkenazi manuscripts; however, the form "qerovtah" has not yet been documented.

191 In the ancient *genizah* sources, *qerovot* of this sort are called simply "י"ח" or "שמונה עשרה".

192 The *ma'arivim* remained a changing element in German rites until quite late, and the communities differed on this point very much from each other. See more on this below, at the end of this introduction. In some places in France and Germany, special *reshuyot* were recited before the *ma'arivim* (actually, before ברכו which preceded the *ma'ariv*). Examples of this type can be seen in the *Quntress ha-Piyyuṭim* at the end of the printed *Mahzor Vitry*, pp. 1 ff., and there in the body of the *Mahzor*, pp. 565 ff. This phenomenon, which also testifies to the great popularity of this genre in northern Central Europe, is unknown in other places and periods.

193 Regarding the *bikkur*, see Fleischer, *Liturgical Poetry*, p. 463. The passage is also sometimes called תוספת ברכו ("the *bikkur* supplement") or simply תוספת ("supplement"). We cannot determine the origin of the term "bikkur". Perhaps it derives from an ancient *bikkur* for Shavu'ot which described the ceremony of bringing the first fruits (= *bikkurim*). The content of the *bikkur* is frequently halakhic.

194 Thus also in the Worms *Mahzor* which R. Ya'aqov Oppenheim copied for communal use, p. 54a, perhaps following our *Mahzor*. But the term appears also in MS Hamburg 152, fol. 44v, in the commentary to the *piyyuṭ* שנת עולמים, as well as in some other ancient *mahzor* manuscripts.

195 The final form of the phrase was possibly influenced by the prayer which follows *taḥanun*, שומר ישראל שמור שארית ישראל, which is based on the verse Ps. cxxi:4.

196 See Fleischer, *The Yozer*, pp. 681, 703.

197 See Fleischer, *Liturgical Poetry*, pp. 180 ff. *Piyyuṭ* manuscripts (including those from the *genizah*) frequently refer to long poems included in *qerovot* by the general term "seder", which always is an abbreviation of a longer term, such as "seder 'avodah" or "seder beriyot 'olam" or "seder dibberin" or "seder pesukin". Regarding these terms, see Fleischer, *Liturgical Poetry*, the references cited in the index.

198 See the *Mahzor Vitry*, p. 310: פירוש על דברות.

199 Regarding these terms, see Fleischer, *Liturgical Poetry*, the references listed in the index.

the ancient *reshut* מסוד חכמים ונבונים,²⁰⁰ and he exhibited his awareness of the construction of the first sections of the *qedushta'ot* by organizing the main parts of the sections, the chains of biblical verses and the concluding strophes separately. At the end of the *meshallehim* he consistently inserted, as we have noted above, the verses ואתה קדוש etc. and ואתה קדוש etc., adding after them the phrase אל נא.²⁰¹ The formula חי וקיים נורא ומרום וקדוש is never missing from the end of the fourth *piyyuṭim* of the *qedushta'ot*, and the fifth *piyyuṭim* are always followed, as they ought to be, by the passage אל נא לעולם תעורר.²⁰² The traditional opening ולך תעלה קדושה etc. also appears consistently before the *silluqim*, sometimes in an abbreviated form.²⁰³

R. Simḥah's awareness of the construction of the *piyyuṭim* is also clear from the way he managed to emphasize their structure. Frequently he copied the fixed words separately and with big letters, noted the acrostics of the *piyyuṭim* using various artistic forms, emphasized the ends of their stanzas in various ways, explicitly distinguished sections from one another, and underscored their sometimes hidden or inconspicuous structural ornaments by varying the size of the letters or the colour of the ink. In the *silluqim*, which have no fixed strophic patterns, but which frequently do contain homiletical sections in which specific words recur, R. Simḥah succeeded in emphasizing the things which required emphasis to a sometimes amazing extent. In places where the constraints on his calligraphy required him to ignore the structure of the *piyyuṭim* (such as in the supplemental *piyyuṭim* added to the *qerovah* for Purim; fols. 17r ff.), R. Simḥah marked the ends of the stanzas with small flowers. His successful arrangement of the extremely complicated patterns of Qiliri's *qerovah* for Purim (fols. 15 ff.) is impressive. Complicated arrangements of this sort, which testify to R. Simḥah's active attention to the structure of the *piyyuṭim* and his fine artistic sense, pervade every page of our *Mahzor*.

R. Simḥah also had interesting information about the authorship of the *piyyuṭim*. Just as with the acrostics, he emphasized through graphic devices the signatures of the *payṭanim* which he found embedded in their *piyyuṭim*, including hidden signatures which an unpracticed eye would not normally notice while reading. Often he noted the name of the author at the beginning of a series of *piyyuṭim*.²⁰⁴ Both the content of these ascriptions and what is omitted from them require study. We must note with great emphasis the ascription of the *yozerot* for *Shabbat Zakhor* and *Shabbat Parah* to R. El'azar b. R. Qilir. Qiliri's authorship of these unsigned *yozerot* is noted in our *Mahzor* in two different ways: מר' קליר at the start of the *yozer* for *Shabbat Zakhor* (fol. 9r), and מר' אלעזר קליר preceding that for *Shabbat Parah* (fol. 20v). The authorship of these *yozerot* as well as of the two others for *Shabbat Sheqalim* and *Shabbat ha-Hodesh*, has been discussed extensively in the scholarly literature, and is still uncer-

tain.²⁰⁵ There can be no doubt that the four *yozerot*, which are virtually identical, were composed by a single author. S.D. Luzzatto already suggested the Qiliri's authorship of them, based on their connection with the *qedushta'ot* which follow them, all of which are, as we have mentioned, by Qiliri. Did R. Simḥah possess an explicit tradition that these *yozerot* were by Qiliri, or did he also ascribe them to the author of the *qedushta'ot* which follow them? It is difficult to answer this question. It is also difficult to understand why R. Simḥah failed likewise to note the authorship of the *yozerot* for *Shabbat Sheqalim* and *Shabbat ha-Hodesh*. However, since the ascription to Qiliri is found in other Ashkenazi manuscripts as well, it would seem that there is some basis for it.

We have already noted above that the *yozer* proper and the *zulat* for *Shabbat ha-Gadol* in our *Mahzor* are compositions of R. Benjamin bar Zerah. Preceding the *yozer* (fol. 34r)²⁰⁶ the scribe noted יוצר לשבת הגדול מר' בנימין. Likewise, in both *piyyuṭim* he marked only the letters of the signature "BiNYaMiN"; he failed to note the continuation of the signature, "BaR ZeRaH". This fact shows to what extent R. Simḥah was dependent on his sources for such information. Apparently R. Benjamin bar Zerah was unknown in R. Simḥah's place, a fact which seems to support Zunz's suggestion that this *payṭan*, despite the fact that many of his *piyyuṭim* appear in the *mahzorim* of Northern Europe, was active in the South, in Italy or Byzantium.

It is somewhat surprising to see the name "Yannai" mentioned at the start of the *qerovah* אונני פטרי רחמתיים for *Shabbat ha-Gadol* (קדושתא מר' ינאי). Yannai's name was totally forgotten by the later generations of Central European Jews, so that its mention in historical sources caused a great deal of astonishment in the first period of modern Jewish research.²⁰⁷ The orthography of the name ינאי at the beginning of the *piyyuṭ* is a strange combination of the two ways in which the name was written, the original form from Erez Israel, ינאי (used by the poet himself), and the more common Babylonian ינאי. R. Simḥah also knew the *payṭan*'s name from the signature of his *meshalleh*; he wrote the acronym letters ינאי in red ink and also emphasized them with ornamented dots.

The way in which R. Simḥah noted the authorship of the great *yozer* of R. Shelomoh ha-Bavli, אור ישע מאושרים (for the first day of Passover), is also interesting. The title (now almost entirely faded) reads only: יוצר ליום ראשון של פסח מר' שלמה. From which we can conclude that the scribe did not know the *payṭan*'s epithet "ha-Bavli". This composition contains, as we noted above, two signatures, "Shelomoh" and "Mordekhai".²⁰⁸ The question of the relationship between the two names is an old scholarly problem; it relates not only to the question of the identity of "Mordekhai", but also to whether the work itself was written by two *payṭanim* (R. Shelomoh and R. Mordekhai) or only by one (R. Shelomoh),

200 This is a short poetic passage whose concluding section varies according to the holidays (Sabbaths and the three festivals on the one hand, New Year on the other, and the Day of Atonement also separately). It appears always at the start of the Ashkenazi *qedushta'ot*, including those which are preceded by long, authentic *reshuyot*. The passage, although rhymed, is apparently very ancient. It is very rare in the *genizah* (T-S H 5/199; Oxford 2741/1). It is not impossible that it first became customary in Babylonia.

201 Regarding these details of structure and those mentioned below, see Fleischer, *Liturgical Poetry*, pp. 138 ff.

202 The passage generally appears in its entirety. Only once, in the *qedushta* for the first day of Shavu'ot, is the prayer noted only by its opening words. It does not appear at all in the *qedushta'ot* for the last two days of Passover, in keeping with the early Ashkenazi custom which will be discussed below.

203 Only once (preceding the *silluq* of אורח חיים, fol. 142r) did the scribe omit the title, because he mistook the beginning of the *silluq* for the continuation of the *dibberin*, as we noted above. A later hand corrected the mistake.

204 It is interesting that he frequently noted the names of the authors, rather than at the start of the *piyyuṭim* themselves, at the beginning of the wording of the regular prayer preceding them. This practice is rare in the *mahzorim*, and it may owe its use here to calligraphic considerations. The matter requires further study.

205 Regarding this, see Fleischer, *The Yozer*, pp. 92 ff.

206 This writing is almost entirely faded now, but it can be read from the original in ultraviolet light.

207 See Zulay, *op. cit.* (above, n. 139), p. 116.

208 See, regarding this, Fleischer, *Shelomo ha-Bavli*, p. 94.

who for some reason signed an additional name in his *piyyut*, as did many *paytanim* before and after him.²⁰⁹ According to the opinion recorded by R. Ephraim of Bonn, R. Mordekhai was R. Shelomoh's brother, and R. Shelomoh included his name in his composition due to his great affection for him.²¹⁰ Modern scholars have also assumed that R. Mordekhai was the brother of R. Shelomoh and that his name was mentioned in the *piyyut* by his brother.²¹¹ The testimony of our *Mahzor*, recorded by the scribe at the point in the *zulat* אהבוך נפש where the acrostic "Mordekhai" changes over (fol. 52v) to "Shelomoh" is surprising. His remark there is worded thus: "Until here, composed by R. Mordekhai b. Rabbenu Shelomoh, while R. Shelomoh composed שחורה ונאה."²¹² Thus, according to R. Simḥah's information (in the second half of the thirteenth century) R. Mordekhai was not the brother, but rather the son of R. Shelomoh,²¹³ and the actual author of the *piyyut*, together with his father. Of course, we still cannot know whether the scribe received a tradition to this effect or just explained the facts in a way which seemed to him reasonable.²¹⁴ It should be noted that R. Simḥah noted the complicated signatures of this *piyyut* with great precision. Also in the concluding passages of the composition על הרי בשמים (fol. 53r) and ברח דודי (53v), whose signatures are intermixed and confounding, the scribe emphasized with total confidence two signature-formulas which modern scholarship failed to extract from the accepted versions: מרדכי הקטן יגדל בתורה חזק (R. Simḥah also noted this wording at the beginning of the *piyyut*),²¹⁵ and ברח דודי חזק שלמה הקטן יהיה חזק יגדל בתורה חזק.²¹⁶ Alongside ברח דודי R. Simḥah even commented in the margin (fol. 53v) about the wording of the poem in relation to its acronym: ברחב מחורים. תמצאו עד שיפוח קץ מחוה זה טעות גדול מפני החתימה שתמצאו בו. Indeed, עד שיפוח is the version of most of the sources, yet R. Simḥah's variant, עד יפוח קץ מחוה, which is required for the signature, is known from other sources too.²¹⁷ It is interesting to note that R. Simḥah did not ascribe רנן אפיק to R. Meshullam bar Kalonymos even though he emphasized the letters signing his name on fol. 63v.

The name of R. Shim'on bar Yizḥaq, the distinguished Ashkenazi *paytan*, is noted three times in our *Mahzor* in three different ways. Preceding אהוביך אהבוך (fol. 70r), R. Simḥah wrote יוצר לחולו של וישע שושני פרח;²¹⁸ preceding מועד פסח מר שמעון בר יצחק הגדול (fol. 77r) he wrote: יוצר ליום ששי [!] של פסח מר שמעון בר יצחק וצורל; and before יוצר ליום אחרון של — (fol. 89r) — אתה הארתה יומם ולילה של. The ascription of this last *yozer* is

mistaken, as we noted above. At the beginning of the *qedushta* אותותיך או ראינו, which is copied afterwards (fol. 92r), the scribe wrote only קדושתא, and we once more are left asking whether we should understand the (mistaken) title at the beginning of the *yozer* as a valid testimony (if an imprecise one), or whether it is only an expansion of R. Shim'on's authorship of the *qedushta* (which is certainly his) to the preceding unsigned *yozer*.

R. Simḥah strangely erred, as we noted above, regarding the authorship of the *qedushta* אמת נוראתיך by R. Moshe bar Kalonymos. At the start of the *amidah* which is embellished by this composition, R. Simḥah wrote only קדושתא (fol. 80r), but alongside the opening of the composition he noted in red ink (perhaps after completing the *Mahzor*): קרובתא של ר' חננאל בר קלונימוס. This title certainly is not based on any tradition, being only a (mistaken) deciphering of the signature in the fictitious concluding stanzas following the *meshalleh*, in which R. Moshe signed the names of his two sons, "Hanan'el" and "Kalonymos". R. Simḥah produced the word "BaR" by taking these two letters from the word "Deḇorah" which ends the first concluding strophe (fol. 81v). The *paytan*'s actual signature, משה ברבי (each letter twice), occurs, as usual, in the fifth *piyyut* of the *qedushta*, and is duly noted by the scribe (fol. 82r). From the unusual way in which R. Simḥah noted the ascription preceding the *qedushta*, it would seem that he was confused by the plethora of signatures which appeared before him in the *piyyut*, and, possessing no dependable tradition about the authorship, he chose the name that seemed most reasonable to him.

Another such strange title appears in the *qedushta* אותותיך או ראינו by R. Shim'on bar Yizḥaq at the beginning of the passage אילי הצדק ידועים (fol. 94v). Here R. Simḥah wrote, again alongside the beginning of the *piyyut*, in red ink (which faded in time): החרוזות הראשונות יסד ר' אליה מפריש הזקן. He also wrote the first word of the *piyyut*, אילי, and the letter *he* of the word הצדק in large letters and decorated them with special ornamentation in order to emphasize the signature. ר' אליה מפריש הזקן undoubtedly refers to the *paytan* R. Eliyahu ha-Zaqen (bar Menahem) of Le Mans, the author of the *azharot* אמת יהנה חבי, ²¹⁹ who was active in France around the middle of the eleventh century, a contemporary and perhaps even a friend of R. Yosef Bonfils, the great French *paytan*. This ascription was not made up by R. Simḥah: E. Róth has already noted²²⁰ that this information appears in R. Liva Kirchheim's compilation on the customs of Worms, and it is also mentioned in MS Hamburg 152 (fol. 39v) in the name of R.

209 Regarding the custom of early *paytanim* to sign other people's names into their *piyyuṭim*, to honour them or for other reasons, see Fleischer, "Qiliri Matters" (above, n. 133), pp. 289 ff.; idem, "Studies on the Poetry of R. Hai Gaon" [Heb.], *Shai le-Heiman* (A.M. Habermann Jubilee Volume), Jerusalem 1977, pp. 246 ff. The usage was common among the *paytanim* of Central Europe from the time of R. Amitai (the end of the ninth century), who signed in several of his *piyyuṭim* the name of his son, 'Avad'el. Above we mentioned R. Moshe bar Kalonymos, who signed in his *qedushta* for the seventh day of Passover the names of his two sons, Hanan'el and Kalonymos.

210 Cited by Urbach, *Arugat ha-Bosem*, IV, p. 45, from MS Parma 665, p. 77c: מבאן ואילך רמו הבבלי ושינה מחרוזתו ועד כאן רשם את שם א ח י מרדכי. This is the way R. Ephraim of Bonn explained several additional signatures which he found in *piyyuṭim*.

211 This was the opinion of L. Zunz, *Die synagogale Poesie des Mittelalters*, Berlin 1855, p. 109; Elbogen, *op. cit.* (above, n. 133), p. 244; also H. Vogelstein and P. Rieger, *Geschichte der Juden in Rom*, Berlin 1896, p. 182.

212 Actually the signature "Mordekhai" already appears beforehand, in the first part of the *silluq* which follows the *yozer* proper, but the scribe did not comment on it there.

213 That was also my guess in my edition of the *piyyuṭim* of R. Shelomoh ha-Bavli, p. 94, without knowledge of the note in our *Mahzor*.

214 The tradition which identifies the "Mordekhai" signed in אור ישע with the son of R. Shelomoh ha-Bavli was also known in Worms at the beginning of the seventeenth century, and it is mentioned by R. Liva Kirchheim in his compilation on the customs of Worms, p. 132b (see more about this source below), as follows: "The *zulat* אהבוך נפש until אהבוך כיון הטוב was composed by R. Mordekhai b. Rabbenu Shelomoh. And שחורה ונאה was composed by R. Shelomoh." These identifications are probably based on our *Mahzor*, as attested by the location of the remark and by its wording.

215 He acted this way on fol. 73r as well, noting at the start of the *ofan* דודי מפעל שליט בכל מפעל what he was able to decipher of the signature. This practice is unusual for titles of ascription.

216 Regarding the complicated problems connected with the acrostics in these two passages, see Fleischer, *Shelomo ha-Bavli*, p. 190.

217 See Fleischer, *ibid.*, p. 223.

218 Regarding *paytanim* dubbed הגדול in ancient sources, see Zunz, *Literaturgeschichte*, pp. 600–601.

219 This *piyyut* was published with a comprehensive commentary by R. Mordekhai Slutzki, Warsaw 1900. See regarding it, Fleischer, *op. cit.* (above, n. 141).

220 See Róth, *op. cit.* (above, n. 2), p. 224.

Ephraim of Bonn.²²¹ R. Ephraim notes in his commentary to this *piyyut*:²²² אומ(רים) שר' אליה, רב אחד, היה בא במקום שר' שמעון מיוסד. סדר זה ויסד הוא חרחה ראשונה שהרי "אילי" זה ד"ה צדק" הרי "אליה". This tradition, which is apparently more reliable than the one in our *Mahzor*,²²³ mentions just R. Elijah, and also explains the emergence of the tale: the beginning of the *piyyut* seemed to be signed "Elijah", though the other parts of the *qerovah* are signed with a different name. In any event, the fact that this story developed in the direction indicated by our *Mahzor*, i.e. that "one R. Elijah" came to be identified with "Elijah the Elder of Paris", is not without significance: it proves that R. Elijah the Elder was known in Germany at that time, and that people considered it reasonable that he had visited Mainz and seen R. Shim'on bar Yizhaq. The fact that R. Elijah is called here "of Paris" is also important. Perhaps it is based on some knowledge about R. Elijah's having been active in that city, something we know of from no other source.²²⁴

Quite frequently R. Simḥah notes the names of authors at the beginning of *ma'arivim*. Thus, before *ליל שימורים אותו אל חצה* (fol. 41r) he notes: מעריב לליל ראשון של פסח מר' מאיר שליח ציבור; before *אור* (fol. 45v); מעריב לליל שביעי של פסח מר' אליעזר בר' נתן; לשביעי גש מעריב לליל שיש [!] של פסח; before *אורי ושעי על הים נגלה* (fol. 46r): מר' מנחם בר יעקב. As we mentioned above, the first of these ascriptions is mistaken. It is amazing that there is not title of ascription before the *ma'ariv* ישראל אור שימורים אור for the second night of Passover, which is really by R. Me'ir bar Yizhaq. Since the two *ma'arivim* follow one after the other in this Codex, perhaps R. Simḥah intended the title with which he (mistakenly) labelled the first *ma'ariv* to also apply to the second. Also at the beginning of *ויוד אביר יעקב נורא עלילה* (fol. 109r) for the first night of Shavu'ot, by R. Yosef Bonfils, there is no title of ascription, even though R. Simḥah noted as usual the acronym by which the *paytan* is explicitly identified by name, יוסף הקטן בר שמואל, at the end of the *piyyut*. Also at the beginning of the *ma'ariv* ביהמ"ד אלהים (fol. 144v), by R. Avraham b. Yehudah ha-Kohen, note of the name of the author is omitted. As we have said, R. Simḥah did not consistently record titles of ascription, so that many large compositions whose authorship was well-known to him were left untitled.

R. Simḥah consistently omitted titles of ascription from the section of Aramaic *piyyutim* for the seventh day of Passover and the first day of Shavu'ot, as well as from the section containing the elegies. The overwhelming majority of them were left without note of their authorship. We have no way of explaining why he excepted from this rule the passage יציב פתגם, which he entitled: "reshut for the *haftarah* by Rabbenu Ya'aqov" (fol. 108r), without mentioning the rest of the acronym ("bar Me'ir"), and the two elegies איכה ישבה בדד ענוגה, which he headed (in a title which can no longer be deciphered) with the name of its author R. Ephraim [of Bonn], and אללי כי באו רוב אלמון ושכול (fol. 183r), which he headed: קינה מרבינו מנחם בר יעקב מורמישא זצ"ל. R. Menahem bar Ya'aqov's name was also mentioned, as we have noted, at the beginning of his *ma'ariv* for the sixth [!] night of Passover (fol. 46r), but his city was not mentioned there.

R. Simḥah the Scribe was an explicitly self-esteeming craftsman

whose expert professional knowledge was not confined to the calligraphic arts. His broad knowledge of the rules of the *piyyut* is indirectly but clearly evident from the manner in which he dealt with the material he copied. Quite often, though, he notes alongside the texts short remarks which indicate that his knowledge was significantly greater than he could demonstrate in the body of the *Mahzor*. True, we cannot assert assuredly that all of these are the work of R. Simḥah. They are few in number and noticeably concentrated at the start of the Codex.²²⁵ Most of those which are apparently his, are notes of variant readings in the *piyyutim*, but sometimes they also contain interesting commentaries. For example, on fol. 12r, in the *mehayye* of Qiliri's *qedushta* for *Shabbat Zakhor*, alongside the line *בפרק עמד [עמלק] כמו שול כמו שלל* he wrote: ס"א שול כמו שלל. Immediately afterwards is an explanation of the version which appears in the *Mahzor*: "מסור" פי' כמו המינין והמסורות. Afterwards comes a hint of another version which is not otherwise noted at all: אבל מסור לא ידעתי: פירושו.

On the very same page, alongside the concluding strophe of the *mehayye*, whose wording in the text is *בעטותך עטרת עדי*, the scribe noted in a comment which was mutilated in binding: ס"א עשרה, כמו עשרה לברשים של הקב"ה, מלך בעשרה לברשים. The sentence *מלך בעשרה לברשים* is a quotation from Qiliri's *yozer* מלך אזור גבורה for the New Year.²²⁶ Alongside the first line of the note someone noted: זה עיקר. In our printed versions we have *עטרת*, but the version *עשרה* and its explanation are also well represented in the commentaries of *piyyut* throughout the generations.²²⁷ Similarly, in the *silluq* of the *qedushta* for *Parashat Zakhor* (fol. 14r), alongside the line which reads *והיקר אתכם בנות פי' מרחץ*, the scribe noted: ס"א בנות פי' מרחץ. This version hints at the famous *Aggada* which appears in the *Pesiqta de-Rav Kahana* for *Parashat Zakhor* (p. 27a in Buber's edition), comparing Israel at the time of the Exodus to a boiling-hot bath until 'Amaleq came and cooled them off in the view of the nations. The variant *בנות* appears and is commented on in MS Hamburg 152, fol. 20v. Another note comments on Qiliri's *qedushta* for *Shabbat Parah* (fol. 23r), where the *piyyut* reads *סקר באיביה ונחשב למחר כמו לזר*; the note reads: ס"א למו זר, כמו לזר.

R. Simḥah added a long explanatory note in the margin of a passage from the *yozer* אור ישע מאושרים by Shelomoh ha-Bavli (fol. 53v), alongside the lines: *ברח דודי עד יפיה קץ מחוזה / חיש נסו / הצללים מזה*. The beginning of the note, which deals with the acronym derived from these lines, was already mentioned above. Following that, the scribe explains the wording of the lines thus: יש "יפיה" — ינשב, [דנתיב] ויפח לקץ לא יכזב [Hab. ii:3] ינשב ויפיה קץ. הנבואה. "חיש" — מדה. "ונסו הצללים מזה" — יבטלו הגליות. The note is found almost *verbatim* in the *piyyut* commentary of MS Hamburg 152 (fol. 55r).

There is one example of a note, apparently written by R. Simḥah himself, which suggests a different version than that which appears in the text, without the support of "other books". In the introductory section of the long Qiliri *silluq* for *Parashat Sheqalim* (אז ראית וספרת) (fol. 5v), where the variant of the codex is *ושקלתה ואמרתה וצברתה*, the copyist notes in the margin: [נראה]: "ואמדת". וסוף החרחה יוכיח על זה, כי אין דרך הפייט לתפוש

221 'Arugat ha-Bosem, IV, p. 41. See also Grossman, *Sages*, p. 94.

222 Read: מייסד, i.e. the author of.

223 The information given in our *Mahzor* is chronologically impossible. R. Elijah flourished about a generation and a half after R. Shim'on bar Yizhaq.

224 The identification "R. Elijah, a certain Rabbi" = "R. Elijah the Elder of Paris" may be the source of the early claim that R. Shim'on bar Yizhaq was "סגליתו" of Rabbenu Eliyahu the Elder who composed the *azharot* "אמת יהגאנ[!] חכי". This claim is found in the *Responsa of Maharshah*, 29.

See Grossman, *Sages*, p. 87. The meaning of the phrase *בר סגליתו* is not clear.

225 This phenomenon is hard to explain. Perhaps R. Simḥah originally planned to make notes throughout the *Mahzor*, but then had to rush to deliver the codex to his patron (as he was rushed in writing it), and no longer could execute all that he had in mind.

226 See D. Goldschmidt, *Mahzor for the High Holy Days*, I, Jerusalem 1970, p. 44: מלך בעשרה לברשים / התאזר בקרושים.

227 See *Siddur 'Avodat Yisrael*, ed. Z. Baer, p. 665, in the explanatory notes.

תיבה אחת בחרוזה אחת ב' פעמים] The word ואמרתה in fact recurs at the end of the passage. The scribe's confidence in his assertion that the *paytan* would not use the same word twice as a rhyming-word in the same stanza demonstrates his expert knowledge of this subject. Indeed, the printed editions and most of the accurate manuscripts have the wording ואמרתה here.²²⁸ As we mentioned, there is not a great deal of material here: the margins of the Worms *Mahzor* are quite empty as compared to those of other ancient manuscripts of this sort.²²⁹

There are only two somewhat longer notes by the scribe, exhibiting some "theoretical" boldness. Both appear at the beginning of the *Mahzor*, one in the margin of fol. 3r and the other in the margin of fol. 5r. On fol. 3r, alongside the first appearance of the abbreviated wording of the passage אמת ויצב which replaced the regular version of this prayer in Ashkenazi communities on days on which a *zulat* was recited,²³⁰ the scribe wrote a relatively long explanatory note, part of which was cut in binding, but which can still be reconstructed precisely. It reads thus:

למה קיצרו ב[אמת] ויצב אף <על> פּי <ש[ינו] ממטבע שטבעו] חכמים? מפני טורח ציבור עשו כן [כדי לומר פיוט זולת], שהרי בכמה ד[ברים] חשו על טורח ציבור, וכן קיצרו בברכות מ[גן].²³¹ ונקרא זולת על שם שאמרו אצל אין אלהים עוד זולתך ותקנהו ליתן ש[בח] על כל נס מעין המאורע ולהזכיר יציאת מצרים שהוא מעין הברכה.

This note is an almost verbatim quotation from Ephraim of Bonn as recorded in MS Hamburg 152, fol. 44v:

מה שקיצרו באמת ויצב אפי' ששינו ממטבע שטבעו חכמים, מפני טורח הציבור עשו כן, שיש לומר פיוט זולת, שהרי בכמה דברים חשו חכמי על טורח ציבור, וכן קיצרו בברכת מגן כמו שנפרש. ונקרא זולת על שם שאמרו אצל אין אלהים עוד זולתך. ותיקנהו ליתן שבח על כל נס מעין המאורע, ולהזכיר יציאת מצרים שהוא מעין הברכה.²³²

Thus, there is no great originality here; indeed, it is difficult to imagine a scribe, even one as expert as R. Simḥah, who would himself make up explanations like this one. Nevertheless, this passage certainly demonstrates the scribe's extensive knowledge of "the professional literature" of this period.

The second lengthy note (fol. 5r) provides similar evidence. It is recorded alongside the first occurrence of the passage אל נא לעולם תעורך in the *Qiliri qedushta* for *Shabbat Sheqalim*. The passage אל נא לעולם

classical *qedushta'ot*, and its presence in this context is one of the unsolved riddles of this payṭanic genre. This passage is clearly made up of two unrelated sections. One of them contains some general phrases of praise of God and it includes a hint to the *qedushta*, while the other is an alphabetical acrostic (from *mem* to the end of the alphabet), including, after introductory praises, sort of an invitation to the congregation to participate in the recital of the *piyyuṭim*. The wording of this passage in our *Mahzor* is as follows:

אל נא לעולם תעורך²³³ ולעולם תוקדש ולעולמי עולמים תמלך ותתנשא. האל מלך מרום נורא וקדוש כי אתה הוא מלך מלכי המלכים מלכותו נצח נוראותיו שיחו ספרו עוזו פארוהו צבאיו, קדוהו רוממוהו רון שיר שבח תוקף תהילות תפארתו.

R. Simḥah added in the margin a note dealing with several matters, some concerning the orthography of the word תעורך and some considering the content of the passage and its function. Unfortunately, the ends of the lines were cut off in the course of the binding of the *Mahzor*, so that some of the words can only be reconstructed by conjecture. The note reads as follows (the words in square brackets are suggestions for completing the lines; the vocalization is in the original):

ר' אברהם חוזה [כותב]
בספריו שיש לומר
לעולם תעורך [ולא]
תעורך של עול[...]²³⁴
5 להרחיב בפני העין]
כמו יעמד וכן זובח
לאֱלהים יחרם [וכן]
מעמד במרכבה
דאחאב. ושיר ז[ה]
10 יש בו קדושה ו[...]
ואלפא ביתא כול[ה]
תיקנו אלא מן מ[ם]
ואילך מלכותו נ[צח]
מפני טורח ציבור]
15 ונהגו לאומרם בכבוד]
ראש מפני ששירת]
מלאכים היא

228 Thus, *ואמרתה*, also appears in the early commentary to this *silluq* which was published by E. E. Urbach, *Sefer Schirmann* [Heb.], Jerusalem 1970, p. 3, who noted there what our *Mahzor* says. Similar notes appear also on fol. 6v: לי נראה ארקא (in place of ארכה in the body of the text); and on fol. 11v, where the body of the text reads ושם רשעים תאבד, with the note in the margin: לי נראה: ירקב. In this instance the note corrects a misquotation of Prov. x:7 according to its correct wording! There is an interesting note on fol. 40v, in the *piyyuṭ* for the *musaf* service on *Shabbat ha-Gadol*. The *piyyuṭ* considers the laws of the baking of *mazzot*, noting which kind of water is fit for this purpose. The wording in the text is: וחמין חמי חמה פסולה / ובמים גרופים נמו לה, based on *TB Pesahim* 42a: אשה לא תלוש בחמה, ולא בחמי חמה, ולא במים הגרופין מן המוליי. The meaning of the text is quite clear: the Sages said to her (to the woman) that the water warmed by the sun, and also water warmed in water heated by the sun, and also water warmed from a warmed kettle is unfit for use. In the margin the following note appears: פירוש לא, פירוש לא, פירוש לא. The note is signed שושן. Apparently the note should be ascribed to the person identified by the signature, but not necessarily: maybe the scribe copied the note here as he found it before him (including the words לני נראה "It seems to me", which in that case refers to the author of the note). We have no way of identifying the שושן to whom the note is ascribed. However, a sage named R. Shemaiah, "who composed commentaries of the *mahzor*", is mentioned among the first Ashkenazi *piyyuṭ* commentators. According to Urbach (*Arugat ha-Bosem*, IV, p. 11), he may be R. Shemaiah, Rashi's disciple

and scribe. It is not impossible that this note is brought in his name. See also E. Róth, in his Introduction to the facsimile edition of MS Hamburg 152, Jerusalem 1970, p. 17.

229 The second volume of the Worms *Mahzor* is also much richer in explanatory notes, both in the margins and also between the lines.

230 See immediately below regarding this.

231 Before the word מן the scribe wrote another time מגין, then wiped it out with a penstroke. מה שקיצרו בברכת מגן refers to the replacement of the regular wording of the beginning of the *amidah* when a *qedushta* is to be recited, by the shorter Palestinian wording. Regarding this custom, see below.

232 Cited by Urbach, *Arugat ha-Bosem*, IV, p. 41. At the beginning of the passage there, there is a typographical error: instead of פּי ש א י נ, read ששינו ממטבע שטבעו חכמים.

233 The scribe consistently wrote the word thus: תעורך. However, on fols. 24r and 30r: תעורך. On fol. 116r: תעורך. Here the passage is only noted by its beginning.

234 I cannot work out in any way these two words, של עול[...]. The letter *shin* of the word של may have been erased in the manuscript. Following [של עול[...]] one can make out the remains of a letter at some distance from those which preceded it. It may be a final *mem*, which would then join with the preceding letters to form the word [עולם], but in the context this word does not make sense. Maybe it ought to be read something like שלעולם [יש להרחיב בפני העין].

In the first part of the note the copyist is justifying the orthography of the word תעורץ as it appears in the text. The verb appears here in the *hoph'al* conjugation, and ought to be vocalized תְּעוֹרֵץ (=תְּעוֹרֵץ) according to the books of "R. Avraham ha-Hoze". It seems that R. Avraham ha-Hoze means R. Abraham Ibn Ezra, for he is sometimes indeed labelled with this epithet in the writings of the early Ashkenazi Hasidim.²³⁵ Although we know of nowhere in the books of R. Abraham Ibn Ezra where he explicitly discusses the vocalization of this word, we do find him dealing several times with the conjugation of פִּיעַ verbs in *hoph'al*. Such passages appear in his *Sefer Zahut*²³⁶ and his *Sefer Moznayim*,²³⁷ as well as in his commentary to Lev. xvi:10. However, the source closest in its phraseology to the wording of R. Simḥah appears in *Sefer Safah Berurah*, as follows:²³⁸

ובבנין הכבד שקראוהו חכמי כל הדקדוק הפעיל אם יהי האות הראשון שהוא שורש עיין, ירחיב אשר לפניו כמו היה מְעַמֵּד במרכבה [I Kings xxii:35]; ה"י ראוי, לולי אות הגרון, להיותו על משקל מְשַׁלֵּף מְשַׁבֵּב. וככה בבנין שלא נקרא שם פועלו: יְעַמֵּד חי [Lev. xvi:10], ובבנין נפעל שהוא כמו נשמר, אמרו אֵל נְעַרְץ [Ps. lxxxix:8], וכל נְעַשָּׂה במרחשת [Lev. vii:9] ניגש הוא נענה [Isa. liii:7]. היה ראוי להיותו על משקל יש נְקַפָּה בלא משפט [Prov. xiii:23].

R. Simḥah's dependence on this passage is easily recognized from the examples brought. The term "הרחב" appears frequently in the usage of R. Abraham Ibn Ezra to note the impact of a guttural letter on the vocalization of the consonant preceding it.²³⁹ R. Simḥah's clarification of this grammatical point and his reliance on R. Abraham Ibn Ezra are not insignificant, of course, even if we do not presume that R. Simḥah composed this note by himself. Even if he copied it from some source, its presence in our *Mahzor* nevertheless testifies to R. Simḥah's sensitivity to grammatical matters and his knowledge of R. Abraham Ibn Ezra's work.²⁴⁰

We could not find a source for the continuation of the note, neither for the section dealing with the passage תעורץ אל נא לעולם תעורץ nor for the reason adduced for the fact that the acrostic starts only from the letter *mem*. However, what the note says about the nature of the passage, that it is "a holy poem" and "a song of the angels", is based on the words of R. Ephraim of Bonn in the aforementioned MS Hamburg 152, fol. 39v, reading as follows: אל נא לעולם תעורץ (ש)כולו שיר של קדושה. The entire note was perhaps copied by R. Simḥah from some ancient commentary of *piyyuṭim*. In any event, it is clear that he was at least somewhat familiar with the commentaries of the *piyyuṭim* produced in the circles of the Ashkenazi sages.

F. THE REGULAR PRAYERS IN THE WORMS MAḤZOR

The part of the regular prayers in the Worms *Mahzor* is fragmentary. This Codex is a *Mahzor*, not a *siddur*. The scribe did not seek to include in this volume the full gamut of the regular prayers, but rather the full scope of the *piyyuṭim* for the special Sabbaths and holidays with which he dealt. However, he did seek to enable the *hazzan* to make convenient use of the book. In other words, he sought to enable the *hazzan* to stand at the lectern and lead the prayers without needing any other book, and without having to thumb through the volume in front of him in order to find what he was looking for. Hence, he copied into the *Mahzor* all the prayers which the *hazzan* would say, from the moment he stood up at the lectern until he finished his part in the prayers, and he took pains to repeat these passages in every section, almost always in their entirety. Thus, just as the manuscript lacks certain entire sections of the fixed prayers, so too, many fixed wordings recur in it a number of times. For example, the passages surrounding the reading of the *shema'* in the morning service are repeated in this *Mahzor* no fewer than thirteen times: once for *Shabbat Sheqalim* (fols. 2r f.), once for *Shabbat Zakhor* (fols. 10r f.), once for *Shabbat Parah* (fols. 21v f.), once for *Shabbat ha-Hodesh* (fols. 27r f.), once for *Shabbat ha-Gadol* (fols. 35r f.), once for the first day of Passover (fols. 51r f.), once for the second day of Passover (fols. 64r f.), once for the intermediate Sabbath of Passover (fol. 72v), once for the seventh day of Passover (fols. 78r f.), once for the last day of Passover (fols. 90v f.),²⁴¹ once for the first day of Shavu'ot (fol. 112r), once for the second day of Shavu'ot (fol. 131v, only from ויציב), and one more time for the second day of Shavu'ot, in the pages added to the end of the *Mahzor* (fol. 220v; copied here only in part).²⁴²

The fixed wording of the evening prayer was also copied by the scribe in its entirety four times, with each *ma'ariv*.²⁴³ However, in two *ma'arivim*²⁴⁴ the scribe did not copy the prayers in full, but rather only hinted at them with some connecting words.

The scribe was highly inconsistent in copying the regular text of the *'amidah*. *'Amidot* in which *piyyuṭim* were not recited were not copied at all,²⁴⁵ but, surprisingly enough, the *'amidah* for the intermediate Sabbath of Passover which is said without *piyyuṭim* was copied from the *qedushah* through the end of the fourth benediction (fol. 76r). In the *'amidot* in which *piyyuṭim* were recited the scribe consistently copied the texts inserted between

235 Regarding this subject, see L. Fleischer, "R. Avraham ha-Hoze and R. Avraham Ibn Ezra" [Heb.], *Luah Yerushalayim*, XI (1951), pp. 178 ff. See also the article by Y. Freimann in the "Eshkol" *Encyclopaedia* (s.v. *Avraham ha-Hoze*) [Heb.], and the bibliography there. R. Abraham Ibn Ezra is called "Avraham ha-Hoze" by R. El'azar of Worms and R. Avraham, the author of *'Arugat ha-Bosem*.

236 Ed. G. Lippmann, Fiorda 1827, p. 68b.

237 Offenbach 1791, pp. 24b, 49b.

238 Ed. G. Lippmann, Fiorda 1838, pp. 17b ff.

239 See L. Prijs, *Die grammatikalische Terminologie des Abraham Ibn Ezra*, Basel 1950, pp. 127 ff. The example from זובח לאלהים יחרם (Ex. xxii:19) does not appear in the aforementioned works of Ibn Ezra; in his commentary to Lev. xvi:10, as well as in *Sefer Moznayim*, p. 49b and *Zahut*, p. 68a, he cites כל רכשו יחרם (Ez. x:8). Maybe R. Abraham Ibn Ezra omitted the verse from Exodus because of its content. Perhaps R. Simḥah cited it because it is better known.

240 As we have mentioned above, the vocalization of תעורץ itself is nowhere discussed explicitly in the works of Ibn Ezra. R. Simḥah, or whoever he was quoting, extended Ibn Ezra's remarks on the class of פִּיעַ verbs, and thereby fashioned the unusual written form and vocalization of the word.

241 Only until the end of the *zulat*; afterwards he noted עורת אבותינו and did not copy the continuation (fol. 91r).

242 From המאיר לארץ, or, on the Sabbath, from שבת נותנים לו (see below).

243 For the first night of Passover (fol. 41r); for the second night of Passover (fol. 42v); for the "sixth" night of Passover (fol. 46r); and for the first night of Shavu'ot (fol. 144v).

244 For the seventh night of Passover (fol. 45v) and for the second night of Shavu'ot (fol. 144v).

245 Thus, he did not copy the *'amidah* for the morning service of the first day of Passover, since it was said without a *qedushta*, nor those of the *musaf* services in which no *piyyuṭim* were included.

the passages of poetry. The fixed wordings of the *musaf* 'amidot in which *shiv'atot* were recited²⁴⁶ also were copied anew each time, as well as the weekday 'amidot in which *qerovot* were recited.²⁴⁷ Also copied in full were the 'amidot in which, according to the tradition of the scribe's time and place, it was customary for the priests to recite the priestly blessing. The scribe copied the *musaf* 'amidah of the first day of Passover (fol. 60r), and the 'amidot of the morning service of the second day (fol. 69r), the seventh day (fol. 87v), and the last day of Passover (fol. 100r). Likewise, for Shavu'ot, the scribe copied the 'amidot of the morning service (fol. 123r) and of *musaf* (fol. 124r) for the first day, as well as the *musaf* 'amidah for the second day (fol. 142v).²⁴⁸

Also the Sabbath 'amidot in which *qedushta*'ot were recited naturally were all copied up to the *qedushah*. In most instances the scribe continued past the *qedushah*,²⁴⁹ but only as far as the completion of the fourth benediction.²⁵⁰ Only for *Parashat ha-Hodesh* (fol. 31r) did he copy the 'amidah to the very end. The scribe also copied the wording of the *musaf* 'amidah for *Shabbat ha-Hodesh* (but only as far as *מקדש השבת*), because of the passage *אדיר דר מתנחים*, which was customarily recited in the middle of the fourth benediction. It is hard to say exactly what criteria guided the scribe in copying the 'amidah. We may conjecture that he was influenced by considerations of how to lay out the pages calligraphically.²⁵¹

At the beginning of the *Mahzor* the scribe began the sections for the special Sabbaths with the *yozerot*, indicating neither the opening of the prayer (ברכו את ה' המבורך), nor the opening of the first benediction preceding the *shema* (ברוך... יוצר אור ובורא חושך etc.). However, on *Shabbat ha-Hodesh* he departed from this practice, and before the *yozer* he indicated the end of *נשמת כל חי*, starting from the words *שוכן עד*. He copied the passage beginning with *שוכן עד* and the passage *בפי ישרים* etc., to the end, adding on to this the end of *ישתבח שמך*, from *אל ההודאות* on. The intermediate passages (*ישתבח שמך* and *ובמקהלות רבבות עמך* etc., until *אל ההודאות*) he omitted. Then he indicated *יתגדל ויתקדש* and immediately proceeded (without *ברכו* etc.) with the opening of the first benediction, to which, according to the Ashkenazi custom on the days that a *yozer* was said,²⁵² he added the formula *אור עלם יהי באוצר חיים אורות מאופל אמר יהי*. From here on he followed this practice, with minor modifications, for the beginning of each section of the *Mahzor*.²⁵³ At the beginning of the *yozer* for the first day of Passover he opened with *הגבור לנצה*, as was customary on Passover in the communities of western Ashkenaz,²⁵⁴ and copied the wording of the *qaddish* in its entirety. Here he also copied the wording of the opening formula *ברכו את יי המבורך לעולם ועד*, and the response, *ברוך יי המבורך לעולם ועד*. He followed the exact same pattern, although less lavishly, at the beginning of the section for the second day of Passover (fol. 61v), the beginning of the section for the intermediate Sabbath of Passover (fol. 70r), and the beginning of the section for the "Sixth Day of Passover" (fol. 77r). Then, again very lavishly, he copied these passages at the beginning of the *yozer* for the last day of Passover (fol. 89r). The opening of the prayers for the last day of Passover is also

repeated, in the exact same words and same form on the page which was appended to the end of the *Mahzor* (fol. 219r), due to the replacement of the *yozer* for this day by another one.

The opening of the prayers for the first day of Shavu'ot, according to the tradition presented in the *Mahzor*, was especially elaborate. At the beginning of this section (fol. 110r), after the heading *ליום* מתחיל החון מציל עני מיד חוק ממנו ועני ואביון מגולו. Then he copied the *piyyut* *מי אדר זה* in its entirety, following it by the continuation of *נשמת* until *שם קדשו*. Then, he wrote in large letters *האל בתעצמות עורך*, the words with which the *hazzan* used to begin his prayer on Shavu'ot in the congregations of western Ashkenaz. Henceforth he copied as on the rest of the festivals *בפי ישרים* etc., *אל ההודאות* until the end of the benediction, and the full wording of the *qaddish*. He had no room left for *ברכו*, and had to make do with indicating the formula by its opening word. In similar fashion, although less elaborately, he copied out the beginning of the prayer in the section for the second day of the festival (fol. 130r). However, here he only had enough room for *האל בתעצמות עורך* until *תתקדש*. The passage *אל ההודאות* he did not copy at all, and he copied only the first paragraph of the *qaddish* (up to *ואמרו קריב ובזמן קריב ואמרו* (up to *אמן*)).

No other fixed texts of prayers appear in the *Mahzor*. However, at the end of the 'amidot the scribe indicated that *qaddish* is said (by the words *יתגדל ויתקדש*), sometimes in large letters and sometimes in small ones, depending on how much room he had left on the page. Once only, at the end of the 'amidah for the seventh day of Passover (fol. 88v), he copied the wording of the full *qaddish* (*קדיש תתקבל*) in its entirety.

The scribe handled in a strange way the subject of saying *hallel* on the festivals, as we have already mentioned above. In the section for the first day of Passover he did not copy the 'amidah of the morning service, since it had no *qedushta*; perhaps for the same reason, he also failed to indicate the recitation of *hallel*. Yet on the second day of Passover (fol. 70r), immediately following the 'amidah of the morning service, he copied the following verses of the *hallel*: *הודו ליי כי טוב* etc., up to *אנא יי* etc., and *אנא יי* up to *הושיעה נא* up to *הצליחה נא*, but no more. He copied these same verses on fol. 88v, at the end of the section for the seventh day of Passover. At the end of the 'amidah for the last day he in no way indicated the recitation of *hallel*, and he likewise altogether ignored the *hallel* in the sections for both days of Shavu'ot. In contrast, he copied all of the *hallel* in the section for the intermediate Sabbath of Passover (fol. 75r), indicating in a lengthy remark at the beginning of the text the days on which the full *hallel* is recited, as well as the wording of the benediction said when the full *hallel* is recited, and that said when only the half *hallel* is recited. We discuss the significance of this later on.

Several points are noteworthy regarding the way of copying the fixed prayers in the Worms *Mahzor*. We already pointed out above that when bringing the concluding lines of *נשמת כל חי* the scribe regularly skipped over the passage *ובמקהלות רבבות עמך* and

246 Thus, in the *musaf* service of *Shabbat Sheqalim* (fol. 7v) and *Shabbat ha-Hodesh* (fol. 32r), and of the first day of Passover (fol. 60r).

247 For Purim (fol. 15v) and for the Ninth of Av (fol. 157r). In the latter, the regular wording is copied only until the end of the 'avodah benediction.

248 The 'amidah of the morning service for this day appears (fols. 141v ff.) only up to the end of the fourth benediction, at which point the scribe noted *רצה ומודים* and stopped.

249 However, in the 'amidah of the morning service for *Parashat Parah* (fol. 26r), he stopped after the first verse of the *qedushah* and did not continue.

250 Thus in *Parashat Sheqalim* (fol. 7v), in *Parashat Zakhon* (fol. 15r), and on *Shabbat ha-Gadol* (fol. 38v). Regarding *Parashat Parah* see the

preceding note, and regarding *Parashat ha-Hodesh*, see immediately below.

251 The efforts of the scribe to always start the prayers (which appear many times, as we have noted) on the same part of the page is noticeable in the *Mahzor*.

252 Regarding this, see below.

253 At the beginning of the section for *Shabbat ha-Gadol* (fol. 34r), the scribe did not have room to copy the passage beginning with *אל ההודאות*. He likewise omitted mention of the *qaddish* preceding *ברכו* afterwards, for the same reason.

254 See below.

the beginning of the passage שמך ישתבח up to אל ההודאות. In the wording of the *qaddish* following נשמת and preceding ברכו the text of the response, יהא שמיה רבא etc., is regularly omitted. Instead, the continuation of the *qaddish* always starts with a bolder copying of the words לעלם ולעלמי עלמיא.²⁵⁵ These words are always copied separately, sometimes in large red letters, centred on a line of their own. In one instance (fol. 48r) a later hand listed next to them: [יש] גורסים [לעלם ולעלמי עלמיא], and in another place (fol. 61v), [יש] גורסים [לעלמי]. On fol. 70r the vocalizer apparently ignored the *vav* of ולעלמי and did not vocalize it;²⁵⁶ on fol. 77r this *vav* seems to have an erasure line drawn on it. Also on fol. 219r, which is the page appended to the *Mahzor* in order to change the *yozer* for the last day of Passover, the three words mentioned above appear with greater emphasis, however here the text is explicitly spelled out, לעלם לעלמי עלמיא, without a *vav*. Similar to the absence of the two paragraphs at the end of נשמת כל חי, there is a most remarkable omission from the prayer surrounding the reading of the *shema'* in the Sabbath morning service. At the end of the *yozerot* for all the Sabbaths, and for festivals which coincide with the Sabbath, the *Mahzor* always alludes to the passage הכל יודוך, except that the wording by which this is indicated is consistently ו כל יודוך (with the letter *vav*).²⁵⁷ However, the text which is copied immediately thereafter²⁵⁸ is not הכל יודוך. Indeed, this prayer is not copied in the *Mahzor* even once. Likewise, the passage following this prayer, אל ארך על כל המעשים, also is absent from the *Mahzor*. In all instances the prayers for the Sabbath begin at this point with the words שבה שבת which begin the concluding verse of אל ארך לו.²⁵⁹ Only from this point on is the fixed prayer copied through to the end. However, the alternative texts for the weekdays are copied in their entirety, from המאיר לארך on.

The *shema'* also is never copied in its entirety in the *Mahzor*. The scribe used a variety of means to indicate its recitation. Twice he copied the first verse of the *shema'* preceding it with the words אמן אל מלך נאמן, setting off the initial letters of אמן אל מלך נאמן with dots (fols. 3r, 35v). Twice he wrote אמן אל מלך נאמן, without continuing any further (fols. 65r, 79r). In other instances he indicated that the *shema'* was to be said by a note: וקור' קרית שמע (or: קריית) (fols. 10v, 22r, 73v, 52r, 113r). Twice (fols. 27v, 91r) he placed the prayer אמת וציב immediately following the *ahavah* benediction with no reference to the *shema'* at all.

The priestly blessing is indicated in the *Mahzor* in two different ways. In the *'amidot* in which the priests actually used to bless the congregation, the priestly blessing is graphically given great prominence. The opening formula אלהינו ואלהי אבותינו ברכנו does not appear at all. The summoning word כהנים sometimes appears and sometimes is omitted. The words of the blessing itself are copied in large letters, and next to them are the verses which the congregation was accustomed to recite after the enunciation of each word of the blessing by the priests. This is how the priestly blessing appears on fol. 61r (for *musaf* of the first day of Passover; without כהנים),²⁶⁰ on fol. 69v (for the morning service of the second day of Passover; with כהנים),²⁶¹ on fol. 123v

(for the morning service of the first day of Shavu'ot; without כהנים),²⁶² and on page 144r (for the *musaf* of the second day of Shavu'ot; with כהנים). In the *'amidot* in which the priests did not actually bless the people, the scribe simply copied the passage of the blessing from אלהינו ואלהי אבותינו ברכנו ברכה on. This is the case for the *musaf* of *Shabbat Sheqalim* (fol. 9r), for the *qerovah* of Purim (fol. 20v), for the morning service of *Shabbat ha-Hodesh* (fol. 31v), and for *musaf* of that Sabbath (fol. 34r).

Every mediaeval Jew was well versed in the precise wording of the prayers, and no one was likely to make significant errors in copying them. R. Simḥah, the scribe of the Worms *Mahzor*, certainly knew all the prayers by heart. Hence it is all the more remarkable that his copying of the fixed prayers which recur in this Codex several times, as indicated above, are not always identical. While some of the variations may be accounted for as accidental omissions or slips of the pen, others by no means can be explained this way. This is most obvious in the prayers surrounding the *shema'*, which, as we have said above, are copied in the *Mahzor* no fewer than thirteen times. For example, in the passage אשר שבת, לאל אשר שבת, in most instances the scribe copied the usual wording זה שבת של יום השביעי, but in the very beginning of the *Mahzor* (fol. 2r) he wrote שבת של יום שביעי, without a *he*. Further on in this prayer, in most instances he copied שבת של יום השביעי, but on fol. 27r he wrote שבת ואומר, and on fol. 10r he wrote שבת ואומר.²⁶³

The continuation of this passage is most confused. In the Sabbath prayers the *Mahzor* generally reads על שבת מעשה, as is customary also in our day (fols. 10r, 27r, 35r, 78v); but in the beginning of the *Mahzor* (fol. 2v), perhaps by mistake, we find תתברך יי אל הינו על שבת מעשה יריך. Twice, however, on fols. 21v and 90v, instead of תתברך מושיענו, the text reads יתברך מושיענו. At the beginning of the next passage the *Mahzor* consistently reads תתברך צורנו מלכנו גואלנו (fols. 21v, 27r, 35r, 78v). This holds true for this place in all the prayers for weekdays too (fols. 31r, 64r, 78v, 90v, 112r). In the Sabbath prayers, however, we twice have יתברך צורנו מלכנו גואלנו (fol. 2v²⁶⁴ and fol. 72v). On fol. 27r, in a passage erroneously copied out of place, we also have יתברך; but when the passage was copied for the second time in the correct place, the text reads again תתברך.

The confusion in this matter is apparently connected with the wording which consistently appears in the weekday prayers of the *Mahzor* at the end of the passage המאיר לארך. There, at the end of תמיד מספרים אל ברוך גדול דעה, where our prayer books read תתברך יי אלהינו כבוד אל וקדושתו, etc., the Worms *Mahzor* regularly reads תמיד מספרים כבוד אל בקדושתו. יתברך יי אלהינו etc. Each time, the first letters of the words מספרים, כבוד, בקדושתו and יתברך are highlighted with three dots, in order to point out the word מבי (מי), which they combine to form. Every place where this special marking occurs in the *Mahzor* some later hand (apparently that of the vocalizer) marked the letter *yod* in יתברך to be erased, and wrote either below or above it a small *tav*, in order to change the version of יתברך to that of תתברך. The variant יתברך instead of וקדושתו is known for this prayer, although it is

255 This phenomenon is found only in the sections for the holidays, because the *qaddish* preceding ברכו is not copied even once in the section for the four special Sabbaths.

256 It is even possible that he marked the letter with a small circle to be deleted, but there is a clear *shuruq* in the *vav* of ולעלמי on fol. 89r.

257 However, on the aforementioned page added at the end of the *Mahzor* (fol. 220v), הכל יודוך is written without a *vav*. It also appears that way sometimes (בשבת הכל יודוך) without a *vav* in a later hand, in the places where the scribe omitted to note at the end of the *yozerot* the alternative wording for holidays which coincide with the Sabbath.

258 The supplemental folio is the same in this regard, as we have mentioned.

259 The word שבת at the beginning of the passage is almost always emphasized with larger letters.

260 A later hand wrote between the lines here the beginning of the passage אלהינו ואלהי אבותינו ברכנו etc.

261 A later hand added here the wording of the prayer רבנו של עולם אני שלך וחלמותי שלך etc.

262 A later hand added here the beginning of the passage אריא ברכנו, emphasizing the word כהנים in it.

263 A later hand, apparently that of the vocalizer, added a *vav* in the space above the *bet* in order to correct the text.

264 This was corrected, maybe by the vocalizer, to read תתברך.

not common.²⁶⁵ However, the *יתברך* which comes after it has not yet been noted by scholars. It is likely that this variant is a vestige of Italian influence. According to the Italian *siddur* in the weekday prayers the alphabetic acrostic *אל ברוך* is regularly followed by *אלהינו יי יתברך* etc.; and in *Seder Hıbbur Berakhot*²⁶⁶ the wording is: *תמיד יספרו לאל ב ק ד ו ש ת ו י ת ב ר כ יי אלהינו בשמים ממעל: ועל הארץ מתחת ועל כל שבח מעשה ידך והמאורות אשר יצרת הם יפארוך וקדושתו וקדושתו*; yet the version *אלהינו יי יתברך* is attested in manuscripts as well as in printed editions; and it is most surprising that Dr. Goldschmidt did not point this out in his description of the rite of the Jews of Rome.²⁶⁷ The alternate formulations which occur in our *Mahzor* in this part of the weekday and Sabbath prayers are probably due to the fact that the variant *יתברך* was in the scribe's mind. I wonder whether the combination *מכבי* has been noted previously in the early Ashkenazi prayer rites. I have never come across any allusion to it in the manuscripts of *mahzorim* which I have examined.

The way the benediction *אהבה רבה* is copied in our *Mahzor* is also not uniform. In some places (fols. 2v, 52r, 91r) in the beginning of the benediction we have the reading *כן תחנונו ותלמדנו*. But in all the other places (fols. 22r, 27v, 35v, 64v, 73v, 79r, 113r) we find only *תחנונו ותלמדנו*.²⁶⁸ Here, too, the confusion is apparently related to different traditions of wording for this passage in the regular prayers.²⁶⁹ In the passage which follows, the scribe renders the text as *להביק להשכיל* in most instances, but on fols. 27v, 73v, 91r and 113r he writes *ולהשכיל*. On fol. 2v and in all the other instances of this prayer he wrote *הגדול והנורא בטחנונו*, but on fols. 27v and 65r he copied *הגדול הגבור והנורא*.²⁷⁰ In the passage *עזרת אבותינו* of fol. 3r, the scribe omitted the word *מגן* from the phrase *מגן ומושיע לבניהם אחריהם*. This word is present in all remaining instances. However, on fols. 36v and 113r we have *ומגן*.²⁷¹ The continuation of the passage reads, in general, *ומבית עבדים פדיתנו*, except on fols. 28r, 36v and 65v, which read *מבית*, without the *vav*. The treatment of the phrase, *יום סוף בקעת*, is very muddled. It appears thus on fols. 22v, 28r, 36v, 74v, and 132r. However, on fol. 3r *טבעת* is omitted. On fols. 11r, 53v, 80r and 113v *העברת* is omitted.²⁷² There is also much confusion regarding the phrase *על שבחו אהובים*.²⁷³ That is how it appears on fols. 3r and 65v. However, on fols. 28r, 36v and 80v the reading is *לאל רוממו לאל*. In contrast, on fols. 22v, 74v, 113v, and 132r, the scribe rendered *לאל רוממו לאל*. (The latter two instances were corrected to *לאל רוממו*.) Lastly, on fol. 53v the wording

is *לאל רוממו לאל*, but the word *רוממו* has been erased by a later hand, and *רוממו* written in the margin. In the continuation of the passage, as well, there are minor variations between instances. In most cases the text reads *ומוציא אסירי*, but on fols. 11r, 28r, 36v, 53v and 65v it reads *מוציא*. Usually the text continues *מבורך הוא ומבורך ברוך הוא ומבורך*, but on fols. 22v, 28v, 36v, and 74v *מבורך* appears (sometimes with a *vav* added above the word).

The textual variations at the end of the *ge'ulah* benediction are extremely significant. The first time this passage occurs in the *Mahzor*, on fol. 3v, the scribe wrote *ופדה כנאמר יהודה וישתאל* (with the word *שמו* added in the margin). The wording in the text proper remained, throughout, as it was first rendered. That is how it was copied again on fol. 65v (without *שמו*) and on fol. 113v (with *שמו*); however, in both these places a later hand marked the sentence *וגאלינו* etc., to be deleted. In all the remaining places, this sentence was not included at all from the outset. We know that there was a controversy in Ashkenaz regarding the saying of *וגאלינו* etc., which will be discussed in some detail further on. The appearance of these two variations, alternating with each other, can certainly not be taken as an inadvertent slip of the pen.

There are minor variations also in the rendition of the evening prayer, which is copied in full in our *Mahzor* four times (fols. 41v, 43r, 46r, 109r). In the first instance (fol. 41v) the scribe wrote *אמת ואמונה קיים עלינו* (a later hand corrected: *וקיים*); yet in the remaining places he wrote *וקיים*.²⁷⁴ In the benediction on fol. 44v, he wrote *אויב דבר וחרב*; but in two other places (fols. 42r, 110r) he omitted the word *אויב*. Further on, on fol. 42r, he wrote *כי אל שומרנו ומצילנו אתה אל*.

Naturally there are fewer deviations in the wordings of the *'amidah* and the *qedushot*, yet even here the texts are not altogether uniform. In the wording of *יעלה ויבוא*, for example, on fols. 69r, 67v and 141v the copier wrote *ישמע ויפקד*; but on fols. 100r and 123v he wrote *יפקד* without a *vav*. In each rendition he wrote *יעלה ויבוא יגיע יראה וירצה*, save for fol. 87v, where he wrote *ירצה ויגיע* and omitted *ירצה*. Also, in the paragraph of *והשיאנו* in the *'amidah* of the festivals, he copied two different wordings. On fols. 69r and 100v he wrote *לחיים לשמחה ולשלום*,²⁷⁵ but in all the other places (fols. 61r, 87v, 123v) he wrote *לחיים לשמחה ולששון*.²⁷⁶ Our findings in the wording of the *qaddish* are even more remarkable. In every instance of a *qaddish* preceding *ברכו*, copied in full, the scribe wrote *לעילא לעילא מכל ברכתא* (fols. 48r, 61v, 70r, 77r, 89r and fol. 210r, the folio appended to the original *Mah-*

265 This is how it appears in the *Mahzor Vitry*, MS Reggio, which is described by Goldschmidt, *Studies in Prayer and Piyyut*, p. 68, and in *Seder Hıbbur Berakhot* (see below). It is also the wording of the Persian rite as published by S. Tal, *The Prayer Rite of the Persian Jews* (Heb.), Jerusalem 1981, p. 56; however, between the lines there the text is corrected to read *וקדושתו*.

266 In Schechter's copy, p. 20.

267 *Studies in Prayer and Piyyut*, p. 157. It is noteworthy that the Italian rite has this wording only on weekdays. On Sabbaths the entire passage is left out. Instead, the prayer is closed thus: *שמך יי אלהינו יתקדש חכך מלכנו יתפאר בשמים ממעל ועל הארץ מתחת ועל כל שבח מעשה ידך ועל מאורות אשר יצרת המה יפארוך סלה*.

268 On fols. 27v, 35v, 73v, and 79r a later hand added *כן*.

269 The *Hasidim* of Ashkenaz strongly opposed the addition of the words *כן תחנונו ותלמדנו* in *אהבה רבה*; see Urbach, *Arugat ha-Bosem*, IV, p. 93, who quotes there an important passage from MS British Library 534. (The wording there ought to be corrected to: to the benediction *אהבה רבה* [the word is added between the lines] *כן תחנונו ותלמדנו* [the word is added between the lines] *ועל מעיניהם וטחו עיניהם מראות מה שכתב החסיד וכו'*. The other manuscripts mentioned by Urbach there (n. 36) say that "some fools add *ותלמדנו* and also skip *תחנונו* *כן*

in order that there should be 100 words: they are making a mistake." In the printed *Mahzor Vitry* and in MS Reggio the wording is like the regular version: *כן תחנונו ותלמדנו*. However, in *Seder Hıbbur Berakhot* (Schechter's copy, p. 21) the text is *תחנונו* (without *ותלמדנו*). In the regular versions of the Italian *siddur*, the wording is *תחנונו ותלמדנו* as in Ashkenaz. *תחנונו* without *ותלמדנו* is also the version of the *Siddur of R. Se'adyah Gaon*, Jerusalem 1962², p. 14.

270 On fol. 2r the word *גיבור* is noted in a later hand in the margin.

271 In the last two instances the letter *vav* was erased by a later hand.

272 On fol. 113v the phrase was added by a later hand.

273 In the continuation of the prayer the text always reads *נתנו* (in place of *נתנו* in the regular versions), but it is generally corrected by the vocalizer.

274 Regarding the wording of the prayers at this point, compare C. Reif, "Liturgical Difficulties and Geniza Manuscripts", *Studies in Judaism and Islam*, Jerusalem 1981, pp. 98 ff.

275 This is also the wording of the corrector on fol. 143v; see below. On fol. 69r a later hand corrected thus: he wrote a small *bet* on *לשמחה* and a small *aleph* on *ולשלום*, and above the word *לשמחה* he noted *ולששון*.

276 On fol. 61r a later hand added the word *ולשלום* above. On fol. 143v the body of the text was corrected *ולששון* in place of *ולשלום*.

zor). However, on fol. 110v, before the section for the first day of Shavu'ot, there is but one לעילא. The wording of the full *qaddish* appearing on fol. 88v, as well, reads only מכל ברכתא לעילא.

We also ought to mention here the strange superfluous אמן which the scribe slipped in at the beginning of the *Mahzor* (fol. 2v), after the *me'orot* benediction. Above we already remarked on the scribe's regular practice of adding אמן after the *ahavah* benediction. The word אמן does not occur after the *me'orot* benediction anywhere else in this *Mahzor*.

It is difficult to account for these peculiarities. Even though other parts and aspects of the *Mahzor* seem to indicate that the scribe worked somewhat carelessly, when it comes to the fixed wording of the prayers what he did is particularly astonishing, especially since his deviations, for the most part, are not isolated occurrences, but rather patterns which, in some instances, recur in just the same form quite a number of times. Sometimes we know the variant wordings which occur in the *Mahzor* to have been versions used by some Ashkenazi communities in the Middle Ages. If we are not to say that the scribe blindly pieced together his complete *Mahzor* out of a number of partial *Vorlagen* which had different readings, then we must say that the scribe did not copy the fixed wordings which he was accustomed to say, but rather some slightly different wording which he had been specially commissioned to write. He then deviated from this wording several times, unconsciously reverting to the wording familiar to him, and alternately returned to the wording which he had been commissioned to copy. Of course we cannot say definitely which version was his own and which his employer's, but since we do not know exactly where he came from, nor where his patron was from, the whole matter is not of great significance. Nevertheless, the fact itself may help us get closer to solving the problem of identifying the liturgical rite of our Codex, as we shall see below.

G. THE RITE OF THE WORMS MAHZOR

The Worms *Mahzor* is, as we have said, a typical Ashkenazi *mahzor*, and the liturgical usage presented in it is the familiar rite of western Ashkenaz. This needs no proof because it is self-evident from every page of the Codex, both in terms of its fixed wordings and in terms of its *piyyuṭim*. We have already remarked above that the *Mahzor's* faithfulness to the fixed patterns of the Ashkenazi liturgy testifies to the antiquity of this rite, and to the steadfast manner in which the Jewish communities adhered to its fundamental elements from the early Middle Ages until modern times.

Among the typical features of the *mahzorim* of Ashkenaz, which we already see fully established in the Worms *Mahzor*, we must mention first of all the changes which occur in the fixed wording of various prayers when recited along with *piyyuṭim*. This point is important especially because it shows us how the liturgical customs of Central Europe were related, at the time of their inception, to the prayer rite of Erez Israel, and how the Jews of Central Europe viewed the payṭanic material which reached them from Erez Israel.²⁷⁷ As is well known, the wording of the Central European prayers is much closer to what we know as the Babylonian rite than to the rites of Erez Israel recently revealed to us in the Cairo *genizah*. However, the *piyyuṭim* of the Central European rite are mostly from Erez Israel. They were transmitted from the East to Italy, and from there northwards, probably at the stage when the fixed wording of the prayers in these centres was Palestinian as well.²⁷⁸ The *piyyuṭim* came from Erez Israel together with the fixed wording of the prayers surrounding them, and were received by these congregations as a single unit. They did not change anything, either in the *piyyuṭim* themselves or in the fixed wording surrounding them, even after having changed the wording of their prayers (for the occasions on which *piyyuṭim* were not recited) according to the Babylonian rite. As a result of this development, several passages of prayer appear in the *mahzorim* of Ashkenaz in two different wordings, one of them, according to the Babylonian rite, for the weekdays and for the Sabbaths and festivals on which *piyyuṭim* were not recited, and the other one, according to the rite of Erez Israel, for those occasions when *piyyuṭim* were said. These double passages are found even in the Ashkenazi rite of today. The *yozer* proper in Ashkenazi prayers is regularly introduced by the poetic line אור עולם בארצו חיים אורות מאופל אמר יהי,²⁷⁹ which was part of the fixed wording of the *me'orot* benediction, according to the rite of Erez Israel. This passage is not said in Ashkenaz²⁸⁰ except on those days on which a *yozer* is said. At the end of *ofanim*, in Ashkenazi congregations, instead of the usual והאופנים והחיות והחיות ישוררו וברוכים יפארו ושרפים הקודש etc., the Palestinian passage והחיות ישוררו וברוכים יפארו ושרפים הקודש etc., is recited. At the beginning of the *zulatot* the usual wording of אמת ויצב is replaced by another shorter wording which comes from Erez Israel;²⁸¹ and at the end of the *ge'ulot*, a short transitional passage is inserted (the only one which is perhaps not from Erez Israel, but rather from Italy): בגלל אבות תושע בנים ותביא בגולה לבני בניהם.²⁸² All these variations are preserved in our *Mahzor* with the utmost precision. And since it does not reproduce fixed wordings except for those occasions on which *piyyuṭim* are said, it does not include, for example, the regular wording of אמת ויצב at all.²⁸³

277 Regarding this, see Fleischer, *The Yozer*, pp. 154 ff.

278 Regarding the basically Babylonian character of the regular wording of the European prayers, including those of Central Europe, see Goldschmidt, *The Mahzor for the High Holy Days*, I, Jerusalem 1970, p. 15. Regarding the probability that the early Italian rite agreed with the contemporaneous Palestinian rite see E. Fleischer, "Hedveta b. R. Avraham — The First Italian *Paytan*?" [Heb.], *Italia*, II (1981), Hebrew section, pp. 22 ff.

279 The ancient version of the line was אור עולם without a *bet*. This line, which dates from the period of anonymous *piyyuṭ*, was improperly ascribed to Yosse b. Yosse and was even included in A. Mirsky's edition of that poet's *piyyuṭim*, Jerusalem 1977, p. 213.

280 However, in the Italian rite, it is the regular beginning of the *me'orot*

blessing on Sabbaths and festivals, even when no *piyyuṭim* are recited in the prayers.

281 As we mentioned, R. Simḥah explained this phenomenon in the margin of fol. 3r, according to the Ashkenazi traditions.

282 The passage is regularly recited at this point in the Italian communities, even in the absence of *piyyuṭim*. However, the passage itself was already known in the East in the time of R. Se'adyah Gaon (*Siddur RaSaG*, p. 110 [for the Sabbath evening prayer]), and it is already mentioned (and rejected) in *Seder Rav 'Amram Gaon*, ed. Goldschmidt, Jerusalem 1972, p. 20.

283 This fact was already noted by D. Goldschmidt in his article on the Worms *Mahzor*, *Studies in Prayer and Piyyuṭ*, p. 24.

The case is similar for the evening prayers which include *piyyuṭim*. Here, too, the fixed wordings preceding the verses מי ימלוך לעולם ועד and כמכה באלים יי בגילה ברינה בשמחה to בשמחה רבה ואמרו כולם זה צור ישענו פצו פה זה אלי ענו ואמרו כולם. Both these changes are present in our *Mahzor*. According to the liturgical rite of eastern Ashkenaz, in the context of a *piyyuṭ*, even the wording of the *ge'ulah* benediction was changed from גאל ישראל (as in the Babylonian rite) to צור (מלך) (as in the rite of Erez Israel). However, this change was not instituted in western Ashkenaz, nor does it appear in our *Mahzor*.

It was an ancient custom in Ashkenazi congregations, during the *musaf 'amidah* on holidays on which the priests blessed the congregation, to insert a special passage, beginning with the words ותערב לפניך עתירתנו כעולה וכקרן (עבודת ישראל עמך). This passage, also originating from Erez Israel,²⁸⁴ was concluded with the Palestinian wording of the *'avodah* benediction ברוך... שאותך לבדך המחזיר שכינתו לציון, ביראה נעבוד. This custom too, is found in our *Mahzor* in the *musaf 'amidot* of all the festivals, yet the connection between this passage and the priestly blessing was not evident in the time and place of our scribe. According to the practice of his time, the priests blessed the congregation in the morning service as well, but the passage ותערב etc. is indicated only in *musaf*.

All of these details²⁸⁵ were part of the Ashkenazi rite from time immemorial, and there is nothing new about their presence here, aside from the fact of the early date of documentation. However, our *Mahzor* does exhibit an additional detail which disappeared from later liturgical practice. In all the *'amidot* embellished with *qedushta'ot*, instead of the usual (Babylonian) wording of the beginning of the first benediction, we regularly have the parallel Palestinian formulation האל הגדול הגבור והנורא אל עליך קונה ברוך... האל הגדול הגבור והנורא אל עליך קונה ברחמי שמים וארץ.²⁸⁶ This change, which occurs also in the East,²⁸⁷ and in Spain,²⁸⁸ as well as in Italy,²⁸⁹ is attested in several early Ashkenazi manuscripts,²⁹⁰ but apparently sank quite rapidly into oblivion.²⁹¹ Aside from all the places it occurs in the *Mahzor* proper, it is also mentioned in the marginal note of the copyist, on fol. 3r, where he explains as quoted above, the "short"

(Erez Israel) wording of אמת ויציב: "Likewise they abbreviated the *magen* benediction." There can be no doubt that this usage was widespread in early Ashkenazi congregations, for this practice is consonant with the liturgical phenomena reviewed above. It was apparently abolished by a ruling of R. Ephraim of Bonn, which appears in MS Hamburg 152, fol. 44v, as follows:²⁹²

מסוד חכמים: כשהחזן מתחיל הקרובה או אל עליון קונה ברחמי שמים וארץ, מסוד חכמי ונבו [=מסוד חכמים ונבונים] וכו'. אבל לי נראה לסיים את הברכה כך: אל עליון [גמל] חסידים [טובים] וקונה [הכל] חוכר [חסדי] אבתת [ומביתא] גתאל [לבני] בניהם [למען] שמו באהבה. מסוד חכמים [ונבונים] וכו' [...] וכן שמעתי מקרובי אבי' ישראל²⁹³ שהיה מסיים כל הברכה של מגן עד חתימתה ואחר כך הוא אומר [מסוד] חכמים [ונבונים] כו' וכן עיקר, שלא לשנות מן המטבע שטבעו [חכמים], כי אפילו מה שמפסיקין את הברכה [ואומר] פיוטי [הרבה] קשה כאשר כתבת [למעלה], ואף כי מקצרים אותה. ואינו דומה לברכת אמת ויציב שמקצרים אותה [בשביל] הזולת, שהרי אינן דומות שאר ברכות ליי"ח ברכות של תפילה [...] ועוד שהרי לא קיצרו בברכת [מחיה] המתים בשביל הפיוט. וכן ראיתי את ר' שמואל הפרנס ואת ר' יחיאל בנו שהיו גומרים הברכה, שכן קיבלו מן הזקנים וכן מנהג בורמישא.

From this passage we see that in the times of R. Ephraim, whose words the manuscript quotes, the custom of "shortening" the *magen* benediction was generally accepted in Ashkenaz, and only a few isolated scholars deviated from this practice. R. Samuel ha-Parnas and R. Yehiel, his son, are known of only from this source,²⁹⁴ so perhaps this sentence and what follows it about the rite practiced in Worms is an addition which can be ascribed to the redactor of the volume in which the remark appears, or to the person who copied it.²⁹⁵ If so, the remark here regarding the rite of Worms would belong to a later period, when the opinion of R. Ephraim of Bonn and Ra'avan had become accepted also in the community of Worms and in other Ashkenazi communities. Indeed, in our *Mahzor*, too, the usual Babylonian wording for the opening of the benediction has been copied in the margin, in every place, by a later hand. We cannot establish exactly how much later the work of this annotator was, nor, therefore, when the text was brought into accord with the above-mentioned ruling in the place where the *Mahzor* was in use. Still, the corrections do not appear to be very early.

284 However, in the ancient versions the passage only started with the second sentence, אנה רחום ברחמיך הרבים; regarding this matter, see Fleischer, "News", *op. cit.* (above, n. 109), p. 261.

285 With the exception of the replacement of the wording גאל ישראל in the *ge'ulah* blessing of the evening prayer by the wording מלך צור ישראל, as we mentioned above.

286 This introduction survived in the Ashkenazi rites only in the "one benediction comprising seven" (מגן אברהם), which is said on Sabbath eves after the silent *'amidah*. Regarding the wording of this introduction and its dissemination, see N. Wieder, "Studies Concerning the Wording of the *'Amidah* in the Ancient Babylonian Rite" [Heb.], *Sinai*, LXVIII (1976), pp. 93 ff., and especially, pp. 116 ff. His conclusions there differ from ours. Regarding the wording ברחמי שמים וארץ, see Wieder, *loc. cit.*

287 In *genizah* manuscripts this introduction frequently appears at the beginning of *qerovot* (as known, the regular wording of the prayers is generally not copied in *piyyuṭ* manuscripts from the *genizah*). It is, though, usually impossible to ascertain whether a given manuscript served in a Babylonian or a Palestinian synagogue. However, see *Siddur RaSaG*, p. 184, where this Erez Israel introduction appears at the beginning of the Gaon's *shiv'ata* of *azharot* אצל אלהים. Yet this *shiv'ata* was not originally included by the Gaon in his *Siddur*. Several *qerovot* of some Babylonian poets, such as Shelomoh-Suleiman al-Sangari and Yosef Albaradani, open with the word וארץ. See also the next note.

288 Many early Spanish *qedushta'ot* begin with the word וארץ. This word is intended to tie the *piyyuṭ* to the end of the Palestinian opening of the *'amidah* (קונה [ברחמי] שמים וארץ). *Qedushta'ot* beginning with this

word were written by R. Shelomoh Ibn Gabirol, R. Yizhaq Ibn Giat, and R. Abraham Ibn Ezra, as well as by later Provençal *paytanim*. See Davidson, *Thesaurus*, the letter *vav*, Nos. 66-73.

289 The Erez Israel introduction appears before all the *qerovot* (*shiv'atot*, *qedushta'ot*, as well as *qerovot* for weekdays) in the *Seder Hibbur Berakhot*. See A. Schechter, *Studies in Jewish Liturgy*, Philadelphia 1930, pp. 97 ff. In the later Italian rite the *qedushta'ot* were omitted, but the Erez Israel introduction does appear at the start of the sole *qedushta* which survives in this rite, the *qedushta* for the Day of Atonement.

290 Including, among others, MS Oxford 1042, fols. 23v, 38v, and MS British Library 656, fol. 37v.

291 It is also omitted from the second volume of the Worms *Mahzor*; this is absolute proof that the two volumes are not dependent on one another, but rather representatives of two different rites. It is inconceivable that two different usages were customary within the same community in this matter (as Wieder suggests, *op. cit.* [above, n. 286]). The "Babylonian" introduction appears in the second volume at the beginning of the *qedushta'ot* for Sukkot as well.

292 The passage was copied by Urbach in *'Arugat ha-Bosem*, IV, p. 41.

293 Namely, R. Eli'ezer bar Nathan (the Ra'avan).

294 See Urbach's note on this matter, *loc. cit.*

295 This is the reasonable conclusion, for after adducing a proof from the Ra'avan, R. Ephraim would not need to pay attention to the practice of more obscure individuals. MS Hamburg 152 was copied in 1318 (see Urbach, *ibid.*, p. 59), almost fifty years after our *Mahzor* was written.

It is noteworthy that the replacement of the usual wording by the wording of Erez Israel only occurs in the 'amidot of the Sabbath and festival morning services ornamented by *qedushta'ot*. The *musaf* 'amidot which are embellished with *shiv'atot* and the weekday 'amidot embellished with *qerovot* have in our *Mahzor* the usual Babylonian beginning. This indicates that the rite was from its inception "frozen", and that the people who established it did not understand its underlying logic.²⁹⁶

Another area in which we may see the impact of the *piyyutim* on the wording of the prayers accompanying them concerns the opening word of the first benediction preceding the reading of the *shema* on Sabbaths. According to the rite of our *Mahzor* the *yozerot* were intended to lead, on Sabbaths, to הכל יודוך; and on weekdays, i.e., on holidays which came out during the week, to המאיר לארץ.²⁹⁷ The full text of הכל יודוך never occurs in the *Mahzor*, as we have already noted above. However at the end of the *yozerot* we consistently find כל יודוך and not הכל יודוך. This wording never appears in the usual Ashkenazi prayers. Yet, in early Ashkenazi *mahzorim* it does appear quite frequently following the *yozerot*, to indicate that that passage is to be recited.²⁹⁸ This rather strange use may be a result of the tendency of some early Ashkenazi congregations to emphasize the fact that the fixed wording of the prayer is a sort of direct continuation of the *piyyut*. An allusion to such a liturgical practice may perhaps be found in as early a source as the *yozer* אודך כי אנפת for Ḥannukah written by R. Yosef b. Shelomoh of Carcassone (c. early eleventh century), and whose last line reads משבי הדורים ו ה כל יודוך. Over the course of time the custom apparently became obscured, and the communities reverted to the usual wording of the prayer.

In western Ashkenaz it was customary for the *hazzan* to begin the morning service on Sabbaths at the end of the prayer ושמח כל חי, with the passage beginning שוכן ער מרום וקדוש שמו. On festivals this practice was changed, in order to point out the special character of the various holidays. On Passover it was customary to begin with הגבור לנצח, on Shavu'ot with בתעצמות עורך, on the High Holy Days with המלך (היושב), and on Sukkot with הגדול בכבוד שמך. This early custom is already described in *Sefer Tashbez* of R. Shimshon b. R. Zadok, a student of R. Me'ir of Rothenburg.²⁹⁹ In the practice of eastern Ashkenaz, and in the later rite, all that remained of this custom was the change in the point where the *hazzan* takes over to האל on the festivals and to המלך on the High Holy Days. However, in early *mahzorim*, as in our *Mahzor* as well, everything is as described above. This custom was maintained in Worms all the time, but it is not a custom unique to that community.

Some of the liturgical practices presented in the Worms *Mahzor* are less well known. In this respect, our Codex exhibits several

amazing phenomena, which in and of themselves are inexplicable. Were it not for the extensive (and much later) *minhagim* literature at our disposal, some of these practices would remain unexplained. Fortunately, the prayer rites of the Ashkenazi communities, and particularly those of the Rhineland, have been recorded, sometimes by way of allusion and sometimes in great detail, in the works of the Ashkenazi rabbinical authorities; these works help us understand what we see in several parts of the *Mahzor*, and also indicate how widespread and how early the customs in question are. Among these sources are several quite early works describing the rite of Worms, especially the customs which set this rite apart from those of the rest of the communities of western Ashkenaz.³⁰⁰ These works are the *Minhagim* (=Customs) books of R. Liva (R. Yehudah Liva b. R. Yosef Moshe) Kirchheim and R. Yuspa (R. Yiftah' Yosef b. R. Naftali Manz-pach) Shammash. Both of these compositions are extant in manuscript form. R. Liva began writing his book (*Minhagim shel Qahal* [= *The Customs of the Community*]) in 1625, and continued to work on it until his death in 1632. In his work he relied on an earlier compilation describing the liturgical practices of Worms. R. Liva's work has come down to us, copied and edited by R. Sinai son of R. Yizhaq Zeklin Loanz, a resident of Worms and the first printer of the Worms *siddur*, in 1715. He completed his copying of R. Liva's *Minhagim* in 1746. This manuscript was owned by the library of the Rabbinical Seminary of Breslau, and today is kept at the Institute of Jewish History in Warsaw. A photocopy of it may be seen in the Institute of Microfilmed Hebrew Manuscripts of the National and University Library in Jerusalem (Film No. 11602). R. Yuspa Shammash was born in 1604 and died in 1678. He wrote his *Minhagim* in two versions, a long one and an abbreviated one.³⁰¹ In the longer version, written in 1648, he recorded the customs of Worms in great detail, including those practiced both there and in other communities, without paying a great deal of attention to proper editing and correct order. He made various marginal notes and additions to this volume, until 1656. These additions expanded the length of the work and confused its structure to such an extent that sometimes it is difficult to follow the order of the text. This version has been preserved in R. Yuspa's own handwriting, in a manuscript which now resides in the Bodleian Library in Oxford, Catalogue No. 909. R. Yuspa based the shorter version on the longer one, in an attempt to restore order to it and to cut down its unwieldy length. This second version also has come down to us in the author's own handwriting. The original now resides in Worms itself, and a photocopy of it may be found in the Institute for Microfilmed Hebrew Manuscripts in Jerusalem, Film No. 31234. Another edition of the longer version has reached us, written by

296 The other way is found, for example, in *Seder Hibbur Berakhot*, where the Erez Israel introductions appear regularly at the beginning of all the types of *qerovah*, as we have said.

297 In this matter there were several variant customs in the early Ashkenazi communities, as we can deduce from the concluding words of the Central European *yozerot*. See Fleischer, *The Yozer*, pp. 62 ff.

298 This is the consistent practice of MS Oxford 1033 (from the year 1258) at the end of every *yozer* for the four special Sabbaths, and of MS Oxford 1035 (which is the continuation of the aforementioned manuscript), fol. 145, at the end of the *yozer* for Sukkot, and of MS Parma 585 at the end of אדיר ונאה (there, for the Sabbath following Shavu'ot); however, afterwards, at the end of the *yozer* for the intermediate Sabbath of Passover: הכל יודוך. This codex was written by several hands at different times. This is also the reading in the second volume of the Worms *Mahzor*, fol. 3r, at the end of the *yozer* for the New Year: אם שבת אומי, הכל יודוך הכל, but the first *vav* was crossed out later. Likewise in the margin there: הכל יודוך הכל [here too the first *vav* is crossed out] בנחת. On fol. 74r there: אם שבת אומי.

הכל יודוך ואם לאו אומר התזן המאיר לארץ. Also in MS München 69 at the end of the *yozerot*: הכל יודוך, with three exceptions, which have: הכל יודוך. Also in MS Oxford 1025, fol. 42r, at the end of the *yozer* for *Shabbat ha-Gadol*, and fol. 64v, at the end of the *yozer* for the intermediate Sabbath of Passover, as well as on fols. 71r and 110r: הכל יודוך. This last manuscript is also not entirely consistent, though. The great *Mahzor* of Amsterdam also consistently has הכל יודוך.

299 *Sefer Tashbez*, Warsaw 1901, para. 245, p. 55.

300 A. Epstein has written an exhaustive consideration of the works concerning the customs of Worms: "Die Wormser Minhagbücher", *Gedenkbuch zur Erinnerung an David Kaufmann*, pp. 288 ff., Breslau 1900. Most of the information below about these works is based on material drawn from this article.

301 For the relationship between the extant versions of R. Yuspa Shammash's work on the customs of Worms see Y. Zimmer, "Marriage Customs in Worms" [Heb.], *Sinai*, LXXXVI (1980), pp. 14 ff. All the details in our text regarding this issue are drawn from this article.

one of R. Yuspa's sons. He prepared his edition while his father was still alive, and while R. Yuspa himself was still adding remarks to the longer version of his work. A photocopy of this edition, which for a while was owned by A. Epstein, may be found in the Schocken Institute for Jewish Studies, in Jerusalem.³⁰²

Aside from these two works, which are of inestimable importance to us in learning about the customs of Worms and in understanding our *Mahzor*, we have one other manuscript of a *Mahzor*, albeit a later one, of the Worms rite. This *Mahzor* was copied by R. Ya'akov Oppenheim in 1623,³⁰³ and today resides in the aforementioned Bodleian Library in Oxford, Catalogue No. 1031. R. Ya'akov Oppenheim was familiar with our Worms *Mahzor*, and was certainly also influenced by it.

The special *piyyuṭim* of Worms, supplemented by a succinct description of the Worms customs, have also been printed twice. Once was in 1714, on the initiative of R. Sinai b. R. Yizḥaq Zeklin Loanz, mentioned above, who also emended R. Liva Kirchheim's *Minhagim* (*Ma'aravot Yozerot u-Seliḥot 'im ha-Pesugim u-Minhagim de-Q.Q. Wormaisa*, Frankfurt o/M 1714); and once in 1737, by R. Aharon ha-Levi of Worms (*Seder Seliḥot 'im Pesugim u-Ma'aravot ve-Yozerot ve-Zulat Yom Kippur Qatan 'al-pi Seder u-Minhag Q.Q. Wormaisa*). This edition was printed in Sulzbach.³⁰⁴ Both these editions only include the *piyyuṭim* and liturgical uses in which the rite of Worms differed from that of other places, in the first edition in short, and in the second one in greater length. At the end of both works there is a short list of the customs considered by its compiler unique to the community of Worms.³⁰⁵

Now let us analyze the rite of our *Mahzor* in detail, considering its wording of the fixed prayers.

We have already mentioned the strange practice employed by the scribe in all the places where he copied the concluding sections of *וּבְמִקְהֵלוֹת*, namely the omission of the two passages *נְשַׁמַּת כָּל הַיּוֹם* and *יִשְׁתַּבַּח שְׁמֶךָ לְעַד מְלַכְנוּ*, as far as *אֵל הַהֲדָאוֹת*. This omission, which as we have said is consistent and recurs eight times in the *Mahzor*, illustrates a special custom practiced on the festivals in early Ashkenazi communities, and apparently especially in the Rhineland: these two passages were not recited by the *hazzan*, but rather were chanted in choir by the congregation.

The *hazzan* would only sing in *אֵל הַהֲדָאוֹת*. From that point on he would continue reciting the prayer until the end, and then he would say *qaddish*. We do not know the reason for this practice, but can suggest that it arose in order to put into actual practice what was said in the initial passage *וּבְמִקְהֵלוֹת* ("and in the assembly") *יִתְפָּאֵר שְׁמֶךָ מְלַכְנוּ*. Be that as it may, the custom to which our *Mahzor* clearly attests³⁰⁶ is also alluded to in the *Minhagim* book of *Maharil* (Ya'akov b. Moshe Moellin) where, describing the beginning of the *hazzan's* prayer on the festivals, we regularly find the remark, *וְיָחֹזֵר אֶל הַהֲדָאוֹת* (=returns [to] *אֵל הַהֲדָאוֹת*).³⁰⁷ The custom, as it was practiced in Worms as late as the seventeenth century, is described in fine detail in the work of R. Liva Kirchheim. In the order of prayer of the morning service for regular Sabbaths he notes (p. 42b): "The *hazzan* begins chanting *וּבְמִקְהֵלוֹת* ... *וּבְמִקְהֵלוֹת* ... The *hazzan* says the half *qaddish* and chants *וּבְמִקְהֵלוֹת*." However, in his description of the morning service on Passover he says: "The *hazzan* begins with *לְנִצְחָה* etc. ... and says *אֵל הַהֲדָאוֹת*". Likewise for the morning of Shavu'ot: "The *hazzan* begins with *הָאֵל בְּתַעֲצוּמוֹת עוֹךְ* ... and says *אֵל הַהֲדָאוֹת*", etc.³⁰⁸

Here we must add what we already mentioned above regarding the omission of *הַכֵּל יוֹדוּךָ* and of *אֵל אֲדוֹן* up to *שִׁבְחָה נִתְנִים לֹ* in all instances where the Sabbath prayers are copied in our *Mahzor*. This omission, too, results from a practice common in the congregations of the Rhineland, namely placing these passages in the mouths of the congregation, which would sing them in unison, and in certain places in antiphony. This practice was customary only on the Sabbaths during the summer, in most places beginning only on *Shabbat ha-Gadol*, but in Mainz and Worms beginning from *Shabbat Sheqalim* on.³⁰⁹ On all the Sabbaths on which this was the practice the *hazzan* would begin with *שִׁבְחָה נִתְנִים לֹ* and continue from there, exactly as our *Mahzor* reflects. This custom is also described by R. Liva Kirchheim, in his description of *Shabbat Sheqalim* (p. 122a): "The *hazzan* begins chanting aloud *וְיִצְרֵךְ אֲדוֹן* [הַכֵּל יוֹדוּךָ] *וְיִצְרֵךְ אֲדוֹן* ... Then they start saying *הַכֵּל יוֹדוּךָ* at length, with a drawn out melody, and they do so all through the summer, until *Shabbat Bereshit*, and the *hazzan* begins *שִׁבְחָה נִתְנִים לֹ*."³¹⁰ He notes the same use in the beginning of his work, in his descrip-

302 Nothing of R. Liva's book of customs has yet been published, except for a few historical passages included by Epstein in his article, *op. cit.* (above, n. 300). The majority of this work deals with matters of prayer, so that interest in it has been limited. R. Yuspa described in colourful details many aspects of the everyday Jewish life in Worms. He had excellent literary skills, although his typically Ashkenazi Hebrew was somewhat turgid. Several sections of the work by R. Yuspa Shammash have been published; see S. Assaf, *Sources on the History of Education among Jews* [Heb.], I, Jerusalem 1925, pp. 217 ff.; idem, "Simḥat Torah Customs in Worms" [Heb.], *Beit ha-Knesset*, II, No. 1 (1958), pp. 7 ff.; A.M. Habermann, "Customs for the Month of Adar from the *Book of the Customs of Worms* by R. Yosef Yuspa Shammash" [Heb.], *Sinai*, Jubilee Volume (1958), pp. 482 ff.; idem, *Bar-Mizva Customs*, Jerusalem 1958 (special print); idem, "Customs of the Worms Community" [Heb.], *Sinai*, LXXIX (1977), pp. 247 ff.; and Zimmer, *op. cit.* (above, n. 301). All of these publications, except for the last one mentioned, are from the short version of the work. Zimmer published a passage from the long version. In none of these aforementioned passages is there much material touching upon the order of the prayers.

303 Regarding this, see Epstein, *op. cit.* (above, n. 300), p. 291.

304 See Goldschmidt, *Studies in Prayer and Piyyuṭ*, p. 9.

305 In the two editions the customs are virtually identical. They were composed by R. Sinai Loanz, who brought to print the first edition of the Worms rite. His vast familiarity with the customs of Worms was based on his work on R. Liva Kirchheim's book, which he copied, as we have mentioned above.

306 It also appears this way in several early Ashkenazi *mahzorim*. According

to a still later custom, the *hazzan* began from the start of the *ישתבח* benediction: *אֵל הַהֲדָאוֹת* *בְּתַעֲצוּמוֹת אֵל מֶלֶךְ גָּדוֹל בְּתַעֲצוּמוֹת אֵל הַהֲדָאוֹת* etc. However, even in *mahzorim* which attest to this use, the phrase *אֵל הַהֲדָאוֹת* is copied in large letters, a remnant of the earlier stage of the custom (for example, in MS Oxford 1042, fols. 219v, 250r). In MS Parma 585, which was written, as we noted, by several copyists, the two customs appear mixed together. However, in the second volume of the Worms *Mahzor*, both *וּבְמִקְהֵלוֹת* and *ישתבח* appear in their entirety (at the beginning of the volume). This is another matter in which the custom of the second volume is different from that of our *Mahzor*.

307 Warsaw 1874, p. 19b (Passover): "The leader of the prayers begins *וּבְמִקְהֵלוֹת* and returns to *אֵל הַהֲדָאוֹת*. Likewise there, p. 22a (Shavu'ot) and 33a (Sukkot). However, in the Laws of the New Year (p. 38b) and the Day of Atonement (p. 47b) he expressly states: "And he returns to *וּבְמִקְהֵלוֹת* of *ישתבח*."

308 It also appears that way in the Worms *Mahzor* copied by R. Ya'akov Oppenheim, p. 54b.

309 See *Maharil* (above, n. 307), p. 58a: "*Parashat Sheqalim*. In Mainz and in Worms they start to recite *הַכֵּל יוֹדוּךָ* at length, with a drawn-out tune, and they continue doing so all summer until the intermediate Sabbath of Sukkot. Everywhere else they begin to draw out *הַכֵּל יוֹדוּךָ* on *Shabbat ha-Gadol* and they stop on the first Sabbath of the *seliḥot* of the Days of Awe."

310 Regarding *Shabbat Bereshit* (fol. 104v) he notes: "And one recites *הַכֵּל יוֹדוּךָ* quickly." Likewise in the short version of R. Yuspa Shammash, p. 22, for the intermediate Sabbath of Sukkot: "The leader of the prayers sings *שִׁבְחָה נִתְנִים לֹ*." Also in the morning service for the seventh day of

tion of the Sabbath prayers in general (p. 42b): “And he chants *ברכו* and they say *הכל יודוך* singing, but everything according to its season, for there are times when it is not sung, as I shall write, God willing. And they say *אל ארון* also with a melody.” In the gleanings which end the manuscript R. Liva remarks: “Whenever a *yozer* is said, then the *hazzan* begins out loud from *שבח נתנים לו*. And if the *hazzan* says *הכל יודוך*, then *שבח נתנים לו* is not said twice” (p. 161b).

We do not know how this custom emerged, nor for what reasons. It might be that the early Ashkenazi Jews viewed both passages as sorts of *piyyuṭim*, in other words as a *yozer* proper, and rendered them as passages of song. Or it might be that what we have here is nothing more than the desire to realize in actual practice what follows from the beginning of the passage, *הכל יודוך והכל ישבחך* so that *הכל* should not be represented by the voice of the *hazzan* alone.³¹¹ This is somewhat similar to the hypothesis we advanced above, to explain the omission of the passage *ובמקהלות*. If we are pedantic about what was said in these sources regarding the difference between the rite practiced in the communities of Mainz and Worms and that practiced in other communities, the former beginning to sing *הכל יודוך* on *Shabbat Sheqalim* while the latter only beginning on *Shabbat ha-Gadol*, then we must perforce conclude that our *Mahzor* represents the rite of either Mainz or Worms, since the passages *הכל יודוך* and *אל ארון* are omitted in it from *Shabbat Sheqalim* on. However, it is extremely doubtful whether it is appropriate to adopt this view when dealing with such an early source. We shall discuss this matter in detail below.

It is worth noting that the two practices just described give us an important key to understanding the emergence of two payṭanic genres innovated in Ashkenaz — the *אל ההודאות* and the *שבח*. The presence of these two genres in Ashkenazi *piyyuṭ* has already been noted by scholars.³¹² The first genre presents short poems which lead in the end to the passage *אל ההודאות* in the prayer *ישתבח*, and the other presents poems with strophes beginning with the word *שבח* and ending with the word *קדש*. These poems serve as an introduction to the passage *שבח נתנים לו*. The reason for the emergence of these two genres has remained obscure. Yet, the custom just described provides an obvious explanation for the formation of the two types. At *אל ההודאות* and *שבח נתנים לו*

the *hazzan* was expected to begin singing again after an interlude, and it was considered fitting for him to begin with a brief poetic embellishment. The connection between modes of prayer and poetical creativity is proven again here, as it is demonstrated time and again throughout the history of payṭanic poetry.

Another thing proven again by these findings, is that this *Mahzor* was indeed meant to be used by the *hazzan*, rather than by an individual worshipper. Had the scribe considered the possibility that this book would be put into the hands of an individual worshipper he would by no means have omitted the aforementioned passages, which are integral parts of the prayers. Only because he knew that the goal of writing this Codex was different did he permit himself to skip over the passages which the *hazzan* did not customarily recite, according to the use of his time and place.

This may also explain the surprising feature we mentioned above, namely, the omission of all the passages of the *hallel*, save for the lines *הודו ליי* etc., and *אנא יי הושיעה נא* etc. It is likely that on festivals³¹³ the chapters of the *hallel* were sung by the congregation in unison, while the *hazzan* would recite by himself only the aforementioned verses. The role of the *hazzan* in saying these verses is indeed stressed in the sources, as is well known, but it has not yet been proven by external evidence that the *hallel* was actually sung in this fashion.³¹⁴

A related matter is the emphasis which the scribe places on the words *לעלם ולעלמי עלמיה* in the response *יהא שמייה רבא* of the *qaddish*. This, as well, is connected to a custom practiced in Ashkenaz on the festivals,³¹⁵ namely, that the *hazzan* would begin reciting the second part of the *qaddish* with a repetition of the end of the response, from *עלמיה* [or *לעלמי*]: *לעלם ולעלמי עלמיה* on. This custom is hinted at by Maharil,³¹⁶ and is also noted by R. Liva Kirchheim. With respect to the Passover morning service he remarks concerning the *hazzan* (p. 130b): “He says *אל ההודאות* and says *לעלם ולעלמי עלמיה*.” Similarly, in the Shavu’ot morning service he writes (p. 149b): “He says *אל ההודאות* and says *לעלם ולעלמי עלמיה*, and one does not say *לעלמי עלמיה*.”³¹⁷ As we noted above, in some places the wording in our *Mahzor*, which consistently read *לעלמי עלמיה*, was indeed emended to read *לעלמי עלמיה*.³¹⁸ The origin of this way of reciting the *qaddish* must be looked into; perhaps it is Italian.³¹⁹

Passover there: “On the Sabbath [...] *הכל יודוך*; the leader of the prayers sings *שבח נתנים לו*.” In the long version, p. 50a, in the margin of the section of the customs for *Shabbat Bereshit*: “One ceases singing *הכל יודוך* with a tune.” Also there, for *Shabbat Sheqalim*, on p. 52b: “And we begin to sing *הכל יודוך* *responsively*, verse by verse.” Also in the list of customs appended to the 1714 edition of the Worms *siddur*, in *Parashat Sheqalim*: “One begins to recite *הכל יודוך* *responsively* and with a tune, until *Shabbat Bereshit*.”

311 Perhaps this ancient custom has left a remnant in the Ashkenazi synagogues of our days, albeit restricted to the *piyyuṭ* *אל ארון* only. That passage is in many places sung chorally by the congregation. Even in our day the *hazzan* begins again from *שבח נתנים לו*.

312 See Fleischer, *Liturgical Poetry*, pp. 460, 462.

313 Because for the intermediate Sabbath of Passover the entire text of the *hallel* is copied (fol. 75r).

314 However, the *hallel* is copied in exactly the same fashion at the beginning of the Nürnberg *Mahzor*: there as well, of all the *hallel* only the verses *הודו ליי* and *אנא יי* appear. The parallel — and it is certainly not the only one to be found in Ashkenazi *mahzorim* — strengthens the plausibility of the explanation suggested in the body of this introduction.

315 We cannot know whether that was the custom also for regular and special Sabbaths, for the *qaddish* is not copied in these sections of our *Mahzor*, but it is reasonable to assume that the custom was different on those days, for otherwise it would not have been emphasized so in the *mahzorim* and *Customs* books as a custom of the festivals. In any event, on the intermediate Sabbath of Passover, our *Mahzor* emphasizes *לעלם ולעלמי עלמיה*, as on holidays. See more about this below.

316 The note is missing from the customs of Passover. However, on Shavu’ot (p. 22a), we find: “And he returns to *אל ההודאות* and also returns to *לעלם ולעלמי עלמיה*.” Likewise on p. 38b for the New Year, p. 47b for the Day of Atonement, and p. 53a for Sukkot.

317 However, in R. Ya’aqov Oppenheim’s *Mahzor*, which like our *Mahzor* also greatly emphasizes the letters under consideration, the wording is *לעלם ולעלמי עלמיה* (p. 54b). In the second volume of the Worms *Mahzor*, fol. Iv, the version is *לעלם ולעלמי עלמיה* (here again the custom of the second volume differs from that of our *Mahzor*). See, though, the remark there of a later hand on fol. 30r: “The *hazzan* starts *לעלמי עלמיה*.”

318 Regarding the distinction between the versions *לעלמי עלמיה* and *לעלמי עלמיה* see the printed version of the *Mahzor Vitry*, p. 55, and the notes of the editor. See also *The Siddur of R. Shelomoh b. R. Shimshon of Worms* [Heb.], ed. M. Hershler, Jerusalem 1972, p. 81; *Siddur Ez Hayim* [Heb.], ed. I. Brodie, I, Jerusalem 1962, p. 81.

319 The wording of the weekday *qaddish* is copied out twice in the *Seder Hibbur Berakhot* without any comments (Schechter’s copy, pp. 19, 77). However, in the *qaddish* which precedes *ברכו* on the Sabbath (p. 107), the text in the copy is: *אמן יהשיר מברך לעלם ולעלמי עלמיה* [...]. The text in the copy is: *לעלם ולעלמי עלמיה*. *לעלמי עלמיה* הוא יתברך שמייה דקדשא בריך הוא לעילא לעילא ולעלמי עלמיה. *לעלמי עלמיה* הוא יתברך שמייה דקדשא בריך הוא לעילא לעילא ולעלמי עלמיה. [...] Schechter underlined the words *לעלמי עלמיה* and noted in the margin of his copy: “Sic. in the MS, twice”. There can be no doubt that this passage exhibits the same custom. Instead of *לעלמי עלמיה* read *לעלמי עלמיה* [וכן] *לעלמי עלמיה*.

An early Ashkenazi custom, which it seems has not yet been noted and which occurs consistently in our *Mahzor*, is that of saying [מכל ברכתא] לעילא לעילא in the *qaddish* preceding ברכו on the three festivals,³²⁰ just as, according to the later custom, it is said in every *qaddish* during the Ten Days of Repentance. The custom in Yemen, as we know, is to always say a double לעילא in the *qaddish*, throughout the entire year; and the same holds for Italy.³²¹ Yet all the other rites known to us acknowledge only one לעילא throughout the entire year.³²² As in the case of all the practices we have examined thus far, that of doubling לעילא in the *qaddish* preceding ברכו is noted by Maharil on all the holidays,³²³ and it occurs quite consistently in the ancient *mahzorim* of western Ashkenaz.³²⁴ This practice was still current in Worms in the time of R. Liva Kirchheim, and he notes it both for Passover (p. 134b: "he doubles לעילא"), and for Shavu'ot (p. 149b). It is surprising that R. Yuspa does not record this custom, nor is it recorded in the Worms *Mahzor* of Ya'aqov Oppenheim. It seems that it was practiced only with respect to the one *qaddish* preceding ברכו in the morning service, for we have found no indication of it with respect to all the other instances of *qaddish*. In the only full *qaddish* which appears in our *Mahzor*, at the end of the 'amidah for the seventh day of Passover (fol. 88v), there is but one לעילא. However, there certainly must have been differing customs with regard to this detail.

The manner in which R. Simḥah copied the two לעילא in our *Mahzor* is also very interesting. He always took pains to separate the two words in some manner or other, be it by a miniscule line suspended between the words, or (as in most instances) by an unusually large space between them. It is difficult to say what his intention was in so doing. Perhaps he sought nothing more than to give prominence to the doubling of the word, so that the *hazzan* would not skip the second one in his chanting; or perhaps he perceived of the first לעילא as drawn towards what preceded it and the second towards what followed, thus rendering something like לעילא הוא בריך וקדשא and then לעילא מכל ברכתא etc. It is worth checking whether this practice also occurs in other early *mahzorim*.

According to our *Mahzor*'s rite the *hazzan* had to say אמן and אל before reading the first line of *shema*'. There can be no doubt that the אמן which is noted several times in our *Mahzor* after the *ahavah* benediction was to be said by the *hazzan* after the benediction he himself recited, for, besides the fact that we do not find אמן written at the end of any other benediction, we have

already seen beyond any doubt that this *Mahzor* was intended for the *hazzan* and that it includes (almost) nothing aside from what he himself was to say. It is also clear that according to the custom of the *Mahzor* the formula אל מלך נאמן was added in every case; in other words, it was recited aloud by the *hazzan* before the congregation began to recite the first verse of the *shema*' together with him. Actually these, too, are well known customs of the Ashkenazi communities, and are well documented in early *mahzorim*. Concerning the אמן said after the *ahavah* benediction by the person pronouncing it, we have an explicit reference in *Sefer ha-Rokeah* of R. El'azar b. Yehudah of Worms.³²⁵ He treats this matter at length, explaining why in this benediction the worshipper should have to say אמן after his own benediction. R. Me'ir of Rothenburg had already ruled that אמן should not be said here, as cited in *Sefer Tashbez*.³²⁶ "One should not say אמן אמן because אל מלך נאמן is in place of אמן." Other rabbis, as well, have ruled the same.³²⁷ The custom of having both the *hazzan* and the individual worshipper say אל מלך נאמן before *shema*' was widespread in Central Europe in the early Middle Ages, and has been discussed in detail by I. Ta-Shema.³²⁸ The custom is documented in many Ashkenazi manuscript *mahzorim* and was without doubt practiced in Worms for a long time.³²⁹ However, R. Liva Kirchheim asserts that one should not say אל מלך נאמן before reading *shema*', as he writes in his work (p. 20a): "One does not say the three words אל מלך נאמן, for all our sages have agreed that they should not be said." However, from his very remark it is clear that where he lived the matter still required special mention.

One of the unusual liturgical practices which occurs in our *Mahzor* has to do with the priestly blessing. According to the established Ashkenazi rite, it is customary for the priests to go up to bless the congregation only on the festivals, and then only during the *musaf* service. That is how it appears in Moshe Isserles' emendations to the *Shulḥan 'Arukh, Oraḥ Ḥayyim*, 128:44. Yet according to the rite of our *Mahzor*, the priests had to deliver the priestly blessing in the morning service of the holidays as well. The order of the priestly blessing has been copied in our *Mahzor* in all the 'amidot of the festivals except the morning service for the first day of Passover, whose 'amidah is not copied in the *Mahzor* at all, as we have already noted above.³³⁰ Still, the priestly blessing is copied in detail in the morning service for the second day of Passover (fol. 69v),³³¹ the morning service for the seventh day (fol. 88r), the morning service for the eighth day (fol.

320 Only once, on fol. 110v, in the *qaddish* preceding ברכו on the first day of Shavu'ot, is only one לעילא copied, apparently in error.

321 That is already the situation in *Seder Hibbur Berakhot*, Schechter's copy, p. 19. It is also alluded to on p. 77; and expressly so there, p. 107.

322 In the *siddur* of Maimonides, though, לעילא appears twice in every instance (ed. Goldschmidt, *Studies in Prayer and Piyyut*, p. 203) This is the source of the Yemenite rite.

323 See *Maharil* (n. 307), p. 19b (Passover): "And he says לעילא twice"; p. 22a (Shavu'ot): "And he says לעילא twice in the *qaddish*"; p. 53a (Sukkot): "And he says לעילא twice".

324 This is how it appears in MS Parma 585 (in all its sections), MS British Library 658, fol. 47v, MS British Library 659 (from the year 1349), and others.

325 Para. 220, s.v. אמן אל מלך נאמן.

326 Warsaw 1901, para. 240, p. 54.

327 See, for example, *Sefer ha-Manhig*, ed. Y. Raphael, Jerusalem 1978, pp. 65 ff. There, after a long discussion, the author concludes that "in הבורח and אהב עמו ישראל he should not answer 'Amen' after his own blessing. Nevertheless, the custom in all of Spain is to answer [אמן] after הבורח and אהב for the reason we have stated, and after גאל ישראל as well." "Amen" also appears following הבורח and אהב את עמו ישראל in *Siddur RaSaG* (pp. 14 and 26); see the editors' note there to line 12 on p. 14, citing the words of R. Naḥshon מתיבתא אר"י: "In three places an individual answers

'Amen' to his own blessing: in בונה ירושלים, and in הבורח באהבה, and in אהב עמו ישראל (!); for thus is the custom of the ancients and of early *hasidim* and thus is the *halakha*." See also the references on this subject listed there. In *Seder Hibbur Berakhot* (p. 21a of Schechter's copy) too, הבורח באהבה is followed by "Amen" and אל מלך נאמן (in the evening service the *shema*' prayer is not copied at all; *ibid.*, p. 74). However, in the printed *Mahzor Vitry*, p. 64, there is no "Amen", only אל מלך נאמן.

328 I. Ta-Shema, "אל מלך נאמן — The Development of a Custom" [Heb.], *Tarbiz*, XXXIX (1970), pp. 184 ff.

329 Both customs are represented in MS Oxford 1025, whose rite is very similar to that of Worms. On fol. 2r: "אמן הבורח בעמו ישראל". At the end of the quire there the *shema*' prayer begins with אל מלך נאמן. These words are copied in large letters. The emphasis on the words אל מלך נאמן which precede the *shema*' prayer is frequent in early Ashkenazi *mahzorim*. In MS Oxford 1042 "Amen" does not appear after הבורח, but אל מלך נאמן does appear (fols. 249r, 257v). Likewise, in MS Oxford 1054 (an eastern Ashkenazi *mahzor*) and MS British Library 656 אל מלך נאמן always appears, but without "Amen".

330 As we mentioned, the scribe generally copies the regular wording of only those prayers which contain *piyyuṭim*.

331 The *musaf* 'amidah is not copied here for the aforementioned reason. Similarly below.

100v), and the morning service for the first day of Shavu'ot (fol. 123v), as well as in the *musaf* for that day (fol. 130r)³³² and for the second day of Shavu'ot (fol. 144r).³³³ The same was the practice in Worms in the seventeenth century, as described by R. Liva Kirchheim for the morning service of the first day of Passover (p. 135a),³³⁴ the seventh day of Passover (p. 142a), the first day of Shavu'ot (p. 110a) and the second day of this festival (p. 151a). The custom is noted with emphasis as being a special practice of Worms in the appendix on customs in the printed editions of the Worms *siddur*. However, it is also alluded to obliquely in *Maharil* (p. 63b), in the paragraph discussing the priestly blessing, in which the priests are cautioned "to wash their hands after they remove their shoes before saying *hallel*, because of the dirt", a law which only applies to the morning service. Evidently, the practice was not unique to Worms.³³⁵

Every time the priestly blessing is copied in the *Mahzor*, save one place (fol. 130r), the biblical verses which the public (including the *hazzan*) would say during the priestly blessing are copied along with the words of the blessing themselves. The custom of saying verses with the words of the priestly blessing is already alluded to in the Talmud, and also presented in the *Seder Hibbur Berakhot*.³³⁶ It was preserved in Ashkenazi communities until a very late date, despite protests by many rabbis who were apprehensive lest the mumbling of these verses deflect the attention of the worshippers from the blessing itself.³³⁷ In Worms too, the custom of saying these verses was abolished, as R. Liva remarks (fol. 135r). Yet the custom did not vanish; it steadily appears in the printed editions of the Ashkenazi *mahzor*.

The rite of our manuscript differs from the generally accepted Ashkenazi practice with respect to the wording of the *musaf 'amidot* on festivals. In the usual Ashkenazi rite these *'amidot* include groups of verses listing the sacrifices of the various festivals. The same is true of the *musaf 'amidot* of Sabbaths and New Months. In our *Mahzor* these verses are not included in the festival *musaf 'amidot*. In these *'amidot* the passage *מפני חטאינו* is

concluded with the sentence *כמו שכתבת עלינו בתורתך על ידי משה* (without *כאמור*) and continues with *אלהינו ואלהי עבדך מפי כבודך* (without *כאמור*) and continues with *אלהינו ואלהי עבדך מפי כבודך* etc. However, for a holiday which falls on the Sabbath, at the end of *מפני חטאינו* our *Mahzor* adds the word *כאמור* and brings the verses dealing with the Sabbath sacrifices (*וביום ישמחו במלכותך השבת שני כבשים* etc.) together with the paragraph *ישמחו במלכותך*, which is customarily said in the Sabbath *'amidot*.³³⁸ Regarding the recitation of the verses on the festival sacrifices in the *musaf 'amidot*, differing practices already existed in the East, and are described in as early a source as the *siddur* of Rav Se'adya Gaon.³³⁹ Early *geonim* disagreed in this matter.³⁴⁰ In early France it was not customary to say any verses at all in the *musaf 'amidot* save on Sabbath and New Month. Rashi testifies to this explicitly in a *responsum* reproduced in *Siddur Rashi*.³⁴¹ However, he himself testifies there to a different practice encountered by him in the Rhineland, namely that R. Me'ir ben Yizhaq Sheliah Zibbur used to say these verses in the *musaf 'amidot* on festivals. Rashi himself ruled that in his locality one should follow the practice of R. Me'ir. He also mentions that his teacher, R. Yizhaq ha-Levi, ruled that on the New Year one should mention even the passages pertaining to the New Month.³⁴² However, the rabbinical authorities of Worms in subsequent generations, apparently including even R. Shelomoh b. Shimshon (Rashbash),³⁴³ challenged his innovation on this latter point. It seems that in the course of time the custom of saying verses pertaining to the sacrifices in *musaf* on festivals was abandoned altogether in Worms. This is indicated in *Sefer ha-Rokeah*,³⁴⁴ and was also the practice of other Ashkenazi rabbis at that time.³⁴⁵ Subsequently, all the Ashkenazi communities instituted the practice of saying these verses in the *musaf* service on festivals, leaving Worms, which persisted in not saying them, an exception. Yet, on holidays which fell on the Sabbath, days on which even in ancient Worms it had been customary to say the sacrifice verses pertaining to the Sabbath,³⁴⁶ the practice of also saying the verses pertaining to the festival was instituted, in order to give the list of the

332 This time, though, the scribe copied the Priestly Blessing in a short form, omitting the biblical verses (about which see below). However, there can be no doubt that he intended this passage for the priests actually performing the blessing, since it appears here without the introduction *ברכת אלהינו ואלהי אבותינו* etc., which is customarily recited in the *'amidah* when the priests do not actually bless the congregation. Also, the passage *ותעבר* appears here as usual.

333 The passage is missing in the morning service for the second day of Shavu'ot (fol. 142r), since the scribe only copied the *'amidah* up to the fourth benediction.

334 There is no such passage for the intermediate Sabbath of Passover. It seems that the priests did not go up to bless the congregation on the intermediate Sabbath of Passover in the time of R. Liva. On the festivals the priests blessed the congregation even on the Sabbath.

335 See *Sefer Minhagim of the School of Rabbi Me'ir ben Barukh of Rothenburg* (Heb.), ed. I. Ellenbein, New York 1938, p. 26.

336 Schechter's copy, p. 39.

337 The author of the *Rokeah* already ruled (para. 323): "And the congregation should not recite verses". Thus also in the *Shulhan 'Arukh, Oraḥ Ḥayyim*, 128:26. However, the Remah (=R. Moshe Isserles) in his note there mentions the Ashkenazi custom and tends toward authorizing it ("In any event, now that the priests draw out [their blessing] with singing, it became customary to say verses as well[...] but it is better not to say them").

338 See fols. 60v and 142v (the *musaf* services for the first day of Passover and second day of Shavu'ot). On fol. 60v the word *כאמור* was enclosed in a circle by a later hand. On fol. 142v the scribe forgot to write *כאמור*, but he noted in red ink before the section of the sacrifices: *ובשבת אומר*.

339 See there, p. 152: "And many of our congregation do not say verses in the *musaf* service, since they are afraid of erring in the verses; instead, they say *על ידי משה עבדך*, following which they say *עלינו רחמן רחמן*.

And this is certainly sufficient. However, if someone learned the verses of each festival by heart, without mixing them up, saying them carefully is preferable to omitting them". See also Elbogen, *op. cit.* (above, n. 133), p. 102.

340 Regarding this, see L. Ginsburg, *Geonica*, II, New York 1909, p. 188. The *responsum* of the *gaon* (apparently Rav Naḥson) adduced there fixes that the verses should not be said in the *musaf* service.

341 See *Siddur Rashi*, ed. S. Buber, Berlin 1911, secs. 174–176, pp. 80 ff. (= *Mahzor Vitry*, p. 358): "I have not observed in any of our places on any of the festivals the custom of saying the verses about the additional sacrifices, since they are not known fluently except for [the verses about] the additional sacrifices for the Sabbath and the New Month, which are frequent and are known fluently."

342 Regarding this matter, see Grossman, *Sages*, pp. 293, 330.

343 See Grossman, *ibid.*, p. 337.

344 See sec. 325. However, on the New Year they recited in Worms the verses for the New Year without adding those for the New Month; see sec. 204 there.

345 See the quotation by Urbach in *Arugat ha-Bosem*, IV, p. 71, from R. Asher b. R. Ya'akov ha-Levi of Osnabrück: "My teacher and relative, R. Shemu'el of Bamberg, the son of R. Barukh of Mainz, did not say verses on all the festivals, nor on the New Year, nor on the Day of Atonement, and he did not even say *ישמחו במלכותך* when a festival coincided with the Sabbath. And it is reported that the faithful messenger (i.e. the *hazzan*) R. Moshe Kohen, the *hazzan* of Mainz, did likewise." As Urbach notes there, R. Moshe Kohen was the brother-in-law of the author of the *Rokeah*. See also *Arugat ha-Bosem*, III, p. 464, n. 53.

346 Since everyone knew the verses for the Sabbath, and there was no concern that they would be confused, as Rashi noted in his aforementioned *responsum*.

niyyot,³⁵⁹ and most of the *minhagim* books.³⁶⁰ However, *Or Zarua'* and the *Mordekhai* ruled that אל ארך אפים should be said, and so did the *Maharil Customs* (p. 35a): “אל ארך אפים is said even if it is not a Thursday, as on any public fast day.” In the same place we read: “Likewise, in Frankfort they say אל ארך אפים even if it falls on any other day of the week.”³⁶¹ That is also the custom of our *Mahzor*, and it is clear from the wording that in the opinion of the scribe, R. Simḥah, one ought to say אל ארך אפים on the Ninth of Av in any event, and not necessarily only on a Thursday. But the later custom in Worms was not to say אל ארך אפים, as indicated in R. Liva's book (fol. 157v): “אל ארך אפים is not said if it should fall on a Thursday, all the more so יהוא רחום is not said.” Likewise, in the shorter version of R. Yuspa Shammash, p. 36: “Neither *tahanun* nor אל ארך אפים is said, if it falls on a Monday [!] or Thursday.” A similar emendation was made between the lines of our *Mahzor*, by a later hand: “אל ארך אפים is not said”.

Here we ought to mention the non-uniform wording which occurs in our *Mahzor* at the conclusion of the *ge'ulah* benediction in the morning services. We have already mentioned this fact, and have noted that three times the scribe wrote shortly preceding the benediction, וגאלנו יי צבאות [שמו] קדוש ישראל³⁶² (fols. 3v, 65v, 113v), but that in the rest of the instances he did not include this sentence at all. Whether to include this sentence, in these words or in others, at the end of the passage צור ישראל, was a subject of controversy in the communities of western Europe.³⁶³ According to an early French tradition, this sentence was apparently recited at the end of the paragraph, a practice which became established in the communities of the Rhineland, as well. We know for certain that R. Me'ir ben Yizḥaq Sheliah Zibbur, the *payṭan* of Worms, used to add this sentence at the end of the passage. But the *Hasidim* of Ashkenaz were vehemently opposed to this practice because the computation of the number of words and letters in the passage צור ישראל (without the added verse) worked out well with their mystical teachings. They protested strongly against the “French”, and were skeptical about the reliability of the tradition which placed R. Me'ir Sheliah Zibbur among those siding with the extended wording. Through their influence, apparently, the phrase was removed from the closing of the benediction, and care was taken by the congregations not to recite it.

The tradition which attributes the incorporation of this sentence at this point to R. Me'ir Sheliah Zibbur indicates that the early

Worms practice, possibly influenced by the French, had been to recite it here.³⁶⁴ It seems, however, that the wording was changed after a while, in the spirit of the *Hasidim* of Ashkenaz, perhaps due to the influence of R. El'azar, author of the *Rokeaḥ*.³⁶⁵ The later Worms custom was not to say this verse, as follows from its absence in the version of the Worms *Mahzor* copied by R. Ya'aqov Oppenheim. This may be deduced indirectly, as well, from a passage in R. Liva Kirchheim's *Customs* (p. 22b), in which he describes the closing of the *ge'ulah* benediction in accordance with early Ashkenazi mystics' calculation of the words: “One says as far as גאל ישראל; and there are 14 letters in צור ישראל — a mystical allusion to the fact that the redemption began on the 14th of Nisan. It has 60 letters altogether for 60 times 10 thousand were redeemed on the 14th of Nisan.” This is the interpretation of the *Hasidim* of Ashkenaz for their version of the wording צור ישראל, which does not include the sentence וגאלנו, etc.

The wording of two more prayers deserves some attention. The passage אל ארך על כל המעשים, which as we have said never occurs in our *Mahzor* except from the letter *shin* of its acrostic, always concludes in our *Mahzor* with the shorter formula: תפארת וגדולה ... שרפים ואופנים וחיות הקודש. The customary wording according to the later practice is שרפים ואופנים וחיות הקודש.³⁶⁶ That is also the wording in the manuscript and printed editions of the Italian prayer rite. However, in the ancient *Seder Hibbur Berakhot*³⁶⁷ the wording is almost exactly as in our *Mahzor*: שרפים עם שרפים. The same appears in *Seder Rav 'Amram Gaon*.³⁶⁹ In the seventeenth century the shorter wording שרפים ואופנים קודש was considered to be unique to the community of Worms. It is explicitly mentioned by R. Liva Kirchheim, on page 42b of his work: “He concludes with שרפים ואופנים קודש, and one does not say וחיות הקודש.” It is also among the customs listed in the appendices of the two printed editions of the prayer rite of Worms. However, this wording actually occurs also in other early Ashkenazi manuscripts not connected with the community of Worms.³⁷⁰

The second phrase of note is the one which, in the Sabbath *'amidot*, concludes the passage במנוחתנו רצה אלהינו ואלהינו רצה אבותינו רצה במנוחתנו ואלהינו רצה. This wording is common to most of the early sources, in the East and West alike.³⁷¹ Here, too, the Ashkenazi communities appear to have maintained the ancient Italian custom. The wording in *Seder*

359 The end of the Laws of Fast Days.

360 Such as *The Customs of R. Hayyim Paltiel*, ed. Goldschmidt, p. 59, and *The Customs of Avraham Klausner*, p. 130.

361 This is how it appears in *The Customs of R. Zalman Yent* also; see *The Customs of R. Isaac Tyrnau*, p. 180. The statement there that one says אל ארך אפים “even when it is not Monday or Thursday” (also in the note there) is a slip of the pen, for the Ninth of Av never falls on a Monday.

362 As we mentioned above, the copyist twice omitted the word שמו from the sentence. It is problematic to assume that this was (twice!) a slip of the pen, for the sentence is a quote of a biblical verse, so that it is inconceivable that a learned man would omit a word from it. Perhaps in the liturgical context the word was omitted in some places, so that a verse would not be used as a blessing (cf. *TJ Berakhot* i:8, 3d: “One does not use a verse as a benediction”). Perhaps this is also the reason that the wording was changed to וגאלנו.

363 See the detailed discussion of this matter in Urbach, *Arugat ha-Bosem*, IV, pp. 84 ff. See also Hershler, *The Siddur of Rabbenu Shelomoh b. R. Shimshon of Worms* (above, n. 318), pp. 94 ff.

364 Urbach correctly noted that there is no reason to assume that the verse was added by R. Me'ir Sheliah Zibbur. The opponents of the custom ascribe it to “the French”. The verse וגאלנו יי צבאות etc. is strongly fixed in this place in the ancient customs of Erez Israel, always ending the early piyyuṭim (=the *ge'ulot*); see Fleischer, *The Yozer*, pp. 181 ff., 357 ff.,

361. See also J. Mann, “Genizah Fragments of the Palestinian Order of Service”, *Hebrew Union College Annual*, II, pp. 294 (top), 305, 324. It is also found in the main text of the *Siddur RaSaG*, p. 16, although it does not appear in the extant versions of *Seder Rav 'Amram Gaon*. See also Urbach, *ibid.*, n. 87. Perhaps R. Me'ir Sheliah Zibbur changed the wording of the verse, as noted above, saying וגאלנו, in the imperative form, i.e. as a supplication; this seems to be suggested also by the vocalization in our *Mahzor*. Regarding the wording צור ישראל, see also Y. Heinemann, *Studies in Jewish Liturgy* [Heb.], Jerusalem 1981, pp. 129 ff.

365 See *Arugat ha-Bosem*, IV, *loc. cit.* The tradition is reported by R. El'azar of Worms in the name of R. Shemu'el Ḥasid.

366 In the printed edition of the *Mahzor Vitry*, p. 154: שרפים וחיות עם אופנים קודש.

367 Schechter's copy, p. 109.

368 This passage does not appear at all in the *Siddur RaSaG*.

369 Ed. Goldschmidt, p. 71.

370 That is how it appears, for example, in MS München 381, and also in the second volume of the Worms *Mahzor*, fol. 3r.

371 This is the wording of the complete version of Se'adya's *Siddur* (MS ENA 4036; see the *variae lectiones* on p. 112 of the *Siddur RaSaG*) and in the *Seder Rav 'Amram Gaon*, ed. Goldschmidt, p. 63 (the version there is: וגאלנו יי צבאות etc.). Also in *Siddur ha-Rambam* (=Maimonides'

*Hibbur Berakhot*³⁷² is indeed (אזהביך) וישמחו בך ישראל אזהבי שמך (mistakenly copied), exactly as in our volume. However, in later Italian *siddurim*, both manuscripts and printed editions alike, we have: וישמחו בך כל ישראל מקדשי שמך. The Ashkenazi practice was apparently modified in accordance with a note appearing in the *Customs* of R. Isaac Tyrnau: "It is usual to conclude with שמך (את) אזהבי בך ישראל etc., which is what is written in most *siddurim*. This is very surprising for it is not like the closing of the benediction, nor like the opening of the benediction, and furthermore, 'rejoicing' is only appropriate for the pilgrimage festivals. I have found in an ancient commentary [most editions read: in an ancient *siddur*], and also heard from experts in the matter, that one should say וינחו בו ישראל מקדישי שמך etc., which suits both the beginning and the closing of the benediction. And this seems to be correct."³⁷³

The Rite of the Maḥzor in Its Piyyuṭim

We have already noted that when R. Simḥah set about writing his *Maḥzor*, the *piyyuṭim* of the Ashkenazi communities were already fixed and even uniform in their general outlines. There were, however, still differences between the various communities and districts, some of which remained differing until modern times. Significant were the differences between the western Ashkenazi and the eastern Ashkenazi communities; but even within each of these sub-groupings there were *piyyuṭim* unique to certain specific congregations, *piyyuṭim* which also survived in their respective places for hundreds of years. Most of these differences in the poetical embellishment of the prayers naturally focused around the less important liturgical occasions, yet even the liturgy of the major holidays sometimes manifested slight variations. Such unique *piyyuṭim* sometimes arise quite unexpectedly in early Ashkenazi *maḥzorim*, and are also found described in the extensive Ashkenazi literature on prayer rites. Our *Maḥzor*, too, is not completely devoid of such characteristics.

We may point out, for example, the absence of the *ofanim* in the *piyyuṭim* for the four special Sabbaths before Passover. The *yozerot* for these special Sabbaths have, in the Ashkenazi rites, three *piyyuṭim*: the *yozer* proper, the *ofan* and the *zulat*. The *ofanim* for these occasions are very short, containing but four lines.³⁷⁴ But this entire complex of *piyyuṭim*, with its three components, was already present in the *Seder Hibbur Berakhot*,³⁷⁵ although the later *siddurim* of Italy dropped the *ofanim* and the *zulatot*. The *yozerot* proper and the *zulatot* are apparently present in all the Ashkenazi *siddurim*, earlier and later ones alike, while the *ofanim* are lacking in several of the early *maḥzorim*. In the seventeenth century, the absence of the *ofanim* in the *piyyuṭim* of the four special Sabbaths was considered unique to the practice in Worms, and was stressed separately for each of the special Sabbaths by both R. Liva and by R. Yuspa Shammash.³⁷⁶

Prayer Book), ed. Goldschmidt, p. 205: וינחו בו כל ישראל אזהבי שמך, from which the Yemenite wording certainly derives. Also in the *Persian Siddur*, *op. cit.* (above, n. 265), p. 122: וינחו בו ישראל כי הם אזהבי שמך. See also Elbogen, *op. cit.* (above, n. 133), p. 110.

372 Schechter's copy, p. 122.

373 Spitzer's edition, *op. cit.* (above, n. 87), p. 19. However, also R. Ya'aqov Oppenheim's copy of the Worms *Maḥzor*, fol. 52v, reads: וישמחו בך ישראל אזהבי שמך.

374 Regarding these *ofanim* and what they and their structure teach us about the history of the *yozer*, see Fleischer, *The Yozer*, pp. 178 ff.

375 Schechter's copy, pp. 163, 164, 168, 169.

376 In R. Liva's *Customs*, this matter appears on pp. 122b ff. In the short

In the section of the *piyyuṭim* embellishing the prayers on *Shabbat ha-Hodesh*, on fol. 27r, the scribe copied the *ofan* משרתי עומדים of R. Me'ir Sheliah Zibbur. This *ofan*, and the אלהיכם brought in the *musaf 'amidah* (זריח שמשו) (fol. 32v),³⁷⁷ are not for *Shabbat ha-Hodesh*, as we have already pointed out above, but rather for any Sabbath which coincides with the New Month. They were intended to be said here only when *Shabbat ha-Hodesh* happened to coincide with the New Month of Nisan. R. Me'ir's *ofan* is copied numerous times in manuscript Ashkenazi *maḥzorim*, always among the *piyyuṭim* of the Sabbath which coincides with a New Month, generally together with the *ofan* לך אלים אלפי אלפים (ל. 810), which is ascribed to R. Benjamin ben Zerah. In later Ashkenazi *maḥzorim*, משרתי עומדים prevailed over לך אלים. The Maharil (p. 58b) mentions the former as a regular *ofan* for the Sabbath which coincides with the New Month. In Worms, when *Shabbat ha-Hodesh* coincided with the New Month, it was customary to incorporate אופן של ראש חודש, אלהיכם של ראש חודש in the body of *piyyuṭim* for *Shabbat ha-Hodesh*, as presented in our *Maḥzor*. This is noted by R. Liva for *Parashat ha-Hodesh* (fol. 130v), and even before that, for *Parashat Sheqalim* (fol. 124r). However, in his time they used to say in Worms on a Sabbath which coincided with a New Month, the *ofan* לך אלים (p. 44a), perhaps following Maharil's instruction. R. Yuspa Shammash preserves an interesting remark on the subject, presented as follows, in the longer version of his work (p. 16a):

Note: In 1646 Sabbath *Parashat ha-Hodesh* and the New Month coincided, and some members of the community³⁷⁸ wished to recite the *ofan* of the Sabbath and the New Month and *Parashat ha-Hodesh* which was written in the *Maḥzor* of the congregation, and whose author was R. Me'ir Sheliah Zibbur. It was decided not to recite it, because the custom here was to say that of the Sabbath and the New Month, and thus was it done.

In this context, the "Maḥzor of the congregation" refers, of course, to our Worms *Maḥzor*, and the *ofan* for the Sabbath, the New Month, and *Parashat ha-Hodesh* written in it is R. Me'ir Sheliah Zibbur's משרתי עומדים. Some of the worshippers were of the opinion that it was a special *ofan* for the Sabbath, the New Month and *Parashat ha-Hodesh*, and were in favour of saying it. The regular *ofan* for the Sabbath which coincides with the New Month in the time of R. Yuspa was לך אלים; he says this explicitly in the longer version of his work.³⁷⁹ Be that as it may, one need not assume that לך אלים was customary in Worms as early as the thirteenth century; it seems more likely that the rite accepted this *piyyuṭ* at a later period.

The order of *piyyuṭim* for *Shabbat ha-Gadol* (fols. 34v ff.), as presented in our *Maḥzor*, matches the western Ashkenazi liturgical rite. However, the *yozer* אתי מלבנון, which is copied most elaborately in our *Maḥzor*, was not customary in Worms unless *Shabbat ha-Gadol* also happened to be the Sabbath following a

version of R. Yuspa Shammash's work, on pp. 103, 106, 113. This passage was also published by A.M. Habermann, *Sinai Jubilee Volume* (1978), pp. 483, 489. Of course, the *ofanim* are also missing from R. Ya'aqov Oppenheim's Worms *Maḥzor*, pp. 18b, 22b, 37b, 42b.

377 See regarding this above. The custom of saying אלהיכם on the Sabbath which coincides with the New Month is mentioned several times, by R. Liva and R. Yuspa and in the printed *Customs of Worms*. However, the beginning of the *piyyuṭ* is not noted.

378 In the original text: בעלי בתים = ביה, i.e. members of the congregation.

379 Fol. 20r: אופן של שבת זריח מתחיל לך אלים. In R. Ya'aqov Oppenheim's *Maḥzor* also, לך אלים appears as *ofan* for this occasion (p. 5b).

wedding. This is indicated in the *Mahzor* next to the beginning of the *piyyut*, as we have mentioned above. This special custom of Worms is noted with some emphasis by R. Liva Kirchheim (p. 132b): "The *yozer* מלבנון אתי is not said unless there is a wedding on that Sabbath." R. Yuspa Shammash notes simply (p. 16 of the shorter version): "On *Shabbat ha-Gadol* there is no *yozer*, but *zulat* [!] of *Shabbat ha-Gadol* beginning אומרת."³⁸⁰ The departure in Worms from the common usage is also noted in the customs printed at the end of the Worms *siddurim*. Here, too, it is hard to imagine that we are dealing with a very ancient practice; the Maharil mentions the *yozer* for *Shabbat ha-Gadol* without making any special remark,³⁸¹ and had he been aware of a practice of omitting the *yozer*, he certainly would have mentioned it. The fact that the congregation continued reciting the *yozer* on Sabbaths honouring a bridegroom also indicates that it had originally been customary to say this *piyyut* on all occasions. The deletion may have had to do with the wish of the people there to differentiate between *Shabbat ha-Gadol* and the four special Sabbaths preceding Passover, namely to give greater weight to the four special Sabbaths than to *Shabbat ha-Gadol*. They may also have wished to shorten the morning service, since they had lengthened *musaf*, as we shall discuss shortly.

The *qedushta* of Yannai, אנוני פטרי רחמתי, which was customarily recited on *Shabbat ha-Gadol* in the rite of western Ashkenaz, was expanded in most places by the *piyyut* אדיר דר מתוחים (fol. 39v in our Codex), which is a long, poetic passage containing laws pertaining to Passover, a sort of special *azharot* on the *halakhot* of this holiday. This *piyyut* is anonymous, but appears to be very ancient, and is cited as early as the twelfth century.³⁸² However, it is inconceivable that it was written in the East. Its presence in the *piyyut* אנוני פטרי possibly inspired R. Yosef Bonfils to include a long halakhic *piyyut* in his *qerovah* for *Shabbat ha-Gadol*, אלהים בצעוך,³⁸³ R. Yosef lived in the middle of the eleventh century. Almost everywhere אדיר דר ובכן אין לפניך of Yannai *silluq* of Yannai מתוחים (fol. 38v).³⁸⁴ However, the custom in Worms was to say this *piyyut* in the *musaf 'amidah*, following ישמחו במלכותך, perhaps because that was the established place for *azharot* on Shavu'ot. This is explicitly stated by R. Liva Kirchheim (p. 132b), and by R. Yuspa Shammash in the longer edition of his work (fol. 20b) and this is how it appears in the printed Worms *siddurim*, as

well as in our *Mahzor*.³⁸⁵ However, it is unlikely that this custom was completely unique to the Worms community. The Maharil notes its practice in "some regions".³⁸⁶

The *ma'arivim* for the first and second nights of Passover which appear in our *Mahzor* are common to the rites of all the communities of western Ashkenaz — the anonymous ליל שימורים ליל שימורים אור ישראל by R. Me'ir Sheliah Zibbur, for the second night.³⁸⁷ However, the *ma'arivim* for the last two nights of the festival — אור לשביעי by the Ra'avan for the seventh night and אורי ישעי by R. Menahem b. Ya'aqov of Worms for the last night — do not correspond to any Ashkenazi rite ever recorded. The *piyyut* אורי ישעי is generally recorded for the seventh night, whereas for the eighth night, in most instances, the *piyyut* אמונת אומן (5636 .א.), by El'azar of Worms, author of the *Rokeah*, appears.³⁸⁸ The *ma'ariv* אור לשביעי, which appears in our *Mahzor* for the seventh night, was customarily said in some of the western communities on the last night, and is cited as such in the *Maharil* (p. 19b) and in the *Minhagim* of R. Zalman Yent.³⁸⁹ The later practice in Worms was identical with the rite of the rest of the western Ashkenazi communities, i.e., they recited אורי ישעי on the seventh night and אמונת אומן on the last night. It is presented thus by R. Liva (pp. 141b and 143a). Thus, the practice in our *Mahzor* is unusual in two ways: in changing the day on which אורי ישעי is prescribed and in recording אור לשביעי for the last night instead of אמונת אומן. Regarding the displacement of אורי ישעי we must call to mind the puzzling heading which appears in our *Mahzor* above this *piyyut* on fol. 46r. There אורי ישעי is copied (after אור לשביעי above which [fol. 45v] is written מעריב ליל שביעי של פסח מר' אלעזר בר נתן) under the heading מעריב ליל ששי של פסח מרב מנחם בר יעקב.³⁹⁰ This strange heading, which by no means can be understood literally, may perhaps indicate that the scribe erred in ordering the two *ma'arivim*. In other words, maybe it implies that אורי ישעי should have come before אור לשביעי (even though it is copied after it). If so, then it is for the seventh night, while אור לשביעי is for the night following, i.e., the eighth night, as recorded by the Maharil and R. Zalman Yent.³⁹¹ In any event, אור לשביעי as placed in our *Mahzor* does not correspond to the later custom of Worms, nor does it accord with most rites of western Ashkenaz. However, we should not exaggerate the significance of this detail, for during the Middle Ages there were considerable fluctua-

380 The same note appears on p. 20a of the long version.

381 Fol. 8v: "Yozer מלבנון כלה אתי and ofan and zulat". However, there is no ofan in our *Mahzor*.

382 See Zunz, *Literaturgeschichte*, p. 89. Regarding this *piyyut*, see also I. Davidson, *Machzor Yannai*, New York 1919, p. xxxvii.

383 The passage intended is בחיל להתייבבה אבוא, which is also sort of an *azharot* of the laws of Passover. In the regular editions it appears after the *rahit* הפלאת נסים או רוב נסים and before the *silluq*, i.e. its placement parallels that of אדיר דר מתוחים in Yannai's *qerovah* in the majority of the manuscripts and customs of western Ashkenaz. In the classical *qedushta'ot* which were used as models by the *paytanim* of Western Europe, there are no such halakhic "sedarim".

384 In Mainz it was customary to recite אדיר דר מתוחים at this point, as the *Maharil* (p. 8b) explicitly notes. See also Zunz, *Literaturgeschichte*, p. 89.

385 It is amazing that this is not clear in the Worms *Mahzor* of R. Ya'aqov Oppenheim. There (p. 52b), אדיר דר מתוחים appears after the *silluq* of אורי ישעי and the note to say the *qedushah*, but without any remark at all, in order, as it were, to be said in the middle of the fourth benediction of the 'amidah of the morning service! Following the *piyyut* is a note to say ארא רצה.

386 See *ibid.*, p. 8b: "There are regions where it is customary to recite אדיר דר מתוחים in the *musaf* service, when the leader of the prayers finishes זכר ליציאת מצרים."

387 Regarding this *piyyut*, R. Liva Kirchheim says in his *Customs* (p. 137b): "On the second night one recites the *ma'ariv* ליל שימורים אור ישראל, which was composed by Rabbenu Me'ir Sheliah Zibbur אורי ישעי of Worms." This order is also recorded in the *Maharil*, p. 19b.

388 However, some communities recited at this point אשכולות אומן אורי ישעי, by R. Yequiel b. R. Yosef (238 .ו). Regarding this *paytan*, see Zunz, *Literaturgeschichte*, p. 177.

389 See the *Customs of R. Zalman Yent*, *op. cit.* (above, n. 87), p. 178. R. Zalman Yent was active in northern Italy, in Treviso, but he originated from the Rhineland, and the customs he records are those of his native land. The order of the *ma'arivim* is there as follows: "Ma'ariv for the seventh night of Passover: אורי ישעי, *bikkur* [...] מתי אבוא; *ma'ariv* for the last night of Passover: אור לשביעי, without a *bikkur*. Some places, though, say אורי ישעי [= אורי ישעי אומן]; this is the rite of eastern Ashkenaz, also without a *bikkur*."

390 The two titles are faded now.

391 It ought to be noted that the scribe erred in a similar fashion on fol. 77r, where he wrote "Yozer for the sixth day" etc., instead of "for the seventh day": yet the error was corrected there in the margin, while at the beginning of the *ma'ariv* (fol. 46r), no correction was made. I cannot explain the error at the beginning of the *yozer*.

tions in the *ma'arivim* with congregations changing their own prayer rites quite frequently.³⁹²

The *yozerot* for the first two days of Passover accord with the rite of all the Ashkenazi communities: אור ישע מאושרים, by R. Shelomoh ha-Bavli, for the first day, and אפיך רנן, by R. Meshullam b. Kalonymos, for the second day. In Mainz, however, it was customary to reverse the order, and say אפיך רנן on the first day, and אור ישע on the second. This is explicitly stated by R. Avraham Klausner,³⁹³ and is the same in the *Maharil*, as well.³⁹⁴ Thus, our *Mahzor* does not follow the rite of Mainz. According to the two sources just mentioned, in Mainz it was customary also to say a *qerovah* in the morning service of the first day of Passover,³⁹⁵ but in our *Mahzor* (as in all the Ashkenazi *mahzorim*) there is no *qedushta* for the first day of Passover. Hence, in this respect, too, our *Mahzor* differs from the rite of Mainz.

The *yozerot* which appear in our *Mahzor* for the intermediate Sabbath of the festival and for the last two days of Passover (אתה הארתה and וישע שושני פרח, אהוביך אהבך) are the *yozerot* for these days in most of the *mahzorim* of western Ashkenaz.³⁹⁶ But the *ofanim* which were customarily recited in these communities, (י. 335) ידועי שם and (מ. 921) מחוללת מהללת, do not appear in our volume. These two *piyyuṭim* are late ones, and probably came into use in these communities at a later period. Even in the later prayer rite of Worms *ofanim* were not said on these days, as R. Liva notes explicitly on pp. 141b and 143b of his compilation. However, this was also the practice in Mainz.³⁹⁷ Yet in the liturgy for these days, the rite of Worms differed from that of other communities. On the last day of Passover, in Worms, the usual אתה הארתה was replaced by the *yozer* אור ישראל וישע אור ישראל by R. Me'ir Sheliah Zibbur. As we recall, this *piyyuṭ* is copied on a separate sheet which was added to the *Mahzor* near the time it was written. The practice of saying this *piyyuṭ* on the last day of Passover appears to have been unique to Worms.³⁹⁸ In the rest of the Ashkenazi communities it was customary to say it on the first Sabbath after Passover. The fact that the contents of our *Mahzor* were adapted to suit the custom of Worms in this respect near the time it was written may perhaps be evidence that it was used in Worms at a very early period.

Now let us move on to the subject of the *qedushta'ot*. The three *qedushta'ot* which appear in our *Mahzor* to embellish the services on Passover, אימתי אשר בכורש, for the second day (fol. 66r), אימת נוראותיך for the seventh day (fol. 80r) and אותותיך אז ראינו for the last day (fol. 92r), accord with the prayer rite in most of the

communities of western Ashkenaz.³⁹⁹ This was also the rite in Worms in the seventeenth century. In the *qedushta'ot* of the last two days of the festival the western Ashkenazi congregations omitted the passage אל נא לעולם תערך which appears in all the *qedushta'ot* after their fifth *piyyuṭ*. This practice is already mentioned in MS Hamburg 152, fol. 39v, at the end of the commentary on the fifth *piyyuṭ* of אימת נוראותיך, in the name of R. Ephraim of Bonn, as follows:

Here is where אל נא לעולם תערך should be said, and there are some who say it; however in older *mahzorim* I have not found it in the *qerovot* for the last two days of Passover. I have heard the reason for this given as follows: this *seder*, [אילי הצדק ידועינן], which is to be said now based on the section וישע,⁴⁰⁰ tells of the drowning of the Egyptians in the Red Sea. Now it is said in the *Tanḥuma*, on the passage או יסיר משה ובני ישראל, and in the first chapter of tractate *Megillah* [fol. 10b] regarding the verse, "and the one came not near the other all the night", that the Holy One did not let the ministering angels say a *qedushah* on that day, for He said to them: The works of My hands are drowning in the sea, and you dare sing? Therefore, one does not say אל נא לעולם תערך, which is in its entirety a song of *qedushah*.

Also the *Maharil* notes plainly (p. 20a): "On the last two days of Passover one does not say אל נא לעולם תערך."⁴⁰¹ Indeed, this passage is missing from the two *qedushta'ot* in our *Mahzor* too. However, in the later Worms rite אל נא לעולם תערך was said on these two days, as R. Liva Kirchheim states explicitly for the seventh day of Passover (fol. 142v) and also for the eighth day (fol. 143v).⁴⁰² In our *Mahzor* the later practice is noted in both places: in אימת נוראותיך (fol. 82v) a later hand wrote in the margin אל נא לעולם תערך and in אותותיך אז ראינו (fol. 94v) the entire passage has been copied into the margin.

In this very place, in the two *qedushta'ot*, the early Ashkenazim used to say the liturgical formula יי מלך יי מלך יי מלך לעולם ועד before beginning the recitation of the *rehiṭim*.⁴⁰³ This practice also is noted by R. Ephraim of Bonn in MS Hamburg 152, fol. 40v: "I have found יי מלך יי מלך יי מלך לעולם ועד in ancient *mahzorim* that one says here, before the *silluq*, וה' מלך ה' מלך ה' מלך ה' ימלך לעולם ועד, and then ובכן ולך etc. is said, and that's right." No doubt this refers to the very same practice, even though R. Ephraim notes it as relating to the *silluq*. Here the later rite in Worms was the same as the earlier one: the recitation of this formula is mentioned in both the *qedushta'ot*, before the order of the *rehiṭim*, by R. Liva

392 The tremendous variability of the *ma'arivim* in the rites of the mediaeval Ashkenazi communities is well illustrated in D. Goldschmidt's posthumous *Mazor for Sukkot* (ed. Y. Fraenkel, Jerusalem 1981): as noted in the introduction there, p. 27, on the four nights of the festival no less than twenty different *ma'arivim* were customary in the Ashkenazi communities!

393 See *The Customs of R. Avraham Klausner, op. cit.* (above, n. 98), p. 116: "In Mainz the *yozer* for the first day is [...] אפיך רנן and on the second day אור ישע."

394 P. 19b: "[In Mainz] the *yozer* אפיך רנן is said on the first day."

395 "קרובץ שיר השירים." Apparently this refers to the *qedushta* שיר השירים צפה; cf. Zunz, *Literaturgeschichte*, p. 688, and idem, *Ritus, op. cit.* (above, n. 3), p. 96. This *qedushta* was customarily recited on the second day of Passover in the early Italian rite (on the first day they recited אתה הארתה, which was said on the second day in the Ashkenazi rite). It appears in its entirety in *Seder Hibbur Berakhot*, Schechter's copy, pp. 224 ff., and it was published by E. Fleischer, *Hanokh Yellin Memorial Volume* [Heb.], Jerusalem 1974, pp. 454 ff.

396 R. Avraham Klausner, though, reverses the order of the *yozerot* for the final two days.

397 According to R. Avraham Klausner, p. 120: "In Mainz no *ofan* is recited,

neither on the seventh day nor on the eighth."

398 However, according to MS British Library 659, this was also the rite of Cologne. Zunz, *Literaturgeschichte*, p. 146, notes the custom for Worms and some French communities ("in Worms und in einigen französischen Orten").

399 In eastern Ashkenaz the order of the *qerovot* for the last two days is reversed.

400 The *seder* is indeed based on the verses of the Song at the Red Sea, starting from Ex. xiv:30 (וישע).

401 R. Avraham Klausner, on p. 121 of his *Customs*, reports the same thing.

402 R. Yuspa Shammash also notes this for the seventh day of Passover (p. 22 in the short version), but for the eighth day of the festival (p. 23) there is no such note. The opposite is true of the Worms *Mahzor* of R. Ya'aqov Oppenheim: on the seventh day אל נא לעולם תערך is not found, but it does appear for the eighth day!

403 The introduction to the *rehiṭim* of the two *qedushta'ot* is וכן וישע יי ביום ההוא.

404 R. Ephraim of Bonn refers to himself thus many times. The term has not yet been adequately explained: see Urbach, *Arugat ha-Bosem*, IV, pp. 39 ff.; Habermann, *Studies*, VII, p. 218; idem, *History of Piyyuṭ and Poetry*, II, p. 192.

Kirchheim,⁴⁰⁵ as well as by R. Yuspa Shammash.⁴⁰⁶ However, in the body of our *Mahzor* there is no indication of this custom; it appears only in a later marginal note in both places (fols. 82v and 94v).⁴⁰⁷

Considerable space in our *Mahzor* is occupied by the Aramaic *piyyuṭim* for Passover and Shavu'ot. The custom of including these texts in the liturgy on these days was certainly known in ancient Worms. Proof of this may be found in the large number of *piyyuṭim* of this type written by R. Me'ir b. R. Yizḥaq Sheliah Zibbur, the *payṭan* of Worms. However, the space allotted to these *piyyuṭim* in Ashkenazi communities gradually decreased over the years, until they disappeared almost completely in most regions.⁴⁰⁸ The congregations altogether did away with the custom of translating the Torah reading, and of all the *piyyuṭim* which once surrounded and extended the *targumim*, they maintained only the magnificent *reshut* of R. Me'ir Sheliah Zibbur, *אקדמות מילין*, the expansion, *ארכין יי שמיא לסיני*, and the *reshut* for *haftarah targum*, *יצוב פתגם* by R. Ya'aqov b. Me'ir (Tam). R. Avraham Klausner⁴⁰⁹ still knew the passage *אתא דווגמא* (in our *Mahzor*, fol. 101v) as an alternative to *יצוב פתגם*. But by his time it was no longer customary in Mainz to "say anything other than *אקדמות מילין*", as the Maharil also notes (fol. 22r). Later on in Worms even the custom of saying *אקדמות* was abolished, although it was written by a *payṭan* from that very place, as related by R. Liva (p. 150a):

One does not say *אקדמות* (here in Worms). The reason for not saying *אקדמות* is, as I heard, because once there was a *hazzan* here in the congregation of Worms who said *אקדמות* in a pleasing voice and with great devotion, and when he had finished, the Lord took him. Therefore it is not said.

R. Liva did not like this reason, and added: "But this reason does not satisfy me. For, on the contrary, after this incident happened with the *hazzan*, we see that this prayer is a very excellent one, and it should be said every year with devotion. Surely there is another unstated reason for this, which has been forgotten."⁴¹⁰ R. Liva gives absolutely no indication that any other Aramaic passage was read, and the same holds for R. Yuspa Shammash. The custom is not even mentioned in the Worms *Mahzor* of R. Ya'aqov Oppenheim. In any event, the appearance of these passages in our *Mahzor* does not prove anything, for it is an ancient *Mahzor*. The Aramaic portion is still present in its entirety, for example, in the Nürnberg *Mahzor*, which was written in 1331, some fifty years after the *Mahzor* of Worms. It should be noted, though, that the beginning of the process, which eventually led to the Aramaic texts being altogether eliminated from use in Ashkenaz, is already evident in our *Mahzor*. To be sure, introductory and elaborative *piyyuṭim* are

relatively plentiful here, yet several important components are already missing. The translations of the *haftarot* for Passover, save for the one for the seventh day, do not appear at all,⁴¹¹ and, of the translations of the *haftarot* for the seventh day of Passover and both days of Shavu'ot, only a few verses appear. Passages are also missing from the translation of the Torah reading for the seventh day of Passover and the first day of Shavu'ot. The poetic concluding passages of the translations of the *haftarot*, the like of which are present in abundance in the printed *Mahzor Vitry*, are altogether missing in our work. An intermediate state of affairs, such as the one presented by our *Mahzor*, has not been described in outside sources, but it doubtless has parallels in other manuscript *mahzorim*. In any event, both the direct and the indirect evidence of later sources which are hardly aware of the liturgical reality still reflected quite strongly in our *Mahzor* makes our findings not very surprising.

Let us move on to the *piyyuṭim* for Shavu'ot. The *ma'ariv* for the first night, *וירד אביר יעקב* by Yosef Bonfils (fol. 109r), is common to all the Ashkenazi *mahzorim*, and contains nothing new. However, the *piyyuṭ* for the second night, *אלהים ביתה מושב יחידים*, is somewhat exceptional, for in almost all the provinces of western Ashkenaz, the *ma'ariv* said on the second night was *אל דיבר אלהים יי דיבר* by the Ra'avan. Actually the Maharil does mention *אלהים ביתה* as the custom in "some places" on the second night of Shavu'ot, but the rite of these places never became the established practice. However, in Worms this *piyyuṭ* was constantly recited on the second night of Shavu'ot; it is even printed in the special *siddur* of the rite of Worms. R. Liva also makes special note of this *piyyuṭ* being said (p. 150b).

The prayer *נשמת* on the first day of Shavu'ot, is embellished in our *Mahzor* by the *piyyuṭ* *מי אדר והוד* (fol. 110r). This passage was meant to be inserted in the service between *מגחלו* and *מי ועני ואבין מגחלו*, as the scribe indicates. In the seventeenth century the practice of saying this *piyyuṭ* was considered a special custom of the Worms community. It is specifically noted by R. Liva in his description of the order of the morning prayers on the first day of the holiday (p. 149b). Yet in the time of R. Liva this *piyyuṭ* was already no longer recited in its entirety, rather, most of the middle of it was left out. The *piyyuṭ*, with the middle passages omitted, was printed in both editions of the Worms *siddur*.⁴¹² This practice is also cited by R. Yuspa Shammash (p. 29). One should not think, however, that from the very beginning this practice was unique to Worms. From the circle of R. Me'ir of Rothenburg⁴¹³ we hear simply that "in *נשמת כל חי* on the first day of Shavu'ot, it is customary to say *מי אדר והוד*, because it has in it the words *מי התאור עון*, and *עון* is nothing other than Torah." In the *Customs* of R. Avraham Klausner⁴¹⁴ it is presented as the custom of Mainz on *Shabbat Bereshit*, and likewise

405 P. 142a: "And he says: *ובכן וישע ה' ה' מלך ה' מלך ה' ימלך לעולם ועד*. The exact same note in precisely the same wording also appears on p. 143b, for the last day of the festival.

406 In the short version, pp. 22 and 23; in the long version, pp. 22b and 23a. Also in R. Ya'aqov Oppenheim's Worms *Mahzor*, pp. 86a ff.

407 However, in the *qerovah* for the last day of Passover (fol. 98r) the formula appears once again in the margin, before the *silluq*, exactly as it appears in the words of R. Ephraim of Bonn. It seems that this note was written earlier than the other two notes, perhaps by the same hand as that which added the words *אל נא לעולם* in the margin of fol. 94v. In any event, no such note appears before the *silluq* for the seventh day of Passover.

408 Only in Italy was the custom of translating the *haftarot* into Aramaic on all the festive days of Passover and Shavu'ot preserved until modern times. The *targumim* still appear in their entirety in the *Rome Mahzor* of S.D. Luzatto, Livorno 1856. However, the recital of the passages of expansion and the *reshuyot* ceased even in Italy.

409 Ed. Dissen, *op. cit.* (above, n. 98), p. 124.

410 This matter is also mentioned, without explanation, in the customs listed at the end of the printed *Worms Rite*: "And *אקדמות* is not said".

411 As we have mentioned, only *reshuyot* for these *targumim* appear here. It is problematic to suggest that the *targumim* themselves were recited from an other volume, since the *targum* of the *haftarot* for the seventh day of Passover and the two days of Shavu'ot do appear in the *Mahzor*, albeit in an abridged form.

412 In our *Mahzor*, a late hand noted alongside the line *עון מתן עון* *במוך ביום ועד מתן עון*, where it became customary in Worms to interrupt the reading of the *piyyuṭ*: "Un[til] h[ere]". At this point they continued with *מי שיפר בגלומים* *הבטחים*, but the upper part of the page is damaged at this point. The point at which they returned to reading the *piyyuṭ* certainly must also have been noted in the margin.

413 See *Sefer ha-Minhagim etc.*, *op. cit.* (above, n. 335), p. 30. The editor noted there that this custom is also mentioned in the *Rokeah*, but I could not find it there.

414 Ed. Dissen, *op. cit.* (above, n. 98), p. 61.

in the *Maharil* (p. 66b). In Worms, too, this *piyyuṭ* was also recited on *Shabbat Bereshit*.

The *yozerot* which appear in our *Mahzor* for both days of Shavu'ot, *אדון אמנו* for the first day, and *אילת אהבים* for the second day, are the usual *yozerot* for these two days, according to all the Ashkenazi prayer rites.⁴¹⁵ Also the *ofanim* *ועתה בנים שירו* *למלך* for the first day, and *אורחות ארזים* for the second day, and the *zulatot* *שמעת אנכי* for the first day, and *אנכי גדול בנעדים* for the second day, are typical in the western Ashkenazi rites, and are mentioned by the *Maharil* (p. 22a). However the practice in Worms, or at least their later custom, was to replace the *yozer* proper and the *ofan* for the second day with the *yozer* *אדיר ונאה* and the *ofan* *אדיר ונאה*. This is explicitly stated by R. Liva (p. 150b) and by R. Yuspa Shammash (p. 29). Both *piyyuṭim* are copied in the Worms *Mahzor* of R. Ya'aqov Oppenheim and appear in both printed editions of the Worms *siddur* as well as in the lists of customs appended to them. As we have mentioned, the alternate *piyyuṭim*, *אדיר ונאה* and *אדיר ונאה*, were copied on separate sheets of parchment in a later hand and were added to our *Mahzor*; they now appear at the end of the Codex, from fol. 221 on. No doubt this was done in order to adapt the contents of the *Mahzor* to the accepted practice in Worms. We do not know of other communities where the two aforementioned *piyyuṭim* were recited on Shavu'ot.⁴¹⁶ What we do not know is whether this had always been the practice in Worms, or whether at some point in the history of this rite a change had taken place. In any event, adding on the pages containing the two alternate *piyyuṭim* testifies to the presence of our *Mahzor* in Worms at the time this was done. If our appraisal regarding the early date of these pages is correct, then we must conclude that our *Mahzor* was in use in Worms as early as the fifteenth century.

In Worms on the second day of Shavu'ot, it was not customary to say a *zulat*, and hence *אמת וציב* was also said according to the usual wording ("of weekdays"). This is specifically mentioned by R. Liva, p. 140b, and a similar remark was made by R. Yuspa (p. 29). Indeed, there is no *zulat* in the pages appended to the *Mahzor*.⁴¹⁷

The *qedushta'ot* *אורח חיים מוסר תוכחת* (in our Codex, for the first day; fol. 114r) and *ארץ מטה ורעשה* (for the second day; fol. 132v) are both known in the Ashkenazi rite. However, the order in which they are presented in our *Mahzor* is unusual. It especially differs from what is reported as the rite of Mainz. According to R. Avraham Klausner (p. 124), and the *Maharil* (p. 22a), in Mainz it was customary to say *ארץ מטה ורעשה* on both days of Shavu'ot; but on the first day the *seder* *דרכו ראשית דרכו* in this *qedushta* was replaced by the passage *אז טרם נוסדו ארץ ושמים*, taken from the *qerovah* *אורקא הרעיש איום* of R. Yoḥanan ha-Kohen.⁴¹⁸ In eastern Ashkenaz the *qedushta'ot* were said in reverse order, *ארץ מטה* in the first day and *אורח חיים* in the

second, as recommended by R. Isaac Tyrnau (p. 62). However, the way R. Isaac handles the issue proves that in many places the custom was to do it the other way around.⁴¹⁹ Be that as it may, the rite of our *Mahzor* is once again seen to be different from the Mainz rite. The practice in Worms, though, was as it appears in our *Mahzor*.⁴²⁰

The *azharot* appearing in our work in the *musaf* services of the first and second days of Shavu'ot are the same as in all the Ashkenazi rites. The works of R. Liva Kirchheim (pp. 149a, 150b) and of R. Yuspa Shammash (pp. 29, 30) accord with our *Mahzor*.

For the night of the Ninth of Av, after Lamentations, our Codex has three *piyyuṭim*: (1) *על אלה אני בוכיה... תסתור לאלם תרשישים*; (2) *בליל זה יבכיון*; and (3) *אז בחטאינו חרב מקדש*. In the margin of *בליל זה* a later hand copied the stanza *זכור זה* which was added to this *piyyuṭ* on the night of the Ninth of Av when it coincided with the end of the Sabbath. These *qinot* are also the ones which appear in the *Maharil* (p. 34b), except that they are preceded by the rhymed paraphrase of Lamentations v, *זכור זה*.⁴²¹ In the Worms of R. Liva and of R. Yuspa the arrangement of this part of the service also began with *זכור זה* (which does not appear in our Codex), and continued like what we have here, but with the omission of *בליל זה*. Only when the Ninth of Av began after the Sabbath did they say the stanza *זכור זה* by itself.⁴²² We do not know the reason *בליל זה* was omitted in Worms, nor whether that had been the practice there from the outset. The *Maharil* informs us that such was the practice in Frankfurt.⁴²³ However, from the fact that R. El'azar, author of the *Rokeaḥ* (a resident of Worms) added a stanza of his own on to *בליל זה יבכיון*, namely *זכור זה*, we learn that in his time and place it was customary to say *בליל זה יבכיון*. The scribe's omission of the passage *זכור זה* from our Codex perhaps should not be viewed as very significant, for he may not have taken into account the case of the Ninth of Av falling after the Sabbath. In the passage of consolation which concludes the *qinot* (תרחם), R. Liva notes that in Worms the custom was to say *ברחמים* without adding on the word *רבים*; but in the *Mahzor* the words *ברחמים רבים* appear (fol. 157r), and at the end of the order for the morning service we have (fol. 184r): *ותשוב בירושלים רבים רחמים* (!). Deletion of the adjective may have been influenced by the words of Zach. i:16, which appear after *ככתוב*.⁴²⁴ In any case, in all these details our *Mahzor* differs from what we are told about the later rite of Worms.

The elegies for the Ninth of Av, on the other hand, are exactly the same as the Worms rite described by R. Liva (p. 157b) and R. Yuspa (p. 36). In Worms it was customary to begin the order of the *qinot* with the recital of fifteen *Qiliri qinot* by the *ḥazzan*. These *qinot* are recorded in the two sources mentioned, and completely parallel to what we have in our *Mahzor* from fol.

415 However, R. Avraham Klausner, p. 124, notes the opposite order for Mainz.

416 In the other Ashkenazi communities these *piyyuṭim* were recited, as we mentioned above, on the Sabbath following Shavu'ot.

417 However, in the body of the *Mahzor* there is a *zulat*, so it is preceded by the *אמת וציב* for the festivals, i.e. the short version of Erez Israel.

418 See the dissertation of N. Weisenstern, *The Piyyuṭim of Yoḥanan b. R. Yehoshua'* [Heb.], Jerusalem 1984, p. 93, and in the notes there.

419 In fact, the *piyyuṭim* appear in the Nürnberg *Mahzor* as they appear before us: *אורח חיים* first, followed by *ארץ מטה*. They also appear that way in the *Customs* of R. Zalman Yent, *op. cit.* (above, n. 87), p. 179.

420 It appears that way in the *Customs* of R. Liva Kirchheim, pp. 149b and 150b.

421 Goldschmidt, *Qinot*, p. 24.

422 R. Liva's *Customs*, p. 156b; R. Yuspa Shammash's *Customs*, p. 35 in the short version; p. 28a in the long version.

423 P. 34b: "In Frankfurt, they only recite *על אלה*, then *בחתאינו*, even [when the Ninth of Av falls] on the night following the Sabbath" (i.e. they do not recite *זכור זה*; this passage is also missing, as we mentioned, in our *Mahzor*, but it was added in the margin).

424 *במה אמר יי שבתי לירושלים ברחמים*. However, on fol. 157r the scribe got mixed up even in the biblical verse and wrote *ברחמים רבים*. He also copied *וקו ינטה* after that, in place of *וקו ינטה*. In the Italian *mahzorim* the wording of the conclusion of the *piyyuṭ* is *תאמר לירושלים*. However, according to our wording, the omission of the word *רבים* impairs the four-part metre of the line.

160r to 170v. In most of the Ashkenazi communities, it was customary at this point to say seventeen Qiliri *qinot* at one pass, and in a different order.⁴²⁵ In Worms the order of the service after these *qinot*, according to R. Liva (p. 158), was as follows: "Then the most eminent man in the congregation recites a *qinah*, and after him, whoever in the congregation wishes to recite *qinot* ... and when the congregation finishes saying *qinot*, then the most notable member of the congregation begins the *ziyyonim* (Odes to Zion), and after him whoever in the congregation wishes to, recites *ziyyonim*, but in any event the important and elder members take precedence; and after all the *ziyyonim* they say *אלי ציון ועריה*, and after that the *hazzan* starts in with *הילילו לה ליום* up to *משמר מעוזיה* to *עד אנא* [!] *מספר בציון*, after which the *hazzan* also says it. The *hazzan* then says, as on the previous day, [או בחטאינו], until *מאור נגהיך*. The congregation says *תרחם ציון* out loud, then it is repeated by the *hazzan*. Then the *hazzan* and the congregation recite together [יד] *נביאר* etc., in an undertone, and then a few verses of consolation, in order to conclude with consolation." In our *Mahzor* the passage *הילילו לה* comes immediately after the fifteen Qiliri *qinot*. R. Simḥah follows his practice here, namely, putting into the *Mahzor* only the sections recited by the *hazzan*. In this respect *הילילו לה* was similar to Qiliri's fifteen *qinot*. He copied all the rest afterwards, as an addition, so that the *hazzan* would be able to follow the reading of the individuals from the congregation, or even to read an elegy himself, together with the rest of the readers. The concluding portions of the service, which were identical with what he presented for the night of the Ninth of Av, he did not copy again in their entirety, only alluding to them by again copying the verse *תרחם ציון כאשר אמרת*.

The section of *qinot* in later times in Worms was far richer than that which is presented in our *Mahzor*. The number of *ziyyonim* increased, and the metered *qinah* *אלי ציון ועריה*, which does not appear in our *Mahzor*, was added. In our *Mahzor* no special section was allotted to *ziyyonim*, and the *piyyut* of R. Yehudah ha-Levi, *ציון הלא תשאלי*, which is the prototype for the *ziyyonim*, is presented here as a regular *qinah* (fol. 179v). The order of *qinot* doubtless assumed its final form after the time our *Mahzor* was written.

H. THE WORMS MAHZOR AND THE PRAYER RITE OF WORMS

The question posed frequently by scholars regarding the relationship of our *Mahzor* to the prayer rite of Worms cannot be answered definitively even after investigating the contents of this Codex and the rite which emerges from it. As we have seen above, in many seemingly quite significant details the *Mahzor* represents what the works of later authorities have presented as the prayer rite of Worms, yet in not a few other details, also significant, it deviates from that rite. What prevents us from reaching a definitive conclusion is our inability to date developments in the local prayer rites of the early Ashkenazi communities. The early source material extant on this subject is scanty, and for the most part it does not provide explicit intima-

tion of differences in rite between communities, save for a few marginal instances. Moreover, we also have no way of knowing how to interpret the statements of rabbinical sources, early or late, that a given practice constitutes the prayer rite of one or another community. Did they necessarily intend to say that a given practice was customary only in that community, and not in any other place? Or did they mean to say that the custom first became established in a certain place, and from there spread to a few, or to many, neighbouring communities?

Even in the later records of the Worms customs, which date from the seventeenth century on, we do not know which are ancient practices and which more recent ones, which were unique to the Worms community from the outset and which became particular to Worms after initially having been common to Worms and other communities. A further question is whether, and to what extent, our *Mahzor* had an impact on establishing the prayer rite of Worms; and if so, to what extent points of correlation which emerge by comparing our Codex with the documented prayer rite of Worms are significant. All of these questions, for which we do not have sufficient answers, prevent us from firmly stating the rite of which community is authentically represented in our *Mahzor*.

One must bear in mind, of course, that the community of Worms was a large and flourishing community, which produced many great rabbis and decisors, including some of the great men who shaped the Ashkenazi prayer rites. It is hard to imagine that the customs of Worms were actually specific to that community alone, and were not adopted by other communities as well. Indeed, the opposite assumption seems reasonable, namely, that in early times the practices of most of the Ashkenazi communities were very similar to one another, and that they were established by the authoritative rulings of the rabbis of Worms, Mainz, Speyer and the rest of the large Rhineland communities. Differences, initially simply in determining which *piyyuṭim* would be recited, and over the years perhaps also in the arrangement of the service or in one or another detail of the fixed wording of the prayers, might have resulted from later developments, by virtue of various decisions by local rabbis or various local occurrences. The prayer rite of Worms, almost the only one which was recorded in full detail, may have developed as a special rite, not due to its being special from the outset, but due to its being preserved with greater fastidiousness than the rites of other Rhineland communities.

In any event, we may say, that the prayer rite of our *Mahzor* is quite close to what in the course of time became established as the rite of the Worms community, with the differences fewer and less significant than the similarities. Some of the points where the rite of the *Mahzor* differs from that of Worms may result from later development of the Worms rite. Other points of divergence may be due to the fact, proven above in a number of places, that the scribe R. Simḥah did not write his own rite in this Codex, but rather worked according to guidelines based on another rite, which may have been the rite of Worms. These guidelines may have been incomplete, and he may have erred in following them, either according to the rite of his own locality, or according to his mistaken understanding of what he had

425 Cf. *Maharil*, p. 32b.

been commissioned to do. In this respect, switching the *yozer* אתה הארתה which was the established *yozer* for the last day of Passover in all the communities of western Ashkenaz, to יושע אור ישראל, which became established as a peculiar practice of Worms, seems to me to be quite significant. As we have said above, the text proper of our *Mahzor* presents the usual *piyyut*, but it was replaced very early by the special *piyyut* of Worms, in separate parchment sheets appended to the *Mahzor*. This switch, if indeed it is as ancient as palaeographers claim, testifies that the *Mahzor* came into the jurisdiction of Worms at a very early date, and perhaps also to its having been written according to the rite of this community from the outset, except that the scribe erred in this spot, substituting the rite of his own locality.

It is true that we must still wonder about the rest of the differences between the *Mahzor* and the Worms rite which were not "corrected" until a very later date, something which seems to indicate that the *Mahzor* matched the prayer rite of its locality for a long time, or that it was not in active use possibly for centuries. Yet in this respect one must bear in mind that early *hazzanim* did not blithely correct the wording or the rite in the written *mahzorim* at their disposal at will, preferring to "correct" whenever necessary orally, without committing anything

to writing. A moving passage encouraging this approach appears in the *Maharil* (p. 48a). One should also bear in mind the fact that we do not know when our *Mahzor* became "the *Mahzor* of the congregation" of Worms. Maybe it was owned by private individuals for several generations, and given to the congregation only in the sixteenth century.

In any event, one ought not to consider that what we call the "rite of Worms" in defining the original wording of our *Mahzor* was a special and exceptional rite of this community. Above we have repeatedly stressed the fact that details of a rite or wording which at first glance appeared unique to our *Mahzor*, were actually common in the early Middle Ages to the Worms community and many of the large communities of the Rhineland. At that time all these communities were apparently forged from a single mould, with but a few exceptions, and the rabbis of Worms undoubtedly played a decisive role in establishing the uniformity of this mould.

In any case, what we have in our *Mahzor* is a faithful reflection, even if not altogether precise, of the central rite of the communities of western Ashkenaz towards the end of the thirteenth century. In this respect it may serve as a corner-stone in evaluating the wordings, arrangements, and rites of prayer which emerge from the rest of the ancient Ashkenazi *mahzorim*.