

“Peering through the Lattices”

Mystical, Magical, and
Pietistic Dimensions
in the Tosafist Period



EPHRAIM KANARFOGEL

“Peering through the Lattices”

“Peering through the Lattices”

Mystical, Magical, and Pietistic Dimensions
in the Tosafist Period



EPHRAIM KANARFOGEL



Wayne State University Press
Detroit

Copyright © 2000 by Wayne State University Press,
Detroit, Michigan 48201. All rights are reserved.

No part of this book may be reproduced without formal permission.
Manufactured in the United States of America.

04 03 02 01 00

5 4 3 2 1

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Kanarfogel, Ephraim.

Peering through the lattices : mystical, magical, and pietistic
dimensions in the Tosafist period / Ephraim Kanarfogel.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and indexes.

ISBN 0-8143-2531-9 (alk. paper)

1. Tosafists. 2. Mysticism—Judaism—History—To 1500. 3. Magic,
Jewish—History—To 1500. 4. Hasidism, Medieval. 5. Tosafot.

I. Title.

BM501.8.K36 2000

296.1'2''00902—dc21

99-14014

Published with the assistance of the Lucius N. Littauer Foundation and the
Murray and Madeline Baumel Judaic Studies Faculty Incentive Award

ISBN 978-0-8143-2531-5
eISBN 978-0-8143-3994-7

For my parents

עוד ינובון בשיבה דשנים ורעננים יהיו

Contents

Preface	9
Acknowledgments	13
Abbreviations	17
Introduction: Perceptions of Tosafist Spirituality	19
1	
Asceticism, Pietism, and <i>Perishut</i>	33
2	
Pietistic Tendencies in Prayer and Ritual	93
3	
Mysticism and Magic: Pre-Crusade Traditions and the Reaction of Early Tosafists	131
4	
Between Tosafists and German Pietists	189
5	
Integration and Expansion during the Thirteenth Century	221
6	
Conclusions and Implications	251
Appendix: Ashkenazic Rabbinic Scholars	259
Index of Manuscript References	261
Index of Names and Subjects	265

Preface

As often occurs in scholarship, findings and pathways that are chanced upon initially can ultimately yield significant results. After the completion of my *Jewish Education and Society in the High Middle Ages*, which focused primarily on the societal and curricular structures of education and rabbinic learning in medieval Ashkenaz, I began, mainly for a change of pace, to reread and to explore further kabbalistic and other mystical literature that appeared in Provence and Spain during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. I was struck early on by the fact that a number of these texts mentioned or alluded to Ashkenazic rabbinic figures, including German Pietists and apparently some tosafists as well.

To be sure, these names were sometimes jumbled or misconstrued. Nonetheless, mindful of the illuminating studies by Israel Ta-Shma on the absorption and adoption of Ashkenazic customs and practices by the Zohar, and by a number of recent studies that successfully trace Provençal and Spanish kabbalistic themes directly back to *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, I set about trying to ascertain whether these Ashkenazic scholars were merely being co-opted by kabbalists in order to lend their kabbalistic material additional significance and context, or whether the Ashkenazic rabbinic figures mentioned were actually involved in some type of mystical studies, of which the kabbalists might have been aware.

The results of that initial inquiry were published under the title “Rabbinic Figures in Castilian Kabbalistic Pseudepigraphy: R. Yehudah *he-Hasid* and R. Elhanan of Corbeil,” as part of a special issue of the *Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy*.¹ In the documentation for that study, I pointed to evidence both

¹*Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy* 3 [Studies in Jewish Mysticism, Esotericism, and Hasidism] (1993):77–109.

PREFACE

from manuscript sources and from published medieval rabbinic texts which suggests that tosafists such as R. Jacob of Corbeil, R. Isaac of Corbeil, and R. Meir of Rothenburg, among others, were indeed familiar with various types of mystical teachings. These results, in addition to other related findings, indicated that a larger study of additional manuscript texts and published works was worth undertaking, in order to evaluate properly the extent to which tosafists were involved in aspects of mysticism. The book now before you is a presentation and discussion of those findings.

The tosafists flourished in northern France and Germany (and, to a lesser extent, in Austria, Italy, and England) during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. They revolutionized the study of the Talmud, following the pioneering efforts of their ancestor and teacher Rashi. The claim that a number of tosafists were familiar with mystical doctrines is rather new, and perhaps even startling. In previous studies, I have followed the dominant view in modern scholarship—which will be reviewed below in the introduction—that the tosafists were decidedly talmudocentric. This view assumes that despite the very full library of earlier Jewish literature which they had at their disposal, the tosafists concentrated their efforts and training on the mastery of the talmudic text and on the surrounding halakhic and rabbinic literature, with the possible exception of biblical studies. But even the study of the Bible was undertaken, for the most part, through the prism of the talmudic corpus.² There was no overt interest in or concern with extra-talmudic pietism, let alone with issues of theology and theosophy. Only *Hasidei Ashkenaz*—led by R. Judah *he-Hasid* and his devoted student, R. Eleazar of Worms, and reflecting interests of the pre-Crusade period—were involved in these disciplines and practices; at the same time, they critiqued aspects of tosafist dialectic and Ashkenazic religious life in general, including prevalent prayer customs and liturgical texts.

A few words about the structure of the presentation are in order. Chapters 1 and 2 will identify the varieties of ascetic and pietistic practices that can be found among northern French and German tosafists. There was certainly no formal pietistic movement among the tosafists, and a number of tosafists were categorically against ascetic practices that can be labeled as *perishut*. Nonetheless, forms of self-denial, *ḥasidut*, and even *tiqqunei teshuvah* (which have been associated heretofore only with the *Hasidei Ashkenaz*), can be traced in tosafist writings.³ Possible connections between the tosafists who

²See my “On the Role of Biblical Studies in Medieval Ashkenaz,” *The Frank Talmage Memorial Volume*, ed. Barry Walfish (Haifa, 1993), 1:151–66.

³Analogous material can be found in tosafist writings to all five sections on “religious issues” delineated by Yitzhak Baer in his classic study of *ḥasidut Ashkenaz*,

Preface

exhibited these tendencies and the German Pietists will be explored, as will the extent to which some tosafists appear to have adopted Pietist prayer practices, texts, and rituals. We shall see that many of those tosafists who were associated with *hasidut* and *perishut* were also involved with mystical teachings. The second chapter will conclude with a brief discussion about the relationship between pietism and mysticism in medieval Ashkenaz.

Chapters 3 through 5 will offer a detailed chronological survey and characterization of mystical studies within the rabbinic culture of Ashkenaz, from the pre-Crusade period through the end of the thirteenth century. Several distinct types of mystical and magical or theurgic teachings and practices, known to Ashkenazic scholars in the pre-Crusade period at the academy of Mainz in particular, can be identified. These include the interpretation of Divine Names and an awareness of their uses (e.g., for protection, for prophylactic techniques and procedures, or for oracular and quasi-prophetic prognostications, including various forms of *she'elat halom*), and an understanding of the powers and roles of various angels and other heavenly beings.

These interests were not shared, however, by early tosafist leaders such as Rashbam, Rabbenu Tam, and Raban, despite their familiarity with some of them. Several explanations for this change in attitude will be suggested. It is clear that this posture affected many subsequent tosafists who displayed no inclination toward mystical teachings. This may also account, in part, for the prevailing perception of the tosafist period, and for the tendency in earlier scholarship to ignore or downplay interest in these areas during this period.

At the same time, however, in the second half of the twelfth century, several leading students of Rabbenu Tam do show signs of interest, which intensify throughout the remainder of the tosafist period. We shall see that the major areas of interest within the tosafist period correspond precisely to those of the pre-Crusade period. It is likely that a number of thirteenth-century tosafists and other rabbinic scholars, especially those hailing from Germany, were influenced by the German Pietists. But there is also evidence within northern France for mysticism and pietism of the type found amongst the *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, for which the question of influence is less easily resolved.

The presence within Ashkenazic rabbinic culture of elements of pietism and mysticism that had heretofore been associated only with the German

¹ “Ha-Megammah ha-Datit/ha-Hevratit shel ‘Sefer Hasidim,’” *Zion* 3 (1937):1–50 [sections three through seven: *החסיד; היחס אל התלמוד; הלכות קידוש השם; נשמות המתים; חזד; החסידות; נבוכו; הלכות תשובה*]. This is not the case, however, with regard to the social issues that Baer identifies.

PREFACE

Pietists requires a restatement, in narrower terms, of the extent of the Pietists' uniqueness within Ashkenaz itself and throughout the medieval Jewish world. Spanish kabbalists cited tosafists as well as German Pietists as repositories of *torat ha-sod* material, as I have indicated. Moreover, the interest in penances, pietistic prayer practices, and magic among Ashkenazic rabbinic scholars during the late medieval and early modern periods cannot be attributed solely to the impact of *Hasidei Ashkenaz*. The German Pietists remain, however, the only Ashkenazic figures who expressed a strong interest in theosophy and produced a substantial, if not systematic, corpus in this area.

I am not suggesting that the tosafists were outright mystics, nor that they attempted to invest their talmudic or halakhic interpretations with mystical significance. To be sure, the absence of esoteric teachings in medieval talmudic commentaries and halakhic works generally may be due primarily to the nature of these genres and the relationship between them.⁴ There is hardly any reference to kabbalistic material in Nahmanides' vast talmudic corpus, despite his prominent stature as an active kabbalistic thinker.⁵ Nonetheless, a number of tosafists did acquire, perhaps from their ancestors as well as from the German Pietists, interest in areas that can certainly be termed mystical. Indeed, these tosafists must be added to the list of medieval rabbinic scholars who pursued spiritual disciplines outside the confines of pure legalism and talmudic studies. The inclusion of tosafists in this group constitutes a significant shift in our view of medieval Jewish intellectual history.

⁴See, e.g., Jacob Katz, "Halakhah ve-Kabbalah: Magga'im Rishonim," [reprinted in his] *Halakhah ve-Qabbalah* (Jerusalem, 1986), 28–33; idem, "Halakhah ve-Qabbalah ke-Nos'e Limmud Mitharim," *Halakhah ve-Qabbalah*, 76–77; Isadore Twersky, *Rabad of Posquières* (Philadelphia, 1980²), 299–300; Moshe Idel, "We have No Kabbalistic Tradition on This," in *Rabbi Moses Nahmanides: Explorations in His Religious and Literary Virtuosity*, ed. Isadore Twersky (Cambridge, Mass., 1983), 52–63; idem, "R. Moshe b. Nahman—Qabbalah, Halakhah u-Manhigut Ruhanit," *Tarbiz* 64 (1995):535–78. Cf. Israel Ta-Shma, *Ha-Nigleh shebe-Nistar* (Tel Aviv, 1995), 36–40.

⁵For possible kabbalistic references in Nahmanides' talmudic commentaries, see *Hiddushei ha-Ramban*, *Shevu'ot* 29a, s.v. *ha di-tenan* (end), and Isak Unna, R. Moshe b. Nahman, *Hayyav u-Fe'ulato* (Jerusalem, 1954), 23; *Bava Batra* 12a, s.v. *ha de-²amrinan*, and Shraga Abramson, "Navi, Ro'eh ve-Hozeh," *Sefer Yovel Muggash li-Khevod ha-Rav Mordechai Kirschblum*, ed. David Telsner (Jerusalem, 1983), 118, n. 3; *Yevamot* 49b, s.v. *kol ha-nevi'im*, and Elliot Wolfson, *Through a Speculum That Shines* (Princeton, 1994), 344, n. 65, 351, n. 86; and Nahmanides' *Milhamot ha-Shem* to *Berakhot*, end. Cf. *Hiddushei ha-Ritva*, *Rosh ha-Shanah*, 35a (end); *Qiddushin* 39b–40; *Shevu'ot* 9a, s.v. *mai ta'ama de-R. Yehudah*; my "On the Assessment of R. Moses b. Nahman (Nahmanides) and His Literary Oeuvre," *Jewish Book Annual* 51 (1993–94): 158–72 [reprinted in *Jewish Book Annual* 54 (1996–97):66–80]; and below, ch. 4, at n. 65.

Acknowledgments

The completion of a book represents an opportunity for appropriate recognition of those who contributed to its development and formulation, as well as to those who enhanced the author's intellectual, professional, and personal well-being. Unfortunately, I must begin by noting the untimely death of a lifelong mentor, Rabbi Hirsh Fishman *z"l*. I take some consolation in the fact that Rabbi Fishman had begun to replicate the *rebbe-talmid* relationship with one of my sons. It is our fervent hope that we can perpetuate his memory by continuing to espouse the Torah study and values for which he so firmly stood.

The steady encouragement and support of Professor Isadore Twersky *z"l* were always especially meaningful. His tragic passing leaves a great void in Jewish scholarship, and it deprives us of a singular teacher and role model. May his memory be for a blessing.

On a happier note, I am pleased to acknowledge my colleagues in administration at Stern College for Women, Deans Karen Bacon and Ethel Orlan. Ms. E. Billi Ivry, who endowed the Rebecca Ivry Department of Jewish Studies at Stern College that I am privileged to chair, is remarkable in her commitment to Jewish women's education and to other great Jewish causes. My family and I are deeply grateful to Ms. Ivry for her unflagging interest in my academic work as well. This interest has culminated in my recent appointment as E. Billi Ivry Professor of Jewish History, a milestone that I will always cherish.

Numerous colleagues, friends, and students have contributed both directly and indirectly to this book, and it is impossible to mention all of them by name. Three distinguished colleagues who reviewed a draft of the book, Moshe Idel, Israel Ta-Shma, and Elliot Wolfson, stand out for their willingness to discuss ideas and texts, and for their profound suggestions. Their impact on

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

this work is greater than even the frequent citation of their writings suggests. In addition, Professor Idel was kind enough to invite me to an international conference on magic in Judaism that afforded me an excellent opportunity to present some of my findings; Professor Ta-Shma shared with me his immensely helpful note cards from a seminar that he and Professor Idel conducted a number of years ago at Hebrew University on *sod* in Ashkenaz; and Professor Wolfson edited and published an article of mine, which contains a number of first steps toward the present study, in a special issue of his *Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy*. Professors Charles Raffel and Moshe Sokolow, and my students Tzippy Russ and Yardaena Osband, have also read a draft of the book, offering a number of insightful comments and suggestions for which I am grateful.

I wish to thank the Lucius N. Littauer Foundation and its director, Pamela Ween Brumberg, for a significant publication grant. Yeshiva University has generously and consistently provided travel funds for academic conferences and meetings in Israel that were indispensable for my research there. In addition, President Norman Lamm has recognized my work by presenting me with the Murray and Madeline Baumel Faculty Incentive Award. I also wish to thank the Hebrew University of Jerusalem and the Blechner Chair of Jewish Studies at Ben-Gurion University of the Negev for their lecture invitations and hospitality, which facilitated two of my stays in Israel.

The majority of the published sources and works used in the course of this study were consulted at Yeshiva University's Benjamin Gottesman Library. Virtually all of the many manuscripts cited here were viewed at the Institute of Microfilmed Hebrew Manuscripts at the Jewish National and University Library in Jerusalem. My thanks to the staffs of both these institutions. Arthur Evans and Kathy Wildfong at the Wayne State University Press have once again done an excellent job in bringing this book to press. Their patience and trust are always appreciated.

The last and most heartfelt set of thanks goes to the members of my family. My parents, to whom this book is dedicated, made it clear to my sister Susan and to me, from the time that we were young, that nothing would give them greater pleasure than to see us develop into ethical, personable, and highly educated people who would share their knowledge with others. To this end, my parents have always taken an immense interest in my work, and it is my father who (only half-jokingly) continues to monitor my research and publication schedule.

My wife, Devorah, has expended herculean efforts to provide me with the time and the environment necessary for doing the work that she knows I so much enjoy. Words cannot fully express my gratitude; suffice it to say that I am

Acknowledgments

still in complete agreement with the sentiments found at the end of the acknowledgments in my first book. Our children—Tova, Dovid, Moshe, Atara, Chaya, and Temima—do not always cooperate but, then again, they're not supposed to. I know, however, that they recognize and appreciate the importance of this endeavor to me, and that they also realize just how much a part of it they truly are.

Abbreviations

Journals

AHR	<i>American Historical Review</i>
AJS Review	<i>Association for Jewish Studies Review</i>
HUCA	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
JJS	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>
JQR	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>
JSQ	<i>Jewish Studies Quarterly</i>
MGWJ	<i>Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums</i>
PAAJR	<i>Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research</i>
REJ	<i>Revue des études juives</i>

Manuscript collections

B.M.	British Museum
Bodl.	Bodleian
Cambr.	Cambridge University
HUC	Hebrew Union College
JNUL	Jewish National and University Library
JTS	Jewish Theological Seminary of America
Mont.	Montefiore
Vat.	Vatican
SHB	<i>Sefer Hasidim</i> (Bologna ms.), ed. Reuben Margoliot (Jerusalem, 1957)
SHP	<i>Sefer Hasidim</i> (Parma ms.), ed. Jehuda Wistinetzki (Frankfurt, 1924)

Introduction: Perceptions of Tosafist Spirituality

The tosafists did not inherit a philosophical tradition, nor did they have access to or interest in the developments and changes regarding philosophy and religious thought that were occurring throughout contemporary Christian society.¹ Scholars who have studied the creativity and literature of the tosafists have assigned them a very limited role in mystical or esoteric studies as well. These researchers maintain that only the German Pietists, who were contemporaries of the tosafists, were involved in the study of *torat ha-sod*.²

Ephraim Urbach, the modern biographer of the tosafists, devotes nearly twenty-five pages of his 770-page work, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot: Toledoteihem, Hibbureihem, Shitatam*, to the Pietist leader R. Eleazar of Worms. R. Eleazar composed not only a number of *tosafot* but also a halakhic work, *Sefer Roqeah*,

¹See my *Jewish Education and Society in the High Middle Ages* (Detroit, 1992), 60–73. Cf. Gad Freudenthal, “The Place of Science in Medieval Hebrew Communities,” *Rashi, 1090–1990 [Hommage à Ephraim Urbach]*, ed. Gabrielle Sed-Rajna (Paris, 1993), 599–601; Bernard Septimus, *Hispano-Jewish Culture in Transition* (Cambridge, Mass., 1982), 50–51, 64–65; David Ruderman, *Jewish Thought and Scientific Discovery in Early Modern Europe* (New Haven, 1995), 45–47, 55–59; and below, ch. 3, n. 70, ch. 4, n. 40. On rationalism in medieval Ashkenaz, see below, ch. 3, nn. 67–69, 72, 75, 86.

²See, e.g., Heinrich Graetz, *Divrei Yemei Yisra'el*, vol. 4 (Warsaw, 1897), 270–78; Moritz Güdemann, *Ha-Torah ve-ha-Hayyim be-Arzot ha-Ma'arav Bimei ha-Benayim*, vol. 1 (Warsaw, 1897), 117–39; I. H. Weiss, *Dor Dor ve-Dorshav*, vol. 4 (New York, 1923), 298–312; Victor Aptowitzer, *Mavo le-Sefer Rabiah* (Jerusalem, 1938), 1–20; S. W. Baron, *A Social and Religious History of the Jewish People* (Philadelphia, 1957–58), 5:49–56, 6:42–45; *A History of the Jewish People*, ed. H. H. Ben-Sasson (Cambridge, Mass., 1976), 525–27, 545–53. Cf. my “The ‘Aliyah of ‘Three Hundred Rabbis’ in 1211: Tosafist Attitudes Toward Settling in the Land of Israel,” *Jewish Quarterly Review* 76 (1986):210–11.

INTRODUCTION

as well as related collections of halakhic rulings. To be sure, *Sefer Roqeah* is more in the spirit of *sifrut de-Vei Rashi* than other tosafist halakhic works of the thirteenth century. Nonetheless, R. Eleazar's halakhic rulings and written opinions were accorded great authority by a number of German tosafists. At the outset of his treatment, however, Urbach writes that R. Eleazar of Worms's integration of exoteric and esoteric teachings had no followers among subsequent tosafists and Ashkenazic *posqim*, although R. Eleazar had some degree of influence on later scholars. This is apparently a reference to R. Eleazar's small group of students, especially R. Abraham b. Azriel of Bohemia, to whom Urbach refers several times in his discussion of R. Eleazar.³

Toward the end of this discussion, Urbach suggests that R. Eleazar's influence in promulgating Torah study that would lead to *hasidut* was not restricted to Eleazar's colleagues and students in Germany, but reached northern France and even Spain. As proof, Urbach cites Nahmanides' well-known letter of 1232 to *rabbanei Zarefat* in conjunction with the Maimonidean controversy (טרם אענה אני שוגג) in which Nahmanides asserts that one of Eleazar's treatises on *sod ha-yihud* had reached him in Spain and was also to be found in northern France. Urbach next notes the impact that R. Eleazar's *torat ha-sod* had on kabbalistic circles in Provence. He concludes that R. Eleazar's works "were available in northern France, as per Nahmanides' testimony, although his name is not mentioned explicitly very often." Urbach goes on to suggest, without pointing to any specific examples, that R. Eleazar's halakhic writings contributed to the conception of piety in Ashkenaz that included "abiding devoutness, love of Torah study and the performance of its precepts while preserving the minute details of custom, and a desire to comprehend the inner meaning and secrets of the world and its existence."⁴

Urbach refers to R. Eleazar's Pietist teacher, R. Judah *he-Hasid*, only in passing, principally because R. Judah wrote next to nothing in the realm of *halakhah* or talmudic commentary. Indeed, Urbach notes that even the responsa of R. Judah that have survived deal almost exclusively with issues of

³See E. E. Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot* (Jerusalem, 1980⁴), 1:388–411. Urbach also published a three-volume critical edition of R. Abraham b. Azriel's massive liturgical and piyyut commentary, *'Arugat ha-Bosem*. In his introduction (vol. 4; Jerusalem, 1963), Urbach painstakingly locates *'Arugat ha-Bosem* within its genre in medieval Ashkenaz. In this work as well, Urbach conveys the impression (in a number of instances) that R. Eleazar of Worms and his student R. Abraham, who had an abiding interest in esoteric teachings and interpretations, were part of a relatively isolated circle that had little in common with recognized tosafists in these and related matters. Cf. below, n. 12.

⁴Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:408–9.

custom and *hasidut*, rather than with talmudic interpretation or halakhic reasoning. Urbach also highlights the very different approaches to the same ritual question, as well as the differing methods of argumentation, taken by R. Judah and the tosafist R. Isaac *Or Zarua*^c.⁵

The scattered references in Urbach's *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot* to *torat ha-sod* and *kabbalah* appear, for the most part, with regard to German Pietists and their associates or students.⁶ Even in the few instances where Urbach acknowledges that *hasidut* or *torat ha-sod* considerations appear to have had an impact on a tosafist, he tends to portray them as uneventful.⁷ The implication of Urbach's work is that tosafists had no abiding interest (or training) in *torat ha-sod*, or even in quasi-mystical areas such as magic.⁸ This characterization accords fully with Urbach's views regarding the (small) extent to which rabbinic scholars of the talmudic period were involved in these disciplines, and especially with his

⁵ *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:390–92. This comparison is rendered even more significant by the fact, noted elsewhere by Urbach, that R. Isaac studied “issues of *hasidut* in particular” with R. Judah *he-Hasid* (and with R. Eleazar of Worms). See *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:437–39, and below, ch. 1, n. 16. See also *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:412–13, for R. Simḥah of Spires's response to a question asked of him by R. Judah. This incident is described by Urbach as “another example of the difference between the decisor who rules leniently based on halakhic grounds, and the *hasid* who is concerned and is stringent not for halakhic reasons but because of considerations of piety (*yir'ah*).” Cf. below, ch. 2, n. 16. Urbach has a brief discussion of R. Judah's father, R. Samuel *he-Hasid* (1:192–95), in the context of the rabbinic leadership of Spires during the first half of the twelfth century.

⁶ There are eleven entries for the terms *hasidut/hasidim* in the index (in addition to a separate listing for *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, which has seventeen entries). Many of these also refer, however, to the German Pietists, with no implication for the tosafists. The term *kabbalah* (the entry under *sod* says “see *kabbalah*”) has only fourteen index entries, again several times in connection with the Pietists. Cf. *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 2:586, n. 2. Urbach was, of course, fully aware of the esoteric teachings found in the prayer and *piyyut* commentaries of the German Pietists. See *'Arugat ha-Bosem*, ed. Urbach, 4:73–111.

⁷ See, e.g., *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:150–51, regarding R. Jacob of Corbeil; 1:161, regarding R. Eliezer of Metz; 1:387–88, regarding Rabiah; and 2:522, 547, 564, regarding R. Meir of Rothenburg. Urbach deals with Rī's extensive *sod* and *hasidut* proclivities in fewer than two pages (1:237–39). See also 1:199 (and cf. *'Arugat ha-Bosem*, 4:99–100, n. 75), regarding R. Isaac b. Mordekhai of Regensburg; and below, ch. 4, nn. 23, 29.

⁸ One or two of the entries under *kabbalah* deal with magic. There is only one listing under *kishuf*, one listing under *mazzalot*, one under *Shem ha-Meforash* (which describes a magical usage), one on *shedim*, and three under *mehashvei ha-qez* (although one of these refers to a calculation that was arrived at through neither mystical nor magical means). Cf. *Teshuvot u-Fesaqim*, ed. Efraim Kupfer (Jerusalem, 1973), 310, n. 3; *'Arugat ha-Bosem*, 4:110, n. 30; and below, ch. 4, n. 38.

INTRODUCTION

assertion that *Merkavah* mysticism emerged from a realm outside that of talmudic literature and thought.⁹

By the same token, those who have studied the *torat ha-sod* of *Hasidei Ashkenaz* make almost no mention of any tosafists.¹⁰ Indeed, until relatively recently, even those who sought to characterize the exoteric teachings and pursuits of the German Pietists failed to notice any connection between Pietists and tosafists. Although Yizhak Baer makes reference, in his lengthy study of *Sefer Hasidim* and *hasidut Ashkenaz*, to Ashkenazic talmudism,¹¹ until the 1970s

In his review of Urbach's corpus, Yaacov Sussmann stresses the need to recognize and evaluate more accurately the overall impact of German Pietism on the intellectual history of medieval Ashkenaz. See Sussmann, "Mif'alo ha-Madda'i shel Professor Ephraim Elimelekh Urbach," *E. E. Urbach, Bio-Bibliographyah Mehqarit [Musaf Madda'e ha-Yahadut]*, ed. David Assaf (Jerusalem, 1993), 61, n. 105. See also Sussmann, 34, n. 48, concerning the academy at Evreux; and cf. below, n. 22. (This observation is related to others made by Sussmann concerning the approach taken by Urbach in correlating the methods and writings of northern French tosafists with those of their German counterparts. See Sussmann, 39–40, 47–54; and cf. below, ch. 2, n. 27.) One has the sense, however, that Urbach was a bit more attuned to these issues in the revised (fourth) edition of *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, which appeared in 1980, than he was in the first edition, which was published in 1955.

⁹See, e.g., Urbach, "Ha-Mesorot 'al Torat ha-Sod bi-Tequfat ha-Tanna'im," *Studies in Mysticism and Religion Presented to Gershom G. Scholem*, ed. E. E. Urbach et al. (Jerusalem, 1967) [Hebrew section], 1–28; idem, *Hazal* (Jerusalem, 1983⁵), 81–114, 161–75; and cf. idem, "Asqezis ve-Yissurim be-Torat Hazal," *Sefer Yovel le-Yitzhak Baer*, ed. S. W. Baron et al. (Jerusalem, 1961), 48–68; *Hazal*, 384–96. See also the assessments of Sussmann, "Mif'alo ha-Madda'i," 73–74, n. 148, 77–78, n. 151; Elliot Wolfson, *Through a Speculum That Shines* (Princeton, 1994), 78, 122; Yosef Dan, "Demuto shel Hakham He'n u-Ma'amdo shel ha-Mequbbal be-Tarbut Yisra'el," *Proceedings of the Eleventh World Congress of Jewish Studies* [Div. C, vol. 2] (Jerusalem, 1994) [Hebrew section], 7–8; idem, "Sheloshah Sefarim Hadashim be-Heqer Sifrut ha-Hekhalot ve-ha-Merkavah," *Tarbiz* 65 (1996):538.

¹⁰See, e.g., Y. Dan, *Torat ha-Sod shel Hasidut Ashkenaz* (Jerusalem, 1968). Dan refers to R. Isaac b. Moses Or Zarua^c (66, 188), who preserved esoteric material from the German Pietists in his *Sefer Or Zarua^c*, and to R. Jacob (b. Asher) *Ba'al ha-Turim* (78), who mentions esoteric prayer interpretations of the Pietists. Gershom Scholem makes no mention of tosafists in his chapter on *Hasidei Ashkenaz* in *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (New York, 1941). Note also the almost complete absence of references to tosafists in *Mysticism, Magic and Kabbalah in Ashkenazi Judaism*, ed. K. E. Grözinger and Joseph Dan (Berlin, 1995). Cf. Scholem, *Origins of the Kabbalah* (Princeton, 1987), 239–40, 249–51; Moshe Idel, *Kabbalah: New Perspectives* (New Haven, 1988), 91–92; and Wolfson, *Through a Speculum That Shines*, 111, 191.

¹¹Yitzhak Baer, "Ha-Megammah ha-Datit/ha-Hevratit shel Sefer Hasidim," *Zion* 3 (1937):10–14; 18–19, at n. 38.

no discussion of the German Pietists referred in any meaningful way to the tosafist enterprise.

Studies which appeared in that decade maintained that significant aspects of a broad Pietist critique concerning talmudic and rabbinic studies, as well as prayer practices, were directed toward Ashkenazic talmudists—including tosafists—by implication if not by name. Among the Pietists' demands were an uncompromising insistence on certain textual variants and distinctive practices in prayer, the cultivation of liturgical poetry and its interpretation, the expansion of biblical studies, and the primacy of talmudic learning that would be geared more toward reaching practical halakhic conclusions and less toward unbridled dialectical exercises. Nonetheless, even in these studies, the Pietists remained fundamentally outside tosafist circles and vice versa, with both groups portrayed as somewhat at odds with each other.¹²

In addition, the interest expressed in the study of *sod* by certain Ashkenazic rabbinic scholars in the pre-Crusade period was believed to have bypassed the rabbinic legalists in twelfth-century northern France who changed the face of talmudic studies following the First Crusade. Scholars have assumed that this interest was retained only by the German Pietists, who were consciously driven to return to earlier patterns or models of spirituality. (Indeed, the influence of a number of pre-Crusade rabbinic values can also be seen in the Pietist critique, just described, with regard to exoteric areas of study.) Moreover, R. Judah *he-Hasid* was a direct descendant of the Qalonymides, a leading pre-Crusade family whose knowledge of *sod* has been documented. The sentiments expressed in the writings of *Hasidei Ashkenaz* concerning the importance of good lineage (*yihus*) in marriage and in other societal contexts undoubtedly stemmed from the fact that the Pietists were themselves German blue bloods.¹³

¹²H. H. Ben-Sasson, “*Hasidei Ashkenaz ‘al Haluqat Qinyanim Ḥomriyyim u-Nekhasim Ruḥaniyyim Bein Benei ha-Adam*,” *Zion* 35 (1970):77–79; Haym Soloveitchik, “Three Themes in the *Sefer Hasidim*,” *AJS Review* 1 (1976):311–57; Israel Ta-Shma, “*Mizvat Talmud Torah ki-Ve’ayah Ḥevratit-Datit be-Sefer Hasidim*,” *Sefer Bar Ilan* 14–15 (1977):98–113. See also *idem*, *Ha-Nigleh shebe-Nistar* (Tel Aviv, 1995), 104, n. 101; my *Jewish Education and Society*, 86–91; and cf. Ivan Marcus, *Piety and Society* (Leiden, 1981), 102–5.

¹³See Avraham Grossman, “*Yihus Mishpahah u-Meqomo ba-Hevrah ha-Yehudit be-Ashkenaz ha-Qedumah*,” *Peraqim be-Toledot ha-Hevrah ha-Yehudit*, ed. E. Etkes and Y. Salmon (Jerusalem, 1980), 20–21; *idem*, *Hakhmei Ashkenaz ha-Rishonim* (Jerusalem, 1981), 29–48, 86–92, 408–9, 438–39; Soloveitchik, “Three Themes,” 336–37, 345–54. The well-known responsum of R. Solomon Luria—in which he presents a listing and brief description of many of the leading tosafists, followed by a listing of the

INTRODUCTION

The distance between tosafists and *Hasidei Ashkenaz* was presumed on the basis of a number of other factors as well. Identifying adherents of Pietist teachers such as R. Samuel *he-Hasid*, R. Judah *he-Hasid*, and R. Eleazar of Worms—who did not themselves represent a monolithic approach—is not an easy task. *Sefer Hasidim*, the main exoteric work of *hasidut Ashkenaz*, suggests that the number of *hasidim* in any particular locale was small.¹⁴ Although the

Qalonymides and *Hasidei Ashkenaz* that highlights their involvement with *sod*—fosters the impression that these groups of scholars were fundamentally separate. It must be noted, however, that R. Solomon, by his own indication, reports his information from two distinct sources with different foci. The first (about which R. Solomon says **אעתיין רק מה שמצוותי והוועך** *ל*) is a late thirteenth- or early fourteenth-century treatise that is found also, with variants, in ms. Bodl. 847, fols. 36r–36v. [My thanks to Dr. Avraham David for providing me with a copy of his transcription of the ms. passage. Cf. Urbach, *Ba’alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:253, n. 4*; 321, n. 17. On the dating of this text, see Y. N. Epstein, “*Liqqutim*,” *Ha-Qedem* 1 (1907–8):129–30, who attributes the version cited by Maharshal to a student of R. Meir of Rothenburg, arguably R. Asher b. Yehi’el. The ms. Bodl. version (of which Epstein was unaware) does not contain the reference to Maharam noted by Epstein. See also Grossman, *Hakhmei Ashkenaz ha-Rishonim*, 46–47, n. 68.] This treatise compiles a list of medieval halakhists—beginning with R. Sherira, R. Hai, Rif, and R. Hanan’el—which then gives way to the naming of many tosafists. Included in this list are R. Eleazar of Worms, R. Judah *he-Hasid* (possibly of Regensburg, although the reference is unclear; these two names are found only in the version in *Teshuvot Maharshal*), and other tosafist figures whose pietistic affinities are noted, such as R. Elijah *he-Hasid* of Paris (see below, ch. 3, n. 95) and R. Ezra *ha-Navi* (of Moncontour; see below, ch. 5, n. 67). Cf. David Kaufmann, “Liste de Rabbins Dressée par Azriel Trabotto, *REJ* 4 (1882):208–25, and Eric Zimmer, “*Seder ha-Posqim le-R. Azriel Trabot*,” *Sinai* 77 (1975):237–52.

R. Solomon Luria then adds a Qalonymide family chain of tradition, which he reports having found (**שׁוֹב מצאתי**). The bulk of this material—minus some embellishment; see, e.g., *Sefer Hasidim*—Ms. Parma H3280, ed. Ivan Marcus (Jerusalem, 1985), editor’s introduction, 19–20, n. 45, and below, ch. 2, n. 85—is similar to passages in the esoteric prayer commentary of R. Eleazar of Worms. See *Perushei Siddur ha-Tefillah la-Roqeqah*, ed. Moshe Hershler (Jerusalem, 1992), 1:228–29; and cf. Grossman, *Hakhmei Ashkenaz ha-Rishonim*, 31–32, 44–47. Thus, the absence of any correlation between the names in the two listings copied by Maharshal in his responsum is a function of their separate origins, rather than a statement by Maharshal (or an earlier compiler) concerning the relationship (or lack of relationship) between the scholars in these texts.

¹⁴See, e.g., Jacob Katz, *Exclusiveness and Tolerance* (New York, 1962), 98–99; Gershom Scholem, “Three Types of Jewish Piety,” *Eranos-Jahrbuch* 38 (1969):344; Soloveitchik, “Three Themes,” 336–38; and cf. idem, “Le-Ta’arikh *Hibburo shel ‘Sefer Hasidim’*,” *Tarbut ve-Hevrah be-Toledot Yisra’el Bimei ha-Benayim*, ed. Reuven Bonfil et al. (Jerusalem, 1989), 383–88; and Tamar Alexander-Frizer, *The Pious Sinner* (Tübingen, 1991), 4–8.

tosafist R. Samson of Sens was aware of the distinctive *tallit* worn by *Hasidei Ashkenaz*,¹⁵ no separate Pietist communities appear to have been established. Indeed, Ashkenazic rabbinic literature does not even allude to the struggles between Pietists and non-Pietists that are referred to explicitly in *Sefer Hasidim* and other Pietist texts.¹⁶ R. Eleazar of Worms maintained there was no one to whom he could transmit Pietist esoteric lore (*torat ha-sod*); however, recent research indicates that he did have students in this realm, despite his statements to the contrary.¹⁷

In looking for disciples of *hasidut Ashkenaz*, a distinction should be made between those who followed certain Pietist teachings or doctrines and those who were full-fledged members of the Pietist movement. Another useful distinction that has already been drawn contrasts the sectarian approach favored by R. Judah *he-Hasid*, which entailed more radical forms of atonement and pietism, with the personalist program advocated by R. Eleazar of Worms (author not only of the oft-cited *Sefer Roqeqah* but also a signatory on *Taqqanot Shum*), which was more compatible with existing societal customs and institutions.¹⁸ Ostensibly, R. Eleazar's pietistic and penitential regimens would have been easier to follow than those of R. Judah.

In any case, aspects of the foregoing analysis suggest that disciples and followers of the Pietists would be found primarily, if not exclusively, in Germany. Indeed, small circles of rabbinic scholars who followed aspects of the teachings of *Hasidei Ashkenaz* have been identified near where R. Judah

¹⁵See R. Samson's responsum, preserved in *She'elot u-Teshuvot Maharam mi-Rothenburg* (Prague, 1895), #287.

¹⁶See J. Dan, "Ashkenazi Hasidism, 1941–1991: Was There Really a Hasidic Movement in Medieval Germany?" *Gershom Scholem's Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism 50 Years After*, ed. Peter Schäfer and Joseph Dan (Tübingen, 1993), 87–101, and I. Marcus, "The Historical Meaning of *Hasidei Ashkenaz*: Fact, Fiction or Cultural Self-Image?" *Gershom Scholem's Major Trends*, 103–14.

¹⁷See, e.g., Daniel Abrams, "The Literary Emergence of Esotericism in German Pietism," *Shofar* 12 (1994):67–85, and Israel Ta-Shma, "Mashehu 'al Biqqoret ha-Miqra Bimei ha-Benayim," *Ha-Miqra bi-Re'i Mefarshav [Sefer Zikkaron le-Sarah Kamin]*, ed. Sarah Japhet (Jerusalem, 1994), 453–59.

¹⁸See, e.g., Marcus, *Piety and Society*, 54–74, 109–20, 127–29, and idem, "Judah the Pietist and Eleazar of Worms: From Charismatic to Conventional Leadership," *Conference Proceedings: Jewish Mystical Leadership, 1200–1270* (Jewish Theological Seminary, New York, 1989), 15–21. Cf. Soloveitchik, "Three Themes," 347–49, and my "On the Role of Bible Study in Medieval Ashkenaz," *The Frank Talmage Memorial Volume*, ed. Barry Walfish (Haifa, 1993), 1:166, n. 61.

INTRODUCTION

he-*Hasid* resided, first in Spires and later in proximity to Regensburg. Some of these followers were themselves Qalonymide descendants.¹⁹

Yet specific teachings and more general goals of the German Pietists also appear to have had an impact on tosafists in northern France during the thirteenth century. Both Urbach and Jacob Katz suggested (approximately forty years ago) that R. Moses of Coucy was influenced by the German Pietists with regard to procedures for repentance and penance, as well as in his attitudes toward non-Jews. To be sure, R. Moses' unique role as a traveling preacher may have contributed to his interest in these areas, but this role also reflects the influence of *Hasidei Ashkenaz*.²⁰

More recently, the tosafist academy at Evreux—headed by the brothers R. Moses, R. Samuel, and R. Isaac b. Shne'ur—has been identified as one that espoused several key doctrines and teachings of the German Pietists, even though there is scant evidence for any direct contact between them.²¹ Some examples of affinity include the downplaying of tosafist dialectic, the study of those areas of the talmudic and rabbinic corpus that were often neglected in medieval Europe, the development of proper intention in prayer, and the production of liturgical commentaries and handbooks, as well as *piyyutim*.

¹⁹See Yaakov Sussmann, "Massoret Limmud u-Massoret Nosah shel Talmud Yerushalmi," *Mehqarim be-Sifrut ha-Talmudit le-Regel Melot Shemonim Shanah le-Sha'ul Lieberman* (Jerusalem, 1983), 14, n. 11, 34–35; idem, "Mif'alo ha-Madda'i," 51–52, n. 87; Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:207, 222, 375–76, 420; Israel Ta-Shma, "Le-Toledot ha-Yehudim be-Polin ba-Me'ot ha-Yod Bet/ha-Yod Gimmel," *Zion* 53 (1988):347–69, and *Zion* 54 (1989):205–8; and my *Jewish Education and Society*, 75–76 [to 174, n. 62, add *Sefer Hasidim*, ed. Judah Wistinetzki, (Frankfurt, 1924), sec. 588]. Cf. my "On the Role of Bible Study," 1:157–58; and below, ch. 1, n. 76.

²⁰See Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot* (Jerusalem, 1955), 387, and Katz, *Exclusiveness and Tolerance*, 102–5. See also Shraga Abramson, "Inyanu be-Sefer Mizvot Gadol," *Sinai* 80 (1976):210–16, and my "Rabbinic Attitudes Toward Nonobservance in the Medieval Period," *Jewish Tradition and the Nontraditional Jew*, ed. J. J. Schachter (Northvale, 1992), 24–26.

²¹The doctrines of the Pietists probably reached Evreux through literary channels. Nonetheless, a passage in Gedalyah ibn Yahya's *Shalshelet ha-Qabbalah* (sixteenth century) raises the possibility that a R. Samuel b. Judah—who studied with R. Eleazar of Worms and with Eleazar's teacher, R. Moses ha-Kohen of Mainz—also studied subsequently at Evreux. See Norman Golb, *Toledot ha-Yehudim be-'Ir Rouen Bime'i ha-Benayim* (Tel Aviv, 1976), 98–99; Aptowitzer, *Mavo le-Sefer Rabiah*, 199–200; Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:407; and cf. *Teshuvot u-Pesaqim*, ed. Kupfer, 312. [For evidence of a fourth brother, R. Hayyim, see *Tosafot Rabbenu Perez 'al Massekhet Eruvin*, ed. Chaim Dickman (Jerusalem, 1991), 215 (68b). Cf. *Tosafot ha-Rosh 'al Massekhet Pesahim*, ed. Avraham Shoshana (Jerusalem, 1997), editor's introduction, 12–13.]

Moreover, significant parallels between several works of Rabbenu Yonah of Gerona (especially *Sefer ha-Yir'ah*) and *Sefer Hasidim*, noted by scholars at the beginning of the twentieth century but never sufficiently explained, can be easily accounted for by the fact that Rabbenu Yonah studied in his early years at the academy of Evreux.²² Additional instances of pietistic practices and conceptions among tosafists, in forms similar to those of *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, are the subject of the first chapter.

In addition to considerations noted earlier in this introduction, the relative inability of modern scholarship to detect the presence of mysticism and magic in tosafist circles may be more fully understood by considering several of the approaches taken by Joshua Trachtenberg in his pioneering work, *Jewish Magic and Superstition* (subtitled *A Study in Folk Religion*), originally published sixty years ago.²³ Following the work of Lynn Thorndike in particular, Trachtenberg offered a thorough treatment of medieval Jewish magic, relying in large measure upon *Sefer Hasidim* and other published writings of the German Pietists, as well as the writings of Ashkenazic halakhists.

Nonetheless, Trachtenberg was unaware of several important developments, mostly because of circumstances beyond his control. He was not familiar with many manuscript passages involving both twelfth- and thirteenth-century tosafists, as well as German Pietists, that have an important bearing on the topics in which he was interested.²⁴ Nor did he know the full extent of the Pietists' rich theosophical literature (and the impact which that literature had on Spanish kabbalah). Finally, Trachtenberg was not sufficiently aware of the texts of *Hekhalot* literature, the significance of this literature for the German Pietists (and for other Ashkenazic rabbinic figures), or the role played by Ashkenazic Jews in preserving (and editing) this corpus.²⁵ It should be noted that in the first half of the ninth century, Agobard of Lyons learned from

²²See my "Educational Theory and Practice in Ashkenaz during the High Middle Ages" (Ph.D. diss., Yeshiva University, 1987), 176–80; Israel Ta-Shma, "Hasidut Ashkenaz bi-Sefarad: Rabbenu Yonah Gerondi—Ha-Ish u-Fo'alo," *Galut Aḥar Golah*, ed. Aharon Mirsky, et al. (Jerusalem, 1988), 165–73, 181–88; and my *Jewish Education and Society*, 74–79, 172–80. Cf. Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:479–86; Shimon Shokef, *Jewish Ethics and Jewish Mysticism in Sefer ha-Yashar* (Lewiston, 1991), 18; J. N. Epstein, "Al ha-Kol," *Mehqarim be-Sifrut ha-Talmud u-Vileshonot Shemiyot* 2 (Jerusalem, 1988), 776–89; Binyamin Richler, "Al Kitvei Yad shel 'Sefer ha-Yir'ah' ha-Meyuḥas le-Rabbenu Yonah Gerondi," *Alei Sefer* 8 (1981):51–57; and Sussmann, "Mif'alo ha-Madda'i," 34, n. 48.

²³New York, 1939. There have been numerous reprintings. Cf. Steven Wasserstrom in *AJS Review* 20 (1995):202.

²⁴Cf. Yosef Dan, *Torat ha-Sod shel Hasidut Ashkenaz*, 37–38, n. 7; 184.

INTRODUCTION

Jews in his realm about concepts and constructs such as the magical powers of the letters of the alphabet, the nature of the *kisse ha-kavod*, and *Shi'ur Qomah*-like descriptions of the Almighty, all of which reflect material found in the *Hekhalot* corpus. Whether or not the Jews who reported this material were fully aware of its esoteric dimensions, their report suggests that pieces of *Hekhalot* literature, if not entire sections, were known (and available) to Jews in central France well before the year 1000. The presence of this literature in southern Italy at that time, and in the Rhineland by at least the early eleventh century, has also been established.²⁵

²⁵See, e.g. Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, 84–110; Baron, *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*, 6:44; Dan, *Torat ha-Sod shel Hasidut Ashkenaz*, 13–14, 19–20, 24–28, 205–8; idem, “*Sheloshah Sefarim Hadashim*” 540–42; Israel Ta-Shma, “*Sifriyyatam shel Ḥakhmei Ashkenaz Benei ha-Me’ah ha-Yod Alef/ha-Yod Bet*,” *Qiryat Sefer* 60 (1985):307–9, and *Qiryat Sefer* 61 (1986–87):581; Moshe Idel, *Kabbalah: New Perspectives* (New Haven, 1988), 88–92, 191–97; idem, *Messianic Mystics* (New Haven, 1998), 47–51; Peter Schäfer, “The Ideal of Piety of the Ashkenazi Hasidim and Its Roots in Jewish Tradition,” *Jewish History* 4 (1990):9–23; idem, *The Hidden and Manifest God: Some Major Themes in Early Jewish Mysticism* (Albany, 1992), 6, 64–65, 92–95, 157–62; Elliot Wolfson, “*Demut Ya’aqov Haquqah be-Kisse ha-Kavod*: ‘Iyyun Nosaf be-Torat ha-Sod shel Hasidei Ashkenaz,” *Massu’ot* [Studies in Kabbalistic Literature and Jewish Philosophy in Memory of Prof. Ephraim Gottlieb], ed. M. Oron and A. Goldreich (Jerusalem, 1994), 131–85; idem, *Through a Speculum That Shines*, 80–81, 234–47; idem, “The Mystical Significance of Torah-Study in German Pietism,” *Jewish Quarterly Review* 84 (1993):47–50; Ivan Marcus, “*Qiddush ha-Shem be-Ashkenaz ve-Sippur R. Amnon mi-Magenza*,” *Qedushat ha-Hayyim ve-Heruf ha-Nefesh*, ed. I. Gafni and A. Ravitzky (Jerusalem, 1993), 136–37; Annelies Kuyt, “Traces of a Mutual Influence of the Haside Ashkenaz and the Hekhalot Literature,” *From Narbonne to Regensburg: Studies in Medieval Hebrew Texts*, ed. N. A. van Uchelen and I. E. Zwiep (Amsterdam, 1993), 62–86; idem, “The Haside Ashkenaz and Their Mystical Sources: Continuity and Innovation,” *Jewish Studies in a New Europe* (Copenhagen, 1998), 462–71; Michael Swartz, *Scholastic Magic* (Princeton, 1996), 219–20; *Siddur Rabbenu Shelomoh mi-Germaiza ve-Siddur Hasidei Ashkenaz*, ed. Moshe Hershler (Jerusalem, 1972), 82; and below, ch. 1, n. 40.

²⁶See Moshe Idel, “*Ha-Mahshavah ha-Ra’ah shel ha-E-l*,” *Tarbiz* 49 (1980):356–57; idem, “*Tefisat ha-Torah be-Sifrut ha-Hekhalot ve-Gilgulehah ba-Qabbalah*,” *Mehqerei Yerushalayim be-Mahshevet Yisra’el* 1 (1981):28, n. 21; Reuven Bonfil, “*Eduto shel Agobard me-Li’on ‘al ‘Olamam ha-Ruhani shel Yehudei ‘Iro ba-Me’ah ha-Teshi’it*,” *Mehqarim be-Qabbalah, be-Filosofyah Yehudit uve-Sifrut ha-Musar vehe-Hagut*, ed. J. Dan and J. Hacker (Jerusalem, 1986), 333–38, 347–48; Elliot Wolfson, “The Theosophy of Shabbetai Donnolo, with Special Emphasis on the Doctrine of *Sefirot* in His *Sefer Hakhmoni*,” *The Frank Talmage Memorial Volume*, ed. Walfish, 2:281–316; Ta-Shma in the preceding note; and below, ch. 3, n. 1. See also Saul Lieberman, *Sheq’in* (Jerusalem, 1939), 11, for additional evidence from northern France; and cf. *‘Arugat ha-Bosem*, ed. Urbach, 4:78, n. 38*.

In addition—or perhaps as a result—as the subtitle of his book indicates, Trachtenberg viewed medieval Jewish magic as most closely related to superstition and folk religion rather than as an offshoot or an allied field of Jewish mysticism. Since the German Pietists recorded and were involved with many aspects of magic, and since their mystical teachings were (in Trachtenberg's view) markedly less sophisticated than those of their Spanish and Provençal counterparts, Trachtenberg was inclined to study this magic from the popular level up rather than from the mystical level down.²⁷ In fact, however, the nature of much of the magic itself—as well as the parallels to *Hekhalot* literature and the involvement of both the German Pietists and certain tosafists in studies that are decidedly mystical—suggests how Ashkenazic magic derived its status in the eyes of rabbinic scholars as a discipline related to mysticism rather than as a transformation of folk custom. We will find, for example, that within Ashkenazic rabbinic circles there was a greater interest in using Divine or angelic names for incantations and prayers than in using them in conjunction with amulets, talismans, or other kinds of objects and images.²⁸

²⁷Cf. Ithamar Gruenwald, “Ha-Mageyah veva-Mitos—Ha-Mehqar veva-Mezi’ut ha-Historit,” *Eshel Be’er Sheva* 4, ed. Haviva Pedaya (Jerusalem, 1996), 11–12, 23–24; Deena Stein's review of Daniel Sperber, *Magic and Folklore in Rabbinic Literature*, in *Mehqerei Yerushalayim be-Folqor Yehudi* 18 (1996):137–39; Jeffrey Russell, *Witchcraft in the Middle Ages* (Ithaca, 1984), 1–13; Richard Kieckhefer, “The Specific Rationality of Medieval Magic,” *AHR* 99 (1984): 813–36; and idem, *Magic in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1989), 151–75.

²⁸See, e.g., Israel Ta-Shma, “Meqorah u-Meqomah shel Tefillat ‘Aleynu le-Shabeah’ be-Siddur ha-Tefillah: Seder ha-Ma’amadot u-She’elat Siyyum ha-Tefillah,” *The Frank Talmage Memorial Volume*, ed. Walfish [Hebrew section], 1:88–90; and Y. Dan, *Torat ha-Sod shel Hasidut Ashkenaz* 28, 74–75, 88–94, 219–22. Cf. Baron, *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*, 6:46–47; Gerrit Bos, “Jewish Traditions on Strengthening Memory and Leone Modena’s Evaluation,” *Jewish Studies Quarterly* 2 (1995):41–45; Moshe Idel, *Hasidism: Between Ecstasy and Magic* (Albany, 1995), 68; Kieckhefer, *Magic in the Middle Ages*, 69–80; Ioan Couliano, *Eros and Magic in the Renaissance* (Chicago, 1997), 107–11, 130–43; Judah Goldin, “The Magic of Magic and Superstition,” in his *Studies in Midrash and Related Literature*, ed. B. L. Eichler and J. H. Tigay (Philadelphia, 1988), 353–57; Norman Golb, “Aspects in the Historical Background of Jewish Life in Medieval Egypt,” *Jewish Medieval and Renaissance Studies*, ed. Alexander Altmann (Cambridge, Mass., 1967), 13; Yuval Harari, “Im Biqqashta Laharog Adam: Kishfei Hezeq ve-Hitgonenut Mipneihem be-Mageyah ha-Yehudit ha-Qedumah,” *Madda’ei ha-Yahadut* 37 (1997): 127–34; and idem, *Harba de-Mosheh* (Jerusalem, 1997), introduction, 70–76. A similar distinction can be made between *Hekhalot* literature itself and *Sefer ha-Razim*. See, e.g., Rebecca Lesses, “Speaking with Angels: Jewish and Greco-Egyptian Revelatory Adjurations,” *Harvard Theological Review* 89 (1996):57–58. See below, ch. 3, n. 116; ch. 4, n. 42; and cf. Dov Schwartz, *Astrologiyyah u-Mageyah be-Hagut ha-Yehudit Bimei ha-Benayim* (Ramat Gan, 1999), 23, 265–66.

INTRODUCTION

This suggestion leads us in a direction that is similar to what Immanuel Etkes has concluded with regard to increased reliance upon magic by Ashkenazic scholars in eastern Europe at the end of the seventeenth century. The heightened interest of talmudic scholars in kabbalah led to a strengthening of their belief in the efficacy of magic against demonic forces. The association of magic with kabbalah during a period in which kabbalah was prominent enhanced the status of magical practices for these rabbinic scholars.²⁹

Evidence for the correlation between mysticism and magic held by rabbinic scholars in medieval Ashkenaz, primarily in manuscript passages, will be seen throughout the course of this study. For now, two brief statements about the overarching relationship between these two disciplines will suffice. Moshe Idel has argued that Jewish magic—which he defines as “a series of acts and beliefs that presume the possibility of achieving (beneficial) physical results through the use of techniques not subject to empirical explanation”—and Jewish mysticism ought to be studied and classified together, as forms of religious expression that are virtually intertwined. The soundness of this approach has already been demonstrated by the greater emphasis in recent scholarship on the interplay between mysticism and magic in *Hekhalot* literature, *hasidut Ashkenaz*, and Hasidism. To be sure, magic is a “lower” form of religious expression than mysticism, since magic seeks to effect a lower stratum of existence. Yet Jewish magic, no less than *torat ha-sod*, is based on reliable traditions and teachers.³⁰ Idel also compares and contrasts the mystical study or contemplation of Divine Names and their powers with the magical activation and use of these powers.³¹

²⁹I. Etkes, “Meqomam shel ha-Mageyah u-Va‘alei Shem ba-Hevrah ha-Ashkenazit be-Mifneh ha-Me’ot ha-Yod Zayin/ha-Yod Het,” *Zion* 60 (1995):69–104. See also Moshe Rosman, *Founder of Hasidism: A Quest for the Historical Ba’al Shem Tov* (Berkeley, 1996), 13–26; and Idel, “Jewish Magic from the Renaissance Period to Early Hasidism,” *Religion, Science, and Magic*, ed. Jacob Neusner (New York, 1989), 108–10.

³⁰See Idel, “Yahadut, Mistiqah Yehudit u-Mageyah,” *Madda‘ei ha-Yahadut* 36 (1996):25–40 [= “On Judaism, Jewish Mysticism and Magic,” *Envisioning Magic*, ed. Peter Schäfer and H. G. Kippenberg (Leiden, 1997), 195–214]; idem, *Hasidism*, 65–81; and cf. R. J. Z. Werblowsky, *Joseph Karo: Lawyer and Mystic* (Philadelphia, 1980), 38–83; and Scholem, *Origins of the Kabbalah*, 97–123. Note the classic distinction—formulated by Evelyn Underhill, *Mysticism* (London, 1910), 70—that magic signifies the wish to control reality for the magician’s personal agenda, while mysticism promotes the unselfish goal of mystical union. On the relationship between secrecy and magic, see Richard Kieckhefer, *Magic in the Middle Ages*, 140–44.

³¹Cf. Idel, “Al Kavvanat Shemoneh ‘Esreh Ezel R. Yizhaq Sagi-Nahor,” *Massu’ot*, ed. Oron and Goldreich, 25–42; idem, “Defining Kabbalah: The Kabbalah of the Divine Names,” *Mystics of the Book*, ed. Robert Herrera (New York, 1993), 97–122.

Similarly, Elliot Wolfson has written recently that “in some cases it is extremely hard to draw the line between mysticism and magic within Jewish sources.... One may legitimately distinguish mysticism from magic on the basis of the stated goals of a given source, but one must at the same time recognize the conceptual underpinnings shared by both enterprises.” Wolfson also notes the close relationship between magic and mysticism in the *Hekhalot* corpus. The mystical component utilizes magical techniques, while the magical component is often linked to mystical experiences.³²

More precise definitions of magic and mysticism, as these two phenomena manifest themselves in medieval Ashkenazic rabbinic texts, will emerge from our treatment of those texts.³³ Before proceeding to that phase of our discussion, however, I shall turn to an analysis of pietism in medieval Ashkenaz. This analysis will ultimately show that the connection between pietism and mysticism found within *hasidut Ashkenaz* also holds true for those tosafists who were inclined toward mysticism and magic.

³²See Elliot Wolfson, “Jewish Mysticism: A Philosophical Approach,” in *History of Jewish Philosophy*, ed. D. H. Frank and Oliver Leaman (London, 1997), 454–55, 459. Cf. Alexander Altmann, *The Meaning of Jewish Existence*, ed. Alfred Ivry (Hannover 1991), 58–61; and L. H. Schiffman and M. D. Swartz, *Hebrew and Aramaic Incantation Texts from the Cairo Geniza* (Sheffield, 1991), 12–26.

³³Michael Swartz, *Scholastic Magic*, 18–20, identifies three central elements in Jewish magical texts from late antiquity and the early Middle Ages: emphasis on the power of the name of God, intermediacy of the angels in negotiating between Divine providence and human needs, and application of Divine Names and ritual practices for the needs of specific individuals. In addition to the studies cited by Swartz as the basis of his formulation, see Michael Fishbane, “Aspects of Jewish Magic in the Ancient Rabbinic Period,” *The Samuel Goldman Lectures 2* (Chicago, 1979), 29–38; Peter Hayman, “Was God a Magician? Sefer Yesira and Jewish Magic,” *Journal of Jewish Studies* 40 (1989):225–37; Claudia Rohrbacher-Sticker, “Magische Traditionen der New Yorker Hekhalot-Handschriften JTS 8128 im Kontext ihrer Gesamtredaktion,” *Frankfurter Judaistische Beiträge* 17 (1989):101–49; Lesses, “Speaking with Angels,” 41–60; Brigitte Kern-Ulmer, “The Depiction of Magic in Rabbinic Texts: The Rabbinic and the Greek Concept of Magic,” *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 27 (1996):289–303; and below, ch. 3, n. 10. Cf. Dov Schwartz, “Mageyah, Madda Nisyoni u-Metodah Madda’it be-Mishnat ha-Rambam,” *Mehqerei Yerushalayim be-Mahshevot Yisra’el* 14 (1998): 25–45.



1

Asceticism, Pietism, and *Perishut*

The Approach of *Hasidei Ashkenaz*

The German Pietists combined their interest in esoteric studies with an extensive program of pietistic behaviors and outlooks. These included manifestations of asceticism and *perishut* such as acts of self-denial (beyond those observances mandated by Jewish law), the professing of extreme humility bordering on self-humiliation, and sustained or pronounced stringency in ritual matters.¹ In order to identify and evaluate properly the presence of ascetic and pietistic practices within the larger rabbinic culture of medieval

¹See, e.g., Yitzhak Baer, "Ha-Megammat ha-Datit/ha-Hevratit shel Sefer Ḥasidim," *Zion* 3 (1937):1–50, esp. 6–7; Gershom Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (Jerusalem, 1954³), 92; Yosef Dan, *Sifrut ha-Musar ve-ha-Derush* (Jerusalem, 1975), 62–65; Haym Soloveitchik, "Three Themes in the *Sefer Ḥasidim*," *AJS Review* 1 (1976):318–20, 329–37, 352–54; Ivan Marcus, *Piety and Society* (Leiden, 1981), 11, 34; Daniel Sperber, *Minhagei Yisra'el* 1 (Jerusalem, 1989), 194–97, *Minhagei Yisra'el* 2 (Jerusalem, 1991), 106–7; and Israel Ta-Shma, *Halakhah, Minhag u-Mezi'ut* (Jerusalem, 1996), 160–63, 249–50. Scholem lists "ascetic renunciation of the things of this world" as one of the "three things above all others [that] go to make the true Ḥasid." Of course, the *tiqqunei teshuvah* (penances) of the German Pietists were also suffused with a large measure of asceticism. See Baer, 18–20; Scholem, 105–6; Asher Rubin, "The Concept of Repentance Among Hasidey Ashkenaz," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 16 (1965):161–76; Dan, 133; idem, "Le-Toledot Torat ha-Teshuvah shel Hasidut Ashkenaz," *Yovel Orot*, ed. B. Ish Shalom and S. Rosenberg (Jerusalem, 1985), 221–28; Marcus, 124–28; Sperber, 1:128–32; Shimon Shokef, *Ha-Teshuvah be-Sifrut ha-Musar ha-Ivrit, be-Filosofyah ha-Yehudit uva-Qabbalah* (Lewiston, 1995), 64–70; Talya Fishman, "The Penitential System of

CHAPTER 1

Ashkenaz, it is worthwhile to assess briefly the scope and intent of these practices in the thought of *Hasidei Ashkenaz*.

Stringency, self-denial, and even self-affliction were cultivated and valued by the German Pietists not as ends unto themselves, but as means of fulfilling the hidden Will of God, securing atonement, or achieving future rewards: “for according to what one enjoys in this world, one loses reward in the world to come.”² Passages in *Sefer Hasidim* recommend regular fasting and other forms of personal asceticism not only as part of the German Pietists’ penitential system—i.e., as a response to sins that have already been committed—but also as a means of avoiding sin and enhancing an individual’s devotion by recognizing his debt to his Creator.³ R. Judah *he-Hasid* himself fasted regularly

Hasidei Ashkenaz and the Problem of Cultural Boundaries,” *Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy* (forthcoming). Several of these studies discuss the impact of Christian penitential practices on the penances prescribed by the Pietists. See also M.-D. Chenu, *Nature, Man, and Society in the Twelfth Century*, ed. Jerome Taylor and Lester Little (Chicago, 1968), 204–13; and I. Ta-Shma, *Ha-Sifrut ha-Parshanim la-Talmud*, vol. 1 (Jerusalem, 1999), 95–96.

Paragraph 1661 (p. 400) in *Sefer Hasidim*, ed. Jehuda Wistinetzki (Frankfurt, 1924) [based on ms. Parma (De Rossi) 1131, referred to hereafter as *SHP*]—which appears as part of a unit entitled *פְּרִישָׁוֹת מִן הָעוֹלָם פְּנֵי לְבָב וּמִנוֹחָה לְגֻפָּךְ וְאַהֲבָתָה* (=*SHP* 280), para. 89—asserts that in cases where rabbinic opinions differ, it is best to follow the stringent position in situations where no economic loss is involved, even if the *halakhah* can be legitimately decided in favor of the more lenient position. See below, ch. 2, n. 59.

²*SHP* para. 277 (p. 89), and cf. para. 15 (p. 15). See also *Sefer Hasidim*, ed. Reuven Margoliot (Jerusalem, 1957) [based on the edition published in Bologna (1538), referred to hereafter as *SHB*], para. 89 [=*SHB* 280], 97 (=*SHP* 280): *חַכְמָם אֶחָד צָהָר לְבָנו שֶׁלְאַיְהָנָה יוֹתֵר מִזֶּה עַוְלָם טְרָדָה הַלְבָב וַיְגַעַת הַגּוֹף*. [Cf. the formulations of Rabbenu Yonah, below, n. 90.] On the nature and provenance of the penitential material in the first unit of *SHB* (secs. 1–152), see Ivan Marcus, “The Recensions and Structure of *Sefer Hasidim*,” *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* 45 (1978): 137, 152–53, and cf. Yehudah Galinsky, “Rabbenu Mosheh mi-Coucy ke-Hasid, Darshan u-Folmosan: Hebbetim me-‘Olamo ha-Mahshavti u-Fe’iluto ha-Zibburit,” (M.A. thesis, Yeshiva University, 1993), 74, n. 55, and below, n. 71. Although the strongly ascetic forms of penance are largely absent from this unit, the attitudes expressed regarding asceticism as a religious value are consistent with what is found in *SHP*. See the next note, and below, ch. 4, n. 2.

³See, e.g., *SHP* 281, 19, 41, 66–67 (cf. *SHB* 527), 942 (*SHB* 340), 1129, 1137, 1290, 1553, 1722 (*SHB* 575), 1882, 1950, and cf. Gerald Blidstein, *Honor Thy Father and Mother* (New York, 1976), 196–97, n. 31, and E. E. Urbach, *Ba’alei ha-Tosafot* (Jerusalem, 1980⁴), 1:192. With regard to *perishut* and *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, I have suggested that the medieval educational blueprint entitled *Sefer Huqqei ha-Torah*, which describes the establishment of academies that housed פְּרִושים, reflects a German milieu

in general and a series of teachings of the German Pietists in particular. The *perishut* referred to in this document has specific parallels to material in *Sefer Hasidim*, and in other texts of the German Pietists. See my *Jewish Education and Society in the High Middle Ages* (Detroit, 1992), appendix A, 101–5.

Haggai Ben-Artzi, “Ha-Perishut be-Sefer Ḥasidim,” *Da’at* 11 (1983):39–45, has argued that despite espousing a philosophy that could lead to asceticism, an ascetic lifestyle was not considered “the good way” according to *Sefer Hasidim*. Although it is true that *Sefer Hasidim* advocates a full marital life, which is one of the proofs offered by Ben-Artzi (see also Soloveitchik, “Three Themes,” 329, n. 51), his argument concerning ascetic practices is flawed in several respects. First, while asserting that *SHB* presents a somewhat different view, Ben-Artzi restricts himself to an analysis of *SHB*. Moreover, he misses a significant nuance within this text. He stresses that *SHB* advises that one should not fast all the time (*tamid*) or that one whose services are needed by others should not weaken himself through fasting (52, 617; note also 527). But at the same time, unnoticed by Ben-Artzi, *SHB* reports (97, 225; see also the end of 617, and the parallel passages in *SHB*) that a number of *hasidim* instructed their children to fast at regular intervals, lest they become too immersed in worldly pleasures. Clearly, *SHB* is advocating a level of asceticism that, at the same time, would not incapacitate a person and thereby defeat its purpose. [Cf. R. Eleazar of Worms, *Sefer Roqeah*, sec. 209, regarding fasting on Mondays and Thursdays; *Arba’ah Turim*, *Orah Hayyim*, 134; and Gedalyahu Alon, “Le-Yishuvah shel Baraita Aḥat,” *Tarbiz* 4 (1933): 285–91.]

Finally, Ben-Artzi seems to misinterpret *SHB* 12. He reads this passage as suggesting that one may enjoy pleasurable foods (*ma’adanim*) that are not being consumed merely to sustain oneself, as long as one does not eat so much as to satiate himself completely. A reading of the full passage, which begins with the phrase **שורש חסידות יראת ועווב את יצרו מפני יראת ה**, yields a different conclusion. *SHB* maintains that a measure of *hasidut* is achieved when a person wishes to enjoy something but he refuses it as a sign of *yir’at ha-Shem*—not because he is under any external pressure or even because of fear of sin, but simply as a means of demonstrating his complete love for and awe of the Almighty. Refusing certain foods is an excellent vehicle for reaching this state, since indulgence in culinary pleasures can lead to bad thoughts. If a person has the opportunity to eat fish or meat or other pleasant foods, he should resist eating them only because of his *yir’at ha-Shem* (and not because of other considerations), and he should not allow himself to become satiated to the full extent of his desire. See also Reuven Margoliot’s notes, *ad loc.*, and cf. *SHB* 1017. In this instance as well, *SHB* is advocating controlled asceticism as a means of expressing genuine dedication and devotion. See also *Sefer Gematri’ot le-R. Yehudah he-Ḥasid* (Los Angeles, 1998), ed. Daniel Abrams and Israel Ta-Shma, 32 (fol. 4v): **וחייב אדם להאכילה את עצמו כדי שייהיה בו כח לפרט את אשתו ובינוי. כת'** [משלי 27:27] **וזי חלב עוים ללחמך שלא תשחוט עוים אלא תחפרנס מן החלב תן חיים לנערותיך שלא ילמד לבניו לאכלי בשר בכל יום כראמי** [השווה חולין פר: לעולם יאכל אדם פחות מהה שיש לו ויתכטה אשתו ובניו במה שיש לו. See *SHB* 1031 for a situation in which a demanding manifestation of personal *perishut* associated with the wearing of *tefillin* is discouraged, because the difficulty in sustaining the *perishut* might lead to neglect of the *mitzvah* itself (ך). See also below, n. 34.

CHAPTER 1

(and frequently), even on the Sabbath.⁴ Moreover, R. Eleazar of Worms suggested that various modes of pietistic thought and behavior could prepare an individual for mystical study or experience.⁵ Members of contemporary mystical conventicles in Provence were often referred to as *perushim*, *nezirim*, and *hasidim*, reflecting similar considerations on their part.⁶

We shall see over the course of this study that among tosafists as well there is a strong correlation between those who advocated or practiced forms of pronounced pietism and those who were involved with dimensions of magic and mysticism. Pietism in tosafist circles did not entail a search for the hidden Divine Will; that was unique to the German Pietists.⁷ But it did include patterns of personal behavior subsumed under the headings of asceticism and *perishut* outlined above.⁸ Although all tosafists demonstrated fealty to Jewish law and its observance, only some tended toward supererogatory behaviors. Before moving, however, to the identification of those tosafists and Ashkenazic rabbinic figures of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries who embraced aspects

⁴See *Haggahot Maimuniyyot*, *Hilkhot Ta'anit*, 1:2[6]. Cf. Yaakov Gartner, *Gilgulei Minhag be-^cOlam ha-Halakhah* (Jerusalem, 1995), 99–100, and S. W. Baron, *A Social and Religious History of the Jews* (Philadelphia, 1958), 6:49.

⁵See Marcus, *Piety and Society*, 21–22, 36, 117–18. Cf. Elliot Wolfson, “The Mystical Significance of Torah-Study in German Pietism,” *JQR* 84 (1993):44, n. 4; Soloveitchik, “Three Themes,” 321, n. 27; Moshe Idel, *R. Menahem Recanati ha-Mequbbal* (Jerusalem, 1998), 113–19; and below, ch. 2, n. 76, for further discussion. Note that *perishut* is included among the aphorisms of R. Pinhas b. Ya’ir (*‘Avodah Zarah* 20b, and the parallel passage in some editions of *Mishnah Sotah* 9:15), as a stage in achieving spiritual perfection. Cf. *Sefer Roqeah*, *Hilkhot Hasidut*, שורש תורה פרישות מהירות. Note also the stratification of *perishut* in *Sotah* 22b and *Yerushalmi Berakhot* 9:5.

⁶See Gershom Scholem, *Reshit ha-Qabbalah* (Tel Aviv, 1948), 84–91; idem, *Origins of the Kabbalah* (Princeton, 1987), 229–33; Isadore Twersky, *Rabad of Posquières* (Philadelphia, 1980²), 25–29; cf. Idel, “Kabbalah and Elites in Thirteenth-Century Spain,” *Mediterranean Historical Review* 9 (1994):6–7, n. 2; and Gartner, *Gilgulei Minhag*, 90. On asceticism and its role in promoting spirituality in the thought of Nahmanides, see Ritva, *Sefer ha-Zikkaron*, ed. Kalman Kahana (Jerusalem, 1982²), 91–92; Chaim Henoch, *Ha-Ramban ke-Ḥoqer ukhe-Mequbbal* (Jerusalem, 1978), 131–36; Bezalel Safran, “R. Azriel and Nahmanides and the Fall of Man,” *R. Moses Nahmanides (Ramban): Explorations in His Religious and Literary Virtuosity*, ed. Isadore Twersky (Cambridge, Mass., 1983), 83–85; and my “*Nezirut ve-Nidrei Issur be-Mishnatam shel ha-Rambam veva-Ramban*,” *Hadarom* 50 (1990):79–84.

⁷See Soloveitchik, “Three Themes,” 311–25.

⁸See S. D. Fraade, “Ascertical Aspects of Ancient Judaism,” *Jewish Spirituality from the Bible Through the Middle Ages*, ed. Arthur Green (New York, 1987), 253–88, for an excellent methodological overview of the categorization of asceticism in rabbinic literature.

of asceticism and pietism, it will be helpful to survey manifestations of these behaviors in pre-Crusade Ashkenaz.

Pre-Crusade Antecedents

As Avraham Grossman has noted, the liturgical poetry of R. Simeon b. Isaac *ha-Gadol* (c. 950–1030) refers to the cultivation of holiness and *perishut*,⁹ and to related themes: the virtue of modesty; the importance of being able to feel embarrassment and humiliation and thus to recognize more generally the relative insignificance of man; and the goal of being satisfied with little in terms of physical needs and desires.¹⁰ R. Jacob b. Yaqar, a student of R. Simeon *ha-Gadol* and Rabbenu Gershom, and Rashi's major teacher at Mainz in the second half of the eleventh century, was also known for being exceedingly humble and self-effacing in his Divine service and for his *perishut*.¹¹

According to a tradition recorded in *Sefer Hasidim*, R. Jacob would stoop to clean the floor in front of the Holy Ark with his beard. Although the method of cleaning used by R. Jacob may have been exaggerated by *Sefer Hasidim*,¹² there is no reason to doubt the evidence that R. Jacob regularly performed menial tasks that were perhaps better left to others as an indication of his deeply felt piety. Moreover R. Jacob, who is described as being exceedingly

⁹ Avraham Grossman, *Hakhmei Ashkenaz ha-Rishonim* (Jerusalem, 1981), 100–1, 415, n. 15. Note, e.g., the passage in A. M. Habermann, *Piyyutei R. Shim'on b. Yizhaq* (Berlin–Jerusalem, 1938), 101: קידש עצמן בפרשות אורה.

¹⁰ See Habermann, *Piyyutei R. Shim'on b. Yizhaq*, 103: יקר כספו והבו ונעים גדי צאנו מוחמדוי מכללו קריין מה מועילו וחובב ומתהווה את ואלפיו משקהו ומאכלו חברתו וכל מוחמדוי מכללו קריין מה מועילו וחובב ומתהווה את שאינו שלו ... יבין ושכיל בדעתו ושכלו ישםו ויעת במתה גורלו.

¹¹ Grossman, *Hakhmei Ashkenaz ha-Rishonim*, 246–48. For R. Jacob's teachers, see *ibid.*, 237. For the unusually deep modesty of R. Eliezer *ha-Gadol*, an older contemporary of R. Jacob's at Mainz (who was also a student of R. Simeon *ha-Gadol* and Rabbenu Gershom, [ibid., 216]), see *ibid.*, 223.

¹² See *SHP* 991, and David Berger's review of Grossman entitled "Heqer Rabbanut Ashkenaz ha-Qedumah," *Tarbiz* 53 (1984):486–87. On the importance of growing a beard in Pietist thought, cf. ms. Parma 1033, fol. 26r, column 3 (in the name of R. Judah *he-Hasid*, who also commends there the loud and deliberate recitation of *pesuqe de-zimra* [ש"מ]; cf. *SHP* 1620, and Soloveitchik, "Three Themes," 330–33). On the gravity of the prohibition in Pietist thought of shaving with a razor, see the Pietist sources cited in my "Rabbinic Attitudes Toward Nonobservance in the Medieval Period," *Jewish Tradition and the Nontraditional Jew*, ed. Jacob J. Schacter (Northvale, 1992), 26, n. 66; in Eric Zimmer, 'Olam ke-Minhago Noheg (Jerusalem, 1996), 49; in Israel Ta-Shma, "Od li-Ve'ayat ha-Meqorot ha-Ashkenaziyyim be-Sefer ha-Zohar," *Kabbalah* 3 (1998): 262; and in Israel Yuval, *Hakhamim be-Doram* (Jerusalem, 1989), 296–97, n. 54. Cf. below, n. 30, and ch. 4, n. 46.

CHAPTER 1

careful with regard to the performance of ritual slaughter, also ruled that post-partum bleeding—which was considered by the Torah to be non-menstrual blood (*dam tohar*)—should in fact be treated as menstrual blood (*dam niddah*). Those (few) who ruled this way were characterized by Rashi's students as “*benei 'adam... perushim*” who were “exceedingly strict” in separating themselves. This ruling was also espoused by R. Jacob's student, R. Solomon b. Samson. R. Solomon issued a number of stringent rulings in critical ritual matters and argued consistently against the implementation of newly issued halakhic rulings that conflicted with established customs and practices.¹³

A second teacher of Rashi's in Mainz, R. Isaac b. Judah, is also described in the *sifrut de-Vei Rashi* as a *parush*. He earned this sobriquet by eating only a single egg for the final meal before the fast of *Tish'ah be-Av*.¹⁴ R. Isaac's intention was to eat as little before the fast as possible, thereby rendering the fast, which was viewed as a vehicle for repentance, more arduous.¹⁵

Rashi's teacher at Worms, R. Isaac *ha-Levi*, fasted two days in observance of *Yom ha-Kippurim*. Although R. Isaac adopted this position based on his understanding of the requirements of talmudic law, the motivation of personal piety is apparent, since he did not require others to do it. Moreover, the only German authorities who followed this practice in the tosafist period were

¹³Grossman, *Hakhmei Ashkenaz ha-Rishonim*, 334–38. Both these tendencies are broadly characteristic of the German Pietists as well. See Soloveitchik, “Three Themes,” 353, n. 133. Zimmer maintains (229–31, esp. n. 45), against Grossman, that the stance of R. Jacob and R. Solomon in their *dam tohar* ruling may reflect purely halakhic considerations rather than a notion of *perishut*. But, as has been noted, the association of these rabbinic scholars with other rulings and characteristics of *perishut* and pietism suggests that *perishut*, as an extra-halakhic value, played a role in this instance as well. Indeed, the stringency which treated *dam tohar* as *dam niddah* was later espoused almost exclusively by members of *Hasidei Ashkenaz* and other rabbinic scholars connected with them. See Zimmer, 232–34, and below, ch. 2, n. 86.

¹⁴Grossman, *Hakhmei Ashkenaz ha-Rishonim*, 310. Cf. Israel Ta-Shma, “Al Kammah ‘Inyanei Mahzor Vitry,” *‘Alei Sefer* 11 (1984): 83, n. 5a, and below, n. 18.

¹⁵Cf. *Sefer Roqeah*, sec. 310; *Arba‘ah Turim*, *Orah Hayyim*, sec. 552. The attempt by *Hasidei Ashkenaz* to drastically limit the priestly blessing in the diaspora to the festivals only—because of concerns about ritual impurity (see Zimmer, 135–40, and cf. below, ch. 2, n. 51)—would undoubtedly have been aided, if not partially adumbrated, by R. Isaac b. Judah's ruling that a *kohen* who is a mourner may not participate in the priestly blessing, especially since this ruling was extended to include all unmarried *kohanim*. See, e.g., *She’elot u-Teshuvot R. Meir b. Barukh [mi-Rothenburg]*, ed. Prague, #345; *Shibbolei ha-Leqet*, ed. S. K. Mirsky (New York, 1966), 201; and *Shibbolei ha-Leqet*, ed. S. Buber (Vilna, 1887), *hilkhot semahot*, sec. 43.

R. Judah *he-Hasid* and R. Eliezer b. Joel *ha-Levi* (Rabiah). Even their mutual student, R. Isaac b. Moses *Or Zarua*¹⁶ felt that this practice should be discontinued because it was dangerous—further evidence for the lack of general acceptance of this position.¹⁷

R. Isaac *ha-Levi* also did not eat meat for the entire three-week period between the seventeenth of Tammuz and the ninth of Av,¹⁸ a practice that Rabiah attributed to *perushim*.¹⁹ *Sefer Ma'aseh ha-Geonim* reports, at the beginning of a section entitled *minhag Tish'ah be-Av*, that R. Isaac b. Moses

¹⁶ Israel Ta-Shma, *Ha-Nigleh shebe-Nistar* (Tel Aviv, 1995), 96, n. 56, suggests that a reference by R. Isaac *Or Zarua*^c to an interpretation of his teacher, R. Judah *Hasid* (which appears to conflict with a passage in *Sefer Hasidim*), is to material from one of R. Isaac's main teachers, R. Judah b. Isaac Sir Leon of Paris, not from R. Judah *he-Hasid* of Spires and Regensburg, founder of the German Pietists. This resolution is, however, problematic. Although R. Judah Sir Leon is called R. Judah *he-Hasid* by some later rabbinic scholars, medieval halakhists do not usually refer to him in this way. Moreover, R. Isaac certainly received teachings, especially pietistic ones, from R. Judah *he-Hasid* of Regensburg—even if he was not one of R. Isaac's major teachers, as R. Judah Sir Leon and Rabiah were. See Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:323, 437–39 (and cf. above in the introduction, nn. 5, 10); the gloss from *Sefer Or Zarua*^c, *hilkhot Shabbat*, 2:42, found at *SHP* 427 (pp. 126–28); *Sefer Or Zarua*^c (responsa), 1:114; and *Sefer Or Zarua*^c, *pishei 'avodah zarah*, 4:200. Cf. *Sefer Or Zarua*^c, 1:399; *hilkhot moza'ei Shabbat*, 2:89, 95; *pishei 'avodah zarah*, 4:267; the introductory *Alfa Beta* to *Sefer Or Zarua*^c, secs. 25, 30; and below, at the beginning of ch. 5, regarding the mystical doctrines in *Sefer Or Zarua*^c. Finally, ms. Parma 1033 (fols. 123r–123v) records an interpretation similar to the one referred to by R. Isaac *Or Zarua*^c, that is attributed (by a R. Moses) to ר' יהודה החסיד מראמגנסבורג. See also *Siddur Rabbenu Shelomoh mi-Germaiza ve-Siddur Hasidei Ashkenaz*, ed. Moshe Hershler (Jerusalem, 1972), 184.

¹⁷ Grossman, *Hakhmei Ashkenaz ha-Rishonim*, 287. Cf. *Sefer Rabiah*, ed. Avigdor Aptowitzer, 3:658–59, for a clear indication that Rabiah as well did not demand this of others. See also below, n. 37; and cf. Y. N. Simhoni, “Ha-Hasidut ha-Ashkenazi Bime' ha-Benayim,” in *Dat ve-Hevrah be-Mishnatam shel Hasidei Ashkenaz*, ed. Ivan Marcus (Jerusalem, 1987), 68. In n. 117, Grossman demonstrates that although two texts attribute this practice to R. Isaac b. Judah of Mayence rather than to R. Isaac *ha-Levi* of Worms, it was in fact the latter's practice. Grossman further suggests, without firm proof, that R. Isaac *ha-Levi* had seen this done already by his major teacher, R. Eliezer *ha-Gadol* of Mainz, who was also a direct Qalonymide ancestor (and spiritual mentor) of R. Judah *he-Hasid* (see below, ch. 3, n. 11). See ms. Cambr. Or. 786, published in *Shitat ha-Qadmonim*, ed. M. Y. Blau (New York, 1992), 373. In this collection of *pesaqim* [see below, ch. 2, n. 18], mention is made of a R. Samuel b. Isaac (cf. Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:248) who also fasted for two days. R. Isaac of Dampierre (Ri) appears to have been the only major tosafist in northern France who observed the fast of Yom Kippur for two days. See below, n. 30.

¹⁸ Grossman, *Hakhmei Ashkenaz ha-Rishonim*, 288.

CHAPTER 1

(a pious scholar of Mainz who demonstrated great religious devotion as an “active” martyr in 1096, serving also as a role-model for others)²⁰ did not bathe from the seventeenth of Tammuz through the ninth of Av. R. Isaac b. Judah abstained from eating meat from *Rosh Hodesh* until after the fast, R. Meshullam b. Moses did not eat meat on the tenth of Av throughout his life, and other individuals (וְעַד יְשִׁבּוּ בְּנֵי אָדָם) fasted on both the ninth and tenth of Av.²¹

It should be noted that all of the eleventh-century German rabbinic scholars who espoused the various pietistic and ascetic tendencies outlined above were associated with the academy of Mainz. Two of them taught at Worms (R. Isaac *ha-Levi* and R. Solomon b. Samson), but both had been students of pietists at Mainz.²² As we shall see in chapter 3, when magical and mystical studies of the pre-Crusade period are surveyed, these disciplines as well were pursued only in Mainz, with barely an exception. An explanation for the concentration of these interests in Mainz, and away from Worms, will emerge from that discussion.

¹⁹ *Sefer Rabiah*, 3:659–60. As in the case of the Ashkenazim who fasted two days for *Yom ha-Kippurim*, whom he characterized as חסידים ואנשי מעשה (*Arba'ah Turim, Orah Hayyim*, sec. 624), R. Jacob b. Asher *Ba'al ha-Turim* referred to those who abstained from meat during the three weeks as פְּרָשִׁים and *יהידים* (*O. H.*, sec. 551). On the use of these terms in *Arba'ah Turim*, cf. below, n. 35.

²⁰ See Grossman, *Hakhmei Ashkenaz ha-Rishonim*, 393–94. To be sure, the entire phenomenon of medieval Ashkenazic martyrdom presumes a pietistic orientation, even though the degree to which martyrdom during the Crusades had a specific impact on the development of *Hasidei Ashkenaz* is a matter of contention. See, e.g., Jacob Katz, *Exclusiveness and Tolerance* (New York, 1961), 82–94; Yosef Dan, “Be’ayat Qiddush ha-Shem be-Toratoh ha-‘Iyyunit shel Tenu‘at Hasidut Ashkenaz,” *Milhemet Qodesh u-Martir’ologiyah be-Toledot Yisra’el uve-Toledot ha-‘Ammim* (Israel Historical Society: Jerusalem, 1968), 121–29; Robert Chazan, *European Jewry and the First Crusade* (Berkeley, 1987), 143–47, 206–7, 214–15, 325–26, n. 14; idem, “The Early Development of *Hasidut Ashkenaz*,” *JQR* 75 (1985):199–211; Marcus, *Piety and Society*, 150–51, n. 57; idem, “Hierarchies, Religious Boundaries and Jewish Spirituality in Medieval Germany,” *Jewish History* 1 (1986):7–26; Haym Soloveitchik, “Religious Law and Change: The Medieval Ashkenazic Example,” *AJS Review* 12 (1987):205–21; and see below, n. 31, regarding Riba.

²¹ *Sefer Ma’aseh ha-Geonim*, ed. Abraham Epstein (Berlin, 1910), 34. See also *Sefer Rabiah*, 3:657–60; *Arba’ah Turim, Orah Hayyim*, sec. 558; *Shibbolei ha-Leqet*, ed. Buber, sec. 274 ... וְנִמְצָא תְּהִזְבֵּחַ שְׂנָהָגָן רִ' מְשׁוֹלָם זְכַרְלָן ... יְמִינָו ...; *Sefer ha-Pardes*, ed. H. L. Ehrenreich (Budapest, 1924), 260; *She’elot u-Teshuvot Maharil*, ed. Isaac Satz (Jerusalem, 1979), 220 (and the reference to *Sefer Hasidim* in n. 9). Cf. Zimmer, ‘*Olam ke-Minhago Noheg*, 188–89, and Gartner, *Gulgulei Minhag be-‘Olam ha-Halakhah*, 9–21, for possible antecedents from the talmudic and geonic periods of some of these practices.

For now, one additional locus of rabbinic asceticism in this period, which also had a connection to Mainz, should be mentioned. R. Simeon *ha-Gadol* of Mainz was a member of the Abun family, which originated in Le Mans in northern France. Indeed, while it is possible that R. Simeon's grandfather, R. Abun (d.c.970), had already emigrated to the Rhineland, it is probable that R. Simeon was still in Le Mans for part of his student days. In any event, the rabbinic leaders of the Le Mans community in the generation after R. Abun were R. Menahem and his sons, R. Elijah and R. Isaac.²³

At the time of his death, R. Menahem was characterized by his son, R. Elijah, as a holy and devout person who consecrated his body throughout his lifetime by afflicting it via fasting and denial.²⁴ The second son of R. Menahem, R. Isaac, is described as being one of those *perushim* who, like

²²See Grossman, *Hakhmei Ashkenaz ha-Rishonim*, 177, 243–45 (regarding R. Jacob b. Yaqr), 326, and above, n. 13. Cf. Gartner, *Gulgulei Minhag*, 31–39. Although all three of Rashi's teachers were associated with ascetic or pietistic practices (see above at nn. 11, 14, 17), Rashi did not, for the most part, affect these behaviors. Thus, for example, he chided *perushim* (ר' ייש מן הפרושים) who fasted for *ta'anit Esther* on both Thursday and Friday when Purim occurred on Sunday (see *Mahzor Vitry*, see 245, ed. Simon Hurwitz [Nuremberg, 1923], 210; the variants in *Shibbolei ha-Leqet*, ed. Buber, sec. 194; and *Sefer ha-Pardes ha-Gadol*, sec. 204). He also criticized those who fasted two days for Yom Kippur (see Sperber, *Minhagei Yisra'el*, 4 [Jerusalem, 1995], 207, n. 6). Nonetheless, Rashi's great humility, his stringent personal conduct in situations where he had granted latitude to others, his striking position on minimizing prayer during times of illness because of the difficulty in maintaining proper *kavvanah*, and even his concern about overeating with regard to *se'udah shelishit* may be the result of this training. See Grossman, *Hakhmei Zarefat ha-Rishonim* (Jerusalem, 1995), 136–38, 141–42; *idem*, *Hakhmei Ashkenaz ha-Rishonim*, 282, 371–72 (describing the humility of R. Isaac *ha-Levi* and the Makhirites); and cf. Soloveitchik, "Three Themes," 330–33. Note also Rashi's definition of *perishut* in his commentary to 'Avodah Zarah 20b, s.v. *perishut*: אַפָּ מִזְבֵּחַ הַמּוֹתֵר פָּרֵשׁ לְהַחְמִיר עַל עַצְמוֹ. On the noteworthy humility displayed by Rashbam, who grew up in the house of Rashi, see Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:47–48, 73, 76.

²³Grossman, *Hakhmei Zarefat ha-Rishonim*, 38–39, 95.

²⁴ר' מנחם רבי הקדוש, גוף הקדש, גוף העמינה גוף המסתוג כל ימיו בתרעינה גוף. Note the reference in *Sefer Minhag Tov* (ed. Meir Weiss, *Ha-Zofeh le-Hokhmat Yisra'el* 13 [1929]:200–221) to a R. Elijah *ha-Zaqen*, who was linked to the heavenly angels and is described as conducting himself as a *parush*. This passage probably refers to R. Elijah b. Menahem of Le Mans rather than to the early tosafist, R. Elijah b. Judah of Paris. Cf. Grossman, *Hakhmei Zarefat ha-Rishonim*, 85, 104–5; Hananel Mack, "Derashah shel R. Eliyahu ha-Zaqen be-Tokh Midrash Mimei ha-Benayim," *Zion* 61 (1996):213; and below, ch. 3, n. 95. [R. Judah *he-Hasid* appears to have been a direct descendant of R. Elijah of Le Mans; see now the addenda to the second edition of Grossman, *Hakhmei Zarefat ha-Rishonim* (Jerusalem, 1997), 610.]

CHAPTER 1

R. Isaac b. Judah of Mainz, ate a minimal amount of food prior to the fast of the ninth of Av.²⁵

The Evidence from Twelfth-Century Tosafist Texts and Related Literature

In the twelfth century there were groups of people as well as individuals who pursued forms of *perishut* or asceticism. Rabbenu Jacob Tam, the leading tosafist of the day, encountered this phenomenon but appears not to have supported it. He was asked to respond to a report that “many devout Jews who have embraced purity and *perishut* (בְּטוֹרָה) do not wish to feed their young children on Yom Kippur, even though these children have not yet reached the age when they are to be trained [to fast]. And those who do feed [their young children] are told that they have violated a commandment, since adults are required to prevent children from committing overt sins.” Without offering an assessment of their motives or their ideological position, Rabbenu Tam ruled simply that feeding these children was completely permissible.²⁶ It should be noted that the tendency toward *perishut* in this case (as in a number of the other instances mentioned above) may have had its roots in earlier Palestinian custom. Although the precise age of the youngsters who were urged to fast is tied to variant readings in Palestinian rabbinic texts, the tendency itself, which finds no support in the Babylonian Talmud, was quite pronounced.²⁷

²⁵ Grossman, *Hakhmei Zarefat ha-Rishonim*, 84. R. Isaac b. Menahem ate only salted bread and water, without any vegetable or relish. Cf. above, n. 14. On the nature and place of fasting and asceticism in the medieval Christian milieu, see Caroline Bynum, *Holy Fast and Holy Feast* (Berkeley, 1987), esp. 31–47, 107–10, 208–18, 294–96.

²⁶ *Sefer ha-Yashar le-Rabbenu Tam* (*Heleq ha-Teshuvot*), ed. Shraga Rosenthal (Berlin, 1898), 108, 111. Cf. Sperber, *Minhagei Yisra'el*, 2:130–32; and Giles Constable, *The Reformation of the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge, 1996), 150–53, 192–94. [In this instance, Rabbenu Tam did not allow young boys to perform the religious obligation of adults. Cf. Ivan Marcus, *Rituals of Childhood* (New Haven, 1996) 119–20, and Israel Ta-Shma, “Be-Koah ha-Shem: Le-Toledotav shel Minhag Nishkah,” *Bar Ilan* 26–27 (1995):389–99.] In another context, Rabbenu Tam referred to *perushim* as those who exhibited a high level of moral conduct, a status which some sought to attain illegitimately. See Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:91. The use of the term in this context, however, is based on a talmudic passage concerning the Pharisees (*Sotah* 22b), although it may also be indicative of Rabbenu Tam's understanding of this term in general. See also *Sefer ha-Yashar*, 85.

²⁷ See *Massekhet Soferim*, ed. Michael Higger (New York, 1937), 318–19. The variants range from the ages of one and two to eleven and twelve. Cf. Ivan Marcus, “The Dynamics of Ashkenaz and Its People Centered Authority,” *Proceedings of the Rabbinical*

Rabbenu Tam also ruled, without additional comment, in the case of an individual who had vowed and then undertaken “many fasts” without accepting them through verbal declaration the day before, as is usually required for personal fasts. Rabbenu Tam argued that these fasts were effective in fulfilling the person’s vow(s) because the individual had definitely intended to undertake them; formal verbal acceptance was preferred but was not an absolute requirement.²⁸

At the end of the *Tosafot* texts that contain this ruling of Rabbenu Tam, R. Isaac b. Samuel of Dampierre (Ri) is noted as following the preferred practice of accepting a personal fast by inserting a formula of request at the conclusion of the ‘Amidah of the afternoon service on the day before. The texts state further that it was Ri’s standard practice [*ורוי היה רגיל רגיל ר*] to do this even on Sabbath afternoon, when he wanted to fast on Sunday. The implication of this passage is that Ri undertook personal fasts with some frequency.²⁹

Assembly 54 (1992):134; idem, *Rituals*, 39–41; and Y. D. Gilat, “Ben Shelosh-‘Esreh le-Mizvot,” *Mehqerei Talmud* 1, ed. Yaakov Sussmann and David Rosenthal (Jerusalem, 1990), 44–45. See also the parallel passage in *Orhot Hayyim*, pt. 2 (1–2), sec. 24, and *Kol Bo*, sec. 74, which records the Ashkenazic initiation ceremony and describes it as a venerable custom practiced by the elders of Israel in Jerusalem (see Marcus, *Rituals of Childhood*, 33, and below ch. 3, n. 18) and still in vogue in some places. This is followed by another bona fide Jerusalem custom: instructing children from the ages of three, four, and five to complete their fasts on Yom Kippur. [For a discussion of the overall impact of *minhagei Erez Yisra’el* on Ashkenaz, see, e.g., Avraham Grossman, “Ziqqatah shel Yahadut Ashkenaz ha-Qedumah ‘el Erez Yisra’el,” *Shalem* 3 (1981):57–92; Israel Ta-Shma in *Qiryat Sefer* 56 (1981):345–48; Grossman in *Zion* 47 (1982):192–97; and Ta-Shma, *Minhag Ashkenaz ha-Qadmon* (Jerusalem, 1992), 21, 61–69, 98–103.]

²⁸*Tosafot ‘Avodah Zarah*, 34a, s.v. *mit’anin le-sha’ot*. Cf. *Tosafot Rabbenu Elhanan*, ed. David Frankel (Husiatyn, 1901), ad loc.; Urbach, *Ba’alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:131. Rabbenu Tam had no difficulty, of course, in establishing a public fast day and day of mourning to commemorate the deaths of the Jews of Blois in 1171, as the result of a ritual murder charge. See Urbach, 1:112, and Robert Chazan, “The Blois Incident of 1171: A Study in Jewish Intercommunal Organization,” *PAAJR* 36 (1968):13–31.

²⁹See also *Semaq*, sec. 97: *ושמעתי כי הרוי היה אמר בא-להי צור הרני לפניך בתענית י. ייחידי למחהר*. In a responsum in which Ri nullified a vow undertaken by a young man to severely restrict his diet in the event that he continued to gamble (Urbach, *Ba’alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:259–60; cf. my “Rabbinic Attitudes Toward Non-Observance,” 27–29), Ri observed that the young man in question, who may have been a Torah scholar, was not, however, *חסיד ופושך כל כך שיכוף את יצרו [לקיים את נורו]* *כל ימי צבאו*. This phrasing further speaks Ri’s own familiarity with a regimen of *perishut*. Ri was in contact with well-known Provençal *perushim* such as R. Asher b. Meshullam of Lunel, who, according to R. Benjamin of Tudela, “removed himself from [the pleasures of] this world, studied day and night, and fasted and did not eat meat,” although the direction of influence is uncertain. See Urbach, 1:237–38, and below, ch. 4, n. 10.

CHAPTER 1

A passage in *Pisqei ha-Tosafot* concludes that since a stringent position must be taken with regard to a doubt that concerns a law of biblical origin, it would be appropriate to fast two days for Yom Kippur in the Diaspora, where each *yom tov* segment of the biblical festivals was observed for two days because of doubts concerning the appearance of the new moon. Since, however, a decree that cannot be upheld by the general public ought not be promulgated, this practice could not actually be required. According to this text, Ri did, however, fast for two days.³⁰

R. Isaac b. Asher *ha-Levi* (Riba) of Spires was an older tosafist contemporary of Rabbenu Tam. He had studied in Mainz prior to the First Crusade and with Rashi in Troyes. An account recorded in a fourteenth-century work, *Pisqei Reqanati*, details the circumstances under which Riba died c. 1133. He was seriously ill prior to Yom Kippur. His doctors advised him that if he fasted on Yom Kippur he would surely die, but that even if he ate, he might still die. Riba decided that the possibility of his dying did not outweigh his obligation to fast. He did not eat that day and subsequently passed away.³¹

³⁰ *Pisqei ha-Tosafot li-Menahot* #201, cited by Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:238. [On the compiler of the *Pisqei ha-Tosafot*, see Urbach, 2:734–38.] Cf. above, n. 17, for the similar practice of R. Judah *he-Hasid* and Rabiah. According to a passage in ms. Cambr. Or. 786, fols. 181v–182r, Ri also permitted fasting on *Rosh ha-Shanah*, as R. Judah *he-Hasid* did. Ri's reasoning was that a fast for repentance on *Rosh ha-Shanah* would not be any worse than a *ta'anit halom*, which is permitted on *Rosh ha-Shanah*. See also Ri in *Tosafot Berakhot*, 49b, s.v. *אי בשי אכלי*, and below, ch. 2, n. 46, for additional references and discussion; and cf. *Sefer Mordekhai 'al Massekhet 'Eruvin*, sec. 494. [Rabiah was aware from his teachers that some fasted on *Rosh ha-Shanah*, but he ruled against it; see *Sefer Rabiah*, 3:634, and below, n. 37.] Ri also followed the same *humra* as the German Pietists with regard to permissible means of shaving and hair-cutting—a situation characterized by *Sefer Hasidim* as one in which it was necessary to prohibit something that is technically permissible in order to prevent that which is definitely prohibited from being done—as opposed to Rabbenu Tam, who held the more prevalent, lenient view. See Zimmer, "Olam ke-Minhago Noheg", 47–49. Urbach also notes that Ri was known for taking an inordinately long time to say his prayers, always finishing them after everyone else in his group. In addition, Ri's father was called a *hasid*; see Urbach, 1:228, n. 4.

³¹ See Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:173. On the implications of this source for a patient's right to refuse medical treatment, see Daniel Sinclair, "Patient Autonomy: The Right to Choose," *Le'ela* (September, 1994): 15; idem, "Ma'amadah shel ha-Refu'ah ve-Tippul Refu'i Neged Rezono shel ha-Holeh," *Shenaton ha-Mishpat ha-'Ivri* 18–19 (1993–94):281–82; and Eliezer Ben-Shelomoh, "Himan'ut me-Tippul Refu'i mi-Tokh 'Zidqut," *Assia* 49–50 (1990):77–79. Note also the reference to a *הלי* and *Hekhalot* literature in R. Moses Taku, *Ketav Tamim*, ms. Paris 711, fol. 19v.

Rabiah, Rī's younger contemporary in Germany, cites two Yom Kippur practices that he ascribes to *perushim*, and he suggests several rabbinic and midrashic sources on which they are based. By immersing themselves prior to Yom Kippur and remaining on their feet throughout the night (during the evening service, or perhaps literally the entire night) and day of Yom Kippur, these *perushim*, according to Rabiah, sought to imitate the behavior of the angels.³²

The *perushim* to whom Rabiah refers may have been pious individuals who were not formally associated with each other or with any organized group or movement. But since Rabiah flourished in Germany at precisely the same time as R. Judah *he-Hasid* and his student, R. Eleazar of Worms, it is tempting to suggest that these *perushim* were connected in some way to *Hasidei Ashkenaz* and their leaders. Indeed, two late thirteenth-century Italian works that followed the teachings of the German Pietists also mention these (or related) customs. The author of *Sefer Tanya Rabbati* writes that he had heard of places where they did not leave the synagogue on the night of Yom Kippur but remained awake reciting penitential prayers (*selihot ve-tahanunim u-viduyim*).³³ *Sefer Minhag Tov* recommends that one stand the entire night on Yom Kippur in the synagogue, not sleeping at all, and reciting *Shir ha-Yihud* and other *yihudim* and *baqqashot* until daybreak, when the congregational prayers begin.³⁴ The practice of standing all night and all day on Yom Kippur

³²See *Sefer Rabiah*, 2:185, 190; and see also above, n. 19.

³³*Sefer Tanya Rabbati*, ed. Simon Hurwitz (Warsaw, 1879), 172, sec. 81. On the relationship of this work and its parallel, *Shibbolei ha-Leqet* (see Israel Ta-Shma, "Shibbolei ha-Leqet u-Khefelav," *Italia* 11 [1995]:39–51), to the pietism and teachings of *hasidut Ashkenaz*, see below, ch. 2, n. 34.

³⁴*Sefer Minhag Tov*, ed. M. Z. Weiss, *Ha-Zofeh* 13 (1929):235. The author of *Sefer Minhag Tov*, who composed his treatise c. 1275, may have studied with northern French tosafists. He did study with R. Moses b. Meir of Ferarra and perhaps settled in Bari or Taranto, although it is unclear whether he was of Italian origin. See Eric Zimmer, "Tiqqunei ha-Guf bi-She'at Tefillah," *Sidra* 5 (1987):91, n. 10 [= "Olam ke-Minhago Noheg, 74, n. 10]; Israel Ta-Shma, "Le-Toledot ha-Yehudim be-Polin ba-Me'ot ha-Yod Bet/ha-Yod Gimmel," *Zion* 53 (1988):365, n. 65; idem, "Havdalah 'al ha-Pat," *Sefer ha-Zikkaron leha-Rav Nissim* (Jerusalem, 1985), 1:145.

This work is full of ascetic practices in the spirit of *Hasidei Ashkenaz* and the academy at Evreux (below, nn. 82–83); see esp. 232, 237. (R. Judah *he-Hasid* is cited once by name, in sec. 69.) It recommends such practices as walking barefoot, enduring lengthy fasts, and the frequent recitation of *viduyim* and *tahanunim*. In the author's introductory remarks (218), he discourages indulging even in pleasures that are permitted and suggests the need to undertake many kinds of *perishut*. Like *Sefer*

CHAPTER 1

(and spending the entire night reciting hymns and praises) is attributed by R. Jacob b. Asher in his *Arba'ah Turim* to *'anshei ma'aseh*, a term he employs with regard to *Hasidei Ashkenaz*.³⁵

In supporting the position that on the Sabbath a Jew may warm himself over a fire that a non-Jew has kindled expressly for use by the Jew, R. Yom Tov of Joigny—a student of Rabbenu Tam who settled in York, England (c. 1180)—asserts that this was done by both his father and R. Meshullam (of Melun), “who were *perushim*.” The term *perushim* in this context would appear to refer simply to individuals who observed Jewish law punctiliously and did not allow themselves to be overly lenient. The force of R. Yom Tov’s claim is that if two pious and conservative decisors permitted this practice, it was certainly an acceptable position.

At the same time, all major rabbinic decisors in Germany (through the late thirteenth century) held the stringent view: that a Jew may not warm himself by a fire that has been kindled by a non-Jew on the Sabbath, even in cases where the non-Jew has done so without being asked by the Jew. In a

Hasidim, this work stresses complete decorum in the synagogue, with no talking whatsoever (224, sec. 3; cf. below, n. 151). For other liturgical practices and interpretations common to *Hasidei Ashkenaz* and *Sefer Minhag Toy*, see, e.g., B. S. Bamberger, *Shorashei Minhag Ashkenaz* (Bnei Brak, 1995), 188, 206–7. On the composition of *Shir ha-Yihud* by a member of the German Pietists, see below, n. 88.

³⁵*Arba'ah Turim*, *Orah Hayyim*, sec. 619. Cf., however, R. Eleazar of Worms, *Sefer Roqeah*, sec. 217 (end), and below, n. 68. On the use of the terms *hasidim* and *'anshei ma'aseh* by *Arba'ah Turim* to connote *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, see, e.g., *Orah Hayyim*, secs. 98, 241, 249 (and cf. *Bayit Hadash*, s.v. *ve-yir'eh*, and in sec. 686, s.v. *ukeshe-hal*), 460, 624; and cf. 46, 101, 113, 268, 529, 539, 551, 554, 557, 591, 602, 624, and *Yoreh De'ah*, sec. 361; Moshe Hallamish, “*Be'ayyot be-Heqer Hashpa'at ha-Qabbalah 'al ha-Tefillah*,” *Massu'ot* [Studies in Kabbalistic Literature and Jewish Philosophy in Memory of Prof. Ephraim Gottlieb], ed. Michael Oron and Amos Goldreich (Jerusalem, 1994), 204; *Shitat ha-Qadmonim* (above, n. 17), 334. *וכן ראיתי אנשי מעשה תלמידיו של ר' יוזהה* (החותם); Yehudah Liebes, *Het'ot shel Elisha* (Jerusalem, 1990), 106–7; and below, n. 93, ch. 2, n. 52, and ch. 5, n. 75. [Note Ramban’s use of the phrase *חסידים ואנשי מעשה* to characterize those from whom he received a *seder ha-viddut* for a person near death. See *Kitvei ha-Ramban*, ed. C. D. Chavel (Jerusalem, 1964), 2:47, cited also in *Perush R. Asher b. Yehi'el le-Massekhet Mo'ed Qatan*, 3:76, and in *Arba'ah Turim*, *Yoreh De'ah*, sec. 338; and see also ms. Sassoon 408 [=B. M. Or. 14055], fol. 150. On Ramban’s awareness of *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, see, e.g., my “On the Assessment of R. Moses b. Nahman (Nahmanides) and His Literary Oeuvre,” *Jewish Book Annual* 51 (1993–94):170–71 (=Jewish Book Annual 54 [1996–97] 78–79). Cf. ms. Vat. Rossiana 356, fol. 2r; ms. Parma 1138, fol. 96v; and Elliot Horowitz, “The Jews of Europe and the Moment of Death in Medieval and Modern Times,” *Judaism* 44 (1995):273–74.]

responsum, R. Meir of Rothenburg—whose close relationship with *hasidut Ashkenaz* will be discussed below—acknowledges the validity of the French position, held (also) by one of his French teachers and by R. Jacob of Orleans; this was predicated on the notion that people become somewhat ill sitting in an unheated home, a situation in which instructing a non-Jew to kindle the fire would be permissible according to the letter of the law. Nonetheless, Maharam concludes that this is prohibited “in our kingdom” for reasons of “**חומרא ופရישות**.” Moreover, R. Judah *he-Hasid* had earlier prescribed harsh penances (*tiqqunei teshuvah*) consisting of fasts, lashes, and confessions over a six-month period for anyone who instructed a non-Jew or a maidservant to light a fire to warm their home on the Sabbath. Thus, in the German orbit, another practice rooted in and characterized as *perishut* was, in fact, associated with *Hasidei Ashkenaz*.³⁶

Although Rabiah cannot be characterized as a committed follower of the German Pietists, he was familiar with a number of their teachings and pietistic

³⁶See Israel Ta-Shma, *Halakhah, Minhag u-Mezi'ut be-Ashkenaz* (Jerusalem, 1996), 160–67; Jacob Katz, *Goy shel Shabbat* (Jerusalem, 1984), 47–53; Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:144. Perhaps this development was also a factor in the use of the term *perushim* by R. Yom Tov of Joigny, although we cannot be absolutely certain that he was aware of the German position. Three of the most prominent supporters of the German position—R. Simhah of Spires, R. Avigdor Kohen *Zedeq*, and R. Isaac b. Moses *Or Zarua*—were also closely connected to *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, as we shall see below. [Ta-Shma counters effectively Katz's contention that Rabiah held the lenient position. He also demonstrates that the stringent German position (once again) follows Palestinian *halakhah*—which was based on several passages in the Talmud Yerushalmi—while the lenient northern French position was based primarily on Rabbenu Tam's interpretation of the Bavli.]

Similar to R. Yom Tov of Joigny, R. Joseph of Orleans [*Bekhor Shor*], who was also a student of Rabbenu Tam, employs the term *perushim* to describe individuals who followed carefully an established Ashkenazic custom of splitting the second meal into two; this would ensure that a third, separate meal could be eaten on the Sabbath. In this particular case, however, R. Joseph considers the *perushim* to be foolhardy (*מעשנאות*), since their observance of this custom may lead them to overeat (*תאטה*), and this would undermine the legitimacy of the third meal. See Ta-Shma, *Minhag Ashkenaz Qadmon* (Jerusalem, 1992), 210–12. In all likelihood, the reference in *Sefer ha-Orah*, ed. Solomon Buber (repr. Jerusalem, 1967), 89, to *hasidim* who postponed baking *mazot* until as close to Passover as possible connotes individuals who conducted themselves stringently (according to the German practice, instead of the more lenient French practice), rather than an organized group of *hasidim*. Indeed, R. Yehudah *he-Hasid* himself agreed with the French position in this instance. See Ta-Shma, *Minhag Ashkenaz ha-Qadmon*, 248; Zimmer, ‘*Olam ke-Minhago Noheg*, 281–83; and below, ch. 2, n. 44.

CHAPTER 1

practices. Rabiah fasted two days for Yom Kippur as R. Judah *he-Hasid* did,³⁷ and he cites interpretations and legal decisions of R. Judah on a handful of occasions, referring to him in a responsum to R. Eleazar of Worms as “our teacher.”³⁸ Rabiah also records a *gematria* interpretation that he heard in the name of R. Samuel *he-Hasid*: The numerical value of the opening words of the *Avinu Malkenu* prayer, אָבִינוּ מֶלֶכְנוּ חֲטָאָנוּ לְפָנֶיךָ, corresponds to that of the phrase “R. Aqiva who composed it.”³⁹

³⁷ See above, n. 17. Note that Rabiah (like R. Eleazar of Worms) did not, however, advocate fasting on *Rosh ha-Shanah*; see above, n. 30. See also *Haggahot Maimuniyyot, Hilkhot Shofar*, 1:1 [1]; a passage in *Sefer Assufot* (ms. Jews College 134/Montefiore 115), whose author appears to have been a student of both Rabiah and R. Eleazar of Worms (transcribed in *Zekhor le-Avraham*, ed. Avigdor Berger [Jerusalem, 1993], 25, and see also 19–20); and cf. *Sefer Or Zarua*^c, 2:257, and below, ch. 2, n. 36; ch. 3, n. 62. Nor did Rabiah support undertaking a *ta'anit halom* on the Sabbath. See *Sefer Rabiah*, 2:621–22, and cf. *Sefer Or Zarua*^c, 2:407, and below, ch. 2, n. 46.

³⁸ See Aptowitz, *Mavo la-Rabiah*, 22, 252, 343. See also E. E. Urbach, “*Liqqutim mi-Sifrei de-Vei Rashi*,” *Sefer Rashi* (Jerusalem, 1956), 333, n. 6.

³⁹ שְׁמַעְתִּי בְּשֵׁם ר' שְׁמוֹאֵל הַחֲסִיד אָבִינוּ מֶלֶכְנוּ חֲטָאָנוּ לְפָנֶיךָ עֹלָה בְּגִימְטְרִיא רַבִּי עֲקִיבָּא יִסְדוֹן. See *Sefer Rabiah*, 2:232 (and n. 6); and cf. *Ta'anit* 25b; and Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:195, n. 79. For other citations of this *gematria*, see ms. Hamburg 152, fol. 106v.; *Sefer Assufot* (above, n. 37), 27; *Sefer Or Zarua*^c, 2:281; ms. Cambr. Add. 858, fols. 45r–45v (a commentary to *Avinu Malkenu* by R. Avigdor Katz; see below, ch. 2, n. 30); *Sefer Matteh Mosheh*, ed. Mordechai Knoblowicz (Jerusalem, 1978²); *Ammud ha-'Avodah*, pt. 5, para. 801 (p. 254). In this *gematria* (as Rabiah himself notes subsequently), the word חֲטָאָנוּ is counted as it is read, without the 'alef. Cf. R. Moses Isserles' gloss to O. H., sec. 583:2 (and his *Darkhei Mosheh*, ad loc.), and Sperber, *Minhagei Yisra'el*, 4:49. Also, in most of the texts that record the *gematria*, R. Aqiva is spelled with a *heh* at the end, rather than with an 'alef—as in Palestinian texts from the talmudic period, and as this name was often spelled in texts of the German Pietists. Cf. below, ch. 4, n. 31.

In *Siddur Rabbenu Shelomoh mi-Germaiza ve-Siddur Hasidei Ashkenaz* (ed. Moshe Hershler, 222), R. Aqiva's authorship of *Avinu Malkenu* is derived, anonymously, by noting that the 247 words in *Avinu Malkenu* correspond in *gematria* to **הַנָּה עֲקִיבָּה**. (Cf. *Siddur*, 20, n. 14.) The number 247=רָמֶז also confirms that this prayer should be recited with a slow cadence, as a *zemer*, and that adding any words or phrases to this prayer, as was advocated in non-Pietist circles, is inappropriate. A manuscript passage attributes this derivation and discussion to R. Samuel Bamberg; see now Simcha Emanuel, “*Ha-Polmos 'al Nosah ha-Tefillah shel Hasidei Ashkenaz*,” *Mehqerei Talmud* 3 [in press], n. 135 (end); and below, ch. 2, n. 15.

On the other hand, while *Sefer Hasidim* advised that two weddings should not take place at the same time because of 'ayin ha-ra considerations, Rabiah felt this consideration could be routinely ignored if there were economic exigencies, **וּשְׁוּמָר פְּתָאִים ה'**. See *Sefer Rabiah*, 3:504–5, and n. 1; and cf. *'Arugat ha-Bosem*, ed. E. E. Urbach, vol. 4 (Jerusalem, 1963), 110.

Rabiah endorsed the custom of menstruant women not entering the synagogue. This custom originated in the *Baraita de-Massekhet Niddah*, a text related to *Hekhalot* literature and preserved by the German Pietists, who also supported its stringencies.⁴⁰ In addition, Rabiah records two passages from *Hekhalot* literature itself, a corpus that the German Pietists played a role in shaping.⁴¹ Rabiah was the first Ashkenazic rabbinic authority to cite a formulation in *Hekhalot Rabbati* that instructs the eyes should be raised heavenward during the recitation of the *Qedushah*. Rabiah asserts that when the Almighty sees and hears this demonstration, He responds by kissing three times the image of Jacob that is engraved on the *kisse ha-kavod*.⁴²

The second *Hekhalot* passage, which Rabiah mentions as appearing in (mystical) *sefarim hizoniyyim*, was cited to justify the practice of bowing during the recitation of the ‘Avodah on Yom Kippur. According to this passage (which also is found in fuller form in *Hekhalot Rabbati*), R. Nehunyah b. *ha-Qanah*

⁴⁰ *Sefer Rabiah*, 1:45, *Sefer Or Zarua*^c, 1:360. At the same time, Rabiah (*Sefer Or Zarua*^c, loc. cit.) relaxed some of the *Baraita*’s additional restrictions (*harhaqot*) concerning a husband and wife eating together. On Rabiah’s position—as well as the nature of the *Baraita*, its affinity with *Hekhalot* literature, and its adoption and dissemination by the German Pietists and other Ashkenazic rabbinic figures—see Yedidyah Dinari, “Minhagei Tum’at ha-Niddah—Meqoram ve-Hishtalshelutam,” *Tarbiz* 49 (1980):302–24; idem, “Hillul ha-Qodesh ‘al Yedei Niddah ve-Taqqanat Ezra,” *Te’udah* 3 (1983):17–38; Israel Ta-Shma, “Miqdash Me’at”—Ha-Semel ve-ha-Mamashut,” *Knesset Ezra* [*Sifrut ve-Hayyim be-Vit ha-Knesset*], ed. Shulamit Elizur et al. (Jerusalem, 1994), 359–64; Sharon Koren, “Mysticism and Menstruation: The Significance of Female Impurity in Jewish Spirituality” (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1999), ch. 1; and below, ch. 2, nn. 81–82.

⁴¹ See the extensive literature cited above in the introduction, n. 25. [Note that a passage found in *Sefer Orhot Hayyim*, as part of R. Eleazar of Worms’s *Sefer ha-Kapparot*, is cited in *liqqutim* on the *Semaq mi-Zurich as leshon Sefer Hekhalot*. See Israel Ta-Shma, “Issur Shetiyat Mayyim ba-Tequfah u-Meqoro,” *Mehqerei Yerushalayim be-Folqor Yehudi* 17 (1995):32.]

⁴² See *Sefer Rabiah*, 1:70, and n. 19; Eric Zimmer, “Tiqqueni ha-Guf bi-She’at ha-Tefillah,” *Sidra* 5 (1989):94–95 [=Zimmer, *Olam ke-Minhago Noheg*, 77–78]. The *Hekhalot* characterization of the response of the Almighty during the *Qedushah* is alluded to already in an *’ofan* by R. Ephraim of Bonn (1133–1197): **ונשך צור דמוות הדיצור בכס עצזר והו א נבדך**. See A. M. Habermann, *Piyutei R. Ephraim b. Ya’aqov mi-Bonn* (Jerusalem, 1969), 17, and below, ch. 2, n. 26. See also below, ch. 2, n. 25, for a reference to this *Hekhalot* notion in an *’ofan* by R. Barukh b. Samuel of Mainz (d. 1221). See also *Sefer Rabiah*, 1:26, regarding movement of the head during the recitation of *Shema* as an indication of proper intention, a practice with roots in *Sefer Yezirah*; and cf. Zimmer, “Tenuhot u-Tenu’ot ha-Guf bi-She’at Qeri’at Shema,” *Assufot* 8 (1995):360–61.

CHAPTER 1

instructed his students to bow and prostrate themselves when he taught them the pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton. Rabiah adds, on the basis of the Yom Kippur liturgy, that those who heard the *Kohen Gadol* pronounce the Tetragrammaton on Yom Kippur also prostrated themselves; he further remarks that this practice is not mentioned in the Talmud.⁴³ It should be noted, however, that Rabiah's citation of *Hekhalot* texts to explain (common) liturgical or synagogue practices does not mean that Rabiah was necessarily attuned to the mystical nature of these texts.⁴⁴

Rabiah did record mystical material with regard to the protective powers of *mezuzot* and the structure and efficacy of the priestly benediction. Victor Aptowitzer, Rabiah's modern biographer, has argued cogently, however, that while Rabiah may have been a kind of *hasid*, these two texts should not be taken as evidence that he was a *ba'al sod*, since in both instances he cites the esoteric material from geonic or other earlier rabbinic scholars (*rabbotenu ha-darshanim*).⁴⁵

To be sure, there are additional mystical texts or concepts—whose association with Rabiah will be evaluated later in this study—that might also serve to link him to *Hasidei Ashkenaz*. In these instances as well, however, the evidence does not suggest that Rabiah himself was mystically inclined.⁴⁶ At this

⁴³Sefer Rabiah, 2:196, and n. 20. Cf. Zimmer, "Tiqqunei ha-Guf," 114–15 [=*Olam Ke-Minhago Noheg*, 94–95.] On the term *ḥizoniyim* as an indication of a work of *sod*, see Sefer Rabiah, n. 20; and cf. below, nn. 61–62, for a similar usage of the term *sefarim penimiyim*.

⁴⁴The *Hekhalot* passage concerning *Qedushah* is found in a printed version of *Seder Rav Amram Gaon*, although this version does not appear at all in Daniel Goldschmidt's critical edition of the *Seder*; see Elliot Wolfson, "Demut Ya'aqov Haquqah be-Kisse ha-Kavod: 'Iyyun Nosaf be-Torat ha-Sod shel Ḥasidut Ashkenaz," *Massu'ot* ed. Oron and Goldreich, 152, n. 110. For the citation of this passage in subsequent Ashkenazic rabbinic literature, see below, n. 60. Although Rabiah attributes this passage to *Sefer Hekhalot*, some of the subsequent citations refer to its source as *Ma'aseh Merkavah*; see below, ch. 3, n. 37.

⁴⁵See Aptowitzer, *Mavo la-Rabiah*, 19–20, 481–82. Cf. Ta-Shma, *Ha-Nigleh shebe-Nistar*, 94, n. 33; Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:388; Jacob Elbaum, *Teshuvat ha-Lev ve-Qabbalat Yissurim* (Jerusalem, 1993), 19, n. 1; and Ruth Langer, *To Worship God Properly* (Cincinnati, 1998), 221–24. The *mezuzah* treatise (זה נצאת בתרשובה הגאנונית) was published with annotations by Avigdor Aptowitzer in "Mi-Sifrut ha-Geonim," *Sefer ha-Yovel li-Professor Shemu'el Krauss* (Jerusalem, 1937), 96–102. See also below, n. 156. The *birkat kohanim* passage was first published by Aptowitzer in *Ve-Zot li-Yehudah* [Festschrift for J. L. Landau] (Tel Aviv, 1936), and more recently in *Sefer Rabiah*, ed. David Deblitsky (Bnei Brak, 1976), 263–66.

⁴⁶See below, ch. 4, nn. 56–57.

point, then, we cannot conclude with certainty that the *perushim* on *Yom ha-Kippurim* referred to by Rabiah should be identified mainly with the German Pietists, despite several suggestive points in common between the Pietists and Rabiah. Rabiah also refers to those who did not eat meat or drink during the three weeks prior to the ninth of Av and who undertook additional fasts during this period as *perushim*. But as we have seen with regard to standing on Yom Kippur, the notion that *Hasidei Ashkenaz* may have espoused these particular practices is found, or implied, only in later Ashkenazic sources.⁴⁷

On the other hand, R. Abraham b. Nathan *ha-Yarhi*, author of *Sefer ha-Manhig*, identifies those who had the custom of standing the entire day on Yom Kippur not as *perushim* but as **חסידי צבאת**, although like Rabiah he cites a passage from *Pirkei de-R. Eliezer* to support this custom.⁴⁸ R. Abraham, who hailed from Provence, was a wandering scholar who visited centers of Torah study throughout western Europe. He traveled first to the north, where he studied primarily with R. Isaac of Dampierre—whom he refers to several times as *Rabbenu ha-Qadosh* (and whose pietism was noted earlier).⁴⁹ R. Abraham also journeyed southward, reaching the Spanish city of Toledo around the beginning of the thirteenth century.⁵⁰

R. Abraham mentions other tosafists by name and incorporates much material from northern France into his *Sefer ha-Manhig*, as well as some German material,⁵¹ although it is uncertain whether he studied in or even

⁴⁷See above, n. 19, and nn. 33–35. Cf. *SHP* 548; Joseph b. Moses, *Leqet Yosher*, ed. Jacob Freimann (Berlin, 1903), pt. 1, 107; *Sefer Minhag Tov*, ed. M. Z. Weiss, *Ha-Ζofeh* 13 (1929):237; Moritz Güdemann, *Ha-Torah ve-ha-Hayim*, vol. 1 (Warsaw, 1897), 219, regarding references to *perushim* in *Sefer Assufot* (cf. above, n. 37); Gartner, *Gulgulei Minhag be-‘Olam ha-Halakhah*, 32–34; and Zimmer, ‘*Olam ke-Minago Noheg*, 229–39. Zimmer (233–34) seeks to identify (a practice of) *perushim* at the time of Rashi with *Hasidei Ashkenaz*. Note that with regard to ritual stringencies associated with *Hasidei Ashkenaz* having to do with various forms of impurity, Rabiah's views do not coincide with those of *Hasidei Ashkenaz* nearly as much as do those of his student, R. Isaac b. Moses *Or Zarua‘*; see below, ch. 2, nn. 82, 86.

⁴⁸*Sefer ha-Manhig*, ed. Yizhak Raphael (Jerusalem, 1978), 1:363.

⁴⁹See *Sefer ha-Manhig*, 2:475, 478, 519, 526, and see above, n. 29.

⁵⁰See Twersky, *Rabad of Posquières*, 240–43; *Sefer ha-Manhig*, editor's introduction, 11–18; Bernard Septimus, *Hispano-Jewish Culture in Transition* (Cambridge, Mass., 1982), 32–35, 48, 55; and Israel Ta-Shma, “*Hasidut Ashkenaz bi-Sefarad: Rabbenu Yonah Gerondi—Ha-Ish u-Fo‘alo*,” *Galut Ahar Golah*, ed. Aharon Mirsky et al. (Jerusalem, 1988), 171–73.

⁵¹*Sefer ha-Manhig*, editor's introduction, 38–39.

CHAPTER 1

visited Germany. Two of three versions of the laws of *tefillin* in *Sefer ha-Manhig* record a *gematria* interpretation (concerning the two *shins* that are engraved on the *tefillin shel rosh*) which he “received in the name of the German Pietists” (קְבָלָתִי בְשֵׁם חֲסִידִי אַלְמַנְיָא); this suggests that R. Abraham did not meet these Pietists personally.⁵² Parenthetically, these formulations are highly significant, for they establish that in the late twelfth century, behaviors of *hasidut Ashkenaz* were already being practiced by a group of people. These manifestations did not result only from the impact of *Sefer Hasidim*, nor did they remain within a single family.⁵³

Although this is the only context in *Sefer ha-Manhig* in which the term חֲסִידִי אַלְמַנְיָא appears, it is not the only instance in which R. Abraham included material that is associated with the German Pietists. *Sefer ha-Manhig* records a *rashei/sofei tevot* application derived from the final word of each book of the Pentateuch, which had been heard by an informant in the name of R. Isaac *ha-Lavan*. This application—which equates the word חָרֵם with the 248 limbs of a person’s body, thus suggesting that whoever violates a *herem* causes harm to his entire being and is thereby subject to all the punitive oaths contained in the Pentateuch—is found almost verbatim in one version of *Sefer Hasidim*.⁵⁴

⁵² *Sefer ha-Manhig*, 2:607, 626. R. Abraham refers to three German tosafists—R. Efraim [of Regensburg] (1:201–2), R. Isaac b. Asher (Riba) [of Spires] (2:508, 627), and Ri *ha-Lavan* [of Prague] (1:33)—as being from the larger area of Allemagne, although R. Efraim is also referred to by *Sefer ha-Manhig* as R. Efraim of Regensburg (2:659), and Ri *ha-Lavan*’s name in the oldest manuscript of *Sefer ha-Manhig* (Bodl. 900) is replaced by that of R. Isaac of Spires. [Ri *ha-Lavan* cites Riba often, and toward the end of his life he served as a judge in Regensburg. See Urbach, *Ba’alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:216, 218.] There is no evidence that R. Abraham had personal contact with any of these scholars. He mentions a written formulation of their views or indicates that he heard their position. The material that R. Abraham cites from Ri *ha-Lavan* can be found in *Sefer Hasidim*; see below, n. 54.

In one instance, R. Abraham cites an interpretation he heard from the mouth of R. Ḥayyim (b. Ḥanan’el) *ha-Kohen* (*Sefer ha-Manhig*, 1:36). R. Ḥayyim studied with Rabbeinu Tam in Troyes (or Ramerupt) and lived in Paris; see Urbach, 1:112, 124. In one of the later manuscripts of *Sefer ha-Manhig* (cited in the critical apparatus, loc. cit.), R. Ḥayyim is characterized as *ha-Qadosh R. Ḥayyim b. Ḥanan’el me-Allemagne*. Even if this reading is correct, however, the identification of *Hasidei Allemagne* in *Sefer ha-Manhig* with *Hasidei Ashkenaz* remains well-based.

⁵³ Cf. Marcus, *Piety and Society*, 131, 147, n. 3, and above, in the introduction.

⁵⁴ *Sefer ha-Manhig*, 1:33, and *SHB* 106 (and cf. below, n. 71). See also Jacob Gellis, *Tosafot ha-Shalem*, 2:35; *Shibbolei ha-Leqet*, pt. 2, ed. Simcha Hasida (Jerusalem, 1988), 231 (sec. 49); and *Sefer Kol Bo*, sec. 139, fol. 98b. On Ri *ha-Lavan*’s possible connections to *Hasidei Ashkenaz* (through R. Judah b. Qalonymus of Spires), see Urbach, *Ba’alei*

R. Abraham also follows closely a formulation of R. Samuel *he-Hasid*, without mentioning his name, in outlining the content of the liturgy of the final paragraph of the *Shema* that leads into the 'Amidah.⁵⁵

Sefer ha-Manhig maintains that the custom in northern France and Provence of the prayer leader calling out *hazaq* to each person who received an 'aliyyah to the Torah was based on a passage in *Bereshit Rabbah*. Modern scholarship has had difficulty locating this passage in extant versions of *Midrash Rabbah*. A recent suggestion points to a formulation in *Bereshit Rabbah*

ha-Tosafot, 1:222–23. See also *Perushei ha-Torah le-R. Yehudah he-Hasid*, ed. Y. S. Lange (Jerusalem, 1975), 8. [At least one of Ri *ha-Lavan*'s brothers, R. Petahyah of Regensburg, had contact with R. Judah *he-Hasid*; see Avraham David, "Sibbuv R. Petahyah me-Regensburg be-Nosah Hadash," *Qovez 'al Yad* n. s. 13 (1996): 239–43; *Arugat ha-Bosem*, ed. Urbach, 4:125–26; and Israel Ta-Shma, "Le-Toledot ha-Yehudim be-Polin ba-Me'ot ha-Yod Bet/ha-Yod Gimmel," *Zion* 53 (1988):352, n. 16, 368–69.] In the *Kol Bo* text, this passage is part of an actual *herem* pronouncement, and it is followed by a formulation in which both angelic and Divine Names are adjured in order to punish anyone who violates the *herem*. This *herem* form, which appears to have been in wide use although no location or area is specified, bears similarities to various magical and mystical adjurations discussed below; see ch. 3, n. 112. For the impact of these formulations in judicial and societal contexts, see Simha Goldin, "Tafqidei ha-'Herem' ve-ha-'Taqqanot' ba-Qehillah ha-Yehudit ha-Ashkenazit Bimei ha-Benayim," *Proceedings of the Eleventh World Congress of Jewish Studies* (Jerusalem, 1994) [Div. B, vol. 1], 107–8.

⁵⁵See *Sefer ha-Manhig*, 1:77–78, and the editor's notes, ad loc. Cf. "Arugat ha-Bosem", ed. Urbach, 4:86–87, and S. Emanuel, "Ha-Polmos 'al Nosah ha-Tefillah shel Hasidei Ashkenaz," nn. 85–86. The formulation of R. Samuel was an interpretation of a liturgical reading favored originally by R. Meir *Hazzan* (שליח ציון) that was subsequently challenged by R. Judah *he-Hasid* and R. Eleazar of Worms (whose view was shared by Rabbenu Tam). On R. Meir, cf. below, ch. 2, n. 65, and ch. 3, n. 122. *Sefer ha-Manhig*, 2:402, describes the atonement associated with *Hoshana Rabbah* in terms similar to those found in sources linked to the German Pietists. These notions were conflated further by the Zohar. See Ta-Shma, *Ha-Nigleh shebe-Nistar*, 22–23, and below, ch. 2, n. 34, and ch. 5, n. 27. Note also the affinities between *Sefer ha-Manhig* (cited in one instance in the name of *ha-Qadosh* R. Yom Tov [of Joigny?]; see below, n. 67) and a Pietist prayer commentary, with regard to the number of times the word *barukh* appears in *Barukh she-Amar*. See *Sefer ha-Manhig*, 1:42, 51, and Moshe Hallamish, "Be'ayot be-Heqer Hashpa'at ha-Qabbalah 'al ha-Tefillah," *Massu'ot*, ed. Oron and Goldreich, 214–15.

The author of *Sefer ha-Manhig* could easily have been a conduit for the asceticism of the German Pietists (and of Ri), which may have penetrated into southern France. See Marc Saperstein, "Christians and Christianity in the Sermons of Jacob Anatoli," *The Frank Talmage Memorial Volume*, ed. Bary Walfish (Haifa, 1993), 2:233–34; idem, "Your Voice Like a Ram's Horn": Themes and Texts in the Tradition of Preaching (Cincinnati, 1996), 69; and below, ch. 4, n. 10.

CHAPTER 1

that conveys the essence of what is found in *Sefer ha-Manhig*, albeit in different terms.⁵⁶ Interestingly, two related medieval Ashkenazic texts also identify this passage from *Bereshit Rabbah* as the source of the custom, citing it from “the writing of R. Judah *he-Hasid*” (מכחיתת הר’ יהודה החסיד).⁵⁷

Sefer ha-Manhig displays additional affinities with the German Pietists with respect to magical and mystical phenomena that will be discussed later. One aspect of this material that relates directly to the passages in *Sefer ha-Manhig* under consideration here should be mentioned. In outlining the proper conduct or form a person must display during the ‘Amidah prayer in particular, R. Abraham writes that he found a midrashic source that obligates a person to move himself or sway during prayer based on a verse in Psalms: “All my limbs should say, God who is like thee?” He further indicates that this was the practice of רבני צרפת וחסידיה.⁵⁸ The notion of swaying during prayer, together with its biblical source, is found in *Sefer Hasidim* as an imperative.⁵⁹ R. Zedekiah b. Abraham *ha-Rofe Anav* writes in his *Shibbolei ha-Leqet*—a mid-thirteenth century halakhic compendium that preserves Ashkenazic

⁵⁶See *Sefer ha-Manhig*, 1:182, and Ta-Shma, *Minhag Ashkenaz ha-Qadmon*, 182–83. Ta-Shma also notes a similar approach in the commentary to *Bereshit Rabbah* composed in eleventh-century Mainz.

⁵⁷See Moshe Hershler, “Minhagei Vermaiza u-Magenza, de-Vei Rashi ve-Rabbotav, u-Minhagei Ashkenaz shel ha-Roqeah,” *Genuzot* 2 (1985):19, sec. 34, and *Sefer Minhagim de-vei Maharam ben Barukh mi-Rothenburg*, ed. Israel Elfenbein (New York, 1938), 12. The reference to *Sefer Roqeqah* in the text published by Elfenbein refers only to the customs concerning the Torah reading for a groom before his wedding that are mentioned just prior to the *hazaq* custom, not to the *hazaq* custom itself. In Elfenbein’s version, the custom of reciting *hazaq* was limited to the completion of each book of the Torah. See now Ya’akov Spiegel, “Amirat *Hazaq* ve-Yishar Koah,” *Bar Ilan* 26–27 (1995):343–57.

⁵⁸*Sefer ha-Manhig*, 1:85. Cf. *Sefer ha-Manhig*, 1:191, and below, ch. 3, n. 56.

⁵⁹SHB, sec. 57. It is also found in R. Jonah of Gerona’s *Sefer ha-Yir’ah*, ed. B. Y. Zilber (Bnei Brak, 1969), 33, sec. 78, which has marked affinities with *Sefer Hasidim*; see below at n. 84. R. Judah *ha-Levi*, *Kuzari*, 2:79, offered a simple logistical explanation for swaying (since many people read from the same volume), although it appears the *Kuzari* passage refers to several people reading from a biblical text rather than from a prayerbook. Another tradition in medieval rabbinic literature explains the appropriateness of swaying (or at least moving one’s head) during Torah study, based directly on the verse which notes that the children of Israel trembled or moved when they got close to the Divine presence at Mount Sinai: וירא העם וינווער (Exodus 20:15). It is found in several versions of the Ashkenazic educational initiation ceremony [see my *Jewish Education and Society*, 116–17, 197], e.g., *Mahzor Vitry*, 628, 630 (sec. 508), and R. Aaron *ha-Kohen* of Lunel, *Orhot Hayyim*, pt. 2, ed. Moshe Schlesinger (Berlin, 1899), sec. 3, 24–25 (=Kol Bo, sec. 74, fol. 43a), which adduces additional biblical prooftexts. Cf.

customs and liturgical practices—that he found the source of this practice (based on the aforementioned verse in Psalms) in *Ma‘aseh Merkavah*, which connotes a *Hekhalot* text.⁶⁰

Sefer ha-Manhig continues by discussing another procedure, which appears in “internal [mystical] books” (*sefarim ha-penimiyyim*), concerning the intentions one should have while reciting blessings to the Almighty. This procedure is found in *Hekhalot* literature.⁶¹ Moreover, Moshe Idel has argued recently that the particular aspects of *kavvanah* described in this passage reflect

Moshav Zeqenim ‘al ha-Torah, ed. Solomon Sassoon (Jerusalem, 1982), 169; *Tosafot ha-Shalem*, ed. Jacob Gellis, vol. 8 (Jerusalem, 1990), 122; *Ba‘al ha-Turim ‘al ha-Torah*, ed. Jacob Reinitz (Jerusalem, 1993), 1:207; and *Zohar*, 218b. See also Zimmer, “*Tiqqunei ha-Guf bi-She‘at ha-Tefillah*,” 118–20 [=“*Olam ke-Minhago Noheg*, 99–101], and Marcus, *Rituals of Childhood*. 72–73.

⁶⁰ *Shibbolei ha-Leqet*, ed. S. K. Mirsky (New York, 1966), 183 (sec. 17). According to Zimmer, “*Tiqqunei ha-Guf*,” 120, n. 164 [=“*Olam ke-Minhago Noheg*, 100, n. 164], the source for this practice cannot be found in extant *Hekhalot* texts but is alluded to in *Midrash Tehillim* (which also reflects the editing of *Hasidei Ashkenaz*; see below, n. 63) and in a *piyyut* of R. Eleazar Qallir. *Shibbolei ha-Leqet*, 194 (sec. 20), also cites the practice of raising one’s eyes (and heels) during *Qedushah* (found in *Hekhalot Rabbati*), from a text that he again calls *Ma‘aseh Merkavah*. Cf. Gershom Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition* (New York, 1960), 101–2, and below, ch. 2, n. 34. [Raising one’s eyes during *Qedushah* is also mentioned by (the Pietist) R. Abraham b. Azriel in his *‘Arugat ha-Bosem* (based on “*Sefer Hekhalot*”) and by *Sefer Minhag Tov*. Cf. *SHB*, sec. 18, and *SHP*, secs. 1582–87. Indeed, it appears from a passage in *Arba‘ah Turim*, O. H. sec. 125 (also citing “*Sefer Hekhalot*”), that this was the custom throughout Ashkenaz (although the raising of the heels was omitted by a number of authorities, including R. Eleazar of Worms and Rabiah). See Zimmer, *Olam ke-Minhago Noheg*, 77–78, 109–110; Ivan Marcus, “Prayer Gestures in German Hasidism,” *Mysticism, Magic and Kabbalah in Ashkenazi Judaism*, ed. K. E. Grözinger and Joseph Dan (Berlin, 1995) 49–53; and above, n. 42. *Sefer ha-Manhig*, 1:88, records these practices from *sefarim penimiyyim*, a term that connotes *Hekhalot* literature. See the next note, and cf. Zimmer, 109, n. 215.]

⁶¹ See *Sefer ha-Manhig*, 1:85, editor’s notes to line 21. As in the *Sefer ha-Manhig* passage cited in the previous note, the reference to *sefarim penimiyyim* is apparently to *Hekhalot Rabbati* in particular. In *Sefer ha-Manhig*, 2:622, the term connotes unspecified esoteric works that are cited together with *Alfa Beta de-R. Aqiva*. Cf. Twersky, *Rabad of Posquières*, 242–43. [The use of this term in *Mahzor Vitry*, ed. Hurwitz, 112, sec. 144, is probably taken from *Sefer ha-Manhig*; see below, ch. 3, n. 56]. *Sefer ha-Manhig* also appears to have had access to *Otiyyot de-R. Aqiva* (1:14, 16, 90), and *Sefer Yezirah* is cited explicitly. See 1:12, 2:611, and 2:625: *וקבלתי לפֵי טבָע הָעוֹלָם סְטוֹר הַצִּירָה בְּסִפְרָה צִירָה*. Although *Sefer ha-Manhig* may have received some of this material from Provençal and Spanish kabbalists, (see editor’s introduction, 19, 29), the parallels to Ashkenazic material with regard to the *Hekhalot* passages are quite clear. See also below, n. 63.

CHAPTER 1

esoteric teachings of the German Pietists that were received by Provençal mystics such as R. Isaac Sagi Nahor.⁶² *Sefer ha-Manhig* concludes this section by noting that this concept should be transmitted only to those who are appropriate (*zenu'im*).⁶³

The link between *Hasidei Ashkenaz* and *Hekhalot* literature is, as has already been noted, strong and well established.⁶⁴ As we shall see throughout this study, the impact of *Hekhalot* literature on Ashkenazic rabbinic literature as a whole, in both esoteric and exoteric contexts, was also substantial. Given that R. Abraham b. Nathan *ha-Yarhi* was originally from Provence, and that there are several significant correlations in his work between practices of *Hasidei Zarefat* and *Hasidei Ashkenaz/Allemagne*, it is possible that R. Abraham viewed Ashkenazic *hasidut* as a larger single entity, with adherents in both northern France and Germany.⁶⁵

⁶²See Moshe Idel, “Al Kavvanat Shemoneh ‘Esreh Ezel R. Yizhaq Sagi Nahor,” *Massu’ot*, ed. Oron and Goldreich, 31–32; idem, “Ha-Tefillah be-Qabbalah Provence,” *Tarbiz* 62 (1993): 265–72; and cf. idem, “Ha-Kavvanah ba-Tefillah be-Reshit ha-Qabbalah: Bein Ashkenaz u-Provence,” *Porat Yosef* [Studies Presented to Rabbi Dr. Joseph Safran], ed. Bezalel Safran and Eliyahu Safran (New York, 1992), 5–14 [Hebrew section]; below, ch. 2, n. 14; and ch. 4, n. 10.

⁶³See, e.g., *Qiddushin*, 71a, where the transmission of the forty-two-letter Divine name is restricted to *kohanim* *zenu'im*, and cf. *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur*, ed. Peter Schäfer (Tübingen, 1981), sec. 303, which concludes that the *Sar ha-Torah* formula was preserved for the generations, *זה שומר לנו ימים*. Just prior to the comment on swaying during prayer, *Sefer ha-Manhig* (1:84) cites *Midrash Tehillim* (ed. Buber, 122), for a discussion of the way God is referred to in the formulation of blessings. On the presence of Ashkenazic (esoteric) teachings, including those of the German Pietists, in versions of this midrash, see below, ch. 3, n. 13. Indeed, a very similar formulation is found in the prayer commentary of R. Eleazar of Worms. See ‘*Arugat ha-Bosem*, ed. Urbach, 4:81–82, and Elliot Wolfson, *Through a Speculum That Shines* (Princeton, 1994), 203. The passage in *Sefer ha-Manhig* ends with the comment, *veha-mevin yavin*; cf. 1:153. For additional examples of Ashkenazic influence on *Sefer ha-Manhig* in matters of *sod* and *hasidut*, see, e.g., 1:56–57 (regarding the interpretation of *kaddish*), and cf. below, ch. 3, n. 55. See also 2:550, 1:300–303 (regarding fasting on *Rosh ha-Shanah*). Cf. Reuven Bonfil, “*Bein Erez Yisra’el le-Vein Bavel*,” *Shalem* 5 (1987):18, n. 63, and below, ch. 2, n. 38.

⁶⁴See above, n. 41.

⁶⁵Even after he settled in Spain, R. Abraham *ha-Yarhi* traveled back to northern France, serving as a kind of go-between in the earliest phase of the Maimonidean controversy. See Septimus, *Hispano-Jewish Culture in Transition*, 32–35, 48, 55. Note that the *Hug ha-Keruv ha-Meyuhad* was a mystical circle whose members lived in northern France and England but whose ideas had much in common with *hasidut Ashkenaz*. See, e.g., Yosef Dan, “*Hug ha-Keruv ha-Meyuhad bi-Tenu‘at Hasidut Ashkenaz*,” *Tarbiz* 35 (1966):349–72; Moshe Idel, *Golem* (Albany, 1990), 81–82, 92–93; and Wolfson, “*Demut Ya‘aqov*,” 140–41, 183–85.

At the same time, it is also plausible that the *Hasidei Zarefat* and the **רבני חסידיה** referred to by R. Abraham included tosafists, or even consisted primarily of them. That all of the northern French tosafists whom R. Abraham calls *ha-Qadosh*—Ri, R. Elijah of Paris, and R. Jacob of Corbeil—were involved to some degree in pietistic practices or mystical teachings⁶⁶ cannot be mere coincidence.⁶⁷ To be sure, the possibility remains that *Hasidei Zarefat* who stood throughout Yom Kippur, like the *perushim* referred to by Rabiah, were unconnected individuals who exhibited similar forms of pietistic behavior.⁶⁸

⁶⁶For Ri, see *Sefer ha-Manhig*, 2:475, 478, 487, 519, 526; and see above, n. 29, and below, ch. 4, n. 10. For R. Elijah, see *Sefer ha-Manhig*, 1:49, 337, 2:649; and below, ch. 3, nn. 95–96 (although it would appear from these references that R. Abraham did not have personal contact with R. Elijah). R. Meshullam of Melun writes about R. Elijah: **שאן עורה נגעה בישראל על אדם כמוותו בעונה וביראת חטא** והזכיר מעשה נסים של נעלית דלה עורה על הרב ידעת כי לא לבבוז אלא (Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:76). Rabbenu Tam refers to this description of R. Elijah by R. Meshullam of Melun writes about R. Elijah: **שאן עורה נגעה בישראל על אדם כמוותו בעונה וביראת חטא** והזכיר מעשה נסים של נעלית דלה עורה על הרב ידעת כי לא לבבוז אלא (Urbach, 1:79, and see also 1:122). For R. Jacob of Corbeil, see *Sefer ha-Manhig*, 2:649, and cf. below, ch. 4, nn. 22–23. In this instance, R. Abraham indicates he heard R. Jacob's view (on the question of invalidating the *gizit* at burial, which was the same as R. Elijah's) from R. Jacob's mouth. [This passage in *Sefer ha-Manhig* is the only medieval rabbinic text I have come across that provides the name of R. Jacob of Corbeil's father (Isaac); see my “Rabbinic Figures in Castilian Kabbalistic Pseudepigraphy: R. Yehudah *he-Hasid* and R. Ellhanan of Corbeil” *Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy* 3 (1993):88.]

⁶⁷The same manuscript of *Sefer ha-Manhig* (JTS) that refers to R. Hayyim *ha-Kohen* (*Sefer ha-Manhig*, 1:36)—about whom there is no evidence for pietistic practices (although cf. my “The ‘Aliyah of ‘Three Hundred Rabbis’ in 1211: Tosafist Attitudes Toward Settling in the Land of Israel,” *JQR* 76 [1986]: 191–215)—as *ha-Qadosh* also refers to *ha-Qadosh* R. Yom Tov (1:51). If this is R. Yom Tov of Joigny, I have noted an element of *perishut* associated with him and a liturgical interpretation similar to one held by *Hasidei Ashkenaz*; see above, nn. 36, 55. Cf., however, the critical notes to *Sefer ha-Manhig*, loc. cit., and the editor's introduction, 36, where a different R. Yom Tov is indicated. At the same time, R. Hayyim *ha-Kohen* is identified in this manuscript as hailing from Allemagne. If the variants in the JTS manuscript are seen as possible scribal embellishments and ignored (as Raphael did in establishing the main text of *Sefer ha-Manhig*), what emerges is that all northern French tosafists called *ha-Qadosh* by *Sefer ha-Manhig* had a pietistic or mystical bent. Cf. Zimmer, ‘*Olam ke-Minhago Noheg*, 100, n. 165. On the use of the title *Qadosh* in medieval rabbinic texts to connote piety, saintliness, or ascetic tendencies (rather than martyrdom), see my “Rabbinic Figures in Castilian Kabbalistic Pseudepigraphy,” 84–85, n. 30.

⁶⁸R. Asher b. Yehiel writes simply that “many people in Ashkenaz” stood during Yom Kippur, based on a passage in *Pirkei de-R. Eli'ezer*; see his commentary to *Yoma*, 8:24, and above, n. 48. The practice of immersing on the eve of Yom Kippur, which was

CHAPTER 1

R. Abraham makes mention (once) of *Hasidei Provence*, who were particularly careful that from the time that the wheat for making *mazot* was cut, no water come in contact with that wheat. In this context, *hasidut* merely connotes a special or added measure of observance.⁶⁹ Nonetheless, the uses of the term חסידי צרפת in *Sefer ha-Manhig* that we have encountered point to a loosely connected group of northern French pietists or scholars, if not an organized movement,⁷⁰ that may have had ideological connections with the German Pietists and perhaps tutorial links as well.

These findings lead us to consider several possibilities. Do examples of Pietist-like behavior in northern France and Germany at this time suggest that German Pietists had followers in tosafist circles—aside from those who resided in close geographic proximity—or was this pietism an aspect of the broader Ashkenazic rabbinic culture? To put it differently, thirteenth-century tosafists who displayed these types of behavior may have received them as traditions that originated in the pre-Crusade period, just as the German Pietists themselves did. Or they may have been introduced to them by the Pietists directly or through their works. The latter possibilities are viable even if the tosafists did not subscribe to the full range of Pietist teachings or to all of the embellishments and reworkings of the pre-Crusade concepts that the Pietists undertook.

also ascribed by Rabiah to פורישים (above, n. 32), is found in geonic sources; see *Seder R. 'Amram Gaon*, ed. Daniel Goldschmidt (Jerusalem, 1971), 160, and the literature cited there. Cf. R. Asher b. Yehi'el, loc. cit.; *Arba'ah Turim*, *Orah Hayyim*, 606; *Sefer Roqeah*, sec. 218; and *Sefer Or Zarua'*, 2:277 (fol. 63a). The earliest record for the custom of standing all day on Yom Kippur may in fact be the passages in *Sefer ha-Manhig* and *Sefer Rabiah*. [The cryptic reference in *Mahzor Vitry*, 389 (sec. 351), found in a pericope labeled 'ת (=טפוח)', may have originated with R. Abraham b. Nathan, who added material to this work. See *Sefer ha-Manhig*, editor's introduction, 35–37, and cf. *Mahzor Vitry*, 382 (sec. 346).] Although R. Asher b. Yehi'el writes that this practice was widespread in Ashkenaz, cf. *Sefer Or Zarua'* (above); *Tanya Rabbati* and *Sefer Minhag Tov* (above, nn. 33–34); and *Arba'ah Turim*, O. H., 619, who notes explicitly that this was the custom only of 'anshei ma'aseh be-Ashkenaz. [R. David Abudarham, writing in Seville in 1340, indicates that only *yehidim* stood the entire day. See his *Abudarham ha-Shalem* (repr. Jerusalem, 1963), 291, and cf. *Beit Yosef*, loc. cit.]

⁶⁹*Sefer ha-Manhig*, 2:460. A similar usage may be evident in a passage in which *Sefer ha-Manhig*, 1:59, delineates the portions of rabbinic texts that "hakhamim ve-hasidim" substituted for the *Qaddish*, *Barekhu*, and *Qedushah* prayers, when they prayed individually without a quorum.

⁷⁰Cf. Zimmer, 'Olam ke-Minhago Noheg', 230, 233.

The Academy at Evreux, Rabbenu Yonah, and R. Moses of Coucy

Specific teachings and more general goals of the German Pietists do seem to have had an impact on tosafists in northern France during the thirteenth century.⁷¹ As we have noted, a school of tosafists in northern France during the first half of the thirteenth century—the academy of the brothers R. Moses b. Shne'ur and R. Samuel b. Shne'ur of Evreux—appears to have internalized a number of Pietist teachings concerning talmudic study and interpretation.⁷² It is helpful to summarize briefly some of the documentation for that phenomenon, in order to appreciate the extent to which Pietist doctrines and practices permeated tosafist circles.

Many of the *Tosafot* texts that emerged from this *beit midrash*—including the standard *Tosafot* to *Qiddushin*, *Nazir*, *Arakhin*, and *Temurah*, *Tosafot R. Samson of Sens* to *Sotah*, and the so-called *Tosafot Rashba* to *Menahot*—emphasize simple, straightforward interpretation of the talmudic text. These *Tosafot* also seek to clarify and explain Rashi's comments, often reproducing Rashi's comments in full, and they contain much less comparative dialectic than is normally found in *Tosafot* texts.⁷³ As Haym Soloveitchik and Israel Ta-Shma have demonstrated, the German Pietists were gravely concerned about the overuse of dialectic and the development of dialectical *hiddushim* by unqualified students. They wished to promote a talmudic studies that would direct the student more clearly in matters of *halakhah* and allow him to master the talmudic text at hand.⁷⁴ The unusual *Tosafot* just described would make a major contribution toward achieving this aim. It is therefore likely that the

⁷¹ Many of the *le'azim* in *SHB* are French, and there is a (shortened) northern French version of *Sefer Hasidim* (called “*Sefer Hasidut*”) in ms. Bodl. 875, which was copied in 1299 (=SHB 1–152). See, e.g., Güdemann, *Ha-Torah ve-ha-Hayyim*, 1:229–30; I. G. Marcus, “The Recensions and Structure of ‘Sefer Hasidim,’” *PAAJR* 45 (1978):131–53; and Marcus’s introduction to *Sefer Hasidim* [ms. Parma H 3280] (Jerusalem, 1985), 10. This development may indicate the presence of followers of *hasidut Ashkenaz* in northern France or it may simply reflect the diffusion and adaptation of *Sefer Hasidim* through western Europe. Cf. above, n. 2.

⁷² See above, introduction, at n. 21.

⁷³ Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:455–56, 482–84, 2:632–33, 636, 655–57, 670–71. See also Avigdor Arieli's note in ‘Alai Sefer 16 (1989):149–50, and ‘Olat Shelomoh (Petah Tikva, 1989), 1:14–17.

⁷⁴ See Soloveitchik, “Three Themes,” 339–52; Ta-Shma, “Mizvat Talmud Torah ki-Ve’ayah Hevratit-Datit be-Sefer Hasidim,” *Sefer Bar Ilan* 14–15 (1977):98–113. See also Marcus, *Piety and Society*, 102–5; my *Jewish Education and Society*, 86–91; and note, e.g., *SHP* 801: *גם אם יכתב פירושים יפרש הכל*. *כדי שלא יהיה יגיא להשוו ויתבטל משאר דברי תורה*.

CHAPTER 1

brothers of Evreux composed these *Tosafot* under the influence of the educational critique of the German Pietists.⁷⁵

This contention is buttressed by the fact that another interpretational strategy characteristic of the academy at Evreux also corresponds to a position of the German Pietists. The brothers of Evreux commented on virtually all the tractates in *Seder Qodashim* (as well as tractate *Sheqalim* in the Jerusalem Talmud), an area that many Ashkenazic talmudists understandably ignored. The German Pietists valued greatly the study of *Seder Qodashim* (as well as other “unpopular” tractates) precisely because it was being ignored in many circles.⁷⁶ Additionally, *Seder Qodashim* was the focus of a commentary compiled in eleventh-century Mainz.⁷⁷ The concern shown by the German Pietists for the study of *Seder Qodashim* may also be a reflection of their

⁷⁵ Urbach’s suggestion, *Ba’alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:482–83, that these *Tosafot* were composed to compensate for the significant loss of talmudic texts following the Trial of the Talmud (by providing additional Rashi texts that included Rashi’s citations from the Talmud, and by allowing students to grasp more easily the correct interpretation of the talmudic *sugya* at hand) is undercut by the fact that no tosafists in this period other than the brothers of Evreux reacted in this manner to the shortage of books. Cf. Baron, *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*, 9:65–71, who is skeptical about whether the shortage of volumes had a significant impact on talmudic study and, indeed, about the extent of the loss in western Europe.

⁷⁶ See *SHP*, pars. 1 (p. 2), 1509, and cf. 765, 1495; and cf. R. Yonah’s *Sefer ha-Yir’ah*, ed. Zilber, 64, sec. 248. Yaakov Sussmann, “Massoret Limmud u-Massoret Nosah shel Talmud Yerushalmi,” *Mehqarim be-Sifrut Talmudit le-Regel Melot Shemonim Shanah le-Sha’ul Lieberman* (Jerusalem, 1983), 14, n. 11, maintains that a circle of thirteenth-century Spires scholars who were closely linked (and in most cases related) to the *Hasidei Ashkenaz* (e.g., R. Judah b. Qalonymus) attempted to stretch the scope of study from the “three orders” (*Mo’ed*, *Nashim*, *Neziqin*) to include *Qodashim*, *Talmud Yerushalmi*, and other relatively neglected areas of rabbinic literature, such as *aggadah* and *tefillah*. Cf. Ta-Shma, “Mizvat Talmud Torah,” 105, n. 6. Sussmann also notes (34–35) that the German Pietists and their relatives and students were practically the only *rishonim* to produce commentaries on *Yerushalmi Sheqalim* (whose content is closely related to *Seder Qodashim*). There is a commentary to *Sheqalim* that Saul Lieberman attributed to a student of R. Samuel b. Shne’ur of Evreux; see *Sefer ha-Yovel li-Khevod Alexander Marx* (New York, 1950) [Hebrew section], 295. Both Urbach (*Ba’alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:405) and Sussmann (35) reject this identification and suggest that this commentary was authored by R. Eleazar of Worms or one of his circle. However, the relationship between the brothers of Evreux and the teachings of the German Pietists being reviewed here lends additional support to Lieberman’s attribution. See also below, ch. 2, n. 61.

⁷⁷ See Grossman, *Hakhmei Ashkenaz ha-Rishonim*, 165–70.

deep-seated desire to return to or imitate the curriculum of the pre-Crusade period.⁷⁸

R. Moses of Evreux issued a statement on achieving proper *kavvanah* in prayer that could have been composed by a German Pietist: “A person must remove all extraneous thoughts from his heart during prayer and direct his heart only to the source. He must consider every word before he expresses it. If he does this in every instance and does not sin, his prayers will be pure and acceptable before the Almighty.”⁷⁹ This statement is almost identical to a formulation at the end of a text attributed to R. Moses that is recorded in both *Sefer Kol Bo* and *Sefer Orhot Hayyim*. In *Sefer Kol Bo*, the text is entitled **דברים המבאים לידי יראת החטא אשר כתוב הר”מ מאירוֹן**.⁸⁰

This text contains a number of additional parallels to passages in *Sefer Hasidim*. Included are the avoidance of haughty and other sinful behavior

⁷⁸ See also above, introduction, n. 12. On *humra* at Evreux, see below, n. 175, and ch. 2, n. 65.

⁷⁹ *Haggahot Rabenu Perez* to R. Isaac of Corbeil, *Sefer Mizvot Qatan*, precept 11, n. 3 (the precept is headed *le-hitpallel be-kavvanah*), and cf. below, n. 153; Urbach, *Ba’alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:480–81; *SHP*, sec. 11. **כשיטפלל האדם עירך שיעמוד ביראה ... שלא זויך** בchaplla כאלו שמה אם היה כבר מסיים אלא בכל כונה לחת בכל מטה **שמוחזיא מפיו**, 440–43, 1585, 1605; and Soloveitchik, “Three Themes,” 333–34. The gloss of R. Perez containing the statement of R. Moses of Evreux appears at a point where R. Eleazar of Worms is cited by *Sefer Mizvot Qatan* on the importance of maintaining appropriate *kavvanah* throughout the blessings of the ‘Amidah prayer: **מי שמתבונן בשאלתו ולא יזכיר בשבחו של הקב”ה מהшиб את עצמו** (cf. *SHP* 1577–79, 393, and R. Abraham Oppenheim, *Eshel Avraham* to *Shulhan ‘Arukh*, *Orah Hayyim*, sec. 97); see below, n. 152. A statement by R. Samuel of Evreux on *kavvanah* is recorded by Rabbenu Perez in a gloss to *Semaq*, precept 97.

⁸⁰ See *Sefer Kol Bo*, sec. 66 (end), fol. 32a; R. Aharon ha-Kohen of Lunel, *Orhot Hayyim* (Florence, 1750), vol. 1, 103a (at the end of a section entitled ‘inyanim aherim bi-teshuvah); and cf. Tuvia Preschel, “Iggeret she-Yuhsah be-Ta’ut la-Ramban,” *Talpiyyot* 8 (1961):49–53. R. Samuel of Evreux was called *he-Hasid* by his student, R. Yedidyah b. Israel (who may have been a teacher of R. Judah *he-Hasid*’s son R. Zal[t]man). See *Shitah ‘al Mo’ed Qatan le-Talmido shel R. Yehiel mi-Paris*, ed. M. Zaks (Jerusalem, 1937), 2:113, and cf. Urbach, *Ba’alei ha-Tosafot*, 2:569, n. 25. R. Samuel was also the teacher of R. Isaac of Corbeil, who bore the title *hasid* (see Urbach, 2:572–73) and had other affinities with the German Pietists, and of R. Meir of Rothenburg, who was strongly influenced by the Pietists; see below regarding both of these scholars. Moshe Hershler, in his edition of *Siddur R. Shelomoh mi-Germaiza ve-Siddur Hasidei Ashkenaz* (Jerusalem, 1972), 184, identified the R. Samuel who found a liturgical interpretation “written in the hand of R. Judah the Pious” as R. Samuel of Evreux. Cf. Hershler, 88. It is likely, however, that this scholar was R. Samuel Bamberg. Cf. Hershler, 119, 136, 223, 296; and below, ch. 2, n. 15.

CHAPTER 1

through the cultivation of meekness toward others and by remembering the Divine Presence at all times, and the acquisition of knowledge about how to fulfill the law as the primary goal of Torah study.⁸¹ Moreover, it is appended in *Sefer Kol Bo* to a treatise by R. Eleazar of Worms entitled *Sefer Moreh Hatta'im/Sefer ha-Kapparot*.

Both R. Moses and R. Samuel of Evreux exhibited forms of ascetic behavior. *Orhot Hayyim* and *Kol Bo* list the five prohibitions on the ninth of Av which are based, in part, on the restrictions that a mourner has during the *shiv'ah* period. On *Tish'ah be-Av*, however, it was agreed that one need not “turn over the bed” and sleep on the floor. “But R. Samuel of Evreux was personally strict and slept on the floor.”⁸² R. Isaac b. Joseph (or R. Perez b. Elijah) of Corbeil ruled that one should not enjoy the physical pleasures of the world during the week any more than he needs to sustain his body. He may do so in public, however, to avoid ridicule. “And R. Moses [of Evreux] would cut his meat into very fine pieces in order not to be able to savor the taste of the meat.”⁸³

The affinities between the academy at Evreux and *hasidut Ashkenaz* help to resolve a long-standing question of authorship. Several works by Rabbenu Yonah of Gerona bear the unmistakable influence of the German Pietists. Notable among these is *Sefer ha-Yir'ah*, a veritable program of pietistic behavior

⁸¹Cf., e.g., *SHP*, sec. 754; *SHB*, sec. 53; Rabbenu Yonah, *Sefer ha-Yir'ah*, 35, sec. 105; Soloveitchik, “Three Themes,” 329, 344; Galinsky, “Rabbenu Moshe mi-Coucy ke-Hasid, Darshan u-Folmosan,” 40–43, 70–71.

⁸²See *Sefer Orhot Hayyim*, *Hilkhot Tish'ah be-Av*, sec. 13 (end), fol. 95a, *Kol Bo*, sec. 62, fol. 27a. Cf. Zimmer, ‘*Olam ke-Minhago Noheg*, 194. A colleague and associate of the brothers of Evreux, R. Netan’el *ha-Qadosh* of Chinon, fasted during the daytime when he sat *shiv'ah*; see *Kol Bo*, sec. 114, fol. 88b, and below, ch. 3, n. 104.

⁸³See S. Sha’anan, “*Pisqei Rabbenu Perez va-Aherim be-‘Inyanei Orah Hayyim*,” *Moriah* 17:9–10 (1991):12, sec. 15, and cf. above, n. 3. These *pesaqim* were published by Sha’anan from ms. Paris 407, fols. 236c–237a. The first group of *pesaqim* in this manuscript match other *pesaqim* from R. Perez. The notion of not enjoying the pleasures of this world and the description of R. Moses’ practice are found, however, on fol. 236d, after the name of R. Isaac (of Corbeil) is mentioned. Moreover, these passages appear in ms. Cambr. Add. 3127 (fol. 165v), in a section of *pesaqim* attributed to R. Isaac of Corbeil, in which R. Isaac is referred to as *ha-qadosh* and in which other expressions of self-denial are found (fol. 166r). On these manuscripts, see Simcha Emanuel, “*Sifrei Halakhah Avudim shel Ba’alei ha-Tosafot*” (Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University, 1993), 238–40. Both R. Isaac of Corbeil and R. Perez of Corbeil were students at Evreux. See Urbach, *Ba’alei ha-Tosafot*, 2:571, 576; *Tosafot Rabbenu Perez ‘al Massekhet Sukkah*, ed. Shemayah Greenbaum (Jerusalem, 1972) [appended to his *Si’ata di-Shemayah*], editor’s introduction, 195–96; and below, nn. 168, 177, and ch. 2, n. 69.

that has many parallels to passages in *Sefer Hasidim* but does not seem to reflect the Spanish milieu. Despite these parallels, a number of scholars have questioned and even rejected the attribution of this work to Rabbenu Yonah.⁸⁴ In fact, however, Rabbenu Yonah's authorship may be retained, for he studied at Evreux with both R. Moses and R. Samuel, and it was there that he came into contact with the teachings of *Hasidei Ashkenaz*. Indeed, the only medieval rabbinic scholar mentioned by name in *Sefer ha-Yir'ah* is R. Samuel b. Shne'ur, who is referred to as the author's teacher.⁸⁵

⁸⁴See Benjamin Richler, "Al Kitvei ha-Yad shel Sefer ha-Yir'ah ha-Meyuhas le-Rabbenu Yonah Gerondi," *Alei Sefer* 8 (1980):51–59, and the literature cited in nn. 1–2; Yehiel Zilber, "Sefer ha-Yir'ah le-Rabbenu Yonah Gerondi he-Hasid," *Moriah* 10:9–10 (1981):94–96; and cf. Galinsky, "Rabbenu Mosheh mi-Coucy ke-Hasid," 123, n. 21; and above, nn. 59, 76. On the prohibition of gazing at women in R. Yonah's writings and in *Sefer Hasidim*, cf. A. T. Shrock, *Rabbi Jonah b. Abraham of Gerona* (London, 1946), 161; Soloveitchik, "Three Themes," 329; and below, n. 178.

The work is attributed in some manuscripts to R. Yehudah *he-Hasid* and in others to a R. Yizhaq *Hasid*. In three places in R. Aharon *ha-Kohen* of Lunel's *Orhot Hayyim* (*hilkhot qizit*, sec. 23 [fol. 3b], *hilkhot qeri'at shema*, sec. 18 [fol. 12b], and *hilkhot tefillah*, sec. 16 [fol. 14a]), material from *Sefer ha-Yir'ah* is attributed to ר' חסיד. Richler has suggested, on the basis of a copyist's mistaken assumption and the prologue to *Orhot Hayyim*, that this refers not to R. Yehudah *he-Hasid* but to R. Yizhaq (*Hasid*) of Corbeil, author of the *Semaq*. While I agree that R. Aharon *ha-Kohen* may not have considered Rabbenu Yonah to be ר' חסיד, author of *Sefer ha-Yir'ah* [Rabbenu Yonah is cited in *Orhot Hayyim* by name more than ten times, although *Orhot Hayyim* attributes a passage from *Sefer ha-Yir'ah* to Rabbenu Yonah on one occasion (see the next note)], it is highly unlikely that he equated ר' חסיד with R. Isaac of Corbeil. R. Isaac is cited with great frequency throughout *Orhot Hayyim*, always as ר' קורביל (Mkorebil). Moreover, there are two sections in *Orhot Hayyim* where ר' חסיד and ר' קורביל are both listed (separately) as espousing the same position [*hilkhot tefillah*, sec. 16 (fol. 14a) and sec. 33 (fol. 15b)], and another place in which ר' חסיד and ר' קורביל are mentioned in very close proximity (*hilkhot qizit*, secs. 21, 23–24). [R. Yehudah *he-Hasid* is mentioned once by name, in *hilkhot 'erev Yom ha-Kippurim*, sec. 6 (fol. 103b).] For further discussion of this problem and its ramifications, see my "Rabbinic Figures in Castilian Kabbalistic Pseudepigraphy: R. Yehudah *he-Hasid* and R. Elhanan of Corbeil," *Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy* 3 (1993): 90–95.

⁸⁵See *Sefer ha-Yir'ah*, 16, sec. 43: *ומפי מורי הרב ר' שמואל ב'ר שניאור שמעתי דאיין ציריך* לברך משומש אלא כשותן בערךין מתקופתך והוא מוחזין למקומון. Richler notes that R. Samuel's name is included in only five non-Ashkenazic, relatively late manuscripts from among the more than forty extant manuscripts, suggesting a later addition to the text. *Sefer Orhot Hayyim*, however, which predates virtually all the extant manuscripts, records this formulation in the name of Rabbenu Yonah (*hilkhot tefillin*, sec. 4 [fol. 7a], citing his teacher R. Samuel), thus confirming, somewhat ironically, Rabbenu Yonah's authorship of *Sefer ha-Yir'ah*. See also R. Yom Tov b. Abraham Ishvilli

CHAPTER 1

Sefer ha-Yir'ah focuses largely on piety and prayer and on modesty in personal comportment—areas for which there is ample evidence that the brothers of Evreux took their cue from the German Pietists.⁸⁶ Close parallels in phrasing as well as content between *Sefer ha-Yir'ah* and R. Moses of Evreux's treatise, *Devarim ha-Mevi'im Lidei Yir'at ha-Het*, referred to above, are found in passages that stress the need to eliminate haughtiness and replace this tendency with constant striving for modesty and humility. The demands of extreme personal humility common to both works include not walking at one's fullest height or stature, not looking directly into the face of another, and the need to always remember that every thought a person has and every act he performs is done before the Almighty and must be for the sake of Heaven.⁸⁷ Moreover, a significant number of manuscript copyists transcribed *Sefer ha-Yir'ah* (which

[Ritba, c. 1300, recorded by R. Yosef Ḥaviva, *Nimmuqeī Yosef*, *Hilkhot Ḥiẓit*, in the standard editions of the Babylonian Talmud following tractate *Menahot*, fol. 12a], who cites this position as “a comment of R. Yonah in the name of R. Mosheh b. Shne'ur of Evreux.” (The names of the brothers of Evreux are associated with R. Yonah interchangeably). As Ta-Shma notes in a postscript to his “*Hasidut Ashkenaz bi-Sefarad*,” (above, n. 50), 193, *Hiddushei ha-Ritba* (*Rosh ha-Shanah*, 34a) cites a passage from “*Sefer ha-Yir'ah le-Rabbenu Yonah*,” removing any doubt concerning R. Yonah's authorship.

⁸⁶See above, nn. 78–80. A student of R. Moses of Evreux compiled *Sefer 'al ha-Kol*, an unusual handbook of legal decisions and customs regarding prayer, including discussions about the correct *nosah ha-tefillah*. R. Moses' son (and perhaps R. Moses himself) composed a *siddur*, and R. Isaac, a lesser known brother of R. Moses, wrote *piyyutim*. See Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:485; J. N. Epstein, “*Al ha-Kol*,” *Sinai* 94 (1984):123–36 [=Epstein's *Mehqarim be-Sifrut ha-Talmud u-Vileshonot Shemiyot*, ed. E. Z. Melammed, vol. 2 (Jerusalem, 1988), 776–89]; and Henri Gross, *Gallia Judaica* (Paris, 1897), 40–41.

⁸⁷See *Sefer ha-Yir'ah*, secs. 4–7, 14, 105–6, 128, 146. R. Moses' treatise is followed in *Sefer Kol Bo* (sec. 67) by a section entitled *Seder Darkhei Teshuvah* that is actually R. Yonah's (*Ye-*)*Sod ha-Teshuvah*. The lengthier treatment in *Sefer ha-Yir'ah* counsels that intense focus on these issues is to begin from the time one awakens and should continue throughout the day at every opportunity. Cf. the “*seder ha-yom*” description attributed by Israel Ta-Shma, “*Quntresei 'Sodot ha-Tefillah' le-R. Yehudah he-Hasid*,” *Tarbiz* 65 (1996):75–76, to Rabbenu Yonah, and cf. Emanuel, “*Ha-Polmos 'al Nosah ha-Tefillah shel Hasidei Ashkenaz*,” n. 69. For a similarity between *Sefer Hasidim* and *Sefer ha-Yir'ah* with regard to the proper way for a scribe to copy Hebrew works and commentaries, see Malachi Beit-Arié, “Paleographic Identification of Hebrew MSS.: Methodology and Practice,” *Jewish Art* 12–13 (1986–87): 17, n. 7, and idem, “Ideal Versus Reality: Scribal Prescriptions in *Sefer Hasidim* and Contemporary Scribal Practices in Franco-German Manuscripts,” *Rashi*, 1040–1990: *Hommage à Ephraim Urbach*, ed. Gabrielle Sed-Rajna (Paris, 1993), 562–63.

was also entitled *Sefer Hayyei 'Olam*) together with works of the German Pietists.⁸⁸ Similarly, Rabbenu Yonah's authorship of *Sha'arei 'Avodah*—which cites midrashim and *piyyutim* that appear to have been known only in Ashkenaz (and, in some cases, that were quoted almost exclusively in works by German Pietists)—may also be confirmed.⁸⁹

⁸⁸ Bodl. 875 (completed in Ashkenaz in 1299) contains *'Ammudei Golah (Semaq)* followed by *Hayyei 'Olam* and a version of *Sefer Hasidim* with predominantly French glosses. Bodl. 1098 (Ashkenaz, c. 1290) and Breslau [Signatur] 255 also juxtapose *Sefer Hasidut/Hasidim* and *Sefer Hayyei 'Olam/Sod ha-Teshuvah*. [The Breslau ms., which is no longer extant—apparently having been lost in the Holocaust—is listed and described as no. 248 in *Catalogue of the Hebrew Manuscripts in the Library of the Juedisch-Theologisches Seminar in Breslau*, ed. D. S. Loewinger and B. D. Weinryb (Wiesbaden, 1965²), 175–76; cf. the editors' foreword, vii–ix. In this ms., Rabbenu Yonah's works are followed by a later collection of *sifrut de-Vei Rashi* that cites R. Judah *he-Hasid* among others, and was possibly compiled by R. Isaiah di Trani. See E. E. Urbach, "Liqqutim mi-Sifrei de-Vei Rashi," *Sefer Rashi* (Jerusalem, 1956), 322–25, and cf. Israel Ta-Shma, "Sefer Shibbolei ha-Leqet u-Khefelav," *Italia* 11 (1995): 46–47]. Bodl. 2343 and 1114 (Ashkenaz, c. 1410) and Parma 3175 (De Rossi 166) group *Sefer ha-Yir'ah/Sefer Hayyei 'Olam* with *Sod ha-Teshuvah* and (R. Judah *he-Hasid*'s) *Shir ha-Yihud*. (These manuscripts attribute all three texts to R. Yizḥaq ḥasid. See above, n. 84.) [On the attribution of *Shir ha-Yihud* to R. Judah *he-Hasid*, or another of the *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, see Joseph Dan's introduction to the Jewish National and University Library's edition of *Shirei Yihud* (Jerusalem, 1981), 7–15. Cf. below, ch. 3, n. 110. Note that the version of *Sod ha-Teshuvah* found in the margins of ms. Cambr. Add. 377, fols. 105v–107r, is attributed to R. Eliezer (sic.) of Worms.] Bodl. 884 (Ashkenaz 1384) contains *Semaq*, the testament (*zava'ah*) of R. Judah *he-Hasid*, and a brief section of *tiqqun shetarot*, followed by *Sefer Hayyei 'Olam* and *Sod ha-Teshuvah*, which was also written by Rabbenu Yonah; see Shrock, *Rabbi Jonah b. Abraham of Gerona*, 69–79. The first part of Bodl. 2274 (Ashkenaz, c. 1390) contains *Hayyei 'Olam*, R. Eleazar of Worms's *Hilkhot Teshuvah*, a prayer commentary attributed to Nahmanides but in fact similar to tracts of *ḥasidut Ashkenaz*, citing R. Judah *he-Hasid*, R. Sa'adyah Gaon, and R. Samuel of Bamberg; a brief eschatological text and one on Holy Names; and *She'elot u-Teshuvot le-R. Ya'aqov of Marvège*, attributed here to Rabbenu Jacob Tam instead. Ms. Casanatense 117 (fourteenth century) juxtaposes R. Jacob of Marvège's *Teshuvot min ha-Shamayim*, *Sefer Hayyei 'Olam*, and R. Eleazar of Worms's *Moreh Hatta'im*. (*Semaq* precedes this group of texts in fairly close proximity). Cambr. Add. 2580 (1397) contains *Semaq*, *Sefer ha-Yir'ah*, and R. Eleazar of Worms's *Moreh Hatta'im*. See also Cambr. Add. 3127, which contains *Sefer Hayyei 'Olam* followed by *Semaq* and several Pietist works, including *sodot ha-tefillah* (see the next note) and *Zava'at R. Yehudah he-Hasid*.

⁸⁹ See Norman Bronznick, "Ba'aluto shel R. Yonah Gerondi 'al Sefer Sha'arei ha-'Avodah ha-Nidpas," *Ha-Darom* 28 (1969):238–42. Cf. Y. S. Zachter, "Kavvanat Qeri'at Shema," *Yeshurun* 2 (1996):32, n. 19, and M. M. Kasher, *Shema Yisra'el* (Jerusalem, 1980), 253–55. Israel Ta-Shma has raised the possibility that R. Yonah was the editor of a collection of *sodot ha-tefillah* of *Hasidei Ashkenaz* (with some additional

CHAPTER 1

Rabbenu Yonah's approach and attitudes toward asceticism, especially as expressed in his *Sefer ha-Yir'ah* and *Sod ha-Teshuvah*, are strikingly similar to those of *Sefer Hasidim*. He recommends a regular regimen of fasting and encourages, as a form of asceticism, the diminution of pleasures associated with eating.⁹⁰ To be sure, a passage in *Sha'arei Teshuvah* condemns excessive fasting as an ascetic impulse and especially as a means of grieving.⁹¹ But *Sefer Hasidim*, no less than Rabbenu Yonah, expresses concern about excess and abuses or over zealousness in fasting.⁹² Moreover, other passages in *Sha'arei*

Provençal material) that are characterized (inaccurately) in several manuscripts as the *sodot* of Ramban. See Ta-Shma, "Quntresei 'Sodot ha-Tefillah' le-R. Yehudah he-Hasid," *Tarbiz* 65 (1996)73–77 (and idem, *Ha-Nigleh shebe-Nistar*, 50–52); but cf. Emanuel, "Ha-Polmos 'al Nosah ha-Tefillah shel Hasidei Ashkenaz," (above, n. 39), nn. 68–71; below, ch. 3, nn. 110, 118; and ch. 5, nn. 47, 74.

⁹⁰See *Sefer ha-Yir'ah le-Rabbenu Yonah*, ed. Zilber, 73, sec. 328: One day a month or more, a person should undertake a fast or at least eat only bread and water. That day should be a day of weeping and introspection about specific sins or about how the person has incurred great liability before the Master of the Universe. See also *Sefer ha-Yir'ah*, 2–3, secs. 4–10; the ms. version of *Sefer Hayyei 'Olam* cited by Margoliot in his notes to SHB 12 (*Meqor Hesed*, n. 1); and cf. Shokek, *Ha-Teshuvah be-Sifrut ha-Musar ha-'Ivrit*, 77–88. This formulation is similar to a passage in Rabbenu Yonah's (*Ye-*)*Sod ha-Teshuvah*: A person should continue to afflict himself over prior sins that he has already overcome. If a person is not strong enough to withstand harsh afflictions and fasts, he should at least resist his desires. He should not allow his desires to be fulfilled regarding food and drink. As Rabad said, a significant means of restraint concerns the withholding of food. This does not mean a person should give up meat and wine entirely. Rather, when a person eats and still has the desire to eat more, he should abstain in honor of the Creator and not satiate fully his desires. This behavior will keep a person from sin and remind him of the precept to love the Creator more effectively than fasting once a week. Each day, as he eats and drinks, he should deny his desires in honor of his Creator. [On Rabad and asceticism, see above, n. 6.]

⁹¹See *Sha'arei Teshuvah*, 3:82, and cf. Saperstein, "Christians and Christianity in the Sermons of Jacob Anatoli," (above, n. 55). Rabbenu Perez, in a gloss to *Sefer Mizvot Qatan*, sec. 175, cites a version of this formulation in the name of Rabbenu Yonah: While it is inappropriate to tear one's clothing more than is required or destroy one's property as a sign of mourning over a death, and while it is also inappropriate to abuse or weaken one's body, e.g., by fasting, as a reaction to one's troubles or to mourn a loss, one who grieves and fasts for his sins is considered commendable. It should also be noted that *Sha'arei Teshuvah* appears to represent the Spanish phase of R. Yonah's ethical writings. See Ta-Shma, "Hasidut Ashkenaz bi-Sefarad," 181–88; and Shokek in the preceding note.

⁹²On *Sefer Hasidim* and asceticism, see above, at the beginning of this chapter, esp. nn. 2–3. For a parallel between *Sefer ha-Yir'ah* and a pietistic practice of R. Eleazar of Worms, see *Sefer ha-Yir'ah*, 72, sec. 309, and cf. Elliot Ginsburg, *The Sabbath in the Classical Kabbalah* (Albany, 1989), 246, n. 21.

Teshuvah stress the importance of refraining from pleasure and obliterating lustful desires.⁹³

The process by which Pietist teachings were transmitted to these talmudists in northern France remains unclear. There was no direct contact between the brothers of Evreux and R. Judah *he-Hasid* or R. Eleazar of Worms. Nor is there evidence that the academy of Evreux received personal instruction from any other associates of *Hasidei Ashkenaz*.⁹⁴ Indeed, there is the possibility of parallel development rather than influence, although the number and nature of the affinities certainly point to influence. The doctrines of the Pietists probably reached Evreux through literary channels. It is possible that the brothers of Evreux became aware of and adopted some of the basic values and formulations of the Pietists from the exoteric literary sources that may have been available to them. Perhaps they shared the concerns of R. Judah *he-Hasid* and R. Eleazar of Worms concerning the disappearance of the religious values

⁹³In several passages in *Sha'arei Teshuvah*, R. Jonah recommends **הצער במעשה**, **מניעת נפשו** **מן התענוגים**, **шибירת התאותה**, **שבירת**, and **מניעת**. See H. J. Zimmels, *Ashkenazim and Sephardim* (London, 1958), 241, nn. 4–5 [the final reference to *Sha'arei Teshuvah* in n. 5 should be to 4:12], and cf. 242, at n. 5. Similarly, R. Jonah discusses the virtues of forgoing permitted pleasures (*perishut*) in his Commentary to *Avot*. See *Perushei Rabbenu Yonah me-Gerondi 'al Massekhet Avot*, ed. M. S. Kasher (Jerusalem, 1969), 7 (1:5), 34–35 (2:16), 48–49 (3:17), 53 (3:21). See also the commentary of *Talmidei Rabbenu Yonah* to *Berakhot* at the beginning of ch. 5 (30b–31a). This passage, citing Rabbenu Yonah, describes the intense *kavvanah* necessary during prayer, which will lead to a total separation of the pure spirit from all physical desires and pleasures. Note the similar notion found in *Tur*, *O. H.*, sec. 98 (referring to the German Pietists; see above, n. 35): **ובן** **הו** **עשה** **חסידים** **ואנשי** **מעשה** **שהיו** **מתבודדים** **ומכונין** **בתפלתם** **עד** **שהיו** **מנגעים** **לחתפשטו** **הגשימות** **ולהתגברות** **רוח** **השכלה** **עד** **שהיו** **מנגעים** **קדוב** **למעלת** **הנבואה**. As a result, if an extraneous thought entered the mind of the *hasid* during prayer, he would be silent until it passed. See also *SHP* 451, and *SHB* 773; *Semaq*, sec. 11, and below, nn. 150, 153; *Beit Yosef* and *Darkhei Moshe* to *Tur*, loc. cit. (ר' in the *Darkhei Moshe* passage is ר' יונה); A. J. Heschel, “Al Ruah ha-Qodesh Bimei ha-Benayim,” *Sefer ha-Yovel li-Khevod Alexander Marx* (New York, 1950) [Hebrew section], 186–87; Daniel Abrams, “From Germany to Spain: Numerology as a Mystical Technique,” *JJS* 47 (1996):93; and Elliot Wolfson, “Sacred Space and Mental Iconography,” *Ki Barukh Hu*, ed. Robert Chazan et al. (Winona Lake, 1999), 602–5.

⁹⁴Small esoteric circles connected to the main branch of the German Pietists, such as the *Hug ha-Keruv ha-Meyuhad*, flourished in northern France (see above, n. 65). But there is no evidence that the brothers of Evreux were involved in the esoteric studies pursued by *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, nor is there any specific evidence that members of the *Hug ha-Keruv ha-Meyuhad* practiced exoteric forms of pietism. For a possible conduit between R. Eleazar of Worms’ circle and Evreux (a R. Samuel b. Judah), suggested only on the basis of a later medieval Jewish chronicle, see the introduction, n. 21.

CHAPTER 1

of old Ashkenaz in the face of the domination of their northern French tosafist colleagues. But it must also be noted that the academy of Evreux was also characterized by a fair degree of openness. The brothers of Evreux produced *Tosafot* texts that adhered to the classic style of tosafist dialectic,⁹⁵ and they allowed younger students to decide matters of religious law and open their own study halls in ways that would seem antithetical to the teachings of *hasidut Ashkenaz*.⁹⁶ Although the voice of German Pietism, or at least its spirit, appears to have called out to the study hall at Evreux, Pietist teachings were not followed blindly or even completely.

Similar problems of classification and transmission arise with respect to R. Moses b. Jacob of Coucy, a slightly older contemporary of the brothers of Evreux.⁹⁷ As a devoted student of R. Judah Sir Leon, R. Moses was a direct heir of the leading tosafists of the twelfth century—Rabbenu Tam and Ri—and some of his *Tosafot* have survived.⁹⁸ But R. Moses is best known for two related activities that were not undertaken by these earlier tosafists. He composed a full-fledged halakhic code, *Sefer Mizvot Gadol* (*Semag*). And he preached in Ashkenazic locales, but especially in Spain, about precepts that were being neglected out of confusion, ignorance, or lack of interest.⁹⁹ Indeed, R. Moses indicates that his preaching experiences led him, in part, to compose *Semag*.¹⁰⁰

The image of *Hasidei Ashkenaz* can be seen in both these enterprises. As Israel Ta-Shma has noted, the spate of halakhic works spawned by tosafists in the last part of the twelfth century and throughout the first half of the thirteenth century—works such as R. Eleazar of Metz's *Sefer Yere'im*; R. Barukh b. Isaac of Worms's *Sefer ha-Terumah*; *Sefer ha-Rabiah*; R. Eleazar of Worms's *Sefer Roqeqah*; the (lost) *Sefer ha-Hokhmah* of R. Barukh b. Samuel of Mainz;

⁹⁵See Ta-Shma, “*Hasidut Ashkenaz bi-Sefarad*,” 167–68; and see now *Tosafot Maharam ve-Rabbenu Perez ‘al Masskehet Yevamot*, ed. Hillel Porush (Jerusalem, 1991), 15; *Tosafot Yeshanim ha-Shalem ‘al Masseket Yevamot*, ed. A. Shoham (Jerusalem, 1992), 24–26.

⁹⁶See my “Rabbinic Authority and the Right to Open an Academy in Medieval Ashkenaz,” *Michael* 12 (1991): 233–50.

⁹⁷See, e.g., *Pisqei R. Yehiel mi-Paris*, ed. E. D. Pines (Jerusalem, 1973), editor's introduction, 9–10.

⁹⁸Urbach, *Ba‘alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:477–78.

⁹⁹On the geographic areas in which R. Moses preached, see my “Rabbinic Attitudes Toward Nonobservance in the Medieval Period,” *Jewish Tradition and the Nontraditional Jew*, ed. Schachter, 9–10, n. 16, and 24–25, n. 62.

¹⁰⁰See *Semaq*, introduction, and Judah Galinsky, “*Qum ‘Aseh Sefer Torah mi-Shenei Ḥalaqim*, *Le-Birur Kavvanat R. Mosheh mi-Coucy bi-Khetivat ha-Semag*,” *Ha-Ma‘ayan* 35 (1994):23–31.

R. Isaac b. Moses of Vienna's *Sefer Or Zarua*^c; and R. Moses of Coucy's *Sefer Mizvot Gadol*—all conform to the recommendation of *Sefer Hasidim* that practical *halakhah* and other ethical and religious dimensions of Torah study be given preference over the more intellectualized pursuit of dialectical *hiddushim*.¹⁰¹ Even those authors who studied with northern French tosafists and focused on the dialectical initiatives of Rabbenu Tam and Rⁱ¹⁰² summarized and correlated this material in brief halakhic terms, thereby minimizing the dialectical extensions and nomenclature.

To be sure, there may have been other factors that led to the composition of these codes. The revolutionary scope and achievements of twelfth-century tosafist dialectic virtually demanded an effort at summation (especially in view of the worsening conditions for Jews in Christian Europe),¹⁰³ in addition to the influence of Sefardic codes and halakhic methodology on Ashkenaz—a process that was already underway by the second quarter of the thirteenth century.¹⁰⁴ Nonetheless, the fact that R. Moses of Coucy and others who had connections with *hasidut Ashkenaz*—such as R. Eliezer of Metz¹⁰⁵ and R. Isaac *Or Zarua*^c¹⁰⁶—composed these codes points to a degree of Pietist influence.

¹⁰¹See Ta-Shma, “*Mizvat Talmud Torah*,” 104–6, and my *Jewish Education and Society* (above, n. 74); and see also Ta-Shma, “*Qavvim le-Ofiyyah shel Sifrut ha-Halakhah be-Ashkenaz ba-Me’ot ha-Yod Gimmel/Yod Daled*,” *‘Alei Sefer* 4 (1977):20–41.

¹⁰²See Soloveitchik, “Three Themes,” 348–49; idem, “Religious Law and Change: The Medieval Ashkenazic Example,” *AJS Review* 12 (1987):216–17; idem, *Halakhah, Kalkalah ve-Dimmui ‘Azmi* (Jerusalem, 1985), 82–84. As noted by Soloveitchik, R. Eleazar of Worms's *Sefer Roqeah* does not generally take into account new developments of the tosafist period. See also Urbach, *Ba’alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:397–401, and below, ch. 2, n. 61.

¹⁰³See the formulation of Arnold Toynbee, cited and applied to medieval halakhic literature by Isadore Twersky, *Introduction to the Code of Maimonides* (New Haven, 1980), 72; Soloveitchik, “Rabad of Posquières: A Programmatic Essay,” *Peraqim be-Toledot ha-Hevrah ha-Yehudit*, ed. E. Etkes and Y. Salmon (Jerusalem, 1980) [English section], 16; idem, “Three Themes,” 339.

¹⁰⁴See, e.g., Avraham Grossman, “*Ha-Qesharim Bein Yahadut Sefarad le-Yahadut Ashkenaz Bime’i ha-Benayim*,” *Moreshet Sefarad*, ed. Haim Beinart (Jerusalem, 1992), 179–85, and Septimus, *Hispano-Jewish Culture in Transition*, 46–51, 59–60.

¹⁰⁵See Urbach, *Ba’alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:160–61. Cf. Galinsky, “R. Mosheh mi-Coucy ke-Hasid,” (above, n. 2), 10–12. In addition to the connections discussed by Urbach, which include the fact that R. Eliezer was a teacher of R. Eleazar of Worms, the introduction to *Sefer Yere’im* (whose very title bespeaks an inclination toward pietism) adumbrates, in briefer and somewhat milder fashion, the critique leveled by *Sefer Hasidim* against the unchecked use of dialectic (*pilpul ha-qushyot*), which can lead to the

CHAPTER 1

Israel Ta-Shma has also emphasized the decidedly German provenance of this wave of codification, which extended the model established by R. Eliezer b. Nathan of Mainz (in his *Sefer Raban*). R. Moses of Coucy, who hailed from northern France, would appear, at first blush, to be outside this schema. And yet, other affinities or connections between R. Moses of Coucy and *hasidut Ashkenaz* have been identified. Jacob Katz linked the approach taken by R. Moses of Coucy in preaching and writing about Jewish-Gentile relations to *hasidut Ashkenaz*. Like *Sefer Hasidim*, R. Moses employed moral considerations beyond the letter of talmudic law, ruling more stringently than other tosafists on certain forms of Jewish-Gentile contact and urging his fellow Jews to espouse a high standard of moral perfection in order to justify their redemption, even in the eyes of the Gentiles.¹⁰⁷

There are also several significant similarities between R. Moses and R. Yonah of Gerona that lead back to *Hasidei Ashkenaz*. Unique among leading medieval talmudists, both men publicly preached *derashot* and offered admonition on similar issues, utilizing similar styles. Indeed, Ta-Shma has identified and published a fragmentary letter and public sermon that he concludes were composed by either R. Moses of Coucy or R. Yonah of

neglect of *mizvot* and the absence of *yir'at ha-Shem*. Cf. Urbach, 1:26, and below, n. 171. See below, ch. 4, n. 19–21, for pronounced similarities between formulations in *Sefer Yere'im* and *Sefer Hasidim* regarding the permissibility of communication with souls after they have departed, and other mystical issues. For additional pietistic affinities, see Zimmer, ‘*Olam ke-Minhago Noheg*, 281, n. 2 (and above, n. 36); idem, “*Tenuhot u-Tenu'ot ha-Guf bi-She'at Qerit Shema*,” *Assufot* 8 (1994):348, n. 25; Elimelekh Horowitz, “*Zedaqah, ‘Aniyyim u-Fiqah Hevrati bi-Qehillot Yehudei Eiropah bein Yemei ha-Benayim le-Reshit ha-‘Et ha-Hadashah*,” *Dat ve-Kalkalah*, ed. Menahem Ben-Sasson (Jerusalem, 1995), 227–28; ms. Bodl. 659, fol. 27v; I. Ta-Shma, “*Eliezer b. Samuel of Metz*,” *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, 6:628–29; and idem, *Halakhah, Minhag u-Mezi'ut be-Ashkenaz*, 249–50; and below, ch. 2, at nn. 46, 62. See also *Sefer Yere'im*, secs. 404–7, on the nature of *yir'at ha-Shem*, and cf. Soloveitchik, “*Three Themes*,” 311–20, 327–28, n. 50. Note that ms. Livorno (Leghorn Talmud Torah) Cod. 2 [=ms. JNUL 4°621], fols. 22r–v, attributes a penitential program (*seder teshuvah*) of R. Eleazar of Worms to R. Eliezer of Metz. Cf. V. Aptowitzer, *Mavo la-Rabiah*, 314, and Ivan Marcus, “*Hasidei Ashkenaz Private Penitentials*,” *Studies in Jewish Mysticism*, ed. J. Dan and F. Talmage (Cambridge, Mass., 1982), 69. R. Eleazar of Worms's Pietist student, R. Abraham b. Azriel of Bohemia (see below), makes extensive use of *Sefer Yere'im*. See ‘*Arugat ha-Bosem*, ed. Urbach, 4:164. For R. Eliezer's own commentaries on *piyyutim*, see E. E. Urbach, “*Sefer ‘Arugat ha-Bosem le-R. Avraham b. Azriel*,” *Tarbiz* 10 (1939):40.

¹⁰⁶See, e.g., Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:437–39; Marcus, *Piety and Society*, 112; and above, n. 16.

¹⁰⁷Jacob Katz, *Exclusiveness and Tolerance* (New York, 1961), 102–5.

Gerona.¹⁰⁸ The firm impact of *hasidut Ashkenaz* on Rabbenu Yonah in these matters, possibly through the Evreux connection,¹⁰⁹ is beyond question.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁸ Israel Ta-Shma, “Iggeret u-Derashat Hit’orerut le-Ehad mi-Rabbotenu ha-Rishonim [Ba’al ha-Semag ’o Rabbenu Yonah Gerondi],” *Moriah* 19:5–6 (1994): 7–12. The texts were found in a Moscow ms. in a Sefardic hand, at the end of Rabbenu Yonah’s *Iggeret ha-Teshuvah* (which was probably written in northern France, and certainly reflects Pietist influence). Ta-Shma is inclined to think the sermon was from R. Moses of Coucy, based on parallel passages in *Semag* and the feeling of closeness to the redemption that R. Moses affected—which also explains partially the great success he enjoyed (by his own account) in getting thousands of Spanish Jews to repent and return to fuller observances. The letter, which may have been from R. Moses to the people of his hometown or region in northern France, comes from a Torah scholar who traveled to a faraway land to preach and arrived in a particular city where he achieved great success, especially in the realm of communal Torah study. He decided to stay a little while longer there, to address certain difficulties that had arisen. While the overall thrust and circumstances of the letter accord more with the career of R. Moses, R. Jonah also traveled a great deal, stressing Torah study and ethical teachings in addition to establishing *yeshivot*. Indeed, the language of the letter and the details of its author’s own scholarly writings accord more with Rabbenu Yonah. In any event, Ta-Shma’s admitted inability to draw any definitive conclusions on the question of authorship demonstrates effectively the pronounced similarities between Rabbenu Yonah and R. Moses of Coucy in terms of career, religious orientation, and expression. Note also the significant parallel between *Semag*, *mizvat ‘aseh* 3 and R. Yonah’s *Sha’arei ‘Avodah* (see above, n. 89) discussed by Galinsky, “Rabbenu Mosheh mi-Coucy ke-Hasid,” 28. See also *Semag*, *lo ta’aseh* 2; *Sefer ha-Yir’ah*, sec. 139; and cf. below, n. 112.

¹⁰⁹ Urbach, *Ba’alei ha-Tosafot* (Jerusalem, 1955), 387. See also Urbach, *Ba’alei ha-Tosafot* (1980), 1:469–70; and cf. Yitzhak Baer, “Ha-Megammah ha-Datit/ha-Hevratit shel Sefer Ḥasidim,” *Zion* 3 (1937):6–7. Urbach notes that Baer, *Toledot ha-Yehudim bi-Sefarad ha-Nozerit* (Jerusalem, 1959), 148–54, posited Pietist influences on Rabbenu Yonah’s preaching and pronounced interest in the dissemination of ethical teachings, while apparently unaware of R. Moses of Coucy, whose potential as a source of influence was better documented. On the other hand, Urbach was himself unaware of the connection between Rabbenu Yonah and the German Pietists, via Evreux. Cf. Ta-Shma, “Rabbenu Yonah Gerondi,” 171, and Galinsky, “Rabbenu Mosheh mi-Coucy ke-Hasid,” 16, 84.

¹¹⁰ See also Abramson, below, n. 115, and my “Rabbinic Attitudes Toward Nonobservance in the Medieval Period,” 24–26; and cf. R. Langer, *To Worship God Properly*, 228–30. Interestingly, *Sefer Hasidim* restricts the imperative of giving *tokhrehah* (admonition) to these situations in which the one offering the rebuke believes there is at least a chance he will be heeded. This position is held also by *Semag* (and *Semaq*). Rabbenu Yonah’s position appears to have been closer to that of R. Eliezer of Metz (codified also by Maimonides), who held that the imperative was operative in (virtually) all circumstances. See Soloveitchik, “Three Themes,” 336, n. 82; Marcus, *Piety and Society*, 87–88; Eli Yassif, “Ha-Sippur ha-Eksemplari be-Sefer Ḥasidim,” *Tarbiz* 57

CHAPTER 1

Rabbenu Yonah copied a penitential supplication composed by R. Moses of Coucy, without attribution, into his [Ye-]*Sod ha-Teshuvah* (which was itself appended by Rabbenu Yonah to his *Sefer ha-Yir'ah*).¹¹¹ This supplication, and similar manuscript texts by R. Moses that have also been identified, reflect the spirit of the *tiqqunei teshuvah* of Ḥasidei Ashkenaz and contain parallels to penitential prayers authored by R. Eleazar of Worms and R. Judah *he-Hasid*. Indeed, an early manuscript version of one of R. Moses' supplications was copied immediately following a very similar prayer by R. Eleazar of Worms, תפלת השב בכל כחו.¹¹²

(1988):243–44, n. 53; Bernard Septimus, “Piety and Power in Thirteenth-Century Catalonia,” *Studies in Medieval Jewish History and Literature*, ed. Isadore Twersky (Cambridge, Mass., 1979), 215–21; Norman Lamm, “Hokheah Tokhiah ‘et ‘Amitekha,” *Gesher* 10 (1982): 170–76; and Galinsky, “Rabbenu Mosheh mi-Coucy ke-Hasid,” 99–100.

¹¹¹See Ta-Shma, “Rabbenu Yonah Gerondi,” 170. On the (mistaken) attribution of *Sod ha-Teshuvah* to R. Eleazar of Worms, see above, n. 88.

¹¹²Versions of two supplications attributed to R. Moses were published by Y. D. Gilat, “Shetei Baqqashot le-R. Mosheh mi-Coucy,” *Tarbiz* 28 (1959):54–58, from two Bodl. mss.: Oppenheim 759=Neubauer 1118 [France, late thirteenth century], fol. 134v, entitled אָנָּא הָאָלֹהִי אֶבְרָהָם יִצְחָק יִשְׂרָאֵל רִ' מְשָׁה מְקוֹצִי בָּרוּאֵי שְׁבָרָאָתִי וּגְלָלָנִי אָנָּא הָאָלֹהִי יִשְׂרָאֵל, and beginning בְּקַשְׁתָּמָרְבָּךְ and beginning בְּקַשְׁתָּמָרְבָּךְ, and Michael 355=Neub. 554 [Italy, late fifteenth century], fol. 106v, entitled אָנָּא הָאָלֹהִי יִשְׂרָאֵל תְּפִילָה תְּקִנָּה הַסְּמָג לְאֹמְרָה בְּכָרְעִיהָ חַטָּאתִי עֲוֵיתִי פְּשָׁעִתִי. The version found in Opp. 156=Neub. 1114 [Ashkenaz, 1410, see above, n. 88], fol. 103v (column 3) [which follows *Shir ha-Yihud veva-Kavod* (attributed here to R. Judah *he-Hasid*), R. Jonah's *Hayyei 'Olam/Sod ha-Teshuvah* (attributed here to R. Isaac *Hasid*), Maimonides' *Hayyei 'Olam* (=a passage from *Moreh Nevukhim*), and a prayer for resurrection that included Maimonides' thirteen articles of faith] is similar to Opp. 759/Bodl. 1118, but adds a brief coda asking for the rebuilding of Jerusalem and the advent of the messiah. This version of R. Moses' prayer is also found, with variations (and entitled תְּפִלָּה מִיאָתָר רִ' מְשָׁה מְקוֹצִי ... הַתְּחִנָּה יִסְדָּר רִ' מְשָׁה מְקוֹצִי), in ms. Cincinnati 436 (an Ashkenazic *siddur* copied in 1435) on fol 213v, immediately following R. Judah *he-Hasid*'s addenda for each day of the week (based on *Berakhot* 17b) that were inserted in *E-lohai Nezor* at the conclusion of the 'Amidah (fols. 212v–213a). [For an earlier manuscript version of these addenda, see ms. Paris 646, fol. 237r.]

This form of R. Moses' prayer also follows immediately after the prayer by R. Eleazar of Worms, entitled תפלת השב בכל כחו, in ms. Opp. 758=Bodl. 1105 [Ashkenaz, 1326–27], fols. 435r–435v. R. Eleazar's prayer is preceded by several other texts associated with the German Pietists, including *shirei ya-Yihud veva-Kavod* (fols. 390r–420v); see below, ch. 3, n. 110. R. Moses' prayer is followed by two *Hekhalot*-style prayers and a text entitled *Birkat ha-Evarim*, which was composed by a member of Ḥasidei Ashkenaz (see below, n. 114). In ms. Parma 1220 (Spain, fifteenth/sixteenth centuries), fol. 106r, a shorter form of this version (which is identified by a different hand in the margin as a *tehinnah* from the mouth of R. Moses of Coucy) follows a

R. Moses refers to one of these *baqqashot* in his *Sefer Mizvot Gadol*. Toward the end of his lengthy exposition of the laws of repentance, he writes: “One should bow on his knees (*yikhra ‘al birkav*) for one hour a day, with his hands outstretched heavenward, and confess (*ve-yitvaddeh*), and ask for mercy

penitential work by R. Eleazar of Worms known as *Moreh Hatta’im* or *Sefer ha-Kapparot* (fols. 103–5). This work, which is referred to simply as *hilkhot teshuvah*, opens with a Pietist chain of tradition. Cf. Ivan Marcus, “*Hasidei ’Ashkenaz* Private Penitentials: An Introduction and Descriptive Catalogue of Their Manuscripts and Early Editions,” *Studies in Jewish Mysticism*, ed. Joseph Dan and Frank Talmage (Cambridge, Mass., 1982), esp. 70–71.

The earliest record of the second supplication published by Gilat is found in *Orhot Hayyim*, *Hilkhot Rosh ha-Shanah*, sec. 26, which contains R. Jonah’s *Sod ha-Teshuvah*. R. Jonah included the supplication in his work, without attribution; see Ta-Shma in the preceding note. With regard to this text as well, Urbach, *Ba’alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:470, n. 18, notes similar *viddui* supplications in *Sefer Roqeah*, *Hilkhot Teshuvah*, esp. sec. 20, **תפלת השב בכל בחו**. The juxtaposition of R. Moses’ and R. Eleazar’s prayers in Bodl. 1105 supports Urbach’s suggestion. [Ms. Vat. 331 (fourteenth century), fols. 240v–241r, copies this prayer as a *tefillah/tehinnah* of R. Yonah ha-Qadosh. Ms. Parma 1354 (Italy, sixteenth century), fols. 152r–153r, entitles this supplication but does not attribute it to anyone.] Cf. *Sefer Roqeah*, *Hilkhot Teshuvah*, sec. 21, and Marcus, “*Hasidei ’Ashkenaz* Private Penitentials,” 57–61.

For a *viddui* attributed to R. Judah *he-Hasid*, see ms. Paris l’Alliance 482 (Ashkenaz, fourteenth century), fol. 33, and ms. Vat. Rossiana 356 (Italy, 1412), fol. 2v. For a *tefillah u-tehinnah* attributed to R. Judah *he-Hasid* (beginning **ירצרי ברבו רחמייך כבושים אפר** **מעומך ... תעבור את חטאתי סלח נא על כל פשעי כפר לעונתי חלני מיסוריין ומורחות מזוויקן**), see ms. Parma 1138, fol. 139v (Hebrew foliation), found also in ms. Brit. Mus., Add. 26883 (*Catalogue of the Hebrew and Samaritan Manuscripts in the British Museum*, ed. G. Margoliouth, vol. 2 [London, 1905], 255 [no. 640]). Cf. below, ch. 3, n. 99. [Note also the *selihah* for the morning service of Yom Kippur by R. Judah *he-Hasid*, **אל-להם בישאל גוזל יהודין**, whose lines are structured according to a sequence of Divine Names. See *Mahzor le-Yamim Nora’im*, ed. E. D. Goldschmidt, vol. 2 (Jerusalem, 1970), 237–38; Israel Ta-Shma, “*Mashehu ‘al Biqqoret ha-Miqra Bimei ha-Benayim*,” *Ha-Miqra bi-Re’i Mefarshav* (*Sefer Zikkaron le-Sarah Kamin*), ed. Sarah Japhet (Jerusalem, 1994), 454, n. 13; ms. Montefiore 6 (Northern France, 1394), fol. 1r; ms. Bodl. 1812, fol. 145v; ms. Macerata 310 (see below, ch. 3, n. 110); ms. JTS Mic. 1640, fol. 179v; ms. Parma 1138, fol. 134 (in Hebrew foliation; 91r–91v in standard foliation); and ms. Paris 633, fol. 30 (in a section copied by R. Isaac b. Isaac; see Colette Sirat in *REJ* 119, pp. 10, 20–21, n. 6, and cf. below, ch. 3, n. 100). In some of the manuscript versions, the phrase **ומי שאומרה מובטח שהוא בן עולם הבא** appears. Among the penitential supplications in this prayer is the phrase **אנא נורא קדוש תרבה מוחילתך פשענו סלחנה שהוא בן עולם הבא** [תגלויל מירוחין]. Cf. ms. Paris 835, fols. 119v–120r (in the name of Ramban); *Shirei ha-Yihud ve-ha-Kavod*, ed. A. M. Habermann (Jerusalem, 1948), 12–13, 16; ms. Parma 1221 (Spain, fifteenth century), 189v (cf. below, ch. 5, n. 49); ms. Bodl. 1209 (Ashkenaz, 1329), 19r (אָנָא מָרֵה חֲטָאֵים); and below, n. 142.

CHAPTER 1

that the Almighty should assist him in his repentance. I have composed a special supplication (*baqqashah*) for this [purpose] which is written [and available] for everyone.”¹¹³

A passage in *Sefer Hasidim* explains and commends the practice of blessing the Almighty upon arising by comparing one who arises to one who is released from prison and is obligated to offer thanks. While a person is asleep, he is in effect shackled, since he has no control over his body. Upon awakening, he must therefore offer a blessing for each of his limbs “that had been bound, but has now been released, so that you may use them for your benefit (לעשות תקנתך בהם).” This passage further relates the actions of a *hasid* who blessed his various limbs and prayed that each of them would be faithful to their Creator and not be the cause of sin.¹¹⁴ A passage in *Semag* has a

¹¹³*Semag*, ‘aseh 16 (fol. 69a). Galinsky, “Rabbenu Mosheh mi-Coucy ke-Hasid,” 29–30, argues that *Semag* is referring here to the first supplication described in the preceding note (Bodl. 1118). While Galinsky notes some suggestive parallels between this first text and other passages in R. Moses’ corpus, in his view the second text (Bodl. 554) appears to reflect concepts that were more central to *hasidut Ashkenaz*. One of the main distinctions between the two texts that Galinsky suggests, however—that of *baqqashah* versus *tefillah*—cannot be maintained throughout the manuscript variants. Thus, for example, the version of the first text found in Bodl. 1114 (see the preceding note) is entitled *תפלת הד' משה מוקצי* (rather than *baqqashah*). Moreover, the manuscript juxtaposition described in the preceding note indicates similarities between writings of the German Pietists and the first text as well. Finally, the requirement of bowing during the supplication expressed in *Semag* appears specifically in the second text. See also Y. D. Gilat, “Tiqqunei ha-Guf bi-She’at Tefillah (he’arah),” *Sidra* 7 (1991):159. Urbach, *Ba’alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:469–70, describes this passage in ‘aseh 16—together with several that precede it and others found in nearby sections—as reflecting the intense penitential style of the German Pietists without the aspect of *teshuvat ha-mishqal* (in which the penitent must afflict himself physically in a manner judged to be commensurate or proportional to the pleasure he received from his sin). Cf. Jacob Elbaum, *Teshuvat ha-Lev ve-Qabbalat Yissurim* (Jerusalem, 1993), 20, n. 3, and 31, n. 31.

¹¹⁴*SHP* 2 (p. 4)=*SHB* 155. A passage in *Midrash Tehillim* (ed. Solomon Buber, 124a–b), whose Ashkenazic manuscript versions are replete with passages reflecting distinctly Ashkenazic customs and traditions (see below, ch. 3, n. 13), lists the names of the limbs and the precepts they are suited to perform. Both the *Midrash Tehillim* passage and the *SHB* passage cite the verse that was also used by *Sefer Hasidim* to support the pietistic practice of swaying during prayer; see above, n. 59. Malachi Beit-Arie, “Birkat ha-Evarim,” *Tarbiz* 56 (1987):265–72, cogently suggests that a series of actual blessings collected in a listing entitled “blessings of the limbs” (found in ms. Bodl. 1105, fols. 436v–438v) was composed by a member of the German Pietists as a reflection of the instruction in *Sefer Hasidim*. This text appears in a portion of the manuscript that contains other texts of the German Pietists, as well as one of R. Moses of Coucy’s

lengthy listing of many of the limbs in the body and what each of them allows the human being to do. Although this passage is based almost verbatim on a formulation in R. Shabbetai Donnolo's *Sefer Hakhmoni* (or *Takhkemoni*),¹¹⁵ its purpose in *Semag* is to impress on the individual the incredible favor the Almighty has bestowed upon him in providing all these limbs with all their functions. By recognizing this, the human being will serve the Almighty with great love and will strive to do as many *mitzvot* as possible, since he knows he cannot repay the Almighty's kindness in full. *Semag*'s approach to *ḥovat ha-’evarim* is consonant with the material in *Sefer Hasidim*. It should also be noted that *Hasidei Ashkenaz* were familiar with *Sefer Hakhmoni* and were influenced by it in a number of contexts.¹¹⁶

Judah Galinsky has recently sought to portray R. Moses of Coucy as a northern French *ḥasid*, a tosafist deeply interested in promoting the development of ethical behavior and proper character traits, rather than as someone under the direct influence of the German Pietists. Galinsky demonstrates that while R. Moses' formulations with regard to the primacy of truthfulness in all dealings and forums seem to draw both conceptually and linguistically upon *Sefer Hasidim*, his formulations with respect to humility and anger do not. To be sure, these two character traits are also discussed extensively in *Sefer Hasidim*, and the ideological positions found in *Sefer Hasidim* are close to those taken by *Semag*. Nonetheless, a pattern of direct influence is not evident with regard to these issues. Rather, it appears that R. Moses based his positions on those of Rashi.¹¹⁷

In addition, Galinsky notes that R. Moses was uninterested in some of the theological doctrines that were central to the German Pietists. He did not attempt to search for the larger or hidden Divine Will, nor did he stress particular resourcefulness regarding *yir’ah* in order to discover that Will.

supplications; see above, n. 112. On the concept of *ḥovat ha-’evarim* and its implications in the works of Rabbenu Yonah and R. Isaac of Corbeil, see Ta-Shma, “Hasidut Ashkenaz bi-Sefarad,” 168, n. 8, and below, n. 171.

¹¹⁵See Shraga Abramson, “Inyanut be-Sefer *Mitzvot Gadol*,” *Sinai* 80 (1977): 209–16.

¹¹⁶See Elliot Wolfson, “The Theosophy of Shabbetai Donnolo, with Special Emphasis on the Doctrine of *Sefirot* in *Sefer Hakhmoni*,” *The Frank Talmage Memorial Volume*, ed. Walfish, 2:281–316; and the literature cited in n. 55. Cf. Israel Ta-Shma in *Qiryat Sefer* 60 (1985):307.

¹¹⁷Galinsky, “R. Mosheh mi-Coucy ke-Hasid,” 39–50. See now idem, “Ve-Lihiyot Lefanekha ‘Eved Ne’eman Kol ha-Yamim—Perek be-Haguto ha-Datit shel R. Mosheh mi-Coucy,” *Da’at* 42 (1999):13–31.

CHAPTER 1

Moreover, R. Moses attached no importance to fasting or other forms of self-denial. R. Moses' *hasidut* expresses itself through dedicated Torah study, unquestioning service of the Creator, and especially through interaction with others. By being particularly humble, slow to anger, and steadfastly honest, the *hasid* serves his Maker as well, and indeed, truly comes to know Him. Concerns expressed by R. Moses about the need to control one's impulses may have been derived as much from Maimonides' *Mishneh Torah*, upon which *Semag* was based, as from the writings of the German Pietists. In Galinsky's view, the (northern French) pietism represented by R. Moses of Coucy was interested neither in philosophical teachings nor in mystical studies or practices as means of perceiving the Divine realm. The northern French *hasid*, R. Moses of Coucy, was able to address certain issues in Jewish thought without recourse to the German Pietists and their esotericism.¹¹⁸

Galinsky also questions Ta-Shma's focus on the influence of *Hasidei Ashkenaz* in R. Moses' attempt at halakhic codification. He suggests there were a number of other motives that propelled R. Moses to write his work, including the requests of individuals and the importance of adjusting the *Mishneh Torah* from an Ashkenazic perspective. Moreover, R. Moses wished to provide a proper vehicle for Torah study. Had he merely wished to give practical halakhic guidance to the masses, he could have written a much more compact, basic work. In addition, R. Moses refers to the dream he had in which he was instructed to compose the work he did.¹¹⁹

As we have noted, however, R. Moses of Coucy had significant affinities with *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, many of which are acknowledged by Galinsky. Even R. Moses' concern with and treatment of humility and anger is similar to the approaches of the Pietists, as well as to those of R. Moses of Evreux and Rabbenu Yonah.¹²⁰ Moreover, the special supplications for one seeking penance, common to both *Hasidei Ashkenaz* and R. Moses of Coucy, represent a shared view¹²¹—even if R. Moses did not subscribe, in terms of concept and terminology, to every aspect of the Pietist program of *tiqqunei teshuvah*. R. Moses

¹¹⁸See Galinsky, "R. Mosheh mi-Coucy ke-Hasid," 65; and idem, "Da 'et E-lohei Avikha ve-'Avdehu: Havvanato shel Ba'al ha-Tosafot R. Mosheh mi-Coucy 'et ha-Hora'ah Lada'at 'et ha-Shem," *Mi-Safra le-Sayfa* 48 (1995):59–64.

¹¹⁹See Galinsky, "R. Mosheh mi-Coucy ke-Hasid," 24, n. 24, and above, n. 102.

¹²⁰See *ibid.*, 4–5, 16, 28, 67, n. 12, 71, nn. 29–30, 73–74, nn. 54–55; and see the next note. I have demonstrated that there are close parallels between *Sefer Hasidim* and formulations of R. Moses to which Galinsky refers in 71, n. 30; see above, nn. 79–81.

¹²¹See Galinsky, "R. Mosheh mi-Coucy ke-Hasid," 80–81, n. 108. On similarities regarding the parameters of *tokhrehah* (Galinsky, 82–84), cf. above, n. 109.

of Coucy also appears to have been one of the only tosafists who was not a *pashtan* in the mold of Rashbam or R. Joseph *Bekhor Shor* to have authored a systematic commentary to the Pentateuch.¹²² As I have demonstrated elsewhere, tosafists who were not *pashtanim* did not generally value biblical study as a separate discipline. They were thus content to offer scattered *Tosafot*-like comments on various verses, reflecting their talmudocentric approach to biblical literature. The German Pietists, however, recognized the importance of Bible study as a separate discipline in both the exoteric and esoteric realms, and their commentaries reflect this view. R. Moses' affinity with the German Pietists and his role as a *darshan*, which is also consistent with Pietist thought as we have seen, may explain his unique efforts at Torah commentary.¹²³

Semag fits the profile of a halakhic work that is consonant with the approach of *hasidut Ashkenaz*, regardless of any other expressed motivations. Giving practical halakhic guidance was precisely the aim of the directives in *Sefer Hasidim*.¹²⁴ R. Moses' stated reliance on a dream that directed him to compose *Semag*,¹²⁵ and his acknowledgment of another dream that dictated the inclusion of לֹא תשכח אֶת הַאֱלֹקִים as a *mitzvah lo ta'aseh* despite the fact that

¹²² Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:478–79.

¹²³ See my *Jewish Education and Society*, 75–90, and my “The Role of Bible Study in Medieval Ashkenaz,” *The Frank Talmage Memorial Volume*, ed. Walfish, 1:151–66. A biblical interpretation by R. Judah *he-Hasid* is cited in *Peshatei Ram mi-Coucy*. See *Perushai ha-Torah le-R. Yehudah he-Hasid*, ed. Y. S. Lange (Jerusalem, 1975), 159. As Galinsky notes (“R. Mosheh mi-Coucy *ke-Hasid*,” 6, n. 6), considerations of Jewish-Christian polemic may have also played a role in R. Moses’ commentary. Among tosafists, R. Isaiah di Trani also composed a systematic Torah commentary, a fuller version of which has been discovered only recently. He too had connections with the German Pietists, via his German tosafist teachers. See, e.g., ms. Moscow-Guenzberg 303, fols. 63r, 68v, 65r, 87v, 97r; Israel Ta-Shma, “Sefer ‘Nimmuqi ḥumash’ le-R. Yishayahu di Trani,” *Qiryat Sefer* 64 (1992–93):751–53; idem, “Sefer *Shibbolei ha-Leqet u-Khefelav*,” *Italia* 11 (1995):47; C. B. Chavel, *Nimmuqi ḥumash le-Rabbenu Yeshayah* (Jerusalem, 1972), editor’s introduction, 5 (and cf. below, ch. 2, n. 23); Ta-Shma, “Ha-Rav Yeshayah di Trani ha-Zaqen u-Qesharav ‘im Bizantiyyon ve-Erez Yisra’el,” *Shalem* 4 (1984):409–16; idem, *Ha-Nigleh shebe-Nistar*, 55, and below, ch. 2, n. 60, and ch. 5, nn. 21–23.

¹²⁴ Note also R. Moses of Coucy’s statement, in the introduction to the *mitzvot aseh*, concerning the importance of understanding the *mitzvot* derived from the orders of *Qodashim*, *Zera’im*, and *Taharot*. *Semag* is the only tosafist code to incorporate these areas. See above, n. 76, for parallels in the thought of the German Pietists, and cf. Galinsky, “R. Moses mi-Coucy *ke-Hasid*,” 10–11, 17.

¹²⁵ *Semag*, “aseh 3 (end), and cf. Galinsky, “Qum ‘Aseh Sefer Torah,” (above, n. 100).

CHAPTER 1

Maimonides did not do so¹²⁶ are examples of a phenomenon that was sometimes associated with magic or *sod* in Ashkenazic rabbinic traditions.¹²⁷ On the other hand, the very brief description of these dream experiences, and the fact that the dreams were related to R. Moses' planned literary endeavor, raise certain questions. Were they inspired through mystical means or conjured magically, or were they agitated by R. Moses' deep convictions and spirituality, without any form of magical or mystical manipulation?¹²⁸

R. Moses refers to an unidentified heavenly reason (*סיבת מן השמים*) that impelled him to travel to various locales preaching the observance of the commandments.¹²⁹ While this term need not reflect an actual mystical experience on the part of R. Moses,¹³⁰ the messianism which he espoused—and which may have been part of his (heavenly) reason for wanting to bring others to a higher level of observance—was linked to forms of prophetic dreams and expressions that existed in Ashkenaz in his day.¹³¹ As we shall see, R. Judah *he-Hasid* and his father, R. Samuel, were involved in prophetic messianism, as were other thirteenth-century tosafists engaged in mystical activities.¹³² A manuscript passage contains R. Moses' presentation of an eschatological formulation of his older colleague, R. Isaac b. Abraham, which also reflects an esoteric approach.¹³³ As was the case with Rabiah, there is, on

¹²⁶*Semag*, negative precept 64 (end).

¹²⁷See Monford Harris, *Studies in Jewish Dream Interpretation* (Northvale, 1994), 15–38; and below, ch. 3, nn. 3, 77–80; ch. 4, n. 59; ch. 5, nn. 22–23.

¹²⁸See Steven Kruger, *Dreaming in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1992), 15–34, 43–46, 89–92, 151; Ḥida, *Shem ha-Gedolim*, s.v. *Rabbenu Mosheh mi-Coucy* (*ma’arekhet ha-gedolim*, 100, sec. 178); and see now Judah Galinsky, “Rav Mosheh mi-Coucy ve-ha-Polmus ha-Yehudi Nozeri ba-Me’ah ha-13,” (forthcoming), pt. 1.

¹²⁹*Semag*, introduction to the negative precepts (end), and cf. Galinsky, “Qum ‘Aseh Sefer Torah,” and idem, “R. Mosheh mi-Coucy ke-Hasid,” 84–85.

¹³⁰See, e.g., Twersky, *Rabad of Posquières*, 291–97; Gershon Scholem, *Origins of the Kabbalah* (Princeton, 1987), 206–7; A. J. Heschel, “Al Ruah ha-Qodesh Bime’i ha-Benayim,” 193–201; *She’elot u-Teshuvot min ha-Shamayim*, ed. Margoliot, editor’s introduction, 6–13; and Moshe Idel’s preface to A. J. Heschel, *Prophetic Inspiration After the Prophets*, ed. Moses Fainerstein (Hoboken, 1996).

¹³¹See Galinsky, “R. Mosheh mi-Coucy ke-Hasid,” 87–90; Katz, *Exclusiveness and Tolerance*, 80–81; Gilat, “Shetei Baqqashot le-R. Mosheh mi-Coucy,” 54–55; and Israel Yuval, “Liqrat 1240: Tiqvot Yehudiyyot, Pahadim Nozriyyim,” *Proceedings of the Eleventh World Congress of Jewish Studies* [Div. B, vol. 1], 113–20.

¹³²See Alexander Marx, “Ma’amar ‘al Shenat Ge’ulah,” *Ha-Zofeh le-Hokhmat Yisra’el* 5 (1921):194–202; and below, ch. 4, nn. 8–9; ch. 5, n. 67.

¹³³See ms. Darmstadt Cod. Or. 25, fols. 13v–17v; Yuval, above, n. 131; Urbach, *Ba’alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:468–69; and below, ch. 4, n. 37.

balance, insufficient evidence to conclude that R. Moses of Coucy was among those (northern French) tosafists who were significantly involved with mystical studies. His strong manifestations of pietistic leanings are, however, without question.¹³⁴

It is entirely possible, as Galinsky has proposed, that there was a northern French version of *ḥasidut*, with R. Moses of Coucy as one of its prime exemplars. Like the brothers of Evreux, R. Moses remained a dedicated tosafist and continued to pursue tosafist methods and intellectual values. It should not be expected that he would espouse a *ḥasidut* completely identical to that of the German Pietists.

The establishment of this phenomenon, however, begs several questions. Where and with whom did it originate, and how did R. Moses acquire pieces of material that are quite similar to Pietist teachings? In light of the affinities that have been noted, it is difficult to imagine that this branch of *ḥasidut* had a completely separate development from *ḥasidut Ashkenaz*. Indeed, even if Rashi were one of the sources for French Pietism, we shall see that he too was familiar with several aspects of pre-Crusade *torat ha-sod*.¹³⁵ Based on all the material I have presented thus far—including the pre-Crusade manifestations of piety and character development, and the practices attributed to *Hasidei Zarefat* by *Sefer ha-Manhig*—the most likely possibility is that both the northern French and German forms of *ḥasidut* emerged from common aspects of the rabbinic culture of early Ashkenaz. Thus, R. Moses of Coucy may have received certain pietistic teachings from sources within *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, and he may have derived others from either pre-Crusade traditions or twelfth-century northern French predecessors.¹³⁶

¹³⁴Cf. Galinsky, “R. Mosheh mi-Coucy ke-Hasid,” 59–61, and idem, “Da ‘et E-lohei Avikha ve-‘Avdehu,” 59–64. Although I agree with Galinsky that R. Moses was not philosophically inclined (cf. above, introduction, at n. 1), his contention that R. Moses wished to suppress esotericism in the same manner as Rashbam (cf. below, ch. 3, nn. 67–69) has not been amply demonstrated. Cf. also below, n. 156.

¹³⁵See below, ch. 3, sec. 2. Rashi was not inclined, however, toward asceticism or *perishut*; see above, n. 22.

¹³⁶*Sefer Yere’im* by R. Eliezer of Metz (whose affinities with *Hasidei Ashkenaz* have been noted [above, n. 105]) had a significant influence on *Semag*. See, e.g., Urbach, *Ba’alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:474, and Galinsky, “Rabbenu Mosheh mi-Coucy ke-Hasid,” 11–12. In theory, the same two paths were open to Rabbenu Yonah at Evreux, although his relationship with German Pietism in particular appears to have been highly developed. [Regarding R. Yonah and mysticism, see Joseph Dan, *Jewish Mysticism and Jewish Ethics* (Seattle, 1986), 28–39, and Gershom Scholem, *Mehqerei Qabbalah*, ed. Yosef ben Shelomoh and Moshe Idel, vol. 1 (Jerusalem, 1998), 35.] The links between German

CHAPTER 1

An example of the latter path of transmission, which bypasses the German Pietists, can be seen in the following instance. A number of medieval rabbinic sources record customs concerning the positioning of the hands during the 'Amidah. No discussion of how to position the hands is found, however, in the writings of any German authorities, including *Hasidei Ashkenaz*. Indeed, the issue was hardly even mentioned in German rabbinic literature. Rabiah and *Sefer Or Zarua'* cite a talmudic passage that sometimes served as the basis for one practice, but they offer no discussion or direction.¹³⁷ On the other hand, both *Sefer ha-Yir'ah* and *Semag* offer practical instructions. Rabbenu Yonah discusses how to hold one's hands while praying (the right above the left) and where to place them while sitting or standing during prayer.¹³⁸ R. Moses of Coucy notes that one ought to "stretch his hands heavenward" while reciting the confessional (*viddui*) to atone for one's sins.¹³⁹ Thus, two northern French *ḥasidim*, R. Jonah and R. Moses of Coucy, dealt with these forms of pietistic practice, while the German Pietists were completely silent about them.¹⁴⁰

Pietism and the pre-Crusade period have been firmly established; see my *Jewish Education and Society*, 86–91, and above, introduction, n. 13.

¹³⁷See Eric Zimmer, "Tiqqunei ha-Guf bi-She'at ha-Tefillah," *Sidra* 5 (1989):101 [=*'Olam ke-Minhag Noheg*, 84].

¹³⁸See Zimmer, "Tiqqunei ha-Guf," 102. Zimmer regards R. Yonah as a Separdic rabbinic scholar in this context, rather than as a student of northern France, despite the appearance of the passage in *Sefer ha-Yir'ah*; cf. above, at n. 84. Zimmer further suggests that material from R. Aharon *ha-Kohen* of Lunel's *Orhot Hayyim* may have had an impact upon R. Jonah (מײַרְהָא). This suggested pattern of transmission is difficult to accept, however. *Orhot Hayyim* was composed after R. Jonah's works and cites R. Jonah by name on a number of occasions, once specifically in conjunction with *Sefer ha-Yir'ah*; see my "Rabbinic Figures in Castilian Kabbalistic Pseudepigraphy," 92, n. 52, and above, n. 85. [Views similar to that of R. Jonah concerning the positioning of the hands during prayer are also found in the pietistic *Sefer Minhag Tov* (see above, n. 34) and later in the biblical commentary of the kabbalist Rabbenu Bahya b. Asher. For the possible impact of Christian ritual on this aspect of Jewish prayer practice, cf. Daniel Sperber, *Minhagei Yisra'el* 3 (Jerusalem, 1994), 88–91; 4:71–74; and H. Soloveitchik in *AJS Review* 23 (1998): 225.]

¹³⁹See *Semag*, 'aseh 16, and Gilat (above, n. 113).

¹⁴⁰This development is somewhat curious, in light of the fact that *Hasidei Ashkenaz* were generally quite interested in various kinds of movement during prayer, as we have seen. This practice is not mentioned in *Sefer ha-Manhig*, either. On the other hand, as noted by Zimmer ("Tiqqunei ha-Guf," 99–100), Ramban, the Zohar, and other mystically inclined sources of the period endorse it. Cf. Marcus, "Prayer Gestures in German Hasidism" (above, n. 60).

The small number of full-fledged students who have been associated with the Pietists (not to mention the absence of any Pietist communities or settlements) belies the extent to which certain of their values were broadly held—especially those values that were part of Ashkenazic rabbinic culture in the pre-Crusade period. Whether or not the German Pietists were the source, we have been able to discover various forms of *hasidut* and *perishut* within rabbinic circles in both northern France and Germany. As we shall now see, the presence of these phenomena continued and even intensified in the second half of the thirteenth century, perhaps under more direct Pietist influence.

The Case of R. Isaac of Corbeil

R. Isaac b. Joseph of Corbeil (d.c.1280) was a northern French tosafist. Like R. Moses of Coucy, he authored a halakhic code, known as *'Ammudei Golah* or *Sefer Mizvot Qatan*. Indeed, R. Isaac's work owes much to R. Moses' *Sefer Mizvot Gadol* in terms of content and approach, even as it employs a somewhat different style of presentation.¹⁴¹ In addition, it appears that R. Isaac shared a number of more overtly pietistic affinities with R. Judah *he-Hasid* and with his student, R. Eleazar of Worms, reflecting a significant measure of influence.

R. Isaac recorded all four modes of penance that were the hallmarks of the penitential programs of both R. Judah and R. Eleazar. These include *teshuvat ha-mishqal* and *teshuvat ha-katuv*, which often required the penitent to undergo harsh physical afflictions.¹⁴² This inclusion is rendered even more suggestive by the fact that R. Abraham b. Azriel—a devoted Pietist student of

¹⁴¹See Israel Ta-Shma, "Isaac ben Joseph of Corbeil," *Encyclopaedia Judaica* vol. 9, 21–22, and idem, "Hasidut Ashkenaz bi-Sefarad," 168, n. 8.

¹⁴² מיני *Ammudei Golah* (=*Sefer Mizvot Qatan* [Semaql], Kapust, 1820), sec. 53: תשובה הם: תשובה הנדר תשובה הכתוב תשובה המשקל תשובה החרטה. Cf. *Sefer ha-Roqeah ha-Gadol* (Jerusalem, 1967), 25, *Hilkhot Teshuvah*, sec. 1 (end): ז' עניינית תשובה הם: תשובה הבאה תשובה הנדר תשובה המשקל תשובה הכתוב תשובה הבאה תשובה הבאה תשובה הנדר תשובה המשקל תשובה החרטה. On the four modes of penance in the writings of R. Judah *he-Hasid* and R. Eleazar of Worms, see Baer, "Ha-Megammah ha-Datit/ha-Hevratit," 18–20; Yosef Dan, *Sifrut ha-Musar ve-ha-Derush* (Jerusalem, 1975), 128–33; and Marcus, *Piety and Society*, 39–52. The substitution of *תשובה* for *תשובה* in the *Semaql* passage is not a problematic discrepancy. The term *תשובה* appears as a substitute or definition for *תשובה* in *SHP* 37 and in other related Pietist texts. See *Sefer Roqeah*, *Hilkhot Teshuvah*, sec. 4; Israel al-Nakawa, *Menorat ha-Ma'or*, ed. H. G. Enelow, vol. 3 (New York, 1933), 114–15; and Marcus, 50.

Cambr. Add. 394 (Ashkenaz, fourteenth/fifteenth centuries), fols. 83v–84r, records a penitential *teḥinnah* by an Isaac b. Joseph (of Corbeil?) [See also Israel Davidson, *Ozar ha-Shirah ve-ha-Piyyut*, vol. 1 (New York, 1924), 73, #1594].

CHAPTER 1

R. Eleazar of Worms who cites formulations of R. Eleazar on the *teshuva* process and its efficacy—makes no reference to *teshuvat ha-mishqal* or to the need for physical afflictions as part of the *teshuva* process.¹⁴³

R. Moses of Coucy, whose affinities with the *hilkhot teshuvah* of the German Pietists have been discussed, also stopped short of requiring forms of self-affliction as an aspect of repentance.¹⁴⁴ On the other hand, R. Simḥah of Spires, a contemporary of R. Moses who was also linked to R. Judah *he-Hasid*,¹⁴⁵ issued a ruling regarding repeated domestic abuse (requiring the husband to be physically punished according to the judgment of the court) that appears to allude to the concept of *teshuvat ha-mishqal* as its basis.¹⁴⁶ R. Meir of Rothenburg, a younger contemporary of R. Isaac of Corbeil who studied with R. Samuel of Evreux and was influenced by a number of teachings of *ḥasidut Ashkenaz*,¹⁴⁷ prescribed physical punishments and afflictions as penance in a number of responsa. In one instance, R. Meir referred specifically to *Sefer Roqeah* as his source.¹⁴⁸ Nonetheless, R. Isaac of Corbeil remains the first northern French halakhist to refer to the full program of Pietist penances.¹⁴⁹

אודה על חטאתי בעוד بي נשמותי ויראתי וחודרתי מפני פחדה... ואיככה אנתנפֶל
מפני האדון ה'... צרכי אני ספרתי ואת חטאתי זכרתי... כי חטאתי לה... נפשי
על יצרך ואיזה לי על שברך מה אשיב לה... חולין נא וגוח... אלוי יחנן לה...
לבוי דוחה עלי כי קרוב יום ה' רגואו ואל תחתאו כי חטאתם לה... ישיב גוף לנשומה
אם עושים מאומה לשלוח לי אשר לא יאהה ה'... ואיככה אמרת נקי אני מה...
הטיבה ה' קדוש ישמעו לקוראינו כי אל רחום ה'.

This passage is followed by liturgical and halakhic material from other thirteenth-century Ashkenazic rabbinic figures, such as R. Netan’el of Chinon (see below, ch. 3, n. 104), R. Solomon b. Samuel (below, ch. 2, n. 4), and R. Azri’el (see A. Havazalet, “Teshuvot R. Azri’el b. Yehi’el,” *Zefunot* 1 [1989]:5–14, and Z. Leitner, “Seridim mi-Perush R. Azri’el le-Massekhet Nazir,” *Sefer ha-Zikkaron li-Khevod R. Shmu’el Barukh Werner* [Jerusalem, 1996], 156–62), supporting the possibility that the Isaac b. Joseph in this passage is the author of *Semaq*. For similar *tehinnot* or *vidduyim* attributed to R. Moses of Coucy, R. Judah *he-Hasid*, and R. Eleazar of Worms, see above, n. 112.

¹⁴³ See ‘Arugat ha-Bosem, ed. Urbach, 4:179–80.

¹⁴⁴ See Urbach, *Ba’alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:469–70.

¹⁴⁵ See below, ch. 2, n. 16, and ch. 5, n. 12.

¹⁴⁶ See Avraham Grossman, “Yahasam shel Hakhmei Yisra’el ‘el Hakka’at Nashim,” *Proceedings of the Tenth World Congress for Jewish Studies* (Jerusalem, 1990) [Div. B, vol. 1], 121–23 [=“Rabbinic Views on Wife Beating, 800–1300,” *Jewish History* 5 (1991):59–61.] Cf. Marcus, *Piety and Society*, 126–27.

¹⁴⁷ See below, ch. 2, sec. 3.

¹⁴⁸ See Baer, “Ha-Megammah ha-Datit/ha-Hevratit,” 19, n. 38; Jacob Elbaum, *Teshuvat ha-Lev ve-Qabbalat Yissurim* (Jerusalem, 1993), 19–22; H. J. Zimmels,

R. Isaac's striking formulation on synagogue decorum and comportment, found without attribution at the end of his lengthy discussion of the precept of prayer and its performance, owes much to the writings of the German Pietists:

Woe to those who chatter idly or act frivolously in the synagogue during the prayer service. They prevent their children from meriting the world to come. We should draw an *a fortiori* argument for ourselves from the Christians. If they can stand silently [*ke-’ilmim*] in their churches, we who stand before the King of kings, the Holy One blessed be He, can certainly do so. Our predecessors have told us, and we have seen with our own eyes, that several synagogues have been turned into churches because people acted foolishly in them.... Thus, everyone must feel the need to be in awe and tremble before Him and not talk, at least during the cantor's repetition of the *Shemoneh ‘Esreh*.¹⁵⁰

Using almost identical phrases and terms, two passages in *Sefer Hasidim* address the three points that are the focus of the *Semaq* passage: the need to eliminate talking and frivolous behavior in the synagogue, the fact that the need for better behavior can be derived, *a fortiori*, from the behavior of the Christians (בָּבּוּת תְּפִלָּתָם עָמְדִים בַּתְּרָבוֹת), and the incidence of Jewish houses of worship that were destroyed or taken over by Christians because of the frivolous behavior that had occurred in them. In addition, the penitential literature of the Pietists prescribes very harsh penance regimens for those who talk during prayer services in the synagogue.¹⁵¹

Ashkenazim and Sephardim (London, 1958), 241–43. On Maharam and *Semaq*, see below, n. 169. For references to Pietist penances in the rabbinic literature of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, see Marcus, *Piety and Society*, 128–29; Yedidyah Dinari, *Hakhmei Ashkenaz be-Shilhei Yemei ha-Benayim* (Jerusalem, 1984), 85–93; Elbaum, *Teshuvat ha-Lev ve-Qabbalat Yissurim*, *passim*.

¹⁴⁹Although *Semaq* lists the four Pietist modes of penance without providing any specific guidance regarding their application, R. Perez of Corbeil offers a brief definition of each type, fully consonant with Pietist literature, in his gloss to the *Semaq* text. Cf. R. Perez's gloss to *Semaq*, sec. 175, citing Rabbenu Yonah (above, n. 91); S. Sha'anan, "Pisqei Rabbenu Perez va-Aherim," *Moriah* 17/9–10 (1991):12, sec. 15 (above, n. 83); and below, ch. 2, nn. 69–70. See Eric Zimmer, "Olam ke-Minhago Noheg, 230–34 (esp. n. 54), for *Semaq*'s inclusion of a stringent practice regarding *yemei tohar* associated with both northern French *perushim* and German Pietists, and cf. below, ch. 2, n. 86.

¹⁵⁰*Semaq*, sec. 11 (end). Cf. Ivan Marcus, "Jews and Christians Imagining the Other in Medieval Europe," *Prooftexts* 15 (1995):220–21.

¹⁵¹See *SHP* 1589, 224; Moshe Hallamish, "Sihat Hullin be-Veit ha-Knesset: Mezi'ut u-Ma'avaq," *Milet* 2 (1985):226–27, 243–44; Moritz Güdemann, *Ha-Torah ve-ha-Hayyim*,

CHAPTER 1

Sefer Mizvot Qatan, which does not mention many contemporary names—aside from R. Isaac's immediate teachers, the two major twelfth-century northern French tosafist masters, Rabbenu Tam and Ri, and the pillars of Sefardic *halakhah*, Rabbenu Hanan'el, Rif and Rambam—cites (from the *hilkhot hasidut* of R. Eleazar of Worms at the beginning of its treatment of prayer. The material on prayer begins with a discussion of the need for proper *kavvanah*. *Semaq* defines *kavvanah* as thinking about the meaning of each word and making sure that not one word is skipped, taking the same care one uses when counting coins. German Pietists underscored the importance of not skipping or changing a word or even a single letter of prayer, since this would disturb the internal harmony and overall efficacy of the prayers. Indeed, they counted and analyzed the number of words and letters in many prayers, as a means of arriving at each prayer's inner meaning. They believed that reciting the liturgy slowly and accurately unlocks the esoteric meanings of the prayers and, at the same time, faithfully preserves ancient rabbinic formulae.¹⁵²

R. Isaac writes that if one cannot have proper *kavvanah* throughout all the blessings of the *Shemoneh 'Esreh*, one should at least try to maintain *kavannah* during the first three blessings (the unit entitled *Avot*) and during the blessing of *Modim*:

And R. Eleazar of Worms wrote in his book¹⁵³ that it is very good to have *kavvanah* at the conclusion of each of the blessings (of the

1:69. SHP 1484 also employs the term *תרבותה* in connection with proper decorum in the synagogue. On the importance of proper comportment during prayer in the thought of the German Pietists, see also SHP 517, 1574; Soloveitchik, "Three Themes," 330–34; and below, n. 153. See also the pietistic *Sefer Minhag Tov*, ed. Weiss, *Ha-Zofeh* 13 (1929):224, sec. 3, and Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 2:572–73. Despite the strictness of the German Pietists regarding Jewish-Gentile relations, they emulated those behaviors of non-Jews which they felt had merit. See Katz, *Exclusiveness and Tolerance*, 93–105; Baer, "Ha-Megammah ha-Datit/ha-Hevratit shel Sefer Hasidim," *passim*; Soloveitchik, 315–25; and cf. D. Berger, *The Jewish-Christian Debate in the High Middle Ages* (Philadelphia, 1979), 27. [Note R. Isaac of Corbeil's statement in *Semaq*, sec. 1, in which he repudiates sharply the view of the "philosophers," that the world is governed by the constellations.]

¹⁵² See, e.g., SHP 1575; *Arba'ah Turim*, O. H. 113; *'Arugat ha-Bosem*, ed. Urbach, 4:83–99; Sperber, *Minhagei Yisra'el*, 1:121–24, 2:95–98; and below, n. 162, and ch. 2, nn. 15, 26.

¹⁵³ See *Sefer Roqeah*, *hilkhot hasidut*, *shoresh zekhirat ha-Shem ve-ha-tefillah be-'ahavah uve-simhah tamid kol ha-yom*. Cf. *Roqeah*, sec. 322; SHP, secs. 1577–79, 393; and R. Abraham Oppenheim's *Eshel Avraham* to *Shulhan Arukh*, *Orah Hayyim*, sec. 97. See also *Orhot Hayyim*, *Hilkhot Tefillah*, sec. 37 (fol. 16a) and *Kol Bo*, sec. 11, fols. 5a–b, which include the formulations of *Semaq* and R. Eleazar of Worms (and R. Jonah as well) regarding *kavvanah*. Cf. *Mishneh Torah*, *Hilkhot Tefillah*, 4:15, and *Haggahot*

Shemoneh 'Esreh) since they [the conclusions] contain [all together] 113 words, equivalent to the 113 words in the prayer of Hannah. And it stands to reason that whoever has proper *kavvanah* during his requests, but not during [the blessings which are in] praise of the Holy One blessed be He, does himself harm. One should think that since if he were standing before a human king he would be very precise with his words, he certainly must do so before the King of kings, the Holy One blessed be He.¹⁵⁴

R. Isaac cites R. Judah *he-Hasid* by name just once in *Sefer Mizvot Qatan*, but the context and location give the citation prominence. In delineating the extent to which one must be prepared to give up his life to sanctify the Divine Name ('*al qiddush ha-Shem*), R. Isaac, like other medieval Ashkenazic halakhists, extends some of the basic parameters found in talmudic literature.¹⁵⁵ He notes that while, strictly speaking, a Jew whose life is threatened by a non-Jew may transgress all prohibitions (with the exceptions of adultery, murder or idolatry) in order to save himself, it is a *middat hasidut*—a commendable act of unusual piety—not to transgress any prohibition even under the penalty of death. R. Isaac includes this discussion at the very beginning of his work (in the third precept discussed), as part of the precept to demonstrate love for the Almighty ('*ahavat ha-Shem*).

The second of two anecdotal proofs that R. Isaac presents in support of his position involves R. Judah *he-Hasid*. *Semaq* recounts an incident in which Rabbi Judah instructed his students not to travel to attend a wedding because armed robbers frequented the road they would have to take. The students went anyway, confident they could invoke a Divine Name to save themselves. When they returned, R. Judah informed them they stood to lose their share in the world to come unless they retraced their path without invoking the Name,

Maimuniyyot, ad loc. It is at this point, when *Semaq* cites R. Eleazar of Worms, that R. Perez in his gloss cites R. Moses of Evreux on the importance of thinking about each word as it is being said. See above, n. 79. Cf. R. Perez's gloss to *Semaq*, sec. 97, citing R. Samuel of Evreux on *kavvanah*; and below, ch. 2, n. 69.

¹⁵⁴*Semaq*, sec. 11, beginning. Cf. *Arba'ah Turim*, O. H., sec. 98; *Beit Yosef*, ad loc., s.v. *ve-ya'ir*; and above, n. 93. See Mark Verman, *The History and Varieties of Jewish Meditation* (Northvale, 1996), 155–57, regarding the appropriate *kavvanot* during the recitation of the *Shema* as delineated in *Semaq* and in the writings of R. Ezra of Gerona.

¹⁵⁵See, e.g., Katz, *Exclusiveness and Tolerance*, 82–85, and Haym Soloveitchik, "Religious Law and Change: The Medieval Ashkenazic Example," *AJS Review* 12 (1987):207–11.

CHAPTER 1

even if doing so meant they would perish. They went back on the road and were killed.¹⁵⁶

This episode does not appear in full narrative form in the literature of *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, but it is consonant with a passage in *Sefer Hasidim*: “A person who embarks on a journey should not say, ‘I will adjure [the name of] angels to protect me,’ but should instead pray to the Master of the universe. Several prophets were killed but they did not adjure the Holy Name (וְלֹא הָשְׁבִיעוּ בְשָׁם הַקּוֹדֶשׁ). Rather, they stood in prayer saying, ‘If He does not hear our prayers, we are not worthy of being saved.’ They did not undertake any tactic other than prayer.”¹⁵⁷ Other passages in *Sefer Hasidim* associate the inappropriate or untutored magical adjuration of *Shemot* with extremely dire consequences and shed further light on the gravity of such acts.¹⁵⁸

¹⁵⁶See *Semaq*, sec. 3; Urbach, *Bafelei ha-Tosafot*, 2:572, and cf. 1:387–88; Solovitchik, “Religious Law and Change,” 210, n. 8; and cf. *Orhot Hayyim*, pt. 2, sec. 4 (*Din Ahavat ha-Shem ve-Yir’ato*), 26. On *qiddush ha-Shem* in the thought of *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, see Baer, “Ha-Megammah ha-Datit ha-Hevratit,” 14–15; and above, n. 20.

¹⁵⁷*Semaq*, sec. 154, following *Semag*, ‘aseh 23, instructs that the words כְּבוֹד בְּמוֹכַתō כְּבוֹד be written on the outside of the *mezuzah*. These fourteen letters represent the three Divine Names found in the verse of *Shema Yisra’el*, the name *E-lohenu* surrounded by two Tetragrammatons. (The letters of these Names are represented by the letter that follows it in the Hebrew alphabet). On the so-called fourteen-letter Name, see Trachtenberg, *Jewish Magic and Superstition*, 92, and below, ch. 5, n. 63. Cf. *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur*, ed. Schäfer, sec. 513. Although R. Asher b. Yehi’el (*Hilkhot Mezuzah*, sec. 18) and *Tur* (Y. D., sec. 288) identify this as an accepted Ashkenazic custom (in northern France as well as Germany), *Semag*, *Semaq*, and *Sefer Assufot* (see Moses Gaster, *Studies and Texts* [London, 1925–25], 3:230) are the only Ashkenazic rabbinic sources to mention it explicitly. [In the geonic treatise on *mezuzot* cited by Rabiah this practice is alluded to only in cryptic fashion; see Aptowitzer, “Mi-Sifrut ha-Geonim,” 100–101; and above, n. 45. On *Sefer Assufot*’s involvement with *sod* interpretations and magical practices, see below, ch. 3, nn. 18, 59; ch. 4, n. 57.] On the use of this Name in Ashkenaz for protection, see Trachtenberg, 148–50. The *Zohar* also adopted this practice regarding *mezuzot*; see *Ta-Shma*, *Ha-Nigleh shebe-Nistar*, 23; and idem, “Od li-Ve’ayat ha-Meqorot ha-Ashkenaziyyim be-Sefer ha-Zohar,” 263.

¹⁵⁸*SHP* 211=SHB 205. See Margoliot’s note to this passage (*Meqor Hesed*, n. 5) for citations (and embellishments) of the story in subsequent rabbinic and kabbalistic literature, and cf. *SHP* 583, regarding the performance of circumcision in a dangerous situation. In one version, the story involving R. Judah is traced to the rabbis of northern France (=*Semaq*?), and in another R. Jonah *Hasid* is suggested as the teacher of the students; cf. above, n. 84, and below, n. 171. Note also the passage in *Hekhalot* literature, adduced by Margoliot, that is parallel to part of the narrative.

¹⁵⁸See, e.g., *SHP* 210, 212–13, 379, 797, 1452; *SHB* 206, 1172, and Margoliot’s appendix entitled *Hasidei ‘Olam*, 586–89; Dan, *Torat ha-Sod shel Hasidut Ashkenaz*, 19, 28, 74–76, 218–22; Haviva Pedaya, “Pegam ve-Tiqqun shel ha-E-lohut be-Qabbalah

R. Isaac offers no further comment on the story involving R. Judah *he-Hasid* and his students. R. Judah's posture will be analyzed more fully below, when his views on the use of Divine Names for magical purposes are discussed. Nonetheless, it is clear that R. Isaac relied on R. Judah's response to suggest that there are situations in which one should voluntarily give up his life 'al *qiddush ha-Shem* (or in order not to desecrate God's Name), even if it is possible within the letter of the law to avoid this fate. R. Isaac defined such an act as one of pietistic devotion (*middat hasidut*). R. Eleazar of Worms's student, R. Abraham b. Azriel, enunciated the same concept in different terms: when it comes to *qiddush ha-Shem*, **בְּלֹא מְחֻמָּר תִּבְאֹעַלְוָה בָּרְכָה**.¹⁵⁹ In addition, R. Isaac of Corbeil's inclusion of this episode demonstrates his awareness that Divine Names could be invoked magically in order to avoid danger. According to R. Judah *he-Hasid*, the use of *Shemot* had to be carefully controlled, but their potential efficacy was acknowledged by both R. Judah and R. Isaac.¹⁶⁰

An account of the origin of the 'Aleynu prayer and the reflection of this origin in the text of 'Aleynu, attributed in other sources to R. Judah *he-Hasid*, is presented in *Sefer Orhot Hayyim* as the explanation of R. Isaac of Corbeil. "R. Isaac of Corbeil (*Ha-Ri mi-Corbeil*) wrote: I heard that Joshua instituted it ['Aleynu] at the time that he conquered the land [of Israel] and he inscribed his name of humility [*shem qatnuto* (his original name); *Hoshea*^c] in reverse [= **עַלְיוֹן לְשָׁבָח**, ש = **שְׁלָא שֵׁם חַלְקָנוּ**, ו = **וְאַנְחָנוּ בּוּרְעִים**, ה = **הַוָּא אַלְקִינוּ**]. [Therefore,] One who says **אָבֵל אָנָחָנוּ** [כּוּרְעִים] errs [since the *vav* of *Hoshea*^c would be supplanted by 'alef, the first letter of **אָבֵל**]."¹⁶¹

Two extant traditions from R. Judah *he-Hasid* concern Joshua's authorship of 'Aleynu. One is that the prayer contains 152 words, which is the *gematria* (numerical) equivalent of his father's name, **בִּן נָנָן** (*bin Nun*). The second is that Joshua composed this prayer when the Jewish people entered the land of Israel and began to capture various cities and regions. "Joshua saw the many man-made idols which were being destroyed and authored this hymn of praise to God. He inscribed his name in it backward, at the beginning of each verse, for reasons of modesty, so that not all would understand that he had composed it." The letters and their related phrases are then spelled out to form *Hoshea*^c, exactly as they are in the *Orhot Hayyim* passage attributed to

R. Yizhaq Sagi Nahor," *Mehqerei Yerushalayim be-Mahshevut Yisra'el* 6/3–4 (1987):157, n. 1; and below, ch. 4, nn. 41–42.

¹⁵⁹See 'Arugat ha-Bosem, ed. Urbach, 4:167, n. 76.

¹⁶⁰Cf. *Semaq*, sec. 143, on sorcery, and cf. below, ch. 3, n. 87.

¹⁶¹*Orhot Hayyim*, *Tehinnah aharei shemoneh 'esreh*, sec. 8, fol. 21b; and cf. *Kol Bo*, ch. 16 (*Tefillah*), 9a.

CHAPTER 1

R. Isaac of Corbeil. "Therefore, every God-fearing person should be careful not to add or subtract any word from what our forefathers have established because all depends on the measurement [amount] of the words."¹⁶²

There are several other suggestive parallels between teachings of the German Pietists and formulations of R. Isaac of Corbeil. These include material on *neħush* and *siman* (symbolic divination),¹⁶³ *tokekħah* (admonition and rebuke),¹⁶⁴ monetary compensation for the teaching or study of Torah,¹⁶⁵ and the extent of a woman's obligation to study Torah.¹⁶⁶ R. Isaac's relationship with *Hasidei Ashkenaz* also helps to account for a recurring pattern in manuscript collections. Copyists from the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries and beyond juxtaposed *Semaq* with works of *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, suggesting that a perception developed quickly that these works were related.

¹⁶²Ms. Kaufmann A399, fol. 50r, cited in 'Arugat ha-Bosem, ed. Urbach, 4:98. See also Elliot Wolfson, "Hai Gaon's Letter and Commentary on 'Aleynu: Further Evidence of Moses De Leon's Pseudepigraphic Activity," *JQR* 81 (1991):380–81. Wolfson lists a series of manuscript texts and published works that contain this tradition, occasionally in the name of R. Judah *he-Hasid*. I have demonstrated that all these works and their authors or compilers were connected, in different ways, to the German Pietists; see my "Rabbinic Figures in Castilian Kabbalistic Pseudepigraphy," 97–98, n. 73. As the present study serves to indicate, R. Isaac of Corbeil also had a connection to R. Judah *he-Hasid* and his followers. [In *Orhot Hayyim, ha-Ri mi-Corbeil* invariably refers to R. Isaac b. Joseph; see also my "Rabbinic Figures," 92–93, 98, n. 74.]

¹⁶³*Semaq*, sec. 136; *SHB* 59; *SHP* 14, 377; *Sefer Roqeqah, hilkhot Yom ha-Kippurim*, 106; *Semag, lo ta'aseh* 53; *Sefer ha-Yir'ah*, ed. Zilber, 53, sec. 228; Gudemann, *Ha-Torah ve-ha-Hayyim*, 1:159; and Dinari, *Hakhmei Ashkenaz*, 157. Cf. ms. Parma 541, fol. 264v (end): *וַיְהִי עַרְבָּה וַיְהִי בְּקָרְבָּה יְמֵם וּבְבָשָׂר בְּאַוְתָה פְּרָשָׁה לֹא תִּמְצָא פ' כִּי אֵין לוֹ פָּה מִשְׁמָחָתִיל לִלְמֹד בְּיָמֵד ד' אוֹ מֵשְׁמִיטִים בּוֹ וְהַזְּהָרָה חֲכָמִים אֵין מִסְתִּימִין בְּד' ... כִּי לִילִית הַוְּלָכָת בְּלִיל רַבִּיעִי וְאֵין סִימָן בְּרָכָה בְּאַוְתָה יְמֵם וּבְיָמֵם שְׁנִי כְּמוֹכָב עַל כֵּן אֵין מִתְחִילִין וְאֵין מִסְתִּימִין כִּי טוֹב בְּבָרְשָׁתִים; Ta-Shma, *Ha-Nigleh shebe-Nistar*, 98, n. 65 (end); Georges Vajda, "Liqqutim mi-Sefer Musar Bilti le-Ehad me-Rabbanei Zarefat," *Sefer Hayyim Schirmann*, ed. Shraga Abramson and Aaron Mirsky (Jerusalem, 1970), 103–6; idem, "Une Traite de Morale d'Origine Judeo-Française," *REJ* 125 (1966):267–85; and Richard Kieckhefer, *Magic in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1989), 85–91.*

¹⁶⁴*Semaq*, sec. 112; *SHP* 1338, 1972; *Semag, 'aseh* 11. Cf. Soloveitchik, "Three Themes," 336, n. 82; Marcus, *Piety and Society*, 87–88, n. 4; and above, n. 110.

¹⁶⁵See my *Jewish Education and Society*, 43–46, 91–97.

¹⁶⁶On the obligation to teach women the commandments for which they are responsible and their obligation to study that material, see *SHP* 835 and the introduction to *Semaq* (which consists of written remarks from R. Isaac, preserved by his students). Cf. *Sefer ha-Agur*, sec. 2; *Beit Yosef* to *Orah Hayyim*, sec. 47 (end); and *Hida, Yosef Omez*, sec. 67. See also my review of S. P. Zolty, "And All Your Children Shall Be Learned": *Women and the Study of Torah in Jewish Law and History* (Jason Aronson, 1993), in *JQR* 87 (1996):192–95.

This relationship may also account for some unusual intertwinings of R. Judah *he-Hasid* and R. Isaac in subsequent medieval halakhic texts, such as R. Aharon *ha-Kohen* of Lunel's *Orhot Hayyim*.¹⁶⁷

There is no evidence of any personal contact between R. Isaac of Corbeil and the central figures of *Hasidei Ashkenaz*. Several of the parallels that have been noted suggest that R. Isaac may have read *Sefer Hasidim* and *Sefer Roqeqah*, and perhaps other Pietist works as well. In addition, R. Isaac studied at the academy of Evreux.¹⁶⁸ This could account not only for the similarities between R. Isaac and the German Pietists with respect to their approaches to prayer and penance, but also for various aspects of *Semaq* itself. With its unwavering dedication to the formulation of practical *halakhah* that could be studied by the masses, as demonstrated by its simplicity and accessibility, *Semaq* conforms fully to the specifications of the German Pietists concerning the goal of Torah study¹⁶⁹—despite the fact that much of *Semaq* represents the fruits of twelfth-century tosafist dialectic.¹⁷⁰

Moreover, sayings and exempla employed by *Semaq* to exhort the reader to higher levels of ethical and religious conduct—as well as the classification of the commandments in accordance with various parts of the body and the

¹⁶⁷See my “German Pietism in Northern France: The Case of R. Isaac of Corbeil,” in *Hazon Nahum* [Studies in Jewish Law, Thought, and History Presented to Dr. Norman Lamm], ed. Jeffrey Gurock and Yaakov Elman (New York, 1997), 222–27.

¹⁶⁸See, e.g., *Semaq*, sec. 151 (ר' ברא דיו נהגנן); sec. 153, in which both R. Samuel of Evreux (ר' שמואל) and his brother Ri [=R. Isaac] b. Shne'ur are mentioned [R. Isaac is also cited at the end of sec. 281, regarding נשות בשכבה]; sec. 219 (ספק סכנת נשות מאיירא); and cf. Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 2:571. Note also the references to R. Isaac's teachers at Evreux in his *pesaqim*. See Moshe Hershler, “Pisqei Rabbenu Yizhaq mi-Corbeil Ba'al ha-Semaq mi-Tokh Ketav Yad,” *Sinai* 67 (1970):244–49; Y. S. Lange, “Pisqei R. Yizhaq mi-Corbeil,” *Ha-Ma'ayan* 16:4 (1976):95–104; H. S. Sha'anan, “Pisqei Rabbenu Ri mi-Corbeil,” *Sefer Ner li-Shema'ayah* [Sefer Zikkaron le-Zikhro shel ha-Rav Shema'ayah Sha'anan] (Bnei Brak, 1988), 5–32. Cf. Y. S. Lange, “Le-'Inyan ha-Semaq mi-Zurich,” *Alei Sefer* 4 (1977): 178–79; Henri Gross, *Gallia Judaica* (Paris, 1897), 39; and Emanuel, “Sifrei Halakhah Avudim shel Ba'alei ha-Tosafot,” 231–45.

¹⁶⁹See *Semaq*, introduction, for R. Isaac's own assessment of his purpose in authoring *Semaq*, as a means of insuring that all would know the essentials of those precepts which can still be performed. Note also the strong approbation of *Semaq* expressed by R. Meir of Rothenburg, whose own relationship with *Hasidei Ashkenaz* will be discussed below (ch. 2, sec. 3). See Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 2:573, and cf. below, ch. 2, n. 62. Some editions of *Semaq* append a group of *liqqutim* from R. Meir to the end of sec. 81 (laws of oaths and vows).

¹⁷⁰See above, n. 102.

CHAPTER 1

division of the work into seven sections, one for each day of the week—are techniques that can be found in the writings of R. Isaac's fellow student at Evreux, Rabbenu Yonah.¹⁷¹ *Semaq* includes a distinct precept for looking at the *zizit* during the recitation of *Shema*. Geonic sources had earlier rejected this interpretation of the phrase *וּרְאֵתֶם אֶת־*, arguing that the *zizit* (*tallit*) were already inspected when the initial blessing was made over them. In his *Sefer ha-Yir'ah*, Rabbenu Yonah also instructs one to hold the *zizit* and look at them during the recitation of *Shema*.¹⁷²

In addition to all these conceptual and textual affinities with *Hassidei Ashkenaz*, R. Isaac was given to deep personal piety.¹⁷³ Both contemporaries and students refer to him as *hasid*,¹⁷⁴ just as one of R. Isaac's teachers in northern France, R. Samuel of Evreux, and R. Isaac's father-in-law, R. Yehiel of Paris, were also called *hasid*.¹⁷⁵ Moreover, a collection of R. Isaac's *pesaqim* and

¹⁷¹See Ta-Shma, “Hasidut Ashkenaz bi-Sefarad,” 168, n. 8. Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 2:572, notes the influence of the proto-Pietist *Sefer Yere'im* on the structure of *Semaq*. Cf. above, n. 105.

¹⁷²See *Semaq*, sec. 29; *Sefer ha-Yir'ah* (ed. Zilber), 22, sec. 73. See also *Beit Yosef, Orah Hayyim*, sec. 24, s.v. *katav Ba'al ha-Ittur*; S. K. Mirsky, “Meqorot ha-Halakhah ba-Midrashim,” *Talpiyyot* 1 (1944): 49–51, 54–55; and S. Kook, *Iyyunim u-Mehqarim* (Jerusalem, 1963), 1:335–37. R. Yonah is cited in *Semaq*, sec. 281 (in *hilkhot Shabbat*, regarding **אָוֹפָה**).

¹⁷³See Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-tosafot*, 2:573.

¹⁷⁴See the introduction to *Semaq*; Gross, *Gallia Judaica*, 563; and Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 2:572–75. R. Isaac of Corbeil is also described as *hasid* in the heading of the two versions of his *pesaqim*, Bodl. 781, fol. 68v, and Paris 390, fol. 251v. To be sure, these titles may have been included by copyists or others simply as a sign of general piety or spiritual greatness. Nonetheless, depending upon their dating and provenance, these manuscripts may reflect the impression that R. Isaac of Corbeil was connected with the German Pietists or another pietist group, such as the one at Evreux, on the basis of specific *pesaqim* that he issued. [Note also that R. Isaac was called *he-Hasid* in the colophon of the version of *Semaq* preserved in Bodl. 875, an Ashkenazic manuscript copied in 1299. See Richler, “Al Kitvei Yad shel Sefer ha-Yir'ah” (above, n. 84); above, n. 88; and my “German Pietism in Northern France” (above, n. 167), 222, 226, n. 69.]

¹⁷⁵R. Samuel of Evreux is called *he-Hasid* by his student, R. Yedidyah b. Israel; see *Shitah 'al Mo'ed Qatan le-Talmido shel R. Yehiel mi-Paris*, ed. M. L. Zaks (Jerusalem, 1937), 2:113. [R. Yedidyah may have been the teacher of R. Judah *he-Hasid*'s son, R. Zal(t)man; see Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 2:569, n. 25.] R. Yehiel of Paris is referred to as *hasid* in *Orhot Hayyim*, pt. 2, *Issurei Ma'akhalot*, sec. 12 (p. 286). In *Hilkhot Zizit*, sec. 15 (fol. 3b) he is called *ha-qadosh*. In Bodl. 2343 and Parma 3175 (De Rossi 166), R. Yehiel's *pesaqim* are called *פסקין* (horrorot m'hochshe'dar ר' ייחיאל). Cf. above, n. 88; Israel Ta-Shma, “Li-Meqorotav ha-Sifrutiyim shel ha-Zohar,” *Tarbiz* 60 (1991):663–65; and see now idem, *Ha-Nigleh shebe-Nistar*, 95, n. 42. Note that the brothers of Evreux were

personal practices is replete with manifestations of asceticism and *perishut*.¹⁷⁶ These include stern warnings against gazing at women and their clothing, looking into the face of a *rasha*, cultivating frivolous behavior (*sehoq*) and aimless activities (e.g., *letayyel be-hinnam*), and enjoying food and other pleasures on weekdays to a greater extent than is required for healthful subsistence (*derekh ta'anug*). In addition, one should fast on a regular basis.¹⁷⁷ On these fast days, which ideally should occur every few weeks (in imitation of the *'anshei ma'amad*), one must repent completely, confess his sins and specify his wrongdoings to a *rav*, and ask the Almighty for forgiveness. If one cannot fast, one should set aside charity funds for that day. Indeed, when any member of the household of *ha-qadosh* R. Yizhaq was sick, or when he himself was suffering, he would give eighteen (*hai*) *peshitim* to charity.

Several of these practices bear unmistakable similarities to doctrines of the German Pietists.¹⁷⁸ It must be stressed, however, that, like the brothers of Evreux who continued to produce standard *Tosafot* texts that employed

involved in the compilation of certain versions of R. Yehiel's *pesaqim*; see Emanuel, "Sifrei Halakhah Avudim shel Ba'alei ha-Tosafot," 231–36. *Pesaqim* of R. Yehiel are also found in ms. Cambr. 786, in a collection of rulings primarily from associates of *Hasidei Ashkenaz*; see below, ch. 2, nn. 18, 41.

R. Perez of Corbeil cautioned that one should not speak during the quasi-repetition of the 'Amidah on Friday evenings (*berakhah 'ahat me'en sheva*), since a soul once told R. Yehiel of Paris that the angels threw him up and let him fall by himself because he talked during this prayer. See below, ch. 2, n. 70, and ch. 5, n. 43. A similar notion is found in *SHP* 1073 (and cf. below, ch. 2, n. 52). To be sure, even those northern French tosafists given to *hasidut* expressed their concern (and disagreement) with stringencies they believed were without halakhic basis (*מנגד שתוות*); see below, ch. 2, n. 11.

¹⁷⁶Ms. Cambr. Add. 3127, fols. 165v–166v. On this collection of rulings (and its parallels described in the next note) see Emanuel, "Sifrei Halakhah Avudim," 238–40. This manuscript also contains *pesaqim* from R. Yehiel of Paris and works by other students at the academy of Evreux. See now Stephan Reif, *Hebrew Manuscripts at Cambridge University Library* (Cambridge, 1997), 219–21.

¹⁷⁷The text offers an example of this regimen through a description of R. Moses (of Evreux), who would slice his meat into very thin pieces in order not to experience its full flavor (*לטנטום טעם בשר חזוב*). Some of these notions (and the description of R. Moses) are also found in ms. Paris 407 (fol. 236d), published by S. Sha'anan, "Pisqei Rabbenu Perez va-Aherim," *Moriah* 17:9–10 (1991):12. There is some confusion as to which *pesaqim* in these manuscripts belong to R. Isaac of Corbeil and which to R. Perez of Corbeil. See above, n. 83. In any case, both studied at Evreux and either could have recorded the practice of R. Moses. It is conceivable that the practices of *ha-qadosh* R. Yizhaq recorded in these *pesaqim* associated with R. Isaac of Corbeil refer to R. Isaac b. Shne'ur, the third brother at Evreux, but it is more likely that they reflect the practices of R. Isaac of Corbeil, as recorded by one of his students. Cf. above, n. 34.

CHAPTER 1

dialectic even as they produced others that curtailed its use, R. Isaac of Corbeil did not renounce his tosafist background in order to pursue pietistic ideals.

R. Isaac of Corbeil's German contemporary, R. Meir of Rothenburg, exhibited even greater affinities with *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, in both pietistic and esoteric contexts. The pietistic affinities can be seen not only in R. Meir's ritual practices, but also in his halakhic rulings and in his biblical and prayer interpretations. Before focusing on R. Meir, the next chapter will identify a group of lesser-known tosafists in thirteenth-century Germany and Austria who were clearly under the influence of the German Pietists in regard to these disciplines and areas as well.

Several of these figures impacted directly on R. Meir of Rothenburg, who appears to represent a kind of amalgamation of tosafist and Pietist teachings. A complete assessment, however, of the impact of these rabbinic scholars on R. Meir (and the extent of R. Meir's activities) must follow a discussion of their mystical proclivities, and can be found in chapter 5.

¹⁷⁸On the strongly formulated prohibitions against gazing at women, and exhortations to minimize *sehoq* and even idle strolls, see Soloveitchik, "Three Themes," 328–30, esp. n. 53, and *SHP*, secs. 102–3, 432, 770. On confessing sins to a *hakham*, see Marcus's analysis of the sage-penitential found in *Sefer Hasidim* in his *Piety and Society*, 75–76, 142–43. Approbation for the notion of giving charity to memorialize the dead is found in *SHP* 35, 273; in *Sefer Roqeah*, sec. 217; and in the name of R. Shemaryah b. Mordekhai of Spires, a student of R. Eliezer Hazzan of Spires (who instructed R. Samuel *Hasid* in *torat ha-sod*). See Ta-Shma, *Minhag Ashkenaz ha-Qadmon*, 301, n. 9; *Mahzor Vitry*, sec. 353; and cf. Louis Finkelstein, *Jewish Self-Government in the Middle Ages* (New York, 1964²), 230; and below, ch. 2, n. 7. [Included in these *pesaqim* is the instruction to consciously train eight- or nine-year-old children not to mention a Divine Name in vain and not to speak profanity or *leshon ha-ra*. This is perhaps related to the concept found in *Sefer Hasidim*, that children can be held fully accountable for their actions even before the age of twelve or thirteen (see below, ch. 2, nn. 22–23), although the goal of the *pesaqim* may simply have been to ensure that children not do these things when they grow older. The great concern which Jews displayed in training young children in these behaviors is highlighted in polemical literature. See., e.g., R. Joseph Kimhi, *Sefer ha-Berit*, ed. Frank Talmage (Jerusalem, 1974), 25–27, and Joel Rembaum, "A Re-evaluation of a Medieval Polemical Manuscript," *AJS Review* 5 (1980):86–88.]



2

Pietistic Tendencies in Prayer and Ritual

I

There were a number of rabbinic figures and tosafists in medieval Ashkenaz who subscribed to and worked with the exoteric biblical interpretations of the German Pietists, including the Pietists' particular usages of techniques such as *gematria* and *notariqon*, and their interpretation of patterns or anomalies within the masoretic text (*te'amim shel Torah/Humash*).¹ Moreover, there were those who accepted and promulgated the Pietists' readings and variants of liturgical texts, setting aside even northern French prayer rites in favor of those of *Hasidei Ashkenaz*.² As we shall see, those tosafists who supported the Pietists' readings were more likely to refer to their correctness than to their mystical

¹See, e.g., Ivan Marcus, "Exegesis for the Few and for the Many," *Mehqerei Yerushalayim be-Mahshevot Yisra'el* 8 (1989):1*-24*; Joseph Dan, "The Ashkenazi Concept of Language," in *Hebrew in Ashkenaz*, ed. Lewis Glinert (New York, 1993), 11-25; my "On the Role of Bible Study in Medieval Ashkenaz," *The Frank Talmage Memorial Volume*, ed. Barry Walfish (Haifa, 1993), 1:151-66; Joseph Davis, "Philosophy, Dogma, and Exegesis in Medieval Ashkenazic Judaism: The Evidence of *Sefer Hadrat Qodesh*," *AJS Review* 18 (1993):216-18; *Perushei ha-Torah le-R. Ḥayyim Palti'el*, ed. Y. S. Lange (Jerusalem, 1981), editor's introduction, 10-11; *Perush Ba'al ha-Turim 'al ha-Torah*, ed. Y. K. Reinitz (New York, 1993), editor's introduction, 12-16; and below, n. 52.

²See, e.g., Eric Zimmer, 'Olam ke-Minhago Noheg (Jerusalem, 1996), 114-18; Elliot Wolfson, "Hai Gaon's Letter and Commentary on 'Aleynu: Further Evidence of Moses de Leon's Pseudepigraphic Activity," *JQR* 81 (1990-91):380-83; Moshe Hallamish, "Be'ayot be-Heqer Hashpa'at ha-Qabbalah 'al ha-Tefillah," *Massu'ot*, ed. Michal Oron and Amos Goldreich (Jerusalem, 1994), 213 (*Sefer ha-Mahkim* follows a Franco-German rite; see my "Rabbinic Figures in Castilian Kabbalistic Pseudepigraphy," *Journal of Jewish Thought*

CHAPTER 2

underpinnings. Nonetheless, this aspect of the discussion will begin to move us past pietistic prayer practices and postures toward mysticism, since the Pietists' liturgical readings do reflect, after all, deeply held considerations of *sodot ha-tefillah*.³

Israel Ta-Shma has published a brief article that presents and assesses all that is known about R. Solomon b. Samuel *ha-Zarefati*.⁴ R. Solomon (c.1160–

and *Philosophy* 3 [1993], 97, n. 73); and below, ch. 3, n. 74. See also ms. Paris 633 (a northern French collection from the thirteenth century, described in Collete Sirat, “Un Rituel Juif de France: Le Manuscrit Hébreu 633 de la Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris,” *REJ* 119 [1961]:7–39), fols. 30r, 48v (material from R. Judah *he-Hasid* and R. Eleazar of Worms.) See also ms. Uppsala 21 [a northern French *maḥzor* for the festivals with a German component, copied in the fourteenth or fifteenth century], fol. 146r, and David Wilhelm, “Le-Minhag Ḥarefot ha-Yashan,” *Tarbiz* 24 [1955]:133; fol. 81r (*Shir ha-Yihud* by R. Judah *he-Hasid*); fol. 104 (prayers according to the *nusḥa’ot* of *Hasidei Ashkenaz*); below, ch. 3, nn. 103, 110; and ms. B.M. 243 (Or. 2853; sixteenth-century *Ashkenaz*), described by A. Marmorstein in *REJ* 76 (1923):113–29. Marmorstein notes there is a general blending of *Ashkenazic* customs with *minhagei Ḥarefot*, including *tefillah*. A number of associates of R. Judah *he-Hasid* are referred to in this manuscript, such as R. Moses Fuller (see below, n. 41) and R. Jacob of Corbeil (see below, ch. 4, nn. 26–28). On problems in identifying the author or compiler of this manuscript, cf. Urbach, *Ba’alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:486, n. 32. The frequently mentioned י”נ is most likely R. Yizhaq, but it could also be R. Zadoq or *rabbanei Ḥarefot*. See, e.g., Menahem Kahana, “Perushim la-Sifrei ha-Genuzim bi-Khetuvei Yad,” *Sefer Zikkaron leha-Rav Yizhaq Nissim* (Jerusalem, 1985), 2:100–105, esp. 102, n. 60; and Israel Ta-Shma, “Le-Toledot ha-Yehudim be-Polin ba-Me’ot ha-Yod Bet/ha-Yod Gimmel,” *Zion* 53 (1988):358–59. On the use of י”נ to represent R. Isaac b. Samuel (Ri) in a number of northern French and German rabbinic texts—including R. Eleazar of Worms’s *Sefer Roqeah*—see Ya’akov Lisfritz, “Hilkhot Hag’alah mi-Khetav Yad le-Rabbenu Avigdor Kohen Zedeq,” *Sefer ha-Zikkaron li-Khevod R. Shmu’el Barukh Werner*, ed. Yosef Buksboim (Jerusalem, 1996), 132, n. 15. On the composition of *Brit. Mus. 243* and its parallels—including ms. Hamburg 45 (known as *Perushim u-Fesaqim ‘al ha-Torah le-R. Avigdor*), ms. Mantua 36, and the printed edition of *Moshav Zeqenim ‘al ha-Torah*, ed. Solomon Sassoon (Jerusalem, 1959)—see Simcha Emanuel, “Sifrei Halakhah Avudim shel Ba’alei ha-Tosafot” (Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University, 1993), 226–30, and below, n. 9. Large parts of B. M. 243/Hamburg 45 have recently been published by Makhon Harerei Qedem under the title *Sefer Perushim u-Fesaqim le-R. Avigdor Ḥarefati* (Jerusalem, 1996). See also below, n. 28.

³See, e.g., ‘Arugat ha-Bosem, ed. E. E. Urbach (Jerusalem, 1963), 4:73–111; Joseph Dan, “The Emergence of Mystical Prayer,” *Studies in Jewish Mysticism*, ed. Joseph Dan and Frank Talmage (Cambridge, Mass., 1982), 85–120; and Shimon Shokef, *Ha-Teshuvah be-Sifrut ha-Musar ha-‘Ivrit* (Lewiston, 1966), 65.

⁴Israel Ta-Shma, “Mashehu ‘al Biqqoret ha-Miqra Bimei ha-Benayim,” *Ha-Miqra bi-Re’i Mefarshav [Sefer Zikkaron le-Sarah Kamin]*, ed. Sarah Japhet (Jerusalem, 1994), 453–59.

1240) was born in northern France, but he studied in Spires with R. Samuel *he-Hasid* and with R. Samuel's sons, R. Judah *he-Hasid* and R. Abraham, and then in Regensburg with R. Judah *he-Hasid* and others. R. Solomon's commentary, *Te'amim shel Humash*, contains *gematria*, as well as exoteric and *sod* interpretations that are similar in style to those associated with R. Judah *he-Hasid* and his students; both R. Judah and R. Samuel *he-Hasid* are among those cited.⁵ After these *Te'amim*, R. Solomon offers interpretations of difficult portions within Ibn Ezra's biblical commentaries, especially those dealing with Divine Names. Among the *sodot* which R. Solomon explains is the notion, mentioned cryptically by Ibn Ezra, that Moses did not write all the biblical verses himself but that several phrases or expressions were added by others. This concept is also found in the biblical commentaries of R. Judah *he-Hasid* and other members of his circle.⁶ Indeed, Ta-Shma has also identified another (anonymous) biblical exegete from northern France who was heavily

⁵See ms. Paris 353, fol. 68v–81v. The manuscript continues (through fol. 89) with additional formulations from R. Solomon that employ similar techniques, including *gematria* and the *ש"בתקן* method. One passage contains an analysis of the Hebrew alphabet from the beginning and then backward from the end. On the mystical significance of the letters of the alphabet taken backward (as a Divine Name, according to R. Eleazar of Worms), which is also a component of the Ashkenazic educational initiation ceremony, see Ivan Marcus, *Rituals of Childhood* (New Haven, 1996), 109–10, 145, n. 29, and the studies of Moshe Idel that are cited. [For an earlier controversy about whether the author of *Te'amim shel Humash* was from the pre-Crusade period or the twelfth century (predicated on the regular appearance of the name R. Leontin in the text), see Avraham Grossman, *Hakhmei Ashkenaz ha-Rishonim*, (Jerusalem, 1981), 86–87, n. 36. See also I. Levi in *REJ* 49 (1909): 231, and 'Arugat ha-Bosem, ed. Urbach, 4:82–83, n. 62; these sources list the same incorrect ms. number, Paris 358. There is no longer any doubt that R. Solomon, who was familiar with pre-Crusade traditions through the German Pietists, is the actual author.] *Te'amim shel Humash* is preceded in the manuscript by a *yihud* composition of R. Eleazar of Worms, among other *sod* and kabbalistic material.

⁶See H. J. Zimmels, "Ketav Yad Cod. hebr. Hamburg 45 ve-Yiḥuso le-R. Avigdor Katz," *Ma'amarim le-Zikhron R. Zevi Perez Chajes*, ed. A. Aptowitzer and Z. Schwarz (Vienna, 1933), 248–61 (esp. 252, 259, n. 7). [Zimmels cogently suggests that the commentaries to the five *megillot* in this manuscript (Ashkenaz, fourteenth/fifteenth centuries) were composed by R. Avigdor himself. The Torah commentaries (and *pesaqim*) may also have been composed, in part, by R. Avigdor, although it appears that students or other members of his circle were also involved; cf. above, n. 2. As a result, biographical details that have been understood to apply to R. Avigdor (such as the references to R. Yom Tov of Joigny as his grandfather) may in fact apply to one of the other, unnamed composers. See also Zimmels, "Le-Toledot R. Avigdor b. Eliyyahu Kohen Zedeq me-Vienna," *Ha-Zofeh le-Hokhmat Yisra'el* 11 (1931):110–26.]

CHAPTER 2

influenced by exegetical methodologies and doctrines of *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, including their approach to biblical authorship.⁷

Ultimately, R. Solomon returned to northern France, where he was in contact with R. Yehiel of Paris.⁸ Ta-Shma suggests that R. Solomon was the father of the tosafist, R. Samuel b. Solomon of Falaise, who was involved with R. Yehiel of Paris in the Trial of the Talmud. In his commentary to R. Yosef Tov Elem's liturgical poem for *Shabbat ha-Gadol*, *E-lohei ha-ruhot lekhhol basar*, R. Samuel cites two *gematria* interpretations from his father. These are the only

The difficulties some have expressed regarding the notion of post-Mosaic authorship and the Pentateuch, noted by Israel Ta-Shma at the beginning of his article (above, n. 4), may be mitigated somewhat by the fact that the Ashkenazic scholars who espoused this notion were closely connected to *Hasidei Ashkenaz* (see also the next note), suggesting that it was not widely held among medieval rabbinic scholars. See now Ta-Shma, "Perush Anonimi Biqorti (bi-Khetav Yad) le-Sefer Tehillim," *Tarbiz* 66 (1997):417–23. On R. Avigdor Katz and *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, see below, at the end of this section. Cf. M. Shapiro in *The Torah u-Madda Journal* 4 (1993):202–3. Avraham Ibn Ezra, who expressed similar ideas, had a significant impact on the thought of *hasidut Ashkenaz*. See, e.g., Yosef Dan, *Torat ha-Sod shel Hasidut Ashkenaz* (Jerusalem, 1968), 29–31, 113–16, 138–45, and cf. below, n. 8, and ch. 3, n. 97; Avraham David, "Le-Toledot shel R. Eleazar b. he-Hasid R. Matatyah me-Hakhmei Erez Yisra'el (?) ba-Me'ah ha-Yod Gimmel," *Qiryat Sefer* 63 (1991):996–98; and below, ch. 4, n. 68. [For the possible Byzantine roots of the notion of post-Mosaic authorship, see Richard Steiner, "The Byzantine Commentary to Ezekiel and Minor Prophets and Its Place in the History of Biblical Exegesis," unpublished paper read at the Twelfth World Congress of Jewish Studies (Jerusalem, 1997); and idem, "Behinot Lashon be-Ferush li-Yechezkel ule-Trei 'Asar shebe-Megillot ha-Ivriyyot mi-Byzantium," *Leshonenu* 59 (1996):39–56. Cf. Dov Schwartz, *Astrologiyyah u-Mageyah* (Ramat Gan, 1999), 332–34, citing "R. Yeshayah me-Erez Trani," and below, ch. 5, n. 21.]

⁷ Israel Ta-Shma, "Perush Divrei ha-Yamim shebi-Ketav Yad Munich 5," *Me-Ginzei ha-Makhon le-Ta'azlumei Kitvei ha-Yad ha-Ivriyyim*, ed. Avraham David (Jerusalem, 1996), 135–41. The teachers of the author's teacher were R. Eleazar (Eliezer) b. Meshullam *Hazzan* and the northern French *peshat* exegete R. Yosef Qara. (According to J. N. Epstein, the author's teacher was R. Samuel *he-Hasid*.) R. Eleazar received *sodot* from R. Qalonymus, the father of R. Samuel *he-Hasid*, and practiced customs, continued by the German Pietists, which had mystical or magical connotations. These include the elongation of the chanting of *Barekhu* on *moza'ei Shabbat* and the dropping of sixteen droplets of wine from the *Seder* cup. See Grossman, *Hakhmei Ashkenaz ha-Rishonim*, 230, 390 (the reference to *Sefer Or Zarua'* in n. 136 should be to pt. 2, sec. 89 [end]); and below, ch. 3, nn. 12, 25.

⁸The recorded contact that R. Solomon had with R. Yehiel concerned the biblical teachings of R. Abraham Ibn Ezra. See ms. Paris 353, fol. 77r. Cf. Shraga Abramson, "Iggeret ha-Qodesh ha-Meyuheset la-Ramban," *Sinai* 90 (1982):244–49, and below, ch. 4, n. 39.

extant references by R. Samuel to his father, and there is no other evidence linking R. Solomon to tosafist teachings.⁹ R. Samuel does refer, in his liturgical commentary, to his tosafist teachers, R. Solomon of b. Judah of Dreux (whom

⁹Ms. Bodl. 2273 contains a relatively short biblical commentary by a R. Avigdor (headed by the phrase *ונתוב עדין בקצרה, כמלקט בשבלים, מפי החכם אביגדור*) that was published recently by Avraham Goldmintz, “*Perush ha-Torah le-Rabbenu Avigdor*,” *Sefer ha-Zikkaron li-Khevod R. Shmu’el Barukh Werner*, 166–97. This commentary is replete with exegetical methods employed by the German Pietists involving letters and words (such as *gematria*, *notariqon*, *millui*, *semukhin*, א”ת ב”ש; see above, n. 1), as Goldmintz’s consistent noting of parallels to the so-called *Perush Roqeah* and to the *Perush Ba’al ha-Turim* demonstrates. This commentary cites R. Eleazar (of Worms) by name in one instance, concerning the absence of the final form of the letter *peh* in the grace after meals; see Goldmintz, 196, n. 88; *Sefer Roqeah*, sec. 337; and below, ch. 3, n. 59. It also cites R. Qalonymus and R. Joel (Goldmintz, 185) together with a R. Sa’ad’el, R. Aaron, and R. Amitai (the early Ashkenazic *payyetan*?) on the names and functions of various angelic *memunim*. R. Qalonymus and R. Joel are referred to as *ḥasidim* and are mentioned together with R. Judah *he-Hasid* in an Ashkenazic (*Shi’ur Qomah*) commentary to the forty-two-letter Name; see *Merkavah Shelemah*, fol. 30a, and Elliot Wolfson, *Through a Speculum That Shines* (Princeton, 1994), 232. A *gematria* interpretation that relates an angelic name to Creation, composed by R. Qalonymus and R. Joel *Hasidim*, is found in ms. Parma 541, fol. 264v. The sixteen-sided sword, referred to by R. Qalonymus b. Isaac (father of R. Samuel *he-Hasid*) and other Qalonymides, is mentioned twice in Bodl. 2273; see Goldmintz, 177, 179, and cf. below, ch. 3, nn. 13–14. On R. Joel *he-Hasid*, cf. *Sefer Gematri’ot le-R. Yehudah he-Hasid*, ed. Daniel Abrams and Israel Ta-Shema (Los Angeles, 1998), editors’ introduction, 3.

The precise identity of this R. Avigdor is, nonetheless, unclear. He proposes the year 1212 for the redemption, in the name of another scholar (Goldmintz, 190). This would suggest he is definitely not the tosafist R. Avigdor b. Elijah Katz of Vienna, who was a student of R. Simḥah of Spires and died c. 1275 (see below, at n. 28, and cf. Efraim Kupfer, “*Li-Demutah ha-Tarbutit shel Yahadut Ashkenaz ve-Hakhamehah ba-Me’ah ha-Yod Daled/ha-Tet Vav*,” *Tarbiz* 42 [1972]:119, n. 27). Although there are a number of common methodologies and even some exact parallels between Bodl. 2273 and the biblical commentary from the school of R. Avigdor b. Elijah (see above, n. 6), these are neither sufficiently weighty nor numerous enough to overcome the large chronological disparity. (Perhaps R. Avigdor b. Elijah had the commentary of the other R. Avigdor in front of him.) For the similarities, see, e.g., *Perushim u-Fesaqim le-R. Avigdor*, editor’s introduction, 15, n. 24; 82–83, 92, 131 (regarding *שר המונה על גיהנום ששמו סגינן אל* 240, מעליהם בגמי [ליל] הוועננא רביה זהוא סימן / רמו שבאותהليل מסתכלין /), *סרגל מעליהם בגמי* (and 444), 269, 284–85, 323 (and 444), 434, 436; Goldmintz, 181–82 (2), 185, 189, 190, 191, 192, 195, 197; and cf. Goldmintz’s introduction, 163. In any case, the R. Avigdor of Bodl. ms. 2273 (who appears to have been a slightly older contemporary of R. Judah *he-Hasid*) does have a connection to *Hasidei Ashkenaz* and represents another example of a scholar who utilized their biblical interpretations and methodology. Cf. Daniel Abrams, *Sexual Speculation and Merkavah*

CHAPTER 2

he refers to as *ha-Qadosh mi-Dreux*) and R. Jacob of Provins (who had an awareness of mystical concepts), and also to an unidentified teacher named R. Menahem *Hasid*.¹⁰ Aside from his hesitancy in ruling leniently against

Mysticism in Medieval Germany (Tübingen, 1997), 66–67. He may also be the R. Avigdor Ḥarefati who was involved in the transmission of certain *Hug ha-Keruv ha-Meyuhad* texts; see Yosef Dan, “*Hug ha-Keruv ha-Meyuhad bi-Tenu‘at Ḥasidut Ashkenaz*,” *Zion* 35 (1966):356–58, and esp. n. 33, and idem, *The ‘Unique Cherub’ Circle* (Tübingen, 1999), 51–52, 119–20. A northern French origin would give him one more point in common with R. Solomon b. Samuel. Unlike R. Solomon b. Samuel, however, the R. Avigdor of Bodl. 2273 is not linked to any tosafists. [A. R. Avigdor b. Isaac is mentioned in the northern French polemical tract, *Sefer Yosef ha-Meqanne*, ed. Judah Rosenthal (Jerusalem, 1970), 53, n. 1, but he appears to have been a contemporary of R. Yehi’el of Paris (c.1240). See also Zadoc Kahn, “*Le Livre de Joseph le Zelateur*,” *REJ* 3 (1881):3, and cf. *Perushim u-Fesaqim le-R. Avigdor*, 13.]

A treatise by yet another R. Avigdor is cited by a student of the German Pietists in the late thirteenth century, R. Asher of Osnabrück (see below, n. 21). See, e.g., *Siddur Rabbeinu Shelomo mi-Germaiza ve-Siddur ḥasidei Ashkenaz*, ed. Moshe Hershler (Jerusalem, 1972), 71, 157, and cf. Jordan Penkower, *Nosah ha-Torah be-Keter Aram-Zovah: Edut ḥadashah* (Ramat Gan, 1992), 48, n. 118. This R. Avigdor appears to be the copyist of ms. Parma 655, R. Avigdor b. Menahem. See ‘*Arugat ha-Bosem*, ed. Urbach, 4:55, 58, 69–70, and Emanuel, “*Sifrei Halakhah Avudim shel Ba’alei ha-Tosafot*,” 248. [The author of *Sefer Matat* was a student of R. Avigdor b. Menahem, and R. Judah b. Yaqqar was the teacher of this R. Avigdor; it is unlikely that R. Judah was also the teacher of R. Avigdor b. Elijah Katz. Cf. *Perushim u-Fesaqim le-R. Avigdor*, editor’s introduction, 9–10.] See also ms. B. M. 752, fol. 72r [=B. M. 756, 116v–117r; Milan Cod. Ambrosiana 53/10 (P12 sup.), 140r; and cf. ms. Munich 92, 3r]: **אני אביגדור קבלתי: מר' אלעזר מי מבכה נאדר בקדש תר' מבכה רמו לי ספרות וכו'**

¹⁰See Urbach, *Ba’alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:462–63; and cf. Norman Golb, *The Jews in Medieval Normandy* (Cambridge, 1998), 394–99. There is a reference to *ha-qadosh R. Ya’aqov* (see *Sefer Or Zarua*, pt. 2, sec. 256, fol. 114) that may refer to R. Jacob of Provins. On R. Jacob’s mystical proclivities, see below, ch. 4, n. 38. R. Solomon *ha-Qadosh* of Dreux is also referred to as *החסיד הנורל*; see *Tosafot ha-Shalem*, ed. Jacob Gellis, v. 1 (Jerusalem, 1982), 241–42. Cf. ms. Cambr. Or. 71 (Ashkenaz, 1398), fol. 166r.

וזאת מצאת בירושלמי. שלח ה’ר יעקב מגרמויה אח הקדוש מדורויש חנוך
ואליהם ייבורו אל מלך וחוק לא טעמו טעם מיתה הלו בימי וביליה ולא חוקן.
ידיך מלפניך אלהי השמים שם שלא חוקךך אני לא אזוק.

(Cf. Urbach, *Ba’alei ha-Tosafot*, 2:519, n. 47, in regard to R. Jacob b. Judah of Dreux.) Prior to this passage are a number of pieces dealing with pietism and magic: the ethical will of R. Judah *he-Hasid* (fol. 139v–140); a series of angelic adjurations and *segullot* for protection in various situations, and to achieve love; and an amulet to be written on deerskin that would insure success in non-Jewish courts (fol. 162r). Fols. 165r–165v record prayer interpretations and versions of R. Judah *he-Hasid* [that the prayer *ha-Shem*

established customs (even when the halakhic reasoning behind the customs is somewhat questionable), R. Samuel of Falaise displays no overt tendencies toward *hasidut* or *perishut*.¹¹

E-lohei Yisra'el was composed by Hezekiah and the correct versions of *Or Hadash* and *Zur Yisra'el*; see, e.g., 'Arugat ha-Bosem, ed. Urbach, 4:84–87, 92–93 (and above, ch. 1, n. 55), and Simcha Emanuel, "Ha-Polmos 'al Nosaḥ ha-Tefillah shel Hasidei Ashkenaz," *Mehqerei Talmud* 3 (in press), nn. 95, 97.] Just prior to the passage that mentions *ha-qadosh mi-Dreux*, on fol. 166r, is a chapter **חפלת הדרכ בדוק ומונסה** from R. Eleazar of Worms (found in a number of manuscripts, e.g., ms. Parma 1033, fol. 26r, col. 2 [המהלך בדרכן בדוק ומונסה, [במקומות סכונה וכור], and see below, ch. 4, n. 49]), which details a magical procedure for traveling to a dangerous place that involves the use of three stones and the recitation of verses, and concludes with the phrase **ולא יהא נזוק**. R. Eleazar's prayer is followed by another magical adjuration for protection from danger on the road:

תפלת ותחנה בדרכ-בקשה מכם מיכאל וגבrial ואכתריאל שעתםידו
בקשה לפני מלך מלכי המלכים הקב"ה שאצליך בכל דרכי שאלך, הן מליטים
שלא יייקו אותך, הן מושדים הן מלולין הן מארדים הן מאשה הן מכל פגע רע
ומחרב... הן מכל מני פורעניות המתרגשות לבוא לעולם ושלא שלוט שטן...
ולא ממנינה... לא בגופי ולא במנומי. יהי רצון מלפניך שתשמעו והרבינו ובקשו
(ג' פעמים לישענתך) וכו'... למי שהו יראו מושום דבר בדרכ או במקומות אחרים יאמרו
זה השם ג' פעמים לאהבה... זה השם נקרא חרבו של הקב"ה וטוב לאומרו נגדר
שונאו.

For R. Menahem ḥasid, see Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:149, 369–70, 2:620, n. 12. Cf. below, ch. 4, n. 33; Daniel Abrams, "Ketivat ha-Sod be-Ashkenaz ve-ha-Ma'avar li-Sefarad," *Mahanayim* 6 (1992):97–98; and idem, "The Literary Emergence of Esotericism in German Pietism," *Shofar* 12 (1994):73.

¹¹Cf. below, ch. 3, n. 93. See Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:463–64 (regarding *qitniyyot*); and Ta-Shma, "Samuel ben Solomon of Falaise," *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, 14:814. Urbach sees R. Isaac *Or Zarua'* as similar to R. Samuel in this regard, while R. Yehiel of Paris was much less hesitant in declaring invalid accepted stringencies that were, in his view, not well based. See *Haggahot R. Perez to Semaq*, sec. 93:4, and Urbach, 1:459, concerning the use of *fenouil* (fennel) for *sekhakh*. Although R. Samuel of Evreux sided with R. Yehiel in this case and allowed the fennel, both R. Samuel and R. Isaac of Corbeil agreed with R. Samuel of Falaise and prohibited the use of *qitniyyot* on Passover. See *Mordekhai Pesahim*, sec. 588, and *Haggahot Maimuniyyot*, cited in *Beit Yosef*, O. H. 453, s.v. *ve-yesh 'oserim*. See also *Sefer Or Zarua'*, pt. 2, fol. 59a, and Israel Ta-Shma, *Minhag Ashkenaz ha-Qadmon* (Jerusalem, 1992), 248. R. Samuel of Falaise notes that the custom in Ashkenaz was to be strict and bake the *mazot* on Passover eve, after all leaven had been removed or destroyed. In northern France, however, this was only done as a *hiddur mizyah*. Nonetheless, R. Samuel writes that he insisted upon this stringency, despite the fact that the lenient ruling had been accepted widely in his region, and with ample justification: **ואעפ'כ אני מוחמיר לעצמי... ואך על פי שהדבר פשוט להיתר**.

R. Samuel of Falaise (and his brother, R. Isaac b. Solomon) may have been the authors of a letter during the 1230s phase of the Maimonidean controversy that called

CHAPTER 2

There is another aspect of R. Solomon b. Samuel's writings that points to other rabbinic scholars who had intellectual contacts with tosafists while being heavily involved with interpretations of the German Pietists. R. Solomon composed addenda to a standard twelfth-century Ashkenazic prayer commentary, composed or edited by R. Eliezer b. Nathan (Raban); these addenda appear in several manuscripts, mostly as marginal notes.¹² The notes cite *sodot ha-tefillah* from a R. Eleazar of Forcheim (Vorcheim)¹³ and liturgical

for the literal acceptance of *aggadah* (regarding such issues as the nature of *gan 'eden*), while eschewing the need for either esotericism or philosophy: *כִּי אֵין לְהֻמֵּךְ כִּמְהָ* *לְמַעַלָּה וּלְמַתָּה*. See Joseph Shatzmiller, "Li-Temunat ha-Mahloqet ha-Rishonah 'al Kitvei ha-Rambam," *Zion* 34 (1969):128, 139, and cf. Joseph Davis, "Philosophy, Dogma and Exegesis in Medieval Ashkenazic Judaism," *AJS Review* 18 (1993):216. [Note, on the other hand, ms. Vat. 266, which has a version of R. Samuel's *E-lohei ha-Ruhot* commentary followed by the Ashkenazic paraphrase of *Emunot ve-De'ot* utilized by *Hasidei Ashkenaz* and their associates (such as *Semag*, R. Elhanan b. Yaqr, and R. Meir of Rothenburg; see Davis, 209, n. 57, and *Arugat ha-Bosem*, ed. Urbach, 1:176, n. 17), and R. Eleazar of Worms's *hilkhot hasidut*. See Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 462, n. 4. Cf. below, nn. 50–52; and ch. 4, n. 68.]

¹²See Ta-Shma, "Mashehu 'al Biqqoret ha-Miqra," 454, nn. 7–8. See also Add. ms. Verona (Municipal Library) 101 (85.2), and Cambr. Add. 491/1 (which refers, on fol. 131r, to R. Solomon as *בדר שמואל הגראפתי הקדוש*); and Abrams, "The Emergence of Esotericism," 72–73. The relationship between R. Solomon's glosses and the base of *siddur Raban* is seen most clearly in ms. Vat. 274 (Ashkenaz, c.1430), fol. 186r–211v. (R. Solomon's comments are often marked by *taf* for *tosefet*.) Note that Raban himself does not include any *sod* material; see below, ch. 3, n. 72.

¹³See *Siddur Rabbenu Shelomoh mi-Germaiza ve-Siddur Hasidei Ashkenaz*, ed. Hershler, 42, 115. The first comment attributed to R. Eleazar (ר' אלעזר) *בSTDOROT SH'L HARB AL'UZR* (מורכחים) is that the terms *שְׁלֹמָה בְּדַר שְׁמֹאָל הַגְּרָאָפָּתִי הַקָּדוֹשׁ* (זנָה וְסִכְרָה עַל יְהִינָּה) are the names of angels appointed over the demons (הַשְׁמָנוֹנִים עַל הַשְׁדִּים) that are alluded to in the psalm. The role of the angels is to prevent the demons from having their way with people in order to damage them (לְהַזִּיקָם). R. Solomon cites this passage from the liturgical commentary of R. Ephraim of Bonn; see below, n. 26. For the manuscript variants of this passage, see ms. Vat. 274, fol. 198v; Kaufmann A399, fol. 13v; and Munich 393, fol. 18v. For a similar type of interpretation cited by both R. Solomon and R. Eleazar of Worms in the name of R. Jacob *ha-Nazir*, see the next note.

The second of R. Eleazar of Vorcheim's interpretations cited by R. Solomon (ר' אלעזר מהר' מורה כהן) suggests that King Hezekiah composed the prayer *ה' א-לֹהִי כְּחַנְתִּיךְ ר' אַלְעֹזֵר מָוֹרְכָּחִים יִשְׂרָאֵל*, as evidenced by a mnemonic pattern that appears in the prayer. For additional manuscript references to this passage, see Bodl. 1102, fol. 26; Cambr. Add. 394, 17r; and Munich 393, 57v; and cf. *Arugat ha-Bosem*, ed. Urbach, 4:98, n. 64; and Moshe Hershler, "Perush Siddur ha-Tefillah ve-ha-Mahzor Meyuhas le-R. Eliezer b. Nathan mi-Magenza," *Genuzot* 3 (1991):71. A statement on the authorship of this prayer by Hezekiah is attributed to R. Judah *ha-Hasid* himself in ms. Cambr. Or. 71, fol. 165r, and

interpretations from R. Samuel *he-Hasid*, R. Judah *he-Hasid*, and especially from the prayer commentaries and *sodot* of R. Eleazar of Worms. The influence of *Hekhalot* literature can also be detected.¹⁴

JTS Mic. 8122, fol. 100r; see above, n. 10. See also Hershler, *Siddur R. Shelomoh mi-Germaiza*, 116, n. 18; and *Perushei Siddur ha-Tefillah la-Roqeah*, ed. Hershler (Jerusalem, 1992), 2:403, n. 1. On R. Eleazar of Vorcheim's contact with R. Judah *he-Hasid* (see *Perushei ha-Torah le-R. Yehudah he-Hasid*, ed. Y. S. Lange [Jerusalem, 1975], 143) and his awareness of R. Judah's prayer interpretations, see Simcha Emanuel, "Ha-Polmos 'al Nosah ha-tefillah shel Hasidei Ashkenaz," n. 121. R. Solomon b. Samuel's teacher, R. Isaac *ha-Zaqen* b. Joseph, also preserved interpretations he heard from R. Judah.

¹⁴A sampling of the citations found in ms. Cambr. Add. 394 (Ashkenaz, fourteenth/fifteenth centuries) includes: (1) a *sod* commentary by R. Eleazar of Worms to the prayer *E-lohai Neshamah* (fol. 1v); see also *Perushei Siddur ha-Tefillah la-Roqeah*, 1:6–8, ms. Vat. 274, fol. 194; Cambr. Add. 561 (fourteenth century), fols. 7v–8v (in the margin); (2) the number of words in total and the number of times the word בָּרוּךְ שָׁמָר (fol. 3v) [cf. ms. Vat. 274, fol. 186r; *Siddur Rabbenu Shelomoh mi-Germaiza* (see nn. 14–15 for *Hekhalot* influence); Moshe Hallamish, "Be'ayot be-Heqer Hashpa'at ha-Qabbalah 'al ha-Tefillah," *Massu'ot*, ed. Michal Oron and Amos Goldreich (Jerusalem, 1994), 214]; (3) a *piyyut* following *Barekhu*, authored by R. Judah *he-Hasid*, which outlines a similar pattern of angelic response to the one angel who calls out *Barekhu* and alludes to the inclusion of the Divine Name of twenty-two (or forty-two) letters in the angelic response (fols. 12v–13r; cf. *Siddur Rabbenu Shelomoh*, 82, n. 86, for a *Hekhalot* source.); (4) a passage in *sodot shel geonim*, attributed also to R. Eleazar of Worms, that the seventy-two words in the *Qedushah* (through the blessing *ha-E-l ha-qadosh*) correspond to the שָׁם *המִפְרָשׁ* of seventy-two letters. This explains the custom of not speaking until the blessing is completed (fol. 15v; cf. *Siddur*, 107).

Among the citations in ms. Vat. 274 are: (1) R. Solomon's interpretation of the *plene* spelling of the word *E-lohai* (with a *vav*) toward the beginning of *Ashrei* as an allusion to the six characteristics of Messiah (listed in Isaiah 11) and also as a hint that Hezekiah, who had six lofty names (see Isaiah 9:5), would come from King David (fol. 190v, and see also ms. Cambr. 561, fol. 15r) [R. Shelomoh writes that he received this from פָּהָר צְחַק הַזָּקָן בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל. Urbach (ed., 'Arugat ha-Bosem, 4:82–83, n. 62) is unable to identify Isaac *ha-Zaqen*. Cf., however, S. Emanuel (in the above note), who identifies him as a teacher of Solomon; and below, ch. 3, n. 4]; (2) a *sod* (מלבוקן) on סוד עומק from כבד (כבד) from R. Judah *he-Hasid* and from R. Eleazar of Worms, which R. Solomon stresses should not be revealed to everyone; (3) an explanation for the absence of the letter *nun* in *Ashrei* according to an interpretation of R. Eleazar of Worms citing R. Judah *he-Hasid*; (4) the claim that one who deletes the *vav* in the verse וְחִרְבָּב פִּפְיוֹת בִּידָם (Psalms 149:6) is considered אַרְיוֹה שָׁאָג מֵלָא יִרְאָה, because the *gematria* equivalent of the word חִרְבָּב is 191, as in the verse (Amos 3:8) referring to the call of the Almighty, (fol. 191r; cf. *Siddur*, 65); (5) the number of words in the blessings 'al *netilat yadayim* and 'asher *ya'azar* and the connotations, from the *sodot* of R. Eleazar of Worms (194r); (6) the need to preserve precisely the text of blessing *gomei hasadim tovim le-'ammo Yisra'el* (and

CHAPTER 2

Several of the manuscripts in which R. Solomon's comments appear also contain similar marginal notes and comments on the liturgy by R. Samuel b. Barukh of Bamberg. R. Samuel strongly supports the prayer interpretations, wordings, and numerical analyses of *Hasidei Ashkenaz* and earlier Qalony-mides.¹⁵ R. Samuel studied with R. Eliezer of Metz and R. Simḥah of Spires.¹⁶

not to add or delete even a single word), since the number of words is equivalent to the numerical value of the word חן אלעוז בן ריב"ק (fol. 194v).

On fol. 205v–206r, R. Solomon writes that he heard from מהורי העורי in the name of R. Jacob *ha-Nazir*, that two of the descriptions in the prayer *E-l Adon* (*da'at* and *tevunah*) are in fact the names of two angels who surround the *kisse ha-Kavod*, and, further, that *tif'eret* and *gedulah* in that prayer are the *gematria* equivalents of the angels Mikha'el and Gavri'el. See Scholem, *Reshit ha-Qabbalah*, 72, n. 4; *idem*, *Origins of the Qabbalah*, 207–9; and cf. Meir Bar-Ilan, *Sitrei Tefillah ve-Hekhalot* (Jerusalem, 1987), 115–20; *'Arugat ha-Bosem*, ed. Urbach, 4:117–19, and below, ch. 4, n. 58. R. Eleazar of Worms presents this interpretation in his prayer commentary (ms. Bodl. 1204, fol. 152v, and cf. *Siddur Rabbenu Shelomoh*, 160) without mentioning R. Jacob *ha-Nazir*. Urbach suggests that both R. Eleazar and R. Jacob, who apparently visited northern France, received this teaching from R. Judah *he-Hasid*. See also *'Arugat ha-Bosem*, 4:38, n. 82, and *Siddur*, 228. On the connections between R. Jacob *ha-Nazir* and the German Pietists, see also the studies of Moshe Idel cited above, ch. 1, n. 62, and below, ch. 4, n. 10.

R. Solomon also includes the interpretations of northern French exegetes: ואני שלמה ביר שמואל מצאתי בפירוש רבינו שמואל הצעפרי בן הח"ר מאיר לבר קורא אותה [ריש אשורי] תהלה לפיה שמן תהלה לזרע טופח הספר לא תמצוא בו אף תיבבה אחת לשון בקשה אלא הכל לשון שבח הוא ותהלה. ת' [תוספות] (fol. 190v). There is an additional citation from Rashbam at the end of fol. 191r. These citations are possibly from the nonextant commentary of Rashbam to Psalms. Cf. *'Arugat ha-Bosem*, 4:12, 153–54, for interpretations of Rashbam on verses in Psalms cited by R. Eleazar of Worms and his student R. Abraham b. Azriel, and see also *Rashbam 'al ha-Torah*, ed. David Rosin (Breslau, 1882), xix. On fol. 198r, R. Solomon discusses Moses' authorship of several chapters in Psalms.

¹⁵See, e.g., ms. Cambr. Add. 394, fol. 18v (cf. *Siddur R. Shelomoh*, 119), and 20v; Bodl. 1205, fol. 48v; Bodl. 2274, fol. 24v; and above, ch. 1, n. 39. See also *Perushei Siddur ha-Tefillah la-Roqeqah*, ed. Hershler, 1:359, 2:403, 442, 471–73, 543; ms. Cambr. 561, fol. 50r (margin); *Siddur R. Shelomoh*, 136 (based on a *piyyut* of R. Simeon *ha-Gadol*), and 184 (fol. 221–23); ms. B. M. 534, fol. 13r–15v; B. M. 754, fol. 130r–134v; Bodl. 1103, fol. 40, 54v, 75; Paris 646, fol. 6; and cf. C. Sirat in *REJ* 119 (1961):11. A number of these texts contain pieces of the “liturgical polemic” associated with *Hasidei Ashkenaz*. See *'Arugat ha-Bosem*, ed. Urbach, 4:92–97; Israel Ta-Shma, “*Quntresei 'Sodot ha-Tefillah*” le-R. Yehudah *he-Hasid*,” *Tarbiz* 65 (1996):65–77; and Emanuel, “*Ha-Polmos 'al Nosaḥ ha-Tefillah shel Hasidei Ashkenaz*.”

¹⁶See Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:429. Note that both R. Eliezer of Metz and R. Simḥah of Spires had a relationship with *Hasidei Ashkenaz*. For R. Eliezer of Metz, see

He exchanged a series of letters on halakhic matters with R. Simhah—who regarded R. Samuel as the worthy successor of his father, R. Barukh b. Samuel of Mainz—and he also sent queries to Rabiah. It is not known whether R. Samuel composed any halakhic monographs or *Tosafot*. A number of his responsa have survived, mostly in the collections of his student, R. Meir of Rothenburg.¹⁷ Many of his *pesaqim* are found in a collection edited by one of his students, in which R. Samuel is referred to as “*mori ha-ro’eh*.¹⁸

R. Samuel appears to have composed a full-fledged prayer commentary of which remnants are extant, and it is possible that his marginal comments, similar to the kind made by R. Solomon b. Samuel, were part of this larger commentary.¹⁹ A number of R. Samuel of Bamberg’s comments were preserved by his student, R. Asher b. Jacob *ha-Levi* of Osnabrück, himself a copyist and editor of liturgical collections²⁰ with his own connections to *Hasidei*

above, ch. 1, n. 105. R. Simhah studied with R. Eliezer of Metz, R. Abraham b. Samuel *he-Hasid*, R. Judah b. Qalonymus of Spires, and R. Moses *ha-Kohen* of Mainz (who was also a teacher of R. Eleazar of Worms). See Urbach, 1:411–20. Urbach notes that R. Simhah was asked a halakhic question by R. Judah *he-Hasid*; cf. ms. Bodl. 659, fol. 82v. He also points to a midrashic interpretation offered by R. Simhah that is very similar, in both form and content, to a comment made by R. Eleazar of Worms at the beginning of his pietistic introduction (*shoresh ’ahavat ha-Shem*) to *Sefer Roqeah*. R. Simhah authored a commentary to *Sifra* and is included in the “Spires circle” that was encouraged and influenced by *Hasidei Ashkenaz* to expand their studies beyond the traditional talmudic tractates and into other areas of rabbinic literature as well (see above, introduction, n. 14, and ch. 1, n. 76). For R. Simhah’s additional affinities with *hasidut Ashkenaz*, see Ta-Shma, *Halakhah, Minhag u-Mezi’ut be-Ashkenaz*, 160–63; Elbaum, *Teshuvat ha-Lev ve-Qabbalat Yissurim*, 225–26; Emanuel, “*Sifrei Halakhah Avudim shel Ba’alei ha-Tosafot*,” 213–14, n. 12; above, ch. 1, n. 146 (regarding *teshuvat ha-mishqal*); and below, ch. 5, n. 12. Note the pietistic formulation by R. Simhah recorded in the introductory *Alfa Beta* to *Sefer Or Zarua*^c (cf. below, ch. 5, nn. 3–6), sec. 44.

¹⁷Urbach, *Ba’alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:430–32. See also the halakhic decision issued by R. Samuel of Bamberg and R. Moses Taku in *Siddur Rabbenu Shelomoh mi-Germaiza*, 296.

¹⁸This collection, found in ms. Cambr. Or. 786 (fols. 167d–186b), was published in *Shitat ha-Qadmonim*, ed. M. Y. Blau (New York, 1992), 319–95. On the editor of the collection, cf. Emanuel, “*Sifrei Halakhah Avudim shel Ba’alei ha-Tosafot*,” 289–90, and 163, n. 4. The manuscript is dated 1282. On this collection, see also Ta-Shma, below, n. 41.

¹⁹See Daniel Goldschmidt, *Mehqerei Tefillah u-Piyyut* (Jerusalem, 1980), 61–62; Israel Ta-Shma, “*Quntresei ‘Sodot ha-Tefillah* le-R. Yehudah *he-Hasid*,” 70–77; and S. Emanuel, “*Ha-Polmos ‘al Nosaḥ ha-Tefillah shel Hasidei Ashkenaz*,” sec. 4.

²⁰See Israel Ta-Shma, “*Al Kammah ‘Inyanei Maḥzor Vitry*,” *‘Alei Sefer* 11 (1984):81–89; Simcha Emanuel’s response in *‘Alei Sefer* 12 (1985):129–30; Ta-Shma’s rejoinder, *ibid.*, 131–32; and *‘Arugat ha-Bosem*, ed. Urbach, 4:70–72.

CHAPTER 2

Ashkenaz.²¹ The prayer comments of R. Samuel of Bamberg demonstrate his familiarity not only with the liturgical interpretations of the German Pietists, but also with their insistence that particular *nusḥa'ot* be preserved precisely, in order to retain their internal structure and harmony. Only in this way could the full effects of these prayers be realized, in both exoteric and esoteric realms.

Moreover, R. Samuel of Bamberg offered a scriptural derivation of a significant aspect of *hasidut Ashkenaz*, which was cited elsewhere in the name of R. Judah *he-Hasid*. Part of the German Pietists' search for the larger Divine Will entailed emphasizing the thoughts and feelings that lay behind an act, as well as the notion that the intellectual ability to discern, rather than the fixed age of legal adulthood alone, determined responsibility for one's deeds. This principle was derived, in two passages in *Sefer Hasidim*, from the case of Er and Onan (following the approach of one version of *Midrash Tanhuma* that they were eight or nine years old), and from instances involving other biblical figures. The derivation is also cited in R. Judah *he-Hasid*'s biblical commentary [which was compiled by his son R. Moses Zal(t)man] and in R. Judah *he-Hasid*'s name in several collections of so-called tosafist biblical interpretations.²²

²¹See Joseph Perles, "Die Berner Handschrift des Kleinen Arukh," *Jubelschrift zum siebzigten Geburstag des Prof. Dr. H. Graetz*, (Breslau, 1887), 2–3, 16–20. For R. Asher's citation of R. Judah *he-Hasid* and R. Eleazar of Worms using the title *mori*, see also Ta-Shma, "Al Kammah 'Inyanei Mahzor Vitry," 85. For other examples of R. Asher's connection with *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, see, e.g., ms. Kaufmann A399, fols. 29r, 33v [=Bodl. 1102, fols. 17, 19]; and ms. Munich 423, 55a [=Bodl. 1102, fol. 21].

According to Ta-Shma, "Quntresei Sodot ha-Tefillah" (above, n. 15), which seeks to modify significantly the earlier conclusions of Joseph Dan concerning R. Judah *he-Hasid*'s disdain for the inaccuracy of northern French prayer texts in particular, R. Asher received material on the *sodot ha-tefillah* of *Hasidei Ashkenaz* in the form of a treatise compiled by the brother-in-law of R. Judah *he-Hasid*'s brother, R. Abraham. R. Asher edited, embellished, and distributed this treatise. Indeed, it was he (and not R. Judah *he-Hasid* or R. Eleazar of Worms) who incorporated the anti-French animus that has been associated with German Pietists. Emanuel, "Ha-Polmos 'al Nosah ha-Tefillah," construes the process of transmission somewhat differently, concluding that the treatise under discussion was composed by an unknown student of R. Samuel Bamberg (although like Ta-Shma, Emanuel also removes R. Judah *he-Hasid*, and probably R. Eleazar of Worms as well, from any passages which express a particular anti-French bias). Emanuel demonstrates conclusively that R. Judah and his immediate students were concerned about any version, be it French or German, that deviated from their own precisely formulated liturgical readings. Cf. *'Arugat ha-Bosem*, ed. Urbach, 4:92, and Soloveitchik, "Three Themes," 351, n. 28.

²²See Soloveitchik, "Three Themes," 324–25, and esp. n. 33; *Perushei ha-Torah le-R. Yehudah he-Hasid*, ed. Lange, 52–53; *Tosafot ha-Shalem*, ed. Gellis, vol. 4 (Jerusalem, 1985), 63–64; and cf. above, ch. 1, n. 80; ms. Moscow 348, fol. 245v.

One formulation, composed by R. Judah's son, reads: "My father asked: Why were Er and Onan punished since they had not yet reached the age of punishment? He answered that these are the Heavenly laws (*dinei shamayim*), that a person is punished according to [the level of] his intelligence. If a minor is as perspicacious as a twenty-year-old, then he is punished. And proof may be brought from Samuel [the prophet], whom Eli wanted to punish for issuing a halakhic ruling in his presence, even though he [Samuel] was only two years old." This passage is cited elsewhere, in shorter form but with exact linguistic parallels, in the name of R. Samuel of Bamberg.²³

On the basis of parallel passages in *Yerushalmi Pe'ah* (8:8) and *Sheqalim* (5:4), *Sefer Hasidim* instructs that funds which an individual has available for charity are best given to righteous scholars involved in the study of Torah for its own sake (*le-yir'ei ha-Shem ha-'osqin be-Torah lishmah*), rather than toward the building of (additional) houses of worship. R. Samuel of Bamberg is cited as adducing one of these *Yerushalmi* passages to prove that it is preferable to give charity to teach young men (לְלִימֹוד נָעֲרִים), rather than to give charity to the synagogue.²⁴

R. Samuel's affinities with the liturgical teachings and commentaries of the German Pietists may have come to him through his father, R. Barukh b. Samuel of Mainz. R. Barukh was a *payyetan* and tosafist halakhist who authored the voluminous and oft-cited, but no longer extant, *Sefer ha-Hokhmah*. According to E. E. Urbach, it was R. Barukh who asked

²³Ms. B. M., Or. 9931 [=Gaster 730 (Ashkenaz, fourteenth century)], fol. 16r. (Cf. *Nimmuei Humash le-R. Yeshayah*, ed. C. B. Chavel, 28.) The formulation of R. Samuel of Bamberg was preserved by (a student of) R. Yedidyah b. Israel (of Nuremberg) as part of a collection of Ashkenazic biblical comments. This compilation contains numerous interpretations from the tosafists R. Jacob and Joseph of Orleans and R. Yom Tov of Joigny. It also cites R. Judah *he-Hasid* frequently, as well as other figures who were connected to his teachings, such as R. Yaqr ha-Levi of Cologne (26v–27r) and R. Isaac Fuller (fol. 121r); see below, n. 41, and ch. 5, n. 81. Another interpretation of R. Samuel Bamberg is cited on fol. 76r. On the connection between R. Yedidyah and the son of R. Judah *he-Hasid*, see above, ch. 1, n. 175. [A R. Nathan b. *he-Haver* R. Moses of Bamberg appears in *Perushei ha-Torah le-R. Yehudah he-Hasid*, 154.]

²⁴See *SHP* 862, 1707, and R. Samson b. Zadoq, *Sefer Tashbez* (Lemberg, 1858), sec. 536 (*dinei hasidut*). Cf. Solovitchik, "Three Themes," 344, n. 109; my *Jewish Education and Society*, 17, n. 10; and *Shitat ha-Qadmonim*, ed. Blau (above, n. 18), 334, 367. The passage in *Sefer Tashbez* appears as part of a section entitled *dinei hasidut* (secs. 532–65), which lists a number of pietistic practices of R. Meir of Rothenburg and mentions R. Judah *he-Hasid* three times. See below, nn. 49, 52. Regarding R. Samuel's pietistic affinities, see also below, n. 46.

CHAPTER 2

R. Judah *he-Hasid* about how to deal with the obligation of reciting *Qeri'at Shema* in the morning, by the prescribed time, on those festivals and occasions where the length of the prayer service made reaching that deadline impossible. R. Judah, whose penchant for the slow recitation of the prayers in order to enhance *kavvanah* is well-documented, responded that he relied on the *Shema* that was recited at the very beginning of the morning service for this purpose. He then went on to discuss his recurring theme of retaining proper *piyyut* and other liturgical texts, and how local custom cannot be maintained if the texts conflict with certain principles. R. Judah demonstrated some of his points using *piyyutim* of R. Simeon *ha-Gadol* and R. Eleazar *ha-Qallir*. As a *payyetan* and interpreter of *piyyutim*, R. Barukh would have been most interested in R. Judah's guidance, and indeed, Urbach maintains, it is possible to see the influence of R. Judah in R. Barukh's work.²⁵

This influence can also be found in the work of R. Barukh's senior colleague on the Mainz rabbinical court, R. Ephraim b. Jacob of Bonn.²⁶ Recent

²⁵See 'Arugat ha-Bosem, ed. Urbach, 4:94–96. Cf. Soloveitchik, "Three Themes," 333, n. 70; and Israel Ta-Shma, "Barukh ben Samuel of Mainz," *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 4:280–81. On the importance of the slow recitation of prayer in the thought of *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, see above, ch. 1, n. 12. The very involvement of R. Barukh and his son R. Samuel in the writing and interpretation of *piyyutim* perhaps bespeaks the influence of the German Pietists; cf. Soloveitchik, 351–52, and below. See also A. M. Habermann, "Piyuitei R. Barukh b. Shmu'el mi-Magenza," *Yedi'ot ha-Makhon le-Heqer ha-Piyut* 6 (1946):56, 60–61, 79–82, for examples of *Hekhalot* material included by R. Barukh in his *piyyutim*. Like R. Simhah of Spires (above, n. 16), R. Barukh studied with R. Judah b. Qalonymus b. Meir in Spires, with R. Eliezer of Metz, and with R. Moses b. Solomon *ha-Kohen* of Mainz, whom he replaced on the rabbinical court of Mainz. On *Sefer ha-Hokhmah*, see Urbach, *Ba'alei Ha-Tosafot*, 1:425–29; and Emanuel, "Sifrei Halakhah Avudim shel Ba'alei ha-Tosafot," 122–55.

²⁶R. Ephraim of Bonn, who may also have been a teacher of R. Barukh, was a prolific commentator on *piyyut* and liturgy, in addition to authoring responsa and *hiddushim* to a number of tractates. See 'Arugat ha-Bosem, ed. Urbach, 4:39–51. He was in contact with R. Judah *he-Hasid* (who appears to have been slightly younger than R. Ephraim), with R. Judah's brother R. Abraham, and with Rivaq of Spires, and he may have received material from R. Samuel *he-Hasid*. Like *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, he counted carefully the number of words in various prayers and offered interpretations based on those numbers. Cf. *Mahzor Vitry*, 519, and 'Arugat ha-Bosem, 4:110, n. 30. R. Ephraim's comments on the themes of Divine Names and the *kisse ha-Kavod* are occasionally linked with those of R. Eleazar of Worms. See, e.g., *Siddur Rabbenu Shelomoh mi-Germaiza*, ed. Hershler, 60, 70–71, 98, 109, n. 38, 114, 154, and cf. Emanuel, "Ha-Polmos 'al Nosah ha-Tefillah shel Hasidei Ashkenaz," n. 2; Elliot Wolfson, "Demut Ya'aqov Haquqah be-Kisse ha-Kavod," *Massu'ot*, ed. M. Oron and A. Goldreich (Jerusalem, 1994), 140, n. 44; above, ch. 1, n. 42; and below, ch. 4, nn. 52–54.

scholarship has confirmed the impact of *Hasidei Ashkenaz* on the fixing and interpretation of prayer and *piyyut* texts in both Germany and northern France. If thirteenth-century Ashkenaz was dominated by northern France in terms of talmudic studies and interpretation, Germany was dominant in terms of prayer and liturgical poetry.²⁷

Another student of R. Simhah of Spires who had significant pietistic (and mystical) connections with *Hasidei Ashkenaz* was R. Avigdor b. Elijah *ha-Kohen* (d.c.1275), often referred to as R. Avigdor Katz (*Kohen Zedeq*). R. Avigdor was a native of Italy who studied in Spires and taught in Ferrara and Verona. Among those who corresponded with him were R. Zedekiah b. Abraham *ha-Rofe min ha-Anavim*, author of the *Shibbolei ha-Leqet*, and several of Zedekiah's relatives. R. Avigdor is mentioned in standard *Tosafot* texts. He succeeded R. Isaac *Or Zarua*^c in Vienna, and was a teacher of R. Meir of Rothenburg. R. Avigdor authored a commentary on the *Megillot*, and he and members of his circle produced a lengthy multi faceted commentary to the Torah (which also includes legal practices and customs). These commentaries often reflect the exegetical methods of the German Pietists, and there are specific parallels in interpretation and doctrine.²⁸

According to one manuscript passage, R. Solomon b. Samuel quoted the *sodot* of R. Eleazar of Vorcheim from a commentary by R. Ephraim of Bonn; see *Siddur*, 42, and above, n. 13, and cf. Ruth Langer, *To Worship God Properly* (Cincinnati, 1998), 215–18. R. Ephraim transmitted the story of R. Amnon and the bishop of Mainz, and he concludes by noting that R. Amnon appeared after his death to R. Qalonymus b. Meshullam in a dream (*be-mar'ot ha-lailah*), at which time he transmitted the text of *U-Netaneh Toqef* to R. Qalonymus. See *Sefer Or Zarua*^c, pt. 2, sec. 276, and below, ch. 3, n. 3. Ms. Parma 1274 (Morocco, 1449) records *piyyutim* of R. Ephraim of Bonn and R. Samuel Bamberg.

²⁷See Sussmann, "Mif'alo ha-Madda'i shel Professor E. E. Urbach," (above, introduction, n. 8), 61; and cf. Soloveitchik, "Three Themes," 349–50. [For *piyyutim* composed by northern French *tosafists*, see *Leqet Piyutei Selihot*, ed. D. Goldschmidt (Jerusalem, 1993), 217–18 (R. Judah Sirleon); 263–73 (R. Joseph of Orleans); 357–61 (Ri); 191–202 (R. Tuvyah of Vienne); and cf. 662–91 (northern French manuscripts). See also Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:124 (R. Elijah of Paris); 140 (R. Joseph of Orleans); 146 (R. Yom Tov of Joigny); 260 (Ri); 270 (Rizba); 492 (R. Tuvia of Vienne); and cf. 2:528, 564.] On the impact of Germany with regard to prayer texts, see also above, nn. 2, 21.

²⁸See I. A. Agus, "Avigdor b. Elijah *ha-Kohen*," *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, 2:963. Urbach has no focused discussion of R. Avigdor, see his *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 2:607, 628 for references to R. Avigdor in the standard *Tosafot* to *Eruvin* and *Ketubot*. Cf. H. J. Zimmels, "Le-Toledot R. Avigdor b. Eliyyahu Kohen Zedeq me-Vienna," *Ha-Zofeh me-Erez Hagar* 15 (1931):110–26; *Shibbolei ha-Leqet ha-Shalem*, ed. Mirsky, editor's

CHAPTER 2

R. Avigdor reported that R. Judah *he-Hasid* in his day (*be-doro*) fasted on *Rosh ha-Shanah*, while his own teacher, R. Simḥah of Spires, did not.²⁹ R. Avigdor authored a commentary to *Avinu malkenu*, which included the

introduction, 13–25; *Shibbolei ha-Leqet*, vol. 2, ed. M. Z. Hasida (Jerusalem, 1988²), editor's introduction, 23–26, 32–35; Israel Ta-Shma, "Sefer *Shibbolei ha-Leqet u-Khfelav*," *Italia* 11 (1996):46–47; Urbach, 2:565, n. 4; and above, nn. 2, 6, 9, regarding the Torah commentary. A number of individual sections from ms. Hamburg 45, primarily those labeled *pesaqim*, have been published in recent years. See, e.g., S. E. Stern, "Pisqei Rabbenu Avigdor Kohen Zedeq be-^cInyanei Shemittah ve-Yovel," *Moriah* 19:10–12 (1994):10–14; idem, *Seder Qiddush ve-Havdalah le-Rabboteinu ha-Rishonim* (Bnei Brak, 1991), 51–57. [For additional responsa and *pesaqim* of R. Avigdor, see, e.g., ms. Parma 918, fol. 26r; ms. Paris 1408, 56v–57r; Parma 425, fols. 31v–32r; Parma 1237, fols. 47v, 143v; Parma 929, fols. 96, 150, 223; and cf. Eliyahu Lichtenstein, "Be'ur bi-Yerushalmi le-R. Avigdor Kohen Zedeq," *Bi-Netivot Yam* 3 (Petach Tikva, 1972), 171–73.]

Although R. Avigdor refers to R. Judah *he-Hasid* and R. Eleazar of Worms by name in only a handful of instances (see *Perushim u-Fesaqim le-R. Avigdor* [above, n. 2], editor's introduction, 15–16), numerous parallels show that he was clearly aware of and attuned to their biblical comments and other writings. See, e.g., *Perushim u-Fesaqim*, 12, 13–14, 15, 21, 28, 32 (and esp. n. 8), 37, 52, 70, 82, 84, 90, 107, 111 (including the Pietist conception of the *Kavod*), 131, 166, 176, 208, 220, 230, 263, 265, 321, 324, 339, 344. A similar pattern can be seen in *Perush R. Avigdor Katz li-Megillat Esther*, ed. Zvi Leitner (Jerusalem, 1994), and *Perush R. Avigdor Katz le-Shir ha-Shirim*, ed. S. A. Wertheimer (Jerusalem, 1971; based on the edition of Y. Bamberger on *Shir ha-Shirim*, Frankfurt 1899]). See also Jacob Gellis, "Qeta'im mi-Ba'alei ha-Tosafot 'al Megillat Esther," *Moriah* 21:5–6 (1997):3–4.

R. Avigdor, like R. Judah *he-Hasid* and R. Samuel Bamberg (above, n. 22), interpreted that 'Er and Onan were fully culpable for their actions, even at age eight or nine (*Perushim*, 13). R. Avigdor's position concerning the donning of *tefillin* on *Tish'ah be-Av* (at *Minḥah*) and his explanation (*Perushim*, 30, 474) are in line with the Pietist approach to compromise, where possible, between conflicting ritual and halakhic views, a viewpoint that was championed by (his student) R. Meir of Rothenburg; see below, n. 59, 65. See also *Perushim*, 161, 434, and below, nn. 52, 62. R. Avigdor cites approvingly the view held also by R. Judah *he-Hasid* (in both *Sefer Hasidim* and in R. Judah's Torah commentary), that one who writes a Torah scroll must gather together a quorum and write the Divine Names in their presence; see *Perushim*, 109, and nn. 20–21. R. Avigdor also cites a passage from *Midrash Avkir* (*Perushim*, 123–24), a text associated with the German Pietists in particular (see below, ch. 3, n. 13). His discussions of giving charity on behalf of the sick and the departed (*Perushim*, 315, and cf. n. 18, as well as 462, from ms. Mantua 36; see also *Shibbolei ha-Leqet*, secs. 81, 239) and the recitation of *piyyutim* following the reading of the Torah (*Perushim*, 317) are also consonant with the unique views of *Hasidei Ashkenaz*. See also above, ch. 1, nn. 56–57, 178, and below, n. 34; and above, n. 6.

²⁹See Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:419. Cf. Ta-Shma, above, n. 16.

gematria by R. Samuel *he-Hasid* that demonstrates R. Aqiva's role in the dissemination of this prayer.³⁰ He also followed prayer *nusha'ot* favored by *Hasidei Ashkenaz*.³¹

Moreover, R. Avigdor authored a treatise of ethics and beliefs entitled *Sha'arei Musar*, which contains a number of similarities to material in *Sefer Hasidim*. R. Avigdor stresses the development of fear of Heaven and sin by remembering that all one's actions are done under the eye of the Creator. He writes about breaking the desire to sin (*le-shabber 'et libbo*) and considering always the proximity of one's death (*yom ha-mitah*). He also describes the powerful efficacy of *kavannah* in prayer even after one has sinned, the need to be extremely humble and self-effacing in dealing with others, and the paramount importance of doing *teshuvah*, which is to be preceded by shame (*bushah*) and weeping.³²

A close parallel to *Sefer Hasidim* can be seen in a passage that recommends specific strategies and opportunities for engaging an unrelated child or adult in Torah study, even on a small scale, thereby preventing them from sitting idly by. (כדי שלא ילכדו בטלים).³³ In this treatise, R. Avigdor also cites the passage from *Hekhalot Rabbati* (referred to by R. Avigdor as "Ma'aseh Merkavah") that describes the lifting of the eyes and the body by those reciting *qedushah* and the response of the Almighty.³⁴ R. Avigdor's brother, Eliezer b. Elijah *ha-Kohen*, authored a rhymed treatise of rebuke (*tokhehah*).³⁵

³⁰See ms. Cambr. Add. 858 (Ashkenaz, fifteenth century), fols. 45r–45v (פִּירּוֹשׁ אֲבִינוּ מַלְכֵנוּ דָּקְרוֹקִי הָרָאֵךְ [=ר' אַיְגָדוֹר כ"ג]); above, ch. 1, n. 39; and below, ch. 5, n. 14.

³¹See Benyamin Hamberger, *Shorashei Minhag Ashkenaz* (Bnei Brak, 1995), 61–62, 67–69, 72–73. In this instance, retention of the *nosah* in question (ישמחו בָּן יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲוֹהָבִ שָׁמֶךְ) stemmed from similar perceptions between *Hasidei Ashkenaz* and R. Avigdor on the requirement to manifest *simhah* on the Sabbath. See also Zimmer, 'Olam ke-Minhago Noheg, 126–27; and Wieder, below, n. 65.

³²See *Sha'arei Musar* le-R. Avigdor *Kohen Zedeq* in *Shitat ha-Qadmonim*, ed. M. Y. Blau (New York, 1989), 1–7, based on ms. Rome Casanatense 159 (Italy, 1454), fols. 21r–25r. Other manuscript versions are Paris 839 (Ashkenaz, fourteenth century), fol. 72 (which contains only the first page); Sasoon 405 (Italy, 1415), fols. 82–85; and Vat. 251 (Italy, fourteenth century), fols. 28r–32v. A text of *Sha'arei Musar* was also published separately in Jerusalem in 1993. See also *Shibbolei ha-Leqet*, pt. 2, ed. Simcha Hasida, 226–27 (sec. 48).

³³See *SHP*, secs. 762–64.

³⁴See also the parallel citation in *Perush R. Avigdor Katz le-Shir ha-Shirim*, ed. Wertheimer, 27. The earliest Ashkenazic rabbinic scholar to cite the *Hekhalot* passage itself (from "Sefer Hekhalot") was Rabiah; see above, ch. 1, nn. 42–44. R. Avigdor is the first to mention *Ma'aseh Merkavah* as the source of the passage. On the interpretation of

the *Hekhalot* passage, cf. Elliot Wolfson, “Demut Ya‘aqov Haquqah be-Kisse ha-Kavod,” *Massu‘ot*, ed. Oron and Goldreich, 152–57. This passage is also cited by R. Zedekiah b. Abraham in his *Shibbolei ha-Leqet ha-Shalem*, sec. 20, and in R. Jacob b. Asher’s *Arba‘ah Turim*, *O. H.*, sec. 125. Like his teacher R. Avigdor, R. Zedekiah refers to the source (in *Shibbolei ha-Leqet*, sec. 17, as well; see above, ch. 1, n. 60) as *Ma‘aseh Merkavah*, while R. Jacob calls it *Sefer Hekhalot*. Cf. Wolfson, *Along the Path* (Albany, 1995), 142–43, n. 184, and Daniel Abrams, “*Ma‘aseh Merkavah* as a Literary Work: The Reception of *Hekhalot* Traditions by the German Pietists and Kabbalistic Reinterpretation,” *Jewish Studies Quarterly* 5 (1998):339, nn. 46, 47. [Rashi is the earliest Ashkenazic rabbinic authority to refer to the work entitled *Ma‘aseh Merkavah*; see below, ch. 3, nn. 34–37.] For another reference to *Hekhalot* literature (along with the teachings of R. Eleazar of Worms) in R. Avigdor’s commentary to *Shir ha-Shirim*, see *Perush R. Avigdor*, ed. Wertheimer, 11. Cf. *Perushim u-Fesaqim le-R. Avigdor*, 473, nn. 5–6; Wieder (below, n. 50); and I. Ta-Shma, “*Od li-Ve‘ayat ha-Meqorot ha-Ashkenaziyyim be-Sefer ha-Zohar*,” *Kabbalah* 3 (1998):259–60. For R. Avigdor’s interest in mysticism, see below, ch. 5.

On the tendency toward *perishut* and (German) pietism in *Shibbolei ha-Leqet*, see, e.g., *Shibbolei ha-Leqet*, sec. 93 (R. Aqiva’s crying on the Sabbath; cf. *Ginzei Schechter*, 2:54, and below, n. 45); Zimmer, ‘*Olam ke-Minhago Noheg*, 49–50, 135–37, 139–40, 227–31; Yaakov Gartner, “*Yeye Sheme Rabbah Mevorakh—Shitot u-Meqorot*,” *Sidra* 11 (1996):47, n. 40; M. Hallamish, “*Be‘ayot be-Heqer Hashpa‘at ha-Qabbalah ‘al ha-Tefillah*,” *Massu‘ot*, ed. Oron and Goldreich, 211–13; I. Weinstock, *Be-Ma‘agalei ha-Nigleh veva-Nistar* (Jerusalem, 1969), 249–59; M. Fishbane, *The Exegetical Imagination* (Cambridge, Mass., 1998), 139–40; Ta-Shma, *Ha-Nigleh shebe-Nistar*, 22–23 [add to the Pietist sources regarding the practice for *לִיל והשען רַבָּה* (esp. looking at one’s shadow in the moonlight): *Perushim u-Fesaqim le-R. Avigdor*, 240, and Goldmintz, “*Perush ha-Torah le-Rabbenu R. Avigdor*,” (above, n. 9) 188]; and see also Moshe Idel, R. Menahem Reqanati *ha-Meqabal*, vol. 1 (Tel Aviv, 1998), 113–15; idem, “*Gazing at the Head in Ashkenazi Hasidism*,” *Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy* 6 (1997):276–79; *Sefer Gematri‘ot le-R. Yehudah he-Hasid*, ed. Abrams and Ta-Shma, introduction, 16, and 58 (fol. 17v); Moritz Gudemann, *Ha-Torah veva-Hayyim*, vol. 1 (Warsaw, 1897), 164, n. 6; above, n. 28; ch. 1, nn. 15, 21–22, 54, 60; and below, ch. 5, nn. 25–27.

R. Yehi‘el b. Yequti‘el *Anav*, copyist of the *Yerushalmi* ms. Leiden and relative of R. Zedekiah b. Abraham *ha-Rofe*, was the author of *Sefer ha-Tanya*, a halakhic compendium parallel to *Shibbolei ha-Leqet*. He also wrote an ethical work entitled *Ma‘alat ha-Middot* that is comparable to *Sefer Hasidim* in a number of respects. See, e.g., Gudemann, *Ha-Torah veva-Hayyim*, vol. 2 (Warsaw, 1899), 171–80, 293–95; Ta-Shma, “*Sefer Shibbolei ha-Leqet u-Khfelav*,” 47–48; and above, ch. 1, n. 33.

³⁵See ms. Vat. Urb. 22 (Italy, fifteenth century), fols. 65r–66r (הבה נתחכמה לתרו) (לנשמה... יסד ר' אליעזר אחוי של ר' אביגדור כהן צדק), and Emanuel, “*Sifrei Halakhah Avudim shel Ba‘alei ha-Tosafot*,” 228; ms. Parma 147, fol. 145; ms. Bodl. 913, fols. 15r–16v; Bodl. 914, fols. 182r–183v; Bodl. 2287, fols. 19r–28r; Bodl. 2858, fols. 3r–14r.

II

Interactions between *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, tosafists, and other Ashkenazic rabbinic figures with regard to certain issues of observance and ritual may also reflect pietistic affinities among these groups. The problem of fasting on *Rosh ha-Shanah* serves as an illustration. Although it was not discussed explicitly in either the Babylonian or Palestinian Talmud, by the early geonic period a Palestinian custom had developed to fast on *Rosh ha-Shanah* as an additional measure of repentance. Leading Babylonian Geonim were aware of this custom and condemned it; *Rosh ha-Shanah* was a festival, and special meals were therefore required. Although R. Nissim Gaon of Kairwan offered some support for fasting, the medieval Sefardic orbit followed the position of the Babylonian Geonim. Moreover, Rabiah, Rizba, R. Eleazar of Worms, R. Simḥah of Spires, and *Shibbolei ha-Leqet* all prohibited fasting, despite the awareness on the part of some that there were still individuals in Ashkenaz who did fast—and that this practice extended back to early Ashkenaz. Not surprisingly, among those who fasted was R. Judah *he-Hasid*.³⁶

In the mid-thirteenth century, a new series of discussions on this matter was initiated by colleagues, students, and followers of R. Judah *he-Hasid*. Most significant about these discussions was not only the position taken by some to fast, but also their argumentation. All of the earlier rabbinic discussions revolved around halakhic constructs, such as the nature of *Rosh ha-Shanah* as a *yom tov* (should it be considered akin to the *shalosh regalim*) or the controversy between the Tannaim R. Joshua and R. Eliezer as to whether a *yom tov* should be celebrated primarily through festive meals or through Torah study (in which case fasting might be permissible).

In one of these newer exchanges, it was reported that R. Abraham Haldis of Bohemia, a halakhic decisor connected to *Hasidei Ashkenaz*,³⁷ fasted on *Rosh ha-Shanah*. His proof was a somewhat unusual *kal va-homer* from a fast that was permitted on the Sabbath, the *ta'anit halom*, which was undertaken as the

³⁶For a fully-documented discussion of this issue, see Yaakov Gartner, *Gilgulei Minhag be-‘Olam ha-Halakhah* (Jerusalem, 1995), 74–96. Cf. Y. D. Gilat, “Ta‘anit be-Shabbat,” *Tarbiz* 52 (1982): 10–15.

³⁷On R. Abraham Haldis, see ‘Arugat ha-Bosem, ed. Urbach, 123–25; Shlomo Spitzer, “Minhagei ha-R. Avraham Haldis,” *Qovez ‘al Yad*, n.s. 9 (1980):153–215; and cf. Ta-Shma, below, n. 41. [Toward the end of R. Abraham’s collection of customs (214), there is an adjuration to neutralize *Potah* and remove forgetfulness (to be recited before or after *HaYadah*) that contains the same *Shemot* as those found in *Mahzor Vitry*, sec. 150, 115–16; see below, ch. 3, n. 58. To Spitzer’s list of manuscript citations in 153 n. 2, add ms. Bodl. 682, fols. 163v, 278r; and ms. Budapest (National Museum) 2°1, fol. 153b.]

CHAPTER 2

result of a troubling dream. R. Abraham reasoned that if a *ta'anit halom* was permitted on the Sabbath—even though it is unclear if the dream was brought on by an angel (in which case its contents are genuine) or by a demon (in which case the contents are contrived)—one may certainly fast on *Rosh ha-Shanah* when all are being judged by the Almighty (in order to avoid a harsh judgment).

R. Abraham b. Azriel, the well-known Pietist student of R. Eleazar of Worms, disagreed with this reasoning. In the case of a negative dream, if in fact it was transmitted by an angel, a person must fast, and it is for this reason (in order that he fast and repent) that Heaven revealed the dream to him. But as for *Rosh ha-Shanah*, it is possible that the person is due to receive a positive judgment, so there is no need for him to fast. And if a person knows that he has sinned, let him fast prior to *Rosh ha-Shanah*. A R. Yizhaq, however, asserted in the name of ha-R. Abraham (Haldiq?) that one must fast so that “your table shouldn’t be full while the Almighty’s is empty.” The explanation given for this phrase is that while the number of bullocks offered on all other festivals is at least two, on *Rosh ha-Shanah* only one is offered, and the portion which the Almighty receives is therefore diminished. R. [Abraham b.] Azriel responded that if this is so, one would also have to fast on *Shemini Azeret*, because only one bullock was offered then as well. Additional proofs to prohibit fasting on *Rosh ha-Shanah* were apparently offered, but they were not reproduced in this version of the exchange.³⁸

E. E. Urbach thought originally that the R. Yizhaq who cited R. Abraham Haldiq was R. Yizhaq *Or Zarua*.³⁹ But in *Sefer Or Zarua* itself the same discussion is recorded between scholars from Prague and Regensburg, one generation earlier. “My teacher R. Isaac b. Mordekhai [Ribam] of Prague fasted on *Rosh ha-Shanah*, applying a *kal va-homer* from *ta'anit halom* . . . and R. Moses b. Ephraim [of Regensburg] said to fast on *Rosh ha-Shanah* so your table shouldn’t be full. . . . R. Barukh b. Isaac of Regensburg retorted that if so, you must fast on *Shemini Azeret* as well.”⁴⁰ Clearly, this was a running controversy

³⁸This version is found in *Ma'aseh Roqeh*, sec. 130 (Sanok, 1912), fol. 31. See also the responsum of R. Avigdor of Vienna (above, n. 29). Regarding dreams transmitted by angels or by *shedim*, cf. *Berakhot* 55b.

³⁹See the first edition of Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 333–34; cf. *Arugat ha-Bosem*, ed. Urbach, 4:124, and the 1980 edition of *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:402.

⁴⁰*Sefer Or Zarua*, *Hilkhot Rosh ha-Shanah*, sec. 257. Cf. *Beit Yosef* and *Bayit Hadash* to *O. H.*, sec. 597, s.v. *ve-²okhlin*, and below, ch. 4, n. 30. R. Moses b. Ephraim's son Judah transmitted *sodot ha-tefillah* from the school of R. Eleazar of Worms. See ms. Moscow-Guenzberg 511, fol. 1r; Henri Gross in *MGWJ* 49 (1905):692–700; and Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:207.

over two generations, with the later scholars deriving their positions from their predecessors. What is striking here is that all of the rabbinic scholars involved are from Regensburg, Austria, and Bohemia—locations which have recently been shown to have had a fairly high degree of fealty to R. Judah *he-Hasid*. Indeed, Israel Ta-Shma has explained that R. Judah *he-Hasid*'s move from Spires to Regensburg was an attempt to be closer to his students and followers in central and eastern Europe.⁴¹

In a related development, Eric Zimmer has demonstrated that *minhag Austreikh* (Österreich), which tended to follow the halakhic rulings and positions of R. Judah *he-Hasid*, is generally more stringent than *minhag Reinus* (Rhineland), where R. Judah's teachings were less accepted. In a number of cases (e.g., the status of *dam tohar* and the counting of *shiv'ah neqiyyim*), the more stringent position was also found in northern France in the pre-Crusade period or in the early twelfth century, suggesting that R. Judah favored older French customs over Rhineland practices.⁴² Zimmer sees additional support for his claim in the finding of Y. M. Pelles, that the customs of R. Ḥayyim Palti'el and R. Abraham Ḥalduq, which reflect *minhag Austreikh* on the whole as well as the customs of Magdeburg in particular, were based on *minhagim* of *sifrut de-Vei Rashi*.⁴³ This thesis yields two conclusions. One is that there was

⁴¹Israel Ta-Shma, "Le-Toledot ha-Yehudim be-Polin ba-Me'ot ha-Yod Bet/ha-Yod Gimmel," *Zion* 53 (1988):347–69, and idem, "Yedi'ot Ḥadashot le-Toledot ha-Yehudim be-Polin ba-Me'ot ha-Yod Bet/ha-Yod Gimmel," *Zion* 54 (1989):205–8. Ta-Shma has identified a number of central and eastern European rabbinic scholars who were committed followers (in terms of halakhic rulings) of R. Judah *he-Hasid*. His research is based in large measure on manuscripts, including three related ones that contain halakhic and other material from the German Pietists and from Regensburg (Cambr. Or. 786 [see above, n. 18], Bodl. 696 [Ashkenaz, fourteenth/fifteenth centuries], and Bodl. 1150 [Ashkenaz, fourteenth century]). Included in this group of scholars, aside from R. Abraham Ḥalduq, are such names as R. Moses Fuller, R. Jacob b. Nahman of Magdeburg, R. Jacob *ha-Kohen* of Cracow, and R. Moses Taku. On R. Jacob *ha-Kohen*, see also *Sefer Gematri'ot le-R. Yehudah he-Hasid*, introduction, 14, and cf. Haym Soloveitchik in *AJS Review* 23 (1998):230.

⁴²Zimmer, 'Olam ke-Minhago Noheg, *passim*, and esp. 296–97. Cf. *Sefer Raban, massekhet Avodah Zarah*, sec. 299: *וְאַנְיִ שְׁמַעְתִּי שְׁחִתִּי רִינְשְׁבָּרָק מַחְמִירָן ... אֲבָל חַכְמִי רִינְשְׁבָּרָק לֹא הַקְפִּידָוּ כָל*.

⁴³See *Minhagei Vermaiza le-R. Yuda Liva Kircheim*, ed. Y. M. Pelles (Jerusalem, 1987), 16, n. 6. R. Ḥayyim Palti'el was a student of R. Meir of Rothenburg. Both R. Ḥayyim and R. Abraham were in Magdeburg with R. Jacob b. Nahman, whose link with R. Judah *he-Hasid* had been quite close; see above, n. 41. In support of this claim, it is also argued that R. Ḥayyim Palti'el spent time in northern France (which would explain references to him as R. Ḥayyim of Falaise; see 'Alei *Sefer* 8 [1980]:142, 145). Indeed, R. Ḥayyim appears to have married the daughter of R. Samuel of Falaise.

CHAPTER 2

some tendency toward *humra* and *perishut* in *sifrut de-Vei Rashi* (which comports with the findings in chapter 1). The second is that R. Judah *he-Hasid* had a fairly significant impact on Ashkenazic *minhagim*, at least in central and eastern Europe.⁴⁴ Thus, R. Judah's own proclivities toward fasting, even on *Rosh ha-Shanah* (and on the Sabbath as well), undoubtedly played a role in engendering the discussion about the appropriateness of fasting on *Rosh ha-Shanah*.⁴⁵

Moreover, the mode of this discussion is almost meta-halakhic. Neither approach deals with the halakhic status of *Rosh ha-Shanah* as a festival. The first approach deals with the nature of dreams and the roles of angels and demons. The response to it does not question the existence of these aspects, but only their impact. The second approach works with a talmudic formulation (*Bezah* 20b, *Hagigah* 7a), but applies it in a manner that the Talmud does not. The Talmud uses this concept (in both *sugyot*) to suggest that those aspects of the sacrificial service and the offerings on a festival that are directed primarily to the Almighty must be on a par with what is offered on the festival by an individual for his own consumption. In this case, however, the reasoning is extended and applied to suggest that God must be given more than a person receives and that one must deny his own needs in order to provide properly for God. The direction of the argumentation may be explained by the fact that this

⁴⁴See also Zimmer, ‘*Olam ke-Minhago Noheg*, 271, 277. Indeed, Zimmer claims (281–83, 286) that R. Judah *he-Hasid* himself preferred the old *minhag Zarefat*, against Rhineland custom, in one instance (concerning the baking of *maẓot* only on ‘*erev Pesah* after *hazot* or on *Pesah* itself when the festival began on Saturday night). It remains unclear, however, whether this is true for R. Eleazar of Worms as well, despite similarities between *Sefer Roqeah* and the *sifrut de-Vei Rashi*. Cf. Ta-Shma, *Minhag Ashkenaz ha-Qadmon*, 245–48, and Soloveitchik, “Three Themes,” 348–49. For another potential example regarding R. Judah *he-Hasid*, note that *minhag Austreikh* was to exempt *rashei yeshivah* from taxes, while *minhag Reinus* did not; see *Terumat ha-Deshen*, #342. *Sefer Hasidim* was more lenient than the rest of Ashkenaz when it came to tax exemptions; see my *Jewish Education and Society*, 45–46, 91–95. The difficulty here, however, is that the lenient position of *Sefer Hasidim*, which perhaps gave rise to *minhag Austreikh*, appears to have been *sui generis*. To this point, there is no evidence that the earlier French practice was similar. See also below, n. 86. On the interaction between R. Judah *he-Hasid* and students of Rabbenu Tam, see now Rami Reiner, “Rabbenu Tam: Rabbotav (Ha-Zarefatim), ve-Talmidav Benei Ashkenaz,” (M.A. thesis, Hebrew University, 1997), 68–70; and cf. ‘*Arugat ha-Bosem*, ed. Urbach, 4:113, 163; and Soloveitchik in *AJS Review* 23 (1998):231–32.

⁴⁵For R. Judah's regular regimen of fasting, which could include the Sabbath, see above, ch. 1, n. 4. Cf. *Shibbolei ha-Leqet*, sec. 93, citing R. Aqiva; R. Moses Isserles' gloss and *Taz* to *O. H.* 288:2; and Gartner, *Gilgulei Minhag*, 99–100.

circle of rabbinic scholars was reacting to a pietistic practice that originated in Israel and made its way to pre-Crusade Europe, after which it was continued by R. Judah *he-Hasid* and others. Given their relationship with R. Judah, these rabbinic scholars responded in what was essentially a pietistic idiom.⁴⁶

III

R. Meir (Maharam) of Rothenburg (d.1293), who studied in both northern France and Germany, exhibited numerous affinities with the German Pietists, and he followed many of their specific formulations. Several of R. Meir's teachers were either themselves students of *Hasidei Ashkenaz* or were otherwise involved in magical or mystical studies. These teachers include R. Isaac b. Moses *Or Zarua*^c (with whom R. Meir studied in Würzburg), R. Avigdor *Kohen Zedeq* of Vienna, R. Judah b. Moses *ha-Kohen* of Mainz (whom R. Meir referred to as *mori ha-qadosh*, and whose father R. Moses was a teacher of R. Eleazar of Worms), R. Ezra *ha-Navi* of Moncontour, R. Yehi'el of Paris, R. Samuel of Falaise (son of R. Solomon b. Samuel), and R. Samuel of Evreux.⁴⁷ R. Meir imposed an intense form of *teshuvat ha-mishqal*, including lashes, wandering, and “a year or two of fasting” on those who sought expiation for crimes of

⁴⁶Since Ribam (a student of Riba *ha-Levi* and Rabbenu Tam) was the teacher of the one who transmitted the account recorded in *Sefer Or Zarua*^c (above, n. 40), it is possible that R. Isaac *Or Zarua*^c had an earlier literary source in front of him. Cf. Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:196, n. 8. Note that R. Judah *he-Hasid* asked Ribam a question concerning *torat ha-mal'akhim*; see below, ch. 4, n. 29. Note also that R. Isaac *Or Zarua*^c held, against R. Qalonymus and Rabiah, that it was still appropriate in their time to fast a *ta'anit halom* on the Sabbath. See *Sefer Or Zarua*^c, pt. 2, sec. 407. [Fasting on the Sabbath was also permitted by R. Eliezer of Metz and R. Samuel Bamberg; see *Mordekhai Shabbat*, sec. 229.] For other evidence of R. Isaac *Or Zarua*^c's pietism, see, e.g., Zimmer, 'Olam ke-Minhago Noheg, 94–95, 109; Elbaum, *Teshuvat ha-Lev ve-Qabbalat Yissurim*, 19, n. 1, and 225–26; Marcus, *Piety and Society*, 112, and 126–27 (regarding *tiqqunei teshuvah* of *Hasidei Ashkenaz*); *Sefer Or Zarua*^c, *pishei Bava Mezī'a*, pt. 3, sec. 359 (and cf. Rabbenu Tam's formulation in *Tosafot Bava Batra* 5a, s.v. *arba'ah*, and Nahmanides' commentary to Deuteronomy 6:18, s.v. *ve-`asita ha-yashar veha-tov*); and below, nn. 82–83, 86. (For R. Ephraim of Regensburg and R. Judah *he-Hasid*, see below, ch. 3, n. 78.)

In Cambr. Or. 786, fols. 181d–182a [=*Shitat ha-Qadmonim*, ed. M. Y. Blau, 377, sec. 284], and in *Mordekhai ha-Shalem* 'al *Massekhet Rosh ha-Shanah*, ed. Y. Horowitz (Jerusalem, 1989), 24, ר' ציון מודנפריך (Ri) is cited as espousing the first position (to fast on *Rosh ha-Shanah*), instead of Ribam. See the discussion of these texts in Emanuel, “*Sifrei Halakhah Avudim shel Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*,” 192–93. On Ri's propensity for fasting, similar in many respects to that of R. Judah *he-Hasid*, see above, ch. 1, n. 30.

⁴⁷See Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 2:523–28, and below, ch. 5.

CHAPTER 2

informing; he also imposed fasts and lashes on anyone who verbally denigrated a son of an important family.⁴⁸

According to one of his students, R. Meir cautioned not to say **לך אכול בשמחה לחם** after a *hatavat ḥalom*, because he had a tradition (*qabbalah*) from Rabbenu Yehudah *Hasid* not to say it, since the first letter of each of these words spells **אַבְל'** (mourner).⁴⁹ R. Meir derived and supported the wording of prayer texts using *gematria* and other methods similar to those used by *Hasidei Ashkenaz* for this purpose.⁵⁰ Following the lead of his father, R. Barukh, he interpreted earlier *piyyutim* in the style of *Hasidei Ashkenaz* as well.⁵¹ R. Meir

⁴⁸See R. Meir's *Responsa* (Cremona, 1507), 214; Y. Baer, "He-Megammah ha-Datit/ha-Hevratit shel Sefer *Hasidim*," *Zion* 3 (1937):19, n. 38; Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 2:536; Elbaum, *Teshuvat ha-Lev ve-Qabbalat Yissurim*, 22, n. 9; Daniel Sperber, *Minhagei Yisrael*, 2 (Jerusalem, 1991), 129, n. 5; and above, ch. 1, nn. 147–48.

⁴⁹R. Samson b. Zadoq, *Sefer Tashbeż* (dinei *hasidut*), sec. 553. Cf. *Ẓava'at* R. Yehudah *he-Hasid* in *Sefer Hasidim*, ed. Margoliot, 33, sec. 12. On Maharam and R. Eleazar of Worms, see Elliot Ginsburg, *The Sabbath in the Classical Kabbalah* (Albany, 1989), 246, n. 21. A practice attributed to R. Eleazar of Worms (found also in Rabbenu Yonah's *Sefer ha-Yir'ah*; and cf. ms. Parma 1033, fol. 26r, col. 3) is found in *Minhagim de-Vei Maharam* (ed. Israel Elfenbein, p. 7).

⁵⁰See Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 2:547. See also Naftali Wieder, "Be'ityah shel Gematria Anti-Nozerit ve-Anti Islamit," *Sinai* 76 (1975):5–10; idem, "Tiqqunim be-Nosah ha-Tefillah be-Hashpa'at Leshonot Lo'aziyot," *Sinai* 81 (1977):27–29, for R. Meir's citation of passages in *Hekhalot* literature to support liturgical readings favored by the German Pietists. See also above, n. 11. Cf. ms. Cambr. Add. 1022 (Byzantium, 1425), fol. 100v, which describes R. Meir as following a practice of *Hasidei Ashkenaz* that *Qeri'at Shema* must be recited from a prayerbook and may not be said by heart: *ולכן נהוגין חסידי אשכנו להחפפל ק"ש* שמע מתוך הכתב ובפרט שlich' ציבור מה"ר מאיר מורותבורק *ז"ל* *ב[תב] שאסור לקריאתו שלא מן הכתב...* *ולכן בכל מקום שלוחי ציבור האשכנוי קורין ק"ש* *בלחש*. Cf. *Arba'ah Turim*, O. H., 49 *Tosafot ha-Rosh 'al Massekhet Sotah*, ed. Y. Lifshitz (Jerusalem, 1969), 75 (406); and *Teshuvot Maharam*, ed. Prague, #313. Maharam also supported, at least partially, the sometimes criticized Pietist custom (see, e.g., *Sefer Roqeah*, sec. 320, and *Sefer Minhag Tov* [above, ch. 1, n. 34], sec. 11) of standing during the recitation of the first portion of *Shema*. See Eric Zimmer, "Tenuhot u-Tenu'ot bi-She'at *Qeri'at Shema*," *Assufot* 8 (1994):348. See also *Sefer Berakhot le-Maharam*, ed. Shlomo Spitzer (Jerusalem, 1988), 133; but cf. *Beit Yosef* to O. H. 98, s.v. *u-mah she-katav be-shem ha-Ram*, and *Haggahot Maimuniyyot*, *Hilkhot Tefillah*, 4:15[20]. Note also Güdemann, *Ha-Torah ve-ha-Hayyim*, 1:131–36, who maintained that R. Judah *he-Hasid* and Maharam were at opposite ends of the spectrum with regard to esoteric teachings. Cf. below, ch. 5.

⁵¹See Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 2:564, and *Arugat ha-Bosem*, ed. Urbach, 4:59–60. Like *Sefer Hasidim*, Maharam restricted the priestly benediction to festivals, since he held that immersion was required (just as he preferred immersion in order for a *ba'al qeri* to pray). See Zimmer, *Olam ke-Minhago Noheg*, 135–36, and cf. 22–24; *SHB* 18, 53;

authored a treatise on *ta'amei ha-mesorah*, a subject dealt with extensively by R. Judah *he-Hasid* and R. Eleazar of Worms. Subsequent work in this discipline by R. Meir's students, R. Asher b. Yehiel and R. Jacob b. Asher *Ba'al ha-Turim*, preserved and built upon the earlier material.⁵²

and *Sefer ha-Yir'ah*, ed. Zilber, sec. 22. On the attitude(s) of *Hasidei Ashkenaz* and R. Meir toward the land of Israel, see my "The 'Aliyah of 'Three Hundred Rabbis' in 1211: Tosafist Attitudes Toward Settling in the Land of Israel," *JQR* 76 (1986):205–9; Israel Ta-Shma, "Al Odot Yahasam shel Qadmoni Ashkenaz le-'Erekha ha-'Aliyah le-Erez Yisra'el," *Shalem* 6 (1992):315–17; and Avraham Grossman, "Ziqqato shel Maharam mi-Rothenburg le-Erez Yisra'el," *Cathredra* 84 (1997):63–84.

⁵²See Y. S. Lange, *Ta'amei Mesoret ha-Miqra le-R. Yehudah he-Hasid* (Jerusalem, 1981), 11; idem, "Perush Ba'alei ha-Tosafot 'al ha-Torah—Ketav Yad Paris 48," *Alei Sefer* 5 (1978):73; *Maharam mi-Rothenburg: Teshuvot, Pesaqim, u-Minhagim*, ed. I. Z. Kahana, vol. 1 (Jerusalem, 1957), editor's introduction, 14–15; *Perush Ba'al ha-Turim 'al ha-Torah*, ed. Y. K. Reinitz (Jerusalem, 1993), editor's introduction, 16. [Indeed, some manuscripts (e.g., Bodl. 271, and Moscow-Guenzberg 82) mixed or juxtaposed the comments of R. Judah *he-Hasid* and Maharam.] For the impact of R. Eleazar of Worms on R. Meir's work, see Jordan Penkower, "Ya'aqov ben Ḥayyim u-Ẓemihat Mahadurat ha-Miqra'ot ha-Gedolot" (Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University, 1982), 31–50. See also Penkower, *Nosah ha-Torah be-Keter Aram-Zovah*, 38–39, for the interest shown by R. Judah *he-Hasid's* nephew, R. Eleazar b. Moses *ha-Darshan*, in masoretic studies. R. Eleazar b. Moses was also involved in the transmission of Pietist teachings; see, e.g., Wolfson, *Through a Speculum That Shines*, 198, 232, and below, ch. 3, nn. 12–13. Note also the *Te'amim shel Humash* of the Pietist R. Solomon b. Samuel (above, n. 5).

In his marginal notes to ms. Leipzig 1, Makhr b. Qershavya, a thirteenth-century copyist and *naqdan*, lists several early Ashkenazic talmudists and tosafists who composed masoretic treatises and were involved in masoretic studies: R. Gershom, R. Joseph Tov Elem, the tosafist R. Menahem of Joigny, R. Meir, and R. Perez. Both Penkower, "Ba'al ha-Tosafot R. Menahem mi-Joigny ve-Hibbur ha-Mesorah 'Okhlah ve-'Okhlah,' Mahadurat Ketav Yad Halle," *Iyyunei Miqra u-Farshanut* 3 (1993) [Sefer Zikkaron le-Moshe Goshen-Gottstein], 291, n. 26, and Avraham Grossman, "Haggahot R. Shemayah ve-Nosah Perush Rashi," *Tarbiz* 60 (1991):91–92, are inclined to identify R. Perez with R. Perez b. Elijah of Corbeil (who studied with R. Yehiel of Paris, the brothers of Evreux, and R. Meir of Rothenburg). They are also inclined to identify R. Meir as R. Meir b. Qalonymus of Spires (although R. Meir ha-Levi Abulafia is also a possibility for Grossman). In light of R. Meir of Rothenburg's involvement in composing interpretations or *te'amim* of the *mesorah*, and because of the relationship between R. Meir and Rabbenu Perez (see below, ch. 5, regarding *sod*), the possibility that R. Meir of Rothenburg is the intended reference should not be discarded. Cf. Abraham Epstein, *Mi-Qadmoniyut ha-Yehudim* (Jerusalem, 1965), 266–69. In any event, it is significant that the three tosafist representatives (including either R. Meir of Rothenburg or R. Meir of Spires) had connections to *hasidut Ashkenaz* or to other forms of pietism. R. Meir of Spires was part of the Spires circle that included R. Samuel and his son R. Judah *he-Hasid*. See Sussmann, above, ch. 1, n. 76, and Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:363–65. For R. Perez, see below, nn. 69–71.

CHAPTER 2

An important aspect of Maharam *mi-Rothenburg*'s legal methodology also reflects a position found in *Sefer Hasidim*. In order to fully appreciate this comparison, a brief discussion of Maharam's legal methodology is necessary. Despite the hundreds of Maharam's legal decisions that are extant, it is impossible to categorically describe R. Meir's tendencies toward strictness (*humra*) or leniency. For every programmatic statement that appears, one can find examples that contradict it. R. Meir writes, "In all matters that the great scholars (*gedolim*) disagree, I rule with the stricter view, unless there is an obvious leniency that has been transmitted and adopted (*heter pashut she-pashat hetero*) in the practices of the earlier [sages] who have preceded us."⁵³ Yet there are responsa in which R. Meir challenges his predecessors directly and rules leniently, against them.⁵⁴ Nonetheless, R. Meir's proclivities in deciding matters of Jewish law may be accurately described as conservative, especially when compared to the tendencies of many of his *tosafist* predecessors.⁵⁵

On R. Asher b. Yehiel's familiarity with *sodot ha-tefillah* of *Hasidei Ashkenaz* and with their tendency to count every word, see his *Responsa*, 4:20, and cf. *Perushei Siddur ha-Tefillah la-Roqeah*, 1:254–55, 342–46; M. Hallamish, “Be’ayot be-Heqer Hashpa’at ha-Qabbalah ‘al ha-Tefillah,” *Massu’ot*, ed. Oron and Goldreich, 204; and Emanuel, “Ha-Polmos ‘al Nosah ha-Tefillah shel Hasidei Ashkenaz,” n. 2. See also Jacob b. Asher, *Arba’ah Turim*, *O. H.*, sec. 113, and cf. Elliot Wolfson, “The Mystical Significance of Torah Study in German Pietism,” *JQR* 84 (1993):51, n. 29; D. Abrams, “From Germany to Spain: Numerology as a Mystical Technique,” *JJS* 47 (1996):92–93, n. 39; Yoel Catane, “Sefer ‘Hanhagat ha-Rosh’ ha-Mekhuneh ‘Orhot Hayyim,’” *Zefunot* 9 (1991):13–24, and 10 (1991):15–19; Aharon Ahrend, “Ha-Perush ha-Qazar shel Ba’al ha-Turim la-Torah,” *Mahanayim* 3 (1993):180–87; and below, ch. 5, nn. 70, 75. Note the citation from *SHP* 1073 in *Arba’ah Turim*, *O. H.*, sec. 268: *בספר חסידים מעשה בחסיד אחד שראה אל מה פניך מורייקות אמר לו מפני שהחיה מדבר ביבולו לחסיד אחר במותו ופניו מורייקות אל* למה פניך מורייקות אמר לו מפני שהחיה מדבר אומרים אותו בשעה שהציבור אומרים אותו. Cf. *Bah* and *Perishah*, loc. cit., and below, ch. 3, n. 46. For other references to pietistic practices associated with *hasidut Ashkenaz* in *Arba’ah Turim*, see above, ch. 1, n. 35; and see Jacob b. Asher’s ethical will, published by Solomon Schechter in *Beit ha-Talmud* 4 (1885):377–79. See above, nn. 24, 49, for the section in *Sefer Tashbez* (authored by Maharam’s student, R. Samson b. Zadoq) entitled *Dinei Hasidut*. This section includes pietistic practices from R. Judah *he-Hasid*, R. Samuel of Bamberg, and R. Meir himself, among others. See also *Sefer Tashbez*, secs. 248, 257–58, and below, ch. 5, n. 44.

⁵³ *Responsa* (Berlin, 1891) 294 (#356).

⁵⁴See Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 2:447–51; I. A. Agus, *Rabbi Meir of Rothenburg* (Philadelphia, 1947), 1:41–48; and Yedidya Dinari, *Hakhmei Ashkenaz be-Shilhei Yemei ha-Benayim* (Jerusalem, 1984), 94, n. 117.

⁵⁵See *Terumot ha-Deshen*, #101, who cites the view of Maharam that a *humra* against the Talmud itself is nonetheless appropriate. Cf. Yehudah Levi, "Humrot,"

Rather than advocating one position or the other, R. Meir often concluded that both sides of a halakhic controversy should be represented by or even incorporated into his final ruling. Thus, Maharam ruled that a new fruit or garment should be procured to enable one to make the *she-heheyenu* blessing on the second day of *Rosh ha-Shanah*. This ruling skirted the unresolved dilemma, stemming from the days of Rashi and his teachers, of whether the two days of *Rosh ha-Shanah* are to be considered one elongated day or viewed as two separate festival days—in which case the *she-heheyenu* blessing for the festival itself would have to be repeated.⁵⁶ Similarly, R. Meir ruled that a non-Jew should dig the grave and fabricate the coffin and shrouds for a Jew who was to be buried on the second day of a festival (*yom tov sheni shel galuyot*), while Jews should carry the coffin. This decision effectively bridged the opposing positions of R. Isaac *Or Zarua*^c (who held with the *She'iltot* that a Jew should not be involved at all in the burial of his dead on *yom tov sheni* unless no Gentiles were available) and Rabiah (who not only rejected the position of the *She'iltot* vis-à-vis the second day of *yom tov*, but also required that Jews carry the coffin if the burial took place on the first day of the festival.)⁵⁷ In essence, R. Meir felt that the demands of both opposing halakhic positions must be satisfied.

Sefer Hasidim, aside from displaying a general tendency toward *humra*,⁵⁸ offers the following guideline in a section entitled *ענני שחיטה טהרה ופרישות* (matters of ritual slaughter, purity, and asceticism): “In all situations where rabbinic scholars argue but there is no issue of monetary loss or damage to others, and one position is lenient and the other is strict, even if the law is according to the lenient view, it is better to follow the stricter view in a situation where the two positions do not contradict each other.”⁵⁹ This pietistic notion appears to be behind Maharam’s legal reasoning, although there were other Ashkenazic decisors who employed a similar strategy before him. A series of tosafists—including R. Barukh of Worms, R. Moses of Coucy, R. Samuel of Evreux, R. Isaac of Corbeil, and finally R. Meir of Rothenburg (and his students R. Asher b. Yehiel and R. Mordekhai b. Hillel)—recommended that in

Meshubahot, Hedyotot va-Appiqorsuyyot,” *Ha-Ma‘ayan* 18:2 (1975):19–33; above, n. 11; and see my “Preservation, Creativity and Courage: The Life and Works of R. Meir of Rothenburg,” *Jewish Book Annual* 50 (1992–93):249–59.

⁵⁶See the sources in *Maharam: Teshuvot, Pesaqim u-Minhagim*, ed. Kahana, 1:298–99 (#531–35).

⁵⁷See the sources cited in Katz, *Goy shel Shabbat*, 169.

⁵⁸See Soloveitchik, “Three Themes,” 318–19.

⁵⁹*SHP*, sec. 1661.

CHAPTER 2

וְרָא שְׁמִים יָצָא יְדֵי שְׁנִיהם / לְצַאת יְדֵי שְׁנִיהם, both the *tefillin* of Rashi and the *tefillin* of Rabbenu Tam should be worn.⁶⁰

Although all these tosafists were associated to some extent with *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, except perhaps R. Barukh b. Isaac of Worms,⁶¹ it is difficult to demonstrate that their solution necessarily reflects the thinking of the Pietists.

⁶⁰See the sources cited in Yaakov Gartner, “Toledot Minhag Hanahat Shetei Zugot Tefillin ‘ad Zemanno shel R. Yosef Karo,” *Sidra* 8 (1992):8–12 [=Gartner, *Gilgulei Minhag be-‘Olam ha-Halakhah*, 147–52.] Gartner makes no mention of *Hasidei Ashkenaz* in his discussion. Cf. Ta-Shma, *Ha-Nigleh shebe-Nistar*, 96, n. 54, and Daniel Sperber, *Minhagei Yisra’el*, 1 (Jerusalem, 1989), 41–42.

The talmudic principle is enunciated by R. Nahman b. Yizhaq in *Berakhot* 39b and *Shabbat* 61a. Note also the strategy employed by R. Pappa to combine two competing liturgical variants into one inclusive statement (הֲלֹךְ נִמְוִינָה לְתַרְיוּחוֹ); see *Megillah* 21b, *Ta‘anit* 6b–7a, and cf. *Hullin* 46a. See also Avraham Grossman, “Al Darko shel ha-Qallin ba-‘Asiyyat Pesharath be-Divrei Aggadah,” in Sperber, *Minhagei Yisra’el*, 2:72–75; *Tosafot Berakhot* 39b, s.v. *ha-kol modim* (ופעמים מפיק הרוי נפשיה מפלוגתא) and 18a, s.v. *le-mahar* (זהריעבע א”ה היה רגיל לאפוקי נפשיה מפלוגתא); *Pisqei ha-Rid le-Massekhet Yoma*, ed. A. Y. Wertheimer (Jerusalem, 1966), 465–66; and *Teshuvot ha-Rid*, ed. Wertheimer (Jerusalem, 1967), 298 (responsum 61).

An additional aspect of the *tefillin* ritual should also be noted in this regard. An older Italian pre-Crusade tradition, preserved in *Sefer ha-Pardes* and ratified by R. Judah he-*Hasid* and R. Simhah of Spires (as recorded in *Sefer Or Zarua*^c), and by R. Eleazar of Worms, R. Eliezer of Metz, and R. Judah b. Qalonymus, recommended making one blessing on the *tefillin shel yad* and a second on the *tefillin shel rosh*. In his talmudic commentary, Rashi takes the position, held by a number of Spanish authorities, that only one blessing should be made for both; Rabbenu Tam suggests that the one blessing be made only after both *tefillin* have been put on. R. Asher b. Yehiel, citing his brother, notes a ruling of R. Samuel of Evreux that since there is a controversy in this matter, it is preferable to make only one blessing and not make a second about which there is some doubt. R. Asher himself made only one blessing in his youth but was ultimately convinced that two blessings should be made, as was the widespread practice throughout northern France and Germany. In this case, the Evreux position, rather than the one espoused by *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, appears to reflect the more conservative view of halakhic decision-making. It should be noted, however, that the German Pietists were defending an older Ashkenazic (Italian) position against the incursion of a newer talmudic interpretation. Indeed, this battle was already under way in the eleventh century, as the passage in *Sefer Or Zarua*^c indicates. For all the relevant primary sources, see Ta-Shma, *Ha-Nigleh shebe-Nistar*, 53–58.

⁶¹Despite his association with Worms, R. Barukh was a devoted tosafist student of Ri, and his *Sefer ha-Terumah* reflects the dialectical enterprise in northern France; see above, ch. 1, n. 102; Urbach, *Ba‘alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:349–50, and esp. n. 27; and my “The ‘Aliyah of ‘Three Hundred Rabbis’ in 1211,” 202–4, 211–12. But if R. Barukh is indeed

Several of these tosafists mention the underlying talmudic concept explicitly. Moreover, their application of this concept addresses a situation in which the opposing positions, held by two of the most important halakhists of the day were mutually exclusive.⁶² Maharam, on the other hand, used this methodology on a number of occasions, in situations that fit the guidelines in *Sefer Hasidim* more closely. In addition to the two instances described above, he employed this methodology with regard to contested procedures for breaking bread (*bezi'at ha-pat*)⁶³ and *se'udah shelishit*,⁶⁴ and to the problem of wearing

the author of the so-called תמייד המיווחט לראי'ב"ד, as a number of scholars have suggested, he espoused a stringency usually associated with *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, that a *kohen* whose wife was a *niddah* should not participate in *birkat kohanim*, since he may have become contaminated with her *tum'at niddah* by touching objects that she touched. See Zimmer, 'Olam ke-Minhago Noheg, 135–37, esp. n. 25. Note also that *Sefer Roqeqah* cites *Sefer ha-Terumah* at least five times, referring to it once as *Sefer ha-Terumah she-yasad ha-R. Barukh b. Yizhaq mi-Zarefat*; see Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:348, n. 21, and 353, n. 51. Urbach (354–56) is skeptical about R. Barukh's authorship of the commentary to *Tamid*, precisely because it criticizes certain French *Tosafot* and because it cites R. Samuel *he-Hasid* and "the *Hasid*" (=R. Judah *he-Hasid*). The latter is described by the author of the commentary as his teacher; he is cited primarily about spiritual issues, such as the nature of miracles and the *Shekhinah*. Urbach observes that "R. Barukh, author of *Sefer ha-Terumah*, was not a student of 'the *Hasid*.'" Urbach is more inclined, however, to accept the possibility that R. Barukh authored the פירוש תנינים המיווחט לר"ש משאנץ (based on correlations to the standard *Tosafot Zevahim*, which were composed by R. Barukh). See *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:315. R. Barukh authored *Tosafot* to several other tractates in *Seder Qodashim* (as well as to *Nazir*; see Urbach, 1:354). These compositions place R. Barukh squarely in the camp of the brothers of Evreux and *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, who encouraged the study of these "neglected" areas in particular; see above, ch. 1, n. 76. See also ms. Sassoon 290, fol. 107, sec. 207, for an amulet that would cause its bearer to have no fear of any ruler (שלָא תירא ממלָך וسلطן). This amulet is attributed to a R. Menahem, who received it from his father-in-law, R. Barukh. R. Barukh of Worms had a son-in-law named Menahem; see below, ch. 4, n. 39, for further discussion.

⁶²*Semaq*, sec. 154, also rules that the *mezuzah* should be placed diagonally on the doorpost as a compromise between the positions of Rashi and Rabbenu Tam. Here too, however, he employs the phrase ליצאת ידי שניהם to explain his approach. See also *Sefer Yere'im*, sec. 400 (end), and Sperber, *Minhagei Yisra'el*, 1:50. *Sefer Yere'im*, sec. 325, uses the phrase ייצא ידי כולם to justify his ruling that a razor should not be used even to shave facial hair that is not technically considered to be *pe'ot*. See also *Semaq*, sec. 70; R. Jonah of Gerona, *Sha'arei Teshuvah*, 3:78; and cf. Zimmer, 'Olam ke-Minhago Noheg, 48.

⁶³See *Haggahot Maimuniyyot*, *Hilkhot Berakhot*, 7:3[3]; the variant in *Teshuvot, Pesaqim u-Minahagim*, ed. Kahana, 1:158 (sec. 131); and Sperber, *Minhagei Yisra'el*, 1:39–40.

CHAPTER 2

(or not wearing) *zizit* and *tefillin* on the ninth of *Av*, which he resolved by donning his *tallit* and *tefillin* only in the (late) afternoon.⁶⁵

⁶⁴Teshuvot, *Pesaqim u-Minahagim*, ed. Kahana, 1:221 (#257), 1:266 (#420); and Sperber, *Minhagei Yisra'el*, 2:38–40. Cf. Kahana, ed. 1:288–89 (#496), for Maharam's approach to writing on the intermediate days of a festival, which represents something of a compromise between the differing views concerning the permissibility of writing an *'iggeret shalom*. Cf. *Sefer Roqeh*, sec. 308, and *Beit Yosef* to *Orah Hayyim*, sec. 546. See also R. Jonah's view on the procedure for kindling the *Hannukah* lights, cited in R. Yeroham, *Toledot Adam ve-Havvah*, 9:1, and in *Darkhei Mosheh* to *Orah Hayyim*, 676:1, which would bridge the differing opinions of earlier authorities on the nature of the blessing *she'asah nissim*. Cf. the analysis of R. Joseph Soloveitchik recorded in *Mesorah* 4 (1991):7–9.

⁶⁵See *Haggahot Maimuniyyot*, *Hilkhot Ta'anit*, 5:1[5]; Sperber, *Minhagei Yisra'el*, 2:44–45, Zimmer, 'Olam ke-Minhago Noheg, 181–82; and above, n. 28. (The fact that R. Eleazar of Worms did not propose the same procedures does not detract from the intent of Maharam's methodology; see Zimmer, nn. 39, 42.) In several of the cases noted in this discussion, R. Meir's solution is characterized by the phrase **לאפוקי נפשיה** rather than by a version of the talmudic phrase, suggesting perhaps that R. Meir had extra-talmudic considerations. R. Moses of Evreux, or perhaps Maharam himself, also used this phrase (see *Sefer 'al ha-Kol*, ed. M. Z. Weiss, *Ha-Goren*, 7 [1908]:5–6, sec. 1) to explain the custom of beginning the blessing before *Shema* with two different (competing) phrases in *Shaharit* and in *Ma'ariv*. See also Sperber, 2:33–35. This practice was already found, however in the geonic period. Indeed, *Sefer Or Zarua'* writes: **בדגאנונים פסקו לקיים דברי שניהם**, although it is perhaps significant that this practice appears to have been followed only in Germany for the most part, not in northern France. See Israel Ta-Shma, "Ahavat 'Olam ve-Ahavah Rabbah," *Sefer ha-Yovel le-Rav Mordekhai Breuer*, ed. Moshe Ahrend et al. (Jerusalem, 1992), 2:601–11, esp. 608. [Note also the "compromise" regarding the text of the 'Amidah on Sabbath eve proposed by R. Meir **שליח ציבור** (who was venerated by *Hasidei Ashkenaz* as **בקי ... בטודות ובמורשתם**; and **ובבעמיהם**; see ms. Kaufmann A399, fol. 34r, and Grossman, *Hakhmei Ashkenaz ha-Rishonim*, 294). Also see Naftali Wieder, "Yishmah Mosheh," *Mehqarim ba-Aggadah, Targumim u-Tefillot Yisra'el le-Zekher Yizhaq Heinemann*, ed. Ezra Fleisher (Jerusalem, 1981), 96–98.] and Zimmer, 'Olam ke-Minhago Noheg, 123–27.

Maharam's approach to the issue of rule by the majority, in which he amalgamates Rabbenu Tam's more "stringent" position (requiring unanimity) with the more commonly held view advocated by Rabiah (majority rule), may also be understood as an attempt by R. Meir to harmonize these positions, although this case does not conform in several respects to the guidelines in *Sefer Hasidim*. See my "Unanimity, Majority, and Communal Government in Ashkenaz During the High Middle Ages," *PAAJR* 58 (1992):79–106, and my "Preservation, Creativity and Courage," 252–55. See also *Arba'ah Turim*, *O. H.*, sec. 128, for R. Meir's compromise position (between the views of Rambam and R. Gershom/Rashi) on whether repentance allows a *kohen* who has killed someone to resume pronouncing the priestly blessing. Such a *kohen* should not be told to ascend the *dukhan* (to offer the blessing) but, if he does so on his own, he should not be removed.

Two responsa of R. Meir regarding martyrdom also appear to reflect the influence of both *hasidut Ashkenaz* and *Hekhalot* literature. In the first, R. Meir was asked to respond concerning the tragic situation of an individual who slaughtered his family as Christian attackers neared, and who was then saved either before he could commit suicide or prior to his death as a result of the suicide attempt. The question put to Maharam was whether the individual required any form of penance (*kapparah*) for his actions. R. Meir ruled that he did not, because his actions were justifiable and conformed to Ashkenazic rabbinic precedent.⁶⁶ It appears from this text, however, that Maharam was completely comfortable with the notion of securing expiation through prescribed physical penances, a hallmark of Pietist thought, as we have seen.

In another responsum, R. Meir asserted that once someone had made the decision to undertake martyrdom, he felt none of the pain of death, regardless of the means of execution. R. Meir supported this contention with two textual proofs: a passage from *Sefer Hekhalot* and an explanation based on the structure of the biblical *mesorah*.⁶⁷ He saved his most striking proof, however, for last.

⁶⁶ *Teshuvot, Pesaqim u-Minhagim*, ed. Kahana, vol. 2 (Jerusalem, 1960), 54 (#59), and cf. Haym Soloveitchik, "Religious Law and Change: The Medieval Ashkenazic Example," *AJS Review* 12 (1987): 209–11, nn. 7–8.

⁶⁷ *Responsa* (Prague), #517: *וכן אמר מהר"ם מאחר שנגמר אדם בדעתו למסור את נפשו* על קידוש השם, מקום ואילך כל מיתה שעושים לו אינו מוגישי כלל. וראייה מן המסתורה הכווי ב'. הכווי בחליתו וחד הכווי פצעוני. ככלומר כשהכווי ופצעוני לא היה לי כאב הכווי בחליתו. ומבייא ראייה מספר היכלות שר' חנניה בן תרדיון היה במקומם קיסר ששוה חידשים והרג שיתה אלףן ורכסן והגנווים. לטף וחדשים נליך למעלה ושותפו קך אחד במקומו בדבשות Cf. Maharam's *Ta'amei Mesoret ha-Miqra* (published by Kahana in his edition of Maharam's responsa, above, n. 52), 39; *Sefer Tashbez*, sec. 415; *Orhot Hayyim, hilkhot Rosh ha-Shanah*, sec. 24 (end). *Kol Bo*, sec. 67 (end); ms. Vat. 471, fol. 58r; and ms. Budapest/Kaufmann A266, fol. 410. In ms. Bodl. 378, fol. 22r–22v, and ms. Bodl. 1106, fol. 342v, the proof from *Sefer Hekhalot* is cited (incorrectly) in the name of Rabbenu Tam. Cf. *Teshuvot, Pesaqim u-Minhagim*, ed. Kahana, 2:231–32 (#136), and below, ch. 3, n. 87. For the mystical implications in the formulation of Maharam and its association with the *Hekhalot* corpus, see Michael Fishbane, *The Kiss of God: Spiritual and Mystical Death in Judaism* (Seattle, 1994), 51–55, and idem, "The Imagination of Death in Jewish Spirituality," *Death, Ecstasy and Other Worldly Journeys*, ed. John Collins and Michael Fishbane (New York, 1995), 191. Cf. R. J. Z. Werblowsky, *Joseph Karo, Lawyer and Mystic* (Philadelphia, 1977), 172–73. In ms. Kaufmann A266, fol. 411, Maharam is cited as mandating a blessing for those who were about to sanctify the Name through martyrdom. Cf. Soloveitchik, "Religious Law and Change," 208–9, and the literature cited in n. 6. For the possible roots of this blessing in *Hekhalot* literature, see Meir Bar-Ilan, *Sitrei Tefillah ve-Hekhalot* (Jerusalem, 1987), 141–52; and cf. Peter Schäfer and Shaul Shaked, *Magische Texte aus der Kairoer-Geniza*, vol. 2 (Tübingen, 1997), 105, 114, 155, 159.

CHAPTER 2

"There is no one in the world who will not scream when he touches fire with even the smallest finger (or limb). Even if he tries to restrain himself, he will be unable to do so. But [we have seen] many [times] martyrs (*qedoshim moserim 'azmam 'al qiddush ha-Shem*) [who are burned or killed who] do not scream at all."⁶⁸

R. Perez b. Elijah of Corbeil, a younger colleague of Maharam who also studied with R. Yehiel of Paris and at the academy of Evreux, cited his teachers at Evreux regarding means for achieving *kavvanah* in prayer.⁶⁹ He also referred approvingly to a number of ascetic practices. These include fasting and limiting one's enjoyment of food, as well as an awareness of the full range of *tiqqunei teshuvah* and other stringencies endorsed by German Pietists.⁷⁰ R. Perez, like Maharam, accepted the notion that a devoted martyr could withstand the challenge and feel no pain, if initially he had proper intentions regarding the Tetragrammaton (אָמֵן בְּזַהֲרָה בְּתַחְלָה).⁷¹

⁶⁸Cf. David Tamar in *Qiryat Sefer* 33 (1948):376, and ms. Moscow 348, fol. 246v.

⁶⁹When *Semaq* (at the beginning of section 11) cites R. Eleazar of Worms on the importance of maintaining appropriate *kavvanah* throughout the blessings of the 'Amidah prayer (מי שמתכוין בשאלתו ולא יכוין בשבחו של הקב"ה מחייב את עצמו), R. Perez in his gloss cites the Pietist-like formulation of R. Moses of Evreux on the importance of thinking about each word as it is being said. Cf. R. Perez's gloss to *Semaq*, sec. 97, citing R. Samuel of Evreux on *kavvanah*. See above, ch. 1, n. 79.

⁷⁰See above, ch. 1, n. 91, in the name of R. Jonah. In his *pesaqim*, R. Perez appears to endorse the ascetic eating practices of R. Moses of Evreux; see above, ch. 1, nn. 83, 177. He also lists his own practices concerning *ta'anit halom* for a dream experienced during the day (which he notes differed from that of R. Judah *he-Hasid*) and avoiding conversation with any woman in his home, including his mother-in-law, unless there was another male present. R. Perez cautioned that one should not speak during the quasi-repetition of the 'Amidah on Friday evenings (*berakhah 'ahat me'en sheva*), because a soul once told R. Yehiel of Paris that the angels threw him up and let him fall by himself because he talked during this prayer. Cf. above, n. 52, for a similar notion in *Sefer Hasidim*. (R. Perez also refused to take water to drink from even the youngest of his students.) See S. Sha'anan, "Pisqei Rabbenu Perez va-Aherim," *Moriah* 17/9–10 (1991):10–14, secs. 7, 8, 15, 26; ms. Paris 407, fols. 236c–237a; and ms. JTS Rab. 1077, fol. 20r. Although R. Isaac of Corbeil (*Semaq*, sec. 53) lists the four Pietist modes of penance without providing any specific guidance regarding their application (see above, ch. 1, n. 142), R. Perez of Corbeil in his gloss offers a brief definition of each type, fully consonant with Pietist literature. [On R. Isaac and R. Perez of Corbeil, see also Getzel Ellinson, "Le-Heqer Qavvei ha-Pesiqah shel ha-Rosh," *Sinai* 93 (1983):236–37.]

⁷¹See *Orhot Hayyim*, *hilkhot Rosh ha-Shanah*, sec. 24 (end); *Sefer Kol Bo*, sec. 67 (end); and cf. above, n. 67. On R. Perez and masoretic studies (similar to those undertaken by *Hasidei Ashkenaz* and R. Meir of Rothenburg), see above, n. 52. See also Samson b. Eliezer, *Barukh She'amar*, ed. M. M. Meshi-Zahav (Jerusalem, 1970), 19.

IV

Brief reference was made earlier to a correlation between rabbinic figures who espoused *perishut* or *ḥasidut* and were also involved in esoteric studies. A number of Provençal mystics were called by titles *parush*, *nazir*, or *ḥasid*, indicating that their mystical studies were coupled with ascetic practices and other forms of self-denial. These behavioral modes were thought to be part of the mystical experience, as they were in the kabbalistic schools of Gerona⁷² and in the mystical circles of sixteenth-century Safed.⁷³

Similarly, Moshe Rosman has argued recently that there was an existing “mystic-ascetic-hasidic tradition” in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Germany and Poland that preceded the rise of Hasidism. Rabbinic scholars who pursued this outlook undertook additional fasts and other physical penances, prayed with intense devotion that included both crying and ecstatic movements, and studied kabbalistic literature, in addition to their regimen of regular Torah study. Rosman suggests that this tradition was generated in part by a renewed commitment to ideals and practices of *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, especially with regard to *teshuvah*.⁷⁴ The pietism and asceticism that underlie the magical and mystical rituals in *Hekhalot* literature represent further suggestive examples of this kind of correlation.⁷⁵

Chapters 1 and 2 have identified a range of pietistic and ascetic behaviors and outlooks among tosafists and rabbinic figures in medieval Ashkenaz. Prior to a discussion of the involvement of these scholars in mysticism and magic, it

R. Abraham of Sensheim writes that “from the time that I left R. Meir of Rothenburg, I have not found anyone observing the precepts of fringes, phylacteries and *mezuzah* fully and punctiliously except for R. Perez of Corbeil, and my teacher *ha-qadosh*, *ha-rav*, *he-hasid* R. Zuslein, and my teacher R. Malki’el of Hagenau.” Cf. my “Rabbinic Attitudes Toward Nonobservance in the Medieval Period” (above, ch. 1, n. 99), 7–14. On R. Perez and *sod*, see below, ch. 5 (end).

⁷²See above, ch. 1, n. 6.

⁷³See, e.g., Werblowsky, *Joseph Karo, Lawyer and Mystic*, 38–83, 149–51.

⁷⁴M. Rosman, *Founder of Hasidism: A Quest for the Historical Ba’al Shem Tov* (Berkeley, 1996), 27–39. Cf. Gedalyah Nigal, “Qabbalah Ma’asit be-Frankfurt be-Me’ah ha-Shemonah ‘Esreh,” *Sinai* 118 (1996):89–95.

⁷⁵See, e.g., Peter Schäfer, *Hidden and Manifest God*, 89–95, and M. Swartz, *Scholastic Magic*, 153–66; cf. Elliot Wolfson, “Jewish Mysticism: A Philosophical Overview,” in *History of Jewish Philosophy*, ed. Daniel Frank (London, 1997), 451–52. Cf. Robert Mathieson, “A Thirteenth-Century Ritual to Attain the Beatific Vision,” *Conjuring Spirits*, ed. Claire Fanger (Phoenix Mill, 1998), 151–53; and Richard Kieckhefer, “The Devil’s Contemplatives: The *Liber Iuratus*, the *Liber Visionum* and the Christian Appropriation of Jewish Occultism,” *ibid.*, 250–65.

CHAPTER 2

is appropriate to review, in greater detail, evidence for the correlation just described within medieval Ashkenaz itself. Ivan Marcus, mindful of Gershom Scholem's characterization of *hasidut Ashkenaz* as "mystical moralism," has argued that the emphasis placed by R. Eleazar of Worms—in the *Hilkhot Hasidut* preamble to his *Sefer Roqeqah*—on the religious perfection of the individual through personal pietism had as its ultimate goal the preparation of the individual for mystical experiences in prayer. R. Eleazar's focus on the development of spiritual inwardness reaches its climax in the twelfth section of his *hilkhot hasidut* (called *shoresh qedushat ha-yihud u-Shemo u-Merkavah ve-sodotav*), which is, in essence, a mystical tract of contemplation and analysis concerning *yihud ha-Shem*.⁷⁶

Peter Schäfer has established conceptual and even linguistic parallels between typical ascetic and pietistic practices of *hasidut Ashkenaz*, and instructions contained in *Hekhalot* literature for the one seeking to enter the Heavenly palaces (*yored Merkavah*). He suggests that this body of earlier Jewish literature (with which the German Pietists were very familiar, since they served as its transmitters and editors) was the source of these practices of *Hasidei Ashkenaz*—rather than Christian asceticism or other temporal stimuli, such as the trauma of the Crusades and other intense persecutions.⁷⁷

⁷⁶See above, ch. 1, n. 5, and cf. K. E. Grözinger, "Between Magic and Religion—Ashkenazi Hasidic Piety," *Mysticism, Magic and Kabbalah in Ashkenazi Judaism* (Berlin, 1995), 28–42. (Marcus also writes [Piety and Society, 85] that even as most followers of *hasidut Ashkenaz* were initiated into a life of pietism, they were not initiated "into the mysteries of the esoteric tradition about God." At the same time, "they received guidance and counsel from [Pietist] Sages who did have such knowledge.") See also Dan, *Torat ha-Sod shel Hasidut Ashkenaz*, 71–73, and idem, "Sifrut ha-Yihud shel Hasidei Ashkenaz," *Qiryat Sefer* 41 (1966):533–44. Although Dan maintains that the area of *sifrut ha-yihud* is one of the more exoteric within the thought of *Hasidei Ashkenaz* (cf. Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:408–9), he notes that the twelfth section of R. Eleazar's ethical introduction to *Sefer Roqeqah* is a departure from what precedes it. It appears to be an opening into the world of *sod* for those who studied R. Eleazar's halakhic and pietistic material; see esp. 537 (sec. 7). There are intimations of mystical experience in the opening section of R. Eleazar's *hilkhot hasidut* and in his discussion of *kavvanah* in prayer. In the sections on pietism and the study of Torah, however, *sod* refers to the deep (exoteric) knowledge that Torah scholars acquire through their study of Torah and *musar*. These aspects of R. Eleazar's introduction are similar to the program propounded by *Midrash Mishlei*. Proper participation in a regular regimen of Torah study can lead ultimately to the study of *sod*. See *The Midrash on Proverbs*, ed. Burton Visotzky (New Haven, 1992), 56–57, and the editor's introduction, 4.

⁷⁷Peter Schäfer, "The Ideal of Piety of the Ashkenazi Hasidim and Its Roots in Jewish Tradition," *Jewish History* 4 (1990):9–23. On the issue of asceticism and martyrdom, see also Israel Marcus, "Hierarchies, Religious Boundaries and Jewish

Schäfer does not discuss at any length the esoteric traditions of German Pietism and their relationship to the pietistic elements. Nonetheless, the following formulation suggests that he envisions the linkage between *hasidut Ashkenaz* and *Hekhalot* literature as reflecting a very similar, even commonly held, approach to the relationship between pietism and mysticism.

Both traditions clearly assume that their adepts, the Hasid and the esoteric of early Jewish mysticism, are capable of wisdom and special cognition. Indeed, this confidence in the ability of their fellows to enjoy a special, deeper insight was perhaps the element which cemented the sense of group solidarity evidenced by the Pietists and the Yorede Merkavah.⁷⁸

The tosafists based some of the examples of pietistic and ascetic practices described in chapters 1 and 2 on *Hekhalot* practices. In the following chapters, we shall encounter an even wider array of magical and mystical techniques and concepts (with many based on *Hekhalot* literature as well) expressed in most instances by the same tosafists. The correlation between pietism and mysticism in *Hasidei Ashkenaz* and, indeed, in *Hekhalot* literature itself, suggests that this correlation in the tosafist realm cannot be coincidental. As has been noted, tosafists did not pursue the study of theosophy as the Pietists did, and they cannot be properly classified as mystics. Nonetheless, the findings in chapters 1 and 2 regarding pietism, asceticism, stringency, and *perishut* serve as a kind of foundation for the magical and mystical dimensions which can be discerned among certain tosafists.

It is appropriate to close this chapter with an example of how pietism and *perishut* may directly reflect magical and mystical concerns as well. There are several types of restrictions designed to promote separation (*harhaqot*) prescribed for a menstruant—having to do primarily with dining with her husband, modes of dress, reciting blessings, and entering the synagogue—which cannot be found, for the most part, in talmudic literature, but which are found in the so-called *Baraita de-Massekhet Niddah*.⁷⁹ This unusual text, which

Spirituality in Medieval Germany,” *Jewish History* 1 (1986):25, n. 34. The evidence presented in ch. 1 and in this chapter for asceticism in tosafist circles, and its origins, offers strong proof for the role of internal religious stimuli. Cf. Y. N. Simhoni, “Ha-Hasidut ha-Ashkenazit Bimei ha-Benayim,” in *Dat ve-Hevrah be-Mishnatam shel Hasidei Ashkenaz*, ed. Ivan Marcus (Jerusalem, 1987), 68–78.

⁷⁸Schäfer, “The Ideal of Piety,” 17.

⁷⁹Yedidyah Dinari, “Minhagei Tum’at Ha-Niddah Meqoram ve-Hishtalshelutam,” *Tarbiz* 49 (1980):302–5.

CHAPTER 2

appears to have originated in *Erez Yisra'el* during the early geonic period, is linked to *Hekhalot* literature.⁸⁰ From its earliest days, Ashkenazic Jewry accepted many of these stringencies; so did its rabbinic authorities. Early tosafists—such as Raban, whose goal was to harmonize accepted practice with the talmudic corpus—undertook to evaluate these stringencies in light of talmudic law. This effort produced a rationalistic or legalistic interpretation for these *harhaqot* (as a function of ritual impurity) that contributed to their mitigation.⁸¹

R. Isaac b. Moses *Or Zarua'*, however, continued to support many of these *harhaqot* (*kol mah she-yakhol 'adam le-hahmir ba-niddah yahmir*), because of considerations of “danger” (*va'ani shamati mi-ta'am sakkanaḥ*). In doing so, R. Isaac b. Moses of Vienna was perhaps following R. Eleazar of Worms, who located their presence in the eleventh-century *Ma'aseh ha-Geonim*, as a means of stressing the authentic (and binding) nature of the stringencies. The danger associated with the menstruant by R. Isaac—noted also by Nahmanides in his Torah commentary (הבלן מזיק, גם מבטן מולדיך גנאי ועשה רושם רע)—derives from the *Baraita de-Massekhet Niddah*, in which the menstruant is described as possessing the ability not only to transmit impurity but also to (magically) impart certain diseases or afflictions, such as boils, leprosy, and physical disabilities. Both R. Isaac *Or Zarua'* and Ramban mention the *Baraita* in their formulations.⁸²

⁸⁰See Lieberman, *Sheqi'in*, 22; Zimmer, ‘Olam ke-Minhago Noheg, 222, and the literature cited in n. 7; Swartz, *Scholastic Magic*, 164–65, 214–15; Israel Ta-Shma, “Miqdash Me'at”—Ha-Semel ve-ha-Mamashut,” *Knesset Ezra*, ed. Shulamit Elizur et al. (Jerusalem, 1994), 360.

⁸¹See Dinari, “Minhagei Tum’at Ha-Niddah Meqoram ve-Hishtalshelutam,” 321–23; and Israel Ta-Shma, *Halakhah, Minhag u-Mezi’ut be-Ashkenaz* (Jerusalem, 1996), 280–88. Ta-Shma argues that diminutions of the *harhaqot* had already been advocated by Rashi. Among tosafists who accepted the diminished levels were R. Eliezer of Metz and Rabiah. Note that while Raban tried to explain away a problematic talmudic passage in order to justify the Ashkenazic custom that a *niddah* made the blessing following her immersion (rather than prior to the act, as is normally mandated for the recitation of a blessing), Rabbenu Tam (and his brother-in-law, R. Samson of Falaise) railed against this custom—which is found in the *Baraita de-Niddah*—in very strong terms. Ri, on the other hand, held that the custom was valid, without accepting Raban’s exegesis. Interestingly, these developments form an excellent model or paradigm for the positions taken by twelfth-century tosafists regarding the efficacy of magic and *sod*; see the next chapter, and cf. Weinstock, *Be-Ma’agalei ha-Nigleh*, 249–59.

⁸²See *Sefer Or Zarua'*, pt. 1, sec. 360; Nahmanides’ commentary to Genesis 31:35; *Sefer Roqeah*, sec. 318 (end); Dinari, “Minhagei Tum’at Ha-Niddah Meqoram ve-Hishtalshelutam,” 303, 310, 322–23; and cf. Ta-Shma, *Halakhah Minhag u-Mezi’ut*

As we shall see, R. Isaac *Or Zarua*^c, like the German Pietists, was attuned not only to the existence of *shedim* and *maziqin*, but also to the magical nature of their powers.⁸³ His retention of the many stringencies associated with the *niddah* emerged, in all likelihood, from the nexus of *perishut* and magic. Moreover, within *Hekhalot* literature itself, menstrual impurity had to be assiduously avoided, lest it interfere with the mystical rituals and visions sought by the adepts. The slightest trace of impurity could lead to immediate recall from a mystical vision.⁸⁴ Similarly, accounts about *Hasidei Ashkenaz* and others who were aware of the mystical and magical powers of *Shemot* describe their attempts to keep menstruants far away from Holy Names and rituals that involved them, lest the *niddot* unwittingly wreak havoc with the Names by their very presence.⁸⁵ Although other tosafist halakhists were aware of the *Baraita de-Niddah* and were prepared to retain some of its stringencies as bona fide halakhic *humrot*—if not demonstrations of piety—R. Isaac *Or Zarua*^c

be-Ashkenaz, 287. (*Maḥzor Vitry* endorsed these prohibitions because of *hergel* ‘*averah*, a more neutral kind of reason.) Many of these *harhaqot* were also adopted by the *Zohar*, despite their relative absence in the early medieval Spanish tradition. See Ta-Shma, *Ha-Nigleh shebe-Nistar*, 24. Ramban notes that the negative powers attributed to the *niddah* were also recognized by “the philosophers.” Cf. C. T. Wood, “‘The Doctors’ Dilemma’: Sin, Salvation and the Menstrual Cycle in Medieval Thought,” *Speculum* 56 (1981):710–27; and H. J. Zimmels, *Magicians, Theologians and Doctors* (New York, 1952), 117.

⁸³See Dan, *Torat ha-Sod shel Hasidut Ashkenaz*, 188, n. 19, and below, ch. 4. Regarding *Sefer Or Zarua*^c and the stringencies of *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, see above, n. 40; ch. 1, nn. 16–17; and below, n. 86; ch. 5, n. 8. *Tosafot Pesahim*, 111a, s.v. *’im*, explains the talmudic passage at hand—that if a woman passes between two men at the beginning of her menstrual period she will kill one of them—to mean that if the woman had practiced sorcery (*kishuf*) on one of the men, the power of her impurity would make it effective. Cf. Swartz, *Scholastic Magic*, 165, n. 69. (Rashi, and Rashbam, *ad loc.*, interpret simply that her passing between them damages them, without indicating the vehicle for the damage or its nature.)

⁸⁴See Swartz, *Scholastic Magic*, 154–72. The rituals include the cleansing of one’s clothes and body, immersion, fasting and the avoidance of certain foods, and the avoidance of sexual and social contact. See also below, ch. 3, n. 8.

⁸⁵See the Qalonymide chain of tradition recorded in *She’elot u-Teshuvot Maharshal*, #29 (end; on the origins and nature of this source, see above, introduction, n. 13), and Sharon Koren, “Mysticism and Menstruation: The Significance of Female Impurity in Jewish Spirituality” (Ph.D. diss., Yale, 1999), ch. 1. The concern of these adepts (which included figures found in *Megillat Ahimza*^c in addition to *Hasidei Ashkenaz*) was also based on their familiarity with the requirements and regulations for purity found in *Hekhalot* literature. For other efforts to protect books of *Shemot*, see *SHP*, secs. 213, 1819. On the danger associated with a *niddah*, cf. *SHB* 1126.

CHAPTER 2

(following R. Eleazar of Worms) appears to have had additional considerations in arguing for their almost complete retention.⁸⁶

With these kinds of correlations in mind, we are now prepared to trace the involvement of Ashkenazic rabbinic scholars with magic and mysticism, from the pre-Crusade period through the end of the tosafist period.

⁸⁶Ta-Shma, “Miqdash Me‘at—Ha-Semel veva-Mashma‘ut,” 351–64, and Zimmer, ‘Olam ke-Minhago Noheg, 220–49, relate the Ashkenazic *humrot* regarding the *harhaqot* of a *niddah* to other stringencies—those regarding the duration of the *niddut* period and the status of *dam tohar* following the birth of a child. For Zimmer, these *humrot* reflect, for the most part, the pietistic impact and influence of R. Judah *he-Hasid*, especially (as suggested almost explicitly by R. Meir of Rothenburg) on his followers in the “outlying” areas of central and eastern Europe, and thereby on *minhag Austreikh* in general. See above, n. 44. This pattern of influence is also evident with regard to the ability of a *ba‘al qeri* to pray and lead the prayers in the synagogue, and to pronounce the priestly blessing; see Eric Zimmer, “Mo‘adei Nesi‘at Kappayim,” *Sinai* 100 (1987):455–57 [=‘Olam ke-Minhago Noheg, 135–40; cf. above, n. 51]; and cf. Sperber, *Minhagei Yisra‘el*, 4:39–40; Ta-Shma, 360, n. 29; and Yedidyah Dinari, “Hillul ha-Qodesh ‘al Yedei Niddah ve-Taqqanat Ezra,” *Te‘udah* 3 (1983):17–38. [R. Isaac *Or Zarua‘* held virtually all these stringencies as well. See Zimmer, ‘Olam ke-Minhago Noheg, 136; 229–30, nn. 37–38; 242, n. 14; 245–48.] Ta-Shma suggests that Ashkenazic rabbinic culture, following the Palestinian tradition, invested the holiness and sanctity of the synagogue with particular significance and stringency (note, e.g., *Sefer Yere‘im*, sec. 104). These overarching analyses accord quite well with the presence and place of *perishut* and pietism in medieval Ashkenazic rabbinic thought that have been demonstrated in this chapter. See now Avraham Grossman, “Mi-Morashatah shel Yahadut Sefarad: Ha-Yahas ‘el ha-Ishah ha-‘Qatlanit’ Bimei ha-Benayim,” *Tarbiz* 67 (1998):551–58.



3

Mysticism and Magic: Pre-Crusade Traditions and the Reaction of Early Tosafists

I

There was substantial interest in *torat ha-sod* on the part of rabbinic scholars in pre-Crusade Germany, but it existed almost exclusively in Mainz and, within Mainz, among members of the Abun and Qalonymus families.¹ R. Simeon b.

¹Sodot that circulated in Italy (and France) during the late ninth and early tenth centuries were brought to the Rhineland by migrating Qalonymides, members of the Abun family, and others. See, e.g., Joseph Dan, "The Beginnings of Jewish Mysticism in Europe," *The Dark Ages*, ed. Cecil Roth (Ramat Gan, 1966), 282–90; idem, *Torat ha-Sod shel Ḥasidut Ashkenaz* (Jerusalem, 1968), 13–20; idem, "Hithavvut Torat ha-Sod ha-‘Ivrit," *Mahanayim* 6 (1994):12; Avraham Grossman, *Hakhmei Ashkenaz ha-Rishonim* (Jerusalem, 1981), 29–35; and cf. Robert Bonfil, "Bein Erez Yisra’el le-Bavel," *Shalem* 5 (1987):1–30; idem, "Eduto shel Agobard mi-Lyons ‘al ‘Olamam ha-Ruhani shel Yehudei ‘Iro ba-Me’ah ha-Teshi‘it," *Mehqarim be-Qabbalah, be-Filosofyah Yehudit uve-Sifrut ha-Mussar vehe-Hagut* [Muggashim li-Yeshayah Tishby], ed. J. Dan and J. Hacker (Jerusalem, 1986), 327–48; Elliot Wolfson, "The Theosophy of Shabbetai Donnolo, with Special Emphasis on the Doctrine of *Sefirot* in his *Sefer Ḥakhmoni*," *The Frank Talmage Memorial Volume*, vol. 2 [=Jewish History 6 (1992)], ed. Barry Walfish (Haifa, 1993), 282–84; *Megillat Ahima‘az*, ed. Benjamin Klar (Jerusalem, 1974), 13–15, 21–23, 33–34, 50–51, and the editor's comments, 118–19; Ezra Fleischer, *Ha-Yozerot be-Hithavvutan uve-Hitpathutan* (Jerusalem, 1984), 660–772; and Stephen Benin, "Megillat Ahima‘az u-Meqomo be-Sifrut ha-Bizantit," *Mehqerei Yerushalayim be-Mahshevet Yisra’el*, 4 (1980):237–50. Piyutim from tenth-century Italy contain verbatim extracts as well as interpolations of *Hekhalot* material. See also *Piyyutei R. Shim‘on b. Yizhaq*, ed. A. M. Habermann (Jerusalem, 1938), 18–20; Zvi Malachi, "Ha-Mistiqah ve-Shirat ha-Qodesh ha-‘Ivrit," *Mahanayim* 6 (1994):79; and Elliot Ginsburg, "The Many Faces of Kabbalah," *Hebrew Studies* 36 (1995):118, n. 13.

CHAPTER 3

Isaac *ha-Gadol*, whose pietism was noted at the beginning of the first chapter, included in his *piyyutim* such concepts as the ineffable Name of seventy letters (שם ה' המפורש בשבעים אותיות) and descriptions of the names and functions of angels in their devotional services to the Almighty, a well as references to *Hekhalot* literature.² A passage in a late thirteenth-century manuscript refers to an *zman* composed by R. Simeon *ha-Gadol* and set to a particular melody (*niggun*). The *niggun*, which was purported to be a tune of the angels, was transmitted to R. Simeon in a dream by the heavenly *ba'al ha-halom*.³ R. Simeon

²See Grossman, *Hakhmei Ashkenaz ha-Rishonim*, 100–101 [and cf. Peter Schäfer, *The Hidden and Manifest God* (Albany, 1992), 36]; *Perushei ha-Siddur la-Roqeah*, ed. Moshe Hershler (Jerusalem, 1992), 1:255; *Piyyutei R. Shim'on b. Yizhaq*, 58, 98, 160; and *Mahzor le-Yamim ha-Nora'im*, ed. Daniel Goldschmidt (Jerusalem, 1970), vol. 1, 77–78, 109–11, for *piyyutim* of R. Simeon b. Isaac and R. Eleazar *ha-Qallir* that list and compare (favorably) the praises to God offered by human beings to those offered to God by the angels. A *piyyut* from the less mystically inclined French talmudist, R. Yosef *Tov 'Elem*, however, lists only the human praises (*Mahzor le-Yamim ha-Nora'im*, vol. 1, 201–2). Cf. Avraham Grossman, *Hakhmei Zarefat ha-Rishonim* (Jerusalem, 1995), 79–80. [The messianic predictions from R. Yosef *Tov Elem*'s son, R. Zekharyah/Zevadyah, are based on verses that were subjected to midrashic (and political) analysis; he did not say that he received a “prophetic” dream about a particular year, as others did. See Grossman, *Hakhmei Zarefat ha-Rishonim*, 51–52; and below, n. 41; ch. 4, nn. 8–9, 37; ch. 5, n. 67.] For additional examples of descriptions of angelic names and functions in pre-Crusade Italy and Germany (by authors such as R. Solomon *ha-Bavli*, R. Amitai, and R. Benjamin b. Zeraḥ), see *Mahzor Sukkot*, ed. Daniel Goldschmidt (Jerusalem, 1981), 88, 258–62, 358, 362, 364, 366. [On the name *Adiriron*, found in some of these *piyyutim* and in *Hekhalot* literature, see *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur*, ed. Peter Schäfer (Tübingen, 1981), secs. 204, 301, 411; and cf. Gershom Scholem, “*Havdalah de-R. Aqivah: Maqor le-Massoret Mageyah ha-Yehudit bi-Tequfat ha-Geonim*,” *Tarbiz* 50 (198–81):253, note to line 10; ms. Bodl. 1812, fol. 91r; ms. Montefiore 6, fol. 15; *Arugat ha-Bosem*, ed. E. E. Urbach, vol. 3 (Jerusalem, 1963), 537; Reuven Margoliot, *Mal'akhei 'Elyon* (Jerusalem, 1988³), 2–3; and Peter Schäfer and Shaul Shaked, *Magische Texte aus der Kairoer-Geniza*, vol. 2 (Tübingen, 1997), 115.]

³Ms. Bodl. 1153, fols. 167v–168r: אופן לרביינו שמעון הגורל בינוין. ובלטוי שהנוינו מסר לו בעל החולום והוא בעין נינו שיר של מלכים. On the role of the *ba'al ha-halom* in transmitting material to people, see, e.g., Rashi to *Yevamot* 24b, s.v. *gerei halomot*; *Sanhedrin* 30a, s.v. *ba'al ha-halom* (cf. Reuven Margoliot, *Margaliyyot ha-Yam* [Jerusalem, 1977], ad loc.); and cf. Rashi's biblical commentary to *Esther* 4:1. See also *SHP*, secs. 324, 382, 1550; R. Eleazar of Worms's *Hokhmat ha-Nefesh*, fols. 4a–b, 6a; the description of R. Eleazar's colleague, R. Menahem b. Jacob of Worms, cited in Henry Malter, “*Dreams as a Cause of Literary Composition*,” *Studies in Jewish Literature in Honor of Kaufmann Kohler* (Berlin, 1913), 202; and see also Jacob Elbaum, “*Shalosh Derashot Ashkenaziyyot Qedumot*,” *Qiryat Sefer* 48 (1973):342–43, and esp. n. 22; Michael Swartz, *Scholastic Magic* (Princeton, 1996), 49; and below, n. 44. Cf. the responsum of

R. Hai in which he acknowledges hearing about *she'elot ḥalom* but is somewhat skeptical about the possibility of achieving them in his day (*Ozar ha-Geonim* [vol. 4] *le-Massekhet Ḥagigah*, ed. B. M. Lewin [Jerusalem, 1931], 17–18, 24–25; and see now *Teshuvot ha-Geonim ha-Hadashot*, ed. Simcha Emanuel [Jerusalem, 1996], 126, 137–38, and below, n. 10). Note the more positive reaction regarding *shirim u-ma'amarim* received via a dream in Moshe Ibn Ezra, *Sefer ha-‘Iyyunim ve-ha-Diyyunim*, ed. A. S. Halkin (Jerusalem, 1975), 121–23 [=*Shirat Yisra’el*], ed. B. Z. Halper (Leipzig, 1924), 101–8. See also A. J. Heschel, “Al Ruah ha-Qodesh Bimei ha-Benayim,” *Sefer ha-Yovel li-Khevod Alexander Marx* (New York, 1950), 176–77. For a dream experience similar to that of R. Simeon—in which R. Uri, the martyred brother of Rabiah, transmitted a *selihah* (and the tune to which it should be chanted) to another scholar, who then presented it—see below, n. 80.

On the transmissions of songs or *piyyutim* in dreams, cf. Shraga Abramson, ‘Inyanut be-Sifrut ha-Geonim’ (Jerusalem, 1974), 31–35; idem, “Navi, Ro’eh ve-Ḥozeḥ—R. Avraham ha-Ḥozeḥ,” *Sefer ha-Yovel li-Khevod ha-Rav Mordekhai Kirshblum* (Jerusalem, 1983), ed. David Telsner, 121–22; below, ch. 5, n. 67; and *Sefer Or Zarua*‘, pt. 2, sec. 276, regarding *U-Netanneh Toqef*. (R. Qalonymus b. Meshullam, who is listed as having received this *piyyut* from R. Amnon of Mainz, was a contemporary of R. Simeon ha-Gadol. See Grossman, *Hakhmei Ashkenaz ha-Rishonim*, 35, 101–2.) Reports of other instances of liturgical poems and melodies being received from the heavenly realm at this time in Mainz and other locales contribute to the historicity of the story of R. Amnon, or at least to the plausibility of its Ashkenazic origin. Cf. Ivan Marcus, “Qiddush ha-Shem be-Ashkenaz ve-Sippur R. Amnon mi-Magenza,” *Qedushat ha-Hayyim ve-Ḥeruf ha-Nefesh*, ed. I. Gafni and A. Ravitzky (Jerusalem, 1993), 140–45, and see now Eli Yassef, “Aggadah ve-Historiyyah,” *Zion* 64 (1999):192–200. [A version of *U-Netanneh Toqef*, quite close to the one attributed to R. Amnon, appears in the Cairo Geniza. See ms. B. M. Or. 5557G, fols. 67v–68v; *Mahzor le-Yamim ha-Nora’im*, ed. Goldschmidt, 2:404; Naftali Wieder, *Hitgabshut Nosah ha-Tefillah ba-Mizrah uve-Ma’arav* (Jerusalem, 1998), 1:441–42. Prof. Yosef Yahalom informs me that a forthcoming study will argue that this prayer is part of the corpus of the early medieval Israeli *payyetan* Yannai.] See also the description of R. Samuel of Spires, father of R. Judah *he-Hasid*, in ms. JNUL 8° 1070, fol. 58v: *אלו החרוזים ששמעו ר' שמואל משפירא בשעה שעלה לركע בשם הנורא המכבר שכח יפה*. On this passage, see Daniel Abrams’s review of *Shirat ha-Roqeḥ*, ed. Isaac Meiseles, in *Kabbalah* 1 (1996):285–87.

Receiving songs of angels and *sodot* through dreams or heavenly ascents was also part of the *Hekhalot* mystical experience. See Dan, “Hithavvut Torat ha-Sod ha-‘Ivrit,” 13–14. Dan holds that *Hasidei Ashkenaz* did not actually experience this as the *yordi ha-merkavah* did, but rather viewed these issues as keys to understanding God. Cf., however, Elliot Wolfson, *Through a Speculum That Shines* (Princeton, 1994), ch. 5, who offers extensive proofs in support of the experiential dimension of *hasidut Ashkenaz*. See also Peter Schäfer, “The Ideal of Piety of the Ashkenazi Hasidim and Its Roots in Jewish Tradition,” *Jewish History* 4 (1990):9–23. Cf. Nicholas Watson, “John the Monk’s *Book of Visions*,” *Conjuring Spirits*, ed. Claire Fanger (Phoenix Mill, 1998), 163–81.

CHAPTER 3

was also a proponent of directing prayer through angels, who could serve as intermediaries to the Divine realm and to the *kisse ha-Kavod*.⁴

In a *yozer* for *Shavu'ot*, R. Simeon describes the relationship between the female Torah and the male Deity and how the Torah rests on the knee of God, in addition to laying a foundation for a mystical motif involving the feet of God.⁵ Several fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Italian manuscripts record brief

⁴See *Seder ha-Selihot ke-Minhag Lita*, ed. Goldschmidt (Jerusalem, 1965), 189–90, and cf. Goldschmidt's introduction, 11–12, for the origins of these notions in *Hekhalot* literature. On prayer to angelic intermediaries, see Rashi, *Sanhedrin* 44b, s.v. *le-'olam yeva'qesh 'adam rahamim*. Rashi interprets a statement of R. Yohanan, *לעולם יבקש אדם שישים שיוו הכל מאמענן את כחיו ואל יהו לו צרים מלמעלה שישים עוזו מלאכיו דשות לבקש רחמים ושלא יהו לו מיטנים מלמעלה*, as follows: For additional approbation for the practice of directing prayers to angels, cf. *Shibbolei ha-Leqet*, ed. Solomon Buber (Vilna, 1887), sec. 282, in the name of R. Avigdor Katz (based on Rashi in *Sanhedrin* and a passage in *Shir ha-Shirim Rabbah*); Y. S. Zachter, "Teshuvah le-Ba'al ha-Roqeah be-'Inyan Amirat Makhnisei Rahamim," *Yeshurun* 3 (1997):41–46; Simcha Emanuel, "Al Amirat ha-Piyyut Makhnisei Rahamim," *Ha-Ma'ayan* 38:1 (1997):5–11; Shlomo Sprecher, "Ha-Polmos 'al Amirat Makhnisei Rahamim," *Yeshurun* 3, 706–18; *Sefer Gematri'ot le-R. Yehudah he-Hasid* (Los Angeles, 1998), Daniel Abram's introduction, 11, and Israel Ta-Shma's introduction, 16–18, and 61 (fol. 19r); *She'elot u-Teshuvot Mahari Bruna*, #274 (cited in *Seder ha-Selihot*, ed. Goldschmidt, 12, n. 12); below, n. 38, and ch. 5, nn. 15, 50. Note also the *piyyut* *דמעות העלוב* (written by the eleventh-century *payyetan* Moses b. Shabbetai of Rome, that was recited on the High Holidays in northern France. See *Ma'zor le-Yamim ha-Nora'im*, ed. Goldschmidt, 1:125–26. (On R. Shabbetai, see Grossman, *Hakhmei Ashkenaz ha-Rishonim*, 350.) See also the *kinah* *צין צפירה פאר* (end) by R. Meir b. Eleazar *ha-Darshan* of Lombardy, listed in Israel Davidson, *Ozar ha-Shirah veva-Piyyut* (New York, 1970), 3:323 (#36); the *selihah* *מלאכיו רחמים* by R. Samuel b. Judah *ha-Kohen* of Mainz, in *Seder ha-Selihot ke-Minhag Lita*, ed. Goldschmidt, 35–36 (and cf. Grossman, *Hakhmei Ashkenaz ha-Rishonim*, 325); *תפלת תקח* (end), by R. Meir *שליח ציבוד* (in Goldschmidt, 135–36); and R. Simon b. Isaac's *תורת הקדשה* (Goldschmidt, 166–68); and below, n. 111. Cf. ms. Cambr. Add. 858 (Ashkenaz, fifteenth century), fols. 46v–47r, which maintains that R. Simeon b. Isaac had a son named *Elhanan* who was kidnapped by Christians and eventually became the pope. He was reunited with his father under unusual circumstances, renounced Christianity, and followed in his father's footsteps, dying a martyr's death. This account (which has different versions) is, however, a later legend. Cf. Grossman, *Hakhmei Ashkenaz ha-Rishonim*, 89–90, and Eli Yassif, *Sippurei ha-'Am ha-'Ivri* (Jerusalem, 1994), 335–36. R. Simeon did have a descendant called (פַחַד ר' יִצְחָק הַזָּקָן בֶּן יוֹחָנָן), who transmitted *sodot ha-tefillah*; see Grossman, 91, 118, and above, ch. 2, n. 14. For other descendants of R. Simeon involved with *sod*, see below, ch. 4, n. 5 (R. Elhanan b. Yaqar), and ch. 5, n. 33 (R. Elijah Menahem of London).

⁵See Elliot Wolfson, "Images of God's Feet: Some Observations on the Divine Body in Judaism," *People of the Body*, ed. Howard Eilberg-Schwartz (Albany, 1990), 154. Cf. Wolfson, "Demut Ya'aqov Haquqah be-Kavod: 'Iyyun Nosaf be-Torat ha-Sod

magical and mystical techniques (*kabbalah ma'asit*) in the name of R. Simeon, usually in conjunction with *sodot ha-tefillah* and other esoteric teachings of the German Pietists, and occasionally with kabbalistic works. These include a “*Shem ha-meforash* that R. Simeon brought down from the heavens” (having ascended to the heavens using a mystical technique), which had been used in Creation (and could produce a *golem*),⁶ as well as *sod* interpretations of liturgical and esoteric texts,⁷ and a means of receiving heavenly guidance or prognostication upon awakening from a sleep induced through the use of specially prescribed Divine Names (בָּהַקִּין שָׁאֵלָה).⁸ Rabbenu Tam, citing a

shel Ḥasidut Ashkenaz,” *Massu'ot*, ed. Michal Oron and Amos Goldreich (Jerusalem, 1994), 174, n. 190, and 177, n. 209; and *idem*, *Along the Path* (Albany, 1995), 53, 150, n. 203. See also Wolfson, “The Mystical Significance of Torah-Study in German Pietism,” *JQR* 84 (1993):58, n. 59, for a *yozer* of R. Simeon *ha-Gadol* asserting that when a precept is performed, the Divine *Kavod* is increased or enhanced. *Kavod* here may refer not only to honor for God, but to the esoteric conception of the *Kavod*, which was developed in the thought of the German Pietists. Cf. Wolfson, *Along the Path*, 171, n. 307.

⁶For R. Simeon's *Shem ha-Meforash*, see Bodl. 1960, fol. 102r, and ms. B. M. 752, fol. 96. Cf. Gershom Scholem, “Ha-Im Nitgalleh ‘Izzavon ha-Sodot shel Abu Aharon ha-Bavli?” *Tarbiz* 32 (1963):255–57.

⁷See ms. Parma 540/3, fol. 19 [and cf. *Perushei Siddur ha-Tefillah la-Roqeah*, ed. Moshe Hershler (Jerusalem, 1992), 1:228–29; R. Simeon was part of the chain of *torat ha-sod* tradition of Ḥasidei Ashkenaz; cf. above, introduction, n. 13]; Cambr. Add. 647/9, fols. 30–39; B. M. 752, fol. 7r: *פָּרְשֵׁי שְׁכָטָא שֶׁל הַבּוֹרָא* ... *וּמָה שְׁכָתוּ בְּתּוֹרָה כִּי דַּעַל כְּסִיָּה*, *פָּרְשֵׁי שְׁכָטָא שֶׁל הַבּוֹרָא* ... *וְלֹא פִּירְשׁ מֵהַכְּשָׁרָנוּ אֲבָל פָּרְשֵׁי רַבִּינוּ יִתְבָּרֵךְ שָׁמוֹ לְאַיִלָּה שְׁלִים עַד שִׁיקָּח נְקָמָה בְּעַמְלָקָן*. and see below, n. 23.

⁸Ms. Sassoon 290, fol. 612: *שָׁאֵלָה בָּהַקִּין אֲמֻתִית וּמְנוּתָה בְּקַבְּלָה מִפְּרַט שְׁמֻעָן הַגּוֹל*. In preparation for this experience, the petitioner had to purify and immerse himself, don white clothing, observe a three-day preparation period, and adjure a series of Divine Names. These techniques reflect the influence of *Hekhalot* literature. See, e.g., Michael Swartz, “Like the Ministering Angels: Early Jewish Mysticism and Magic,” *AJS Review* 19 (1994):135–67; Rebecca Lesses, “Speaking with Angels: Jewish and Greco-Roman Revelatory Adjurations,” *Harvard Theological Review* 89 (1996):57; *idem*, “Ritual Practices and God's Power: Adjurations in the *Hekhalot* Literature, Jewish Amulets, and Greek Revelatory Adjurations” (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1995), 153–97; and *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur*, ed. Schäfer, secs. 501–7, 517, 623–39. See also ms. Sassoon 290, fol. 291 (sec. 777): “Wash and purify by nightfall, write in the evening on the left palm ... and lie down; this [dream] question is *beduqah* from the *hakham* R. Shabbetai.” Cf. *Harba de-Mosheh*, ed. Yuval Harari (Jerusalem, 1997), editor's introduction, 89–99. For additional *she'elat halom* material in ms. Sassoon 290, as well as *she'elat halom* techniques (including *she'elat be-haqiz*) in kabbalistic literature, see Moshe Idel, “Iyyunim be-Shitat Ba'al ‘Sefer ha-Meshiv,’” *Sefunot* n.s. 2 [17] (1983):201–26. Cf. the *she'elat halom* formula attributed to R. Judah *he-Hasid* in ms. Vienna 28 (Heb.

tradition of *Hakhmei Lothaire* that originated in the pre-Crusade period, characterized R. Simeon as a master of magical or esoteric techniques (מלומד) (בנסים).⁹

It should be noted that three of the prevailing elements in Jewish magical texts of late antiquity and the early middle ages—the magical and theurgic powers of Divine Names and their mystical meanings, the conjuring of angels as intermediaries to negotiate between Divine providence and earthly needs, and the magical application of Divine Names and ritual practices for the purposes of individuals¹⁰—are attributed to R. Simeon *ha-Gadol*. These same elements form the structure for the involvement of subsequent Ashkenazic rabbinic figures as well.

148), fol. 58r; Yosef Dan, “Le-Torat ha-*Halom* shel Ḥasidei Ashkenaz,” *Sinai* 68 (1971):288–93; and Monford Harris, *Studies in Jewish Dream Interpretation* (Northvale, 1994), 33–34. Harris (19–20) notes a distinction in *Sefer Ḥasidim* between visions, which one sees when awake, and dreams, which occur during sleep. For the general medieval context, see, e.g., Steven Kruger, *Dreaming in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1992), 99–122; *Moreh Nevukhim*, 2:36; and Ronald Finucane, *Miracles and Pilgrims: Popular Beliefs in Medieval England* (New York, 1977), 83–85. On the notion of *she’elat be-haqiq*, cf. the commentaries of Radaq and Ralbag to 1 Samuel 28:6; P. Schäfer and S. Shaked, *Magische Texte aus der Kairoer-Geniza*, vol. 1 (Tübingen, 1994), 133–50; and see also Lesses, “Ritual Practices and God’s Power,” 274–98.

On *she’elat halom* in medieval rabbinic literature, see Joshua Trachtenberg, *Jewish Magic and Superstition* (New York, 1939), 241–43; *She’elot u-Teshuvot min ha-Shamayim*, ed. Margoliot, editor’s introduction, 15–20; Heschel, “Al Ruah ha-Qodesh Bimei ha-Benayim,” 198–201; Isaac Pehah, “Divrei *Halomot ba-Halakhah*,” *Tehumin* 5 (1984):422–26; and below, n. 115, and ch. 5, nn. 22, 49. Cf. Ibn Ezra’s long commentary to Exodus 14:19, and 28:9; his short commentary to Exodus 3:15; and R. Bahye b. Asher’s commentary to Deuteronomy 29:28 (end). On the phrases בזק [אmittah / טוביה] ומנטה with regard to magical teachings and *segulot* (including general medieval parallels), see H. J. Zimmels, *Magicians, Theologians and Doctors* (London, 1952), 112, n. 1; and ms. Vat. 244, *passim*.

⁹See *Mahzor Vitry*, ed. Simon Hurwitz (Nuremberg, 1923), 364; *Shibbolei ha-Leqet ha-Shalem*, ed. Buber, sec. 28 (p. 26) [=ed. S. K. Mirsky (New York, 1966), 216]. Cf. Avraham Grossman, “Zemihat Parshanut ha-Piyyut,” *Sefer Yovel li-Shelomoh Simonsohn* (Tel Aviv, 1993), 69; Moshe Idel, *Kabbalah: New Perspectives* (New Haven, 1988), 320, n. 119; *Teshuvot Ḥatam Sofer*, OH, #16; and below, ch. 5, n. 24. The Talmud refers to both R. Shim'on bar Yohai and R. Nahum of Gimzo as *melummad be-nissim*, although the connotation may be somewhat different. See *Me'ilah* 17b, and *Sanhedrin* 109a. R. Simeon is also characterized as בֶּן סְגָלָתָה of R. Elijah *ha-Zaqen*; see above, ch. 1, n. 24.

¹⁰See Schäfer, *The Hidden and Manifest God*, 49, 81, 89–92, 105–7, 109, 112, 143–45, 150–59, 161, 165; Swartz, *Scholastic Magic*, 18–20, 157–58; idem, “Scribal Magic and Its Rhetoric: Formal Patterns in Hebrew and Aramaic Incantation texts from the Cairo Genizah,” *Harvard Theological Review* 83 (1990):179; idem, “Magical Piety in

R. Eliezer *ha-Gadol* (c.990–1060), a prominent ancestor of R. Judah *he-Hasid*, was the source of a number of liturgical and ritual interpretations and customs.¹¹ Among them is the practice at the Passover Seder, presented by R. Eleazar of Worms, of repeatedly dipping a finger in the cup of wine and releasing sixteen drops, as the various plague listings are recited during the Seder. According to R. Eleazar, this practice was transmitted by R. Eliezer *ha-Gadol* and his household to subsequent Qalonymides. Some who had not received this tradition were apparently unsure of its authenticity and purpose. It was understood by the Qalonymides, however, as a means of summoning or conjuring the sixteen-sided avenging sword of the Almighty. This Divine sword could diminish the powers of pestilence and other *maziqin* that were represented by the sixteen times the word *dever* is mentioned in the book of Jeremiah. In addition, the sword could grant meaningful life. This aspect of the sword's powers is symbolized by the sixteen scheduled weekly 'aliyyot to the Torah (characterized in the Bible as a source of life) and by the eight references to life in the special insertions during the 'Amidah of the High Holidays that

Ancient and Medieval Judaism," *Ancient Magic and Ritual Power*, ed. Marvin Meyer and Paul Mirecki (Leiden, 1995), 171; Norman Golb, "Aspects of the Historical Background of Jewish Life in Medieval Egypt," *Jewish Medieval and Renaissance Studies*, ed. Alexander Altmann (Cambridge, Mass., 1967), 12–16; L. H. Schiffman and M. D. Swartz, *Hebrew and Aramaic Incantation texts from the Cairo Genizah* (Sheffield, 1992), 12–22; Brigitte Kern-Ulner, "The Depiction of Magic in Rabbinic Texts: The Rabbinic and the Greek Concept of Magic," *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 27 (1996): 289–303; and *Magische Texte aus der Kairoer-Geniza*, ed. Schäfer and Shaked, vol. 2, 1–6, 35, 43, 71, 155, 171, 275. See also the responsum of R. Hai, possibly to R. Nissim Gaon, on various issues of magic and sorcery. (For the most complete version, see now *Teshuvot ha-Geonim ha-Hadashot*, ed. Emanuel, sec. 115, 124–46.) Among the magical techniques discussed by R. Hai are the use of Divine Names for a variety of purposes: knowledge and transmission of these names, *she'elat halom*, and various forms of *kishuf*. On the use of Divine Names to be saved from robbers, to harm someone, or for *qefizat ha-derekh*, see, e.g., *Megillat Ahima'az*, ed. Klar, above, n. 1; Sharon Koren, "Mysticism and Menstruation: The Significance of Female Impurity in Jewish Spirituality"; (Ph.D. diss., Yale, 1999), ch. 1; Markerman and Shulamit Adler, "Path Jumping in the Jewish Magical Tradition," *Jewish Studies Quarterly* 1 (1993–94):131–48; and Yuval Harari, "Im Biqqashta Laharog Ben Adam: Kishfei Hezeq ve-Hitgonenut Mipneihem ba-Mageyah ha-Yehudit ha-Qedumah," *Madda'ei ha-Yahadut* 37 (1997):111–42; and *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur*, ed. Schäfer, sec. 830. See also Gershom Scholem, *Reshit ha-Qabbalah* (Tel Aviv, 1948), 203; Richard Kieckhefer, *Magic in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1989), 85–90; and below, ch. 4, sec. 2.

¹¹ Grossman, *Hakhmei Ashkenaz ha-Rishonim*, 230–31. See also below, n. 25. On R. Eliezer's piety, see Grossman, 221–23.

CHAPTER 3

were recited twice during each prayer service (by the congregation and by the *hazzan*) for a total of sixteen times.¹²

R. Qalonymus b. Isaac, a grandson of R. Eliezer *ha-Gadol* (and the father of R. Samuel *he-Hasid*) lived in Mainz during the late eleventh century, and he was a link in the transmission of Qalonymide *sod* traditions. Indeed, R. Qalonymus, who is referred to as both *ha-zaqen* and *he-hasid*, was listed as one of those who followed the custom of spilling the drops of wine during the Passover Seder. Moreover, R. Qalonymus also wrote, in an unrelated context, of the sixteen-sided sword of the Almighty. According to R. Qalonymus, God would use this sword to slay the angel of death. R. Qalonymus gives the source of this teaching as *Sefer Hekhalot*.¹³

¹²In addition to being found in *Sefer Amarkal*, fol. 27a, and in ms. Bodl. 1103, fol. 34v [which are cited by Grossman, *Hakhmei Ashkenaz ha-Rishonim*, 230, n. 105; and see also the citations in Israel Yuval, “Ha-Naqam veha-Qelalah, ha-Dam veha-‘Alilah,” *Zion* 58 (1993):38–39], this passage appears, with variants, in ms. B. M. 610 (Add. 14762), fol. 17r (in the margin), and in ms. Frankfurt 227, fol. 67r. Cf. *Tosafot ha-Shalem*, *Haggadah shel Pesah*, ed. Jacob Gellis (Jerusalem, 1989), 94; *Sefer Roqeah*, *Hilkhot Yom ha-Kippurim*, sec. 214 (p. 107); ms. Bodl. 2273 (a Torah commentary composed in the early thirteenth century by a R. Avigdor, who appears to have been associated with *Hasidei Ashkenaz*; see above, ch. 2, n. 9), fol. 8r–9v; and see A. Y. Goldmintz, “Perush ha-Torah le-R. Avigdor,” *Sefer Zikkaron le-R. Shemu’el Barukh Werner*, ed. Yosef Buksboim (Jerusalem, 1996), 177–79. [At this point, ms. Bodl. 2273 also mentions that the priestly blessing was done each day; see Zimmer, ‘Olam ke-Minhago Noheg, 135–40, and cf. above, ch. 2, n. 86.] Ms. Bodl. 945, a biblical commentary composed by Eleazar (or Eliezer) b. Moses *ha-Darshan*, a grandson of R. Samuel *he-Hasid* (cf. above, ch. 2, n. 52), suggests (fol. 72v) that the sword is alluded to by Exodus 15:3. This verse, which characterizes God as a warrior, begins with the letter *yod* (10) and ends with the letter *vav* (6). See *Tosafot ha-Shalem*, ed. Gellis, 7:221. [On the compiler of this commentary, see *Kitvei R. Avraham Epstein* 1 (Jerusalem, 1950):250, n. 11; Israel Ta-Shma in *Shalem* 6 (1992):315–16; and Adolf Neubauer, in the next note.] Cf. *Darkhei Moshe* to O. H. 473, sec. 18. For the sequencing of items that represent the number sixteen in texts associated with *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, see also ms. Vat. 324, fol. 4r, cited in Moshe Hallamish, “Be‘ayyot be-Heqer Hashpa‘at ha-Qabbalah ‘al ha-Tefillah,” *Massu‘ot*, ed. Oron and Goldreich, 215; *Sefer Gematri‘ot le-R. Yehudah he-Hasid*, 29 (fol. 3r); and cf. Bodl. 1575, fol. 24r. [Note also *Shibbolei ha-Leqet*, sec. 218: פִּי אֲחִי נָטוּרָה זוֹ הַחֲרֵב, רִבְנִים כָּל הַאוֹתּוֹת שָׁעַשָּׂה בְּמִצְרָיִם. On this passage, see below, ch. 5, n. 33; and cf. *Harba de-Mosheh*, ed. Harari, editor’s introduction, 54–58.]

¹³Parma 541, fol. 266v, sec. 78. For an example of this notion in *Hekhalot* literature, see *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur*, ed. Schäfer, #49. See also B. Z. Luria, “‘Harbel’ ve-Gilgulah be-Sifrut ha-Midrash,” *Beit Miqra* 7:4 (1963):107–8; and the passage in *Midrash Avkir*, published by A. Marmorstein, *Me’assef Devir* 1 (1923):138ff. [On the relationship between this midrash and *Hekhalot* literature, and the citation of

This passage appears as part of a larger section or treatise of *segullot* and *hashba'ot* in an Ashkenazic manuscript (Parma 541) that was copied in the thirteenth or fourteenth century. Although some of the material is recorded anonymously and may represent the pre-Crusade period, as the R. Qalonymus passage does, names of twelfth- and thirteenth-century German Pietists and

this midrash in particular by Ashkenazic scholars and German Pietists (esp. R. Eleazar of Worms), see Adolf Neubauer, "Le Midrasch Tanhuma," *REJ* 14 (1887):109–10 (cited in Bodl. 945, the Torah commentary attributed to a grandson of R. Samuel *he-Hasid*, see the previous note); Moshe Idel, "Ha-Mahshavah ha-Ra'ah' shel ha-E-l," *Tarbiz* 49 (1980):358–59, nn. 7–8; *Perushei Siddur ha-Tefillah la-Roqeah*, ed. Hershler, 1:294, 2:428, 467; Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:395; *Arugat ha-Bosem*, ed. Urbach, 4:173–74; ms. Paris 640, fol. 13d; R. Avigdor Katz in *Perushim u-Fesaqim le-R. Avigdor* (Jerusalem, 1996), 123–24 (see above, ch. 2, n. 28); and cf. Idel, *Kabbalah: New Perspectives* (New Haven, 1988), 117–22. See also Toviah b. Eliezer, *Leqah Tov (Pesiqta Zutarti)*, ed. Solomon Buber (Vilna, 1880), editor's introduction, 40; Solomon Buber in *Ha-Shahar* 11 (1883):339; M. D. Herr in *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, 16:1516–17; Epstein, *Mi-Qadmoniyyot ha-Yehudim*, 301–4.]

This idea is found also in *Midrash Tehillim* (*Shohet Tov*), ed. Solomon Buber (Vilna, 1891) [to Psalms 31, sec. 6 and 78, sec. 19, and cf. 36, sec. 8], but R. Qalonymus mentions only the *Hekhalot* source. Although the locale and date of the composition of *Midrash Tehillim* are far from certain (Israel or Byzantium during the geonic period?), it is likely that this material came to the midrash from the *Hekhalot* literature rather than vice versa. Cf. Moshe Idel, "Tefisat ha-Torah ba-Hekhalot uva-Kabbalah," *Mehqerei Yerushalayim be-Mahshevet Yisra'el* 1 (1981):36–37, n. 39. (On the dating of the *Hekhalot* corpus, see, e.g., Wolfson, *Through a Speculum That Shines*, 74–81, and Swartz, *Scholastic Magic*, 9–13.) Indeed, *Midrash Tehillim*, and *Midrash Mishlei* as well, contain a number of allusions to rituals and mystical and magical materials of Ashkenazic provenance (although it should be noted that the passages about the sixteen-sided sword do not appear solely in the Ashkenazic manuscripts of the midrash). See *Midrash Tehillim*, ed. Buber, editor's introduction, sec. 12, and 128, n. 36 (at Psalms 17:5); Israel Ta-Shma, *Minhag Ashkenaz ha-Qadmon* (Jerusalem, 1992), 142–43, 202, 285; idem, *Ha-Nigleh shebe-Nistar* (Tel Aviv, 1995), 22. See also *The Midrash on Proverbs*, ed. Burton Visotsky (New Haven, 1992), editor's introduction, 3–4, 10; and see also 128, n. 28; 136, n. 9; 139–40, nn. 39, 45, 51; 142, n. 7; 146, n. 10. And cf. Gershom Scholem, "Reste neuplatonischer Spekulation in der Mystik der Deutschen Chassidim und ihre Vermittlung durch Abraham bar Chiya," *MGWJ* 75 (1931):175, n. 3. Note also the citation from *Midrash Tehillim* in *Sefer Roqeah*, in the final section of *hilkhot hasidut* (שְׁרָוֶת הַיְהוּדָה וְשְׁמוֹ וּמְרֻכְבָּה וּסְדוּתָיו), and cf. *SHP* 1044, and below, ch. 5, n. 43. My thanks to Mordechai Silverstein, who is writing a doctoral dissertation at Hebrew University on *Midrash Tehillim*, for checking the manuscripts of the midrash and for confirming a number of my impressions. On R. Qalonymus b. Isaac and the transmission of *sod* in early Ashkenaz, see also Grossman, *Ḥakhmei Ashkenaz ha-Rishonim*, 398, n. 175, 418, 423.

CHAPTER 3

tosafists also appear (including R. Menaḥem of Joigny, a student of Rabbi Tam), in addition to Ashkenazic rabbinic figures whose identities are unclear.¹⁴ Among the magical techniques and aims described, without attribution, are the transporting of a person from afar, the apprehension of a thief through the recitation of various Divine Names, and the achieving of *petiḥat ha-lev*.

In the Parma manuscript passage, *petiḥat ha-lev* connotes the ability to understand Torah teachings clearly and recall those teachings effortlessly.¹⁵ According to this manuscript passage, the state of *petiḥat ha-lev* was to be accomplished through the writing of a request formula (and adjuration) on a well-boiled egg that was determined to have been the first ever laid by a hen, by the recitation of the adjuration that was directed to the *Sar ha-Torah* as well as the *Sar ha-Panim*, and by eating the egg. These procedures, and the angels to whom they are directed, reflect known concepts and figures within *Hekhalot* literature, although the precise application in the Ashkenazic text at hand constitutes a partial synthesis of different *Hekhalot* rituals.¹⁶

Similar procedures for achieving *petiḥat ha-lev* and for fending off forgetfulness were also part of an educational initiation ceremony, as well as other ritual practices that appear in rabbinic texts from both northern France

¹⁴See ms. Parma 541, fols. 262r–263v, 266v–267r, secs. 76–83. On this section of the ms., see also above, ch. 1, n. 163; ch. 2, n. 9; and below, ch. 4, nn. 31–32. Regarding R. Qalonymus *he-Hasid*, cf. Dan, *Torat ha-Sod shel Hasidut Ashkenaz*, 59, n. 36.

¹⁵Cf. Israel Ta-Shma, “*Sefer ha-Maskil*”—*Hibbur Yehudi-Zarefat* *Bilti-Yadua*‘ *mi-Sof ha-Me’ah ha-Yod Gimmel*,” *Mehqerei Yerushalayim be-Maḥshevet Yisra’el* 2:3 (1983):436–37; idem, *Minhag Ashkenaz ha-Qadmon*, 213–14; Ivan Marcus, *Rituals of Childhood* (New Haven, 1996), 49–50, 56–57, 115–16; Ta-Shma’s review in *JQR* 87 (1996):237–38; and Scholem, *Reshit ha-Qabbalah*, 65, n. 1. [On the connotation of *lev satum*, see *SHP*, sec. 748, and Ralbag’s commentary to Job 39:30.]

¹⁶See, e.g., Peter Schäfer, “Jewish Magic Literature in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages,” *JJS* 41 (1990):75–91; idem, *The Hidden and Manifest God*, 89–95, 106–7, 114–17, 142–45; and M. D. Swartz, “Magical Piety in Ancient and Medieval Judaism,” *Ancient Magic and Ritual Power*, ed. Meyer and Mirecki, 167–83. For memory practices, see Swartz, *Scholastic Magic*, 33–50, and Rebecca Leses, “The Adjuration of the Prince of the Presence: Performative Utterance in a Jewish Ritual,” *Ancient Magic and Ritual Power*, 185–206. On *petiḥat ha-lev* and memory, see Gerrit Bos, “Jewish Tradition on Strengthening Memory and Leone Modena’s Evaluation,” *Jewish Studies Quarterly* 2 (1995):41–45. On the development of a culture of memory in thirteenth-century northern Europe, see Jacques Le Goff, *The Medieval Imagination* (Chicago, 1988), 78–80. On the heart as a seat of memory, see, e.g., Mary Carruthers, *The Book of Memory* (Cambridge, 1990), 48–49, and the sources cited in Eric Jager, “The Book of the Heart: Reading and Writing the Medieval Subject,” *Speculum* 71 (1996):2, n. 4. Cf. Ioan Couliano, *Eros and Magic in the Renaissance* (Chicago, 1987), 132–35.

and Germany in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.¹⁷ In the educational initiation ceremony, a teacher cited biblical verses (and letters of the alphabet) that were written both on a cake whose dough had been kneaded with honey and on hard-boiled eggs. The young initiate then imitated what he heard; he ate these foods and the verses on them. One version of this ceremony contains a magical incantation against *Potah*, the prince of forgetfulness, which was intended to ensure that the child would succeed in his studies and remember what he learned. Divine Names were invoked to activate this adjuration.¹⁸ In addition, all the German versions of this ceremony place it on the festival of *Shavu'ot*. According to *Sar ha-Torah* and other *Hekhalot* magical texts, *Shavu'ot* was the most propitious time to draw down Torah knowledge using magical techniques, for it was then that adepts would conjure the *Sar ha-Torah*.¹⁹

Ivan Marcus, in his analysis of the initiation ceremony, cites formulations from R. Eleazar *ha-Qallir*, R. Sa'adyah Gaon, and *Sefer Raziel* (a work that often reflects geonic and other early medieval traditions) as models of magical techniques for “acquiring wisdom” or *petihat ha-lev* that involved the eating of cakes or eggs.²⁰ The procedure for achieving *petihat ha-lev* through the eating of the magical egg, as outlined in ms. Parma 541, suggests that the use of adjurations and *Shemot* for magical purposes was in vogue within Ashkenaz itself in the late eleventh or early twelfth century²¹—even before the first recorded description of the educational initiation ceremony.²²

¹⁷See, e.g., Marcus, *Rituals of Childhood*, and Scholem, “Havdalah de-R. Aqivah: Maqr le-Massoret Mageyah ha-Yehudit bi-Tequfat ha-Geonim,” 243–49, 256, 278–79.

¹⁸See Marcus, *Rituals of Childhood*, 29–31, 68. This version, found in *Sefer Assufot* (which was composed by a student of R. Eleazar of Worms and Rabiah; see above, ch. 1, nn. 37, 47, and below, ch. 4, n. 57), also includes several verses from Psalm 119 (a psalm that contains allusions to “expanding the heart”), among those to be inscribed on the cake and the egg. Cf. ms. JTS Mic. 8114 (end), fol. 17v.

¹⁹See Marcus, *Rituals of Childhood*, 45–46, 66–67, 151, n. 29. Marcus also notes the use of magical eggs (fresh, roasted, and eaten with incantations on them) in *Hekhalot* texts and in *Harba de-Mosheh*. [See also R. Benjamin Beinish *ha-Kohen* of Krotoshin, *Amtahat Binyamin*, ed. Moshe Bakal (Jerusalem, 1970), 39, 76. On this work, which was written in 1716, see now Immanuel Etkes (above, introduction, n. 29).] Although the version of the initiation ceremony found in *Mahzor Vitry* does not mention *Shavu'ot*, it links the ceremony to *mattan Torah*. See Marcus, 25–32, and cf. Swartz, *Scholastic Magic*, 43–67; and below, ch. 5, n. 63.

²⁰See Marcus, *Rituals of Childhood*, 59–67, and Ezra Fleischer, “Inyanim Qiliriyim,” *Tarbiz* 50 (1981):282–302. Note the association of R. Eleazar *ha-Qallir* with magical cakes by R. Nathan b. Yehiel of Rome, author of the *Sefer ha-'Arukha*. Cf. Schäfer, *The Hidden and Manifest God*, 92–95, and Joseph Naveh and Shaul Shaked, *Magical Spells and Formulae* (Jerusalem, 1993), 160–62, 177–78, 181–85.

CHAPTER 3

R. Meshullam b. Moses (d.1094), a contemporary of R. Qalonymus b. Isaac in Mainz, describes the mystical completion of the name of God that is alluded to and achieved through the recitation of the Kaddish.²³ Together with

²¹Ms. Parma 1033 (Ashkenaz, 1310), fol. 25v, col. 2, records a recommendation that one who wishes to remember what he has studied should recite a magical formula over a cup of wine or beer. This formula includes an adjuration, **בָּשָׂם פָּתָחָא רְפֵאָא יְפֵתָחָה** and **לְבִי שְׁלָא אַשְׁכָּה מֵה שְׁלָמָדָה וּמֵה שְׁנָנָתִי לְעוּלָם**. In addition, the person may take a small cake, knead it with honey, inscribe on it two verses from Ezekiel (3:2–3, in which Ezekiel envisions himself eating God's words) as well as the alphabet, and eat the cake. Cf. Marcus, *Rituals of Childhood*, 53–65; ms. Bodl. 1598, fols. 92v–93v; ms. Vat. 244, fol. 31r; and Swartz, *Scholastic Magic*, 161, n. 49. The section of ms. Parma 1033 in which this passage is found contains halakhic material from the Rhineland in the late eleventh century, various anonymous formulae to achieve happiness and success (including *petihat ha-lev*) or protection, a *shemirat ha-derekh* attributed to R. Eleazar of Worms (see above, ch. 2, n. 10), and several pietistic modes of conduct in the name of R. Judah *he-Hasid* (see above, ch. 1, n. 12).

Ms. Vat. 243, a sixteenth-century Italian manuscript that contains magical practices attributed to a number of tosafists (see below, ch. 5, nn. 16, 46, 78), records a technique for achieving *petihat ha-lev* (fol. 13r) that is also quite similar to aspects of the passage in Parma 541. It calls for taking the first egg from a hen that has never laid an egg before, boiling the egg, and writing a formula with *Shemot* on it. [Cf. Naveh and Shaked, *Magic Spells and Formulae*, 177, for a magical technique, using a new egg, to induce sleep.] For other similar *petihat ha-lev* techniques in medieval Ashkenaz rabbinic circles, see ms. Vat. 243, fols. 4v, 12r [a *petihat ha-lev* for every *Moza'ei Shabbat*, to insure that *Potah*, the angel of forgetfulness, should not rule, using the names נָאָפָּס סָגָּף נָאָפָּס; see below, n. 59]; ms. Paris 716, fol. 23r; and ms. Vienna 28 (Hebrew 148), fol. 57r; mss. JNUL 8°476, fol. 23r, and 8°397, fol. 207r; and Gershom Scholem, *Kitvei Yad be-Qabbalah* (Jerusalem, 1930), 8, 110. Cf. *Sefer Gematri'ot le-R. Yehudah he-Hasid*, 95–96 (fol. 36):

ט. פְּסָוקִים שְׁכָתִ' בָּהּ יְשִׁירֵ' לְבִזְבָּחָן לְאַוְרָם לְנַעַר הַמְּכַנְּסִין אָוֹתּוּ לְיַאֲשׁוֹנָה לְמַקְרָא.

²²The angelic figure גָּלִיצָר, associated in the Parma 541 text with the adjuration on the egg שָׁר הַתּוֹרָה גָּלִיצָר הַמְּגַלָּה טֻמְמַנְתָּה אַנְיָלִיטִיךְ (and שָׁר הַפְּנִים שֵׁם אַ-הַיָּה אַ-שְּׁר אַ-הַיָּה), is found in ms. Sassoon 290, sec. 1024 (fol. 387) as part of a *segullah* from R. Judah *he-Hasid* to stop blood from the nostrils (דָם נְחִירִים). Cf. R. Benjamin Beinish, *Amatahat Binyamin*, ed. M. Bakal (Jerusalem, 1970), 75–76. On this angel's roles in *Hechalot* literature, see David Halperin, *The Faces of the Chariot* (Tübingen, 1988), 416–17; and cf. Margoliot, *Mal'akhei Elyon*, 47, sec. 63. [On גָּלִיגָּאָל as the *Sar ha-Torah* in the Parma passage, see Margoliot, 54, sec. 93; and cf. Ta-Shma, *Ha-Nigleh shebe-Nistar*, 97, n. 59a, and Halperin, 408.] Ms. Sassoon 290, sec. 1019, fol. 385, also has a *petihat ha-lev* technique using a newly laid egg (בִּיאָה בַת יוֹמָא), which is characterized as טֻבָּה וּמְנוּסָה. The egg is boiled, various Divine *Shemot* are written on it, and it is eaten within one hour. Cf. *Synopse zur Hechalot-Literatur*, ed. Schäfer, secs. 574–78.

²³Ms. JNUL 8° 3037, fol. 37r, cited in Haviva Pedaya, "Mashber ba-E-lohut ve-Tiqquno ha-Te'urgi be-Qabbalat R. Yizḥak Sagi Nahor ve-Talmidav" (Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University, 1989), 261, n. 52: ... הַכְּסָה וּשְׁמִינְלָאוּ שִׁיחָה שְׁלָמִים ...

Mysticism and Magic

R. Qalonymus b. Isaac, R. Meshullam is credited with maintaining interest in mysticism in Mainz in the last part of the eleventh century. Several texts and piyyutim link R. Meshullam to *sodot* that were later received by the German Pietists. Several of the piyyutim reflect the influence of *Hekhalot* literature, although some of these may have been composed by R. Meshullam b. Qalonymus of Lucca (d.c.1000), rather than by R. Meshullam b. Moses.²⁴ R. Meshullam's son, R. Eleazar (or Eliezer), *hazzan* of Spires, was known for prolonging the chanting of *Barekhu* at the conclusion of the Sabbath—a prayer practice commended later by the German Pietists as a means of prolonging the return of the souls to *gehinnom*. Indeed, R. Eliezer *Hazzan* was another direct link in the chain of *sodot ha-tefillah* (and esoteric or magical practices, including the spilling of sixteen drops of wine during the Seder described above) that were transmitted from the Qalonymides to R. Judah *he-Hasid*. R. Eliezer passed these secrets to R. Judah's father, R. Samuel *he-Hasid*.²⁵ R. Jacob b. Yaqr, Rashi's principal teacher, also displayed a distinct interest in *Sefer Yezirah*²⁶ and appears, on the basis of manuscript fragments, to have composed a commentary on it.²⁷

Pedaya also cites a related formulation of R. Eliezer *ha-Gadol* from ms. JNUL 8° 4199, fol. 35. See also above, n. 7, regarding R. Simeon *ha-Gadol*, and below, n. 55. On R. Meshullam's ascetic practices, see *Ma'aseh ha-Geonim*, 34; and see above, ch. 1, n. 21.

²⁴See Grossman, *Hakhmei Ashkenaz ha-Rishonim* 76–78, and above, n. 9; also Abraham Epstein, *Mi-Qadmoniyot ha-Yehudim*, ed. A. M. Habermann (Jerusalem, 1958), 232–34. Cf. Scholem, “Reste neuplatonischer Spekulation in der Mystik der Deutschen Chassidim,” 173, n. 4.

²⁵Grossman, *Hakhmei Ashkenaz ha-Rishonim*, 390–91. See also above, ch. 2, n. 7. [The manuscript text referred to by Grossman in 390, n. 136, can be found in *Perushei Siddur ha-Tefillah la-Roqeah*, 2:588. The reference to *Sefer Or Zarua*^c in this note should be to pt. 2, sec. 89 (end). See also ms. Paris 1408, fol. 143v.] R. Eliezer's student, R. Shemaryah b. Mordekhai of Spires—a contemporary (and neighbor) of R. Samuel *he-Hasid*—formally derived the practice of donating to charity in memory of departed souls from a passage in *Sifrei*. This derivation appears in *Sefer Hasidim*, which further encouraged the practice. See Ta-Shma, *Minhag Ashkenaz ha-Qadmon*, 301, n. 9; and above, ch. 1, n. 178. On the significance of prolonging the *Barekhu* prayer, see also below, n. 56.

²⁶On the esoteric nature of *Sefer Yezirah* and its use as a magical text, see, e.g., Gershom Scholem, *Origins of the Kabbalah* (Princeton, 1987), 24–35; Moshe Idel, *Golem* (Albany, 1990), passim; Wolfson, “The Theosophy of Shabbetai Donnolo,” 286–87; and idem, *Through a Speculum That Shines*, 70–72, 138–43. Cf. Yosef Dan, “Ha-Mashma‘ut ha-Datit shel Sefer Yezirah,” *Mehqerei Yerushalayim be-Mahshevet Yisra’el* 11 (1993): 7–35.

²⁷Ms. Rome Angelica Or. 45, fol. 118–19, noted in Grossman, *Hakhmei Ashkenaz ha-Rishonim*, 257; see also Idel, *Golem*, 58. [On R. Jacob b. Yaqr as a role model for

CHAPTER 3

II

Rashi was himself familiar with mystical traditions on Divine Names and with a number of esoteric texts and magical and theurgic techniques. In his talmudic commentary to tractate *Sukkah*, Rashi reproduces a scriptural derivation for the Divine Name of seventy-two letters that is found in *Sefer ha-Bahir*.²⁸ He explains, as did an anonymous Ashkenazic contemporary, that the creation of various beings by rabbinic scholars described in talmudic literature was accomplished by means of letter combinations involving Divine

R. Judah *he-Hasid*, see *SHP* 99; Grossman, 246; D. Berger's review of Grossman, "Rabbanut Ashkenaz ha-Qedumah," *Tarbiz* 53 (1984):486–87; Eli Yasif, "Rashi Legends and Medieval Popular Culture," *Rashi, 1040–1990: Hommage à Ephraim Urbach*, ed. Gabrielle Sed-Rajna (Paris, 1993), 486; and above, ch. 1, n. 12.] Rabbenu Gershom, who taught R. Jacob at Mainz, may have also composed a commentary to *Sefer Yetzirah* or contributed to a so-called Mainz commentary. See Grossman, 149. Also see Israel Ta-Shma in *Qiryat Sefer* 53 (1978):361, n. 15*; *Qiryat Sefer* 57 (1982):705; and *Qiryat Sefer* 60 (1985):307, nn. 50–51.

²⁸See Rashi's commentary to *Sukkah* 45a, s.v. *'ani va-ho*, and *Sefer ha-Bahir*, ed. Reuven Margoliot (Jerusalem, 1978), secs. 106, 110 [=ed. Daniel Abrams (Los Angeles, 1994), secs. 76, 79]. Cf. *Leqah Tov* (*Pesiqa Zutarti*) to Exodus 14:21, ed. Buber, 88; *Midrash Sekhel Tov*, loc. cit; Ibn Ezra's citation from *Sefer Razi'el* in his long commentary to Exodus 14:19; and Ibn Ezra's short commentary to Exodus 3:15 (citing *Sefer ha-Razim*). See also the discussion of this derivation in R. Eleazar of Worms's commentary on the liturgy, analyzed in Wolfson, *Through a Speculum That Shines*, 235–36; the so-called *Perush ha-Roqeah 'al ha-Torah*, ed. Chaim Konyevsky, vol. 2 (Bnei Brak, 1980), 73; and *Sefer Gematri'ot le-R. Yehudah he-Hasid*, introduction, 9–10, n. 46. Cf. Mark Verman, *The Books of Contemplation* (Albany, 1992), 162; Jordan Penkower, *Nosah ha-Torah be-Keter Aram ḽovah* (Ramat Gan, 1992), 48, n. 116; and below, n. 89. The Rashi passage was cited, in turn, by Nahmanides in the introduction to his Torah commentary, where he sets forth his kabbalistic schema that the Torah is composed entirely of Divine Names; see Moshe Idel, "Tefisat ha-Torah be-Sifrut ha-Hekhalot ve-Gilgulehah ba-Qabbalah," *Mehqerei Yerushalayim be-Mahshevot Yisra'el* 1 (1981):52–53; and below, ch. 5, n. 30. Rashi indicates in other places those Divine Names about which he received no interpretation or tradition. See *Qiddushin* 71a: *שם בן שתים עשרה* וּבָן אַרְבָּעִים וּשְׁתִים לְאַפְרִישׁוּ לְנָ. Cf. *Sanhedrin* 101b, s.v. *uvi-leshon*, and *Sanhedrin* 60a, s.v. *Shem ben 'arba 'otiyot*.

On the other hand, Rashi seems to have been better informed than certain Geonim with regard to the Name of seventy-two letters. Cf. the responsum of R. Hai in *Teshuvot ha-Geonim ha-Hadashot*, ed. Emanuel, 134–35, and Theodore Schrire, *Hebrew Magic Amulets* (London, 1966), 93–99. On R. Hai's attitude toward esoteric knowledge and techniques, especially the use of *Shemot* for magic and theurgic purposes, see Trachtenberg, *Jewish Magic and Superstition*, 88–89, 94; Baron, *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*, 6:125–29, and cf. 5:45–46 regarding R. Ḥanan'el; Idel, *Kabbalah: New Perspectives*, 90–91; idem, *The Mystical Experience in Abraham Abulafia* (Albany,

Names as contained in *Sefer Yezirah* or *Hilkhot Yezirah*.²⁹ While *Sefer Yezirah* is mentioned in one of the talmudic passages on which Rashi comments, Moshe Idel has shown that the specific methods advocated by Rashi—which adumbrate methods recorded by R. Eleazar of Worms—are not inherent in the talmudic passages themselves, nor can they be derived directly from extant versions of *Sefer Yezirah*.³⁰ This indicates that Rashi was familiar with, and possibly even involved in, the formulation of independent *torat ha-sod* and magical concepts, and was not merely reflecting talmudic or rabbinic material. Rashi refers to *Sefer Yezirah* on other occasions in his biblical and talmudic commentaries, in the contexts of letter combination and Creation. In one instance, the reference is to a nonextant version of *Sefer Yezirah* that circulated in northern France and Germany during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.³¹

1988), 15–17; idem, “Al Kavvanat Shemoneh Esreh Ezel R. Yizhaq Sagi-Nahor,” *Massu’ot*, 32; Wolfson, *Through a Speculum That Shines*, 110–11, 144–48, 155–56, 157, 216–17 (for R. Hanan’el as well); idem, “The Theosophy of Shabbetai Donnolo,” *The Frank Talmage Memorial Volume*, ed. Walfish, 2:284; Asi Farber-Ginat, “Iyyunim be-Sefer Shi’ur Qomah,” *Massu’ot*, ed. Oron and Goldreich, 373–74; I. Gruenwald, “Ha-Ketav, ha-Mikhtav ve-ha-Shem ha-Meforash,” in *Massu’ot*, 87–88. Although R. Hai himself appears to have rejected a mystical approach, his formulations and ideas were developed further by the German Pietists. See, e.g., Wolfson, *Through a Speculum That Shines*, 193, 197, 215–17, and note also (218, 226, 228, 252) the Pietist commentary on the forty-two letter Name, attributed (incorrectly) to R. Hai. For R. Nissim Gaon, see also Simcha Emanuel, “Serid Hadash mi-Sefer Megillat Setarim le-R. Nissim Gaon, *Sefer ha-Yovel le-R. Mordekhai Breuer*, ed. Moshe Bar-Asher (Jerusalem, 1992), 2:535–51, and Shraga Abramson, *Rav Nissim Gaon—Hamishah Sefarim* (Jerusalem, 1965), 278. The fact that R. Nissim, R. Hanan’el, and R. Nathan *ba’al ha-’Arukh* were involved in these discussions points to an interface between rabbinism and mysticism but, as in the case of R. Hai, this does not necessarily indicate a personal interest. On R. Hanan’el, cf. A. J. Heschel, “Al Ruah ha-Qodesh Bimei ha-Benayim, *Sefer ha-Yovel li-Khevod Alexander Marx* (New York, 1950) [Hebrew section], 176, n. 6. [In Bodl. 2575, fol. 1a, the reference concerning Akatriel should be to ר’ חננאל = ר’ חננאל, rather than to ר’ חננאל = ר’ חננאל, Cf. below, n. 120.]

²⁹Rashi, *Sanhedrin* 65b, s.v. *bara gavra*, and 67b, s.v. *asqei be-hilkhot yezirah*. The statement of Rashi’s contemporary, found in Bodl. 1207, is cited by Idel, *Golem*, 40, n. 19. Cf. Meiri’s rationalistic conception of this talmudic passage as presented in *Beit ha-Behirah le-Rabbenu Menahem ha-Meiri*, *Massekhet Avot*, ed. S. Z. Havlin (Jerusalem, 1994), editor’s introduction, 49, n. 123.

³⁰Idel, *Golem*, 30–31, 50, 58. See also Gershom Scholem, *On the Kabbalah and Its Symbolism* (New York, 1965), 169, n. 1.

³¹See *Shabbat* 104a, s.v. *’amar lei*; *Menahot* 29b, s.v. *’ahat be-heh*; *Berakhot* 55a, s.v. *’otiyot*; Epstein, *Mi-Qadmoniyot ha-Yehudim*, 226–31; Nicholas Sed, “Rashi et le Pseudo-Sepher Yezirah,” *Rashi*, 1040–1990, ed. Sed-Rajna, 237–50; *Sefer ha-Pardes*, ed. H. L. Ehrenreich (Budapest, 1924), 314–15 [=Mahzor Vitry, 108, and cf. *Tos. Haggigah*

CHAPTER 3

Rashi interprets the talmudic assertion that R. Ḥanina b. Ṭradyon was consigned to a harsh death because he pronounced or expressed each letter of the Divine Name (*she-hayah hogeh 'et ha-Shem be-'otiyotav*) publicly, as follows: R. Ḥanina explicated the Name (*doresho*) according to its forty-two letters and did with it (magically) that which he wished (*ve-'oseh bo mah she-hayah rozeḥ*).³² Moreover, Rashi writes that the Tannaim who entered *Pardes* ascended to the heavens through a technique involving the recitation of a Divine Name ('alu la-raqia' 'al yedei Shem).³³ Similarly, in his interpretation of a talmudic statement that R. Yishma'el received revelations from the angel Suri'el, Rashi writes that "R. Yishma'el ascended to the heavens via a *Shem* [as is found] in the *Baraita* of *Ma'aseh Merkavah*."³⁴ He defines unidentified *sitrei Torah* referred to in another talmudic passage as those secrets contained in "*Ma'aseh Merkavah*, *Sefer Yezirah*, and *Ma'aseh Bereshit*, which is a *Baraita*."³⁵ In his commentary to Isaiah 6:3, Rashi cites a work entitled *Midrash Aggadah*

3b, s.v. *u-mi*, and *Shibbolei ha-Leqet*, sec. 126]; and see now Sarah Japhet, "Massoret ve-Hiddush be-Perush Rashbam le-Sefer Iyyov," *Tefillah le-Moshe* [Biblical and Judaic Studies in Honor of Moshe Greenberg], ed. Mordechai Cogan et al. (Winona Lake, 1997), 129*–132*.

³²Rashi, 'Avodah Zarah 17b, s.v. 'alav li-serefah. See also *Tosafot Sukkah* 5a, s.v. *yod heh*; *Tosafot* 'A. Z. 18a, s.v. *hogeh ha-Shem*; and *Tosafot* 'al *Massekhet Avodah Zarah* le-R. Elhanan b. Yizhaq, s.v. 'ela mai ta'ama; and cf. Ithamar Gruenwald, "Ha-Ketav, ha-Mikhtav ve-ha-Shem ha-Meforash—Mageyah, Ruhaniyyut u-Mistiqaḥ," *Massu'ot*, ed. Oron and Goldreich, 92. [Note also that both *Tosafot* and *Tosafot R. Elhanan* suggest that at the time of R. Ḥanina's death as a martyr, it was expected he would see angels or some other unusual (heavenly) sight.]

³³*Hagigah* 14b, s.v. *nikhnesu le-pardes*. See also Moshe Idel, *The Mystical Experience in Abraham Abulafia*, 14–17; idem, *Kabbalah: New Perspectives*, 92; Wolfson, *Through a Speculum That Shines*, 111; Heschel, "Al Ruah ha-Qodesh Bimei ha-Benayim," 177, n. 7; Daniel Abrams, "From Germany to Spain: Numerology as a Mystical Technique," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 47 (1996):91–92; Yehuda Liebes, *Heṭ'ot Shel Elisha* (Jerusalem, 1990), 4–5; and cf. Baron, *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*, 5:50–51, and 346, n. 56; and Rashi's commentary to *Ezekiel* 40:2.

³⁴*Berakhot* 51a, s.v. 'eimatai yavo 'adam. Cf. Margoliot, *Mal'akhei 'Elyon*, 146, sec. 189, and *Die Geschichte von der Zehn Martyren*, ed. Gottfried Reeg (Tübingen, 1985), 19*–32*. The *qefizat ha-derekh* proposed by Rava in *Yevamot* 116a was accomplished, according to Rashi, s.v. *bi-qefizah*, 'al yedei Shem. Cf. Ritva, ad loc.; Verman and Adler, "Path-Jumping in the Jewish Magical Tradition," 134; and Rashi, *Shabbat* 81b, s.v. 'amrei 'inhumitta.

³⁵*Hagigah* 13a, s.v. *sitrei Torah*. In a subsequent comment on the same folio, Rashi describes both *Ma'aseh Merkavah* and *Ma'aseh Bereshit* as "*Beraítot*" (formal collections). Cf. Rashi to Ecclesiastes 1:9. On the identity of these works, cf. Joseph Dan, "Rashi and the Merkavah," *Rashi, 1040–1990*, ed. Sed-Rajna, 262, n. 13.

Ma‘aseh Merkavah. Gershom Scholem maintained that these references to *Ma‘aseh Merkavah* are to a recension of *Hekhalot Rabbati* (or, as the research of Peter Schäfer has characterized more precisely, a *Hekhalot* macroform with parallels to *Hekhalot Rabbati*),³⁶ which was also cited by R. Eleazar of Worms and by the mid-thirteenth century halakhic compendium, *Shibbolei ha-Leqet*.³⁷ Rashi asserts that a person may ask angels to assist him in ensuring the efficacy of his prayers. This suggests the notion of directing prayer through angels by adjuration, a *Hekhalot* construct that, as we have noted, was advocated by R. Simeon *ha-Gadol*.³⁸ Rashi also displays familiarity with magical techniques for the thwarting of *maziqin*³⁹ and for divination.⁴⁰

³⁶See Schäfer, *The Hidden and Manifest God*, 77–78.

³⁷Gershom Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition* (New York, 1960), 101–2. (For Rashi’s awareness of *Shi‘ur Qomah*, see p. 129, in a note to p. 40, line 2.) Scholem’s reference to *Shibbolei ha-Leqet* is to sec. 20. Additional references in medieval Ashkenazic rabbinic literature to the *Hekhalot* text entitled *מעשה מרכבה* can be found in *Tosafot ‘Avodah Zarah* 2b, s.v. *Romi hayyevet* (*Tosafot R. Elhanan*, ad loc. [s.v. zu *Romi hayyevet*], attributes this citation to Ri); ‘*Arugat ha-Bosem*, ed. Urbach, 1:204, 206; *Shibbolei ha-Leqet*, sec. 17; R. Avigdor of Vienna, *Sha‘arei Musar* (Jerusalem, 1993), 5 (and cf. *Arba‘ah Turim*, O. H., sec. 125); in *Sefer ha-Mahkим*, ed. Jacob Freimann (Cracow, 1908), 8; and in ms. Paris 1408, fol. 75v (col. 2), by the scribe Elqanah, a student of R. Meir of Rothenburg: *אני אלקננה ראייתיה במעשה מרכבה וברי*. See Colette Sirat, “Le Manuscrit Hébreu 1408 de la Bibliothèque Nationale,” *REJ* 123 [1964]:348; and below, ch. 5, n. 55. Cf. Daniel Abrams, “*Ma‘aseh Merkavah* as a Literary Work: The Reception of *Hekhalot* Traditions by the German Pietists and Kabbalistic Reinterpretation,” *Jewish Studies Quarterly* 5 (1998):329–45; and above, ch. 2, n. 34.

Rashi is cited by both R. Judah *he-Hasid* and R. Eleazar of Worms regarding insertions he added to the *E-lohai nezor* prayer following the ‘*Amidah*. R. Judah’s formulation (ms. Paris l’Alliance H48A, fol. 10v) suggests that these addenda came from a text entitled *Ma‘aseh Merkavah*. See Grossman, *Hakhmei Zarefat ha-Rishonim*, 181. Nonetheless, the possibility raised by Grossman, that the Pietists derived their addenda from *Ma‘aseh Merkavah* and that Rashi’s addenda, in this instance, were from an earlier geonic source, is valid. On R. Judah *he-Hasid* and addenda to *E-lohai nezor*, see also ms. Paris 646 (Ashkenaz, fourteenth century), fol. 237r=ms. Cincinnati 436 (Ashkenaz, 1435), fols. 212v–213r. On the somewhat curious absence of Rashi in *Sefer Hasidim*, cf. Israel Ta-Shma, “*Mizvat Talmud Torah ki-Ve‘ayah Datit ve-Hevratit be Sefer Hasidim*,” *Bar-Ilan* 14–15 (1977):113 [=Ta-Shma, *Halakhah, Minhag u-Mezi‘ut be-Ashkenaz* (Jerusalem, 1996), 128–29.]

³⁸See Rashi, *Sanhedrin* 44b, s.v. *le-‘olam yevaqesh ‘adam rahamim*, and *Hiddushei ha-Rashash*, ad loc. Cf. *Shibbolei ha-Leqet*, sec. 282 (citing R. Avigdor Katz, who based his formulation on Rashi in *Sanhedrin* 44b and on a passage in *Shir ha-Shirim Rabbah*); *She’elot Mahari Bruna*, #274; Frank Talmage, “Angels, Anthems and Anathemas: Aspects of Popular Religion in Fourteenth-Century Bohemian Judaism,” *The Frank Talmage*

CHAPTER 3

There are instances, to be sure, in which Rashi interprets a concept or passage in a manner that is antithetical to mystical or kabbalistic teachings. He was, of course, a *peshat*-oriented biblical exegete and a straightforward talmudic commentator who studied at the academies of Mainz and Worms.⁴¹

Memorial Volume, ed. Walfish, 2:13–16; Heschel, “Al Ruah ha-Qodesh Bimeh ha-Benayim,” 183, n. 42; Swartz, “Magical Piety in Ancient and Medieval Judaism,” 171; and above, n. 4. [Note Meiri’s (rationalistic) comment on this talmudic passage: one should ask his friends for help.]

³⁹See Rashi, *Shabbat* 81b, s.v. *’amrei ’inhu milta* (and the parallel Rashi passage on *Hullin* 105a), and *Sanhedrin* 95a, s.v. *’ein havush*. Cf. Rashi, *Shabbat* 90b, s.v. *reah ra*; *Shabbat* 66b, s.v. *’even tequmah*; *Sanhedrin* 101, s.v. *roqeq* (and *SHP* 1397); Trachtenberg, *Jewish Magic and Superstition*, 184; Moshe Catane, “Le Monde Intellectual de Rashi,” *Les Juifs au regard de l’histoire*, ed. G. Dahan (Paris, 1985), 83–84; Harari, “Kishfei Hezeq ve-Hitgonenut Mipneihem” (above, n. 10), 120–21; Bernard Septimus, *Hispano-Jewish Culture in Transition* (Cambridge, Mass., 1982), 87; and Güdemann, *Ha-Torah ve-ha-Hayyim*, 1:173.

⁴⁰*Sanhedrin* 101, s.v. *sarei shemen*, 67b, s.v. *de-qappid*; and *Megillah* 3b, s.v. *mazlaihu*. Cf. Wolfson, *Through a Speculum That Shines*, 208–9, nn. 75, 81, 266, n. 334; Joseph Dan, “Samael, Lilith and the Concept of Evil in Early Kabbalah,” *AJS Review* 5 (1982):27–28, n. 54; idem, *Torat ha-Sod shel Hasidut Ashkenaz*, 190–91; Scholem, “Havdalah de-R. Aqivah” (above, n. 17), 251–52, n. 5, 259, n. 31.

Given Rashi’s familiarity with *Hekhalot* and other early mystical texts, and especially with the magical powers associated with *Shemot*, it would not have been inconceivable for Rashi to author or transmit magical *segullot*. Nonetheless, Grossman (*Hakhmei Zarefat ha-Rishonim*, 142, 181) is correct in concluding that the *segullah* to thwart armed robbers through the use of *Shemot*, attributed to Rashi in a manuscript from the eighteenth century (ms. Warsaw 285), is not his, primarily because of the late date of this text. Note also ms. JTS Mic. 7928, which records *segullot* for fear, danger on the road, *she’elat halom*, difficulty in childbirth, and appearing before a ruler—all attributed to R. Solomon *Zarefati* and transcribed by *ha-navon*, R. Halafsa *ha-kohen* b. Shalomoh. See A. Marmorstein in *Me-Assef Zion* 1 (1931):31. The identity of R. Solomon of *Zarefat* remains a question, but it is unlikely that he is Rashi. The manuscript is found in the Cairo Geniza, and similar aims and techniques are found in other Geniza texts. See Naveh and Shaked, *Magic Spells and Formulae*, 149, 162, 185–86, 215, 217.

⁴¹See, e.g., Elliot Ginsburg, *The Sabbath in the Classical Kabbalah* (Albany, 1989), 105, 122; Elliot Wolfson, “Metatron and *Shi’ur Qomah* and in the Writings of Hasidei Ashkenaz,” *Magic, Mysticism, and Kabbalah in Ashkenazi Judaism*, ed. K. E. Grözinger and J. Dan (Berlin, 1995), 79, n. 96; Margoliot, *Mal’akhei ‘Elyon*, 179, sec. 289, nn. 1–2; Ivan Marcus, “The ‘Song of Songs’ in German Hasidism and the School of Rashi: A Preliminary Comparison,” *The Frank Talmage Memorial Volume*, ed. Walfish, 1:181–89; and cf. Joseph Davis, “R. Yom Tov Lipman Heller, Joseph b. Isaac ha-Levi, and Rationalism in Ashkenazic Jewish Culture, 1550–1650,” (Ph.D. diss., Harvard, 1990), 72–75. [In *Shibbolei ha-Leqet*, sec. 20, Rashi is cited as offering an exoteric interpretation of why it is appropriate to sway in prayer. But the verse he cites as part of his

Moreover, Eleazar Touitou has argued recently that Rashi's Torah commentary reflects the view that the Torah's orientation was anthropocentric rather than theocentric. Thus, although Rashi was aware of the esoteric approach to the creation of the world, he interpreted the biblical Creation story and other sections of the Torah as being interested primarily in imparting a didactic message that would mold man's behavior, rather than in transmitting theological constructs.⁴² Nonetheless, great care must be exercised when drawing conclusions from the fact that Rashi does not appear to utilize *Hekhalot* material in a particular context, as the following analysis serves to illustrate.

In a brief article entitled "Rashi and the Merkavah," Joseph Dan presents two examples which suggest to him, at least tentatively, that Rashi "either did not have, or chose not to use, *Hekhalot* traditions," and that he "did not integrate *Hekhalot* material into his literary structure."⁴³ The second example adduced by Dan emerges from Rashi's commentary to Ezekiel. Rashi declines to discuss the esoteric meaning of the term *hashmal* in his commentary to Ezekiel,

explanation is the same one referred to in both *Hekhalot* and Pietist materials; see above, ch. 1, nn. 58–60.] It was suggested early on that the commentary on *Chronicles* attributed to Rashi was not written by him, because it contains *torat ha-sod* material and pietistic concepts and techniques not usually found in Rashi. Indeed, Y. N. Epstein argued (*REJ* 58 [1909]:189–99) that it was authored by R. Samuel *he-Hasid*.

The dates for the coming of the Messiah found in Rashi's commentary to Daniel 8:14, (1352) and to *Sanhedrin* 97b (1478) were primarily the result of exegetical considerations (see Gershon Cohen, "Messianic Postures of Ashkenazim and Sephardim," *Studies of the Leo Baeck Institute*, ed. Max Kreuzberger [New York, 1967], 126–27), as was the prediction offered by Rashi's French student R. Shema'ayah (see Grossman, *Hakhmei Zarefat ha-Rishonim* [Jerusalem, 1995]), 357, and see now Simcha Emanuel, "Heshbon ha-Luah ve-Heshbon ha-Qez," *Zion* 63 (1998):143–55. Cf. above, n. 2; below, ch. 4, nn. 8, 37; ch. 5, n. 67; and Israel Ta-Shma, "Hishuv Qizzin le-Or ha-Halakhah," *Mahanayim* 59 (1961):57–59. The phrase *במו שחרואני מן השמים* found in a responsum attributed to Rashi (see *Teshuvot Rashi*, ed. Elfenbein, 282, and Grossman, *Hakhmei Zarefat ha-Rishonim*, 137), does not necessarily reflect an actual quasi-prophetic or mystical experience on Rashi's part. See Isadore Twersky, *Rabad of Posquières* (Philadelphia, 1980²), 291–94; *Teshuvot Rashi*, loc. cit., nn. 12–13; and below, ch. 4, n. 60; ch. 5, n. 23. The phrase *במו שחרואני מן השמים* appended to Rashi's commentary to Ezekiel 42:3, s.v. *ba-shelishim*, is a later interpolation. See Abraham Levy, *Rashi's Commentary on Ezekiel 40–48* (Philadelphia, 1931), 85.

⁴²E. Touitou, "Bein Parshanut le-Etiqah: Hashqafat ha-'Olam shel ha-Torah lefi Perush Rashi," *Sefer Zikkaron le-Sarah Kamin*, ed. Sara Japhet, 312–34. Cf. idem, "Ha-Reqa ha-Histori shel Perush Rashi le-Sefer Bereshit," *Rashi—'Iyyunim be-Yezirato*, ed. Z. A. Steinfeld (Jerusalem, 1993), 102.

⁴³Joseph Dan, "Rashi and the Merkavah," *Rashi, 1040–1990*, ed. Sed-Rajna, 259–64.

CHAPTER 3

offering instead a rabbinic interpretation, as well as his own interpretation—which was based on the biblical context. There is nothing in Rashi's interpretations to suggest an awareness of *Hekhalot* texts or ideas. Moreover, Dan maintains that Rashi's refusal to disclose the so-called esoteric interpretation, which was predicated on one version of a talmudic dictum, does not prove that he was actually aware of *Hekhalot* material. Rather, Rashi's concern may have been a theological or anthropomorphic one, having to do with the danger of interpreting **חشم ל** as relating to the figure of God. Despite Dan's best efforts, however, this example as an indication that Rashi did not use or have *Hekhalot* material remains an argument from silence.

Dan's first example comes from Rashi's commentary to *Hagigah* 14b. A somewhat mysterious formulation attributed to R. Aqiva, which was linked to his entrance and that of his colleagues into *Pardes*, states that “when you arrive at stones of pure marble, do not say ‘water, water.’” The Talmud does not explain this prohibition. Only in *Hekhalot* texts of the *Merkavah* tradition do we find that the mistaking of marble for water is an indication that the mystic has failed a test and may not enter into the sixth palace.

According to Dan, Rashi's comment, **מים מים יש כאן אין נלך אל תאמרו**, taken together with the prior portion of the talmudic passage, “do not say,” is diametrically opposed to the *Hekhalot* approach. In Dan's view, Rashi's interpretation of R. Aqiva's warning is that one who sees water should *not* say, in defeat, that it cannot be crossed (literally, how can we go on?)—that his quest has ended. R. Aqiva is offering encouragement rather than a stern warning. The mystic should not hesitate, because these waters are an imaginary obstacle. Rather, he should proceed further in his quest, against the guidelines in the *Hekhalot* literature.

David Halperin, in his study of early Jewish responses to the vision of Ezekiel that appeared several years before Dan's article, understands the comment of Rashi very differently. He considers it evidence of Rashi's awareness of *Hekhalot* material. In Halperin's view, Rashi's comment, **מים מים יש כאן אין נלך, יש כאן אין נלך**, is a paraphrase of R. Aqiva's warning: “There is water, water here; how can we go further?” According to Rashi, and parallel to the *Hekhalot* material, the sight of water *does* stop the mystic from proceeding further. Indeed, Halperin suggests that Rashi is intimating that the mystic in this case may feel like the children of Israel at the Red Sea, who found their way blocked by water and could not proceed.

Moreover, Rashi glosses the phrase “pure marble” (when you arrive at stones of pure marble) with the words **מבהיק כמים צלולין** (shining like clear water). Halperin notes that the word **צלולות** appears in a related *Hekhalot* text in conjunction with the marble stones, and he suggests that Rashi perhaps

derived his interpretation of “pure marble” from a *Hekhalot* source. In short, not only is Rashi’s interpretation of this passage fully consonant with *Hekhalot* literature, it may well have been drawn from it.⁴⁴

In both his biblical and talmudic commentaries,⁴⁵ Rashi was influenced by the mystical midrash *Otiyyot de-R. Aqiva*. In one instance in his talmudic commentary to *Hullin*, which is parallel to a passage in his commentary to Ezekiel, he interprets that *demut* or *parzuf Ya‘aqov* represents the male aspect within the Godhead.⁴⁶ As Elliot Wolfson has demonstrated, this mystical formulation was espoused later by both R. Eleazar of Worms and members of the *Hug ha-Keruv ha-Meyuhad*.⁴⁷

⁴⁴David Halperin, *The Faces of the Chariot*, 210, 534, n. 1. See also 184, 219–20, 243, for other instances in which Rashi’s interpretation is consistent with *Hekhalot* literature. Cf. Avraham Grossman, *Hakhmei Zarefat ha-Rishonim*, 205, n. 249. See also Rashi, *Sanhedrin* 103a, s.v. *shalosh maftehot lo nimseru le-shaliah*, which accords precisely with a *Hekhalot* conception of the heavenly **אוצר**. See Schiffman and Swartz, *Hebrew and Aramaic Incantations from the Cairo Genizah*, 159. Rashi interprets the talmudic term *ba‘al ha-halom* as *שר המראת חלומות בלילה*; see above, n. 3; and cf. Heschel, “Al Ruah ha-Qodesh Bimei ha-Benayim,” 176–77, nn. 6–7; Trachtenberg, *Jewish Magic and Superstition*, 72; Harris, *Studies in Jewish Dream Interpretation*, 33.

⁴⁵See Israel Ta-Shma, “Sifriyyatam shel Hakhmei Ashkenaz Benei ha-Me’ah ha-Yod Alef/ha-Yod Bet,” *Qiryat Sefer* 60 (1985):307; and Abraham Berliner, *Rashi ‘al ha-Torah* (Frankfurt, 1905), 427 (*liqqutim*), to Numbers 14:4. See also above, n. 31.

⁴⁶See Rashi, *Hullin* 91b, s.v. *פְּרָצּוֹפַ אָדָם שְׁבָאָרְבָּעַ חִיּוֹת בְּדִמּוֹת יְעָקֹב*: *בְּדִימּוֹנָו שֶׁל מַעַלָּה*, and Rashi’s commentary to Ezekiel 1:5, s.v. *וְהוּא דִמּוֹת פְּרָצּוֹפַו שֶׁל יְעָקֹב*: *דִמּוֹת אָדָם לְהִנְהָה אַבָּנָה*.

⁴⁷See Elliot Wolfson, “Demut Ya‘aqov Haquqah be-Kavod: ‘Iyyun Nosaf be-Torat ha-Sod shel Hasidut Ashkenaz,” *Massu’ot*, ed. Oron and Goldreich, 137–41; 154–56, nn. 116–17; 162, n. 138; 165, n. 151; 170, n. 173; and cf. 137, n. 35. Idem, “The Image of Jacob Engraved upon the Throne: Further Reflection on the Esoteric Doctrine of the German Pietists,” in his *Along the Path*, 8–12; 117, n. 37; 119, n. 54; 148, n. 192; 156, n. 225; 160–61, n. 239. [Pseudo-Rashi to *Ta‘anit* 5a anticipates an association made by *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, that *ישראל טבא* is equivalent to *אֱלֹהִים* (a Divine hypostasis); see ‘Arugat ha-Bosem, ed. Urbach, 4:85, n. 77, and cf. 7a, s.v. *yafuzu*. This commentary was composed by a student of Rashi, possibly Ribon or Rashbam. See J. P. Guttel, “Remarques sur le ‘Pseudo-Raschi’ de *Ta‘anit*,” *REJ* 125 (1966):93–100, and the literature cited in nn. 3–4. See also Zeraḥ Warhaftig, “Devarim ki-Feshutam—‘al Massekhet *Ta‘anit*,” *Ha-Ma‘ayan* 36:1 (1996):43. One passage (*Ta‘anit* 15a, s.v. *uve-qabbalah*), cites a question raised by *Tosafot*, suggesting that the author of this commentary was one of the *tosafists*.] On the similarities between Rashi’s mythic approach to the understanding of the sanctification of the new moon and the approaches taken by *Sefer Hasidim* and by kabbalists, see Yehuda Liebes, *Studies in Jewish Myth and Jewish Messianism* (Albany, 1993), 48–53 [=“de Natura Dei—‘al ha-Mitos ha-Yehudi ve-Gilgulo,” *Massu’ot*, 284–88.]

CHAPTER 3

Rashi's genuine interest in aspects of *torat ha-sod* helps to explain not only the citation and amplification of passages in his commentaries by the late thirteenth-century work *Sefer ha-Maskil* (written by R. Solomon Simḥah of Troyes, a descendant of Rashi),⁴⁸ and by kabbalistic works such as the *Zohar* and *Sefer Ma'arekhet ha-E-lohut*,⁴⁹ but also the notion expressed by the fifteenth-century *Sefer ha-Meshiv*—and by R. Mordekhai Jaffe and Ḥida, among others—that Rashi was thoroughly conversant with *sitrei Torah* and was immersed in their study when he wrote his commentaries.⁵⁰ Attribution of esoteric teachings to Rashi was not simply a case in which deep ideas were associated with a great scholar, with no firm basis. At the same time, Rashi's awareness of the various *sod* dimensions that were studied in pre-Crusade Mainz should not be overstated. Rashi was certainly not a mystic, nor did he involve himself in theosophy. Indeed, this higher form of kabbalah or *sod* was largely absent in the pre-Crusade period as a whole. It is perhaps for this reason, in addition to other exegetical considerations mentioned above, that

⁴⁸See Israel Ta-Shma, “*Sefer ha-Maskil*—*Hibbur Yehudi-Zarefati Bilti Yadua*’ mi-Sof ha-Me’ah ha-Yod Gimmel,” *Mehqerei Yerushalayim be-Mahshevet Yisra’el* 2 (1983):418; and Gad Freudenthal, “Ha-Avir Barukh Hu u-Varukh Shemo be-*Sefer ha-Maskil* le-R. Shalomoh Simḥah mi-Troyes,” *Da’at* 32–33 (1994):205, n. 46; 221, n. 120.

⁴⁹See Ephraim Gottlieb, *Mehqarim be-Sifrut ha-Qabbalah*, ed. Joseph Hacker (Jerusalem, 1976), 203, for a passage in Rashi’s commentary to *Hagigah* which may have been the source of a Zoharic conception of *gilgul*, and 319, for a characterization of Creation that *Sefer Ma’arekhet E-lohut* derived from Rashi’s commentary to the beginning of the Torah.

⁵⁰See Abraham Gross, “Rashi u-Mesoret Limmud ha-Torah she-Bikhtav bi-Sefarad,” Rashi, *Iyyunim be-Yezirato*, ed. Steinfeld, 50–53; Baron, *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*, above, n. 33; Raphael Halpern, *Rashi—Hayyav u-Perushav* (Jerusalem, 1997), 1:256–58; below, n. 98; and the studies cited in Grossman, *Hakhmei Zarefat ha-Rishonim*, 205, n. 248. See also Idel, *Kabbalah: New Perspectives*, 237–39; idem, “Iyyunim be-Shitat Ba’al ‘Sefer ha-Meshiv’,” 239–41; and idem, *Golem*, 131, 226. Cf. Rashi to *Bava Batra* 12a (end). Although his description of the relationship between *ḥokhmah* and prophecy is not as openly suggestive in mystical terms as compared to the comment of Ramban ad loc., Rashi’s comments may still hold some significance in this regard. See Heschel, “Al Ruah ha-Qodesh Bimei ha-Benayim,” 179, and Shraga Abramson, “Navi Ro’eh ve-Hozeh—R. Avraham ha-Hozeh,” *Sefer Yovel Muggash li-Khevod Mordechai Kirschblum*, ed. David Telsner (Jerusalem, 1983), 118. See also Rashi, *Ta’anit* 4a, s.v. *u-khetiv*, and Yohanan Silman, *Qol Gadol ve-Lo Yasaf* (Jerusalem, 1999), 108. A manuscript passage maintains that prior to R. Jacob of Marvège, author of *She’elot u-Teshuvot min ha-Shamayim*, Rashi had the capacity to undertake heavenly ascents in order to receive halakhic guidance; see Alexander Marx, “A New Collection of MSS. in the Cambridge Library,” *PAAJR* 4 (1933):153, n. 29. See also Heschel, 194; and below, ch. 5, n. 24.

Rashi's descriptions of the Divine do not usually reflect a mystical orientation and that Rashi extended the talmudic prohibition of delving into esoteric interpretations of the Godhead in Ezekiel by at least one verse.⁵¹

Nonetheless, the interest and familiarity displayed by Rashi with regard to magical and mystical concepts and techniques carried over into works that were associated with his school. Passages in *Mahzor Vitry* and other volumes of the so-called *sifrut de-Vei Rashi* (found in sections that can be shown to reflect traditions of Rashi himself or of his circle)⁵² describe the marital imagery of the Sabbath in a manner later expanded upon by dévotes of kabbalah,⁵³ adopt *Bahir* imagery to explain the efficacy of the Sabbath against *maziqin*,⁵⁴ analyze the role of the kaddish in filling out the Divine Name⁵⁵ and protecting the

⁵¹See Dan, "Rashi and the Merkavah" (above, n. 43); Touitou, "Bein Parshanut le-Etiqah" (above, n. 42); and Ya'akov Spiegel, "Meqorot be-Perush Rashi le-Yirmiyahu ve-Yehezkel," Rashi, *Iyyunim be-Yezi'rato*, ed. Steinfeld, 204.

⁵²*Sefer ha-Pardes* in particular reflects the halakhic positions of late eleventh-century Ashkenaz and, quite often, those of Rashi himself. Thus, *Shibbolei ha-Leqet* cites material in *Sefer ha-Pardes* as *hilkhot Rabbenu Shelomoh*. See Ta-Shma, *Ha-Nigleh shebe-Nistar*, 55, and idem, *Minhag Ashkenaz ha-Qadmon* (Jerusalem, 1992), 149–50.

⁵³See E. K. Ginsburg, *The Sabbath in the Classical Kabbalah*, 106, 168, n. 189, 175, n. 230, and cf. 168, n. 186. Ginsburg's study demonstrates that a number of themes which were central to the Zohar's conception of *sod ha-Shabbat* derived from *Sefer ha-Pardes*. Cf. Ta-Shma, *Ha-Nigleh shebe-Nistar*, 32, and the next note.

⁵⁴See Israel Ta-Shma, *Minhag Ashkenaz ha-Qadmon*, 148–56. The custom of changing the final blessing of the *Shema* on Friday evening (from the *shomer 'ammo Yisra'el la'ad* ending recited during the weekdays to *ha-pores sukkat shalom 'aleinu ve-'al kol 'ammo Yisrael*) is supported by Bahiric parables, which indicate that when the Jewish people are closer to God through the performance of positive precepts, as on the Sabbath, they require less protection through prayer. These parables and their application were retained in full by *Perush ha-Tefillot le-Rabbenu Shelomoh*, which was composed either by Rashi himself or by one of his students and was recorded in *Sefer ha-Pardes* and in *Mahzor Vitry* in shorter form. The custom, together with its interpretation and imagery, were recorded by the Zohar as well, confirming the presence of a mystical approach. See also Penkower, *Nosah ha-Torah be-Keter Aram Zovah*, 48, n. 116.

⁵⁵See Haviva Pedaya, "Pegam ve-Tiqqun shel ha-E-lohut be-Qabbalat R. Yizhaq Sagi Nahor," *Mehqerei Yerushalayim be-Mahshevet Yisra'el* 6 [3–4] (1987):253–59; and see above, nn. 6, 17. Cf. Ta-Shma's source corrections in *Ha-Nigleh shebe-Nistar*, 95, nn. 48–49; and Aryeh Goldschmidt, "Perush ha-Qaddish le-Ba'al Mahzor Vitry," *Yeshurun* 3 (1997):5–14. Pedaya notes (258, n. 15) that certain tosafists attempted to blunt the mystical interpretation of the kaddish; see below, ch. 4, n. 2. See Yaakov Gartner, "Ha-Me'aneh be-Qaddish 'Yehe Shemeh Rabbah Mevorakh,'" *Sidra* 11 (1996):40–41, for affinities between *sifrut de-Vei Rashi* and *Hasidei Ashkenaz* regarding the structure and wording of *qaddish*. For a mystical conception of the *demut Ya'aqov* that appears in *sifrut de-Vei Rashi*, see Wolfson, "Demut Ya'aqov" (above, n. 47), 137, n. 35.

CHAPTER 3

deceased,⁵⁶ and recommend that Divine and angelic names and markings be included in *mezuzot*.⁵⁷

⁵⁶*Mahzor Vitry*, ed. Hurwitz, 112–13, sec. 144, recounts the story of a deceased person who was spared the travails of *gehinnom* because his son recited *Barekhu* and *kaddish* (*yehe shemeh rabbah*) on *moza'ei Shabbat*. This story is extant only in late midrashic sources. It is cited (and embellished) by a number of Ashkenazic sources, including texts of *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, and by the *Zohar* as well. See M. B. Lerner, “Ma‘aseh ha-Tanna ve-ha-Met,” *Assufot* 2 (1988):60–67; Ta-Shma, *Minhag Ashkenaz ha-Qadmon*, 299–306; and idem, *Ha-Nigleh shebe-Nistar*, 93, n. 33; and ms. Bodl. 378 (Ashkenaz, c. 1300), fol. 45v. At the beginning of the *Mahzor Vitry* passage, the phrase **נמצא בספרים הפנימיים. ת' [=חוטפות]** appears. This addendum, which was probably from R. Abraham b. Nathan, author of *Sefer ha-Manhig* (see *Sefer ha-Manhig*, ed. Y. Raphael, editor’s introduction, 35–37), suggests the story originated in some type of esoteric text. On the use of the term *sefarim penimiyim* in *Sefer ha-Manhig* to connote *Hekhalot* texts, such as *Sefer Hekhalot* or *Ma‘aseh Merkavah*, see Raphael, 29, and above, ch. 1, n. 61. [On the use of this term, cf. *Sefer ha-Pardes ha-Gadol*, sec. 191.] The passage in *Mahzor Vitry* concludes with the observation that “the custom is, therefore, to designate someone who has no father or mother as the prayer leader on *moza’ei Shabbat*, to recite *barekhu* or *kaddish*.” See also *Siddur R. Shelomoh mi-Germaiza ve-Siddur Hasidei Ashkenaz*, ed. Moshe Hershler (Jerusalem, 1972), 75; and Hershler, “Sefer Hasidim le-R. Yehudah he-Hasid, Mahadurah ve-Nosah Hadashah mi-Tokh Ketav Yad,” *Genuzot* 1 (1984):129. The next passage in *Mahzor Vitry* (sec. 145) notes that the custom is to lengthen the prayers on *moza’ei Shabbat*, since this delays the return of the souls who normally reside in *gehinnom* but who are let out on Shabbat. This custom was endorsed in pre-Crusade Ashkenaz by R. Eleazar *Hazzan* of Spires (above, n. 25; and see also the interpretation by R. Jacob b. Yaqar in M. Hershler, “Minhagei Vermaiza u-Magenza, de-Vei Rashi ve-Rabbotav u-Minhagei Ashkenaz shel ha-Roqeah,” *Genuzot* 2 [1985]:23, sec. 53), and subsequently by R. Eleazar of Worms, by (his student) R. Isaac *Or Zarua*^c, and by liturgical texts of the German Pietists. See Ta-Shma, *Minhag Ashkenaz ha-Qadmon*, 307–10; ms. Paris 1408, fols. 143v–144r; below, ch. 5, n. 11; *Sefer ha-Manhig*, 1:191; *Shibbolei ha-Leqet*, sec. 129, regarding the slow and deliberate recitation **ויהי נחום** at the conclusion of the Sabbath; and cf. *Sefer Tashbez*, secs. 257–58; and I. Ta-Shma, “Vihi No‘am u-Qedushah de-Sidra bi-Tefillat Moza’ei Shabbat,” *Hazon Nahum*, ed. Y. Elman and J. Gurock (New York, 1997), 58–62.

⁵⁷See *Mahzor Vitry*, 648–49; *Siddur Rashi*, ed. Solomon Buber (Berlin, 1911), sec. 455; *Sefer ha-Pardes ha-Gadol*, sec. 285 (citing also the views of R. Judah *ha-Hasid*). Cf. Victor Aptowitzer, “Le Nom de Dieu et des Anges dans la Mezouza,” *REJ* 60 (1910):40–52; above, ch. 1, n. 45; and below, ch. 4, n. 16. On the use of material from *Mahzor Vitry* by the *Zohar*, see Ta-Shma, *Ha-Nigleh shebe Nistar*, 21–22, and 92–93, n. 33. Ta-Shma’s larger claim (21–31) is that numerous halakhic practices and customs in the *Zohar* derived from earlier Ashkenazic sources. Included also in this path of transmission is the “white magic” in the *Zohar*, which Ta-Shma believes is of Ashkenazic origin, having arrived there via *Hekhalot* texts. On counting the words in prayer, a practice usually associated with *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, see *Mahzor Vitry*, 519, and cf. above, ch. 2, n. 26.

Fending off forgetfulness by means of magical adjurations—a practice that had its roots in *Hekhalot* mysticism—is a component of the *Havdalah* ceremony in *Mahzor Vitry*.⁵⁸ The version of the educational initiation ceremony in *Mahzor Vitry* does not contain the magical adjurations against *Potah* found in the thirteenth-century *Sefer Assufot*.⁵⁹ Nor were there any verses written on the

⁵⁸ See *Mahzor Vitry*, 115–16. The basic formula, to neutralize *Potah*, and to remove an uncomprehending heart (*עכשוו לב*) from the person reciting the formula, is also found in earlier geonic sources, such as *Seder R. Amram*, and in subsequent Spanish sources as well. Cf. Scholem, “*Havdalah de-R. Aqiva*,” 23–49, 278–79, n. 138; and I. Marcus, *Rituals of Childhood*, 138, n. 34. In addition, the fuller *Havdalah de-R. Aqiva* contains a series of magical *hashba’ot*, which often reflect *Hekhalot* formulations, to be recited after the Sabbath to ensure that one’s wishes will be granted, especially with regard to thwarting *kishuf* and other nefarious forces. See, e.g., Scholem, 256, line 18, which contains a section from *Hekhalot Zutarti* that includes the Divine Name, אָזְבּוֹנָה, found in other *Hekhalot* texts. On this Name, cf. *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur*, ed. Schäfer, secs. 415–19; Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkavah Mysticism and Talmudic Tradition*, 66–71; Yosef Dan, “*Shem shel Sheminiyyot*,” *Minhah le-Sarah*, ed. Moshe Idel et al. (Jerusalem, 1994), 119–34; Theodore Schrire, *Hebrew Amulets* (London, 1966), 112–13; Verman and Adler, “*Path Jumping in the Jewish Magical Tradition*,” 145; ms. Moscow-Guenzberg 1302, fol. 15v; and *Arugat ha-Bosem*, ed. Urbach, 4:77. Invoking this Name guaranteed that one would find himself among *maziqin* and *shedim*. Virtually all the manuscripts of the *Havdalah de-R. Aqiva* are of German provenance and associated with members or students of *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, who also cite it in their works. Cf. Y. Dan, “*Sefer ha-Navon le-Ehad me-Hasidei Ashkenaz*,” *Qovez ‘al Yad* 6:1 (1966): 203, n. 12, 209–10; and *Perushei Siddur ha-Tefillah la-Roqeah*, ed. Moshe Hershler (Jerusalem, 1992), 1:182, 247, 2:606. According to Scholem, the magical material may have originated in Babylonia during the geonic period, after which it was brought to southern Italy and from there to Germany.

⁵⁹ See above, n. 18. According to the *Assufot* text, the words פֶּה אָזְבּוֹנָה are recited ten times, followed by the incantation against *Potah*, which concludes with a series of Divine Names. These names are not actually written in the *Assufot* text but can be found in the almost identical formula against *Potah* used in the *Havdalah* ceremony (see the preceding note). On the significance of the words פֶּה אָזְבּוֹנָה, see Moshe Idel, “*Tefisat ha-Torah be-Sifrut ha-Hekhalot ve-Gulgulehah ba-Qabbalah*,” *Mehqerei Yerushalayim be-Mahshevet Yisra’el* 1 (1981):47, who notes a passage from ms. Berlin Tübingen Or. 942, that the *gematria* of לְשׁוֹן (which refers to the anthropomorphic Glory) is equal to פֶּה, which means the latter term connotes a Divine Name. [Cf., however, SHB 1154: since the final form of the letter *peh* appears in the names of many angels with the power to do damage (*mal’akhei habbalah*, including פֶּן and פֶּגֶש, among others), no final *peh* is found in any prayer except the *musaf* service, in which the appropriate additional sacrifice for the day (וְאֵת מוֹטֶף יוֹם) must be mentioned in any case. See also *Sefer Roqeah*, sec. 337, and *Sefer Assufot* itself (ms. Jews College 134/Montefiore 115, fol. 157v): “All letters are utilized in the grace after meals except final *peh*, so that none of these (bad)

CHAPTER 3

foods which the young initiate should eat, as in *Sefer Roqeqah*,⁶⁰ although several magical elements are present in the *Mahzor Vitry* version. As in the *Roqeqah* passage, the child licked honey off the letters of the alphabet written on a tablet, after reciting them. Also, the cakes that had been kneaded with honey and the hard-boiled eggs (both of which are more numerous in the *Mahzor Vitry* version) were eaten specifically to achieve *petiḥat ha-lev*.⁶¹ The additional recitation of the alphabet backward, which appears to have been part of the ceremony in the Reggio manuscript of *Mahzor Vitry* (as it was in *Sefer Roqeqah* and *Sefer Assufot*), mystically represented a Divine Name, according to R. Eleazar of Worms in his *Sefer ha-Hokhmah*.⁶² Even the swaying of the child

angels are indicated. These angels will not affect anyone who recites the grace. Similarly, no final *peh* appears in אָוֹר אָזְרֵי or in the *shemoneh ‘esreh* either.” See also ms. Moscow-Guenzberg 182, fol. 153v, and ms. Bodl. 784, fol. 98r; and cf. Moritz Gudemann, *Ha-Torah ve-ha-Hayyim*, vol. 1 (Warsaw, 1897), 37, n. 3; Margoliot’s *Meqor Hesed* to *SHB*, loc. cit.; and above, ch. 1, n. 163. The so-called *Perush ha-Roqeqah ‘al ha-Torah*, ed. Chaim Konyevsky, vol. 2, (Bnei Brak, 1980), 24, written by a member of *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, asserts that the recitation of a series of certain verses, none of which contains the letter *peh*, will ward off the various harmful angels whose names end with this letter. Cf. below, n. 110.]

⁶⁰See Marcus, *Rituals of Childhood*, 32. *Horayot* 13b recommends five techniques to improve memory, including the eating of an unsalted, hard-boiled egg. This is recorded as normative by medieval rabbinic texts, such as *Pisqei R. Yeshayah di Trani (Rid)*, ed. Abraham Wertheimer (Jerusalem, 1990), 66, although it should be noted that R. Isaiah di Trani himself had some proclivities for *sod*; see below, ch. 5, nn. 19–21. On the other hand, the rationalistic R. Menahem ha-Meiri, clearly wishing to downplay the notion of magical foods, maintains that all these practices point to the general notion of eating only well-cooked and properly checked foods, which will not be *metamitem et ha-lev*. Cf. Mary Carruthers, *The Book of Memory*, 50. Generally speaking, a good diet and the right foods are important for memory, although Carruthers is writing from the nonmystical standpoint. See also Swartz, *Scholastic Magic*, 150–62.

⁶¹Cf. above, n. 16.

⁶²See Marcus, *Rituals of Childhood*, 39, 100, 145, n. 29. As Marcus notes, the recitation of the alphabet backward at the time a child begins to study is also described in the pietistic Torah commentary, *Te’amim shel Humash*. The author of this commentary was an older contemporary of R. Eleazar of Worms, R. Solomon b. Samuel. R. Solomon studied with R. Samuel and R. Judah *he-Hasid* in Spires and Regensburg before returning to his native northern France. See above, ch. 2, n. 5. The *gematria* derivation of this practice given by R. Samuel, and its application, is found also in the so-called *Perush ha-Roqeqah ‘al ha-Torah*, ed. Konyevsky, vol. 3 (Bnei Brak, 1981), 284–85 (*Devarim* 33:4). Cf. *Sefer ha-Pardes*, ed. Ehrenreich, 310. In the ancient world, the alphabet was learned and remembered by reciting it forward and backward. See Marcus, 36, and Carruthers, *The Book of Memory*, 111.

during his recitation of verses—found in the *Maḥzor Vitry* version and in a later German liturgical commentary (ms. Hamburg 152)—and the covering of the child with a cloak on the way to and from the ceremony—found also in the liturgical commentary (and partially in *Sefer Roqeah*)—may have been derived from *Hekhalot* constructs.⁶³ Indeed, the four earliest and most complete versions of the Ashkenazic initiation ceremony—those found in *Maḥzor Vitry*, *Sefer Roqeah*, *Sefer Assufot*, and ms. Hamburg, which include the magical uses of *Shemot* and the implementation of *Hekhalot* techniques and practices—suggest that these underlying concepts were known to those who performed and participated in the ceremony.⁶⁴

⁶³See Marcus, *Rituals of Childhood*, 149, n. 97, and above, ch. 1, nn. 58–59. [Marcus, 73, notes also the (practical) reason given for swaying during Torah reading and study by the *Sefer Kuzari*.] According to Marcus, 69–71, the wrapping of the child (so that he cannot see certain objects) reflects either considerations of purity based on the *Hekhalot*-related *Baraita de-Masskhet Niddah* (in which seeing impurities renders the observer impure) or the symbolic initiation of the child into wisdom. Cf. Swartz, *Scholastic Magic*, 163, and above, n. 8. See also Marcus, 98, for the relationship between the initiation ceremony as recorded in *Maḥzor Vitry*—which is the only version to include vicarious atonement—and the pietistic *Sefer Huq hei ha-Torah*—which was the product of German Pietists or Provençal mystical circles. Cf. my *Jewish Education and Society in the High Middle Ages* (Detroit, 1992), 101–5.

⁶⁴Marcus considers the version of the initiation ceremony found in *Sefer Roqeah* (whose author, R. Eleazar of Worms, lived ca. 1160–1230) to be the earliest one (having been written down in the late twelfth or early thirteenth century), while he suggests that the *Maḥzor Vitry* version appeared some time later. This dating schema supports Marcus's thesis that the reaffirmation of this ceremony was a significant step in a larger effort by the German Pietists and German Jews more generally to preserve earlier Ashkenazic culture—which was more custom-oriented and contained magical components—in the face of tosafist dialectical incursions that were causing these cultural aspects to fade. The ceremony was found initially in the work of a German Pietist, who claimed it was a venerable custom, while its first appearance in a northern French text (where it may not have been actually observed) was only later. See Marcus, *Rituals of Childhood*, 26, 32, 104, 112–14, 137, n. 27, 138–39, nn 35, 41.

Marcus's argument concerning the dating of the versions of the initiation ceremony is, however, somewhat problematic. According to Marcus, the earliest manuscript of *Maḥzor Vitry* that contains the ceremony is the Reggio Manuscript [=JTS Mic. 8092]. But this manuscript, as Marcus notes, is dated 1204; see *Rituals of Childhood*, 138, n. 41, and cf. Ta-Shma's review (above, n. 15), 238. As such, the *Maḥzor Vitry* version of the ceremony is not necessarily any later than the one found in *Sefer Roqeah*. In addition, Marcus's suggestion (32, 114) that the ceremony was perhaps not in vogue in northern France has not been amply demonstrated.

Nonetheless, it is possible to preserve the overall thrust of Marcus's theory in light of the present study. The issue of retaining or eliminating mystical and magical practices

CHAPTER 3

III

In addition to the magical and mystical material found in *sifrut de-Vei Rashi*, there is an astrological work with mystical overtones⁶⁵ produced by R. Jacob b. Samson, a student of Rashi. The disposition of pre-Crusade

was not simply a case of German Pietists or German Jews versus tosafists. As we shall see, a number of northern French tosafists also wished to retain these aspects of early Ashkenazic rabbinic culture. Indeed, as we have already seen, *Mahzor Vitry* contains other magical practices and elements as well, even if its version of the initiation ceremony is not identical to the one found in *Sefer Roqeah*. Thus, the presence of this ceremony in both Germany and northern France, although not universally held, testifies to the relative strength of the more traditional position in Ashkenazic rabbinic circles generally, despite the advance of the tosafist innovations and changes that Marcus describes. Cf. S. E. Stern, “*Seder Ḥinnukh Yeladim le-Torah ule-Yir’ah mi-Beit Midrasham shel Ḥakhmei Ashkenaz*,” *Żefunot* 1:1 (1988):15–21, and A. N. Z. Roth, “*Ḥinnukh Yeladim le-Torah be-Shavu’ot*,” *Yeda ‘Am* 11 (1966):9–12. On the availability and usage of *hashba’ot* and *Shemot* in northern France, in prayer liturgies and other public contexts, see below, esp. nn. 98–99, 110.

⁶⁵Grossman, *Ḥakhmei Zarefat ha-Rishonim*, 418–23; Ronald Kiener, “Astrology in Jewish Mysticism from the *Sefer Yesira* to the *Zohar*,” *Mehqerei Yerushalayim be-Mahshevet Yisra’el* 6 [3–4] (1987): 1*–42*. Cf. Ta-Shma, *Ha-Nigleh shebe-Nistar*, 32, and Trachtenberg, *Jewish Magic and Superstition*, 249–59. See also Bodl. 2275 (Germany, 1329). This manuscript contains several amulets, *Sefer Miẓvot Qatan*, *Midrash va-Yosha*, and *minhagim de-Vei Maharam* (including also passages from *Sefer Hasidim*, and from R. Eleazar of Worms and Rabiah). Fols. 48r–50v consist of material on *qiddush ha-hodesh*, ‘ibbur, and the like. Fols. 49v–50r contain a lengthy passage from *Sefer ha-Alqoshi* on the deleterious effects (particularly with regard to the poisoning of water) that may result when the *tequfot* change (*האלקושים*). These effects are caused because there is a period when the angelic figure (*memuneh*) responsible for the new *tequfah* has not yet assumed his role, allowing conflicts between various *mazzalot* to produce various *maziqim*. Amulet-writers may attempt to ward off these effects [See also ms. Bodl. 692 (Ashkenaz, 1305), fols. 88r–99v, which lists the *sod ha-‘ibbur* of R. Jacob b. Samson, from ch. 23 of *Sefer ha-Alqoshi* (the calculations are for 1123).] For partial transcriptions and analyses of the material in *Sefer ha-Alqoshi* on the changing of *tequfot*, see Grossman, *Ḥakhmei Zarefat ha-Rishonim*, 420–22, and Israel Ta-Shma, “*Issur Shetiyat Mayim ba-Tequfah u-Meqoro*,” *Mehqerei Yerushalayim be-Folqlor Yehudi* 17 (1995):27–28. Additionally, as Grossman notes, other material in *Sefer ha-Alqoshi* reads like a commentary to *Sefer Yesirah* (which R. Jacob b. Samson may also have composed). On the similarity between R. Jacob’s view of the change of the *tequfah* and that of *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, see below, ch. 4, n. 9; and cf. ‘Arugat ha-Bosem, ed. Urbach, 4:79–80. For other *sod* material attributed to students of Rashi, see Grossman, *Ḥakhmei Zarefat ha-Rishonim*, 173 [ms. Vat. 422, fol. 51v, and ms. Lund 2, fol. 74r, record that a student of Rashi named R. Judah fixed a liturgical reading based on what was written in a *sefer sotot*], 368.

rabbinic scholarship toward mysticism and magic was not shared, however, by all of Rashi's immediate students and successors. Rashi's grandson, R. Samuel b. Meir (Rashbam), was aware of the mystical powers of *Shemot* and of the existence of esoteric texts, as a passage in his commentary to 'Arvei Pesahim indicates.⁶⁶ In at least two significant contexts, however, he distances himself from mystical interpretation and symbolism.

Sara Kamin has demonstrated that Rashbam's interpretation of the Creation story was intended to bypass any possibility of cosmogonic or theosophic speculation. In his commentary to *Qohelet* (2:3, 2:13), Rashbam asserts that only exoteric wisdom, which is absolutely necessary for mankind to master, be pursued. *חכונה עמוקה ויתירה*, which Rashbam (7:24) identifies as the wisdom contained in *Ma'aseh Merkavah* and *Sefer Yezirah*, is not needed by mankind and therefore should not be pursued.⁶⁷ In addition, Rashbam

⁶⁶Rashbam, *Pesahim* 119a, s.v. *sitrei ha-Torah*: **מעשה המרכבה ומעשה בראשית בראשית** ופירושו של שם כרכיב זה שמי לעולם המרכבה ו*ma'aseh bereshit* כexamplars of *sitrei Torah*, Rashbam here connects, as Hasidei Ashkenaz did with even greater emphasis, speculation on the chariot with the mystical knowledge of the Divine Name. See, e.g., *Sefer Roqeqah*, [Hilkhot Hasidut] *Shoresh Qedushat ha-Yihud u-Shemo u-Merkavah ve-Sodotav* (end): **ובכל השמות ויצאי משם הנכבד** ב"ה וב"ש ספר המרכבה וספר מעשה בראשית ו"י יצירה וט' שמות וט' הכבוד אין לסתות בס' הזה. Cf. Wolfson, *Through a Speculum That Shines*, 235; Haviva Pedaya, "Pegam ve-Tiqqun," 157, n. 2; and Koren, "Mysticism and Menstruation," above, n. 10. A formulation similar to Rashbam's is found in *Mahzor Vitry*, 554–55 (commentary to *Avot*). See also Moshe Idel, "Tefisat ha-Torah be-Sifrut ha-Hekhalot ve-Gilgulehah ba-Qabbalah," 36, n. 38. Rashbam may have had a hand in the *Avot* commentary, along with other students of Rashi (including R. Jacob b. Samson). See Israel Ta-Shma, "Al Perush Avot shebe-Mahzor Vitry," *Qiryat Sefer* 42 (1977):507–8. And cf. Grossman, *Hakhmei Zarefat ha-Rishonim*, 413–16; and below, ch. 4, n. 2. In one place in his Torah commentary (Exodus 3:15), Rashbam employs an *w'אלהב* technique to interpret the verse's usage of a Divine name. Cf. *Hizquni 'al ha-Torah*, ad loc.

⁶⁷Sara Kamin, "Rashbam's Conception of the Creation in the Light of the Intellectual Currents of His Time," *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 31 (1986):91–132. Cf. Rashbam's comment to *Pesahim* 119a in the preceding note; *Perush R. Shmu'el b. Meir le-Qohelet*, ed. Sara Japhet and Robert Salters (Jerusalem, 1985), 52–53, and n. 187; Rashi's commentary to *Qohelet*, 7:24; Gila Rozen, "Perush Rashi le-Qohelet," (M.A. thesis, Bar Ilan University, 1996), 57, 111, 162; *Perush ha-Roqeqah 'al ha-Megillot*, ed. Chaim Konyevsky, vol. 2 (Bnei Brak, 1984), 162; and above, n. 35. See also Eleazar Touitou, "Shitato ha-Parshanim shel Rashbam 'al Reqa ha-Mezi'ut ha-Historit shel Zemanno," *Iyyunim be-Sifrut Hazal, ba-Miqra, uve-Toledot Yisra'el*, ed. Y. D. Gilat et al. (Jerusalem, 1982), 69; Moshe Greenberg, "Darkah shel Sarah Kamin ba-Mehqar," *Ha-Miqra bi-Re'i Mefarshav [Sefer Zikkaron le-Sarah Kamin]* (Jerusalem, 1994), 25 (who notes also the anti-cosmogonic tendency of R. Yosef Bekhor Shor, also known as the tosafist R. Joseph

CHAPTER 3

attempted to explain away talmudic superstitions and folk magic.⁶⁸ Rashbam has been described and portrayed as a rationalist,⁶⁹ although it is highly doubtful that he was exposed to the study of philosophy in any form.⁷⁰

of Orleans); Judah Galinsky, "Rabbenu Mosheh mi-Coucy ke-Hasid, Darshan u-Folmosan: Hebbetim me-'Olamo ha-Mahashavti u-Fe'iluto ha-Zibburit" (M.A. thesis, Yeshiva University, 1993), 59–61; and see now Sarah Japhet, "Massoret ve-Hiddush be-Perush Rashbam le-Sefer Iyyov" (above, n. 31), 132*–33*. R. Hayyim Yosef David Azulai (Hida, d. 1806) records a tradition in which Rashi appeared after his death to R. Samuel b. Meir in a dream and taught him the secret vocalization of the Tetragrammaton. The unusual nature of this transmission notwithstanding, a fifteenth-century manuscript source (Sassoon 290, fol. 218, sec. 299, which may have formed the basis of this tradition) contains a passage in which this pronunciation is placed in the mouth of ר' שמואל בן קלונימוס החסיד (father of the חסידי אשכנו), R. Meshullam of צרפת, about the proper reading of the Divine Name. It is possible that the names of the two R. Samuels became interchanged. This type of discussion would certainly have been appropriate for members of חסידי אשכנו. Cf. below, ch. 5, n. 66. It is also interesting to note once again, in this regard, that R. Samuel *he-Hasid* was suggested as the real author of the pietistic pseudo-Rashi commentary to Chronicles. See above, n. 41.

⁶⁸See Louis Rabinowitz, *The Social History of the Jews of Northern France in the 12th–14th Centuries* (New York, 1972), 197, 206–7; and E. E. Urbach, "Madda'ei ha-Yahadut—Reshamim ve-Hirhurim," *Mehqarim be-Madda'ei ha-Yahadut* (Jerusalem, 1986), 17–18. Cf. Rashbam, *Bava Batra* 58, s.v. *amar lehu kulhu nekhasei de-hai*; the commentary of R. Samuel Strashun of Vilna (Rashash), ad loc.; and *Bava Batra* 73b, s.v. *sham' in bei malka ve-qatlahu*.

⁶⁹Throughout his study cited above (n. 67), Touitou portrays Rashbam as a rationalist, very much in the spirit of the twelfth-century Renaissance. See also Touitou, "Darko shel Rashbam be-Heleq ha-Halakhi shel ha-Torah," *Millet* 2 (1984):275–88; Joseph Davis, "R. Yom Tov Lipman Heller, Joseph b. Isaac ha-Levi, and Rationalism in Ashkenazic Jewish Culture, 1550–1650," 6–42; and Baron, *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*, 6:294–95. Regarding Rashbam and R. Joseph Qara as well, see Grossman, *Hakhmei Zarefat ha-Rishonim*, 261–66, 318–23, 467–80; idem, "Galut u-Ge'ulah be-Mishnato shel R. Yosef Qara," *Tarbut ve-Hevrah be-Toledot Yisra'el Bimei ha-Benayim*, ed. Reuven Bonfil et al. (Jerusalem, 1989), 269–301; and below, n. 86. See also Joseph Davis, "Philosophy, Dogma, and Exegesis in Medieval Ashkenazic Judaism: The Evidence of *Sefer Hadrat ha-Qodesh*," *AJS Review* 18 (1993): 213, n. 67, for the suggestion that Rashbam's insistence on *peshat* and his rejection of "metaphysics and esoteric doctrines" was perhaps at the root of some of R. Moses Taku's criticisms. [For Taku's negative attitude toward esoteric texts, see, e.g., J. Dan, "Ashkenazic Hasidism and the Maimonidean Controversy," *Maimonidean Studies* 3 (1992–93): 42–44; Y. N. Epstein, "R. Mosheh Taku ben Hisdai ve-Sifro Ketav Tamim," in his *Mehqarim be-Sifrut ha-Talmud uvi-Leshonot Shemiyyot*, 1:294–302; *Arugat ha-Bosem*, ed. Urbach, 4:81; Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:423–24; and cf. above, ch. 1, n. 31.] An epistle from the Maimonidean controversy of the 1230s, which was written by an Ashkenazic rabbinic

Rashbam's German contemporary, R. Eliezer b. Nathan (Raban), also avoided recourse to *sod*. Raban's lack of involvement in the transmission of *sodot* and esoteric studies is evident in a number of instances. His introduction to his commentary on the prayers and *piyyutim* is strikingly similar in both style and content to that of R. Eleazar of Worms's prayer commentary. These two introductions have, in fact, been arrayed side by side and compared in contemporary scholarship.⁷¹ This comparison serves, however, to highlight a glaring difference. While R. Eleazar of Worms expresses keen interest in elucidating *sodot ha-tefillah* and *sod ha-berakhah*, Raban makes no mention of

figure (who may have hailed from northern France), appears to maintain (in agreement with Rashbam) that the study of *sod*, as well as philosophy, is unnecessary. See Shatzmiller, above, ch. 2, n. 11. The polemical nature of this epistle must weigh most heavily, however, in any assessment of its intentions.

⁷⁰On the relative absence of philosophical (and scientific) study in Ashkenaz during the high Middle Ages, see above, introduction, n. 1; David Berger, "Judaism and General Culture in Medieval and Early Modern Times," *Judaism's Encounters with Other Cultures*, ed. Jacob Schacter (Northvale, 1997), 117–22; Davis, "Philosophy, Dogma and Exegesis," 209–13; A. Grossman, *Hakhmei Ashkenaz ha-Rishonim*, 424; H. Soloveitchik, "Religious Law and Change: The Medieval Ashkenazic Example," *AJS Review* 12 (1987):213, n. 12; Daniel Lasker, "Jewish Philosophical Polemics in Ashkenaz," *Contra Iudeos*, ed. Ora Limor and Guy Stroumsa (Jerusalem, 1996), 195–200. Note that the Ashkenazic figures identified by Davis in 209, n. 57, as being aware of the Hebrew paraphrase of Sa'adyah's *Emunot ve-De'ot* were either themselves *Hasidei Ashkenaz* (R. Judah *he-Hasid*, R. Eleazar of Worms, members of the *Hug ha-Keruv ha-Meyuhad*) or tosafists who were closely associated with *hasidut Ashkenaz* (R. Moses of Coucy, R. Meir of Rothenburg). Cf. Moshe Idel, "Perush Mizmor Yod-Tet le R. Yosef Bekhor Shor," *Alei Sefer* 9 (1981):63–69, who suggests that Yosef Bekhor Shor was influenced, uniquely amongst the tosafists, by Bahya Ibn Paquda's *Hovot ha-Levavot*; Sarah Kamin, "Ha-Polmos Naged ha-Allegoriyyah be-Divrei R. Yosef Bekhor Shor," *Mehqerei Yerushalayim be-Mahshevot Yisra'el* 3 (1984):367–92; Yosefa Rahaman, "Melekhet ha-Sevarah be-Perush Bekhor Shor la-Torah," *Tarbiz* 53 (1980):615–18; and above, n. 67. Regarding science, see above in the introduction, n. 1, and below, ch. 4, n. 40.

Rashbam's approach regarding the playing down or discarding of the esoteric treatises and concepts of which he was aware (which holds true to an extent for *Rabbenu Tam* as well, as we shall see shortly) accords with a trend in twelfth-century Franco-German rabbinic scholarship noted by Israel Ta-Shma, "The Library of the French Sages," *Rashi*, 1040–1990, ed. Sed-Rajna, 535–40. Unlike the pre-Crusade period, in which leading scholars tried to acquire and adapt any earlier Jewish texts they could find, in an eclectic manner, tosafists restricted their libraries and were not nearly as interested in integrating earlier texts other than the Talmud and related rabbinic texts. Cf. below, n. 124.

⁷¹See Grossman, *Hakhmei Ashkenaz ha-Rishonim*, 348, and *Siddur Rabbenu Shelomoh mi-Germaiza ve-Siddur Hasidei Ashkenaz*, ed. Hershler, editor's introduction, 29.

CHAPTER 3

these subjects at all.⁷² In a methodological statement, Raban suggests that his omission of esoteric material was by design, even though he (like Rashbam) was aware of this kind of material: “I do not need to interpret and explain *’ofannim* [liturgical poems on that portion of the *Shema* which mentions various angelic and heavenly beings], because *ma’aseh Bereshit* and *ma’aseh Merkavah* may not be explicated even in private. But I will explain the *peshat* in order that one can have a basic understanding of what he is saying.”⁷³

Raban records in his *siddur* the Ashkenazic custom of switching the final blessing of the *Shema* on Friday night from *ha-shomer ‘ammo Yisra’el la-’ad* to *ha-pores sukkat shalom*, and he attributes this change to the protection against danger that the Sabbath affords its adherents. But only in a parallel passage from a *siddur* produced by *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, which appended material to the *siddur* of Raban, is a *Bahir*-like *exemplum* included, similar to those found in *Sefer ha-Pardes* and *Mahzor Vitry*.⁷⁴

⁷²On the absence of *sod* in Raban’s prayer and *piyyut* commentaries, see ‘*Arugat ha-Bosem*, ed. E. E. Urbach, 4:24–39, 73–74. Urbach concludes his analysis of Raban’s prayer and *piyyut* commentaries by stating unequivocally that *הוּא [רַאֲבָן] לֹא הַכּוֹנִיט לְתוֹהָם עַנְיוֹנִי סָדָה*. See also Stefan Reif, “Rashi and Proto-Ashkenazi Liturgy,” *Rashi*, 1040–1990, ed. Sed-Rajna, 450–52; idem, *Judaism and Hebrew Prayer* (Cambridge, 1993), 171–75; and cf. Simcha Emanuel, “*Sifrei Halakhah Avudim shel Ba’alei ha-Tosafot*” (Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University, 1993), 85–87. The so-called pseudo-Raban prayer commentary contains mystical material. See Chaim Levine, “*Perush ‘al ha-Mahzor ha-Meyuhas le-Raban*,” *Tarbiz* 29 (1959–60):162–75; A. Y. Hershler, “*Perush Siddur ha-Tefillah ve-ha-Mahzor Meyuhas le-R. Eliezer b. Nathan mi-Magenza (ha-Ra’avan) Ketav Yad Frankfurt*,” *Genuzot* 3 (1991): 1–128; and cf. ‘*Arugat ha-Bosem*, 4:38, n. 81.

⁷³Cited in ‘*Arugat ha-Bosem*, ed. Urbach, 4:29. Cf. Alexander Shapiro, “*Polmos Anti-Nozeri ba-Me’ah ha-Yod Bet*,” *Zion* 56 (1991):79–85, for further evidence of Raban’s rationalism.

⁷⁴See *Siddur Rabbenu Shelomoh mi-Germaiza ve-Siddur Hasidei Ashkenaz*, ed. Hershler, 139–40, and see esp. n. 28. On the identification of this *siddur*, which was published primarily from ms. Bodl. 794, see Grossman, *Hakhmei Ashkenaz ha-Rishonim*, 346–48. Various versions and pieces of Raban’s commentary to the prayers, such as ms. Budapest/Kaufman A399 and Bodl. 1102, have marginal notes or even addenda attributed to, e.g., R. Judah *he-Hasid*, R. Eleazar of Worms, and R. Samuel Bamberg, which contain *sod* material. See ‘*Arugat ha-Bosem*, ed. Urbach, above, n. 72; *Siddur Rabbenu Shelomoh mi-Germaiza*, editor’s introduction, 15–30; and above, ch. 2, nn. 19–21. [Hershler, 23–24 and Urbach, 4:24, note that a piece of *perush ha-Raban* appears in ms. Parma 1033; on this manuscript, see above, n. 21.]

Moshe Hallamish (“*Be’ayot be-Heqer Hashpa’at ha-Qabbalah ‘al ha-Tefillah*,” *Massu’ot*, ed. Oron and Goldreich, 212, n. 67), noting Grossman’s identification of the main *siddur* published by Hershler as that of Raban, points to a conflict between a position of Raban in that *siddur* and a view attributed to Raban in another *siddur* in ms.

Moreover, Raban reports an interpretation by his brother Hezekiah that, according to Elliot Wolfson, was intended to vigorously deflect a mystical approach. Hezekiah writes that one bows before a Torah scroll not because of any inherent Godliness in the Torah itself, but rather because the *Shekhinah* dwells within the Holy Ark. A mystical tradition embraced and expanded upon by the German Pietists identified the Torah with the Divine glory, the *Kavod*. The Torah scroll is described as the Divine footstool. According to this tradition, one bows to the Torah because it is in fact a manifestation of the Divine. In their formulation, Hezekiah and Raban wished to offset this view.⁷⁵

Hamburg 153. According to ms. Hamburg (cited by Urbach and reproduced by Hallamish, 214), Raban held that the word *barukh* was meant to appear thirteen times in the *Barukh she-amar* prayer. (Interestingly, while R. Eleazar of Worms agreed with this number, his reasons are different and tend to be more theologically based than those offered by Raban, which are completely exoteric.) But Hallamish notes that on p. 21 of Hershler's *siddur*, the number given is ten; this casts some doubt on Grossman's identification. What Hallamish failed to notice, however, is that this material comes from a section of the *siddur* manuscript labeled by Hershler (on p. 19) as *siddur Hasidei Ashkenaz* (based, for the most part, on ms. Munich 393), not from the body of the larger *siddur* published by Hershler. [The number ten is primarily the view of kabbalists, including R. Judah b. Yaqr; see Hallamish, 212–13, and below, ch. 4, n. 25. On the affinity noted by Hallamish, 213, between R. Nathan b. Judah's *Sefer ha-Mahkdim* and *hasidut Ashkenaz*—despite R. Nathan's French origins—see my “Rabbinic Figures in Castilian Kabbalistic Pseudepigraphy,” *Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy* 3 (1993):97, n. 73. R. Nathan cites a rite from *Ma'aseh Merkavah*; see above, n. 37.]

⁷⁵See Elliot Wolfson, “The Mystical Significance of Torah-Study in German Pietism,” *JQR* 84 (1993):71–73, and *idem*, *Through a Speculum That Shines*, 248–50. As Wolfson notes, R. Eleazar of Worms cites this formulation in the body of his halakhic work, *Sefer Roqeah*, despite the fact that both he and R. Judah he-Hasid espoused the more mystical view in esoteric and pietistic texts. See also *Sefer Raban*, *massekhet Berakhot*, sec. 127. R. Hanan'el interpreted the talmudic passage (*Berakhot* 6a) that the Almighty dons *tefillin* to mean not that God has a visible body which can be seen, but that certain human beings may perceive Him through *re'iyat ha-lev*—loosely translated as imagination. Cf. Wolfson, *Through a Speculum That Shines*, 147–48; *Sefer Gematri'ot le-R. Yehudah he-Hasid*, introduction, 10–11; and below, ch. 4, n. 2. Thus when the Torah states that Moses saw God's back, it refers to this process of *re'iyat ha-lev*. Similarly, when R. Yishmael Kohen Gadol in the Holy of Holies saw Akatri'el seated ‘al kisse ram ve-nissa (*Berakhot* 7a), it was through the powers of *re'iyat ha-lev*. When R. Isaac b. Moses *Or Zarua*^c, a student of *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, cites R. Hanan'el (*Sefer Or Zarua*^c, *hilkhot qeri'at shema*, secs. 7–8), he adds that R. Hanan'el, in offering the interpretation involving *re'iyat ha-lev*, supports the interpretation that Akatri'el was not merely an angel but a manifestation of the Divine *Kavod* (which could not be physically seen by man), a notion associated with *Hasidei Ashkenaz*. This is also included by R. Judah b. Qalonymus of Spires, an associate of R. Judah he-Hasid (see above, ch. 1,

CHAPTER 3

Raban is referred to in a late medieval *Ma'aseh Bukh* as a *ba'al Shem*, capable of effecting miraculous acts such as *qefizat ha-derekh*.⁷⁶ This later perception may have been predicated on an incident in which Raban reversed one of his halakhic rulings. He initially permitted wine that had come into contact with a particular utensil that had been used for libation wine (*yayn nesekh*). After issuing this ruling, Raban went to sleep and dreamed that his teacher (and father-in-law) was reading a verse that Raban then interpreted, in the dream, as referring to those who drink *yayn nesekh* and eat pork. When Raban awoke, he understood from this dream that he had incorrectly permitted the wine. Raban then reviewed a key factor in his lenient ruling and discovered, after a time, that his main assumption had been incorrect. At that point, both he and those who drank the wine, at his instruction, fasted for two days.⁷⁷

Two related experiences help to put Raban's dream in perspective. R. Ephraim of Regensburg, a contemporary of Raban, ate a fish called *barbuta*, believing it to be from a kosher species. That night an elderly man with flowing hair and a lengthy beard appeared to him in a dream with a plate full of insects (*shera'zim*), bidding R. Ephraim to eat them. When R. Ephraim protested, the old man suggested that these *shera'zim* "are as permitted as those that you ate today." When R. Ephraim awoke, he knew that Elijah (*Eliyyahu zakhur la-tov*) had appeared to him, and from then on he refrained from eating that fish.⁷⁸ As

n. 76) in his *Sefer Yihusei Tannaim va-Amoraim*, from which *Sefer Or Zarua'* may have received its material; see Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:376–77; and below, ch. 4, n. 51, and ch. 5, n. 7. Raban, however, cites from R. Hanan'el only the concept of *re'iyat ha-lev*, making no mention of the notion of the *Kavod*. [Cf. above, ch. 2, nn. 81–82. Raban offered a rationalistic approach to various *harhaqot* for a menstruant that were proposed in the *Baraita de-Massekhet Niddah*, which contributed to a lessening of these stringencies, a goal shared by Rabbenu Tam. On the other hand, the thirteenth-century tosafist R. Isaac *Or Zarua'*, following the lead of *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, continued to stress the more esoteric or magical nature of these stringencies, as a means of protection from danger.]

⁷⁶See A. J. Heschel, "Al Ruah ha-Qodesh Bimei ha-Beinayim," 196, and Sara Zfatman, *Bein Ashkenaz li-Sefarad: Le-Toledot ha-Sippur ha-Yehudi Bimei ha-Benayim* (Jerusalem, 1993), 82, n. 7, 105.

⁷⁷See *Sefer Raban*, sec. 26. The event is described as having occurred in 1152. Cf. R. Hayyim David Joseph Azulai, *Shem ha-Gedolim* (Warsaw, 1876), *Ma'arekhet ha-Gedolim*, 26, sec. 199. Hida adduces talmudic examples of Tannaim and Amoraim who, like Raban and others, had dreams that had an impact on their halakhic decisions. See also *Shem ha-Gedolim*, 62–64, sec. 224.

⁷⁸*Sefer Tashbez*, sec. 252. According to this text, the story of R. Ephraim's dream was related by R. Barukh (of Worms, author of *Sefer ha-Terumah*?). But according to *Sefer Or Zarua'*, pisqei 'Avodah Zarah, sec. 200 (and see also *Semaq mi-Zurikh*, ed. Y. Y.

opposed to R. Ephraim, whose dream was, in any case, more pointed, Raban never claimed a *gillui Eliyyahu*. As we shall see, there were other tosafists who also rendered or changed halakhic decisions because they claimed to have seen Elijah in a dream. Moreover, upon awakening, Raban proceeded to “verify” the instruction in his dream by reviewing his ruling, while R. Ephraim (and the others) did not.⁷⁹

R. Uri b. R. Joel *ha-Levi*, a grandson of Raban, was burned to death as a martyr in 1216. R. Mordekhai b. Eliezer composed a *selihah* to commemorate R. Uri. A manuscript that records the *selihah* indicates that R. Uri himself was its author. He transmitted the text of the *selihah* to R. Mordekhai in a dream, along with the liturgical tune (*niggun*) to which it should be chanted.⁸⁰ The nature of the communication during this dream, which is reminiscent of a dream that R. Simeon *ha-Gadol* had,⁸¹ further suggests that Raban’s dream was not primarily a mystical experience. Although Raban’s dream testifies to his deep spirituality, it entails neither magical techniques nor mystical perspectives.⁸²

Har-Shoshanim, vol. 2 [Jerusalem, 1977], 293, n. 135), it was R. Judah *he-Hasid* who initially recounted the dream of R. Ephraim of Regensburg, suggesting some relationship between R. Ephraim and *Hasidei Ashkenaz*. Cf. Urbach, *Ba’alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:204; and Tamar Alexander, “Rabbi Judah the Pious as a Legendary Figure,” *Mysticism, Magic and Kabbalah in Ashkenazi Hasidism*, 135–36. Similar regimens of *tiqqunei teshuvah* for a penitent murderer were prescribed by R. Judah *he-Hasid* and R. Ephraim of Regensburg. See ms. Parma 1237, fol. 36v. See also above, ch. 2, n. 40. In discussing the reliability of dreams in halakhic contexts, R. Samuel, the son of R. Ezekiel Landau, raises the issue of verification; see *Noda Bi-Yehudah, Yoreh De’ah* (*mahadura tinyana*), #30. In R. Samuel’s view, R. Ephraim’s piety caused him to prohibit the *barbuta* because of his dream, despite the fact that Rabbenu Tam and other tosafists (who were not granted a dream by the “*ba’al ha-halom*”) permitted this fish because they believed it had scales. See also R. Samuel’s *Shivat Zion*, #52.

⁷⁹See below, ch. 4, n. 59 (Rabiah), and ch. 5, n. 20 (R. Isaiah di Trani). Cf. *SHP* 386, and below, ch. 4, n. 3, regarding *halakhah* and prophecy.

⁸⁰See ms. Bodl. 1155 (Ashkenaz, fourteenth century), fol. 171v: *סליחה זו עשויה ליל אוורי החסיד בן ר' יואיל הלוי בניגן תורה ישראל* *סליחה יסד החסיד החבר ר' אוורי בן רבינו יואיל הלוי*, אחר Aptowitzer, *Mavo la-Rabiah*, 67: אשר נגע בו ונחרג ונשרף... וצוה להעתיק לה' מרדכי בן אליעזר בחולמו, כי רמז בה samo, מצוה לו להחפיל אותה בניגן תורה ישראל

⁸¹See above, n. 3; and cf. *Sefer Yere’im*, secs. 334–35 (below, ch. 4, n. 19).

⁸²Cf. Urbach, *Ba’alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:180; *She’elot u-Teshuvot min ha-Shamayim*, editor’s introduction, 6–7; R. J. Z. Werblowsky, *Joseph Karo: Lawyer and Mystic* (Philadelphia, 1977), 41–43; *Sefer Raban*, pt. 2, *Massekhet Yoma*, end; above, ch. 1, n. 126; and Judah Galinsky, “R. Moshe mi-Coucy ve-ha-Polmos ha-Yehudi-Nozeri ba-Me’ah ha-Yod Gimmel” (forthcoming), n. 64.

CHAPTER 3

In light of the shifting attitudes toward *torat ha-sod* in medieval Ashkenaz during the first half of the twelfth century, it is helpful to consider briefly the changing status of magic in medieval Christian society. In the early part of the Middle Ages, magic was considered a practical science or skill. From the mid-eleventh century through the mid-thirteenth century, however, magic was denigrated generally, and associated with heretics and Jews. Secret knowledge was feared, and penances were prescribed for those who resorted to the use of magic.⁸³ But these penances were directed only at those who invoked demons or prescribed charms and amulets. According to John of Salisbury (d.1180) and other contemporary masters, the manipulation of demonic powers (black magic) was to be eschewed. Other magical arts, such as divination—which relied on natural objects or the initiation of quasi-prophetic or dream-like states—were still considered acceptable.⁸⁴ In Christian Europe also, the twelfth century witnessed a move away from the supernatural and toward the rational, which further limited the role that magic could play.⁸⁵

IV

Rabbenu Tam, the greatest of the early tosafists, has been characterized as a rationalist.⁸⁶ Like Rashbam, Rabbenu Tam interpreted talmudic passages in ways that eliminated the roles of superstition and *shedim*, which had been left

⁸³See Edward Peters, *The Magician, the Witch and the Law* (Philadelphia, 1978), 47, 56, 66–67, 70–80, 160–61.

⁸⁴Benedicta Ward, *Miracles and the Medieval Mind* (Philadelphia, 1989²), 10–13; Valerie Flint, *The Rise of Magic in Early Medieval Europe* (Princeton, 1991), 6–7, 29–35, 66–68, 87–92, 146–57; and Lynn Thorndike, *A History of Magic and Experimental Science*, 2:7–8 (Peter Abelard), 13–15 (Hugh of St. Victor), 137–54 (Hildegard of Bingen), 155–70 (John of Salisbury), 341–60 (William of Auvergne).

⁸⁵See, e.g., Peter Brown, “Society and the Supernatural: A Medieval Change,” *Daedalus* 104 (1975):133–51; John Baldwin, “The Intellectual Preparation for the Canon of 1215 Against Ordeals,” *Speculum* 36 (1961):611–36; C. M. Radding, “Superstition to Science: Nature, Fortune, and the Passing of the Medieval Ordeal,” *American Historical Review* 84 (1978):945–69; Gabor Klaniczay, *The Uses of Supernatural Power* (Princeton, 1990), 45–50; Richard Kieckhefer, *Magic in the Middle Ages*, 176–201; Jonathan Elukin, “The Ordeal of Scripture,” *Exemplaria* 5.1 (1993):135–60. Note, however, that rationalism wanes, and is supplanted, once again, by more popular beliefs, from the mid-thirteenth century through the fifteenth-century. See, e.g., David Knowles, *The Evolution of Medieval Thought* (London, 1962), 311–17; Shulamit Shahar, *The Fourth Estate* (London, 1983), 268–80; and E. Peters, *The Magician*, 89, 110–37.

⁸⁶See, e.g., Urbach, *Ba‘alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:70–71, 88–93; Grossman, *Hakhmei Ashkenaz ha-Rishonim*, 94–95; idem, “Zemihat Parshanut ha-Piyyut,” *Studies in Honor of Shlomo Simonshohn*, ed. Daniel Carpi et al. (Tel Aviv, 1993), 69; idem, “Shorashev shel

intact by Rashi and other predecessors.⁸⁷ Moreover, Rabbenu Tam was unswervingly talmudocentric. He was not even inclined, as Rashbam was, toward the study and interpretation of Scripture as a distinct discipline.⁸⁸

Qiddush ha-Shem be-Ashkenaz ha-Qedumah,” *Qedushat ha-Hayyim ve-Heruf ha-Nefesh*, ed. I. Gafni and A. Ravitzky (Jerusalem, 1993), 108–9, n. 22; and cf. R. Jacob Ibn Ḥaviv, ‘Ein Ya‘aqov to *Shabbat* 119a, s.v. *Katvu ba-Tosafot*: *כְּבוֹנָת רִית לְקַרְבָּן אֶל הַשְׁכָל*; and Rami Reiner, “Le-Ofi Ti‘uneihem ve-Ta‘anoteihem shel Rabbenu Tam ve-Rabbenu Meshullam,” *Shenaton ha-Mishpat ha-‘Ivri* (forthcoming). On Rabbenu Tam’s mathematical prowess, see ms. Paris BN 633, fol. 250v, and Colette Sirat, “Un Rituel Juif de France: Le Manuscrit Hébreu 633 de la Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris,” *REJ* 119 (1961):22. [On applied mathematics by tosafists and possible contemporary Christian influence, see Martin Stern, “A Mathematical Tosafot—A Case of Cross-Cultural Contact,” *Niv ha-Midrashia* 22–23 (1990):37–41. Cf. below, ch. 4, n. 2; and see my *Jewish Education and Society*, 69–73; Grossman, *Hakhmei Zarefat ha-Rishonim*, 21–24, 453–56; and Ta-Shma, *Halakhah, Minhag u-Mezi‘ut be-Ashkenaz*, 28–35, regarding Christian dialectic and its possible influence on the tosafists.]

⁸⁷ See, e.g., Rashi, *Menahot* 32b, s.v. *sakkah*; *Tosafot Menahot* 32b, s.v. *sakkah*; and R. Yeroham b. Meshullam, *Toledot Adam ve-Havvah* (Venice, 1553), sec. 21, pt. 7 (fol. 179c). As opposed to Rashi, who interpreted the talmudic dictum that a misplaced *mezuzah* was harmful because it could not serve to eliminate *shedim*, Rabbenu Tam saw the potential harm merely as the risk of injury if one bumped into the *mezuzah* because of its poor placement. Cf. *Teshuvot R. Meir mi-Rothenburg* (Cremona, 1557), #108, and Daniel Sperber, *Minhagei Yisra’el*, vol. 1 (Jerusalem, 1989), 46–56. As compared to Rashi (above, n. 45), Rabbenu Tam cites *Otiyyot de-R. Aqiva* in purely halakhic contexts (i.e., only as a source for the technical writing of *sifrei Torah*), as does Rabiah, with no concern for its mystical implications. See Israel Ta-Shma, “Qavvim le-Ofiyah shel Sifrut ha-Halakhah be-Ashkenaz ba-Me’ah ha-Yod Gimmel/ha-Yod Daled,” *‘Alei Sefer* 4 (1977):26–27; Rabbenu Tam’s *Hilkhot [Tiqqun] Sefer Torah in Ginzei Yerushalayim*, ed. S. A. Wertheimer, vol. 1 (Jerusalem, 1896), 97–99; *Sefer Rabiah*, ed. D. Deblitzky (Bnei Brak, 1976), 220 (sec. 1149); *Sefer ha-Manhig*, ed. Raphael, 2:587, 620; R. Samson b. Eliezer, *Barukh She’amar*, ed. M. M. Meshi-Zahav (Jerusalem, 1970), 74 (sec. 41), 101. Cf. *Tosafot R. Elhanan* to ‘Avodah Zarah 28b, s.v. *shoryeinei de-‘eina*, and above, ch. 2, n. 67. [Note also the differences between Rabbenu Tam and R. Judah *he-Hasid* in defining the thirteen Divine attributes. See, e.g., *Tosafot Rosh ha-Shanah* 17b, s.v. *ve-shalosh*, and *SHP*, secs. 414–15; *Sefer ha-Manhig*, 1:277–78; J. Gellis, *Tosafot ha-Shalem*, vol. 10 (1969):124–35; and S. E. Stern, “Perush Yod Gimmel Middot le-Rabbenu Tam,” *Yeshurun* 3 (1997):3–4. Cf. Ibn Ezra to Exodus 34:6; Moses Zucker ed., *A Critique Against the Writings of R. Sa‘adya Gaon* by R. Mevasser b. Nissi *Ha-Levi* (New York, 1955), 118; and my “Rabbinic Figures in Castilian Kabbalistic Pseudepigraphy,” 93, n. 57, 95, n. 67, regarding R. Isaac of Corbeil.]

⁸⁸ See, e.g., my “On the Role of Bible Study in Medieval Ashkenaz,” *The Frank Talmage Memorial Volume*, ed. Walfish, 1:151–66. Even Rabbenu Tam’s interest in *piyyut* was partially motivated by his interest in *halakhah*. See Urbach, *Ba‘alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:107–10. Grossman, “Perush ha-Piyyutim le-R. Aharon b. R. Hayyim ha-Kohen,”

CHAPTER 3

There are only a handful of passages in Rabbenu Tam's substantial corpus which, as far as I can determine, reflect mystical considerations, but their implications must be considered carefully. *Tosafot Hagigah* cites Rabbenu Tam as defining *Ma'aseh Bereshit* as the Divine Name of forty-two letters that can be derived from the first two verses of the Torah and that played a role in Creation. As we have noted, however, there were extant Ashkenazic traditions about Divine Names (and mystical speculation) that Rashbam had mentioned. Moreover, this particular tradition (which had apparently not yet reached Ashkenaz by Rashi's day, but was later expanded upon by both R. Eleazar of Worms and the *Zohar*) was also cited in the name of R. Hai Gaon.⁸⁹ In two of the places where *sod* or magic is involved, Rabbenu Tam cites the material as having been transmitted by his father, R. Meir, in the name of *Hakhmei/Geonei Lothaire* of the pre-Crusade period. Rabbenu Tam makes no attempt to explain or analyse these instances; he simply accepts them as earlier traditions or perceptions to be upheld as a matter of custom or respect.

In the first instance, Rabbenu Tam endorses the notion that one should not eat after sunset on the Sabbath because of the danger from *shedim/maziqim* that had befallen those who did. As we shall see, this was not merely an issue of popular belief or superstition; it was related to mystical concepts.⁹⁰ Rabbenu Tam also reported an earlier tradition, in the context of a statement on the importance of reciting *piyyutim*, which described how R. Eleazar *ha-Qallir* appeared when he composed *piyyut(im)* that referred to the angels who surrounded the *kisse* or *merkavah*. According to this tradition, a fire lit up and burned around him (ליהטה אש סביביו). It was in this context as well

Be-Orah Madda [Sefer Yovel le-Aharon Mirsky], ed. Zvi Malachi (Lod, 1986), 453, explains the sustained involvement of talmudocentric, rationalistic tosafists such as Rabbenu Tam in *piyyut* as a function of the sheer importance of this discipline in the hierarchy of the Ashkenazic tradition. Cf. Haym Soloveitchik, "Three Themes in the *Sefer Hasidim*," *AJS Review* 1 (1976):345, 352, n. 131, and Zvi Malachi, "Rashi and his Disciples in Relation to the Old Paytanim," *Rashi*, 1040–1990, ed. Sed-Rajna, 455–62. [On Rabbenu Tam and R. Eliezer *ha-Gadol* concerning the order of the Torah portions in the *tefillin shel rosh*, see Grossman, *Hakhmei Ashkenaz ha-Rishonim*, 227.]

⁸⁹See *Tosafot Hagigah* 11b, s.v. *'ein dorshin*; Elliot Wolfson, "Letter Symbolism and Merkavah Imagery in the *Zohar*," *Alei Shefer: Studies in the Literature of Jewish Thought*, ed. Moshe Hallamish (Ramat Gan, 1990), 217*–218*; and cf. ms. Bodl. 2344, fol. 3r; and above, n. 28.

⁹⁰See Ta-Shma, *Minhag Ashkenaz ha-Qadmon*, 102, 203–13. Cf. *Teshuvot Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, ed. I. A. Agus (New York, 1954), 56; *Shibbolei ha-Leqet*, sec. 130; ms. Bodl. 659, fol. 35; and below, ch. 4, n. 34, regarding R. Menahem of Joigny, who was much more active in analyzing and applying this precaution, and in arguing his own interpretations.

that Rabbenu Tam characterized R. Simeon b. Isaac *ha-Gadol* as *melummad be-nismi*.⁹¹

In another formulation, Rabbenu Tam offered a position on the name Metatron, usually associated with the highest angel (*Sar ha-Panim*). According to Rabbenu Tam, “the Holy One blessed be He is Himself called Metatron.”⁹² Some Pietist authors similarly identified Metatron with *Shekhinah*, the Divine Presence. Although R. Moses b. Eleazar *ha-Darshan*, a grandson of R. Judah *he-Hasid*, was against identifying the angelic Metatron with the Divine Presence, he allowed the name Metatron to be attributed to *Shekhinah*. “This [identification] is not a mistake. This is another secret that is explained in the name of Rabbenu Tam (*sod she-meforash be-shem Rabbenu Tam*).”⁹³

Although R. Moses viewed this formulation of Rabbenu Tam as a *sod*, it is far from certain that Rabbenu Tam did. The last part of R. Moses b. Eleazar’s statement may mean that this identification was a secret from the perspective of someone familiar with *sod*, which Rabbenu Tam expressed openly or unwittingly. Indeed, it was suggested by Rabbenu Tam to solve a problem of exoteric scriptural exegesis. Following an older rabbinic view, Rashi identified the angel in Exodus 23:20—sent by God to “guard the way” of the Jewish people following the sin of the golden calf—as Metatron. Rashi arrived at this interpretation by means of a *gematria* approach. Some had questioned this conclusion, since the *gematria* that Rashi used could be wielded differently.

⁹¹ See above, n. 9, and cf. Rami Reiner, “Rabbenu Tam: Rabbotav (ha-Zarefatim) ve-Talmidav Benei Ashkenaz” (M.A. thesis, Hebrew University, 1997), 15–21, 45. See also R. Moses Taku’s *Ketav Tamim* in *Ozar Nehmad* 4 [1863], 85 [=Joseph Dan’s transcription of ms. Paris H711 (Mercaz Dinur, Jerusalem, 1984), fol. 34v], in which R. Eleazar *ha-Qallir* is described as a *mal’akh E-lohim*; Fleischer, above, n. 20; and cf. *Va-Yiqra Rabbah*, 16:4, and Ruth Langer, “Kalir Was a Tanna,” *HUCA* 67 (1996):95–106.

⁹² *Moshav Zeqenim ‘al ha-Torah*, ed. S. D. Sassoon (London, 1959), 198. See Daniel Abrams, “The Boundaries of Divine Ontology: The Inclusion and Exclusion of Metatron in the Godhead,” *Harvard Theological Review* 87 (1994):299–300.

⁹³ The text is cited in Wolfson, *Through a Speculum That Shines*, 260, with manuscript references given in n. 306. (On this text and its milieu, see also ms. Berlin Or. Qu. 942, fol. 127r; Scholem, *Reshit ha-Qabbalah*, 195–205; and Dan, *Torat ha-Sod shel Hasidut Ashkenaz*, 255–58.) This text also intimates that the “secret” attributed to Rabbenu Tam is found, with other names of Metatron, in a book by R. Nehemyah [b. Solomon], another follower of the German Pietists in the late thirteenth-century. E. E. Urbach, “Sefer ‘Arugat ha-Bosem le-R. Avraham b. Azriel,” *Tarbiz* 10 (1939):50–51, suggests that this R. Nehemyah was the son of R. Solomon b. Samuel, himself a student of the German Pietists; see above, ch. 2, at n. 9. Cf. ‘Arugat ha-Bosem, ed. Urbach, 4:119, and Wolfson, 231–32, n. 177. [A R. Nehemyah describes *te’amim* of Gog and Magog in ms. Parma 541, fol. 266v; see above, nn. 13–14, and below, ch. 4, n. 32; ch. 5, n. 67.]

CHAPTER 3

At this point, Rabbenu Tam stepped in and confirmed the role of Metatron in this verse, citing a passage in *Pesiqta* in which the Almighty characterizes Himself as the guard (*manitor/shomer*) of the Jewish people. The net effect of Rabbenu Tama's interpretation is to identify Metatron with God (with the help of the *Pesiqta*), but this came about in the course of establishing a biblical interpretation. Indeed, a *Tosafot* passage cites R. Tam's resolution of contradictory talmudic and *piyyut* texts that seem to identify Metatron as both *Sar ha-'Olam* and *Ha'nokh*, two different angels who cannot be the same. Rabbenu Tam did not question the angelic nature of Metatron and made no mention of God. Moreover, in this instance as well, R. Tam offered his resolution regarding the names of Metatron with a passage from the *Midrash Pesiqta*.⁹⁴ Rabbenu Tam was interested in clarifying the role of Metatron (and other heavenly figures) on the basis of rabbinic (rather than esoteric) texts. One of the positions he formulated in this endeavor may have been helpful to *ba'alei sod*, but it cannot be demonstrated from this instance that he was a *ba'al sod* himself.

Caution must also be exercised with regard to several other passages that mention Rabbenu Tam's name in connection with esoteric phenomena and techniques. In three such texts, Rabbenu Tam is paired with another contemporary scholar who had perceived affinities with secret lore—a detail that confirms the inherently pseudopigraphic nature of these passages. Moreover, the mystical techniques are done in Rabbenu Tam's presence or with respect to his teachings. They are never performed by Rabbenu Tam himself. In one passage, Rabbenu Tam is joined with R. Elijah of Paris, who was known for his deep piety and for his mystical traditions concerning the end of days.⁹⁵ In response to a request from a father who had been unable to

⁹⁴See *Tosafot Yevamot* 16b, s.v. *pasuq zeh*; and see also the parallel *Tosafot Hullin* 60a, s.v. *pasuq zeh*, and the variant in *Tosafot Yeshanim ha-Shalem 'al Massekhet Yevamot*, ed. Abraham Shoshana (Jerusalem, 1994), ad loc. Cf. Margoliot, *Mal'akhei 'Elyon*, 79–80, nn. 13–14; and *Tosafot ha-Shalem*, ed. Gellis, 8:343 (sec. 11), 346–47 (secs. 9, 11).

⁹⁵These traditions, which lend credence to R. Elijah's reputation as a *ba'al sod*, were recorded by his grandson, R. Jacob of Provins (a student of Rabbenu Tam), who was associated with other esoteric teachings. See *Teshuvot u-Fesaqim*, ed. Efraim Kupfer (Jerusalem, 1973), 309–12, and below, n. 98, and ch. 4, n. 37. On the piety of R. Elijah, see Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:76, 79, 122; and see above, ch. 1, n. 66. R. Elijah (b. Judah) of Paris is sometimes confused with another northern French pietist from the first half of the eleventh century, R. Elijah b. Menahem of Le Mans; see above, ch. 1, n. 24. See also Avraham Grossman, "Ha-'Aliyyah la-Regel shel R. Eliyyahu b. Menahem," *Tarbiz* 56 (1987):273–278, and idem, *Hakhmei Zarefat ha-Rishonim*, 86–87, 98, 104–5.

attend the burial of his murdered son, Rabbenu Tam and R. Elijah supposedly permitted the use of a Divine Name in order to resurrect (the image of) the son.⁹⁶

According to a text of the *Hug ha-Keruv ha-Meyuhad*, a mystical circle that flourished in northern France and England and was associated with the German Pietists, Avraham Ibn Ezra created a *golem* in the presence of Rabbenu

⁹⁶ Vienna 152 [Hebr. 47] (Italy, fifteenth/sixteenth centuries), fols. 1v–2r (following a section entitled **פירוש לשם המפורש**):

אמר ר' יצחק מעשה ונחרג אליוו בן הרב ר' תודורוס מעיר קרנות כבן עשרים שנה ונחרג בתוך העיר. ונזכר ואביו לא היה בעיר ובשובו לא רצה לאכול ולשחות עד שיתירו לו גודלי הדור ובינו יעקב ברמו ורבינו אליוו בפרש להעלות לפניו בנו בשם המפורש. ויציא לו כל הקהלה... ויצתה נשלה לחם שיתירו לו וכן עשו והתירו לו. ורחץ וטבל ולبس לבנים והתענו כל הקהלה ביום ה' והלכו כלם לבית הכנסת והכינסה ה' [השם] בין הפסיפים והשביע נפש נוראה בין הפסיפים ולכך בנו להוריידו מן הארון לעיני כל הקהלה דבר לו כרצוינו לעיניהם ואח"כ החזירו בארון. וזה ספר לנו הרב להורות סדר המעשה. [זא- והילך תפלה אליוו וברונו לטובה בשם ר' אלקי ישראל... ובטוף: ואשנורה עוזתיך נגד מלכים ולא אבושים. בא"ה שמע תפלה.]

This passage is part of a small treatise, several pages long, on the use of *Shemot* for *hashbā'ot*. See A. Z. Schwarz, *Die Hebräischen Handschriften der Nationalbibliothek in Wien* (Leipzig, 1925), 161–63. The Divine Names that appear prior to this text and were the ones used in this story represent, by implication, a tradition shared by *Sefer ha-Bahir* and the German Pietists. See Scholem, *Reshit ha-Qabbalah*, 38–39, n. 2, and *idem*, *Origins of the Kabbalah* (Princeton, 1987), 100–102. Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:123, considers this story “characteristic of the Jewish experience in northern France,” although he includes it in his discussion of R. Elijah of Paris rather than Rabbenu Tam. [Once again, it should be noted that the preparations for using the *Shem* in this passage are very similar to what is prescribed in *Hekhalot* literature; cf. above, n. 8. For magical techniques attributed to a *ru'ah*, see ms. Vat. 244 (Spain, fourteenth century), fols. 2v, 28r; and cf. Henri Gross in *MGWJ* 49 (1905): 695, n. 3.] On locating a corpse through magical means, see also *Sefer ha-Yashar le-Rabbenu Tam* (*heleq ha-teshuvot*), ed. Shraga Rosenthal (Berlin, 1898), 191: אבל בטביה עין מעשים בכל ימי שודרט מיאשנני, see ms. Vat. 244 (Spain, fourteenth century), fols. 2v, 28r; and cf. Henri Gross in *MGWJ* 49 (1905): 695, n. 3.] On locating a corpse through magical means, see also *Sefer ha-Yashar le-Rabbenu Tam* (*heleq ha-teshuvot*), ed. Shraga Rosenthal (Berlin, 1898), 191: אבל בטביה עין מעשים בכל יום אחר שנין עשר חודש מות ניכר. והרב הקדוש ר' שמשון בשודגין בעל החלום לאחר יום אפיקלו לאחר שנין עשר חודש מות ניכר. והרב הקדוש ר' שמשון בשודגין בעל החלום לאחר חצי שנה ניכר כאלו הוא חי. Cf. *Sefer Or Zarua'*, *Hilkhot 'Agunah*, pt. 1, sec. 692 (fol. 97c). R. Samson of Falaise, brother-in-law of Rabbenu Tam and the grandfather of Rizba and R. Samson of Sens, was martyred. As Urbach (1:119) interprets this passage, his body was found or handed over six months later, through the efforts of a *ba'al ha-halom* (who initiated or interpreted a dream). See also Aptowitzer, *Mavo la-Rabiah*, 420. At that point, the body could still be identified through distinguishing signs or features (*tevi'at ayin*). Here, too, Rabbenu tam was not the initiator of any magical processes, nor was he necessarily involved in them. Cf. Heschel, “Al Ruah ha-Qodesh Bimei ha-Benayim,” 182, n. 37 (end).

CHAPTER 3

Tam. The figure of Ibn Ezra was often co-opted by medieval Jewish mystics, including the German Pietists, just as Ibn Ezra was himself the subject of legends and tales involving *torat ha-sod* practices.⁹⁷ In the third instance—which appears in the sixteenth-century *Shalshelet ha-Qabbalah* and is characterized by Urbach as a popular legend—Mosheh Rabbenu was summoned by adjuration to decide if Rabbenu Tam or R. Elijah of Paris was correct in their argument about whether the *qesher shel tefillin (shel yad)* must be tied anew each day.⁹⁸

The final case is perhaps the most instructive. Several non-Ashkenazic manuscripts contain a *tefillah* or *baqqashah* (which begins with a form of the phrase אָנוּ הֵן אֱלֹהִים שָׁלִיט בָּעוֹלָמִים וּבְהַתּוֹנוֹם) that is attributed at the outset to Rabbenu Tam. The earliest of these is an Italian manuscript dated 1286. The prayer begins with standard requests for salvation from various types of afflictions and other forces that may seek to harm a person. But it then moves to a series of adjurations (*hashba'ot*), which adjure both Divine and angelic names not only for purposes of protection, but also to acquire and retain Torah knowledge, to receive forgiveness from the Almighty, and to achieve long-lasting success in temporal and spiritual matters. Two of the adjurations or requests involve Metatron. There are also statements—attributed

⁹⁷See Idel, *Golem*, 81–82, 86–87, 92–93, nn. 4, 11, and see also the revised Hebrew edition of *Golem* (Jerusalem, 1996), 276–77. The *Hug ha-Keruv ha-Meyuhad* produced a number of pseudepigraphic treatises in addition to the *Pseudo-Sa'adyah* commentary in which this passage is found. See Yosef Dan, “*Hug ha-Keruv ha-Meyuhad bi-Tenu'at Hasidei Ashkenaz*,” *Tarbiz* 35 (1966):349–72. Note that Ibn Ezra praised Rabbenu Tam as a *mal'akh ha-E-lohim* (See Heschel, “*Al Ruah ha-Qodesh Bimeï ha-Benayim*,” 182, n. 34), and there was certainly literary contact between them (Urbach, 1:109–10). On Ibn Ezra in the thought of *hasidut Ashkenaz*, see, e.g., Yosef Dan, *Torat ha-Sod shel Hasidut Ashkenaz* (Jerusalem, 1968), 29–31, 113–16, 138–43, and Wolfson, *Through a Speculum That Shines*, 177, 193, 215, 222, 246–47. For legends about Ibn Ezra, see, e.g., Naftali ben Menaḥem, *Avraham Ibn Ezra—Sihot va-Aggadot 'Am* (Jerusalem, 1943), and *idem*, *'Inyanei Ibn Ezra* (Jerusalem, 1978), 337–73.

⁹⁸See Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:88; Norman Golb, *Toledot ha-Yehudim be-'Ir Rouen Bimeï ha-Benayim* (Jerusalem, 1976), 98–100; and cf. Eli Yasif, “*Rashi Legends and Medieval Popular Culture*,” *Rashi, 1040–1990*, ed. Sed-Rajna, 483–92; ms. Moscow-Guenzberg 926 (Lisbon, 1474), fol. 174r (cited in Grossman, *Hakhmei Zarefat ha-Rishonim*, 142); and above, introduction, n. 21. According to this text, the request to summon Moses was made to R. Samuel *ha-navi/navi 'emet* (=R. Samuel *he-Hasid*?; cf., e.g., Heschel, “*Al Ruah ha-Qodesh Bimeï ha-Benayim*,” 181, and Wolfson, *Through a Speculum That Shines*, 191) by R. Jacob of Provins. [Note also the late variant, ms. JTS Lutski 1062 (*Mizrah*, seventeenth/eighteenth century), fols. 26v–27r, which substitutes R. Yehi'el of Paris for R. Elijah of Paris.]

to R. Yishma'el and R. Aqiva on the salutary effects of studying (and utilizing) these esoteric procedures—that are paraphrases of material in *Hekhalot* literature.⁹⁹

⁹⁹Ms. Parma 1390, fols. 15r–16r. In this manuscript, the prayer is introduced by a note indicating that it is efficacious for someone who becomes suddenly mute, or perhaps unable to pray (תפללה למי שיאלם לשונו פתאות). It is also entitled (as in other manuscripts) *tefillah nora'ah le-R. Yishma'el*.

אנא ה' אלקינו ישראל מושל בעליונים ושולט בחתונותים... שמע נא את תפלה
 עברך כי עני ובין אני והשלך אימה ופחד... וורוון ושגנון וויק ומזיק וכל
 שיקומו עלי לרעה... ידמו כאבן... ואני לא אבוש. בקשה מכם מלאכי השורט
 מטטרון מיכאל וגבrial מיכאל טורייל שתעמידו בקשה לפני הקב"ה לשמעו
 תפלותי ובקשתי... למחול ולשלוח לכל עונותינו... משביע אני עליכם בשם
 אכתריאל ושב תהלות ישראל בשם שביעים שמוטוי הקדושים המפורשים נקודות
 ובתורה שתקרו המפתחות ותפתחו השערות ברשות מלך מלכי המלכים...
 לדעת בינה והשכל פרישות נקיות רוח והצלחה והצלחה ארכוה כמשם בתוקפה
 והלבנה בחוץ החדש זו בדבר וזו בקשה בכל מקום שאני הולך... ומארמי יהו
 מתקים בדבש ונופת צופים אמן אמן סלה. משביע אני עליך אהבתה הממונה על
 האהבה ובכך חיבתך לפני הקב"ה לחוץ וליחס ולרחלמים... ומיחילה וסיליחה
 לכפר... אמר ישמעאל מי שוננה הרו הגודל הזה פניו מציהיבות וקומו נאה לו
 ואימתו עליו שאינו שוכח דברי תורה כל ימיו ויצר חורע אינו שולט בו ניצל מן
 הרוחות ומן השדים... ור' יעקבה כהב שלמדנו שיעור של צערנו טוב לנו בעזה
 ונוח לנו בעזה ובמי שוננה הרו הגודל הזה שוננה המשנה כל יום אחר תפלה
 מעלה לו לכל זה היא... משביע אני עליך מטטרון... ושמי הטוב ילק בכל
 המקומות והיה חלומו מישבן [סוב]¹⁰⁰ שמורה בגופי ואל אשכח דבר מפי ומלב
 ותיטב לי מטובר והعبر כל פיות ודברי שקר ורעות מעלה. באיה שמע תפלה.

[On the *Hekhalot* formulations in this text (in the names of R. Yishma'el and R. Aqiva), see Schäfer, *The Hidden and Manifest God*, 107, 115, 117. Cf. Swartz, *Scholastic Magic*, 221, n. 38; idem, "Jewish Magic in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages," *JJS* 41 (1990):79–88; Lesses, "Speaking with Angels," 46–54; and Harari, "Kishfei Hezeq ve-Hitgonenut Mipneihem" (above, n. 10), 111–13.] The material following this prayer (fol. 16r; a series of verses about sacrifices and the service of the *kohanim*, and a collection of seventy verses from Psalms beginning with the phrase *וְאַתָּה ה' מִن בָּעֵד* *ma'amadot* (see below)). The manuscript consists almost entirely of kabbalistic and philosophical works [including *Keter Shem Tov*, by R. Abraham of Cologne; a *tefillat yihud* attributed to R. Nehunya b. ha-Qanah and other kabbalistic *liqqutim*; a commentary on the ten *sefirot*; *Sefer Yihud* by R. Asher b. David b. Rabad; *Sha'ar She'ol* by R. Azriel of Gerona; the prayer attributed to Rabbenu Tam; a *megillat setarim*; a philosophical analysis of the soul; a commentary on the *sefirot* by Jacob b. Jacob; Ramban's commentary to *Sefer Yezirah*; and R. Eleazar of Worms's *Hokhmat ha-Nefesh* and his *Ma'amar 'al ha-Nevu'ah*, which cites R. Sa'adyah Gaon, R. Hanan'el, R. Nissim Gaon, Donnolo, R. Judah *he-Hasid*, and *Sefer ha-Hayyim*.] Cf. Moshe Idel, "Gazing at the Head in Ashkenazi Hasidism," *Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy* 6

CHAPTER 3

This prayer is found, however, in a northern French manuscript dating from the mid-thirteenth century, with no mention of Rabbenu Tam. In this manuscript, which is a *maḥzor* or *siddur* and ritual compendium, the prayer is divided into two parts. The larger portion has the name of a little-known tosafist, R. Isaac b. Isaac of Chinon, inserted into the text as its author or client.¹⁰⁰ The smaller portion of the prayer (which is copied twice in this

(1997):277, nn. 31–33, and see now Idel, *R. Menahem Recanati ha-Mequbbal*, vol. 1 (Tel Aviv, 1998), 42–45. JTS Mic. 2131 (Italy, c.1600), fols. 35v–36r, attributes the same prayer to Rabbenu Tam and describes it as תפלת למי שיאלים לשנו פתואום. The prayer is preceded by the same kabbalistic works as in ms. Parma 1390. Cfr. *Amtahat Binyamin* (above, n. 19), 10–11.

See also ms. B. M. Add. 26,883 (Italy, fourteenth century, unpaginated) [=#640 in *Catalogue of the Hebrew and Samaritan Manuscripts*, ed. G. Margoliouth (London, 1905), 2:255.] This manuscript consists of kabbalistic prayers, including a *tehinnah* of R. Judah *he-Hasid*, יוציא ברוב רחמיך ברכך אפר ועטם, found also in ms. Parma 1138, fol. 139v [Hebrew pagination, fol. 96v], and in ms. Parma 1354, fol. 121v, with no name); an adjuration to send the angel Uriel, who is identified as the prophet Elijah; a prayer attributed to the prophet Elijah; the first prayer section attributed to Rabbenu Tam, בבקשה מכם מלאכי השרת מטטרון וכו'; a *shemirat ha-derekh* of Ramban, which he derived from *Sefer Yezirah*; a second piece of *tefillat Rabbenu Tam*, בבקשה מכם מטטרון טוריאל; another prayer of Elijah; and a *tefillat ba'al teshuvah* from *ha-qadosh ha-R. Yonah* beginning with the phrase, אנוּה ה' חטאָי (see above, ch. 1, n. 112). The prayer(s) attributed to Rabbenu Tam can also be found in ms. Vat. Rossiana 356 (Morocco, 1412), fol. 65v. This manuscript contains, among other things, a *viddui* of R. Judah *he-Hasid* (fol. 2v) [תבווא], *segullot* על מצוות עשה וubarvo על מצוות לא תשעה שבסכתה ותורה שבעל פה ... בזון כליות ולב אין דבר נעלם מכם ... תמלח ותסלח על כל עונונתינו; regarding both the *tehinnah* and *viddui* of R. Judah *he-Hasid*, cf. above, ch. 1, n. 112]; *Sefer ha-Ma'arakhah le-R. Eliyyahu* (fols. 7v–41v; cf. below, n. 107), including *shir ha-Yihud* (14r); *segullot* and *hashba'ot* for daily blessings (43v–44r); a prayer by Ramban for the eve of *Rosh ha-Shanah* (fol. 65r); guidelines for repentance from R. Eleazar of Worms (fol. 74); as well as *segullot* and *hashba'ot* (91–102) including *segulot* עיי סנדלפין להצלחה; a means of escaping detection by a ruler; and two *segullot* for *petiḥat ha-lev*, on fols. 96v–97v.

¹⁰⁰See ms. Paris 633, fols. 196r–197v [transcribed in Colette Sirat, “Un Rituel Juif de France,” 36–38]. There is no prior attribution of the prayer, and it is introduced by the instruction, “Say this after your prayers and it will help for everything. Say it in purity in your house or in the synagogue and here it is.”

אנא ה' אלקינו ישראל מושל בעליונות ושולט בתהותינו קרוב לקוראיו באמת
מציל עני מוחזק ממנה ובין מגוזו שמע נא על [196ב] תפלת עברך ואל תחננו
והסר ממנה אימתה פחדך ורשותך ותודה ותשיגנו עירונך ויק ומיק ולילין
ושידין ובכירה רעה ויצר הרע שיקומו עלי להחטיא ל' יצחק ביר' יצחק. בגודל
וירעך יידמו כבנן ובמוראך אם יראוני לא יזקוני ואמ' יקרמוני לא גיעוני ... הם
יפצטו ואני לא אפוץ ... [197א] ... בבקשה מכם מלאכי השרת מטטרון

manuscript) contains the second adjuration of Metatron and is unattributed.¹⁰¹ Since this manuscript version of the prayer is the closest to Rabbenu Tam in terms of both geography and chronology, the absence of any reference to Rabbenu Tam is significant.¹⁰²

וְטוֹרִיאָל שֶׁר הַפְנִים וְעוֹרִיאָל מִיכָּאָל וְגַבְרִיאָל שְׁתַעַמְדוּ בְּבָקָשָׁה וּבְתַחְנוּנִים לְפָנִי
 מֶלֶךְ מֶלֶכִים הַקִּבְיָה לְשֻׁמוּעַ תְּפִלָּתִי וְתַחְנָתִי וּבְקַשְׁתִּי לְמַחְלָל וְלְלַטְלָחָל עַל
 כָּל עֲנוֹתִי שְׁעַשְ׀יוֹתִי בֵּין באָוֹתִים בֵּין בְּרָצְוֹן בֵּין בְּהַדְרָה בֵּין בְּמַחְשָׁבָה בֵּין בְּשָׁוָגָן בֵּין
 בְּמַיּוֹד אֲנֵי יִצְחָק בְּרִ' יִצְחָק בְּשֵׁם אַכְתְּרִיאָל יִשְׁבַּת הַתְּלָלוֹת שְׁלִן וְחַסְדִּים
 הַקְּדוֹשִׁים הַמְּפֹרְשִׁים בְּגַנְקִוּת וּבְטַהֲרָה שְׁתַקְתָּחוּ מִפְתְּחוֹת שְׁלִן וְחַסְדִּים
 וּבְיִנְחָה וּבְשִׁלְלָה לְהַצְלִיחָה לִי בְּשֵׁמִי [גַּמְבָּן] יִצְחָק בְּרִ' יִצְחָק בְּכָל מָקוֹם שָׁאַלְךָ וְאַשְׁבָּר
 וְשְׁמַעְיִי בְּצִלְיוֹ מַעֲשֵׂי וְאַמְרוֹי וְהַיּוֹ מַתְוקִים כְּדַבֵּשׁ וְנוֹתָת צַפְוִים וּמַשְׁבִּיעִי אֲנֵי עַלְךָ
 הַמְּלָאָךְ הַגּוֹדָל הַמְּמוֹנָה עַל אַהֲרָה לִתְחַנֵּן אֲוֹתִי לְחַן וְלְחַסְדָּךְ וּלְרַחֲמָיךְ בְּעַינֵּךְ וּבְעַינִי
 כָּל רֹאֵי בֵּין מִמְעָל בְּשֵׁמִים בֵּין מִתְחַת לְשָׁמִים וְתְהִיה הַשְׁעָה הַזֹּאת וְהַיּוֹם
 רְצָוֹן שְׁעַת רְצָוֹן יּוֹם יְשֻׁוָּה וְאַוְלָה מְחִילָה וְכִפְרָה וְהַצְלָה הַצְלָה וְרוּחָה וְעוֹשָׂר
 וּבְכָדָשׁ שְׁלָא אַעֲטָרָךְ לִידֵי מִוְתְּנוֹת בָּשָׁר וְדָם וְלֹא לִידֵי הַלּוֹאַתָּם וְלֹא אַבּוֹשׁ לְעוֹלָם
 וְעַד אָמֵן.

¹⁰¹ See ms. Paris 633, fol. 74r. The formulation attributed to R. Yishma'el (in ms. Parma 1390 and others; see above, n. 99), appears (preceded by a passage from *Shi'ur Qomah*) with the instruction that it is good to recite every night and day after prayers. See also fol. 6v–7r, in the name of R. Yishma'el: אשר אָדָם שִׁגְמָוֶר: הרַזְחָה מְשׂוֹרָה לְשָׁהָרִית וְגּוֹ' On fol. 74v (and again on fol. 129; see Sirat, 39), the following is found:

מַשְׁבִּיעִי אֲנֵי עַלְךָ מַטְתָּרוֹן עַבְדוּ שֶׁל יִצְחָקוּ שְׁמָךְ כָּשֵׁם רַבְּךָ שְׁתִּיקָּקְ לִי לְעַשּׂוֹת
 חַפְצִי וְיַהְיוּ פְנֵי מִצְחָבָת וְשֵׁמִי הַטּוֹב יְלַךְ בְּכָל מִקְמוֹת יִשְׂרָאֵל וְיַהְיוּ חִלּוּמוֹתִי
 מִרְשָׁבִים לִי וְתָהִרְתִּי שְׁמָרוֹת בְּגֻנוֹפִי וְאֶל שְׁבָחָךְ דָּבָר מַפִּי וּמַלְבִּי מִן הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה עַד
 הַיּוֹם הַבָּא וְתָטִיב לִי מַטְוּבָךְ בְּעוֹלָם הַזֶּה וְגַם לְעוֹלָם הַבָּא וְתָבִקֵּשׁ רַחֲמִים לְפָנִי כְּסָא
 הַכְּבוֹד וּמַחְול לִי כָּל עֲנוֹתִי שְׁעַשְ׀יוֹתִי וְאֶל יִשְׁלָוֹת בֵּי יִצְרָר הָרָע לְעוֹלָם וְתַצְלִינִי מִכָּל
 חַיִת רְעוֹת [וּמִכָּל שְׁדִין וְלִילָּין וּמִגְּרִים] וּמִפְגָּעִים רְעִים וּלְטָטִים [וּמִכָּל בְּנֵי אָדָם
 הַרְעִים] וּתְפָלְטִינִי מִכָּל נְחֵשׁ וּקְרֵב וּשְׁרָף [וּמִכָּל חַיִת וּמִכָּל בָּרִית וּרְעוֹת שְׁבָעוֹלָם]
 וּתְסִכְרִיר פִּוּת מִכָּל דּוֹבְרִי רְעוֹת. בָּרוּךְ אַתָּה ה' שָׁמַעַת תִּפְלָה.

On the division of this prayer into different sections, cf. ms. B. M. Add. 26,883 (above, n. 99).

¹⁰² Ms. Cambr. Add. 1176 (Ashkenaz, fifteenth century), fols. 115v–116r, has a version of the larger portion of the prayer (in the midst of a *seder ma'amadot*; see below) that is almost identical to the Paris 633 version (above, n. 100) for the first part and is very similar to Parma 1390 (above, n. 99) for the second part, beginning with the phrase חיִים בְּרִ' יְחִיאָל הַלְּיִי. The name appears in the first part and in the second, as those who recited the various *baqqashot*. On fol. 49r of ms. Cambr. Add. 1176, רִ' חיִים בְּרִ' יְחִיאָל is identified as the *hatan Torah* who received the honor of completing the yearly cycle of the Torah reading. At the end of the version of the prayer found in ms. Vat. Rossiana 356 (above, n. 99), the words אֲנֵי שְׁלָמָה בְּנֵי אֶלְיָהו appear. [A later version of the prayer, with addenda but

CHAPTER 3

At the same time, the attribution of these requests and *hashba'ot* to R. Isaac b. Isaac of Chinon is both reasonable and appropriate. Despite its decidedly French base, the *maḥzor* as a whole contains prayers and *nusha'ot*

unattributed, is found in a Sefardic *siddur*, ms. Paris 592 (1444), fols. 56r–57v. The prayer follows a *baqqashah la-Ramban* (52r) and a *baqqashah le-ahar ha-tefillah la-hakham he-hasid*, R. Isaac b. ha-Rav R. Avraham b. David. A version like the one in Parma 1390, but in a different order, is found, also unattributed, in ms. Parma 1124 (Italy, fifteenth century). The client is simply פלוני בן פלוני. In this case, the prayer is situated within a number of prayers and *segullot* attributed to R. Judah *he-Hasid* and Ramban. See below, n. 110, and ch. 5, n. 74.]

Another brief version of the prayer is found anonymously in ms. Paris 391 (Ashkenaz, fourteenth century), fol. 69r. This version contains an angelic *hashba'ah*, which begins like those found in Paris 633 (although the name of Metatron is omitted) but continues with standard requests for physical protection on the road, from robbers, from *shedim*, from [evil] men, women, the sword, pestilence, and so on:

בבקשה מכם מיכאל וגריאל ורפהל ואכתריאל שתעמדו תפליה בבקשה
וברחנןינו לפני מלך המלכים דCKERה שיציליח ודרבי בכח מקום שאני הולך
הן מליטשין שלא יזיקוני הן משליך הן מאמין ומאשה הן מכל געג רע
הן מחרב הן מרעב הן מכל מיני פורענות הבותות ומתרגשות לעולם. מן הכל
הצילני ה' אליה ישראאל ושלוא ישלוות שליטה במעשה ידי ולא בגנוי ולא במווני.
יהיר מלפניך ה' אליה וא-ל-יה אבוחוי שורה השעה הזאת שעת רצון מלפניך
שהשמעת תחנני ובקשתי א' א' סלה. ד' צב-אות עמננו וכוכ' לישועתך קווית ה'.
גד גוד יגדנו וזה יגד עקב (הרבה פעמים). [בטוף: כדי שצילך בידינו כמו
עשה גד בשעיבר את הירך למלחמה על הכנעניים וחור לאבינו בשלום. עליינו
לשבח]

Note the similar prayer in ms. Cambr. Or. 71 (see above, ch. 2, n. 10), and cf. *Derekh Erez Rabbah*, ch. 11 (end).

[This prayer appears in ms. Paris 391 as part of a *siddur* that is interspersed with *piyyutim* and *seliḥot* from Ashkenazic figures such as R. Meir of Rothenburg and Rabiah (fols. 55–61, 76v, 80v) and R. Eleazar, the son of R. Judah *he-Hasid* (fol. 82r), whose *seliḥah* is based on the *Shem ha-Meforash* derived from the verses in Exodus 14:19–21, as well as the Name of 216 letters corresponding to אַרְיָה. There are also halakhic formulations from Maharam (93r) and R. Samson of Coucy and Rizba (107v–108). See also below, n. 111.]

This version of the prayer is almost identical to one that R. Joseph Hahn of Frankfurt (d.1803) cites in his *Yosef Omez* (102, sec. 484) as a prayer from Rabbenu Tam, to be recited daily, which would remove any *pega ra* and grant success in all of one's endeavors. R. Joseph writes that he copied this prayer from the treatise of R. Eliezer Treves of Frankfurt (i.e., the kabbalistic prayer commentary, *Diqduq Tefillah*, on the *siddur Mal'ah ha-Areẓ De'ah* [Thunegen, 1560], composed by R. Naftali Hertz [Drifzan] Treves and published by his sons Joseph and Eliezer [d.1566]). Cf. Heschel, "Al Ruah ha-Qodesh Bimeī ha-Benayim," 182–83.

associated with *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, as well as esoteric material.¹⁰³ R. Isaac of Chinon, who had connections to the academy at Evreux, was one of the copyists of this manuscript. Indeed, the largest share of mystical formulations is found in sections that he copied, including both parts of the esoteric and magical prayer under discussion.¹⁰⁴

¹⁰³ See ms. Paris 633, e.g., fols. 6v–7r (above, n. 101); 18 (ה' י-ה-ה השם הגודל והקדוש והורא שתעליה דברי) 19 (ל' יהודה החסיד יה רצון מלפני יה-ה השם הגודל והקדוש והורא שתעליה דברי); this section of the ms. is from the early thirteenth century; 30r (ט' יהודה החסיד); 48v, 76v, 81r, 104r (cf. Zimmer, *Olam ke-Minhago Noheg*, 115–18); 104v, 117–20, 125–27, 138, 183 (see below, n. 113); 188–89, 204, 205v (ה' רצון שתשמע קול בשמייךך); cf. *She'elot u-Teshuvot min ha-Shamayim*, ed. Margoliot, #9, 53–54; below, n. 111; and *Amtahat Binyamin*, 14, 209, 211–12 (see below, n. 114), 215, 218v, 220, and 222 (the prayer of R. Yishma'el; cf. *Amtahat Binyamin*, 10). [Fol. 250v has a mathematics problem with the solution of Rabbenu Tam (see above, n. 86). This underscores the fact that Rabbenu Tam's name does not appear at any point in the manuscript in conjunction with the prayer under discussion.]

¹⁰⁴ R. Isaac b. Isaac's involvement as a scribe serves to confirm that this manuscript is earlier (c. 1250) than ms. Parma 1390 (dated 1286). For R. Isaac's genealogy, which dates him with some precision, see Sirat, "Un Rituel Juif de France," 32; for the sections copied by Isaac, see Sirat, 11–23. The manuscript also contains a calendar for the years 1263–74. R. Isaac b. Isaac of Chinon also composed *piyyutim*; see ms. Bodl. 2550, sec. 57; Parma 855, fol. 161r; and Sirat, 33. He is mentioned in *Tosafot Nazir* and *Tosafot Me'ilah*, two collections that emanated from the academy at Evreux. See Sirat, 30; Henri Gross, *Gallia Judaica* (Paris, 1897), 580; *Tosafot Rabbenu Perez le-Massekhet Bava Mezi'a*, ed. Hayyim Hershler (Jerusalem, 1970), editor's introduction, 12; ms. Vat. Urb. 27, fol. 27v (in the margin: ב' שמעתי ממו ר' יצחק בן ר' יצחק); Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 2:636, 673; and cf. Adolf Neubauer, "Documents Inédits," *REJ* 12 (1886):81; Norman Golb, *The Jews in Medieval Normandy* (Cambridge, 1998), 514–23; and below, ch. 5, n. 37.

For additional linkages between the academies at Evreux and Chinon at this time, see the reference to R. Isaac's older contemporary, R. Netan'el of Chinon, in the Evreux-based *Sefer 'al ha-Kol*, sec. 1 (cf. above, ch. 2, n. 65). See also *Tosafot Maharam ve-Rabbenu Perez 'al Massekhet Yevamot*, ed. Hillel Porush (Jerusalem, 1991), which cites *ha-qadosh* R. Nentan'el (157a) and cites him two other times as R. Netan'el of Chinon (see the index, 15–16); *Tosafot R. Meir mi-Rothenburg* in *Shitat ha-Qadmonim 'al Massekhet Yevamot*, ed. M. Y. Blau (New York, 1986); and cf. Samson of Chinon, *Sefer Keritut*, ed. S. B. Sofer (Jerusalem, 1965), editor's introduction, 26, and Israel Ta-Shma, "Netan'el of Chinon," *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, 12:972–73. R. Moses of Evreux is mentioned four times, as is *ha-qadosh* [R. Solomon] *mi-Dreux*; cf. ch. 2, n. 10, and ms. Cambr. Add. 561 (Ashkenaz, fourteenth century), fol. 66r. R. Samuel *he-Hasid* is also mentioned once. See also *Tosafot Yeshanim ha-Shalem 'al Massekhet Yevamot*, ed. Abraham Shoshana (Jerusalem, 1994), 616–17 (index), which includes, in addition to those scholars already noted, R. Samuel of Evreux and R. Moses *ha-Kohen* of Mainz

CHAPTER 3

Additional excerpts of these prayers (or related variants) are found, without attribution, in several other medieval Ashkenazic *maḥzorim* or prayer collections. These prayers appear most often in a liturgical unit, toward the end of the prayer service, known as the *seder ha-ma‘amadot*. This unit, which has been described and analyzed by E. E. Urbach on the basis of northern French

(a teacher of R. Eleazar of Worms). Moreover, this *Tosafot* collection cites R. Netan^{el} of Chinon more than any other extant medieval rabbinic text; it also cites R. Moses of Evreux quite frequently. See the editor’s introduction, 22–26, which lists a number of texts that note specific interactions between R. Netan^{el} and the brothers of Evreux. See also *Shi’at ha-Qadmonim*, ed. M. Y. Blau (New York, 1992), “*Pisqei Rabbenu Yosef*,” 377, and *Kol Bo*, sec. 114 (fol. 85a, and cf. fol. 88b: *הקרוש רבינו נתנאל מקין היה אבל ושב בתעניית וסמרק לדבר לא תאכלו על הדם וביליה היה אוכל משלו*). Cf. Solomon Schechter, “Notes on a Hebrew Commentary to the Pentateuch in a Parma Manuscript,” *Semitic Studies in Memory of Alexander Kohut*, ed. George Kohut (Berlin, 1897), 487–94; Urbach, *Ba‘alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:457–58, 480–81; and Eric Zimmer, “*Seder ha-Posqim le-R. Azri’el Trabot*,” *Sinai* 76 (1975):248. Note that ms. Parma 159 (late twelfth century) was copied by an Isaac b. Netan^{el}.

[A. R. Netan^{el} b. Joseph of Chinon composed a *shir ha-yihud* (יִיחַ מִן הַרְבָּץ) that was sometimes connected to Elijah’s *seder ha-ma‘arakhah*. Like R. Elijah’s work, R. Netan^{el}’s composition ended each day with a *baqqashah* or *segullah*. See ms. Parma 363 (Italy, fourteenth century), fol. 5v, where R. Netan^{el}’s work follows “seventy verses (of protection)” and the *seder ha-ma‘arakhah* of R. Elijah. See also ms. Parma 591, fol. 6v; Parma 654, fol. 258; A. M. Habermann, *Shirei ha-Yihud ve-ha-Kavod* (Jerusalem, 1948), 73–85; and below, n. 110. R. Netan^{el} also composed a *seder ha-tamid* (תָּרִיב לְעֵמֶר נְדֹרֶשׁ). See ms. Cambr. Add. 394 (Ashkenaz, fourteenth century), fols. 88–96, and Bodl. 2502 (Ashkenaz, thirteenth century), fols. 12v–13v. See also ms. Parma 963 (Italy, fifteenth century), fol. 431, and Cambr. 561, fol. 66. This R. Netan^{el} is probably the grandson of the earlier R. Netan^{el}. See Urbach, 1:458, n. 41*, and Avraham Grossman in *Mehqarim be-Talmud 3* (forthcoming).]

As a result of her study of ms. Paris 633, Sirat makes the passing but perceptive observation (“*Un Rituel Juif*,” 15, 31, n. 1) that material in this manuscript—especially from portions copied by R. Isaac (such as an acrostic of the letters in Exodus 14:19 representing Divine Names [fol. 202] and his presentation of R. Nehunyah b. ha-Qanah’s prayer [see above, n. 99], as well as other mystical prayers and incantations to avoid danger and achieve other states discussed above, which found their way into the kabbalistic collection *Amtahat Binyamin*)—suggests that the religious thought of the (northern French) *tosafists* was affected by (German) mysticism, and that angels and demons played a great role in their world view. See also Sirat, “*Le Livre hébreu en France au Moyen Age*,” *Michael* 12 (1991):306–7, and M. Banitt, “*Une formule d’exorcisme en ancien français*,” *Studies in Honor of Mario Pei*, ed. John Fisher and Paul Gaeng (Chapel Hill, 1972), 37–48. The group of parallel and related manuscript passages (to be discussed in the following notes)—of which Sirat was unaware—and many other aspects of the present study confirm Sirat’s intuition.

manuscripts from the thirteenth century¹⁰⁵—and more recently by I. Ta-Shma, on the basis of an English manuscript dated 1189¹⁰⁶—sought to represent the readings and activities of the so-called *'anshei mishmarot* who, during the days of the Temple, mirrored the sacrificial rites performed by the *kohanim* with readings and recitations.

The *seder ha-ma'amadot* consisted typically of verses for each day of the week: from the beginning of *Sefer Bereshit*, the psalm of the day (and other psalms), daily chapters from the books of the prophets, as well as a *seder ma'arakhah*—a description of the order of the altar service based on talmudic formulations (especially those of Abbaye found in *Yoma* 27b and 33a), often attributed to the eleventh-century scholar and pietist R. Elijah b. Menahem of Le Mans.¹⁰⁷ Several of the manuscripts add additional biblical sections, as well as lists of seventy (or seventy-two) verses, and eleven verses that begin and end with the letter *nun*. They also contain requests or supplications for personal protection and support, as well as the *'Aleynu* prayer.¹⁰⁸

The pietistic and mystical dimensions of the *ma'amadot* sections are substantial. In addition to the material from R. Elijah of Le Mans—which perhaps also masks *Hekhalot* passages attributed to Elijah the prophet—Ta-Shma has focused attention on the *Hekhalot* background of the *'Aleynu* prayer, which was given great prominence by R. Judah *he-Hasid* and R. Eleazar of Worms as well, and also on the presence of additional *Hekhalot* passages in the earliest versions of these sections.¹⁰⁹ It should also be noted that the “eleven verses beginning and ending with *nun*” (as well as one version of the “seventy verses”), which were recited as magical forms of protection, are associated in various texts with R. Judah *he-Hasid* or other members of *Hasidei Ashkenaz*.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁵E. E. Urbach, “*Mishmarot u-Ma'amadot*,” *Tarbiz* 42 (1973): 313–27.

¹⁰⁶Israel Ta-Shma, “*Meqorah u-Meqomah shel Tefillat 'Aleynu le-Shabeah'* be-Siddur ha-Tefillah: *Seder ha-Ma'amadot u-She'elat Siyyum ha-Tefillah*,” *The Frank Talmage Memorial Volume*, ed. Walfish, [Hebrew section] 1:85–98. Cf. Habermann, *Shirei ha-Yihud ve-ha-Kavod*, 87–97, and ms. Paris 632, fols. 2v–3v.

¹⁰⁷See Grossman, *Hakhmei Zarefat ha-Rishonim*, 102–4, and above, n. 95.

¹⁰⁸See the manuscripts described by Urbach in “*Mishmarot u-Ma'amadot*,” esp. ms. Cambr. Add. 667.1; ms. B. M. Add. 11.639; ms. Bodl. 1105; ms. Parma 591.

¹⁰⁹See Ta-Shma, above, n. 106, esp. 87–88, 95. See also Moshe Hallamish, “*Nosah Qadum shel 'Aleynu Leshabeah'*,” *Sinai* 110 (1992):262–65; Elliot Wolfson, “*Hai Gaon's Letter and Commentary on 'Aleynu: Further Evidence of Moses De Leon's Pseudepigraphic Activity'*,” *Jewish Quarterly Review* 81 (1990–91):365–409; and Naftali Wieder, “*Be-'Ityah shel Gematria anti-Nozerit ve-anti-Islamit*,” *Sinai* 76 (1975):5–10.

¹¹⁰See, e.g., *Sefer Gematri'ot le-R. Yehudah he-Hasid*, 16, 138 (fol. 57v); ms. B.M. 1056 [Add. 11, 639] (northern France, 1278; cf. *Catalogue*, ed. Margoliouth, 3:422),

CHAPTER 3

In several instances, the supplications for personal protection found in *seder ha-ma'amadot* are enhanced by mystical prayers and magical *hashba'ot* of the type under discussion. An Ashkenazic manuscript, copied in the fourteenth

fol. 161r–167r, and fol. 528v; ms. Cambr. Add. 1176 (above, n. 102), which also concludes the *seder ha-ma'amadot* with a *shir ha-Yihud* by R. Judah *he-Hasid*, as does ms. Bodl. 1105 (Germany, 1326), fol. 384v–420v; cf. Urbach, "Mishmarot u-Ma'amadot," 317, n. 54); ms. Paris 391, fol. 61r–64v (see the next note); ms. Paris 633, fol. 183 (below, n. 113); ms. Parma 1390 (above, n. 99); ms. Parma 1124, fol. 50v–51r, which lists the eleven verses just before a קבלה מר' יהודה החסיד; ms. Bodl. 659, fol. 112v (מטעם ר' יהודה החסיד), and *Sefer Gematri'ot le-R. Yehudah he-Hasid*, 48 (fol. 12v), which maintains that the first three of the eleven verses were cited by the prophet Elisha in formulating the purification process for the leper ממן (2 Samuel 5); and cf. above, n. 102. [Ms. Parma 363 has the seventy (-two) verses, whose recitation constitutes a kind of magic formula to assure protection, followed (fol. 5v) by R. Elijah's *seder ha-ma'arakhah* (whose various versions also contain extensive requests for different types of protection and salvation) and the *shir ha-yihud* entitled ז"ה מן ה' ר' נטנאל by R. Netan'el of Chinon. After describing the greatness of the Almighty using *Hekhalot* passages, this *shir ha-yihud* ends with requests for atonement (*kapparah*) and for redemption. See Habermann, *Shirei ha-Yihud vega-Kavod*, 73–77, 88, 190. Ms. Parma 591 does not list the verses but does have a German *shir ha-Yihud* as well as the one by R. Netan'el of Chinon.] See also ms. Macerata Biblioteca Comunale 310, described by B. Richler in *Me-Ginzei ha-Makhon le-Tazlumei Kitvei ha-Yad ha-'Ivriyyim* (Jerusalem, 1996), 99. The manuscript is from Provence, c. 1400. Fols. 136–41 contain the names of talmudic tractates and "seventy-two verses" from Psalms to be said each morning, followed by the mystical *selihah*, א-להים בישראל גודל יהודך, attributed to R. Judah *he-Hasid* (see above, ch. 1, n. 112). After this *selihah* there is a brief prayer *tefillah*, ז"ה שתעשה למען שמוריך דיקרים והסורים בתפלה הזאת רצון...; cf. above, n. 103. In ms. Paris 646, fol. 237r, the seventy verses are followed immediately by R. Judah *he-Hasid's* addenda to the נזיר א-להוי נזיר prayer (see above, n. 37). See also the listing of the seventy-two verses (beginning with א-אתה ה' מגן בעניך) to be recited after several penitential poems, in R. Jacob *Hazzan mi-London*, *Ez Hayyim* [composed in 1287], ed. Israel Brody (Jerusalem, 1962), 132–34; and in ms. Sassoon 408 (Italy, fourteenth century)=ms. B. M. Or. 14055, fol. 3–19. [The seventy verses, which begin with this phrase, are occasionally attributed to Ramban. See, e.g., ms. Vat. Rossiana 356, fol. 41v; Parma 1124, fol. 36; and *Amtahat Binyamin*, fol. 21–23.]

On the power of the eleven verses according to Pietist sources, see *Perush ha-Roqeah 'al ha-Torah, Vayiqra* (parashat *Tazria*), ed. Konyevsky, 239–40, for a list of these verses (which appear throughout the Bible), with the instruction that if one recites them without interruption, good tidings will occur. Moreover, they should be recited before going to sleep and in any dangerous situation, and it is good to read them with heartfelt intention. R. Judah *he-Hasid* (ר' יהודה בשם) is cited as organizing the first words of the verses in a particular order, perhaps to allow them to be remembered more easily. It is also noted that neither the letter *samekh* nor the letter *peh* appears in these verses. *Peh* is the last letter in the names of a number of negative angelic *memunim*, such as נגף, שצף, קצף, שצף, קצף, נגף (הזהר אנטף); cf. above, n. 59. Similarly, *samekh* stands for *satan*. One who

century, contains an unattributed variant of one of the so-called *tefillat Rabbenu Tam*.¹¹¹ The English manuscript described by Ta-Shma has an even more extensive adjuration, which invokes a lengthy string of Divine Names to provide protection for the individual reciting them.¹¹² One of the adjurations

knows how to recite these verses with proper intention will render these *mal'akhei habbalah* unable to harm him (*le-satan lo*); see also *Sefer Gematri'ot le-R. Yehudah he-Hasid*, 138. In addition, the letter *nun* creates a *siman tov*. As the Talmud indicates (*Berakhot* 56b), one who sees the letter *nun* in a dream will be successful. Cf. *Perushei Siddur ha-Tefillah la-Roqeah* [Jerusalem, 1992], 2:442; and *Sefer Gematri'ot le-R. Yehudah he-Hasid*, Ta-Shma's introduction, 16. [This material is also found in *Moshav Zegenim* to *Va-Yiqra* 13:9; in ms. Bodl. 2344 (*Pa'anéah Raza*), fol. 89v; and in different form in *Perush Rabbenu Bahya b. Asher* to *Bamidbar* 32:32, where reciting these eleven verses is deemed important because the *Shem ha-Meforash* emanates from them. Thus, one who mentions these verses with the Name that emerges from each of them will be spared any fear.]

¹¹¹See ms. Paris 391, fol. 69r (above, n. 102). The *ma'amadot* component in this manuscript is diminished, consonant with the trend over the course of time noted by Ta-Shma (above, n. 107). Nonetheless, the adjurations appear toward the end of the service and conform to the patterns of the *ma'amadot* texts described above. The prayer is followed (fol. 73v) by *tahanun* and *selihot* prayers, including the invocation of angels to ask the Almighty for mercy (*מְכִנִּיטִי רָחִמִּים*). Prior to the prayer, there are two sets of seventy verses (the first set beginning with the phrase *זֶאת הַמְּנֻדֵּה*; fols. 61r–v). These are followed by the eleven verses beginning and ending with the letter *nun*, whose recitation will protect a person (fol. 64v). Next come two *piyyutim* (fol. 65r) often associated with *Hasidei Ashkenaz* and *הַאֲוֹתָן בַּדְּמָשְׁפֵט* and *אָדָרָת וְהַאֲמָנוֹת*. [See the commentary on *הַאֲוֹתָן בַּדְּמָשְׁפֵט* attributed to R. Eleazar of Worms in, e.g., ms. Parma 1138, fols. 120–21 (in the Hebrew foliation, =fols. 79r–81v in the standard foliation); Cambr. Add. 858, fols. 15r–16v; JTS Mic. 2367, fols. 177v–178r, and Rab. 689, fol. 194; Darmstadt 25, fol. 110; Budapest/Kaufman A174, fols. 194–95; Bodl. 1812, fol. 94; Munich 212, fol. 26v; Bologna 2914, fols. 220v–223r. *הַאֲדָרָת וְהַאֲמָנוֹת* originated in *Hekhalot* literature and was also the focus of a commentary by *Hasidei Ashkenaz*. See Bar-Ilan, *Sitrei Tefillah ve-Hekhalot*, 16–18, and the study of Joseph Dan cited on 17, n. 10.] These *piyyutim* are followed by a series of supplications, including the suggestion that our prayers are like sacrifices; thus they should be accepted along with our repentance, and they should be viewed by the Almighty as the prayers of the *Avot* and other pious ancestors. After some requests and praises, fol. 68r contains Abbaye's *seder ha-ma'arakhah*, and fol. 68v lists the ten commandments (which are found in other samples of *sefer ha-ma'amadot*; cf. Urbach, "Mishmarot u-Ma'amadot," 319, and idem, "Ma'amadam shel 'Asseret ha-Dibberot ba-'Avodah uva-Tefillah," 'Asseret ha-Dibberot bi-Re'i ha-Dorot [Jerusalem, 1986], 141–42), followed by *Adon 'Olam* and then the *hashba'ot* in the middle of fol. 69r. A similar order is found in the earlier ms. Paris 633; see below, n. 113, and cf. ms. Parma 3499, fol. 108.

¹¹²Ta-Shma, "Meqorah u-Meqomah shel Tefillat 'Aleynu le-Shabeah,'" 89–90 (ms. Corpus Christi, 133). At the end of the morning service, prior to the recitation of

of Metatron copied by R. Isaac of Chinon also appears in close proximity to a list of the “seventy verses” and among other supplications and requests similar to one of those found in the English manuscript.¹¹³ Moreover, another adjuration is found toward the end of R. Isaac of Chinon’s *maḥzor*; this closely resembles the extensive adjuration found in the English manuscript.¹¹⁴

‘Aleynu and the verses representing the *ma’amidot*, the group of seventy verses beginning with the letter *nun* (fol. 300r), followed by other verses “which, when recited after the seventy verses, will protect against military arms.” This section opens with the eleven verses that begin and end with the letter *nun* (fol. 302v). The remaining verses are followed by a brief *yehi razon* to guard the individual from sin and grant him salvation and success, and then by a complex esoteric *hashba’ah*, which invokes a lengthy series of angelic and Divine Names—including the *Shem E-hyeh Asher E-hyeh*; the *Shem* that is inscribed on the head-plate of Aaron the High Priest; the *Shem ha-Meforash* of forty-two letters; and the *Keter ha-Gadol ha-Gibbor vega-Nora*. The adjuration seeks protection from many forms of evil and suffering and asks for mercy, success, and fulfillment (fol. 303). It ends with the blessing of *shomea’ tefillah* (304r–v). Cf. ms. Paris 391, in the above note, and ms. Parma 1138, fols. 134r–141v. Close parallels can also be found in ms. 290, fol. 381r, sec. 1003, in the name of R. Elijah Menahem of London (see below, ch. 5, n. 40) and in *Sefer Razi’el* (Amsterdam 1701, repr. 1985), 144: קמייע טוב ובודק ומונסה לחן, לתפיסה, לחורב, לפתיחת הלב ... מלאכיהם הממונים על ה' תמו ... הצלחני כתיבת והקמייע לפב”פ לשמורדו מחרב פיביות ועוזרו פולטורה וממלטו מארם רע בין ברית בין שאינו ביתה ... והצילהו מכל כישוף ומכל מני פורעניות ועניות ... משבע עיי פב”פ בשם אורירון ואדרירון. To be sure, the formula in *Sefer Razi’el* is for an amulet, while ms. Corpus Christi’s formula is purely liturgical. [On the angelic names invoked, cf. above, n. 2.] For other similar usages, see the *segullah* that appears in Bodl. 1107–8 (German prayer rite, 1341), fols. 306v–307r, and the *hashba’ah* בשם אכתריאל, בשם מיבאל השר to implement a *ḥerem* that appears in *Kol Bo*, sec. 139. The *hashba’ah* to implement a *ḥerem* that appears in *Kol Bo*, sec. 139, שם של מ”ב אותיות, בסוד שם המפורש, בשם הגלגים וגוי בשם הגורל, בשם מטטרון, סנדרפון, שם של מ”ב אותיות, בסוד שם המפורש, בשם הגלגים וגוי בשם אטור הוא לה’ וככ’; see also above, ch. 1, n. 54); below, n. 115; and cf. *Kol Bo*, sec. 66 (*Moreh Hatta’im le-R. Eleazar mi-Worms*), fol. 31b.

¹¹³See ms. Paris 633, fol. 183. The seventy verses, beginning with the phrase וְאַתָּה הָנָן בְּעֵדָיו, appear in close proximity to one of the *hashba’ot* of Metatron, followed by an expanded *tefillat ha-derekh* and other personal requests; see Sirat, “Un Rituel Juif de France,” 20. The verses are part of a *seder ha-ma’amidot* (copied by someone other than R. Isaac of Chinon) that follows the ‘Aleynu prayer (fol. 104v). It consists of Abbaye’s *Seder ha-Ma’arakhah* (fols. 157–173r), verses to be recited each day, the eleven verses which begin and end with *nun*, the *Hechalot* prayer *Ha-Adderet vega-Emmunah*, and the ten commandments, as well as two chapters of the Pentateuch (fols. 173v–182r). See Sirat, 12–13; and cf. above, nn. 111–12.

¹¹⁴Ms. Paris 633, fols. 211v–212r:

כִּי צְרוֹת שִׁיחָה לְאָדָם יֹאמֶר וְהִוְנֶצֶל: בְּשֵׁם אֵא אֲשֶׁר אָא הַחֲקוֹק בְּמִעֵץ אַהֲרֹן
וּבְזַעֲקַתָּא דְשִׁלְמָה וּבְזַעֲקַתָּא דְהַמּוֹדִיאָל (תְּטוּרִיאָל) וּבְזַעֲקַתָּא דְמַטְתָּרוֹן קְדוּשָׁא רְבָא
עֲבָדָה הָ (יְקוּק) הַנְּקָרָא עַל שְׁמוֹ וּבְזַעֲקַתָּא דְבָרִיאָל וּבְנָנוֹ רִי יְשֻׁמָּעָל וּבְזַעֲקַתָּא

In short, all these *mahzorim* demonstrate that there was much interest in theurgic prayer and magical uses of *Shemot* in rabbinic circles in northern France, England, and Germany from the second half of the twelfth through the thirteenth centuries. Magical *hashbatot* and requests for protection and other aims may have been commonplace, and they undoubtedly carried a high degree of rabbinic approbation. Some of this material originated in *Hekhalot* literature or was found in texts of the German Pietists. In addition, several of the *mahzorim* contain material on *she'elat halom*, another *Hekhalot* technique that appears in rabbinic circles,¹¹⁵ as well as procedures for dream

דشمישיאל ובזעקה דנהריאל ובשם המפורש שהוא בן מ"ב אותיות [אבותת"ץ קרע שטן]. משבע עליים הקדושים האלו שטעוני ותסיעוני והצלוני ... לשוני מלטוני והשמרוני ותהגוני תחתני לחן ולהחסן ולרחמים בעני כל רוזאי אותי ... [ב212] והסר את בעך מעליינו יגדל רחמיך על מדוריך ... והתנשם על ביך במדת רחמיך ותכנס להם לפנים משותה הדין ה' יברך את עמו ישראל בשלום. [בשאדים ישב בתהנית יאמר אחריו תפלה-יה'ך מלפניך ... (תהנית של' במקום קרבן)]

The introductory list of *Shemot* and angelic names is virtually identical to those found in ms. *Corpus Christi* 133 (published by Ta-Shma; see above, n. 112). See also *Teshuvot ha-Geonim ha-Hadashot*, ed. Emanuel, 125, 133. The requests are worded in somewhat different fashion, but they are essentially similar. The only significant stylistic difference is that the passage in ms. *Corpus Christi* is part of a prayer formulation that ends with a blessing, while the passage in Paris 633 is recited as a separate request. Note, however, the short mystical adjuration found in ms. Paris 633 (fol. 74 and 129; see above, n. 101), which also ends with the blessing of *shomea' tefillah*. See also ms. *Vat. Rossiana* 356, above, n. 99. Although many personal *tehinnot* from Ashkenaz ended with this blessing, and there was halakhic justification for this practice, some Ashkenazic authorities, including R. Judah *he-Hasid*, were against the inclusion of the blessing. See Ta-Shma, *Minhag Ashkenaz ha-Qadmon*, 140, n. 10, and the literature cited. [The passage cited from *Sefer ha-Yir'ah*, which allowed this blessing, constitutes a rare disagreement between this work and the teachings of R. Judah *he-Hasid*; see above, ch. 1, n. 84.]

¹¹⁵For *she'elat halom*, see, e.g., ms. Paris 1408 (Ashkenaz, fourteenth century [1329]), fol. 146r. The tosafists mentioned in this manuscript are primarily German. The manuscript also contains customs, liturgical comments, ethical insights, and esoteric comments from R. Eleazar of Worms; a talmudic commentary and a series of penitentials from R. Judah *he-Hasid*; and a number of halakhic rulings, responsa, and brief treatises from R. Meir of Rothenburg. A significant role was played in the copying of this manuscript by the scribe Elqanah, a student of Maharam, who cites a passage from *Ma'aseh Merkavah*. See Colette Sirat, "Le Manuscrit Hébreu 1408 de la Bibliothèque Nationale," *REJ* 123 (1964): 335–58, esp. 348; see also the description by M. Schwab in *REJ* 64 (1912):280–81; and see above, n. 37. On fol. 146r, at the bottom of a section about a ruling in *'issur ve-heter* (in the same handwriting, but shifted on the folio page), there is a *she'elat halom be-shem Sandalfon*:

שרה רבא השבעתי אותו סנדלפון שאמה ממונה על השאללה שתובא לי
הليلה ותפתר לי חלומי בשם שפתר גבריאל ליטוף חלום פרעה. ותבוא לי

CHAPTER 3

interpretation. Specific attribution of any mystical or magical prayers to Rabbenu Tam, however, remains totally unsubstantiated.¹¹⁶

שאלתי ובקשתי ממה שאבקש מוך בוה הלילה. השבעתי אותו השר סנדלפון בשם המפורש היושב בעבי שחיקם השמיים העליונים היושב בערבה... השבעתי אותו סנדלפון בשם א' אשר א'... ורעו גודלי עליונים ותחתונים... תרעש הארץ... השבעתי אותו השר סנדלפון בשם הקב"ה שהוא מפורש בע' שמות והוא מפואר בעליונים ובתחתונים. השבעתי אותו השר סנדלפון בשם מיכאל תקופת ניסן בשם עניאל שהוא על זרעה בארץא. השבעתי אותו השר סנדלפון בשם תימניא תקופת תמוז שהוא על אילנו ועלמא. השבעתי בשם מטראיל תקופת תשרי שהוא על מיטרא גינזיא. השבעתי וכוי בשם סטראיל תקופת טבת שהוא על חלומות. הראינו כי בוה הלילה מה שביליה וכן לי שאלתי ובקשתי. חצום י' ימים.

Another request is found on the other corner at the bottom of the page:

ברוך- ירץ עצמו ויצום אותו יום... ויאמר... בשלשים שנה למפרע. בוה העין... מראות ואראה הדשים נפתחים כבר וחר על הגולה בתרן ואני לחודש בחמשה ברביעי שנה בשלשים ויהי (= למפרע). ויאמר ז' פעמים ה' אלקי האמת הראיini חלום אמתה. ה' אלקי ישראל העזק הראיini חלום צוק... ה' טוב הראיini חלום טוב... ה' מפואר הראיini ח' מפואר וכוי ויחשוב לבבו ויאמר לבבו י' פעמים כל אחד ואחד יבוא מה שבקש.

[The first *baqqashah* is to know something through *she'elat halom*, the second is more of a free request. On these forms of *she'elat halom*, cf. *Sefer Razi'el*, 114, 137–38; above, n. 8; ms. Bodl. 2312, fol. 57v (below, ch. 4, n. 39); and below, ch. 5, n. 37. On Sandalfon in this literature, see, e.g. Schäfer, *The Hidden and Manifest God*, 92, 106; Margoliot, *Mal'akhei Elyon*, 148–50; Wolfson, *Through a Speculum That Shines*, 264; idem, "Mystical-Theurgical Dimensions of Prayer in *Sefer ha-Rimmon*," *Approaches to Judaism in Medieval Times*, ed. David Blumenthal, vol. 3 (Atlanta, 1988), 77, n. 146; Daniel Abrams, "The Boundaries of Divine Ontology: The Inclusion and Exclusion of Metatron in the Godhead," *Harvard Theological Review* 87 (1994):301; and see now Arthur Green, *Keter* (Princeton, 1997), 23–32, 100–101. Sandalfon is also invoked in *Kol Bo*, sec. 139 (above n. 112). See also above, n. 99 (end), and cf. *Tosafot Hagigah* 13b, s.v. *ve-qosher*.]

¹¹⁶Regarding dream interpretation, see the section entitled *pittaron halomot* in Paris 633, fols. 118–20. See also ms. Moscow-Guenzberg 13 (Ashkenaz, fourteenth century), fols. 25, 27–38; ms. Paris 187 (Italy, fifteenth/sixteenth centuries), fols. 61r–63v (following *seder ha-teshuva* by R. Eleazar of Worms, a *viddui* attributed to Ramban and texts of *gittin* from *Semaq* and *Sefer ha-Terumah*); and ms. Paris 644 (Ashkenaz, thirteenth/fourteenth centuries), fols. 22r–25v (*pittaron halomot*). Cf. Harris, *Studies in Dream Interpretation*, 29–30; Trachtenberg, *Jewish Magic and Interpretation*, 230–41; Thorndike, *A History of Magic and Experimental Science*, 2:290–302; and Kruger, *Dreaming in the Middle Ages*, 7–16. It should be noted that magical material in the *mahzorim* is all formulaic. There is no evidence in these texts for magical amulets or symbols that might be applied in addition to the prayers. Cf. *Sefer Razi'el*, above, n. 112. For an example of a northern French daily prayer rite that followed the rulings of Rabbenu Tam in particular and contains none of the mystical or magical elements discussed here, see ms. Cambr. 790 (thirteenth century), fols. 1–14.

It should be noted that there are a number of other texts and statements incorrectly attributed to Rabbenu Tam, especially in the realm of Jewish-Christian polemics.¹¹⁷ These mistaken attributions may have occurred simply because Rabbenu Tam was the leading scholar of his day.¹¹⁸ In addition, R. Jacob *ha-Levi* of Marvège, a younger Provençal contemporary of R. Jacob Tam and author of *She'elot u-Teshuvot min ha-Shamayim*, was also referred to as Rabbenu Tam. R. Jacob *ha-Levi*'s responsa utilize the mystical technique of *she'elat halom* to resolve halakhic questions, heightening the difficulty in identifying "Rabbenu Tam" when this name appears in *sod* or magical contexts.¹¹⁹ Indeed, the very way the name Rabbenu Tam is usually recorded,

¹¹⁷See David Berger, *The Jewish-Christian Debate in the High Middle Ages* (Philadelphia, 1979), 13, n. 22, 248–49; Frank Talmage, "Ha-Polmos ha-Anti-Nozeri be-Hibbur Leqet Qazar," *Michael* 4 (1976):67–68; *Sefer Yosef ha-Meqanne*, ed. Judah Rosenthal (Jerusalem, 1970), 45, sec. 23, n. 1; *Tosafot ha-Shalem*, ed. Jacob Gellis, vol. 5 (Jerusalem, 1986), 57; Heschel, "Al Ruah ha-Qodesh Bimei ha-Benayim," 182, n. 37; and my "On the Role of Bible Study in Medieval Ashkenaz," *The Frank Talmage Memorial Volume*, ed. Walfish, 1:163, n. 42. On the attribution of the mildly kabbalistic ethical work *Sefer ha-Yashar* (thirteenth century) to Rabbenu Tam (whose halakhic work and talmudic compendium bear the same title), see Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:107–8, and Shimon Shokef, *Jewish Ethics and Jewish Mysticism in Sefer ha-Yashar* (Lewiston, 1991), 3–27.

¹¹⁸Cf., e.g., Gottlieb, *Mehqarim be-Sifrut ha-Qabbalah*, 516–24; Tuvia Preschel, "Iggeret she-Yuhasah be-Ta'ut la-Ramban," *Talpiyyot* 8 (1961):49–53; my *Jewish Education and Society*, 174–75, n. 69; Ta-Shma, "Quntresei 'Sodot ha-Tefillah' le-R. Yehudah he-Hasid," *Tarbiz* 65 (1996):74–77; above, n. 110, and ch. 1, n. 89; *Sefer Tagmulei ha-Nefesh le-Hillel ben Shemu'el mi-Verona*, ed. Yosef Sermonetta (Jerusalem, 1981), 154, n. 136; and cf. Avraham Epstein in *Da'at ve-Hevrah be-Mishnatam shel Hasidei Ashkenaz*, ed. Ivan Marcus (Jerusalem, 1987), 32–33, n. 21.

¹¹⁹See *She'elot u-Teshuvot min ha-Shamayim le-Rabbenu Ya'aqov mi-Marvège*, ed. Margoliot, editor's introduction, 21; Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot* 1:238, n. 45*; Israel Ta-Shma, "She'elot u-Teshuvot min ha-Shamayim: Ha-Qovez ve-Tosafotav," *Tarbiz* 57 (1988):57; Sperber, *Minhagei Yisra'el*, 1:41, n. 5, 2:256, 4:313–14; the studies cited in my "Rabbinic Figures in Castilian Kabbalistic Pseudepigraphy," 82, n. 21, and 95, n. 66; above, ch. 1, n. 88; and below, ch. 4, n. 61. [For references to R. Jacob of Orléans, a student of Rabbenu Tam, as **ר"ת מאורילינש**, see, e.g., Urbach, 1:142; and *Tosafot ha-Shalem*, ed. Gellis, vol. 3, 200; vol. 4, 212, 241; vol. 5, 3, 38; vol. 9, 48, 196, 205, 208–9, 215; vol. 10, 15, 151. For R. Jacob of Chinon as **ר"ת מקינן**, see *Tosafot Rabbenu Perez he-Shalem* 'al *Massekhet Eruvin*, ed. Chaim Dickman (Jerusalem, 1991), *passim*; and H. Gross, *Gallia Judaica*, 579. For R. Jacob of Corbeil as **ר"ת מקורביל**, see *Tosafot ha-Shalem*, ed. Gellis, vol. 9, 133, and cf. below, ch. 4, n. 27.] The sources cited by Heschel, "Al Ruah ha-Qodesh Bimei ha-Benayim," 182–84 (nn. 36, 37, 46), that associate **ר"ת** with *she'elat halom* can be shown to refer to R. Jacob of Marvège. See also *She'elot u-Teshuvot min Ha-Shamayim*, ed. Margoliot, editor's introduction, 21–22; ms.

CHAPTER 3

using only the *rashei tevot* ר"ת, lends itself to imprecise or confused reference.¹²⁰

Beginning in the middle of the twelfth century, R. Samuel b. Qalonymus *he-Hasid* of Spires and his son, R. Judah *he-Hasid* (followed by the latter's student, R. Eleazar of Worms), rejuvenated and greatly expanded (to include a highly developed theosophy) the mystical teachings and expressions of *hasidut* they had received from their Pietist ancestors and teachers who studied almost exclusively in Mainz.¹²¹ Perhaps the relative lack of interest in *torat ha-sod* shown by Rashbam, Raban, and Rabbenu Tam—despite their clear awareness of this material—was because the methodology of the academy at Worms in the last part of the eleventh century adumbrated and, through R. Meir b. Samuel (the father of Rashbam and Rabbenu Tam) and others, helped stimulate the development of tosafist dialectic. The influence of Worms, where mystical teachings were not in evidence, was dominant at the beginning of the tosafist period.¹²²

Bodl. 2274, fol. 28; and cf. ms. Bodl. 781, fols. 91–95. Two other texts that make this association (cited by Heschel in nn. 42, 44), *Sefer Yosef Omez* and *Shalshelet ha-Qabbalah*, are significantly later works, and the distortions in both cases in regard to Rabbenu Tam have already been noted (above, nn. 98, 102). The reference in *Sefer ha-Yashar* to Rabbenu Tam as a *navi* has been shown to have an exoteric connotation; see Shraga Abramson, “*Navi, Ro’eh ve-Hozeh*,” *Sefer Yovel Muggash li-Khevod ha-Rav Mordekhai Kirschblum*, ed. David Telsner (Jerusalem, 1983), 118–23. Cf. R. Reiner, “*Rabbenu Tam: Rabbotav (ha-Zarefatim) ve-Talmidav Benei Ashkenaz*,” 47–48, n. 169.

שאלה ל’ר’ת אם ש כה זויה השם [ה] צ-באוות[לעשות הדבר הנורל הזה. A second question, which is not directed to any particular scholar, concerns the use of other Divine Names. See also above, n. 28, and Daniel Abrams, “*Sefer Shaqod le-R. Shemu’el b. R. Qalonymus ve-Torat ha-Sod shel Talmid R. Eleazar mi-Worms*,” *Assufot* (forthcoming), nn. 58, 60. In an Eastern manuscript dated 1636, ms. Jerusalem/Menahem Feldman 3, the following appears in an addendum to the body of *Sefer Shoshan Sodot* (fol. 182r–183r): **שאלה ל’ר’ת דרך ששאל מאן ל’ר’ת ... טליק סוד גמתריות ... שאלה ששאל מאן ל’ר’ת ... טליק סוד**.

¹²⁰On Mainz traditions and *hasidei Ashkenaz*, see above, ch. 1, nn. 11–12, 22, and above, nn. 11–13. For the concentration of pietism in Mainz during the pre-Crusade period, see also above, ch. 1, n. 22. On the dating of *Sefer Hasidim*, cf. Haym Soloveitchik, “*Le-Ta’arikh Hibburo shel ‘Sefer Hasidim’*,” *Tarbut ve-Hevrah be-Toledot Yisra’el Bimei ha-Benayim*, ed. Reuven Bonfil et al. (Jerusalem, 1989), 383–88; and Ivan Marcus, *Piety and Society* (Leiden, 1981), 136–37, 153, n. 88.

¹²¹See my *Jewish Education and Society*, 69–74; Grossman *Hakhmei Ashkenaz ha-Rishonim*, 343, 412–15, 437–38; idem, “*Reshitan shel ha-Tosafot*,” *Rashi: ‘Iyyunim bi-Ye’irato*, 57–68; and idem, *Hakhmei Zarefat ha-Rishonim*, 437–54. The only master associated exclusively with Worms who was involved in the transmission of *sodot ha-tefillah* and esoteric *ta’amim* and with the use of *Shemot*—in addition to his activity as

The influence of Mainz, on the other hand, was barely felt in the early twelfth century, although it did return at a later point. Even Raban, who studied in Mainz before the First Crusade, makes almost no reference to pre-Crusade rabbinic material from there, probably because of the disruptive impact of the First Crusade.¹²³ Israel Ta-Shma has argued that there was a conscious effort by twelfth-century tosafists (especially in northern France) to constrict their libraries, at least with respect to earlier halakhic writings, in order to focus without distraction on their independent approach to talmudic interpretation. For this reason, the rabbinic literature of eleventh-century Ashkenaz was largely ignored by the early tosafists.¹²⁴ Whether by design or by circumstance, these tosafists did not embrace the mystical, magical, and pietistic teachings and practices that had been prevalent in pre-Crusade Mainz.¹²⁵

V

Although the dialectical method and approach to talmudic interpretation pioneered by Rabbenu Tam and his contemporaries dominated Ashkenaz through the end of the thirteenth century, there is much evidence to suggest that not all tosafists shared their attitude toward the disciplines of mysticism and magic, which had been a scholarly endeavor in the pre-Crusade period, as we have noted. Indeed, we shall see that several students of Rabbenu Tam—including Ri, R. Eleazar of Metz, and Ribam, among others—were involved in aspects of mystical studies and practices. All this activity stands in addition to the presence of related material that has been noted in *sifrut de-Vei Rashi*, and in prayer texts and interpretations from the late twelfth century and beyond.

Once again, the question should be raised as to whether the German Pietists, who were coming into their own at this very point in time, were particularly influential in disseminating mystical and magical materials in northern France (and Germany), or whether there was a broader stream within rabbinic culture throughout medieval Ashkenaz that valued these disciplines—just as there was a stratum represented by Rashbam and Raban that apparently

a *payyetan*—(all of which calls to mind R. Simeon *ha-Gadol*) was R. Meir b. Isaac ימ" (Shalih Zibbur). See Grossman, *Hakhmei Ashkenaz ha-Rishonim*, 293–95; and above, ch. 1, n. 55; ch. 2, n. 65.

¹²³Grossman, *Hakhmei Ashkenaz ha-Rishonim*, 439.

¹²⁴See Ta-Shma, “The Library of the French Sages,” *Rashi*, 1040–1090, ed. Sed-Rajna, 535–40, and cf. above, n. 70.

¹²⁵For Rabbenu Tam’s (negative) attitude toward *perishut*, see above, ch. 1, nn. 26–28, and see also ch. 2, n. 81 for Raban. Cf. Urbach, *Ba’alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:176, 2:742.

CHAPTER 3

did not. Although Divine Names and their uses and powers were an area of great interest and significance in the esoteric thought of the German Pietists,¹²⁶ we shall see that the leaders of *Hasidei Ashkenaz* were not as supportive of the actual use of *Shemot* and *hashba'ot* for practical purposes as might have been expected. This suggests that Ashkenazic tosafists who discussed and advocated these techniques were motivated to do so because of their own spiritual heritage or religious commitment.

¹²⁶See, e.g., Haviva Pedaya, “Pegam ve-Tiqqun,” 157, n. 1, and the literature cited there, and Wolfson, *Through a Speculum That Shines*, ch. 5, *passim*.



4

Between Tosafists and German Pietists

I

The dialectical method pioneered by Rabbenu Tam and other early tosafists held sway in northern France and Germany throughout the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.¹ The influence of these scholars is perhaps also evident in those *Tosafot* texts that appear to downplay or modify mystical or magical interpretations proposed by Rashi and others.² At the same time, however,

¹For a survey of the contours of tosafist dialectic, see my *Jewish Education and Society in the High Middle Ages* (Detroit, 1992), 69–79, and the literature cited in 168, nn. 21–26; 172, n. 53; 173, n. 57; 179–80, n. 88.

²See, e.g., *Tosafot Berakhot* 3a, s.v. *ve-’onin* (=Tosafot R. Yehudah Sir Leon, *Tosafot Rabbenu Perez*, ad loc.), and Haviva Pedaya, “Pegam ve-Tiqqun shel ha-E-lohut be-Qabbalat R. Yizhaq Sagi Nahor,” *Mehqerei Yerushalayim be-Mahshevot Yisra’el* 6 [3–4] (1987):258; *Tosafot Hagigah* 14b, s.v. *nikhnesu la-pardes* (בגון על ידי שם ולא עלי למעלה), and *Tosafot ha-Rosh*, ad loc. (ms. Moscow-Guenzberg 488, fol. 39r); *Tosafot ha-Rosh*, *Gittin* 84a, s.v. [‘]al menat sheta’ali; *Tosafot Qiddushin* 73a, s.v. *mai’ikka lememar*; *Tosafot ha-Rosh* and *Tosafot Tukh*, ad loc. (ed. A. Z. Scheinfeld [Jerusalem, 1982], 130); *Tosafot Sukkah* 45a, s.v. [‘]ani va-ho; and see Rashi above, ch. 3, nn. 28, 33–34. The approach of the *ספר הערך*, which was also espoused by R. Hai and R. Hanan’el, locates the experience of the *Merkavah* mystic in his own mind or imagination. See Elliot Wolfson, *Through a Speculum That Shines* (Princeton, 1994), 144–48. Despite the influence of this view on mystical doctrines of *Hasidei Ashkenaz* (Wolfson, 214–17, and see above, ch. 3, n. 75), it is apparent that *Tosafot Hagigah* is attempting to skirt the more explicit *sod* implications of Rashi’s interpretation. See also Moshe Idel, *Kabbalah: New Perspectives* (New Haven, 1988), 90–91,

CHAPTER 4

there are *Tosafot* texts whose interest in concepts such as the function of *hayyot* and *’ofannim*, the use of *Shemot* to achieve revelation, and the possibility of

who stresses the rationalistic nature of R. Hai's approach; Joseph Dan, "The Beginnings of Jewish Mysticism in Europe," *The Dark Ages [The World History of the Jewish People*, vol. 11], ed. Cecil Roth (Ramat Gan, 1966), 284–85; idem, "Sefer Sha’arei ha-Sod ha-Yihud ve-ha-Emunah," *Temirin* 1 (1972):149–50; above, ch. 3, n. 28; and cf. *Tosafot ’Avodah Zarah* 28b, s.v. *shoryeneini de-’eina*.

See also *Tosafot R. Yehudah Sir Leon ’al Massekhet Berakhot*, ed. Nissan Zaks (Jerusalem, 1969–72), 2:599 (*Berakhot* 53b, s.v. *gadol ha-’oneh ’amen*). The interpretation of the talmudic dictum—that one who answers *’amen* to a blessing is greater than the one who makes the blessing, since *’amen* is the gematria equivalent of the letters of the Tetragrammaton in both its written and vocalized forms (and the one who answers, therefore, has, in effect, invoked the name of the Almighty two times)—is rejected by R. Yehudah Sir Leon as **אָנָּא נָדִיר אָל**. This interpretation originates in *Mahzor Vitry*, 97 (sec. 126), and *Sefer Hasidim* (SHB 18, in the "French" recension of the work; cf. above, ch. 1, n. 2); it is found almost exclusively in works that were part of the circle of the German Pietists or connected to it, such as *Sefer Roqeah*, *Sefer ’Arugat ha-Bosem*, and *Sefer Or Zarua*^c. See also *Tosafot ha-Rid* (cf. below, ch. 5, n. 21) and *Perush Ba’al ha-Turim ’al ha-Torah*, ed. Y. K. Reinitz (Jerusalem, 1993), 2:522 (to *Devarim* 27:26). See the sources cited in *Tosafot R. Yehudah Sir Leon*, ed. Zaks, nn. 316–17 (and note R. Menahem ha-Meiri's rationalistic interpretation). Cf. Ruth Langer, *To Worship God Properly* (Cincinnati, 1998), 219, n. 111. *Sefer ha-Manhig*, ed. Y. Raphael, 1:31–32, cites this interpretation in the name of Rashbam, whose awareness of esoteric teachings related to Divine Names has been noted (above, ch. 3, n. 66), although this attribution has been questioned by David Rosin (in the introduction to his edition of Rashbam's *Perush ’al ha-Torah* [Breslau, 1882], xvii), in light of Rashbam's rationalism; and see also Raphael's note, loc. cit. This Ashkenazic interpretation ultimately made its way into the *Zohar* [and should be added to the list of examples compiled by Israel Ta-Shma, *Ha-Nigleh shebe-Nistar* (Tel Aviv, 1995), 21–26] and into the biblical commentary of R. Bahya b. Asher (*Shemot* 14:31). Rashba (*Responsa*, 5:53) refers to the esoteric interpretation of this talmudic passage (*’inyan ne’elam le-ba’alei hokhmah*). In his aggadic commentary to *Berakhot*, he links the esoteric interpretation of the passage to the *sefirot*. See also the formulation of Rabbenu Yonah cited in *Beit Yosef*, O. H., sec. 124, and Maharsha to *Sotah* 40b, s.v. *minayin she’ein ’omrim*. [R. Judah Sir Leon's awareness and rejection of the suggested esoteric interpretation is consistent with the fact that he is cited as proposing a messianic date on the basis of a calculation, rather than through a dream or quasi-prophecy as a number of his contemporaries did. See E. E. Urbach, *Ba’alei ha-Tosafot* (Jerusalem, 1980²), 1:344; my "Rabbinic Figures in Castilian Kabbalistic Pseudepigraphy: R. Yehudah he-Hasid and R. Elhanan of Corbeil," *Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy* 3 (1993):88, n. 41; above, ch. 3, n. 41; and below, n. 8.]

See *Tosafot Shabbat* 156b, s.v. *kalda’ei*, regarding the prohibition of using *goralot* to predict the future, and cf. *Beit Yosef*, *Yoreh De’ah*, sec. 179. See also *Semag*, *lo ta’aseh* 52; *Tosafot Niddah* 16b, s.v. *ha-kol bidei shamayim*; and Jacob Bazak, *Le-Ma’alah min ha-Hushim* (Tel Aviv, 1985²), 61–62.

solving halakhic dilemmas by quasi-prophetic means transcends the realm of pure *sugya* interpretation or the resolution of conflicting talmudic passages.³

Moreover, a number of Rabbenu Tam's leading students in both northern France and Germany exhibited familiarity with esoteric teachings, even though they do not appear to have had any formal connection to *Hasidei Ashkenaz*. An eschatological formulation by R. Isaac b. Samuel of Dampierre (Ri), R. Tam's nephew and most important student—which describes those who will merit their reward in *gan 'eden* but will not continue to exist in *'olam ha-ba*, and also details the fates of complete *resha'im* and *zaddiqim*—is cited by R. Elhanan b. Yaqr of London in his mystical commentary to *Sefer Yezirah* in the name of R. Isaac *ha-Zaqen* [=Ri].⁴ R. Elhanan, who spent time in northern France with

³See *Tosafot Haggigah* 13b, s.v. *katuv 'ehad 'omer*; 13a, s.v. *ve-raglei ha-hayyot* (based on midrash and Yerushalmi), and *Tosafot ha-Rosh*, ad loc. (ms. Moscow 488, fols. 38v–39r); and *Hullin* 92a, s.v. *barukh ofannim* (and see ms. Vat. 159, fol. 91r). This *Tosafot* is interested in the difference between functions of various types of angels, but the discussion is couched in *'im tomar/yesh lomar* terms and proceeds on the basis of talmudic texts. Cf. *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur*, ed. Peter Schäfer et al. (Tübingen, 1981), secs. 146, 197, 236, 723–24. See also *Tosafot Gittin* 84a, s.v. *'al menat she-ta'ali*, and *Tosafot Sukkah* 45a, s.v. *'ani va-ho*. Cf. Rashi, above, ch. 3, n. 28; *Tosafot Sanhedrin* 22a, s.v. *arba'im yom qedem yezirat ha-valad*, and *Pishei ha-Tosafot*, ad loc. (and cf. SHB, 794–95, and *Levush*, O. H., 230:1); *Tosafot Eruvin* 60b, s.v. *'ein 'elu 'ela divrei nevi'ut* (and cf. *Tosafot Bava Batra* 12a, s.v. R. Yose; *Tosafot Menahot* 109b, s.v. *ba-tehillah*; *Tosafot Yevamot* 14, s.v. R. Yehoshua^c; Shraga Abramson, R. Nissim Gaon: *Hamishah Sefarim* [Jerusalem, 1965], 292, n. 237; and E. E. Urbach, "Halakhah u-Nevu'ah," *Tarbiz* 18 [1947]:10–22; 22, n. 188). *Tosafot Avodah Zarah* 2b, s.v. *zu Romi*, cites the *Hekhalot* text, *Ma'aseh Merkavah*, which asserts that Rome merited large-scale destruction following the murder of R. Hananyah b. Traydon. In *Tosafot R. Elhanan*, ad loc., this reference is attributed to Ri. See *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur*, secs. 115–20; Gershom Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkavah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition* (New York, 1960), 101–2; and above, ch. 3, n. 37. A passage attributed in *Sifrut de-vei Rashi* to *Sefer Yezirah* is cited by *Tosafot Haggigah* 3b, s.v. *u-mi*. Cf. above, ch. 3, n. 31.

⁴Ms. JTS Mic. 8118 (ENA 838), fol. 65v. Joseph Dan, who transcribed R. Elhanan's commentary from this manuscript, inadvertently missed the passage. His transcription skips from the beginning of fol. 65r and resumes at the same point on fol. 66r. See his *Tekstim be-Torat ha-E-lohut shel Hasidut Ashkenaz* (Jerusalem, 1977), pt. 2, 34–35, and his "Sifrutam ha-'Iyyunit shel Hasidut Ashkenaz" [Hebrew University, M. A. seminar] (Jerusalem, 1973), 34–35. This passage does not appear in the other version of R. Elhanan's commentary published by Georges Vajda. See Vajda, "Perush R. Elhanan b. Yaqr le-Sefer Yezirah," *Qovez 'al Yad* n.s. 6 [16] (1966):148–50 [and cf. lines 183–93]. The only other northern French rabbinic scholar mentioned by R. Elhanan in his commentary [most of his sparse references are to Spanish or Provençal philosophers] is Rashi, who is cited in both versions regarding *mazzalot*. See JTS Mic. 8118, fol. 65v, and Vajda, line 250. [In another manuscript that contains the version published by Vajda—

CHAPTER 4

fellow members of the *Hug ha-Keruv ha-Meyuhad*,⁵ indicated that he studied *Sefer Yezirah* with an unnamed scholar who himself had studied it with R. Isaac ha-Zaqen.⁶ There is an additional instance in which a member of the *Hug ha-Keruv ha-Meyuhad* associated Ri with the study of *Sefer Yezirah*. According to one variant of the *Hug*'s Pseudo-Sa'adyah commentary to *Sefer Yezirah*, Ri [ר' עלי הוזקן] and his disciples wished to create a *golem* in the course of their study of *Sefer Yezirah*, but the students became endangered in the process. Ri directed them to reverse the letters of the alphabet they had recited previously, and the students were spared.⁷

Ri is included among a list of Ashkenazic scholars who purportedly received and transmitted mystical prognostications: ר' עליה למרים וקבל דבריהם ממלacky השרת.⁸ He is perhaps the only rabbinic figure in that group who has not been associated with the German Pietists, although it is likely that he was

Nuremberg (Municipal Library) Cent. V app. 5/1 (seventeenth century), of which Vajda was apparently unaware—the letters representing Rashi are fully written out in the margin (fol. 59v) as R. Shelomoh Yarhi (of Lunel). See Hida, *Shem ha-Gedolim* (Warsaw, 1878), *Ma'arekhet ha-gedolim*, 116; and Maurice Liber, *Rashi* (Philadelphia, 1904), 34.]

⁵See above, ch. 1, n. 65. The precise connection and relationship between the *Hug ha-Keruv ha-Meyuhad* and *Hasidei Ashkenaz* remain somewhat elusive. See also Vajda, "Perush R. Elhanan b. Yaqr," 148; Dan, *Tekstim be-Torat ha-Elohut*, 22; and the literature cited in my "Rabbinic Figures in Castilian Kabbalistic Pseudepigraphy," 84–85, nn. 27–31, 106, nn. 100–101. In his *Sod ha-Sodot*, R. Elhanan writes that he is a descendant of R. Simeon ha-Gadol (שמעון הגודול), who was a significant figure in esoteric studies in Mainz during the eleventh century and was originally from northern France. See above, ch. 3, n. 4. For *segulot* and *hashbot* by R. Elhanan, similar to those composed by *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, see below, n. 49.

⁶See Vajda, "Perush R. Elhanan b. Yaqr," 148, 184; Gershom Scholem, *Origins of the Kabbalah*, ed. R. J. Z. Werblowsky (Princeton, 1987), 250–51, n. 103; Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:237; and below, n. 9.

⁷See Moshe Idel, *Golem* (Albany, 1990), 81–82, 91–92, n. 4. As Idel indicates, the more common reading of the scholar who was teaching *Sefer Yezirah* is ר' ייבראם. It is likely that this refers to R. Isaac b. Abraham of Dampierre, a student of Ri. Cf. my "Rabbinic Figures in Castilian Kabbalistic Pseudepigraphy," 105–6, n. 99; the revised Hebrew edition of *Golem* (Jerusalem, 1996), 309–10, n. 4; above, ch. 1, n. 156; and below, n. 37.

⁸See Alexander Marx, "Ma'amar 'al Shenat Ge'ulah," *Ha-Zofeh le-Hokhmat Yisra'el* 5 (1921):194–202, and cf. above, ch. 3, n. 6. The text published by Marx from ms. Bodl. 388 (fourteenth century) includes similar heavenly prognostications from R. Samuel and R. Judah *he-Hasid*, R. Ezra *ha-Navi* of Moncontour, and R. Troestlin *ha-Navi*. Cf. Gershon Cohen, "Messianic Postures of Ashkenazim and Sephardim," *Studies of the Leo Baeck Institute*, ed. Max Kreutzberger (New York, 1967), 128–30. Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:238, suggests that this account of Ri should be dated (like the manuscript itself) from the fourteenth-century. Grossman, *Hakhmei Zarefat ha-Rishonim*, 51, has located a parallel manuscript, ms. JTS Rab. 1609. On fol. 32r,

visited in northern France by R. Judah *ha-Hasid* and that he met R. Samuel *he-Hasid* as well.⁹ R. Abraham b. Nathan *ha-Yarhi* (of Lunel) studied with Ri.

R. Hai Gaon and R. Zevadyah (Zekharyah), son of R. Yosef *Tov 'Elem*, offer (political) signs that would signify the approach of the *ge'ulah* (cf. above, ch. 3, n. 2): "And my father told me in the name of R. Judah [Sir Leon] of Paris that Bil'am lived in the middle of (the duration of) the world." According to Grossman, this suggests that the writer or compiler of (part of) this text was from the mid-thirteenth century (a position held also by Adolf Neubauer; see his *Catalogue of the Hebrew Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library* [Oxford, 1886], 85). This is confirmed by the fact that most of the messianic dates listed in the text are in the 1230s. See also Scholem, *Origins of the Kabbalah*, 230, n. 5. The latest messianic date found in the text (1296) suggests that no part of it was composed later than 1280. Although this text is thus somewhat late in terms of authenticating the positions of R. Hai and R. Zevadyah b. Yosef *Tov 'Elem*, the characterization of Ri is not in question. Cf. Urbach, 1:337, n. 21. On the reliability of this text, see also below, ch. 5, n. 67. [On the other hand, the formulation attributed to Ri in the introduction to the fourteenth-century Spanish compendium *Zedah la-Derekh*—that no one else could have composed a work comparable to R. Isaac Alfasi's *Halakhot* unless he communicated with the *Shekhinah* (Urbach, 1:251)—remains unsubstantiated. Cf. Jacob Katz, *Halakhah ve-Qabbalah* (Jerusalem, 1986), 348, and my *Jewish Education and Society*, 66–67. The description of Ri as 'ה רישׁמָה in ms. Bodl. 847, fols. 36r–36v, is a reflection of Ri's position as the outstanding talmudist of his generation. See also below, n. 64.]

⁹See my "Rabbinic Figures in Castilian Kabbalistic Pseudepigraphy," 88, nn. 41–42. The similar messianic dates suggested by all the central figures in the so-called *ma'amar 'al shenat ha-ge'ulah* discussed in the preceding note (R. Samuel *he-Hasid*, R. Judah *he-Hasid*, R. Ezra *ha-Navi*, R. Troestlin *ha-Navi*, and Ri) imply some relationship among these figures.

On Ri's deep piety and his tendencies toward fasting and self-denial, similar to those of R. Judah *he-Hasid*, see above, ch. 1, nn. 29–30. [*Ha-Qadosh mi-Danpira*, mentioned several times in *Pishei Rabbenu Yehiel mi-Paris*, refers to Ri rather than to his martyred son R. Elhanan. See Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:459, n. 45, and cf. my "Rabbinic Figures in Castilian Kabbalistic Pseudepigraphy," 84–85, n. 30.] For Ri's awareness of *Hekhalot* literature, see above, ch. 3, n. 37. R. Judah *he-Hasid* (d.1217) was a younger contemporary of Ri, who died between 1185 and 1190; see Urbach, 1:253. Ri and R. Judah *he-Hasid* (in *Sefer ha-Kavod*, and as cited by R. Eleazar of Worms) held the same view concerning the danger of drinking water at the *tequfah* and the permissibility of using water for *mazzah* from the day on which the *tequfah* changes, which includes both an awareness of the *sakkana* involved (due to the absence of the angelic *memunim* who protect the water supply from *maziqim*) and the notion that religious devotion can supersede forms of *sakkana*. Similar approaches to this issue are found only in *Sefer ha-Alqoshi* (written by a student of Rashi who was adept in astrology; see above, ch. 3, n. 65); *Sefer Assufot* (written by a student of R. Eleazar of Worms); *Sefer ha-Manhig* (by an author who studied with Ri; see the next note); the *Zohar*; and R. Mena'hem Ziyyoni, who followed closely the teachings of *Hasidei Ashkenaz*. See Israel Ta-Shma, "Issur Shetiyyat Mayim ba-Tequfah u-Meqoro," *Mehqerei Yerushalayim be-Folklor Yehudi* 17 (1995):21–32. [On the generally more conservative posture of Ri as compared to

CHAPTER 4

It was within Ri's circle that R. Abraham observed certain pietistic and mystical practices in prayer that he attributed to scholars and pietists in northern France.¹⁰

A talmudic passage that alludes to the tactics of *poterei halomot* (dream interpreters) was understood by Ri as referring to those who arrived at their interpretation on the basis of the *mazal* under which a person was born, rather than through the application of any kind of *ḥokhmah*.¹¹ The Talmud prohibits the use, even for medicinal purposes, of trees worshipped by idolaters. Ri

Rabbenu Tam, in terms of both personality and their tendencies in legal reasoning, see, e.g., Jacob Katz, *Exclusiveness and Tolerance* (New York, 1961), 30–36, 46–47, and Haym Soloveitchik, "Three Themes in the *Sefer Hasidim*," *AJS Review* 1 (1977):341, n. 98.]

¹⁰See, e.g., *Sefer ha-Manhig*, ed. Y. Raphael (Jerusalem, 1978), 1:363, 2:475, 478, 519, 526. On R. Abraham of Lunel (and R. Judah b. Yaqr) as students of Ri, see also Israel Ta-Shma, "Hasidut Ashkenaz bi-Sefarad: Rabbenu Yonah Gerondi—ha-Ish u-Fo'alo," *Galut Ahar Golah*, ed. Aharon Mirsky et al. (Jerusalem, 1988), 171–73; my "Rabbinic Figures in Castilian Kabbalistic Pseudepigraphy," 97–98, n. 73; and below, n. 34. On the role of R. Abraham as a conduit during the Maimonidean controversy, see above, ch. 1, n. 50. On *sod* in *Sefer ha-Manhig*, see above, ch. 1, nn. 61–63.

Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:237–38, suggests that R. Abraham of Lunel was Ri's contact with the mystics of southern France. The scholars of Lunel (who were both talmudists and mystics), including R. Asher b. Meshullam, asked halakhic questions of Ri. R. Asher was characterized by R. Benjamin of Tudela as renouncing worldly affairs, studying day and night, and fasting and not eating meat. See also Israel Ta-Shma, *R. Zeraḥyah ha-Levi Ba'al ha-Ma'or u-Vnei Hugo* (Jerusalem, 1992), 162–66. (For Ri's ascetic tendencies, see the preceding note.) On awareness in southern France of the ascetic renunciations usually associated with German Pietism, cf. Marc Saperstein, "Christians and Christianity in the Sermons of Jacob Anatoli," *The Frank Talmage Memorial Volume*, ed. Barry Walfish (Haifa, 1992), 2:233. R. Jacob b. Saul *ha-Nazir* of Lunel, also had connections to *Hasidei Ashkenaz* and to rabbinic scholars in northern France. See Moshe Idel, "Ha-Kavvanah ba-Tefillah be-Reshit ha-Qabbalah: Bein Ashkenaz li-Provence," *Porat Yosef*, ed. Bezalel and Eliyahu Safran (New York, 1992) [Hebrew section], 5–14; idem, "Al Kavvanat Shemoneh 'Esreh 'ezel R. Yizḥaq Sagi Nahor," *Massu'ot*, ed. Oron and Goldreich, 31–36; *'Arugat ha-Bosem*, ed. Urbach, 4:117–19; Ta-Shma, *Minhag Ashkenaz ha-Qadmon* [Jerusalem, 1992], 127–28, and n. 10; Avraham Grossman, "Perush ha-Piyyutim le-R. Aharon b. Hayyim ha-Kohen," *Be-Orah Madra* [*Sefer Yovel le-Aharon Mirsky*], ed. Zvi Malachi et al. (Lod, 1986), 462, n. 23; and above, ch. 2, n. 14. [Note that more than twenty manuscripts of Rashi's commentary to Job add exegetical material from R. Jacob *ha-Nazir*, following the last of Rashi's comments in ch. 40; see, e.g., ms. Parma 181 (Ashkenaz, twelfth/thirteenth centuries), fols. 263–64.]

¹¹See *Tosafot Berakhot* 55b, s.v. *potrei halomot*; *Tosafot R. Yehudah Sir Leon*, ad loc.; and cf. above, ch. 3, n. 116. Cf. the similar approach suggested in the response to the

suggested that the effectiveness of these trees, as opposed to others of the same kind, was unlocked because the idolators invoked *shelim*.¹² Moreover, Ri approved the magical summoning of *shelim* in order to ascertain through divination the whereabouts of lost objects.¹³ In light of Ri's familiarity with mystical teachings and magical techniques, it is likely that his support of the magical summoning of *shelim* to find lost objects reflects more than a simple acceptance of popular beliefs or superstitions.¹⁴

Another leading student of Rabbenu Tam, R. Eliezer of Metz (1115–98), has a lengthy discussion in his *Sefer Yere'im* about *hashba'at shelim* and *hashba'at malakhim*. He concludes that these techniques, which are akin to methodologies found in *Sefer Yezirah*, are not prohibited as *ma'aseh keshafim*. When a person, however, "creates an actual object or changes a person's mind through his own magical manipulations" (not through *hashba'at malakhim* or *hashba'at shelim*), that person is guilty of sorcery.¹⁵

she'elat halom of R. Jacob of Marvège in his *She'elot u-Teshuvot min ha-Shamayim*, ed. Margoliot, #22, 61–62. See also Heschel, "Al Ruah ha-Qodesh Bimei ha-Benayim," 179, n. 17, on Ri's use of the phrase *divrei nevi'ut* in a halakhic context; and cf. *Shitah Mequbbezet* to *Bava Mezi'a* 85b, in which Ri is cited by *Tosafot Shanz* (אומר ר' שבחים) (זראחו).

¹²See *Tosafot Pesahim* 25, s.v. *huz*, and *Tosafot Rash mi-Shanz*, ad loc.

¹³See Abraham Halpern, "Sefer Mordekhai ha-Shalem le-Massekhet Bava Qamma" (Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University, 1978), vol. 2, 211–12 [to *Bava Qamma* 116a=idem, (Jerusalem, 1992), 2:213]: פָּסָק רַי לֹא כָּל אֲשֶׁר הָתָנה דָּבָר וּרְגִלְעִין לְתֹת יְוָהָר מִכְדֵּי טִירָחוֹ. Ri expressed this view in an actual case, and it was recorded by R. Judah Sir Leon. See also *Semag*, *aseh* 74 (fol. 153), and cf. *Semag*, *lo ta'aseh* 55 (fol. 11a); R. Eliezer of Metz (below, n. 19); *Sefer Or Zarua'*, *Bava Qamma*, sec. 457; and below, ch. 5, n. 13. For other medieval Ashkenazic halakhic texts that deal with the permissibility of consulting *shelim* to apprehend a thief and for other purposes, see below, ch. 5, nn. 21, 72; and cf. below, n. 49, and the next note.

¹⁴For magical techniques and *segullot* (from Ashkenazic scholars) that could be used to catch a thief, see, e.g., ms. Parma 541, fol. 267r (sec. 80), and ms. Vat. 243, fol. 12r. [Cf. ms. Milan Ambrosiana P12, sup. 53/10 (on this manuscript, cf. Gershom Scholem in *Qiryat Sefer* 11 [1934–35]:185–86), fol. 138v (end), in the name of Isaac b. Samuel, regarding the philosophical possibility of immersion in air as well as water. This figure is, however, R. Yizhaq de-min Akko, rather than Ri. Note that a R. Isaac (*ha-Navi*) *Zarefati* is referred to in writings of the German Pietists as well as Geroneze kabbalists. See my "Rabbinic Figures in Castilian Kabbalistic Pseudepigraphy," 100, n. 80; below, ch. 5, n. 49; and cf. Chavel, *Kitvei ha-Ramban*, 2:346.]

¹⁵*Sefer Yere'im ha-Shalem*, ed. Avraham Abba Schiff (Vilna, 1892–1902), sec. 239. This position is attributed to R. Eliezer in R. Yeroham b. Meshullam, *Toledot Adam ve-Havvah*, sec. 17, pt. 5 (fol. 159d). See also *Semag*, *lo ta'aseh* 55; *Tosafot ha-Shalem*, ed. Jacob Gellis, vol. 6, 186–87; above, ch. 3, n. 29 (Rashi); above, n. 13 (Ri); and below, ch. 5, n. 13 (R. Avigdor Katz), and n. 21 (Rid).

CHAPTER 4

R. Eliezer also suggests that mystical names and markings quite similar to those found in *Mahzor Vitry* be included in *mezuzot*. Unlike *Mahzor Vitry*, however, and perhaps in deference to Rabbenu Tam, R. Eliezer writes that these are not absolutely required by Jewish law (*‘eino le-‘ikkuvah ve-lo le-mizyah*) but should be included for added protection (*le-tosefet shemirah*).¹⁶ R. Eliezer is cited by his student, R. Eleazar of Worms, as ruling that it is appropriate to stand during the recitation of the first portion of *Qeri’at Shema*. This ruling, which has pietistic overtones, is based on (a passage in) *Hekhalot* literature. All subsequent proponents of this view in Europe during the thirteenth century were either German Pietists or among those associated with *hasidut Ashkenaz*.¹⁷

R. Eliezer of Metz cautioned against a person saying, even in jest, that God had told him something directly. This warning may be indicative of R. Eliezer’s familiarity with quasi-prophetic experiences—of the kind experienced by Ri’s student, R. Ezra *ha-Navi* of Moncontour, and others—that will be discussed more fully below.¹⁸ On the other hand, R. Eliezer permitted the binding of a dying individual by oath to return after his death, to tell or answer whatever he is asked (*ha-mashbia‘ ̄et ha-holeh lashuv le-‘ahar mitah le-hagid lo ‘asher yish’al lo*). In R. Eliezer’s view, this is not a violation of the prohibition against communicating with the dead (*doresh ̄et ha-metim*), since the request was made to the individual while he was still alive. Although R. Eliezer cites two talmudic texts in support of this arrangement, he once

¹⁶ *Sefer Yere’im ha-Shalem*, sec. 400. See also *Haggahot Maimuniyyot*, *Hilkhot Tefillin* 4:4; *Mahzor Vitry*, 648–49 (and above, ch. 3, n. 57); *Sefer Pardes ha-Gadol*, sec. 285 (which includes the practice of R. Judah *he-Hasid*; cf. *Ta-Shma*, *Halakhah*, *Minhag u-Mezi’ut be-Ashkenaz*, 282–87); Urbach, *Ba’alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:161; and Victor Aptowitzer, “Le Nom de Dieu et des Anges dans la Mezouza,” *REJ* 60 (1910):40. Cf. *Semag*, *‘aseh* 22, *‘asur le-hosif*. R. Abraham b. Azriel cites R. Judah *he-Hasid*, R. Eleazar of Worms, and R. Eliezer of Metz concerning the halakhic and mystical implications of erasing certain Divine Names; see ‘*Arugat ha-Bosem*, ed. Urbach, 3:32. In general, *Sefer Yere’im* is cited extensively by R. Abraham; see ‘*Arugat ha-Bosem*, 4:164.

¹⁷ See Erich Zimmer, “*Tenuhot u-Tenu’ot ha-Guf bi-She‘at Qeri’at Shema*,” *Assufot* 8 (1995):346–48, esp. 348, n. 25. Among those who supported this practice (which originated in *Erez Yisra’el*) were the *Sefer Minhag Tov*, R. Meir of Rothenburg, and several Spanish kabbalists. Cf., e.g., above, n. 2, for a similar pattern of development.

¹⁸ See *Sefer Yere’im*, sec. 241 (fol. 110a); *Haggahot Maimuniyyot*, *Hilkhot ‘Avodah Zarah* 5:8 [1]; and Urbach, “*Halakhah u-Nevu’ah*,” 22, n. 188. Urbach suggests that R. Eliezer’s published warning in this matter demonstrates that it was a fairly frequent occurrence. R. Jacob of Marvège, author of *She’elot u-Teshuvot min ha-Shamayim*, was a younger contemporary of R. Eliezer of Metz. Although R. Jacob flourished in Provence, his work had an impact in Ashkenaz and perhaps also raised the specter of baseless claims for Divine guidance. See below, ch. 5, nn. 22–24, 67.

again displays clear interest in occult practices.¹⁹ Indeed, R. Eliezer's formulation adumbrates a lengthier passage in *Sefer Hasidim* concerning a commitment made between two people that the first of them to die would communicate with the other, either through a dream or in a more vivid form.²⁰

In referring to the way that *kohanim* hold their hands during the priestly benediction (with their fingers separated), R. Eliezer writes that he does not know the origin of this custom, but he asserts that it was practiced *be-qabbalah*. He also heard that it was based on a midrashic interpretation of the biblical phrase, *meziz min ha-harakkim*. In light of the mystical formulations that relate to the placement of the hands of the *kohanim*, this term perhaps reflects the impact of esoteric teachings.²¹

A contemporary of R. Isaac of Dampierre and R. Eliezer of Metz, R. Jacob of Corbeil (d.1192)—who is referred to as both *ha-Qadosh* and *he-Hasid*

¹⁹See *Sefer Yere'im*, secs. 334–35; *Haggahot Maimuniyyot*, *Hilkhot 'Avodah Zarah* 14:13 [8]; and *Beit Yosef*, *Yoreh De'ah*, sec. 179, s.v. 'ov. According to R. Eliezer, the biblical prohibition called **אוב** involves the use of sorcery to raise the deceased from his grave. In the case at hand, however, the communication takes place while the deceased remains in his grave (which is further reason to permit it). This passage from *Sefer Yere'im* is also included by Zedekiah b. Abraham *ha-Rofe* in his *Shibbolei ha-Leqet* (*ha-heleq ha-sheni*), ed. Simcha Hasida (Jerusalem, 1988), 43, sec. 11). [Maimonides, *Hilkhot 'Avodah Zarah*, loc. cit., writes that any act by which a dead person can inform the living is punished by lashes.] Cf. *Shulhan 'Arukh*, *Yoreh De'ah*, 179:14; and *Shakh*, ad loc., sec. 16 (who notes the correlation between R. Eliezer's view and positions of the *Zohar* and *hakhmei ha-qabbalah*).

²⁰See SHP 324: *אם שני בני אדם טובים בחיהם נשבעו או נהנו אמונהם יחד אם ימותו אחד מהם שיוציא לחבירו היאך באוטו עולם וכו'*. Cf. Monford Harris, *Studies in Jewish Dream Interpretation* (Northvale, 1994), 20; and above, ch. 1, n. 105, and ch. 2, nn. 52, 70.

²¹*Sefer Yere'im*, sec. 269 (end; fol. 127b). Cf. *Midrash Leqah Tov* to Numbers 6:23; *Perushei ha-Torah le-R. Yehudah he-Hasid*, ed. Y. S. Lange (Jerusalem, 1975), 166; *Arba'ah Turim*, O. H., sec. 128; and the kabbalistic sources cited in *The Book of the Pomegranates*, ed. Elliot Wolfson (Atlanta, 1986), 254 (note to line 12). See also Elliot Horwitz, "Al Ketav-Yad Mezuyar shel Sefer Mishneh Torah," *Qiryat Sefer* 61 (1986): 584–85; and Hananel Mack, "Midrash Askenazi le-Perek Alef be-Sefer Yeshayahu," *Zion* 63 (1998):124. On the mystical implications of *meziz*, see Moshe Idel, "Tefisat ha-Torah be-Sifrut ha-Hekhalot ve-Gilgulehah ba-Qabbalah," *Mehqeri Yerushalayim be-Mahshevet Yisra'el* 1 (1981):35, n. 36. [According to *Shibbolei ha-Leqet*, sec. 23, this positioning of the hands by the *kohanim* signifies that **אימת לבינה עלילדם**.] In *Sefer Yere'im*, sec. 322 (fol. 360), R. Eliezer ruled that a deceased non-Jew does not engender *tum'at 'ohel*, based on the fact that the prophet Elijah conducted himself this way and entered a non-Jewish cemetery. Cf. Urbach, "Halakhah u-Nevu'ah," 12, n. 96. Other *rishonim* also ruled according to Elijah; cf. *Tosafot Yevamot* 61a, s.v. *mi-magga* citing Ri, found in *Haggahot Maimuniyyot*, *Hilkhot Avelut* 2:3, in the name of Rabbenu Tam.

CHAPTER 4

[*mi-Corbeil*]²²—was cited concerning the number of words to be recited in *Shema* and the effects of their recitation, in a manner that modern scholarship has already noted reflects a mystical or pietistic bent.²³ R. Zedekiah b. Abraham Anav *ha-Rofe* offered a reason for the established Ashkenazic custom of maintaining the number of words that comprise the core of *Qeri'at Shema* at 248. He found this reason, which was formulated on the basis of a *gematria*, among the “*Ta'amei R. Yehudah he-Hasid*.” It is essentially an embellishment of a passage in *Midrash Tanhuma*, that the words of the *Shema* correspond to the number of man's limbs. Reciting the *Shema* properly will save a person from both sin and demon (*shed*).²⁴ The only other contemporary rabbinic figures to

²²See, e.g., *Tosafot Shabbat* 27a, s.v. *she-ken*; *Shabbat* 61a, s.v. *dilma*; *Sefer Or Zarua*, *pisqei 'avodah zarah*, pt. 4, sec. 270; and Henri Gross, *Gallia Judaica* (Paris, 1897), 562. R. Jacob of Corbeil was martyred. The epithet *ha-Qadosh* was also used, however, to connote saintliness, piety, or ascetic tendencies. See Isadore Twersky, *Rabad of Posquières* (Philadelphia, 1980²), 27–28, and above, n. 9. [Jacob was characterized by *Sefer Yuhasin* as a mequbbal; see Urbach in the next note.]

²³See Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:150–51; Norman Golb, *Toledot ha-Yehudim be-Ir Rouen Bimei ha-Benayim* (Jerusalem, 1976), 239, n. 400; Avraham Grossman, “*Perush ha-Piyyutim le-R. Aharon b. Hayyim ha-Kohen*,” 461–62. The formulation from R. Jacob cited in these studies was preserved in a *piyyut* commentary written by his nephew, R. Aaron *ha-Kohen* (ms. Bodl. 1206, fol. 148v). R. Jacob was quoted as advocating the recitation of the complete *Shema* at one's bedside, since, according to the *Tanhuma*, the 248 words in it (including the phrase *E-l melekh ne'eman*) would protect the 248 limbs of the human body. (A more complete reference, that the recitation of *Shema* would also protect specifically against *maziqin*, is found only in ms. Paris 167; see below, n. 26). As far as I can tell, the name of R. Jacob's father does not appear in any rabbinic texts of Ashkenazic origin (nor is there any indication of a father's name in texts that mention R. Jacob's brother, R. Judah of Corbeil). See my “*Rabbinic Figures in Castilian Kabbalistic Pseudepigraphy*,” 88, n. 43. *Sefer ha-Manhig*, whose author R. Abraham b. Nathan of Lunel studied in northern France with Ri (see above, n. 10), does, however, give their father's name as R. Isaac. See *Sefer ha-Manhig*, ed. Raphael, 2:649. Scholem, *Origins of the Kabbalah*, 249–51, 324, suggested generally that Corbeil was a seat of mystical studies. In my “*Rabbinic Figures in Castilian Kabbalistic Pseudepigraphy*,” I endeavored to document this assertion with regard to several tosafists and other known rabbinic figures associated with Corbeil, but there are still names that remain unidentified. A *gematria* interpretation of the phrase *תְּהִלָּה תְּהִלָּה*, which hints at the destruction of both Temples, and *gematriya* and שְׁבָטָה interpretations of the ensuing biblical phrases that yield references to Divine Names and eschatological dates, are cited in ms. Bodl. 2105 [the biblical commentary of R. Ephraim b. Samson] (fol. 101v), in the name of R. Eliezer of Corbeil. See *Tosafot ha-Shalem*, ed. Gellis, vol. 1 (Jerusalem, 1982), 19; and cf. my “*Rabbinic Figures*,” 81, n. 16.

²⁴See *Shibbolei ha-Leqet ha-Shalem*, sec. 15, ed. S. K. Mirsky (Jerusalem, 1976), 175; and ms. Bodl. 659 (*Shibbolei ha-Leqet ha-Qazar*), fol. 9. *Shibbolei ha-Leqet* records

cite both the midrash itself and the notion that the proper recitation of *Shema* will protect a person by warding off demonic forces (*maziqin*) were the talmudist and kabbalist R. Judah b. Yaqr (d.c.1215)—whose receipt of esoteric traditions from the German Pietists has been documented recently²⁵—and R. Jacob of Corbeil. Indeed, R. Judah b. Yaqr's formulation corresponds precisely to the formulation of R. Jacob of Corbeil as it appears in a fuller version still in manuscript.²⁶ A biblical comment by R. Jacob anticipates almost

additional passages from the otherwise unknown treatise of *Ta'amei R. Yehudah he-Hasid*. See sec. 185 (ed. Solomon Buber, 144) and the end of sec. 236; ms. Bodl. 659, fols. 41r, 62, 112v, 113v, and cf. Jacob Freimann's introduction to *SHP*, 6; and ms. Paris 1408, fol. 40v. Cf. Elliot Wolfson, "Circumcision and the Divine Name: A Study in the Transmission of Esoteric Doctrine," *JQR* 78 (1987):110–11. In the pietistic introduction to his *Sefer Roqeah* (*Hilkhot Hasidut, shoresh neqiyut me-het*) [Jerusalem, 1967], 15, R. Eleazar of Worms cites (anonymously) a *gematria* of the word 'avon in the context of the 248 words of *Shema* that is also found in the passage from *Ta'amei R. Yehudah he-Hasid* cited in *Shibbolei ha-Leqet*, but he makes no reference to demons. In his discussion of the recitation of *Shema* in the body of *Sefer Roqeah* (p. 211), R. Eleazar merely cites the *Tanhuma* text to support the custom of 248 words, without any of the pietistic embellishment. See also *Perushei Siddur ha-Tefillah la-Roqeah*, ed. Moshe Hershler (Jerusalem, 1992), 1:282. On *Shibbolei ha-Leqet* and *sod*, see below, ch. 5, nn. 28–30.

²⁵See *Perush ha-Tefillot veva-Berakhot le-R. Yehudah b. Yaqr* (Jerusalem, 1979), 30. The uniqueness of R. Judah's interpretation of the protection offered by the recitation of *Shema* has been noted by Elliot Wolfson, "Dimmui Antropomorfi ve-Simboliqqah shel Otiyyot Sefer ha-Zohar," *Mehqerei Yerushalayim be-Mahshevet Yisra'el* 8 (1989):161, n. 162. On R. Judah's receipt of mystical teachings from the German Pietists, see my "Rabbinic Figures in Castilian Kabbalistic Pseudepigraphy," 97–98, n. 73, and below, n. 35. Ta-Shma, *Ha-Nigleh shebe-Nistar*, 95, n. 42, notes that the hymn *E-l Adon* (recited as part of the Sabbath morning prayer service) was included in the *siddurim* of both R. Judah b. Yaqr and R. Eleazar of Worms. This custom reached both R. Yehi'el of Paris and the Zohar. See below, ch. 5, n. 43.

²⁶Ms. Paris 167/2, fols. 93r–93v: R. Judah b. Yaqr also studied with the tosafist *Rizba* in northern France (see Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:263–64, and below) and may have gained access there to R. Jacob's material. Whether R. Judah received his material from R. Jacob or from R. Judah *he-Hasid*, the fact that only he—a devotee of *Hasidei Ashkenaz*—R. Judah *he-Hasid*, and R. Jacob of Corbeil had this interpretation cements the relationship or at least the common approach of R. Jacob and German Pietism. [For the impact of the accepted Ashkenazic custom concerning the number of words in *Shema* on the Zohar, see the pioneering study of Israel Ta-Shma, "E-l Melekh Ne'eman—*Gilgulo shel Minhag (Terumah le-Heqer ha-Zohar)*," *Tarbiz* 40 (1970):184–94; idem, *Minhag Ashkenaz ha-Qadmon*, 285–96; idem, *Ha-Nigleh shebe-Nistar*, 15; and my "Rabbinic Figures in Castilian Kabbalistic Pseudepigraphy," 108–9, n. 108.]

CHAPTER 4

precisely a passage in the Pietist biblical commentary attributed to R. Eleazar of Worms, which was actually composed by another student of R. Judah *he-Hasid*.²⁷ The specific methods of interpretation utilized by R. Jacob were among those favored by R. Judah.²⁸

R. Jacob's full comment appears in ms. Paris 167 among a collection of tosafist interpretations, especially those of Rabbenu Tam, that were grouped under the heading *Perush ha-Torah me'et Shelomoh ha-Kohen b. Ya'aqov ha-Kohen*. The manuscript was copied in Byzantium in 1443. In the version in ms. Bodl. 1206 (see above, n. 23), R. Aaron also notes that there was a controversy between his uncle R. Jacob, *ha-qadosh mi-Corbeil*, and Rabbenu Jacob [Tam] of Ramerupt. His uncle adduced proofs that the *Shema* recited at bedtime (after nightfall) was more important, while Rabbenu Tam argued that the *Shema* recited during the evening prayer in the synagogue (after sundown) was more crucial. Cf. *Ta-Shma, Minhag Ashkenaz ha-Qadmon*, 319, n. 17, and Grossman, above, n. 23. As Urbach notes (*Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:151, n. 48), this controversy involved many more Ashkenazic (and Sefardic) rabbinic figures than the two R. Jacobs. Urbach indicates, however, that the only other known reference to the position of R. Jacob of Corbeil in this matter is found at the beginning of *Sefer Or Zarua'*, *Hilkhot Qeri'at Shema* (sec. 1), in which R. Jacob is quoted as responding to one of Rabbenu Tam's questions against the position of Rashi (who held that the later *Shema* was the more important). Ms. Paris 167 (fols. 92r-93v) records a lengthy version of the argument between Rabbenu Tam and R. Jacob of Corbeil, while commenting on the biblical locus of *Shema* in the portion of *Va-Ethanan*. In this fuller version of R. Jacob of Corbeil's position, he suggests answers to all four of the questions Rabbenu Tam had posed against Rashi's position (as recorded in the *Or Zarua'*, the position with which R. Jacob of Corbeil concurred). The essential element of R. Jacob of Corbeil's resolution of the conflicting talmudic sources was that a scholar who recited the *Shema* at the preferred time (after nightfall) did not have to recite it again at his bedside upon retiring, but others (nonscholars) who had read the *Shema* earlier must recite it fully (i.e., not just the first paragraph) at their bedsides. In this regard, R. Jacob was advocating the earlier Ashkenazic position, which was also held by *Sefer Hasidim*. Cf. Jacob Katz, "Ma'ariv bi-Zemanno u-Shelo bi-Zemanno," *Zion* 35 (1972):39-48, and my *Jewish Education and Society*, 86-99.

²⁷ See *Da'at Zeqenim* to Deuteronomy 12:21; the so-called *Perush ha-Roqeah 'al ha-Torah*, ed. Chaim Konyevsky, ad loc. (3:221); and cf. Victor Aptowitzer, "Le Commentarie du Pentateuque Attribué à R. Ascher ben Yehiel," *REJ* 51 (1906): 75-76; *Tosafot Hullin* 28a, s.v. *ve-'al rov*, and *Tosafot ha-Rosh*, ad loc.; and *Tosafot ha-Rosh* to *Hullin* 122b, s.v. *ve-gam*. The striking correspondence between R. Jacob's comment and the material found in *Perush Roqeah* blunts Aptowitzer's claim that the *gematria* interpretation(s) in the style of *Hasidei Ashkenaz* offered by R. Jacob do not link him directly to the teachings of the German Pietists. On the author of the *Perush Roqeah*, see Joseph Dan, "The Ashkenazi Hasidic Gates of Wisdom," *Hommage à Georges Vajda*, ed. Gerard Nahon and Charles Toutati (Louvain, 1980), 183-89, and idem, "Perush ha-Torah le-R. Eleazar mi-Germaiza," *Qiryat Sefer* 59 (1984):644.

R. Isaac b. Mordekhai (Ribam) of Bohemia, another devoted student of Rabbenu Tam, was asked a question by R. Judah *he-Hasid* with regard to *torat ha-mal'akhim*. One biblical passage implies that many angels watch over a righteous person, while another suggests that only one angel is involved. The answer given by Ribam is that the single angel is the *Sar ha-Panim*, who commands other angels under his control to traverse the world and ensure that nothing will harm righteous people (*she-lo yaziq shum davar la-zaddiqim*). E. E. Urbach has suggested that, in the absence of any other evidence for R. Isaac's involvement in mystical studies, it was probably Ribam who asked the question of R. Judah *he-Hasid*, rather than the reverse. Urbach supports his claim by emending the text of the question to read “הַרְבָּבָם שָׁאַל מִתְּהִלָּה ר' יְהוָדָה חַסִּיד,”²⁹ rather than “הַרְבָּבָם נִשְׁאַל מִרְּיְהוָדָה חַסִּיד,”²⁹ Aside from the interest in

A passage in ms. Bodl. 682, fol. 37r (in a gloss), which cites a ruling of R. Jacob of Corbeil, *mi-pi ba'al ha-halom*, refers apparently to R. Jacob of Marvège. See *She'elot u-Teshuvot min ha-Shamayim*, ed. Margoliot, #5, 49–52; cf. Eric Zimmer, ‘Olam ke-Minhago Noheg (Jerusalem, 1996), 136–37; and above, ch. 3, n. 119, and below, ch. 5, n. 48.

²⁸On the *gematria/hathalot tevot* methodologies of R. Judah *he-Hasid*, cf. Wolfson, “Circumcision and the Divine Name,” 88; Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:399; *‘Arugat ha-Bosem*, ed. Urbach, 4:110, n. 32; Joseph Dan, “The Ashkenazi Concept of Language,” *Hebrew in Ashkenaz*, ed. Lewis Glinert (New York, 1993), 11–25; and above, ch. 2, n. 1.

²⁹See ms. Paris 772 (R. Eleazar of Worms's prayer commentary), fol. 23v (ר' יְהוָדָה חַסִּיד מִמּוּרִי דּוֹיִם בֶּן מַרְדּוֹכַי), cited in *‘Arugat ha-Bosem*, ed. Urbach, 4:99, n. 75; and cf. Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:199, n. 38; and *Perushei Siddur ha-Tefillah la-Roqeah*, ed. Moshe Hershler, 1:87. [The Philadelphia ms. noted by Hershler is, in fact, ms. Moscow-Guenzberg 614. See below, and see also S. Emanuel, “Ha-Polmos ‘al Nosah ha-Tefillah shel Ḥasidei Ashkenaz,” *Mehqerei Talmud* 3 (in press), n. 25.] Prior to making his emendation, Urbach pointed out that Ribam was purely a talmudist who was uninvolved in *sod*, except in this instance. (Note also that in *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:389, Urbach does not list Ribam among R. Eleazar of Worms's teachers. In the first edition of that work [1955], Urbach notes Ribam's lack of involvement in *torat ha-sod* but suggests no emendation of the text.)

In ms. Moscow-Guenzberg 614 (fol. 21r) the question is asked by R. Judah of “R. Mordekhai.” Aptowitzer, *Mavo la-Rabiah*, 317, n. 5a, suggests that this reading should be corrected on the basis of Paris 772. Israel Ta-Shma, on the other hand, argues that this is the correct reading. See his “Le-Toledot ha-Yehudim be-Polin ba-Me'ot ha-Yod Bet/ha-Yod Gimmel,” *Zion* 53, (1988): 363–64. Ta-Shma points out that although Ribam was from Regensburg—which was also R. Judah *he-Hasid*'s residence during the latter part of his life, thus affording ample opportunity for contact between the two scholars—Ribam was much older than R. Judah. Because of this age difference, it is hard to imagine that R. Eleazar of Worms was Ribam's student. At the same time, there is a R. Mordekhai of Poland who was connected with R. Judah's circle in Regensburg (see *Perushei ha-Torah le-R. Yehudah he-Hasid*, 94); there is also an

CHAPTER 4

mystical teachings to be found among other students of Rabbenu Tam, Ribam's pietistic and meta-halakhic tendencies with respect to fasting on *Rosh ha-Shanah* further support the fact that he was the source of the information rather than the questioner.³⁰

unidentified R. Mordekhai whose name appears in a *sod* context in a text of the *Hug ha-Keruv ha-Meyuhad*. (See the so-called *perush le-Sefer Yezirah meyuhas le-R. Sa'adyah Gaon* in ms. B. M. 754, fol. 124r). It is perhaps this R. Mordekhai (assuming that both these references are to the same person) of whom R. Judah asked his question.

In response to Ta-Shma's suggestion, several points should be made. First, R. Eleazar of Worms's reference to Ribam as his teacher may be purely honorific, as is the case in countless instances involving tosafists and other *rishonim*. Indeed, there is also no evidence that R. Eleazar was a student of "R. Mordekhai." R. Judah *he-Hasid*'s relative youth lends credence to the fact that he was asking the question and not the reverse, as Urbach suggests (although there is at least one other example from Ashkenaz of a teacher or senior scholar asking a student, or less venerable figure, a question concerning *sod*; see ms. B. M. 752, fol. 78r: *שאל רビינו יב"ק ב"ר מאיר את תלמידו ר' אלעור מגרמייא היאך יש להמליכו בשמי ובארץ ובארבע ווחות. והשיב לו יש להמליכו בעשר ספירות ואלו הן עומק ראשית ועומק אחרית כי*). Moreover, the solutions proposed by both Urbach and Ta-Shma were offered primarily because they had no other evidence linking Ribam to mystical teachings. Since we can now see that there was significant interest in this area among R. Tam's French students, not to mention his German ones, Ribam's association with this question is appropriate, especially in light of Ribam's own pietistic proclivities that bring him even closer to R. Judah *he-Hasid*. See the next note, and cf. Rami Reiner, "Rabbenu Tam: Rabbotav (Ha-Zarefatim) ve-Talmidav Benei Ashkenaz," (M.A. thesis, Hebrew University, 1997), 81.

³⁰See above, ch. 2, nn. 38–40. Cf. *She'elot u-Teshuvot min ha-Shamayim*, #86. R. Judah *he-Hasid* did, of course, respond to pietistic and mystical questions. See, e.g., Ivan Marcus, "Hibburei ha-Teshuvah shel Hasidei Ashkenaz," *Studies in Jewish Mysticism, Philosophy and Ethical Literature Presented to R. Isaiah Tishby*, ed. Joseph Dan and Joseph Hacker (Jerusalem, 1986), 375, n. 30. See also *Orhot Hayyim*, *Hilkhot 'Erev Yom ha-Kippurim*, sec. 6 (fol. 103b), and ms. Bodl. 682, fols. 369r–370r.

The inclusion of Ri *ha-Lavan*, another student of Rabbenu Tam, together with R. Judah b. Yaqr and Ramban in a text regarding *sefirot* (produced by R. Moses of Burgos) is pseudoeigraphic; see Urbach, *Bat'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:222. Ri *ha-Lavan* was not a contemporary of the other two; see Gershom Scholem in *Tarbiz* 3 (1924):276–77. Nonetheless, A. M. Habermann, in *Yedi'ot ha-Makhon le-Heqer ha-Shirah ha-'Ivrit* 3 (1937):94, n. 3, suggested that the inclusion is accurate, based on the fact that R. Isaac received *קצת טעמיין מן המחווזר* from R. Judah b. Qalonymus, father of R. Eleazar of Worms, who was knowledgeable in *sod* teachings. See ms. Bodl. 970, fols. 126r–132r, and see also Neubauer's *Catalogue*, 209. In light of the actual involvement of a number of Rabbenu Tam's students in *sod*, the co-opting of Ri *ha-Lavan* is readily understood, even if his own involvement in this area is doubtful; see my "Rabbinic Figures in Castilian Kabbalistic Pseudepigraphy," *passim*, for Spanish distortions of Ashkenazic figures.

R. Menahem of Joigny, yet another student of Rabbenu Tam, is mentioned as transmitting a *siman* for the arrival of Elijah the Prophet.³¹ This passage occurs in a manuscript section that, as noted above, is laden with references to German Pietists and their predecessors and to mystical techniques and *segullot*.³² R. Menahem is cited in a *Tosafot* passage as suggesting that salt is put on bread to keep the *satan* away.³³ He also argues strongly against Rabbenu

³¹ Ms. Parma 541, fol. 266v (sec. 76): *אור זרוע לנידיק ולישרוי לב שמחה סופי תיבות ר' עקיבה. וכן אביו יעקב בגימטריא ר' עקיבה. והוא היה בן גר יה-ו-ה. וסימן אליו הנביה קבלתי בשם ר' מנחם מיאומי Mishlei, ch. 9 (Elijah buried R. Aqiva), and in *Nedarim* 50a (Elijah supported R. Aqiva, *parnasat zaddiqim*). Maimonides writes, in the introduction to his *Mishneh Torah*, that R. Aqiva's father, Joseph, was himself a *גָּר צָדִיק*. Cf. *Perush R. Nissim Gaon to Berakhot* 27b, s.v. *nuqeи le-R. Aqiva de-let leh zekhut 3avot*, which asserts that R. Aqiva was descended from non-Jews.]*

³² See above, ch. 3, nn. 14–15. R. Menahem's *siman* appears immediately before “*te'amim*” of R. Nehemyah [b. Makhir (?); see Grossman, *Hakhmei Ashkenaz ha-Rishonim*, 361–86] regarding *Gog u-Magog*. See below, n. 37, and ch. 5, n. 67. The *gematria* and/or *sofei tevot* derivations of the name R. Aqiva that precede R. Menahem's *siman* also appear in a contemporary manuscript, ms. Parma 563 (Ashkenaz, thirteenth century), fol. 40v (without attribution); in R. Eleazar of Worms's *Rimzei Haftaratot* (to Isaiah 61), published in *Perush ha-Roqeah 'al ha-Torah*, ed. Konyevsky, vol. 3 (Bnei Brak, 1981), 330; and in R. Isaac b. Moses' *Alpha-Beta* introduction to his *Sefer Or Zarua*^c (see below, ch. 5, at n. 3), sec. 1. See also *Pithei Teshuvah*, to *Even ha-^cEzer, shemot nashim* (following sec. 129), under the letter *reish*. For additional *gematria* derivations (with pietistic implications) in Ashkenazic sources that involved the name of *ר' עקיבה*, see above, ch. 1, n. 39. Cf. Moshe Idel, “*Tefisat ha-Torah be-Sifrut ha-Hekhalot ve-Gilguleha ba-Qabbalah*,” *Mehqerei Yerushalayim be-Mahshevet Yisra'el* 1 (1981):36–37, n. 39.

In ms. Moscow-Guenzberg 734, fol. 92v, the *sofei tevot* are shown to yield the word *קרע*; the *sofei tevot* of the words *ליישרוי לב שמחה* are equivalent in *gematria* to the word *טוב*. The implication drawn from these *sofei tevot* is that complete repentance, when achieved through *yissurim*, redounds to the benefit of the individual. This derivation follows a *segullah* attributed to R. Judah *he-Hasid* (fol. 92r, *מקובל ממר יהודיה החסיד*), which prescribes certain hand motions (or signs made with the fingers) and formulae to prevent an *אודם רע*, such as someone who is armed with a sword, from doing harm. [Fols. 88r and 89v contain *qabbalot* from Nahmanides for *shemirat ha-derekh* and for turning an enemy into a friend (מִיד יהפּוּר לְבָ אֹיֵב לְאֹהֶב).] Fol. 94r contains a *goral* from R. Meir of Rothenburg for taking action in the future; see below, ch. 5, n. 49. Cf. *Ohel Hayim* [A Catalogue of the Manuscripts of the Manfred and Anne Lehmann Collection], vol. 1, ed. Moshe Hallamish and Eleazar Hurvitz (New York, 1988), 193–94. In the Lehmann ms., the “*qabbalah*” from R. Judah *he-Hasid* to stop an *adam ra* is on fol. 21 (and an additional *qabbalah* follows); Maharam's *goral* is on fol. 44.

³³ See *Tosafot Berakhot* 40a, s.v. *have melah*, and *Ta-Shma, Minhag Ashkenaz ha-Qadmon*, 257–59. Cf. Isaac b. Judah *ha-Levi, Pa'anach Raza* (repr. Jerusalem, 1965), *שָׁנָן דָּרְךָ נִיחוֹשׁ הַהוּגִין אֶת הַנֶּפֶשׁ שָׁלָא יִקְמֹר*: 311.

CHAPTER 4

Tam that the problem of eating on the Sabbath during twilight (*bein ha-shemashot*), because the souls in *gan 'eden* and in *gehinnom* would be disturbed (*gozel 'et ha-metim*), applies to Friday evening rather than to *Shabbat* afternoon.³⁴

נִמְמָתָה מִמְּנָה. On *Pa'anéah Raza*'s affinities with *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, see below, ch. 5, n. 79. Although the use of salt to protect against demons and witchcraft reflects an aspect of popular belief or superstition, discussions of the use of salt in Pietist and kabbalistic sources suggest dimensions of magic or esoteric teachings. See, e.g., *SHP* 1465–67, and *Sefer Roqeah*, sec. 353 (p. 240; and cf. Aaron Katchen, "The Convenantal Salt of Friendship," *The Frank Talmage Memorial Volume*, ed. Walfish, 1:167); Güdemann, *Ha-Torah ve-ha-Hayyim*, 1:162, n. 4; and Trachtenberg, *Jewish Magic and Superstition*, 160. As Ta-Shma notes, the protective powers of salt in this instance can be correlated with other, older Ashkenazic ritual practices that also took into account protection from *maziqin*.

R. Menahem's interest in *mesorah*, similar to that of *Hasidei Ashkenaz* and their followers, has been noted (above, ch. 2, n. 52). See also the references to R. Menahem of Joigny and *ha-Qadosh* R. Yom Tov b. Isaac of Joigny (*min ha-perushim*; cf. above, ch. 1, n. 36) in ms. Bodl. 1150 (Ashkenaz, fourteenth century), fol. 19v, in a collection of ritual law that includes halakhists from the circle of R. Judah *he-Hasid*, such as R. Moses Fuller, R. Eliezer of Bohemia, and R. Jacob b. Nahman of Magdeburg (fol. 17v–18r, 20r). These rulings follow *shirei ha-yihud ve-ha-kavod* that are also associated with *Hasidei Ashkenaz*. See also ms. JNUL 8°476, fol. 107r; Ta-Shma (above, ch. 2, n. 41), 368–69; and the piyyut by R. Menahem b. Perez *ha-Zaqen* in *Leqet Piyyutim u-Seliḥot me-³et Payyetanei Ashkenaz ve-Zarefat*, ed. Daniel Goldschmidt and Jonah Frankel (Jerusalem, 1993), 2:433–44. R. Menahem of Joigny is identified in Norman Golb, *Toledot ha-Yehudim be-⁴Ir Rouen Bimei ha-Benayim*, 92, as the teacher of R. Samuel of Falaise. R. Samuel refers to an unidentified teacher of his as R. Menahem *Hasid*; see above, ch. 2, n. 10.

³⁴See *Moshav Zeqenim 'al ha-Torah*, ed. Solomon Sassoon (London, 1959), 144 (on Exodus 16:5) [=*Perushim u-Fesaqim le-R. Avigdor (Zarefat)*], ed. E. F. Hershkowitz (Jerusalem, 1996), *pesaq* 125, pp. 95–96]: והטעם נכן לפִי שבאים מתיים קרובין תוך שנתן י"ב חרש מין שלחם טובלין בהר היוציא מגן עון ונכנtiny שם, لكن בששותה מים או [בבין] הששותות בערב שבת] גולן את קרובינו. (The souls who spent the week undergoing the rigors of judgment were able to quench their thirst only as the Sabbath approached.) The position taken by R. Menahem was also held by R. Meshullam of Melun (and by R. Judah *he-Hasid*). Cf. *Sefer Or Zarua'*, vol. 2, *hilkhot moza'ei Shabbat*, sec. 89; S. E. Stern, "Shetiyyat Mayim be-Shabbat Bein ha-Shemashot," *Yeshurun* 2 (1996):3–4; Ta-Shma, *Minhag Ashkenaz ha-Qadmon*, 203–5; and *Sefer Gematri'ot le-R. Yehudah he-Hasid*, ed. Daniel Abrams and Israel Ta-Shma (Los Angeles, 1998), 49 (fol. 13r). For the view of Rabbenu Tam, see his *Sefer ha-Yashar (heleq ha-teshuvot)*, ed. Rosenthal, secs. 45:6, 48:12, and above, ch. 3, n. 90. As Ta-Shma notes, R. Jacob of Marvège posed a *she'elat halom* to ascertain whether one who ate on the Sabbath between afternoon and evening prayers "sinned," as R. Jacob [Tam] had ruled (*She'elot u-Teshuvot min ha-Shamayim*, #39). The answer he received was clearly in the negative. Cf. *Shibbolei ha-Leqet*, *'inyan Shabbat*, sec. 127, who cites this dream of "the *zaddiq*," R. Jacob of

R. Isaac b. Abraham (Rizba), the older brother of R. Samson of Sens and one of Ri's most important students, is referred to in a kabbalistic formulation. There remains some doubt, however, as to whether a kabbalistic compiler appended his interpretation to a remark originally made by Rizba in the course of analyzing a ritual concept or whether Rizba actually discussed the mystical material himself.³⁵ On the other hand, Moshe Idel has suggested that either

Marvège, to counter the claim of Rabbenu Tam. Yaakov Gartner, *Gilgulei Minhag be-‘Olam ha-Halakhah* (Jerusalem, 1995), 183–89, demonstrates the insistence of kabbalists that the third meal must take place following *minhah* on the Sabbath afternoon.

³⁵See Scholem, *Origins of the Kabbalah*, 251, n. 107. To his student Nahmanides, R. Judah b. Yaqr passed along tosafist talmudic methodology and Ashkenazic halakhic material and customs he received from Rizba. See, e.g., *Hiddushei ha-Ramban to Pesahim* 117b (=Orhot Hayyim le-R. Aharon ha-Kohen mi-Lunel, *hilkhot leil Pesah*, sec. 21), and cf. *Sefer Roqeah*, sec. 283; Urbach, *Ba‘alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:396, n. 57; and Solomon Schechter, “Notes on Hebrew MSS. in the University Library of Cambridge,” *JQR* 4 (1892):250. Indeed, it appears that Ramban’s awareness of the importance of maintaining the 248 words of *Shema* by reciting *E-l melekh ne’eman* came from the north via R. Judah b. Yaqr. See Israel Ta-Shma, “E-l Melekh Ne’eman—Gilgulo shel Minhag,” 288–89, n. 7. R. Judah b. Yaqr also probably passed along esoteric material that he received from unidentified German Pietists; see, e.g., Elliot Wolfson, “Demut Ya‘akov Haquqah be-Kisse ha-Kavod: ‘Iyyun Nosaf be-Torat ha-Sod shel Hasidei Ashkenaz,” *Massu’ot*, ed. Oron and Goldreich, 154–56 (cf. idem, *Along the Path*, 27–29); M. Idel, *Kabbalah: New Perspectives*, 96; idem., “R. Moshe ben Nahman—Qabbalah, Halakhah u-Manhigut Ruhanit,” *Tarbiz* 64 (1995):542–43, 576–78; Elliot Ginsburg, *The Sabbath in the Classical Kabbalah* (Albany, 1989), 108–9; 168–69, nn. 183, 189; 175–76, n. 231, above, nn. 25, 26; and below, ch. 5, n. 43. But there is no firm basis on which to suggest that Rizba was a source of mystical teachings for R. Judah b. Yaqr.

Wolfson, “By Way of Truth: Aspects of Nahmanides’ Kabbalistic Hermeneutic,” *AJS Review* 14 (1989):176–77, observes that Ramban, who cites R. Judah b. Yaqr in his halakhic writings, never actually mentions R. Judah with regard to any kabbalistic doctrines. Nonetheless, it is clear that Nahmanides was influenced by R. Judah in mystical matters, and it is therefore likely that Ramban received mystical teachings directly from R. Judah. See also Ginsburg, *The Sabbath in the Classical Kabbalah*, 21; 42, n. 20; 147, n. 55; 151–52, n. 88; 168–69, n. 189; idem, “Sacred Marriage and Mystical Union: Some Thoughts on the Kabbalah of Judah b. Yaqr and the Problematics of its Interpretation,” (unpublished paper, 1992); and Hananel Mack, “Zemanno, Meqomo u-Tefuzato shel Midrash Bamidbar Rabbah,” *Te‘udah* 11 (1996):94–95. [Cf. Haviva Pedaya, “Ziyyur u-Temunah be-Parshanut ha-Qabbalit shel ha-Ramban,” *Mahanayim* 6 (1994):114–23, for certain techniques of mystical *parshanut* that Ramban may have derived from Hugo of St. Victor.] For other examples of possible Christian influences on Nahmanides’ exegesis, see the literature cited in my “On the Assessment of R. Moses b. Nahman (Nahmanides) and His Literary Oeuvre,” *Jewish Book Annual* 51 (1993–94):165, n. 25.

CHAPTER 4

Rizba or Ri is the intended figure in a cryptic reference to the making of a *golem* that appears in a text produced by the *Hug ha-Keruv ha-Meyuhad*.³⁶ Rizba also issued formulations on the coming of the Messiah and prognostications on the end of days that have mystical overtones.³⁷ Similar material was presented by

³⁶Idel, *Golem*, 91–92, n. 4. Cf. above, n. 7.

³⁷See ms. Darmstadt Cod. Or. 25 (Ashkenaz, fourteenth century), fols. 13v–17v. Among R. Isaac b. Abraham's formulations is an interpretation of the talmudic passage (*Bava Batra* 74b–75a) that Gabriel will hunt the Leviathan. Cf. Gottlieb, *Mehqarim be-Sifrut ha-Qabbalah*, 327–28. Rizba also offered a blueprint that divides the messianic age into two portions and projects dates for each. The first part will begin at the end of the fifth millennium (before 1240). This part will occur before the resurrection. During the second part (which will occur within the sixth millennium), resurrection will take place, with the righteous living forever. Cf. Heinrich Breslau, "Juden und Mongolen, 1241," *Zeitschrift fuer die Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland* 1 (1887):99–102; Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:270, n. 46*; and I. J. Yuval, "Liqrat 1240: Tiqvot Yehudiyot, Paḥadim Nozeriyim," *Proceedings of the Eleventh World Congress of Jewish Studies*, Div. B. (Jerusalem, 1994), 113–20; and A. H. Silver, *A History of Messianic Speculation in Israel* (New York, 1927), 99 (citing the tosafist biblical commentary *Da'at Zeqenim*). For similar divisions and (miraculous) conceptions of the messianic age, see 'Arugat ha-Bosem, ed. Urbach, 2:255–56 (citing R. Moses Taku); *Tosafot Shabbat* 63a, s.v. *ein bein ha-'olam ha-zeh li-yemot ha-mashiah* (and cf. Rashi, *Sukkah* 41a, s.v. *i nami*; *Tosafot*, ad loc., and Rashi's commentary to *Jeremiah* 31:3); *Tosafot Shavu'ot* 16b, s.v. *ein bein*; and cf. Don Isaac Abravanel, *Yeshu'ot Meshiḥo*, *iyyun shelishi*, ch. 7. The formulations of Rizba are recorded as part of a larger treatise entitled *derashot shel ha-melekh ha-mashiah, ve-gog u-magog* (fol. 13v) by one of Rizba's students, ostensibly R. Moses of Coucy. Cf. Urbach, 1:270, n. 46, 1:468–69; and A. Grossman, "Ziqato shel Maharam mi-Rothenburg 'el Erez Yisra'el," *Cathedra* 84 (1997):81–82.

The nature of this treatise, including Rizba's material, is further elucidated by noting what follows in ms. Darmstadt. Fols. 26–28 contain (*pirqei*) *Gan Eden*, similar to *pirqei Hekhalot* and related also to the *Zohar* (see Ta-Shma, *Minhag Ashkenaz ha-Qadmon*, 202–3, n. 6.). Fols. 28–29 contain questions asked by R. Eliezer about resurrection and *yezirat ha-velad ve-'inyano* from R. Eleazar of Worms. Fol. 50 describes the wars to be waged by the Messiah, and fols. 50–54 contain pietistic *she'arim* of R. Eleazar of Worms (cf. Yosef Dan, *Torat ha-Sod shel Hasidut Ashkenaz* [Jerusalem, 1968], 68–71). See fols. 68 and 77 for other *sodot* and messianic prognostications. And note fols. 102 (citing R. Samuel *ha-Navi*=R. Samuel *he-Hasid*); 110r (R. Eleazar of Worms's commentary to the *piyyut*, *Ha-'ohez be-yad mishpat*; cf. above, ch. 3, n. 111); 110v (the Tetragrammaton, including the *te'amim* of R. Isaac of Bamberg); 121v (*mazzalot* for men and women).

Ms. Cambr. Add. 1022/1 (cf. above, ch. 2, n. 50) contains a lengthy *hishuv ha-qez*, which cites written interpretations and interpolations of verses in the Book of Daniel by ר' יב"א / ר' יצחק בן אברהם (fols. 151r, 152r, 153v). According to this material, Ri(z)ba stressed that the messianic era could commence after the year 1200. [Rizba is sometimes referred to as Riba; see Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:261, and Hida, *Shem ha-Gedolim* (Warsaw, 1878), *ma'arekhet gedolim*, 70 (sec. 291). In this case, the identification is

R. Jacob b. Meir of Provins, a relative and younger contemporary of Rizba and a grandson of R. Elijah of Paris.³⁸ Rizba may have given instructions for the magical use of *Shemot*. The instructions that bear his name are patterned after guidelines found in *Hekhalot* literature for the use of Divine Names.³⁹

made good by the text itself.] The different time frames for the messianic era outlined by Rizba (d.1210; see Israel Ta-Shma in *Shalem* 3 [1981]:320) here (1403, 1468) and in ms. Darmstadt Or. 25 are perhaps a function of the different methods of prediction employed in these texts. Rashi also suggested two dates that were separated by more than a hundred years; see above, ch. 3, n. 41. The material in the Cambridge ms. is similar in a number of respects to calculations made by Nahmanides. See Robert Chazan, *Barcelona and Beyond* (Berkeley, 1992), 176–85, and cf. above, n. 35. For messianic predictions and calculations by other Ashkenazic rabbinic figures and tosafists, see above, ch. 3, n. 2; above, nn. 8–9; and below, ch. 5, n. 67. On ms. Cambr. 1022, see Marc Saperstein and Ephraim Kanarfogel, “*Ketav-Yad Byzanti shel Derashot*,” *Pe’amim* 78 (1999):164–84.

Cf. ms. Hamburg 293 (Ashkenaz, fifteenth/sixteenth centuries), fols. 22v–23r, for a *shir shel ge’ulah* by Isaac b. Abraham. Each stanza ends with an acrostic of Elijah.

³⁸See *Teshuvot u-Fesaqim*, ed. Kupfer, 308–12, and Golb, *Toledot ha-Yehudim be-‘Ir Rouen*, 103. R. Jacob apparently received his tradition concerning the end of days from his grandfather. The tradition was also linked to a date for the advent of the Messiah given by R. Eleazar of Worms, which in turn followed material from R. Judah and R. Samuel *he-Hasid* concerning angelic powers and the neutralizing of *maziqin* and *shedim*. On R. Jacob of Provins and Rizba, see ms. Bodl. 783, sec. 158, cited in Urbach, *Ba’alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:271, n. 48. R. Isaac b. Moses *Or Zarua*, a student of both R. Jacob and R. Eleazar of Worms, may also have had a role in the transcription of R. Jacob’s material. See Kupfer, 312, n. 25. See also above, ch. 3, n. 98.

³⁹See ms. Bodl. 2312 (Germany, 1591), fol. 51r: ...
כֹּן קָבְלָתִי מֵהֶרְיָצָחַן אֶבְרָהָם שֶׁכְלָמִי שְׁוֹרָצָה לְפָעָול מִשְׁמָמִי אָו עַיְבִּיתָעָנָה וִיטְבָּול ... To be sure, this manuscript is relatively late, and we cannot be certain that the tosafist Rizba is the intended reference. Note that *Hekhalot* forms can also be seen in the *segullot* on fol. 53r, and in the *she’elat halom* on fol. 57v. On Rizba and *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, with respect to the *teshuvah* required for an apostate who returns to Judaism, see *Semaq mi-Zurich*, sec. 156 (ed. Y. Har-Shoshanim [Jerusalem, 1973], 2:49); *Teshuvot ha-Rashba ha-Meyuhasot la-Ramban* (Warsaw, 1883), #180; Urbach, *Ba’alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:407; and cf. J. Elbaum, *Teshuvat ha-Lev ve-Qabbalat Yissurim*, 225–26. On Rizba, *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, and *Hekhalot*, see also Ginsburg, “Sacred Marriage and Mystical Union,” nn. 48, 58–59, 77, 83.

R. Barukh of Worms (d.c.1211, in Israel) was a dedicated student of Ri, who also displayed some ideological and textual links with *Hasidei Ashkenaz*; see above, ch. 2, n. 61. See also ms. Sassoon 290, fol. 107 (sec. 207), which records a procedure for preparing an amulet to insure *שֶׁלֶא תִּרְאֶת מֶלֶךְ וְשָׁלְטָן* (which was *בְּדֹוק וּמְוֹסָה*) (which was *בְּדֹוק וּמְוֹסָה*) by a R. Menaḥem, who received it from his father-in-law, R. Barukh. Three Divine Names were to be engraved on three lines on a band of silver (*טַב שֶׁל כְּפָק*). The silver band was to be rolled into an amulet form and placed between the arms and chest of the bearer (*בְּחִיקוֹ*), who would then feel no fear of any ruler or government. [See also ms. Rome

II

R. Judah *he-Hasid*, the central figure among *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, was a contemporary of these students of Rabbenu Tam and Ri. An assessment of the attitude of late twelfth- and thirteenth-century tosafists to magic must take into account the nuanced views of the German Pietists concerning magic. The German Pietists invested commonly held beliefs in demonic and other forces with theological meaning. They also recognized the efficacy of *sodot* and the adjuration of *Shemot* for magical purposes, such as *she'elat halom*, or as part of *segullot* for protection (such as *shemirat ha-derekh*) and healing.⁴⁰ The Pietists

Casanatense 137 (Ashkenaz, thirteenth century), which contains *liqqutim* from *Sefer ha-Terumah* followed by a *ḥazaqah* and *berkim* (45r), *רעים ורשות קולות וברקים* (45v), *ספר רפפורט* (45v), *חצרן חילמות תענית, דין וטגולות* (46v). Cf. above, ch. 3, n. 116.] R. Barukh traveled to Israel via Candia, where he and his son-in-law, R. Menahem, were signatories on the so-called *Taqqanot Qandi'ah*. Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:352; Israel Ta-Shma, "Keroniqah Hadashah li-Tequfat Ba'alei ha-Tosafot me-Hugo shel Ri ha-Zaqen," *Shalem* 3 (1981):321–22; and Elhanan Reiner, "Aliyyah ve-'Aliyyah la-Regel le-Erez Yisra'el, 1099–1517" (Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University, 1988), 69–73. [Two other signatories on the *Taqqanot Qandi'ah*—R. Matatyah (*Hasid*) and his son, R. Eleazar (*Hasid*)—also came to Candia from northern France. R. Eleazar authored a commentary on *Ibn Ezra*, as well as a collection entitled *Sodot Derekh Derash* (which includes such themes as *sod yedi'at ha-Shem* ve-*'ahavato* ve-*'avodato*, *ve-sod 'avot u-gevurotav u-qeddushot ha-Shem*... *ve-sod tefillin*, *ve-sod mezuzah*, *ve-sod qizit*). See Avraham David, "Le-Toledotav shel R. Eleazar b. he-Hasid R. Matatyah me-Hakhmei Erez Yisra'el (?) ba-Me'ah ha-Yod Gimmel," *Qiryat Sefer* 63 (1991):996–98. Cf. above, ch. 2, nn. 6, 8.]

⁴⁰See Dan, *Torat ha-Sod shel Hasidut Ashkenaz* 19–20, 28, 37–39, 58–59, 88–94, 184–202; idem, "Sarei Kos ve-Sarei Bohen," *Tarbiz* 32 (1963):359–69; and above, ch. 3, n. 8. Cf. Israel Ta-Shma, "Quntres Zekher 'Asah le-Nifle'otav le-R. Yehudah he-Hasid," *Qovez 'al Yad* n.s. 12[22] (1994):123–46; Wolfson, *Through a Speculum That Shines*, 208–14; Michael Swartz, *Scholastic Magic* (Princeton, 1996), 179–80; and below, ch. 5, n. 10.

See also above, introduction, n. 1. Against the view of Gad Freudenthal, that Ashkenazic Jewry was completely opposed to the study of philosophy and science, David Ruderman notes that *Hasidei Ashkenaz* were aware of some of the philosophical trends of their day and were even more strongly aware of certain scientific and natural phenomena, despite the absence of a sustained philosophical tradition. This interest, however, was not directed toward a rationalistic investigation of science or nature *per se*. Rather, it was designed to marshal empirical evidence for compelling or unusual natural phenomena in order to support a theological point concerning the powers of the Almighty (*zekher 'asah le-nifle'otav*). Magic as well was viewed as a function of godliness. There was no involvement in the study of science in Ashkenaz until the late Middle Ages, following significant exposure to philosophy. See also David Berger, "Judaism and General Culture in Medieval and Early Modern Times," *Judaism's Encounters with Other Cultures*, ed. Jacob Schachter (Northvale, 1997), 117–22.

preferred the higher-level *hashba'at mal'akhim* for accomplishing magical acts, rather than *hashba'at shedim*,⁴¹ although passages in *Sefer Hasidim* suggest that even the use of *Shemot* in this way should be avoided in practice, except in cases of particular need. Indeed, *Sefer Hasidim* asserts that a number of prophets were killed, rather than resort to the adjuration of Divine Names to save themselves. They were prepared to rely only on their prayers.⁴²

⁴¹See Dan, *Torat ha-Sod shel Hasidut Ashkenaz*, 218–22. Indeed, the Almighty Himself adjures angels through his own *Shemot*. *Hashba'at mal'akhim* is an important theological construct that demonstrates the cosmic power of adjuration when coupled with Divine Names. Cf. 'Arugat ha-Bosem, ed. Urbach, 4:84 (angels make use of the ineffable Name of forty-two and seventy-two letters), and below, n. 47. See also *Sefer Hasidim* [Parma], ed. J. Wistinetzki (Frankfurt, 1924), sec. 80, 327, 367, (371), 1453, 1818, 1983. [On SHP 80, in which a *ḥasid* undertook a *she'elat halom* to ascertain who would sit next to him in *gan 'eden*, see also Ivan Marcus in *Jewish History* 1 (1986):19; idem, in *Rabbinic Fantasies*, ed. D. Stern and M. Mirsky (Philadelphia, 1990), 227–28; Tamar Alexander, "Folktales in *Sefer Hasidim*," *Prooftexts* 5 (1985):22–25, and the literature cited in nn. 8–9; and Monford Harris, *Studies in Jewish Dream Interpretation*, 33. Cf. SHP 1556. On the use and significance of *she'elat halom* in *Sefer Hasidim*, see also Monford Harris, "Dreams in *Sefer Hasidim*," *PAAJR* 31 (1963):51–80; idem, *Studies in Jewish Dream Interpretation*, 33–34; and Yosef Dan, "Le-Torat ha-Halom shel Hasidei Ashkenaz," *Sinai* 68 (1971):288–93.] The Pietist work *Sefer ha-Hesheq* contains a number of examples of *hashba'at mal'akhim*. See, e.g., *Sefer ha-Hesheq* 'al *Shemot Metatron Sar ha-Panim she-Masar le-R. Yishma'el Kohen Gadol keshe-'Alah la-Marom*, ed. I. M. Epstein (Lemberg, 1865), 1b–7a (secs. 3, 4, 12, 14, 24, 39, 54); ms. Moscow-Guenzberg 90, fols. 127v, 134v, 135v; ms. Florence Plut.II.5/12, fols. 241–43; and Yehuda Liebes, "Mal'akhei Qol Shofar," *Mehqerei Yerushalayim be-Mahshevet Yisra'el* 6:1–2 (1987):177–95. Cf. *Perushei ha-Torah le-R. Yehudah he-Hasid*, ed. Y. S. Lange (Jerusalem, 1975), 106 [=Yosef Dan, "Sippurim Dimonologiyim mi-Kitvei R. Yehudah he-Hasid," *Tarbiz* 30 (1961):288–89]; Trachtenberg, *Jewish Magic and Superstition*, 83; Ta-Shma, *Ha-Nigleh shebe-Nistar*, 31–32 (on the Ashkenazic base of the magic in the *Zohar*); idem, "Quntres Zekher 'Asah le-Nifle'otav," 138–39, 142; Claire Fanger, "Medieval Ritual Magic," *Conjuring the Spirits*, ed. Fanger (Phoenix Mill, 1998), vii–ix; and below, n. 48.

⁴²See SHP, sec. 211: *כל שעוסק בהשבות מלאכים או בהשבות שדים או בלחישות כשפים לא יהיה סופר טוב ויראה רעות בגופו ובבניו כל ימיו. אך יתרוחך אדם מעשות כל אלה ולא בשאלת חלום ולא יעסוק שאחרים יעשו לו... ואם יעצה בדרך אל אמר אשבע מלאכים שישמרוני אלא יתפלל לפני הקב"ה. וכמה נבאים נהרגו ולא השבעו בשם הקדש אלא בתפלת עמדו.* A similar formulation to the first part of the passage is found in ms. Moscow-Guenzberg 182 (Ashkenaz, 1391; a manuscript version of R. Judah's ethical will), fol. 150v. See also the anecdote about R. Judah *he-Hasid* and his students in *Sefer Mizvot Qatan*, *mizvah* 3 (above, ch. 1, nn. 156–58); and R. Eleazar of Worms in *Sefer ha-Shem* (ms. B.M. 737, fol. 18v): *כי היה ברויאלי אהוב השם ולא רצה אלא בתפלה... ואוהבי השם לא ישבעו בשםנו. עניini השבעות ומזיקים* [The last sections are part of a unit entitled

CHAPTER 4

Nonetheless, Ramban and Rashba point to unnamed *Hasidei Ashkenaz* as those who were involved consistently in the manipulation of *shedim* for divination and other purposes.⁴³ R. Isaac *de-min 'Akko* writes that R. Judah

In this unit, *Sefer Hasidim* advises *inter alia* that Divine Names may not be employed even to cause people to fear the Almighty, nor can their use influence the ultimate fate of a soul in either direction.] *SHP* 213 recommends that one who has young sons should not leave a book of *Shemot* in his house, lest they use it without his knowledge; cf. Sharon Koren, "Mysticism and Menstruation: The Significance of Female Impurity in Jewish Spirituality" (Ph.D. diss., Yale, 1999), ch. 1. *SHP* 1458 instructs that Divine Names should be taught only to a *ḥakham*. *כדי שלא יטוק בהם ואם סבור לטובה לעשותות*. See also secs. 1459–60, 797, and Dan, *Torat ha-Sod shel Hasidut Ashkenaz*, 74–76. Cf. *Sefer Hasidim* [Bolognal], ed. Reuven Margoliot (Jerusalem, 1957), secs. 204–6, 1153, 1172, and the appendix by the editor (entitled *Hasidei 'Olam*), pp. 586–89; the *Zava'ah* published in *SHB*, p. 16, sec. 20, and the sources cited in *Meqor Hesed*, ad loc.; Dan, "Sippurim Dimonologiyyim," 288–89 (=Perushei R. Yehudah *he-Hasid la-Torah*, ed. Lange, 106); Mark Verman and Shulamit Adler, "Path-Jumping in the Jewish Magical Tradition," *JSQ* 1 (1993/94): 138; and Güdemann, *Ha-Torah ve-ha-Hayyim*, 165–66. In his *Sodei Razaya*, R. Eleazar of Worms cites extensively from *Sefer ha-Razim* with regard to its descriptions of the levels of heaven and the angels who dwell at each level. He does not, however, record any of the practical magical material, which included angelic adjurations as well as symbolic acts. See *Sefer ha-Razim*, ed. Mordechai Margoliot (Jerusalem, 1967), editor's introduction, xiv. Cf. *Harba de-Moshe*, ed. Yuval Harari (Jerusalem, 1997), editor's introduction, 149–52. *Sefer Hasidim* is also decidedly anti-amulet; see *SHP* 379, 1455, 1457, and *SHB* 1114, although cf. *SHP* 367.

⁴³Ramban's formulation, found in his name in *She'elot ha-Rashba ha-Meyuhasot leha-Ramban*, 283, is also cited in *She'elot u-Teshuvot ha-Rashba*, 1:413 (fol. 149a): *כִּי אַנְּיָה חֲסִידִי אַלְמַנְיָא לְעֹסֹק בְּדָבְרֵי שְׁדִים וּמִשְׁבִּיעִין אָוֹתָן וּמִשְׁלֹחָנִין אָוֹתָן וּמִשְׁתָּמָשִׁים מעשה שְׁדִים לְחוֹד וּמִעֲשָׂה כְּשָׁפִים לְחוֹד*. Therefore, Ramban concludes, *חֲסִידִי* Some of these texts (or their variants) omit the word *חֲסִידִי*, perhaps suggesting a somewhat wider Ashkenazic phenomenon. See also *Kitvei ha-Ramban*, ed. C. Chavel (Jerusalem, 1968³), 1:381; *Teshuvot ha-Rashba*, ed. H. Z. Dimitrovsky (Jerusalem, 1990), 1:307, and cf. 2:473, 478; Ramban's commentary to Leviticus 17:7; Marc Saperstein, "Christians and Christianity in the Sermons of Jacob Anatoli," *The Frank Talmage Memorial Volume*, ed. Walfish, 2:238, n. 10; David Horwitz, "Rashba's Attitude Towards Science and Its Limits," *Torah u-Madda* 3 (1991–92):52–81; José Faur, "Two Models of Jewish Spirituality," *Shofar* 10:3 (1992):30–34; Bazak, *Le-Ma'alah min ha-Ḥushim*, 99–102; Haviva Pedaya, "Ziyyur u-Temunah be-Parshanut Magit," *Mahanayim* 6 (1994):123; and Josef Stern, "The Fall and Rise of Myth in Ritual," *Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy* 6 (1997):240–45. Cf. *Tosafot ha-Shalem*, ed. Gellis, vol. 6, 186–87 (to Exodus 7:11, *וַיַּקְרָא פָּרָעָה לְחַכְמִים וּלְמְכַשְּׁפִים וַיַּעֲשֵׂה גַּם גּוֹתֹתָמִי מִצְרָיִם בְּלֹתִים כְּנָסִים*); *Margaliyyot ha-Yam* to *Sanhedrin* 67b; Lynn Thorndike, *A History of Magic and Experimental Science*, vol. 2 (New York, 1923), 7–8; above, n. 13; and Septimus, *Hispano-Jewish Culture in Transition*, 86–87. On the term *חֲסִידִי אַלְמַנְיָא* in Ramban's writings, see also his *derashah* entitled *Torat ha-Shem Temimah*, in *Kitvei ha-Ramban*,

he-Hasid was adept in the use of *Shemot* for both white and black magic.⁴⁴ Even more striking is the formulation of R. Moses Taku, in which he censures the Pietists for “making themselves like prophets” through the pronunciation of Holy Names with theurgic intentions, thereby producing results similar to those achieved by magicians or exorcists.⁴⁵ According to an account transmitted by his son (R. Zal[t]man) and grandson, R. Judah *he-Hasid*, while living in Spires, conjured the spirit of a dead person. The person proceeded to describe how, following his death, *shedim* in the form of cows walked on his face, just as R. Judah had predicted, because he had been guilty of shaving off his beard (and *pe'ot*) with sharp scissors during his lifetime.⁴⁶ According to a

1:162. Cf. above, ch. 1, n. 36, and *She'elot u-Teshuvot ha-Rashba*, 1:548, fol. 72a. For the impact of the *torat ha-sod* of *Hasidei Ashkenaz* on Ramban, see, e.g., my “On the Assessment of R. Moses b. Nahman (Nahmanides) and His Literary Oeuvre,” 170–71; Moshe Idel, “Defining Kabbalah: The Kabbalah of the Divine Names,” *Mystics of the Book*, ed. R. A. Herrera (New York, 1993), 99–104; above, n. 35; and below, ch. 5, n. 30.

⁴⁴ See *Sefer Me'irat 'Enayim*, ed. Amos Goldreich (Jerusalem, 1981), 409, n. 11: ר' יהודה חסיד היה יודע לעשות טוב ורע; יודע להשתמש בשם של תורה ובשם של היפך תורה. Cf. Wolfson, *Through a Speculum That Shines*, 268, n. 341; Moshe Idel, “Al Kavvanat Shemoneh ‘Esreh ‘Ezel R. Yizhaq Sagi-Nahor,” *Massu’ot*, ed. Oron and Goldreich, 40–41; idem, “Shelomoh Molkho ke-Magiqqon,” *Sefunot* 18 (1985):199–200 (with reference also to R. Eleazar of Worms; see below, n. 48); and Zimmer, ‘*Olam ke-Minhago Noheg*, 22–23.

⁴⁵ See R. Moses Taku, *Ketav Tamim*, ed. Raphael Kirchheim, in *Ozar Nehmad* 4 (1860):84 [=Fascimile of ms. Paris H711, ed. Joseph Dan (Jerusalem, 1984), fol. 33r; cf. the editor's introduction, 13, n. 29]. On the connotations of this passage in terms of prophecy, theurgy, and theosophy, cf. Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, 100–103; Idel, *Kabbalah: New Perspectives*, 98–99; idem, “The Mystical Experience in Abraham Abulafia” (Albany, 1988), 18; idem, “Al Kavvanat Shemoneh ‘Esreh,” 32; idem, “Le-Gilgulehah shel Tekhniqah Qedumah shel Hazon Nevu’i Bimei ha-Benayim,” *Sinai* 86 (1980):1–7; Wolfson, *Through a Speculum That Shines*, 267–68; and below, ch. 5, n. 67.

⁴⁶ See the passage in *Sefer ha-Gan* 6b–7a, cited in Zimmer, ‘*Olam ke-Minhago Noheg*, 49, n. 37; ms. Bodl. 973 [Sefer Hadrat Qodesh le-R. Zeligmann Bing] (Ashkenaz, 1465–69), fols. 16r–16v; ms. London (Beit Midrash) 73 (1518), fol. 14r; ms. Bodl. 1589 [Adam Sikhli ‘im Perush Hadrat Qodesh le-R. Shim'on b. Shemu’el] (Ashkenaz, 1537); I. J. Yuval, *Hakhamim be-Doram* (Jerusalem, 1989), 296–97, n. 54; H. H. Ben-Sasson, “*Hasidei Ashkenaz* ‘al Haluqt Qinyanim Ḥomriyyim u-Nekhasim Ruhaniyyim Bein Benei Adam,” *Zion* 35 (1970), 66, n. 36; and Yassif, *Sippur ha-‘Am ha-‘Ivri*, 364–65, 396. [*Sefer ha-Gan*, not to be confused with a tosafist biblical commentary of the same name, is an early fourteenth-century work composed by R. Isaac b. Eliezer, a student of R. Yedidyah of Spires and Nuremberg. R. Yedidyah was a colleague of R. Meir of Rothenburg and a student of R. Samuel of Evreux; see above, ch. 1, n. 80. On this work,

passage in *Pa'anah Raza*, R. Judah related the situation of an adept (*tahor*) with whom an angel regularly conversed (*לדבר אלהי*).⁴⁷

R. Solomon Simhah of Troyes (c.1235–1300), author of *Sefer ha-Maskil*, named R. Judah as a leading authority on the use of *Shemot* and the adjuration of angels and demons, even though R. Solomon held that these techniques should be studied but not actually used.⁴⁸ There are a number of *hashba'ot* and *segullot* in manuscript attributed to R. Judah *he-Hasid* and R. Eleazar of Worms, although some of the manuscripts are from the sixteenth century and beyond, raising questions about the reliability of the attributions in them.⁴⁹

see Israel Ta-Shma, “Hasidut Ashkenaz asher bi-Sefarad: Rabbenu Yonah Gerondi—Ha-Ish u-Fo‘alo,” *Galut Ahar Golah*, ed. Aharon Mirsky et al. (Jerusalem, 1988), 171.] Cf. my “Rabbinic Attitudes Toward Nonobservance in the Medieval Period,” 26, n. 66, on the prohibition against shaving in Pietist penitentials, and above, ch. 1, n. 12. On communication with departed souls, see also *Arba‘ah Turim*, O. H., sec. 268, citing *Sefer Hasidim* (1073); *SHP* 555, 1556; Yassif, *Sippur ha-Am ha-‘Ivri*, 314–15; Tamar Alexander-Frizer, *The Pious Sinner* (Tübingen, 1991), 22; above, nn. 19–20; and below, ch. 5, nn. 11, 43.

⁴⁷See ms. Bodl. 2344, fol. 133r. One day, the angel did not appear. The adept fasted for three days, after which the angel reappeared. The adept asked him why he had not appeared earlier, and the angel explained that when the *tahor* ate from a fowl that had been fattened by ingesting portions of a pig’s intestines, he had unwittingly eaten pig.

⁴⁸See below, ch. 5, n. 54. According to R. Moses Cordovero (cited in Idel, “Shelomoh Molkho ke-Maqiqon,” above, n. 44): ומعلوم לא ראיינו מי שנכנס בזה [עיסוק] בשמותינו שלא פול בה זלוט הקדושים הטהורים בגין ר' יהודה החסיד ור' יוסף גיקטיליא ור' אלעזר מגמייזא ור' מבז' וכיוצא רבים שהיו יודעים כה השם ולא נשתמשו בו ולא בפעולות ולא בטעור מוגמייזא ור' מבז' [For the notion that one who pronounces adjurations “bothers” the Almighty or the angels (טטריזים את המלאכים), cf., e.g., *SHP* 212.]

⁴⁹Examples from manuscripts of the fourteenth century or earlier include: ms. Bodl. 1098, fol. 77r (a magical *tefillat ha-derekh*, including various permutations of Divine Names, which would ward off all armed robbers and non-Jews); Vienna 28 (Heb. 148), 58r (a *she’elat halom* formula; cf. above, ch. 3, n. 8); Bodl. 1038, fol. 17v; Parma 1033, fol. 26; and Paris 716, fols. 294v–295v (a *shemirat ha-derekh* that mandated the placement and retrieval of stones, together with the recitation of biblical verses); cf. Vat. 243, fols. 10r, 14r, 15r; Warsaw 374, fol. 270r; Cambr. Or. 71, 166r; Livorno Talmud Tora 138, fol. 38r; above, ch. 2, n. 10, and ch. 3, n. 21; Paris 646, fols. 237v–238r [in the margin] (=mss. Cincinnati 436, fols. 212v–213r: *segullot* followed by prayers for individual needs, to be recited after the completion of the ‘*Amidah*’); and ms. Paris 632, fol. 41r. See also Mark Verman and Shulamit Adler, “Path Jumping in the Jewish Magical Tradition,” 136–39; Wolfson, *Through a Speculum That Shines*, 268, n. 341; above, n. 32; and below, ch. 5, nn. 16–17, 63–65, 74, 78. A number of these (practical) magical techniques are characterized by the term *qabbalah* (as in *qabbalah mi-R. Eleazar mi-Germaiza*). Cf. D. Abrams, “The Literary Emergence of Esotericism in German Pietism,” *Shofar* 12:2 (1994):75, n. 24; and D. Sperber, *Minhagei Yisra’el*, vol. 3

The Pietists' complex posture regarding the use of magical *Shemot* and incantations appears to be similar to their view regarding messianic speculation. While insisting that messianic speculation should not take place openly, *Hasidei Ashkenaz* nonetheless engaged in such speculation on their own, through various mystical or magical means. The dangers inherent in messianic speculation could only be mitigated by those few who were capable of applying the proper (mystical) techniques and safeguards.⁵⁰

German tosafists such as R. Judah b. Qalonymus (Ribaq, d. c. 1199), who lived in Spires while R. Judah *he-Hasid* was there, refer to pieces of *torat ha-sod* they received from R. Judah. Ribaq's *Sefer Yihusei Tanna'im va-Amora'im* contains a lengthy passage, citing *Hekhalot* literature, which interprets the activities of R. Yishma'el *Kohen Gadol* based on the *torat ha-Kavod* of the German Pietists. Ribaq's passage also deals with the role of Akatri'el as a representation of the Divine (*Shem*) or as an angel, another issue dealt with extensively by the Pietists.⁵¹

(Jerusalem, 1994), 199. For similar types of *hashba'ot* attributed to R. Elhanan b. Yaqr, see JTS Mic. 1878, fol. 128r, and ms. HUC Acc. 14, fol. 86v. For a magical means of injuring (and apprehending) a thief, see SHB 1162, and R. Eleazar of Worms, *Hokhmat ha-Nefesh*, fol. 17b. [Note also the formula for *petiħat ha-lev* and other *segullot* (*le-happil* *zimah* *al benei adam*, *le-qiyum banim*, and for overall personal security—*zaino nizoq le-olam*) found in ms. B.M. 737 (Add. 27, 199; Italy, 1515), fols. 470v–471v, and ms. Munich 81, fols. 201–2, interspersed among writings of R. Eleazar of Worms.] Cf. Paris 776, fol. 174v; Prague 45, fol. 145v; Parma 997, fol. 321r; Parma 1354, fol. 147r. (prophylactic techniques attributed to R. Judah *he-Hasid*), and below, ch. 5, nn. 46–47, 74.

⁵⁰See, e.g., Dan, *Torat ha-Sod shel Hasidut Ashkenaz*, 241–45; Baron, *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*, 6:47; Avraham David, "Sibbuv R. Petahyah me-Regensburg be-Nosah Hadash," *Qovez 'al Yad* n.s. 13 [23] (1996):240–43, 252–53; *Sefer Gematri'ot le-R. Yehudah he-Hasid*, introduction, 14, 66 (fol. 21v); below, ch. 5, n. 67; and cf. Peter Schäfer, "The Ideal of Piety of the Ashkenazi Hasidim and Its Roots in Jewish Tradition," *Jewish History* 4 (1990):15–16; Israel Ta-Shma, "Hishuv Qizzin le-Or ha-Halakhah," *Mahanayim* 59 (1961):57–59; Shlomo Eidelberg, "Gilgulav shel ha-Ra'ayon ha-Meshihi Bein Yehudei Ashkenaz," *Bein Historiyyah le-Sifrut*, ed. Stanley Nash (Tel Aviv, 1997), 25–26; and Moshe Idel, *Messianic Mystics* (New Haven, 1998), 47–51.

⁵¹See Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:379; and below, ch. 5, n. 7. Cf. Yaakov Sussmann, "Massoret Limmud u-Massoret Nosah shel Talmud ha-Yerushalmi," *Mehqarim be-Sifrut Talmudit* [Yom Iyyun le-Regel Melot Shemonim Shanah le-Sha'ul Lieberman] (Jerusalem, 1983), 14, n. 11, 34–35; and below, ch. 5, n. 12. (Ribaq also cites a R. Menahem *Hasid*; see Urbach, 1:369–70, and above, ch. 2, n. 10.) *Hasidei Ashkenaz* were heavily involved in the preservation and transmission of *Hekhalot* literature. As has been noted throughout this study, familiarity with this literature on the part of certain tosafists suggests that it was available more widely in Ashkenaz, in non-Pietist circles as well. Cf., e.g., Michael Swartz, *Scholastic Magic*, 218–19; Robert

CHAPTER 4

R. Ephraim b. Jacob (b. Qalonymus) of Bonn (b.1132) was a slightly older contemporary of R. Judah *he-Hasid*, and succeeded his teacher R. Joel *ha-Levi* as *’av bet din* in Bonn. R. Ephraim was in contact with R. Judah and with Ribaq, and he may even have received material from R. Samuel *he-Hasid*.⁵² In addition to counting words and letters in prayers and interpreting the prayers based on these sequences, as R. Judah *he-Hasid* and other *Hasidei Ashkenaz* did,⁵³ R. Ephraim offered a description of the *kisse ha-Kavod* in a liturgical commentary that is quite similar to esoteric formulations of R. Eleazar of Worms and versions of *Sod ha-Egoz*.⁵⁴

As we noted in the first chapter, *Hasidei Ashkenaz* influenced a number of northern French tosafists in the areas of educational curriculum, liturgy, ethics, and repentance. Given the presence of mysticism and magic in pre-Crusade Ashkenaz, evidence for these disciplines in northern France from the early thirteenth century may reflect the influence of the German Pietists, in addition to any existing northern French traditions. Interestingly, a Provençal broadside issued during the Maimonidean controversy censures “*Zarefatim* and their scholars, their heads and men of understanding” for “hearken[ing] to soothsayers and dreamers of false dreams . . . with the vanities of [magical] names, appellations of angels and demons and to practice conjuration and to write amulets. . . . For they fancy themselves masters of the Name, like the true prophets of renown. But they are fools and madmen, full of delusions.”⁵⁵

The influence of *Hasidei Ashkenaz* in these matters should not be overstated, however, even with regard to Germany. We have already confirmed the assessment of Victor Aptowitzer that R. Eliezer b. Joel *ha-Levi* (Rabiah)—the leading German tosafist of his day and a contemporary of Rizba and R. Judah *he-Hasid*—was not involved significantly with *sod*, despite several

Bonfil, “*Eduto shel Agobard mi-Lyons ‘al ‘Olamam ha-Ruhani shel Yehudei ‘Iro be-Me’ah ha-Teshi’it*,” *Studies in Jewish Mysticism, Philosophy and Ethical Literature Presented to Isaiah Tishby*, ed. J. Dan and J. Hacker, 327–48; and above, introduction, nn. 25–26.

⁵²See ‘*Arugat ha-Bosem*, ed. Urbach, 4:40.

⁵³See *Siddur Rabbenu Shelomoh mi-Germaiza ve-Siddur Hasidei Ashkenaz*, ed. Hershler, 60, 109, n. 38, 114; Simcha Emanuel, “*Ha-Polmos ‘al Nosah ha-Tefillah shel Hasidei Ashkenaz*,” n. 2; and above, ch. 2, n. 26.

⁵⁴See *Siddur Rabbenu Shelomoh mi-Germaiza*, 70–71, and Elliot Wolfson, “*Iyyun Nosaf be-Torat ha-Sod shel Hasidut Ashkenaz*,” *Massu’ot*, ed. Oron and Goldreich, 140, n. 44 [=idem, *Along the Path* (Albany, 1995), 121, n. 65].

⁵⁵... בַּהֲבִיל שְׁמוֹת כְּנָנִי מְלָאכִים וְשָׂדִים וְלֹעֲשֹׂת הַשְׁבָּעוֹת וְלֹכְתּוֹב קְמִיעוֹת... כִּי עֲשָׂו... עצם בעלי שם כניבאי האמת הידועים... See Septimus, *Hispano-Jewish Culture in Transition*, 86–87.

manifestations of *hasidut*.⁵⁶ In addition to the sources noted and analyzed by Aptowitzer, Rabiah suggested a substitute letter representation for the Tetragrammaton, that was the same as one suggested by R. Eleazar of Worms in his *Sodei Razayya*. But practical *halakhah* was at issue in this case, and a mystical approach is not necessarily reflected.⁵⁷ There is also a reference to Rabiah having compiled a *selihah* based on a Name combination used by *Hasidei Ashkenaz*. The manuscript that records this information is quite late, however, and there is even a gloss at the end attributing this piece to **אבי עזרא** (Abraham Ibn Ezra) rather than to Rabiah.⁵⁸

A quasi-mystical experience is attributed to Rabiah. This episode was not connected in any direct way to *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, however, and, indeed, the nature of the experience itself requires clarification. According to a passage in an Ashkenazic manuscript from the fourteenth century, Rabiah (*Avi ha-^cEzri*)

⁵⁶See Aptowitzer, *Mavo la-Rabiah*, 19–20, 481–82; and cf. *Sefer Rabiah Hullin*, ed. David Deblitsky (Bnei Brak, 1976), 22 (sec. 1081); *Ta-Shma, Ha-Nigleh shebe-Nistar*, 94, n. 33; and above, ch. 1, n. 45.

⁵⁷See Rabiah in *Sefer Assufot*, cited in Jacob Lauterbach, “Substitutes for the Tetragrammaton,” *PAAJR* 2 (1930–31):60–61, and cf. Wolfson, *Through a Speculum That Shines*, 253, n. 269. The author of *Sefer Assufot*, a collection that contains magic and *sod* material (see above, ch. 3, n. 18), was a student of both Rabiah and R. Eleazar of Worms. See above, ch. 1, n. 37; and cf. Wolfson, 253, nn. 269, 271; Simcha Emanuel, “*Sifrei Halakhah Avudim shel Ba^calei ha-Tosafot*” (Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University, 1993), 196; and ms. Parma 563, fols. 120–21.

R. Samson b. Eliezer, *Barukh She-^camar* (Jerusalem, 1970), 74, cites Rabiah about the importance of consulting *Alfa Beta de-R. Aqiva* regarding the written formulation of the letters in a *Sefer Torah* or *tefillin*: **וכל מי שאומנתו מלאת שמים יבין ויראה בא"ב דר' עקיבא לעשוות במאמרה**. This is a matter of technical usage, however, and does not imply any affinity to the mystical materials found in the *Alfa Beta*. Indeed, R. Tam is also cited as espousing a similar view in his *Tiqqun Sefer Torah*; see also *Barukh She-^camar*, 101, and cf. above, ch. 3, n. 87. Rabiah wished to ignore completely the problem of *gozel* *z'et ha-metim* (כתח לחייטר שאין לחוש בדבר) associated with drinking and eating on the Sabbath afternoon (*bein ha-shemashot*), a prohibition that Rabbenu Tam received from his father and retained (see above, ch. 3, n. 90). Rabiah's father, R. Joel, had also observed the prohibition. See *Haggahot Maimuniyyot, Hilkhot Shabbat*, 30:10:[20]; and cf. above, ch. 3, n. 80.

⁵⁸See Gershom Scholem, *Kitvei Yad be-Kabbalah* (Jerusalem, 1930), 113; above, ch. 3, nn. 8, 28, 97; and see now Dov Schwartz, “*Ha-Mashma^cut ha-Magit shel ha-Shem ha-E-lohi bi-Yezarato shel R. Avraham Ibn Ezra*,” *Biqqoret u-Parshanut* 32 (1998):39–51. R. Jacob *ha-Nazir* (in ms. Vat. 274, fol. 206r; see above, ch. 2, n. 14) cites an analysis of the angelic figure in the *E-l Adon* hymn from *מהרי העוזר*. Urbach, in his edition of *Arugat ha-Bosem*, 4:119, raises the possibility that the reference is to R. Joel, son of Rabiah, but then he goes on to suggest that this identification is improbable.

CHAPTER 4

maintained that Elijah the Prophet instructed him to side with the view of those authorities who prohibited a particular malformation of the lung as a *terefah* (וּאֲלֵהוּ הנְּבִיא וּכֹר לְטוֹב הָרָה לֹן לְאָסָר אָנוֹן בְּאָוֹמָא). The passage also notes that the case at hand was one of considerable controversy between major rabbinic decisors in northern France and Germany throughout the eleventh and twelfth centuries. By Rabiah's day, all of the communities in northern France followed the stringent view, while most of the leading German communities favored the lenient view.⁵⁹

To be sure, a claim of heavenly or angelic instruction does not automatically signify that the decisor in question underwent a mystical experience. It may mean that after studying the point of controversy, he was able to reach a firm and unimpeachable conclusion.⁶⁰ This possibility is strengthened when the decisor claims that the guidance came from Elijah, whose role in deciding unsolved controversies of Jewish law is commonplace in rabbinic thought.

Moreover, Rabiah presented both sides of the controversy in his *Sefer Rabiah*, along with the names of various important scholars who supported each position, without reaching an unequivocal decision himself. His students and successors in Germany, however, decided ultimately in favor of the stringent view. Rabiah also did not state in his own work that Elijah aided him. At the same time, R. Jacob of Marvège posed this very issue (of how to decide the controversy) as one of the questions that he addressed to Heaven. The response that he received was to be stringent.⁶¹ These factors suggest the possibility that a later Ashkenazic figure embellished Rabiah's view in the manuscript passage.

But even if the experience attributed to Rabiah actually occurred, it must be compared with those of his family members who were involved in

⁵⁹See ms. Paris 1408, fols. 2r–2v. This passage appears as part of a brief treatise entitled *דיל' טריפות מאבי העזרוי* in a section of the manuscript copied by Elqanah *ha-Sofer*, a student of R. Meir of Rothenburg who was familiar with *Hekhalot* literature and other mystical texts. See above, ch. 3, nn. 37, 115.

⁶⁰See Isadore Twersky, *Rabad of Posquières* (Philadelphia, 1980²), 291–97, and above, ch. 1, n. 130.

⁶¹See *Sefer Rabiah*, Hullin, ed. Deblitsky, 49 (sec. 1089), and n. 23 (for the parallel passages in *Sefer Or Zarua'*, *Sefer Mordekhai*, and *Haggahot Maimuniyyot*). See also ms. Bodl. 659 (*Shibbolei ha-Leqet ha-Qazar*), fol. 102v; Parma 1237, fol. 140v; *Shibbolei ha-Leqet*, ed. Buber, *hilkhot terefot*, sec. 8; and R. Jacob of Marvège, *She'elot u-Teshuvot min ha-Shamayim*, #62–64, and esp. #68: *עוד שאלתי על אומה דסרך לאונגן אם הלבכה כדברי המתירין או כדברי האויסין... והשיבו זה כלל גדול בטיריפות דומיסיף ייספֿר... ונראוה מה שבל המוחמיר מתברך*. Cf. above, ch. 3, n. 119, and below, n. 63.

establishing or confirming ritual or liturgical practices on the basis of dreams. A comparison indicates that Rabiah's experience was somewhere between the relatively superficial dream of his grandfather, Raban—through which Raban realized, upon awakening from his Sabbath nap, that he had ruled incorrectly in a matter that had presented itself just prior to his going to sleep⁶²—and the more intensely mystical dream in which Raban's martyred brother, R. Uri, dictated a liturgical poem to a R. Mordekhai b. Eliezer.⁶³ Thus, Rabiah's interest in mysticism generally remains unsubstantiated, and there is no evidence, in any case, for *Hasidei Ashkenaz* playing a role in this matter.

R. Samson of Sens, who was a major figure in the composition, redaction, and dissemination of *Tosafot* texts in northern France, showed no interest in magic or in mystical ideas. Indeed, the confluence of Rabbenu Tam, Raban, Rash *mi-Shanż*, R. Judah Sir Leon, and perhaps Rabiah may be partially

⁶²See above, ch. 3, nn. 77–79.

⁶³See above, ch. 3, nn. 80–82. R. Isaiah of Trani supported a ruling of his in another aspect of *hilkhot terefot* on the basis of a *gillui Eliyyahu*. In this case, however, R. Isaiah reported a more involved exchange between himself and Elijah; in addition, R. Isaiah's formulation is similar to those of R. Jacob of Marvège in his *She'elot u-Teshuvot min ha-Shamayim*; see below, ch. 5, nn. 19–20. Rabiah's reported dream is more of a *gillui* than Raban's, but far less explicit than that of Rid. On the distinction between dreams and visions in a medieval context, see R. C. Finucane, *Miracles and Pilgrims* (New York, 1977), 83–85. See also above, ch. 1, n. 128, and ch. 3, n. 8. On prophecy and *halakhah*, cf. above, n. 3.

Yosef Kafah, “Teshuvot Rabbenu Ya‘aqov me-Ramerug,” *Qovez ‘al Yad*, n.s. 7 (1968), 95–96, records a passage in which *Sefer ha-Ezer* (*Sefer Rabiah?*) came across some kind of heavenly indicator (מצא מציאה כנבואה או כבת קול מן השמיים), which held that הלהנה בריך בכל מקום. R. Jacob of Marvège received this principle—that the law is always in accordance with R. Isaac Alfasi—in response to one of his heavenly שאלות. See his *She'elot u-Teshuvot min ha-Shamayim*, #2, and cf. above, n. 61. Since *She'elot u-Teshuvot min ha-Shamayim* was composed at the end of the twelfth century, perhaps Rabiah (assuming that *Sefer ha-Ezer* does in fact refer to one of his compositions)—whose work was written a bit later—is citing this principle from that work. This citation does not appear, however, in extant versions of *Sefer Rabiah*, nor are there any other citations from *She'elot u-Teshuvot min ha-Shamayim* in Rabiah's writings. *Shibbolei ha-Leqet*, a mid-thirteenth-century compendium that refers to *She'elot u-Teshuvot min ha-Shamayim* on a number of occasions, openly cites this responsum, in ‘Inyan Tefillin’ (ed. Buber, 383) [=ed. Mirsky, 90]. Cf. Israel Ta-Shma, “She'elot u-Teshuvot min ha-Shamayim, ha-Qovez ve-Tosefotav,” *Tarbiz* 57 (1988):56–63, and below, ch. 5, n. 23. The great weight given to Alfasi in halakhic matters can be characterized, according to *Shibbolei ha-Leqet*, by the biblical phrase ואת בריתני אקים את. [The *gematria* Torah commentary attributed to R. Eleazar of Worms at the end of ms. Bodl. 1812 cites a scholar called Avi ha-Ezri; cf. Urbach, *Ba‘alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:401, 405–6.]

responsible for the current perception of minimal tosafist involvement in mysticism and magic.⁶⁴ This perception is also supported by the fact that the standard *Tosafot* texts published together with the various talmudic tractates devote relatively little space to consideration of these issues, although as we noted at the beginning of this chapter, they do appear in *Tosafot* from time to time. The relative absence of this material in *Tosafot* texts may be, however, as much an issue of genre as an indication of lack of involvement. Indeed, Nahmanides' talmudic commentaries are almost completely devoid of references to esoteric or kabbalistic material, despite Nahmanides' obvious commitment to the study of *torat ha-sod*. We should expect that tosafists who were interested in *sod* and magic, no less than Nahmanides, would wish to separate these disciplines from their talmudic commentaries and halakhic analyses.⁶⁵

The material presented in this chapter suggests that interest in magic and mysticism that can be detected among a number of tosafists and rabbinic scholars in northern France and Germany during the second half of the twelfth century and into the first part of the thirteenth century may have developed independently of the German Pietists. As we have seen, the Pietists expressed a reticence in connection with the magical use of *Shemot* (despite their obvious familiarity with the magical techniques and their willingness to employ them under certain circumstances) that contemporary tosafists did not express.⁶⁶

Several considerations, not shared by tosafists, may have motivated the Pietists. As we have noted, the Pietists were highly aware of the theoretical underpinnings and practical manifestations of demonology and magic commonly available in the world around them. They sought to utilize these disciplines as a means of achieving a deeper understanding of the Creator, who, they believed, operates not only within natural spheres, but in supernatural ways as well. Indeed, even prophecy could be better appreciated through an

⁶⁴Cf. Ḥida, *Shem ha-Gedolim*, *ma‘arekhet gedolim*, s.v. R. Shimshon b. Avraham mi-Shanz; Joseph Davis, “R. Yom Tov Lipman Heller, Joseph b. Isaac ha-Levi and Rationalism in Ashkenazic Culture, 1550–1650” (Ph.D. diss., Harvard, 1990), 48–49; Moshe Halbertal, *People of the Book* (Cambridge, Mass., 1997), 161–62, n. 40; and above, n. 11. See also above, nn. 2, 8, regarding R. Judah Sir Leon of Paris. The characterization of R. Samson of Sens in ms. Bodl. 847, fol. 36r, as an *‘ish ‘iyyun* refers, in context, to his analytical prowess with regard to talmudic studies. Cf. *She’elot u-Teshuvot Maharshal*, #29; *Teshuvot u-Fesaqim*, ed. Kupfer, 115 (sec. 70); above, n. 8; introduction, n. 13; and below, ch. 5, n. 72.

⁶⁵ See above, preface, nn. 4–5.

⁶⁶Occasionally, however, tosafists raise objections, both theoretical and practical, regarding the manipulation of *shedim* that bordered on sorcery (*kishuf*). See, e.g., above, n. 19; below, ch. 5, n. 21; and Bazak, *Le-Ma‘alah min ha-Ḥushim*, 77–90.

analysis of certain magical techniques.⁶⁷ At the same time, their intimate involvement with magic and demonology made the Pietists uniquely aware of the dangers inherent in these disciplines. The only tosafist who analyzed the properties of *shelim* and their destructive powers in a manner close to that of the *Hasidei Ashkenaz* was R. Isaac b. Moses of Vienna. R. Isaac's theories will be reviewed in the next chapter.

In addition, the Pietists were involved in the study of two areas that do not appear to have evinced much interest among tosafists, but which may further explain the Pietists' hesitations regarding magic and demonology. The Pietists were influenced by systems of philosophical thought, especially forms of Neoplatonism and material found in the Hebrew paraphrase of R. Sa'adyah Gaon's *Emunot ve-De'ot*.⁶⁸ It was their philosophical orientation, for example, that caused *Hasidei Ashkenaz* to deny the possibility, in simple terms, of Divine

⁶⁷ See above, nn. 40, 45.

⁶⁸ See, e.g., Ronald Kiener, "The Hebrew Paraphrase of Sa'adyah Gaon's *Kitab 'al Amanat Wa'l-I'tiqadat*," *AJS Review* 11 (1986):1–25; Gershom Scholem, "Reste neuplatonischer Spekulation in der Mystik der deutschen Chassidim und ihre Vermittlung durch Abraham bar Chija," *MGWJ* 75 (1931):172–92; E. E. Urbach, "Helqam shel Hakhmei Ashkenaz ve-Zaresfat ba-Polmos 'al ha-Rambam," *Zion* 12 (1946):150–54; Dan, *Torat ha-Sod shel Hasidut Ashkenaz*, 18, 22–24, 28–30, 99–100, 111–13, 129–43 (and in the next note); Wolfson, *Through a Speculum That Shines*, 192–205; and cf. idem, "The Mystical Significance of Torah-Study in German Pietism," *JQR* 84 (1993):65–67, regarding Judah of Barcelona. See also *Sefer Gematri'ot le-R. Yehudah he-Hasid*, 70 (fol. 23v): פילוטופים בignum מוחכמים נבוניים.

Interestingly, it appears that the Hebrew paraphrase of Sa'adyah's *Emunot De'ut* was actually cited in thirteenth-century Ashkenaz only by figures and works with a palpable connection to *Hasidei Ashkenaz*. These include *Sefer Hasidim* and various esoteric texts of *hasidut Ashkenaz*; R. Eleazar of Worms; his student, R. Abraham b. 'Azriel; R. Elhanan b. Yaqr (of the *Hug ha-Keruv ha-Meyuhad*) and *Sefer ha-Navon*; and tosafists who had a close association with German Pietism, such as R. Moses of Coucy and R. Meir of Rothenburg. (R. Moses Taku, the sharp critic of *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, was also keenly aware of the paraphrase, citing it in order to attack it.) The lone exceptions occur (not surprisingly) in two instances of polemic. R. Samson of Sens cites the paraphrase in one of his responsa to R. Meir *ha-Levi* Abulafia (who had himself cited it during the earliest phase of the Maimonidean controversy), as does the handbook of Jewish-Christian polemics, *Sefer Yosef ha-Meqanne*, ed. Judah Rosenthal (Jerusalem, 1970), 3–6. See Kiener, 16–17, 22–23, nn. 84, 86; Y. Dan, *Hasidut Ashkenaz be-Toledot ha-Mahshavah ha-Yehudit* (Tel Aviv, 1990), 1:150; Joseph Davis, "Philosophy, Dogma, and Exegesis in Medieval Ashkenazic Judaism," *AJS Review* 18 (1993):209, n. 57; Dov Schwartz, *Ha-Ra'ayon ha-Meshihi be-Haqut ha-Yehudit Bimei ha-Benayim* (Ramat Gan, 1997), and above, ch. 2, n. 11. Cf. Berger, "Judaism and General Culture in Medieval and Early Modern Times," 118, and Daniel Lasker, "Jewish Philosophical Polemics in Ashkenaz," *Contra Iudeos*, ed. Ora Limor and Guy Stroumsa (Tübingen, 1996), 198–99.

CHAPTER 4

corporeality, even as a number of other Ashkenazic rabbinic scholars embraced such a view.⁶⁹ With regard to practical magic and demonology as well, the Pietists' philosophical background may have caused them to pull back a bit, just as the "rationalists" among the tosafists—such as Rabbenu Tam and Rashbam—also wanted to downplay these notions.

Moreover, Moshe Idel has argued that among Spanish kabbalists who viewed the magical arts favorably, those who were engaged in theosophy were inclined to consider magic from a less practical, more theoretical standpoint.⁷⁰ The powers and properties of the Divine Names were considered in Pietist thought to be areas of esoteric study, a means of comprehending the Godhead. Indeed, the most comprehensive esoteric work composed by R. Eleazar of Worms, *Sefer ha-Shem*—in which R. Eleazar interprets the Name in accordance with *torat ha-sod* and describes the functions and implications of the Name in both the higher and lower worlds—contains a ceremony in which the Name is passed to adepts. Formal transmission of the Name was not intended so that adepts could make use of it for magical purposes, but so they could receive the theosophical secrets connected with it,⁷¹ or the mystical practices and revelatory experiences related to its pronunciation.⁷² Because tosafists were involved neither in the study of philosophy nor in the study of theosophy, the issues that confronted *Hasidei Ashkenaz* regarding magic and demonology need not have troubled them.

When we look at the thirteenth century, we shall see that the influence of German Pietists appears to grow in matters of magic and *sod*, as has been demonstrated with regard to asceticism and *perishut*. At the same time, the overall interest and involvement of tosafists in mystical studies and magical techniques continued to take root and became even more widespread. It is not always possible to discern, however, whether a particular development reflects the influence of *hasidut Ashkenaz* or whether it is a result of the broader influence of Ashkenazic rabbinic culture as a whole.

⁶⁹See, e.g., Septimus, *Hispano-Jewish Culture in Transition*, 78–81; Berger, "Judaism and General Culture," 95–100; Dan, *Torat ha-Sod shel Hasidut Ashkenaz*, 71–73; idem, "Ashkenazi Hasidism and the Maimonidean Controversy," *Maimonidean Studies* 3 (1992–93):29–47; Davis, "Philosophy, Dogma and Exegesis," 213–14, n. 69; and 'Arugat ha-Bosem, ed. Urbach, 4:74–83. Cf. Wolfson, *Through a Speculum That Shines*, 195–234, and Moshe Idel, "Gazing at the Head in Ashkenazi Hasidism," *Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy* 6 (1997):280–94.

⁷⁰See Moshe Idel, "Yahadut, Mistiqah Yehudit u-Mageyah," *Madda'ei ha-Yahadut* 36 (1996):25–40.

⁷¹See Dan, *Torat ha-Sod shel Hasidut Ashkenaz*, 74–76.

⁷²See Moshe Idel, "Defining Kabbalah: The Kabbalah of the Divine Names," 97–122; Wolfson, *Through a Speculum That Shines*, 234–47; and above, ch. 3, n. 126.



5

Integration and Expansion during the Thirteenth Century

Two of the most important thirteenth-century tosafist halakhists, R. Isaac b. Moses *Or Zarua*^c of Vienna (d.c.1250) and R. Meir of Rothenburg (d.1293, who studied in his youth with R. Isaac), represent German rabbinic traditions. Nonetheless, they also spent considerable time studying with leading rabbinic scholars in northern France and should be considered, on balance, as the heirs of the tosafist enterprise there.¹ At the same time, R. Isaac and R. Meir not only embraced aspects of the pietism of *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, as we saw in the second chapter, but also expressed significant interest in mysticism and magic, quite possibly under Pietist influence as well. These dimensions in the writings of R. Isaac and R. Meir will be considered together with those of R. Avigdor b. Elijah *Kohen Zepeq* (d.c.1275, often referred to as R. Avigdor Katz)—a lesser-known tosafist who was both the successor of R. Isaac b. Moses in Vienna and a teacher of R. Meir of Rothenburg²—and those of several other contemporaries.

R. Isaac begins his *Sefer Or Zarua*^c with an analysis of the Hebrew alphabet (*le-falpel be-’otiyot shel ’alfa beta*). In addition to citing mystical and esoteric texts such as *Otiyyot de-R. Aqiva*, *Alfa Beta de-R. Aqiva*, and *Sefer Yezirah*,³ this treatise refers to letter combinations, *gematriyyot*, and *sofei tevot*

¹See E. E. Urbach, *Ba’alei ha-Tosafot* (Jerusalem, 1980⁴), 1:436–39; 2:527–28; Haym Soloveitchik, *Halakhah, Kalkalah ve-Dimmui ’Azmi* (Jerusalem, 1985), 82–83; and idem, “Three Themes in the *Sefer Hasidim*,” *AJS Review* 1 (1976):349.

²See above, ch. 2, n. 28.

³R. Isaac cites the *Alfa Beta de-R. Aqiva* twice in the first section of his treatise (and in sections 21, 28, 33) and suggests he is modeling his treatise after that type of work.

CHAPTER 5

utilized in other Ashkenazic *sod* literature⁴; to pietistic prayer practices based on *Hekhalot* texts⁵; and to other mystical teachings, including *torat ha-mal'akhim*.⁶ R. Isaac *Or Zarua*^c interprets the talmudic account of

The introductory mnemonic alphabets reflect *Shabbat* 104a, which itself has clear affinities with *Sefer Yezirah*. See Israel Ta-Shma, “Sifriyyatam shel Hakhmei Ashkenaz Bnei ha-Me’ah ha-Yod Alef/ha-Yod Bet,” *Qiryat Sefer* 60 (1985):307; Ivan Marcus, *Rituals of Childhood* (New Haven, 1996), 138–39, n. 41; and cf. Yosef Dan, *Torat ha-Sod shel Hasidut Ashkenaz* (Jerusalem, 1968), 69–70. The passage in sec. 28 mentions both the *Alfa Beta* and *Sefer Yezirah* for a letter derivation of ש. [Cf. the *Alfa Beta be-Yihud ha-Bore* in R. Elhanan b. Yaqr’s *Sod ha-Sodot* (ms. JTS Mic. 8118), cited in Yosef Dan, *Tekstim be-Torat ha-Elohot shel Hasidut Ashkenaz* (Jerusalem, 1977), 22. R. Elhanan asserts that “I saw it written and intended to copy it to the best of my ability, in order to transmit it to Israel.”]

⁴R. Isaac begins the treatise by expressing his joy at being able to identify the correct formal spelling of the Hebrew name *Aqvayah* (עֲקִיבָה) rather than עֲקִיבָא (on the basis of a *sofei tevot* analysis of the verse שְׁמַה לְבָדֵק וּלְשִׁנְיָה לְבָדֵק שְׁמַה). [According to *Seder ha-Dorot*, R. Isaac was unsure of how to spell this name for a bill of divorce, and this solution came to him in a dream. His gratefulness for the Heavenly edification caused him to name his book *Sefer Or Zarua*^c; see *She’elot u-Teshuvot min ha-Shamayim*, ed. Reuven Margoliot (Jerusalem, 1957), editor’s introduction, 8.] This *sofei tevot* analysis is similar to a *gematria* analysis that R. Isaac himself (among others) attributes to R. Samuel *he-Hasid* (*Sefer Or Zarua*^c, pt. 2, sec. 281): וּרְשָׁמוֹאֵל הַחֲסִיד הִיא אָוֹרֵב אַבִּינוּן (מלכ”ט חטָא”נוּ לְפִנֵּי רַעַלָּה בְּגַיְרַבְּיָה הַזְּהָרָה קְרִיאָה) Cf. above, ch. 1, n. 39, and ch. 2, n. 30. Note Urbach’s observation (*Ba’alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:439), that R. Isaac’s *ודרוש על האלפָא-בִּיתָא*, with which he begins his work, testifies that he is a disciple of R. Judah *he-Hasid* and R. Eleazar *Roqeah* (who also began his halakhic work, *Sefer Roqeah*, with a pietistic introduction; cf. above, ch. 2, n. 86, and below, n. 8.) In the first section of his introduction and in secs. 11–13, and 21, R. Isaac utilizes the *gematria* technique of *millui*, a technique associated especially with the German Pietists. See Ivan Marcus, “Exegesis for the Few and for the Many: Judah *he-Hasid*’s Biblical Studies,” *Mehqerei Yerushalayim be-Mahshevot Yisra’el* 8 (1989):1*–24*, and Joseph Dan, “The Ashkenazi Concept of Language,” *Hebrew in Ashkenaz*, ed. Lewis Glinert (New York, 1993), 17. For the possible esoteric connotation of the phrase found in sec. 12, that circumcision constitutes a seal of the Divine Name, see below, n. 29.

⁵See sec. 2 for the raising of the eyes during *qedushah* (a practice based on *Hekhalot* texts that became fairly widespread in Ashkenaz; see above, ch. 1, nn. 42, 60). Note also *Sefer Or Zarua*^c, pt. 2, sec. 281, in which R. Isaac bases the practice of prostrating oneself at the recitation of the *Shem ha-Meforash* as described in the *Yom Kippur ‘avodah* on a teaching of R. Nehunya b. ha-Qanah found in *Sefer shel Qedushot* (=*Hekhalot Rabbati*, cited also in *Sefer Rabiah*, 2:196–97, in the name of *Sifrei Hizoniyim*). See above, ch. 1, n. 43.

⁶According to sec. 3, the letter *alef* (which is פָּלָא spelled backward) teaches a person to pay attention to the wonders of the Torah, לִדְעָה סָד הַדָּבָר וּלְעַמּוֹד עַל עֲקָרוֹן. Torah study is referred to several times in this treatise as a means of acquiring special or

R. Yishma'el and Akatri'el in terms of the *torat ha-Kavod* of *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, perhaps influenced also by a passage in *Sefer Yihusei Tanna'im va-Amora'im*.⁷

secret knowledge. See, e.g., the theme repeated in sec. 6: Torah study leads to the revelation of *ta'amei Torah*; cf. sec. 24. Note the reference to the *mal'akh Sar ha-Torah* in sec. 29 (cf. secs. 35, 41), and see also the last section (sec. 50), which discusses the proper manipulation of angels so that *mal'akhei habbalah* will not be granted control over a person. An annotated version of this treatise has recently been published by Yosef Movshowitz in *Sefer Zikkaron le-R. Shiloh Raphael*, ed. Movshowitz (Jerusalem, 1998), 95–144. For two passages in this text found also in the pietistic introduction to *Sefer Roqeah*, see the notes to 134–35.

On the power of dreams to influence halakhic decisions in *Sefer Or Zarua'*, note (in addition to the suggestion that R. Isaac himself had a dream about the spelling of *Aqivah*, above, n. 4), pt. 1, sec. 692, in which R. Isaac records the incident of the *ba'al ha-halom* who located the corpse of R. Simeon *ha-Qadosh* (the brother-in-law of Rabbenu Tam) so that it could then be identified; see above, ch. 3, n. 96, and *She'elot u-Teshuvot min ha-Shamayim*, editor's introduction, 9, n. 6. See also *Sefer Or Zarua'*, pt. 4, *pisqei 'Avodah Zarah*, sec. 200: *וְאַנִי הַמְחַבֵּר שְׁמָעִתִּי מִפְּנֵי הַקְדוֹשׁ רַבִּינוּ יְהוָה הַסִּדְךָ שָׁאַמֵּר בְּלֶשׁן זוּה שְׁכֵל מֵי שִׁיאָכֵל בְּלֶבֶטָא לְאַכְלֵל לְזִוְתָן*. The text then continues with an account of R. Ephraim of Regensburg, who permitted this kind of fish and experienced a dream that demonstrated to him the error of his decision. See above, ch. 3, n. 78. R. Isaac's son, R. Hayyim, dreamed that he saw R. Meir of Rothenburg, whom he had never seen when R. Meir was alive. The unanticipated appearance of R. Meir communicated a message to R. Hayyim about retaining a particular talmudic *girsah*; see *She'elot u-Teshuvot Maharah Or Zarua'*, #164, and cf. below, nn. 69, 72.

⁷See *Sefer Or Zarua'* *hilkhot qeri'at Shema*, secs. 7–8; and above, ch. 4, n. 51. R. Isaac rejects the view of R. Hanan'el that R. Yishma'el saw Akatri'el only in his mind (imagination), as well as the view that Akatri'el is only an angel (who could therefore be perceived). He accepts the notion (in accordance with *hasidut Ashkenaz*) that Akatri'el is the *Kavod* which is Divine, but is nonetheless revealed. Cf. Gershon Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (Jerusalem, 1941), 110–16; Reuven Margoliot, *Torat ha-Mal'akhim* (Jerusalem, 1988³), 12; Elliot Wolfson, *Through a Speculum That Shines* (Princeton, 1994), 127, 147, 262, nn. 314–15; Arthur Green, *Keter* (Princeton, 1997), 62–65, 99; Daniel Abrams, "Sefer Shaqod le-R. Shemu'el b. R. Qalonymus ve-Torat ha-Kavod shel Talmid R. Eleazar mi-Vorms," *Assufot* (forthcoming), nn. 65–66; and above, ch. 3, n. 75.

Yehuda Liebes notes that the approach of R. Isaac *Or Zarua'* (whom he characterizes as "one of the leading Ashkenazic halakhists in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries who knew nothing about Kabbala") in highlighting the connections between women and the (new) moon was one step removed from the (fully mystical) approach found in *Sefer Hasidim*, which was itself quite close to the view of kabbalists. In light of the material assembled here, R. Isaac's affinity for these teachings is hardly surprising. See Liebes, *Studies in Jewish Myth and Jewish Messianism* (Albany, 1993), 50–51 [= "de Natura Dei—Al ha-Mitos ha-Yehudi ve-Gigulo," *Massu'ot*, ed. Amos Goldreich and Michal Oron (Jerusalem, 1994), 285–86; and see also *Darkhei Mosheh* to *O. H.* 426, end.]

CHAPTER 5

R. Isaac cites R. Eleazar of Worms, that the *sheliaḥ zibbur* sustains the chanting of *barekhu* at the conclusion of the Sabbath, because the souls return to *gehinnom* after this point. As long as the chanting continues, they cannot return.⁸

In his discussion of a talmudic passage implying that *shedim* do not observe Jewish law—and interpreted in this way by Rashi—R. Isaac *Or Zarua*^c cites R. Judah *he-Hasid*, who maintained that *shedim* “believe in the Torah and [also] do whatever the *hakhamim* decreed.” Thus, they would not violate even a rabbinic prohibition (of *teḥum*). In a case where it appears that they traveled on the Sabbath, they were merely communicating through long tubes. In reality, however, *shedim* observe even the [rabbinic] requirements of the Oral Law.⁹ When R. Judah was asked how, in light of this principle, *shedim* could engage

⁸Sefer *Or Zarua*^c, *hilkhot moza'ei Shabbat*, pt. 2, sec. 89 (fol. 24a). R. Eleazar noted that this was also done by R. Eliezer b. Meshullam *Hazzan* (of Spires). R. Eliezer *Hazzan* was a direct link in the esoteric chain of tradition of the German Pietists. Cf. Ta-Shma, *Minhag Ashkenaz ha-Qadmon* (Jerusalem, 1992), 307; and above, ch. 3, n. 25.

Sec. 44 of R. Isaac's introductory *Alfa Beta* treatise contains a lengthy discussion about the importance of achieving *hasidut*, and it includes one formulation by R. Isaac's teacher, R. Simhah of Spires (whose own affinities with *hasidut Ashkenaz* will be reviewed below)—that one cannot receive a more important blessing than *yir'at shamayim*—and another formulation on *'ahavat ha-Shem* that is quite similar to a passage in an introductory section (*Hilkhot Hasidut—Shoresh Ahavat ha-Shem*) of *Sefer Roqeah* (see Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:420, n. 56). A biblical interpretation of R. Judah *he-Hasid* is cited by R. Isaac in sec. 25. It should also be noted that the first halakhic topic that *Sefer Or Zarua*^c addresses is *hilkhot zedaqah*, which contains a number of pietistic themes (although doctrines of *zedaqah* unique to *Sefer Hasidim* are not necessarily espoused; see, e.g., Haym Soloveitchik, “Three Themes,” 344, n. 104). Indeed, the entire *Alfa Beta* treatise is a kind of *hilkhot hasidut* introduction, similar in a number of respects to the beginning sections of *Sefer Roqeah* (which took its cue from Rambam's *Mishneh Torah*; see, e.g., Dan, *Torat ha-Sod shel Hasidut Ashkenaz*, and Ivan Marcus, *Piety and Society* [Leiden, 1981], 131–32); and cf. above, ch. 2, nn. 40, 83, 86. Note the *Sefer Hasidim*-like critique of unbridled dialectic in sec. 23. One is allowed to be *mefalphel* but must be careful not to permit what is prohibited, to declare pure that which is impure, or the reverse. Cf. *Sefer Or Zarua*^c, *hilkhot 'erev Shabbat*, pt. 2, sec. 33. R. Isaac did not wish to rely on a ruling of Rabbenu Tam in practice because he believed it was the product of Rabbenu Tam's powerful intellect, which could prove, in theory, that a reptile was pure (וְהָרְבָּר יְדֹעַ גָּדֵל לְבָו שֶׁל רְתַתְּרַת שְׁרֵץ). Cf. Urbach, 1:69–70, n. 62*.

⁹Sefer *Or Zarua*^c, *hilkhot 'Eruvin*, sec. 147. Cf. Y. L. Zlotnick, *Ma'aseh Yerushalmi* (Jerusalem, 1947), 29–30, and above, ch. 4, n. 15. *Sefer Or Zarua*^c cites (*ha-Qadosh*) Rabbenu Yehudah *he-Hasid* in other meta-halakhic as well as halakhic contexts. See, e.g., *hilkhot Shabbat*, sec. 42 (cf. the material in the gloss to *SHP*, sec. 427, and *hilkhot moza'ei Shabbat* in the preceding note); *she'elot u-teshuvoth*, sec. 114; *hilkhot Tefillin*, secs.

in illicit sexual relations with certain women,¹⁰ he responded that *shelim* have an arrangement whereby their observance of the Torah is contingent on being treated properly by human beings. If someone harms (or bothers) them, however, they can, in turn, harm that person. The discussions in *Sefer Or Zarua*^c concerning *shelim* correspond closely to material found in *Sefer Hasidim* and in an esoteric text of *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, *Sefer ha-Kavod*.¹¹

R. Avigdor b. Elijah Katz was born in Italy and studied under R. Simḥah of Spires.¹² R. Simḥah permitted R. Avigdor to perform *leḥishah* over

555, 561–63; *pishei 'Avodah Zarah*, sec. 200; Simcha Emanuel, “Ha-Polmos ‘al Nosah ha-Tefillah shel Hasidei Ashkenaz,” *Mehqerei Talmud* 3 (in press), nn. 130–32; and see above, n. 6. Cf. *hilkhot moẓa’ei Shabbat*, sec. 95; *hilkhot qeri’at Shema*, sec. 17; *pishei Bava Mezi’ā*, sec. 3; and Ta-Shma, *Ha-Nigleh shebe-Nistar*, 96, n. 56. [For R. Isaac as a student of R. Abraham b. Azriel, see also ‘Arugat ha-Bosem, ed. Urbach, 4:112–13, 119, 126–27, 165. On the association of R. Jonathan b. Isaac of Würzburg, another of R. Isaac’s teachers, with *sod* material, see Gershon Scholem, *Reshit ha-Qabbalah* (Tel Aviv, 1948), 197–98, and Urbach, *Ba’alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:222, 438.]

¹⁰This is apparently a reference to *Niddah* 13b, which R. Isaac *Or Zarua*^c addresses independently at the end of *hilkhot ba’al qeri* (pt. 1, sec. 124). In that section, he also recounts the story of a *ḥasid* who was seduced by a female demon on Yom Kippur. Cf. Yosef Dan, “Sippurim Dimonologiyim mi-Kitvei R. Yehudah he-Hasid,” *Tarbiz* 30 (1961):278–89; idem, *Torat ha-Sod shel Hasidut Ashkenaz*, 194–200; and above, ch. 4, n. 42. Dan notes that not all the stories or anecdotes about demons preserved by *Hasidei Ashkenaz* necessarily reflect Pietist beliefs. These were often popular stories, preserved in their original form in order to make particular points of theology.

¹¹See Dan, *Torat ha-Sod shel Hasidut Ashkenaz*, 186–88. The notion that *shelim* observe *mitzvot* is part of the larger view of the German Pietists (which conflicts with the views of both philosophers and kabbalists) that demonic powers emerge from the positive aspect of the Divine realm. Cf. *Sefer Hasidim Parma*, secs. 733, 1763, 379 Barbara Newman, “Possessed by the Spirit: Devout Women, Demoniacs, and the Apostolic Life in the Thirteenth Century,” *Speculum* 73 (1998): 749–57; and Dorit Alloro-Cohen, “Ha-Mageyah veha-Kishuf be-Sefer ha-Zohar” (Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University, 1989). See also *Sefer Or Zarua*^c, pt. 2, sec. 50 (end), which records the story of R. Aqivah (ר' עקיבא) and his meeting with a dead person who had to gather trees every day in order to be burned with them. He had been a tax collector who had hurt (or killed) the poor. He would be released from this plight only if he had a son who could say ברכו (ברוך) and קדיש (קדשה), to which the community would answer יהא שמייה רבבה וככ' (יהא שמייה רבבה וככ'). Although this story is present in a number of midrashim, the only other medieval Ashkenazic sources in which it is found are mystical texts or texts associated with *Hasidei Ashkenaz* and their followers. See Ta-Shma, *Minhag Ashkenaz ha-Qadmon*, 299–308; M. B. Lerner, “Ma’aseh ha-Tanna veha-Met,” *Gilgulav ha-Sifruyyim veha-Hilkhatiyyim*, *Assafot* 2 (1988):29–68; *Sippurei Gilgulim ve-Ruhot*, ed. M. Y. Blau (New York, 1995), 40–41; and above, ch. 3, n. 56.

¹²R. Simḥah studied with R. Eleazar of Metz and with R. Abraham b. Samuel he-Hasid, among others. See Urbach, *Ba’alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:411–20, who also notes that

CHAPTER 5

R. Simḥah's eyes on the Sabbath, when R. Simḥah experienced severe discomfort. R. Avigdor learned the *leḥishah* technique from a woman and performed it twice a day.¹³ R. Avigdor authored a commentary to the *Avinu Malkenu* prayer that was copied after R. Eleazar of Worms's esoteric treatise, *Hokhmat ha-Nefesh*. The commentary refers to *sod* dimensions of *Avinu Malkenu*, in addition to describing exoteric concepts of repentance and redemption. It also identifies parts of the prayer that are related to *Hekhalot* literature.¹⁴

R. Avigdor espoused the notion of directing prayer through angels who could serve as intermediaries (וְתַהֲיוּ מַלְيָכִים יוֹשְׁרִים לִפְנֵינוּ).¹⁵ Moreover, several manuscripts attribute a magical *shemirat ha-derekh* to him. After a person has departed his city, and he is at the distance of an arrow's flight, he should turn his back toward the city. According to one version, he should then recite the verse that records Jacob's recognition of the angels who met him (and protected him) following his departure from Lavan, and then state: "Just as Jacob was not harmed by his brother Esau, I should certainly not be harmed."¹⁶ In a second

R. Judah *he-Hasid* asked a halakhic question of R. Simḥah. R. Simḥah, in turn, authored a commentary to *Sifra*, and he is included in the "Spires circle" that was influenced by *Hasidei Ashkenaz*. For these and additional affinities with *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, see above, ch. 1, n. 145–46, and ch. 2, n. 16. For R. Avigdor Katz's pietism, see above, ch. 2, sec. 1 (end).

¹³See ms. Bodl. 666 (*Mordekhai Gittin*, at the end of *perek ha-zoreq*); *Teshuvot Maharam* (Prague), #55; *Mordekhai Shabbat*, sec. 385; Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:411, n. 20; Yuval, *Hakhamim be-Doram*, 260–61; and Joshua Trachtenberg, *Jewish Magic and Superstition* (New York, 1939), 199–200. In response to a question from R. Zedekiah b. Abraham *ha-Rofe*, R. Avigdor prohibited *lehitshot* that invoked *shedim*, whether for personal needs or to divine the future. See *Shibbolei ha-Leqet*—*Ha-heleq ha-Sheni*, ed. Simcha Hasida (Jerusalem, 1988), 41–43 (sec. 10). Cf. above, ch. 4, n. 15, and below, nn. 23, 54. Cf. the position of Ri, cited in *Arba'ah Turim*, *Yoreh De'ah*, sec. 179; *Beit Yosef*, ad loc.; *Arba'ah Turim*, *Orah Hayyim*, sec. 306; and *Sefer Gematri'ot le-R. Yehudah he-Hasid*, ed. Daniel Abrams and Israel Ta-Shma (Los Angeles, 1998), introduction, 16, and 59 (fol. 18r).

¹⁴See ms. Cambr. Add. 858 (Ashkenaz, fifteenth century), fols. 34r (העתיקתי מס'ר) (פירוש אבינו מלכנו דקדוק מורה"ץ) and 45r–45v (חכמת הנפש סוד הר' אלעוזר) and see above, ch. 2, n. 30. Cf. *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur*, ed. Peter Schäfer et al. (Tübingen, 1981), sec. 334. On R. Avigdor's ethical treatise, *Sha'arei Musar*, which has parallels to *Sefer Hasidim* and cites *Hekhalot* literature, see above, ch. 2, nn. 32–34.

¹⁵See *Shibbolei ha-Leqet*, sec. 282, and above, ch. 3, nn. 4, 38. R. Avigdor bases his reading primarily on an interpretation of Rashi. Cf. below, n. 50.

¹⁶See ms. Sassoon 408=B.M. Or. 14055 (Italy, fourteenth century), fols. 192–93. (שמירת הדרכ מושם הר' אביגדור בזון צדק). and ms. Vat. 243, fol. 12r. *Bab ha-R' Avigdor Bazon* (fol. 4v). Vat. 243 also contains magical formulae from R. Meir of Rothenburg (fol. 4v), his student R. Dan [Ashkenazi] (fols. 6v, 10r; see below, n. 46), and a number of other

version, the person recites a specific Divine Name that will protect him from all kinds of *maziqin* (*u-mikol maziq u-maziq yishamer*).¹⁷ An Italian manuscript contains a brief commentary on Ezekiel's vision of the chariot according to both *peshat* and *sod* ascribed to R. Avigdor of Rome.¹⁸

Ashkenazic rabbinic figures (and to solve a number of different problems). See also ms. Livorno Talmud Torah 138, fols. 28r, 29v, 36r, 38r. [Both ms. Sassoon 408 (fol. 70) and ms. Vat. 243 (fol. 171) contain a *shemirah la-derekh* that Ramban purportedly sent from Akko. See also ms. Sassoon 408, fols. 76–77, 85–89; ms. Vat. 243, fol. 8v; ms. Moscow-Guenzberg 1302; and below, n. 74. R. Avigdor's *shemirat ha-derekh* was based on *Sefer Yezirah*, and it includes the verse(s) that describe Jacob meeting the angels; cf. below, n. 78. See also ms. Cambr. Or. 71 (Ashkenaz, 1398), fol. 166r, for a similar *shemirat ha-derekh* involving the brother of the tosafist R. Solomon (*ha-qadosh*) of Dreux (cited above, ch. 2, n. 10).] Just prior to R. Avigdor's *segullah* in Vat. 243, a series of amulets and *kelaf* pieces are described. These contain Metatron and other angelic names, linked with various *avot*, to be used for revenge (*neqamah*). Also described is a properly prepared *kelaf* text that, if attached to the neck of a chicken, will lead to the identification of a thief. R. Avigdor's formulation is followed by a *petiḥat ha-lev* for after the Sabbath, which is meant to conjure and neutralize *Potah*, the angel of forgetfulness, and ensure that certain nefarious angelic figures (מלאכי חבלה) should not dominate, such as סָגָר, נָשָׁא, קָרָב. Cf. *Sefer Assufot*, ms. Mont. 134, 67r (published by S. A. Stern in *Zefunot* 1 [1989]:20–21); Marcus, *Piety and Society*, 113; and above, ch. 3, n. 59. Fol. 14r contains a *kabbalah me-R. Yehudah he-Hasid* to aid in childbearing. It includes the instruction that after a three-day period, the Names that Moses gave to Joshua should be written on the bark of a fruit-bearing tree. Fol. 14v contains a *qefizat ha-derekh* procedure attributed to R. Eleazar of Worms. It involves immersion and anointing of the body and the writing of *Shemot* on snakeskin, which should be worn as an amulet suspended from the left arm. See Mark Vermann and Shulamit Adler, “Path-Jumping in the Jewish Magical Tradition,” *Jewish Studies Quarterly* 1 (1996):139. Fol. 15r has another *qabbalah me-R. Yehudah he-Hasid*: whoever recites the following three verses will be saved from all troubles (אזה סתר לך ... בטחו בה עדי עד וכו'). This is followed by other means of protection against robbers, aids to travel, aids for difficult births, and the like, which also appear throughout ms. JNUL 8°476—partially described in Gershom Scholem, *Kitvei Yad be-Qabbalah* (Jerusalem, 1930), 8–12—and cf. above, ch. 4, n. 49.

¹⁷ See ms. B.M. Or. 10619 (sixteenth century), fol. 23r, and ms. Parma 671 (fifteenth century), fol. 93. [Fol. 95 has a *shemirat ha-derekh la-Ramban*; see the preceding note.] Cf. Parma 112 (46–50), 997 (297), 3499 (112). The biblical commentary associated with R. Avigdor and his circle, Hamburg 45, describes an unusual situation in which the noses of a Jew and a non-Jew were cut off and transplanted to the other person. This event and its results also appear in a collection of tales attributed to R. Judah *he-Hasid*. See H. J. Zimmels, “*Ketav Yad Hamburg Cod. hebr. 45 ve-Yihuso le-R. Avigdor Katz*,” *Ma’amarim le-Zikhron R. Zevi Perez Chajes*, ed. A. Aptowitzer and Z. Schwarz (Vienna, 1933), 260, and Dan, “*Sippurim Dimonologiyim mi-Kitvei R. Yehudah he-Hasid*,” 289.

¹⁸ See ms. Cambr. Add. 3111 (fifteenth century), fols. 63v–65r.

CHAPTER 5

R. Isaiah di Trani, another Italian tosafist and student-colleague of R. Simḥah of Spires who cites northern French and German rabbinic figures and works, ruled in a responsum that a particular adhesion of the lungs rendered an animal a *terefah* on halakhic grounds. But in addition, R. Isaiah writes, Elijah appeared to him in a dream and confirmed his ruling.¹⁹ To be sure, R. Isaiah stresses that dreams are not authoritative in and of themselves, and that his ruling is well-based in talmudic law. Nonetheless, R. Isaiah's experience is suggestive. R. Isaiah writes that when Elijah appeared in his dream, he asked for Elijah's guidance (siman) for the lenient and strict positions using a biblical phrase, a technique commonly used by R. Jacob of Marvège in his *She'elot u-Teshuvot min ha-Shamayim*.²⁰ In another instance, R. Isaiah is cited as permitting divination that is done using holy Divine Names (*Shemotav ha-qedoshim*), since "this is the greatness and might of the Almighty." Only the conjuring of *shedim* for this purpose is prohibited (because the manipulation of *shedim* is a form of sorcery).²¹

The Italian halakhist R. Zedekiah b. Abraham *ha-Rofe min ha-Anavim*, who studied in Germany and cites both R. Isaiah di Trani and R. Avigdor Katz frequently, among other tosafists and Ashkenazic authorities, reports in his

¹⁹See *Teshuvot R. Isaiah di Trani* [Rid], ed. Wertheimer, #112, 510–11; and cf. Israel Ta-Shma, "Ha-Rav Yeshayah di-Trani ha-Zaqen u-Qesharav 'im Bzyantiyyon ve-Freṣ Yisra'el," *Shalem* 4 (1984):409–16, and idem, "Sefer Shibbolei ha-Leqet u-Khfelav," *Italia* 11 (1996): 46–47. On Rid's place within the tosafist enterprise, cf. Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:413; Isadore Twersky, "The Contribution of Italian Sages to Rabbinic Literature," *Italia Judaica* (Rome, 1983), 390–400; and my "Progress and Tradition in Medieval Ashkenaz," *Jewish History* 14 (2000; in press).

²⁰See Ta-Shma, "Ha-Rav Yeshayah di-Trani," 415, n. 28. Cf. above, ch. 3, n. 79, and ch. 4, n. 59. See also *Tosafot Rid* to *Hagigah* 16a.

²¹See R. Jacob b. Asher, *Arba'ah Turim*, *Yoreh De'ah* 179, and *Beit Yosef*, ad loc., s.v. *katav ha-Ramah*. Cf. *Tosafot Rid* to *Qiddushin* 71a, and above, ch. 4, n. 15. (For the view of R. Jacob and his father, R. Asher, see below, n. 72.) Rid records a mystical interpretation found in *Sefer Hasidim* and other Pietist sources concerning the response of 'amen' to a blessing. See *Piskei R. Yeshayah di-Trani le-Massekhet Berakhot*, ed. A. Y. Wertheimer (Jerusalem, 1964), 164–65, and above, ch. 4, n. 2. On Rid and interpretations of *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, see above, ch. 1, nn. 88, 123. Rid's grandson Ri'az composed formulations against the study of philosophy, although he did not necessarily advocate the study of *sod*. See Simcha Assaf, *Meqorot le-Toledot ha-Hinnukh be-Yisra'el*, vol. 2 (Tel Aviv, 1931), 96–98. Abraham Abulafia had apparently taught (pieces of) *Moreh Nevukhim* to Ri'az (and to R. Zedekiah b. Abraham *ha-Rofe*; cf. the next note). See Ta-Shma, "Ha-Rav Yeshayah di-Trani ha-Zagen," 411, and Moshe Idel, R. Menahem Reqanati *ha-Mequbbal*, vol. 1 (Tel Aviv, 1998), 36.

Shibbolei ha-Leqet that unnamed *rabbanim* performed a *she’elat ḥalom* to know if the burning of the Talmud in *Zarefat* in 1244 (1242?) was ordained by the Creator in Heaven. The response they received was that, indeed, this tragic event was a Divine decree (*gezerah de-Oraita*).²² R. Ḥayyim Yosef David Azulai (*Hida*, d.1806) noted that *Shibbolei ha-Leqet* was influenced by R. Jacob of Marvège’s *She’elot u-Teshuvot min ha-Shamayim* (Provence, c.1200), which *Shibbolei ha-Leqet* cites a number of times, referring to R. Jacob as *ha-Zaddiq*.²³ It should also be noted that R. Mikha’el *ha-Mal’akh*, an otherwise unknown thirteenth-century rabbinic figure from northern France, is described as having “ascended to the heavens” to resolve doubts or questions through trances and other methods similar to those ascribed to R. Jacob of Marvège.²⁴

²²See *Shibbolei ha-Leqet*, sec. 263 (*hilkhot ta’anit*), and the parallel citation in Yehiel b. Yequiti’el, *Tanya Rabbati* (Warsaw, 1879), sec. 58 (end), fol. 63. Cf. *She’elot u-Teshuvot min ha-Shamayim*, ed. Margoliot, editor’s introduction, 18–19, and the description in *Midrash ‘Asarah Harugei Malkhut* (above, ch. 3, n. 34) of R. Yishma’el’s heavenly ascent to ascertain whether the decree against the martyrs had emanated from the Almighty. See also above, n. 13, ch. 3, n. 9; and ch. 4, n. 19. On the relationship between *Shibbolei ha-Leqet* and Ashkenazic rabbinic literature, see now Ya’akov Spiegel, *Seder Hovat Leil Shimmurim* (Lod, 1998), editor’s introduction, 7–8, 12, 26; and above, ch. 3, n. 52.

²³See, e.g., *Shibbolei ha-Leqet*, secs. 9, 31, 127, 157 (typically cited as **בשאלוות חלום העדריק ר' יעקב**); *Shibbolei ha-Leqet (Ha-heleq ha-Sheni)*, ed. S. Hasida, 4 (sec. 1, end), 75 (sec. 17); and ms. Bodl. 659 (*Shibbolei ha-Leqet ha-Qazar*), fols. 10v, 17v, 34, 40r, 49v, 100v; and above, ch. 4, n. 61. Cf. *Hida*, *Shem ha-Gedolim, ma’arekhet ha-gedolim*, s.v. R. Ya’aqov *he-Hasid*; *She’elot u-Teshuvot min ha-Shamayim*, ed. R. Margoliot, 19–21; Israel Ta-Shma, “*She’elot u-Teshuvot min ha-Shamayim, Ha-Qovez ve-Tosfotav*,” *Tarbiz* 57 (1988):56–63; idem, *Minhag Ashkenaz ha-Qadmon*, 205; Yosef Dan, “*Shut min ha-Shamayim Meyuhasot le-R. Eleazar mi-Vermaiza*,” *Sinai* 69 (1971):195; and my “Rabbinic Figures in Castilian Kabbalistic Pseudepigraphy: R. Yehudah *he-Hasid* and R. Elhanan of Corbeil,” *Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy* 3 (1993):95, n. 66. The phrases *kefi mah she-yoruni min ha-shamayim* and *kol mah she-yar’uhu min ha-shamayim* appear in a document that binds the litigants to the decisions of the judges, found in *Shibbolei ha-Leqet*, vol. 2, ed. M. Z. Hasida (Jerusalem, 1969), *hilkhot dayanim*, 202. Cf., however, Twersky, *Rabad of Posquieres*, 291–97, and above, ch. 1, n. 130.

²⁴See Alexander Marx, “A New Collection of MSS. in the Cambridge Library,” *PAAJR* 4 (1933):153, n. 29; R. Abraham Torrutiel’s supplement to Ibn Daud’s *Sefer ha-Qabbalah* in *Sefer ha-Hakhamim ve-Qorot ha-Yamim*, ed. Adolf Neubauer (Oxford, 1887) [*Sefer ha-Qabbalah le-R. Avraham b. Shelomoh*], 105, and in Avraham David, *Shetei Keroniqot Ivriyyot mi-Dor Gerush Sefarad* (Jerusalem, 1979), 28; and Moshe Idel, *Kabbalah: New Perspectives* (New Haven, 1988), 91; and cf. ms. Bodl. 2423 (Ashkenaz, fourteenth century), 4v. Interestingly, in this description, Rashi is considered to be a predecessor of R. Jacob of Marvège in these matters; see above, ch. 3, n. 50. The name R. Mikha’el is found in proximity to Ashkenazic pietistic material in ms. Parma 541, fol. 264r, and in ms. Bodl. 271, fol. 107r. Cf. Chaim Levine, “*Al Perush ha-Mahzor ha-Meyuhas*

CHAPTER 5

Shibbolei ha-Leqet's inclusion of passages and practices from *Hekhalot* literature has already been noted, as has its use of pietistic material from R. Judah *he-Hasid* (including the little-known quasi-mystical *te'amim shel R. Yehudah he-Hasid*²⁵) and other teachings and stringencies of *hasidut Ashkenaz*.²⁶ Indeed, precisely because of its pietistic bent, *Shibbolei ha-Leqet* has also been shown to be an important source of Ashkenazic customs for the *Zohar*.²⁷

Moreover, *Shibbolei ha-Leqet* refers to esoteric concepts held by *Hasidei Ashkenaz* and the members of the *Hug ha-Keruv ha-Meyuhad*. Among these are the notion of the feminine aspect of the Godhead,²⁸ the mystical correlation between the performance of *berit milah* and the Tetragrammaton (through circumcision, one cleaves to the Divine Name),²⁹ as well as the concept—found in *Shi'ur Qomah* and other earlier mystical works—that the Torah is comprised of a series of Divine Names (the Torah in its entirety can be transmuted through a new division of letters into names of God). This concept was also espoused by R. Eleazar of Worms (and other Pietist writers) and by Ramban, raising the possibility that both Ramban and *Shibbolei ha-Leqet* received it from *Hasidei Ashkenaz*.³⁰

le-Raban," *Tarbiz* 29 (1960):167, for a R. Mikha'el *mi-Yavan*, and *Zohar Amar*, "Ziyyunei Qevarim be-Erez Yisra'el," *Qovez 'al Yad* n.s. 14 (1998):289, for a R. Meir *Zarefat Ba'al ha-Nes* who lived in the early thirteenth century.

²⁵See above, ch. 4, n. 24, and cf. Elliot Wolfson, "The Mystical Significance of Torah-Study in German Pietism," *JQR* 84 (1993):44–46. Note also the citation of *Sefer Gematri'ot* in *Shibbolei ha-Leqet*, sec. 137, and cf. *Sefer Gematri'ot* le-R. Yehudah *he-Hasid*, ed. Abrams and Ta-Shma, 4.

²⁶See above, ch. 1, n. 60, and ch. 2, n. 34. Regarding *Sefer Yezirah*, see *Shibbolei ha-Leqet*, sec. 126, and above, ch. 3, n. 31.

²⁷See, e.g., Ta-Shma, *Ha-Nigleh shebe-Nistar*, 21, n. 36, 22, 27–28; *my Jewish Education and Society*, 177–78, n. 81; and cf. above, ch. 3, n. 57.

²⁸See Wolfson, *Along the Path*, 25–29, 142–43, n. 184; and above, ch. 2, n. 34.

²⁹See Elliot Wolfson, "Circumcision and the Divine Name: A Study in the Transmission of Esoteric Doctrine," *JQR* 78 (1987): 85–112, esp. 110–11.

³⁰See *Shibbolei ha-Leqet*, sec. 8, citing unnamed earlier authorities (מצאות הטעם); *Sefer Roqeah*, sec. 311; Trachtenberg, *Jewish Magic and Superstition*, 314, n. 4; Wolfson, "The Mystical Significance of Torah-Study in German Pietism," 47–50; Moshe Idel, "Tefisat ha-Torah be-Sifrut ha-Hekhalot ve-Gilgulehah ba-Qabbalah," *Mehqerei Yerushalayim be-Mahshevet Yisra'el* 1 (1981):27–30, 53–54 (esp. n. 102); idem, "We Have No Kabbalistic Tradition on This," *Rabbi Moses Nahmanides (Ramban): Explorations in His Religious and Literary Virtuosity*, ed. Isadore Twersky (Cambridge, Mass., 1983), 54, n. 10; Israel Ta-Shma, "Be-Koah ha-Shem—Le-Toledotav shel Minhag Nishkah," *Sefer Bar Ilan* 26–27 (1995):389–99; and above, ch. 3, nn. 4, 28. Cf. Ruth Langer, *To Worship God Properly* (Cincinnati, 1998), 217–19.

In light of R. Zedekiah's affinities with *hasidut* and *sod*, the question of whether the *payyetan* R. Benjamin b. Abraham *ha-Navi* (ostensibly R. Zedekiah's brother Benjamin, who is mentioned constantly in *Shibbolei ha-Leqet*)³¹ had *sod* leanings, as his title *navi* suggests, must also be reevaluated. Shraga Abramson has argued that this title refers to R. Benjamin's superior Torah knowledge on an exoteric level, rather than to an inclination toward esoteric studies, and notes that *Shibbolei ha-Leqet* never refers to his brother by his title in any event.³² But if the author of *Shibbolei ha-Leqet* was himself sensitive to *sod*, as we have seen, it was perhaps not necessary to single out his brother in this manner. R. Benjamin is cited by *Shibbolei ha-Leqet* as interpreting the biblical phrase *zeroa' netuyah* (the Almighty's might)—which was active in securing the release of the Jews from Egypt—as “the *Shem ha-Meforash* which is called *Harba de-Moshe*.” This magical formula is found in a version of *Sefer ha-Razim*, and it was alleged that Moses used it to perform all the signs he did in Egypt.³³

³¹A הלכות שחיטה לר' יהודה בן בנימין בן אברהם הרופא is found in ms. Paris 620, fols. 247–58, 294–97; and see also fols. 240v–249 (ר' יהודה בן בנימין ענו). Cf. Ta-Shma, *Ha-Nigleh shebe-Nistar*, 27; idem, in *Zion* 54 (1989):205; and Simcha Emanuel, “Sifrei Halakhah Avudim shel Ba’alei ha-Tosafot” (Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University, 1993), 253–59. Benjamin authored a brief, rhymed ethical treatise (*Sha’arei Darkhei Ez ha-] Hayyim*), that was mildly ascetic (זון להתרחק מהאיסור). It was published in *Qovez ‘al Yad* 1 (1885):71–74, and see also, e.g., ms. Parma 918, fols. 8v–11v; and above, ch. 2, n. 35.

³²Shraga Abramson, “*Navi, Ro’eh ve-Hozeh*—R. Avraham ha-Hozeh,” *Sefer Yovel Muggash li-Khvod ha-Rav Mordechai Kirschblum*, ed. David Telsner (Jerusalem, 1993), 119–20, 125, 132. On the esoteric implications of the title *navi* and its usage in Ashkenaz, see below, n. 67.

³³See *Shibbolei ha-Leqet*, sec. 218 (fol. 97a); Y. Spiegel, *Seder Hovat Leil Shimmurim*, 90–91; above, ch. 3, n. 12, and cf. *Sefer ha-Razim*, ed. Mordekhai Margoliot (Jerusalem, 1967), editor’s introduction, 61–62 (which notes that *Shibbolei ha-Leqet* is citing a different version of *Sefer ha-Razim* than the one that is extant). On *Harba de-Moshe* in this context, cf. Simcha Emanuel, *Teshuvot ha-Geonim ha-Hadashot* (Jerusalem, 1995), 131. On the use by Moses of *Shem ha-Meforash* to perform the signs in Egypt (see Rashi to Exodus 2:4), cf. *Tosafot ha-Shalem*, ed. Jacob Gellis, vol. 6, 186–87, and above, ch. 4, n. 42. For a mystical formulation in one of R. Benjamin Anav’s *piyyutim*, see Wolfson, *Along the Path*, 119, n. 54. See also *Shibbolei ha-Leqet—Ha-heleq ha-Sheni*, ed. Hasida, editor’s introduction, 37–41, and esp. 40, n. 119.

For another reference to a nonextant version of *Sefer ha-Razim*, see Daniel Abrams, “*Sefer Shaqed le-R. Shemu’el b. R. Qalonymus ve-Torat ha-Kavod shel Talmid R. Eleazar mi-Vorms*,” *Assufot* (forthcoming), n. 87. R. Eleazar of Worms cites the extant version of *Sefer ha-Razim* frequently, especially in his *Sodei Razzaya*, but almost exclusively with regard to descriptions of the heavens rather than for its magical material; see Margoliot, xiv, 59, and above, ch. 4, n. 42. Generally speaking, however, *Sefer ha-Razim* is not cited

CHAPTER 5

R. Elijah Menahem b. Moses of London (1220–84), a contemporary of R. Meir of Rothenburg who studied also in northern France and was a descendant of R. Simeon *ha-Gadol*,³⁴ inserted formulae involving Divine Names in *mezuzot* (literally, he carved Names on the doorpost) that protected the home from fire.³⁵ He referred to the *sod* interpretations implicit in the Targum to the verses of *qedushah de-sidra*.³⁶ R. Elijah is also credited with transmitting two magical adjurations that included both Divine and angelic names. One of them was designed to bring on a dream that would answer particular questions (similar to a *she'elat halom*). This procedure involved the release of a Divine Name that could be found by pronouncing formulae over certain grasses or herbs (*Shem ha-katuv be-yereq*) and was described as *seder ha-she'elah*.³⁷ R. Eliyahu also reports a prophetic dream he had (זהנה אקיין) in which he offered, in response to a question, an interpretation of a problematic passage in the

extensively by Ashkenazic rabbinic sources, despite its relationship to *Hekhalot* literature (see, e.g., Margoliot, 41). This is perhaps because much of the magic in *Sefer ha-Razim* is associated with amulets and substances, in addition to any magical formulae. Ashkenazic rabbinic magic is, almost exclusively, formulaic or literary. See above, introduction, at n. 28.

³⁴See Cecil Roth, "Toledot Rabbenu Eliyyahu Menahem mi-Londrish," in *Perushei Rabbenu Eliyyahu mi-Londrish u-Fesaqav*, ed. M. Y. Zaks (Jerusalem, 1956), 20–22, 29, 41. Cf. Grossman, *Hakhmei Ashkenaz ha-Rishonim*, 87–88, and above, ch. 4, n. 5. On R. Elijah's ascetic tendencies, see Roth, *The Intellectual Activities of Medieval English Jewry*, 62–64.

³⁵See A. Marmorstein, "Some Hitherto Unknown Jewish Scholars of Angevin England," *JQR* 19 (1928–29):32; ר' מנחם חזן מלונדון [ר' אליהו מל' מונז'ה] חקק על משקוף הבית בסכין את השמות וניגל כל הבית of protection, cf. Victor Aptowitzer, "Les Noms de Dieu et des Anges dans la Mezouza," *REJ* 60 (1910):39–52, and *REJ* 65 (1913):54–60 (and see above, ch. 3, n. 57, and ch. 4, n. 16); and Wolfson, "Circumcision and the Divine Name," 81–82.

³⁶See Perushai Rabbenu Eliyahu (*Pesaqim mi-Sefer Zera'im*), 34–35, and cf. Langer, *To Worship God Properly*, 211, 219, n. 11.

³⁷ See ms. Sassoon 290, fol. 381r, sec. 1003:

מה שיסד הר' אליהו מלוגורייש בשחרציה לעשות שאלהר תפנה לבך משר עסקים ותיזיר כוונך ומחשבך בהכנות החדרס. ישב בדד באימה מתעטף בטלייהו וחפלין בראשו ונך יהחיל מכתם לדוד כל מומרו בכוונה הלב... ויקראם הבוגרונים ואה' יכרע על ברכוו ובפיו למרוח וכבה יבר... י"ר מלפנייך כל ייחשוב ייחשב בשם שכחוב לפניו ולאיב' יבטאהו בשפחים. ועוד אני מתחנן לנפרך בסמן ייחשוב בשעה קצotta השם הגדול החוקן במצוות אהרן הנחalker לשלשה בתים... אottiות עפ' צירוף הנקודות. ועוד אני מתחוויל לנפרך בשם ד' המפורש א-ה-ה... עליה למניין שביעים ושתים... וכל אלו הדברים שאלת הראשונה.

grace after meals.³⁸ There appears to have been a strong connection between R. Elijah's father, R. Moses of London, and R. Moses of Evreux.³⁹

צווארו ויהיו בידיו למשמרת עד עת צורך ואח"כ יאמר... השר הגדול כמו שכותוב למלعلا בסוד הראשון גנגיון – שאלת חלום בערב – קלף קשור במשמעות ובנויות וכו'}. ואם יורצה להשתמש בשם המפורסם בעשביים לבר יאמר יר"מ כל יכול מוטל על כל יודע כל... שותקבת הפלתי אני פ' עבדך בן אמרך וזה למשרתך השר הגדול שנקרו מטרון שתשלח לי את יבתכיאל ואת יתבתיאל ואת קפקפיאל אשר הם מותחת רשותו שיחיעוני בכתיבתך מפורשת בזה הניר ששמתי במקום פ' התשובה שאלתי שהוא קר וכך בשם ה'... שכותבים למלعلا בראשן. 38ב- גם לבת קול למלعلا מהש' הנכבד ב"ה בשם הכתוב בעשביים ולעשות קודם הבקשה על דרך הכתובים ולחשוב בו ככתבו. ובהלן האחרון לשני ושנו לראשון גם הוא מען עוזין מכמ' עד יאבה העוז ב"ה ליתן לנו פנאי. השתרול בו למן תוע כל 382- (ס"י 1004) שולח עשביים ואומר שמות... ועוד כתוב ר' אליו כותב ששלוח השם הכתוב בעשביים וכן אמר זה החשם עם העשב... ואח"כ תוכיר את השמות הכתובים למטה בכוונת הלב ואלו הן השמות... משבייע יה-ו-ה. נ"א קבלה מגוזלי אשכזב יזכרנו בעשבי שליטין... י"מ מדרות הוזן וזהו אל-להים ויבין ה' ר' וכו'.

[The end of sec. 1002 discusses the Name of fourteen letters (see below, n. 63) in a kabbalistic context. See also ms. JNUL 8° 397, fol. 364r.]

Cf. Roth, "Toledot Rabbenu Eliyyahu," 39–40. Once again, the preparations involved in this procedure are reminiscent of material found in *Hekhalot* literature. The *hashba'ot* themselves are similar to those found in earlier Ashkenazic manuscripts; cf. above, ch. 3, n. 112. [On the angel קפקפיאל, see Theodore Schrire, *Hebrew Magic Amulets* (New York, 1966), 130.] In addition, R. Isaac of Chinon, whose familiarity with *hashba'ot* and interest in mystical prayers and supplications has been documented (above, ch. 3, n. 104), was a northern French contemporary of R. Elijah. [R. Isaac's son, R. Samson b. Isaac of Chinon (author of *Sefer Keritot*, d.c.1330) is reported, by R. Perez b. Isaac *ha-Kohen*, to have prayed with simple *kavvanah* (אני מתפלל לדעת זה התיינוק).] This description was meant by R. Samson to show his disagreement with the approach of the kabbalists, who prayed to one *sefrah* or another, depending on the particular prayer. See *She'elot u-Teshuvot min ha-Rivash*, 157.]

³⁸See Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 2:505–6. Urbach makes no note of the prophetic experience in this passage, citing it with regard to a different issue entirely. (Interestingly, R. Elijah—like R. Zedekiah b. Abraham, author of *Shibbolei ha-Leqet*—was a medical doctor).

³⁹See Y. N. Epstein, "Perishat R. Eliyyahu Menahem b. Mosheh mi-Londrish," *Madda'ei ha-Yahadut* 1 (1926):64–65; E. E. Urbach, "Mi-Toratam shel *Hakhmei Angliyyah mi-Lifnei ha-Gerush*," *Sefer ha-Yovel li-Khevod Yisra'el Brody* (London, 1967), 7; and Israel Ta-Shma, "Ketav Yad Parma 933 ('Tosafot Hakhmei Angliyyah)' ve-'Erko," 'Alei Sefer 5 (1978):92–96. See also Y. S. Lange, "Le-'Inyan ha-Semaq mi-Zurich," 'Alei Sefer 4 (1978):178–79, who suggests, like Urbach, that R. Moses of London may have studied in Evreux. Regarding R. Jacob *Hazzan* of London and *sod*, see, e.g., his *Ez Hayyim*, ed. Israel Brody (Jerusalem, 1962), 1:198–205; 2:334–39, 378–79; *Siddur Rabbenu Shelomoh mi-Germaiza ve-Siddur Hasidei Ashkenaz*, ed. Moshe Hershler (Jerusalem, 1972), 82, n. 86; and above, ch. 3, n. 110.

CHAPTER 5

Another son of R. Moses of London, R. Yom Tov, whose pietistic tendencies were characterized by the phrase **חסיד היה וירא שמים**, took his own life as a means of achieving expiation. The text that reports this incident refers also to R. Moses as a *ḥasid* and suggests that R. Yom Tov was troubled by demonic forces within him that caused him to consider conversion to Christianity. To atone for these thoughts, he committed suicide. The writer of this text recommended, in the spirit of *ḥasidut Ashkenaz*, various forms of ascetic and physical penances (including עינויים, *סיגופים*, *מלכות*) that would allow the sinner to repent without having to lose his life.⁴⁰ It should be noted, however, that included in a series of questions concerning penances to which R. Judah *he-Hasid* responded is the following: if a person kills himself because of his sins (as a means of expiation), does he transgress the prohibition of committing suicide (as derived from the biblical phrase, **אך את דמכם לנטשׁתיכם אדרוש**)? In his response, R. Judah *he-Hasid* allowed or even prescribed suicide (**טוב הוא לאודם**) to atone for sins.⁴¹

R. Meir of Rothenburg was a student of R. Isaac *Or Zarua*^c and R. Avigdor of Vienna, and of other rabbinic figures linked to magic and *sod*, including R. Ezra *ha-Navi* of Moncontour⁴² and R. Yehiel of Paris.⁴³ R. Meir exhibited

⁴⁰Ms. Paris 1408, fol. 31. The text was published by Efraim Kupfer in *Tarbiz* 40 (1971):385–87. See also Urbach, *Ba’alei ha-Tosafot*, 2:498–99; Avraham Grossman, “Shorashav shel Qiddush ha-Shem be-Ashkenaz ha-Qedumah,” *Qedushat ha-Ḥayyim ve-Ḥeruf ha-Nefesh*, ed. I. Gafni and A. Ravitzky (Jerusalem, 1992), 126–27; idem, *Hakhmei Zarefat ha-Rishonim*, 503–4; and cf. Alexander Murray, *Suicide in the Middle Ages*, vol. 1 (Oxford, 1998), 339–47.

⁴¹See ms. Bodl. 682 (Ashkenaz, after 1452), fol. 370r (published now in Shlomo Spitzer, “She’elot u-Teshuvot Rabbenu Yehuda *he-Hasid* be-Inyanei Teshuvah,” *Sefer ha-Zikkaron le-R. Shemu’el Barukh Werner*, ed. Yosef Buksboim [Jerusalem, 1996], 202). For a description of the manuscript (which consists primarily of an annotated **ש. קייזר פסקי דין ר' יודה**), cf. S. Emanuel in *Me-Ginzei ha-Makhon le-Tazlumei Kitvei ha-Yad ha-‘Ivriyyim*, ed. Avraham David (Jerusalem, 1995), 105. [For other examples of R. Judah *he-Hasid*’s penitential responsa, see Ivan Marcus, “Hibburei ha-Teshuvah shel ḥasidei Ashkenaz,” *Studies in Jewish Mysticism, Philosophy and Ethical Literature Presented to Isaiah Tishby*, ed. J. Dan and J. Hacker (Jerusalem, 1986), 375, n. 30. And cf. my “Rabbinic Figures in Castilian Kabbalistic Pseudepigraphy,” 94, n. 63, and above, ch. 4, n. 30.] In this fascinating (and troubling) responsum, R. Judah *he-Hasid* cites several incidents and texts as proofs—including the death of R. Eliezer b. Haradja, who killed himself for his sins and was praised by a heavenly voice; a passage in *Bereshit Rabbah* asserting that the nephew of R. Yose b. Yo‘ezer killed himself in a torturous manner and was considered meritorious; and the case of an apostate who said he sinned through water (the baptismal font) and therefore threw himself into water (and drowned) as a means of expiation.

⁴²On R. Ezra *ha-Navi* of Moncontour, see below, n. 67.

affinities with the German Pietists, and with R. Judah *he-Hasid* in particular, on a wide range of issues. These include conservatism in halakhic decision-making, the conception of *qiddush ha-Shem*, biblical interpretations characterized as *ta'amei massoret*, liturgical practices and *nosah ha-tefillah* (for which R. Meir adduced passages in *Hekhalot* literature in support of readings favored by R. Judah), procedures for repentance and *tiqqunei teshuvah*, and even protection of women from spousal abuse and attitudes toward *Erez Yisra'el*.⁴⁴

⁴³R. Yehiel (d.c.1265) wrote a commentary on the *Hekhalot*-based *E-l Adon* prayer. See ms. Paris l'Alliance 133, cited in Colette Sirat, "Un nouveau manuscrit du *Mahzor Vitry*," *REJ* 125 (1966):262; Israel Ta-Shma, "Li-Meqorotav ha-Sifruyyim shel *Sefer ha-Zohar*," *Tarbiz* 60 (1991):663–65; and idem, *Ha-Nigleh shebe-Nistar*, 49, 95, n. 42. Although the recitation of *E-l Adon* was included in the *siddur* of R. Eleazar of Worms and in the *siddur* of R. Judah b. Yaqr (which means, as Ta-Shma notes, that it was known within the circle of Ri's students even before R. Yehiel of Paris), R. Yehiel's interest in this particular hymn is nonetheless significant. On the *Hekhalot* aspects of *E-l Adon* (which can be discerned from the prayer commentaries of *Hasidei Ashkenaz* and R. Judah b. Yaqr), see Meir Bar-Ilan, *Sitrei Tefillah ve-Hekhalot* (Jerusalem, 1987), 115–20.

Underscoring the need to recite the *berakhah* *'ahat me'en sheva* in the *ma'ariv* service on Friday night carefully and without interruption, R. Yehiel is said to have been in contact with a *neshamah* who described how the angels throw him up and let him descend on his own because he used to talk during the *hazzan's* recitation of this prayer. See S. Sha'anan, "Pisqei R. Perez va-Aherim be-'Inyanei Orah Hayyim," *Moriah* 17:9–10 (1991):14, sec. 26, and above, ch. 2, n. 70. For a similar phenomenon in *Sefer Hasidim* (recorded also in *Arba'ah Turim*), see above, ch. 2, n. 52. The notion that there are forty-nine distinct approaches to every halakhic issue, associated by Ritva ('Eruvin 13b) and Maharshal (*Yam shel Shelomoh*, introduction to *Bava Qamma*), with esoteric teachings, is cited by R. Perez of Corbeil from *Tosafot* R. Yehiel (on the basis of a passage in *Midrash Tehillim*). See *Tosafot* R. Perez *ha-Shalem* 'al *Massekhet Eruvin*, ed. Chaim Dickman (Jerusalem, 1991), 48. On R. Yehiel's interest in Avraham Ibn Ezra (and his contacts with R. Solomon b. Samuel), see above, ch. 2, n. 8. Cf. ms. Vat. 324, fol. 278 (questions concerning resurrection in which R. Yehiel of Paris's name appears), and *Arugat ha-Bosem*, ed. Urbach, 4:39, n. 82.

⁴⁴[Although many of the following references are mentioned above, in a series of notes at the end of ch. 2 (in the section on Maharam's pietism and affinities with *hasidut Ashkenaz*), it is worthwhile listing them again here, with some additional sources, in a single comprehensive note.] See, e.g., ms. Cambr. Add. 1022, fol. 100v; *Sefer Tashbez*, sec. 553; Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 2:522, 536, 547, 564; *Ta'amei Mesoret ha-Miqra lel-R. Yehudah he-Hasid*, ed. Y. S. Lange (Jerusalem, 1981), 11; idem, "Perush Ba'alei ha-Tosafot 'al ha-Torah-Ketav Yad Paris 48," *Alei Sefer* 5 (1978):73; *Teshuvot u-Fesaqim le-R. Meir mi-Rothenburg*, ed. I. Z. Kahana, vol. 1 (Jerusalem, 1957), 14–15; my "Preservation, Creativity and Courage: The Life and Works of R. Meir of Rothenburg," *Jewish Book Annual* 50 (1992–93):249–59; Israel Ta-Shma, "Al Odot Yahasam shel Qadmonei Ashkenaz le-'Erekh ha-'Aliyah le Erez Yisra'el," *Shalem* 6 (1992):315–17, but

CHAPTER 5

It should also be noted that R. Meir studied for a time with R. Samuel of Evreux.⁴⁵

As reflected in a number of manuscript passages, R. Meir was involved in aspects of both magic and practical esoteric applications, through the recitation of *Shemot* and mystical formulae, and the writing of amulets involving letter combinations and the use of Divine Names. In some instances, his formulae are recorded in manuscripts in close proximity to those of R. Judah *he-Hasid*, R. Eleazar of Worms, and other Ashkenazic figures, including his own student, R. Dan. The purpose of these formulae was to achieve certain aims and states of being, such as *petihat ha-lev*,⁴⁶ and protection from physical harm and danger, whether caused by rulers and *maziqin*, or through incarceration.⁴⁷ Maharam

cf. my “The ‘Aliyah of ‘Three Hundred Rabbis’ in 1211: Tosafist Attitudes Toward Settling in the Land of Israel,” *JQR* 76 (1986): 205–9; Avraham Grossman, “*Ziqato shel Maharam mi-Rothenburg ‘el Erez Yisra’el*,” *Cathedra* 84 (1997):63–84; idem, “*Yahasam shel Ḥakhmei Yemei ha-Benayim ‘al Haka’at Nashim*,” *Proceedings of the Tenth World Congress of Jewish Studies*, Div. B, vol. 1 (Jerusalem, 1990), 121–23 [=“Medieval Rabbinic Views on Wife-Beating,” *Jewish History* 5 (1991):57–61]; idem, “*Haggahot R. Shemayah be-Nosaḥ Perush Rashi*,” *Tarbiz* 60 (1991):91–92; Naftali Wieder, “*Be’ityah shel Gematria Anti-Nozerit ve-Anti-Islamit*,” *Sinai* 76 (1975):5–10; idem, “*Tiqqunim be-Nosaḥ ha-Tefillah be-Hashpa’at Leshonot Lo’aziyot*,” *Sinai* 81 (1977): 27–29; *Sefer Berakhot le-Maharam*, ed. Shlomo Spitzer (Jerusalem, 1988), 133; R. Meir of Rothenburg, *Responsa* (Prague), 517; *‘Arugat ha-Bosem*, ed. Urbach, 4:59–60; and cf. R. Langer, *To Worship God Properly*, 215–24, 233.

⁴⁵See Urbach, *Ba’alei ha-Tosafot*, 2:528 [For R. Meir’s impact on Ashkenaz throughout the fourteenth century and beyond, especially with regard to *tiqqunei teshuvah* and conservatism in halakhic decision-making, see above, ch. 1, n. 148; ch. 2, n. 48; and my entry in *The Yale Companion to Jewish Writing and Thought in German Culture*, 1096–1996, ed. S. Gilman and J. Zipes (New Haven, 1997), 27–34].

⁴⁶See ms. Vat. 243, fol. 4v [and cf. Israel Ta-Shma, “*Rabbenu Dan be-Ashkenaz uvi-Sefarad*,” *Studies . . . Presented to Isaiah Tishby*, ed. Dan and Hacker, 390–91, and ms. Livorno Talmud Tora 138, fol. 36r. A *qabbalah* (for salvation) from R. Dan is on fol. 6v; see also fol. 10r, and below, n. 78.] See also ms. JNUL 8°476, fol. 50v, and above, n. 16. For a Sabbath practice that Maharam mi-Rothenburg endorsed as a means of achieving *petihat ha-lev*, see the passage in ms. Montefiore 130, fols. 54v–55r, cited by Israel Ta-Shma, “*Be’erah shel Miryam*,” *Mehqerei Yerushalayim be-Mahsheveth Yisra’el* 4 (1985): 263 [=*Minhag Ashkenaz ha-Qadmon*, 213–14]; and cf. ms. Moscow-Guenzberg 182, fol. 156r, in the name of עוזן מהר”ם נשותנו (= *Mahar”m Nashtano*).

⁴⁷See Gershom Scholem’s transcription of ms. Cambr. Add. 664, fol. 72r, in *Qiryat Sefer* 4 (1927–29):317—“When the king wished to detain R. Meir in prison, R. Meir uttered a verse and was willingly released.” See also *Shitat ha-Qadmonim ‘al Massekhet Yevamot*, ed. Moshe Blau (Jerusalem, 1986), editor’s introduction, 8. Scholem writes that R. Meir is mentioned as a “*ba’al Shem* and *ba’al nissim* in numerous old manuscripts of practical kabbalah.” See also ms. Moscow-Guenzberg 717, fol. 185, and ms. Bodl. 1936,

fol. 72r–72v, for *hashba'ot* and amulets from R. Meir of Rothenburg and Ramban that could be employed to ease childbirth, to thwart enemies, to make a person beloved by all, and to secure the Almighty's assistance. Cf. David Berger, *The Jewish-Christian Debate in the High Middle Ages* (Philadelphia, 1979), 253; *Sefer Tashbez*, secs. 257–58 (and *Matteh Mosheh*, sec. 370); Elliot Wolfson, "Sacred Space and Mental Iconography," *Ki Barukh Hu*, ed. Robert Chazan et al. (Winona Lake, 1999), 624, n. 110; and above, ch. 3, n. 56. [Mystical and magical material from Ramban is frequently linked to and interchanged with material from Ashkenazic figures, hardly surprising in light of Ramban's genuine affinities with Ashkenazic teachings in these areas. See, e.g., the literature cited in my "Rabbinic Figures in Castilian Kabbalistic Pseudepigraphy," 108–9, n. 108; Ta-Shma, *Ha-Nigleh shebe-Nistar*, 31–40, 50–52; A. Grossman, "Ziqqato shel Maharam mi-Rothenburg 'el Erez Yisra'el," 66, n. 8; and above, ch. 4, n. 35. Regarding liturgical texts attributed to R. Judah *he-Hasid* and to Ramban, cf. above, ch. 1, nn. 89, 112; ch. 3, n. 110; and below, n. 74. See also ms. Parma 540, fol. 19 (above, ch. 3, n. 7).]

R. Meir's perception of the *mezuzah* as a protection from *shedim* and other forces emerges quite clearly from his well-known responsum on the need for *mezuzot* throughout one's residence (Cremona, #108): מובטחים שכלי בית שמוטקין במוותה כהכלתא, אין שום מזיך יכול לשלוות בו Cf. Baron, *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*, 5:317–18, n. 72. Note also a related formulation in *Arba'ah Turim*, *Yoreh De'ah*, sec. 286 (and in R. Asher b. Yehi'el, *Halakhot Qetanot*, *Hilkhot Mezuzah*, sec. 10): וכן עשה הר'ם לפתח בית מדרשו ואומר בשחה ישן בו שינת הצהרים היה רוח מבעתו מרטונברוג מזווה לפתח בית מדרשו ואומר בשחה ישן בו שינת הצהרים היה רוח מבעתו קודם שתקן בו מזווה. [See also Maharam's responsum (Lemberg, #140=Samson b. Zadoc, *Sefer Tashbez*, sec. 60) concerning the wearing of coral as a means of avoiding 'ayin ha-ra. Cf. *Teshuvot ha-Rashba*, 4:245, and H. J. Zimmels, *Magicians, Theologians and Doctors* (London, 1952), 136.]

In a responsum concerning the educational initiation ceremony that was in vogue in Ashkenaz throughout the high Middle Ages (see above, ch. 3, n. 17), R. Meir permitted eating the peeled eggs as part of the ceremony, despite talmudic concerns about the presence of *ruah ra'ah*, either because *ruah ra'ah* was perhaps no longer a common phenomenon in his day or because the (holy) writing on the eggs repelled the spirits. R. Meir was also not concerned that when children ate the cakes on the festival (*Shavu'ot*, when the ceremony normally took place), they would be liable for erasing the letters written on the cakes when they ate them. At the same time, R. Meir asserted that the writing on the cakes given to the children for *petihat ha-lev* should not include Divine Names (as was apparently the practice) but only angelic ones. See Marcus, *Rituals of Childhood*, 115–16. R. Meir's concern was not, however, a legalistic one designed to curtail or undercut the ceremony *per se*. As we have seen (above, n. 46), Maharam himself fully understood and supported the religio-magical conception of *petihat ha-lev*. Rather, R. Meir's concern was similar to the one expressed by R. Judah *he-Hasid* (Marcus, 114, with which R. Eleazar of Worms disagreed)—that biblical verses should not be written on the cakes (or that the cakes should not be given to the children to eat) because it was improper to excrete these verses. R. Meir was concerned about the improper treatment of *Shemot* themselves, while R. Judah extended this concern to the biblical verses in general (which contained and also represented *Shemot* in Ashkenazic thought; see above, n. 30). Both R. Meir and R. Judah had higher pietistic concerns that

CHAPTER 5

decided a matter of monetary law that he had not studied or discussed with his teachers based on what he learned from the angelic *ba'al ha-ḥalom* (הובחתי מפי) in a dream he had while being held captive in the tower of Ensisheim.⁴⁸ Moreover, R. Meir issued a *she'elat ḥalom* and a *goral* for predicting or knowing the future.⁴⁹

caused them to seek to modify this ceremony for *petihat ha-lev*. Cf. above, ch. 3, n. 21. It is also possible that R. Meir was seeking to create a kind of compromise between the views of R. Judah and R. Eleazar of Worms. The author of *Sefer Assufot*, whose interest in this ceremony was also centered on its *petihat ha-lev* aspect, followed the view of his teacher, R. Eleazar of Worms. See above, ch. 3, n. 18; S. E. Stern, "Seder Hinnukh ha-Yeladim le-Torah ule-Yir'ah mi-Beit Midrasham shel Hakhmei Ashkenaz," *Zefunot* 1:1 (1988):20–21; and cf. R. Yehezkel Landau's commentary, *Dagul me-Revayah*, to *O. H.* 340:3.

⁴⁸See *Teshuvot Maimuniyyot le-Sefer Qinyan* (*hilkhot sekhirut*, ch. 5), #31; and cf. *She'elot u-Teshuvot min ha-Shamayim*, ed. Margoliot, editor's introduction, 9; *Teshuvot Maharam b. Barukh*, ed. M. A. Bloch (Berlin, 1891), 201 [ms. Amsterdam II], #108 (end). See also *Tif'eret Shemu'el* to *Perush R. Asher b. Yehi'el*, *Bava Mezi'a*, ch. 6, n. 2. For additional examples of R. Meir's reliance on *ḥalomot*, see *Sefer Mordekhai*, *Bava Qamma*, sec. 1, and *Sefer ha-Parnas le-R. Mosheh Parnas Rothenburg* (Vilna, 1891), sec. 415.

⁴⁹See ms. Parma 1221 (Spain, fifteenth century), fol. 189r–290v, for a *she'elat ḥalom* to ascertain the end of days attributed to Maharam (שאלת הר' מאיר מרטנבורק על גואלתו מה שחראו לו בחולם). Cf. Adolf Neubauer, "Documents Inedits," *REJ* 12 (1886):92; Scholem, above, n. 47; idem, *Qiryat Sefer* 7 (1930–31):162. For the *goral*, see the manuscript described in *Ohel Hayim* [A Catalogue of the Manuscripts of the Manfred and Anne Lehmann Family], ed. Moshe Hallamish and Elazar Hurvitz, vol. 1 [Kabbalistic Manuscripts], (New York, 1988), 193–94. Fol. 21 contains a *qabbalah* from R. Judah *he-Hasid* on what to do if one sees an *'adam ra* and is afraid of him. [Also in this passage, *he-Hakham vehe-Hasid R. Yizhaq Zarefati* (cf. my "Rabbinic Figures in Castilian Kabbalistic Pseudepigraphy," 100, n. 80) is linked to the recitation of a Divine Name by an unnamed Jew, which caused an attacker hoisting a sword to fall.] Fol. 44r records the *goral* of Maharam ("to know what will be"). Cf. ms. Moscow-Guenzberg 734, fols. 92r (*mequbbal me-R. Yehudah he-Hasid*, for protection from an evil person) and 94r (*sh'elat goral Maharam*, which required washing one's body and waiting three days before writing a formula to be used in connection with a *humash*; certain verses would suggest themselves, *אי'ח"ב זיהה לו תשובה וכוננה לאלהר*). See above, ch. 4, n. 32. In ms. Paris 776 (Sefarad, fifteenth/sixteenth centuries), fol. 175r, a similar oracular technique (opening a codex of the Pentateuch according to a prescribed pattern in order to predict the future) attributed to R. Meir is found just after an adjuration for protection (*shelo yukhlu le-haziq lo*) by R. Judah *he-Hasid* (fol. 174v). Cf. Verman, *The Books of Contemplation*, 201, n. 32; ms. Parma 563, fols. 95r–96r; and Jonathan Elukin, "The Ordeal of Scripture," *Exemplaria* 5.1 (1993):142–60. See also the references to *goral* in *Sefer Hasidim Parma*, 169, 255, 371.

Although some of the manuscripts in which this material appears are relatively late, or are of non-Ashkenazic provenance, R. Meir's involvement in *torat ha-sod* can be confirmed⁵⁰ from the writings of a number of his students and followers.⁵¹ R. Solomon Simḥah b. Eliezer of Troyes, author of a work entitled *Sefer ha-Maskil*, studied rabbinic literature with Maharam and with Rabbenu Perez of Corbeil. He displayed a clear familiarity with the *torat ha-Kavod* of *ḥasidut Ashkenaz* and with a form of the doctrine of the ether (referred to by R. Solomon as *'avir mufla barukh Hu u-varkukh Shemo*) that was akin to the *'avir* recognized by the German Pietists. R. Solomon was also interested in the use of Divine Names to achieve certain effects and in the manipulation of demonic and angelic forces. He mentions as the greatest

⁵⁰A passage that appears in a collection of Maharam's responsa—[*Sefer Sha'arei Teshuvot Maharam b. Barukh*, ed. Bloch, 325–26 [ms. Munich], #5—decries the use of *hashba'ot* composed of Divine or angelic names. This passage was not written, however, by Maharam. As the conclusion of the passage indicates, it comes from *Sefer Malmad ha-Talmidim* (Lyck, 1866, fol. 68a), by the Provençal rationalist R. Jacob Anatoli (who later settled in Italy). Cf. Trachtenberg, *Jewish Magic and Superstition*, 243, 311, n. 23, who was unaware of R. Jacob's authorship of this passage; Marc Saperstein, *Decoding the Rabbis* (Cambridge, Mass., 1980), 192; and idem, "Christians and Christianity in the Sermons of Jacob Anatoli," *The Frank Talmage Memorial Volume*, ed. Barry Walfish (Haifa, 1993), 2:236, 238, n. 10, and 241, n. 34. In this passage, R. Jacob also decries the role of angels as mediators between man and God during prayer (and he specifically rejects the liturgical phrase that refers to angels as *makhnsei rahamim*), as did R. Meir of Narbonne and R. Isaac b. Yedayah in Provence. See Saperstein, 191–93. A number of Ashkenazic rabbinic scholars we have encountered approved of the notion of angels as mediators. See above, ch. 3, n. 4.

⁵¹R. Ḥayyim b. Makhir characterizes the greatness of R. Meir in terms of his ability to seek out and uncover hidden *sitrei Torah*. See *Teshuvot Maharam*, ed. Bloch, 57 [ms. Parmal], #476: זה אשר כתבתי למורה רבי מאיר מעין החכמה ומקור המזימה מסלחותיו רומה: ייורדים תהומה עברו יהמה מוחפשים סתורי תורה בחדרי חדרים מפענחים צפונותיה ונבעו מצעוניה מתייפים ומוסללים ונבחנים ונצפרים זכימ' חפיכ' ופינ' ונמתוקים מדבר' כל' שומעיהם ישקו עצמותיהם ויעלו כל'יותיהם כמוני העציר הבא בשיטה אחורונה כורע ומשתחזה לעומת בגד' מורי שיאיר עני על מה ששמעתי מכברך. In the context of the halakhic issue raised by R. Ḥayyim, however, this description may refer solely to R. Meir's achievements in the realm of exoteric Torah knowledge. For the use of similar descriptive phrases in liturgical poems by R. Eleazar *ha-Qallir*, R. Joseph *Tov Elem*, and Raban, see Y. Oppenheimer, "Ha-Shem Zafnat Pa'aneah-Perusho ve-Gilgulav," *Sinai* 115 (1995):79–80. On Maharam's spirituality, see also Michael Fishbane, *The Kiss of God* (Seattle, 1994), 51–55, and idem, "The Imagination of Death in Jewish Spirituality," *Death, Ecstasy and Other Worldly Journeys*, ed. John Collin and Michael Fishbane (Albany, 1995), 191. On R. Ḥayyim b. Makhir, cf. I. A. Agus, *Rabbi Meir of Rothenburg* (Philadelphia, 1947), xxvii–xxviii, and Simcha Emanuel, "Teshuvot Maharam Defus Prague," *Tarbiz* 57 (1988):572–73, n. 54.

CHAPTER 5

authorities in these areas R. Yehudah *he-Hasid* and Rabbenu Meir *ha-Gadol* (*ha-me'orot ha-gedolim*, *Rabbenu Yehudah he-Hasid ve-Rabbenu Meir ha-Gadol*), indicating his own direct teacher, R. Meir of Rothenburg. Indeed, R. Solomon's consistent application of the addendum *barukh Hu u-varukh Shemo* to the *'avir ha-mufla*, which he considered to be an aspect of the Divine Being, also reflects a convention associated with *Hasidei Ashkenaz*. In addition, R. Solomon provides a physiological description of the state of *petiḥat ha-lev* and suggests the ways that this phenomenon facilitates the understanding and retention of Torah knowledge and other wisdom.⁵²

According to R. Solomon, the Almighty gave man the ability to control *shedim* through the aegis of two fallen angels (*Shemhaza'el* and *Azza*)⁵³ and also by invoking Divine Names that were known to some. Indeed, the correct recitation of a sequence of *Shemot* has the capacity to bring the Messiah. At the same time, however, use of these powers might cause men to lose sight of their Divine origins and experience a diminution of *yir'at shamayim*. Moreover, the power of Divine Names over demons is effective even when activated *be-tum'ah*, by sorcerers or those who err in their ways, because all is derived from the Almighty and from the power of His six names. Therefore, Divine Names should not be utilized in practice, although teaching (or learning) about their powers is permitted.⁵⁴

⁵²See Israel Ta-Shma, "Sefer ha-Maskil—*Hibbur Yehudi-Zarefat* Bilti *Yadu'a mi-Sof ha-Me'ah ha-Yod Gimmel*," *Mehqerei Yerushalayim be-Mahshevot Yisra'el* 2 (1983): 416–38. [Note that the attitude toward astrology and the way it affects man as expressed in *Sefer ha-Maskil* is quite close to what is found in *Perush le-Sefer Yezirah le-R. Elhanan b. Yaqar*.] For further discussion of *'avir* and related concepts in *Sefer ha-Maskil*, see Gad Freudenthal, "Ha-Avir Barukh Hu u-Varukh Shemo be-Sefer ha-Maskil le-R. Shelomoh Simhah mi-Troyes," *Da'at* 32–33 (1994):187–234. Freudenthal also published and annotated selected illustrative passages from Moscow-Guenzberg 508 (the lone extant ms. of this work) in *Da'at* 34 (1995):87–129. See now his "Stoic Physics in the Writings of R. Sa'adia Gaon al-Fayyumi and Its Aftermath in Medieval Jewish Mysticism," *Arabic Sciences and Philosophy* 6 (1996): 133–36. See also J. Davis, "R. Yom Tov Lipman Heller, Joseph b. Isaac *ha-Levi*, and Rationalism in Ashkenazic Culture, 1550–1650" (Ph.D. diss., Harvard, 1990), 67; and cf. Scholem, *Origins of the Kabbalah* (Princeton, 1987), 251.

⁵³For earlier versions of this motif, and for its presence in the *Zohar*, see Margoliot, *Mal'akhei 'Elyon*, 274–75, 292; Moshe Idel, "Ha-Mahshavah ha-Ra'ah shel ha-E-l," *Tarbiz* 49 (1980):359, n. 8; Rashi to Numbers 13:33; and B. J. Bamberger, *Fallen Angels* (Philadelphia, 1952), 129–33, 177–81.

⁵⁴See ms. Moscow 508, fol. 47v (transcribed by Freudenthal in *Da'at* 34, 118, and see also n. 3): *כִּי הַכָּל נָעֵשָׂה עִי שְׁדִים אוֹ מִכְחָ אֲבָנִים אוֹ עַשְׁבִים כִּי הַכָּל בָּא מִכְחָ הַקְּבָ"ה וּמִכְחָ שְׁמוֹתִיו. וְלֹא צָה הַקְּבָ"ה שְׁלָא יִשְׁאָל אָדָם בָּאָבָּו וְיִדְעָוָנוּ וּכְרֹא מִפְנֵי שְׁהָם מְעוּטִים אֲתָא יִרְאָתָם שְׁמִים מִלְבָד בְּנֵי הָאָדָם ... וְלֹא יִתְלֹו הַכָּחָ וְהַמְּשֻלָּה בְּהַקְּבָ"ה ... וּמִפְנֵי שְׁלָא יַרְגִּילָו בָּהָם צֹה*

Mark Verman identified a *Hug ha-‘Iyyun* text, in a fourteenth-century Spanish manuscript, in which R. Meir of Germany (*me-Allemagne*) and R. Perez of France (*mi-Żarefat*) offered definitions and explanations of an unusual celestial name, *Ara’aryeta*—an appellation for the Primal Ether (*‘avir ha-qadmon*). R. Meir identified this Divine representation as *’or qadmon*: “It is from the pure and holy name and it corresponds to One, His unity, First, His unicity, His transformation, One.” R. Perez called its name “Tenth level. . . . There is in this the secret of the Cherubs.” Verman cites this text (and another related one) as proof of the impact of *Hasidei Ashkenaz* upon the *Hug ha-‘Iyyun* (in addition to other evidence that R. Eleazar of Worms directly influenced the *Hug*). Verman writes that “the individuals referred to in this text such as R. Meir or R. Perez of France are not known to us from other sources.”⁵⁵ At the same time, he notes two mystical techniques attributed to an “unidentified” R. Meir, one in ms. Vat. 243 and the other in Paris 776, in close proximity to a prophylactic technique attributed to R. Judah *he-Hasid*.⁵⁶

In light of the array of evidence presented above, there can be little doubt that the R. Meir of Germany mentioned in this text is R. Meir of Rothenburg, just as the R. Perez of France is probably the tosafist R. Perez b. Elijah of Corbeil.⁵⁷ R. Perez studied with R. Samuel of Evreux, R. Isaac of Corbeil, and Maharam. He is best known for his editing of *Tosafot* texts and for his glosses on R. Isaac’s *Sefer Mizvot Qatan* and on *Sefer Tashbez*, a compilation of customs and practices of R. Meir.⁵⁸ Although there is less evidence, as compared with

הקב”ה שלא לעשותם אבל ללימודם מותר
ומזה שיש כח למכשפים ולשומוט . . . כי הכל בא מכח הקב”ה המכח ו’
שמותיו . . . ומפני שלא ירגלו בהם בטיב זהה הקב”ה שלא לעשותם, אבל ללימודם מותר
32r–33v; and cf. R. Moses Cordovero, above, ch. 4, n. 48.

⁵⁵See Verman, *The Books of Contemplation*, 101, n. 201, and 200–204.

⁵⁶Verman, *The Books of Contemplation*, 201, n. 32. Cf. above, nn. 16, 49. Magical techniques attributed to R. Judah and R. Meshullam are found in close proximity in ms. Bodl. 123/4; see below, n. 63.

⁵⁷The identification of R. Meir and R. Perez in the ‘Iyyun text with the tosafists R. Meir of Rothenburg and R. Perez of Corbeil offers further support for Verman’s dating of the ‘Iyyun circle texts (between 1230 and 1270 in Castile) contra Gershom Scholem (who argued for the first quarter of the thirteenth century in Provence). Cf. my “Rabbinic Figures in Castilian Kabbalistic Pseudepigraphy,” 83, n. 24, and Wolfson, *Along the Path*, 179, n. 351. The one easily identified contemporary name mentioned in *Hug ha-‘Iyyun* texts is that of R. Eleazar of Worms. For the influence of *Hasidei Ashkenaz* on the *Hug ha-‘Iyyun*, see the literature cited in my “Rabbinic Figures,” 80, n. 13, and 104, n. 96.

⁵⁸See Urbach, *Ba’alei ha-Tosafot*, 2:575–81. On R. Perez and R. Isaac of Corbeil, see also Getzel Ellinson, “Le-Heqr Qavvei ha-Pesiqa shel ha-Rosh,” *Sinai* 93 (1983):236.

CHAPTER 5

Maharam *mi-Rothenburg*, to connect Rabbenu Perez directly with the German Pietists or with magical techniques, the asceticism and pietism manifested in his glosses to *Semaq* and in his *pesaqim*⁵⁹ make him a good choice for the role that he plays in the *‘Iyyun* texts.

Hug ha-‘Iyyun texts intimate that members of the circle learned about the teachings of R. Meir and R. Perez, as well as the teachings of R. Eleazar of Worms, from a R. Meshullam who came from Brittany or elsewhere within northern France or *malkhut Ashkenaz*.⁶⁰ Although R. Meshullam is unknown to us in any non-kabbalistic contexts, it is likely that he was the direct link between the tosafists, the Pietists, and the *Hug ha-‘Iyyun*. Virtually all extant manuscript references to R. Meshullam link him with teachings of the German Pietists.

In the *Hug ha-‘Iyyun* text described above, which includes the teachings of R. Meir and R. Perez, R. Meshullam's own *qabbalah* for the Divine Name associated with the Primal Ether is also mentioned.⁶¹ In another manuscript, which contains large blocks of material from the German Pietists, R. Meshullam has a homiletical discussion on the angelic hosts who participated in revelation at Mount Sinai.⁶² In still another, a *qabbalah* from R. Meshullam on the magical use of Divine Names in amulets, derived from *Sefer Raziel*, is preceded by a magical *shemirat ha-derekh* attributed to R. Judah *he-Hasid* on the use of a magical egg to induce feelings of love.⁶³ An additional *qabbalah* from R. Meshullam is found in a manuscript containing a similar technique from

⁵⁹See above, ch. 2, nn. 69–71. For R. Perez's use of *Hekhalot* literature, see *Tosafot Rabbenu Perez ‘al Massekhet ‘Eruvin*, ed. S. Wilman (Bnei Brak, 1980), 43b, s.v. *ha lo ‘ata Eliyyahu be-Shabbata*, and cf. *Hekhalot Rabbati*, ch. 39, in *Battei Midrashot*, ed. S. A. Wertheimer (Jerusalem, 1950²), 1:30–31. See also R. Langer, *To Worship God Properly*, 215. On the mistaken attribution of *Sefer Ma‘arekhet ha-E-lohut* to R. Perez of Corbeil, see Ephraim Gottlieb, “*Ma‘arekhet ha-E-lohut*,” *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 11:637–39 (=Gottlieb, *Mehqarim be-Sifrut ha-Qabbalah*, ed. J. Hacker [Jerusalem, 1976], 775–78).

⁶⁰The broad (and occasionally diverse) geographic references with regard to R. Meshullam are typical of the way Spanish kabbalists refer to Ashkenazic figures. See my “*Rabbinic Figures*,” 107, n. 105.

⁶¹See above, n. 58. R. Meshullam's *qabbalah* represents the view of *‘anshei ha-dat ha-penimit* (devotées of esotericism) and is followed by Nahmanides characterization of the Primal Ether that was received (and adopted) by kabbalist-sages (*hakhmei ha-qabbalah*).

⁶²See ms. Bodl. 2282 (Ashkenaz, fourteenth century), fol. 13r. Cf. Verman, *The Books of Contemplation*, 204, n. 39.

⁶³See ms. Bodl. 123/4 (Mizrah, fifteenth/sixteenth centuries), fols. 70v–71r: *מקבלת ממשלים צרפתית – מה שקבלנו מן הספר הנקרה רזיאל כתשכחות ג' פסוקים הללו על דרך זה ... יعلו ע"ב שמות והם מועלים לעניינים גודלים. זהו שם המפושת של אורים ותומים. על קלף צבוי וימצא חן ושביל טוב וכו' ומכל מרענן בישין ושותים ויתרפה מהולו וופול אויבים ...*

Nahmanides, together with a formula for *qefizat ha-derekh* from R. Eleazar of Worms.⁶⁴ A *qabbalah* from R. Meshullam on the use of the *Shem ha-Meforash*, which was based on *Sefer Hekhalot*, indicates that R. Eleazar of Worms used this Name to transport himself on a cloud.⁶⁵ Finally, a manuscript passage discusses an argument between R. Samuel *he-Hasid* and R. Meshullam about how to vocalize the Tetragrammaton (*Shem ha-Meforash*).⁶⁶

משביעני אני שתצלנו הימים ובכל יום ... ידי שם זה שישלוט על כל ב"א גוים ישמעאלים וכי Cf. Verman, *The Books of Contemplation*, 205. Prior to this *qabbalah* are a number of *segullot*, using a variety of *Shemot*. On fol. 68r, the fourteen-letter and twenty-two-letter Names (ד' אלקיינו ה' –כחו במוֹכָתוֹ כְּבוֹד אָנָקְתָּם פָּסְתָּמִים פָּסְפָּסִים דִּוְיִינִסִּים) are recorded. Cf. *Sefer Razi'el*, 145; Trachtenberg, *Jewish Magic and Superstition*, 92; Schrire, *Hebrew Magic Amulets*, 97; ms. Bodl. 1812, fol. 96v; Peter Schäfer and Shaul Shaked, *Magische Texte aus der Kairoer Geniza*, vol 2 (Tübingen, 1997), 127, 130, 288; and above, ch. 1, n. 156. Fol. 68v has a *shemirat ha-derekh* attributed to R. Judah *he-Hasid*: שמירת הדרך מר' יהודה החסיד וצריך לאומרה ביציאתו מן העיר ... שר ליה שמו יוזך משבייע אני בשם יה-ו-ה שותוליכנו לשלים עד מקום פלוני בעלי שם פגע וכור ובל היזק בשקט והצילנו. The *segullot* on fols. 69r–70v are to achieve success and the approbation of others, to instill fear in or weaken one's enemies, to prevent forgetfulness, to assist a woman who cannot produce milk, and to cause feelings of love. In one instance, the formula was to be written on a magical egg; see above, ch. 3, nn. 18–19.

⁶⁴See ms. Ancona 23/3 (Italy, 1717), fols. 51v (קבלה מר' מושלום לצער בנון לרפואה), 53v (רמבנן), 73v (ר' אלעזר). Cf. Verman and Adler, "Path-Jumping in the Jewish Magical Tradition," 139.

⁶⁵Ms. Milan Ambrosiana 62, fol. 109v (Meshullam the Zadokite from Brittany [Treport] transcribed a Name from the *Sefer Hekhalot* found by R. Nehunyah b. Ha-Qanah: "R. Eleazar conjured this Name, that he had received, when he rode on a cloud as he did frequently.") On this passage, cf. Verman, *The Books of Contemplation*, 204–10; Wolfson, "Demut Ya'aqov Haquqah be-Kisse ha-Kavod: 'Iyyun Nosaf be-Torat ha-Sod shel Hasidut Ashkenaz," *Massu'ot*, ed. Oron and Goldreich, 184–85, n. 236; and Moshe Idel, *The Mystical Experience in Abraham Abulafia* (Albany, 1988), 159, n. 146. Various theosophical teachings are also found in this passage (and in another from R. Meshullam). The presence of theosophical material in R. Meshullam's case is readily understood, just as it is for R. Meir of Rothenburg and *Sefer ha-Maskil*, given their connection to the mystical teachings of *Hasidei Ashkenaz* that were being disseminated in the second half of the thirteenth century. These developments serve, however, to highlight once again the fact that theosophy was largely absent from Ashkenazic *sod* in general, and that Ashkenazic *sod*, *pace Hasidei Ashkenaz*, was limited for the most part to the magical and mystical properties of Divine Names. [In the one extant instance in which R. Meshullam discusses halakhic material (ms. Cambr. Or. 786, fol. 174v; noted by Verman, 205, n. 41), he cites a ruling of R. Abraham Haldaq, a rabbinic decisor associated with *Hasidei Ashkenaz*; see above, ch. 2, nn. 18, 37.]

⁶⁶Ms. Sassoon 290, fol. 218, sec. 299. Cf. above, ch. 3, n. 67, for the tradition of Hida regarding Rashi and Rashbam. See also *Siddur Rabbenu Shelomoh mi-Germaiza ve-Siddur Hasidei Ashkenaz*, ed. Hershler, 157.

CHAPTER 5

In his *Sefer ha-Maskil*, R. Solomon Simḥah of Troyes offers an almost immediate date for the beginning of the redemption and refers to the prophetic *hishuv ha-qeẓ* activities of R. Ezra *ha-Navi* of Moncontour. R. Ezra, “*alah la-shamayim*,” ascended to heaven using *Hekhalot* magical or mystical techniques and inquired about the *qeẓ* from the prophets Ḥaggai, Zekharyah, and Malakhi. In the course of his heavenly experience, R. Ezra received certain verses or songs which he was then able to transmit.⁶⁷ R. Ezra studied in his youth with Ri, whose similar experience with prophetic messianism has been noted.⁶⁸ In his later years, R. Ezra taught R. Meir of Rothenburg during

⁶⁷See Ta-Shma, “*Sefer ha-Maskil*,” 432–33; and cf. above, ch. 3, nn. 3, 8, 80. On R. Ezra’s heavenly and prophetic activities, see also Scholem, *Origins of the Kabbalah*, 239–40; Idel, *Kabbalah: New Perspectives*, 91–92; A. Marx, “*Ma’amar ‘al Shenat Ge’ulah*,” *Ha-Zofeh le-Hokhmat Yisra’el* 5 (1921):194–99; Joseph Shatzmiller’s addenda to *Gallia Judaica in Qiryat Sefer* 45 (1970):609–10; Heschel, “*Al Ruah ha-Qodesh Bimeī ha-Benayim*,” *Sefer ha-Yovel li-Khevod Alexander Marx* (New York, 1950) [Hebrew section], 184; Shraga Abramson, “*Navi, Ro’eh ve-Hozeh*,” *Sefer ha-Yovel Muggash li-Khevod ha-Rav Mordekhai Kirschblum*, ed. David Telsner (Jerusalem, 1983), 121–23; and Urbach, *Ba’alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:336–37. [R. Ezra is also called *mal’akh ha-Shem* in other texts.] R. Troestlin (=Menahem or perhaps Nehemyah) *ha-Navi* is mentioned as having had experiences related to those of R. Ezra. Cf. ms. JTS Mic. 8114 (end), fol. 17v. Scholem, *Origins of the Kabbalah*, 239, n. 86, notes references to a R. Nehemyah (*Hasid*) in texts associated with the German Pietists. See also ms. Parma 541, fol. 266v (sec. 77, and cf. above, ch. 4, n. 31), where a R. Nehemyah records “*te’amim of milhemet gog u-magog*.” See also fols. 264v–265v for other eschatological events, and cf. above, ch. 4, n. 32. See above, ch. 4, n. 14, for a R. Isaac *Navi* mentioned in Pietist writings.

Messianic dates achieved through prophetic dreams, similar to the experiences of R. Ezra and R. Troestlin, are also attributed to R. Samuel and R. Judah *he-Hasid*. See Marx, “*Ma’amar ‘al Shenat Ge’ulah*,” op. cit., and Gerson Cohen, “Messianic Postures of Ashkenazim and Sephardim,” *Studies of the Leo Baeck Institute*, ed. Max Kreutzberger (New York, 1967), 128–30. See also Simcha Assaf, “*Te’udot Hadashot ‘al Gerim ve-‘al Tenu‘ah Meshihit*,” *Zion* 5 (1939–40):116–17, 123–24 [=idem, *Meqorot u-Mehqarim* (Jerusalem, 1946), 146–48, 153–54] for R. Eleazar of Worms’s validation of the date generated by R. Ezra’s prophetic messianism. And cf. *Teshuvot u-Fesaqim*, ed. Efraim Kupfer (Jerusalem, 1973), 310; Dan, “*Sippurim Dimonologiyim*,” 280–81; Moshe Idel, “*Le-Gilgulehah shel Tekhniqah Qedumah shel Hazon Nevu’i Bimeī ha-Benayim*,” *Sinai* 86 (1979):1–7; *Teshuvot ha-Rashba*, 1:548; and below, n. 79. At the same time, *Sefer Hasidim* (SHP 212) denounces those engaged in messianic prognostication because this activity involves the inappropriate summoning of angels or *shedim* and the use of Divine Names. The tension inherent in Pietistic writings in this respect is similar to what has been observed in their writings concerning the use of magic generally. See Dan, *Torat ha-Sod shel Hasidut Ashkenaz*, 241–45; Israel Ta-Shma, “*Le-Toledot ha-Yehudim be-Polin ba-Me’ot ha-Yod Bet/ha-Yod Gimmel*,” *Zion* 53 (1988):352, n. 16; and above, ch. 4, n. 50.

⁶⁸See above, ch. 4, nn. 8–9.

Integration and Expansion during the 13th Century

R. Meir's student days in northern France. It is therefore possible that Maharam received esoteric and magical material from R. Ezra as well.⁶⁹

Additional manuscript evidence suggests that several other students or associates of Maharam may have been involved with *sod* or magic. R. Yehiel—the father of Maharam's most famous student, R. Asher (Rosh)—adopted the practice of reciting *barukh Hu u-varukh Shemo* each time a Divine Name was mentioned, a practice that originated with the German Pietists (and was also followed by R. Solomon Simḥah of Troyes).⁷⁰ Magical *segulot* as well as *sodot* are also attributed to R. Asher b. Yehiel himself, although the presence of this material only in relatively late manuscript passages and the specific contents in certain cases weaken some of the attributions. According to one text, Rosh transmitted a formula that would protect an individual and his money from thieves or demonic forces.⁷¹ The authenticity of this passage is perhaps heightened by the fact that R. Asher is cited by his son, R. Jacob *Ba'al ha-Turim* (who also studied with R. Meir of Rothenburg), as having allowed divination utilizing *shedim* (as Ri did) in order to locate a stolen object.⁷² Also likely to be

⁶⁹See above, n. 49, for a *she'elat ha-qeẓ* attributed to R. Meir of Rothenburg. One of the three references in *Tosafot* texts to R. Ezra as *ha-Navi* is found in *Tosafot R. Perez* (to *Bava Qamma* 23b). Cf. Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 336, nn. 14*, 16: Abramson, "Navi, Ro'eh ve-Hozeh"; and above, n. 6.

⁷⁰See Naftali Wieder, "Barukh Hu (u-)Varukh Shemo—Meqoro, Zemanno ve-Nosaho," *Sefer ha-Yovel le-Ezra Zion Melammed* (Ramat Gan, 1982), 277–90; above, n. 52; and cf. Y. S. Zachter, "Kavvanat Shema," *Yeshurun* 2 (1996):29, n. 9. Note also R. Asher's *Responsa*, 4:20: *כִּי יִשְׁלַׁי קָוְנָטָרֵיס מַעֲשֵׂה יִשְׁנָן וְנִתְהַבֵּב בּוֹ כִּי הַבְּרִכּוֹת שֶׁל כָּל הַשָּׁנָה*; and see above, ch. 2, n. 52, and below, n. 75.

⁷¹Ms. Warsaw 9 (Ashkenaz, sixteenth century), fols. 152r–153r. Rosh also ruled that one who drinks *yayn nesekh*, even unwittingly, must fast for five days. This penance was also prescribed by R. Judah *he-Hasid* on the basis of the number of times that wine or products of the vine are referred to in Deuteronomy 32:32 (which begins *כִּי גַּגְּפָן סְדוּם גַּפְנָם*). See ms. Bodl. 784, fol. 99v; my "Rabbinic Attitudes Toward Nonobservance in the Medieval Period," *Jewish Tradition and the Nontraditional Jew*, ed. J. J. Schacter (Northvale, 1992), 25–26, nn. 64–66; above, ch. 1, nn. 148–49, and ch. 3, n. 77. For other dimensions of R. Asher b. Yehiel's piety, see A. H. Freimann, *Ha-Rosh ve-Ze'ezav* (Jerusalem, 1986), 82–84, and Zimmels, *Ashkenazim and Sefardim*, 22, 32–33. The anti-philosophy stance taken by Rosh during the early fourteenth-century phase of the Maimonidean controversy is certainly compatible with his involvement with magic and *sod*.

⁷²See *Arba'ah Turim*, *Yoreh De'ah*, sec. 179 (end), and *Beit Yosef*, ad loc. For Ri (and others), see above, ch. 4, nn. 13–14. See also the responsum by R. Isaac b. Elijah (a contemporary of Maharam) [in *Teshuvot Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, ed. I. A. Agus (New York, 1954), 223–24], in which R. Isaac approves the use of *hashba'at shedim* for finding

CHAPTER 5

authentic is a *sod* that R. Jacob b. Asher received from his father. R. Asher is described in this passage as *mequbbal ve-hakham*.⁷³ A *shemirat ha-derekh* attributed to R. Asher is found together with magical techniques of Ramban and others associated with *Hasidei Ashkenaz*.⁷⁴

stolen property and for predicting the future (עתידות). This responsum tends to support Jacob Katz's contention (see his *Halakhah ve-Qabbalah* [Jerusalem, 1986], 349), that R. Isaac b. Elijah's criticism of students who engaged in *שין ולא גמרא* (found in *She'elot u-Teshuvot Maharah Or Zarua*^c, #163) refers to those who generated excessive *pilpul* without concern for the halakhic ramifications of the talmudic text, rather than the suggestion of Urbach (*Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 2:586, n. 2) that *שין* connotes the study of philosophy and/or *sod*.

⁷³Ms. JTS Mic. 1851 (Sefarad, fifteenth/sixteenth centuries), fols. 1r-1v. The Spanish kabbalist David b. Yehudah *Hasid*, who spent time in Germany and acquainted himself with Ashkenazic esoteric teachings (see, e.g., Idel, *Kabbalah: New Perspectives*, 98, and my "Rabbinic Figures in Castilian Kabbalistic Pseudepigraphy," 97, n. 73), records a *qabbalah* from Rosh that the *ge'ulah* would occur in 1328, as well as a question from Rosh's son, R. Judah, regarding *gilgul ha-nefesh*. See also *Ta'am Zeqenim* le-R. Eliezer Ashkenazi (Frankfurt, 1855), 64-66; and Iris Felix, "Peraqim be-Haguto ha-Qabbalit shel ha-Rav Yosef Angelet," (M.A. Thesis, Hebrew University, 1991), 5. [The question on *gilgul ha-nefesh* from R. Yehudah ben *ha-Rosh* may have been due to the influence of Spanish Kabbalah. It is found also in ms. Paris 738 (Spain, fifteenth/sixteenth centuries), fol. 367-69.] At the same time, R. Judah b. *ha-Rosh* rejected the validity of astral magic. See Dov Schwartz, "Astrologiyyah u-Mageyah Astralit bi-Megalleh *Ammuqot* le-R. Shelomoh Alqonstantin," *Mehqerei Yerushalayim be-Folqlor Yehudi*, 15 (1993):59, and idem, *Astrologiyyah u-Mageyah be-Hagut ha-Yehudit Bimei ha-Benayim* (Ramat Gan, 1999), 266-67. For the possible impact of *Hasidei Ashkenaz* on R. Judah with regard to curricular matters, see S. Assaf, *Meqorot le-Toledot ha-Hinnukh be-Yisra'el*, vol. 1, 26-27; and cf. my *Jewish Education and Society in the High Middle Ages*, 79-80, 88-90.

⁷⁴See ms. Moscow-Guenzberg 1302 (Mizrah, 1431), fol. 14r: *שמירת הדין לר' י"ש*. *שבראה לטרים או [זרם] שאותה ירא ממנה האמר ששעה פעמיים על סדר אבעבועות... ותוקף ייך*. A *shemirah* attributed to Ramban, designed to protect against thieves while traveling on the road, involves taking two stones and reciting various Divine Names (fol. 10r). A second *shemirah*, which Ramban sent from Barcelona, also included various finger movements (fol. 12r). An anonymous *shemirah la-derekh* (fol. 11r) cites verses that describe the angels who protected Jacob during his flight from Esau and verses depicting the *'ananei ha-kavod*. Several prayers for protection during an ocean-going voyage, including one that Ramban purportedly recited during his journey to Israel, are also recorded (fol. 10v, 12v-13r, 13v; on the *shemirot* and prayers attributed to Ramban, cf. ms. Vat. 243 [above, n. 16], and Israel Ta-Shma, "Qovez Hilkhot Tefillah u-Mo'adot le-Ehad mi-Talmidei Rabbenu Yonah," *Qovez 'al Yad* n.s. 13 [1996]: 274, n. 2). Fol. 15r lists a *shemirah* that entailed hand movements and the phrase to be recited, *אזובות ישמראן*. For similarities between these magical formulae and techniques within Ashkenaz, see above, n. 16; ch. 3, nn. 58, 99; and ch. 4, nn. 32, 49. See also the parallel material in ms. Parma 1124 (Italy,

R. Jacob b. Asher's own connections to *Hasidei Ashkenaz* are readily evident. In his *Arba'ah Turim* there are frequent references to (and general approbation of) pietistic and ascetic practices of *Hasidei Ashkenaz* and to Pietist approaches to *tefillah*. These include the cultivation of proper *kavvanah* and the establishment or retention of proper liturgical texts, often through the application of *sodot ha-tefillah*.⁷⁵ Indeed, biblical interpretations of the *Ba'al ha-Turim* often include masoretic and other kinds of comments from the Pietists themselves, or in their style, including notions that can be characterized as *sod*.⁷⁶

R. Asher b. Yehiel and his family fled Germany for Toledo, Spain, in the face of persecutions during the early years of the fourteenth century. R. Dan, another student of R. Meir of Rotherburg, followed the same path, ultimately earning, as Rosh did, the approbation of leading Spanish talmudists.⁷⁷ Two

fifteenth century), fols. 48r–54r, which includes a *qabbalah* from R. Judah *he-Hasid* to ensure security each day through the recitation of certain verses in a particular order, as well as the eleven verses for protection that begin and end with the letter *nun*, attributed to German Pietists (fols. 50v–51r). Cf. above, ch. 3, nn. 102, 110; ch. 4, n. 49.

⁷⁵See, e.g., O. H., secs. 51, 113 (דורי רשותם הם חסידי אשכנו אשר היו שוקלין) (טוטופין מספר מנין תיבות התפילות והברכות וכגד מה נתנו Moshe Hallamish, "Sihat Hullin be-Veit ha-Knesset—Mezi'ut u-Ma'avaq," *Milet* 2 (1985):243; and above, ch. 1, n. 35. For the overall impact of the German Pietists and their literature (as well as Rabbenu Yonah's *Sefer ha-Yir'ah*) on the structure and content of *Arba'ah Turim* (esp. in *Orah Hayyim*), see Yehudah Galinsky, "Sefer Arba'ah Turim ve-ha-Sifrut ha-Hilkhatit bi-Sefarad ba-Me'ah ha-Yod Daled" (Ph.D. diss., Bar Ilan, 1999). Cf. R. Langer, *To Worship God Properly*, 213, 233. On the connotation of *dorshei reshutot* in sec. 113, as a representation of *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, cf. Y. K. Reinitz in *Shema'atin* 109 [1991]:110, and *Shema'atin* 111–12 [1993]:141; Daniel Abrams, "From Germany to Spain: Numerology as a Mystical Technique," *JJS* 47 (1996):92–93; ms. B.M. Or. 2853, fols. 3r, 47v; *Perushim u-Fesaqim 'al ha-Torah* le-R. Avigdor Zarfati (above, ch. 4, n. 2), 32, 37, 57–58, 120, 263, 386, 420, and the editor's introduction, 15–16. Cf. Trachtenberg, *Jewish Magic and Superstition*, 18, n. 8, 322; Zimmels, *Ashkenazim and Sephardim*, 112, 189–190, 232; Jacob Lauterbach, "The Ancient Jewish Allegorists in Talmud and Midrash," *JQR* 1 (1910–11):332–33, n. 36; and above, ch. 1, n. 93.

⁷⁶For examples of affinities between the biblical interpretations of the German Pietists (and Zohar) and those of the *Ba'al ha-Turim* (with particular reference to counting words or letters), see, e.g., *Ba'al ha-Turim 'al ha-Torah*, ed. Y. K. Reinitz (Jerusalem, 1993), 1:2, 105, 157–58, 251; 2:272, 282–83, 299, 332, 347, 540–41, 549, 555; cf. the editor's introduction, 16. See also Aharon Arend, "Ha-Perush ha-Qazar shel Ba'al ha-Turim 'al ha-Torah," *Mahanayim* 3 (1993):180–87, and above, ch. 2, n. 52.

⁷⁷See Israel Ta-Shma, "Ashkenazi, Dan," *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, 3:725, and *Perush R. Bahya 'al ha-Torah*, ed. C. D. Chavel (Jerusalem, 1977), 2:19, and the editor's introduction, 1:10; and S. Z. Havlin, "Teshuvot Hadashot leha-Rashba," *Sefer Zikkaron le-R. Ya'akov B. Zolty*, ed. Yosef Buksboim (Jerusalem, 1987), 220–21, n. 5.

CHAPTER 5

magical *segullot* and formulae are found in manuscripts in R. Dan's name, in close proximity to those of R. Judah *he-Hasid* and other Ashkenazic figures. In addition, R. Dan transmitted a *sod* formulation concerning resurrection and the miracles of the messianic era—although, to be sure, these passages may have been composed in Spain, under the influence of Spanish Kabbalah, rather than in Germany.⁷⁸ R. Yaqr of Cologne, a contemporary of R. Meir of Rothenburg, is mentioned in two parallel manuscript passages (from *Sefer Sodot/Raza Rabba*, a work associated with *hasidut Ashkenaz*) regarding esoteric derivations and uses of *Shemot*.⁷⁹

⁷⁸See ms. Sassoon 290, fol. 254, sec. 565: שמירה מופלאה בשם הר' דין אם אתה חולך ברגלים עמדו בדרך ווילך ישחה ואם חולך ברכב בשעת הרכבה שים רגלי אחד על ברגל האוכף. Various biblical verses and *Shemot* are recited. [Sec. 566 contains a *segullah* from R. Judah *he-Hasid* that involves carrying a piece of wood from the gate of one's city and exchanging it along the way for wood that comes from bridges that are crossed or villages that are visited; cf. above, ch. 4, n. 49.] See also ms. Vat. 243, fols. 6r (*kabbalah be-shem ha-R. Dan*), and 10r (a *segullah* from R. Dan, in close proximity to a *segullah* from R. Judah *he-Hasid*); ms. Bodl. 916, fol. 40, and above, nn. 16, 46, esp. Ta-Shma, “Rabbenu Dan be-Ashkenaz uvi-Sefarad.” See also Scholem, *Kitvei Yad be-Qabbalah*, 78 (ms. JNUL. 8°151, Italy/Ashkenaz, sixteenth century) for a ... שם ממלך; ms. Bodl. 1618, fol. 109v, and note the formulations of R. Judah *he-Hasid* on fols. 55v, 59v, 77v.

⁷⁹See ms. JTS Mic. 1885 (Italy, fifteenth century), fols. 71–73; ms. Paris 843 (fifteenth century), fols 69–70; and Scholem, *Reshit ha-Qabbalah*, 197–98. On R. Yaqr, see Israel Ta-Shma, “R. Yeshayah mi-Veil: Ḥakham Bilti Noda mi-Zeman Maharam mi-Rothenburg,” *Sinai* 66 (1970):140–46; Urbach, *Ba’alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:222, 413, 438, 2:538; Y. M. Pelles, “Teshuvah le-Rabbenu Yaqr b. Samuel ha-Levi,” *Moriah* 16:11–12 (1989):5–7; and Simcha Emanuel, “Sifrei Halakhah Avudim shel Ba’alei ha-Tosafot,” 280–81.

R. Isaac b. Judah *ha-Levi*'s *Pa’aneah Raza* is a *tosafist* Torah commentary from the late thirteenth century that includes much exegetical and pietistic material from the German Pietists as well. See, e.g., Güdemann, *Ha-Torah ve-ha-Hayyim*, 1:121, 129–30, n. 8, 138, 164, n. 5, 218; Y. S. Lange, “Le-Zehuto shel R. Hayyim Palti’el,” *Alei Sefer* 8 (1980):142–43; Abba Zions, “Al ha-Mehabber shel *Pa’aneah Raza*,” *Or ha-Mizrah* 29 (1981):210–14; Ta-Shma, “Le-Toledot ha-Yehudim be-Polin ba-Me’ot ha-Yod Bet ha-Yod Gimmel,” *Zion* 53 (1988): 357–58; Joseph Davis, “Philosophy, Dogma and Exegesis in Medieval Ashkenazic Judaism: The Evidence of *Sefer Hadrat Qodesh*,” *AJS Review* 18 (1992):218; Eric Zimmer, ‘*Olam ke-Minhago Noheg* (Jerusalem, 1996), 233–34; A. J. Heschel, “Al Ruah ha-Qodesh Bime’i ha-Benayim,” 181–82, n. 31; Norman Golb, *The Jews of Medieval Normandy* (Cambridge, 1998), 187, n. 30; and above, ch. 3, n. 110; ch. 4, nn. 33, 47. Just as Eleazar of Worms named his halakhic work *Sefer Roqeah*, since רקוּח is the *gematria* equivalent of פָּעָנָה, Isaac notes in his introduction that both רַזָּא and צְהֻקָּה are the equivalent of צְחֻקָּה. There are *remazim* to a date for the advent of the Messiah in the portions of *Va-Yishlah* (*Pa’aneah Raza* [Jerusalem, 1965],

Integration and Expansion during the 13th Century

With these students of R. Meir of Rothenburg, the tosafist period comes to a close. The second half of this study has demonstrated that during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries in Ashkenaz, there was sustained interest in esoteric studies and magical theory and practice among tosafists. Moreover, many of the tosafists who expressed interest in these disciplines also exhibited a tendency toward *perishut* and pietism. While the talmudic methodologies of Rabbenu Tam and Raban dominated the entire period, their downplaying of other pre-Crusade disciplines, such as *torat ha-sod*, was not fully accepted. Indeed, later tosafists expanded their *sod* interests, perhaps under the influence of the German Pietists. Although the Pietists also developed a unique theosophical system in which tosafists were not involved, the common level of mystical and magical discourse among Ashkenazic talmudists was significantly higher than has heretofore been thought.

137), *Balaq* (376–77), *Ki-Tavo* (432) and *Va-Yelekh* (437–38); cf. above, n. 67; ch. 4, n. 37; *Perush R. Yosef Bekhor Shor 'al ha-Torah*, ed. Yehoshafat Nevo (Jerusalem, 1994), 373–75; and A. H. Silver, *A History of Messianic Speculation in Israel*, (New York, 1927), 85–87. Moreover, *Pa'aneah Raza* also contains pieces of magical and mystical material. See, e.g., *parashat Shemini*, 297, for a description of charms made from the tongue and the eye of a peacock that could guarantee victory in any litigation and induce other salutary states. These charms were tested by *Hakmei Yavan* and by others, and they were found to be genuine. Cf. ms. Munich 50, fol. 191v. See also *parashat Shemot*, 193; *Zav*, 287; *Qedoshim*, 312. *Ba'alei ha-sod* are cited in *parashut Toledot*, 110, and *Ki Tissa*, 255. In addition, the author himself suggests, in the colophon, that he had an interest in esoteric studies. See *Pa'aneah Raza*, introductory section, 2, and see also ms. Bodl. 2344, fol. 144r. Cf. Güdemann, 168, n. 3; Abba Zions, "Pa'aneah Raza le-R. Yizhaq b. Yehudah ha-Levi" (D.H.L. diss., Yeshiva University, 1974), 1–10, 44–51; Wolfson, *Through a Speculum That Shines*, 211, 251–52, 254, n. 275; and idem, "The Mystical Significance of Torah-Study in German Pietism," *JQR* 84 (1993): 55, n. 45. For *sod* in the biblical commentary of R. Hayyim Paltiel (composed by a younger contemporary of R. Meir of Rothenburg, and similar in several respects to *Pa'aneah Raza*), see Lange, op. cit. Cf. above, ch. 2, n. 43, and Hananel Mack, "Midrash Askenazi le-Perek Alef be-Sefer Yeshayahu," *Zion* 63 (1998):124. On the level of awareness of kabbalistic and magical material in late thirteenth-century Ashkenaz, see also Moshe Idel, "Notes in the Wake of the Medieval Jewish-Christian Polemic," *Immanuel* 18 (1984):54–63; Naomi Feuchtwanger, "The Coronation of the Virgin and of the Bride," *Jewish Art* 12–13 (1987):213–24; and Wolfson, *Through a Speculum That Shines*, 264, n. 322. Cf. Y. Dan, *Torat ha-Sod shel Hasidut Ashkenaz*, 252.



6

Conclusions and Implications

The data assembled and presented in this study suggest that ascetic practices and mystical and magical teachings were a recognizable part of the spiritual lives of a number of twelfth- and thirteenth-century tosafists. Although the *ba'alei ha-Tosafot* were known primarily for their achievements and advancements in the realm of talmudic studies, many of them were familiar with both the techniques and the theories of these other disciplines as well.

We have seen that considerations of *perishut* and *hasidut* did have an impact, at times, on the talmudic interpretations and legal rulings of these tosafists. Additional examples can undoubtedly be discovered through further research. Mystical and magical dimensions remain, however, mostly behind the scenes. They do not occupy a prominent place in tosafist writings, although they become more easily recognizable by the middle of the thirteenth century. Given the esoteric nature of these disciplines, however, this pattern of development is not unexpected. Indeed, the firm correlation that has been documented—between those tosafists who displayed ascetic tendencies and those who were most familiar with esoteric teachings—is a reflection of the more general characteristics of *torat ha-sod* and its adherents as well.

This revision of the dominant perception of tosafist spirituality constitutes a significant shift in the perceived balance of intellectual proclivities displayed by medieval rabbinic figures. According to the prevailing view, tosafists were uniformly halakhocentric.¹ They occupied a kind of middle

¹On the full connotation of this term, see Isadore Twersky, "Religion and Law," *Religion in a Religious Age*, ed. S. D. Goitein (Cambridge, Mass., 1973), 69–82.

CHAPTER 6

ground between the outstanding *rishonim*, led by Maimonides, who supplemented their talmudic and rabbinic studies with philosophical studies and investigation, and those, led by Nahmanides, who were devotees of mysticism and Kabbalah.² Although a significant group of tosafists, led by Rabbenu Tam, did occupy the middle position in which talmudic studies alone dominated, the present study offers evidence which places many Ashkenazic rabbinic figures—including R. Isaac of Dampierre, R. Eliezer of Metz, R. Jacob and R. Isaac of Corbeil, R. Isaac and R. Avigdor of Vienna, R. Zedekiah *Anav*, and R. Meir of Rothenburg, among others—on the mysticism/asceticism side of the ledger. Further research must be undertaken to ascertain whether the anti-philosophical (anti-Maimonidean) approach taken by a number of tosafists and other Ashkenazic rabbinic figures during various phases of the Maimonidean controversy, which was linked also to a literal reading of aggadic literature, resulted at least partially from mystical leanings—in addition to the lack of philosophical awareness and training in medieval Ashkenaz.³

To be sure, no tosafists can be classified as kabbalists, since none of them formulated anything that could be construed or labeled as Kabbalah. Nonetheless, we have seen that tosafists were involved with a number of distinctly mystical and magical dimensions. These include analyses of Divine and angelic names and functions, various kinds of protective or prophylactic adjurations and *she'elot halom* (that utilized both angelic and Divine Names),

²Nahmanides was also quite familiar with philosophical literature and concepts, and he made extensive use of them. Nonetheless, Ramban should certainly be considered a kabbalist, first and foremost. See my “On the Assessment of R. Moses b. Nahman (Nahmanides) and His Literary Oeuvre,” *Jewish Book Annual* 51 (1993–94):158–72.

³See E. E. Urbach, “Helqam shel Ḥakhmei Ashkenaz ve-Zarefat be-Folmos ‘al ha-Rambam u-Sefarav,” *Zion* 12 (1947):149–59; Joseph Dan, “Ashkenazi Hasidim and the Maimonidean Controversy,” *Maimonidean Studies* 3 (1992–93):29–47; Joseph Davis, “Philosophy, Dogma, and Exegesis in Medieval Ashkenazic Judaism: The Evidence of *Sefer Hadrat Qodesh*,” *AJS Review* 18 (1993):208–19; Israel Ta-Shma, “Sefer Nimmuei *Humash* le-R. Yeshayah di Trani,” *Qiryat Sefer* 64 (1993):752; Joseph Shatzmiller, “Les Tossafists et la Première Controversie Maimonidienne,” *Rashi et la culture juive en France du Nord au moyen âge* (Paris, 1997), 55–82; David Berger, “Judaism and General Culture in Medieval and Early Modern Times,” *Judaism’s Encounter with Other Cultures*, ed. J. J. Schacter (Northvale, 1997), 95–125; Moshe Halbertal, *People of the Book* (Cambridge, Mass., 1997), 109–19; and above, ch. 2, n. 4. To be sure, an anti-philosophical stance taken by a rabbinic scholar should not cause us to automatically presume that he is pro-mysticism. See, e.g., Bernard Septimus, *Hispano-Jewish Culture in Transition* (Cambridge, Mass., 1982), 104–15.

Conclusions and Implications

theurgic prayer, and quasi-prophetic experiences through which messianic dates and other kinds of guidance were received.

The mystical dimensions that have been identified within rabbinic scholarship in medieval Ashkenaz would support the larger view that mystical teachings and practices were highly compatible with this scholarship. Indeed, the claim that rabbinic culture in the talmudic period, and by extension the writings of its adherents in the medieval period, were virtually devoid of a mythic substrate and of any theurgic or mystical impetus would appear to be severely undercut by the results of this study. It should be possible, however, to define more narrowly the parameters of mystical activity within rabbinic circles and arrive at a more nuanced assessment of the relationship between these disciplines or fields.⁴

The involvement of tosafists with mysticism and magic, and with asceticism and *perishut*, represents the continuation of a pattern established during the pre-Crusade period in Mainz. Indeed, it was the strict talmudocentric approach, favored by Rabbenu Tam and other early tosafists in twelfth-century Germany and northern France, that marks a change within Ashkenaz. While these twelfth-century tosafists may have taken their cue from the academy at Worms, their talmudocentricity did not dominate all subsequent tosafist creativity, even as their dialectical method did. Interest in the study of Talmud and *halakhah* alone was not necessarily the rule.

Although the tosafists saw themselves as direct successors or later models of the Tannaim and Amoraim,⁵ it is important to consider how mystical and magical material reached the tosafists (and their predecessors in the pre-Crusade period). Clearly, *Hekhalot* literature played a major role in this process. Irrespective of the scholarly debate about whether *Hekhalot* literature was produced for and by rabbinic scholars or for less learned individuals who

⁴For a brief overview of these issues and the positions taken by contemporary scholars, see Elliot Ginsburg, "The Many Faces of Kabbalah," *Hebrew Studies* 36 (1995):116–20. Cf. Hava Tirosh-Rothschild, "Continuity and Revision in the Study of Kabbalah," *AJS Review* 16 (1991):161–92; Michael Swartz, *Scholastic Magic* (Princeton, 1996), 11, n. 28; Moshe Idel, "Kabbalah and Elites in Thirteenth-Century Spain," *Mediterranean Historical Review* 9 (1994):6–13; idem, "R. Mosheh b. Nahman—Qabbalah, Halakhah u-Manhigut Ruhanit," *Tarbiz* 64 (1995):535–78; and Israel Ta-Shma, "R. Yosef Karo Bein Ashkenaz li-Sefarad—Le-Heqer Hitpashtut Sefer ha-Zohar," *Tarbiz* 59 (1990):153–70. The nature of the *Hekhalot* literature is also related to this discussion. See below, n. 6.

⁵See my "On the Right to Open an Academy in Medieval Ashkenaz," *Michael* 12 (1991):233–50, and my "Progress and Tradition in Medieval Ashkenaz," *Jewish History* 14 (2000).

CHAPTER 6

wished to use the magical *Sar ha-Torah* techniques to acquire Torah knowledge—an approach which, to date, can be fairly characterized as the minority position—magical techniques and mystical conceptions from *Hekhalot* texts penetrated into medieval Ashkenaz in both exoteric and esoteric form.⁶ Although *Hasidei Ashkenaz* have been assigned a large role in the editing and redaction of the *Hekhalot*, there is no reason to assume that only they were aware of this corpus. Indeed, we have encountered a number of citations of *Hekhalot* literature in medieval Ashkenazic rabbinic texts, including passages from a little-known work entitled *Ma'aseh Merkavah*. *Hekhalot* texts and practices were the sources of several widespread liturgical and ritual customs as well. *Hekhalot* literature is also replete with magical techniques and incantations that, as we have seen, influenced tosafist formulations both directly and indirectly.⁷

Moreover, there is an ascetic aspect to this literature as well. Ascetic practices are designed primarily to prepare an individual to use Divine and angelic names in various adjurations, after which a number of tosafist formulae are modeled. Nonetheless, the asceticism favored by the *Hekhalot* texts may have also been a source of the more general tendencies toward pietism and *perishut* that we have detected in the pre-Crusade and tosafist periods.⁸

Peter Schäfer has made a similar argument with regard to *Hasidei Ashkenaz*. He suggests that the rise of *hasidut Ashkenaz* ought not be explained mainly as a response to twelfth-century stimuli (such as persecution, Christian asceticism, or the rise of tosafist dialectic). There are, in fact, roots in *Hekhalot* literature for many of the ascetic and self-effacing behaviors affected by *Hasidei Ashkenaz*. Self-perfection, especially through physical restraint, was considered by *Hekhalot* writers to be a significant means of achieving a closer relationship

⁶See the summary and analysis in Elliot Wolfson, *Through a Speculum That Shines* (Princeton, 1994), 74–80, 111–17. Cf. David Halpern's review of Peter Schäfer's *The Hidden and Manifest God*, in *AJS Review* 19 (1994):254–57; Swartz, *Scholastic Magic*, 7–18; and Reuven Bonfil, "Eduto shel Agobard me-Lyons 'al 'Olamam ha-Ruhani shel Yehudei 'Iro ba-Me'ah ha-Teshi'it," *Mehqarim be-Qabbalah, be-Filosofyah Yehudit uve-Sifrut ha-Musar vehe-Hagut*, ed. J. Dan and J. Hacker (Jerusalem, 1986), 333–38, 347–48.

⁷For the impact of *Hekhalot* literature on exoteric magical practices, cf. Shaul Shaked, "On *Hekhalot*, Liturgy and Incantation Bowls," *Jewish Studies Quarterly* 2 (1995):203–7. See also Michael Swartz, "'Like the Ministering Angels': Ritual and Purity in Early Jewish Mysticism and Magic," *AJS Review* 19 (1994):135–67.

⁸Cf. S. D. Fraade, "Ascetical Aspects of Ancient Judaism," *Jewish Spirituality from the Bible Through the Middle Ages* (New York, 1987), 253–88, and Yitzḥak Baer, *Yisra'el ba-'Ammim* (Jerusalem, 1955), 99–117.

Conclusions and Implications

with the Almighty, even without undertaking magical adjurations or heavenly journeys.⁹ To be sure, the asceticism and *hasidut* espoused in *Sefer Hasidim* is more pronounced and more extensive than the ascetic and pietistic patterns we have found among certain tosafists. Nonetheless, this tendency among tosafists as well (which includes not only regular fasting and a diminution in the pleasures of food and drink, but also strictures against gazing at women and their clothing, looking into the face of a wicked person, and taking walks for pleasure) may have been inspired, in part, by *Hekhalot* literature and related texts, such as the *Baraita de-Massekhet Niddah*.

At the same time, the fact that certain tosafists recognized the legitimacy of the full program of *tiqqunei teshuvah* associated with the German Pietists, the appropriateness of confessing one's sins to a *rav* (which some Pietists advocated), and the value of reciting lengthy and sometimes physically demanding confessionals (*vidduyim*) helps to explain why these aspects of the Pietists' program were accepted by a significant number of Ashkenazic rabbinic authorities in the late Middle Ages and beyond.¹⁰ Indeed, the interest displayed in magical and mystical concepts by Ashkenazic talmudists and halakhists in the late medieval and early modern periods and beyond also needs to be reevaluated in light of the tosafist period—although, to be sure, the number of non-Ashkenazic influences grows as the centuries unfold.¹¹ The serious interest in these concepts during the tosafist period also helps to explain why

⁹See Peter Schäfer, "The Ideal of Piety and Ashkenazi Hasidim and Its Roots in Jewish Tradition," *Jewish History* 4 (1990):9–23. See also Robert Chazan, "The Early Development of *Hasidut Ashkenaz*," *JQR* 75 (1985):199–211.

¹⁰See, e.g., Jacob Elbaum, *Teshuvat ha-Lev ve-Qabbalat Yissurim* (Jerusalem, 1993); Yedidyah Dinari, *Hakhmei Ashkenaz be-Shilhei Yemei ha-Benayim* (Jerusalem, 1984), 85–106; and Shlomo Eidelberg, *Jewish Life in Austria in the XVth Century* (Philadelphia, 1962), 43–44, 85, n. 19, 90–91.

¹¹See Israel Yuval, *Hakhhamim be-Doram* (Jerusalem, 1989), 87–90, 285–310; Dinari, *Hakhmei Ashkenaz*, 285–86. Cf. David Knowles, *The Evolution of Medieval Thought* (New York, 1962), 311–17; Immanuel Etkes, "Meqomam shel ha-Mageyah u-Va'alei Shem ba-Hevrah ha-Ashkenazit be-Mifneh ha-Me'ot ha-Yod Zayin/ha-Yod Het," *Zion* 60 (1985):69–104; Moshe Rosman, *Founder of Hasidism: A Quest for the Historical Ba'al Shem Tov* (Berkeley, 1996), 13–48; Meir Raffeld, "Al Me'at Sheqi'in Qabbaliyyim be-Mishnato ha-Hilkhatit shel ha-Maharshal," *Da'at* 36 (1996):15–33; and the ascetic practice attributed to the *Beit ha-Levi* in *Mesorah* 12 (1996):35–36. References to *Hasidei Ashkenaz* in later Ashkenazic literature may be to medieval Ashkenazic rabbinic scholars/tosafists as a whole. See my *Jewish Education and Society in the High Middle Ages* (Detroit, 1992), 191, n. 24 (regarding R. Hayyim b. Bezal'el), and R. Jacob of Karlin, *Mishkenot Ya'aqov* (repr. Jerusalem, 1960), 121.

CHAPTER 6

tosafists are cited and mentioned in various kabbalistic works¹² and why the Zohar chose to adopt Ashkenazic *minhagim* in a large number of instances.¹³

This study suggests that within medieval Ashkenaz itself the German Pietists were not as unique as heretofore thought. Indeed, I have wrestled throughout this work with the question of whether the Pietists were the source of a particular phenomenon espoused by certain tosafists, or whether these tosafists received this material from pre-Crusade Ashkenazic rabbinic culture or from tosafist predecessors. This question is particularly acute with regard to developments in northern France through the first quarter of the thirteenth century. For the remainder of the thirteenth century, it is possible to conclude that while northern French rabbinic creativity was dominant with respect to talmudic commentary and study, in the realms of prayer and *piyyut* and their interpretation—including their mystical components—German rabbinic scholars led the way.¹⁴

To be sure, significant differences between Pietists and tosafists remain. *Sefer Hasidim* contains passages that frame, at least in theory, an elite pietist movement or community that wished to separate itself from the mainstream in Ashkenaz in order to pursue a life of *hasidut* to the fullest extent. These passages are in addition to the peculiar forms of necromancy and the systematic interest in *shedim* found throughout *Sefer Hasidim*, the more pronounced pietistic and ascetic tendencies that have been noted (including the search for the hidden Divine Will), and the strong concerns expressed with regard to the use of dialectic and contentious talmudic study. With regard to *torat ha-sod*, only the German Pietists (and their associates, such as the *Hug ha-Keruv ha-Meyuhad* in northern France) were significantly engaged in the study of theosophy, developing a system of *sefirot*-like hypostases and other theosophical concepts—especially the *Kavod*—that had an impact on subsequent developments in Spanish Kabbalah.¹⁵ The sustained interest in

¹²See my “Rabbinic Figures in Castilian Kabbalistic Pseudepigraphy: The Case of R. Judah *he-Hasid* and R. Elhanan of Corbeil,” *Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy* 3 (1993):77–109.

¹³See Israel Ta-Shma, *Ha-Nigleh shebe-Nistar* (Jerusalem, 1995).

¹⁴See Yaakov Sussmann, “Mif’alo ha-Madda’i shel Ephraim Elimelekh Urbach,” *Mussaf Madda’ei ha-Yahadut* 1 (1993):61; and cf. Ta-Shma, *Halakhah, Minhag u-Mezi’ut be-Ashkenaz, 1000–1350* (Jerusalem, 1996), 17–19, and Haym Soloveitchik, “Catastrophe and Halakhic Creativity in Ashkenaz—1096, 1242, 1306, and 1298,” *Jewish History* 12 (1998):71–85.

¹⁵See, e.g., Gershom Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (New York, 1956), 111–18; Yosef Dan, *Torat ha-Sod shel Hasidut Ashkenaz* (Jerusalem, 1968), 104–70; Wolfson, *Through a Speculum That Shines*, 195–269.

Conclusions and Implications

these areas by the German Pietists alone within medieval Ashkenaz¹⁶ is directly related to the fact that only *Hasidei Ashkenaz* expressed familiarity with the philosophical teachings of several Jewish Neoplatonists. Even the Hebrew paraphrase of R. Sa‘adayah Gaon’s *Emunot ve-De‘ot* is cited almost exclusively in Pietist texts. The philosophical leanings of the Pietists account, in part, for their preference in studying the esoteric properties and characteristics of the Divine Names, rather than adjuring them for personal needs or other more mundane purposes.

Recently, there has been much discussion about whether *Hekhalot* texts and procedures reflect an approach that was fundamentally esoteric or exoteric.¹⁷ This issue can also be raised concerning certain geonic and other early medieval formulations (such as those of R. Hai and R. Ḥanan’el on visionary experiences).¹⁸ Even the mystical study and manipulation of Divine Names within the kabbalistic framework can be divided into theosophical and more experiential components.¹⁹

With these kinds of distinctions in mind, it is clear that the tosafists highlighted in this study were not mystics who approached Judaism from the perspective of esotericism, just as they were not trying to form a separate pietistic movement. They were rabbinic scholars who received, as part of the intellectual culture of medieval Ashkenaz, an awareness of and interest in pietistic and mystical teachings and practices.²⁰ Although some tosafists ignored or downplayed these impulses, others acknowledged and adopted them in a moderate or partial way, and still others cultivated them more fully and developed them further.

¹⁶Overall, references by tosafists to Pietist conceptions of *torat ha-Kavod* are few and far between. At least one of the tosafists who refers to this material, R. Isaac b. Moses *Or Zarua*^c, was part of the Pietists’ circle in thirteenth-century Ashkenaz and was directly influenced by them—as were R. Meir of Rothenburg and the author of *Sefer ha-Maskil*, who discuss theosophical concepts and issues. See above, ch. 5, nn. 7, 65.

¹⁷See above, n. 6, and see now Rachel Elior, “From Earthly Temple to Heavenly Shrine,” *JSQ* 4 (1997):217–23, and Moshe Idel, “Al ha-Qedushah ve-ha-Zefiyyah ba-Merkavah,” *Me-Qumran ‘ad Qahir*, ed. Joseph Tabory (Jerusalem, 1999), 7–15.

¹⁸See, e.g., Wolfson, *Through a Speculum That Shines*, 144–48, 155–56; Moshe Idel, *Kabbalah: New Perspectives* (New Haven, 1988), 90–91; and cf. idem, *Golem* (Albany, 1990), 48–49; and Yehuda Liebes, *Het’o shel Elisha* (Jerusalem, 1990), 1–10, 105–10.

¹⁹See Moshe Idel, “Defining Kabbalah: The Kabbalah of the Divine Names,” *Mystics of the Book*, ed. R. A. Herrera (New York, 1993), 97–122, and cf. idem, “Yahadut, Mistiqah Yehudit u-Mageyah,” *Madda‘ei ha-Yahadut* 36 (1996):25–40.

²⁰Cf. M. Idel’s preface to A. J. Heschel, *Prophetic Inspiration After the Prophets*, ed. M. M. Faierstein (Hoboken, 1996), 8–9.

CHAPTER 6

In any case, the inner spiritual lives of the *ba'alei ha-Tosafot* cannot be characterized as monolithic. Rather, we have encountered among the tosafists a range and richness of religious virtuosity and expression that suggests a more balanced or nuanced view of their composite personality. This degree of intellectual and spiritual breadth surely befits rabbinic scholars of their stature and rank.

Appendix: Ashkenazic Rabbinic Scholars

The chart on the following page provides an overview of many of the Ashkenazic rabbinic figures referred to in this study. Only the most basic chronological and geographic details are given. It may be assumed that those scholars for whom no specific dates have been supplied are roughly contemporaneous with the other names on their line in the chart, although differences in life span may mean that the transitions from line to line are not as neat as they appear to be. Familial and teacher-student relationships, which are noted throughout the body of the book, have generally not been included here. The column(s) on the left contain(s) the names of rabbinic scholars from northern and central France (and England). The middle columns consist of scholars from Germany, Austria, and Italy. The column furthest to the right lists several key figures among the German Pietists.

APPENDIX: ASHKENAZIC RABBINIC SCHOLARS

Menahem of Le Mans and his son, Elijah <i>ha-Zaqen</i> (c.980–1060)	Simeon b. Isaac <i>ha-Gadol</i> (c.950–1030, Mainz)			
Joseph b. Samuel <i>Tov Elem</i> (c.980–1050, Anjou and Limoges)	Eliezer b. Isaac <i>ha-Gadol</i> (c.990–1060, Mainz)	Jacob b. Yaqr (c.990–1064, Mainz)		
Solomon b. Isaac יִשְׁאָל (1040–1105, Troyes)	Isaac b. Eliezer <i>ha-Levi</i> (c.1000–1075, Worms)	Isaac b. Judah (c.1010–1085, Mainz)		
Meir b. Samuel (c.1060–1135, Ramerupt)	Elijah b. Judah (Paris)	Isaac b. Asher <i>ha-Levi</i> (d.c.1130, Spires)	Qalonymus b. Isaac (d.1126, Mainz/Spires)	
Samuel b. Meir רַבְמִן (c.1080–1160)	Jacob b. Meir זְרַבְמִן (c.1100–1171, Ramerupt)	Eliezer b. Nathan רַבְנִן (1090–1170, Mainz)	Isaac b. Mordekhai רַבְמִן and Ephraim b. Isaac (1110–1175) (Regensburg)	Samuel b. Qalonymus <i>he-Hasid</i> (b.1115, Spires)
Isaac b. Samuel (יעַיְן) (d.1189, Dampierre) Yom Tov b. Isaac (d.1190) and Menahem b. Perez Jacob of Corbeil (d.1192) (Joigny) Eliezer b. Samuel (d.1198, Metz)	Jacob b. Meir זְרַבְמִן (c.1100–1171, Ramerupt)	Judah b. Qalonymus b. Meir (d.1199, Spires)	and his son, and his son,	
Isaac b. Abraham רַבְעַמִּן (d.1210), and his brother, Samson b. Abraham (d.1214, Sens)	Barukh b. Isaac (d.1211, Worms)		Judah b. Samuel <i>he-Hasid</i> (d.1217, Spires/Regensburg)	
Judah b. Isaac Sir Leon (1166–1224, Paris)	Eliezer b. Joel <i>ha-levi</i> זְרַבְנִין (c.1140–1225, Bonn)	Barukh b. Samuel (c.1150–1221, Mainz), and his son, Samuel Bamberg		
Solomon b. Judah דָּרְעֵךְ Ezra <i>ha-Navi</i> מִנּוֹנְטוּר Jacob b. Meir (Moncontour) (Provins)	Simhah b. Samuel (Spires)	Moses b. Hisdai Taku	Eleazar b. Judah (d.c.1230, Worms)	
Moses b. Jacob כּוּכְבִּי Yehiel b. Joseph (Coucy) (d.c.1265, Paris)	Isaiah b. Mali di Trani (d.c.1250)	Isaac b. Moses <i>Or Zarua'</i> וְרָאוּא (d.c.1250, Vienna)	Abraham b. Azriel (d.c. 1240, Bohemia)	
Netan'el and Isaac b. Isaac of Chinon Moses and Samuel of Evreux			Abraham Haldiq	
Isaac b. Joseph (d.1280, Corbeil)	Elijah Menahem b. Moses (c.1220–1284, London)	Zedekiah b. Abraham <i>ha-Rofe Anav</i> (Rome)	Avigdor b. Elijah <i>Kohen Zedeq</i> צַדְקָה (c.1200–1275, Vienna)	
Perez b. Elijah (Corbeil, d.1298)		Meir b. Barukh of Rothenburg (c.1220–1293)		
		Asher b. Yehiel וְרַבְמִן and his son, Jacob בָּאֵל <i>ha-Turim</i>		

Index of Manuscript References

Ancona		Budapest (National Museum)	
23	243	2° 1.....	111
Berlin		Cambridge (University Library)	
Or. Qu. 942.....	169	Add. 377	65
Bologna (University Library)		Add. 394	81, 100–102, 178
2914	181	Add. 491	100
Breslau		Add. 561	101–2, 178
255	65	Add. 664	236
British Museum		Add. 667.1	179
Cat. Margoliouth–		Add. 858	48, 109, 134, 181, 226
243 (Or. 2853).....	94, 247	Add. 1022.1	116, 206, 235
534 (Harley 5529).....	102	Add. 1176	175, 180
610 (Add. 14762).....	138	Add. 2580	65
640 (Add. 26883).....	73, 174	Add. 3127	62, 65, 91
737 (Add. 27199).....	209, 213	Add. 3111	227
752 (Add. 15299).....	98, 202		
754 (Harley 5510).....	202	Or. 71	98, 100, 176, 227
756 (Or. 1055).....	98	Or. 786	39, 44, 91, 103, 115, 243
1056 (Add. 11639)	179–80	Or. 790	184
Or. 5557G	133		
Or. 9931 (Gaster 730)	105		
Or. 10619	227		
Or. 14055	46, 180		
Budapest (Kaufmann)		Cincinnati (HUC)	
A174	181	436	72, 147
A266	123	Acc. 14	213
A399	88, 100, 104, 122, 162		
Darmstadt		Darmstadt	
		Cod. Or. 25	78, 206–7
Florence (Laurenziana)			
		Plut. II 5/12	209
Frankfurt			
		Hebr. 8° 227	138

INDEX OF MANUSCRIPT REFERENCES

Hamburg	
45	94–95, 227
152	48, 157
153	163
293	207
Jerusalem (Feldman)	
3	186
Jerusalem (JNUL)	
4° 621 (Livorno 2)	70
8° 151	248
8° 397	142, 233
8° 476	142, 204, 227, 236
8° 1070	133
8° 3037	142
8° 4199	143
Leipzig	
1	117
Livorno (Talmud Tora):	
2	70
138	212, 227, 236
London (Jews' College)	
Beth Hamidrash	
73	211
Montefiore	
6	73
130	236
134	48, 155, 227
Mantua	
36	94
Macerata (Biblioteca Comunale)	
310	73, 180
Milan-Ambrosiana	
53/10 (P 12, sup.)	98, 195
62 (S 13, sup.)	243
Moscow-Guenzberg	
13	184
82	117
90	209
182	156, 209
303	77
348	104, 124, 165
488	189, 191
Munich	
5	240–41
614	201
717	236
734	203, 238
1302	155, 246
New York (JTS)	
Lutski 1062	172
Rab. 689	181
Rab. 1077	124
Rab. 1609	192–93
Mic. 1640	73
Mic. 1851	246
Mic. 1878	213
Mic. 1885	248
Mic. 2131	174
Mic. 2367	181
Mic. 7928	148
Mic. 8092	157
Mic. 8114	141, 244
Mic. 8118	191, 222
Mic. 8122	101
Nuremberg (Municipal Library)	
Cent. V. app. 5/1	192
Oxford (Bodleian)	
Cat. Neubauer-	
123	242
271	117, 229
378	123, 154
388	192
554	72
659	103, 180, 198–99, 216, 229
682	111, 201–2, 234
692	158, 171
696	113
781	90, 186
783	207
784	156, 245
794	162
847	24, 193, 218
875	59, 65, 90

Index of Manuscript References

884	65	390	90
900	52	391	176, 180–82
913	110	407	62, 91, 124
916	248	592	176
945	138–39	620	231
970	202	632	179, 212
973	211	633	73, 94, 167, 174–78, 180–184
1038	212	640	139
1098	65, 212	644	184
1102	100, 104, 162	646	72, 102, 147, 180, 212
1103	102, 138	711	169, 211
1105	72, 74, 179–180	716	142, 212
1106	123	738	246
1108	182	772	201
1114	65, 72, 74	776	213, 238
1118	72, 74	835	73
1150	204	839	109
1153	132	843	248
1204	101	1408	108, 147, 154, 183, 216, 234
1205	102		
1206	198, 200		
1207	145		
1209	73		
1575	138		
1589	211		
1598	142		
1618	248		
1812	73, 181, 217, 243		
1936	236		
2105	198		
2273	97, 138		
2274	65, 102, 186		
2275	158		
2282	242		
2287	110		
2312	184, 207		
2343	65, 90		
2344	181, 249		
2423	229		
2502	178		
2550	177		
2575	145		
2858	110		
Corpus Christi			
133	181–83		
Paris (Bibliothèque Nationale, héb.)			
167	198–200		
187	184		
353	95–96		
Paris (l'Alliance)			
H 48A (153)	147		
H 133A (187)	235		
H 482	73		
Parma			
Cat. De Rossi–			
112	227		
147	110		
159	178		
166	65, 90		
181	194		
363	178, 180		
425	108		
540	135		
541	88, 97, 138–42, 169, 195, 203, 229, 244		
563	203, 238		
591	178–79		
654	178		
655	98		
671	227		
855	177		
918	108		
929	108		
963	178		
997	213, 227		
1033	99, 116, 142, 212		
1124	176, 180, 246–47		
1138	46, 73, 174, 182		
1220	72		

INDEX OF MANUSCRIPT REFERENCES

1221	73, 238	Vatican
1237	108, 165, 216	Ebr.
1274	107	159
1354	73, 174, 213	142, 195, 226–27, 236
1390	173–77, 180	244
		142, 171
		251
		109
		274
		100-2, 215
Prague (Jewish Museum)		324
45	213	138, 235
		331
		73
Rome (Angelica)		422
Or. 45	143	158
Rome (Casanatense)		Rossiana–
117	65	356
137	208	46, 73, 174–75, 183
159	109	Urb. Ebr.–
		22
		110
Sassoon		Verona (Municipal Library)
290	121, 135, 142, 160, 182, 186, 207, 232, 243, 248	101 (85.2)
405	109	100
408	46, 180, 226	Vienna (National Library)
		28 (Hebr. 148)
		142, 212
		152 (Hebr. 47)
		171
Sweden		Warsaw
Lund L.O.2	158	9
Uppsala 21	94	245
		285
		148
		374
		212

Index of Names and Subjects

Abbaye, 179, 182n. 113
Abraham b. Azriel, R., 20, 21n. 3, 81–82, 87, 102n. 14, 112, 260
Abraham b. Nathan *ha-Yarhi*, R., 51–53, 56–58, 193–94
Abraham b. Samuel *he-Hasid*, R., 103n. 16
Abraham Haldis, R., 95, 113, 260
Abun family, 41, 131
academies: at Evreux, 26, 59–63, 71, 89, 90–92, 124, 177; at Mainz, 148; at Worms, 148, 186
adurations, 141, 155, 181–82, 209, 212, 252. *See also* prayers; supplications
‘aggadah, 60n. 76, 100n. 11
Agobard of Lyons, 27–28
Aharon *ha-Kohen* of Lunel, R., 89
Akatri’el (angel), 223
‘Aleynu prayer, 87, 179, 182n. 112
Alfasi, R. Isaac, 193n. 8
‘aliyah/‘aliyyot, 53, 137
alphabet, Hebrew, 28, 86n. 156, 95n. 5, 97n. 9, 156, 221. *See also* numerical analyses
‘Amidah prayer, 43, 53, 54, 80, 91n. 175, 137–38
‘Amudei Golah. *See* *Sefer Miqvot Qatan*
Amnon, R., story of, 107n. 26, 133n. 3
Amoraim, 253
Amtahat Binyamin, 178n. 104
amulets, 98n. 10, 227n. 16, 236
angelic names, 29, 53n. 54, 86, 97n. 9, 132, 154, 172, 182n. 112, 252
angels, 41n. 24, 112, 114, 168; adjuration of, 140, 212; of death, 138; Divine Names and, 244n. 67; in heaven, 210n. 42; as intermediaries, 13, 134, 226, 239n. 50; prayers and, 124n. 70, 147, 235n. 43; righteous people and, 201; in worldview of tosafists, 178n. 104. *See also* names of specific angels
approbations, 89n. 169
Aqiva, R., 48, 150, 173, 225n. 11
Arba’ah Turim, 46, 247
‘Arugat *ha-Bosem*, 20n. 3
asceticism, 33–37, 119, 124, 127, 242; antecedents in pre-Crusade period, 37–42; atonement and, 234; Christian, 126, 254; Evreux academy and, 62; German Pietists and, 220; R. Isaac of Corbeil and, 91; Rabbenu Yonah and, 66–67; of tosafists, 251, 253; in twelfth-century tosafist literature, 42–58
Asher b. Jacob *ha-Levi* of Osnabrück, R., 103
Asher b. Meshullam of Lunel, R., 43, 194n. 10
Ashkenaz, medieval, 30, 65, 79, 93, 107, 125, 256; adjuration of Divine Names in, 168; conception of piety in, 20; education initiation ceremony in, 237n. 47; esotericism in, 249; magic in, 141; mysticism in, 214; Passover customs in, 99n. 11; philosophical awareness in, 252; practice of fasting in, 111; rabbinic culture/literature of, 33–34, 187, 257; *torat ha-sod* in, 166. *See also* France, northern; Germany; astrology, 158, 193n. 9, 240n. 52
atonement, 25, 180n. 110, 234
Austria, 113, 260
Av, 39, 40, 42, 51, 62, 122
Avigdor b. Elijah *Kohen Zedeq* (Katz) of Vienna, R., 95n. 5, 97–98n. 9, 107, 108–9, 115, 221, 225–27, 234, 252, 260

INDEX OF NAMES AND SUBJECTS

Avigdor b. Isaac, R., 98n. 9
Avinu Malkenu prayer, 48, 108–9, 226
Avodah prayer, 49
 Azulai, R. Hayyim Yosef David, 229
Baraita de-Massekhet Niddah, 49, 127–30, 157n. 63, 164n. 75, 255
Barekh prayer, 96n. 7, 101n. 14, 143, 154n. 56, 224
 Barukh b. Isaac of Worms, R., 68, 119, 120, 260
 Barukh b. Samuel of Mainz, R., 68, 103, 105–6, 260
 Benjamin b. Abraham *ha-Navi*, R., 231
 Benjamin of Tudela, R., 194n. 10
Bereshit Rabbah, 53–54, 234n. 41
 Bible, 108n. 110, 137
 biblical commentaries/interpretations, 77, 95, 104, 145, 148, 235
 black magic, 166, 211
 Bohemia, 20, 113
 Bonn, Germany, 214
 burials, 119
 charity, 91, 105, 108n. 28, 143n. 25
 children, 42, 92n. 178, 109, 141, 156
 Christianity, 69, 83, 123; Christian-Jewish polemics, 185; conversion to, 234; legend of Jewish pope, 134n. 4; magic and, 166
 circumcision, 86n. 157, 230
 commentaries, 26, 61, 95, 100, 101, 103–4, 145, 159
 confession, 47, 91, 255
 cosmogony, 159
 Creation story, 149, 159
 Crusades, 23, 40n. 20, 44, 126, 187
 customs, 99n. 11, 107, 114, 128n. 81, 137, 138, 254, 256
dam niddah, 38
dam tohar, 38, 113, 130n. 86
 Dan, R., 236, 247–48
 death, 109, 123, 211; angel of, 138; communicating with the dead, 196–97
 demons (*shedim*), 114, 178n. 104, 195, 198, 212, 219, 224–25, 239, 245; Divine Names and, 240; protection against, 204n. 33
derashot, 70
Devarim ha-Mevi'im Lidei Yir'at ha-Het, 64
 dialectic, 23, 59, 69, 92, 256; Christian, 167n. 86; Rabbenu Tam and, 189; tosafist, 26, 68, 69, 89, 186, 254
 Diaspora, 44
 divination, 147, 166, 210, 228, 245
 Divine Being, 240, 241
 Divine Names, 29, 53n. 54, 135, 155n. 59, 239, 252; alphabet and, 95n. 5; amulets and, 236; angels and, 101n. 14; biblical commentaries and, 95; catching thieves with, 140; children and, 92n. 178; circumcision and, 230; commentaries on, 106n. 26; divination and, 228; esotericism and, 190n. 2, 220, 257; German Pietists and, 188; *Hekhalot* guidelines for use, 207; kabbalism and, 242–43; kaddish and, 153; magic and, 30, 182n. 112; *mezuzot* and, 154, 232; Primal Ether and, 242; Rashi and, 144–45, 146; reasons for adjuring, 172; ritual practices and, 141; theurgic powers of, 136; Torah and, 230; used for protection, 85–87, 137n. 10, 181, 209, 227. *See also Shemot*
 Divine Will, 36, 75, 104, 256
 Donnolo, R. Shabbetai, 75
 dreams, 78, 107n. 26, 132, 133n. 3, 160n. 67, 232; contrasted with visions, 136n. 8; halakhic rulings and, 164, 165, 217, 238; interpretation of, 184n. 116, 194
 dress, modes of, 127
 drink, abstention from, 51
 eastern Europe, 30, 113, 130n. 86
 education, 214, 237n. 47
 eggs, magical, 140–41, 142n. 21, 156, 242
 Eleazar b. Judah of Worms, R., 19–20, 24, 45, 48, 81, 128, 202n. 30, 260; *Aleynu* prayer and, 179; *Baraita de-Massekhet Niddah* and, 130; biblical commentaries of, 97n. 9, 108n. 28, 156, 200; on Divine Names, 95n. 5, 156, 220, 230, 243; esotericism and, 183n. 115, 226, 236; Evreux academy and, 67–68; on fasting, 111; halakhic works and, 147; *hilkhot hasidut* of, 84; influence of, 20; *kavvanah* and, 61n. 79; magic and, 142n. 21, 212; messianism and, 207n. 38; mysticism and, 151, 186; Passover customs and, 137; penitential prayers of, 72, 73n. 112; personal pietism of, 25, 126; prayer commentaries of, 101; Rashi and, 145; on Sabbath practices, 224; *sodot ha-tefillah* and, 161; students of, 81–82, 112; *ta'amei ha-mesorah* and, 117; teachers of, 115, 196; Tetragrammaton and, 215; on Torah, 230; treatise by, 62. *See also Sefer Roqeq*

Index of Names and Subjects

Eleazar b. Meshullam, R., 96n. 7

Eleazar *ha-Qallir*, R., 106, 141, 168

Eleazar *Hazzan* of Spires, R., 143, 154n. 56, 260

Eleazar of Forcheim, R., 100, 107n. 26

Elhanan b. Yaqar of London, R., 191–92

Eliezer b. Elijah *ha-Kohen*, 109

Eliezer b. Haradja, R., 234n. 41

Eliezer b. Isaac *ha-Gadol* of Mainz, R., 39n. 17, 137, 138, 260

Eliezer b. Joel *ha-Levi*, R., 39, 260

Eliezer of Metz, R., 21n. 7, 68, 69, 71n. 110, 102, 103n. 16, 187, 195–97, 252, 260

Elijah b. Judah of Paris, R., 57, 170–71, 207, 260

Elijah b. Menahem of Le Mans, 179, 260

Elijah Menahem b. Moses of London, R., 232–33, 260

Elijah the Prophet, 203, 216, 228

Emunot ve-De'ot, 219, 257

England, 46, 171, 183, 260

Ephraim b. Isaac of Regensburg, R., 164–65, 260

Ephraim b. Jacob of Bonn, R., 106, 214

Erez Yisra'el, 128, 235

esotericism, 78, 79n. 134, 116n. 50, 159, 161, 218; German Pietists and, 67n. 94, 127, 135, 188, 199; *Hekhalot* literature and, 173, 254; kabbalism and, 125; Rashi and, 144, 149–50, 152

ethics, 109, 214

Evreux (France), academy at, 26, 59–63, 71, 89, 90, 177; asceticism and, 62; on *kavvanah* in prayer, 124; *Tosafot* and, 91–92

exegesis/exegetes, 95–96, 169, 205n. 35

exempla, 89

exotericism, 19, 93, 95, 159, 226, 231, 254

Ezra *ha-Navi* of Moncontour, R., 115, 196, 234, 244, 260

fasting, 41–42, 47, 115–16, 124; excessive, 66; inspired by *Hekhalot* literature, 255; penance and, 38, 91; personal declaration of, 43; on *Rosh ha-Shanah*, 108, 111–12, 114, 202; *Sefer Hasidim* on, 34, 35n. 3; on Yom Kippur, 44, 48

Ferrara, Italy, 107

festivals, 114

fires, 46–47

folk religion, 29

food, 35n. 3, 66, 91, 124, 255

France, northern, 20, 28, 41, 51, 53, 56, 95, 242; biblical exegetes in, 95–96; dialectic in, 189; esotericism in, 191; influence of *Hasidei Ashkenaz* in, 214; magic in, 183; prayer interpretation in, 107; predominance in talmudism, 67, 253, 256; rabbinic culture in, 81; rabbinic scholars from, 23, 260; ritual practices in, 140–41; *Sefer Yezirah* in, 145; Spanish Jews in, 71; tosafists in, 59, 68, 79, 187; *Tosafot* texts in, 217. *See also Ashkenaz*, medieval

France, southern. *See* Provence

frivolous behavior, 83, 91

gematria, 48, 93, 95, 96, 97n. 9, 169, 200n. 27; prayers and, 87, 116; *Qeri'at Shema* and, 198–99; Tetragrammaton and, 190n. 2. *See also* numerical analyses

Gentiles, 70, 84n. 151, 98n. 10, 119, 227n. 17

geonic period, 50, 111, 122n. 65, 128, 141, 155n. 58

Germany, 20, 46, 81, 125; dialectic in, 189; esotericism in, 191; magic in, 183; prayer interpretation in, 107; predominance in mysticism, 256; rabbinic scholars from, 260; ritual practices in, 140–41; *Sefer Yezirah* in, 145; talmudocentrism in, 253; tosafists in, 214–15. *See also* Ashkenaz, medieval; Rhineland

Gerona, kabbalism in, 125

Gershom, Rabbenu, 37

Godhead, feminine aspect of, 230

golem, 135, 171, 206

Hai Gaon, R., 168

hair-cutting, 44n. 30

halakhic rulings, 20, 38, 82, 92, 105, 113, 164, 183n. 115

halakhic works, 19–20, 54–55, 77, 89, 99, 185n. 117; asceticism and, 34n. 1; codes, 76, 81; compendiums, 110n. 34, 147; monographs, 103; mysticism and, 215; Sefardic, 84; Torah and, 68–69

halakhists, 27, 39n. 16, 82, 105, 129, 221, 228–29, 255

Hanan'el, Rabbenu, 84, 163n. 75

Hanina b. Tradyon, R., 146

Hannukah, 122n. 64

Hanokh (angel), 170

ha-Qadosh title, 57

hashba'ot, 176, 180, 182n. 113, 183, 188, 212

INDEX OF NAMES AND SUBJECTS

hasid title, 90, 97n. 9, 125, 234
Hasidei Ashkenaz, 22, 75, 103–4, 115, 162, 191; asceticism and, 247; biblical exegesis and, 96; esotericism and, 33–37, 188, 225, 230; Evreux academy and, 67; *Hekhalot* literature and, 254–55; *Hug ha-Keruv ha-Meyuhad* and, 192n. 4; on lineage and marriage, 23; magic and, 220, 246; messianism and, 213; numerical analyses of, 102; *nusha'ot* associated with, 176–77; *perushim* and, 45–46; philosophy and, 208n. 40, 257; pietism of, 221; prayer and, 80, 93, 107, 116; Rabiah and, 47–51; *Semaq* and, 88–89; tosafists and, 24–25, 111, 120–21, 214. *See also* Pietists, German
Hasidei Provence, 58
Hasidei Zarefat, 56, 57
Hasidism, 30, 125
hasidut, 21, 99, 125, 215, 224, 231; in *Sefer Hasidim*, 255, 256; talmudic interpretations and, 251
hasidut Ashkenaz, 47, 52, 77, 79, 123, 230, 248; Evreux academy and, 62, 68; experiential dimension of, 133n. 3; *Hekhalot* literature and, 127; magic and, 220; meaning of, 58; mysticism and, 31, 126, 196; in northern France, 59n. 71; penances and, 234; Rabbenu Yonah and, 70–71; rise of, 254; *Sefer Hasidim* and, 24, 104; talmudism and, 22; *torat ha-Kavod* of, 239
Havdalah ceremony, 155
Hayyim ha-Kohen, R., 57n. 67
hazaq custom, 54n. 57
Hekhalot literature, 27–28, 29, 49, 55, 101, 110n. 34, 123, 125, 132, 196; *'Aleynu* prayer and, 179; *Hasidei Ashkenaz* and, 56; *hasidut Ashkenaz* and, 127; *Baraita de-Massekhet Niddah* and, 127–28; Divine Names in, 207; esotericism and, 173; magic/mysticism and, 30–31, 213, 244; menstrual impurity in, 129; *nosah ha-tefillah* and, 235; prayers and, 226; rabbinic scholars and, 253–54; Rashi and, 149–51; ritual and, 140; synagogue practices and, 50
Hekhalot Rabbati, 49, 109, 147. *See also* *Ma'aseh Merkavah*; *Sefer Hekhalot*
High Holidays, 137
hilkhot hasidut, 84, 126
hilkhot teshuvah, 82
Hilkhot Yezirah, 145
Hokhmat ha-Nefesh, 226
Holy Ark, 37, 163
hovat ha-'evarim, 75
Hug ha-'Iyyun, 241, 242
Hug ha-Keruv ha-Meyuhad, 67n. 94, 151, 171, 192, 206, 230, 256
humility, 33, 64, 87
Ibn Ezra, R. Avraham, 95, 171–72, 215
idolatry, 194–95
Isaac b. Eliezer *ha-Levi*, R., 38–40, 260
Isaac b. Isaac of Chinon, R., 174, 176–77, 260
Isaac b. Joseph of Corbeil, R., 62, 63n. 84, 81–92, 119, 241, 252, 260
Isaac b. Judah of Mainz (Mayence), R., 39n. 17, 40, 42, 260
Isaac b. Moses of Mainz, R., 39–40
Isaac b. Moses *Or Zarua'* of Vienna, R., 21, 39, 107, 112, 219, 221–24, 234; on burial customs, 119; *Hasidei Ashkenaz* and, 51n. 47; magic and, 128–30, 164n. 75; *Sefer Or Zarua'* of, 69; as teacher, 115
Isaac b. Shne'ur of Evreux, R., 26
Isaac *de-min 'Akko*, R., 210–11
Isaac *ha-Lavan*, R., 52
Isaac *ha-Navi Zarefat*, R., 195n. 14
Isaac *ha-Zaqen*, R. *See* Ri (R. Isaac b. Samuel of Dampierre)
Isaac *Sagi Nahor*, R., 56
Isaiah b. Mali di Trani, R., 77n. 123, 228, 260
Israel, ancient, 115
Italy, 28, 107, 120n. 60, 131n. 1, 155n. 58; pre-Crusade, 132n. 2; rabbinic scholars from, 260; tosafists in, 228
Jacob b. Asher *Ba'al ha-Turim*, R., 46, 117, 245, 246–47, 247, 260
Jacob b. Meir of Provins, R., 98, 207, 260
Jacob b. Samson, R., 158
Jacob b. Yaqr, R., 37–38, 143, 260
Jacob *ha-Levi* of Marvège, R., 185, 195n. 11, 216, 228, 229
Jacob of Corbeil, R., 57, 197–200, 252, 260
Jacob of Orleans, R., 47
Jaffe, R. Mordekhai, 152
Jewish law, 107, 118–20, 119, 128, 196, 216
Jewish Magic and Superstition: A Study in Folk Religion (Trachtenberg), 27
Jewish pope, legend of, 134n. 4
Jews, 27–28, 69, 166, 231
John of Salisbury, 166
Joseph b. Samuel *Tov Elem*, R., 96, 260

Index of Names and Subjects

Joseph *Bekhor Shor*, R., 77

Judah b. Isaac Sir Leon, R., 39n. 16, 68, 217, 260

Judah b. Moses *ha-Kohen* of Mainz, R., 115

Judah b. Samuel *he-Hasid*, R., 20–21, 24, 25–26, 39, 45, 81, 82, 95, 116, 169; ancestors of, 23, 137; on angels, 201, 202n. 29; *Bereshit Rabbah* and, 54; biblical commentaries of, 104, 108n. 28; as central figure of *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, 208; cited in *Sefer Mizvot Qatan*, 85–87; esotericism and, 236; Evreux academy and, 67–68; on fasting, 34, 36, 48, 115; influence of, 130n. 86; liturgical interpretations of, 101; magic and, 142n. 21, 143, 179, 180n. 110, 183n. 114, 210–14; messianism and, 78; *minhagim* and, 114; mysticism and, 186; on penances, 47; pietistic works of, 230; prayers and, 72, 106; responsa of, 185; *Ri* and, 193; on *shedim*, 224–25; Spires circle and, 117n. 52; students of, 111, 156n. 62, 200; on suicide, 234; *ta‘amei ha-mesorah* and, 117; testament of, 65n. 88

Judah b. Yaqr, R., 199–200, 235n. 43

kabbalah/kabbalism, 21n. 6, 125, 135, 178n. 104, 199, 205, 218; Divine Names and, 242–43; magic and, 21n. 8; new moon and, 223n. 7; in Provence, 20, 55n. 61; *rishonim* and, 252; in Spain, 27, 55n. 61, 248, 256; talmudic scholars and, 30; Torah and, 144n. 28; tosafists and, 256; use of salt in, 204n. 33; works of, 152

Kaddish prayer, 142, 153, 154n. 56

kavvanah, 61, 67n. 93, 84–85, 106, 124; in *Arba‘ah Turim*, 247; Provençal mysticism and, 55–56; sin and, 109

Keter ha-Gadol ha-Gibbor ve-ha-Nora, 182n. 112

kisse ha-Kavod, 28, 106n. 26, 134

Kohen Zedeq. See R. Avigdor b. Elijah of Vienna

lashes, 47, 115, 116

Le Mans, France, 41

legal practices. *See* Jewish law

lehitshah technique, 225–26

liturgical texts, 93, 96, 100–101, 104, 106, 135, 154n. 56, 157, 247. *See also* *piyyutim*; prayers

Luria, R. Solomon, 23–24n. 13, 235n. 43

Ma‘aseh Bereshit, 146, 162, 168

Ma‘aseh ha-Geonim, 128

Ma‘aseh Merkavah, 22, 55, 109, 146, 147, 159, 162, 254. *See also* *Hekhalot Rabbati*

Magdeburg, Germany, 113

magic, 21, 27, 29, 54, 78, 86, 125, 168, 221, 236; amulets, 98n. 10; ascent to Heaven with, 244; in Christian society, 166; Divine Names and, 86–87; eggs and, 140–41, 142n. 21, 156; *perishut* and, 129; protection from danger, 99n. 10, 179–81; rabbinic scholars and, 30, 159, 234; secrecy and, 30n. 30; in the *Zohar*, 154n. 56

Maharam (R. Meir b. Barukh) of Rothenburg, 21n. 7, 47, 61n. 80, 103, 232, 252, 260; approbation of *Semaq*, 89n. 169; esotericism and, 234–39; German Pietists and, 115–24; *Hasidei Ashkenaz* and, 92; on penance, 82; pietistic practices of, 105n. 24; rabbinic traditions and, 221; students of, 245, 247, 249; teachers of, 107

Mahzor Vitry, 153, 154n. 56, 155–57, 162, 190n. 2, 196

Maimonidean controversy, 20, 99–100n. 11, 214, 252

Maimonides (R. Moses b. Maimon), 71n. 110, 72n. 112, 78, 252; magic and, 246; *Mishneh Torah* of, 76, 203n. 31; on Torah and Divine Names, 230

Mainz, Germany, 38, 40, 41, 44, 60, 138, 152; academy at, 148, 186–87; mysticism in, 143, 186; R. Amnon and bishop of, 107n. 26; rabbinical court in, 106; *torat ha-sod* in, 131

martyrdom, 40, 123–24, 133n. 3, 134n. 4, 165, 217

masoretic text, 93, 117, 123, 204n. 33

maziqin (demonic forces), 147, 153, 155n. 58, 158n. 65, 168; Divine Names and, 227; protection from, 198n. 23, 199, 236

mazzot, 58, 99n. 11

meat, abstention from eating, 51

Megillot, 107

Meir b. Qalonymus of Spires, R., 117n. 52

Meir b. Samuel, R., 186, 260

Meir *ha-Gadol*, Rabbenu, 240

Menahem b. Perez, R., 260

Menahem ha-Meiri, R., 156n. 60

Menahem *Hasid*, R., 98

INDEX OF NAMES AND SUBJECTS

Menahem of Joigny, R., 117n. 52, 140, 168n. 90, 203–4

Menahem of Le Mans, R., 41, 260

Menahot (tractate of Talmud), 59, 64n. 85

menstruation, 38, 49, 127, 128–30

Meshullam b. Moses, R., 142–43, 260

Meshullam b. Qalonymus of Lucca, R., 143

Meshullam of Brittany, R., 242–43

Meshullam of Melun, R., 46

Messiah/messianism, 72n. 112, 78, 206, 207n. 38, 213, 240, 244, 248

Metatron (angel), 169, 170, 172, 175, 182, 227n. 16

mezuzah, 121n. 62, 125n. 71, 154, 196, 237n. 47

middat hasidut, 85

Midrash Aggadah Ma'aseh Merkavah, 146–47

Midrash Mishlei, 126n. 76, 139n. 13

Midrash Pesiqta, 170

Midrash Tanhuma, 104, 198

Midrash Tehillim, 55n. 60, 74n. 113, 139n. 13

Mikha'el ha-Mai'akh, R., 229

minhag Österreich, 113, 114n. 44, 130n. 86

miraculous acts, 164

Mishneh Torah, 76, 203n. 31

miyot, 77n. 124

modesty, 64

Mordekhai b. Eliezer, R., 165

Mordekhai b. Hillel, R., 119

Moses b. Eleazar *ha-Darshan*, R., 169

Moses b. Jacob of Coucy, R., 26, 68–72, 71n. 108, 75–80, 81, 82, 119, 260

Moses b. Meir of Ferrara, R., 45n. 34

Moses b. Shne'ur of Evreux, R., 59–63, 76, 178n. 104, 233, 260

Moses *ha-Kohen* of Mainz, R., 26n. 21, 103n. 16

Moses of London, R., 233, 234

mourning, 38n. 15, 66n. 91

mysticism, 27, 125, 221, 252; magic and, 29; *Merkavah*, 22; messianism and, 78; pietism and, 127; rabbinic scholarship and, 159; wine and, 96n. 7

Nahmanides, 20, 65n. 88, 128; Christian influence on, 205n. 35; on divination, 210; *kabbalah* and, 252; talmudic commentaries of, 218

Name, ineffable, 132, 209n. 41

nazir title, 36, 125

necromancy, 256

Nehunyah b. *ha-Qanah*, R., 49–50, 178n. 104

new moon, 44, 151n. 47, 223n. 7

Nissim Gaon of Kairwan, R., 111

non-Jews. *See* Gentiles

nosah ha-tefillah, 235

notariqon, 93, 97

numerical analyses, 48, 52, 101n. 14, 102, 106n. 26, 198n. 23, 205n. 35. *See also* alphabet, Hebrew; *gematria*

nusha'ot, 104, 109, 176–77

Otiyyot de-R. Aqiva, 151

Pa'aneah Raza, 248–49

Palti'el, R. Ḥayyim, 113

parush title, 38, 125

Passover, 47n. 36, 99n. 11, 137, 138, 143

payyetan, 105, 106, 231

penance, 33n. 1, 73–74, 81–82, 123, 166, 214, 226. *See also* *teshuvah*; *tiqqunei teshuvah*

Pentateuch, 52, 77, 96n. 6

Perez b. Elijah of Corbeil, R., 62, 124, 239, 241, 260

perishut, 37, 47, 99, 125; fasting and, 42; German Pietists and, 33, 81, 220; magic and, 127, 129; R. Isaac of Corbeil and, 91; talmudic interpretations and, 251; tosafists and, 249, 253

persecutions, 123, 126, 247

perushim, 36, 39, 41–42, 45–46, 57

pesaqim, 103, 108n. 28

peshat, 160n. 69, 162

petiḥat ha-lev, 140–41, 142n. 21, 156, 227n. 16, 236; education initiation ceremony and, 238n. 47; Torah knowledge and, 240

philosophy, 208n. 40, 219, 220, 257; formulations against study of, 228n. 21; Maimonides and, 252

Pietists, German, 25, 61–62, 79, 115; anti-French animus of, 104n. 21; biblical interpretations of, 93; chart of, 259–60; Divine Names and, 245; esotericism of, 127, 135, 188, 199; Evreux academy and, 64; exegetical methods of, 97n. 9, 107; *Hehkalot* literature and, 27; liturgical interpretations of, 104; magic and, 29, 218; mystical circles associated with, 171; northern French pietists and, 56, 58; penance and, 255; *perushim* and, 51; preservation of Ashkenazic culture and, 157n. 64; social status of, 23; *torat ha-sod* and, 19; tosafists and, 22–23, 59, 158n.

Index of Names and Subjects

64, 249. *See also Sefer Hasidim; Hasidei Ashkenaz*

Pirkei de-R. Eliezer, 51

Pisqei ha-Tosafot, 44

Pisqei Reqanati, 44

piyyutim, 20n. 3, 26, 37, 106–7, 116, 161–62, 168, 217, 256; esotericism and, 21n. 6; German Pietists and, 65; *Hekhalot* literature and, 143; ineffable Name and, 132; supplications and, 181n. 111

Poland, 125

polemic, 219n. 68

posqim, 20

Potah (angel), 155, 227n. 16

poterei halomot, 194

Prague, 112

prayers, 23, 29, 45, 48, 60n. 76, 64, 74, 80n. 140, 92, 94n. 2, 247, 256; angels and, 147; commentaries to, 100, 101, 103–4; comportment in synagogue and, 83; directed to angels, 134; esotericism and, 174–84; High Holidays and, 137–38; *kavvanah* and, 61, 67n. 93, 84–85, 124; magic and, 187; penitential, 72; proper intention in, 26; protection and, 209; quorum and, 58n. 69; swaying during, 54, 148n. 40; theurgic, 144, 211, 253. *See also* adjurations; *sodot ha-tefillah*; supplications; specific prayers

pre-Crusade period, 23, 58, 79, 95n. 5, 139, 253; antecedents of pietism in, 37–42; curriculum of, 61; disciplines of, 249; eclecticism in, 161n. 70; France in, 113; *Hakhmei/Geonei Lothaire*, 136, 168; *kabbalah* and, 152; magic/mysticism in, 130, 131, 158–59, 214; *perishut* in, 254; pietistic practices in, 115; rabbinic culture in, 81, 187, 256; *tefillin* in, 120n. 60

Primal Ether, 241, 242

prophecy/prophets, 152n. 50, 209, 244

Provence, 20, 29, 36, 51, 53, 56, 196n. 18

pseudepigraphic literature, 170, 172n. 97

Purim, 41n. 22

purity, 119

qabbalah. *See kabbalah/kabbalism*

Qalonymides, 23, 24n. 13, 102, 131, 137, 143

Qalonymus b. Isaac, R., 96n. 7, 97n. 9, 138–39, 142, 143, 259

Qalonymus b. Meshullam, R., 107n. 26

Qara, R. Yosef, 96n. 7

Qedushah prayer, 49, 55n. 60, 101n. 14

Qeri'at Shema prayer, 106, 196, 198

Qiddushin, 59

Qohelet, 159

quorum, 108n. 28

Raban (R. Eliezer b. Nathan of Mainz), 70, 100, 128, 161–65, 187, 217, 249, 259

rabbanei Zarefat, 20

rabbinic literature, 25, 42, 60n. 76, 103n. 16, 187, 239

rabbinic scholars, 96n. 6, 144, 220; chart of, 259–60; esotericism and, 257–58; *Hekhalot* literature and, 253–54; kabbalism and, 125; legalists, 23; in northern France, 23, 218, 221; R. Judah *he-Hasid* and, 113, 115; *torat ha-sod* and, 131; tosafists and, 100

Rabiah (R. Eliezer b. Joel *ha-Levi*), 21n. 7, 44n. 30, 45, 57, 78, 111, 119; German Pietists and, 47–51; magic and, 214–17; on majority rule, 122n. 65

Rambam. *See Maimonides*

Ramban. *See Nahmanides*

Rashba (R. Solomon Ibn Adret), 210

Rashbam (R. Samuel b. Meir), 77, 102n. 14, 187, 259; Divine Names and, 168; rationalism of, 159–60, 190n. 2; study of Scripture and, 167; *torat ha-sod* and, 186

Rashi (R. Solomon b. Isaac), 38, 59, 79, 120, 167, 168, 259; appearance in dream, 160n. 67; *gematria* and, 169; magic and, 189; mystical traditions and, 144–53; students of, 158–59; Talmud and, 60n. 75; teachers of, 143

rationalism, 160, 166, 220

redemption, 108n. 110, 226, 244

Regensburg, Germany, 26, 95, 112, 113, 201n. 29

repentance. *See* penance

responsa, 48, 103, 106n. 26, 123, 183n. 115, 185, 234n. 41

resurrection, 206n. 37, 248

Rhineland, 28, 41, 113. *See also* Germany

Ri (R. Isaac b. Samuel of Dampierre), 43, 44n. 30, 45, 51, 57, 68, 69, 84, 187, 252, 260; dream interpreters and, 194; esotericism and, 191; mysticism/magic and, 194–95; *Sefer Yezirah* and, 192; students of, 205, 208; as teacher, 244

Riba (R. Isaac b. Asher *ha-Levi*), 44, 260

Ribam (R. Isaac b. Mordekhai of Bohemia/Regensburg), 21n. 7, 187, 201–2, 260

INDEX OF NAMES AND SUBJECTS

Ribaq (R. Judah b. Qalonymus b. Meir of Spires), 60n. 76, 103n. 16, 106n. 26, 120n. 60, 202n. 30, 213, 214, 260

Rif (R. Isaac al-Fasi), 84

rishonim, 252

rituals, 111, 119, 129

Rizba (R. Isaac b. Abraham), 78, 111, 205–7, 260

Rosh (R. Asher b. Yehiel), 117, 119, 245, 247, 260

Rosh ha-Shanah, 44n. 30, 108, 111–12, 114, 119, 202

Rosh Hodesh, 40

Sa‘adyah Gaon, R., 141, 219, 257

Sabbath, 36, 153, 162; *Barekhu* prayer and, 143, 224; eating on, 204, 215n. 57; fasting on, 111–12, 114; fires on, 46–47

Safed, mysticism in, 125

Samson b. Abraham of Sens, R., 205, 217, 260

Samson of Falaise, R., 128n. 81

Samuel b. Barukh of Bamberg, R., 102–5, 260

Samuel b. Judah, R., 26n. 21, 67n. 94

Samuel b. Qalonymus *he-Hasid* of Spires, R., 24, 48, 53, 95, 96n. 7, 109, 143, 186, 260; father of, 138; liturgical interpretations of, 101; *Ri* and, 193; students of, 156n. 62; on Tetragrammaton, 243

Samuel b. Shne‘ur of Evreux, R., 59–63, 82, 90, 115, 119, 260; on Passover stringencies, 99n. 11; as teacher, 236, 241

Samuel b. Solomon of Falaise, R., 96, 99, 115

Sar ha-‘Olam (angel), 170

Sar ha-Panim (angel), 201

science, 208n. 40

sectarianism, 25

seder ha-ma‘amadot, 178–80

Seder Qodashim, 60–61

Sefardic influence, 69, 111

Sefer Assufot, 155, 156, 157, 238n. 47

Sefer ha-Bahir, 144, 171n. 95

Sefer ha-Hokhmah, 68, 105, 156

Sefer ha-Kavod, 225

Sefer ha-Manhig, 51–56, 58, 79

Sefer ha-Maskil, 152, 212, 239, 244

Sefer ha-Pardes, 120n. 60, 153n. 54, 162

Sefer ha-Razim, 231, 232n. 33

Sefer ha-Shem, 220

Sefer Hasidim, 22, 24, 25, 74, 75, 89, 225; on asceticism, 34, 35n. 3, 255; on charity, 105; on children’s moral responsibility, 92n.

178, 104; on communicating with the dead, 197; on comportment in synagogue, 83; on Divine Names, 86, 209, 210n. 42; on fasting, 66; halakhic works and, 69; *hasidut* and, 256; legal methodology and, 118, 119; magic in, 27; parallels to, 61, 63; pietism in, 37; on prohibition, 44n. 30; Tetragrammaton in, 190n. 2; Torah study in, 109. *See also* Pietists, German

Sefer ha-Terumah, 68

Sefer ha-Yashar, 185n. 117

Sefer ha-Yir‘ah, 54n. 59, 62–63, 63–66, 72, 80, 90

Sefer Hayyei ‘Olam. *See Sefer ha-Yir‘ah*

Sefer Hekhalot, 123, 138, 243

Sefer Kol Bo, 61, 62

Sefer Ma‘aseh ha-Geonim, 39–40

Sefer Minhag Tov, 45

Sefer Mizvot Gadol, 68, 69, 71n. 108, 73, 74–75, 77, 80

Sefer Mizvot Qatan, 81, 84, 85, 88, 89–90, 158n. 65, 241

Sefer Moreh Hatta‘im/Sefer ha-Kapparot, 62

Sefer Or Zarua‘, 69, 80, 112, 120n. 60, 190n. 2, 221, 225

Sefer Orhot Hayyim, 61, 63n. 84, 80n. 138, 87–89

Sefer Raban, 70

Sefer Rabiah, 68, 216

Sefer Raziel, 141, 242

Sefer Roqeah, 19–20, 25, 68, 89; food in, 156; *hilkhot hasidut* preamble, 126; initiation ceremony in, 157; penances in, 82; Tetragrammaton in, 190n. 2

Sefer Sodot/Raza Rabba, 248

Sefer Takhkemoni, 75

Sefer Tanya Rabbati, 45, 110n. 34

Sefer Tashbez, 241

Sefer Yere‘im, 68, 69n. 105, 195, 197n. 19

Sefer Yezirah, 143, 145, 159, 191–92, 195, 221

Sefer Yihusei Tanna‘im va-Amora‘im, 213, 223

Sefer Yosef ha-Meqanne, 98n. 9

segulot, 203, 208, 212, 245, 248

self-denial. *See* asceticism

Semag. *See Sefer Mizvot Gadol*

Semaq. *See Sefer Mizvot Qatan*

Sha‘arei ‘Avodah, 65

Sha‘arei Teshuvah, 66–67

Shabbat ha-Gadol, 96

Shalshelet ha-Qabbalah, 172

shaving, 44n. 30

Index of Names and Subjects

She'elot u-Teshuvot min ha-Shamayim, 185, 228, 229

Shem ha-Meforash, 182n. 112, 243

Shema prayer, 53, 90

Shemaryah b. Mordekhai of Spires, R., 143n. 25

Shemini 'Azoret, 112

Shemoneh 'Esreh prayer, 83, 84–85

Shemot, 141, 157, 207, 208, 236, 248; care required for use of, 86, 87; German Pietists and, 188, 218; menstruant women and, 129; Messiah and, 240; mystical powers of, 159; revelation and, 190; used for protection, 148n. 40

Sheqalim (tractate of Talmud), 60, 105

Shibbolei ha-Leqet, 54–55, 107, 110n. 34, 111, 147, 197n. 19, 229, 230–31

Shir ha-Yihud, 45

Shi'ur Qomah, 28, 230

shiv'ah neqiyim, 113

Sifra, 103n. 16

sifrut de-Vei Rashi, 20, 38, 113, 114, 153, 158, 187

Simeon b. Isaac *ha-Gadol*, R., 37, 41, 106, 131–36, 165, 169, 232, 260

Simḥah b. Samuel of Spires, R., 21n. 5, 82, 102, 103, 107, 108, 111, 120n. 60, 225–26, 228, 260

sins, 35n. 3, 42, 61, 66n. 91, 74, 109, 198; avoidance of, 34; confession of, 80, 91; of golden calf, 169; suicide and, 123, 234

sod, 161, 201n. 29, 214, 222, 231; German Pietists and, 220; prayers and, 226; Qalonymide, 138; Rabbenu Tam and, 185; rabbinic figures linked to, 234; Rashi and, 152; of resurrection, 248; students of Maharam and, 245–46

sod ha-berakhah, 161

sod ha-yihud, 20

Sodei Razayya, 215

sodot ha-tefillah, 94, 100, 104n. 21, 135, 161; chain of, 143; liturgical texts and, 247; transmission of, 186n. 122

Solomon b. Judah of Dreux, R., 97–98, 260

Solomon b. Samson, R., 38, 40, 260

Solomon b. Samuel *ha-Zarefati*, R., 94–103, 98n. 9, 100, 102–3, 103, 115

Solomon Simḥah b. Eliezer of Troyes, R., 152, 212, 239, 240, 244, 245

Solomon Zarefati, R., 148n. 40

songs, 132, 244

sorcery, 195, 197n. 19

Sotah, 59

Spain, 20, 29, 63, 68, 220, 247, 248

Spires, Germany, 26, 95, 107, 213

spirituality, 23

suicide, 123, 234

Sukkah (tractate of Talmud), 144

summation, 69

superstition, 29, 160, 166, 168

supplications, 72–74, 172, 179, 180, 181n. 111. *See also* adjurations; prayers

Suri'el (angel), 146

synagogue, 45, 50, 127; charity and, 105; decorum in, 46n. 34, 83; holiness of, 130n. 86; menstruant women barred from, 49

ta'anit halom, 111–12

Taku, R. Moses, 160n. 69, 211, 260

tallit, 122

Talmud, 47n. 36, 50, 114, 150, 253; Babylonian, 42, 64n. 85, 111; burning of, 229; Jerusalem (Palestinian), 60, 111; talmudic interpretation, 187; tractates of, 103n. 16; on trees, 194; Trial of the, 60n. 75, 96

talmudic literature, 127, 144

talmudic period, 21

talmudism/talmudists, 22, 59, 70, 117n. 52, 247

Tarn, Rabbenu (R. Jacob b. Meir of Rameupt), 44, 68, 84, 120, 217, 259; on *Baraita de-Massekhet Niddah*, 128n. 81; dialectical method of, 69, 189; magic and, 135–36, 184, 185–86; on majority rule, 122n. 65; on *perishut*, 42, 43; as rationalist, 166–75; Sabbath customs and, 203–4, 215n. 57; students of, 46, 52n. 52, 115n. 46, 140, 187, 191, 195, 202, 203, 208; talmudism of, 249, 252, 253; *torat ha-sod* and, 186; tosafist interpretations of, 200n. 26

Tammuz, 39, 40

Tannaim, 146, 253

Taqqanot Shum, 25

Te'amim shel Humash, 95

Te'amim shel R. Yehudah he-Hasid, 230

tefillin, 35n. 3, 52, 120, 122, 172

teshuvaḥ, 81–82, 109, 115, 125, 207n. 39

Tetragrammaton, 50, 86n. 156, 124, 230; *gematria* and, 190n. 2; letter representation for, 215; Rashi and, 160n. 67; vocalization of, 243

theosophy, 27, 152, 159, 220, 249, 256

theurgic prayers, 144, 211, 253

INDEX OF NAMES AND SUBJECTS

thieves, protection against, 245, 246n. 74

tiqqunei teshuvah, 76, 124, 235, 255

Tish'ah be-Av, fast of, 38

tokhrehah, 71n. 110

Toledo, Spain, 51, 247

Torah, 20, 51, 53, 62, 71n. 108, 76, 109, 125; commentaries on, 77n. 123, 107, 149, 156n. 62; Divine glory and, 163; Divine Names and, 144n. 28, 168, 172, 230; goal of study, 89; Hebrew alphabet and, 222n. 6; magic and, 141; *petiḥat ha-lev* and, 140, 240; on post-partum bleeding, 38; relationship with God, 134; scholars of, 105; *shedim* and, 225; *sod* and, 126n. 76; sword of Almighty and, 137; women and, 88; *yom tov* and, 111

torat ha-Kavod, 239, 257n. 16

torat ha-mal'akhim, 222

torat ha-sod, 19, 21, 79, 213, 249; Divine Names and, 220; legends and tales about, 172; Maharam and, 239; in Mainz, 131; Nahmanides' devotion to, 218; Rashi and, 145, 149n. 41, 152; Ribam and, 201n. 29; shifting attitudes toward, 166; theosophy and, 256; tosafists and, 22, 251; traditions of, 30

tosafists, 22n. 8, 36, 51, 125, 258; asceticism of, 42–58, 251; biblical interpretations of, 77, 93, 104; German Pietists and, 24–25, 58, 59, 111, 120–21, 158n. 64, 214; halakhic works of, 68–69; *Hekhalot* literature and, 127, 255; kabbalism and, 256; legal methodology and, 118; libraries of, 161n. 70, 187; liturgical commentaries and, 96–97; magic/mysticism and, 27, 31, 78–79, 93–94, 128n. 81, 178n. 104, 218, 220, 251; masoretic studies and, 117n. 52; in northern France, 57, 68; *perishut* and, 249; philosophical tradition and, 19

Tosafot, 43, 59–60, 68, 91–92, 103, 107, 170, 189–91, 203, 208

Tosafot Hagigah, 168, 189n. 2

Tosafot R. Samson of Sens, 59

trances, 229

Troestlein, R., 244n. 67

Troyes, France, 44

Uri b. R. Joel *ha-Levi*, R., 165

Uriel (angel), 174n. 99

Verona, Italy, 107

wandering, 115

water, 150, 158n. 65, 193n. 9

weddings, 48n. 39

white magic, 154n. 56, 211

women: conversation with, 124n. 70; gazing at, 63n. 84, 91, 92n. 178, 255; illicit sexual relations with, 225; menstruating, 49, 127, 128–30; new moon and, 223n. 7; spousal abuse and, 235; Torah and, 88

Worms, Germany, 38, 40, 148, 186

Yahya, Gedalyah ibn, 26n. 21

Yaqr of Cologne, R., 248

Yedidyah b. Israel, R., 105n. 23

Yehi'el b. Yequtiel *Anav*, R., 110n. 34

Yehi'el of Paris, R., 90, 91n. 175, 96, 115, 124, 234, 260

Yerushalmi *Pe'ah*, 105

Ye-Sod ha-Teshuvah, 72

yihud ha-Shem, 126

yir'at ha-Shem, 35n. 3

Yishma'el, R., 146, 173, 223

Yishma'el *Kohen Gadol*, R., 213

Yom Kippur, 38, 41n. 22, 42, 44–45, 48, 49; standing during, 51, 57, 58n. 68; Tetragrammaton and, 50

Yom Tov b. Isaac of Joigny, R., 46, 47n. 36, 57n. 67, 95n. 5, 105, 260

Yom Tov b. Moses of London, R., 234

Yonah of Gerona, Rabbenu, 27, 54n. 59, 63–64, 70–72, 76, 80, 90, 190n. 2

Zaltman, R. Moses, 104

Zedah *la-Derekh*, 193n. 8

Zedekiah b. Abraham *ha-Rofe Anav*, R., 110n. 34, 198, 252, 260; on burning of Talmud, 228–29; *Shibbolei ha-Leqet* and, 54–55, 107, 197n. 19, 231

zizit, 122

Zohar, 9, 152, 153n. 54, 168, 256