

Rabbinic Figures in Castilian Kabbalistic Pseudepigraphy: R. Yehudah He-Ḥasid and R. Elhanan of Corbeil

Ephraim Kanarfogel

Yeshiva University, New York, USA

I

R. Shem Tov ben Gaon, best known for his commentary to Maimonides' *Mishneh Torah* entitled *Migdal Oz*, was also the author of a number of kabbalistic treatises.¹ Among those extant is *Baddei ha-Aron* which deals primarily with the kabbalistic significance of Hebrew letters, vowels, cantillations and scribal adornments.²

This work, completed in Safed in 1325, preserves an epistle that was purportedly sent from the "great yeshivah in Worms" to the sages of Apulia in southern Italy. The epistle outlines a chain of transmission that brought kabbalistic secrets from Mata Meḥasya (near Sura) to Apulia. The chain was copied from the writings of **החסיד הרב ר' יהודה בן הגאון הפארט הישיבה רבנו אחא מקורביל**. R. Yehudah himself was part of the chain. In Apulia, the secrets were taught (or more precisely, passed on in brief written form) by a Rav Qeshisha, described as **החסיד רבנו יהודה הקדוש שבא מקורביל גאון גדול** to his student, **הגאון הקדוש רבנו יהודה** and R. Eleazar of Worms studied with **הגאון הקדוש רבנו יהודה** and received these secrets from him. R. Eleazar in turn passed them on to his worthy students in Worms.³

¹ See D.S. Loewinger, "R. Shem Tov b. Avraham ben Gaon," *Sefunot* 7 (1963): 7–39. The best-known (and earliest) of R. Shem Tov's kabbalistic writings is *Keter Shem Tov*, a supercommentary on the *sodot* of Ramban. A text of *Keter Shem Tov* was published in Judah Koriat, *Ma'or va-Shemesh* (Livorno, 1839), pp. 25–54. Cf. Moshe Idel, "Perush Lo Yadua' le-Sodot ha-Ramban," *Da'at* 2–3 (1978): 121, and idem., "Le-Toledot ha-Issur Lilmod Qabbalah Lifnei Gil Arba'im," *AJS Review* 5 (1980) [Hebrew section]: 9–10.

² *Baddei ha-Aron* is found at the beginning of both ms. BN Paris 840 and ms. Oxford/Bodl. (Neubauer) 1630. Loewinger published a facsimile of the Paris manuscript (Jerusalem, 1979).

³ See Yosef Dan, "Iggeret Germaiza' u-Ve'ayat ha-Pseudepigrafah ba-Qabbalah ha-Qedumah, *Mehgerei Yerushalayim be-Mahshenet Yisra'el* 3:1 (1984) [= *Studies in Jewish Mysticism, Philosophy and Ethical Literature Presented to Isaiah Tishby*, ed. Yosef Dan and Yosef Hacker (Jerusalem, 1986)]: 111–13.

The secrets in question were characterizations of the ten *sefirot*. These characterizations were followed by a brief explanation attributed to R. Eleazar of Worms. The epistle notes that R. Eleazar's related explanations on scribal markings were his own and were not received from his teacher. Indeed, a certain Rav Shishna, who was with R. Eleazar, offered a different interpretation of some of these symbolisms. A messenger was sent to Corbeil to clarify the matter. Rabbenu Elhanan, who was a wise and venerable friend of the "holy teacher" R. Yehudah, was in Corbeil at the time. He offered yet another formulation.

The author(s) of the letter then described a mystical vision that had been experienced in an earlier period by a singular mystic in Mata Meḥasya ("where the loftiest yeshivah had once been"). The contents of this vision had been passed on to the authors by their predecessors. According to R. Shem Tov, the epistle ends at this point. Since the kabbalistic contents of the letter were in consonance with his own teachings, R. Shem Tov writes that he felt no need to comment further on this document.⁴

Gershom Scholem determined, on the basis of manuscript evidence, that the "Epistle from Worms" (hereafter EW) was connected to another account of the transmission of kabbalistic secrets. According to the latter text, the mystical revelation at Mata Meḥasya was made known to R. Eleazar of Worms by a Berakhya of Damascus. R. Eleazar's secrets were then transmitted to an academy head in Lunel. This transference occurred in the days of the "holy R. Elhanan." The author describes his own travels in Provence and the secrets that he learned after he had returned home to his native Spain from Nathaniel of Montpellier whose uncle had received these secrets from R. Ḥasdai ha-Nasi.⁵

Scholem initially attributed both this document and EW to the *Hug ha-Iyyun*. The *Iyyun* circle, which in Scholem's view flourished in Provence circa 1200–1240, produced other works that used pseudigraphy to link actual scholars with unknown or non-existent figures. An apparent goal of these texts was to link Provencal esotericism with German Pietism or pietistic figures in northern France and Germany.⁶ Another text, identified initially by Scholem, contained a responsum by a Yehushiel Gaon Ashkenazi to Solomon of Corbeil that supposedly reached R. Yediyah of Marseilles, as well as schools in Worms and Lunel.⁷

Scholem subsequently concluded that EW and the related account involving R. Eleazar of Worms were composed by R. Isaac b. Jacob ha-

⁴ Dan, "Iggeret Germaiza," pp. 113–116.

⁵ Gershom Scholem, *Origins of the Kabbalah*, ed. R.J. Zwi Werblowsky (Princeton, 1987): 355–59.

⁶ Scholem, *Reshit ha-Qabbalah* (Tel Aviv, 1948), pp. 162–63.

⁷ Scholem, *Origins*, pp. 250, 324. Cf. Scholem in *Qiryat Sefer* 1 (1924): 291.

Kohen, author of *A Treatise on the Left Emanation*.⁸ R. Isaac composed other pseudepigraphic texts of similar style, including the R. Yehushiel passage just described. EW was preserved by R. Isaac's relative (and devotee), Shem Tov ben Gaon. The eschatological material in it corresponds to other teachings of R. Isaac. Identifying the author as R. Isaac accords with the internal dating of the letter (mid-thirteenth century) and with the fact that the author lived in Spain but travelled to Provence and was interested in Provencal kabbalah. Nonetheless, Scholem maintained that the *Hug ha-Iyyun* did play a role in the composition of this document. He suggested that R. Isaac incorporated a number of pseudepigraphic passages that were originally written by members of the *Iyyun* Circle after the death of R. Eleazar of Worms.⁹ Scholem's attribution of EW to R. Isaac ha-Kohen was initially confirmed, from a different perspective, by Yosef Dan.¹⁰

Scholem grappled with the degree of historicity in EW. Some of the names mentioned in EW, such as R. Qeshisha or R. Shishna, are undoubtedly fictitious.¹¹ R. Eleazar of Worms is the only figure in EW whose

⁸ Scholem, *Origins*, p. 355, n. 309. On R. Isaac's treatise and its sources, see Scholem, "Qabbalat R. Ya'aqov ve-R. Yizḥaq Benei R. Ya'aqov ha-Kohen," *Madda'ei ha-Yahadut* 2 (Jerusalem, 1927): 168–71, 189–97, 244–64; and Dan, "Samael, Lilith, and the Concept of Evil in Early Kabbalah," *AJS Review* 5 (1980): 17–40. R. Shem Tov Ibn Gaon, in describing the aptitude of R. Moses of Burgos, compares R. Moses to those who taught him *torat ha-sod*, R. Isaac and R. Jacob ha-Kohen. R. Shem Tov writes that unlike R. Moses, the Kohen brothers did not achieve the rank of "בעלי הוראה במלמד" . See the text in Scholem, "Le-Heqer Qabbalat R. Yizḥaq b. Ya'aqov ha-Kohen," *Tarbiz* 3 (1932): 260–61. R. Moses was apparently an active judge. It remains unclear, however, whether R. Shem Tov's assessment of the Kohen brothers' prowess in talmudic/legal studies was made relative to the official position and standing of R. Moses or whether this was an absolute indication that the Kohen brothers were in fact not "talmidei hakhamim" as Scholem asserts. In any event, there is no evidence to suggest that the esoteric teachings of the Kohen brothers were intended to deviate from the norms of rabbinic observance or that they had no interest in the teachings of rabbinic circles. Indeed, this circle produced *sodot* on *ta'amei mitzvot*. See, e.g., *Sodot le-R. Ya'aqov ha-Kohen* published by Scholem himself in "Qabbalat R. Ya'aqov ve-R. Yizḥaq," pp. 240–41. Cf. Mark Verman, *The Books of Contemplation* (Albany, 1992), p. 177, n. 32.

⁹ Scholem, *Origins*, p. 359. Cf. Verman, pp. 27, 166.

¹⁰ See Dan, *Ofiyyo u-Meqorotav shel Sefer Baddei ha-Aron* (Jerusalem, 1977), p. 60. Dan's more recent suggestion ("Iggeret Germaiza" [above, n. 3], pp. 131–38), that Shem Tov Ibn Gaon himself authored EW, has been effectively countered by Mark Verman, *The Books of Contemplation*, p. 174, n. 27.

¹¹ On R. Qeshishah, see Scholem, *Origins* (above, n. 8). Scholem notes that *Sefer ha-Bahir*, in similar fashion, refers to a R. Amora. On the use in Castilian Kabbalah of Aramaic nouns or descriptive names as pseudepigraphic epithets, see Verman, *The Books of Contemplation*, pp. 1, 173, n. 24. [On the use of angelic names (especially those with the suffix -el or -iel) for kabbalistic pseudepigraphy, and the connection to *Hekhalot* literature, see Dan, "Samael, Lilith, and the Concept of Evil," p. 21, n. 18; idem, "Anafiel, Metatron ve-Yozer Bereshit," *Tarbiz* 52 (1983): 447–57; Verman, pp. 75–76; Michael Swartz, *Mystical Prayer in Ancient Judaism* (Tübingen, 1992), pp. 216–20; and David Halperin, *The Faces of the Chariot* (Tübingen, 1988), pp. 207–08, 258–59, 294–95, 368–70, 377–78, 393–94.]

The name (R.) Shishna appears only three times in talmudic literature [*Bavli Gittin* 62a, *Bavli Menahot* 90a, *Yerushalmi Shabbat* 19:1]. In these texts, Shishna is the name of the father or son of the subject of the passage. The sheer rarity of this name further commends its use as the name of an imaginary medieval kabbalist. See below, n. 27.

authenticity was beyond question. Indeed, there are some clear parallels between EW and the well-known (and authentic) chain of Ashkenazic esoteric transmission preserved by R. Eleazar.¹² To be sure, the latter text begins with Abu Aharon of Baghdad, who brought mystical teachings from Babylonia to Italy that were passed on directly to the German Pietists, and ends with R. Eleazar's activity in Worms. There is no indication of any continuation in Provence. Nonetheless, the significant impact that German Pietism, and specifically R. Eleazar of Worms, had on the kabbalistic writings of R. Isaac ha-Kohen (as well as, to a lesser extent, on the writings of the *Hug ha-Iyyun*) is well-documented.¹³ R. Eleazar's central role in EW is hardly accidental.

On the other hand, the description in EW of R. Eleazar's immediate teacher of esoteric material, R. Yehudah *be-Hasid*, is highly problematic. Ostensibly, EW is referring to the historical R. Yehudah *be-Hasid* (d. 1217), who lived in the German cities of Speyers and Regensburg, and was indeed R. Eleazar's major teacher. The placement of R. Yehudah *be-Hasid* in Corbeil (northern France), however, appears to be a complete fabrication. Placing a known scholar in a location in which he never lived is more of a distortion than the invention of both scholar and locale. Scholem described this shift as "pure fiction in which [the Tosafist] Yehudah of Corbeil and Yehudah the Pious of Regensburg are merged into one person."¹⁴ Dan suggested that the placement of R. Yehudah in northern France constituted a prominent example of one of the major goals of kabbalistic pseudepigraphy, referred to above. EW was composed, in part, to demonstrate that certain kabbalistic teachings originated in the east and passed through all major areas of Jewish settlement in western Europe

¹² On the different recensions of the Abu Aharon passage and their significance for medieval Jewish thought and history, see Dan, *Torat ha-Sod shel Hasidut Ashkenaz* (Jerusalem, 1968), pp. 14–20, and Abraham Grossman, "Hagiratah shel Mishpaḥat Qalonymus me-Italyah le-Germanyah," *Zion* 40 (1975): 154–85.

¹³ See Dan, "Samael, Lilith and the Concept of Evil," pp. 26–27; idem., *Hasidut Ashkenaz be-Toledot ha-Maḥshavah ha-Yehudit* (Tel Aviv, 1990), v.1, pp. 34–36, 148–50; Scholem, "Qabbalot R. Ya' aqov ve-R. Yizḥaq Benei R. Ya' aqov ha-Kohen," pp. 191–93, 248–49. The kabbalistic writings of R. Isaac's brother, R. Jacob ha-Kohen, also reflect the influence of R. Eleazar. See Elliot Wolfson, "Metatron and Shi'ur Qomah in the Writings of Ḥaside Ashkenaz," (to be published in the proceedings of a conference entitled "Mysticism, Magic and Kabbalah in Ashkenazic Jewry" [Frankfurt, December, 1991], ed. K.E. Grözinger), esp. n. 113. On R. Eleazar and *Hug ha-Iyyun*, see Verman, *The Books of Contemplation*, pp. 199–201; Elliot Ginsburg, *The Sabbath in the Classical Kabbalah* (Albany, 1989), pp. 43–44, n. 16; and Elliot Wolfson, "Demut Ya' aqov Ḥaqqah be-Kisse ha-Kavod: Iyyun Nosaf be-Torat ha-Sod shel Ḥasidut Ashkenaz," *Sefer Zikkaron li-Professor Ephraim Gottlieb*, ed. Michal Oron and Amos Goldreich (forthcoming), n. 236. Cf. below, n. 25.

¹⁴ For the different aims and reasons for pseudepigraphic writings in ancient and medieval literature, see Martin E. Cohen, *Shiur Qomah: Liturgy and Theurgy in Pre-Kabbalistic Jewish Mysticism* (Lanham, MD., 1983), pp. 82–87. Cf. Scholem, *Origins*, p. 109; Swartz (above, n. 11); Dan, *Huḡei ha-Mequbbalim ha-Rishonim*, ed. Yizḥaq Agasi (Jerusalem, 1986): 21–32.

(Italy, Germany, Provence, as well as northern France), prior to their arrival in Spain.¹⁵

Despite the obvious fabrication of R. Yehudah's locale, Scholem argued that this passage in EW was perhaps an indication of the presence of esoteric studies in Corbeil, similar to the teachings of the German Pietists, if not to Spanish Kabbalah. The problem with this hypothesis, as Scholem himself noted, is that none of the other references to Corbeil as a center of esoteric studies can be corroborated. R. Solomon of Corbeil, referred to in one of the texts described above, is not mentioned in any other source. The Tosafist, R. Ya'aqov of Corbeil, brother of R. Yehudah of Corbeil, offered gematria interpretations in the style of the German Pietists, hardly enough to qualify him or his brother as a mystic. Scholem was inclined to identify the R. Elhanan of Corbeil referred to in EW as R. Elhanan the son of R. Isaac of Dampierre (Ri). Ri was involved in esoteric studies to a degree, as were perhaps some of his students. Scholem was left to conclude rather tentatively that "though it is hardly possible to regard the specific traditions traced by the kabbalists to Corbeil as authentic, we cannot dismiss the possibility that they were influenced to some extent by the recollection of an actual center of esoteric studies similar to those of the German *Hasidim*."¹⁶

Mark Verman recently discussed the historicity of the pseudepigraphic writings of R. Isaac ha-Kohen as part of his critique of Scholem's hypothesis that *Sefer ha-Bahir* originated in the east and arrived in Provence only later.¹⁷ Scholem's single most important piece of evidence was a text attributed to R. Isaac ha-Kohen which maintained that the *Bahir* was written in Israel and was transmitted first to the pietists of Germany [*Allemanyā*] and through them to kabbalists in Provence.¹⁸

Verman attempted to underscore the flaw in Scholem's "linear" conception of the spread of kabbalistic teachings by pointing to the ahistorical tendencies in other writings of R. Isaac (and the *Hug ha-Iyyun*), including EW and the texts related to it. Since none of the rabbinic figures referred to in any of these texts, with the exception of R. Eleazar of Worms, could be meaningfully corroborated, Verman concluded that the texts have little

¹⁵ See Dan, "Iggeret Germaiza," p. 116.

¹⁶ Scholem, *Origins*, pp. 249–50, 324. [In his earlier writings, Scholem was even more hesitant to identify Corbeil as a center of esoteric studies; see, e.g., "Le-Heqer," *Tarbiz* 2 (1931): 420, 429, n. 4; *Tarbiz* 3 (1932): 278–79, and below, at n. 106.] A R. Samson of Corbeil was an unknown addressee of Ramah in his appeal to northern French scholars for support of his anti-Maimonidean position (c. 1204). See Bernard Septimus, *Hispano-Jewish Culture in Transition* (Cambridge, Mass., 1982), p. 49.

¹⁷ Verman, *The Books of Contemplation*, pp. 170–92.

¹⁸ Scholem, *Origins*, pp. 40–41, 99–105. Cf. Moshe Idel, "Ha-Kavvanah ba-Tefillah be-Reshit ha-Qabbalah: Bein Ashkenaz li-Provence," *Porat Yosef* (Studies Presented to Rabbi Dr Joseph Safran), ed. Bezalel and Eliyahu Safran (Hoboken, 1992), pp. 5–14.

or no historical value. The significant impact of R. Eleazar of Worms' mystical teachings on both R. Isaac and on the *Hug ha-Iyyun* accounts for the fact that he is the only historical figure in their respective pseudepigraphic works. Indeed, Verman suggested that the legends about Abu Aaron of Baghdad, recorded by R. Eleazar of Worms as part of the family tradition and esoteric heritage of the German Pietists, may have been the literary model for R. Isaac.¹⁹

Ephraim Urbach, following Scholem, had suggested that there was at least a kernel of historicity embedded in FW.²⁰ Identifying R. Yehudah b. Aḥa with the Tosafist R. Yehudah of Corbeil, Urbach proposed that the name **יְהוּדָה** should be emended to the word **יְהוֹדָה**. With this emendation, the text would be referring to R. Yehudah b. . . . and our Rabbi [Ya'aqov], his brother of Corbeil.²¹ Verman correctly characterized this emendation as strained. Moreover, Urbach's conclusion, that this text demonstrates that the study hall of the brothers of Corbeil was a center for esoteric studies, could not, in Verman's view, be corroborated from anything else that is known about their activities.²² The notion that Corbeil was a center for esoteric studies, perhaps similar to those of the German Pietists, had already been proposed by Scholem. But for Scholem as well, this remained a suggestive but unproven theory.

On the basis of evidence that has gone largely unnoticed, I shall argue that the placement of R. Yehudah *be-Hasid* in Corbeil was neither fanciful

¹⁹ Verman, *The Books of Contemplation*, p. 177.

²⁰ See E.E. Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot* (4th edition, Jerusalem, 1980), v.1, pp. 149–52, and esp. n. 51.

²¹ R. Ya'aqov of Corbeil, often referred to as "*ba-Qadosh mi-Corbeil*," was cited in Tosafist literature with greater frequency than his brother R. Yehudah. Some scholars, including Scholem (*Origins*, 249, n. 99, citing Professor Norman Golb), sought to identify him with R. Ya'aqov of Marvège, author of *She'elot u-Teshuvot min ha-Shamayim*. See also Henri Gross, *Gallia Judaica*, p. 562, and Reuven Margoliot in the introduction to his edition of *She'elot u-Teshuvot min ha-Shamayim* (Jerusalem, 1957), pp. 19–23. This identification has been shown to be erroneous. See Victor Aptowitz, "Le Commentaire du Pentateuque Attribué à R. Ascher ben Yehiel," *REJ* 51 (1906): 75–76; Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, p. 150, n. 44; and Israel Ta-Shema, "She'elot u-Teshuvot min ha-Shamayim: Ha-Qovez ve-Tosafotav," *Tarbiz* 57 (1988): 56–63. On epithets for R. Ya'aqov, see also David Conforte, *Qore ha-Dorot*, ed. David Cassel (Berlin, 1846), fol. 16b.

²² See Verman, *The Books of Contemplation*, p. 177, n. 32. Verman thought that Urbach also wished to identify R. Qeshisha (of Apulia) in EW with an actual rabbinic figure named R. Qershavya who was mentioned at the end of one version of *taqqanot Rabbenu Tam*. It appears, however, that Verman erred in his assessment. Urbach referred to R. Qershavya following his discussion of the brothers of Corbeil (Verman citing the 1968 edition, p. 130; with no changes in the 1980 edition, p. 152). This discussion was part of the chapter entitled "Students of Rabbenu Tam in Northern France." Urbach then mentioned R. Qershavya, not in connection with the brothers of Corbeil, but rather as someone who had contact with a possible student of Rabbenu Tam, R. Avraham of Bourgueil. On R. Qershavya, cf. *Teshuvot u-Pesaqim*, ed. Ephraim Kupfer (Jerusalem, 1973), pp. 316–19, and Avraham Grossman, "Haggahot R. Shemayah ve-Nosah Perush Rashi," *Tarbiz* 60 (1991): 89–90.

nor random. It was a believable claim that could be justified or defended by a thirteenth-century Spanish kabbalist such as R. Isaac ha-Kohen. It is even possible that R. Isaac and his colleagues actually assumed that this datum was true. In either case, R. Isaac's approach to the transmission of kabbalistic teachings in western Europe was grounded, at least partially, in reality.

II

As opposed to the fictitious scholars of Babylyonia and Italy referred to in EW, R. Eleazar of Worms was quite real.²³ Moreover, his inclusion in this text is not surprising. As has been noted, R. Eleazar was venerated by both R. Isaac and his circle of Castilian kabbalists and by the *Hug ha-Iyyun*.²⁴ Members of the *Hug* were involved in the diffusion of R. Eleazar's teachings into Spain in their day, just as R. Isaac ha-Kohen and his brother R. Ya'aqov were responsible for introducing R. Eleazar's teachings to Castile in the latter portion of the thirteenth century.²⁵ Indeed, R. Isaac

²³ In regard to the *Sefer ha-Bahir* as well, the eastern portion of its origins, as described in the passage attributed to R. Yizhaq ha-Kohen (above, n. 18) is the most murky. Cf. below, n. 103. In the chain of tradition preserved by R. Eleazar of Worms, however, Abu Aharon of Baghdad was an actual figure whose activities can be corroborated by other sources. See, e.g., Joseph Dan, "Jewish Mysticism in Europe," *World History of the Jewish People (The Dark Ages)*, ed. Cecil Roth (Rutgers, 1966), pp. 282–84, and Reuven Bonfil, "Bein Erez Yisrael le-Vein Bavel," *Shalem* 5 (1987): 1–30.

²⁴ See above, n. 13, and below, n. 96. The role of R. Eleazar accords with Verman's larger claim, against Scholem, that the bulk of the *Hug ha-Iyyun* texts were composed not in the first quarter of the thirteenth century (in Provence) but rather in the middle of the thirteenth century (1230–1270, in Castile).

²⁵ See Elliot Wolfson, "Circumcision and the Divine Name: A Study in the Transmission of Esoteric Doctrine," *JQR* 78 (1987): 86–87, 96–97; idem., "Letter Symbolism and Merkavah Imagery in the Zohar," *'Alei Shefer* [Studies in the Literature of Jewish Thought Presented to Rabbi Dr. Alexandre Safran], ed. Moshe Hallamish (Ramat Gan, 1990), pp. 205*–06*; and cf. Shlomo Blickstein, *Between Philosophy and Mysticism: A Study of the Philosophical-Kabbalistic Writings of Joseph Gikatila* (Ph.D., Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1983), pp. 54–55, 93–96. Dan, "Samael, Lilith and the Concept of Evil," pp. 27–32, argued that in his adaptation of the teachings of R. Yehudah *be-Hasid* and R. Eleazar of Worms concerning *sarei ba-kes* and *sarei ba-bohen* (magical means of divining demons that were compared to prophecy), R. Isaac ha-Kohen extended the scope of their teachings to posit an actual connection between prophecy and magical divination. Dan attributes this seeming inaccuracy to the fact that R. Isaac was not a direct disciple of the German Pietists and that even those who taught him the Pietists' material might not have received it first-hand. See also Dan, pp. 33–40. [It should be noted, however, that texts of R. Yehudah and R. Eleazar themselves do make the connection made by R. Isaac. See Wolfson, *Through a Speculum That Shines: Vision and Imagination in Medieval Jewish Mysticism*, chapter five (*Haside Ashkenaz*: Veridical and Docetic Interpretations of the Chariot-Vision), nn. 81,92,95,97.] Earlier in his study (p.26), Dan wrote that R. Isaac, following a trend in Spanish kabbalah of the second half of the thirteenth century, attributed teachings to the German Pietists because of their reputation as the bearers of authentic earlier traditions. Spanish kabbalists, as EW itself demonstrates, used the reputation of the German Pietists

apparently met a student of R. Eleazar in Provence.²⁶ It is my contention that two of the three scholars with whom R. Eleazar interacted according to EW, R. Yehudah and R. Elhanan, also represent actual historical figures: R. Yehudah *be-Hasid* and R. Elhanan b. Yaqar, who was a contemporary of R. Yehudah and R. Eleazar.

R. Eleazar, R. Yehudah, and R. Elhanan, shared a significant connection. R. Yehudah *be-Hasid* and his student, R. Eleazar of Worms, were the leading figures of *ḥasidut Ashkenaz*. R. Elhanan b. Yaqar was a member of the *Ḥug ha-Keruv ha-Meyuḥad*, an esoteric circle that flourished in northern France.²⁷ Despite the geographic distance, and some obvious differences in orientation and writing style, unmistakable similarities between the esoteric teachings and conceptions of this circle and those of the German Pietists have been identified.²⁸ Indeed, the *Ḥug ha-Keruv ha-Meyuḥad* has been characterized by modern scholarship as a branch or another strain of *ḥasidut Ashkenaz*.²⁹ The existence of these similarities, which appear specifically in texts of R. Elhanan as well, strongly suggests that it was this R. Elhanan whom EW described as a colleague of R. Yehudah *be-Hasid*.³⁰ Although R.

to enhance their own credibility. At the same time, “. . . R. Judah the Pious . . . and R. Eleazar of Worms were regarded by R. Isaac and by other kabbalists as an authoritative source for kabbalistic knowledge.” It would appear that regardless of any changes or deviations that he imposed, R. Isaac believed that his information about the teachings of the German Pietists was accurate and that he was, in fact, a devoted student of those teachings. R. Avraham Abulafia, who taught in Castile during the first half of the 1270’s, consulted directly works of R. Eleazar of Worms that dealt with the combination of letters of the Divine name. Nonetheless, he too adapted those teachings to conform to his own mystical tendencies. See Moshe Idel, *The Mystical Experience in Abraham Abulafia* (Albany, 1988), pp. 22–24, and *Kabbalah: New Perspectives* (New Haven, 1988), pp. 97–102. Cf. below, n. 40.

²⁶ See Scholem, *Origins*, pp. 183–84; Dan, ed., *The Early Kabbalah* (New York, 1986), p. 166; idem., *Torat ha-Sod shel Ḥasidut Ashkenaz*, p. 261; and Verman, *The Books of Contemplation*, pp. 177–78.

²⁷ See Dan, “Ḥug ha-Keruv ha-Meyuḥad bi-Tenu’at Ḥasidei Ashkenaz,” *Tarbiḥ* 35 (1966): 349–72 [= *Iyyunim be-Sifrut Ḥasidei Ashkenaz* (Ramat Gan, 1975), pp. 89–111]; Vajda, “De quelques infiltrations chrétiennes dans l’œuvre d’un auteur anglo-juif du XIII^e siècle,” *Archives d’histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge* 29 (1961): 15–19 [= *Mélanges Georges Vajda*, ed. G.E. Weil (Hildesheim, 1982), pp. 313–17.] R. Shishna, the third figure who interacted with R. Eleazar in EW and the only one whose actual existence cannot be proven, played a relatively minor role. His lone comment, to a statement made by R. Eleazar of Worms, served as a foil for R. Elhanan’s lengthy response. See above, n. 11, and below, n. 103.

²⁸ See Dan, *Ḥasidut Ashkenaz be-Toledot ha-Maḥshavah ha-Yebudit*, v.1, pp. 150–52, v.3, pp. 77–84; idem., “The Ashkenazi Hasidic Gates of Wisdom,” *Hommage à Georges Vajda*, ed. Gerard Nahon and Charles Touati (Louvain, 1980), pp. 183–89; Georges Vajda, “Perush R. Elhanan b. Yaqar le-Sefer Yezirah,” *Qoveḥ ‘al Yad* n.s. 6 [16], (1966): 147–97; and Elliot Wolfson, “Demut Ya’aqov Ḥaḥuqah be-Kisse ha-Kavod,” (above, n. 13).

²⁹ See Dan, *Torat ha-Sod shel Ḥasidut Ashkenaz*, pp. 50–53, 168; *Ḥugei ha-Mequbbalim ha-Rishonim*, pp. 70–76.

³⁰ Scholem (*Origins*, p. 250, nn. 101, 103) appears to reject this identification because R. Elhanan was referred to as *mi-London* (and that is apparently where he actually wrote his commentaries to *Sefer Yezirah*) and because R. Elhanan b. ha-Ri was a genuine *qadosh*=martyr. Also, there is evidence that Ri himself was involved in esoteric studies. See Scholem, *Origins*, pp. 250–51, and Urbach, *Ba’alei ha-Tosafot*, v.1, pp. 238–39. Scholem’s reasoning is unconvincing. The appellation *qadosh* need

Elhanan composed his commentary to *Sefer Yeẓirah* in London, it is very likely that he spent time in northern France with other members of his circle.³¹ To be sure, R. Elhanan is never connected specifically with Corbeil in any texts unrelated to EW. He is placed there in EW because EW maintains that R. Yehudah *be-Ḥasid* was there. Nonetheless, since R. Elhanan can be associated with northern France in terms of intellectual activities and colleagues, his placement in a particular locale need not be considered an example of purposeful fabrication or even of inaccuracy.³²

At first blush, it appears quite difficult to justify the placement of the German-born and bred R. Yehudah *be-Ḥasid* in Corbeil by EW. Before attempting to explain the relevance of Corbeil to R. Yehudah, we must take note of R. Yehudah's penchant for anonymity and the possible impact of that posture upon those who were not members of his circle or milieu. Because he preferred anonymity, R. Yehudah's esoteric works were markedly less well-known than those of his student R. Eleazar of Worms. Several works which were apparently composed by R. Yehudah were preserved by and even attributed to R. Eleazar. When R. Yehudah *be-Ḥasid's* name is found in medieval rabbinic and mystical texts, the name of his father, R. Samuel, is almost never mentioned. Occasionally, R. Yehudah is identified by his initials only, **רי"ח**. Yosef Dan has suggested that a student of R. Yehudah and R. Eleazar, R. Avraham b. Azriel (author of *Arugat ha-Bosem*) formulated the acronym **ריח בשם ניהוח** (= R. Yehudah *Ḥasid* b. Shmu'el), which appears in a number of texts associated with the German Pietists, as a means of identifying and attributing R. Yehudah's words while respecting his strong preference for anonymity.³³

not necessarily connote a martyr, especially when used in medieval mystical texts. Rather, it was used to connote saintliness or piety, as well as asceticism. See Isadore Twersky, *Rabad of Posquières* (second edition, Philadelphia, 1980), pp. 27–28, and esp. n. 34. Indeed, EW itself refers to R. Yehudah *be-Ḥasid* (who was not a martyr) as *qadosh*. The association made by Scholem to Ri is suggestive but it must be noted that R. Elhanan b. Yaqar studied *Sefer Yeẓirah* with a student of Ri, and cites Ri in his commentary! See Vajda, "Perush R. Elhanan b. Yaqar," p. 148. Cf. below, n. 99.

³¹ See Dan, "Gates of Wisdom," p. 188; Ronald Kiener, "The Status of Astrology in the Early Kabbalah," *Mehqerei Yerushalayim be-Mahshevet Yisrael* 6: 3–4 (1987): 27–29*; and Verman, *The Books of Contemplation*, pp. 154–55, n. 160.

³² Especially in regard to talmudic studies and intellectual history, Spanish (and Provençal) Jews routinely considered northern France and Germany to be a single entity. See, e.g., Bernard Septimus, *Hispano-Jewish Culture in Transition* (Cambridge, Mass., 1982), pp. 37, 49, 85–87. R. Elhanan of Corbeil is cited by R. Todros Abulafia in his *Sha'ar ha-Razim* (ms. Munich 201, fol. 56v) in a passage similar to the one found in *Baddei ha-Aron*. See Scholem, *Origins*, p. 250, n. 101, and *Sha'ar ha-Razim le-R. Todros b. Yosef ha-Levi Abulafia*, ed. Michal Kushnir-Oron (Jerusalem, 1989), pp. 73–76.

³³ See Dan, "Li-Demuto ha-Historit shel R. Yehudah he-Ḥasid," *Tarbut ve-Hevrah be-Toledot Yisrael Bimei ha-Beinayim*, ed. Reuven Bonfils et al. (Jerusalem, 1989), 389–98; *Ḥasidut Ashkenaz be-Toledot ha-Mahshavah*, v.1, pp. 185–89; *Iyyunim be-Sifrut Hasidei Ashkenaz*, pp. 67–68, 143. The numerical equivalent (*gematria*) of **ריח בשם ניהוח** is **חסיר**. On the general desire of R. Eleazar to publicize the esoteric Pietist teachings that he received, see Dan, *Iyyunim*, pp. 45ff.; Verman, *The Books of Contemplation*, p. 122; and Wolfson, "Demut Ya'aqov," (above, n. 13).

Indeed, it cannot be assumed that anyone outside R. Yehudah's immediate circle knew his father's name or any other biographical details.

The reference by EW to R. Yehudah *be-Ḥasid* as the son of R. Aḥa can be attributed to simple lack of knowledge on the part of the Spanish kabbalist(s) who composed it. It was necessary to supply a name for the father or R. Yehudah *be-Ḥasid* in order to maintain the credibility of the document. One is tempted to suggest that the name should read Abba (meaning father), although none of the manuscript sources confirm this reading.³⁴ R. Aḥa's role in EW is purely honorific. Like *qeshisha* (as in Rav Qeshisha), *aḥa* is an Aramaic noun that lends itself for use as a contrived name.³⁵ Perhaps אַחא was selected because Yehudah *be-Ḥasid* is occasionally described in esoteric texts as אַב הַחֲכָמָה.³⁶ Interestingly, some northern French mystics may have been under the erroneous impression that the name of R. Yehudah's father began with an 'alef.³⁷ This impression could have had an impact in Spain as well.

On the other hand, thirteenth-century Spanish kabbalists undoubtedly knew something about the family and origins of R. Eleazar of Worms. R. Eleazar intended his works to be copied widely and to be identified as his. His name and the name of his father (Yehudah) were included in his works. The names were either mentioned explicitly or were spelled out fully by means of acrostic.³⁸ Works by R. Eleazar were cited by Geronese

³⁴ See above, n.2. EW is also found in ms. Berlin Qu. 833 (fols. 89v-91r), which contains a collection of kabbalistic texts. See Scholem, *Origins*, p. 355, n. 309. Cf. Reuven Margoliot, *Le-Ḥeḡer Shemot ve-Kinnuyim ba-Talmud* (Jerusalem, 1989), pp. 51–52, and see now Boaz Huss, "Sefer Poqeah Ivrim-Yedi'ot Ḥadashot le-Toledot Sifrut ha-Qabbalah," *Tarbiz* 61 (1992): 501–02.

³⁵ See above, n. 11.

³⁶ R. Yehudah was referred to as אב החכמה in a key passage in Pietist penitential texts. See Ivan Marcus, *Piety and Society* (Leiden, 1981), pp. 122–23, and idem., "Pietistic Penitentials," *Studies in Jewish Mysticism*, ed. Frank Talmage and Joseph Dan (Cambridge, Mass., 1982), pp. 60–61, and p. 79, n. 28. [Note also the similar, slightly unusual use of the term *gaon* in both EW and this passage. Cf. Marcus, *Piety and Society*, p. 173, n. 13 (= "Pietistic Penitentials," p. 80, n. 29); Isadore Twersky, *Introduction to the Code of Maimonides* (New Haven, 1980), p. 66, n. 113.] In the original version, the passage also includes R. Yehudah's father's name as well as his earlier Qalonymide lineage. In later derivative Spanish versions, such as the one found in Israel Al Nakawa's *Menorat ha-Ma'or*, ed. H.G. Enelow (New York, 1929–32), v. 3, p. 113, and even in the late thirteenth-century English rabbinic compendium, *Eẓ Ḥayyim* (Jerusalem, 1962), v.1, p. 203, the text removes R. Yehudah's lineage and simply records that R. Eleazar of Worms received the penitentials from R. Yehudah. See Marcus, *Piety and Society*, p. 171–72, n. 40, p. 173, n. 12. Perhaps an intermediate version retained the אב החכמה phrase which was later emended to form the name of R. Yehudah's father.

R. Eleazar of Worms himself refers to R. Yehudah as אב החכמה in his prayer commentary. See ms. Paris 772, fol. 73, and Scholem, *Origins*, pp. 260–61; and *Perushei Siddur ha-Tefillah la-Roqeah*, ed. Moshe Hershtler (Jerusalem, 1992), p. 314, and the editor's introduction, pp. 11–13. In *Sefer ha-Emmunot le-R. Shem Tov b. Shem Tov*, composed in Spain c.1425, the student of R. Eleazar of Worms, with whom *be-Ḥasid ha-Qadosh R. Eleazar* (of Worms) studied, is referred to as אב החכמה. There is no reference to R. Aḥa at all.

³⁷ See below, n. 99.

³⁸ See Ivan Marcus, "The Organization of the Haqdamah and Hilekhot Ḥasidut in Eleazar of Worms' *Sefer ha-Roqeah*," *PAAJR* 36 (1968): 85–94.

kabbalists such as Nahmanides and R. Ya'aqov b. Sheshet and, as we have noted, at least one of R. Eleazar's students met with his Provencal and Spanish counterparts.³⁹

R. Eleazar b. Yehudah is often referred to in medieval mystical texts (and in halakhic texts as well) as R. Eleazar of Worms. R. Yehudah *be-Hasid* is almost never identified with a particular city. A Spanish kabbalistic text from the first half of the thirteenth century, that lists both Ashkenazic and Spanish mystical figures, includes R. Eleazar of Worms and R. Yehudah *be-Hasid* of Allemagne [?].⁴⁰ Thus, the placement of R. Yehudah in Corbeil would not automatically ring untrue. At the same time, there is evidence from *Tosafot* texts which suggests that R. Yehudah *be-Hasid* travelled to northern France, where he was in direct contact with R. Isaac of Dampierre.⁴¹ The length of his stay is impossible to determine. In this case

³⁹ See above, n. 26. On Nahmanides' citation of R. Eleazar, see J. Dan and E.E. Urbach, below, n. 108. For R. Ya'aqov ben Sheshet, see his *Meshiv Devarim Nekhohim*, ed. Georges Vajda (Jerusalem, 1969), p. 114.

⁴⁰ See the text published by Scholem from ms. Bodl. 1816 and Vatican 236 in "Iqvotav shel Gabirol ba-Qabbalah," *Me-Assef le-Sifrut ule-Divrei Mahshavah*, ed. A.A. Kabak and A. Steiman (Tel Aviv, 1940), pp. 175–76. The version found in Vatican (Neophyti) 11 was published by Ben Zion Dinur and subsequently by Moshe Idel. See Idel (above, n. 18), p. 5.

In his epistle *Ve-Zot li-Yehudah*, Avraham Abulafia associates R. Yehudah *be-Hasid* with Regensburg/Rothenburg. See Idel, *Language, Torah, and Hermeneutics* (Albany, 1991), p. 134, n. 6. It should be noted, however, that Abulafia wrote this work toward the end of the 1280's, well after the heyday of the Cohen brothers in Castile. See Idel, *Kivei R. Avraham Abulafia u-Mishnato* (Ph.D., Hebrew University, 1976), p. 27. Moreover, Abulafia left Castile around 1275, wandering as far north as France. He reached Italy c. 1280; see Idel, *Kivei*, p. 3. It is likely that Abulafia received his information about R. Yehudah at that time. Abulafia also notes that he had access to a written record or book of R. Yehudah's teachings; see Idel, *Language, Torah and Hermeneutics*, *ibid.*, and pp. 142–43, n. 48. He also talks about having studied directly from the books of R. Eleazar of Worms. See Idel, *Kabbalah: New Perspectives* (Yale, 1988), pp. 97–99, and *idem.*, *The Mystical Teachings of Abraham Abulafia* (Albany, 1989), pp. 22–24. The Cohen brothers may have received information about R. Yehudah, and the teachings of the German Pietists generally, through oral tradition. Cf. Idel, *Kabbalah*, pp. 211–12, and Wolfson, "Circumcision and the Divine Name," and Dan, "Samael, Lilith and the Concept of Evil," (above, n. 25). A written account might be expected to contain more information about the author, although it should be noted that even Abulafia does not mention, as far I can tell, the name of R. Yehudah *be-Hasid's* father.

Two other kabbalists who were active in Castile and might have supplied accurate biographical information about R. Yehudah *be-Hasid* were also probably unknown to the Cohen brothers. An Ashkenazic visionary, R. Abraham of Cologne, arrived in Castile in the 1270's. He was a contemporary of the Cohen brothers' students. See Idel, *Kabbalah*, *ibid.*; and cf. Dan, *Torat ha-Sod shel Hasidut Ashkenaz*, p. 259; and below, n. 48. The Castilian kabbalist R. David b. Yehudah, who travelled to Germany and reached Regensburg, and was familiar with the esoteric teachings of the German Pietists, wrote his major work c. 1300. See Daniel Matt, *The Book of Mirrors: Sefer Mar'ot Zove'ot* (Chico, Calif., 1982), editor's introduction, p. 3; Idel, *Kabbalah*, p. 100; and below, n. 73.

⁴¹ See *Tosafot Sens le-Massekhet Ketubot*, ed. Avraham Liss (Jerusalem, 1973), p. 50 [*Ketubot* 18b], s.v. *uve-kehulo*, and Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, p. 237, n. 42. [See also Urbach, pp. 289, n. 78, 391, n. 20.] Urbach (p. 323) notes that several rabbinic biographers and modern scholars referred to R. Yehudah Sir Leon (of Paris) as R. Yehudah (*mi-Paris* [ha-] *nigra*) *Hasid*. See also Hayyim Yosef David Azulai, *Shem ha-Gedolim* (Warsaw, 1878), *Ma'arekhet Gedolim*, p. 45, s.v. *Rabbenu Yehudah be-Hasid*. Urbach dis-

as well, the fact that R. Yehudah may have spent time in northern France allows the claim to be made a half-century later, particularly to a Spanish audience, that he hailed from Corbeil.⁴²

In addition to possible geographic realities, other kinds of evidence can be marshalled to support the association of R. Yehudah with Corbeil. As has been noted, there was a Tosafist named R. Yehudah of Corbeil who was a contemporary of R. Yehudah *be-Hasid*. R. Yehudah of Corbeil was a relatively minor figure in the Tosafist enterprise. His better known brother, R. Ya'akov of Corbeil, was referred in at least one *Tosafot* text by the ambiguous title, (Maha)Ri Corbeil.⁴³ Moreover, no Tosafist source in which either of the brothers are cited makes any mention of their father.^{43a}

misses these claims as groundless and correctly concludes that the name R. Yehudah *be-Hasid* in medieval rabbinic texts refers only to R. Yehudah *be-Hasid* from Germany (Regensburg). Perhaps the association of R. Yehudah *be-Hasid* with Paris flowed not from a French Tosafist being confused with R. Yehudah of Regensburg but rather from the fact that the genuine R. Yehudah *be-Hasid* projected a presence in northern France. R. Yehudah *be-Hasid*'s critique of specific liturgical customs and variations that were in vogue in *Zarefat* (northern France) cannot be cited as absolute proof that he actually visited there. Nonetheless, it may have proved support for the perception that he had an active connection to the region. See *Perushei Siddur ha-Tefillah la-Roqueah*, ed. Hershler, v.1, pp. 136–37, 225, 277, 302, 335, 359; v.2, pp. 402, 420; and Urbach, *Arugat ha-Bosem*, v.4, pp. 92–100; Dan, “The Emergence of Mystical Prayer,” *Studies in Jewish Mysticism*, ed. Joseph Dan and Frank Talmage (Cambridge, Mass., 1982), pp. 87–107, and “Li-Demuto ha-Historit shel R. Yehudah *be-Hasid*,” (above, n. 33), pp. 392–96; [see now Israel Ta-Shema, *Minhag Ashkenaz Qadmon* (Jerusalem, 1992), p. 140, n. 10]. Cf. Haym Soloveitchik, “Three Themes in the Sefer *Hasidim*,” *AJS Review* 1 (1976): 339–54; Ta-Shema, “Mizvat Talmud Torah Ki-Ve'ayah Datit-Hevratit be-Sefer *Hasidim*,” *Bar Ilan* 14–15 (1977): 104–08; and Ivan Marcus, *Piety and Society* (Leiden, 1981), p. 168, n. 80.

Note also the inclusion of R. Yehudah of Paris (=R. Yehudah Sir Leon) among the French and German figures who offered messianic speculations in Alexander Marx, “Ma'amar 'al Shenat ha-Geulah,” *Ha-Goren* 8 (1911): 194–99. Except for Ri, who as noted above (n. 30) was involved in some form of esoteric studies, and R. Yehudah, all other Ashkenazic names mentioned were either rabbinic leaders of the German Pietists, such as R. Yehudah *be-Hasid* himself and his father R. Samuel, or so-called prophets who were associated with *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, such as the *nevi'im* of Moncontour and Trestlein. On these prophets, see Scholem in *Tarbiz* 2 (1931): 244–45, 514; Idel, *Kabbalah: New Perspectives*, pp. 88–96; Verman, *The Books of Contemplation*, p. 19; Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, v.1, pp. 336–39; and Israel Ta-Shema, “Sefer ha-Maskil, Hibbur Yehudi-Zarefati Bilti Yadu'a mi-Sof ha-Me'ah ha-Yod Gimel,” *Mehqerei Yerushalayim be-Mahshevet Yisra'el* 2 (1983): 432–33. Note also the influence of R. Eliezer *mi-Metz* on his student, R. Eleazar of Worms. See below, n. 75.

⁴² R. Yehudah's father, R. Shmuel *be-Hasid*, who apparently travelled to several areas in western Europe, may have spent time in northern France as well. See *Kitvei R. Abraham Epstein*, v.1 (Jerusalem, 1950), pp. 254–55, and Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, p. 192.

⁴³ See *Tosafot Pesahim* 99b, s.v. 'ad, and Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot* 1: 150–51, nn. 46, 49*. See also the so-called *Tosafot ha-Rash 'al ha-Torah* passage, below, n. 46. For the relatively meager literary output of the brothers of Corbeil, see Urbach, pp. 149–52, and Gross, *Gallia Judaica*, pp. 561–62. For additional material, see, e.g., Jacob Gellis, *Tosafot ha-Shalem*, v.8 (Jerusalem, 1990), p. 174, and the *pesaqim* in ms. Montefiore 130, fol. 40v, Mont. 100, fol. 41r, Warsaw 204, fol. 27v, and Bodl. 781, fol. 69v (sec. 107). Cf. *Perushei ha-Torah le-R. Hayyim Paltiel*, ed. I.S. Lange (Jerusalem, 1981), p. 314, n. 16, and *Moshav ha-Zegenim 'al ha-Torah*, ed. Solomon Sasson (London, 1959), p. 180.

^{43a} See Urbach (above, n. 20), but cf. *Sefer ha-Manbig*, ed. Y. Raphael (Jerusalem, 1978), 2:649.

As such, it is neither difficult nor devious to merge the identities (or at least the locales) of the two genuine rabbinic figures named R. Yehudah. In addition, possible affinities between the teachings of R. Ya'aqov, who is referred to as *ha-Qadosh* or *he-Hasid [mi-Corbeil]*, and those of R. Yehudah *be-Hasid* and R. Eleazar of Worms should not be ignored. In his *Shibbolei ha-Leqet* (c. 1250), R. Zedqiyah b. Avraham Anav *ha-Rofe* offered a reason for the established Ashkenazic custom of maintaining the number of words to be recited as part of the *qeri'at shema* at 248. He found this reason, which was formulated on the basis of gematria, among the “*Ta'amei R. Yehudah be-Hasid.*” It is essentially an embellishment of a midrashic passage, that the words of the *Shema* correspond to the number of a man's limbs. Reciting the *Shema* properly will save a person from both sin and demons (*shed*).⁴⁴ The only other contemporary rabbinic figures to 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 R. Yehudah b. Yaqar (d. circa 1215), whose receipt of esoteric traditions from the German Pietists has been documented recently, and R. Ya'aqov of Corbeil (d. 1192).⁴⁵ A biblical comment of R. Ya'aqov anticipates almost precisely a

⁴⁴ See *Shibbolei ha-Leqet ha-Shalem*, sec. 15 (ed. S.K. Mirsky [Jerusalem, 1976]), p. 175. Note that *Shibbolei ha-Leqet* records two other passages from the otherwise unknown treatise “*Ta'amei R. Yehudah be-Hasid.*” See sec. 185 (ed. Solomon Buber, p. 144) and the end of section 236. 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], p. 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 be-Hasid*” cited in *Shibbolei ha-Leqet* but he makes no reference to demons. When discussing the recitation of the *Shema* in the body of *Sefer Roqeah* (p. 211), R. Eleazar cites the *Tanhumah* text to support the custom of 248 words alone, without any of the pietistic embellishments. See also *Perush Siddur ha-Tefillah la-Roqeah*, ed. Hershler, v.1, p. 282.

⁴⁵ See *Perush ha-Tefillot ve-ha-Berakhot le-R. Yehudah b. Yaqar* (Jerusalem, 1979), p. 90. [The uniqueness of R. Yehudah's interpretation of the protection offered by the recitation of *Shema* was noted by Elliot Wolfson, “Dimmui Anthropomorphi ve-Symboliqqah shel Otiyyot be-Sefer ha-Zohar,” *Mehqerei Yerushalayim be-Mahshevet Yisrael* 8 (1989): 161, n. 162.]

R. Yehudah b. Yaqar's phrasing corresponds precisely to the formulation of R. Ya'aqov of Corbeil found in ms. Paris BN 167/2, fols. 93r-93v: *li-shemirah mipnei ha-maziqin*. R. Yehudah received teachings from the German Pietists; see below, n. 73. He also studied with the Tosafist Rizba in northern France (Urbach, v.1, pp. 263–64), and may have gained access there to R. Ya'aqov's material. No matter R. Yehudah's source, the fact that only he, a devotee of *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, R. Yehudah *be-Hasid*, and R. Ya'aqov of Corbeil had this interpretation further solidifies the connection between R. Ya'aqov and German Pietism, especially in the minds of Spanish kabbalists. For the impact on the Zohar of the accepted Ashkenazic custom concerning the number of words in *Shema*, see the pioneering study of Israel Ta-Shema, “E-1 Melekh Ne'eman-Gilgulo shel Minhag (Terumah le-Heqer ha-Zohar),” *Tarbiz* 40 (1970): 184–94, and below, n. 108.

R. Ya'aqov's formulation appears in Paris 167 within a collection of Tosafist interpretations, especially those of Rabbenu Tam, which 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. Urbach (pp. 150–51) and Norman Golb, *Toledot ha-Yehudim be-'Ir Rouen Bimei ha-Benayim* (Jerusalem, 1976), p. 139, n.

passage in the Pietist biblical commentary attributed to R. Eleazar of Worms, which was actually composed by another student of R. Yehudah *be-Hasid*.⁴⁶ The specific methods of interpretation utilized by R. Ya'aqov were among those favored by R. Yehudah⁴⁷

Another means of associating R. Yehudah *be-Hasid* with Corbeil arises through a linkage between R. Yehudah *be-Hasid* and R. Yizḥaq b. Yosef of Corbeil, author of *Ammudei Golah/Sefer Mizvot Qatan*. R. Yizḥaq (d. 1280)

400, cited a more basic formulation from R. Ya'aqov that was preserved in a passage in a *piyyut* commentary written by his relative R. Aharon b. R. Hayyim ha-Kohen (Bodl. 1206, fol. 148v). In this passage, R. Ya'aqov was quoted as advocating the recitation of the complete *Shema* at one's bedside since, according to *Tanḥuma*, the 248 words in it (including the phrase *E-l melekh ne'eman*) would protect the 248 limbs in a human body. (The full reference, that the recitation of *Shema* would also protect against *maziqin*, is found only in the Paris manuscript version.) In the Bodl. text, R. Aharon then notes that there was a controversy between his uncle R. Ya'aqov *ha-Qadosh mi-Corbeil* and Rabbenu Ya'aqov [Tam] *mi-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 important. See also Avraham Grossman, "Perush ha-Piyyutim le-R. Aharon b. Hayyim ha-Kohen," *Be-Orah Madda* [Meḥqarim le-Aharon Mirsky] (Lod, 1986), pp. 461–62, and Israel Ta-Shema, *Minḥag Ashkenaz ha-Qadmon* (Jerusalem, 1992), p. 319, n. 17. As Urbach notes (p. 151, n. 48), this argument involved many more Ashkenazic (and Sefardic) rabbinic figures than the two R. Ya'aqovs. Urbach notes, however, that the only other reference to the position of R. Ya'aqov of Corbeil is found at the beginning of *Sefer Or Zarua'*, *Hilkhot Qeri'at Shema*, sec. 1, in which R. Ya'aqov 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. Ya'aqov of Corbeil in commenting on the biblical locus of *Shema* in *Va-Etḥanan*. In this fuller version of R. Ya'aqov's position, he suggests answers to all four of the questions that Rabbenu Tam had posed against Rashi's (and his) position, as recorded in the *Or Zarua'*. The essential element of R. Ya'aqov'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 while others (non-scholars) who had read the *Shema* earlier must recite it fully (i.e., not just the first paragraph) at their bedside. In this regard, R. Ya'aqov was advocating the earlier Ashkenazic position that was also held by *Sefer Hasidim*. See Jacob Katz, "Ma'ariv bi-Zemanno u-Shelo bi-Zemanno," *Zion* 35 (1972): 39–48, and my *Jewish Education and Society in the High Middle Ages* (Detroit, 1992), pp. 86–99.

⁴⁶ See *Da'at Zeqenim* to *Deuteronomy* 12:21; the so-called *Perush ha-Rosh 'al ha-Torah*, ad loc., and cf. Aptowitz (above, n. 21); *Tosafot Hullin* 28a, s.v. *ve-'al*; *Tosafot ha-Rosh* to *Hullin* 28a, loc. cit. and *Tosafot* and *Tosafot ha-Rosh* to *Hullin* 122b, s.v. *ve-gam*. Compare the so-called *Perush Roqeaḥ 'al ha-Torah*, ed. J. Kanevsky (*Devarim*), p. 211. The striking correspondence between R. Ya'aqov's comment and the material found in the *Perush Roqeaḥ* blunts Aptowitz's claim that the gematria interpretation(s) in the style of *Hasidei Ashkenaz* offered by R. Ya'aqov do not link him directly to the teachings of the German Pietists. On the author of the *Perush Roqeaḥ*, see Dan, "The Ashkenazi Hasidic Gates of Wisdom," (above, n. 28), and idem., "Perush ha-Torah le-R. Eleazar mi-Germaiza," *Qiryat Sefer* 59 (1984): 644.

⁴⁷ On the *gematria/bathalot teivot* methodologies of R. Yehudah *be-Hasid*, cf. Elliot Wolfson, "Circumcision and the Divine Name," p. 88. Cf. Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, p. 399, and *Arugat ha-Bosem*, v.4, p. 110, n. 32. R. Ya'aqov of Corbeil was martyred. References to him as (R. Ya'aqov) *Ha-Qadosh mi-Corbeil* (see, e.g., *Tosafot Shabbat*, 27a, s.v. *she-ken*, 61a, s.v. *dilma*, and above, n. 43) establish another possible link to "R. Yehudah *ha-Qadosh mi-Corbeil*" in EW, although cf. above, n. 30.

flourished in Corbeil at roughly the same time that R. Yizḥaq ha-Kohen was active in Spain.⁴⁸ Within rabbinic literature of the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, there are instances in which the names ר"י חסיד and R. Yizḥaq [*Ḥasid*] of Corbeil were closely linked and even interchanged. It is possible that simple scribal error or misunderstanding underlies these changes. After all, the letters ר"י חסיד [רי"ח צס] could yield R. Yehudah *Ḥasid*, R. Yizḥaq *Ḥasid*, or R. Yonah *Ḥasid*.

In all likelihood, however, these changes were the result of more complex permutations. Over the past century, scholars have analysed three passages from *Sefer Ḥayyei Olam/Sefer ha-Yir'ah* that were attributed by R. Aharon ha-Kohen of Lunel in his *Sefer Orḥot Ḥayyim* to ר"י חסיד.⁴⁹ A number of manuscripts and printed works attributed *Sefer Ḥayyei Olam* to Rabbenu Yonah of Gerona.⁵⁰ This attribution was initially questioned in light of some marked similarities in content and parallel passages between *Sefer Ḥayyei Olam* and *Sefer Ḥasidim*. Without any other indication, רי"ח should connote R. Yehudah (*be-*)*Ḥasid*. Recent research, however, has firmly established that Rabbenu Yonah, who also had an affinity to *ḥasidut Ashkenaz*, was the author of *Sefer Ḥayyei Olam*.⁵¹

Sefer Orḥot Ḥayyim attributes positions in both *halakhah* and ethics to Rabbenu Yonah by name, without the title חסיד. Clearly, the author of *Orḥot Ḥayyim* was unaware of R. Yonah's authorship of *Sefer Ḥayyei Olam*. Moreover, it appears that רי"ח in the *Sefer Orḥot Ḥayyim* connotes not R. Yehudah *Ḥasid* but R. Yizḥaq *Ḥasid*. In the prologue, R. Aharon of Lunel cites a passage from *Sefer ha-Yir'ah* which he attributes to R. Yizḥaq *Ḥasid* [*Ḥesed*].⁵²

Benjamin Richler has suggested that this puzzling attribution to R.

⁴⁸ R. Isaac ha-Kohen was active c. 1260. See Moshe Idel, *Kabbalah, New Perspectives*, pp. 211–12; Elliot Ginsburg, *The Sabbath in the Classical Kabbalah*, pp. 13–14; and the entry by Scholem on R. Ya' aqov ha-Kohen in *EJ* 9: 1219. R. Eleazar of Worms died c. 1230.

⁴⁹ *Orḥot Ḥayyim* (Florence, 1750) *Hilkhot Ziqit*, sec. 23 (fol. 3b); *Hilkhot Qeri'at Shema*, sec. 18 (fol. 12b); *Hilkhot Teḥillah*, sec. 16 (fol. 14a). See A. Loewenthal, "Das Buch des 'Ewigen Lebens' und seine Bedeutung in der Literatur des Mittelalters," *Festschrift zum achtzigsten Geburtstag . . . Wolf Feilchenfeld* (Pleschen-Schrimm, 1907), pp. 66–76; A.T. Shrock, *Rabbi Jonah ben Abraham of Gerona* (London, 1948), pp. 92–95; Yehiel Zilber, *Birur Halakhah* (Bnei Brak, 1976), pp. 32–34.

⁵⁰ Benjamin Richler, "Al Kitvei Yad shel 'Sefer ha-Yir'ah' ha-Meyuḥas le-Rabbenu Yonah Gerondi," *Alei Sefer* 8 (1981): 51–57.

⁵¹ See above, n. 49, and the studies cited in Richler, nn. 1–2; Israel Ta-Shema, "Ḥasidut Ashkenaz bi-Sefarad: Rabbenu Yonah Gerondi-ha-Ish u-Fo'alo," *Galut Aḥar Golah* (Meḥqarim be-Toledot Am Yisrael Muggashim li-Prof. Hayyim Beinart), ed. Aharon Mirsky *et al.* (Jerusalem, 1988), pp. 169–70; Yehiel Zilber, "Sefer ha-Yir'ah le-Rabbenu Yonah Gerondi Ḥasid," *Moriab* 10: 9–10 (1981): 94–96. On the relationship of Rabbenu Yonah to *Ḥasidut Ashkenaz*, see below, n. 64.

⁵² An inferior manuscript of *Orḥot Ḥayyim*, JTS Rabb. 666 (Spain, 1524), corrects the passage to read R. Yizḥaq *Ḥasid* (fol. 14r). A gloss substitutes R. Yonah for R. Yizḥaq. Bodl. 2366 (Spain, fifteenth/sixteenth century), retains the spelling *ḥesed*. The printed text, which generally follows the Bodleian manuscript as far as content and even in regard to the numbering of sections within a topic [which is not done in the JTS ms.], also has *ḥesed*. Cf. above, n. 49. On the attribution of *Sefer*

Yizḥaq may be understood on the basis of manuscript research.⁵³ *Sefer Ḥayyei Olam* was frequently copied together with R. Yizḥaq of Corbeil's *Ammudei Golab/Sefer Mizvot Qatan*. In several early Ashkenazic manuscripts of *Sefer Mizvot Qatan*, including two of three manuscripts that were copied before 1300, *Sefer Ḥayyei Olam* was juxtaposed with *Semaq*.⁵⁴ In Bodl. 875 (copied in 1299), the author of *Semaq* is listed in the colophon as “R. Yizḥaq be-Hasid b. Yosef mi-Corbeil.” Richler suggests that a subsequent non-Ashkenazic copyist mistakenly assumed that the author of the *Semaq*, R. Yizḥaq *Hasid*, was also the author of the following pietistic work, *Sefer Ḥayyei Olam*, whose author was not listed with the text. The attribution to R. Yizḥaq was then picked up by others, including R. Aharon ha-Kohen of Lunel.

Richler's solution poses a new problem. The name ר״י קורביל is found in two places in *Orḥot Ḥayyim* in very close proximity to that of ר״י חסיד.⁵⁵ Indeed, in one passage, ר״י קורביל and ר״י חסיד are listed together as espousing the same position.⁵⁶ In *Sefer Orḥot Ḥayyim*,

Ḥayyei Olam to R. Yizḥaq *Hasid*, see also R. Moshch ha-Kohen, *Sefer Ḥasidim Qatan* (Podgoze, 1899), pp. 9, 14 (secs. 25, 27), and below, n. 65, 68.

On Rabbenu Yonah in *Sefer Orḥot Ḥayyim*, see, e.g., *Hilkhot Qedushah Meyushav*, sec. 1; *Tefillah*, secs. 37 (cf. *talmidei Rabbenu Yonah le-Massekhet Berakhot* [12a]), 45; *Mah she-Mosifim be-Sbeni uva-Hamishi*, sec. 16; *Talmud Torah*, sec. 10; *Se'udab*, sec. 25; *Birkat ha-Mazon*, sec. 55; *Shabbat*, sec. 75; *Hilkhot Rosb ha-Shanah*, sec. 26 [which contains a text of Rabbenu Yonah's *Sod ha-Teshuvah*; see below, n. 65]; pt. 2, *Ahavat ha-Shem ve-Yir'ato*, sec. 11, p. 31; *Ketubot*, sec. 17, p. 87, sec. 27, p. 99.

⁵³ Richler, pp. 52–53.

⁵⁴ In De Rossi 189 [Parma 1940] (dated 1297) and Bodl. 875 (1299), *Sefer Ḥayyei Olam/Sefer ha-Yir'ab* immediately follows *Semaq*. In Vatican 165, *Ḥayyei Olam* immediately precedes *Semaq*. In Bodl. 884, the two works are separated by two brief texts, *Zava'at R. Yehudah be-Hasid* and a *tiqqun sbetarot*. For additional information on the contents and provenance of some of these manuscripts, see below, 65.

⁵⁵ See above, n. 49. ר״י קורביל is mentioned in *Hilkhot Zizit*, secs. 21 and 24. These sections are only a few lines away from sec. 23, which records ר״י חסיד as requiring different blessings for *tallit qatan* and full-sized *tallit*. JTS Rabb. 666 (fol. 19r) writes ה״ה קורביל and ה״ה חסיד instead of the more accurate הר״י חסיד and הר״י קורביל (ביל) found both in the printed text and ms. Bodl. 2366.

⁵⁶ *Hilkhot Tefillah*, sec. 16 (on not touching areas of flesh that are usually covered during prayer, found in both the printed text and Bodl. 2366): “וכ״כ הר״י מקור׳ והר״י חסיד ז״ל.” Subsequently, at *Hilkhot Tefillah*, cnd sec. 33 (fol. 15b), where the prohibition of praying with one's private parts exposed is discussed, the earlier position is referred to and described as that of “ולמעלה כתבנו דעת הר״י: ר״י חסיד” and R. Perez (of Corbeil) and ר״י קורביל. “מקור׳ והר״י פרץ והר״י חסיד ז״ל על דין זה.” Note that in JTS Rabb. 666 (fol. 40r), these passages are “corrected.” In the first instance, ר״י קורביל (written in this case as הר״י מקורביל) is mentioned as concurring with the prior point. Then, following a period, alone is cited on the issue of touching one's body during prayer. In the subsequent passage in *Hilkhot Tefillah* (fol. 44r), the earlier position is identified as that of: “ה״ה מקור (ביל) והר״פ והר״ש.” It should be noted that *Orḥot Ḥayyim, Hilkhot Tefillin*, sec. 4 (fol. 7a), does attribute one halakhic formulation that derives from *Sefer ha-Yir'ab* to Rabbenu Yonah. Interestingly, the passage in question played a crucial role in establishing Rabbenu Yonah's authorship of *Sefer ha-Yir'ab* since it contains the name of his teacher, R. Samuel of Evreux. See Zilber (above, n. 49), p. 33; Ta-Shema (above, n. 51); and Richler (above, n. 50), pp. 54–55.

ר"י קורביל, who is cited with great frequency, invariably refers to R. Isaac of Corbeil, author of the *Sefer Mizvot Qatan*.⁵⁷ Additional passages from *Semaq* were incorporated anonymously.⁵⁸ It would have been virtually impossible for the author of *Orhot Hayyim* to equate ר' יצחק חסיד with R. Yizḥaq of Corbeil as Richler had suggested.

The two parallel passages in the anonymous *Sefer Kol Bo*, a work closely related to *Orhot Hayyim*, mention only one name. In the first instance it is R. Yizḥaq, in the second, R. Yizḥaq *Hasid*.⁵⁹ Like *Orhot Hayyim*, *Kol Bo* relied heavily upon R. Yizḥaq's *Sefer Mizvot Qatan*. In fact, *Kol Bo* cites material from this work without attribution even more frequently than *Orhot Hayyim* does.⁶⁰ In *Kol Bo*, R. Yizḥaq of Corbeil is not referred to as

⁵⁷ R. Yizḥaq's locale, (from) Corbeil, which is always included in order to distinguish him from others called Ri, is usually abbreviated as (מ)קורב' or (מ)קורי'. Sections that cite Ri Corbeil most frequently include *Hilkhot Tefillah*, *Sukekab*, *Milab*, *Qiddushin*, *Mezuzah*, *Issurei Ma'akhalot*. R. Yizḥaq's halakhic work is referred to explicitly in *Hilkhot Birkat ha-Mazon*, sec. 31 (fol. 33b). Sec. 3 of the unit entitled *Din Mah she-Mosifim be-Shevi uva-Hamishi* (fol. 23b) contains R. Yizḥaq's interpretation of the thirteen Divine attributes. See below, n. 67.

⁵⁸ Striking evidence for both the high degree of anonymous usage of the *Semaq* by *Orhot Hayyim* and the sizable overall extent to which *Orhot Hayyim* relied on R. Yizḥaq's work can be found in the latter portion of *Orhot Hayyim*. Starting with Part Two, ed. Moshe Schlesinger (Berlin, 1899–1902), sec. 34, *Hilkhot Zedakah*, p. 441, almost all of the next sixteen sections (topics) begin with either an explicit reference to R. Yizḥaq of Corbeil or an anonymous citation from *Sefer Mizvot Qatan*. These sections deal, for the most part, with issues of monetary law and, towards the end, with general ethics and conduct. [The final sections of *Orhot Hayyim* exhibit a similar reliance upon Maimonides' *Mishneh Torah*.]

R. Yosef Karo's observation about the degree to which *Sefer Kol Bo* relied upon *Semaq* despite the absence of explicit attributions applies in different measure to the related *Orhot Hayyim* as well. See below, n. 60.

⁵⁹ *Kol Bo* (Leipzig, 1860), chapter 22, *Din Hilkhot Zizit* (fol. 15a): " . . . ויהי יצחק כתב " makes precisely the same distinction between the blessings for *tallit qatan* and *tallit gadol* as the passage in *Orhot Hayyim* does; chapter 11, *Din Hilkhot Tefillah* (fol. 5b): " . . . ויהי יצחק חסיד כתב " has the exact same text as *Orhot Hayyim* regarding not touching flesh. Silber (above, n. 49) noticed the second series of parallel passages but did not compare them to the first.

⁶⁰ R. Yosef Karo, *Beit Yosef, Orhot Hayyim* 9, s.v. *ve-katav be-Sefer Mizvot Qatan*, remarked that "it is usual and frequent (*ragil be-harbeh meqomot*) for the *Kol Bo* to record the words of *Semaq* (and its glosses) anonymously." Cf. below, n. 74. In the instance in *hilkhot zizit* that occasioned the *Beit Yosef's* comment, the *Kol Bo* had indeed cited a passage from *Semaq* without attribution but had included the gloss of R. Perez to that passage by name. [Note that the parallel passage in *Orhot Hayyim*, *Hilkhot Zizit*, sec. 1 (fol. 3a), also does not mention ר"י קורביל by name.] Compare *Kol Bo*, chapter 24 (*Se'udah*), fol. 17a, and *Orhot Hayyim*, *Hilkhot Se'udah*, sec. 32 (fol. 31a). *Orhot Hayyim* cites a position about the blessing *ha-tov veba-metiv* in the name of the rabbis of Evreux that was also held by (their students), R. Yizḥaq of Corbeil and R. Perez. In the *Kol Bo* passage, the rabbis of Evreux and R. Perez are listed while R. Yizḥaq's name, which appeared in *Orhot Hayyim* between the other two, was omitted. Compare also *Orhot Hayyim Hilkhot Mezuzot*, pt. 2, p. 195 with *Kol Bo*, chap. 91 (fol. 58b).

Although R. Yizḥaq of Corbeil is cited by name with much greater frequency in *Orhot Hayyim*, there are a number of instances in which *Kol Bo* includes R. Yizḥaq's name with his view and *Orhot Hayyim* omits it. Compare, e.g., *Orhot Hayyim*, *Hilkhot Shabbat (Din Arvei Shabbatot)*, sec. 5 (fol. 44a) with *Kol Bo*, chap. 31 (15b); *Hilkhot Yom ha-Kippurim*, sec. 22 (fol. 105b) with *Kol Bo*, chap. 69, fol.

(Maha)Ri Corbeil. Indicative of the central role that his work played, he is always referred to simply as R. Yizḥaq.⁶¹ The relationship between the *Kol Bo* and *Orḥot Ḥayyim*, especially the question of which work was written first or which served as a basis for the other, has not been firmly resolved. The leading view currently is that *Kol Bo* was composed first.⁶² If so, the title R. Yishaq Ḥasid may have been used first by *Kol Bo* and taken from there by *Orḥot Ḥayyim*, although it is certainly possible that the case at hand does not support the regnant perception. Irrespective of the solution to this dilemma, the *Orḥot Ḥayyim* texts connect R. Yizḥaq of Corbeil with another rabbinic figure named ר"י חסיד. For a reader of the *Orḥot Ḥayyim* texts, and perhaps for R. Aharon ha-Kohen of Lunel as well, it is most likely that ר"י חסיד connotes R. Yehudah Ḥasid.⁶³

Moreover, even if ר"י חסיד in the *Orḥot Ḥayyim* passages is assumed to represent Rabbenu Yonah, the connection to R. Isaac of Corbeil in these passages is suggestive. Recent research has shown that R. Yonah and

34b; *Hilkhot Hannukah*, sec. 15(118a) with *Kol Bo*, chap. 44, fol. 3b; *Hilkhot Pidyon Bekhorot*, pt. 2., pp. 20–21, with *Kol Bo*, chap. 126 (fol. 97b); *Hilkhot Avodah Zarah*, pt. 2, p. 230, with *Kol Bo*, chap. 97 (65a); cf. also *Hilkhot Ḥalah* pt. 2, pp. 200–01, with *Kol Bo*, chapter 89 (57a).

There is nothing in *Kol Bo* that approaches *Orḥot Ḥayyim*'s systematic reliance upon *Semaq* in the sections of part two indicated (above, n. 58). Note, however, that *Kol Bo*, chapter 76 (46a) is entitled “*Hilkhot Gittin mi-Sefer R. Yizḥaq ז"ל (=Semaq)*,” [cf. *Orḥot Ḥayyim*, pt. 2, p. 171, “*tofes ha-get mi-leshon ha-Ri Corbeil*”]. Chapter 77 contains “*Seder Ḥalitzah shel ha-R. Yizḥaq ז"ל*” [cf. *Orḥot Ḥayyim*, pt. 2, p. 182, “*Seder Ḥalitzah shel ha-Ri mi-Corbeil*,”] and chapter 125 (fol. 97a) is entitled “*Kezat Dinim meha-R. Yizḥaq ז"ל*” and consists of material from *Semaq* on the priestly benediction.

⁶¹ Because *Kol Bo* refers to R. Yizḥaq of Corbeil simply as R. Yizḥaq, there are occasions when the identity of a particular R. Yizḥaq cited in *Kol Bo* is unclear. References to R. Yizḥaq can sometimes connote R. Yizḥaq al-Fasi or R. Yizḥaq of Dampierre. See, e.g., *Sefer Kol Bo (Heleq sheni)*, ed. David Avraham (Jerusalem, 1990), *Hilkhot Shabbat*, pp. 113–14. See also *Kol Bo*, chap. 24 (*Din Hilkhot Se'udab*), 17a and *Orḥot Ḥayyim Hilkhot Se'udab*, sec. 35 (31b).

⁶² See S.Z. Havlin, “R. Aaron ben Jacob ha-Kohen of Lunel,” *Encyclopedia Judaica*, 2: 12–13; “Kol Bo,” *EJ* 10: 1159–60; Haym Soloveitchik, *She'elot u-Teshuvot ke-Maqor Histori* (Jerusalem, 1990), pp. 94–100. Both works probably straddled the turn of the fourteenth century.

⁶³ R. Yehudah *be-Ḥasid* is referred to by name once in *Orḥot Ḥayyim*, in *Hilkhot Erev Yom ha-Kippurim*, sec. 6 (fol. 103b): “נשאל אל ר' יהודה חסיד.” The question put to him concerned the apparent discrepancy between the maximum number of lashes that an earthly tribunal could administer (39) and the Heavenly court's maximum of 60. R. Yehudah responded that since an earthly court could punish a person from the age of thirteen, their maximum was three times thirteen. The Heavenly tribunal, on the other hand, only meted out punishment to those aged twenty and above. Thus, their maximum was three times twenty. A talmudic source (*Ḥagigah* 15a) that described Metatron receiving sixty bursts of fire as punishment was also cited. This “responsum” of R. Yehudah should be added to the diverse list of his responsa compiled by Ivan Marcus, “*Hibburei ha-Teshuvah shel Ḥasidei Ashkenaz*,” in *Studies . . . Presented to Isaiah Tishby* (above, n. 3), p. 375, n. 30. [In his important article (pp. 369–84), Marcus transcribed and thoroughly analysed a penitential responsum of R. Yehudah (“*al 'isqei teshuvah*”) and a Pietist penitential text that followed. In addition to the extant manuscript versions noted by Marcus (cf. his *Piety and Society*, p. 172, nn. 7–8), portions of these texts were also included in ms. Breslau 248. This manuscript was apparently destroyed, however, in the Holocaust. See D.S. Loewinger and B.D. Weinryb, *Catalogue of the Hebrew Manuscripts of the Library of the Juedisch-Theologisches Seminar in Breslau* (Weisbaden, 1965), pp. 175–76.]

R. Yehudah *Hasid* shared not only the same initials but several ideological affinities as well.⁶⁴ The parallels between *Sefer ha-Yir'ab* and *Sefer Hasidim* alluded to above are but one small example of this relationship. The textual linkages in *Orhot Hayyim* that have been discussed strengthen the impression that R. Yehudah *be-Hasid* had a connection to [R. Yizḥaq] Corbeil. As will be seen shortly, R. Isaac of Corbeil also had genuine ideological affinities to both R. Yehudah *be-Hasid* and Rabbenu Yonah. These affinities may have informed the linkages in *Orhot Hayyim/Kol Bo* that have been noted to this point.

The perception that R. Isaac of Corbeil was connected to the main branch of *Hasidei Ashkenaz* is reinforced by the composition of several late thirteenth- and early fourteenth-century manuscripts. These manuscripts juxtaposed *Semaq* and works of R. Yehudah *be-Hasid* and R. Eleazar of Worms. Bodl. 875, completed in 1299 as noted earlier, contains *Semaq* followed by *Sefer Hayyei Olam* and *Sefer Hasidut*, a version of *Sefer Hasidim* with French glosses.⁶⁵ Vatican Ebr. 247 (Ashkenaz, 1324) contains *Semaq*, followed by *Pirquei Avot* and R. Eleazar of Worm's *Moreh H'atta'im*.⁶⁶ Bodl. 873 (Ashkenaz, 1309) juxtaposed *Semaq* (followed by *Pisqei ha-Semaq*) and *Sefer Huqqei ha-Torah*. *Huqqei ha-Torah* was composed either by *Hasidei Ashkenaz* or in Provençal mystical circles.⁶⁷ Interestingly, three fourteenth-century Spanish manuscripts copied *Sbir ha-Yihud* (usually attributed to R. Yehudah

⁶⁴ See Israel Ta-Shema, "Hasidut Ashkenaz bi-Sefarad: Rabbenu Yonah Gerondi-ha-Ish u-Fo'alo," pp. 165–93, and my *Jewish Education and Society in the High Middle Ages*, pp. 74–78, 98–99.

⁶⁵ Bodl. 884 (Ashkenaz, 1383) contains *Semaq*, the testament (*gava'ab*) of R. Yehudah *be-Hasid*, a brief section of *tikkun sbeiarot*, followed by Rabbenu Yonah's *Sefer Hayyei Olam* and *Sod ba-Teshuvah*. (R. Yonah's name is not mentioned in the manuscript). On R. Yonah's authorship of (*Ye-*)*Sod ba-Teshuvah*, see Ta-Shema, "Hasidut Ashkenaz," p. 170, and Shrock, *Rabbi Jonah*, pp. 69–79.

⁶⁶ Cambridge Add. 2580 (1397) contains *Semaq*, *Sefer ha-Yir'ab* and *Moreh H'atta'im*. *Moreh H'atta'im* and portions of Eleazar's pietistic introduction to *Sefer Roqeah* (*Hilkhot Hasidut*) were copied in the margins of the *Semaq* text found in Bodl. 878 (dated 1430). The first section of Bodl. 2274 (1311–13) contains *Hayyei Olam*, *Hilkhot Teshuvah* from R. Eleazar of Worms' *Sefer Roqeah*, a gematria prayer-commentary attributed to Ramban, two short eschatological texts, *Teshuvot min ha-Shamayim* [attributed in this manuscript to Rabbenu Tam; cf. above, n. 21. On the attribution of a work of this title (or the extant work) to R. Eleazar of Worms, see J. Dan, "She'elot u-Teshuvot min ha-Shamayim le-R. Eleazar mi-Worms," *Sinai* 69 (1971): 195.], ordinances of Rabbenu Gershon and Rabbenu Tam, brief texts of kabbalistic *ta'amei ha-mizvot* and prayer commentaries, *Semaq*, and liturgical poems by R. Yizḥaq of Corbeil.

⁶⁷ See my *Jewish Education and Society in the High Middle Ages*, pp. 105–06. Ms. Paris 646 (fourteenth century) contains *Semaq*, followed by various *segulot*, and an *E-lohai Nezor* prayer attributed to R. Yehudah *be-Hasid*. [Cf. the "*tefillah u-tehinab le-R. Yehudah be-Hasid*" in ms. De Rossi 1138/2 (Parma 2430), fol. 139v; Yizḥaq Gilat, "Shetei Baqqashot le-R. Mosheh mi-Coucy," *Tarbiz* 28 (1969): 54–58; and below, n. 82.] A fifteenth-century Ashkenazic manuscript, Moscow/Guenzberg 366/5, contains a commentary on the thirteen Divine attributes by R. Yizḥaq of Corbeil that is found in *Sefer Orhot Hayyim* (see above, n. 57). The commentary appears between a treatise attributed to R. Eleazar of Worms, *Inyanei ha-Nefesh*, and R. Eleazar's *Hilkhot Teshuvah*. The manuscript is comprised entirely of R. Eleazar's works and thirteenth- and early fourteenth-century Geronese and Castilian kabbalistic treatises.

he-Hasid), followed by (R. Yonah's) *Hayyei Olam-Sefer ha-Yir'ab* and (*Ye-*)*Sod ha-Teshuvab*, and attributed all of these works to "R. Yizḥaq *Hasid*".⁶⁸

The linkages of R. Yizḥaq of Corbeil to R. Yehudah *he-Hasid* described thus far were perhaps themselves the result of weightier considerations. There are a number of significant affinities between the teachings and formulations of R. Yizḥaq and those of R. Yehudah. R. Yizḥaq is the only thirteenth-century northern French rabbinic scholar to list all four modes of penance that were the hallmarks of the penitential programs of both R. Yehudah *he-Hasid* and R. Eleazar of Worms.⁶⁹ *Sefer Mizvot Qatan* cites R. Yehudah *he-Hasid* once, prominently, regarding the extent, at least in theory, to which one must be prepared to die *'al qiddush ha-Shem*.⁷⁰ R. Yizḥaq's striking position on synagogue decorum and deportment, formulated with-

⁶⁸ Bodl. 2343, De Rossi 166 (Parma 3175), Bodl. 1114. On the attribution of *Shir ha-Yiḥud* to R. Yehudah *he-Hasid*, see *Shirei ha-Yiḥud*, ed. J. Dan (Jerusalem, 1981), editor's introduction, pp. 7–15. Note that the version of *Sod ha-Teshuvab* found in the margins of Cambridge Add. 377 (3/17), fols. 105b–107a, is attributed to R. Eliezer (sic) of Worms. See also the concluding ode to ms. Cambridge Add. 379–2/4 (fol. 81r), composed by a sixteenth-century scribe, describing how fortunate and joyful he felt at being able to copy and thereby bring together the works *Sefer Hasidim*, *Sefer ha-Yir'ab*, and *Sefer Mizvot Qatan*. For manuscripts that record R. Isaac of Corbeil's legal decisions as *Pisqei R. Isaac Hasid*, see below, n. 79.

⁶⁹ *Semaq* (Constantinople, 1510), sec. 53. On the four modes of penance in the writings of R. Yehudah *he-Hasid* and R. Eleazar *Roqeah*, see Yizhak Baer, "Ha-Megammah ha-Datit ha-Hevratit shel Sefer Hasidim," *Zion* 3 (1937): 18–20, and Ivan Marcus, *Piety and Society* (Leiden, 1981), pp. 39–52, 176, n. 31. On the appearance of these penances in rabbinic literature of the thirteenth through fifteenth centuries, see Marcus, pp. 126–29. Even one of R. Eleazar of Worm's closest students, R. Avraham b. Azriel, does not refer to *teshuvat ha-mishqal*. Urbach, *Arugat ha-Bosem*, v.4 (Jerusalem, 1939), p. 179 [and see also *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, v.1, pp. 469–70] maintains that R. Moses of Coucy did not do so either. (R. Moses was a confirmed follower of the German Pietists; see the references in my *Jewish Education and Society*, p. 179, n. 87). The other references in thirteenth-century rabbinic sources are either vague reflections of these modes or limited applications of them. Cf. Baer, *ibid.*, n. 38, and Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, p. 394, n. 38. To be sure, *Semaq* mentions them without any further guidance regarding their application. Note also that *teshuvat ha-ba'ab* is called *ḥaratab* in the *Semaq* passage. This is not, however, a significant discrepancy. The word *ḥaratab* appears as a defining term for *teshuvat ha-ba'ab* in *Sefer Hasidim* (Parma), sec. 37, and in R. Eleazar of Worms, *Sefer Roqeah*, *Hilkebot Teshuvab*, p. 26. Cf. Marcus, *Piety and Society*, p. 52, and Israel Al-Nakawa, *Menorat ha-Ma'or*, ed. H.G. Enelow, v. 3, pp. 114–15. Note also the gloss of R. Perez to *Semaq* sec. 175, where he maintains, in the name of Rabbenu Yonah, that extensive fasting and other means of self-affliction are appropriate actions for one who wishes to repent. On the references to Pietist penances in rabbinic literature of the fifteenth century, cf. Yedidyah Dinari, *Haḥbmei Ashkenaz be-Shilbei Yemei ha-Benayim* (Jerusalem, 1984), pp. 85–93, and see now Jacob Elbaum, *Teshuvat ha-Lev re-Kabbalat Yissurim* (Jerusalem, 1993).

⁷⁰ *Semaq*, sec. 3. [According to this passage, the students of R. Yehudah *he-Hasid* relied on uttering a Divine name to ward off harm, a use of this practice that R. Yehudah did not condone. Cf. *SHP* 1448–53; Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, p. 99, and below, n. 83.] Cf. *Orhot Hayyim*, pt. 2, sec. 4 (*Din Abavat ha-Shem ve-Yir'ato*), p. 26, and Haym Soloveitchik, "Religious Law and Change: The Medieval Ashkenazic example," *AJS Review* 13 (1987): 210, n. 8. On *qiddush ha-Shem* and *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, see Yizhak Baer, "Ha-Megammah he-Datit ha-Hevratit shel Sefer Hasidim," pp. 14–15; Dan, "Be'ayat Qiddush ha-Shem be-Toratah ha-Iyyunit shel Tenu'at Hasidut Ashkenaz," *Milhemet Qodesh u-Martyrologiyyah be-Toledot Yisrael uve-Toledot ha-Ammim* (Israel Historical Society, Jerusalem, 1968), pp. 121–29; Marcus, *Piety and Society*, pp. 150–51, n. 57; Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, pp. 387–88, 572; *idem.*, *Arugat ha-Bosem*, v. 4, p. 167.

out attribution, owes much to R. Yehudah *be-Hasid* and other members of *Hasidei Ashkenaz*.⁷¹ *Sefer Mizvot Qatan*, which does not mention many names outside of R. Isaac's teachers and major Tosafists such as Rabbenu Tam and Ri, cites R. Eleazar of Worms toward the beginning of the work, at the start of a lengthy segment on proper *kavvanah* in prayer.⁷² A description of the origin of the *Aleynu* prayer that was attributed to R. Yehudah *be-Hasid* and found initially in the works of German Pietists, and was preserved almost exclusively in Pietist sources or kabbalistic sources that had traceable access to the teachings of the Pietists,⁷³ is presented in *Sefer Orhot*

⁷¹ See *Semaq*, sec. 11 (end). Cf. *SHP* 1589; Moshe Hallamish, "Siḥat Ḥullin be-Veit ha-Kneset: Mezi'ut u-Ma'avaq," *Milet* 2 (1985): 226–27 (esp. n. 7), 243–44; Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, v.2, p. 572, n. 7; Moritz Güdemann, *Ha-Torah veba-Ḥayyim* (Warsaw, 1897), v.1, p. 69.

⁷² *Semaq*, sec. 11. Cf. below, n. 74. In his gloss to *Semaq*, ad loc., R. Perez b. Elijah of Corbeil cites a Pietist-like formulation of R. Moses of Evreux regarding *kavvanah* which includes the need to focus clearly on the Diety, to remove all extraneous thoughts, and to think about each word before pronouncing it. See my *Jewish Education and Society*, p. 76.

⁷³ See 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 located the tradition in question, that Joshua composed *Aleynu* upon entering the Land of Israel, in German Pietist texts such as *Siddur Hasidei Ashkenaz* (at one point in the name of R. Yehudah *be-Hasid*), and *Arugat ha-Bosem*; in two manuscripts that contain collections of Pietist material (Paris 1408 and JTS Mic. 2430); in the kabbalistic prayer commentary (*Or Zarua'*) of R. David b. Yehudah *be-Hasid*, who travelled to Germany and was familiar with German Pietistic material in particular (see the sources cited by Wolfson in n. 58; idem., "Circumcision and the Divine Name," pp. 110–111, n. 101; Elliot Ginsburg, *The Sabbath in the Classical Kabbalah* [Albany, 1989], p. 178, n. 244); and in Nathan b. Yehudah's *Sefer Maḥkim*.

R. Nathan studied with R. Yehiel of Paris, the father-in-law of R. Isaac of Corbeil, who was referred to as *hasid* (see below, n. 80). The liturgical customs in *Sefer ha-Maḥkim*, as in David *be-Hasid's Or Zarua'*, followed a Franco-German rite, rather than a Spanish one. R. Nathan's major teacher was R. Yizḥaq b. Todros, a kabbalist, who was also the teacher of R. Shem Tov Ibn Gaon, author of *Baddei ha-Aron*. Regarding these aspects of R. Nathan's training, see Jacob Freimann's introduction to his edition of *Sefer ha-Maḥkim* (Cracow, 1909), pp. 99–104, and Julius Wellestz' review in *REJ* 61 (1911), pp. 155–56. Moreover, R. Yizḥaq b. Todros studied with R. Yehudah b. Yaqar who recorded in his *siddur* the precise text of *Aleynu* that the German Pietists insisted upon in order to maintain the proper mystical hints and connotations of the prayer, including its origins with Joshua. See *Perush ha-Tefillot le-R. Yehudah b. Yaqar*, ed. S. Yerushalmi (Jerusalem, 1968), pp. 88–91 [= C.B. Chavel, *Ha-Darom* 26 (1968): 23–26]. Although R. Yehudah b. Yaqar does not mention the German Pietist's tradition concerning the origin of *Aleynu* explicitly, his preference for thier *nusah* is not surprising given the fact that he received other mystical teachings from them. See Elliot Wolfson, "Demut Ya'aqov Ḥa'aqov Ḥa'quqah be-Kisse ha-Kavod: Iyyun Nosaf be-Torat ha-Sod shel Hasidei Ashkenaz," *Sefer Zikkaron li-Prof. Ephraim Gottlieb*, nn. 118–20; Ginsburg, *The Sabbath in the Classical Kabbalah*, pp. 108–09, pp. 168–69, nn. 183, 189, pp. 175–76. n. 231. Cf. Solomon Schechter, "Notes on Hebrew MSS. in the University Library at Cambridge," *JQR* 4 (1892): 247–54.

[Schechter's claim, accepted by Scholem (*Origins*, p. 251, n. 106), that R. Yehudah b. Yaqar received kabbalistic material from the Tosafist Rizba, has not been proven sufficiently. R. Yehudah received Tosafist talmudic methodology as well as Ashkenazic halakhic materials and customs from Rizba, which he passed along to his student Ramban. 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. Yehudah b. Yaqar. See Israel Ta-Shema, "E-l Melekh Ne'eman-Gilgulo shel Minhag," *Tarbiz* 39 (1970): 288–89, esp. n. 7. Elliot Wolfson has observed that Ramban, who cites R. Yehudah in his talmudic commentaries, never actually mentions R. Yehudah in regard to any

Ḥayyim as the explanation of R. Yizḥaq of Corbeil.⁷⁴

kabbalistic doctrines. See Wolfson, “By Way of Truth: Aspects of Nahmanides’ Kabbalistic Hermeneutic,” *AJS Review* 14 (1989): 176–77. Nonetheless, as Wolfson notes, it is clear that Ramban was influenced by R. Yehudah in mystical matters and highly unlikely that Ramban did not learn mystical teachings from R. Yehudah directly. See also Ginsburg, pp. 21, 42, n. 20, 151–52, n. 88. R. Yehudah may have passed along esoteric material that he received from unidentified German Pietists. There is no firm basis, however, on which to suggest that Rizba was a source of mystical teachings for R. Yehudah b. Yaqar. The key passage that Schechter cites has R. Yehudah taking a talmudic interpretation of Rizba and embellishing it with a kabbalistic interpretation that he well may have learned elsewhere. Although Rizba studied with Ri, who had an interest in torat ha-sod (see above, n. 30), one must proceed cautiously in identifying the students of Ri who were involved in this aspect of his teachings. See below, n. 99. Scholem (*Tarbiz* 3 [1932]: 276–77), followed by Ta-Shema (*Encyclopedia Judaica* 10: 354) maintain that R. Yehudah studied kabbalah with R. Yizḥaq *Sagi Nabor*. This claim has been questioned, however, by Elliot Ginsburg (p. 147, n. 55), and others.]

The only rabbinic source identified by Wolfson which cited the German Pietists’ *Aleynu* tradition and did not otherwise appear to have an overt connection to the Pietists was *Orḥot Ḥayyim/Kol Bo*. The rabbinic figure to whom this passage should be attributed is R. Yizḥaq of Corbeil; see the next note. As the present study has hopefully demonstrated, he too did have a real or perceived connection to the German Pietists. On R. Yehudah *be-Hasid* and *Aleynu*, cf. Dan, “*Sifrut ba-Yihud shel Hasidei Ashkenaz*,” *Qiryat Sefer* 41 (1966), pp. 536, 540–41.

⁷⁴ *Orḥot Ḥayyim, Tehinah Aharei Shemoneh Esreh*, sec. 8, 21b; *Kol Bo*, chapter 16 (*Tefillah*), 9a. Wolfson’s suggestion (“Hai Gaon’s Letter,” at n. 59), that Ri Corbeil in this passage is the tosafist R. Yehudah of Corbeil, is highly unlikely. As we have noted, Ri Corbeil in *Orḥot Ḥayyim* invariably refers to R. Yizḥaq of Corbeil, even where the reference is not found in *Sefer Mizvot Qatan*. Moreover, the anonymous formulation in the *Kol Bo* also conforms to the pattern noted by *Beit Yosef* (above, n. 60), of citing R. Yizḥaq of Corbeil’s material anonymously. (As we have noted, *Sefer Orḥot Ḥayyim* often supplies the name). The paucity of material produced by or preserved from R. Yehudah of Corbeil (above, n. 43), and the fact that ר״י קורביל as the author of *Semaq* is commonplace in medieval rabbinic literature, further support the overwhelming likelihood that R. Yizḥaq of Corbeil was responsible for the *Orḥot Ḥayyim/Kol Bo* passage.

There are two other issues where suggestive affinities between R. Yehudah *be-Hasid*, *Semaq* and *Semaq* are evident. Regarding *neiḥush*, see *Semaq* sec. 136, *SHB* 58, *Semaq, lo ta’aseh* 53; *SHP* 14; and Dinari (above, n. 69), p. 157. See also G. Vajda, “Liqqumim mi-Sefer Musar Bilti Yadua’ le-Eḥad Rabbanei Zarefat,” *Sefer Hayyim Schirmann*, ed. Shraga Abramson and Aharon Mirsky (Jerusalem, 1970), pp. 103–06, and cf. Vajda, “Une Traite de Morale d’Origine Judeo-Francaise,” *REJ* 125 (1966): 267–85. Regarding admonition and rebuke (*tokbeḥah*), see *Semaq*, sec. 112, *SHP* 1338, 1972, and *Semaq, ’aseh* 11; and cf. Soloveitchik, “Three Themes in the *Sefer Ḥasidim*,” p. 336, n. 82, and Marcus, *Piety and Society*, pp. 87–88, and n. 4. Cf. below, n. 78.

Several other sections in *Orḥot Ḥayyim/Kol Bo* also serve to enhance the image of R. Yizḥaq of Corbeil as a pietist. *Orḥot Ḥayyim, Hilkhot Tefillah*, sec. 37 (16a) cites a series of views regarding proper *kavvanah* during *Shemoneh Esreh*. According to Rabbenu Yonah, one who has prayed without proper *kavvanah* should ideally pray again, although *kavvanah* during the *Avot* blessings is sufficient. Following an interpretation of Rabbenu Yonah’s position by Rashba, and a citation from *Sefer ha-Eshkol* that *kavvanah* is required throughout, Ri (=R. Yizḥaq) Corbeil is cited as holding that if it is impossible to have *kavvanah* throughout, one must at least maintain it in the opening *Avot* blessings. Following an opinion of R. Asher, that *kavvanah* is required during the core of each blessing, R. Eleazar of Worms is cited as recommending, similarly, that *kavvanah* must be achieved at least at the end of each blessing. The parallel passage in the *Kol Bo* [chap. 11 (*Tefillah*), 5a–b, that mentions R. Yizḥaq (of Corbeil), *Sefer ha-Eshkol*, R. Asher, and R. Eleazar of Worms by name, and refers to Rabbenu Yonah’s position anonymously], is followed immediately by the position attributed to R. Yizḥaq *Hasid* concerning not touching one’s body during prayer (see above, n. 59). Cf. also *Orḥot Ḥayyim, Hilkhot Tefillin*, sec. 26 (end), 9b/*Kol Bo Tefillin* 14b; *Orḥot Ḥayyim, Hilkhot Birkat ha-Mazon*, sec. 25, 22a, but note *Kol Bo*, fol. 22a.

Like Rabbenu Yonah, whose *Shā'arei Teshuvah* served as a significant model for the structure and approach of *Sefer Mizvot Qatan*,⁷⁵ R. Yizḥaq was a student at the academy of the brothers of Evreux.⁷⁶ The study hall at Evreux has been noted for its strong affinities to the *Ḥasidei Ashkenaz*, especially in their approaches to talmudic studies, *kavvanah* in prayer, and repentance.⁷⁷ These affinities would account for the unswerving dedication of *Sefer Mizvot Qatan* to the formulation of practical *halakhah* that could be studied by the masses,⁷⁸ as well as the similarities between R. Yizḥaq of Corbeil and the German Pietists that have been noted in regard to prayer and penance. In addition, R. Isaac was given to deep personal piety. Contemporaries and students referred to him as **חסיד**.⁷⁹ One of R. Isaac's teachers at Evreux, as well as his other major teacher, R. Yeḥiel of Paris, were also referred to by the title **חסיד**.⁸⁰

⁷⁵ Ta-Shema, "Ḥasidut Ashkenaz bi-Sefarad, p. 168, n. 8. *Semaq* was also influenced by R. Eliezer of Metz' *Sefer Yere'im*. R. Eliezer was a teacher of R. Eleazar *Rogeeb*, and *Sefer Yere'im* exhibits some proto-pietistic features. See Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, pp. 161, 572. Cf. Haym Soloveitchik, *Halakhah, Kalkalah ve-Dimmui Azmi* (Jerusalem, 1985), pp. 93–95.

⁷⁶ See Urbach, p. 571. See also *Mordekhai Pesahim*, sec. 588, and Ta-Shema, *Minbag Ashkenaz Qadmon*, p. 272, n. 3. The brothers of Evreux are also among the relatively few names mentioned by R. Yizḥaq in *Semaq*. Note also the references to his teachers at Evreux in his *pesaqim*. See Moshe Hershter, "Pisqei Rabbenu Yizḥaq mi-Corbeil Ba'al ha-Semaq mi-tokh Ketav Yad," *Sinai* 67 (1970): 244–49, and I.S. Lange, "Pisqei R. Yizḥaq mi-Corbeil," *Ha-Ma'ayan* 16:4 (1976): 95–104. Cf. Lange, "I.e-Inyan ha-Semaq mi-Zurich," *Alei Sefer* 4 (1977): 178–79.

⁷⁷ On the connections between the study hall at Evreux and *Ḥasidei Ashkenaz*, see Israel Ta-Shema, "Ḥasidut Ashkenaz bi-Sefarad," pp. 165–73, and my *Jewish Education and Society in the High Middle Ages*, pp. 74–78. Note that R. Samuel of Evreux also made a major statement concerning *kavvanah* in prayer (*Haggagot R. Perez*, sec. 96, and see above, n. 72). Regarding the practical handbooks on prayer and the *siddurim* composed under the auspices of Evreux, see also J.N. Epstein, "Al ha-Koi," in his *Mehqarim be-Sifrut ha-Talmud*, v. 2, ed. E.Z. Melammed (Jerusalem, 1988), pp. 776–89.

⁷⁸ See Israel Ta-Shema, "Mizvat Talmud Torah ki-Ve'ayah Hevratit/Datit be-Sefer Ḥasidim," *Bar Ilan* 14–15 (1977): 103–06, and idem., "Qavvim le-Ofiyah shel Sifrut ha-Halakhah be-Ashkenaz ba-Me'ot ha-Yod Gimmel/Yod Daled," *Alei Sefer* 4 (1977): 31–34. Virtually all of the Tosafists who composed *sifrei halakhah* in the mid-thirteenth century, including now R. Isaac of Corbeil, had a palpable connection with the German Pietists. While many of their works, including *Semaq*, represented the fruits of Tosafist dialectic (see Haym Soloveitchik, "Three Themes in the *Sefer Ḥasidim*," *AJS Review* 1 [1976]: 345–50), the simplicity and accessibility of *Semaq* conform to the specifications of the German Pietists. See Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, pp. 571–72; Gudemann, *Ha-Torah ve-ha-Ḥayyim*, pp. 65–66; and my "The Right of a Student to Open an Academy in Medieval Ashkenaz," *Michael* 12 (1991): 238, n. 45. Cf. *SHP* 835 and the introduction to *Sefer Mizvot Qatan* on the obligation to teach women the commandments for which they are responsible and the obligation upon women to study that material. Cf. *Sefer ha-Agur*, sec. 2; *Beit Yosef, Orah Ḥayyim*, sec. 47 (end); and *Hida, Yosef Omer*, sec. 67. See also my *Jewish Education and Society*, pp. 43–46, 91–97.

⁷⁹ See the introduction to *Semaq*, and Urbach, v.2, pp. 572–73, 575. See also the next note.

⁸⁰ R. Samuel of Evreux was called *hasid* by his student R. Yediyah, who apparently taught the son of R. Yehudah *be-Hasid*. R. Samuel also found a passage written in the hand of R. Yehudah *be-Hasid*. See my *Jewish Education and Society*, p. 175, nn. 72–73, and Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, p. 569. R. Yeḥiel is referred to as *hasid* in *Orhot Ḥayyim*, pt. 2, *Issurei Ma'akhalot*, sec. 12, p. 286. In *Hilkhot Zizit*, sec. 15 (3b), he is called *ha-Qadosh R. Yeḥiel*. R. Yeḥiel's *pesaqim* are called

III

The connection between R. Yehudah *be-Hasid* and R. Yizhaq of Corbeil that may have been exploited by Castilian kabbalists in their reconstruction of earlier esoteric traditions, was not the only instance in which a thirteenth-century Tosafist was perceived by contemporary kabbalists to be an active figure within the circle of *Hasidei Ashkenaz*. M. Verman discovered two (Castilian) *Iyyun* texts in which R. Meir of Germany [*me-Allemagne*] and R. Perez of France [*mi-Zarefat*] offered definitions and explanations of an unusual celestial figure. Verman cited these texts as proof for 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 wrote “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.”⁸¹ At the same time, he noted two mystical techniques attributed to “an unidentified” R. Meir, one in ms. Vatican 243 and the other in ms. Paris 776, in close proximity to a prophylactic technique attributed to R. Yehudah *be-Hasid*.⁸²

The R. Meir in the latter two passages is undoubtedly Maharam mi-Rothenburg (c. 1220–1293). Maharam displayed other affinities and connections to *Hasidei Ashkenaz* in regard to both ethical and esoteric teachings and practices.⁸³ Given his background, he is, in all likelihood, the R.

מסקי הוראות מהחסידי רי יחיאל/פסקי החסידי רי יחיאל in Bodl. 2343/2 and De Rossi 166 (Parma 3175). Cf. above, n. 68, and I. Ta-Shema, “Li-Meqorotav ha-Sifrutiyim shel ha-Zohar,” *Tarbiz* 60 (1991): 663–65. R. Yizhaq of Corbeil is also described as *hasid* in the heading of two versions of his *pesaqim*. Bodl. 781, fol. 68v, and Paris 390 [correct Urbach, p. 575, n. 21], 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, these manuscripts, depending upon their dating and origins, may have further contributed to the impression that certain figures had affinities to the German Pietists and their students. Note, e.g., that R. Yizhaq was called *be-Hasid* in the colophon to the version of *Semaq* preserved in Bodl. 875, which was an Ashkenazic manuscript copied in 1299. See above at n. 54.

There is a reference to a R. Yizhaq *Hasid* in *SHP* 1356=*SFB* 432. A R. Yizhaq *Hasid Zarefati* is found together with R. Yehudah *be-Hasid* in a manuscript that contains practical kabbalistic techniques; see below, n. 83. R. Yizhaq *Zarefati*/R. Yizhaq *Navi* is referred to in another manuscript that emanated from *Hasidei Ashkenaz*. See Dan, “The Ashkenazi Hasidic Gates of Wisdom,” *Hommage à Georges Vajda* (above, n. 28), p. 187. While it is impossible in some cases and highly unlikely in others that the R. Yizhaq referred to was R. Yizhaq of Corbeil, these sources also foster the impression that there was a R. Yizhaq from northern France associated with the German Pietists.

⁸¹ Verman, *The Books of Contemplation*, pp. 101, n. 201, and pp. 200–01.

⁸² Verman, p. 201, n. 32. On prophylactic techniques and *segulot* attributed to R. Yehudah *be-Hasid*, see, e.g., ms. British Museum Or. 10233/4, fol. 112r; ms. Bologna (University) 3574h/2, fol. 116v; and cf. Dan, *Torat ha-Sod shel Hasidut Ashkenaz*, p. 41; above, n. 70; and the next note.

⁸³ Israel Ta-Shema, “Rabbenu Dan be-Ashkenaz uvi-Sefarad,” *Studies . . . Presented to Isaiah Tishby* (above, n. 3), pp. 390–91, identified R. Meir in this manuscript as Maharam mi-Rothenburg and also noted other thirteenth-century figures, including R. Yehudah *be-Hasid*, R. Eleazar of Worms and R. Meir’s student, R. Dan, who are mentioned in this collection of Ashkenazic magical techniques. [For techniques associated with R. Eleazar of Worms, see, e.g., ms. Brit. Museum 737 (Add. 27199), fols.

Meir in the text discovered by Verman as well.⁸⁴ While we cannot be absolutely sure that R. Meir expressed the explanation attributed to him by the *Hug ha-Iyyun*, the attribution itself certainly makes sense.

For similar reasons, R. Perez of France in the *Iyyun* texts is probably the Tosafist R. Perez b. Elijah of Corbeil. R. Perez studied with R. Samuel of Evreux, R. Isaac of Corbeil, and R. Meir of Rothenburg. He is best-known

470v-471v, and ms. Munich 81, fols. 301-02. Among the goals of these *segulot* are *petiḥat ba-lev*, *le-happil' emah 'al benei 'adam*, *le-qiyum banim*, and overall personal security ('*eino niṣṣaq le-'olam*). See also below, at n. 104.] See also Gershom Scholem, *Kitvei Yad ba-Kabbalah* (Jerusalem, 1930), pp. 10-11, who similarly identified the R. Meir who prepared an amulet for *petiḥat ba-lev* as R. Meir of Rothenburg. In this manuscript, which is primarily of Ashkenazic origin but also contains practical kabbalah techniques from Spanish kabbalists such as Nahmanides, R. Yehudah *be-Hasid* once again appears in close proximity to Maharam mi-Rothenburg. [For another example of the appearance of R. Yehudah *be-Hasid* and R. Meir of Rothenburg in a manuscript containing practical kabbalah techniques, see *Obel Hayim*, A Catalogue of the Manuscripts of the Manfred and Anne Lehmann, ed. Moshe Hallamish and Elazar Hurvitz, v.1 [Kabbalistic Manuscripts] (New York, 1988), pp. 193-94. Beginning on fol. 21 is a "qabbalah" from R. Yehudah *be-Hasid* on what to do if one saw an "'*adam ra*" and was afraid of him. In this passage, *be-Hakham vebe-Hasid R. Yizḥaq Zarefati* is linked to the mentioning of a Divine name by an unnamed Jew, which caused an attacker carrying a sword to fall. Cf. above, n. 70. Fol. 43 of that manuscript records a kabbalistic lottery (*goral*) of Maharam. See also ms. Moscow/Guenzberg 734/5, fols. 92r (*mequbbal mi-R. Yehudah be-Hasid*) and 94r (*goral Maharam*).] For a Sabbath practice that Maharam mi-Rothenburg endorsed as a means of achieving *petiḥat ba-lev*, see the passage in ms. Montifeore 130 (fol. 55a) cited by Ta-Shema, "Be'erah shel Miryam," *Mehqerei Yerushalayim be-Mahshevet Yisrael* 4 (1985): 263. In a note, Ta-Shema refers to another of his studies, "Sefer ha-Maskil-Hibbur Yehudi-Zarefati Bilti Yadu'a mi-Sof ha-Me'ah ha-Yod Gimmel," *Mehqerei Yerushalayim* 2 (1983): 416-38, in which he describes the phenomenon of *petiḥat ba-lev* as it appears in a little-known work of the late thirteenth century, *Sefer ha-Maskil*. The author of *Sefer ha-Maskil*, R. Solomon Simḥah b. Eliezer, hailed from northern France (Troyes) and was a student of Maharam and Rabbenu Perez. He too was quite familiar with esoteric teachings of the German Pietists. In one passage (Ta-Shema, p. 432), he mentions that he learned about the powers of the Divine name and related issues by studying the teachings of various scholars. Greatest among them were "*ba-me'orat ha-gedolim*, Rabbenu Yehudah *be-Hasid ve-Rabbenu Meir ha-Gadol*." I hope to discuss the authenticity of the attribution of magical techniques to R. Meir of Rothenburg (referred to in this note and in the next note) in a separate study on *torat ba-sod* in the realm of the Tosafists.

⁸⁴ For additional linkages between Maharam mi-Rothenburg and *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, see E.E. Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, v.2, pp. 522, 547, 564; I.S. Lange, *Ta'amei Massoret le-R. Yehudah be-Hasid* (Jerusalem, 1981), p. 11; idem., "Perush Ba'alei ha-Tosafot 'al ha-Torah-Ms. Paris 48," *Alei Sefer* 5 (1978): 73; I.Z. Kahana, *Teshuvot u-Pesaqim le-R. Meir mi-Rothenburg*, v.1 (Jerusalem, 1957), pp. 14-15; my "The 'Aliyah of 'Three Hundred Rabbis' in 1211: Tosafist Attitudes Toward Settling in the Land of Israel," *JQR* 76 (1986): 191-215; Israel Ta-Shema, "Al Odot Yaḥasam shel Qadmonei Ashkenaz le-Erekh ha-Aliyah le-Erez Yisrael," *Shalem* 6 (1992): 315-18; Avraham Grossman (above, n. 22), pp. 91-92 [R. Meir is connected in this instance as well with R. Perez, regarding *ta'amei massorah*]; and idem., "Yaḥasam shel Hakhmei Ashkenaz Bimei ha-Benayim le-Hakka' at Nashim," *Proceedings of the Tenth World Congress of Jewish Studies*, Division B, v.1 (Jerusalem, 1990), pp. 122-24. Maharam studied with R. Shmu'el of Evreux. See Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, v.2, p. 528. Cf. Naftali Wieder, "Barukh Hu (u-)Varukh Shemo-Meqoro, Zemanno, ve-Nosaho," *Iyyunim be-Sifrut Haṣal, ba-Migra, uve-Toledot Am Yisrael [Muqdash likhvod Prof. E.Z. Melammed]*, ed. Y.D. Gilat et al. (Ramat Gan, 1982), pp. 277-80; Wolfson, "Circumcision and the Divine Name," *JQR* 78 (1987): 96, n. 55; Dan, *Torat ha-Sod shel Hasidut Ashkenaz*, pp. 77-78; and Ta-Shema in *Sinai* 64 (1969): 254-57, and S.E. Stern in *Zefunot* 14 (1992): 7, regarding R. Meir *Hasid*.

for his editing of *Tosafot* texts and for his glosses on R. Isaac's *Semaq* and on *Sefer Tasbbez*, a compilation of customs and practices of R. Meir.⁸⁵ Although there is less evidence, as compared to Maharam mi-Rothenburg, that connects R. Perez directly with the German Pietists, his teachers and training, and perhaps even his place of residence, make him a good choice for the role that he plays in the *Iyyun* texts.⁸⁶

IV

Thus far, I have argued that the details and description of the rabbinic scholars portrayed in EW, including the placement of R. Yehudah *be-Ḥasid* in Corbeil, were quite believable. There is a fair degree of accuracy, or even historicity, in the portion of the text that describes the rabbinic scholars of western Europe. One remaining facet of the text must now be evaluated. Was the kabbalistic content of EW that was attributed specifically to R. Yehudah *be-Ḥasid*, R. Eleazar *Roqeah*, and R. Elhanan essentially pseudepigraphic, or does it reflect actual teachings of these figures?

Scholem has noted that the *ketarim* (*sefirot*) and their descriptions that were attributed to R. Yehudah *be-Ḥasid* and R. Eleazar of Worms in EW, correspond much more closely to formulations of the *Ḥug ha-Iyyun* (and subsequent Provencal/Spanish kabbalah) than they do to formulations of the German Pietists. R. Eleazar of Worms discussed the nature and func-

For further evidence of Maharam mi-Rothenburg as a practitioner of practical kabbalah, see the description by Scholem in *Qiryat Sefer* 4: 317 of ms. Cambr. Add. 664, fol. 72a ("when the king wished to detain R. Meir in prison, R. Meir uttered a verse and was willingly released.") Scholem writes that R. Meir is mentioned as a "*ba'al Shem* and *ba'al nissim* in numerous old manuscripts of practical kabbalah." Cf. David Berger, *The Jewish-Christian Debate in the High Middle Ages* (Philadelphia, 1979), p. 253. See also Scholem in *Qiryat Sefer* 7: 162, regarding a text in which R. Meir is described as undertaking a *she'elat halom* regarding the end of days, and see *Tosafot ha-Shalem*, ed. Y. Gellis, v.3 (Jerusalem, 1983), p. 227. Cf. above, n.41. Regarding Maharam and *qiddush ha-Shem*, see Haym Soloveitchik (above, n. 70), p. 209, and my "Preservation, Creativity and Courage: the Life and Works of R. Meir of Rothenburg," *Jewish Book Annual* 50 (1992-93): 258-59.

⁸⁵ Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, v.2, pp. 575-81. On R. Perez and R. Isaac of Corbeil, see also Getzel Ellinson, "Le-Heqer Qavvei ha-Pesiqah shel ha-Rosh," *Sinai* 93 (1983): 236.

⁸⁶ R. Perez cited two of his teachers at Evreux regarding *kavanah* in prayer (above, nn. 72, 76). These passages express clear affinities to *Ḥasidei Ashkenaz*, for whom this was a central issue as well. In addition, R. Perez recognized the appropriateness of physical affliction during the repentance process. See above, n. 69. The 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. See above, n. 24. On the mistaken attribution of *Sefer Ma'arekhet ha-Eloket* to R. Perez, see E. Gottlieb in *Encyclopedia Judaica* 11:637.

[Coincidentally, R. Perez, *rosh yeshivah shehu me-erez Ashkenaz*, and R. Yehudah of Corbeil (*Sefaradi*), two figures who functioned in sixteenth-century Turkey, are juxtaposed in Y. Ben Zvi ed., *Massa'ot Erez Yisrael le-R. Moshe Bassula* (Jerusalem, 1938), pp. 62-63. Cf. A. David, "Aliyatam shel Megurashei Sefarad le-Erez Yisrael ve-Hashpa'atam 'al ha-Yishuv," *Moresheet Sefarad*, ed. Hayyim Beinart (Jerusalem, 1992), p. 441.]

tion of *keter^celyon*, a term found in EW, but had no concept of the emanated, dynamic *ketarim* of the kind described in EW.⁸⁷ To be sure, Scholem himself had noted similarities of function between the German Pietists' *havvayot* and the *sefirot* in the teachings of R. Yizḥaq Sagi Nabor,⁸⁸ and a possible connection between the *sefirot* in *Sefer ha-Bahir* as a focus of meditation in prayer, and certain allusions and intentions during prayer that were expressed by *Ḥasidei Ashkenaz*.⁸⁹ Nonetheless, the particular formulations in EW do not reflect the esoteric teachings of the German Pietists in a meaningful way.

On the other hand, the identification of R. Elḥanan of Corbeil in EW as R. Elḥanan b. Yaḡar points to some parallels in terminology and doctrine that have not been considered. EW never uses the term *sefirot*, preferring instead the term *ketarim*. The process by which the *ketarim* emanated was referred to as *'azilut*. Although the verb forms *'azal* or *ne'eḡal* appear in the writings of the main branch of *Ḥasidei Ashkenaz*, only R. Elḥanan b. Yaḡar actually uses the term *'azilut*. In his writings, *azilut* connotes a dynamic type of emanation that corresponds to the process described in EW.⁹⁰ In addition, the connotations of both *keter^celyon* and *'avir* (ether) in EW are

⁸⁷ Scholem, *Origins*, pp. 356–57. Scholem notes that the order of the *sefirot* in EW corresponds to the *Bahir* configuration rather than to that of Spanish kabbalah.

⁸⁸ *Origins*, pp. 182–87. See also Idel, “Ha-Sefirot she-Me’al ha-Sefirot,” *Tarbiz* 52 (1988): 243, 262, 268, 278–80.

⁸⁹ *Origins*, pp. 194–96. See also Dan, *Torat ha-Sod shel Ḥasidut Ashkenaz*, pp. 116–29; idem., “The Emergence of Mystical Prayer,” *Studies in Jewish Mysticism*, ed. Joseph Dan and Frank Talmage (Cambridge, Mass., 1982), pp. 113–15; Idel, *Kabbalah: New Perspectives*, pp. 191–97; “Ha-Kavvanah ba-Tefillah be-Reshit ha-Qabbalah: Bein Ashkenaz u-Provence,” *Porat Yosef* [Studies Presented to Rabbi Dr Joseph Safran], ed. Bezalel and Eliyahu Safran (Hoboken, 1992), 5–11. Scholem, despite his conviction that the *Sefer ha-Bahir* passed through Germany (*Origins*, chapter three; cf. Idel, “Ha-Kavvanah ba-Tefillah,” p. 14, n. 53), does not take a consistently clear stand on the issue of influence. Dan concludes that the Pietist and kabbalistic terminologies developed separately. Cf. *Torat ha-Sod*, pp. 94–97, 118, 128–29. Idel, on the other hand is strongly inclined to the view that certain kabbalistic teachings did follow or result from those of the Pietists. Cf. Idel, *Kabbalah*, pp. 15, 133, 144–46; idem., “Al Kavvanat Shemoneh Esreh Ezel R. Yizḥaq Sagi Nahor,” *Sefer Zikkaron li-Prof. Ephraim Gottlieb* (forthcoming); and “Be-Or ha-Ḥayyim: Iyyun be-Eskatologiyah ha-Qabbalit,” *Qedusbat ha-Ḥayyim ve-Ḥeruf ha-Ḥayyim*, ed. Y. Gafni and A. Ravitsky (Jerusalem, 1993), pp. 191–210. See also the studies of Elliot Wolfson cited in nn. 13, 108, and his “Images of God’s Feet: Some Observations on the Divine Body in Judaism,” *People of the Body*, ed. Howard Eilberg-Shwartz (Albany, 1990), pp. 155–62. In terms of *kavvanah bi-tefillah*, the differing views are also tied, in part, to the question of whether R. Eleazar of Worms composed certain crucial passages that appear as part of his *Sefer ha-Ḥokhmab*. Cf. below, n. 108.

⁹⁰ See Dan, *Torat ha-Sod*, pp. 86–87, 157, 163–64, 168; idem., *Ḥungei ba-Mequbbalim ha-Rishonim*, pp. 99–106, 122–28; “The Emergence of Mystical Prayer,” pp. 93–102. It should be noted that the verbs *'azal/ ne'eḡal* appear in the sources of *Ḥasidei Ashkenaz* in the context of creation rather than emanation. Scholem published a text of R. Moses of Burgos [*Tarbiz* 4: 224] in which “ha-Gaon ha-Qadosh R. Elḥanan,” as cited by Ramban, described *sefirot* in terms that were fully compatible with Provençal or Spanish kabbalah. It cannot be proven conclusively, however, that this reference is to R. Elḥanan b. Yaḡar. See above, n. 30.

consonant with R. Elhanan's use of these terms.⁹¹

Moreover, there is a significant series of structures described in EW which the *Hug ha-Iyyun* might actually have learned about from R. Elhanan. EW refers to various *'olamot* and records a discussion on this topic involving several of the rabbinic figures. The most complete conclusion is expressed by R. Elhanan. As Scholem has noted, terminology of the type found in EW reflects the influence of the Neoplatonic system of the five worlds.⁹² Scholem has shown that several works composed by German Pietists and members of the related *Hug ha-Keruv ha-Meyuhad* formulated a series of Hebrew terms for this system based on the writings of R. Avraham bar Hiyya.⁹³ In EW, the worlds are described as: *E-lohut (mitbod-ed)*, *madda (sekhel)*, *nefesh (tenu'ah)* and *gufot (oti'ot)*. The closest parallel in the material collected by Scholem is: *Modi/Trani ravrevanut, madda (yezirah), nefesh*. The order of the worlds in the commentary of R. Elhanan to *Sefer Yezirah* (one version of which notes explicitly that R. Elhanan's source for this system was Abraham Bar Hiyya) has a sequence that is virtually identical to the sequence in EW: *Norani/Trani (hu'eḥad qadosh), ravrevanut (kisse, ḥayyot, keruvim, 'ofanim, galgalim, malakhim), madda (ruah ha-qodesh ha-shoreh); nefesh; yezirah (teva)*.⁹⁴

Both Mark Verman and Yosef Dan have noted other instances in which R. Elhanan b. Yaqar exerted significant influence on the *Hug ha-Iyyun* in regard to key terms and concepts.⁹⁵ Through the studies of Verman and Dan, we are also aware of the influence that *Hasidei Ashkenaz* had on the *Hug* and on R. Isaac ha-Kohen as well.⁹⁶ Thus, the figures selected by the

⁹¹ See Verman, *The Books of Contemplation*, pp. 153–54, and esp. n. 160 [on R. Meshullam the Zadokite and his relationship to *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, see below, n. 104]; Dan, *Hugei ha-Mequbbalim ha-Rishonim*, pp. 159–61; and cf. Scholem, *Origins*, pp. 358–59.

⁹² See Scholem, "Reste neuplatonsicher Spekulation in der Mystik der deutschen Chassidim und ihre Vermittlung durch Abraham bar Chija," *MGWJ* 75 (1931): 172–91, and cf. Idel, "Jewish Kabbalah and Platonism in the Middle Ages and Renaissance," *Neoplatonism and Jewish Thought*, ed. L.E. Goodman (Albany, 1992), pp. 319–21.

⁹³ The representative text of the *Hug ha-Keruv ha-Meyuhad* is the Pseudo-Sa'adyah commentary to *Sefer Yezirah*. On the provenance of this text, see below at n. 99.

⁹⁴ See Vajda, "Perush Sefer Yezirah le-R. Elhanan b. Yaqar," (above, n. 28), pp. 164–65, 192–93, and Dan, *Hugei ha-Mequbbalim ha-Rishonim*, pp. 118–21. On the less sophisticated approach to *torat ha-'olamot* and the smaller impact that this concept had within the main branch of *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, see Dan, *Torat ha-Sod shel Hasidut Ashkenaz*, pp. 157, 203–05, and idem., "Hug ha-Keruv ha-Meyuhad bi-Tenu'at Hasidei Ashkenaz," (above, n.27), p. 371.

⁹⁵ Verman, *The Books of Contemplation*, pp. 41, n.47, 47, 82, n.146, 84, n.156, 102–103; Dan, *Hugei ha-Mequbbalim ha-Rishonim*, pp. 43, 72–73, 133. Cf. above, nn. 91, 92.

⁹⁶ See Verman, pp. 38, n.9, 40, n.15, 41, n.18, 46, 82, n. 143, 104–05, 109, n.249, 112, n.264, 199–200. As Verman notes, even R. Eleazar of Worms who, in Verman's view, was the only contemporary historical figure referred to in the *Hug's* pseudepigraphic treatises, had a book attributed to him by the *Hug* that he did not compose. See Scholem in *Qiryat Sefer* 6 (1929): 275; idem., *Kitvei Yad ba-Kabbalah*, pp. 14–15; *Origins*, pp. 323–24; and cf. below, n.103. On R. Isaac ha-Kohen and *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, see above, nn. 25–26.

author(s) of EW to transmit the kabbalistic descriptions of the *ketarim* were scholars who had actually been a source for other material that the *Hug* and R. Isaac ha-Kohen received. This suggests the possibility that much of the material in EW, and not only the description of the *'olamot*, was actually transmitted to Provencal or Spanish kabbalists from R. Yehudah *be-Hasid*, R. Eleazar of Worms, and R. Elhanan b. Yaqar. It is also possible that certain core teachings were received which were then embellished upon or put into different language by the *Hug* or R. Isaac.

But even if the sefirotic material was synthesized by the author(s) of EW and put into the mouths of others, the figures who were chosen would have appeared fully credible since they transmitted other material to the author(s). Indeed, a further explanation for the placement of R. Yehudah and R. Elhanan in Corbeil by EW can now be suggested. By implying that there was intellectual comradery and even actual contact between R. Yehudah and R. Elhanan, EW was bringing together two groups of *Hasidei Ashkenaz* which were geographically and doctrinally distinct.⁹⁷ The joining of these groups by EW can, however, be readily understood. The commentaries of R. Elhanan b. Yaqar to *Sefer Yeẓirah* display numerous similarities to the writings of *Hasidei Ashkenaz*.⁹⁸ Techniques for the development of the *golem* were taught by R. Yehudah *be-Hasid* to R. Eleazar of Worms. They were also discussed in the Pseudo-Sa'adyah commentary to *Sefer Yeẓirah*, a mid-thirteenth century text of the *Hug ha-Keruv ha-Meyuhad*, as well as in texts of the *Hug ha-Iyyun*.⁹⁹ Moreover, recent research by Elliot Wolfson has demonstrated that the main group of German Pietists also espoused the notion of a *keruv*, a Divine power which was revealed to prophets, and which corresponded to the *kavod* that sat upon the throne. The *kavod ha-Elyon*, which was never revealed to man, sat upon the *keruv*. Although the term *keruv ha-meyuhad* was never used by the German Pietists, and the Pietists and the *Hug ha-Keruv ha-Meyuhad* devel-

⁹⁷ See above, nn. 27,29.

⁹⁸ See Vajda's notes to R. Elhanan's *Sefer Yeẓirah* commentary (above, n.28), *passim*.

⁹⁹ See Idel, *Golem, Jewish Magical and Mystical Traditions on the Artificial Anthropoid* (Albany, 1990), pp. 55–73, 81–91. According to the Pseudo-Sa'adyah text, an event transpired involving a ר. י. ב. א. and his students, in which these techniques were actually employed. Idel (pp. 91–92, n.4), has suggested that ר. י. ב. א. is Rizba, the Tosafist R. Isaac b. Abraham of Dampierre. Rizba was a student of Ri, who was apparently involved in the study of mystical texts. There are other sources which link Rizba to mystical traditions.

It is difficult, however, to verify that Rizba himself studied or taught kabbalah. He was indeed, the teacher of the talmudist/kabbalist R. Yehudah ben Yaqar, but it appears that R. Yehudah embellished Rizba's rabbinic teachings with kabbalistic interpretations; see above, n.73. References to the kabbalist R. Isaac the Frenchman (*Zarefat*) could refer just as easily to Ri, for whom the evidence is stronger, than to Rizba; see above, n. 30. On the other hand, Idel noted that the two thirteenth-century authors who had the most detailed discussions about making a *golem* were R. Eleazar of Worms and R. Avraham Abulafia. R. Avraham knew R. Eleazar's commentary on *Sefer Yeẓirah*, in addition to other material from R. Eleazar, and was even familiar with R. Yehudah *be-Hasid*'s writ-

oped separately from both historical and literary standpoints, the role of the *keruv* was remarkably similar in both groups.¹⁰⁰

This approach of EW accords with other developments in the history of kabbalah as well. Ashkenazic kabbalists of the late thirteenth century, including R. Yehudah *be-Hasid's* descendant R. Mosheh b. Eliezer (or in some manuscripts, Eleazar) *ba-Darshan*, considered the *Hug ha-Keruv ha-Meyubad* and the main Pietist group, led by R. Yehudah and R. Eleazar of Worms, to be closely related. These kabbalists integrated the teachings of the two groups.¹⁰¹ Perhaps they were of the view, held also by their Castilian counterparts, that the two schools, which never communicated openly but which had much in common, interacted or at least developed together.

The relatively careful manner in which EW accounted for the receipt of esoteric teachings from the German Pietists and the *Hug ha-Keruv ha-Meyubad*, (if not the origins of those teachings), suggests that the affinity which Castilian kabbalists such as R. Isaac ha-Kohen expressed toward *Hasidei Ashkenaz* was not merely a tactical maneuver, undertaken to anchor their own esoteric teachings on those of the venerable German Pietists. Even in unlikely situations, it is possible to uncover sources for material from or about *Hasidei Ashkenaz* that the Castilian kabbalists considered reliable. R. Isaac recounts a hagiographic story about R. Eleazar of Worms riding (and falling off) clouds through his use of the Divine name.¹⁰² It has been shown that R. Meshullam the Zadokite told an identical story. R. Isaac presumably learned about it from him.¹⁰³

ings on *Sefer Yezirah* which were most crucial. In his *Perush le-Sefer Yezirah*, R. Eleazar describes the technique for making a *golem* as a received tradition. Idel interprets this phrase to mean that he received the tradition concerning the *golem* from R. Yehudah *be-Hasid*.

In light of the text of EW itself, and the connection between *Hasidei Ashkenaz* and the *Hug ha-Keruv ha-Meyubad* that we have described, perhaps ריבא (=R. Yehudah b. Aḥa) refers to R. Yehudah *be-Hasid*. Given R. Yehudah's active involvement in the *golem* tradition, his participation in the incident is quite possible. How the story reached the Pseudo-Sa'adyah text and how R. Yehudah became ריבא is not known. But if this is in fact what occurred, the name R. Yehuda b. Aḥa in EW was based on an initial (or name) for R. Yehudah's father that existed in an esoteric circle related to *Hasidei Ashkenaz* with which the authors of EW were very familiar. See above, n.36.

¹⁰⁰ See Elliot Wolfson, "Demut Ya'aqov Haquqah be-Kisse ha-Kavod: Iyyun Nosaf be-Torat ha-Sod shel Hasidut Ashkenaz," *Sefer Zikkaron li-Prof. Ephraim Gottlieb* (forthcoming). Cf. Idel, *Kabbalah*, pp. 128–33; 160–62; 191–97; and Scholem, *Origins*, pp. 182–84.

¹⁰¹ See Dan, "Goralah ha-Histori shel Torat ha-Sod shel Hasidei Ashkenaz," *Mehqarim be-Qabbalah uve-Toledot ha-Datot Muggashim le-Gershom Scholem* (Jerusalem, 1968): 87–99; *Torat ha-Sod shel Hasidut Ashkenaz*, pp. 255–58. Cf. Scholem, *Reshit ha-Qabbalah*, p. 78, n.1.

¹⁰² See Scholem, "Qabbalat R. Ya'aqov ve-R. Yizḥaq," *Madda'ei ha-Yahadut* 2 (1927): 254.

¹⁰³ Verman, *The Books of Contemplation*, p. 178, conjectured that R. Meshullam was the source of R. Isaac's pietistic legends, including this one. Scholem appeared to be suggesting this as well in *Qiryat Sefer* 11 (1934–35): 189.

There was at least one text produced by R. Yizḥaq ha-Kohen that involved R. Eleazar of Worms and was otherwise completely pseudepigraphic in terms of the scholars mentioned in it. This is the

R. Meshullam had a noticeable impact upon on the teachings of the *Hug ha-Iyyun*. In a *Hug* text discussed earlier, R. Meshullam, who is described as hailing from a city in *malkhut Ashkenaz*, is linked to R. Meir of Germany (=R. Meir of Rothenburg) and Rabbenu Perez of France. In another text incorporated by the *Hug ha-Iyyun*, he is referred to as being from a town in Brittany. The preface to that text refers to the magical practices of R. Eleazar of Worms. Additional texts describe R. Meshullam's own magical and mystical practices, which were similar to those of R. Meir. In one of these texts, in which he is described as R. Meshullam of France, magical techniques are listed that were derived from a treatise composed by *Hasidei Ashkenaz*.¹⁰⁴

Members of the Hug apparently assumed that R. Meshullam was a student or associate of the *Hasidei Ashkenaz*. Stories that he told about R. Eleazar of Worms would thus be considered authoritative and could be recorded as such. The case of the otherwise unknown R. Meshullam is another example of the way in which the *Hug ha-Iyyun* extended the circle of the German Pietists to encompass rabbinic figures in northern France or Germany whom they perceived as being related to the Pietists. As we have already seen in regard to R. Meir of Rothenburg, R. Perez of Corbeil and even in regard to R. Yehudah *be-Hasid* himself, Spanish (Castilian) kabbalists were often unaware or unsure of the precise locale of a particular Ashkenazic figure. As a result, they referred to these scholars' locations in general terms such as Allemagne or Germany or France.¹⁰⁵ Moreover, as

description of the more complex transmission process, preserved in a Berlin ms., and linked to EW (see above, nn. 5,34), that began in Mata Meḥasya and continued with R. Berakhyah of Damascus transmitting material to R. Eleazar. Ultimately, the material reached Provence via figures who are otherwise unknown. One of them was R. Solomon b. Mazliah of Arles. As Verman has perceptively noted (*The Books of Contemplation*, pp. 172–76), a passage in R. Yizḥaq ha-Kohen's *Treatise on the Left Emanation* described a similar pattern of transmission (without R. Eleazar of Worms) that involved R. Berakhyah of Damascus and an Arles figure named R. Mazliah. Verman concluded that this, and other passages by R. Yizḥaq which exhibited similar pseudepigraphic tendencies, demonstrate that R. Yizḥaq tended to produce documents that had little historical value. See above at n.19.

The difference between these documents and EW, however, is that EW contains historical figures other than R. Eleazar who are identifiable. Moreover, the haziness or lack of verifiability in EW was confined to the easternmost beginning of the transmission process. Where a discreet portion of a potentially pseudepigraphic document can be isolated, one cannot simply assume that the rest of the document was also constructed along pseudepigraphic lines and patterns. Although the *Hug ha-Iyyun* also utilized pseudepigraphy (see Verman, pp. 27–30, 114–15, 145, 199–200), their input into EW may have been more balanced as well.

¹⁰⁴ See Verman, pp. 202–05. Cf. Amos Goldreich, “Me-Mishnat Hug ha-Iyyun,” *Mehqerei Yerushalayim be-Maḥshevet Yisrael* 6:3–4 (1987): 141.

¹⁰⁵ See above, nn. 40,81. See also Moshe Idel, “Shelomoh Molkho Ke-Magiqqon,” *Sefunot* 18 (1985): 199–20, and idem., *Language, Torah, and Hermeneutics in R. Abraham Abulafia*, p. 134, n.6. For other examples in Spanish and Provençal rabbinic literature of non-specific geographic references to rabbinic scholars from northern France, see my *Jewish Education and Society in the High Middle Ages*, p. 160, n.43. See also *Sefer ha-Manbig*, ed. Y. Raphael, 1:201.

the various descriptions of R. Meshullam indicate, even these general terms were sometimes used interchangeably.

In a note to an early analysis of EW in which he dealt with the figures R. Yehudah *be-Hasid*, R. Eleazar of Worms, and R. Elhanan of Corbeil, Scholem wondered “what the Provençal kabbalists of the first half of the thirteenth century were thinking when they confused and intermingled names and places that they undoubtedly knew.”¹⁰⁶ This question could not be phrased the same way, however, in regard to R. Isaac ha-Kohen, and any members of the *Hug ha-Lyyun* who flourished in Castille during the second half of the thirteenth century. As we have seen, it is possible to find explanations or justifications for many of the seemingly confused names and places in EW. Moreover, precisely because they were not recognized talmudists and were not otherwise attuned to the personalities and tendencies of contemporary Ashkenaz rabbinic culture and literature, R. Isaac and the others were bound to have some inaccuracies in their efforts to identify the Ashkenazic figures from whom they had received esoteric material.¹⁰⁷ In addition, they tended to view *Hasidei Ashkenaz* as one (large) group although this too was not without justification.

It remains impossible to identify firmly what the authors of EW received from the Pietists and what they may have attributed to the Pietists which actually originated in Provence or in Spain itself. Nonetheless, EW indicates that these Spanish kabbalists considered *Hasidei Ashkenaz* to be a vital link in the transmission of *torat ha-sod*.¹⁰⁸ None of the details in EW about

¹⁰⁶ Scholem in *Tarbiz* 4 (1932): 429, n.4.

¹⁰⁷ See above, n.25.

¹⁰⁸ Although there is little correlation between the esoteric material in EW and the teachings of the German Pietists (see above, at n.89), EW’s implicit linkage of the *Hasidei Ashkenaz* to Provençal and Spanish kabbalah is not without basis. Later Ashkenazic kabbalists integrated the teachings of these groups as well (see above, n.101). Moreover, recent research has pointed to some clear examples of direct influence by *Hasidei Ashkenaz* on Spanish kabbalah. See the studies of Idel, Wolfson, Scholem, and Ginsburg, cited above, nn. 25, 40, 73, 89, 99, 100. See also Wolfson, “The Mystical Significance of Torah Study in German Pietism,” *JQR* [forthcoming], n. 100; idem., “The Secret of the Garment in Nahmanides,” *Da’at* 24 (1990): 26–27, n.9; idem., “By Way of Truth,” (above, n.73), pp. 109, 118, n.48, and pp. 137–38, n.100; Dan, “Le-Heqer ha-Aggadot ‘al R. Eleazar mi-Worms,” *Sinai* 74 (1974): 171–77; Urbach, *Ba’alei ha-Tsafot*, v.1, pp. 408–09; Idel, “We Have No Kabbalistic Tradition on This,” *Rabbi Moses Nahmanides: Explorations in His Religious and Literary Virtuosity*, ed. Isadore Twersky (Cambridge, Mass., 1983), p. 54, n.10; idem., “Shelomoh Molkho,” (above, n.105); and Jeremy Cohen, *Be Fruitful and Increase, Fill the Earth and Master It, The Ancient and Medieval Career of a Biblical Text* (Ithaca, 1989), pp. 187–88. [For additional bibliography on the relationship between *Hasidei Ashkenaz* and Spanish and Provençal Kabbalah, see Wolfson, “Circumcision and the Divine Name: A Study in the Transmission of Esoteric Doctrines,” *JQR* 78 (1987): 86–87, n.24; idem., “Merkavah Tradition in Philosophical Garb: Judah ha-Levi Reconsidered,” *PAAJR* 57 (1990–91): 180, n.3; and Idel, “Al Kavvanot Shemoneh Asreh Ezel R. Yizhaq Sagi Nahor,” *Sefer Zikkaron li-Prof. Ephraim Gottlieb*, n.103.]

For the influence of Ashkenazic customs and practices on the Zohar, see the studies of Ta-Shema cited by Idel, “Ha-Kavvanah ba-Tefillah,” p. 14, n.54, and Wolfson, “Hai Gaon’s Letter and

the suggested eastern origins of its material can be verified. As far as the rabbinic figures of Germany and northern France, however, the author(s) of EW attempted to present a credible picture. Gaps that had to be filled in utilized details that appeared, certainly from the perspective of EW's audience, to be quite plausible. Indeed, the plausibility of the material suggests that the author himself believed that his version was essentially accurate.

Acknowledgements

I wish to thank Professors David Berger and Elliot Wolfson for reviewing a draft of this paper. Professor Wolfson directed my attention to a number of texts and references and was kind enough to provide me with typescripts of several of his forthcoming studies.

Commentary on 'Aleynu," *JQR* 81 (1991): 383, n.74. Many of these studies have been collected in Ta-Shema's *Minhag Ashkenaz Qadmon* (Jerusalem, 1992). See also Ta-Shema's new articles, "Minhagei Tefillat Minhag," *ibid.*, pp. 198–200, and "Ha-Mazah ha-Shelishit shel Leil ha-Seder, pp. 269–70. Cf. Yehudah Liebes, "Kezad Nithabber Sefer ha-Zohar," *Mehqerei Yerushalayim* 8 (1989): 12–14.

Idel, "Ha-Kavvanah ba-Tefillah," p.10, following a brief discussion of the relationship between certain Provençal kabbalistic teachings and esoteric traditions of the German Pietists, concluded that the kabbalistic tradition (composed by R. Yizḥaq ha-Kohen), that the *Sefer ha-Bahir* was transmitted from Germany (Allemagne) southward (to Provence), supports and is supported by the various connections between Provence, Spain, and Ashkenaz just outlined. Cf. above, nn.17–18, and Wolfson, "Images of God's Feet," (above, n.89).

[Note that there is one striking example of a term found in texts of *Ḥasidei Ashkenaz* that was used similarly by EW. EW refers to the tenth 'azilut as *bat kol*. This term functions as a name of *Shekbinah* (the tenth *sefirah*) in the proto-kabbalistic Pseudo-Hai commentary on the mystical forty-two letter name of God that was included in R. Eleazar of Worm's *Sefer Ha-Hokhmah*. See ms. Bodl. 1812, fol. 60v, and ms. Bodl. 1568, fol. 5r. On the nature of the commentary and its relationship to R. Eleazar, see Scholem, *Origins*, pp. 184–87, esp. n.206; Dan, *Torat ha-Sod shel Ḥasidut Ashkenaz*, pp. 122–29; Wolfson, "Images of God's Feet," (above, n.89); and idem., *Through A Speculum That Shines* (above, n.25), n.195. *Bat kol* is also used in this manner in R. Eleazar's *Sodei Razanya*, ed. Israel Kamelhar (Bilgoraj, 1936), p. 44, cited by A.J. Heschel, "Al Ruah ha-Qodesh Bimei ha-Benayim," *Sefer ha-Yovel Likhvod Alexander Marx* (New York, 1950), p. 176, n.4.]