In several studies published over the past two decades, Menahem Schmelzer has focused his attention on the writing of \textit{piyyut} in medieval Ashkenaz. In his own words: “Beginning with the 1990’s, my interest turned to medieval Hebrew poetry in Ashkenaz. I was fascinated to realize that medieval Ashkenazi rabbis were also prolific in composing occasional poems, many of them on weddings. This somehow stood in contrast with the stereotypical impression of them being the authors of exclusively lachrymose poems on tragic events. A few of my later articles deal with Ashkenazi Piyyutim.”

Included among these studies are two that deal extensively (from both the internal literary and comparative perspectives) with heretofore unknown \textit{piyyutim} (a \textit{yoẓer} and a \textit{zulat}, on various themes and aspects of redemption) for the Sabbath(s) before Passover by R. Menahem b. Makhir, a leading German \textit{payyetan} of the late eleventh century. Another article presents an unknown \textit{ge’ulah} for one of the Sabbaths during the \textit{Sefirat ha-Omer} period, by an Ashkenazic author named Solomon (whose precise identity is uncertain), which has an unusual focus on the economic hardships suffered by medieval Ashkenazic

Jewry (in contrast to the security felt by the Jews of yore, when they were allowed to partake of the so-called *bizat Miẓrayyim*).  

A most important discovery by Professor Menahem Schmelzer, which further confirms the notion that Ashkenazic *payyetanim* also composed liturgical poems for “happy occasions,” is of a *ma’ariv* for *Simḥat Torah*, by the German Tosafist R. Moses b. Ḥisdai Taku. Prior to this finding, R. Moses Taku’s only known *piyyut* output consisted of two *seliḥot*. Similarly, Professor Schmelzer has discussed some lesser-known venues for wedding *piyyutim* that were developed in medieval Ashkenaz, including different types of embellishments for the *Nishmat* prayer and the recitation of *E-l Adon* on the *Shabbat hattan*, and various *reshuyyot* associated with the *hattan* and his entourage.

Moreover, Professor Schmelzer has most recently published a

---


5. See *Studies in Jewish Bibliography*, 190–208 [Hebrew section] (published originally in Zvia Ben-Yosef Ginor, ed., *Essays on Hebrew Literature in Honor of Avraham Holtz* [New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 2003]). The bulk of the *piyyutim* mentioned to this point were found by Menahem Schmelzer in New York, Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary, MS 8972. He also published an analysis of the poetic openings and conclusions found in *Sefer Yihuse Tanna ‘im va-Amora ‘im* by the German Tosafist R. Judah b. Qalonymus b. Meir of Speyer (d. 1199), along with two parallels in manuscript to the seventh such section of poetic verses. See *Studies in Jewish Bibliography*, 177–187 [Hebrew section] (published originally in *Between History and Literature: Studies in Honor of Isaac Barzilay* ed. Stanley Nash [Tel Aviv: Hakibbutz Hameuchad, 1997]). Rabbinic works in Jewish law and exegesis were sometimes a significant venue for versification during the Tosafist period (which, as noted by Menahem Schmelzer, has received scant attention).
detailed study of manuscript collections of wedding poems for the Shabbat ḥattan (yozerot, ʼofanim, zulatot, and reshuyyot) featuring piyyutim by some seventeen Ashkenazic authors, from the eleventh through the thirteenth centuries. A number of these piyyutim have never been published, including four by R. Joseph b. Nathan he-Ḥazzan of Wurzburg (mid-twelfth century), six by R. Menahem b. Jacob of Worms (d. 1203), two by R. Nathan b. Isaac of Mainz (ca. 1220), and three by R. Yaqar b. Samuel ha-Levi of Cologne (d. 1271). 6

Among the larger group of seventeen rabbinic authors are several German Tosafists and leading figures during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, whose prowess and productivity as both talmudists and payyetanim are well known: R. Eliezer b. Nathan (Raban) of Mainz (d. ca. 1165), R. Ephraim b. Isaac of Regensburg (d. 1175), and R. Barukh b. Samuel of Mainz (d. 1221), each of whom composed approximately thirty piyyutim, and R. Eleazar of Worms (d. 1237), who composed more than fifty piyyutim. Ephraim Urbach, the preeminent biographer of the Tosafists, has provided detailed treatments of the rabbinic writings and methods of each of these figures. Toward the end of these treatments, he takes note of their achievements in piyyut composition as well. 7

6. See Menahem Schmelzer, “Piyyutim le-Nissu’in le-Rishonei Hakhmei Ashkenaz,” Le-Of Zikaron: Meḥkarim ba-Shirah ha-ʻIvrit uve-Moreshet Yišra’el Sefer Zikaron le-Aḥaron Mirski, ed. Ephraim Hazan and Joseph Yahalom (Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University, 2008), 173–185. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Mich. 573 (Neubauer 1099), Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Opp. 673 (Neubauer 1149) and Moscow, Russian State Library, MS Guenzberg 611 were the main manuscript resources for this study.

Nearly complete critical editions of their numerous *piyyutim* have also been produced, with the lone exception of Raban.⁸

In light of Menahem Schmelzer’s findings concerning the “happy” (occasional) *piyyutim* that were composed in Ashkenaz (as a suggestive supplement to the *seliḥot* and *qinnot* that were unfortunately never “out of season”), it is interesting to note that Raban was the most well-rounded within this group of leading rabbinic scholars and *payyetanim*,

con, Daniel Sperber, Aharon Gaimani (Ramat Gan: Bar Ilan University, 2008), 203–216.

⁸. See Abraham Meir Habermann, “Piyyutei Rabbenu Ephraim b. Yizhaq me-Regensburg,” *Yedi‘ot: Makhon le-Ḥeḳer ha-Shirah ha-‘Ivrit* 4 (1938): 121–195; idem., “Piyyutei Rabbenu Barukh b. Shmu‘el mi-Magenza,” *Yedi‘ot: Makhon le-Ḥeker ha-Shirah ha-‘Ivrit* 6 (1946): 47–160; Isaac Meiseles, ed., *Shirat ha-Roke‘ah: The Poems of Rabbi Eleazar Ben Yehudah of Worms* [Hebrew] (Jerusalem: Isaac Meiseles, 1993). Habermann, ed., *Gezerot Ashkenaz ve-Ṭsarfat* (Jerusalem: Sifre Tarshish, 1945), 72–88, Raban published a *seliḥah* (E-lohim zedim qamu ’alenu, ‘Lord, the marauders have risen up against us’) and a *zulat* (E-lohim be-‘oznenu shamanu, “Lord, we have heard with our ears”), as well as his lengthier, more prose-like chronicle, which were composed to mark the disastrous impact of the First Crusade. See also Avraham David, “Historical Records of the Persecutions during the First Crusade in Hebrew Printed Works and Manuscripts,” *Facing the Cross* [Hebrew], ed. Yom Tov Assis et al. (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 2000), 194–198. A series of liturgical compositions by Raban for the High Holy Days and the *Shalosh Regalim* (and by Ephraim of Regensburg and Eleazar of Worms as well) are found in the various *maḥzorim* edited by Daniel Goldschmidt and Yonah Fraenkel. See the index in *Maḥzor Shavu‘ot* [Hebrew], ed. Yonah Fraenkel (Jerusalem: Koren, 2000), 715–716. Six of Raban’s *seliḥot* are published in *Leket Piyyute Seliḥot*, ed. Daniel Goldschmidt and Avraham Fraenkel (Jerusalem: Me’kidse Nirdamim, 1993), 1:64–73, as are nearly twenty by R. Eleazar of Worms (74–111), and one (for Yom Kippur) by R. Ephraim of Regensburg (113–116). Note that Raban’s triplet (*shelishiyah*), Haniḥenu ’el har qodeshekha (Goldschmidt and Fraenkel, 66), in which each stanza concludes with a verse that has the word ‘al or ve-‘al in it (and is quite similar to another *shelishiyah* by Raban, Tavo ’enqat asirekhka= Goldschmidt and Fraenkel, 71–72) was published from Parma, Biblioteca Palatina, MS 585 (föl. 137r), a *piyyut* manuscript of which Zunz was unaware. Similarly, R. Ephraim of Regensburg’s *seliḥah* for Yom Kippur, Umlalah yoshevet ba-mitah (with a siyyomet migra’i’t) was published from Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, ebr. 315, another manuscript to which Zunz did not have access.
with a third of his *piyyutim* linked to the *Shabbat ḥattan*, a third meant for the additional liturgy of the festivals, and a third consisting of *seliḥot* and *qinnot*. On the other hand, nearly three-quarters of R. Ephraim of Regensburg’s *piyyut* corpus consist of *seliḥot* and related compositions, which is also the case for R. Eleazar of Worms and to a slightly lesser degree for R. Barukh of Mainz. At the same time, it is possible to detect the influence of Spanish meter and poetics (especially in terms of rhyme schemes and the artistic use of biblical phrases) in the *piyyutim* by this group of well-known Ashkenazic authors.

Professor Schmelzer’s recent research opens up a number of additional directions and possibilities for the study of *piyyut* in Germany during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries and for a more complete understanding of the intellectual and cultural interests and achievements of the Tosafists and their associates at that time. As a modest contribution toward this endeavor, we shall now look more closely at the types of *piyyutim* produced by four of the lesser-known German halakhists and rabbinic figures included by Menahem Schmelzer in his study of Ashkenazic *piyyutim* for the *Shabbat ḥattan* whose liturgical compositions have not been fully published (as noted above), R. Joseph of Wurzburg, R. Menahem of Worms, R. Nathan of Mainz and R. Yaqar of Cologne.
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9. See my *The Intellectual History and Rabbinic Culture of Medieval Ashkenaz* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2013), 396–397, 412–424, for a survey of the genres, styles and numbers of their *piyyutim*. The discussion there is preceded by an analysis of the patterns and genres of pre-Crusade Ashkenazic *piyyut*, which is indispensable for a complete discussion of these issues. Note that *seliḥot* for Yom Kippur and *yoẓerot* for Sabbaths during the *Sefirat ha-Omer* period (or for *Shabbat Shuvah* and *Shabbat Ḥazon*) are properly considered to be part of the *seliḥot-qinnot* category.

R. Joseph b. Nathan Hazzan of Wurzburg, a rabbinic judge as well as a shaliah zibbur, corresponded with Raban in matters of monetary law,\textsuperscript{11} and possibly with Rabbenu Tam (d. 1171) as well.\textsuperscript{12} R. Joseph was the author of nearly fifteen piyyutim that were carefully metered in the Spanish style. Among these are five selihot: a petiḥah commemorating the events of 1096;\textsuperscript{13} a triplet (shelishiyyah) for the ten days of penitence in which each stanza ends with a biblical phrase that contains the Hebrew word for morning, \textit{boqer};\textsuperscript{14} another in which nearly every phrase is of biblical or Talmudic origin;\textsuperscript{15} another in which each stanza concludes with a biblical phrase from Exodus, chapters 32–34, relating to Moses’ entreaty of the Almighty and the thirteen

\textsuperscript{11} See Solomon Zalman Ehrenreich, ed., \textit{Even ha’-ezer hu Sefer Raban} (repr. Jerusalem: n.p., 1975), fols. 298b–299b, and Emanuel, \textit{Shivre Luḥot}, 73–74 (n. 106). The questions sent by R. Joseph to Raban sought guidance in two cases that had come before him. The first involved a loan extended by A to the wife of B in which written collections (quntresim) of selihot were given as collateral (and were later misplaced). The second (and perhaps related) case involved a (holy) book that had been given as collateral, in the presence of witnesses.

\textsuperscript{12} There is some question as to whether this is also the R. Joseph (or Yose) of Trento (or perhaps Trani or Taranto) who corresponded with Rabbenu Tam and whose ruling about non-kosher brine is cited by Rabiah (and indeed, whether Joseph b. Nathan Ḥazzan of Wurzburg hailed originally from an Italian locale, or from Tīrnau in central Europe). See Victor Aptowitzer, \textit{Mavo le-Sefer Rabiyah} (Jerusalem: Meḳitse Nirdamim, 1938), 257, 352; Leopold Zunz, \textit{Literaturgeschichte der synagogalen Poesie} (Berlin: L. Gerschel Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1865; hereafter cited as \textit{LG}), 271; Ismar Elbogen, Aron Freimann, Haim Tykocinski eds., \textit{Germania Judaica}, vol. 1 (Tubingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1963), 481–482; Emanuel, \textit{Shivre Luḥot}, ibid.; and R. Reiner, “‘A Tombstone Inscribed’: Titles Used to Describe the Deceased in Tombstones from Würzburg between 1147–1148 and 1346,” \textit{Tarbiz} 78, no. 1 (2009): 141–142.

\textsuperscript{13} See Parma, Biblioteca Palatina, MS 3139 (De Rossi 588), sec. 10 (\textit{E-l’erekh ‘appayim nozer hesed la-’alafim}), published by Habermann in \textit{Gezerot Ashkenaz ve-Tsarfat}, 89–90.

\textsuperscript{14} \textit{Agurah ‘olamim be-’ohalekha} (I will dwell forever in your tent).

\textsuperscript{15} \textit{Tavo lefanekha shav’at ’engat ’asir} (The pleas and the plaints of the restrained shall reach You).
Divine attributes that he invoked; and a selihah for the Tenth of Tevet.\(^{17}\)

For the liturgy of the festivals, R. Joseph b. Nathan composed a ma’ariv for Shemini Azeret,\(^{18}\) as well as a bikkur addendum (to the final blessing of the evening Shema, ha-pores sukkat shalom), which focuses on the simhat beit ha-sho’evah that was celebrated in the Temple.\(^{19}\) Every stanza in these compositions concludes with a biblical verse (referred to in modern terminology as a siyyomet miqra’it or as a soger min ha-miqra), a technique frequently found in classical as well as Spanish liturgical poetry, which was then embraced by a number of Ashkenazic payyetanim as well.\(^{20}\) The ma’ariv-bikkur and its themes were also the object of Ashkenazic piyyut commentary as found in several (related) manuscripts, an indication of the significance attached to these compositions.\(^{21}\) R. Joseph also authored two reshuyyot

16. *Uman be‐’ombo le‐hithanen lefanekha* (The artisan when he stood to make entreaties before You; [Moses is the artisan here]). These three selihot have been published (and annotated) in *Leket Piyuṭe Selihot*, ed. Goldschmidt and Fraenkel, 1:275–280. In the notes on the payyetanim represented in their collection of selihot, (2:782–783), the editors question the attribution of *Uman be‐’ombo* to R. Joseph Ḥazzan (which is attributed to Joseph by Zunz, *LG*, 273, followed by Israel Davidson, *Otsar ha‐Shirah veha‐Piyut* (repr. New York: Ktav, 1970) 1:86 (1854):a, since this composition is found only in a manuscript of French (selihot) rites (Parma, Biblioteca Palatina, MS 3007 [De Rossi 654], fol. 67), while all of R. Joseph’s other piyyutim are found in manuscripts of German rites and (selihot) collections. In addition, virtually all of Joseph’s liturgical compositions are tightly metered (as has been noted), while this one is not.


19. *Odot be’er ha‐mayim ‘ot hi le‐ezrahiyyim* (With regard to the well of water, it is a sign for all of the inhabitants). See *Mahzor Sukot*, 294–297.


21. See Parma, Biblioteca Palatina, MS 2342 (De Rossi 541), (Ashkenaz, thirteenth
for *Simḥat Torah*, one to fete the individual who was honored with the ‘*aliyyah* that completed the reading of the Torah (*hattan Torah*), and the other for the *hattan Bereshit*. Both of these were composed using another Spanish technique (which also tested the poetic skills of the composer), of a single rhyme throughout (referred to as a *ḥaruz ‘aḥid* or a *ḥaruz mavriaḥ*), which is the typical rhyme scheme in which such *reshuyyot* were written.22

As noted by Menahem Schmelzer, R. Joseph Ḥazzan composed a *yoẓer*, ’ofan, and zulat to be included in the *Shema* prayer on a *Shabbat ḥattan*, as well as a *reshut* for the groom’s being called to the Torah.23 In addition, R. Joseph composed an *E-loheikhem* for the *Shabbat ḥattan*, which was meant to be recited at the end of the *Qedushah* for the *Musaf* service in conjunction with the biblical phrase found there (from Numbers 15:41), ‘*ani ha-Shem E-loheikhem*.24 As such, fully

---


two-thirds of R. Joseph’s *piyyutim* were composed for festivals and joyous occasions. Indeed, the distribution or balance of R. Joseph’s *piyyut* corpus follows precisely the compositional pattern of Raban’s thirty *piyyutim*. This suggests that *piyyut* composition at this point during the Tosafist period in Germany may have been governed, at least in part, by certain larger conventions or approaches.

III

R. Menahem b. Jacob of Worms, who had contact with the Tosafist (and student of Rabbenu Tam) R. Ephraim of Regensburg, was the senior member of the Worms rabbinical court on which R. Eleazar b. Judah of Worms (who was R. Menahem’s nephew or perhaps his great nephew) also sat, and he was a leading local rabbinic authority and halakhic decisor. Indeed, the epitaph on his tombstone reads in part: *

We do not know any of R. Menahem’s students by name, and no remnants of any halakhic writings by R. Menahem have survived. At the same time, however, R. Menahem’s procedures for *kashering* utensils were cited by both R. Eleazar of Worms and by R. Eleazar’s student, the anonymous author of the halakhic compendium *Sefer Assufot*; R. Eleazar also cites the practice of R. Menahem for eating


26. It is perhaps for these reasons that Urbach barely mentions R. Menahem in his *Ba’ale ha-Tosafot* (1:369–370, 406).
milk and meat dishes (one after the other) on Shavuot. R. Menahem is cited on a number of occasions in the circumcision manuals of R. Jacob ha-Gozer and his son R. Gershom, which were compiled in the first half of the thirteenth century by a third (anonymous) mohel. Moreover, Sefer Assufot presents a variety of authoritative halakhic rulings and practices in the name of R. Menahem of Worms, and indicates in at least one instance that R. Menahem did in fact have a substantive group of students whom he instructed in matters of Jewish law.

At the same time, R. Menahem b. Jacob was a rather prolific payyetan, who composed more than thirty piyyutim. As listed by Professor Schmelzer, R. Menahem composed three yoẓerot and two reshuyyot for a Shabbat ḥattan, as well as a zulat. R. Menahem also composed a maʿariv and a bikkur for the last day(s) of Passover, both

27. See Emanuel, Derashah le-Fesaḥ (above, n. 25), and ibid., 72–73, n. 36.
29. See Sefer Assufot (whose author also identifies himself as a student of Rabiaḥ), London, Montefiore Library (Halberstam Collection), Halb. 115 (formerly London Montefiore 134), fols. 22r (col. 2); 26r (col. 1), “and R. Menahem instructed his students in a case where the feather had broken off internally,” hayah moreh le-talmidav; 55r (col. 2); 66r (col. 2); 84v (col. 4); and see also 17r (col. 1). See also Sefer Kushyot, ed. Yaakov Yisrael Stal (Jerusalem: Yaakov Yisrael Stal, 2007), 167–168 (sec. 215), for siman le-nerot Ḥanukkah by R. Menahem based on a Talmudic sugya; and Germania Judaica, 1:452.
30. In one of his own piyyut commentaries, R. Eleazar of Worms cites an interpretation from R. Menahem b. Jacob (which R. Eleazar indicates was a part of R. Menahem’s larger commentary to the piyyutim of the pre-Crusade payyetan, R. Meir, shaliaḥ zibbur of Worms). See Emanuel, Derashah le-Fesaḥ, 39–40n153, and cf. ʿArugah ha-Bosem, ed. Urbach, 33–34n69.
31. See Menahem Schmelzer, “Piyyutim le-Nisu’in,” 177–78, sec. 11 (and see Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Opp. 673 (Neubauer 1149), fols. 143v–144v, 161v–165v, 214r–218r, 233v–237v). Note also (for this occasion) E-loheikhem me-shortav shoʿ alim ʿayeh meqomo, in Zunz, LG, 296, sec. 16. One of R. Menahem’s yoẓerot for the ḥattan, Eleh toledot be-hibarʾ am peʿulato, was also designated for a Sabbath on which a circumcision took place.
with a *siyyomet miqra’it*.\(^{32}\) Professor Schmelzer has pointed to several passages in this *ma’ariv* that suggest that R. Menahem subscribed to the doctrine of the German Pietists concerning the (many) miracles that are presently hidden within nature (that will be revealed at the end of days, as represented by the biblical phrase *zekher ‘asah le-nifle’otav* [Psalms 111:4]). This insight gains support in view of R. Menahem’s association with R. Eleazar of Worms, and his affinity for mystical teachings and magical techniques more broadly.\(^{33}\) The suggestion by Leon Weinberger, however, that R. Menahem b. Jacob composed a *ma’ariv* for Purim, is belied by the fact that this *piyyut* appears in *Maḥzor Vitry* in the name of (mi-*ma’amad*) R. Menahem b. Aaron.\(^{34}\)

In terms of commemorative *piyyutim*, R. Menahem composed two *’ahavot* (which were to be recited just before the blessing *ha-boḥer be-‘ammo Yisra’el be-’ahavah* in the morning *Shema*) for the Sabbath prior to Shavuot (that was typically designated by Ashkenazic communities

\(^{32}\) See *Mahzor Pesah*, ed. Yonah Fraenkel (Jerusalem: Koren, 1993), 347–355; Paris, Musée de Cluny, Cluny 12290, fols. 160r–v; and Moscow, Russian State Library, MS Guenzberg 611, fols. 182v–184r. Fleischer, *Ha-Yotsrot*, 55, suggests that the *ma’ariv* was originally written for the seventh night of Passover, but, as often occurs, it was listed in some liturgies for the eighth night as well. See also Ezra Fleischer, “Prayer and Piyyut in the Worms Mahzor,” [Hebrew] in the Introductory Volume to *Worms Mahzor* (Jerusalem, National Library of Israel, MS Heb. 4° 781), ed. Malachi Beit-Arié (Vaduz [Liechtenstein]: Cyelar Establishment; and Jerusalem: National and University Library, 1985), 31. The *ma’ariv* begins, *Ori ve-yish’i ‘al ha-yam niglah* (My light and my salvation appeared on the sea); its *ge’ulah* section has the word *yam* (with different or no conjunctions) at the conclusion of each line. The brief *bikkur*, *Mattai ‘avo ve-‘er ‘eh pnei E-lohim la-haqbilah* (When will I come and see the presence of the Lord to greet it, as the focus of the pilgrimage to Jerusalem and the Temple), also has a *ḥaruz ‘ahid*. See also Giessen, Universitätsbibliothek, Giessen 892 (F 39878 in the IMHM), fols. 87r–v, in which R. Menahem’s *ma’ariv* is followed by one from R. Eleazar of Worms (with a series of refrains) for the eight day of Passover (fol. 88v–89v), *Emunat ‘omen* (*Mahzor Pesah*, 363–367, and see also Meiseles, *Shirat ha-Rokeah*, 99–107).


as the Sabbath on which the martyrs from 1096 and other persecutions were to be memorialized). He also wrote a composite elegy for the martyrs of Boppard (1179–80) and York (1190), in which these martyrs are linked and compared to the sons of Aaron on the one hand and to Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah on the other, and a liturgical poem that marked the end of the siege of Worms in March of 1201. In one of R. Menahem’s three qiṅnot for the Ninth of Av (marking the destruction of the Temple), the final stiche of each stanza consists of a biblical phrase that ends with the word bayit.

R. Menahem composed a variety of penitential prayers. These include a yoẓer for Shabbat Shuvah that has a siyyomet miqra’it,


37. Maẓor ba’atah ha-‘ir (A siege has reached the city). See Zunz, LG, 296, sec. 21.

38. Me’onei shamayim shehaqim yizbelukha, mele ‘im me-hodkha ve-hem lo yekhalkukha, ve-‘af ki ha-bayit (The celestial palaces, the heavens that house you, are filled with your splendor, yet they cannot contain You, how much less so the Temple?). See Zunz, ibid., sec. 20. For the two other qiṅnot, see Zunz, ibid., 296, secs. 17, 19.

along with an 'ofan and a zulat.⁴⁰ Among R. Menahem’s selihot are three metered tehinot for the end of the selihot service (one of which is also designated as a tamid),⁴¹ a selihah for the ten days of penitence with a siyyomet miqra’it,⁴² another in which each stanza concludes with a biblical verse that ends with the word (le-)‘olam,⁴³ an ‘agedah with a siyyomet miqra’it,⁴⁴ and a selihah for the Fast of Gedaliah.⁴⁵

In addition, R. Menahem composed three pizmonim including one for a circumcision that occurred on a fast day (in which each stanza concludes with a biblical verse that ends with the word [ha-]berit),⁴⁶ and another for the Fast of the Seventeenth of Tammuz (with a siyyomet miqra’it).⁴⁷ The third pizmon, which also has a siyyomet miqra’it, was related to (and modeled after) the Zekhor berit pizmon by Rabbenu Gershom for ‘erev Rosh ha-Shanah (with the double refrain, ve-hashev shevut ‘ohalei Ya’agov--ve-shuv be-raḥamim ‘al she’erit Yisra’el). R. Menahem’s version refers (similarly) to several themes: the destruction of the Temple by the Romans, contemporary persecutions at the hands

⁴⁰ See Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France MS héb. 648, fol. 60r, for the ‘ofan, Makhon kisse be-hod nose, and fol. 61v for the zulat (to be recited in the niggun of ‘ahuvah ‘ani lefanekha). See also the fourteenth-century Ashkenazic rite maḥzor in a private collection in Jerusalem (IMHM F 41225), fols. 86v–87r.

⁴¹ The identifying acrostic found within E-lohim habbet be-shibbud galut, published and annotated in Leqet Piyyutei Selihot, eds. Goldschmidt and Fraenkel, 1:406–408 reads Zemaḥ b. Jacob (rather than Menahem b. Jacob). Zemaḥ and Menahem, however, have the same gematria value, and R. Menahem included this equivalent “nickname” in several of his other selihot; see Leḳeṭ Piyuṭe Selihot, 2:813. For the (lengthy) tehinah-tamid, ‘Asihah ‘im levavi ve-ruḥi ḥippes, see ibid., 1:413–417. The final tehinah, Ashrei ha-‘am beharam ha-E-l (ibid., 418–421) is not mentioned by either Zunz in his LG, or by Israel Davidson in his Otsar ha-Shirah ve-Piyut.

⁴² See Leḳeṭ Piyuṭe Selihot, 408–409, Emet rosh devarkha nora ve-‘ayom.

⁴³ Ibid., 410–412, Anahnu ha-deveqim ba-Shem ke-gadil ve-‘avot.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 422–425, Et devar gdsheka zekhor ve-havtaḥat.

⁴⁵ Et zom ha-shevi‘i. See Zunz, LG, 297, and Davidson, 1:389 (8594:8).

⁴⁶ See Leḳeṭ Piyuṭe Selihot, 426–427, Mi-bor tishlah ‘asirai ‘avor pesha li-she’erit (to be recited to the niggun of Shofet kol ha’areẓ).

⁴⁷ Ibid., 429–430, Mishneh shibbaron hoshbarti ve-nitati la-vuz.
of the Christians, and calls for Divine vengeance that would be swift and thorough.48

Although the percentage of R. Menahem b. Jacob’s *piyyutim* that are not *selihot* or *qinnot* is not nearly as high as that of Raban (meaning that R. Menahem’s output is not nearly as well balanced, and he is closer in this respect to R. Ephraim of Regensburg, R. Barukh of Mainz, and R. Eleazar of Worms), Ezra Fleischer has linked the *piyyutim* of R. Menahem to those of Raban in terms of their structure and significance, and has suggested that they are deserving of a critical edition and additional close literary study.49 The importance of R. Menahem’s *piyyutim* within medieval Ashkenaz is further underscored by the comments and interpretations that were offered to several of them.50

IV

R. Nathan b. Isaac was a lesser-known *dayyan* in Mainz, who nonetheless was also a signatory (along with Rabiah, R. Simhah of Speyer, R. Eleazar of Worms, and other leading Tosafists and rabbinic authorities) of the so-called *Taqqanot Shu’im* that were promulgated in


50. See Hollender, *Clavis Commentatorium*, 126 (to R. Menahem’s *ma’ariv* for the seventh day of Passover, *Odeh hasdo*); 168 (to the *ma’ariv* for the seventh day of Passover, *Ori ve-yish’i ‘al ha-yam nigleh*); 337 (to the *zulat* for *Shabbat ha-Gadol*, *‘Emun nu huva*); 514–515 (to the *selihah* for the Fast of Gedalyah, *Et zom ha-shevi’i*); and 816 (to the *ma’ariv* for the seventh day of Passover, *Matai ve-’avo*).
the Rhineland during the 1220s. In addition, R. Nathan and his judicial colleague in Mainz, R. Eleazar b. Simeon, presented a matter that had come before them (concerning the wife of an impotent husband who wanted a divorce) to Rabiah for his input.\(^{51}\)

R. Nathan b. Isaac of Mainz composed at least five \textit{piyyutim} (and as many as eight).\(^{52}\) Three of these are \textit{selihot} (with a \textit{siyyomet miqra’it}) for the penitential period of the \textit{Yamim Nora’im}.\(^{53}\) Another \textit{selihah}, for the Fast of Esther,\(^{54}\) and a \textit{qerovah}, for (the Amidah of) \textit{Ta’anit Ester}, appear in the name of R. Nathan b. Isaac only in Provençal prayer rites, and thus may have been the products of a(n otherwise unknown) Provençal \textit{payyetan} of the same name.\(^{55}\) The remaining \textit{piyyutim} composed by R. Nathan b. Isaac of Mainz are for “happy”


\(^{53}\) For \textit{Eikhakah ‘ukhal ve-ra’iti ‘erekh ma’anit}, see \textit{Leḳeṭ.Piyuṭe.Seliḥot}, 2:505–509, and see also Cremona, Archivio di Stato, Cremona Arch 56 (Ashkenaz, fourteenth to fifteenth centuries, from book bindings; IMHM F 34136). As noted by the editors of \textit{Leḳeṭ.Piyuṭe.Seliḥot}, this composition has phrases such as \textit{va-yasimu ‘otot be-qerev} (see Psalms 74:4), which serve as allusions to the Crusaders and their symbols, as well as a series of expressions about the misdeeds of Edom and references to the \textit{Akedah}. For the \textit{shelishiyyah}, \textit{E-lohim shelah ‘ezrah}, see \textit{Leḳeṭ Piyuṭe Seliḥot}, 2:509–511, and see also Hamburg, Staats und Universitätsbibliothek, Cod. hebr. 39 (IMHM F 26291), and Modena, Archivio di Stato, Modena Arch 20 and Modena Arch 30 (IMHM #PH 6854); and for the \textit{shelishiyyah}, \textit{Anokhi ‘afar va-‘efer hata’ai ‘azmu mi-lesapper}, see \textit{Leḳeṭ Piyuṭe Seliḥot}, 2:511–513, and Parma, Biblioteca Palatina, Cod. Parm. 3139 (De Rossi 588), sec. 217.


\(^{55}\) \textit{Ki E-li ‘aveli he-mir le-gilah} (For my Lord has exchanged my mourning for joy); see Davidson, \textit{Otsar ha-Shirah ve-ha-Piyut}, 2:470 (182:2), and Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, ebr. 553 (Provence, 1389), fol. 8v. Note also that \textit{qerovot} were hardly produced by any German \textit{payyetan} after R. Meir Shatz of Worms (who was active in the late eleventh century). Cf. \textit{Piyute R. Yehi’el b. Abraham me-Roma}, ed. Avraham Fraenkel (Jerusalem: Mekitse Nirdamim, 2007), editor’s introduction, 11.
occasions, and consist of a yoẓer and a zulat for a Shabbat ḥattan (as noted by Menahem Schmelzer), and perhaps an addendum to the Nishmat prayer on Shavuot. The fact that virtually half of R. Nathan’s piyyut output was intended for “happy” (occasional) venues takes on added significance when we consider that several German Tosafists and rabbinic judges during this period including Rabiah, his father R. Yo’el ha-Levi, R. Simḥah of Speyer (and his students, R. Samuel b. Abraham ha-Levi [also called R. Bonfant] of Worms, and R. Isaac b. Moses Or.Zarua’), R. She’alti’el b. Menahem, and R. Judah b. Moses ha-Kohen of Friedberg-Wurzburg (whose total output was on a scale similar to that of R. Nathan b. Isaac of Mainz) composed seliḥot (and qinnot) exclusively.

V

R. Yaqar of Cologne, the son of R. Samuel ha-Levi [R. Bonfant] of Worms, was an active communal judge, halakhist, and student of mysticism. He produced a variegated corpus of piyyutim, much of

56. See Schmelzer, “Piyyutei Nissu’in,” 178, sec. 14, and see also Moscow, Russian State Library, MS Guenzberg 611, secs. 203–204, and Zunz, LG, 332. In the Moscow manuscript, R. Nathan’s wedding piyyutim are included just before four ‘ofanim (secs. 205–208) by R. Yehudah ha-Levi (whose piyyutim were widely appreciated in medieval Ashkenaz, along with those of Ibn Gabirol and Ibn Ezra; see, e.g., Schmelzer, Studies in Jewish Bibliography [Hebrew section], 194–198, and Fleischer, Ha-Yotsrot, 670–671, 680–683, 704–706), and a yoẓer and an ‘ofan for a circumcision on the Sabbath (secs. 209–210) by R. Menahem b. Jacob.

57. Nishmat ne’imah penimah temimah qehilllah qedoshah; see Davidson, Otsar ha-Shirah veha-Piyut, 3:233 (788:2), but cf. Zunz, LG, 727 (in the Hebrew index, 107). On this genre and venue in Ashkenaz, see Ezra Fleischer, Shirat ha-Kodesh ha-‘Ir Vit ha-Yome ha-Benayim, 461–463; idem., Ha-Yotsrot, 626, n. 40; and cf. Mahzor Shavu’ot, ed. Fraenkel, 90–92. Similarities have been noted by these modern scholars between Ashkenazic piyyutim for Nishmat and those of the Sefardic payyetan, R. Joseph Ibn Avitur. See also Schmelzer, Studies in Jewish Bibliography, 193–195.

58. See my The Intellectual History and Rabbinic Culture of Medieval Ashkenaz, 427–430. To be sure, the seliḥot-only model had a number of important earlier adherents in Ashkenaz, including Rabbenu Gershom and Rashi.

59. On R. Yaqar and his family, see Israel M. Ta-Shma, Keneset Mehkarim, vol. 1
which is still in manuscript. These include the yozer, 'ofan and zulat for a Shabbat ḥattan noted by Menahem Schmelzer,\(^{60}\) as well as an E-loheikhem for this occasion, and an E-loheikhem for the Sabbath of a circumcision.\(^{61}\) Interestingly, a manuscript passage asserts that the custom in Mainz was not to recite any E-loheikhem addenda to the Qedushah with three exceptions: when Rosh Hodesh occurred on the Sabbath, when there was a Shabbat nissu‘in, and when there was a circumcision on the Sabbath. On these occasions, the E-loheikhem formulated (she-yasad) by R. Yaqar of Cologne was instituted (and recited) by R. Yaqar’s son, R. Bonfant ha-Levi he-Ḥazzan.\(^{62}\)

A reshut authored by R. Yaqar to fete the ḥattan Bereshit (on Simḥat Torah), which was composed according to Spanish meter (and had both a haruz 'aḥid and an internal rhyme scheme), has an additional set of stanzas that could be added so that it might (also) serve as a reshut for a bridegroom.\(^{63}\) R. Yaqar also composed a relatively rare ge’ulah

---

\(^{60}\) See Schmelzer, “Piyyutim le-Nissu‘in,” 178, sec. 15, on the basis of Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Mich. 573 (Neubauer 1099). These are also found in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Opp. 673 (Neubauer 1149): the yozer, Agadem ve’ikkaf be-shirah ‘arevah (fol. 110r); the ‘ofan, E-l na’araz bimromei zevulim (fol. 110v, where it is also noted that this ‘ofan was recited in the niggun of ‘ehad qadosh); and the zulat that follows, Ahuvah kelulah meshukhat ḥasadim simḥat yahid simḥat rabbim.

\(^{61}\) E-loheikhem yahid ve-nissa mi-kol ne’elam, in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Opp. 673 (Neubauer 1149), fol. 146v; E-loheikhem yözi ba-beten, and Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Mich. 327–328 (Neubauer 1107–1108) (Ashkenaz, fourteenth century), fol. 244r (where the compiler also notes that this piyyut is from “my teacher R. Yaqar”) = Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Opp. 642 (Neubauer 1106), fols. 154v–155r.

\(^{62}\) See Hamburg Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, Cod. hebr. 86, fol. 72v, cited in Emanuel, Shivre Luḥot, 181n128.

\(^{63}\) Yefeh nof ta’vat ‘ayin yelid ḥattan demutkekha. See Maḥzor Sukkot, ed. Goldschmidt, 464–466.
(recited at the very end of the morning Shema, in conjunction with the blessing of ga’al Yisra’el) for a Shabbat hattan.64

In terms of commemorative piyyutim, R. Yaqar composed a zulat for the Sabbath that fell after the twentieth of Tammuz, on which the pogrom of 1267 known as gezerat Pforzheim (Purzin, which was in Baden in western Germany), was commemorated.65 He also wrote two qinnot, which are interspersed in a Cluny manuscript together with qinnot by Ibn Gabirol, R. Yehudah ha-Levi, and R. Menahem b. Jacob of Worms.66 In addition, one of the authors of the extensive piyyut commentary found in Parma, Biblioteca Palatina, Cod. Parm. 3205 (De Rossi 655) identifies himself as a student of both R. Yehi’el of Paris and R. Yaqar of Cologne.67

64. Yeminkha E-li go’ali romemah tasir madveh [masveh] kelimah. See Zunz, LG, 488. R. Yaqar’s contemporary, R. Meir of Rothenburg (d. 1293), a leading Tosafist and prolific payyetan, also composed a ge’ulah that imitated one by R. Yehudah ha-Levi. (The ge’ulah genre was indeed much more common in Spain.) See Fleischer, Ha-Yotsrot, 704–706.

65. See Sefer ha-Dema’ot, ed. Simon Bernfeld (Berlin: Eshkol, 1923), 1:322–325; Abraham Meir Habermann, Gezerot Ashkenaz ve-Tsarfat (Jerusalem, n.p., 1945), 191–193; Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Opp. 673 (Neubauer 1149), fol. 55v. This zulat concludes with a plea for both consolation and revenge, on the order of the splitting of the Red Sea. It is “signed” (as are other piyyutim by Yaqar), Yaqar ha-Levi he-’aluv, the unfortunate, and was to be chanted to the tune of the piyyut titled Nahem.tenaḥem. Habermann notes that a qinnah by R. Meir of Rothenburg’s brother Abraham (titled Ez’aq.be-mar.lev), about a pogrom in Pforzheim that mentions the deaths of R. Samuel ha-Levi and his son R. Yaqar, apparently reflects a second such episode that occurred there in 1271. See also Zunz, LG, 488, and Ta-Shma, above, n. 59.


67. The student, Orsherago b. Asher (fol. 32v) cites mori ha-Rav Yaqar ha-Levi on
Seven of R. Yaqar’s ten *piyyut* compositions were focused on happy occasions, the largest such percentage of the German rabbinic figures whose work we have surveyed. His apparent awareness of Spanish poetic conventions and his interest in cultivating new genres or opportunities for *piyyut* composition reflect trends within German Tosafist and *beit din* circles that we have noted throughout this brief study. R. Yaqar’s *piyyutim* also have at least a few things in common with the eighteen *piyyutim* by his better-known contemporary, R. Meir of Rothenburg as well.68 It is interesting that all of the rabbinic *payyetanim* mentioned in this study, from the well known to the lesser known, functioned as *dayyananim* as well as Talmudists. One wonders whether this development is mere coincidence or happenstance, or whether *piyyut* composition was in some way an outgrowth or a reflection of the service that these rabbinic scholars provided as jurists (or of the way that they structured their intellectual and spiritual proclivities).

To be sure, their Tosafist counterparts in northern France during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, who were not as likely to serve as consistently as rabbinic judges (but rather as *rashei yeshivah*),69 were also involved to an extent with *piyyut* composition, but that is another story.70 Suffice it to say that the research of our *Ba’al ha-Yovel* has opened new vistas on the writing of *piyyut* in medieval Ashkenaz that have already borne fruit, and will continue to do so.

---

68. See, e.g., above, n. 64, and my *The Intellectual History and Rabbinic Culture of Medieval Ashkenaz*, 436–440.

69. See my “Religious Leadership during the Tosafist Period,” passim.

70. Comparison of the situations in northern France and Germany is a major focus of the chapter on *piyyut* in my recent book (above, n. 68).

---

fols. 145r, 151v, and 158v. He also notes a comment that he heard from his teacher, R. Yeḥi‘el of Paris (fol. 158r), and another that he heard from (or in the name of) R. Eleazar of Worms.
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