

The Worms Maḥzor: Its History and Its Palaeographic and Codicological Characteristics

Malachi Beit-Arié

A. THE TWO PARTS OF THE WORMS MAḤZOR AND THEIR CONNECTION

THE MAḤZOR OF THE Jewish community of Worms consists of two volumes, both of which are in the Jewish National and University Library. Volume I, Heb. 4^o 781/1, presented in this facsimile edition, contains the prayers and particularly the *piyyuṭim* for special Sabbaths, Purim, *Shabbat ha-Gadol*, Passover, Shavu'ot and the Ninth of Av. Two books of the Bible and other biblical selections are copied here. The other volume, Heb. 4^o 781/2, contains the liturgy and *piyyuṭim* for the High Holy Days and Sukkot.

Both volumes of the *Maḥzor* served the Worms community for hundreds of years, as attested by the many notations of the cantors who served in the community's Great Synagogue from 5326 (1565/6) onward (see below). However, there is no doubt that each volume was written by a different scribe and that originally there was no connection between the two.¹

We shall present palaeographic, codicological, textual, and historical proof for the separation of the two volumes. First and foremost, a comparison of the scripts indicates that in spite of their similarities — both have the same type of adorned, square Ashkenazi script — there are distinct morphological differences, and also a difference in the size of their letters. The Tetragrammaton substitution differs as well. These points alone are sufficient to conclude that each volume was written by a different

copyist. The two volumes visibly differ in the size of their sheets and their height/width proportions. The page dimensions of Volume I are 373–378 mm × 298–302 mm, whereas in Volume II they are 450–452 mm × 310–312 mm. To be sure, the margins of Volume I were cut more than those of Volume II, but both also are patently different in the format of the written text area and its layout. The written text area in Volume I is 284–295 mm × 201–205 mm with 27 lines (except for three quires of 26 lines); the written area in the biblical part is 287–300 mm × 213–216 mm, of three columns and 32 written lines; whereas the written text area of Volume II is 270–273 mm × 187–189 mm with 25 lines; the biblical part here has two columns and its text area is the same as the body of the *Maḥzor*. It follows that the ruling of the sheets and the marginal pinpoint markings to guide those lines differ in both volumes.

Each undoubtedly had a different vocalizer since their vocalization systems differ and reflect different patterns of pronunciation. The vocalization patterns of Volume I represent the Palestinian-Tiberian vocalization system and a pre-Ashkenazi reading tradition;² the vocalization of Volume II is entirely Tiberian.

Both also differ in their ornamentation. In contrast to the abundance of ornamentation, illumination and illustration in Volume I, there is very little ornamentation in Volume II.

1 Two comprehensive descriptions of the Worms *Maḥzor* have thus far been published. The first, primarily devoted to detailing the contents and *piyyuṭim* of its two volumes, was published close to the time the *Maḥzor* was transferred to the Jewish National and University Library: F.D. Goldschmidt, "The Worms *Maḥzor*" [Heb.], *Kiryath Sepher*, XXXIV (1959), pp. 388–396, 513–522 (henceforth: Goldschmidt); it was later included in a collection of his articles: *Mehqerei Tejillah u-Piyyuṭ* (Studies in Prayer and Piyyuṭ), Jerusalem 1979, pp. 9–30. The second description was published by Róth: E. Róth, "Das Wormser Machsor", in *Festschrift zur Wiedereinweihung der Alten Synagoge zu Worms*, Frankfurt o/M 1961, pp. 217–227 (henceforth: *Sefer Worms*). Róth published this description with certain changes, along with tables of illustrated pages, in *Udim*, published by the West German Committee of Rabbis (*Udim — Zeitschrift der Rabbinerkonferenz in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland*), XI–XII (1981–1982), pp. 219–233 (henceforth: Roth). A detailed description of the vocalization of Volume I of the *Maḥzor* was published by M. Beit-Arié, "The Vocalization of Volume I of the Worms *Maḥzor*" [Heb.], *Lěšonenu*, XXIX (1965), pp. 27–46, 80–102 (also

included, with an addendum, in *Qovez Ma'amarim bi-Leshon Hāzal* (Collected Articles — Mishnaic Hebrew), I, Jerusalem 1972, pp. 302–317). A palaeographic description of the first part of the *Maḥzor* is included in the volume of Colette Sirat and M. Beit-Arié, *Manuscrits médiévaux en caractères hébraïques portant des indications de date jusqu'à 1540*, I, Jerusalem–Paris 1972, No. 7. In Goldschmidt's estimation, the second volume was apparently written a bit after the first, and possibly by another scribe. Róth, pp. 219–221, treated the problem of the *Maḥzor*'s unity at length and arrived at the correct conclusion that, though the two volumes complement one another, they are not to be considered as a single work. Beit-Arié has pointed out the recognizable differences between the two parts. Sirat and Beit-Arié completely separated the two volumes and only included the first volume in the corpus of dated manuscripts. My thanks to my colleagues Prof. Ezra Fleischer, Prof. Bezalel Narkiss and Prof. Chone Shmeruk who read this paper and made helpful comments.

2 See its description below, in I. Eldar's article.

The histories of both also differ. The marginal notes, the corrections, and the many marginal additions in Volume I show that it was in continuous use from the time it was written till later generations, while the marginal notes and glosses of the other are almost entirely late, apparently no earlier than the sixteenth century. It would seem, then, that the second volume of the *Mahzor* was hardly used prior to the sixteenth century.

Textual examination also reveals that the two are not part of a single *mahzor* written by two copyists working together. The set of *piyyuṭim* in Volume II is incomplete, lacking the *ma'aravot*.³ The most telling proof, however, is the double copying of the Book of Ecclesiastes which appears in Volume I (minus the beginning) and also in Volume II.

We have before us, then, two separate units of a *mahzor* for the entire year, each written by a different scribe at approximately the same time and in the same region. Since they complemented one another, they were joined together for the use of the *hazzanim* of the Great Synagogue in Worms, probably sometime in the sixteenth century.

Let us now describe Volume I, our facsimile reproduction.

B. THE SCOPE AND ORDER OF THE MAḤZOR, ITS PERIOD AND COPYIST

Ms. Jerusalem, the Jewish National Museum and Library Heb. 4^o 781/1, in its 217 folios, contains a *mahzor* consisting of the following sections:

1 *Orders of Prayer and Piyyuṭim*:

(1) Fols. 1v–108v: for special Sabbaths (the Four *Parashot*, Purim, *Shabbat ha-Gadol*) and Passover, divided thus — fols. 1v–8v: *Parashat Sheqalim*; fols. 9r–15r: *Parashat Zakhor*; fols. 15v–20v: Purim; fols. 20v–26r: *Parashat Parah*; fols. 26r–34r: *Parashat ha-Ḥodesh*; fols. 34v–41r: *Shabbat ha-Gadol*; fols. 41r–108v: Passover.

The four last leaves of this section constitute a reduced quire of two sheets. At the end of it, the scribe wrote an abbreviated colophon in the form of a rhymed closing formulation, common to the copyists of Germany and France, in which he inserted his name:

חזק ונתחזק, הסופר שמחה לא יזיק.
Simḥah the Scribe will not be damaged" (fol. 108v).⁴

The copyist wrote the end of the text on this page as a geometric design.

(2) Fols. 109r–155r: for Shavu'ot.

At the end of this section as well (fol. 155r), the scribe wrote a closing formulation identical to that of section (1) above, also containing his name.⁵ The text on the last page is also written in geometric form.

(3) Fols. 155v–184r: for the Ninth of Av.

The end of this section is written on a reduced quire of two sheets (four leaves). The end of the text is written as a geometric design. Fol. 184v was left blank from the start.

II *Sections from the Bible*:

(4) Fols. 185r–203r: The Book of Ecclesiastes, from the middle of i:10 to the end of the book (fols. 185r–189r; before fol. 185 there is a leaf missing which contained the opening of the book through the middle of i:10) and the Book of Job (fols. 189v–203r). The end of this section is written on a reduced quire of two sheets (four leaves). The end of the Book of Job is written in a geometric design enclosed by two circles drawn in ink, followed by the scribe's concluding formulation: חזק ונתחזק הסופר לא יזיק אמן (fol. 203r). The other side of the leaf was left blank.

(5) Fols. 204r–217v: Passages read on the Ninth of Av, in addition to the Book of Job which we just described.⁶ Fols. 204r–217r: Jer. i:1–xxiii:6; fols. 217r–217v: Isa. xxxiv:1–xxxv:10. The end of this section, which is the end of the original manuscript, is written on a reduced quire of three sheets (six leaves). The end of the Isaiah segment is written in geometric design form beneath which the scribe wrote a detailed colophon, the second half of which is rhymed (fol. 217v):

3 As Goldschmidt pointed out, p. 389.

4 For the sources of this formulation in the later *midrashim* and the possibility that it contains an anti-Muslim polemic, see: A. Almann "The Ladder of Ascension", *Studies in Mysticism and Religion Presented to Gershom G. Scholem on His Seventieth Birthday*, Jerusalem 1967, pp. 1–32, esp. pp. 31–32.

5 This partial colophon was written in red ink which had faded somewhat and therefore a later hand had gone over a few of the letters with a brown ink quill. The last stich of the rhymed formulation (עד שעלה חמור בסולם) was written by the copyist with the regular brown ink in which the text was written, vertically toward the top, for lack of space at the end of the page.

6 Cf. the words of the *Baraita* in the Babylonian Talmud, *Ta'anit* 30a: "And it is forbidden to read in the Torah, Prophets or Writings... but he may read where he is not accustomed to read...and he may read in the *qinot*, in Job and in the dire prophecies of Jeremiah." As to the practice of reading the Book of Job and a section of the Book of Jeremiah on the Ninth of Av, cf. *Siddur Rav Sa'adia Gaon*, ed. I. Davidson, S. Assaf, B.I. Joel, Jerusalem 1963, p. 318: "and there are even more things (forbidden) than on the Day of Atonement, to wit the prohibition of reading [the Scriptures]...except in the depressing sections such as Jeremiah, Job and Lamentations..." On reciting Job and selections of Jeremiah and Isaiah which were copied in the *Mahzor* in Ashkenaz, see *Sefer Maharil*, "The

Laws of the Ninth of Av", Warsaw 1874, p. 35a: "And anyone of the congregation who volunteers, recites the entire Book of Job and some of Jeremiah which are saddening things from the beginning until ערקנו ה'. Then he recites קרב גרים which is in the middle of the Book of Isaiah until ונסתין ואנחה."

The entire corpus of the synagogue reading, including the aforementioned sections, was copied in various mediaeval manuscripts. See, for example, the fifteenth century MS Milano, Biblioteca Ambrosiana C 73 sup. (Berheimer Catalogue, No. 8) which has the Pentateuch, the *haftarot*, Jer. i:1–xxiii:6, Isa. xxxiii–xxxiv, the Five Scrolls, and Job (the Institute of Microfilmed Hebrew Manuscripts at the Jewish National and University Library [henceforth: IMHM], f.12260); MS Parma, the Palatine Library 3197 (Catalogue de Rossi, No. 597) which has the Torah sections and *haftarot* read on the festivals and special Sabbaths, the Five Scrolls, Job, Jeremiah and Isaiah as mentioned above (IMHM, f. 14321). MS Oxford, the Bodleian Library Can. or. 136 (Neubauer Catalogue, No. 18), written about 1300 in Ashkenaz, containing the Pentateuch, the Five Scrolls, the *haftarot*, Jer. i:1–xxiii:6, Job and Isa. xxxiii–xxxiv; MS Jerusalem, Heichal Shelomo 74, which was written in Ashkenaz in the fifteenth century, contains a Ninth of Av unit consisting of the Book of Lamentations, *qinot*, Job and Jeremiah, as mentioned above (IMHM, f. 3875).

I, Simḥah b. Judah the scribe, have written this *maḥzor* for my uncle R. Barukh b. Isaac in forty-four weeks, editing and arranging from beginning to end every prayer read by the *hazzan*, and have completed it, with the Almighty's help, on the 28th of Tevet in the 32nd⁷ year of the era. May the Lord privilege him to use it to thank, to praise, to chant, to laud the Creator of his soul and to bequeath it, as intended, as an act of piety, for his soul, for he means well; may his righteousness endure forever. And I, Simḥah the Clerk, will give praise, thanks and glory to my Rock through my majestic labor which is beautiful and bright, which I have executed in faith and purity. May He grant me the privilege of seeing children and grandchildren busying themselves with the study of the Torah and may He save me from all anguish and trouble, Amen and Amen speedily.

The colophon with which the scribe ends his work gives us details about the copying, its contents, the time of the production, and information about the scribe and the one who ordered the copy made. Like the title-page of printed books, it tells us important information about the nature of the copied book.

First, the name of the scribe (and that of his father), which had only been hinted at in the scribal concluding formulations at the end of both parts and in four other places in the body of the text,⁸ is here given explicitly: Simḥah b. Judah the Scribe. The designation "Scribe" refers to the father, who was also a professional book copyist. Proof of this is apparently found elsewhere in the *Maḥzor*, where we are also given the father's origin. An initial word on fol. 95r happened to be "and my scribes". Around it is a penned decoration and beside it, drawn in the margin, is a

likeness whose one hand is holding the decoration which encloses the opening word, while the other is holding aloft a tablet, like the opening of a book, on which is written in small cursive script: "Judah the Scribe from Nuremberg [sic]", "Simḥah the Scribe", "Shemaiah the Fren [sic]". The second name is that of the copyist of the manuscript, whereas the first name cannot be the name of another scribe who helped in the copying because our manuscript is all of one hand and one script. Therefore, it must be that the first name is that of the scribe's father, Judah, as mentioned in the colophon and, if so, we learn that he came from Nuremberg, i.e. the city of Nuremberg in the centre of the district of Franconia (Bavaria) in Germany, and that the full name of the scribe is Simḥah b. Judah the Scribe of Nuremberg.⁹ The third name, "Shemaiah the Fren", written there in connection with the word "and my scribes", indicates that he, too, was connected with the production of the book. The name was not completed for lack of space and obviously should be "Shemaiah the Fren[chman]". However, it cannot be the name of a second copyist who, as it were, shared in the copying for, as mentioned, the entire *Maḥzor* was copied by a single hand and there is no doubt that Simḥah the Scribe wrote the entire manuscript himself as he attests in the colophon: "editing and arranging from beginning to end every prayer recited by the *hazzan*."¹⁰ What, then, was Shemaiah the Frenchman's part in the making of the book?

There are two possibilities for identifying Shemaiah the Frenchman: two other professionals were involved in the *Maḥzor*'s production — the vocalizer who pointed the entire text and even proofread it (see below),¹¹ and the artist responsible for its decoration and illustrations. The style of the script in which these three names are written resembles the small cursive writing of the

7 The scribe forgot to write the word **ושחית** and therefore wrote it in the margin. This word is written in the copyist's script and letters the size of those of the colophon, and therefore there is no doubt that this insertion was added by the copyist. Between the words **שלשית** and **לפרט**, and above the word **ושחית** in the margin, insertion signs were put in, but that these were done by the copyist is doubtful.

8 The scribe's name, Simḥah, is also hinted at on fols. 22v, 129r, 143r, 176v. It was the practice of many mediaeval scribes in most regions to hint at their names by decorating words which occurred in the copied text and contained, or corresponded with, their names, and Simḥah the Scribe did likewise. On fol. 22v the word **שמחה** occurs in line 14, and it is given prominence by dots of the quill. On fol. 129r, it is written in red ink on the last line, decorated with a thin frame of brown ink whose hue seems to be brighter than that of the text, in the style of the decoration of a few of the acrostics. On fol. 143r, in line 11, the combination **תפארת שמחה** occurs; the letters **שמחה** are written in red ink and the end of the word is decorated. On fol. 176v the combination **ששון שמחה** occurs in line 14; the second word has quill decoration. In addition to these hints, we have an instance in the body of the *Maḥzor* where the scribe refers to himself in the first person. On fol. 76v, before the copy of **אריז אוריז**, the copyist wrote in red ink in line 22: "One does not say **אריז** on the intermediate days of the Festivals and yet I write it." And see below, Section D, about the scribe's marginal notes.

9 It seems that L. Zunz, who probably saw the Worms *Maḥzor*, already noticed the names inserted in the aforementioned illustration and concluded that Judah the Scribe of Nuremberg was the scribe's father. Steinschneider quotes Zunz on the identification of the Leiden Academy of Sciences manuscript which was written by Simḥah b. Isaac (today MS Leiden, University Library Acad. 214), in which he brings proof for the fact that Simḥah was a common name in Worms. Zunz indicates, among the examples: "Simcha der Schreiber, Sohn Jehuda's aus Nürnberg lebte 1272 in Worms"; see *HB* (= *Hebräische Bibliographie*), V (1862), p. 143, n.1. There is no doubt that Zunz was referring to our *Maḥzor* since, as much as twenty years earlier, he had mentioned Simḥah b. Judah among the copyists of Germany and France (L. Zunz, *Zur Geschichte und Literatur*, Berlin 1815, p. 208) on the basis of the listing of the biblical part of the Worms Synagogue *Maḥzor* in Kennicott's list of biblical

manuscripts; see B. Kennicott, *Dissertatio Generalis in Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum cum Variis Lectionibus ex Codicibus Manuscriptis et Impressis*, the appendix to his book *Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum cum Variis Lectionibus*, II, Oxford 1780, p. 99, No. 378). The listing, containing the name of the copyist and the date of the copying from the colophon, is also included in Kennicott's list as cited (with additions) by de Rossi: G.B. de Rossi, *Variae Lectiones Veteris Testamenti ex Immensa MSS*, I, Parma 1784, pp. lxxvii–lxxviii.

In Kennicott's list and in Zunz's book mentioned above, the origin of the scribe's father is not mentioned. In his list of German copyists, Freimann repeated Zunz's list in *HB*; see A. Freimann, "Deutsche Abschreiber und Punktatoren des Mittelalters", *ZfHB* (= *Zeitschrift für Hebräische Bibliographie*), XVIII (1915), p. 119, No. 1270. Even Róth had already concluded in his first article, p. 223 (p. 224 in his second article), that the name Judah of Nuremberg refers to the scribe's father.

10 It is not possible to know whether or not another scribe participated in copying those sections of the *Maḥzor* which were lost (see below about the missing sections). A scribe named Shemaiah copied, in cursive script, most of the quires of the London manuscript of the Vitry *Maḥzor*, British Library, Add. 27200–27201 (A. Margoliouth, *Catalogue of the Hebrew and Samaritan Manuscripts in the British Museum*, II, London 1905, No. 655) which was apparently copied in 1241/2, but in any case not after 1256. This Shemaiah who copied the Vitry *Maḥzor* was probably French.

11 A vocalizer named "Shemaiah" pointed the MS Parma, Palatine Library 3197 (I.B. de Rossi, *MSS Codices Hebraici Biblioth. I.B. de Rossi*, Parma 1803, No. 597), which contains the sections and the *haftarot* read on the Festivals and the special Sabbaths (see above, n. 6), and wrote an undated colophon at its end. The copyist's name was "Barukh", according to the decoration of this word each time it appeared in the text. The Parma manuscript was written in Ashkenazi script at approximately the same period as the Worms *Maḥzor*. There is a similarity between the square script of the vocalizer's supplements in the copied Parma manuscript text and the square script of the vocalizer's supplements in the biblical text of the Worms *Maḥzor*, but there are evident differences between the vocalization practices of the Parma manuscript and those of biblical texts in the Worms *Maḥzor*.

glosses, which were written by the scribe Simḥah himself (see below), though the form of the letters differ slightly from that of the glosses themselves; but the cursive script in which the vocalizer's glosses are written (see below) is patently different from the script of the names. The writing of these names had to have been done after the figure holding the tablet had been drawn. Since logic dictates that the *Mahzor* was vocalized after its writing had been completed and before it had been embellished and illustrated, it is a reasonable assumption that the third name points to that of the artist, who may even have inserted the names himself into his drawing — in which case the name of the *Mahzor*'s artist was Shemaiah the Frenchman.¹²

It should be noted that Simḥah b. Judah of Nuremberg, scribe of the Worms *Mahzor*, also copied MS Oxford, Bodleian Library Loud. Or. 324.¹³ This manuscript contains the Pentateuch and the Targum Onkelos verse for verse. There, at the end of the Book of Genesis,¹⁴ the scribe wrote a closing formulation in which he included his name: "Be strong, let us be strong, Simḥah the Scribe will not be damaged. Amen. Sela."¹⁵ A comparison of this manuscript and the Worms *Mahzor*, especially in the biblical sections, leads to the conclusion that the scribe Simḥah who copied the Oxford manuscript is Simḥah b. Judah, the scribe of the Worms *Mahzor*. The copy of the Oxford Pentateuch is more orderly and calligraphic than the *Mahzor*, and its dimensions and those of its letters are larger, but the scripts in the two manuscripts are similar. Furthermore, the graphic devices and scribal practices in both are identical, as well as the form of the Tetragrammaton substitution in the body of the *Mahzor* and in the Targum in the Oxford manuscript.¹⁶ There is also a similarity between the penned decorations round the letters of the initial words of the Pentateuchal books and, as well, between that of the last word of the Oxford manuscript Pentateuch and the various initial words in the *Mahzor*.¹⁷ Finally, the number of lines (and columns) in the Oxford manuscript and in the biblical portion of the *Mahzor* is identical. It is quite clear, however, that the Penta-

teuch of the Oxford manuscript was not vocalized by the vocalizer of the *Mahzor*.¹⁸

The second piece of information emerging from the colophon is the name of the person for whom the *Mahzor* was written — Barukh b. Isaac, the scribe's uncle. Indeed, at the start of the *Mahzor* (fol. 1v) we have, in red ink within the large initial *aleph* of the initial word *el* (in the traditional shortened *aleph-lamed* combination form), which begins the *piyyuṭ* אל מתנשא for *Shabbat Sheqalim*: "mine, Barukh b. R. Isaac ז"ל".¹⁹ Simḥah b. Judah the Scribe also explains the reason for copying the *Mahzor* for his uncle Barukh b. Isaac: "May the Lord privilege him to use it to thank, to praise, to chant, to laud the Creator of his soul"; apparently, Barukh b. Isaac ordered the copy of this magnificent and large-sized *Mahzor* in order to pray from it, and, if so — he was a *hazzan*. However, the continuation of the statement attests to the owner's main purpose in having it copied:

להניחו לשם מצוה בעבור יחידתו, כאשר עלה ברעתו

The sense of this formulation seems clear. Barukh b. Isaac commissioned the copying of the magnificent *Mahzor* in order to leave it, after his death, as a bequest — which is the meaning of the term לרבותי as used by the Sages in many places in the Mishnah, the Tosefta, the halakhic Midrashim, and the Talmud²⁰ — as an act of piety, for his soul, a meaning of the word חידדה already found in this sense in Bible, Midrash and Liturgical Poetry.²¹ Consider the fact that while Simḥah the Scribe concludes the colophon with a petition that the Holy One, blessed be He, grant that he live to "see children and grandchildren studying the Torah", he refrains from mentioning the children of the one who commissioned the manuscript. The fact is that nearly all of the mediaeval Hebrew manuscripts written by scribes for other people contain a blessing for the owners, in one formulation or another, that "he, his seed, and his seed's seed", or "he, his children and children's children" be privileged to peruse the

- 12 In Róth's first article, p. 223, he read the name as "Schemajah hazajjar" and therefore did not hesitate to conclude that it was the name of the *Mahzor*'s artist. In his second article, p. 232, n. 46, he re-examined his reading from a slide, in light of my reading שמעיה הצרפתי in *Manuscrits médiévaux*, and he still stands by his reading שמעיה הצרפתי.
- 13 A. Neubauer, *Catalogue of the Hebrew Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library and in the College Libraries of Oxford*, I, Oxford 1886, No. 25.
- 14 Fol. 68v.
- 15 In the Catalogue itself, Neubauer erroneously noted that the copyist's name is "Baruch", but corrected the error in the corrigenda at its end. See below, n. 18.
- 16 In the Oxford manuscript one also finds a slightly different form of the Tetragrammaton, concentrated in several places in the MS.
- 17 A fact which helps prove that these quill decorations are the work of the copyist.
- 18 This is clear even without a comparison of the vocalization systems of the biblical part of the Worms *Mahzor* and that of the Oxford manuscript. In the Oxford manuscript, the vocalizer added the *Masorah Parva* and a selection of the *Masorah Magna* in a square script completely different from that of the *Mahzor*'s vocalizer (see below, Section D). The vocalizer's name seems to be "Barukh" since this word, which occurs in the text of the *Masorah* on fol. 16v, was ornamented. This is probably the reason for Neubauer's error in the Catalogue. The *Masorah Magna* was written in "Barukh's" hand only on fols. 1v–17v; on fol. 17r it was written in another hand. On fols. 87v–90r the *Masorah Magna* was written by a third hand.
- 19 In the colophon, the copyist did not indicate the name of the owner's father in the blessing for the dead, nor did he even add the customary formulae of blessing to the names of the living. The indication of ownership is formulated in the first person (apparently the letter *yod* had

been written under the word *shet*, as Prof. Bezalel Narkiss noticed), and it is possible that the notation was inserted in the spaces of the opening-word by the owner himself and not by the copyist. It seems that the hue of the red ink is somewhat different from that of the red ink used by the copyist. The name of the owner is inserted in the initial word at the start of the *siddur* in MS Oxford, Bodleian Library Opp. 643 (Neubauer Catalogue, No. 1109 — is not mentioned in the catalogue), fol. 3v. The name is written in gold, within the spaces of the word "Barukh", but part of it has been erased or has sprung off. Traces of it can still be read: ".... daughter of R.... may he enjoy a life of good days". The *siddur* was written in Ashkenaz about the year 1318/9.

- 20 This meaning is already implicit in the Bible: "So, too, I loathed all the wealth that I was gaining under the sun. For I shall leave it to the man who will succeed me" (Eccles. ii:18). And see E. Ben-Yehuda, *Thesaurus of Ancient and Modern Hebrew*, s.v. יָרַח, p. 2065; C.Y. Kasovsky, *Thesaurus Mishnae*, III, Jerusalem 1959, pp. 1185–1186, and this entry in his other concordances. Compare, for example, "Even if his father lay dying and left to him ten thousand" (*Mishnah Arukhin* iv:3); and many other examples in the Talmud.
- 21 See entry יָרַח in the Ben-Yehuda *Thesaurus*, p. 2018. The Bible already has the specific parallelism between *yehidah* and *nefesh*, as for example: "Save my life (*nafshi*) from the sword, my precious life (*yehidati*) from the clutches of a dog" (Ps. xxii:21). And in *Bereshit Rabba* xiv:9 the interpretation is explicit: "It has five names: *nefesh*, *neshamah*, *hayyah*, *ruah*, *yehidah*... *yehidah* (unique) because all the limbs are duplicated, whereas this is unique in the body" (Theodor & Albeck, 2nd ed., Jerusalem 1965, pp. 132–133. See the parallels there and subsequent versions in R. Saadia Gaon and the *piyyuṭ*). Róth's hypothesis, p. 219, in translating this passage of the colophon as "es dann seinem Einzigen (Sohn) zu hinterlassen" — as if referring to the owner's only son — is untenable.

volume “till the end of all generations”²² Hence we conclude that Barukh b. Isaac was childless and had the magnificent *Mahzor* copied for him as an act of piety in order to bequeath it to his community for congregational use as a memorial after his death. However, it seems that from the very outset he initiated the copying of the *Mahzor* so that it might serve the community and the *hazzan* of the synagogue in his lifetime, on special Sabbaths, Festivals and the High Holy Days as is attested by the Yiddish rhyme which Simḥah the Scribe himself wrote in the spaces within the letters of the initial word ברענט on fol. 54r, whose content is a blessing for the one who carries the *Mahzor* (which was kept at the home of the owner Barukh b. Isaac) to the synagogue.²³

In the colophon, Simḥah the Scribe specifies the exact date that his copy was completed — the 28th of Tevet, in the 32nd year of the era,²⁴ which is January 2, 1272.²⁵ This date raises some difficulty since, in the year 5032, the 28th of Tevet fell on a Sabbath.²⁶ It is possible, of course, that the scribe completed his work on Saturday night, but specified the Sabbath date, not that of the next day, or perhaps the copyist erred as he did when, in writing the date, he omitted the word ורשתי (“2nd”) and added it in the margin — as have not a few copyists who specified the day of the month and the day of the week with the discrepancy of a day between them.²⁷

The scribe offers us further information, very rare in Hebrew colophons — the length of time the copying took: “I wrote this *mahzor*... in forty-four weeks”, that is, 308 days, or more than ten months. Therefore, Simḥah the Scribe began copying the *Mahzor* in the middle of the month of Adar, 5031 (the end of February, 1271) and completed it on the 28th of Tevet, 5032 (January 2, 1272).

The colophon provides important information about the scope of the *Mahzor*. Simḥah b. Judah expressly states: “I edited and arranged from beginning to end every prayer said by the *hazzan*.” He stresses the fact that he copied a complete *mahzor*, yet the volume before us has only the liturgy and *piyyuṭim* for special Sabbaths, Passover, Shavu’ot and the Ninth of Av. Did the *mahzor* which Simḥah copied originally contain the High Holy Days and Sukkot liturgies, though these are missing in our volume? Or did Simḥah only intend to tell us that he copied the entire rites of prayer for Parashat Sheqalim through the Ninth of Av?²⁸ We can take the words of the colophon at their face value, for there is internal evidence that the *Mahzor* originally included the liturgies and *piyyuṭim* of the entire year.

The solution of this question is to be found in the biblical part of the *Mahzor*. When the *Mahzor* was acquired by the National and

University Library in Jerusalem, the leaves of the biblical part (fols. 185r–216v) were at the beginning of the volume, and this was their place until recently. The restoration of the manuscript and its quires was completed before it was photographed for this facsimile edition. As a result of my codicological research, it was decided to arrange and bind the quires of the biblical unit at the end of the *Mahzor*, after the liturgy of the Ninth of Av, and to foliate the leaves of the manuscript anew. In this facsimile of the *Mahzor* there are two sets of numbers in the extreme upper corner of the first page of each leaf: the new numbering and underneath, in parentheses, the old (upon which are based all the references in the literature dealing with the Worms *Mahzor* till now). We have appended at the end of the Hebrew version of this article a parallel table of the old and new foliations.

The biblical part has a different layout of the text. The books of Ecclesiastes, Job and Jeremiah are written in three columns of 32 lines each whereas the body of the *Mahzor* is written in a single column of 27 (or 26) lines. The fact that the scribe’s colophon is written at the end of this unit proves beyond all doubt that this part concluded the original *mahzor*.

The biblical part includes biblical portions customarily recited on the Ninth of Av (Job, Jer. i:1–xxxiii:6, Isa. xxxiv:1–xxxv:10) whose connection to the content and scope of the *Mahzor* is today self-evident. Yet, surprisingly, the first book copied is Ecclesiastes, which is read on Sukkot — a holiday whose liturgy is not in the *Mahzor* before us! Now, the beginning of the Book of Ecclesiastes is missing from the *Mahzor*. The reconstruction of the quires indicates that the first leaf of the quire is missing before fol. 185. The missing 9½ verses at the beginning of Ecclesiastes occupied but a small part of one column; therefore logic dictates that the missing page must have held the end of another biblical book, probably one of the other four Scrolls — the Song of Songs (for Passover), Ruth (for Shavu’ot), Lamentations (for the Ninth of Av), or Esther (for Purim).

There is no doubt that Simḥah the Scribe would not have copied the Book of Ecclesiastes had not the *mahzor* from which he copied also contained the Sukkot liturgy. Therefore, the Book of Ecclesiastes is witness that the original *mahzor* did indeed encompass the liturgy of the entire year. It opens with *Shabbat Parashat Sheqalim*, as does our volume, and is attested to by the inscription “belonging to me, Barukh b. Isaac, of blessed memory” which was inserted in its initial-word (fol. 1v). The original continued in the same order as does our Codex until the end of the Ninth of Av liturgy (fol. 181r). Between folios 181 and 185 (the beginning of the biblical part) there were whole quires which contained the liturgies of Rosh ha-Shanah and the Day of

22 See the hundreds of colophons in *Manuscripts médiévaux* (above, n. 1), I–III. If it is hard to imagine that a magnificent, large *mahzor* should be copied for someone’s private use, see *ibid.*, I, No. 31 — the colophon of the “Nuremberg *Mahzor*”, also of the Ashkenazi rite, MS 24100 in The Schocken Institute for Jewish Research. This magnificently ornamented *Mahzor*, which is larger than the Worms *Mahzor* both in size and number of pages, was written in 1331 for Joshua b. Isaac, and the copyist concluded the colophon with a blessing for the owner “that he and his sons and his sons’ sons be privileged to pore over it in prayer till the end of all generations, Amen, Amen, Amen, Selah.”

23 See Ch. Shmeruk’s discussion of this rhyme, elsewhere in this volume. It was undoubtedly written by the *Mahzor*’s copyist in red ink, and probably vocalized in brown ink by the *Mahzor*’s vocalizer. The letters *gimel* and *tav* were marked with the *lene* (*rafeh*) sign just as the vocalizer of the *Mahzor* did.

24 I.e., with the omission of the thousands, and obviously the *he* (=5, signifying five thousands) was omitted, so that the date is 5032.

25 See E. Mahler, *Handbuch der jüdischen Chronologie*, Leipzig 1916, p. 566.

26 *Ibid.*

27 See, for example, *Manuscripts médiévaux*, II, Jerusalem-Paris 1980, No. 13, n. 4; No. 28, n. 3; No. 90, n. 6.

28 One may assume that had Simḥah copied only part of the annual *mahzor*, he would have specifically indicated it in the colophon, as we find in the colophons of partial *mahzorim* of the Ashkenazi rite. See, for example, the colophon of MS Oxford, Bodleian Library Bodl. 113, the last four folios of which were completed in 1406 and which contains the order of service for the High Holy Days and Sukkot: “I have completed half the *mahzor*” (Neubauer Catalogue, No. 1044). In the colophon of MS Oxford Mich. 420, which contains a *mahzor* for Sukkot and was written in 1427: “I have completed this *mahzor* of Sukkot” (Neubauer Catalogue, No. 1054). In the Passover *mahzor* of 1430, MS Oxford Opp. 163–4: “I have written this order of Passover” (Neubauer Catalogue, Nos. 1052–1053).

Atonement, Sukkot and *Shabbat Hanukkah*, in the customary order of the mediaeval Ashkenazi *mahzorim*,²⁹ followed by the four Scrolls (or perhaps only three, without the Scroll of Esther) and the beginning of Ecclesiastes. This section of the original *Mahzor* was lost and only the continuation of the Book of Ecclesiastes, Job, chapters of Jeremiah and Isaiah, and the colophon remained.

Most probably these portions were lost when the original volume was separated into two parts for ease of use, as were other mediaeval *mahzorim*.³⁰ It seems that the *Mahzor* had already been split up and its sections separated at an early period, perhaps in the fourteenth century, at which time the biblical portion, including the missing Scrolls, were bound at the front of the *Mahzor*. This conclusion can be drawn from the table of contents written on fol. 184v, the blank page at the end of the Ninth of Av liturgy. This was the last page of the *Mahzor* as it reached us and upon which are found most of the glosses of the *hazzanim*. Under an ultra-violet lamp, on the upper part of the page one can read a short supplement to the Ninth of Av liturgy in a semi-square script of about the fourteenth century and, at its end, written in a more cursive script but seemingly from the same hand: "Finished Lamentations, Job, Jeremiah and קרבו³¹ at the beginning of the *mahzor* with the Scrolls for the Festivals; I will begin with *kerovez* of the High Holy Days." From this notation we can conclude that by the fourteenth century the *Mahzor* no longer contained the liturgy and *piyyuṭim* for the month of Tishri, and that the biblical section was already bound at the front of the volume. In addition to Job and chapters of Jeremiah and Isaiah, it perhaps contained the Scrolls of the Festivals, i.e. Ecclesiastes (preserved in the manuscript), the Song of Songs, and Ruth. Whether the biblical part contained only the Scrolls of the Festivals or all five of them, it is reasonable to assume that the order followed the liturgical sequence of the *Mahzor*: Esther (to be read on Purim), the Song of Songs (on Passover), Ruth (on Shavu'ot), Lamentations (on the Ninth of Av), and, finally, Ecclesiastes (for Sukkot), which has remained in this part of the *Mahzor*. The chapters of special readings for the Ninth of Av (Job, Jeremiah and Isaiah) followed the Scrolls as is the order in manuscripts which contain only the corpus of synagogue readings.

This discussion of the scope and arrangement of the Worms *Mahzor* will conclude with a description of the late supplements which were written on separate leaves or sheets and, until

recently, interspersed within the *Mahzor* itself. After restoration and reconstruction, these additions have been separated from the original manuscript and set at the end (fols. 218–224). All of these supplements were written on parchment.

On fol. 218, which was bound at the beginning of the *Mahzor* in front of the biblical part, the Morning Benedictions were copied on the verso page (the recto page is blank) in a script like that of the *Mahzor*, in larger letters and different format. The page has 22 lines compared to 27 in the *Mahzor* proper and the vocalization of this early supplement is different from the vocalization system in the *Mahzor* proper. Originally this supplement consisted of more than one folio but the rest is missing.

Fols. 219–220 (formerly fols. 147–148) are two leaves of a single sheet which were inserted between fols. 108 and 109 in an opening of the middle of a quire. Their insertion there was out of place. As Goldschmidt³² has pointed out, these leaves were apparently written to replace fols. 89–90. Fol. 219 begins exactly as does fol. 89, but instead of the *yozer* for the last day of Passover, אתה הארת יומם ולילה, the *yozer* אוֹר יִשְׂרָאֵל was copied there and in the subsequent supplement. Indeed, a fifteenth or sixteenth century hand had penned in the margin of the הארת אתה *yozer* on fol. 89v: "This is not said in Worms", and in the margin of the *yozer* אוֹר יִשְׂרָאֵל in the supplement on fol. 219r, an early hand wrote: "In no instance is the *hazzan* to be kept from reciting this *yozer* unless it falls on the Sabbath..." Though this supplement was written in an early script of the type used by Simḥah the Scribe, it was undoubtedly penned by someone else, as can easily be seen by the different form of the Tetragrammaton. The number of lines on the pages of this supplement is the same as that in the body of the *Mahzor*, showing the attempt to match the substitution to the original *Mahzor*. The vocalization, however, differs from the system used in the *Mahzor* proper.

Fols. 221–224 (formerly fols. 35–38) are two sheets which were written later in a script characteristic of about the year 1400. They contain (fols. 221–224) a *yozer* and *ofan* for the second day of Shavu'ot and were intended to replace fols. 130b and ff. in the *Mahzor* proper.³³ These leaves were inserted between the end of the biblical part and the beginning of the *Mahzor* before its reconstructed order. Previously they had been inserted elsewhere, also out of place, as is indicated by a later note in cursive script above the illustrated initial word of the *yozer* אֵילַת אֲדוּמִים on fol. 130v, which the text of these pages was intended to replace: "This is not recited but instead one recites אדיר תאה as well as the *ofan*

29 See, for example, the Ashkenazi rite *Mahzor* MS Revigo, Biblioteca dell'Accademia dei Concordi Silvestriana 216, which was written in the same year in which the Worms *Mahzor* was completed (according to the copyist's colophon it was apparently written in 1242, but according to the vocalizer's colophon and the day of the week indicated, it should be 1272). This *Mahzor* begins with *Shabbat Parashat Sheqalim* and concludes with Sukkot and *Shabbat Hanukkah* (IMHM, f. 7; Hebrew Palaeography Project of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities E 86). The same order occurs in the Ashkenazi rite *Mahzor* MS Karlsruhe, Badische Landesbibliothek, Codex Reuchlin 309, which was written in 1292 (IMHM, f. 2175–2177; Hebrew Palaeography Project G 80). The same with the Ashkenazi *Mahzor* MS New York, Jewish Theological Seminary of America Mic. 4843, which was written near the time of the Worms *Mahzor*, in 1279, which begins with *Parashat Sheqalim* and concludes with Sukkot (IMHM, f. 25744; Hebrew Palaeography Project D 67). The order of the only Ashkenazi *mahzor* dated earlier than the Worms *Mahzor*, MS Oxford Mich. 617 (Neubauer Catalogue, No. 1033) and Mich. 627 (Neubauer Catalogue, No. 1035; the Catalogue erroneously indicates that No. 1034 is the continuation of No. 1033), which was copied in 1257/8, is *Shabbat Hanukkah* (deficient at the beginning), the special Sabbaths–Sukkot (according to the structure of the quires it

seems that this *mahzor* was initially written in two volumes: Volume One with *Hanukkah*–Shavu'ot and Volume Two containing Rosh ha-Shanah–Sukkot). In all of these early *mahzorim* the scribe's colophon is written at the end of the year's order of prayer, after Sukkot or *Hanukkah*. An investigation of the descriptions of the Ashkenazi *mahzorim* in the Neubauer Catalogue shows that this is the order of all the complete *mahzorim*, of those that begin with *Parashat Sheqalim* and those that begin with *Hanukkah* (Nos. 1023, 1025–1027, 1029–1032).

30 Thus the Leipzig *Mahzor* was split into two parts, including the Canticles, Ruth and Ecclesiastes Scrolls which were originally a continuum, but were artificially split into two parts as they were connected. Today, Part I has Canticles, Ruth (the end of which, today, is in Part II) and the end of Ecclesiastes; most of Ecclesiastes is in Part II. See the contents of the parts of the *Mahzor* by E. Katz, in the volume of commentaries to the partial facsimile edition, *Mahzor Lipsiae*, Leipzig 1964, pp. v, xiii; also *ibid.*, p. 71, and B. Narkiss' introduction, p. 87.

31 Thus begins the section of the Book of Isaiah which was copied in the *Mahzor*.

32 P. 394

33 As indicated by Goldschmidt, p. 390.

אורח; כבודו אורח; תורח back 26 leaves to find אדיר תואה". In any case, it is clear that this supplement was incorporated in the *Mahzor* before 1667 since there are notations of *hazzanim* at the bottom of its final empty page, the earliest of which was written in that year (see below).

C. WHERE WAS THE MAHZOR WRITTEN?

The detailed colophon which the copyist of the *Mahzor* wrote at the end of the volume, does not indicate where it was written. Whereas the mediaeval Hebrew copyists active in Spain, Italy and the East most often specified in the colophons the place in which they worked, their Ashkenazi brethren, especially those active in Germany, did not do so. Not a single Hebrew manuscript has survived from before 1290 whose colophon states that it was written in Germany.³⁴ Therefore, the fact that the colophon does not mention where the manuscript was written comes as no surprise.

The *Mahzor* is written in a square Ashkenazi-German script³⁵ characteristic of German manuscripts written in the second half of the thirteenth century. Their Germanic origin can be established by the rite of prayer (in liturgical manuscripts), by the origin of their scribes or their forebears, or by the style of decorations and illustrations.³⁶ Our *Mahzor's* script, therefore, attests to the fact that it was written in Germany. This is further proven by the order of the prayers and *piyyuṭim*, which belongs to a branch of the West German rite,³⁷ and also by the rhyme in early Yiddish written in the spaces of the initial word ברענו.³⁸ As mentioned above, the name of the scribe's father was "Judah the Scribe of Nuremberg", i.e. that his origin was the city of Nuremberg in the Franconia region of Bavaria, where many Jews lived in the thirteenth century.

Reason dictates that one does not point out one's place of origin, or that of one's father, unless he himself resides elsewhere, either

permanently or temporarily. Indeed, in almost all of the mediaeval colophons which state where they were written as well as the origin of the copyists, the owners, or their fathers' origins, there is no identity between the two places. It is therefore a near certainty that the *Mahzor* was not written in Nuremberg.

Was "the Worms *Mahzor*" written in that city in the central Rhine region which held one of the oldest and most important Jewish communities, a centre of Torah and learning? Did it originate in that vibrant spiritual centre wherein flourished such great scholars as Rashi, Meir b. Barukh of Rothenberg (MaHa-RaM), and R. Eliezer b. Judah, author of *Sefer ha-Roke'ah* and one of the founders of the German Hasidic movement? The prevailing opinion is that this *Mahzor*, preserved for hundreds of years in the Worms community and used by the *hazzanim* of the Great Synagogue, was actually written in Worms. Goldschmidt, who recorded all of its *piyyuṭim*, took it for granted that the manuscript was produced in Worms. Otherwise he would not have written: "The *Mahzor*, which was meant for use by the *hazzan* of the community's Great Synagogue, gives us the rite of this famous community at the time that the volume was written".³⁹ Zunz also assumed that the *Mahzor* was written in Worms.⁴⁰ Yet, we do not know that the *Mahzor* was always housed in the synagogue of the Worms community. The earliest specific testimony placing the *Mahzor* in the Worms synagogue is tucked away in a notation by one of the many *hazzanim* who officiated in this synagogue and left their mark in the many comments and notations on the *Mahzor's* margins and blank pages. Though most of these jottings are in the first volume of the *Mahzor*, the oldest turns out to be in the second. In the margin of fol. 16r of the second volume we read: "I inquired of my father and teacher, the *Hasid*, Rabbi Wolf *Hazzan*, may the memory of the righteous be a blessing, of the holy community of Prague..." This gloss concludes, "Isaiah, *Hazzan* of the holy community of Worms, the Lord is my Rock and my Redeemer, 326 of the abbreviated era",⁴¹ i.e. 1565 or 1566.⁴² The earliest dated notation

34 The earliest German manuscript indicating where it was written is MS Amsterdam, University Library Ros. 609, a *mahzor* for the High Holy Days and Sukkot according to the Western Ashkenazic rite, written in 1290 in Esslingen, North-Württemberg. There is an earlier manuscript in which mention is made that it was written in Ashkenaz but the place of its writing is not indicated; it is the MS Wrocław, University Library M 1106, written in 1237/8 "in the land of Ashkenaz translated as ארצות" (cf. Targum Jer. li:27). The vocalizer-masorete of this manuscript, in that same year, vocalized and inserted the *Masorah* of MS Milano, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, B 30 inf., which was written in 1236 for an owner who came from Ulm. The French manuscripts have many more indications of where they were written. The earliest of them is MS Vatican Ebr. 31, which was written in La Rochelle (western France) in 1215.

35 Prayer instructions which were inserted when the *Mahzor* was being copied were written in a non-square, semi-cursive script, a bit smaller than the regular size of the text's script. See, for example, fol. 37v, line 19 (קורן קרית שמע, in red ink); fol. 79r, line 14 (in red ink, partially erased); fol. 113r, line 12 (קורין קרית שמע).

36 For example, MS Oxford Mich. 617, 627, a Western Ashkenaz rite *Mahzor* written by Judah b. Samuel known as Zalman in 1257/8, or the MS Amsterdam *Mahzor* written in Esslingen in 1290. The style of the writing clearly differs from that of the square, Ashkenazi script which we find in the manuscripts written in France. The style of writing of the Worms *Mahzor* is similar to that of the Bible manuscripts written in Ashkenaz, such as the manuscript which, till recently, was in the General Theolog-

ical Seminary Library in New York and is now in the D. Friedberg Collection in Toronto, which was written in 1264 (Hebrew Palaeographic Project, D 180); MS Paris, Bibliothèque nationale hébr. 1-3, of 1286 (*Manuscrits médiévaux*, I, 12); MS London, the British Library Add. 9402, of 1286; MS East Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, MS 11am. 80, of 1290.

37 See Goldschmidt; and below, the article of F. Fleischer.

38 See below, the article of Ch. Schmeruk on the rhyme.

39 Goldschmidt, p. 389.

40 Cf. above, n. 9.

41 A similar note, which ends "signed by Isaiah, *Hazzan* of the Holy Community of Worms, the Lord is my Rock and My Redeemer", is written on fol. 47r, *ibid.*

42 Therefore there is no longer any basis for Epstein's theory that the inscription on fol. 17v in the Register of the *Hekdesh* which was in the possession of the Worms Community (and which was lost or went up in smoke in the synagogue fire on *Kristallnacht*; see Cohen, below, p. 120), about the acquisition of a large *mahzor* for the entire year in Eful, 1578, refers to our *Mahzor* and attests to the beginning of its use in Worms. See A. Epstein, "Die Wormser Minhagbücher", in *Gedenkbuch zur Erinnerung an David Kaufmann*, Breslau 1900, p. 291. The first to note this source was D.J. Cohen, "Das Archiv der Gemeinde Worms", *Bulletin fuer die Mitglieder der Gesellschaft der Freunde des Leo Baeck Instituts (Leo Baeck Institute Bulletin)*, I (1957), p. 118. (In the footnotes to Epstein's article, p. 299 is printed in error instead of p. 291.) Epstein, *ibid.*, even theorizes that the words of Josfa Shammash in the manuscript of the abbreviated version of the customs of the Worms Community (a

entered by a *hazzan* in Volume I is on fol. 185v: "Kalonymos... the Levite, may he enjoy a long life, Amen... *Hazzan* in the holy community of Worms... in 335 of the abbreviated era." i.e. in 1574 or 1575. Therefore, we have no explicit evidence that the *Mahzor* served the Worms community before the sixteenth century,⁴³ and we certainly have no proof whatever that Simḥah the Scribe wrote the entire *Mahzor* in Worms.

Not only are we unable to prove that the Worms *Mahzor* was written in Worms, but it may well be that the *Mahzor* itself hints at the fact. At various places in the *Mahzor* there are evidences of changes in the order of prayer: supplements were added at various times and, in particular, omissions were noted. Even had the *Mahzor* been written in Worms, such changes in the rite of a community could have taken place in the course of generations as its users adapted it to the changing rite. But it would seem that the insertion of fols. 219–220 to replace fols. 89–90, as described above, is evidence that the *Mahzor* was not written in Worms or that, in any case, it was not the specific Worms rite that was copied in it.⁴⁴ Leaves 219–220 were specially written to replace the last day of Passover's *yozer* וְלֵילָה יוֹמֵם הָאֵרֶת יוֹמֵם וְיִרְשָׁע אֲדוֹר יִשְׂרָאֵל. The script, as already indicated, is early, of the same type as that of the *Mahzor* proper and, to all indications, of a period very close to that of the *Mahzor*'s completion. To be sure, the note "this is not recited in Worms" in the margin of the *אתה הארת הַאֵרֶת* *yozer* on fol. 89v was done by a later hand, about the end of the fifteenth century, yet it is clear that the substitute *yozer* was copied at a much earlier period, at the latest one generation after the *Mahzor* was written; its insertion attests that close to the time of their writing the *piyyuṭim* of the *Mahzor* did not reflect the local rite of the Worms congregation. Therefore, it is logical to conclude that the *Mahzor* was not actually written in Worms but was already in use there at a very early period, certainly close to the time it was written. Be that as it may be the marginal note on fol. 89v mentioned above is evidence that the *Mahzor* was in use in Worms at the end of the fifteenth century at the latest.⁴⁵ The other comments which expressly indicate a different Worms rite are of a later time, such as that in the margin of the text of Jeremiah in the third column of fol. 209v: "In Worms one starts here on the Ninth of Av after the *qinot*..."

It is very reasonable to assume that the early emendation in the margin of line 4 of fol. 80r, referring to the words בְּרִיחֵם הָרִגָּת וְכָל sheds light on the early location of the *Mahzor* or even upon on

where it was written. This marginal notation reads: "This is said aloud on that day, such is the rite of Würzburg, וְכָל בְּכוֹרֵיהֶם." Würzburg, in northwest Bavaria, is situated, as the city from which the scribe's father came (Nuremberg), in the region of Franconia. This, then, is the earliest geographic note found in the margins and attests to the *Mahzor*'s whereabouts at the beginning of its adventures.

Furthermore, this marginal note is written in cursive script, in a style identical to that of the cursive glosses which can be proven to have been written by the copyist of the *Mahzor* himself and which differs so clearly from the script style of the many other marginal notations on the pages of the *Mahzor*.⁴⁶ If Simḥah the Scribe did in fact write this note, is this enough to attest that the *Mahzor* was written in Würzburg? What comes to mind is the fact that the earliest illustrated Hebrew manuscript from Ashkenazi areas — the first and foremost of the German manuscripts in which all sorts of stratagems were employed to avoid portraying the human visage, and amongst which the Worms *Mahzor* is one — was written in 1232/3 by Solomon b. Samuel "from the State of Würzburg".⁴⁷ Note that the cities Würzburg, Nuremberg and Worms are not far from one another. Nuremberg is about 90 kilometers southeast of Würzburg and Worms is about 120 kilometers west of Würzburg. There certainly are grounds for assuming that Simḥah b. Judah of Nuremberg wrote the *Mahzor* in Würzburg or its environs and that, close to that time, the *Mahzor* was used in Würzburg. Perhaps, after the destruction of the Würzburg community in 1298 during the Rindfleisch persecution, it reached Worms and it was then that the substitute fols. 219–220 were inserted. At any rate, it is almost a certainty that the *Mahzor* was written in the Nuremberg-Würzburg-Worms region.

D. EDITORIAL STAGES

Careful examination of the *Mahzor*'s folios reveals many changes in the copied text and many hands that amended or made marginal notations. The variety of notes reveals the long history of the *Mahzor* and its use. Scrupulous investigation uncovers many types of corrections and notations: corrections by the scribe himself and by the vocalizer; changes of letters in the text and even of words; early glosses suggesting a different formulation or another version; early liturgical notes, a few explanatory com-

microfilm of the original manuscript: IMIIM, f. 31234), which he composed between 1618 (the date of the composition of the full version) and 1676 (see *ibid.* p. 308). "before the start of *Kol Nidrei* (the *mahzor* called *Roke'ah* is sold", refer to our *Mahzor* (i.e. to Volume II of the *Mahzor*) which was later, in error, attributed to the author of *Sefer ha-Roke'ah*. Note was already taken by Blogg of the practice of the Worms Community to use, on the Day of Atonement, a *mahzor* whose writing was attributed to the author of *ha-Roke'ah* (S. E. Blogg, *Aedificum Solomonis*, Hannover 1831, p. 135). In the chronicle which Eleazar of Worms, author of *Sefer ha-Roke'ah* composed (and which was printed there), about the attack upon himself, the members of his household, his students and his teacher, in which his wife and his two daughters were killed in 1196, he notes that "before her death she had purchased parchments for writing books."

43 It may be possible to conjecture that both parts of the *Mahzor* were already in use in the Worms Community prior to 1457. That year, the scribe Simon b. Moses Eikenwelden copied and vocalized the order of prayer for weekdays and Sabbath for the Worms Community, and Epstein (above, n. 42, p. 290) still had this manuscript before him. One of

the two colophons of this *mahzor* was published by J. L. Levisohn, "A Few Comments about the Formula of Prayer of Our Brethren in the City of Worms" [Heb.], *Ha-Maggid*, II, No. 42 (1858), p. 167 (Levisohn was the first to publish the colophon of our *Mahzor*: *ibid.*, III, No. 12, 1859, p. 48); the other was published by S. Salfeld, *Das Martyrologium des Nuernberger Memorbuches (Quellen zur Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland, III)*, Berlin 1891, p. 306, n. 2. Perhaps this attests to the fact that the Worms Community did have a *mahzor* for the entire year and therefore it ordered a copy of the weekday and Sabbath order of prayers, and perhaps that *mahzor* was our *Mahzor*.

44 But see below, E. Fleischer's detailed discussion of the *Mahzor*'s rite and wording.

45 And cf. above, n. 42.

46 See below, Section D.

47 MS Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Cod. Hebr. 5 (part of the manuscript was written by another scribe) see: B. Narkiss, *Hebrew Illuminated Manuscripts*, Jerusalem 1969, p. 29; J. Gutmann, *Hebrew Manuscript Painting*, London 1979, p. 73 and Pl. 17.

ments, deletions and supplementary insertions, the rewriting of words which had faded; captions for illustrations, headings, notations, and markings from later periods. There is almost no single page left as it originally issued from the copyist. Sometimes, the modification of the text is not evident but is hidden solely in the vocalizer's pointing. The examples brought below are but a selection, yet they contain enough to represent the various layers of the *Mahzor's* editing and the traces of its use.

1. Copyist's Corrections

In the margins of the *Mahzor* there are many places where additions are noted to correct omissions in the body of the text. There is no doubt that some of these were written by Simḥah the Scribe. In the margins of the *yozer* for *Parashat ha-Hodesh* on fol. 27r the *ofan* for the Sabbath and the New Month, משרתי עומדים, is added in square script. This was undoubtedly written by the Scribe; indeed, the initial word משרתי is written in red ink (which has faded). The *Mahzor's* vocalizer, of course, vocalized this supplement. In the margin of fol. 33v, the copyist wrote the blessing for the Sabbath which coincides with the New Month⁴⁸ in red ink.⁴⁹ In the margin of the bottom line of fol. 37r the Scribe added a whole column in small square script. On fol. 91v, at the top of column 18, the word תבנת was omitted and the Scribe added it in red ink (the vocalizer pointed it). On the other hand, the supplement written in square script very similar to that of the Scribe's and inserted into the written area at the end of line 19 on fol. 69v (vertically toward the top) was probably *not* written by Simḥah because it was not pointed, which indicates that it was added after the *Mahzor* had been vocalized. In the biblical text on fol. 195r, a word which had been skipped at the beginning of line 10 of the next folio was added in the margin, written in the Scribe's hand in letters slightly smaller than those of the text. On fol. 16v the Scribe apparently added, in the margin of line 16, a word which he had omitted in the line itself (תקן) and, above it, and, between the two words where the word should have been, he put the symbols for insertion (circles).

Identifying the editing or corrections of the Scribe himself is not clear and simple, for it is bound up with the vocalizer's corrections. In various places we can distinguish marks cancelling out letters or words written in error. Clearly, these signs of correction were made before the *Mahzor's* vocalization, since these letters or words were not pointed. However, there is no way of knowing whether these deletion signs were made by the copyist after he realized his mistakes, or by the vocalizer. From many examples of cancelled letters within vocalized words and the writing of other letters above them and their vocalization (see below), it is clear that the vocalizer's practice was to cancel a letter by putting an arc or semi-circle through the letter, near its top, and to indicate the cancellation of an entire word by putting this symbol in its first and last letter. Yet here and there we find another sign for cancelling words or letters which were not pointed, in the form of quotation marks (") or an apostrophe (') above the letter. On fol. 37v we have this twice: in both instances the copyist erred, skipped a word, caught the mistake, and left the word unfinished. In line 12, he wrote ולחשכיל ללמ לשמוע ללמד and in line 13 את כל דברי תלמוד באה תורתך באהה. In both these places, above the last

letter of the erroneous words whose copying was interrupted, i.e. above the *men* in line 12 (ללמ) and above the *he* in line 13 (באה), we have the slanted "quotation marks". There is no doubt that these markings were the work of the copyist who became aware of the error and stopped writing the word — so we now know the copyist's sign for deletion, which differs from that of the vocalizer. Similarly, on fol. 76v the copyist's pen slipped and he wrote the first letter of the word after the next on line 23: וכות מ את מקדשך. This letter, too, is marked with the "quotation marks" as is the *alef* on fol. 123v, line 17. Thus one can identify the copyist's corrections in other places, such as on fol. 86v, line 13 (the letter *vav* in the word שלוחו is marked with the "quotation marks" and is vocalized accordingly as: שִׁלְחוּ); on fol. 123v, line 8, the last word (הושיאנו, with "quotation marks" above the letter *vav*) and line 10 (above the letter *yod* in the word בתורתך); and on fol. 135r, line 13 (above the letter *yod* in ממעינות). Such "quotation marks" also appear in many other places where it is clear that the scribe was aware of the copying error, as on fol. 104v, over the erroneous, uncompleted letter in line 6, at the beginning of the second hemistich of line 23, and above the letter of the acrostic at the beginning of line 24. On fol. 140v the word בפנים is doubled — at the end of line 21 and at the beginning of line 22; the word at the end of line 21 was not pointed and was cancelled by two sorts of symbols, by the arc in the first and last letters, in the vocalizer's fashion, and by the "quotation marks" over the first letter, as was the scribe's practice. On fol. 181v, לבעלי, the last word of line 25, unvocalized, was cancelled by a "quotation marks" sign above the letter *lamed* because the scribe had made a mistake and written it before the word which should have preceded it.

Sometimes the copyist's sign for cancellation is the single diagonal apostrophe, as above the letters which he wrote at the end of line 5 on fol. 18v.⁵⁰ Thus, a lengthy, unvocalized dittography (which occurred because of the similarity of the words) was cancelled on fol. 172v, lines 24–25, by an apostrophe sign above the first word (ישתרג) and above the last word on line 24, above the beginning of the first word of line 25 and above the end of the last word of this dittography on line 25 (דורג). In the last line, another dittography in this folio was similarly cancelled. In like manner, the two unpointed words דן שבטי⁵¹ at the end of the first line on fol. 174r were cancelled: an apostrophe was placed above the first letter of the first word and the last letter of the second word. In the margin of this line the correction סנהדרין was written in small cursive script and, as we shall see later, this gloss was actually written in the scribe's own cursive script, a fact which strengthens the identification of the cancellation symbol with the scribe himself. The last unvocalized word on line 14, fol. 179v, which was doubled in error at the beginning of the next line, was cancelled by an apostrophe sign above the last letter.⁵²

We have isolated, then, the scribe's editing signs for deleting letters, words, or word sequences. Clearly, the diagonal "quotation marks" or apostrophe above letters are exclusively the scribe's symbols, but it is by no means clear that the scribe did not also use the cancelling arc or semicircle within the letter, in the manner of the vocalizer. At least once we can discern the use of this sign, almost undoubtedly, by the copyist. On fol. 130v, in the second hemistich of the sixth line from the bottom, the letter *samekh* was doubled in copying a word which had been split (for

48 A later hand inserted this text into the body of the text.

49 The red ink partially faded but the vocalization signs, which were written in brown ink, are recognizable.

50 The scribe probably wished to write the beginning of the next word there, as in the stratagem of the layout, but erred.

51 Dittography of the end of the previous hemistich which was copied on the same line.

52 The word before it, *asher*, was not pointed and was also cancelled, but with the cancellation signs as used by the vocalizer.

reasons of prosody): **בס סיני**. The scribe wrote the letters of **סיני** in red ink. The extra *samekh* which had not been pointed, is marked with the cancellation sign of the arc in the body of the letter, in red ink as well. It is difficult to assume that the vocalizer, who used no red ink at all in pointing the *Mahzor* and proofing it, made use of red ink in correcting this letter. Reason dictates that the copyist noticed the doubling of the letter as he was writing the rest of the word in red ink and made the cancellation sign while his quill still held the red ink. Quite possibly the use of this symbol is not an exception, and the copyist may have used it in other places. It may be that a few of the corrections which we attribute to the vocalizer (see below) should therefore be attributed to Simḥah the Scribe.

In addition to the marginal supplements and cancellation corrections of the scribe, there are two marginal notations in cursive script whose language and nature prove that they were penned by the scribe. Their discovery enables us to recognize the scribe's cursive scripts, isolate it from the other cursive scripts in the margins of the manuscript's folios, and identify additional notations and corrections of his.

On folio 175r, in the margin of line 20, the following appears in an early cursive script: "Here are missing three stanzas which I did not find in my **מעתיק**." The last word is cut off at the margin with only its first letter, *shin*, remaining — but there is no doubt that the word should be completed as **שלי** according to a similar gloss written in the identical script in the margin of the book of Ecclesiastes (see below). This notation could have been written only by the copyist who, as he was working, realized from the acrostic that three stanzas were missing in the document from which he was copying the *piyyut*, and he therefore indicated their absence in the margin, commenting "I did not find it **שלי**". The meaning of the term **מעתיק**, then, is the copy from which the scribe worked. If it were the vocalizer who realized the omission and noted that he did not find the missing stanzas, it is not plausible that he would use the term **במעתיק שלי** (my copyist) for Simḥah. Secondly, if the vocalizer had discerned the omission, he would simply have noted the absence of the stanzas and would not have had to add the obvious — that he had not found it in the *mahzor* he was vocalizing. Furthermore, as we shall see below, the vocalizer's cursive script differs entirely from the script of this correction.

Another note formulated in the same style and in the identical cursive script is to be found in the margin of the Book of Ecclesiastes, on fol. 186r, between the first and second columns: **אמרתי אני** omitted, since I did not find it in my copy". The gloss refers to Eccles. iii:17 which opens with the words **אמרתי אני בלבי את הצדיק** **ואת הרשע ישפט האי** *Mahzor* probably because of the similar beginning of the very

next verse **אמרתי אני בלבי על דברת בני האדם לברם** but was inserted out of place and copied between verses 1 and 2 of Chapter iv in the second column, lines 25–26. Circular, tailed signs connect the note with the beginning of the verse erroneously inserted in the second column. When the scribe realized that a verse in the copy before him had been omitted and later inserted in the wrong place and that he, without paying attention, had copied the error as it was in the copy before him, the scribe made the omission-insertion notation and attributed the error to the copyist from whose work he was copying our manuscript.⁵³

These two notations identify the cursive script of the *Mahzor*'s scribe, Simḥah b. Judah, and can help us to locate the other glosses and notations in his small cursive script. While it is true that the folios of the *Mahzor* contain very many glosses and several notations in cursive scripts which are very difficult to classify, the writing of the two notations discussed above is unique in its characteristics, its style and its quill, and is distinguishable in a few notations and glosses whose script is identical or very similar in form and style to that of these notations. The first of these is a lengthy liturgical notation, of which the ends of the lines were cut off, in the margin of the copy of **אמת ויצוב** on fol. 3r, which begins: "Why **אמת ויצוב** [אמת] has been shortened." Also written in a similar script is the long note, the ends of whose lines have also been truncated, in the margin of fol. 5r, which opens: **ר' אברהם חוה** and refers to the word in line 18, **תעורץ**, which has a circle over it. The first part of the note deals with the pointing/spelling of the word **תעורץ** while the second part relates to the *piyyut* **תעורץ לעולם אל נא לעולם** and its partial acrostic. On fol. 12r, in line 16, the word **עשרת** is marked with a circle above it and in the margin, written in the script we are discussing, there is a gloss on another reading: "In other books **עשרת** like **עשרה לבושים** is a note on fol. 53v in the margin of the *ge'ulah* **עדין דודי עד שתחפץ** **עדין קץ מחוה**, (חש) **עדין קץ מחוה**, (חש) above which there is a circle: "In most *mahzorim* one may read **עדין קץ מחוה** which is altogether wrong because of the acrostic." The start of the note refers to another version which is rejected, and its continuation explains the aforementioned stichs. Apparently, the correcting note **סנהדרין** in the margin of the first line of fol. 174r, replacing the dittography **יה שבטי** which was deleted by the copyist's cancellation signs (see above), is also written in the small cursive script of the scribe, as well as the completion of the word **השבת** which was inserted above line 5 on fol. 61r and marked on top with the regular cancellation signs used by Simḥah b. Judah in his copying. It may be that the notation **ואחר כך אומ' אתה יצרתה** in the margin of line 15 on fol.

53 Perhaps the word **מעתיק** is only a *plene* version of the word **מעתיק**. The most common term to indicate an exemplar in the mediaeval Hebrew colophons, except for such formulations as "the book from which I copied", is **העתק** (a copy), used extensively by the copyists in the Byzantine areas, but it is also found in the colophons of the Italian and Ashkenazi copyists. See, for example, MS London, Jews' College Library 309 (fol. 12r), which was copied in Ashkenaz in 1395, and MS Oxford Mich. 408 (fol. 23v), which was copied in Regensburg in 1506; MS Paris, Bibliothèque nationale hébr. 237 (fol. 187v), which was copied in Kastoria (Greece) in 1437 (*Manuscrits médiévaux*, I, 59); MS Vatican Ebr. 187, which was copied in Candia in 1462/3; MS Leiden, Or. 4755 (fol. 215v) which was copied in Byzantium in 1482 and MS Leiden, University Library Or. 4801 (fol. 172v), which was copied in Turkey in 1492; MS Warsaw, Jewish Historical Institute 260 (fol. 55v), copied in

Siena (Italy) in 1425/6, MS Oxford Mich. 505 (fol. 133v), copied in Italy in 1476, and MS Paris, Bibliothèque nationale hébr. 929, which was copied in Italy by a copyist of Ashkenazi origin in 1462 (*Manuscrits médiévaux*, II, 94). Besides the term **העתק**, we find the term **העתקה**, as in MS Paris hébr. 372, which was written in Rimini (Italy) about 1378; in MS Parma 3240 (fol. 174v), written in Pesaro (Italy) in 1401 ("in the **העתקה** which was before me") and in MS Oxford Opp. 292 (fol. 83v), written in Ashkenaz in 1536. Another term, which we find in the Ashkenazi colophones, is **תופש**, i.e., a copy, as in the colophon of the fourteenth century vocalizer in MS Parma 3270 and MS Hamburg, Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Cod. Hebr. 151 (fol. 156v), which was copied in 1469.

54 In an earlier period another hand added: "this is the right version" (**זה עיקר**).

32v was written by this hand.⁵⁵ Identical to the style of lettering of these notes and glosses is that of the instructive notation on fol. 80r, "This is said aloud on that day, such is the rite of Würzburg," which was discussed in the previous section. The names which were inserted in the illustration of the initial word סופרי on fol. 95r, which was dealt with above in Section B, were written in like style though the forms of their letters vary slightly. If, in fact, all these notations and glosses were the work of the scribe, then we know that in addition to copying the body of the *Mahzor*, Simḥah added a few marginal notations — some grammatical, some liturgical, some giving variants, some explanatory.

2. Vocalizer's Corrections

The *Mahzor* was vocalized by a vocalizer and not by the scribe. The first proof for this is the fact that the scribe specified in the colophon that he had written the prayers but not that he had also pointed them — a fact usually noted by scribes in the colophon.⁵⁶ Hence, the *Mahzor* was copied by Simḥah the Scribe but was given to a professional vocalizer for pointing. Secondly, the colour of the ink in which the manuscript was pointed is lighter than the ink in which the text was copied. Above all, the many instances in which the vocalization of the words contradict the spelling to the point of changing consonants prove that the vocalization was done by another hand.

The vocalizer pointed the entire manuscript, the prayers, the *piyyuṭim* and the biblical sections as well. He did not vocalize the prayer instructions written in the body of the *Mahzor* nor did he, of course, vocalize the beginnings of the words which the scribe had written at the end of the lines, for these are repeated at the beginning of the next line and were written only as an accepted device for preserving the layout and for filling in the spaces at the ends of lines (see below). Similarly, the vocalizer did not point erroneous words which the scribe had already marked with the cancellation symbol (cf. above, para. 1), or those, even a series of words, which he himself corrected. Instead of pointing them, he marked them with the cancellation signs — in the form of an arc or semi-circle — in the bodies of the first and last letters of the word or series of words, contiguous to the roof of the letter, as was the practice of the Ashkenazi vocalizers. Thus, for example, the vocalizer did not point the series of words which the copyist had doubled by mistake (dittography) on fol. 7r, line 18 (תמלוך ביצין ועד בקרוב בימינו לעולם ועד) but put the cancellation sign in the first letter, *tav*, and in the last letter, *dalet*.⁵⁷ Similarly, the superfluous doubling of the text on fol. 14v, line 15 (כי הם זרע ברך) was not

vocalized; the first letter of the first word and the last letter of the last word of this series were marked with the vocalizer's cancellation symbol. Likewise, an entire verse which was duplicated in error in the *modim* blessing on fol. 31v, lines 24–25,⁵⁸ was not pointed, nor was a verse duplicated in its entirety on fol. 72v, line 23 through the first word of line 24.⁵⁹

Throughout the *Mahzor*, consistently, individual erroneous words or letters are marked with cancellation signs and not vocalized; letters within words are cancelled and the word is vocalized accordingly. Here are a few examples: fol. 12r, line 3 (the second *yod* in the word יהיר is marked with a cancellation sign and the word is vocalized יְהִיר); fol. 40v, line 1 (הצרים), line 20 (אבל), and line 22 (כלים); fol. 53r, line 9 (the last letter of the word מחרים is marked with the vocalizer's cancellation sign and the word is vocalized: מְחַרְמִים); fol. 54v, line 25 (the last two letters of the word קוליע were cancelled and not pointed); fol. 65r, line 23 (the letter *vav* in the word לחמי was cancelled and not vocalized); fol. 104v, line 3 (the beginning of the second hemistich); fol. 151r, line 16 (the letter *het* in the word למחיה was marked with a cancellation sign and not vocalized); fol. 179v, line 14 (the next to last word was cancelled and not pointed).⁶⁰

Again it should be emphasized that the cancellation of complete unvocalized words was done quite possibly by the copyist who, as far as can be seen, used the cancellation symbols of the vocalizers at least once.⁶¹ Cancellation signs in the form of an arc or semicircle were the common correction mark of vocalizers and, understandably, others who corrected the *Mahzor* over the generations were also apt to use them; however in these cases it is obvious that cancellation signs were added after the vocalization.⁶²

The vocalizer's proofing and correcting of the text while pointing it was not limited to cancelling words or letters and vocalizing the word accordingly. One can distinguish other types of corrections by the vocalizer: cancellation of a letter or letters within a word; the writing of other letters above the cancelled ones and the pointing of the substitute letters under the erroneous ones; the cancellation of letters and words and their correction in the margins; the insertion, between the lines and in the margins, of omitted letters or words, some in a small square script with a fine quill.

Here is a selection of examples for the first type of correction. On fol. 15v, line 16, the letter *het* of the word שחיה was cancelled and a small *he* was written above it. On fol. 18a, 4th line from the bottom, the scribe had written the word ירלרי; the vocalizer pointed the first four letters, cancelled the last two with his cancellation marks, and wrote a final *mem* above the fifth letter,

55 The interpretative note which was added in the margin of fol. 160r about the word עוברי in the body of the line עוברי אילו נביאי השקר שעברו ישרי, was apparently not written by the scribe, in spite of the similarity between its style of writing and that of his cursive script.

56 For example, in the manuscript of the weekday and Sabbath order of prayers which was copied for the Worms Community in 1457, which was mentioned above, n. 43.

57 Later on these words were encircled in black ink and vocalized.

58 Because of the length of the double text which takes up two lines, the vocalizer put a cancellation sign not only in the first and last letters of the verse but also in the last letter of the first line (line 24).

59 The vocalizer did not perceive the erroneous doubling immediately and began to point the beginning of the verse, but as soon as he sensed the error, he stopped. The cancellation sign is written in the last letter of the verse (line 24). Later on, the doubled verse was encircled (line 23 separately and the lone word on line 24 separately). At a later time, deletion signs of this sort were added in bright ink in other places as well, for example on fol. 73v, lines 24 and 25, for the words which the vocalizer had not cancelled.

60 The word אשר, in whose first two letters the cancellation signs were written. The last word, which the copyist repeated at the beginning of the next line, was cancelled by means of a single apostrophe above the last letter.

61 See the previous paragraph. The cancellation sign in the last word, which was doubled in error at the end of line 6 on fol. 40r (דן) is, to be sure, a sign used by the vocalizers; however, the hue of its ink is similar to that of the scribe's ink, not that of the vocalizer's, and there are similar examples in other places.

62 For example, on fol. 38v, line 3, we find the cancellation of the word מרת which was erroneously inserted into the text through force of habit. The cancellation signs that are in three of the word's letters were not made by the vocalizer, for the word is pointed (unless the vocalizer noticed the copyist's error after he had pointed the word). The cancellation of the two last letters of the word מתי on fol. 172v, line 13 (and the writing of לא in small, square, fine quill writing above them) was also done after the vocalization.

i.e. יולדם. On fol. 66r, 3rd line from the bottom, the scribe had written רך; the vocalizer cancelled the final *kaf* and wrote a small final *zade* above it. On fol. 71r, line 20, the scribe had written the word בטובכת; the vocalizer pointed the entire word, even the first letter, but did not place a *dagesh* in the *bet* — rather, he placed a cancellation sign in it and, in small square script, wrote a *mem* above it, i.e. מטובכת. Another example to prove, like the previous one, that corrections of this kind were made by the vocalizer, is hidden on fol. 73v, line 3: the copyist wrote לעומת; the vocalizer, with a fine quill, inserted a final *mem* above the end of the word and pointed it לעומתם. On fol. 122r, in the first hemistich of line 4, the *samekh* in the word פוסקי was cancelled and a small *sin* was written above it in cursive script and with a fine quill. On the other hand, in the very same line, above the *alef* which had been marked with the vocalizer's cancellation sign in the word אנתשם, a fairly large *ayin* was written in square script by a thicker quill.⁶³ On fol. 123r, line 6, the last letter of the word הנעים had been cancelled and in cursive, fine script, above it, was written מ (the *vav* pointed). On fol. 175r, line 2, the scribe had written בלולת; the *tav* was cancelled and, above it in square script, a fine quill had wrote a *yod*, and the corrected word was vocalized בלולתי. This is another example where the vocalization was adapted to the corrected word and clearly proves that the correction of the consonants was done by the vocalizer. However, it may be that a few of these repairs, where the vocalization fits both the word written by the scribe and the corrected one, were not done by the vocalizer — as is shown, for instance, by the correction on fol. 172v, line 13: the letters *mem*, *yod* of the word ימי were marked with the vocalizer's cancellation signs even though the *mem* was already vocalized, and the word לא was written above them in small, square script with a fine quill.

Beside the vocalizer's practice of cancelling letters and placing their corrections above them, we also find some lone examples of letter corrections in the margins by the vocalizer. On fol. 12r, line 7, the letter *alef* in the word להובא was cancelled. A circle was placed above it and the letter *he* was written in the margin, i.e. להובה. Similarly, the letter *het* in the word טבוח on fol. 16v, line 6, was corrected and the letter *ayin* was put in the margin with a dot above it. This example is proof that this form of correcting letters is also the vocalizer's, for the letter *he* which was cancelled was not vocalized whereas its substitute letter *ayin* in the margin was. We also learn from here that the circle was the vocalizer's sign for a marginal correction.

The vocalizer also corrected words from which letters had been omitted: such letters he inserted above the word and vocalized them beneath the word. For example, on fol. 2r the vocalizer attached a letter *he*, in fine square script, to the beginning of the word מנחיל in the last line and pointed it before pointing the *mem*. On fol. 86v, line 3, the scribe had written צינים and the vocalizer put a small *het* between the *zade* and the *yod* and pointed it צינינים. On fol. 45, end of line 2, the word נצאר was written; the vocalizer attached a small *kaf* to the beginning and pointed this letter beneath the word before pointing the *yod*. On

fol. 91v, line 18, the copyist had written והנה; the vocalizer placed a *shuruq* between the *he* and the *gimel* and the word was pointed as corrected. On fol. 104v, line 26, the vocalizer appended a small *lamed* to the beginning of the word מיעבר and pointed it with a *sheva* before pointing the *mem*; in the same manner, he appended the letter *lamed* at the beginning of the word on fol. 137r, line 13, hemistich one, and at the beginning of the word on fol. 140v, at the start of line 4. On fol. 174r, line 3, the copyist wrote the word ונהלך; the vocalizer added an *alef* between the letters *nun* and *he*, placed a very short dividing line between the letters *he* and *lamed* in order to separate the adjoining words, and vocalized it: ונהלךך.

The vocalizer, it seems, also inserted entire short words which had been omitted by the scribe above the line and vocalized them. See, for example, the insertions of the word כן on fol. 73v, above line 11 and the word לו on fol. 81v, above line 22. However, he sometimes added the missing words in the margins. This form of correction is very prominent in the margins of the columns of the biblical part (fols. 185r–217v) where many words were written (even parts of verses, as on fol. 193r) which had been omitted by the scribe. These supplements were written in a square script and marked with a tailed circle — and almost all of them were surely done by the vocalizer, as is proven, for example, by the emendation-correction in this hand on fol. 195r, column 2, line 10. The scribe had erroneously written ואין; the word was not pointed, was marked with the vocalizer's cancellation signs and the correction sign (the tailed circle) above it, and in the margin לא was written.

A few other words which the scribe had omitted in the course of copying the *Mahzor* and which were added in a gloss are written in a square script similar to that of the vocalizer's marginal supplements in the biblical part. Logic dictates that these, too, are the vocalizer's. On fol. 61r there is a circle marked above the space between the words באהבה in line 4, and the word אלהינו is written (and vocalized) in the margin. The word תמרוחך, which was omitted at the end of the line, is written (and vocalized) in the margin of line 2, fol. 64v. In a similar square script, in the margin of line 21 on fol. 31r, the word נצה which had been omitted at the beginning of the line is written.⁶⁴ The last words of the second hemistich of line 10 and line 22 on fol. 99v were also written in a small cursive script with a fine quill.⁶⁵ Therefore it would appear that it was the vocalizer's practice to use square script for writing complete words which the scribe had omitted when copying.

Yet, there are at least two instances in which the vocalizer used a cursive script to supplement entire words which the scribe had omitted, as witness those marginal corrections which clearly are the work of the vocalizer. These can be seen in those places where the words in the text proper were not pointed, were marked with the vocalizer's cancellation signs within and his circle above, and the substitute word written in the margin in cursive script. Thus, on fol. 27v, the first word in line 24, בנפלאות, not pointed, is marked with the cancellation sign and is replaced by the vocalized word מתלאות written in cursive script in the margin; like-

63 The *yod* which was suspended there between the last letters of the word, was written in brown ink, different both from that of the copyist and that of the vocalizer.

64 As with the corrections made by other hands, no insertion sign is written when the completion is at the end or start of a line.

65 It turns out that the scribe consciously omitted copying them. The letters with the concluding *v*-rhyme of the stichs of the *piyyut* were written on this page in red ink in two straight rows, and the verses of the stichs are at varying removes from the conclusion of the rhyme, in keeping with the

lengths of the stichs, which shows that the scribe first wrote the rhyming syllables in red ink and only then did he copy the stichs of the *piyyut* in the regular brown ink; and therefore he was constrained to squeeze their endings in before the final syllable. In line 22 he was forced to write the last two letters of the next to the last word on top of the concluding red ink letters. (The last word, as has been said, was added in the margin by the vocalizer.) This page then, provides us with interesting information on the copyist's usages of red ink.

wise, on fol. 61r, line 11, the word בעירך is replaced by the word ביראה.⁶⁶ On fol. 54v, line 18, the word חנני is not pointed at all nor is it cancelled by the vocalizer's cancellation marks; it is doubtful, therefore, that the double-version marginal correction קלתי חנתי⁶⁷ סיא⁶⁸ is the work of the vocalizer.⁶⁸ Nevertheless, the first two corrective glosses, made without a doubt by the vocalizer, exemplify the vocalizer's cursive script and enable us to ascertain that most of the very numerous other glosses and notations, written in an early cursive script in several styles, were written not by the vocalizer but by others who used the *Mahzor*.⁶⁹

Elsewhere, we find a special corrective gloss which was assuredly done by the vocalizer. On fol. 23r, line 24, the word לעב was not pointed, was cancelled by vocalizer cancellation signs, and written in the margin in the small square script, in the copyist's square script style: סיא להצדיק. The vocalizer was not satisfied merely to correct the text but indicated that his correction is based upon a reading in another text or texts.

It seems that some of the many cantillation signs (*shalsholet*) curled above various words in the *Mahzor* are attributable to the vocalizer. These signs are not, apparently, the meager vestiges of a general system of accentuation. The decorative impression of these signs and the tendency to have them curved and elongated lead one to think that these are merely vocal signs which were familiar to the *hazzanim*.⁷⁰ Most of these *shalsholet* decorations were produced by a thick quill, certainly by the copyist, as proven by the *shalsholet* sign in red ink above the word written in red ink on fol. 150r, line 7 and apparently also in line 4. Still, there are thin *shalsholet* signs, done by a fine quill like that of the vocalizer, as on fols. 147v (line 14), 148r (line 22 — two signs), 148v (line 3), 149v (lines 17, 19, 23), 154v (line 14). These signs, all concentrated in אקדמות מלין and in the extended Aramaic translation of the Ten Commandments for Shavu'ot, seem to have been added by the vocalizer.⁷¹

3. Glosses, Notations, Supplements and Deletions after Completion of the *Mahzor* and Its Vocalization

Many different hands corrected the *Mahzor* and added marginal notes during the hundreds of years since it was copied, pointed and illuminated. As stated, there is almost not a single folio in this manuscript which has remained as it left the hands of the copyist and vocalizer. Most of the pages bear ample witness, in the form of corrections and notations, to the *Mahzor*'s prolonged and continuous use. Some of these corrections and notations were added early, in periods close to the time the *Mahzor* was copied; some at the end of the Middle Ages; some in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; and some even later. Because of the difficulty involved in precisely setting their time-frames on the

basis of their scripts, we have preferred to describe them not chronologically but by categories.

(a) Supplementary Glosses and Corrections

These corrections are not changes in formulation but rather corrections of corruptions. Most of them are marginal notations which supply words omitted by the copyist and which were made by users of the *Mahzor*.

Most of the corrections of this sort were made in early periods, generally in cursive script with vocalization. They are difficult to classify by their scripts, though it is easy to discern some written by the same hands. As stated above, it may be that some of these were written by the vocalizer. The words that were corrected in the text or the place where they were to be inserted in the text were marked with the regular correction signs, be it by a circle, arc, or tailed circle, with the tail always pointing toward the margin where the correction was written. Generally, correction signs were not placed above the first or last word of a line; likewise, insertion signs were not indicated when the supplementary word was intended for the beginning or end of a line, except for thin drawn lines connecting the correction to the beginning or end of the line.

Here are examples of words omitted by the copyist and added in the margins in early cursive scripts, with their insertion sign between the words in the body of the line:⁷² fol. 2v, last line (הגיבור); fol. 3v, line 9 (שמו); fol. 7r, line 15 (קול);⁷³ fol. 8v, line 11 (אדון); fol. 13r, line 18 (להיים); fol. 15r, line 10 (לעומת); the supplement is meant for the end of the line; fol. 25v, line 24 (בה); fol. 30v, line 19 (קדש); fol. 32v, line 25 (הזה); fol. 33r, line 12 (דרשים); without an insertion sign, but it is clear the word is to be filled in between the words ראשי and להם (line 23 (שבת); fol. 39r, line 15 (שמך) and line 25 (two supplements: the first in the left margin with the tail of its insertion sign pointed toward it; the other, in the right margin with that tailed sign pointing toward it); fol. 40r, line 14 (המך); completing the end of the line and indicated by a fine connecting line); the word וחשק on fol. 49r, line 12, marked with "vocalizer" semicircle cancellation signs in the letters *het* and *qof*, with a tailed circle mark above it and the gloss והפץ⁷⁴ in the margin; fol. 82v, line 12 (ולא נכע); fol. 85r, line 6 (עליהם באהב); fol. 99r, line 3 (שמו); fol. 122v, line 1 (חנה) and line 17 (שהוא); fol. 179v, line 12 (איר).

On rare occasions words were added in square script (but not the square script of the copyist's or vocalizer's supplements), some at an early period — like the word שמוני in the margin of line 5 on fol. 36v and the word יקר in the margin of line 20 on fol. 160v; some at a later time, like the word ארון in the margin of line 1 on fol. 8r and the word לעמו in the margin of line 16 on fol. 35r.

In a few places, an early hand filled in words whose beginnings

66 On the same page, in line 4, the word שבת was not vocalized. It was not cancelled by the vocalizers' cancellation signs but was deleted by a fine quill line run through it.

67 ספר אחר, ספרים אחרים = סיא, i.e. other books, or another book.

68 The gloss sign above the word is not a circle, as was the vocalizer's practice in the body of the *Mahzor*, but a tailed circle, as was the vocalizer's way when he wanted to insert his supplements in the biblical part.

69 One must admit that it is difficult to base the identification of these scripts on two words containing only ten different letters. Though their style seems different from the styles of the other glosses and notations, it is not improbable that some of the many other glosses are the work of the vocalizer.

70 See M. Beit-Arié, "The Vocalization of the *Mahzor* of the Holy Com-

munity of Worms" (above, n. 1), p. 93 (= *Collected Articles*, p. 335), where there is a complete listing of these signs in the *Mahzor*.

71 For a similar reason it is possible to ascribe to the vocalizer the ornamentations of the acrostic on fols. 70v–72r, which are finer than the scribe's signs. On fol. 72r, the large initial-words were also ornamented with *shalsholet* signs which were made by a fine quill, as in the Aramaic *piyyuṭim* for Shavu'ot.

72 Almost all of the words brought below in this paragraph are vocalized, but we have presented them without their vocalization.

73 Later on, another hand inserted the word in the body of the line, between the word משמיעים and the word מתנשאים.

74 Even though the cancellation signs are identical to those of the vocalizer, it is clear that this gloss is not his, for the corrected word is vocalized (the vocalization is somewhat erased).

had been written at the ends of the lines as a layout device, but the scribe had forgotten to copy them in their entirety at the beginning of the next line. On fol. 42r, at the end of line 18, the copyist had written the first letter of the word (*qof* followed by a graphic filler), but then had forgotten to rewrite it along with the rest of the word. An early hand put the complete word in the margin in cursive script: קרובו. Similarly, at the end of line 18 on fol. 42v, the copyist had written the first two letters of the word but erred and did not write the full word at the beginning of the next line, and the glossator wrote it in the margin (וגליל); and the same at the end of line 15 on fol. 140r.

Word completions from later periods, such as that in the margin of line 22, fol. 35r, are scarce because most of the omissions were noticed and corrected during the earlier periods of the *Mahzor's* use. Sometimes the supplement was inserted in the body of the text. Thus, for example, the word מנגן was added above the word מושיע on fol. 3r, line 21, in a thin cursive script, and, likewise, in the body of line 14, fol. 67r, written in a crude square script, the words חי וקיים נורא were added in red ink and pointed in brown ink.⁷⁵

Corrected readings which are not in the nature of variants, such as the word נשך in the margin of line 3 on fol. 140r in place of נסך in the body of the line, are very rare. From the early periods, we find reading corrections with other signs also. Thus, for example, the words מן העם on fol. 19r, line 10, are framed, and in the margin, in a quite early script, are the words מן החר אל העם; above the cancelled words in the body of the line and the corrected reading in the margin are the tailed-circle signs.⁷⁶ At a later period, words were corrected by running a fine line through them and inserting the corrections above them in small script, as on fols. 151r and 151v.

On fol. 179v, in the body of line 14, we have a correction, apparently early, in the order of the words אשר ארתך. A small *bet* is written over the first word and, over the second, the letter *alef*, to indicate that the phrase is to be read ארוך אשר. In the margin of fol. 1v we find such a later correction at the head of three stanzas: ג, א, ב (bet, alef, gimel) to indicate that the order of the stanzas had become confused.

(b) Variant Readings and Vocalizations

These glosses too, are not to be classed as changes in the liturgical formulation (*nosah*) but rather as notations that were made in the margins of the *Mahzor* at various times — some earlier, some later — which bring another version of the word or its vocalization, based upon other sources, or suggest another reading based upon the personal considerations of the annotator.

Variants of single words cited from other books are indicated by ס"א (*sefarim aherim, sefer aher*: other books, another book) in different places in the margins of the *Mahzor*. Almost all of them were written in early cursive scripts and most of them apparently by a single hand: fol. 2v, line 2 (ס"א משיענו) refer to the last word); fol. 9r, line 18 (ס"א רעה); undoubtedly meant for רועה, which is unmarked); fol. 13v, line 26 (ס"א פלוטי); the word פלוטי marked by a circle above it); fol. 14v, line 12 (ס"א קרא); relating to the word יראי, marked as mentioned above); fol. 17r, line 8 (ס"א בנים); for the word

בנים, marked as above) and line 16 (ס"א להט); for לאט, marked as above); fol. 33v, line 18 (ס"א קשות); relating to כשות, and marked with an incomplete circle); fol. 41r, line 6 (ס"א ונמוסלה); relating to the end of the line); fol. 42r, line 13 (ס"א הגידו); referring to the word הגיע marked with a circle); fol. 45v, line 7 (ס"א לעלם); for the word לעלם, marked with a tailed circle); fol. 47r, line 13 (ס"א ידריך); for the word הדריך marked with a circle); fol. 51v, line 15 (ס"א מרעף); referring to the word מרעף marked with a tailed circle); fol. 56v, line 2 (ס"א הדר); for the word הדר marked as above); fol. 63r, line 18 (ס"א ונטס); referring to תוסס marked as above); fol. 79v, line 5 (ס"א טקשי); for the word טפשו marked as above) and line 21 (ס"א ומספדים); referring to the word מופסדים marked as above); fol. 104r, line 15 (ס"א רך); referring to the first word).

Two notes about a variant reading, also of an early period, are unique in that the *alef* of the abbreviation ס"א is written in square script whereas the word to which the note refers in the body of the line is marked with an arc: fol. 24r, line 7 and fol. 33v, line 18. On fol. 66r, line 13, the letter *samekh* in the word מסכתה is marked with a circle and, in the margin, ש ס"א is written in square script, i.e., hinting at the reading משחתה.⁷⁷

Two early corrections of another reading have to do with the vocalization. Written on fol. 17v, in the margin of line 14, where the initial word is vocalized בלשון, we have נקדים בלשון (=some vocalize בלשון). On fol. 17v, in the margin of line 23, only the vocalization from another source is cited: ס"א, This other version of the vocalization certainly refers to the first word ושלחו i.e., ושלחו.

A few of the early marginal corrections dealing with another variant indicated by ס"א are accompanied by grammatical or interpretive explanations. On fol. 23r, in the margin of line 16: ס"א למוך referring to the word למוך which is unmarked. On fol. 64r, line 5, the last word לתקיים is marked with a tailed circle and written in the margin: "Other books have לתרום, as לתרום derives from פרצה." On fol. 12r, line 8, the word מסור is marked with a tailed circle and written in the margin: "Other books have שול, meaning שלל. And the meaning of מסור is as in the phrase המינן המסורת, but I do not know the meaning of מסור." In the margin of fol. 14r, line 24 we have a notation which undoubtedly refers to בנות: "Other books have בנות, which means: a bath."

A few variant readings were suggested from surmise without the reason, or are given together with the reason or explanation. These originate in an early period and may be of one hand. On fol. 5v, in the margin of line 12, there is a gloss referring to the word ואמרת (unmarked): "In my opinion this should be ואמרת, and the end of the stanza proves it, as no poet uses a word twice in one and the same stanza."⁷⁸ On fol. 6v the word ארקה in line 22 is marked with a circle and in the margin is the notation: לי נר ארקה (=in my opinion ארקה). On fol. 11v, in line 15, the word תאבר is marked with a circle with the marginal notation: לי נר ירקב (=in my opinion ירקב). On fol. 40v, the last word of line 16, לה — within the hemistich נמו לה הגרופים נמו — is marked with an incomplete circle, and in the margin the one making the correc-

75 In a continuation of this insertion, the words נורא ומרום וקדוש were added in the margin in another square script, unvocalized.

76 It is possible, of course, that the frame around the corrected words was added later on.

77 And cf. the gloss ס"א in square script in fol. 23r, line 24, which apparently, as stated above in the preceding paragraph, is from the hand of the vocalizer.

78 Indeed, the word ואמרתה occurs at the end of that stanza.

tion added: "In my opinion לא, which means...".⁷⁹ This note is signed with the abbreviation שושיץ.⁸⁰

Rare are the ס"א corrections in later handwritings. There are such readings, for example, on fol. 35v (line 7), fol. 112r (line 17), fol. 161r (line 4), and fol. 156v (line 26). At the end of this last line there is mention of חזן מקיק פראג (=Hazzan of the Jewish community of Prague). Most of the later corrections giving a variant reading, written almost certainly by the same hand in the late Middle Ages, relate to missing letters and are not marked by ס"א but by various designations such as ...במקצת (=some; fol. 35v, line 2 and the very same on fols. 51r, 112r, 112v); יש נוקדין (=some vocalize; for example, on fols. 112r, 130r); יש גורסיך ייג (=some read; e.g., on fols. 48r, 50r, 64r, 112v).⁸¹ Sometimes the later editor added וכן עיקר (=and this is the right version) or ועיקר (=and the right version is) to his corrections (as on fols. 112r, 129v, 130r). The words in question were usually marked with a tailed circle.

(c) Omissions, Substitutions and Additions to the Formulation of the Prayers and the *Piyyuṭim*

In addition to the substitute *piyyuṭim* written on separate sheets and inserted into the *Mahzor* in the early periods, as already described above in Section B, we find, over the generations, other ways of marking deletions and omissions including completions or substitute texts, in the margins of the *Mahzor*. These changes are from later periods. Marks of omission or the writing of additions from the early periods are rare. In the margin of the *piyyuṭ* אדירים לא אמרו on fol. 93v there is a notation, in rather early cursive script, written on two lines whose beginnings have been cut off: רם אומנם כל אלו [בקול רם ומתחיל] (=to be skipped for the greater part; and one begins aloud אלו רם).⁸² On fol. 94v, the *piyyuṭ* לעולם תעורר was completed in a rather early square script. On the other hand, from the later periods, there are more suggested omissions and these are cited with the mark of א"א (i.e. אין אומרים — not to be read) in the margins of the *piyyuṭim* or stanzas, as on fols. 28v, 34v, 156r. There are also more supplements of substitute formulations and additions from the later periods, such as the *qina* (threnody) for the eve of the Ninth of Av which was added in the upper margin on fol. 156v in rather late square script, at the end of which is the note נוסחה במדינת פולין (=its wording is as in the Polish communities; and in Prague it is like this); the formulation of the benediction אל עליון קונה ברחמי שמים was changed, in a later cursive hand, to גומל מלך עזר ומושע ומגן טובים וקונה הכל... מלך עזר ומושע ומגן, which is said before the Priestly Blessing, was inserted in the body of the text on fol. 100v. Our last example of an addition is the prayer concerning dreams to be said by an individual, which was written in the margin of the Priestly Blessing there.

(d) Instructions for the *Hazzan*

In various periods, but particularly in the later ones, notations dealing with the sections which the *Hazzan* (or the congregation) recites aloud were added in the margins of the *piyyuṭim* and the prayers. There are few such in early scripts. In early script, we find "the *Hazzan* begins" on fol. 91v in the margin of the lines 6,11,14⁸³ and, in the same hand, the notations "this stanza is recited aloud" in the margin of line 2, fol. 97v and "start here" in the margin of lines 5 and 14 on that same folio and in the margin of line 3 on fol. 98r.

However, most of the notations of this sort were written in much later cursive scripts, some from the last years of the Middle Ages and some in later times. The usual notation is "*Hazzan*", as in the margin of fols. 2r, 4r, 7v, 8v, 9r (in the body of the *piyyuṭ*), 10r, 28v, 29r, 72r, 120v; but other formulations are found, such as חזן מתחיל (=the *Hazzan* starts; fols. 10r, 11r, 72v, 96v), or its abbreviation ח"מ (e.g. fol. 65v, line 10; fol. 72r over the word חזן in another hand; חזן מתחיל בקיר⁸⁴; fol. 82v, above lines 6 and 18); חזן אומר זה (= *Hazzan* says this; fol. 96v, line 16); חזן מתחיל השייך (=here the cantor begins; fol. 120v, line 2). On fol. 209v, in the margin of the copy of Jer. ix:24, in the third column, there is a detailed notation: "In Worms, on the Tenth of Av, one begins here after the *qinot*, and proceeds until עדקינו⁸⁵, each verse alternately, and then קרבו גינים, written hereafter,⁸⁶ is being recited by the community and the *hazzan* together."

A few "cantorial" notations deal with the way the material should be intoned. On fol. 65v the word ממצרים in line 18 is marked, and in the margin there is the note: "the *Hazzan* chants with a tune". In the margin of fol. 91r (line 8) and the margin of fol. 112v (line 25) there is a notation concerning ברוך נעמות לאל ברוך in the High Holy Days mode". Many modal notations were added in the margins of the *qinot* for the Ninth Av (see fols. 160r, 166r, 166v, 168v, 169r, 169v, 170r, 170v).

(e) The Rewriting of the Text

The scribe of the *Mahzor* wrote individual words and consecutive sections of the text in red ink — the openings and conclusions of liturgical units, initial-words, initial-letters of stichs of *piyyuṭim*, refrains of *piyyuṭim*, letters of an acrostic, instructions, blessings, special prayers, and consecutive sections of various texts which he wanted to be prominent. In the course of time this red ink faded, and some of the letters or words became very blurred, especially at the beginning of the *Mahzor*. Many of these words (or letters) were later restored by hands which rewrote the faded letters in a bright brown or dark brown ink. Though they tried to copy the scribe's original script, the imitation was unsuccessful enough to attest that it was done in a considerably later period.

79 The gloss corresponds to the words of the Babylonian Talmud, *Pesahim* 42a: דרש רבא אשה לא הלש בתמה ולא במים הנרופן

80 Perhaps this abbreviation indicates the name of the glossator. It is difficult to imagine that a gloss is presented here in the name of R. Sasson (which the glossator corrupted to "Shoshan"), the familiar name for R. Shelomo b. Shimshon, the leader of the Worms Community, a contemporary of Rashi, who wrote commentaries on the *piyyuṭim* and verified their texts (see: A. Grossman, *Hakhmei Ashkenaz ha-Rishonim* [The Early Sages of Ashkenaz], Jerusalem 1981, pp. 326–384). And perhaps, the letters *shin, vav, shin, nun* stand for an unknown glossing formula, such as שניאת ומנסרת...נקט.

81 On fol. 162v, in the margin of line 3, another reading in a different writing is introduced by "in accurate books...".

82 The reference is to the stanza which begins אלו המכעיסים (fol. 94v, line 3).

83 In a writing identical to the truncated marginal note on fol. 93v in the matter of the omission mentioned above in Section C.

84 An abbreviation: בקול רם (=aloud).

85 In the margin of the same leaf there is the notation עד כאן (=ill here). Jer. xxiii:6, i.e., till the end of the section of Jeremiah in the *Mahzor* (fol. 217r).

87 I.e., Isa. xxxiv:1–xxxv:10 which is written in the *Mahzor* after the Jeremiah section (fol. 217r–v).

The rewritings that were done in the bright brown ink whose colour now, on the faded red ink, is slightly yellowish, were done in a rather crude script, whereas those in the dark brown ink were done by a more skilled, and probably earlier, hand. Generally, traces of the original red ink script are still discernible through the overscript. Similarly, of course, traces remained of the original vocalization of the rewritten words, done in brown ink. Such rewriting is recognizable, for example, on fols. 5r, 5v, 8r, 13v, 15v, 16v (all the large letters on the left side, the initial-letters on the right and the blessings), 17v (line 3), 19r (lines 4–5), 19v, 20r, 20v,⁸⁸ 24r (lines 13–15, as well as parts of the large letters in line 16), 26r (line 5), 26v (line 5), 27r (two words in line 5), 29r, 29v–30r (the letters of the acrostic *אלעזר בירבי קליר*, 30r (lines 8–9), 33r (line 19)⁸⁹, 33v (the outlines of three letters in the initial-word on line 18, some of whose letters were originally written in red ink), 34r (line 22), 78r (lines 24–25), 157r, 159r–168v.

On fol. 73r, the initial-letters of the stichs of the last four rows were rewritten in a kind of violet ink. On fol. 21r it seems that the sections which had originally been written in red ink were rewritten in red ink and, likewise, it seems, in line 5 of fol. 21v.

As has been said, most of the restorations were done primarily at the beginning of the *Mahzor*. In the middle of the *Mahzor* there are partial restorations in bright ink, a bit here, a bit there, done mainly by outlining the body of the letters or part of the letters which had been written in red ink, especially the initial-words such as on fol. 115v, 116v–119r, 122r, 127r. A crude hand, most likely late, outlined the letters *שמו* in the large initial words *ליל שמורים* which had been written in red ink on fol. 41r, and crudely ornamented its open spaces.

(f) Captions for Illustrations and Headings

Inscriptions in small cursive scripts were added to a few of the illustrations. The words *sheqel* and *yisra'el* in the cups of the balance scales in the illustration at the beginning of the *Mahzor* (fol. 1v) were added in a rather late script. In the illustrated frontispiece of the *yozer* for the first day of Shavu'ot, *ארתן אמנו* (fol. 111r), whose subject is the giving of the Torah at Mt. Sinai, the bird-headed figures are holding in their hands what seem to be long scrolls. Within these scrolls, in an early cursive script which is now mostly blurred, it appears that the Ten Commandments had been inscribed. This script is more carelessly executed than the names that were inserted in the illustration of the initial-word *והטורי* on fol. 95r and whose style is like that of the cursive script of the scribe Simḥah, as mentioned above in Section B. The inscription *אלעזר הכהן* on fol. 21r above the drawing of the figure of the slaughterer beside the initial-word *אום*, on whose other side is a drawing of the red heifer, was written in square script the size of the writing of the text, but it seems that it may not have been written by the scribe. At the head of various columns, later hands added captions: “*yozer* for *Shabbat ha-Gadol*” (on fols. 34v, 36r–38v), “*musaf* for *Shabbat ha-Gadol*” (on fols. 39r–41r), “*ma'ariv* for the first night of Passover” (on fol. 41v), these written in a later cursive script; “*ma'ariv* for the second night of Passover” (on fol. 45r), “*yozer* for the first day of Pas-

sover” (on fol. 49r, in yellowish ink which has been somewhat erased), “for the first day of Shavu'ot” (on fols. 111v, 112r), these written in a rather late square script.

(g) Records of *Hazzanim* and *Shammashim*

In a few places in the *Mahzor*, mainly where pages were left blank at the beginning of the *Mahzor* (fol. 1r), at the end of the liturgical section (fol. 184v), and at the end of the *Mahzor* (fol. 224v), *hazzanim* recorded their use of the *Mahzor* as cantors either by listing their origins and dates or by merely leaving us their names or signatures. Most of these inscriptions and notations are explicitly by *hazzanim* or novices but, since one of these is expressly by a *shammash*, it seems that the notations of names and signatures may also have been done by the *shammashim* of the synagogue. In a few of the listings, the community in which the *Hazzan* served is mentioned, and in each instance it is Worms. A considerable number of the inscriptions and signatures are partially blurred and a few are almost totally undecipherable. The many inscriptions on fol. 184v were read with the help of an ultra-violet lamp.

Following is a list, in chronological order, of the legible listings of *hazzanim* with dates (according to the Jewish calendar), followed by those without date. The record of *hazzanim* from Volume Two of the *Mahzor*, which is smaller, was inserted in the following list with the notation “Vol. II”.

- (1) 326 (1565/6): “I inquired of my father my teacher, the *Hasid*, our teacher, Reb Wolf, the *Hazzan*, may the memory of this righteous one be a blessing, of the holy community of Prague...signed by Isaiah, *Hazzan* of the holy community of Worms, may our Rock protect it and keep it in life, 326 of the abbreviated era” (Vol. II, fol. 16r; there is a similar note with his signature also in Vol. II, fol. 47r).
- (2) 335 (1574/5): “Kalonymos...the Levite, may the days of his life be many and good, Amen...*Hazzan* in the holy community of Worms...in 335 of the abbreviated era” (fol. 184v).
- (3) 349? (1588): “I, Joseph, son of my father, my master, Judah, of blessed memory, from the country of...the first day...Hanukkah 349” (*ibid.*).
- (4)–(6) 352 (1591/2): blurred inscriptions of at least three *hazzanim*, members of the *רופא* family, one of them from the year 352 (*ibid.*).
- (7) 360 (1599/1600): a completely blurred inscription (*ibid.*).
- (8) 365 (1604/5): “[...] son of Simon, may his memory be a blessing for life in the world to come, called Hertz, *לומר* from the land of Hesse...365 of the abbreviated era” (*ibid.*).
- (9) 412 (1652): “David Tevli son of Elhanan, may he live a long and good life, Bachrach of the holy community of Hanau⁹⁰ this day, 6, *Parashat Sheqalim* 412 of the abbreviated era” (*ibid.*).
- (10) 412 (1652): “Signed by Benjamin son of Menaḥem of Boppard⁹¹ near the Rhine River, studying [...] in the holy community of Worms with R. Isaac, son of the Gaon, his honour, our teacher, Zussman, Head of the Court in the lands of Trier, this day, Friday, New Month Adar 612 of the abbreviated era” (*ibid.*).⁹²

88 There is also a large segment there which had been written in red ink which had faded but was not rewritten.

89 The formula of the benediction is *ביא די האל הקדוש*. These words were probably written in red ink like the rest of the words in that line whose red ink had faded greatly, but they were not rewritten. The original writing of the benediction is entirely erased but its vocalization has survived. Even the spaces of the two initial-words on that page were filled in with a similar yellowish ink (lines 3 and 14).

90 Near Frankfurt.

91 In the Coblenz region; see M. Brann, *Germanica Judaica*, I, Breslau 1934, pp. 61–63.

92 This entry is evidence that these lists were not necessarily written by *hazzanim*. It was written on the same day as the entry before it (and the one after it), and perhaps even the one who made the previous entry was not a *hazzan*.

(11) 412 (1652): "Signed by Samuel, son of Moses [?] Meir, may the memory of the righteous be a blessing, with Zanwil, *Shammash* of the holy community of Worms, this day, Friday, New Month Adar 412, according to the abbreviate era" (fol. 183v, in the upper margin).

(12) Before 427 (1667):⁹³ "I thank God who privileged me to be cantor and public trustee here in the holy community of Worms, a major Jewish centre. It is not a result of my merit but that of my fathers. Therefore I inscribe my name here as a memorial for my children. Perhaps they too will be privileged. Abraham Evril, son of my father, my master, Solomon Zalman Evrilis, may his Rock preserve him, cantor of the aforementioned holy community" (fol. 224v).

(13) 427 (1667): "What am I and what my life that I have come to sign after that one who turned many from sin and was a person who feared God. And I, who am but dust and ashes, did not earn the privilege of being *Hazzan* and public trustee here in the holy community of Worms. But I have been privileged because of the merit of my fathers, signed by the young man...Moses son of our teacher R. Benjamin, may the memory of the righteous be a blessing, expelled from Vilna, the first day of the week, Tammuz 17, 427"⁹⁴ (*ibid.*).

(14) 460 (1700): "I, Itamar, son of our teacher R. Meir Segal, may the memory of the righteous be a blessing, cantor of the holy community of Worms, may our Rock protect and keep it in life, came here to the aforementioned holy community on the eve of New Month Sivan, 5460, from the holy community of Apta (Opatow), may our Rock protect and keep it in life, from the districts of Poland, may the Lord grant me to settle here in peace and tranquility..." (fol. 1r).

(15) 468 (1708): "I, David, son of my father, my master Meir Israel, of blessed memory, cantor of the holy community of Worms, came here to the aforementioned holy community in the month of Elul, 468.⁹⁵ May the Blessed Lord privilege me to dwell here in peace and tranquility, repose and security, until the coming of the Redeemer, Amen" (fol. 184r, in the lower margin; there is another inscription in his hand on fol. 1r).

(16) 470 (1710): the signature of Kalonymos b. Jacob Katz, New Month Iyar, 470⁹⁶ (Vol. II, fol. 219v).

(17) 472 (1712): "I am studying *hazzanut* here with the honorable David, *Hazzan* here in the holy community of Worms. Written on 4 Sivan, 472, I, David [...]vil b. the honorable R. Mordecai...of the holy community of Mannheim" (fol. 224v).

(18) 499 (1739): "Kalonymos... ל"ט of the holy community of Lissa (Leszno) in the lands of Great Poland...cantor in the holy community of Worms, 21 Elul, 499" (Vol. II, fol. 68v).

(19) 534 (1773/4)–579 (1818/9): "Hayyim b. the honorable Jacob Segal, cantor in Worms" from "534 to 579", "and I am about seventy" (Vol. II, fol. 152v).

(20) 569 (1809): "I, called Meir, son of my father, my master Leib, of blessed memory ... Wednesday, 23 Adar, 569, according to the abbreviated era" (fol. 1r).

(21) 603 (1842): "Joseph Jekhel *Hazzan* b. my father my master

Isaac ha-Cohen", "Worms", the eve of the Day of Atonement, 603 (Vol. II, fol. 60v).

(22) 613 (1852): Moses b. David, who led in the *musaf* service of New Year and the Day of Atonement 613 (Vol. II, fol. 120r).

Undated inscriptions:

(23) "I, the insignificant Elia choirboy for Isaac" (Vol. II, fol. 208v).

(24) "Isaac b. Hayyim Katz known as Izek" (fol. 184v).

(25) "Mordecai... b. Asher Ansel" (*ibid.*)

(26) "Naftali" (fol. 184r; the inscription is torn in the upper margin toward the top).

(27) "David b. Arié Leibush ד"ר from Keshinof Odessa" (*ibid.*; in the outer margin toward the top, in a very late square script with hollow letters).

(28) "Shimshon" (fol. 184v).

(29) "Nathan b. Kalonymos" (*ibid.*).

(30) "Elia, son of my master, my father...Jacob Weiss from the holy community of Haigerloch"⁹⁷ (*ibid.*).

(31) "I, Akiba b. of my master, my father Tobias Segal Shatz Epstein here in the holy community of Worms" (fol. 1r).

(32) "I, Elia b. the honorable R. Barukh Segal" (*ibid.*).

(33) Careless inscriptions by "Juda" (fol. 175v; reversed).

E. RECENT HISTORY OF THE MAHZOR

The lists of the *hazzanim* attest to the constant use of the *Mahzor* in the synagogue of the Worms community at least from 1565/6 onward. The *Mahzor* was in the Great Synagogue of the community until *Kristallnacht*. On the 9th of November, 1938, the ancient synagogue of the Worms community went up in flames and was despoiled by Nazi rioters. Immediately after the synagogue was set afire, Dr. Friedrich M. Illert, who at that time was Director of the Cultural Institute and the city's Archivist and as such responsible for the archives and museums of Worms, tried to discover what had happened to the manuscripts and other items which had been on display in the Jewish Museum in the corridor of the synagogue and to the Community Archives which had been preserved in the community offices located next to the synagogue, but which had not been harmed by the conflagration.⁹⁸ He learned that the displays in the synagogue corridor had been burnt and that the Community Archives had disappeared. With the help of the Worms municipality and the Hesse State Government, Dr. Illert tried to track down the Archives, to no avail. In the summer of 1943 or thereabouts, the head office of the Gestapo in Darmstadt sought an expert who could decipher foreign manuscripts, and Dr. Illert was recommended as a likely candidate. He was invited to the ducal palace in Darmstadt and there, in the palace basement, he was asked to identify a pile of manuscripts. Dr. Illert immediately realized that he had before him the Archives of the Jewish Community of Worms, including the two volumes of the *Mahzor*. At personal risk, he succeeded in

⁹³ According to the next entry, which relates to it (see below, No. 13).

⁹⁴ The letter ב at the end of the date signifies: according to the abbreviated era.

⁹⁵ Cf. above, n. 91

⁹⁶ Cf. above, n. 94. It is almost certain that entry No. 18 was made by him.

⁹⁷ See Z. Avneri, *Germanica Judaica*, II, Tübingen 1968, p. 316.

⁹⁸ See his list: F.M. Illert, "Die beiden Machsor-Bände von 1272" in *Sefer Worms* (above, n. 1), p. 228.

getting all of the material out of the cellars of the Gestapo and transferred for safekeeping to one of the towers of the city's Cathedral (Dom St. Peter). Because of this, the two volumes of the *Mahzor* were also saved from the Allied bombing of the city.⁹⁹ In 1956, negotiations began between Israel's delegation in Germany, the *Branche Française* of the Jewish Trust Corporation for Germany organization, Dr. Alex Bein (the State of Israel's Archivist and Director of the Central Zionist Archives in Jerusalem) and Mr. Daniel Jacob Cohen (Director of the General Archives for Jewish History), on the one side, and the various German jurisdictions, on the other, about transferring the Worms Jewish Community Archives to Israel. Dr. Bein and Mr. Cohen were also asked by Dr. Kurt D. Wormann, Director of the Jewish National and University Library in Jerusalem, to negotiate for transferring the volumes of the *Mahzor* to the Jewish National and University Library in Jerusalem. On the 2nd of October, 1956, an agreement to transfer the Archives and the *Mahzor* to Israel was signed in Cologne. On the 19th of December, 1956, the agreement was approved by the Worms Municipality. On the 14th of March, 1957, the material was given over to the Israel Mission to Germany and, about three months later, it was moved to Israel.¹⁰⁰ The volumes of the *Mahzor* were turned over to the Jewish National and University Library, the Community Archives were turned over to the General Archives for Jewish History (now the Central Archives for the History of the Jewish People), and the remains of five Torah scrolls, saved from the ruins of the synagogue by Dr. Illert, were turned over to the Ministry of Religions.¹⁰¹

While Volume II of the *Mahzor* has been preserved in excellent physical condition, this has not been the case with Volume I which was, apparently, used more frequently. Indeed, its binding was preserved — it was restored at the beginning of the twentieth century — but its folios were separated from one another and there was no trace left of the structure of its quires; its margins, to a great extent, were cut, its illustrations damaged, and many of the pages stained. In 1981, the Jewish National and University Library began the restoration of Volume I of the *Mahzor* with the counsel of Prof. Otto Wächter, Director of the Institute for Restoration of the National Library in Vienna and one of the world's great authorities on illuminated manuscript restoration, who visited Jerusalem at the Library's invitation. Through the generosity of the Austrian National Library, by the end of 1981 ten illuminated folios which had been especially damaged were restored at the Institute for Restoration of the Library in Vienna

under Prof. Wächter's supervision. The work of restoring the *Mahzor*, including reconstruction of its quire structure, was completed in 1982 after which it was photographed for this facsimile edition.

F. A CODICOLOGICAL DESCRIPTION OF THE MAHZOR

1. Material

The *Mahzor* was written on sheets of parchment. At the time the *Mahzor* was copied, parchment was the only writing material in Germany. On the *Mahzor*'s parchment folios there are many scores and holes; these were there from the outset, as in fols. 9, 60, 76, 85 (two holes), 87, 89, 109, 119, 180. A few of the holes were patched when the *Mahzor* was written but the patches did not survive, and all that remained are the stitchings of the patches around the holes, as in fols. 4 (two remains of patches), 57, 63, 84, 137,¹⁰² 153, 190, 200. On fol. 83 one can make out where a hole was patched without sewing.

Over the years, various folios were torn, as in the upper part of fol. 110, the bottom of fol. 79, and fol. 186 whose length was cut. Similarly, many tears are discernible in the folio margins.

On fols. 154–176, even after the restoration of the manuscript, many tallow stains remained, presumably from the drippings of candles. These stains appear only on the folios of the liturgy for the Ninth of Av and offer rare "archaeological" evidence of the Ashkenazi custom — whose earliest documented source seems to be approximately from the period of the *Mahzor* — of praying on the eve of the Ninth of Av by the light of a single candle lit near the *Mahzor* of the cantor,¹⁰³ a custom also attested to in the *Sefer ha-Minhagim* (Book of Customs) of the Worms Community.¹⁰⁴

Both sides of the animal hide from which parchment was made — the outer or hair-side and the inner or flesh-side — were prepared for writing, and in most kinds of parchment used in the Middle Ages for the writing of Hebrew books, the differences between the two sides were retained and are still distinguishable. The hair-side is rougher and, generally, the roots or their follicles remain. The flesh-side is smooth and glossy, with no traces of hair. Manuscripts written on parchment whose two sides are discernible are usually arranged by matching the sides so that the two

99 See D.J. Cohen, "Das Archiv der Gemeinde Worms", *Leo Baeck Institute Bulletin*, I (1957), p. 120.

100 The examination of the shipment of material in Jerusalem took place on June 13th, 1957, according to Minutes of June 14, 1957.

101 The information was assembled from documents in the Jewish National and University Library and the Central Archives for the History of the Jewish People. My thanks to Dr. D.J. Cohen, Director of the Central Archives, for his help. See also: G. Illert, "Die jüdischen Altentümer in Worms in den Jahren 1938–1961", *Sefer Worms* (above, n. 1), pp. 233–239.

102 There is a gash across which, on each side of the folio, the scribe wrote a word.

103 Apparently, earliest source for this practice is *Sefer ha-Mordekhai* by Mordecai b. Hillel Ashkenazi (1240?–1298), a pupil of R. Meir of Rothenburg (born in Worms), quoted in *Sefer Maharil*, Warsaw 1874, p. 34a: "The *Mordekhai* in the laws of mourning says that it is our custom in the synagogue on the Ninth of Av to light only one candle for the *hazzan* etc. as is justified by the verse 'The sun and the moon have

become black...' and so is it written in the *Agguda* [by Alexander Suslin ha-Kohen]: on the eve of the Ninth of Av all the candles in the synagogue are extinguished except that of the *hazzan* and another from which to light the *hazzan*'s, should it go out; and thereafter the Maharil followed that practice every year." Later on, this custom was included in the *Shulhan Arukh, Orach Hayyim, Hilkhot Tish'a be-Av*, 559:3.

104 *Sefer ha-Minhagim* of the Worms Community which was composed by Judah b. Joseph Moses known as Liva Kircheim, and which was completed in 1613, has survived for us in a 1746 copy which somehow reached the Rabbinical Seminary in Breslau; see Epstein (above, n. 42), pp. 292–303. The manuscript is preserved today in the Jewish Historical Institute in Warsaw, MS 32; a photostat of it is in the IMHM of the Jewish National and University Library, E. 11602. Among the practices of the Ninth of Av we find (fol. 155v): "and all of the candles [in the synagogue] are extinguished, even the perpetual ones, as soon as the *hazzan* says *הוא נרדום* except for two — one to be placed before the *hazzan* and one from which to relight it if it is extinguished."

pages at every opening of the book appear identical, hair-side or flesh-side alternating. In the parchment which the scribe of our *Mahzor* used, however, the two sides cannot be distinguished. Both sides of the parchment appear absolutely identical: both are rough and there are no traces of hair roots or follicles.¹⁰⁵

This kind of parchment (vellum) preparation, by a technique which makes both sides appear completely identical, is characteristic only of Hebrew manuscripts in Germany, from the middle of the thirteenth century onward, though the beginnings of this technique are already recognizable at the end of the twelfth century.¹⁰⁶

2. The Composition of the Quires

As stated, the structure of the quires in Volume I of the *Mahzor* was not preserved: all of its leaves were separated one from the other. Even the folds of the sheets in the pairs of conjugate leaves which were connected to each other and made up the quires were not preserved. Similarly, devices usually used by the Hebrew copyists to assure the order of the quires¹⁰⁷ — such as a catchword in the margin of the last leaf of the quire (which is to be the first word of the next quire) — could not help us to discover the composition of the quires, since the margins of the manuscript were cut considerably. Still, we have managed to reconstruct the codex and the precise composition of all of its quires. This reconstruction was done by a careful examination of the pinholes which were used for the ruling of the lines and which remained in the inner margins of the manuscript's folios.

In the Middle Ages it was the copyists' practice to use a sharp instrument (an awl, knife, or compass) for pricking the outer margins of the parchment sheets or the outer and inner margins of the parchment leaves in order to make columns of tiny holes or nicks on both edges of the open sheet or leaf¹⁰⁸ to guide the ruling of the lines. With the aid of a ruler, each line was ruled from hole to parallel hole. To assure that these columns of prickings were parallel and uniform throughout the quire, they would pierce all the folios of the quire at one time, while the quire was folded. Thus it was possible to rule the sheets or folios uniformly, and to reach a standard form of writing.¹⁰⁹

Columns of such small pin-pricks which guided the copyist in his ruling were in fact preserved in the inner margins of the *Mahzor's* folios. Since the quires were not pricked mechanically but in individual units, it is possible to carefully examine the forms of the prickings and their spacing, the track of the course of the columns, the angles of the prickings and to see where these change. Such examination reveals that the number of folios pricked as a unit was generally eight, and since it is clear that each quire was done separately, it can be concluded with certainty that the *Mahzor* was composed of quires of four sheets folded over (eight folios), which was indeed the regular composition of the quires in Hebrew manuscripts from Germany.¹¹⁰

In this fashion it was possible to reconstruct precisely the original composition of all the quires of the *Mahzor*, as will be shown below. The correctness of this reconstruction is supported by

several facts: Folios 157–180, on which the scribe wrote 26 lines, as against the other folios of the liturgical part of the *Mahzor* on which he wrote 27 lines, actually comprise three full quires in our reconstruction. Four reduced quires — three of two sheets (four folios) and one of three sheets (six folios) — which were found in our reconstruction, indeed belong at the end of sections. The biblical part is written on separate quires. The leaves on which traces of hair signs were found (fols. 144r and 145v) are in fact one side of an inner sheet in our reconstruction.

Here is the reconstruction of the *Mahzor's* composition by quires: 13 quires of 4 sheets (8 folios): fols. 1–8, 9–16, 17–24, 25–32, 33–40, 41–48, 49–56, 57–64, 65–72, 73–80, 81–88, 89–96, 97–104.

1 quire of 2 sheets (4 folios): fols. 105–108 (the end of Passover).

9 quires of 4 sheets (8 folios): fols. 109–116, 117–124, 125–132, 133–140, 141–148, 149–156, 157–164, 165–172, 173–180.

1 quire of 2 sheets (4 folios): fols. 181–184 (end of the Ninth of Av and end of the liturgical segment; fol. 184v was left blank from the start).

2 quires of 4 sheets: fols. 185–195 (the first folio of the quire is missing),¹¹¹ 196–199.

1 quire of 2 sheets: fols. 200–203 (end of Job).

1 quire of 4 sheets: fols. 204–211.

The last quire of 3 sheets (6 folios): fols. 212–217.

Oxford MS Laud. Or. 324, a well-preserved manuscript which was also written by Simḥah the Scribe, is also made up of four-sheet quires (8 folios). In this manuscript, whose bottom margins (and the others as well) were not cut to the same extent as those of the Worms *Mahzor*, catchwords have remained in the bottom margins. This system of catchwords — writing the opening word of the next quire on the bottom of the last page of the preceding quire — ensured the proper sequence of the quires of the codex when it was first bound and in all subsequent bindings. It was the only system for preserving the order of the codex customary in the Ashkenazi manuscripts of that period.¹¹² There is no doubt that Simḥah the Copyist also wrote such catchwords at the end of each quire but they were cut off over the years with the rebindings of the *Mahzor*.

3. Ruling

The pages, leaves or sheets of the manuscript were ruled before they were written upon. The ruling is the architectural plan for the written area and its relationship to the page or opening of the book. It guides the scribe in his copying and provides the copy with unity and order. Likewise, in the design of the book's opening, it expresses aesthetic concepts and traditions.

As stated above, the *Mahzor* was ruled by means of tiny prickings in the margins which were made by a sharp metal instrument, probably a knife. These prickings, visible on the inner margins of each of the *Mahzor's* folios, were used for guiding the ruling of the lines. They were all made at the same time on each quire while it was folded. Sometimes these were done from the recto side and sometimes from the verso side.

105 Only on rare occasions have roots of the hair survived as, for example, in the sheets of fols. 144r/145v.

106 M. Beit-Arié, *Hebrew Codicology — Tentative Typology of Technical Practices Employed in Hebrew Dated Medieval Manuscripts* 2, Jerusalem 1981, pp. 22–25, 111 (henceforth: Beit-Arié).

107 See *ibid.*, pp. 50–68.

108 Similarly, prickings were made in the upper and lower margins to guide the drawing of the vertical margin lines.

109 Beit-Arié, pp. 69–72.

110 *Ibid.*, pp. 43, 48.

111 This folio contained the beginning of the Book of Ecclesiastes, preceded by the end of one of the other Scrolls before it. Between fols. 184 and 185, not only is this folio missing but all the many other quires which contained the *mahzor* for the High Holy Days and Sukkot, as well as the beginning of the *Mahzor's* biblical section. It could be that these quires and those which survived at the end of this section were originally bound in a separate volume.

112 Beit-Arié, p. 54.

Undoubtedly, vertical rows of pricks were also made in the outer margins of the *Mahzor's* original folios, parallel to the inner column, but these were cut away when the manuscript was bound after its completion or when, in the course of time, it was rebound, as was the case with many manuscripts. The existence of rows of pricks in the outer margins is a must, to guide the copyist in ruling the lines of the manuscript's folios or sheets or pages. With the aid of a ruler, they drew the ruling instrument (stylus or pencil) from the pricking in one margin of the folio (or sheet or page) to the parallel one in the other. In mediaeval Hebrew manuscripts written on parchment, we find two systems of pricking the margins for guiding the ruling of the lines. In one system, common to all of the Hebrew manuscripts which were produced in the Orient, in Byzantium and in Italy, in the early Ashkenazi manuscripts and in a few of the Sephardi ones from the latter part of the thirteenth century on, only the right-hand margins of the folded quire were pricked; therefore, each unfolded sheet had a row of prickings in the right outer margin and a similar row in the left outer margin and the copyist ruled the lines of the two leaves of the open sheet simultaneously. In the other system, customary to the Sephardi and Ashkenazi manuscripts only, both the outer and inner margins of the folded quire were pricked; thus each folio had a row of prickings in the outer margin and a parallel row in the inner one and the copyist ruled the lines of the folio (or two folios at once) or the lines on both sides of the folio by aligning the ruler with the parallel prickings.¹¹³ Clearly, therefore, there had to have been such rows of pricks in the outer margins of the *Mahzor* as well¹¹⁴ which, as we said, disappeared with the cutting of the margins.

In the mid-thirteenth century, in Ashkenaz — in the lands of Germany and France — we can discern the shift from the one system of pricking to the other. All the early manuscripts were pricked only on the outer margins whereas most of the manuscripts written in the last third of the thirteenth century were pricked alike on both the outer and inner margins as were, almost without exception, all of the Ashkenazi manuscripts from the beginning of the fourteenth century on. The beginning of the new technique is already evident in the quires written by one of the two scribes who copied a manuscript in Germany in 1223/3,¹¹⁵ yet the earliest Ashkenazi manuscript which has all of its quires pricked according to the new system was only written in 1261,¹¹⁶ near the date when the Worms *Mahzor* was copied.

In addition to the inner margin marking for ruling the lines, prickings were also made in the *Mahzor's* margins to guide the

ruling of the vertical marginal lines. For each vertical margin line, two pricks were made: one in the upper margin and one in the lower. Most of the upper margin pricks, however, did not survive, disappearing with the cutting of the upper margins for the rebinding or rebindings of the *Mahzor*; but those of the lower margins did remain and are found in many quires. The prickings for the ruling of the vertical margin lines have remained in their entirety in the lower margins and in part of the upper margins of the quire of fols. 157–161.¹¹⁷ In the quires which contain the biblical part of the *Mahzor*, six pin-pricks have remained in the lower margins, identical to the number of vertical margin lines which had been ruled for copying the biblical part which was written, as we have said, in three columns.

The number of marks for ruling the *Mahzor's* lines is of course the same as the number of lines ruled, but is one more than the number of actual written lines, for it was the practice of the Ashkenazi copyists to write the rows of words between two ruled lines¹¹⁸ unlike those of the rest of the Diaspora, who suspended their letters from the ruled lines and wrote as many lines as they scored. Therefore, in most of the *Mahzor's* quires which have 27 written lines, we find 28 pricks in the vertical rows of inner margin marks; in the three quires with 26 written lines (fols. 157–180), 27 pricks; while in the quires of the biblical part, which have 32 written lines, there are 33 pricks.

In the marginal markings for ruling we find a phenomenon familiar to us only from the Ashkenazi manuscripts. In all the manuscripts written outside of Ashkenaz, we find rows of single pricks whereas in many Ashkenazi manuscripts, beginning with the earliest one dated,¹¹⁹ we have pairs of prickings instead of one. The pairs of prickings do not appear in the margins of every line but only in a few select lines among the first and last ones and often also among the middle ones.¹²⁰ From the manuscripts whose ruling has survived intact, it appears that the lines whose margins contain the pairs of prickings were drawn from pin-hole to pin-hole, with the ruled line continuing across both the inner and outer margins, whereas the lines whose margins have the single prickings were drawn only between the vertical marginal lines of the written area.¹²¹ In the Worms *Mahzor* we find that in the quires of 27 written lines and 28 marginal prickings (and 28 ruled lines), there is always a second prick alongside the first and third, the fourteenth¹²² and sixteenth, the twenty-sixth and twenty-eighth (the last one). In the three quires with 26 written lines and 27 pricks (fols. 157–180), a second prick of similar form was added alongside the first and third, the thirteenth and fif-

113 *Ibid.*, p. 70.

114 In the MS Oxford which Simḥah the Scribe copied, prickings in the outer margins of most of the quires did indeed survive. In Volume II of the Worms *Mahzor*, whose margins were cut to a somewhat lesser degree than those of Volume I, one can make out the traces of the prickings of the outer margins.

115 This is MS Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Cod. Hebr. 5, one of whose scribes came from Würzburg (see above, n. 47).

116 MS Toronto, Friedberg Collection, which formerly was in the General Theological Seminary Library in New York and whose style of writing is similar to that of our *Mahzor* (and see above, n. 36). It seems that pricking of the outer and inner margins was already customary in Hebrew manuscripts written in England at the end of the twelfth century, as was the case with the insular Latin manuscripts. See M. Beit-Arié, *The Only Dated Hebrew Manuscript Written in England (1189 CE) and the Problem of Pre-Expulsion Anglo-Hebrew Manuscripts*, Oxford 1985, pp. 11–14, 25–28.

117 Prickings remained in the upper margins of the folios of sheets 159/162, 160/161.

118 We find a parallel, if not identical, phenomenon in English Latin

manuscripts from the thirteenth century. Until then, in the Latin manuscripts in England no line was ruled above the first written line which, as we know, was written *above* the drawn line. In the thirteenth century the copyists in England adopted the practice which originated in Europe and ruled a line above the first written line. See N.R. Ker, "From 'above top line' to 'below top line' — A Change in Scribal Practice", *Celtica*, V (1960), pp. 13–16.

119 MS Florence, The Central National Library II–I–7, a Talmud written in 1177.

120 To the best of my knowledge, this phenomenon was noticed in (late) Latin manuscripts only by A. Derolez, *The Library of Raphael de Marcatellis*, Ghent 1979, p. 11; but see the next note.

121 About the ruling of the first and last lines, the second or third, and the next to last lines or the second from the last across the entire sheet in English manuscripts, see: N.R. Ker, *English Manuscripts in the Century after the Norman Conquest*, Oxford 1960, pp. 42–43. Ker does not deal with the pricking of these lines at all.

122 Except for the second quire (fols. 9–16), which does not have an additional prick-mark in this line.

teenth, the twenty-fifth and twenty-seventh. In the quires of the biblical part of the *Mahzor* (fols. 185–217), which have 32 written lines and 33 prickings (and 33 ruled lines), a second mark was added beside the first and third, the sixteenth and eighteenth, the thirty-first and thirty-third. The locations of the additional pricks in the folios of the liturgical part are different from those in the folios of the biblical part. In the folios of the body of the *Mahzor*, the added prick was made toward the margin (inner), whereas in the biblical part it is toward the written area.

The difference in the pricking technique in Ashkenaz, and especially in Germany, was related to the difference in the preparation of the parchment as well as to the difference in the manner of ruling and the tool used for it. The early manuscripts were written on parchment in which the natural differences between the two sides had been preserved; were pricked on the outer margins only; and were ruled with the aid of a hard point only on the hair-side of the opened sheet. The manuscripts produced with the new system were written on parchment prepared so that both sides appeared identical; were pricked alike on both the outer and inner margins; and every page was ruled by pencil.¹²³ The earliest Ashkenazi manuscript which was completely produced with these new techniques is the MS Toronto, mentioned above, which was written in 1264; *Mahzor Worms*, written eight years thereafter, is one of the early manuscripts produced in its entirety according to the new system.

To be sure, it is difficult to make out the horizontal lines and the markings of the vertical margin lines on the pages of the *Mahzor*, but one can still find weak traces of ruling done with a thin black pencil, which are clearly visible with a magnifying glass. Traces of the ruling are evident, for example, on fols. 41r, 121r, 134v, 138v, 145r, 149v, 150r, and more clearly in the leaves of the biblical part, e.g. fols. 191r, 191v, 201r. The pencil used for ruling manuscripts in the Middle Ages was of metal, made up of three parts lead and one part bronze.¹²⁴ In the course of time, its markings were entirely or mostly erased from the parchment leaves, as in the case of the *Worms Mahzor*, or only traces of the scratch of the metal pencil remained, as we find in the *Mahzor*, for example, on fols. 70v–72v where the traces of the ruling of the lines seem to be engraved by a sharp instrument.¹²⁵

As was mentioned, the pages of the *Mahzor* have one line more ruled than written, and the letters were written between one ruled line and the next, as was done by the copyists of Ashkenaz only. In addition to the single vertical margin line to the right and left of the ruled lines,¹²⁶ traces can be made out within the written area of vertical margin lines in keeping with the prosodic structure of the *piyyuṭim* and their division into hemistichs, as on fols. 70v–72v.

4. The Layout of the Text

It is difficult to analyze and present the format of the *Mahzor*, i.e. the relationship between the layout of the written area to the size of the parchment leaves, and the aesthetic design of the opening, because the margins of the manuscript were not only cut down during its bindings over the generations, but were cut neither uniformly nor proportionately. A few facts attest to the great degree to which the margins of the folios — the upper, lower, outer and even inner ones — were reduced. On the lower margins, there remain no quire catchwords which were undoubtedly at the bottom of the last leaf of each quire, to the right of the left margin line.¹²⁷ Likewise, no prickings for guiding the ruling of the vertical margin lines remain in many quires. In the outer margins, no columns of pin-pricks for guiding the ruling of the horizontal lines have survived — columns which generally were one or two centimeters from the edge of the folio. Also attesting to the trimming of the outer margins are the truncated notations which had been written there, like the one, apparently written by the copyist himself, on fol. 3r.

The absence of the marks for drawing the vertical margin lines and their traces on a few folios only, attest to the removal of the upper margins; and the truncated marginal notes written there, as on fol. 22v, attest to the cutting of the inner margins, where rows of pricks for the ruling of the lines did in fact remain at a recognizable distance from the edge of the folio and where apparently the amount of cutting after the sheets fell apart into single folios was minimal. The trimming of the margins not only changed the ratio of the page or sheet size to the written text area entirely, but it even distorted the page layout of the written text area so that we cannot determine the aesthetic and geometric principles employed by the scribe, because the margins were not trimmed uniformly. To be sure, the outside dimensions of the *Mahzor's* folios after cutting are uniform enough (373–378 mm × 298–302 mm), but the dimensions of the margins around the written area are not uniform and vary by approximately 2 cms. Therefore it is impossible to examine the proportions of the *Mahzor's* page layout and compare them to the proportions and geometric models of the layouts which were customary in the mediaeval manuscripts.¹²⁸ Generally one can still ascertain that the width of the lower margins was much greater than that of the upper ones, as was customary in all the Hebrew manuscripts. Yet the widths of the inner margins are identical and sometimes even greater than those of the outer ones, which is unlike the page layout patterns of the Hebrew copyists.¹²⁹ Undoubtedly the outer margins were trimmed to a much greater extent than were the inner ones.¹³⁰

123 See Beit-Arié, p. 84, also n. 159, on the period of transition in the second half of the thirteenth century when both techniques were prevalent.

124 See A. Stiennon, *Paléographie du moyen âge*, Paris 1973, p. 159.

125 In Volume II of the *Mahzor*, which was not as damaged in the course of time as Volume I, the ruling by pencil did indeed survive and is quite evident.

126 This pattern of ruling also applies to the columns of the biblical part of the *Mahzor*, for even there the columns of text are bounded by single margin lines. In the Hebrew manuscripts (as in the non-Hebrew ones) there are more complex ruling patterns in which several margin lines are ruled. There have been attempts to classify the variegated forms of ruling in the Hebrew manuscripts; see M. Dukan, *La classification des schémas de réglure dans les manuscrits hébreux du moyen âge* (Thèse pour le doctorat de III^e cycle, Université de la Sorbonne Nouvelle, Paris III), I–II, Paris 1982.

127 As in MS Oxford which Simḥah the Scribe copied.

128 On these proportions and geometric models in the Latin MSS see the

“La mise en page” section in J. Gillisen, *Prolegomènes à la codicologie*, Gaud 1977, pp. 123–244.

129 According to the proportions for page layout spelled out in a formula for copyists in a ninth century Latin manuscript (MS Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 11884), the upper margins should be two-thirds of the lower (and outer) margins, and the inner margins two thirds of the upper margins. The ratio of the folio's width to its length, according to this formula, is 5:4, and the width of the lower and outer margins is one part of the dimensions of the length. See E.K. Rand, *The Earliest Book of Tours* (*Studies in the Script of Tours*, II), Cambridge (Mass.) 1931, p. 88.

130 The margins of MS Oxford, which Simḥah the Scribe had copied, were trimmed much less than those of the *Mahzor* and can attest to the proportions of the scribe's page layout. The MS Oxford dimensions are much larger than those of the *Mahzor*: 580 mm × 385 mm. The width of the bottom margins is almost double that of the upper ones (120mm : 68mm), and the width of the outer margins is 1½ times greater than that of the inner ones (85 mm : 55 mm).

The ratio between the width of the written area and its length is firm. Despite the slight deviations in the uniformity of the dimensions of the written area, mainly in length (284–295 mm × 201–205 mm in the body of the *Mahzor*; 287–300 mm × 213–216 mm in the biblical unit), the ratio of written area to length is approximately 0.71 on the pages of the *Mahzor* and approximately 0.73 on the pages of the biblical part.¹³¹

5. Devices to Maintain the Left-hand Margin

Though the left margin sets the limit of the lines, it does not guarantee that the lines written in Hebrew will in fact end in a straight edge. Unlike the Latin scribes, Hebrew copyists tried very hard to produce lines as uniform as possible, to avoid protrusions beyond the left margin line, to fill the lines to the end, and, in this way, to preserve the uniform page layout of the book. The mediaeval Hebrew copyists developed a broad range of devices for this purpose, some common to broad geo-cultural areas, some unique to one or another region.¹³² The scribe of the Worms *Mahzor* also employed various means to write lines of more or less uniform length which conform to the end margin lines, except for the *piyyuṭim*, which were written in prosodic form. His stratagems are those common to the Ashkenazi copyists and fall into two categories: those by which the scribe fills out the line up to the margin bounding-line and that which prevents the margin from being exceeded.

(a) Stratagems for Filling the Line

When the scribe neared the end of the line and realized that after writing the next word there would still be some empty space left, he adopted one of the following devices or combinations thereof:

(1) *Widening the last letters of the last word.* When employing this device, the scribe of the *Mahzor* refrained from widening a

letter if its extension would distort its form or cause it to resemble another letter.¹³³ Thus, the scribe was not wont to extend the letters *gimel*, *vav*, *zayin*, *yod* and final *nun* for, if he widened them, their form would resemble the letter *resh*; nor would he widen the letters *tet*, regular *mem*, *ayin*, regular *pe* and regular *zade*, which do not lend themselves to it.¹³⁴ The letters most commonly extended in the writing of the *Mahzor*'s scribe are *alef*, *dalet*, *he*, *lamed*, *qof*, *resh*, *tav*, and final *mem*, as in the later traditions of writing a Torah scroll,¹³⁵ and also final *kaf*. This stratagem is very common in the pages which were not written in prosodic form in the body of the *Mahzor*, and at the ends of the lines of biblical text columns. See, for example, fol. 40r where this stratagem appears at the end of a number of lines (final *mem* at the end of line 3, *he* at the end of line 6, *alef* at the end of line 7, *resh* at the end of 14, *dalet* at the end of 15, *tav* at the end of 16, *dalet* at the end of 17, *resh* at the end of 21, final *mem* at the end of 24, final *pe* at the end of 25), or fol. 3r at the end of whose lines only the letters *alef*, *he*, *lamed*, *tav* and final *mem* are widened (*alef* at the end of lines 9, 24; *he* at the end of 11; *lamed* at the end of 13; *tav* at the end of lines 1, 2, 15; final *mem* at the end of line 19).

Generally, it is the last letter that is widened. However, if the last letter or the last two letters do not lend themselves to being extended, the scribe will extend a preceding letter: see for example, fol. 2v, line 22 (*qof* preceding *yod*); fol. 3r, line 2 (*tav* preceding *nun* and *yod*); fol. 35v, line 4 (*dalet* preceding *vav* and final *nun*). Yet on occasion the scribe does extend a letter preceding a final one even when the latter is expandable, as on fol. 81r, end of line 24 (the *alef* preceding the *dalet*).

(2) *Anticipating the beginning of the next word.* Like the Hebrew copyists in all regions, the *Mahzor*'s scribe fills the empty spaces at the ends of lines by beginning the next word till he reaches the margin line. At the start of the next line, he rewrites the complete

131 Different proportions are found in the early oriental manuscripts of the Bible. See M. Beit-Arié, "Codicological and Palaeographic Description", in *The Damascus Pentateuch*, Part II (*Early Hebrew Manuscripts in Facsimile*, II), Copenhagen 1982, p. 8.

132 For a detailed survey of these devices see Beit-Arié, pp. 87–103. While the roots of this tradition originate in the prohibition against exceeding the margin lines in the writing of a Torah Scroll (Talmud Bavli, *Menahot* 30a–b and below, n. 134), the beginnings of a few stratagems are already evident in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

133 Hebrew copyists apparently began to use this device only in the latter part of the ninth century (and perhaps even a bit earlier); cf. S.A. Birnbaum, *The Hebrew Scripts*, I, Leiden 1971, cols. 173–174. On the extension of letters on Jewish tombstones of the Middle Ages preserved in the Cluny Museum in Paris, see the recently published: Colette Sirat, "Écriture sur pierre et écriture sur parchemin", *La Revue du Louvre et des Musées de France*, IV (1983), pp. 250–251. On the Arabic origin of the dilatation cf. Colette Sirat, *Les papyrus en caractères hébraïques trouvés en Égypte*, Paris 1985, pp. 72, 75.

134 An extended regular *pe* may resemble a regular *kaf*. Even a regular *nun* is not generally extended but, on occasion, its base alone is lengthened so that it does not resemble a regular *kaf* (see, for example, fol. 35v, line 25). It may be that regular letters were not extended because it was possible to extend the last letter of those words. Extension of the letter *shin*, which is also not easy, is most rare: see, for example, on fol. 187v, col. 3, line 17.

135 The practice of extending the last letters of lines in the writing of a Torah Scroll is documented for the first time, to the best of my knowledge, by Menahem b. Solomon Me'iri (Provence, 1249–1316) in his *Kiryat Sefer*, ed. M. Herschler, Jerusalem 1956, p. 62: "and if he can only fit two letters within the area and must write three outside it, he should not do it but

should leave the space blank or extend the letters of the previous word to reach the end of the line." Me'iri is referring to a *Baraita* in the Babylonian Talmud: "If he has a five-letter word, he should not write two within the column and three outside it, but rather three within the column and two outside it. If he has a two-letter word, he should not abandon it between the columns but should go back and write it at the beginning of the line" (*Menahot* 30a–b). Apparently his permission to extend the letters was contrary to the opinion of the *Rishonim* and even the *Aharonim*. Maimonides, *Mishneh Torah*, *Hilkhot Sefer Torah*, vii:5 rules: "He must leave the space blank and start at the beginning of the row." The author of *Haggahot Maimuniyyot*, Meir Ha-Kohen, a pupil of R. Meir b. Baruch of Rothenberg, adds explicitly: "but it is forbidden to make the letters larger and draw them out till the end of the line." A specific prohibition against extending the letters is still found in the *Shulhan Arukh*, *Yoreh De'ah*, *Hilkhot Sefer Torah*, para. 273: "and if there is no room to write three letters within the column, he should leave the space blank and not draw out the letters to make them larger than the rest in order to fill out the column." Only in the later books on the laws of writing Torah Scrolls do we find evidence of the aforementioned practice of extending the letters, presented with some hesitation. See, for example, Jonah Landsofer, *Benei Yonah*, Prague 1802, fol. 3a: "and the main thing is that they extend *alef*, *dalet*, *he*, *lamed*, *qof*, *resh*, *tav* and, sometimes, the closed *mem*...and if that is the tradition, we accept it." Compare also what is said by Seligmann Baer Bamberger, *Meleket Shamayim*, Altona 1853, Rule 11:2 (fol. 43a) about another tradition of enlarging the letters *resh*, *dalet*, *tav*, *he*, and his note of reservation: "and it is far preferable that he should not extend any letter lest he change its form, for then it is invalid by the law of the Torah itself."

word.¹³⁶ Above the last letter (sometimes above the one before it), the scribe will place a sign, usually a very short, vertical line like that by which he marks an abbreviated word. However, one can easily distinguish between the beginnings of these words, which are but a graphic device for filling the line, and abbreviated words similarly marked, since these anticipated words at the ends of the lines were obviously not pointed by the vocalizer. The number of letters of the next word which the copyist writes is not fixed. It depends upon the amount of space remaining till the margin line, and the decision of the copyist to employ only this stratagem or to combine it with another (see below). Therefore the number of letters may vary from only one to most of the letters of the next word.

This device is very common and can be seen on most of the pages which were not written in prosodic form. See, for example, fol. 4v, at the end of lines 1, 2, 11, 23; fol. 205r, column 1, at the end of lines 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 10, 15, 23, 28, 29.

There is a variation of the above technique: like many Ashkenazi copyists writing in the square script, the copyist sometimes uses the last letter from the beginning of the next word, inserting it to fill out the line, writing it, however, not in its complete form, but in truncated fashion, omitting a part of it. This applies to the letters *alef* (for example, fol. 27r, end of line 23), *mem* (for example, fol. 4v, end of line 23), *ayin* (for example, fol. 75v, end of line 24), *pe* (for example, fol. 82r, end of line 20) and *shin* (for example, fol. 26v, at the end of line 13).¹³⁷

(3) *Graphic filler*. Very often, to fill the lines to the margin, the scribe inserts graphic forms which are not letters. These kinds of filler are typical of the Ashkenazi copyists. There are two main types: the most common can be seen at the end of the last line of fol. 1v and the other, at the end of line 17 on fol. 3r. To be sure, there are so many variations of these two types that sometimes the differences between them become blurred; see, for example, the graphic fillers at the ends of lines 3, 5, 10, 11, 17, on fol. 6v, or the ends of lines 3, 12, 16, 23, 26, on fol. 7r.

The graphic filler as a device for filling the end of a line is usually used by itself or after the "start of the next word" stratagem, as on fol. 2v (the last line), fol. 25r (lines 2, 3). In such instances, the graphic filler is sometimes connected to the last letter of the anticipated word and, as a result, its form is changed; see, for example, the connection of the graphic filler to the letter *vav* on fol. 12r (end of line 6), on fol. 26r, (end of line 4), and on fol. 27v

(end of line 16), the joining of the graphic filler to the letter *resh* on fol. 100r (end of line 5), and to the letter *dalet* on fol. 30v (line 22). The graphic filler is similarly connected to the letter *mem* when it is written incompletely at the end of anticipated words (for example, on fol. 27r, line 16).

(b) *Stratagem for Remaining within the Margin Line*

At the ends of lines the scribe did not hesitate to deviate slightly beyond the left margin line when it was a matter of writing one or two letters; these were usually written in compressed form. In a few places, at the ends of stanzas of *piyyut* or prayers, when the scribe reached the end of the line but still had another complete word or two to copy, he did not copy it on an additional line but wrote it above the end of the line vertically toward the top; see fols. 5r (line 17), 16r (line 10), 16v (line 5), 20r (last line), 29r (line 22), 37r (line 16), 58r (line 18), 92v (line 25), 168v (line 11). In this fashion, at the end of two of the *Mahzor's* sections, the scribe wrote four words above the last line (on fol. 155r and fol. 184r). With the help of this device, customary almost exclusively among the Ashkenazi copyists,¹³⁸ the scribe did not stray noticeably beyond the margin and preserved the uniform length of the lines.

Appendix: The Old and New Foliations

At the time of its restoration, the manuscript's folios were rearranged according to the reconstruction of its original order. The new arrangement consists mainly of transferring the biblical part, with its concluding colophon, from the beginning of the *Mahzor* to its end; separating the later supplements, which had been written on folios or separate sheets and inserted into the body of the *Mahzor*, and placing them at the end of the manuscript. The table on p. 2 compares the old numeration of the folios, by which the *Mahzor* has been cited in scholarly research till now, and the new folio numeration.

It should be noted that in the old foliation the numbers 176 and 177 had been omitted and that, therefore, there is a discrepancy of two folios between the previous descriptions of the *Mahzor* and the number of folios in the new foliation. The old foliation has not been erased from the manuscript's folios and appears in parentheses adjacent to the new foliation.

136 While the beginnings of the use of this stratagem developed together with the device of extending the letters, its origins may be earlier, for we find it used once in one of the letters which has survived from the period of the Bar Kokhba Revolt, in the Beit Mashiko Letter (cf. Beit-Arié [above, n. 116], p. 89, n. 165). About this stratagem on the Jewish tombstones of France, see Sirat (above, n. 133). The unusual statement of R. Eleazar of Worms, quoted by the *Shitah Mequbbezet*, explaining the end of the *Baraita* in *Menahot* mentioned above in the previous note, hints at the use of this stratagem in the time of the *Mahzor* and in its region: "What does it mean that he 'should go back and write'? It should not have said 'go back' since he had not started at the end of the line, and R. Eleazar of Worms explains that this is for a situation where he has a word of five letters such as *AV-Ra-HaM*, writes *AVR* and has the *HM* left over — even though we have said that he may write two letters outside [the area], since these two letters in themselves constitute a word [*HeM*] he may not abandon it but must go back and write the entire word *AV-Ra-HaM* at the beginning of the line." In the *Shitah Mequbbezet*, the source indicated is *Menahot*. A similar formulation is included in a manuscript of glosses to the treatise *Menahot* printed in Venice in 1522, attributed to

Bezalel Ashkenazi, MS Jerusalem, Jewish National and University Library 3° 79 (there the source is indicated as *ת"ח*) and in the book *Binyan Shelomo le-Hokhmat Bezalel* by Solomon Adeni, pupil of Bezalel Ashkenazi, MS London, British Library Or. 421 (Margoliuth Catalogue, No. 421; IMHM, I. 6163), fol. 79r, in the name of *ת"ח חיצונית* ("external *tosafot*"). Therefore, it is clear that this "external *tosafot*" gloss from Eleazar of Worms' commentary was indeed quoted by Bezalel Ashkenazi, in spite of the doubts raised about attributing the *Shitah Mequbbezet* on the order of *Kodashim* to him (see A. Shohetman, *Alii Sejer*, III, 1977, pp. 63–93).

137 Sometimes other last letters are written in compressed form at the ends of anticipated words, such as the *zade* on fol. 209r, column 2, end of line 25; *bet* on fol. 183r, end of line 26; *qof*, whose foot was shortened, on fol. 27r, end of line 22.

138 At the ends of lines they even wrote other letters of the word this way. Cf. Beit-Arié, p. 103 and Table 31; and see *ibid.*, n. 169, on a similar stratagem employed by the scribe of the *Pesher Habakkuk* scroll of the Judean Desert documents.