1. Indeed, Istanbul was also the place where the rulings of Jacob Zemah were printed, as a preface to Rabbi Shmuel Gabbai’s *Meirat Eyinaiim*. But this text was only printed once, in a relatively limited edition, and cannot be compared to the Ari’s *Shulchan Aruch,* which was printed within a number of decades in Krakow, Frankfurt (Oder), and Amsterdam, alongside additional books in the same vein, such as Meir Popresh’s *Or Tzadikim.*
2. It should be noted that although the place of publication is important as a marker for questions related to reading culture and the demand for certain kinds of literature, and can be useful in determining the cultural Zeitgeists among publishers and their circles, it is not a definite indicator of these matters. Many factors could contribute to a certain area becmoing a super-regional printing center, such as the 16th century Italian printing centers, that supplied much of the demand for books also in Eastern Europe. For example, literature printed in Italy during the 17th century found its way into the Ottoman Empire and North Africa. An in-depth study of these kinds of trade contacts and material transmissions necessitates further research. Beyond this discussion, there was one popular tikkun that was printed in the Ottoman Empire already in the middle of the 17th century: *Tikkun HaLyla* and *Tikkun HaYom*, edited by Nathan of Gaza. This text was printed during a single, eventful year – 1666, the peak of Sabbatean events – in no less than five (!) different cities: Amsterdam (six different editions published in three different printing houses, one of which in translation to Spanish), Istanbul, Mantua, Frankfurt, and Prague. The next time the text was reprinted after this date was only in 1801, in Salonika.
3. Thus, for example, merely a year after the first printing of HY, *Shearei Tzion* was printed in Istanbul; this book becameone of the most crucial compositions for the dissemination and adoption of Lurianic ritual literature, prayers, and tikkunim in the Ashkenazi regions. Exactly seventy years after the first edition of *Shearei Tzion* was published in Prague, and after having been reprinted in 12 different editions, the book was printed, for the first and last time, in the Ottoman Empire. For an additional example for this kind of indirect shift in printing and reading culture that took place in the wake of HY, see Benayahu, op. cit.
4. The prayers and tikkunim of HY’s author for the month of Nisan were printed primarily in the booklet *Shkhiot HaChemda*, whose first issue was published in Istanbul as early as 1734, only three years after the first edition of HY, and thereafter reprinted many times in the Ottoman Empire and in Italy. Not all the editions noted by Yaari contain the “problematic” prayers mentioned explicitly by the Hida, although many of them do.
5. Compare this with the view of Rabbi Yechezkel Landau, for whom the fact that a number of popular repentance fasts lacked a Talmudic source exemplified that “most of their words are built on baseless assumptions (*svarot kersiot*).” According to the Hida, the “baseless assumptions” upon which Landau remarked were the work of those who sought to use their intellect to introduce innovations in ritual law, doing away with the Ari’s computations, which are the only reliable ones.
6. Rabbi Efraim HaCohen of Ostroh belonged to Nathan of Gaza’s circle in Salonika, from where he moved to Italy, settling for a time in Modena.
7. To be precise, it is not that this tradition was widespread among many Sabbatean groups, as can be understood from the exchange of letters between Vitali and Efraim HaCohen, and from Vitali’s testimony about Abraham Rovigo, and the custom of Shlomo Ayllon. But the content of their correspondence is nonetheless crucial, as it explicitly frames the question as rlated to the Hassidic customs of the Sabbateans, particularly in Northern Italy and Greece. It seems that Vitali (who was also connected to Nathan and Rovigo’s circles) identifies motives connected to tendencies towards “hypernomian” chastity characteristic of Nathanite Sabbatean circles; in his eyes, the main issue was the extent to which religious traditions and customs were opened up to innovation, thus deviating from tradition.

Vitali was also part of Nathan of Gaza’s circle in Salonika, together with Rabbi Efraim HaCohen, and later became associated with Abraham Rovigo’s circle, and it seems he kept his Messianic beliefs.

1. Vitali avoided the suspicion of those who fought against Sabbateanism, and was widely revered; even Sabbateanism’s most extreme opponents, such as Rabbi Moshe Hagiz, esteemed and respected him. Despite his faith, Vitali stood staunchly by established Lurianic tradition, as passed down to him by his teacher, Moshe Zacut, and refused to accept Sabbatean kabbalistic practices that deviated from it. “But it seems that his way of life, his charitable acts, and his relation to Lurianic kabbalah – in these he followed the path shown to him by Moshe ben Mordechai Zacut.”
2. It is true that Rabbi Immanuel Hai Ricchi upheld this position even earlier, in his book *Mishnat Hasidim*. And indeed, as Tishbi ha shown, there is a deep connection between HY and Ricchi’s writings. Benayahu suggests that this is evidence of “his connection […] to Sabbatean kabbalists.” See the report of the Cistercian monk, Gaudenty Pikulski, who was sent to investigate Jacob Frank and his Sabbatean followers in Landskron, in 1756, who lists Ricchi’s *Yosher Levav* as one of the four books presenting the essence of Sabbatai Tsevi’s faith.
3. The Hida, as usual, did not go into detail about which “summaries and compiled pamphlets” he meant, but it was HY that was mostly responsible for publicizing matters. The fiery debate in Modena struck chords in a number of printed books (responsa), and exchanges of letters between rabbinical authorities of the period, but it is unlikely that these are the text to which the Hida is referring to here. (The discussion concerning the responsa is primarily halachic in nature, and is unrelated to the kabbalistic considerations with which the Hida is concerned here; moreover, it is doubtful whether the private exchanges of letters were published during his lifetime). But above all: the Hida’s term “summaries and compiled pamphlets” is similar to his description of HY as a “collection of sources,” and implies that his warnings against the former apply directly to the latter. In any case, the Modena debate among kabbalists is the context of these passages.
4. See for example the popular prayer composed by the Hida for Rosh HaShanah afternoon. While some parts are indeed taken from HY, the Hida was intentionally discerning, selecting certain lines, but omitting others that have a messianic, Sabbatean character.
5. As for example in his repeated discussions on the correct transmission of the Ari’s writings, and his reservations about certain editions that reflected, according to him, an inauthentic mixing of reliable and unreliable sources.
6. Although the order in which the Hida’s publications appeared is known, their date and order of composition is much more difficult to ascertain, a difficulty that creates uncertainty abjout the immediate context to which the Hida is responding, and hampers our attempt to understand the development of his thought and writing. His three volumes of responsa are also undated. Moreover: some of the Hida’s manuscripts were written in an ongoing process that included re-writings, editing, and additions. Thus, we are faced with a multi-layered textual product, and recourse to the manuscript is not always fruitful, although at times it may be of help (we do not posses an autograph for all his published texts). The Hida’s insisted on proofreading his works before printing, and would update the contents at this late stage according to his later knowledge and halachic developments. Thus, we know he approved of the views expressed in his writings at the time of their publication, but it is not always easy to determine the point in time when he adopted them. Nonetheless, we can state that the Hida’s reservations concerning the wider contexts of the phenomena describe here – a prominent example of which would be the printing of kabbalistic books – became more pronounced from the 1760’s and onwards.
7. From the Hida’s repeated descriptions of the custom, it seems clear that this is a new tradition, created in the 17th century, which had become “rather widespread in the last generation.” It seems highly probably that these are Sabbatean practices.
8. Tishbi has already clearly demonstrated the widespread and varied use the author of HY makes of the title “my teacher” (*mori*) to ascribe importance and authenticity to various instructions. The sources HY’s author attributes to his “teacher” in fact originated from a wide range of periods and places.
9. Oded Cohen has recently treated this question extensively. Cohen has admirably stated the need to view the Hida’s relation to HY in a nuanced manner, and, according to him, though there can be no doubt about the Hida’s basic approach to Sabbateanism, the dualism suggested by Tishbi is unconvincing. Cohen’s main argument pertains to the distinction between Sabbateanism itself and the Sabbatean texts: Cohen argues that the Hida treated books as independent products, in keeping with his worldview regarding texts and books. I do not seek to contend with this distinction, but only to add upon it a further one, related to the matters dealt with here, and concerning the heart of the “true” kabbalistic tradition. In this context, the salient distinction is between different spiritual beliefs (even if they may be considered deplorable) and pragmatic practice; to an extent, the distinction is also between beliefs and practices, on the one hand, and their authors, as people, on the other. That is, the Hida’s positions stem not only from the nature and status of the “independent” texts, but also from the fact that while he considered certain beliefs to be detrimental, he did not think it necessary to call into question religious authorities who were well anchored in the “normative” Jewish world – providing there was no real deviation from prescribed, ritual practice.
10. Despite his tendency to accept Lurianic kabbalah, Nathan’s thought about the Ari’s kavanot was ambivalent, and for a long period he did not accord them any space; these equivocal voices continued to echo much later in the thoughts of his students. But over time the main voice concerning the Ari’s kabbalah in general, and the status of the kavanot in particular, became clearer – see for example the work of Avraham Miranda. His thought echoes the idea that there is a connection between the state of the worlds, the tikkun of mundane world, and the dynamic and fragile state of the kavanot in the generation after Sabbatai. He ends with the statement that “in the matter of the kavanot, I heard from the elders of Jerusalem in 1646 that our teacher, Rabbi Nathan, rescinded his earlier view and stated that the worlds had returned to their place, in light of our grievous sins.” It seems this expresses the general attitude adopted after the conversion, when the central injunction among many Sabbatean Hasidic groups was to uphold the Ari’s kavanot. And even if discussions continued among Nathan’s students, and in Rovigo’s circle, about the Ari’s kavanot, the position of the Izmir circle – expressed by HY, and the extensive space it devotes to Lurianic kavanot, as well as in other writings from the same period and place – and their rapid acceptance not only in their immediate surroundings, but across all of Southern Europe and beyond, clearly attest to the transformation of this tendency. It should also be noted that חילוקים מסומות between different layers of intention (as expressed by Sharaf) are not unthinkable for the Hida, quite the opposite (even if he was unwilling to sustain any objection in principle to the need for these kavanot; see his repeated statements concerning “general *kavanah*” and “private kavanah”).
11. Of course, such a stable reality could be undermined, as happened, for example, with the appearance of the Frankist movement, and the widespread reactions it elicited in various spheres. For this, as well as another, slightly different, pattern for containing Sabbateanism see Kahana. This pattern was more complex, its character was at odds with the Southern European nature, and the “threat” that it presented was also different.
12. This continual aspect, and the attraction it generated, as part of an attempt to contain, and maybe even to correct, Sabbateanism, has been well treated by Maoz Kahana in his article… Kahana treats the halachic and nomistic aspects in Sabbatai’s though in his article…
13. They were influenced particularly by the image of their teacher, Nathan of Gaza, whose tendency towards Lurianic kabbalah and its ritual practices was striking. In Italy, the most prominent group in this regard during the second half of the 17th century was the circle that surrounded Abraham Rovigo and his students in Modena. Although Tishbi has emphasized the devout Sabbatean beliefs of this group, as well as their hopes for a revelation of Sabbatai that would lead to a radical reform of the halachic system, Tishbi also recognizes that by the end of the 17th century these tendencies had become significantly weakened, and almost completely disappeared. Beyond this, I am uncertain how significant these beliefs were with regards to the present discussion, and what place such beliefs have – even the radical ones – in assessing a practicing pious group (which is the argument I am making here).
14. In light of this insight, the possible question that may arise – how is it possible to reconcile the Hida’s negative stance towards the book, with his great admiration for its publisher, who was also one of his teachers – is a little less disturbing (although we must not assume, in any case, that the Hida suspected his teacher was the composer, but only the publisher).
15. It is possible that in a small number of cases he adopted the position espoused by HY in matters of halacha and ritual, when this position did not clash with other traditions.
16. The subject here is not a fear of intimate relations, but rather much more delicate frameworks and nuances, that take place within a Hassidic-halachic system. If anything, the greater fear was not from antinomism, but from hypernomism, as can glimpsed in the exchange of letters between Vitali and Efraim HaCohen.