p. 200

hinting at Emden’s intention to provide a rebuttal to men of wrongdoing. This may reflect that from the very beginning Emden is indicating that the context for this work is his struggle with adversaries, as well as his frustration that he was being tested like Job.

. This verse establishes very early on Emden’s premuim on the value of truth, something which he repeats often in this work and elsewhere (see Chapter 4, n. 21).

Psalms 146:6 is the very first verse clearly referred to by Emden in this work. It is interesting to note how much that entire chapter in Tehillim includes themes that will figure prominently in this work, in addition to the emphasis on truth mentioned here: praise of God (verses 1-2), the folly in trusting in him (verse 3 is clearly relevant to him whose name was Yaakov); God helps the oppressed and victims of injustice (verse 7-9).

He may also be intending to cloak himself in the authority of Jacob the patriarch.

This phrase clearly indicates that he intended for this work to be read by his children although, as is quite clear, by others as well (see my introduction).

This verse is the beginning of a dramatic speech made by Yotam at the top of Mount Gerizim after his brothers had been murdered by Avimelech who had only recently been crowned king. By use of a parable, Yotam accused Avimelech of treachery, and calls out to the *baalei Shchem* not to follow him because he will ultimately destroy them. Rather, they must act in a way that will make them deserving of God’s blessings.

It is possible that Emden is using this verse – and the context in which it appears – as a polemic against his enemies who have destroyed their brothers. The text would then mean that Emden is telling his readers

the phrase would read as XX and is patently blasphemous.

Perhaps Emden intends to invoke zekhut avot here, a central theme in the first part of this work.

Perhaps Emden means to argue that he has a special relationship to God, as opposed to his enemies

. Emden considers himself afflicted like Job but here he is acknowledging the righteousness of God’s actions, citing the words of Elihu in defense of God.

clearly echoing the title of this book

p. 201-02

then these two phrases rhyme

Furthermore, this point represents a slight shift in Emden’s focus. Until this point, Emden is reflecting the difficult position he was in, beset by adversaries. Here Emden is referring to another theme, praising God for the salvation He has wrought for him. Both of these motifs are outlined more explicitly in the introduction to the second part of the work (below, pp. 140b-142a).

, The full verse reads XX. It means that all the brothers of the pauper hate him and his friends withdraw from him. Although he pursues them with words, the words remain his and his alone, also clearly reflecting the frustration Emden feels here

Perhaps it means that those, like Eyb, who force themselves into positions of leadership would be unsuccessful. But it is unclear to me.

. my version is more likely

p. 202-03

The word נגד also appears in the previous quote from תהלים. See the previous footnote.

Once again, this would refer to Emden’s enemies and to God’s protection of him from them.

The verses before and after this one are relevant here and might contribute to understanding what Emden had in mind in citing this one:

Job asks his friends to pity him because God has afflicted him. He does not want to be pursued and wishes that his words could be inscribed forever in a book. This is precisely what I believe Emden wants to accomplish with this work he is now setting out to write. At the end of the day he believes that he will be vindicated by God who will live forever.

The full text reads as follows,

Perhaps Emden is intending here to suggest that unlike the lives and actions of his enemies which will not be recorded for posterity, his life and actions will be forever recorded in this book.

In this verse, the prophet Ezekiel says that false prophets will not merit any of the blessings of God, perhaps a reference to those Emden considers to be his enemies.

Emden makes reference to this phrase often in his works.

p. 203

From here it is clear that Emden’s intended audience for this book included his descendants

. Once again, the explicit mention of Yaakov here is not coincidental.

. These words are added in the version of

. This entire first paragraph introduction is difficult to understand, as it is a collection of different verses brough together. Nevertheless, I hope I have demonstrated that it serves to set the stage for a number of important themes in this work: expressing gratitude to God for His assistance and asserting Emden’s righteousness in the face of his adversaries. Compare this section, an introduction to the first part of the work which is a biography of his father, to Emden’s more elaborate introduction to Part 2 of this book when he begins to tell the story of his own life (below, pp. 140b-142a). See my introduction.

P 204

It is necessary to correct the reference of

For additional information regarding him, see

for at least a short period of time, R Yaakov may have been a Shabbetai.

P 208

He ,mistakenly notes that Reb Elyeh was a student of the Maharal. For this case of mistaken identity, see Shnayer Z. Leiman,

P 210

(This book was reprinted with the same pagination in

Gershom Scholem, cites an English translation of a letter written in 1674 from a non-Jew, Christoph Arnold, to J. Christoph Wagenseil, including a slightly different version of this story.

p. 211

For a similar, earlier, version of this story, see Moshe Idel, "The Golem in Jewish Magical Mysticism, " p. 31; *idem.*, *Golem*, p. 208. For this version, see Hillel J.

Louis Jacobs, *Theology in the Responsa* (London, 1975), 170, points out that Hakham Zevi’s responsum is not in reply to a question put to him, but is a discussion of an issue he raised for himself. Moshe Idel (*Golem*, p. 218; *idem*. and Emily D. Bilsky, "The Golem: An Historical Overview," p. 13) suggested that perhaps both Hakham Zevi and Emden were interested in exploring this issue on their own in order to protect their ancestor from the charge of murder. However, there seems to be some ambiguity regarding Hakham Zevi’s position on whether or not one would be permitted to kill such a "golem." See J. David Bleich,

This position of the Hakham Zevi was discussed and debated in subsequent halakhic literature

For modern applications of Hakham Zevi’s responsum and the "golem" issue in general, see Azriel Rosenfeld,

P 212

See XXי that Emden was said to have told in the name of R. Elyah

p. 213

at which point in the service on Shavuot should one recite

P 215

I have more recently concluded that this השערה is incorrect

p. 216

Therefore those who offer suggestions as to

p. 218

Emden here writes that RDO told him about his grandfather but it is unclear when this happened. Perhaps it was when they were both in Hannover on 1714 (see below, p. 132b) or when Emden visited with him in Prague in around 483 (see below, p. 155b).

p. 219

in the version of the text

p. 220

where Glikl records that HZ refused to give RBK a *heter* he requested.

The issue he addresses, the controversy in Mantua, took place that year

This is in keeping with the tradition of constant ongoing Talmud Torah around the clock, day and night, a tradition that started earlier but became more widespread in the eighteenth century and, as Emden describes below (p. 119b), was the practice in his father’s kloiz in Altona. This practice reached its peak in the Volozhin yeshiva in the nineteenth century.

p. 221

His sefer musar, *Kav ha-yashar* was very popular in the eighteenth century

In the version of that work printed . . .

p. 222

For the movement of refugees of the Chimielnicki Massacres of 1648-1649 into Moravia, see

P 223

For when R. Jacob assumed the position of Rabbi in Ofen

This is a reference to the fact that they were of the Greek Orthodox Chrisitan faith

This is the person in charge of all the captive

p. 224

In the manuscript there is a mark that looks like a large *khof* after the word *la-aretz*.

p. 225

," although here "*tumam*" refers to their mistaken naivité

According to R. Pinhas Katzenellenbogen, it was he who told this story to three of the sons of Hakham Zebi, Natan, Dovid, and Ephraim, when they came on a Friday night to his home כשבאו לביקור לקהילת בראד בשנת תק"ח. "וספרתי להם את כל הקורות את אבי זקינם מו"ה יעקב ז"ל והנס אשר נעשה לו כאשר שמעתי מפה קדוש אאמ"ו זצללה"ה [ר' משה] והיו מתמיהים על דבר החידוש הזה, ואמרו אלמלא לא באנו לכאן אלא לשמוע דבר זה דיינו."

However, that version of the story is slightly different than the one presented here (It places it in Ovin during a.

p. 226

This story has been printed and discussed in a number of places

p. 229

Their arrival in Budin bishnat Tav Chaf Vav directly coincided with the rise of the Sabbatian movement which swept through almost the entire Jewish world at that time, and Budin was no exception. Like other Hungarian communities, it too became a center of Sabbatean influence and activity

p. 230

For other references to Sabbatianism in Ofen, see D. Kaufmann, XX, reprinted as a separate monograph (Waitzen, 1912)

For general information about this community during this period, see

See, especially, the secondary literature in Hungarian cited there on p. 92, nn. 46, 47

p. 232

where Emden cites a story he heard from his father about the status of Jews under Islam that he probably heard now while he was in the East.

Raphael Patai, *The Jewish Alchemist* (Princeton, 1994), 483, writes – to my knowledge with no evidence – that Ḥakham Ẓebi spent some twelve years in Salonika and then one more in Belgrade

19. If this story ever happened, and it is highly unlikely, it happened during this chapter in HZ’s life.

It was during this trip to the East, that Ḥakham Ẓebi came into contact with present and former Sabbatians and gained a first-hand knowledge of Sabbatian traditions and beliefs, so much so that he was approached by others for information about the movement.

P 233

. S. Krauss, "Die Palästinasiedlung," p. 88, n. 45, errs in writing that the son of this R. Saul married HZ’s daughter Miriam. This *mechutan* of HZ was another R. Saul The same mistake is made by

According to Emden, his father already had first hand experience with Sabbateans as a child:

Interestingly, Hakham Zevi’s first hand knowledge of Sabbatean lore is indicated by the fact that a later work quotes him כמקור למסורת שבתאית על מותו של שבתי צבי:

p. 234

For this issue, and Hakham Zevi’s central role in it, see

In addition to exposing Ḥakam Ẓebi to Sabbateanism, this trip also gave him first hand information about Sephardic Jewry and, from then on, he had a special connection to the Sephardic community

, and much more below

He also learned the language spoken by the

he also learned

שם "אשכנזי" by which he was known.

It is important to point out here that *s”t* in HZ’s signature clearly cannot refer to *sefardi tahor* given that he was an Ashkenazi.

p. 235

although he refers to himself as

p. 236

For other places where divrei Torah of HZ were published, see

Some of these, in addition to the *shu"t* and *divrei Torah* printed in,

It is only after the first edition was published that the title of the work became שו"ת חכם צבי. This was noticed in passing by

p. 237

As a result of a disagreement he had with the lay leaders there

p. 238

In 1770, the Prussian government asked RZH, then rabbi of Berlin, to co-author with Moses Mendelssohn a book on Jewish law and eight years later it was published under the title *Die Ritualgesetze der Juden.*

. For Levin’s complex relationship with Mendelssohn and Wessley and the world view they represented, see Alexander Altmann,

In his letter resigning from his position as rabbi in Berlin he explicitly noted that the members of the community there did not allow him to express his true feelings about Wessley.

p. 239

They are discussed in

For his position on the ongoing issue of

For portraits of RZH, known as Hart Lyon when he served as rabbi of the Great Synagogue in London, see his edition of Emden’s commentary on Pirkei Avot,

p. 240

Emden’s relationship with his nephew was a close but complicated one

For a short story involving

R. Zevi Hirsch had in his possession Emden’s copy of Azarayah de Rossi’s *Meor Einayim* with Emden’s notes in the margins. See

This copy is found today in the library of Jewish Theological Seminary in New York.

They were published together with LS a number of times beginning in Berlin, 1834. See the title page of that volume

p. 241

Their practice was that before the wedding the groom would sign a document (called a *shtar hazarah*) that if his wife would die without children, her dowry would revert back to her father.

For more on Hakham Zevi’s role as rabbi in Sarajevo, see Moritz Levy, *Die*

The disagreement that led, at least partially to his

adversary

p. 242

HZ orignally thought that the Chayon he met in that city was the same Chayon he had met earlier in Sharai but when he met him he realized that he had been mistaken

the brackets are in his text

She questions the credibility of Ayllon’s report and concludes that Hayon was “most likely the Chiya Arokh from Sarajevo.” However, Ayllon’s version of the events is also found elsewhere

P 245

It means that if you have money in your hand that belongs to someone else, open the palm of your hand to give it to him. Here it means to bribe.

p. 246

For an analysis of the entire episode,

p. 246-7

This story sounds very similar to a story about HZ and RBK where RBK wanted permission from a number of rabbis, including HZ, to marry a certain woman and HZ refused. See below, Chapter 2, n. 106. Might E be merging these two stories?

It is very interesting to note that this case was invoked by the Jewish council in Hamburg in 1732. In arguing that it did not have the authority to lift a ban against an individual (Joseph Jonas), it cited as a precedent the case of Marcus Ansbach who was placed under the ban by a rabbi in Cracow because he married someone deemed inappropriate for him by Jewish law. They noted that although the Kaiser and the Prussian king intervened on his behalf with very strong letters of support written to the king of Poland who threatened to expel the Jews if the ban was not lifted, the Jewish authorities there still refused to do so. The relevant documents, found in the Hamburg State Archives, are cited in David H. Horowitz, “Fractures and Fissures

No single man from the age of twenty and higher was allowed to live in Yerushalayim.

Emden’s first wife was Rachel, granddaughter of R. Naphtali Katz. See below, p. 133a. On R. N. Katz, see there, n. 133.

p. 248

David Giladi, "The Jews of Hungary and Eretz Israel," 129, writes that he died "about 1697/8."

We know that HZ followed Ashkenazi customs.

It is impossible to accept the conclusion of Alexandr Putik, "The Prague Sojourn," pp. 88-92, 122, that RY died in 1711-1712.

His proof is that if he died at age 73, he would have been in his mid thirties when the story took place (described earlier, pp. 115a-116a) about how he returned to his wife after having been given up for dead, and it would not have been possible for Emden to refer to him there as “*bahur bi-shanim* (p. 115a) or “*rakot shanav*” (p. 115b). This point is also made by

p. 249

as part of his long journey

and he still referred to himself as "

And, referring to himself about a year later, Emden again uses the phrase

p. 250

For another example of this mistaken identity, see E. Carmoly, “Nafthali ha-Cohen,”XX. See Gershon Scholem’s copy of Meir Benayahu’s article on R Yaakov Vilna, cited above, in Osaf Gershom Sholem (#5141). He added a note there (on p. ) that R Yaakov Vilna married the daughter of R Naftali in Israel. This is a well known custom, but I unable to discover other sources for it prior to the eighteenth century.

writes that she was engaged to Salomon Oettingen Lichtenstadt, son of the communal leader Abraham Aaron

p. 251

for an elaborate treatment of the matter, including many earlier sources, see

p. 253

Hakham Zevi married off the eldest four children (three daughters and Emden) and engaged a fourth daughter בחייו (p.149a). When he died, seven children were unmarried (p. 146a).

p. 254

For evidence of the number of children generally born in a family during this period,

He also had other children later in Amsterdam who did die young. See below p. 132a, 143b. There were fifteen in all (p. 134a). As a result, Dembitzer, Kelilat Yofi 1, p. 99a, is not fully precise when he writes, citing Megillat Sefer here,

For Jewish infant mortality in Amsterdam at this time, see

Although the context would imply that Emden was writing this in that year (see my introduction), this word is not in the manuscript.

See XX and the references cited in n. 50. On the background of the kloiz in the Sephardic community see

p. 256

[“This holy book is readily available in Hebrew and Yiddish and everyone can read it. I have studied this holy book for more than twenty years, thanks to God, may He be blessed, and have memorized this introduction.”] I translated from the original based on the English translation of Morris M. Faierstein, *The* Libes Briv *of Isaac Wetzlar* (Atlanta, 1996), 58. For the original text, see there, in Yiddish, p. 15.

[“All the old holy books always call this book, ‘the holy book.’ I am certain that when you will have read this book several times, you will thank me profusely, and the merit will protect me and all of Israel. I ask you to read in it as long as you live. I assure you that I have read and studied it more than fifty times and every time found something new in it.”] I translated from the original based on the English translation of Morris M. Faierstein, *The* Libes Briv, p. 102

No other book had as great an influence on Wetzlar. See

p. 257

Several Yiddish editions of Havot ha-Levavot were published in Amsterdam at this time. See

For the study of these works in Ashkenazi circles in previous generations, see Eric Zimmer, who notes that R. David gave daily lectures on matters of Kabbalah and philosophy including the

This was cited

It is also repeatedly cited in the secondary literature on the subject. See, for example,

p. 258

For the continued interest of rabbinic scholars in the Tur even after the publication of the SA,.

For Hakham Zevi’s extensive knowledge of grammar,

In spite of these protestations, Emden’s knowledge of grammar was quite extensive and he makes numerous dikduk comments in his Amudei Shamayim and Shaarei Shamayim commentary on the Siddur and in his LS commentary on the Mishnah

p. 259

Clearly, this reflects great knowledge of *dikduk.* Indeed, given all of this one wonders why Emden downplays his knowledge in this area.

One finds something similar regarding

he goes on to reflect a significant knowledge of dikduk

p. 260

where Emden offers a long spirited defense of scholars accepting presents.

This trait of HZ is confirmed by another source as well

p. 261

For this and more on the frequency of births in this period

p. 262

. פירושו you may keep your gifts for yourself and give your presents to others.

Emden often writes with pride how HZ refused to accept presents from anybody

p. 265

But see below, p. 123b, where Emden writes that there was a wealthy parnas in the community who wanted to support HZ and he would have been able to do so had there not been those in the community who were opposed to the arrangement.

p. 266

On the challenge that *stam yeynam* posed during that time

It is interesting that RY Eyb refers to this as well

For this issue in eighteenth century Frankfurt, see Edward Fram,

p. 267

This story is repeatedly cited

he introduces it by saying

p. 268

This passage from MS about HZ’s involvement in helping

p. 270

Emden’s use of the word "מוכס" here touched off an interesting exchange in the pages of the journal *Ha-Shiloah* very shortly after David Kahane printed the book for the first time. Ahad Haam reprinted this passage from MS there and after the words "משפחה שאין בו מוכס" added in parenthesis ."שם זר וחדש לגובה ומאסף מעות א"י!" On p. 582 of that same journal, דר. שמעון ברנפלד (דר. ש. ב.) responded with an explanation trying to defend Emden’s use of the word.

The next verse reads,

Emden uses phrases like this a number of times in this work indicating that he was aware that he had strayed from the focus of his presentation. See my introduction.

p. 271

There it means the increased value of the object; here it means praise. See the next note.

Most of the books in Michael’s collection originally owned by Emden – and many, if not all, with notes of Emden’s in his handwriting in the margins – were bought by the British Museum library. See

Assuming that this is – even mostly – true, it is possible to utilize this work to assess the level of intellectual achievement reached by Emden, then a mere twenty years of age at the time he delivered this eulogy for his father. Indeed the level was a high one. The *hakdamah* and the *kinah* contain poetic mosaics of various biblical and talmudic phrases while the *techinah* is suffused with assorted Kabbalistic allusions. The *hesped* itself, which occupies the bulk of the work, is impressive, and contains a wide range of sources: A dozen or so talmudic references as well as midrashic, medieval and later material. In addition, although Emden disclaimed an interest in Kabbalah by stating: “*ve-en li esek binistarot kan”* (p. 5b), the *hesped* is replete with Kabbalistic ideas and is liberally sprinkled with statements from the *Zohar* and the teachings of Rabbi Isaac Luria. It also reflects issues and concerns as well as a tone which later appeared often throughout Emden’s literary oeuvre: self-assurance, an interest in exegesis and philology, and a desire to establish complete harmony between differing points of view, particularly between the esoteric (“*nistar*”) and exoteric (“*nigleh*”) teachings.

p. 272

Yet, although, as indicated, this discourse is characteristic of Emden’s later writing, its exegetical methodology was quite different from that which he employed in his subsequent works. In this work, Emden utilized the type of forced and pilpulistic constructions for which he later often expressed disdain. It is odd to read the following from a man who was to be repeatedly critical of the homilitical methodology current in his day

Perhaps Emden tailored his remarks here to the tastes of an audience – the Polish community of Lemberg accustomed to talmudic casuistry - which he knew would appreciate this type of style. If so, his repeated references to the fact that this discourse was very well received do not simply reflect retrospecitve pride but should be understood also as an attempt to justify what he clearly considered to be a methodological compromise.

For an example of Emden’s sharp critique of contemporary Ashkenazi drush, see SY 1:81(a):

p. 273

Natalie Zemon Davis pointed out that it is interesting to note that Hakham Zevi taught his son none of these languages and Emden had to learn some languages other than Hebrew on his own (see below, pp. 163b, 1-164a, 1). See “Glikl has Juda Leib – ein jüdisches, ein europäisches Leben,” in Monika Richarz, ed., *Die Hamburger Kauffran Glikl: Jüdische Existenz in der Frühen Neuzeit* (Hamburg, 2001), 41. This could be because HZ did not consider it important or, more likely, because he really didn’t teach his son anything, even *limmudei kodesh* (see below, p. 144b, and elsewhere).

He is also referred to that way in a description of a portrait of him as cited in I. Solomons,

p. 276-7

In 1751, while rabbi in Amsterdam, RAL was invited to assume the post of rabbi in Prague.. Le-maaseh he never actually filled that position. The appointment was rescinded because the community no longer wanted him after he supported Emden vs. Eyb.

Emden’s relationship with his brother-in-law was a complicated one. One senses Emden’s jealousy at his father’s generosity to him when he married his daughter Miriam (below, pp. 136a, 147b). Emden also expressed less than respect for RAL’s Torah knowledge (below, pp. 124a, 148b

. Yet, RAL wrote a *haskamah* to the commentary on the siddur written by his brother-in-law. Emden introduces it as follows

RAL also played a very central role in siding with his brother-in-law in his controversy with Rabbi Yonatan Eybeschutz, and his name came up repeatedly in Emden’s books on that subject. See, especially,

הוא נפטר באמשטרדם בשביעי של פסח, שנת תקט"ו. ב"ספר הזכרונות" של ק"ק אמשטרדם one can find a detailed description of the days prior to his death, his death, his funeral the next day on *yom tov aharon shel ha-chag* in Miderburg,

,a short boat ride away, and memorial services that took place in his memory. In all these, the Sephardic community in Amsterdam was actively involved.

On this matter of writings of HZ left unpublished in his lifetime

Contrast this with Emden’s very critical description of RYK who, he claims, used to act only for the sake of getting presents. See p. 176a.

It is interesting to note that Yehuda Aryeh Modena, in his *Chayei Yehudah*, also points to difficulties that were attendent upon his birth, that were more physical than emotional. For this phenomenon in general in autobiographical texts, see Marcus Moseley,

p. 280

Emden repeatedly discusses illnesses in this work; it is a recurring motif in it. For more, see

p. 282

*Encyclopedia Judaica* 6 (Berlin, 1930), 586, first writes 1697 and, a few lines later, writes: "1696 oder 1698";

p. 283

the book was printed in XX although it is impossible to know when Emden wrote these words. In any case, regardless of which date we accept for Emden’s birth, he was clearly at least sixty years old in XX

For references to Altona as Emden’s birthplace, see below p. 119b,

The very first time in this work that he refers to himself, discussing his birth, he calls himself Yavetz, not Yaakov.

To my mind, this issue later figured very prominently in the eyes of E who felt that he should have been chosen as CR of AHW after RYK died in 1749, following in the footsteps of his father and maternal grandfather who had served in that position. For more on this, see my introduction.

For general background about this name, see

For descriptions of births in autobiographical texts that were associated with problems or traumas, see

For more on the preference for sons over daughters

She also addresses Emden’s overall attitude to women.

p. 287

This reference here is to the Great Northern War that began in 1700 when an alliance of Denmark -under the leadership of Frederick IV-, Norway, Saxony, Poland and Russia declared war on the Swedish Empire, and it lasted until 1721 with the defeat of Sweden. Altona, then under Danish rule, was less safe than Hamburg. For this war,

p. 288

בכת"י unclear

For examples of the opposite

p. 289

The phenomenon of wealthy Jews setting up a beit midrash in their house for local Torah scholars whom they supported is well known. ראו למעלה, פרק א, הע' 254.

Elsewhere, Emden was critical of this phenomenon.

For the phenomenon of wives sometimes being more generous than their husbands

p. 290

there it is positive, here it is negative

For an example of where HZ refused to go along with a request of RBK

who is a signatory on a document

p. 291-2

There is a growing literature on the Jewish practice of sons or sons-in-law inheriting the rabbinic position from their fathers or fathers-in-law. See XX and the various articles printed in *Jewish History* 13:1 (1999). In the nineteenth century, Hatam Sofer reviewed many of the earlier sources regarding this issue in an important responsum (*Orah Hayyim*, #12) that has received some attention. See Stuart A. Cohen,

p. 292

To my mind, this issue later figured very prominently in the eyes of E who felt that he should have been chosen as CR of AHW after RYK died in 1749, following in the footsteps of his father and maternal grandfather who had served in that position. For more on this, see my introduction.

based on many other examples just in this work alone.

This is no longer extant.

It stands to reason that there is a connection regarding

p. 293

,". . . it was decided that both candidates should serve, but alternately, each for a period of six months. Naturally, friction and strife over religious questions ensued, and finally became so intense that in 1709 Ashkenazi deemed it advisable to resign."

p. 294

For a very important document on this episode which, like *Megillat Sefer* here and XX makes no reference whatsoever to the

p.296

the desire of the London community to arrange for a portrait of HZ

p. 298

Emden uses phrases like this a number of times in this work indicating that he was aware that he had strayed from the focus of his presentation. See my introduction.

Maybe one of the reasons HZ was interested in accepting the offer of the Amsterdam community was because it boasted an established printing press which could publish his divrei Torah. For Amsterdam as a center for Hebrew printing then, see

p. 299

For another example of writers travelling to cities with printing presses in the previous century,

For the difficulty of this trip in the winter and the difficulties the family encountered in becoming acclimated in their new country of residence,

p. 304

For the complexities surrounding community mikvahs and the collection of fees for their use a generation earlier in Altona, see

p. 305

For a portrait of R. Yehiel Mikhel, see

For a portrait of him, see

Perhaps this is what Emden was referring to when he wrote about

p. 308-9

David Kahana, the editor of the first printed edition of MS, intended to publish Leyb’s work but died before being able to do so. See Radensky, p. 45. It was published only in 1978 by Z. Shazar. For this work by Shazar , see

For reviews of his edition, see

p. 309

For the testimony that Reb Leib received directly from Hakham Zevi regarding the place and date of Shabbetai Zevi’s death,

A significant portion of R. Leib’s text was translated into English in p. 311

Emden himself repeatedly criticized the *hazanim* of his generation. For an example of a sharp formulation,

p. 312

For more references to Emden’s negative attitude to חזנים

p. 313

For a particularly sharp formulation

For earlier medieval and other modern critques, see

He was uncomfortable writing

p. 316

For more on the respect of the Sephardim for Hakham Zevi at the beginning of this affair

It means that the book was defective from the outset.

p. 318

The library of the London Beit Din contained a manuscript of Nehemyah Hayon entitled ספר העצומות on the *Zohar* and *Tikkunei Zohar* with notes in the margin by R. Ayllon. See the Christie’s catalogue for an auction on June 23, 1999, p. 79.

Interestingly, it has been noted that his work *Leket ha-Kemah* is the first to include

p. 319

Hagiz will reappear in this book not only as a supporter of HZ, but as someone with whom E himself, some thirty years his junior, had an ambivalent relationship. For a description of it, see the index to this book, s.v. “Hagiz, R. Moshe” and my *Rabbi Jacob Emden*, pp. 201-02

The context in the gemara is that if a reshus that is too small to have it considered as a separate area in its own right (thereby prohibiting carrying on Shabbat within it) abuts a larger one in which carrying is forbidden, it merges with it and become a place where carrying is also forbidden. Emden uses this phrase as a play on words to mean that a "min" or heretic becomes involved with other heretics and, ultimately, can not be separated from them

p. 322

Emden here is correct about the beginnings of the Sephardic settlement and the relationship between Sephardim and Ashkenazim in the early years of Jewish life in Amsterdam. For more recent treatment of the subject, see

Yosef Kaplan has devoted a great deal of attention to this subject. For a list of relevant articles of his, see

p. 324

Relevant here is also the fact that Emden repeatedly referred to himself - and others referred to him - as "קנאי בן קנאי"

For the use of this phrase to and by R. Moshe Hagiz, see Elisheva Carlebach,

p. 325

See here E’s intended readership

p. 326

E will devote some attention to this controversy with RYE towards the end of this work. See pp. 203a and on

p. 327

The issue of Eyb’s alleged crypto-Christianity was raised in an anonymous pamphlet published in Altona in May, 1752 entitiled *Kurzer*

On the issue in general, see there pp. 143-51.

p. 330

he refers to XX in an analysis of his position

p. 331

לפי זה טועה, Albert M. Hyamson, who writes thatIt is even said that he (i.e., Haham Zevi) was offered the appointment of Haham of London, but this is apocryphal

It has been suggested that it was for this reason that HZ may have chosen Ashkenzi as his family name. It is more likely that he was given that name by the Sephardim in the East when he studied among them in his youth (see above, p. 116a).

p. 332

For an example of where he favors minhag sefardim, see

Most of the members of the Jewish community in Livorno in central Italy were of Spanish and Portuguese origin and the only official languages of the Jews there were Spanish and Portuguese. See

He too cites HZ’s teshuvah and takes him to task for writing to R. Mordecai, one of the parties in the dispute, and not sharing his misgivings with him directly, as rabbi of the community. This story is summarized by

p. 333

This controversy also came to the attention of the non-Jewish community and a reference to it is included in Johann Jacob Schudt,

p. 333-4

Mordechai’s wife was Freudchen, a daughter of Glükl of Hamlen. His son was Moses Marcus who, despite strong opposition from his father, converted to Christianity. On Moses, see his

p. 334

There is some question as to where HZ’s boat docked. See

p. 336

According to Roth, R. Aberle was the one who suggested getting Hakham Zvi involved in the Nieto affair.

Mistakenly refers to

p. 337

This passage has been dealt with at length in

He points to this passage as evidence for a shift in the role of the rabbi in the perception of his admirers. See too

See too p. 126 for a reference to the type of hat HZ is wearing in the portraits

Apparently there are three extant copies, one in the Jewish Museum in London, and two in private hands, one in Jerusalem and one in London.

For information about rabbinic portraits in the eighteenth century in general and Hakham Zevi in particular, see

p. 338

There is also a mistaken reference to a”temunah” of Yavez as well

I saw such a portrait in the private possession of Professor Shnayer Z. Leiman

E writes there about a medal that was produced for ר' אלעזר ב"ר שמואל רוקח when he was elected CR in Amsterdam in 1735

p. 339

For more on this medal, see

For earlier portraits on medals, see

For Emden’s much more critical attitude to a portrait of Eyb venerated by his followers, see

For more on R. Rokeach and his family relationship to Emden, see below, n. 415.

This city will become very significant for Yavetz when he will move there in the summer of 489 (=1729) to assume the position of rabbi. See below, Chapter 7.

p. 340

his very strong attraction to a young woman he wanted to marry

to fit with the biblical verse he wanted to cite

But this formulation is strange

p. 341

This was a very important episode in Emden’s life

p. 342

I assume that, here too, Emden is referring to the events of the Great Northern War that was taking place at that time. See Chapter 2, n. 56.

There are several references in MS to Emden’s staying in inns

These were public places where Jews and non-Jews directly encountered one another in real, clear and unmediated ways. One wonders if and how these encounters exposed Emden to the larger non-Jewish world. For examples of the social significance of inns during this period, see

p. 343

It is interesting that E waited to explain the historical context of his father’s תשובה printed as סי' א' in his book of תשובות until the end of the תשובה. That he does not do so as an introduction to the תשובה gives the impression that he felt there was no need for him to justify why he begins his own book of shu"t with one by his father. This is reminiscent of MS itself where he begins the work with the story of his father’s life, and does not present the context of and justification for the book until he presents his own life. This, however, leaves open the question of why he did not present the entire historical context for this shu"t at the beginning of #3 where he presents his own responsum on the matter.

But the context is different

indicating that he was still alive and sometimes followed by z"l clearly written after he died).

Also, the text and tone of the salutation at the beginning of SY 1:3 indicate that he intended to send at least part of it directly to R. Yehiel Mikhel

p. 344

He had a special connection to what he wrote in his youth even if he later came to disagree with it

For this and other examples of this phenomenon,

He was one of the most colorful and interesting figures of the eighteenth century. On him, see

For a fire in Frankfurt that he was accused of starting, see Chapter 5, n. 202

p. 345

There were previous family connections between

In addition, R. Aryeh Leib, who married Miriam, the eldest daughter of Ḥakam Ẓebi (see Chapter 1, n. 426) was the son of R. Saul (see Chapter 2, n. 276) and grandson of R. Heschel (see Chapter 1, n. 32). R. Heschel had a daughter named Grona who was married to R. Meshullam Zalman b. Yoel Hakohen whose daughter was a daughter-in-law of R. N. Katz and the mother of Rachel, Emden’s first wife

and his attitudes towards death have recently been the subjects of a series of studies by

p. 346

Yehuda Liebes has argued that R.N. was not unequivocal in the position he took against Hayyon. He questions R.N.’s later claim that his *haskamah* for Hayyon’s *Oz L'Elohim* was obtained under false pretences and lists other Sabbatean books to which R.N. also gave *haskamot*. In addition, Liebes finds in R.N.’s writings

To strengthen the impression that R.N. was an anti-Sabbatian, Liebes notes that he married off his granddaughter "לרודף השבתאים המפורסם ר' יעקב עמדין" (Heb. p. 294; Eng. p. 210). However, at the time of this wedding, Emden was just seventeen (and maybe sixteen; see below, n. 270; Chapter 4, n. 4) years old and not "*mefursam*" at anything. More correct to say would be that R.N.’s marrying his granddaughter to the son of HZ, ,רודף השבתאים המפורסם gave the impression that he, too, shared those beliefs

p. 348

which touches, inter alia, on money given to a young couple as dowry. He probably had his own situation on mind (see below, n. 283):

p. 348-9

Emden here makes it clear that this was a marriage arranged for him by his father and not one in which he had any emotional involvement. The only time he mentions *ahavah* or *“hibah yeterah”* here is in the personal relationship between the two parties to this *shidduch* – the groom’s father and the bride’s grandfather – and not between the bride and groom. Indeed, Emden will clearly describe below (p. 191a) how he and his wife had a difficult relationship. The contrast between this and the deep emotional attachement Emden felt towards the girl in Emden whom he wanted to marry and which he described in such intense terms close to forty years later (see below, pp. 143a-b) is striking.

There is a growing literature on the phenomenon of arranged marriages between young teenagers during this period based on social and financial considerations and not romantic ones, an arrangement that aroused particular criticism by Maskilim in the following generation

p. 351

E writes about him in

p. 352

Indeed, the fact that Emden writes this is the reason why Avraham Shmuel Yehuda Gestetner wrote an entire monograph arguing that parts of Megillat Sefer were forged

p. 353

where he writes that that an earlier illness of his when he was a child also caused

For a second description of this story, see

It is interesting to note that, as a teenager, Emden felt that he had enough medical knowledge to diagnose his own illness.

This is also the first reference to the "*moroh shehorah*" from which he repeatedly reports that he suffered for many years

p. 354

His life and works have not yet received the attention they deserve

p. 355

For a fascimile of his handwriting see

p. 356

RYK was serving as the Chief Rabbi in The Triple Community when Emden arrived there to live in 1732 after having served as rabbi in Emden for 4 years. E will have a great deal to write about him below.

p. 357

By contrast, HZ did have the right to do this. See above, p. 126b

Later on in this work, Emden wrote a long critique

I analyze it in detail in my introduction

p. 358

Emden uses this phrase a lot throughout his writings as an expression of respect for his father. It means, far be it from the offspring of his father to ever do anything even remotely innapropriate

Another phrase that reflects this sentiment that Emden uses is X or something very similar to it

For Emden’s striking openness here, see my introduction

It is clear to me that he is here describing his own personal experience.

The inability to consummate one’s marriage on one’s wedding night became a recurring theme described in early Haskalah autobiographies

p. 359

I totally disagree with Andreas Gotzmann that Emden’s writing about his impotence on his wedding night is an expression of an attempt on his part to show how scholarly and pious he was, so absorbed in matters of the spirit, that he could become oblivious to matters relating to his own body, including his sexuality. First of all, I do not have the impression at all from this work, as well as from any of his writings, that Emden was concerned about projecting such a particular image about himself. He presents himself as someone who is concerned with truth regardless of the consequences (see below, Chapter 4, n. 21) but does not go out of his way to present himself as someone who is particularly pious. Related to this is the fact that after this event he went on to father twenty children and nowhere else does he give the impression of being oblivious to his sexuality. Indeed he wrote earlier about his attraction to a young girl he wanted to marry and to an unmarried cousin who would have been willing to have sexual relations with him. He also wrote quite openly about his sexual desires. In my mind, this statement is yet another example of Emden’s total unselfconsicousness in his autobiographical reflections. For Gotzmann’s position, from which he then, erroneously, develops conclusions about early modern rabbinic attitudes to sexuality, see his “Respectability Tested

p. 359-60

Emden’s condition here may shed some additional light on a comment of his

printed in the traditional volume of the Gemara). The Gemara there is discussing the diminishing of sexual desire in old age. It reports that when for Rav Kahana was reciting verses before Rav and encountered the verse “ve-safer ha-aviyonah” (Kohelet 12:5), “nagid ve-itnach,” Rav uttered a long sigh. At which point Rav Kahana said “shema mina butal leh chemdah de-Rav, from this we may conclude that Rav’s desire had ceased”.

It would appear that he was trying to avoid the understanding that Rav simply missed the enjoyment of physical, sexual pleasure and preferred the interpretation that he regretted that he could no longer use sexual intimacy as an instrument of enhancing shalom bayit. Emden went on to note there that Rav had a challenging relationship with his wife, and he cited Yevamot 63a. There is no doubt that there is textual evidence for this interpretation, as Emden himself relates this to the text a few lines earlier which reads “mishum shalom be-bayit” which Rashi (s.v. mishum shalom be-bayit) interprets as “ever tashmish.” However, might this possibly also be referring to Emden’s own situation and the effect it may have had on his own shalom bayit? My thanks to Professor Dov Septimus for suggesting this interpretation to me

.

p. 360

For Emden’s age of seventeen years at the time of his wedding, see also below,

For the difficulties some parents had in meeting their dowry obligations during this period, see

p. 361

Throughout this work, Emden repeatedly criticizes his father-in-law

This is a way of restructuring a loan to be construed as an investment or partnership so as to circumvent the prohibition against collecting or paying *ribit* on a loan

It is not clear how long after Emden’s wedding did his father leave. See below, Chap 4, n. 4.

p. 362

Emden is clearly aware of the division of his work into two parts: stories about his father and stories about himself. He refers here to the next part of his book where he writes about his own life. See my introduction.

At this point it is appropriate to mention how Emden noted later

His travels continued significantly after his father’s death (see Chap. 5, n. 67).

This reflects a certain historical consciousness on Emden’s part that he will not elaborate on details of an event for which he was not present. See my introduction.

There was a history of antagonism between RYK and Haham Zvi. See below p. 175b where Emden relates that RYK tried to stop Haham Zevi from settling in Altona.

p. 363

Gershon David Hundert, *The Jews in a Polish Private Town*, pp. 122-23, who also casts doubt on the truth of this whole story as it is presented here for a similar reason. In addition, he claims that if Zvi Hirsch was indeed as guilty as Emden asserts, would not Haham Zevi have annuled the match between his daughter and Zvi Hirsch’s son?

p. 364

For some reason unclear to me, her name on her *matzevah* is Sarah Nehamah

The central role played by Adam Mikołaj Sieniawski, one of the most prominent wealthy individuals of the time, is the focus of

R. Yisrael Ritfin has been identified by XX as Yisrael Rubinowicz, general manager (or *ekonom*) of the Sieniawski-Czartoryski administration in the eighteenth century.

For this phenomenon at this time, see

p. 365

some wanted HZ to settle in Altona at that time but that the newly elected Chief Rabbi, RYK, opposed it

p. 366

David Kaufmann, in his review of Kahane’s edition of Megillat Sefer published in *MGWJ* 41 (1897):334, already pointed out that this work corrects the mistake of Dembitzer, Caro and Buber.

p. 368

there is no reference there to

Where would he have learned it? Perhaps during the time he spent in the East?

p. 369

This matter became an issue in later centuries, and was especially a focus of criticism by the Maharal

On this passage as reflecting poorly on the Polish rabbinate, see

This was the central institution of Jewish self-government in Poland and Lithuania from the middle of the sixteenth to the middle of the eighteenth century. See *Encyclopaedia Judaica*

p. 370

The cemetery, on the site of the present Krakivskyi Market in Lvov, was destroyed first by German occupiers during World War Two and then by the Soviet authorities.

p. 371

There is some debate about who followed – or was invited to follow – the HZ as rabbi in Lvov

p. 372

After the death of R. Yaakov Reischer, author of *Shvut Yaakov*, who was serving as rabbi in Metz, both R. Falk and R. Yonoson Eybshuetz were candidates for the position. R. Falk was chosen and, after he left for the rabbinate in Frankfurt in 1741 (501), R. Eybeschuetz become the rabbi.

R. Falk was a major figure in the controversy over Eyb, and Emden cites him often in his works on it

p. 373

When Hida visited R. Falk in Worms late in the summer of 1754, R. Falk had recently been deposed as rabbi of the Frankfurt community by supporters of Eyb due to his intense opposition to their rabbi. While there R. Falk took Hida into his confidence and showed him a series of documents which he believed clearly implicated Eyb as a Sabbatean and Hida reacted with great upset. He wrote,

He died shortly thereafter

He played a role in the activities against Sabbatians in 1725

he got into a fight with Sabbateans over the book Hemdat Yamim

who suggests that R. Eliezer may have harbored Sabbatean leanings. Would this be a rare example of where Emden erred, convinced that someone was an anti-Sabbatean when that may not have been the case? Generally, the opposite is more common.

p. 374

(He was first married to the daughter of R. N. Katz, grandfather of Emden’s first wife

p. 376

he was too uncomfortable

For “agalah shel post” during this period, see

p. 380

Emden was very critical of those of his contemporaries who cut off their beards

In fact many of them, rabbis included, shaved. See, for example

p. 381

Emden’s focus on the physical description of his father is unusual and is reminiscent of

p. 382

In their *haskamot* to his *Sefer Eshel Avraham* (FFdM, 506) some of the greatest rabbis of the generation wrote with great respect about R. Avrohom in ways that reflect more than the use of conventional rabbinic hyperbole

p. 385

From this story it is clear that R. Avraham Bruda arrived in Hamburg for his son’s engagement before 467, the year R. Meshulam Zalmon Mireles died (see Chapter 1, n. 236)

p. 387

He was also an opponent of Nehemiah Hayun in 1712

p. 388

It means not at all.

It isn’t clear whether Emden was already seventeen when he was married and, if so, he was separated from his father immediately after his wedding or he was sixteen when he was married, turned seventeen some two weeks later, and then separated from his father

p. 387

This is an unusual phrase and is virtually unknown in rabbinic literature

Emden often draws attention to his emphasis on truth

p. 388

It is clear that E stresses this because he was accused of not always insisting upon the truth. He himself makes mention of this

In addition, E repeatedly cites his commitment to truth as a defence as to why he does not hesitate to argue even with great respected rabbinic predecessors, something for which he was severly criticized

Finally, maybe he wrote that here to posit that his comitment to truth is so strong that he has nothing to hide about himself or anyone else.

p. 389

Here Emden indicates that they are the ones for whom he whote this book. See my introduction.

p. 390

This point of remembering God’s kindness to him in his controvery with Eyb is an important one for Emden

p. 391

This matter which motivated him to write this work

Emden here means the opposite, that the whole world is filled with their shame

Just like there the money Avimelech gave was to demonstrate Sarah’s innocence so that others should not belittle her, so too here truth demonstrates Emden’s innocence

p. 392

It means that these kinds of treatments are best between Pesach and Shavuot.

XX The text is reprinted in XX and because he is not sure what this means he added

p. 393

For more on the level of parental concern over the illness of children during this time, see Linda A. Pollock, *Forgotten Children: Parent-child relations from 1500 to 1900* (Cambridge, 1983), 124-31. She writes that it is wrong to assume, as many had, that parents then were unconcerned with the welfare of their children due to a high infant mortality rate. Her research shows that parents were anxious and upset by the ill health of their children, a conclusion supported by Emden’s description here.

p. 394

Discipline in school was often harsh during this time period. See, for example,

For school discipline in general during this time, see

It is also interesting to note a contemporary critique of *melamdim* from the opposite perspecitve, that they do not discipline their students enough either out of fear of their parents’ reaction or because they didn’t care enough about their students to do so. See

It is very interesting that Emden remembers only sicknesses from his youth and that he relates how the leprosy on his penis was "גרם לאבותי דאגה יגון ואנחה."

p. 395

For information about this among those who lived in the next generation, see

In addition, this is the first of many times in this work where Emden writes with great interest and in great detail about his body and about the different sicknesses he suffered. In fact, his attention to matters of his body is extraordinary and this serves as a major theme of this work. For this theme in general at this time, see

p. 396

The reference here is to

p. 397

ה"טעם ידוע במשפחה" is unclear but becomes clearer when one notes that the only other place this phrase appears in MS is later in this chapter (beg p. 146b) where it refers to someone associated with Sabbatianism. One wonders why E who was normally very forceful and direct in pointing out someone's Sabbatian leaning is here being so cryptic and circumspect. Perhaps in this case he did not want to bad mouth R. Leib and his family because he still had warm feelings for his daughter as is evident from the way he here described the episode that occurred some thirty-five to forty years earlier. If this is true, it offers an interesting window into E's personality. See

p. 398

I get the sense that Emden is expressing deep frustration here and even seems to be expressing himself in a somewhat less than fully respectful manner.

It is remarkable that Emden states explicitly that he did consider the possibility of contravening the wishes of his father. It would also appear that he would have been able to do so, had he so chosen.. For more on marriage in general during this period, see pp. 25-31. On this story as an example of a digression from the communal norms of *shidduchim,* see

It is fascinating that even now, at the height of his anti-Sabbatean activities, Emden was sorry that he did not marry into a Sabbatean family, if, indeed, this is the meaning of "אותו הפגם של משפחה." So strong were his feelings, still, for this woman

I assume the reference here is to the difficulties Emden had with his first wife (see below, p. XX). He is writing, in effect, that although he thought at the time that he gave up on the girl from the city of Emden that he was destined to do better, in fact that was not the case.

For the prerogative of parents to determine choices של השידוכים לבניהם באותו התקופה, ראו

p. 399

the rich man with whom Emden had alot to do when he became rabbi there.

It is interesting that although he clearly had strong feelings for this girl, Emden describes her only as a “melumedet maskelet” and the daughter of a rich man who would have given him a substantial dowry. He reserves the category of feelings for her feelings to him, first at that time and then later, in E,

Yet, it is clear that he had a chibah for her even though he did not feel comfortable describing it here as such

In the traditional community, love generally followed marriage as in the verse in Bereshit XX. Compare this to Hida who was clearly in love with the women he later married

This story drew the attention of XX who included it in his

For a similar story about a father blocking a *shiduch* proposal that his son wanted, see

p. 400

Once again, Emden is referring to the events of the great Northern War that was taking place at that time. See Chapter 1, n. 57.

p. 401

Emden does not give the name of this woman.

Below (p. 145a-b) Emden writes that three years elapsed from the time he arrived in Bruda shortly after his wedding until the death of his father

p. 403

Emden also often referred to statements that he heard from his father, to actions of his father that he witnessed, and to actions of his father that he was unsure of. For example,

p. 404

Emden also refers to stories he heard from his father about what happened at the height of the Sabbatean movement

There are also a number of cases where Emden cites a custom or opinion of his father’s but it is unclear if he directly saw him act that way or heard it directly from him.

In addition, there are a number of occasions when Emden cites actions of his father that he witnessed, although . . .

p. 405

Most interesting is the testimony of one who directly heard from Emden about a practice of his father’s

There is another consideration relevant here. In addition to reticence due to youth, Emden was apparently somewhat intimidated by his father

Note how Emden describes his father’s opposition to certain practices or points of view

The words in bold are more than simple expressions of disapproval and indicate that as a young child Jacob perceived of his father as a harsh person who had no tolerance for any opinion with which he disagreed. No wonder that the young boy was afraid of being humiliated by his father. Based on this, Emden's expression of such a view in a written letter to his brother-in-law, R. Aryeh Leib in 1717 at the age of nineteen (SY1:4, cited above) probably reflects more than mere conventional filial deference

Note also the reference to his father as being in the Holy of Holies . True, young Jacob did sit on his father’s lap but he may very well indeed have been afraid of him

p. 406

In this context, it is instructive to note how Emden often uses the phrase XXX when explaining or defending certain behaviors of his, also a reflection of the powerful role the image of his father played in his life

Finally, in light of the special relationship Emden had with his father, his comment on the margin of his chumash is very interesting

Emden made this point repeatedly earlier in describing the qualities of his father

Regardless, . . .

On other occasions, Emden also drew attention to his lack of formal Torah training

p. 407

For the practice of a young married couple to live in the bride’s parents’ house during this period, see

The next reference is also from this same story of Lot and Sodom

p. 408

Emden uses this verse a number of times in MS to refer to himself

There is surely no question that Emden knows that the midrash applies the verse

For more on Emden's first wife Rachel, see below,

There is a popular story that focuses on . . .

p. 409

They were inherited by Emden’s daughter Chana (see Ch. 13, n. 182). She sold most of the books and manuscripts she inherited from her father to R Hayyim Mikhel in Hamburg but kept some, including this Tur. It was inherited by XX and in the yaer 1868 it went on auction with several other items in Amsterdam.

For the catalogue of this auction, see

p. 410

When the collection was offered for auction in that year, Meijer Roest, the well known Hebrew bibliographer, and author of the 1867 catalogue, above, wrote about it to Rabbi Bernard Felsenthal, a prominent Reform rabbi living in Chicago. Felsenthal published a Letter to the Editor in *The Nation* on June 18, 1868 (“A Valuable Library to be Sold,” p. 492) publicizing this collection and asking some American institution to buy it. For Roest’s letter to Felsenthal and related correspondence, see Robert Cohen, “Bibliotheca Rosentaliana te koop. Enige brieven van Meijer Roest Mzn. en George Rosenthal aun Dr B. Felsenthal in der Verenigde Staten,” *Studia Rosentaliana* 9:1 (1975):90-102. Some interest was expressed by the Jewish community of Philadelphia and by Cornell University but it was purchased by Temple Emanuel in 1871. The Temple acquired an important collection estimated to be worth $10,000 from Frederik Müller, an Amsterdam bookseller, featuring books from three libraries, including Emden’s.

In 1890, Arnold Ehrlich was engaged to prepare a catalogue of the books. See the result in A. B. Ehrlich, "Die

Richard Gottheil, the son of the rabbi of the temple, Gustav Gottheil, was appointed as the first professor of rabbinical literature at that institution

For a full presentation of this story, see

My thanks to Michelle Chesner, Librarian for Jewish Studies at Columbia University, for bringing this article to my attention. For a description of some of these books, see

Most of Emden’s books on Hayim Michael’s collection were sold to the British Library. The manuscripts in the collection were sold to the Bodleian Library in Oxford. See

p. 411

For different arrangements between parents-in-law and sons-in-law at that time, see

p. 412

Emden was sensitive to the fact that Eybeschuetz had many students and he often writes how they were all no good

I believe that references to XX in *Ez Avot* (pp 5a, 8a) refer to Eybeschuetz's student

It is also highly remarkable to note that Emden’s first born son Meir was born during this time. Surprisingly, and almost incomprehendably, Emden did not see fit to mention it here, where it chronologically belongs in his story. The first reference to his son Meir is below, pp. 156b-157a, when Emden writes that when he returned home from a long journey, his son was seven years old.

p. 413

There it refers to shiur in sense of amount, here it refers to shiur in sense of study.

p. 414

Relevant to the phenomenon described here, see

p. 415

A short time after delivering the sermon,

Having a beard was a sign of being a talmid hakham

For Emden’s characterization of himself as XX,

p. 416

It is referring to . . .

p. 417

It means, open the palm of your hand and pay him.

The irony to which Scholem refers there is even sharper because, as will be seen below, R. Nathan's daughter married a brother of Emden.

For the cryptic nature of this Sabbatean reference, see also above,

p. 418

The reference here is unclear

Emden also praises his sister Nechamah for also not wanting to remarry after the death of her husband. See p. 136b, 149a. For the notion that a widow who chooses to remain a widow and not remarry merited special commendation,

p. 419

It would appear that Emden here is holding up his mother as a paradigm of how a wife should feel about her husband, in contrast to what he will describe below (pp. 191a, 193b and more) about his wives’ attitude to him

p. 421

The meaning here is that, with regard to his education, it was as if Reb Aryeh Leib was born into the household of HZ

p. 422

For highly respectful descriptions of him, see

Compare Emden’s description here of his sister’s qualities as a wife with the way he describes his own wives, below pp. 191a, 193b, and more

One gets the sense here that there is more than a tinge of jealousy here on Emden's part for all that his father gave his brother-in-law, so much more than he gave Emden himself, as per earlier, p. 144a.

p. 426

R. Shaul served as CR for thirty-five years

p. 427

This letter is most well known for the regards it includes from the Gra to R. Saul's uncle, Emden, and was written just a few months before Emden died:

p. 428

For a portrait of R. Saul, see

For four generations of this family who served as chief rabbis in Amsterdam, see

Emden here is clearly referring to himself as a brother of their mother. His characterization of his nephews as being similar to him underscores that he saw himself a חכם גדול וספר גדול וחסיד. I assume that the phrase “domim be-miktzas” here refers to similarity in character, not physical image.

p. 431

Once again, note Emden’s awareness that he has strayed from the primary focus of his work. See my introduction.

He finds it “hard to explain” how Emden could write this about Polish Jewry. He suggests that “when he wrote this many decades later, he must have idealized [the] situation in Poland when he was young.”

It means evils that compound one another due to the fact that they follow one another in close proximity

The talmud there discusses the principle that a person who occupies a property for three years is considered its rightful owner. The question arrises if this applies when there are separate witnesses for each year of the three years, i.e., there are two witnesses that he occupied it for the first year, a separate set of witnesses for the second year and a separate set of witneses for the third. Rabbi Akiva rules that testimony is valid only if it establishes a complete *davar* and not a *hazi* *davar* and hence here, since each separate group of witnesses testify to only one year, in itself only a partial *davar*, their combined testimony is inelegible to testablish his residency

p. 433

It goes without saying that . . .

This is a piece of paper signed by someone attesting to the fact that he owes someone else money; in German it is called a "Wechselbrief"

p. 434

I assume that this *mesharet* was not Jewish. Emden often took along a *mesharet* on his trips. On the phenomenon at this time, see above, Chapter 3, n. 333

Note that Emden here does not inform the reader if his *mesharet* recovered.

Here it means handfuls.

I don’t know what led him to conjecture this.

At this point (until p 163a, 2), Emden begins to describe a decade long series of travels throughout Europe which took him to Frankfurt-am-Main, Berlin, Hamburg, Hannover, back to Frankfurt, London, Amsterdam, Fuerth, Eiger, Prague, Brünn, Breslau, an unnamed town in Hungary, Pressberg, Drezin, back to Hannover and Amsterdam and finally to Emden, with only occasional stops back home. Emden associated the cities he visited with either the season of the year or the Jewish holiday he spent in them. See, for example, Purim in Hamburg (p. 152b), winter in London (p. 154b), after Pesach and summer in Amsterdam (p. 154b-155a), mid winter back home in Bruda (p. 156b), from before Pesach until after Shavuot in Pressburg (p. 159a), and fall in Hamburg (p. 163b, 1). He consistently did not note any years with one exception but that date many not be accurate. See below, n. 447.

Lacking access to MS which was as yet unpublished when he wrote his biography of Emden, Wagenaar, *Toledot Yaavez*, p. 9, did not discuss these travels at all. M. J. Cohen devoted an entire chapter to them (Chap 3, pp. 41-55) but never mentioned a single date!

Jakub Goldberg discusses the reasons for journeys described in the“diaries” or “memoirs” written in the eighteenth century by Solomon Maimon (to get a secular education), Dov of Bolechov (to import wine) and Moshe Wasercug (to find *parnasah*). Emden also embarked on the journey to find *parnasah* by selling his father’s books and collecting the debts owed him.

. On travelling during this time, see . . .

For another example of travelling for financial reason, that of Moses Hagiz, see

p. 439

An *arev* is a guarantor for a loan. If the borrower defaults, the lender can collect from him. An *arev kablan* is a guarantor who actually transfers the money from the lender to the borrower and therefore becomes equally responsible as the borrower for the payment of the loan. The lender may choose to collect from either of them.

It means that his *pinkas* was examined and he was punished for his behavior

p. 440

For a conversation Emden had then with R. Ber Kohen re Hakham Zevi, see

p. 441

This means that by going to these people it would be tantamount to me forcing them to buy the book out of respect for me.

Emden followed the same practice with regard to his own books as well

This is something that specifically addresses this situation

p. 442

But there is evidence that Emden sometimes did send his books as gifts

There the meaning is "for a great deliverance." But the phrase came to mean the opposite, "for a great escape," as in Bereshit . . .

p. 443

when E’s grandfather-in-law was the rabbi a much more well known fire broke out..

Four people were killed, five hundred houses were destroyed displacing some eight thousand people and many sefarim and sifrei Torah were burnt. R. Katz was accused of being responsible for the fire, was imprisoned and forced to resign his position as rabbi of the community

p. 444

It means handfuls of prosperity

p. 445

For more on this, see

p. 447

It was the Hambro Synagogue, founded by Mordechai Hamburger when he split from the main Duke’s Place Synagogue and started his own.

p. 450

Is it possible that Emden was writing here from personal experience?

For more on this matter, see

For a discussion of the role of coffee in early modern Jewish life, including some halakhic issues raised by this drink, see the references in D. Kaufmann,

This source should be added to those cited there

On London coffee houses in the first half of the eighteenth century, see

p. 451

The first coffeehouse in the British Isles was opened by a Jew in Oxford, England in 1650. Two years later one was opened in London, and by the later part of the century it was a fixture of life in that city. See

Great-grandson

p. 452

As indicated here, and elsewhere in his works, Emden had an unusually wide ranging medical knowledge, even if it was not always fully accurate. He also had the highest regard for the science of medicine in general.

Many passages from the Siddur dealing with these issues have been collected by

Unfortunately, as the title of the article indicates, Steinberg did not use the authentic edition of the Siddur (see below, p. 199a) and, as a result, the passages he cites must be compared to the original in order to verify their accuracy. Furthermore, he omits some selections from the Siddur that are relevant here (for example, pp. 1:13b-14a, cited repeatedly above).

In addition, that work is most unsatisfactory.

Yet, Emden's great respect for medical knowledge notwithstanding, he unequivocally insisted that it defer to the opinion of Hazal in those instances where the two came into conflict

This is also most clearly evident in his correspondence with Moses Mendelssohn regarding the issue of early burial. See Moses Mendelssohn, *Gesammelte Schriften* vol. 16, pp. 157-58, #134; p. 159, #135; pp. 161-63, #137; pp. 166-68, #139. For an analysis of this correspondence, and of Emden's awareness of and attitude to medical knowledge, see my introduction and my

p. 453

It means that I almost ended up behind bars

For the censorship of Jewish books in Prague at the time, especially under the authority of the Jesuits, see

The head imperial censor of Hebrew books then was the Jesuit professor of Hebrew at the Prague Clementinum, Father Franz (Fransiscus) Haselbauer. There was a very difficult situation caused by these censorship requirement, and RJ Eyb, who was then darshan in Prague, worked with Haselbauer in 1728 to print a heavily censored edition of the Talmud.

p. 454

For a description of the saga surrounding this complex and multifaceted story, see

p. 455

For the activities of the Jesuits in eighteenth century Prague and Bohemia, see

In his frenzy to destroy Eyb during the time this book was being written (see Intro), Emden mistakenly telescoped these events. In 1725-1726 a major campaign was initiated against various itinerant Sabbatian emissaries who had been travelling throughout Eastern and Central Europe disseminating Sabbatian doctrine and seeking adherents to their cause. Men like Neḥemya Ḥ̣ayon, Leibele (Judab Leib) Prostiẓ, Israel Ḥasid and Moshe Meir of Zolkiew were hounded by one community after another in an attempt to oppose this movement which had recently begun to infiltrate in that area. R. Moses Ḥagiz, then living in Altona, and R. Ezekiel Kaẓenellenbogen, Chief Rabbi of The Triple Community, expended great effort in galvanizing broad communal support against these Sabbatian activists and their teachings. Various rabbinic courts gathered evidence against them and bans were promulgated in various cities throughout Europe.

A series of excommunications against Sabbatians were issued in July-September of 1725. For the July 2 excommunication, see E. Duckesz, *Ivah le-Moshav*, pp. 23-25. A second excommunication was issued on August 23 specifically against Neḥemya Ḥayon and Leib Prostitz. See *Lehishat Saraf* (1726), 15a-16a and J. Emden, *Torat ha-Kena’ot*, 4la-42a. Emden also referred to it in his *Shevirat Luhat ha-'Aven*, 25a. On September 6, Altona joined the communities of Amsterdam and Frankfurt-am-Main in anti-Sabbatian pronouncements, collectively entitled *Hivya de-Rabanan*. The Yiddish-German originals were printed by XX

p. 456

An abridged Hebrew translation can be found in *Torat ha-Kena'ot*, *ibid*., 37a-b. R. Yehezkel Kaẓenellenbogen was prominently featured in each one of these documents, together with others

One of the central figures of this controversy was the young, but already highly acclaimed, R. Jonathan Eybeschütz of Prague who was alleged to have strong ties with these Sabbatians. Discovery was made of correspondence between him and Ḥayon. In addition, it was alleged that his wife and daughter-in-law came to support Ḥayon on the outskirts of Prague after he was banned from entering that city (see Chapter 2, n. 497). Also, in testimony gathered in the Mannheim rabbinical court against Leibele Prostiẓ in 1725, it was alleged that Leibele considered himself to be the Messiah, son of Joseph, and Eybeschütz the Messiah, son of David. Eybeschütz' most significant role in the controversy, however, was due to the fact that he was alleged by both Sabbatians and their opponents to be the author of the major Sabbatian tract entitled *ve-'Avo Hayom 'el ha-'Ayin* (see below, p. 159a).

Ḥagiz and Kaẓenellenbogen were particularly upset by what they considered to be Eybeschütz' presence in the Sabbatian camp. Although he had not yet attained the prominence and following he was to have twenty-five years later, the preacher from Prague was already recognized as an outstanding and brilliant scholar. The presence of such a respected authority on the Sabbatian side granted the movement great legitimacy and credibility. In order to clear himself of any suspicion, Eybeschütz joined his Prague rabbinic colleagues in signing the ban against Sabbatianism issued in that city on September 16, 1725, but doubts as to his real sympathies continued to linger

p. 457

Secondary literature includes Václav Žáček, "Zwei

p. 458

For another story about seeing an enemy through the window, see below, p.

Emden's description of this incident, written some three decades after it occurred, while actively engaged in his heated controversy with Eybeschütz, clearly reflected the jaundiced eye of a bitter opponent whose present bias distorted his perception of the past. Not only is there no evidence of any animosity between these two men prior to the controversy, but Emden even noted on many occasions that when Eybeschütz first arrived in Hamburg to assume the position of Chief Rabbi of The Triple Community in September 1750 they enjoyed a cordial and mutually respectful relationship

p. 459

The subjectivity of this later reconstruction by Emden is obvious.

Regarding the complex relationship between RO and HZ, see above,

There it means chosen; here it means young

p. 460

For Emden's liberal position on *pilegesh*, see

He related to sexuality with great openness and frankness

For his relatively more lenient position on . . .

For other very personal statements about this matter, see

In his book he discusses sexual matters in a particularly graphic way

p. 461

This was a major issue in nineteenth century Haskalah circles

The article was serialized in a newspaper first.

In the view of Mortimer J. Cohen, Emden’s preoccupation with sex should be considered in explaining his extreme position against Eyb. See, in particular, his *Jacob Emden: Man of Controversy*, pp. 50, 59-62, 77, 80, 174-75, 177, 178, 267-72, and his review of Moshe Perlmutter's book in *JQR* 39 (1948): 57-58. However, this was correctly disputed by both Gershom Scholem and Salo Baron in their reviews of his book

It was Cohen’s striking psychohistorical analysis of the personality of Emden that motivated both of these great scholars to write reviews of his book. Baron begins his review with, “

See Cohen’s response to Baron,

For other reviews, see

p. 462

In this context, it interesting to note that Shmuel Feiner characterizes Emden’s opposition to secular studies as being couched "בדימויים אירוטיים."

This story also drew the attention of

p. 463

It is quite clear that Emden is writing here from his personal experience. For the event from the perspective of the woman

Here it means the Christian last rites

p. 464

It is important to place Emden’s story here within the large context of his well-known liberal attitude to Gentiles and, specifically, to Christians.

Although, in theory, Emden was remarkably open and tolerant, in practice, as is represented here, he was not. For Emden’s attitude to Christianity - both in theory and in practice – see.

p. 465

It is interesting to note that Emden had no real connection with contemporary Christians. For him, Christianity was the Christianity of the Old Testament. This is in clear contrast to Eyb who was in personal and direct contact with Christians in his day. See

Also relevant here is

On the role of the increase in travel and mobility in bringing Jews and Christians together in early modern times, see

and esp. the secondary literature cited in p. 388

That means X similar to Yaakov Avinu to whom the verse in Bereshit refers.

p. 466

He is listed as part of Emden’s household in Brod in 1726. See.

It is remarkable that this is Emden's first reference in this book to his oldest son whom he did not mention earlier when he was first born. See too

The problem is, however, that it includes in the text much material whose historical veracity is then questioned in the notes

p. 467

R Meir is most well known for his halakhic exchange with the Besht in which both express a great deal of for one another respect

On this correspondence, see

p. 468

After a strong attack on X and stating that . . .

It is not surprising that . . .

It was restored in . . .

. . . where his opposition seems to be less vociferous

p. 469

see the critique of this arrangement by

It is remarkable how Emden relates this tragedy here without any emotion whatsoever. This nonchalance is similar to the response of a Veith Kahn to a question about his family in Frankfurt in 1672. He named four children and added that “about two or three have died.” See

For a contrasting reaction of a father, R. Yom Tov Lipmann Heller, who expressed great grief at the loss of a child, see

For varying reactions to the death of children during this period, see

p. 470

He was the child to whom she gave birth in this pregnancy

For other examples of economic uncertainty and its implications

p. 472

Here it means . . .

p. 475

For background on this 1725-1726 controversy around Sabbatianism in general and Eyb in particular, see above,

This book written by Eyb and never published was believed by his opponents to be blatantly Sabbatian and, as a result, played a major role in the controversy against him. See

p. 476

For the story of how this work was discovered in the bags of travellers who were students of Eyb and confiscated, see

The context there is the *egel*, an appropriate parallel to what Emden is accusing Eyb of here.

p. 477

the controversy to which Emden devoted his full energies, including the present work

he describes his encounter in language very similar to that which he uses here

p. 478

His initial reluctance

On the 1725-1726 anti Sabbatean campaign as a whole, including Emden’s role, or lack of role, seeabove, Chapter 5, n. 371.

Emden's reluctance now to publicly take on Eyb stands in stark contrast to his behavior some twenty-five years later, in 1751, when his attack on Eyb for this very reason – his Sabbatianism – precipitated one of the most bitter controversies in Jewish history. At that point he wrote a lot about why neither he nor other rabbis went after Eyb earlier, in 1725. In light of the extreme positions Emden took in his later controversy with Eybeschütz, these excuses for remaining silent in 1725 ring hollow. The fact that he was a young man at the time should not have been considered a drawback because he had not been expected to lead the actual attack on Eybeschütz. After all, as he repeatedly noted, it was R. Moses who had requested his advice and it was he who would have taken the initiative had Emden suggested it. More significantly, his assertion that nothing would be accomplished by publicizing the matter is precisely a position he repeatedly railed against later on in the 1750s. In the course of his bitter anti-Eybeschütz polemic, Emden also had very harsh words for those, like R. Ezekiel Landau, who recognized the dangers of Eybeschütz ‘s Sabbatianism but preferred a more moderate approach for the very same reasons Emden gave in explaining his own position in 1725. Like Emden, Landau was convinced that Eybeschütz was a Sabbatian but nevertheless, out of a concern for upholding “*kavod ha-Torah*” and minimizing “*ḥillul Hashem*,” he felt that subjecting Eybeschütz to total exposure and censure as demanded by Emden would be counterproductive. For Landau’s view, see

Yet, in the 1750s, Emden strongly attacked Landau for maintaining such a point of view. Emden’s moderate anti-Sabbatianism in 1725 became extreme anti-Sabbatianism in 1751 and what he was prepared to overlook in 1725 he hounded with a vengeance twenty-five years later. It wasn't so much the new amulet evidence which caused Emden to take a harsher stand against Eybeschütz; it was a fundamental change in tactics. In fact, in attempting to explain his new approach of relentless hounding and disclosure of Eybeschütz, Emden made no explicit mention of the amulets at all

p. 480

However, once again, Emden’s explanation rings hollow. Eybeschütz had a wide following already in 1725 and many “ksheirim” were being “ensnared” by him already then.

This distinction between Emden’s behavior in 1725 and 1751 was already made briefly but not fully developed by L. Greenwald *ha-Rav R. Yehonatan Eybeschutz*, p. 68, n. 26.

It is most striking that, in the heat of his controversy with Eybeschütz, Emden got so carried away that he even attacked those who did not publicly censure Eybeschütz in 1725, obviously overlooking the fact that he himself was among those to blame. See

This does not read like the assessment of someone who later devoted his life to uprooting every vestige of the movement.

It is also interesting to note that Emden followed a similar passive strategy regarding another major controversy regarding Sabbatianism which broke out just a few years later, this time revolving around the Italian, R. Moses Ḥayyim Luẓatto. Claiming to be privy to special revelations from a *maggid*, Luẓatto founded a secret circle of confidants with whom he shared the maggid’s teachings. When the existence of the small group came to the attention of the broader public in the summer of 1729, both R. Yeḥezel Kaẓenellenbogen, The Triple Community’s Chief Rabbi, and R. Moses Ḥagiz, then living in Altona, suspected, among other things, that it represented a new manifestation of Sabbatianism and began to vigorously oppose it. Both rabbis actively started to recruit support from their colleagues against this “evil sect.” After a hiatus of a few years, from the summer of 1730 to the winter of 1733-34, the controversy resurfaced, with these same two figures still leading the opposition. As a result of their efforts, a number of bans were issued in 1735 against Luẓatto's writings.

In 1735, Emden was already living in Altona and was approached by Ḥagiz to get involved against Luẓatto. But, once again, Emden’s involvement was only a minor one. He later claimed that he was not invited to join R. Kaẓenellenbogen and R. Ḥagiz in signing their original ban against Luẓatto because of the Chief Rabbi’s personal opposition to his involvement but this may not tell the entire story

For tension between Emden and Hagiz in this controversy, see Elisheva Carlebach, *The Pursit of Heresy*, p. 334, n. 52.

Nevertheless, even after he was approached, Emden preferred to take a more passive, secondary role

p. 481

In his later controversy with Eybeschütz, Emden would never have accepted such an argument as an excuse for passivity. It is thus clear, once again, that prior to that controversy Emden was not terribly invested in anti-Sabbatian polemics. Indeed, the one letter he did write (*ThK*, pp. 55b-56a) was only one of the many gathered by Ḥagiz.

Emden's name was listed among those who supported this position

See the primary sources cited

He was reluctant

p. 482

For Emden this was a real problem

In the manuscript these four words are written twice in a row.

p. 484

the manuscript is unclear

In most places in the Talmud the phrase is used in a negative connotation; here it is used positively.

p. 485

See the official registration of the houses and inhabitants in the Judengasse there from 1726 discussed in David Kaufmann, “Zu R. Jakob Emdens Selbstbiographie,” p. 362. There we find R. Jacob subletting No. 60 from Moyses Markus whose father had died that year at age 87. Under the heading profession is written “a student” and Emden is described as earning a living by studying. His wife Rochel, identified as the daughter of the local rabbi, and his sons Meir and Shlomo and daughter Sarah are also mentioned. There is also reference made there to two servants, “Schamsche von Leipnikh” and “Zieperle von hier.” Emden’s father-in-law lived in No. 50 with his wife Edl and two unmarried sons, Löbl and Herrschl, an unmarried daughter named Schöndl, a cook and a servant

Emden’s date of departure from Bruda is unclear. We do know that he was still there on

p. 487

It means small pieces of gold

It is unclear exactly when Emden left Bruda. We do know he was still there on 7 Kislev 486, the day he wrote his letter to RDO, cited above,

p. 488

It means full handfulls of prosperity

p. 489

He was also instrumental in bringing Emden’s nephew, R. Zevi Hirsch (above Chapter 1, n. 166), to London to serve as rabbi. See

For other references to him in this work, see the index to this work

p. 490

. For some reason that is not clear to me, the next eight pages in the ms. are divided into two parallel columns. The story continues with the right column (pp. 163a-166b) then the left column (p. l63a-top right of p. 167a). I indicate the first as 163a, 1 and on and the second as 163b, 1 and on.

p. 492

Remember that this was one of Emden's main motivations in writing this book. See my introduction.

This word is written twice, once at the end of the line and again at the beginning of the next line.

p. 493

At this time, Emden had two or three children. See below, p. 163b, 2. He for sure had two sons but it is unclear if his daughter Sarah was born already.

His name was Cornelius Bontekoe (1647-1685). He was a Dutchman who studied medicine at the University of Leiden and served as physician to Friedrich Wilhelm, Elector of Brandenberg. He was also a Professor in Frankfurt on the Oder. He wrote several treatises on tea, *Gebruik en misgebruik van de thee* (1686), *Tractat van het excellenste Kruyd thee* (1678), and one co-authored with Steven Blankaart. See also his “Tractaat

p. 494

Despite having died at a young age, Bontekoe played a major role in championing medical reform in the 1670’s and 1680’s and his writings on the great efficacy of tea were well known and influential. See

My thanks to Dr. Maoz Kahana for bringing this article to my attention.

For important information on the role of tea in eighteenth century Europe, see

Here Emden uses this reason to justify his involvement with "inyanei ha-olam"

Compare XX where he uses it to explain his involvement in

Is this a reference to non-Jewish knowledge?

p. 495

*Le-daati*, this notion, that knowledge of “*hokhmot hizoniyot*” is important for developing and maintaining social relationships with the general society, is a new argument which represented a departure from previously presented justifications of it. In a very subtle way and perhaps without even being fully aware of it, Emden was sensitive to something in his general environment which influenced him to acknowledge the need to study secular literature. At some level he recognized that the lack of such knowledge would be, for him, an unwelcome barrier between him and the world at large in which he lived. Apparently feeling somewhat estranged from his broader society, Emden felt the need to break out of the mold of the traditional Jewish curriculum to feel more socially a part of it. See also

E describes his great curiosity about knowing XX in a number of different places in his writings. See below, n. 385. It is interesting that already in 484 he is referred to as

This is due to the association they made between the Latin characters and the Christian priesthood (called *galachim* because many shaved their heads)

p. 496

The parentheses is in the original text

For a similar story – teaching oneself German by deciphering the Gothic script – see

On this phenomenon, see

He considers the Maimon story to be “apochryphal.”

See XX for the historical context for this

For another example from this period of a tutor teaching a foreign language – in this case Polish and, in this case, with the explicit support of the father – see

p. 497

Compare this to Emden’s reluctance to compose himself a German memorandum to the Duke defending the Jewish tradition on *halanat metim* expressed in his letter to Moses Mendelssohn dated 25 Sivan 532 (June 26, 1772) requesting of him that he write it,

Clearly there is a difference between the knowledge of German that Emden claims here he had with the level necessary to compose a letter to the Duke. Mortimer J. Cohen, *Jacob Emden*, p. 289, n. 39, is wrong in asserting that there is a contradiction here in Emden’s works

Emden read newspapers avidly

P. 498

He notes how this emerging concern of “nakedness” in the face of a more enlightened Christian society would characterize an increasing number of Jews in subsequent years.

. It is, however, clear that this is not to be taken literally and reflects more on Emden's attitude to these studies. As much as Emden was ma’arich be-bet ha-kise, he clearly could not have limited his study of all the secular subjects he outlines earlier (and see below, n. 385) to the time he spent in the outhouse

I believe, however, that it is more correct to say that Emden himself was ambivalent about the significant attention he was paying to secular studies; his concern in doing so was a personal one and not *bushah* for what others might think

P. 499

For Emden’s ambivalent attitude, see my

It is interesting that he repeats here both the rationales he gave earlier, p. 164a, 1

This passage is cited often in secondary literature. See for example

Emden made repeated references to his great curiosity about many, if not all, the aspects of human creativity that he mentioned here

p. 500

A careful examination of Emden's writings reveals, indeed, a signficant -- albeit unsophisticated -- level of knowledge in many of these areas. See my *Rabbi Jacob Emden*, pp. 514-33 for multiple examples of this phenomenon. See also

He interprets the last few lines of this responsum

He overstates Emden’s opposition to secular studies based primarily on . . .

In my view he also overstates the impact of Emden’s wide-ranging reading of non-Jewish texts described above on his critique of *minhagim* and on what Sorotskin sees as his interest in Yiddish

p. 503

In spite of Emden's repeated descriptions of the illnesses he suffered, it is during this period (late winter 1729) that he completed his first book length work, *Luah Eresh* (see p. 73b). For this work, see below, p. 218b, n. 147. There are also fourteen responsa which can definitively be dated during this period which deal with a variety of halakhic issues

Four of them were addressed to XX who often visited Emden and posed questions to him

While important for helping paint a portrait of Emden as a talmudist, they contain no information about his personal life other than a few references to his sicknesses (SY 1:23, 38, 40, 47, 48) and the difficulties he experienced from living in a foreign environment (SY 1:47, 74).

There it is negative; here it is positive

p. 504

She was the woman who Emden was anxious to marry some thirteen years earlier. See above, pp. 143a-b. On p. 143a, Emden refers to her as “*betulah melumedet maskelet*,” on p. 143b as “*ishah hashuvah.*” In fact, M.J. Cohen, speculates that Emden “may have been subconsciously drawn there [i.e. Emden] by the woman of his adolescent love.” While this may be so, it is important to realize that the city of Emden lies in an almost direct line from Amsterdam to Altona

On the involvement of women in public communal matters, see

The parenthesis are in the text

p. 505

It means a a small obligation or assignment

This is all part of his defense in his controversy with RYE. See my introduction.

Jacob Katz cites this as an example of the rabbinate being

On sending for one’s wife after accepting a job in a different city during this time, see

R. Meshullam Zalman, named apparently after his great grandfather (see above, Chapter 1, n. 236), was born in Brod

His name appears on the official registration of the houses and inhabitants of the Judgengesse in Brod from 1726. See above, Chapter 4, n. 255. He travelled with his family first to Emden and then to Altona. At age 11, upon the death of his mother, his father sent him away from home, first to Golgau and then to Poland (see below pp. 191b-192a). He married a woman from Brod (see p. 196a), lived in Poland and served first as CR in Podheyitz and then as rabbi of the Hambro Synagogue in London (below pp. 221b-222a). At the end of his life he suffered depression and returned to Altona where he was institutionalized and died.

M.Z. filed a petition with the king after his father died asking that the dispute he was having with the executors of his father’s estate be heard before the royal courts. The plea was repeated and the authorities ordered that the case be heard within the Jewish community. See

For lists of Emden’s children and descendents, most of them incomplete, see

It was apparent that she was named for Emden’s mother (see above, p 119a,

His nephew,

She too is mentioned in the list of the members of Emden’s family in the Brod Judengasse Register from 1726. See also, n. 33.

It is dated 13 Sivan.

p. 507

For some of Emden’s early adjustment problems in Emden, see

This is reminiscent of the pain Emden’s father had for him when he was sick in his youth. See above, p. 134b, where he uses the same words

On the custom to name a child after ancestors, see *Bereshit Rabbah* 37:7. *Sefer Hasidim* (Margaliot ed.), #460, mentions the custom to name after a deceased ancestor.

Emden had a great deal of knowledge in *inyanei nistar* and incorporated a lot of it into many of his writings. In particular, see repeatedly in his commentaries on the Siddur and see his Kabbalistic dictionary entitled

For his intensive use of Kabbalah, see

p. 508

It is actually shocking to read in

Nothing can farther from the truth

It is possible to definitively place this event in . . .

p. 509

He refers to the fact that

In fact, he filled all the books in his library with pen marks, representing punctuation, vocalization and textual emendations

p. 510

It is a reference to

Emden also personally supervised local business establishments (SY 1:32, also SY 2:137) and worked hard to raise money for an emissary seeking funds for the Jews of Hebron (SY 1: 33; on him, see below, p. 165a, 2 and n. 121). Almost every responsum written while in Emden contained a complaint about how busy and harried he was

Emden's insistence here and earlier (n. 73) with regard to his teaching can only be understood in light of the fact that already long before the eighteenth century it was a well accepted practice for rabbis to earn substantial amounts of money for teaching, preaching and matchmaking

p. 511

On the reception of this work, see

There is absolutely no question that this assertion on Emden’s part can only be fully appreciated when one recognizes, once again, that this work was written by Emden while fully immersed in his controversy with Eyb. He is stating here that even those who lived in Prague, where Eyb had a great reputation as a darshan, stated that they never heard *drushim* as great and as wonderful as those delivered by him.

Having spent only three full years in Emden . . .

The book revolves around a series of questions

p. 512

In this work, Emden cites the Zohar and other kabbalistic sources many times and utilizes kabbalistic terminolgy often. At the end (p. 24a), apparently concerned that he may have revealed too much Kabbalah, he wrote

This particular drashah is very important to understand Emden’s position regarding the relationship between halakhah and Kabbalah. See esp pp 10a-b, 20b. Throughout this long discussion of the Zohar he has only the highest regard for it.

He refers to this work in many of his writings

Emden speaks very strongly against Sabbatians, Hasidim (missing in the 1911 edition), and philosophers. He also discusses his favorable attitude towards non-Jews. Here too he makes reference to difficulties with his vision,

This deals with

This is a reference to

He actually delivered

p. 513

For a preliminary analysis of these three works, see my

For a generally negative assessment of

Although one can dismiss this statement as self-serving, in fact there is objective evidence that this was the case. In 1732, four Jews from the Italian city of Mantua became involved in a tax dispute with their community. They challenged a long established law obligating them to pay taxes on monies which they kept outside the ciry and they turned to the Gentile authorities for assistance in their litigation. The Mantuan rabbis, David Finzi and Aviad Sar Shalom Basilea, ruled in favor of the community and appealed to their rabbinic colleagues for support. At the request of R. Moses Ḥagiz, Emden penned a long responsum in which he also defended the community's position (*SY* 1:78). See the statements made about Emden by the rabbis involved in this dispute. Although some of them can be attributed to standard rabbinic *melizah*, their respect for Emden is obvious and significant. His name is also mentioned at the end of a list of prominent rabbis who supported the community’s position

p. 514

see his words of thanks responding to his words where they are significantly *maarich* in praise of him

He added an editorial note while preparing the work for publication

he had no problem reprinting the entire text of the letter of thanks from the Mantuan rabbis, including these extensive words of praise for him

This episode is discussed in

where Emden recalled this case as an example of the fact that even as a young man he was highly regarded by the great rabbis of Italy

how even as a young man he became involved in the affairs of distant communities

It is interesting that Emden makes no reference to this episode here in his autobiography describing those years although, as indicated by his references to it in other texts written when he wrote MS (like *SLhaE* and *ThK* cited above; see too *Edut bi-Yaakov*, 58b) it is clear that he remembered it very well

p. 515

Many original documents related to this case are printed in

p. 517

The person who buys the right to distribute the *aliyot* in accordance with his will is called a

In a wide-ranging and documented justification of his ruling, Emden insistently argued that he was correct and that any opposing point of view was ignorant and unsubstantiated. It is, in fact, impossible to understand the extremeness of Emden's language and position in that responsum without appreciating the circumstances which gave rise to it. To get a sense of the passion on the other side of the issue, see

p. 518

Note also Emden's ending comments which place this episode squarely among others where Emden stands up for what was right, even though it was very difficult for him, and invoked the behaviour of his father as a precedent, like he did repeatedly in his controversy with Eyb.

It is absolutely impossible to understand the sharpness of Emden’s halakhic postion here without being aware of the background of this story

p. 519

Emden often wrote that he voluntarily often desired to leave Emden because he simply did not enjoy being a rabbi

Although he does not mention there that this is a reference to his stay in Emden, I believe it is

*Shtar hazi zakhor* is a document by which a father voluntarily obligates himself to give his daughter at the time she gets married half of the inheritance that a son of his would receive at that time. For an explanation of this document

p. 520

For examples of this from late eighteenth century Frankfurt, see

For this phrase, see

Emden often noted how God punished his enemies

See this in a similar context in . . .

p. 521

For Yavetz's problems with the climate

It ultimately resulted in

For R. Moses Hagiz’s problems with the climate in Emden, see

For repeated references to Emden's sickness in the responsa he wrote during the period,

p. 522

On Emden’s accepting treatment from doctors, see

It would appear from here (and above, p. 166a, 2) that Emden's wife's sickness was not "Brustleidens" as described by

p. 523

cited in the next note

he notes that providence was on Emden’s side because shortly after he turned down the post in Posen, the Jewish community there suffered terrible calamities.

See also above, p. 161a, when Emden writes how R. Gavriel Eskeles offered him a position of rabbi but he turned it down (see there, n. 187).

It is important to understand why Emden repeatedly insists that he was not interested in serving as a rabbi, not in Emden nor anywhere else. In a letter to his students seeking their support, Eyb accuses the Emden forces of jealousy over the fact that he had been chosen to succeed RYK as Chief Rabbi of AHW over their mentor (see Eyb, *Luhot Edut* [Altona, 1755], 43b). As a result, Emden goes out of his way – time and time again – to deny this charge.

p. 524

At this point, the double columns found in the manuscript beginning with p. 163a (see Chapter 6, n. 282) end and the text reverts to normal, with the words filling the entire line.

He cites this as evidence that Eyb was a better father than Emden because Eyb insisted that he attend his son’s wedding on his way from Prague to Metz.

Emden, however, did travel during this period. Most interesting is a report of Shlomo Zalman Hanau of a conversation he relates that he had with Emden in Amsterdam in 490

p. 525

After this word, there is a line and a half empty space in the manuscript.

See there for the required characteristics necessary for someone to serve as a *shat”z* on Rosh Hashana. Later authorities equate *shat”z* and *ba’al tokea*

I am convinced that this story serves as the background of the dispute which prompted the choice of topic for his sermon on Shabbat

While it is difficult to determine how much of this sermon was actually presented orally and how much of it was added later when it was prepared for publication (a problem common to *derashot* literature in general), if my conjecture is correct, it emerges that Emden determined the subject of this sermon only three or four days prior to delivering it. This event occurred on the first day of Rosh Hashanah which, that year, fell on a Tuesday and the sermon was delivered the following Shabbat. That Emden was able to compose such a learned discourse on so short a notice indicates, once again, his high level of Torah scholarship.

Although this sermon was preached בראשית שנת תצ"א (above, n. 80) and, therefore, only a year and a half after his arrival in Emden, Yavetz may have confused the date here in his autobiography written over twenty years later and mistakenly described it as having taken place ".אחר שלש שנים"

For Emden reconciling with Jonathan, see above p. 165a, 2; p. 165b, 2.

p. 526

These words were written twice, once here and once below. Since they clearly do not belong here, I placed them here in parenthesis

p. 527

For more on the reputation which Emden claimed he enjoyed among the Gentiles in Emden

It is interesting to note that Emden uses *arel* as a description for a gentile even in a favorable context

p. 528

It seems strange that Emden would just simply relate how he told a lie.

p. 530

The parenthesis is in the text.

For these soliciters, see

who describes a copy of their letter appealing for funds dated 5 Av 5469 (= July 12, 1709). The emissaries are identified as R. Feibish b. Joseph and Leib b. Jacob and their letter is endorsed by R. Gavriel Eskeles dated 17 Marcheshvan [5470] (= October 21, 1709), R. Naftali Katz of Frankfurt am Main dated 10 Adar 1 5470 (= February 10, 1710) and HZ himself dated 27 Nissan 5470 (= April 27, 1710).

For another example of a fraudulent solicitor, this time collecting for Eretz Yisrael, see

p. 531

he was to be blamed, among other things, for

See, in particular,

p. 532

This end parenthesis has no beginning parenthesis

It means a urinal

For this phrase, see

p. 533

He was married three times and Hakham Zevi’s mother came from a different wife of RMZ than did this Binyamin

p. 535

It means that because they descend from blemished lineage they make blemished arguments.

p. 536

Note that Emden places two small lines at the end of this word, indicating that it has a double meaning

The Gemara notes that the word *damim* is in the plural, indicating that it refers to more than one blood

In this context, one may mean money and the other blood in the sense of exposing themselves to danger

p. 537

Emden devotes much attention to this episode of the criminals from Minsk but I have not been able to find information about it from other sources.

He asked regarding various aspects of his medical training on Shabbat

That place from where he was the first Jew to graduate with a medical degree. In 1743 he defended his doctoral dissertation on medicine in the Talmud in which he wanted to demonstrate that the medical culture of the Jews was in no way inferior to that of other cultures, ancient or modern.

p. 538

It is interesting that the reader gets the impression that the story was not presented "*bi-kezarah*" at all but rather at great repetitive length

One would imagine that this episode which involved a number of people in different communities would have an echo in some sources other than MS but I have been unable to locate them. It is hard to believe that a trial of such proportions took place and Emden was the only one who wrote about it. Who were these criminals? How many towns were taken in by them? Is there evidence in AHW of their arrest?

p. 539

after Emden moved into his community where Emden writes very critically of him. Perhaps this event already prejudiced Emden against him.

p. 540

Emden made reference earlier to *talmidim* he had while in Emden. See pp.

There is no question that this particular boast that even these who lived in Prague never heard sermons as great as the ones he delivered must clearly be seen in light of Emden’s polemic with Eyb throughout this work. After all, Eybeschuetz had preached in Prajac for XX years and enjoyed a great reputation there as a preacher. Yet, Emden here is claiming that his own preaching surpassed even that of Eyb, without menitoning Eyb by name.

p. 541

That work notarized and dated June 21, 1731 stated

Emden writes repeatedly that he was enthusiastically welcomed by the local inhabitants in Altona

p. 542

Here it means, "to the very last one"

p. 543

Here it means that necessity compelled me

p. 544

Emden's repeated complaints about his struggle to earn a livelihood are a significant focus in this work. See, for example, below,

p. 545

He gives these same two reasons for not leaving Altona in spite of the difficulties with parnasah he was facing then, i.e., the house he built and the improvement of his health and that of the members of his family

Emden insisted that his name was either Yavetz or Jacob Hirschel, as he was referred to in official German documents (see, for example ). He railed against being called “Jacob Emden” because, as he clearly stated, he was not born in the city of that name, had no roots there, and disliked his stay there. In addition, what both of these names had in common, and the probable reason why they were so important to him, is that they included both his name and his father’s. For him, to replace Tzvi or Hirschel with Emden was sacrilege.

Yet at the same time he had no objection to being referred to as the av bet din.

. Since he never denied that he served as rabbi of that community and since he never again served in any official rabbinic capacity, he referred to himself that way and so was referred to by others

See the introduction to the printing of the beginning of

On occasion he was also referred to as “me-Emden,” This was not as bad as calling him Yaakov Emden but it was also incorrect because he was “from” AHW, not Emden

p. 546

Finally, on occasion he was still referred to as XX

But this formulation is strange.

He is referred to as R. Emden.

It is interesting to note how, in another context, Emden noted how someone could be associated with a city even though he had no real connection to it

p. 547

Elsewhere Emden noted that those who suffer from discharges are prone to fainting

The name of the second one was Rachel, born in the summer of 1739. Her mother, after whom she was named, died one week after giving birth to her from complications of the childbirth

p. 548

Once again, one sees how Emden was interested in presenting his story “in order.” See my introduction.

Emden repeatedly writes how he was enthusiastically welcomed by the local inhabitants of Altona who were magnanimous in their offer to help him however they could

Hagiz lived in Hamburg from 1718 to 1725 when he moved to Altona.

p. 550

He made reference to his synagogue

Apparently by then Hagiz wanted ot hold services during the week and Emden wanted permission to hold them on woeekends and holidays as well. This also more fully sheds light on why this matter “garam ketzat” as Emden states immediately following

It also explains why Emden notes in his book that he needed to seek permission of the *parnasim* there to allow a member of the community to pray in his synagogue

Also, his entire bitter controversy with Eyb

p. 551

In fact, precedents for such a private arrangement already existed

For other examples of synagogues in private homes during this time, see

At the end of the eighteenth century, R. Nosson Adler was put in *cherem* in Frankfurt because he insisted on holding private services for his followers outside the established synagogue. See Edward Fram, *A Window on Their World*, p. 58. See also p. 350. In his case, his minyan was unauthorized; he did not receive to hold one in his house. This is in contrast to E and Hagiz who were granted such permission by the kehila. For examples from a later period, see

It is thus wrong for many reasons

A letter of Emden to Hagiz dated 5 Elul 492 reflects this closeness. See above, Chap

It means that it could not be otherwise

p. 552

At the beginning of his controversy with Eyb, the fact that Emden had his own minyan was used as proof of his generally behaving inappropriately

He defended himself from this charge

The truth is that nobody could possibly believe that RMH vioulated even an *issur de-rabanan* on Shabbat. Even assuming that Emden is correct with what he saw, we are left unaware of the exact curcumstances of what RMH permitted. Was the coffee prepared by a gentile mesharet? Did he drink it from a kli rishon, sheni or even shlishi? More information is necessary here

For a recent halakhic analysis

This phrase appears often in the Talmud

p. 553

It means totally

p. 555

For more on Hagiz's duplicity regarding Emden

He wrote favorably about him

In fact, Hagiz had many contacts with Katzenellenbogen over the years. Both worked together in leading roles to oppose Eyb in 1725. See above,

p. 556

Nevertheless, Emden did print letters addressed to him which included this title.

He refers to this in his book

p. 557

For this idea, that he saw as an opportunity to exercize the power of rabbinic authority, see

The issue revolved around whether Moshe Rabbeinu died on a Friday or Shabbat. Hagiz insisted

p. 558

Eight years later, in the course of the controversy over the writings of Ramhal, Hagiz was still being attacked for his position on this matter

For the role of Hagiz in particular, see

Hagiz was born in 1671 and was more than twenty-five years older than Emden. In 1732 when Emden arrived in Altona he was around thirty-four years old and Hagiz was sixty-one years old

p. 559

Liberles points out that Emden uses the word *le-taken* and not *le-vashel* here but that this would still be a violation of the Shabbat.

The text here and its meaning are unclear

p. 560

Emden clearly considers this work to be a *hitnazlut*.

For the significance of this sentence,

p. 561

For Emden’s use of this phrase and its significance

It is not one of those mentioned in the Mishnah

But it made its way into the liturgy and Emden included it in his siddur

p. 564

It would appear that this should be

On a few occasions, Emden refers to this newly published work in his LS commentary. See, for example,

p. 565

The reference to the

Also printed there is a brief section of Emden’s *LS* (RH 4:7) which was not published in his own work

where Bick cites a passage from Emden’s *Iggeret Purim*, 23a, where Emden retracted this *haskamah*

where Emden’s student asks him if his repudiation of the *haskamah* he gave on this work appeared yet in print and Emden directs him to the passage in *Shevirat Luhat ha-Even*

p. 566

There were a number of Emden’s works still in manuscripts when he wrote this

p. 568

It is introduced as follows:

RMH was born in Jerusalem in 1671 and in 1693-1694 left Eretz Yisroel to collect money to reestablish a sound fiscal basis for his yeshiva in Jerusalem. He travelled throughout Europe for decades and returned to Eretz Yisroel some time after 1739

Emden returns to this below in his multi-page negative description of RYK

At the end, Benayahu concludes

p. 569

Surely Emden would have made some reference to their familial connection and not simply have referred to him as

p. 572

Once again, Emden realizes that he has strayed from his focus and is now returning to it. See my introduction.

At this stage it is important to note that most of the information available about Emden’s life in Altona prior to his controversy with Eybeschütz in 1751, like that relating to his stay in and departure from the community of Emden described above, is found in *MS* and in other texts written in connection with that controversy and, again similar to that earlier case, was colored by it. Accused by Eybeschütz’s supporters of being a meddlesome and disrespectful troublemaker (see my introduction), it was clearly in Emden’s best interest to claim, as he repeatedly did, that until circumstances forced him against his will to assume a more active role in the community, he consistently maintained a low profile, did not seek communal involvement, concentrated solely on his Torah studies and on earning a livelihood and virtually did not even walk out of his house.

(Parenthetically, it is almost shocking to note the contrast between what he describes here, even accounting for a measure of exaggeration, and the constant intense travelling that Emden did just a few years earlier, for about ten years! See pp. 150a-163a, 2 [and, especially, Ch. 5, n. 67]). It was certainly to his benefit to claim that he arrived in Altona to an enthusiastic welcome from the community and that he retained the respect and high esteem of its members for close to two decades (see *Edut bi-Yaakov*, 14a; *Shevirat Luhat ha-Even*, 23b). It is true that there is no independent evidence to suggest that Emden was not being truthful and there is, therefore, no reason to deny the basic tenor of his presentation. Nevertheless, it cannot simply be accepted at face value as a dispassionate, objective description and it probably reflects not a small measure of exaggeration.

p. 573

For a history of tension between HZ and RYK, see p. 136a and n. 306.

It is also significant that, as a young man in Brisk, Kaẓenellenbogen was a student of R. Moses Zusskind Rothenberg with whom Ḥakham Ẓevi had a major halakhic disagreement in 1710 (see above, Chapter 2, n. 129). Indeed, when R. Rothenberg’s collection of responsa was published in 1716, including the ruling against Ḥakham Ẓevi (*Shut Maharan* *Zusskind* #33), it contained an approbation by the Chief Rabbi of The Triple Community in which he publicly acknowledged his debt to his teacher. See Y. Duckez, Ivah le-Moshav, p. 21. If, as some have argued, this dispute was so bitter that it led to a diminution of Ḥakham Ẓevi’s authority at that time, it is eminently plausible that Emden would have harbored a great deal of resentment against anyone who so proudly indentifed himself as a student of his father’s adversary. Also, Kaẓenellenbogen himself publicly disagreed with Ḥakham Ẓevi in his own *She’elot u-Teshuvot Knesset Yehezkel* #28 (where he opposed a ruling in *Shut HZ* #101; Emden, in his own *Sheilat Yavetz*, vol 1, #156, ridiculed RYK’s argument and defended his father’s position)

In the spring of 1733, shortly after his arrival in Altona, Emden also worded two letters to K with great deference

It is dated 1733

p. 574

In the first responsum, Emden posed a series of four questions on something RYK had addressed in his recently published collection of responsa, *Shu"T Knesset Yecheikeil*, and in the second letter the point of departure was something the Chief Rabbi was in the midst of teaching. In both cases, Emden’s tone was highly differential. Shortly thereafter, he bestowed upon the Chief Rabbi the honor of *sandek* at the brit of his son Zevi Hirsch who had just recently been born and he sought a *haskamah* from him when he published his LS Mishnah Commentary some three months later

, see. For a famous use of this phrase

For Emden’s charge that K was greedy for money, see too below, pp. 181b-182a, 184b, 197a-b. Elsewhere, Emden also noted that while K had been serving as rabbi in AHW, he received an offer from the community of Metz to be their rabbi. According to Emden, he responded by using this offer to force a salary increase from the lay leadership of AHW, threatening to leave unless it was granted

In several places, Emden accuses K of not taking a strong stand against Eyb in 1725 (see Chapter 5, n. 371) because of pressure from RBK

p. 575

For more on the tension between Emden and RYK a few years after Emden’s arrival in Altona,

. Once again Emden is aware that this is a digression. See my introduction.

This is an understatement. Emden devotes the next fifteen pages to an excoriating attack on K. See below, n. 234.

This is an unusual phrase. I found it only in

Emden often drew attention to his emphasis on truth

p. 578

On p. 126b Emden describes his father’s move from Altona to Amsterdam but there is no mention there of

p. 579

There the concern is people ridiculing the bet din; here the concern is the bet din ridiculing him

p. 580

In the second half of the seventeenth century, and throughout the eighteenth century, many Polish Jews, including rabbinic scholars of different levels of knowledge, moved to Germany. This was due both to the precarious situation for Jews in Poland and the growing new opportunities for Jews in Germany

Emden was upset that Ashkenazi Jews sought their rabbis from distant places. For a long expression of this

In the reprint of his siddur

p. 581

Underlying this critique, I believe, is Emden’s sense that this happened after K died and he was rebuffed in his attempt to succeed him when the community chose an outsider, Eyb, to fill this position. Although Emden repeatedly rejected the charge that he was jealous of Eyb for having been chosen as rabbi instead of him (see Chapter 7, n. 198), in many of his writings dealing with the controversy it is fairly clear that, all his protestations to the contrary notwithstanding, he really would have liked to be the Chief Rabbi of AHW or, at the very least, expected Eyb to at least have consulted with him about the position or, even more, have turned it down altogether out of respect and deference to him. See my introduction.

Here it is used in a negative sense

There is even a suggestion that the situation described here may even actually explain Katzenellenbogen’s unusual respect for *melamdim* expressed in his shut. See

This is giving too much credence, in my opinion, to what Emden is writing here.

p. 582

For the custom for leaders of the community to go out to greet their new rabbi

Emden’s sarcasm is very evident here

p. 584

In other words, what happened was deserved

He refers here to the fact that they rejected Hagiz then as the rabbi and chose K instead

Shochatman who enumerates all the names of *mehutanim* of RYK referred to as such in *Shut Knesset Yehezkel* by RYK and none have that name. Since he found a work in a ms. identifed as having been written by a R. Natan, son-in-law of RYK, he speculates that maybe

p. 585

it means that he sought to turn everything upside down

p. 587

This statement is extraordinary in light of the fact that all Emden is doing for some fifteen pages or so is precisely this, elaborating on

It is interesting to note that Emden was respectfully deferential to RK in the one extant private correspondence between them from that period

Regarding Emden’s correspondence with RH, see above, p 175a

p. 588

The reference is to Eyb to whom he just referred

For a second version of this story,

Visiting someone on a *regel* indicates that the visitor considers himself a student of the person he is coming to visit

p. 589

the teshuvah is dated XXX

A little later E bemoans the fact that bribery was so common

He also refers to X where he wrote that he too was similarly offered a bribe to change his position

For the charge of bribery,

See the title page of the first edition

p. 590

An analysis of Emden’s position in the previous case (SY 1:26-28) indicates that he took a lenient position there in a similar matter of *zekukah le-yibum*. It is therefore extremely possible that, having heard of Emden’s view in that case, RYK thought that he would be supportive of him in this case as well. This, however, was not to be. Here Emden argued that a lenient position was only justified when it is certain that the apostate was sincere in following his newly accepted religious beliefs. However, when such clear evidence is lacking, like in this case, one is obligated to assume that he converted only for the sale of financial and other similar considerations and that, still, really, *libo la-shamayim*. In such a case, where the conversion cannot be proven to have been fully genuine, the requirement for *halizah* cannot be waived and the wife cannot be allowed to remarry.

p. 591

In fact, ever since 1726 when Samuel Popert (שמואל זנוויל פופרט) received a license to print Hebrew books in Altona, the law was that all books needed the approval of the CR before they were printed. Emden’s printer named Aharon (see below) knew this and was following the law when he showed this book to the CR prior to agreeing to print it. See

On Emden’s later attempts to get permission to publish Hebrew books in Altona without being subject to this restrictive rule, see below, Chapter 11, n. 423.

He worked first as the printer in the press opened by Ephraim Heckscher in Altona in 1732 and served as a key figure in Emden’s printing press and in printing in that city in general for close to forty years. He worked for Emden from 1744 until 1752 and then, during Emden’s controversy with Eyb, he took sides with Eyb and printed his *Luhot Edut* in Altona in 5515

Independent confirmation can also be found in a hitherto unexamined source, one of The Triple Community’s communal *pinkasim*. An entry dated August 17, 1740 notes how Aharon Zeẓer requested permission to print books by Emden. Permission was granted but only on condition that he (i.e. Emden) promise that he not attack R. Kaẓenellenbogen nor any individual in the Triple Community.

p. 592

Emden never gave the community leaders such an assurance and publication of his collection of responsa was indefinitely suspended. The work was not published until 1749, after the dealth of K

Emden often noted that K referred to him a number of halachic issues which arose in the community

p. 593

It contains two response

See also the version found in

p. 597

In addition to the references above, Emden referred to this story in a number of his works

Emden also noted that the family of this woman whom he felt should not have been allowed to remarry continued to hate him

p. 598

Emden often claimed that K was overly servile to the local lay leadership, excessively demeaning himself before the wealthy and going out of his way to flatter them

For the deference Emden claimed K showed to RBK in particular, see

who takes this description seriously and writes

It means that between the midwife and the woman giving birth the child will be lost

p. 599

There the context is lust; here it is a grudge. What they both have in common is to be emotionally caught up in the situation

For more on Emden’s accusation of K taking revenge, see

It means that it is a rumor that did not stop

p. 601

This reference there is to

Emden made general reference to these anti-K responsa as a group in

Emden argued that he benefited the community by publicly opposing many of the Chief Rabbi’s rulings, thereby saving many from error

See XX where Emden agreed with K. In SY 2:57 Emden related how he personally once had a chicken whose kashrut status was questionable and referred the matter to K for his opinion. Although he felt that K was too stringent in his ruling, he accepted it anyway and instructed the members of his household to sell it to a non-Jew

It is the plural of *krigl* which means a small pitcher or a jug, the diminutive of krig or krug. In German it is “krug.”

He is very upset at the repeated *chirufim* that Emden levels here in this section against RYK and cites this example in particular

p. 602

He concludes,

This article is part of a series where Rabbi Plotski claims that too many depend on Emden’s negative assessments of people without doing independent research

However, R. Plotski sometimes erred in his critique of Emden.

David Kaufmann, in his review of Kahane’s editon of Megillat Sefer, p. 334, who points to the “real mistreatment” (“erne wahre Macerirung”) of K here

For another defense of RYK from the charges of Emden, see

It means that the tenth animal that is designated as maaser is marked with a sign.

p. 603

This is an idiomatic expression, “The Cossack does the bear dance.” I have been unable to identify its source.

p. 604

Contrast this to Emden’s description of how a person should behave in the presence of *amei ha-aretz* in *Migdal Oz*, p. 89b.

p. 605

It is clear to me that E had RYK in mind here

It means one by one

It means on credit

p. 607

Once again this is evidence that Emden’s controversy with Eyb is uppermost on his mind as he is writing this work. See my intro. Here Emden attributes social class considerations to those who supported Eyb. For more on this aspect, see Chapter 12, n. 243.

p. 608

“Perek shirah” is a play on the title of a work consisting of praises to God uttered by all of His creations except human beings. ראו מלאכי בית-אריה, פרק שירה: מבואות

For Emden’s additios that are found in the 40 page manuscript Emden which includes additions to his commentary on the siddur as a whole

Part of the rabbi’s salary was income from being *mesader kiddushin*

p. 609

One must contrast Emden’s description here of RYK with the great respect other rabbinic contemporaries of his had for him

p. 610

It means that I only asked for something for which there already had been an exception.

p. 611

The parnassim took turns being Parnass of the Month

Here it means that the ongoing minyan in Emden’s house was stopped

p. 612

on this phenomenon throughout the centuries and attempts made to deal with it, see

X, a common phrase in rabbinic literature

It is found throughout, from p 34a-35b

Already David Kaufmann, in his review of Kahane’s edition of Megillat Sefer, corrected Kahane’s interpretation of this abbreviation to XX

p. 613

This work was later published

See XX where, for some reason, he does not give the name of the community

p. 615

these are all cited by XX

p. 616

he wanted to be paid a referral fee, as a go-between

p. 617

on the difficulties in procuring

The formulation here clearly indicates what he thought of R. Eybeschutz, an attitude fully forthcoming elsewhere in his writings as well

Here he means a willing slave

But this is 25 years before the event described here

p. 618

the word is XX as in the beginning of this paragraph

p. 620

In the ms, this *hgh"h* which consists of the following paragraph, is written in a column on the right side of the page. It is unclear to me why this was done

see XX for a story of how Emden hurt his leg on his journey from Brun back home to Altona in 483

p. 621

It means that he enjoyed a benefit from the situation

Again note how Emden is conscious of wanting to present his story without interruption. See my introduction.

In a letter to his students seeking their support, Eyb accused the Emden forces of jealousy because he had been chosen to succeed K over their mentor

In a letter to his students seeking their support, Eyb accused the Emden forces of jealousy because he had been chosen to succeed K over their mentor

p. 622

And, in his defense, Emden very often loudly proclaimed his lack of interest in that position for a number of reasons: “by nature” he hated the rabbinate, he was physically and intellectually unsuited for the position; he personally opposed many Ashkenazi customs and practices and therefore did not feel that it was appropriate for him to serve as a rabbinic leader in an Ashkenazi community; the rabbinate requires deceit, expressions of favoritism and sycophantry; it would divert his attention and energies away from the study of Torah

It is, nevertheless, quite clear that, all his protestations to the contrary notwithstanding, Emden really would have liked to be the Chief Rabbi of AHW. See Chapter 9, n. 125

On a number of occasions Emden noted that he had the rights to the position by virtue of the fact that it was held by his father and grandfather

See the articles by XX

p. 623

Emden notes that RV and his family opposed his becoming rabbi of the Triple Community. He wrote

Emden often refers to the fact that RV joined forces with the Eyb faction against him. In describing what happened on the Sunday after the controversy broke out, Emden wrote

p. 624

It means that they kept their faith

p. 625

For this in the context of its time, see

Here Emden means "an old saying."

p. 626

It means a person with whom one enjoys a special business relationship

p. 627

It would appear that Emden bought and sold lottery tickets.

p. 628

Emden here repeatedly gives the impression that he was not an expert in business and often depended upon people to help him but, in the end, they deceived him

It would be interesting to compare Emden’s personal business practices with what he prescribes as appropriate in Siddur 1, 269b-

p. 629

Once again Emden realizes that he has lost the thread of his presentation. See my introduction.

His wife only became pregnant at the very end of the years they spent in Emden

p. 630

Emden also continued to teach his own students

The work is dated 493

For more on the freedom with which Emden spent money, see

Note Emden does not mentioned her name here. See below, n. 298

According to Ulinka Rublack, deaths during childbirth were relatively uncommon in early modern Germany. See

p. 631

For *melamdim* hired to teach girls

For other opportunities for girls to study Torah, see

For more on the wife being responsible for the education of the children in the absence from home of her husband, see

p. 632

For more on the eighteenth century woman working outside the home, see

This profession, and this source, should be added to those mentioned in Janine

I have no doubt that he is here reflecting his own personal experience.

Emden’s remarks here about his wife remind me on the comment of Radak

For Emden’s position on the role of wives and women in general

In his review of David Kahane’s *Megillat Sefer*, published in *MGWJ* David Kaufmann points to Emden’s treatment of his first wife here as an example of how Emden’s commitment to truth did not spare even those closest to him

For the emphasis of E on truth, see

p. 633

This was clearly grating to Emden because he undoubtedly knew that there was a long tradition of exempting rabbis from paying taxes

One gets the sense, perhaps, that this use of this verse is formulaic, that he is more upset at losing this ideal of an “eshet ne’urim” than losing this particular woman with whom, as he indicates, he had a tense relationship. One senses, similarly, that he was more upset about the lack of respect he received at the hands of the communal authorities at the time of her burial than her death itself.

p. 634

He errs in writing that this conversation took place in 493 when Emden first wanted to settle in Altona

The contrast between the way he describes his two sons is extraordinary. He writes with warmth about his second son; his first one does not even merit a name.

p. 635

and he left over children who were raised by their grandfather

he was invited by the Lvov community to become their rabbi

p. 636

For this in the context of its time, see

Both parentheses are in the text

that a mikveh cannot have water leaking through its cracks

p. 638

The house was subsequently taken down

For more on Jews owning houses during this time, see

Note Emden’s lack of emotion here in describing the death of his daughter

The words XX are written on the top of the next page

p. 639

As indicated earlier (pp. 179b-181a), while he began working on this publication in 499, he did not in fact publish it until 1749

See the sources cited by Scholem

p. 640

His daughter, Batya Zviyah, was Emden’s third wife. See below, p. 196b-197a.

E married his niece in

p. 641

Emden blamed his own unhappy marriage to a Polish woman, in part, on

p. 642

For general background on second marriages during this period, see

p. 643

See XX that tosefet ketubah (money the husband or his estate would pay in case of divorce or death in addition to the ikkar ketuba) is added based on the local custom. Apparently in R. Emden’s area they added 1/3. Here she promised a certain amount for the dowry, which she then reduced by half and now she gave that dowry only partially in cash, making up the rest with goods which she had appraised (shum) at an exaggerated value. She then wanted him to add the customary 1/3 based on this questionable sum

The mishnah (*Ketubot* 6:3; 66a) explains that when a bride brings goods into the marriage, such as clothing and utensils, they are appraised for their value (shum) at the time of the wedding. A stipulation is made in the Ketubah that in the event of divorce or the death of the husband, the husband or his estate must pay back only 4/5 of the value of those goods (lifhot homesh- to reduce the amount by 1/5). This reduction takes into account the wear and tear on the goods and/or any possible exaggeration of the value of the goods at the time of the wedding

The manuscript is unclear

p. 644

But it is more likely that Emden made a party only for the "pnei ha-kehillah," not for the entire community

Compare Emden’s description here of what he wanted his wife to be with what he describes as the appropriate way a wife should behave in *Migdal Oz*, pp. 89a-b.

p. 645

Here he indicates that he would have preferred his wife play an active role in business.

For the phenomenon during the period of the wife providing for the husband while he spent his time studying Torah

This *kuntres* is not extant but it is interesting that he wrote it. See my introduction.

p. 649

The following paragraph is written down the right side of the bottom half of p. 196a

p. 650

For general background, see

Note that Emden does not mention the name of any of these children, as well as the twin of Nehamah mentioned above. See too above, n. 23.

She died one month shy of three full years of marriage

Once again, note the total absence of any emotion here. It is interesting to note that as Megillat Sefer progresses, Emden expresses greater upset when recounting the death of his children. Near the very end of the work ( ) he writes that the death of a daughter caused him “great wailing.”

For Emden accepting treatment from doctors, see

“Shomrim” are those who attended to the sick separate from doctors

p. 652

For an earlier example, see

This is different than – and an extension of – communal celebrations known as Purim sheni, celebrating deliverances from local enemies. See, for these,

For the influence of the high mortality of Jewish women on the length of marriages during this time, see

p. 654

this work is part of a group of sermons

p. 655

For the popular phenomenon of sermons delivered in honor of a wedding, see

She outlived her husband by over twenty-five years and died on

She is buried next to her husband in the Koenigstrasse cemetery in Altona

Emden made reference to his marriage to his third wife at the end of his introduction to the first volume of his Siddur that he began working on shortly thereafter (see p. 199a)

p. 657

Emden just wrote this a few lines ago. Was he distracted when he was writing this?

For the formal documents of permission as well as the correspondence between Emden and the secular authorities which preceded it, see

Emden applied for a royal license on August 20, 1743 and asked that it be granted “ohne jemandes Beeinträchtigung,” without any restrictions. Arnheim suggests that the reason he did that was to avoid in the future the problem he encountered a few years earlier in 1740 when he was thwarted from publishing his *Shut*. When the printer, Aharon b. Eliyahu ha-Kohen, saw that one the responsa was critical of the Chief Rabbi (see above, pp. 179b-180a), he realized that he could not publish the book because of the exisiting rule in the community that all manuscripts needed the approval of the Chief Rabbi and the community’s lay leadership for publication. Emden was forced to postpone printing the volume for close to ten years. As a result, he now wanted permission to print what he wanted without any restrictions and in his application noted that both his father and grandfather served as chief rabbis in Altona in order to help him gain his request. This, however, was denied him. Nevertheless, during his controversy with Eyb, Emden published about half-dozen works opposing the chief rabbi (see below, p. 218a) directly contravening this rule. This explains why the title pages of several of them indicate that they were printed in Amsterdam even though, in fact, they were printed in Emden’s own printing press in his house in Altona (see, for example, Chapter 15, n. 123). On November 11, 1743, he received permission from the Danish King, Christian VI, to operate the printing press as long as he obtained prior approval from Altona’s Chief Rabbi and lay leadership. After he died, Emden reapplied for permission from his son and successor, Frederick V, and received it again on February 20, 1747. Not a word about the restriction placed on Emden’s printing is mentioned here. Note the fact that

p. 658

Most important to note is that some of the title pages also included the phrase in Latin characters, “Cum Privil. Majest.” which means, “with the permission of the King.”

Emden used the fact that he received this permission to print from the king for his polemelic advantage against Eyb. In discussing Eyb’s Luhot Edut, he wrote

Emden also showed knowledge of the business of printing in his own works

p. 659

For a list of all the works printed in Altona between 1743 and Emden’s death in 1776, including those he published, see M. Grunwald, *Hamburgs deutsche Juden*, pp. 169-72.

For the history of Hebrew printing in Altona, see

Emden also repeatedly noted that he derived no monetary benefit from the books he printed

p. 660

It means “boxes.”

but it had come to mean wild, savage or uncivilized

p. 661

(the biblical reference there is to Gen 28:17 found in Parshat Vayetze, a Torah portion read during the fall)

It is a sharply worked critique

in the later winter of 1729

p. 662

There was a history of neglect for the study of *dikduk*, particularly among Ashkenazi Jews

Although Emden claims here that he has no particular expertise in grammar, his works – especially LS, his hagahot on Shas, MuK, and both volumes of the Siddur - are full of grammatical comments.

p. 663

He did not print it by the time he

For pages with multiple references to

Some hundred references to Luah Eresh can be found in these pages alone. Over sixty more are scattered throughout the work

This is found throughout the Siddur. See, for example, his postscript to the second volume of the *Siddur* (158a) where Emden noted that he included alot of historical information based on the Bible, *Megillat Ta'anit* and other rabbinical and historical sources. In fact, as Emden went through the yearly calendar in his second volume, he noted not only what ritual practices must be performed on each day but also recorded which important events in biblical and medieval times occurred then.

p. 664

Emden published a kabbalistic dictionary by that name

This is an exceptionally accurate characterization by Emden of this work. For other assessments of the work by Emden himself, see

In addition to providing information about all of the above, Emden’s Siddur is also significant because it contains many important statements about a variety of subjects which are critical for an understanding of his overall intellectual profile. For references to his generally negative attitude toward philosophy

they arrive at strange conclusions as to what they consider acceptable behavior; philosophy was responsible for all the difficulties faced by the Jews during the First and Second Commonwealth, for the destruction of the Temple, the growth of sectarian movements and the Spanish expulsion (on this see

p. 665

where E adds that philosophy was also responsible for the destruction wreaked on Eastern European Jewry in the seventeenth century).

For his negative attitude towards *piyyut*, see

For his favorable attitude towards non-Jews (Emden repeatedly noted that all major contemporary religions share a basic belief in the existence of God, Providence and the notion of reward and punishment, see

His assertion that

His commentary also contains much information about the human body and medicine (many of these passages have been collected by

Unfortunately, as the title indicates, Steinberg did not use the original, authentic edition of the Siddur. As a result, the passages he cites must be compared to the original to verify their accuracy. Also, his collection is not exhaustive.

For various aspects of the natural world, see, for example, *Shaarei Shamayim* 49b (a pig cannot possibly see the sky), 52b (about a creature which has eyes under its skin), 103b (the heat of the sun doesn't penetrate beyond the outer layer of the earth; the source of fire is deep inside the earth, why fire rises), 113a (darkness is not just the absence of light but an independent essence), 217b (change of climate results in sickness), 230b (why the head of a baby emerges first from the womb; the earth is 6,000 *parsangs* wide with a diagonal of 2,000 *parsangs*), 224b (the earth revolves; see M. Kasher, "ah-Arez 'o ha-Shemesh Merkaz ha-'Olam," *Talpiot* II [1946], 402), 411a (chemistry); *Amudei Shamayim* 32b (alchemy), 67a (astronomy).

For examples of Emden’s knowledge of medieval history, see references to the status of Torah learning in the days of R. Israel Isserlein (I:32b); Yom Tov Lipmann Muelhausen who lived three hundred years before Emden and was a contemporary of Maharil (I:176b); the German halakhic tradition being more reliable than that of Spain (I:411b-412a); the destruction of Jewish communities during the Crusades (II:57a); the Chmielnicki massacres of 1648 (II:57a, 66b, 77b); the Spanish Expulsion (II:76b, 77a); the death of Yehosef ha-Nagid on the ninth of Tevet and the subsequent destruction of the Jewish community in Granada, Spain (II:149b); the Castillian Jewish community being saved from the danger of Martin Gonzolo and Frankfurt Jewry being saved from Vincent Fettmilch (Vintz) (II:155a); the expulsion of Jews from France in Av of 1306 (II:157b).

Emden’s additional notes to his *Siddur* also contain a variety of historical references. See M. Bick’s edition of the *Siddur* (New York, 1966), II, 84 (pogroms in Germany); 87, 88, 90, 91, 97 (destruction of Jewish communities during the Crusades); 88, (anti-Jewish activity in Prague in 1389); 94-95 (martyrdom of the Cologne community); 96 (massacre of Blois Jewry in 1171); 97 (Chmielnicki massacres); 100 (impact of the Spanish Expulsion); 103 (expulsion of the Jews from Provence in 1306). Also, Emden cited *Sefer Yosippon* in I:51b and Solomon ibn Verga’s *Shevet Yehuda* in II:19b-20b and 105a-b.

For Emden’s knowledge of geography, see, for example, I:35a (the land of Israel is 600 *parsangs* distance from Altona-Hamburg), 224b (the Atlantic Ocean), 230b (landlocked bodies of water, like the Caspian Sea, the Dead Sea and the Kinneret), 233a (Garev and Ge'ata are located in the vicinity of Jerusalem); II:2b (the North and South Poles are uninhabited).

For the centrality of Israel and Jerusalem for Jews in Emden’s thoughts, see, for example, I:23b-24a, 30b-36a (including an explanation of why he personally did not emigrate to the Holy Land, 35a-b), 218a; II:25b. Some of these statements were reprinted in

p. 666

For his knowledge of Greek, see

His commentary also reflects his assessment of his contemporary Jewish community. See, for example, his critique of the tendency on behalf of some of his contemporaries to ape gentile habits of dress, fashion, music and games (עמודי שמים, עמ' יח, א; שערי שמים, עמ' עו, א- עז, א; עז, ב - עט, א). He was also upset with the intermingling of men and women during holiday celebrations (שערי שמים, עמ' נב, א-ב), lack of decorum during prayer - as opposed to Christians who behave with the greatest respect in Church (עמודי שמים, עמ' כו, ב; תט, ב- תי, א), insincere piety (עמודי שמים, עמ' קמג, א; רסו, ב; שנח,א), the general neglect of Torah and proper behavior (עמודי שמים

that the fact that Emden here chose 1-2-3 as his numerical formulation and not א-ב-ג drew the attention of halakhic authorities

p. 667

This source is quoted and discussed by

It is also interesting to note that in the Siddur Emden often cites practices in the name of the Ari that seem to be unfounded

He suggests that

An interesting testimony about the limited availability of copies of the siddur is found in the Leibes Brief by R Yizhak Wetzlar. He writes that he had just acquired the book “this year” but that it had not been “widely distributed.”

p. 668

Here it means to actually hit

p. 669

The reference to the page in the siddur there needs to be corrected to p. 269a

It is interesting to note that Emden’s addition of bankers to the list in the Mishnah in Kiddushin is mentioned in passing by

He gives no indication there of the major controversy that this brief addition caused.

The first volume was completed some 2 years after he began working on it on the first day of Hannukah

The haskamah is dated

which, Emden informs us here, he requested after the volume was completed. See below. Also noteworthy in this context is the fact that the prayer for the government found in the *Siddur* (I:369b) is in honor of King Frederick who became King of Denmark (which at that time had jurisdiction over Altona) in 1746

For an example of the phenomenon he mentions, see

It is dated

p. 670

The book also contains a *haskamah* from Emden’s brother-in-law, R. Aryeh Leib of Amsterdam, dated

It is most interesting to compare this extraordinary story to statements of Emden elsewhere describing a total disinterest in soliciting *haskamot* at all for his works

It is striking that in one of his works, Emden actually pointed with pride to the high esteem in which RYK held him as evidenced by this approbation

See this in spite of the fact that Emden wrote at the very end of his introduction (I:39b) that he was interested in procuring a *haskamah* for this work.

p. 671

Emden often made references, both within his Siddur and elsewhere, to the great difficulties he encountered while working on it

Also, at the end of the first volume of his MuK (103a-b) Emden described a potentially dangerous fire in his study room that occurred during the time he was preparing the Siddur for publication

p. 672

Here he means that as he was almost finished writing the book he was forced to stop.

Vol 1 was completed on Hannukah 507 (see above, n. 54). From the beginning he intended the work to contain more than one volume

where Emden prayed for divine help to complete the rest of it

Yet, it is interesting that in his first volume Emden often blames his workers for pushing him to finish the work and not giving him the opportunity

Emden’s complaint that the beginning of the work was already being printed while he was in the midst of composing the rest is easily confirmed by a perusal of the printed text. At times, corrigenda printed immediately after a particular text refer to passages in it by their page number. See for example, I:38b-39b (corrigenda to I:2a-36b), 56b-58b (corrigenda to 43a-54b); II:128a (corrigenda to II:122b). Furthermore, in about one hundered and fifty instances, Emden cross-referenced to a passage printed earlier and referred to it by its page number. For example, I:219a contains a cross-reference to I:199b; I:222b contains cross-references to I:200a, 201a and 202a. The earliest such example I found, other than the corrigenda referred to above, is in I:127a.

p. 673

At the very end of his first volume of the Siddur, *Amudei Shamayim*, Emden wrote,

For other omissions and abridgements in the Siddur due to haste, see

The haste in which the book was printed is evident throughout. The work contains a number of displaced sections which were inadvertently overlooked and later interpolated. (For examples, I:56b-57a belongs after I:43a; the bottom of I:261a belongs on I:258a; I:262a belongs on I:244a; almost the entire I:296a belongs on I:290a and the bottom of I:319a belongs on I:170b. Note also the addendum on I:325a-b). There is also a general sloppiness in the printing of the work, some page numbers (I:176 and 357-359) appear twice while others (I:385-387 and 416) do not appear at all, and minor printing errors abound. See, for example, I:98a, l.11: should read ידיהם ורגליהם; 217b, l. 1: "45" should be "48"; 225a, l. 3: "*hamishi*" should be "*shishi*"; 314a, l. 19: there should be a "7" at the beginning of the line; 314a, l. 25: "6" should be "9"; 379b, l. 2: "59" should be "58"; 405a, l. 23: "Perek 5" is missing; II:16a, l. 16 and 22a, l. 7: "*mavo*" should be "*mavuy*"; 21a, l. 11: "10" should be "9"; 44b, l. 1: "24" should be "25"; 63a, l. 16: "*shvil* 15" should be "*shvil* 14"; 86a, l. 23: "8" should be "7"; 128a, l. 14: "5" should be "4"; 133a, l. 20: "8" should be "7"; 135a, l. 2: "22" should be "23"; 142a, l. 4: "2" should be "1"; something is also missing between l. 11 and l. 12; 151b, l. 1: "10" should be "20"; 154a, l. 8: "7" should be "8". On II:21a, 44b, 86a, 128a, 133a, 151b, 154a the rest of the numbers in the sequence must be adjusted accordingly.

There are also misprints in the page numbers of I:222 and 321.

Note also II:57b where the twenty-eighth day of the month of Nisan is said to fall on Saturday while the thirtieth of that month is said to fall on a Wednesday. The reader is also informed (II:59a-b) that both the nineteenth and twenty-seventh of 'Iyyar fall that year on a Saturday. These are not simply misprints but rather reflect sloppiness on Emden’s part.

The overall structure of the *Siddur* also betrays a lack of systematization. For example, the title page described the work as containing fifty sections while the Table of Contents at the end (I:415b-418a) identified fifty-seven; Emden introduced the seventh chapter of the unit dealing with sexual matters by stating that it will contain two sub-sections (I:355b) but later he presented three (I:first 357a); at the beginning of his discussion of the month of Tishrei (II:81a) Emden stated that it will be divided into six parts while, in fact, there are seven; his discussion of hanhagat ha-se'udah does not follow the order of topics he outlined at the beginning of his presentation (I:275b).

Most striking is the fact that the Table of Contents printed at the end of the first volume does not accurately reflect the order in which some issues were indeed presented. For example, in the Table of Contents (I:417b, #28) Emden listed the section dealing with business after that dealing with laws relating to travel; in the text, business (I:268a-271b) preceded travel (I:271b-275a). Even within the section on travel, the Table of Contents (*ibid*.) does not reflect the order found in the work itself (I:271b-273a). Also, unlike the order of the Table of Contents (I:418a), the additional kinot mourning the destruction of the Temple are printed *before* the practices relating to preparing for bed (I:328b-330b).

There are also instances where Emden’s commentary was not synchronized with the text he published. In *Siddur* II:27b, Emden noted in his commentary that “*shederashah* ben Zoma” should have a *mapik* but the printed text does not reflect that. Sometimes other considerations are to be taken into account. For example, in I:172a, Emden’s commentary on “*aleinu*” includes remarks on the phrase “*she-hem mishtahavim la-hevel ve-la-rik*” but it does not appear in the text. Although clearly maintaining that it should be included, Emden exercized self-censorship by not printing it. As late as 1750 that passage was still considered offensive and was legally proscribed by the government. See J. R. Marcus, *The Jew in the Medieval World* (Cincinnati, 1938), 95, for the charter issued by Frederick the Great of Prussia on April 17, 1750.

It is interesting, however, that the Table of Contents of the second volume (II:155b-156b) is in perfect conformity with the actual sequence of the work.

Emden also correctly admitted at the end of the first volume’s list of corrigenda (I:415a) that, "it does not (even) represent one-third or one-quarter" of the changes that had to be made.

Nevertheless, on occasion Emden did pay attention to printing technicalities. See, for example, I:63b (previous printers who left a space at this point are wrong); 282a (he punctuated passages from the *Zohar*); 306b (he explained why he chose large type for a particular word).

It is interesting to note that elsewhere, Emden complains that haste in printing results in shortcuts which leads to error

p. 675

For a similar problem regarding

None of these minor technical deficiencies, however, minimize the greatness of Emden’s achievement. The *Siddur* is an outstanding work and a major contribution to the area of liturgy. See my article, cited above, n. 29.

p. 676

where Emden writes that their efforts at boycotting the book were successful

It means head of the zealots.

p. 677

It resulted in a number of technical errors.

p. 678

The manuscript is in the Bibliotheca Rosenthaliana in Amsterdam. See L. Fuks and R. G. Fuks-Mansfeld, *Hebrew and Judaic Manuscripts in Amsterdam Public Collections*, vol. 1 (Leiden, 1973), 71, #142. Emden made references to it in *Siddur* I:127b, 135a; *SY* I:144; *SY* II:17. Parts were printed by A. H. Wagenaar, Toledot Yavez, Appendix IX, x-xiii, and, in corrupt form, by Moshe Tzvi Aryeh Bick who reprinted the first edition of the *Siddur* (Tel Aviv, 1966) and selectively included some of these additions at the end of Vol. 2. See also A. Bick (Shauli), in *Moriah* 5:1-3 (1973), 19-22, and *idem.*, “ha-Ḥasidut bi-Sidduro shel ha-Yaveẓ,” *Shanah bi-Shanah* (5733-5734), 368-70. They are included in the two volume siddur of Rabbi Yaakov Emden published by Hotsa’at Sefarim Eshkol (Jerusalem, 1994). As indicated on the cover page, #2, these additions and corrections are reflected in the printed text there by a different font

The Siddur was printed a number of times, most popularly as *Siddur Bet Yaakov,* but all the editions include various additions not found in the original version and, therefore, must be used with great caution

p. 679

For one example of halakhic errors that may result from relying on these later editions, see

Parts of the Siddur commentary were reprinted in different contexts

Part of Emden’s Siddur, his commentary on Perek Shirah (Volume 1, pp. 43b-58b) was reprinted in his lifetime in Livorno, 1772, together with Sefer Avodat Mikdash by R. Menachem di Lonzano and R. Menahem Azaryah mi-Fano. There is, however, no mention there of his name. The title page refers to it simply as "עם פירוש נאה ע"ד [= על דרך] האמת," and all personal references at the beginning and end of the commentary are deleted. Perhaps the reason for this omission is the fact that on a number of occasions in his commentary on the Siddur, Emden criticized this work. See, for example, *Ammudei Shamayim*, p. 71a, 315b-316b, 373a. It was printed again by פינחס זליג גליקסמן בלודז, תרצ"ד. One must exercize caution, however, because Gliksman transcribed it from a later edition of Emden’s siddur which included much material not found in the original. See Y. Refael, “Kitvei Rabi Yaakov Emden,” p. 240, n.

As noted earlier (p. 200a and n. 86, 87) Emden often complained that preparing the Siddur with great haste resulted in his often including many rashei tevot and that he hoped to include a table of rashei tevot at the end of the entire work. He did not do so but the task was undertaken by מאיר סג"ל בספרו קרית ספר שנדפס בראשונה אוסטרהא, תר"ך. The book deciphers thousands of abbreviations, as well as sometimes emends the text or provides sources. It carries a haskamah of ר' יוסף שאול נאטאנזאהן מיום י"ז אב שנת תק"כ. הספר חזר ונדפס באדעסא, תרכ"ד עם הקדמה קצת שונה.It was recently appended to the second volume of M. Bick’s edition of Emden’s Siddur (1966) with some changes. ראו גם לוח ראשי תיבות שבסידור בסוף אברהם חיים וואגנה, תולדות יעב"ץ (מהדורת אמסטרדם, 1868), עמ' XXI-LI. For the challenges surrounding *rashei tevot* in books, ראו יעקב שמואל שפיגל, עמודים בתולדות הספר העברי, עמ' 310-28

Meir Segal also published a work solely devoted to identifying the sources of statements made by Emden in his Siddur.

p. 680

It means that if God did not delay avenging the humiliation of a King of Edom (ורש"י ד"ה דמלכא דאדום, "אע"פ שהוא אדומי") he will certainly not delay avenging your humiliation

It means to go bankrupt

In his review of Kahane’s edition of MS, p. 336, David Kaufmann lists this among other examples of where German language idioms made their way into this text

and attacks it very strongly

p. 681

It means that some may hear of this but will not hear of that

p. 682

It seems more likely that an exact number was written here: “He will serve X number of years at hard labor and then will be expelled from the land.”

p. 683

Emden often noted how God punished his enemies. See Chapter 7

He even recorded how his Siddur was actually torn into pieces by his enemies. ראו עדות ביעקב, עמ' לח, ב (correct pagination);

p. 684

the leader of Emden’s enemies in this case

Once again, Emden underscores his ignorance in business matters. See above, Chapter 10, n. 315.

p. 686

Emden recorded in a number of places that shortly after Eyb arrived in AHW in 1750, he sent the new Chief Rabbi a copy of his Siddur to examine and that Eyb praised the work highly and recommended that every household in town own a copy. See

p. 687

(regarding Eyb’s attitude at that point to Emden’s works in general);

He even wrote that when Eyb first arrived in AH”W, he was very supportive of Emden’s siddur in spite of the controversy it generated with the bankers

Nevertheless, the ill will generated by this controversy continued to fester and, during the height of his conflict with Eyb, he speculated that perhaps some of his opposition then stemmed from this group of bankers who could still not forgive him for what he had done

Emden’s controversy with the bankers was also used to discredit Mortimer J. Cohen’s assertion that Emden’s controversey with Eyb needs to be understood in the context of a class struggle taking place in AHW at that time. In Cohen’s view, the lower class sided with Eyb while the upper class, which saw its position threatened by the new Chief Rabbi, rallied around Emden. See Mortimer J. Cohen, *Jacob Emden*, pp. 12-14, 24, 82, 95, 109-15, 148, 236-37, 240 and p. 305, n. 35. (But see *ibid.*, p. 305, n. 30, where he quotes an opinion contrary to his own.) However, in both of their reviews of Cohen’s book, Gershon Scholem and Salo Baron pointed out that Cohen adduced no evidence for such a class struggle and certainly none to prove the positions he claimed were adopted by both of the major protagonists of this controversy. Both correctly note that many of the wealthy communal leaders were, in fact, solidly in the Eyb camp. In fact, they had been alienated by Emden before the controversy even began when he aroused their ire by this pejorative aside about bankers that he included in his Siddur. Indeed, as noted above, Emden himself asserted that they never forgave him and joined the opposition to him when the controversy arose. See Gershon Scholem, *Kiryat Sefer* 16 (1940):322-24; Salo Baron, *Jewish Social Studies* 1:4 (1949):485-86.

See XX who takes a position similar to that of Cohen’s here

And see XX where Emden does frame this controversy in class terms

In his refutation of Baron’s review of his book (*JSS* 2 [1940]:121), Mortimer J. Cohen claimed that Emden’s apology led to a reconciliation between him and the bankers. These texts indicate that this was simply not the case.

מאד מעניין לציין that in an entirely different context, E favorably refers to

p. 688

he expresses his desire

It means that they sought to harm something that brought only goodness to the world

p. 689

He ended his book with that section

It is clear that his intention was to continue because in the course of his work he refers the reader to *aliyot* beginning with letters after *mem* in the alphabet. See, for example, references to XX

In fact, the last page of the first printed edition of the book ends in the middle of a sentence at the bottom of the page

p. 690

Given Emden’s repeated references to Altona as his home and that of his ancestors, I take *binyan avot* as a reference to his *avot*, not the *avot* in general.

p. 691

It would appear from here that this work was authored by Emden himself. See below, Chap. 15, n. 129

Carl Anton (b. September 11, 1722), formerly Moses Gerson Cohen, converted to Christianity at the age of twenty-five in Wolfenbüttel on July 30, 1748. He studied in his youth in Prague with Eyb with whom, he claimed, he maintained contact even after his conversion. In his writings, Anton inferred that Eyb was secretly drawn to Christianity via Sabbatean *kabbalah*. His name is cited often in Emden’s works

Regarding Karl Anton and his role in the Emden-Eyb controversy, see his

p. 692

Emden repeatedly noted that Eyb really wrote Anton’s work

under the words “Akizat Akrav” in large letters is written XX in small letters

on this claim, see

p. 693

It was in the middle of discussing this work that Emden went on a tangent about his controversy with Eybeschutz

It is interesting to note that the beginning of Emden’s controversy with Eybeschutz also impacted on his ritual behavior

p. 694

This is the first time Emden mentions this as a consideration for marrying his niece. It does not appear earlier, (p. ) when he first writes about this marriage.

This phrase appears a number of times in the Zohar

In this context it is particularly interesting to note that after Emden died, this third wife of his was engaged in a bitter struggle with his children from his earlier marriages over his estate. See my introduction.

p. 695

In the manuscript, the words XX and XX are written on a line by themselves separated by a space. It appears to me that they belong where I put them in the text. For that day as the birthday of his son

He published a letter written by Aryeh Yehuda that was dictated to him by his father when he could no longer write by himself

It is unusual to find Emden writing with such warmth about one of his children

It began on February 4, 1751 when Yavez announced in his private synagogue in his home that a amulet ascribed to Chief Rabbi Eybeschuetz could only have been written by a believer in the false messiah Shabbetai Zevi. The fullest account of the opening stages of the controversy is found in *Iggeret Purim* (see below, n. 41).

p. 696

For additional book length biographies, see

For a particular passage of Eyb’s in his Kreti u-pleti, see

p. 697

In the last number of years Machon Yerushalayim and others have published a number of volumes with hiddushim of R. Eyb on Tanakh, the Talmud, the Haggadah, passages in the Rambam’s Mishneh Torah and the Shulhan Arukh. A number of editions of his drashot, entitiled Yaarot Devash have also been published

p. 698

Here he refers to it as Megillat Purim, not Iggeret Purim

For a list of controversy related works, both published and unpublished (by the time he was writing those words in ), see below, p. 218a-b.

The literature about the E-Eyb controversy and related matters is large and growing while important material is still in manuscript, most notably *Gahalei Esh,* 3 vols, found in the Bodleian Library in Oxford. See Ad. Neubauer, *Catalogue of the Hebrew Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library* p. 755, #2189. For a preliminary description of the manuscript, see idem.,

p. 699

See too the series of articles by Sid Z. Leiman all entitled,

p. 700

For analyses of this controversy in nineteenth and twentieth century Jewish historiography, see

and the secondary literature cited there. In addition, the following biographies of Eyb contain much information relevant to the controversy

A full history of this controversy remains to be written. In the meanwhile, Emden’s descripton below needs to be checked against all the information forthcoming from all these primary sources and analyzed in light of all the secondary literature on the subject.

p. 701

Before Emden escaped from Altona he was put under house arrest

On June 30, 1752, the king granted Emden permission to return to Altona. Emden printed the kinds German letter in Hebrew letters in

p. 702

The formulation here is unclear. David Kahane added

What Emden writes here needs to be correlated with other sources about the events of the controversy. This story has yet to be told. In the interim, regarding this point, see

It means that God allows a wicked person to fulfill all his desires in this world before He punishes him in the World to Come

p. 703

this is one of the components of teshuvah

p. 704

It means that God does not punish without a reason for it.

It means, speech like the thrust of a sword

p. 705

It is unclear to me what work of his Emden is referring to here

Emden was involved in a battle against Eyb and was asked to write a treatise regarding it. He did but the baalei batim procrastinated.

p. 706

It means that when going to adjudicate a case, Rav Huna would ask for the tools of his trade – stick, strap, horn and sandal – in case any of them would be necessary to carry out his ruling

Emden already had dealings with the Ober President

p. 707

It means that he lost all his possessions.

. Once again, Emden realizes he has strayed from his focus. He noted (p. 204a) that his interest here is not the story of his controversy with Eyb so the last few pages in which he described it is a digression.

For Emden being referred to as “ab”d me-Emden,” see

There is no indication there that either of them was a mohel

p. 708

she married the son of her cousin

She was the one who inherited her father’s books and manuscripts and sold a number of books and manuscripts to R. Hayyim Mikhael, a book dealer in Hamburg in the 1820s

The last page of the manuscript of R. Emden’s *Kolan shel Sofrim* (Neubauer, p. 86, #392:4) contains the following notation by Michael

p. 709

should read “his *daughter* sold it”

It means, why the decree was issued with such haste?

p. 711

Notice that Emden changes the spelling of the book from עדות, tablets of testimony, to אדות, with an alef. Ed with an alef and a yod is a biblical word that means calamity or disaster (see Jer. 48:16, Job 21:30 and elsewhere). “Yom eidam” means the day of their downfall, when sinners will be punished (see Deut. 32:35). See too Avodah Zarah 2a. Emden means that these tablets written by Eyb testify to his guilt and, therefore, will lead to his downfall. They are the last testimony that he will fail

In fact, this was the first work published by Eybeschutz

It means that I am and there is none besides me

p. 713

this is a strange *rashei tevot*.

p. 714

As is known, three years marks the accepted time for a rabbinic contract

p. 715

It means that they were discrete when they did forbidden things

It means things that are offensive

p. 716

Emden here is referring to the following set of incidents. On December 5, 1755, Jacob Frank arrived in Poland where he was received with great enthusiasm by members of the Sabbatean communities who had lived there in an underground fashion for several decades. At the end of January, 1756, he visited Lanskroun (Landskron) in the province of Podolia where it was reported that he and his followers conducted some kind of antinomian Sabbatean religious orgy with Christian overtones. Frank and several others were arrested but he was freed shortly thereafter. The rabbi of the city appealed to the members of the rabbinical court in the nearby town of Satanow, which had religious jurisdiction over that area, to investigate the matter. They conducted an inquiry into the affair and, in the process, their attention was drawn to a network of Sabbatean adherents in that area who, while outwardly living traditional Jewish lives, flagrantly abrogated Jewish law in private. They reported their findings at a rabbinical conference in Brody in June 1756, and these Sabbateans were placed under the ban, a ruling that was confirmed at a meeting of the Council of the Four Lands in Konstantynow the following September. In response to the harassment and persecution of the Sabbateans throughout Podolia and beyond that followed, those identifed with this movement approached local Christian religious authorities, in particular Bishop Mikolaj Dembowski of Kamieniec-Podolski, and claimed that the reason they were targets of the Jewish community was because they share with Chrisitians a belief in Jesus and other matters of faith. They were successful in gaining the bishop’s support for a while, perhaps because he hoped that, in due time, they would fully adopt Christianity.

An important related text is “Ma’aseh Nora be-Podolia,” a purported eyewitness account of some of these early events involving Frank and his followers in Poland, published by Emden at the end of his *Sefer ha-Pedut ve-ha-Purkan* (Altona, 1769), 27a-30b. It was reprinted, with notes and analysis, in Majer Balaban, “Studien und Quellen zur Frankistischen Bewegung in Polen” in *Livre D’Hommage a la Mémoire du Dr. Samuel Poznański* (Warsaw, 1927), 47-68; idem., *Le-Toledot ha-Tenu’ah ha-Frankit*, 295-320. Emden refers to it briefly in *Sefer Hit’avkut*, 19a. Balaban already noted the unreliability of parts of this account, as did Avraham Ya’ari, “Le-Toldot Milhamtam,” 458

p. 717

For secondary literature on these events, see.

Most recently, see my.

because he wanted to have it printed in time for the recital of *birkat ha-hamah* that year.

As indicated on the title page, the book was printed “in Hamburg, bei Christian Simon Schröder.” However, both the font and the pages on which the book was printed indicate that it was, actually, printed in Emden’s house; like all of his other books that he printed. Emden, who could publish nothing without the approval of the CR (see Chapter 11, n. 423), who in this case was Eyb, had this book officially published by Schröder who was licensed to publish without Eyb’s approval. Other books of Emden’s indicate Amsterdam on the title page as the place of publication (for example Torat ha-kena’ot, Akizat Akrav, Sefer Shimush) but (as I indicated there) they too were published by him in his printing press in his house in Altona. He indicated Amsterdam as a way of legally protecting himself.

p. 718

It seems quite clear that this is another one of Emden’s puns

It is Aramaic for “parasite worm.”

p. 719

Elsewhere Emden wrote that he published a version of this essay in German

p. 720

Trunk points out that at first Abraham took a more cautious position in light of the significant support Eyb enjoyed in Poland and only later, after the appearance of the Frankist movement, wrote in strong support of Emden. Adam Teller is unconvinced by Trunk’s argument. See his

He appears very often throughout all of Emden’s works on the controversy

p. 721

R Baruch was born in Konstantynów, Poland and studied under R. Jacob Joshua Falk, author of the *Pnei Yehoshua*. He also had substantial knowledge of Christian theology and was probably the best connected Jew in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. He took advantage of the close relationship he enjoyed with Karol Sedlnicki, secretary of Poland’s Royal Treasury, who lived in Konstantynów and influenced him to become involved in the Emden- Eyb controversy. R. Boruch played a central role in that controversy and in the anti-Frankist efforts in Poland beginning in 1756. He is mentioned often in this context in Emden’s works. See, for example

Eretz Yavan is a reference to Russia where the Christian population was Greek Orthodox.

Chaim mi-Lublin and his father Avraham played a prominent role in support of Eyb in the E-Eyb controversy

p. 722

For further references to the involvements of both *mehutanim* of Emden, RA Yoskis and Baruch me-Erez Yavan, in the Frankist controversy in Poland, see the articles cited above,

He unfavorably contrasts Emden here not traveling to his daughters weddings (and, earlier, his sons’ weddings) with Eyb who did travel to his son’s wedding. One must note, however, that there are many factors that could lead a parent in the eighteenth century not to be present at a child’s wedding and, also, Emden was present in Amsterdam in 1775 at the wedding of his daughter Chanah

p. 723

For a reason unclear to me, the copyist left the last third of this page blank and, in the next two pages, left unusually large margins, first (p. 209a) on the right and then (p. 209b) on the left.

Earlier (p. 203b and see n. 30) he wrote with such warmth about this child.

p. 724

This is the final reference to a child of Emden’s that was born. This was his twentieth child and he was born (in 1758) when his father was around sixty years old

p. 725

For the burning of the Talmud and the events that led up to it, see

For a contemporary description of the burning of the Talmud and its impact,

p. 726

For a contemporary description of the burning of the Talmud and its impact,

The burning of the Talmud made an impression on the Polish Christian community as well, and it was described in the Polish press

Emden noted that it was also reported in the German press

There were those who vowed to fast on 4 Cheshvan, the day the books were burned in Kamenetz

It means someone who rejoices in the misfortune of another.

p. 727

There is some questions as to the exact date of Dembowsky’s death

It is clear that his death deprived the Frankists of their most staunch ally and the tide turned decidedly against them

The suddenness of his passing so close to the burning of the Talmud was seen by the Jews as a clear punishment from God for what he had done. Emden referred to it earlier (p. 207b) as a “nes gadol.”

All sorts of myths and legendary stories spread about the events surrounding Dembowsky’s death and Emden collected and printed many of them. There are many, but one example will suffice:

p. 729

At the end of Sefer Shimush (88a-89a) Emden published a series of woodcuts that aimed to depict the death of Bishop Dembowski. On these woodcuts, see

For more on Emden’s close relatives who were in close contact with him, regarding this matter, see

p. 731

This may explain why Emden did not let up in his attacks against Eyb even after he died in 1764

p. 732

although it is strange that he uses a verse about Bilam to refer to himself

p. 734

his name appears in documents from earlier years

p. 735

He was required to pay four percent of the profits.

This addition does not appear in the first edition and it is unclear to me where it came from.):

p. 736

these words were so sharp that the editor who published them felt the need to address them

In fact, anyone familiar with Emden’s writings would not consider these words sharp at all.

p. 738

This phrase appears often in rabbinic literature

It means to swear holding an object of mitzvah to impress upon the one taking the oath how serious it is.

See XX where Emden also uses the word with a *samakh*.

p. 740

It is remarkable that Emden finds it necessary to include this information here

Also, in a discussion of the permissibility of ingesting a liquid laxative on the ninth of Av Emden noted in a matter of fact way that

Note how both names are spelled with an “aleph.”

This story about looking out the window and seeing an enemy walk by outside is reminiscent of one he told about an event that happened in Prague many years earlier involving R. Yonatan Eyb.

p. 741

Emden had a printing press in his house

He points out a contradiction in Emden’s writing because in *Edut bi-Yaakov* he writes that he left everything *hefker* and did nothing to get in the way of the search.

p. 742

but he, having the benefit of the text of MS, correctly explained it

Earlier this name was spelled

p. 743

This verse in the context of the story of Lot conjurs up feelings of being under attack, a feeling relevant here.

p. 744

Indeed, Emden’s copy of the Tur to which he refers here, with his extensive notes in the margins, is found in the Butler Library of Columbia University (MSS. 893 INL A53). Sure enough, it is exactly as Emden describes it to be here.

p. 746

It means that sensitive people grieve over this matter, that, as Rashi explains, one is considered to be a sinner even for an unintentional transgression.

There it means that there is no other place where this word appears in Tanach; here it means that an event like this never occurred before

p. 748

there it refers to God

For another, more limited reference to this story, see

p. 750

where it means the amount of money spent on the purchase of the item *(gevia ha-kesef)*. Here it means a receipt or voucher. Maybe, even, it reflects a double pun, a broken, or false, writing

Here it is spelled with an aleph

where Emden presents three arguments as proof that Torat he-kenaot is not the second part of AA.

There the context is a favorable one

p. 754

apparently these are the ones that he writes here that he sold. Apparently a full five years had not yet elapsed since he bought them

p. 755

There, though, it means deliverance; here it means bankrupcy

He was one of the five who led the persecution of Emden over his *Akizat Akrav*. See above, p. 213a

p. 757

For the phrase *yom eid* as a reference to idolatry, see

p. 758

Emden devoted part of his Sefer Hitavkut, entitled Sehok ha-Ksil, to Wolf Eybeschuetz

This, instead of that which is appropriate during that time, i.e.

p. 759

Here Emden seems to be saying that Wolf is building his *netia shel simchah* out of *ilanei serak* which is permitted but in the process he destroyed many wonderful *ilanei maakhal*.

For this in the context of its time

During that time, all such activity is prohibited

For a discussion of all these sources, see

p. 760

. The format of writing on this page is very unusual, seven lines of text, several lines blank, some ten lines of text and the last third of the page blank.

p. 761

It is interesting to note that Emden uses the same phrase in describing his father’s controversy with Hayon. See above p. 130a.

That he saw his controversy with Eyb in the context of his previous controversy with Hayon is clear

Here he means that that which is repulsive is in the high heavens

At that point there is a space of some 5 1/2 lines blank in the manuscript.

Here it means that close to the time it was being finished it was stopped.

p. 762

Here it means that close to the time it was being finished it was stopped.

Once again he spells Yaakov with an aleph

After this there looks like an entire line is skipped but it is not clear.

Once again, there seems to be a line skipped between this and the next paragraph.

This is an insult

p. 763

There is a one page, two side, document, entitled XX that Emden published which lists (on the back) all the works he printed until year XX

and, on the front, a list of the books he wants to print, almost all of which are mentioned below. Wagenaar saw a copy of it and printed it in his *Sefer Toledot Yaavetz*, pp. XIII-XIIII. See also ibid., pp. 39-40. Yitzhak Rephael printed a copy of another handwritten version of it, but the version is slightly different than the one printed by Emden

Neither Wagenaar nor Refael saw the original but it is now available in two versions; one in the Gershom Scholem Library, #5375.1. As noted in my introduction, one concludes with the startling announcement by Emden that he lost his manuscript of MS and requesting anyone to give him information about it

Emden also printed lists of his yet unpublished works at the end of *Sefer Shimush*, pp. 89 a-b (that book was published in 5523; see below, p. 219b) and on the last page of *Sefer Hit’avkut*, Altona ed, p. 165b (published around 5530; see below, n. 173). This last page is not included in the Lvov reprint of *Sefer Hit’avkut*.

p. 764

This work is the first in a very long list of works published by Emden. Emden himself makes reference to this on the title page both directly and indirectly, by a reference to לחם הביכורים (ויקרא כג:כ), a play on the title of the book as well as a reference to it as his "בכורים".

On the title page of chelek Alef the date of publication appears erroneously as אייר תפ"ח. Emden corrected it to read 493 at the beginning of his משנה לחם (עמ' א, א), a collection of addenda to Lehem Shamayim which was printed at the end of chelek beiz. Printing commenced after Passover and was completed some three months later, in the middle of Av. ההסכמה של האב"ד ר' יחזקאל קצנלנבוגין is dated ט"ו אב תצ"ג (ראו מעבר לעמוד השער). The end of Emden’s postscript to the work is dated 17 Av (p. 122b) and the concluding printer’s note is dated 18 Av (שם). The date on the proofreader’s note is אב, תצ"ג (p. 120b)

p. 765

the book is entitled

This book is a defense of the opinion of R. Yehezkel Katzellenbogen against that of XX

the second is also dated

reluctant to get involved

the postscript is dated

as is indicated on the title page of the first edition

The title page of the second edition of *Iggeret Bikoret* contains additions not printed in the first edition. It was reprinted in Zhitomir, 1867 and Jerusalem, 1970

For a careful analysis of this work, including the differences between the two editions, see

p. 766

It is rare for Emden to have reprinted a work he printed once, and such an act *omer dorsheni.* For other examples, see

This generally overlooked work is very important for an overall assessment of Emden’s intellectual profile. It engages in a long discussion regarding the relationship between medicine and Torah and analyzes the reliability of a doctor in matters of Jewish law. It also reflects Emden’s wide-ranging medical knowledge and features a long discussion on the notion of progress and Emden’s attitude toward his predecessors

In the context of discussing various “unnatural” occurrences in this book Emden is even ready to accept the notion of a virgin birth (25a; see too SY2:136). It also contains references to Aristotle (24a), Avicenna (21a, 24a) and to the philosophical notion that G-d does nothing in vain (20a). It is also an important source for Emden’s attitude toward the Palestinian Talmud (5a, 14a, 18a, 19a, 28a) and for his assertion that Rashi’s commentary can also be accepted as normative *pesak* (32a).

This work also played an important role in Emden’s bitter struggle with Eyb. In the course of that controversy. Emden was depicted by his opponents as an inverterate troublemaker and agitator who had consistently shown no respect for RYK (see my introduction). One of the ways he responded to this charge was to repeatedly point to his defense of RYK in this work, Iggeret Bikkoret.

p. 767

Finally, it is interesting that Emden accused Eyb of plagarizing from this book

The work was most recently reprinted in

where he notes that the manuscript includes “more than the printed edition.”Michael also owned a printed copy of the work with Emden’s notes in the margins

p. 768

While Emden did get ten comments on LS on Zeraim and Moed, three are from the same person (R Aharon Aptrod, #3, 7, 10), two from another (R’ N dayyan, #5, 8), and one (#2) is from his brother. One (#4) is from R. Moshe Hagiz (on this, see above, pp. 174b-175a).

Several parts of the siddur were reprinted in a number of different formats

The book was reprinted many times.

In addition, several parts of this work were reprinted in different formats

p. 769

Then he begins a comprehensive discussion of a series of inyanim in alphabetical order under the overall title of Bet middot

For some reason, the book ends abruptly at this point. It is clear to me that Emden stopped here in the middle. See below, and n. 121.

A careful analysis of this work remains to be undertaken (what is original about it and what is simply derivative of other sources; what is the point of reproducing large sections of medieval works – Hovot ha-levavot, Maalot ha-Middot and more – verbatim? In addition, this work includes much material very important for understanding Emden’s view on a wide variety of issues. Its importance, however, has hitherto been overlooked. For example (all page numbers are

p. 770

Emden refers to this book in his writing on

Like the Siddur, this work too was rushed (see above, Chapter 12, n. 81, 87).

There is an interesting printing curiosity at the beginning of this work relating to whether circumcision strengthens or weakens sexual desire. One early edition has an extra page added (2b-3b) including the following passage:

p. 771

The edition that includes these lines in very rare; in most editions of the work, even those dated the same year, this section is missing. For another example of different editions of a book with virtually the same title page

On p. 145a, Emden printed a Table of Contents until Aliyat ha-yira’ah (#32). He then immediately continues with Aliyat ha-kavot (#33). Perhaps this begins the second part of the book.

p. 772

Sadly, he never completed this work

XX year in Hebrew translates to XX year in English

At the end of the work (first edition, pp. 75b-82b), Emden included the second part of LE against Hanau.

This work is especially significant for two proofs that the Rambam was not the author of the Guide (פ"ג מט"ו), references to (סוף פ"ג; פ"ד, מי"א; פ"ה, מ"ב) שבתאות; attitude to Christianity and Islam (פ"ד, מי"א), his attitude to philosophy and knowledge of non-Jewish sources, (פ"ב, מי"ד; פ"ה, מכ"ב)

However, the portrait is of R. Zevi Hirsch, not Emden

The drasha contains a long aside by Emden about his battle against Sabbateanism beginning with an expression of gratitude to his brother-in-law for helping him in his efforts (p. 6b-7a; for this, see above Ch. 1, n. 426)

p. 773

For a sermon delivered by R. Eyb upon hearing the news of this expulsion

p. 774

This work was precipitated by Emden’s controvesy with Eyb. Emden wrote it while he was living in his sister and brother-in-law’s home in Amsterdam after having escaped from his home in Altona at the end of

On page 72b-73a he writes that he needs to conclude his work on this book quickly because he was just given permission to return home to Altona after nine months in exile.

The first part of the book presents four different accounts of Shabbetai Zevi and other texts about the movement in its early stages. These primary sources are interspersed regularly with Emden’s own comments. It also includes a section on the Hayon Controversy, on the first controversy involving Eyb in 1725-1726, on the Ramhal controversy, and, at the end, it turns to his controversy with Eyb which precipitated its writing.

Emden describes his motive for writing the book in a few places throughout the work

Emden reflects an historical sense through his efforts here to collect and preserve primary sources about the Sabbatean movement

For a *mafteach* for this work, see the end of his *Kizzur Zizat Novel Zvi*, p. 60a-b. For a brief description of the content of this work, see

For English translations of some of the earlier texts, see

p. 775

Although Emden does not clearly identify himself as the author of the book and references to him throughout it are written in the third person, it is clear that he is the author

XX misses this in his analysis.

For references to Emden in the third person throughout the work

Emden refers to this work in many of his writing where it also becomes clear that he is the author

p. 776

Emden tells the story of the background of this work in

p. 777

For all the drama surrounding this work, see above, pp.

Of all the polemical works of Emden, this one was most harshly judged

Emden inserted his own glosses in smaller font throughout the work

Sasportas did not publish this work in his lifetime and in 1737, at the request of his son, R. Abraham, R. David Meldola produced an abridged version printed in Amsterdam (see the title page of the work there and Meldola’s introduction). However, leaders of the community who were uncomfortable that members of their families had been involved in the Sabbatean movement ordered the entire print run to be destroyed. The book would have completely disappeared had Emden not published it based on a copy (allegedly the only remaining one) that he found in Amsterdam

By republishing this work by Sasportas as part of his polemic vs Eyb, Emden was not only expressing his interest in republishing deociments relevant to the 17th century Sabbatian movement (as he did in Thk; above n. 128), but perhaps was also implicitly arguing that the eighteenth century Sabbateanism against which he was fighting was the same as the seventeenth century Sabbateanism against which Sasportas battled. It is clear, however, that these two expressions of Sabbateanism were very different from one another. Emdens’s KZNZ was a different book than was the ZNZ published some twenty years earlier. More work is being done to be more precisely *magdir* what Sabbateanism actually meant in the eighteenth century.

p. 778

The work also includes a halakhic discussion on the practice of birchat ha-chamah

He also demonstrates his beki’ut

For another example of Emden’s wide ranging knowledge

p. 779

where Emden includes it in his list of as yet unpublished works. In fact, a second edition did appear, reprinted as an appendix to *Sefer Meteg la-Hamor* in *Sefer Shimush* (see below, n. 136). For a critical edition and annotation of both versions, see

I analyze this work at length in my

For some reason, the title on the title page is XX but the title on the top of each inside page is XX

It is a point by point refutation of Eybeschutz’s book

Paweł Maciejko errs in accepting Zolkiew as the place of publication. See

p. 780

it is the title of a collection of three books. Here Emden refers to it as XX with apostrophes; on the title page of the book the apostrophes don’t appear

He also refers to it repeatedly in XX

For the reason why the publication of the book was delayed

For a description of the contents of the book

Like the case in some of his other *kitvei polmos*, Emden did not explicitly include his name on the title page.

p. 781

One must examine it carefully to see how reliable it is.

. This work clearly does not belong here since it is purely halakhic and is not controversy based at all. It is correctly listed immediately below.

These were printed at the end of volume 2

For a long quote from

The earliest stage of this work began with notes that Emden wrote in the margins of the copy of the Tur that he received from his uncle as a wedding present (see p. 145a). That copy, which also includes margnalia notes by Emden on Tur Yoreh Deah, Choshen Mishpat and Even ha-Ezer, is presently in the Butler Library of Columbia University (MSS. 893 INL A53). The next stage was writing the commentary in a series of notebooks that Emden used as the basis for the two volumes he prepared for publication beginning in 521 and ended in 528 (see below, n. 275). These notebooks were in possession of Hayim Michael in Hamburg (see Ozrot Hayyim, p. 38, #428 and are presently in the Bodleian Library (MS. Mich 224; See Ad. Neubauer, *Catalogue of the Hebrew Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library*, p. 105, #519:1. For more information about the writing of this book, see my introduction.

For references to Emden’s commentary on YD, see Migdal Oz, p. 17b; on Choshen Mishpat, see there, p. 18a-b; 165a

p. 782

This work remained in Emden’s family until it was sold at auction, among other works of his, in Amsterdam in 1768. See

p. 783

There are additional *shu”t* of Emden that were not printed in either volume of SY

It means a kind of glue used by scribes.

This is different from Emden’s hagahot printed in the back of the standard Shas. These are taken from Emden’s comments in the margin of his personal Shas presently found in the National Library at the Hebrew University (Beit Hasefarim ha-Leumi ve-ha-Universitai) in Jerusalem

p. 784

It has, however, been pointed out (see for example, Bombach, p. 480; Spiegel, p. 420) that not all the hagahot in the margins of Emden’s Gemara were included in what was printed. For an interesting example regarding Emden’s attitude to Hasidut, see

A fuller version of these hagahot were included in

Emden refers to a project of his to reprint the Talmud

For a picture of an amud of Emden’s personal shas, see there, p. 103. This project, however, never came to fruition

Having spent only three full years in Emden

The book revolves around a series of questions

p. 785

In this work, Emden cites the Zohar and other kabbalistic sources many times and utilizes kabbalistic terminolgy often. At the end (p. 24a), apparently concerned that he may have revealed too much Kabbalah, he wrote

It may also be true that Emden himself was not uncomfortable with this but only wrote what he did as a disclaimer to deflect criticism that he was concerned might be directed against him by others.

It would be important to determine the extent to which the Zohar was encorporated into drashot in the eighteenth century. An analysis of the *Yaarot Dvash* of RYE would be very instructive here. Would the average *balebus* in Emden have understood these references? Were they included to benefit his audience or to impress his audience?

This particular drashah is very important to understand Emden’s position regarding the relationship between halakhah and Kabbalah. See esp pp 10a-b, 20b. Throughout this long discussion of the Zohar he has only the highest regard for it.

He refers to this work in many of his writings

Emden speaks very strongly against Sabbatians, Hasidim (missing in the 1911 edition), and philosophers. He also discusses his favorable attitude towards non-Jews. Here too he makes reference to difficulties with his vision,

p. 786

For a preliminary analysis of these three works, see my

Compare this to the generally negative assessment of

There are a number of issues that still need to be considered regarding these “drashot.” First is their length. It is inconcernable that Emden actially orally delivered what he later published for each of therese presentations. Secondly, more thought needs to be given to the question of wheather these works belonging in the genre of “drashot” or whather they are really shiurim or halakhic presentations. If the later is the case, then the contrast between these and Emden’s opposition to the accepted homiletical practices of his contemporaries is irrelevant.

For some relevant background sources, see

p. 787

Emden also included it in the lists of works he hoped to publish

For the phrase XX, see

The letter vov appears twice in a row.

p. 788

These books were part of the collection of Emden’s books and manuscripts that went on auction in Amsterdam in 1868, bought by Temple Emanuel in 1871, and transferred to Columbia University in 1892

p. 789

And, at the beginning of this document Emden announces his interest in getting support for a very ambitious project:

This careful textual and philplogical emphasis designed to provide a correct or proper version of all these texts is not characteristic of the eighteenth century and reflects the uniqueness of Emden’s interest

He also makes reference to this project as the very end of

This proposed work by Emden was the subject of part of his exchange with Moses Mendelssohn. See the letter from Emden dated 25 Sivan 1772 and the letter from MM dated 29 Sivan. See Moses Mendelssohn, *Gesammelte Schriften,* vol. 16, pp. 158, 159. But the project never came to fruition

p. 790

Given that Emden wrote hagahot in dozens of books (see ) it is unclear to me why he singles out this one here.

He refers to his plans to publish

This book is a kabbalistic dictionary or lexicon, interpreting words, following the order of the aleph-bes, from a kabbalisitic perspective.

For the significance of

p. 791

Mitpahat sefarim literally means book cloth referring to cloths used as wrappings for the sefer Torah (See *Megillah* 25b-26a). On the title page Emden notes that his book is meant to clothe the Zohar which, were it to be “naked,” would be dangerous because it could be misued by heretics to support their heretical beliefs. He was motivated to devote so much attention to the Zohar because it was being used, especially by Frankists, to justify their antinomian behavior.

It is interesting to note that Emden here does not include this work in the list of books he presents here as having been written against Sabbeteanism.

In the first chelek of this work Emden argues that many parts of the Zohar could not have been written by R. Shimon bar Yochai. He notes that the Zohar is not mentioned in the Talmud, it contains many passages that contradict the Talmud and it contains many passages (hundreds of them) that reflect terms, historical events and ideas that post dated Rashbi. He also points to biblical verses that were misquoted in the work and to theological beliefs that he considers to be unacceptable. And, he argued this all while asserting his great respect for the Zohar. His book begins with the following

Emden’s position here is a complex one. He wishes to uphold the sanctity of the core of the Zohar and sees it as an authentic source of Jewish mystical knowledge which he greatly valued while, at the same time, trying to neutralize its dangerous potential

p. 792

Moses Mendelssohn refers to this book favorably

For another favorable reference to *Mitpahat Sefarim*

This was left out of the 1912 printing of these responsa

p. 793

XX who argues that Emden’s postion questioning the authenticity of the Zohar was only meant as an anti-Sabbatean polemic and was not meant to be taken at face value as representing his own position

he also took this positon, claiming

It has long been demonstrated, however, that no such book ever existed. See XX and the exchange of letters between

Note also the quip attributed to Hatam Sofer about this work:

On the authoritative value of this work see

they were intended to respond to all the claims of Emden, one by one.

p. 794

he was responding to

For a strong critique of Kunitz and defence of Emden

p. 795

This passage was already noted by

Tamara Morsel-Eisenberg has recently written about this work. I thank her for making her paper, “*Mitpachat Seforim*: Authenticity, Criticism and Authority: The Role of Print in Emden’s Critique of the *Zohar*,” available to me.

This book is also important because it contains one of the earliest references to the emergence of Hasidut. See Chapter 5, n. 455.

p. 797

See my introduction.

There are, in addition, two other works that Emden published that he did not include in this list

It was published in Altona in 1776, the year he died, and deals with a fight that took place between the communities of Altona and Hamburg that had begun six years earlier and had dragged on for six years

Emden was asked to rule on this matter involving the broader community because during this time, from 1770-1775, there was no chief rabbi in AHW. Rabbi Horowitz died on 6 Iyyar 527 less than two years after assuming the position of Chief Rabbi. He was followed by R. David Berlin who also died after serving only two years as Chief Rabbi. At that point, according to דוד ליב צינץ, ספר גדולת יהונתן, עמ' 120, the community leaders thought that maybe appointing a Chief Rabbi of AHW during Emden’s lifetime was disrespectful to him and so they determined not to do so until after Emden’s death. R. Refael Hakohen assumed the position in 1776, after Emden died, and he served in that positon for some 23 years.

p. 798

Neither of these works were on Emden’s mind as this time, the second one, obviously, because the issue which it addresses occurred after he wrote these words.

. For an explanation of the choice of the name

With regard to the name “tannin,” see below, p. 218a, where Emden refers to Eyb by that word

For the story of the writing of this work and its unfinished nature

p. 799

This book has remained unpublished. The manuscript, in Emden’s hand, is found in the Bodleian Library. See Ad. Neubauer, *Catalogue of the Hebrew Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library*, p. 755, #2190:1; Ms. Mich. 618.

Iggeret Purim was acquired by the Bodleian from the collection of Hayim Michael in 1848. See M. Steinschneider, *Oẓrot Hayim* (Hamburg, 1848), 1, #12. For the Bodleian acquisition of part of the Michael collection of Emden’s works, see

The books in Michael’s collection originally owned by Emden were bought by the British Library. See Chapter 1, n. 400.

Copies of the work are available on microfilm at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem (Makhon le-Tazlumei Kitvei Yad #20473) and at the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York (Louis Ginzberg Microfilm Library, Reel # 514)

Various parts of the manuscript have already been published by A. Bick (Shauli)

However, contrary to Bick’s assumption, the information contained there is not new; the entire episode is already described in *Shevirat Luhot ha-’Even* (1756), 45b. See also SY2:126. Other passages, published by Bick in a hopelessly garbled fashion at the end of his edition of MS (Jerusalem, 1979), 276-79, representing pp. 28a, 42b and 43b of the manuscript, describe R. Emden’s familiarity with general medical literature, some of the sicknesses he suffered and his most intimate sexual fee1ings. Wagenaar, *Toledot Yavetz,* p. 19, also printed the beginning of this work (ms., p. 1a) and a brief selection from the end (ms., p. 43b).

Finally, I also printed four passages from the manuscript containing information which goes beyond the immediate confines of the controversy and serves to further elucidate various aspects of R. Emden’s intellectual gestalt. See my "Rabbi Jacob Emden’s *'Iggeret Purim*," pp. 441-46. Passage I shows his general reluctance to become involved in the study of *shemot* and his insatiable curiosity about all forms of knowledge. Information is also forthcoming about his first wife’s grandfather, R. Naphtali Katz (on him, see above, ch. 3, n. 130). In Passage II, R. Emden states that Sabbateans are worse than idolators and certainly more evil than members of other religions for whom he had a high regard (on this, see above, Chapter 5, n. 446). Passage III is very significant for a full understanding of R. Emden’s attitude to Maimonides. Most important are his statements challenging (but not totally rejecting) the Maimonidean authorship of the *Guide for the Perplexed* and his negative attitude to philosophy. Here too R. Emden attributes the Spanish Expulsion of 1492 to its negative influence. While these positions of R. Emden are already well known, his description of a resurgence of philosophical inquiry in his own day is not found elsewhere and is a very significant statement to be considered in an overall assessment of his attitude to the study of philosophy. In Passsage IV, R. Emden clearly claims to have written *‘Akiẓat ‘Akrav*, a work dealing with the controversy, which was published anonymously (see too בסמוך and Chapter 15, n. 129). This information is important for an understanding of that work as well as others similar to it (e.g. *Shevirat Luḥot ha-’Even* and *Sefat ’Emet*) for which R. Emden does not claim authorship. It is clear from these selections that a full appreciation of R. Emden’s intellectual posture cannot be gained without a careful study of his works relating to the controversy, just as any study of his attitude to Sabbateanism must include a close analysis of his halakhic treatises. It is essential that one be familiar with all of R. Emden’s works in order to comment on any one of them.

Emden himself refers to this text on a number of occasions

p.800

The existence of this work was widely known. It is referred to by

In this connection it is relevant to point to the relationship between Emden and the biblical Mordecai pointed out by

The first part of the book is a description by Emden of the events of the controversy. Beginning on p 29b is a collection of letters he sent and received, interspersed with some personal comments, about his controversy with Eyb and with the Frankists

For a very interesting critique of a number of comments in this work

p. 801

It is a devastating critique of the letter by XX who dared to suggest a compromise

The most trustworthy text

The letter of Landau was written in poetry, each line ending with the letter *ayin*. Emden’s work parodies it, claiming that he will open your eyes (פתח עֵינַיִם) and expose all the *ayins* (פתח עַיְנִים) and show why he rejects Landau’s compromise

p. 802

writes that this work, “for the most part, was a summary of all his previous works against Eibeschuetz

p. 803

It is interesting that Emden does not refer to it here by the name

He claims that he

However, one must treat with great caution anything published by Bick (see my introduction)

The books that relate to the controversy

that the book was published “[probably] Amsterdam, 1752.”

p. 804

The work consists of two parts. The first is a collection of thirty-five *kameot* distributed by Eyb with Emden’s commentary, called *Pirusha le-sakanta*, explaining them and pointing out their Sabbatean allusions. The second half is a collection of letters on the controversy primarily by XX

Finally, this list of what was published and what was still in manuscript when Emden wrote this has been used to try to identify when certain of his works were published

There seems to be an entire line blank between the end of this paragraph and the beginning of the next one.

Emden’s explanation here is a different one

In their historical notes to the English translation of this text, Howard Adelman and Benjamin Ravid note that only some of the works listed here were printed at the time Modena began to write this list in his autobiography and that he updated the list by later adding titles in the margin and between the lines of the manuscript. See

p. 805

but this date would not follow the chronology in this section

p. 806

He is one of the five, above,

p. 807

But it is not clear to me why Emden chooses to formulate it this way here

There is a line of empty space between the end of this paragraph and the beginning of the next.

Emden’s lack of emotion in describing the death of his daughter is striking. Cf below, n. 249.

p. 808

Emden mourned more for her death than for the death of Esther. See above, n. 232.

p. 809

In his review of Mortimer J. Cohen’s book, *Jacob Emden: A Man of Controversy,* Salo Baron cites this passage to disprove Cohen’s theory that a class struggle also accounted for the E-Eyb controversy, with the lower class supporting Eyb and the upper class supporting Emden. See Chapter 12, n. 243.

Emden owned a copy and wrote notes in the margin. It was first in the possession of

p. 810

This formulation is difficult for me because Emden writes in a postscript at the end of Muk Vol 2

This city in Bessarabia, the Ukraine, served as a refuge for Jacob Frank and his followers when they were forced to leave Poland. See “Khotin,” *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 12 ( ), 117. The entry there also notes that the community sent emassaries to Germany to raise money for its support.

p. 811

It is unclear to which *hibur* Emden refers here. Perhaps it is his *MuK* mentioned above on p. 220a.

p. 812

By this point, Emden was suffering from various ailments

For sentiments like these, see

p. 813

E wrote about himself in the third person

Emden also concludes his *MuK* with the standard prayer

Emden elaborated on the importance of making aliya to Israel and then stated (pp. 35a-b) that although he too greatly desired to live there, various extenuating circumstances made it impossible for the time being:

He concludes by charging his children to make aliya a priority for themselves

p. 814

There are a number of examples of contemporaries of Emden who also were interested in making Aliyah

Regarding this nephew,

For other examples of those in the early modern period who decided to make *aliyah*, especially elderly widows

p. 815

For a reference to Eybeschutz’s death

For Eyb’s sickness and Emden’s very critical description of Eyb’s behavior during the last months of his life, see

There too he notes that when he died

However, a different account of Eyb’s death includes the names of two people who were present at that time

For Eyb’s portrait, see

p. 816

On rabbinic portraits in general, see above, Chapter 3, nn. 90, 91.

It should be noted that some of these portraits were done in Eyb’s lifetime.

The death of Eyb also had a direct personal influence on Emden. It is interesting to note that the earliest reference to Yavetz adding the name Yisrael to Yaakov comes from a responsum dated

In another responsum dated just six days later (*SY* 2:144), 6 Adar, 525, Emden was addressed as

For other, later, references to this name by Emden and others

He explicitly acknowledges this change in a few places

p. 817

Emden here is clearly associating his change of name with the success he had in his battle against Eyb who had recently died. This point is made clearly by

However, it is clear that this change of name has nothing to do with sickness but everything to do with the death of RYE. Just like the name Yisrael was added to his namesake, Yaakov avinu, after he was successfully ne’evak with an “ish” (see Bereshit 32:25), so did Yavetz add that name to his own after he was ne’evak with an “ish,” namely RYE. He considered himself as having been successful after the death of his arch rival.

but here it means an insane asylum.

p. 818

(called Daniel in German documents) was born in 1719, studied in yeshiva in Frankfurt, returned to Hamburg in 1741 and became a prominent businessman and Jewish communal leader. He was appointed Hoffaktor and court agent by royal authorities in different areas and represented the Triple Community in the presence of secular authorities. He was distantly related to and a strong supporter of Eyb which probably accounts for his opposition to Emden here. He is the first in the list of AHW’s communal leaders to sign their correspondence with R. Yizhak Horowitz regarding his appointment as their new rabbi in 1765

Again the name of an enemy of Emden is spelled with an *aleph*

This time it appears, contrary to his protestations the last time the job in AHW was open, that Emden really did want the position of Chief Rabbi

p. 819

For a list of those who were considered for the position of rabbi

He was one of the signatories on the *cherem* against the Frankists promulgated in Brod in 5516 (1756)

p. 821

The Hambro synagogue was founded in 1707 when Mordechai Hamburger split from the main Duke’s Place Synagogue and started his own

He served in the Great Synagogue on Dukes Place but there was now an effort to unite that synagogue with the Hambro Synagogue.

p. 822

An *iggeret mered* is a document issued by the *bet din* declaring that a woman’s ketubah is to be decreased or increased on account of either her rebelliousness or that of her husband.

Mentioned in many texts

Emden was, in fact, a major *mekubal* and this assertion is ridiculous.

The reference here is to a knife that has a notch on it. Depending on the type of notch, it is either valid or invalid to be used to slaughter an animal.

p. 823

There is some information available on RMZ’s tenure as rabbi in London. For a *seder tefillah* he composed to be recited on 3 Tevet 537 (= December 13, 1776), a fast day commanded by the king to pray for the success of His Magesty’s army against the American colonies, see C. Dushinsky, *The Great Synagogue, London*, p. 78, n. 67. For his “Sermon on General Fast and Prayer” delivered on that occasion, see Joseph Jacobs and Lucien Wolf, *Bibliotheca Anglo-Judaica* (London, 1888), 190, #1792. For his role in the dispute regarding *shehitah* involving his father and Jacob Kimchi

For his role in the dispute regarding a *get* involving R. Solomon Buzaglo, see

For more on RMZ’s tenure as rabbi in London, see

Finally, even if Emden is right that at the beginning of his son’s tenure RMZ enjoyed the support of his community, this was not to last. R. David Tevele Schiff wrote in a letter to his brother, R. Meir, in Frankfurt, dated Rosh Hodesh Iyyar 540, that RMZ was constantly begging his community to stay but that they refused to allow him to do so and that he was being forced to leave

p. 824

and his issues with the rabbi are repeatedly

p. 825

he appears frequently in Emden’s works as a Sabbatean and leading follower of Eyb

p. 826

This entire article is based on references in Emden’s writings

It means that no one spoke out against it

In the cherem printed there Emden also included

There is a growing literature on Shmuel Yaakov Falk, one of the most interesting and unusual figures in the eighteenth century

p. 827

For a famous portrait of him, attributed to John Singleton Copley, see

I saw that portrait hanging on the wall in the New York City apartment of Irene Roth, widow of Cecil Roth.

It was offered for sale by auction by Kestenbaum & Company in New York on January 31, 2013. The expected price was $30,000-50,000. It sold for $75,000.

p. 828

includes many comments of his on *Kreti U-Pleti* by Eyb.

Emden uses the same phrase regarding Eyb

This is a play on the words

For other references to how RYH disappointed Emden, see the two references

Nothing less than an absolute unequivocal rejection of Eyb and his followers would possibly suffice for Emden.

p. 829

Emden announced a proclamation in his synagogue against Eyb’s followers on 7 Tishrei 526 and was very upset that RYH was not supportive of it

p. 830

For Emden’s propensity to write separate *kuntresim*, see my introduction

For previous examples of this illness

p. 831

By the point, the level of self revelation on the part of Emden should not surprise the reader. See my introduction.

Emden printed a copy of the letter of the Rechnitz community to him and his letter to them in *Sefer Hit’avkut,* Altona, pp. 136b-140b; Lvov, pp. 75a-77a. Both shed more light on this event. They wrote that when the leaders of their community received the *herem* Emden published against SZ including their rabbi, these leaders dismissed it. And when they, the writers of this letter, sent a letter to the leaders of the Hamburg community seeking clarification, they were informed that they knew nothing about it and that, in fact, the *herem* was to be rescinded. Not content with this response, they were now turning to Emden directly for clarification

p. 832

Emden responded that even after Eyb died there were still those who remained his followers.

In a letter sent to his student, R Yaakov Katz, Emden writes that, in fact, his efforts were successful

Emden’s MS ends abrupty at this point. See my intro.