

JACOB EMDEN

HIS LIFE AND WORK

G R A D U A T I O N T H E S I S

Submitted to the faculty of
the HEBREW UNION COLLEGE as
part requirement for the
degree of Rabbi

Signed

Solomon J. Bazel

Cincinnati, Ohio

March 28, 1923

Recd. 5/78

To my father
who has inspired me
to the study of Jewish
history and Lore

Table of Contents

Introduction

Part One - An Account of Shabbatai Zebi and his Movement -

History of Zebi - Plan and Purpose of the Shabbatians

Rabbis' Objection to Shabbatians - Zebi adopts Isla-

mism. pp. 1-9

Part Two - Life of Emden. pp.10-61

Chapter One - Jewish Scholarship at end of Seventeenth

Century - Literature of this Period - Influence

of Shabbatians pp.10-12

Chapter Two - Zebi Ashkenazi. 13-20

Chapter Three - Jacob Emden. 21-34

Chapter Four - Emden in Altona. 35-38

Chapter Five - Jonathan Eibeschtütz. 39-42

Chapter Six - Emden-Eibeschtütz Controversy. . 43-54

Chapter Seven - The Frankists. 55-59

Chapter Eight - Last Years of Emden's Life 60-61

Part Three - Works of Emden. 62-64

Part Four - Conclusion - An Appreciation of Emden 65-68

Bibliography

Emden - Autobiography (190 ה'תר"ס).

חלק

Graetz - History of the Jews Vol.V

" - Geschichte der Juden Vol.X, 3rd edition

Gutman Klemperer - /ש"ן "ח

Jewish Encyclopedia Vol.V

" " " II

" " " XI

I N T R O D U C T I O N

In speaking of a history of a people, we are often prone to think of events, political and social, of dates, of wars, of treaties. Though mentioning characters that have played important roles in the enactment of the drama of history, we generally think of them only as they are recorded in tales and legends - as people who have risen to the occasions that presented themselves, or as men whom circumstances have forced to do as they did. We are as a rule unmindful of the peculiar traits of the individual hero or villain in history. We seem oblivious to the fact that the "person" was indeed a personality, human, with qualities and faults, with virtues and vices, capable of love and hate. Seldom do we, unless we be historians, take into account the antecedent events and circumstances that are the roots whence spring certain characters. It is not uncommon to disregard the environment, physical and spiritual that have influenced men in history, making them either benefactor or malefactor of mankind. It may seem trite to say that were it not for peculiar circumstances, events in history would have come to pass, they would have taken on a quite different complexion.

*Portance
Wisch
Kunst
ruled*

The writer essays to bear in mind these various "bits of history" in the endeavor to give an account of the life and work of Jacob Emden. In his desire to portray the story of a character in such light, with the knowledge, that apparently unimportant details may be of major significance, he was influenced by his teacher Dr. Deutsch.

With this idea in mind one feels that in order to give a fairly adequate estimate of the life and work of Jacob Emden, one must proceed with a brief history of Shabbatai Zewi and ^{his} movement. Perhaps if there were never a Shabbatai Zewi in history, there would not have been a Jacob Emden, for Emden's attitude toward

this movement has placed him in the history of the Jew. / 2

Part one of this account then shall consist of a brief history of the Shabbatian movement. The second part of this treatise shall be divided into two main sections, the first dealing with the biography of Emden until the period of his residence in Altona, and the second section will deal with the remaining years of his life. Part three will be devoted to an account of Emden's works. Part four, the conclusion, will be the expression of an appreciation of the man Emden.

PART ONE

AN ACCOUNT OF SHABBATAI ZEBI
AND
HIS MOVEMENT

AN ACCOUNT OF SHABBATAI ZEBI AND HIS MOVEMENT

Shabbatai Zebi, the pseudo-Messiah, was born in Smyrna on the ninth of Ab 1626. He was of Spanish parentage. As was the custom of the times, his father (Mordecai) desired this his son should interest himself in the study of the Talmud. Shabbatai, however, was not attracted to his study of rabbinic literature or perhaps it should be said that he was attracted more to the study of Kabbala. He was eager for the knowledge of the Zohar. Luria's mysticism fascinated him. He believed that Kabbala could only be mastered by an ascetic.¹ *Was not the only one.*

The year 1666 was to play an important role in the history of the Jewish people. It was designated to be the year of the fifth Monarchy. It was proclaimed by enthusiasts to be the Messianic year during which Jews were to witness the coming of the Messiah, and were to be returned in full splendor and pomp to their land of Palestine.² The Zohar, the bible of the Kabbalists too gave testimony with regard to the coming of the Messiah for it declared that the year 5408 (1648) would be the dawn of the era of redemption.

1. Graetz, J. H. Vol. V. ch. 4

2. During the first half of the 17th century some extravagant notions of the near approach of the Messianic time and more especially of the redemption of the Jews and their return to Jerusalem were set forth by Christian writers and entertained by Jews and Christians alike. The so-called apocalyptic year was assigned by Christian authors to the year 1666.

Jew. Encyc. Vol. XI, p. 219

3. Ibid

At the age of twenty Shabbatai Zebi had become master of a group of admirers. His pleasing personality, his comely appearance, his peculiar manners and his mode of life attracted people and he soon found himself to be the leader of a number of followers. The year 1648 was approaching. Influenced by his study of the Zohar and by his love of Kabbala, and feeling his influence on others, Zebi was not indifferent to arrogate to himself unusual powers and honor. He proclaimed himself to be a Messiah, the redeemer of Israel. This attempted honor was not very successful, for the college of Rabis put him and his followers under ban. Zebi left Smyrna in 1651.

After leaving Smyrna Zebi finds himself in Salonica, which was the home of mysticism and subsequently a more fertile field for Kabbalistic fancies. Here too he gained adherence, but it seems that his profession, Messiah of the Jews, did not meet with general approval, for he was forced to leave Salonica. From Salonica he travelled about, spending some time in Athens, Cairo, and finally set out for Jerusalem (1663).³

The year of the approach of the Messiah was near at end, and Zebi thus far was unsuccessful in convincing people that he was destined to be the savior of the Jews. But they who believe in fate and who depend on miracles do not despair. Zebi had hopes and bided his time. Jerusalem was a fruitful center for mystical fancy, and the people of Jerusalem were therefore amenable to Zebi's tactics and fantasies.

People in distress, particularly Orientals are susceptible to wonder-workers who profess to relieve them of their troubles. The people of Jerusalem were at this time in very bad straits. The Turkish officers had threatened them with extra heavy taxation. Their only support could come through wealth. Their eyes turned to a wealthy Jew of Cairo. Zebi was chosen as delegate to appeal to him. Fate seem to prepare for all this, for when Zebi was in Cairo he had met this wealthy Jew (Raphael Joseph Halabi) and had won his friendship. Zebi took this opportunity to play the part of savior in the Holy City.⁴ While in Cairo he married a girl who was de-

for the community of

clared to be the wife of the Messiah. Worshippers of Zebi who were influenced by his services in Cairo (which were of great benefit to the people of Jerusalem), date his powers as a miracle-worker from this period.

While in Cairo and on his return to Jerusalem, Zebi made progress in his dreams. He succeeded in winning the staunch support of many followers. One who deserves special mention was Nathan Ghazati. His success spread with magnetic force but the Rabbis of Jerusalem felt his power growing and began to oppose him. Zebi soon left Jerusalem. His reasons for leaving is a moot question. From Jerusalem he continued traveling about, gaining adherence as he journeyed. His success seemed to be of such a nature that when he returned to Smyrna (1655), the man that had been placed upon him^{was} either wilfully overlooked or consciously forgotten.⁵ Here he dared to announce himself as the Messiah (New Year 1655). He did so publicly and from no other place than the synagogue, and was welcomed in his new role by the people. His pretensions were accepted and the people actually prepared for the time when they would leave their homes for Palestine. Jews and Christians alike believed in him.⁶ Not only the masses but also Rabbis and men of cultural and philosophical minds were among his adherents. His fame spread throughout the lands and produced wild excitement wherever his name was mentioned.

4. Gr. - H. of J. Vol.V, p.125

5. Ibid p.133

6. Ibid

On Rosh Hashana 7 1655 (5422)

PLAN AND PURPOSE OF THE SHABBATIANS

It was part of the plan of the Shabbatians to modify and perhaps abolish Rabbinical Judaism. An important tenet of the Zohar, the all-important book of the Cabbalists, is that in the time for grace, in the world order 17'57 5514 17'57 the rabbinical laws of Judaism would become nullified, the regulations concerning lawful and forbidden things would lose their significance completely. Since the Messiah was at hand, to the Shabbatians the time seemed ripe for the neglect of and disregard for the Rabbinic law. It can be readily seen that the Talmud with its rigorous laws was a "thorn in the side" of the Shabbatians. It bound them on all sides. They could not pursue their activities and their loose manners and feel compromised with the laws of the Rabbis.⁷ The Messiah was to be their leader and the Rabbis were to have no authority.

RABBIS' OBJECTION TO SHABBATIANS

This attitude toward Rabbinism may be properly called its declaration of war. Though heretofore Shabbatai could count among his admirers or half-admirers and followers many Rabbis, and though many who believed in the Talmud also found it plausible to support Shabbatai as Messiah and deliverer of Israel, these Rabbis now objected strongly to the activities and pretensions of the Messiah whose desires were to destroy the law. In every community there could be found a few who were not as staunch in their admiration for Shabbatai. Doubt crept into the minds of many who were called א'793. Their numbers were filled mainly by those א'793 who acquainted with and learned in the Talmud desired to protect it from the attacks made by those anxious to dethrone it from its seat of glory.

7. Whether Shabbatai himself drew of this conclusion is doubtful. But some of his adherents gave this theory prominence. A certain bitterness

It is necessary to point out that heretofore Rabbinism and Kabbala were closely related i.e. many Rabbis were students and staunch supporters of Kabbala. This can also be seen from the fact that the cause of the variance between the Shabbataians and the Rabbis was not Kabbala, but the attempts of the Kabbalists who were now followers of Shabbatai to negate the importance of the Rabbinism. While their interest in Shabbatai waned they remained true to the Kabbala. They felt that the attitude of hostility to the Schulchan Aruch and Rabbanism was harbored merely by Shabbatai and his followers. The first step taken by the Shabbatians toward the disintegration of traditional Judaism was the changing of the fast of the tenth of Tebet to a day of feasting and rejoicing.⁸ This order was heeded by many. However, those who were adherents to the strict requirements of traditional Judaism, and who expected the Messiah to add new burdens upon them before the day of redemption could come, were horridly shocked at this decree.

The activities of the Shabbatians in Smyrna became a matter of great concern to the officials of Turkey. Their dreams were akin to expressions of rebellion. They believed that in the year 1666 Zebi would place the sultan's crown upon his own head.⁹ Zebi was summoned to the authorities to appear in Constantinople. In true fashion Shabbatai interpreted the summons as a measure in his behalf, as another opportunity to prove his Messiahship, just as he had considered his trip to Cairo in behalf of the Jews of Jerusalem. So certain was he of the

toward the Talmud and the Talmudic method prevailed in this circles... In their wanton extravagance the Kabbalists had so entirely changed the conception of the deity, that it had dwindled into nothingness. Graetz-Hist. of the Jews. Vol.V, p.142

8. Samuel Primo in the name of his divinity, directed a circular to the whole of Israel in semi-official form.

"The first-begotten son of God, Shabbatai Zebi, Messiah and redeemer of the people of Israel, to all the sons of Israel, Peace! Since ye have been deemed worthy to behold the great day and the fulfillment of God's word by the prophets, your lament and sorrow must be changed into

outcome of his journey to Constantinople that he made full preparations before he set out on his trip. One of the most interesting features of his plan is that he divided the world into twenty-six parts assigning these partitions to his most devoted of friends and followers.

As if the events of his life were predestined, he began his journey to Constantinople at the beginning of the year 1666. But arriving at the landing-place Shabbatai was arrested. When brought before the high officials and questioned as to his intentions, he proved himself to be either an imposter or a coward. His reply was of a nature to warrant his innocence. He maintained that he was merely a Jewish *na'ar*, and that if the Jews attached more importance to him, or were greatly attached to him, that all this was not of his doing. Despite his assertions he was imprisoned.

Zebi's imprisonment did not have any evil effect on him. Instead of taking his troubles to be an evil omen, he understood them to be signs of his greatness and importance. Nor did his plight effect any change of heart in his followers. Zebi was transferred from Constantinople to the castle of Dardanelles at Abydos. And to Abydos his followers flocked from all countries to catch a glimpse of the imprisoned savior.

Belief in Zebi became stronger. People everywhere made preparations to return to Palestine. Blessings were inserted for Zebi in the prayers.¹⁰ Interest in him and devotion to him emboldened Zebi so that he continued in his be-

into joy, and your fasting into merriment, for ye shall weep no more. Rejoice with song and melody, and formerly spent in sadness and sorrow, into a day of jubilee, because I have appeared." Graetz - Hist. of the Jews; Vol. V, p.143

9. J.E. Vol.XI, p.222

10. Almost everywhere a prayer for him was inserted in the following

liefs. He and his followers went so far as to annul more of the Rabbinic laws.¹¹ He is said to have planned a complete change in the Jewish festivals, annulling the traditional ones even including the Day of Atonement.

ZEBI ADOPTS ISLAMISM / *Islam*

But interest in him was on the increase both among Christians and Jews. The populace was in a veritable frenzy. The situation in Turkey at this time is not difficult to understand. Matters came to such a point that the Turkish officials threatened Zebi with cruel punishment with conversion to Islamism as an alternative. On Sept. 14, 1666, he was brought before the sultan and was converted.¹²

As would be expected, upon Zebi's conversion, some of his followers whose faith in him was strong enough to allow them to be deluded thus far, followed suite and adopted *Islam* Islamism. Zebi realized that his act may cast suspicion upon him, therefore a few days after his induction into the new faith he wrote to his followers at Smyrna: "God has made me an Ishmaelite. He commanded and it was done. The ninth day of my regeneration."¹³

Though some of his followers approved of his conversion and in turn abandoned Judaism, Zebi's adoption of Islam pierced the very heart of many Jewish communities. Could it really have been true that they were following a mere phantom?

form: "Bless our Lord and King, the holy and righteous. Shabbatai Zebi, the Messiah of the God of Jacob." Graetz - H. of J.; Vol.V, p.150

11. ...He declared the fast of the 17th of Tamuz be abolished because on this very day he had realized his Messianic character.... He appointed the 23rd of Tamuz (July 25, 1666), a Monday, - to be kept as a strict Sabbath. Ibid - p.151

12. Gr. - H. of J. Vol.V, p.155
J.E., Vol.XI gives Sept. 16, 1666 as the day and refers to Buchler in "Kaufman Gedenkbuch" p.453 Note 2 Breslau 1900

13. Gr. - H. of J. Vol.V, p.155

The disillusionment was bitter. They were ashamed of their folly, were jeered by young and old, mocked at by Christians. And in the domain of Turkey disaster loomed on the horizon. The sultan planned to destroy all Jews in his empire, for the belief in Zebi and in his plans was tantamount to rebellion. He was prevented from carrying out his plans by his counselors.

All this did not put an end to the Shabbatians movement. Zebi still was the distinguished Messiah. Many of his followers were not dismayed by the circumstances. Samuel Primo, Jacob Israel Duchan, Jacob Falliachi held fast to Zebi. His conversion was enshrouded in mystery. Certainly the Messiah could not have forsaken them. Through their efforts the people renewed the faith in Zebi. Once again congregations in Smyrna began to insert their blessing for Shabbatai in their prayers.

The Rabbis, especially those of Turkey, now felt that their word was needed. One more uprising of the Shabbatians might have meant doom for the Jews, and again, they wanted to stamp out all traces of Zebi and his followers. They therefore placed under ban all those who dared even to pronounce the name of Zebi or to converse with his followers, and threatened to hand over all transgressors to secular authorities. Despite these efforts, Shabbatai's followers persisted in believing in him,¹⁴ and even observed his rulings.¹⁵

In the year 1680 Zebi soon began his revolutionary fantasies anew. He posed as a Mohamèdan and perhaps influenced some of his new-coreligionists and perhaps interested them in the Kabbala. He was now given more freedom and began associating with Jews more and more. He played a double role, appearing as Jew and then again as Mohamèdan. Despite his conversion he persisted in his character as

14. Gr. - H. of J. - Vol.V, p.156 ff.

Messiah. He posed as an ardent Jew and then again as a devoted Mohamedan.

This double role undoubtedly aroused the suspicion of the Turkish authorities and resulted in his banishment from Constantinople. He was sent to Dulcigno, a small town in Albania, that had no Jewish population. Here he lived until the day of his death abandoned and foresaken. He is said to have died on the day of Atonement 1676. 1675

15. J.E. Vol.XI, p.225 In many communities the 17th of Tamuz and the 9th of Ab were still observed as feast days despite bans and excommunications.

PART TWO

L I F E O F E M D E N

Chapter One

JEWISH SCHOLARSHIP AT END OF SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

At a period when people are influenced by pure mysticism and are easily led and influenced by flimsy dreams of one individual who arrogates to himself the power of saving an entire human race, one can expect to find the people to be *cannot* moved by reason and pure thought. Possibly those who are opposed to the Kabbala or to the mystic elements in religion may maintain that the study of the Zohar and Kabbala may have been responsible for the fact that Jewish scholarship was at a very low ebb at the end of the seventeenth century and at the beginning of the eighteenth. On the other hand they who are opposed to mere study of the Talmud, may say that the Jews of this period were in this condition because they limited their study to the Talmud.¹

The masses were very ignorant and superstitious and having none to lead them, or rather having leaders who were equally bigoted and superstitious, they remained steeped in ignorance and even utterly helpless. They depended on miracles, looked for wonders. Naturally then, such soil was fertile for the cultivation of fake-cures and wonder-workers. The belief in magic spread as if by magic. Ignorant Rabbi and ignorant congregation believed in and suffered because of this aberration of the Jewish mind. The Rabbis wrote amulets (Kameos) which were believed to have the power to cure one of disease. This work was often required of them and they seemed to devote themselves to this duty.²

Graetz's picture should not be taken as entirely in accordance with the facts.

1. The leaders of the community were for the most part led astray wandering as in a dream, and stumbling at every step. But few rabbis occupied themselves with any other knowledge beyond the Talmud, or entered on a new path in this study. Graetz - Hist. of Jews; Vol.V, pp.200

2. Graetz - H. of J. Vol.V, p.201

LITERATURE OF THIS PERIOD

Quite different from other periods of Jewish history, little of worthy literature was produced at this time, little of poetry was written, and history was almost neglected. Rabbis wrote quite a heap of material, but the writings were heaps upon heaps of petty quarrels, or groups of sermons, new and unimportant interpretations of Rabbinic works, and a few books of devotion. Many of the Rabbis wrote pamphlets or books as a means to provide themselves with earnings. In such a society one can not expect the morals of the people to be of the highest character. Jews became very materialistic. The method of attaining wealth was of no concern; the main desire was to obtain wealth. People did not live in accordance with the moral teachings of their religion. Jewish society became divided into "castes", the rich belonging to the "worthy" class. These rich and affluent Jews were made leaders of the community. He whose fortune it was to have wealth was given honor and respect by the Rabbi and congregation.³ Most of the Jews during this period suffered poverty, and this condition may be responsible for the state of affairs.⁴

INFLUENCE OF THE SHABBATIANS

After the death of Shabbatai Zebi, belief in him did not come to an end. A certain Daniel Bonifaux, an uneducated cantor of Smyrna, kept alive the belief in Zebi. The resuscitation of a belief in Zebi was not to proceed untrammelled in its path. The Rabbis of Smyrna were eager to prevent trouble so through

3. A satire of the period scourges very severely the almighty power of money, to which all bowed down. The "dollar binds and loses, it raises the ignorant to the chief offices of the community." Gr. - H. of J. Vol.V, p.205

their efforts Bonifaux was compelled to leave Smyrna. However, banishment from Smyrna did not deter him in his activities. Kabbala spread its tentacles to Poland where it clung tenaciously. The doctrines of the Shabbatians were taught by a certain Mordecai of Eisenstadt (Mocheach). He seemed to influence the people of Bohemia, Hungary, Moravia, and Italy. He posed as Shabbatai risen from the dead. Perhaps it may be said that the Shabbatian sect began in Poland at the instigation of this Moses of Eisenstadt. *Mordecai*

When the Shabbatian movement began to show life within the borders of Germany, the Rabbis as usual took notice and proceeded to attack the movement. The Rabi to be consulted in this instance was Chacham Zebi, none other than the father of Jacob Emden, and curiously enough the son of a most zealous Shabbatian.⁵

4. Ibid

5. Graetz - Hist. of Jews; Vol.V, p.221

Chapter Two

ZEBI ASHKENAZI

Jacob Emden, Yabez, was born at Altona June 4, 1697. Jacob Israel as he was called, was the son of Zebi Hirsh Ashkenazi, a noted Talmudist, who in turn was a descendant of a long list of well known scholars.¹ His paternal grandfather whose name he bore was one of the ~~sons~~ ^{you said we considered a Ben "y"} of Vilna before the period of the Chmelniecki massacres.² His grandfather Jacob was in the locality which was traversed by the Cossaks. During one of their attacks, he was separated from his wife and family and had almost lost his life at the hands of the marauders. Only a miracle saved him from death.³ Shortly after this incident Jacob reunited with his family.

Zebi, father of Yabez was born in Moravia, where his father joined the family after his escape from the marauders. He studied with his father and with his grandfather, was diligent and capable. While a youth he went away from his home, journeyed to Salonica. He spent most of his time with Elijah Kovo.⁴ From Salonica he returned to Bodin, his father's home. While still in his youth he acquired fame as a student. He wrote a series of Responsa which were considered to be a manifestation of his erudition.

Zebi married into a family that was wealthy and respected in Bodin. In the year 1686 Austria conquered the fortress Bodin from Turkey.⁵ During the attack on the city his wife and child were killed.⁶ His parents and relatives

not in text

1. J.E. Vol. II, p.201

2. Auto. - Emden p.4

3. Ibid - p.6
נבאשר פגען באיש הצדיק הזיה וגזר עליו השבאי
שיבירי נחרב זהתי/ראשו וכן צטה פשט צוארו נחרב חרה ושיטה ולחיסור
נפשו זהריגה על קדושת הש"ת ובצורתו על ברכיו לקבל המיתה במחבת
חרב וכמעט פרחה נשמתו הנה זה מאן ה' נוגע בו כי נתן ה' רחמים בלב
הצר הצירי וחמל על רבות שנו ותחת שהיה רוצה להוליך החרב על צואר
בצר חתך נמחיו רחמיו וצשה לו רחיקה בצר בקרנה של כלי הפצו בדרך ביה
יו ואמר לו קים לך כאל בחור ולך נפשך

Not in text
 were sent to Berlin, having been taken captive by the Austrians. During the siege of ~~Ubin~~ *spent in Hungary* (Budin), Zebi held office as Rabbi in the city of Sarajevo.⁷ When he heard that his family were sent to Berlin, he made his way to Germany. He had little of money left at his disposal and yet would not accept financial aid.⁸ Then he began a series of wanderings. Zebi travelled to Venice, thence to Prague. He had already achieved fame, and in Prague he was offered an opportunity to marry; he refused and went on to Berlin. Here, too, he had several opportunities to marry into wealthy families. These he refused, for he desired to marry into a family of honorable lineage; he respected intellect and was not attracted by wealth. While in Berlin he married Sarah, daughter of Meshalem Zalman Neumark, chief Rabbi of Altona, Hamburg, and Wandsbeck.⁹ This Sarah was the mother of Jacob Emden, and of four other sons, and five daughters.

Zebi was soon elected as Rabbi in Altona, where the leaders of the congregations built a school for him. To this institution came students from Poland and Lithuania, for Zebi's knowledge was known to people everywhere. For this work Zebi accepted no remuneration, he taught for the love of the work. He hated self, and even refused to accept money for services for which other Rabbis did accept remuneration and to which they were entitled.¹⁰ Zebi was very devoted to the study of the Torah, he was interested in neither personal gain or glory, he lived a simple life and his aim was none other than to fulfill the precepts of his religion. His time was spent in the school (ישיבה), though his income was only sixty ^{thaler} dollars a year. Living under such circumstances it is not surprising to learn that he was neither strong nor did he enjoy good health. He was strict in his diet and admonished his children not to indulge in luxuries, for luxuries make the mind dull.¹¹ The admonition to his children may not stand a scientific test,

4. Auto. p.8

Ibid - p.4 note 14

Meaning of passage that satisfied himself with meager salary of community & did not accept any private gifts. Was "Kloos-rabbi"?

but it sheds light on the men's desire for knowledge and for educated children. Culture, as he understood it, was paramount to all else.

Zebi taught for a period extending to twenty years. He acquired fame not only in Altona, Hamburg, and Wandsbeck, but also in other countries. He was known even in Jerusalem.. Polish Rabbis as well as Rabbis throughout Germany wrote to him for his opinion on different questions that perplexed them. His word was law not only to the Ashkenazi Rabbis; even the Sephardic Rabbis sought his opinion. He was actually considered as authority. He seemed to care for the religious life in Jewry, seeing that many were lax in their observances, particularly on the Sabbath and to Passover, he issued new decisions (חוקים).

Zebi was father to the needy and appressed. Charities were distributed through him to those who were in want. He was entrusted with vast sums, for the wealthy knowing his honesty and his strong character realized that proper distribution would be made by him.¹²

The community of Jerusalem had depended for its existence on money sent from European countries. Custodians of the moneys collected were located at Frankfurt-am-Mein, Vienna Venice and Jerusalem. But the Jews of this period, being of a lower morale than was characteristic of the Jew,¹³ were not careful in the distribution of charity. Vast sums of money were embezzled or lost, which fact had drastic effect on the people of Jerusalem.

-
5. Ibid - p.4 Note 4
 6. Ibid - p.8
 7. J.E. - Vol.II, p.201
 8. Auto.
 9. J.E. Vol. II, p.202
 10. Auto. p.11

כי כל תורתו לשם שמים היה לא להתגדל ולמצוא חן
בעיני בני אדם, רק כל מאגרתו ומצאו להרבות כבוד בוראו
ולקיים עמליו התורה בכל לבבו ובכל נפשו ובכל מאורו

The community at Jerusalem (the Ashkenazic element) was almost reduced to a minimum. When Zebi was Rabbi in Amsterdam he took upon himself the task of distributing the moneys for Jerusalem through reliable parties and in a systematic manner. Jacob Emden in his autobiography¹⁴ states that he had seen the receipts for the moneys. This act on the part of Zebi was meant to enable the people of Jerusalem to establish religious schools and congregations, as did the Sephardic Jews who were supported in their enterprises by contributions from Amsterdam, London, Moravia and Turkey. Zebi had warned the German Jews of the Embezzlement of funds, but his cries fell on deaf ears. 2

Zebi Ashkenazi seemed to be different from the average Rabbi of that day. This well-versed scholar in Talmud and Rabbinic literature, whose education extended beyond these borders. Jacob Emden speaks of his abilities and qualities,¹⁵ and considers among those worthy of mention his knowledge of worldly affairs, his ability to speak Spanish, Italian, Turkish, Hungarian, and German. He considered him an able statesman consulted in secular and political matters as well as on matters of Jewish concern. He was of an affable nature respected by those who knew him, for they realized his sincerity and conscientiousness. He was offered financial assistance when in need but was persistent in his refusals of aid.

Shortly after his second marriage he engaged in business with a partner; he invested money, expecting to devote himself to his studies. The business was not successful, the money was lost, the partner fled to Amsterdam. This affair led him to worry and he was soon overtaken by sickness.

11. Auto. - p.12

12. Auto. - p.14

13. Cf. p.III

14. Auto. - p.15

He recuperated from his financial losses. Friends of his aided him in new business enterprises which proved very successful. Among his friends was a certain ^{Rabbi} Reb Moses. His financial pursuits brought him sufficient for his needs and he persistently refused to accept remuneration for his services to the community.

After the death of Zalman ^{Mirrel} Mirriles, chief Rabbi of the three communities (Altona, Hamburg, and Wandsbeck), interest was keen in the election of a new Rabbi. One party favored the election of Chacham Zebi, son-in-law of the departed leader, while another group favored the election of Rab ^{Moses Lisskind} Meir ben Alex on der Rothenberg, son-in-law of the wealthy Israel Furst. Zebi had been elected Rabbi of the two communities, but the division arose in Altona, where it was finally decided that both Rabbis should serve, for periods of six months each.¹⁶ Quarrels multiplied, and Zebi finally decided to return to his work in the school (rabbi of the Klaus)¹⁷ and refused to reconsider the position of Rabbi of Altona despite efforts on the part of his friends, who urged him to hold his post.

Shortly after resigning from his post as Rabbi in Altona, he was elected as Rabbi of Amsterdam in 1710. He accepted this position at a salary of ^{2,500} seventy-five guilders annually. He refused to accept gifts for his services, desiring to be independent and to be obligated to none; he wished to act justly and honestly in his official capacity, and refused remuneration for any duties that he performed.¹⁹ He was honored and recognized both by Sephardic and Ashkenazic, (generally one Rabbi was not satisfactory to both parties).

From the very beginning he encountered a hostile party. The community had been divided through^a conflict over two cantors. The prevailing party was headed

15. Auto. - p.16

16. Auto. - p.22; J.E. - VOL. II, p.202 ; - Does not mention that controversy arose only in Altona

17. J.E. - Vol. II, p.202

Gophers
By a certain Aaron Gakish. Efforts were made by them to win the favor of Haham Zebi, but the latter decided only on the scale of merit, which in this case was due to the weaker party. The weaker party was finally vindicated by the government. Matters came to the point that they wanted him to resign when his contract terminated. ²⁰
²¹

Though his father was a follower of Shabbatai Zebi, Haham Zebi was a strong opponent of the Shabbatians. The occasion presented itself while he was in Amsterdam, to make clear his point of view in this matter. Chiyya Chayyim had made his way to Amsterdam. He was mistaken by Zebi to be an old enemy of his but when the error was rectified, Zebi, gentleman that he was acknowledged his mistake. ²² However, Chayyim was accused of endorsing heretical articles of Cordosa, which was translated to being a believe in Shabbatai Zebi. Chayyim relented from his course for a time but soon soon reaccepted his former faith in Shabbatai. These actions aroused the suspicion and curiosity of even some of the Portugese members of the community. A certain Moses Chagis sided with Chacham Zebi (Ashkenazi) and later was asked to examine the writings of Chayyim. ²³ When the investigating committee who favored Chayyim failed to report the results of its investigation of Chayyim's works, Ashkenazi placed the Shabbatians under ban (July 23, 1713). ²⁴ After this action the other party led by Ayllon, Rabbi of the Portugese element announced that Chayyim was innocent of the charges. ²⁵ Ashkenazi did not find himself in com-

Chayyim
Chayyim
large Com. strong
Hafiz (important Rabbi of Jerusalem)
Saltzman

18. Auto. - p.24

19. Ibid

20. Ibid - p.29 ff.

21. J.E. - Vol.II, p.202;- states that record found which shows that Ashkenazi's salary was withheld from him.

22. J.E. - Vol.II, p.202

23. Auto. - pp.30 & 31

fortable circumstances after these proceedings, for the Portugese element was the more prominent, being the most wealthy, holding the highest positions in the community, and owing their advantages to the priority of their residence in Holland.²⁶ Ashkenazi stood alone except for a few friends that remained loyal to him. Seeing that Ashkenazi could not be swayed from his position, the influential Portugese element took the matter to the secular courts. It is interesting to note here that Ashkenazi experienced a cycle of events in his anti-Shabbatian activities similar to those undergone later by his son.

Professors were consulted for opinions in the case and the king was appealed in the behalf of Hayyim, because of the latter's belief in Zohar. Hence the king perforce decided in favor of Hayyim.²⁷ This action and the infidelity of the Portugese caused Ashkenazi to leave Amsterdam. His family was sent to Emden, while his family journeyed to London in the beginning of 1714.²⁸

His decision to go to London was due to the invitation tendered him by Sephardic Jews of London, men who knew him when he was head of the school of Altona. At that time the Portugese of London wanted to elect him as their Rabbi, but he refused because as he maintained, he desired to live as an Ashkenazi and to raise his family in the same form of Judaism.

However, when the news of Ashkenazi's trouble reached London, he was called and received with great honor. Their love for the man was so deep that they desired a portrait of him, which he refused because he believed that photography was אי ציור. Nevertheless, a portrait of him was obtained by some means.

*Not yet in existence.
Painting*

24. J.E. - Vol.II, p.202

25. Auto.- p.30 Emden states that Ashkenazi's opinion was accepted and later the book in question was taken from him. The party that examined the book favored Hayyim and made a favorable ^{report}. They then turned the hearts of the community against Ashkenazi

After the festival of Passover, Ashkenazi returned to his family in Emden. He then proceeded to Poland, stopping for a while at Hanover, Halberstadt, Berlin, and Breslau.²⁹

While in the vicinity he was called to Hamburg to serve as a member of judicial board convened to settle a complicated legal question.³⁰

In the year 1717, Ashkenazi was called as Rabbi to Lemburg. Though he held office for only four months, he was honored and respected in his congregation and by the community at large. The Jews of Lemburg were steeped in ignorance, and Ashkenazi planned and actually began to teach them Jewish lore, but his efforts could not bear fruit, for soon after he accepted the position he died (Rosh Chodesh Iyar 1718).³¹

Ashkenazi was one of the most distinguished men of his day. Scholar, unselfish, honest, and devoted to truth, he often incurred the wrath of those whom he bitterly opposed. He was lamented by his contemporaries, who united in praising his learning. Only part of his works have been printed - his *אשכנזי חכמים* which he wrote and edited while in Amsterdam in 1712.³²

Ashkenazi raised a son who conscientiously and eagerly continued the work for which Ashkenazi prepared him. In scholarship, character, and interests Jacob Emden was a worthy son of his father.

26. Auto. - p.32

27. Auto. - p.34

28. J.E. - Vol.II, p.203

29. Ibid

30. Auto - p.41

31. Auto. - p.45 ff.

32. J.E. - Vol.II, p.203

Chapter Three

JACOB EMDEN

Jacob Emden, whose real name was Jacob Israel ben Zebi Ashkenazi whence is derived the name "Yaabez" resembled his father Chacham Zebi whom he made his model in life.¹ He was a welcome child being the first son born to his parents, being preceded by three girls.

Shortly previous to Emden's birth, his father suffered great financial loss in a business enterprise in which he had been engaged with a partner. These losses had greatly affected his health and he became a victim of the bubonic plague.² Being critically ill Ashkenazi journeyed to a health resort for recuperation, but returned in time to introduce his son into the covenant of Abraham. Emden was born on the fifteenth of Sivan 1697.³ Ashkenazi was then forty years of age.

Emden was not blessed with a strong constitution, having been inflicted with many diseases, at times being critically ill.⁴ He was a pampered child, but his parents took care not to carry the affections to the point of spoiling him. At the age of three Emden was sent to school. He was diligent in his studies, for at the age of five he had completed *חמשה עשר*. His early school days did not benefit him physically. His father realized the evil effects that this early training had on Jacob, and determined to send his other sons to school so early in life.⁵ Jacob continued to study with his father during their period of residence in Altona and from 1710-1714 during their residence in Amsterdam.⁶

1. Graetz - "Gesch. der Juden" - Vol. X, p.357, note 2: J.E. Vol.V, p.149;-- Emden was officially called Jacob Herschel.

2. Auto. - p.54;-- Emden calls it the black disease which is generally understood to be the bubonic plague.

also melancholy

Emden was still a child when he realized fully well the meaning of his father's experiences in life. It seems that Ashkenazi's financial losses were the cause of great worry to him, for Jacob attributes his father's poor health to his father's financial losses.⁷ He and his sisters well understood the troubles that his father had experienced in the community of Amsterdam.⁸

In the year 1710 Ashkenazi answered the call from the community of Amsterdam. A controversy arose over the position of Chazan (cantor) which added seriously to the worries of Ashkenazi. Emden seems to have been greatly affected by his father's experiences, for he mentions them in his autobiography.⁹

Emden was Bar Mitzvah at Amsterdam. Shortly after this milestone in his life began a period of distress for the family of Ashkenazi. During this period conditions were not conducive to study. The period referred to by Emden is the one during which his father incurred the hatred of those who supported Hiyya Hayyim. Emden attributes the blame for the troubles to Solomon Aylon, Rabbi of the Portugese element.¹⁰

Ashkenazi had gone to London (1714) after he had given up his post in Amsterdam. The family was sent to Emden. The mother and her five sons and five daughters all of whom were born at Altona remained without their leader for a few months. Upon Ashkenazi's return from London, Jacob was offered an opportunity to marry the learned daughter of a certain Reb Loeb Emden. Ashkenazi opposed the match for a reason that he did not divulge. Though Emden felt that the marriage

on account of a certain blessing in the family.

3. Gr. - "G. der J." - Vol.X : gives date 1698

4. Auto. - p.56 ff.

5. Ibid

6. J.E. - Vol.V, p.149

7. Auto. - p.57

would have benefited him and would have proved a worthy one, his love and respect for his father prevented him from expressing his views.¹¹

The family soon began journeying to Poland. During the year 1715, Ashkenazi was called to Hamburg to judge a complicated legal case,¹² and took Jacob with him. Emden was stricken with a blood-disease and was forced to remain in Hamburg for a time. He then returned to Breslau where Emden was married.¹³

Ashkenazi valued education and honor more than wealth and desired that his children should be joined in wedlock only with members of cultured families. Emden married the daughter of Mordecai ben Naphtal Cohen, Rabbi of Ungarisch Brod Moravia.¹⁴ At the age of seventeen Emden was separated from his home, for shortly after his marriage Ashkenazi returned to his duties in Hamburg and Emden journeyed with his wife and his father-in-law to Moravia.¹⁵

Emden's separation from his father had its effects on the young man. His weak condition, his desire for study, and above all his love for his father made him feel his lonesomeness.¹⁶

Emden was promised dowry, which his father-in-law could not supply. He had even used all the money given as gifts by the friends of the family.¹⁷ Constant requests for the money that Emden needed were of no avail. This disappointment soon led to unkind feelings, made Emden miserable, and almost led to Emden's separation from his wife.¹⁸ Though this lack of funds was of great significance to Emden, his greatest lack was not material but spiritual. His desire for study

8. See ^{above} p. 18 23 of previous chapter

9. Auto. - p. 57 ff.

10. Auto. - p. 58 note 1

11. Auto. - p. 59

12. See ^{above} page 20

58

was great. His studies were interrupted during his father's troubles in Amsterdam. Here in Moravia he had little opportunity for study. His library consisted solely of the *ג'רמ'ר* which he received as a wedding present, and though his father-in-law possessed many valuable and necessary volumes, conditions were such that Emden did not care to make use of his father-in-law's library,¹⁹ nor his literary wealth.

At Ungariah-Brod Emden spent three years during which he was occupied as lecturer in Talmud. He refused to accept remuneration for his services. He enjoyed the work and was very conscientious in his duties. But his pleasures were short-lived. News came to him of the death of his father, and Emden journeyed to Lemberg in 1718.²⁰

While in Lemberg he continued teaching and was offered the position as head of the school, which offer he refused. Though many urged him to remain as Rabbi and teacher Emden was far from anxious to accept a post as Rabbi. He was quite young and humble and did not feel that he was capable of remaining as teacher, i.e. of properly fulfilling his duties.²¹

Emden was almost persuaded to remain in Lemberg, because of the plight of his father's family. Favorable economic conditions and the future of the family were of great concern to him. About nine months after Ashkenazi's death his wife died at the age of forty. Emden took sick shortly after this. The family and the property was taken to a brother-in-law of Jacob.²²

Emden had written to his wife asking her to come to Poland, where he wished to remain. Being young and living with her parents she refused to join him. Emden remained in Lemberg until the winter of 1719. He attended to several family matters. Of the little inheritance left, Emden took naught but the unsold copies

13. Auto. - p.60

14. J.E. - Vol. V, p.149

of the Responsa that his father had written.²³ To him was left the obligation of disposing of them in order to obtain funds for the family.²⁴

Arriving home (Moravia), Emden was again stricken with illness. After his recovery, he again set out on a journey, this time with the task of disposing of his father's books, and to collect debts due to his father. He had paid some of his father's obligations from his own capital, hoping to replenish his purse with the money he would collect. His first station was Hamburg. Success there depended on a certain Baar Cohen (גר"ב), friend of Ashkenazi and Emden.²⁵

Reb Mordecai Cohen had indebted himself to Reb Händele who in turn was indebted to Ashkenazi. Cohen's wealth was squandered and stolen by his children, hence Reb Händele could not be paid; this fact ultimately meant great loss to Emden. Not all was as discouraging as the first case appeared. A certain wealthy Reb Eliezer London had heard from his sons (who lived in Hamburg) of the death of Chacham Zebi (Ashkenazi). He donated the sum of one hundred dollars for the orphans of Ashkenazi, but this sum was never received, for a son of the donor had also squandered his father's wealth. Thus far Emden's trip afforded him little profit, in fact he did not even collect enough money to cover his travelling expenses.

Emden succeeded in selling copies of the Responsa of Ashkenazi in Hamburg, Altona, and Wandsbeck, to the leaders of the communities; though he refused to

15. Auto. - p.42 .

16. Auto. p.61

17. Auto. p.42

18. Ibid. p.61

19. Ibid

20. Auto. p.62

send complimentary copies to anybody, as many others did in order to obtain gifts. He had the opportunity to become wealthy and enrich his family, for the Jews in Germany enjoyed affluence. Emden sold few copies of the Responsa.²⁶

From Hamburg Emden journeyed to Hanover where he lived with Gompel Hanover, who together with his brother he enjoyed riches and honor. Here Emden did not fare well, for shortly after his arrival the two brothers absconded because of financial difficulties. The property that was left was attached by the government, Emden innocently suffered, for his property and money were included among the property of the guilty brothers.²⁷

managed to take out his things

Emden then journeyed to Frankfurt-am-Mein which had been the crowning community of Ashkenazic Jewry. Fire had made a visitation on the city and the people suffered great losses. Emden did not wish to put the books on sale because of the plight of the people,²⁸ though he would have succeeded in disposing of some of the books.

Having met with little success Emden determined to return to his home, but was advised to go to Mannheim and Metz. Feeling that he would be destined to meet with failure, he was about to start for home, when another suggestion came to him to go to London. Emden accepted the suggestion because a certain Mordecai Hamburger had returned from India where he had obtained vast riches. A brother-in-law of Mordecai had suggested that Emden journey to London. Emden undertook the trip which was beset with danger. His efforts were futile; little success met

21. Auto. p.63

22. Ibid p.64 ff.

23. ^{above} See p.20

24. Auto. p.70

25. Ibid p.71 ff.

26. Auto. p.75 ff.

him in London.²⁹

The following spring Emden began his return trip by way of Amsterdam. When he arrived at Amsterdam he was again visited by sickness which retarded his going to Moravia. From Amsterdam he journeyed to Prague.

Eibes~~schütz~~³⁰ was at this time Rabbi at Prague, and had already begun losing the respect of the people. Rumors/^{were}spread which ~~cast~~ed suspicion on him as Rabbi. Even the Rabbis of the vicinity were lax to oppose him, because they had great respect for his family and wife's family who were very powerful and had influence particularly with the Catholics. Despite the Rabbis, Eibeselnitz's true self was known to his associates and family.³⁰ His own father-in-law wished to disown him.³¹

Emden arrived home empty-handed; he had accomplished very little and had spent the money that he had possessed. His home was in a sense poverty-stricken and Emden saw little opportunity for success in Moravia. During his travels he had noted that there was better opportunity for a livelihood in Holland. He then engaged himself as broker dealing in pelts that were brought at Hungary and sold at Amsterdam. Though this new enterprise seemed successful for a time it soon proved itself to be a complete failure. Among other business experiences Emden engaged himself in the sale of jewelry, but it seems that his commercial activities did not meet with success. The jewelry business forced him to travel. He

27. Auto. p.75

28. Ibid p.76

29. Ibid p.77 ff.

30. Auto. p.81

31. Emden - ⁹ חתנו רצק להציגהו סגסו - p.2 הלאבוק

had crossed into Germany expecting to dispose of his wares, but was apprehended by officers at Pressburg and brought to trial for his offense.³² While at Pressburg he lived with a certain Rabbi Moshe who had once been the head of a school at Lemberg. He made his home in Pressburg until his trial was settled.

While at the home of this Rabbi he became introduced to the underhanded acts that were current at that time. A certain individual had come to Pressburg from Prague from the school of Eibeschtitz. He carried with him libelous pamphlets of his teacher who had consulted certain leaders of Vienna who had visited Prague. These leaders had returned to Vienna with writings of their Rabbi (Eibeschtitz). Similar proceedings were current in Pressburg. These writings were at this time at the house of ^{Rabbi} Moses. Several of the men of the community decided to investigate the baggage of the visitor that came to Rabbi Moshe and found among his belongings manuscripts written by Eibeschtitz. These writings were mystic and of ^a strange nature. Rabbi Moshe who was unacquainted with Kabbala, perhaps had not realized the import and meaning of those writings, and was eager to know what disposition should be made of them. Emden realizing their import suggested that they should not be made public. The writings contained reproaches, blasphemies, and misrepresentations of the secrets of Kabbala, and therefore Emden thought they should be burned. At any rate none should be aware of them, and no benefit should be derived from them.

Emden realized that he had nothing tangible to work with so he decided merely to keep the matter in mind. He concluded, however, that Eibeschutz was responsible for the pamphlets though Eibeschutz did not affix his signature to them, and the authorship of the pamphlets was kept secret. Even the disciples dared not divulge the author, revealing the secret only to their immediate friends.³³

32. Auto. p.85 ff.

33. Ibid p.88 ff.

Economic circumstances that surrounded Emden were not of the most favorable nature. His friends were ready and eager to assist ^{him proffers} but all were refused, Emden desiring no assistance or charity.

Emden continued on his business travels with Amsterdam as his destination. Here he was again attacked by a chronic ailment which remained with him for a period of twenty years.³⁴

Emden was not limited in his desire for education. He did not believe that one should exclude secular knowledge, though he felt that a Jew should not occupy himself with secular knowledge except during twilight hours.³⁵ Emden had a deep yearning for study. He was anxious to know foreign languages and history. While in ^{*Lomburg*} ~~Amsterdam~~ he studied German and also became acquainted with Latin script. His new acquisitions he obtained not in any regular manner but by snatches of information. He learned to read the language of the people of Holland, and to understand some Latin. His desire for information led him to the fields of law, ^{and} literature; he acquainted himself with the customs of the people, with their ideas regarding Jewry and Judaism, he was anxious to pursue the social duties that were necessary for cultured people. In the fields of science he also desired information, acquainting himself with Botany, philosophy, physiology, and medicine.³⁶

Upon leaving Amsterdam for Altona, he passed through Emden where he was urged to accept a post as Rabbi and teacher. Though he disliked the Rabbinate and had determined not to accept any position, he saw that the people of Emden were desirous to have him, that he was elected unanimously, and that they were without any religious leader.³⁷ Emden accepted the position of Rabbi (1729) whence he de-

O. G. V. : 1728

34. Auto. - p.98 ff.

35. J.E. - Vol.V, p.149

36. Auto. - p.96 ff.

rived his name. He spent part of his time writing, completing some of his works that he had begun elsewhere. He was anxious to lead the people in the proper path, and therefore issued new decisions *שופט*, in order to turn them from their erring ways.³⁸

He offered his services as Rabbi and teacher gratis. He refused to accept money from rich or poor. He insisted upon being independent thought the people were accustomed to pay the sum of twenty-two dollars for each sermon that was delivered. He was reluctant to preach, desiring to devote his time to study and teaching, not with a sense of pride nor to make his studies the source of material benefit.³⁹

Emden refused to show favoritism. He was not affected by the psychology of the mass, and refused to lower himself to the level of the people of his day, who respected, honored, and flattered those whom fortune had favored. Many of the Rabbis of the time had favored the wealthy members of the community, but Emden soon made the people aware of his stand on such matters.

52 7020 (p. 100 x nothing for 's read 's)
A certain Cohen Jonathan Levi, a wealthy resident of Emden fearing Emden as leader of the community became an enemy of his. He felt that Emden as Rabbi would affect the prestige he enjoyed - that of lay leader of the community. Emden's predecessor had obeyed the commands of Jonathan who had wielded influence and had issued orders in congregational and community affairs. But wealth presented no special reason for Emden's respect. Though Jonathan had favored the election, he soon gave

37. Auto. p.100 ff.

38. Ibid - p.101

39. Ibid

evidence of his dissatisfaction with Emden, showed him little respect and desired to belittle him in the eyes of the people. Emden planned to leave the Rabbinate, which he had accepted reluctantly. But the love for him that the community at large evinced, prevented his deserting them.

Jonathan had suffered financial losses and had also been visited with troubles in his family. Whether because of these incidents or not, Jonathan soon befriended himself once more to Emden, and the latter enjoyed the support of the entire community.⁴⁰

Though Emden received the full support of his people, his residence in Emden was beset with troubles. His family suffered diseases, which he attributed to environmental conditions; air, food, and water supply.⁴¹

doubtful (see p. 30)
Receiving no remuneration for his services as Rabbi and teacher, Emden engaged in commercial pursuits, or perhaps the reverse is true. Being successful in his commercial enterprises, Emden in his pride desired to remain independent of congregational support. While in Emden he continued in the capacity as broker, and enjoyed a good income. Though Emden was well situated, the city of Emden, enjoying the respect of the people and possessing a satisfactory income, he longed to leave. The physical sufferings endured by his wife and children urged him to move to his birthplace Altona.

Several incidents occurred which were responsible for Emden's leaving his post, despite the urgent requests to the contrary made by the people of Emden. In the summer of 1732 about a half year before Emden's departure for Altona several men made their way to the community of Emden. They had come from Minsk and maintained

40. Auto. - p.103

41. Ibid - p.104

(see p. 107) and 300 - 1729 but prob. misprint for 1739.

that they were hard-pressed and needy. They had in their possession bogus letters and false credentials. These letters were to have been written by the leaders of the community of Minsk and meant to be delivered to various communities, asking for financial assistance. These men who presented these letters were designated as authorized collectors of the moneys that were to be contributed. As was to be expected, these innocent-appearing men with apparently genuine credentials were received with honor and respect and success in many communities, Portugese and German alike. Among the cities they had traveled were Amsterdam and London.

When these men arrived in Emden one of these men stated that he was related to Jacob Emden. Emden felt that these "representatives" were engaged in a plan to obtain funds surreptitiously. He also suspected that they were followers of Shabbatai Zebi.⁴²

A few days after these "representatives" had come to the city, Emden was visited by his uncle ^{R.} ~~Benjamin~~ Benjamin of Lithuania, who lived in a town in the vicinity of Minsk. Emden related to him the story told by the "representatives" and learned from his uncle was without truth. Emden endeavored to disclose the false representatives, but they succeeded in winning the support of the people. Their influence went so far as to antagonize one of Emden's staunchest friends and supporters. They succeeded in collecting funds even in Emden's own community. Jacob, however, realizing that he could not prevent their collecting of moneys decided nevertheless to continue in his apprehensions of these men. He obtained from them their credentials and sent them to Altona to Moses Hagis who was at that time a friend and supporter of his. Emden wrote to investigate the matter carefully and to attempt to verify the statements made and to identify the signatures. At that time many people who resided in Lithuania were to be found in Altona.⁴³

When the letter came to Hagis there happened to be in the community of Altona a wealthy individual of Lithuania (Minsk), a retired merchant, whose name had

been affixed to the credentials. When he saw the letter which Hagis had received from Emden, he disclaimed connection and emphasized that the signature had been forged, and that edict of Minsk described was without foundation. Not testimony that was presented seemed to be sufficiently valid to convince the people of Emden of the fraudulent activities of the "representatives" of Minsk. Emden warned these men not to attempt to collect funds in Altona. They disregarded his warnings but met with great opposition when they arrived there.⁴⁴

Emden began to feel that his residence in Emden would not extend for a much longer period. His friend⁴² turned against him, the Rabbinate which he disliked became more of a burden upon him, and he was anxious to go to his native town, where he hoped to live as a private citizen. He did not care for any of the monetary returns, which other Rabbis had, nor did he desire to conduct himself as did the other Rabbis of his day, who obtained incomes from many sources and through various means, eg. gifts, mixing in private matters for money, arranging marriage-parties (ח'ב'ר'ש). Emden was quite unique in this respect, mainly that he determined to accept no financial returns for the services that he returned as Rabbi.⁴⁵

Emden's wife had repaired to Altona several months earlier after she had gone to witness the marriage of her first-born. Emden himself went to Altona at the end of 1732. The people of Emden tried to prevent his leaving, and when they had learned that no efforts to dissuade him from leaving would be of any avail, they consoled themselves with the belief that Emden would remain in Altona for only a short period and would return to minister unto them. Emden, however, knew the impossibility of this and urged them to elect another Rabbi. The congregation refused to proceed with any election, pinning their hopes on Emden's return. While

42. Auto. - p.108

43. Ibid - p.110

Frankfurt
-34-

Jabetz was in Emden he had several offers with large communities. The town of Metz among others promised him honor and a big position, but Emden chose to remain where he was, for it offered him time for study. To an extent he enjoyed his life there, but pressure of circumstances were responsible for his dislike of the Rabbinate and for his leaving the community.⁴⁶

Six or eight

Six or seven years after his departure he received an invitation from the community of Emden. He was promised a large salary and a larger territory. Emden refused again and they remained without a Rabbi for a period of ten years. Their constant urgings and their many invitations were not without effect on Jacob Emden. He was often tempted to return to Emden, for he had little income in Altona. Other conditions and factors ^{forced} ^{remain} /ed him to/in his native town: he had bought a home, for which he had expended quite a sum, and furthermore his family had enjoyed much better health in their new surroundings.⁴⁷

Though the most interesting and most important part of Emden's life began after his residence in Altona, the period and the events ending with his removal from Emden throw light on his character,⁴⁸ for his firmness and his honesty are as clearly expressed in this period as in any other. It is only that the events that occur later in his life are of more universal interest to Jewry that special emphasis is made of his residence in Altona and not that Emden undergoes any change of heart or policy in life. Emden shows himself to be genuine and honest throughout his career.

44. Auto. - p.111

45. Ibid - p.112

46. Ibid - p.113

47. Ibid - p.114

48. An appreciation of Emden given in a later chapter

Chapter Four

EMDEN IN ALTONA

Upon arriving at Altona Emden was received with honor and respect. He requested of this community that he be permitted to possess a private synagogue, owing to the fact that it was difficult for him to go to congregational services.¹

Moses Hagis, head of the Portugese/^{community} was at first friendly to him, he had known him since Jacob was a youth. Emden knew of the trials and tribulations of Hagis, particularly when he was in Amsterdam. He admired Hagis and appreciated the fact that he had viewed his (Emden's) criticisms of himself without anger.² But the friendship between them was not destined to endure.

Emden's request for a private synagogue did not affect Hagis favorably. Emden refused to emphasize some of the misdeeds of Hagis even when the latter acted hostile toward him. Relations were strained further when Emden wrote his *an appreciation* *ד'שם ד'נ'ן* and did not ask Hagis to write the preface. *70507*. Emden's reasons were that he disliked praise³ and especially when the praise was not genuine.

Emden had reasons to believe that Hagis was not sincere, that he was hypocritical in his friendship and in his adulations. He had spoken maliciously of Ezekiel Katzenellenbogen, chief Rabbi of the German community, though he appeared friendly to him. These various incidents led Emden to suspect Hagis. Further fuel was added to the flame by maligners who besmirched Emden's character before Hagis.

Though Hagis was hostile to Emden, he withheld his feeling toward him. Emden desired to prove that gossipers were responsible for Hagis' attitude toward him, while Hagis assured him of his friendship. However, later incidents bore testimony of his unfriendliness toward Emden.

Emden was given a welcome reception by the people of Altona, but he felt that there was one who did not seem joyed with his arrival, Ezekiel Katzenellen-

bogen. The enmity toward him was perhaps of the nature of a feud. He would have prevented his coming to Altona as did Ezekiel's father to Chacham Zebi, father of Emden.⁵

2. Ezekiel himself

Despite the apparent ill feeling that Ezekiel bore against him, Emden, though a new-comer, paid Katzenellenbogen a visit. He was received coldly and was told not to expect his friendship.⁶

Katzenellenbogen had been chief rabbi of the three communities for about thirty-five years, after having come from Lithuania. He was not a successful teacher, and had written much, his writings were not noteworthy being mainly profuse and embellished *מזכר* to books. Emden maintained⁷ that he was unworthy of the position he had held and that he had obtained it by untruthful and dishonest means, that he was very ignorant and was not lax to be unjust in his decisions. His actions and life were of such a nature that the people of Hamburg refused to accept him and his council as their authority.⁸

When Emden was traveling in order to dispose of the books left by his father, while in Hamburg he had made his home with Reb Baer Cohen. This act as well as former incidents made for the hatred of Joel Shaa'v for Emden. After Baer Cohen's

-
1. J.E. - Vol.V, p.149
 2. Auto. -. p.117
 3. Ibid - p.116
 4. Ibid -.p.117 ff.
 5. Ibid - p.122
 6. Ibid - p.123
 7. Ibid - p.124 ff.
 8. Ibid - p.134

death and shortly before Emden's residence in Altona, Joel Shaav was reappointed to his office as one of the leaders of the German community. When Emden came to Altona, Shaav found the opportunity to show his hostility to him. Upon the advice of Moses Hagis (who was at first friendly to Jabetz), Emden paid Shaav a visit. Despite Emden's attitude, Shaav was persistent in his unfriendly attitude.⁹

Though Emden was not befriended by these men, they can not be considered as characteristic representatives of the community of Altona, for the people of Altona favored Emden and respected him. Even those who had been inimical to Chacham Zebi manifested a friendly interest and love for Emden. They showed him respect and admiration.¹⁰ This friendly attitude continued until the time when Eibschutz^e appeared on the scene at Altona.

About three years after Emden's arrival at Altona his wife died at childbirth. An incident occurred at this time which forced Emden to ascertain his position in the community. Some had regarded him as a stranger in their midst, however when the matter was discussed he was declared to be a member of the community.¹¹ Emden married a second time during the middle of 1740. He then engaged himself in a new pursuit. He dealt with pledges, lending money to those who needed finances for a period of time. He engaged in this new enterprise hoping that he would be able to devote his time to study.¹² He was not successful, losing his principle.

The next few years were not the happiest for Emden. He lost several children and finally in 1743 his second wife died. Emden himself had been critically ill. At this time, Emden realized that the community of Altona was friendly to him.¹³

9. Auto. - p.140

10. Ibid - p.143:- They were accustomed to send him a citron for yearly until 1751, but when Eibeschutz came trouble began. 120

11. Auto. - p.152

In the year 1744, Emden married the daughter of his brother Ephraim Ashkenazi. Emden at this time was in dire circumstances. He had little of finances and had been unsuccessful in his commercial pursuits. He now received financial aid from a certain Reb Meir Emden, who also assisted him in obtaining a permit to open a printing establishment.¹⁴ His work in Altona after this period consisted in writing and printing his writings. He continued in this enterprise until opposition and lack of finances forced him to abandon his work and his native town for a short period of time. These events occurred during the Eibeschutz-Emden controversy.

12. Auto. - p.157

13. Ibid - p.161:- Prayer for his recovery made in the three communities.

14. Auto. - p.165

Chapter Five

Jonathan Eibeschutz

Jonathan Eibeschutz was born at Gracow 1690, a scion of a long line of Kabbalistic families. His father Nathan Nata was at one time Rabbi of a sea-port called Eibeschutz, whence Jonathan derives his name.

Eibeschutz was possessed of a keen mind and a retentive memory and these he applied to two fields of education. Talmud gave him opportunity to develop his reason and Kabbala satisfied his mystical nature. He attempted to cross the paths of learning but feeling that there would be opportunity for excellence only in Talmud, he remained a student of Talmud, and Rabbinic literature, and yet his desire for success and his vanity made him lead others to believe that his educational horizon was by no means limited.¹

His writings on non-Talmudic subjects and his occasional pamphlets bear testimony that he was unacquainted with the Jewish philosophers who wrote in Hebrew.² He was ^cacquainted only with the Talmud, which afforded him opportunity to sharpen his mind, and to develop his power of reasoning.

Eibeschutz was easy-going in nature. He disliked the gloomy ultra-piety of the German and Polish Jews. He interested himself in Kabbala and in the followers of Shabbatai Zebi, hence Rabbinism and strict adherence to the Law could have meant little to him, and the breach of Talmudic orders would have had little effect on him.³

Whatever the reasons may be, Eibeschutz did not declare himself to be anti-Rabbinical. Either his convictions were not genuine or his character was too weak to venture the conflict that would ensue. His life was a pendulum movement between

No use has been made
of 594's notes to Hebrew
translation of Grafts
when Grafts's unfair
treatment of Eibeschutz
has been pointed out.

Moscowian (has
nothing to do with
Meer
see).

reason and fancy, - Talmud and Kabbala. His hypocritical life - the natural result of such a mind - was not perhaps of his own making or choosing.

Eibeschutz succeeded in gaining many followers. Though he wavered and was not constant, and because of his difference from other Rabbis, his knowledge and authority gained support in a wide world.⁴

In 1714 he went to Prague where he married and made his home. Here he became preacher. He did not escape the suspicions of the people who felt that he had at least leanings toward the followers of Shabbatai Zebi. He was skillful enough to divert for a while the attention of those who suspected him. He decreed a ban on all Shabbatians (1725).

Despite his apparent innocence Eibeschutz had at this time interested himself deeply in the heresy of the day. He confessed his inner feelings to his former teacher Meir of Eisenstadt. Eibeschutz succeeded in maintaining his authority and adding to himself many disciples who became staunch supporters of their erudite master. His heresy was forgotten and his merits were rewarded by appointing him preacher of Prague 1728.⁵ *Jew. Encyclop. gives date about 1714.*

Eibeschutz's conduct did not fail to impress all with the idea that his learning and Jewishness were not sincere and genuine. Many felt that his association with Jesuits (who were not too friendly to the Jews) was for selfish reasons. He received permission from the bishop of Prague to print the Talmud which was so often prosecuted by the Catholic Church. Many believed that his main desire was to obtain means for a profitable income rather than for Jewish interest, for, his

1. Gr. - G. der Juden - 3rd Ed. Vol.X, p.355

2. Ibid

3. Gr. - G. der Juden - 3rd Ed. Vol.X, p.349

357-8

All above vaccination

permit was granted on condition that any word or expression be expunged that in the least manner opposed Christianity. Eibeshutz agreed to the conditions and began the publication of the Talmud 1728-1739.

Naturally ~~as it~~ would be expected that the wrath of the Jewish population ~~was~~ would be aroused. The community of Frankfurt-am-Mein at the instigation of Moses Chages ^{is} and David Oppenheimer, spent money and efforts to obtain from the emperor a prohibition of the Prague Talmud.⁶

See however Rabinowitz's remark in Hebrew Fractions, VIII, 464 note.

Eibeschutz felt perhaps that his opportunities in Prague were poor, he therefore applied for the post in Metz which was vacant. ~~An~~ Act of heresy against him prevented his election. Jacob Joshua Falk succeeded in obtaining the position where he remained only for a few years, when he was called to Frankfurt-am-Mein. Eibeschutz succeeded in obtaining sufficient influence to be elected in 1745.⁷ 1744

Eibeschutz succeeded in winning the favor of the community during the first years at Metz, so much so that he was ~~not~~ allowed to accept another position that was offered him in 1746. His actions, however, soon secured to meet with disfavor, for he began losing his supporters and his staunchest friends, nor would they bear witness to his professed innocence. His former friend and colleague, Nehemiah Reischer ~~who~~ was instrumental in his election at Metz now became his bitter enemy. Eibeschutz no longer felt at home in Metz. He had few friends and had little opportunity to display his erudite Talmudic mind. He was therefore anxious to obtain the position of Rabbi of the three communities of Altona, Hamburg, and Wand-sbeck.⁸

4. It has been stated that the council of Rabbis of F.a.Mein, had clear proofs of Eibeschutz's connections with **Lobale Prossnitz** and the Podolia Shabbatians. Only his extensive influence and the host of disciples protected him from the edict of excommunication, that was levelled against the others. Gr. - G. der Juden - Vol.X, p.351 358

5. J.E. Vol.V, p.308

Through his connections and because of his fame as the most distinguished of Talmudic and miracle workers, Eibeschutz succeeded in being elected to the position. These three cities had their own civil jurisdiction based on Rabbinical law. Eibeschutz with his knowledge, keen mind, and sharp wit was fully capable for the position.

1750
Eibeschutz became Rabbi of the community where Emden lived 1751. His alliance and leanings toward Shabbatian heresy were not unknown to Emden who was anxious to defeat all opportunities and opponents of traditional Judaism. These facts were sufficient to forebode evil and disorder that were soon to arise in Altona and to the immediate surroundings.

359
6. Gr. - G. der Juden - Vol.X, p.352 :- Jonathan also used his relations with with the Christians in a manner beneficial to Jews. See Ibid p.353 note 2.

7. Gr. G. der Juden- Vol.X, p.353, Note 5

8. Gr. - G. der Juden - Vol.X, p.356

360
364-5

it his purpose to cultivate his friendship and to draw him closer and by some means or manner to prevent his bitterness from effecting him. Emden held himself aloof, feeling that sooner or later a quarrel between them must ensue.

Shortly after Eibeschutz's arrival, the three communities had suffered from a terrible visitation. Several young women died throughout the year in childbirth. Those women expecting to become mothers became terrified and consulted the Rabbi hoping that he would use his influence to prevent the recurrence of such tragedies. Eibeschutz prepared amulets writings (Kameos) for the purpose of exorcising the spirits, and also indulge in other ^{forms} of magic. He had distributed similar amulets in Metz, Frankfurt-am-Mein, and in several other localities. ^{ה'תקנ"ח} ^{Kameot}

New ~~reports~~ ^{reports} soon came from Frankfurt-am-Mein that these amulets were not of the usual nature, that they bordered on the line of heresy.⁴

One of these amulets was opened in Altona and was found to contain references to Zebi.⁵ Despite the fact that the words were altered by the change in the position of some letters, the significance of the amulets and the references were easily understood. The amulets came into the hands of Emden who by this time was quite certain of Eibeschutz, but still dreaded to make a strong attack, fearing the possible conclusions. Eibeschutz was certainly famed to be the the coast learned Talmudist and had succeeded in recruiting th usand of followers who were religious and lay leaders in communities of importance.

Though Emden was diffident in pursuing the case, the matter received full publicity in the communities. All efforts to suppress the scandalous affair were

1. See p.28 ff.

2. J.E. Vol.V, p.150

3. Gutman Klemperer ^{ה'תקנ"ח} p.66

4. Gr. - G. der Juden - Vol.X, p.360

of no avail. Scandalous and shameful it was for these communities that a little ⁻⁴⁵⁻ over two decades before had condemned and branded the Shabbatians as heretics. The chief Rabbi was to be supported and that was to be secret. News of Emden's point of view came to the people and he was threatened not to publish the affair.⁶

Emden explained his view in his own synagogue declaring that he considered that the writer of the amulets a Shabbatian and therefore deserved to be excommunicated. He did not accuse the chief Rabbi of the authorship, but since they were given by him, he was duty bound to clear himself of all suspicion. This occurred on Feb. 4, 1751.⁷

Naturally, this action on the part of Emden roused the ire of the entire community. Emden, an unofficial Rabbi, so to speak. A layman in the community had declared that the chief Rabbi deserved to be excommunicated. That was the interpretation given to Emden's words. Eibenschutz had been insulted and inroads had been made by Emden on his authority. Eibenschutz's friends were strong enough to continue the war that had begun.

Emden himself
Emden was ~~summarily~~ *publicly* placed under the ban, and the council threatened with the ban any and all who would visit his synagogue. The synagogue was tabooed and closed, and Emden was further prohibited to print anything on his establishment.⁸ This last clause was clearly meant to prevent any return attacks from Emden. These were but the beginnings of the controversy which though born of hatred, malice, and sincerity ended with a salutary effect on the Jews of Europe.

Though Eibenschutz found support among his many disciples, he felt it advisable to exonerate himself in the eyes of the public-at-large. He gave publicity to the entire affair, posing as an innocent individual who was attacked and maligned by the impudent Emden, who dared call him a heretic. He did not find the task of clearing

himself a facile one, he encountered many stumbling blocks and found it necessary to become violent mendacious in order to argue his case.

Emden stood alone. Those who favored him and concurred with his opinion were reticent, fearing to expose and express themselves.

Those who were disciples of Eibeschutz would support him even if he proved to be heretical, and the public who believed in him could not be led to believe, that the chief Rabbi, the noted Talmudist could be guilty of such a ^{he} heinous crime. The accusation of Emden was considered to be absolutely groundless.

Little was known of the history of the movement and people therefore favored Eibeschutz, who used every means to to appear innocent of any wrong. With those who realized the meaning of the charges, Eibeschutz tried various means. He delivered a lecture in his synagogue, during which he took a solemn oath that he cherished naught that any bearing on the Shabbatian beliefs. To appear more virulent in his opposition he he imprecated maledictions on the sect and excommunicated his opponents who slandered him.⁸

What should have been done to Emden after the chief Rabbi had emphasized his strongly ~~his~~ innocence. The leaders of the community felt themselves duty-bound to order the "slanderer" to leave Altona. Emden did not obey the order given. He sought support in the charter granted to him by the governmental authorities, but he found that public opinion was very much against him. Emden accepted the challenge and found support from other cities.

Adon New evidence came in the form of letters and amulets from the city of Metz (end of 1751), Eibeschutz's former charge. Eibeschutz had distributed these and

vocation:- "Oh God of Israel, Thou who dwellest in the adornment of Thy might. (A Kabbalistic allusion) Send through the merit of thy servant, Shabbatai Zebi, healing for this woman, whereby Thy name and the name of the Messiah, Shabbatai Zebi may be accepted in the world."

thing was not so simple. It depended on the validity of the formulation of letters. See note 7 in brackets 512 # a 100.

acknowledged that he was a believer in Zebi. Nehemiah Reischer and Rabbi Samuel Heilman, goaded Emden on, sending testimony and evidence to Altona of Eibeschutz's heretical beliefs. An examination of the amulets were made and they were found to be of the same nature as those distributed in Altona. The possessors were ordered to send them to the authorities with penalty of excommunication for disobedience. Eibeschutz had lost all support in Metz for clear evidence was given of his being the author of these amulets.

Emden realized that he was not alone in his cause, but his supporters were of no aid to him, for they were acknowledged enemies of Eibeschutz. Jacob Joshua Falk, Rabbi of Frankfurt-am-M^ain was consulted by both factions, but he could not give his decision wide publicity, for he opposed Eibeschutz.⁹

Emden was not victorious despite his support. His party was by far in the minority. The people were overwhelmingly in favor of the chief Rabbi. All his opponents were labelled as personal enemies, and therefore their views were thought to be prejudiced. Many were declared excommunicated by the disciples of Eibeschutz. Emden was among those excommunicated. The bull of excommunication was published and distributed throughout Poland, where it met with approval on the part of the devoted followers of Eibeschutz and Rabbis who found it expedient to follow him. Great sums were spent for the dissemination of the propaganda against Emden and in favor of Eibeschutz.¹⁰ Physical force was resorted to in order to prove the strength of the prevailing party. Emden felt that his life was endangered by, his opponents, and repaired to Amsterdam where he was welcomed. His wife in Altona was ordered not to dispose of his property.¹¹

6. Gr. - G. der Juden - Vol.X, p.360

7. Ibid - p.361 note 1.

8. Ibid - p.362 370

9. Ibid - p.364 372

Eibeschutz realized that for Emden, to set up his residence in Amsterdam would perhaps prove harmful to him, that Emden perhaps would give wide publicity to the view of the minority. He therefore issued a decree (3rd of Sivan 1751) to all his supporters in Germany, Poland, and Italy to remain loyal to his cause.¹² At the same time reports were spread that the amulets in question contained nothing that was dangerous or heretical, rather they embodied deep orthodox mysticism that could not be comprehended by the masses. His disciples doing his bidding acted at times rashly; young Rabbis would malign older people and excommunicated veteran scholars. Such an occurrence in Lublin aroused the indignation of many, though few suspected that such actions were due to the machinations of the supreme ruler at Altona.

Courage came to the aid of the few. Several Rabbis including Falk and Heilmann challenged Eibeschutz to clear himself of the charges.¹³ The challenge was not accepted, for it would have perhaps meant defeat. Wide publicity brought this matter to the attention of the Gentiles. The entire affair did not raise the Jews in the eyes of their neighbors. The controversy spread to Poland where it was carried on in an even less dignified manner than at the seat of the controversy.

The band of opponents finally ordered that the writer of the amulets be cut off from Jewish society. None was permitted to study Talmud with him, - almost a complete repetition of the conditions that were laid down against Emden. His supporters were to be excommunicated and his name was taboo. Many German and Venetian communities agreed to these proposals.¹⁴

10. Gr. - G. der Juden - Vol. X, p. 365

11. אגרות אגרות p. 63a

12. Gr. - G. der Juden - Vol. X, p. 365

13. Ibid

14. Ibid - p. 368

373

373

374

375

-49-

Entire Jewry suffered excommunication, being divided into two camps, each of which used the ban as an effective weapon against the other. The scope of the ban and the readiness with which it was employed resulted in its failure. Its teeth became ineffective and it lost its entire strength and importance. Perhaps since then, the ban had been of little use in the life of the Jewish people.¹⁵ Just as Cham Zebi's quarrels were submitted to the secular courts, similarly the controversy between Eibeschutz and Emden was taken out of the hands of the Jewish courts and was given over to the decision of the Gentiles. For this action ^{Emden} and his followers can not be called guilty. More likely it was the work of Eibeschutz and his followers.

The trial was not characterized by any smoothness. Bitterness and animosity were allowed to play important roles. Important and unimportant details were introduced, but the court failed to uphold the prevailing party. The verdict was issued on the 30th of June, 1752.¹⁶

Emden returned to Altona welcomed by his friends. He was irritated because Eibeschutz had taken the case to court while he was far from the scene of battle. He was anxious for revenge, desiring to obtain damages for the losses. Urged by his friends not to take action he agreed to forego payment of reparation.¹⁷

Shortly after his return to Altona a governmental decree was issued removing Eibeschutz from his post and demanding that Eibeschutz clear himself in the eyes of the people of the charge relative to the amulets.¹⁸

Emden now safe in his home, having been vindicated, busied himself with an account of the activities of Shabbatai Zebi and his followers.¹⁹ He referred

15. Gr. - G. der Juden - Vol.X, p.368, Note 1.

16. Ibid - p.369 :- Council of Altona severely censured for its illegal and harsh treatment of Emden, and fined one hundred thalers. Emden was permitted to return to Altona and the use of synagogue and printing press was restored

17. Auto. - p.178

little to Eibeschutz but his main purpose was to show to the people that the aim of the heretical movement was to remove the belief ^{in God} in Judaism and to replace it with a belief in the Messiah and his fancies. He did not fail, however, to mention the alliance of Eibeshutz with the followers of Zebi.

Eibeschutz felt that his position was not resting on the firmest ground. To aid him, he allied himself with an apostate Jew, Carl Anton.²⁰ Anton was to present Eibeschutz's case in skillful manner before the world, to vindicate Eibeschutz, even to praise his works and character. Emden was pictured the villain of the story. Eibeschutz was cleared of all suspicion with regard to his belief in a false Messiah. Evidence was introduced to prove the innocence of Eibeschutz of the malicious charges, brought against him.²¹ The book was dedicated to the king of Denmark, and hints were given to exonerate the innocent victim.

Thru the influence of the book and the efforts of a Jewish agent who used to have power at the Court of Brunswick.²², the court favored Eibeschutz declaring that that the "case" of the amulets should be suppressed, that the majority of Rabbis took sides with Eibeschutz and therefore his case must have been just. On the seventh of February, 1754 a decree was issued by the government to the above effect and read in about the synagogue at Altona.²³ The decree was not altogether in favor Eibeschutz.²⁴

Eibeschutz then met with success. At the suggestion of the secular government Eibeschutz's position was voted secure, and he himself swore fealty to the king. Though apparently Eibeschutz was being vindicated, actually his cause was on the wane. People had become acquainted with his character and his methods, and became inimical to him. Governmental decree had little effect in changing the opinion of

18. Ezekiel Landau friend of Eibeschutz wrote to him at this time declaring the amulets to be heretical and urging that he (Eibeschutz) clear himself of the accusation that he was the author. Though the letter was well-intentioned, its effects were unfavorable to Eibeschutz who had claimed authorship, but argued that they contained no heresy. Gr. - G. der Juden - p.369, Note 7

378
Really note
to his long Note (

the people. The leaders of the opposition were eager to prove to the king that his judgments were not well grounded, and they laid before the council of Altona the plea that Eibeschutz be deprived of his Rabbinical powers and be excommunicated until he repent of his heresy.²⁵

The bitterness of the conflict led the council of Altona to induce Eibeschutz to submit his case to an impartial Rabbinical court of arbitration and to abide by its decision.

Neither party could appoint judges satisfactory to the others. The opponents of Eibeschutz were anxious to bring the matter to a decision while Eibeschutz was anxious to postpone the case until a more opportune time.²⁶ A meeting was held during the latter part of 1753 and one also during the month of July 1754. At both meetings the opponents of Eibeschutz met with little success.²⁷ Eibeschutz understood these proceedings to be marks of the popularity of his cause. He was anxious to avoid submitting his case to the decision of the Rabbinical court. He schemed even to the hurt of himself and his opponents who were in increasing in number.²⁸ Many of the former followers who had been members of the council, now opposed him proclaiming him a heretic.

After several appeals to the king for justice, and a fair decision, he decided to bring the matter to final judgment, to ascertain whether Eibeschutz was an arch-heretic or a maligned person. The matter was to be submitted to a group of Christian professors and theologians. They were finally to decide with regard to

19. Emden denied authorship of this work. See Note p.370 G. der Juden

20. Gr. - G. der Juden - p.371; See note 2

21. The book is believed to have been dictated by Eibeschutz to Emden. Gr.- G. der Juden, p.371

22. 27b

23. Gr. - G. der Juden - p.372

Handwritten notes:
 17. Max von. But himself wrote an account of the case.
 378
 379
 (Grätz, 380, note 1).
 2. Anton
 380

the amulets.

Eibeschutz decided to publish his case. On June 27, 1755 his *לוחות צדק* appeared. It was the first work that he had published and contained a statement of his case, written in calm, passionless language, though it was so constructed as to prove that he was altogether innocent and that the cause of all the discussion could be laid at the feet of Emden and his associates. He failed to convince Jewry of his innocence. Though he tried skillfully to conceal his guilt he was unsuccessful, failing to enlist the support of any of the Rabbis. This treatise did not remain unanswered. Emden was perhaps joyed to find that Eibeschutz exposed his own ignorance and in addition insulted the people, considering them gullible enough to accept his arguments. Emden answered Eibeschutz by writing his *שבירת לוחות צדק* in which he exposes the ignorance and folly of Eibeschutz as shown in his work *לוחות צדק*.

Has the author read these works in the original to make these statements?

Emden's answer did not receive the welcome expected. His abusive style and venomous expressions were to his own hurt. The controversy had cost Emden money and health, he had suffered almost complete poverty. While he was busily engaged with his refutations against Eibeschutz, plans were made to frustrate his schemes. A band of the followers of Eibeschutz (men of low standing, some of whom later regretted their actions)²⁹ stole into the home of Emden, threatened him with death unless he turned over to them his malicious writings against Eibeschutz. They tempered with his printing press and confiscated his writings. The final raid was made when a *serach* warrant was issued upon evidence obtained from Emden himself.³⁰ Despite the suddenness of the occurrence and the fact that Emden had no opportunity to hide the material wanted, and though the intruders plundered everything they found, they did not succeed in obtaining the evidence desired. They took much with them, but their evidence was of no purpose.³¹

Another publication meant to benefit Eibeschutz but harming him in the eyes of the Jews appeared from a Christian ~~writer~~ ³² possible. A certain professor and pastor Megerlin, who was asked by the Danish king for his opinion in the case, ventured the opinion that the amulets referred in mystical manner to Jesus Christ. He referred to Anton's book maintaining that it did not represent Eibeschutz in proper perspective.³³ His article also made appeals to the entire Jewish community.³⁴

Though Megerlin's argument presented Eibeschutz in an altogether unfavorable light to the Jews, they convinced King Frederick of Denmark of the worth of Eibeschutz, who was satisfied to disregard the disapproval of the Jews, if he obtained the favor of the government. The king altered his former decisions, permitting Eibeschutz to hold office. The community of Altona was ordered to recognize and respect him.³⁵

Eibeschutz was victorious and his victory was celebrated with pomp and ceremony by his followers (middle of Dec. 1756).³⁶ Though Eibeschutz had apparently succeeded in his strife of six years duration, events even soon to occur which did not add to his triumph, rather they detracted from his influence and meant the loss of many of his supporters.

25. See Note 2 p.372 ³⁸¹ ~~Gr. - G. der Juden~~ Vol.X

26. He bided his time, waiting until his disciples were ready to come to his aid. On Oct., 1753 a meeting was held at which a collection of writings against Eibeschutz were burned. See ³⁸¹ ~~Gr. - G. der Juden~~ p.50b; ³⁸² ~~Gr. - G. der Juden~~ p.86b

27. ³⁸¹ ~~Gr. - G. der Juden~~ p.52b; Evidence in their favor was destroyed ⁵⁶⁶

28. See note 4, p.374 ³⁸² ~~Gr. - G. der Juden~~

29. Auto. - p.181 ff.

30. Ibid - p.190 ff.

31. Ibid - p.197 ff. for details of raid

32. Gr. - G. der Juden - p.376 n.2

33. Ibid - p.376;- ³⁸⁵ Megelin further charges that Emden's opposition to Eibeschutz was due to the latter's Christian learning. He suggested that Eibeschutz remove his mask and resign from the Rabbinate and to allow himself to be baptized.

34. See Ibid p.376 Note 3 ^{385, note 1}

35. Gr. - G. der Juden p.377;- The community of Hamburg over which Eibeschutz had no jurisdiction for three years again recognized him as their Rabbi.

36. Ibid

Chapter Seven

THE FRANKISTS

*On the Frankists the author
ought to have used Kraus
man's work / translated
from Polish into Hebrew
by Yehoshua / also saw apph
ment from the data.*

The contentions of Anton that Shabbatians no longer inhabited the face of the earth was in part true, though for the most part false, and was meant to vindicate the guilty Eibeschutz. In Padolia there was a nest of these people who proved themselves to be "outside the camp of Israel". The activities of the anti-Shabbatians had not the greatest effect desired. From all appearances those who were not followers of Zebi would have believed that the sect no longer existed, for they, the Shabbatians carried on their work secretly, and they slowly gained adherents.¹ The controversy between Eibeschutz and Emden was actually responsible for their new appearance, or for their bald public reappearance.

The communities had been divided into two camps, and in many instances the pro-Eibeschutz party was by far the predominant. This fact encouraged the Shabbatians to reappear "on the face of the earth" and to boldly declare themselves anti-Talmudists.

The leader of the bold group was a certain Jacob Lebovitz, a man of notoriety, by far the most dishonest and most fraudulent men of his day. In his youth he had made himself acquainted with Kabbala, preferring it to the Talmud. He had experienced much having travelled while yet a young man, and had become skilled in "selling his birth-right", going from one religion to another. While in Turkey he had acquired the name of Frank.²

Frank had learned the art of the sensational leader. He influenced the people with his personality, with his humbleness, leading them to believe that he was merely doing his destined work, that all Messiahs were reincarnations of the same soul.

1. Gr. - G. der Juden - p.378 Podolia and Pokotia (Poland) were peopled

His marriage to a beautiful woman served his cause. He was thought to be a superior being and therefore his adherents had implicit faith in him. He had heard of the ~~activities~~ ^{disappearances} in Poland and made his appearances there suddenly on Nov. 1755.

Conditions in Poland were favorable for Frank. The Shabbatians who remained in these districts secretly, now saw an opportunity to proclaim their principles. They had been in need of a leader, and Frank supplied the need, appearing as the successor of Shabatai Zebi. The full import of this was ~~clear~~ ^{chiefly} understood by those initiated into the secrets of "Shabbatianism". They too understood the trinitarian Godhead consisting of the Ancient One, the Holy King, and a female personage in the God head. Frank represented the Holy Lord and was to be respected as such.

He succeeded in organizing the Shabbatians of Podolia and its surrounding territory into a sect which called by his name "Frankists". Being Shabbatians, their main aim was to undermine Rabbinic Judaism. Their actions were in direct opposition to the demands of Rabbinic Judaism. This movement attracted not only the un-⁴ educated suffering populace³, but also many of the mystical Rabbis and Darshanim. 2

It must be mentioned that public appearances and meetings by these Frankists were practically impossible, for the eyes of the Rabbis were directed against heretical uprisings. Even secret meetings did not always prove successful.⁵ One of these meetings was broken up and resulted in the deportation of Frank as a foreigner. News of the activities of the Frankists came to the ears of the strictly pious Rabbis of Poland; and the Frankists were ~~subjected~~ ^{subjected} to their attacks, for the actions of the Frankists in defiance of Rabbinical law point out a very low state of morale that had made its way into the Jewish society.

with students of Talmud who scoffed at the laws of Judaism, scorned Rabbinical lore, and who were of loose morals. 300

2. Jacob ben Loeb, son a Rabbi of Galicia See note 1, p.378 Gr. - G. der Juden - Vol.X

3. The movement of Shabbatianism had attracted many who had witnessed or

At Brody, a sentence of excommunication was pronounced (20 Sivan 1756) against the Frankists. No one was permitted to intermarry with them, and they were considered non-eligible to the post of Rabbi, to any religious office or any position as leader.⁶ This ban was ratified by a great synod on the 25th of Sept, 1756, and was published and distributed throughout the Jewish communities to be read monthly and to be observed meticulously. A strong thrust was made to avoid further troubles from Anti-Talmudists. The document prepared by the synod declared that no persons under the age of thirty was permitted to study Kabbala or to read the Zohar. The decision though perhaps apparently arbitrarily and opposed to intellectualism was a necessary step since these works had for many years had a harmful effect on the peace and harmony of the Jewish people. The Rabbis felt that the study of the Zohar and the Kabbala in itself was not harmful,⁷ but that the immature mind was not able to grasp the wholesomeness of these works and they therefore desired to prevent the evil effects of the Zohar, though they did not intend to attack the Zohar itself.

Emden received at this honor which perhaps he himself did not expect. The Rabbis of Poland turned to Emden in their distress. When the Shabbatians were attacked by the Jews of Poland, they sought refuge from the secular authorities. They complained to the bishops (who were the rulers) that they were pursued and prosecuted by the Jews because of their belief which was very similar and quite related to the belief of the Christians. Much money spent obtained for their protection of the rulers and they were provided with cities of refuge.⁸

Emden in reply to the queries of the Polish Rabbis advised that the deeds of

had suffered from the Chmelnicki persecutions J.E. Vol.V, p.476

4. Gr. - G. der Juden - See 378 ff.

5. Ibid - p.381

6. Ibid

379
380

Meaning of passage is that the immured acts of the
sectarians be published by quotations from
the Shabbatians be published, and that they be rebuked for their acts in Christian
publications.⁹ Emden wrote his *אור חיים* 170, which was directed against the
sectarians. He included references to the activities of Eibeschutz and his allies,
and exposed Eibeschutz attitude toward the Torah. Eibeschutz used all means to pre-
vent the dissemination of the information contained in this new publications. The
publicity given to this new work did not by any means prevent interest in its con-
tents. Emden continued exposing the activities of the sectarians and led the spi-
ritual war on those who were ready to accept Christianity in order to continue
their fight against the Talmudists.

In this heated battle Emden arrived at a conclusion that was of great inter-
est and importance to succeeding generations. The conditions in Poland led Emden
to make a careful study of the Zohar and its contents. His careful inquiring led
him to the opinion that the Zohar was not the entire work of the author to whom it
was ascribed (Simeon b. Yochai), that at least a part of it was the work of an im-
postor. This conclusion of Emden was a radical step which he took after careful
study, previous to occurrences in Poland he had considered heretical any individual
that dared doubt the genuineness and sacred character of the Zohar.¹⁰

with regard to the
In his *אור חיים* 170 Emden answers the question *prosecution of the Frankists*.
He endorsed punishment emphatically, considering them shameless transgressors of
sacred law. Though this permission from Emden was not solely responsible, it was
the only word that was needed for the events that followed. The Jews denounced the
Frankists declaring them to be a new sect, stating that they were within the ju-
risdiction of the Catholics.

urging to prosecute the Frankists
171-172

7. See further under "Conclusion", Part IV

8. Auto. p.185 :- The bishop of Kamnitz and his aids supported these he-
retics and permitted them to take hold of their new faith. He ordered the
Talmud and the holy books to be burned, bringing disgrace and apparent de-
feat to the Talmudists.

Frank realized that this would perhaps mean persecution at the hands of the Catholics; he soon appeared on the scene and ordered that many of their sect should submit baptism in order to emphasize their belief in the trinity and their opposition to the Talmud.¹¹

Heated warfare ensued between the two camps. The Frankists declared and reiterated their similarity to Christianity insisting that the Talmudists oppressed them because of the superiority of the ^{new} belief. They were venomous in their charges, anxious to separate themselves from the Jewish community.¹² Such an attitude toward the Jews obtained for the Frankists the favor and protection of the secular authorities. The Frankists continued to be a menace to the Jews, and their activities had one affect on the Rabbis of Poland. They realized the low state to which the intellectualism of the Jew had come. Emden, in this entire affair, was the highest authority, and it must be remembered, that his attitude was by far not the attitude of the majority of the Rabbis. This difference of opinion was not due to a difference of reasoning but to the state of ignorance of the major portion of the Jewish Rabbinate of this period. Emden did perform a service. He opened the eyes of the people to the frauds and the chimeras by which they were enticed and led astray.

9. Auto. - p.185

10. Gr. - G. der Juden - p.383

11. Frank had changed his faith on other occasions see p.55

12. They charged the Jews with desiring Christian blood, that the Talmud vindicates the murder of Christians Gr. -G. der Juden - p.385

Chapter Eight

LAST YEARS OF EMDEN'S LIFE

The activities of Eibeschutz and the various means that he employed to discredit the charges of Emden, and to defame Emden, were not altogether successful. Though Eibeschutz continued to wield power, Emden's claims were not discredited. The activities in Poland, described in the preceeding chapter give evidence of Emden's authority on orthodox Judaism. He was consulted by the members of the Synod of Constant~~ino~~ for his opinion,¹ on matters of interest to entire Jewry of his day.

Even in his own land his cause was not altogether lost. The associated of Eibeschutz must have realized his character, for though several of them helped Eibeschutz in his schemes, it is not altogether certain that they did not realize their wrongs toward the man Emden.²

Withal Emden's last years were not much more pleasant than those previous in his life. Though his authority was recognized by some, Emden did not receive the recognition that he with his nature and erudition desired.

After the death of Eibeschutz (Elul 1764), many wanted to elect Emden to the position once held by his father, but Emden's friends evidently were not in the majority, though his enemies did not desire that their feelings be made public.³ Emden was recognized and shown some honor by being advised with in regard to the candidate to be chosen. His suggestion was accepted, and the Rabbi recommended by him was elected successor to Eibeschutz.

Emden continued his controversy with the followers of Eibeschutz; he established a school in which he taught those principles which were antagonistic to the principles taught by the pupils of Eibeschutz. Though many of the friends of Ei-

7. Note, 240-11 states that expelled a number of pupils of Eibeschutz

beschutz were opposed to this move by Emden, he was not hampered in his work.

Emden was disappointed in the man of his choice, the Rabbi of Altona, for the latter was not genuine nor honest in his work, nor did he fail to curry favor with the people,⁴ attempting to please the opponents and friends of Eibeschutz alike.

During the year 1774, Emden had planned to journey to Palestine, where he intended to spend the remainder of his life. He was unable to settle matters before leaving, and continued to postpone his trip. Friday evening April 19, 1776, Emden breathed his last, at the ripe age of eighty. A worthy accrostic has been ascribed on his tombstone in Altona, giving evidence of the respect and love for him felt by those who know him.

-
1. J.E. Vol.V, p.150
 2. Mendel Speyer, one of those who raided Emden's home for certain manuscripts later apologized to him Auto. p.200 ff.
 3. Method of election and secrecy described pp.209 ff. - Auto.
 4. He paid deference to Eibeschutz and despite Emden's warnings honored the grandson of Eibeschutz with the title *גאון* Auto. - p.211

PART THREE

W O R K S O F E M D E N

WORKS OF EMDEN

Emden was quite a prolific writer showing a desire to put into form his opinions already in his early life.¹ After Chacham Zebi had moved with his family from Emden, Jacob had remained with an uncle of his, with whom he studied his father's Responsa. He then wrote an essay on his father's תשובות.²

Emden's early life was spent in study and teaching. While yet in Bruda, he completed his לחם שמים, a contemporary commentary on the Mishnah. Here too he completed his כיוצא קטן on טור אורח חיים. He issued many תקנות and finished part of his שאלת יעקב.

When in Amsterdam (after his third marriage), he wrote his מסע שמים which was a compilation of the laws and customs for the entire year. This work he believed to be of great necessity. It contained all the prayers and all the duties, incumbent on an observant Jew. He included notes on personal advice and bits of personal opinion.³ His intentions were misunderstood and attempts were made to prevent its publication,⁴ but his opponents realized the futility of their cause. The book was finally published Sept. 1748. The same year Emden wrote his Siddur.

His works may be divided into two distinct classes: polemical and Rabbinical. Among the polemical are:

1. Torath Hakena'oth - a biography of Shabbatai Zebi and criticisms on Nehemiah Chayyim, Eibeschutz, and others. Amsterdam, 1752
2. Eduth Bes Yaakov - on the supposed heresy of Eibeschutz. This also

1. J.E. Vol.V; Auto. [reference 2, pp 203-4]

2. An exception to this that he desired to publish his views is the case of his Autobiography which he says was to show God's mercy to him and to give courage to others in distress and finally to relate his victory over his enemies. Auto. pp.33 & 54 ff.

3. Auto. - p.59

Reference in correct

- contains, a letter to the Rabbis of the "Four Lands". Altona, 1756
3. Shimamush - 3 parts *only last part* a refutation of heretical demonstrations .
Amsterdam, 1758-62
 4. Shobirat - Luchot Ha-owen - a refutation of Hibeschutz's *1770 1771*,
Altona, 1759
 5. Three polemical pamphlets published in 1762
 6. Four writings on money -changers and bankers. Unpublished

His Rabbinical works include:

1. Lechem Shamayim - commentary on Mishnah with a treatise in two parts
on Maimonedes "Yad", Bet Ha-behirah - Altona, 1728, Wandsbeck, 1733
2. Iggeret Bikkoret - responsa. Altona, 1733
3. Sheelat Yaabetz - a collection of responsa. Altona, 1739-59
4. Siddur Tefillah - Altona, 1745-48
5. Ez Abot - a commentary to Abot and Lechem Nekudim - grammatical notes.
Amsterdam, 1751
6. Shaagat Aryeh - sermon, also included in his "Kishshurim Lyaakob".
Amsterdam, 1755
7. Seder 'Olam Rabbah we-Zuta and Megillat Taanit, - edited with critical notes. Hamburg, 1757
8. Mor U-keziah - 2 parts, the first part called *1770 1771* being an
expurgation of the Zohar. Altona, 1761-68
9. Zizim U-Ferachim - a collection of Kabbalistic articles arranged in
alphabetical order. Altona, 1768
10. Luach Eresh - grammatical notes on the prayers, and a criticism of
Solomon Henas "Shaare Tefillah". Altona, 1769
11. Shemesh Zedakah - Altona 1772
12. Pesach Gadol - Tefillath Yeshurun, and Cholim Ketani. Altona 1775

4. Though at first welcomed, the book soon met with great opposition. In

13. Shaare 'Azarah - Altona, 1776
14. Dibreth Emeth u-Mishpath Shalom -

Among his unpublished Rabbinical writings are:

1. Kishshurim le- Yaakob - collection of sermons
2. Zaakath Damim - refutation of the blood accusation in Poland
3. Gab-'Ed - commentary to Rashi and to the Targum of the of the Pentateuch
4. Em la-Binah - commentary to the whole Bible
5. Em la-Mikrah we-la-Masoreth - also a commentary to the Bible
6. Mogillath Sefer - containing biographies of himself and his father, written 1752. *2 seals with events much later*

Emden also annotated several works among which are : Saadia Gaon's "Sefer ha-Pedut we ha-purkan"; Elijah Levita's "Meturgeman"; Caro's "Kereti u-Feleti".

He is also considered to be the author of a Kabbalistic work.⁵

*All this taken from
J. G.*

the second part he agreed to remove all objections. Auto. pp. 169 ff.

5. Wagenaar in his Toledoth Yaabez

PART FOUR

CONCLUSION

AN APPRECIATION OF EMDEN

AN APPRECIATION OF EMDEN

Jacob Emden famed as a great scholar, was not altogether free from the limitation of his age. He was a Jew interested in his people and in his religion. Son of a learned Rabbi and descendant of a line of Talmudists, Emden was the beneficiary of good training and strong character. His love for his father was of such a nature that he desired to simulate him in his own life. In his activities one may say that Emden did succeed in living in accordance with the example set him by his father. In nature, however, he fell short.

Emden was unsociable, inconsiderate, and melancholy - a lover of solitude. Perhaps all these were not his own desires. He had spent his childhood in misery. Economic conditions were not the most favorable, and moreover were unfavorable his physical circumstances. He suffered with many diseases during his childhood, was pampered by his parents, and continued throughout all his life to be a victim of sickness and ennui. After leaving his father's home there was none to comfort him. Physical discomfort and general unhappiness may be rightly blamed for Emden's better nature.

Emden was well versed in Talmud and was eager for general knowledge. He did not desire to limit his education to Rabbinic lore, but his peculiar views prevented his acquiring vast knowledge in other fields of education.¹ Yet he was far above the students of his day.

Emden wrote much, was a skilled stylist, independent in nature and fearless. His fight for the truth was genuine and effective, though the means employed were to the hurt of others and to his own hurt. Emden was arrogant, quarrelsome, and obstinate, choosing every opportunity to declare spiritual war and employing the most deadly weapons to win his cause.² He did not know the meaning of surrender.

1. Cf. p. 2

When he found reason for a quarrel (justly) but felt that his time was not ripe, he bided his time before he made any action.³

His quarrels were always for the "right"; though many believe that he was merely quarrelsome, his life shows that he was anxious that fraud and falsehood be dethroned, he was ever anxious for the welfare of the people.

Emden was strictly orthodox in his religious views, and was true to tradition despite the possible changes warranted by circumstances.⁴ In fact he considered himself the guardian of true orthodoxy and took furtive glances at all wrongs with his keen eye which seemed hypocrisy and heresy, though they were not noticed by those near at hand. In this respect he followed in the footsteps of his father who, too enjoyed the dangers of heresy-hunting.

Emden was opposed to philosophy though he knew nothing of the subject. In his peculiar manner he dared express that the "Guide to the Perplexed" could have possibly been the work of so orthodox a Rabbi as Maimuni.⁵

With his knowledge of the Talmud and his love of Judaism it may appear strange that he did not possess any desire for the Rabbinate. A descendant of a Rabbinical family, and one who craved for honor and respect, Emden had a peculiar desire to be elated to the Rabbinate in order to have the pleasure of declining the selection.⁶ Only once did he accept the offer when he became the Rabbi of Emden.

2. Gutman Klemperer / 2/c "p p. 66;

3. Cf. p. 28

4. J.E. Vol.V, p.150

5. Ibid; תנ"ך ופירושים

6. Cf. p. 43

Though differing in many respects from the people and Rabbis of his day, he was similar to them in his attitude towards Kabbala and the Zohar. He regarded highly both Kabbala and its canon, the Zohar. His quarrels were not against Kabbalists nor Zoharists, and perhaps ^{he himself} ~~was~~ not free from belief in mysticism and Kameos. ^{Remer} It may be noticed that the changes in his greatest controversy were directed on the ground of Shabbatian heresy and on no other ground. It was only later when Emden made a searching study into the Zohar that he declared against its ^{authenticity} ~~authenticity~~.

Though the question of Shabbatian heresy was the main difference of opinion and perhaps the main cause for the Emden-Eibeschutz controversy,⁷ it may be considered sufficient ground for the service rendered by Emden. He performed the task of a purifier. The fangs of heresy (in the form of Messianism) had been imbedded into the flesh of Judaism for quite a time. Heresies are of different types. The belief in Zebi, had threatened the foundation of Rabbinism, and Rabbinism though at ^{seemed to be} ~~it~~ times a deterrent to progress, has always made for ^{the preservation of Judaism and} ~~the progress of~~ Jewry. Especially was this form of heresy dangerous when it allied itself with Christianity, which has always looked for the annihilation of the people and the destruction of the religion. The Shabbatians were dangerous, but even more were they especially treacherous, in hiding, and when they did appear above surface they appeared in false form.

Graetz maintains that history has not decided definitely whether Emden or Eibeschutz was in the right. Nevertheless, this moot question does not detract from the service rendered by Emden. Eibeschutz may have been innocent. If he were, he was accused innocently, of a grave charge but through the accusation was unravelled the scheme of an enemy that had buried itself secretly within the body of Jewry and was gnawing at its very heart. Emden succeeded in locating the disease. He may

7. Some believe that through personal grievance the quarrel started, and to that cause it may be well attributed. See J.E. Vol.V, p.309

have been mistaken, in the cause, but the knife that ^{he} thrust helped considerably in ^{all}alloging the pain and aided in the recovery. Emden certainly prevented the growth of irrational mysticism which if continued would have led to the complete moral debasement and decay of the Jewish people for the evil had spread its roots throughout the lands where Jews had settled.

If he had not been fanatical in his point of view, (as many claim he was) , he would have perhaps not have succeeded. He performed a service. The means he employed were perhaps to his hurt, unfortunately, but his work should be remembered. His contribution is perhaps too often forgotten.