56. Perhaps basil.
57. See the magic deed in the following *Chronicle* entry, replete with mystery and the uniting of the broken world.
99. In 1780 the Lord did the following deed.

A secret act

The Lord went to the woods to the Paradise and there the day before he gave an order to split down the middle a little oak that was growing facing the sun and whose branches were bent towards the sun. The next day he himself went out towards the dawn and ordered Franciszek Szymanowski and Dębowski to spread out that little oak and the Lord trod upon it three times with his right foot, always coming towards it from the right side. The Lord did this deed three times. The first time was the 26th of June; the 2nd, the 7th of March and the 21st 1780. The Lord said that that act was to repair the *bruch* [break, disaster]. Thereafter the Lord ordered to take a rock in the left hand, and after lighting a fire, to throw the rock at the roots of the little oak and entwine the little oak with twigs and to go away from there. This act he repeated, every time with a young oak.

58. Cf. Jeremiah 45:3, in BT Megillah 6b.
59. Cf. Genesis 31:40. The reading of the Hebrew as *va-tidar* for *va-tidad* suggests an error in the transcription of the Hebrew script rather than an oral/aural one.
60. I have not located the source of this saying; cf. BT Shabbat 88b and BT Yoma 72b.
61. Joseph Perl, *Megalleh Temirin* (Vienna, 1819).
62. Manuscript 6968 lacks *we wszystkim* (in every way).
63. The first occurrence of "the Holy Lord" here might refer to the "unknown Good God"; the second, to Frank himself (cf. "the Lord"), who was in fact heavily pock-marked.
64. Manuscript 6968 + Heb: *Eloho szolach malucho.*
65. Daniel 6:23; cf. dictum 324.
66. Written [17]94, clearly an error.
67. Daniel 2:38.
68. BT Shabbat 156a. Frank, on the basis of a rabbinic statement (which he takes to mean the virtual reverse of what was intended; see the talmudic passage), explains that the struggle that resulted in the change of Jacob's name in the Bible led to the captivity of Israel in Egypt.
69. As in dictum 1402 (only in Kraushar, *Jacob Frank and the Polish Frankists*, 2:88), where he describes the union of the Brothers and Sisters of the Company with their parallels in the world of the Big Brother as the "uniting of fire and water."

14

When a Rabbi Is Accused of Heresy

The Stance of Rabbi Jacob Joshua Falk in the Emden-Eibeschuetz Controversy

SID Z. LEIMAN

Introduction

Rabbi Jacob Joshua Falk was born in Cracow in 1681. A distinguished talmudist of noble lineage, he succeeded Rabbi Zvi Hirsch Ashkenazi (d. 1718) as Chief Rabbi of Lwow in 1718. Large numbers of students were attracted to his *yeshivah* in Lvov, and later to his *yeshivot* in Berlin, Metz, and Frankfurt. In 1739 at Amsterdam, the first volume of his magnum opus, *Penei Yehoshu'a*, appeared in print. A running commentary on the Talmud—largely defending Rashi against the strictures of Tosafot—it is studied to this day in all *yeshivot*. Falk served as Chief Rabbi of Frankfurt from 1742 until 1753. He was seventy years old—and serving in Frankfurt—when the Emden-Eibeschuetz controversy erupted in 1751. At the time, he was generally recognized as the *zeqan ha-dor*, the senior and most authoritative rabbi in an age of rabbinic titans.[1]

Strangely, Falk's stance in the Emden-Eibeschuetz controversy has been largely neglected by modern scholarship. Except for the brief comments by Graetz,[2] Kahana,[3] and others[4] in their general accounts of the controversy, no book, monograph, or scholarly study has focused specifically on Falk's role. Some key issues that need to be addressed include the following: What were Falk's objectives in his struggle against Eibeschuetz? What means did he employ in order to obtain those objectives? Specifically, what strategies did Falk employ in waging the war

against Eibeschuetz? Did Falk succeed? These issues—at least in the published literature—have never been raised, much less resolved. Indeed, the very framing of the questions is intended to set an agenda for scholars to pursue. Precisely because this is a pioneering investigation, whatever is said here is provisional at best. Moreover, due to constraints of time and space, the scope of this investigation is necessarily narrow and limited. Should others be stimulated to broaden and deepen the investigation, *ve-hayah zeh sekhari* (let that be my reward).

The Controversy

The Emden-Eibeschuetz controversy erupted on Thursday, February 4, 1751, when Rabbi Jacob Emden (d. 1776) announced at a private synagogue service held in his home that an amulet ascribed to the Chief Rabbi could only have been written by a secret believer in the false messiah, Shabbatai Zvi. The Chief Rabbi, Rabbi Jonathan Eibeschuetz (d. 1764), was a renowned talmudist who had served with distinction as rabbi, teacher, and preacher in Prague and Metz, prior to his assuming the post of Chief Rabbi of the triple community of Altona, Hamburg, and Wandsbeck in September 1750. Emden's announcement initiated what was perhaps the most explosive rabbinic controversy in the last three hundred years. The controversy would involve not only the leading rabbis of the eighteenth century, such as Ezekiel Landau (d. 1793) of Prague[5] and Elijah b. Solomon (d. 1797) of Vilna,[6] but also Christian scholars and foreign governments.[7] The controversy was widely reported in the newspaper and periodical literature of the time,[8] and continues to be a rich topic of investigation for modern scholarship.

Eibeschuetz, a distinguished kabbalist, wrote amulets to help ward off evil spirits, to protect those in danger—especially pregnant women—and to heal the sick. Indeed, as early as 1743, while serving as Chief Rabbi of Metz, he was widely known as a *ba'al shem*, a master of the secrets of the Kabbalah who wrote amulets.[9] In Metz itself, and throughout the surrounding Jewish communities of Alsace-Lorraine, Eibeschuetz wrote amulets. When he left Metz in 1750 and made his way northward through the Rhineland, he wrote and sold amulets in the various Jewish communities on the Rhine, including several in Frankfurt. Upon his arrival in Altona (which then belonged to the Kingdom of Denmark) and Hamburg (a free city in Germany) in September 1750, he had barely unpacked his bags when rumors were rife about the new Chief Rabbi's Sabbatean leanings. Apparently, some of the amulets written in Frankfurt were shown to leading rabbinic scholars in that city, who immediately designated them as Sabbatean in character. Letters from Frankfurt were sent to private individuals in Altona and Hamburg, warning them about the heretical leanings of their new Chief Rabbi. When these rumors came to Eibeschuetz's attention, he dismissed the charges as a recycling by his enemies of similar charges leveled against him in the 1720s. Eibeschuetz claimed they were false charges then, as they were now. Nonetheless, several members of the triple community were now alerted to a potential problem, and they decided to monitor Eibeschuetz's amulets to the extent possible. It did not take long before an amulet written by Eibeschuetz in Hamburg fell into their hands. It appeared to them to be Sabbatean in character, and they eventually consulted with Emden, who concurred. The Chief Rabbi denied that he wrote the amulet in question. The triple community was once again rife with rumors. Matters came to a head when Emden was summoned to a meeting with representatives of the Jewish council of the triple community in Altona on Tuesday, February 2, 1751. A second meeting was scheduled for the following Thursday; it never convened. Emden realized at the first meeting that he was going up against a stacked deck of cards; the triple community was intent on vindicating its Chief Rabbi. And so Emden decided to go public on that fateful Thursday morning. The scheduled meeting, of course, was canceled. The next day, Friday, the Jewish council officially disbanded the private synagogue service that had convened in Emden's home for almost twenty years. Shortly thereafter, Emden was placed under house arrest; all social contact with Emden was banned. He was notified that within six months he would have to leave Altona permanently. That very Friday, Emden's last day as a free citizen in Altona, he managed to send out letters to several of the leading rabbinic authorities of the time. Each received a synopsis of the events that had occurred—similar to the summary presented here—and an urgent plea for aid. One of the letters was addressed to Rabbi Jacob Joshua Falk of Frankfurt.[10]

Options in the Controversy

What to do about Eibeschuetz was the prime issue for most of European Jewry in 1751. For many, the issue was one of establishing Eibeschuetz's innocence or guilt. Evidence needed to be gathered, examined, and

weighed by a rabbinic court, after which a decision would be rendered and the matter laid to rest once and for all. This was not the case for Emden, Landau, Falk, and others. Their minds were made up early in the fray: Eibeschuetz was guilty.[11] The key issue for them was establishing a strategy. How do you bring Eibeschuetz down without destroying rabbinic Judaism in the process? How do you depose, arguably, the leading talmudist (certainly so in number of students) of the eighteenth century—who will surely turn to his disciples in a moment of need—without risking a civil war whose devastating effects may in fact lead to victory for the forces of Sabbateanism? A variety of options needed to be considered, none of them particularly pleasant.

Option A: The Emden Approach

Emden opted for confrontation with Eibeschuetz from the beginning to the end of the controversy. His single-minded goal was to "defrock" and depose Eibeschuetz. For Emden, Eibeschuetz—even if he repented—could never again serve as rabbi, *darshan* (preacher), or *rosh yeshivah* (head of a talmudic academy).[12] A rabbi who is simultaneously a confirmed Sabbatean can never again be trusted to hold public office. The means toward attaining the goal was sustained and unrelenting frontal attack. The scandal was to be kept in the headlines at all times. Any means could be used to bring Eibeschuetz down: yellow journalism, slander, protests, informing the governmental authorities, and, of course, the wielding of rabbinic power. Emden placed Eibeschuetz under the ban, as well as Eibeschuetz's family and his disciples. Emden accused any rabbi who wrote a letter in defense of Eibeschuetz of either being a Sabbatean or an acceptor of bribes.

Emden, however, was his own worst enemy. He kept tripping over himself. Among his more egregious claims: Eibeschuetz was an *am ha-areṣ* (ignoramus), and he, Emden, was a better public preacher than Eibeschuetz.[13] These and other ridiculous claims led to total loss of credibility on Emden's part. They did more to shore up Eibeschuetz's innocence than anything Eibeschuetz could have claimed on his own behalf. Emden was a loose cannon, to say the least. Sober-minded rabbis distanced themselves from him.

Option B: The Landau Approach

Two rabbis, Ezekiel Landau and Mordecai of Duesseldorf (d. 1770), foresaw much that would transpire.[14] Early on, they warned the anti-Eibeschuetz forces that any frontal attack on Eibeschuetz was doomed

to failure. They stressed that Eibeschuetz was articulate, bold, and influential in governmental circles. He could not be defeated. He could, however, be neutralized. The only strategy worth pursuing was a strategy of neutralization. All rabbis in Europe would be asked to sign a general ban against any and all forms of Sabbatean belief. Eibeschuetz, as one of the leading *gedolei ha-dor* (rabbinic authorities of the era), would be among the first rabbis asked to sign the ban. Given the present set of circumstances, this would be an offer he could not refuse. Indeed, given the accusations that had been leveled against him, even more could be demanded of him. He must publicly denounce belief in Shabbatai Zvi, and in any and all Sabbatean writings, especially those Sabbatean writings ascribed to Eibeschuetz himself. He must agree to withdraw all his amulets from circulation, and to never write amulets again. The rationale here was simple: once Eibeschuetz was cleansed of Sabbatean connections, he would be identified publicly only by his Torah teaching, which was great indeed. What he really believed in the deep recesses of his heart was a matter between Eibeschuetz and God. This was a brilliant approach; it also provided Eibeschuetz with a graceful exit from the controversy. It failed only because Emden and, more importantly, Falk were relentless in their pursuit of Eibeschuetz.

Option C: The Falk Approach

The most distinguished member of the anti-Eibeschuetz forces was neither Emden, nor Rabbi Samuel Hilman Heilprin (d. 1765) of Metz,[15] nor Rabbi Aryeh Leib (d. 1755) of Amsterdam.[16] While they led the battle against Eibeschuetz in its opening stages, they eventually gave way to Rabbi Jacob Joshua Falk of Frankfurt. From April 1751 until his death on January 16, 1756, Falk directed the campaign against Eibeschuetz. A clever strategist, he began by forging a coalition of German rabbis. The goal was to isolate Eibeschuetz, and then force him to appear before a Jewish court of law. There, he would either be vindicated or found guilty. If found guilty, he could be rehabilitated—meaning that Eibeschuetz would be given the opportunity to repent, to express genuine regret for the sins of his past, and to accept upon himself the penance prescribed by the court. If rehabilitated, he could serve once more as Chief Rabbi, *darshan*, and *rosh yeshivah*. If defrocked, he could never again serve as rabbi, preacher, or teacher anywhere in the world.

Falk's approach was a principled one. It was predicated on the principle that there can be no duplicity in a *gadol be-yisrael* (rabbinic authority). A *gadol be-yisrael* who is also a secret Sabbatean must either

be rehabilitated or defrocked. Falk, in effect, distanced himself from the Emden approach, which offered no possibility of rehabilitation on the part of Eibeschuetz, even as he distanced himself from the Landau approach, which—by focusing on outer form rather than inner conviction—did not require genuine repentance on the part of Eibeschuetz.

Eibeschuetz, for his part, rejected the Emden approach out of hand. He welcomed the Landau approach and implemented all its stipulations with alacrity.[17] With regard to the Falk approach, he apparently was in no hurry to make a court appearance. Instead, he chose to engage in a battle of wits against Falk and his rabbinic coalition.

The rationale for Falk's position was poignantly argued in a broadside published by Rabbi Aryeh Leib of Amsterdam in 1752.[18] It was a public response to a group of rabbis who defended Eibeschuetz by explaining away the amulets, and who expressed concern for the *kevod ha-torah* (honor accorded to the Torah learning) of rabbinic scholars and the *ḥillul ha-Shem* (profaning of the name of God) if the controversy would be allowed to continue. Every word of the broadside against Eibeschuetz's defenders was approved by Falk, who as commander-in-chief of the anti-Eibeschuetz forces made a point of editing every broadside before it could be published.[19]

The text reads in part:

ידעתי גם ידעתי שחכמים גדולים כמותם יודעים האמת לאמתו, אך שהם רוצים בתקנתו, אמנם תקנתם גופו והדרתו ולא תקנתם רוחו ונשמתו, לא כן אנחנו, אנו רוצים בתקנתו תיקון נפשו ונשמתו, וישב על כסא כבודו וגדולתו, אך בשובו מרשעתו ויודה על האמת ויקבל עליו שלא ישוב לכסלתו, ואז טוב לו אחרית דבר מראשיתו, וזה הוא כל מגמת כוונתינו להעמיד הדת על תלה ולהיות לכלנו שפה אחת ודברים אחדים, לייחד ולקדש שמו הגדול הנערץ בקדושתו . . . . סוף דבר חכמים ונבונים כמותם יודעים ומבינים תוכן הענינים, אך שרוצים לחוס עליו, ומלבשים הענין שעושים לשם שמים שלא להרבות מחלוקת בישראל ומפני חלול השם.

I know well that great scholars such as yourselves know the truth of the matter. You even want to rehabilitate him. But you have rehabilitated his body and outer appearance, not his spirit and soul. Not so for us. We want to rehabilitate his spirit and soul. Let him retain his seat of glory and greatness, but only if he turns from his wickedness, admits the truth, and resolves never to return to his folly. Then the end of the matter will be better for him than its beginning. This is our only concern: to reestablish our Faith on its mound, so that we all share one language and the same words, in order to unify and

sanctify the Great Name of the One held in awe due to His sanctity. . . . The bottom line: scholars such as yourselves know full well the essence of the matter. But you wish to take pity on him, and you cover up the matter by claiming that what you do is for the sake of Heaven, in order to contain divisiveness in Israel and prevent the desecration of [God's] Name.

Falk's Role in the Controversy

Long before the outbreak of the controversy, Falk was known for his ability to battle and contain Sabbateanism. In 1722, while serving as rabbi of Lvov, he excommunicated all Sabbateans in a public ceremony.[20] In 1725, he presided over judicial proceedings that allowed penitent Sabbateans to return to normative Judaism. One of the penitents, a distinguished rabbi, informed Falk as follows:

גיבט איין עצה, וואש טוט מען איך וויש בידיעה ברורה דש ר' יונתן איזט ראש לכולם.

Please provide advice: What shall we do? I know with certainty that Reb Yonasan [Eibeschuetz] is the head of all of them [the Sabbateans].[21]

Falk, then, had reason to suspect Eibeschuetz as early as 1725. In that same year, the leading rabbis (including David Oppenheim[22] [d. 1736] of Prague, Ezekiel Katzenellenbogen[23] [d. 1749] of Altona, and Jacob Cohen Poppers[24] [d. 1740] of Frankfurt) established a policy that all Sabbateans had to be either rehabilitated or excommunicated. With regard to those Sabbateans who opted for rehabilitation, the policy was that they could be rehabilitated only in the presence of three *geonei ereṣ rabbanim mefursamim* (master talmudists who are also prominent rabbis).[25] Falk applied this policy to Eibeschuetz. Not only would Eibeschuetz have to appear in a Jewish court of law; it would have to be in a court consisting of three distinguished *geonim*—and presided over by none other than Falk himself.[26]

It is one matter to have a policy; it is quite another matter to implement it. Initially, Falk refused to enter the fray. He refused to respond to Emden's urgent plea at the start of the controversy (see above).[27] Doubtless, he understood it was a no-win situation. After several months of disarray, which saw virtually all the rabbis in Europe under excommunication (for supporting either Emden or Eibeschuetz), calls came from all quarters that Falk, as *zeqan ha-dor*

and a tried and tested Sabbatean-buster, end the stalemate and restore order.[28] His strategy was one of diplomacy, resolve, and gradual escalation of rabbinic power, as necessary. In brief, he did the following over a five-year period:

1. He sent private messages (via third parties) to Eibeschuetz, asking that Eibeschuetz contact him. Eibeschuetz did not respond.[29]

2. He published a missive, calling for the accused party to appear before a rabbinic court. He deliberately made no mention of Eibeschuetz's name in this public missive. Eibeschuetz did not respond.[30]

3. He addressed a private message directly to Eibeschuetz, asking that Eibeschuetz contact him. Eibeschuetz did not respond.[31]

4. In the summer of 1751, Falk printed as a broadside his private message addressed directly to Eibeschuetz. The letter indicated for all to see that if Eibeschuetz were to refuse to appear before a rabbinic court, Falk would rally rabbis the world over and appropriate action would follow.[32]

With this public threat, Falk finally caught Eibeschuetz's attention. What followed was a battle of titans—Falk and Eibeschuetz—which ended only with Falk's death in 1756.

At the height of the controversy, on Second Adar 6, 5513 (March 12, 1753), with Eibeschuetz still refusing to appear in a court of Jewish law, Falk called for Eibeschuetz to be defrocked. He did so in a letter addressed to the *keṣinim, parnasim, u-manhigim* (lay leadership) of Altona, Hamburg, and Wandsbeck.[33] The letter, published here for the first time, reads:

וורמיישא יום ב' ויו אדר שני תקי"ג לפ"ק

אליכם אישים חכמי חרשים שלומכן יסגא לחדא, ה"ה האלופים רוזנים קצינים פרנסים ומנהיגים בג' קהלות אה"ו יע"א.
ולכבוד הדיינים המופלגים וכל לומדי התורה וליחידי סגולה היראים והחרדים לדבר ה', דברי שלום ואמת.
הנה מראשית כזאת הודעתי אתכם זה כמה פעמים ליסר ולהוכיח אתכם על אודות האב"ד שלכם הנקרא ר' יונתן אייבשיץ, שהסית והדיח את רבים מבני עמינו מאמונתינו האמתית ומהדת המאושר לאמונה הכוזבת ולהדת המשוקץ והמגועל, והיא האמונה והדת של שק"צי צבי ימ"ש ונימח זכורו, שכבר נשתקע שמו ואבד זכרו מן העולם. זה יותר משלושים שנה על ידינו במדינת פולין, שהוחרמו ונתנדו בשנת תפ"ב לפ"ק בק"ק זאלקווי ע"י שבעה רבנים ושבעה שופרות וכבוי נרות בחרם הגדול הכתוב בס' כל בו, ועל כל פרק ופרק חדש וחדש מזל ומזל תקעו שברים ותרועה, וכל העם בקיבוץ גדול ותינוקות של בית רבן ענו אחריהן אמן, ויזעקו אל אלקים בקול

גדול ובכי גדולה עד למרום, וכמה וכמה פושעים וחטאים מכת הארורה הזאת עמדו אתנו על הבמה, וגם המה התוודו על עוונם בבכי ובזעקה גדולה ומרה ואמרו כזאת וכזאת עשינו, כפי סדור הנוסחא שסדרנו, ולאחר יציאת מבהכנ"ס י"ז בתמוז בשתא ההיא הוכרחו לנהוג בעצמם דיני אבלות ונידוי שבעה ושלושים ככל דיני המנודה ואבל, זולת שאר עונשין ונזיפות אשר יצא מאתנו ז' הרבנים, ואנא ברישא, שהייתי אב"ד דק"ק לבוב והגליל בעת ההיא. וכמו כן נעשה בכמה ק"ק שבמדינות פולין ע"י המנוח הגאון המפורסם בתורה וחסידות מוהר"ר אלעזר זלה"ה שהיה אב"ד בק"ק אמשטרדם, ומשם נסע לארץ הקדושה מנוחתו כבוד. וגם הרב המאה"ג הגאון המפורסם מוהר"ר אריה ליב נר"ן אב"ד דק"ק אמשטרדם החזיקו על ידינו בכל מקומות ממשלתם.
ובשנת תפ"ה החזיקו על ידינו שלשה מוסדי ארץ במדינות אשכנז, ה"ה הרב המנוח הגאון המפורסם מוהר"ר יעקב כהן זלה"ה שהיה אב"ד בקהילת פפד"מ, והמנוח הגאון המפורסם מר"ה יחזקאל זלה"ה שהיה מרא אתרא דלכון, והגאון המנוח מוהר"ר אברהם זלה"ה שהיה אב"ד בקהילת אמשטרדם. ומימים ההם והלאה שקטה הארץ קצת במדינות פולין ובמדינות אשכנז כמבואר הכל באר היטב בקונטרס הנדפס מחדש הנקרא חויא דרבנן. ולא נשאר מכת הרשעים ארורים שמחזיקים באמונת הש"ץ ודתו ימ"ש כ"א מעט מזעיר שעשו מעשיהם בחשאי, ואחר הדלת והמזוזה שמו זכרונם, עד שבא האב"ד שלכם והחזיר הטומאה ישינה ליושנה כטומאה רצוצה שבוקעת ועולה, עד שקבץ בער"ה כמה וכמה תלמידים שאינם הגונים לאין מספר שהחזיקו על ידו, וכמעט שיצא דבריהם בפומבי ולא היה כח ביד גדולי הדור לעונשם על ככה כל זמן שלא היה בירור גמור, עד שזה לערך עשר שנים נתגלה לי הדבר ע"י תכריך מחבילות של שטרי הדיוטות וספרי מינות שהיה בין אב"ד שלכם הנ"ל ובין ליבל פרוסטיץ ימ"ש, ודברי אפיקורסות ומינות שלא נמצא כמוהם לרעה מיום הוסדה הארץ, ובתוכם נזכר הקונטרס ואבוא היום אל העיון, וכל זה מסר לידי הגאב"ד דק"ק פיורדא ה"ה מוהר"ר דוד שטרויס נר"ו שהיה אז אחד מדייני מומחה בק"ק פפ"ד, זולת מה שהגיד לי פא"פ ע"י כמה ברורים שר' יונתן הנזכר לא נמצא מין ואפיקורס כמוהו, וכמו כן הגיד לי בשנה דאשתקיד, כדברים האלה הגיד לי פא"פ הרב הגאון הישיש מר"ה משה נר"ו אב"ד דמדינת מאגענצא, וגם הגאון אב"ד במדינת שוואבאך ה"ה מוהר"ר העשיל נר"ו, מלבד מה שהריצו אגרותיהם אל הרבנים מוהר"ר דוד ומוהר"ר העשיל הנ"ל באלו הימים. ותכריך גדול של שטרות מסר לידי הרב המופלג מוהר"ר נפתלי הירץ נר"ו אב"ד בקהילת מערגטום והגלילות, ממה שהגיע לידו מכתבי המנוח הגאון המפורסם מוהר"ר יעקב כהן זלה"ה שהיה אב"ד בקהילת פפ"ד.
וכל זה היה בתחילת ביאת האב"ד שלכם לקהילת מיץ, שקלקל שם ג"כ בעניני התפילין בחה"מ, ושאר דברים כיוצא באלו, עד שעוררתי עליו בקול גדול הגאון המנוח מר"ה יחזקאל זלה"ה שהיה מרא אתרא דלכון, ולגאון המפורסם מוהר"ר אריה ליב נר"ו אב"ד בקהילת אמשטרדם, ולשארי רבנים, והשיבו לי בכתבם ששניהם לדבר אחד נתכוונו לאמר שבקי לרוויא דמנפשיה נפלי, כולי האי ואולי יתבררו הדברים בבירור יותר גמור, ומאז החזרתי כמה כתבים מהנ"ל למרי קמאי. ולכן כאשר האב"ד שלכם ראה שלא מיחו בידו גדולי הדור החזיק בטומאתו ואמר מי

אדון לי מאחר שנתקיימו לו הבטחות ליב פרוסטיץ ימ״ש, שהבטיח אותו שנתגלה לו בחזיון לילה משיח שלהם שק״צי צבי ואמר לו שבעת כאשר יתגדל שם ר׳ יונתן למעלה אזי מתוך כך יתגדל שם ש״ץ ימ״ש, ואז יתהפכו שמותיו ויקרא צבי שק״צי, כאשר נמצא בכתבים הנזכרים ע״פ עדים ברורים שנגבו בכמה בתי דינין במדינות מעהרין, ה״ה הגאון המנוח המפורסם מוהר״ר ישכר בעריש י״ץ אב״ד דק״ק ניקלשבורג והגאון המפורסם מוהר״ר הילמן נר״ו שהיה אב״ד בקהילת קרעמזיר בעת ההיא, וגלל כן נמצא בכמה קמיעות בתחילתן כתב שק״צי צבי ובסוף כתב צבי שק״צי. וגלל כן ג״כ התחיל ר׳ יונתן הנ״ל לעשות יותר בפומבי להקל בד׳ תעניות ולכתוב כמה וכמה קמיעות לאין מספר, שכולם כתובים על שם ש״ץ ימ״ש. ובתוכם כתב בפירוש יתגדל ויתקדש בבתי הבי בעולם, והרבה מינות ואפיקורסות כיוצא באלו, אלא שבכל זה עדיין לא נתגלו הדברים על בורין מאחר שהקמיעות תפורין בנרתיקן ומכוסין, עד שזה לערך שלשה שנים נתגלה ענין הקמיעות בבירור גמור, שע״י שנפתח אחת מהן נפתחו כולם, ונמצאו בכולן דברי שקוצים וגילולים מינות ואפיקורסות, ועי״כ כתבתי לו אג״ש המתחיל בחרוז השוכן בשמי מרומים, שכבר נדפס מחדש דברי האגרת לבדו, וגם מה שנדפסו כמה וכמה קמיעות בכרך קטן, ואף שעיקר הדפוס לא נעשה על ידי, מ״מ הקמיעות ההם ברור כשמש שיוצאין מתחת ידו וביחודאותן חמשה קמיעות המקוימים משתי נאמני הקהילה בקהילת מיץ, מלבד כמה וכמה קמיעות שכתב בקהילת פפ״ד מידי עברו דרך שם, וכולן כאחד מקרא בלתי טהור שנזכר בהם שם התועב ש״ץ ימ״ש, ועל כל אלה הוכחתיו בתוכחת מגולה באג״ש הנזכר, ולא השבני דבר או חצי דבר.

נמצא שעניני הקמיעות אינן אלא גילוי מלתא בעלמא, שנתגלה עונו ונתגלה קץ וזמן לזמר עריץ ולהכרית החוחים והקוצים המינים והאפיקורסים הנוטים אחר אמונת ש״ץ ודתו ימ״ש, עד שבאמת משום כך נתפרסמו עניני הקונטרס ואבוא היום אל העיון וחיבור אילת אהבים של שיר השירים וכוונות תקיעות שופר וכוונות מגילת אסתר שכולם חיבור אחד לטומאה וכולם מלאים חרופים וגדופים ממש כפירת כל התורה כולה, כאשר נתגלה לי זה עשר שנים ע״י הרב הגאון מוהר״ר חיים כהן אב״ד דק״ק לבוב, ועכשיו נתברר יותר ע״י כמה וכמה רבנים מובהקים במדינות פולין שנתאספו יחד ביומא דשוקא בק״ק בראד בחודש חשון העבר, ולכן יצאנו לקראתו בכתבים הקודמים בשנה דאשתקד וגם עתה מקרוב להודיע לכם מה שעשינו בענין זה נעשה הכל בהסכמות ממש כל רבני אשכנז ופולין. הלא זה הדבר אשר דברנו שהאב״ד שלכם הטה את לב המלך ושריו באומרו שרוב הקהילות והלומדים עומדים על צדו, ובאמת לא נמצא אפילו שנים או שלשה גרגרים מרבנים מובהקים שיעמדו על צדו, כ״א רבים מהאספסוף מכת הארורה הנזכרים הנגררים אחריו, ומהם רבים שהמה ממיודעיו וממשפחתו כאשר כתבתי באריכות, שכבר הגיע השעה להודפו ולרודפו עד חובה, לולי שעשינו לכבוד המלכות ה״ה המלך האדיר והחסיד יר״ה, שכל כוונתו ומגמתו להשתיק הריב ולעשות שלום בגבולכם, ולכן כתבתי שגם אנו פותחין לו בשלום להזהירו עוד בהתראה אחרונה ע״י מיודעיו או ע״י נאמני הקהילה. וכהיום שהגיע לעינו, שכבר נעשה המעשה שנמסר לו ההתראה ע״י שני נאטאריוס ומתוך תשובתו ניכר שעדיין עמד במרדו ואינו משגיח כלל לדברי חכמי גאוני דורינו,

לכן אנחנו עומדים על דעתינו ולדברינו כמו שכתבתי, שכללו של דבר הכל הולך אחר החתום ולמדין משטה אחרונה שכל זמן שלא יקבל עליו האב״ד שלכם לקיים מה שנפסק עליו ולשוב בתשובה שלימה רצויה וברורה, הרי הוא כא׳ מהמינין והאפיקורסין לכל דבר, כמבואר בכתבים הקודמים מאתנו, ויש בכלל זה שהוא מוחרם ומנודה ומובדל ומופרש מכל קדושת ישראל, ואין צריך לומר שיוסר המצנפת הטהור מעל ראשו להורות שום דבר הנוגע באיסור והיתר ולדרוש ברבים ובכל דברים השייכים לנימוסי הדת שלנו, רק שלא יחרימו אותו בפירסום בפועל בלתי רשיון משרי ויועצי המלך, וכ״ש שלא יעשו אותו כלה לדחותו על שעה א׳ בשתי ידים, וכולי האי ואולי יכניע את ערפו הקשה לטוב לו כל הימים, לעקור מקום קביעת מקומו מקהלתכם וילך עם כל בני ביתו כמאן דביש ליה בהאי מתא אזל למתא אחריתא, ששינוי המקום יגרום לשוב בתשובה שלימה כמ״ש הרמב״ם ז״ל בהל׳ תשובה, וגם בכל מקומות אשר יקבע מקום דירתו יקבל ויאסר על עצמו שלא לנהוג שום רבנות ועניני הוראה על כמה וכמה שנים אשר יורו לו חכמי גאוני דורינו, וכשיקבל עליו כנ״ל חלילה לכם לעשות לו שום דבר ביזוי, וכ״ש שלא לשלוח בו יד, והלואי שיצא מעצמו לזמן הנראה בעיניכם, שהוא מההכרח לצאת מקהלתכם, ואם יהי׳ מהצורך ליתן לו צדה לדרך איזה סך קצוב, וכ״ש מהשכירות והכנסות שמגיע לו עד כלות משך ימי שטר הרבנות, ובכל זה נכנסנו עמו הרבה לפנים משורת הדין כיון דבר אוריין ובר אבוהן הוא.

אמנם על אלו המכעיסים מאנשי זרוע שבקהילתכם שאפילו בפתחו של גהינם אינן חוזרין בתשובה מחמת איזה ניצוח שלהם ומחמת אונאות ממון, ועי״כ גורמין המחלוקת בקהילתכם ובשאר קהילות כאשר עשו עד הנה, הללו אין להם כפרה כלל, ועל קצינים פרנסים ומנהיגים והאלופים הדיינים שבקהילתכם מוטל להתרות בהם עוד הפעם, שאם לא ישובו מדרכם הרעה יחרימו אותן בפועל ולעשות בהם שפטים גדולים כראוי ונכון בעיניהם, ואף לקונסם בקנס עצום ומסוים חצי למלך יר״ה וחצי לאיזה דבר טוב וכשתתנהגו ככל הדברים האלה הרי אתם מופקעים מהחרמות ושמתות ונידוים, וכ״ש אותן אנשים שהיו מצדו להתגבר במחלוקת וע״י גזרתינו חזרו בתשובה להכיר את בוראם, וגם המה מופקעים מכל החרמות ושמתות ונידוים שיצאו מפי גאוני דורינו בכל משך שנים שעברו, וכל הקללות והארורים יתהפכו לברכה אי קיימי בהמנותייהו ולא יחזרו לסורם ח״ו, ויקבלו תשובה שלימה לפני המקום כל אחד לפי ענינו כאשר יורו להם דייני ולומדי קהילתכם את הדרך אשר ילכו בה, ולא בדרך כפיה ח״ו כ״א לצאת י״ח שמים. ומעתה תתנהגו בשלום אהבה ואחוה וריעות והראשונות לא תזכרנה עוד, ירב לכם הרבה זכויות שזכיתם לכם, שעל ידכם תתבטל ותתעקר הטומאה רצוצה של ש״ץ ימ״ש, ומה רב טוב הצפון לכם לצדיקים, וכ״ש לבעלי תשובה דעבדי תשובה מעלי ושכרכם יהיה כפול מן השמים, וה׳ ישלח ברכה והצלחה באסמיכם ובכל משלח ידכם עד ביאת הגואל צדק שיבוא במהרה בימינו אמן.

כ״ד החותם לכבוד המקום ולכבוד תורתנו הקדושה ולטובת כל אחינו בני ישראל, ובהסכמת גאוני חכמי דורינו, הצעיר יעקב יושע קראקא, פה ק״ק ורמייזא, ומצפה לתשועת ה׳ להוציא מחשבה לפועל לשבת בא״י תוב״א.

Worms, Monday, 6 Second Adar, 5513

To the wise lay leaders of the triple community, Altona, Hamburg, and Wandsbeck, may God protect it, and may he grant you increased well-being, and to the distinguished judges and all the Torah scholars, and to those exceptional individuals who fear the word of God, words of peace and truth.

I have previously warned you on many occasions regarding your Chief Rabbi, who is called Rabbi Jonathan Eibeschuetz, and who has enticed and led astray many Jews from the true faith to the false and abominable belief, the religion of Shabbatai Zvi, may his name and apparition be blotted out. His name has already receded and his memory has been blotted out from the world.

More than thirty years have passed since we placed [all Sabbateans] under the ban in Zolkiew, Poland, in the year 1722, in the presence of seven rabbis with seven ram's horns, and by means of extinguishing candles, as is prescribed for the great ban in *Sefer Kol Bo*.[34] At the end of each paragraph of the text used in the ceremony, and at the mention of each month and sign of the zodiac, they sounded the ram's horn. All the Jews gathered in large numbers, and the school children responded "Amen." They cried out to God in a loud voice, even unto the heavens. Many of the sinners from the accursed sect stood with us on the platform. They too confessed their sins, crying out loudly and bitterly, saying, "Such and such have we done," according to the fixed text that we formulated. When we left the synagogue on the seventeenth day of Tammuz in that year, we required the penitents to practice the law of mourning and of being placed under the ban, whether for seven or thirty days, aside from the other punishments meted out by us, the seven rabbis. I presided [over the ceremonies], serving at the time as Chief Rabbi of Lwow and environs. Similar action was taken in various communities throughout Poland by the late Gaon, renowned for his Torah and piety, Rabbi Eleazar, who [later] served as Chief Rabbi of Amsterdam.[35] From there he traveled to the Holy Land, where he rests in peace.[36] So too the distinguished Gaon, Rabbi Aryeh Leib, [the present] Chief Rabbi of Amsterdam, took similar action in the communities under his control.[37]

In 1725, three "pillars of the earth" in Germany took similar action. They were the late renowned Gaon, Rabbi Jacob Kohen, Chief Rabbi of Frankfurt;[38] the late renowned Gaon, Rabbi Ezekiel, who served as your Chief Rabbi;[39] and the late Gaon, Rabbi Abraham,

Chief Rabbi of Amsterdam.[40] From then on, the Jewish communities of Poland and Germany found some respite [from the Sabbatean threat]. All this is recorded explicitly in the recently reprinted broadside called *Ḥivya de-Rabbanan*.[41] Only a few members of the accursed sect remained who still believed in Shabbatai Zvi and his teaching, a small number who practiced their deeds in secret, behind closed doors. That is, until your Chief Rabbi came and restored the old impurity, causing it to rise once again. He gathered together unworthy disciples who supported him. They almost went public, yet the rabbinic leaders of the generation could not punish them as long as the evidence was less than clear. Approximately ten years ago, however, it was all revealed to me when I discovered a cache of letters and heretical manuscripts that formed the correspondence between your Chief Rabbi and Leibel Prosstitz [*sic*],[42] may his name be blotted out. These were heretical works without parallel since the world was created. Mentioned in these writings was the [heretical] tract, *Va-Avo ha-Yom el ha-Iyyun*.[43] All this was given over to me by the Chief Rabbi of Fuerth, Rabbi David Strauss,[44] who at the time served as a judge on the rabbinic court of Frankfurt. This, aside from what he told me orally, based on much investigation, that there is no other heretic the like of Rabbi Jonathan. So too he informed me last year. I heard similar comments, face to face, from the elderly Gaon, Rabbi Moses, Chief Rabbi of Mayence,[45] and from the Gaon, Rabbi Heschel, Chief Rabbi of Schwabach.[46] This, aside from letters sent at that time to the above mentioned Rabbi David and Rabbi Heschel. Moreover, the distinguished Rabbi Naftali Hertz of Mergentheim[47] presented me with a large cache of letters that he had gotten from the archive of his father-in-law, the late renowned Gaon, Rabbi Jacob Kohen, who served as Chief Rabbi of Frankfurt.

All this took place at the start of your Chief Rabbi's tenure in Metz, where he fouled up with regard to the wearing of *tefillin* on *ḥol ha-mo'ed* and other such issues.[48] I complained bitterly to the late Gaon Rabbi Ezekiel, who was your Rabbi, and to the renowned Gaon, Rabbi Aryeh Leib, Chief Rabbi of Amsterdam, and to other rabbis, calling for a protest on their part. They replied in writing, both coming to the same conclusion: "Leave a drunkard to his own devices, he will fall by himself."[49] Would that were to happen; if not, perhaps more persuasive evidence will come to light. At that time, I returned much of the written material to its original owner.

When your Chief Rabbi saw that no protest came forth from the leading rabbis of the generation, he became firm in his impurity, saying, "Who can lord it over me?" Moreover, [he believed that] the predictions of Leib Prosstitz, may his name be blotted out, came true. Leib assured Rabbi Jonathan that their Messiah, Shabbatai Zvi, had appeared to him in a vision at night. The Messiah informed him that when Rabbi Jonathan's name would become great on high, the Messiah's name would also become great, at which point his name will be reversed, and he will be called Zvi Shabbatai. So according to the above mentioned writings,[50] as attested by trustworthy witnesses whose testimony was recorded in the Jewish courts of Moravia, under the aegis of the late renowned Gaon, Rabbi Issachar Berish, Chief Rabbi of Nikolsburg,[51] and the renowned Gaon, Rabbi Hilman, who at the time was Chief Rabbi of Kremsier.[52] That is why some [of his] amulets open with Shabbatai Zvi and close with Zvi Shabbatai. [Due to the lack of rabbinic protest,] Rabbi Jonathan began to go more public [with Sabbatean practices], treating lightly the four fasts and writing countless amulets, all invoking the name of Shabbatai Zvi, may his name be blotted out. In them he wrote explicitly, "May the name of BBTY HBY[53] become great and sanctified in the world," and other such heresies. But none of this became open knowledge because the amulets were sewn into their cover and hidden away [from the naked eye]. Some three years ago the matter of the amulets became open knowledge when one of the amulets was opened, which led to all the amulets being opened. Abomination, filth, and heresy were found in all of them. So I addressed a "letter of peace" to him, beginning with the words, "He who resides in the heavens on high."[54] It has recently been published separately [as a broadside].[55] So too many of the amulets have been published in a small pamphlet[56]—even though I had nothing to do with its publication—and it is clear as the sun that he wrote them. This is especially true regarding the five amulets notarized by the two official notaries of the Jewish community of Metz.[57] Aside from this, he wrote numerous amulets as he passed through the Jewish community of Frankfurt. All of them contain impure texts and invoke the abominable Shabbatai Zvi, may his name be blotted out. Regarding all this, I chastised him in the above mentioned "letter of peace." He replied with neither a word nor half a word.

It is evident, then, that the amulets merely make public what was always known. His sins have been revealed, [and] so too the time

has come to extirpate the wicked and to cut off the thorns and thistles, i.e., the heretics who believe in Shabbatai Zvi and his teaching. Truthfully, due to the amulets, the existence of the treatises titled *Va-Avo ha-Yom el ha-Iyyun*, *Ayyelet Ahavim* on Song of Songs, *Kavvanot Teqi'ot Shofar*, and *Kavvanot Megillat Ester* became public knowledge.[58] They combine to form a single book of impurity. All these treatises are replete with blasphemy, a denial of the Torah in its entirety. All this was already revealed to me some ten years ago by the Gaon, Rabbi Ḥayyim Kohen, Chief Rabbi of Lwow.[59] Now it has become even clearer on the basis of the discussion of numerous distinguished rabbis in Poland, who convened on market day, last Ḥeshvan, in Brody.[60] Therefore, we confronted him with our earlier missives sent out last year, and now again more recently, making sure to inform you that whatever we have done in this matter was done with the full consent of all the rabbis in Germany and Poland. We have already informed you that your Chief Rabbi misled the King and his officers when he claimed that the majority of Jewish communities and Jewish scholars support him. In fact, not even two or three distinguished rabbis support him. His supporters come from the masses who are members of the accursed sect, many being associates of his and members of his family. I have written about this at length. The time has come to run him out of the community. We are restrained only by the honor due the Crown, the mighty and pious King, may his glory increase.[61] His only concern has been to contain the controversy and to restore peace in your community. That is why I wrote that our opening position [to Rabbi Jonathan] was one of peace, issuing him a final warning via his associates or the communal authorities.

He has now seen our summons and warning, and the deed is done, for two notaries delivered it to him. From his response, it is evident that he is still a rebel, and is not concerned at all about the words of the wise Geonim of our generation. We therefore stand by our decision and words, as already recorded. The rule is: all follows the closing section, and one learns from the last line. So long as your Chief Rabbi refuses to follow the legal decision that was rendered regarding him, and so long as he does not genuinely repent, he is considered a heretic for all purposes, as spelled out in our writings. This includes: he is placed under the ban, and separated from all that is holy in Israel. There is no need to mention that the holy headdress will be removed from his head. He is banned from deciding

any issue of Jewish law pertaining to what is prohibited or permitted. He may not preach in public or participate in any matter pertaining to Jewish law and practice. He may not, however, be banned in a public ceremony, until proper authorization from the royal authorities is obtained. He surely may not be forcibly removed from office. Would that this works! Perhaps he will bend his stiff neck for his own eternal benefit, and will leave your community, moving away together with his entire family. For one who fares poorly in one place should move away to another; the change of place will lead him to genuine repentance, as Maimonides has written in "Hilkhot Teshuvah."[62] Wherever he settles, he must vow and agree not to serve as a rabbi or decisor of Jewish law for as many years as the rabbis of our generation determine. Once he agrees to the above, he may not be abused in any manner, and certainly not harmed physically. Would that he leaves of his own accord, within a time frame acceptable to you! It is essential that he leave your community. If it is necessary to provide him with provisions for his journey, this should be done. Certainly, he should receive whatever monies are owed him for the remainder of his rabbinic contract. Regarding all these matters, we have ruled leniently, and not applied the letter of the law, for he is a rabbinic scholar and of noble lineage.

Regarding those hot-headed members of the community who are prone to using strong-arm tactics either to assure victory or for monetary gain—who would not repent even when faced by the gates of hell—and thereby incite controversy in your community and in other communities as well, there is no atonement whatsoever for them. It is incumbent upon the communal officials and the judges of your community to warn them once again that if they refuse to abandon their wicked ways, they will be placed under the ban. The communal officials can punish them severely as they see fit. They can be fined a huge sum of money, half of which will be turned over to the King, and half of which will be designated for some useful purpose. When you act according to these guidelines, all previous bans issued against you will become null and void. This applies even more so to all supporters of Rabbi Jonathan during the controversy who, due to the instructions we have issued, repent and recognize their Creator. All previous bans issued against them in past years by the great rabbis of our generation are null and void. All the curses shall be transformed into blessings, but only if they remain faithful and do not revert to their sinful ways, and if

they repent fully before God, each according to his situation and according to the instructions he receives from the judges and scholars of your community. Repentance, of course, cannot be forced upon anyone. It can only be done in order to fulfill the will of Heaven.

I beseech you to practice the ways of peace, love, and friendship. The earlier sins will no longer be recalled. May your increased merit enable you to annul and extirpate the impurity of Shabbatai Zvi. How great is the reward stored away for the righteous! How much more so will be the reward for those who genuinely repent! Your reward from Heaven will be doubled. May God fill your storehouses—and whatever you undertake—with blessing and success. May He continue to do so until the righteous redeemer appears, soon, in our time, Amen.

These are the words of the one who signs in honor of God, and in honor of the holy Torah, and for the benefit of our brethren the children of Israel, and with the support of the wise Geonim of our generation, the young one, Jacob Joshua of Cracow, here in Worms, awaiting God's salvation, who is in the process of implementing his goal of settling in the land of Israel.

Conclusion

Did Falk succeed? Much, of course, depends on how one defines success. Personally, Falk paid dearly for his efforts to bring down Eibeschuetz. He was deposed from the rabbinate of Frankfurt and spent his last years as a layman, wandering between Mannheim, Worms, and Offenbach, where he died in 1756.[63] On the communal front, it would also appear that Falk failed. The goal was either to rehabilitate or defrock Eibeschuetz. Neither event occurred. Eibeschuetz never appeared before a Jewish court of law, so no rehabilitation took place. In 1753, he took his case (without making a personal appearance) before the Council of the Four Lands in Jaroslaw and was vindicated by a large plurality.[64] In 1756, he was reelected as Chief Rabbi of Altona, Hamburg, and Wandsbeck by an even greater plurality than in his first candidacy. He died in 1764 as Chief Rabbi of the triple community, and was buried with full honors in the rabbinic section of Altona's Koenigstrasse cemetery. Eulogies were delivered in his honor in Altona and Prague, if not the world over.[65]

Falk failed largely because he was following a script designed in 1725 by master talmudists who were also prominent rabbis, so that they could lord it over lesser rabbis and laymen who were tainted by

Sabbateanism. But Eibeschuetz was not a lesser rabbi; indeed, he was perhaps the most prominent of the master talmudists. No one could lord it over him. Eibeschuetz was clever: precisely because Falk was following a script, Eibeschuetz anticipated every move he made, and was always one step ahead, outmaneuvering and outflanking him—at least for a while.

In this battle of heavyweights, neither could knock out his opponent. Eibeschuetz perhaps won on points, but he won only the battle. Hounded by Falk, Eibeschuetz was discredited and isolated from almost all the rabbis in Germany and from most Sabbateans. Students no longer flocked to his lectures. No new offers came his way, and Eibeschuetz died lonely and defeated. Sabbateanism would never again pose a real threat to rabbinic Judaism.[66] Falk had won the war.

Notes

1. On Falk, see M. Horovitz, *Frankfurter Rabbinen*, ed. J. Unna (Jerusalem: n.p., 1969), 126–66. Significant material was omitted from the Hebrew edition: רבני פרנקפורט (Jerusalem: Mossad Harav Kook, 1972), 90–118. See also D. L. Zinz, עטרת יהושע (Bilgoraj, 1936; photo-offset, New York, 1982).
2. H. Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden*, 3rd ed. (Leipzig, 1897), 10:332–97 and notes.
3. D. Kahana, תולדות המקובלים השבתאים והחסידים (Tel Aviv, 1926), 2:23–54 and appendices.
4. See, e.g., S. P. Rabbinowitz's revised Hebrew version of Graetz's *Geschichte der Juden*, דברי ימי ישראל, (Warsaw, 1899), 8:455–528, 614–36.
5. See S. Leiman, "When a Rabbi Is Accused of Heresy: R. Ezekiel Landau's Attitude Toward R. Jonathan Eibeschuetz in the Emden-Eibeschuetz Controversy," in *From Ancient Israel to Modern Judaism: Essays in Honor of Marvin Fox*, ed. J. Neusner et al. (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 3:179–94.
6. See S. Leiman, "When a Rabbi Is Accused of Heresy: The Stance of the Gaon of Vilna in the Emden-Eibeschuetz Controversy," in מאה שערים (Studies in Memory of Isadore Twersky), ed. E. Fleischer et al. (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 2001), 251–63.
7. See, e.g., B. Brilling, "Das Erste Gedicht auf Einen Deutschen Rabbiner aus dem Jahre 1752," *Bulletin des Leo Baeck Instituts* 11 (1968): 38–47. Cf. the studies by C. Anton, S. J. Baumgarten, D. F. Megerlin, and J. F. Zachariae reprinted in *Period Documents Concerning the Emden-Eibeschuetz Controversy*, ed. B. Ogorek (Brooklyn: n.p., 1992).
8. See, e.g., J. S. E. F. v. Bernstorff, "Nachricht von der den Juden zu Hamburg und Altona entstandenen und nunmehr geendigten Streitigkeit: ob der itzige Oberrabbi von dem ehemaligen falschen Messias der Juden Sabbathai Zebhi ein Anhaenger sey?" in *Anhang zu den Actis Historico-Ecclesiasticis* 17 (1754): 997–1031. Cf. the gazette accounts reprinted in B. Ogorek, *Period Documents*.
9. See מעשה נורא זכה ברורה (Detmold, 1743), reprinted in G. Nigal, סיפורי דיבוק בספרות ישראל (Jerusalem: R. Mass, 1983), 107–14.

10. J. Emden, ויקם עדות ביעקב (Altona, 1755–56), 4a–9a; Emden, התאבקות (Altona, 1769), 10a–23a. Cf. J. Eibeschuetz, לוחת עדות (Altona, 1755; photo-offset, Jerusalem, 1966), introduction.
11. That Emden considered Eibeschuetz guilty from the start requires no documentation (beyond the references listed in the previous note). For Landau, see Leiman, "When a Rabbi . . . R. Ezekiel Landau." For Falk, see below.
12. J. Emden, עקיצת עקרב (Altona, 1753), 19b.
13. For Eibeschuetz as *am ha-areṣ* (ignoramus), see J. Emden, שבירת לוחות האון (Altona, 1756), 16b, 38b. For Emden as preacher, see his מגילת ספר, ed. Kahana (Warsaw, 1897), 101, 112; cf. ויקם עדות ביעקב, 13b.
14. For Landau, see Leiman, "When a Rabbi . . . R. Ezekiel Landau." For Rabbi Mordecai of Duesseldorf, see שפת אמת ולשון זהורית (Altona [actually Amsterdam], 1752; photo-offset, Jerusalem, 1971), 59–60. A short biography of Rabbi Mordecai of Duesseldorf appears in *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (Jerusalem, 1971), vol. 7, col. 1175.
15. Rabbi Samuel Hilman Heilprin served as rabbi of Kremsier in Moravia from 1720 to 1726. In 1751, he succeeded Rabbi Jonathan Eibeschuetz as Chief Rabbi of Metz, serving in that post until his death. On Heilprin, see A. Cahen, "Le Rabbinat de Metz," *Revue des études juives* 12 (1886): 289–94. Cf. L. Loewenstein, *Geschichte der Juden in der Kurpfalz* (Frankfurt, 1895), 198–201.
16. Rabbi Aryeh Leib b. Saul served as rabbi of Dukla, Rzeszow, and Glogau. In 1740, he succeeded Rabbi Eleazar b. Samuel as Ashkenazic Chief Rabbi of Amsterdam. See Z. H. Horowitz, לתולדות הקהילות בפולין (Jerusalem: Mossad Harav Kook, 1978), 202–23.
17. For Emden's testimony that Eibeschuetz refused to write amulets after the controversy began, see עקיצת עקרב, 5a.
18. The original broadside is preserved in various public and private collections. It was also printed in שפת אמת ולשון זהורית (the first edition is without pagination), end pages. It was inadvertently omitted from the Jerusalem reprint of 1971 (which was based on a faulty original).
19. See Falk's letter to Rabbi Aryeh Leib of Amsterdam, dated 8 Second Adar, 5513 (March 14, 1753), in J. Emden, פתח עינים (Altona, 1756), 13b–14b.
20. See Falk's letter published below. Cf. J. Emden, תורת הקנאות (Altona, 1752), 34a.
21. J. Praeger, גחלי אש (Bodleian Library manuscript Michael 106), 1: fol. 70a. Cf. G. Scholem, "ברוכיה ראש השבתאים בשאלוניקי," ציון 6 (1941): 193n55 (reissued in G. Scholem, מחקרי שבתאות, ed. and annotated by Y. Liebes [Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 1991], 376n186).
22. Rabbi David Oppenheim, famous bibliophile, served as Chief Rabbi of Nikolsburg (1689–1702) and Prague (1703–36). See Y. K. Duschinsky, תולדות הגאון ר' דוד אופנהיימער (Budapest, 1922); cf. his "Rabbi David Oppenheimer," *Jewish Quarterly Review* n.s. 20 (1929–30): 217–47.
23. Rabbi Ezekiel Katzenellenbogen served as Chief Rabbi of Altona, Hamburg, and Wandsbeck from 1713 until his death. See E. Duckesz, אוה למושב (Cracow, 1903), 21–29.
24. Rabbi Jacob Cohen Poppers served as Chief Rabbi of Frankfurt from 1718 until his death. See Horovitz, *Frankfurter Rabbinen*, 117–24 (Hebrew edition, 84–89).
25. Since the Sabbatean heresy was characterized by duplicity, one could never be certain that a Sabbatean's repentance was genuine. Hence the need for safeguards,

such as a Jewish court consisting of distinguished *geonim*. See Y. D. Wilhelm and G. Scholem, קרית ספר, 30 (1955): 99–104. See esp. 104: "כרוזי יחויא דרבנך נגד כת שבתי צבי"

> ופן ואולי תשובותיהם רמי' איזט עושה מעשה נח"ש, ע"כ אין תשובתו רצוי' ומקובלת ביז ער ווערט זיין תשובה מקבל זיין בפני שלושה גאוני ארץ רבנים מפורסמים, דש רעכטי תשובה חקירה ודרישה האבין אויב פיו ולבו שווים זיין.
>
> Lest their repentance be an act of deceit, in the manner of Nehemiah Ḥayon, no one's act of repentance will be accepted as genuine until he appears before three talmudic masters who are also prominent rabbis. They—by means of interrogation—will determine whether what he says is what he believes and, hence, whether his repentance is genuine.

26. Early in the fray, Falk demanded that Eibeschuetz appear before a rabbinic court consisting of three distinguished *ge'onei ereṣ*. Only when Eibeschuetz's delaying tactics became evident did Falk insist that he must sit on, and preside over, the court. Doubtless, Falk felt that only he would be in a position to grill Eibeschuetz and determine the genuineness of his repentance. Certainly, Falk's colleagues were persuaded that only he had the requisite fortitude, expertise, and wisdom that it would take to contain Eibeschuetz.
27. So Emden, התאבקות, 23a.
28. See, e.g., Landau's letter of 1752, in J. Praeger, גחלי אש, 2: fol. 129a. Cf. Rabbi Mordecai of Duesseldorf's letter referred to above, note 14.
29. שפת אמת ולשון זהורית, 57.
30. Ibid., 30, 34–35.
31. Ibid., 57–58.
32. The broadside is available in public and private collections. For the text, see ibid. Cf. Eibeschuetz, לוחת עדות, introduction (in the Jerusalem 1966 ed., 4).
33. The text appears in J. Praeger, גחלי אש, 2: fol. 169a–173a.
34. ספר כל בו (New York, 1946), 98b, §139.
35. The reference is to Rabbi Eleazar b. Samuel (d. 1742), who served as rabbi of Brody from 1714 to 1734, and as Ashkenazic Chief Rabbi of Amsterdam from 1735 to 1740. See E. Katzman, "הגאון החסיד ר' אלעזר רוקח זצ"ל אב"ד בראד ואמשטרדם", *Perspective* 3 (1976): 61–72. For the concluding portion of Katzman's essay, see כל ספרי ר' אלעזר רוקח (Benei Beraq: Y. Heilprin, 1983), 1:29–40.
36. On his pilgrimage to the land of Israel, see Y. Bartal, "עליית ר' אלעזר מאמשטרדם לארץ ישראל בשנת תק"א (1740)", in מחקרים על תולדות יהדות הולנד, 4 (1985): 7–25, ed. Y. Michman.
37. See above, note 16.
38. See above, note 24.
39. See above, note 23.
40. Rabbi Abraham b. Judah Berliner served as Ashkenazic Chief Rabbi of Amsterdam from 1716 to 1730. Cf. M. H. Gans, *Memorbook*, trans. A. P. Pomerans (Baarn, 1977), 165.
41. The broadside was first issued in 1725, then reissued (in part) in Altona in 1752. For the text of the original broadside, see Wilhelm and Scholem, "כרוזי יחויא דרבנך נגד כת שבתי צבי". The 1752 reissue appeared in a broadside titled למען דעת.

42. On the Sabbatean prophet Judah Leib b. Jacob Prossnitz (d. ca. 1730), see the biographical entry by Gershom Scholem in *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 13:1240–42. Cf. Y. Liebes, סוד האמונה השבתאית (Jerusalem: Mossad Bialik, 1995), 70–76 and notes.
43. The anonymous theosophical Sabbatean treatise often ascribed to Rabbi Jonathan Eibeschuetz is more accurately titled *Va-Avo ha-Yom el ha-Ayin*, *apud* Genesis 24:42. On the treatise and its author, see Liebes, סוד האמונה השבתאית, esp. 344n85.
44. Rabbi David Strauss (d. 1762) served as Chief Rabbi of Fuerth from 1748 until his death. See L. Loewenstein, "Zur Geschichte der Juden in Fuerth," *Jahrbuch der Jüdisch-Literarischen Gesellschaft* 6 (1908): 187–90.
45. The reference is to Rabbi Moses Brandeis, who served as Chief Rabbi of Mainz from 1733 until his death in 1767. See L. Loewenstein, "Zur Geschichte der Rabbiner in Mainz," *Jahrbuch der Jüdisch-Literarischen Gesellschaft* 3 (1905): 228–31; cf. L. Rakow, ed., ספר זכרון קרן ישראל (London: n.p., 2000), 63–65. See Brandeis's חידושי רבי משה חריף (Jerusalem: Mekhon Yerushalayim, 1987).
46. The reference is to Rabbi Joshua Heschel b. Rabbi Aaron Moses Ezekiel, who served as Chief Rabbi of Schwabach from 1749 until his death in 1770. See D. L. Zinz, גדולת יהונתן (Piotrkow, 1930–34), 289; cf. B. Z. Ophir, ed., *Pinkas ha-Kehillot: Germany-Bavaria* (Jerusalem: Yad Vashem, 1972), 364.
47. Rabbi Naftali Hirsch Katzenellenbogen (d. 1800) served as Chief Rabbi of Mergentheim (1741–63). See Loewenstein, *Geschichte der Juden in der Kurpfalz*, 240–43.
48. See Zinz, גדולת יהונתן, 134 and 283.
49. BT Shabbat 32a.
50. See Praeger, גחלי אש, 1: fol. 58a.
51. Rabbi Issachar Baer Eskeles (d. 1753) served as Chief Rabbi of Moravia and Hungary, administering both offices from Nikolsburg and Vienna. On Eskeles, see Loewenstein, "Zur Geschichte der Rabbiner in Mainz," 226–27.
52. See above, note 15. Doubtless, Falk is referring to a document signed by Rabbi Issachar Baer and Rabbi Samuel Hilman Heilprin, whose text is preserved in Praeger, גחלי אש, 1:fols. 59b–60a.
53. In *atbash* code—in which *alef* becomes *tav*, *bet* becomes *shin*, and so forth—BBTY HBY = SBTY ZBY, i.e., Shabbatai Zvi.
54. The letter, dated 11 Sivan, 5511 (June 4, 1751), appears in שפת אמת ולשון זהורית, 56–58.
55. The letter first appeared in print as a broadside in Amsterdam, 1751. Its appearance in print was a matter of contention between Eibeschuetz and Falk. Eibeschuetz claimed that it appeared in print even before he received it. See his לוחת עדות (Jerusalem, 1966), 4. Falk explained that it was printed without his permission. See שפת אמת ולשון זהורית, 62.
56. שפת אמת ולשון זהורית (Amsterdam, 1752).
57. See S. Leiman and S. Schwarzfuchs, "New Evidence on the Emden-Eibeschuetz Controversy: The Amulets From Metz," *Revue des études juives* 165 (2006): 229–49.
58. All the treatises listed were ascribed to Rabbi Jonathan Eibeschuetz. Their titles became public knowledge due to various broadsides published during the controversy. See, e.g., the addendum to the letter of Rabbi Ezekiel Landau, circulated in August 1752 and published in the broadside אספקלריה המאירה (Altona, 1753).

59. Rabbi Ḥayyim ha-Kohen Rapoport (d. 1771) served as Chief Rabbi of Lwow from 1740 until his death. See S. Buber, אנשי שם (Cracow, 1895), 69–72.
60. Landau alludes to a rabbinic conference that convened in 1752 on market day in Brody. See Emden, פתח עינים, 7b. Falk may be referring to the proclamation issued by a rabbinical group that convened in Brody in 1752. The proclamation, printed in אספקלריה המאירה, lists by title the various heretical works ascribed to Eibeschuetz. The proclamation, however, is dated Ellul (August) 1752, whereas Falk dates the meeting to Ḥeshvan (October) 1752.
61. Altona in 1753 belonged to the kingdom of Denmark, whose ruler, Frederick V, reigned as king of Denmark and Norway from 1746 to 1766.
62. Maimonides, *Mishneh Torah*, "Hilkhot Teshuvah" 2:4.
63. See Zinz, עטרת יהושע, 15–25.
64. See L. Lewin, "Die Synode und die Emden-Eibenschuetz'sche Fehde 1751–56," in his *Neue Materialien zur Geschichte der Vierlaendersynode* (Frankfurt, 1916), 50–66.
65. For the eulogy in Altona (by Rabbi Isaiah Breslau), see Emden, התאבקות, 111a. For the eulogies in Prague (by Rabbi Ezekiel Landau, Rabbi Zeraḥ Eidlitz, and others), see E. Landau, דרושי הצל"ח (Warsaw, 1884), 92–93, and Z. Eidlitz, אור לישרים (Budapest, 1942), 27–41. Emden's claim, loc. cit., that no eulogies were delivered outside of Altona and Prague, cannot be taken seriously. See, e.g., Rabbi Mordecai b. Samuel, שער המלך (Amsterdam, 1774), vol. 2, gate 5, chap. 7.
66. I.e., after Eibeschuetz's death in 1764. Due to its affirmation of the blood libel, followed by mass conversion to Christianity in 1759, much of the Frankist branch of the Sabbatean heresy lost whatever credibility it may once have had in rabbinic circles.

Contributors

Miriam Bodian (Ph.D., Hebrew University) is Professor of Jewish History at Touro College. Her research deals with the conversos and other areas in early modern Jewish history. She is the author of *Hebrews of the Portuguese Nation: Conversos and Community in Early Modern Amsterdam* (1997) and *Dying in the Law of Moses: Crypto-Jewish Martyrdom in the Iberian World* (forthcoming).

Joseph M. Davis (Ph.D., Harvard) is Associate Professor of Jewish Thought at Gratz College. He is the author of *Yom-Tov Lipmann Heller: Portrait of a Seventeenth Century Rabbi* (2004) and other studies on the intellectual culture of medieval and early modern Ashkenazic Jews.

Daniel Frank (Ph.D., Harvard) is Associate Professor of Near Eastern Languages and Cultures at the Ohio State University. His publications include *Search Scripture Well: Karaite Exegetes and the Origins of the Jewish Bible Commentary in the Islamic East* (2004), an edited volume, *The Jews of Medieval Islam: Community, Society, and Identity* (1995), and other studies devoted to Karaite Judaism and medieval Jewish biblical exegesis.

Matt Goldish (Ph.D., Hebrew University) is Melton Professor of Jewish History at the Ohio State University. He has published *Judaism in the Theology of Sir Isaac Newton* (1998) and *The Sabbatean Prophets* (2004), as well as studies on Sefardic history and Jewish messianism.

Ephraim Kanarfogel (Ph.D., Yeshiva University) is Ivry Professor of Jewish History at Yeshiva University. His research deals with the intellectual and social history of medieval European Jewry. His publications include *Jewish Education and Society in the High Middle Ages*

Rabbinic Culture and Its Critics

Jewish Authority, Dissent, and Heresy in Medieval and Early Modern Times

Edited by

DANIEL FRANK
and
MATT GOLDISH

2008

Wayne State University Press
Detroit