

Why Did Rabbi Jacob Emden Not Publish His *Megillat Sefer*?*

Jacob J. Schacter

Rabbi Jacob Emden (1697–1776) was one of the most colorful and controversial Jewish figures in the eighteenth century. Reared in a learned home, he was a preeminent scholar whose achievement in the field of rabbinic literature was substantive and significant.

In addition, Emden played a major role in the eighteenth-century battle against Sabbatianism and, in the last two and a half decades of his life, devoted himself to exposing and hounding all vestiges of that movement. He focused in particular on Rabbi Jonathan Eibeschuetz, arguably the greatest rabbinic figure of his generation, whom he accused of being a follower of Shabbetai Tsevi. Finally, Emden lived long enough to witness the emergence of the Haskalah. Unlike some of his more traditional colleagues, he was sensitive to the shifting nuances of thought represented by that movement and was aware of the changes to Jewish life that it potentially represented.¹

Emden was a prolific author, whose literary oeuvre contains works

* I am very honored to present this essay in honor of my teacher and role-model, Dr. Shnayer Z. Leiman. His exceptionally wide-ranging encyclopedic knowledge of virtually every area of Jewish scholarship is matched only by his stellar outstanding personal character. I am in awe of the vastness of his learning and the depths of his human decency. He shares the bounty of his knowledge freely, selflessly and graciously and I have learned an enormous

on all genres of rabbinic creativity. He authored commentaries on the Bible, the Mishnah, the Talmud, the Siddur, the *Arba'ah Turim* as well as the *Shulhan Arukh*, a half dozen homiletical discourses (*derashot*), hundreds of responsa, various monographs dealing with halakhic topics, a kabbalistic dictionary, a dozen tracts related to his controversy with Eibeschuetz, and more.²

Among the works written by Emden was *Megillat Sefer*. The book consists of three unequal parts. The first quarter is a biography of his father, the great rabbinic scholar, Ḥakham Tsevi Ashkenazi. In the second part, consisting of about half of the work, Emden recounted the story of his life up until the time he was writing it. Then, in 1758, with his autobiographical impulse spent, Emden began to write a series of unrelated entries, presenting one event after another as they occurred to him. He described his illnesses; bankruptcies in his community; rabbinic challenges faced by his son, Meshullam Zalman, in London; a personal dispute he was asked to help adjudicate; and more. He also listed all the books he wrote, both those already in print and those still in manuscript. In the last part of this work, autobiography gave way to diary.³

amount from him in the last four decades. May *Hakadosh Barukh Hu* grant him many more years of good health to continue to illuminate and to inspire.

My thanks to Dr. Benjamin R. Gampel for his very helpful assistance with this article.

1. See my “Rabbi Jacob Emden: Life and Major Works” (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1988).
2. See the extensive bibliographies of Emden’s works presented in Avraham Ḥayyim Wagenaar, *Toledot Yave”ts* (Lublin, 1880), 18–27, 30–40; Yeḥezkel Duckesz, *Ḥakhmei AH”W* (Hamburg, 1905; repr. Israel, 1968), 69–74; and Yitshak Refael, “Kitvei Rabbi Ya’akov Emden,” *Areshet* 3 (1961): 231–76.
3. Throughout this essay, I refer to the Warsaw, 1896 edition of *Megillat Sefer* edited and printed by David Kahana even though it is not a fully accurate transcription of the manuscript (which itself is only a copy of the original; see below). Acknowledging and claiming to correct some of the mistakes in the Kahana edition, Avraham Bick-Shauli printed *Megillat Sefer* in Jerusalem, 1979, but his version is much worse than Kahana’s. He recklessly and irresponsibly added to or deleted from the text, switched its order, and was generally sloppy.

On the face of it, the book seems curiously unbalanced and the selectivity of its contents somewhat strange. Why is it, for example, that Emden devoted roughly the first fifty pages, fully one quarter of the entire book, to a biography of his father?⁴ True, Ḥakham Tsevi was a very important figure in his son's life, but the amount of attention devoted to him seems well out of proportion in a book purported to be about Emden himself.

Second, how does one explain what appears to be a disproportionately large amount of space devoted to degrading, destroying, and vilifying Rabbi Ezekiel Katzenellenbogen, a recognized rabbinic and communal authority of the period who served as Chief Rabbi of Emden's Triple Community (AH"V: Altona, Hamburg, and Wandsbeck) for over three and a half decades, from 1713 until his death on July 9, 1749? In a long and rambling tirade, Emden repeatedly poked fun at what he characterized as Katzenellenbogen's unintelligible speech and handwriting; accused him of greed, theft, perversion of justice, and other major violations of Jewish law; asserted that he lacked simple common sense; claimed that he unfairly took advantage of his position; and charged that he was abysmally ignorant of even basic, elementary features of Jewish law and tradition.⁵ Why this tremendous animus against Katzenellenbogen in the first place and, also, why is it here, expressed in such extremes in a book ostensibly devoted to the story of Emden's own life?

There are less significant apparent anomalies, nuances, and emphases that also call for comment. Why did Emden go out of his way to describe his experience as rabbi in the town of Emden where he served from 1729 to 1732 in a very positive light, and why was he so

As a result, his edition is worthless. In 2012, Avraham Ya'akov Bombach published an incomplete version of *Megillat Sefer* in Jerusalem, explicitly noting that he was not going to include those parts he considered to be inappropriate. I am presently completing a new accurate edition of *Megillat Sefer*, with an introduction and extensive annotations.

4. *Megillat Sefer*, pp. 7–53.

5. *Ibid.*, pp. 122–40.

careful to delineate the circumstances under which he left there?⁶ Why did he stress how he was welcomed by the Altona community when he returned there to live in the late summer of 1732?⁷ Of course, it is natural for an author to present himself in as favorable a light as possible, but is there something else relevant here that could provide a different perspective for these as well as other comments expressed in *Megillat Sefer*?

The key to all these enigmas lies in a correct appreciation of the precise purpose of this book. Emden had a specific goal in mind, and it was not at all simply to record his own life story for posterity. Once properly understood, this goal perfectly explains and clarifies all these otherwise inexplicable imbalances, emphases, and anomalies.

Emden offered the reader of *Megillat Sefer* three different explanations to account for why he wrote it. First, he wrote, he wanted to remember and to publicize God's many kindnesses to him, which enabled him to overcome all the adversities and calamities that afflicted him through his life up until that point:

To make known the lovingkindness of God to me from my youth, in spite of the fact that much afflicted me . . . I was [exposed] to almost all hardships, to difficult occurrences and mishaps without even a moment's surcease. The Lord, may He be blessed, rescued me from them all and aided me until now. *He has punished me severely, but did not hand me over to death* (Psalms 118:18) . . . I therefore said that I would tell of your Name, O Lord, to my brothers, my children and my descendants so that I will not forget His kindnesses and my soul *not forget all His bounties* (Psalms 103:2) . . . *That a future generation might know – children yet to be born – and in turn tell their children* (Psalms 78:6) and they should *praise the Lord for He is good; His steadfast love is eternal* (Psalms 118:1, 29) for He has saved *the soul of the needy from the hands of evildoers* (Jeremiah 20:13).

6. Ibid., pp. 99–114.

7. Ibid., pp. 114–15.

Second, he wrote, he composed this book to strengthen others who were similarly afflicted by providing them with faith to persevere in spite of all the difficulties they encountered, “to strengthen weak hands, those broken of spirit and afflicted of heart. . . . *May many see it and stand in awe, and trust in the Lord (Psalms 40:4), that they might put their confidence in God, and not forget God’s great deeds (Psalms 78:7).*”

And finally, he wrote:

In order that the sun of my righteousness should shine forth . . . *because of the wicked that oppress me, my deadly enemies that encompass me about (Psalms 17:9).* They have slandered me, *making me odious among the inhabitants of the land (Genesis 34:30),* to destroy me by their hands with their insults, lies and recklessness which have spread to every side and corner. Their shame is throughout the land. Many of their libelous writings will certainly remain extant in the world for some time. Therefore, necessity has compelled me to clarify my case before God and man. My righteousness will go forth as the light (cf. Psalms 37:6). *He will deliver the guilty (Job 22:30).* Truth is my witness. Behold it will serve as a vindication for me, for my children and my descendants, may God protect them.⁸

What “hardships . . . difficult occurrences and mishaps” did Emden have in mind as he set himself to the task of composing this work? Who were these “wicked . . . deadly enemies” to whom he refers, whose slander and libel motivated him to take up his pen in self-defense?

Emden here is referring to those who opposed him in his controversy with Rabbi Eibeschuetz, raging with full force when these words were written in the first part of the 1750s. On Thursday morning, February 4, 1751, Emden made an announcement in his private prayer room, located in his home in Altona, a suburb of Hamburg, asserting that the author of an amulet he had recently examined was without question a believer in the false messiah Shabbetai Tsevi. Although

8. *Megillat Sefer*, pp. 54–55, with slight corrections from the manuscript (below, n. 40), pp. 140b–142a (p. 141 precedes p. 140 in the manuscript).

Emden did not directly state that Eibeschuetz, the recently elected Chief Rabbi of the community, was responsible for the amulet, it was a well-known fact that he wrote it. This accusation of Emden's, which charged Eibeschuetz of being guilty of blatant heresy, was a most serious one. It aroused the anger of many who rose up against Emden in defense of Eibeschuetz, precipitating one of the most intense, explosive, bitter, nasty, and repercussive controversies in all of Jewish history.⁹

9. The complete story of this extraordinary chapter in Jewish history remains a major historical desideratum. Many references to both primary sources and secondary literature on the controversy can be found in my forthcoming edition of Emden's *Megillat Sefer* (above, n. 3).

Most relevant here, in this volume in honor of Professor Leiman, are the many articles he has written on a variety of aspects related to the controversy. See his "When a Rabbi is Accused of Heresy: R. Ezekiel Landau's Attitude Toward R. Jonathan Eibeschuetz in the Emden-Eibeschuetz Controversy," in Jacob Neusner, Ernest S. Frerichs and Nahum M. Sarna, eds., *From Ancient Israel to Modern Judaism: Intellect in Quest of Understanding: Essays in Honor of Marvin Fox*, vol. 3 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 179–94; "When a Rabbi is Accused of Heresy: The Stance of the Gaon of Vilna in the Emden-Eibeschuetz Controversy," in Ezra Fleischer, Gerald Blidstein, Carmi Horowitz and Bernard Septimus, eds., *Me'ah She'arim: Studies in Medieval Jewish Spiritual Life in Memory of Isadore Twersky* (Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Magnes Press, 2001), 251–63; "When a Rabbi is Accused of Heresy: The Stance of Rabbi Jacob Joshua Falk in the Emden–Eibeschuetz Controversy," in Daniel Frank and Matt Goldish, eds., *Rabbinic Culture and its Critics: Jewish Authority, Dissent, and Heresy in Medieval and Early Modern Times* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2008), 435–56.

In addition, see his "Perush Ha-Gaon R. Yehonatan Eibeschuetz li-Ketsat Aggadot mi-Massekhet Berakhot," *Or Ha-Mizrah* 29 (1981): 418–28; "The Baal Teshuvah and the Emden–Eibeschuetz Controversy," *Judaic Studies* 1 (1985): 3–26; "Mrs. Jonathan Eibeschuetz's Epitaph: A Grave Matter Indeed," in Leo Landman, ed., *Scholars and Scholarship: The Interaction Between Judaism and Other Cultures* (New York: Yeshiva University Press, 1990), 133–43; "Sefarim ha-Hashudim be-Shabbeta'ut: Reshimato shel ha-Gaon Yavets zt"l," in Refael Rosenbaum, ed., *Sefer ha-Zikkaron le-Rabbi Moshe Lifshitz zt"l* (New York, 1996), 885–94; "Rabbi Jonathan Eibeschuetz's Attitude towards

From the very outset of this bitter conflict, Emden was accused by the pro-Eibeschuetz forces of being grossly disrespectful to contemporary Torah scholars and to even more illustrious great rabbis of previous generations. In addition, they accused him of being simply an inveterate agitator and petty, jealous troublemaker with a long history of being rejected by all with whom he had come into personal contact. His reputation was being sullied and potentially ruined by these and other constant and relentless attacks upon him. In response, Emden wrote *Megillat Sefer*, virtually a point-by-point refutation of the specific criticisms leveled against him by his opponents in the controversy, with the explicit intention of defending himself from these charges by setting the record straight for the members of his family, his contemporaries and for posterity. Its major goal was nothing other than to provide a carefully crafted presentation to salvage, in whatever way he could, an increasingly battered reputation.

Attempting to account for his extreme anti-Sabbatianism, manifested in his single-minded opposition to Eibeschuetz, in sources other than a bitter, contentious, and cantankerous personality, Emden took the trouble to invoke, at great length, the image, model, and precedent of his revered father. Ḥakham Tsevi was himself involved in a bitter struggle against Neḥemiah Ḥiyya Ḥayyun, whom he had accused in 1713, while serving as the Ashkenazi Chief Rabbi

the Frankists,” *Polin* 15 (2002):145–51; “Rabbi Jonathan Eibeschuetz and the Porger,” *Judaica Studies* 4 (2004):3–29; “Haskamot R. Yehonatan Eibeschuetz ve-R. Yaakov Emden,” *Or Ha-Mizrah* 51 (2005):169–203; “New Evidence on the Emden–Eibeschuetz Controversy: The Amulets from Metz,” *REJ* 165:1–2 (2006): 229–49 (with Simon Schwarzfuchs); “Rabbi Ezekiel Landau: *Letter of Reconciliation*,” *Tradition* 43:4 (2010): 85–96; “Iggeret Shelomim’ le-Rabbi Yeḥezkel Landau,” in Yosef Hacker and Yaron Harel, eds., *Lo Yasur Shevet mi-Yehudah: Hanhagah, Rabbanut u-Kehillah be-Toledot Yisrael* (Jerusalem, 2011), 317–31; “Rabbi Jonathan Eibeschuetz and the Alleged Jewish–Christian Sect in Eighteenth-Century Amsterdam,” in Elisheva Carlebach and Jacob J. Schacter, eds., *New Perspectives in Jewish–Christian Relations: In Honor of David Berger* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2012), 175–201.

of Amsterdam, of being a Sabbatian.¹⁰ Emden invoked his father's struggle against Ḥayyun as a model and precedent for his own struggle against Eibeschuetz some forty years later. Here were, in both cases, heroic figures possessed of great rabbinic learning, waging lonely and intense battles against the accursed Sabbatian heresy, at odds with their respective established communal leaders and at great personal risk. Emden repeatedly asserted, in *Megillat Sefer* and elsewhere, that it was his revered father's experience that served as the paradigm after which he modeled his own behavior, referring to himself on a number of occasions as "a zealot, the son of a zealot (*kana'i ben kana'i*)" and noting as often that "whatever happened to the father happened to the son (*kol mah she-ira la-av ira la-ben*)."¹¹ A fully positive and sympathetic treatment of Ḥakham Tsevi was, therefore, absolutely crucial and essential for his own defense. Although postponing the presentation of his own life story until the book was well underway helped account for a work that Israel Zinberg characterized as having a "unique construction,"¹¹ it was vitally necessary and fit perfectly with his primary motive in composing the work. Furthermore, Ḥakham Tsevi's own reputation was under attack by Emden's opponents in the controversy. Not only did they assert that Emden was forced out of the town of Emden against his will (see below), they also charged that Ḥakham Tsevi was expelled from Amsterdam in 1714 in the wake of the Ḥayyun controversy. Hence, setting the record straight, and presenting an accurate presentation of his father's life story, was crucial for Emden as well.

This interpretation similarly accounts for Emden's intense and bitter attacks on Katzenellenbogen. As the controversy unfolded, Emden

10. For references to both primary sources and secondary literature on the Ḥayyun Controversy, see my forthcoming edition of Emden's *Megillat Sefer* (above, n. 3).

11. Yisrael Zinberg, *Di Geshikhte fun der Literatur bay Yidn*, vol. 5 (New York, 1943), 244. This is reminiscent of Stendahl's comment at the end of Chapter 2 of his autobiography, *The Life of Henry Brulard* (New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1958), 17, "After all these general reflections, I'll proceed to get born."

was depicted in general as a troublemaker and agitator but he was also specifically accused of showing gross disrespect for Katzenellenbogen, the Chief Rabbi of his community, who had died prior to the outbreak of the controversy, in 1749, and whose passing left an opening for the position of Chief Rabbi which Eibeschuetz filled a year later.¹² In response to this charge, Emden devoted part of *Megillat Sefer* to attack Katzenellenbogen personally, bitterly and repeatedly, implicitly arguing that such a wicked and unworthy individual eminently deserved whatever criticism and disrespect he had expressed against him.

Among other charges, he belittled what he described as the Chief Rabbi's incredibly low level of Torah learning. He also accused him of being overly servile to the local lay leadership and charged that, due to the Chief Rabbi's well-known dishonesty, the local secular authorities barred him from exercising judicial authority in Hamburg. In addition, he mercilessly ridiculed Katzenellenbogen's personal behavior (eating, drinking and singing). Faced with the obvious question as to how such an alleged total misfit was able to secure and maintain the position of Chief Rabbi of one of Europe's foremost Jewish communities for close to four decades, Emden claimed that he got the position only through "great machinations and powerful cunning" and kept it due to "his extraordinary luck [which] helped him." In a word, the worse Katzenellenbogen was made to be, the better could Emden justify his disdain for him. Once again, the larger context of the Emden-Eibeschuetz controversy is crucial for a proper understanding of this work.

Putting *Megillat Sefer* into this context goes a long way to explain not only Emden's wide-ranging excursus about Ḥakham Tsevi and his verbose diatribe against Katzenellenbogen, but it also provides a sharper perspective from which more clearly to understand and appreciate other parts of the work as well. For example, while it is perfectly natural to expect Emden to put as positive a spin as possible on his

12. See, in particular, the letter from the leaders of the Triple Community to R. Aryeh Leib, Ashkenazi Chief Rabbi of Amsterdam and brother-in-law of Emden, printed in Yonatan Eibeschuetz, *Luḥot Edut* (Altona, 1755), 17b.

brief stint as rabbi of the city of Emden, certain specific details and subtle nuances of his presentation gain new clarity when seen from the perspective of the controversy. Two of his enemies' accusations are relevant here: (1) their assertion that he harbored an intense feeling of jealousy against Eibeschuetz, who was elected to the prestigious position of rabbinical head of the Triple Community, an office that they claimed Emden desperately craved for himself; (2) their description of him to the secular authorities as quarrelsome and cantankerous, unable to live anywhere in peace and, as proof, accused him of having been expelled from the city of Emden rather than leaving from there on his own volition.

Acutely sensitive to both of these charges and very much aware of their negative implications in his battle against Eibeschuetz, Emden repeatedly asserted that he was courted by the community of Emden and "forced" to accept a position he never sought or wanted; that he was highly popular there, well respected by Jews and Gentiles alike; that the entire community benefited materially and spiritually from his presence; that the community constantly urged him to remain in their midst as their spiritual leader despite his often-expressed desire to leave; that the only reasons he eventually did leave were the sicknesses repeatedly suffered by him as well as by members of his household and his growing discomfort with the rabbinate; that the community honored him when he left and went so far as to delay appointing his successor for a number of years in the vain hope that he would return. While one would expect to find such assertions in any type of autobiography, acknowledging that they were specifically presented as part of Emden's defense in his controversy with Eibeschuetz lends them greater force, clarity, and significance.

To a lesser extent, this perspective also sheds light on another part of the autobiography, Emden's description of his early years in Altona. Once again, to counteract his enemies' assertions to the contrary, Emden stressed how he arrived in the community to an enthusiastic welcome from its inhabitants who granted him the special privilege of holding private prayer services in his home; that he retained their respect and high esteem for close to two decades until the outbreak

of the controversy; that he repeatedly benefited the community in ways both financial and spiritual; that, until circumstances forced him against his will to assume a more active role, he consistently maintained a low profile, did not seek communal involvement, worked hard to earn a living while concentrating on his Torah studies, and, he added elsewhere, virtually did not even walk out of his house. Here too, with the controversy lurking directly in the background, these assertions take on a new urgency, clarity, and significance. There is no doubt that it is the Emden-Eibeschutz controversy that serves as the central fulcrum of this work which Emden began to write in 1752 as the controversy was already well under way.¹³

Central to Emden's polemic against Eibeschutz were the dozen books he published intended to publicize the heretical nature of Sabbatianism in general and that of Eibeschutz in particular. Emden recognized the power of the printed word and utilized it repeatedly. He was able to do this with relative ease because he had twice been granted permission to operate his own personal printing press in Altona, first by the Danish king, Christian VI, on November 11, 1743, and again by his son and successor, Frederick V, on February 20, 1747.¹⁴ This privilege was very important to Emden; he wrote how he invested

13. *Megillat Sefer*, p. 11.

I dealt with this point in greater detail in my "History and Memory of Self: The Autobiography of Rabbi Jacob Emden," in Elisheva Carlebach, John M. Efron and David Myers, eds., *Jewish History and Jewish Memory: Essays in Honor of Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi* (Hannover: Brandeis University Press, 1998), 428–52, and am returning to it in my introduction to my forthcoming edition of *Megillat Sefer* (above, n. 3).

14. For the texts of the formal documents granting this permission, as well as the correspondence between Emden and the secular authorities that related to them, see Bernhard Brillling, "Die Privilegien der Hebräischen Buchdruckereien in Altona (1726–1836)," *Studies in Bibliography and Booklore* 9:4 (1971):153–66; idem., "Zur Geschichte der Hebräischen Buchdruckereien in Altona," *Studies in Bibliography and Booklore* 11:1–2 (1975–1976): 41–56. Altona then was under the jurisdiction of Denmark.

significant sums of money in the printing press he established in his home¹⁵ and he repeatedly made references to it in his writings.¹⁶ Indeed, Emden utilized this privilege to publish many books of his own from the time he was granted it until the very last year of his life.¹⁷

After the beginning of 1751, however, Emden was faced with a challenge because his accusation against Eibeschuetz aroused the ire of the lay leaders of his community and motivated them to prevail upon the king to revoke this privilege of his to operate a printing press. This could have presented Emden with a formidable challenge but he was undaunted and undeterred. In spite of this ruling, Emden proceeded to print a number of works against Sabbatianism and Eibeschuetz in his personal printing press. In recognition of the fact that he was operating illegally, he hid that fact, sometimes not noting any place of publication or sometimes including names of different cities on their title pages. In yet other cases he indicated that a work was published by a student of his, sometimes identified by the name of “David Avaz.” But all these books were printed in no other place than in Emden’s own printing press located in his home, and it was he and no one else who authored them.

With this background, I come to the title of this essay. Emden was fully committed to his battle against Eibeschuetz for the last twenty-five years of his life. Emden published many books devoted to this battle, something easy for him to do because he owned his own printing press. Emden wrote *Megillat Sefer* as a polemic directly related to this

15. *Megillat Sefer*, p. 167.

16. See his *Shevirat Luhot ha-Aven* (Altona, 1756), 2b, 33b; *Edut be-Ya’akov* (Altona, 1755), 8a, 19a, 27b, 29b; *Iggeret Purim* (still in manuscript; see Ad. Neubauer, *Catalogue of the Hebrew Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library and in the College Libraries of Oxford* [Oxford, 1886], 755, #2190:1; Ms. Mich. 618), pp. 9b, 17b; and *Megillat Sefer*, pp. 165, 169.

17. See the bibliographies of Emden’s works cited above, n. 2, and the list of all his books, both published and unpublished, that Emden included in *Megillat Sefer*, pp. 203–4.

controversy and was clearly interested in insuring that as many people as possible read it. And there is indeed evidence that Emden wanted to publish this work. As noted above, he wrote it for the members of his family,¹⁸ but, as also noted above, his net was cast wider than that, addressing “my brothers” (which I do not take as a reference to his siblings), “the beloved reader,” “all who fear God,” “future generations,” and expressing his desire to praise God “amid the multitude.”¹⁹ Also, after recounting a particular story he concluded, “May the wealthy listen and learn a lesson” from it.²⁰ Furthermore, in his published works Emden actually refers his reader on more than one occasion to *Megillat Sefer*²¹ and he included “*Megillat Sefer*” in the list of his works that he wrote at the end of *Megillat Sefer*.²² And, so, my question is: why did Rabbi Jacob Emden not publish *Megillat Sefer*?

It is important to note that when Emden decided to refrain from publishing something, he explicitly explained why this was the case. In a work published in 1752, Emden noted that he was reluctant to include an extensive attack against Neḥemiah Ḥiya Ḥayyun whom his father had sharply excoriated for being a Sabbatian almost four decades earlier. Although he had written against Ḥayyun in the past, Emden wrote that he saw no point in devoting significant attention

18. See *Megillat Sefer*, pp. 54, 55. See also pp. 3, 118 (“*yotse’ei ḥalatsai*”).

19. *Ibid.*, pp. 33, 55, 123.

20. *Ibid.*, p. 110.

21. *Sefer Shimmush*, p. 37a (published in Altona [although the title page states “Amsterdam”], 1763); twice in *Mor u-Ketsi’ah*, vol. 1, p. 103b (published in Altona, 1768); and *Mor u-Ketsi’ah*, vol. 2, p. 2a (published in Altona, 1768). Indeed, Emden included hundreds of references in his writings to works of his that were still in manuscript, some of which he later published (like *Mitpahat Sefarim*, *Luah Eresh*; *She’elat Yavets* vol. 2) and some of which remained unpublished (like *Mor u-Ketsi’ah* on *Yoreh De’ah*, *Ḥoshen Mishpat* and *Even ha-‘Ezer*; *Iggeret Purim*; *Tsa’akat Damim*; and his lengthy addendum to his commentary on the Siddur).

22. *Megillat Sefer*, p. 204. Cf. Yitshak Refael, *Mishnat Halevi* (Jerusalem, 1985), 29, who simply assumes, with no explanation, that *Megillat Sefer* was not meant to be published.

to him now, in this work, “in order not to further arouse hatred and jealousy which have already passed (*she-lo le’orer sin’ah gam kin’ah she-kevar avdah*) . . . for our intention is only to bring merit to the public (*le-zakkot ha-rabbim*).”²³

A similar rationale justifying the withholding of one of his works, in order to avoid further public censure of others, appears elsewhere as well. In the course of discussing appropriate business practices in his commentary on the Siddur, printed in 1747, Emden quoted the words of the Mishnah that “a person should not teach his son to be . . . a storekeeper because their trade is the trade of robbers.” He then parenthetically added six words stating that this also applies to “a money changer in these generations.” This aside aroused the ire of bankers in the Triple Community who considered this to be a personal attack on them and who agitated with the local Jewish authorities to have the page containing these words torn out of the book and who, Emden claimed, were even prepared to do him physical harm.²⁴ In the heat of this controversy, Emden penned a monograph entitled *Zikkaron ba-Sefer* describing what occurred and defending his position. But this work remained on his desk. Although by then Emden had been granted permission to operate his own printing press (see above), he explained in a number of places that he decided not to publish it “in order not to arouse further strife . . . in addition because their jealousy and hatred has already passed (*afki kin’atam ve-sin’atam kevar avdah*);”²⁵ “Had I not been concerned with arousing strife it would have already been published;”²⁶ “I did not want to make an uproar

23. *Torat ha-Kena’ot* (Altona, 1752), 29b.

24. See *Amudei Shamayim* (Altona, 1745), 269a. Emden’s Siddur commentary contained much more than comments on various prayers. See my “Rabbi Jacob Emden: Life and Major Works,” pp. 256–369, and my “The Siddur of Rabbi Jacob Emden: From Commentary to Code,” *Torah and Wisdom: Studies in Jewish Philosophy, Kabbalah, and Halakha (in Honor of Arthur Hyman)* (New York: Shengold Publishers Inc., 1992), 175–87. The passage from the Mishnah is found in *Kiddushin* 82a. Emden describes this event in *Megillat Sefer*, pp. 168–71.

25. *Mor u-Ketsi’ah*, vol. 1, p. 103b.

26. *Mor u-Ketsi’ah*, vol. 2, introduction, p. 2a.

in the world... I knew that it would not bring honor to them... not to persist in disputes.”²⁷ It is particularly interesting to note that he referred to this sensitivity regarding *Zikkaron ba-Sefer* also in *Megillat Sefer* itself where he wrote that he did not publish *Zikkaron ba-Sefer* “so as not to further the enmity.”²⁸

But neither of these examples is relevant to *Megillat Sefer*. While Emden was no longer interested in revisiting the Ḥayyun Controversy “which [has] already passed,” or in pursuing his vendetta against various wealthy individuals and lay leaders in the Triple Community, his controversy with Eibeschuetz did not at all recede in importance for him with the passage of time. Emden was fully committed to hounding Eibeschuetz, the members of his family, his followers, as well as others whom he accused of being Sabbatians, with stubborn stridency and fearless ferocity even after Eibeschuetz died on September 18, 1764, more than thirteen years after the controversy began, and he continued to do this for the rest of his life. It is hard to believe that the sentiments expressed in these two cases would motivate him to refrain from publishing *Megillat Sefer*. He never offered this rationale to explain why he did not publish that work and I do not believe that he could have done so.

Elsewhere, Emden presented other reasons for not publishing works that he authored. In the case of *Iggeret Purim*, for example, a work that he composed describing the events that transpired at the beginning of his controversy with Eibeschuetz, he wrote that it remained in manuscript because he had not yet finished writing it, and this for a number of reasons: he was missing details about some events that occurred in Altona during the time he sought refuge in Amsterdam shortly after the controversy began; he would have to devote much effort to finishing it which he was not interested in doing at the time; and because some documents he needed to complete the

27. *Edut be-Ya'akov*, p. 16a.

28. *Megillat Sefer*, p. 171.

This work was later published by Avraham Bick (Shauli), “Rabbi Ya'akov Emden u-Milḥamto be-Shulḥanei Altona,” *Tarbiz* 42:3–4 (1973):461–68.

story were stolen from him. All of these resulted in his writing that, “as of now, it is impossible for him [i.e., Emden] to finish the book.”²⁹

True, a similar consideration may have been relevant in the case of *Megillat Sefer* for a different reason. As noted above, this work consists of three distinct parts, a biography of his father, the story of Emden’s own life up until the time he was writing it with a primary focus on material that he considered to be relevant to his defense during his controversy with Eibeschuetz, and then a diary-like set of entries. Might this explain why Emden never published this work? At which point in one’s life does one decide that the time has come to publish one’s autobiography or diary? After all, the morrow may bring yet another experience worthy of recording. Perhaps Emden did not publish *Megillat Sefer* because he had not yet completed writing it. In fact, the work ends abruptly describing a controversy that took place in 1766 regarding a rabbi in the community of Rechnitz. Unlike the case of *Iggeret Purim*, the story he started out writing in *Megillat Sefer* was, indeed, finished but there were other, different stories that, perhaps, remained to be written.

Furthermore, on more than one occasion Emden explained that his *Iggeret Purim* and *Teshuvat ha-Minin* (also related to the controversy) remained in manuscript because they were both very large works, presumably either too time consuming or costly to print, even for him.³⁰ *Megillat Sefer* is slightly longer than *Iggeret Purim* and perhaps this too may account for the fact that Emden did not publish it.³¹

29. *Shevirat Luhot ha-Aven*, p. 2b. Emden here wrote in the third person.

30. See *Sefer Hit'avkut* (Altona, 1769), pp. 28a, 165b (for some reason, this entire passage does not appear in the second edition of this work [Lvov, 1877]); *Shevirat Luhot ha-Aven*, p. 7a. For other references to the large size of *Iggeret Purim*, see *Edut be-Ya'akov*, p. 3b; *Shevirat Luhot ha-Aven*, p. 2b; to the large size of *Teshuvat ha-Minin*, see *Edut be-Ya'akov*, p. 13a.

Teshuvat ha-Minin was composed in reaction to the book written by the apostate Carl Anton in favor of his teacher, Rabbi Eibeschuetz. For information about Anton and this work, see my forthcoming edition of *Megillat Sefer* (above, n. 3).

31. *Iggeret Purim* contains 73,224 words; *Megillat Sefer* contains 76,599 words.

Emden never wavered in his battle against Eibeschuetz. Emden published many books devoted to this battle which he could easily do as the owner of his own printing press. Emden wrote *Megillat Sefer* as a polemic directly related to this controversy. He wanted to publish this work and was clearly interested in as many people as possible reading it. MIGHT there be another reason why did he not publish it?

I would like to suggest a most surprising reason and, I believe, a most compelling one. Sometime after 1769, Emden published a one page broadside printed on both sides, entitled *Moda'a Rabbah le-Orayta*. On one side, he solicited financial support for a formidable project of his that he wanted to undertake: the printing of a new edition of the Bible that would include various Targums and other material and commentators that were already printed in the earlier Venice and Basle editions of the Bible. His edition would correct all the printing errors found there, provide punctuation and other clarifications and would include several of his own commentaries as well. All this would be done in a clear, beautiful way on elegant paper, including maps and genealogical lists, and in an edition that would be easy for the reader to carry and study. The other side of this document featured a two-column list of thirty-two books that Emden had already published, divided into three size categories designated as “folio,” “quarto,” and “octavio.” This was followed by a list of works of his that were still in manuscript for which he was also seeking support to publish. The document concluded with an elaborate proclamation, printed in seven plus lines at the bottom of the page, prohibiting the reprinting of any of his works.³²

32. This document is included in M. Steinschneider, *Catalogus Librorum Hebraeorum in Bibliotheca Bodleiana* (Berolini, 1852–1860; repr. Hildesheim, 1964), 1207–08, no. 9, but Dr. César Merchán-Hamann, Hebrew and Judaica Curator at the Bodleian library, informed me that it is not in the Bodleian's collection. There is a mention of it in Yeshayahu Vinograd, *Otsar ha-Sefer ha-Ivri* (Jerusalem: The Hebrew University, 1994), 26 (Altona #114). I found a copy of it in the National Library of Israel in Jerusalem (System Number 000852315; I have been unable to locate the original). My thanks to Dr. Benny Ogorek for his assistance and to Yisrael Dubitsky and Zmira Reuveni for

I found a second version of this document with writing only on one side of it containing Emden's two column list of his books. The other side is blank. This page is similar to the parallel page of the previously described document but with one very striking difference. In this version, instead of the warning against reprinting his works that appeared at the bottom of the page, Emden published the following in three lines:

This is a proclamation that the author has lost three works in his handwriting entitled (*Megillat Sefer* and *Teshuvat ha-Minin*) in one bound volume and a third entitled (*Halakhah Pesukah* on *Tur Oraḥ Ḥayyim*).³³ Whoever finds them or knows their whereabouts or who informs the author where they are will receive a reward (“*sekharo mishalem*”)³⁴ ... But the one who hides it in his possession from having stolen it, “his sin will not be overlooked” (*nakkeh lo yenakkeh*).³⁵ This warning is sufficient.³⁶

arranging for me to receive a copy of it (see Appendix 1). Avraham Ḥayyim Wagenaar saw a copy of this broadside and printed the solicitation page in his *Toledot Yave"ts*, pp. XIII–XIII (see too pp. 39–40). Yitshak Refael, “Kitvei Rabbi Ya'akov Emden,” pp. 235–42, printed an imprecise version of both sides of this document, also from a copy of it that he saw. Neither Wagenaar nor Refael saw the original.

33. This commentary on *Tur Oraḥ Ḥayyim* is not to be confused with Emden's *Mor u-Ketsi'ah*, two volumes of which had already appeared in print by the time this broadside was printed after 1769 and are included there as such. The broadside includes *Halakhah Pesukah* in this list of as yet unpublished works. See also Arnold B. Ehrlich, “Die Unedirten Schriften Jacob Emden's in der Bibliothek des Tempel Emanuel zu New York,” *Der Zeitgeist* 2 (1881): 227. Emden often refers to *Halakhah Pesukah* in his works. See my forthcoming edition of *Megillat Sefer* (above, n. 3).

34. See *Bava Metsi'a* 51b, 68b, and elsewhere.

35. See Exodus 34:7, and elsewhere.

36. This document is in the Gershom Scholem Library, housed in the National Library of Israel, Jerusalem (#000411707). See Yosef Dan and Esther Liebes, eds., *Sifriyyat Gershom Sholem be-Torat ha-Sod ha-Yehudit: Catalog*, vol. 1 (Jerusalem, 1999), 448, no. 5860. The parentheses are in the text.

There are two mistakes in this brief entry. First, the date given there is

Why did Rabbi Jacob Emden not publish *Megillat Sefer*? The answer may be very simple. The manuscript was no longer in his possession. It was either lost or stolen!³⁷

The manuscript was found some time before 1810 when the beginning of the work was published in the Haskalah journal *Ha-Me'asef*.³⁸ At some point it was copied, and the copy was included in the collection of the prominent Hamburg book collector, Ḥayyim Michael,³⁹ who sold it to the Bodleian.⁴⁰ A copy of that copy served as the basis

“around 1760” while the document itself clearly refers to “the end of 1769.” Second, and much more significantly, it notes that this document is “slightly different” from the list published by Refael, oblivious to this most important and significant distinction.

For a copy of this text, see Appendix 2. My thanks to Dr. Zvi Leshem and Ms. Hagit Dreyfuss of the National Library of Israel for facilitating my request to reproduce this document here.

37. I am reminded of an explanation offered in an article published in 2015 as to why Moshe ibn Ezra hid his name in his *Kitāb al-Muḥāḍara wal-Muḍakara* (*Sefer ha-'Iyyunim ve-ha-Diyyunim*). After presenting six suggestions, none of which he considered compelling, the author wrote that maybe his name had, indeed, been included on a page at the beginning or end of the work but that page was lost. See Yosef Danah, “Mipnei Mah Nimna R' Moshe ibn Ezra me-Hazkarat Shemo be-Sifro 'Kitāb al-Muḥāḍara wal-Muḍakara' (Sefer ha-'Iyyunim ve-ha-Diyyunim)?” in Dov Schwartz and Gilah Fribur, eds., *Mi-Yashan le-Ḥadash be-Sefer ha-'Ivri* (Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University, 2015), 35–44.

38. “Toledot Gedolei Yisrael, Megillat Sefer,” *Ha-Me'asef* (1810): 79–97. The introduction (p. 80) explicitly states that the manuscript utilized there was written in Emden's handwriting.

39. See the reference to it in the catalogue of the collection prepared by M. Steinschneider, *Otsrot Ḥayyim* (Hamburg, 1848), 36, #407.

40. See Ad. Neubauer, *Catalogue of the Hebrew Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library and in the College Libraries of Oxford*, p. 590, #1723:2.

For the sale of Emden's manuscripts in the Michael collection to the Bodleian, see H.M. Rabinowicz, *The Jewish Literary Treasures of England and America* (New York, London and Toronto: Thomas Yoseloff, 1962), 34; Naphtali Ben-Menaḥem, “‘Or Ha-Ḥayyim' ve-'Otsrot Ḥayyim'” introduction to *Sefer Or Ha-Ḥayyim* by Ḥayyim Michael, second ed. (Jerusalem 1965), IX; Ruth P.

for the edition of *Megillat Sefer* published by David Kahana in Warsaw, 1896.⁴¹

The copy sold by Michael to the Bodleian is still found there.⁴² The whereabouts of the original manuscripts of *Megillat Sefer* as well as those of *Teshuvat ha-Minin* and *Halakhah Pesukah* remain unknown.

Goldschmidt-Lehmann, “Osafim shel Hebraikah ve-Yudaikah be-Britanyah ha-Gedolah,” *Yad le-Kore* 16:1 (1976): 4–5.

41. See above, n. 3. See p. IV of the Kahana edition.

42. There is a measure of confusion regarding both the original manuscript and the copy. As noted (above, n. 38), the introduction to the text printed in *Ha-Me’asef* states that the manuscript utilized there was written by Emden. Steinschneider (above, n. 39) asserted that the copy utilized by the editors of *Ha-Me’asef* was owned by Michael, in which case Michael owned the original manuscript. However, another version is presented elsewhere. The *Ha-Me’asef* text was reprinted at the beginning of *Sefer Naḥalat Ya’akov* written by R. Jacob ben Jacob Moses Loberbaum of Lissa, Emden’s great nephew. The book was first published in Breslau, 1849 and was reprinted several times. The introduction to this text also asserts that Michael owned the original manuscript and it was this text that was sold to the Bodleian. The version held in the Bodleian, however, is clearly not the original but a copy.

APPENDIX 2

5385.1

רשימה

מחזורי השפורם בעולם נשם הרב כמדקין וחלטיו הנרפטים

פארית



- 1 לחם שמים ח'א' על שני סדרי משניות האשונים
- 2 כנוה חל'ל' לקונטרס בנין ביה הבחירה
- 3 דיע' לחם שמים חלק שני על ארבעה סדרים אמורים
- 4 משנה לחם מהדורה על שני סדרים ראשונים
- 5 שאלת יעבץ ח'א' עשרה הלחם ט"ח
- 6 אגרה בקורה ש"ח בדיני סו'ס ת' דפוס שני עשהפנות
- 7 סוד קאפיה ח'א' שני חלקים טרד היום וסדר השנים
- 8 שאילת יעבץ חלק שני

קווארטא

- 1 עץ אבוח עספיות ברעמורה ח'א' ולחם שמים' ולחם קדוים ונספוח לוח ארש' ח'ב' דקדוק על פירוקי אבות
- 2 הודח הקמאר על עין רע של הו'ע' ע"ן שריי חלקות הנמדין אשר ח'רע עמ'א' עד זמנ'ו' בטוקסובא גז'ל' ל'צ'ר' עליו עבדי' הנע'ל'
- 3 קיצור צי'ח' גובל צבי' להרב כמוה'ר'י שמוסר'ה' ז'ל' מרפוס סכית מנה היטב ממוקשי שבועי' התענות הרבות שכללו בדפוס ראשון' מואר ונוטרי' בטאות הדלור'ח' ל'ח'ת' לו' ע'י' הרב הספורם מחבר' חבורי' טריה' ח'ל'ו' ונוסף עליהם שני' ממה'ר'י' ש'ז'ל' צ'ה' כ'ול' מוקק'ים ע'י' ה'ח'ות'ן' ח'ל' - והשבו'ו' הרמה'ה'ל' הרב בעל הח'בור'ים' כ'מנ'ה' חידושי' ד'י'ום' בה'ל' כ'י'כ' :
- 4 הפלת שירים
- 5 פסח גדול
- 6 משפט שלום
- 7 עקריה עקבי' שרת' על אלוות קמיע' א' קטנה של איינש'ן
- 8 שפת אמת קדון קמיעות של ח'ל' (וספר'ה' לכ'נת'ה')
- 9 סגריה לוח ה'ח'ון' משבר' הבור' ע'ב'ים' ל'ח'ת' א'דות' כ'פ'ן' ח'ל'יו' ח'ל' ס'ל'ט'
- 10 אספר שיש' מהאור' כ'ת' ש'ן' כ'פ'ל'ד' ל'י'ע' בש'נת' ט'ר'ג' ל'פ'ק' כ'ול' ח'מ'ה' ח'ל'ק'ים' (ח') ש'וע' ל'מו'ס' (צ') ח'ת'ג' ל'ח'מ'ור' (ד') ר'ח'ן' מה'פ' (ד') ש'ע'ט' ל'בו' כ'ס'יל'ים' כ'נ'ד'ע'מ'ל' ה'ב'ש'ל'ים' כ'ע'מ'ת'ים' ו'ח'א'ו'ת'יה'ם' ה'ע'ו'ה' ל'ל'א' (ה') כ'ט'ט' ע'ט'ר'
- 11 (מ'ט'פ'ח' ס'פ'ר'ים') ע'ל' א'לו'ות' ס'י'ה' ר'י'ע' ו'ת'יק'ו'נים' ל'ק'ק'ן' ו'ל'ז'ר'פ'ס' מ'ו'ק'ש' ש'י'ב'ו'ים' ש'כ'פ'לו' ב'ה'ם' כ'מ'צ'י'ת' מ'ע'ת'יק'ים'
- 12 צ'ל'תי' כ'וד'ע'ים' ו'ה'י' כ'ת'מ'ח'ך' מ'ע'ש'יה'ם' כ'ט'ו'פ'ו' כ'ז'כ'ר' ק'ל'ת' מ'ע'ב'ין' א'י'י'ב'ש'ל'יר' :
- 13 (ל'י'ז'ים' ו'מ'ר'ח'ים') ר'מו'ים' ו'נ'י'מ'ט'ר'י'א'ו'ת' כ'ת'מ'ת' ס'ל'מ'ת' *
- 14 (ע'רו'ת' ב'יע'ק'ב') ו'ר'ח'ה' לו' ה'ש'ת'ל'א'ש' ח'ם' ע'ל' ז'ק'ת'ו' ו'א'מ'ו'כ'ו' ל'נ'י' י'ש'ר'א'ל' ו'ז'ו'ת' ו'ה'פ'ת'ח'ד' ל'נו' ע'ד' י'א'ת' ג'ו'אל' *
- 15 (א'ג'ר'ת' ס'ו'ס') ל'ב'ד' מ'י'ו'ח'ד' ל'ד'י'א' ר'פ'ו'ל'יו'ן' ע'ל' ע'ס'ק' ב'ש' ח'ל' *
- 16 (ב'ית' י'ו'כ'ת'ן') א'י'י'ב'ש'ל'יר' * מ'ע'ש'ה' ע'ר'ים' ו'כ'ב'לו'ת' ע'ש'ה' מ'כ'ט'ר'יו' כ'ק'ז'ר'
- 17 (פ'ח'ח' ע'י'נים') ל'ק'ר'ע'י'ב'י' א'ג'ר'ת' י'א'מ'פ'לי' מ'ל'י'ז'ו' *
- 18 (ש'מ'ש' ז'ד'ק'ה') ד'רו'ש' ל'ח'ת'ו'כ'ה' *
- 19 (י'ז'י'ז' ע'ת'ג'ם') ד'רו'ש' ל'ה'ס'ד'ר' י'ח'יד' ב'ד'ו'ד'ו' ג'ה'א'ון' ה'מ'מ'ו'ל'ם' כ'מו'ה'ר'י' כ'ז'י' א'ש'כ'נ'י' ז'ל' *
- 20 (ש'א'ג'ת' א'ר'יה') ה'ס'פ'ד' ע'ל' ח'ת'ו'ט' ה'י'ג' כ'מו'ה'ר' א'ר'יה' ל'י'ב' ו'ל'א'ב'ד' ד'ק'ק' א'מ'ש'ט'ר'ים' *

אקמויא

8 (סדר הפלת ועמודי שמים) אספר כולל לעבודת ה' בכל ימי השבוע וליליות ושעותיה' לנהוג ולשאינוהוג

פורעת

ואת שאנאבד מן המחבר שלשה חבורים מחיבת ידו קראים בשם (מגילת ספר ותשובת המינין) בכרך אחד והשני' נקרא בשם (הלכה פסוקה על ט"ח האמואל אותם או יודע היכן הם' או נותן ידיעה להמחבר היכן הם יקבל עכרו משלם בהשנות חן • אבל הכובע אותם תחת ידו מגול נקס לא ינקיה רי' באזהרה •

ולתהנהג האדם הישראלי הרומניות והטבעית • צביתו ועל שלחנו ובמפתו • ונלחמו לדרך ועסקו בד'א' ולמוד תורה • כלול וכלול דייטס והלכות וכל מיני ידעו' התעמ'כו' ל'איש יהודי ישר ונלחמו ל'א' ול'ד'

2 (פיר' הפל'ים) סדרים כ'ל'ל' ל'ב' או' ג' ידעו' ש'נה שנה נמי'ס מ'ר'ים ומ'פ'ורים לעבודת התפלה והק'ר'נות והכ'ס'ים ש'ל'ר'עו' ו'ר'י'כ'י' ה'ת'לו' ב'ה'ס' י'ו'ס'ו'ם' ש'ני' ס'פ'ר'ים' א'לו' נ'ר'פ'ים' ב'ש'ני' מ'י'ני' כ'י'ר' ט'ו'ב'ים' ו'צ'י'ו'ט'ים' *

3 (ברכות שמים) וספר מגדול עזו נקשר בסדר חיי האדם מיום ל'א'ת'ו' מ'ד'ח'ם' א'מו' ע'ד' ה'י'ו'ת' ל'א'ש' ב'ר'מ'ז'ו'ה' • ו'ת'י'ו'ק'ת' ב'ת' י'ב' כ'ו'ל' ס'ד'ר'ים' מ'א'י'ר'ים' כ'כ'ל' • ו'ל'ג'ו'ר'ך' א'יש' י'ש'ר'א'ל' ל'ב'ן' ו'ל'ג'ת' • כ'מ'א'ו'ת' ד'י'כ'ין' ו'ה'ל'כו'ת' ו'ה'ק'ג'ו'ת' י'ש'ר'ת' ע'פ' ה'ת'ו'ר'ה' ו'ה'ק'ב'ע' ע'ד' ה'י'ע'ס' ל'ת'ל'ית' ב'י'ו'ד'ו'ל'ם' • ו'ג'לו'ה' א'לו' ס'פ'ר' ב'תי' מ'ד'ו' ג'ד' ל' כ'מ'ו'ס' ו'ר'י'א' • ו'כ'ל'ל' ח'ר'ב' ד'יעו'ו' ע'ב'ע'יו' ב'כ'ר'ח'ו' ו'ה'ק'ב'ע' ח'ב' מ'ס'פ' ה'ל'ו' ב'ש'ני' מ'י'ני' כ'י'ר' ל'פ'י'ק'ן' ק'לו'ב' ה'ת'ק'ק' 4 (ס'פ' ר'ב'ה' ח'ו'ט'א' ו'מ'צ'י'ת') ע'ס' פ'י'ו'ט' (ע'ל'ט'ס' ב'ז'ו'ר') ו'ב'ר'כ'ת' ה'ח'מ'ה' ו'ר'י'כ'ים' ו'ח'י'ס' ה'ת'ח'ב'ר' ל'ר'א' ר'פ'ו'ל'יו'ן' א'ש'ר' ע'ב'ד'ו'ן' • ע'ל' ע'י'ן' ע'ד'א'ל'י' ה'ר'ל' ה'מ'ר' כ'ת'ח'ל'מו' ו'מ'ת'ו'ק' כ'ט'ו'פ'ו' כ'א'ש'ר' ע'ב'ר' א'ו'ת'ם' א'יש' א'ל'מ'ת' *

6 (לוח ארש) ח'א' י'ג'ל' ד'ק'ד'וק' ה'ת'פ'ל'ה' *

7 כ'ר'ך' כ'ו'ל'ל' ע'ש'ת'ה' ס'פ'ר'ים' י'ש'ים' מ'ו'נ'י'ס' ו'מ'ח'ו'ק'ים' ל'א'ש'ר'י' ה'ת'ק'ו'ה' ה'ר'ד'ו'מ'ים' ו'י'ש'ים' (א') (ה'פ'ד'ו'ת' ו'ה'פ'ו'ר'ק'ן' (ב') א'ג'ר'ת' ח'י'מ'ן' (ג') ה'מ'ל'מ'ר' ח'י'ס' ל'כ'ר'י' (ד') ו'כ'ט'ו'פ'ו' כ'ז'כ'ר' ה'ס'ם' ע'ל' ע'ד'א'ל'י'ע' ו'כ'ת'ק'י'ו'ת' ה'נ'ע'מ'ת' ה'א'יש' כ'ת'מ'ן' ל'ס' כ'ב'ת'ו'ב' ל'ד'י'א' ע'ב'ד'ו'ת' כ'כ'ו'ה' מ'פ'ו'ן' ב'ש'ל'מו'ת' :

8 כ'ר'ך' כ'ו'ר'ש' • ק'ט'ו'ן' ל'מ'ר'א'ה' ע'א'ו'ס' כ'ב'מ'ו'ת' ו'ר'ב' ה'א'י'כ'ו'ב' כ'ו'ל'ל' ד'י' ר'א'ש'ים' (א') (כ'ת'א'ב'ק'ו'ת' מ'ע'י'ן' ה'מ'א'ו'ר'ע' ש'ל' א'יש' ש'ד'ה' ע'ם' א'יש' ח'ם' (ב') ש'ח'ו'ן' ה'כ'ס'ל' (ג') ל'ג' י'מ'י'ני' • ש'ם' ש'ק'ר'ה' ע'מ'נו' כ'ב'ע'ר' ו'נ'ע'ר' • כ'ט' ע'ל' ס'ו'ק'ן' ו'כ'ס'ל' (ג') י'ק'ב' ו'ז'א'ב'מ'פ'ל'ת' ה'א'ר'י'ה' ו'ח'ז'ב' ע'ב'ד'ו'ת' ע'ד'ו'ת' ה'ב'ח'ו'ר'ים' ה'כ'ש'ר'ים' (ד') נ'ש'ד'ו'כ'ה' (ה') מ'ת'א'ו'ר'ע'ו'ת' כ'מ'ט'ש'בו' מ'א'י'י'ש'ל'ר' • ו'ד'ע' מ'ר'ע'ים' ע'ל' ע'ב'ד'ו'ן' ו'ל'מ'ד'יו'ן' ע'ר'י' • ב'ר'פ'א'ג' • ב'מ'י'ן' • כ'פ'פ'ד' • ב'נ'ק' ב'ע'כ'ר'כ'י'ן' • כ'ע'ט'ע'מ'פ'י' • ב'ט'י'פ'ל'ן' • ב'ע'ל'י'ש'ו'א' • ו'מ'רו'ס'ת'י'ן' א'י'י'ב'ש'ל'יר' ע'ו'י'ן' ב'ו'ז'ל'ג' • ב'פ'ר'ע'ש'ב'ו'ר'ג' מ'ן' ה'מ'י'ט'ים' ת'ש'ד' כ'ת'ן' א'ר'פ'א'ל'ן' ב'ע'ל' ש'ד' ש'ח'ו'אל' • א'ה'ר'ן' ה'א'ר'ד'ע'ק'ן' • מ'ס'מ'פ'י' מ'י'נו'ת' ש'ח'י'ב'ר' א'י'י'ב'ש'ל'יר' • ו'מ'ה' ש'כ'ע'ט'ה' כ'נ'ג'ו'ד'ו'כ'ת'ה' ל'פ'ו'ר' מ'ד'ב'ק' מ'ד'ו'ע' ש'ר'ל'ס' מ'כ'ל' ל'ד'ר'ים' י'א'ג'ר'ת' מ'ה'ר'ב' ד'ל'י'ס'א' ל'פ'ו'ר' מ'ד'ב'ק' מ'ד'ו'ע' ש'ר'ל'ס' א'י'י'ב'ש'ל'יר' ל'ה'י'ו'ת' ב'ית' ה'מ'א'ו'ר'ע' ה'ל'ו' ש'ל' ש'י'ן' ו'כ'ת' ש'ל' ה'א'ר'ו'ה' ש'ר'י'ך' ש'מ'י'ד'ה' י'ח'י'ר'ה' • כ'י' א'ל' פ'ס'ק'ה' ו'ה'מ'ת'ו'ל' ב'נ'ח'ש' ק'ד'מו'י' כ'פ'ט'ו'י'ע'ד' ה'י'ו'ם' • ה'ב'ל' מ'ס'ו'ר'ד' כ'ת'ל'ית' ע'ד' ס'ו'ק' ש'נת' ת'ק'כ'ע' ל'פ'י'ק' • ל'ה'א'ר' ע'י'ני' ע'ו'ר'ים' • ל'ה'ע'י'ר' ל'בו'ת' ו'ש'ח'ה' נ'כ'ס'ו'ת' ה'ע'ב'ר'ים' י'ש'ר'ים' ב'ר'ים' • ע'ו'ב' ל'ה'ו'ד'ו'ת' ל'ה' ש'ע'ל'ה' ל'ח'ם' מ' ש'יע' ו'ר'ב' ו'ה'י'ל'ט' • מ'ר'ש'ת' ה'מ'י'כו'ת' ס'פ'רו'ס'ה' ל'י'ג'ג'ס' • ו'י'ז'כ'ו' ע'ת' ד'ו'א' ג'ו'אל'ס' ב'צ' א'ת'ן' *

כ'מ'א'ן' מ'וד'ע'א' ר'ב'ס' ל'א'ו'ר'י'ת'א' • מ'י' מ'ה'כ'ד'ב' ל'ה'י' מ'ב'ע'לי' כ'י'פ'ים' א'ו' מ'ד'פ'י'ס'ים' ל'ה'ז'י'א' ל'א'ור' כ'ד'פ'ו'ם' ס'ק'ר'א' ג'ד'ול' ה'ל'ט'ו'ד' ג'ד'ול' מ'ו'נ'י'ס'ים' מ'ב'ו'א'ר'ים' ו'מ'ו'א'ר'ים' • ו'כ'ן' א'ר'ב'ע'ה' ט'ו'ר'ים' • ו'מ'ד'ר'ו'ס' • ו'ס'פ'ר'י' ד'ר'יק' • מ'כ'ל'ל' ו'ש'ר'ס' מ'ו'נ'ה' • ו'מ'פ'ו'ר'ס'ים' • ע'ס'ו'ס'פ'ר'ים' ר'ב'ים' מ'ד'ו'ש'ים' ס'פ'ר'י'כ'י' ע'ל' ה'מ'ח'ב' ה'כ'ל' ב'י'ח'ו'ד' ס'פ'ר' ק'ו'ל'ן' ש'ל' ט'ו'פ'ר'ים' ח'י'ג'ן' ס'פ'ר' ט'ו'ר'ע'ל' ג' ט'ו'ר'י' ס'פ'ר' ה'ק'ש'ו'ר'ים' ל'יע'ק'ב' ד'ר'ש'ו'ת' • ס' ה'ל'כ'ה' פ'ס'ו'ק'ת' ע'ל' א'ז'ח' ס' ע'ש'ת' ר'וד' ע'ם' ה'נ'ח'ו'ח' ר'בו'ת' נ'פ'ל'או'ת' • ס' ו'ה'ש'ת' ע'ם' נ'ו'ס'פ'ו' • ס' ה'ע'ר'ו'ך' ע'ם' ה'ס'מ'ו' • ס'פ'ר' ה'נ'ח'ו'ח' ס'פ'ר' ה'ו'ח' ו'ר'י'ס' ו'ר'י'ס' ק'י'ב'ו'ן' ו'ה'ג'לו'י' ל'ח'ם' ט'ע'ש'י'ר'ו' א'ס'ן' • כ'ל' א'ש'ר' ג'ו'ב'ה' ר'ו'ח'ו' א'ו'ח'ו' ל'בו'ב' א'ז' ה'ר'ב'ים' • ת'ח'ת' ש'כ'רו' א'ו'ח'ו' • ל'ה'רו'י'ת' ה'ר'ב'ה' ל'ע'צ'ט'ו' ל'ב'ים' ו'ל'ו'ל'חו' •

*“In the Dwelling of a Sage
Lie Precious Treasures”*



Essays in Jewish Studies in
Honor of Shnayer Z. Leiman

EDITED BY

Yitzhak Berger and Chaim Milikowsky



The Michael Scharf Publication Trust of Yeshiva University Press

KTAV PUBLISHING HOUSE