

Motivations for Radical Anti-Sabbatianism: The Case of Ḥakham Zevi Ashkenazi

Jacob J. Schacter

One of the most significant and lasting contributions of Gershom Scholem to Jewish scholarship is his serious and objective treatment of the Sabbatian movement in all of its phases and complexity. In his magisterial two-volume history of Sabbatianism and in a number of important articles, Scholem broke important new ground in the study of this movement, presenting the history of its rise, heyday, and ongoing impact in dramatic and comprehensive detail.¹

Scholem's wide-ranging studies elucidated many aspects of the Sabbatian phenomenon: the state of mind of mid-seventeenth century world Jewry which set the stage for the unprecedented spread of this messianic movement against a background of Jewish messianic activism which, until that time, had been the province of only a select few; the actual story of the movement itself until the death of Nathan of Gaza in 1680; the backgrounds and personalities of the major protagonists in this extraordinary drama; the various complex and conflicting kabbalistic teachings which gave meaning to the movement; the features which differentiated its 'radical' from its more 'moderate' factions; the role of the movement in the history of Jewry in the eighteenth century and in setting the stage for *Haskalah*, *Ḥasidut* and other devel-

- 1 See: G. Scholem, *Shabbetai Zevi ve-ha-Tenu'ah ha-Shabbeta'it bi-Yemei Ḥayyav*, Tel-Aviv 1957 (= *Shabbetai Zevi*). English version, see: idem, *Sabbatai Ševi: The Mystical Messiah*, tr. R. J. Z. Werblowsky, Princeton 1973 (= *Sabbatai Ševi*). See also: idem, *Mehkarim u-Mekorot le-Toledot ha-Shabbeta'ut ve-Gilgulehah*, Jer usalem 1982 [1974]. More than three dozen of Scholem's articles relating to Sabbatianism were collected, introduced and brought up to date by Y. Liebes in *Mehkarei Shabbeta'ut*, Tel-Aviv 1991. For analyses of Scholem's treatment of Sabbatianism, see: D. Biale, *Gershom Scholem: Kabbalah and Counter-History*, Cambridge and London 1979, index, s.v. 'Sabbatai Zevi', 'Sabbatianism'; J. Dan, *Gershom Scholem and the Mystical Dimension of Jewish History*, New York and London 1987, pp. 286–312; and the reviews of Werblowsky and Kurzweil, cited below in note 5.

opments in modern Jewish history; and, most significantly, the ideology which motivated Jews to remain 'believers' in that most paradoxical of phenomena, an apostate messiah. In analyzing these and other complex issues, Scholem single-handedly placed the study of the Sabbatian messianic movement and its crypto-Sabbatian aftermath, in all their intensity, scope and drama, on the agenda of serious Jewish scholarship.

But while the spectacular spread and continued influence of Sabbatianism was carefully chronicled and painstakingly presented by Scholem, the substantial opposition to the movement, especially after Shabbetai Zevi's apostasy, also deserves equally thoughtful consideration. On first glance, it would appear that the phenomenon of anti-Sabbatianism offers much less of a challenge to the historian. After all, once Shabbetai Zevi converted to Islam, it was only obvious and logical to conclude that he could not be the messiah, however sad and painful such a conclusion might have been to those who had been absolutely convinced that they had been living in the long-awaited messianic era. Simply put, an apostate messiah could not be a messiah. Yet, the matter is not as simple as that. Scholem, his students and their students have clearly demonstrated that Sabbatian 'believers' did not share one single unidimensional ideology but rather, on the contrary, held very different and often contradictory positions. The fundamental differences between the theologies of Shabbetai Zevi himself, Nathan of Gaza, Abraham Cardozo, Samuel Primo, and the members of the radical Salonika school, to name just a few, were so significant that it is impossible to speak simplistically of a monolithic Sabbatian 'movement'. And what is true of the 'believers' is also true of their opponents. A multiplicity of motives and orientations characterizes the anti-Sabbatian camp as well. There are factors other than the logical and obvious one that need to be considered in a fuller and more nuanced presentation of the anti-Sabbatian position.

For example, in attempting to explain the opposition of Isaac Cardozo (1603/1604-1683) to Sabbatianism, Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi did not simply assume the obvious – that after Shabbetai Zevi's conversion to Islam, Isaac could simply no longer believe him to be the messiah – and leave it at that. Scholem had already noted how various theories advanced to justify Shabbetai Zevi's conversion resonated particularly among former Marranos who could especially identify with a dissonance between an external conversion to another faith and an inner reality of a far different order. The justification advanced by Isaac's own

brother Abraham, who took a position diametrically opposed to that of Isaac and who emerged as one of the leading architects of post-conversion Sabbatian theology, 'For he [the messiah] was destined to become a Marrano like me [אנוס כמוני]', had a special meaning for former Marranos and accounts for a disproportionate number of them maintaining their faith in Shabbetai Zevi even after his conversion to Islam.² However, Yer ushalmi argued that the Marrano connection can work two ways. For if there were factors in the life experience of former Marranos which militated in favor of their being continued believers in Shabbetai Zevi even after his conversion, there were also equally compelling factors which militated against such a belief. Yer ushalmi showed how it was precisely his experiences as a former Marrano which led Isaac to disavow any association with the apostate messiah, for continued belief in Shabbetai Zevi after that point presupposed accepting certain assumptions which smacked of the Christianity Isaac had rejected when he moved from Spanish court to Italian ghetto.³ In explaining the phenomenon of anti-Sabbatianism, then, additional considerations have been taken into account, other than the simple logic of the basic position itself.

I want to extend this analysis into the next generation or two and ask not what factors accounted for an anti-Sabbatian position *per se*, but what factors accounted for a *particularly vehement and extreme* anti-Sabbatianism. By the time Shabbetai Zevi died in 1676, and certainly in the decades that followed, the rejection of Sabbatianism was even more commonplace and obvious. Why someone could no longer believe in a dead apostate messiah required less and less of an explanation. What needs to be addressed, however, is the issue of the *intensity* of the anti-Sabbatian position. Why did some rabbis and communal leaders become extreme in their anti-Sabbatianism while others were

- 2 See: G. Scholem, 'Mizvah ha-Ba'ah ba-'Averah', *Knesset*, 2 (1937), pp. 347–392, esp. 358–359; reprinted in: idem, *Melḥakim u-Mekorot* (ibid.), pp. 9–67, esp. 23–24; tr. into English as 'Redemption Through Sin', in: idem, *The Messianic Idea in Judaism*, New York 1971, pp. 78–141, esp. 94–95. See also: idem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, New York 1946, pp. 309–310. For the phrase אנוס כמוני, see: A. Freimann (ed.), *Anyenei Shabbetai Zevi*, Berlin 1913, p. 88; reprinted in: Jacob Sasportas, *Sefer Zizkat Novel Zevi*, ed. I. Tishby, Jerusalem 1954, p. 291.
- 3 Y.H. Yer ushalmi, *From Spanish Court to Italian Ghetto*, New York 1971, pp. 302–349. For a similar example in the case of Isaac Orobio de Castro, see: Y. Kaplan, *Mi-Nazrut le-Yahadut*, Jerusalem 1982, pp. 183–203; idem, *From Christianity to Judaism*, Oxford 1989, pp. 209–234.

more moderate and subdued in their opposition to that movement? Why, for example, did R. Jacob Sasportas (c. 1610-1698) and R. Moses Ḥagiz (1671-1751) devote so much of their enormous talents and prodigious energies to combating Sabbatianism while the vast majority of their contemporaries did not? Why did R. Jacob Emden (1697-1776) become such an extreme and obsessive anti-Sabbatian while others in his generation like R. Ezekiel Landau (1713-1793), the author of the *Noda' bi-Yehudah*, for example, did not? After all, Sid Z. Leiman has shown that Landau too, like Emden, was convinced that R. Jonathan Eybeschütz was a Sabbatian.⁴ Yet, unlike Emden, his position in the famous Emden-Eybeschütz controversy was a far more mild and moderate one.

There is no doubt that in considering the question of extremism or obsession in behavior, one's personal psychological predisposition plays a major role. Some people are just more contrary and extreme in their behavior than are others. There are always those who see huge conspiracies and dangerous threats where others see only petty distractions and minor nuisances. But these psychological considerations alone are insufficient to account for this phenomenon and other factors have been and need to be introduced to provide for a fuller and more nuanced analysis.

In her study of R. Moses Ḥagiz, Elisheva Carlebach placed Sasportas' anti-Sabbatianism within the context of his long time role as a social critic, expressing his strong opposition to those phenomena he observed in the Jewish community which, he believed, would undermine the rabbinic tradition.⁵ As far as Ḥagiz himself is concerned, Carlebach

4 See: S. Z. Leiman, 'When a Rabbi is Accused of Heresy: R. Ezekiel Landau's Attitude Toward R. Jonathan Eibeschutz in the Emden-Eibeschutz Controversy', in: J. Neusner, E. S. Frerichs and N. M. Sarna (eds.), *From Ancient Israel to Modern Judaism. Intellect in Quest of Understanding: Essays in Honor of Marvin Fox, III*, Atlanta 1989, pp. 179-194.

5 E. Carlebach, *The Pursuit of Heresy: Rabbi Moses Hagiz and the Sabbatian Controversies*, New York 1990 (= *The Pursuit of Heresy*), p. 5. The matter of Sasportas' anti-Sabbatianism is a complicated one and it still merits further analysis. See the problematic assessment of his personality and character in Tishby's introduction to his edition of Sasportas' *Sefer Ziztat Novel Zevi*, pp. 13-39, repeated and amplified by Scholem in *Shabbetai Zevi*, pp. 468-470; *Sabbatai Ševi*, pp. 566-569. Scholem's famous characterization of Sasportas' portrait as presenting 'the face of a Jewish "Grand Inquisitor"' (*Shabbetai Zevi*, p. 468; *Sabbatai Ševi*, pp. 566-567) clearly shows that he went too far in his desire to present the Sabbatian movement fairly and objectively, and underscores the need for a more balanced view of the entire phenomenon of anti-Sabbatianism.

noted a number of considerations: a 'personal proclivity for zealotry'; a desire to follow the example set by his father, R. Jacob Ḥagiz, and his teacher, R. Abraham Yiẓḥaki; and a lifelong passion for revitalizing the rabbinate and rabbinic authority.⁶ In the case of Emden, in particular, there is no question that psychological considerations played a major role. The complexities of his personality and his propensity for controversy are well known and not open merely to speculation.⁷ Nevertheless, here too other considerations have been suggested. As in the case of his senior colleague Ḥagiz, and even more so, Emden had an almost obsessive desire to relive the life of his father, Ḥakham Zevi Ashkenazi, who, as we will see, was a leading anti-Sabbatian.⁸ In addition, Yehudah Liebes has argued that Emden's messianic pretensions for himself as well as for the members of his immediate family were a significant factor (if not *the* significant factor) in accounting for the extremism of his

For critiques of their attitude towards Sasportas, see: R. I. Z. Werblowsky's review of Scholem's book, 'Hirhurim 'al "Shabbetai Zevi" le-G. Scholem', *Molad*, 15 (1957), p. 545 (see Scholem's reply to Werblowsky's criticism in his 'Od Davar, Tel-Aviv 1989, pp. 98–104); B. Kurzweil, 'He'arot le-"Shabbetai Zevi" shel Gershom Scholem', *Ba-Ma'avak 'al 'Erkhei ha-Yahadut*, Tel-Aviv 1969, pp. 130–134; A. Korman, *Zeranim ve-Kitot ba-Yahadut*, Tel-Aviv 1966, pp. 278–283; A. Gross, 'Demuto shel R. Ya'akov Sasportas mi-Tokh Sefer ha-Shu"t "Ohel Ya'akov"', *Sinai*, 93 (1983), pp. 132–141; E. Moyal, *Rabbi Ya'akov Sasportas*, Jer usalem 1992, pp. 55f. In order fully to understand Sasportas' motivation, it is obviously essential to determine whether his opposition toward the movement was clear and unambiguous from the very beginning or whether there was even a brief period of time when he entertained a positive attitude toward it. This issue is dealt with by Tishby in *Sefer Zizit Novel Zevi*, pp. 43–44, and in a later article by him, 'Al Mishnato shel Gershom Scholem be-Ḥeker ha-Shabbeta'ut', *Tarbiz*, 28 (1958–1959), pp. 119–123; reprinted in: idem, *Netivei Emunah u-Minut*, [Ramat-Gan 1964] Jer usalem 1982, 1994, pp. 258–262, and in two reviews of Tishby's book: R. Shatz-Uffenheimer, *Beḥinot*, 10 (1956), pp. 50–67; M. A. Anat (Perlmutter), 'Ha-Sefer "Zizit Novel Zevi" le-Rabbi Ya'akov Sasportas', *Tarbiz*, vol. 26. no. 3 (1957), pp. 338–344. See too: Moyal, *ibid.*, pp. 128–143.

6 Carlebach, *The Pursuit of Heresy*, pp. 6, 39–40, 43, 52–53, 123, 157–159. Carlebach also briefly discusses the anti-Sabbatianism of R. Jacob Zemaḥ (p. 34), the Frances brothers (pp. 34, 137), and R. Joseph Ergas (pp. 137–143).

7 I am completing a critical edition of *Megillat Sefer*, Emden's autobiography, to be published by Mossad Bialik, where all this will be spelled out in great detail.

8 Emden consistently refers to himself as 'a zealot, the son of a zealot [זקן בן זקן]'. For a list of sources, see: J. J. Schacter, 'History and Memory of Self: The Autobiography of Rabbi Jacob Emden', in: E. Carlebach, J. Efron and D. Meyers (eds.), *Jewish History and Jewish Memory: Essays in Honor of Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi*, Hanover 1998, p. 448, n. 30.

anti-Sabbatianism.⁹ Clearly more than psychological predisposition to controversy needs to be considered.

I would like to suggest another consideration which, I believe, should be taken into account when assessing the factors which led some to adopt a particularly vociferous and vehement anti-Sabbatian position. The family backgrounds of several leading anti-Sabbatians in the eighteenth century reveal that they shared one thing in common – close relatives who were known to have been confirmed followers of Shabbetai Zevi in the previous generation or two, not only before but even after his conversion. For example, R. Moses Galanté (1620-1689) was a leading Sabbatian.¹⁰ His grandson, R. Moses Ḥagiz, was a prominent anti-Sabbatian.¹¹ R. David Yizḥaki (c.1615-1694) had been a devoted follower of Shabbetai Zevi for many years.¹² His son, R. Abraham Yizḥaki (1661-1729), was one of the principal opponents of Sabbatianism at the beginning of the century.¹³ R. Moses Pinheiro (d. 1689) was a childhood friend and early associate of Shabbetai Zevi and remained an ardent spokesman for the movement as late as 1690.¹⁴ His grandson, R. Joseph Ergas (1685-1730), was a prominent and active anti-Sabbatian.¹⁵ Further research will undoubtedly yield additional examples of this phenomenon as well.

Given the enormous popularity of Shabbetai Zevi in the heyday of

- 9 See: Y. Liebes, 'Meshihiyuto shel R. Ya'akov Emden ve-Yaḥaso la-Shabbeta'ut', *Tarbiz*, 49 (1980), pp. 122–165; reprinted in: idem, *Sod ha-Emunah ha-Shabbeta'it*, Jer usalem 1995, pp. 198–211, 396–421.
- 10 See: G. Scholem, *Shabbetai Zevi*, index, s.v. 'Galanté, Moshe'; *Sabbatai Ševi*, index, s.v. Galanté, R. Moses; *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, 7 (1971), pp. 259–260. There is some question as to how long Galanté remained a 'believer'. See: Carlebach, *The Pursuit of Heresy*, pp. 35–36, 42. Carlebach considers Galanté to have been 'a supporter' as late as 1674 (p. 42).
- 11 See above note 5.
- 12 See: G. Scholem, 'Parshiyot be-Ḥeker ha-Tenu'ah ha-Shabbeta'it', *Zion*, 6 (1941), pp. 87–89; idem., 'Li-She'elat Yaḥasam shel Rabbanei Yisra'el 'el ha-Shabbeta'ut', *Zion*, 13–14 (1948–1949), pp. 59–62; reprinted in: idem, 'R. David Yizḥaki ve-Yaḥaso la-Shabbeta'ut', *Meḥkarei Shabbeta'ut*, pp. 194–201. For an updated bibliography on Yizḥaki (prepared by Y. Liebes), see: *ibid.*, pp. 201–202.
- 13 See: Carlebach, *The Pursuit of Heresy*, index, s.v. 'Yizḥaki, Abraham'. See too: M. Friedman, 'Iggerot be-Farashat Pulmus Neḥemiah Ḥiyya Ḥayyon', *Sefunot*, 10 (1996), pp. 490–491; *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, 16 (1972), pp. 839–840; A. Almaliah, *Ha-Rishonim le-Ziyyon: Toledoteihem u-Pe'ulatam*, Jer usalem 1970, pp. 76–80.
- 14 *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, 13 (1971), pp. 536–537.
- 15 *Ibid.*, 6 (1971), pp. 839–841; Carlebach, *The Pursuit of Heresy*, index, s.v. 'Ergas, R. Joseph'.

the movement, it is fair to assume that almost any Jew in the eighteenth century had some relative who had once been a 'believer' prior to Shabbetai's conversion. What is of special significance in the examples cited here, however, is that Yizhaki, Pinheiro and Galanté continued to maintain their belief in Shabbetai Zevi even *after* his conversion, at a time when he had been abandoned by the vast majority of his followers. That each of these persistent Sabbatians had direct descendants who were later in the forefront of the movement against Sabbatianism is what I want to highlight here.

First, a methodological consideration. To be sure, Sabbatianism in one's family, in and of itself, is not enough to explain one's extreme and rabid opposition to the movement. There were undoubtedly many moderate anti-Sabbatians (who were opponents of the movement but in a less extreme and virulent fashion) and even non-Sabbatians (who simply were neither opponents nor followers of the movement) who also had close family members who were 'believers' even after Shabbetai Zevi's conversion. The presence of a Sabbatian forebear surely did not insure a virulent and extreme anti-Sabbatian descendant. Conversely, there probably were active anti-Sabbatians in the eighteenth century who did not have a Sabbatian skeleton in their family's closet and whose motivations stemmed from other considerations entirely. Nevertheless, for some, with a certain type of psychological temperament, having had a Sabbatian in their family might account, to some extent, for their own unusually strong, active and vehement reaction to that movement. This was not necessarily the only motivation, or even the dominant one, but I suggest that it too needs to be taken into account.

There are a number of ways to explain this nexus. For example, one possibility may be that these later anti-Sabbatians were reacting to the extreme embarrassment and discomfort they felt over the presence of this heresy within the confines of their own immediate families. Rather than feel defensive, they took the initiative and positioned themselves in the forefront of the struggle against it, to actively search out and uproot any vestige of that foulness which had contaminated their own loved ones. In other words, the best defense was an offense.

Or maybe it was not simply a matter of discomfort or embarrassment. Is it possible that this discomfort or embarrassment led these virulent anti-Sabbatians to feel a great deal of anger towards their heretical Sabbatian forebears which, due to their close personal connection, they found difficult to express? Is it conceivable that, as a result, they transferred this anger onto the Sabbatian movement as a whole?

Perhaps, in a different vein, the knowledge that Sabbatianism had penetrated their own families and affected their respected forbears made these descendants more aware than were others of the potential power and alluring attractiveness – and therefore danger – of the movement. For if their beloved father or grandfather could have been misled, so could anyone else. They knew, from their own intimate experience, just how dangerous this heresy could be. This consideration, in and of itself, can be operative on two different, even contradictory, ways. Perhaps their ancestors, having seen the error of their ways, became so full of hatred and venom for the movement that led them astray and transmitted the intensity of their anti-Sabbatian feelings to their descendants. Conversely, it may even be possible that these descendants themselves were tempted – at some level – to follow in their forebear's footsteps and so, perhaps, needed to be extra vigilant to defend against an impulse which may have been real and threatening to them. Perhaps, therefore, they needed to quiet their own inner doubts and fears – and maybe even unconscious wishes – by taking the offensive against what for them loomed as a formidable personal threat. Unlike the first set of possibilities that reflect unconscious (or maybe even conscious) shame regarding personal identity, this consideration focuses on unconscious (or maybe even conscious) anxiety over potentially destructive behavior. In either case, the result is the same – a concerted effort to uproot and destroy the source of the evil perceived of as a threat.

Finally, perhaps the suggestion made regarding R. Abraham Yizhaki could be applied to others as well: 'The man who was cognizant of the original deeds of his father and of his [father's] regret and deep remorse became a determined opponent of the movement that led his father astray. In this way, he sought to achieve atonement and purification for his father's soul'.¹⁶ While all these psychological suggestions are pure conjecture, they are plausible in helping explain a recurrent pattern that, I believe, is worthy of consideration.

*

How relevant is this analysis to help account for the particularly strong and extreme anti-Sabbatian behavior of Ḥakham Zevi Ashkenazi, one of the leading opponents of the movement through the second decade

16 See: M. Benayahu, 'Ma'amadah shel ha-Tenu'ah ha-Shabbeta'it bi-Yer ushalayim', in: S. Lieberman and A. Hyman (eds.), *Sefer ha-Yovel li-Khevod Shalom Baron*, Jerusalem 1975, pp. 66–67.

of the eighteenth century?¹⁷ In 1666, as a young boy, Zevi moved to Ofen-Buda, later known as Budapest, together with the members of his family.¹⁸ His arrival in that city directly coincided with the rise of the Sabbatian movement which swept through almost the entire Jewish world at that time. Ofen was no exception. Like many other Hungarian communities, it too became a center of Sabbatian influence and activity.¹⁹ Many years later, Ḥakham Zevi related to his son, R. Jacob Emden, some of his own eyewitness experiences with Sabbatians at that time:

My revered father, who was a child during the time of Shabbetai Zevi, told us and testified that at that time there were women who said: 'Let us go and slay demons'. They dressed themselves in white linen garments and moved their outstretched arms to and fro in the air, one here and one there. They spread out the dress²⁰ and collected much blood from the air with their clothes, as if with their own hands they shed much blood. [. . .] One woman said: 'Who wants me to give him the aroma of Gan Eden?' With

- 17 This major figure has not received the scholarly attention he deserves. The best study to date is still J. Bleich, 'Ḥakam Zebi as Chief Rabbi of the Ashkenazic Kehillah of Amsterdam (1710–1714)', unpublished Masters' thesis, Yeshiva University, New York 1965.
- 18 See: Jacob Emden, *Megillat Sefer*, Warsaw 1896 (= *Megillat Sefer*), p. 7, where Emden writes that his father arrived in Buda together with his father, R. Jacob Zak, and maternal grandfather, R. Ephraim ha-Kohen. For 1666 as the date of their arrival, see the introduction of R. Judah ha-Kohen to the responsa of his father, R. Ephraim ha-Kohen, *She'elot u-Teshuvot Sha'ar Ephraim*, Lemberg 1886 (= *Shu"t Sha'ar Ephraim*), beginning. It is impossible to determine young Zevi's precise age at that time because his date of birth is unknown, with suggestions ranging from 1648 to 1661. See: A. H. Wagenaar, *Sefer Toledot Yavez*, Lublin 1881, p. 4; M. Gr unwald, *Hamburgs deutsche Juden*, Hamburg 1904, p. 66; M. Balaban, 'Shalshet ha-Yahas shel Mishpaḥat Orenstein-Broda', *Sefer ha-Yovel li-Khevod Dr. Mordekhai Ze'ev Broda*, Warsaw 1931, p. 21; D. Kahana, *Toledot ha-Mekubalim, ha-Shabbeta'im ve-ha-Ḥasidim*, I, Tel-Aviv 1921 (= *Toledot ha-Mekubalim*), p. 130; Z. Y. Lerer, 'He'arot ha-Ḥakham Zevi ve-ha-Yavez 'al Sefer "ha-Bahur"', *Zefunot*, 14 (1992), p. 101. See *Megillat Sefer*, where Emden writes that his father was 'still a lad, young in years [נער רך בשנים]' while living in Buda.
- 19 See: Sasportas, *Sefer Zizat Novel Zevi*, pp. 129, 131, 209, 215; Scholem, *Shabbetai Zevi*, index, s.v. 'Budapest'; *Sabbatai Ševi*, index, s.v. 'Budapest' and 'Ofen (Buda)'. For other references, see: D. Kaufmann, *Die Erstürmung Ofens und ihre Vorgeschichte*, Trier 1895, p. 19; reprinted in: idem, *Gesammelte Schriften*, II, Frankfurt a. Main 1910, p. 301; idem, *Die letzte Vertreibung der Juden aus Wien und Niederösterreich*, Vienna 1889, p. 91; Y. Greenwald, 'Le-Toledot ha-Mekubalim be-Ungaryah', *Sinai*, 24 (1949), pp. 193–195.
- 20 Cf. Deuteronomy 22: 17.

her hands outstretched towards the heavens she caught some air and offered an exceedingly fragrant odor to whoever wanted.²¹

He also told a story about a young boy in Sarajevo during the days of Shabbetai Zevi who, for a period of time, was suddenly endowed with the prophetic power of being able to inform people about all the sins they had ever committed.²²

As a young man, Ḥakham Zevi traveled to the East to study Torah,²³ and there came into contact with former followers of the movement from whom he undoubtedly heard a great deal about its traditions and beliefs. In Adrianople, he encountered R. Jacob Straimer who had been a 'believer' prior to Shabbetai's conversion.²⁴ On a visit to Belgrade in 1679, he also met R. Joseph Almosnino who had been a follower of Shabbetai Zevi.²⁵ Interestingly, Ḥakham Zevi's first-hand knowledge of Sabbatian lore is indicated by the fact that a later work quotes him as a source for the Sabbatian tradition that the messiah died in Arnaut-Belgrade, Albania.²⁶

- 21 Jacob Emden, *Zot Torat ha-Kena'ot*, Altona 1752, p. 5a. Sabbatians claimed that a fragrant odor exuded from Shabbetai Zevi's body which they identified as the smell of Gan Eden. See: Scholem, *Sabbatai Ševi*, p. 139.
- 22 Emden, *ibid*. See also: Scholem, *Sabbatai Ševi*, pp. 636–637. Ḥakham Zevi served as rabbi in Sarajevo for a few years beginning around 1686. See: Emden, *Megillat Sefer*, p. 9; *She'elot u-Teshuvot Ḥakham Zevi*, Amsterdam 1712 (=Shu"t Ḥakham Zevi), introduction; R. Judah ha-Kohen, introduction to *Shu"t Sha'ar Ephraim*. See also: *Jewish Encyclopedia*, 2 (1903), p. 202; M. Levy, *Die Sephardim in Bosnien*, Sarajevo 1911, pp. 16–17; A. L. Frumkin and E. Rivlin, *Toledot Ḥakhami Yerushalayim*, II, Tel-Aviv 1969 [1928] (=Ḥakhami Yerushalayim), p. 82 and n. 1; I. Solomons, 'David Nieto and Some of his Contemporaries', *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England*, 12 (1931), p. 18; *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, 14 (1971), p. 871.
- 23 Emden, *Megillat Sefer*, p. 8; Emden, *Zot Torat ha-Kena'ot*, p. 27a; *Kerem Shelomoh*, vol. 10, no. 7 (1987), p. 10.
- 24 See: *Shu"t Ḥakham Zevi*, #7,141. J.L. Puhvizer, *Divrei Ḥakhamim*, Hamburg 1692, p. 28b, cited by A. Ya'ari, *Ta'alumat Sefer*, Jerusalem 1954, p. 21. For evidence of Straimer's Sabbatianism, see: Emden, *ibid*.
- 25 See: *Shu"t Ḥakham Zevi*, #41, 168. For Almosnino's Sabbatianism, see: Kahana, *Toledot ha-Mekubalim*, p. 89, n. 3; Scholem, *Shabbetai Zevi*, pp. 189, 535; *Sabbatai Ševi*, pp. 232, 636; M. Benayahu, *Ha-Tenu'ah ha-Shabbeta'it be-Yavan (Sefunot, 14) (1971–1978)*, p. 249, n. 138.
- 26 See: Leib b. Oyzer, *Bashraybung fun Shabsay Tsvi*, ed. Z. Shazar, S. Zucker, and R. Plesser, Jerusalem 1978, pp. 166–167. For this issue and Ḥakham Zevi's central role in it, see: Y. Ben-Zvi, 'Mekom Kevurato shel S"Z ve-ha-'Edah ha-Shabbeta'it be-Albania', *Zion*, 17 (1952), pp. 75–78, 174; G. Scholem, 'Heikhan Met Shabbetai Zevi', *Zion*, 17 (1952), pp. 79–83; idem, *Shabbetai Zevi*, p. 790; *Sabbatai Ševi*, p. 921; Benayahu, *ibid.*, pp. 247–251.

Also interesting is some anecdotal evidence which indicates that Ḥakham Zevi was considered to have been an opponent of Sabbatianism even in his youth. It was told that when Shabbetai Zevi demonstrated that he was, indeed, the messiah by flying through the air in Adrianople, Ḥakham Zevi ridiculed him by himself duplicating that feat. In fact, close to two hundred years later, Adrianople's Jewish elders were still pointing to the two houses where this miracle had allegedly occurred.²⁷

While serving as head of the *klaus* in Altona during the last decade of the seventeenth century, Ḥakham Zevi became further involved in anti-Sabbatian activities in a variety of ways. His son later recorded how his father opposed the itinerant Sabbatian teachers Ḥayyim Mal'akh and Zadok of Grodno.²⁸ According to Emden, his father was also instrumental in supporting Polish opposition to R. Judah Ḥasid and his Sabbatian followers. He had received a request for information about them from R. Shaul, rabbi of Cracow, who 'assiduously inquired from my revered father who was reared in the East and about whom he was certain that he knew the nature of this cursed sect'. It was apparently clear that Ḥakham Zevi enjoyed a reputation as an expert on this movement due to his early contact with some of its followers. He advised R. Shaul to harass them and, when his advice was followed, they left Poland for Germany. Upon their arrival in Ḥakham Zevi's then hometown of Altona, he continued his personal opposition to this group.²⁹ Finally, Ḥakham Zevi's anti-Sabbatian career culminated, of course, in his major bitter battle against Neḥemiah Ḥiyya Ḥayyon while serving as Ashkenazi Chief Rabbi of Amsterdam in 1713-1714.³⁰

In trying at least partially to account for the intensity of Ḥakham Zevi's anti-Sabbatianism, it might be useful to examine the attitudes of some of the members of his immediate family towards that movement. There is, in fact, good reason to believe that his own mother's brother, R. Judah ha-Kohen, and even his own father, R. Jacob Zak, were Sabbatians, at least for some period of time. I do not enter here into the

27 See: A. Danon, 'Kat Yehudit-Muslemit be-'Erez Togarmah', *Sefer ha-Shanah*, I, Warsaw 1900, p. 178; idem, 'Documents et traditions sur Sabbatai Cevi et la secte', *REJ*, 37 (1898), p. 104. Danon also cites an anecdote regarding the anti-Sabbatianism of Ḥakham Zevi's wife.

28 Emden, *Zot Torat ha-Kena'ot*, pp. 26b-27a.

29 Emden, *ibid.*

30 This entire dramatic story has been most recently treated by Carlebach, *The Pursuit of Heresy*, pp. 75-159.

absolutely crucial and, I believe, ultimately most important question of what, precisely, did it mean to be a 'Sabbatian' in the last third of the seventeenth century. Scholem, his students and their students have already shown in great detail that under no circumstances did post-conversion Sabbatian theology represent one single, unified, monolithic ideology. On the contrary. The nuances not only of 'who is a Sabbatian' but 'what is Sabbatianism' are still in the process of being identified and refined. Nevertheless, as far as the argument of this study is concerned, even a most minimal identification with the movement will suffice and, perhaps, the evidence may suggest even more than that.

R. Judah was the son of R. Ephraim ha-Kohen, the renowned communal rabbi and author of *She'elot u-Teshuvot Sha'ar Ephraim*.³¹ R. Ephraim had four children; one was R. Judah and another was Neḥamah, married to R. Jacob Zak and mother of Ḥakham Zevi.³²

The evidence for R. Judah's Sabbatianism comes from the very close relationship he enjoyed with R. Avraham Rovigo, the well known Italian Sabbatian activist and leader. Around 1686-1687, R. Judah visited Rovigo at his home in Italy.³³ The two remained in contact, and about a decade later, in 1697, Rovigo informed his followers, including R. Judah,

31 For R. Judah, see his introduction to his father's *Shu"t Sha'ar Ephraim*; S. J. Fuenn, *Kiryah Ne'emanah*, Vilna 1915, pp. 90–91; Frumkin and Rivlin, *Ḥakhmei Yerushalayim*, pp. 82–85; Y. Y. Greenwald, 'Rabbanei Ungariyah she-ʿAlu le-ʿErez Yisra'el mi-Shnat 5445 ʿad 5655', *Sinai*, 26 (1949–1950), pp. 222–225; M. Benayahu, 'Ḥalifat Iggerot bein ha-Kehillah ha-Ashkenazit bi-Yerushalayim ve-R. David Oppenheim', *Yerushalayim*, 3 (1950), pp. 108, 115, 118–122; idem (above note 16), pp. 62–63, 65; Y. Buksbaum, 'Ha-Gaon Rabbi Aryeh Yehudah Leib Katz ztz"l, ha-Rishon mi-Gedolei Hungariyah she-ʿAlah le-ʿErez ha-Kodesh', *Moriyah*, vol. 14, no. 5–8 (1986), pp. 30–39; M. A. Z. Kinstlicher, 'Bein Oyvin le-Erez ha-Kodesh', *Zefunot*, vol. 1, no. 3 (1989), pp. 90–99.

32 For R. Jacob, see: *Megillat Sefer*, pp. 3–7 (the manuscript of *Megillat Sefer* [A. Neubauer, *Catalogue of the Hebrew Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library*, Oxford 1886, p. 590, parag. 1723:2], 117a contains an important passage missing in the Kahana edition which will appear in my forthcoming edition of this work); *Shu"t Ḥakham Zevi*, introduction; *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, 9 (1971), p. 1216, and the references cited there; Greenwald, *ibid.*, pp. 225–226; Y. D. Feld, 'Ḥelkei Avanim', in *She'elot u-Teshuvot Nish'al David*, Jerusaleim 1982, pp. 246–47; idem., 'Ḥalukei Avanim', in R. Pinḥas Katzenellenboigen, *Sefer Yesh Manḥilin*, Jerusaleim 1986, pp. 416–417; Kinstlicher, 'Bein Oyvin le-Erez ha-Kodesh', *Zefunot*, vol. 1, no. 2 (1989), p. 91 and n. 21; S. Englard, 'Shibushim Nefozim bi-Megillat Yoḥasin', *Zefunot*, 13 (1991), p. 88.

33 I. Sonne, 'Ovrin ve-Shavim be-veito shel Rabbi Avraham Rovigo', *Sefunot*, 5 (1961), pp. 283–284, parag. 18.

about the appearance of a *maggid* in his school in Italy.³⁴ R. Judah was also the leader of a group of members of Rovigo's circle who traveled with their teacher from Livorno to Jerusalem in the winter of 1701-1702.³⁵ Upon arriving there, Rovigo and his family stayed for a while in R. Judah's home.³⁶ Finally, and most significantly, Rovigo chose R. Judah as one of a select group of ten students to study in his yeshiva there. There is strong reason to believe that Rovigo selected only those who shared his Sabbatian views and, indeed, many of the members of this group which constituted Rovigo's innermost circle have already been independently identified as having been followers of that movement.³⁷

It has already been claimed that mere membership in Rovigo's Jerusalem yeshiva may be enough to establish one's Sabbatian credentials,³⁸ a conclusion which would seem to be certainly warranted in the case of R. Judah whose closeness with Rovigo was of such intensity and long duration. But the evidence here may be even stronger. A listing of amounts of money that Rovigo sent to R. Judah in Jerusalem in 1694 and 1695 contains the following entry: 'Afterwards I also sent him two other *pizi* for [a copy of] *Derush Taninim*'. Isaiah Sonne, who published this text, simply assumed that this is a reference to the well-known Sabbatian tract by Nathan of Gaza, and concluded that it fully confirms R. Judah's Sabbatianism.³⁹ Like Sonne, Scholem also asserted, albeit tentatively, that R. Judah was a Sabbatian,⁴⁰ but neither he nor Sonne

34 G. Scholem, *Ḥalomotav shel ha-Shabbeta'i R. Mordekhai Ashkenazi*, Jerusalem 1938 (=Ḥalomotav), pp. 34–35.

35 An account of this journey was printed by Jacob Mann in *Me'asef Zion*, 6 (1934), pp. 71–84, and reprinted by A. Ya'ari, *Iggerot Erez Yisrael*, Tel-Aviv 1943, pp. 226–242. For R. Judah, see: Mann, *ibid.*, pp. 64, 71, 76, 79, 81; Ya'ari, pp. 226, 231, 236, 238.

36 See: Mann, *ibid.*, pp. 64, 81; Ya'ari, *ibid.*, p. 239.

37 See: Mann, *ibid.*, pp. 64, 68, 84; Ya'ari, *ibid.*, p. 241. For another link between R. Judah and Rovigo, see: M. Benayahu, 'Shemu'ot Shabbeta'iyot mi-Pinkeseihem shel Rabbi Binyamin ha-Kohen ve-Rabbi Avraham Rovigo', *Michael*, 1 (1973), p. 24; reprinted in: idem, *Ha-Tenu'ah ha-Shabbeta'it be-Yavan* (above note 25), p. 464.

38 See: M. Benayahu, 'Rabbi Ya'akov Vilna u-Veno ve-Yahaseihem la-Shabbeta'ut', *Yerushalayim: Mehkarei Erez Yisrael*, vol. 1, n. 4 (1953), p. 205; A. Ya'ari, *Sheluhēi Erez Yisrael*, Jerusalem 1951, p. 337.

39 Sonne (above note 33), p. 284. For the text of this work, see: G. Scholem, *Be-Ikevot Mashiah*, Jerusalem 1944, pp. 9–52. For the particular significance of Nathan of Gaza's works in the school of Rovigo, see: G. Scholem, *Leket Margaliyot*, Tel-Aviv 1941, p. 18.

40 Scholem, *Ḥalomotav*, p. 35 ('קרוב לשער שגם ר' יהודה כהן [...] היה שבתאי'). See below, n. 42.

made the obviously significant familial connection between him and Ḥakham Zevi.

One may also possibly adduce proof of R. Judah's Sabbatianism from a subtlety in a description of him by his grandnephew, R. Jacob Emden. At the beginning of his autobiography, *Megillat Sefer*, Emden stated that R. Judah moved to Jerusalem '[and died] with a good name [בשם טוב]':⁴¹ Such a characterization is rare in Emden's writings and one gets the impression that R. Judah did not enjoy 'a good name' for his entire life, perhaps due to an involvement at some point with the Sabbatian movement.⁴²

We know that, as a child, Ḥakham Zevi enjoyed a close relationship with his uncle. R. Judah writes at the beginning of his introduction to his father's *She'elot u-Teshuvot Sha'ar Ephraim* that the two of them were the same age and, as boyhood friends, had studied together with R. Ephraim in the city of Ofen where the latter served as rabbi.⁴³ In addition, R. Judah kept in contact with R. Jacob Zak, his brother-in-law and Ḥakham Zevi's father.⁴⁴ Although there is no evidence of further direct contact between R. Judah and Ḥakham Zevi, it is unlikely that Ḥakham Zevi was unaware of his uncle's and close childhood friend's peregrinations, including his Sabbatian predispositions.⁴⁵ And so, perhaps the knowledge that his own uncle had been a Sabbatian was one factor in motivating Ḥakham Zevi to take such a strong stand against the movement.

41 Emden, *Megillat Sefer*, p. 4.

42 Cf.: M. Benayahu, 'Kehal Ashkenazim bi-Yer ushalayim bi-Shenot 1687–1747', *Sefunot*, 2 (1958), p. 145, who adduced this very quote as proof that R. Judah had never been a Sabbatian. Benayahu's other proof, that R. Judah was part of an anti-Sabbatian delegation in 1704 which published a sharply worded proclamation against followers of the movement, can be challenged by the example of R. Jonathan Eybeschütz who was accused of being a 'believer' in spite of the fact that he publicly condemned and excommunicated Sabbatians. Nevertheless, it is interesting to note that in his handwritten notes in the margin of his personal copy of his *Ḥalomotav shel ha-Shabbeta'i R. Mordekhai Ashkenazi* (p. 35), Scholem wrote: *בנינו הוכיח ספונות ב' קמה שלא היה ר' אריה לייב כ"ץ זה שבתאי כי בשנת תס"ד היה: בשליחות אנטי שבתאי*. See also: M. Benayahu, "Ha-Hevrah Kedoshah" shel Rabbi Yehudah Ḥasid ve-'Aliyato le-Erez Yisrael', *Sefunot*, 3–4 (1959–1960), p. 157, n. 102.

43 R Judah ha-Kohen, introduction to *Shu"t Sha'ar Ephraim* (beginning).

44 See: 'Kuntres Aḥaron', *ibid.*, 99a-b.

45 Even though Ḥagiz, Ḥakham Zevi's anti-Sabbatian colleague, was not aware of Rovigo's Sabbatianism (see Carlebach, *The Pursuit of Heresy*, pp. 76–77), it is likely that Ḥakham Zevi knew the full truth about his uncle and his affiliations.

But what is even more striking is that there is evidence that Ḥakham Zevi's own father, R. Jacob Zak, may have been, for at least a short period of time, a believer in Shabbetai Zevi. Indeed this assertion has been widely accepted as true. Heinrich Graetz, David Kahana, Jecheskiel Caro, Leopold Greenwald, Sandor Büchler, Salomon Rosanes, Aharon Fuerst and Gershom Scholem all asserted, with varying degrees of certitude, that he was a Sabbatian.⁴⁶ The sole evidence for this assertion comes from an admittedly biased and potentially unreliable source and needs to be weighed very, very carefully. In responding to the charge leveled by Ḥakham Zevi in Amsterdam, 1713, that he was a Sabbatian, Nehemiah Hayyon wrote a number of pamphlets, including one entitled *Ha-Zad Zevi* which was printed in that city the following year. In the course of his remarks in the introduction to this work, Hayyon wrote:

Mr. Zevi b. Jacob is the son of the firm believer in Shabbetai Zevi who was in the city of Budin (called Ofen in German).⁴⁷ It was he who caused a Jew to die for refusing to make a *mi she-berakh* in the synagogue for the life of Shabbetai Zevi. He ruled that this constituted a rebellion against the kingdom of the house of David

46 See: H. Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden*, X, Leipzig 1868, pp. 238–239; H. Graetz–S. P. Rabinovitz [SPR], *Sefer Divrei Yemei Yisrael*, VIII, Warsaw 1899, p. 256, n. 2; D. Kahana, *Even ha-To'im*, Vienna 1873, p. 34, n. 4; reprinted in: *Ha-Shaḥar*, 3 (1872), p. 490, n. 4; idem, *Toledot ha-Mekubalim*, p. 90, n. 4; J. Caro, *Geschichte der Juden in Lemberg*, Crakow 1894, p. 128; L. Greenwald, 'Le-Korot ha-Shabbeta'im be-Ungaryah', *Ha-Zofeh me-Erez Hagar*, 2 (1912), p. 149; also printed as a separate monograph, Weitzner 1912, p. 5; idem., 'Le-Korot ha-Ḥasidut be-Ungaryah', *Ha-Zofeh le-Hokhmat Yisrael*, 5 (1921), p. 267; Greenwald (above note 31, pp. 225–226; S. Büchler, *A Zsidók Története Budapesten*, Budapest 1901, pp. 154–155; S. Rosanes, *Korot ha-Yehudim be-Turkiyah ve-'Arzot ha-Kedem*, IV, Sofia 1934–1935, p. 140; A. Fuerst, 'Budapest', *'Arim ve-Immahot be-Yisrael*, II, Jerusalem 1948, p. 127; Scholem, *Shabbetai Zevi*, p. 467; *Sabbatai Zevi*, p. 565. See too: J. Zsoldos, *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, 4 (1971), p. 1449. Cf.: Y. Y., Greenwald, *Korot ha-Torah ve-ha-Emunah be-Hungaryah*, Budapest 1921, p. 15; L. Greenwald, *Toledot Ḥakhmei Yisrael*, Kolel Toledot ha-Gaon R. Ephraim ha-Kohen mi-Vilna, Cluj 1924, p. 9; S. A. Horodezky, *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, 11 (1971), p. 1216.

47 The city was known as Budin in Turkish, Ofen in German and Buda in Hungarian. These names are often interchanged in Hebrew texts. See, for example, *Shu"t Ḥakham Zevi*, introduction; Emden, *Megillat Sefer*, p. 4. See also Freimann (above note 2), p. 65; Rosanes, *ibid.*, p. 135; Y. Margalit, *Seder Ha-Get*, ed. Y. Satz, Jerusalem 1983, p. 311, n. 8, end; Y. Satz, 'Seder Get be-Kehillot Hungaryah', *Moriyah*, 14 (1985), p. 9, n. 1.

and permitted the blood of that Jew [to be shed]. There are witnesses here who can corroborate this fact.⁴⁸

Clearly, utilizing this text as the sole evidence of R. Jacob's alleged Sabbatianism requires an explanation. After all, how can one accept at face value the testimony of a bitter adversary of Ḥakham Zevi who might have been prepared to publish anything in the heat of their controversy in order to promote his position? Indeed, Aryeh Leib Fr umkin rejects this evidence from *Ha-Zad Zevi* primarily for this reason.⁴⁹ Nevertheless, it is reasonable to argue that this source is, indeed, a reliable one and that, in fact, all the distinguished historians who accepted it as legitimate may have been correct.

It may be argued that what was at issue for Ḥayyon here was not the Sabbatianism of R. Jacob, per se. Had he so desired, Ḥayyon could have attempted to blunt the sharpness of Ḥakham Zevi's attack against him, at least to some extent, by turning around and pointing out to him that his own father had himself been a Sabbatian. Ḥayyon could have plausibly and effectively responded to Ḥakham Zevi by arguing that he (Ḥakham Zevi) not be so quick in condemning others for maintaining such a position if his own father had been similarly guilty. If, in fact, asserting the Sabbatianism of R. Jacob was the essence of Ḥayyon's argument (your own father was a Sabbatian; what do you want from me?), then one could plausibly argue that this information would be suspect. However, this was not the essence of his claim. What he *did* stress in R. Jacob's behavior was not his Sabbatianism but, rather, his callous disregard for the sanctity of human life which, in this one particular instance, happened to express itself in a Sabbatian related case. R. Jacob's crime, according to the Sabbatian Ḥayyon, was that, by being prepared to kill an opponent, he was being *too fervent* in his Sabbatian belief. It was this violation of the sanctity of human life that Ḥayyon charged was shared by father and son. In the case of the latter, this hap-

48 N. Ḥayyon, *Ha-Zad Zevi*, Amsterdam 1714, n.p., pp. 2b-3a.

49 Fr umkin and Rivlin, *Hakhmei Yerushalayim*, II, p. 152. Fr umkin also raises another, less serious objection. He claims that only somebody with a great deal of authority in the Ofen Jewish community could have the power to make such a ruling. Since, according to Fr umkin, R. Jacob became the rabbi there only in 1678 after the death of his father-in-law, this event would have had to have occurred at that time and it is unlikely that such a blessing on behalf of Shabbetai Zevi would still be recited publicly two years after his death and twelve years after his apostasy. For my rejection of this argument, see the first chapter of my forthcoming edition of *Megillat Sefer*.

pened to express itself in exactly opposite circumstances, for Ḥayyon accused Ḥakham Zevi for being prepared to kill him for his Sabbatian beliefs. But, for Ḥayyon, the essence of his argument was that both father and son shared a lack of concern for human life; the fact that the father expressed such a tendency in a matter involving a Sabbatian seems to be only incidental. If this is, indeed, the case, and if R. Jacob's Sabbatianism was not the central focus of Ḥayyon's argument, then there may be some truth to his statement and the evidence contained therein may be, maybe, considered reliable.

In addition, Ḥayyon made sure to add, 'there are witnesses here who can corroborate this fact'. He could easily have omitted this sentence entirely or have eliminated even just the word 'here'. The impression he gives is that he is prepared to produce these witnesses if necessary, a willingness which further militates in favor of the authenticity of his report. This is especially telling because just a few pages later Ḥayyon showed a special sensitivity to matters whose truth can be easily ascertained. In describing the criticism leveled at one of his works, he wrote: 'He heaped calumny and [spread] various lies and fabrications upon my book, *even in a matter whose truth can easily be verified* [ואפילו במלתא דעביד] [לגילויי].⁵⁰ Someone who could attack others for not being sensitive to 'a matter whose truth can easily be verified' would surely be sensitive to this charge himself. And, indeed, one should not lose sight of the fact that Ḥayyon published this in 1714, during the lifetime of Ḥakham Zevi, and there is no evidence that Ḥakham Zevi, or anyone else, ever disputed it.

It is obvious that the preceding analysis is predicated upon the assumption that Ḥayyon was generally a writer not prone to wild, reckless or wholly unsubstantiated fabrications. Indeed, a reasoned objective reading of Ḥayyon's works reveals an author who may have often exaggerated, and even, on occasion, lied,⁵¹ but who, also, did not always disregard the truth in order to defend himself. Surely Ḥayyon is not to be automatically trusted, especially when attacking his arch-enemy, but, at the same time, the veracity of his writings is not to be automatically rejected. Each statement must be carefully and objectively assessed on its own merits.⁵²

50 Ḥayyon, *Ha-Zad Zevi* (above note 48), p. 5a.

51 See, for example, Carlebach, *The Pursuit of Heresy*, p. 299, n. 33.

52 Indeed, Benayahu does give credence to an allegation made by Ḥayyon in this same text against R. Moses Ḥagiz, another of his major adversaries. See: M.

Finally, the essence of Hayyon's charges against R. Jacob and his son are neither as inherently implausible nor as extreme as they may appear to be. The merciless sentence attributed to R. Jacob could possibly have had a precedent in the behavior of Shabbetai Zevi himself who permitted shedding the blood of 'non-believers' and even commended those who did.⁵³ Furthermore, there are a number of examples of vigorous physical struggles in the synagogue between Sabbatians and their opponents.⁵⁴ The story could have happened and, perhaps, it really did.⁵⁵

In conclusion, if, in fact, either R. Judah ha-Kohen or R. Jacob Zak were Sabbatians, maybe their behavior can be considered one factor among others that account for the virulence and aggressiveness of Ḥakham Zevi's attitude towards that movement. As far as his son, R. Jacob Emden, is concerned, this was much less of a consideration. Besides being one further generation removed, there are enough other,

Benayahu, 'Le-Toledot Batei ha-Midrash bi-Yer ushalayim ba-Me'ah ha-17', *HUCA*, 21 (1948), pp. 15–16 (Hebrew section).

- 53 In Venice a dispute broke out in the synagogue on the Sabbath and an opponent of Sabbatianism was almost killed. One of the 'believers' who was present at the time wrote Shabbetai Zevi and asked whether it was sinful to kill a 'non-believer' on the Sabbath. Shabbetai responded that, on the contrary, 'there is no greater sanctification of the Sabbath than this', and promised great rewards for such behavior. See: Freimann (above note 2), pp. 55–56; Sasportas, *Sefer Zizit Novel Zevi*, pp. 129–130, 150. See also: Scholem, *Shabbetai Zevi*, pp. 415, 421–422; *Sabbatai Ševi*, pp. 505, 511–512; M. Benayahu, 'Yedi'ot me-Italyah u-me-Holand al Reishitah shel ha-Shabbeta'ut', *Erez Yisrael*, 4 (1956), p. 195. See also: Emden, *Zot Torat ha-Kena'ot*, p. 5b; R. Ḥayyim Benveniste, *She'elot u-Teshuvot Ba'ei Ḥayyei*, 3:228; Scholem, *Shabbetai Zevi*, pp. 423–24; *Sabbatai Ševi*, p. 514.
- 54 In addition to the sources cited above, see: Sasportas, *Sefer Zizit Novel Zevi*, pp. 3, 192–193 (for an incident which took place in Hamburg); Benayahu, *ibid.*, p. 199, n. 48; Scholem, *Shabbetai Zevi*, p. 481; *Sabbatai Ševi*, pp. 579–580; B. D. Weinryb, *The Jews of Poland*, Philadelphia 1973, p. 218; Anat (Perlmutter) (above note 5), p. 341. For examples of special prayers recited in the synagogue for Shabbetai Zevi, see: Scholem, *Sabbatai Ševi*, pp. 262, 424–425, 533–534, 579–580.
- 55 It must be noted that here, in the case of R. Jacob and unlike the case of R. Judah, no evidence at all is forthcoming from the works of Emden. On the contrary, Emden writes with only the highest regard about the grandfather for whom he was named. See the references in *Megillat Sefer* cited above in note 32. Also directly relevant to this discussion is the attitude of R. Ephraim ha-Kohen himself to Sabbatianism. This issue is a complex one and revolves primarily on a close analysis of two of his responsa, *Shu"t Sha'ar Ephraim*, #64–65, and R. Joseph Almosnino, *Sefer 'Eduṭ be-Yehosef*, 2:32. For a preliminary treatment of this matter, see: L. Jacobs, 'Rabbi Ephraim Ha-Kohen and a Heretical Sermon', *Three Score and Ten: Essays in Honor of Rabbi Seymour J. Cohen on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday*, Hoboken 1991, pp. 133–141.

more direct, factors to account for the intensity of his anti-Sabbatianism.⁵⁶ In the case of Ḥakham Zevi, however, one generation closer and in the absence, as yet, of any other compelling explanation, perhaps this can be considered a militating factor. Perhaps, like R. Abraham Yizhaki, R. Joseph Ergas, and his colleague R. Moses Ḥagiz, Ḥakham Zevi too was influenced by the Sabbatianism he encountered within his own close personal immediate family.

56 See above notes 8, 9. This notion of one generation's point of view strongly affecting how future generations would deal with a particular issue has far reaching implications in other areas as well. For example, Professor Ada Rapoport-Albert suggested to me that it could account for the particular virulence of some opponents of Hasidism whose close relatives were adherents of that movement. See, for example, Y. Hisdai, 'Reishito shel ha-Yishuv ha-'Mitnagdi' ve-ha-'Hasidi' be-Erez Yisrael – 'Aliyah shel Mizvah ve-'Aliyah shel Shlihut', *Shalem*, 4 (1984), pp. 231–269. Professor Moshe Idel suggested another example of this phenomenon, but with opposite results. He hypothesized that the reason Ḥakham Zevi and R. Jacob Emden were so adamant in denying any halakhic validity to a *golem* was to provide a defense for their ancestor who killed one, for if a *golem* could count to a minyan, R. Elijah Ba'al Shem would have been guilty of murder. In this case, their unusually strong position supported an ancestor's behavior. For their position on this matter, see: M. Idel, *Golem: Jewish Magical and Mystical Traditions on the Artificial Anthropoid*, Albany 1990, p. 207ff.