Classic Essays on Jews in Early Modern Europe

Designed for both students and seasoned scholars, this volume provides an innovative guide to the study of the Jewish past from the late Middle Ages to the Enlightenment. It makes available seventeen contributions, published between 1904 and 1984, which are veritable landmarks in the scholarship on Jewish history in early modern Europe but have so far remained little accessible. Many are here translated into English for the first time, while all but one are not currently available in English online. The editors' introduction situates these classic essays in relation to the growing perception that the early modern period in Jewish history possesses its own distinctive features and identity. Accompanied by a rich bibliography, the volume highlights the many changes that the academic study of this vital phase of the Jewish past has undergone during the last hundred and twenty years.

Jonathan Karp is Associate Professor of Judaic Studies and History at Binghamton University SUNY, USA.

Francesca Trivellato is Andrew W. Mellon Professor of Early Modern European History at the Institute for Advanced Study, in Princeton, NJ, USA.

Edited by Jonathan Karp and Francesca Trivellato

Classic Essays on Jews in Early Modern Europe

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 2023
by Routledge
4 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

and by Routledge
605 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10158

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Names: Karp, Jonathan, 1960- editor, translator, writer of introduction. |
Trivellato, Francesca, 1970- editor, translator, writer of introduction.
Title: Classic essays on Jews in early modern Europe / edited by Jonathan Karp and Francesca Trivellato.
Description: New York : Routledge, 2023. | Series: Classic essays in Jewish history | Includes bibliographical references and index. | Some articles translated from French, German, Hebrew, or Italian.
Identifiers: LCCN 2022034333 | ISBN 9781409431558 (hardback)
Subjects: LCSH: Jews—Europe—History. | Jews—Europe—Historiography. | Europe—History. | Europe—Civilization—Jewish influences.
Classification: LCC DS135.E8 C57 2023 | DDC 940/.04924—dc23/eng/20220726
LC record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2022034333

ISBN: 978-1-4094-3155-8 (hbk)

Typeset in Times New Roman
by Apex CoVantage, LLC

CONTENTS

VOLUME INTRODUCTION

A Jewish "Early Modern Period" *Avant la Lettre*?

Jonathan Karp and Francesca Trivellato

This volume has three aims: first, to gather important but hard-to-find articles from academic journals and volumes published before the digital age; second, to make available in English a number of fundamental contributions to the field of Jewish history that have hitherto not been translated; and third, to situate the literature collected here in the context of past and ongoing academic debates about the sources, methods, and purview of Jewish history in what has since come to be known as the "early modern period," roughly 1500–1750.

The volume's title, *Jews in Early Modern Europe*, requires explanation because it adopts a periodization that only recently has become common currency among historians of the Jewish past. It would have been foreign to almost all of the scholars included here. On the surface, debates about periodization can appear sterile, or at least arcane – a way in which academic historians mark their territory and highlight their importance. Upon closer scrutiny, however, it is evident that the ways in which we break down the flow of time and the labels we apply to each segment of that flow reflect deeper concerns. In some instances, those labels and segmentations can be instruments to shake conventional wisdom. We give new names to historical periods because we constantly re-imagine the past in light of new questions and new analytical categories.

The expression "early modern" either did not exist or was not in wide circulation at the time the essays gathered in this volume were published. To this day, it remains neither neutral nor uncontroversial. Historians of Europe adopted it slowly, although they did so with greater frequency during the second half of the twentieth century. The idea was to displace the primacy of the canonical sequence of the trio "Renaissance," "Reformation," and "Enlightenment," in part because these labels – and the phenomena they signified – were seen to be too much focused on intellectual and ideological developments at the expense of more structural and social ones.[1] The broader (some would say, vaguer) category of early modern first took hold among

1 Jerry H. Bentley, "Early Modern Europe and the Early Modern World," in *Between the Middle Ages and Modernity: Individual and Community in the Early Modern World*, eds. Charles H. Parker and Jerry H. Bentley (New York, NY: Rowman and Littlefield, 2007), 13–31.

economic historians in the 1960s in reaction to the focus on industrial revolution, before winning wider acceptance in the following decades, although hardly without resistance. In fact, by the 1980s, a new debate emerged about the suitability of the notion of "early modernity" not only for European but also for world history. For some, this rubric had the potential of jumpstarting comparisons between different regions of the globe that appeared to have undergone analogous transformations, notably in the process of state building, but also with regard to cultural and religious phenomena.[2] Others, however, objected to what they viewed as its inescapable Eurocentric presumptions, not to mention its terminological fuzziness.[3] Yet despite such lingering reservations, the early modern periodization is now widely employed.

What then is at stake in positing the existence of an "early modern" period of Jewish history? To answer this question, we first need to emphasize that the concept appeared in general European history writing decades before it was applied to the study of the Jewish past. True, given the relatively small size of the field, there is often a time lag in the adoption by Jewish historians of general historiographical innovations. But a more important consideration is also at play. It is fair to say that general European and Jewish historians approached their respective topics from contrary standpoints. Among the former, the concept of the early modern represented an attempt to push the advent of modernity forward in time; that is, to reject longstanding historiographical assumptions inspired by Jakob Burckhardt (1818–1897), Max Weber (1864–1920), and others that located modernity's inception decisively with the timeframes of the Renaissance and Reformation. After World War II, historians of Europe began to carve out a period from the fifteenth to eighteenth centuries whose character was defined not by its anticipatory quality – as a kind of forerunner of modernity – but by its hybrid distinctiveness, an era that was neither wholly medieval nor essentially modern.[4] The confusion that surrounds the early modern terminology reflects this very ambiguity, but is also the result of a deliberate imprecision: the early modern label intentionally aimed to defuse historical teleology. Its hybrid character suggested the comingling of older and newer trends. Yet when Jewish historians later sought to adopt the same designation, they had almost the opposite intent. Theirs was a self-conscious rebellion against traditional periodizations of Jewish history, which posited that the Jewish

2 Joseph F. Fletcher, "Integrative History: Parallels and Interconnections in the Early Modern Period, 1500–1800," *Journal of Turkish Studies*, 9 (1985): 37–58; Sanjay Subrahmanyam, "Connected Histories: Notes Towards a Reconfiguration of Early Modern Eurasia," *Modern Asian Studies*, 31, no. 3 (1997): 735–62.

3 Randolph Starn, "The Early Modern Muddle," *Journal of Early Modern History*, 6, no. 3 (2002): 296–307.

4 For pertinent remarks, see Merry E. Wiesner-Hanks, *Women and Gender in Early Modern Europe*, 4th ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019), 9–10; J.H. Elliott, *History in the Making* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2012), 57–60; Yosef Kaplan, "Is There an 'Early Modern Period' in Jewish History" (Hebrew), *Zion*, 83, no. 2 (2018): 201–19, esp. 206–08, n. 35.

Middle Ages had lasted up to and even through the late eighteenth century. After all, Jews had experienced no major Renaissance movement. Nor did they have a Reformation, which is why the nature and timing of the Jewish Enlightenment had figured so disproportionately in discussions of Jewish modernity.[5]

Traditionally, most Jewish historians writing before World War II painted the years 1500 to 1750 in darkish hues, as a time marked by mass expulsion from the West (Iberia), bloody massacre in the East (Poland), and "ghettoization" in between (Italy and parts of Germany). Jewish culture, too, in these centuries was typically characterized in terms of intellectual stagnation and religious rigidity. The great nineteenth-century historian Heinrich Graetz (1817–1891) spoke of "a general demoralization of Judaism" in this period, when the remarkable spiritual achievements of the Middle Ages were reduced to messianic misadventure and debilitating superstition.[6] Though ambivalent about the modern era, because he welcomed emancipation but decried the concurrent forces of disaffiliation, assimilation, and conversion, Graetz depicted the centuries immediately preceding emancipation as shrouded in a darkness before the dawn. His vision rested on what was a widely shared consensus among nineteenth-century Jewish historians, who assumed a contrast between an era of general European dynamism (Renaissance creativity, scientific discovery, and religious skepticism) and one of Jewish torpor. Graetz's contemporary and rival, the theoretician of Reform Judaism Abraham Geiger (1810–1874), referred to the existence of a Jewish premodern mentality that was fixated on the "long present" (in Hebrew, *ha-zman ha-zeh*); that is, on the unchanging character of a long – exceedingly long – Jewish Middle Ages.[7] It is interesting in this light that these modern secular scholars held a view that paralleled traditional Jewish theology: both saw the Middle Ages as essentially synonymous with the period of *Galut* – exile. The difference is that for the traditionalists, the exilic condition would inevitably conclude with the advent of the messiah, whereas for the secular historians, emancipation and integration into European societies substituted for divine

5 We do not mean to downplay the importance of Renaissance in early modern Jewish history, but simply to assert that its place is not equivalent to that occupied in general European, let alone Italian, history. There is indeed a very significant literature on Jewish Renaissance studies. For summaries and bibliography, see David Ruderman, *Essential Papers on Jewish Culture in the Renaissance and Baroque Italy* (New York, NY: New York University Press, 1992). Similarly, while Jews did not experience a parallel Reformation, the Protestant Reformation exerted profound effects on contemporaneous and subsequent Jewish history. See, for instance, R. Po-chia Hsia, "Judaism and Protestantism," in *The Cambridge History of Judaism*, vol. 7: *The Early Modern World, 1500–1815*, eds. Jonathan Karp and Adam Sutcliffe (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 50–76. For a programmatic statement on Jewish Reformation scholarship, see Debra Kaplan and Magda Teter, "Out of the (Historiographic) Ghetto: Jews and Reformation Narratives," *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 60, no. 2 (2009): 365–94. See also the review essay by Jonathan Karp, "Jews, Hebraism, and the Reformation World," *Reformation*, 12 (2009): 177–90.

6 Heinrich Graetz, *History of the Jews*, 6 vols. (Philadelphia, PA: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1891–1898), 5: 199–232.

7 Max Wiener, *Abraham Geiger and Liberal Judaism: The Challenge of the Nineteenth Century* (Philadelphia, PA: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1962), 196.

redemption. Regardless, both viewed the Jewish Middle Ages as a protracted period of stigmatization, during which Europe's Jews felt themselves to be strangers.

For some twentieth-century Jewish historians, modernity was another name for the end of exile. Zionist historians, in particular, had a major stake in determining its moment of inception. The periodization scheme of the emblematic Zionist historian Ben-Zion Dinur (1884–1973) is illuminating. In an essay published in 1937 in the Hebrew periodical *Zion*, Dinur asserted that the modern era (in Hebrew *ha-'et he-ḥadash*) began with the start of a series of migrations from eastern Europe to Jerusalem of hundreds of colonists, initially under the leadership of the pietist Rabbi Judah He-Hasid at the end of the seventeenth century, to continue uninterrupted thereafter. He regarded this "going up" and back to the Land as a proto-Zionist movement of pioneers voting with their feet to end the exilic condition.[8] In subsequent writings, Dinur modified his periodization considerably, depicting the Middle Ages (what he labeled the era of "Israel in exile") as extending from the Muslim conquest of Palestine in 636 CE to the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948. However, within his schema, he divided this lengthy period into various segments, including some overlapping with the sixteenth through eighteenth centuries, which he defined in relation to shifts in Jews' demographic concentrations, economic orientations, experiences of insecurity and crisis, as well as toleration and patronage.[9]

A far richer expression of this same nationalist bent emerged from the fertile mind of the great historian of Jewish mysticism, Gershom Scholem (1897–1982). He presented the transition from medieval to modern in terms of a historical dialectic of exile and redemption. The latter began with the spiritual crisis generated by the fifteenth-century Iberian expulsions, a monumental cataclysm in Scholem's view, whose spiritual effects enveloped the entire Jewish world. This mood, according to Scholem, found initial expression in the recondite theories of a group of mid-sixteenth-century Jewish mystics active in the town of Safed, in Palestine. The resultant Lurianic version of kabbalah, a formulation that Scholem believed had recentered the esoteric doctrines of earlier Jewish mysticism on a new myth of divine exile, was gradually disseminated to Jewish communities as far away as Amsterdam and Lublin (in eastern Poland), thereby laying the ideational groundwork for the 1665–66 Jewish messianic movement of Sabbatai Sevi. Even Sabbatai's subsequent conversion to Islam did not abort the effort to end the exile through mystical messianic means. Rather, it sent it underground, where those who continued to follow him – or his memory – covertly planted the seeds of a new religious skepticism. It was this critical religious outlook that generations later would lead, according to Scholem, to the flourishing of the Jewish Enlightenment and early Reform Judaism, contributing as decisively as assimilationist trends to modernize the collective outlook of Judaism. Scholem's remarkable, if

8 Ben-Zion Dinaburg (Dinur), "The Ideological Background of the Immigrations to the Land of Israel, 1740–1840" (Hebrew), *Zion*, 2 (1937): 93–105, esp. 93n1.

9 Dinur, *Yisra'el ba-Golah*, 2 vols, 2nd ed. (Tel Aviv: Devir, 1958–1972), 1: 9–11, 40–45. See also Kaplan, "Is There an 'Early Modern Period,'" 203–4.

convoluted, theory thus linked together assimilatory and nationalist impulses as twin, unfolding expressions of a common Jewish exhaustion with exile, of which Zionism – through its replacement of traditional messianism with political activism – represented the truly vital and positive element.[10]

Few historians swallowed Scholem's sweeping hypothesis whole.[11] Many of his contemporaries found little in the years between the Iberian expulsions and the French Revolution to indicate any fundamental changes in Jewish mentalities that they could describe as incipiently modern. Perhaps the most striking instance of skepticism was that of Katz, Scholem's younger colleague at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. In 1957, influenced by the sociological theories of Weber and Karl Mannheim (1893–1947), Katz produced a pioneering study, *Tradition and Crisis*, that painted a composite portrait of Ashkenazic Jewry in the two centuries preceding emancipation. As Yosef Kaplan notes, although Katz wrote *Tradition and Crisis* at a time when some European historians were beginning to construct the early modern periodization, their innovations found little echo in his work. Indeed, while Katz viewed Jewish history from the sixteenth through the early eighteenth centuries as distinctive – marked for him, as for Scholem, by "crisis" – he insisted that the period's regnant Jewish values and way of life (ones of strict halakhic adherence) remained essentially consistent with medieval antecedents.[12] At most, Katz thought of the period as transitional, characterized by devotion to traditional norms – economic, political, and religious – that were being eroded at their foundations, albeit largely imperceptibly. Similarly, Haim Hillel Ben-Sasson (1914–1977), a contemporary leading light at the Hebrew University, viewed these centuries as transitional (and we might ask: what period is not?), but in no sense revolutionary or transformative.[13]

10 Scholem outlined this thesis early in his career and repeatedly thereafter in various formulations: Gershom G. Scholem, "Zum Verständnis des Sabbatianismus: Zugleich ein Beitgrag zur Geschichte der 'Aufklärung,'" *Almanach des Schocken Verlags auf das Jahr*, 5697 (1936): 33–49; Scholem, "Redemption through Sin," in *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism: The Hilda Stich Stroock Lectures, 1938; Delivered at the Jewish Institute of Religion, New York* (Jerusalem: Schocken, 1971 [1941]), 78–141; Scholem, *The Messianic Idea in Judaism and Other Essays on Jewish Spirituality* (New York, NY: Schocken, 1971), 84. See also Jacob Katz, "On the Relationship between the Sabbatian Movement, the Haskalah, and Reform" (Hebrew), in *Studies in Jewish Religious and Intellectual History: Alexander Altmann Jubilee Volume*, eds. Siegfried Stein and Raphael Loewe (Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, 1979), 83–100; Pawel Maciejko, "Gershom Scholem's Dialectic of Jewish History: The Case of Sabbatianism," *Journal of Modern Jewish Studies*, 3, no. 2 (2004): 207–20.

11 Katz, "On the Relationship"; Samuel Werses, *Haskalah ve-Shabta'ut: Toldotav shel Ma'avak* (Jerusalem: Merkaz Zalman Shazar, 1988).

12 Yosef Kaplan, "Jacob Katz's Approach to the Jewish Early Modern Period" (Hebrew), in *Historiography Reappraised: New Views of Jacob Katz's Oeuvre*, eds. Israel Bartal and Shmuel Feiner (Jerusalem: Shazar, 2007), 19–35. See also the contrasting assessments by Bernard Dov Cooperman in the Afterward to his reissue and translation of Katz's *Tradition and Crisis* (New York, NY: New York University Press, 1993), 237–53 and Elisheva Carlebach, "Early Modern Ashkenaz in the Writings of Jacob Katz," in *Pride of Jacob: Essays on Jacob Katz and his Work*, ed. Jay M. Harris (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 65–83.

13 Kaplan, "Is There an 'Early Modern Period,'" 203.

Scholem's presentation subordinated external, circumstantial factors to internal ones. The drive toward national transformation, he insisted, emerged from within the spiritual, religious, and psychological dynamics of Judaism, particularly kabbalah. Yet the construction of a concept of a Jewish early modern periodization depended on demonstrating that changing material conditions in European life had created fundamentally new contexts for Jews to interact with non-Jews, particularly, although not exclusively, in the economic sphere. A case along these lines was adumbrated by the Israeli historian Shmuel Ettinger in the 1960s, but only fully worked out in a 1985 milestone book by the British historian Jonathan Israel. That Israel was trained as a Europeanist and not primarily a historian of Jews proved advantageous. His vast command of sources in numerous languages enabled a broad framing of Jewish history within the changing European settings, and indeed the fact that Israel lacked facility with Hebrew and rabbinic sources forced him to focus more on the external forces that shaped Jewish fate. The principal achievement of his 1985 *European Jewry in the Age of Mercantilism* (which has since been revised and republished) was to paint a coherent and cohesive portrait of a Jewish world intertwined above all by commercial networks. By focusing on the economic activities of Jews in general, though in particular of those expelled from Iberia, Israel helped to undermine a traditional historiography that had viewed the two centuries after 1492 as ones of severe decline. In its place he proposed an alternative historical arc for European Jewry. Downgrading the Middle Ages to a time when Jewish urban crafts and inter-regional trading networks paled when compared to the trans-oceanic ventures of the early modern period, he presented the post-expulsion era between 1550 and 1700 as a high point of Jewish life, when the need to pacify Europe after the wars of religion brought about new forms of toleration for Jews. Sephardic Jews in cities like Venice, Livorno, Hamburg, and especially Amsterdam reached unprecedented levels of acculturation and wove far-flung webs of credit from the Caribbean to East Asia. Absolutist princes in Central Europe made room for small Ashkenazic Jewish communities, while Jewish life in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth stabilized. Meanwhile, the interest expressed by Christian intellectuals in the Bible and other Hebraic writings engendered new conversations with Jewish scholars. Israel saw these changes as reflecting the confluence of massive demographic shifts among Jews (the new Iberian diaspora to the eastern Mediterranean and the Atlantic seaboard, the gradual migration of Central European Jews to Poland) with alterations in the structural development of European economy resulting from proto-industrialization in the northwestern sector of the European continent that was fostered by the importation of Baltic food and fuel and the growth of Atlantic overseas trade.[14] In a subsequent collection of essays, *Diasporas within a Diaspora*, he demonstrated

14 Jonathan I. Israel, *European Jewry in the Age of Mercantilism, 1550–1750* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1985). A revised edition was issued by the same publisher in 1989. In 1997, a reprint of the 1989 edition appeared in the Littman Library of Jewish Civilization.

how from 1550 to 1700 western Sephardic Jews became a crucial ethnic commercial group in a newly globalizing world.[15]

Discussions of Israel's contributions to an emerging notion of the Jewish "early modern" often miss the fact that he neither employs the term itself (opting instead for the more limited "age of mercantilism") nor identifies its salient features with respect to any larger internal Jewish historical trajectory.[16] On the contrary, Israel's grand synthesis ends on a somber note, with the demise of crypto-Judaizing in Iberia, the declining fortunes in the western Sephardic diaspora, and the disappearance of the mercantilist doctrines that favored them. Israel's account conveys neither triumphalism nor teleology: from the standpoint of modernity, Jews' mesmerizing commercial rise signals less a new morning than a false dawn. Ironically, for Israel, it is in the mid-eighteenth century, the time of Moses Mendelssohn (1729–1786) and the Haskalah, often portrayed as the essential markers of Jewish modernity, that Jews experienced a decline in both their economic fortunes and their intellectual prestige.[17]

The framing of a more self-conscious, integral, and overt vision of a Jewish early modernity had to await the publication in 2010 of what has now become a crucial work on the period, David Ruderman's *Early Modern Jewry: A New Cultural History*. If in his wide-ranging analysis Israel had drawn important parallels between the Court Jews in the Holy Roman Empire and the most prominent Sephardic financiers in the United Provinces, while weaving a tapestry that encompassed the whole of Europe, from Vilna to Lisbon, from London to Ragusa, Ruderman went a step further still. He shifted the focus from economics to culture and from Jewish-Christian relations back to dynamics internal to Jewish societies. By borrowing the concept of "connected histories" from scholars interested in bridging the gulf between Europe and the rest of the world, Ruderman challenged the sharp divide drawn by Katz and others between Sephardim and Ashkenazim and outlined a more integrated approach to Jewish history than previously devised. Focusing on migration patterns, changes in Jewish self-government, the circulation of printed books, and the religious hybridity of *conversos* and followers of Sabbatai Sevi, Ruderman highlighted the many intertwined structures that traversed Sephardic, Italian, and Ashkenazi communities. In so doing, he has produced a deeply revisionist account, showing that the inception of modernity encompasses "a larger and more complex phenomenon that the Haskalah

15 Jonathan I. Israel, *Diasporas within a Diaspora: Jews, Crypto-Jews, and the World of Maritime Empires, 1540–1740* (Leiden: Brill, 2002).

16 It should be noted that Israel uses "mercantilism" in a non-technical sense as denoting a period of European history during which economic considerations gained primacy in the policies and administration of both republican and dynastic states. Equally noteworthy is that Israel's analysis focuses on intellectual history and political events as much as on macro-economic shifts.

17 On this point, see Jonathan Karp, "Can Economic History Date the Inception of Jewish Modernity?," in *The Economy in Jewish History: New Perspectives on the Interrelationship between Ethnicity and Economic Life*, eds. Gideon Reuveni and Sarah Wobick-Segev (New York, NY: Berghahn, 2011), 23–42, esp. 25–26.

movement alone."[18] In other words, consistent with Scholem, Dinur, and other members of the "Jerusalem School," but in contrast with Israel (and Katz), Ruderman makes the case that the modern era of Jewish history really began long before the eighteenth-century Jewish Enlightenment.

While there is no gainsaying the ingenuity of Ruderman's synthesis, it is more accurate to say that he consolidated rather than created the new historical paradigm of the Jewish early modern. In retrospect, we see that Ruderman gave a concise and cogent formulation to a body of historical analysis (to which he himself had abundantly contributed) that had been percolating since the 1970s and 1980s. This included a new interest in Hebraist and kabbalistic collaborations between Christians and Jews;[19] a focus on the spiritual challenges faced by those New Christians who sought to return to Judaism;[20] an emphasis on newly emerging Western centers of Jewish communal life and scholarship, such as Venice and Amsterdam;[21] new approaches to the study of heresy and orthodoxy;[22] as well as renewed attention to Ottoman Jewish communities, their economic networks, and their intellectual links, especially with Italian Jews.[23]

18 David R. Ruderman, *Early Modern Jewry: A New Cultural History* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2010).

19 The influence of Richard H. Popkin deserves mention here. See Jeremy D. Popkin, ed., *The Legacies of Richard Popkin* (Dordrecht: Springer, 2008). Other early studies include Aaron Katchen, *Christian Hebraists and Dutch Rabbis: Seventeenth-Century Apologetics and the Study of Maimonides' Mishneh Torah* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983) and the brilliant overview by Frank Manuel, *The Broken Staff: Judaism through Christian Eyes* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992).

20 Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi, *From Spanish Court to Italian Ghetto: Isaac Cardoso; A Study in Seventeenth Century Marranism and Jewish Apologetics* (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1971); Yosef Kaplan, *Mi-Natsrut le-Yahadut: Hayav u-Fo'olo shel ha-'Anus Yitzḥak Orobio di Castro* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1982), English version: *From Christianity to Judaism: The Story of Isaac Orobio de Castro* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989); Yirmiyahu Yovel, *Spinoza and Other Heretics* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1989); Gérard Nahon, *Métropoles et périphéries séfarades d'Occident: Kairouan, Amsterdam, Bayonne, Bordeaux, Jérusalem* (Paris: Cerf, 1993); Renée Levine Melammed, *Heretics or Daughters of Israel?: The Crypto-Jewish Women of Castile* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1999).

21 Benjamin Ravid, *Studies on the Jews of Venice, 1382–1797* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003); Miriam Bodian, *Hebrews of the Portuguese Nation: Conversos and Community in Early Modern Amsterdam* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1997); Daniel Swetschinski, *Reluctant Cosmopolitans: The Portuguese Jews of Seventeenth-Century Amsterdam* (London: Littman Library, 2000). Mention must also be made of the important contributions of Robert (Reuven) Bonfil to the study of early modern Italian Jewries. His work was first published in Italian and Hebrew during the 1970s and 1980s and later translated into English, notably, *Rabbis and Jewish Communities in Renaissance Italy* (Oxford: Littman Library, 1989) and *Self and Other: Jewish Life in Renaissance Italy* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1994).

22 Elisheva Carlebach, *The Pursuit of Heresy: Rabbi Moses Hagiz and the Sabbatian Controversies* (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1990).

23 Francesca Trivellato, *The Familiarity of Strangers: The Sephardic Diaspora, Livorno, and Cross-Cultural Trade in the Early Modern Period* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2009).

Core to this new synthesis was an invigorated understanding of kabbalah as a remarkably heterogeneous and highly synthetic body of discourse that drew on a wide array of influences from Renaissance Platonism to Sufi mysticism and whose character was shaped divergently by local factors across the wide expanse of the Jewish diaspora. In the wake of Scholem's death in 1982, it became possible for the study of kabbalah to free itself from the powerful but limiting trajectories he forged, enabling the exploration of other avenues, including fruitful and multifaceted interactions with Renaissance philosophical trends.[24] Similarly, the image of the Italian ghetto was divested of some of its lachrymosity and afforded greater nuance and complexity than before – with various scholars showing that the ghetto possessed at times as much a protective (if inadvertently so) as a repressive character and functioned as both a refuge from and an alternative to the expulsions occurring elsewhere in Italy and western and central Europe. The ghetto even helped to foster a distinctively Jewish subculture within the broader Italian milieu, as Kenneth Stow has shown in the case of Rome.[25]

One area highlighted by Ruderman – what he names the "knowledge explosion" in early modern Judaism (especially the consequences for Jewish life of the European print revolution) – certainly represents a decisive break with the medieval past; for the dissemination of printed books reinforced and broadened commercial and cultural networks, helping to unify and even standardize previously disparate and far-flung Jewish intellectual life and religious praxes.[26] These and related topics came to form a rich body of knowledge, mostly though not entirely

24 This development was spearheaded by the work of Moshe Idel, whose *Kabbalah: New Perspectives* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1988) was a clarion call for scholars to move beyond Scholem's paradigms. Among the many who contributed to this broadening effort there were Scholem's contemporaries (such as Katz, George Vajda, Isaiah Tishby, and Joseph Dan), as well as younger scholars (notably Yehudah Liebes, Rachel Elior, Lawrence Fine, Ronit Meroz, Ada Rappoport-Albert, Eliot Wolfson, Roni Weinstein, and Yaacob Dweck).

25 See especially the chapters by Benjamin Ravid, Kenneth Stow, and Robert Bonfil in Ruderman, *Essential Papers on Jewish Culture in Renaissance and Baroque*, 373–428; and more recently, Kenneth Stow, *Theater of Acculturation: The Roman Ghetto in the Sixteenth Century* (Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press, 2001); Stow, *Anna and Tranquillo: Catholic Anxiety and Jewish Protest in the Age of Revolutions* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2016); Stefanie B. Siegmund, *The Medici State and the Ghetto of Florence: The Construction of an Early Modern Jewish Community* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2006); Dana Katz, *The Jewish Ghetto and the Visual Imagination of Early Modern Venice* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017). For recent overviews of the term "ghetto" and the history of this institution, see Daniel B. Schwartz, *Ghetto: The History of a Word* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2020) and Mitchell Duneier, *Ghetto: The Invention of a Place, the History of an Idea* (New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2016).

26 Ruderman, *Early Modern Jewry*, 98–118, building on the research of Bonfil, "Changes in the Cultural Patterns of Jewish Society," in Ruderman, *Essential Papers on Culture in Renaissance and Baroque*, 401–25; Amnon Raz Krakotzkin, *The Censor, the Editor, and the Text: The Catholic Church and the Shaping of the Jewish Canon in the Sixteenth Century* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007); and especially Elhanan Reiner, "The Ashkenazic Elite at the Beginning of the Modern Era: Manuscript Versus Printed Text," *Polin: Studies in Polish Jewry*, 10 (1997): 85–98, discussed in this introduction below. This literature, of course, stems from the rich

centered on the western Sephardic and Italian realms, one that made possible a burgeoning and holistic conception of early modern Judaism.

With the publication of Ruderman's book, the Jewish early modern had truly come of age. This success is less the result of the book's specific delineation of "five primary components of the early modern experience for Jews," one or more of which have come under scrutiny by critics, than its effectiveness at broad synthesis.[27] Although not the first to appropriate the early modern label for Jewish history, Ruderman has made the most forceful and persuasive case yet for it. Still, we should not forget that others before him had deployed the label in a definitive manner. Two years prior to Ruderman, Dean Philip Bell had published the first synthetic book-length treatment of the subject, with a similar title.[28] And as early as 2001, Elisheva Carlebach identified the period from 1500 to 1750 as "early modern" in an important study of Jewish converts to Christianity.[29] More recently, in her 2011 book on Jewish calendars, Carlebach opted for "early modern Europe" as part of the subtitle of her book, without further specification.[30] Starting in 2004, a summer faculty seminar called "Early Modern Workshop: Resources in Jewish History" has been convened annually, initially by Madga Teter, Adam Teller, and Edward Fram, and more recently by other faculty members on a rotational basis.[31] Meanwhile, thoughtful synthetic pieces have related the history and historiography of the Jews to the notion of European or even global "early modernity."[32] The year 2018 saw the publication of the volume of *The Cambridge History of Judaism* devoted to the early modern period, co-edited by Jonathan Karp and Adam Sutcliffe, whose over 1100 pages with 41 chapters examine a multitude of regions and phenomena, making it the most comprehensive treatment yet of the broad topic.[33] All of this suggests that the Jewish early modern has now achieved

---

body of work on the print revolution in European society, starting with Elizabeth Eisenstein, *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979).

27 Magda Teter, in particular, has taken issue with four components of Ruderman's study: his narrow and traditionalist definition of "culture" as synonymous with rabbinic discourse; his almost complete neglect of women and gender; his inability, in her view, to link internal to European-wide structural change; and his failure to accord eastern European Jewry an attention commensurate with its overwhelming demographic importance. See Magda Teter's review of Ruderman's *Early Modern Jewry* in *The Journal of Modern History*, 83, no. 4 (2011): 861–63.

28 Dean Phillip Bell, *Jews in the Early Modern World* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2007).

29 Elisheva Carlebach, *Divided Souls: Converts from Judaism in Early Modern Germany, 1500–1750* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2001).

30 Elisheva Carlebach, *Palaces of Time: Jewish Calendar and Culture in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2011).

31 A rich collection of bibliographical and documentary instruments is available online: http://wesscholar.wesleyan.edu/emw/ and https://research.library.fordham.edu/emw/

32 Elisheva Carlebach, "European Jewry in the Early Modern Period: 1492–1750," in *The Oxford Handbook of Jewish Studies*, ed. Martin Goodman (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 363–75; Debra Kaplan, "Jews in Early Modern Europe: The Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries," *History Compass*, 10, no. 2 (2012): 191–206.

33 *The Cambridge History of Judaism*, vol. 7.

paradigmatic status. The question driving this book is how this new periodization might shape the way we look at earlier history writing on European Jews from the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries.

* * * * *

The essays collected in this volume shed light on the debates just summarized but do so from the vantage point of the scholarship of earlier generations on the period now called early modern. We will devote the remainder of this introduction to highlighting some of the benefits of revisiting this earlier scholarship and exploring how at times it anticipated the new periodization scheme – hence the title early modern *avant la lettre* – while touching upon characteristic themes of the period in such domains as marriage and family, economic life, education, communal organization, and religious toleration.

Although historians naturally assume that newer supersedes older scholarship, the truth is that earlier writings can retain some value, whether because as pioneering efforts they remain touchstones for subsequent research or because their quality as summary encapsulations of an important topic has never been surpassed, even if individual assertions require modification. Examples of the former include Jacob Katz's remarkable 1945 essay on "Marriage and Sexual Life at the Close of the Middle Ages" (Chapter 3) and Selma Stern's composite, if romanticized, portrait of Jewish women in the Central European ghetto (Chapter 4), published in 1925. Both were written well before the study of women, gender, and sexuality emerged as recognized subjects not just in Jewish history but also in historical writing as a whole. The study of gender in early modern Judaism offers a key for understanding the broader character of the era, its continuity with the medieval past, and, conversely, its possible anticipation of modernizing transformations. Although the last twenty-five years have seen the appearance of a significant body of scholarship on gender and women in this period, at present no synthetic overview along the lines outlined by these two opening efforts exists.[34]

34 Notable overviews can be found in Renée Levine Melammed, "Sephardi Women in the Medieval and Early Modern Periods" and Howard Adelman, "Italian Jewish Women," both in *Jewish Women in Historical Perspective*, ed. Judith R. Baskin, 2nd ed. (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1998), 128–49 and 150–68, respectively; Ruth Lamdan, *A Separate People: Jewish Women in Palestine, Syria and Egypt in the Sixteenth Century* (Leiden: Brill, 2000); Natalie Zemon Davis, *Women on the Margins: Three Seventeenth-Century Lives* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995); Julia R. Lieberman, ed., *Sephardi Family Life in the Early Modern Diaspora* (Waltham, MA: Brandeis University Press, 2010); Moshe Rosman, "The History of Jewish Women in Early Modern Poland: An Assessment," in *Jewish Women in Eastern Europe*, eds. Chaeran Freeze, Paula Hyman, and Antony Polonsky, special issue of *Polin: Studies in Polish Jewry*, vol. 18 (2007), 25–56; Edward Fram, *My Dear Daughter: Rabbi Benjamin Slonik and the Education of Jewish Women in Sixteenth-Century Poland* (Cincinnati, OH: Hebrew Union College Press, 2007); Bluma Goldstein, *Enforced Marginality: Jewish Narratives on Abandoned Wives* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2007); Elisheva Carlebach, "Fallen Women and

Two other essays, likewise presented here for the first time in English translation, fit into this same category. I.S. Révah's seminal 1959 study of Iberian *conversos*, "Les Marranes," was one of the first extended treatments of Jewish converts to Christianity to make intensive use of archival sources, mostly Inquisitorial documents. Révah's analysis (Chapter 5) established the empirical framework for subsequent debates on the reliability of Inquisitorial records and the true extent of crypto-Judaizing activities. Similarly, although a later work than most of the others included here, Attilio Milano's 1971 treatment of baptisms of Roman Jews in the early modern period (Chapter 8), here translated from the Italian original, was the first discussion of this painful topic by a Jewish historian who had access to Christian documents that had been concealed from scholars.

Other selections offer fruitful examples of how the analysis of Jews' presence and representation within broad European phenomena, such as the Enlightenment and modern capitalism, can revise the interpretation of these phenomena both in their own right and in the frame of Jewish history. While numerous studies have detailed how individual Enlightenment thinkers like Voltaire and Lessing, but also Toland, Diderot, Herder, and Kant, depicted Judaism and Jews, Paul H. Meyer's 1963 summary of Enlightenment attitudes toward Jews (Chapter 15) retains its value as a judicious synthesis, offering a rich assortment of quotations from primary texts.[35] Another essay that falls into this latter category, Shmuel Ettinger's "The Economic Activities of the Jews" (Chapter 16), provides an effective brief overview of Jewish economic distinctiveness; here, it is translated from Hebrew for the first time. Ettinger, in a typically sober assessment, manages to avoid the Scylla and Charybdis of most "big picture" writings about Jews' economic roles, neither overstating their contribution to medieval and early modern commerce, nor downplaying apologetically their largely commercial orientation in the early modern period.[36]

Revisiting some of the older scholarship dealing with events and personalities of the centuries subsequently labeled "early modern" also enables us to resituate the data they present in a fresh historical perspective. For instance, when it was first published in 1957, Jacob L. Teicher's piece speculating on the possible international rationales for the Amsterdam Jewish community's excommunication (*ḥerem*) of the young Baruch Spinoza read simply as a bold historical conjecture

---

Fatherless Children: Jewish Domestic Servants in Eighteenth-Century Altona," *Jewish History*, 24 (2010): 295–308.

35 Meyer's essay should ideally be read in tandem with Shmuel Ettinger's important essay on "The Beginnings of the Change in the Attitude of European Society Toward the Jews," in *Studies in History*, eds. Alexander Fuks and Israel Halpern (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1961), 193–217. For a more recent, extensive, and nuanced treatment of the topic, see Adam Sutcliffe, *Judaism and Enlightenment* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

36 For further reading suggestions, consult Cornelia Aust, "Jewish Economic History," *Oxford Bibliographies in Jewish Studies*, www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo-9780199840731/obo-9780199840731-0106.xml?rskey=mALQg2&result=1&q=aust#firstMatch, accessed on October 22, 2022.

(Chapter 9). Today, especially in light of the influential research of Jonathan Israel, Teicher's hypothesis speaks powerfully to the geopolitical considerations that, at that moment, confronted Amsterdam's Jewish leaders.[37] Similarly, Abraham A. Neuman's lucid 1945 discussion of the classic work of sixteenth-century history writing, the *Shevet Yehuda* of the Spanish exile Solomon ibn Verga (Chapter 6), appears to anticipate a core argument of Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi's influential 1982 book *Zakhor: Jewish History and Jewish Memory*. Neuman broaches the key premise of Yerushalmi's chapter on sixteenth-century Jewish history writing, that the trauma resulting from the catastrophic expulsion of Spanish Jewry in 1492 effected a sea change in the mentality of Jews, rippling even well beyond the exiles themselves.[38] Just as Yerushalmi would later detail, Neuman noted that the aftermath of the expulsion witnessed a spate of meditations on the course of the Jewish past that far outpaced in number and vitality most medieval Jewish chronicles. At a time when, writes Neuman, "halakah, exegesis, and philosophy" dominated Jewish intellectual life, the expulsions and forced conversions in the 1490s reawakened historical consciousness and made chronicling the past a Jewish necessity for the first time since late Antiquity. True, neither Neuman nor Yerushalmi viewed this change as a long-lasting one, let alone a harbinger of Jewish modernity. But, critically, both historians – and Neuman nearly forty years earlier than Yerushalmi – suggested that a changing Jewish historical consciousness in the sixteenth century indicated an important break with the recent medieval past.

Finally, at least one early work included in this volume appears to anticipate quite explicitly the "early modern" periodization: Cecil Roth's "European History and Jewish History: Do Their Epochs Coincide?," first published in 1929 (Chapter 1). We recall that the concept of the early modern, although today broadly applied with little reservation, was at its inception derived from the European experience. Roth, an eclectic historian if ever there was one, began his career not in Jewish history, but as a student of European history with a focus on Renaissance Florence.[39] It was from this standpoint that he first began to explore the history of Italian Jewry during the fifteenth through the seventeenth centuries. In his essay reproduced here, Roth unabashedly urges the adoption of a Eurocentric

37 Jonathan Israel, "Dutch Sephardi Jewry, Millenarian Politics, and the Struggle for Brazil (1640–1654)," in *Sceptics, Millenarians and Jews*, eds. David S. Katz and Jonathan I. Israel (Leiden: Brill, 1990), 76–97.

38 Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi, *Zakhor: Jewish History and Jewish Memory* (Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press, 1982). Both Neuman and Yerushalmi perhaps derived this insight from a common source: Gershom Scholem's *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, published in 1941 (see n. 10 above). On the *Shevet Yhehuda*, see, most recently, Jeremy Cohen, *A Historian in Exile: Solomon Ibn Verga, Shevet Yehudah, and the Jewish-Christian Encounter* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2017).

39 His little-known first monograph, based on his Oxford dissertation, was a thorough study of a neglected but important subject. See Cecil Roth, *The Last Florentine Republic* (London: Methuen & Co, 1925).

model for Jewish historical periodization. This perspective required considerable stress and strain. Roth knew well that sizeable Jewish populations had flourished in North Africa and the Middle East. Yet he insisted that the dominant strand in post-exilic Jewish experience was the European Christian one: "the history of the Jews in Europe begins where the Middle Ages themselves begin, at the period of Christianization of the Roman Empire." But whereas the European historian's paradigm focused on Renaissance individualism, fiscal and bureaucratic centralization, and the expansion of secularism – all processes that Roth dated to the end of the fifteenth century – he located their Jewish counterparts in the experience of the *marranos*, the crypto-Jews whose outward identity was necessarily shaped in conformity with European culture and norms. The *marranos*, according to Roth, were the Jewish vanguard, mastering the dominant European written and unwritten customs and, at least for those who migrated to the port cities on both sides of the Atlantic, participating in the progress of liberty that paralleled the triumph of modern commercial society.

Roth's bold hypothesis represents one of the earliest challenges to the Germanocentric model that until recently dominated the historiography of Jewish modernization. As mentioned, in the eyes of Graetz, it was Mendelssohn with his program of Jewish Enlightenment (Haskalah) who ushered in the modern period of Jewish life toward the end of the eighteenth century.[40] Since the 1980s, however, growing numbers of historians have been challenging this approach. Some, including Todd Endelman, have argued that modernity was a social process more than an ideological program. He and others have asserted that the experience of acculturation and partial integration in the framework of religiously tolerant and commercially liberal Atlantic societies was far more pertinent to modernizing Jewish life than the programmatic manifestos of German-Jewish philosophers.[41] Others, like Kaplan, have championed a Sephardic-centered "alternative path to Jewish modernity"

40 Heinrich Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden von den ältesten Zeiten bis zur Gegenwart*, 11 vols. (Leipzig: Oskar Leiner, 1853–1876), vol. 10, ch. 1 ("die Mendelssohn'sche Epoche"); Graetz, *History of the Jews*, 5: 291–374.

41 Jacob Katz, ed., *Toward Modernity: The European Jewish Model* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction, 1987); Todd Endelman, *The Jews of Georgian England: Tradition and Change in a Modern Society* (Philadelphia, PA: The Jewish Publication Society, 1979); Jonathan Frankel and Steven J. Zipperstein, eds., *Assimilation and Community: The Jews in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992). Interestingly enough, this approach had been adumbrated much earlier, not for the Atlantic world but for seventeenth-century Germany itself, by the Israeli historian Azriel Shohet in his Hebrew monograph *'Im ḥilufe Tekufot: Reshit ha-Haskalah be-Yahadut Germaniyah* (Jerusalem: Bialik, 1960). Relying mostly on anecdotal accounts of moralizing preachers, Shohet documented a growing incidence of social deviance and defiance of rabbinic authority and norms in rural Jewish settlements and posited that this phenomenon laid the social groundwork for the eventual emergence of Haskalah. Although at the time of its publication the author was criticized for an uncritical reliance on biased sources, his thesis remains plausible and attractive. Recently, Shmuel Feiner has resurrected a version of it, albeit in a far more rigorous fashion, in his *The Origins of Jewish Secularism in Eighteenth-Century Europe* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010).

rooted in the seventeenth-century experiences of the descendants of Iberian Jews and former crypto-Jews returning to Judaism. According to Kaplan, these comparatively worldly and mercantile Jews adopted a form of Jewish identity that was religiously compartmentalized: long before the nineteenth-century poet Judah Leib Gordon coined the expression, they were "men in the streets and Jews in the home."[42] Along similar lines, others, such as Lois Dubin and David Sorkin, have focused their attention on those whom they call the "Port Jews" of places such as Livorno, Trieste, London, and Amsterdam as the crucial agents of change.[43] All of these approaches could have found in Roth a congenial voice, although it is hardly evident that this early and somewhat obscure essay was a source of inspiration for any of them. Few today would agree with Roth's unabashed championing of western Europe as the standard-bearer of progress. However, in retrospect, we can readily appreciate his early dissent from the then-regnant Haskalah paradigm.

Part of the agenda in proposing a Jewish early modern era is to suggest that Jewish societies and cultures evolved gradually and in concert with a multiplicity of regional changes more than in isolation or through an abrupt historical rupture like that effected by the French Revolution. Proponents of a Jewish early modernity have sought to push modernity's origins back into the preceding centuries, employing a model that will now be familiar to us: the demographic shifts spurred by the Iberian expulsions were followed by the growth of international Jewish commercial networks, which in turn fostered increased interaction with other Jewish societies as well as with non-Jews. This new openness led some Jews to participate in contemporary scientific inquiry, while Jewish involvement in the print revolution helped undermine, through the wide circulation of texts, both rabbinic authority and local custom (the definitive text effaces the localized manuscript version while its authoritative voice supersedes that of the individual).[44]

Regardless of whether we choose to accept this model, it is not hard to see how some of the more specialized essays collected here retrospectively fit into it. In regard to the shift in Christian attitudes toward Jews, even the limited toleration

42 Yosef Kaplan, *An Alternative Path to Modernity: The Sephardi Diaspora in Western Europe* (Leiden: Brill, 2000). It appears that Kaplan subsequently adopted a more comprehensive conception of the early modern periodization that extends beyond Amsterdam Sephardim and linked communities, perhaps in reaction to the synthetic formulation of Ruderman's *Early Modern Jewry*. See also Kaplan, "Is There an 'Early Modern Period,'" esp. p. 211. On Gordon, see Michael Stanislawski, *For Whom Do I Toil: Judah Leib Gordon and the Crisis of Russian Jewry* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1988).

43 David Sorkin, "The Port Jew: Notes Toward a Social Type," *Journal of Jewish Studies*, 50, no. 1 (1999): 87–97; Lois C. Dubin, *The Port Jews of Habsburg Trieste: Absolutist Policies and Enlightenment Culture* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1999); see also the overview and references in Lois C. Dubin, "Port Jews Revisited: Commerce and Culture in the Age of European Expansion," *The Cambridge History of Judaism*, 7: 550–75.

44 Ruderman, *Early Modern Jewry*, lays out the argument in cogent detail. See also Kaplan "Is There an 'Early Modern Period.'"

explored in Koppel S. Pinson's 1951 discussion of "German Pietism and the Jews" (Chapter 14) signals a subtle shift. Pinson argues that, in contrast to the virulent hostility to Jews displayed by Martin Luther and most of his fellow reformers, the seventeenth-century Pietist movement sought to restore the Reformation's spiritual vitality and, in so doing, introduced a very different tone – more humane and to a degree even sympathetic to contemporary Jewish culture, sensibilities, and language, even if admittedly missionary in intent.[45] Likewise, implicit in the title of Francis L. Carsten's 1958 precis, "The Court Jews: Prelude to Emancipation" (Chapter 12), is the claim that the emergence of a loose cohort of Jewish financiers, brokers, and army suppliers was well suited to the haphazard nature of Central European state-building in the aftermath of the 1648 Peace of Westphalia. This cooperation, albeit asymmetrical, helped restore the principle of Jewish economic utility to the statecraft of post-Reformation Europe, which led some governments to permit the limited reintroduction and incorporation of small Jewish communities to Central European territories from which they had been excluded for decades or even centuries. Though hardly a clear path to emancipation, Carsten is right to see the phenomenon of the Court Jew as a crucial step toward that later process.[46]

Equally convincing is the brief, and never before translated, 1916 German article by Josef Esselbacher, "The Emergence of General Education among the Jews before Mendelssohn" (Chapter 13), which elucidates some of the important intellectual trends and figures in German-Jewish life prior to the emergence of Mendelssohn. This was a generation of Jewish scholars who engaged with contemporary European learning, particularly in the areas of science and mathematics, in a way that anticipated aspects of Mendelssohn's program – in fact, one or two of these figures, including Israel Zamosc (1700–1772) and Aaron Gumperz (1723–1769), became Mendelssohn's mentors or colleagues. By situating Mendelssohn within a longer trajectory of Jewish scientific and philosophical engagement, Eschelbacher deflated the claim to his novelty in a way that prompted later historians to search more deeply for antecedents. While Eschelbacher did not himself define these predecessors in terms of an "early Haskalah," that very label would be deployed by a number of subsequent scholars, including Shmuel Feiner and David Sorkin. In a sense, these historians have argued the position that even the paradigmatic "German road" of Jewish modernity went back further than is generally assumed.[47]

45 For the most up-to-date scholarship on Pietist relations with Jews, see Peter Vogt, "Connectedness in Hope: German Pietism and the Jews," in *A Companion to German Pietism, 1660–1800*, ed. Douglass H. Shantz (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 81–115. On broader German Protestant missionary aims directed at Jews, see Christopher Clark, *The Politics of Conversion: Missionary Protestantism and the Jews in Prussia, 1728–1945* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

46 See the recent overview by David Sorkin, *Jewish Emancipation: A History across Five Centuries* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2019).

47 Shmuel Feiner, "The Early Haskalah in the Eighteenth Century" (Hebrew), *Tarbiz*, 67, no. 2 (1998): 189–240; David Sorkin, "The Early Haskalah," in *New Perspectives on the Haskalah*, eds.

Other selections in this volume do not disturb the traditional schemas of periodization but do unsettle longstanding assumptions about the very nature of "modern" versus "premodern." Perhaps the best known of these is Salo W. Baron's epochal 1928 essay "Ghetto and Emancipation" (Chapter 2). Baron was no reactionary and certainly no obscurantist, but throughout his life he combatted the forces that he perceived as threatening the traditional forms of Jewish life in modern liberal democracies. Indeed, one is struck by the date of this essay, written in the wake of the restrictive immigration laws in the United States and the end of a democratic regime in Poland, and just a year before the 1929 collapse of the stock market. It is perhaps not surprising if today this short piece retains its capacity to startle readers who tend to equate modernity with progress. For our purposes, it is worth noting that Baron divided the long arc of diaspora Jewish history into two, epitomized in the dualism of the essay's title, thereby precluding any fundamental distinction between the Middle Ages and the Early Modern Period, which were equally subsumed under the notion of the "Ghetto" era.

Baron's coining of the phrase the "lachrymose conception" of Jewish history will be familiar to many readers, but is widely misunderstood.[48] Baron's purpose was not to downplay medieval persecution of Jews, but to show that in some respects medieval circumstances compared favorably with their treatment and fate in modern life.[49] "Jews have suffered many violent persecutions in the

---

Shmuel Feiner and David Sorkin (London: Littman Library, 2001), 9–26. The notion of an early or proto-Haskalah was first broached by Salo Baron in the first edition of his *Social and Religious History of the Jews*, 3 vols. (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1937), where he wrote that "seventeenth-century Italian Jewry revealed all the fundamentals of Haskalah" – even subtitling this section of the work "Italian and Dutch Haskalah" (2: 205–12, esp. 207). Some scholars seeking a Baronian imprimatur for their hypothesis of an early Haskalah have made much of these pages. But it has also been pointed out that during the long subsequent history of his scholarly life, Baron never again affirmed the hypothesis of an early Haskalah, if that is what it was, or backdated the inception of Jewish modernity to the seventeenth century. Moreover, a close analysis of the organization of the first edition of his *Social and Religious History*, especially the second volume, reveals that his method was to advance his narrative thematically as much as chronologically, putting in adjacent order related phenomena, so that for instance he followed his discussion of "Jews and Capitalism," detailing the mercantile activities of seventeenth-century Jewish communities, with one on "Jews and Socialism," because he saw this as a logical topical segue (however confusing to readers), and not because he believed the economic theories of Simone Luzzatto were antecedent to and causal of those of Karl Marx. See also Isaac Barzilay, "The Italian and Berlin Haskalah (Parallels and Differences)," *Proceedings of the American Academy of Jewish Research*, 29 (1960–1961): 17–54, and recently Adam Shear, "'The Italian and Berlin Haskalah': Isaac Barzilay Revisited," in *Early Modern Culture and Haskalah: Reconsidering the Borderlines of Modern Jewish History*, eds. Shmuel Feiner and David B. Ruderman, special issue of *Simon Dubnow Institute Yearbook*, vol. 6 (2007), 49–66.

48 While Baron frequently invoked the phrase "lachrymose conception of Jewish history" in his later writings, he initially formulated it in this early essay simply as "the lachrymose theory of pre-Revolutionary woe." Baron, "Ghetto and Emancipation," 526. See p. 24 in this volume.

49 See David Engel, "Crisis and Lachrymosity: On Salo W. Baron, Neobaronianism, and the Study of Modern European Jewish History," *Jewish History*, 20, nos. 3–4 (2006): 243–64.

post-emancipation period," he pointed out, "and they are conscripted to boot!" If readers in 1928 understood this lament, how much more so in the aftermath of the Shoah? In other words, Baron's viewpoint, first forcefully articulated in this essay, was not to romanticize the long Jewish Middle Ages, but to knock the status of the emancipatory one down a peg. "If the status of the [medieval] Jew (his privileges, opportunities, and actual life) was in fact not so low as we are in the habit of thinking, then the miracle of emancipation was not so great as we supposed." Baron correctly showed that at the start emancipation was not a process typically spearheaded by the Jews themselves but rather one that emerged from the logic of modern state-building and its accompanying concept of citizenship. Indeed, Jewish communities (or at least some of their leaders) were themselves often wary of the changes that emancipation could bring – to their traditional norms, their authority, and fiscal well-being. While there is no question that most Jews (in eastern Europe and not just in the West) soon came to support emancipation, there is also little doubt that they would have greatly preferred to define it on their own terms, and that its outcomes were rarely commensurate to its promises.

And here the second of Baron's articles included in this volume, his 1942 "Modern Capitalism and Jewish Fate" (Chapter 17), is especially pertinent. Written in the middle of World War II, it reads largely as a political statement, praising capitalism over socialism but warning against the dangers that it, and its counterpart, individualism, posed to organized Jewish life. When placed within the rich genre of writings about the purported contributions of Jews to the historical evolution of capitalism, Baron's essay constitutes a remarkable conceptual inversion.[50] Although the literature on Jews and capitalism goes back to the mid-nineteenth century, it was Werner Sombart's notorious 1911 tome *Die Juden und das Wirtschaftsleben* (*The Jews and Economic Life*) that propelled the topic into academic prominence.[51] As the British historian H.R. Trevor-Roper pointed out in his 1957 reconsideration of Sombart's volume, though riddled with errors, "nevertheless in a preposterous way, the book is a classic, for Sombart stated a problem which others have answered less wildly than he, and are answering still"[52] Out of

50 On this older historiography, see Jonathan Karp, "Kopf ohne Körper? Wirtschaftsgeschichte jüdische Lebenswelten," in *Kapitalismusdebatten um 1900: Über antisemitisierende Semantiken des Jüdischen*, ed. Nicolas Berg (Leipzig: Leipziguniversitätsverlag, 2011), 49–69; Cornelia Aust, "Narrative jüdischer Wirtschaftsgeschichte in Osteuropa," in *Zwischen Graetz und Dubnow: Jüdische Historiographie in Ostmitteleuropa im 19. Und 20. Jahrhundert*, ed. François Guesnet (Leipzig: Leipziger Akademische Verlagsanstalt, 2009), 177–201; Aust, "Jewish Economic History,"; and Francesca Trivellato, *The Promise and Peril of Credit: What a Forgotten Legend about Jews and Finance Tells Us about the Making of European Commercial Society* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2019), esp. 197–215.

51 Werner Sombart, *Die Juden und das Wirtschaftsleben* (Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot, 1911); English version: *The Jews and Modern Capitalism*, translated by M. Epstein (London: T.F. Unwin, 1913).

52 H.R. Trevor-Roper, "Jews and Modern Capitalism," in his *Men and Events: Historical Essays* (London: Macmillan, 1957), 156–60, cit. 159–60.

Sombart's wild, irresponsible but still provocative speculations, a field of Jewish economic history was born. Indeed, the very effort to expose Sombart's errors contributed to a deeper analysis not only of Jewish but also of general European economic history in the early modern period.

Trevor-Roper's backhanded tribute to Sombart makes no mention of the other side of the coin – not how Jews might have helped shape capitalism, but how capitalism helped shape Jews. This is exactly the question Baron takes up in his 1942 essay. As in "Ghetto and Emancipation," here, too, Baron challenges the assumption of progress. On the eve of European Jewry's destruction, the full magnitude of which could not yet be imagined, the essay posited a clear association between the very real crisis currently afflicting Jews and the apparent one confronting the future of global capitalism. Capitalism's evolution – in Sombart's terminology, from "early" to "late" – had already given rise to such disparate responses as fascism, communism, and the New Deal, argues Baron.[53] As for the early modern period, Baron aligned it with Sombart's initial stage of mercantile capitalism (*Frühkapitalismus*), which he characterized as one that was essentially "good for the Jews" because it had opened up new regions of settlement, along with new occupations, while making possible a remarkable demographic expansion. Although Baron had described the two centuries prior to the French Revolution (the start of the emancipation era) as especially bleak for the Jews (in "Ghetto and Emancipation" he actually described the period as the Jewish "Dark Age"), here we find a contrary motif. In both of Baron's essays reproduced here, even this low point exhibits positive features compared with modernity. Baron suggests that in Jewish (as in general European) history, modernity unfolded gradually and the transformation it wrought had strong economic, as well as demographic, underpinnings. Though the opening up of opportunities for segments of the Jewish population in major cities and along the Atlantic seaboard (especially in North America) affected relatively few Jews, it still proved a hopeful harbinger. At the same time, most Jews during these centuries were still isolated in the "ghetto," a word that Baron understood in a figurative as well as literal sense.

For Baron, the early modern period was the age of the ghetto par excellence.[54] As he saw it, in terms of administrative autonomy, communal solidarity, and even

53 On capitalism's various stages, see Werner Sombart, *Der Moderne Kapitalismus*, 3 vols. (Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot, 1902–1927).

54 Jacob Katz, among others, felt similarly. See Katz, *Exclusiveness and Tolerance: Studies in Jewish-Gentile Relations in Medieval and Modern Times* (London: Oxford University Press, 1961); Katz, *Out of the Ghetto: The Social Background of Jewish Emancipation, 1770–1870* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973). The expression "age of the ghetto" is often used by Italian historians, even if the degree of autonomy of Jewish life in eastern Europe was much greater than in the peninsula. Attilio Milano describes the period from 1600 to 1789 as "the age of oppression": Milano, *Storia degli ebrei in Italia* (Turin: Einaudi, 1963), 286–337. For the notion of "the age of the ghetto," see also Kenneth R. Stow and Sandra Debenedetti Stow, "Donne ebree a Roma nell'età del ghetto: Affetto, dipendenza, autonomia," *La rassegna mensile di Israel*, 52, no. 1 (1986): 63–116.

economic utility, the ghetto had genuine virtues, which were the elements of premodern and, especially, early modern Jewish life (Baron actually deployed the expression "early modern" as early as 1928) that would have to be sacrificed under the irresistible sway of both emancipation and high capitalism. Not only did the crises wrought by late capitalism threaten Jewish physical survival, but the atomizing logic of the capitalist system had also sapped Jews' inner wherewithal to weather the storm.[55]

Of course, there are weaknesses in the proposition of a Jewish early modernity. Some of the most trenchant criticisms have come from historians of eastern European Jewry, who rightly observe that most of the trends identified with this "alternative path," particularly increased intellectual integration and openness, declining communal authority, and the slow accretion of rights and freedoms, simply do not fit the situation of the then most numerous and arguably vibrant Jewish community in the world, that of Poland and Lithuania.[56] Contrary to tendencies elsewhere in the Jewish world, in Poland the Jewish population declined in the urban centers of the western parts of the country, but grew in the small towns and villages of the rural hinterlands of Lithuania, Belarus, Ruthenia, and Galicia. By the seventeenth century Jews in these regions were incorporated into the prevailing quasi-feudal structure, in which the managerial role assigned to them was not geared to introducing any sort of modernizing innovations.[57]

Meanwhile, in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Poland, traditional Jewish learning, particularly Talmudic study, reached its apex and the Jewish community achieved heights of communal autonomy and self-government not seen since medieval Spain.[58] And while this community, like others throughout the Jewish world, now exhibited increasingly oligarchical tendencies, with the rabbinic class subordinated to the stratum of wealthy laymen, rabbinic culture and reputation remained primary, if not absolute, indicators of the prevailing value system that was deeply rooted in Jewish law (halakhah).[59] As for the suggestion, advanced

55 It is by no means certain, however, that Jewish communities outside of eastern Europe, where the legacy of communal autonomy remained most vivid, would have felt this transformation as sharply.

56 See especially Gershon Hundert, *Jews in Poland-Lithuania in the Eighteenth Century: A Genealogy of Modernity* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2004), 1–20. See also Ruderman's summary and response to critics of the early modern Jewish paradigm in his *Early Modern Jewry*, 214–20.

57 Adam A. Teller, *Money, Power, and Influence in Eighteenth-Century Lithuania: The Jews on the Radziwiłł Estates* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2016).

58 Gershon Hundert, "Poland: Paradisus Judaeorum," *Journal of Jewish Studies*, 48 (1997): 342.

59 Edward Fram, *Ideals Face Reality: Jewish Law and Life in Poland, 1550–1665* (Cincinnati, OH: Hebrew Union College Press, 1997); Adam Teller, "Rabbis without a Function? The Polish Rabbinate and the Council of the Four Lands in the Sixteenth to Eighteenth Centuries," in *Jewish Religious Leadership: Image and Reality*, ed. Jack Wertheimer (New York, NY: Jewish Theological Seminary, 2004), 371–400. See also Elisheva Carlebach, "The Early Modern Jewish Community and Its Institutions," in *The Cambridge History of Judaism*, vol. 7, 175. For a broad, capsule

especially by Elhanan Reiner, that the authority of the living rabbi was weakened by the diffusion of printed texts and the erosion of traditional localism, there is in fact evidence that this period witnessed a profusion of local custom (*minhag*) and a continuous assertion of local prerogative. Reiner has argued forcefully that printing brought profound changes to the pedagogical character of rabbinic Judaism and ultimately led to rabbinic decline in eastern Europe because the growing availability of books over manuscripts to a degree democratized access to the authoritative store of knowledge that was previously the unique property of a more select elite. Eventually, as Reiner shows, printed halakhic codes helped separate the utilitarian application of halakhic rulings from the more abstract examination of the formal and hermeneutic character of sacred texts. But it seems a questionable claim that the authoritative printed text led inexorably and drastically to a diminution of localism and orality. We should not mistake expressions of fear on the part of rabbis at the time for what was actually happening on the ground. Recent scholarship on European book culture demonstrates that the printed book did not always displace the handwritten manuscript but rather created new synergies between the two, as evidenced, for example, by the copious handwritten annotations on the margins of printed pages.[60] As Reiner himself concludes in one of his studies:

> The Ashkenazi halakhic book at the beginning of the modern era retained certain features inherited from the medieval scribal tradition of knowledge transmission. In certain respects, it was a kind of printed manuscript, that is, a text which, in the way it took shape, rejected the new communicative values of print culture and created a text with esoteric components, thus protecting its elitist position.[61]

As the case of the relationship between print and manuscript cultures demonstrates, dividing lines between eras rooted in presumed sharp shifts in mentalities and practices appear all too blurry when placed under the historian's microscope. Nor can such ambiguity be explained away as reflections of the hybrid and contradictory nature of the implicitly paradoxical "early modern" age. Surely, even

---

assessment, see Jay Berkovitz, "Rabbinic Culture and the Historical Development of Halakhah," in *The Cambridge History of Judaism*, vol. 7, 351, 358–359.

60 On this point see, for instance, Ann Blair, *Too Much to Know: Managing Scholarly Information Before the Modern Age* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2010); Michelle Levy, *Literary Manuscript Culture in Romantic Britain* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2020).

61 Reiner, "The Ashkenazi Elite at the Beginning of the Modern Era: Manuscript Versus Printed Book," *Polin: Studies in Polish Jewry*, 10 (1997): 85–98, esp. 98. See also Reiner, "Transformations of the Polish and Ashkenazi Yeshivot during the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries and the Dispute over *Pilpul*" (Hebrew), in *Ke-Minhag Ashkanaz u-Folin: Sefer Yovel le-Chone Shmeruk*, eds. Israel Bartal, Chavah Turnianski, and Ezra Mendelsohn (Jerusalem: Zalman Shazar, 1989), 9–80. On the intense pushback in favor of local custom (*minhag*), see Berkovitz, "Rabbinic Culture," 362–63.

if periodization is more art than science, more convention than rule, and more approximation than precision, the apparently exceptional nature of eastern European Jewry (and *mutatis mutandis*, Ottoman Jewry too), especially in light of its numerical size, poses a serious challenge to the very notion of an early modern Judaism.[62]

Confronting this challenge is beyond the scope of our present task, but we must highlight two essays in this volume that emphasize the tendencies in eastern Europe that run counter broad generalizations about the period. Jacob Goldberg, the groundbreaking historian of Jewish legal status in premodern Poland, offers a masterful overview of the privilege *de non tolerandis Judaeis*, which was sought by towns in western and central Poland to prohibit Jews from being able to reside and, for the most part, even to trade in their precincts (Chapter 11). In other parts of Europe, the opposite was occurring. Burghers had once petitioned for this privilege in order to eliminate Jewish commercial competition as well as to strengthen what they perceived as the religious integrity of their urban polity against the power of the nobility, which employed Jews as their agents. But by the seventeenth century, this privilege was disappearing in the western and central regions of the continent. In Poland, to the contrary, *de non tolerandis Judaeis* became part and parcel of the Jews' so-called eastward expansion, which led to their increasing exodus from the more urbanized, western parts of the Commonwealth and their growing colonization of the vast eastern territories controlled by nobles.

The oldest essay included in our volume, Simon Dubnow's 1904 "Poland's Council of the Four Lands and its Relations with Local Jewish Community Governments" (Chapter 10), examines the early minute book of this conciliar body, which, from the mid-sixteenth century, expanded Jewish communal autonomy in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth to its maximal extent. Translated into English for the first time, Dubnow's remarkable, if colorful, essay was among the first to explore the genre of *pinkasim* (communal minute books). It quotes liberally from the primary texts while advocating forcefully for the genre's core relevance to excavating Jewish communal history. Dubnow's approach seems more relevant today than ever, with a host of recent publications, conferences, and websites that focus on *pinkasim* as a rare but incomparably valuable historical source.[63] Dubnow's examination illuminates the extent to which efforts to centralize Jewish

62 Objections to the notion of an early modern period in Jewish history have been raised by Joseph R. Hacker, one of the leading authorities on Ottoman Jewry, who regards the period between the sixteenth and the eighteenth centuries as one of essential continuity with the Middle Ages: Hacker, "Was There an 'Early Modern' Period in Jewish History?" (Hebrew), in *'Avne Derekh: Masot u-Meḥkarim be-Historiyah shel 'Am Yisra'el*, eds. Zvi Yekutiel, Emmanuel Etkes, David Assaf, and Yosef Kaplan (Jerusalem: Zalman Shazar, 2016), 165–80. See also Kaplan, "Is There an 'Early Modern Period,'" 208–9.

63 https://web.nli.org.il/sites/nli/english/collections/jewish-collection/pinkassim/pages/default.aspx; see also the references added to the critical notes in chapter 7.

self-government constantly met, if they did not directly provoke, tension and resistance from traditional bastions of local Jewish power.

We cannot close without mentioning an essay that stands out from the others in this collection, namely Cecil Roth's delectable miniature on the Italian-Jewish adventurer, inventor, polymath, and courtier Abraham Colorni (Chapter 7). A sort of Jewish Baron von Munchausen, Colorni is an unusual, albeit not altogether unknown, type in Jewish history. Combining the fairy tale aura of a Joseph della Reina, the military mystique of a David Reubeni, and even the escape artistry of Harry Houdini, Colorni, like all of those characters, came to a tragic end. Although hardly remembered today except by specialists, his presence is especially welcome in this volume, for in an era of Court Jews, messianic pretenders, and scientific charlatans, he can serve as a veritable synecdoche for the age.[64]

Roth's gift as a writer, on full display here, is a reminder that history can also be literature. Not all the volume's selections meet this test, yet we have tried to include ones that will be read with profit and enjoyment by specialists and general readers alike (and have done our best to render those in translation in fluid English prose). As these remarks make clear, these are classic essays by virtue of their influence and fame, in some cases, and their ability to prompt us to revisit old and new debates, in others. At the same time, we make no claim to presenting a comprehensive portrait of the early modern Jewish world. There are certainly major gaps. Kabbalah and other forms of Jewish mysticism achieved arguably their greatest currency during these centuries, but the reader would not know it from these texts. Given the criteria of selection – to include mostly essays published before the mid-1960s that are relatively hard to find today – we made the decision not to republish any of the works of Gershom Scholem, the premier authority on the topic of Jewish mysticism during this period. Scholem's works (most of which were written in German and Hebrew) have largely been translated into English and are still in print.[65] Moreover, notwithstanding the vital contributions of Scholem's contemporaries, such as Isaiah Tishby (1908–1992) and George Vajda (1908–1981), perhaps the greatest proliferation of academic kabbalah scholarship that he helped inspire emerged in the aftermath of his death in 1982.[66] This work, alongside the many signal publications that have appeared in recent decades on the role of printing and the history of the Jewish book, does not appear in this volume because our aim has been to reproduce materials that are both early and hard to acquire, as well as unavailable in English.

64 For a recent rejoinder and fresh portrait of Colorni, see Daniel Jütte, *The Age of Secrecy: Jews, Christians, and the Economy of Secrets, 1400–1800*, translated by Jeremy Riemer (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2015), 116–223.

65 For one of the latest additions, see Gershom Scholem, *Sabbatai Sevi: The Mystical Messiah, 1626–1676*, translated by R.J. Zwi Werblowsky, with a new introduction by Yaacob Dweck (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2016).

66 See n. 24.

There is also regrettably little in the volume on Ottoman Jewry, a veritable cornerstone of the early modern Jewish world, yet arguably difficult to subsume under the rubric of "European" (the Balkan communities notwithstanding), or, for that matter, on the legal transformations that contributed to the coming of emancipation (although Baron's "Ghetto and Emancipation" certainly hints at those transformations). In addition to Scholem, a number of major scholars have been left out whose writings have added immeasurably to our understanding of this period, including Haim Hillel Ben-Sasson,[67] Majer Bałłaban (1877–1942),[68] Solomon Schechter (1847–1915),[69] and Raphael Mahler (1899–1977).[70] It is our hope that the present volume will whet the reader's appetite and send them to search for the many works cited in our footnotes to continue reading on their own.

67 Especially notable in the early modern framework are: Haim Hillel Ben-Sasson, "The Generation of the Spanish Exiles Considers its Fate," in *Studies in Jewish History*, ed. Joseph Dan (New York, NY: Praeger, 1989), 83–98; Ben-Sasson, "Jewish-Christian Disputation in the Setting of Humanism and the Reformation in the German Empire," *Harvard Theological Review*, 59, no. 4 (1966): 369–90; Ben-Sasson, "The Reformation in Contemporary Jewish Eyes," *Proceedings of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities*, 4, no. 12 (1970): 239–326.

68 See Israel M. Biderman, *Mayer Balaban, Historian of Polish Jewry: His Influence on the Younger Generation of Jewish Historians* (New York, NY: I.M. Biderman Book Committee, 1976) and, more recently, Maria Gotzen-Dold, *Mojżesz Schorr und Majer Bałłaban: Polnisch-jüdische Historiker der Zwischenkriegszeit* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2014).

69 Though he published on many periods of Jewish history, some of Schechter's contributions to aspects of the early modern period are particularly worthwhile. See for instance, "The Memoirs of a Jewess of the Seventeenth Century [Frau Glückel von Hameln]" and especially "Safed in the Sixteenth Century, a City of Legists and Mystics," both included in Solomon Schechter, *Studies in Judaism: Second Series* (Philadelphia, PA: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1908).

70 See the bibliography of his writings in Shmuel Yevin, ed., *Sefer Rafael Mahler: Kovets Mehkarim be-Toldot Yisrael, Mugash lo bi-Melot lo Shiv`im ve-Hamesh Shanah* (Merhavyah, Israel: Sifriyat Po'alim, 1974).