

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Faculty Publications, Classics and Religious Studies
Department

Classics and Religious Studies

January 1994

Hebrew Censorship in Hanau: A Mirror of Jewish-Christian Coexistence in Seventeenth-Century Germany

Stephen G. Burnett

University of Nebraska - Lincoln, sburnett1@unl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/classicsfacpub>



Part of the [Classics Commons](#)

Burnett, Stephen G., "Hebrew Censorship in Hanau: A Mirror of Jewish-Christian Coexistence in Seventeenth-Century Germany" (1994). *Faculty Publications, Classics and Religious Studies Department*. 46.

<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/classicsfacpub/46>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Classics and Religious Studies at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications, Classics and Religious Studies Department by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

Hebrew Censorship in Hanau:
A Mirror of Jewish-Christian Coexistence in
Seventeenth-Century Germany

Stephen G. Burnett

Hebrew printing was an important channel of cultural and religious expression for the Jews of early modern Europe. Printed service books aided public worship, and works of popular piety, often written in Yiddish or Ladino, enabled “women and ignorant men” to learn the rudiments of halakhic practice.¹ The printing press also made it possible for rabbis to own their own copies of talmudic tractates, responsa collections and books of sermons. Printing helped Sephardic refugees from Spain to maintain their distinctive intellectual and religious identity and some of their traditions in their lands of exile. While printing was a powerful means for supporting Jewish life, it was also a heavily regulated one. In most of Europe, notably in Germany, Jewish printers were not permitted to publish any book unless they were able to satisfy a Christian censor that it was “fit to print.”²

Pre-publication censorship was a fact of life for every printer in early modern Germany. German cities and states sought to maintain strict control over what appeared in print and what was available for sale within their borders, both for religious and political reasons. Jewish books were no exception to this rule. The censorial records of the Jewish press in Hanau from the early seventeenth century provide insight into the limits of written expression laid down by Hanau’s magistrate and the means it used to enforce these standards. The documents also suggest that these standards were at best a minor inconvenience to Hanau’s Jewish printers and that, practically speaking, they were able to print virtually anything that they wished. Their freedom to print was not acci-

Published in Raymond B. Waddington and Arthur H. Williamson, eds., *The Expulsion of the Jews: 1492 and After*. Garland Studies in the Renaissance, Vol. 2. New York & London: Garland Publishing Inc., 1994. A division of Taylor & Francis, Inc.

Copyright © 1994 Raymond B. Waddington and Arthur H. Williamson

dental, an indulgent whim of Hanau's princely government. Instead, it was a consequence of both Jewish accommodation to Christian censorship standards and the advance of Hebrew education among Christians.

When considering Jewish printing in Hanau and the problems that official censorship created for the printers, it is worth remembering that tension between Christians and Jews was not the most dangerous form of religious conflict within the German Empire during the early seventeenth century. The years immediately before 1620 were a period of escalating conflict between three contending Christian confessions—Lutheranism, Calvinism, and Catholicism—each one championed by a different alliance of imperial cities and territorial states. The middle Rhine area especially was fraught with tension because Calvinism made some of its deepest inroads there, particularly in the Palatinate, Hesse-Kassel, and the Wetterau counties.³ The city of Hanau was ruled by Count Philipp Ludwig II of Hanau-Münzenberg, a small territory which shared borders with the Lutheran imperial city of Frankfurt and the Catholic Prince-Bishopric of Mainz.⁴ Philipp Ludwig was educated as a Calvinist, and one of his first acts after he assumed power in his principality in 1595 was to change its official confession from Lutheranism to Calvinism.⁵ Given the fiercely Lutheran identity of the citizens of Frankfurt and the Catholic loyalty of the Prince-Bishopric of Mainz, Philipp Ludwig's Calvinist stance was bound to complicate any disagreements that he had with his neighbors.

The Jewish policies of Philipp Ludwig and his successors were a further source of conflict with Frankfurt and Mainz. The count opened the city of Hanau to Jewish settlement on 18 December 1603, and he openly sought to persuade Frankfurt Jews to move there.⁶ The new community quickly grew from ten families in 1603 to 159 persons in 1607. Philipp Ludwig soon demonstrated that he also was willing to defend his Jewish subjects against outside political threats. In 1606 the German emperor formed a commission to investigate allegations that the leaders of German Jewry were involved in a conspiracy against the empire. These charges were based on a number of ordinances passed by a Jewish synod in Frankfurt during 1603.⁷ Among the commissioners were representatives of the prince-bishops of Cologne and Mainz. In 1607 the commission summoned Rabbi Manus from the town of Windecken in Hanau-Münzenberg to appear before it in Bonn. Despite the threat of imperial legal sanctions, Philipp Ludwig forbade Rabbi Manus to go and responded with scorn to the commission's demands. He made it clear that he would not tolerate any harassment of his Jewish subjects by outside governments.⁸ As a result of the count's policies, Hanau soon gained the reputation of being a haven for Jews.

After Philipp Ludwig's death in 1612 his wife Catharina Belgica, acting as regent for her son Philipp Moritz, continued his relatively tolerant Jewish policy. When the Jews were expelled from Frankfurt in 1614, her government gave refuge to 209 Jews.⁹ The tolerance of Hanau's rulers for their Jewish subjects and the stable legal situation in Hanau made it possible to establish a Jewish printing business there.

Jewish printing was a rarity in Germany before 1650. Between the Peace of Augsburg in 1555 and the Peace of Westphalia there were only three Jewish presses active within Germany itself, located in the towns of Tiengen in Baden, Thannhausen in Bavaria, and Hanau.¹⁰ In each case the territorial rulers had to decide whether Christians could in good conscience allow the printing of Jewish books, since by so doing they were in effect supporting Jewish community life and the Jewish religion. Heinrich Heidfeld, the church superintendent of Hanau, put the problem this way: even if Jewish books could be shown to be without blasphemy, they would still confirm the Jews in their stubborn unbelief.¹¹ Dr. Wilhelm Sturio, Philipp Ludwig's main legal advisor, thought long and hard about the issue; but he concluded in the end that Jewish printing was a licit activity under imperial law, approving a license for the press on 1 May 1609.¹² Winning permission to print Hebrew books was only the first hurdle that the printers had to negotiate. They also had to contend with both Jewish communal oversight and the imperial system of printing oversight, most notably the censor of Hebrew books in Hanau.

Since the production and distribution of Jewish books was vitally important to Jewish communal life, it is not surprising that Jewish authorities sought to regulate Jewish printing. After the mid-sixteenth century, when waves of confiscations and book burnings broke over many Italian Jewish communities, Jewish leaders used several different strategies to ensure that Jews could safely buy, sell, and own books. These included the voluntary expurgation of privately owned books, pre-publication review, and most importantly, a massive effort by scholars to sanitize the texts of Jewish classics to ensure that they could safely be reprinted.¹³ At best, these Jewish scholars produced fine critical texts that were at the same time free of any derogatory references to Christianity or the Christian magistrate. Other books suffered much at the hands of Christian censors, most notably the *Basel Talmud* which was censored by both Marcus Marinus of Brescia, the papal inquisitor of Venice, and Pierre Chevallier, a Calvinist censor in Basel itself.¹⁴ From a legal point of view, however, previously censored books could be reprinted safely without fear of repercussions, as Walter Keuchen, the Hebrew censor of Hanau, noted in several of his reports.¹⁵ However,

text editing and expurgation were not enough to protect Jewish communities from the threat posed by Christian authorities. First in Italy and later in Germany, communal authorities instituted pre-publication review as a further line of defense.

Jewish communal oversight of printing came to Germany half a century later than it did to Italy. In 1603 a rabbinical synod in Frankfurt promulgated an ordinance requiring that all Jewish books, old or new, first receive the permission of three Jewish central courts (*Batai Abot Bet Din*) before they could be printed in Basel or anywhere in Germany.¹⁶ These central courts were located in Frankfurt, Worms, Fulda, Friedberg, and Günzburg.¹⁷ Zimmer suggests that this sanction was introduced to regulate the book trade and to ensure the doctrinal purity of what was published, but there may have been another reason: communal self-protection.¹⁸ The Frankfurt statute did not specify either the form that rabbinical certification should take or require that it be indicated in the books themselves. The practice of printing “approbations” (*haskamot*) written by rabbis, however, might reflect such a policy.¹⁹

Five Hanau imprints from this period, all of them first editions, contain “approvals.”²⁰ The book *Shefa Tal*, for example, had a total of eight “approvals”—four from Frankfurt rabbis, one from the rabbi of Hanau and three from prominent rabbis in Prague, Frankfurt, and Friedberg in Hesse.²¹ While each rabbi gave a formidable array of titles along with his name, the latter three significantly mentioned that they were chief rabbis, that is, presiding judges of rabbinical courts (*ab beit din*).²¹ Three other books, however, did not contain approvals from three rabbinical courts. *Ginat Egoz* was approved by the chief rabbis of Frankfurt and Friedberg, while *Nishmat Adam* and *Gedolot Mordecai* were both approved by only one rabbinical court each—Frankfurt and Fulda, respectively.²³ Although each of these books contained at least three rabbinical *haskamot*, most of them were supplied by less prominent Frankfurt rabbis.²⁴

These statements of rabbinical approval cannot be conclusively identified as legal statements of central rabbinical courts (or their equivalent) allowing authors to print their books, but they are consistent with such an interpretation. Four of the five books had “approvals” which contained statements explicitly granting permission for a book to be printed; none of the five contained statements of permission from three central courts of the five authorized in the Frankfurt ordinance.²⁵ Sabbatai Horowitz and Bendet Akselrad, authors from Prague and Lvov, also sought approbations from rabbis in their home cities.²⁶ Both the absence of “approvals” in most Hanau imprints from this period and the instances where only one or two

central courts gave permission for printing reflect the breakdown of central rabbinical authority in Germany during this period.²⁷

The policy of pre-approval for Jewish books laid down by the Frankfurt synod no longer reflected political reality within the empire because this ordinance, like the others, was based upon the assumption that German Jews were subject first and foremost to the German emperor. In fact, territorial princes and the magistrates of cities had a far greater say in the day-to-day affairs of Jewish communities. Territorial princes were unwilling to allow the Jews residing in their territories to seek legal redress through rabbinical courts in cities or territories outside their jurisdiction, and required their Jewish subjects to establish local courts within their territories.²⁸ Territorial Jewish authorities, in turn, became increasingly important for German Jewish life. The Hanau approbations reflect this development since the majority of them were written by Frankfurt rabbis sitting on the Frankfurt rabbinical court.²⁹ The three wealthy Frankfurt Jews who underwrote the costs of the Hanau Jewish press presumably sought the approval of the local rabbinate to ensure that their books were marketable in their own city, which also was a center of the Hebrew book trade in Germany, thanks to the Frankfurt Book Fair.³⁰ The final Hanau imprint from this period that contained approbations—Bendet Akselrad’s *Ben Daat* (1616)—contains perhaps the best evidence for the breakdown of central rabbinical authority. Rabbis from Fulda, Fürth, Mainz, Metz, and Schnaittach, all of them claiming the title *ab belt din*, wrote approbations for it, although none of these communities had originally been numbered among the Jewish central courts.³¹ Their emergence can perhaps be linked with the civic uprisings in Frankfurt and Worms which made it impossible for these central courts to function.³²

For the moment, the extent and effectiveness of Jewish communal oversight for Jewish printing in early seventeenth-century Hanau must remain an open question. From the printer’s point of view, however, Jewish oversight of Jewish printing was probably less of a concern than was Christian oversight. The Jewish approval process cost the printers and their clients time and money; Christian oversight could put them out of business.

By the early seventeenth century the Holy Roman Empire had laws on its books which in theory made possible effective oversight of book production and distribution.³³ The components of this system were prepublication review (censorship in the strict sense of the word); the limitation of printing to towns where competent censors were available to review books; and supervision at the point of distribution through the Imperial Book Commission at the Frankfurt Book Fair.³⁴ Some states such as Bavaria went fur-

ther, taking additional measures such as inspecting shipments of books at the border and authorizing searches of private libraries for illicit books.³⁵ But these provisions were not very effective for overseeing the Hebrew book market. Christian imperial inspectors and border guards could not be expected to have a working knowledge of Hebrew and Yiddish. Prepublication review was the only effective means that Christian rulers had to control Jewish presses.

Since all three state confessions were in agreement that no “Jewish blasphemies” should be allowed to appear in print, the censor’s judgements had to be broadly representative of Christian opinion if the books were to be sold outside of Hanau itself. There were enough ill-disposed Lutheran and Catholic Hebraists who would have been more than ready to raise the alarm if the Calvinists of Hanau were somehow in league with the Jews. At the same time, German Christians of all three confessions had at their disposal a growing body of literature which served to define “Jewish blasphemy” in fairly precise terms.

By the early seventeenth century an increasing number of books by Christians and Jewish converts had appeared in print, purporting to explain Judaism to a Christian audience and to underscore its flawed beliefs and practices. These included the works of Johannes Pfefferkorn, Antonius Margaritha, Ernst Ferdinand Hess, Christian Gerson, and others.³⁶ The publication of Johann Buxtorf’s *Juden Schul* in 1603 was an important milestone in the dissemination of information about Judaism among Christians, since Buxtorf based his discussion upon Joseph Karo’s *Shulhan Aruk* and Simon Levi Günzburg’s *Minhagim*, two sources that were regarded as authoritative by German Jews and that were representative of the religious practices of German Jewry.³⁷ *Juden Schul* was quickly translated into Latin and reprinted in 1604, 1612, and 1622 in Hanau, raising the possibility that Keuchen and his superiors would have known of it. Buxtorf’s *Juden Schul* and its less scholarly predecessors served to inform educated Christians about the actual tenets of Judaism and to alleviate many of their fears about the Jews, even if such books did not necessarily encourage respect for the Jews.³⁸ More practically, they provided a “canon” of offensive Jewish beliefs, particularly for unacceptable Jewish prayers, which censors and magistrates could consult when considering whether a given book should be printed or sold.³⁹

Defining “blasphemy” in specific cases, however, remained a matter of individual judgment, and a well-informed, temperate censor could both protect his employers, in this case the count and the magistrate of Hanau, and also satisfy the printers who needed his approval to produce and mar-

ket their wares. Fortunately, Walter Keuchen, Hanau’s Hebrew censor, was just such a man.

Walter Keuchen was born around 1590 in Düren, a town in the Duchy of Jülich.⁴⁰ He received a Calvinist education, studying at the Herborn academy and the universities of Basel, Heidelberg, and Geneva.⁴¹ Keuchen received at least some of his training in Hebrew language and literature from Johann Buxtorf, the author of *Juden Schul*, at Basel University. Their correspondence between 1613 and 1618 reveals that Keuchen worked at least informally as Buxtorf’s agent in Hanau and Frankfurt, purchasing books and manuscripts for him and passing on items from Buxtorf to third parties.⁴²

Keuchen served both the government of Hanau and the Hebrew printers of Hanau in a number of capacities. He was rector of the town gymnasium from 1612 until 1622, and worked at the same time as Hanau’s official Hebrew censor.⁴³ He also corrected proofs for the Hebrew printers, particularly on the Sabbath when the normal Jewish corrector was unwilling to work. Keuchen was not a very good corrector; on at least two occasions, Seligmann Ulma, the regular Jewish corrector, added disclaimers at the end of books, blaming an unnamed Christian for the poor job of proof-reading.⁴⁴ Whatever his shortcomings as a corrector, Keuchen’s censorial reports on Jewish books show him to be a competent Hebraist. They also reveal a good deal about the variety of Jewish books that a Christian magistrate was willing to allow in print.

There is as yet no definitive bibliography of Hebrew books printed in Hanau; but, by comparing the most recent bibliography of Hanau imprints with those books mentioned in the censorial records, it is possible to reconstruct a list of submissions. Between 1609 and 1622 at least forty-two books of greater or lesser length were submitted for prepublication review at Hanau, and thirty-one of these are known to have been printed, including a Hebrew lexicon written by a Christian.⁴⁵ Only two books were rejected for publication.⁴⁶ These numbers, however, are tentative since censor’s reports for eight books that were known to have been printed in Hanau have not been preserved; and it is quite possible that some of the books mentioned in the reports were indeed printed but no exemplars have survived.⁴⁷ I have also discovered one previously unknown Hanau imprint from this period—a prayer book—which raises the possibility that others may yet be found.⁴⁸ While uncertainty about the actual number of submissions and rejections rules out any sort of statistical analysis of the effects of censorship in Hanau, the censorial reports that have been preserved suggest what sorts of ideas Hanau’s magistrate and censor considered unacceptable in Jewish books and what steps they were willing to take to control Jewish printed discourse.

Walter Keuchen issued twenty-two reports on thirty different Hebrew books between 1609 and 1622.⁴⁹ They reveal much about the duties of a censor, the kinds of material that he sought to suppress, and the procedures that he followed to ensure that only fully sanitized books appeared in print.⁵⁰ Censors throughout early modern Europe were employees of higher authorities, not laws unto themselves. Keuchen's job was to describe each book in appropriate detail, to certify whether or not it contained any kind of religiously offensive or seditious remarks, and to render a judgment as to whether the book was printable or not. The magistrate reserved for itself the final decision, based upon the information provided by the censor.⁵¹ It could also authorize special precautions during the actual printing process to ensure that no changes were made to the approved text. In three cases the printers were ordered to bring each gathering to Keuchen for inspection immediately before it was printed.⁵² Only after the magistrate was satisfied that the work was printable would they allow the phrase *Cum licentia superiorum* to be printed in Latin characters on the cover to assure inspectors and other officials that it could safely be sold.⁵³ By requiring pre-publication review and authorizing the inspection of individual gatherings by the censor when it was thought necessary, the magistrate maintained constant oversight of the text until the process of printing was complete. Its requirement that the censor provide a summary of the contents of each book meant that their decisions to permit or refuse permission for printing were made on the basis of informed judgement.

The practice of censorship in Hanau did not, of course, always conform to its theory. The system of reporting and approval used by Hanau's magistrate provided it with a paper "chain of evidence" demonstrating that they provided an effective degree of oversight for the text of each Jewish book printed there, mainly by showing that a trained expert had vetted them before production. How much of each book Keuchen actually read cannot be inferred from his reports. Between the years 1610 and 1613 he included fairly detailed summaries of the books he reviewed, whether or not there were any potential problems in allowing them to be printed. After 1613 his reporting became more perfunctory, concerned primarily with whether or not a book contained anything offensive.⁵⁴ In only three cases after 1613 did he write a more detailed report, and each of these books was potentially controversial.⁵⁵ Evidently what mattered most to the magistrate was that it had a report on file, not how long or detailed it was.

Whenever the magistrate authorized a second reading of material immediately before it went to press, there also was an element of showmanship involved. This is clear from Keuchen's report on Talmud tractate *Ni-*

dda, the first portion of the Talmud printed in Germany since the Council of Trent.⁵⁶ Through assiduous diplomacy, Ambrosius Froben had been able to surmount the legal barriers when he printed the Talmud in Basel between 1579–81 and was allowed to distribute it through Frankfurt, but the Talmud was still regarded with suspicion in some quarters.⁵⁷ Keuchen suggested that the magistrate authorize a second reading of each gathering to allay such fears, even though he himself found nothing offensive in this Talmud tractate.⁵⁸ By authorizing this procedure the magistrate would ensure that no additions were made in the course of printing and allay the suspicions of other governmental authorities.

Keuchen's definition of offensive or blasphemous material was fairly narrow. He looked for statements that were either patently anti-Christian or unambiguously offensive to a Christian government.⁵⁹ It is difficult to know exactly what Keuchen was looking for, since he seldom found anything in the books that he read which fit this description.⁶⁰ Keuchen had theological qualms about only one book. It was a prayer book with a prayer for travellers containing references to several kabbalistic practices that he thought might be considered offensive by some Christians. These questionable practices included using the secret names of God and the angels in prayer and the mystical "invocation" of the Hebrew alphabet.⁶¹ Keuchen reported that twenty-eight out of the thirty books he reviewed had no offensive material, describing them variously as free of insults to religion and the magistrate, free of anything impious, or stating that there was "nothing in them to prevent their printing." In seven cases he did not explicitly declare them to be printable but raised no objections to them.⁶²

There are several reasons for Keuchen's apparent lack of concern. To begin with, twenty-three of the thirty books submitted to him for review were reprints which had already been approved by censors elsewhere.⁶³ Moreover, Keuchen was willing to examine each book philologically as an individual entity, without reference to its place in the theological and social context of Judaism. When describing a prayer book in 1610, for example, Keuchen noted that the prayers were mostly derived from the Psalms or other parts of the Hebrew Bible. When they mentioned the gentiles in prayer, it was to ask God to be gracious to them. Even those prayers which sought deliverance from the yoke of captivity and restoration to the land of their fathers were derived from the prophets.⁶⁴ Keuchen's remarks at this point should not be misconstrued, however much they might resemble apologetic points made by Menasseh b. Israel a few decades later.⁶⁵ He was not motivated by sympathy for Judaism as a religion, as we shall see shortly. In fact, he distrusted his Jewish co-workers and thought that constant vigi-

lance was necessary to prevent them from slipping unauthorized additions into texts just before printing.⁶⁶ What mattered to him and to his superiors, however, was that no overtly hostile references to Christianity appeared in print. Presumably they understood that when German Jews prayed for deliverance from the domination of others they had their Christian overlords in mind; but, so long as they did not explicitly say so, Keuchen and his superiors were satisfied.⁶⁷ Hanau's ruler and his government were able to authorize Jewish printing, not only because other places outside of Germany had done so first, but also because they and their censor Keuchen agreed that what the Jews actually said and did was for the most part inoffensive, and they had the philological means to demonstrate this. This perspective allowed them to permit Jewish printing with a clear conscience and gave them confidence that they could defend their policy against hostile neighbors.

The ready availability of previously censored books and the judiciousness of Hanau's censor and government made it possible for the Jewish printers to produce a wide variety of books on a number of topics. The forty-three books submitted for publication can be divided roughly into four categories: Hebrew Bibles and commentaries, Jewish law (including responsa), prayer books, and books on personal piety and Kabbala. The breadth of what the Hanau magistrate considered printable is best illustrated by two books: *Yudischer Theriak*, one of the first Jewish apologetic works printed anywhere in Europe, and the *Vincenzlied*, one of the two books that they rejected.

Samuel Friedrich Brenz, a Jewish convert to Lutheranism, in 1614 composed a scathing and scurrilous attack upon Judaism entitled *Jüdischer Abgestreiffter Schlangenbalg* (*Jewish Brood of Snakes Revealed*). Salman Zvi Hirsch, a Jew who lived in Aufhausen, a village near Bopfingen in Swabia, quickly composed a response, entitled *Yudischer Theriak* (*Defense of the Jews*), and travelled to Hanau in January of 1615 to lobby the magistrate for permission to print his book.⁶⁸ Keuchen was ordered to read both Brenz's book and *Yudischer Theriak* before he passed judgement on the latter. Keuchen was rather surprised that Hirsch considered Brenz's book so offensive, since much of what he wrote concerned how Jesus' contemporaries had treated him and their response to the gospel.⁶⁹ He neglected to mention that Brenz had made other more dangerous and defamatory allegations, including blood libel accusations.⁷⁰ Nevertheless Keuchen concluded that *Yudischer Theriak* was printable, since its author was responding to charges raised against Judaism and did not attack Christianity in any way. Hirsch had composed his book very carefully to ensure that it could

appear in print. For example, he discussed only a few parts of Brenz's sixth and seventh chapters on the Messiah and the Trinity, limiting his response to correcting errors in the use of talmudic and other citations.⁷¹ The only acrimony in the book was directed against Brenz personally, since Hirsch considered him to be an apostate, and a stupid one at that.⁷² Keuchen enthusiastically recommended that the work be printed because it would be invaluable for helping Christian scholars develop counter-measures for various forms of Jewish apologetic arguments.⁷³ While this might sound like a rather contrived argument to modern ears, it enabled Hirsch to publish probably the first Jewish apologetic book ever to appear in print in, of all places, confessional Germany on the eve of the Thirty Years War.

The Hanau magistrate concurred with Keuchen's judgment. The only restriction that they placed upon its publication was that it could appear only in Yiddish.⁷⁴ The author had wanted to print the work in German, but he had been unable to do so.⁷⁵ Finally, the clamor of other Jews, who wanted him to print the book as quickly as possible to meet the apologetic need of the hour, convinced him to print it in Yiddish.⁷⁶ Hebrew scholars and theologians would have had little trouble reading a Yiddish book, but other Christians would not be able to do so.⁷⁷ By limiting its circulation to Jews and Christian experts, the magistrate reduced the political risks involved in allowing the book to be printed.

The only book that the Hanau authorities found politically offensive was a narrative poem entitled the *Vincenzlied*, which commemorated one of the great tragedies to befall German Jewry during the seventeenth century. On 24 August 1614, the Jews were expelled from Frankfurt by Vincent Fettmilch and his followers and were forced into exile after losing most of their property. Eventually the emperor intervened, sending troops to put down the rebellion. Fettmilch and his lieutenants were executed on 20 March 1616, and later the same day most of Frankfurt's Jews returned to the city with an army escort to the accompaniment of fife and drums, a kind of triumphal parade. Thereafter the day of return was celebrated by the Frankfurt Jews as the *Purim Vincenz* the day when Fettmilch, the second Haman, was killed.⁷⁸ Shortly afterwards Elhanan Hein composed the bilingual *Vincenzlied* in alternating Hebrew and Yiddish stanzas. In July of 1616 the work was presented to Keuchen for his evaluation. After describing its contents, Keuchen cautioned that printing the poem might have unpleasant repercussions upon Hanau's relations with Frankfurt, and he recommended sending it on to Basel or some other Jewish press.⁷⁹ The magistrate rejected the work one day later. It was difficult enough to maintain civil relations between Hanau and Frankfurt at the best of times without publishing what

amounted to a gratuitous insult with the “*licentia superiorum*” of Hanau’s magistrate. To this day no one knows where the first edition of this poem was printed.⁸⁰ If it was printed in Hanau, the Jewish printers put their business at risk and defied an official prohibition to do so.

The restrictions placed upon the Jewish press of Hanau in some ways reflect the restrictions upon German Jewish life in general in the early seventeenth century. Jews could print, sell, and possess their own religious books in Hebrew and Yiddish, but they were not allowed to disseminate their ideas in German. They were free to pursue their own cultural and religious life within their communities so long as they refrained from explicit criticism of Christianity or Christian governments. When Christian governments invited Jews to settle in their cities or territories, they acted pragmatically, seeking economic expansion rather than religious conformity. To this extent Jewish life in seventeenth-century Germany differed little from the period before the Reformation.

The degree of toleration implicit in the Hanau censorial records is striking, however, and cannot be explained completely by pragmatism and economic utility. To be sure, Count Philipp Ludwig had economic considerations in mind when he opened Hanau to Jewish settlement, and when his government allowed the establishment of a Jewish press he hoped to gain both monetarily through annual license fees and also perhaps to add sparkle to the city’s reputation as a center of learning.⁸¹ The decision to allow Jewish printing was, however, both a political and religious one during the confessional age in Germany, where church and state were so closely linked in the process of state-building.⁸²

What Hanau’s censorial records suggest is that there was a confluence of interests for three parties: German Jewish communal authorities, the magistrate of Hanau, and the Jewish printers there. Each party had an interest in promoting Hebrew printing and yet all recognized that the actual books produced could pose a potential danger to them. If a book produced in Hanau were judged to contain blasphemy or sedition, Hanau’s magistrate would have paid a political price for allowing it to be printed, and would presumably have closed down the press or otherwise punished the Hebrew printers. Other Jewish communities might also have had to endure the political repercussions, including at very least confiscation of the book. Thus, all parties were probably inclined to examine each book carefully before it went to press.

Although all three parties worked toward the same end, they did so independently, and their activities were also probably unknown to each other. Keuchen, for example, suspected that the Jewish printers were opportunist

and hoped for chances to slip additions into books at press time, thus violating the standards set by him and his superiors. In fact the printers were probably well aware of the dangers involved in disobeying the magistrate. All of the parties recognized the imperial system which oversaw the book trade and made no effort to circumvent it.

Despite these barriers, Hanau’s Jewish printers enjoyed a remarkable degree of freedom in what they were allowed to print. The efforts of Jewish writers, editors, and community leaders provided them with more books even than they were able to print. Advances in Hebrew learning among Christians, especially after Hebrew language instruction became more widely available in schools and universities, provided a pool of potential censors who could evaluate these Jewish books independently of Jewish teachers or assistants. It was, in the end, the confidence of Keuchen and his superiors that he could evaluate these books properly that made Hebrew printing in Hanau possible. Jewish printing was allowed in Hanau only because it posed no threat to Christian religious dominance in Germany; and it could at times benefit the Christian community.

NOTES

Research for this paper was supported in part by a Research Assistance Grant from the American Academy of Religion. I would like to thank Dr. Gerhard Menk of the Staatsarchiv Marburg for bringing the Hanau censorial records for Hebrew books to my attention and also for the willingness with which he and Dr. U. Lowenstein (also from the Marburg SA) answered my numerous questions about the Hanau records. I am also indebted to Dr. Moshe N. Rosenfeld of London, England, Herr Hans Jacob Haag of the Zentralbibliothek Zürich, and Dr. A. K. Offenbergh of the Bibliotheca Rosenthaliana, Amsterdam, who provided me with photocopies of the rabbinical “approbations” for Hanau imprints.

1. Chava Weissler, “The Religion of Traditional Ashkenazic Women: Some Methodological Issues,” *Association of Jewish Studies Review*, 12 (1987): 78.
2. There is as yet no general study of censorship of Jewish books by Christian authorities throughout early modern Europe. See provisionally William Popper, *The Censorship of Hebrew Books* (New York, 1899).
3. Heinz Schilling, “Confessionalization in the Empire: Religious and Societal Change in Germany Between 1555 and 1620,” in his *Religion, Political Culture and the Emergence of Early Modern Europe. Essays in German and Dutch History* (Leiden, 1992), pp. 226–30.
4. Heinrich Bott, *Gründung und Anfänge der Neustadt Hanau 1596–1620*, vol. 1: *Die Gründung der Neustadt Hanau 1596–1601: Darstellung und ausgewählte Quellen* (Marburg, 1970), pp. 42–44.
5. Bott, *Hanau*, 1: 47–56.
6. The city council of Frankfurt was aware of his plans by August of 1603 and rightly feared that Philipp Ludwig hoped to lure some of “their” Jews away. See Heinrich Bott, *Gründung und Anfänge der Neustadt Hanau 1596–1620*, vol. 2: *Die Anfänge der Neustadt Hanau 1602–1620* (Marburg, 1971), p. 53.
7. Volker Press, “Kaiser Rudolf II. und die Zusammenschluß der deutschen Judenheit: Die sogenannte Frankfurter Rabbinerverschwörung von 1603 und ihre Folgen,” in *Zur Geschichte der Juden im Deutschland des späten Mittelalters und der frühen Neuzeit*, ed. Alfred Haverkamp (Stuttgart, 1981), pp. 243–93.
8. Philipp Ludwig is said to have responded to representatives of the commission “mit sonderbarem spott ganz schimpflich.” The Prince Bishop of Trier also flatly refused to allow any of his Jews to be summoned. See Press, “Kaiser Rudolf II,” pp. 270–71.
9. Ludwig Rosenthal, *Zur Geschichte der Juden im Gebiet der Ehemaligen Grafschaft Hanau unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Juden in Bergen bei Frankfurt am Main und der dortigen Vorfahren des Verfassers vom 77. bis 19. Jahrhundert* (Hanau, 1963), p. 53.
10. Moshe N. Rosenfeld, “The Development of Hebrew Printing in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries,” in *A Sign and A Witness: 2,000 Years of Hebrew Books and Illuminated Manuscripts*, ed. Leonard Singer Gold (New York, 1988), p. 97.
11. “Quaque omnes Judaeorum preces, quamcunque etiam pietatis habeant specimen blasphema sunt, quia directae non sunt ad verum illum Deum, qui est pater Dn. nostri Iesu Christi Messiam nos id potius labore, quomodo Iudaeos Christo possemus lucrifacere, quam ut in sua, quam detestamur religione per nos confirmetur fiantque tanto obstinatioribus.” H. Heidfeldius to the Kanzlei, 23 May 1609. Marburg SA Best 81 B81 3/4 Nr. 5, f. 18. On Heidfeld, see Bott, *Hanau*, 2: 205.
12. Gustav Könnecke, *Hessisches Buchdruckerbuch enthaltend Nachweis aller bisher bekannt gewordenen Buchdruckereien des jetigen Regierungsbezirks Cassel und des Kreises Biedenkopf* (Marburg, 1894), p. 137.
13. Isaiah Sonne, *Expurgation of Hebrew Books—the Work of Jewish Scholars. A Contribution to the History of Censorship of Hebrew Books in Italy During the Sixteenth Century* (New York, 1943).
14. Joseph Prijs, *Die Basler Hebräische Drucke (1492–1866)*, ed. Bernhard Prijs (Olten, 1964), p. 176.
15. Marburg SA Best 81 B81 3/4 Nr. 5, ff. 20, 22, 26, 48, 55.
16. Eric Zimmer, *Jewish Synods in Germany during the Late Middle Ages (1286–1603)* (New York, 1978), pp. 176–77.
17. These central courts had been established by a German rabbinical synod in 1582. See Jonathan I. Israel, *European Jewry in the Age of Mercantilism, 1550–1750* (Oxford, 1985), p. 44.
18. Zimmer, *Jewish Synods*, pp. 83–85. Rabbinical approvals also later served as a form of copyright protection. According to Dr. Moshe Rosenfeld, the first Hanau imprint to enjoy such protection was Isaac Luria b. Solomon, *Sefer Hakavanot*, Venice: Bragad apud

- Giovanni Cajon, 1620 [=Hanau, 1624]. Moritz Steinschneider, *Catalogus librorum Hebraeorum in Bibliotheca Bodleiana* (1852–60. Reprinted Hildesheim, 1964), p. 1135 no. 5386. Letter to the author, 10 March 1992. See his “Jüdischer Buchdruck am Beispiel der Sulzbacher Druckerei,” in *Geschichte und Kultur der Juden in Bayern. Aufsätze*, ed. Manfred Treml, Josef Kirmeier and Evamaria Brockhoff (München, 1988), pp. 240–41. More generally, see Meir Benayahu, *Copyright, Authorization and Imprimatur for Hebrew Books Printed in Venice* (Jerusalem, 1971) [Hebrew].
19. The Frankfurt ordinance was modeled after a rabbinical ordinance passed at the synod of Ferrara in 1554 which required rabbinical approvals to be printed in the books themselves. See Louis Finkelstein, *Jewish Self-Government in the Middle Ages* (New York, 1964), pp. 310, 304.
 20. The five Hanau books printed between 1609 and 1622 which contain approvals are: *Nishmat Adam* (1611), *Shefa Tal* (1612), *Ginat Egoz* (1614), *Gedolot Mordecai* (1615), and *Ben Daat* (1616). Rosenfeld to the author, 10 March 1992.
 21. The three chief rabbis were Isaiah b. Abraham Horowitz of Frankfurt, Ephraim b. Aaron Luntschitz of Prague, and Jacob Ulma of Friedberg. Elia b. Moses Loanz, the rabbi of Hanau, also wrote an approbation for the book as he did for *Nishmat Adam* and *Shefa Tal*, although he could not claim the title of chief rabbi until he assumed that post in Mainz.
 22. Daniel J. Cohen, “Die Entwicklung der Landesrabbinate in den deutschen Territorien bis zur Emanzipation,” in *Geschichte der Juden im Deutschland*, ed. Haverkamp, p. 227. Both Friedberg and Frankfurt were the seats of “central rabbinical courts” in Germany. Israel, *European Jewry*, p. 44. The rabbi of Prague was, of course, not the chief rabbi of a German central court.
 23. These were Isaiah b. Abraham Horowitz of Frankfurt and Aaron Samuel b. Moses Shalom (of Kremniz/Crzeminiac) of Fulda.
 24. For information on the Frankfurt rabbinical court and its members, see Markus Horovitz, *Frankfurter Rabbinen. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der israelitischen Gemeinde in Frankfurt a. M.*, ed. Josef Unna (Hildesheim, 1972), pp. 275–86.
 25. For example, Isaiah b. Abraham Horowitz and his Frankfurt colleagues wrote jointly concerning *Nishmat Adam*: “B^ekken haskamenu ve-hirshenohu l^e-habo^o le-bet ha-defus. . . .” The fifth book, Joseph b. Abraham Gikatilia’s *Ginat Egoz*, contained three approbations recommending the book to prospective readers. Gikatilia’s book apparently required no “approval.”
 26. These were Ephraim b. Aaron Luntschitz of Prague and Abraham b. Joel Ashkenazi of Lvov.
 27. However, the synodal decisions may have been enforced to some degree by regional courts. The imperial commission of 1606 claimed that some Jews who had broken the Frankfurt ordinances on coinage, printing, interest, bread, and wine had indeed been punished by Jewish courts but did not provide any specific examples. Cohen, “Landesrabbinate,” pp. 236–37.
 28. Cohen, pp. 236–37.
 29. Horovitz, *Frankfurter Rabbinen*, pp. 279–81.
 30. Könnecke, *Hessisches Buchdruckerbuch*, pp. 136–37.
 31. The chief rabbis were Joseph b. Isaac Halevi Ashkenaz of Metz, Petahiah b. Joel of Schnaittach, Elia b. Moses Loanz of Mainz, Aaron Samuel b. Moses Shalom (from Kremniz) of Fulda, and Simson b. Joseph of Fürth.
 32. See Christopher R. Friedrichs, “Anti-Jewish Politics in Early Modern Germany: The Uprising in Worms, 1613–1617,” *Central European History*, 23 (June/September 1990): 91–152.
 33. For a recent discussion of these components see Ulrich Eisenhardt, “Staatliche und kirchliche Einflußnahmen auf den deutschen Buchhandel im 16. Jahrhundert,” in *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Buchwesens im konfessionellen Zeitalter*, ed. Herbert G. Gopfert, et al. (Wiesbaden, 1985), pp. 295–313.
 34. Wolfgang Bruckner, “Die Gegenreformation im politischen Kampf um die Frankfurter Buchmessen. Die Kaiserliche Zensur zwischen 1567 und 1619,” *Archiv für Frankfurts Geschichte und Kunst*, 48 (1962): 67–86.
 35. Dieter Breuer, “Zensur und Literaturpolitik in den deutschen Territorialstaaten des 17. Jahrhunderts am Beispiel Bayerns,” in *Stadt-Schule-Universität-Buchwesen und die deutsche Literatur im 17. Jahrhundert*, ed. Albrecht Schöne (Munich, 1976), pp. 470–91.
 36. Joseph Kalir mentions these authors and a number of others in his “The Jewish Service in the Eyes of Christian and Baptized Jews in the 17th and 18th Centuries,” *Jewish Quarterly Review*, 56 (1966): 51–80. For a discussion of seventeenth-century convert literature, see

- Martin Friedrich, *Zwischen Abwehr und Bekehrung. Die Stellung der deutschen evangelischen Theologie zum Judentum im 17. Jahrhundert* (Tübingen, 1988), pp. 43–49, 78–79, passim.
37. “Quaeris praeterea, quomodo Fabulas illas judaicas contesserim. Respondeo ipsos Judaeos mihi suggestisse. Primo & principaliter oblato libro Rituum, cui *Minhagim* nomen. Et qui hebraeo germanice editus est. Eum si cupis tibi dono mittam. Deinde intellexi totum illorum jus, civile & canonicum & quae praeterea habeat, *dinim* quasi Aphorismis comprehensum in libro, cui *Shulhan Aruk* nomen. Hunc etiam opera Judaeorum accepi. Postea Talmud ipsum & eos, quos praeterea cito, assecuus sum, in hos animi gratia excurri, & quicquid reperi, ad *Minhagim* retuli.” Johannes Buxtorf I to Matthias Martinius, Basel, 4 September 1606, printed in Johann Buxtorf, “Epistola Johannis Buxtorfii, P. ad Matthiam Martinium,” *Bibliotheca historico-philologico-theologica*, classis 4, fascicle 3 (1721): 601. More generally, see my dissertation “The Christian Hebraism of Johann Buxtorf (1564–1629)” (University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1990), pp. 151–54.
 38. R. Po-chia Hsia, *The Myth of Ritual Murder: Jews and Magic in Reformation Germany* (New Haven, 1988), pp. 149–51.
 39. Hans-Martin Kirn, *Das Bild vom Juden im Deutschland des frühen 16. Jahrhundert dargestellt an den Schriften Johannes Pfefforkorns* (Tübingen, 1989), pp. 43–46. There are no indications from the censor’s reports that Keuchen was aware of the expurgation lists used by Italian censors of Jewish books. On these lists and their uses, see Sonne, *Expurgation*, passim.
 40. His marriage record in Hanau identifies him as the son of “Guillaume (Wilhelm) Keuchen d’Huren (Düren).” Hanau Stadtarchiv: Wallonisches Traubuch, f. 43 (July 1614). The Keuchen family was apparently quite large and many were Calvinists. See Josef Geuenich, “Die Älteste und Diakone der reformierten Gemeinde Düren 1591–1723,” *Mitteilungen der Westdeutschen Familienkunde*, 57–58 (1969–70): 237–39, and Karl Ventzke, *Evangelische Gemeinden in Düren vom 16. Jahrhundert bis 1944* (Düren, 1986), p. 26.
 41. On Keuchen’s education see Hans Georg Wackernagel, ed., *Die Matrikel der Universität Basel: 1460–1818*, 5 vols. (Basel, 1951–1980), 3: 52.
 42. M. Kayserling, “Richelieu, Buxtorf Père et Fils, Jacob Roman. Documents pour servir à l’histoire du commerce de la librairie juive au XVII^e siècle,” *Revue des études juives*, 8 (1884): 79. Keuchen’s correspondence with Buxtorf the elder is preserved in Basel Universitätsbibliothek MS G 160: 317–22.
 43. Bott, *Hanau*, 2:487.
 44. Abraham Yaari, “Complaints of Proofreaders about Printing by Gentiles on the Sabbath,” [Hebrew] in his *Studies in Hebrew Booklore* (Jerusalem, 1958), pp. 174–75, quoting the comments of Seligmann Ulma at the end of *Arba Turim* (1610–11) and *Ginat Egoz* (1615). Keuchen identified himself as the gentile Sabbath corrector: “Und well ich noch liber à publico munere, pflge ich den Sambstag, was zu corrigieren, allein zu überlesen, welches Sontags von Judischen setzer corrigiert, und von mir und meinen lectore montags morgens letztlich überlesen word.” Walter Keuchen to Johann Buxtorf, n. p., 19 January 1618, Basel UB MS G I 60: 320^r.
 45. Herbert C. Zafren, “A Probe into Hebrew Printing in Hanau in the Seventeenth Century or How Quantifiable is Hebrew Typography,” in *Studies in Judaica, Karaitica and Islamica Presented to Leon Nemoy on his Eightieth Birthday*, ed. Sheldon R. Brunswick (Ramat Gan, 1982), pp. 283–85.
 46. These books are *Tefillat ha-Derek* (1611), mentioned in Marburg SA Best 81 B81 3/4 Nr. 5, f. 24, and Elhanan Hein, *Vincenzlied* (1616), *ibid.*, f. 64.
 47. No censor’s reports have survived for the following Hanau imprints: the *Responsa* of Jacob Levi Molin, Jacob Weil, and Solomon ibn Adret (all printed in 1610), Seligmann Ulma, *Mare ha-Musar* (1610–1613?), Sabbatai Sheftel b. Akiba Horowitz, *Shefa Tal* (1612), Bendet (Baruch) Akselrad b. Joseph, *Derashot al Eseret ha-Debarot* (1616), and Meir ibn Gabbai, *Mare Elohim* (1622). There is also no report on Valentin Schindler’s *Lexicon pentaglotton* (1612), the sole “Christian book” known to have been printed by the Hanau Hebrew press, although it was censored. See Hans Jacob Henne’s letter of complaint to the Hanau Kanzlei, Hanau, 25 May 1610, Marburg SA Best 81 B81 3/4 Nr. 5, f. 21.
 48. *Seder Tefillot*, German and Polish rite, 8° (Hanau, 1618) [Basel University Library, call no. FA VIII 26]. Moshe N. Rosenfeld discovered a further Hanau imprint from 1625/1626 which he described in “Ein jüdischen Wandkalender für das Jahr 5386 (1625–1626),” *Nachrichten der jüdischen Bürger Fürth* (1990): 31–32. Since I am focusing on censorship in Hanau rather than printing there, I have not addressed the question of how many Jewish books were printed after 1622.

49. In addition to some of the imprints reported by Safran, the books described in the censorial reports (Marburg SA Best. 81 B81 3/4 Nr. 5) include six prayerbooks and eight other books. The eight books probably included: Isaac Ibn Sahulo b. Solomon, *Mashal ha-Qadmoni* (1610) and Kalonymos b. Kalonymos, *Eben Bohem* (1610) [f. 23], Abraham Horowitz b. Sabbatai, *Berit Abraham* (1611) [f. 24], Solomon ibn Gabirol, *Kether Malkut* (1611) [f. 24], Meir ibn Aldabi b. Isaac, *Shebile Emunah* (1611) [f. 26], Moses Yakar Ashkenazi, *Petah Enaim* (1611) [ff. 39–40], Elhanan Helen, *Vincenzlied* (Rejected: 22 July 1616) [f. 64], and a treatise on slaughtering, perhaps Jacob Weil's *Shehitot* (1617) [f. 68].
50. Heinrich Heidfeld wrote the first censorial report on Hebrew books at Hanau, discussing several reprints of Plantin Hebrew Bibles and two prayerbooks (f. 18). In his report, however, he questioned the propriety of Jewish printing and, although he censored other books (ff. 5–9, 19), he apparently did not review any other Jewish books.
51. Quid talium prelo praemitti possit, statuet Prudent. & Amplitudo vestua." Marburg SA Best 81 B81 3/4 Nr. 5, f. 24. Keuchen acknowledged this repeatedly throughout these records. See ff. 48, 58, 59, 64, 70.
52. Marburg SA Best 81 B81 3/4 Nr. 5, ff. 40,44, 70.
53. Zaphren noted that the last book to bear this phrase on the title page was printed in 1620, suggesting that its absence after 1620 implied that the printing privilege had run out. "Hanau," p. 276. I think it more likely that the magistrate felt that an indication of official approval was no longer necessary.
54. "Judaei pro Censura Imperialem ut solvant, rogo, jubeantur." Marburg SA Best 81 B81 3/4 Nr. 5, f. 45. See also ff. 22, 48, 55, 58,73.
55. These included Salman Zvi Hirsch, *Judischer Theriak* (1615), Elhanan Helen, *Vincenzlied* (1616), and tractate *Nidda* of the Babylonian Talmud (1617).
56. See Salo Baron, "The Council of Trent and Rabbinic Literature," in *Ancient and Medieval Jewish History: Essays by Salo Baron*, ed. Leon A. Feldman (New Brunswick, 1972), pp. 353–71.
57. Ernst Staehelin, "Des Basler Buchdruckers Ambrosius Froben Talmudausgabe und Handel mit Rom," *Basler Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Altertumskunde*, 30 (1931): 7–37.
58. "Nec habet haec pars, cujus cause rejiceretur, quinque apertae impietatis, praeter nudum Talmudi nomen. Sed quia complura hinc inde suspecta loca recisa olim fuerunt, ne illa in nostra hac typographia per dolum rursus irrepunt, necessarium videretur, ne Judaei sumpsum hinc impendentes, omnia suo libita, ut hactenus factum, agerent. Nihil enim censura prodest, nisi operarii ipsi teneantur non aliter imprimere, quaeque quam lege & recognitione ipsis libri permittuntur. Nec hoc tantum, sed quotidiana fere inspectio ne operorum opus esset." Marburg SA Best 81 B81 3/4 Nr. 5, f. 70. Ironically, a copy of the Basel printing of tractate *Nidda* served as the Vorlage for the Hanau imprint. See Moritz Steinschneider, *Catalogus Librorum Hebraeorum*, p. 264, no. 1807.
59. ". . . nihil contra Religionem, vel adversus Magistratum expresse dictum reperi." Keuchen to the Kanzlei, 16 February 1610, Marburg SA Best 81 B81 3/4 Nr. 5, f. 20.
60. In two instances Keuchen recommended making a few changes but did not specify what he found unacceptable: "... praeterque loco uno & altero, ubi mihi acies illa retundenda videbatur" (f. 23), and "... sed & hinc inde quae suspectius dici videbantur apertius digesta, aut amputata sunt" (f. 25).
61. "Sed quam hic quaedam miscetur, quae pié institutam mentem offendere possent; ut sunt singulares quidam orantium gestus, Angelorum Deique nominum secretus usus, & siqui sunt alii vocum aut literarum abusus: Quid talium prelo permitti possint, statuet Prudent. & Amplitudo vestu." 29 January 1611, Marburg SA Best 81 B81 3/4 Nr. 5, f. 24. See Joshua Tractenberg, *Jewish Magic and Superstition: A Study in Folk Religion* (New York, 1939), pp. 90–100, 155–56, and I. Elbogen, *Der jüdische Gottesdienst in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung* (1931. Reprinted Hildesheim, 1962), pp. 376–77.
62. Nothing against religion or magistrate: ff. 20, 23, 56. Nothing against religion (using a variety of phrasings): ff. 22, 25, 45, 47, 68, 70, 76 (3 books), 77. Nothing to prevent its printing: ff. 55, 58, 59, 73, 79. No explicit statement: ff. 23 (*Even Bohem*), 24, 26, 48.
63. The seven Hanau "first editions" for which censors' reports exist are: *Yeshu'ot Nahmot* (1620) [f. 76], *Olam ha-Ba'* (1620) [f. 76], Aaron b. Moses Shalom, *Nishmat Adam* (1613) [f. 25], Baruch b. David Gnesen, *Gedolot Mordecai* (1615) [f. 55], Bendet (Baruch) Akselrad b. Joseph, *Ben Da'at* (1616) [f. 59], and Solomon Zvi Hirsch, *Yudisher Theriak* (1615) [f. 47]. The censor's reports for three Hanau first edi-

- tions—Bendet (Baruch) Akselrad b. Joseph, *Derash al eseret ha-Debarot*, Sabbatai Sheftel b. Akiba Horowitz, *Shefa Tal*, and Seligmann Ulma, *Mare Musar*—have not been preserved.
64. “Preces ut maxime ex Psalmis, & reliquo corpore biblico. . . . Gentium quas vocunt, subinde fit mentio quatenus Deo gratias agunt, quod se ex omnibus elegerit, Legemque dederit; & orant, ut tandem a Jugo Captivitatis liberentur, & in terram patriam reducantur. Atque in hisce plaerumque utuntur loquendi formulis ex Prophetis praesertim petitis, ut preces suae eo ratiores, & a captione tutiores videantur.” Marburg SA Best 81 B81 3/4 Nr. 5, f. 22 (21 November 1610). It is worth pointing out, however, that the text Keuchen reviewed had already been thoroughly revised and expurgated by Jewish scholars. This process of revision was already underway by 1546. Sonne, *Expurgation*, pp. 36–37.
65. Menasseh b. Israel, *Vindiciae Judaeorum* (1656), reprinted in *Menasseh ben Israel’s Mission to Oliver Cromwell*, ed. Lucien Wolf (London, 1901), pp. 125–34.
66. “Hoc nunc solum rogo, ut, quod ante septimanas sex septemae scripto monui de Judaeorum nostrorum in excudendis libris periculosa libertate, recordari viri Amplit. velit. Nam quid Censura iuverit, si praeterea sit nulla inspectio, si correctori omnia, quae velit, licet addere vel detrudere si denique Typographus fide vestrae Amplit. obstrictus & teneatur.” Marburg SA Best 81 B81 3/4 Nr. 5, f. 48 (3 May 1615).
67. See Johann Buxtorf, *Juden Schul* (Basel, 1603), p. 460. On the legal discussion surrounding this problem see William Horbury, “The Benediction of the Minim and Early Jewish-Christian Controversy,” *Journal of Theological Studies*, 33 (1982): 31–32.
68. Petition of Salman Hirsch, Jew of Aufhausen, to the Kanzlei of Hanau, 30 January 1615. He gave his address as: “Jud zu Aufhausen, der Zeit zu Hanaw bei den guldenen Adler.” Marburg SA, Best 86, 31116. See Hermann Süß, “Salman Zvi und sein ‘Jüdischer Theriak, Hanau,’ 1615,” *Nachrichten für den jüdischen Bürger Fürth* (Sept., 1983): 41–45.
69. “Ille fere aliud nihil continet, quam Judaeis objici consuetas criminationes; quod Christum, ejusque & Evangelium, & sectatores injuriosis dictis factisque odiose persequantur.” Marburg SA Best 81 B81 3/4 Nr. 5, f. 47.
70. Samuel Friedrich Brenz, *Jüdischer Abgestreifter Schlangenbalg* (1614. Reprinted Nürnberg, 1680), pp. 5–6. Brenz’s book was printed together with *Yudischer Theriak* in Johannes Wülfer, *Theriaca Judaica ad Examen Revocata* (Nürnberg, 1681).
71. “Ad sextum a. & septum cap non respondit, nisi quae allegata ex Talmudo, utpote ab allegante non intellecta, aliter interpretetur.” Marburg SA Best 81 B81 3/4 Nr. 5, f. 47.
72. “Judaeus [i.e., Hirsch] vero defensor dictas incusationes ita fere declinat, ut dicat Schlangenbalchium hominem esse horum omnium imperitissimum, & Judaeis ideo contradicentem, ut pinguis offis futatur.” Keuchen characterized the tone of the book this way: “. . . quia tum Responsio hac absque maledicentia est; nisi quod in Personam opponentis quandoque acrior sit. . . .” Marburg SA Best 81 B81 3/4 Nr. 5, f. 47.
73. “Et Christianis ideo est utilis futura, ut cogno scant, quid effugia Judaei quaerant, quando haec, & alis eis objiciuntur; penes vos erit, viri prudentissimi, tractatus huius impressio & evalgatio.” Marburg SA Best 81 B81 3/4 Nr. 5, f. 47.
74. “Hierauff das Hebraisch exemplar bewilliget, aber Teutsch exemplar zutrucken verboten.” Their judgment was written on the verso side of Hirsch’s petition. Petition of Salman Hirsch, Jew of Aufhausen, to the Kanzlei of Hanau, 30 January 1615. Marburg SA Best 86, 31116. It was also written on the bottom of Keuchen’s report and was dated 4 February 1615. Marburg SA Best 81 B81 3/4 Nr. 5, f. 47.
75. “. . . furnemlich habe ich mich in namen gemenen Juden gegen ansehnlichen hohen potentaten verpflichtet ehest miglich ein biechlin auf deutsche/ darin wie sich den bezichtigten lestern / excusieren darin gegen zu lesen. Welches aber biß hero nit bescheden konden.” Marburg SA Best 86, 31116.
76. “Den ob gleich woll mein Intent nicht wollen gewesen, solch biechlen hebreisch schrifft drucken zu lasen, so bin ich doch dazu gedrungen, seid melden nun sonsten von der Judenschafft kein vorschub geschieht, biß sie das werk zu sich lasen.” Marburg SA Best 86, 31116.
77. Johann Buxtorf wrote and published a short guide for reading Yiddish in his *Thesaurus Grammaticus* (Basel, 1609), anticipating that Christian scholars might wish to read Yiddish books.
78. Horovitz, *Frankfurter Rabbinen*, p. 52.

79. “Sed quia tum temporis non infimi quidam civium Frankfortensium mirari videbantur, talim hinc in sui despectum superiorum licentiã in vulgus sporgi.” (22 July 1616) Marburg SA Best 81 B81 3/4 Nr. 5, f. 64.
80. On its later publication history, see L. and R. Fuks, “Hebrew Book production and Book trade in the Northern Netherlands and their German Connections in the 17th Century,” in *De Arte et Libris: Festschrift Erasmus 1934–1984*, ed. Abraham Horodisch (Amsterdam, 1984), p. 177.
81. Keuchen mentioned this second reason in his first censorial report: “Inter illas vires cum Typographia quae praecipuum sit instrumentum, quo fama boni Principis & Reipubl. existimatio quaequam latissime extendatur & augeatur; tum vero summo laudis fuit consilium vestrum de hebraea typographia erigenda, per quam melius efficitur id, quod intenditur, quam Graeca aut Latina unquam fieri possit.” Marburg SA Best 81 B81 3/4 Nr. 5, f. 20.
82. Schilling, “Confessionalization,” pp. 208–09.