



# The European Legacy

## Toward New Paradigms

ISSN: (Print) (Online) Journal homepage: <https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/cele20>

## My Brother Michael Heyd (1943–2014): A Personal Intellectual Profile

David Heyd

To cite this article: David Heyd (2020): My Brother Michael Heyd (1943–2014): A Personal Intellectual Profile, The European Legacy

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10848770.2020.1771860>



Published online: 16 Jun 2020.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



## My Brother Michael Heyd (1943–2014): A Personal Intellectual Profile

David Heyd

Department of Philosophy, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Mt. Scopus, Jerusalem 9190501, Israel

Philadelphos

### Beginnings

Michael Heyd was born in March 1943 in Jerusalem, which at the time was still part of British Mandatory Palestine. With his sharp historical sense he later expressed his astonishment at his (our) parents' decision to conceive him in the summer of 1942, when the small Jewish community in Palestine was threatened by Rommel's fast advancing Panzer Division in Egypt. Although Montgomery's counterattack in El Alamein probably saved his life, the circumstances of his birth symbolized for him life's precariousness and the contingency of history.

Unlike most people, Michael knew from a young age that he wanted to be a historian. His interest in the past was no doubt sparked by our father, professor Uriel Heyd, a renowned historian of the Ottoman Empire at the Hebrew University. Already at the age of seven Michael loved sitting on a stool in the bathroom and listening to stories about Maria Theresa and Marie Antoinette, while father was getting his daily shave. Michael gratefully acknowledged father's impact on his academic career by dedicating his first book, *Between Orthodoxy and the Enlightenment*, "To the memory of my father, Professor URIEL HEYD, who was the first to show me the excitement of History and the value of Scholarship."

But while for Uriel history meant primarily politics, diplomacy, power, law and institutions, Michael, from quite an early stage, was attracted to *ideas*. Here, his schoolteachers played a formative role, especially those who introduced him to philosophy (which he read along with history for his BA). Both our parents, who emigrated from Germany in 1934, were suffused with European culture. But Uriel made a deliberate decision to switch from the study of economics and law in Germany to the study of the Middle East, where as a dedicated Zionist he made his new home. Michael later noted that it was ironic that he, the Israeli-born (*sabra*), made unawares the move back to Europe with its rich history and culture on which he was raised. Both Heyds were diligent readers of texts in unfamiliar languages. But whereas Uriel went eastwards picking up Arabic, Turkish and Persian, Michael travelled back to Geneva, Paris and London, to study Latin manuscripts and books. Uriel died prematurely while Michael was still a student, but one can imagine his surprise at his son's choice to study the intricacies of Protestant theological debates about Original Sin in the late seventeenth century.

Michael seems to have followed Marc Bloch's warning long before he could have read it: "But a man may wear himself out just as fruitlessly in seeking to understand the past, if he is totally ignorant of the present." Michael's interest in current affairs was no less passionate than his interest in the past. Already at the age of eleven he immersed himself in the story of the battle of Dien Bien Phu between the French and the Viet Minh in Vietnam and even built "a fortress" around his bed (probably identifying with the besieged French forces). His source of information was the daily newspaper (there was no television in Israel at the time). Throughout his life he was engaged in political affairs—both in Israel and in the international sphere. Since his curiosity extended to all historical periods, he acquired an impressive body of knowledge in fields which were far from his professional expertise. Contemporary debates on subjects such as state and religion or secularization and toleration and how these concepts had developed in the early modern period lay at the core of his interests.

However, unlike historians engaged in the political debates of their own societies, Michael consistently resisted the attempt "to learn a lesson from history." He always held that, in contrast to the hope of many people, "history will never serve as a judge" in political controversies. Future historians, he claimed, would replicate the political and ideological disputes about right and wrong (prudent or foolish) of *their own time*, in their interpretation of the events of *our times*. He adhered to the principle of the strict separation between history and current politics, which in fact was also upheld by Uriel. This separation, however, did not mean that the study of past ideas and values could not enhance one's sensitivity to or analysis of contemporary issues. It is in this spirit that Michael welcomed the examination of how the phenomenon of the Enlightenment (or of toleration) is seen by historians in current-day Mediterranean countries that are still struggling to form a stable political culture.

Politically, Michael was a social democrat. For many years he was a member of the Israeli Labour Party, the rise and fall of which he witnessed more than once in his lifetime. He viewed with apprehension the rise of messianic forms of the national religious forces in Israel after 1967 but was hardly surprised by them. Unlike many of his friends in the left, he saw the religious revival in Israeli society as a reaction to the rapid secularization that had characterized the Zionist movement. Michael thus shared with Uriel an acute awareness of the historical force of religion (which modernity could not suppress), for Uriel was one of the first scholars to trace a similar process in Turkey: already in 1968 he detected the signs of religious revival in rural regions after decades of the forced secularization introduced by Atatürk and his successors (see his article "The Revival of Islam in Modern Turkey").

Contrary to the widely held belief of liberal philosophers, individuals do not plan their life as if it were a story. This also applies to one's professional life: Much of it is the product of contingent circumstances, unforeseen opportunities, chance encounters with documentary materials or influential scholars. This does not, however, mean that *in retrospect* we cannot find some unifying structure or some persistent themes in a scholar's *oeuvre*. The following is my modest attempt to present a bird-eye's view of Michael's main research interests and to connect them to his biography.

## Transitions

Michael regarded J. L. Talmon—whose interest lay in *historical transitions*—as his main mentor. But while Talmon focused on grand-scale processes from the Enlightenment and

the French Revolution to the romantic period and to twentieth-century totalitarian ideologies, Michael focused on smaller-scale changes in the early modern period. Although he joked that history till the sixteenth century was the business of archeologists and following 1789 was the business of journalists, he believed that the roots of modernity and the political and cultural identity of Western society lay in the Reformation and the Scientific Revolution.

While the early modern period is defined by its “revolutionary moments,” Michael held that to understand these moments we should trace how the scientific discoveries and new religious ideas were transmitted, adopted and adapted in the existing cultural institutions and society at large. Although philosophers and scientists see Descartes as the towering figure and the starting point of modern philosophy, from a historical point of view, his impact cannot be understood without tracing the ways in which his ideas spread to different disciplines and locations. Thus for Michael the role of the intellectual historian was to examine the ways new ideas were *disseminated* and the kind of opposition or resistance this entailed. Radical changes in religion and science take time to be accepted and implemented in existing institutions, which is precisely what *transitions* are all about.

Michael's first book, *Between Orthodoxy and the Enlightenment: Jean-Robert Chouet and the Introduction of Cartesian Science in the Academy of Geneva* (M. Nijhoff, 1982), which was based on his doctoral dissertation in Princeton, demonstrates his fundamental approach to transitional historiography. It deals with the fairly long process it took for the new Cartesian ideas to be absorbed by academic institutions. As a test case, he chose the Academy of Geneva (at the suggestion of his supervisor Ted Rabb) at the turn of the eighteenth century. Believing that the diffusion of knowledge was not a purely intellectual process but one which involved social and historical factors, he focused on the struggles over the introduction of Cartesian science and philosophy in an institutionally and geographically peripheral site (the Academy was not recognized as a “university”).

His work centered on Professor Jean-Robert Chouet, whose personality and career embodied this kind of transition. Michael described him as a devout Calvinist who never challenged theological authority, but who, at the same time, was captivated by Cartesian natural philosophy and determined to introduce it into the curriculum. In other words, Chouet, while engaged with modern ideas and methods of investigation, still adhered to traditional pedagogical methods and teaching frameworks. Chouet's plan took time to materialize and involved struggles with the college authorities and theologians, particularly regarding the nomination of a Professor of Mathematics (i.e., the new sciences). It was only by becoming rector of the university and having good contacts with the City's lay authorities that Chouet finally succeeded in his struggle.

During his research on Geneva in the 1970s Michael became increasingly aware of social history. His interest in the diffusion of knowledge, unlike its creation, invention or discovery (which can more easily be ascribed to individuals), called for greater sensitivity to the social conditions, traditions and institutions of higher learning as the driving forces in this process. So he set out to examine the hypothesis that part of the successful struggle for the modernization of the Academy's curriculum was aimed at attracting more *foreign* students to Geneva, students who would promote its reputation and contribute to its income. This was the time he undertook a systematic *quantitative* study, involving detailed tables and graphs of the number of students registered in different years and from different countries of origin, following their placement record,

tracking their family social background and their choices of subjects of study. He was inspired to use this methodology again by Ted Rabb, who was then Chairman of the American Historical Association's Committee on Quantitative History. Although in the early 1970s scholars had only limited access to the budding computing technology, Michael made good use of his earlier experience in computing during his military service.

A similar interest in transitional periods can be detected in the other major subject Michael embarked upon in his second book, *"Be Sober and Reasonable": The Critique of Enthusiasm in the Seventeenth and Early Eighteenth Centuries* (Brill, 1995). In a nutshell, the book traces the transition from the theological reaction to the practices of religious enthusiasts to the more psychological and medical understanding of their frame of mind. If in the seventeenth century religious fervor was regarded as something undesirable that had to be suppressed, by the early eighteenth century it was regarded as a mental illness that should be treated with sensitivity and empathy. Michael saw this as yet another example of a process of "disenchantment" or enlightenment. But, as with the incorporation of Cartesianism into the university curriculum, this too was a long, *non-linear* process, with vicissitudes and relapses.

Thus, in the first half of the seventeenth century, Anabaptists, Quakers, Millenarians, charismatic fanatics, "prophets" claiming direct contact with God, were all regarded as challenging both institutional religion and the public order. They were said to be possessed by the devil, to be false prophets and deniers of the authority of the Scriptures. Their divine frenzy and manic behavior was perceived as endangering traditional institutions. But by the turn of the eighteenth century these enthusiasts became known as "melancholics" (following Robert Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy*). Enthusiasm could now be explained as physiological excess (mania) or as physiological deficiency (depression). It had become a scientific matter, calling for a mechanistic, corpuscular explanation. Furthermore, as Michael proposed, enthusiasm started to be regarded as a kind of inspiration that was no longer confined to religious experience but now extended to artists and even scientists, including Descartes himself! This new attitude led to greater toleration of enthusiasm and to the recognition of its positive role in creative activity. The former attitude of antagonism had been transformed into an implicit alliance between enthusiasts and those who believed in artistic inspiration of the romantic kind. But according to Michael this could only have happened within a relatively secularized context and as part of an anti-clerical movement. However, and perhaps paradoxically, the religious establishment was happy to join the "disenchanted" attitude to religious enthusiasm by relegating it to the worldly sphere of medical pathology, which did not challenge any theological or institutional authority.

A unique aspect of Michael's research of the subject is found in his article on how the Christians viewed the self-proclaimed Jewish messiah Sabbatai Zevi in 1666 and the following decades. It turns out that Sabbateanism attracted the attention of Christian theologians throughout Europe and was used as a tool in the internal controversy with millenarians, false prophets and other enthusiasts. The typical Christian response was that Sabbatai Zevi was a false messiah and an impostor who was driven by diabolical (rather than medical) forces. Michael also explained the identification of the Christian religious establishment with the rabbis of Smyrna (Izmir, Sabbatai's native city), who saw the danger in the charismatic impact he had on his many followers. By calling Sabbatai Zevi

“a Jewish Quaker” ministers thus heightened the suspicion with which Quakers, Anabaptists and other millenarians were held.

This is probably the only case in which Michael’s and Uriel’s work converged. Uriel had studied the mystical movements in the Ottoman Empire, particularly the dervish rites, both in Turkey and in the Balkans. But he also wrote a short article, “A Turkish Document on Sabbatai Zevi,” in which he described a rare letter from the Grand Vizier that refers to the “heretic Jewish convert who was dressed as a Muslim” and “who should be executed.” On the periphery of the massive research on Sabbatai Zevi in Jewish history, the paths of the two Heyds thus crossed in looking at this figure from either the Christian or the Muslim perspective.

There is no need to speculate what it was that attracted Michael to the study of enthusiasm. As stated in the Preface to his book, it was “the oscillations between melancholy and enthusiasm as well as ... moments of sobriety and reasonableness.” Those who knew him can attest to his sobriety and reasonableness; but even if they did not recognize the melancholic side of his personality, they were familiar with his enthusiasm in the positive, eighteenth-century sense of intellectual fervor and academic passion.

## Education

Throughout his adult life Michael was deeply engaged in education, perhaps the most powerful tool in the diffusion of knowledge. As an MA student he earned his living as a history and philosophy teacher in high school. The job filled him with satisfaction, and although he knew he was heading for an academic career he played with the idea of maintaining a part-time position in school. Later on he was involved in projects of the Ministry of Education, particularly in designing the school curriculum in history. He saw his academic role as primarily that of a teacher and considered himself no less a transmitter of knowledge than a researcher. He was a devoted supervisor as well as a popular teacher of the first-year introductory course, which he had himself designed, on Early Modern History.

This explains Michael’s particular interest in the history of education, in which the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries played a significant role (Locke and Rousseau being the central figures, whose writings on education Michael repeatedly taught). The opening paragraph, a quotation from Franklin Baumer’s 1949 article, says it all:

[To learn] how an entire society, as distinguished from a few individuals within society, comes by the ideas it holds collectively ... [the intellectual historian] must branch out into the history of education which, thus far, he has left (and with what woeful results) to the antiquaries and the professional educators.

An example of Michael’s attempt to follow Baumer’s plea is his study of how the method of *disputatio* was used in the transition and gradual incorporation of natural philosophy into the university curriculum. We tend to see the disputation as a medieval rhetorical format that was despised by modern philosophers like Erasmus and replaced by new forms of discourse based on personal experience and experimental testimony. Again, Descartes (together with Hobbes, Locke and many others) served as models of this radical, almost abrupt, change in argumentative style. But Michael shows how the method of

disputation outlived the old Aristotelian ideas and medieval theological dogmas. In Chouet's Academy professors still presented their students with Theses, assigning one of them the task of formulating Objections to the theses, while asking another to prepare a Response to the objections. It is fascinating to see how this method was used in the teaching of the new science as, for example, in the debate about the vacuum. Michael presents as a test-case the defense by one of the students of the Cartesian view of the impossibility of a vacuum, in the form of a disputation, despite Descartes's denigration of the method. Indeed, some of the most subversive ideas in metaphysics, theology and science (including Spinoza's allegedly atheistic ideas) were spread by means of the disputative technique. Michael demonstrates that the disputation served as an efficient tool in the development of the critical examination of traditional theories in the light of the new science and should therefore not be exclusively associated with dogmatic thinking and the appeal to authority. In transitional periods new ideas are often transmitted to the next generation by means of old methods.

In another study Michael examines how theorists of education in the early modern period dealt with this tension between authority and criticism. Here his object was not the formal method of university teaching but the interpretation of a Biblical verse (Proverbs 22:6): "Train up the child according to his way/He will not swerve from it even in old age" (חנוך לנער על פי דרכו, גם כי יזקין לא יסור ממנה). He discusses the different English translations of the verse to characterize the competing philosophies of education. Our "paedocentric" interpretation of the verse proves to be by no means natural, let alone obvious, for it can be interpreted either normatively or descriptively: educate the child as he *ought* to become, or raise him according to his natural inclinations. The sixteenth-century translations lean towards the more authoritarian approach, as do the Puritan translations, including the King James authorized version of 1611, according to which the child's spirit should be broken so as to implant moral virtues in him. However, the seventeenth-century translations convey a more liberal view: education should fit the child's needs, which change according to age and individual capacities. This typically modern humanist approach, which we take for granted, was first advanced by Locke (and later on by Rousseau), who was among the first to define the goal of education as enabling the child to become an autonomous adult.

A completely different example of Michael's interest in education was the project of the history of the Hebrew University. As one of its initiators and co-editor of the first volume of the series, this project combined Michael's professional interest in the history of higher education with his personal commitment to his alma mater. The Hebrew University, founded in 1925, was one of the leading symbols of the Zionist movement and of the nascent Jewish national identity. The long and often fierce debates about the university's national role—the language of teaching, the relative weight of research and teaching, and the identity of the students to whom it would appeal—all contributed to the understanding of the history of the creation of the state.

Michael tackled this subject in terms of the history of education, the prism through which so much may be learnt about the power structure of society, its values, and what it wishes to pass on to future generations, and which applied to all levels of the educational process, from the family, through the school system, up to the institutions of higher education. For Michael the case of the Hebrew University was of particular interest, since, in contrast to an old institution like the Geneva Academy, which underwent slow and

gradual changes, it was created *ex nihilo*: its structure and content had to be formed as a matter of pure design, with no precedents or tradition. Thus, for example, a choice had to be made whether to construct it on the model of an American college focused on teaching (Jabotinsky's view) or on the German research university (or institute, as Weizmann urged); whether the language of teaching would be German (since many of the potential faculty would come from central Europe) or Hebrew (a revived language with very limited means to discuss scientific and technological matters); whether to appeal to local students living in Palestine or to Jewish students in the diaspora (many of whom were denied the opportunity to get a university education due to numerous *clausus* regulations).

But Michael stressed that the central dilemma at its inception was ideological: to what extent should the university be viewed as part of the building of a new society for the Jews and the formation of national identity. University education has always been the most universally oriented stage in the education of young people, but universities—especially the German model in the nineteenth century—had also played an important role in the promotion of the cultural legacy of the nation. Michael was always aware of the tension between the universalistic and the particularistic pull in the identity of the Hebrew University, where today there is talk of a partial switch from Hebrew to English as the language of teaching. Michael had his doubts, for example, about the division of Jewish and General history into two separate departments. He was also ambivalent about the pressure on faculty members, even in the humanities, to publish almost exclusively in English and believed that it was part of a scholar's responsibility to communicate with her own society. So the decision to publish the project of the history of the Hebrew University in Hebrew seemed only natural, despite its potential interest to non-Hebrew readers around the world.

## Secularization and Toleration

Michael grew up in a secular family. Our parents came from German-Jewish families, which were not assimilated but whose Jewish identity was not religious in the orthodox sense of the word. For both of them Zionism, which included raising their children in Israel, was the solution to what seemed to them the hopeless task of preserving a Jewish identity in a secular world in the diaspora. But secular Zionism, the dominant culture from the time of the British Mandate to the first years of independence, started to give way to new voices and political forces. The struggle between state and religion gathered momentum in the 1960s and 1970s (partly due to the 1967 war). Michael's attitude was more conciliatory towards the Orthodox sector and the religious institutions of the state compared to that of the staunch liberal supporters of a complete separation of state and religion. Despite leading a "secular" life, he was sensitive to the power of religious beliefs on human beings and suspicious of the hopes of the Enlightenment to surpass the age of religion in human history.

On the conceptual level, Michael reminded his students and readers that the term "secular" was itself a Christian concept deriving from *saeculum*, which meant 'that which belongs to this world' (or in the original Roman Latin, 'a human lifetime or generation'). And for Christians the worldly was by no means "secular" in our sense of the word, but was filled with religious meaning. Accordingly, Michael's aim was to go beyond the common



associations of secularization—the rise of science, modernization, deism and atheism—to its roots in the religious crisis of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. It was a break *within* religion, rather than its abandonment, that had started the process of secularization.

Michael referred to this break as “the collapse of Jacob’s ladder.” The traditional Christian division between this world and the transcendent world has always called for some *bridge*, “the soteriological bridge,” lest this world failed to attain its full religious meaning. Michael’s metaphor is more fitting, however, since the ladder, in contrast to a bridge, highlights the vertical nature of the relation (and in Jacob’s story, there is constant angelic movement up and down the ladder). For Catholics the means of maintaining the ladder (or the bridge) is through the mediation of Jesus, the Church, the Sacraments, and human religious acts or “works.” But after the Reformation these means were lost to the Protestants who were left with an empty gap between the mundane and the transcendental. Faith alone, *sola fide*, became their fundamental religious principle, yet this ladder proved to be shaky and was challenged by mystics and religious enthusiasts (who claimed *direct* access to God), on the one hand, and by the rational attempts to understand God (Deism, or biblical criticism à la Spinoza), on the other. The collapse of the various “ladders,” ontological, epistemological, sociological and theological, had left a vacuum that was gradually filled by non-religious (or “secular”) institutions and practices, such as the state and science, and the theories of natural law and the social contract.

Michael did not see these developments as unidirectional; rather, he emphasized the pendulum movement which in the course of the eighteenth-century saw the return of religious fervor—the Great Awakening in America, Pietism in Germany, Methodism in England, and Hassidism in Judaism (and he identified similar reactive movements of religious revival in twentieth-century societies). New ladders kept being built despite the belief that in the age of modern science and technology people no longer had any need of them.

The study of secularization thus led Michael to focus on the formative role of Christian ideas in the rise of the Enlightenment. Inspired by the work of Yehoshua Arieli, he showed how the internal controversies within Protestant culture relegated the divine to a purely transcendental realm beyond the concerns of public and political institutions. Furthermore, God was no longer conceived as governing human history, thus leaving it to be explained in exclusively mundane, human terms. As Michael argues in “Christian Roots of the Critique of the Idea of Election on the Eve of the Enlightenment,” Pierre Bayle, anticipating Voltaire, fiercely attacked the millenarians and the idea of history as subjected to divine Providence. There is nothing sacred in history; ultimately, its secularization is the outcome of the strict Calvinist conception of God’s transcendence and thus another example of the collapse of Jacob’s ladders. Salvation can only be hoped for on the individual level as a particular act of God rather than as a historical millenarian goal awaiting humanity as a whole.

The rise of modern science similarly illustrates the process of secularization. As Michael reminded us, members of the Royal Society understood their research as imbued with religious meaning. Although natural philosophy is independent of theology, the study of nature is a privileged way to study God’s ways. Unlike theologians, whose focus was salvation, scientists tried to understand creation. In a way, they competed with theologians by constructing a ladder of their own. But this endeavor gradually waned in the

eighteenth century when scientific research was no longer understood as aiming at a religiously significant goal. It became “secular” in the modern, religiously neutral sense. Although modern science has lost its religious underpinnings, Michael insisted on its historicity. This led him in the 1980s to initiate and set up with colleagues from the social sciences and philosophy a Master’s Program in the History, Philosophy and Sociology of Science.

Toleration, another concept associated with modernism and secular liberalism, was similarly a Christian idea from the early modern period that had been “secularized.” Michael was particularly interested in toleration as a response to religious enthusiasm. He studied Shaftesbury’s *Letter Concerning Enthusiasm* (1707) in which, following Robert Burton’s analysis of enthusiasm in medical terms, Shaftesbury advocated *toleration* towards enthusiasts, arguing that the medical *treatment* of enthusiasts was hopeless and their persecution immoral. The right response was what Shaftesbury called “raillery,” to laugh or mock them. But his *Letter* was met with strong reactions, which raised the issue of the *limits* of toleration. The critics’ argument was that, since the enthusiasts often challenged the sacred principles of religion, the defense of these principles was incompatible with toleration. Michael was interested in the question of toleration throughout his teaching career and I felt privileged to co-teach with him a seminar on the subject in which we combined historical development with philosophical analysis.

## Original Sin

Michael devoted the last years of his life to the study of original sin, the central Christian doctrine that had undergone radical transformation during the Reformation and then gradually declined during the transition to the Enlightenment. This decline or “psychological turn” occurred in the period Michael was particularly interested in—the turn of the eighteenth century—which he repeatedly referred to as “the eve of the Enlightenment.” He passed away while writing his projected book on original sin, of which he completed the first chapter—a history of original sin up to the Reformation. We can gain an idea of his approach from this chapter and from a couple of articles he wrote on the subject.

Original Sin is original in two senses: it is Adam’s sin and the sin of all human beings. Yet the theological problem is to explain how all the generations from Adam onwards inherited it, and why even newly born, innocent children are marked by it. This problem, known as the question of *imputation*, became even more urgent with the Reformation, since according to Protestant theology even baptism cannot erase original sin without God’s grace. Adam’s sin, in the harsher interpretation, had stained the whole of humanity. In other words, Adam *represented* all of us and accordingly by divine imputation we are all guilty of original sin. But in the milder interpretation, original sin signified the human *inclination* to evil. Although as a hereditary property, this inclination is universal, it does not *by itself* lead an individual to sin. In one of his articles Michael examines the debate between two Calvinist scholars, Josué de la Place arguing that we have all inherited the corrupt nature of human beings but not the sin itself, while Anthony Garissole insists on the doctrine of imputation, despite the original sin being mediated by our personal sins. Furthermore, inclination does not mean guilt, and human beings can be held responsible only for the sins they can avoid. This transition from a predestined sin that is inherent to human beings as such to a more personal view of sin as a matter of *will* is “moralistic” in

nature, which means that morality, self-restraint, and the education of children replace the fear of ultimate damnation.

In a draft chapter of his planned book Michael examines English theologian Edward Stillingfleet's attempt to maneuver between the Trinitarian analysis of original sin and the rational, moralistic view most famously promoted by Locke. Michael identified Stillingfleet's consistent avoidance of the very term "original sin" and highlighted his view that Adam's sin and particularly his guilt cannot be inherited (or imputed). Yet he insisted that as Christ can save human beings despite their not being guilty of their sins, so can Adam be responsible for these sins after the Fall. However, this middle way approach can be understood as a sign of the decline of the concept of original sin itself.

Michael thus saw the decline of the doctrine of original sin in seventeenth-century Protestantism as a form of its "secularization." Sin acquired a moral, personal meaning; it related to what an individual *did* rather than to what he essentially *was*. To reach this conclusion, he used personal diaries as sources for tracing the transition from the theological discourse on sin as an irremediable human condition, to its explanation in terms of the human *experience* of sin, namely, as the *emotion* of the sense of guilt.

\*\*\*

Michael Heyd's work cannot be summarized in a short survey, nor can his personality as a historian be captured in a few pages. Ted Rabb described him as "a historian through and through." For many years he served as the President of the Historical Society of Israel and for ten years he was on the Board of the Comité International de Sciences Historiques (CISH). His abiding concern with the diffusion of knowledge found expression both in his research topics and in his personal relations. This Special Issue attests to his colleagues' appreciation and to his generous willingness to share his knowledge.

On his deathbed, while reflecting on his life, Michael asked me to remind him of the name of the lead actor in Ingmar Bergman's *The Seventh Seal*. I told him it was Max von Sydow but wondered why he asked. He replied: "because we are both engaged in the same battle—playing chess against death." It was no coincidence that Michael was preoccupied at the very end his life with this struggle, but we should remember that in the film it is not by some supernatural power that Death wins the chess game with the pilgrim but merely by a mundane trick of deception.

## Select List of Michael Heyd's Publications

*Between Orthodoxy and the Enlightenment: Jean-Robert Chouet and the Introduction of Cartesian Science in the Academy of Geneva.* The Hague: Nijhoff, 1982.

"Protestantism, Enthusiasm and Secularization in the Early Modern Period: Some Preliminary Reflections." In *Religion, Ideology, and Nationalism in Europe and America*, edited by Moshe Zimmermann, 9–27. Jerusalem: The Historical Society of Israel, 1986.

"Christian Roots of the Critique of the Idea of Election on the Eve of the Enlightenment." In *The Idea of the Chosen People in the Jewish and non-Jewish Traditions*, edited by Shmuel Almog and Michael Heyd. Jerusalem: Shazar Center, 1991. [In Hebrew]

*"Be Sober and Reasonable": The Critique of Enthusiasm in the Seventeenth and Early Eighteenth Centuries..* Leiden: Brill, 1995.

- "The Limits of Toleration in the Early 18th Century: Shaftesbury's Letter Concerning Enthusiasm and the Reactions to It." In *The Emergence of Tolerance in the Dutch Republic*, edited by G. Berkvens-Stevelinck, Jonathan Israel, and G. H. M. Posthumus Meyjes, 155–71. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- "Between Nationalism and Universalism, Between Research and Teaching: The Beginnings of the Hebrew University." In *Education and History*, edited by Rivka Feldhai and Immanuel Etkes,, 355–375. Jerusalem: Shazar Center, 1999. [In Hebrew]
- "The 'Jewish Quaker': Christian Perceptions of Sabbatai Zevi as an Enthusiast." In *Hebraica Veritas? Christian Hebraists and the Study of Judaism in Early Modern Europe*, edited by Allison P. Coudert and Jeffrey S. Shoulson, 234–65. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.
- "Original Sin, the Struggle for Stability, and the Rise of Moral Individualism in Late Seventeenth-Century England." In *Early Modern Europe: From Crisis to Stability*, edited by Philip Benedict and Myron P. Gutmann, 197–233. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2005.
- "Changing Emotions? The Decline of Original Sin on the Eve of the Enlightenment." In *Representing Emotions*, edited by Penelope Gouk and Helen Hills. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2005.
- "Dogmatic Education or Training for Critical Thought? A 17<sup>th</sup>-Century Scholastic Disputation Concerning the Void" (with Asaph Ben-Tov) (in Hebrew). *Iyyun* 57 (October 2008): 323–50.
- "Train up the Child According to His Way: Authoritarian Education or Training for Autonomy? Early Modern English Translations, Commentaries, and Sermons on Proverbs 22:6 as a Case Study." In *Education and Religion: Authority and Autonomy* (in Hebrew), edited by Immanuel Etkes, Tamar Elor, Michael Heyd, and Baruch Schwarz, 101–44. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 2011.
- "The Collapse of Jacob's Ladders? A Suggested Perspective on the Problem of Secularization on the Eve of the Enlightenment." In *Jewish Culture in Early Modern Europe, Essays in Honor of David B. Ruderman*, edited by Richard I. Cohen, Natalie B. Dohrmann, Adam Shear, and Elchanan Reiner, 229–38. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2014.
- "From Total Depravity to Limited Autonomy: Reflections on the Transformative Potential of Protestantism." In *Religious Movements and Transformations in Judaism, Christianity and Islam*, edited by Yohanan Friedmann, 27–50. Jerusalem: Israeli Academy of Science, 2016.
- "The Disappearance of Original Sin? The Post-Crisis Theology of Edward Stillingfleet." In an unpublished manuscript on Original Sin.