



LIBRARY COPYRIGHT NOTICE

www.huc.edu/libraries

Regulated Warning

See Code of Federal Regulations, Title 37, Volume 1, Section 201.14:

The copyright law of the United States (title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material.

Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specific conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be "used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research." If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of "fair use," that user may be liable for copyright infringement.

This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law.

ANTI-CHRISTIAN ELEMENTS OF THE "SEFER NITSACHON"

Rabbinical thesis of

DAVID MAX EICHHORN

Class of 1931

HEBREW UNION COLLEGE

JACOB RADER MARCUS, referee

rec'd. 8/78

Dedicated to

my beloved parents

JOSEPH BACHRACH EICHHORN

and

ANNA ZIVI EICHHORN

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer of this thesis gratefully records his obligation to Dr. Jacob R. Marcus, Professor of History at the Hebrew Union College, for his many helpful suggestions and to Dr. Moses Battenwieser, Professor of Bible, and Dr. Jacob Z. Lauterbach, Professor of Talmud, for their invaluable criticisms and assistance in clearing up textual difficulties.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Dubnow, Simon "Weltgeschichte des Juedischen Volkes" Berlin, 1925-9
V:340-343
- Eisenstein, J.D. "Otsar Vikuchim" Pp.115-117, 236-260 New York, 1928
- Fuenn, S.I. "Keneset Yisrael" I:443-444 Warsaw, 1886
- Fuerst, Julius "Bibliotheca Judaica" II:403 Leipzig, 1863
- Graetz, Heinrich "Divre Y'me Yisrael" (trans. from German by S.P.
Rabinowitz) VI:75-6, 421, 485 Warsaw 1890-1900
- Kaufmann, Judah "Rabbi Yom Tov Lippmann Muhlhausen" New York, 1926
- Kaufmann, Judah article in "Ha-Toren" Vol. XI:80-105
"Rabbi Yom Tov Lippmann Muhlhausen"
- Lazare, Bernard "Anti-Semitism" Pp.147-178 New York, 1903
- Lippmann Muhlhausen, Yom Tov "Sefer Nitsachon" Altdorf, 1644
(Hackspan edition)
- Marx, Alexander and Margolis, Max "History of the Jewish People"
Pp.402-412 Philadelphia, 1925
- Seligson, Max article in Jewish Encyclopaedia "Yom Tov Lippmann
Muhlhausen" Vol. VIII:97-98 New York, 1901-1906
- Steinschneider, Moritz "Jewish Literature" (trans. from German
by W. Spottiswood) London, 1857
- Wolf, Johann Christopher "Bibliothecae Hebraicae" Manuscript #1364
Vol. I, III, IV Hamburg, 1715-1731
- Zunz, Leopold "Zur Geschichte und Literatur" Pp.124, 129, 194, 380
Berlin, 1845

TABLE OF CONTENTS .

Bibliography

Chapter One--Biography of Yom Tov Lippmann Muhlhausen	Page 1
Chapter Two--History of the "Sefer Nitsachon"	14
Chapter Three--Analysis of the "Sefer Nitsachon"	
Division One--General Analysis	21
Division Two--Analysis of Anti-Christian Portions	24
Chapter Four--Conclusion	98

Appendix:

- Index #1--List of anti-Christian passages in the "Sefer Nitsachon"
- Index #2--List of Biblical verses whose Christian misinterpretations are refuted in the "Sefer Nitsachon"

CHAPTER ONE

BIOGRAPHY OF YOM TOV LIPPMANN MULLHAUSEN

Chapter One

Biography of Rabbi Yom Tov Lippmann Muhlhausen

Jewish history abounds with heroes, men who have struggled valorously in defense of their people and their religion. Some have shown their mettle on the field of battle. Others there have been who, through the power of language, both spoken and written, have labored just as indefatigably and courageously to protect their brethren from the onslaught of their oppressors. The man whose life-history will be unfolded in this chapter belongs to that great army of Jewish soldiers who fought, not with weapons of iron or steel; but who used their tongues and pens to combat the enemies of their people. He lived in a time when stalwart leadership and staunch resistance to outside forces were sorely needed.

The latter half of the fourteenth century found the Jews of Austria in dire circumstances. The ravages of the great plague known as the Black Death (1348-1349) had exacted great toll from the Jews of Europe. The Jews not only had suffered heavily from the bubonic plague but were charged by a fanatical populace with being the cause of the dread epidemic. More than two hundred Jewish communities were totally destroyed by their disease-crazed Gentile neighbors before the blood-thirstiness and rapacity of the mobs was satiated. This great upheaval was followed by thirty years of comparative peace. The Jews were given an opportunity to recuperate slightly from the bitter tragedy which had threatened to wipe them from the face of the earth. Then in the year 1378, Wenceslaus (1378-1400) ascended the throne of the Germanic empire and once again the Jews in this region found themselves confronted with the task of self-preservation. At the Diet of Ulm in 1385, one-fourth of all debts owed by Chris-

2

tians to Jews were cancelled outright and the other three-fourths were ordered to be paid, not to the Jews to whom the money rightfully belonged, but to the cities in which they lived. In 1389 and 1390, similar decrees were again promulgated with added provisions which made them even more devastating and more wide-spread in their effects than the dictum of 1385. Debt-remission became the general policy of the country and the Jews were on the verge of complete economic ruin.

In this grievous time, the Jews of Prague were the victims of an even more disastrous happening. On Easter Sunday of the year 1389, on a very flimsy pretext, the holiday mobs, with words of hate upon their lips and thoughts of murder in their hearts, attacked the Jewish quarter of the city, ransacked the homes of these weak and defenseless innocents, and brutally put to death more than three thousand souls. Even the dead were not spared. Bodies were exhumed from the graves of the Jewish cemetery and torn to pieces. The synagogue was burned to the ground. The Torah scrolls were destroyed. Wenceslaus then confiscated the property of the Jews who were slain in the pogrom.

But the cup of sorrow of the Prague Jewish community was not yet full. A converted Jew named Peter (before his conversion he was called Pesach) brought word to the authorities that the Jews were defaming the Christians in their prayers. As a result, the Jews of the community were thrown into prison and threatened with death or baptism unless they could disprove the charges of Pesach-Peter. In this great crisis, the Jews of Prague called upon one of their leaders, Yom Tov Lippmann Muhlhausen, to defend them and to prove them innocent of any wrong-doing. He answered the charges of his adversary with great skill and courage (1). But his efforts

(1) These charges are discussed in ch.3, div.2, part 2, sec.6.

were unsuccessful. He himself tells us (1): "From the evil one (Peter) went forth evil so that seventy seven souls were killed for the sanctification of God's name on the first of Ellul, 5160 (Aug.22, 1400), and after that, on the twenty-first of Ellul (Sept.11, 1400), three more suffered martyrdom at the stake; and the evil one was removed from this world and from the world to come (2)." The lives of Lippmann and the other prisoners were spared for some unknown reason; and Lippmann expresses his gratitude to God for his deliverance by concluding his account of the disputation thus: "Therefore I, the most humble of those who remain, praise and exalt the King of heaven and acknowledge that all His works are justified and just are His ways. Give thanks unto the Lord for He is good for His love endures forever." Such was the man Yom Tov Lippmann Muhlhausen, meek in spirit but great in piety, the humblest of the humble among his own people, a mountain of strength, an undaunted hero in the presence of his enemies.

Where was Lippmann born? We do not know (3). Where did he die? We do not know (4). The dates of his birth and death are also not known. One fact, however, is well established and that is: he lived for a long time in Prague and, while there, was very active in the affairs of the community. Kaufmann (5) believes that he came to Prague before the pogrom of 1389 and also is of the opinion that

(1) Mitsachon par.354.

(3) Graetz (VI:75) and Zunz (Zur Geschichte und Literatur, 124 and 194) believe he came from Muhlhausen in Alsace. Kaufmann (p.14) says this is not so. Kaufmann believes that either his grandfather migrated to Austria from Alsace or he came from Muhlhausen, a small town in Bohemia, 40 miles south of Prague. In either case, his birthplace is unknown.

(2) This seems to mean that Peter was also killed at this time. This is hardly possible. It may mean that Peter died a natural death about the same time as the three men were burned at the stake.

(4) It seems that he died in Cracow because Bishop Bodeker of Brandenburg, who wrote his refutation of the "Mitsachon" in 1435, says that Lippmann lived in Cracow. (See Jewish Encyclopaedia VIII,97). Eisenstein (p.115) and Kaufmann believe that he died in Cracow.

(5) P 16.

4

his disputation with Peter took place in 1389. Graetz (1) and Marx and Margolis (2) maintain that the disputation took place in 1394 while Lippmann himself says that it occurred in 1399 (3). Why these various chroniclers of Jewish history refuse to believe the account of Lippmann is hard to understand. It certainly seems logical to suppose that if the year 1400 is the correct date of the martyrdom of Lippmann's fellow-prisoners, 1399 is also the correct date for their incarceration. The authorities would not have kept these men in prison for either six or eleven years after the disputation and then executed some and set free the remainder (4). At any rate, it is certain that Lippmann was in Prague by the year 1399. Manuscript 223 in the Halberstam collection contains an account of a document which he issued in Prague in 1413 (5). So he lived and worked in Prague for fourteen years at least and there is a great likelihood that he lived there much longer. Shortly after 1413, he moved to Cracow for Bishop Bodeker declares that he wrote the "Nitsachon" in Cracow in 1420. We shall prove in chapter two that Lippmann wrote this work no later than 1413 but there is no reason for not believing Bodeker's statement that Lippmann was living in Cracow in 1420. Dubnow (6) is even willing to grant that Bodeker's statement is wholly true. He says that since Prague and Cracow had such close relationships, both national and commercial, with each other at this time, Bodeker

(1) Vol. VI p.75.

(2) P.411.

(3) In his introduction to the account of the disputation.

(4) Wolf (Manuscript 1364-I,347) gives the date of the disputation as 1459 which is, of course, absolutely wrong. Graetz (VI,485, note 3) explains that Wolf made this mistake through confusing the Hebrew date 519 with the common era date 1459.

(5) See Jewish Encyclopaedia VIII,97.

(6) Weltgeschichte des Juedisches Volkes p.343, of vol.5V.

may be right in saying that Lippmann wrote the "Nitsachon" in Cracow. And so we leave the problem of the wanderings of Lippmann (1). The documents which have thus far been uncovered dealing with this character in Jewish history do not furnish us with much definite information. All that we can state positively is that Yom Tov Lippmann Muhlhausen came to Prague no later than 1399 and left no earlier than 1413. In 1420 we hear of him in Cracow. How long he resided there and whether or not he died in that city is not known. (2)

Besides Lippmann's controversy with Peter, other facts are known concerning his standing in the Prague community and his activities there. The Halberstam manuscript, mentioned before, shows us that he was one of the Dayyans of the Prague community together with the famous Rabbalist, Abigdor Kara. In this manuscript, Lippmann is called "Yom Tov, the son of Solomon, who is called Lippmann Muhlhausen." (3) Jacob Moellin of Mayence addressed responsa to him. Israel Isserlein mentions him as one of the five rabbis who took part in the council which met in Erfurt between 1400 and 1410 (4). Very little is known concerning the decisions of this council. These references show us that Lippmann was looked up to by his contemporaries as one of the leaders of his time. Besides this, we know from the "Nitsachon" that he was often involved in religious disputations with Christian religious leaders. In three passages of the "Nitsachon" (5), he

(1) For a hypothetical explanation of Lippmann's wanderings before he reached Prague, see chapter 2, page 18.

(2) Naphtali Hirsch Treves, in the introduction to his Siddur, states that Lippmann lived in Prague. So says Fuenn (I, 443). Graetz says that he resided in the suburb of Prague known as Wischigrod. Fuerst (Bibliotheca Judaica II, 403) says he lived in Cracow.

(3) See Graetz VI, 75, note 1. This reference to his father is the only one which we have which gives us any information regarding the family of Lippmann.

(4) In Terumat Ha-deshen--section Pesakim uchsavim, par. 24. See Graetz VI, 421, note 3.

(5) Paragraphs 179, 225, and 290.

6

tells us that the chief of the priests of Lindau, a town in Bavaria, asked him questions concerning interpretations of Old Testament verses (1). This priest of Lindau seems to have known some Talmudic Haggada which he probably had learned from a Jewish convert. He asked Lippmann for the interpretation of a certain story in the Talmud based on Psalm 104 (especially verse 26b). Lippmann says concerning this question, "It is no wonder that the priest was perplexed in this matter and that the Minim make fun of this story for I have known some Jewish sages who believed it literally; therefore I explained to him that the whole thing is nothing but a parable (2)." Bodeker, in his book refuting Lippmann, tells us that Lippmann used to visit the Christian churches, observe the ceremonies carried on there, and listen to the sermons of the priests, in order to be able to intelligently combat the anti-Jewish charges of his Catholic neighbors. This was a quite unusual procedure in those days of bigotry and persecution and is indicative of the earnestness and zeal of this man in his efforts to shield his co-religionists. Many sections of the "Hitsachon" indicate that Lippmann had many arguments with the Christian clergy of Prague and also with Jewish converts. The dispute over Proverbs 30:1-4, recorded in Par.310 of the "Hitsachon", could only have been held with someone who knew the Talmud well.

This sums up about all the information which we have concerning the communal activities of Lippmann. We know much more about the extent of his learning and the literary products which he wrote. From the point of view of learning, Lippmann is one of the most exceptional Jews who lived in northern Europe during the Middle Ages.

(1) In what manner the chief priest of Lindau and Lippmann communicated with each other is a matter impossible to determine. Did the Bavarian send written statements and questions to Lippmann? Did he travel to Prague? Did Lippmann, while travelling through Germany, meet this priest? Any of these conjectures is plausible.
(2) Par.290.

He belonged to that rare class of individuals who combined a thorough knowledge of Judaism with a rich secular education. Just how he procured this non-religious training is not known but his books show us that not only was he at home with the Hebrew classics but with many works of Latin authors as well. He was a man of unusual ability and unusual knowledge. He knew thoroughly Biblical, Rabbinic, and Karaitic literature and also made a study of Greek philosophy and Christian literature, especially the New Testament. Besides the fields already mentioned, he had other very important interests. He was an energetic propagandist for Kabbala. His works are full of Kabbalistic references and theories (1). Historians are in almost complete agreement that the medieval writer of many Kabbalistic works, Tav Yomi, is none other than Yom Tov Lippmann Muhlhausen (2). He was acquainted with the latest scientific theories of his age and, although we may smile at some of the now discarded theories which he advances in the "Nitsachon", we can not but admire the wide range of knowledge which Lippmann possessed. In Paragraph 77 of the "Nitsachon", he couples a discussion of the abandoned doctrine of the four elements with proofs that the moon's light is a reflection of the sun and that the earth is round, theories which sound very much up-to-date. In Par.339, he discusses at length the orbit of the sun in a manner which leaves the amateur astronomer completely baffled. One weakness in his armor of learning which can be detected is that his knowledge of Hebrew grammar was not of the best. In two places in the "Nitsachon" (3), he errs in his state-

(1) See Par.2, 133, and 224 of the "Nitsachon".

(2) Tav Yomi is the Aramaic form of Yom Tov. See Graetz VI,75, note 1.

(3) See discussion of וַיִּבְרָא in Par.5 and of פְּדוּתָא in Par. 269.

ments about grammatical constructions, as is pointed out in chapter three, division two. Yet this is a fault which he shared with most Middle Age Jews and Christians so we can not criticise him very harshly in this matter. Some notion of the extent of Lippmann's knowledge can be gained through the list of books and authors which he quotes in the "Mitsachon". The non-Jewish works which he draws upon mostly are the writings of Aristotle (1), the Vulgate translation of the New Testament (2), and the work of Gregorius (3). It is not possible to state positively which of the many Gregoriuses this one is. Among the great mosaics of Jewish literature, the following are cited: the Bible, Talmud Babli, Talmud Yerushalmi (4), Targum (5), Sefer Yetsira (6), Sifra (7), and Midrash Tanchuma (8). Lippmann was not only well acquainted with the Talmud but also with the writings of the great Talmudic commentators. He quotes Rashi (9), Asher of Toledo (10), Chananel (11), Al Fasi (12) Nathan of Rome (who wrote the Dictionary) (13), Samuel ben Meir (14), Kalonymus (15), Meshullam ben Kalonymus (16), Moses of Coucy (17), Rabbenu Tam (18), and Meir of Rothenberg (19). Among the Kabbalists whom he mentions are Ramban (20), Eleazar of Worms (הפנימונים) (21), Samuel, the author of שו"ת אור חיים, (22), and Asher ben David ben Abraham (23). Lippman was even more generous with names of philosophers than with Kabbalists. The philosophers to whom he refers are Maimonides, Saadya (24), Baachye ibn Pakuda (25), Nissim (26), Abraham ibn Ezra (27), and Shemariah of Negraponte (28). From this long list of books and

(1) Par.2. Note--Not all of the references to paragraphs in which books or authors are cited will be listed here. Those which are quoted frequently will not be given any paragraph-references while paragraph-references will be given for those less frequently quoted.

- | | | | | |
|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|
| (2) Par.8. | (8) Par.3. | (14) Par.301. | (20) Par.29. | (26) Par.12- |
| (3) Par.218. | (9) Par.15. | (15) Par.123. | (21) Par.124. | (27) Par.60- |
| (4) Par.62. | (10) Par.57. | (16) Par.66. | (22) Par.124. | (28) Par.2. |
| (5) Par.6. | (11) Par.124. | (17) Par.9. | (23) Par.202. | |
| (6) Par.2. | (12) Par.120. | (18) Par.125. | (24) Par.3. | |
| (7) Par.82. | (13) Par.120. | (19) Par.108. | (25) Par.57. | |

names, we can deduce the fact that Lippmann was a prolific reader and knew how to make good use of the literature which he read.

From whom did Lippmann learn to handle Hebrew books with so much facility? Who were his teachers? Lippmann himself offers us no information in this matter. He makes no mention in any of his works of the names of his contemporaries or his teachers. Kaufmann (1) guesses that his teachers might have been R. Meir Ha-Levi, chief rabbi of Vienna (1393-1408), who invented the rabbinical title of Morenu, R. Shalom of Heustadt, R. Samson ben Eliezar, and especially the Kara brothers and R. Abigdor. Kaufmann believes that from the latter Lippmann learned his Kabbalistic principles. Fuenn (2) disagrees with this assumption. He says that Abigdor could not have been a teacher of Lippmann because he was a younger contemporary of Lippmann.

Lippmann's method of interpreting Biblical verses can be understood through the statement that Lippmann was in his theology a Kabbalist, in his philosophy a Maimunist, and in his exegesis a Peshatist. In other words, he was in the very vanguard of the thought of his time. He was far from being a conservative or what we would, in slang, term a "back-number". These three schools of thought clashed with each other at a number of points and Lippmann tried very hard to bring them together and formulate for himself a consistent point of view. He believed that God was the First Cause and from Him emanated the nine spheres and the ten Intelligences. He explains his Kabbalistic beliefs very thoroughly in Par.2. He was a firm believer in the metaphysical portions of Maimonides' philosophy except that he, unlike Maimonides, posits the existence of angels and demons. As a strict Peshatist, he naturally attacks the allegorical inter-

(1) Pp.16 and 17.

(2) I:444.

pretation of the Scriptures, another feature of the Maimonidean system. In Par.2, he writes: "Concerning this (i.e., the allegorical) manner of interpretation, it is said, (Num.15:31) 'He hath despised the word of the Lord'; for it is an injurious manner of exposition." Like Maimonides, he rids the Bible of all anthropomorphic meaning. He did not interpret the stories in the Talmud literally but regards them as parables, as is explained in chapter three, division two, section five. He does not hesitate to differ with Talmudic interpretations of Biblical verses. "Let not him who finds in this Sefer Ha-Mitsachon", he writes in his introduction to the book, "explanations which differ somewhat from the explanations of the rabbis find fault with me for the Torah may be interpreted in many ways, as it is written (Jer.23:29), 'Is not My word like fire? saith the Lord; and like a hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces?'"

Most of the facts which are known about Yom Tov Lippmann Muhlhausen are gleaned from his extant writings, especially the "Sefer Mitsachon". These are quite numerous but references found in Lippmann's works and in other manuscripts lead to the belief that he wrote many other books which have not been preserved. From these references we gather that Lippmann was an extremely versatile and voluminous author. He delved into many fields of thought and the material which has been preserved indicates that he worked thoroughly and conscientiously. Lippmann's greatest literary effort, if we are to judge by the influence which it has exercised on both the Jewish and non-Jewish worlds, is undoubtedly the "Sefer Mitsachon", the "Book of Refutation", the work which endeavors to silence all anti-Jewish utterances of Christians, Karaites, heretics, and doubters. Since chapter two of this thesis is devoted to a discussion of the history of this book and chapter three to an analysis of its contents, it is not necessary to do more here than merely mention it. The most complete

list of the works which Lippmann wrote, and those which are attributed to him by some scholars but about which there is some doubt, is found in Kaufmann's book on "Yom Tov Lippmann Muhlhausen", pp. 61-86. Here Kaufmann discusses each book in detail. Those who are interested in Lippmann's literary efforts will benefit by consulting this extremely scholarly section of Kaufmann's work. For our purpose, a mere listing of the books which Kaufmann mentions will be sufficient. Besides the "Nitsachon", Kaufmann believes that Lippmann wrote the following Kabbalistic works, גורן חיים,

גורן חיים, notes on גורן חיים, the piut גורן חיים, a commentary on גורן חיים, a commentary on גורן חיים, and "Notes of R. Tavyomi." He wrote, both in his role as author and as Dayyan of the Prague community, the following documents pertaining to matters of Jewish ritual: גורן חיים, גורן חיים, גורן חיים, גורן חיים, גורן חיים, גורן חיים, and גורן חיים. He also wrote a prayer based on the thirteen attributes of God.

The works which Kaufmann lists as doubtful are: a. גורן חיים, a poem based on the Nitsachon, b. a commentary on the Torah, c. a commentary on the Song of Songs, d. a commentary on the Haftarahs, e. a commentary on Abot, f. גורן חיים, g. a work on the commandments of the Sabbath day, and g. the well-known book of the Musar literature גורן חיים. It is almost certain that Lippmann did not write all these literary products.

But there is ample proof that he wrote a goodly percentage of them, enough to keep any scholar working for a life-time. So to the designations of Lippmann the polemist and Lippmann the judge must be added,

(1) The commentary to Abot is mentioned in the "Nitsachon", par. 197.

the honorable title of Lippmann the scholar.

Through his "Nitsachon", Lippmann left a decided impress on the generations which followed him. His other works were known to the legalists and the Kabbalists but, outside of these restricted circles, they were almost unknown. From his writings we gather that his was a powerful personality, a firm and fearless determination to adhere to his ideals and his principles. He was not without a sense of humor. In the "Nitsachon", par.258, we find a very fine example of his ability to view even the most serious matters in a rather flippant manner. "Christus", says he, "is not the name of Jesus; indeed, ד'יע ד'יער is his name." Other examples of this sort are found in par.8 and 227. He possessed much common sense. He took to heart the words of Kohelet, "There is a time to keep silence, and a time to speak." In the disputation with Pesach-Peter, he did not attempt to display his erudition but he cleverly evaded all the accusations which Peter leveled at the Jews by giving answers which he knew would not displease the Christians. Yet when he wrote the "Nitsachon", when he was not hampered by the exigencies of the moment and was intent on building up a strong bulwark of defense for his people, he allowed his great store of knowledge free play and set forth his case in clear and unmistakeable language. He was a deeply religious man, not only in the sense of strict conformity to established tradition but also in his recognition of the high ethical principles which should guide human conduct. In par.124 of the "Nitsachon", he complains that his own Jewish contemporaries are ignorant and irreligious. "They know", says Lippmann, "what is permitted and what is prohibited but they do not know God." Such was the man, Yom Tov Lippmann Muhlhausen, a character in Jewish history about whom we

know little; but the little that we know about him reveals to us a personality of great inner strength, a staunch defender of the weak and oppressed, a seeker after the truth, a Jew who evokes in our hearts feelings of respect and pride.

CHAPTER TWO

HISTORY OF THE SETER NITSACHOM

Chapter Two

History of the Sefer Mitsachon (1)

When was the "Sefer Mitsachon" written? Hackspan (in his Latin Commentary, Graetz (2), and Fuenn give the date 1399. This is incorrect because in speaking of his disputation with Peter, Lippmann tells us of three Jews who were burned at the stake in 1400 (3). Kaufmann believes that the book was written between 1401 and 1405 (4) but his proofs are not very conclusive. Zunz (5) and Seligson (6) say that it was written before 1410 because they believe that Lippmann predicts the coming of the Messiah in the year 1410 (in the "Mitsachon" par.335). They are wrong in their belief because Lippmann nowhere in the "Mitsachon" tries to predict when the Messiah will come. In fact, he very explicitly says (in par.332) that although the Bible establishes a certain period of time (1335 years) during which preparations will be made for the coming of the Messiah, no one knows when this 1335-year period will begin. Dubnow places the time of writing as about 1410. Bishop Bodeker maintains that the book was written in Cracow in 1420. He also is wrong for Kaufmann cites a passage from the "Sefer Ha-eshkol" (written in 1413) in which the "Mitsachon" is mentioned. The exact date of the composition of the

(1) Kaufmann rightly points out in his book (p.61) that the work of Lippmann should be called "Sefer Ha-nitsachon" and not "Sefer Mitsachon". The reason for this is that Lippmann in many places in the book refers to it as "Ha-nitsachon". Kaufmann believes that the reason Lippmann selected this title is because the numerical value of 102350 and 1420 are almost the same. This is a very ingenious thought and is, in all probability, correct. However, I prefer to keep the designation "Sefer Nitsachon" because this book is referred to in all Jewish and non-Jewish works simply as "Nitsachon". For example, on the title-page of Hackspan's edition, we find the title given as "Sefer Nitsachon". So rather than cause confusion in the mind of the reader who might think that "Mitsachon" and "Ha-nitsachon" are two different works, it is preferable to remember this book, not by the title which the author gave it but by the title which has been given it by the centuries.

(2) For notes (2) to (6), see next page.

- (2) Vol.VI,75,note 1.
- (3) "Nitsachon", par.355.
- (4) P.63 *of his book*.
- (5) "Zur Geschichte und Literatur", p.194.
- (6) Jewish Encyclopaedia VIII,97-98.

"Mitsachon" can not be determined. It was written no earlier than 1400 and no later than 1413 in Prague, since we have already shown in chapter one that during these years, Lippmann was living in Prague. (1)

Why was it written? Kaufmann believes that Lippmann wrote the "Mitsachon" as a guide-book for Jews who would be forced to engage in disputations with their enemies (2). Although it is true that the Jews did use the "Mitsachon" for this purpose, it is not true that Lippmann wrote the book with this intent. He wrote it in order to present to his own Jewish brethren and to the Gentile world a clear picture of the Jewish religion and to remove from the minds of both Jew and non-Jew many errors which were lodged there. He makes this clear in his introduction to the "Sefer Mitsachon":

"The author says: 'Lord, how many are mine adversaries become! (Ps.3:2) 'Many are they that rise up against me.' '(Ps.22:17a) For dogs have encompassed me; a company of evildoers have enclosed me.' The classes of heretics include children of both believers and atheists, Sadducees (Karaites), and Christians, to the exclusion of such as are perfect in deed and understanding. Among those who lack this perfection, some add (to the words of Scripture) and some detract, some refute (the heretics), and some mock. They enclosed my path with hewn stone (see Lam.3:9) and they built against me great bulwarks. I beheld the people and they walked in darkness (see Is.50:10) and mountains of darkness surrounded them so that none ventured in or out to battle for the faith. And I shook the dust out of my bosom (see Neh.5:13) and I said to them, 'Fear not and be not afraid because of this great multitude for the victory is not to them but to the Lord; and I will cast my lot with God for He stands at the right hand of the downcast. I will fight the battles of the Lord and I will break down the wall and I will search the ways and the sun will shine upon the mountains like the light of the morning and I will make perfect those who are lacking (in knowledge and faith). I will reveal the secrets and I will show that those who add (to the Scriptures) really detract (from it), and that the mockers are wrong. I will refute the enemies who argue without reason and I will raise the sound of battle in the camp to refute them with mocking words (play on Ps.4:1).' And now to commence the task of repairing the breaches in our true faith: The Torah speaks of four sons,--one a wise man, one a fool, one an evil man, and one who didn't know how to inquire. Indeed there are right in our midst very learned men who do not carefully reflect on our religion. And there are evil men, free-thinkers, (3)

(1) This statement is based on the prevailing beliefs of Jewish scholars concerning the "Mitsachon" and its author. For another theory regarding the date of the "Mitsachon", see note 1 of page 18 in this chapter.
(2) P.69 of Kaufmann's book.
(3) All under-scoring and remarks in parentheses in this quotation are mine.

11

both circumcised and uncircumcised, who criticise the law of God and His prophets and saints. And also the Sadducees (Karaites) do not pay heed to the rabbis. And there are fools who only follow blindly the letter of the law and perform mechanically the commandments of God and His law but do not comprehend the underlying reasons for doing so. And all the words of the rabbis they take literally and they talk of impossible things as though they were in the realm of the possible. And then there are the Christians, who do not know how to ask, as shall be expounded in this book in many places. Therefore, hearken to me, my people and my brethren; have faith in the Lord your God and you will find comfort; believe in His prophets and you will prosper. For the edification of all, I will explain the sixteen things which are the bases of our religion and which are contained in the book of the law of God which He gave to us on Mt. Sinai through Moses, greatest of all prophets, and I will remove the indecision of those who refrain from perfect faith, who criticise and err in the Tannach, and I will give the bases for some of the commandments, statutes, verses, and stories which seem strange. And I will explain some of the words of the rabbis, concerning which many err, for all of them are based on sound reasons which can remove deep-rooted and old errors in which those uncircumcised in the flesh and those uncircumcised of heart have gone astray and how much more difficult to convince hostile heretics who have no correct judgments! I intend to silence them forever (!); therefore let not him who finds in this Sefer Ha-nitsachon explanations which differ somewhat from the explanations of the rabbis find fault with me for the Torah may be interpreted in many ways, as it is written, 'Is not My word like fire? saith the Lord; and like a hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces? (Jer.23:29)'. And God searches the heart (i.e., I will not try to deceive you.). And would that I could command the copyists that they change not my words for I know that they will do violence to my writings because of lack of understanding. For then, when they shall read hurriedly, it shall not be as now--now if any man take issue with me, he challenges me, and if I can not prove him wrong, in his presence, I praise him and remove the error from the book which I have written."

This clearly shows that the "Nitsachon" was not written as a disputation text-book but it "presents in shortened form our religion which we received from Moses who had received it from God" and its purpose is not to attack the beliefs of others but to strengthen

the faith of our own co-religionists. (1)

The "Mitsachon" was kept hidden from the Christians for many years. The Jews feared that if the Christians got hold of the manuscript, they would punish the owners and destroy the manuscripts. Finally, in the first half of the seventeenth century, a Christian, Theodore Hackspan, who taught Hebrew in the University of Altdorf, managed to lay his hands on a copy of the "Mitsachon". He tells us, in his Latin commentary to the "Mitsachon" (2), that a copy of the manuscript was in the possession of the rabbi of Shneittach, a town near Altdorf, but this man refused to show this copy to anyone. One day, while Hackspan was arguing with this Jew over the interpretation of Psalm 22, the rabbi produced his copy of the "Mitsachon" in order to substantiate his arguments; whereupon Hackspan took the book from him by force, carried it back to Altdorf, and never returned it to its owner. In the year 1644, Hackspan published this manuscript in its Hebrew form, together with a Latin commentary on the book. Two editions of this book appeared in the same year, the first in Altdorf and the second in Nuernberg. It contains not only the "Mitsachon" and Hack-

(1) One proof of the truth of this statement is the fact that the disputation with Peter is mentioned nowhere in the first 346 paragraphs of the "Mitsachon" but seems to be tacked on as a sort of appendix. This fact not only shows us that disputations with Christians were not uppermost in Lippmann's mind when he wrote the book; but it also allows us to make some very interesting conjectures. Might it not be possible that Lippmann really spent his early years in Muhlhausen in Alsace, wandered across Germany (and during his wanderings met the chief-priest of Lindau) and Austria, wrote the "Mitsachon" during these years, arrived in Prague in the course of his journeys, was selected as Pesach-peter's opponent because of the polemical ability he had manifested in the "Mitsachon", and later, because of the clever way in which he had conducted his side of the disputation of 1399, was chosen by the Prague community to be one of its Dayyanim? If these conjectures could ever be shown to be correct, then the "Mitsachon" would date from some year prior to 1399! I offer this suggestion with great hesitation, knowing full well that this supposition is not found in the studies on Yom Tov Lippmann Muhlhausen written by men much more capable of building up hypotheses than myself.

(2) See Kaufmann pp.64-65.

span's commentary, known as "De Usu", but also a section in Hebrew, setting forth some of the refutations of David Kimchi to Christian interpretations of a number of the Psalms. We learn the date of the writing of the manuscript which Hacksan seized and the name of the scribe from a notation appended to the end of the Hebrew text. This notation reads: "I give praise and thanks to the Creator of the universe that this book was completely finished on the second day of the month of Av, 5349 (1589) here in the village of Midnitz (1) at the time of the reading of שני עשר אלף (found in parasha אפר, Deut.7:24) which (i.e., the word ע"ב) is the numerical symbol of the year of my birth (i.e., 5311 or 1551 C.E.). This signifies (i.e., the word ע"ב) that no man can conquer this 'Sefer Ma-nitsachon'. Blessed be He Who has freed me (from this work of copying), Amen Selah, says the scribe, Joseph, son of the saint, R. David, may his memory be a blessing, who is known (by the German name of) Joseph Teimer." The Altdorf edition of Hacksan ~~is~~ ^{was} the one used in preparation of chapter three of this thesis. It is a well-prepared edition, clearly printed, and indicates that great pains were taken in its production. It has two title-pages, one in Latin and the other in Hebrew. The Hebrew title-page is very picturesque. It tells in picture-form the history of the Jewish religion which culminates in the Jew acknowledging that the Christian religion is superior to his own. This is followed by a section in Latin in which Hacksan dedicates the book to his patron, Prince John. Then the "Nitsachon" is printed in 195 pages, together with marginal references by Hacksan to the various books which Lippmann quotes. In these references Hacksan shows an amazing knowledge of Hebrew literature.

(1) Could not determine the location of this village.

The anti-Christian refutations of Himchi and Mackspan's Latin commentary occupy the remaining pages of the book.

Other editions of the "Hitsachon" which have appeared are: Altdorf 1681 (prepared by Wagenseil), Amsterdam (1709 and 1711), and Koenigsberg (1847). Besides this, we have Wagenseil's corrections of Mackspan's edition (published in Altdorf-Muernberg by Wagenseil in 1674), Hebrew and Latin texts of Paragraph 8 with a refutation of this scurrilously anti-Christian section, published by Sebald Snelle in Altdorf (1643), and a Latin translation of the portions which deal with the Prophets and Hagiographa, published in Altdorf (1645) by Elendinger.

The publication of Mackspan's edition created a great stir in Christian circles and many Christian scholars busied themselves publishing refutations to the work of Lippmann. These refutations are known under the general title of "Anti-Lippmannia". There is one work directed against the "Hitsachon" which goes back to a time contemporaneous with the life-time of the author. This is the famous refutation written by Stephan Bodeker, Bishop of Brandenburg, in the year 1435. Lippmann may still have been alive when this work appeared. Wilhelm Schickard also published a refutation shortly before Mackspan's book appeared, under the title of "Triumphator Vapulans sive Refutatio" (Tuebingen, 1629). After the appearance of the editions of 1644, many books attacking the statements of Lippmann were published. The best known of these are "Disputatio Contra Lippmanni Hitsachon", written by Stephen Gerlow (Koenigsberg, 1647) and "Anti Lippmannia" by Christian Schotan (Franeker, 1659).

CHAPTER THREE

ANALYSIS OF "SEFER NITSACHON"

Chapter Three

Analysis of "Sefer Nitsachon"Division One--General Analysis of the Book.

In chapter two, we have discussed the history of "Sefer Nitsachon". In this division, we will set forth, in a general way, the Plan and contents of the book.

The "Sefer Nitsachon" begins with a preface in which Lippmann sets forth his reasons for writing this work. He concludes his preface as follows:

"And behold, I will divide the Sefer Ha-nitsachon into seven parts, corresponding to the seven days of the week, like the seven days of creation, in order to make it easy for him who desires to make use of the book. And six of them aim to strengthen the conviction of those weak in faith, in accordance with the saying of the rabbis, 'Be diligent to learn Torah in order that you shall know how to answer the free-thinker' and in this class are included all those who are weak in faith. And these six are all gathered up in the seventh so that all together present in shortened form our religion which we received from Moses who received it from God." (1)

Lippmann then proceeds to explain this seven-fold division. In the first division, he includes all the "answers and contradictions of the words of the Christians". Then comes a list of 66 paragraphs of the "Nitsachon" which deal with the Christians (2). The second division includes "explanations of the doings of the righteous ones in the Bible which the masses do not understand." The third division contains "interpretations of the strange verses which are in the

(1) The underscoring is mine. This applies to all underscoring found throughout the thesis. This is done in order to emphasize certain statements of Lippmann which substantiate certain beliefs of mine in regard to Lippmann and the "Nitsachon".

(2) Although Lippmann includes only 66 paragraphs in his anti-Christian list, actually there are many more than 66 paragraphs which deal with Christian problems. In the analysis of the anti-Christian portions of the "Nitsachon", which occupies Division Two of this chapter, 101 paragraphs are quoted in the course of the discussion. A list of these paragraphs will be found in Index #1 on page 100 of this thesis.

24 books lest from them people shall learn that which is untrue and shall turn from the path of life." In the fourth division are assembled "the reasons for the commandments.....Rambam also gave reasons for the commandments, and to add to his work I have come--even though the duty of giving reasons is not enjoined upon us--only the fulfillment of the commandments is enjoined--for it is possible that some bases are not clear to us." The fifth division discusses "the abhorred abominations which are current concerning the 24 books and which mock the words of the rabbis." The sixth division contains "an answer for heretics and answer for the Sadducees (Karaites) who were given heretical teachings by their father so that they deny the validity of the Oral Law".

The seventh division deals with the "sixteen things which are the fundamentals of our religion":

"All of them are found in the Tannach and the Gemara, corresponding with the knowledge of our learned wise men in thought and in tradition; and when they seek to learn something from the book of the Lord and they read in it, not one of these principles is missing. And furthermore, (I have included) statements of the wise men which are scattered through many books and are very profound. And I will also include great and deep matters, without introduction or preface, according to the saying of the rabbis, 'One should always teach his disciples in the most concise manner.' Therefore do not read this section in haste until you have become accustomed to reflect carefully on all of them and shall believe them and shall strive to bring about the time when all the matters pertaining to this division shall be observed and the world will keep every day as a Sabbath day. '(Num.23:10) And let mine end be like this.' I assembled these things on the Sabbath, because it is written, '(Gen.2:3) And God blessed the Sabbath day.' The sixteen principles are the following:

1. To believe that there is a controlling force in the universe and He is God and especially 2. to believe that God created the world from nothing.

3. To believe that God resurrects the dead.

4. To believe that God, who brought us out of Egypt, gave us the Torah which we now have.

5. To believe that God sees the doings of every man, whether good or evil.

6. To believe that God rewards and punishes after death according to one's merit.

7. To believe that God has no bodily form and no shape or materiality and 8. to believe that He has no limits but His domain extends over all worlds.

9. To believe that His Torah which we now have will exist forever and will never be changed.

10. To believe that God is unique and that there is no other unity like Him.

11. To believe that God is One everlasting and will not change.

12. To believe that it is not fitting to worship and to pray except to God alone.

13. To believe that prophecy came from God.

14. To believe that God in the future will bring the Messiah.

15. To believe that God is without doubt infinite.

16. To believe that the prophecies of Moses supersede those of all the prophets." (1)

Each one of these seven headings is followed by a list of paragraphs in the "Mitsachon" in which Lippmann discusses the subject mentioned. Lippmann mentions altogether 330 paragraphs although "Sefer Mitsachon" contains 354 paragraphs. His listing is not accurate, as has been stated in the foot-note on page 21. It is an arbitrary arrangement which he adopted in order to carry out his plan of making the divisions in his book accord with the number of days in the week and in the year. Regarding the 354 paragraphs, he says:

"All the paragraphs of the Sefer Ha-nitsachon are 354, like the number of days in the lunar year by which the Jewish calendar is fixed, to show that every Israelite is obligated every day of the year to study his religion and to remove the stumbling-block from those who lack the proper spirit."

346 of the paragraphs are comments on verses from the Bible, arranged according to the order of the books in the Bible (2). The last eight paragraphs narrate Lippmann's disputation with the convert Pesach-Peter. The author says that the number 346, whose Hebrew equivalent is לפ, shows us that the book was written for the glory of God's name. In the section which deals with the verses from the Pentateuch,

(1) It will readily be seen that Lippmann's 16 points follow the creed of Maimonides very closely in thought though not in arrangement. The essential differences are that Lippmann puts especial stress on the "creatio ex nihilo" (#2) and on God's infinitude (#8 and #15). (2) Lippmann's arrangement is in accord with the tradition recorded in the Baraita in Baba Bathra 14b. (See Kaufmann p.63.) The order he employs is as follows: Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Isaiah, Minor Prophets, Ruth, Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Lamentations, Daniel, Esther, Ezra and Nehemiah, Chronicles.

24
23a

the book is divided into Parashas. The rest of the book is divided into sections which correspond to the separate books of the Prophets and Hagiographa. 153 paragraphs are contained in the Pentateuch section, 112 in the Prophetic portions, and 81 in the Miscellaneous Writings section (1). There are very few comments on the Agurim.

So much for the physical make-up of the "Sefer Mitsachon".

A thorough analysis of the contents of the book lies outside the scope of this thesis. It contains attacks upon Christians, Karaites, and those who follow the philosophy of Aristotle without accepting the Jewish elements injected into this philosophy by Rambam. It refutes charges made against the Jewish religion and the Jewish people by outside groups. It contains many Kabbalistic references and theories and defends the conviction of Lippmann that one who has not become well-versed in Kabbala has not penetrated the deepest recesses of religious thought. To repeat what we said in chapter two, it is not meant to be primarily, as Kaufmann would have us believe, a textbook for Jews who engaged in disputations but it was intended to be a book which would "present in shortened form our religion which we received from Moses who received it from God." But its historical fate has been to become known as a virulent anti-Christian polemic, and the other elements, which in the mind of the writer were probably of equal or greater importance than his anti-Christian utterances, have exercised very little influence on the life and literature of either the Jewish or non-Jewish world.

(1) Index #1, which lists the anti-Christians paragraphs, shows that 31 paragraphs deal with the Pentateuch, 32 with the Prophets, and 38 with the Hagiographa. This plainly shows that the order of importance of the Biblical divisions, from the point of view of Christian polemicists, is: Hagiographa, Prophets, Torah.

Chapter Three

Analysis of "Sefer Nitsachon"Division Two--Analysis of Anti-Christian Portions

Division one of this chapter has discussed the general make-up of the "Sefer Nitsachon". Although the title of this thesis is the "Anti-Christian Elements of the Sefer Nitsachon", we have pointed out that Lippmann was not only concerned with refuting the accusations which the Christians of his day made against the Jews but he also attacked the Karaites and those who were followers of the philosophy of Aristotle without accepting the changes made in this philosophy by Maimonides. A great portion of his book also is concerned with neither apologetic nor polemical material but is designed to clear up matters in the Jewish religion which are not understood by many of the faithful. With all these aspects, this division will have no concern. It is sufficient to impress upon the mind of the reader that Lippmann was concerned with refuting the notions of the heretics, Karaites, and Mohammedans as well as the Christians. The material to be presented in this division deals only with the charges leveled against the Christians by the Jews and with the refutation of charges made by the Christians against the Jews. A thorough analysis of the entire book would necessarily include a study of its anti-Karaite, anti-heretical, philosophical, and Kabbalistic elements. This has not been attempted. We will leave these analyses to those who are better fitted to undertake them and more interested in these fields of research than the writer. Our concern is to set forth in detail the polemical and apologetic portions of Yom Tov Lippmann Muhlhausen's book which dealt with his Christian neighbors.

In order to facilitate the perusal of this section for the reader,

an outline of the main divisions of the investigation follows:

Part One--Attack on Christianity.

Section 1. Against its theological dogmas.

Section 2. Against some of its customs and institutions.

Section 3. Against it as an organized religion.

Part Two--Defense of Judaism against Christian attacks.

Section 1. Defense of moral qualities of Jewish people.

Section 2. Defense of certain Jewish sages.

Section 3. Defense of certain Jewish customs.

Section 4. Defense of certain Jewish theological beliefs.

Section 5. Defense of the Talmud.

Section 6. Defense of certain portions of the liturgy.

Part One--Attack on Christianity

Section One--Against its theological dogmas.

As one would naturally expect, Lippmann's attack on the theology of Christianity centers around the personality of Jesus. How does Lippmann treat this personality? Certainly not as vilely and scurrilously as he is treated in "Toldot Yeshu". Lippmann calls him no bad names, and only in one instance does he in any way impugn the moral uprightness of Jesus. In paragraph 8, speaking of Jesus' mother, Lippmann writes:

"And they (the Christians) have another difficulty to explain for they themselves say that Mary died just like everybody else. And according to their own words, why did he (Jesus) cause his mother to die and not cause her to live as he caused Enoch and Elijah to live; and is it not written in the Torah, (Ex.21:15) 'He who killeth his father or his mother shall surely die'? And if he nevertheless caused his mother to die, how could he follow that which is written, (Deut.28:9) 'Thou shalt walk in his ways'?"

This is the only instance in the whole book in which the author holds Jesus to be guilty of an offense against the ethical code. One sen-

ses that Lippmann, at the bottom of his heart, holds Jesus in high esteem and feels that his quarrel is not with the man Jesus but with the legends and beliefs which sprung up about him. Perhaps this conjecture is wrong. Perhaps Lippmann was afraid to put in any derogatory material because of the fear that his book would fall into enemy hands and bring harm to the Jews. This is possible but not probable. Lippmann is so very outspoken and fearless in many other sections of his book that it is not likely that he would have hesitated to defame the character of Jesus if he had felt inclined to do so. The theological notions upon which Lippmann concentrates his polemical efforts may be sub-divided into three classes: first, those which deal with the Christian claims that Jesus is a god; second, the Christian contentions that Jesus was the Messiah; and third, their claim that their religion has displaced Judaism.

We will now consider the first of these three categories--namely, the Christian claim that Jesus is a god. Lippmann devotes a great amount of attention to the Christian dogma of the Trinity. He includes in his dissertation much material which is found in earlier polemics and adds much that is his own. He gives the Jewish interpretation of the verses in which the Christians claim that the Trinity is mentioned and also cites other verses in which, according to Christian exegetes, Jesus is mentioned, and shows that these very verses disprove the doctrine of the Trinity, and he also adds arguments of his own, not derived from any Biblical sources, to prove the fallaciousness of the Christian belief.

The well-known argument of the Christians that (Gen.1:1)

God created (Deut.10:17) Gods

"Lord of lords" indicate a plurality of Gods, Lippmann answers by saying that these are terms which denote mastery and rulership and are the plurals of majesty. He proves that these plural forms are

used with a singular meaning not only in connection with sacred matters but with secular affairs also (1).

Gen.1:26 נַעֲשֶׂה אֱדָם בְּצִלְמֵנוּ כִּדְמוּתֵנוּ "And God said, 'Let us make man in our image, after our likeness'" is given a different interpretation than that advanced by the rabbis, although Lippmann avers that the rabbinical interpretation may also be used. He represents God as speaking to the earth. Lippmann is exceedingly anxious to rid the verse of all anthropomorphic meaning. The verse means that man is made up of both the Godly and the earthly.

"And the words 'in our image' does not mean the form of the face and the body.....But the word 'image' refers to one thing which is like another in wisdom and existence and nature and perfection. And by 'according to our likeness' is meant that man shall resemble us (i.e., God and earth) as when one compares the strength of one thing to another, saying that they are like each other in goodness of eye or of heart; and this is the traditional interpretation of these words." (Par.6) (2)

Gen.11:7 "Come, let us go down and there confound their language", Lippmann seems to interpret as a speech addressed by God to His heavenly household although this is not very clear.

The author of "Sefer Mitsachon" also gives the correct interpretations of those verses in which the Christians claim that the Trinity is explicitly mentioned.

Gen.18:1-2 "And the Lord appeared unto him by the terebinths of Mamre.....; and he lifted up his eyes and looked, and lo, three men stood over against him" was cited by the Christians as proof that God is three-in-one. The three men, says Lippmann, were angels (Par. 23). The whole of par.128 is devoted to interpretations of verses of this sort. Christian exegetes found the Trinity mentioned in

(1) Lippmann quotes in this connection Ex.4:16 and Gen.39:20.

(2) Although Lippmann does not say so, this interpretation is so closely akin to that of Ramban that he must have procured it from Ramban. This interpretation is certainly far removed from the traditional one if by "traditional interpretation" we mean that advanced by Rashi and ibn Ezra. Ramban declares that he found his interpretation in the commentary of Joseph Kimchi.

Deut.6:4 "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God the Lord is One", Isaiah 6:3 "Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of Hosts", and Psalm 50:1 "God, God, the Lord has spoken". Let us quote Lippmann's answer at length for it is extremely interesting:

"(In regard to Deut.6:4), it is plain that they are in error; as is shown from what follows in v.5 'And thou shalt love the Lord thy God' and where is the third member of the Trinity mentioned? And so they erred in interpreting Is.6:3.....And behold, here again the answer to this contention is immediately at hand, as it says (v.3) 'the Lord' and 'hosts' and where is the third one? And furthermore, this verse did not prophesy concerning the future but concerning the present, that very time.....and Jesus was not yet born...(1)

And furthermore, they misinterpreted that which they found written in Ps.50:1, and they associated the three names with one speaking; and in a thousand places we have seen only two names associated with one speaking, as it says (Gen.2:4) 'In the day that the Lord God made earth and heaven' and this they did not consider; and not only this but in the book of Joshua (Josh.22:22).....six names are mentioned and yet one who knows understands that this passage establishes His unity. And if they say from now on that He is a six-in-one, they also speak falsely for the names are only indicative of God's attributes; at times one, two, or three are mentioned and at times thirteen; and because the understanding of all of them is not able to comprehend these answers, I will endeavor to answer them according to their opinion that the Trinity is implied in all these places; yes, they do imply a trinity; and this true trinity is that the Blessed One was, is, and always will be."

Several other paragraphs contain refutations of a similar nature. The Christians translate Is.9:5 as follows: "For a child is born to us, a son is given to us; and the government is upon his shoulder; and his name is called 'Wonderful in counsel is God the Mighty (Holy Ghost), Everlasting Father, Ruler of peace (Jesus).'" Lippmann translates the last part of the verse as follows: "His name is called 'He who is wonderful in counsel, a mighty God, the Eternal Father will call his name 'Prince of peace'". The verse has no reference to Jesus or the Trinity but speaks of the future Messiah. This is discussed in par.226.

(1) In par.224, Lippmann gives us an explanation of Is.6:3. He explains that "Holy, holy, holy, etc." was said by the Seraphim. The three "holy"s refer to God's holiness which manifests itself in three worlds--the world of the Intelligences, the world of the Spheres, and own material world. This is, quite evidently, a Kabbalistic interpretation.

Another example of the same sort is Ezekiel 18:4: "Behold, all souls are Mine; as the soul of the Father, so also the soul of the Son is Mine; the soul that sinneth (against the Holy Ghost), it shall die. (This is the Christian translation.)" The underlying concept here is that the Christian God has three souls. Those who sin against the Father or the Son will be pardoned but those who sin against the Holy Ghost are beyond redemption. All this, says Lippmann, is tommy-rot. The Christians pick out one verse and disregard the rest of the chapter. This particular verse has nothing to do with God but teaches man the doctrine of individual responsibility.

Now let us turn our attention to the other side of the argument. Not only does Lippmann disprove the Christian contentions but, using their own interpretations, he shows how absurd it is to try to find the concept of the Trinity in the Bible. He picks out the well-known verse in Isaiah. (Is.52:13) "Behold, my servant shall be wise" which the Christians are certain refers to Jesus. We see that Jesus here is called "servant" which does not fall in the category of Father, Son, or Holy Ghost. Therefore the Trinity becomes a Quartet. And since servants are things of this material world and wisdom is a spiritual quality, the "servant" must be part of the Sonship and the wisdom of the Fatherhood so we have two elements in Jesus, the Father and the Son; and this destroys the three-in-one theory of the Christians. Jesus becomes either a duality or a plurality (Par.236).

Then the Christians interpret Psalm 110:1 "The Lord saith unto my Lord, 'Sit thou at My right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool'" as referring to God and Jesus. In discussing this verse, Lippmann brings into play that powerful biting sarcasm which he knows how to use so well. If the Trinity is a three-in-one, how is it possible for one of the Trinity to sit at the right hand of another? God tells Jesus to sit at His right hand until He makes Jesus' ene-

mies his footstool--and after that is accomplished, where will Jesus sit (Par.292)?

The discussion on the Trinity is concluded with two quotations from Lippmann's writings which need no comment. They clinch the argument.

"Regarding the Son whom they say was earthly, is it possible, according to their knowledge, that there should be in him breath as in the rest of mankind when such a thing is not possible in heavenly creatures? Also how can they say now regarding the Father and His godliness that His unity is three-fold when they have already associated with Him both body and spirit? and I have already explained above in par.126 that unity can not be attributed to a body which is divided." (Par.128)

"Another question: Before the birth of Jesus, against their will the Christians must admit that there were only the Father and the Holy Ghost. But after that, God was changed into a man and the Son was added. And it is written in Mal.3:6 'For I the Lord change not; and ye, O sons of Jacob, are not consumed.' Did not Bilaam prophesy against Jesus (Num.24:23 'Alas, who shall live because of him who has made himself a god?' Alas for all those who shall live after his making himself a god. Alas, for all those who do not believe in him are persecuted, and those who do believe in him shall be lost from the world to come, as Num.24:24 says, 'But ships shall come from the coast of Kittim, and they shall afflict Asshur, and shall afflict Eber, and he also shall come to destruction.' And it is known that the Kittim are the Romans and it is known they they afflicted Assyria and afflicted the Hebrews and because of Jesus they are lost from the world to come."

All through the "Sefer Nitsachon", Lippmann refers often to the Christian belief that Jesus is the son of God as a false doctrine. He refutes this theological concept in a number of ways--by upholding the belief in God's unity, by giving the right interpretation of those Biblical verses which, according to the Christians, refer to Jesus' Sonship, and by proving that Jesus' father was a creature of flesh and blood. We will consider first Lippman's exegetical remarks concerning the Biblical verses referred to and then proceed to discuss the problem of the paternity of Jesus, which will involve also a discussion of the dogma of the Virgin Birth.

The Christians claim that the Sonship of Jesus is proved by a number of Biblical passages. Those cited and commented upon by Lipp-

mann are Psalm 2:1-7, Psalm 72 (entire), Proverbs 30:4, and Daniel 3:25 (1).

Ps. 2:1-7, says Lippmann, refers to David. The main arguments of his refutation center around vv. 6-7 "(God says) 'Truly it is I that have established My king upon Zion, My holy mountain.' I will tell of the decree: The Lord said unto me: 'Thou art My son; this day have I begotten thee.'" When was Jesus ever king upon Mt. Zion? God spoke this during the period of David's reign and how can it be linked to happenings in the period of the Second Temple? Lippmann also raises a grammatical point concerning the phrase "This day have I begotten thee" to prove that the phrase refers not to a father but to a mother; but his grammar is faulty and the argument has no weight (2).

The whole of Psalm 72 refers to a king and his son. These, according to the Christians, are God the Father and Jesus the Son. No, replies Lippmann, the whole Psalm refers to an earthly king and a king's son who pray to God for justice and righteousness nor are any God-like qualities attributed to either of them. If the Christians are right, then when did Jesus rule the whole world (3)? When did all kings and nations ever serve him or his followers (4)? How can v. 15 "That he may live and that he may give him of the gold of Sheba, that he may pray for him continually" refer to a god? Also

(1) These passages are discussed in the "Nitsachon" in paragraphs 269, 279, 310, and 328 respectively.

(2) Lippmann says that 2d in the Pal always refers to the mother and that when the father is meant, the Mifil is used. While this is generally the case, there are many verses in the Bible in which 2d is used in the Pal to refer to the father, e.g., Gen. 4:18; 10:8, 13, 15, 24, 26; 22:23, 25:3; Prov. 23:24 and others. The word used here is 2d and Lippmann claims that if the father was meant it would read 2d.

(3) V. 8 "May he have dominion also from sea to sea, and from the River unto the ends of the earth."

(4) V. 11 "Yea, all kings shall prostrate themselves before him; all nations shall serve him."

the conditions described in v.16 have not been fulfilled (1). The whole of Psalm 72 really speaks of Solomon and of the Messiah who will arise from Solomon's descendants.

Prov.30:4 reads:

"Who has ascended up into heaven, and descended? Who has gathered wind in his fists? Who has bound the waters in his garment? Who has established all the ends of the earth? What is his name and what is his son's name, if thou knowest?"

Christians say this refers to Jesus, the son of God, who came down from heaven and went back again. The refutation: If the Christians are correct, the text would read, "What is his name and what is his father's name?". Furthermore, do they not know the name of the Father and Son? If the verse referred to Jesus, it would say "Who hath descended from heaven and then ascended" for that is what the Christians say Jesus did. Lippmann's opponent in this particular matter must have been a converted Jew who knew the Talmud because we can infer from Lippmann's statements that the Christian tried to prove from passages in the Talmud that it is possible to invert the word-order of such phrases as "descended and ascended". Lippmann proves that the passages which are quoted from the Talmud by the Christian are not analogous to the passage under discussion (2). Prov.30:4 really refers to Moses. The first part of the verse is not interrogative but definite. VV.3-4 should be translated as follows:

"And I (Solomon) have not learned wisdom that I should have the knowledge of the holy one (Moses), who ascended up into heaven and descended, who gathered the wind, etc.....What is his name and what is his son's name, if thou knowest?"

Solomon, who disobeyed the law of Moses by marrying many wives, repented because he had not lived up to the Torah as had Moses. Solomon wanted to know if any such great man as Moses lives in his own time and so he asked, "What is his name?" Then he thought that per-

(1) V.16 "....May his fruit rustle like Lebanon; and may they blos-

som out of the city like the grass of the earth."

(2) The Talmudic passages referred to are found in Shabbat 34b, Eruvin 21a, and Pesachim 2a.

haps such a one did live but was now dead and his son or his grandson was living and so he said, "What is his son's name?" However, Solomon's quest was unsuccessful for "there never has arisen in Israel a man like unto Moses".

The last passage discussed in this connection by Lippmann is Daniel 3:25 "He answered and said: 'Lo, I see four men loose, walking in the midst of the fire, and they have no hurt; and the appearance of the fourth is like a son of the gods.'" The "son of the gods", according to the Christians, is Jesus. Lippmann explains that this fourth person is the angel whom God has sent to save the three Jews. In support of his argument he quotes Daniel 3:28 "Blessed ^{be} ~~by~~ the God of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, who hath sent His angel, and delivered His servants that trusted in Him."

The discussion of the paternity of Jesus is incomplete without an account of Lippmann's attitude toward the doctrine of the Virgin Birth. Needless to say, he does not think that Jesus was born of a virgin. He is certain that Joseph, Mary's husband was the father of the child (1). He believes that the Holy Ghost had nothing to do with the conception of Jesus but he was conceived in the customary manner. Let us first read his general observations on this doctrine and then study his explanations of those Biblical verses in which the Christians find the Virgin Birth mentioned.

"....From nature it is known that it is impossible for a person to be born without the seed of a man being put in the womb of a woman and also for a virgin to give birth without any reception of seed. And if they say that with God everything is possible, answer them that it is true that God is able to do anything and that greatness and glory are His; yet God forbid that one should speak of the disgrace of birth and torments and death in connection with God. And on the contrary, they can not believe that God is able to do anything if they say that it was necessary for their god to undergo

(1) That Lippmann is certain that Joseph was the father of Jesus is clear from the following passage taken from paragraph 8:

"....In the beginning of the Gospels, the family tree of Jesus is given and it is reckoned from King David (Matt.1:1-17). So-and-so begat so-and-so until 'So-and-so begat Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ (Matt.1:16)' or in Latin 'Iosepha virum Maria de qua natus est Jesus, qui vocatur Christus'. And behold in their language, 'vir' means 'husband' and 'virum' means 'her husband'; and 'custos' which means 'guardian' or 'procurator' which means 'servant' is not written there but it explicitly says 'virum' which means 'her husband'. And furthermore, what is an even more convincing argument: If Joseph was not the father of Jesus, of what importance is his family history to Jesus? And behold, their learned men say that she was Joseph's fiancée and from this, they know that she was also from the family of David. For, in those former generations, a woman was married into the family of her father, as it is written concerning the daughters of Zelophehad, (Num.36:11) 'They were married unto their father's brothers' sons.' And also this is idle talk. For this is only true of a daughter who inherits property, in order that her inheritance should not become the property of another tribe and in all their books it is not written that she inherited property. And even if it could be proven from this that she was from the tribe of Judah, how could they prove that she was from the family of David? And furthermore, was it fitting to build up a family history for Jesus indirectly from a relative of his mother when one is unable to determine the nature of the pedigree? And would it not have been more fitting to construct his genealogy from the father of his mother and to figure out the genealogy of Mary? but this was all done because Joseph was really his father."

36

torments and a terrible death and that he was not able to redeem them in another manner. And further, concerning what they say that it was a miracle that she gave birth without receiving the seed of man, indeed, God should not have performed the half-miracle of having Jesus born in the womb of a woman without the seed of man (and, concerning this, let me say that her womb certainly did contain the seed of a man) but He should have performed a full miracle, without seed and without a womb; she should have spoken him into existence and did it without stuttering; and, if they really believe that the womb was necessary, then it is logical for them to believe that the seed was also necessary. They also say that she did not become pregnant through the womb but that the Spirit entered her via the brain. And every one who is listening to me shall laugh at this because the Christians must believe that it went down from the brain to the body and from the body to the belly until it entered that certain place of hers, and, according to their way of thinking, why did he not at the hour of birth go back the same way. That, too, would have been a real miracle. Yet we have never heard anyone say that his (Jesus) birth was different from all other births for do they not say that she was in a bad way when the time came to bring forth so that she was in great difficulty until Joseph procured Shulamis for her and she delivered her and she wrapped her in rags and laid him (Jesus) in a manger?....." (Par.8)

Now let us turn to those verses which all who have studied Jewish and Christian polemics know so well. The first, ^{is} that famous verse in Isaiah, (Is.7:14) הָרָא וְנָתַן בְּנוֹתָם "Behold, an ^{part} אִשָּׁה has conceived and brought forth a son." The first, ^{is} of par. 225, which discusses this verse, will be translated here, not only because it is very interesting but also because it gives us an insight into the conditions of the time of Rabbi Lippmann and the extent of his secular knowledge.

"The priest who had charge of the monks of Lindau said to me: 'אִשָּׁה means a married woman, either old or young, but אִשָּׁה means a virgin who is young.' And I answered him that just as the word 'virgin' may mean a woman who is young or one who is old so the word אִשָּׁה includes two types of women, both single young women and married young women....And I did for him that which he desired for he came to me to gain information; and I knew that in their books, they translated אִשָּׁה as 'virgo' which means a mannish woman, in German called a 'mannin', which also means a married woman (1); and they did not translate אִשָּׁה with 'ancilla' or 'puella' which mean 'virgin'."

(1) Lippmann must have confused the Latin word "virgo" with "virago". Perhaps he did this intentionally. "Virgo" means "virgin" and "virago" means a "mannish woman". At any rate, his answer to the priest shows either his facetiousness or his ignorance.

Having explained that and does not "virgin" but "young woman", Lippmann gives the correct interpretation of Isaiah 7:14. He explains that during the reign of Ahaz, the wife of the prophet, a very young married woman, bears a child. This is a sign that within sixty-five years, Aram and Samaria will be overthrown by Assyria and will go into exile. This child had a father, for Is.8:4 says about it, "For before the child shall have knowledge to cry: My father, etc." The child was not an unusual boy. At first he was without knowledge and later he obtained understanding. The verse could not possibly refer to Jesus who was born many hundred years later at the close of the period of the Second Temple.

In par.226, Lippmann refutes the Christian contention that Isaiah 9:6 proves the Virgin Birth. In this verse we find the word and, written with a final Mem in the middle of the word. The Christians say that this enclosed Mem proves that the mother of Jesus was a virgin because they believe that the whole verse refers to Jesus. If this is so, says Lippmann, then their interpretation of and falls, because in that word the Mem is open. But Is.9:6 refers to the Messianic period and the Mem is closed to indicate that God keeps hidden the knowledge of when the Messianic period will begin.

Par.207 deals with the Christian charge that Jer.31:22 "...For the Lord hath created a new thing in the earth: a woman shall bear a man" means the Virgin Birth for, say they, is it a new thing for a woman to bear a man? Says Lippmann: Why does the verse say "woman" and not "virgin"? Furthermore, the word used for woman, and, means a married woman! The Christians pick out this one verse and do not seek to understand it in connection with the context. The whole chapter tells of Israel's return from exile and describes the conditions which will prevail in that time.

The discussion of the manner in which Mary gave birth to Jesus

will be closed with another quotation from par.8, which, incidentally, is the longest and most bitter of the sections in the "Sefer Mitsachon" which attack the Christians.

"....It is revealed and known that there is not, among all the things which God created, anything which ^{is} as polluted as the certain place of a woman, full of urine and blood. Her vagina is full continually of stinking slime. And they greatly insult their god when they say that he developed in such filth for nine months in the midst of the polluting placenta; and they themselves say that she was impure like any other woman for, behold, they say that she brought two doves as a purification offering (See Luke 2:24). Also above I explained that she gave birth in the usual manner; for, behold, even in the giving of the Torah, it is written, (Ex.19:15) 'For three days come not near a woman.' And when they say that the world was cursed because of a woman, therefore He^l also desired to reform it by means of a woman, bring up the argument that He should have reformed the world through a serpent because it started the business. It was the first cause. And if they say that the sin of the serpent was not great because he was not commanded, then answer that the world should have been reformed by means of a man for his sin was greater, for he was commanded (not to eat the fruit of the tree) and she was not, as it says (Gen.2:16-17), "And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, 'Of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat; for, in the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die.' And Eve was not yet created. And, furthermore, she sinned with her mouth: therefore he (Jesus) should have been born from there to reform the world and not from the polluted place. And, furthermore, why did he wait until his mother was thirteen years old. He should have been born when she was two or three years old and this would have been a real miracle. And if they say that this would have been contrary to nature, ask whether her conceiving via the brain without seed was not also contrary to nature? but the truth is that she was a grown up lady and gave birth just like everybody else."

Let us now continue our discussion of Jesus the god-man. In par.124, Lippmann states that the Christians say they know what God looks like because they have seen Jesus. Any anthropomorphic statement of this sort arouses Lippmann's ire. In par.8, he attacks the conception that Jesus was part god and part man.

"....If the ^{God} says that only part of his god was of earthly stuff, we answer that it thus with all men for every one receives his soul from God...and what is then the difference between him (Jesus) and any other man? And if he shall say that the soul of Jesus was greater than that of other men, do you not find often that the spirit of God is greater in one man than in another?....And not only this but they believe that he stands up above continually in his physical form on the cross for no good reason at all, naked, and that he descends once a day in thousands of pieces of bread, and each one is a perfect miniature of him. This is really so wonderful that it is beyond comprehension...."

There is practically nothing said in the "Sefer Mitsachon" concerning the events narrated in the New Testament about the life of Jesus, except the happenings connected with his birth and his death. Only once is his ability to perform miracles referred to. In par. 112, we find the following:

"....And it said concerning the Christians that they sneer at the Talmud because of the exaggerations which it contains. Do not they believe an enormous exaggeration in their saying that Christobel (Jesus) was so great that he walked on the sea?"

This sounds as though Lippmann might have been one who had not much faith in any sort of miracle; but there are many other sections in his book which substantiate his firm belief in miracles performed by both God and man. In this faith, he was a creature of his time and shared with his contemporaries all their mental virtues and shortcomings. He certainly must have known thoroughly the Synoptic accounts of Jesus' miracles but he most likely regarded them as historically accurate, since the Talmud also attributes the same sort of powers to some of the Jewish sages who lived in that period.

We now come to the final doctrines which Lippmann fought that deal with Jesus the god. These involve the events leading up to the crucifixion, the death of Jesus, and the belief that, after his death, he descended into Hell and redeemed from there all the righteous who had died in previous generations. In par.8, that section which we have drawn upon so often for our polemical material, Lippmann makes a general comment on the death of Jesus.

"...Why was it necessary (for Jesus) to receive harsh torments and a horrible and shameful death and to die in the middle of his days like a wicked man, as it says (Ps.55:24), 'Men of blood and deceit shall not live out half their days.' Truly, alas for the guilty ones that they should confer godship on the dead! and at the time of his death, who was made chief in his stead? What advantage is there in naming one who is killed a god? or one that is a man? as it says (Ezek.28:9), 'Wilt thou yet say before him that slayeth thee: 'I am God?' But thou art man and not God.'....And there are those who

say that he (Jesus) was really a man (1) and some say that even today he stands above in the form of a man on the cross."

In other passages, based on verses in the Prophets and Psalms, Lippmann refutes the Christian contentions that the crucifixion of Jesus is referred to in the Bible. The sections with which he specifically deals are Isaiah 63:2, Amos 2:6, Nahum 1:11, Zechariah 12:10, and Psalm 22.

The Christians say that Is.63:2 "Wherefore is thine apparel red and thy garments like him that treadeth in the winevat?" refers to Jesus because when he was killed, his garments were stained with blood. Lippmann rightly points out that the next verse (Is.63:3) proves the falsity of this assertion. It reads "I have trodden the winepress alone, and of the peoples, there was no man with Me; yea, I trod them in Mine anger, and trampled them in My fury; and their lifeblood is dashed against My garments, and I have stained all My raiment." This shows that the "bloody garments" belong not to one who has been killed but to one who has killed others. The context shows that the verse refers to the redemption of Israel from exile. This passage is discussed in par.240.

Par.247 takes up Amos 2:6 "Thus saith the Lord: For three transgressions of Israel, yea, for four I will not reverse it: because they sell the righteous one for silver and the needy one for a pair of sandals." The fourth transgression, claim the Christians, was selling the righteous one (Jesus) for silver and for this sin the Jews can never be forgiven. Lippmann's answer: The sin of which the prophet speaks was committed during the period of the First Temple. The prophet is addressing king Jereboam and the people of the kingdom of Israel of his generation. He also thunders against Damascus, Gaza, Tyre, Edom, and Moab (the nations from which the Christians originated) and so, on the basis of Christian reasoning, there is also no hope or pardon for them. Also the prophet separates the sins

(1) This phrase could certainly not refer to the Jews whom Lippmann knew, all of whom certainly believed that Jesus was a man. It must refer to certain Christians whom Lippmann knew or of whom he had heard who, like the Arian Christians, denied the divinity of Jesus.

of Israel from those of Judah, and since the Christians have always claimed that the people of Judah sold Jesus, how can they make this denouncement of the people of Israel refer to Jesus? Furthermore, what of the phrase "And the needy one for a pair of sandals"? Who is the "needy one? Could they call their god a "needy one"? Therefore, there must have been two men--one who was sold for silver and another who was bartered for a pair of sandals. But this could not be so for then the number of transgressions would increase from four to five! The true explanation is that the fourth transgression was that the rich used false measures in selling goods to the poor and also took bribes from them. Concerning the Christian contention that the Jews can never be forgiven for selling Jesus, Lippmann says that the Bible clearly states that only the generation which sins will be punished. No transgression will ever go unforgiven eternally.

The Christians maintain that Nahum 1:11 "Out of thee came he forth that deviseth evil against the Lord, that counselleth wickedness" refers to Judas Iscariot. In par.256, Lippmann gives the lie to this assertion by showing that the opening verse of the book of Nahum specifically states that the whole book refers to Ninevah, capitol city of Assyria.

The next passages which deals with the crucifixion is par.263, discussing Zech.12:10 "And I will pur upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, a spirit of grace and of supplication; and they shall look unto Me because they have thrust him (Jesus) through; and they shall mourn for him, as one mourns for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for him, as one that is in bitterness for his first-born." If this really means Jesus, comments the author, the text should read: "And they shall look unto Me because they have thrust Me through." The passage really has reference to the redemption of Israel. The slain referred to are all the Jews who

have been killed by the nations. These people are referred to collectively and therefore the singular tense is used in talking about them.

Psalm 22 is that famous Psalm which begins "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?" According to the New Testament (1), Jesus uttered these words during his hours of suffering on the cross; and *with* this tradition as a basis, the Christians maintain that the whole Psalm refers to Jesus and recounts the many miseries which Jesus underwent during his trial and execution. Lippmann says that the Christians believe that Jesus said this whole Psalm on the cross, that the fleshly part of him addressed the spiritual element. He continues: The Christian interpretation is indeed difficult to understand. How can the Christians believe that their god was so filled with a lack of faith that he thought that God had forsaken him? Didn't he know that he was going to die and couldn't he have prevented his death through the godly powers which he possessed? Didn't he acknowledge that another is his God when he said "My God" and did not say "My Father"? And when he said (v.3), "I call by day and Thou answerest not; and at night, and there is no surcease for me; yet Thou art holy, O Thou that art enthroned upon the praises of Israel", did he not admit that he was an Israelite whose prayer God hears? Yet why did God not hear Jesus' prayer? Couldn't Jesus have said more than this? Couldn't he have called God's attention to the fact that he was his son and asked why his Father does not listen to him? "Perhaps the ears of the Christians do not hear what goes forth from their mouths!" Do they not say that he was only born in order to die and to go to Hell and redeem them? So why should he want to save himself? Then too it might be interpreted that God

(1) See Matt.27:46 and Mark 15:34.

11
did hear his prayer and he cried day and night to no avail and was answered. Also the Psalm mentions that he had fathers (v.5) and brothers (v.23) and yet they say he had no father and that his mother was a virgin who bore no other children. In addition, they call their god "a worm and not a man" (v.7). But enough of this foolishness. "It is not necessary to interpret this Psalm," says Lippmann, "for it is evident that David wrote the Psalm about himself."

The last concept of the Christian church which we shall discuss in reference to Jesus the god is the belief concerning his descent into Hell after the crucifixion. Lippmann, in the "Mitsachon", does not seem to be much concerned with the Vicarious Atonement doctrine which maintains that Jesus, through offering his body on the cross, became an atonement for all the sins which would be committed by future generations. What makes him angry is the Christian belief that before Jesus died on the cross, everybody who had died in previous generations was in Hell and that Jesus, after his death, redeemed from this terrible abode the righteous ones who preceded him. Upon this tradition he concentrates all his weapons of exegesis and sarcasm to disprove the Christian assertion that such men as Abraham, Moses, and David roasted in Hell before the death of Jesus. We will take up his refutations in the following order--first, his interpretations of verses which the Christians believe show that Jesus redeemed the righteous dead from Hell; second, a number of Biblical verses which he cites to refute the Christian theory; and last, other proofs and remarks which he advances in support of his contention.

The Christians find proofs of their belief in Gen.37:35, Ps. 89:49, Is.30:33, and Ezek.31:14-15.

Gen.37:35 "For I will go down to Sheol to my son mourning."
This, say the Christians, shows that before Jesus came, Jacob was in Hell. "After Joseph was sold and Jacob imagined that his sons

had killed him, he worried about Hell." says Lippmann. "If it was decreed from the days of the first man that he would go to Hell, why did he not worry about going to Hell before this? And also after that, when he saw Joseph, he said (Gen.46:30), 'Now, let me die'; that is to say, 'I am not concerned about my death.' And why didn't he worry about Hell? But certainly his worrying about Hell was not because of the sin of the first man but because of himself for he thought that because of his transgression, Joseph was killed because he knew that his sons hated Joseph and, nevertheless, he sent him to them to the field." (Par.40)

Ezek.31:14:15 "For they are all delivered unto death, to the nether parts of the earth, in the midst of the children of men with them that go down to the pit. Thus saith the Lord God: In the day when he (Jesus) went down to the netherworld, I caused the deep to mourn and cover itself for him, etc."

Lippmann proves that these verses speak, not of Jesus, but of Pharaoh. (Par.216)

Is.30:33 "For Tophet (Hell) is prepared from of old; yes, it is prepared for the king, deep and large; the pile thereof is fire and much wood; the soul of the Lord (Jesus), like a stream of brimstone, doth burn in it."

Isn't it a shameful thing for the Christians to say that their god burned in Hell? Also the ^{word} שֶׁלֶת used in this verse does not mean "soul" but "breath". These are the only comments that Lippmann makes. He does not give what he considers to be the correct interpretation of the verse. (Par.230)

Ps.89:49 "That man is he that liveth and shall not see death, that shall deliver his soul from the power of the grave?"

This means, maintain the Christians, that Ethan the Ezrahite believed that before Jesus, everybody died and went to Hell. Lippmann says that they do not understand the purport of the whole Psalm which speaks of the coming of the Messianic reign of the house of David. The Psalmist, in v.49, regrets that he may die before the advent of the reign of the Davidic dynasty and implores God to hasten the advent

of the Messiah. (Par.287)

In many Scriptural passages, Lippmann finds statements which prove that the Christian tradition is wrong.

Ps.55:22b-24 "His words were softer than oil, yet were they keen-edged swords. Cast thy burden upon the Lord and He will sustain thee; He will never suffer the righteous to be moved. But Thou, O God, wilt bring them into the nethermost pit; men of blood and deceit shall not live out half their days; but as for me, I will trust in Thee."

David declares that only the wicked go to Hell. (Par.278)

Ps.86:13 "For great is Thy mercy toward me; and Thou hast delivered my soul from the lowest nether-world."

David affirms that he will not go to Hell when he dies. (Par.284)

Gen.15:15 "Thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace." Does this mean that God promised Abraham that he would go to Hell (1)?

Ex.20:5 "Visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children to the third and fourth generations."

And how can they say that the sin of Adam was visited upon his seed's seed to the thousandth generation (1)?

I Sam.28:15 "Why hast thou disquieted me to bring me up?"

Why should Samuel be angry if he was brought forth from Hell (1)?

Jonah 4:3 "It is better for me to die than to live."

Did Jonah want to go to Hell (1)?

Num.11:15 "If Thou deal thus with me, kill me, I pray Thee."

Did Moses want to go to Hell (1)?

Ps.16:10 "For Thou wilt not abandon my soul to the nether-world; neither wilt Thou suffer Thy godly one to see the pit."

This is David speaking (1).

Job 3:16-18 "Would that I had been a hidden untimely birth; as an infant that never saw light. There the wicked cease from troubling; and there the weary are at rest. There the prisoners are at ease together; they hear not the voice of the task-master."

Was Job thinking of Hell (1)?

(1) Par.8.

Eccl.7:1 "The day of death is better than the day of birth" and 4:2 "I praised the dead that are already dead." Would Solomon say these things if he knew that the dead were destined to go to Hell? (Par.8)

All the other arguments which Lippmann uses to disprove the Christian assertion that Jesus, after his death, descended into Hell and redeemed the righteous are found in paragraph 8 (1). This paragraph comments on Gen.2:17 "For in the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die." The Christians say that SIN means this world and SINN means the world to come; or, in other words, that those who die shall go to Hell until the coming of Jesus. "They speak blasphemy and pervert the Torah. For this way of thinking is contradicted by the Tannach, by logic, by nature, by their own books, and by reason in many ways." In the course of his argument, Lippmann mentions all the Biblical verses which we have listed in the last paragraph, and, in addition, he advances additional arguments. We will record these in his own words because he expresses them very succinctly and well.

"They say....that Jesus himself told his disciples a parable concerning a certain rich man whose name was Dives, who had a poor brother by the name of Lazarus. This needy brother asked him for something to eat. He refused and when they died, the rich man went to Hell and the poor man entered the bosom of Abraham. And the rich man looked up and said, 'Father Abraham, allow my brother to dip his little finger in cold water and to place a drop of water on my tongue.' And Abraham answered, 'My son, remember that you had many good things in your life-time and Lazarus suffered torments; and from now on, it is he who shall be in comfort and you shall be in affliction.' (2)....And behold, Jesus was not yet dead, and yet Abraham and the poor man were not in Hell.

- (1) The reader will notice that quotations and references taken from par.8 have occurred repeatedly in discussing other theological matters. This is because Lippmann does not always stick to the particular matter under discussion but often digresses and brings other topics into the discussion. Therefore, in par.8, he also attacks the doctrines of Trans-substantiation, Virgin Birth, messiahship of Jesus, the crucifixion, the Trinity, and others.
- (2) See Luke 16:19-31.

How can it enter their minds to speak impudently concerning Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, Moses, Aaron, David, and the rest? Are not they acknowledged to be righteous men? And from now on, argue with them on their own grounds, saying: 'Why did he (Jesus) cause them to die?' He should have caused them to live until after he was born as he caused Enoch and Elijah to live, as it is said, concerning Enoch (Gen. 5:24), 'God took him and he was no more.' And if they say that he (Jesus) caused him to die, say that if this is so, he should also have taken unto himself the rest of the righteous men. And it is explained concerning Elijah the prophet that he is alive, as it is said, (2 Kings 2:11) 'And he went up in a chariot of fire, etc.' (1)....And so argue with them, 'Why did he delay so long in his birth and allow those who loved him to stay so long in Hell, without cause, through no fault of theirs?' And if they say that it was necessary to delay until Mary his mother was born, were there not many righteous women before her, like Sarah, Miriam, Deborah, Abigail, Chuldah--for all of them were prophetesses? Or granting their story, why did he not create Mary many generations before?

They say that everybody went to Hell until Jesus redeemed them and pardoned the sin (of Adam and Eve). And do we not see just the opposite? For all the curses, as Gen. 3:16, 'In pain thou shalt bring forth children' and (3:18) 'Thorns and thistles shall it bring forth to thee' and, concerning the serpent, (3:14) 'Upon thy belly thou shalt go', have continued after Jesus just as they were before he came; and he didn't change a thing. And therefore it is only necessary to say that these things, which are not generally known, are of no value and to cease discussing this disgraceful matter.

And furthermore, we do not find Hell mentioned in any place... Also, God forbid that a doctrine that children who have not sinned should go to Hell should be attributed to the Judge of all the earth.

And there is a further difficulty: They say that it was necessary for Jesus to die in order that Satan might take his soul to Hell as he does all other souls; for, when a man sins, he gives his whole soul to Satan. And now Satan made a mistake for he took the soul of Jesus and brought it by mistake to Hell and he (Jesus) brought forth all the souls there. And you can argue with them: 'How did Satan make a mistake when he took the soul of Jesus? Are not all souls his of all the seed of man?' And why should he make distinctions between one person and another? And if they say concerning him that (the mistake Satan made was that) he (Jesus) was a righteous man, are there not many righteous men and suckling babes which they say were in Hell?"

And now from Jesus the god, we turn to Jesus the Messiah. The Christians are anxious to prove that Jesus is the Messiah whom the Jews have been awaiting through the centuries. If they can convince the Jews that Jesus is really the Messiah, then they will be able to convert the Jews to Christianity. Lippmann was a zealous defender of the religious tradition of his people. He was a firm believer in the Messianic tradition and confidently expected the coming of the

Messiah at some future time although he did not venture to predict when this would be. He was very anxious to prove that Jesus was not the true Messiah and he does this by proving that the Messianic passages in the Bible do not refer to Jesus and by proving that the Messiah has not yet come. The second part of his proof we will discuss later and, in this section, will confine our attention to a consideration of those passages in which the Christians found mention of Jesus' Messianic character.

The first thing which the Christians had to prove was that Jesus was descended from David. It has already been pointed out (1) that Lippmann used this Christian tradition in order to prove that Joseph was the father of Jesus. This a favorite trick of Lippmann. He grants the Christian premises and then proceeds, on the basis of these premises, to pick the Christian beliefs to pieces. But now he is intent on disproving the very premises which, for argument's sake, he had previously granted. Now he wants to show that Jesus is not a descendant of the house of David. He does this by showing that the Christian interpretation of certain verses in Scripture is false. These verses are found in Num.24:17 and Isaiah 11:1.

The Christians think that Jesus is meant in the verse (Num.24:17), "There shall step forth a star out of Jacob and a sceptre shall arise

(1) See foot-note on page 38 in connection with the discussion of the Virgin Birth. Another interesting passage which deals with Jesus' Davidic descent is found in par.112:

"I heard also concerning a certain Biblical scholar who pointed out to a priest that if it were not for the Talmud, the Christian religion would be in great difficulty, for it is written in the Torah (Deut.23:3), 'An Ammonite or a Moabite shall not enter into the congregation of the Lord.' And, behold, they connect that man (Jesus) to the lineage of king David through his (Jesus') mother. And he (king David) is descended from a Moabite! And if it were not for the Talmud in which is written 'The Torah says 'Ammonite' and not 'Ammonite's', etc. (Yebamot 76b), the family of David would be forbidden to enter into the congregation; and because of the Talmud, the family was permitted to enter the congregation; and he (the priest) acknowledged that such was the truth in the matter."

out of Israel." The answer, says Lippmann, is found in the second part of the verse "And he shall break down all the sons of Seth." Seth is an ancestor of Noah, the father of all mankind, so that he of whom the verse speaks will be the ruler of all the world because of victories in war. This is true neither of Jesus or of his followers. But it refers to the true Messiah "who will establish his eternal kingdom as the stars are established and he will rule over all the world". (Par.118)

070' 1822M 7331 10' 832M "And there shall come forth a shoot out of the stock of Jesse, and a twig shall grow forth out of his roots." This is clear proof, say the Christians, of Jesus' Davidic origin. 733 refers to 73100. The Messiah referred to in this chapter, over the Jewish polemist, has not yet come because the predicted miracles have not yet been wrought. Furthermore, the terms used for the Messiah could not apply to a god. The end of the exile which is mentioned has not yet occurred. And if 733 refers to Jesus, how do the Christians explain Isaiah 14:19 2800 2343 2272 2026 2026 where 733 is referred to as "abhorred"? And finally, if the Christians really believe that Jesus is of Davidic origin, how can they escape the fact that Joseph must have been his father? (Par.227)

Dan.7:13 "...And behold, there came with the clouds of heaven one like unto a son of man." "Son of man" is a term used often in the New Testament as a synonym for Messiah (1). Here, too, the Chris-

tians believe that "son of man" means Jesus the Messiah. This is all wrong, says the writer of "Sefer Nitsachon". "Son of man" clearly infers that the person mentioned has a father who is a man. And those Christians who say that עליו refers to the mother of Jesus are wrong for, if this were so, the text would read עליו. Also vv.13b and 14 read "And he came even to the Ancient of days and he was brought near before Him and there was given him dominion and glory and kingdom that all peoples, nations, and languages should serve him; his dominion is an everlasting dominion which shall not pass away...." The Christian religion has not spread over the whole world. The Christians do not even rule over the grave of Jesus. Then, too, the text says "Son of man" and it should read, if the Christians are correct, "son of God". Also the angel says to Daniel (Dan.7:27), "And kingdom and dominion and greatness of kingdoms under the whole heaven shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High; their kingdom is an everlasting kingdom." So the dream does not refer to one man but to a whole people, to Israel who are destined to rule through eternity. The fourth kingdom referred to in Daniel is Christianity, for it says of them (Dan.7:25), "...And it shall think to change the seasons and the law." (Par.329 and 330)

Daniel 9:24-27 "Seventy weeks are decreed upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish transgression, and to make an end of sin, and to forgive iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal vision and prophet, and to anoint the most holy place. 25. Know therefore and discern, that from the going forth of the word to restore and to build Jerusalem unto one anointed, a prince, shall be seven weeks; and for three-score and two weeks, it shall be built again, with broad place and moat, but in troublous times. 26. And after three-score and two weeks shall the anointed one be cut off, and be no more; and the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; but his end shall be with flood; and unto the end of war, desolations are determined. 27. And he shall make a firm covenant with many for one week; and for half of the week, he shall cause sacrifice and offering to cease; and upon the wing of detestable things shall be that which causeth appalment; and that until extermination wholly determined be poured upon that which causeth appalment."

The Christians join two verses which have no connection with each other, add and detract and say that it is written here that when the Holy of Holies is anointed, the Jewish Messiah will be cut off; and they interpret it to mean that when Jesus came, the Messianic hopes of Israel ceased. They speak falsely for the kings of the house of David, who were anointed, ceased at the end of the First Temple, 410 years before Jesus (1). Another proof that the Christians are wrong is that Bar Chochba, a descendant of David, ruled for two and a half years in Bethar (132-135), as did also his son and grand-son. Although our kingdom has now ceased, it will be restored in the Messianic period. We really would not have to answer the Christians in this matter for they join together two matters which are wholly unconnected--the seventy cycles of the period of holiness and the fact that the anointed one will be cut off at the end of 62 cycles. Lippmann also says that he has proved in other sections of his book that our kingdom and our Messiah will endure forever. The cutting off of the anointed one is connected with that time when "extermination wholly determined will be poured upon that which causeth appalment" and then our kingdom will return. "That which causeth appalment" means idol-worship. This extermination is a long time off and no one knows when it will occur. The "anointed one" mentioned in Daniel

(1) Lippmann is confused in his chronology and in his historical data. He identifies the converted Jewess, Helena of Adiabene, with Salome Alexander and Monebaz with Hircanus, the son whom Herod killed. The 410 mentioned here is based on the Christian reckoning that Jesus lived in the time of Herod. However, Lippmann did not believe in the historicity of this particular Jesus. In par. 347, which is part of the account of Lippmann's disputation with Pesach-Peter, he says, "R. Yechiel in the disputation in Paris (1240) proved to the Christians that there were two Jesuses. The Jesus in whom the Christians believe lived in the days of Hillel while the Jesus mentioned in the Talmud lived in the days of Joshua ben Perachya--and Hillel lived many generations after Perachya." Also in this present discussion, which is found in par. 332, he brings up the matter of when Jesus lived and avers that he really lived in the reign of Alexander Jannaeus in the time of Joshua ben Perachya and not, as the Christians believe, in the days of Herod. This indicates that Lippmann did not believe that this second Jesus ever lived.

is not our Messiah for if he had been, Daniel would have written "our anointed one" but the word refers to those Gentile kings who will be destroyed when our Messiah comes.

Lippmann then gives his interpretation of the passage. In v.24, the 70 weeks refer to 70 cycles of seven years each, or 490 years. The 70 years of the Babylonian exile plus the 420 years of the Second Temple make 490 years. So the seventy weeks ended with the destruction of the Second Temple. In v.25, the "going forth of the word" refers to the beginning of the Babylonian captivity. The "anointed one" means Cyrus. So from the beginning of the exile to the beginning of the reign of Cyrus was seven weeks or 49 years. 21 years later, the Second Temple was finished. The 21 years plus the 413 years that the Second Temple stood in peace equals 434 years or the 62 weeks mentioned in v.26. The "anointed one cut off" is Agrippa who was killed in the middle of the last seven years that the Temple stood. 413 plus 7 equals 420, the number of years that the Second Temple stood. "The people of the prince that shall come" refers to the Roman army. So Lippmann proves that this whole passage deals with the period of the Babylonian exile and the Second Temple and has nothing to do with Jesus the Messiah; and as for the coming of Messiah, no one can predict when he will come. (Par.332) (1)

And now let us turn to the third division of our discussion of the theological dogmas of Christianity. The points to be discussed in this section have nothing to do with the personality of Jesus

(1) Before leaving the discussion of Jesus as god and Messiah, it might be well to note Lippmann's clever explanation of the term יהושע used by Jews as a euphemism for Jesus. The convert Peter (Par.350) maintained that this a blasphemous expression. "Not at all," says Lippmann. "יהושע refers to something which is doubtful. The whole world acknowledges that the Jewish belief in God is right but the belief in Jesus and Mohammed are not accepted universally and, therefore, we call the objects of this belief יהושע, 'in doubt'. If we desired, we could also call Mohammed יהושע". What an original explanation!

but pertain to the claims made for the Christian religion by its adherents. Throughout this division, the reader will notice that the Christian belief is that their religion is world-triumphant while the Jewish religion is on its last legs. The conceit, which manifests itself, is of a sort which, God be praised, has become obnoxious to the modern religious thinker. Not alone the Christian is guilty of thinking his faith the one and only way to God. The Jew, too, is just as vigorous in maintaining that his religion is truth and others are false. The broad and tolerant spirit which was beginning to develop about this time in the minds of such men as Joseph Albo in Spain found no answering echo in Germany.

The first claim of the Christians which commands our attention is that the new law propounded by Jesus abrogated the Torah. In par. 137, Lippmann proves that Jesus was a lesser personality than Moses, and, on this basis, he argues: "Is it possible to believe that a person could abrogate the words of one who is greater than he?" And in par. 125 and 153, he proves that our Torah will endure forever and will never change. Furthermore, he says in par. 137, it is written in the New Testament that Jesus did not come to change the Torah but to fulfill it (Matt. 5:17). In par. 264, Lippmann declares that Malachi's words (Mal. 3:22), "Remember ye the law of Moses My servant" show that no Torah will ever supercede that given to us by Moses.

The Christians say that their religion has supplanted Judaism. They bring as proof Ezekiel 17:24 "...I the Lord have brought down the high tree, have exalted the low tree, have dried up the green tree, and have made the dry tree to flourish." They say that the "high tree" is Judaism and the "low tree" is Christianity. Their exegesis is wrong, says Lippmann. The passage contains no reference to Christianity. The "high tree" is Babylon and the "low tree" is Israel. (Par. 213)

55

Another contention which Lippmann had to disprove was that the Christians are the true Israel. This is a claim often put forth by exponents of Christianity, who claim that Jesus continued the tradition of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Moses, but that the Jews of his time and succeeding generations cut themselves off from this tradition and built up a new tradition steeped in casuistry and formalism. If the Christians really believe that they are the true Israel, complains Lippmann, why do they disobey many commands of God written in the Torah which are headed by the injunction "Speak to the children of Israel"? Also which Christians are genuine descendants of Aaron and entitled to exercise priestly functions? If they say that the Israelites were converted in the days of Jesus, the Aaronites mixed with the rest of the people, and the Torah abrogated, this is wrong for neither the Torah nor the Aaronite priesthood will ever be abrogated. Some Christians say that we should not call ourselves "Israelites" because this term refers to the sons of Jacob and really means the righteous ones of God. We should call ourselves Sadducees and Pharisees. This interpretation of the righteous ones of God is wrong for the term is often used in reference to wicked people, e.g. Isaiah 42:24 "Who gave Jacob for a spoil and Israel to the robbers? Did not the Lord? He against whom we have sinned, and in whose ways they would not walk, neither were they obedient unto His law" and Psalm 78:21 "Therefore the Lord heard and was wroth; and a fire was kindled against Jacob, and anger went up against Israel." Granting, for argument's sake, that they are right--if they are Israelites, it is their duty to fulfill the dictates of the Torah; and even if they are not Israelites, if they wish to lead a righteous life, they must fulfill it for such must be the conviction of every sensible man who knows the word of God. (Par.293)

The Christians interpret Zephaniah 3:8-9 to mean that their

356
religion will be all-powerful in the Messianic era of the future.

These verses read:

"Therefore, wait ye for Me, saith the Lord, until the day that I rise up to the prey; for My determination is to gather the nations, that I may assemble the kingdoms, to pour upon them Mine indignation, even all My fierce anger; for all the earth shall be devoured with the fire of My jealousy. For then will I turn to the peoples a pure language, that they may call upon the name of the Lord, to serve Him with one consent."

The rest of the chapter, which is disregarded by the Christians, proves conclusively that not the Christians but Israel is the nation about whom these predictions are made. "And, furthermore, do they not call Gog, the last of the Christians, in German 'der Antichrist'? And let their ear hear that which goes forth from their mouth, e.g., that he (Gog) will be the last of the nation which is called Christian." (Par.259) In paragraphs 228, 254, and 261, Lippmann proves that Judaism will be the prevailing religion of the Messianic period.

Before continuing with Section 2 of Part 1 of this analysis, which discusses Lippmann's attacks on some Christian customs and institutions, we will list and discuss a large number of Scriptural passages which the Christians say refer to Jesus and which Lippmann says do not. These passages do not fall into any of the three categories already discussed (i.e., Jesus the god, Jesus the Messiah, and Christian claims that their religion has displaced Judaism) but they are of great importance in further illustrating the Christian method of Old Testament exegesis and their inclusion is necessary in order to give a complete analysis of the anti-Christian elements of the "Nitsachon". Not all of the interpretations which the Christians infer from these verses are part of Christian dogmatic theology and some of them may be interpretations which were accepted by some Christian scholars of Lippmann's time and rejected by others; but, in any event, these interpretations must have been advanced in the disputations in which Lippmann took part and he was called upon to refute

them. We will mention these verses in their Biblical order and then set forth, as briefly as possible, Lippmann's refutations of their Christian implications.

Genesis 1:1 "וְהָיָה created אֶת הָאֵלֶּה." וְהָיָה, say the Christians, is Jesus. If this were so, the verse would read "וְהָיָה created אֶת הָאֵלֶּה and the heavens and the earth." וְהָיָה doesn't refer to God or Jesus but means "in the beginning". If it did refer to a god, the word would not be וְהָיָה but הָיָה, the First One. (Par.4)

Exodus 24:1 "And unto Moses He said: 'Come up to the Lord'." And He didn't say: "Come up to Me"; so the Christians say that "Lord" here means Jesus. Lippmann explains that this use of the third person when one would expect the first person to be employed is one of the peculiarities of Biblical style. As proof, he cites Gen.19:24; Gen.4:23; Ex.24:12; I Kings 1:33; and Esther 8:8. (Par.24)

Isaiah 9:5 "For a child is born to us, a son is given to us; and the government is upon his shoulder; and his name is called 'Wonderful in counsel is God the Mighty, Everlasting Father, Ruler of peace'."

The child, say the Christians, is Jesus. No, says Lippmann. The child is Hezekiah the son of Ahaz. The text says "his name" and, if the Christians are right, it would say "his names". And it says (v.6) that this child is to establish and uphold the throne of David and his kingdom while the Christians and Jesus seek to uproot the house of David and Judah. And the lad was born in the days of Isaiah. The correct translation of the verse is "He who is wonderful in counsel, a Mighty God, an Eternal Father, will call his name 'Prince of peace'. The reference to the Messianic period is not only linked to this lad but to the whole house of David. The Messianic period is referred to through the use of the feminine tense so it could not refer to Jesus. (Par.226)

Isaiah 12:3 "With joy shall ye draw water out of the wells of salvation (וְשִׂיעָה). " וְשִׂיעָה means Jesus, say the Christians. Lippmann says, "The text reads 'With joy shall ye draw water' and Jesus' so-called new Torah has brought us only sorrow." The text really speaks of new interpretations of the text of the Torah. (Par.321)

Isaiah 52:13 to 53:12. This is the well-known passage in Isaiah about the "suffering servant". The Christians say the whole passage refers to Jesus. Lippmann says it refers to Israel who will be re-^{that} deemed in the Messianic period. He shows ^{that} Is.54:1-10, which, if the Christians are right, would refer to the mother of Jesus, can not possibly refer to her but is addressed to Jerusalem. 53:3 "He was despised and forsaken of men, a man of pains" applies to one smitten with boils and how can the Christians say this about their god? 52:14 "Many were appalled at thee" shows that the prophet was speaking to his people, for, if it referred to Jesus, the text would say "at him". 53:8 "He was cut off from the land of the living" refers to Israel's exile from Palestine and not to the death of Jesus. If it referred to Jesus, the text would read "He was cut off from the living" for from what land was Jesus cut off? 53:10 "Yet it pleased the Lord to crush him by disease to see if his soul would offer itself in restitution that he might see his seed, prolong his days, and that the purpose of the Lord might prosper by his hand." Here we see conditions attached to the servant's goodness and also a promise of reward. Lippmann says, "Who is crazy enough to attribute these things to a god? They can only apply to men." Also the days of Jesus were not prolonged. Since it says that Jesus cast forth seed, he must have produced many gods! The word "seed" can not be interpreted to mean his disciples for throughout the Bible בְּנֵי means "disciple" and בָּנִים always means "children". 53:9 "He was with the rich in his deaths" shows that it speaks concerning a whole people

and not one man, for could one man die more than once? This is also shown by 54:17 "...heritage of the servants of the Lord". In other places in his book, Isaiah also refers to the people of Israel as a "servant" and a "worm". He calls them "smitten" because they are in exile. 53:7-12 refers only to the righteous of Israel. Lippmann says he interprets the passage literally but, if it is given a Midrashic interpretation, it can be interpreted as meaning the Messiah. The Midrashic interpretation is the one given in the Talmud. (Par.236)

Isaiah 62:10-11 "Cast up, cast up the highway; gather out the stones; lift up an ensign over the peoples; behold, the Lord hath proclaimed unto the end of the earth: Say ye to the daughter of Zion, 'Behold thy savior cometh'."

Jesus, say the Christians, is the "ensign over the peoples" and the "savior". Lippmann says the passage refers to the redemption of Israel. (Par.240)

Micah 5:1-3 "But thou, Bethlehem Ephrassa, which art little to be among the thousands of Judah, out of thee shall one come forth unto Me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth are from old, from ancient days. Therefore will He give them up, until the time when she who travaileth hath brought forth; then the residue of his brethren shall return with the children of Israel. And he shall stand and shall feed his flock in the strength of the Lord, in the majesty of the name of the Lord his God; and they shall abide, for then shall he be great unto the ends of the earth."

The Christians interpret this leader to be Jesus. Lippmann says Jesus could never be a ruler in Israel for we neither believe in him, fear him nor worship him. How can the Scriptures say "In the majesty of the name of the Lord his God" if Jesus is himself a god? And if they say that this speaks of the earthly part of Jesus, this too is impossible for the Scripture says "Whose goings forth are from old, from ancient days." Also this king has brothers. Then too at Jesus' birth, he was not called "king"; but only close to his death was he acclaimed as king. Jesus' rulership never extended to "the end of the earth." Furthermore, the prophecies which follow have not yet been established and will not be established until the Messiah comes. The whole passage really refers to the Messiah who has not yet come

and who will be a descendant of David, who was born in Bethlehem.
(Par.252)

Habbakuk 3:13 "Thou art come forward for the deliverance of
Thy people, for the deliverance of Thine anointed." Lippmann writes,

"In some of the Christian books, there is written instead of
'anointed' 'Christus'; and therefore, they say that in our Torah the
name of Jesus is mentioned. And may these mighty ones be sunk in
water and be utterly cut off; for Christus is not the name of Jesus
but יֵשׁוּעַ is what they should have written; for Jesus is his
name. Therefore, ask them what 'Christus' means? And when they
say that it is a Greek word meaning 'anointed', say to them that if
'Christus' means 'anointed' and not 'Jesus', you not understand why
they call their god Christus, unless it is because their god had
no holiness except that of being anointed or else why did he have
to be anointed?" (Par.258)

Haggai 2:9 "The glory of this latter house shall be greater
than that of the former, saith the Lord of Hosts; and this place
will I give peace, saith the Lord of Hosts."

A Christian priest asks Lippmann: "What was the glory of the latter
Temple? In the First Temple days, you were free; in the Second Temple
period, you were under the Persians and Greeks. Also, in the Second
Temple, you didn't have the ark or prophecy or the Urim and Tumrim
or heavenly fire. And although the Second Temple may have been big-
ger, the First was more beautiful." Lippmann answers that the glory
of the Second Temple was that it lasted 420 years while the First
only was in existence 410 years. The priest contends that these fig-
ures are wrong. He says that the First Temple stood 430 years less
18 months and that we can't prove that the Second stood 420 years.
The truth of the matter is, maintains the priest, that the Second
Temple was greater than the First because Jesus was born during the
Second Temple period. Lippmann proves to the priest that the figures
he (Lippmann) has quoted are correct. Also, he adds that all during
the days of the Second Temple, worship never ceased for a full year
while during the First Temple, in the reigns of Ahaz, Manassah, and
Ammon, worship ceased for long periods. As for the priest's expla-
nation that Jesus caused the glory of the Second Temple to be greater

than that of the First, just the reverse is true. For shortly after the birth of Jesus, our troubles began and the Second Temple was destroyed. (Par.260)

Zechariah 9:9 "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem; behold, thy king cometh unto thee, he is triumphant and victorious, lowly, and riding upon an ass, even upon a colt the foal of an ass."

The Christians say that the "king" is Jesus. They bring further proof for their belief from the fact that on the shoulders of asses there is a likeness of the cross. Lippmann ridicules this contention. He says that anybody can make the sign of the cross by falling on his face and spreading out his arms. This passage can't refer to Jesus because the verse which follows says "And the battle b^{et}w shall be cut off and he shall speak peace unto the nations" and, after Jesus came, wars did not cease. Also it says "And his dominion shall be from sea to sea and from the River to the ends of the earth" which is not true of Christianity. It is a disgrace to their god to call him "lowly". Besides, the whole purpose of Zechariah's prophecy is to foretell the salvation and redemption of Israel. (Par.262)

*Followed
by
an*

Malachi 3:1 "...And the Lord, whom ye seek, will suddenly come to his Temple." The Christians says that the "Lord" is Jesus. Lippmann complains that it is a Christian habit to interpret a verse without considering the context. He proves from the context that this verse speaks of the redemption of Israel. (Par.264)

Psalms 1 "Happy is the man that hath not walked in the counsel of the ungodly, etc." The Christians say that such a perfect mortal has never existed, and therefore they interpret this whole psalm as referring to Jesus. Lippmann says v.3 "And in whatsoever he doeth he shall prosper" could not refer to Jesus for "behold, he was caught through his deeds and was crucified." And their own scriptures say that Jesus cried out many times such phrases as "My God, my God,

62

why hast Thou forsaken me?" And if Jesus was a great success, would he have uttered such a prayer? Also the Christian statement that such a perfect man never existed is foolish for a man who possessed all the virtues spoken of in the psalm could exist. He might not sin against others and yet could sin against himself. (Par.268)

Psalm 16:1-3 and 9-11 "Michtam of David. Keep me, O God; for I have taken refuge in Thee. I have said unto the Lord: 'Thou art my Lord; I have no good but in Thee'; as for the holy that are in the earth, they are the excellent in whom is all my delight..... Therefore my heart is glad, and my glory rejoiceth; my flesh also dwelleth in safety; for Thou wilt not abandon my soul to the nether-world; neither wilt Thou suffer Thy godly one to see the pit. Thou makest me to know the path of life; in Thy presence is fulness of joy, in Thy right hand bliss for evermore."

The Christians say this all was spoken by Jesus. "My flesh also dwelleth in safety" could not mean David, say they, for David was mortal. Lippmann says that the whole Psalm refers to David, as it says, in v.1, "Michtam of David". How can the Christians apply such things as "taking refuge" and "guarding" and "I have no good but in Thee" to their god? They are inconsistent. They say that Jesus went down into Hell and redeemed the souls there and the Psalm says: "Thou wilt not suffer Thy godly one to see the pit." Their explanation of "My flesh also dwelleth in safety" is wrong. This does not imply that the person speaking will never die and it does refer to David. It means that when David dies, worms will not torture him by devouring his body as worms do to wicked men. (Par.273)

Psalm 45--entire, with especial reference to vv.3,8,10-13, and 17. "3.Thou art fairer than the children of men; grace is poured upon thy lips; therefore God hath blessed thee forever. 8.Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated wickedness; therefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows. 10-13.Kings' daughters are among thy favorites; at thy right hand doth stand the queen in gold of Ophir. 11.Hearken, O daughter, and consider, and incline thine ear; forget also thine own people, and thy father's house: 12.So shall the king desire thy beauty; for he is thy lord; and do homage unto him. 13.And, O daughter of Tyre, the richest of the people shall entreat thy favor with a gift. 17.Instead of thy fathers shall be thy sons, whom thou shalt make princes in all the land."

The whole Psalm, say the Christians, refers to Mary because it is

addressed to a woman (1). They say that (v.3) 2'2' "thou art fairer" is a feminine form. Wherever the king is mentioned, Jesus is meant. They are wrong, says Lippmann. He proves that 3e "queen" in v.10 means a woman with whom the king has conjugal intercourse. And 4'2'2' is a masculine form. V.8 shows that the king spoken of here is no god but one who believes in God and not one who was king from birth but who stood out in righteousness above his brethren and so was made king. V.17 shows that the woman mentioned here had children and the Christians believe that Mary was a virgin and had no children besides Jesus. Also they contradict themselves when they make v.11b "Forget also thine own people and thy father's house" refer to Mary for they continually try to trace the genealogy of Jesus and Mary to the family of David. And neither Jesus nor the Christians have ever been (v.17) "princes in all the land". The whole Psalm really speaks of the congregation of Israel which is called "daughter". And the Psalm was written in praise of the righteous kings of Israel. When it says (v.11b) that Israel should forget her people and her father's house, it means that Terach, Abraham's father and Terach's people should be forgotten for they were idol worshippers. Those referred to as ruling over the whole world are Solomon and the Messiah. (Par.277)

Psalm 86--entire, with especial reference to vv.1,11,13-16.
"1.A prayer of David. Incline Thine ear, O Lord, and answer me; for I am poor and needy. 2.Keep my soul, for I am godly; O Thou my God, save Thy servant that trusteth in Thee. 11.Teach me, O Lord, Thy way, that I may walk in Thy truth; make one my heart to fear Thy name. 13-16.For great is Thy mercy toward me; and Thou hast delivered my soul from the lowest nether-world. 14.O God, the proud are risen up against me, and a company of violent men have sought after my soul, and have not set Thee before them. 15.But Thou, O Lord, art a God full of compassion and gracious, slow to anger, and plenteous in

(1) Dr. Battenwieser is of the opinion that this interpretation was never given to Ps. 45 by Christian scholars but that it is a product of Lippmann's imagination.

mercy and truth. 16.0 turn unto me, and be gracious unto me; give Thy strength unto Thy servant, and save the son of Thy handmaid."

Christians think that Jesus recited this whole Psalm. One proof they advance is the phrase in v.16 "son of Thy handmaid." Lippmann says this is no proof for would such a god-like person call his mother a "handmaid"? V.1 "prayer of David" shows that the whole Psalm was written by David and speaks of him. How can the Christians call their god (v.1) "poor and needy"? It says (v.2) "my God" and not "my Father". Why would Jesus say (v.13) "Thou hast delivered my soul from the lowest nether world" when this is not true? How do the Christians explain v.11 "Teach me, O Lord, Thy way" and "Make one my heart to fear Thy name"? Must God teach Jesus the right way and how to curb his passions? If this be so, then Jesus is a man and not a god. (Par.284)

Psalm 87:5 "But of Zion it shall be said: 'This man and that was born in her; and the Most High Himself doth establish her'." This verse the Christians interpret to mean Jesus. Lippmann says that the words "this man and that" show that two men are mentioned. The Christians themselves say that Jesus was born in Bethlehem and not in Zion. And as for the interpretation that after the birth of Jesus, the Most High established Zion, just the reverse is true; for shortly after his birth, Zion was destroyed and has never been restored. The verse really speaks of the Messianic period as foretold by the prophet Isaiah in chapter 66 of his book. (Par.285)

Psalm 110--entire. "1.The Lord saith unto my lord: 'Sit thou at My right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool.' 2.The rod of thy strength, the Lord will send out of Zion: 'Rule thou in the midst of thine enemies.' 3.Thy people offer themselves willingly in the day of warfare; in adornments of holiness, from the womb of blackness which is thine is the dew of thy youth. 4.The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent: 'Thou art priest forever after the manner of Melchizedek.' 5.The Lord at thy right hand doth crush kings in the day of His wrath. 6.He will judge among the nations; he filleth it with dead bodies, he crusheth the head over a wide land. 7.He will drink of the brook in the way; therefore will he lift up the head."

The Christians say the whole Psalm refers to Jesus (1). The refutation: V.2 "The rod of Thy strength will come from Zion"--to the contrary, Jesus was killed in Zion and his strength was broken there. V.3 "From the black womb which is thine, etc." refers to the vaginal regions and how do the Christians interpret this? If they say that it refers to Jesus (i.e., if he had female genitals), why would Jesus want this to be known? V.4 "The Lord hath sworn and will not repent: 'Thou art priest forever, etc.'" Are we to understand that Jesus is made a divine being through this oath so that if it were not for the oath, their god would have no godliness; or, if God had not made the oath, He would be free to repent Jesus' goodness and change it to evil? Also this oath was said concerning Melchizedek king of Salem and what is Jesus' connection with Melchizedek? In short, the Christian interpretation is false. The whole Psalm refers to Abraham. "Lord" (v.1) is Abraham's nickname. God told Abraham that he would triumph over his enemies. V.2a refers to David and Solomon. V.3a refers to David. V.3b refers to Israel for they have sanctified the first-born of every womb to God. "Dew of thy youth" (v.3c) means Abraham because he knew God's name at the age of three. V.4b also refers to Abraham. Vv.5-7 refer to God's announcing to Abraham the redemption of Israel from Egypt (2).

Song of Songs 3:11 "Go forth, ye daughters of Zion, and gaze upon king Solomon, even upon the crown wherewith his mother hath crowned him in the day of his espousals, and in the day of the gladness of his heart."

The rabbis in the Talmud say that everywhere that Solomon is mentioned in the Song of Songs, holiness is to be deduced therefrom. On the

(1) Ps.110:1 has already been discussed in the section on the Trinity. See page 29.

(2) Par.292. This whole interpretation of Lippmann seems very far-fetched and is far removed from genuine Peshatic exegesis, even though Lippmann considered himself a thorough-going Peshatic exegete.

basis of this, the Christians claim that in 3:11, where Solomon is mentioned, it really refers to Jesus (1). If it does refer to Jesus, how can the Christians explain "day of his espousals" and Song of Songs 5:1 "I am come into my garden, my sister" for they do not believe that Jesus had a wife or sister? Also "mother" here is used figuratively to mean "wealth"; but if the Christians insist on a literal interpretation, then ask them what advantage Jesus derived from this crown and what was there in it for the daughters of Jerusalem to see--silver, gold, precious stones, or pearls? The whole verse simply refers to king Solomon. The "crown" is a symbol of the holy spirit which rested on his head.

Daniel 8:15 "And it came to pass, that when I, even I, Daniel, had seen the vision, that I sought to understand it; and behold, there stood before me as the appearance of a man, etc."

Wherever the "son of man" is referred to, the Christians say Jesus is meant (2). "They can't discern the difference between their right and left hands", says Lippmann. For these passages do not speak of vision or prophecy or dream but of the real presence of angels. An angel was sent to Daniel by God. These angels had no god-like elements in them. Lippmann ridicules the Christian belief that "son of man" means Jesus by quoting Ps.146:3 "Put not your trust in the son in whom there is no help" and Job 25:6 "The son of man is a maggot.". Jesus could not have appeared to Daniel for he was not yet born. Dan.10:16 says "sons of men" and the Christians have only one Jesus. Also in Dan.2:11 it says that gods do not dwell with flesh.

(1) Par.322. Lippmann probably disputed this point with a converted Jew who was a Talmudist.

(2) Par.331. For complete "son of man" passages, see Dan.8:15-27 and Dan.10:1 to 12:12.

Part One--Attack on Christianity

Section Two--Against some of its customs and institutions.

Lippmann is mainly concerned with refuting the theological arguments of the Christians. The institutional and ceremonial aspects of the Christian religion do not interest him nearly as much. He knows that the Jew will not be attracted to Christianity through its customs and ceremonies. Judaism is sufficiently colorful on its ceremonial side to keep the Jew faithful to his religion if his mind is not befuddled by theological heresies. The real danger lies in Christian theology and its doctrines which can be dished up to a Jewish mind in most attractive form. The dogmas of the Trinity, Jesus the savior-god, and Jesus the Messiah are certain to make a strong appeal to a mind steeped in Jewish tradition but filled also with rebellious thoughts. Lippmann knew this only too well. He probably saw many of those around him desert the synagogue and enter the portals of the church. He was called upon often to refute the assertions of Jewish converts to Christianity. These arguments which he had with these converts were mostly along theological lines. That is why he took such great pains in discrediting Christian theology and why it was necessary to discuss his refutations of their theology at such great length. But much of the ceremonial and institutional side of Christianity was also obnoxious to him and he did not spare this phase of Christian activity in his criticism.

The ceremony upon which Lippmann heaped most of his scorn was that of the Eucharist or Communion. In a number of places, while discussing an entirely different matter, he pokes fun at the Chris-

tian belief that the communion wafer is the actual body of Jesus (1). "They believe that he stands up above continually in his physical form on the cross naked for no good reason at all and he descends once a day in thousands of pieces of bread and each one is a perfect miniature of him and this is really so wonderful that it is beyond comprehension (Par.8)." At another time he ridicules this belief in his discussion of the Christian translation and interpretation of Psalm 34:9 which the Christians translate "O eat and see that the Lord is good; happy is the man that taketh refuge in Him." The Christians say that this refers to the eating of the communion wafer.

In the first place, says Lippmann, the Christian translation is wrong.

Does not verse one of the same Psalm 28:12-14 1480 21 1212

"when he changed his judgment before Abimelech" prove that in this Psalm, the word 28 does not mean "eat" but it means "judge"?

Furthermore, if the Christians are right, the verse should read "See and eat for the Lord is good, etc" for after he is eaten, he can not be seen. And that he is seen after he has been digested in the bowels--would not this be a ridiculous thing for them to say? (Par.276)

Lippmann was not always able to discuss this matter in such a sarcastic manner. At least once in his polemical career he was involved in a disputation where he got into serious difficulty because of the terms of scorn and derision which the Jews used in speaking of the communion wafer. This time, which is recorded in the "Nitsachon" was in the famous disputation with Pesach-Peter. Here Lippmann was called upon to explain the names which the Jews had given to the

(1) Let not the reader imagine that the use of the word "Christian"

in this thesis is meant to include any but those Christians of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries with whom Lippmann came in contact. In many branches of the Christian church, many of these theological and ceremonial manifestations have undergone great changes since the writing of the "Nitsachon"; although there still are great masses of Christians which entertain the same primitive notions as the opponents of Lippmann.

bread of the Eucharist and also to explain the Jewish custom of burning the אֵין which the Christians claimed was done in order to mock the Christian ceremony of communion. The explanations which he gave are found in paragraphs 351, 353, 353, and 354. Here are the answers which he gave to the Christians: We call the communion wafer אֵין פֶּן because the wafers are kept in the churches and since the Christians bury some of their dead in their churches, the wafers are kept in an unclean place because, according to Jewish law, burial places are defiled and defile everything which comes near them. Therefore the wafers are unclean. The term אֵין פֶּן is used for the same reason. פֶּן does not mean "dung" but is derived from בֵּית "dwelling". The term אֵין פֶּן is used because אֵין is derived from לִפְדֵּ "to redeem" because Jesus, who is believed by the Christians to be in the wafer, is also regarded by them as their redeemer. As for the Christian contention that we burn part of the dough when we bake and we burn the leaven on the eve of Passover in order to mock the Christian communion bread, Lippmann rightly asserts that this is not so. The dough is burnt as a substitute for the offering given to the priest in the days of the Temple. He also explains that on other occasions we burn up bread for religious reasons which have no connection with Christianity. As for the leavened bread on Passover, we do that in order to get rid of all the leaven in our houses before Passover begins. His explanation of the burning of the dough and the leaven is, of course, the only one which is correct. His other explanations are clever prevarications. He knew that the Jews used these terms for the wafer because they despised the idea which was back of the eating of it. He had to concoct some explanation which would not offend the Christians and he tried to do so. All indications are that he lost the disputation. His false statements regarding the offensive terms were probably proven to be un-

true by his convert-opponent and this must have contributed in no small measure to Lippmann's losing out in the controversy.

Another phase of Christian church life which Lippmann attacked was the Christian worship of saints and images. In par.12, he writes, "There are some Christians who worship saints in order that they shall be their interpreters (before God and Jesus) which is comparable to what happens in dealing with earthly kings, for men find it necessary to bribe the king's servants to explain their words to the king. And indeed this is folly and great evil for they do not believe that God knows all their deeds and their words even if one of His servants does not explain them to Him. Or they believe that He is hard to appease and His servants are easy to appease and the servants will win Him over and, goodness knows, this is not so." Concerning the Christian use of images, Lippmann is just as outspoken in his rebuke. Here he uses an even more cogent argument to convince the Christians that they should not allow the display of images in their churches. He quotes that verse from Matthew, which he uses so often to carry his point, which says (Matt.5:17) that Jesus came not to destroy the Torah but to fulfill it. In making images, the Christians disobey the second commandment and therefore are untrue to the teachings of Jesus (Par.347). He says that the reason we Jews make fun of Christian church music is because the Christians worship their images through loud singing (Par.179). In answer to the Christian argument that the images are but symbolical of the Deity and they they do not worship the images but the deities whom the image represents, he replies that this too is evil and forbidden. "Their images are false for it is not possible to imagine Him, as it says (Is.40:18), 'To whom then will ye liken God? or what likeness will ye compare to Him?' (Par.61)"

Lippmann also condemns a number of other Christian practices and institutions. To the Christian contention that one of the proofs of the validity of their religion is that the water used for baptismal purposes does not smell, Lippmann answers that this is no proof because the baptismal waters are odorless for the following reasons: a. Salt is put into the water to keep it clean. b. Fresh water is added constantly. c. Sometimes the water is previously boiled with salt. d. Sometimes dew, which is odorless, is used in the baptismal font. "But," adds Lippmann in characteristic fashion, "the Christians are so ignorant that they can not understand this (Par.289)." In discussing Isaiah 66:17 "....Those who eat swine's flesh, and the detestable thing, and the mouse, will be consumed together, saith the Lord", he says that the Goyim will be punished for eating the forbidden meat of the pig (Par.242). The Christians claim that when the sun stood still at Joshua's command (Josh.10:13), it was the Sabbath day. Since this Sabbath included both Saturday and Sunday, they say that at this time the Sabbath was changed from Saturday to Sunday and they use this verse as their basis for contending that the Jews have the wrong Sabbath day. Lippmann shows that they are wrong by proving that the sun did not delay its setting for a whole day but for less than six hours (Par.155). Even if the Christians are right, he argues, the Christians deserve death because they break the Sabbath laws by working on Sunday and not resting, as the Torah explicitly commands men to do. Commenting on the saying in Pirke Abot (4:28), "Envy, cupidity, and ambition bring forth a man from the world", he condemns the asceticism of those Christian monks who do not eat meat or drink wine, who fast continually, who do not marry, live in hovels, and wear nothing but sack-cloth (Par.317). He believes that these men err because they carry sacrifice of pleasure to an unnecessary extreme.

One of the finest passages in the "Nitsachon" is paragraph 21, in which he rebukes the Christians for forcibly converting a Jew to their faith. We know that this was a very frequent happening in those days and it is surprising that Lippmann does not devote more than one short passage to a condemnation of this practice. Even here he attacks his neighbors in a round-about fashion. He does not speak in general terms but only of this one particular case. Perhaps this is because he was afraid to openly condemn a custom of his time which the Catholics thought was justifiable or perhaps it is because forcible conversions did not happen frequently in his particular vicinity and he had knowledge of only this one case. His words follow:

"And because of what I have said (1), I have proved to them that they have committed an illegal act when they freed a certain Jew who was under sentence of death because he adopted their religion; for religion is not rooted in their (baptismal) water but in the heart. And if this Jew believed in his heart that their religion was the proper one, he would have become a convert before they forced him to do so. And when he promised that he would accept their religion, his mouth did not accord with his heart; therefore, he is not a Goy. And they decreed wrongly when they released him and verily he is a heretic."

Part One--Attack on Christianity

Section Three--Against Christianity as an organized religion.

The charges which Lippmann brings against Christianity as a religion fall into two groups: a. Those which contest the validity of the Christian religion and b. Those which foretell the future fate of the adherents to that religion. In section one of this chapter, we have already seen that Lippmann destroys the theological bases of Christianity. Here we will not repeat his arguments against Christian theology which, by this time, should be well-understood by the reader. We will take up his general arguments through which he attempted to show that Christianity does not rest on firm ground

(1) In the previous portion of the paragraph, he has declared that our religion is not a matter of conformity but is bound up in our hearts.

and has no right to exist.

His first argument is that greatness in size is no proof of the validity of a religion. In par.288, he discusses this matter. Commenting on Psalm 92:8 "When the wicked spring up as grass, and when all the workers of iniquity do flourish, it is that they may be destroyed forever", he declares that the Gentiles are successful in this world and will be destroyed from the world to come. With the Jews just the opposite condition prevails. They have a hard struggle on this terrestrial sphere but they will reap their reward in the hereafter. "All this I have set forth," says Lippmann, "against the nations and critics; but we do not have to answer the Christians in this matter because the Mohammedans are many times greater than they." His second argument is found in par.8. Here he declares that the Christians, unlike the Jews, have no direct evidence concerning their religion. "Is it not written concerning the giving of the Torah (Deut.4:11), 'And the mountain burned with fire, etc.' and (Ex.20:18) 'All the people perceived the thunderings, and the lightnings, etc.' and (Ex.20:19) 'You have seen that I have spoken with you from heaven.'? And concerning this, it is said that there were sixty myriads of witnesses and a great mixed multitude and children and women who thought that this religion was worthy to be received and believed in." Although Lippmann does not explicitly say so, it may be readily inferred from his statement that he does not believe in the validity of the Christian religion because their Torah was not revealed in the presence of a great number of witnesses and because it was not Divinely inspired. But the argument which, for Lippmann, absolutely clinches the matter is that the Christian religion lacks prophets and miracle workers such as we Jews have. He develops this point in par.289. The Christians have no men like Moses, Elijah, and Elisha, men who were imbued by God with miraculous powers. Some Christians say that

they were deprived of these powers through the death of Jesus. But do they not believe that Jesus comes to them every day in their bread? And they say that the death of Jesus was for their good, and, if this explanation of their lack of miracle workers is correct, then the death of Jesus brought evil results to the Christians. What sin did they commit in connection with the death of Jesus? And is it not true that prophecy ceased before his death, for there was no prophecy during the whole Second Temple period? Why, if they are right, is it that, in the whole New Testament, no prophecies or miracle-working are ascribed to Joseph, the father of Jesus, or to Mary? In short, the Christian religion has not a leg upon which to stand. It is invalid and doomed to die.

In the previous paragraph, we have noted one instance in which Lippmann declared that the Gentiles are lost from the world to come. There yet remain several other statements in which Lippmann plainly declared that the Christians will be punished for their persecution of the Jews and will be without a portion in the world to come. In par.122, replying to the Christian charge that they allow the Jews to exist merely because of their (i.e., the Christians') generosity, Lippmann maintains that this is not true and declares that whenever the Christians persecute the Jews, they shed innocent blood. He interprets the references to Edom in the Bible as meaning the Church and then quotes Joel 4:19 "And Edom shall be a desolate wilderness because of the violence against the children of Judah, because they have shed innocent blood in their land" and Obadiah v.10 (which refers to Edom) "For the violence done to thy brother Jacob, shame shall cover thee, and thou shalt be cut off forever" to prove that the Christians will be punished for their anti-Jewish activities. We have already quoted in connection with the discussion of the Trinity that part of paragraph 8 which also condemns the Christians to

73
everlasting oblivion but it will be written down again here as a fitting conclusion to the vicious attack which Lippmann made against the Christian religion, its dogmas, and its institutions:

"Alas, for all those who do not believe in him (Jesus) are persecuted and those who do believe in him shall be lost from the world to come, as Num.24:24 says, 'But ships shall come from the coast of Kittim, and they shall afflict Asshur, and shall afflict Eber, and he also shall come to destruction.' And it is known that the Kittim are the Romans and it is known that they afflicted Assyria and they afflicted the Hebrews and because of Jesus they are lost from the world to come."

Part Two--Defense of Judaism against Christian Attacks.

Introduction

And now we turn from the polemical element in the "Sefer Nitsachon" to the apologetic. It is not our purpose or intent to analyze and to discuss all the apologetic passages in the book but only to deal with those which seem to have been written because of the charges made by the Christians against the Jewish religion. It will be remembered that the purpose of the "Nitsachon" is not only to answer the Christians but to answer all heretics and, says Lippmann in his introduction, "the classes of heretics include children of both believers and atheists, Sadducees (Karaites), and Christians, to the exclusion of such as are perfect in deed and understanding." It might be well to turn back to Division One of this chapter and read again the sixteen principles which Lippmann considers the fundamentals of the Jewish religion. He discusses each one of these principles in the book and these are, of course, very important apologetic material. It is not deemed necessary to record here his proofs for his beliefs but it is quite needful that the reader have the sixteen dogmas well in mind so that he can understand Lippmann's reasoning in a number of matters dealt with in this part of the thesis. Again let it be clearly understood that the passages discussed in this part by no means exhaust the apologetic material of the "Nitsachon" but only include such passages as are needed for an analysis of the arguments which Lippmann advances to refute the anti-Jewish charges of his Christian opponents.

Part Two--Defense of Judaism against Christian Attacks.

Section One. Defense of the Moral Qualities of the Jewish People.

The Christians made many charges against the Jews of Lippmann's

time and he felt that it was necessary to defend his people. These same charges had been levelled against the Jews of earlier times by their opponents and, even in these twentieth-century days, in a period when people are supposed to be filled with a spirit of tolerance and understanding, we are still subject to the same types of criticism which Lippmann was called upon to combat more than five hundred years ago. The answers which he gave to his adversaries are probably not as profound or as scientific as those which we would use today but they make interesting reading and give us a fine insight into the attitude of one Jew of the pre-modern period toward his Jewish kin and his hostile environment. Lippmann was not the cringing ghetto Jew who knelt and fawned at the feet of his enemies. He was proud of his religion and his people, unashamed of his Jewish past, one who was not satisfied with the mere right to live but demanded for his race the honor and the glory which was due them. As we read his defense of the Jewish people, we can not but feel a thrill of pride and a sense of deep admiration for this German rabbi who defied his Christian antagonists to show him any element of weakness in the Jewish people and the Jewish religion. This strain of confidence in the justice of his cause is the sub-stratum which runs through his entire defense of his race against the attack of the Gentile world.

Lippmann was very proud of his people and of the role which they have played in the history of the world. In par.122, he contests bitterly the claim of the Christians that the Jew has no right to exist but that they allow him to continue to thrive because of their great generosity. To the Christian contention that the Jews are wrong for not accepting Christianity, Lippmann replies (Par.122),

"Not only do they heap calumny upon us because of our Torah but they say, 'Why do you not believe in Jesus?' And we answer them, 'Is it not written concerning Israel, (Deut.4:6) 'This great nation

is a wise and understanding people.'? And were they crazy when they bowed down to the golden calf? No, for Satan caused them to err by saying that the Holy Spirit was in it; and there was a great sign for the spirit of life was in it, as it says (Ps.106:20) 'Thus they exchanged their glory for the likeness of an ox that eateth grass.' And for this they were punished and warned not to believe that the Holy Spirit could be in pure gold; just as we can not believe that the Holy Spirit could be in a defiled woman (1) even if also in this case there would be great signs.

All through the "Nitsachon" we notice a decided effort on the part of Lippmann to make saints of all the sages and kings of Israel and to hold the people guiltless in large measure for the various sins which they committed throughout the Biblical period. The Christians delight in finding anti-Jewish material in the Old Testament. They find a formidable weapon in Psalm 78 which has as its theme the idea that, although the Hebrews are a stubborn, wicked, and rebellious people, God has been good to them. Lippmann, in par.281, refutes the Christian notion that this Psalm refers to the Jews of all time. He says that the whole Psalm speaks of the generation of the wilderness wanderings who were punished for their sins. The Christians say that 2 Chronicles 15:3 "Now for long seasons Israel was without the true God and without a teaching priest and without Torah" proves that the Jews are sinners. Lippmann maintains that they are wrong. They do not understand the literal meaning of the text. The verse does not speak of the future but of the past when the kingdom of Judah was faithful to God and was preserved and the kingdom of Israel was not faithful to the Holy One and therefore it was delivered into the hands of its enemies (Par.243).

There is in the "Nitsachon" a refutation of the charge that, according to Jewish law, Jews are not allowed to take interest and a section which seems to seek to refute the blood-accusation which was hurled at the Jews by the Christians so often during the Middle Ages and which has not disappeared yet. The Christians used to accuse

(1) A very evident reference to Jesus' mother.

the Jews of drinking Gentile blood. The most common form which the libel took was that the Jews sacrificed a Christian child just before Passover and used its blood in making unleavened bread. Lippmann discusses Numbers 23:24 in which the heathen prophet Bilaam says of the Israelitish nation "It will drink the blood of the slain." In par.119, he contends that this does not mean that the Israelites will actually drink the blood of the slain but it means that they will be victorious in war and will take the money of the wicked ones and use this money to make a feast. Although Lippmann does not specifically mention the blood-accusation, the very fact that he is so anxious to interpret such an obscure Biblical passage as "It will drink the blood of the slain" seems to show a desire to disprove the fact that Jews ever drank Gentile blood.

Concerning the Christian contention that Jews are not allowed to take interest from them, Lippmann gives a long dissertation on this matter in par.272. The Christians base their charge on Psalm 15 which says "Lord, who shall sojourn in Thy tabernacle? Who shall dwell upon Thy holy mountain? He that walketh uprightly, and worketh righteousness, and speaketh truth in his heart:.....he that putteth not out his money on interest, nor taketh a bribe against the innocent..." Lippmann says "Would anyone be foolish enough to think that David tries to change that which Moses has written in the Torah (Deut.24:21): 'Unto the foreigner thou mayest lend upon interest; but unto thy brother thou shalt not lend upon interest'?" He explains that David speaks only of Israelites because in his time there were no foreigners in the land. Everybody in his dominion was an Israelite. "And", says Lippmann, "if the Christians claim that they are Israelites, I will prove that they are wrong in par.293 (1)." And if the Christians say that they are Edomites who are called "our brethren", there

(1) See page 55.

are two answers to this argument: a. Sennacherib, king of Assyria, jumbled up all the nations and so it is impossible for anyone to prove now-a-days that he is an Edomite and b. Only those are our brethren who believe in our religion. Even a Jew, if he is converted to another religion, falls out of the category of "our brethren". So we are permitted to take interest from anyone who does not follow our religion. So even if the Christians could prove that they are Edomites, we still could ~~could~~ take interest from them.

Turning to his own people, Lippmann tells them not to be afraid or ashamed because of the taunts hurled at them by the Christians. They should not be humiliated by the knowledge that they are a peculiar people for they were specifically commanded by God through the prophet Isaiah to keep themselves apart from the nations for (Is.61:9) "Their seed shall be known among the Goyim.....and all that see them shall acknowledge that they are the seed which the Lord has blessed." This verse shows us that it is no disgrace to be recognized as a Jew by our strange clothing and strange customs, even though the Goyim scorn us now on that account (Par.239). Lippmann pleads with his readers not to emulate the Christians, not to wear Christian garments or curl their hair as do the Christian dandies (Par.103). We must bear our troubles now in good grace. We must cheerfully accept all the burdens which are heaped upon us by our Jewish loyalties and, when the Messiah comes, all this will bring us great reward and honor.

Part Two--Defense of Judaism against Christian Attacks.

Section Two. Defense of certain Jewish sages.

In a number of instances, Lippmann is called upon to defend the religious worth and Jewish loyalty of a number of Biblical characters. The Christians seek to prove from a number of Scriptural passages that Jacob and Moses on certain occasions made the sign of the cross

and were, therefore, believers in the Christian religion. The other charges which Lippmann has to fight are that Esau was a more moral person than Jacob and that Jesus was a much greater man than Moses.

The Christians claim that when Genesis 48:14 says of Jacob that, on his death bed, in bestowing his blessing on Ephraim and Manasseh, he "guided his hands wittingly", it means that he made the sign of the cross.

"The Goyim err in many places because they look only at one letter and skip over a whole section in order to prove their point. Is his (Jacob's) intention not clearly explained in the middle of the chapter for when Joseph said (v.18) 'Not so, my father, for this is the first-born; put thy right hand upon his head', he answered him that it was his intention that Manasseh's younger brother should become greater than Manasseh?" (Par.45)

Moses is accused in two places of making the sign of the cross. They say that Exodus 15:25 "And the Lord showed him a tree, and he cast it into the waters, and the waters were made sweet" means that he threw a crucifix into the water since 18 "tree" and 13 "crucifix" have the same numerical value in Hebrew.

"Just as they think, I will explain it to them; because an idolatrous image stood by the waters, they were despoiled. And God showed this to Moses. Then Moses took it and cast it into the water to find out if any Israelite had caused to image to stand there (1) And because it was an image of wood and the water swallowed it, it was not necessary to grind it to pieces in order that the water should not receive the taste of its strength, as had to be done with the golden calf....." (Par.56)

The second instance is Numbers 20:11 "And Moses lifted up his hand and smote the rock with his rod twice." Why twice? In order to make the sign of the cross, say the Christians. The text tells us, says Lippmann, that he only lifted up his hand once and how is it possible to smite twice in one lifting? It really means that he hit the rock so hard that the rod rebounded and it appeared as though he had hit it twice! (Par.116)

(1) This is a form of the medieval "trial by water" and shows that, in this matter, Lippmann was a child of his age.

82

Another charge which Lippmann had to combat was that Jacob was not such a fine moral type for he twice cheated Esau his brother, as it says (Gen.27:36) "For he hath supplanted me these two times: he took away my birth-right; and, behold, he hath now taken away my blessing." The answer which Lippmann gives to the Christians is a fine example of the way he is able to reason at times--for it can not be said that his reasoning is always as cogent as in this particular case. The arguments which he uses are not original with him. He utilizes Talmudic material to prove that the birth-right which is spoken of here has no connection with inheritance-rights.

"How is this matter related to the buying of the birth-right? For he who is born first can not be changed about so that he is last and for a person to buy the right of being first to inherit the property is not possible in their (Christian) laws, or in the laws of the sons of Noah, or in our laws. For in their laws, the first-born did not get a double portion. And also in the laws of the sons of Noah: for the first-born had no special inheritance rights before the giving of the Torah. And not according to our laws: for no man can sell a thing which has not yet come into existence, and in the life-time of his father, no one has the right to sell his share of the estate to another. But you must admit that the matter stands as Rashi explained--that before the giving of the Torah, the service (of God) was allotted to the first-born. And Jacob acquired the service of God because Esau despised it, as it is written: (Gen.25:34) 'Esau despised his birth-right.'

And how do we explain the matter of Jacob's taking Esau's blessing? This is because of the duty which one owes one's mother for it is a commandment to hearken to her; and this case was not robbery, for Esau until now had not fulfilled this commandment but, on the contrary, he had not consulted his father and mother regarding his actions, for it is written (Gen.26:34-35) 'He took to wife Judith the daughter of Beeri the Hittite, and Basemath the daughter of Elon the Hittite. And they were a bitterness of spirit unto Isaac and to Rebekah.'" (Par.32)

The final point of this discussion, which concerns the relative importance of Jesus and Moses, is of great interest to the Jews. The Christians claim that we have no man in the history of our race who compares to Jesus in importance, that Moses was a mere mortal whose Torah was replaced by that of the god Jesus. It is this type of assertion that Lippmann fights in par.137:

"How can they compare him (Jesus) to Moses who was a man and

not a god? And as for their wise men who say that he also was a prophetthere is an added phrase which can be used to argue with them (Deut.34:10) 'And there hath not arisen a prophet since in Israel like unto Moses, whom the Lord knew face to face.' And against their will they must admit that he was less important than Moses; and how could we believe that he abrogated the Law of Moses? Is it possible to believe that a person could abrogate the words of one who is greater than he?"

Part Two--Defense of Judaism against Christian Attacks.

Section Three. Defense of certain Jewish customs.

Lippmann was called upon to defend certain Jewish traditions and synagogal customs. One Jewish custom which received much maligning and scorn in Christian writings was the custom of circumcision. In par.21 and 22, he answers the Christian criticisms in language cogent and clear. The greater part of his remarks follow:

"The Christians sneer saying that, since the women are not circumcised, they are not subject to Jewish law. They do not know that our religion is not bound up in the circumcision but in the heart. He who does not believe with perfect faith is not made a Jew by reason of his circumcision; he who does believe perfectly is a Jew even if he is not circumcised but one transgression is charged against him. And the commandment of circumcision is not given to women; and so they have the commandment of the child-birth offering which is not given to men.....

Also they sneer concerning the chair which is prepared to honor Elijah who is the angel of the B'rit, for they say that in one day there are many circumcisions in the world and it is impossible for him to attend them all. And similar to this is the story in Sanhedrin (1). It says: A certain Min asked, 'It is said, 'Wherever ten men are assembled, there the Shechina dwells.' How many Shechinas are there?' He answered, 'You and the whole world use the light of the sun. If the sun, which is one, is able to light up the whole world with its rays, how much the more is the Shechina able to spread itself.' And in a similar manner, Elijah supervises all circumcisions. And, furthermore, I will answer them according to their own belief that he attends in person. The angel of death is in an analogous position for there are many deaths in the world and, in one instant, he travels from one end of the world to the other. And Elijah was changed into an angel, as it says (2 Kings 2:11), 'Behold, there appeared a chariot of fire, and horses of fire, which parted them both asunder; and Elijah went up by a whirlwind into heaven.'"

Another defense of the custom of circumcision which is even more convincing in its arguments is found in par.218. Here Lippmann proves

(1) This story is found in Sanhedrin 39a. The Jew in the story is Rabbah Gamliel.

from Ezekiel 31:18 "...Thou shalt be brought down with the trees of Eden unto the nether parts of the earth; thou shalt lie in the midst of the uncircumcised, with them that are slain by the sword." that only uncircumcised people go to Hell.

"And so it is written in the book of Gregorius (1), 'He who is not circumcised like Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob is not able to enter Paradise.' In Latin this reads 'Qui non est circumciscus sicut Abraham, Isaac, et Jacob non potest introire in regnum coelorum.' And behold, they say that the baptismal waters were given as a substitute for circumcision; and they are contradicted by their own authorities! for Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were circumcised with a genuine circumcision and, like them, it is necessary for every man to be circumcised. And, furthermore, it is written (Gen.17:13), 'He that is born in thy house, and he that is bought with thy money, must needs be circumcised; and My covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant.' It states here explicitly that the covenant of the circumcision shall be in the flesh forever. And so he (Ezekiel) says at the end of the book (Ezek.44:9) 'No alien, uncircumcised in heart and uncircumcised in flesh, shall enter into My sanctuary.....'

There are a number of other Jewish customs and ceremonies which Lippmann has to explain. The Christians complain that the Jews accuse them of being idolaters because they bow down to images in the churches and yet the Jews bow down in front of the Ark and therefore they are just as guilty as the Christians. Says Lippmann, "This worship is not for the sake of a god and is not worship of the ark or the Torah but we bow down before the Lord of all because of these things upon which He put His holiness."

"But there is a matter of greater importance to be explained for we find that Nathan the prophet bowed down before David the king, as it says (1 Kings 1:23) 'He bowed down before the king with his face to the ground' and so every day, we bow down to an earthly king; and all this is permitted because it does not concern a godly matter; but, in the making of idols, error is done by the ignoramuses and the women, for all of them bow down to them and say, in their opinion, that the idols have real powers." (Par.61)

Another matter which needs explanation is Exodus 25:18 "And thou shalt make two cherubim of gold, etc." for the second commandment forbids the making of "any image or any manner of likeness".. Lippmann explains that the word בצב comes from צב "cabbage"

(1) I could not determine which of the many famous Gregoriuses this one is nor could the reference which Lippmann gives be located.

because the cherubim looked like cabbage heads, i.e., "they were like the head of a man, perfectly round, yet had not any facial expression." (1)

"Or I can compare this to an earthly king who commands that there be written on the wall of his palace a warning for his servants 'Remember the day of death.' And he has a dead man, lying on a bier, painted above it; for he said that if there are any among his servants who are not able to read this writing, when they see the painting, they will remember his warning. For God commanded in the Ten Words, 'Do not make for yourself any image or any manner of likeness, etc.' and He commanded to place them in the ark of testimony; and He commanded to paint the cherubim on the cover to serve as an example for those who do not know how to read; that is to say, 'Behold, this I have commanded shall not be made.' And what about my explanation that it is forbidden to make a likeness of God which breeds error, as I explained in par.61? This likeness is not of God. And it shall be that when one desires to paint pictures of things which have happened and which look better than this, this remembrance of the prohibition against image-making will prevent the error." (2)

Why, ask the Christians, do you Jews only observe one day Yom Kippur? You observe two-day holidays on every occasion except Yom Kippur. Is it because you do not want to afflict yourselves for two days? Lippmann explains that the rabbis decreed that "no enactment should be forced upon the community unless the majority of the community is able to obey it. (3)" "Therefore it is not permitted to decree a hard matter which the community will not be able to obey in order to prevent the people from committing sin." Why do we not observe two days Yom Kippur? Because many of the people would not be able to fast two days and so it is better that we observe it only one day rather than have the people sin by not fasting two days. However, the other holidays we observe for two days because our people can do this without suffering any serious discomforts. (Par.135)

Another question which Lippmann had to answer was asked him

(1) This is a clever bit of etymology but, as Lippmann himself probably knew, absolutely incorrect.

(2) Par.73. This whole explanation is extremely weak and inconclusive. Lippmann practically admits, by his poor arguments, that, in this matter, the complaint of the Christians is justified.

(3) See Baba Bathra 60b.

by the chief priest of Lindau: "Why do you Jews not sing songs and play instruments during your devotions as did your fathers in Biblical times?" Lippmann quotes Psalm 137:1-4,

"By the rivers of Babylon, there we sat down, yea, we wept, when we remembered Zion. Upon the willows in the midst thereof we hanged up our harps. For there they that led us captive asked of us words of song, and our tormentors asked of us mirth: 'Sing us one of the songs of Zion.' How shall we sing the Lord's song in a foreign land?"

He explains that we are in exile and we will not sing or play until we are restored once more to our home-land, Palestine. (Par.179)

The Christians criticise the Jews for making their circuit around the altar from east to north to west to south. They say that this is contrary to the rotation of the sun which goes from east to south to west to north. Lippmann disagrees with this astronomical reasoning. He says that the sun makes two rotations; first, around the earth every day, and second, the sun is part of a system with a much wider scope. In this system the sun moves from west to south to east to north (i.e., in the same direction as the Jewish march around the altar) but because it makes a rapid rotations around the earth every day (while at the same time making slower headway in its larger course), those who are not scientifically minded imagine that it moves from east to south to west to north (1). "And because of the fools who do not know this," says Lippmann, "I will answer them according to their understanding." He then says that the sun seems to go from east to west because it is rendering homage to God. It is walking backwards in the presence of its Creator as do all who render homage to kings, both heavenly and earthly. Lippmann then proves that when the wall of Jerusalem was dedicated by Ezra, the proces-

(1) It remains for one who is better versed in astronomy than I to pass judgment on the worth of these respective opinions regarding the passage of the sun through the skies.

sion moved around the wall from south to east, etc. so that this is another proof that the Jewish method of circling the altar is correct. (Par.339)

The final attack made by the Christians against the Jewish methods of worship with which Lippmann deals is the charge that all Jewish worship is unacceptable to God. The Christians base their contention on certain Biblical verses, such as Isaiah 1:11 "To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices to me?" and Is.1:14 "Your new moons and your appointed seasons My soul hateth" and Haggai 2:14 "...That which they offer there is unclean." All these verses are interpreted by the Christians as referring to the Jews of all time. Lippmann explains that the prophets were condemning the people who lived in former generations. Haggai was addressing the Jews who lived before the building of the Second Temple and was attacking their lack of religious knowledge and Isaiah, too, was speaking only to his own generation. (Par.260)

Part Two--Defense of Judaism against Christian Attacks.

Section Four. Defense of certain Jewish theological beliefs.

We have mentioned in the introduction to Part two that "Sefer Mitsachon" is as much an apologetical work for Judaism as it is a polemic against Christians, Karaites, and heretics. We have also said that the apologetic elements of the book do not fall within the scope of this paper, except those passages which specifically mention that they were written to refute Christian beliefs. In this section we will discuss certain elements of Jewish theology which were defended by Lippmann in the "Mitsachon" against Christian onslaughts.

Although, as we have seen, Lippmann bitterly attacks the doctrine of the Trinity, in only one place in his book does he say that the Christians do not believe in the unity of God. In par.234, com-

menting on Isaiah 43:10, he defends this theological doctrine. He says, in the course of remarks, that Deut. 10:20. "Before Me there was no God formed; neither shall any be after Me" was written to prove that the contentions of the Christians are wrong. It is not clear whether he is basing his claim on the meaning of the entire verse or on the pun Deut. 10:20. Perhaps he had both these interpretations in mind (1).

Lippmann also is anxious to disprove the Christian belief that Jesus is the intermediary between man and God. He shows that, according to the Bible, it is not possible for a Jew to believe in such an intermediary and neither is it necessary to posit such a person.

"The rabbis said, 'It is forbidden to man to create an intermediary between himself and his Creator'; and the Torah explains here (Deut. 10:20) the reason for the matter, as it says, 'Him shalt thou serve; and to Him shalt thou cleave'; that is to say, He alone is to be served and no intercessor is to be conjured up, as I have explained; But one shall direct his desire toward the Creator of all; for, in this manner, he draws near to the Active Intellect; that is to say, his intellect cleaves to the Active Intellect, as I shall explain concerning prophecy in par. 136. But when one posits intermediaries, he draws near to the outside forces and the spirit of impurity and inclines toward idolatry....."

And how about the statement of Jacob (Gen. 48:16) 'The angel who redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads.'? God forbid that this means that he prayed to the angel but is connected to what is said above (v. 15) 'The God Who hath been my Shepherd all my life long unto this day', He will bless the lads through His angels. And know and understand that in all the prayers in all the 24 books, you will not find any prayer to intermediaries. And, indeed, we find that Israel requested Moses and Samuel to pray for them and Zedekiah sent to Jeremiah to pray for him; and also in Masechet Ta'anit, many such doings are recorded; yet Moses, the father of the prophets, who, while he was alive, acted as intercessor for mankind in so many matters, was not considered to be a god, and no one brought his cause to the intercessor except to obtain help from him and to pray with him to the Lord of all, may He be blessed and exalted." (Par. 132)

(1) Dr. Lauterbach does not agree with this conjecture. He believes that Lippmann was not thinking of the pun Deut. 10:20 but was simply trying to interpret the whole verse as proving God's unity.

Lippmann uses up much of the space in his book proving that the Messiah has not yet come. This was necessary because of the many arguments used by the Christians to convince the Jews that Jesus was their long-awaited Messiah. Since Lippmann derives all his proofs for the non-arrival of the Messiah from the Bible, we will be able to get a clear idea of the nature of his argument from a listing of the Scriptural passages which he uses with brief explanations to make his arguments clear.

Genesis 50:24 "God will surely remember you and bring you up out of this land unto the land which He swore to give to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob." Before the Messiah will come, Israel must be in possession of the Land which God promised to its patriarchs. Since we are still in exile, we know that even the pre-Messianic period has not yet commenced. (Par.47)

Deuteronomy 19:9 "....Then shalt thou add three cities more for thee besides these three." The discussion of this verse in paragraph 138 is the most complete discussion in the "Nitsachon" on the coming of the Messiah and it is worth quoting in full. In the course of this discussion, all the other sections in which Lippmann brings up this problem are mentioned. Since he repeats the same arguments over and over again, it will not be necessary to analyze each passage separately but all the Scriptural passages which Lippmann cites will be listed so that the reader may turn to his Bible and read them. All of ^{them} are understood by Lippmann to be descriptions of happenings in the Messianic era which have not as yet occurred. From all of them he deduces, of course, that the Messiah has not yet come. The translation of par.138 is as follows:

"And this matter never came to pass; yet it was not written without reason (i.e., the matter referred to in Deut.19:9 concerning the three extra cities of refuge). From this, Rambam brought proof that the Messiah has not yet come but he will come; and then he will ful-

fill this verse; and so I have proved from this verse the coming of the Messiah from the Torah; and also in par.46 (which discusses Gen. 49:10) and par.118 (Num.24:17) ; and so it says in Deut.30:3 'And he will return and gather thee from all the peoples whither the Lord thy God hath scattered thee.' And it is written (v.4), 'If any of thine that are dispersed be in the uttermost parts of heaven, from thence will the Lord thy God gather thee, and from thence will He fetch thee.' And, behold, never in any of the other exiles was Israel scattered to the four corners of the earth but it is now in this exile; so we find it explained that in the future the Messiah will come and then these verses will be fulfilled. And it is repeated in the Prophets, as I shall explain in Jeremiah, par.208 (Jer.31:22) and Ezekiel par. 216 (Ezek.20:33ff), 218 (31:14), 219 (37:21), 220 (38:14-15); and Isaiah par.228 (Is.9:6) and Hosea par.243 (Hosea 1:6) and Joel par. 245 (Joel 3:1) and Amos par.247 (Amos 2:6) and Obadiah par.252 (Obad. vv. 8,10,18,20) and Micah par.255 (Micah 5:5) and Zechariah par.261 (Zech.8:23) and 263 (12:10). For the prophets who prophesied punishments also prophesied the consolations. And again in the Writings, as I shall explain in Psalms, par.283 (Ps.81:4-5) and Daniel par. 330 (Dan.7:27). And in the Gemara in Shabbat and Eruvin and Pesachim and many other places, the coming of the Messiah is discussed, may he come speedily in our day.

And in the time of the Messiah, Israel shall return to its land and the kingship of the house of David shall return to its former greatness and his rulership shall extend from one end of the world to the other. But the present natural order will not change in the least, as the rabbis said, 'The only difference between the present time and the time of the Messiah is that in that time the oppression of Israel by foreign nations will cease.' And we read in Shabbat, 'In the future, the land of Israel will bring forth white flour and salted foods.' This is a statement concerning the great good which will be done in that the needs of the body will be easily obtained. For thus it is the custom of men to speak of one who brings forth prepared things. It does not mean that men will find baked bread but they will get wheat already harvested and threshed, as it says (Is.61:5), 'And aliens shall be your plowmen and your vine-dressers.' And there will be no end to the abundance of good things in the days of the Messiah; for behold the rabbis say that they ask man in the hour when he is judged, 'Did you wait for salvation?' And should a man be punished if he has not walked after the lust of his heart to yearn and long for material satisfactions? But (this teaches us that it is man's duty) to wait for and to yearn for and to pray for his coming in order that he may free us from the oppression of those nations who prevent us from worshipping God; and that he may lighten our physical burdens and leave us free to serve our Creator; and in this pleasant restfulness our wisdom shall increase, as it says (Is.11:9), 'And the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord' and (Jer. 31:34) 'And they shall teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying 'Know the Lord'; for they shall all know Me, from the least of them unto the greatest, saith the Lord; and then one will be able to obtain with ease merit for the world to come and a prominent position and eternal existence, as I explained in par.76."

The Christians also say that the reason the Jews are without kingdom and power at the present time is because they refused to recognize Jesus as the Messiah. As Lippmann puts it,

"And now the Samaritans (Christians) cry against God to speak against the Torah and the Prophets, saying that, in our time, because of the sins of the multitude, we are lowly, without kingdom or dominion. They pay no attention to the sermons of the rabbis who are the leaders in the Diaspora. For now, in our days, there was a prince from the seed of David in Egypt...(1)"

Lippmann maintains that the reason we are without country or rulership is because we are in exile; and, when the Messiah comes, we will all be back in Palestine and we will rule the world. The Minim (again the Christians must be meant) interpret Amos 5:2 "Fallen is the virgin Israel; never to rise again" as meaning that never again will the Jews obtain power in the world. Lippmann explains that this verse refers to the kingdom of Israel which will never rise again. But it does not refer to the descendants of the kingdom of Judah for, after this verse was written, many Jews ruled over Palestine. While the Second Temple stood, the priests and Herodians ruled and later (132-135) Bar Cochba had control of the country for a time. And when the Messiah comes, dominion will again be put in the hands of the men of Judah and we will resume our former state of prosperity and freedom. (Par.248)

Part Two--Defense of Judaism against Christian Attacks.

Section Five. Defense of the Talmud.

One of the great bones of contention between the Christians and Jews of the pre-Reformation period was the Talmud. The Christians charged that the Talmud contained many unkind statements about

(1) Par.46. Dr. Marcus believes that the Davidic prince referred to is some member of the Egyptian Nagidate which controlled Jewish affairs in Egypt in this time.

Jesus and the Jews claimed that the Talmud does not make such statements. At times this controversy over the Talmud brought the Jews into danger. The famous disputation in Paris in 1240 between Nicholas Dunin and Yechiel was fought over the Talmud. Dunin charged that the Talmud "contained blasphemies against God, against Jesus, and against Christianity, and it alone was the cause why the Jews stubbornly refused to submit to baptism (1)." Yechiel lost the argument, as was to be expected, and twenty-four wagon loads of Hebrew books were publicly burned. Also, in Tortosa in Spain a famous disputation was held which lasted a year and nine months (from February 1413 to November 1414) in which the Jesus-passages in the Talmud played the major role. Again the Jews lost the battle and the anti-pope Benedict XIII issued a bull (May 11, 1415) forbidding the study of Talmud by the Jews. It is plain therefore that in the period when the "Hit-sachon" was written, the Jews were frequently called upon to defend the Talmud. So we are not surprised to find in Lippmann's book a number of passages in which he refutes a number of the charges made by the Christians against the Talmud.

Lippmann deals with two charges levelled against the Talmud--first, that it blasphemes Jesus' godliness and second, that it is full of exaggerations. Concerning the first charge he says that all the ridicule which the Christians claim the Talmud pours on Jesus is directed against a man named יע' and therefore this can not refer to the Christian Jesus, for, if it would his name would be written as ישוע'. Furthermore, Yechiel, in the Paris disputation, proved that there were two Yeshus, one of whom is mentioned in the Talmud and who lived in the days of Joshua ben Perachya and the other in

(1) Margolis and Marx "History of the Jewish People" p.378.

whom the Christians believe and who lived many generations later in the time of Hillel (Par.347).

"And I heard also concerning a certain Biblical scholar who pointed out to a priest that if it were not for the Talmud, the Christian religion also would be in great difficulty for it is written in the Torah (Deut.23:3) 'An Ammonite or a Moabite shall not enter into the congregation of the Lord'. And behold they connect that man (Jesus) to the lineage of King David through his (Jesus') mother. And he (King David) is descended from a Moabite! And if it were not for the Talmud, in which is written 'The Torah says 'Ammonite' and not 'Ammonitess', etc.', the family of David would be forbidden to enter into the congregation; and because of the Talmud, the family was permitted to enter the congregation; and he (the priest) acknowledged that such was the truth in the matter." (Par.112)

The second charge which the Christians make against the Talmud is that it contains many stories which are impossible to believe. In par.290, we are told that certain Minim (who were probably Christians) made fun of the Talmudic Haggada because they think that the Jews believe these stories literally. Lippmann explains that the Jews only regard these stories as parables and are not expected to believe in their historicity. The Christians also criticise the hyperbolic statements in the Talmud about the par 112 "wild ox" and the par 112 "leviathan". Lippmann says that these are but Fe-shatic interpretations of Job 40:15 to 41:26. He can not understand why these statements should be any harder for the Christians to believe than their belief which they got from the Jew concerning the creation by God of the heavens and the earth (Par.303). Lippmann's main defense of the Talmud is found in par.112. We will not quote this paragraph in full but will just quote a number of sentences which throw light on the high respect which he entertained for the Talmud and the fine understanding he had of its real importance. In the beginning of par.112 he shows that not only the Talmud but also the Bible contains exaggerations so that the argument of the Christians really falls down at its very inception, for the Christians never condemn the Bible on this ground. He also quotes a passage from the

Talmud itself (Eruvin 2b) to show that the writers of the Talmud knew that it contains exaggerations, so that they were not trying to deceive those who would read their writings.

"And it said, concerning the Christians, that they sneer at the Talmud because of the exaggerations which it contains. Do not they believe an enormous exaggeration in their saying that Christobel (Jesus) was so great that he walked on the sea? And, behold, the heretics (probably means the Jewish converts to Christianity) make the Talmud despicable in the eyes of the Gentiles by translating for them from the Talmud only the amazing exaggerations.....It should also be made plain to them that this is not the essence of the Talmud and that they are homiletic interpretations which do not have to be refuted.....but the laws of the holidays and the commandments and concerning damages are the essence, which they call (in Latin) 'jura'; and tell them some of the laws: for instance, that an unpaid watcher (of property) is not responsible for an unavoidable accident or robbery but he is responsible for negligence but one who takes pay is responsible also for robbery and the borrower is responsible also for unavoidable accidents; and if brothers inherit a piece of property, on the east of which is a river which dries up periodically and on the south of which is a constantly flowing river, they have to divide it by 'karnazol' which means crosswise, from corner to corner and from middle to middle, in eight parts like this

Reuben	Simon
Simon	Reuben
Reuben	Simon
Simon	Reuben

and there are many laws like this; (and after the critics have heard them), they will recant and praise it (the Talmud) even after they have reviled it."

Part Two--Defense of Judaism against Christian Attacks.

Section Six. Defense of certain portions of the Jewish liturgy. (1)

The Christians firmly believe that they are attacked in the liturgy of the synagogue. They have tried many times throughout the centuries to prove that certain prayers in our services were written with them in mind. The Jews have always vigorously denied this accusation. It has been proven that these prayers were written in

(1) All of the material in this section is taken from those paragraphs in the "Mitsachon" which deal with Lippmann's controversy with the converted Jew, Pessach-Peter.

pre-Christian times or in countries where Christianity had not developed at the time of the composition of the prayer. But it can not be denied that whatever may have been in the mind of the writers of these prayers, the worshippers who recited them often gave them anti-Christian interpretations. The Christians knew this, both from their own observations and from the reports brought to them by converted Jews. So it is quite natural to find Lippmann called upon to answer charges of anti-Christian sentiments in our liturgy. The prayers which he had to explain, with one exception, are those most commonly met with in polemical literature. They are the twelfth benediction of the Shemone Esre, the Alenu prayer, and a passage from a Yom Kippur piut. The first two, as we have mentioned, were often subjected to adverse criticism by the Christians while the last is a poem which is not found in many Machsorim and therefore not generally known.

In our prayer-book, the twelfth benediction of the Shemone Esre commences as follows: "And for slanderers let there be no hope." But in the Siddur which was used by Lippmann, it began "And for Meshummadim let there be no hope." This is the original reading of the prayer and it was changed later because of Christian pressure. Lippmann explains that this phrase is not meant to be an attack on converted Jews but it means that after a Jew has been converted, his friends and relatives no longer hope or expect that he will return to Judaism. The next phrase, which in our prayer-book reads "And let all wickedness perish as in a moment", read, in the older version, "And let all the Minim perish as in a moment." Pesach-Peter says that Minim here means the Catholic priests. Lippmann claims that this is untrue. If the Catholic priests were meant, the text would not employ the term Minim but would use Christians or Christians. Minim refers to those who are neither devout Christians or devout Jews but are

in doubt as to which is the correct religion for them to follow, people who, in German, are known as "verzweifelte Ketzer", "perplexed heretics". The Christians also resented the next phrases of the prayer "May all the enemies of Thy people be speedily cut off and may presumptuous rulership be speedily uprooted and destroyed." The first phrase "May all the enemies of Thy people be speedily cut off", according to Lippmann, refers to the enemies of the righteous, whether these righteous ones be Christian or Jewish, and it does not mean that the Jews desire their death but pray that their wickedness be removed from their hearts. The second phrase does not have reference to the ruler of the country for the Jews are required to pray for the welfare of their king but refers to those men in history who have dethroned the lawful rulers and usurped thrones for themselves. (Par. 348)

The original Alenu prayer contained the following statement which has been deleted from our Siddur וְיִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׁמְחוּ בְּיְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ וְיִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׁמְחוּ בְּיְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ. It was taken out because the Christians did not like it. They also found fault with the phrase וְיִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׁמְחוּ בְּיְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ which still is retained in the prayer. The Christians say that וְיִשְׂרָאֵל is the numerical equivalent of י"ט and that וְיִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׁמְחוּ בְּיְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ is a slanderous statement about י"ט. Lippmann says it could not refer to Jesus because the Christians do not call their god י"ט but ע"ס and in Hebrew he is called י"ט. Peter answers, "You are right. Some Jews do call him י"ט because he saved them from Hell." This reply, retorts Lippmann, shows Peter's lack of grammatical knowledge. Jeshua is a proper name and is not derived

from ye, "salvation". (1) Therefore, all the ridicule directed against ye in the Talmud does not refer to Jesus for if it did, the Talmud would write his name ye. The references to idol-worshippers do not mean all Christians but only those ignorant ones who believe that God dwells in their idols. It does not refer to those Christians who believe that the images are only reminders of God's presence (Par.347).

The last passage in the liturgy which Lippmann had to explain were the following words from a Yom Kippur piut: prp' p'se, p'p'p' p'se, p'p'p' p'se (2). The Christians claim that, in this passage, the Jews ask God to destroy the Christian religion. Lippmann points out to Pesach-Peter that he does not understand the Peshatic content of the statement. This passage is not a prayer at all but a complaint. It is connected with what has been said in the previous piut. The poet says that the Gentiles cry out prp' p'se, meaning that God has cast away His people. Because of this, the Jews ask God to show them that He has not deserted them (Par.349). Thus does Lippmann dispose of the Christian attacks on the prayers of his people.

- (1) Lippmann is right. ye is a shortened form of ye. See Brown, Driver, and Briggs Hebrew Dictionary p.221. Here Lippmann says that the name ye which the Christians use for Jesus proves that he was created like everyone else. Lippmann, probably intentionally, makes the mistake of deriving ye from ye. It really is a derivative of ye.
- (2) This piut is not found in our Nachsor. Kaufmann, on p.23 of his book, note 86, says: "On the authority of Eisenmenger (Das entdeckte Judenthum, part 2, page 142), the Jews used to write this piut on scrolls. All of it was printed by Wuelferus in his notes to his edition of the 'Theriaca Judaica'."

Chick

CHAPTER FOUR

CONCLUSION

Chapter Four

Conclusion

We have finished our examination of the anti-Christian elements of the "Sefer Nitsachon". We have substantiated our earlier findings that Yom Tov Lippmann Muhlhausen was a man possessed of great religious zeal and a prodigious fund of knowledge. There yet remains the task of briefly presenting a few conclusions drawn from the material which we have collected. It is not necessary to point out the strong points or the weaknesses of the arguments which Lippmann uses against the Christians. One who has read carefully all which has gone before will have drawn his own conclusions already in this regard. The writer feels that, although Lippmann's arguments are sometimes very weak, as a whole he puts up a strong defense against the attacks of the Christians. He seems to try many times to anticipate the Christian rejoinders to his findings in order to make it easier for the Jews who will use his book as a weapon in future disputations. All through the "Nitsachon" there is a very noticeable effort to make saints of the leaders of Israel, especially the Biblical celebrities. He tries to "white-wash" the Jews and their heroes to an almost unreasonable degree. It is doubtful whether he was really convinced that these men were such perfect beings but he desired to leave as little room as possible for Christian mud-slinging. What were his inner feelings concerning the Christians? Not the most friendly, to be sure. Although he rarely speaks of the Christians in very scurrilous terms, he had no high regard for their mentality. He often remarks 1132' 11320 15 "If they were wise, they would understand". He complains that the Christians are incapable of interpreting the Biblical texts literally. Then, too, they possess the bad habit of extracting a certain meaning from a verse

without considering it in its setting. Lippmann often cleverly grants the Christian premises and then proceeds, on the basis of these premises, to disprove Christian contentions. (See especially paragraph 293.) One finishes this study with the feeling that Yom Tov Lippmann Muhlhausen was a very clever man and that the "Sefer Nitsachon" is a very interesting book but neither settled any problems. Lippmann's sharp wit and keen brain were not able to save his eighty fellow prisoners from torture and death. The Gentiles, who slaughtered our Jewish ancestors by the thousands in the years following the appearance of the "Nitsachon" because they refused to accept baptism, were not touched by the arguments advanced in the book of the rabbi of Prague. Life is not literary and literature is not life.

APPENDIX

Index #1

(which contains a list of all anti-Christian passages found in the "Sefer Mitsachon" and their location in Hackspan's edition of this work.)

<u>Paragraph</u>	<u>Page</u>	<u>Paragraph</u>	<u>Page</u>
4	7	246	136
5	8	247	136
6	8	248	137
8	10	252	138
12	15	254	139
16	17	256	140
21	19	258	140
22	19	259	140
23	20	260	141
24	20	262	143
32	23	263	144
40	25	264	145
45	27	268	148
46	27	269	148
47	28	272	149
56	35	273	150
61	38	275	150
73	44	276	151
80	51	277	151
103	59	278	152
112	66	279	152
116	69	281	153
118	70	284	155
119	71	285	155
122	72	287	157
124	74	288	158
128	83	289	159
132	85	290	159
135	89	292	160
137	93	293	161
138	93	303	168
155	102	310	171
179	107	317	174
207	116	321	176
208	116	322	178
213	118	328	179
214	118	329	179
215	119	330	180
218	120	331	180
219	120	332	181
225	123	339	188
226	124	343	190
227	126	347	191
228	126	348	193
230	127	349	193
234	128	350	194
236	129	351	194
239	134	352	194
240	134	353	194
242	134	354	194
243	135		

Index #2

(which contains a list of all Biblical verses in which the Christians find references to their faith which are refuted in the "Mitsachon" together with the number of the paragraph in the "Mitsachon" containing the refutation)

<u>Book</u>	<u>Chap. and Verse</u>	<u>Par.</u>	<u>Book</u>	<u>Chap. and Verse</u>	<u>Par.</u>
Genesis	1:1	4,5	Jeremiah	31:22	207
	1:26	6			
	2:17	8			
	11:7	16	Ezekiel	17:24	213
	18:1-2	23		18:4	214
	27:36	32		31:14-18	218
	48:14	45	Hosea	none	
	49:10	46			
Exodus	50:24	47	Joel	none	
	15:25	56	Amos	2:6	247
	24:1	24		5:2	248
Leviticus	none		Obadiah	none	
Numbers	20:11	116	Jonah	none	
	23:24	119			
	24:17	118	Micah	5:1-3	252
	31:17-18	122			
Deuteronomy	10:20	132	Nahum	1:11	256
	18:15	137	Habakkuk	3:13	258
	19:9	138			
			Zephaniah	3:8-9	259
Joshua	10:13	155	Haggai	2:9-14	260
Judges	none		Zechariah	9:9	262
Samuel	none			12:10	263
Kings	none		Malachi	3:1,22	264
Isaiah	6:3	128	Psalms	1	268
	7:14	225		2:1-7	269
	9:5-6	226		15	272
	11:1	227		16:1-3,9-11	273
	12:3	321		16:10	8
	30:33	230		22	275
	43:10	234		34:9	276
	52:13-53:12	236		45	277
	61:9	239		55:22b-24	278
	62:10-11	240		72	279
	66:17	242		78	281
				86	284
				87:5	285
				89:49	287
				92:8	288
				110	292
				137	179

Index #2 (continued)

<u>Book</u>	<u>Chapter and Verse</u>	<u>Paragraph</u>
Proverbs	30:1-4	310
Job	none	
Song of Songs	3:11	322
Ruth	none	
Lamentations	none	
Ecclesiastes	none	
Esther	none	
Daniel	3:25 7:13 8:15-27 9:24-27 10:1-12:12	328 329-330 331 332 331
Ezra	none	
Nehemiah	9:6	339
I Chronicles	none	
II Chronicles	15:3	343

(Note--In all the sections which have been listed above will be found refutations of Christian contentions although Lippmann does not always allude to the Christians by using the term P'JIN. He employs many other terms in speaking of them such as P'JIN, P'JIN, P'JIN (Par.21), P'JIN (Par.46,73), P'JIN (Par.239), P'JIN (Par.281), and P'JIN (Par.246,317). It is very evident, however, in every case that Lippmann is disproving a Christian interpretation of the verse in question.)