

TABLE OF CONTENTS

**AN ANALYSIS OF THE JÜDISCHER THERIAC
OF SOLOMON UFFENHAUSEN**

**A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the rabbinical degree by
Joseph Levenson**

March 1, 1939

Referee: Dr. Jacob Marcus

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	page
Introduction.....	1
An Analysis of the Book.....	7
1. Against Jesus and Magic.....	7
2. Against the Church - Its Personalities and Paraphernalia.....	18
3. Against the State and a word Concerning Deceit.....	29
4. Against Christians and Something of Jewish Doctors.....	36
5. Prayers Against Christians and Christianity...	47
6. Aggadot.....	56
7. The Trinity and Conclusion.....	59
Conclusion.....	61
Notes.....	63
Bibliography.....	66

I

INTRODUCTION

In the course of world history the attack upon the Jew has been two-fold. He has been subject to the horrors of physical violence and his religious principles have been held up to scorn and contempt. To the cruel pogroms, to the auto da fe--to these forms of physical eradication Israel has found no antidote in the long course of its history. The only answer given was submission. Rarely do we find in the annals of Jewish experience accounts of retaliation, violence returned for violence. The principle of non-resistance emphasized by Christianity in theory finds practical expression in Jewish life.

But this does not mean that the defensive efforts of the Jew have been nil. The attack upon Jewish ideas has not gone unanswered. From the earliest moment of Israel's life in a non-Jewish environment, it was found necessary to uphold Judaism when its opponents saw fit to slander. It was in Alexandria that the first Jewish apologists flourished. In this Egyptian city a profound Greek culture did not deem it too unseemly to attack what seemed to them an inferior culture. Whether it was because Jewish morality was reprehensible or because Jewish tradition remembered too bitterly an Egyptian slavery, the cry of these ancient anti-Semites found ready ears.¹

As a result we find in the period from the first century before the Common Era to the year 2 C. C. such works as the "Sibylline Books" and the "Wisdom of Solomon" expounding the advantages of Jewish virtue over heathen immorality. Philo, the great Jewish philosopher of the first century attempted to conciliate Hebrew prophetism with Greek thought. But perhaps more typical of apologetic literature was the famous work of Josephus, Contra Apion, where calumnies modern in nature are answered.

A struggle for ideological preservation followed in the next thirteen centuries. The Church and to a lesser degree Islam felt that the mother religion need no longer exist; its function would now be fulfilled by the more advanced offspring. In the tenth century Saadya in his Emunot v'Deot presented a justification for Judaism's persistence. With the rise of Christian political power, with the terror of the Crusades, Jewry found it increasingly necessary to rise to a more vigorous defense of its position, for now the very lives of a people were at stake. The list of literary warriors on the side of Jewish defense are numerous. We find in the galaxy of scholars and saints such brilliant luminaries as Moses ibn Tibbon, Hasdai Crescas and Profiat Duran.

And it is from the latter that Solomon Zvi Uffhausen (or Uffenhausen) derives his heritage. Written in the early seventeenth century Der Jüdischer Theriac is part of the great stream of Jewish polemical literature. The book like that of Solomon b. Reuben Bonfied was written in answer to a specific attack by an apostate.² Although it is not as illustrious as Troki's Hizzuk Emunah, we cannot say that it is less worthy in aim nor that it was less salutary in effect.

Both stemmed from the need for a defense of truth although the immediate result was not an alleviation of Jewish suffering.

Before we proceed with a detailed analysis of the Jüdischer Theriac (Zri Hayehudim), we must consider for a moment the work of the apostate Antonius Margarita, Troki's Strengthening of the Faith, and the immediate historical environment in which Uffenhausen wrote. Both of the above-mentioned works are referred to several times by the author, so that their influence cannot be underestimated. Margarita, Uffenhausen charges, proved a fruitful source for the mumar from Ittingen, while the Hizzuk Emunah proved of some help to Uffenhausen himself.³

Antonius Margarita flourished in Bavaria during the first half of the sixteenth century. Converted to Christianity at an early age he became professor of Hebrew at Augsburg and about the year 1530 he printed his slanderous attack on the Jews. His booklet proved invaluable to Luther who repeated the attacks on Jewish ceremonies, messianic beliefs, the alleged anti-Christian sentiments expressed in Jewish prayers, Jewish usury and the "ignorance" of Jewish physicians in his pamphlet Concerning the Jews and their Lies.⁴

Isaac b. Abraham Troki produced his monumental work in the last decade of the sixteenth century.⁵ A Karaite deriving his name from the Russian city of his birth, he was a keen student of Christian theology, and he engaged in many religious disputes with his non-Jewish neighbors. The results of these disputations were gathered in the Hizzuk Emunah, wherein he attempts to disprove the arguments of anti-Jewish writers and to show the superiority of Judaism. So important was his work, so widespread its influence that Voltaire

and other rationalists used it in their onslaughts on Christianity.

Der Jüdische Schlangenbalg appeared in 1614 from the pen of the convert Samuel Friedrich Vrenz. The term snake skin which Vrenz viciously applied to the Jewish religion in his title proved somewhat of a boomerang when Jews punned on the title, calling it גאָלד וואַסער, the idle patter of a snake.

The position of the Jew throughout Europe at the beginning of the seventeenth century was precarious.⁶ The poison of Luther had its devastating effects in Protestant Germany. The works of Troki and other Jewish apologists reflected the hostility of the environment. The few important Jewish communities in Germany were Worms, Prague, and Frankfort. Here the Jews were considered the property of the state, and in the Protestant city of Frankfort the Catholic restrictions against the Jews were more strictly enforced than anywhere else. The work of Vrenz appeared almost simultaneously with the Fettmilch riots in Frankfort. Whether there was any causal relationship between the publication of the convert's work in the month of Ab 1614 and the riots of the 27th of Ellul it is impossible to say, nevertheless both were clear indications of the attitude of the German environment, and the same spirit animated both acts.

In the introduction to his work Solomon Zevi describes how the blasphemous convert challenged him personally to refute the calumnies contained in the Schlangenbalg. "On Monday the seventh of Ab he rode past my door in full regalia and cursed me. Before a large crowd of Jews and Christians he confirmed the truth of the words which he had written ^{against} the Jews. But I answered his 'profanation

of the Name' with a 'sanctification of the Name' and declared him a liar. I swore that I would write a book against his lying words."7

Whereupon Solomon sent messengers to the pillars of Jewry in the various German cities and to Prague, but they cast the burden of labor upon his shoulders. It was indeed a difficult task for the author for he had a wife and six children to support. Nevertheless he remained undaunted. No sacrifice was too great for the cause of his people. If Abraham offered his son in the name of God, he too was willing to sacrifice his family for Jewry's sake.7 We are tempted to smile at the heroics of the author. But to him it was a great task. While his product was not a new revelation of truth, nor his presentation and method particularly novel, his work was an answer to a specific situation. There is something admirable in his courageous words in the face of the crisis and stress in which he lived.

In nine months the book was finished, printed in Hannau and titled the Jüdischer Theriac. The book was translated in Latin in 1680. It was printed in Amsterdam in 1737 under the title Sefer Nizahon. The title page proclaims it to be a healing and healthful book. It consequently bears the Hebrew title Zri Hayehudim, "balm for the Jews.

For obviously practical purposes the book was printed both in Yiddish and in German--in Yiddish that the Jew might know how to answer attacks, in German to reach the Christian populace. The author consequently considers this work as of greater importance than the writing of those who produce tomes of scholarship.

— The structure and method of presentation were dictated by the

structure and presentation of the Schlangenbalg. The apostate divided his book in seven chapters, says Uffenhausen, and I too have composed my book in seven chapters. My book follows faithfully his composition, each chapter beginning where his begins and ending where his ends. But the unlearned apostate has no logical order and coherence. He speaks of the same subject matter in various places. Each charge against the Jews, however, are answered as it appears in the Schlangenbalg. The author of the Theriac confesses that he purposely followed the disorder of the apostate. To inject some sort of order in his work, Uffenhausen has painstakingly numbered each paragraph of his book that it might serve the useful function of a manual for answering specific anti-Semitic charges. He has also added an index that each refutation may be easily found.

The author having properly introduced us to the structure and composition of the work which his position as a human and as a Jew urged him to write, now leads us into the pages of his literary product.

II

AN ANALYSIS OF THE BOOK

1. Against Jesus and Magic

In the first chapter of his anti-Jewish work Vrenz announces that he will deal with certain anti-Christian practices in which the Jews indulge, namely: blasphemy of God, magic, and garlic eating on Christmas eve.

Uffenhausen answers this charge by denying categorically that permission is given to Jews to mock or insult the Christian religion. On the contrary, Jewish leaders insist that Jews be obedient and honor the government under which they live. But this is dealt with in greater detail in a later chapter where a specific charge is answered.⁸

The apostate accuses the Jews of calling Jesus by the shameful name חֲסִידָא which he translates "hanged", having the scornful connotation of an executed criminal. With impeachable logic and scientific reference to Biblical passages, Uffenhausen has little trouble in demolishing the force of this charge. First of all the mumar⁹ has obviously mistranslated the Hebrew. חֲסִידָא means scarlet or worm as is obvious from the context of Lamentations 4.5. In Genesis 46.13¹⁰ the word חֲסִידָא is a good Hebrew name. If it were a shameful term the Hebrews would not have used it as a name.

It would be logical enough for the Jews to use the word חֲסִידָא which means hanged to refer to Jesus, which undoubtedly is the word the ignorant mumar had in mind. The word חֲסִידָא is not a shameful

term, the Christians themselves admitting that Jesus was crucified. וְשָׁמַר is not a shameful term used in referring to the execution of criminals. Furthermore many Jews have been hanged to make atonement for a group misdeed. For example, the seven innocent sons of Saul were hanged in order to allay the famine in the land.¹¹

Furthermore וְשָׁמַר does not always mean "hanged." In the phrase וְנִשְׁמַרְךָ אֶתְּנוּ the term means "hope". "Our eyes are turned hopefully unto you." In translating it thus Uffenhausen does not do violence to the text, but interprets the spirit of the phrase faithfully. In Hosea 11.7 וְנִשְׁמַרְךָ אֶתְּנוּ is translated by Uffenhausen so that the word וְשָׁמַר means doubt or suspense. "My people are doubtful about returning to me."¹² From this it is clear that logically and scientifically the charge that Jews refer to Jesus by the degrading name וְשָׁמַר is unfounded. It is possible that they might call him וְשָׁמַר, but that is not a scornful appellation.

The apostate also charges that the Jews call יֵשׁוּעַ נָצְרִי but נָצְרִי, i.e., the נ is left out of the name, which casts opprobrium upon Jesus. But Solomon Zvi says "I defy the most learned Hebrew scholars to find the insulting connotation in the term נָצְרִי."¹³ נָצְרִי is the name which all Christians call their God and נָצְרִי indicates the place of his nativity. Jesus of Nazareth. Were he from Jerusalem he would be called יֵשׁוּעַ הַיְרוּשָׁמִי, Jesus the Jerusalemite. Furthermore, by no stretch of the imagination can נָצְרִי be interpreted as a word meaning shame. It means watchman from the root meaning to guard. For example, וְנִשְׁמַרְךָ in Exodus 34.7 is translated "showing (watching)

kindness to the thousandth generation."

Mumar charges that Jews call Jesus בן זונה, "the son conceived by a menstruating harlot." That this is untrue is proved by a statement made by the apostate himself. Vrenz says in another section of his book¹⁴ that the Jews say that if Jesus does well no Jew will withhold his daughter from marrying him, indicating clearly that he was perfectly eligible to marry a Jewish girl, whereas Jewish law prohibits marriage with an illegitimate son. Therefore Jesus could not be thought of as such by Jews.¹⁵ Solomon Zvi buttresses his argument by referring to the Jewish dictum against slandering others as stated in Psalm 34 אל תשמוע קול רשע and by arguing that such calumny against Jesus would jeopardize Jewish lives. It is forbidden to put one's life in danger according to Genesis 9.5.¹⁶ Added injudiciousness in slandering Jesus is caused by the activity of numerous Jewish apostates who report secret calumny to the church.

The apostate goes on to say that one Jew insults another by calling him 'Jesus of Nazareth.' Uffenhausen denies that the Christianity divinity is used by Jews as a curse term. Only on occasions of profaning the Sabbath, one Jew may say to another, 'Oh, you're Jesus Christ himself.'¹⁷ In Luke 6.5, Mark 2.28, and in Matthew 12.8 Jesus calls himself as master of the Sabbath.¹⁸ One who has a remedy for every disease is also referred to as a Jesus of Nazareth.

An interesting charge made by the apostate which Uffenhausen categorically denies, contending that the burden of proof rests upon the accuser, is that in Jewish literature there are statements

that God promised Jesus relief from pain and suffering if he would announce in Rome that he was not the Messiah. With his customary contempt for the Mumar's untruth Solomon Zvi labels this as שגגה.¹⁹

Our apostate contends that there is a current Jewish proverb which refers to an early riser as one who has arisen before the Tola has bestirred himself. The anti-Christian implications of this statement are evident if we accept the term Tola as referring to Jesus.²⁰ And furthermore the word used in the proverb is not שחר but שוג, a species of bird. The 'early bird' maxim is used more by Christians than by Jews is Uffenhausen's further contention.²¹

Mumar refers to a secret Jewish book called שחר העליון which contains the story that the child Jesus playing during school hours tossed his ball on a roof. The teacher angrily called him שחר העליון. Whereupon Jesus went home and question his mother until she confessed the truth of this statement. Solomon Zvi wonders how the ignorant apostate who cannot read Hebrew knows of the existence of this mysterious book, which no one else knows about. Then Uffenhausen irrelevantly remarks that if every ball-player were called Mamzer ben Hanidah, there would be few legitimate children in France and Italy where ball playing is a popular pastime.

Returning to the subject the author states that were such a book to be found it would probably be an anti-Jewish forgery. Consequently he takes pains to prove that the Jesus mentioned in the Talmud and Jesus Christ are not identical.²²

Ten proofs are given:

1) Jesus in Talmud was taught by Joshua b. Prachya and Simeon

b. Shetach who lived about 137 B. C. E. But according to the Gospels Jesus was born during the days of Herod Antipas when Hillel and Shammai flourished, about 130 years after Joshua and Simeon. If Jesus of the Talmud and Jesus of Nazareth were the same, he would have been 120 years old when he appeared before Pontius Pilate. The Gospels say he was thirty-three. The conclusion that the two are different personalities is logical.

2) Sanhedrin 44a speaks of a Jesus who was stoned and then hanged on the charge of being a hizni d'm. Gospels relate that Jesus was crucified alive.

3) In the same passage it states that forty days before he was hanged it was announced in the market place that whoever has vindicating testimony let him bring it in behalf of the victim. The Gospels speak of Jesus being hanged suddenly on the morrow of his trial.

4) The passage also states that Jesus had five disciples; the Gospels speak of twelve.

5) The names of the disciples mentioned in the Talmud are:
Yehoshua, Yehonatan, Yehonatan, Yehonatan, Yehonatan. The disciples mentioned in the Gospels are: Peter, Paul, Luke, Mark, John, Judas, Matthew, James, Andrew, Philip and Thomas.

6) The Talmud states that the five disciples were tried simultaneously by a Jewish court in Jerusalem, while in the Gospels we find that the twelve were tried one by one by the Roman court.

7) Proof seven is an amplification of proof two. The Talmud Jesus was executed by stoning. Jesus Christ was condemned to be hanged alive by the Roman governor Pilate. Hanging was not one of the four methods of execution of the Jewish court. Furthermore,

the Jews during the time of Jesus were under Roman rule and the Romans alone had the power to pronounce death sentences. So it is clear that the Romans alone were responsible for the death of Jesus, since their method of execution was used and they alone had the power to enforce it. This perhaps is the most significant statement in Uffenhausen's entire book. For the oft-repeated cry of 'Christ-killer' more than anything else made life for the Jews of that period so precarious.

8) The Jesus mentioned in the Talmud was captured and tried in Lud according to the passage in Sanhedrin 67, while Jesus of Nazareth was captured and tried at Jerusalem.

9) The father of Jesus of Talmud was called Pappus; in the Gospels the betrothed of Mary was named Joseph.

10) Jesus in the Talmud, according to the Sota 47 passage, built a stone before the idol and worshipped it. Jesus of Nazareth served only the one God.

The next section of material deals largely with charges against Jewish superstition and magic. The apostate says that the cobwebs in the synagogue of the city of Worms are not swept away because Jews believe that God dwells in them. A ridiculous blasphemy which is disproved by such well-known Biblical statements as:

... כִּי הַמַּלְאָכִים הָאֵלֶּה הֵם הַמַּלְאָכִים הָאֵלֶּה

וְהַמַּלְאָכִים הָאֵלֶּה הֵם הַמַּלְאָכִים הָאֵלֶּה

Why the Jew of Worms do not sweep away the cob-webs, Solomon Zvi remarks sarcastically, they know better than I. But it certainly is not one of the thirteen principles of the Jewish faith that cob-webs must be swept away.

The mumar very glibly charges that Satan is the real father of the Jews because on the day following Yom Kippur the Jews pay homage to Satan. We pay homage to God and not to Satan, insists Uffenhausen. The apostate's purposeful or erroneous interpretation springs from an old tradition that one's fate is not completely sealed on Yom Kippur and therefore one must be overly careful of Satan because he is the prosecuting attorney who lays one's sins before God. Just as a convalescent person must be more careful of unhealthful influences than a well person, so must the sinful Jew be wary of Satan on the day after Yom Kippur.

The mumar charges that the Kabbalah deals with necromancy and black magic and demons. Not so, says Uffenhausen. The Kabbalah deals with עשרת הדיברות, holy objects, as is explained by the Christian devotees of Kabbalah--Reuchlin, Pica de Mirandola among others. Magic is forbidden by legal injunctions of Exodus 22.7; Deut. 18 and condemned by prophetic utterances. The use of the names of the holy creatures is permitted by the Talmud as stated in Sanhedrin 67 where a distinction is made between Kabbalah and magic.

Uffenhausen deems ridiculous the accusation that Jews conjure up the Queen of Sheba and a coterie of women with whom they dance and make merry and cause to disappear again when their pleasure is done. "I have never seen such a thing," says Solomon Zvi. If such people do exist, he continues sarcastically, their act is certainly not in accordance with Jewish law. The majority of Jews are not interested in such activity. It is clear that the author of the Theriac while not entirely free from the shackles of supernaturalism

is contemptuous of the mumar's belief in magic and superstition.

Friedrich Vrenz accuses Jews of making a "chomer golam", a man made of loam who through magic oaths is given the breath of life. The translation of this term in German is an "ausgezimert Esel", an ass in every sense of the word. Solomon Uffenhausen claims that while he has never seen such a creature, it may have been created in Talmudic times by means of the Sefer Hay'zirah written by Abraham as is disclosed in Sanhedrin 67. Furthermore, the Essenes, writes Josephus, were capable of foretelling the future through ascetic practices. Today, however, the ways of the Kabbalah are hidden from German Jews. The only "golamin" we have, remarks Uffenhausen, are born in a natural way.

Another interesting magic rite charged against Jews is the following: An apple on which a devil's name has been written, is placed in the hand of a dead person. When the apple rots, the person against whom the curse is inveighed dies. By this time Solomon is quite impatient with the exasperating lies of the mumar. "I have already stated," he says, "that Jewish law forbids magic, especially when it is used to kill. Jewish law commands hara'ah thou shalt not murder." If the argument is raised that cases of magical manipulation of the dead is found in Jewish experience, e.g., Saul and the conjuring up of the ghost of Samuel, it can be said that there is tacit consent to such practice if no social harm is inflicted. This case too has extenuating circumstances. While Saul had already shown his sane attitude toward witchcraft by abolishing it, he resorted to it in this case out of despair.

Jews also employ magic rites against Christian women in

childbirth. The mumar accuses "in his book of lies" that Jews at the home of a Christian woman about to give birth take a Malschloss, write a devil's name on it, toss it in a well. Whereupon the mother and child become ill, thin, and oft-times die.

In defense of this charge the evidence shows that such work is magical and the Jewish law provides that a magician be burned.²³ Jewish women are requested to minister to Christians as mid-wives because they are trusted. Uffenhausen injects a note of extreme bitterness and hatred against Friedrich Vrenz. Since he knows so much about magic, perhaps he practiced it himself. Can it be that his evil character was so quickly washed away by the waters of baptism?²⁴

Under the same theme of childbirth and magic the anti-Semite brings up the ancient blood libel. When a Jewess has particularly hard labor pains, the Rabbi writes a secret message on a parchment and places it on her hand and mouth. The ink used, says Schlangenbalg, is the blood of a Christian child.

Solomon Zvi answers that many Christian women serve as midwives for Jews. When difficulties arise, the scroll of the law is taken out, prayers recited, charity vowed, and the magic formula placed on the hand and mouth of the woman is Psalm 19 or a verse from the Pentateuch. The same thing is done for a Christian woman in childbirth if she so desires. The Christian midwives of Frankfort, Prague and Worms have often witnessed these rites. And never has the accusation been made by these women which the mumar makes, nor have other baptised Jews written or spoken such calumny. In fact, the pope, kings, and princes have defended Jews against the false

blood accusation.

With his customary disregard for order the magic theme is dropped and the next anti-Jewish statement deals with the Jewish betrayal and deception of Christians, which, he says, is not really considered sinful by Jews. That this is a lie is easily proved by Uffenhausen through the citation of Jewish law codes. Chapters 2 and 152 of Shema Nishma, Shema Nishma of Maimonides, and Chapter 359 of Shema Nishma contain specific injunctions against false dealing with Christians. The ten commandments are also cited.

The mumar writes that there is a Talmudic statement (without giving the masechta and page) "that he who guards his tongue and mouth before the uncircumcised merits a place in the world to come." He interprets the passage to refer to a person who is careful how he speaks in the presence of stupid Christians who know not God.²⁵

There is no such Talmudic passage. He has reference to a verse in Proverbs (21.23).²⁶ No reference is here made to Jew or Christian. It is obvious that the Biblical passage is a general statement warning against indiscreet talk.

The mumar charges that when Jews are scored because their ancestors caused Jesus' downfall, they answer, 'So much murder and death in this world has been forgotten, would that his death be forgotten.' This, Uffenhausen replies, the Jews cannot be blamed for. Jesus himself, as mentioned in the opening of the first chapter, prayed for the welfare of the Jews.

Another charge against the Jews is that they dishonor Jesus by eating garlic on Christmas eve; nor do Jews study Torah on that night, but eat, drink, and make merry.

That Jews eat garlic is true. They do it as a memorial of suffering in Egypt.²⁷ It is eaten on Christmas eve because the odor of garlic is unpleasant to the Germans. And since the holiday is celebrated for several days and therefore Jews do not have business dealings with them, there will be sufficient time for the smell to wear off.

Secondly, the Talmud (Baba Kama 82a) declares it to be healthful. The reasons that Jews eat garlic is stated in the "Juden-Schul" by John Buckstorf. The apostate evidently does not know that garlic eating is popular among princes, lords, and common people.

That Jews make merry because it is Christmas is untrue. The birth of Jesus which caused so much Jewish suffering is really a day of mourning for Jews. But it happens oft-times that the date of Chanukah coincides with Christmas, and Chanukah is a season of joy for the Jews.

And with these words Schlangenbalg and the Theriac end the first chapter: "Genug von dem ersten Capitel."

. . . .

2. Against the Church - Its Personalities and Paraphernalia

deny the accusation but goes on to prove very convincingly that אבירא does not mean unclean.

The charge that Jews call Lutheran or Evangelical preachers אבירא נאכר he answers effectively and straightforwardly. The translation by Schlangenbalg of the above mongrel Hebrew is 'unclean, false teachers.' Uffenhausen correctly points out that the Hebrew is abominable. To meet the translation, it should have been אבירא נאכר אבירא which is grammatically correct. He then goes on to say, "I swear by God that I have never heard Lutheran preachers called such names. They are always known as Lutheran gallachim."

The Pope, the mumar says, is called Biffior by the Jews, a term of contempt. But Uffenhausen gives two etymologies for the name, German and Hebrew, both of which indicate that it is a term of high honor as mentioned in the Chanukah prayer.²⁹ The first theory is that the name came from the Latin papi which the Christians call the אבירא, chief priest, while the אבירא (er) ending is German to indicate occupation he practiced or town he came from, e.g., Spanior is a person from Spain, Gascoyner, a person from Gascoyne, etc. The Hebrew אבירא comes from א meaning mouth and אבירא meaning to teach. The א and ב both being pataf letters are easily interchanged and we have אבירא one whose mouth teaches--indeed an honorable title.

A Cardinal is called Cardolfon. To this Uffenhausen replies, "I have never heard of such a term and doubt if the mumar ever did. Cardinals are called אבירא by which name the Maccabbeean priests were known.³⁰ And naturally enough the Jews sometimes call a Cardinal, cardinal.

A bishop is called a Hegmon, an insulting name. But it really is a term of honor and distinction found in many prayers, a term which the Roman censors did not see fit to cross out. It is a Greek word meaning leader or chief. Uffenhausen makes the spurious analogy with the Hebrew Manhig. Rashi, he says, translates the words מנהיגים in Isaiah 9.13 with the words פ' מנהיגים פ' מנהיגים 'princes and leaders'.

The ~~Thumherrn~~ ^{Domherrn} are called פ' מנהיגים פ' מנהיגים, unclean princes, the reference being to archbishops. This, however, is untrue. Again Jews call ~~Thumherrn~~ ^{Doh} by the name ~~Thumherrn~~ ^{Doh}.

And so it goes with the entire hierarchy of priests. The mumar accuses the Jews of giving false or descriptive terms to various priests, abbots and abbesses, while Uffenhausen points out the falsehood or disproves that the descriptive term is intended for dishonor by an etymological analysis of the word. One more example of this will suffice. It is charged that the word אב for abbot and the word אבס for abbess are used by the Jews in slanderous fashion. But according to the Targum these words merely refer to one who is shut up in his or her cloister.³¹

And this type of reasoning and etymological proof is carried on to a tiresome degree with reference to charges of calumny against school teachers and minor civil officials. Apparently the apostate became so inflamed in his tirade that he strayed from his religious accusations, indicating that anti-Semitism was not based on purely religious grounds as it nobly professed to be.

Returning to the religious theme, mumar says Jews call Catholicism the old evil religion and Lutheranism the new evil religion. The author of the Theriac answers very indignantly

that no honest man can say that the word 'evil' is used by a Jew in describing Christianity.

The Calvinists are called minim which means heretics. Not true, says Uffenhausen. The blessing which deals with the heretics originated at the time of Ezra. History relates that a man called mani believed in the two powers, good and evil. Those who followed his belief were called minim. That the Calvinists are not minim is evident even to the most poorly informed who know that they believe in one God. Furthermore, the word minim was applicable to a certain group and used in the time of Ezra before Calvinists existed on this earth. A Christian is therefore not considered a heretic by a Jew.

Latin, the language of Christianity is called לשון קדש by Jews. It is untrue that we call it an unclean tongue, says Solomon Zvi, because Latin is really dear to us. Rashi wrote Latin, and it was considered a choice language used by royalty. In Jewish literature it is called the Roman language and was studied by the men of the Sanhedrin and Jewish scholars including the great Maimonides. Jewish prayers are translated into Latin. Interpreting the verse in Deuteronomy (27.8) our sages say that the Torah was given in every language (including Latin). Hebrew, of course, is considered the holy language because it is spoken by God and the angels and is the original language of the Torah. All other languages are called לשון or non-holy. The stupid apostate, Uffenhausen argues, must have heard Latin called לשון קדש. In Italy Latin is used in the church and is therefore called לשון קדש, the language of the church. The apostate confused domo with לשון קדש.

Zechariaiah the verse וְיִשְׂרָאֵל מִמֶּנּוּ בְּיָמָיו is rendered by the Targum as וְיִשְׂרָאֵל מִמֶּנּוּ בְּיָמָיו כְּנוֹכְרָאֵין. The word מִמֶּנּוּ is applied to Israel and is translated to mean a foreign nation, indicating that it is possible to interchange the one for the other unknowing and easily enough when one has a purpose in view.

Hearing church bells for morning and evening prayers, Jews say, there ring the גְּרִינֵה תוֹרָה bells. It has already been proved that גְּרִינֵה is not a dishonorable term and גְּרִינֵה does not mean unclean. How can such a term as גְּרִינֵה be used in connection with bells. And why does the mumar say Jews refer scornfully only to the morning and evening bells. Church bells sound also for the Friday noon mass. This is a false charge.

It is also stated that a chalice is called כֶּלֶךְ, dog. How can a beaker be referred to as a dog even as a slanderous term. Undoubtedly the apostate confuses it with the Hebrew for 'his vessels' כֶּלֶי. Uffenhausen also indicates a false analogy between the Hebrew כֶּלֶךְ and the German kelch.

The apostate says that the Jews call the Messgewand, the priest's robe גְּדֵמָה אֲדָמָה which means garment of death, shroud. The scoundrel uses the coincidence of pronunciation to make a false accusation. Certainly the Jews use the word Messgewand to refer to the priest's robe. Unfortunately such a false interpretation can be made because the word mess and the Hebrew אֲדָמָה are pronounced the same. Instances of cross language homonyms are numerous. The German kalt means cold or fresh. In Italian calit means warm.

The accusation is made that Jews call holy water פִּיקֶנֶץ מֵיִן,

unclean water. No opprobrium is inferred by such an appellation. In Numbers 19 it is found that waters of purification are called PIKNE PIN or פיקנין, i.e., water for the unclean one. In Matthew 8, Luke 5, and Mark 1 Jesus commands lepers and all those unclean of soul to go to the priest who would purify them with the sprinkling of such water.

The mumar says that every Saturday Jews pray for those who would put an end to baptism. The apostate is referring to the prayer for those who would put an end to shmad. And shmad does not mean baptism, which is proved by reference to the phrase שִׁמְדָּא וְהָרָגָא³³. It means murder or destruction. A prayer for the end of needless murder and pillage is certainly not amiss.

To the charge that a baptised Jew is ostracized and odium cast on his family by his ex co-religionists, Uffenhausen readily confesses guilt. And here he makes what can hardly be considered a subtle thrust at Friedrich Vrenz by saying this is due to the evil lies which he writes and speaks of his former fellows and the added enmity and hatred he causes to be aroused against them. Perhaps the apostate author of Schlangenbalg was referring to personal experience when he made this charge.

The Jews are also charged with slandering the church consecration service (Kirchweih) with the word Kirdal. But Uffenhausen confesses that the word is completely out of his vocabulary.

Schlangenbalg claims that in calling an apostate meshumad Jews insult Christianity inasmuch as it means one destroyed from the world.³⁴ Uffenhausen at this point contends that meshumad

does not mean "destroyed" but "estranged."³⁵ Maimonides commenting on the verse וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה אִישׁ אֶת אֱלֹהֵי אֲבוֹתָיו וְלֹא אֶת אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל (Ex. 12.43) says a Jew or Gentile who changes his belief is called a meshumad. Targum translates Genesis 42.4 וַיִּבְלֶה יוֹסֵף בְּעֵינָיו Joseph pretended to be a stranger to his brothers by using the word יִזְרַחְלֵהוּ for estranged. A Christian is not called a meshumad by Jews since he does not estrange himself from his people nor did his ancestors promise to uphold the Torah. But an apostate who is obligated to the guarding of the Torah is called an estranged one, meshumad. From this it is clear, concludes Uffenhausen, that the use of meshumad does not scorn Christianity.

Antonius Margarita of Regensburg calls himself meshumat, one freed from the heavy law. But most apostates call themselves mumarim, "those who changed" religions.

The last supper, says the mumar, is alluded to by Jews in the most derogatory terms, and in referring to communion they say that Christians have eaten the לֶחֶם and יַיִן. The latter Hebrew expression makes no sense, says Uffenhausen, while the discussion of לֶחֶם has been detailed in Chapter one and referred to a number of times. The mumar charges, however, that we call the meal לֶחֶם דְּאִימָה or לֶחֶם דְּבִיבָה. Uffenhausen answers this argument with an ancient contention that Matthew, Mark, and Luke spoke of the bread and wine as Jesus' body and blood, the Hebrew for bread being לֶחֶם and for blood דָּם. The mumar's accusation again in this case rests upon a falsification of the Hebrew.

The apostate goes on to say that Jews passing a cross spit on it and call it נצח נצח. Uffenhausen claims that it is wholly untrue because Jews know that Christians do not regard the cross as a God, but look upon it only as a memorial of the life of Christ. He then gives eleven proofs that goyim mentioned in the Talmud as idol-worshippers are not identical with Christians. This is necessary because in these times Jews call Christians goyim. By way of introduction it is well to note that when the Talmud was being composed in Babylonia Christianity was not common.

1) In Abodah Zorah there is a statement that for three days before their holiday one must not do business with goyim. With Christians today we do business before and after a holiday, and if necessary even on the holiday itself.

2) Jews are not permitted to sell cattle to goyim. To Christians Jews do sell cattle.

3) The Talmud prohibits the selling of weapons to goyim, because they may be used for murder and the seller becomes a partner in crime. To Christians weapons are sold because they are used to punish murder and to mete out justice.

4) The Talmud prohibits Jews to put cattle in stalls of goyim for fear they will commit sexual perversion. Jews do put cattle in stalls of Christians without such apprehensions.

5) It is prohibited to walk alone with a goy in a field. If a Jew wishes security today he takes along a Christian when strolling through a field.

6) One must not use a physician who is a goy. Jews today use Christian physicians constantly.

The apostate goes on to say that Jews passing a cross spit on it and call it עץ ערל. Uffenhausen claims that it is wholly untrue because Jews know that Christians do not regard the cross as a God, but look upon it only as a memorial of the life of Christ. He then gives eleven proofs that goyim mentioned in the Talmud as idol-worshippers are not identical with Christians. This is necessary because in these times Jews call Christians goyim. By way of introduction it is well to note that when the Talmud was being composed in Babylonia Christianity was not common.

1) In Abodah Zorah there is a statement that for three days before their holiday one must not do business with goyim. With Christians today we do business before and after a holiday, and if necessary even on the holiday itself.

2) Jews are not permitted to sell cattle to goyim. To Christians Jews do sell cattle.

3) The Talmud prohibits the selling of weapons to goyim, because they may be used for murder and the seller becomes a partner in crime. To Christians weapons are sold because they are used to punish murder and to mete out justice.

4) The Talmud prohibits Jews to put cattle in stalls of goyim for fear they will commit sexual perversion. Jews do put cattle in stalls of Christians without such apprehensions.

5) It is prohibited to walk alone with a goy in a field. If a Jew wishes security today he takes along a Christian when strolling through a field.

6) One must not use a physician who is a goy. Jews today use Christian physicians constantly.

7) A Jew may not use a barber who is a goy, lest he cut his throat. In Germany, Poland, and other places Christian barbers are used exclusively.

8) Jews are also prohibited to buy or sell wine to goyim, but with Christians such commerce is permissible.

9) Selling of idols is prohibited, but crosses and pictures of Jesus may be sold to Christians.

10) The church of a goy should not be honored nor receive contributions from Jews. But Christian churches are honored as spiritual domiciles and receive Jewish financial contributions.

11) In Sanhedrin 63 there is a prohibition against accepting oaths of idolators, but Christian oaths sworn in the name of God are accepted.

From the above it is clear that the word goyim in the Talmud refers to heathens only. The term goy really means nation. Christians are called thus because they are of no specific nation, but of all nations. Jewish literature uses the word goy even when speaking of the Jewish nation. Note the number of times the Jew is referred to as a גוי or גוי.

The Schlangenbalg states that seeing a cross on the road formed by straws or sticks, the Jew obliterates it and spits on the spot. This is strictly forbidden by the general prohibition against insulting and taking revenge. Furthermore, it is a violation of the prohibition in Genesis 5 against jeopardizing one's life which such an act would involve if it were discovered. If the mumar indulged in such practices as a Jew, it only goes to show that his ignorance is not a recent acquisition.

The mumar also says that a Jew passing a Christian churchyard says, "May their prayers not be heard for thirty days." That this is false is evident from the following: Taanit 16b states that one should go to grave yards to say the prayer for rain. If there is no Jewish cemetery in the town one may even go to one owned by goyim. Jews today in a town where there are no Jewish cemeteries go to the burial grounds for Christians for their pre-Rosh Hashanah and pre-Yom Kippur invocations. Mumar's charge that Jewish imprecations against prayers recited on Christian church yards is ridiculous because Jews themselves pray there and they certainly would not invoke self condemnation.

The mumar wishing to describe Jewish calumny against swearing by sacrament uses the Hebrew לנצות. Again Uffenhausen calls attention to his ignorance. The correct Hebrew is לנצות. The words לנצות means "sent blood", which is not a shameful label.

Jewish law advises that God be praised when a Christian church is torn down or destroyed says the Schlangenberg. The Talmud in making this provision speaks of בית עבודה זרה 'the house of idolatry.' No such mention is made of a Christian church which Jews do not consider idolatrous.

....

3. Against the State and a word Concerning Deceit.

The third chapter of the Theriac answers the charges of Jewish hatred of the Christian state. Schlangenbalg begins with the general accusation that outwardly Jews profess obedience to the secular government, but curse it secretly. No proof is given. The fact that he is an ex-Jew is sufficient testimony that his knowledge is accurate and his statements true.

Uffenhausen, however, indignantly remarks that 'this is an outright lie. We are obedient and loyal to the king of the realm.' He who curses the king acts contrary to God's will because government is considered the servant of God. In Jeremiah 43.10 God speaks of Nebuchadnezzar 'my servant'. If a heathen king is considered a servant of God, how much more honorable is a God fearing Christian ruler in Jewish eyes.

To clinch the argument Uffenhausen marshals a series of quotations from Jewish literature, polemical and otherwise, in which Jews are urged to honor and pray for the welfare of the government ~~under~~ which they dwell. They are listed as follows:

- 1) Jeremiah 29.7 "Seek the welfare of the city....."
- 2) Pirke Aboth 3.2. "...Pray for the welfare of the government. If man did not fear it, one would swallow up his neighbor."
- 3) Midrash Rabba commenting on Canticles 2.1 says that one of the oaths with which God adjured Israel was that they should not rebel against the government.
- 4) Referring to page 33 of an undesignated Yalkut the comment

on an undesignated verse in Kings says "God commanded that the government be shown respect even if it be as despotic as that of Pharaoh or Ahab.

5) Proverbs 24.21 says, "Honor the Lord and the king."

6) The Zohar and other sources inform us that the Torah commands us to offer seventy bullocks at Jerusalem, one for each of the seventy nations.

7) Chapter 8 of Josephus' Contra Apion has a statement in which it is proved from Exodus 22.27 that other nations should not be cursed.

8) Chapter one of the book of Baruch informs us that the Jews of Babylonia sent money to Jerusalem for sacrifices to be offered for the health of Nebuchadnezzar and his son Belthasar.

9) Ezra 6.10 tells the story of Darius who commanded that money be given Jews for the building of the temple and for sacrifices "that they may offer sacrifices of sweet savour unto the God of heaven and pray for the life of the king and his sons."

10) Simeon the Just makes the statement to Alexander that the temple is the spot "where prayers for you and your kingdom are made daily." (Megilat Taanit Chapter 9)

11) Maccabees I chapter 7 mentions sacrifices offered up for the king on Mount Zion.

Then come a series of statements from Josephus which add to the argument that kings were prayed for in the temple, Caesar Augustus and Marc Antony being among those so honored.

Uffenhausen concludes his defense with the following summary:
"I can bring many similar proofs that while the temple stood and

we had our own government we prayed for the welfare of other nations. Now that we are in exile be it far from us to think evil of our neighbors with whom we dwell in security. Every Saturday Jews in all lands pray for the peace of the nation wherein they dwell, not deceitfully, as the mumar charges, but honestly and whole-heartedly.³⁶

Further specific charges of government cursing can now be categorically denied by Solomon Zvi. For example, he says that Jews do not refer to the government as הממשלה, a wanton kingdom. Nor is it true that Jews call the council פ'צה"ל meaning "may they be broken up." The mumar confuses it with the Hebrew word for councillors פ'צח"ל.

The Jews are accused of cursing Christians with the curse of שחיתות, an evil disease. We have already seen that Jews may curse no one. It is true that Jews use the curse among themselves in moments of anger, but never against Christians who do them no harm.

The mumar says Jews call the mayor or Burgomeister הראש meaning head of ignorant stupid ones. Not only is this untrue, but it shows the apostate's deficient knowledge of the Hebrew language. He wants to use the word ראש and not הראש. But in actuality the Hebrew for Burgomeister is הראש, head of the city, as an investigation of Hebrew literature proves.

The apostate states that the fact that Jews call priests gallachim, bald-headed or shaven, is slanderous, because the name originates from a story which Jews circulate concerning Jesus. By means of the magic use of the Divine name stolen from the

temple and sewn in his shinbone Jesus was able to fly. Whereupon the rabbis use the Divine name in similar fashion and cause another Jew to fly above him and to contaminate him by urination. The magic power of Jesus fails through the resulting uncleanness. He falls into a corner and is pulled out by his hair leaving a bald spot. There ^{for} all priests are called gallachim, bald.

The Theriac says that no such story was ever heard or written. Priests are called 'bald' because of the injunction in Numbers 8.

To the accusation that Jews break oaths and promises that they make, Solomon Zvi answers with the story of Rahab the harlot who was permitted to remain alive because of the promise that the spies made as individuals and not as representatives of the nation, even though she was destined for death. Then there is the story of Joshua who kept his covenant with the Gibeonites despite their deceit (Joshua 9), and when Saul broke the oath with the Gibeonites there was hunger in the land for three years it is related in 2 Sam. 21.

In continuing his accusation that Jews swear falsely, the apostate brings up the old 'Kol Nidre' charge, which Uffenhausen says is laughable in its misinterpretation. The Kol Nidre does not refer to the oaths Jews make to Christians or the oaths Jews make among themselves. It refers to the oaths which one makes for himself. For example, if a Jew wishes to be released from the oath he made to fast he recites his intention in the presence of one expert or three common men or by recitation of Kol Nidre on Yom Kippur. But under no circumstances can anyone use the Kol Nidre as an excuse for false swearing to his fellowman.

Commenting on a passage in Nedorim 21, Tosefeth writes that one may not swear falsely even to a goy. How much less, then, can we commit this sin against a God-fearing Christian. The commandment, "Thou shalt not swear falsely", makes no distinction of nationality.

The apostate goes into a long harrangue on the evils of usury as practiced by the Jews. Solomon Zvi answers that the fact that we are permitted to practice usury does not add to our welfare. It would be far better, he contends, for Jews to be permitted to work in the forest and field and be forbidden to usury. "We Jews must hope that farmers will be kind enough to sell us food, whereas lending money brings enmity and hatred against us leading to exile and misfortune. Money is easily stolen, but a field can never be carried away." He also points out that in lending money the Jew is not always sure of repayment, adding to the disadvantages of this method of livelihood.

The strength of Uffenhausen's defense against the charge that Jews bribe government officials is questionable. But this may be due to the fact that much money was given to princes and kings in order to insure the safety of the Jew as much as possible. At any rate, the burden of his argument is as follows: The apostate charges us with bribing the government and saying לֵב קָשֶׁה הוּא which he translates, "it is a hard heart which silver and gold cannot soften." Solomon Zvi points out that the mumar's translation cannot be fitted into the Hebrew.³⁷

A serious accusation of a moral nature is made against the Jews immediately thereafter. The apostate charges the Jews with

low moral practices where money is concerned, even going to the extent of practicing adultery. He tells a story which he claims to be Talmudic of the poor man with a pretty wife who was offered a large sum by a goy who wished to possess her. The poor man went to the authorities who gave him a provisional divorce. Having obtained the money, he remarried her. This story, Uffenhausen says, is nowhere to be found and is merely a fabrication of the apostate. That the Jew have always valued highly the honor of their women is an historical axiom. In Genesis 34 we read the story of Shechem who was plundered by the sons of Jacob because their sister Dinah was defiled. Deuteronomy 23 and 24 contain numerous injunctions against harlotry. Mention need only be made of the ten commandments which contain the charge against committing adultery. Deuteronomy 24 forbids remarriage after divorce. The scholars of the Talmud do not permit what the Torah forbids. In fact, they are more stringent, which is further proof of the apostate's fabrication.

The apostate accuses the Jews of selling hindquarter meat which they do not eat to Christians, spitting on it and inveighing the curse of sam hamaves (poisonous death) upon it. Solomon brings concrete proof that this is a falsehood. In Rome, Prague, Cracow and other cities where thousands of Jews live and are permitted to butcher and sell meat, princes and noblemen buy from them. There have been many baptised Jews from these localities who have never mentioned this calumny. Furthermore, it is legally forbidden to curse God's gifts and to spit on food.

The mumar continues his charges by saying that Jews sell

dead cattle to Christians claiming to be חמור improperly slaughtered. Here the apostate contradicts himself for he had previously contended that trefah meant unclean.³⁸ Certainly a goy would not buy admittedly unclean meat from a Jew. No good Jew practices such deception, for the Talmud prohibits this even though the apostate insists that the contrary is the case.³⁹ The Shulchan Aruch, the official legal Jewish code, forbids the selling of dead cattle to a non-Jew.⁴⁰

The apostate also accuses the Jews of murder, saying that there are times when murder is permitted. This is an outrageous lie. The ten commandments specifically enjoin against killing, and no distinction is made in this categorical injunction between Christian, Turk, Tartar, or Jew. Mumar goes on to say that in Poland and Bohemia Jews kill baptised Jews and others who report to Christians the so-called evil activities of the synagogue dam mutar, permitted blood-shed. Solomon Zvi says he has never heard this shameful lie.

The apostate ends chapter three of his work with the ridiculous statement that if proof is desired that Jews curse church officials and church paraphernalia as has been charged, let one inquire of an innocent Jewish child, what is a church bell called? etc., and he will answer. Ridiculous, says Uffenhausen. If the child doesn't know the meaning of the Hebrew words, how can he reply. It seems that both the apostate and the Theriac end this chapter on a weak note.

. . . .

The apostate says that the Christian has no greater enemy than the Jew, for the Jew acts opposite of Christian law and custom, saying לפי דרכיהם "this is the law of the goyim." Uffenhausen threatens to bring Jewish literature to prove the contrary. His first witness comes from the eighth verse of the twenty-third chapter of Deuteronomy, לֹא תִשְׂקַח אֶת-עֵמֶק מִצְרָיִם, "do not abhor an Egyptian." The argument is that if Jews were forbidden to revenge themselves upon the Egyptian taskmasters when the opportunity was offered during their nationhood, how would Jewish law and practice sanction the vilification of Christians who protect and shield Jews? Proverbs 17.13 counsels against the return of evil for good. Sefer Hasidim enjoins a Jew to give honest business references to a Christian. Kiddushin 70 says קוּם לְפָנֵי זֶקֶן "rise before an aged person". The Talmud refers not only to a venerable Jew, but to a heathen as well. And if before a heathen one must rise, says Uffenhausen, certainly the command is applicable to a God-fearing Christian. The injunction in Leviticus 18 not to follow the abominations of the goyim refers to the idol worshippers in the land of Canaan. In Shabat 67 the Talmud interprets the phrase לפי דרכיהם as meaning the heathen magical

practices which the Christians abstain from also. No ban, however, is placed by the Torah against the performance of the fine deeds which Christians practice.

The mumar charges that the Jewish eulogy for a newly-dead Christian is נפשו כנפשו (he died like a dog). The mumar's charge is based upon the translation of the word כלב as 'dog'. But the Jew prays daily שמואל וישראל ויהודה וירושלם. And if כלב meant 'dog', the prayer would be for the resurrection of dogs. The real meaning of כלב is 'dead body' as is clearly seen from Ezekiel 43.6 and Amos 8.

In using the word נפשו the apostate the Jew of saying that the Christian serves as atonement for his sins. This, Solomon Zvi, tells us, is false. A Jew may say that of his Jewish enemy who has died, but he is forbidden to utter anything but honorable things of his Christian neighbor who has done him no harm.

The mumar writes that Jews say of dead Christians נפשו כנפשו אשר נפשו, which is a lie as well as a perversion of the verse in Proverbs 10 אשר נפשו כנפשו ויהיה נפשו כנפשו. This does not speak of Christians but of evil people in general. At the time the Proverbs verse was written there were no Christians in this world. Furthermore, the Talmud speaks of three categories which do not go to Gehinom after death and one of them is a government which promotes justices, and Christian princes certainly do that.

Maimonides writes in the Moreh Nebuchim that God-fearing nations have a place in the world to come. Uffenhausen makes the blanket statement that many other Jewish scholars and scribe make

a similar assumption in their treatment of immortality.

Do Jews say of a Christian who has died "may his soul rest in Gehinom?" No, says Uffenhausen. A Jew may apply the imprecation against his Jewish enemy, which is shameful and improper in itself. Such statements are never made against innocent Christians. In fact, Jews pray for good Christians asking that their souls "may rest in peace."⁴¹

The mumar then goes on to list a series of curses which he accuses Jews of uttering against Christians.⁴² Uffenhausen finds it too tedious as does the reader to answer each one separately. His general refutation, however, is quite good. He first refers to the principle of 'dina d'malchusa dina'. This obligation, he says, is even stronger than the law of an Israelitish king. A Jew who observes it does not evade taxation. There is also a principle established in the Talmud לפיכך אין אדם נשבע ביהודה (it is forbidden to injure a heathen). From this he makes his usual application to a Christian. So when the apostate says that Jewish law permits evil acts or cursing against heathens or Christians, he is falsifying. The verse in Leviticus 19 "do not curse a deaf one" is interpreted as meaning: curse no one, Jew or Christian, in a language he doesn't understand. Psalm 12.5 predicts a woeful end for one who deceives by smooth talk. Jewish law also councils cheerful greeting of all persons, Jew or Christian.⁴³ There is a story in Berachoth 17 that no man ever greeted Rabban Yochanan ben Zakkai first.

The apostate feels that Christians are slighted when Jews call their graves unclean. But he really need take no offense,

Uffenhausen advises, for all graves, even the cave in which Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are buried, are considered unclean. In Numbers 19 priests are specifically forbidden to contaminate themselves by appearing at a cemetery.

Jews call Christians פ'סר, which the apostate says means stupid ones who know not God. This is untrue, It is clear that the word means uncircumcised, as it is translated by Martin Luther and other Christian commentators. When Scripture speaks of evil creatures the term used is א'פסר (uncircumcised of heart).⁴⁴ An uncircumcised Jew is also called פסר.

Jews refer to a Christian child as a ג'פל (abomination). This is not true. Christian boys are not discriminated against in such a manner. Jewish boys who are 'bums' and do not study are also called פ'גפל (abominations). The term is used to describe a loafer and ne'er-do-well.

Jews are charged with not giving alms to Christians; and when they do contribute it is done begrudgingly or for self-glorification. In answer to this Uffenhausen quotes from Baba Batra 9, the Yoreh Deah, the Hilkot Zedaka of Maimonides, and from Hulin 71 which enjoin Jews to feed the poor of the goyim as well as the poor of the Jews.⁴⁵

Friedrich Vrenz says that no Jew leaves a Christian home without stealing a piece of wood or straw in order to remove his good luck, which brands him as a thief and as a Christian enemy. Uffenhausen replies quite logically that only a thief steals whether he be Jew or Christian. An honest Jew does not steal from a Christian. As for the luck--that is known as magic

practice and it has already been proved that it is forbidden.⁴⁶ But in the very next sentence Uffenhausen weakens his argument and incidentally reveals his true inner feelings when he says that in taking straw or a stick from a Christian house how do we know that a Christian's good fortune is removed with it. Perhaps his misfortune is taken away. This however, does not deter him from refuting the mumar's next accusation with a similar argument. When the apostate says that the Talmud teaches how to remove the good fortune of a Christian by taking earth from four corners of his house and burying it under the threshold, he brands the statement as spurious since it smacks of witchcraft which Jewish law forbids.

It is also untrue that Jews do not accept the testimony of Christian witnesses. There is a Talmudic injunction against the use of the testimony of a goy for specific cases. But a goy is a heathen. Psalm 144 also speaks of 'hnei nechor' who speak falsehoods, but this was written long before Christians existed on this earth. A Christian oath is taken for its full value because Jews know that Christianity considers a false oath sinful. In the case where testimony is needed to prove whether meat is kosher a Christian is disqualified as a witness because he does not observe the dietary laws. In matters which he considers sinful, he is considered a most trustworthy witness.

The apostate continues with a spurious quotation which he says occurs in Shabas and Eruvin, אמרו לו פק פ"ק פ"ד ד' ע"ב (A non-Jew is not called man, but cattle). Uffenhausen confesses that nowhere is such a statement found. The closest thing to it

is Psalm 49.13 אדם לא יתקן עמו, "but
man abideth not in honor; he is like the beasts that perish." This
was written before Christianity had been born and refers to
heathens. We know very well that Christians believe in God and
therefore it is obvious that this verse cannot be applied to them.
In fact, Rabbi Meier in Sanhedrin 59 states that a goy who studies
Torah and believes in the seven Noachin principles is comparable
to a high priest. How much more worthy then, do we consider
Christians who believe in even more of the ethical principles
which Jews hold so dear.

The apostate accuses the Jews of slandering Christians by
saying they permit adultery and that intercourse between a Jew
and a Christian woman is not considered adulterous. Uffenhausen
quotes Sanhedrin 58 to prove that even heathens did not permit
adulterous relationships. Numbers 25 tells the story of Zimri
who was killed by Pinhas because he committed adultery with a
heathen woman. There is also a statement in Sanhedrin 81 to the
effect that "he who commits adultery with a goyah is worthy of
death." The 'kal v'homer' is again invoked as sufficient proof
of Christian sexual purity in the eyes of Jews. Christian women,
Solomon Zvi confesses, are called 'unclean' by Jews. But Jewish
women are also considered in a state of impurity unless they take
periodic ablutions.

Other alleged Jewish slanders of Christians made by the ~~mumar~~
are: They are unclean and children of Satan. Both are lies. The
Jew never believes that the devil can create man. Man is the
product of God and "have we not all one father, one God who
created us."

When Jews pass a place the majority of whose population is Christian, the mumar alleges that they curse the produce of the place. It is untrue to say that Jews curse God's growing things. At the end of Deuteronomy 20 it is stated that when a city is besieged the fruit trees and the produce of the field must not be destroyed. If this is the law for an enemy how can we curse the fruit of friendly Christians argues Uffenhausen. It would certainly be inexpedient for Jews who cannot raise their own food but must depend upon Christians for agricultural products to wish evil upon the food supply. In fact, five times daily God is praised for his gift of grain. On Pesach Jews pray for dew and on Succoth for rain. A statement in the Talmud enjoins each Jew to make a blessing when he passes a beautiful field.

Schlangenbalg writes that when a Christian sees a number of Jews he exclaims, 'how many Jews there are!' Whereupon the Jew hearing this, remarks כמה ד'ני צ'ינים אברהם, which Schlangenbalg translates 'may your eyes pop out.' This is not so. It is merely considered bad luck to count or comment on numbers. It goes back to the practice described in Exodus 30 where census is taken by counting half shekels and not individuals. Similarly when a child's health is praised, the mother avoids misfortune by saying "may your evil eye not hurt him." The phrase אברהם אברהם אברהם 'you have large eyes' is no curse but only an expression to avoid a curse.

The apostate says that Jews do not talk to Christians on the Sabbath in order not to profane the Sabbath with business, but do collect debts from them on that day. That the Jew does not

talk to Christians on Sabbath is a good thing, says Uffenhausen, for Isaiah 58 speaks against honoring material things and doing business on the Sabbath. As for Jews being permitted to collect debts on Sabbath--it is slanderous and untrue as Roland, a Christian scholar, points out. He says that Jews do not go to court on Sabbath and therefore others should not bring them to court on that day. No further proof of this is necessary for Christians are well aware of this fact.

That Jews boast on Sabbath of betraying Christians is an outrageous slander. Ample proof has already been given that slander and deception are against the principles of Jewish practice. The apostate must have been among mockers and scoffers on the Sabbath if it is really true that he heard such boasts.⁴⁷

Jews are also accused of making the statement אנא דמלכא נא, 'kill the best of the goyim.' This is found in the Talmud Jerushalmi and is written not about Christians but about idol worshippers with whom Jews are at military conflict. To kill the leaders is an old method of war strategy mentioned in ISamuel chapter 15. The folly of sparing a war leader is seen in the case of Saul who spared Agog and later Haman the son of an Agagite sought to kill all the Jews. Ahab also was warned by the prophet not to make peace with Benhadad, king of Aram, whom he defeated in battle. But in time of peace, Uffenhausen continues, "be it far from us to harm idol worshippers let alone God-fearing Christians."

The apostate writes that when a Christian government is good to them Jews say they are not true Christian believers. On the

contrary, when Christians are kind to Jews they obey the spirit of Jesus who himself pleaded for the Jews.

The mumar warns against the unreliability of Jewish doctors. He says that they are like שׂוֹדֵמִים who are promised a portion of the לְעוֹלָם עָלִיד after having executed a certain amount of circumcisions. Likewise a Jewish doctor who has taken a prescribed number of Christian lives is granted a portion in the world to come. It has already been proved, says Uffenhausen, that there are strict prohibitions against murder in Jewish law. Such common Biblical phrases as 'do not kill,' "he who spills the blood of a man, his own blood shall be shed," and the saying of Hillel in Pirke Aboth 2.7 are added to bolster previous contentions. It is also a well-known fact that Jewish physicians have been held in high repute by Christians in Rome, Prague, Constantinople and other cities.

Schiangenbalg writes that a mohel's place in gan eden is determined by the number of circumcisions he performs as we have seen in the previous paragraph. And the number that he must perform to merit the honored position is determined by the ginatria of his name. In other words, David would need but five (according to Uffenhausen's calculations, while Solomon would need 375.⁴⁸ But this is nonsense. If a man merits a place in heaven he gets it, according to Jewish belief, whether his name be David or Solomon.

When the priestly descendants שׂוֹדֵמִים during the service it is forbidden to look at their hands. Mumar says this is so because it is superstitiously believed by the Jews that God's presence rests on their hands at the time, and that looking at them will bring blindness to the individual. Having looked

during the ceremony the apostate remains open-eyed to prove the folly of this assertion. Uffenhausen's answer, rationally enough, admits the blindness myth. He explains, however, that the institution of the prohibition was for the purpose of keeping children from confusing the priests by glaring at them during the performance of the commandment. He adds that while full blindness does not occur, as in the case of the mumar--too bad he wasn't fully blinded--one's sight does become dim.

The apostate scoffs at the story of Kamzo and Bar Kamzo.⁴⁹ He says it is ridiculous to believe that the temple was destroyed because of the altercation between these two individuals. Uffenhausen again gives a very good answer. We do not believe, he says, that this was the cause of the temple's fall. We know that it was due to our many sins that the great catastrophe occurred. The story of Kamzo and Bar Kamzo is a lesson in the great Jewish principle--do not shame your friend. The exaggeration is made only to emphasize the importance of saving a fellow-man's face.

The apostate also charges disunity among Jews, apparently wishing to intimate that even Jews themselves fail to agree that their religion is great and important. He says that there are sects in Turkey and Poland called Karaites and Sadducees who do not believe in the Talmud, and that Jews of various lands have different ceremonies and differ in following the order of the prayers.

Uffenhausen replies that apparently the mumar has not read the Gospels. There he would find the Sadducees, Pharisees, and Essenes mentioned. The Sadducees and Karaites are of little

consequence in Jewish life since they do not believe in the oral law without which Scripture is like a sealed book. If tradition followed them it would be found that Jesus is an illegitimate son. Interpreting Scripture literally, the verse in Deuteronomy 23 וְלֹא יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לְאִלֹּהִים אֲחֵרִים would exclude David as well as Jesus from the Jewish fold since they both are descendants of Ruth the Moabite. But the Pharisees interpret the verse as referring to an Amonite and not an Amonitess, a Moabite and not a Moabitess. As for the existence of different customs and prayers, we must realize that those are not the principles of our religion, and difference is due to the influence of local customs and the whims of local leaders.

The mumar charges that the Jews attain eternal life through excess eating and drinking on the Sabbath, for it says in Shabbas 118 that he who fulfills three meals on the Sabbath receives a portion in the world to come. An extra 'soul' is imparted to the Jew on the Sabbath that he might be enabled to eat the more. Uffenhausen answers that it is a religion act to honor the Sabbath by joyful practices. Isaiah 58.13 stipulates "and thou shalt call the Sabbath a delight." The soul referred to is not an extra appetite, but a spiritual enhancement for the purpose of prayer and study.

. . . .

5. Prayers Against Christians and Christianity.

In the fifth chapter Uffenhausen replies to the charges made against individual prayers recited by Jews daily and during the High Holydays which, the mumar alleges, contain veiled and outright imprecations against the Christian religion and Christian states.

The chapter opens with the general statement that the Jews curse Christ and all those who believe in him. That this is not so is derived from an Aggadah in Berachot 7. The story is told that when a Chacham wished to curse a wicked heretic he immediately fell asleep, and when he awoke the word had slipped from his mind. This story is a symbol of the fact that God forbids us to curse even a wicked heretic. How much the less would he desire us to curse an upright Christian.

The apostate quotes a Jewish prayer as follows: שְׁבַח לְךָ יְיָ and translates it: "Bind the Christians with Thy anger, all those who hope for Christ." Uffenhausen admits that he can find this in no Jewish prayer book, while the words themselves are untranslatable, the mumar's rendition being a fabrication.

Another prayer which does not exist and which is mistranslated is לָמַדְתָּ לָנוּ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ. Mumar says it means "why give honor to the hanged one?" It really means "give honor to the worm."

The mumar brings false charges against the Alenu prayer. He points out that the phrase, "they bow down and bend the knee to vanity and naught and pray to a God who does not save" refers to Christians, and that after it is recited the Jew spits three

times. He says that this is all the more plausible because it is noted that the word קִדְּוָה and קִדְּוָה have the same numerical value. The refutation of Uffenhausen is based on a number of points. First of all Jesus himself recited the Alenu prayer against the heathens in Canaan to which the imprecation refers. Secondly no special significance can be attached to the numerical value because the phrase "and the habitation of His glory is in the heaven above." The word קִדְּוָה meaning his glory also has the same numerical value as קִדְּוָה (Jesus). Uffenhausen also points out that these numerical values were taken from Antonius Margarita's work. The Jewish people do not consider Christianity a false belief since Christians believe in the one God. The tenet of the trinity does not deny the unit of God, maintains Uffenhausen.

The next prayer quoted by the mumar is: פְּלִיטָה מִיָּד הַגּוֹיִם וְהַיָּדֵינָהּ מִיָּד הַיָּדֵינָהּ, which means "O God, who will break the yoke of the goyim from off our necks and who will lead us to our land." Uffenhausen says that this is not a prayer against the Christian government, but merely a wish to return to Palestine. And he adds that it is his feeling that the Christians would like to have the Jews return to their land and would even lend them ships for travelling there. Consequently even they would say 'amen' to this prayer.

In his next charge, as Uffenhausen points out, the apostate again misquotes a prayer. The prayer in question is: יְהוָה יִשְׁמַח בְּיָדֵינוּ "may all presumptuous Christian kings

be broken." The mumar's text reads: אֵל מַלְחֻת זָדוֹן אֲבִירָה בִּי אֱלֹהִים. It is gratuitous to restate that malchut zadon does not refer to the Christian government. But more details will be given in the section on meshumadim.

The אֵל מַלְחֻת זָדוֹן אֲבִירָה בִּי אֱלֹהִים prayer קִרְבַּן חַיִּים בְּיָמֵינוּ is translated by the mumar as "tear every Christian decree." This is an obvious mistranslation. It really means "may God revoke the evil decree which has been passed against us." It is based on a belief as stated in Psalms 29, 58, 149; Isaiah 65; Jeremiah 22 that God records every misdeed of every individual in a ledger. It is the record of these sins that the prayer has reference to.

We next come upon a Rosh Hashanah prayer: אֵל מַלְחֻת זָדוֹן אֲבִירָה בִּי אֱלֹהִים קִרְבַּן חַיִּים בְּיָמֵינוּ. It is translated "may God send war upon princes and lords and over all Christianity. May a cloud cover them with anger and may He smite them and break them with his wrath..." Neither Schlangenberg nor Uffenhausen give the entire Hebrew sentence, but the translated text is the same in both. Uffenhausen's answer is that Schlangenberg mistranslates the word אֱלֹהִים. There is no such Christian as a אֱלֹהִים. The Authites were godless heathen who caused the Jews much trouble as stated in II Kings 17 and caused Ezra and Nehemiah much discomfort by their meddlesome activities. It is against them that this prayer is directed and not against Christians.

Another prayer that the mumar from Ettingen mentions is the one beginning קוּמָה אֱלֹהִים בְּאַרְצֶךָ "Arise O, God, in Thine anger." He states that this is an invocation to God for the destruction of those who attempt to convert Jews to Christianity, and that it also asks that "they have no more rule over us."⁵⁰ Uffenhausen

replies that this prayer is not against Christians nor against any people. On the contrary, Jews pray daily that the day may soon come when all people will be one and serve one God. The prayer properly quoted reads thus: קוֹמֵה וּבִנְיָא בְּעֵבְרָתָא דְּבִרְרִים
קְרֵה יוֹם יִלְכוּ מִגְּדוּשׁ דְּיִשְׂרָאֵל לְפִיּוֹת וּלְבִירִים הָאֵלִים דְּרִיכְתָּ בְּוִבְרִים.
It consists of scattered verses from the Hagiographa and the Prophets including verses from Psalm 7 and Jeremiah 38.

Uffenhausen points out that the prayers which the apostate quotes as referring to the destruction of Christian governments are really quotations from the Bible which speak of the day when all nations will be one, that far-off day of judgment known as בְּיוֹם דְּהִפּוּל. One in question is וַיִּפְסֹק כִּסֵּא מַלְכוּתָא דְּהָאָרֶץ
"and may He turn over the throne of the kingdoms of the earth."
This is really a prayer for world unity. An examination of Joel 4.2, Zechariah 14.9 reveals the prophetic expressions in this prayer. The remainder of the prayer which is quoted by Uffenhausen indicates that the reference is to the day of judgment.
וּבְמַלְכוּתָא דְּהָאָרֶץ יִיבָרְכוּ תַּלְמִידֵי אֱלֹהִי וְשָׂמַיָּא וְעַלְמֵי הָאָרֶץ
וַיִּפְסֹק כִּסֵּא מַלְכוּתָא דְּהָאָרֶץ וַיִּמְחַד כִּי אֵלֵךְ לְשִׁמְשָׁא בְּאֶרֶץ אֱלֹהִי דְּאִדְרֵימָא
בְּהָאָרֶץ וַיִּמְחַד כִּי יִשְׁוֶי אֱלֹהִי.

Another example of misinterpretation is found in the mumar's translation of the prayer which reads אֲלֵי אֲבָהוּ וּבִי הִי וְאֲבָהוּ
יִפֹּל לֹא אֵלִים יִפֹּל. The apostate translates it "may all the sands of hill and dale fall on Christians." But truly this is only a figure of speech which declares that on the day of judgment all hills will be level signifying the equality we hope for among mankind. These verses from Isaiah 40, Ezekiel 38,

and Zecnaraiah 14 which describe 'that day' are purely universalistic; no Christian curse is even remotely intended.

Uffenhausen brands as false the mumar's charge that on the Sabbath before the New Moon Jews pray that God may punish the people who live in those places where Jews were killed. Solomon Zvi explains that on the Sabbath before the New Moon a prayer is recited for the dead--martyrs and ancestors. No harm is wished against the government. Most of the evil decrees were made by governments long past, and it is a Jewish principle that the sins of the fathers be not visited upon the sons.

It is also charged that the first quarter of the New Moon is the signal for Jews to jump towards the moon and offer the following prayer: "may its fear fall upon Christians and may our enemies be quiet as stones." The prayer does not mention the word 'Christians' as the apostate interprets it. It refers only to the enemies of the Jews and not to "Christians who harm us not and whom we consider friends."

We next have a discussion of the famous shemonah esrah prayer concerning meshumadim or malshinim. Uffenhausen denies that this is a prayer expressing a curse against Christians. As has already been explained, a meshumad is an estranged one.⁵¹ Uffenhausen makes an interesting side comment that one out of a hundred meshumadim are baptised for reasons of belief. Most of them resort to conversion because of some knavish trick they have perpetrated, because they desire to be freed from German restrictions, because they wish to escape taxes, because of the love of a Christian woman, or because of their hatred for their own wife.

These people write anti-Jewish books to create hatred for their ex-co-religionists as well as propaganda leading to the expulsion of Jews from the land. Therefore Jews pray that the hope of these creatures remains unfulfilled. But "we do not curse them. Their fate is their curse, for they really are robbed of both religions", philosophizes Uffenhausen.

Solomon Zvi brings proof of Jewish loyalty to the government by citing the instance in 1338 when a certain rebel, Arim Leder, wish to seize the throne and war broke out. A Hebrew prayer was composed which reads as follows:

מַלְכוּת חֵלֶק וְלֹא חֵלֶק
וְלֹא חֵלֶק וְלֹא חֵלֶק
וְלֹא חֵלֶק וְלֹא חֵלֶק

This indicates not only Jewish loyalty to the state, but is used as proof that only rebels are referred to as malchut zadon and not the legal government as the mumar charges.

The apostate brings up the famous prayer "Blessed art Thou, O Lord our God, who hast not made me a goy." Solomon Zvi answers that both Antonius Margarita and Luther translate goy by the word heathen. This prayer was composed in time of Ezra and cannot mean Christian. There is also a prayer blessing God for not having "made me a woman." Does this mean that women are deprecated? The prayers are merely expressions of thanks to the Deity for his wisdom in creating the individual as He saw fit.

The apostate also expresses the opinion that the daily prayer beginning יְיָ יְיָ בְּיָמֵינוּ means "may God send help to the children of Israel and make Christianity

as dumb as stone." It is clearly enjoined in Exodus 10.14 that this passage is to be recited daily "in order to remember thy going out of the land of Egypt...and in order to tell it to thy children and to thy children's children." This is the reason for reciting it daily. It is a memorial of the slavery in Egypt written thousands of years before the birth of Christianity. The mumar's accusations are not only false but ridiculously incredible to the informed person.

The אנן חארתץ prayer, the apostate charges, is a prayer asking for the destruction of Christian council. Uffenhausen becomes very bitter against Friedrich Vrenz and exclaims, "May the am-haaretz open his eyes. Does it not say immediately preceeding the statement of frustrating council, 'and to such as curse me let my soul be dumb...If any design evil against me, speedily make their council of no effect.'" The prayer applies to no one specifically but in general against those who cause the Jews suffering. It is certainly not a curse against Christians and the mumar charges.

Schlangenbalg attacks the statement made in the Rosh Hashanah service כִּי כָל הַפְּשָׁעִים כִּלְעָם כִּדְמָה, saying it means "may all Godless Christians go up like smoke and have no more rule." Any ordinary student of Hebrew can see that it means "may wickedness vanish like smoke and no longer hold sway." The paragraph goes on to state "then will the righteous rejoice." The apostate perverts a statement describing an ideal future for the sake of grinding his own ax.

Christians are cursed soundly in prayers recited during the

ten days between Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur, charges Schlangenbalg. He gives as an example the prayer Yah ve shal and translates it "may God tear the garment of the Godless Christians." First of all, answers Uffenhausen, I have never heard of such a prayer. And secondly, his translation of the Hebrew he quotes is incorrect.

Vrenz states that the Mahzor contains a prayer which reads: "For the pain which we suffer, may you take vengeance upon the unclean Christians. Stain Thy arrow in their blood and sharpen Thy sword in their inwards that birds and beasts be sated with therewith. May such punishment soon come upon them, and Thy terrible fear over the Christians." Uffenhausen answers with the exclamation "Such lies ! We are not permitted to curse heathens, much less Christians." The statement to which the apostate refers, he explains, comes from the descriptions in Ezekiel 39 and Isaiah 34 of how God in the days of God and Magog (whom the Christians call anti-Christ) will drop hail and storm upon his people and feed their blood and flesh to birds and beasts. Such events are fanciful visions of the time of resurrection. No curses are contained in Jewish prayers.

Vrenz also brings accusations of Christian cursing based on the phrase יהי נדב ויהי נדב. The verse speaks of the cries of the nations in the visioned future when God's rule will be universal. An examination of Psalm 46, Joel 5, Zechariah 14, and Ezekiel 38 will testify quickly enough to the perversion of the apostate, Uffenhausen points out.

Expressions of universalism are found in Jewish prayers quite frequently. An outstanding example of a prayer recited thrice

daily which contains universalistic sentiments is the second half of the Alenu which states: "May all flesh call upon Thy name and all nations call Thee Lord...may there be one belief for all..."

Another interesting charge of the apostate, falsely brought, is that the Parasha Zachor recited on the Sabbath before Purim is accompanied by anti-Jesus shouting. During the reading, he claims, Jews cry out 12231 INE HNI. The first letters of each word combined spell 101. From this he concludes that the curses are aimed against Jesus. Uffenhausen replies that an examination of the Parasha will reveal that the section deals with Amalek. Haman is a descendant of Amalek, and the expressions of HNI 12231 INE are directed against him. Uffenhausen also refers the reader to Masechta Megillah in the Talmud for a treatment of Amalek throughout the ages.

The mumar translates the prayer עוֹד עַל פְּנֵי הַיָּדֵינוּ "cast Thy scorn upon the Christians who do not know Thee." This is an obvious mistranslation. We noted previously that goyim does not mean Christian nations. The phrase is found in Psalm 79 and at the end of Chapter 10 of Jeremiah. There the reference is to idol worshippers. When it is recited on Pesach it refers to Pharaoh and men of his ilk.

The apostate winds up his accusations in Chapter five of by saying that in 1592 in the city of Tannhausen in Swabia mahzorim were printed containing all the alleged insults and curses at Christians. Uffenhausen replies that he has a copy of the mentioned edition. An examination of the text reveals conclusively that the apostate's charges are absolutely false.

6. Aggadot

In the short sixth chapter of his work, Uffenhausen answers the charges which Friedrich Vrenz makes against certain Talmudic Aggadot, and against the Torah she b'al peh in general. Schlangenberg quotes and ridicules a number of Aggadot. But Uffenhausen doesn't undertake to defend each one. He points out that the apostate errs in his conception of the essence and purpose of the Aggadot, and he gives a few examples to prove this and also to indicate the mumar's favorite practice of misquoting and misinterpreting.

Uffenhausen begins the chapter by saying that the mumar not only shows his ignorance of the Talmud in his discussion of Aggadot but also displays a profound ignorance of the Gospels, which he perhaps hasn't even read. All prophetic thought, Uffenhausen contends, is presented in figurative language. The Aggadot of the Talmud are the vehicles by which the Rabbis promulgated religious truths, even as Jesus spoke through parables. And he shows that he has read the Gospels. Uffenhausen refers the reader to Matthew 13, Luke 8, and Mark 4 to prove his point.

An example of the mumar's usual mistranslations is found in his perversion of the following Aggada. Schlangenberg quotes: One rabbi says the Messiah will enter the world to come riding upon a ass as stated in Zechariah 9. Another rabbi replied that it really is a disgrace for the Messiah to make his appearance in this manner. If it were only known when he will arrive I would send him a multi-colored horse worth one hundred thaler. Uffenhausen comments that the liar does not mention the

page or Masechta of the Gemara in which this story is found, nor does he give the names of the rabbis who conversed. However, he enlightens us by saying that there is an Aggada in Sanhedrin 98a which states that Rabbi Joshua ben Levi said that it is written (Daniel 7) the Messiah will appear in a cloud. It is written elsewhere that he will appear upon an ass (Zecharaiah 9). There is no conflict, however. If Israel will be righteous he will appear in a royal cloud; if not, he will appear upon a lowly ass. Whereupon the king of Persia (and not a rabbi as Schlangenbalg quotes) Sabur by name, replied jestingly, "you say he will appear upon an ass. If I knew when I would send him my speedy steed. Then Rabbi Joshua answered in similar vein, "does your horse have a hundred colors as the ass will have?" Thus we see how our dear blind mumar, concludes Uffenhausen, turned 100 colors into 100 thaler, and made a rabbi out of the king of Persia. He also adds the following jibe: If the ass of a mumar could speak as well as Bilaam's ass, he would be able to speak better and more carefully of his fellow asses.

The apostate charges the Talmud with saying that a Christian who studies the Pentateuch is worthy of death. While he does not give the source, the passage he refers to the statement וְהַגּוֹי הַזֶּה יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה לְעִזְּךָ וְלַבְּרִית הַזֶּה "a goy who becomes involved with the Torah is worthy of death." This refers to an idol worshipper who studies the Pentateuch to heap derision and scorn upon it and to deny its truth. Furthermore, the phrase "worthy of death" has no reference to capital punishment inflicted by humans. It is a way of expressing the punishment of death inflicted by God in the manner he sees fit.

A Christian who believes in the truth of the Bible is only following the urge of his conscience in studying the Torah. (Jews also study Christian culture as is evident from the number of Jewish teachers in the Universities.) There are even statements in Baba Kama and Avoda Zorah to the effect that a heathen who studies Torah and does not mock it is an honorable man. How can we slay one who honors the Torah. Would that the whole world studied it with devotion. Maimonides says that a heathen should be warned that if he studies the Torah for the purpose of deriding it, he will suffer punishment from heaven. Nowhere is it stated that a Turk, Christian, or heathen should be killed because of studying Torah.

Schlangenbalg charges that Jews consider the Talmud as more important than the Bible, and that one who does not observe Talmudic law is called a heretic. Uffenhausen answers that the traditional law as well as the written law was given on Mt. Sinai, so that he who holds the former in contempt dishonors the latter as well. One is as important as the other. For this reason testimony and proof is brought from the Talmud to disprove the contentions of the Mumar. The Talmud teaches "do not kill, do not betray, do not practice magic, do not deal deceitfully, give charity to Jews and Christians, curse no one, honor the government, and pray for its welfare. He who does not meet these standards denies both the written and traditional law and is not considered a good Jew. Mumar says now that we call the Sadducees heretics, above he stated that we call the Calvinists and Zwinglists heretics. Both charges are false as is quite evident from this discussion. The latter statement of Uffenhausen does not quite follow from his previous discussion,

but it probably was very convincing to the public for whom he wrote.

The apostate also calls to attention the statement in Betza 25b שלושה חזקים הם ישראל בין הגוים הכלב בין הבהמות והתרנגול בין העופות.
"There are three mighty ones--Israel among the nations, the dog among beasts, and the cock among fowls." This statement, Schlangenbalg contends, is an indication of Jewish impudence. Uffenhausen answers that we are חזקים strong and proud and not התלוצצים impudent. We are proud of our belief, and as true and faithful as a watchdog who is loyal and obedient to his master, takes his abuse and kindness with equal regard. Uffenhausen indulges in a sermonic parable, comparing the life of the Jew with the life of a dog, both suffering insecurity and hardship with the moments of security few and far between.

.

7. The Trinity and Conclusion

In the seventh and last chapter the apostate chooses a new method of attack. He fabricates the idea that the Talmud itself discredits Judaism and justifies Christianity. He quotes the Talmudic story of a rabbi who dreamed that a bat kol called out from heaven saying, "I, you, and your students are prepared to accept the Trinity." Uffenhausen answers that it is ridiculous to take this as evidence of a Talmudic acceptance of the Trinity. For the scholars of the Talmud, the Pharisees, were

greatly opposed to the teachings of Jesus, which the Christians themselves admit. And the Talmudic scholars are the founders of the principles of the Jewish religion upon whose interpretations the entire diaspora relies. This foolish idea must have entered his mind through a misapplication of an Aggadah in Hagiga 14b, which refers to the third group of heavenly creatures in the heavenly hierarchy. The Talmud Jerushalmi refers to these seven groups of righteous ones who will merit greeting the Deity in the world to come and mentions three groups: you, your disciples, and the disciples of your disciples. In both cases the mumar misinterprets unlike no as the Trinity. And if the foolish contention of the apostate were true, why is he so bitter in his attack and contempt of the Talmud and our scholars in the book he calls Schlangenbalg.

Uffenhausen concludes his book in the customary Jewish manner with a prayer--a prayer for those to whom this book is dedicated, his wife and children who were forced to suffer economically while he devoted himself for nine long months to the completion of his work.

.

III
CONCLUSION

Uffenhausen's Theriac is not representative of the highest in Jewish intellectualism. It is a simple book with a direct and simple message dedicated to the fulfillment of a simple but important purpose. Its very value lies in its simplicity. It is a book for the people, a handbook in anti-Semitic defense. The reader for whom it is intended is not regaled with long and involved arguments defending the dignity of Judaism from slander, misconceptions, and lies directed by a renegade of the faith. It is so written and so constructed that the average Jew might find in it convincing and logical argument for his unsuspecting Christian neighbor who is under constant pressure of anti-Semitic propaganda.

And as such a work we judge it. Its scholarly defects--a few misquotations of reference, a twisting of the letter of the text to reveal its spirit--are inconsequential. And yet despite its lack of intellectual ostentation, the book reveals Solomon Uffenhausen to be a man of wide knowledge. He displays an amazing grasp of Jewish lore and Christian theology--the Bible, the Talmud, Josephus, Maimonides, Jewish liturgy and the Gospels are all within quoting reach. Perhaps not so amazing for a scholar of repute, but certainly admirable in a man whose primary task is the eking out of a living for a wife and a number of children.

Which brings us to the spirit of the man. His book reveals a profound and almost fanatic love for the Jewish people, for the

fine ethical motivations which Jewish literature and life handed down to his generation. And somehow we feel an overflow of that love to his Christian neighbors, to the numerous fine individuals with whom he came in contact who showed no animus, who lived a true Christian life. Time and again he reveals his dislike for apostasy, deception and falsehood as represented by the apostate with whom he wrestled.

In conclusion, we must remember that the Theriac is primarily a study in anti-Semitism. The true insight of Uffenhausen is revealed when he exposes the insincerity of the apostate's anti-religious charges against the Jews and probes deeper into the motives behind the attacks. Is it the love of a Christian woman? Is it economic betterment that prompts Jews to forsake their faith and array themselves as an enemy? The book leaves the impression that there are more than religious bones of contention involved in the peculiar phenomenon of anti-Semitism, although these are the ostensible issues.

Thus we honor the Theriac of Solomon Uffenhausen as a link in the long chain of Jewish Polemical literature extending from the Sibylline Oracles of Alexandria to the latest pamphlet answering the charges of a modern anti-Semitic agitator.

.

NOTES

1. Jewish Encyclopedia, New York, 1902; Articles: "Apologists", "Polemical Literature".
2. Bonfied wrote against Astruc Raimuch.
3. See below p. 52.
4. J. E., "Margarita, Antonius"; H. Graetz, History of the Jews, Philadelphia, 1898, 6 volumes, 4.551.
5. J. E., "Troki"; Graetz, History, 4, 649.
6. Graetz, 4, 697.
7. Uffenhausen, Theriaca Judaica, Nurnberg, 1681, Introduction.
8. See below p. 52.
9. Mumar is the Hebrew for apostate. For the sake of expediency the term mumar shall be used from here on to refer to the author of Schlangenhalg.
10. Uffenhausen quotes Genesis 34, but the correct reference is Genesis 46.13. It may be a textual error.
11. 2Sam.21.
12. There is also the term Asham Talui, zweifelhaftig Opfer, in Lev. 5.18. Jastrow interprets it as a sin offering when you are in doubt as to the commission of a sinful act.
13. Theriac, I,2.
14. Ibid., I, 5.
15. Deut. 23.3
16. See more detailed interpretation of Genesis 5.9 in Theriac I,3.
17. Theriac I, 4.
18. In Luke 6.5 Jesus says, "The son of man is master of the Sabbath."
19. Theriac I, 6.
20. Ibid., I, 1.
21. " , I, 6
22. The material to follow is also found in Dr. J.Z. Lauterbach's as yet unpublished study of Jesus in the Talmud which the writer has had the fortune to investigate.

23. Numbers 23.23
24. Theriac I, 15.
25. For answer to the charge that Arelim means stupid Christians see Theriac 4.6, discussed below p. 31.
26. The verse reads "He who guards his tongue from evil talk, saves his soul from pain."
27. See Numbers 11.
28. Theriac II,2.
29. Ozar Hatfillos, Wilna 1923, p. 25. (See Yozer L'Shabbas V'Hanukah of any Siddur.)
30. Psalm 68.32.
31. Genesis 47.22. Targum translates Kohanim as Kumrayo.
32. The reference is to Sanhedrin, page not given. In his argument Uffenhausen tacitly admits that Hagoyim Ovdein Avodah Zarah refers to Christians, weakening the force of his later arguments where he emphatically insists that the word goy in the Talmud does not refer to Christians, and which he proves most convincingly.
33. Psalm 37; 145.
34. Note how Vrenz accepts Uffenhausen's translation of shmad, whereas previously he had translated it baptised.
35. See above p.24. Is Uffenhausen guilty of an inconsistency?
36. Theriac III, 1. p. 18a.
37. Ibid., 3,12. p. 20a.
38. See p. 18.
39. Hulin 94. 'It is forbidden to deceive a goy.'
40. Hoshen Hamishpat 228.
41. Theriac, 4.2.
42. See Schlangenbalg, (printed with the Theriac), Chapter 4, pp. 17-22).
43. See Pirke Aboth 1.15.
44. Jeremiah 9.25.
45. Theriac IV.8, Eisenstein, Ozar Vikuhim, p.179.

46. Theriac IV.4.
47. Ibid., IV.19.
48. Eisenstein, p. 181.
49. Schlangenbalg, p. 24-25; Gittin 57.
50. Ibid., p. 27.
51. See above, p.25.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

SOURCE

Uffenhausen, Solomon, Theriaca Judaica, Nürnberg, 1681
Vrenz, Friedrich, Schlangenbalg,
(printed together)

GENERAL WORKS

Graetz, Heinrich, History of the Jewish People, Philadelphia,
1898.

Jewish Encyclopedia, New York, 1902. Articles: "Antonius
Margarita," "Apologetics," "Polemical Literature."

Bible, J. P. S., 1915; American Translation, Chicago, 1935.

Apocrypha, Komroff edition, New York, 1937.

HEBREW

Eisenstein, J. D., Ozar Vikuhi, New York, 1928.

Bible, Letteris edition.

Talmud, Babli and Yeushalmi, Horeb edition.

Sidur, Ozar T'fillos, Wilna, 1923.