

HEBREW UNION COLLEGE - JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION
NEW YORK SCHOOL

INSTRUCTIONS FROM AUTHOR TO LIBRARY FOR THESES

AUTHOR Mindy Avra Portnau
TITLE The Life of Fourteenth Century Spanish Jewry
As Reflected in the Polemical Writings of Isidore of Seville

TYPE OF THESIS: D.H.L. () Rabbinic (☒)
Master's ()

1. May circulate ()
2. Is restricted (☒) for 3 years. Library Use o.k.

Note: The Library shall respect restrictions placed on
theses for a period of no more than ten years.

I understand that the Library may make a photocopy of
my thesis for security purposes.

3. The Library may sell photocopies of my thesis. yes ☒ no

2/17/80
Date

Mindy Avra Portnau
Signature of Author

Library
Record

Microfilmed _____
Date

Signature of Library Staff Member

Warm acknowledgements are due to the following:

My parents, Nate Portnoy and Sarah Themper Portnoy, for their love, their lives of integrity, and their unceasing support and encouragement (including my mother's editorial assistance);

Dr. Martin A. Cohen, who provided the theoretical tools and the methodological models for my research; and who has been my academic mentor and role-model;

My husband, Philip Leonard Breen, for his inspiration, his love and support, and his principles.

Perhaps, in our day, we can move beyond polemic to real inter-faith dialogue and communication. In that hope, I dedicate this thesis to the memory of my beloved Rabbi Andrew Klein, who taught me as a child, through word and deed, the meaning of such a dialogue, based on love and respect.

THE LIFE OF FOURTEENTH CENTURY SPANISH JEWRY
AS REFLECTED IN
THE POLEMICAL WRITINGS OF PROFAT DURAN

Mindy Avra Portnoy

Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of
Requirements for Ordination

Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion
New York, New York

1980/5740

Referee: Professor Martin A. Cohen

CONTENTS

I. Introduction.....	1
II. Historical Background.....	4
III. Personal Details.....	7
IV. Literary Style.....	15
V. Sources.....	19
VI. Functions of Sources.....	27
VII. Polemical Arguments.....	42
VIII. Duran's Influence.....	71
IX. Analytical Conclusions.....	72
Notes.....	77
Bibliography.....	83

Al Tehi Ka'avotecha (Do Not Be Like Your Forefathers) appeared sometime between 1390 and 1392. The author of this satirical polemic against Christianity notes an elapse of approximately 1360 years since Jesus' death. This fact provides the earliest possible date of publication. The later date derives from the turbulent circumstances surrounding Spanish Jewry during this period, including the possibility of the author's conversion to Christianity prior to the writing of the text. Such a conversion would have occurred in 1391 or 1392, at the time when anti-Jewish riots and forced conversions to the dominant religion engulfed all parts of Spain.

Later publications added commentary and introduction. In 1554 or 1570 in Constantinople, Rabbi Joseph ben Shem Tov's commentary appeared. He frankly revealed the work's satirical nature, noting that Christian readers misunderstood both the title and the content of the polemic. They garbled the title to Alteca Boteca, and understood it to be an attack upon Judaism. Rabbi Joseph rectified both errors.

In the same edition, Yitzchak ben Yehudah Akrish introduced the author as Profiat Duran, a forced convert to Christianity, who had embarked for Palestine with his friend David. According to Akrish, both intended to return to their original faith. David, however, became convinced of the truth of Christian doctrine. Profiat Duran then wrote Al Tehi Ka'avotecha as a satirical plea to his old friend. Akrish did not note whether or not Duran returned to Spain.

This biography remained the standard one for centuries. More recent evidence from the archives of Duran's hometown, Perpignan, indicates that Duran, too, remained a Christian, and wrote his polemical works in Spain. These facts, plus additional biographical information about the author (see Chapter III), supplement Akrish's skeleton outline, which retains its plausibility.

In 1840, Abraham Geiger included the text of Al Tehi Ka'avotecha in his Ma'le HaPenim, published in Berlin. In 1844, the satire appeared in a collection of polemical writings, Kovets Vikuchim, published in Breslau. Part Two of P.M. Heilprin's Even Bochen (Frankfurt-a-Main, 1846) included a critical edition of the work. J.D. Eisenstein annotated the treatise in his Otsar Vikuchim (1928).

In the work, Duran addresses his friend, David Bonit ben Godon (also rendered David Bonet Bonjorn), and ostensibly commends his choice of Christianity. "Do not be like your fathers!", he admonishes him, in a feigned attack upon the substance of Jewish belief. The polemical letter highlights contrasts between Judaism, a religion commensurate with Reason, and Christianity, a religion of anti-Reason. David has selected the latter; Duran mocks his choice through a thinly-veiled, sharply-phrased satire.

Sefer Kelimat HaGoyim (The Book of the Nations' Disgrace), Duran's second polemical work, dates from 1397.

This is clearly stated by Duran in the Introduction א"ל ע"י

. (397=א"ל ע"י) א"ל ע"י

A 1633 Livorno manuscript served as the basis for Dr. Ze'ev Adolf Poznanski's edition of the text. This appeared in his anthology HaTsofe be'erez HaGer, published in Budapest in 1913-1914. Eisenstein also included this work in his collection of Hebrew polemical documents.

Sefer Kelimat HaGoyim differs significantly from its polemical predecessor. The Sefer investigates the New Testament and other Christian sources in an historico-critical manner, rather than in a personal satirical format. Initiated at the promptings of Rav Hasdai Crescas, Duran's mentor and the acknowledged leader of late-14th century Aragonese Jewry, the book asserts that later Christian doctrines subvert New Testament teachings. Duran probes mistranslation, as well as doctrine; he cites examples of New Testament misquotation of the Hebrew Bible, and of Jerome's further mistranslations. Duran states his intention clearly:

יְהוָה נִלְכַּד בְּיָדוֹ יְהוָה יְהוָה יְהוָה יְהוָה יְהוָה יְהוָה יְהוָה יְהוָה יְהוָה
 יְהוָה יְהוָה יְהוָה יְהוָה יְהוָה יְהוָה יְהוָה יְהוָה יְהוָה יְהוָה
 1".

He cites "authentic" Christianity vs. "inauthentic" Christianity; he devises an internal critique from an external perspective. In this dual position, Duran anticipates both later Jewish polemical literature and internal Christian "reform" material. As Jew and Christian convert, he straddles two worlds as well as two centuries.

II.

Both Al Tehi Ka'avotecha and Sefer Kelimat HaGoyim provide contemporary historical detail. Al Tehi Ka'avotecha hints that Jews were suffering physically---they are described as ק'ח/3 (thirsty) and ר'287 (hungry). Despite the suffering, they continue to observe their ancestral customs: Brit, Laws relating to women, Shabbat, Holidays, a special fast day (probably Yom Kippur), Pesach, and Kashrut.

They attend synagogue services, where they are subjected to Christian conversionary sermons. Duran describes a proclamation that mandates synagogue attendance even by women and young children. Paul of Burgos, David's principal teacher, instigates this proclamation. Paul's anti-Jewish statements extend so far that the Cardinal of Anaplona rebukes him. We know from independent sources that this Paul (nè Solomon ha-Levi) had converted to Christianity in 1391, eventually rose to the position of bishop of Burgos, and wrote an anti-Jewish polemical work, Scrutinium Scripturarum. This fact offers additional justification for the later dating of Duran's polemical tract.

Al Tehi Ka'avotecha includes the information that apostates exist in this community, and carry disparaging nicknames: Circumcised one; Baptized one; Heretic. These names demonstrate a lack of belonging to either the Jewish or Christian communities.

Duran enumerates Christian beliefs: the Trinity, God's

pants, a certain "higher" level of intellectual exchange permeates polemical literature. Duran quotes the French Franciscan exegete, Nicholas de Lyra, at times for support, at times to debate. He also refutes the Christian scholar John of Montpellier: *פאריסדף דרד ד' (16') 101...*
פריבולדף פריבולדף פריבולדף, דרד פריבולדף
פריבולדף פריבולדף פריבולדף פריבולדף פריבולדף
פריבולדף פריבולדף פריבולדף פריבולדף פריבולדף
פריבולדף פריבולדף פריבולדף פריבולדף פריבולדף
 3. ... *פריבולדף פריבולדף פריבולדף פריבולדף פריבולדף*

Forced conversions form the *raison d'être* of Duran's work, however. He specifies Seville, once a great Jewish city, now " *איהבולד פריבולד* "4. According to independent sources, the anti-Jewish riots of 1391 began in Seville.

Duran includes several historical dates in Sefer Kelimat HaGoyim. Christians believe that the destruction of the Temple occurred after the publication of the Gospels, since Jesus' disciples died before 70 C.E., and Peter and Paul were killed by Nero. He also notes the birthdate of Jesus---3760 years after the Creation (i.e. 0 C.E., as it were), and the date of Constantine's conversion---4085 years after the Creation (i.e. 325 C.E.).

Duran provides the historical background for only one late Christian practice. Priestly celibacy was established as Canon 21 at the Fourth Council (known in Christian history as the Fourth Lateran Council) in 1215 under Pope Innocent III.

III.

This briefly-glimpsed historical milieu produced the author Profiat Duran. His several names adumbrate his multi-faceted and mediating role in late-14th century Spanish society. The name Profiat Duran indicates his Spanish identity; Isaac ben Moses HaLevi reveals his Jewish origins; Efodi, the acronym/nickname he utilized as his nom de plume (" ןיפוא דוראן בן משה הלוי = Efod), represents the concealment of both identities. Later, a fourth name would complete the cycle.

Duran was born about the year 1340 in the town of Perpignan, located at the northeast corner of Spain in the district of Catalonia. His father was Duran Profiat; his grandfather was Profiat de Limos. Duran's grandmother, Regina, appears twice in the Perpignan archives, once as the debtor to a Christian merchant of Valencia for gold thread (along with her son, Ferrer), and once as the seller of a Hebrew Bible (along with her son, Duran). Profiat's father, Duran Profiat, merits two references in the archives. Richard Emery describes his status:

In 1347, he was one of twenty-three Jews who stood surety for a loan to the Perpignan Aljama, the organization of the Jewish community. On 5 March, 1348, he was farming the Aljama's taxes on oil brought into the Jewish quarter. He was still living in 1354. It is evident that he was a substantial member of the Jewish community, but certainly not one of its leading figures. There is no evidence that either he or his brother Ferrer engaged in moneylending.⁵

Profiat Duran may have studied for a time in Germany. He may also have been a tutor to the Crescas children. According to the Perpignan documents, he earned his living as a moneylender and physician. In 1381, he served as a councillor to the Aljama, but nothing more is known about his communal activities. No evidence is available concerning a wife or children.

Between 1393 and 1409, Duran appears in the archives under his fourth name, Honoratus de Bonafide, apparently acquired upon his conversion to Christianity. Perhaps he was the same Honoratus de Bonafé who served as astrologer in 1392 in Juan I of Aragon. Yitzhak Baer posits that Duran was still alive in 1414. He bases his presumption on a poem written by Solomon Bonafed at the time of the Disputation of Tortosa, apparently appealing to Duran to compose a new polemical work:

Approach, Ephod!...
See how I have been abandoned
by the princes of poetry,
the cherubs of the family of Lavi⁶

Profiat Duran produced numerous literary works. Besides his two polemical treatises dating from the 1390's, he wrote a condolence letter in 1393 to the son of the recently-deceased Gerona rabbi, Rabbi Abraham ben Rabbi Isaac ha-Levi. Duran mourns the loss of such a saintly leader, and extends his grief to the sufferings of the Jewish community en masse. He analyzes the reasons for the recent anti-Jewish persecutions:

...our dependence on works alone,
divorced from true intentions...
particularly the choice of the
partial good, each of us being
concerned for himself alone, and
not knowing or understanding that
in the long run the security of the
parts depend on the security of the
whole---and this is true of our
people in particular, all of whose
parts are answerable for one another...⁷

He also urges apostates to repent and return to Judaism.
In the following obscurely-phrased passage, Duran admits
his own lapse:

The Lord my God hath put me to
silence and given me water of
gall to drink to repletion and
satiety. The insolent waters have
overwhelmed me, the stream has gone
over my head---this malignancy...And
it is the speaker's will that his
soul, which is bound with yours,
shall weep in secret, for behold,
his is not of his faith, strange is
his deed, and alien his worship...

Duran's major grammatical work, Ma'aseh Efod, appeared
in 1403. In 33 chapters, he encourages the study of Hebrew
language and literature, and offers fifteen rules of study.
Heinrich Graetz assessed its contents: "summarizes the
results of older writers, rectifies their errors, and even
attempts to formulate the principles of Hebrew syntax."⁹

Duran's range extended into philosophy, astronomy,
and history. He wrote commentaries to various works of
Abraham ibn Ezra, and a commentary on Maimonides' Guide.
He composed the latter after completing his grammatical
opus. His major treatise on astronomy, Cheshev HaEfod (The
Belt of the Ephod), concerned the Jewish calendar and the

astronomical theories upon which it was based (1395). Other responsa in this area included a response to Joseph Ben Nachmias' astronomical work Or Olam.

Duran's Ma'amar Zichron HaShemadot is not extant, but later writers referred to this historical work on various expulsions of the Jews. Duran enumerated even such recent expulsions as that from England (1290) and France (1306), and recounted details of persecutions in Catalonia. Don Isaac Abravanel quoted the work in his Yeshuot Meshicho (1497). Solomon Alami alluded in his moral epistle to Duran's work as "le livre des memoires."¹⁰ Both Samuel Usque and Judah ibn Verga utilized it as a resource.

Debate surrounds Duran's religious affiliation. Did Duran convert to Christianity? If he did, how did he manage to write anti-Christian polemical tracts, and remain unscathed by persecution for a period of more than twenty years? If he did not, why did the tradition of his apostasy persist? How can the Perpignan archival material be explained?

Yitzhak Baer concludes that Duran remained Jewish throughout his life. His major proof derives from the very existence of the polemical treatises. Baer maintains that no "new Christian" of the period could have dared to attack Christianity so blatantly. Baer writes:

In all medieval Hebrew prose, there is hardly another work (Sefer Kelimat HaGoyim) with so concise, polished, and direct a style...It is inconceivable that a man who clung so loyally to his religion and fought on its behalf with such determination should, only a short time previously,

have paid obeisance to alien gods. Nor is it likely that, were he a converso, the Church would have allowed him to live as a Jew, and to publish anti-Christian polemics over a period of 25 years.¹¹

Baer attributes the usual biography to "guesswork and erroneous reconstruction."¹²

Baer concedes one potentially contradictory piece of evidence, Duran's "confession" to his friend in Gerona (see supra, pg. 9). Baer asks:

Was the author of the Ma'aseh Efod lamenting the general fate of his generation? Or was he haunted by youthful transgressions and heretical thoughts of which he could not wholly rid himself?¹³

Baer does not know the Perpignan material.

Richard Emery knows the material, and utilizes it extensively. He agrees with Baer's statement "that no baptized Jew would have dared issue, or could have issued without dire results, the tracts under consideration."¹⁴ He even insists that the Al Tehi Ka'avotecha was never misunderstood by Christian readers:

Too many of the converts at whom Profayt directed his work were educated Jews, and some of them were sincere converts, or eager to advance themselves with the Church, or both. Nor does the satire in the Alteca Boteca seem either sufficiently subtle or sufficiently sustained; it is difficult to believe that its author was making any effort to disguise his real attitude.¹⁵

Nevertheless, Emery asserts that Profiat Duran was most certainly forcibly baptized a Christian sometime be-

tween February 1391 and May 1392, Duran adopted the name Honoratus de Bonafide, and was still alive as late as 1409. Emery bases his assertions upon the archival material from Perpignan. As Honoratus, Duran is mentioned in twelve Perpignan documents between January 8, 1393 and September 4, 1409.¹⁶

As late as 1409 he had escaped the attention of the Inquisition, since we know that in that year his assets remained unconfiscated. This is clear enough evidence that he can have taken no overt step suggesting a return to Judaism.¹⁷

Emery accounts for the apparent difficulty in this conclusion by postulating that Duran wrote Al Tehi Ka'avotecha before he converted to Christianity. Certainly such a satirical piece could not have been written and sent by an ostensible Christian to a devout apostate, who might have reported Duran to the Church authorities. Concerning Kelimat HaGoyim, Emery accepts the 1397 dating:

If that date, or any date after 1392, is correct, then the Kelimat was written by Profayt Duran secretly and at great risk. It may well be so. We know him to have been a most unwilling convert.¹⁸

Emery concludes that Duran undoubtedly claimed to have written the work prior to his baptism.

Emery's conclusions, although fitting the details (including the 1393 letter to Duran's friend in Gerona) more plausibly than Baer's, still leaves several unanswered questions: How did the Christian authorities view Duran's other works, especially Ma'aseh Efod? (Emery mentions this

as an example of the risks Duran was willing to take). How did Duran reconcile his admonitions to conversos to return and repent with his own ambivalent position? Why did Hasdai Crescas ask a baptized Christian (however unwilling) to write a polemic against Christianity? What level of credibility would such a work possess? Did the fact of Duran's Christianity eventually persuade Crescas to write his own polemic? Did Duran hope to bridge the gap between internal reform of Christianity (back to a "religion of Jesus", rather than "a religion about Jesus") and an external critique? Perhaps further research in the Perpignan archives and in the history of Spanish Jewry will yield less speculative results. Duran's own history mirrors the tugs-of-war that raged in the consciences of 14th and 15th century Spanish Jews. Torn between two worlds, they martyred, apostasized, polemized, synthesized, compromised.

Another branch of the Duran family originated in Provence, and settled in Majorca in 1306. In 1391, following anti-Jewish riots in Majorca, they moved to Algiers. Zemah Astruc Duran, who died in 1404 in Algiers, led Majorcan Jewry until the persecutions. His son, Simeon ben Zemah Duran (1361-1444) became chief Algerian Rabbi, and wrote an anti-Christian and anti-Moslem polemical work, Keshet U-Magen (Bow and Buckler-1423). Although he does not quote Profiat Duran, he employs certain similar arguments. He argues that Jesus and his disciples strictly observed Toraitic law. Jesus did not intend to abolish Judaism, although he falsely claimed that he was the Messiah. Simeon

Duran also indicates mistakes and alleged forgeries in Jerome's Bible translation, as well as misquotations of Hebrew Scripture by Jesus and his disciples.

Simeon's son, Solomon (c. 1400-1467), succeeded to his father's chief rabbinical position. In 1438, he wrote Milchemet Mitzvah, an attack upon the views of the apostate Geronimo de Santa Fé (Joshua Lorki). Lorki had accused the Talmud of fostering immorality; Solomon Duran flung similar accusations of immorality at the Christian clergy. Duran also asserted that the aggadic sections of the Talmud have no binding force, and he rejected kabbalistic doctrines.

This branch of the Duran family provided leadership for Algerian Jewry through the end of the 18th century. A part of the clan settled in Leghorn in the 18th century, and later moved to London in the 19th century.

David, Profiat Duran's friend and recipient of the satirical plea Al Tehi Ka'avotecha, was a scion of the family of David Bonjorn de Barrio. Bonjorn (Yomtov) was an early-14th century astronomer, who lived in Perpignan and Gerona. His grandson took the name Astruk Francisco Dioscornis upon conversion to Christianity.

Hasdai Crescas initiated the writing of Sefer Kelimat HaGoyim. Crescas (died c. 1412) wrote philosophical and polemical works, and served as the most influential communal and rabbinic leader of Spanish Jewry during this period.

IV.

Two primary literary features characterize Profiat Duran's polemical works. In Al Tehi Ka'avotecha, he utilizes double entendres frequently. In Sefer Kelimat HaGoyim, he employs many non-Hebraic words, particularly when referring to Christian sacraments.

Al Tehi Ka'avotecha begins with a quote from Psalm 34:1: " פִּנְיָוֹ יָצַח מִן־הַמָּוֶת "19 The original text refers to David's feigned madness before Avimelech. Duran applies it to his friend, David, who may be "mad" for believing in Christianity. The idiom "פִּנְיָוֹ יָצַח" can also simply mean "to change one's mind". Thus Duran manages to convey his opinion of David's conversion to Christianity without directly and unambiguously calling him insane.

Duran describes David's letter to him as a "סֵפֶר סֵדֶר"20. Ostensibly, he means that it has taken him a long time to comprehend its meaning, for it is full of "secrets" ("סֵפֶר סֵדֶר"). The noun can also mean "contradictions", however, again revealing while concealing Duran's true opinion of the epistle.

Duran reads David's letter " בְּרִיבָה "21 That either means he has read it seriously and thoughtfully, or that he has read it with a "heavy head", i.e. sadly.

In the satirical work, Duran "laments" the follies of the Jews: " וְהַיְיָ יִשְׁמַח בְּעַמּוֹתָיו "22.
וְהַיְיָ יִשְׁמַח בְּעַמּוֹתָיו

This statement renders two nuances; either the Jews worked

in vain, because their descendants eventually became "idol-worshippers", or the descendants deteriorated because of the sins of their ancestors.

Duran discusses the Christian belief that Jesus continually descends to earth. The "מִן הַשָּׁמַיִם יֵרָד" ²³ involved in this descent literally means "tearing asunder the heavenly sphere", but it also echoes the phrase "abolishing", i.e. that Christians have abolished the Toraitic commandments. Similarly, in analyzing the Messianic belief, Duran refers to it as "דָּגְמָה" ²⁴. This may simply mean "dogma" or it may allude to the Scriptural origin of Messianic belief.

Duran describes his friend, David, as 'נָכוֹן...פְּרוֹמֵם' ²⁵ "פְּרוֹמֵם". "פְּרוֹמֵם" primarily means "honest" or "pure", i.e. David honestly believes in Christian doctrine, and Duran recognizes his sincerity. However, "פְּרוֹמֵם" also connotes "naïveté". Duran here compliments David in a back-handed manner; Honest you are, certainly, but nevertheless gullible.

Duran then "advises" David to indulge in all the foods forbidden to the Jews "בְּלִי קִיּוּן" ²⁶. Although this expression translates as "without restraint", it derives from the same root as "מְרִיב" (heretic). In other words, now that David has ventured so far out of the fold, he may do whatever he pleases, but he is tainted by the stigma of heresy.

Finally, Duran refers to the "פְּחִיז" ²⁷ which Paul of Burgos received from the community (apparently the Jewish community). The people provided these "flowers" in

order to convince Paul to cease from his denunciations of the Jews to higher church authorities. Obviously, " פ'ה'ג' " here equals bribes of some kind, not roses or daffodils.

Sefer Kelimat HaGoyim lacks the satirical tone of its precursor. Although the attacks on Christian doctrine retain a sharp edge, they are couched in historico-critical, rather than literary, language. Thus, there exists only one clear example of a double meaning in the Sefer. In the Introduction, Duran briefly describes the contemporary historical situation of the Jews in Spain. He writes:

1778 10'1151672 13'48 P d1 "
28"... P'11335 P'N7 1300 88

" P'1133 P'N " may mean "stormy waters" in general, referring to the persecutions encompassing Jewish life at the time, or it may specifically refer to "evil waters", i.e. the water of forced baptism. Duran was familiar with both.

Although Al Tehi Ka'avotecha utilizes only one identifiably non-Hebraic term, the previously-mentioned " 1778'210 " (without restraint), Sefer Kelimat HaGoyim abounds with them. In this work, Duran attempts to describe Christian doctrine objectively and subjectively. Both descriptive and analytical, the work employs accurate scientific terminology for Christian beliefs and practices. Apparently, the Hebrew language had not yet developed a neutral vocabulary for such phenomena.

Duran assesses the following Christian concepts in

Romance terminology written in Hebrew script: Apostles, hypostasis, limbo, personae, the cielo inferior (lower heaven), antichrist, Eucharist, purgatory, sacraments, baptism, confirmation, matrimony, congregation, ordination, penance, last rites, and mortal sins. He also uses such terminology when he wishes to convey the Christian understanding of a certain term, even when a Hebrew translation is available, e.g. Samaritans, publicans, Magi, moral law, judicial law, ceremonial law. Finally, he provides a definition of the term "Marranos".

In both works, Duran's literary conventions lie subordinate to his polemical intentions. Al Tehi Ka'avotecha contains the more poetic imagery, the more nuanced language, the more linguistic symmetry (the words "Do not be like your fathers who...", for example, are always juxtaposed to " לפני אבותי "----"but you are not like them"). Its persuasive purpose lends itself to such richness of language and metaphor. Sefer Kelimat HaGoyim, on the other hand, eschews linguistic intricacies for straightforward prose. It intends to convince seriously, not to seduce or mock, Duran's ability to handle these different modes conveys his commitment to the utility of the Hebrew language (later defined explicitly in Ma'aseh Efod) and his understanding of the goals of polemic. The polemical end determined the literary means.

V.

Profiat Duran quotes extensively from the Hebrew Bible in Sefer Kelimat HaGoyim. He utilizes all five books of the Torah, especially Genesis, Exodus, and Deuteronomy. He specifically mentions the following passages: Genesis 2:17; 2:24; 3:23-24; 11:31; 14:18-20; 15:6; 23:17-18; 33:20; 46:26; 49:10; 49:27; Exodus 2:12; 3:6; 4:1-3; 15:7; 17:15; 20:13-14; 21:16; 22:1-3; 25:22; 33:20; 34:33-35; 35:3; Deuteronomy 4:8; 6:4-5; 6:13,16; 8:3; 14:1; 18:15; 23:21; 24:1; 29:27; 30:4-8; 32:21. Duran quotes only two lines from Leviticus, 19:18 ("Love your neighbor as yourself") and 24:20 ("eye for eye, tooth for tooth"), undoubtedly because Christian writers never concentrated on Leviticus very intensively. From Numbers, he selects four passages: 6:13(the ritual for a Nazirite); 12:7 (Moses as God's special servant); 35:28 (law of the city of refuge); and 36:7-8 (inheritance laws for daughters).

Isaiah tops the list of Duran's quotations from the Prophets section of the Hebrew Bible. He cites Isaiah 28 times: 1:8; 2:3; 6:3; 6:9-10; 7:14; 7:16; 7:18; 8:2; 8:7; 8:23; 9:5; 10:22; 11:1; 14:19; 28:16; 29:13; 31:3; 40:3; 42:1-4; 45:23; 52:13; 53:9; 54:11-12; 54:17; 55:1-4; 61:1-2; 62:11; and 65:1. Once again, the reason stems from Christian concern and argumentation vis-a-vis the Hebrew Bible. This concern often focused on the Book of Isaiah. In addition, Duran uses Joshua 1:1; 24:32; Judges 6:38-40; I Samuel 13:1; 21:4; II Samuel 5:14; 12:24; I Kings 18:1; 20:9-11;

II Kings 18:19; 20:19; Jeremiah 3:12-18; 11:3-4; 23:6; 23:36; 31:14-16; 31:31-33; 32:9; 32:37-40; Ezekiel 1:16; 20:25; 29:7; 36:25; 47:1; 47:8; Hosea 11:1; Joel 3:1; Amos 9:11-12; Obadiah 1:1,1-2; Micah 5:1; Habakkuk 1:5; 2:3-4; 3:18; Zechariah 4:7; 9:9; 11:12-13; 13:7; Malachi 3:1.

Duran does not utilize Jonah, Nahum, Zephaniah, and Haggai from among the Prophets. This is somewhat perplexing in the case of Jonah, who is identified in Matthew 12:40 and Luke 11:29-30; 32 as a precursor of Jesus. The absence may indicate that these passages were not widely quoted by Christian writers of Duran's period, or it may simply evidence that Duran's polemical work, though extensive, was not comprehensive.

Psalms provide the major source category from the Writings section in the Hebrew Bible. Duran quotes: Psalm 8:3; 16:8-9; 19:8-12; 27:11; 32:1-2; 51:7; 67:5; 82:6; 91:11-12; 110:1. He also cites Proverbs 30:19; Job 19:25; Ruth 1:1; Daniel 9:26-27; 11:14; I Chronicles 3:5; 7:14-20; II Chronicles 24:20-21; 30:2; 32:3; 32:34. He does not quote from Song of Songs, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther, or Ezra/Nehemiah. Again, the one surprising omission is the Song of Songs, which was allegorized extensively by the Church in line with Christian doctrine.

Turning to the New Testament, Duran reveals familiarity with all parts of the text, and with the emphases of the Church. Among the Synoptic Gospels, Matthew predominates

in his citations, both because of its prominence in Christian writings and because of its extensive quotation of the Hebrew Scriptures. Duran comments on Matthew 1:6-15; 1:20-23; 1:25; 2:1-23; 3:1-4; 3:11; 3:13-17; 4:1-7; 4:10; 4:13; 5:17-44; 6:31-34; 9:9; 9:12-13; 10:5-19; 10:23; 11:2-3; 11:10; 12:1-4; 12:15-26; 12:46-49; 13:13-20; 13:41-42; 13:54-57; 14:1-10; 15:1-3; 15:7-9; 15:11; 15:24; 16:13-17; 16:19; 16:28; 17:22; 18:2-3; 18:18; 19:3-5; 19:16-19; 19:24; 20:18; 21:1-5; 21:15-16; 21:18-20; 22:23-32; 22:41-45; 23:2-6; 23:13-39; 24:1-34; 26:2-28; 26:31-57; 26:63-66; 27:3-10; 27:37; 27:39-43; 27:46; 27:50-53; 28:19-28.

Duran divides the rest of his coverage of the Synoptic Gospels relatively equally. He quotes Mark 1:2-3; 3:22; 6:8-11; 6:35; 7:3; 7:6-7; 7:25-27; 10:7; 10:17-18; 10:37-40; 10:45; 12:28-30; 14:12-27; 14:62; 15:28; 15:33; 16:15-18; and Luke 1:5; 1:28; 2:7-31; 2:40; 2:42-48; 3:23-31; 4:3-4; 4:16-19; 4:25; 6:26-30; 10:3-7; 11:15; 16:17; 16:19-25; 17:5-6; 18:22-25; 21:5-28; 22:19-20; 22:69. From the Gospel of John, Duran takes 1:1-2; 1:12; 1:14; 2:1-4; 3:16; 3:36; 5:30; 6:47-67; 10:19-36; 14:9-10; 14:20; 19:25-27; 19:34.

Duran covers a wide range of the Letters, concentrating primarily on Acts. He cites Acts 1:6-7; 1:14; 2:25-26; 3:20; 3:22; 6:8-12; 7:1-4; 7:14-15; 7:22-26; 7:37; 7:57-58; 8:27-28; 9:1-18; 9:20-25; 10:11-16; 10:28; 13:20-21; 13:34; 13:40-49; 15:1-20; 17:16-18; 19:4; 20:16-17; 22:3-7; 22:12; 23:6-8; 24:4; 24:15; 25:8; 25:11; 26:14; 26:23;

29:14; and 28:17-18. He also includes Romans 2:17-26; 3:20; 3:22; 3:27; 4:3-11; 5:8-21; 6:5; 6:8-9; 8:14-16; 9:4-5; 9:27-28; 9:33; 10:19-20; 11:13; 14:11; 15:10; I Corinthians 1:21-23; 8:6; 10:1-2; 10:17; 15:20-22; 15:32; II Corinthians 3:13-16; 4:4; 12:2; Galatians 1:13-14; 1:17-19; 3:2-10; 3:24; 5:2-3; Colossians 2:5-9; I Thessalonians 4:15-17; I Timothy 4:1-3; Hebrews 3:5-6; 8:10; 10:37-38; James 2:10; 5:13-16; I John 4:2-3; 4:12; 5:7-8; Jude 1:4-5; and Revelation 1:17-18; 5:12; 20:1-14. Duran does not utilize Ephesians, Philippians, II Thessalonians, II Timothy, Titus, Philemon, I and II Peter, and II and III John.

Duran does not restrict himself to Biblical sources, but exercises far greater selectivity in post-Biblical materials. His aim in Sefer Kelimat HaGoyim is not to counter Christianity with Judaism, but rather to indicate the distortions and misunderstandings of post-Jesus Christianity. Unlike medieval public disputants, then, he does not defend Talmud versus the calumnies of anti-Jewish polemicists. He simply uses Jewish post-Biblical sources for information and argumentative ammunition.

Duran quotes Mishna Sanhedrin 2:4; 4:1; Sotah 3:4; Gittin 9:10; Pesachim 1; and Talmud Yevamot 46; Baba Batra 9; 12b; 22; Hagiga 3; Sanhedrin 25b; 35b; 91; 107b; Yoma 39b; Avodah Zarah 8b; Sotah 47a. From Midrashic literature, he uses Tanchuma Toldot 14; Seder Olam Rabah 28; and Mechilta Mishpatim 4. He also cites the Septuagint rendering of Amos 9:11-12 and Rashi's interpretations of Jeremiah 3:17;

Genesis 11:32; and Avodah Zarah 10. He takes several excerpts from Maimonides' works: the Guide, Part I, Section 58; the Letter to Yemen on Isaiah 54:17; the Mishna Torah, Hilchot Sefer Torah 8:4; and Igrot le'Pesia 3:2. Duran also knows the Kuzari (he quotes 3:31), the writings of Benjamin of Tudela, and the Livyat Hen of Rabbi Levi ben Abraham ben Hayim (1245-1315), a philosopher from southern France.

What is more remarkable is Duran's knowledge of post-New Testament and post-Church Fathers' Christian thinking. He devotes a whole section of his Sefer to Jerome's translation, citing specifically Isaiah 7:14; Nahum 1:11; Habakkuk 3:18; Psalm 27:11; Job 19:25; Daniel 9:26; Matthew 13:15; Matthew 27:9; and Romans 10:19. He mentions Augustine's name.

In addition to these Church Fathers, Duran analyzes sections from Nicholas de Lyra's commentaries. This French Franciscan scholar (1270-1349) used Rashi extensively in his Biblical commentaries, and "corrected" Jerome's Vulgate mistranslations through his knowledge of the Jewish exegete. Lyra also wrote two small anti-Jewish polemical treatises. Herman Hailperin considers these treatises moderate in the context of medieval polemical literature, and calls Lyra "serious, loyal, courteous, positive, and truly scientific... all of Lyra's excerpts of the Hebrew materials are an accurate and faithful transcription of the Jewish commentators."²⁹

Duran quotes Lyra on Jeremiah 3:12-18; Matthew 2:19-

23; John 6:63; Acts 6-7; 13:20-21; 15:16-17; Romans 3; and I John 5:8. He also knows Lyra's viewpoint that the Hebrew Scriptures foreshadow the life of Jesus. For example, Lyra identifies Zechariah 9:9 as a foretelling of Jesus in his dual divine/human role. Lyra writes:

the prophet Zechariah is speaking of the coming of God to the sons of Israel. If, therefore, according to them that authority speaks of the Messiah who also in the same authority is said to come in poverty, the conclusion is that He is God and man; so that He is poor in relation to humanity, and potent to save in relation to Divinity.³⁰

Lyra of course identifies this Messiah with Jesus, using other Biblical passages such as Genesis 49:10 and Isaiah 53 for support.

Duran quotes two other post-New Testament sources in Sefer Kelimat HaGoyim; Peter Lombard's Sententiae, a one-volume Christian doctrinal work (1157-1158) and Vincent of Beauvais' Speculum Historiale, the French Dominican's history of mankind until 1254. Daniel Lasker notes that the practice of quoting acknowledged authorities of the other religion "is found in the works of only the most knowledgeable of the polemicists, e.g. Profiat Duran..."³¹ Lasker also points out that most contemporary Jewish polemicists relied upon Christian missionaries and polemicists for their knowledge of Christian doctrine.

Profiat Duran, who most likely was baptized and lived ostensibly as a Christian, was apparently an exception. His quotations of Christian

authors, e.g. Peter Lombard and Nicholas de Lyra, are too exact to have been learned by hearsay.³²

Lasker implies that Duran not only met with certain Christian thinkers (e.g. the aforementioned John of Montpellier), but also studied their writings, as well as earlier post-New Testament texts. Duran recognized that just as Judaism had developed beyond Biblical categories, so too had Christianity. He also saw the opportunity of using internal Christian debate for his own polemical purposes. Apparently, such written materials were accessible to baptized Christians; they would certainly have remained off-limits to members of the Jewish community. Thus, Duran's apparently ambiguous religious status (legally Christian, emotionally Jewish) aided his polemical goals. He could move in both worlds on the basis of different credentials.

Al Tehi Ka'avotecha, because of its personal satiric nature and shorter length, employs far fewer source quotations than does Sefer Kelimat HaGoyim. From the Torah, Duran cites Genesis 49:27 (Jacob's blessing to Benjamin); Exodus 20:21 ("in every place where I cause My name to be mentioned I will come to you and bless you"); Numbers 6:24-26 (priestly benediction); Deuteronomy 6:4 (the Shema); and 29:28 (concealed acts vs. overt acts). From the Prophets, he employs Isaiah 7:14 ("Assuredly, my Lord will give you a sign of His own accord! Look, the young woman is with child and about to give birth to a son. Let her name him Immanuel."); Ezekiel 20:18 ("I warned their children in the wilderness; Do not follow the practices of your fathers, do not keep

their ways, and do not defile yourselves with their fetishes"); Zechariah 1:4 ("Do not be like your fathers!"-- a source of the letter's title); Malachi 3:6 ("For I am the Lord---I have not changed; and you are the children of Jacob---you have not ceased to be"); and 3:22 ("Be mindful of the Teaching of My servant Moses, whom I charged at Horeb with laws and rules for all Israel.")). Duran quotes three selections from the Writings; Psalm 34:1 (previously cited); Psalm 58:9 ("Let them be like the snail which dissolves into slime"); Job 38:19 ("where is the way to the dwelling of light.."); and II Chronicles 30:7 ("Do not be like your fathers and your brethren..."--- another source of the letter's title).

In addition, Duran mentions the Gospel of Matthew, and Acts 7 and 15. He also quotes Mishna Yadaim 4:6.

VI.

What functions do all the aforementioned quotations serve in Duran's polemical treatises?

Duran utilizes the Hebrew Biblical citations in five different ways: 1) to point out their appearance in the New Testament; 2) to show their function as Christian theological underpinnings; 3) to indicate Vulgate mistranslations; 4) to provide literary allusions; 5) for polemical purposes.

In the first instance, several examples will suffice to indicate Duran's method: Psalm 91:11-12 appears in Matthew 4:5-6; Deuteronomy 6:16 in Matthew 4:7; Deuteronomy 8:3 in Matthew 4:4. Exodus is quoted in Matthew 22:32 and Daniel 9:27 in Matthew 24:15. Duran simply reveals the extensive use of Scriptural citation in the New Testament. He also points out mistranslations when appropriate.

Duran also shows how Biblical citations were used (or misused) as Christian theological underpinnings. For example, Isaiah 7:14 provides for Christian thinkers the Biblical foundation for the idea of virgin birth and the non-involvement of Joseph in Jesus' conception. Isaiah's words to King Ahaz that God will give the king a sign through an about-to-be-born male child was viewed by Christian theologians as a foretelling of the birth of Jesus. The Hebrew term "almah" (young woman) was translated as "virgin", providing the event with a miraculous quality. Similarly, the triple repetition of "holy, holy, holy" in

Isaiah 6:3 underlay the Christian Trinitarian belief. Psalm 51:7 ("Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean; wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow") girded the notion of Original Sin. The much-quoted Genesis 15:6 ("and because he Abraham put his trust in the Lord, He reckoned it to his merit") provided the basis for Paul's doctrine of the superiority of Faith over Works. Abraham, according to this doctrine, needed no commandments for salvation; he simply believed in the Lord.

Duran reveals his familiarity with the Biblical background of all major Christian concepts. Jeremiah's avowal that God had promised to establish a New Covenant with Israel (Jeremiah 31:31-33) appeared to Christians as the genesis of their own supersession of the Old Covenant.

See, a time is coming---declares the Lord---when I will make a new covenant with the House of Israel and the House of Judah. It will not be like the covenant I made with their fathers, when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt, a covenant which they broke, so that I rejected them---declares the Lord. But such is the covenant I will make with the House of Israel after these days---declares the Lord; I will put My Teaching into their inmost being and inscribe it upon their hearts. Then I will be their God, and they shall be My people.

The Christian Church saw itself as the New Israel, in place of the Old Israel rejected by God.

Christian thinkers interpreted Moses' veil in Exodus

34:33-35 as symbolic of Israel's partial understanding of the Truth. It would remain for Christians to restore full vision through their belief in the birth and resurrection of Jesus. Melchizedek's offering of bread and wine in Genesis 14:18-19 prefigured the Eucharist, according to these same interpreters, while Ezekiel's references to clean and wholesome water in Chapters 36:25 and 47:1,8 clearly foretold baptism.

These first two functions of Duran's Biblical quotations are pedagogical devices as well, although perhaps unintentionally. While providing a Christian textual and doctrinal background for his polemical arguments, Duran offers his readers abundant factual information about Christianity. The links between the Old and New Testaments and later Christian doctrine stand clearly revealed. This device established Duran's credibility with knowledgeable readers, but it also offered ambivalent readers "dangerous" information. If they followed Duran's arguments to their conclusion, they would reject Christianity; but powerful opposing forces in the surrounding society diminished that possibility. Duran's polemical works, especially Sefer Kelimat HaGoyim, constituted a "crash" course in basic Christianity, as well as a thorough refutation of its tenets.

Duran utilizes the Scriptural quotations in a third way: to indicate Jerome's mistranslations in the Vulgate. He accuses Jerome of mistranslating Deuteronomy 32:21

(found in Romans 10:19), but does not give the exact quote. The mistranslation of Habakkuk 3:18 is readily apparent. The Hebrew text reads: וְיִשְׂמַח בְּיְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי "

"וְיִשְׂמַח בְּיְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי"
 ("Yet will I rejoice in the Lord; exult in the God who delivers me."). The Vulgate translation reads instead: "Ego autem in Domino gaudebo; et exultabo in Deo Iesu meo." ("Yet will I rejoice in the Lord; exult in my God Jesus."). Job 19:25 provides a third example of Jerome's doctrinal mistranslation; the Hebrew text reads:

"וְיָדָעְתִּי כִּי חַי הַיּוֹשֵׁעַ וְעַתָּה יִשְׁתָּלֵּם"
 ("For I know that my Redeemer lives, and at last he will stand upon the earth."). The Vulgate version changes the latter half of the statement into the first-person singular, thereby professing belief in personal resurrection through the Redeemer: "Scio enim quod Redemptor meus vivit, et in novissimo die de terra surrecturus sum."

Duran also provides literary allusions through the Biblical quotations. He describes Spanish Jewry in the words of Isaiah 1:8: "כַּחַת בְּתֵּל הַקִּדְמוֹת וְכַחַת בְּתֵּל הַמִּשְׁעָרִים"³³
 ("Like a hut in a cucumber field, like a city beleaguered"--- in original Biblical text, "כַּחַת בְּתֵּל הַקִּדְמוֹת" reads "כַּחַת בְּתֵּל הַמִּשְׁעָרִים"). He alludes to Amos 9:11, in his hopes for a raising of the "בְּיָמֵינוּ"³⁴ of Spanish Jewish life. Duran describes Jerome and his Jewish assistant in the words of Isaiah 31:3: ³⁵"וְהַיֵּלֵךְ יִפֹּס וְהַנִּסְמָךְ יִפֹּל"
 ("The helper shall trip, and the helped one shall fall").

third year. Duran's polemical point is clear: how can such an ignoramus be the Messiah?

Duran's sarcasm emerges frequently. In reference to Jerome's mistranslation of Habakkuk 3:18 (see supra, pg.

30), Duran asks: 'ל'ק'נ'ן ת'ח'ל 'ד' ת'ל'ח' ת'ל'ע...'
 ת'ל'ע' ת'ל'ח' ת'ל'ע' ת'ל'ח' ת'ל'ע' ת'ל'ח' ת'ל'ע' ת'ל'ח'
 ת'ל'ע' ת'ל'ח' ת'ל'ע' ת'ל'ח' ת'ל'ע' ת'ל'ח' ת'ל'ע' ת'ל'ח'
 37... ת'ל'ע' ת'ל'ח' ת'ל'ע' ת'ל'ח' ת'ל'ע' ת'ל'ח' ת'ל'ע' ת'ל'ח'

To his friend, David, he reverses the passage in Genesis 49:27: " ת'ל'ע' ת'ל'ח' ת'ל'ע' ת'ל'ח' ת'ל'ע' ת'ל'ח' ת'ל'ע' ת'ל'ח' " ("In the morning he consumes the foe, and in the evening he divides the spoil"), in a thinly-veiled attack on the Eucharist.

New Testament quotations also provide grist for Duran's polemical mill. His sarcastic predilection assaults the story of Jesus and the fig tree in Matthew 21:18-20.

Duran writes that the disciples were amazed at Jesus' ability to cause the fig tree to wither: ת'ל'ע' ת'ל'ח' ת'ל'ע' ת'ל'ח' ת'ל'ע' ת'ל'ח' ת'ל'ע' ת'ל'ח'
 , ת'ל'ע' ת'ל'ח' ת'ל'ע' ת'ל'ח' ת'ל'ע' ת'ל'ח' ת'ל'ע' ת'ל'ח'
 38... ת'ל'ע' ת'ל'ח' ת'ל'ע' ת'ל'ח' ת'ל'ע' ת'ל'ח' ת'ל'ע' ת'ל'ח'

In Mark 6:5, Jesus is unable to perform any "mighty works". Does such a person deserve the appellation "God"?

In Matthew 19:16-19, a young man asks Jesus how to achieve eternal life. Jesus tells him to observe all the commandments, and specifies certain Toraitic precepts. Duran quotes this section to prove Jesus' adherence to and admiration of the Law. Only later disciples abrogated such observance. James 2:10 underscores this point: "For whoever keeps the whole law but fails in one point has become guilty

text stands whole, as a believable historical document.

The historical critique begins with Paul. Paul misinterpreted Scriptural language, e.g. Genesis 15:6, in Romans 4:3-11, where Paul instructs the Gentiles that Toraitic commandments are unnecessary. Faith stands above all practical deeds. Paul repeats this contention in I Corinthians 1:21-23, where "Christ crucified" is the only requisite belief. Duran has already proved that Jesus and his disciples observed the commandments. Therefore, Paul's innovations are clearly inauthentic. He opposes "authentic" Christianity (i.e. the religion of Jesus and his disciples) when he writes (in Romans 3:20): "For no human being will be justified in his sight by works of the law since through the law comes knowledge of sin."

Duran occasionally uses the New Testament for information in his polemical works. Acts 9:1-18 and 22:3 present Paul's biography, including his vision on the road to Damascus and his conversion to Christianity. Matthew 3:1-4, 11, 13-17 describes John's baptism of Jesus. Obviously, Duran did not consider his readers to be familiar enough with these stories that he might simply refer to John the Baptist and Paul by name alone.

Finally, Duran utilizes New Testament quotations to indicate their misinterpretations of Hebrew Scriptural passages, and occasionally to point out internal contradictions. He quotes large sections of Matthew in this regard, since Matthew quotes the Hebrew Scriptures extensively. For example, Duran shows that Matthew 2:5-6 misquotes Micah 5:1;

that Matthew 2:16-18 misinterprets Jeremiah 31:15, since Herod's proclamation to kill all the male infants in Bethlehem applied to a tribe of Judah, not to tribal descendants of Rachel (Jeremiah 31:15 reads: "Thus said the Lord: A cry is heard in Ramah---wailing, bitter weeping--- Rachel weeping for her children"); and that Matthew 2:19-23 quotes a Scriptural saying "He shall be called a Nazarene," which doesn't exist in the Hebrew Bible at all.

Mark 1,3 distorts Isaiah 40,3 by leaving out the final part of the citation. Similarly, Romans 4:7-8 misinterprets the meaning of Psalm 32:1-2, and Romans 10:20 slightly misquotes Isaiah 65:1. In Acts 6:8-12, and continuing in Chapter 7, Stephen tells the history of the Israelites. Throughout the narrative, he repeatedly makes small emendations. Duran points these out, and comments:

41". 5ND15N 1c7201 N17 1729 581c 501 "

Acts 13:40-49 misquotes Habakkuk 1:5: פ'לל נל דפ'לל "

[illegible]

Despite Duran's disclaimer, he has attempted to provide a comprehensive listing of all such citations.

Duran also occasionally shows internal textual contradictions. The genealogies in Luke 3:23-31 and Matthew 1:6-15 do not coincide. Similarly, the birth stories in Matthew 2:1-14 and Luke 1:5; 2:7-31, 40 give differing details. In Matthew, Jesus is born in Bethlehem during Herod's reign, but his family then flees to Egypt, and returns to Nazareth later. Luke also places the birth of Jesus in

Bethlehem, but the circumstances are much different. Joseph and Mary have traveled to Bethlehem from their hometown of Nazareth for a census, and return to Nazareth after the birth of the child. Thus, Duran reveals these most glaring internal contradictions, but only once transcends his medieval context by assessing their implications. He uses the birth stories strictly to determine the date of Jesus' birth. However, in the matter of genealogy, he comes closest to realizing the potential power of these

[illegible]

Instead of pursuing this line of thought, however, Duran turns to the detail of female inheritance as it affected Jesus' genealogical descent. He, too, approaches the wall, but leaves its foundations standing, if gradually crumbling.

Duran uses the post-Biblical Jewish sources primarily for legal background information and polemical resource material. In Al Tehi Ka'avotecha, he uses Mishna Yadaim 4:6 as the background for Jewish laws of purity. He quotes Gittin 9:10 to underscore Jesus' affirmation of Toraitic law. In this Mishnaic passage, Beit Shammai forbids a man from divorcing his wife unless she has committed a sexual offense. Jesus thus agrees with Beit Shammai, and is not

proclaiming any new principle in Matthew 5:31-32.

Yevamot 46 states the rules for conversion to Judaism, providing the source for Christian baptism, according to Duran. The "deceivers" simply eliminated the circumcision requirement. Mechilta Mishpatim, Section 4, analogizes the Shabbat laws on lighting a fire to the holiday laws, thus precluding the possibility of Jesus' having been executed on Pesach.

Polemical purposes mingle with such legal data. When Duran calls Jesus a " *ἄφρονας* " ("foolishly pious individual"), he is alluding to Sotah 3:4. Duran quotes Baba Batra 22 to indicate a use of metaphor similar to Jesus' use. In the Talmudic quote, study is called "meat"; clearly, Jesus did not literally intend his followers to consider bread and wine actual substitutes for his flesh and blood. He was merely speaking in parables.

Duran castigates Matthew with the title "tax collector", referring to Sanhedrin 25b, where tax-collectors are disqualified to serve as witnesses. He defends the accuracy of the Masoretic text with a reference to Benjamin of Tudela,

פיקח פסידה יצקד קדיש
יב יכעל ק'יל עס יו' חנה חנני יכעל

44.. דמתי דגרי חורז פו'ר מ'י'ר עס קדיש
 ח'ח ח'ח יס'ח

Maimonides' Hilchot Sefer Torah 8:4 also stands as evidence for the text's accuracy.

In addition, Duran indicates certain Jewish customs with his post-Biblical Jewish citations. Hagiga 3a-b, for

example, provides the information that discourses occurred in the academies on Shabbat.

Post-New Testament Christian sources serve two functions. They indicate additional Scriptural mistranslations, and provide polemical targets. Duran concentrates on Jerome's mistranslations of the Biblical texts, beginning with the famous Isaiah 7:14 passage: "Assuredly, my Lord will give you a sign of His own accord! Look, the young woman is with child and about to give birth to a son. Let her name him Immanuel." Jerome changes the verbs to the future tense, according to Duran. Other examples include the translation of Habakkuk 3:18 (see supra, pg. 30), Daniel 9:26, and Job 19:25 (see supra, pg. 30).

Duran debates Nicholas de Lyra in several places. De Lyra asserts that the entire Torah predicts the coming of Jesus and the events of his life, specifically citing the passage in Isaiah 7:14. Duran calls this assertion

וְיָהוֹשֻׁעַ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׁמְעוּ וְיִתְּנוּ אֶת הַשֵּׁם הַזֶּה לְבָנָם
 וְיִקְרְאוּ אֶת הַשֵּׁם הַזֶּה לְבָנָם וְיִתְּנוּ אֶת הַשֵּׁם הַזֶּה לְבָנָם
 45 "... וְיִתְּנוּ אֶת הַשֵּׁם הַזֶּה לְבָנָם וְיִקְרְאוּ אֶת הַשֵּׁם הַזֶּה לְבָנָם

De Lyra interprets Jeremiah 3:12-18 as proof of the end of Toraitic rule with the coming of the Messiah and the conversion of the Gentiles. Duran denies this vehemently, since the predicted events did not occur in Jesus' time nor afterwards.

Nicholas de Lyra ascribes Matthew's reference in 2:23 to Isaiah 11:1: "A twig (netzer) shall sprout from his stock."

Duran derides this ascription with a different quote from Isaiah, 14:19: "Like loathsome carrion(netzer).\" De Lyra also attempts to justify Stephen's apparent Scriptural misquotations in Acts 6-7, but Duran does not accept the justifications, although he quotes them. Similarly, de Lyra attempts to explain Paul's apparent error of dating in Acts 13:20-21 by combining Samuel's and Saul's years of rule. Duran sarcastically rejects this solution.

Duran occasionally quotes de Lyra approvingly. For example, de Lyra's interpretation of I John 5:8 seemingly places an obstacle before the symbolic basis of the Trinity. If the spirit, the water, and the blood are separate entities, they cannot serve as a collective representation of the Trinity. Also, de Lyra interprets John 6:63 symbolically, with Jesus as the "head" of a community "body". Duran willingly accepts later Christian interpretation when it seems to conflict with established Church doctrine. He juxtaposes Church texts and interpretations one with the other to indicate inconsistency and falsehood.

VII.

Al Tehi Ka'avotecha, Profiat Duran's satirical letter to his friend, David, contrasts Christian and Jewish practices and concepts. Although Duran does not specifically mention Christianity or Jesus, David's faith is based on exactly one fundamental premise---Faith---whereas Judaism agrees with Reason: אמונה (Faith) vs. לוגיקה (Reason).

Duran mentions several Christian practices in the work. A Christian name apparently replaces the convert's Jewish name at the time of baptism. David, for instance, possesses two names. The wafer of communion is discussed several times, underscoring its importance in Christian thought, and its inconceivability in Jewish thought. Christians worship at various holy altars. Finally, Christians do not suffer as much as Jews. Although David will suffer the "slings and arrows" of apostasy (from both sides), he will escape the general misfortunes of the Jewish community.

Duran details the conceptual contrasts between the two religions. Under the main rubric of the supersession of Faith over Reason, Christians reject logic when it conflicts with Church doctrine. For example, they believe that the wafer used in the communion rite equals Christ's body: $\text{הוא הוה} \text{הוא הוה} \text{הוא הוה} \text{אמונה} \text{'כף} \text{'כ}$ "46"... $\text{לפי} \text{הוא} \text{אמונה} \text{אמונה} \text{אמונה} \text{אמונה}$ Duran cannot accept this belief for several logical reasons. How can two bodies interpenetrate one another? Just as Jesus'

large body cannot logically become the small wafer, so Jesus cannot possibly descend and re-ascend through heaven constantly, without tearing apart the heavenly sphere. Furthermore, Duran questions the possibility of a body being in motion and at rest simultaneously; How can Jesus rest in heaven and travel to various altars at the same time? This raises another problem; how can a single body appear on so many altars simultaneously?

The nature of the wafer presents an additional logical contradiction. What happens to the substance of the wafer when its "substance" becomes divine? 121

[illegible]

Also, logic dictates that "seeing is believing"; the wafer never changes at all in relation to the senses.

Normative Christian doctrine dismisses all these problems with an appeal to faith. However, Daniel Lasker points out that some internal Christian opposition to the doctrine of transubstantiation existed throughout the Middle Ages. "It was Profiat Duran who put the Christian criticism into a Jewish framework, and it was from his works that later Jewish polemicists borrowed..."⁴⁸ For all Jewish polemicists, transubstantiation became the paradigmatic example of Christian irrationality.

The doctrine of incarnation fared only slightly better, although it receives little attention in this first polemic. Duran simply accuses Christians of believing that God and the Son are one and the same, a clearly irrational belief. How can God inhabit heaven and earth at the same time?

A second main Christian faith principle advances trinitarianism over monotheism, a belief

49. "יְהוָה יחיד" (YHWH is one) "אֱלֹהִים יְחִידִים" (Gods are one) "אֱלֹהִים יְחִידִים" (Gods are one) "אֱלֹהִים יְחִידִים" (Gods are one) "אֱלֹהִים יְחִידִים" (Gods are one)

Lasker explains:

For the Jewish polemicist, arguing from Aristotelian logic, God's essential unity did not allow for individuals which partook of His essence but were distinct. For the Christian theologian, such individualization in the essence implied neither a multiplicity in God nor a complete identity of the Persons.⁵⁰

Again, Jews and Christians speak past each other.

A third Christian doctrine unacceptable to Duran is God's corporeality. He opposes both the concepts of virgin birth and vicarious atonement. He writes, with sarcasm:

51. "...אֱלֹהִים בְּחַיִּים" (Gods are alive) "אֱלֹהִים בְּחַיִּים" (Gods are alive) "אֱלֹהִים בְּחַיִּים" (Gods are alive) "אֱלֹהִים בְּחַיִּים" (Gods are alive) "אֱלֹהִים בְּחַיִּים" (Gods are alive)

Duran rejects the supersession of literal Scriptural interpretation over rational Scriptural interpretation. He attributes the Pauline concept of original sin to this literal understanding. For Christians, the Messiah (i.e. Jesus) redeems humanity from the ⁵² "...אֱלֹהִים בְּחַיִּים" (Gods are alive) "אֱלֹהִים בְּחַיִּים" (Gods are alive) "אֱלֹהִים בְּחַיִּים" (Gods are alive) "אֱלֹהִים בְּחַיִּים" (Gods are alive) "אֱלֹהִים בְּחַיִּים" (Gods are alive)

Duran also derides the supersession of unlimited freedom

theologians interpreted literally what should have been interpreted poetically. John 10:19-36 offers major evidence of Jesus' use of figurative language. In verse 34, Jesus quotes Psalm 82:6, where human beings are called "gods". He then refers to himself as the "son of God" in this context. He obviously sees himself as a "real" son of God only in a spiritual sense, not in any physical or literal sense.

The "deceivers" also misinterpreted prophetic passages. They used Jeremiah 23:6 as the Scriptural source for the Messiah's divinity; however, Duran identifies other objects in the Bible which are also symbolically called "God". More significantly, Christian theologians identified the child in Isaiah 7:14 with the Messiah. They then derived two basic doctrines from this assumption: 1) that the Messiah was born to a virgin; 2) that the name Immanuel signified his divinity. Duran vehemently rejects this Christian interpretation for several reasons. He points out first of all that " עַלְמָא " does not mean "virgin", but rather "young woman" (as in Proverbs 30:19). Second, the event reported in Isaiah 7:14 took place 500 years before the birth of Jesus. Furthermore, Jerome mistranslated the verse to refer to a future pregnancy, rather than a present one. Duran also carefully notes that whereas the mother in Isaiah 7:14 is to name her own son Immanuel, in the case of Jesus, the angel Gabriel refers to him as Immanuel, but Mary herself names him Jesus. Finally, Duran rejects Nicholas

de Lyra's contention that the entire Hebrew Bible is simply a foreshadowing of Jesus the Messiah: 32051 "

פסוקים 810 פסוקים 71200 ד 12712 14
56. 1138 810 פסוקים 1171 1117 10'8 דלל 11111 1111

Duran sees de Lyra's assertion as a weak defense against the obvious contrasts and distance between the facts of Isaiah 7:14 and the facts of Jesus' birth.

The "deceivers" similarly misunderstood Isaiah 9:5. They identified the marvelous leader with the Messiah, although in fact the verse refers to Hezekiah. Duran supports his identification with quotes from Biblical texts.

Christian scholars recognized the dichotomy between their divine Jesus and their human Jesus. In order to reconcile the two identities, they postulated hypostasis--- i.e., the existence of two opposites in one subject. These opposites, the human and the divine elements, combined to form the Messianic personality of Jesus. The best example of such duality appears in Matthew 27:46, when Jesus calls out to God at the time of the crucifixion; his human side cries out to his divine side. Duran rejects the doctrine of hypostasis as absurd: How can God call out to God? Certainly, Jesus and his disciples never claimed such nonsense.

Duran then turns to the doctrine of the Trinity. He finds certain similarities between the beliefs of the Kabbalists and those of Jesus and his followers. However, the latter distort Kabbalistic belief to such an extent that no real connection exists between them. Most likely, Jesus acquired his magical powers in Egypt, not from

Jewish mystical practices.

Duran tells us that the "deceivers" based the Trinity on the Letter to John 5:7, which as quoted is not extant in any modern English New Testament translation. Duran cites it as follows:

יהוה רוח קדש
57. "האבות, הרוח הקדש והיהוה אחד
פ"ה רוח קדש

("These three give witness in heaven: the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, and these three are one."). He notes that the final phrase may simply mean "are in agreement", as it does in the following passage, I John 5:8 (which is extant). Duran quotes Nicholas de Lyra approvingly in this regard, since the Christian theologian explained the three elements in I John 5:8---the Spirit, the water, and the blood---as three separate elements, each of which validates faith in Jesus. Duran accuses Christian writers of ignoring or denying this interpretation, which would strike a fatal blow to the Trinitarian doctrine.

The "deceivers" also used John 1:1-2 and John 1:14 as foundations for belief in the Trinity. Duran questions the internal logic of this analysis; do these passages not indicate dualism rather than Trinitarianism? They speak of the "Word" and "God", of a "Father" and a "Son"; where does the "Holy Spirit" enter into the arrangement?

The "deceivers" also confused the three divine qualities necessary for the creation of the world---"חכמה" ("wisdom"), "יכולת" ("ability"), and "רצון" ("will") with the Trinity. They equated "wisdom" with the Son, "ability" with

the Father, and "will" with the Holy Spirit. Duran explains each philosophical quality, emphasizing its nature as attribute, rather than separate essence.

Finally, the "deceivers" misinterpreted several Biblical passages in order to support the idea of the Trinity. For example, the thricefold statement of "holy" in Isaiah 6:3 offered apparent substantiation, in addition to the various plural forms of "God" in Scriptural texts. Even the fundamental monotheistic assertion of Judaism, the Shema (Deuteronomy 6:4), contained the Trinitarian secret, because of the repetition of God's name three times. Duran mocks this last "proof" by pointing out that the Shema, according to Christian premise, actually contains a five-faceted divinity, since the middle divine appellation already presupposes the Trinity.

Original sin serves as Duran's next target. He initially explains this Christian concept, noting that Jesus' incarnation and crucifixion provided vicarious atonement for this sin. The "atoner" had to be someone who was both divine and human at the same time. Abraham represented an intermediate level; the commandment of circumcision enabled human beings to ascend to the highest level of hell, but not to transcend it. Only Jesus' crucifixion granted complete grace, i.e. dispensation, forgiveness, to those who believe in him. Duran emphasizes that all Christian scholars, including Nicholas de Lyra, admitted that circumcision offers some ameliorative effect.

Duran's argument against the Christian doctrine of original sin and vicarious atonement travels the same route as did his argument against Jesus' alleged divinity. Jesus himself never claimed to die for anyone else's sin. In places such as Matthew 17:22; 20:18; 26:2-24, he predicted that he would die, but not that he was redeeming anyone by this fate. Later Christian thinkers based the concept on the writings of Paul, especially Romans 5:8-21:

But God shows his love for us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us...Then as one man's trespass led to condemnation for all men, so one man's act of righteousness leads to acquittal and life for all men...

Other such passages include Romans 6:5,8,9, and I Corinthians 15:21-22: "For as by a man came death, by a man has come also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam, all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive."

Only believers in Jesus merit such redemption. Again, Paul is the source, in Romans 3:22: "the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ for all who believe", and Romans 9:33. A quote in John 3:36 also establishes a theoretical basis: "He who believes in the Son has eternal life; he who does not obey the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God rests upon him." The prize is eternal life, unavailable prior to Jesus' crucifixion and resurrection, but now open to all believers in these events.

After Duran explains the Christian arguments, he goes on to demolish them. Again he argues first of all from internal Christian sources, beginning with the New Testament.

Jesus himself states in Matthew 9:12-13 and 15:24 that he has come to save only sinners, not pious individuals or "healthy" souls. Clearly then, according to Duran, Jesus does not postulate original sin, for were there such an entity, all human beings would require redemption. In other passages---Matthew 18:2-3; 19:16-17; 23:13-19; Luke 16:19-25; 18:25; and Matthew 19:24---Jesus and the narrators assume the possibility of eternal life, prior to Jesus' crucifixion and resurrection.

Like any good Jew of the period, then, Jesus believed in individual reward and punishment in the after-life, not in an eternal and universal punishment for Adam's original sin. In Matthew 19:17 and 23:2-6, Jesus advises his followers to observe the commandments in order to merit eternal life. Adam's punishment consisted of physical death, not eternal damnation of the souls of all human beings.

Jesus and his followers, however, did predict two events that did not occur. In Matthew 24:1-31,34, Jesus indicates that he sees the Messianic time close at hand, i.e. during the present generation. Later Christian scholars explained Jesus' statement by asserting that the "present generation" referred to any time between Jesus' birth and the end of the world. In Luke 21:5-28, Jesus predicts that his disciples will not be harmed. In fact, many are killed.

When the later "errant ones" realized that Jesus was not re-appearing immediately, they created new explanations for the delay. Revelation 20:1-14 and I John

4:2-3 provide the basis for the concept of the anti-Christ. Jesus himself predicted various marvelous signs by which his Second Coming would be recognized (e.g. in Mark 16:17-18). Duran rejects the explanations for the delayed parousia, and the marvelous signs, as " 176 " ("falsehood"). Even Christian thinkers had to admit that such signs were part of the early stage of the religion, and were developed simply to strengthen the beliefs of new adherents. Duran rebukes these thinkers: justifications may console you, but Jesus himself spoke unconditionally. He said he would return soon, but he hasn't. Not even the signs have appeared.

The next area for debate centers on the observance of Toraitic commandments. According to Duran, Jesus himself certainly accepted the validity of the Torah, and did not intend to change any word of it. In fact, in passages such as Matthew 5:17-44, Jesus encourages his followers to be even more pious than the Torah requires. (See also Matthew 23:2-3 and Luke 16:17). Furthermore, when Jesus is finally crucified, his accusers do not say that he has transgressed any commandments, but rather that he has claimed Messiahship (Matthew 26:63-66).

Jesus' disciples, too, observed the commandments. In Acts 10:11-16, Peter reveals his observance of the dietary laws. Paul maintains his adherence to Jewish customs in Acts 28:17-18. Ananias, Paul's spiritual guide in Damascus, observes the Jewish law, according to Acts 22:12. Duran concludes: 17'N5J1 10' '3 11-7J 23 53N "

58"... דְּרַבִּי הִ'הֵבֵי פִּי'נִכְנ לִי

Again, it is the "deceivers" who wrongly say that Jesus annulled Toraitic law. They base this idea on two sources: Matthew 15:1-3,11 and Luke 10:3-7. In the first example, Jesus says that nothing which enters inside a man can defile him. Duran counters the "deceivers'" understanding of this statement by pointing out that Jesus' disciples continued to observe the dietary laws, and that Jesus really meant that nothing would defile a person were it not for the divine proscription regarding certain foods. In the second example, Jesus tells his disciples to enter any home on their missionary journeys, and eat whatever is available. Naturally, later Christian thinkers saw this as permission to abrogate the Jewish dietary laws. Duran disagrees. He disproves this understanding of Luke by quoting the parallel passage in Matthew 10:5-19, where the disciples are instructed to witness to Jews only. Duran also reinterprets Matthew 12:1-4, where the Pharisees accuse Jesus' disciples of desecrating the Sabbath. Jesus responds with a comparison to David's men, but does not say that he has permitted his men to desecrate the Sabbath, a critical distinction in Duran's mind.

Duran stresses that Jesus did not evince particular interest in Gentiles at all (see Mark 7:25-27, for example). When he did talk about them, he hoped that they would also follow the laws of the Torah (Matthew 23:19-28; 23:3; 24:15-21). Jesus criticizes the "scribes and the Pharisees" not for

go circumcision, but they must observe the statutes of the Torah: "So, if a man who is uncircumcised keeps the precepts of the law, will not his uncircumcision be regarded as circumcision? Then those who are physically uncircumcised but keep the law will condemn you who have the written code and circumcision but break the law."

(vs. 26-27). Duran comments: ז'ח פד וצווע "60... 'צעל ז'ח פ'גזעפ, פ'צו'ס טעהומר ווארט
צדף צו'ס

Duran concludes this section with a general diatribe against Peter, James, Paul, and Jerome. He applies Nahum 1:11 to Peter, who called Jesus the Messiah and son of God, and to James and Paul, who permitted forbidden things to Gentile converts. He also denounces Jerome for his mis-translation of the verse, which he altered from the past to future tense.

Even the later "deceivers" could not deny that Jesus and his disciples observed the commandments. They explained this apparent anomaly by dividing the observance of the Torah into three eras: 1) from Moses to the crucifixion; 2) from the crucifixion to the publication of the Gospels; 3) from the publication of the Gospels forward. During the first period, the entire legal apparatus was obligatory; during the middle period, the followers of Jesus selectively observed the commandments; during the final period, only the "moral" laws remain operative. Duran rejects this analysis, promulgated by Augustine, citing Matthew 24:20, where Jesus expects the observance of Shabbat to remain even

during the final period. The "deceivers" retort that the Pope retains the right to change any law, based on Matthew 16:19. Duran postpones the full discussion of papal authority.

The "deceivers" also buttressed their argument by quoting prophetic passages, including Psalm 27:11 (Duran accuses Jerome of mistranslation) and Isaiah 42:1-4. In the latter instance, Jesus incorrectly quotes this section in Matthew 12:18-21:

21. 22 2866 8101 "
61". 2715 2315 14872 258 1056 271'

The "deceivers" utilized Jeremiah's discussion of a "new covenant" in Jeremiah 31:31-33 as a prediction of the supersession of the "old covenant". Duran rejects this utilization in several ways. First of all, he points out the misquotation of the passage in Hebrews 8:8-12, and Jerome's further mistranslation of the original passage in the Vulgate. He then quotes Jeremiah 11:3-4 to indicate which covenant is operative:

And say to them, Thus said the Lord, the God of Israel: Cursed be the man who will not obey the terms of this covenant, which I enjoined upon your fathers when I freed them from the land of Egypt, the iron crucible, saying, 'Obey Me and observe them, just as I command you, that you may be My people, and I may be your God'.

Certainly, Jeremiah does not refer to a new covenant written two thousand years after the Exodus. Finally, the Jews are the bearers of the "covenant" in Jeremiah, not the descendants of the "uncircumcised".

Some of the "deceivers" went so far as to say that they were now the true Israel. Since the original children of Israel had disobeyed God and even crucified the Messiah, they had become a mockery among the nations. Duran refutes this assertion by quoting Deuteronomy 30:4-8 and Jeremiah 32:37-40. When the true Messiah appears, Israel will believe in him, and follow God's orders.

Christian thinkers misunderstood Jeremiah 3:12-17 as well. Even Nicholas de Lyra thought that it indicated that Toraitic observance would end when the Messiah came, and that the Gentiles would follow Jesus, and no longer act in evil ways. Duran calls this opinion a "falsehood" for three reasons: 1) Constantine did not declare Christianity the state religion for three hundred years after Jesus' death, and even then, not all Gentiles were gathered into Jerusalem; 2) the prediction in Jeremiah 3:18 that Judah and Israel will reunite in the Land has not happened; 3) the real meaning of the passage in Jeremiah is that at the time of redemption, God will no longer speak from the Ark of the Covenant only, but from everywhere in Jerusalem (Rashi's interpretation).

Some of the "deceivers" wished to abrogate the Torah totally, and to replace it with a new Covenant. They considered the Mosaic Torah lacking in three areas, namely: 1) " $\sqrt{8}(2) \text{ } 73N$ " ("the aspect of the Creator"); 2) " $77M \text{ } P38 \text{ } 73N$ " ("the aspect of the essence of the Torah", i.e. the commandments); 3) " $77M \text{ } 73N$ " ("the aspect of purpose").⁶²

In the area of "the Creator", they criticized the Torah for speaking in secret and incomprehensible ways, especially concerning the Trinity. Moses' veil in Exodus 34:33-35 symbolizes this blurred vision. According to Christian thinkers, the covering on the Torah itself was removed, and the secrets of the Messiah revealed, when Jesus came. However, the "veil" still remains upon the eyes of Israel, because they have not yet recognized Jesus as the Messiah. Christians see God clearly; Jews walk in blindness.

Christian writers divided the second area, the commandments, into three parts: moral laws, judicial laws, and ceremonial laws. In all three areas, the Mosaic Torah contained deficiencies. The moral category barely existed, since the Torah regulates only actions, not inner feelings. Exodus 20:14, for example, forbids covetousness in outward action, but not in inward desire. Judicial laws also harbored flaws. Deuteronomy 23:21 permits lending at interest to a non-Jew; Numbers 35:28 establishes unequal punishment for unintentional murderers.

The ceremonial laws prescribed sacrifices for atonement. According to Christian thinkers, no atoning sacrifice could possibly suffice until the ultimate vicarious atonement of Jesus' death. They cited Ezekiel 20:25 as their Scriptural proof: "Moreover, I gave them laws that were not good and rules by which they could not live." Finally, they criticized the purpose of the Torah,

the "body of Jesus" in several ways. Duran quotes the Sententiae, Chapter 4, where Jesus' body is understood in two ways: as the actual crucified body of Jesus, and as the symbolic body of believers, with Jesus as the head, and the believers as the limbs. This book of Sententiae was a book of Christian doctrine, written by Peter Lombard in 1157-1158. Duran quotes it as if it were a well-recognized source.

Nicholas de Lyra also symbolically interpreted Jesus' words in John 6:63: "...The words that I have spoken to you are spirit and life." Jesus' "body" must be the "body" of the community, with Jesus at its head. Despite these interpretations, the later "deceivers" erected an entire theological doctrine on a very weak foundation. They included within their schema Genesis 14:18-19, where the priest Melchizedek offers bread and wine.

Baptism appears next in Duran's polemic. He recounts the story of John the Baptist in Matthew 3, and raises the first doubt: if Jesus already possessed complete divinity, how could the Holy Spirit descend upon him only now after his baptism (Matthew 3:16)?

Duran distinguishes between the baptism of repentance provided by John, and the baptismal ceremony established by the "deceivers". The former was common during the time of Jesus; the latter approximated proselyte baptism. Naturally, then, Jewish converts to Christianity did not need to undergo the latter. In Matthew 28:19, Jesus specifically

instructs his disciples to baptize the Gentiles, not to baptize Jews. Even Paul recognizes, in I Corinthians 10: 1-2, that Jews need not submit to baptism; "I want you to know, brethren, that our fathers were all under the cloud, and all passed through the sea, and all were baptized into Moses in the cloud and the sea..." Paul's own baptism fits into the category of repentance baptism. None of the other Jewish disciples of Jesus, including his mother, Mary, underwent baptism. Duran emphasizes the difference between the two kinds of baptism, in order to eliminate any ostensible New Testament foundation for the later Christian rite.

The "deceivers" exaggerated the importance of baptism. They asserted that God's grace would descend upon all those baptized in the name of Jesus, and traced the concept of baptism to the "baptism" of Israel in the Sea of Reeds. They also viewed all immersions in the Bible as foreshadowings of the later sacrament. Ezekiel 36:25 and 47:1-8 served as prime examples. Duran rejects these ideas as having no valid basis.

The "deceivers" went even further by interpreting Isaiah 55:1-4 as a forecasting of baptism, the Eucharist, eternal life, Jesus, and the resurrection. They paid no attention to Isaiah 54:11-12, which indicates that the prediction applies to Israel alone. Indeed, none of these signs of redemption occurred in the time of Jesus; in fact, Jews suffered because of Jesus, the opposite of

what will happen at the time of the real Messiah. The real meaning of Isaiah 54-55, especially 54:17, according to Duran, is that all destroyers of the Torah, and subverters of its real meaning, will not succeed.

Duran now explains the role of the Pope. The office derived from Jesus' appointment of Peter as head of the nascent Christian community. Peter and subsequent Popes received the keys to heaven, and sovereignty over the souls in Hell. Duran comments sarcastically on the real

[illegible]

The Pope can also legislate new laws, although he cannot abrogate anything that Jesus proclaimed.

The New Testament source for this authority position is Matthew 16:13-20. Duran points out that Peter never bequeathed his mission to anyone else, and even if he had, Jesus had never ordered him to do so. Furthermore, in Matthew 18:18, Jesus apparently bestows some authority on all his disciples. Duran suggests that this may have included certain magical powers.

Even the Christian theologians realized the weakness of this New Testament foundation for the Papacy. They therefore reasoned that Jesus would certainly not have left his

followers without a leader in his absence. The Papacy ultimately rests then on human logic, rather than Scriptural authority.

Duran returns to the beliefs concerning Mary, although he has previously analyzed them in his polemic. He obviously finds them especially irrational and distasteful. He repeats the Christian belief that Mary was impregnated by the Holy Spirit, and remained a virgin, even during the birth of Jesus (Matthew 1:20-23). He reminds his readers that he has already disproved the Christian analysis of Isaiah 7:14. He also notes that Mary appears only three additional times in the Gospels; John 19:25-27; John 2:1-4; Acts 1:14.

However, the "deceivers" magnified her importance. They wrote that she remains a virgin up until this very day, sitting at the right side of Jesus in heaven. Duran opposes this belief with Matthew 1:25: "but (Joseph) knew her not until she had borne a son; and he called his name Jesus". Obviously, the word "until" implies an end to her virginity. The "deceivers" explained this word by changing the translation of "knew" to "recognized", eliminating its sexual connotation. Other Christian writers denied that "until" implied a temporal boundary. In Matthew 12:47 and Matthew 13:54-57, Jesus has brothers and sisters. According to Duran, the "deceivers" avoided the plain meaning of these texts by interpreting "siblings" as "relatives".

Duran enumerates the Christian sacraments in his

treatise. They are: Baptism, Eucharist, Marriage, Congregation, Ordination, Penance, Last Rites. Priestly celibacy was not originally a prerequisite for priesthood; the "deceivers" instituted it seven hundred years after Jesus and codified it in 1215. Duran quotes I Timothy 4:1-3 to show Paul's apparent approval of priestly marriage:

Now the Spirit expressly says that in later times some will depart from the faith by giving heed to deceitful spirits and doctrines of demons, through the pretensions of liars whose consciences are seared, who forbid marriage and enjoin abstinence from food which God created to be received with thanksgiving by those who believe and know the truth.

Duran spells out the details of Penance and Last Rites, which Christians derive from James 5:13-16. Perhaps these two sacraments were the least familiar to his audience. He also enumerates the seven mortal sins: pride, greed, lechery, anger,gluttony, jealousy, and sloth; and the seven deeds of lovingkindness, which will atone for the sins: hospitality, feeding the hungry, giving drink to the thirsty, clothing the naked, freeing the captive, visiting the sick, and burying the dead.

Following this brief pedagogical interlude, Duran returns to his polemical attack on Christianity. Jesus and his disciples were common people; they misquoted Scripture, and probably could not even read the text, but erred when quoting from sermons they had heard. Even in Duran's own time, Christians misquoted Scripture in

70.. 18' ח'ינ'c 7h1c P'DENJ P'71111
 188c 7N 88 P'67h1N 1'71

Duran also discusses the birthdate and crucifixion date of Jesus. Matthew 2:1-4; Luke 1:5; 2:7-31, 40 simply indicate that Jesus was born during Herod's reign. The "deceivers", however, said that he was born three years before Herod's death. Duran then provides biographical information about Herod, including the durations of the reigns of the Roman emperors from Augustus to Titus. He derives the data both from the New Testament and Vincent of Beauvais' historical work. Duran also quotes Luke 3:23, which gives Jesus' age as thirty.

Duran utilizes this material to prove that Jesus' crucifixion took place about fifty years before the destruction of the Temple, in the fifteenth year of Tiberius. Yet the "deceivers" posited only forty years before the destruction to prove that because of the crucifixion, the Jews were exiled. They established this date for Jesus' crucifixion in order to match Yoma 39b and Avodah Zarah 8b, which state that signs of the impending disaster began forty years before the event. Duran also points out an internal contradiction in the dating. Since the "deceivers" contend that Paul's ministry lasted twenty five years, then Jesus' crucifixion must have occurred fifty years before the destruction of the Temple.

Duran concludes Sefer Kelimat HaGoyim with his polemic against Jerome (see supra, pg. 29). Jerome made some translation mistakes intentionally, most unintentionally.

The unintentional errors resulted from his minimal Hebrew knowledge, and his unlearned Jewish assistant. Duran then responds to the attacks of the "deceivers" upon the Jewish version of the Scriptures. He quotes Maimonides, Benjamin of Tudela, and Judah Ha-Levi, to prove the accuracy and the constancy of the Masoretic text.

Duran composes an epilogue to Hasdai Crescas. He praises the " γ/γ γ/γ γ/γ " ⁷¹, and tells Crescas that he has written the Sefer for the benefit of those individuals who are not as wise as Crescas, and who might benefit from Duran's arguments. The entire text ends with a rhymed blessing on Crescas.

VIII.

Profiat Duran's polemical works influenced specific later polemicists, as well as the general tenor of Jewish polemical argument. In 1397 or 1398, Crescas himself composed Tratado, an anti-Christian polemic written in the Catalan language. Rabbi Joseph ben Shem Tov later translated the work into Hebrew as פ'תחלת דבר '778 F162 (Nullification of the Principles of Christians), the only extant version today. Some debate exists over whether Crescas wrote his polemic before or after Duran's Sefer Kelimat HaGoyim. Renan and Graetz, for example, consider the Tratado an earlier work. Netanyahu, however, considers the Tratado post-Sefer, a literary manifestation of Crescas' dissatisfaction with Duran's work. One proof of this is that Duran never refers to any polemic by Crescas in his book.

In late fifteenth century Italy, Rabbi Abraham Farissol published פ'תחלת דבר /2N (Shield of Abraham), an anti-Christian and anti-Moslem polemical work, based largely on Duran's earlier treatises. Similarly, Chapter 25 of Rabbi Joseph Albo's Sefer Ha-Ikkarim (1485) utilizes a large amount of material found in Sefer Kelimat HaGoyim. Simeon ben Zemach Duran's Keshet U-Magen (Bow and Buckler-1423) employs comparable polemical arguments.

IX.

In order to fully understand Profiat Duran's polemical works, and his own ambiguous, and in some ways peculiar, ideological position, we must appreciate the Jewish situation of his time. Duran's own treatises serve as a mirror of certain aspects of this milieu.

Obviously, many Jews were converting at the time. How many is uncertain, but enough so that Jewish thinkers perceived apostasy as a serious community problem. Duran mentions forced conversions. As the Seville pogrom of 1391 spread northeastward, and a peninsular financial crisis exacerbated tensions, numerous Jews reluctantly underwent baptism as an alternative to death or injury to property or person.

Forced converts, however, need no ideological reinforcement. Clearly, voluntary conversions were occurring, also, in order to necessitate the kinds of polemical argument offered by Duran. Christian beliefs attracted a certain percentage of the Spanish Jewish population. Duran calls these converts "Marranos". There may even have existed a certain overlap between forced converts and voluntary converts, the latter exerting a theological influence on the former with some degree of success.

Debate surrounds the identity of the Marranos. Yitzchak Baer contends that most continued to practice Judaism secretly, and only pretended to believe in Christian doctrine. He writes: "In essence, the Inquisition was correct in its reading of the conversos' attitudes...Conversos and Jews

were one people...⁷² Netanyahu disagrees, asserting that the majority of Marranos were believing Christians. In the late fourteenth century, there had emerged

a new type of convert, one who took to Christendom not by force of circumstances, or for reasons other than religious, but because of his belief in the teachings of Christianity, in their historic truth and religious promise...⁷³

Duran simply mentions that Jews resented apostates, most likely the true believers. They called them names, and feared the influence of anti-Jewish apostate leaders, such as Abner of Burgos, Paul of Burgos, Pablo Christiani, and later Joshua Lorki (Hieronymus de Sancta Fide).

Jewish intellectuals responded to the community's turmoil in several ways. Some fostered internal changes. These branched off in two directions, a mystical way and a rational way. In his works, Duran describes the mystics who performed supernatural acts, attacked rationalism, exhorted the people to moral improvement, and wrote literature such as the Zohar. Duran himself represented the "rational" direction. He contrasts "rational" Judaism with "irrational" Christianity, and extols Reason.

Jewish intellectuals also utilized external sources in their attempt to protect a viable Jewish community. Polemicists such as Duran analyzed the New Testament and later Christian materials to criticize Christian doctrines. From the twelfth century on, treatises appeared "totally dedicated to defending the Jewish position and contending against the Christian one."⁷⁴

This necessitated knowledge of Christian sources on the part of Jewish scholars. They had to know the New Testament, the Church Fathers, later Christian commentaries, and contemporary Christian emphases, practices, and dogma, to some extent. They debated Christian scholars in their works. On an historical level, Jewish polemicists questioned the alleged Messianic nature of Jesus---had the predicted signs of the Messianic era occurred? They also rejected the equation of worldly power with theological correctness. On an ideological/rational/exegetical level, Jews argued with Christian thinkers over the correct Scriptural text and the correct exegesis. Regarding the New Testament, Jewish polemicists both denigrated the text and accused later Christianity of unfaithfulness to its sacred text. As Lasker puts it,

whereas in the discussion of the Hebrew Bible the Christians accused the Jews of taking the text too literally, here it was the Jews who said that certain passages must be understood figuratively.⁷⁵

Examples of this exegetical dichotomy abound in Duran.

A change, however, began to appear in such Jewish literature after the 1391 pogrom period. Whereas fourteenth century anti-Christian literature, such as Isaac Policar's Iggeret HaRafot and Ezer HaDat, Rabbi Shem Tov ben Isaac ibn Shaprut of Tudela's Even Bochen, and Moses of Tordesillas' Ezer HaEmunah, had stressed apologetic, post-1391 anti-Christian literature, beginning with Profiat Duran's polemical treatises, stressed polemic. A new

historical situation had emerged, demanding new responses.
As Netanyahu writes:

Until 1391, Jewish polemical literature was mainly concerned with repelling attacks launched against Judaism on theological grounds, its main task being limited to proving that the claims of its adversaries were unfounded... Christians... assumed the role of aggressors, the Jews of defenders of their traditions... After 1391... Jewish polemical literature... passed from the defensive to the offensive... it now attempted to prove, on the basis of Christian writings, not so much the veracity of Judaism as the falsehood of Christianity. ⁷⁶

In his Biblical criticism, Duran recognizes important distinctions. In addition to revealing his knowledge of Christian Scriptural exegesis and internal New Testament contradictions, he also differentiates between early Jesus and later theology. Essentially, Duran accepts the historicity of the Gospel Jesus, whose quotes are usually acceptable, though sometimes uninformed, and invariably misinterpreted by later disciples. Duran views early Christianity as part of Judaism, and attempts to reclaim the Jewish Jesus. Only Jews know real Christianity, as opposed to the Christian "deceivers".

Furthermore, New Testament stories and Jesus' practices prove Judaism's truth. Jesus observed the commandments, and was a good Jew. Obviously, in Duran's mind, Christians do not understand Jesus. They err in explaining the Hebrew Scriptures, and even Jesus' own words. Medieval Jewish scholars are the only ones who

really understand Jesus. Duran tries to prove in his work that he knows not only the Hebrew Bible well, but also the New Testament, later Christian writings, and the truth beyond all theological falsehoods. He appeals to those Jews who apparently believed in Christianity to some extent, or wished to, and who could be dissuaded from Christianity on rational grounds. The success rate of such polemical literature is unknown.

Duran's importance is as a transitional figure between the worlds of apologetic and polemic, between the world of Spanish Jewry prior to the devastating events of 1391 and afterwards, and between believing Jews and transitional Jews, those moving from a secure faith to an ambiguous societal status. He addresses a newly-developing target audience---uncertain Jews, newly-baptized Jews, voluntary converts---from the perspective of a forced convert who wishes to promote Judaism's cause, alleviate his own guilt, and perhaps outline a universal synthesis between two religions that were once kin, then mistakenly separated over the centuries. His works represented a new literary genre, a victory of aggressiveness over defensiveness, of polemic over apologetic. Yet that very rhetorical victory masked a new fragility in the Jewish community, and new fears foreshadowing the period of the Inquisition.

NOTES

¹Profiat Duran, "Sefer Kelimat HaGoyim", in P'ah/2/ 731/c, ed. |"6055"1= 7/3 731/1 (New York: 1928), pg. 261.

"To investigate the nonsense of the Gentiles, and the mistakes of Jesus and those who followed him, in order to respond to the fundamentals of their rickety religion through the words of the founders themselves who established this pattern." (M.A.P.'s translation).

²Ibid., pg. 281.

"The Jews called the first believers in Jesus Marranos, (meaning: apostasy), because they changed and altered the meaning of Biblical passages, and gave incorrect explanations of Torah. And thus we still call by the name 'Marrano' any Jew who believes in Jesus." (M.A.P.'s translation).

³Ibid., pg. 279.

The argument focuses on Deuteronomy 29:27: "Jesus was the cause of their exile until this time, and of their impoverishment, their humiliation, their mortification, their banishment, and their destruction. It was thus that I responded to a certain Christian scholar, John, who came to me from Montpellier in Provence." (M.A.P.'s translation).

⁴Ibid., pg. 261.

"Like cities led astray" (i.e. idolatrous).

⁵Richard W. Emery, "New Light on Profayt Duran 'The Efodi'," Jewish Quarterly Review, LVIII, No. 4 (April 1968), pg. 330.

⁶Yitzhak Baer, A History of the Jews in Christian Spain, Vol. 2 (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1961), pg.217.

⁷Ibid., pg. 157.

⁸Ibid., pg. 152.

⁹Heinrich Graetz, History of the Jews, Vol. IV (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1894), pg. 191.

¹⁰Ernest Renan, Les Écrivains Juifs Français du XIV^e Siècle (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1893), pg. 405.

¹¹Baer, pg. 152.

¹²Baer, pg. 151.

¹³Ibid., pg. 152.

¹⁴Emery, pg. 329.

¹⁵Ibid.

¹⁶Ibid., pg. 331.

¹⁷Ibid., pg. 334.

¹⁸Ibid., pg. 335.

¹⁹Profiat Duran, "Al Tehi Ka'ayotecha", in 771/c
P' 6121, ed. | "6655" 317 3713' (New York: 1928),
pg. 95.

²⁰Ibid.

²¹Ibid.

²²Ibid.

"Woe to them for their toil and effort, for they made their remnant unfit (or; they made their remnant idol-worshippers)." (M.A.P.'s translation).

²³Ibid., pg. 96.

²⁴Ibid.

²⁵Ibid., pg. 97.

²⁶Ibid.

²⁷Ibid., pg. 98.

²⁸Duran, "Sefer Kelimat HaGoyim", pg. 261.

"The evil waters passed over us (literally; our souls) in Catalonia as well." (M.A.P.'s translation).

²⁹Herman Hailperin, Rashi and the Christian Scholars (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1963), pg. 141.

³⁰A. Lukyn Williams, Adversus Judaeos (London: Cambridge University Press, 1935), pg. 410.

³¹Daniel J. Lasker, Jewish Philosophical Polemics Against Christianity in the Middle Ages (New York: Ktav Publishing House, Inc., 1977), pg. 7.

³²Ibid., pg. 255, footnote 2.

³³Duran, "Sefer Kelimat HaGoyim", pg. 261.

³⁴Ibid.

³⁵Ibid., pg. 287.

³⁶Duran, "Al Tehi Ka'avotecha", pg. 95.

³⁷Duran, "Sefer Kelimat HaGoyim", pg. 287.
 "How could he think that one of the great prophets said this, and yet none of the sages of Israel followed Jesus, even though a true prophet who preceded him (i.e. Jesus) by more than 500 years called him by name and established him as God!" (M.A.P.'s translation).

³⁸Ibid., pg. 262.
 "If they considered him divine, they should not have been surprised; indeed, why didn't this divine being know beforehand that the tree had no figs?" (M.A.P.'s translation).

³⁹Ibid., pg. 281.
 "He (Timothy) hinted here at the separation (from women) and the fasts which the 'deceivers' established as a foundation of their religion."

⁴⁰Ibid., pg. 262.
 "But these statements, and similar ones, do not indicate that he thought himself to be real divinity, but rather express his soul's closeness to the divine." (M.A.P.'s translation).

⁴¹Ibid., pg. 285.

⁴²Ibid.
 "And there are so many similar distortions, that it is not necessary to mention all of them." (M.A.P.'s translation).

⁴³Ibid., pg. 284.
 "The Four Gospels contradict one another a great deal on the matter of genealogy; they are all like blind men groping for a wall. The difficulty is that each one tells of the deeds of Jesus in a different way, and the 'deceivers' early on attempted to make rickety compromises between them and to reconcile the details according to their ability, but with no help from reality. We could give many examples, but to no avail.." (M.A.P.'s translation).

⁴⁴Ibid., pg. 287-288.
 "who traveled to the ends of the earth, in places where no one had ever heard of Jesus, and reported that there was no difference between our version of the Torah and Mishna and theirs, not even as far as a single letter is concerned." (M.A.P.'s translation).

⁴⁵Duran, "Sefer Kelimat HaGoyim", pg. 263.
 "the opposite of the nature of truth, since the signs which God gives to show the truth of a matter occur a short time before the event and not a long time after the event..." (M.A.P.'s translation).

⁴⁶Duran, "Al Tehi Ka'avotecha", pg. 96.
 "...According to the faith, the large body of the Messiah is equal to and carried within the small wafer held in the palm of the hand..." (M.A.P.)

⁴⁷Ibid.
 "The substance of the bread prior to the words of the priest is really bread; but with the completion of the priest's words, this substance becomes an accident, or completely disappears in its form and material. The accidents exist by themselves, not in relation to their subject, and afterwards, the accidents become part of the body of the priest who eats the bread..." (M.A.P.'s translation).

⁴⁸Lasker, pp. 150-151.

⁴⁹Duran, "Al Tehi Ka'avotecha", pg. 95.
 "which is difficult for the mouth to express, and for the ear to hear." (M.A.P.'s translation).

⁵⁰Lasker, pg. 92.

⁵¹Duran, "Al Tehi Ka'avotecha", pg. 95.
 "His wisdom was not able to conceive of any other way to save you other than through Himself; therefore, you believe that He became Flesh in the womb of a virgin..." (M.A.P.'s translation).

⁵²Ibid., pg. 96.
 "punishment...which is not mentioned in the Scriptures." (M.A.P.'s translation).

⁵³Ibid., pg. 98.
 "Don't use your revered and wise father's name in your signature, and don't let your soul consult with him, nor concentrate on his honor in your memory, because if he were still alive, he would choose to lose a son like you rather than see your reality, and even now his soul is mourning in the grave." (M.A.P.'s translation).

⁵⁴Duran, "Sefer Kelimat HaGoyim", pg. 261.
 "they intermingled honey and wormwood." (M.A.P.'s translation).

⁵⁵See footnote 40.

⁵⁶Duran, "Sefer Kelimat HaGoyim", pg. 263.
 "...for this reason, he interpreted the above story as a foretelling and imitation even though it preceded Jesus by 500 years." (M.A.P.'s translation).

⁵⁷Ibid., pg. 265.

⁵⁸Ibid., pg. 271.
 "From all this, it appears that Jesus and his students believed in the eternality of the Torah..." (M.A.P.'s translation).

⁵⁹Ibid., pg. 272.
 "From this, it clearly appears that they loosened the bonds of the Torah and circumcision only for Gentiles, in order to attract them to faith in Jesus." (M.A.P.'s translation).

⁶⁰Ibid., pg. 273.
 "Here he admitted the absolute obligation of Jews to the Torah, and the obligation of the uncircumcised to the Toraitic statutes only." (M.A.P.'s translation).

⁶¹Ibid.
 "And even though he erred in the quotation, it proves that it did not occur to him to change the Torah." (M.A.P.'s translation).

⁶²Ibid., pg. 275.

⁶³Ibid., pg. 276.
 "But they will reject any doubt by saying that a religious matter goes beyond human rationality, and that the human mind is limited in grasping these mysteries and these great, hidden, and distant secrets, because once Jesus said this and established this basic doctrine, one should not question it, since it is the whole truth, and in matters of religious mysteries, faith is certain and investigation is dangerous." (M.A.P.'s translation).

⁶⁴Ibid., pg. 279.
 "they called the keys 'the treasure of the church', and correctly so, because this assumption that made the Pope ruler over these poor and foolish souls, establishes him as ruler over all believers, with the right to all that is theirs, including treasures of silver and gold which he adds to the 'treasure of the church'." (M.A.P.'s translation).

⁶⁵Ibid., pg. 282.
 "The reason for this was not a lack of knowledge, but that he was a tax-collector of a certain city, and it is well-known that all tax-collectors are evil..." (M.A.P.'s translation).

⁶⁶Duran, "Sefer Kelimat HaGoyim", pg. 283.
 "And indeed, they argued correctly against him."
 (M.A.P.'s translation).

⁶⁷Ibid., pg. 284.
 "piety of great stupidity. And this and similar things
 in their 'Torah' show that it does not deserve to be
 called 'Torah', because in observing it, one would
 destroy organized society." (M.A.P.'s translation).

⁶⁸Ibid.
 "These are all ridiculous statements, yet the 'deceivers'
 boasted about them and thought that no other system
 had higher value for the human race." (M.A.P.'s trans-
 lation).

⁶⁹Ibid., pg. 285.
 "Their mouths failed them because they neither knew
 nor understood, and they erred in ways that even
 children in school would not err..." (M.A.P.'s
 translation).

⁷⁰Ibid., pg. 283.
 "because if these signs and wonders had been seen
 at that time, there is no doubt that the Jews would
 have followed the faith of Jesus and would have re-
 gretted what they had done." (M.A.P.'s translation).

⁷¹Ibid., pg. 288.
 "glory of the generation" (M.A.P.'s translation).

⁷²Baer, pg. 424.

⁷³B. Netanyahu, The Marranos of Spain (New York:
 American Academy for Jewish Research, 1966), pg. 84.

⁷⁴Lasker, pg. 2.

⁷⁵Ibid., pg. 5.

⁷⁶Netanyahu, pg. 81.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Baer, Yitzhak. A History of the Jews in Christian Spain. 2 vols. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1961.
- Baron, Salo Wittmayer. A Social and Religious History of the Jews. Vols. X and XI. New York and London: Columbia University Press, 1967.
- Castro, Américo. The Structure of Spanish History. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1954, pp. 466-550.
- Duran, Profiat. " פ'אידא ד'א פ'אידא " and " פ'אידא ד'א פ'אידא ", in " פ'אידא ד'א פ'אידא ". New York, 1928, pp. 94-98, 260-288.
- Emery, Richard W. "New Light on Profayt Duran 'The Efodi'," Jewish Quarterly Review, LVIII, No. 4 (April 1968), 328-337.
- Encyclopedia Judaica. Vol. 3: "Apologetics"; "Apostasy". Vol. 6: "Profiat Duran". Jerusalem: Keter Publishing House, 1972.
- Graetz, Heinrich. History of the Jews. Vol. IV. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1894.
- Hailperin, Herman. Rashi and the Christian Scholars. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1963.
- Lasker, Daniel J. Jewish Philosophical Polemics Against Christianity in the Middle Ages. New York: Ktav Publishing House, Inc., 1977.
- Netanyahu, B. The Marranos of Spain. New York: American Academy for Jewish Research, 1966.
- Payne, Stanley G. A History of Spain and Portugal. Vol. 1. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1973.
- Renan, Ernest. Les Écrivains Juifs Français du XIV^e Siècle. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1893, pp. 395-405.
- Talmage, Frank Ephraim (ed.). Disputation and Dialogue. New York: Ktav Publishing House Inc., 1975.
- Williams, A. Lukyn. Adversus Judaeos. London: Cambridge University Press, 1935.

Zuckerman, Arthur J. "Review of Richard W. Emery's 'The Jews of Perpignan in the Thirteenth Century'," Historia Judaica, XXII, Part 2 (October 1960), 132-134.

Bible translations used: Torah (Jewish Publication Society, 1962); Prophets (Jewish Publication Society, 1978); Writings and New Testament (Revised Standard Version, 1952).