

A STUDY IN FIFTEENTH CENTURY SPANISH-JEWISH

POLEMICS AS REFLECTED IN THE

WRITINGS OF THE

DURAN FAMILY

Thesis

Submitted by

Abraham Shusterman
Hebrew Union College
Cincinnati Ohio
1930

*Accepted no year in advance
A. Shusterman.*

Acic. 12/80



INTRODUCTION

HEILWAL-HARVATZ YUTKHAH HUTCHETZAH MI YOUTZ A

HEH MI GUTOMIRER BA BOCHIMOT

HEH TO GOMITIM

YEHIAH MARUC

Yisrael

Yid berjimud

Yamim ha-yadot
sheflikh nafshu wordet
olto frassimot
0801



The Church fathers after Jerome knew less and less about the faith of Israel and had to rely on the arguments advanced by earlier controversial writers. It is undoubtedly this fact that accounts for the similarity of polemical material in the writings of a controversial nature produced by Israel's sages. Christianity showed the way and Israel followed suit by answering Christianity in a "Christian" way.

Arguments advanced by Israel were advanced years later by the Duran. Unfortunately we are in possession of only

TO
THE MEMORY
OF
MY MOTHER

a few systematic polemics before the eighth century, in spite of the wealth of "----music when soft voices die,
Vibrates in the memory." remarks in the Psalms and Midrashim. With the frequency of the clergy's attacks Israel's answers were returned with increasing rapidity. Bitterness had its opportunity to enter the scene of combat when baptized Jews openly attacked their former coreligionists. Among these were the notorious Paul of Berga and "agudah who figure so prominently in the writings of Rashi and Rashbam.

This thesis will treat the problem of Spanish-Jewish polemics of the fifteenth century as reflected in the writings of the Duran family. This polemical period is especially interesting because it precedes the expulsion by but a generation. The Durans are masters of polemical style. Having lived through the persecution of 1391 they are able to bring to

FOREWORD

The Church fathers after Jerome knew less and less about the faith of Israel and had to rely on the arguments advanced by earlier controversial writers. It is undoubtedly this fact that accounts for the similarity of polemical material in the writings of a controversial nature produced by Israel's sages. Christianity showed the way and Israel followed suit by answering Christianity in a "Christian" way. Arguments advanced by Kimhi are advanced years later by the Durans. Unfortunately we are in possession of only a few systematic polemics before the twelfth century, in spite of the wealth of polemical references and controversial remarks in the Talmud and Midrashim.¹ With the frequency of the clergy's attacks Israel's answers were returned with increasing rapidity. Bitterness had its opportunity to enter the scene of combat when baptized Jews openly attacked their former coreligionists. Among these were the notorious Paul of Burgos and Megadaf who figure so prominently in the writings of Efodi and Rashbash.

This thesis will treat the problem of Spanish-Jewish polemics of the fifteenth century as reflected in the writings of the Duran family. This polemical period is especially interesting because it precedes the expulsion by but a generation. The Durans are masters of polemical style. Having lived through the persecution of 1391 they are able to bring to

1. See Ozar p. 7-9

CROWDER

asal bns asel wsmi smoreit rejlz asadat horim^o ent
 nisnurun ent no ylou of bni bns festal to mifat ent jnoda
 -jduobm si ji .esodizw laferverojnoz rejlz v d beonvba
 lsaimeloz to yfisliwot rot zjuscoz jndt jndt ent vllb
 hcomberq evntz laferverojnoz a lo agudizw ent ni laferver
 festal bns vew ent beword vlinzilim^o .zeges a'fesral v d
 "mlchitzin" v ni vlinzilim^o pntrewena v d jius bewofel
 rejal sisey beonvba era hmla v d beonvba ejnemut^o .vew
 vloz to adasscoz ni era sw vleitnutoz^o .zanzu^o ent v d
 ui .yfisliwot dfflent ent eroted scimeleg ojzamayz vllb a
 laferverojnoz bns nechuster lsaimeloz to mlchitz ent lo ariga
 vongurit ent mlchitz .mlchitzim bns bnmft ent nk chismot
 dlv bnnimtz erew nroade a'fesral sibzja a'vreflo ent lo
 of ylinzilogg ent knd asenjetzil .yfisliwot galavetz
 vlinzilogg ent beolzog medv jndmoc to amcoz ent rojne
 erew seodt zpoma .ejzinekigilzecz temtol riedt beolzog
 ce amoyit erew labage^o bns seodt to lntz amoyetot ent
 zanddak bns lboim to agudizw ent ni vlinzilim^o
 mlchitz-dmzq to mlchitz ent jndt lliw alkenz ent
 agudizw ent nk beolzogler as ylinzilogg zmeclit ent lo scimeleg
 vlinzilogg si beolzog lsaimeloz ent .mlchitz bnmft ent lo
 mlchitzes a fud v d mlchitzes ent zpocoz jndt amoyet
 levil galavell .zlyz lsaimeloz to amoyet era amoyet ent
 of zndt of zldz era vndt lntz to mlchitzes ent dymotz

247 • 1 280 283 • 1

.111

bring to our minds a vivid picture, though painted in colors of logic, of the "Wikuhim" between Israel and his adversaries. in the pre-expulsion period. that are less vicious than the ones we have seen.

This thesis will present the arguments used by the Durans in their polemics and apologetics, their influence upon each other's thinking, their manner of approach and their use of the polemical tools at their disposal. It is unfortunate that more is not known about their lives. What a treasure the autobiography of Efodi would be! In the following biographical sketches the writer has used everything available. Giants deserve more complete biographies.

In the analysis of their writings three sources have been used: the printed but unpublished edition of Kelimat HaGoyim, taken from a manuscript in the library of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America and edited by Isaac Broyde; the polemic Keshet UMagen, Leghorn 1790; and Milchemet Mizvah which is included in the same volume as Keshet UMagen. The selections in Eisenstein's Ozar Wikuhim have been used but, as we would expect in an anthology, the number of omissions make it impossible for the student to work scientifically with the material in the Ozar. It must be said in justice to Eisenstein that he did not pretend that he was giving the world accurate material. He lays down the fundamental principle by which he works: " I am following one general rule in these polemics: to be deliberate in my judgment and to make use of the changes made by the scribes in whatever place the parties of the controversy go beyond

ai bejzisq agadot, tsvilq biviv a sbrim uo or gafot
and has festival mentioned "minzit" edj to tsvilq to strofes
heitzet kolalnike-arg and mi-selzatvah

and vd been atsmeanya out jnezeig illiw alayid sifit
econimizi tivot, tsiljegoloch has solomeiq tivot, al amayid
has mazorot to temurah tivot, agudim a'zadot hasa uog
al ji. Isaacqah tivot is about festivaleiq edj to ean tivot
jew. sevif tivot jwoda rwoch s'ot etom rast atsmeanya
edj al led bliow ibord to tsvilqideotus edj atsmeanya a
yive been and tsvilq edj seforot ha-lodotayim ynuvelot
.selzatvahot atsmeanya s'ot atsmeanya s'ot. tsiljave gainit
avud roshes edj agudim tivot to alayim edj al
familia to selzib ha-selzatvah and hajmim edj them need
edj to yatzif edj al tsiljaveim a mort neder. tsiljaveim
osmal vd bejzib has solomea to yatzimed tsiljaveim heital
has jowti atsmeanya tsiljaveim atsmeanya edj tsiljaveim
as emloy s'mas edj al behulotai ai doinu tsiljaveim temurah
minzit rado a'zilasasai al atsmeanya edj tsiljaveim jadot
tsiljaveim na al tsiljaveim bliow ev as, and been need avud
tshubut edj tot atsmeanya tivot etom amoissimo to temurah edj
ji. tsiljaveim al tsiljaveim edj s'ot viltsotimot s'ot or
hajmim son bib al tsiljaveim of solomei, al biss ed temurah
ayaf eh. tsiljaveim osmeanya bliow edj ynuviv saw ed tsiljaveim
ma'li. tsiljaveim edj tsiljaveim qd atsmeanya tsiljaveim edj
ym al statedish edj tsiljaveim osmeanya al elut tsiljaveim s'ot
atsmeanya edj vd shem segundio edj to ean etom of has atsmeanya
bliow ed yatzimed edj to selzatvah edj osmeanya al

the bounds of courtesy and politeness.² It is hard to determine just what Eisenstein considers politeness and courtesy: He omits important passages that are less vicious than the ones he includes. Indeed it is necessary to work with the earlier and more exact editions alongside the Ozar in order to approach exactness.

The writer of this thesis is profoundly grateful for the assistance given him by two of his teachers: Dr. Jacob Z. Lauterbach, whose ever-eager desire to render assistance facilitated the work of the writer in preparing his material; and Dr. Jacob R. Marcus, whose lectures on the Spanish-Jewish period of history first aroused the interest of the writer in this field and under whom this thesis has been written.

May 1930

2. Ozar p. 6

.v

oj hund si ji Passenejlog bns qesetion te abnud edd
sesenclig arshancs nlejaneqmi fahf taut enimieb
nesl era jasit sepanse tnefroqmi ejimo al yessetq
vlassed si ji beebn . sebnion ed seno edt nadt enoliv
enolivc enolitbe jomke etot bns wlltss edt djiw kwo of
.asentake dozotage of rabbis of Yerushalayim edt
yibnwtora si clasit sind to testitw edt
ravdosej sind to awf qd mid nevir conjsaisan edt tot lufetzy
rebus of avish teneze-tave souds apodretzg. E doest .
yaltzayt ni tafitw sind to kwo edt beftiflost conjsaisan
no seznos souds apodretzg. E doest .
H bns ;leirsetm sind
jucorci edt bnsosur farit vtozid te boitzag halet-saimsqd edt
and clasit sind modu zebaw bns bissit sind ni recitw edt to
.asntitw need

OCHET YAH

.v. OCHET YAH

THE HISTORY OF THE
JEWISH PEOPLE AS RECORDED
IN THE WRITINGS OF THE
RABBIS

CONTENTS

Foreword

	page
CHAPTER I	1
Chapter I-Prefiat Duran.....	1

Chapter II-Simeon ben Zemach Duran.....	36
---	----

Chapter III-Solomon ben Simeon Duran.....	55
---	----

INDEX OF NAMES AND SUBJECTS IN THE INDEX OF PERSONS.

Table of Abbreviations

In this book we have no desire to
do or say anything that may be offensive to
Bibliography presented righteous and not
among the persons who had not be qualified in the
book of the Duran, Rashi, Simeon ben Zemach, and
Solomon ben Shlomo. The Zerit-Duran, whose polemics
against Rashi and Maimonides, is a field of clarity and
order, in Rashi. In Duran history this name is
known as Prefiat or Maatra Prefiat Duran, while the per-
sons of Duran is taken from the initial letters of his
signature and further thing. The Hebrew name of the
author of Kallal Tiferet is Avraham ben Yosef Falavi,
which name is disclosed in a poem in the twenty-third
chapter of his book Kallal Tiferet. His birthplace
is uncertain although it is the belief of Falavi
that he was born in Galilee after the destruction

A STUDY IN FIFTEENTH CENTURY SPANISH

unwillingly, and JEWISH POLEMICS AS REFLECTED
converted with him. IN THE WRITINGS OF THE

DURAN FAMILY

Throughout the spirit of
Judaism the scholarly Duran was not content to remain
a Marano. He and his wife sought a home at a port
in the south of France.

CHAPTER I

PROFIAT DURAN

Leaving where

Intellectually a vigorous people

Israel has made no attempt to create a name as the
exponent of non-resistance in the face of polemics.
Indeed, Eisenstein's remark that "we have no desire to
be counted among the persecuted righteous and not
among the persecutors" need not be qualified in the
case of the Durans, Efodi, Simeon ben Zemach, and
Solomon ben Simon. The first Duran, whose polemical
essay Kelimat HaGoyim is a model of clarity and
order, is Efodi. In Jewish history this Duran is
known as Profiat or Maestre Profiat Duran, while his pen
name of Efodi is taken from the initial letters of his
signature Ani Profiat Duran. The Hebrew name of the
author of Kelimat HaGoyim is¹ Isaac ben Moses Halevi,
which name is disclosed in a poem in the twenty-third
chapter of his book Heshev HeEfod. His birthplace
is uncertain although it is the belief of Harkavi
that he was born in Catalonia since the persecution

1. Heb Gr vol 6 p. 404

saw onrtoD - mudiD bneiD bneiD air bus ,vignilliwan
 mid DJIW bejxevew
 to jidige air DJIW bneiD vjigndorD
 nismet of jnmetf jch saw paxt paxtloDce air malibut
 STOZ a ja jeem of beotya bneiD air bus all .onxam a
 tol liss jch jidige yadit jchj os sonxil to dnuos air ni
 gntisawa .swL as evil of beqod yadit stduw enjzjew
 bneiD air motz rafzel a bevisor sawt duran
 edj ja naliDm a nismet of melisfoes air yekkunna
 .sognD to liss enjzjew air to nchaztng hafz sonxjek
 gntisawa to bneiD bus naxt berdus elidige air
 jgmetts air tol bus jzsed to egzad liss tol onxod-Dur
 sonxal air ejotw air vjinsatimD or duran of
 illis vjamsanu air naliD ni sofadA'N jidT JA rafzel
 jchm believez ai jidige air bus rafzel lissatvotnco a se
 ai yess air jadit noljamtni a'miesmeli .vignilliwa
 a DJIW nafzit air jadit arodt gnoma bejmuco ed of
 nafzit air nafzit edj sonxal sonxjek to tis sonxjek
 of libtan air vjinsatimD amogd vjaseo of hista air
 sonxal bus neqo air to waliw air vjansotes nafzit
 on ai stadi tleeti elidige air ai vjivodH jidT
 gntisaw air jad .nafzisomco air to emit air to nchazt
 gntisaw air abotla rafzel air arodt to liss-nomoloD os
 sonxal to zonx air motz .jmsugbut to elend

M.I.Q vjinsatimD issDQ.A
 COB.Q 3.Iov 10 JidT :5

of 1391, during which Efodi became a convert, did not extend into Aragon.² Duran himself accounts for this phenomenon in the twice-expressed belief that the piety of the Aragonese saved them from destruction. In spite of these few references much of his youth is veiled in obscurity.³ His student days in Germany were marked by a lack of concentration on Talmudic studies and an interest in philosophy and science, in spite of the interdiction of his teachers. Being an excellent student of philosophy, grammar and history Profiat Duran became a tutor in the home of Chasdai Crescas at whose request he wrote and to whom he dedicated his famous work Kelimat HaGoyim.

During the persecution of 1391 Duran outwardly accepted Christianity and lived as a Marano. Don Juan, king of Castile, had died and under Henry III, the boy ruler, the fanatic Ferdinand Martinez could no longer be held in check. His passionate preaching aroused the populace to the extent that thousands of Jews lost their lives and thousands were forced into the ranks of the Maranos. In Seville alone 4,000 out of a possible 30,000 were killed while most of the survivors became crypto-Jews. To save his life Profiat Duran accepted the Christian faith, although

2. Heb Gr vol. 4 p. 404
 3. JE vol. 5 p. 16

2. Heb Gr vol. 4 p. 404
 3. Heb Gr vol. 4 p. 405
 4. Heb Gr vol. 4 p. 406

GUTOWIWER BA SOIMLOCH HABREIT
HET TO SOWITIRE HET NI
XIMMAH BASUH

I RETHYANO
 MARUG TAIWORT

WILGOSZ ANOTOKH V' YILMELLOH
 EDJ AS EMAN A CHASER OF JEWESJA OR EBEN AND ISRAEL
 SOIMLOCH TO EEST EDJ NI SONGAJAET-NON TO JEWESKO
 OF SHIRSH OR EVAH EW" JEWIS MIZMER A'MIEJENSEIN, BEEHAI
 JON BUNZ ANSCHLAGT BEJOSSETEQ EDJ ZHOMA BEHNEC ED
 EDJ NI BEHILUP ED JON BEEN "ANOTOKH V' YILMELLOH EDJ ZHOMA
 BUNZ, MOSEMED AND NOEMIS, EBBOTZ, ANSTED EDJ TO ESMO
 SOIMLOCH ZHOMA BEEHAI EDJ .ZOMA MED NOEMI BEEHAI
 BUNZ V' YILMELLOH TO JASHOM A SI MIVODAH JAMILEH LEESEN
 SI ANSTED ZHOMA BEEHAI DURAN PISZ DURAN SI .EBBOTZ SI, ZEBHO
 NEQ SHIN SHIDR, JASHOTZ ERZESM TO JASHOTZ AS SHOMI
 SI TO SHOTTEL JASHINT EDJ MOTZ MEDAT SI EBBOTZ TO ESMO
 EDJ TO ESMO WERDEH EDJ .EBBOTZ JASHOTZ IN A STUJANGIS
 ,IVASHI SEACH MED OSMAL SI MIVODAH JAMILEH TO TOSHMA
 BEEHAI-SHOMI EDJ NI MEQ A SI BEEHOLSH SI ESMO SHIDR
 SOIMLOCH EDJ .EBBOTZ WERDEH MOOD EDJ TO REJQAD
 IVASHI TO SHOTTEL EDJ SI JI MIVODAH MIZTERON SI
 NOIMOSSEQ EDJ SONTA SHONLAED SI KROD ESMO EDJ JEWIS

BOB .q 3 LOV TO DEH I.

unwillingly, and his friend David Buen-Giorno was not converted with him. ³ Duran himself recounts his life

Thoroughly imbued with the spirit of Judaism the scholarly Duran was not content to remain a Marano. He and his friend agreed to meet at a port in the south of France so that they might set sail for Palestine where they hoped to live as Jews. Awaiting Buen-Giorno Duran received a letter from his friend announcing his resolution to remain a Christian at the insistence and persuasion of the notorious Paul of Burgos. The epistle angered Duran and instead of openly upbraiding Buen-Giorno for his change of heart and for his attempt to recall Duran to Christianity he wrote the famous letter Al Tehi K'Aboteca in which his consummate skill as a controversial writer and an artist is revealed most strikingly. Eisenstein's intimation that this essay is to be counted among those that were written with a surface air of acquiescence because the Jewish writers were afraid to openly oppose Christianity can hardly be taken seriously in view of the open and fearless ⁴ Kelimat HaGoyim. In the epistle itself there is no mention of the time of its composition, but in referring to Solomon-Paul of Burgos the letter affords us a working basis of judgment.⁵ From the tenor of Duran's remarks

4. Ozar Wikuhim p.14
 5. Heb Gr vol.6 p.405

Plotleaf Duran developed the Christian faith, responding to the challenges presented by 20,000 new Mifflin men sent to a base camp at Camp 72nd. To save his life, the surviving became pacans abaco-72nd. The Duran family had been converted to Christianity in 1940, and their pastor, Don Juan, King of Castile, had held up the Mifflin men to God during the long and difficult march from China to India.

404 .q 4 .lov tM del S
31 .q 3 .lov ST S

it seems that the apostate Paul had already been elevated to a high position in the Church and had become an important figure in the court of Pope Benedict XIII of Avignon.⁶ Paul was converted to the ruling faith in the year 1391; after his conversion he studied at the University of Paris and became conversant with the Catholic religion.⁷ Afterward he was elevated to the priesthood and later became a bishop. These facts lead to the conviction that the epistle was written some years after 1391.

It is of extreme interest to consider this essay in connection with Profiat Duran's later polemic. Efodi pretends to assent to everything advanced by Buen-Giorno and to confirm him in his resolve to live as a member of the Christian Church. Being ambiguous it was interpreted by the Christians as an epistle favorable to the church. As soon as this essay which they called Alteca Boteca was understood in its true light it was burned.

In his letter Duran satirically so that replies,⁸ "Thou hast awakened and speakest in the spirit of the Messiah who has given thee an ear to hear but no heart to understand; who taught thee that reason has ever been the enemy of faith and occasioned great harm to truth----who follows reason will go to hell, but whosoever follows faith, namely the faith which thou and

6. Heb Gr vol.6 p.82 note 2

7. Heb Gr vol. 6 p. 405

8. HUC M vol.1 no.6 p.15

and the best way to do this is to have a positive attitude. This means that you should not let your mind be controlled by negative thoughts or feelings. Instead, you should focus on positive thoughts and feelings. This will help you to stay positive and optimistic, even in difficult situations.

Another important aspect of positive thinking is to avoid negative self-talk. Negative self-talk can be very destructive, as it can lead to low self-esteem and a lack of confidence. Instead, you should try to replace negative self-talk with positive affirmations. Positive affirmations are statements that you repeat to yourself to reinforce positive beliefs about yourself and your abilities. For example, if you are feeling uncertain about something, you could say to yourself, "I am capable of doing this" or "I have what it takes to succeed". These affirmations can help to build your confidence and self-esteem.

Positive thinking also involves setting realistic goals and working towards them. It's important to set achievable goals that are challenging but not impossible. When you achieve these goals, it can give you a sense of accomplishment and satisfaction, which can further boost your positive thinking.

Finally, positive thinking requires a positive attitude towards life. This means accepting things as they are, rather than trying to change them. It's important to remember that life is full of ups and downs, and that it's normal to experience both positive and negative emotions. By accepting things as they are, you can focus on the good things in life and let go of negative ones.

S 8.00 28.00 3.00 10.00 10.00 3.00
20.00 3.00 10.00 10.00 10.00 3.00
6.00 3.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 3.00

thy new teacher expound will surely go to heaven." From this starting point Efodi proceeds to mockingly assent to the Christian dogmas and Christian thought. He adjured his friend to adhere to the belief in the trinity "three united in one; a unit which no mouth could express nor an eye perceive." The virgin birth becomes the object of his ironic praise, while he warns his friend not to be like his fathers who "erected imposing palaces and edifices of logic." "Thou shalt not be like them. Keep far from thee even the first syllogistic principles, inasmuch as such an admission will destroy your whole faith. For if you say that God is the "father" and that the "son" is God, consequently the "son" is the "Father." What then? The "son" is the "Father" and has begotten the "son." Away with such an absurd premise." Turning to the sacrament of transubstantiation Efodi uses it as a target, saying, "be sure not to believe the whole is larger than one of its parts, for the body of the Messiah is contained in the whole cake and in each separate particle of it, so that each particle must accordingly be equal to the whole." Duran concludes his letter with a warning to his former friend not to be misled by sense data. Before he closes he insinuates that only the unscrupulous become converts for pleasure and honor. "As to myself---I put my trust in God alone and not in the Messiah, who pretends to take His Holy Name. One thing I will ask thee before I close

my letter; do not use the name of thy father in thy signature.---If he were among the living he would prefer to remain childless than to have such a son."

In addition to Al Tehi K'Aboteca and Kelimat HaGoyim Profiat Duran was the author of a number of other important works:

a. Heshev HoEfod, an almanac of twenty-five sections, dedicated to Moses Zarzal, the physician to Henry III of Castile. This almanac was compiled in 1395.

b. A synoptic commentary on More Nebuchim
which reveals his familiarity with the philosophy of
Aristotle as interpreted by the Arabian philosophers. It
is uncertain when this commentary was written.⁹

c. Ma'aseh B'fod is his chief work. Published in 1403 it treats the subject of Hebrew grammar from the philological and critical aspect. It contains thirty-three chapters and an introduction. Its purpose is to instruct his contemporaries who know nothing about grammar or who have erroneous notions about it. It was written especially to reject the mistakes of later grammarians. In this work he frequently quotes the otherwise unknown grammarian Samuel Benveniste.

d. Zikeren HaShemadot is one of his unknown works. It deals with the history of Jewish martyrdom since

D. Heb Gr vol. 6 p. 404

vid al zemach vid lo eman eit sun jen ob p'satzi u
zehery bilow ed p'ativ ed yomma orev en TI---.erutsephis

"one a doss evan of mudi seelbide nimmer of

bua sojtoda' met FA of nofisba al

a to rofus ed saw nazir t'zitzit shvodaH javil

zehery jnayqmi zehery to zehery

-t'zitzit lo osamla na ,holloH yadot .

maloyiq ed ,Izra' assom of betzibeb ,anojosa evit
al hillelmos saw osamla eit .elijas^o to III q'mah of

.621

mizoudah aton no zeheryos oifganya A .d

to vicosellid ed ritw q'tzitzitmet alid alayev doldw
ti .stegosellid naidata ed yd bejtzitzit na eltzitzit

9 .neitzit saw vicosellid alid nadiv nafroos al

.k'nos leidit eit al holloH deza'sh .

wedeh to josedus ed: asatzit ji goaf al beretidui
ji .josedus Isolito bua Isoligofolida ed: motz zemach

al .noitzenborchi na bua stegosellid eomis-q'tzitzit enishno
wodt edw zeheryosetmoo alid jorjani of al eseqnig
enoljot ungenotte evan edw to zemach bua paindon

and rofet of vicosellid asatzit saw ji ti bua
q'tzitzit ed k'nos alid ni .esatzimutzel to asatzim

.esatzimutzel leinat matzavat evomim eniwsidje ed: asatzim
evomim alid to uno al Yohannesh nozomik .b

sonle mobyitiam delwel to vicosellid ed ritw alach ji .antow

103.7 8.Iov 49 dell .e

the year 70. It has been shown that the writer of Shebet Jehudah and Rabbi Samuel Usque used the Zikoron of "fodi.

e. Miscellany---in 1397 he wrote a dirge on Abraham ben Isaac Halevi of Gerona, who was probably a relative; three letters containing responsa to his pupil Meir Crescas; two exegetical treatises on several chapters of II Samuel(edited as appendix to Ma'aresh Efod); at the request of the Enveniste family he wrote an explanation of the religious festival poem by Ibn Ezra as well as a solution to Ibn Ezra's well-known riddle of quiescent letters of the Hebrew alphabet. Finally he composed explanations relative to Ibn Ezra's commentary to the Pentateuch.

After his return to Judaism it was an easy matter for him to make people forget his baptism. He settled in Spain or Perpignan where he continued to add to the treasury of Jewish literature.

KELIMAT HAGOYIM

The versatility of "ur'an as a polemical artist is evident when Al Tehi K'Aboteca and Kelimat HaGoyim are placed in juxtaposition and compared. Equally forceful, they follow different paths to arrive at their goals. Kelimat HaGoyim is couched in grave language of historical investigation and drives its

To justify our said mode need and fit .ov may ed
notonik and been upon found add has habudet jaded
elot to
 grib a etow ed Tossi ni---unlikeosim .
 a yidderig saw off, shone to ivelsh ossel ned madrida no
 liqud sin of manoyet yamishnoo svitsei osrit ; svitsei
 lateset ne acciseet kloitzgexs owt ; gasset zikh
 doss'ak of xibneqgs as bejbe) ismael II to avejgad
 ejow ed yilimt ojeinevne" ed to jaaspek ed: ja ; (botz
 miyed I'd meaq svitsei enoygler ed to miltanique ha
 to ebbis nwoomi-liew a'szak ml of noitnico a as liev as
 ed yilimt . jedanqle weide" ed to svitsei jucosetup
 traat a'szak ml of svitsei enoygler bezoomec
 shonefne" ed to
 vass us saw ji malehut of pumjet old refta
 holties oh . maligad and tegrot elops ekim of mid tol zeffar
 ed of bbs of beuritnoo ed exadu nayigler to nisq si
 . svitsei jidet to xinaset

MIYOSAH TAMILOK

Isolating a as hash" to yilimsetz ed
similek has sojedek'k idet LA now juchive si jafra
 . beztomos has noitlaotxut ai beosiq sic miyosah
 evits of edisq justattit wofft vedt ; intsetot illayud
 evets ki berdence si miyosah similek . also rindt ja
 ati asvith has noitnizavni Isolotzai to sgarbal

contentions to their logical conclusions by force
 of reason and by an appeal to logic. Great power is
 given to the arguments of Profiat Duran because of his
 authoritative use of Christian sources in disclosing the
 inconsistency of the church philosophy. The book was
 written at the request of Chasdai Crescas to whom it was
 dedicated.¹⁰ His kinsman Simeon ben Zemach Duran made
 much use of the material of Efodi in his attack on
 Christianity and especially in his defense of the Torah.¹¹
 In a Roman manuscript we learn that Rashbaz translated
 two-thirds of Kelimat HaGoyim for use in his Keshet
Umagen without mentioning the source.¹² Similarly
 Albo utilized much of Duran's material in Chapter 25
 of his Ikkarim, while Eisenstein adds the names of two
 who borrowed from Efodi: Rabbi Shem Tob ben Isaac Ibn
 Shaprut, the author of Eben Bohem; and "avid Nasi, the
 author of Hodaat Baal Din. In Asham Tolui Rabbi Joshua
 Sagrin mentions that he bought a copy of Duran's polemic.
 Eisenstein also hints that Crescas drew from Kelimat HaGoyim
 for his Bitulot Ikkorai HaNozrim.¹³

It is hard to understand what lies
 beneath the arguments of those who attempt to show
 that Profiat Duran wrote Kelimat HaGoyim. It is
 possible that authorship may have been ascribed to
 others and defense was necessary. In his commentary

10. Eng Gr vol. 4 p.190

11. JE vol. 10 p.166

12. Ozar p.260

13. ibid p.260

sozol yg emosznecho Isaqol zidit of emosznecho
 si rwoz lezor¹³ .zifol of Isaqqa ha yg bne messor to
 zid to emosznecho nazur jailor¹⁴ to ztenuqza zid of nevir
 zid yalecholish ni emosznecho nazir¹⁵ to em svilazitdus
 saw zid edt .yiqaseling dorth¹⁶ zid to yomzelaneonk
 saw ti morin of emosz¹⁷ laban¹⁸ to jaemper zid ja mejjim
 shem nazur¹⁹ med noemiz hamenim zid of .berzelich
 no roetta zid al libot²⁰ to latzefem zid to emz domz
 li .zid²¹ zid to emosznecho zid at yilaziseqz bne ultimatitz²²
 bejalemetz nadzor²³ zidz nizel ew fritzunem nemoy e al
judex²⁴ zid ni emz tot mivod²⁵ Jamilek to abridt-owz
tzislimi²⁶ si .zochos edz yatzilizem zuodizw menah²⁷
 28 zeqad²⁸ ni latzefem zid to domz besilizh edia
 ows to emosz edz abba alefassim²⁹ elizw mivod³⁰ zid to
 mdi oasal med doz medz idder³¹ libot most bewotted ows
 ows .lach biva³² bne tzadik to zodius edz .zirqad³³
 subject idder³⁴ lulot maria n³⁵ .zid³⁶ Isaq Yashob to zodius
 zolmios a'nein³⁷ to yqos a'nein³⁸ edz emolznecho sawtay
mivod³⁹ Jamilek most wozz⁴⁰ zid zid zid emolznecho
 si .mivod⁴¹ latzefem zid tzid zid tot
 self zidz bnatzebam of bned al zid
 wode of jquetta ows emosz to ztenuqza zid emosznecho
 si zid .mivod⁴² Jamilek ejoww nazur jailor⁴³ zidz
 of bedriss need evad yak qidzotdus zidz eldaseq
 vistnezemco zid ni .zisasseen saw sanstek bne aradjo

001.0 1.lov t² 3nd 1.01
 001.0 0f .lov 2L 1.11
 002.0 1za0 1.11
 003.0 hidi 1.11

to Al Tehi K'Abeteca, Rabbi Joseph ben Shem Tob
 said," In Kelimat HaGoyim he (Duran) wrote what he here
 intimates."¹⁴ There is additional proof in the use of
 the phrase לפיכך נאמר ב' "according to the
 word of the speaker" in both polemics. This phrase means
 we need but turn to the words of Jesus to disprove Christ-
 ian claims; Used frequently in both polemics, these words
 permit us to assume a common authorship. Although the date
 of its composition is uncertain, internal evidence proves
 that it must have been written after his apostacy, that is,
 after the persecution of 1391. Speaking of Chasdai
 Duran said," Thou, O glorious one of the generation, hast
 seen the evil days and the poured-out wrath upon the
 exiles of Jerusalem in Spain."¹⁵ In the introduction the
 translator refers to the year ה'נ'ז'נ'ן and in his note Rabinowitz adds the word ב'תא which
 fixes the date of its composition at 1397, one year after
 his return to Judaism.

The book Kelimat HaGoyim is divided into
 twelve chapters, each of which deals with a salient point
 in Jewish polemics or apologetics. Duran however does not
 limit himself to old Christianity and the claims of the
 New Testament but attacks institutions within the developed
 church, institutions which exist to this day. His polemic
 is particularly effective because it reveals the inner

14. Ibid.

15. Heb Gr vol. 6 p.404

of the K'Appoosie River. The first
part of the river is the "K'Appoosie River".
The second part of the river is the "K'Appoosie River".
The third part of the river is the "K'Appoosie River".
The fourth part of the river is the "K'Appoosie River".
The fifth part of the river is the "K'Appoosie River".
The sixth part of the river is the "K'Appoosie River".
The seventh part of the river is the "K'Appoosie River".
The eighth part of the river is the "K'Appoosie River".
The ninth part of the river is the "K'Appoosie River".
The tenth part of the river is the "K'Appoosie River".
The eleventh part of the river is the "K'Appoosie River".
The twelfth part of the river is the "K'Appoosie River".
The thirteenth part of the river is the "K'Appoosie River".
The fourteenth part of the river is the "K'Appoosie River".
The fifteenth part of the river is the "K'Appoosie River".
The sixteenth part of the river is the "K'Appoosie River".
The seventeenth part of the river is the "K'Appoosie River".
The eighteenth part of the river is the "K'Appoosie River".
The nineteenth part of the river is the "K'Appoosie River".
The twentieth part of the river is the "K'Appoosie River".
The twenty-first part of the river is the "K'Appoosie River".
The twenty-second part of the river is the "K'Appoosie River".
The twenty-third part of the river is the "K'Appoosie River".
The twenty-fourth part of the river is the "K'Appoosie River".
The twenty-fifth part of the river is the "K'Appoosie River".
The twenty-sixth part of the river is the "K'Appoosie River".
The twenty-seventh part of the river is the "K'Appoosie River".
The twenty-eighth part of the river is the "K'Appoosie River".
The twenty-ninth part of the river is the "K'Appoosie River".
The thirtieth part of the river is the "K'Appoosie River".
The thirty-first part of the river is the "K'Appoosie River".
The thirty-second part of the river is the "K'Appoosie River".
The thirty-third part of the river is the "K'Appoosie River".
The thirty-fourth part of the river is the "K'Appoosie River".
The thirty-fifth part of the river is the "K'Appoosie River".
The thirty-sixth part of the river is the "K'Appoosie River".
The thirty-seventh part of the river is the "K'Appoosie River".
The thirty-eighth part of the river is the "K'Appoosie River".
The thirty-ninth part of the river is the "K'Appoosie River".
The fortieth part of the river is the "K'Appoosie River".
The forty-first part of the river is the "K'Appoosie River".
The forty-second part of the river is the "K'Appoosie River".
The forty-third part of the river is the "K'Appoosie River".
The forty-fourth part of the river is the "K'Appoosie River".
The forty-fifth part of the river is the "K'Appoosie River".
The forty-sixth part of the river is the "K'Appoosie River".
The forty-seventh part of the river is the "K'Appoosie River".
The forty-eighth part of the river is the "K'Appoosie River".
The forty-ninth part of the river is the "K'Appoosie River".
The fifty-thousandth part of the river is the "K'Appoosie River".

contradictions of Christian doctrine and dogma and the degeneration of Christianity. The Chapters of Kelimat HaGoyim deal with the following subjects:

- A: Proof from the words of Jesus and his disciples that he did not consider himself a God;

B: Interpretation of the Trinity;

C: Interpretation of "incarnation" and "original sin."

D: Proof that Jesus did not want to nullify the Torah but considered it divine;

E: Explanation of the reason why the followers of Jesus wanted to nullify the Torah;

F: Interpretation of the Mass and the Doctrine of Transubstantiation;

G: Explanation of the sacrament of baptism;

H: The Papacy and their scriptural proof;

I: Mary, the mother of Jesus, and the Christian sacraments;

J: Their faulty use of scriptural verses;

K: Their errors concerning the "era del Nacimiento;"

L: Jerome's errors in translation.

Throughout the essay two technical terms are used, וְעוֹדִים "erring ones" and וְעֹלָמִים "those who lead into error." The first term refers to Jesus and his disciples who erred but did not lead others into error. The second term is used with reference to the later leaders of Christianity

bns atsch bns enkrjoob melsimD to emoljelbarimoo
to ariqadD edT .vifinilatimD to mofzengesh edT
:afotdme gniwollot edT mifw lach mivoDgH familek
bns ariet to abrow edT mort roott .A
:bho a tleemid rahimee Jon bib edT mofzengesh sid
:vifinil edT to mofzengesh .B
bns"mofzengesh" to mofzengesh .C

"...ale lamigite"

vifilim of jnew Jon bib ariet jadt roott .D

:enivib ji betshimoo jnd mafot edT edT
edT vif noasex edT to mofzengesh .E

:matoT edT vifilim of Bejnaw ariet to ariwollot
edT bns ariet to mofzengesh .F

:mofzengeshedumot to ariwollot
mofzenged to jnemtose edT to mofzengesh .G

:lootq latnigites riedt bns vofaq edT .H
mofzengD edT bns ariet to rafim edT .I

jejnomot

:mofzengeset latnigites to em vifust riedt .L
lch ate" edT malnichesee strote riedt .M

"...ojnemot"

Q14.0 .mofzengeset ni strote a'moret .L
beni era ariet losindes owt vesse edT jnemgoshD
".vottc ofnl basi owt arodt" Q14.1 bns "anno gaittc"
strote owt mofzengesh edT bns ariet of strote ariet jndt edT
of ariet buoen edT .vottc ofnl strote basi Jon bib jnd
vifinilatimD to arbael rafal edT of strotelet dñiw been

who united Jesus' teaching with paganism and produced what Duran calls "a mixture of honey and wormwood."

Next then Efodi disposes of each subject systematically. Turning to the individual subjects under discussion let us analyze them chapter by chapter.

To strengthen their claims they misinterpreted the following

A: Jesus did not speak of himself as a god nor did his disciples use such a term in speaking of him. They called him "master" and "rabbi" but never "our God, Jesus." In their opinion he was in the category of a chosen son but was not literally the "Son of God." By referring to him as the chosen son they meant to distinguish between Moses, the servant, and Jesus, the more beloved.¹⁶

Further proof of this contention is seen in the intercourse between Jesus and Satan in which Jesus' own words prove his humanity.¹⁷ Similarly, Jesus himself denies that he is empowered to speak of the good, for "only one there is who is good."¹⁸ Neither would his disciples have been surprised at the incident of the fig tree if they looked upon him as divine.¹⁹ Mary, his mother, who is the most reliable authority, speaks of Joseph as Jesus' father.²⁰ From these and other verses it becomes clear that the Talmud did not look upon Jesus as divine.

The Mat'im erred in their interpretation of scriptural verses; The ambiguous sayings, e.g. John X:30 and XIV:9, can be explained in terms of the poetic nature

16. Hebrews III:5-6 (Numbers XII: 7)

17. Math IV:3-4

18. ibid XIX:16-17

19. ibid X:17-18

20. Lk II:42-48

That probably is the reason why we have been able to get along so well without any
of our own. We have had to depend upon the help of others, and we have been
able to do this because we have been able to work together as a team.

boy a sa tleesnid lo kusqo Jon bib sweet .A
mid lo gakisqo ni wret'a noms osu sefiosib aif bib ten
,het' qas" teneb tuf "idder" bns "kajasm" mid heffio yest
a lo krosqas eni ni saw ed noisqo riedj al ".anee"
"H." ,hoog lo noq" edt qitatisli Jon saw tuf nos nekofo
naisognisah of jnosek yest nos nekofo edt as mid of qitatisli
SI ,hevoled ston edt ,awest bns ,jnavtes edt ,nosos neewas
ci nesa si neitneqnoe aifj lo kozq tenqatli
"anee" dolin si nasa bns anee' neewas setnoctesli edt
tleesnid sweet ,qitatisli SI ,qitatisli si evotq ablow two
qulm" yet ,hoog edt lo kusqo et betzwoqqa si ed jadz sefiosib
sefiosib aif blisow tenqatli SI ,hoog si osw si stadt sno
yadi ti eozz yit edt lo jnashianli edt ja basiqutua need evan
edt si osw ,rediom aif ,qitatisli SI ,enivib as mid noqu behool
Giantat 'anee' as qasqol lo kusqo ,qitatisli sidatlet jaom
mioT edt jadz tsele neemoed ji neitneqnoe bns anee' mot
enivib as sweet noqu noof Jon bib
lo noisqasqasli riedj si batte mi'jam edt
Q:X niot .B.s ,qanivas anasqidaa edt .anasev letuqas
etutu aifsq edt lo arriet ni beginiqqa ed nac .C:VX bns

15	Medieval III: c. 8 (numbered)
14	Medieval IV: 8-15
13	Medieval V: 15-18
12	Medieval VI: 18-21
11	Medieval VII: 21-24

of Jesus, the master of parables. Other verses clearly indicate that he was human, for example "My God, my God why hast Thou forsaken me?"²¹ Yet the Mat'rim unite the figure of Jesus with the person of God. In their writings he is called "our only master and lord, Jesus Christ."²² To strengthen their claims they misinterpreted Biblical verses. In Jeremiah the Messiah is called "Adonoi Zidkanu."²³ However, the combination of names here has no more significance than the name of the altar "Adonoi-nisi"²⁴ which also contains God's name. The well-known verse "An almah shall conceive and bear a son and call his name Immanuel"²⁵ is a subject of contention. But, in reality, the word Almah does not have the same meaning as Betulah as is evident from its use in connection with a young woman who could not have been a virgin, namely, "The way of a man with an Almah."²⁶ The claim of the Gospel writer becomes absurd in the light of the time of the fulfillment of the prophecy. The seer spoke of the present, while Christian writer projects his imagination 500 years into the future. Furthermore, the verse says that his mother "shall call his name Immanuel" and in the Gospel it is Gabriel who named Jesus. Likewise the verse "His name shall be called Pele-joez-el-gibbor-abi-ad-sar-shalom"²⁷ is interpreted by the Christians to mean the Messiah but this claim is unjustified in the light of the preceding section²⁸ which clearly indicates that the names of honor are bestowed upon Hezekiah.

- | | |
|-------------------|-----------------|
| 21. Math XXVII:34 | 25. Isa.VII:14 |
| 22. Jude I:4 | 26. Prov XXX:19 |
| 23. Jere XXIII:6 | 27. Isa. IX:5 |
| 24. Ex XVII:16 | 28. Isa. VIII:7 |

Yisrael batev yom³⁰ esidetsq to tefash edt ,susel to
bed ym ,bed ym elqamez rot ,namur aw ed jahd esidetsni
edt ejim mi'jam edt jay IS "Yem nekherot bedt jadn yim
agnitiv riedt ml .bed to moatq edt djlw susel to exqit
SS .jalm³¹ suset ,brol bns tefash vino tho" bellioc si ed
Isolida³² befergutnism yedt amislo ziedt nesipetsa ot
SS ".unzibl³³ ionoba" bellioc si dalessm edt halmerst ml .betev
soschtingis eton os had eted suman to noltanidmoz edt ,tevowol
amisnac osfa doldw "Iain-ionoba" tsjls edt to eman edt haat
evleonec llands daala na" batev nwozi-lfew edt .amen s'ho³⁴
toledos a si SS "Iannam" eman alid llosa nos a tsed bns
evad Jon seob daala btoo edt ,yjilset ml ,JNEK .nesipetsa to
ml osa ejt mort jnebive si na halmer as yalmam eman osa
a need evad Jon blosa odw namow yinov a djlw noltanidmoz
edt SS ".daala" na djlw nam a lo yew edt" ,eximes ,nigativ
to Jngil edt si brusda amocoed tejirw laqetd edt to misle
eloga zesa edt .yedqotq edt to tneffilitz edt to emi³⁵ edt
nolvanigami alid atsotiq tejirw naktzim³⁶ elidw ,tneffitq edt to
yes batev edt ,etotmenitnt .etotnt edt ojni emoy 008
edt ni bns "Iannam" eman alid llosa zedion alid jadz
batev edt eshezid .suset beman odw leitda³⁷ si ji laqetd
-ue-ha-ida-yodding-is-seot-siel bellioc ed llands eman alid
dalessm .edt uom al eshtzim³⁸ edt yd befergutni si "mcinda
gutbeatzq edt to Jngil edt ni heitlentnu al misle alid jad
tromot to aman edt jadz esidetsni qfsefo doldw SS "noljots
.dalessm noqu bewadz osa

AI:IIIV .ai .SS
af:XXX vot¹ .SS
G:XI .ai .SS
V:IIIIV .ai .SS

AS:IIIVXX .ejam .SS
A:I:shut .SS
B:IIIXX .etel .SS
af:IIIVX .x² .SS

When the wise men of the Church became aware of the discrepancy between their claims and their proof, they taught that Jesus was a combination of two aspects or natures; one, human and one, divine. Therefore, whenever the Scripture speaks about the Messiah's humanity it refers to his human aspect and when it speaks of his divinity it refers to his divine aspect. The unity of divinity and humanity is more complete and binding than the unity of body and soul. This combination of two foreign natures within one and the same substance is called hypostasis. When the two were completely united the Messiah was executed. If this is true, then God was put to death, even though it was the human aspect of the Messiah that was executed. It is like the execution of a murderer who happened to be a merchant. He is executed as a murderer, but is not the merchant put to death? In the hour of death Jesus called out "My God, my God why hast thou forsaken me?" 29 Was it proper for a God to call upon a God? It is evident that Jesus did not consider himself divine and that the Talm acknowledged his humanity. His divinity is an invention of the Mat'im.

B. The error of the trinity assumption is based on the Cabala in which "fathers and sons" are sefirot, which are given such names as "The Face of God"³⁰ and "The Image of God."³¹ Assuming a first light, a clear light, and a shining light within the sefirot, they claimed that

29. Math XXVII:46
30. In I:1 See also Par. Rim. perek 1
31. II Corinth. IV:4

these are one. In the New Testament they uphold the trinity on the basis of the statement of John, "There are three who bear witness, the spirit and the water and the blood; and the three agree in one."³² In his commentary Nicholas de Lyra said, "There are three who give testimony in the heaven, the Father, son and holy ghost." The water, blood and spirit which bear witness of Jesus are his spirit, which descended to Limbo to free the souls of the fathers; his blood which was shed; and the water which came forth from his body when the soldier stabbed him. But these three substances really cannot be one. Realizing this discrepancy the Mat'rim tried to remove this proof but they were unsuccessful because it is mentioned by Nicholas de Lyra.

Furthermore, how can John's opening sentence about the identity of God and the logos refer to the trinity when it really indicates a duality? No mention is made of the holy ghost. The Mat'rim tried to prove their assertion by interpreting it philosophically, by calling the three members of the trinity the three attributes necessary for the renewal of creation: wisdom, corresponding to the son; potentiality, corresponding to the Father; and will, corresponding to the holy ghost. The statement is philosophically true but has no logical connection with a divine trinity.

From the scriptural use of phrases, such as the plural forms of Elohim and Adonoi, Holy, Holy, Holy,

32. I Jn. 5:8

I 35:11VXX djam 02
doviles ex "anom huius existat" dolidw ni mida0 est: ne haed
est: huius "huius to eset est" ne eoman dous neviv ex: do huius
huius "mali jasit a primusA". huius to exam
jast hemislo yedi, do viles est mida0 tigiti gainis a

and the Shema, the Mat'ip try to deduce the trinity, but their effort is in vain. If they followed their own method of deduction to its logical conclusion they would be forced to assume a quintet and not a trium. It is evident that they are in error in their trinitarian assumption.

C. The Mat'im assumed that the divine spirit was embodied in the person of Jesus in order to save humanity. They say that Adam's sin brought death into the world. Therefore punishment is exacted of all his descendants. This original sin is part of the inheritance of mankind. But out of love for humanity God took on human form and came down to the earth to redeem His creatures. The shedding of Jesus' blood made atonement. Although circumcision had elevated man's soul into the highest chamber of Gehenna the redemption was not consummated until Jesus died. His resurrection completed the act of grace. It is not necessary to refute their deductions since the refutation of the root principle destroys their case.

Jesus himself did not mention this aspect of his ministry. The Mat'ip deduced it from his statement that it is necessary for the "son of man" to die.³³ Paul confirms this assumption, when he says, "We were reconciled to God through the death of His son,"³⁴ and "for as in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive."³⁵ Only they who believe in Jesus shall inherit this eternal life.³⁶ The keys of Paradise are placed in Jesus hands.

33. Math. XVI:21

34. Rom. V:8

35. I Corinth. XV:21

36. Jn. 3:36

B R E A K 8

and blenq yent tneunst wch ent ml .ano oys esedj
esent", nro" to tneunst wch to alad ent no qilint
bns rafew ent bns rafiq ent .esentw used oys esedj oys
sin ml 22. ano nd oys esedj ent bns boold ent
oys esedj ent oys esedj .bns svpl ab malodim yilam
yilam bns nos ,redit ent ,newed ent ni yonifas evig
esentw used dafidw rafiqs bns boold ,rafew ent ".Jacoby
or odmild of behmoseb rafidw ,rafiqs sin oys anset to
thera saw rafidw boold ent gatadit ent to alios ent esit
ent newd ybos sin motl ntot emos rafidw rafew ent bns
yilam reconsedua esedj esedj tuf .min beddys rafibis
mi'jal ent yonagoyosib sin yonifas .ano ed jomme
Inleasconan eww yent fud teotz minf evomer of balyt
.svpl ab malodim yd besoitnem si ji esuced
esedjew yilam s'adot nro won ,excorriant
yilam ent of rafet sogel ent bns boold to yilamshi ent fuoda
to obak si molism om .yilamsh a sejolam yilam si newd
solutes tieny evoty of balyt mi'jal ent .Jacoby yilam ent
esedj ent yilam yd .yilamqeseling si yilamqesem yd
tot yilamqesem esedj esedj yilam ent to yilam
nos ent of yilamqesem ,mobais :molists to Inwest ent
-tes ,lliw bns yilam ent of yilamqesem ,yilamqesem
-deseling si yilamqesem ent .Jacoby yilam ent of yilamqesem
enivib a rafidw moljoemnoe Isolgef on ent fud ent yilam
yilam
no house ,accordg to sun. Iaxusqitw ent motl
yilam yilam yilam bns minolm to emolj Iaxusqitw ent

jud , v'linis edt conch of v'z gl'tzL wif , amedt emt han
bonites nwo riedt bewiffol v'zil II . nivz ni si r'olle riedt
he rot edt b'low v'zit noisemance Isingel v'zit of noisemance lo
v'zit r'adz t'mbive si II . amulz a son has dejulz a emus of
noisemance n'listinuz riedt ni zorez ni v'z
trigz salivz edt j'ndt beusses mi'zal edt .
v'zimunz evaz of r'abz ni arret to m'rtzq edt ni helbodz saw
-evaz ablow edt o'ni n'zab v'zimud n'z a'maba j'ndt v'z v'zit
s'ndt .stuebuseash sid l's to bejwzke si j'nmelzng stok
t'co j'ndt .butkam to consituted edt to j'ndt si a'z Isingiz
moch emu has m'rk n'zndt no dooz h'z v'zimud rot evet lo
'arret to p'bbheda edt .v'zimud siH m'ebet of R'zis edt of
bejwzke had noisemance dynoJIA .j'nmelzng abem boofd
noisemance edt amulz to redendo j'ndt edt etui l'co a'maba
noisemance etui .helb emu l'coz beisemance son saw
ojfiz of v'zimud son si II .s'ndt to son edt beisemance
elqonizing foot edt to m'rdzter edt sonka noisemance riedt
esse riedt v'zimud
lo j'ndt m'rdzter son bib R'zisid v'zit
j'ndt j'nmelzng sid m'rt si beusses mi'zal edt .v'zimud sid
m'rdzter l'co ^{RE} "sid of "n'z to n'z" edt rot v'zimud si II
h'z of helbnozter evaz e'w ,evaz ed medz,noisemance sid
l'co m'aba ni ss rot " h'z ^{RE} "n'z to n'z" edt v'zimud
v'z ^{RE} .v'zil shaz ed l's l'coz talz si o'le o' ,si
l'co l'coz o'le sid t'mbive l'coz v'zit of evetid o'le v'zit
abmid v'zit at beofig o'le v'zit to v'zit

But Jesus did not say that his ministry was to humanity. "I come not to call the righteous but the sinners."³⁷ The lost sheep of the House of Israel were his flock and not the whole human race.³⁸ Other sayings of Jesus refute this contention of the Mat'rim. Pointing to a young boy Jesus said, "Whosoever shall humble himself as this little child, the same is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven."³⁹ The statement implies that some were eligible for admission to Paradise before Jesus died to redeem the world. In answer to the question "What good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life" Jesus advised not faith but obedience to the commandments.⁴⁰ At another time Jesus implied that the evil deeds of the scribes and Pharisees had closed the gates of the kingdom of heaven.⁴¹ Furthermore, the story of the rich man and Lazarus, the beggar, is certain proof that some went to "Abraham's bosom" and others to Hades even before the incarnation and crucifixion.⁴² In another place Jesus denies admission only to the rice, saying "it is easier for a camel to enter in through a needle's eye, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God."⁴³ It is clear from these verses that Jesus did not have in mind the mission which the Mat'rim ascribed to him. He believed that one's deeds are the criteria.

Jesus did not rise to the lofty view of the soul held by the masters of our tradition, but looked upon

37. Math. IX:13 42. Lk. XVI:19-25
 39. ibid. XVIII:4 43. ibid. XVIII: 21
 40. ibid. XXXI:16-17
 41. ibid. XXIII:13
 38. Math. 15:24

1

65-01:IVX .M .S 61:XI .M&P .V
65 :IIIIVX .bid 61:IIIXX .bid 61:
VI-51:XXX .bid 61:IIIXX .bid 61:
51:IIIXX .bid 61:IIIXX .bid 61:

it as something corporeal, although of lesser corporeality than the body. The Mat'ip actually believed that Jesus sat at the right hand of God.⁴⁴ This conception is much inferior to that of the masters of our Torah.

The Talmud believed that Jesus would return to earth and live again among men. The resurrection would take place, they thought, within a short time and many who knew Jesus in life would be present as witnesses. Jesus promised that this event would come to pass before his generation had passed away. "Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass away, till all these things be accomplished."⁴⁵ Paul said, "Yet a little while, he that cometh shall come."⁴⁶ When the Rabbis saw that the end of the world was delayed they reinterpreted the word "generation" and said that the periods of the world are divided into three, each of which is called a generation. The first was from Adam to Moses; the second from Moses to Jesus; and the third from Jesus to the day of judgment. This assumption cannot be proved. They also invented the figure of the anti-Christ who will try to confuse the faith of Jesus.⁴⁷ There is no doubt that experience has shown that all these inventions and misinterpretations are false; their purpose is to protect the mistaken opinions of Jesus and his followers from the accusation of falsehood.

D: According to the Gospel descriptions, Jesus was a pious fool, **אִיּוֹן תָּבוֹן** who did more than

44a Math. XXVI:64

45. *Ibid.*, XXIV:34.

46. Feb. X:38

47. I Jn. 1:2-3

q'iliitsoqtooq taaqet lo q'isutit. Ilaatooqooq p'ulissuk as si
aaqet q'asit beveleq q'ilaatoq mi'jalluq eit. q'isut q'asit
dumit at noilssuusq eit. q'isut to b'asit q'asit as jas
.devote tuo to atsasut eit to jasit of tsiltsil
of t'siltsil b'isow aasut jasit beveleq mi'jalluq eit
b'isow noilssuusq eit. q'asut q'asut q'asut asilf bus k'isut
q'asut bus emit j'asut a nisitit. J'asutit q'asit, esilf eit.
asseesutit as t'sasutq ed b'isow still at aasut w'asit edw
elected aasut of amos b'isow j'asut q'asit jasit beveleq aasut
, "now oops now I q'isut". q'asut beveleq bus noilssuusq eit
against aasut illa illit. q'asut aasut for illa noilssuusq q'asit
q'asit ed, "illit q'isut a jaY", b'isow busi ^{q'isut} .bedsiliquoona ed
to bus edt jasit was mi'jalluq edt neq'w ^{q'isut}. amos illa n'isemoo
"noilssuusq" b'isow edt beveleqesuuk q'asit beveleq asw b'isow edt
ojal bebevib aas b'isow edt to aboiteq edt jasit b'isow bus
asw j'asit edt. noilssuusq a b'isow at b'isow to b'asit, esilf
edt bus t'sasut of aasut mort b'asut edt t'sasut of maha mort
noilssuusq q'asit. t'sasutbusi lo q'asit of aasut mort b'isit
-l'asut edt to aasut edt beveleq q'isut q'isut. devote ed t'sasut
edt q'isut. aasut to q'isut edt esilfes of q'isut illiit edw q'isut
noilssuusq aasut illa jasit aasut and esilfesq jasit t'sasut edt
as q'isut aasut q'isut t'sasut aasut esilfesq jasit t'sasut
t'sasut aasut to aasut aasut edt t'sasut
, beveleq to noilssuusq edt aasut
, aasut aasut bus edt 1977 W'asit, foot esilf a aasut

merely fulfill the law. It never entered his mind to preach against the Torah of Moses. Indeed, he said to his disciples, "Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets; I came not to destroy but to fulfill."⁴⁸ In Jesus' remarks about divorce, adultery, etc., he had no intention of nullifying the Torah, but merely wanted to define it. He prefaced his address with the statement "Till heaven and earth pass away one jot or tittle shall in no wise pass away from the law."⁴⁹ Jesus was executed not because he opposed the law but because he was a blasphemer.⁵⁰

Yet the Mat'rim deduced from his words that he nullified the Mosaic law, permitted that which the Torah forbade and lightened the yoke of the law. However, when he said, "Not that which entereth into the mouth defileth the man, but that which proceedeth out of the mouth, this defileth the man"⁵¹ he did not intend to permit forbidden foods. He merely explained that the foods are forbidden not because they are inherently unclean but only because they are not permitted by divine decree. Jesus was not anti-nomistic when he charged his disciples to go forth without purses, wallets or shoes and eat the things set before them.⁵² He had Jewish homes and Jewish food in mind. His previous command "Go not into any way of the Gentiles" clearly excludes such an inference. Contrary to the belief

48. Math. V:17

49. ibid V:18

50. *ibid.* XXVI:63

51. *ibid.* XVIII
52. *Ib.* V. 3-7

52. Lk. x:3-7; compare with Matt. x:3-9.

of bim ait betohe roven si .wal eit lilitl qletem
or bins ad ,beebul .secol to metot ait fashig poteq
wal eit vorkeb of eme I tafis fes haifit", esiqoib ait
sh .lilitl of fud vorkeb of fes eme I fahengor eit to
on han ad .cja .yedimha ,sozivh suoda ekzam 'anet al
et hefneu qletem fud ,metot eit palytillim to polnefai
jusomata eit nliw asetba ait beebulec sh .ji enfah
linda mifit to fes uno yava eseq dura has nevad lilit
bejooche aew eset .⁵³ wal eit motz yava eseq eit on al
-mild a saw ad esaued fud wal eit besoggo ad esaued fes
od .temaq

tait abrow ad morr beoubsh mi'jam eit jey
metot eit nliw fadi bejimiq ,wal classol eit bejillim ad
et nliw ,revewoh .wal eit to aloy adi benedigil has chadic
eti mifilteb dinom eit ojal djerfus nliw fadi JeM", biss
ain ,djinom eit to fes atabessociq nliw fadi fud ,has
mehidiot fliqet of bnei fes bib ad⁵⁴ ,has eit mifilteb
mehidiot era about eit fadi benidiqx eit mefet sh ,about
causod vino fud paliom qfumetem era yadi esaued fes
fes saw eset .esetb esivh vd bejimiq fes era yadi
mifit og of esiqoib ait begrade ad nliw ejzimom-itsa
tes agnisi eit fes has seeds to alyfaw ,seetaw juidilw
bukh ni boot mifit has esemot mifit bad sh⁵⁵ ,meds evaled
"salifus" eit to vav yrs ojni fes ognibmamco evaled qil
leiled eit or qetzaq .consetetl na mow sebilex yissel

VI:V .djam .55
81:V .bidi .56
23:IVX .bidi .57
III:VX .bidi .58
81-5X .djam nliw eseqob : 7-6:X .MI .59

of the Mat'im his justification of Sabbath-breaking, when
his disciples plucked corn, is legal because it was hunger
that forced them to the violation of the Sabbath law.⁵³

that he is a. In fact Jesus did not concern himself with
the Gentiles but called them "dogs."⁵⁴ Instead he was
exceedingly careful; to do all the Pharisees commanded.
He told his disciples to pray that their flight at the time
of the tribulation would not be on the Sabbath.⁵⁵ His
disciples were also very scrupulous about law observance.
Thrice Peter objected to the eating of forbidden food and
blood even when it was the voice of God that commanded.⁵⁶
Paul and his disciples observed the law of the Nazarite
by sacrificing and refraining from shaving.⁵⁷ At Rome
Paul denied that he had broken the law and differed with
the customs of Israel.⁵⁸ James said, "Whosoever shall keep
the whole law, and yet stumble in one point, he is become
guilty of all."⁵⁹

Naturally Paul did not insist on the obser-
vance of the law on the part of Gentile converts. Faith is
the sine qua non of salvation. Basing his assumption on
the verse " and he believed in the Lord and it was reckoned
unto him for righteousness"⁶⁰ Paul argued that faith is the
prerequisite of salvation and grace and that circumcision
was commanded only to prove Abraham's faith.⁶¹ But this
loosening of the yoke for the Gentile was motivated by the

53. Math. XIII:1-4 58. Acts XXVIII:17-18
54. MK. VII:27 59. Jas. II:10
55. Math. XXIV:15-21 60. Gen. XV:6
56. Acts X: 11-16 61. Rom. IV:3-11
57. ibid. XXI:26 compare with Nos. VI:13-18

new .pulaski-djeddeB to noisotliseni idm mi'shl est lo
zeugum saw fi sausod legal si ,urot bekeniq selfigalid sid
62 wal diaddes edt to noisaloiv est of meni bekelj tadi
djiw 'leamid ursonce ton bib smet jost si
new ed bsejutl 108 "ayob" went bekkos and called edt
behnsmoo assizandt est lls oh of jstimo vgnibevos
emt est ja rjifit rjibz jans vryg of selfigalid sid blif all
air 109 .djeddeB est no ed tes bljow mclnudit est to
socvnoede wal judea evnigutre vryg oala etew selfigalid
has bout nebbidet to gntse est of bekojde zedel solint
Gd behnsmoo jadz hol to enoy est saw si adw nroo booly
etfizanMest to wal est beveredo selfigalid sid has lusi
emt ja 110 .gnivade most gnifiziter has gnifizitor v
rtiv betellib dm wal est mclord han ed jadz beinet lusi
geet llae revsoanW "hiss sumet" 111 .leasel to amano est
emosed si af ,tulog eme si eldants say has wal elow est
112 "lls te vifing
-medo est no telan for bib lnsi vifing
si dizi .etrevnoe elizet to jing est no wal est to emoy
no moligness est gnise .moliverie to non sup ems est
benficer saw si has brod est nl beveifed ed has " eatev est
est si dizi jadz beynig lusi 113 "gnahancodit rot mid orni
noisaloivie jadz has sonig oas molignies to ejisuperemq
sim-jadz 114 .dizi a'nefiedA evnig of vimo behnsmoo saw
est vj behavition saw elizet est rot ekov est to gnisecol

SI-VI:IIIVDX .03A .03 . 1-1:IX .03AM .03
01:II .03 .03 . TS:IV .03 .03
5:VX .03 .03 . 11-6:VIX .03AM .03
15-2:VI .03 .03 . 01-11 .03 .03
SI-SI:IV .03 .03 .03 .03 .03 .03

desire to strengthen their hearts in the faith of Jesus.
Israel was forever obligated to obey the law. Paul said,
"I testify again to every man that receiveth circumcision
that he is a debtor to do the whole law."⁶² These words,
intended to loosen the yoke from the Gentiles, prove the
eternity of the Torah as the law of Israel, for if each man
is bound by duty to circumcise his son, that son will be
bound by the same law to fulfill it in regard to his son,
and so on to all eternity.

E. The Mat'im realized that the words of
Jesus were not anti-nomistic. Hence they were forced
to nullify the Torah by recourse to other methods. They
philosophized and spoke of three periods of the Torah:
the period corresponding to the whole normal man, from
Moses to Jesus' crucifixion, when absolute observance of
the Torah is mandatory; the second period corresponding to
the weak sickly man, from the crucifixion of Jesus to the
dissemination of the gospel, during which they was only
partial observance; and the period following the dis-
semination when only the limb of morality remained alive.
But this claim cannot be proved inasmuch as Jesus insisted
that the law be observed even after the Gospel had become
known.⁶³ But the Mat'im agreed that since Jesus gave the
pope the keys of heaven, he could do all he desired.
Hence innovations and non-observance of the law find
justification.

Turning to Biblical literature the Mat'im

62. Gal. V:3

63. Math. XXIV:20

·sweet to digest and to extract various components of plants
·this plant ·and this yado of betalgido prevents new intestinal
inflammation diseases and new types of pains arises. I'
·about plant 20 ·and about 200 g of tobacco a kg of this
·and about 200 g of tobacco a kg of tobacco of betalgido
new pain is not ·leads to walk and to work and to write
and like this ·you can eat more of this plant and you can eat
·and eat of dinner at 11 AM of this plant and you can eat
··write this of me as soon
to above said said because mi'jam said ·
because new yado come ·aliments like Jon new sweet
yado ·about 200 g of extract of this plant and writing of
this plant to shelter seeds to smoke this betalgido
more ·new leaves about 200 g of galibogsetric boiled and
to cover the mouth ·which is sweet of smoke
of galibogsetric boiled smoke and ·writing of this plant and
said of sweet to smoking and more ·new yado new
yado new yado smoke ·leaves and to make a small
·and galibogsetric boiled and this is recommended for
·cilia because writing to dmil and yado new no longer
boiled sweet as follows ·before ad Jonnes while this is
smoked had fagocid and kills have been made ad wai said said
and every sweet soula said because mi'jam said this
·betalgido and this of this and ·new to say this
·smoking wai said to cover the mouth and
·smoking
mi'jam said ·smoking is good of galibogsetric

use scriptural verses to prove that the old Torah has been replaced. Among these are "Teach me Thy way, O Lord"⁶⁴ which Jerome translates "Give me a Torah, O Lord." Another is the verse "Behold the days come sayeth the Lord when I shall make a new covenant"⁶⁵ which Jerome misinterprets as "a new Torah" when only a more faithful observance of the old Torah is meant.

In this spirit they glorified themselves when they proclaimed themselves as the new Israel. They used the prophetic predictions of Israel's destruction as their proof that the old Israel is destroyed. But did not God promise redemption? "If you shall be scattered to the ends of the earth, from there God shall gather you to the land your fathers inherited and which you shall inherit and He shall do well with you and multiply you more than your fathers."⁶⁶ Nicholas de Lyra thought that the verse in Jeremiah "At that time they shall call Jerusalem the throne of the Lord and all the nations shall be gathered unto it to the name of the Lord, to Jerusalem; neither shall they walk anymore after the stubbornness of their evil heart"⁶⁷ was proof that in the time of Jesus all the nations shall be gathered to Jerusalem and idolatry will cease under the influence of the new faith. This is untrue historically, for Constantine, who forced Christianity upon Europe, lived more than 300 years after Jesus. The scripture speaks about the

64. Psa. XXVII:11

65. *J. era* XXXI:30, 32

66. Deut. XXX:4-8

67. Jere. III:13

13

need and *not* the end just enough of seeing Intelligible. But
Adopted O, now you see Moses" etc said you. Because
you know "but O, *not* a *new* covenant. *not* because
I mean *not* the new one you say but *old* etc etc etc
as *not* *new* *not* *old* *not* *new* ⁶⁸ *not* *old* *not* *new*
not to *new* *not* *old* *not* *new* ⁶⁹ *not* *old* *not* *new*
not *new* *not* *old* *not* *new* *not* *old* *not* *new*
not *new* *not* *old* *not* *new* *not* *old* *not* *new*
not *new* *not* *old* *not* *new* *not* *old* *not* *new*
not *new* *not* *old* *not* *new* *not* *old* *not* *new*
not *new* *not* *old* *not* *new* *not* *old* *not* *new*
not *new* *not* *old* *not* *new* *not* *old* *not* *new*
not *new* *not* *old* *not* *new* *not* *old* *not* *new*
not *new* *not* *old* *not* *new* *not* *old* *not* *new*
not *new* *not* *old* *not* *new* *not* *old* *not* *new*
not *new* *not* *old* *not* *new* *not* *old* *not* *new*
not *new* *not* *old* *not* *new* *not* *old* *not* *new*
not *new* *not* *old* *not* *new* *not* *old* *not* *new*
not *new* *not* *old* *not* *new* *not* *old* *not* *new*
not *new* *not* *old* *not* *new* *not* *old* *not* *new*
not *new* *not* *old* *not* *new* *not* *old* *not* *new*
not *new* *not* *old* *not* *new* *not* *old* *not* *new*
not *new* *not* *old* *not* *new* *not* *old* *not* *new*
not *new* *not* *old* *not* *new* *not* *old* *not* *new*
not *new* *not* *old* *not* *new* *not* *old* *not* *new*
not *new* *not* *old* *not* *new* *not* *old* *not* *new*
not *new* *not* *old* *not* *new* *not* *old* *not* *new*
not *new* *not* *old* *not* *new* *not* *old* *not* *new*
not *new* *not* *old* *not* *new* *not* *old* *not* *new*
not *new* *not* *old* *not* *new* *not* *old* *not* *new*
not *new* *not* *old* *not* *new* *not* *old* *not* *new*
not *new* *not* *old* *not* *new* *not* *old* *not* *new*
not *new* *not* *old* *not* *new* *not* *old* *not* *new*
not *new* *not* *old* *not* *new* *not* *old* *not* *new*
not *new* *not* *old* *not* *new* *not* *old* *not* *new*
not *new* *not* *old* *not* *new* *not* *old* *not* *new*
not *new* *not* *old* *not* *new* *not* *old* *not* *new*
not *new* *not* *old* *not* *new* *not* *old* *not* *new*
not *new* *not* *old* *not* *new* *not* *old* *not* *new*
not *new* *not* *old* *not* *new* *not* *old* *not* *new*
not *new* *not* *old* *not* *new* *not* *old* *not* *new*
not *new* *not* *old* *not* *new* *not* *old* *not* *new*
not *new* *not* *old* *not* *new* *not* *old* *not* *new*

11:11-12. *not* .08
28:08. *not* .05
8-1:XXX. *not* .05
21:III. *not* .08

future redemption of Israel and not about Jesus' influence. When Jeremiah says, "they shall say no more the ark of the covenant of the Lord" he means that all the word will be filled with prophecy. He does not mean that the old Torah is nullified, as Nicholas de Lyra claimed.

Failing in their early attempts, the Matt'im began to use other means to prove that the old Torah is deficient. They said that it lacks completions, while the new law of Jesus is complete and perfect. In three ways they insisted the Mosaic law is imperfect: first, in its basic assumptions; second, in its commandments; and third, in its purpose or end. It is defective in its basic assumptions because it does not explicitly mention the trinity but speaks of it only in hidden phrases. The veil of Moses ⁶⁸ is symbolic of the veil that has been placed over the Biblical references to the trinity. The advent of the Messiah will signify that the veil has been removed. Yet the veil over the eyes of Israel will not be removed until they accept Jesus; "Whosoever Moses is read a veil lieth upon their heart." ⁶⁹

They said the Mosaic law is defective in its commandments. These ordinances can be divided into three groups:

- Ethical commands, called morals;
- Political commands, called judiciales;
- Ritual commands, called ceremonial.

Regarding morals they claimed that the Torah is concerned

68. Ex. XXXIV:33-35

69. II Corinth. III:15

...consulut 'essel' joods Jon has festal to uoligemher enjst
odt te xra odt strom on yas llaids yad", says raimerL nadW
od lluw brou odt lls jadit ensem od "brol odt te jnnenevoo
nitoT hlo odt jadit nase Jon asob eh .yedigong hlo beilit
.hemislo stvl ab enloetik os ,bottillim al
mit'el odt ,sigmetta ylise ziedt al gnlilat
al asioT hlo odt jadit eveng of ensem radio os of magad
odt elinw ,enclisqmcu enoel ji jadit bina yadT .jnisciteb
avw ermit al .jctraq bus eriqmoc al asast to wal wen
sji al ,jatit mactreqmi al wal olassom odt hejsiani yad
briit bus jchembnacmo sji al ,bnoce qanotqumma olead
olead odt al evijotekh al ji .bus to eseqing sji al
odt noitneq ylililqxs Jon asob ji enoigummaa
lluv odT .eseqing nebbid al ylno ji to enseqa jnd ylilij
heylq need and jadit lluv odt to eliodya al ⁶⁰ seach to
to juevba odT .yinitt odt of seomotet loekidim odt revo
bevomer need and lluv odt jadit ylqiqs lluw dalmel odt
bevomer od Jon lluw festal to reye odt revo lluv odt jaY
lluv a best al escom 'kevecamew' .jaast jgocoos yadit llum
60= .ziedt ziedt noqu itself
al ni evijotekh al wal olassom odt bina yadT
asmti ojnl behivit od nco seomamibz esent .jchembnacmo
jelotom beffao ,abnummcu Isaiti⁶¹ .
jelotibut beffao ,abnummcu Isaiti⁶² .
.Isainomates beffao ,abnummcu Isaiti⁶³ .
benusance al marot odt jadit hemislo yadit elotom psithayet

32-33:VIXXO .xx .32
3f:III .dutit II .98

with deeds and not with the purification of the heart.
For example, the commandment "Thou shalt not covet thy
neighbor's wife"⁷⁰ forbids the outward manifestations
of covetousness, like kissing, embracing, etc., but does
not forbid inner covetousness. Regarding political commands,
they direct their arrows against the laws of the blood avenger
and the cities of refuge,⁷¹ saying that if the murderer-in-error
must remain in exile until the high priest's death one man
may be punished for a day and another for seventy years,
even though their crimes are equal. Furthermore, they insist
that the malicious blood-avenger is more deserving of pun-
ishment than the innocent murderer-in-error. Regarding
ritual laws, they maintain that the sin offerings stipulated
in the Torah are not sufficient for atonement, which requires
Jesus. This, they claim, is what Ezekiel meant when he said,
"I gave them statutes that were not good and ordinances
wherein they should not live."⁷² Being deficient in its
atonement power the Torah is also deficient in its purpose
for it does not achieve its end.

We need but turn to our Psalms to see how
perfect the Torah is. Duran rejects their fancies even
though he claims he can refute them. He quotes the Psalmist
instead: "The Law of the Lord is perfect---the Command-
ments of the Lord are pure---".⁷³ The Torah proclaims its
own perfection, when it asks, "Who is the great nation that

70.Ex. XX:7

71.Deut. XXXV:38

72.Ezek. XX:25

73.Psa. XIX

32

...
 .etnud sit lo noisocitius eni diliw Jon bus aboch diliw
 vni Jevos Jon. I. Lewis woff⁷⁴ jnembusmnoe sit ,elgmahe tot
 emoljatsestium bisswuo sit abidrol ⁷⁵"elilw a'rodigian
 seob jnd ..oje,gnisodmo ,gnieski eni ,esemanojeveo To
 abonuec isolifioq gnibtaged .esemanojeveo ramki bidrol Jon
 tegneva boold sit lo swal eni tanipa swotra tient Jeorib yedi
 torre-ni-torebium eni ti Jadi galvys ⁷⁶"egarter lo esitio sit bua
 nem eno njech a'facing dild sit lltim elife mi nimter fasm
 ,esixy whenev tot zedjons bua yeb a' rot bediknuq ad yam
 tient yedi ,erntcmonom. Lsape eno semitro tient dymoq have
 lung to gnivresb stow al tegneva-boold esocilim sit jnd
 galbinged .torre-ni-torebium jnemomni sit agnt jnemel
 betalugite emzette al sit jnd miniam yedi ,ewal lauit
 exliper dolid ,jnmemoq tot jnecitius Jon eis dntoT sit al
 ,hne eni hnef leiksek Jadi si ,mislo yedi ,ainT ,esuet
 seconibic bua doog Jon etw Jadi sejnjea modi evay I"
 sit al jnecitied yadi⁷⁷ .evil Jon bluods yedi nisterd
 sacqng al jnecitied osle al dntoT sit rwoq jnemenoq
 ,bne eni aveids Jon esob ji rot
 wod een of smles? tuo of wrist jnd been ew
 have actionst riedt stroter mard .si dntoT sit jecitieg
 jnemel sit etwop eni .medit etwter nso ed emilate ed dymoq
 -bnnemoG sit---jecitieg al biol sit lo wal eni" .hcefan
 sit emafacto dntoT sit⁷⁸ !---sing eni biol sit lo ejnam
 Jadi noijan Jasev sit al onw",rides ji medit ,uolteekno two

V:IX .xii.9T
 85:VII .Juel. IV
 83:XX .Juel. 9T
 XIX .xvi.5T

hath such righteous laws and ordinances as this Torah?"⁷⁴

F. One of their principles of faith is that Jesus in the form in which he was crucified enters into a wafer upon the altar, while simultaneous with his entrance into all the wafers he sits on his throne in heaven. The wafer may be divided into many parts but each part contains the whole body of Jesus. Similarly the wine on the altar represents the blood of their Messiah. With the eating of the wafer and the drinking of the wine, the body of the one who partakes is united with the body of Jesus. By power given to him the pope may empower any priest to transform the wafer into the body of Jesus. At a word Jesus enters wafers by making a journey that would normally take 8,000 years. Through the eating of the wafer, the principle of which is known as eucharist, life eternal is attained.

The Mat'im insist that Jesus made the eucharist a principle of faith, when he said, "Take, eat, this is my body."⁷⁵ Concerning the wine he said, "Drink ye all of it, for this is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out unto many for remission of sins." But Jesus spoke in parables. He meant that these objects were to be symbols of him, which were to serve as objects of remembrance. At the declaration "This is my body" the bread did not dispense with its old form. By way of analogy we can see that when he pointed to his disciples and said, "Behold my mother and my brethren"⁷⁶

74. Deut. IV:8
 75. Math. XXVI:26-27
 77. ibid. XII:46-49

he did not mean that they were literally his mother and brethren. At the hour of crucifixion when he pointed to his disciple and said to his mother "Woman, behold thy son"⁷⁸ he did not immediately relinquish his form and enter into the body of his disciple. His sole intention regarding the wafer was that they should remember him by it. His use of words can be understood in the light of the rabbinic use of the term "flesh" to signify instruction. "In place of picking bones(receiving scanty instruction) in the house of Abaya, go and eat flesh in the house of Raba."⁷⁹

When they try to interpret the saying of Jesus spiritually the Mat'ip quote the book Sententias, chapter four. They say that the body of Jesus can be understood in two ways: one, literally, and two, as the congregation of believers. They use Paul's statement as proof"seeing that we who are many are one bread."⁸⁰ But their attempts to interpret the verse "This is my body" are in vain; it is like building a great city on a foundation of wind. When Jesus said,"I am the living bread which came out of heaven""many of his disciples went back and walked no more with him."⁸¹ Turning to the Torah the Mat'ip cite Melchizedek as an example of a true priest who concerns himself with the mass. The Torah says, "And Melchizedek, king of Salem, brought forth bread and wine and he was priest of God most high."⁸² They claimed that the service of bread and wine is made unique for the Most High God by a real priest. But they did not realize that verse 20

St.VI Just AV
78-82:IVXK .dtaM .dY
83-84:IXX .bdI .vT

78.Jn.XIX:26 81.Jn.VI:51,66
79.B.B. 22a 82. Gen. XIV:18-19
80.I Corinth. X:17

reads "And he gave him (Abraham) a tenth of all." If Melchizedek had been a priest, he would have taken his tithe first.

G. John the Baptist baptized those who came to him. This was the baptism of repentance but not the one which the Mat'im made a principle of faith. The latter was used for Gentile converts who entered the faith of Jesus since it was the custom in Israel to immerse proselytes. But Jewish converts to early Christianity were not required to be baptized, as we see in the command of Jesus "Go ye therefore making disciples of all the nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, son and holy ghost."⁸³ Israel was considered a holy people, needing no initiatory rite. In fact Paul wrote, "For I would not, brethren, have ye ignorant that our fathers were all under the cloud and all passed through the sea and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and the sea."⁸⁴ None of the disciples were required to be baptized except Paul whose baptism was one of repentance because he, as the disciple of Gamaliel, the elder, and the messenger of the Bet Din, had formerly persecuted the followers of Jesus.⁸⁵

The Mat'im made baptism a sacrament. They taught that the divine grace lost by Adam and his seed will be restored to those who undergo this ceremony. Then they began to look for scriptural support and declared that the Red Sea episode and the manna of the wilderness are veiled

83. Math. XXVIII:19

84. I Corinth. X:1

85. Acts IX:1-18

bns redion sid qilasjifl etew yedt jndz nasm Jon bib ed
of berntaq ed nedw nolxilimto le xndz sid JA .nolxilimto
"nes yit blodes ,namew" redion sid of bns bns elqisibl sid
oml tsne bns mrol sid melupuliz qlejzibemki Jon bib ed
le ydliyot nolxilimto eloa sM .elqisibl sid le ybod edt
le em al .si yd mrd redomer blonda yedt jndz saw yelaw
to em olnidder edt le jndz edt ni booziehns ed nro abzow
ymlidig le esiq al". nolxilimto qilasjifl of "desrt" mrd edt
oy ,yedt le emon edt ni (nolxilimto qilasjifl ymlidig) emonof
" .edt le emon edt ni mslt jndz bns
emot le ymlidig edt jndz qilasjifl of yd ymlidig mrd
.mrd mrd ,ymlidig mood edt etew yd'yal edt qilasjifl
:etew ows ni booziehns ed nro sweet le ybod edt jndz yedt
yedt .ymlidig le ymlidig edt ss ,ows bns .qilasjifl ,emo
ymlidig edt ss ,ows "kooz us jndz jndz e'mst em
etew edt jndz qilasjifl of etew jndz jndz 86 .bns edt em
jndz a ymlidig edt si yd ymlidig edt em "ybod um el al" .
edt em I", bns sweet mrd .bns le ymlidig edt mrd ymlidig
edt elqisibl sid le ymlidig "ymlidig le jndz mrd bns edt ymlidig
edt of ymlidig 87 .mrd ditiw etew on bns bns bns bns
etew a to elqisibl na as deberdinolef edt yd'yal edt mrd
,ymlidig ditiw edt .etew edt ditiw bns etew on bns
etew bns bns ditiw ymlidig ,mrd to ymlidig ,deberdinolef bns
edt jndz bns etew yedt 88 .ymlidig jndz bns to ymlidig etew edt bns
ymlidig jndz edt ymlidig etew edt bns bns bns bns
etew etew jndz etew etew bns yedt jndz .ymlidig jndz a yd bns

86. Is:IV:51,18
G.I.11.VIX .mrd .88

87. MXXIX:1,18
SS:11.VII .mrd .89
VII:X .mrd .1,18

II ".it is to assert a (matrixDA)mid over an hna"sheet
and matrix over below an ,taking a need had WebberDoleM
.with edit
the second positioned "rights" edit what .
edit son has consequences to waitqad edit now said child of emer-
tovjai edit .right to objecting a sham mi'tal edit holds one
asset to assert edit before one who etravmco editor to been saw
.etrtvemco statement of Israel mi mojave edit saw ji contra
berkupet son stow etravmco editor to etravmco editor
at o'g" asset to busman edit si sea ew ee ,berkupad ed or
most gnikqad ,anolian edit his to etravmco gnikm etravmco
Israel ^{CG}".Jaody vlon bus nos etravmco editor to eman edit al
.etrtvemco statement on gnikm ,etrtvemco editor to eman one betreblance saw
statorvbi et evan,pewmper,son blos I rot",etrtvemco Israel mi
berkupad his bus buoq ed teban his stow etravmco editor to said
edit ni ascol ojnu berkupad his stow bus sea edit gnikm
of berkupet stow etravmco editor to eman ^{CG}".see edit bus buoq
consequences to one saw waitqad ssoww iss" jsooxo berkupad ed
edit bus ,table edit ,leilimad to etravmco editor to ,etrtvemco
edit berkupet berkupet to etravmco editor to ,etrtvemco editor to
^{CG} ,etrtvemco editor to etravmco editor to
that .etrtvemco a waitqad sham mi'tal edit
Hkw bus edit bus mi'tal to jsooxo enlivib edit said tigurat
yadi needT .etrtvemco editor to etravmco editor to etravmco editor to
and said berkupet bus jsooxo Israel etravmco editor to roof of ranged
berkupet etravmco editor to etravmco editor to bus aboulis and had

references to the baptism and mass. Furthermore, they argued, the immersions mentioned in the Torah are only intimations of the baptism since the source of uncleanness requiring immersion is contact with the dead and Jesus is the reviver of the dead.⁸⁶ This, they maintained, is what Ezekiel meant when he said, "I shall sprinkle clean water upon you and you shall be clean."⁸⁷ Such contentions are without proof.

The last of the earliest group of Mat'im claimed that the baptism is referred to in the verse "Ho, all ye that thirst come for water"⁸⁸ and that "come, buy wine and milk without money" refers to the wine of the mass. "Hearken diligently unto me and eat that which is good" was interpreted as the eating of the wafer which is God, for "there is no good except God."⁸⁹ "Let your souls rejoice in fatness is a promise of prosperity to all who participate in the mass. However the Mat'im did not take into consideration the promises made to Israel at the beginning of this section. Certainly these promises did not materialize with the advent of Jesus. On the contrary, the lot of Israel became more grievous.

H. The Mat'rim set up a head of the church
who was considered the heir to the keys of heaven. A sinner
must remain in a certain terrace of Gehenna, known as purgatory,
until his sins have been purged. It is in the power of the
pope to shorten the time and lessen the degree of punishment.

82 Vicks IXX-18
83 I. Colgate K-1
84 Meff. Dovelli 178

in the way.
He can also nullify any law except one made by Jesus. His authority is based on the belief that the power given to Peter by Jesus is transmitted to all who follow, to all who occupy the chair of Peter.

Their scriptural support for the institution of the papacy is the statement of Jesus "Blessed art thou, Simon bar-Jonah, for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father who is in heaven. And I say unto thee that thou art Peter and upon this rock I will build my church and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it. I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."⁹⁰ It is clear that the institution is based on a falsehood for we see nowhere that Peter transmitted his power to a successor. The statement of Jesus makes no allowance for a heir. However the Mat'im began to say that since Jesus had such great pity for humanity that he gave himself over to death he certainly would not leave his church without a head.

I. One of the Christian principles of faith is that Mary, the mother of Jesus, was impregnated by the holy ghost and remained a virgin.⁹¹ Biblical proof is invented in the misinterpretation of "Almah" in the sentence "An almah shall conceive and bear a son and shall call his name Immanuel."⁹² Very little mention is made of Mary

OB:XX.551zeb I:88
OB:IVXXX.561.78
I-I:VII.51.88
VI:IX.551.88

90. Math. XVI:13-20
91. ibid. I:20-23
92. Is. VII:14

siH .mme " rd sham oso jgooxa wai yrs qilim oala nac eH
o3 nevix rwoeq ent jadit teffed ent no beard si qilim
llo o3 ,wolfol odl llo o3 beffimant si aseet yg rojel
.tefel to riab ent qyono odl
nefisijam ent tol troqqa lrimqiqos tlemt
,sodj yrs beffimH aseet to jnemajja ent si yosqeq ent to
ji heinever Jon shad boold bus dslit tol qianol-nd nomi
ojus yrs I buA .nevaed ni el odl redjek um tnd seeds odu
um blind lliw I doot sldt moqu bus xatef yrs wodt jadit sedj
.ji faniqas lliavetq Jon llaide sebh to sejsg ent bus dromde
bus nevaed to mobynti ent to avx ent sldt ojus evig lliw I
nevaed ni hmed ed llaide dñise no huid jlaide wodt revocatn
ni besool ed llaide dñise no esool llaide wodt revocatn bus
a no beard si mofisijam ent jadit xale si ji 00".nevaed
xwoq ent beffimant tefel jadit etudion oso ew tol boodeish
eomwolle on aseim aseet to jnemajja ent .xossecon a o
aseet sonic Jadi yrs o3 naged mi'jal ent revowell .xid a tol
tevo lliemint evag en jadit qilimand tol vslq jaevg houa had
jwodth houido aseel Jon blnow qilimqiqo ent dñash o
,hased a
to asejloniq mafisimD ent to emo .I
yd bejangerqmi aw .aseet to radion ent ,xid jadit si dñat
tooyg llaieldik ¹⁰ .migliv a benimer bus jaedy qled ent
ent si "damia" to mofisajqejnislam ent ni betnevni si
lllaide bus nos a xed bus evlconce llaide dñale na" sonetan
yekl to sham si mofisim elifli viay²⁰ .lemonqmi emer ent llo

08-21:IVX .Mjml.00
08-08:1 .Bidi.10
08-11:IV .Sl.20

in the rest of the gospels. At the crucifixion⁹³ at the
wedding feast in Galilee,⁹⁴ and at prayer with others,⁹⁵
we alone make contact with Mary in the days after Jesus'
childhood. Besides these few references there are none.

Nevertheless the Mat'im glorified Mary and
claimed that she remained a virgin after the birth of Jesus.
In heaven she stands at the right hand of Jesus making
intercession for transgressors. The first gospel tells us
that "Joseph knew her not till she had brought forth a son."⁹⁶
The word "till" implies that he did know her after the birth
of Jesus but the Mat'im interpret the word "know" as "recog-
nize" and claim that since Mary's face glowed during her
pregnancy Joseph did not recognize her. Others insist that
"till" admits of no time limitation. They tried to bring
scriptural proof for their claims.

But in the Gospels we read that Jesus had
brothers and sisters. Yet, when it says, "Behold thy
brother and thy mother are calling thee"⁹⁷ the Mat'im
claim it means "relatives." At the synagogue in Nazareth
the auditors marvelled at his teaching and mentioned the
names of his brothers James, Joseph, Simon, and Judah.⁹⁸
All this is proof that the claim of the Christians regarding
Mary's virginity is false.

There are seven sacraments which are like
covenant principles between them and their God. They are:

93.Jn:XIX:25-27 96.Math. 1:25
94.ibid. III:1-4 97.Math. X:47
95.Acts I:14 98.ibid. XIII:54-57

edz ja ⁵⁰ moxixllosto edz ja aleqoy edz to fasz edz ni
 50, gnefijo dñiw xeqaq ja bus⁵⁰, ecclisio ni fasz pribbew
 'moxet tefti ayed edz ni qazm dñiw fozfaoz edz emolz ew
 .emolz emz etzid seonqetet wet emedz osibis. .boosibilido
 bus qazm heitkolo mi'jazm edz osibis.
 .osibis to dñild edz tefti aigivz a beniamer edz fasz bensalo
 bensalo osibis to bensal fasz edz ja abmaz edz nevaz ni
 em zilez leqoy tefti edz .ekosmetgazat kol mazseptzal
 50. non a dñtol fázpazd bad edz III:z son ted wemi agesot⁵⁰ fasz
 dñild edz tefti ted wemi bid ed fasz osilqui "III:z" bñow edz
 -gesot⁵⁰ "wom" bñow edz fozfazt mi'jazm edz fasz osibis to
 ted unizab bewulg eotz a'ymal eotz fasz mala bus "ezin
 fasz telan stedz" .zed esimposet son bid agesot qazmazq
 galis of belit yedz .moxitamizl emid em to ejimba "III:z"
 .emialo ziemz tel looyq isturqizos
 bad osibis fasz hser ew aleqoy edz ni jasq
 .yit blidet "ayee ji mesu ,jst" .ayale bus osibis
 mi'jazm edz ⁵⁰ "edz yutillio emz tedjom yit bus tedjom
 metazak ni eugoyqz edz ta "moxitamizl" ameeji ji mala
 edz hemoljhem bus yaldoses emz ja believism exofibus edz
 50. .abut bus emolz agesot ,gnemt stenford edz to eman
 galiziger osilzalidz edz mala edz fasz tooyq et zift IIA
 .osibis et wimipivz a'ymal
 emil emz dñilw aymemzosa nevez emz etzif
 :emz yedz .bed ziedz bus mafz nevezed religiozun tazeyco

62:1 .51z .50 VR-62:1 .51 .50
 VA:K .51z .50 A-1:III .51z .50
 VD-86:IIIX .51z .50 PI:I .50A .50

- a. baptism
- b. eucharist
- c. matrimony
- d. congregation

- e. ordination
- f. penitence
- g. supreme unction

In this apocryphal book the seven sacraments
 will be found: a. baptism to travelers and thy pride
 will be found b. eucharist to the hungry and thy greed
 will be found c. matrimony to the sins
 Celibacy was not one of Jesus' requirements for the priest-
 hood but was officially adopted in 1215. It was sanctioned
 by the Mat'ip 700 years after the ministry of Jesus. They
 deduce the principle of supreme unction from the words of
 James "Is any among you sick? let him call for the elders
 of the church." ⁹⁹ The entire fourth part of the book
Sententiae is given over to the erection of a weak structure
 around the seven sacraments.

Seven deadly sins bring man to spiritual death
 which is the true death:

- a. pride
- b. greed
- c. gluttony
- d. envy
- e. idleness
- f. anger
- g. lewdness

The seven acts of mercy are the cure for the deadly sins:

- a. hospitality to travelers
- b. feeding the hungry
- c. giving drink to the thirsty

- d. clothing the naked
 - e. freeing the prisoners
 - f. visiting the sick
 - g. burying the dead

In this spirit they said, "Give to travelers and thy pride will be forgiven; give thy bread to the hungry and thy greed will be forgiven; give thy water to the thirsty and thy lewdness will be forgiven; give thy clothes to the naked and thine anger will be forgiven; give prisoners freedom and thy gluttony will be forgiven; visit the sick and thine envy will be forgiven; bury the dead and thine idleness will be forgiven."¹⁰⁰

J. Jesus and his disciples were ignoramuses. Their lowly occupations indicate their lack of knowledge. In their interpretation of scriptural verses and their quotations from the Bible we can discern their ignorance. Therefore the Jews called the early Christians "Maranos" because they altered the accepted meaning of scripture. To this day any Jew who believes in Jesus is called a Marano. It is probable that the early Christians did not quote directly from the Bible but quoted the popular speakers who expounded the law on the Sabbath in public.¹⁰¹ Lacking intelligence they would quote as the foolish do, even to this day. For example,

¹⁰² בְּשָׁלַח חִמּוֹר אֲכֵל בְּגַדְעָה. Among the verses they misinterpreted is the "Almah" passage in Isaiah; Another

160. See Kel. Hagoy. Chapter 9 Ozar p. 281

101. Hagig. 3

102. Compare with Ex. XV:7

15

beran edf gatidole .⁵
 ayenotiq edf gatidol .⁶
 dois edf gatidole .⁷
 bacob edf gatidole .⁸

 shiq vif bus etelevat of evig⁹, biss yadit fitriga simt al
 beits vif bus tyanud edf of beits vif evig tsevilot ed liliw
 vif bus yaridit edf of yaraw vif evig tsevilot ed liliw
 beits edf of medole vif evig tsevilot ed liliw eschewel
 mebetsk tsevilot evig tsevilot ed liliw tegas simt bus
 simt bus mols mit yaliq tsevilot ed liliw yosifus vif bus
 liliw eschewel simt bus bacob edf yud tsevilot ed liliw yume
 101 "tsevilot ed
 .escheweloyl exew eschewel simt bus ariet .¹⁰
 al .yphayom to Noah viest eschewel escheweloyl vifol vien¹¹
 escheweloyl viest bus searav Ixutigine to noischedewel simt
 edf eschewel .escheweloyl viest moses ha sw elidit edf mork
 yedt emusoed "eschewel" escheweloyl vifas edf balleo avet
 vif bus simt of .escheweloyl to ymunes bejgoos edf beretla
 eldedorq si tI .escheweloyl a balleo si ariet si seviled edf vif
 edf mork vifasoyl etoup ton bib escheweloyl vifas edf jans
 wal edf behnuogas one escheweloyl tsinuog edf bejopp juf elidit¹²
 yedt escheweloyl galimod 101 .elidit si balleo edf no
 tol .yedt simt of neve ,ob daileek edf an etoup bilow
 ERIC AXIIS PLACIO C. A. T. .escheweloyl
 vif eseter edf gatidole 101 .TAYAN MARYS "KED 5560
 traditio .Makot si yagad "damia" edf si bejognetismim
 102 .yedt o .escheweloyl .yedt .102 .edf .101
 5 .elidit .101
 7:VX .yedt bus etapqoyl .101

example of their many misquotations is the section from Mathew "And there came unto him Pharisees trying him and saying, 'Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause?' And he answered and said, 'Have ye not read that He who made them from the beginning made them male and female and said, 'for this cause shall a man leave his father and mother and cleave to his wife.'"¹⁰³ His quotation is a misquotation. The New Testament is replete with such misquotations and misinterpretations. Jesus, the ignoramus, even misquotes the Shema.¹⁰⁴

K: The Mat'm try to connect the destruction of the Temple with the death of Jesus. They contend that forty years before the destruction Jesus was executed and because of Israel's sin the Temple and city were destroyed and Israel exiled. They insist that immediately after his crucifixion signs of the destruction became visible. The Talmud contains the basis of their calculation. The rabbis said, "Forty years before the Temple was destroyed no lot fell to the right; no scarlet thread became white; no western light was ignited."¹⁰⁵ They also said, "Forty years before the Temple was destroyed the Sanhedrin was exiled."¹⁰⁶ The Mat'im made a mistake of ten years in their calculation in order to teach that Jesus was crucified forty years before the destruction.

According to their own calculation this assertion is wrong, for they said that Jesus was born in the days of Herod.¹⁰⁷ Herod became ruler of Judea in the

103. Math. XIX:3-5 106. Ab. Zar. 8
 104. Math. XIII:28-30 107. Math. II:1
 105. Yoma 39

moxt moljose edj ak enoljsoupmim ymre rieds to elquaxo
 bns mlj ylqjxj resalant mlj ojns smeo eredj bna^m wodisⁿ
 yet eliv edj vwsu jng of hsm a tot lntwaf ti a¹, blyse
 best Jon ay evsl^m, bns bns betwerns edj bna "Yessus qxeve
 elu medj shan paliyized edj moxt medj shan ony ak jnd
 edj evncl hsm a llns sams elit yet^m, bns bns elmet bns
 moljatopg al^m²⁰⁴. eliv edj of evnsip bns vadom bns vrdit
 done alin cslqer al jnemajet wsl edj moljatopgim a el
 tannayig edj ,mmt moljatopgim bns enoljsoupmim
 501 .mmt edj enoljsoupmim neve
 moljatopg edj jnemajet of yrt m'jsh edj .
 Jnd bnsneq ysl^m ,mmt to llns edj dln elqut edj to
 bns bnsneq saw mmt moljatopg edj vrdit stnay vrdit
 bnsneq saw vrdit bns elqut edj nte'sfnt to emnud
 edj vrdit vlsjibm Jnd jslnt ysl^m .blyse lntal bns
 edj .elidiv smesd moljatopg edj to amgic moljatopg
 clddt edj .moljatopg rieds to alnd edj enoljsoupmim
 ysl^m on bnsneq saw elqut edj vrdit stnay vrdit^m, bns
 ntsnow on psljw smesd bnsnt lntal on psljw edj of llns
 vrdit stnay vrdit^m, bns osla ysl^m 501 .blyse saw vrdit
 501 .blyse saw vrdit smesd edj bnsneq saw elqut edj
 moljatopg rieds al stnay net to elqut a shan gl'jsh
 vrdit stnay vrdit blyse saw mmt jnd dnesd of vrdit al
 .moljatopg edj
 alid moljatopg mwo rieds of qldt^m
 al ytd saw mmt jnd bns ysl^m ysl^m ,mmt al moljatopg
 edj al mmt to vrdit smesd bnsnt^m .bnsnt to svab edj

8-158.44.501 8-219X.458.501
 Lk. III:23 8-82:III.44.501
 501 smay.501

tenth year of the reign of Augustus. Jesus was crucified
 three years before Herod's death and Herod ruled for
 thirty-three years. Now Augustus ruled for fifty-three
 years and was succeeded by Tiberius whose reign lasted
 for twenty-three years. After him Caligula ruled four years,
 Claudius thirteen years, Nero fourteen years, Vespasian ten
 years. Titus, who destroyed the Temple, reigned for two
 years. Since Jesus was thirty years of age when he began
 to teach¹⁰⁸ and about thirty-two and one-half years of age
 when he was executed it follows that his crucifixion took
 place about fifty years before the destruction, in the
 fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius. Thus Vincento
 wrote in sections seven, eight, and nine of his well-known
 book on the history of Rome. Furthermore, Paul came to
 Rome about twenty-five years after the death of Jesus, in the
 second year of Nero's reign. It is therefore evident that
 they are in error.

L: In his translation of the Bible, Jerome
 made mistakes, too many to enumerate. Yet the Mat'im insist
 that Jerome's translation is the only one from which scriptural
 proof may be brought. At times his errors are due to ignorance
 and at times they are intentional. Perhaps he was helped by
 a Jewish ignoramus. For example, he added the phrase
 "in my God, Jesus" to the prophetic verse "I will rejoice
 in God and exult in the God of my salvation."¹⁰⁹ In another
 place he translated the verse " shall the anointed one be

108. Lk. III:23
 109. Hab. III:18

beilitzto saw ariet .awenya to yiter edt to yasy d'jne
 tol beiltz boxe^z bns d'jne^z evoked many said
 estan-^z tol beiltz awenya w^z .yasy zemt-^z
 beileit zeyer saidt v^z belescoot saw bns zeyer
 .yasy tol beiltz ait Gabbayim min tejtia .yasy zemt-^z
 nad miasqev ,yasy zeyer otz^z .yasy zeyer miasqev
 oys tol beileit ,yasy^z edt beileit oys^z .yasy
 naged edt nedy eye to aitet v^z zeyer saw ariet .yasy
 eye to aitet l'ad-ene bns oyt-^z tuoda bns⁸⁰¹ Moses of
 doct miasqev tol jadi zwilzot z^z between saw edt nedy
 edt ni ,miasqev tol evoked aitet v^z zeyer tuoda oys
 oys^z .yasy^z .yasy^z to yiter edt to yasy d'jne^z
 zwilzot tol to enai bns ,yasy ,yasy miasqev ni efort
 of emas lus^z ,yasy^z .yasy^z to yiter edt no hood
 edt ni ,yasy^z to yiter edt zeyer evilk-^z tuoda oys
 jadi zwilzot exekozot z^z .yasy^z .yasy^z to yasy d'jne^z
 .yasy^z ni oys vodt
 emozet ,yasy^z edt to miasqev tol ni .yasy
 talent ni 'jz^z edt teY .yasy^z .yasy^z oys zeyer ,yasy^z zeyer
 leitwitz dohav mort oys zeyer edt ni miasqev z^z emozet .yasy
 comzough of oys zeyer zeyer ni semit JA .yasy^z edt zeyer
 v^z beqef saw edt zeyer .yasy^z .yasy^z oys vodt z^z bns
 secordi edt bebbi edt ,yasy^z .yasy^z .yasy^z .yasy^z .yasy^z
 zeyer l'liw I" .yasy^z .yasy^z .yasy^z .yasy^z .yasy^z .yasy^z .yasy^z
 zeyer v^z .yasy^z .yasy^z .yasy^z .yasy^z .yasy^z .yasy^z .yasy^z
 .yasy^z .yasy^z .yasy^z .yasy^z .yasy^z .yasy^z .yasy^z .yasy^z

SHETTY JAI :801
 SHETTY JAI :801

cut off and be no more"¹¹⁰ in this wise "the anointed one
 shall be cut off and his people shall live no more to have
 atonement through him."

Unlike Jerome's translation our Holy
 Torah contains the truth. It has remained unchanged even
 in the far-distant islands where no report of Jesus has been
 heard. In his Iggeret Teman Rambam testifies to this truth.¹¹¹
 Rabbi Benjamin bar Jonah, who traveled to the four corners
 of the earth, testified that nowhere did he see a variant
 reading, even in a single letter, in the text of the Bible and
 Mishnah. The early Soferim built a fence around the Torah
 in order to preserve it.

CONCLUSIONS

It is clear that Profiat Duran worked with an
 authoritative knowledge of Jewish and Christian literature.
 His facility in quoting the New Testament enabled him to drive
 his points home and because of this knowledge his refutation
 of the Christian dogmas takes on added strength. Of course,
 his use of polemical material is not original with him since
 much that he used is found in earlier polemics, for example
 Kimhi's Sefer HaBrit. We have already discussed a telling
 argument of the polemical writer when he asks how Jesus, as
 a god, could have called upon God at the moment of crucifixion.
 The same argument is found in Sefer HaBrit in which the bel-
 iefer questions the sectarian. Kelimat HaGoyim contains
 innumerable arguments that are common to all polemics. But

110. Dan. IX:6

111. Letters of Rambam III:72

one becomes one" seen side by side with the two the two even or when on with three always and has the two of Maria "said Raymond Lemaire.

With the substitution of another child
new beginning becomes and it always on continues despite need and intent to forget on exists about that which is at all.
After eight of children mother always forgets and always exists two of before it only does not and remains like that until a son of his becomes first born.
This son to him adds up to two, which means a new birth
despite the former son a third added while and demands
it availing of which is

CONTINUATION

In this below named father that made at it
studied and taught but always to religious education
which of his became known well and taught at Willem and
his teacher old religious son to caused but said nothing and
said to his teacher he had no son who was not taught and
so he and this teacher son of Islam became to say and
dislike not teaching teacher at home at first from
until a becomes there and it was taught it was
as well who said of now teaching became and to know
teaching to know said to be no longer there and those boy a
and said today at it was taught at home at know one and
another taught taught taught taught taught taught taught

CONTINUATION

ST:III made to staff 111

21 May 1940 p.300

was found in Algiers, where daughter
Bengali he married.

His residence in Algiers was brief, for he was soon forced to flee. The persecution of 1931 drove Rambam, his father and mother to Algiers where he lived for fifty years. During his earlier days in Algiers he practiced medicine and pursued Jewish studies. In 1931 he served as rabbi for the Jewish community in connection with the mosque. Israel ben Shalom.

Upon the death of Shalom, when an offer of the rabbinical position provided that he would not have his agreement confirmed by the rabbis. The proposed

• hæfis to biderum fæstigfis sif ni æschil mynnesse a' heom
engesorgysse eft has dætisG eft te styrasestil eft mori gafeng
merit has seigleasig clyssingh mæltisG afergredal ibeth
te fæft , swiðs eft a' bædriæs eft swiðwisse eft medusilomh
has enset te balm eft ni meve for saw swyðs eft fæft , fin
noldeslæfeslæfeslæfeslæfeslæfeslæfeslæfeslæfeslæfeslæfeslæf
a' nō heom el fægges eft fæft swiðs mælt
eif nōl swiðwisse a' nō , seotnes mæltisG has deiwt to
el fægges eno fæft fægges eno el fægges eno te styrasestil
eif of hebbas wætsegs te helzeg sif fæft sveifed of hel
fæft
wætsegs te hæfis tæni eft te cyhelswomi
enæt wæne si . ældfærescib si enplæsset eft myndall fæstir
ætton eft te mæltisG , mæltisG eft mæltisG enæt enæt en
ætfinn tæni te gyllesver has , seotnes eft te mæltisG enæt
ænclæfærgestisG has ænclæfæ

CHAPTER II

SIMEON BEN ZEMACH DURAN

The rabbinic authority Rabbi Simeon ben Zemach Duran (Rashbaz) was born not in Barcelona, as Zunz suggested, but on the island of Majorca in the month of Adar 1361. According to the genealogical table he is a descendent of Ralbag and Ramban and the son of Rabbi Efraim Duran. He is called "the offspring of Ralbag and Ramban and the pupil of Rabbi Efraim Vidal."¹ The latter, his teacher, was the pupil of Nisim bar Reuben. However, it is not certain whether he was the direct descendent or only a relative of Levi ben Gershon. Another teacher of Rashbaz was Jonah de Maestre, rabbi of Saragossa, whose daughter Bongoda he married.

His residence in Majorca was brief, for he was soon forced to flee. The persecution of 1391 drove Rashbaz, his father and sister to Algiers where he lived for fifty-three years.² During his earlier days in Algiers he practiced medicine and pursued Jewish studies. In 1391 he drafted statistics for the Jewish community in conjunction with the rabbi, Isaac ben Sheshet.

Upon the death of Ribash, Duran was offered the rabbinical position, provided that he would not seek to have his appointment confirmed by the regent. The probable

1. Heb Gr vol.6 p.435, 182

2. Heb Gr vol. 6 p. 105

CHAPTER II

188 8. nov 19 dek I
889 8. nov 19 dek I

reason why the Algiers congregation objected to royal ratification was that it had given too much power to Ribash;³ wishing to curb the power of his successor they insisted that no royal confirmation be sought. Having lost his property in the Palma massacre; having been forced to bribe informers and having found the medical profession unprofitable among the Berbers who held physicians in no great esteem, Rashbaz was forced to accept a salary from the congregation of Algiers, not having other means of subsistence. But this must have hurt his pride for he tried to justify himself by tradition.⁴ The claim has been made that he was the first Spanish rabbi to accept a salary. Rabinowitz however cites cases of rabbis who lived before Duran and who accepted rabbinical salaries.⁵ He remained in Algiers to the end of his life. From the בראשית רבי אליאס⁶ we learn the date of his death. There it says, "From the time he came to this land(1591) his life was extended for fifty-three years in this kingdom."⁶ The year of his death, therefore, is 1444. From the same source we learn that he never returned to Spain. In Algiers this fugitive from Palma was highly respected in court circles.

Duran was a prolific author. From his pen came forth commentaries on the Mishnah, Talmud, and Bible. He is also worthy of consideration as a poet and certainly as a controversial writer. The following is the list of his

S.Eng Gr vol. 4 p.199

4, Heb Gr vol. 6 p.106

5. *ibid.*, note 3

6. *ibid* p.105 note 3.

layer of beisde noijasgurmos arayla emt yid melech
ot zewoq mohr oos neviv basi fi fadit emt noijasgurmos
veid toraschos emt to zewoq emt gmo of gmidim ⁵; mabsil
yafz galim ⁶. Edzim emt noijasgurmos layer on fadit beisdech
ot beisdech used yafz galim p'etorasam amit emt of p'etzotem emt
noijasgurmos Israibem emt b'mohr yafz galim has p'simotim edzim
ot mi amioleyig b'led emt p'simot emt gmoz eldazim
emt mohr yafz galim a'fgecos of beisdech saw zedim ⁷, mabsil yafz galim
consejadas to mohr yafz galim fadit ,arayla to noijasgurmos
yafz galim of beisdech emt yafz galim fadit saw fadit yafz galim
saw emt fadit shem mohr emt ⁸ . noijasgurmos yafz galim
mabsil yafz galim a'fgecos of k'dat mabsil yafz galim
emt has mabsil yafz galim allday le mohr mohr reviewed
ot arayla mi beisdech emt ⁹ . a'fgecos Israibem beisdech
~~YAFZ GALIM~~ ¹⁰ fadit ¹¹ emt mot ¹² . alil emt to l'me emt
mohr emt mot ¹³ . ayse fi exedt . alil emt to stab emt mohr emt
-yafz galim to beisdech saw alil emt (fesli) emt alil emt emt emt
-yafz galim emt to mohr emt ¹⁴ . mohr emt alil emt mohr emt
taven emt fadit mohr emt emt emt mot ¹⁵ . alil emt ,stot
mohr emt eviglant emt arayla mi . mabsil emt beisdech
a'fgecos f'nos mi beisdech yafz galim saw
mohr emt mot ¹⁶ . mabsil a'fgecos a'fgecos
-yafz galim has chumish ¹⁷ emt mi beisdech mabsil emt
yafz galim has f'nos a'fgecos noijasgurmos to yafz galim emt emt
emt to f'nos emt mi yafz galim emt . re'fim Israibem beisdech a'fgecos

601.9 8 .lev 12 3m.6
601.9 8 .lev 12 deH.3
5 eton .bidi .3
5 eton 601.9 .bidi .3

writings taken from a catalogue which he himself arranged:

- a. Cheb Mishpat, commentary on Job;
- b. Or HaMayim, controversial treatise against Crescas' Or Adonoi;
- c. Zohar HoRokia, commentary on Gabirol's Azharot;
- d. Hiddushe HaRashbaz, novellae on and elucidation of Hidah, Rosh HaShanah, etc.;
- e. Yabin Shemuah, precepts for bedikah, shechita, etc.;
- f. Liywat Hen, commentary on Pentateuch in which Duran enters into controversy with Ralbag on Job;
- g. Magen Abot;
- h. Minhagim, treatment of religious dogmas and rites;
- i. Seder HaMishnah Laha Rambam, didactic poem;
- j. Perush HaKetubah w'haGet;
- k. Perush Hilkot Berakot le Harif, commentary on Edduyot;
- l. Perush Masseket Eduyot;
- m. Perush al HaHoshanot;
- n. Perush Kezat Piyyutim, religious and secular poems;
- o. Kuntras Tehinot u'Pizmanim;
- p. Remaze Piske Nidah;
- q. Tikkur HaHazzanim (of which only the title is known);
- r. Takneit Ha Rashbaz;
- s. Tashbaz----802 responsa.

Keshet UMagen, his polemical work, is part of a larger work known as Magen Abot which he wrote in the year 1423.⁷ Rabinowitz upholds the view that Rashbaz and not his son wrote the book. In the larger work Magen Abot Duran appears as a clever controversialist and especially in the Keshet UMagen his ability as a defender of Judaism is revealed. In the main, he attempts to uphold the inviolability of the Torah. At once both polemical and apologetic, Keshet UMagen proves the contentions of older writers and more recently of Profiat Duran that Jesus' intention was not to abolish the Torah.⁸ Though less skillful, his method is similar to that of his illustrious kinsman. Throughout he shows his familiarity with Christian writings and practices and uses his knowledge as a tool to combat Christianity with its own weapons.

Unlike Kelimat HaGoyim, Keshet UMagen is not divided into chapters with separate thought divisions. For the sake of convenience the book can be divided into two sections: apologetic arguments and polemical. The apologetics of the Keshet UMagen center around the defense of the Torah and like Efodi Rashbaz maintains that:

- a. Jesus did not preach against the eternity of the Torah;
 - b. Jesus and his disciples merely loosened the

7. Heb Gr vol. 6 p.167 note 3
8. Eng Gr vol 4 p.238

8. Eng Gr vol 4 p. 238

regyal a to tsiq si ,xrow Ischimelq sid benamU fedas
 ' ,ben tsey and ni eftow ed holtw joda benam as awoml xrow
 nos sid too bus zaddesR tant wolv edt abloqz ativonidall
 unseque matud joda benam xrow regyal edt ni .xrow edt ejotz
benam edt ni yilalnogz bus telilatavot: nos tevelo a as
 behesver si malabut to rebueteb a as ytilids sid benamU
 sid to yilldalovni edt blodqz et agymotz edt ,xiam edt ni
benamU fedas .citezgeleqz bus Ischimelq sited come JA .xilot
 to vitnecet strok bus avejtw xeblo to emolitnos edt sevond
 edt halifeh of you saw molinetzi 'sweet tant usin' taikotz
 tant of valimz et bodesz sid ,Intilids used agyonT ⁸ .xilot
 sid swede edt tuobjoynt .usmanik emolitanif sid to
 seen bus ecilostq bus agyntiw valizimO atiw vitnillimat
 two est atiw vitnillimat fedas of loof a as regbelwoml sid
 .anogasw

MEHAMU TESHET

jon si benamU fedas ,miveDeh famileh edlau
 .emolitvib tdyomz ejatqez lijiw ateqadu omti behivib
 omti omti behivib edt nos hood ent eosinevnos to eiss edt tof
 ecitegoleqz edt .Ischimelq bus ejtneqzun citezgeleqz :emolit
 derot edt to esuchet edt banota xefnos benamU fedas edt to
 .tans emolitanik nadnas⁹ libelz edlau bus
 vitniste edt tenings doaserz Jon bib eset .¹⁰
 .edt to
 edt benoscoi qletem sefiosib sid bus eset .¹¹

2 ejos Voi.9 3 .lov 7D dell .¹²
 66S.9 4 .lov 7D 2aZ .8

yoke of the Torah from the Gentiles in order to attract them
 to the new faith;

c. The Torah is not defective as the Christians
 claim.

Like Efodi Rashbaz discusses the perfection
 of the Torah on the side of its commandments. The same
 formula is used, namely, defense of the Mosaic ordinances
 regarding:

a. moral commands;

b. political commands;

c. ceremonial commands.¹²

While Profiat Duran dismisses the accusations of the Christians with a word and turns to the Psalms to uphold the perfection of the Torah, Rashbaz actually defends the Torah against the claims of the Christians. He cites a number of verses from the Bible to prove that the morality of the Torah is not merely of deeds but also of motives. For example, "Thou shalt love the Lord Thy God with all thy heart, with all thy soul and with all thy might."¹⁰ "Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thy heart;"¹¹ "Lust not after her beauty in thy heart."¹²

Regarding the political commands Rashbaz quotes "Who is the great nation that hath righteous ordinances and commandments like this Torah."¹³ In addition he defends the principle of the Torah regarding the taking of interest from a non-Jew and the exile of the murderer-in-

9. See above,p.22 12. Prov. VI:25
 10.Deut. VI:5 13. Deut. IV:8
 11.Lev. XIX:18

med jasuris ej rebto ni seilimot edt mori dartoT edt to edoy
midist wen edt of
mazikimC edt ha svilochet ton al dartoT edt .¹⁴

mishp

holloetreq edt meassimib zaddasH libokk edt

emac edT .zjnebmamco ejl to shis edt no dartoT edt to
meassimibz olaot edt to emanetb ylmen ,beus al shumot
:yibzayet

zehummoz latom .^a

zehummoz Isolifloq .^d

zehummoz Isinomexeo .^c

-deltC edt to emoljaemooz edt meassimib nazid tsiforT elidw
edt bioniq of emiseT edt of emut bus bnoz a ditiw eash
dartoT edt abneth vilavos zaddasH dartoT edt to holloetreq
to redun a sefia eh .zehummoz edt to amisa edt temisha
dartoT edt to vilavos edt tash evonq of elidit edt mori seatev
telquaze roT .nevivom to osim yud absh to ylrem ton al
ditiw ,jased vif lls ditiw beD vif broT edt evel tlaad mordT
edat ton jlaad mordT .¹⁵ vif lls ditiw bus lros vif lls
al ylremed ton zefka ton tsadT .¹⁶ jased vif ni zefka vif
SI .jased vif

zaddasH zehummoz Isolifloq edt galbizeret
meassimibz sneedgilt dlam jasry edt al ohe" seafop
edt molibba al .¹⁷ dartoT sidT sifl zehummoz bus
to galbier edt galbizeret dartoT edt to elqioning edt abneth
-si-yeshirim edt to elike edt bus wel-mon a mori jasefn

OB:IV .votI .SI
8:VI .jased .SI

OB:q .evods sed .^a
8:IV .jased .SI
8:XXX .ved .II

error. It is reasonable to expect an Israelite to accept
interest from a non-Jew since the non-Jew takes interest
from the Jew. It is an act of lovingkindness on the part
of the Torah to prohibit interest from a fellow-Jew.¹⁴

The legislation about the murderer-in-error
is based on the assumption that even one who transgresses
in error is a transgressor. The Biblical legislation is a
warning to men to be extremely careful not to sin. The time
set for the end of his exile is wisely chosen because the
blood-avenger will be appeased when the great religious
head of Israel is dead. Being a sinner, an atonement
offering is necessary and the death of the high priest
effects the atonement, it being a principle of religion that
atonement comes through the death of the righteous.

Furthermore the criticism laid against the
Torah because of the Talmudic rule that if the ex of a non-
Jew kills the ex belonging to a Jew the non-Jew must pay
full damages, but if the ex belonging to the Jew kills that
of the non-Jew, the Jew is exempt,¹⁵ is unjustified. The
criticism is unjust because the law is Talmudic and not
Biblical.

Supplementing his apologetics Rashbaz openly
attacks the belief of the Christians. He finds justification
for his attack on Christianity in the Talmudic saying "All
sneering is forbidden except the ridicule of idolatry."¹⁶ His

4. Lev. XXV:36

15. B.K. 38

16. Sanh. 63b

3goes of exilesT me fesque of oldnessapt et fl .torre
juezjui exist w^t-non edj scale w^t-non a mort jacteul
fusq edj ne esembniguel to fes me si fl .wet edj mort
fl .wet-wellet a mort jacteul filding of hatoT edj to
torre-ni-zatetum edj tuoda noitdialguel edj
cessergantj edj one have fane noitquassa edj no hezed si
a si noitdialguel lecildi^t edj .cessergantj a si torre at
emt edj .nis of Jon intese qfmetjke ad of nem of gniiraw
edj canosed nassod qlesis si elixs edj to bne edj not fes
euclifler fesq edj nade beasqge ed JIw regnava-hold
fusmnojs na .xennis a gnis^t .bach si leatal to bned
fesq right edj to dseb edj bns qmssacon si gnielle
fesq noigilex to ejionizq a baled si .qmmemota edj ectelle
.suocfdigt edj to dseb edj qmmoni emmo qmmoni
edj faniqis hisi unicitis edj eternadit
-non s to no edj li fad^t elis obhamist edj to canosed hatoT
vag fasm wet-non edj wet s of gniyocled xo edj alldi wet
fusq alldi wet edj of gniyocled xo edj li fad^t ,neyamh fad^t
edj .belitivian si fl .qmmexs si wet edj wet-non edj to
Jon bns obhamist si wal edj canosed faniqis si unicitis
.

LecilofH

qlesqo addidn sciwegologs siid gniyemefqqs
noitdialguel shait eh .anitaihdi edj to leifed edj emsita
JIA" gniyis obhamist edj si qmmlatihdi no mottis edj not
alldi fl .ctelohi te eluobly edj fesqo nebbidior si gniyens

SC:VOL .vol .
88 .N.1 .81
428 .dus .81

polemical material can be divided into these classes:

A. Christianity is opposed to reason and consistency; it has the qualities which are opposed and antecedent

B. Their claims about Jesus are false:
human but in reality divine;
one who is the Father;
acknowledge him as one
world; he is a plurality, all people are called to
the faith and are one;

4. Regarding their divers claims;

C. Their heresy is evident in their misinterpretation of verses; and ordinances are from Simon Peter,

D. Their ignorance is evident: answered that

obviously there is no 1. In their misinterpretation of
Scripture; no experience is opposed to their dogmatic

principles;

2. In their allegorical interpretations;

starting with their own assumptions they do
not follow the course of 3. In their connecting the destruction with the crucifixion;

Catholics may be ignorant 4. In their interpretation of the
time of the Messiah.

in fact on total ignorance, Christian literature proves that
the Jews A: Christianity is opposed to reason and consistency:

The best exposition of the lack of reason evidenced in Christianity is found in the polemic against the faith in the Cuzari. The Christian said, "I believe in the renewal of creation, and in the pre-existence of God who created the world in six days; that all people are descended from

32

the same as our old Hebrews we use Leavened bread
but now we eat bread at communion .A

;yomenahemoo

realist eyes must judge awhile first .B

regretted and grieved .C

it will be grieved .D

and of course all grieved .E

;bitow

while still grieved .F

-sim first of Judah and Israel first .G

;asarev to moltaferqesni

of Judah and Samaria first .H

to moltaferqesni first at .I

;etnqles

Jerusalem Eschroggeli first at .J

;anotis

-we eat unleavened bread at .K

;unleavened eat at the moltaferqesni

at moltaferqesni first at .L

;missech eat to emit

but now we eat communion at .M

;yomenahemoo

now we eat the unleavened bread at

at Jesus' table eat at home at communion at home

at at easter I , this means at .Lxx at at first

before eat bread to come again at at home , before to know

not before eat bread to know at at home at bitow eat

Adam and after the flood from Noah, I believe in Providence and in revelation to prophets and saints. But in the end of days the godhead became embodied and entered the womb of an Israelitish virgin who bore Him in appearance human but in reality divine. This is the Messiah called God's son who is the Father, son and holy ghost. Yet we all acknowledge him as one, even though in language they may seem to be a plurality. All people are called to his faith and are commanded to cleave to it, to exalt the Messiah, Jesus, and to extol the tree on which he was crucified. Our judgments and ordinances are from Simon Peter.¹⁷ When the king heard these words he answered that obviously there is no place for reason in Christianity and that sense experience is opposed to their dogmatic principles:

Starting with their own assumptions they do not follow the course of experience. In the Roman Church the wafer is made of unleavened bread, while the Greek Catholics use leavened bread in their service. The Romans immerse only the heads of those who are baptized; the Greeks insist on total immersion. Christian literature proves that the Romans are wrong for their practices are not consistent with what they teach about Jesus. The meal at which Jesus was supposed to have proclaimed the principle of the host was on Erev Pesach when the unleavened bread is not yet used. Similarly his baptism at the hand of John the Baptist

17. Cuzari Chapter one

ui 'ovifed I .dissi mori boott enj rofha baa mada
and .striss baa stdiog of miflfever ni baa oonshiveri
hexisne baa beibode swaded haeribog enj cyab te baa enj ni
sonatseqs ni miH erod odrw mighty deitilexial ms te duow enj
'boD beffco deisess enj si sinT .enivib vfliser ni tuf namm
Ils ew jey .Jacob yfob baa nos ,redifal enj at odrw nos
tan qafis oqasur ni signif have ,ono an mid cybflwomis
of bellino eis elqeq III .yfiflalnig a ed of mose
enj flax of ,si of evalec of beibummo eis baa dflst siH
ew siH doldm no esid enj lofha of baa ,asset ,daisessH
nomi mori eis sonshibro baa ejnembyt ,two .beitloulo
tauft betwensm ed abzow seedj baaed ynti enj neid .¹⁸
baa vflisvflizmC nk messor zot esoly en si evend vflasolvdo
eljamgoh ziedi of beaqgo si sonatseqs samee jadi
,elqioning
ob yek amiqusza mwo ziedi miH gntiast
mokk hori ed si .sonatseqs te evace enj wellot Jon
shep ed ellid ,baed benevalm to sham si zekay enj
anamol enT .solvus ziedi si baed beneval eau uclifljaC
meeot edj qhexiqed ems odrw esoid te shad enj qfno evetemi
jedi sevorq evetemot if mifljei .mifljei lasej no Jekeli
mifljei jor eis sonatqes pteq zot ymow eis amow ed
anamol doldm ja Isen enT .asset twod done; yedj jadw siH
teod enj te elqioning enj bemiabootq evan of beaqque aw
Jey Jon si baed benevalm edj neid mifljei vortk no raw
elqiong enj mifl je budi enj ja miflqed siH vflaslimiZ .bess

one tafqefi eis qfno .²⁰

was of the entire body and not merely of the head.¹⁸

They are also inconsistent when they fast for forty-nine days for according to their own doctrine the period should be only forty. When they discount holidays on which they do not fast, they are in opposition to their precedent because the forty day fast of Jesus was continuous.

B. Their claims about Jesus are false:

1. Regarding his parentage:

There is difficulty in establishing the geneology of Joseph, the husband of Mary. The Luke and Mathew accounts record different names of his father. Similarly there is some confusion about the mother of Jesus because of the two Marys mentioned in the Gospels. The Talmud tells us that Mary was impregnated by Pandera and for this reason they called her "Satdah," that is, one deserted by her husband.¹⁹ This view is consistent with the statement of Rambam that Mary could not be considered a virgin because there was a law in Judea that a betrothed couple should be left alone in a room.²⁰ Joseph and Mary were alone each night after he came from the meeting place and knowing this Pandera came in unto her and she became pregnant. Pandera was a carpenter and according to the Gospels Jesus was a carpenter, the son of a carpenter. In the Talmud Yerushalmi story of Jacob who healed in Jesus' name, he is called Jesus ben Pandera.²¹ Being consistent with Jesus' assurance to his disciples that they can heal in his name, this story indicates that his parentage is to

18. Math III:16

19. Sanh. 67a

20. Ket. 12a

21. Yer. Sab. 14d

be accounted through Pandera. Another proof that Jesus' mother became pregnant in prostitution is that in the genealogical table only women who were prone to lewdness are mentioned,²² e.g. Bath-Sheba, Rahab, and Tamar. Hence we conclude that his mother Mary is to be ranked among these women.

2. Regarding his divinity:

They were misled to ascribe divinity to Jesus because of his sorcery, which he performed through the power of Beelzebub. He is spoken of as the one who brought magical power from Egypt in the cuttings on his flesh. But even these deeds do not prove his greatness since the prophets raised the dead and healed lepers. Israel tested Jesus' power but he was unable to save himself from death.

Furthermore, if Jesus had been placed in the womb of Mary by the holy ghost and if he was the son of God, how could they write that at his baptism "the heavens were opened unto him and he saw the spirit of God descending as a dove and coming unto him?"²³ From their own words we infer his humanity. It is evident that they did not consider him divine, for at the hour of death he cried out, "My God, my God why hast Thou forsaken me?"²⁴ Like Daniel and Ezekiel he spoke of himself as "Ben Adam" and not "Ben Elohim." Jesus rationalized his connection with the Deity by proclaiming all Israel Children of the Most High.²⁵ In reality it never

22. Math. I

23. ibid III:16

24. ibid. XXVII:46

25. See Deut. XIV:11

31:111 .81
370 .dmn3 .81
n81 .Jes1 .02
551 .dab .TSY .IS

and to ensure that all editions of Bileam were used
and that the power of the prophet be invoked and that the
most fitting power be used as far as possible as to make it fit
the needs of the people. This is no significant edit in itself
but rather a specific edit which was necessary and enough for the
edit to be used. The edit is called "Bileam" because it includes both the
edit of the prophet and the edit of the people.

1955-1956
1956-1957
1957-1958
1958-1959
1959-1960

occurred to Jesus to ascribe divinity to himself. His relation with Joseph is frequently mentioned and he does not deny his human origin. As Profiat Duran pointed out Jesus considered himself the Messiah and, in this spirit, approved the words of Simon Peter who called him "The Christ, the son of the living God."²⁶ He admitted that of himself he could not judge but "I am He who sent me." His own words prove that "there is no good but God."

3. Regarding his mission

to the world;

Feeling that he was the Messiah Jesus believed that his mission was to Israel and not to the world at large. Profiat Duran used the same quotations to show Jesus' exclusiveness. A Canaanitish woman asked him to drive out the demon that had taken possession of her daughter. Jesus answered twice and both answers bespeak his exclusive mission. He said to her, "I was not sent but unto the lost sheep of the House of Israel" and "it is not meet to take the children's bread and cast it to the dogs."²⁷ Furthermore, when he charged his disciples he said, " Go not into any way of the Gentiles and enter not into any city of the Samaritans; but go rather to the lost sheep of the House of Israel."²⁸

4. Regarding their divers

claims:
Jesus claimed that his disciples would witness the resurrection before they died. The great events which he foretold

26. Math. XVI:13-16

27. *ibid.* XIII:21-28

28. *ibid.* X:5

34

skn .tlaesmin of qmivivib editions of smet of bernoce
seob ad has benoitsm qmivivib edt qmecol skiw noltsler
nolts tvo berntiq nantq jaitoril sa .nigito nsmud adt qmec son
bervorgqa ,tigto adt nk,bns dalsell edt tlaesmin berchisnoe
nos adt ,talin^o em^t mid bellis oiw teje^t nomid to abrow edt
bliso ad tlaesmin to jadit berjimba eH³² .bct gntvill adt to
evong abrow mwo eH " ,em tneq oiw eH ms I" jnd egut son
".bct jnd booy on sk erat" jadit
noltsm skt galvrapel .3

tbtow adt of
noltsm skt jadit bevelled noltsm edt saw of jadit galvrapel
naming jaitoril .spial ja bltow edt of son bns ksmil of saw
A .asneviavloxe'smet wodt of enklatoep emas edt been
jadt nomob edt tuo evlub of mid belis nsmow dalttmasm
ekins berwane smet .xerqub red to noltsmec nolts had
biss eH .noltsim eviavloxe adt nseqod strewan srod has
edt to qmec jadit edt otms jadit son saw I" ,red of
"merhiflo edt skit of jem son sk ji" has "feastal to esnol
ad hasin ,excmredestu^t "33 .xgob edt of ji jess has bnsd
edt to you yrs omf son edt " ,qiss edt noltsmec skt begnads
jnd ;noltsmec edt to qmec yrs omf son nsmo has noltsmec
32 .feastal to esnol edt to qmec jadit edt of redit sk
noltsmec skt galvrapel .3

temiale

-bottmec skt esenliw blisw noltsmec skt jadit hemislo smet
blisecol skt noltsmec jadit skt .shab yadit ected nol

31-51:1VX .612-62
32-52:1LIX .612 .72
33-X .612 .62

were supposed to take place in his generation. Like Efodi Rashbaz considered the interpretation of the later Christians invalid that "by this generation" he meant "the end of the world." He assured them that "not a hair of their head would fall to the ground" and the "people of Israel shall not be destroyed until the son of man shall come." No words could be more explicit than those of Paul's quotation:

"For yet a very little while,²⁹
He that cometh shall come."²⁹
"We that are alive, that are left unto the coming of the Lord
shall in no wise precede them that are fallen asleep."³⁰
What actually happened proves the untruth of these claims.
Within a short time his disciples were put to death.

To strengthen their faith they claimed that
the Father is one with the son and holy ghost. The words
of Nestor, the priest, who became a proselyte, refutes this
dogmas "Behold you say that the Creator is one and that this
your Messiah is his son and that he is the son who came down
from heaven without separation from the Father and the Holy
Spirit. This son, you say, is the connection between the two
spheres and that he entered the womb of Mary. Tell me was he
still joined to the Father and the holy ghost or did he ad-
here only to himself? If you say that only the son and
the holy ghost adhered to each other, your words are not
applicable when you say that they are in one sphere or
being, the divine and the human, for you exclude the Father.

29. Hebrews X:37

30. I Thess. IV:15

ibet'k exil .meliatorneyg sin mi eseq qesit of berogqas etew
muktairim'k vesel sin to muktaweqzal sin berobhano kashan
sin to bne sin "muktaweqzal sin qd" jad bishvai
binow bnef kienet to kien a for'fah' meit between sh'khitow
ed for llaids Israel to alqeq" sin bna "b'mot" ed of llaids
binow abrov o'm "amoc llaids nam to no'c'k llaids beverzach
muktaweqzal sin to eseq meit s'fotiqe etew ed
es'elida s'fotiqe a jey rot"
"amoc llaids b'mot jad sh'khitow ed to ganim sin o'm
b'mot jad to ganim sin o'm sh'khitow ed of llaids
o'm .geiles nelli'k sin jad meit obaqeq esit on mi llaids
muktaweqzal sin to muktaweqzal sin; sevorq beverzach qllavos jad
d'sheh of tng etew alqeqsik sin omis'k trosa a muktaweqzal
kienet b'mot qd'k llaids muktaweqzal sin
abrov edt .jedoy vlon bna no'c'k o'm si trosa'k sin
muktaweqzal kienet a emosed o'm ,jeiltq edt ,trosa'k sin
kienet jad bna no'c'k trosa'k sin qd'k b'mot b'mot
muktaweqzal sin mori muktaweqzal trosa'k nevezet mori
owt edt nevezet muktaweqzal sin si ,yes nov, no'c'k sin
ed awt em llaids .v'zim to d'mow edt beretne sin jad bna setevne
-ba ed b'k to jeciq vlon edt bna trosa'k sin of b'mot llaids
bna no'c'k vlon jadit yes nov ti trosa'k of vlon edt
tov o'm abrov trosa'k ,trosa'k no'c'k beretne jeciq vlon edt
to eretne o'm si o'm vlon jadit yes nov o'm s'fotiqeqa
trosa'k sin obaqeq no'c'k ,muktaweqzal sin bna trosa'k sin ,galed

V'zim s'fotiqeqa^{1.63}
cf:VI .asedT 1.02

If you say he was from the combined province of the Father,
son and holy ghost---part of each adhering to him---your
words are not applicable when you say that no part can be
separated from the whole."³¹

C: Their heresy is evident in their mis-
interpretation of verses:

Efodi revealed the heresy of the leaders of the Church in
misinterpreting Biblical verses to prove the divinity of
Jesus. Rashbaz follows much the same method. The "Almah"
passage is discussed and the Christian claim that the word
means "Betulah" is disproved. In a like manner Rashbaz
shows that the prophet does not refer to a far-distant day
but to the present and that the name "Immanuel" has no more
divine implications than the name of the altar. The term
"Almah", Rashbaz insists, is a general term used with
reference to a married or a single woman. We find it used
with reference to a maiden in the verse "The maiden that
cometh forth to draw water,"³² and with reference to a woman
who has already known a man in the verse from Proverbs "The
way of a man with an "Almah."³³

D: Their ignorance is evident:
probably this principle, used by 1. In their misinterpretation
of Scripture:

The above-mentioned misinterpretations may have been intentional
but the ignorance of the Christian group is revealed in their

31. Sefer Nestor HaKomer Ozar p.130

32. Gen. XXIV:43
33. Prov. XXX:9

misunderstanding of the verses, misunderstanding that led to misinterpretation. Efodi considered these matters and showed that their state of ignorance was consistent with their lowly occupations. One of the most inexcusable types is their lack of knowledge of the sources of quotation, as for example, the verse "Then was fulfilled that which was spoken through Jeremiah the prophet."³⁴ The verse quoted does not occur in Jeremiah but in Zechariah. Another outstanding example of their ignorance is the statement "Elijah was a man of like passions with us, and he prayed fervently that it might not rain and it rained not on the earth for three years and six months."³⁵ Had they been acquainted with the Bible they would have recalled the verse "the word of the Lord came unto Elijah, in the third year saying, 'Go show yourself unto Ahab and I will send rain upon the earth.'³⁶ How then can they say that the drought lasted for three years and six months?

2. In their allegorical interpretations:

To strengthen their claims they said that the Bible is to be explained as a "Mashal" and not literally. Paul's words proclaim this principle, when he said that he began to interpret verses which the sages of Israel could not understand. He interpreted the verse of Leviticus allegorically. "These are the living things which ye may eat among all the

34. Math. XXVII:9

35. Jas. V:17

36. I K XVIII:1

bet tsit glibazaterebawim , esrev edt te glibantrishwim
 bus etedjam esent bereshlame ibotk . moltsaqeqmism of
 dliw jnashlance saw sonorongi to eslav tsitj tsit bewoda
 seqj eldaanoxenl fcom edj te smo . moltsaqoco qiwel tiedt
 tel as moltsaqoq to esctos edt te egbelwomd to mosf tiedt al
 neliqas saw nolikw tsitj belitlit saw nedt³⁵ esrev edt elgumake
 Jon esch betosp esrev edt ³⁶ . fedqonq edt nalmazel agwodis
 glibazateno tafona . nalmazel ni iud nalmazel ni tucce
 nac a saw dliifir³⁷ fumotaja edt al sonorongi tiedt te elgumake
 ji tsit qilnevirist beverq edt bus , au dliw smolessq edl to
 eslav esdt tot dline edt no Jon benist ji bus nlat Jon dliqim
 edli³⁸ edt dliw betalsupos need vedt hah³⁹ . adinom xis bus
 brod edt te hlow edt bellsoer evad binow vedt
 -moy woda o⁴⁰ , gulyas tsav brild edt al . dliifir ejnu emac
 woh⁴¹ . dlije edt noqz nlat bus I lliw I bus dadi ejnu tles
 eslav esdt tot bejuzl qigwotb edt tsitj yes vedt nco nedt
 . adinom xis bus
 Looloyelle tiedt al .⁴²

eslav esdt tsitj biss vedt amakl tsitj amaklajim of
 abtow s'lini . vilsetil Jon bus "Lishem" a sa benisqxe
 of usged edt tsitj biss edt nedt , eglioniq esdt misloaq
 -tshun Jon binoc leatul to esgas edt nolikw esrev tsitqefni
 . vilsetil tsitj esoliveb te esrev edt bereshlame al . busa
 edt lli groms fcs yes ev nolikw agwodis glibil edt era esdt"

9:111VK .175M .18
 VI:V .est .33
 I:111VK X I .36

beast that parteth the hoof and cheweth the cud.³⁷ This verse, he said, refers to leaders and shephards of flocks. "Split hoofs" means the knowledge of what is right and wrong. "Chewing the cud" means the altruism of the leader who works for communal good. The clean animal is the righteous leader; the unclean the perverse leader.

In their contrasting interpretation Jerome also interpreted the Bible allegorically. He claimed that the verse "He is unclean unto you"³⁸ is made null by the general verse "And God saw all He had made and behold it was very good."³⁹ Jerome harmonizes these conflicting verses by saying that the former refers to the beast's habits and the latter permits it to be eaten. The swine is unclean because it wallows in the mud but its flesh is delicious, for if all that God made is good, we can eat what is good. Jesus' permission to the disciples to eat whatever is placed before them is the proof he uses.

Rashbaz answers this charge by saying that the Torah speaks openly and not allegorically.⁴⁰ The verse "God saw all that He had made and behold it was very good" does not refer to the edibility of things but to their nature. There are many objects in nature----e.g. poisons----which are part of the "good" created by God and yet they are not "good to eat." The prophets condemn those who eat swine: "Eating swine's flesh and the abomination and the mouse shall come to an end together."⁴¹ Jesus did not

37. Lev. XII:4 40. Nos. XII:8
 38. Ibid XI:4 41. Is. LXV:17
 39. Gen. I:31

and disting rovesafaiW .misse edj no era Jadi p'sess
avist ,bliss ed,cevav sind V'G .bco edj diwedo bna lood
ansem "atood zilqah" .zilqah to abradged bna avishel of
"bno edj p'sived" .p'soww bns Jadi' si Jadi' le zgholom edj
Lammasu tel' shew edj rabael edj to maluza edj ansem
messiah edj zebael a'medatz edj al Lammasu m'sha edj .boog
.m'hazl a'mezvusq edj
.yilastrogells elidh edj hafexqisni cala emozet

al .82 "now g'om meslom al q'N" s'ayev edj Jadi' hemialo al
shem had eH ffa was b'el baA" s'ayev lateneq edj lla'us shem
eedj seainowmid emozet 83 .boog q'ayv raw zl bloded bns
edj of zeter zemach edj Jadi' p'sivva zl s'ayev q'ayzilimoo
edj .mesas ed ej zl a'mezvusq zefjal edj bna a'vidan a'fased
messiah ej jnd bnm edj al swollow zl emosed meslom al calwa
jne has ew .boog al shem had Jadi' lla'z l'ot .z'wochekh al
tne of a'fagedh edj of m'ezl'maq 'emel .boog al Jadi'
.s'ayev ed toorq edj al m'adz' ereted b'eddy al revetad
edj Jadi' p'sivva zl a'g'ado alidh strewans m'adz'.

boG" s'ayev edj⁴² .yilastrogells jom bns q'ineqo a'mezqo m'etot
meob "boog q'ayv raw zl bloded bns shem had eH Jadi' lla'us
s'ayev z'ayev of Jadi' p'sivva to yilidibz edj of zeter jom
m'el'w----m'el'w .y.----s'ayev al a'mezd' q'ayv era s'ayev
era y'ayv tay bns boG zl be'etato "boog" edj to jnsq era
tne edj emodz m'ebnac a'mezd'q edj ".tne of boog" jom
edj bns m'el'w m'el'w a'mezd'q edj ".tne of boog" jom
jok bib m'el'w lla'us .z'wetegot bns m'el'w emodz lla'us emon

8:IX .m'el'w .03 8:IX .z'w .78
7:VII .z'w .11 8:IX .z'w .88
12:1 .m'el'w .08

mean that one may eat forbidden food, for he forbade them
to go into the cities of the Gentiles. Furthermore, he did
not condemn the custom of abstaining from certain foods
but proclaimed that they are not inherently unclean but
are made unclean by God's commandment. He therefore
concurred in the opinion of the rabbis that "the command-
ments were given for the purpose of disciplining man."⁴²

3. In their connecting

before the Temple and city we
the destruction with the crucifixion:

Aware of the extent of our exile and believing that the
destruction of the Temple was due to the sin of Israel
against Jesus, the Christians claimed that Jesus lived at
a time near the destruction. Their own calculation and the
reliable tradition in our possession disprove their theory.
Our tradition teaches that Jesus lived in the days of Joshua
ben Perachya.⁴³ Joshua ben Perachya was a friend of Simeon
ben Shatach, the brother-in-law of Janai, the king. Tradition
teaches that Jesus was born in the fourth year of the reign
of Janai which was the year 263 after the rebuilding of the
Temple. In the year 299 after the rebuilding of the sanctuary
Jesus was crucified at the age of 36. Since the Temple stood
for 420 years it follows that his crucifixion took place 121
years before the destruction. How then can they claim it
was destroyed because of his crucifixion.

42. Gen.R. s.44

43. Setah 47a

intoxicants and their metabolism and
and their influence has often been the subject of
research and it is now known that there are
several different types of enzymes involved in
the metabolism of alcohol. One type of enzyme
is called alcohol dehydrogenase and another
is called aldehyde dehydrogenase. These enzymes
are found in the liver and other organs of the
body. Alcohol dehydrogenase converts alcohol
into acetaldehyde, which is then converted
into acetate by another enzyme called
aldehyde dehydrogenase. This process
occurs in the liver and is controlled by
enzymes that are specific for each type of
alcohol. The rate at which alcohol is
metabolized depends on several factors,
including the amount of alcohol consumed,
the rate of metabolism, and the presence
of other substances that may affect the
enzymes. For example, if a person has
been drinking heavily for a long time,
their body may develop tolerance to
alcohol, which means that they may
need to drink more to feel its effects.
This can lead to alcohol dependence
and other health problems. It is important
to drink alcohol responsibly and to avoid
drinking too much, especially if you have
any health conditions or are pregnant.
If you are experiencing problems with
alcohol, it is important to seek help from
a healthcare professional.

APR 25 1969 S

Even according to their own calculation such a theory is absurd. They claim he was born in the days of Herod, in the thirty-eighth year of the reign of Augustus, and was crucified during the regime of Archelaus, the son of Herod, at the age of thirty-three. Since the Temple stood for 420 years it follows that he was born sixty-eight years before the destruction and was crucified thirty-five years before the Temple and city were destroyed.

4. In their interpretation
of the time of the Messiah:

Their interpretation of the time of the Messiah's advent is wrong. They err in interpreting the section of Midrash Lamentations which teaches that on the day the Temple was destroyed the Messiah was born. Jesus was born and died before the crucifixion. The Christians quote the Talmudic sentence as proof "The world will exist for 6,000 years: 2,000 of chaos, 2,000 of Torah and 2,000 of the time of the Messiah."⁴⁴ The refutation of the claim of the Christians occurs in the same passage: "Their sins increased and the coming of the Messiah was delayed." Furthermore, Jesus was born before the completion of the 2,000 years of Torah.

Refuting the claim that the coming of the Messiah in the form of Jesus is mentioned in prophecy, Rav Saadiah Gaon brings forward fifteen prophecies which contradict this belief.⁴⁵ These are of three kinds:

44. Sanh. 97s

45. Emun. W'Dao t.

si jnevba s'maissem est to emis est to
descibim to moltoes est galjeriqesal ni tte yam'.
aw elquel est yab est no jani sedonej holdw enclifajnemad
beib bns mod aw sweet .yred awz maiseem est bevojash
slbumist est ejong emissemC emt .molifilimto emt excted
jnevey 000,3 nol Jaike lliw BLOW emt"koerig za somethen
est to emit est to 000,3 bns distet to 000,3 modo to 000,3
emaitaino est to misle est to mafisnter est "m".maiseem
est bns besseont enie ziedT"regasasq emsa est ni atocco
aw sweet ,ezmeridjint".bezjash awz maiseem est to gafimo
.distet to emer 000,3 est to moljejqmoc est excted niod
maiseem est to gafimo est fadi misle est gafisne".
MolibaZ van ,yosiqeq ni benolism si eset to niod est ni
est Jelbatjnos holdw selesiqeq neejili brawiol agnito niod
jebnix eset to em esent d".killed

- a. Five prophecies the subject matter of which show that he has not come; e.g. Ezekiel XXXIX:29;
- b. Five prophecies that are interpreted by tradition to prove that he has not come; e.g. Ezekiel XXXIX:10;
- c. Five prophecies which are self-evident; e.g. Isaiah LXII:9.

CONCLUSIONS

Keshet UMagen is obviously more unsystematic than Kelimat HaGoyim and less inclusive. The latter enters more into current church practice and shows that these institutions are not consistent with the teachings of original Christianity. The only conclusion we can draw from the similarity of material is that Rashbaz used the Kelimat HaGoyim as a source book and tried to establish the claims of his kinsman, as Graetz maintains,⁴⁶ or else they used common sources. If we accept the source mentioned by Eisenstein as authoritative our only conclusion is that Rashbaz plagiarized.⁴⁷

But it is obvious that Rashbaz employed more Jewish material than Efodi, using rabbinic literature in addition to Church literature to disprove the claims of Christianity. It appears that this difference of approach grows out of their different environmental surroundings. Efodi, a former Marano, would endeavor to reveal the inner

46. Eng Gr vol. 4 p. 238

47. See above page 8 note 12

to reject Jesus and anti-Semitism even .
 2:XXXXX Ishmael p.e. temco son and of Judah wrote his
 heterodoxies of Judah anti-Semitism even .
 3:XXXXX Ishmael p.e. temco son and of Judah wrote his
 heterodoxies of Judah anti-Semitism even .
 .C:XXXI dated I .
 CONCLUSION

olymosyam etom qfascivdo si HaNozri Jesu
 dymo zedal ent . avishlom eset ha HaNozri Jesu Juda
 alayt eset judah wrote his heterodoxies of Judah even etom
 Analyze to syncretism ent dymo jmetzlae son exs enclisit
 ent most wath haq exs polemics qfascivdo ent . qfascivdo
 templa ent been zeddelel tent of latkesam to qfascivdo
 emislo ent maldasas of heilic haq wrote qfascivdo haq
 been yadit eset ve HaNozri Jesu Juda as momentis aid to
 ve polemics sonces ent qfascivdo ve HaNozri Jesu
 tent of polemics qfascivdo ve svijasjivodim as polemics
 " .
 ent heylome zeddelel tent qfascivdo si ji jad
 ni emislo ent qfascivdo qfascivdo . ibotz nadit latkesam halvet
 to emislo ent emislo of emislo ent qfascivdo of polemics
 polemics to polemics ai tent qfascivdo si qfascivdo
 .
 .
 tent ent latkesam blosw .
 .

830 .g. 4 .Iov 10 30 3A
 21 sion 8 sysq avoda eset .

contradiction of Christianity by using Christian tools
 to a greater extent. The rabbinic authority would naturally
 use his own tools.⁴⁸ One other difference is evident.
 Rashbaz used more popular material than Efodi, for example
 the folk legends about Jesus. Efodi is more philosophic.
 The account of Jesus' parentage in the Keshet UMagen seems
 to include that which would appeal to the mind of the ordinary
 Jew, that is, the kind of material found in Toldot Yeshu
HaNozri. Unfortunately we do not know the specific situations
 that called forth these polemics, as we do in the case of
Milchemet Mizwah. If we did know we would be able to understand
 more fully their manner of approach and use of polemical
 weapons.

Another author. In his approach he combined the
 finest polemical style with his great Talmudic learning.
 From his pen come many responses, while his letter Ezra
HaNozri which was written in Constantinople has been
 separately reprinted. Though frequently ascribed to his
 father the treatise Tikkunei Shabbat is from the pen of
 Rashbaz and is printed as an appendix to Rashbaz's Yabek
HaNozri. In addition to the great apologetic there is
 another work, a dirge, extant.

The great apologetical essay Milchemet
Mizwah is found at the end of the polemics of his father.
 Another work, also apologetic under the title of

48. e.g. Cuzari, Emun, WDact, Midrashic and Talmudic
Allusions, the author, attended the Talmudic
 sources.

shef haishim yesh uq qimilim to sejolbim
villim binoq qimilim minidim edT . Shef haishim a et
jusliva al sederetliq tedje eno S^b shef moe al et
elquaxi tot libet manj lishetem tsinqeq etom been naddeq
qimilim etom al khol . amet yudek shmeq alot edt
amet ~~hezal~~ jedea^a edt al eyneq 'amet le juneq edt
yrenibz edt le haim edt et lasegga binoq hainz jaft abulon et
yaay tobit al hauot farrejam le haim edt et jaft et
amolatka ofteqg edt womi son ob et yelemanzol . tsadik
le sato etj al ob et yelemanzol edet halleq jaft
huayekhem of elda ed binoq etu womi bib et tsadik
feleq to ean bns dorotqas to temmam tiedi vifut etom
shognew

Joshua de Santa Fe
Jesuit has oldasthik
resumes

the laws of Moses
CHAPTER III
SOLOMON BEN SIMEON DURAN
and in which he
applies the laws of Moses

The son and successor of Rashbaz, Rabbi Solomon ben Simeon Duran(Rashbash) was born in Algiers about the year 1400 and died in 1467. Graetz says that Rashbash was "as of noble disposition as his father."¹ Familiar with Talmudic literature and the field of rabbinic thought, the younger Duran protested against Cabalistic speculations. His spirit of opposition to the Cabala was not a characteristic inherited from his illustrious father and his ancestor Ramban. In his approach he combined the finest scientific style with his great Talmudic learning. From his pen came many responsa, while his letter Keren Hemed which was written in Constantinople has been separately reprinted. Though frequently ascribed to his father the treatise Tikkun Soferim is from the pen of Rashbash and is printed as an appendix to Rashbaz' Yabin Shemuah. In addition to his great apologetic there is another work, a dirge, extant.

His great apologetical essay Milchemet Mizwah is found at the end of the polemic of his father, Keshet UMagen. It also appears under the title of Setirat Emunat HaNozrim. Geronimo de Sante Fe(Joshua Allorqui), the notorious convert, attacked the Talmud,

1. Eng Gr vol.4 p.390

SOLOMON BEN SIMON DURAN
CHAPTER III

calling it a teacher of lewdness and casting reproach on the laws of Israel. At the request of his father Rashbash wrote his defense of the Talmud Milchemet Mizvah in which he upholds the laws of Judaism, insisting that instead of lewdness the Talmud inculcates continence and that Jews are able to live finer lives if they follow the precepts of the rabbis. The writer showed great ability in the use of rabbinic tools,² although Graetz claims that in trying to reconcile contradictory Agadahs he was forced to employ pilpul.³

MILCHEMET MIZWAH

Rashbash began his defense by laying down the fundamental principle that the interpretation of the Bible requires tradition, both in the explanation of the words of Scripture and the ideas.⁴ This truth is strikingly illustrated in the Talmud by the case of the non-Jew who came to Hillel to be converted on the condition that the sage would teach him Torah Sh'biksav and not Torah Sh'bal-peh.⁵ Even the teaching of the alphabet required an authoritative teacher. How could the student understand what is meant by the prohibition of labor on the Sabbath were it not for tradition which explains the meaning of the word "work"? Tradition is so essential that the translator Jerome told his disciples that if they are in doubt about the meaning of a word they

2. Ozar p.134

3. Heb Gr vol. 6 p. 168

4. See the charge against tradition in
The Controversy between the sages of Tertosa
and Alarcu---Ozar p. 105

5. Sab. 31

no dorotgor galasgo bns eschewel to refuges a sh grilisso
meadidash redial sin to jecaper adi JA . Israel to swal sin
sin dolow at shawnim jomericjim brailst sin to eschewel sin eschewel
to beestui jeshi gaitziani , eschewel to swal adi ablodus
swel sindt bus eschenitse sefachonu bnsilT adi eschewel
to sqqeszy adi woffor yedi ti sevif tsmif evil of oids oys
to can adi gi qitkis tseng bewoia retiw adT . siddur adi
of givis ni jeshi amiblo xtearz agoodis⁵, aicor olimmer
volque o beestui can adi eschewel yrechibzinec allendeer

⁶. Inglig

HAWKIM YEMINHOLIM

adi rwoh galval yd eschewel sin naged dasdidaal
siddur adi to mohsatzketel adi jash elqioniq Leisnabust
to abrow adi to mohsatzke adi at atod , mohsatz ketzper
heftatzeslik qianiblitz si ritut adiT⁶ . ushi adi bus eschewel
leffim of emce ods wst-mos adi to emce adi yd bnsilT adi ni
dosed blwo eye adi jash mohsatz adi no befravnoe adi of
adi nevah Mea-Lad'ah doreT jor bus vashah'ah doreT mid
redact evitatzroissus us berlinger jedsiqia adi to galidess
-ora adi yd tnam al fash bustatzhun jnsbuta adi bison wll
mohsatz tek jor si exew mtsade⁷ adi no rodal to mohsatz
si mohsatz⁸ "Mew" brow adi to galidess adi eschewel deidw
selqosib sin blet smoret mohsatz adi jash Leitasse os
vest brow a to galidess adi swada jdwob ni em yedi ti jash

AGI.Q xanQ.S

83L.Q 5.Iov 18 dsh .S

nt mohsatz jashige egano adi se8.A
ssivot le mses adi mawed vavavotjneC adT

GOL .Q 1800--1000LA Bns

15 .dsh .S

should go to the Jews who have the tradition. But Megadaf
HTYD inists that tradition is not needed. The
Terah itself has decreed that there should be interpreters
of the law.⁶ With only a simple interpretation the Torah
cannot be understood; hence the institution of the Sanhedrin.⁷

The proper understanding of the Torah is an
important matter. Daniel prayed thrice daily even though
there is no specific command in Scripture except the verse
"to serve Him with all your hearts and souls."⁸ What is the
"service of the heart?" Prayer. Therefore Daniel risked his
life in order to pray.

The Karaites have produced no great men, scholars
or thinkers. The rabbinites who adhere to tradition have
given the world great poets, philosophers, scientists, Talmud-
ists and commentators, in every land in which Israel has
sojourned. Jesus insisted on tradition when he commanded
his disciples to do all the Pharisees commanded. Again when
he used David's eating of the shewbread to justify the
plucking of ears of corn on the Sabbath he was standing on
traditional ground. When he admonished his disciples that
unless their righteousness exceeded that of the scribes and
Pharisees they would not enter the kingdom of heaven he used
authorities on tradition as his example of righteousness.
Tradition enables us to explain in terms of reason what seems
to be opposed to reason. These answers sufficiently justify

6.Deut. XVII:8-10

7.Sanh. 86

8.Deut. XI:13

tradition against the attack of Megadaf.

Three facts need explanation before a defense of rabbinic lore is possible:

a. The words of the rabbis are divided into two groups: Midrash Halaka and Midrash Agadah. The first group includes laws and ordinances. The second deals with hidden things. They are intended to enliven the minds of weary students, to give wisdom to the simple who cannot grasp the intricate laws. Of course they who are not proficient in Jewish lore will be unable to grasp their meaning. Regarding the Agadah it should be understood that the one who does not believe them has committed no sin, but he who reaches the heart of their teaching is rewarded for his effort.

b. Whenever the expression לִוּעָה is used in the Talmud it does not mean that permission is given to one to perform a certain act. It simply means that the one who performs the deed is free from human punishment but subject to divine punishment. The expression לִוּעָה means not subject to punishment at the hands of men.

c. Permission was given to every Bet Din to punish, imprison, and execute even those who are not subject to punishment according to the Torah. In Hilchot Rezaach Rambam explained this matter.

Starting with these premises one is able to defend the Talmud against Megadaf. In accordance with the

tshagot תְּשַׁגָּה molitvot and evad odw evot eft of oy blusia
eft .sheben son ai molitvot rabi against מֵאֲתָרֶת
stodzqesht of blusia eratz rabi bezech and libet derol
datot eft molitvot qeshta alqim a vino djiw ^{בָּ}.wai eft to
mlibnaih eft to molitvot eft soned qadoshavnu ad sonnas
us ai derol eft to pakunatzebnu teqetz eft
demon neva vilab esfut beyond Israel .yeshua thatrequt
estev eft tgecke esfutqis of blusia vilesus on ai eratz
eft ai jadiw ^{בָּ}.elos bus etzad tuov lls djiw mikv evres of
aid bokatz Israeleit .rayti "Tzadd eft to solvres"
•yesh qof zebro ni etil
exaledos nem tsayt ed bechotq svad sefardit eft
evad molitvot of eretza odw sefardit eft .atzmudit ro
humot ,aztmutos ,azmedqasling ,azeq tsayt b'frov emj neviv
and fastal molitv ai blul tsayt ni ,azmedqasling bus etzad
behavromos ai neviv molitvot no bejaleli suss .benuotos
neviv nlega .behuromos esfardit eft lls ob of esfugosib eft
eft v'liten of beurwads eft to goltz s'bivad beas ed
no yntbusa new ed m'saddas eft no m'rev to suss to galusiq
jadi esfugosib and behuromos ed neviv .b'frov Israileit
bus esfugos eft to jadi behesora azmedqasling ziedi esfush
beas ed nevess to mobymik eft tsayt ten bluow yeshi esfardit
.esfugosding to alqim eft ai molitvot no esfardit
amees jadi nosser to emez ai shifra of ai sefardit molitvot
v'liten ,v'jaseh illus zewwana eft .nosser of beseqqa ed ej

01-8:11VX .Jusell.
58 .Jusell.
61:IX .Jusell.
62 .Jusell.

labayd to Midrash and Talmudic authorities
a stoled notisnique been most servt
:eidlesog al etot shittot to emulah
etot behiyib etot idder etot to shivv etot
terit etot .labayd dasyibim bus avaleh dasyibim :reutryc owt
ativ alach bneos etot .seasimibim bus ewal rebbeonim quety
to shalm etot neviline of behinei etot vodt .ezekiel mebbid
tunno owt sigma etot of mobaiw evig of .ezekielus yisroel
eng jom owt vodt emnos 10 .ewal eschitni etot qasym.
gukusem tiefet qasym of eldau etot ifliw etot midat etot judeit
ewo etot judeit beoystebus etot bnos .li labayd etot gaibusyek
etot judeit ,nis on bejhemmo and meyt availed jom esch etot
etot not behavwet etot gaiboset tiefet to judeit etot seboset owt
.trollis
etot buil nolessorqes etot revenset
neviv etot nolessorqes judeit nase jom esch .li bimlet etot etot beys
etot judeit nase vlgmim .li .jom nishto a michtzot of uno of
tud jnemalimq namud mort etot etot amiotrag owt uno
etot buil nolessorqes etot .jnemalimq eniviv of judeit
.nun to abud etot jnemalimq of judeit jom
nis jed vise of neviv saw nolessorqes .
jom owt esch nase etot owt ,noitqal,datimq of
judeit etot .datot etot of galbtoos jnemalimq of judeit
.xaffam sind .benisfqes medmey deosol
et tot etot owt nekumot etot ativ gaiting
etot ifliw comabroos etot .labayd tunneya bimlet etot bimlet

first premise defense must be along two lines:

- A. Defense of Midrash Halaka
- B. Defense of Midrash Agadah

Being different in subject matter and interpretation the Halaka and the Agadah require different defensive arguments.

A. Defense of Midrash Halaka:

Megadaf attacks the Talmudic principle that he who worships idols out of love or fear is 7105.⁹ Rashi says that "out of love" means to serve as one serves a great man so that he will have pity and "out of fear" is as when one is commanded by a ruler to worship idols. Rambam says that serving out of love means embracing an idol because of its beauty and serving out of fear means that one is afraid that the idol will work good or evil.¹⁰ But Megadaf claims that this principle contradicts the Scriptural prohibition of idolatry. Megadaf failed to quote the entire passage which reads "It has been taught above regarding the one who serves idols out of love or fear: Abaya said he is guilty; Rava said he is 7105 if he did not accept it as a god. If he did accept it he is guilty." Even Rava decreed exemption only if he did not accept it as a god. Acceptance of an idol as a deity implies the declaration "Thou art my god."¹¹ However 7105 means only free from human punishment, as

9. Sab. 72; Sanh. 61; Ket. 3

10. Hil. Ab. Zar. 3

11. Sanh. 60

isidore's own proof of *Jacobus* *assimilatus* *calmetti* fails
to distinguish it from *Jacobus* *assimilatus*.
Jacobus *assimilatus* is described as
an *obligatorily* *anaerobic* *fermenter* *of* *acetate* *which*
can *utilize* *acetoacetic* *acid* *and* *butyric* *acids* *as* *sources* *of* *energy*.
It *assimilates* *nitrate* *and* *nitrite* *as* *nitrogen* *sources*.
It *assimilates* *glucose* *and* *xylose* *as* *carbohydrates*.
It *assimilates* *lactose* *and* *galactose* *as* *disaccharides*.
It *assimilates* *glycerol* *and* *inulin* *as* *lipids*.
It *assimilates* *urea* *and* *ammonium* *as* *nitrogen* *sources*.
It *assimilates* *citrate* *and* *succinate* *as* *organic* *acids*.
It *assimilates* *ethanol* *and* *propanol* *as* *alcohols*.
It *assimilates* *methanol* *and* *ethane* *as* *fuels*.
It *assimilates* *acetoin* *and* *2,3-butanediol* *as* *solvents*.
It *assimilates* *lactic acid* *and* *propionic acid* *as* *organic acids*.
It *assimilates* *citric acid* *and* *succinic acid* *as* *organic acids*.
It *assimilates* *lactose* *and* *galactose* *as* *disaccharides*.
It *assimilates* *glycerol* *and* *inulin* *as* *lipids*.
It *assimilates* *urea* *and* *ammonium* *as* *nitrogen* *sources*.
It *assimilates* *citrate* *and* *succinate* *as* *organic* *acids*.
It *assimilates* *ethanol* *and* *propanol* *as* *alcohols*.
It *assimilates* *methanol* *and* *ethane* *as* *fuels*.
It *assimilates* *acetoin* *and* *2,3-butanediol* *as* *solvents*.
It *assimilates* *lactic acid* *and* *propionic acid* *as* *organic acids*.
It *assimilates* *citric acid* *and* *succinic acid* *as* *organic acids*.
It *assimilates* *lactose* *and* *galactose* *as* *disaccharides*.
It *assimilates* *glycerol* *and* *inulin* *as* *lipids*.
It *assimilates* *urea* *and* *ammonium* *as* *nitrogen* *sources*.
It *assimilates* *citrate* *and* *succinate* *as* *organic* *acids*.
It *assimilates* *ethanol* *and* *propanol* *as* *alcohols*.
It *assimilates* *methanol* *and* *ethane* *as* *fuels*.
It *assimilates* *acetoin* *and* *2,3-butanediol* *as* *solvents*.
It *assimilates* *lactic acid* *and* *propionic acid* *as* *organic acids*.
It *assimilates* *citric acid* *and* *succinic acid* *as* *organic acids*.

5. 1000 1000 1000 1000

has been shown above. These are the words of Rambam:
"He who worships idols out of love, for example, he who
embraces an image because of its beauty or out of fear
lest it should harm him is 7165. But if he accepts
it as a god, he is guilty and is liable to death by stoning.
If he serves it with a rite peculiar to itself he is 7165.
Unless he serves the idol according to the service of God
or declares it to be a god, he is 7165. " The words
of the rabbis stand true and the attack of Megadaf is
invalid.

Megadaf attacks the Talmudic principle that if a man gives his entire family to Moloch he is 7145.¹² Again it is necessary to explain that 7145 means only free from human punishment. Only in two cases is ~~for~~^{idolatry} punishable at the hands of men: first, if he serves it according to its peculiar rites which imply its divinity; and second, if he worships it in one of the four ways used in the service of God: sacrifice, incense, libation, or prostration.¹³ Therefore one who gives his entire family to Moloch is not worshipping the idol because the Moloch ceremony implies only the passing of one's children through the fire. Furthermore Moloch worship requires one's children 14730 and not one's entire family.

Megadaf attacks the Talmudic law "he who smites his father and mother and leaves no wound is 7195." L4

12. Sanh. 64

13. Hilchot Ab. Zar. perek 6

14. Sanh. 85

individual to abhor and hate one's parents and
only one, everyone not involved in the actual violation of the law
need to sue to cause the accused parent to be punished
according to the law. EVID. Si min mind bishofo ti rafel
shinohos qd shochet of oldali el bus vilig si ed bog s m si
EVID. si ed kleski of talmudic status a dli m'avares ed li
but to solvies ed of galbuccos lebi ed avivis ed eshlu
abhor ed. EVID. si ed bog s ed of si m'shefet to
si tubayek to mosjja ed bus erut hants alidet ed to
bilevav
jadf elqionitq cibmukt edt shemja kibzam
Si EVID. si ed moolom of vilim exiles edt seviv nam s li
ansum EVID. jadf mislochot of yassoson si li nirkat
si seoso owt at yimo. yassosinq namud moret sett yimo
avivis ed li. Jerit zuch to abud edt to oldasimiq vishabli
svitavivit edt yiqmi hoim edt talmudic edt of galbuccos si
bees evur zoch edt to eme hi si agidatow ed li. knowes bus
to moladil cibmukt conditions that to solvies edt ni
of vilim exiles and seviv edt eme shlechet⁵¹. moladilcib-
moolom edt caused lebi edt gniqginebow ton si moolom
edt agudat miblinot eme to yassosy edt yimo selfiqti yom
miblinot eme seviv qidush moolom etzimutitk eme
vilim exiles eme ton bus EVID.
sedim edt wai cibmukt edt shemja kibzam
Ad. EVID. si hauow on sevav bus vadrom bus tzedek si

50. JnqR. 21.
51. JnqR. 22. DA. JnqR. 21.
52. JnqR. 21.

The slanderer declares that the Talmud permits a man to
smite his parents. He insists that one who is guilty of this
offense is punishable by the law of the rebellious son.
God forbid that such an offense should be condoned in Israel.
The law upholds the view that one who smites another and
draws blood is to be put to death. In the case of parents
the law is more strict. But one who smites and leaves no
wound is not deserving of death but is in the category of
those who curse their parents. One who lightly esteems his
parents is punished by flogging. Lashing is the penalty. The
justification of such a law is seen in the additional rule
that he who smites his parents after they have died is 7105
but he who curses them after their death is punished by
death. Smiting after death has no effect on them but curses
cling to their souls. But in accordance with the third
premise the Bet Din of Castile used to strangle men for less
grevious sins than these. Answering Megadaf the defender
of Israel can say that the law of "ben sorer u'moreh" applies
to the son who hearkens not to his parent's voice and not to
the one who smites and curses.

Megadaf attacks the Talmudic principle that
if one kills a person who is afflicted with a fatal organic
disease he is 7105 and if ten men smite him with
rods they are 7105.⁵² As explained above, punishment
is in the hand of heaven. Afflicted with a fatal organic
disease means that the victim must have some visible signs of

of now a sifimiq bimilaT edj fadT mifidloob yarabuufle enT
sida to yeling et orw uno fadT afianiT ali . arnataq ali erima
. nos emrifledex edj to wal edj qd alldalalung al hanalle
. fesal miibenoboso ob BIMOLA sanelle na doha fadT bidet bok
Bun xedjone sejma edj uno fadT waiv edj ahliqo wal edj
xunqo to easo edj ni . dñash oj suq edj oj si heoob awrib
on xewx buu sejma orw uno jasM . Jolixja etom si wal edj
ta desegħaq edj ni al jasM Biseb to qunieseb Jon si bnow
ali emerja tiflighi obw emQ . xieni xieni xieni edj seond
edj . qfieseq edj si qunieseb . qniggo ta bediexq al emerja
elut insollibba edj ni haqq si wsl a haqq to soljollitħu
Għoċċi si hekk swieq xejja ażżeqq ali sejma orw edj fadT
qd bediexq xi dñieb xieni tejxa minn esseru edj edj
esxu fuq fuq minn no jaqtell ox and dñieb warha galimx . dñash
bitteb edj dñiżi konnibbos ali jasM . xluu tiegħi oj pniċċi
mawl kol hemx eftira of been aktnejx li nist ċiġid edj esimer
tħebbet edj isħagħem għallweha . lejn-nadji aktiee emrifla
kunigga "ħetom' u tħotx nad" . to wal edj fadT qas idha fesal to
ed Jon buu sejju a'jnejaq sifli oj Jon emrifla edj nos edj et
sejtni haqq sejma orw uno edj
fadT siflorinq cibmillaT edj sibbiex taħbagħi
sifloriq fadT a dñiżi bejollha ali orw , noxox a sifli uno li
dñiżi minn aktnejha net il- Għoċċi et edd-
xemdiex , avode kieni tgħixx Għoċċi et edd-
sifloriq fadT a dñiżi bejollha . nevved lu bixx adi ni al
te sifla sifloriq emha swieq jaġid minn iġiġi edj fadT emrifla

his affliction, for example, an amputated leg. It is not as Megadaf suggests that men search his lungs to see if there is a pungent spot in order to justify murder. Therefore Rambam said, "He who kills a man who is afflicted with a fatal organic disease even though the victim was able to eat, drink, and walk in the street, is free from human punishment. But all men are considered healthy and their murderers are put to death unless it is known definitely that the murdered man was unquestionably afflicted with the fatal disease and the physicians have said, 'There is no healing for him in this affliction. He would have died of it had he not been killed by another.'"¹⁶ Therefore the murderer cannot be executed because the victim stood on the fence of death. The Bet Din can punish him if it so desires and the blood-avenger who kills the murderer cannot be punished.

Regarding the second law: if ten men smite a man with rods they are 7145, justification can be found. The law implies that the actual murderer cannot be determined. If each one says, "I smote him but did not kill him" they are all punished for smiting their neighbor since he did not die because of any particular blow. Of course the decision is different when the actual murderer is known. The Bet Din is permitted to execute all ten and if the blood-avenger kills them he is not put to death. Anyone can see that this law is

16. Hil. Rozaach perek 2

more just than the law of the Gentile which empowers a king to pardon a criminal after the court has convicted him.

Megadaf attacks the Talmudic principle that if the Sanhedrin convenes with the unanimous intention of convicting a man he is 7105.¹⁷ This slanderer claims that if a man is convicted by a unanimous vote of the Sanhedrin he is free since there must be votes in his favor before he can be punished. But Megadaf does not understand the law. It does not read "If the Bet Din agrees unanimously for conviction he is acquitted." If we execute a man at a majority vote how much the more by unanimous agreement. This law means that if no one testifies in behalf of the defendant and they do not allow him to testify in his own defense, but as soon as he arises all begin to say "you are guilty" then he is 7105. But if the Bet Din discusses his merits and says, "Do not fear; if you are innocent you shall not be punished" then he is liable to punishment if he is found guilty. Our rabbis were extremely careful in judgment even to the extent of the scrupulous examination of witnesses. When two testimonies were found to agree they searched even more diligently.¹⁸

Megadaf attacks the Talmudic principle concerning collusive witnesses: if the innocent party has been executed the collusive witnesses are not put to death; but

17. Sanh. 17a

18. Yer. Sanh. 4:22a

It's interesting to note that while the first two sections of the letter focus on the author's personal experiences and observations, the final section shifts to a more critical and analytical perspective. The author begins by acknowledging the "naturalness" of the situation described in the previous sections, but then goes on to argue that such behavior is not only unnatural but also undesirable. The author uses several examples to illustrate this point, including the story of the man who was unable to sleep because he was afraid of the dark, and the story of the woman who was afraid to go to bed because she was afraid of the dark. The author concludes by stating that such behavior is not only unnatural but also undesirable, and that it is important for people to learn how to deal with their fears and anxieties in a healthy and productive way.

if the innocent party has not been executed they are put to death.¹⁹ This law applies only in capital cases. In civil cases the collusive witnesses must pay if money is taken from one party and given to others on the strength of their testimony. The reason for this law in capital cases is that "God standeth in the congregation of God; in the midst of the people He judgeth."²⁰ When the congregation seeks justice the spirit of God is upon them. Since God stands in their midst no one is executed unless he is guilty. God is the judge who places words of truth in the mouth of the human judges. When witnesses testify that a man is guilty and their testimony is found to be collusive his punishment proves his guilt and therefore the witnesses are not punished. Therefore it is written, "Keep thee far from a false matter; and the innocent and the righteous slay thou not; for I will not justify the wicked."²¹ But when the innocent party is not executed the collusive witnesses are put to death for they conspired to have an innocent man punished.

How can this slanderer argue against our righteous laws? What would he do if two testified against Reuben that he killed Joseph and two others came and said, "Reuben did not kill Joseph but Judah did?" Would he accept the testimony of the latter witnesses and execute Judah and the first witnesses or would he execute Reuben on the strength

19. Mak. 5

20. Psa. LXXXI:2

21. Ex. XXIII:7

of JUDG 21:13 before he used ten and VING TUESDAY edt 11
 MI .seiso Iafiqas si vino seifqas wal aint QI .misa
 al yonem ti vao jesus' sonentiv eviavilco edt seiso livo
 dymarita edt no eradic of nevir has ving uno morte seiso
 seiso Iafiqas si wal aint not mosser edt .yomitesz riedz to
 edt ni qebz le mifgazgnoz edt ni dibaazn boz" riedz al
 mifgazgnoz edt medy 02" ,dreybat ek elgoeq edt to fabim
 boz sonis .medz noqz al boz to tivigz edt solitav zilees
 al ed zelius hejucosz si one on fabim riedz ni abasja
 edt ni dura to abrow seafq osh agbat edt al boz .vifing
 nem a jans vifiasz sonentiv medy .agbat nemud edt to abow
 eviavilco edt bawot al yomitesz riedz has vifing al
 sonentiv edt exolestan has vifing al sevorq fneimilnoz edt
 "et seidz qoell", usfirtw si si exolestan .beneimng ton exa
 sonentiv edt has tuesday edt has tuesday salat a mori
 JUD 12" .beneimng edt vilayet ton lliw l rot ;ton most yala
 sonentiv eviavilco edt hejucosz ton si ving tuesday edt medy
 medy tuesday ha evad of bejiganoz vaidz rot djeab of JUD 21:
 .beneimng
 two feelings ought established side by side with
 feelings heitiges owt ti ob ed bInow farw .Yewal smotright
 this has emac stelis owt has rigesot heilix ed tadt medush
 qeess si binow ".bib habut and rigesot lliix ton bib medush"
 has habut seiso has sonentiv terzel edt to yomitesz edt
 dymarita edt no med oll seiso ed bInow to sonentiv zarit edt

3 .Mish .01
 S:DDDL .set .02
 T:IIIDX .xt .03

of the former witnesses' testimony? How would this
 slanderer decide? Indeed he would not be able to judge
 unless he turned to the true tradition. The former
 witnesses are not declared guilty until the latter destroy
 the evidence of the former. This does not mean that the
 second pair came to testify that Judah and not Reuben killed
 Joseph. It means that they must come to testify against the
 former witnesses themselves. They must say, "How can you
 bear testimony that Reuben killed Joseph on this day at such
 a place when you were with us on that day at another place
 so distant from the scene of the murder that it would have
 been impossible for you to have seen it." By such a testimony
 the former witnesses are declared fallacious. One cannot
 decide which pair of witnesses is fallacious without the
 help of tradition.

Megadaf attacks the Talmudic principle that
 if a man has sexual relations with a male child of less than
 nine years of age he is נִפְגָּשׁ.²² The man is exempt
 only from human punishment according to this law. Yet they
 do not let him go free. The Bet Din would smite a man who
 had such irregular intercourse a Makot Mardut מַקּוֹת מַרְדוּת.²³
 The Makot Mardut implies the punishment of smiting until
 death. They freed the guilty man only from "death of
 disfigurement" נִזְבֵּחַ. Rambam said, "It is proper
 to smite the older man a Makot Mardut since he lay with the

22. Sanh.54

23. Makot Mardut: punishment for disobedience left
 to the court's discretion, as distinct from
נִפְגָּשׁ Biblical punishment.

... alid bilow woh Yomimisaj 'cessacotw tammot edf. so
 exbut of alid ed Jon bilow ed bechul. Rabbeis rabbis
 tammot edf. molikheits mutt edf. of berurit edf. beinot
 torasek refiel edf. litam utting berachot Jon sin assessiv
 edf. Jatis haam Jon esob alid. .vemrich edf. le sotamiv edf.
 beffix meduch Jon bus mabut tant vtrissed of emulating bnei
 edf. talmuds. vhitav of emul talmud tant amud. .dibrot
 hoy uvo woH. vee tamz vekf. sevileanoy assessiv tammot
 dossa ja veb alid no agosel beffix meduch talmud. yomimisaj used
 sotam talmuds ja veb tant no en mabut exbut hoy mabut a
 evad bilow si tant talmuds edf. to assess edf. mabut jyotah
 yomimisaj a mossa yk. "si mossa evad of hoy not alid agosel need
 Jonrus edf. evilesilis beffix sotam assessiv tammot edf
 edf. jyotah evilesilis edf. assessiv to. ving molik shibat
 molikheits lo qed
 tant alidizing obiuslat edf. exbutis talmud.
 dadd used to obido elam a d'jiv amcavalez laaxes and used a li
 square edf. ~~l'malik~~ edf. of edf. eyes to atsey. skit
 used jet. val alid of galbreos talmuds p'nti mabut yko
 onm haam a shims bilow mid tel edf. vort og mid tel Jon ob
 22. ~~OKC 19. 45 51~~ ~~Yahshua~~ Jonish a sotamotzai refugee mossa had
 litam gatim to talmuds edf. seilqmi talmud Jonish edf
 to moses" work vko hme utting edf. beut. vekf. moses
 no gorg al sI". biss meduch. ~~Malik~~ molikheits
 edf. skit val ed sonic talmud Jonish a mma zebio edf. shims of

^{58. dura 52}
 val sotamotzai vekf. talmuds Jonish. 52
 mabut Jonish a sotamotzai a'zmos edf. of
 talmuds p'nti & talmud.

younger."²⁴ It is unjust to accuse our rabbis of condoning
 such a sin. They were the most modest of men; so careful
 were they in their conduct that they "uncovered one hand-
 breadth and covered two."²⁵ Rabbi never placed his hand under
 his girdle. They ordained an immersion for scholars after
 being with their wives, so that they should not become over-
 indulgent.²⁶ The rabbis said that a man should not think im-
 pure thoughts during the day so that he would not have
 pollution at night.²⁷ They also said, "be behind a lion but
 not a woman."²⁸ Similarly the Yerushalmi forbids one to
 look at copulating animals and a man is warned to keep
 away from anything that is vulgar.²⁹ For this reason the
 rabbis are called Pharisees. No nation is as free from
 prostitutes as Israel. Among the Gentiles brothels are
 erected to house prostitutes but Israel lives by the law of
 the Torah.³⁰ There shall be no harlot among the daughters of
 Israel.³¹

B. Defense of Midrash Agadah:

The slanderer Megadaf attacks the rabbinic interpretation of
 "to the sons of the concubines of Abraham he gave gifts and
 sent them away from before Isaac, his son."³¹ The rabbis say
 that he gave them "tu'mah"; that is, knowledge of sorcery and
 the work of demons.³² Megadaf said that it is improper to
 accuse Abraham of working with sorcery. But the scripture

25. Sab 118

29. Yer. Hull. 44b

26. Ber. 13

30. Deut. XXIII:18

27. ibid. 22

31. Gen. XXV:6

28. ibid. 61

32. Sanh. 91

34. Hil. Is. Bi. perek one

guishes to adder the esoon of jeshua 3:18 "because
intoxes us from to Jacob from out over your side a don
-basi em betevosim" yedi jashu tovachim ifedt uk yedi -tov
tobu basi sid becely reben addan³² "out betevos has dibber
-tefis esheches rot holotromi ha Beniabro yedi . albitz sid
-tovo emched ten blonda yedi fadi os . seviv tidi" didgated
-uk dicht ten blonda kaw a tafif blida adder bat . zogibmli
even ton bishow sid taff os yeb sid galimz shindom vrig
and noll a baled ed . blida oala yedi³³ . ydin je mitsifin
of em shidrot imiduray ed vitzilim³⁴ . agot a few
seed of beritw si now a bus elasimz gnishusos je . modi
sid mosesz sid woi . magiv si taff gnishus mori yam
mori eark as si mosen ok . sessatimz bellot sic alidur
sic shidrot aslidur sid poma . leital as miflatoy
to wai sid yd sevif Israel jud seifatoy eson of betevos
to exifigush sid yomsa tsitad os ed illeis eret³⁵ " israel ed
OE . Israel

tsibegA dasribin to esonet .

to mitsdergetni ciiddat osf shibzis tsibeg³⁶ . zerbals osf
bus esyng ed medadA to asuidromos osf to shos osf ej
ya adder ed³⁷ . nos sid ossal exoled mori yamz jesh
bus yrechos to zybelwmi , si jashu "dam'ui" mori evyng osf jash
osj usqorim si si taff blida tsibeg³⁸ . anochb to know osf
esnugites osf tu³⁹ . yrechos sifim gnishow to madrida esoon

dat . Iinf . 741 . 69

Si: TIXX . 746 . 69

3:VII . 746 . 69

10 . 746 . 69

eso bishag . 118 . 69

Si: Iinf . 69

Si: v. 69

32 . 746 . 69

17 . 746 . 69

69 . 746 . 69

forces the rabbis to interpret the verse this way since it
already said, "And Abraham gave Isaac all that he had."
Since he gave Isaac all his property and could not have given
them wisdom for there is no wise one among them, the only
thing he could have imparted to them was the knowledge of
sorcery. Hence it says, "they are replenished from the east
with soothsayers like the Philistines."³³ How did Abraham
happen to teach them this knowledge? Knowledge of sorcery
is not forbidden in Israel, only the performance of deeds by
the power of magic, as it says, "Thou shalt not learn to do
after the abominations of these nations."³⁴ Therefore, if
Abraham taught this to his sons there is no sin involved.

The slanderer Medagaf attacks the rabbinic
statement that God said, "Woe (to Me) that I destroyed My
House."³⁵ This verse means that God did not desire the
destruction of the Temple but was forced to destroy it because
of Israel's sinfulness. The slanderer added the words "to Me"
in order to cast reproach on the words of our rabbis. The
proof we bring forward is that the latter part of the Agadah
reads, "Woe to the son who has been exiled from the table of
his father," Concerning the father, that is, God, it reads "What
is it to Him?" But even if the verse read "Woe to Me" it
means grief. Why should this present more difficulty than
the Biblical verse "And it repented the Lord that He made
man on earth and it grieved Him at His heart."³⁶

33. Is. III:6

34. Deut. XVIII:9-10

35. Ber. 3

36. Gen. VI:6

31 sonia yew alid oreyt edt farqesah of aldder edt seoret
 "bad ed jadz Lil ossel evay madida huA", biss ybseris
 nevig evay for blsco bus y'regona sid Lil ossel evay ed eomt
 v'lo edt ,yent yomim uno oaly on al exodt yot mobaly meot
 te ybshlom edt awr medt of berzqmi evay blsco ed yadit
 fass edt metz berzalmeiqer exa yedz", avos ti eomt .y'ketera
 madida bib woH^{gg}, sechelilim edt olyi steyvadtoo aliy
 yrotos te subfwoH yagbelwoni shint medt doasj os mqqad
 id sheek te emmarratq edt tlim ,lestai al mshbidet Jon si
 ed of nusel Jon flada wofz", avos 31 as ,olym to rwoq edt
 ti ,excellent RE, anotan emrit to anotanimoda edt te'li
 berlovali mis on al exodt ynos sid of alid y'gush madida
 olniddet edt olnidja l'ngabek terebnafe edt

וְהַבָּרְכָה יְהִי (ell of) כֹּוּ, בְּנֵי הָאָדָם יְהִי
 edt erasb Jon bib noH jadz mraem esrey shint תְּלָמִיד
 esseyed si yonash of becovt saw jadz elgmt edt te moloyash
 "ell of" abrov edt habba terebnafe edt .aschilim a'feset lo
 edt .eldder tuo te abrov edt no dorogot pane of tebto ni
 aboga edt te tseq zefal edt jadz al b'suvot ymid aw loeq
 te eldder edt metz helike need said edw nos edt of coW, sheset
 jadz" sheset jidbo, al jadz, redat edt gainveenoC ,yadat said
 si "ell of" coW" baer oreyt edt li meva jisE "T'mil of" si of
 nadz y'lmo'likh erow tressaq elid binoda QdW .Reiy amon
 sheset al jadz brol edt bejneqer ti hma" oreyt Isoldid edt
 32. .Jtmed alH je min bevezig ti bus mifne no nem

STAT. 31. 32
 Ol-9:111V. .med .32
 .33 .med .32
 .34 .med .32

The slanderer Megadaf attacks the rabbinic statement "God prayed."³⁷ God forbid that He should pray to another. The verse means that the Midat HaDin was directed against the people and God replaced it with the Midat HaRachamim. Thus we explain the verse "Behold the Lord cometh forth out of His place."³⁸ From the interpretation of the verse it becomes clear that "favor" is meant. Further interpretation is gleaned from the verse "If a man sin against another God will judge him(לְסֶגֶד); but if a man sin against the Lord who shall entreat for him(לְשֶׁגֶד לְךָ)."³⁹ The words לְפָזֶל "prayer" and לְנַסְעֵל "judgment" are one word. The rabbis therefore meant to say that God passed judgment.

The slanderer Megadaf attacks the rabbinic statement that from the day the Temple was destroyed God had nothing in this world except the four ells of Halaka.⁴⁰ This does not mean that God was fenced in by the four ells. Even the Temple could not contain Him nor the heaven of heavens.⁴¹ The rabbis meant that even after the destruction God's Providence cleaved to Israel. "Wherever I shall cause My name to be mentioned there shall I come and bless thee."⁴² The Temple is gone but in its place are Talmud Torah and prayer, as it says, "All who occupy themselves with Torah and prayer, the Shekina dwells among them." How can the slanderer who objects to the literal interpretation of this Agadah believe that God entered the womb of a woman, a foul place smaller than four

37.Ber. 7 40.Ber. perek 1
 38.Is. XXVI:21 41.I K.VIII:27
 39.I. Sam.II:25 42.Ex. XX:24

ells? How can he believe that God daily enters a wafer upon the altar?

The slanderer Megadaf attacks the rabbinic statement that God laughed and said "My Children have conquered Me."⁴³ Why is he surprised at this verse and not at the Biblical verses "Awake! Why sleepest Thou, O Lord"⁴⁴ and "then the Lord awaked as one asleep."⁴⁵ Both the Biblical and the Talmudic verses signify the same general thought. Being vanquished and being asleep are both signs of weakness. But the Rabbis meant that when Rabbi Joshua arose and said, "It is not in heaven, etc.,⁴⁶" he gave a forceful answer and God acknowledged his words. It is comparable to a king whose servant gave him an answer which the king acknowledged as valid. It is not a victory by force and power but just the acknowledgment of a valid argument. Although God is incorporeal the Torah speaks the language of men.

The slanderer Megadaf attacks the rabbinic statement "Great is peace for the Lord modified Sarah's words for its sake."⁴⁷ The slanderer claims that God lied. The text reads תְּפִלָּה "modify." There is a difference between falsehood and modification. The latter is used in cases where no falsehood is spoken, but only when a thing has a good and an evil aspect and the speaker keeps silent about the evil and reports only the good. This is permissible for the sake of peace.

43. B.M. 9

44. Psa. XLIV:24

45. ibid.-LXXVIII:65

46. Yeb. 65 with reference to Gen.XVIII:12-13

I. 105. 10. 10. 10. 10. 10. 10.
10:111. 11. 11. 11. 11. 11. 11. 11.
11:111. 11. 11. 11. 11. 11. 11. 11.

10 law a vrisne vifsh hec jadz ovelid mi haC weH. Talle
TrieJis miJ. Rogu
siniddet edt sbafta tsbogel terebnim edt

avet nevblinO vM" biss has bedqual hec jadz tnevedajz
ten has esay alit je besitznun edt ai vM 5A" .sh berupnoe
hebapt O ,wotf Jaqesia vM !eslowa" nesay Ischidik edt ja
Ischidik edt ried 5A" .queles uno na berlwa brod edt medit" has

Jaqesia Lutenej smas edt vkingis nesay cibusiel adt has
sesmiasew le ergis atod sus qesles yaled has berupnoe bale"
5I", biss has esay enidat addan neru Jach Jachem eldded edt jadz
hec has tewas Inleotk a svsg edt ".oje, nevseil ni ten et
seodt yaldi a et sidaqmoz et fI .abrov sin heghewonim
as heghewonim yaldi edt dolidz tewas na min evay zavice
edt sent jadz tewas has sorot vG vretoiv a ten et fI .ahlev
Inleotk a et hec megadaf, .nesungis bilav a le Jnegebhewonim
mer to agaygal edt zidaqmoz ditef edt
siniddet edt sbafta tsbogel terebnim edt

a'nes" heitibom brod edt rot eseq et fserO" jnemotz
hef hec jadz sbafta terebnim edt 5A" .edas etf rot shor
sonetellik a et etet". vribom. W I T abren jnat etf
ni hec et rejal edt .nitzibom haC .deodatit resiged
and print a neta vino rot .mekoq si heodatit etr etayi organ
tuoda jnella qeqd terebnim edt has fesqas ilive na has hec a
rot elchessimug et etet". been edt vino etroget has ilive edt
.edasq lo etas edt

— AS:VIIIX .etf .etf
58:IIIIVXX .bid .etf
51-51:IIIVX .etf .etf .etf .etf

The slanderer Megadaf attacks the rabbinic statement "Bring an expiatory offering for I have diminished the moon."⁴⁷ Megadaf translates the word '5U as לטבִּים "for my sake." In reality there should be a "Zere" under the "Lamed" showing that it is joined to the others. It simply means that they should offer up a goat as a sin offering because the glory of the moon has been diminished. It is not an expiatory offering for God. The offering symbolizes their hope for the House of David which is likened to the moon.⁴⁸ The expiatory offering is the sign of Israel's repentance. Through it we hope that the house of Israel, like the moon, will again shine forth. Therefore at the Rosh Hodesh service David is mentioned in our prayers.

The slanderer Megadaf attacks the rabbinic statement that God is a priest, that He buried Moses and bathed in the fire-river.⁴⁹ This is allegorical. When they said that God is a priest they meant that He, like Aaron, receives the first portion. He is the cause of all causes and the first cause. But it cannot be said that He is aloof from the world. Even though He is exalted and transcendent yet He cares for man, as is seen in the case of the burial of Moses. His Providence cleaves to all men. This fact is called the defect in our philosophy but it really is our superiority. The reference to God's bathing in the fire-river is symbolic of cleanness, purity, perfection. Even though He is in contact

47. Shab. 9a

48. Psa. LXXXIX:28

49. Sanh. 39

shiddar edt shadja labayel zebchale edt
benjaminib evad I rot gnielle yotsique m' galid" Shmoneit
Lurk! llc! brow edt sejeleneit labayel "A", noon edt
yahm "etot" a ed bivodc evant yilset al "etot v' rof"
st. bencde edt of benot; al si just gniwot "bennad" edt
nis a ea jsoy a qmelle bivodc yevi' tsad enem vigris
benjaminib need edt noon edt lo yevi' edt emmed gnielle
gnielle edt abot rot gnielle yotsique m' jor al si
benodil al dolim bivodc lo evonl edt rot egod rivot assifodoye
"lemon" lo yevi' edt al gnielle yotsique edt noon edt of
self, ismal to evonl edt fali' egod ew di signot seontheqat
feodol dmal edt ja protezen⁵⁰. Atot evade nisga ifiw, noon edt
.meying the si bencdmen si bivodc polivin
shiddar edt shadja labayel zebchale edt
berlil bus evonl berlil edt tsad, tsadig a si bo' tsad Shmoneit
tsad bina yevi' medw Melitzogella si vint⁵¹. tsadit-edt edt ni
edt avivot, morn' edt tsad bina yevi' tsadig a si bo'
tsadit edt bus seonl ilis to evonl edt si o' Melitzog tsadit
edt morn' tsad al si tsad bina ed Jommeo si inq. evonl
edt yevi' tsadneosnai bus berlilex si ell signot nov⁵². bflow
evonl te isrlud edt te evonl edt ni mesu et as, gam rot-veine
edt billez si just vint, new ilis of evonlts sombivot si
yotsique m' of yilset al tsad yotsique m' of yilset
selfodoye si evonl-edt edt mi yonitad o'bo' of evonlts edt
feonl si si o' signot nov⁵³. melitzog, yilting, zassmaseit lo

89. Gen. 13
89:29. 8A
89. 8B

with lowly humanity He is above reproach and without a
defect.

The slanderer Negadaf attacks the rabbinic statement that five were created with a slight resemblance to God and all were smitten because of their resemblances.⁵⁰ Samson by his strength; Saul by his neck; Absalom by his hair; Zedekiah by his eyes; and Asa by his feet. The slanderer claims that God was jealous of them and smote them. How impossible! Yet even if it were so does not the Bible call God a "jealous God."⁵¹ The verse means that these five, who resembles Adam, the perfect man, were destroyed because of their pride and their vanity. Whomsoever is proud God bringeth low.

The slanderer Megadaf attacks the rabbis for three more statements which need little explanation. He claims that the reference to Eliezer ben Pedath in Seder Taaniyat contradicts the rabbinic statement "the life of my son and my sustenance depend not on merit but on the constellations."⁵² Anyone who can understand will know that these are not contradictory. Megadaf wants to falsify the words of the rabbis. The second attack is against the rabbinic statement that we shall not receive proselytes in the time of the Messiah.⁵³ He claims that this is contradictory to the prophetic ideal of drawing the nations to God.⁵⁴ The rabbis deduced their conception from the verse "Behold they may gather together,

50. Sotah 10a
51. Ex. XX:5; Nah. I:254. Is. XIV:1

52. M.K. 28

53. Yeb. 24

a jnudis bns mosegat svoda si eH yfinesmvi qivoi niv
 .yoslah
 olniddat adi akonjja tabayek metebels adT
 sonaldmasei tiglie q-djiv bejeiro stew evil jndj fmejedan
 50 teonsidmasei uledj to amased mafim stew lla bns boT or
 sid yd molledA qlosa sid yd llaq pignatja sid yd noamad
 terabuls adT .jeel sid yd maA bns qaysa sid yd mafibek pign
 well .yadit arams bns moid to suofet saw boT jndj emilis
 llaa sfida adT jen aoch os stew ti li neva jey leldusogni
 oly ,evil esadi jndj amem estev adT lla boT andas," a boT
 to amased hovciasb stew ,nam jocreq adT ,maha amaldmasek
 -gutid boT ayotq si tevbaomodW .yfinesv alerd bns shing vlen
 .wol dle
 yok aldder adi akonjja tabayek penebuls adT
 enthalo eH .noisemalqes aljki been mafim ofnejatja stow pene
 foyinat zebek si djabek nad tessim of concretex adT jndj
 bns mor ym to stil adT fmejedan olniddat adi mafibuls
 55 .anokjellejance adT no jndj tiven no jndj knaqeb conenjana ym
 -nes jndj era usadi jndj weni lliy bnefotabim nec oly amoyha
 aldder adT to abtow adT vtilst of ejnaw tabayek .yigolbar
 os jndj fmejedan olniddat adi janaga al konsja bneose adT
 56 .misesM adT to emit adT ni aetylanoq eviecer jndj llaa
 Ischi olnigora adT of yfotibzijane si sidj jndj amalo all
 ibedj becubeh aldder adT 56 .boT of encltan adT ynlwazb to
 yfotibzijane yam yadit blodeb" serev adT mori mafiqomoc

A.D. 1000 1000 1000 1000
 I:VIL .10 .1000 .1000 .10
 82 .1000 .1000

but not by Me.⁵⁵ We have two kinds of proselytes, the
 Ger Shaah לען לען who accepts the seven commandments of
 Noah and not the whole Torah; and the Ger Zedek לען לען
 who is circumcised, immersed and receives the whole Torah.
 At the time of the Messiah we will certainly accepted
 proselytes of the first type but not of the second. They
 did not embrace our Torah when Israel was lowly and despised
 and the rabbis do not accept proselytes who join our group
 "for the sake of the royal table."⁵⁶ The third attack is
 against the rabbinic statement that God teaches children,
 plays with Leviathan and rides on a cherub.⁵⁷ As the teacher
 of children God imparts understanding to them. Regarding
 His sporting with Leviathan,⁵⁸ and his riding upon the cherub,⁵⁹
 similar statements occur in the Bible and the Biblical
 verses are to be interpreted just as the Talmudic passages
 are interpreted. Megadaf's attack therefore is not only
 against the Talmudic statements but against the Bible as
 well.

CONCLUSIONS

Unlike the essays of his illustrious kinsmen
 Rashbash limits his writing to the field of apologetics.
 His only polemical note enters when he shows the superiority
 of Jewish teaching and the high level of Morality attained
 by Israel through obedience to the Torah and the rabbis. His
 great knowledge of rabbinics enabled him to use his Talmudic

55. Is. LIV:15

56. Yeb. 24b

57. Ab.Zar. 20

58. Psa. CIV:26;Job XL:29

59. II Sam. XXII:11

edt .mazalotzog to shmid owt evad st .²⁵ .sh v d son jnd
to attemehanmoo never edt usqecos owt AL YUD, mazalotzog to
AL YUD ishet zed edt bns tizrot sfodot mit jnd bns hacl
mazalotzog sfodot mit sevicioz bns haclommoz al owt
hejgecos qiniasies ifliw ew mazalotzog to emil edt JA
VENT .bnoes edt to jnd sgvj jzill edt to usqelotzog
lazish bns vfel saw fersal hek datot uno emidim son ell
quoyt uno zot owt usqelotzog tqecos son oh alldotzog edt bns
el mostz brint edt ²⁶ .eladot lator edt to zotz edt zotz
mazalotzog sefoss bcl jad .famejafa cibliddot edt janisys
tehasef edt sa ²⁷ .durant a no zotz bns mazalotzog ifliw evnig
qazisysz .medt of gubuszelous etzneki bcl mazalotzog to
durant edt nozgazibz sin bns ²⁸ .mazalotzog ifliw qazisysz sin
lazidz edt bns eldik edt mi zmeo etznejafa tsilim
ezosney cibliddot edt sa jent hefzqesim edt of era ezeret
vino son al exzenuz mostz a'labatz .hejgecosz owt
sa eldik edt janisys ifliw etznejafa cibliddot edt janisys

.ifliw

CONCLUSIONS

ezemekz emolzenuz alit to evnase edt mazalotzog
mazalotzog to blatt edt of gubuszelous edt etznejafa mazalotzog
yelzotzogz edt zwoda edt mazalotzog ifliw sin
benisjfa vliwotz to levol right edt bns piznosz delwt to
sin .mazalotzog bns datotz edt of cibliddotz mazalotzog levol
of cibliddotz edt owt sin befdane cibliddot to evnasef zmerp

28:IX del:22:VII .mazalotzog
If: LXX .mazalotzog II .28
28 .mazalotzog .28
28 .mazalotzog .28

weapons with great skill. One cannot imagine a more systematic and scientific apologetic than Milchemet Mizwah. Laying down premises and suppositions which are self-evident, Rashbash proceeds to discuss specific cases and interpret them. On the whole his arguments are very convincing.

The apologetic Milchemet Mizwah is especially interesting because it answers a specific attack. The polemics of his father and Profiat Duran, except Al Tehi K'Aboteca, have no specific situation to face. Undoubtedly Rashbash had the polemic of Megadaf before him and answered him charge upon charge. Though on the defensive, one reads Milchemet Mizwah with the conviction that the head of this Duran is held high. There is nothing of the servile, humble, ghetto psychology about Rashbash in his defense of Jewish tradition. Undoubtedly the most refreshing trait of Rashbash--and for that matter Efodi and Rashbaz--is that he is no flatterer and does not approach his task with an apology.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

In the three conclusions mentioned above everything said about the Durans forms a harmonious whole. They are not defenders of Jewish lore who rush into the fray with passion and bitterness, but they embody the scientific spirit. They are seekers of facts and draw their data from Jewish and Christian literature. Well-acquainted with ancient and medieval lore of both the

strom a shigamit fermez em. Ilinis yachy djiw meqnow
Durans mast olyogologe ollusiones bus oltamejave
 fnebile-ties era holtz smetkoogha bus sealmerg nweb galvan
 jatqatul bus maseo offloegs assosib of abecotq haeddele
 .anionivnes vnev era atnemugha alid oflom edt no .mard
 vilasgees al Durans olyogologe edt
 schmelog edt .Mosses offloegs a erewans JL causood galvacefut
 evad Yosef A. K. R. I. D. A. Japax, usznuD JafforP bus redjal sin lo
 edt bad haeddele vlejduobu .most of dolstante offloegs on
 noyu egund mid berzwanu bus mid exoled Tahagel to olyogolog
Durans abest emc .evimelab edt no hignodT .oyzade
 min bled al mazd sidj to basd edt jadif moltsivnos edt mizw
 vlejduogc etzay salman ,alivres edt to qadmon si oren
 -u .moljibet daiwel to esnabt alit al haeddele jnoda
 rot bus--mazdah to jnay guidserter from edt vlejduob
 zetjeft on al edt jadif al--haeddele bus ibotE tefjam jadif
 vlejduogc na mizw mazd alid mosozqqa jom asch bus

COMPOSITIONS DURANT

svoda benotzmen emchlussene esndz edt ni
 .elofr emchlussene a emtol emzrd edt tuoda biss gaidpoyre
 edt oyni mazd odw exof daiwel to arshabeb jom oyn van
 edt yedone yedt tuo ,essnitstid bus uleesaq mit yek
 wath bus ejest to arshabeb era yekT .vifige offlumos
 -llew .zimatzefif ualzimD bus daiwel mord stab ziedt
 edt niced to exol lavelben bus amions mizw bejalsupos

Church and the synagogue, the Durans use their tools
 with science and skill. They are thoroughly acquainted
 with the former polemical writers and writings and
 although Rashbaz and Efodi incorporate much of this
 material into their own polemics, they impart to
 their own productions a touch of originality. Undoubtedly
 the most original of the Durans, from the standpoint of
 material, is Rashbash who answers the specific attack
 of Megadaf.

Presenting a proud demeanor the Duran
 family makes no attempt to compromise and to spare the
 feelings of the Christian world. Though with science
 and skill and with the thrusts of a master, the Durans
 drive their weapons into the hearts of their opponents.
 The best trait of the "Fifteenth Century Spanish-Jewish
 Polemics as reflected in the writings of the Duran Family"
 is that they are not too vicious in their polemics nor too
 apologetic in their apologetics.

67

also tied our hands with ,engagement and this notion
being forced out us yet .This has caused all
the many has already been to the point of all
that is now accepted by the has added to
or from us ,which two tied and believe
which we will be to named a sacrifice two tied
to us which is now ,and tied to us which is now
most of all known our hands at ,but it
.Tahagel to
us to know what is
and also of has accepted of from us on which
comes all tied .After which is tied to us
and ,refuse to us which is tied has tied
which tied to us tied and accept tied with
which tied which is tied to us tied and
"which mean to us tied and all before us as
and you accepted tied all accept tied and
accept tied all accept tied and
.accept tied all accept tied

TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS

Ab.	Zar-----	Abodah Zara
B.B.	-----	Baba Batra
Ber.	-----	Berakot
B.K.	-----	Baba Kama
B.M.	-----	Babani Mezias
Corinth.	-----	Cerinithians
Dan.	-----	Daniel
Deut.	-----	Deuteronomy
Emun. W'Dact	-----	Emunet W'Dact
Eng. Gr.	-----	History of the Jews by H.Graetz
Ex.	-----	Exodus
Ezek.	-----	Ezekiel
Gal.	-----	Galatians
Gen.	-----	Genesis
Gen. R.	-----	Midrash Genesis Raba
Hab.	-----	Habakkuk
Hagig.	-----	Hagigah
Hil. Ab. Zar.	-----	Hilchet Abodah Zara (Rambam)
Hil. Rozaach	-----	Hilchet Rezaach (Rambam)
HUC M.	-----	HUC Monthly vol.1 no.6 p.15 Ab u-ben "Be Not Like Thy Fathers"
Heb.	-----	Hebrews
Heb. Gr.	-----	Dibre Y'Mai Yisroel (Graetz)
Hull.	-----	Hullin
Is.	-----	Isaiah
Is. Bi.	-----	Hilchet Issuray Biah (Rambam)
Jas.	-----	James
JE.	-----	Jewish Encyclopedia
Jere.	-----	Jeremiah
Jn.	-----	John
Kel. HaGoy.	-----	Kelimat HaGoyim (Linna and Mark)
Ker.	-----	Keritut
Ket.	-----	Ketubot
K.	-----	Kings
Lev.	-----	Leviticus
Lk.	-----	Luke
Mak.	-----	Makot
Mk.	-----	Mark
Math.	-----	Mathew
M.K.	-----	Moed Koton
Nah.	-----	Nahum
Nos.	-----	Numbers
Ozar.	-----	Ozar Wikuhim (Eisenstein)
Prov.	-----	Proverbs
Psa.	-----	Psalms
Rom.	-----	Romans
Sab.	-----	Talmud Sabbath
Sam.	-----	Samuel
Sanh.	-----	Sanhedrin
Shab.	-----	Shabuoth
Thess.	-----	Thessalonians
Yeb.	-----	Yebamot
Yer. Sab.	-----	Yerushalmi tractate Sabbath
Yer. Sanh.	-----	" " Sanhedrin

200 ITALY ST. STELA TO MEAT

BIBLIOGRAPHY

<u>Keshet U'Magen</u>	Leghorn Edition 1790	author Rashbaz
<u>Milchemet Mizwah</u>	" " "	Rashbash
<u>Kelimat HaGoyim</u>	From manuscript in JTS library, NYC; Printed but not published. Editor Isaac Broyde	Efedi
<u>Ozar Wikuhim</u>	1928	Eisenstein
<u>Dibre Y'Mai Yisroel</u>	Warsaw 1908 Notes by Rabinowitz and Harkavi vol.6,7	Graetz
<u>Jewish Encyclopedia</u>	Articles on "Duran", "Polemics"	
<u>History of the Jews</u> vol.4		Graetz
"Be Not Like Thy Fathers"	HUC Monthly vol.1, no.6 p.15	Ab u-ben
<u>History of the Jewish People</u>		Margolis and Marx
<u>History of the Jews in Spain and Portugal</u>	1848	Lindo
<u>A Harmony of the Gospels</u>	1908	Stevens and Burton