

PhD THESIS

Abstract

Dorottya Zsom

**CONVERSOS IN THE RESPONSA OF SEPHARDIC HALAKHIC
AUTHORITIES IN THE 15th CENTURY**

Budapest

2011

I. Subject and aim of the research

The subject of our research is the history of Iberian Jews converted to Christianity in the 15th century, more exactly, between the years 1391 (massive forced conversion in Iberia) and 1492 (expulsion of the Jews from Iberia).

An ever growing social tension among Jews and Christians erupted in Seville in the summer of 1391, when the kingdom of Castile experienced a period of interregnum. Disorder and riots spread to the rest of Castile, to Andalusia, and to Aragon. Jewish communities were decimated or destroyed, many of their members killed or forcibly baptized; thus originating the social group of converts to Christianity, called “New Christians” or “*conversos*” by Iberian “Old Christians”, that is, Christians of non-Semitic origin. Many Jews who managed to escape from the rioting mob left Iberia and emigrated to North Africa where they could practice Judaism openly. They settled along the North African coast, in Honein, Oran, Mostaghanem, Tenes, Algiers, Bougie, and Tunis; and in inland cities as Tlemcen, Constantine, and Medea. They sometimes joined the Jewish communities already existent there, but more frequently they formed their own, distinct communities. In the course of the fifteenth century, Iberian *conversos* and their descendants did not cease to flee from Iberia to North Africa, despite the repeatedly renewed prohibitions of the Christian rulers to leave their dominium. On the other hand, at that time, the masses of forced converts remaining in Iberia formed a numerous and peculiar group in the society remarkably different from those individual Jews who accepted Christian faith in the previous centuries by choice, for example in the hope of a better carrier. Both Jews and Christians had to face a new social reality, the shaping of a well-defined social and religious group whose members were neither entirely Christians nor Jews. Even the *conversos* who wished to adopt Christian belief could not assimilate to the majority of the society overnight, let alone those who definitely opposed to following Christian religion and did their utmost to observe Judaism in secret. According to the Catholic doctrine, the effect of the sacraments, therefore that of baptism is irrevocable; a person once baptized remains Christian in any case, even if he was baptized against his will. Furthermore, returning to the former faith was considered a most serious sin, which had to be prevented. In consequence, the *conversos* had no choice but to live as if they were Christians, mostly because the Papal Inquisition which had been active in Iberia before the establishment of the Spanish National Inquisition (1481) kept an eye on the neophytes, and censured their relapses. The Christian society was by no means prepared to the integration of a mass of

newly converted Jews; for they as New Christians meant competition to the Old Christians, since all the opportunities which had been denied them as Jews were opened them as Christians. Still, they were not really integrated to the Christian majority; most of the *conversos* were ignorant of the details (or in many cases, the essential doctrines) of Christianity, because they were not educated in their new faith. Furthermore, most of them continued to live in the same neighbourhood, streets, and houses as prior to their conversion, frequently sharing their dwelling place with non-convert Jews. Family ties were not necessarily severed because of the (forced) baptism of some members of the family; *conversos* and Jews formed mixed families interlinked by bonds of kinship, personal interest, custom, and necessity. Jews and *conversos* were in many aspects interdependent, since Jewish law did not annul certain obligations incumbent upon its followers just because one of the parties were converted. On the other hand, a *converso* wishing to observe Judaism in secret could not dispense with the assistance of the Jewish community. Such was the situation in which the leading rabbis of the Jewish communities had to formulate their opinions concerning legal problems that emerged in consequence of the coexistence of Jews and *conversos*, or aroused regarding converts leaving Iberia and returning to Judaism in North Africa.

The main sources of the history of the *conversos* are those of Christian origin; archival documents, files of the Inquisition, polemic literature, and the like. The information obtained from these sources is supplemented by data from Hebrew sources; such as chronicles, letters, polemic and philosophic literature. The responsa written in Hebrew by leading rabbinic authorities of the time also gained some attention, but they were not taken into consideration as extensively and systematically as the other sources.

The thesis wishes to present a systematic and detailed elaboration of the *halakhic* (legal) decisions written by five of the most important authors who wrote responsa concerning *conversos* between the years 1391 and 1492, that is, between the year in which the massive social group of forced converts originated in Iberia, and the year when the expulsion of the Jews from the united kingdoms of the Catholic Monarchs, Queen Isabel of Castile and King Ferdinand of Aragon took place. The expulsion was an event that radically changed the perspectives of the Iberian *conversos*. The *halakhic* authorities were confronted with an absolutely new situation, in which they had to reformulate their position towards the *conversos*. The thesis aims to present all the responsa written in connection with *conversos* by Isaac b. Sheshet Perfet, Simeon b. Zemaḥ Duran and his descendants: Solomon b. Simeon Duran, Zemaḥ b. Solomon Duran and Simeon b. Solomon Duran.

As the focus of the responsa is the *halakhic* discussion, the details concerning the circumstances of the case that are not of basic importance in terms of the discussion are often omitted. Unfortunately, the religion of the converted person is often regarded as indifferent in the argumentation, and therefore it is not always explicitly stated. In the thesis I have dealt with the responsa that concern Iberian *conversos* to Christianity presumably, whether it was stated expressly in the text or if it could be inferred from the context of the responsum. I have also included a few responsa where it was impossible to determine if they concerned *conversos* to Christianity or converts to Islam, but had relevance to the subject under discussion. In these cases, the uncertainty concerning the adopted religion of the converts is clearly indicated in the analysis of the given responsum.

The historical data deductible from the responsa will be presented in its original context, that is, in close connection with the *halakhic* discussion, and not independently of it. This method permits to evaluate the historical evidence offered by the responsum in its proper dimensions, which in many cases shows the limits of the research based on these sources. Consequently, the thesis cannot answer the (in my opinion, erroneous) question whether the *conversos* were Jews or Christians.¹ The purpose of the research is to present an authentic picture of the *conversos* containing all the details offered by the sources, but the imperfect picture so produced would not contain the products of my imagination. I did not make a selection of the sources unlike many other previous studies, thus I do not present the interesting parts of a discourse only, and moreover, I do not try to reinforce any preconceptions with them (in preconceptions I mean the endeavours of the researches to prove the *conversos* being “real” Christians/Jews) — I disclose the whole discourses as they are. As a result, after reading the thesis, the reader will not have a unified (and simplified) view of the *conversos*, mostly because no such unified view ever existed. The thesis is aware of the limits of its subject, and does not want to disclose more than it can, it adheres to the evidence offered by the texts, and does not misrepresent them in order to reach an appealing but unfounded conclusion.

¹ Asked more or less literally by Netanyahu 1966: 2-3, 22.

II. Sources of the research

The responsa are legal decisions in form of detailed answers given to actual questions sent by inquirers who might be rabbis themselves, or anyone capable of formulating a question and forwarding it to a *halakhic* authority willing to answer it. Some responsa deal with hypothetical cases that certainly reflect the reality nevertheless; otherwise the rabbis would not have found it necessary to expound their opinion in written form concerning the issue. The responsa was frequently copied by its author (or the rabbi's students) and thus a copy generally remained in the possession of the rabbi as well. These were later collected and edited by the authors themselves or by their students. Furthermore, the responsa were copied by those who got access to them during their way to the addressees; or by those who were permitted by the owners of the collections to copy them for their use. In the course of the repeated transcriptions, the responsa were sometimes remarkably shortened; the data regarded as irrelevant to the *halakhic* discussion like proper names, dates, etc. were frequently omitted. Sometimes the copied versions were mere digests of the originals containing hardly more than the essence of the question, a brief summary of the *halakhic* argumentation, and the decision. Despite these deficiencies the responsa is still a most valuable source of history, since it generally treats specific events and therefore is strictly connected with the reality of everyday life. The responsum in most cases originates as an answer to the necessity of the moment, and even if it is not void of certain tendentiousness characteristic of other sources of history (like chronicles, or polemic literature, for example), it certainly offers most realistic information regarding the fate of the majority of the *conversos*.

III. A critical survey of the history of the research

H. J. Zimmels: Die Marranen in der Rabbinischen Literatur. Berlin, 1932

Works dealing with Iberian converts on the basis of responsa literature are scarce. The first such compendium was written by H. J. Zimmels. This relatively short work (less than 200 pages) presents and analyses some 80 sources from the year 1391 till 1737. As a result of the width of the timeframe and the number of the sources treated, the author could not discuss the sources profoundly, and could not relate to all of the available texts. Zimmels did not detail the *halakhic* argumentation, but concentrated on the presentation of the historical data contained in the responsa. In spite of that, his work is of paramount importance until this day,

and its approach to the sources is exemplary. As opposed to later historians, the argumentation of Zimmels is accurate and reliable; he does not rush into conclusions and does not draw far-reaching implications on the basis of superficial reading and misinterpretation of the texts. He cannot be accused of trying to prove a presumed thesis at any cost, either through intentional or erroneous false presentation of the sources, by deliberately ignoring those that contradict the given thesis and emphasizing those that support it, or by quoting passages taken out from their original context.

Zimmels (1932:21) differentiated five phases with regard to the position taken by the majority of the rabbis concerning the converts. From the period of the years 1391-1492 Zimmels presented nineteen responsa written by Isaac b. Sheshet Perfet and the members of the Duran family, all of them pertaining to the first phase. In his view, this phase was characterized by and large by a major adherence to Jewish religion on the part of the converts forcibly baptized in 1391 and their descendants, who were in turn deemed by the rabbinical authorities as Jews who sinned (by living outwardly as Christians), but still remained Jews.² It does not mean however that their conversion and staying in Iberia did not have practical consequences regarding their *halakhic* status. Some of these are briefly mentioned and presented by Zimmels but without going into details.

Simcha Assaf: "Anusei Sefarad u-Portugal be-sifrut ha-teshuvot" ["The forced converts of Spain and Portugal in the responsa literature"] Zion 1932, pp. 19-60³

Simcha Assaf's essay on the subject of responsa dealing with Iberian converts was published in the same year as Zimmels' work. This essay is not a systematic discussion of the subject, but it was not intended as such. The purpose of Assaf was in the first place to call attention to the neglected Hebrew sources regarding the history of the *conversos*. He emphasized that beside the already researched inquisitorial documents there existed another group of sources that had remained disregarded till then, namely the *halakhic* decisions written by the contemporary rabbinical authorities. In order to demonstrate the historical relevance of these sources, Assaf presented a selection of some interesting passages. He did not analyze the texts, let alone study them in a systematic way. It is highly probable that Assaf was motivated by the awakening enthusiasm of his time with regard to the descendants of Iberian converts who, after preserving their Jewish identity during four centuries in secret,

² Cf. bSanh 44a

³ I have used the edition of this article published in the collection of essays written by S. Assaf (19 3).

decided to return to Judaism openly.⁴ To this end, Assaf outlined a heroic and quite romantic picture of crypto-Jews adhering to their ancient faith with all efforts possible, and his main concern was to illustrate this heroic struggle with proof texts taken from the responsa, from the files of the Inquisition, or from secondary literature. Since he did not clearly distinguish the sources he used, it is not always entirely clear to what extent the picture formed is based on the responsa themselves, and how much it is based on other kind of sources.

Benzion Netanyahu: The Marranos of Spain from the Late XIVth to the Early XVIth Century according to Hebrew Sources. New York, 1966

The possibly most widely known and controversial work concerning *conversos* (called also *marranos* in Castilian) was written by Benzion Netanyahu. The scope of this work encompasses three kinds of sources: responsa; philosophic and polemic literature; and homiletic and exegetic literature. The thesis that Netanyahu wishes to prove on the basis of these sources is that “the overwhelming majority of the Marranos at the time of the establishment of the Inquisition were not Jews, but detached from Judaism, or rather, to put it more clearly, Christians” (Netanyahu 1966:3) and consequently, the purpose of the Inquisition was not to confront a Judaizing heresy (as the number of those who adhered to Judaism was insignificant in his view) “but to eradicate the Marrano group from the midst of the Spanish people” (Netanyahu 1966:4) due to “racial hatred and political considerations rather than by religious zeal” (Netanyahu 1966:3). Netanyahu formulated his view in an outspoken defiance against the opinion of Y. Baer: “Conversos and Jews were *one people*, bound together by ties of religion, and fate, and messianic hope.”⁵ Furthermore, “essentially the Inquisition was right in evaluating the character of the conversos”⁶, i.e., that they observed Judaism, and continued to live as Jews. But such a short introduction cannot treat in details the controversy between Baer and Netanyahu, therefore I wish to limit my comments on Netanyahu’s use of the responsa as historical sources only.

The most problematic aspect of Netanyahu’s method is that he does not relate to the *halakhic* decisions as to integral texts, where even considerations of historical relevance appear in the context of a legal argumentation, and not independently of it. Moreover, these considerations in general do not constitute the essential part of the responsa, but are disclosed *passim* in the course of the discussion. Often they are not meant to be full-fledged statements

⁴ Assaf begins his article with making reference to the descendants of Portuguese converts returning to Judasim. Cf. Assaf 1943:143.

⁵ Quoted by Netanyahu (1966:2-3) from Baer 1959:365.

⁶ Quoted by Netanyahu (1966:3) from Baer 1959:464.

of universal value, but vague remarks supporting or illustrating the *halakhic* argumentation. It does not mean that they do not reflect historical reality at all, but they must be treated with due circumspection, and first and foremost, always in close connection with their original context. Netanyahu, however, often presents passages of the responsa without even mentioning the question, or elucidating the specific case they relate to. He aims to decide the question of “Jewishness or non-Jewishness of the Marranos” (Netanyahu 1966:22) without being aware of the fact that this question as such was never addressed to the rabbis, but always in connection with some particular aspects.

Netanyahu frequently reaches false conclusions due to the superficial interpretation of the texts. For example, it should not be automatically supposed that if a consideration is not mentioned in a certain responsum, but it is exposed in another, that necessarily indicates that the opinion of the rabbi has changed in the meantime. All the more so, if the new consideration relates to a social or historical phenomenon, which naturally influences the *halakhic* argumentation but does not constitute the basis of it. A rabbi might mention a social phenomenon in order to support his *halakhic* argumentation without attaching cardinal importance to it (as opposed to the historian, who might take out a certain remark of this kind from its original context and relate to it as to an unquestionable historical evidence). For example, if in a responsum (Isaac b. Sheshet Perfet: *Responsa*, no. 11) informers are mentioned while in another text written possibly before⁷ (Isaac b. Sheshet Perfet: *Responsa*, no. 4.) they are not mentioned, it does not mean necessarily that they have appeared in the meantime (as it is supposed by Netanyahu, 1966:30). It is even more misleading if the historian rushes into far-reaching conclusions on the basis of such erroneous implications (e.g., when Netanyahu concludes that due to the alleged appearance of the informers, the whole *converso* community became divided in two conflicting fractions split by an impervious gap, while they formed a unified group beforehand). There are a lot of probable reasons why a text should not mention the informers, and only one of them is the possibility that they have not existed yet. Moreover, nothing in the second responsum indicates that the lack of homogeneity in the group of the converts was a new phenomenon. On the contrary, Isaac b. Sheshet Perfet stated already in the first responsum that some of the converts adhered to Judaism while others abandoned it. The fact that the first responsum does not mention informers does not prove that they did not exist; neither does the fact that the second responsum relates to them demonstrate that the group of the *conversos* as a whole underwent

⁷ It is supposed that the responsa of Isaac b. Sheshet Perfet concerning converts appear in the printed editions in the order they were issued. Cf. Netanyahu 1966:23 and the bibliography referred to there.

such an essential change in the time that lapsed between issuing the two responsa, that led to the emergence of a “new [...] social panorama” (Netanyahu 1966:30)

It is even more disappointing when Netanyahu mentions a part of a statement made by an authority (the part supporting his hypothesis of course), ignoring the rest of it (contradicting his theory).⁸

This is not the appropriate place to offer a detailed critique of Netanyahu’s work. Therefore I wish to choose one typical statement of him in order to demonstrate one of his usual errors.

“While by that time Ribash had already abandoned his unreserved faith in the Jewishness of the Marranos and began to limit their validity as witnesses before a Jewish court, Rashba^ז still insisted on treating them as Jews without any reservation whatsoever...” (Netanyahu 1966:33)

As opposed to this ascertainment the following must be observed:

- 1) Isaac b. Sheshet Perfet (that is, the Ribash) never discussed the “Jewishness” of the converts, but their actual or presumed legal status concerning particular issues (as marriage, testifying, writing a divorce document, handling wine, etc.). A person can be considered *as* a Jew from one point of view, while at the same time he can be considered *as* a Gentile from another point of view.
- 2) In the surviving responsa written by Isaac b. Sheshet Perfet there is no indication whatsoever that he had had “unreserved faith in the Jewishness of the Marranos” (whatever Netanyahu meant by Jewishness). On the contrary, if Isaac b. Sheshet Perfet made general statements about the converts’ degree of adherence to Jewish law, he claimed that they were presumed to violate the law even if they were not literally forced to, and therefore in general they did not qualify as witnesses for example.
- 3) If Isaac b. Sheshet Perfet really began “to limit their validity as witnesses before a Jewish court” (after abandoning his allegedly unreserved faith in them), that would have been an extremely lenient position towards them, since a person has to comply with a number of severe requirements so that he may qualify as a witness. For example, it must be assumed that he never commits even a minor transgression (the penalty of which is lashing), if he is not

⁸ For example, when Netanyahu (1966:42) states that according to Simeon b. ^זemaḥ Duran the death of a convert should not be mourned by his non-convert relatives. Netanyahu fails to mention that this responsum (Simeon b. ^זemaḥ Duran: 2:139) differentiates between three types of converts; two of them should be mourned, the third should not.

evidently and literally forced to.⁹ Whoever is supposed to violate the Sabbath when not under threat of death is usually disqualified as a witness.¹⁰ It has to be noted again, that contrarily to the claim of Netanyahu, Isaac b. Sheshet Perfet never held that converts as a group would qualify as witnesses; on the contrary. A rabbi taking on a more severe position towards converts would not accept them universally as valid witnesses, but might held, for example, that they were to be considered as Jews with regard to their marital status solely, since it depended on their descent, and not on their manners and customs.

Moisés Orfali Levi: Los conversos españoles en la literatura rabínica. Problemas jurídicos y opiniones legales durante los siglos XII-XVI. Salamanca, 1982

The short tractate written by Moisés Orfali Levi is again more a selection of sources than a systematic analysis. Given the limited extension of the work (66 pages), and the five centuries it encompasses, it is obvious that the author could not offer a detailed discussion of the sources, but a kind of anthology drawing the attention of the students of history to a group of less known sources.

Summing up the shared characteristics of these works I wish to point out the following: 1) they relate only to a minor part of the sources available, discussing solely a very limited number of the responsa written on this subject; 2) they do not present the historical data in their *halakhic* context; 3) they do not analyze the texts in a systematic way.

These deficiencies make complimentary research necessary. My work is intended to be a modest contribution in this direction.

IV. Printed editions and manuscripts of the responsa studied

The analysis of the responsa presented is based on the first printed editions of the texts. I have carefully compared the texts of the first printed editions with the available manuscripts of the responsa. For this purpose, I had to read through the manuscripts of collections containing—among several related and unrelated material—the works of the authors under discussion, and to identify the responsa concerning *conversos* one by one. In

⁹ Cf. MT, Hilkhot Edut 10:1-2

¹⁰ Cf. e.g. Isaac b. Sheshet Perfet: *Responsa*, nos. 4, 11, 12, Simeon b. Zemaḥ Duran: *Tashbeẓ* 1:66, 3:312, 3:40, 3:43, Solomon b. Simeon Duran: *Responsa*, no. 553, Zemaḥ b. Solomon Duran: *Yakhin u-Voaz* 1:125.

the course of my work I identified a vast number of responsa not related to my research matter. For the list of the manuscripts consulted see the Introduction of the thesis. The result of this work is the following list of manuscripts related to *conversos*. The number of the responsum is always that of the first printed edition.

IV.1. List of manuscripts related to conversos

IV.1.1. Isaac b. Sheshet Perfet

Responsum no. 1

1. New York – Jewish Theological Seminary Rab. 1410, fols. 39b-40a
2. St. Petersburg, Russian National Library Evr. II A 116, fol. 69a
3. Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Mich. 557, fols. 94a-b

Responsum no. 2

1. New York – Jewish Theological Seminary Rab. 1410, fols. 38b-39b
2. St. Petersburg, Russian National Library Evr. II A 116, fols. 69a-b
3. Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Mich. 557, fols. 94b-95a

Responsum no. 4

1. St. Petersburg, Russian National Library Evr. II A 116, fols. 70a-b
2. Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Mich. 557, fols. 95b-96b

Responsum no. 5

1. St. Petersburg, Russian National Library Evr. II A 116, fols. 70b, 72a-b
2. Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Mich. 557, fols. 96b-97b

Responsum no. 6

1. St. Petersburg, Russian National Library Evr. II A 116, fol. 72b
2. Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Mich. 557, fols. 97b-99b

Responsum no. 11

1. St. Petersburg, Russian National Library Evr. II A 116, fol. 73b
2. Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Mich. 557, fols. 102b-104a

Responsum no. 12

1. Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Mich. 557, fols. 104a-b

Responsum no. 14

1. Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Mich. 557, fols. 105b-108b

Responsum no. 43

1. St. Petersburg, Russian National Library Evr. II A 116, fol. 84a-b
2. Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Mich. 557, fols. 129a-130b

Responsum no. 46

1. St. Petersburg, Russian National Library Evr. II A 116, fol. 84b
2. Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Mich. 557, fols. 133a-134a

Responsum no. 47

1. Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Mich. 557, fols. 134a-b

Responsum no. 48

- Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Mich. 557, fols. 134b-135a

Responsum no. 49

1. Moscow, Russian State Library, Ms. Guenzburg 263, fols. 55a-b
2. Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Mich. 557, fols. 135a-b

Responsum no. 50

1. Moscow, Russian State Library, Ms. Guenzburg 263, fols. 55b-56a
2. Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Mich. 557, fols. 135b-136a

Responsum no. 51

1. Moscow, Russian State Library, Ms. Guenzburg 263, fols. 56a-b
2. Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Mich. 557, fol. 136a

Responsum no. 52

1. Moscow, Russian State Library, Ms. Guenzburg 263, fols. 56b-57b
2. Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Mich. 557, fols. 136a-137a

Responsum no. 61

1. Moscow, Russian State Library, Ms. Guenzburg 263, fols. 64a-66a
2. Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Mich. 557, fols. 141a-143a

IV.1.2. Simeon b. Zemah Duran

Tashbez 1:58:

1. Moscow, Russian State Library, Ms. Guenzburg 401/2, fols. 78b-81b
2. London, Beth Din and Beth Hamidrash 23, fols. 46a-47a
3. St. Petersburg, Institute of Oriental Studies of the Russian Academy B 130, fols. 32a-33b

Tashbez 1:59:

1. Moscow, Russian State Library, Ms. Guenzburg 401/2, fols. 81b-82a
2. London, Beth Din and Beth Hamidrash 23, fols. 47a-b
3. St. Petersburg, Institute of Oriental Studies of the Russian Academy B 130, fol. 33b

Tashbez 1:60

1. Moscow, Russian State Library, Ms. Guenzburg 401/2, fols. 82a-82b
2. London, Beth Din and Beth Hamidrash 23, fol. 47b
3. St. Petersburg, Institute of Oriental Studies of the Russian Academy B 130, fol. 33b-34a

Tashbez 1:61

1. Moscow, Russian State Library, Ms. Guenzburg 401/2, fols. 82b-84a
2. London, Beth Din and Beth Hamidrash 23, fols. 47b-48b
3. St. Petersburg, Institute of Oriental Studies of the Russian Academy B 130, fols. 34a-b

Tashbez 1:62

1. Moscow, Russian State Library, Ms. Guenzburg 401/2, fols. 84a-85a
2. London, Beth Din and Beth Hamidrash 23, fols. 48b-49a
3. St. Petersburg, Institute of Oriental Studies of the Russian Academy B 130, fols. 34b-35a

Tashbez 1:63

1. Moscow, Russian State Library, Ms. Guenzburg 401/2, fols. 85a-88b
2. London, Beth Din and Beth Hamidrash 23, fols. 49a-50b
3. St. Petersburg, Institute of Oriental Studies of the Russian Academy B 130, fols. 35a-36b

Tashbez 1:66

1. Moscow, Russian State Library, Ms. Guenzburg 401/2, fols. 92a-98b
2. London, Beth Din and Beth Hamidrash 23, fols. 52a-55b
3. St. Petersburg, Institute of Oriental Studies of the Russian Academy B 130, fols. 38a-40b

Tashbez 2:60

1. London, Beth Din and Beth Hamidrash 23, fol. 158a

Tashbez 2:139

1. London, Beth Din and Beth Hamidrash 23, fol. 179b

Tashbez 2:201

1. London, Beth Din and Beth Hamidrash 23, fol. 190b

Tashbez 2:215

1. London, Beth Din and Beth Hamidrash 23, fols. 192a-b

Tashbez 2:225

1. London, Beth Din and Beth Hamidrash 23, fol. 193b

Tashbez 2:278

1. London, Beth Din and Beth Hamidrash 23, fol. 208a

Tashbez 3:40

1. London, Beth Din and Beth Hamidrash 23, fol. 232b
2. Moscow, Russian State Library, Ms Guenzburg 1596, fols. 57a-57b¹¹

Tashbez 3:43

1. London, Beth Din and Beth Hamidrash 23, fol. 233a
2. Moscow, Russian State Library, Ms Guenzburg 1596, fols. 57b-58b¹²

Tashbez 3:47

1. London, Beth Din and Beth Hamidrash 23, fols. 234a-235b
2. Moscow, Russian State Library, Ms Guenzburg 1596, fols. 63a-67a¹³

Tashbez 3:83

1. London, Beth Din and Beth Hamidrash 23, fols. 243b-244a

¹¹ According to the erroneous pagination of the ms: 55a-b.

¹² According to the erroneous pagination of the ms: 55b-56b

¹³ According to the erroneous pagination of the ms: 61a-65a.

Tashbez 3:227

1. London, Beth Din and Beth Hamidrash 23, fol. 278b

Tashbez 3:312

1. London, Beth Din and Beth Hamidrash 23, fol. 299a
2. Moscow, Russian State Library, Ms Guenzburg 1596, fols. 27a-b¹⁴

Tashbez 3:323

1. London, Beth Din and Beth Hamidrash 23, fol. 302b

IV.1.3. Solomon b. Simeon Duran

Responsum no. 89

1. New York, Jewish Theological Seminary Rab. 1352; JTS Ms. 7196, fols. 34a-35a
2. Moscow, Russian State Library, Ms Guenzburg 1596, fols. 65b-70a

Responsum no. 90

1. New York, Jewish Theological Seminary Rab. 1352; JTS Ms. 7196, fols. 35a-b

Responsum no. 223

1. New York, Jewish Theological Seminary Rab. 1352; JTS Ms. 7196, fols. 77a-b

Responsum no. 287

1. New York, Jewish Theological Seminary Rab. 1352; JTS Ms. 7196, fols. 105a-b

Responsum no. 368

1. New York, Jewish Theological Seminary Rab. 1352; JTS Ms. 7196, fol. 137b

Responsum no. 414

1. New York, Jewish Theological Seminary Rab. 1352; JTS Ms. 7196, fols. 157a-158a

Responsum no.418

1. New York, Jewish Theological Seminary Rab. 1352; JTS Ms. 7196, fol. 160a

Responsum no. 553

1. New York, Jewish Theological Seminary Rab. 1352; JTS Ms. 7196, fols. 206a-207a

IV.1.4. Simeon b. Solomon Duran (Yakhin u-Voaz 2)

Yakhin u-Voaz 2:3

1. St. Petersburg, Institute of Oriental Studies of the Russian Academy B 130, fols. 110a-111a

¹⁴ According to the erroneous pagination of the ms: 25a-b.

V. Selected Bibliography

The Hebrew names of modern authors' are transcribed in the way they write it themselves (e.g. E. Lipiner, when writing in Hebrew, used the name "Eliyahu", otherwise he used the name "Elias"). In cases I did not dispose of such information, I simply transliterated the names. The names of mediaeval authors are given according to the Encyclopaedia Judaica.

A. Primary sources

Binjamin Zeev: *Responsa* =

David b. Hayim ha-Kohen (Radakh): *Responsa* =

David ibn Avi Zimra (Radbaz): *Responsa* =

Isaac b. Sheshet Perfet: *Responsa* =

Josef ibn Lev: *Responsa* =

Katan, Yoel 1998 =

Meẓ ger, David 1993 =

Moses b. Josef Trani (Mabit): *Responsa* =

Samuel de Medina (Rashdam): *Responsa* =

Simeon b. Solomon Duran: *Yakhin u-Voaz 2* =

Simeon b. Z̄emaḥ Duran: *Tashbeẓ* =

Sobel, Moshe 1998 =

Solomon b. Abraham Adret: *Responsa* =

Solomon b. Simeon Duran: *Responsa* =

Zemah b. Solomon Duran: *Yakhin u-Voaz 1* =

Zera Anashim =

B. Secondary sources

Alcalá, Ángel, ed. 1995. *Judíos. Sefarditas. Conversos. La expulsión de 1492 y sus consecuencias*. Valladolid: Ámbito Ediciones.

Assaf, Simcha. 1933 =

Assis, Yom Tov. 1988. "Sexual Behaviour in Mediaeval Hispano-Jewish society". *Jewish History. Essays in Honour of Chimen Abramsky*. ed. by Ada Rapoport-Albert and Steven J. Zipperstein. London: Peter Halban. 25-59.

Baer, Yitzhak. 1959. =

-----, 1966. *A History of the Jews in Christian Spain*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America. vol. 2

Beinart, Haim. 1983. *Los conversos ante el tribunal de la Inquisición*. Barcelona: Riopiedras.

-----, 1992. "The Great Conversion and the Converso Problem". *The Sephardi Legacy*. ed. by H. Beinart. Jerusalem: Magnes. vol. 1, 346-382.

-----, 1971a. "The Converso Community in the 15th Century Spain". *The Sephardi Heritage*. Ed. by R. D. Barnett. London: Vallentine. vol. 1, 425-456.

-----, 1971b. "The Converso Community in the 16th and 17th Century Spain". *The Sephardi Heritage*. Ed. by R. D. Barnett. London: Vallentine. vol. 1, 457-478.

David, Abraham. 1992. "The Spanish Exiles in the Holy Land". *The Sephardi Legacy*. ed. by H. Beinart. Jerusalem: Magnes. vol. 2, 77-108.

Epstein, Isidore. 1968. *The Responsa of Rabbi Simon b. Zemah Duran as a Source of the History of the Jews in North Africa*. New York: Ktav.

Freehof, Solomon B. 1953. *The Responsa Literature*. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America.

Gil, Moshe. 1976. *Documents of the Jewish Pious Foundations from the Cairo Geniza*. Leiden: Brill.

Gitlitz, D. M. 1996. *Secrecy and Deceit: The Religion of the Crypto-Jews*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society.

Glick, Shmuel. 2006 =

- Grossman, Avraham. 1988. "The Historical Background to the Ordinances on Family Affairs Attributed to Rabbenu Gershom Meor ha-Golah (The Light of the Exile)". *Jewish History: Essays in Honor of C. Abramsky*. ed. by A. Rapoport-Albert and S. Zipperstein. London: Peter Halban. 3-23.
- , 1992. "Legislation and Responsa Literature". *The Sephardi Legacy*. ed. by H. Beinart. Jerusalem: Magnes. vol. 1, 188-219.
- , 2004. *Pious and Rebellious. Jewish Women in Medieval Europe*. Waltham, Mass.: Brandeis University Press. Hanover: University Press of New England.
- Haas, Peter J. 1996. *Responsa: Literary History of a Rabbinic Genre*. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholar Press.
- Hershman, Abraham Moses. 1943. *Rabbi Isaac bar Sheshet Perfet and His Times*. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary.
- Hinojosa Montalvo, José. 1993. *The Jews of the Kingdom of Valencia. From Persecution to Expulsion, 1391-1492*. Jerusalem: Magnes.
- Hirschberg, H. Z. 1974. *A History of the Jews in North Africa*. vol. 1., Leiden: Brill.
- Kahana, Yiṣ ḥak Zeev. 1973 =
- Kamen, Henry. 1985. *Inquisition and Society in Spain in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
- Katz, Jacob. 1958 =
-
- Lamdan, Ruth. 2000. *A Separate People. Jewish Women in Palestine, Syria and Egypt in the Sixteenth Century*. Leiden: Brill.
- Lazar, Moshe and Stephen, eds. 1997. *The Jews of Spain and the Expulsion of 1492*. Lancaster, Calif.: Labyrinthos.
- Leroy, Beatrice. 1985. *The Jews of Navarre in the Late Middle Ages*. Jerusalem: Magnes.
- Levine Melammed, Renée. 1999. *Heretics or Daughters of Israel? The Crypto-Jewish Women of Castile*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- , 2004. *A Question of Identity. Iberian Conversos in Historical Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lipiner, Elias. 2009 =
-
- Marín Padilla, Encarnación. 1982a. "Relación judeoconversa durante la segunda mitad del siglo XV en Aragón: nacimientos, hadas, circuncisiones." *Sefarad*, vol. 42, Fasc. 1, 59-78.
- , 1982b. "Relación judeoconversa durante la segunda mitad del siglo XV en Aragón: matrimonio". *Sefarad*, vol. 42, Fasc. 2. 243-298.
- Meyerson, Mark M. 2004. *Jews in an Iberian Frontier Kingdom. Society, Economy and Politics in Morvedre, 1248-1391*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Netanyahu, Benzion. 1966. *The Marranos of Spain. From the Late XIVth to the Early XVIth Century*. New York: American Academy for Jewish Research.
1997. "The Historical Significance of the Hebrew Sources concerning the Marranos". *Toward the Inquisition. Essays on Jewish and Converso History in Late Medieval Spain*. ed. by B. Netanyahu. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press. 156-182.

Orfali Levi, M. 1982. *Los conversos españoles en la literatura rabínica: problemas jurídicos y decisiones legales durante los siglos XII-XVI*. Salamanca: Universidad Pontificia de Salamanca.

Raphael, David, ed. 1992. *The Expulsion 1492 Chronicles*. North Hollywood, Calif.: Carmi House Press.

Riera i Sans, Jaume. 1983 =

—

Roth, Cecil. 1931. "The Religion of the Marranos". JQR, vol. 22, 1-33.

----- 1946. *Historia de los marranos*. Buenos Aires: Editorial Israel.

Suarez Fernández, Luis. 1964. *Documentos acerca de la Expulsión de los judíos*. Valladolid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.

Soloveitchik, Haym. 1978. "Can Halakhic Texts Talk History?" AJS Review (Association for Jewish Studies) vol. 3, 153-196.

----- 1990 =

—

Zimmels, Hirsch Jacob. 1932. *Die Marranen in der Rabbinischen Literatur*. Berlin: Rubin Mass.

----- 1971a. "The contribution of the Sephardim to the Responsa Literature till the Beginning of the 16th Century." *The Sephardi Heritage*. ed. by R. D. Barnett. London: Vallentine. vol. 1, 367-401.

----- 1971b. "Codifications by the Jews of Spain", *The Sephardi Heritage*. ed. by R. D. Barnett. London: Vallentine. vol. 1, 402-424

VI. Publications in this theme

-- „*The levirate marriage of converts in the responsa of some Sephardic authorities.*” In: Kút, 2008/3, pp. 96-113

-- „*Converts in the Responsa of R. David Ibn Avi Zimra. An Analysis of the Texts.*” In: Hispania Judaica Bulletin, vol. 6., 2008, pp. 267-292

-- „*Uncircumcised Converts in Sephardi Responsa from the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries.*” In: Iberoamerica Global, vol. 1, no. 3, 2008 July, pp. 159-171

-- „*The Return of the Converts to Judaism in the Ottoman Empire and North-Africa.*” In: Hispania Judaica Bulletin, vol. 7., 2010, pp. 335-347

-- “*But the name of the wicked will rot. (Prov. 10:7) Names used by conversos in the responsa literature.*” In: Hispania Judaica Bulletin, vol. 8 (forthcoming)

-- “*Wine Produced and Handled by Converts.*” In: MTA Judaisztikai Kutatóközpont, Értesítő (forthcoming)