

Batya Gallant is a doctoral student at the Bernard Revel Graduate School of Yeshiva University.

THE ALLEGED SABBATEANISM OF RABBI MOSHE HAYYIM LUZZATTO

I. INTRODUCTION

The reputation of Rabbi Moshe Hayyim Luzzatto as a prodigy dates back to his childhood in Padua, in the first decades of the eighteenth century. As a young man, he was considered a master of Bible, Midrash, Talmud, and Halakhah, in addition to having an extensive knowledge of Western languages and literature.¹ Yet more than any other discipline, the study of Kabbala gripped Moshe Hayyim and thus he formed a group of scholars in Padua which immersed itself in the study of mysticism in order to hasten the messianic redemption.²

Rabbi Moshe Hayyim (or Ramhal, as he is popularly known, based on the Hebrew acronym of his name) claimed that a *maggid* (divine power) appeared to him in 1727. This *maggid* revealed kabbalistic secrets to him, and at times actually dictated complete original kabbalistic works. One of Ramhal's disciples, Jekutiel of Vilna, awed by the spiritual heights his master had attained, wrote an enthusiastic description of the mystical activities of Ramhal to Rabbi Mordechai Jaffe of Vienna. Unfortunately, this letter fell into the hands of Rabbi Moses Hagiz of Altona-Hamburg,³ an ardent persecutor of Sabbateans, and thus began a lengthy controversy over Ramhal. At first Ramhal was accused of messianic agitation—a very suspect activity in an era so close to the Sabbatean debacle—and later Ramhal was charged with actual Sabbatean heresy. This essay will examine the accusations of Sabbateanism, will present Ramhal's defense, and discuss the controversy in light of its analysis by twentieth-century scholars.

II. THE ACCUSATIONS

In 1730, Rabbi Hagiz sent a copy of Jekutiel's letter to the rabbis of Venice, and called for an investigation of Ramhal's messianically-

oriented study group. The first mention of the Sabbatean accusation came, ironically, from a defender of Ramhal, Rabbi Raphael Yisrael Kimhi, who testified before the Venetian rabbinate that Ramhal had not been charged with Sabbateanism—an indication, according to Isaiah Tishby,⁴ that such a suspicion did exist. And indeed, in the second stage of the controversy over Ramhal, the accusation of Sabbatean heresy was clearly delineated. Rabbi Hagiz accused Ramhal of excusing the apostasy of Shabbetai Zvi.⁵ Rabbi Jacob Emden joined in the condemnation, claiming that Ramhal's denunciation of Shabbetai Zvi lacked dynamism, and suggested that perhaps Ramhal considered Shabbetai Zvi to be the Messiah, son of Joseph, reserving the title of "Messiah, son of David" for himself.⁶ In his polemical *Torat Ha-Kena'ot*, Rabbi Emden points to Ramhal's use of the term "*tsedek*" when referring to Messiah, son of David, and bases his argument on the fact that "*tsedek*" was often used by Sabbateans to allude to their leader.⁷ Further evidence of Ramhal's Sabbateanism, according to Rabbi Emden, is the fact that Ramhal spent eight days involved in "matters of sorcery" with Rabbi Jonathan Eibeschuetz, who was, in the eyes of Rabbi Emden, the arch-Sabbatean of the eighteenth century.⁸

The entire controversy rested upon these arguments,⁹ and Ramhal was easily able to defend himself against the accusations. There are numerous writings in which Ramhal had attacked Sabbateanism¹⁰ and he attempted to publish a tract entitled *Kin'at Hashem Tseva'ot*, a polemic against Christianity and Sabbateanism.¹¹ Nevertheless, Ramhal continued to be the object of persecution by the Italian rabbinate due to his preoccupation with messianism, was thus compelled to refrain from teaching Kabbala, and was forced to turn his kabbalistic writings over to his beloved teacher, Rabbi Isaiah Bassan. The Sabbatean accusations against Ramhal lost their momentum,¹² and although Ramhal was the subject of bitter controversy for the remainder of his short life,¹³ the argument centered around his messianic activities rather than allegations of Sabbatean heresy. Yet twentieth-century scholars, in particular Isaiah Tishby, have re-opened the case by careful research into Ramhal's personal correspondences with Rabbi Isaiah Bassan. Tishby found many comments in these letters which can be construed as suspicions of Ramhal's Sabbateanism on the part of Rabbi Bassan, and painstaking scrutiny of Ramhal's *Kin'at Hashem Tseva'ot* has led Tishby to conclude that these suspicions have substance.

The first of Tishby's proofs that Rabbi Bassan suspected his disciple of Sabbatean tendencies is Rabbi Bassan's hesitations concerning the *maggid* of Ramhal. An element of *sitra ahara*, the "other (or demonic) side," is often intertwined with true revelations of a

maggid—Rabbi Bassan wrote to Ramhal—and this may be indicated by the *maggid's* preoccupation with messianism. The “forces of evil” attempt to ensnare Jews away from Torah,¹⁴ he explained, by encouraging an obsession with the messianic idea.

Tishby finds further evidence that Rabbi Bassan suspected Ramhal of Sabbateanism in the subsequent words of Rabbi Bassan. Ramhal’s mentor indicated to him that many rabbis received divine revelations during the great repentance movement in 1666, including Nathan of Gaza (whom, incidentally, Rabbi Bassan refers to as “Rabbi Nathan”¹⁵), yet the result of all this messianic agitation was devastating. Rabbi Bassan concluded his correspondence with a challenge to Ramhal: “What, in the last analysis, is the difference between yourself and Nathan of Gaza?” he wrote. “Only that he related all his ideas to Shabbetai Zvi and you do not.”¹⁶ Triumphant, Tishby feels that no further explanation of Rabbi Bassan’s position is necessary. It is clear to him that Ramhal’s rabbi suspected his beloved disciple of Sabbatean heresy.

III. THE TISHBY THESIS

Tishby’s evidence is far from conclusive. A careful analysis of Rabbi Bassan’s words will indicate only that he suspected some evil, unholy influence in Ramhal’s messianic preoccupation; a suspicion of Sabbateanism does not necessarily follow. Throughout Jewish history, long before the advent of Shabbetai Zvi, there were rabbis whose stance against any messianic agitation was very strong,¹⁷ and Rabbi Bassan’s objections fit neatly into that genre. To assume, as Tishby has done, that Rabbi Bassan’s objections to messianism imply a suspicion of Sabbatean heresy is unfounded and unwarranted. The fact that Rabbi Bassan goes on to compare Ramhal to Nathan of Gaza is not to be construed as a charge of Sabbateanism—Rabbi Bassan himself wrote that Nathan accomplished great things, such as explaining the works of Rabbi Isaac Luria and enabling many Jews to repent.¹⁸ Finally, Rabbi Bassan states that the difference between Nathan and Ramhal is that Nathan believed in Shabbetai Zvi and Ramhal does not—in what sense then can Tishby claim that Rabbi Bassan considered Ramhal a Sabbatean? We are, at this point, faced with a need to define “Sabbateanism”—if it implies a belief in Shabbetai Zvi as the messiah, then clearly Rabbi Bassan does not consider Ramhal to be a Sabbatean. Tishby, it seems, has another definition: Any philosophy which has similarities to Sabbatean theology qualifies as Sabbatean. Certainly many philosophies and theologies have overlapping beliefs, but the fine lines that distinguish

them from one another are often the factors that count. Ramhal, according to his own testimony and that of his revered teacher Rabbi Bassan, did not believe that the apostate Shabbetai Zvi was the messiah, and since no one has produced convincing evidence to refute this testimony, one cannot label him as Sabbatean.

Supposing for argument's sake however, that we accept Tishby's tacit definition—that acceptance of many of the tenets of Nathan's theology would render Ramhal a Sabbatean—does Ramhal's theology truly correspond to Nathan's? Let us examine the two prime concepts which, according to Tishby, incriminate Ramhal with Sabbatean heresy, and see whether they pass beyond the bounds of mainstream Jewish thought, from "*netivei emunah*" into "*minut*."

In a private correspondence with Rabbi Bassan, Ramhal asserts that the authentic message of Nathan of Gaza has never been understood, and that his *maggid* has revealed the true secret to him. Of course there are portions of Nathan's writings which are false and incorrect, Ramhal concedes, but this does not diminish the veracity of those parts which are valid.¹⁹ As Rabbi Meir, the tannaitic sage, was able to separate the true kernel from the distorted chaff in the words of his teacher Elisha ben Avuya, Ramhal wrote, so can he, Ramhal, differentiate truth from falsehood in Nathan's writings.²⁰

What the "true secret" revealed by Ramhal's *maggid* was, we do not know. However, in *Kin'at Hashem Tseva'ot*, Ramhal tackles two major factors in Nathan's theology and demonstrates how he separates truth from falsehood in these concepts.

IV. RAMHAL'S THEOLOGY

A. *The Messianic Descent Into Evil*

The Sabbatean explanation for the apostasy of their leader was that the messiah must descend into the *kelippah*, or evil, in order to redeem any holy sparks trapped within that realm.²¹ Although Ramhal concurred that the messiah must, in fact, descend into the *kelippah*, this event, he explained, does not take place in the physical world, and does not cause any impurity in the messiah's soul. Thus it transpires in some spiritual realm and the messiah has no need to accomplish *tikkun* (spiritual restoration) for his own soul, as the Sabbateans believed.²² The apostasy of Shabbetai Zvi, then, is not a messianic act. Tishby claims that since certain details of this theory are not found in the works of Rabbi Luria, Ramhal was evidently influenced by Nathan's essays. However, Ramhal never denied Nathan's influence over his thinking. He maintained that he had

succeeded in utilizing only the valid aspects of Nathan's theology,²³ and thus Tishby's claim proves nothing.

Ramhal's portrayal of the Messiah, son of Joseph, also bears striking similarities to Shabbetai Zvi. This messiah is a soul who has suffered, who has been reincarnated into many personalities, and whom others have attempted to coerce into idol worship. Yet Ramhal explains that the legitimate Messiah, son of Joseph, is saved from final desecration, whereas Shabbetai Zvi was not.²⁴ There are other points of similarity.²⁵ Yet Ramhal maintains that the events described in his writings concerning Messiah, son of Joseph, take place in spiritual spheres and are thus not describing Shabbetai Zvi.

B. Redemption Through Sin, or "Sod Aveirah Lishmah"

The concept of "*Aveirah Lishmah*," a holy sin, was a much more radical innovation of the Sabbateans than any of their messianic theories. It propelled Sabbateanism out of the realm of normative Judaism because, not merely idle philosophy or theology, it advocated action, and as such overturned the basic tenets of Jewish belief.

In *Kin'at Hashem Tseva'ot*, Ramhal begins with the unequivocal statement that a transgression cannot become a *mitsvah*, a holy act.²⁶ Then, however, he expounds at length on the Talmudic comment that "*gedola aveirah lishmah mi-mitsvah shelo lishmah*": a transgression committed for "its" sake, (meaning, for the sake of Torah, or for spiritual perfection) is greater than a *mitsvah* performed for ulterior motives.²⁷ Under certain circumstances, Ramhal tells us, a sin may accomplish great *tikkun*—yet this transgression must be done in a very specific way and with meritorious intentions. Ramhal cautions that one can easily fall into the depths of evil²⁸ if one swerves from the tightrope of proper execution of the act. The example of *aveirah lishmah* which our sages record is the story of Yael, who altruistically seduced and subsequently killed the Canaanite general Sisera, in order to end a devastating war in Israel. Ramhal takes pains to point out that Yael's action was permissible only as "*sod hora'at sha'ah*,"²⁹ a temporary provision for esoteric reasons. It cannot be repeated and the "sinner" must return to total fulfillment of, and commitment to, the commandments once the unusual circumstance has passed. One cannot claim, Ramhal emphasizes, that what was once a transgression is now a *mitsvah*, and thus Sabbateans err because they abrogate certain commandments on a permanent basis. Additionally, Ramhal points out, the decision as to what constitutes a *hora'at sha'ah* can be made only by one qualified in scholarship and piety.³⁰

Ramhal's exposition of *aveirah lishmah* finds its place within the parameters of traditional Jewish thought. To Tishby, however, it is

an amazing stance to take in an anti-Sabbatean tract such as *Kin'at Hashem Tseva'ot*. He finds it particularly surprising because the concept of *sod hora'at sha'ah* is used by Nathan of Gaza as a justification for the "strange acts" (transgressions) of Shabbetai Zvi. Radical Sabbateans, of course, did not base their belief in redemption through sin on the *hora'at sha'ah* principle, since they considered the commandments to be permanently abrogated, and thus transgressing the commandments was holy in all circumstances. Yet the distance between *hora'at sha'ah* and redemption through sin is not unbridgeable, and Tishby calls *hora'at sha'ah* a "weak reed"³¹ with which to dismiss Sabbatean heresy. Tishby is implying that if Ramhal intended to adopt the *hora'at sha'ah* principle, he should have realized that as a consequence, readers would associate his ideas with Sabbatean ones. Furthermore, Ramhal explained that at times *tikkun* requires transgressing the law, in order to appease the *sitra ahara*, the "other side."³² This pronouncement, Tishby explains, can lead to a complete reversal of values, and is thus a very dangerous statement to make. True, Tishby concedes, Ramhal qualified these statements by reiterating that these "holy sins" must always be done in very precise ways, with virtuous motivations, and are always only temporary. In conclusion, however, Tishby claims that these qualifications are insufficient when dealing with such a provocative theme.³³

V. CRITIQUE OF TISHBY

Although one may concur with Tishby that the principle of *hora'at sha'ah* can easily be distorted into justification of acts such as those of Shabbetai Zvi, one cannot conclude, as Tishby has tacitly done,³⁴ that Ramhal, if he was indeed antagonistic to Sabbateanism, should have known better. Tishby is assuming that the intention of Ramhal in *Kin'at Hashem Tseva'ot* was solely to discredit Sabbateanism, and if that were indeed the case, then it is true that Ramhal weakened his thesis by embracing *sod hora'at sha'ah*. However, if we assume that Ramhal was motivated by the need to arrive at the truth, rather than merely by the desire to defend himself against accusations of heresy, he maintained his integrity by giving a candid explanation which, in his opinion, (and as far as I understand it, in the opinion of the Talmudic sages) must include the possibility of temporarily abrogating a commandment as a *hora'at sha'ah*. To omit this Halakhic possibility would be to manipulate his readers. Ramhal did not approach the issue as a lawyer who, with clever arguments, convinces the jury to pass a verdict of "innocent." He approached it as a

rabbinic scholar in search of the truth.³⁵ The fact that “the truth,” namely, *sod hora’at sha’ah*, comes dangerously close to Sabbatean heresy would not justify omitting that truth. Neither he, nor the concept of *sod hora’at sha’ah* can be blamed for the distortions which Nathan of Gaza subjected it to. The line separating *sod hora’at sha’ah*, as Ramhal explained it, from the twisted concepts of Sabbateanism may be a fine line—yet to Ramhal it was a very clear one.

Tishby postulates that perhaps Ramhal explained *sod hora’at sha’ah* naively, not realizing how close this idea comes to the Sabbatean concept of redemption through sin. An alternate explanation, Tishby continues, may be that Ramhal wrote it because he felt compelled to by his *maggid*.³⁶ Both of these suggestions are unacceptable because they ignore the more straightforward possibility that Ramhal had intellectual integrity and that is why he included the problematic issue of *sod hora’at sha’ah* in his anti-Sabbatean tract. He simply considered it to be the true explanation and was undaunted by the possibility that certain individuals might misinterpret it.

Indeed, a severe criticism of Tishby’s insinuations against Ramhal appears in a work by Meir Benayahu entitled *Kitve Ha-Kabbala Shel Ramhal*.³⁷ Benayahu begins by dismissing Tishby’s supposition that the *maggid* compelled Ramhal to write *Kin’at Hashem Tseva’ot*. The style of the work, Benayahu points out, differs drastically from Ramhal’s *maggid*-inspired works, as those were written in obscure Zoharitic style, whereas *Kin’at Hashem Tseva’ot* is lucid and well-organized.³⁸ In addition, Benayahu wrote, Ramhal condemned the concept of *aveirah lishmah*, as it was practiced by the Sabbateans, in no uncertain terms. Ramhal wrote:

Know and understand that the entire edifice which was fabricated by those transgressors (the Sabbateans) is false and in vain . . . they violate the entire Law . . . turning words of a living God into wormwood and gall.³⁹

Benayahu continues to quote Ramhal’s opinion of Sabbateans:

(They are) sinners, officers of Satan . . . destroyers who have planted alien vines in the Lord’s vineyard . . . this (heresy) is more detrimental than the first one (Christianity) . . . because they (the Sabbateans) appear to base their belief on true wisdom (Lurianic kabbala) yet it is nothing but falsehood . . .⁴⁰

Benayahu concedes that Ramhal may have thought that Shabbetai Zvi had originally been slated as a redeemer, but that he failed in his task and that his Halakhic transgressions certainly disqualified him as the messiah.⁴¹ In any event, it is clear to Benayahu that

Ramhal did not consider the converted Shabbetai Zvi to be the messiah, nor did he subscribe to the basic Sabbatean doctrines of *aveirah lishmah* and the actual descent of the messiah into the realm of evil. Ramhal never denied that he was influenced by ideas which are marginal to Sabbatean theology, but as Benayahu points out, this does not render him a Sabbatean.⁴²

Benayahu, incensed over Tishby's analysis, accuses Tishby of harming Ramhal's reputation more than any of Ramhal's contemporaries did. Tishby acts, Benayahu claims, "as a steadfast prosecutor, the likes of which Ramhal never encountered in his lifetime. All of Ramhal's merits are transformed (by Tishby) into liabilities. Tishby is doing this in order to uphold his tenuous structure . . ."⁴³

Benayahu caps his diatribe against Tishby with the ironic conclusion that the words applied to Ramhal by Tishby may well apply to Tishby himself:

(His words are) a long sequence of sorcery . . . if there exists no logical connection between concepts, Ramhal fabricates one with twisted casuistry, and if there are internal contradictions, he ignores them . . . Why? Because he is attempting to substantiate his thesis. The obvious would overturn the structure that he has taken pains to erect, and would show his theories for what they really are: castles in the air.⁴⁴

The Sabbatean allegations made by the Venetian rabbinate against Ramhal may have been put to rest, but the controversy between scholars such as Tishby and Benayahu is very much alive.

NOTES

1. Heinrich Graetz, *History of the Jews*, Vol. V, (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1895), p. 233.
2. Simon Ginzburg, *The Life and Works of Moses Hayyim Luzzatto*, (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1931), p. 22.
3. For the text of this letter, see R. Jacob Emden's *Torat Ha-Kena'ot*, (Amsterdam, 1752), pp. 84–85.
4. Isaiah Tishby, *Netivei Emunah u-Minut*, (Tel Aviv: Masada Press, 1964), p. 169.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 170.
6. R. Emden, p. 104.

באמרנו על שבתאי צבי שהוא טעות, לא אמר שהוא שוא ודבר שקר משיחותו ואמונתו כזב מוחלטי כמו שהיה מהראוי . . . ומי ידע על מה נתכון ביחסן אליו הטעות, שמא חשב אותו למשיח בן יוסף ולעצמו שמר המלוכה של משיח בן דוד. . . .

7. *Ibid.*

8. R. Jacob Emden, *Shevirat Luhot Ha-Even*, (Altona, 1756), p. 40.

ומצאו בין כתביו (של רמח"ל) נרשם בכ"י שהוא עסק עם המין (ר' יונתן) שמונה ימים בעניני קוסמים.

9. Although the above-mentioned accusations constitute the entire spectrum of actual allegations against Ramhal, an additional factor may have contributed to the vehemence of the Sabbatean charge. In 1730, when news of the revelation of Ramhal's *maggid* spread

to Padua, a movement of repentance was set into motion. In an article entitled “*Ha-Maggid shel Ramhal*” (*Sefunot*, V, 1961, pp. 299–336), Meir Benayahu points to the similarity between this movement and the great repentance of 1666, which began when Shabbetai Zvi introduced himself as the Messiah. Those who reacted skeptically to the rumor of Ramhal’s revelations were nevertheless reluctant to detract from the mood of penitence, and thus remained silent. This striking parallel to the misguided silence of the seventeenth-century authorities may have frightened rabbis Hagiz and Emden into action.

10. R. Moshe Hayyim Luzzatto, *Adir ba-Marom*, (Warsaw, 1886), p. 192; *Kelah Pit’hei Hokhmah*, (Jerusalem, 1961), preface.
11. R. Moshe Hayyim Luzzatto, *Kin’at Hashem Tseva’ot*, in *Ginzei Ramhal*, (Bnei Brak, 1980).
12. Traces of this allegation may have lingered, however. See Benayahu’s “*Ha-Maggid shel Ramhal*,” p. 316, for evidence of possible suspicion on the part of R. Hayyim Yosef David Azulai.
13. Ramhal died in 1746 at the age of thirty-nine.
14. Quoted in Tishby, p. 170.
15. Isaiah Sonne, “*Avnei Binyan le-Toledot ha-Yehudim be-Italia*” (*Horeb*, VI), p. 79. According to Sonne, Rabbi Bassan exhibited interest in Nathan’s writings, and retained some of them in his private collection.
16. Quoted in Tishby, p. 171.

אמור מעתה: מה הפרש בין זה לזה? רק שר' נתן כל קוי דבריו היו נמשכים אל נקודת הצבי,
משא"כ בדבריך.

17. See, e.g., Talmud Bavli, *Sanhedrin*, 97b; Maimonides, *Iggeret Teiman*; R. Solomon ibn Adret, *She'elot u-Teshuvot ha-Rashba*, Vol. 1, Responsum 548.
18. Quoted in Tishby, p. 171.
19. *Ibid.*
20. *Ibid.* Ramhal admits, for example, to using the “*yihudim*” (Kabbalistic prayers for unification) of Nathan of Gaza, perhaps as preparation for revelations from his *maggid*. See Benayahu’s “*Ha-Maggid shel Ramhal*,” p. 302.
21. Gershom Scholem, *The Messianic Idea in Judaism*, (New York: Schocken Books, 1971), p. 94.
22. R. Luzzatto, *Kin’at Hashem Tseva’ot*, p. 95.
23. Tishby, p. 184. Tishby points out that had these statements fallen into the hands of Rabbis Emden or Hagiz, they would have intensified their persecutions of Ramhal. This is probably true, yet it is irrelevant in terms of whether or not Ramhal actually was a Sabbatean.
24. R. Luzzatto, *Kin’at Hashem Tseva’ot*, p. 105.
25. *Ibid.*, pp. 98–101. For example, Ramhal uses the serpent motif in his discourse on the messiah, a theme stressed by Sabbateans but one that is found in earlier sources as well.
26. *Ibid.*, p. 95.
27. Talmud Bavli, *Nazir*, 23b.
28. R. Luzzatto, *Kin’at Hashem Tseva’ot*, p. 95.
29. *Ibid.*, p. 98.
30. *Ibid.*
31. Tishby, p. 183.
32. R. Luzzatto, *Kin’at Hashem Tseva’ot*, p. 97.
33. Tishby, p. 184.
34. *Ibid.*, pp. 183–185.
35. R. Luzzatto, *Kin’at Hashem Tseva’ot*, p. 92.
36. Tishby, p. 185.
37. Meir Benayahu, *Kitvei ha-Kabbala shel Ramhal*, (Jerusalem 1979), pp. 142–143, n. 13.
38. *Ibid.*, p. 142.
39. Quoted in Benayahu, *Kitvei ha-Kabbala shel Ramhal*, p. 143, n. 13.

א"כ איפוא תדע ותשכיל איך שוא ומרמה הוא כל בנין החטאים האלה . . . לעבור על כל
דת ודין . . . ולהפוך דברי אלקים חיים ללענה וראש" (כ"י אוכספורד, דף 322 א.)

40. *Ibid.* Quoted from R. Luzzatto, *Kin’at Hashem Tseva’ot*, p. 72.

תרבות אנשים חטאים . . . שרי צבאות ס"מ השטן הגדול . . . אנשי ארס הצבי . . . ויטעו
בכרם ה' צבקות בית ישראל סורי הגפן נכריה . . . זו קשה מן הראשונה . . . אל מוסדות

Batya Gallant

חכמת האמת ובהקדמות נאמנות לפנים אשר נראות מיוסדות על אדני האמת
והצדק ואינם אלא דברי און ומרמה . . .

41. Benayahu, "*Ha-Maggid shel Ramhal*," p. 320.
42. Benyahu, *Kitvei ha-Kabbalah shel Ramhal*, p. 142, n. 13.
43. *Ibid.*, p. 143, n. 13.
44. *Ibid.*

שרשרת ארוכה של מעשי להטים . . . ואם אין קשר מתאים . . . הוא ממציא קשר בפלפולים
נפתלים, ואם קיימים ניגודים וסתירות ביניהם, אינו מתקשה לטשטש ולמחוק אותם . . . וכל כך
למה? משום שצריך למצוא הוכחות לתיזה שלו . . . הדברים שבעין . . . דיים כדי לערער את
בניינו . . . שהוקם בעמל רב ולהציגו כהוויתו האמיתית: מגדל הפורח באויר.