

Joseph Dweck is the Senior Rabbi of the Spanish and Portuguese Sephardi Community of the United Kingdom and the Deputy President of the London School of Jewish Studies.

## ***RUPTURE AND RECONSTRUCTION: A SEPHARDIC RESPONSE***

Professor Haym Soloveitchik’s “Rupture and Reconstruction” was at once familiar and alien to me. The contemporary Orthodox Ashkenazic world which he described with its “swing to the right,” and “the new controlling role that texts...play in contemporary religious life” over the once predominant mimetically-based behaviors was evident. But as an American Sephardic Jew, this was also a world that I did not feel a part of nor one in which I truly belonged. The Sephardic world evolved in different ways. It had not relinquished its mimetic traditions to the degree that Soloveitchik had illustrated with the Ashkenazic community. The rupture of which he spoke was not as profound amongst Sephardic Jews and we also did not share the historic catalysts of Enlightenment and Holocaust which he identified as generating and influencing the rupture he was describing. For us, it was more of a tremor—if anything. There was reverberation, upheaval, change, yes—but not rupture. In the twentieth century Sephardim were developing from a different history and towards a different future than the Ashkenazim. Still, we were no longer isolated. The last century brought the Sephardic and Ashkenazic Jews face to face, living side by side, and they influenced one another.

I am a Sephardic Jew, born in Los Angeles in the mid-seventies. As such, much of my world was and remains different from what Soloveitchik described. But his essay helped me understand *why* it was different.

*Editor’s Note: The central feature of Professor Haym Soloveitchik’s “Rupture and Reconstruction” (TRADITION, Summer 1994) was its focus on trends in Ashkenazic Orthodoxy of the twentieth century. Given Soloveitchik’s areas of scholarly focus, and the community he was describing, it could hardly have been otherwise. Our recent symposium on the twenty-fifth anniversary of the essay neglected to offer other perspectives on the issues from a less “Ashkenormative” angle. We are pleased to offer a corrective with this reflection by the Senior Rabbi of the Spanish and Portuguese Sephardi Community of the United Kingdom.*

## TRADITION

He prompted me to apply, as he had, the respective lenses of mimetic and textual authorities to the contemporary Orthodox Sephardic societies—minorities within a minority—in which I was at home.

The term “Sephardic” today stands for many rich and varied cultures and backgrounds. In the vernacular it has been reduced to refer to anyone who isn’t Ashkenazic. In its proper sense it refers to Jews whose ancestry resided in the Iberian Peninsula. In its more generic meaning it refers to Jews who come from a wide geographical range including but not limited to: Western Europe, the Middle East, and North Africa. The Sephardic perspective that I represent in this particular response may not cover all those, but I believe that it represents significant and fundamental aspects of most of them.

My personal connections lie within two distinct Sephardic communities: That of the Eastern Sephardim (particularly the Syrian Jews of New York) and that of the Western Sephardim (particularly the Spanish and Portuguese Jews of England). I write from both perspectives. Nuances of difference, both mimetic and textually based, certainly manifested differently in both the American Eastern Sephardic communities and the British Western Sephardic community. However, there is much that the both have in common in this regard that is not shared amongst our Ashkenazic brethren.

As I mentioned, Soloveitchik attributed the great rupture of religious life in the European Ashkenazic world to two fundamental factors: the effects of the Enlightenment on European Jewry and its aftermath, and the Holocaust:

In the cities there was the added struggle with secularism, all the more acute as the ground there had been eroded over the previous half century by a growing movement of Enlightenment. The defections, especially in urban areas, were massive; traditional life was severely shaken, though not shattered. How much of this life would have emerged unaltered from the emergent movements of modernity in Eastern Europe, we shall never know, as the Holocaust, among other things, wrote *finis* to a culture (70).

Enlightenment and Holocaust, the two predominant casts that forged contemporary Ashkenazic Jewry, were far less impactful upon Sephardic Jews of all varieties. For most of the Jews in the East, the cultural shifts of Enlightenment and the horrors of the Holocaust did not reach them. In the West, Spanish and Portuguese Jews had been quite accustomed to enlightened thought since the twelfth century in Andalusia, and they

continued to be regularly engaged in secular life and thought which continued with their emigrations to Amsterdam and England. Enlightenment was therefore less of a shock to their system.<sup>1</sup> The Holocaust did not reach the British Isles and thus the Jews of England were able to continue their mimetic traditions with no serious interruptions and did not experience the severing of such traditions as their fellow Jews did on the European continent. These catalysts did not cause rupture to Eastern and Anglo-Western Sephardim and it was evident in their mimetic practices and religious life.

When I was growing up there were many examples amongst Sephardim of mimetic tradition that were unaffected by stringencies that might have been influenced from textual sources. One such example is the *kippa*. Although *Shulhan Arukh* rules that one must not walk more than four *amot* without a head covering the Sephardim did not take that to mean that one must wear a *kippa* at all times. Even the most devout Sephardic laymen in my family and community did not wear a *kippa* outside of synagogue if they were not studying, praying, or eating. In fact, if what one was eating was not a sit-down meal, a sleeve, napkin, or someone else's hand was regularly used to cover one's head for the recital of the pre-blessing in order to keep the law that obligates a head covering when saying God's name.<sup>2</sup> Indeed, a generation earlier, even many of the rabbis who worked in or owned businesses often did not wear their *kippot* to work. In contrast, in typical Ashkenazic Orthodox communities not wearing a *kippa* was tantamount to being irreligious. Another example is that every Sephardic family I knew spoke between washing hands and eating bread,<sup>3</sup> an act that even among the lesser-observant Ashkenazic households is known to be prohibited by Jewish law. The Sephardim that I knew largely lit the Hanukka candles not by a window or doorway as prescribed by the legal codes, but on a table inside the house.<sup>4</sup> These practices among others were essentially identical in both Eastern and Western Sephardic communities. These were also not behaviors that the

<sup>1</sup> Clearly, the broader culture of the Middle Ages was still a religious one; modernity moved away from that. We should differentiate between a fifteenth-century Sephardi encountering Al Ghazali from his late-eighteenth-century Ashkenazi counterpart encountering Kant. Each community was exposed to "outside" ideas in different ways, and each found its own path to modernity. Generally speaking, Sephardim did not have to exit a ghetto (physical or intellectual) in order to encounter modernity, and this "softened the blow."

<sup>2</sup> On *kippa* see *Orah Hayyim* 2:6; 91:3-4.

<sup>3</sup> This was the usual practice in Rabbi Ovadia Yosef's own home; see *Orhot Maran* 12:8.

<sup>4</sup> See *Torat ha-Mo'adim*, Hanukka 3:4.

## TRADITION

rabbis urged us to change as a part of their usual encouragement towards greater observance and piety. The rabbis' reticence testifies to the strength of the mimetic culture amongst the Sephardim.

Because the majority of Eastern Sephardim did not experience the severing of tradition caused by the Holocaust, which wiped out entire Jewish communities in Europe, we brought our traditions with us when we emigrated from our home countries. We were still practicing this way of life in America and in enclaves in which the confidence and identity was markedly robust like in the Syrian community of Brooklyn or the three-hundred year old Spanish and Portuguese community in London, there was no reason to question it or recognize it as an element of laxity or impiety. The unselfconscious way of life that Soloveitchik described regarding the older European societies that had dissipated (70) was still manifest amongst the Sephardim.

We were not immune, however, to the rupture and reconstruction that was taking place amongst our Ashkenazic brethren. We were not reconstructing ourselves with textual analysis and accuracy, but we now lived in close proximity to Ashkenazic communities in Israel, America, and Britain, and we began to feel self-conscious and awkward that we were not undergoing similar processes. This self-consciousness was not entirely self-imposed. Our mimetically based traditional practices were often seen by our Ashkenazic neighbors to be a result of ignorance, a lack of piety, or both.

Enlightenment, as a major factor of this change is in itself a more complex phenomenon. And its complexity manifested among the Sephardim as well. In general, the Enlightenment, or *Haskala*, as it was known in its Jewish form, that shed a startling light upon European Jewry did so at different times and in different ways. Eastern Europe responded differently than Western Europe. The Sephardic Jews of the West in Amsterdam and England did not respond quite like their Ashkenazic neighbors. And the *Haskala* did not reach anywhere near its full intensity, and therefore did not significantly disrupt the religious life and thought of the Eastern Jews.<sup>5</sup>

It is also difficult to consider the effects of the Enlightenment upon the Western Sephardim in places like Italy, Amsterdam, and England as contributing to a rupture. The Western Sephardim were quite used to being involved in the secular world so that the Enlightenment was less shocking to them. For example, the Sephardim of England in the early

<sup>5</sup> See Marc D. Angel, *Voices in Exile* (Ktav Publishing, 1991); Zvi Zohar, *Rabbinic Creativity in the Modern Middle East* (Bloomsbury, 2013).

eighteenth century, many of whom were conversos or descendants of conversos were accustomed to engaging in secular society and thought. The *Hakham*, or chief rabbi, of the community at the time was David Nieto (1654–1728), who was a polymath and respected physician.<sup>6</sup> He was a graduate of the esteemed University of Padua and as *Hakham* he held discourse with the Archbishop of Canterbury and co-religionists of his time. He was also a strong proponent of Newtonian science.<sup>7</sup> The *Hakham* himself was an enlightened scholar as were many of his Western Sephardic contemporaries in Amsterdam and Italy. Enlightenment was a tremor, not a rupture for Western Sephardim. Neither the Reform movement nor, in an opposite vein, Hasidism emerged from amongst the Western Sephardic Jews. Writings such as those of the Italian born Rabbi Moshe Haim Luzzatto (1707-1746) bore great sensitivity to the changes in religious climate due to enlightened thought. He endeavored to write systematic treatments of Jewish thought and philosophy for the layman in the form of his *Derekh Hashem* (authored in Amsterdam) as well as three morality plays, in vogue at the time, in order to infuse religious values into the hearts of the intellectual community.

The same cannot be said, however, for the Eastern Sephardim of that time or after. While there was some influence of European culture, predominantly French, in the Ottoman Empire, the impact did not pervasively penetrate or challenge the religious establishment.<sup>8</sup> The shockwaves of *Haskala* simply did not hit the Orient as it so definitively did in the West, and so there was no impetus to adjust their intellectual systems or their approach to Torah study and instruction. This did allow for the perpetuation of a prominent thread of superstition that ran throughout society in the Eastern communities,<sup>9</sup> which Soloveitchik highlighted as a

<sup>6</sup> Heinrich Graetz writes concerning Jewish life in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries: “[There was] hardly a person commanding respect who could worthily represent Judaism... Few rabbis occupied themselves with any branch of study beyond the Talmud, or entered on a new path in this study. The exceptions can be counted. Rabbi David Nieto, of London was a man of culture. He was a physician, understood mathematics, was sufficiently able to defend Judaism against calumnies...and wrote much that was reasonable”; *History of the Jews* (JPS, 1895), vol. 5, 200.

<sup>7</sup> David B. Ruderman, *Jewish Enlightenment in an English Key* (Princeton University Press, 2000), 185–188. My thanks to R. Shalom Morris for bringing this volume to my attention.

<sup>8</sup> Angel, *Voices in Exile*, 159.

<sup>9</sup> An element identified as a key contrasting detail between “enlightened” Western and “unenlightened” Eastern Sephardim by Rabbi Shemtob Gaguine, Ecclesiastical Head of the Spanish and Portuguese community in England during the 1930s and ‘40s. For example, see his *Keter Shem Tob*, vol. 1, 576.

## TRADITION

hallmark of the mimetic way of life that had been prevalent in the old communities of Eastern Europe (75–76).

The absence of *Haskala* in the Eastern communities left deep and penetrating consequences in the twentieth century, when the aftermath of the “rupture and reconstruction” of the Ashkenazic world would meet with, and impinge upon, the unaffected and, as a result, vulnerable and underdeveloped Eastern Sephardic Jews upon their arrival in the West.

Meanwhile, as the Western Sephardic Jewish community of England carried on, its lack of religious rupture was a double-edged sword. By the 1970s the openness and comfort of their condition also contributed in no small part to the loss of many of its families through intermarriage. Membership was waning, children of past members were either not joining synagogues or were not even halakhically Jewish. If not for an influx of Iraqi Jewish immigrants and refugees along with other Eastern Jewish families during the fifties, sixties, and seventies due to the hostility in Arab lands at the establishment of the State of Israel and then the Six-Day War, the community might well have collapsed. There was a relaxing of standards for these new Eastern Jews. Amongst the Spanish and Portuguese there was a time when no individual who was not a descendant of that community would be allowed membership. Such luxuries, however, could no longer be afforded. There were nonetheless demands that the newly arrived Eastern Jews relinquish their own traditions and take on all the customs and practices of the Spanish and Portuguese congregation. And so the community continued virtually uninterrupted in their customs and ways—albeit with a new constituent cohort.

In Israel, however, there was now greater upheaval for the Sephardic Jews. Those who had lived in Israel before the establishment of the State, as well as those who arrived from Arab lands afterwards due to persecution because of the existence of the State, were subject to prejudice, ridicule, and disrespect by both the secular Ashkenazim who founded the State and the Ashkenazic Orthodox religious leaders who began to rebuild and establish—indeed to “reconstruct”—academies of Torah study and religious institutions. The Sephardic Jews from the Middle East and North Africa, having not gone through the Enlightenment, were misunderstood by the Ashkenazim and sadly seen as unsophisticated, uneducated, unworldly, and uncouth. Their Torah scholarship was not recognized as significant and their customs and ways were seen as foreign and not recognizably Jewish. This stigma introduced a profound sense of shame and self-consciousness among Sephardic Jews.

Contemporaneously, in America, both the Ashkenazic and Sephardic immigrants were challenged with finding their way in a new and unfamiliar country. However, the Ashkenazim with their European background came with the advantage of a familiarity with Western culture unlike the Jews who arrived from the Middle East and North Africa. As a result, the Eastern Jews who arrived on American shores had a greater learning curve in their attempts to align religious life with Western practices. Additionally, the new proximity and intermingling with their Ashkenazic brethren in the New World eventually led to Sephardic self-consciousness and a gradual shift in Sephardic communities towards a more “Ashkenaziesque” way of religious life, which was, as Soloveitchik writes, swinging to the right and “well on its way to being, if it had not already become, the dominant mode of religiosity” (74).

This mainly occurred when it came to religious education and schooling. The textual authority was stressed in the Jewish day schools and yeshivot which were predominantly established and led by Ashkenazim. The sheer outnumbering of Ashkenazim to Sephardim meant that a great majority of all religious schools and institutions were built and led by Ashkenazic rabbis and lay leaders. An education in line with Sephardic tradition was virtually unavailable outside the mimetic reserve that was the Sephardic home and synagogue. Even the handful of institutions and day schools that had been established, while governed by Sephardic lay leaders as trustees, were not predominantly led by Sephardic educators and mentors.<sup>10</sup> This fact held true for the vast majority of yeshivot and schools in America and Israel. By the 1970s Ashkenazic hegemony over Torah education and Jewish life was the dominant paradigm of the Orthodox world.

The Western Sephardim of England, however, carried on in their usual fashion. They were neither self-conscious nor troubled by the developing trend towards the religious right that was occurring around them. One reason for this was that the Spanish and Portuguese Jewish community saw themselves as the aristocracy of Anglo Jewry. They had already undergone an acculturation two centuries earlier, and since that time had not been significantly challenged. The fact that others were becoming more stringently religious or that practice was changing around them did not affect them because their practice had always differed from the Ashkenazim. In this rare case, as contrasted with the other Sephardic communities of the contemporary world, they, not the Ashkenazim, were

<sup>10</sup> At this time Sephardic students were not largely encouraged by their own communities to become educators or rabbis which meant that there were few Sephardim who could fill the teaching positions.

## TRADITION

the “establishment” and founders of Anglo Jewry. They had no qualms regarding their own way and practice. Yet, while they might not have felt self-conscious about their own practice, there was a growing sentiment amongst the Orthodox Jews outside the Spanish and Portuguese community who saw the Spanish and Portuguese as bordering on Masorti/Conservative Judaism or “Orthodox-Lite” rather than strictly observant.

The Sephardic world was drawn towards a new center of gravity and overwhelmingly succumbed to the neo-Ashkenazic world that Soloveitchik describes. Still, in this shift towards textual authority and concomitant stringency, emerged a response from within the Sephardic world that answered the textual foundations of the Ashkenazim but did not follow the stringency that it seemed to necessitate. During the 1980s, Rabbi Ovadia Yosef, Sephardic Chief Rabbi of Israel, answered the textually based move towards stringency with a call towards leniency using textual authority as his basis.<sup>11</sup> In fact, there are few *posekim* who have so comprehensively and thoroughly used written sources to such an extent in the substance of their legal rulings. Yet, his approach was not accuracy towards stringency, but rather diversity of textual sources for leniency. He drew on an older principle that he identified as being particularly espoused as a central value and aspect of Sephardic halakhic tradition emphasizing the pragmatic and human-centric: the legal value of finding leniency in the law— *koha de-hetera adif*.<sup>12</sup> R. Ovadia’s encyclopedic knowledge of texts and deep understanding of the dynamics of Jewish law afforded him the ability to do so.

In the Orthodox world of stringent textual focus, R. Ovadia provided access to practical law that was adorned with a markedly lenient tenor through a meaningful, text-based framework. He also provided, for so many Sephardic Jews worldwide, a renewal of pride and confidence in their uniqueness and integrity of their halakhic traditions in the face of their Ashkenazic brethren. Yet, his approach did affect the mimetic aspects of Sephardic life. Customs of many Sephardic Jews gave way in the light of the authority of R. Ovadia’s vast halakhic rulings to a more uniform,

<sup>11</sup> For example see *Yabi’a Omer*, vol. 2, paragraph 11. Later in that responsum he records his basis: “I will say without hesitation, that [regarding] one who rules stringently to others (in laws that have been treated leniently by the *Shulhan Arukh*), it is bad enough that they have proclaimed what is permitted to be prohibited, but he [with such an approach] will also end up saying that what is prohibited is permitted.”

<sup>12</sup> See *Berakhot* 60a. Maimonides wrote unequivocally in this tenor: “We have explained that it is fitting to permit to all people everything which is possible to permit, and we must not burden them”; *Iggerot ha-Rambam* (Mossad HaRav Kook, 1994), 393.

textual accuracy and many Sephardic Jews abandoned traditional practices that their families had been accustomed to for generations in adherence of his rulings.<sup>13</sup> It is not an exaggeration to say that there was no force which exerted as much influence over pan-Sephardic practice as that of R. Ovadia Yosef. Yet, while the revolution of R. Ovadia and his leadership added much to the pride and self-confidence of Sephardic Jewry worldwide, it did not block the strong effects of the shifting and overwhelming influence of the Ashkenazic reconstruction of contemporary Orthodoxy from permeating the Sephardic world.

In our own day, the Orthodox world continues to “swing to the right” and still greater emphasis is placed on textual authority, accuracy, and uniform practice. There are many Sephardic Jews who have completely embraced the new milieu established by the Ashkenazic world and, having been fully educated in Ashkenazic yeshivot and schools, many Sephardim in America, Israel, and Europe have come to know the Ashkenazic way as the only way. We have espoused their norms of dress and their mode of religious thought and practice. The traditional way of Sephardic Orthodox life is becoming something of an endangered species. The reverberations of the Ashkenazic rupture are now strongly radiating throughout many Sephardic communities.

To be sure, in the Sephardic world, mimetic tradition is still practiced, although it has been diluted, and this is evident in the diversity of customs across individual sub-communities. There is, for example, nothing like the Artscroll siddur in Sephardic liturgy. Ashkenazic practice was uniform enough that from 1984, when the Artscroll siddur was first published, it became a mainstay in Ashkenazic synagogues around the world. By contrast, the recent Sephardic Artscroll siddur, published only in 2019, struggles to incorporate all the different customs and nuances that still exist amongst the Sephardic communities whose members descend from the Middle East and North Africa (they did not even attempt to incorporate the customs and liturgy of the Western Sephardim into the siddur).<sup>14</sup>

<sup>13</sup> R. Ovadia believed that in Israel uniformity of practice under the rulings of Rabbi Yosef Karo (1488–1575), author of the *Shulhan Arukh*, should be considered binding as he deemed R. Karo as the *Mara De’atra*—the accepted rabbinic authority of the region. For a thorough treatment of R. Yosef’s approach to the rulings of R. Yosef Karo see Binyamin Lau, *Mi-Maran ad Maran: The Halachic Philosophy of Rav Ovadia Yosef* [Hebrew] (Yediot Aharonoth Books, 2005), esp. 248–254, and the review by Jeffrey Saks in *TRADITION* 40:2 (2007), 96–101.

<sup>14</sup> The best attempt at integrating all Sephardic customs into one siddur that I have seen is the edition by Koren Publishers (2012), edited and annotated by Rabbi Hanan Benayahu.

## TRADITION

It is possible that if we are to preserve mimetic tradition at all in Orthodox Judaism it might be worth taking a closer look at the Sephardim.

The Sephardic world has had its own experiences with rupture and reconstruction. Maimonides saw the dismantling of the great yeshivot of Spain and the tradition that he grew up with in early twelfth-century Cordova all but erased. Six hundred years later David Nieto found himself at the helm of a congregation of Spanish and Portuguese conversos—a whole Jewish community driven underground and all but nullified by the Inquisition and Spanish expulsion of 1492. In response he composed among other works *Match Dan*, a dialectic following the form of R. Yehuda HaLevi's *Kuzari* which sought to establish the validity, authority, and nature of rabbinic law and oral tradition in Judaism. The approach of these rabbis and many Sephardim like them was not to move away from mimetic tradition and focus on textual accuracy and authority, but rather to teach principles. Their approach focused predominantly on *why* we do what we do and *how* to think, rather than *what* we do. They believed in reconstructing frameworks as precursors to practice.

Today text and information reign supreme in all sectors of society. Google brings practically any information we wish to our fingertips. We have a surplus of data and text. What we do not readily have is *context*. Sephardim maintained the context of mimetic tradition and way of life—which, as Soloveitchik wrote, “is not learned but absorbed...imbibed from parents and friends, and patterned on conduct regularly observed in home and street, synagogue and school” (70). Sephardim traditionally sought to reconstruct that context of a lived tradition through teaching principles.

Today we are witnessing a rupture of society at large. So many of the paradigms, systems, standards, and frameworks that the world had been accustomed to for centuries have either been deconstructed or are being seriously questioned. In such a world, where do custom, heritage, culture, and identity find a place—if we are to assume they have a place at all.? It can no longer be in mimetic tradition alone. Nor is it in the textual study of information. To rely on either exclusively in today's world would be to succumb to living in the extremes, much in the manner that contemporary society at large is being pulled—be it in politics, social groups, or religion. The center is being erased everywhere. And, as Rabbi Efreim Goldberg points out in *TRADITION*'s symposium, “the center must hold.”<sup>15</sup> Yet, never before has the center been so truly difficult to hold. For the center to hold, we must teach principles. We must offer *systems* of thought

<sup>15</sup> *TRADITION* 51:4 (2019), 46–52.

that can be used as a multifaceted, sophisticated lens through which we can assess and evaluate our responses to a world that is developing and changing at lightning speed and increasingly deconstructing into data points waiting to be valued. This approach is not new, and is one that has been used by Sephardim such as Maimonides,<sup>16</sup> Nieto, and Luzzatto<sup>17</sup> in a conscious attempt to deal with breakdowns that they identified in Jewish society which bore similarities to the one we address now.<sup>18</sup>

The Jewish people are no longer living in their respective ethnic silos. The world at large is rapidly globalizing and comprehensively redefining itself, and our people are not immune to this. In this milieu it is not simply a question of retention of heritage regarding various unique approaches to religious life, but a question of how, in the great interconnections and interactions of populations of which we are a part, will the various Jewish cultures and communities bring their unique aspect of heritage and cultural knowledge and experience to the Jewish table and offer it as a contribution to the great tapestry that is being woven from the myriad threads of Jewish experiences throughout two millennia of diaspora. Principles do not focus on information per se, but rather provide tools for valuing information. The Sephardic communities had and have a unique framework for viewing Jewish life. I believe it is a core responsibility of Jewish leaders today to teach these principles much in the fashion that the Sephardic rabbis I've mentioned did, as we face the aftermath of rupture and an uncertain future.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>16</sup> "In my major work which is called *Mishne Torah* ... I also listed all the religious and legal roots... I wished to have all this established on religious principles"; *Iggerot ha-Rambam*, 72–73. "It is more precious in my eyes to teach a fundamental principle of the religion than any other thing I will teach"; *Mishna with Commentary of Rambam* (Mossad HaRav Kook, 1995 [8<sup>th</sup> edition]), 53, vol. 1.

<sup>17</sup> Introduction to *Derekh Hashem; Iggerot Pithei Hokhama va-Da'at*, #1–2 (Friedlander Publishing, 1989), 361–362.

<sup>18</sup> I address this in greater depth in "How Best to Respond to Theological and Philosophical Misconceptions About Judaism in the 21st Century Based on Three Principle Historical Examples" (MA Thesis, London School of Jewish Studies, 2016), available at [www.sephardi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/Dissertation.MA\\_JD\\_.pdf](http://www.sephardi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/Dissertation.MA_JD_.pdf)

<sup>19</sup> I am grateful to Rabbi Dr. Abraham Levy OBE, Emeritus Spiritual Head of the Spanish and Portuguese Congregations of the UK, Rabbi Dr. Raphael Zarum, Dean of the London School of Jewish Studies, Rabbi Harold Sutton, Rosh Yeshiva of Magen David Yeshiva of Brooklyn, NY, and Mrs. Lauren Grunsfeld for their comments and insights on this essay.