

Vom Schem Hamphoras (5)

101. If the Jews had ears or eyes, so that they could hear and see, then it would be easy to tell them and show them, that more than one Book constitutes the Holy Scriptures, and that the Old Testament cannot be alone, although they concern themselves thoroughly and interpret with Moses and the Prophets and yet do not understand them. For they must admit that the Messiah has been promised in the Holy Writ. Therefore, when he comes, he will not be dumb and lame, but will talk and do better than Moses, David, Solomon, and all prophets talked and did. A book will develop from such talk and deeds. For he will let it be written just as Moses recorded his sermons and deeds, Isaiah his, and so forth. The book about the Messiah will be much better, holier, and gorgeous than Moses and the entire Old Testament, for the Messiah is not alone holy, as Moses and the Prophets, but the most holy of all the prophets as the prophet of all the prophets must be. Therefore, his book must be the most sacred of all the many books in the Bible.

102. We damned Goyim did not invent this, for Moses clearly and distinctly declared this to his people, namely that another book of the Holy Scriptures was yet to come and which they were to accept. For this is what he said Deut. 18:15. (as mentioned): "God will send you a prophet from among your brethren, like myself, listen to him." (60) I hope the Jews, however poisonous mean worms they are, can certainly not say that we invented this passage. Now let us hear the words, we do not want to add anything from our own mind, as they are to drag into Scriptures their mad, crazy comments.

103. Moses does not speak of his person in that place, how he was born of his father, but speaks of his position, how he was called and awakened by God to be a prophet; he wants to say: as God has wakened me from among your brethren to be a prophet, so he will again awaken another prophet from among your brethren. This other prophet cannot be Samuel, David, Elia, Elijah, Isaiah or any other who occurred in the Old Testament; for they were all under Moses, taught what Moses (a prophet of God) ordered and promised or announced, that is, circumcision, the Ten Commandments, the laws of the priesthood, nobility, of the services to God, the temple and whatever was to be taught the people from the substance and parts of the Old Testament, outside of that which Moses had ordered and predicted.

104. If this other prophet is expected to do with his prophecy what Moses did, then he must establish other commandments, laws, and rights, a different priesthood, nobility, divine service, temple and rules. Should he, however, reach nothing other than what Moses taught, then it would be Moses himself or one of the old prophets who were under Moses and would not be like him. What did Moses do that he promises with

useless words, "God will arouse another prophet like himself and they shall listen to him"? Even better he said then: when that prophet comes then you shall listen to me, that is, my prophecy. But now he lets go of his mastery, position and prophecy and transfers them to that other prophet and says: "You shall listen to him." For that they should listen to Moses and his prophets drove him earlier, and later drove all prophets, to disgust.

105. This also is proven by the fact that he introduced God himself, who says in 5 Mos. 18:18: "I will place my words in his mouth, so that he will preach what I shall tell him." (61) These words and sermons must be words and sermons differing from Moses' word and sermon; for they shall be future and not yet existing expressions while the words of Moses, placed into the mouth of Moses about forty years earlier at Mt. Sinai, were also written by Moses. That is why Moses defended himself against the disagreeable Jews and let it be known that he plainly enough announced to them that another book, holier than his, will come through another prophet and that another priesthood, divine service, people and law will be founded.

106. Accordingly, all prophets together with Moses announced in agreement with one another, that the Messiah shall be a Prophet and Priest, who will institute another sermon, as Moses proclaimed here. Isa. 2:3, Mich. :2. Many heathens will say: "Let us go up to the House of the Lord, that he teach us his ways; for a law will go forth from Zion, and the Word of the Lord from Jerusalem." (62) Do you realise from this that it did not arise like the law and the word of Moses, but that it is to arise in the future and will be a new and different word? Isa. 61, 1: "The Spirit of the Lord in upon me, therefore he has anointed me (made me Messiah of the Anointed One) for I am to preach the gospel to the wretched, to heal the sorrowful hearts." Ps. 110, 4: "You are forever a priest, according to the manner of Melchizedek." Zech. 9, 10: "He will preach peace from one sea to another, until the end of the world." Isa. 9:6: "He will be a prince of peace." That is what Zechariah also says in 9:10, "Put away horse and wagon," and Isaiah 11:4, "rule without the sword."

107. If he should rule without the sword, and still maintain peace and keep it, then he will not be a king like David and all other kings (who cannot rule without a sword), nor teach their worldly laws, so that his kingdom must be an entirely different kingdom than a worldly kingdom, which is nothing without the sword and his law is nothing, and can have no peace. Even where he should be a priest, preacher and prophet, who shall reign in peace, how can he wait for such a rule, which has no peace, and must have such far-fetched law, but no eternal peace, as the prophets say of him? Israel had peace under Solomon, but only partially so, so that they themselves let it be known that he despoiled and impoverished them; nevertheless, it was no eternal peace. Therefore, it must be different with these other prophets, than with Moses, all prophets, and kings in this world and still remains, or Moses must be a liar with all his prophets. He should not be

like other prophets or kings, that is what the Holy Scriptures of the Old Testament assert; that is why his book, the New Testament, must be a different and a higher testament than the Old Testament.

108. No one is so stupid and senseless as to confirm all of this from Moses and the prophets as in Jeremiah 31:31, for he has too much contempt for these learned, full of shit, (circumcised) saints, and may without permission dismiss all Talmudists and Rabbis (oh that the worst shall be their lot) and say: "See the time will come, says the Lord, that I shall make a new covenant with the house of Israel." (63) Oh, Jeremiah, keep going, where will you end? You do not know how the Rabbis, after 2,000 years are so clever with their comments, which are better than your clear text. Shall a new covenant and testament come? What will become of the old? What will become of the circumcised saints, who do not want to know or tolerate more, not even from Christians, the damned Goyim, than the old? Should you be so courageous as to throw away Moses with the entire holy old scriptures and with it the Talmudists, and the high and super scholarly saints, so that you can prophecy in front of them about a new book and testament?

109. And, what is even worse, you impudent heretic, allow yourself to say: "Not as the covenant was, which I had made with their fathers, as I led them out of Egypt." Oh, Lord, God! Mercy on you, God, you poor Jeremiah, how could you become so mad, that you abolish the old covenant, which was surely made by God himself, as you admit yourself and say: "which I made with their fathers"; mentions the time with it, as if you were not mad, "as I took them by the hand and led them out of Egypt." Well, you are beyond help, you want to be damned by the circumcised saints; so I do not want to beg for you, nor interpret your words otherwise (which I couldn't do anyway), for the circumcised saints cannot tolerate it, it would bring things from bad to worse.

110. But here the super-learned Jews hand us damned goyim a most painful defeat as they write, our Jesus said himself, Matth. 5:17: "He did not come to abolish the law and the prophets, but to fulfil it, for not a single letter nor particle shall be lost, for heaven and earth shall be lost before this would happen etc. " (64) There you have it you damned Goyim. Well, now, who would have ever believed that the Jews are so learned that they could even teach us Christians the New Testament? No doubt a bronze dog in Jerusalem made them so smart with his barking, or a fresh Sham Haperes (vulture) with a lot of smoke, (I meant to say spirit) fulfilled them so that they understand so excellently what it means to fulfil the law.

111. Oh, dear...! the miserable Jews have not known all their lives what the least law even is, let alone what the fulfilment of the law is, and cannot (as long as they are such Jews) ever understand it. Other kinds of folks belong here, such as St. Paul, Romans, 3:21: "God's justice is revealed, and witnessed through the law and the prophets," and Joh. 1:17: "The law was given through Moses; but grace and truth came through Jesus

Christ"; St. Peter, Apost. 15:10, 11: "That is the burden, which neither we nor our fathers could have born, instead we believe we will be saved through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, just as they were." Better tell me how it is possible that the scamps (I meant to say Rabbis) and Sow Jews in their Sow school should understand such great words, when all their lives they did nothing more than to burrow in the Shom Haperes (vultures) with their tusks.

112. I want to say less, for how can a Jew understand what has been said in Matth. 7:12: "What you want people to do to you, do it also to them; that is the law and the prophets." Here almost all of Moses' laws go to ruin. Matth. 22:37: "Love your neighbour as yourself; that commandment is as the first: you shall love God with all your heart. In these two commandments are wrapped up the whole law and the prophets." (65) Moses evidently understood it as he said 2 Mos. 34:6: "Lord, lord, compassionate God, who forgives sin and no one is innocent before you," and David, Ps. 13:3: "Lord, where you look upon sin, who can remain before you?" Ps. 5:8: "See, you love the truth in the hidden, and teach me the hidden wisdom." Here, Jeremiah also says: he does not want to write the new covenant in stone tablets, like the other covenant which never entered the mortal heart of a Jew, and which he never understood, and kept even less; as Jeremiah says (Cap. 31, 32) : "They did not keep that covenant," instead he wanted to write the new covenant in living tablets, upon the hearts so that it would be with living burning letters, so that God's will be done.

113. Now, one must of course speak of and write a book about such a living scripture, written on the heart, just as Moses had to write a book concerning the scriptures on the stone tablets; for less and less will occur in secret as the New Testament has its effect on the hearts upon which it is written, as compared to that testament that is written in stone tablets but not on the hearts. Of course, those of us who are true Christians know all about this; for even the Pope with his church knows nothing of this and gives it no heed. The Jews know about as much about this as a sow knows of the Book of Psalms.

114. From this it is certainly proved that a New Testament was destined to supersede the old one, so that the pride and fame of the Jews is nothing but a crying shame, as they will not permit any testament nor holy scripture to supersede the old one. But it won't help them; their own Old Testament is against them, damns them with their reputation, because its prophecy is so weak, for the old covenant won't do it, the reign of Moses is finished, and the Messiah will not govern according to it, for the New Testament will do it. That is why Moses relinquishes his office and leaves room for the new prophet. That is why the Jews must accept the New Testament, baptism and our belief or they are lost forever. The Old Testament, Moses himself and all the prophets cannot help them but are opposed to them and relegate them to Hell.

115. Here the question arises again as to whether the Messiah did come. If he came, then Jews, heathens and all the world are obliged to accept the New Testament, not

only as a sacred scripture, but the most holy writ superseding the old holy writ. Now it has been sufficiently proved that the Messiah came about 1,500 years ago; so we Christians, and first several thousand children of Israel, thereafter many heathens, accepted the New Testament 1,500 years ago and will continue to accept it until the end of the world; but the dregs, the other Israelites they won't accept it, they hold such a negligible thing in contempt. They have despised the food and disputed all joy, all because of great arrogance and stubbornness; then they wanted to be insulted and grunt because they found nothing in their hunger. Is it tolerable that they should brag and pride themselves that they alone, in all the world, have the holy Scripture, when in fact they do not have one page, not one letter of it, as far as the understanding is concerned, for use and good of the soul; we are not concerned with the physical body or its uses. For what they look for in the scriptures, that they will never find; it is not there, nor was it ever in there, as little as in the most worthless book made on this earth. The Messiah is predicted in it, but not the Messiah they want and about whom they dream.

116. We Christians, however, have both books of the Holy Scriptures, the old and sacred, and in addition, the new and most sacred. The old predicts the Messiah and says: he shall surely come and will be given. The new calls and says: he certainly has come and was given. If the Jews could now accept the new Book, the most holy scriptures, as so many did 1,400 years ago, then they would surely understand that circumcision and all old holiness must yield to baptism and the new holiness which is greater than all other holiness. For at the time that the Messiah and his book were still stuck in the old book, that is, in the promise, there was evidently no other holy scripture than the old book, in whose promise all saints who hoped for such a promised Messiah were saved. For he is the one and the only Messiah, who was promised to them but came and appeared to us, so that no other can be expected nor come.

117. After, however, the Messiah published this book and gave it to us, there is no need to wait for any further promises. Just as the old book is now a form of witness for God, that the Messiah was to have come, so the new book is so much more a witness of God, now that the Messiah has come. Thus, the two Cherubim (66) facing each other in the Chair of Grace, that is, the Old and New Testament, say that Jesus Christ, the son of Mary, is the Saviour of the world and the right Chair of Grace before God, against our sin, death, Devil and Hell. Therefore, it is fulfilled as it has been said: "Israel shall live in safety," when the last Jews seek to interpret as the end of time.

118. Since, however, the Jews refuse to accept this, they have neither the old nor the new book, neither God the provider nor Messiah the deliverer, are suspended between heaven and earth, touch down nowhere, do not meet either the old or the new book, as Zechariah 5:1 (67) showed the flying letter which he called maledictio, curse; for their lessons are boastful cursing; otherwise they truly know nothing about the scriptures. In

the first place, it is sure that they do not know the promises of the Messiah. Furthermore, they do not understand the Ten Commandments, because, without Messiah, they cannot be understood. In the third place, they cannot understand what the ceremonies mean. In addition, because the priesthood has disappeared, they also do not well understand the origin of the ceremonies. In the fourth place, no Jew understands the noble, precious examples of the lives of the fathers, Adam, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, David, all told, the whole people of Israel. For they do not know what true belief, true good works, are. This is proved by their blind, mad, miserable Talmud companions, their commentaries and finally their grammar. That is why they have nothing more from the Old Testament. It says: "I am the light," (says Messiah, Joh. 8:12) where that is not so, what else can there be there except only darkness? (68)

119. This should be said in answering in a dull and crude fashion the stiffnecked Jews and their prickly, poisonous question, namely that 1 Mos. 49:10 and 5 Mos. 18:15 powerfully prove, and with him all prophets together and sufficiently, that Mary was and must be the mother of Messiah from the tribe of Judah and the house of David. If they will not believe Moses, then they'll believe the apostles less. Furthermore, such an answer is certain and good enough for us Christians, as said, the son Messiah must come from David, and we believe in addition that his mother was virgin, in which case she must be David's flesh and blood and natural daughter: otherwise, her son Messiah could not be David but of a different breed, because his mother would be of a different blood, although it is curious that she, Mary, had to bear (a child) without any man's blood and flesh.

120. Through this evidence in the Old Testament we shall now see the New Testament and how richly and powerfully it proves the same thing, i.e., that Mary must be David's daughter. First, St. Matthew, 1:1 begins his book, "This is the book about the birth of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham." Here you are told that Jesus Christ or the Messiah is the son of David and the son of Abraham; therefore, his mother must be the daughter of David and Abraham, because she is a virgin who bore without a man as is proved by the apostle. And if St. Matthew had not written another word about this, except this opening of his book, then that would have been enough proof that Mary must be of the House of David. For the son, Messiah, proves where the mother comes from, not the mother (as the mad Jews seek) where the son comes from, or that he is of the tribe of Judah. Now the apostle carries this to the extreme, and counts three times fourteen generations since Abraham, those are two hundred and forty generations, so that one could say for each generation: his daughter is Mary and Jesus is his son, as he is David's and Abraham's son; so that Matthew acknowledges forty-two times in the course of the generations that Mary is of the tribe of Judah and the flower of David. And, to sum it up, as often as Jesus is called the Messiah in the Old and the New Testament, that is how often Mary, his mother, is proved to be the daughter of David.

121. However, since many are concerned why the apostle turns to those words in the last paragraphs, he derives Joseph, places Miriam, whom he cannot derive in a straight line from David as he derives Joseph: here we ought (if we know nothing else) honour the Holy Ghost and think that Matthew knew the relatives of Mary very well at Nazareth, because he knows Joseph, her husband so well and considered him a friend, and it is unbelievable that he should testify forty-two times that Christ is David's son in a straight line of the generations, and that still the mother came from a foreign tribe, as if he had become mad and dull minded in the extreme.

122. Nevertheless, we want to take a look at the words of the apostle and see if he too can derive Miriam from David as well as Joseph. It is certain that St. Matthew derives the line through Solomon and St. Luke through his brother Nathan; those are two lines, through one relationship as two brothers, from David; for in King Joash they come together, and must come together in one line because 2 Chron. 22:9, 10 says that Athaliah killed all royal seed except for Joash, and as the text states: "There was no one of the house of Ahasja who would become king." Here ends the line of Solomon so that Christ could come of his blood; according to the line of the brothers and fathers, but not from the posterity of his body, but, as Luke says, from Nathan, his brother.

123. Whether the two apostles separate these lines from one another later, I will not explain now; it is certain that they remain in the House of David; but when it comes to the grandfather of Joseph they agree, for both agree upon Matthan or as Luke calls him, Matthes. I noticed that he was called Matthan according to the Grammar but Matthes according to ordinary laymen's language, just as we Germans derive from Johannan, Hans, Hansel, and Renno; or Nicolaus, Nickel, Claus, etc. We Germans pronounce the name Matthes plain and right, as it is written in Hebrew, Matthath, Thaf raphato [the weak letter Thaf] (69) et A puro vel Italico (that is with a--~ that has been augmented with Raphe and with a clear and Italian A). (70)

124. Let us note this Matthes, everything depends on him, for there is where the blood of Abraham and David comes close to the Messiah, almost in the last house. For up to the house of this Matthes, Messiah came from up above, and we certainly have him in this house; for he must come from this house alone, it is insignificant and whatever comes from the houses of brothers or cousins is placed in the rear, they do not concern us, he is in the house of Matthew. Even if we had nothing more than this Matthew, then we would still have more than enough to answer those who are concerned how Mary and Joseph could have been from one tribe and one House. Because the Messiah is in the House of Matthes, and must come from the House of Matthes, the apostle has thereby clearly and obviously proved that both Mary and Joseph must not only come from the tribe of Judah and the House of David but also from one house of Matthew, the grandfather of Joseph; because the Messiah must come from the house of Matthes. If the Messiah is in the House of Matthes, then his mother must certainly also be of it, as

the one who, a virgin, and of the House of Matthes, David and Abraham, shall bear the Messiah. For in whatever house the Messiah may be, his mother Mary must certainly be there before, (as was said above) which shows that she is a virgin and has no husband; it is achieved by the virginity which leads the Messiah with his mother from all fathers to himself.

125. What was the shortcoming which prevented St. Matthew from proving to us that Mary and Joseph are of one tribe and one house and father? The shortcoming lay in the fact that we did not notice from which father the Messiah came, and that his mother must be in the same one, because she shall be a virgin, and cannot acknowledge that her child stems from any human other than herself and her, father. That Hieronymus, Lyra and others write that it will have to be proved that Mary and Joseph are of the same origin and that he took her in marriage according to the Law of Moses, 4 Mos. 36:6, 7, (71) so that the possessions would not be separated into strange tribes, that is far too indifferent and too unimportant and also too far in the past and looking to supersede David and yet does not help at all; just as Burgensis justly and correctly rejects this. Why did we not investigate this Matthes? then we would have gotten a lot closer to this, so close that it could not have been closer.

126. Because the Messiah must come from the House of Matthes and from nowhere else, let us see what comes from that House. First, his son Jacob comes from there, as Matthew writes. The Messiah does not come from the house of this Jacob, hasn't been included either, for his son, Joseph, comes from it. Mary cannot as yet come from it, nor be his daughter, although she is in it with her son the Messiah; otherwise, Joseph would have taken his father's sister or his grandfather's natural daughter, which God, through Moses, prohibited. 3 Mos. 18:12. It could even less be another daughter of Matthes, who became the mother of the Messiah, so it must be alone Mary, For the daughters leave the houses of the fathers for other houses, that is why the scripture does not regard the female line. Therefore, Matthes must at least have one son, from whom the Messiah comes and this Eli, as Luke writes. He begot a daughter, Maria Jacobi, and she is not the one; and thereafter a younger daughter, Maria, she is the one. If he had more sons and daughters, it would make no difference; for the Messiah must come from a virgin, the daughter of Eli.

127. Here we now have the mother of the Messiah, she is a sibling of Joseph, and both are grandchildren of one grandfather, Matthes. Therefore, it has been sufficiently proven that Mary and Joseph are of the same tribe and lineage, while she is a grandfather's grandchild, the children of two brothers, and could not be closer unless they were physical brothers and sister. Through Moses it was permitted in this people, that siblings could marry one another, that is, a grandfather could associate his two grandchildren or two brothers could do this with their children among this people, so that the apostle calls Joseph Mary's husband and Mary the bride of Joseph; as if he meant to say:

because you have heard that Joseph is Mary's husband, you knew her well enough to know that according to common usage those of one lineage are siblings.

128. Thus, the apostle brought the Messiah, his mother with him, from the beginning through all the houses of the patriarchs to Matthes' house then to Eli's house and from there to Joseph's house, where he was born and educated; not of his body, but of the body of his wedded wife, or in his married state, and Messiah is his legal son, and Joseph his legal father, but only from the virgin Mary. Since we are aware that Joseph and Mary are the grandchildren of the great patriarch Matthes, we have enough evidence and are certain that Mary is with Joseph of the House of David. Whoever wants to quibble about the two brothers Jacob and Eli, as to whether Jacob took his brother's daughter Mary and gave her to his son Joseph, or whether Eli took his brother's son, Joseph, and gave him to his daughter Mary, he may do so; it is enough for us that they, the two fathers of Joseph and Mary, were the sons of Matthes.

129. That Hieronymous writes that according to the lineage of St. Matthew Jacob is the natural father of Joseph while according to Luke's lineage, it is Eli whom he also calls Eliakin and Joakim (for all three are regarded as one name as Nicolaus, Nickel, Claus), who is his father, that is, his father-in-law or cousin, in the sense that the daughter's husband is called son, and the son's wife is called daughter, and according to the law that a brother must permit the children of his deceased brother [to] call him father and be one.⁽⁷³⁾ That pleases me a good deal, and better than Eusebius with Lyra, who believes Jacob took his brother Eli's widow and begot Joseph with her. In that event, Mary and Joseph, (Joakim or Eli's daughter) would be mother, children and natural siblings, which Moses would not tolerate, 3 Mos. 18, 6.

130. Here the old question arises: Which one of the apostles among the two, Matthew and Luke, describes the paternal line, since it is obvious that Matthew, as is proved above, followed the fraternal line from Salomon down to Ochosias. First, one must let go of Lyram and his part in this, with their opinion, for they go too far afield, for he holds that Nathan was not the natural son of David, but of the prophet (who would have been as old as David himself) and came from Uriah and Bethsaba together with the other brothers, Simea and Sobab, 1 Chron. 3, 5, whom David late elected to be adoptive children and only Salomon was the son of Bethsaba; that is the meaning of the saying in Proverbs 4:3: "I was the only son of my mother," etc. That is nothing; in that manner, Christ would be Uriah's son, he was a Hittite, a heathen, although more pious than a thousand Israelites.

131. Furthermore, it suffices for a Christian, that both apostles introduce David's children, be that father's or brother's line, and both remain in the house of David, do not count adoptive children or alien blood. From when Christ comes. he comes from David. I hold with those like Luke who derive it from the paternal line, until Eli; since the line of Metthes splits in two, one part on Jacob and the other on Eli, he must place Joseph, the

son of Eli, that is Edom, on the grounds, as he himself says, that Joseph is the putative father of Christ, but not the natural father as the line would have demanded it if Mary, his bride, had not been a virgin mother, and in the manner of scripture will not tolerate to follow the line of women; nevertheless he is still putative. One body with his bride Mary as he is putative father of Christ. In sum, as said before, the father Matthes makes it clear that Mary and Jesus are the children of one house and one father.

132. It worries some that Matthew says again and again, genuit, genuit, he begat or bore; they therefore believe that Matthew talks about the natural line which follows birth, from father to son, on and on; Luke, however, talks about the fraternal or paternal line., which they call legalem, not adoprivam, as Lyra believes but, because a brother, according to the law, he must concern himself with the children of his deceased brother, as if he were their father. This, I do not believe, St. Matthew does not believe it himself and cares nothing for it. For he lets only three members outside, among the kings and says: Joram begat Usia; which is impossible because Usia was born four generations, i.e., one hundred years, after the death of Joram, in addition descends in the fraternal line from Nathan, not Solomon, from where Joram came. The same thing was done among the nobility after the Babylonian captivity, for he leaves a lot out, counts only fourteen, where Luke counts twenty-two, and could not name anything: Asar begat Zadok, where perhaps two or three are left out; that is why the genuit adds nothing here to the belief that Matthew ought to be the paternal line.

133. His manner of speaking is to say genuit, or he begat him etc. With that he means only he is from him or born of his blood, as we say in German; Carolus comes from or is born of Maximilian. He shows this also in the title with these words: "This is the book concerning the birth of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham." Christ was of course not born of nor begotten by David; nor is he his son, because he comes from him according to the blood. Therefore birth in this case cannot mean the personal birth of the Saviour, where he lists forty births of his ancestors. Luke, however, uses the paternal line. For he praises himself at the beginning, that he researched it all carefully and wants to write about it. We must believe him because we believe far greater and different things. For such registers were known among the Jews, wrote down everything, (as was their fashion) as two examples show, i.e., Chronicles (and) Ezra; also Moses, who diligently describes the generations of Jacob and Esau.

134. Matthew admits freely that he wanted nothing more than to count in an orderly fashion, for he says, he wants to calculate three Tassaradecadas, three times fourteen, from Abraham to Christ. And because he found fourteen patriarchs, he did not want to name more than fourteen kings and fourteen nobles. Because the writers, through no fault of the apostle, a king, Joakim, the father of Jechonja, was left out, so that only thirteen kings are mentioned, a shortcoming which Hieronymus also shows in the Greek books. Luke, however, lists four times fourteen, takes all of them, even those who were

not kings, as also Nathan and his offspring. Added to this same Luke by the scribes is the fourth generation after Noah, i.e., Kenan, which cannot be. Therefore I consider it a useless effort, to compare all names with one another, because we do not have the registers. And it is not written in the first place for us heathens (but for the Jews) who no doubt knew it. It suffices that we compare as much as we can; you can ask Josephus and Philo about that.

135. I am willing to risk any friendship on my opinion or understanding; whoever can do it better, shall be right.

Levi.* Aaron. Zadok. Jojada. A*

* Refers to the priestly line

Abraham.** David. Joas. Zerubabel. Matthes

** Refers to the royal line

Zacharias Elisabeth John the Baptist

Anna Eli . Jacob.

Maria Cleophae Maria Joseph Salome Zebedaus

1. Jacob 2. Simon 3. Joses.** 4. Juda

JESUS

1. Jacobus major 2. John Evang.

136. This Mary, the mother's sister of our Lord or his aunt, is called Maria Jacobi of the son, in the Gospels; is also called Maria Cleophae by the other man who was still alive on Christ's Easter Day, Luke 24:18. Therefore, Juda is also called Jacobi, perhaps because he is the brother of Jacobi, Alphao, the first husband of Maria Jacobi. These are called the brothers of our Lord, because they are the children of his Mother's sister.

137. Furthermore, the angel Gabriel says, Luc. 1:36, that Elizabeth is the older female relative or aunt of Mary; that cannot be otherwise, for Mary's mother was Elizabeth's sister, we will let her be Anna as she is called everywhere. Because Elizabeth is of the tribe of the priests, as the angel says, from the daughters of Aaron, that is why I place the two sisters, Anna and Elizabeth, into the line of Aaron, so, Joachim or Eli of the tribe of David takes the one sister, Anna, and Zacharias of the tribe of the priests the other one, Elizabeth. Therefore, Mary becomes Aaron's, daughter of the tribe of the priests, on her mother's side and David's daughter of the royal house on her father's side; therefore, Christ is both of the priestly and the royal blood. And Elizabeth is her aunt and the great aunt of the Lord; thus, Mary, would be a sibling of John the Baptist, and he a near cousin in the third degree of our Lord Jesus Christ.

138. Now Salome wants to be something special, expects an advantage with the Lord, because she asks him to place her two sons, one at the right (Matth. 20, 2 []) the other on the left, in his kingdom, which I interpret to mean that they must have listened to him carefully. That is why I consider her Joseph's sister; she thought Maria Jacobi the sister of the mother, I am, however, the father's sister; that is why I am entitled to precedence with my children before the mother's sister with her children. Although Joseph no longer has a child, my sons are Jesus' closest friends, and she thinks, Jesus is the son of Joseph, as everyone held the same view at the same time (Luc. 3:23). The others grumbled against this, no doubt the children of the mother=sister, and perhaps untold more with them who also sought to be the greatest, as we read in the Gospels. Herewith, Jacobus the Great and John the Baptist also become cousins of the Lord, with the name so close as Jacobus and Simon, Juda and Joseph, but one generation further, according to the blood. For Joseph is not the natural father of the Lord, only his mother Mary and Salome are the daughters of two brothers, etc.

139. From this one can see, how the Lord's closest relatives forced themselves on him according to the human manner, and still he conducts himself in a friendly and brotherly way. No gleam of majesty glows here, but. the outward servile form.

140. Many, such as Bonaventura, (74) believe, with conviction and a clear conscience, that John the Baptist and Mary Magdalene were groom and bride at the wedding at Cana, according to the sequence in John the Baptist. Someone else may have a different (but free) conviction it may be Simon or Juda the bridegroom, and the bride also a near aunt in the next or third degree; for the apostles call Simon of Cana and Juda zealots, that is, of Cana. It ought to be considered, that bride and groom must have been the close relatives of Mary, since she is present herself and helps to run it [the wedding]. For she would not frivolously mix into a strange or distant friend's wedding, as there were other women, closer.

141. However, the final opinion of the apostles, particularly Matthes, with such a line of the family, is this, that he wants to instruct and strengthen the ignorant, weak Jews, but stuff the mouth of the stubborn with these two statements: Jesus is Messiah and Mary is a virgin. For these two statements were the most difficult for the pious to believe, and utterly impossible to believe for the stubborn; the cause was, he was well known in Nazareth with his father, mother and many friends, for he was raised there and had lived there for thirty years, and like any apprentice, worked as a carpenter with his father Joseph, did not go to school, learned nothing, the same after his father's death when he supported himself with his poor mother, did not let anyone notice anything special but kept himself simply quiet like any other young man of his kind, that she was used to him and could not in her heart accept that this unschooled, gross and poor carpenter was to be learned and in addition a preacher all his life.

142. Suddenly, when the thirty years are over, he leaves his trade, runs away, lets himself be baptized by St. John with others, begins to preach, to interpret and teach scripture and do wonders, so that the whole world is aghast, so that all priests and teachers appear as useless, meaningless gossips compared to him. That was a strange, incomprehensible thing in their eyes and ears. It was even stranger that he was not only a prophet but the Messiah himself. Oh, what strange, contemptuous speeches were made about that! Dear one, keep quiet, should Jesus preach, do you think I don't know him? I have lived with him for thirty years, and know well who he is and what he can do.

143. Take yourself as an example: If you had lived, worked, eaten, drunk etc. with Hans N., the son of a poor citizen for thirty years, and you knew him as well as yourself, that he never knew one letter, and that he wandered into another country that same year, and you now heard that he is preaching and is learned, and that all scholars consider this a miracle; you would say to the reporter: Are you silly or are you joking? Do you think I don't know Hans N. with whom I broke bread for thirty years? And if a great noise came about to the effect that he had become king or Roman emperor you would say: Well, he has gone crazy and the world has gone mad and wants to be mad, but don't tell it to me, I know him too well. That is how it appeared to the Nazarenes with regard to Jesus.

144. Since he came home again a bit over one-half year later, he went to school, gets up, takes the book Isaiah in hand, reads from it, sits down, and holds a beautiful sermon so that all are astonished; now they all see him themselves, cannot deny it is Jesus, whom they know very well, begin and say, Matth. 13:54ff: "From where does so much wisdom and power come to him? Is he not the son of a carpenter? Is not his mother called Maria? And his brothers Jacob and Joses, Simon and Juda? And are not his sisters all with us? From where does all that come to him? And they were angered by him." Why were they angry? They could not believe that what they heard and saw was from God. This person they knew too well and he was too unimportant; that is why they thought he had submitted to the Devil, who sought to commit this unheard of thing through him. And since he attacked them with one word, they took him at that same hour, led him outside of town, meant to break his neck by driving him down from the mountain as a malicious person.

145. For in his lecture on Isaiah he allowed them to notice that he is the Messiah, for he said, the same word is fulfilled in him Isaiah at 61:1: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, therefore the Lord anointed me," that is, made into the Messiah, although he was a beggar as they knew him. Thereupon he rebuked them, as if they were not worthy of his miraculous deeds, as Luke mentions at chapter 4 verse 16. Then they became angry and thought: Get rid of such a Messiah, he will cause trouble; we know he is a beggar but wants to be Messiah. Away with that lout who only recently helped to erect a house and picked up shavings with us, and suddenly became Messiah, that is, king of all kings, and holds us holy people of Israel in contempt as he will not do what pleases us, etc.

146. Now, however, they become even more angry because he rose from the dead and rose into heaven (but they thought he was dead now as he deserved as a deceiver), and they should now not only view this Jesus, who had dealt with them as he pleased as the Messiah but accept him even after death as a Lord of Heaven and earth; that was a repugnant and unbearable sermon for them, they found it offensive and the greatest number of them fell to this day; for their thoughts must have been right, God must have lied and been wrong, as they do even now, and have lied and murmured against Jesus, so that it is unspeakable and can also not be put in writing.

147. Yes, that is (as I began) the foremost and final task of the apostle, that he was anxious to convince the Jews of Jesus so that they would accept him as the Messiah, and forget about all difficulties and not be hindered by the fact that he lived among them so contemptuously for thirty years and that he was crucified so shamefully. For this is the son of Abraham, David and all the patriarchs, counted out according to the line, up to the mother Mary who was identified as a virgin by both Isaiah and the Holy Ghost; not a common son of David and the patriarchs, as several others, such as Joseph, Simon, Juda and Jacob; but the singular, exceptional, wonderful son, in whom the prophecy and promise of Abraham and David and all the prophets happened and was fulfilled. If they were to accept this son, that is, the prophecy and the promise, then they would have seized upon the right Messiah, then they would let go of the Old Testament, including circumcision, priesthood, nobility, the temple, Jerusalem and all laws, which come from this and belong to it: for they would not need it anymore. Instead, they would gladly accept the New Testament, including Baptism, sacraments and everything the Messiah taught and ordered and keep much more holy than the Old Testament has ever been and would not insist that no further Holy Book or scriptures can be except the Old Testament of which they dream.

148. The evangelist did not work for nothing and in vain, among other evangelists and apostles. Many were converted, and accepted Jesus with great joy, could not wonder enough, before they could understand it that God had fulfilled his promises in so lovely and so friendly a manner. The others held on and still hold on to the word of Isaiah 53:2, 3: "We saw him, but there was no body, that we could have desired him. He was the most contemptible and worthless, full of pain and illness, he was so contemptible that one would cover the face before him: that is why we did not pay attention to him" etc. However, he who wants to be the Kochab or Messiah to the Jews, he need not be well formed or good to look at, for they certainly hold him in contempt, says Isaiah.

149. Let us then conclude, the Jews, as mentioned, will easily believe that the line as proposed by Matthew correctly reaches from Abraham to Jesus; that long they stand still and listen. For at that time all men and women of the tribe of Judah, many thousands, came as well from Judah and the greater part of the house of David as Joseph, Mary and their son Jesus although they never looked at them. But as the apostle

insists: "of whom is born Jesus, who is called Messiah," they recoil as if thunder had struck them down, they no longer hear anything, even though the apostle inserted so many links into the line of which he may have wanted to use far fewer; even though he leaves out many of them, in order to show that it is not necessary to name them all (for they were glad to hear their descent praised) so that this holy matter would conclude in a friendly and nice manner. ,

150. To this, St. Matthew wants to say, not only from his own spirit (although he has power, right and command), that Mary, a virgin, has given birth, but also introduces the prophet Isaiah, so as to coax them in a friendly way through their own scriptures. But what good is it among the stubborn, gnarled, stiff necked, damned Jews? They have made a great effort to explain their views as they have with all the others but cannot achieve anything any way for they are always seeking excuses and seek to make true one lie with seven more lies. However, as said earlier, one should leave the Jews alone and ignore how the devil riots in them. If there is a human heart among them, God will find it; with the others, the proverb applies: Lost like the soul of a Jew. Therefore, to strengthen and ornament our belief, how hilarious (but poisonous) that the devil treats them with this proverb and against St. Matthew.

Notes

60. *The Jerusalem Bible* trans/aw as follows: "The Lord thy God will raise up to you a prophet from the midst of thee of thy brethren like me; to him you shall hearken . . . "

61. *Jerusalem Bible*: "I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren like thee, and will put my words in his mouth; and he shall speak to them all that I shall command him."

62. Here is at least one Biblical passage which Zionists like to quote as evidence for their claim that Jews have a right to establish themselves in Israel and in Jerusalem. Luther, however, views such claims as unjustified and ascribes them to "heathens." The quotation used by Luther occurs in both Isaiah and Micah.

63. There are some Christians who associate in a New Covenant Church basing their beliefs in part on this sentence. Nevertheless, this passage is given a wholly different interpretation in Judaism.

64. *Mathew 5:17*: "You must not think that I have come to abolish the Law or the Prophets: I have not come to abolish them but to complete them. "In this verse lies one of the most important claims of Christianity concerning the succession of Christianity to the divine privileges earlier accorded Judaism. Some Christians today, and almost all Christians in Luther's day, claimed the Tora, (the Jewish law) claimed that the Jews who convert to Christianity are really not giving up the Tora because belief in Jesus as the

Christ or Messiah fulfils the law far better than any effort by any man to meet the requirements of the 613 commandments which the Tora imposes.

65. *Matthew quotes Leviticus 19:18. The entire sentence reads: "You shall not take vengeance, nor bear any grudge against the children of your people, but you shall love your neighbour as yourself." This so-called Golden Rule is also repeated in Romans 13:10, the Teachings of the Twelve Apostles and in the Apostolic Constitution. It is remarkable that for centuries Christians and Jews argued vehemently over which of the faiths should receive credit for this teaching. Since Judaism is older than Christianity, Christians would sometimes argue that Judaism states the Golden Rule only in the negative form but Christianity states it in a positive form and is therefore entitled to more credit.*

66. *The word cherub(im) is Hebrew for "attendant(s)." It is sometimes translated as "angels," although the Greek word angelos means messenger. Angelos was introduced into the Greek version of the Bible as a direct translation of the Hebrew malach, which means "messenger."*

67. *Zechariah 5: 1: "Then I turned and lifted up my eyes, and looked, and behold; a flying scroll . . . " Zechariah lived in the sixth century B. C. E. He is regarded as of the "minor" prophets. His prophecy consisted of visions which needed interpretation. He was one of those who urged the rebuilding of the temple after its first destruction by Nebuchadnezzar in 597 B.C.E.*

68. *John 8: 12: "I am the light of the world; The man who follows me will never walk in the dark but will live his life in the light."*

69. *In the Hebrew language the last letter of the alphabet in the Ashkenazi tradition may be pronounced either "saf" or "taf" depending on the meaning of the word in which the letter occurs. In the Sephardic tradition, the letter is always pronounced "taf" Luther refers to the Ashkenazi pronunciation inasmuch as the German Jews whom he knew used the Ashkenazi pronunciation. In fact, the word "Ashkenaz" was used for centuries to denote Germany while the word "Sefarad" was used to denote Spain, another centre of Jewish culture in the Middle Ages. Modern Hebrew as spoken, in Israel is pronounced according to the Sephardic or Spanish pronunciation.*

70. *This Latin phrase means "and moreover with a clear Italian 'A.'"*

71. *The laws of inheritance among the ancient Hebrews are mentioned here as follows: "Only within the family of the tribe of their father shall they marry. So the inheritance of the children of Yisra'el shall not remove from tribe to tribe."*

72. *"Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy father's sister: she is your kinswoman"*

73. *This is called the "Levirate" in anthropological usage. From Latin levir, the husband's brother. This was important in Jewish law and is mentioned repeatedly in several*

sections of the Bible. Thus, Genesis 38: 8-10 concerns Onan, who "spilled his seed upon the ground" rather than impregnate his sister-in-law with whom he was duty bound to have children. The children would, however, carry on the family of his brother and would be attributed to his brother. The eldest son of such a union inherited the property and the name of the deceased. Deuteronomy 25:5 states, "If brethren dwell together, and one of them die, and have no child, the wife of the dead shall not be married abroad with one not of his kin; her husband's brother shall go in unto her, and take her to him to wife, and perform the duty of a husband's brother unto her. "

74. Giovanni de Fida.11.za, also known as St. Bonaventura (1221-1274), was a famous medieval writer. A bishop and a cardinal, he was canonized in 1482 and immortalized in Danie's Inferno as a saint.