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Medieval Hebrew Philosophical Terminology in the Making¹

Daniel J. Lasker

When I was writing my dissertation almost forty years ago, I did what many people do at that stage in their careers – I gathered all the texts I could find, read them, and wrote down on index cards the philosophical arguments I could find in each text. Since I was not writing about the use of mysticism in the polemics, I did not note any arguments based on mystical or Kabbalistic ideas (even though I have long thought that that would make a good subject for a dissertation). I did not record exegetical arguments. I did not record historical references. I was pretty well disciplined as to what I would record and what I would ignore.

Soon after completing my research, I realized that of all the things I did not write down, the one I regretted the most was not writing down Hebrew terms for Christian theological concepts, those concepts which are foreign to Judaism and, thus, do not have natural Hebrew terms to express them. It seemed to me then, and it seems to me now, that one can learn a lot about the cultural transfer of concepts and the interchange of ideas by the extent to which new terms became accepted into Hebrew vocabulary. I have not gone back and read all the polemical works once again, and I cannot claim comprehensiveness in my discussion of Christian terms; I would,

¹ This English internet version is based upon the oral presentation at the workshop, “Medieval Hebrew Philosophical Terminology in the Making,” Institute for Advanced Studies, Hebrew University, December, 2011; and my Hebrew article “Christian Concepts in Hebrew – The Trinity as an Example,” Leshonenu 75:2-3 (2013): 239-250. It retains many of the characteristics of the oral presentation.
however, like to discuss how Hebrew authors dealt with the problem of expressing foreign religious doctrines, as a case study of cultural transfer and translation.

Let’s begin with the well-known fact that languages reflect the cultures which produce them. Apparently, Eskimos do not have 400 words for snow and the 1000 Arabic words for camels is exaggerated, but I do know that classical Hebrew has no terms for specifically Christian theological concepts. Of course, when Christians of the first few Christian centuries developed their theology, and their doctrines were still in the formative state; the languages they used also did not include terms for specifically Christian concepts. This problem was overcome by adapting existing terms to express the newly innovated concepts thereby giving them particular Christian meanings.\(^2\) Although most Christian theologizing of the first few centuries was carried out in Greek and Latin, one can assume that some Jewish-Christians must have been using Hebrew or Aramaic words in new theological contexts, but we apparently do not have texts which would illustrate that.\(^3\)

As long as Jews were not involved in direct theological criticism of Christianity in Hebrew, in other words until the late eleventh or the twelfth century,

\(^2\) Some of these issues are discussed by Harry A. Wolfson, *The Philosophy of the Church Fathers*, vol. 1, Cambridge, MA, 1964.

\(^3\) There have been recent attempts to define better the relations between Jews, Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians in the first few centuries of the Common Era, and to understand how eventually there emerged two religions: Rabbinic Judaism and Christianity. If Jewish-Christians created any literature, it did not survive and our knowledge of them and their beliefs is known from non-Hebrew or non-Aramaic literature. See, e.g., Adiel Schremer, *Brothers Estranged: Heresy, Christianity, and Jewish Identity in Late Antiquity*, Oxford 2010; Daniel Boyarin, *Border Lines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity*, Philadelphia 2004.
they had no reason to develop Hebrew terms for Christian theology. The first Jewish anti-Christian polemics were written in Judaeo-Arabic, and Jewish authors simply used the current Arabic terms which had been adopted by Arabic-speaking, and -writing, Christians and which featured in Muslim anti-Christian polemics. But when Jews began expressing themselves in Hebrew about Christianity, they were forced to use find locutions to describe the doctrines they were criticizing. Similarly, when Christians-by-choice such as Abner of Burgos/Alfonso de Valladolid began polemicizing against Judaism in Hebrew, they also needed to present their theology in Hebrew terms. How, then, were Christian concepts expressed in Hebrew? Since a thorough examination of all specifically Christian terms in Hebrew would require a monograph, I would like to begin modestly by discussing one example of how Jews went about innovating Hebrew terminology for Christian concepts: Hebrew terms for Christian Persons of the Trinity.

Before beginning it is useful to add a caveat: polemical texts are notoriously prone to editorial activity which had as its goal the making of arguments more user friendly to the audiences. Thus, even if one has a good manuscript of a polemical

4 As far as I know, rabbinic literature does not have specific Christian theological terms even if there are references to Jesus and to Christianity; see R. Travers Herford, Christianity in Talmud and Midrash, various editions; Peter Shafer, Jesus in the Talmud, Princeton 2007.


6 A good example is the editorial activity which marks the first Jewish anti-Christian polemic, Qīṣṣat mujādalat al-usquf (in Judaeo-Arabic) and its Hebrew translation, Sefer Nestor hakomer; see Daniel J. Lasker and Sarah Stroumsa, The Polemic of Nestor the Priest, 2 vols., Jerusalem 1996.
work, unless it is an autograph, there is no guarantee that the terms included in it are the same ones used by the original author. It is possible that as Hebrew terms for Christian concepts developed, an editor or scribe might have substituted a current word for the one that originally appeared in the text. Some manuscripts might also have scribal errors which complicate this study. Nevertheless, I will try to give a chronological account of the development of Hebrew terminology for Persons as best as can be extrapolated from the texts as we have them.

When examining the Christian concept of the Trinity, we see that the Hebrew terms for the specific Persons - Father, Son and Spirit - were relatively easy. They are rendered in Hebrew by *av*, *ben* and *ruaḥ* (sometimes *ruaḥ ha-qodesh*; sometimes, derogatorily, *ruaḥ ha-tumʿah*). Trinity also seems to have been relatively easy, since the Christians themselves merely adopted Greek and Latin terms (*he trias*; *trinitas*) which meant a triad of some sort. The first Jews to argue in writing against the Trinity wrote in Arabic in the mid-ninth century, and like the Muslims and Christians, they used Arabic terms from the root meaning “three” – either *tathlith*, the more common form in Christian Arabic theology, or *thalatha*, the three. Around the same time, we have evidence that some Hebrew *paytanim* referred to the Christian doctrine as *shilush*, which became the standard Hebrew term. In a non-poetical context, *shilush* can be traced back to the second half of the eleventh century in the Karaite Tobias ben


8 I rely on the Historical Dictionary of the Hebrew Language, as accessed and researched for me by Uri Melammed; see [http://hebrew-treasures.huji.ac.il](http://hebrew-treasures.huji.ac.il).
Moses’ translation of Yusuf al-Basir’s *Muhtawi*. It makes its way into Rabbanite prose Hebrew at least 100 years later, both in one of the first anti-Christian treatises written in Hebrew, Jacob ben Reuben’s *Milhamot ha-shem*, and in Judah Ibn Tibbon’s translations of Bahya ibn Paquda’s *Duties of the Heart*, Judah Halevi’s *Kuzari*, and Saadia’s *Beliefs and Opinions*. Samuel ibn Tibbon uses *shilush* as a translation of Maimonides’ term for Trinity, *tathluth*, and *shilush* is the term in use today in modern Hebrew (usually as *ha-shilush ha-qadosh* - the Holy Trinity - presumably not to accord it special dignity but to distinguish it from other triads).

But what word describes the specific status of the Father, the Son and the Spirit? The Church Fathers themselves struggled with that question and the Greeks decided that they were *hypostases* (from the Greek for underlying reality) or *prosopa* (singular: *prosopon*, from the Greek for face or mask). The Latins generally used *personae* (singular, *persona*, also meaning mask) since, in this period, *hypostasis*

---

9 Yosef Ha-Ro’eh, *Sefer Ne’imot*, ed. Yosef Algamil, Ashdod, 5764, p. 138 (like Algamil’s other editions, this version should be used with caution).


13 Ed Yeroham Fischel, Leipzig, 5619, p. 54; in the traditional editions of these Ibn Tibbon translations, the anti-Christian passages, including references to the Trinity, have been censored.


15 See Avraham Even Shushan, *Ha-milon ha-hadash*, different editions, s.v. *shilush*; non-Christian usages of this term can be seen in a Hebrew Google search of the word *shilush*. 
often was translated by *substantia*. The Christians believed that the entire Godhead was a substance (or *ousia* in Greek); thus *substantia* was an inappropriate term for just one of the Persons.¹⁶ Hypostasis was translated into Syriac as *qnoma*¹⁷ and made its way into Arabic as *uqnum* (plural, *aqānim*), which became the standard word for the hypostases of the Trinity.¹⁸ When Judaeo-Arabic authors were looking for a term for the individual members of the Trinity, they usually employed *uqnum*. We see that term in the ninth-century Daud al-Muqammiš’s *Twenty Treatises*¹⁹ and in the anonymous *Qiṣṣat mujādalat al-usquf* (Account of the Disputation of the Priest), even though the author sometimes used *qunūm* in the sense of substance and not person.²⁰

---


In the tenth-century, the Karaite Qirqisānī makes reference to *aqānīm*, as does the eleventh-century Karaite Yusuf al- Başîr.

On the basis of different understandings of the status of the three persons of the Trinity, other Arabic words were used as well for them, most notably *ṣifah* (attribute), *maʿna* (thing), *shakhs* (individual) and *khasṣa* (special quality). Some of these terms were picked by Jewish authors as well, such as Saadia who refers to the three *ṣifāt* (attributes) in his *Beliefs and Opinions*, while using the word *aqānīm* in his commentary on the Torah (Gen. 1:26).

One of the first translators of Christian terminology into Hebrew was the aforementioned Karaite Tobias ben Moses. He translates *aqānīm* in Yusuf al- Başîr’s *Muḥtawī* as *eiqiyyonīm*, probably influenced by the Greek *eikones* (images). In rabbinic literature, the loan word *iqon* or *eiqon* appears as likeness or portrait. Judah Hadassi, writing in Constantinople in the mid-twelfth century, also rendered *aqānīm*


26 *Sefer Ne’imot*, pp. 131, 138-139.

as *eiqiyyonim*, basically copying from the Hebrew translation of al-Baṣir, although he also mentions *rashuyyot* (a rabbinic term for authorities or powers).\(^{28}\) Interestingly enough, *eiqiyyonim* was still in use as Persons in the early eighteenth century in the Karaite Solomon ben Aaron of Troki’s *Migdal Oz*.\(^{29}\)

The search for a Hebrew term for Persons of the Trinity does not stop with *eiqiyyonim*. The next example is the anonymous paraphraser of Saadia’s *Beliefs and Opinions*, who worked around the end of the eleventh century, perhaps in Byzantium or Byzantine Italy, and whose version of the book is characterized by expansive wordiness. How does he render Saadia’s account of the Persons into Hebrew? First of all, by glossing the translation with the Arabic term *aqānīm*, even though it is not in the original (at least not in the Judaeo-Arabic version we have).\(^{30}\) Saadia writes: “The

---


\(^{29}\) Golda Akhiezer and Daniel J. Lasker, “Solomon ben Aaron of Troki and his Anti-Christian Treatise ‘Migdal ‘Oz,’” in Dan D.Y. Shapira and Daniel J. Lasker, eds., *Eastern European Karaites in the Last Generations*, Jerusalem, 2011, p. 109 (Hebrew). It is of note that Judah Hadassi, living in Christian Byzantium, relies upon Judaeo-Arabic writings for his understanding of Christianity; 600 years later, Solomon ben Aaron, living in Christian Lithuania, is still using the same Arabic-Greek-Hebrew term for the Persons of the Trinity. This just underscores the importance of Jewish anti-Christian polemics written in Islamic countries for the entire Jewish polemical enterprise; see Lasker, “Critique.”

\(^{30}\) It is possible that the deviations in the paraphrase from the Arabic are a result of the fact that the translator had an Arabic text in front of him which is different from the one we have (this was suggested to me by Eliezer Davidovich; cf. Henry Malter, *Saadia Gaon, his Life and Works*, Philadelphia 1943, p. 362).
Christians were mistaken and they believed that God has diversity (ghairiya), so they made him into three (thalatha).” The paraphraser translates: “The Christians were mistaken in this matter and believed that God has internal distinction and diversity (hiluf ve-shinui) such that they made him into three parts (halaqim) which are called aqānim.” A few lines later, when Saadia writes that the Christians took the three attributes (ṣifār) and made them into a Trinity, the paraphraser calls them three qinyamim which are three ‘iqqarim. And at the end of the discussion of the attributes, the paraphraser says the Christians believe in three umot u-qenumot, whatever that means.  

At the other end of the Mediterranean Sea, the twelfth-century translator of Qīṣṣat mujādalat al-usquf, the person who changed this Judaeo-Arabic polemic into the Hebrew Sefer Nestor ha-komer, translated aqānim as qinyanim which is more authentically Hebrew than eiqiyyonim, qinyamim or qenumot, but still hardly means “Person” in the Christian sense. Qinyan, however, is used in Nestor for more than Person; like the original Judaeo-Arabic which confuses the meaning of uqnūm, the translator used the word qinyan for both person and substance, namely the full Godhead. In fact, the one manuscript of Nestor that has Judaeo-Latin glosses translates the word qinyan as substantia.  

Jacob ben Reuben, one of the first Jews to use shilush for Trinity, reproduced a passage from Nestor which used qinyan, né uqnūm, for Person, but he obviously did

---


not find that terminology sufficient. He was also familiar with the paraphrase of Saadia, but he did not use any of the terms there either. Instead, he offers a number of alternate Hebrew translations of persons: rashuyot, parțufim (faces or visages, a rabbinic word from the Greek prosopon), gufot and geramim (both meaning bodies). As far as I know, Jacob was the first Jewish author to use the word persona, writing that the parțufim are called personas, each of which is a separate guf.

Working at the same time that Judah Ibn Tibbon was commencing his translation project, Jacob was obviously searching for an adequate Hebrew terms to represent the Christian notions. Even though Jewish authors subsequently adopted Jacob’s terms, no translation of persona ever became standardized.

As noted, some of the Arabic authors used terms for the Persons of the Trinity taken from the world of attributes (ṣifah, ma’na, khaṣṣa), and this was because the philosophical discussion of divine attributes had its origin in Christian-Muslim debates as to the nature of the Persons and their relation to qualities which could be attributed to God. Thus, Saadia says that the Christians identified the attributes (ṣifāt) life and knowledge with the Son and the Spirit. In the Ibn Tibbon translation of Beliefs and Opinions, ṣifah is rendered by middah and to ’ar, the word which later

---

33 Milhamot Ha-Shem, p. 154.
35 Jastrow, Dictionary, p. 1238.
36 Milhamot Ha-Shem, pp. 4, 40, 44.
38 Wolfson, Kalam, pp. 112-132.
became the standard Hebrew term for divine attribute, and thus for one of the Persons.\(^{39}\)

The twelfth-century polemicists, Jacob ben Reuben and Joseph Kimhi, did not make a connection between the Persons and the attributes, despite Saadia’s arguments, and therefore they did not use the word \textit{to ’ar} for Person.\(^{40}\) Joseph Kimhi’s son, David Kimhi (Radak) also did not make a connection between Persons and attributes; he called each Person a \textit{heileq}.\(^{41}\) In the thirteenth century, however, such a connection becomes customary in Jewish polemical works, and undoubtedly it represents the explanations of the Trinity that Jews heard from Christian polemicists (even though identifications of the Persons with the attributes, such as that of Abelard, were condemned at the Council of Sens in 1141).\(^{42}\) This can be seen clearly in Nahmanides’ account of the Disputation of Barcelona in which he records a visit to

\(^{39}\) Saadia, \textit{Emunot}, p. 26a. In his discussions of divine attributes in \textit{Beliefs and Opinions}, 2:4 (which precedes his refutation of the Trinity), Saadia used the word \textit{ma ’ān}, translated by Ibn Tibbon as ‘\textit{inyan}.

\(^{40}\) For Jacob’s translations, see above. Kimhi was aware of the terms Father, Son and Spirit, but he did not use a term to translate Person and his refutations of the Trinity were more appropriate to a belief in many Gods than in a belief in the Trinity; see Joseph Kimhi, \textit{The Book of the Covenant}, trans. Frank Talmage, Toronto, 1972.

\(^{41}\) Ephraim (Frank) Talmage, ed., \textit{The Book of the Covenant and other Writings}, Jerusalem, 1974, p. 71 (Hebrew).

the Barcelona synagogue by King James and the Dominicans on a Sabbath after the Disputation. According to Nahmanides, Raymond de Pena Forte preached concerning the Trinity, saying that the Trinity is wisdom, will and power. Nahmanides does not, however, use a specific term for the Persons.\footnote{Hyam Maccoby, \textit{Judaism on Trial}, Rutherford, et al., 1982, pp. 144-146; Lasker, \textit{Philosophical Polemics}, pp. 67-68.} Another thirteenth-century author, Meir ben Shimon of Narbonne, identified the Christian theory of the Trinity with the divine attributes, in which the Father was power, the Son was wisdom and the Holy Spirit was will. Meir calls each Person a “power” (koah), continuing that even though Jews believe in divine attributes, they do not make them into “three bodies.”\footnote{Meir ben Simeon of Narbonne, \textit{Sefer Milḥemet Mizvah}, Parma ms. 2749 (De Rossi Catalogue 155), 107b-108a; Lasker, ibid, p. 66.} Nahmanides’ and Meir’s Italian contemporary, Moses ben Solomon of Salerno, offered many philosophical arguments against the Trinity, and he alternated between using the Latin personas and the Hebrew to’ar, but he also called them inyanim and haveirim.\footnote{Stanislaus Simon, \textit{Mose ben Salomo von Salerno und seine philosophischen Auseinandersetzungen mit den Lehren Des Christentums}, Breslau, 1931, pp. I-XX; Lasker, ibid, p. 67.}

By the fourteenth century, to’ar had become almost standard as the Hebrew term for Persons, although it is often glossed with the Latin so that the readers could understand to which attributes reference was being made. Refutations of the Trinity were also pitched to theories of attributes, so the term to’ar was a natural fit. Profiat Duran offers the opinion that the Christian Trinitarian error stemmed from their misunderstanding of Kabbalah – they thought that the sefirot are essential attributes.
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(te’arim azmiyyim) rather than relational attributes (te’arim zeirufiyim), and, thus, they mistakenly believed in the Persons of the Trinity. Hasdai Crescas’ arguments against the Trinity are almost all phrased as criticisms of the theory of essential attributes. His Hebrew translator, Joseph ben Shem Tov, rendered the term Persons as te’arim, but then hastened to add the editorial comment that some people had criticized Crescas for his own theory of essential attributes, using against it the very same arguments Crescas himself had used against the Trinity. Joseph said that the critics misunderstood since they associated Persons with attributes (te’arim) which is incorrect; Persons should be translated parzuﬁm. In contrast to these Jewish anti-Christian polemicists, Abner of Burgos uses the term to’ar in his Hebrew anti-Jewish writings. It would have been interesting to see his full Hebrew vocabulary for Christian terms but most of his Hebrew works survive only in Castilian translations.

46 Proﬁat Duran, “Sefer kelimmat ha-goyim,” in Ephraim (Frank) Talmage, Kitvei Pulmus le-Profet Duran, Jerusalem, 5741, pp. 11-16; Lasker, ibid, pp. 74-75.
48 Abner’s main surviving treatise in Hebrew is Teshuvot ha-meharef, in which he used to’ar; see Yitzhak Baer, “Torat ha-Qabbalah be-mishnato ha-queristologit she Avner mi-burgos,” Tarbiz 27 (5718 [1957-58]): 278-289. The full text was published by Jonathan Hecht, “The Polemical Exchange between Isaac Pollegar and Abner of Burgos / Alfonso of Valladolid according to Parma MS 2440 ‘Iggeret Teshuvat Apikoros’ and ‘Teshuvot la-Meharef’,” New York University Diss., 1993. Since Abner explained the Trinity in terms of his theory of attributes, it was natural for him to use the Hebrew term to’ar to translate “persona;” see Shalom Sadik, “Determinism and Trinity in the Thought of Abner of Burgos,” Ben-Gurion University Diss., 2011, pp. 58-69.
Even among philosophically minded polemicists, to’ar was not the only word used. Moses ha-Kohen of Tordesillas (end of the fourteenth century) has qinyan, apparently meaning thereby substance, but the translator of his vernacular treatise used temunot and golmim. His younger contemporary, Shem Tov ibn Shaprut, used a number of sources, including the works of Jacob ben Reuben and Profiat Duran. When he quotes Jacob, the Persons are gufot and parẓufim; when he quotes Duran they are te’arim. Joseph Albo (first half of the fifteenth century) states that in the Christians doctrine there are “three distinct things (devarim) each one of which is independent,” but he does not appear to be using davar as a translation of Persona into Hebrew.

Northern European Jewish polemicists did not discuss the Trinity in the context of attributes, so to’ar was a less likely fit. Joseph Bekhor Shor (mid-twelfth century) called a Person heileq; Joseph ben Nathan Official and the anonymous authors of Nizzahon Yashan and Teshuvot ha-minim (thirteenth century) use the term


51 I rely here on an unpublished transcription of Even Bohan done by Libby Garshowitz, which she was kind enough to share with me. This passage does not appear in Frimer, ibid.


53 Joseph Bekhor Shor, Peirushei Rabbi Yosef Bekhor Shor al ha-Torah, ed. Y. Nevo, Jerusalem, 5754, p. 6. I would like to thank my friend Martin Lockshin for pointing out this source to me.
rashuyyot (powers) with which they were familiar from rabbinic literature.\textsuperscript{54} Joseph ben Nathan also referred to the Persons as rashuyyot.\textsuperscript{55} The second Paris disputation of 1271 or so, apparently instigated by Pablo Christiani of Barcelona fame, and thus with Iberian connections, has personas.\textsuperscript{56}

The point is clear: in Medieval Jewish discussions of Christianity, in both polemical and philosophical literature, no one Hebrew word ever became the accepted translation for the Persons of the Trinity. Perhaps the most widespread term was to’ar, but this was by no means the only word in use and it was not used exclusively for Person. This situation continued into the Early Modern period; for instance, the seventeenth-century Judah Aryeh Modena calls the Persons halaqim.\textsuperscript{57} This remains true even in modern Hebrew. I have been able to find the following translations for Persons in contemporary works: ishim, parẓufim, yeishuyyot, demuyyot, ofanim, panim, mahuyyot, and hofa’ot.\textsuperscript{58}

Although I have restricted myself here to the Trinity and the Persons, the same results would most likely come from a study of other specifically Christian concepts, such as incarnation and transubstantiation. On the basis of this one example, however, 


\textsuperscript{55} \textit{Yosef Ha-Meqanne}, p. 57.

\textsuperscript{56} Joseph Shatzmiller, \textit{La deuxième controverse de Paris}, Paris and Louvain, 1994, p. 54.


\textsuperscript{58} For references, see the Hebrew article and the appendix below. This documentary evidence can be supplemented by the fact that when I ask my students, native speakers of Hebrew, what the word for Persons is, they disagree as to what the correct answer is.
two general remarks can be made on the larger topic of cultural transfer. First, one of
the differences between Hebrew terms for Christian concepts and terms in other
languages for the same concepts is that the Hebrew terms were generally invented by
non-believers, not by believers. Thus, there was no need to worry about theological
correctness. Jewish writers could use such inexact terms such as *gufim* or *geramim*
with impunity despite their obvious inappropriateness given the nuances of the
Christian view of the Persons. But Jewish polemicists were not Christian theologians
and could use the terms they wanted or which promoted their refutations.
Second, this short survey of the vicissitudes of one term indicates that Christian
theological concepts never became naturalized into the Jewish consciousness as
expressed in the Hebrew language. Christian attempts to convince Jews of the truth of
Christianity over the course of 2000 years could not cross even the linguistic hurdle.
Jews have been willing and able to integrate terminology of many fields which were
originally foreign to Judaism – science, technology, theology, grammar,
hermeneutics, linguistics, sports, entertainment and the like – but they have been
unwilling and unable to integrate Christian terminology into their holy language. I
believe that this fact has wider implications for the nature of Judaism and Jewish
culture than merely a question of vocabulary.

59 An exception is Abner of Burgos/Alfonso de Valladolid; unfortunately most of his Hebrew
works are not extant in their original language.
Appendix – Hebrew Terms for Persons of the Trinity (Chronological Order)

Greek – hypostasis/hypostases or prosopon/prosopa

Latin – persona/personae

Syriac – qnômâ

Arabic – uqûml/aqûnim

Saadia – sifah/sifâtl/aqânîm

Byzantine Karaites, Judah Hadassi, Solomon ben Aaron of Troki – eiqiyyonim

Saadia paraphraser – halaqîm/aqanim/qinyanim/iqarim/umot/qenumot

Nestor ha-komer – qinyan

Joseph Bekhor Shor – heileq

Jacob ben Reuben – rashuyyot/paṟẓûfim/gufot/geramim/qinyan/iqar

Ibn Tibbon Family – middah/to’ar

David Kimhi - heileq

Meir ben Simeon - koah/guf

Moses ben Solomon of Salerno – persona/to’ar/inyanim/haverim

Joseph ben Nathan Official – rashuyyot/dimyonot

Nizzâhon Yashan/Teshuvot ha-minim – rashuyyot

Second Paris Disputation – personas

Abner of Burgos (Alfonso de Valladolid) – to’ar

Moses ha-Kohen of Tordesillas – qinyanim

Meir ben Jacob - temunot/golmim

Shem Tov ibn Shaprut – gufot/paṟẓûfim/te’arim

Profiat Duran – te’arim

Joseph ben Shem Tov - te’arim/paṟẓûfim

Judah Aryeh Modena - halaqîm
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Frank Talmage – ishim/parzufim

Eitan Bornstein – yeishuyyot, demuyyot

David Flusser - parzufim (personae)/lofanim

Wikipedia – panim/yeishuyyot

Ynet Encyclopedia – yeishuyyot

Deborah Amir – mahuyyot

Jacob Shavit – demuyyot/hofa’ot