The article discusses Nahmanides’ typological interpretation of Abraham’s encounter with Melchizedek as recounted in Genesis 14:18-20. According to the author, Nahmanides, in his commentary on the account, deviates from his standard exegetical method; he chooses to pursue the typological approach appearing in the Midrash and Rashi, offering his own original interpretation. The author argues that this deviation represents an attempt on Nahmanides part to polemicize, at least implicitly, against Christological conceptions of Melchizedek.

The article offers an original contribution to the issue of Nahmanides’ polemics with Christianity, an aspect of his commentary which has yet to receive due consideration in the scholarly literature.

The article is well organized and addresses its subjects systematically and sequentially. The methodology and arguments are logical and consistent. The author’s careful and perceptive reading of Nahmanides’ commentary on this passage, and his meticulous comparison to other interpretations earlier in the commentary, lead the reader to an astute and convincing explanation of these differences.

The use of primary and secondary sources is comprehensive and certainly reflects the most up-to-date research. Nevertheless, the article would benefit from the addition of some additional sources which would provide an important contribution; see my comments below.

In light of the aforementioned, I recommend that the article be published in *JJS*.

I must mention that English is not my mother tongue, and I therefore cannot comment on the quality of the article’s prose and style.

Below are some suggestions which, if implemented, may improve the quality of the article:

1. The citation of the passage about Abraham and Melchizedek (in the title and p. 7) is inadequate: the passage should be fully sourced as Gen. 14:18–20 and not just as verses 18-20.

2. Note 14: Since the author has enumerated many commentators who adopt Rashi’s approach, R. Joseph Bekhor Shor and Radak should be mentioned as well.

3. The scholarship on Nahmanides is extensive; citing every study ever written about him would be impossible in the context of this article. Nevertheless, for a complete picture, certain important and particularly relevant articles should be consulted and considered for inclusion.

Note 12 could include:

Marvin Fox, “Nahmanides on the Status of Aggadot: Perspectives on the Disputation at Barcelona, 1263”, *JJS* 40 (1989), pp. 95–109.

Note 32 could include:

Frank Ephraim Talmage, “An Hebrew polemical treatise, anti-Cathar and anti-Orthodox”, *Apples of Gold in Settings of Silver: Studies in Medieval Jewish Exegesis and Polemics*, ed. Barry Dov Walfish, Toronto 1999, pp. 212–237 [=*Harvard Theological Review* 60, 3 (1967), pp. 323–348].

Note 40: There are other scholars, besides Twito, who have discussed Nahmanides’ anti-Christian polemics such as:

Mordechai Z. Cohen, “Nahmanide's Four Senses of Scripture Signification: Jewish and Christian Contexts”, *Entangled Histories - Knowledge, Authority, and Jewish Culture in the Thirteenth Century*, eds. Elisheva Baumgarten, Ruth Mazo Karras, Kathelin Mesler, Philadelphia 2016, pp. 38–58.