

Abstract of Thesis: A study of Muslim polemics directed against Jews.

A survey of the anti-Jewish literature of Islam shows that whilst parts of the Koran are violently anti-Jewish Islam tends to ignore the Jews, and when it treats of them appears to draw considerably on Christian sources. In this connection, the authenticity of Ali Ṭabarī's work can be established.

An outstanding polemist was Ibn Ḥazm, but his contention that the Bible is a forgery is quoted in detail in works a century before, as the opinion of still earlier Mu'tazilites.

Samau'al al-Maghribī, a convert from Judaism, a century later, marks a further stage in the polemic. The later works who quarried from his works are discussed, and the connections between them made clear. In particular, the connections between his tract and Ibn Kammūna's work are traced.

Abrogation of one revelation by a later is the pivot of this controversy, and had a large share in developing the Muslim theory. The charge of anthropomorphism was brought against the Jews, and particular emphasis laid on their infidelity.

ProQuest Number: 10731223

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10731223

Published by ProQuest LLC (2017). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

AV109

A STUDY OF
MUSLIM POLEMICS DIRECTED AGAINST JEWS.

By MOSHE PERLMANN

Thesis submitted to the University of London for
the degree of Ph.D. (Internal) in History, Faculty of Arts.

September, 1940.

M. Schreiner wrote on this subject in 1888. Since then much new material has come to light, and still more remains which has not yet been published. This justifies a new attempt to survey the subject, although some MSS. were unobtainable.

I have thought it advisable to include such works as Elbiri's poem and some fatwas. But I have avoided repeating Fritsch's catalogue of the labours of Muslim biblical exegetis

Such a survey as this is necessarily indebted to publications by many workers. I have been anxious to indicate that.

My own effort includes the framing of the survey, the confrontation of old evidence in Muslim and Jewish texts, the establishment of the authenticity of 'Alī Ṭabarī's book, the tracing of the connections between Samau'al and later authors, notes on unpublished texts of Islāmī and Ṭabāṭabā'ī, some suggestions about the original sources of the Muslim argument, and notes on some minor points. The main chapters (on Ibn Ḥazm and Samau'al) are based on independent work on the sources

Chapters I.-IV. treat of the sources and beginnings of the controversy; chapters V.-XI. of the authors and their works; chapter XII. is a résumé of the polemic.

I wish to express my appreciation of Professor Tritton's kindness and patience in the reading of the draft of my thesis.

I wish, also, to express my thanks to the staffs of the Libraries at which I have worked; in particular, to the staff of the Library of the S.O.S.

CONTENTS.

Bibliography.

Chapter	I. Introduction.	1	-	
"	II. The Jews in the Koran and the Tradition.	5	-	
"	III. Sources of early polemics.	9	-	
"	IV. The tenth century.	27	-	
"	V. Ibn Ḥazm.	36	-	
"	VI. Two typical Muslim scholars.	60	-	
"	VII. Samau' al al-Maghribī.	65	-	
"	VIII. Ḳarāfī and Rāzī.	92	-	
"	IX. Under the Mongols.	99	-	
"	X. Under the Mamluks.	108	-	
"	XI. The Maghreb.- Conclusion	120	-	
"	XII. The controversy: An outline.	128	-	
Notes		144	-	

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Abbreviations.

- E.I. Encyclopaedia of Islam.
 E.J. Encyclopaedia ~~of~~ Judaica.
 J.E. **JEWISH** Encyclopaedia.
 GAL. Brockelmann, Geschichte d. arabischen Literatur.
 HUCA. Hebrew Union College Annual.
 JA. Journal Asiatique.
 JAOS. Journal of the American Oriental Society.
 JQR. Jewish Quarterly Review.
 JRAS. Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society.
 MGWJ. Monatsschrift f.d. Geschichte u.d. Wissenschaft des Judentums.
 REJ. Revue des Etudes Juives.
 RMM. Revue du Monde Musulman.
 RSO. Rivista d. Studi Orientali.
 ST P.L. M. Steinschneider-Polemische u. apologetische Literatur, etc.
 ZA. Zeitschrift f. Assyrologie.
 ZATW. " " d. alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.
 ZKV. Zapiski Kollegii Vostokovedov.
 ZDMG Zeitschrift d. Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft.

Abraham b. Daud - Sefer Ha-emunah ha-ramah, ed. and tr. S. Weil
 Frankf. 1852.

Ibn 'Abdūn - ed. Levi-Provencal, JA.1934.

Abdul Aleem - I'jaz al Quran. Islam. Culture VII.

Abū-l-Fidā' al Mukhtaṣar, ed. 1870.

Abū-l-Ma'ālī Muhammad al-Husayni al-'Alawī, Bayān al-adyān
 485 H. - ed. Ikbāl, Tehr. 1312.

- tr. by F. Gabrieli, Rendiconti della R.A. Naz.
 dei Lincei, 1932; Masse, Rev. Hist. Rel. 1926.

E. Amar - cf. Wansharisi.

Tor Andrae - Die Person Muhammeds.

- Der Ursprung d. Islams u.d. Christentum.

S. Asaf - An ancient Karaite polemist against Rabbanites,
 Tarbiz IV. 1933.

al-Ash'arī - Maḳālāt al-Islāmiyīn.

W.Bacher - Bibel u.biblische Geschichte i.d. mohammedanische Literatur, Kobak's Jäschurun, VIII. 1871.
 - Zu d.v.Algahiz zitierten Uebersetzung aus Jesaja JQR 13.
 - Eine kulturgeschichtliche Boraytha u. ihre Wandlungen MGWJ. 1873.
 - Der arabische Titel d. religionsphilosophischen Werkes Abr.b.Daud's, ZDMG. 42.

'Abd al-Kāhir al-Baghdādī - Al-Farḳ bayn al-Firaḳ.
 - tr. 1. by K.Ch.Seelye, NY., 1920.
 2. by A.S.Halkin, Tel-Aviv, 19

D.H.Baneth - Ibn Kammuna, MGWJ 69. 1925.

S.Baron - A social a. religious history of the Jews, NY, 1937

Barth - Midraschische Elemente i.d. muslimischen Tradition, Festschr. Berliner. 1903.

C.H.Becker - Das Reich d. Ismaeliten i. koptischen Danielbuch (Nachr.r.K.Ges.d.Wiss.zu Göttingen. 1916).

Belin - Fetoua relatif à la condition des Zimmis, JA 1851 -

J.J.Benjamin - Acht Jahre im Orient.

J.Bergmann - Juedische Apologetik i. neutttest. Zeitalter, B. 190

Al-Bērūnī K. al-atār al-baḳiya 'an al-ḳurūn al-khālīya, ed. Sachau.

C.Brockelmann - Aus Ibn al-Gauzi's K. al-Wafa, Beiträge z. Assyrologie III.

E.G.Browne - A literary history of Persia.

B.Chapira - Lettre aux Juifs du Yemen, REJ. 99.

W.St.Clair-Tisdall - A manual of the leading Muhammedan objections to Christianity. 2 ed. L.SPCK. 1909.

I.Davidson - Sa'adia's polemic against Hiwi al-Balkhi, NY 19

R.Dozy - Poème d'Abou Ishac d'Elvira contre les Juifs de Grenade (in Recherches etc. I.).
 - Histoire des Musulmans d'Espagne

W.Eichner - Nachrichten über d. Islam b.d. Byzantinern, Isla 23, 1936.

E.Fagnan - Arabo-Judaica, REJ 59.

J.Finkel - A risala of al-Jahiz, JAOS 47, 1927.

- W. Fischel - Arabische Quellen z. Gesch. d. babylonischen
Judenheit i. 13. Jhd. MGWJ 79, 1935.
- Jews in the economic & political life of medieval
Islam.
- I. Friedlaender - Die Messiasidee im Islam (in Festschr. A.
Berliner, Frankf. 1903).
- Qirgisani's Polemik gegen d. Islam, ZA 26.
- Jewish-Arabic Studies, JQR NS I.-III.
- The Heterodoxies of the Shiites according to
Ibn-Hazim, New Haven 1907-9.
- Muhammedanische Geschichtskonstruktionen
(Beitr. z. Kenntnis d. Orients IX.)
- Abdallah b. Saba, ZA 23, 1909.
- Zur Komposition von Ibn Hazm's Milal (Or.
Studien-Festschr. Th. Noeldeke I., 1906).
- E. Fritsch - Islam u. Christentum i. Mittelalter, Bresl. 1930.
- M. Gaster - Das Shiur Komah, MGWJ 37, 1893.
- F. Giese - Die geschichtl. Grundlagen f. d. Stellung d. christl.
Untertanen im osmanischen Reich, Islam 19.
- I. Goldziher - Ahl al kitab, E.I. I. 184.
- Bada', E.I.
- Die Zahiriten.
- Muhammedanische Studien.
- Le Livre de Moh. b. Toumart.
- Vorlesungen über d. Islam.
- Die Richtungen d. islamischen KoranAuslegung.
- Proben mudammed. Polemik gegen d. Talmud
I.) Ibn Hazm, Kobak's Jeschurun VIII., 1872.
II.) Ibn Kayyim al-Gauziya, ib. IX., 1873.
- Der aegyptische Arzt Muwaffik, MGWJ XX.
- Polemik d. Drusen geg. d. Pentateuch, in Geiger's
jued. Zeitschrift, XI. 1875.
- Ueber muhammedanische Polemik geg. Ahl-al-Kitab
ZDMG 32, 1878.
- Ueber jued. Sitten u. Gebraeuche aus muhamme-
danischen Schriften, MGWJ, 1880.
- Arabische Aeusserungen über Gebraeuche d. Juden-
heit beim Gebet u. Studium, MGWJ, XX.
- Usages juifs d'après la littérature religieuse
des Musulmans, REJ 28, 1894.
- Ibn-Hud, the Mohammedan Mystic and the Jews of
Damascus, JQR VI., 1894.
- Saïd b. Hasan d'Alexandrie, REJ, XXX., 1895.
- Mélanges Judeo-Arabes, REJ 43, 44, 47, 49, 50, 60.
- Die Sabbathinstitution im Islam (Gedenkbuch D.
Kaufmann 1900).

- I. Goldziher - Kämpfe um d. Stellung d. Hadit im Islam, ZDMG 61, 1907.
- Zur Gesch. d. hanbalitischen Bewegung, ZDMG 62
- M. de Goeje - Quotations from the Bible in the Kuran and the Traditions (Sem. Stud. in mem. of Al. Kohut).
- E. Garcia Gomez - Polémica religiosa entre Ibn-Hazm e Ibn al Nagrila, Al-Andalus IV., 1936.
- R.J.H. Gottheil - Dhimmis and Moslems in Egypt (Old Test. and Sem.St. in mem. of W.Harper, II., Chicago, 1908).
- Wasiti, and answer to the Dhimmis, JAOS 41, 1920.
- A fetwa on the appointment of Dhimmis to office, ZA 26.
- A. Guillaume - The influence of Judaism on Islam (in The legacy of Israel, OXF. 1927).
- Ja. Guttman - Die Religionsphilosophie d. Abr. ibn Daud, Göttingen, 1879.
- Je. Guttmann - Zur Kritik d. Offenbarungsreligion i.d. islamischen u. juedischen Philosophie, MGWJ 78, 19
- Ibn al-Hājj al-Madkhal, ed. 1348/1929.
- A.S. Halkin - Samaritan polemics against the Jews, Proceedings of the Amer. Acad. f. Jewish Research, VII., 19
- B. Z. Halper - The Jews under the Fatimides, Hatakufa 18, 1923
- Jewish literature in Arabic, ib., 22-24.
- A. Harkavy - Kirḳisani on the Jewish sects, Zapiski VIII., 189
- The Muslim contention on Muhammed's name in the Pentateuch, ib. IX., 1895.
- Fragments of anti-Karaite writings of Sa'adia, JQR 13.
- Ibn Ḥazm - K. al-fiṣal fī-l-milal wa-n-niḥal C.1317.
Span. tr. by Asir Palacios; cf. Gomez.
- H. Hirschfeld - Arabic Chrestomathy in Hebrew characters, L 1892.
- Ein Karaer über d. Vorwurf jued. Torafaelschu ZA 26.
- New researches into the composition and exegesis of the Qoran, L. 1902.
- Mohammedan criticism of the Bible, JQR 13.
- Early Karaite critics of the Mishna, ib. 8.

- H. Hirschfeld - Historical and legendary controversies between Mohammed and the Rabbis, ib. 10.
- Leo Hirschfeld - Sa'd b. Mansur Ibn Kammunah u.s. polemische Schrift, B. 1893.
- J. Horovitz - Judaeo-Arabic relations in pre-Islamic times, Isl. Culture III.
 - u.S.G. Weil - Bibel i.d. islamischen Literatur, E.J. IV.
 - The Arabian nights, Hatekufa 23.
 - Bulukija, ZDMG LV.
- Cl. Huart - Le rationalisme musulman, Rev.d.l'Hist.d.Rel. 50.
- Ikhwān aş-Şafā' - Rasā'il.
- 'Abd al-Ḥakḳ al-Islāmī, lithography and MSS. BM, Ind.Off.Rabat
- Jāhiz - ar-Radd 'alā-n-Nasārā (in the 3 epistles publ. by J. Finkel, Cairo, 1926) cf. J. Finkel; French: in Hesperis 1939; cf. W. Bacher.
- Ibn al-Jauzī - Naḳd al-'ilm wa-l-'ulamā' au talbīs iblīs, K.134
- A. Jeffery - New trends in Moslem apologetics (In The Moslem World of to-day, ed. by J.R.Mott, 1925).
- Judaism and Christianity v. II. ed. by H. Loewe, L. 1937.
 (W.L. Knox - Pharisaism and Hellenism.
 J. Parkes - Rome, pagan and Christian.
 E. Rosenthal - Islam)
- Aḥmad al-Ḳalkāshandī - Şubḥ al-a'shā, v.XIII.
- Ibn Kammūna, Sa'd b. Manşūr - cf. Baneth, L. Hirschfeld, MS. Oxf.
 - Treatise on the differences between the Rabbanites a. Karaite in H.Hirschfeld's Chrestomathy.
- Ḳarāfī - Al-ajwiba al-fākhira 'an al-as'ila al-fājira, MS.; BM.
- D. Kaufmann - Saadia et Hiwi al-Balchi, REJ 27.
- Ibn-Ḳhaldūn - k. al-'Ibar II.
- Ibn al-Ḳhaṭīb - Al-Iḥāta fī akhbār Gharnāta, C.1319.
 - K. a māl al-a'lam, Rabat 1934, ed. Levi-Provençal.

Abū-l-Husayn 'Abd ar-Rahīm al-Khayyāṭ - K. al-intiṣār wa-r-radd
ed. Nyberg, 1925.

Abū Yūsuf Ya'kūb al-Kirkisānī cf. Harkavy, I. Friedlaender,
H. Hirschfeld.

Knox cf. Judaism.

P. Kraus - Zu Ibn al-Mukaffa', RSO XIV.
- Beiträge m. islamischen Ketzergesch., ib. XIV.
(M. Guidi's notes ib.).
- Hebraeische u. syrische Zitate i. ismaelitischen
Schriften, Islam 19.

S. Krauss - The Jews in the works of the Church fathers, JQR,
V.-VI.
- Das Leben Jesu nach jued. Quellen, B. 1902.
- The complaints against the Rabbis, Ṣiyunim, Simhoni
memorial, 1929.

A. Kruinsky - Description of two polemic MSS. Drevonsti Vostochni
nija, III., 1.

G. Levi Della Vida - Appunti e quesiti di storia letteraria
araba, RSO 13.

R. Levy - cf. (Ibn al-) Ukhuwa.

H. Loewe - cf. Judaism.

Maimonides - The epistle to Yemen (publ. by D. Holub in Ha-
Shahar 1873; partial tr. by S. Morais in JQR 1935
cf. B. Chapira; in Arabic, BM MS.

Makkarī - Nafḥ at-ṭīb.

Al-Makrizī- al-Khiṭaṭ.

J. Mann - The Jews in Egypt & Palestine under the Fatimid
Caliphs.
- An early theologico-polemical work, HUCA XII.-XIII.
- Texts and Studies (esp. on Moses b. Samuel, a Jewish
Katib in Damascus and his pilgrimage).
- La lettre polemiste de Jacob b. Elie al Pablo
Christiani, REJ 82, 1926.

J.S. Margoliouth - On "The book of Religion and Empire" Proc.
Brit. Ac. XVI.

- al-Mas'ūdī - Murūj ad-dahab.
- K. at-Tanbīh.
- Di Matteo - Le preteze contradizioni della S. Scripture seconde
Ibn Hazm, Bessarione, 1923.
- Il tahrif od alterazione della Bibbia secondo i
musulmani, Bessarione.
- L. Massignon - La légende "De tribus impostoribus", Rev. Hist.
Rel. 82.
- A. Mez - Die Renaissance des Islams, Heidelberg 1922.
- A. Mingana cf. Ṭabarī.
- E. Mittwoch - Muslimische Fetwas über d. Samaritaner, Orient.
Liter. ZG. 29, 1926.
- Murtadā b. 'Alam Hudā - Ṭabsirat al-'awāmm, ed. A. Ikbal, Tehr.
1313.
- Ibn an-Nakkāsh - Fetwa cf. Belin.
- J. Neubauer - Karaeische Studien, MGWJ 83, 1938.
- Th. Noeldeke - Amalekiten.
- Burzoes Einleitung z.d. Buche Kalila wa Dimna,
Strassbg. 1912.
- H.S.Nyberg cf. al-Khayyāṭ.
- J. Obermann - Ein Werk agadisch-islamischen Synkretismus, Z f S
1927.
- Masin Palacios - Abenhazam.
- La tesis de la necesidad de la revelacion en el
Islam y en la escolastica, Andalus III. 1935.
- La indiferencia religiosa en la Espana musul-
mana segun Abanhazam, Cultura Espanola 1907.
- Un tratado morisco de polemica contra los
judios (in Melanges H.Derenbourg, P.1909).
- P. Paquignon - Quelques documents sur la condition des Juifs au
Maroc. RMM 1909.
- J. Parkes - cf. Judaism.
- H. Peres - La poesie andalouse en Arabe classique, P.1937.
- A. Posnanski - Shiloh I.Lpzig. 1904.

- S. Posnanski - Hiwi Ha-Balkhi (Ha-Goren, VII.1907).
- Ibn Hazm über jued. Sekten, JQR.16, 1904.
- Yahyā b. Ibrāhīm ar-Raḳilī - Ta'yīd al Milla, cf. Palacios
Un tratado, etc.
- Rāzī - Maḳatīh al Ghaib.
- I'tikādāt furuk al-Mushrikīn wa-l-Muslimīn.
- S. Rawidowicz - Saadia and Maimonides on the problem of anthropomorphism (Kneset, Tel-Aviv, 1938).
- G. Richter - Ueber d. älteste Auseinandersetzung d. syrischen Christen m.d. Juden. Zeitsch. f.d.neutest. Wiss., 1936.
- H. Ritter - (Philologica) Ibn al Gauzi's Bericht über Ibn ar-Rewendi, Islam 19.
- J. Rivlin - Muhammed's Testament to Ali (D.Yellin Studies, Jerusalem. 1935).
- E. Rosenthal - cf. Judaism.
- Sa'adia - Kitāb al-Amānāt wa-l-i'tikādāt, ed. S. Landauer Leiden, 1880.
- Sa'id b. Yusuf v. Sa'adia.
- Sa'id b. Ḥasan v. Goldziher, Weston.
- Ibn Ṣā'id K. Tabakāt al-Umam ed. Cheikho, Beyrouth, 1912.
- Samau'al al-Maghribī - Ifhām al-Yahūd cf. M. Schreiner; MS.Cair VI. 113.
- S. Schechter - Geniza Specimens, JQR, 13.
- Schmiedl - Die juedische Religionsphilosophie über d. Anthropomorphismen d. Bibel, MGWJ XVI., 1867.
- A.E. Schmidt - New materials on the alleged mention of Muhammed name in the Pentateuch, Zapiski 24, 1916.
- Four Arabic MSS. ZKV V., 1930.
- M. Schreiner - Samau'al b. Jahja al-Magribi u.s. Schrift "Ifhām al-Jahūd", MGWJ XLII., 1898.
- Nachträge u. Berichtigungen, MGWJ, 43.

- M. Schreiner - Bemerkungen z. Chronik d. Josef Sambari, ZDMG XLV., 1891.
 - Contributions à l'histoire des Juifs en Egypte, REJ 32, 1896.
 - Zur Geschichte d. Polemik zwischen Juden u. Mohammedanern, ZDMG XLII., 1888.
 - Beiträge z. Geschichte d. Bibel i.d. arabischen Literatur (Semitic Studies in memory of Al. Kohut, Berl. 1897).
 - Beiträge z. Geschichte d. theologischen Bewegung en i. Islam, ZDMG LII., 463-510.
 - Der Kalam i.d. juedischen Literatur, B.1895.
 - Studien über Jeschua b. Yehuda, B.1900.
 - Zur Charakteristik R. Samuel b. Hofni's und R. Ha'is, MGWJ 35, 1886.
- M. Schwabe - The ten Jewish associates of Muhammed, Tarbiz 1930
- M. Schwab - Les non-Musulmans dans le monde de l'islam, RMM, 19
- Shahrastānī - K. al Milal wa-n-nihal, ed. Curston, Germ. tr. Th. Haarbrücker, 1850-7.
 - K. Nihāyat al-Ikdām fī'ilm al-Kalām, ed. A. Guillaume, Oxf. 1934.
- Shāmī 'Umar b. Muh. - Niṣāb al-ihtisāb, BM 98996, cf. Ind. Off. Cat. II., facs. 3, N 1693.
- J. Simhoni - Moses Ibn Ezra's book on Hebrew poetry, Ha-Tekufa, 23
- Simeon b. Zemah Duran - Keshet u magen, publ. by Steinschneider in Magazin f.d. Wiss. d. Judent. 1881, tr. by him ib. 1880.
- H. Speyer - Yahud, E.I. IV.
- E. Stein - Hiwi, the Jewish Marcion (in Sefer Klausner, Tel-Aviv 1937).
- M. Steinschneider - Die arabische Literatur d. Juden, Frankf. 1902.
 - Polemische u. apologetische Literatur i. arabischer Sprache, Lpzg., 1877.
 - Gaubari's "entdeckte Geheimnisse" ZDMG 19.
- Suyūṭī - Itkān.
- Ṭabarī - Ta'rīkh
 - Tafsīr.

- 'Alī b. Rabban aṭ-Ṭabarī - K. ad-dīn wa-d-daula, ed. A. Mingana 1923; tr. by A. Mingana, in "The book of religion & Empire" 1922.
- Ṭabarsī - K. al Ihtijāj, Lit. Tehr. 1302.
- Ṭabāṭabā'ī - MS. BM.
- F. Taeschner - Die alttestamentlichen Bibelzitate ..., in aṭ-Ṭabari's Kitab ad-Din, etc., in Oriens Christianus 1934.
- Ibn-Taymiya - Majmū'at fatawā.
- A.S. Tritton - The Caliphs & their non-Muslim subjects, Oxf. 1937
- Islam and the protected religions, JRAS, 1931.
- A.G. Tumanyan - Old Armenian authors on Muhammed and Islam, Drevnosti Vostochneya IV., 1913.
- Muh. Ibn al-Ukhūwa - Ma'ālim al qurba, ed. R. Levy, Cambr. 1937-
- al-'Umarī - al-ta'rīf fī-l-muṣṭalah ash-sharīf.
- G. Vajda - Les Zindiqs en pays d'Islam au début de la période abbasside, RSO XVII., 1937.
- Juifs et Musulmans selon le Ḥadīṭ, JA 1937.
- Judaeo-Arabica, REJ 99, 1935.
- Ahmad al-Wansharīsī - Al-Mi'yār al-mughrib, French selection by E. Amar, La pierre de touche des fétwas, I.-II., in Arch. Marocaines XII.-XIII.
- G. Weil - cf. J. Horovitz.
- S.A. Weston - The K. Masālik an-Nazar of Sa'īd b. Ḥasan of Alexandria, JAOS 24, 1903.
- A.L. Williams - Adversus Judaeos (Christian apologiae) Cambr. 1935.
- Yehuda Ha-Levi - K. al-hujja wa-d-dalīl fī nasr ad-dīn ad-dalīl ed. H. Hirschfeld, Lpzg. 1887; Engl. tr. by the editor, L. 1905.
- Ibn Zafar - K. Khayr al-bishar bi-khair al-bashar, ed. A.H. 1280
- Shaykh Ziyāda, MS. S.O.S.
- M. Zucker - Notes on religious disputations between Jews and Islam (Hebrew, Festschrift A. Kaminka, Vienna 1937)

I. INTRODUCTION.

Islam at its rise found the Jews a powerful element in Medina. In later times, the Jews were a section of the population of the rising Islamic world.

The early period of Islam is characterised by the clash with Arabian Jews whom Muhammad had failed to win over to his creed. The Koran bears clear evidence of the struggle.

From the time of the Abbasids controversial tracts have been preserved. The ninth century produced at least four polemical treatises (still extant) against Christians, but none against Jews. Later, too, the bulk of polemics against Jews and their tenets is meagre as compared with that of the works against Christianity.

Thus, whilst the earlier Arabian stage of Islam resounds with Moslem-Jewish strife, classical Islam directed its polemic mainly against Christians.

It is not difficult to see the point of this shift of interest. In the conquered territories, Christianity with its various denominations and sects, was the religion of the large majority of the people (as in the Byzantine lands); or at least of the monotheists (as in Persia). The Jews were now far less important in the eyes of the Muslims. Christians filled many of the posts in the administration, and more than once fought in the Muslim army. Later, they took a prominent

place in the intellectual revival under Islam. The importance of the Christians was enhanced by the fact that, outside the Islamic world, Christianity was a State religion.

All these factors enabled the Christian communities to maintain for centuries an independent communal life under Islam. Thus the process of Arabisation and Islamisation aroused Christian opposition, or at any rate evoked a defensive attitude against the new faith.

The position of the Jews was different. Though numerous in some parts of the Islamic world, they were few as compared with Christians. They were not represented in the administration, and although there were several Jewish garrisons, there was no need to consider them seriously as a military force. Nor had they any external power behind them to lend them support.

By that time, too, their segregation and the characteristics of their communal life were firmly established; and one of its features was an aversion from discussing their religion with outsiders.

In short, whereas for the vast majority of Christians their reduction to the lower status of ahl ad-dimma must have rankled until it became a grievance creating, in turn, a situation which forced their writers into arguments with the new rulers and their faith, the status of the Jews underwent little or no change; indeed, their position was substantially improved under Muslim rule. This fact, as well as their

general indifference towards other religions, precluded them from attacking Islam.

Hence it is clear why the main stream of late Muslim polemics was directed against Christians, a striking fact when we remember the acrimonious attacks on the Jews in the Koran.

From the standpoint of theology, also, polemics against Christians seemed more logical than against Jews. Islam accepts certain basic Christian tenets, first among them the mission of Jesus; this fact gave rise to the impression that a Christian need only accept the Muslim claim on behalf of Muhammad, to be regarded as a true believer. But the conversion of a Jew seemed a more difficult matter. A Jew would have to be convinced, first of all, of the abrogation of the Law of Moses, and then brought to accept the Muslim claims on behalf of Jesus and Muhammad, successively, before he could accept the dominant creed.

Yet within the scope of the general polemical literature, mainly anti-Christian as it is, there is much that concerns the Jews and the formation of judgment about them and their Scriptures.

The first extant systematic treatment of the Jews and their lore is relatively late, it is not a ^{work} specially devoted to the subject, but part of a general compendium of theology, Ibn Hazm's Milal (XIc.). Only about a century later does the "classical" work aimed specifically against Jews appear,

supplied by a Jewish convert, Samau'al b. 'Abbās al-Maghribī.

Polemic utterances occur early; expositions of polemics are relatively late. A survey of this polemic must also take into account to some extent the anti-Christian polemics and the accounts of the "Milal" books.

Much of the information possessed by the Muslim authors about Jews and the Jewish religion was evidently supplied by converts, not only from the Jewish, but also from the Christian faith. Indeed, it seems safe to assume that since the majority of the converts were Christians, some of the anti-Jewish prejudices and arguments then current amongst the Christian populations found their way into Muslim circles.

II. THE JEWS IN THE KORAN AND IN THE TRADITIONS.

In the Koran, the terms Yahūd, or alladīna hādū - contemporary Jews, Banū Isrā'īl - the Jews of olden times, are frequently used. God had revealed to them the Taurāt and the Zabūr. Forgetting the Divine Dispensation, the Jews transgressed God's commandments, ^{and} flouted the prophets, and even slew them (III.180). Therefore many punishments fell upon them (II.58); e.g., some of them were turned into apes for desecrating the sabbath (II.59; VII.166).

Muhammad came to confirm their scriptures (III.2; IV.50), but they did not accept him. They concealed the revelation (II.36; III.64), or did not understand it (II.73); they tried to mislead people (III.62,95), having no compunction about deceiving the pagan Arabs (III.69). Therefore, although they knew from their books all about Muhammad "as they knew their own children" (II.141), they made false statements about the scriptures (IV.48; 5.45), distorting the texts.

In contradiction to them, the Prophet declares that Ibrāhīm and Ismā'īl were Muslim prophets (II.119; III.58,60; XIX.55), who built the Meccan temple (II.119; III.90) before the revelation of Mūsā, to which the Jews refer. Thus, Islam is the original revelation. This cuts the ground from under

the feet of the unbelievers.

They make blasphemous statements: That God's hand is chained up (V.69); that 'Uzair is the son of God (IX.30). At the same time, they are stubborn in their opposition to the true prophet. They must be regarded as enemies (III.27; V.56,62). The believers will find that they are their fiercest enemies, the Christians being much more friendly (V.85). Therefore, after they had rejected many friendly overtures (II.59; V.73), it was decided that they must be fought against, made tributaries, and compelled to pay poll-tax, as a mark of their humiliation(IX.29).

In the Fātiḥa, the words al-maghḍūb alayhim are supposed to refer to the Jews.

In Tradition Jews occupy only a small place.

They are reproached with evading and disobeying the Law, and inventing laws of their own instead. The best-known instance of this is that they abolished stoning for adultery, and substituted a milder punishment; but when questioned by Muhammad on the subject, they sought to deceive him.

Believers should not apply to them for information, whether about the facts of the past, or religious-legal regulations.

Again and again the admonition is repeated: "Do not enter into discussion with them; do not say either 'yes' or 'nay' to

their assertions; neither believe nor disbelieve them."

When it is necessary to quote them, special reasons for this will always be found. They cannot be trusted for they deleted references to the Prophet from their books. They tried also to test him by putting to him questions. But the result, of course, was only to give him another opportunity to prove the divine origin of his inspiration. Persisting in their obduracy, they did not shrink from plotting, practising sorcery and poisoning, until they were finally crushed and driven out of Arabia.

The Jews extended their hatred of the Prophet to all Muslims. They mispronounced the usual "Peace be unto you", so that it came to mean: "Poison be upon you"; for which reason it is wiser and safer to reply with a mere: "The same to you". They always try to trick the unsuspecting Muslim.

To imitate them is positively forbidden. Indeed, it is right to do the exact opposite of what they do. This point, khālifūhum, is fundamental; to refute a proposition, to prove a thing is repugnant, it is sufficient to ascribe it to the Jews. They became, in a way, the incarnation of evil. No wonder that, when the world comes to an end, and when ḍajjāl threatens to destroy those of the true faith, the Jews will be betrayed in their hiding-places even by the crying of the rock: "Here is a Jew behind me. Kill him."

Although the ḥadīṭ is sometimes accurate in its

description of the outward appearance of the Jews, it does not display understanding of their tenets. For example, it cannot distinguish between what is biblical and what is not. References to the Bible are few, although garbled "versions" from Taurāt and Zabūr abound.

Information of this kind, and the judgments resulting from it, are also to be found in the sīra and in the works of the historians using the ḥadīṭ. We find them embellished by the Ḳuṣṣāṣ with strange flights of fancy, especially where the ancient Banū-Isrā'īl are concerned.

A special value seems to be attached to exposures of Jews by converted Jews, usually Ka'b al-Aḥbār and Wahb b. Munabbih.

III. SOURCES OF EARLY POLEMICS.

Both the historians and the commentators on the Koran were called upon to deal with Jewish matters. Both were at first in the grip of the ḥadīṭ. Later, they tried to obtain some knowledge from the Jews themselves, or from their writings. It is not surprising that it was the historian rather than the theologian who made those efforts. But most authors show by their errors that they had no access to sources (apart from quotations supplied by converts), and that the influence of the Koran and Ḥadīṭ was too strong to allow of more than the beginnings of independent study, the more so as interest soon flagged.

One example may serve to illustrate how scholars were unable to free themselves from their traditions, even although these created new difficulties; it also shows how and why their efforts to obtain information for purposes of study involved them in controversy.

The Koran mentions Hāmān in the company of Fir'aun. The Muslim scholars tried to find out more about Hāmān. They applied to the ahl-al-kitāb, who told them the story of Esther. But that story relates to the days of the Persians, "under Ardashir". Now a thousand years separate Pharaoh from

Ardashir. One of the sources, either the Muslim or the biblical, must be wrong. The Muslim scholars, however, refused to accept the notion of an error in the "word of God"; consequently, it was the Bible that was in error. Obviously the case was one of distortion or forgery - of taḥrīf, tabdīl, taghyīr.

This is an example of a crude solution. Later, subtler methods were employed; e.g., it was suggested that the Hāmān of the Koran and the Hāmān of the Bible were not identical. One might have lived in the time of Moses, the other in that of Ardashir.

Muslim scholars were aware of the difficulties by which they were beset. Jāḥiẓ (d. A.D.869), in his Epistle against the Christians, described the Muslim approach to the subject. Muslims are more favourably inclined towards Christians than towards Jews. To explain that he proceeds to analyse the circumstances in which the Muslims encountered the Jews. At first they quarrelled. Later, the Jews were envious of their Muslim conquerors. Then the assertion of the Koran that the Jews would be found to be the greatest enemies of Islam began to make itself felt. "And history, as we know, provides future generations with prejudices and predilections." Christians are learned; Jews are narrow-minded, and confine themselves to their own scriptures; they have no secular

knowledge. Moreover, people are impressed by Christians on account of their high rank in the administration and the professions, whereas Jews are usually "dyers, tanners, cuppers, butchers, cobblers". So people tend to believe that their faith is as filthy as their vocations. Even biology is brought into the argument: Jews marry only amongst themselves, and therefore produce a poor breed.

The Christians, who are so influential, start religious arguments and disputes, at the same time attacking the Jews, using the arguments of Zindīks and atheists.

Jāhīz tries to steer a middle course on the question of the scriptures. He avers that they are inspired, but adds that Jewish interpretation of them may be faulty, primarily because of the Jews' ignorance of Arabic, which hampers them when it comes to giving explanations to Arabs.

On the other hand the author, by way of attacking the Christians, defends the Jews against some accusations based on misunderstanding of passages of the Koran; e.g., the assertion that "God's hand is chained up", and their alleged belief in "Uzayr". The real trouble with them is that they do not believe in free will at all.

Here, therefore, is an attempt, although an indirect one, to analyse the causes of the Muslim's difficulties in approaching the subject of the Jews.

ابن كُتَيْبَة

Ibn Kūtaiba (d. 276/889) declares that "the Arabs had still (in the Jāhiliya) retained some remnants of the original Abrahamic religion of Ismā'īl; for example, the pilgrimage." He then supplies a small collection of biblical quotations for use as a 'lām, testimonies to and announcements of Muhammad. They are those about Ismā'īl, Arabia and the desert and the succession of prophets. First the classical passage: Genesis XVII.20, God's promise to make of Ismā'īl a great nation. Then the story of Hagar: Genesis XXX.9ff. The verse Genesis XVI.12, "And he will be a wild man; his hand will be against every man, and every man's hand against him; and he shall dwell in the presence of all his brethren", is quoted thus: "His hand will be over all, and the hands of all will be outstretched towards him in submission". The prophecy was fulfilled by the transference of both religion and empire from B. Isrā'īl to B. Ismā'īl. This came to pass through the acts of Muhammad.

In Deuteronomy XXXIII.2: "The LORD came from Sinai, and rose up from Seir unto them; he shined forth from mount Paran", Sinai stands for the Torah and Moses; Seir refers to the Gospel and Jesus; for Jesus lived in Seir in the region of al-Khalīl (Hebron), in a village called an-Nāṣira . . . ; Mount Paran refers to the Koran. Nobody doubts that Paran is Mecca. The scriptures mention Paran as the dwelling place of Ismā'īl

(Genesis XXI.21); Or - was there any other prophet in a place called Paran?

Deuteronomy XVIII.18: ". . . a Prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee"; and Deuteronomy XXXIV.10: "And there arose not a prophet since in Israel like unto Moses". When the promise is made, the Bible asserts that no prophet after Moses was "like unto Moses", so that the text cannot refer to any other biblical prophet.

Habakkuk III.3: ". . . and the Holy One from Mount Paran". "Habakkuk prophesied in the days of Daniel". Here again, the name Paran connects the text with the subject. But the name of the prophet of Mecca is plainly referred to: ". . . His glory . . . full of his praise" (hodo u-t^ehillato) is translated as "The praise of Aḥmad (Vḥmd) and his sanctification (min taḥmīd aḥmad wa-takḏīsihi)". Again: "If this be not so, then who is this Aḥmad whose praise fills the earth?"

The forty-second chapter of Isaiah is quoted at length as a description of Muhammad. The Hebrew and Syriac versions are given. Isaiah XXI.6-9: The camel-rider is Muhammad, who did away with the idols of Babylon.

At the very end, we learn the sources. The truth cannot be concealed, for in Syriac the name of the prophet is derived from the root sh b h, which corresponds to the Arabic Vḥmd. New Testament proofs follow. It is, therefore, probably a compilation from material supplied by a Christian convert.

A converted Christian, the physician 'Alī b. Rabban aṭ-Ṭabarī, wrote an apology for Islam in the middle of the 9th century. About the same time, a Nestorian, Abraham b. 'Aun al-Iskāf, wrote a work against the Jews.

Christian attacks on Jews in Arabic, probably deriving from pre-Islamic antecedents, became a mine of information for Muslims. Polemics against the Jews in Arabic by Christians, seem to be at least as numerous as those by Muslim authors.

"The book of religion and empire" of the convert 'Alī b. Rabban aṭ-Ṭabarī is a rich mine of Bible quotations, and it makes several new points. Thus it stresses (p.35) the argument that if the non-Muslims do not accept "scriptural testimony" about Muhammad adduced by Muslims, then "We, the Muslims, will not believe the adversary who says that the Torah and the Gospel do not contain falsehoods."

The writer says that the zindīqs did not believe in the Bible, arguing that God could not have revealed such injunctions as sprinkling blood on the altar; or the obscene stories; nor have urged a prophet (Hosea) to marry a harlot, etc. (p. 46f; 51f.) We thus learn that a discussion had been going on as to the value of the biblical testimony and the biblical accounts.

Ṭabarī wants to retain the biblical testimony and to fit the Islamic revelation into its framework. But he is not consistent; for (p.45/51) at the same time he is stressing

that the stories of the Koran are better than those of the Pentateuch. The miracle (i'jāz) of the Koran and the domination of Islam are strong arguments for Islam (p.42/59).

A whole chapter (p.66-73) is devoted to proving that if belief in Muhammad be rejected, then the Bible itself is null and void; for all the prophecies about Ismā'īl and the Prophet are then foolish. A number of biblical passages follow, the renderings of many of them strongly reminiscent of those of Ibn K̄utaiba. The prophets cursed the Children of Israel and foretold the ignominy reserved for them (p.46/51; 141/166).

The author uses the Syriac text, but notes where the Hebrew and Greek versions deviate from it.

The most vigorous and militant literary representative of the numerous rationalists of the Islamic world, then in a ferment, seems to have been Rawandī.

Apparently Rawandī gave up rationalizing Islam, and turned to pure rationalism. Having arrived at this means of solving his doubts, he then turned against creeds in general, and the dominant creed in particular. His main theme is the supreme value of reason as the source of knowledge and judgment. Religion puts up a defence by asserting the value of revelation and prophecy. Rawandī proceeds to refute these assertions. "He has no use for this theory". Revelation either contains what reason itself can supply us with, in which case it is superfluous; or else something other than reason teaches, in

which case we cannot accept it. Muhammad's laws seem to be contrary to reason, prayer is senseless, the pilgrimage absurd. "Circling round the ka'ba is not different from circling round any other house."

Peoples were tricked by "miracles" into submission to the Prophets. The disciples of the latter may have lied deliberately when transmitting their messages. In any case no credence can be attached to tradition. A crowd of poor Arabs could not know more about the fate of Christ than the older and far more numerous communities of Jews and Christians. All these stories about angels whose intervention brings victory at one time, but at another cannot prevent defeat (Badr-Uhud), are hopeless nonsense. But the spirit of man is strong enough to find a way out. Astronomy will advance without any prophets; human craft without any revelation can extract music from the dried intestines of animals strung over a piece of wood. Reason through science, versus religion consisting of senseless ritual and baseless tradition, shows the way.

He who has imposed disease, poverty and suffering on man cannot be wise and merciful. But it would seem that God knows only the art of killing. If there is a God, what need has He of the prophet? Those who preach in His name use the tricks of sorcery to fool their victims. The Koran is a self-contradictory, foolish book. A good poem is far better than koranic chatter. In any case, a non-Arab cannot appreciate its

"marvels".

Rawandī's frontal attack on the foundations of belief, and particularly on Islam, created a profound impression, and raised a storm in theological circles and in the literature of the time.

Rawandī was not alone in that particular field of work. The names of other authors have recently come to light; but it is doubtful if much opinion of this kind found its way into writing; and what there was of it was doomed to perish quickly.

Now Rawandī's name is traditionally connected with Jews; he was even said to be of Jewish origin. A Jew said to a Muslim: "He will destroy your books as his father destroyed ours." To this Rawandī replied: "Moses said there was to be no prophet after him . . ." This seems, however, to have been one of the cases where Jewish connections were ascribed to a man only to discredit him. The stories about him insist that he was a man of no principles, who wrote pamphlets to order, particularly for the Jews, for 400 dirhams, and extorted another hundred by threatening to refute his own pamphlet at once. All sources agree that he found a refuge with some Jews, and died at the home of one of them. There may have been some kernel of truth in the stories, although they appear to be exaggerations.

Juwānī, Ghazālī's master, accuses the Jews of having

learned from Rawandī how to pose problems. Salmon b. Yeruhim, the Karaite polemist, comments on Ecclesiastes VII.16: ". . . neither make thyself overwise" thus: "like those who run about the streets of the cities and the market-places in search of worldly books such as the writings of the philosophers and those of Ibn ar-Rawandī and Ibn Suwayd who seduce people away from belief in God and His prophets." A volume of Rawandī's is mentioned in the Geniza list of a private Jewish library.

There were Jews who applied Rawandī's method in criticising the scriptures.

Sa'adia wonders at those who imagine there is no Lord over them. He finds a description of them in Psalm II.3: "Let us break their bonds asunder, and cast away their cords from us." People question God's omniscience and prescience, in order to undermine belief. Old queries about texts and problems; malicious criticism by Christians, pagans and dualists; the impact of the new and still confused intellectual activities; a constant stream of heterodoxies, especially the Karaite schisms - all these have now set up a religious and cultural fermentation. In Baghdad, in the Xth century, a circle of people of different religions (including Buddhists and dualists) used to meet for discussion. A poet, the son of an exilarch, is mentioned as one of this circle, as well as a Jewish philosopher whom Mas'ūdī had met.

The figure who stands out most clearly is Hīwī ha-Balkhī, a contemporary of Rawandī, for he wrote about 875. From the retorts flung back at him about a quarter of his two hundred questions can be ascertained. He is accused of following the Zoroastrians. Sa'adia says that he inclined to believe in the Trinity.

There is a striking similarity between Hīwī's assertions and the biblical criticism of the Pehlevi book Shikand, probably due to their common derivation from older sources. Criticism of the Bible by pagan classical authors was taken over by Christian sectarians, especially those tainted by Gnosis, to discredit the Old Testament and its demiurgos of this world/^{of evil} and pollution. Marcionites spread these views further East and passed them on to Manichaeans. This mixture was/^{now}marshalled by Hīwī against the Jewish beliefs. This accounts also for the fact that he is accused of both Zoroastrian and Christian leanings.

Hīwī's queries concerned God and His attributes, creation, ritual, miracles and biblical stories. Why did God ask Adam where he was (Gen.III.9), and Cain where his brother was (Gen.IV.9), if He is omniscient? In Gen.VI.6 it says: "And it repented the LORD that he had made man on the earth." Surely He had known beforehand what would happen. Why was Israel chosen, and what was the use of rearing Ismael? What about the other peoples: left to other deities? One cannot understand the reason for the offering to God of meat and bread and

wine. Why should God have tempted Abraham? Is there any sense at all in the "red heifer" and the scapegoat? Why is Israel in abject slavery?

On miracles: The word keren does not mean radiant, but Moses' face was dry like a horn when he descended from Sinai, as the result of his long fast. Manna is a natural product known under such and such names. (And apparently also the crossing of the Red Sea was susceptible of a rational explanation.)

Contradictions are found in the list of Hiram's ancestors (I.Kings VII.13-14, with II.Chronicles II.14); and also in the two oaths, the one promising Palestine to the children of the Patriarchs; the other asserting that they would never enter the land (Numbers XIV.23). The story of Lot is objectionable.

Ḥīwī made a great impression on his contemporaries, and may have tried to play the part of a reformer. Again, his writings were but the extreme expression of certain tendencies of the period. A tenth century Geniza tract turns against those Jews connected with the Mu'tazila who try to steer a middle course between Islam and Christianity. A collection of biblical queries about the Bible has been found; but its purpose is not known. R. Hai (d. 1038) says that he does not follow the example of those who, like Samuel b. Ḥofni (d.1034), believe only in the strictly scriptural miracles of prophets

but not in the miraculous deeds of saintly men, nor even in the reality of the performance of the witch of En Dor. Such rationalism he recognises as being the result of extensive reading of secular books.

Post-biblical Jewish institutions were subjected to the criticism of Jewish sectarians, especially the Karaites. The point at issue was always the same; and it was raised anew under the influence of similar problems in Muslim circles. The issue was tajsīm, anthropomorphism, and its consequences in religious life and teaching.

Ḳirḳisānī (937) knows that the method which tried to remove the difficulties by discovering hidden meanings in the passages under review - meanings which made them spiritual and allegorical, and removed all doubts - was of ancient origin. This old method was now revived under the new Arabic names bāṭiniya and ta'wīl. Others even went so far as to criticise the traditional texts. The old Logos doctrine lurks behind the idea put forward by some, such as the Karaite teacher, Benjamin Nahawandi, that all biblical passages about God - His revelation to human beings; His talking, acting, etc. - refer to God's angels acting on His authority as His go-betweens amongst men.

Another point was the attitude of the Karaites towards the Islamic world. A middle way was sought. Some accepted

Jesus as a great prophet, higher in rank even than all the others. There were also Karaites who maintained that Jesus had been only a holy man (min auliyā' allāh) but not a prophet, and that he had not claimed to be one. The gospel was not a revealed book, but rather a piece of biography. The Jews, they said, incited by the Rabbanites, had murdered him, and had certainly been in the wrong; but that was their way with all opponents. (Wahādā sabīlulum fī kull man arād al-khilāf alayhim.)

The Koran, too, was accepted. True, it was not for the Jews, who already had their own scriptures, but it would serve for the Arabs and others. The Koran and its interpretations should be studied. God sent Muhammad to the Arabs. Let every community go its own way, and serve God according to its own teachings. (It is well known that minor sects, especially the 'Isāwīya, held similar views.)

An early record of Karaite polemics is contained in some Geniza fragments of the ninth century which may have come from a k. al faḍā'ih of Ibn Sāḳawayh.

Here the arguments against Rabbanism run on two lines.

- 1.) Its claim to be a continuation of prophecy and revelation is nonsensical; for the simple reason that the Rabbanites differ amongst themselves on every question. But two or more contradictory opinions on a subject cannot be of divine origin. That would be

absurd. Examples of such differences are mentioned. And even so the Rabbanites have recourse to their ingenuity (min tarīḳ al istidlāl), not to their tradition (naql).

- 2.) Far more serious is the accusation that the Rabbanite idea of God is gross anthropomorphism. The Rabbanites do not hesitate to give the most shocking descriptions of God's limbs, in the writings called Shi'ur ḳomah and Oṭiyot. In these, God is described as wailing, mourning, praying, talking to R. Ismael or to the righteous in Eden.

The critic quotes from a collection of queries whose author he mentions by name. Thus not merely the rank and file, but the great ones amongst the Rabbanites stand indicted.

At about this time, a Christian author of the West already knew something of this material. About 824-8, Agobard, Bishop of Lyons, fulminating against the Jews, referred to Jewish superstitions and their unworthy ideas about God. He drew upon older Christian sources in Greek, and also claimed to have had Jewish informants.

It has been suggested more than once that Karaites supplied the material for the Muslim critics of the Talmud. This does not seem at all unlikely, seeing that the great confusion existing among the Karaites weakened their resistance to the Muslim environment, and paved the way for the conversion of a

good many of them to Islam. On the other hand, the use of the same material in the West, where probably there were no Karaites in the first half of the ninth century, and the use of Greek sources, must make us cautious in saying that Karaites were the source of the belief that Jews were anthropomorphists. Even this material may have trickled in to the Muslims through Christian channels. It is difficult to see, however, how the Karaites could have failed to contribute to the stock of Muslim information.

We find those accusations of anthropomorphism in full spate about 935, when Salmon b. Yeruḥim wrote his "Book of the Wars of the Lord", in which the relevant haggadas were relentlessly exposed in Hebrew rhymes.

The earliest instance of these matters being brought before a Muslim audience appears to be in a disputation which, it is alleged, took place at the court of Ibn Ṭūlūn (868-883). Mas'ūdī (d. 345/958) tells ~~of~~ a monk who had attended many gatherings where religious problems were discussed. Involved in a discussion and hearing that his opponent was a Jew, the monk exclaimed: "Oh, a majūsī, then!" Asked what he meant, he explained that the Jews resembled the majūs in that they sometimes permitted marriages with daughters. Thus: If a Jew married to his niece, i.e., the daughter of his brother, died, that brother is entitled by the Levirate law to marry the widow

that is, his own daughter. In vain the Jew denied the allegation. Enquiry was made, and it was discovered that such a case had actually occurred - that of the Jewish physician himself. . . .

The monk then attacked the Bible. He laid stress on the anthropomorphic passages, beginning with: "In the image of God" (Gen. I.27); God's white hair and beard (Daniel VII.9); God as a devouring fire (Deuteronomy IV.24). Improper stories are found in the Bible: Lot and his daughters; Aaron's part in the making of the golden calf. And not only in the Bible. (The account, however, draws no distinction between biblical and non-biblical sources.) On the Day of Atonement, the Jews pray to the "little Lord", ar-rabb aṣ-ṣaghīr, whom they call Meṭatron, who will tear his hair and wail: "Woe unto me that I destroyed my house and orphaned my daughter! My shoulders are bowed. I shall not raise them until I have rebuilt my house." The Jews have many fables and confusions of the same kind, as well as contradictions in their scriptures.

The monk went on to attack not only texts but the logic of Jewish arguments. The Jews, he averred, are opposed to rational thinking in that they insist on the immutability of the Law, and deny naskh, abrogation. They insist that Moses was the prophet, which is illogical. They believe in Moses because he offered some proof of his mission. If another prophet does the same, why should not he be accepted likewise?

This account is peculiar in that a Christian is made to attack the Scriptures. True, Mas'ūdī adds that he learned that the monk maintained the equal tenability of all creeds, takāfu' al-madhab (later: t. al-adilla), which indicates a rationalist attitude.

IV. THE TENTH CENTURY.

By the beginning of the tenth century Muslim literature presents a certain accumulation of material bearing on the history, scriptures and beliefs of the Jews; that the sources of this material are varied (Jewish and Christian converts, Christian tracts, queries of sceptics and rationalists, theological and historical inquiry, mutual calumnies of Rabbanites and sectarians, etc.); and that the polemic is already well under way.

If we turn to the Arabic sources of Jewish origin, we find copious evidence of the discussions, and of the arguments used. It is of considerable interest that Jewish authors are already busy compiling whole series of refutations and apologetics to counter the attacks of Muslims and quasi-Muslims, or even Jewish sceptics whilst the Muslim texts do not pay much attention to the subject. Two ~~outstanding~~ works of this kind are outstanding. One is Sa'adia's Kitāb al-Amānāt wa-al-I'tikādāt, written in 933; the other, Ḳirḳisānī's Kitāb al-Anwār wa-al-Marākib, written in 937.

Both tell of great intellectual struggle. The Jews are forced to fight back under the pressure of the attacks of the Muslims. It was felt that though there was some opposition to speculation, kalām, nothing was to be gained by ~~shrinking~~from

the conflict. Replies must be made, and in the very terms used by the sceptics themselves, to refute the attacks.

But while *Ḳirḳisānī* plainly refers to his adversaries and explicitly attacks Islam, Sa'adia, more reticent, confines himself to pointing out the purpose of his work, without actually naming those he refutes. The spiritual instability of the times - the conflict of ideas and the search for solutions of urgent problems - is characterised by Sa'adia rather in abstracto; whilst *Ḳirḳisānī* vividly portrays the people and their doubts. Sa'adia writes: "A man will apply himself for some time to a certain system (*madhab*) only to renounce it because of some defect he has discovered in it, and he will then pass on to another system. He is like a man going to a town without knowing the road leading to it. He marches a parasang along the highway, becomes confused, turns back, and walks off in another direction." *Ḳirḳisānī* states that the dissensions are so numerous that it is rare to find two Karaites who are in agreement on all subjects. Sa'adia has "heard of people who said there was no need for prophets. Reason would suffice to show a man what was right and what wrong" (referring to *Rawandī-Ḥīwī?*). Others could not reconcile themselves to the accounts of incidents in the lives of the prophet (Moses and the wizards of Egypt; the flight of Jonah; the prophets eating, drinking, suffering, dying), and were unsettled by them (*mā yuwaswisu fī-ṣ-ṣudūri*).

Sa'adia devoted himself mainly to the refutation of the charge of anthropomorphism. "God's image" (Genesis I.) is explained as a mere figure of speech (tashrīf wa tafḍīl) which bears the same connotation of an honourable mode of address as the expression 'Ibrāhīm, the friend of God' (khalīl Allāh) "as interpreted by those to whom I refer my refutations in the present volume".

He sees three cardinal points in the Muslim polemic:

1) Anthropomorphism; 2) Abrogation; 3) the subjection of the Jews. Since the first and second points are connected with the Bible, he dwells on numerous passages to explain away the difficulties raised, and indicates a fourth point - taḥrīf. But his refutation is not directed against the Muslims themselves, but rather against those Jews who were affected by doubts and spread those doubts within the fold, and were far more dangerous precisely because they took over the methods of their opponents, whilst applying their own real knowledge of the scriptures to the task of discovering the contradictory and confusing statements contained in them.

Sa'adia states, not without a touch of pride, that the old Aramaic translators already grasped the passages concerned in a spiritual way.

As to abrogation - its supporters argue that creation is full of cases in which one thing may be considered as abrogating another: Life versus death; holydays and week-days;

fasting and good; sight and blindness; rich and poor; variations of colours. Muslims say: The Law of Abraham was superseded by the Law of Moses. Then why is it not conceivable that the latter, in its turn, should have been superseded by another Law? Why should Moses and his Law be exalted so highly? If it is because he showed proofs of his mission and performed miracles, then let us consider whether others cannot claim to be able to do likewise. Prophecy is proved by miracle. Some try to maintain that abrogation was predicted in the Bible. In Deuteronomy XXXIII.2, the references to Sinai, Seir and Paran are interpreted as bearing directly on the successive phases of revelation, Paran being the name of Mecca. Other arguments are put forward in favour of abrogation, based on deductions from the texts. Thus, marriage with a sister was evidently permitted at first, although forbidden later; Cain was not killed, although the Law required later blood for blood; the people offered up sacrifices, but this right was later confined to the priests, the family of Aaron; the sacrifice of Isaac by Abraham was first commanded, and the command was afterwards withdrawn; the tabernacle was superseded by the Temple, and so on.

Ḳirḳisānī knows the Koran and Ḥadīṭ well, and draws a distinction between the beliefs of the masses and those of the

theologians. The subjects he deals with are naskh, predictions (a'lām) of Muhammad, his miracles, and especially the miracle of the Koran.

But first of all, he derides the notion that proof can be adduced from the scriptures on any question, if they are forged.

On predictions: It is nonsense to say that the texts foretell Muhammad. But Muslims say that the Jews lie. The following quotation shows that the whole range of arguments on taḥrīf was evolved and developed by his time. If his assertion that the great Mu'tazilites al-'Allāf and an-Nazzām occupied themselves with the subjects is true, it is an interesting sidelight on their pursuits.

"Modern Moslem theologians assert that even in the case of Moses they believe in his prophecy solely on the basis of the statements of Muhammad, and not at all on the basis of the Jewish and Christian tradition. This, however, is in contradiction to the opinion of their older theologians, such as Abū-l-Hudayl al-'Allāf and Ibrāhīm al-Nazzām, and others. Two reasons forced the modernists to seek refuge in this theory. First, their reluctance to dispute with the Jews, who insist that if Moslem theologians admit that the Jewish traditions ought to be studied and may be adduced as authority in argument, they must likewise admit that the Jewish tradition about the perpetuity of the Torah is also true, thus conceding

that the statement of Muhammad - in this respect - is false. Secondly, Muhammad asserted that he is mentioned in the Torah, and that Moses foretold his coming; we all assert, however, that this is not true, since we do not find it in the Torah. This forces them to deny the fact that Muhammad himself recognises (the holiness and authority of) the Torah, since he calls it and its people, the Jews, to witness on his behalf in more than one place in his book. . . . They even say: 'The Torah which you possess is not genuine, original Torah, and the man Moses in whom you believe is not the same man as the one in whom we believe.' When we ask them: 'Why do you think so?', they answer: 'Because the true prophet Moses is the one who foretold (the advent of) Muhammad, and the true Torah is the one in which this is written... . As soon as you say that in the Torah which you possess this (the advent of Muhammad) is not written, and the man Moses in whom you believe has not foretold it, we learn that this Moses and this Torah are not the (true) ones.' Yet in this way they contradict, as we have shown above, their own principles, and make Muhammad out a liar, inasmuch as he declared this Torah to be true, and called its people to witness in his behalf in many places (of the Koran). In addition to that they reject the evidence of the Jewish tradition."

Ḳirḳisānī states that many Muslims reject the Bible as a whole. That is the practice of the vulgar amongst the Muslims

(Ḳaul al-‘a wāmm). The learned, however, refuse to countenance this attitude. They declare that the wholesale rejection of evidence and tradition held by great numbers of people from East to West would undermine the belief in knowledge and tradition as such (Yajib min hādā an laisa fī-l-‘ālam khabar ṣahīḥ). And if once these were undermined, the prophecies and commandments would ultimately fall into abeyance, and cease to be handed down from generation to generation. Instead the learned put forward two other arguments: 1) The genuine Torah had been burned by Nebuchadnezzar, and the version now used by the Jews is merely a later compilation; 2) Muhammad is referred to in the Torah by allusions (ramz) which must be understood and interpreted correctly (ta‘wīl wa-istikhrāj); but the Jews distort the allusions by false interpretation.

Miracles, especially the inimitability of the Koran, were further issues in the polemic. But this i‘jāz al-Ḳur‘ān is a strange miracle. Arabs alone are capable of appreciating it; and few even amongst them, it would seem, are able to appreciate it at its true worth. The assertion that nobody could withstand Muhammad is wrong. He met with much opposition; and imitations and different versions of the Koran had existed, which the victorious Muslims had taken care to hunt out and burn. It was not prophecy nor the Koran which had been victorious, but the sword (fa-raja‘ al-amr ilā-s-sayf).

In two major works of the tenth century - the Fihrist and the "Chronology" of Bīrūnī - there is some information about Jews; and we learn from them of the standard of knowledge on the subject at that time.

The Fihrist tells of a translation of the Bible by Aḥmad b. 'Abd Allāh b. Salām; but the translator stated that there had been 124,000 prophets, 104 revelations, 21 ṣaḥīfa of ~~Adam~~, 10 of Abraham, etc. - all this as biblical matter. A respected Jew had informed the author of the Fihrist that "Mūsā wrote a book called the Mishna in Hebrew and Aramaic". Sa'adia is mentioned, but not his translation.

Bīrūnī cites his authorities from whom he received some information on Jewish history and calendar calculations. Fragments on Jewish sects are thrown in (reproduced by Makrīzī), and the different versions of the Bible are mentioned. The words "hastēr astīr" (I will surely hide), Deuteronomy XXXI.18, are taken by some to allude to the year 1335 of the Seleucid era, and to the rule of Islam at that time. But Bīrūnī gives no credence to these views, and he is also opposed to playing with the numerical values of words, which can be made to prove anything, and therefore prove nothing. Clear indications of the advent of the new prophet are to be found only in such passages as Deuteronomy XVIII.18.

Bīrūnī wants to destroy the illusion of the Jews who cling to the notion that, in accordance with Genesis XLIX.10,

the sceptre has not yet departed from Judah. He proves that the exilarch has no temporal power.

V. SPAIN. IBN ḤAZM.

The West now steps in with a fundamental work on the subject, which in Spain in the first half of the XIth century, was a matter not merely of theoretical but of considerable social and political interest; and some echoes of it have been preserved in both verse and prose.

In some of the small states of the *Mulūk at-ṭawāif*, Jews rose to high positions in commerce, in industry, and even in the government. It was not a few individual Jews that rose to high office, but rather a case of the bulk of the Jews having reached a high standard in the social and intellectual spheres; and this was the more conspicuous because the Jews were concentrated in masses; a town like Lucena was preponderantly Jewish.

Samuel b. Nagdela became the virtual head of the government and the army of Granada, after winning a civil war on behalf of the claimant he supported.

Very soon "Jewish domination" became a party cry in civil strife and an excuse for venting grievances. A massacre broke out in 1066, many years after Samuel's death, but his son and successor Joseph was one of the victims.

In the campaign of hate, it would seem literature played

its part. Maḳḳarī says that in Andalus even children and Jews were courteous and polite. But that did not prevent poets from calling the Jews "apes" or "swine", although the latter epithet was, for the most part, applied to Christians.

One of these poets was Abū Ishāḳ Ibrāhīm b. Mas'ūd al-Tujībī al-Elbīrī (of Elvira, about 459 H). His poem is said to have precipitated the outbreak of the Ṣinhāja against the Jewish rule. His motives are not known. In any case, he can scarcely have been the first poet to carry on an agitation against the rule of the Nagdelas. Rumours were spread that they were plotting to establish a kingdom of their own. In such an atmosphere it was easy to inflame the passions of the masses. Elbīrī's abrupt lines were calculated to whip into a frenzy emotions already running high, and coming as they did at what seems to have been the right moment, they proved successful.

Four major themes are found in the poem.

1. The prince is responsible (rahin). He alone lifted up the unbeliever (minnā yaḳūmu-l-mu'īn) As a Muslim he ought to end the disgrace. Jews must live in humiliation (asfal as-sāfilīn).

2. The present position is intolerable. Allah himself urged the Muslims to refrain from befriending these unbelievers

They are, too, of low race (hijna). That is why they are everywhere treated like dogs. They are sure to destroy whatever Muslims build up. The earth trembles because of the unheard-of horror, and God's punishment is as like to fall upon us as upon them.

3. The pride of the Jewish minister. His house is luxuriously appointed, laid out in marble tiles (rakh khama), etc. He keeps the Muslims standing waiting on his doorstep.

But the poet does not devote much space to the personality or way of living of Nagdela. His hate is far more comprehensive.

4. The "domination", the sway the Jews as a body have over the country.

He says that the Jews have at last got all they wanted. They have divided up the whole state - the capital and the provinces - amongst themselves. One comes across members of the accursed race everywhere. They have grabbed the state revenues. They devour everything they can lay their hands on. You need only use your eyes; you need only compare their luxury with your poverty, their fine clothes with your tatters, their sumptuous table with your dirham meals. They ride about proudly, and treat the Muslims and their nobles, and devotees with arrogance. State secrets are in their keeping. Animals are slaughtered in the market-places for their households,

whilst Muslims have to be satisfied with the "iṭrīf" the Jews throw away as unclean. No wonder these infidels dare even to avow their contempt for the Muslim faith. Their prayers rise higher than those of the believers.

The Iḥāṭa of Ibn al-Khaṭīb, in which this poem has been preserved, refers to Nagdela's bold attacks on Islam and the Koran, and mentions a refutation by Ibn-Ḥazm. This refers to Samuel Nagdela. He started controversies of the kind referred to, and we have Ibn-Ḥazm's (d.456/1064) own accounts of them. The famous Zāhirī doctor tells of his contacts with Samuel in two works: a) a pamphlet of refutation, probably that referred to in the Iḥāṭa; and b) his al-Fiṣal fī-l-milal

Ibn Ḥazm had done his best to hasten the collapse of the "Jewish domination". Indeed, his short, violent treatise is very like the poem of Elbīrī. It consists of eight chapters and an epilogue. But far more instructive than the theological material are the outspoken admonition to the Ziri King of Granada, and the attacks on the Jews in general and on Samuel in particular. Each chapter reproduces an objection made by Samuel to the Koran, followed by insulting remarks and rejoinders to Samuel's objections; and lastly, a counterblast proving that the Bible contains passages far more gross, far more damning than those Koranic verses to which Samuel had raised objections.

"O God, we complain to Thee. The people of the kingdoms of our faith have become so absorbed in worldly affairs that they neglect the observance of their religion. They build castles; they will soon abandon them. But their faith, which accompanies them in this world and in their eternal abode, they do not cultivate. They are absorbed in piling up riches, sometimes with results fatal to their own lives, and helpful to their enemies - to an extent that prevents them from defending their faith, although it is the faith which gives them strength in their earthly life, and can secure to them life eternal. Now weaklings and tributaries take advantage of the opportunity thus afforded them, and infidels wag their tongues. The great ones should consider the situation for their own sakes. . .

". . . A man who was filled with hatred towards the Apostle - a man who is, in secret, a materialist, a free-thinker, a Jew - of that most contemptible of religions, the most vile of faiths . . . loosened his tongue . . . and became conceited in his vile soul, as a result of his wealth. His riches, his gold and his silver, robbed him of his poor senses; so he compiled a book in which he meant to demonstrate the contradictions in the Word of God, the Koran . . . When I came to know of the affair, of the work of that accursed creature, I did not cease searching until I had found that filthy book, so that I might refute it, with the competence, insight, clarity

and knowledge God had bestowed upon me... . . I was fortunate, and obtained a manuscript containing a refutation written by a Muslim. So I copied out the passages that polemist had reproduced from the work of that ignominious ignoramus. I proceeded at once, with God's help, to refute his evil thoughts. By God, his argumentation proves how poor is his knowledge, how narrow his mind, about which I already knew something. For I used to know him when he was still naked except for a few tatters, always in sorrow, empty except for calumny."

Towards the end there is a stab at the ruler.

"It is my firm hope that God will treat those who befriend the Jews and take them into their confidence as He treated the Jews themselves. . . . For whosoever amongst Muslim princes has listened to all this and still continues to befriend the Jews, holding intercourse with them, well deserves to be overtaken by the same humiliation, and to suffer in this world the griefs which God has meted out to the Jews, apart from their chastisement in the next world. Whosoever acts in this manner will be recompensed by suffering along with the Jews themselves according to God's threats against them in their Torah, in the Fifth Book (Deuteronomy XXVIII.15-58, quoted in full). . . . On their own evidence, this is God's message, and the chastisement He has apportioned them . . . Then let any prince upon whom God has bestowed some of His bounty take heed . . . Let him get away from this filthy, stinking, dirty crew beset with God's

anger and malediction, with humiliation and wretchedness, misfortune, filth and dirt, as no other people has ever been. Let him know that the garments in which God has enwrapped them are more obnoxious than war, and more contagious than elephantiasis. **May** God keep us from rebelling against Him and His decision, from honouring those whom He has humiliated, by raising up those whom He has cast down. . . ."

The words of Mutahabbī may be applied to Ibn Nagdela:

"If you act nobly towards a noble man, you attach him to
you;

But if you act nobly towards a vile man, he revolts.
To greatness, generosity in place of the sword is as
harmful

As the use of the sword in the place of generosity."

The arguments of the Jew are futile, his reasoning poor, etc. And this is the chief ('amīd) of the Jews, their great man, their scholar! If only he at least knew Arabic! He asks why the Koran ascribes healing-power to honey (XVI.71) since those who are fevered, or whose bile is inflamed are made worse by honey. Does God say that all diseases are cured by honey? Not at all. The text says very clearly: Some people. Such a statement is true. But how dare he talk in this way, when a biblical prophet (II. Kings XX.7) performed cures with honey; and in that hotch-potch (ikhtilāṭ) which they call the Torah, the highest praise given to Palestine is that it flows

with honey and milk?

But there is nothing to wonder at in all this. The Jews are the most terrible liars. Their scriptures are full of the most extravagant statements. They were promised a land of their own, but they find themselves under the Muslim yoke. Their exilarchs are bastards, and so were their kings and Moses; for they were begotten in marriages unlawful under their own law. They entertain degraded conceptions of the Deity, and so on.

Thus Ibn Ḥazm - for the first and last time in this polemic - raises the question of the employment of Jewish officials by a Muslim government.

In Fiṣal he dwells more than once on his Jewish contacts; but he always confines himself to theology, and never encroaches on politics. Even in the brochure against Samuel, the political passages are merely a framework for theological argumentation.

Our author is outspoken about his aversion to Jews in general. He imputes to them every detestable quality. Describing how the birthright was filched by Jacob from Esau, he exclaims: "By my life, that is just the Jewish way! With but rare exceptions, you will find that they are all contemptible tricksters" (138.*). Jews are "as a rule, the greatest liars on earth; they and their ancestors along with them. Although I have met a large number of them, I have found only two who are

* Unless otherwise stated, the references are to volume I.

really intent on the truth." This, says Ibn Ḥazm, explains why they are so ready to believe nonsensical stories themselves. Dirty, vile, filthy, stinking, are epithets he frequently employs against the Jews (154,156). What revolts him most of all is their claim to superiority, the superior airs they give themselves.

In A.H. 404 he had a discussion with Samuel on the theme: "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah" (Gen.XLIX.10). Samuel pointed to the exilarchs as bearing out the truth of the verse. To which he replied: "But that is not so; for the exilarch cannot compel anyone, be he Jew or non-Jew, to carry out his orders; therefore his office is merely a title without any power. There is no leadership, no sceptre in the hands of the exilarch." Indeed, for centuries there were no Davidic exilarchs at all; the priests of the house of Aaron headed the people. The Davidic exilarchate is a recent institution (152-3). The Jews console themselves with absurd delusions. Accepting Jacob's benediction, they believe that other peoples will one day serve them. It is certain, however, that they have been living for centuries in utter humiliation, serving others.

But "to live on delusions is good enough only for fools". Even Esau has ruled over them (138-9).

Even in their lying, they show what fools they are; for they contradict themselves over and over again. Indeed, in their lies they disclose their own shame. What a people! What

a lineage! Abraham married his own sister, Sarah. Samuel tries to explain this away by saying that in Hebrew the word "sister" might be taken to mean "relative". But he was proved wrong by his own text, which indicated clearly that Sarah had been a sister on the paternal side (135). Ibn Ḥazm goes on to say that Isaac was a thief; Jacob married Leah in error; and Moses himself was descended from such a union! Reuben fornicated with his father's wife, Judah with his son's wife. And from such a union were descended David and Solomon! (He makes a slip: Joshua fornicates with Rahab.) Amram married his aunt, which was against the law; and she bore him a son, Moses. David commits a crime against Uriah and his wife. His son Absalom defiles his father's wives. Solomon's wives bring their idols along with them (147-8).

Ibn Ḥazm mentions many more such matters, all of them closely related to those in the above-mentioned pamphlet; cites the texts of passages in his detailed analysis of biblical records; and further stresses the urgency of retorting to Jewish counter-arguments as to parallel difficulties in the Koran.

- a) God and Moses (Exodus XXIV.). In the Koran the parallels to this chapter are mere figures of speech (161). Moses, doubting, asks where so large a quantity of meat is to be obtained. In the Koran (XIX.7-11) in a similar passage, there is no implication of doubt (182). Again, God is called a devouring fire. But

the Koran (XXIV.25) calls Him nūr and miṣbāḥ. Yes; because 1) nūr is one of the asmā'; and 2) nūr is the equivalent of hudā (160).

- b) The veracity of the reports of the multiplication of the Jews in Egypt was another matter discussed with Jews (174).

Jacob married two sisters. Jews use subterfuge: before Moses there was no Law. This is wrong: Noah was forbidden to touch the blood of meat, which prohibition was a law.

But discussions are nauseating; for Ibn Ḥazm's opponents are in the habit of explaining away even the most self-evident nonsense and contradictions (208). Joshua (Joshua V.) had to enjoin circumcision, and this proves that Moses did not carry out the practice; that is, he disobeyed a basic command. To this, his opponent replies that the contravention was excusable during the years of wandering in the desert. That is not true. On the contrary, Joshua had much more difficult conditions to cope with - endless wars; whilst under Moses the Jews spent long periods in the same places (205). So deeply rooted in the Jewish nature is the habit of explaining things away to their own satisfaction that they declare that a book like the Canticles, which is in truth no more than a hotch-potch of eroticism, also belongs to their holy scriptures. Or if the notion occurs to them, they will try to extricate themselves

from the difficulty involved by asserting that in Canticles they find allegorical references to alchemy (208).

One asks oneself why the Jews are so obdurate; and one can catch a glimpse of the answer when one hears their views about Jesus and Muhammad. Many enlightened Jews incline to the belief that they, too, were prophets. Indeed, Josephus himself seems to indicate that idea (99). But their adherence to their forefathers; their partisanship ('aşabiya); their desire to continue to hold the exalted positions into which they have worked their way - it is these things which keep them from seeing the truth (116). That is how the Jewish notables appear in the eyes of Ibn Ḥazm. He is also baffled by the inexplicable way in which glaring falsehood and obvious nonsense have kept people's minds enchanted and enchained for centuries (178-9). "But everyone who knows them (the Jews) recognises that they are the filthiest people, a villainous breed, false, mean and cowardly" (202). They are undoubtedly worse than the Christians, the latter being in fact their foolish victims (209 f.).

The chapters against the beliefs of Jews and Christians in the Fiṣal form part of a larger whole. Having refuted the ideas of those who seek for a purely rational truth, without religious dogma (94-98); and of those who are sceptical, not about the existence of God, but about the messengers of the Godhead, i.e., the prophets (98-116), Ibn Ḥazm turns his attack

on those who do not believe in the true prophet. He sets about analysing Jewish lore (116-224 and some notes in vol. II. where, 1-81 the Christians are taken to task). By this method of elimination, he at last reaches the stage when he can devote himself to an exposition of the doctrines of the only "saving group" - his own. Apparently, he incorporated into the *Fisāl* an earlier work against the "people of the book".

Ibn Ḥazm shows that the Jewish scriptures are all wrong; how those scriptures arose, and became the canon of "sacred writings"; what attitude Muslims should adopt towards them (203-4); after which he gives some notes on other books of the Old Testament (204-217); and against the Talmudic legends and rites (217-224).

This is a work on texts. The author has in mind a people as the upholders of a religion (*milla*). To refute that religion it is necessary to disprove its sacred writings: first the Old Testament, but more especially the Pentateuch. The author quotes extensively from the latter, and brings forward a good deal of matter from the historical writings. But he has little to say about the prophetic books and the **ḥagtoğrapha**; he deals with them in haphazard fashion, in an appendix, as though this part of his work were a mere afterthought. As to that other body of Jewish lore, the post-biblical, he clearly thought little of it, and he reduced his comments to a few pages in a final appendix. We can thus see that his main task was to refute the

Pentateuch and the traditions of the Jews.

In addition to the Bible, Ibn Ḥazm had read Yosippon. He must have used an older source for his notes on the Jewish sects (98 f.).

Ibn Ḥazm likes to bring forward a quotation, to analyse it, to demonstrate its bearing on his subject, discussing, for example, if it is a case of *tahrif* or *tashbīh*; and in this way to produce a series of sub-chapters. At the very outset he tells the reader that he will not make use of those texts whose difficulties his opponents might explain away (117). And, indeed, he keeps his word, in two places, at any rate (144 & 151), and once he admits to being unsure about the version (121). He mentions several passages, but withdraws his attack upon them, because they are ambiguous.

He is still under the influence of his oral disputations (cf. 142, 1.7), and is expecting retorts which he is quick to refute in advance. Indeed, the oral discussions are frequently mentioned. He feels, too, that he has not only to attack the Jews, but also to refute their arguments against the Koran (119, 129, 142, 147).

In his predilection for figures he bears a resemblance to Sa'adia. They seem to be a passion with him. It is as if the figures were to him the surest part of his biblical knowledge. They enable him to dispense with translation, and rely on mere logic. He fills page after page with computations about the

ages of Noah, Moses, the kings, etc., and certainly displays much astuteness in that direction. Now and again, he gives vent to his bitter detestation of the villain who inserted the wrong figures; a rascal with no knowledge of mathematics, who made a laughing-stock of bible-readers (128).

An analysis of the Pentateuch reveals in that book:-

- 1) Contradictions (121,151 f., 158, 160 f.,170);
- 2) Illogical statements (135,144,156,172 f.,184);
- 3) Strange statements (129,131,146,154,163,181,186);
- 4) Wrong calculations (121,122,124,165,179,183,190);
- 5) False statements: a) Geographical (118,128);
b) Historical (136,138,152 f.);
- 6) Inappropriate statements about God and His prophets (121,133,135,137,140,143,145-8,167 f.,183,185);
- 7) Anthropomorphisms (118,130-2,153,160-1,164 f., 199-201).

In the other books of the Old Testament he finds still more flaws to add to his collection (204 seq.). "Judaism strongly tends towards materialism. In the Torah there is no mention whatever of resurrection, nor of rewards after death, which not only shows that the Jews are materialists beyond a doubt, but that they have combined materialism with polytheism, anthropomorphism, and with every silliness in the world" (207).

Another fault in the biblical reports is that that

essential proof of the prophetic mission - the miracle - is absent. Moses was successfully imitated by the magicians of Pharaoh. This is either true or ~~it~~ is not. If that were true, Moses could not be a prophet. There would be no criterion by which one might distinguish between a prophet and a magician (107,154). Revelation can be judged only by miracles (108). As against this, Islam has in the Koran the indubitable, permanent miracle (105). It is not merely a rhetorical marvel. Thousands of people, Arabian Jews amongst them, were challenged to produce something like it; and "God prevented the people from producing anything like it" (106).

Obviously, a book which is one mass of contradictions, illogical statements, and nonsense, cannot be relied upon. A book full of anthropomorphism, inappropriate and even obscene statements about God and the prophets, cannot be accepted as of divine origin. Therefore, the Bible must be repudiated by every pious man.

But the Jews claim that it is authentic, reliable and sacred. They refer to their tradition. That is worth little, if anything. As to the texts - the versions differ from one another (II.7-10). Their forefathers were unbelievers (I.209; II.82). The traditions of a people who are such liars and have produced such shameless forgeries are of no value. The chain of their tradition was broken many times in their history, not only by invaders, but by the Jewish kings. The

Torah was never disseminated amongst the people; only the priests knew it (187). The priests were not better than the rest of the people (199). Between Moses and Saul, there were no less than seven apostasies (189). Nebuchadnezzar crushed the priests (193). The prophets were always despised and persecuted. The Northern Kingdom was a hot-bed of idolatry (193-5).

Then, what could the people have known of this Torah? Only Deuteronomy XXXII. But even this is full of anthropomorphism, and is therefore a forgery (199-201). That is why it was easy to deceive the people, and to impose the forged book on them.

The Torah was written during the period of the Second Temple, when priests ruled the land. At that time they had synagogues and offered prayers everywhere throughout the country, not only in Jerusalem, which again was contrary to the Law (117,197).

The oldest Jewish tradition goes back no farther than the days of Hillel and Shamai, Simeon and Mar Akiba. The only law which is older is that of the levirate (II.83). The Muslim tradition (II.81 seq.) is closer to us; everything in it can be traced back in detail, and verified by a mass of trustworthy witnesses whose references are to the one and only text (115). Indeed, in Islam the tradition goes back to divinely inspired evidence; whilst the Jews cannot bring evidence from anybody in

contact with a prophet (II.7 ff., II.84).

It is obvious that the forger must have been a most unscrupulous atheist (123). Ezra compiled the Torah 40 years after the return from Babylon, that is 110 years after the destruction of Jerusalem (187, 198).

The Muslims should recognise that there had been revelations to the Jews and their prophets, but that the records were altered and mixed up with forgeries; so that no evidence which has been drawn from Jewish sources can be valid. The knowledge which Muslims have of those revelations has come from Muhammad and the Koran. The true Torah also contained prophecies about the advent of Muhammad. A Muslim believes in the prophecies of Ṣāliḥ and Hūd, and does not care if the Jew denies them in his book.

Ibn Ḥazm sets forth an analysis of passages of the Koran and ḥadīth referring to the Torah, and triumphantly proceeds to demonstrate how accurately they square with his exposition. He points out, too, that his results are based on the plain commonsense that is in the text; he had no need for doctrinal interpretations (ta'wīl).

A Muslim may quote from the true Torah as quoted in the Koran; but a Jew or Christian cannot rely on the Torah, nor make use of the Koran.

The author had heard that there were Muslims who did not take taḥrīf seriously, and refused to accept the statement

that the biblical texts had been distorted. Such a state of mind was the result of ignorance and of the desire to evade the inferences from clear passages of the Koran (203, 211 seq., 215). Despite his violent accusations that the Bible is a forgery, Ibn Ḥazm nevertheless inserts a few a'lām. They are the usual ones: Deuteronomy XVIII.18-19, and XXXIII.2 (111), and Daniel II.31 ff (112). Of a strange kind is that referring to Psalms LXXII., where he mentions "the wilderness . . . Sheba", and puts in an addition about "blood-money", and (verse 16) "they of the city" - min al-Madīna! (207).

Over and over again, Ibn Ḥazm brings proof to show that although the Jews repudiated abrogation, their own scriptures contain many passages in support of it. Of many passages he says that they are at any rate sufficient to prove the case for abrogation.

The opponents of abrogation fall into two groups: ¹⁾ Those who declare that it is altogether impossible, since abrogation would mean change in God; 2) those who regard it as possible but deny that it has taken place.

Ibn Ḥazm argues that every command is given in terms of time. For example, life and death; the greatness and the humiliation of a nation. An unbeliever merits the punishment of death; but from the moment he is converted, it would obviously be wrong to condemn him (100). He asks with irony: You say

you were given a law for ever; well, were you not also given a country for ever? (109). Accept nashh and our Prophet; or we do not recognise yours (102).

The biblical cancellations of commands include:-

- 1) The marriage laws: Abraham (135), Jacob (141);
- 2) War and peace, etc.: Moses' intervention saves Israel (163); the Gibeonites (101);
- 3) Dietary laws: Abraham's meal for the angels (131);
- 4) The laws of retribution: the end of Achan's family (Joshua VII.), as against purely personal responsibility in Deuteronomy XXIV.16 (204 f.).

Anthropomorphism is brought to the fore inevitably on every occasion; particularly in the section against the Talmud, Ibn Ḥazm ~~al-Ḥazm~~ exposes the anthropomorphic concepts of the Jews. The Haggadas contain "old wives' tales" (218). The author mentions Shi'ur Koma and Seder Nashim (221).

It is easy to believe that the people who wrote such things were capable of bribing St. Paul into seducing the Christians into accepting the divinity of Christ, thus diverting them from true monotheism. They sent 'Abdallāh b. Sabā' on the same mission to 'Alī, thus inventing bāṭiniya (221 f.). Such people are godless. And they are the authorities for the Jews! (219) Some Jews are ashamed of their anthropomorphic texts (120, end).

Ibn Ḥazm works himself up to fever heat over the legends about R. Ismael meeting God in mourning after the destruction of the Temple (222). The Jews, "that is, the Rabbanites amongst them", glorify Meṭatron, the Little Lord, on the Day of Atonement (223). It is not for nothing that humiliation is the lot of the Jews in this world, and that eternal fire will be their portion in the next.

The appendix on post-biblical lore was apparently compiled from suitable passages supplied to the author. Indeed, it looks as though a complete set of excerpts had been supplied to him, calculated to provide him with scope for his torrent of indignation. Such a set might very well have been provided by a Karaite. Ibn Ḥazm himself mentions Ananites (99) in Toledo and Talavera. In his outline, they look quite respectable, accepting only what the prophets enjoined, repudiating the rabbis and their inventions. From the earliest times, compilations of passages suitable for polemics against the Rabbanites had been in vogue amongst Karaites. The persecuted Karaism of Spain certainly did not refrain from making use of them.

The most typical of these Karaite arguments seems to be, not, as is usually suggested, the exposure of the anthropomorphic haggadas, but rather the contention that the rabbis, although they all claimed to decide their problems under divine inspiration, differ from one another.

But if it seems reasonable to assume that one appendix

was built on a set of suitable passages, the same may well be true of the other appendix - on the prophets and hagiographa. It is to be noted that this appendix is not very competently done. The quotations are evidently made from a Christian Bible. It is not clear whether Ibn Ḥazm called in the aid of a Christian convert to Islam, who selected the examples for him. True, the author might himself have read the passages he quotes. But then there are so many errors in this short appendix - strange, false quotations from Psalm LXXVIII.15 (206) from Joshua (204); from Ecclesiastes (208); and from Isaiah (209). Copying or slips in copying from some secondary source would account for those errors. Ibn Ḥazm also mistook biblical passages for Talmudic (219 f.).

But there can be no question as to the soundness of his knowledge of the Pentateuch. He not only traces the passages in the order in which they appear, but compares texts far apart from each other, and sometimes draws upon the historical books of the Bible outside the Pentateuch.

Ibn Ḥazm took pains to acquaint himself with the available facts. He at least read a translation of the Jewish and Christian scriptures. Indeed, his knowledge is so sound that his confrontations arouse suspicion. One feels that he may have used for some of them material wrought to fit a certain pattern, a compilation of "knots" designed to suit his purpose. He was acquainted with people who could supply him with such

materials. He read extensively (2,99,130), and came in contact with a large number of people, including Moslem and non-Moslem intellectuals indifferent in matters of religion (vol.V.119 seq.); and he may have been in close contact with persons who would have known that there were spots on the biblical sun. As early as in book I.96, Ibn Ḥazm mentions that he has met people who admit that all religions are true; and he sets out to refute them (102). But he returns to the same subject towards the very end of his book (V.119 f.). Some people refuse to admit even the idea of God; whilst others, granting so much, refuse to accept any particular religion as the true one (takāfu' al-adilla). Ibn Ḥazm held discussions with persons who expressed these views. He gives the names of Jewish physicians. When one of them was told that he might save his soul by going over to Islam, he replied: "Change of religion is silly (vol.V.120). Who goes over from one faith to another is a shameless trickster in religious beliefs".

We can, however, ascertain nothing definite on this matter but it is perhaps not out of place to recall that in Ibn Ḥazm's time doubts and confrontations, etc. were by no means unknown. A few decades later, Abraham b. Ezra confronted "dangerous" texts with the cryptic: "And the clever will understand"; and Peter Alphonsi delivered a Latin attack on the Talmud on Karaite lines.

Ibn Ḥazm's attacks called forth some interest and provoked

replies. A Hebrew pamphlet against Islam, ascribed to R. Salomo b. Adret, bears some indications of having been written against Ibn Ḥazm. The same might be said of the anti-Muslim paragraphs in Abraham b. Daud's "Exalted Faith". Nevertheless, it would seem that before long he was forgotten.

Ibn Ḥazm was perhaps the only Muslim to make a study of the infidel's material. But his attacks are not examples of clear thinking and consistency, as they are sometimes said to be. He merely repeated opinions which Kirkisani quotes from Muslim scholars of much earlier date; and the reader cannot but be impressed by the far more lucid expositions of the older doctors. Ibn Ḥazm, however, was the first to include a Talmudic section in literary polemic, and his attacks were, after all, directed not only against books but also against persons and a people.

VI. TWO TYPICAL MUSLIM SCHOLARS.

About a century after Ibn Ḥazm, Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Ḥafṣ (565/1169), compiled a work of "announcements", entitled: "Khayr al-bishar bi-khayr al-bashar" (Bulak. 1280. 1863).

This is a typical Muslim collection. It comprises four kinds of "proclamations": 1) "Of the old, revealed book of God; 2) Of the words of the rabbis; 3) Of the soothsayers (kuhhān); 4) Of the Jinns."

It includes everything which might possibly - or possibly - prove that the Apostle of God arrived on the crest of a wave of predictions about his glory. The book, however, is not controversial, but is rather designed to appeal to the heart of a believing Muslim. It also displays the peculiar characteristics of Bible exegesis by a Muslim theologian who has made no effort to study the sources he is discussing. Consequently, the work is based almost entirely on legendary material. The author has mixed up in a hopeless jumble quotations and résumés of biblical tales. But it is easy to see that what he read were but different collections of "testimonies", amongst others, apparently, that of Ibn Ḳutaiba. The tales he refers to are drawn from biographies of the

Prophet. (Wāḳidī is mentioned by name.)

He deals first with the Ismail passages, bringing in two or three different versions of each (none of them Sa'adian; one close to the original; another an Islamizing one; a third like that of Ibn Ḳutaiba).

"As the Bible, by mentioning Jacob, is really referring to his posterity, so, in like manner, when it mentions the father, it is referring to Ismail's child" (6). Genesis XVII. 20 ("bi-mīd-mīd") refers to the Prophet. To whom else could it refer? There are various translations of these words: jiddan-jiddan, ṭayyib ṭayyib, ḥaḳḳan ḥaḳḳan, ḥamd ḥamd (7-8). Then comes the Paran revelation (8). "None among the ahl al-Kitāb will deny that Medda is meant" (9). This is followed by the passage from Deuteronomy: "Prophet from amongst their brethren". The author heard that the unaludterated text predicted "a man of the camel, a man of many women and few children" (12). Several quotations, especially from Isaiah, are interpreted as bearing out the fact that the glory of Arabia was predicted of old (14).

The second chapter quotes Wahb b. Munabbih and Ka'b al-Aḥbār, as revealing what the people of the book usually conceal (22 ff.). But these revelations put into the Bible even the story of the dynastic strifes of Islam (26).

The knowledge of the subject usual in a Muslim scholar may be gauged from the Kitāb al milal wa-n-niḥal of Shahrastānī

(d. 548/1153) written in 521/1127. It displays a student's standard conception of the Jews and the polemic against them. He discusses the Jewish faith, and wherein it falls short of Islam. The subject is also taken up in the theological compendium of the author in the K. Nihāyat al-Ikdām fī 'ilm al-kalām.

The eternal Nūr including the grace of prophecy was transferred from Israel to Ishmael. The unlettered (ummīyūn), says Shahrastānī, lived in Mecca; the people of the book in Medina. Then the "light" was split (insha'aba), and the former took over the prophecy. This was the course followed by history:

Jerusalem - prophecy (nubūwa) - outward form of religion -
 (ḡawāhir) - against unbelievers like Fir'aun
 and Hāmān;

Mecca - holy ritual (manāsik), maintenance of the Ka'ba
 against idolators (Milal 162, par.1).

There is no place here for Christianity. On the other hand, mention is made of the controversy between Christianity and Judaism, and the extremes of both. The knots of this strife have been unravelled by Islam, the faith of the "golden mean" (163, I., and 165 f.).

The Jews have seventy sects (167, 171), and are divided on the question of free will along the same lines as the Muslims, the Karaites being the anthropomorphists and determinists (164). The word Yahūd is derived from the root h w d- return in repentance (162, par. II.). The author formulates the

points of the controversy (164): abrogation, anthropomorphism, free will, Messianism. He disposes of the scriptures in advance (165). They obviously cannot be revelation, so coarse are their contents. Distortions crept in, either into the very wording of the texts, or else into the interpretation of them. The Jews say that Abraham was promised greatness for Ishmael; meaning worldly power, empire, and not the gift of prophecy. But if the Jews admit that God Himself promised to the Arabs the power of Islam, then they must decide whether or not that promise includes the power to rule by law and justice. If not, then how could God have promised such a "compensation" - that of injustice and tyranny - to the seed of Abraham? Again, if the ~~mlk~~ of Islam is based on truth and justice, this would be equivalent to a recognition that Islam and its ruler are justified in their claims. But the first of these claims is Islam itself. Nevertheless, Shahrastānī does not depart from the line of "testimonies" Parān is the place of the last, i.e., the perfect, revelation (166). The Pentateuch, he maintains, is full of anthropomorphism. The Christians liken creature to Creator; the Jews liken Creator to creature (132).

But the main point is abrogation.

The Jews reject the idea of naskh, saying that it is mere

badā' (Q164). Such sudden, capricious changes of the law are beyond imagining, when ascribed to God. If there was a dispensation, it was for all time; and such there was - the Law of Moses.

"The abolition of commandments which have been given to men - that is impossible, where God is concerned; for it would imply that He changes His mind, and regrets His previous utterances. If one of us ordered a slave to do something, and then stopped him doing it either at once or at some future date, that would indicate that the matter appeared different to him, i.e., something he had not anticipated had occurred; or he had regretted his former order. Such propositions are impossible of Him to whom nothing in heaven or on earth is obscure" (Nihāya, 499).

As against this view, Shahrastānī asserts that changes required by the divine Providence, included in the divine plan from the beginning, come as stages toward perfection (takmīl), not as abolition (ibtāl), and that therefore naskh cannot be regarded as badā', but is rather the secret clause. Thus, the Jewish argument is dismissed.

"Man progressed from code to code until the perfection of all codes was reached. Nothing lies beyond it but resurrection" (N. 503). ~~Biblical~~ Proofs of abrogation (from the Bible) are added (N.500).

VII. SAMAU'AL AL-MAGHRIBĪ.

It was left for a Jewish convert to supply a really practical concise manual written with the specific purpose of refuting Jews. It aimed also at giving more substantial material in place of the naive Muslim groping for "announcements". The most important and influential book concerning our subject is the Ifhām al-Yahūd, written in the middle of the XIIth century by Samau'al b. Yahyā al-Maghrībī. It is a compendium of information - Hebrew quotations and translations; refutation of Jewish arguments; a genuine autobiography with the story of a conversion; and something resembling a discourse on the "Jewish question".

Samau'al was very careful to give a clear account of personal matters: his family, descent, course of studies, achievements, and the conversion to which he was guided after much thought, and after two visions. His story is also told in a good concise account of his work in a Hebrew chronicle.

"I will describe how God vouchsafed unto me His divine guidance, and how circumstances led me from earliest childhood until I left the Jewish sect, so that the story of my life may serve as an example and a lesson to those whom it reaches. . .

My father was called Rāb Yahūdā b. Abūn. . He was from the city of Fās, in Morocco, Rāb was a title and not a name; for it means 'scholar'. He was the most learned man of his time in the sciences of the Torah, and he had a fine style of writing, both in poetry and prose, in the Hebrew tongue. The Arab-speaking people called him Abū-l-Baḳā' Yaḥyā b. 'Abbās al-Maghribī. Most of their notables have an Arabic name beside their Hebrew one."

Then the author goes on to tell of his maternal lineage, stating proudly that he was of the tribe of Levi; that is, of the tribe to which Moses belonged. But he was also a descendant of the Davidic line. His mother's name was the same as that of the mother of the prophet Samuel; she too was childless; she too vowed a vow. So when a son was born to her, she called him Samuel, "which is in Arabic al-Samau'al; and my father called me Abū Naṣr."

His father was also his first teacher, and taught him Hebrew, the scriptures, and the commentaries, up to his thirteenth year. After that his secular education started. It was based on mathematics, Indian computation, and the study of astronomical tables (zījāt). Then followed medicine under Abū-l-Barakāt Hibat Allāh, along with clinical work and therapeutics, taught him by a relative. Samau'al is very proud, indeed quite vain of his attainments; he mentions the names of all his teachers, and points out in how short a time he mastered

his subjects. At the age of fourteen he had completed his studies in mathematics; then he took up diwan accountancy, mensuration, algebra with equations, and geometry. He went in for Euclid and Arabic literature, but could find no competent teacher. That did not deter him. He set about teaching himself, and not only succeeded in grasping the precious texts, but even superseded their authors by correcting some of the solutions and by rearranging Euclid. He continued his studies until his eighteenth year. God bestowed upon him the understanding denied to others, and Samau'al wrote many mathematical treatises to enlighten his fellow-men.

But all this was a mere side-line to his medical career. He was so absorbed in his studies and his books, and so given over "with passionate love to the sciences" that he would often forget his daily bread which he earned by his medical practice. And in that too he was successful. "For God came to my aid, so that I could distinguish a curable disease from an incurable one, and I never treated a patient but to heal him. I have never refused to treat a patient, except when the other doctors also refused. . ." He lays claim to numerous medical, or rather pharmaceutical, discoveries. He practised in Syria, Irak, Persia.

As to adab, it seems to have been a mere addition, acquired by reading as a distraction from more serious study. Samau'al tells us that, since his tenth year, he had been enchanted by stories of bygone times. He mentions his reading of the

romances of Antara and Alexander, etc. "Later, when I came to consider things I found that most of the romances derived from the works of historians. So I devoted myself to history. My mind tended that way, and I read the works of Ibn Miskawayhī, Ṭabarī, etc." Nor did he neglect books on wezirs and scribes.

He gained from this very wide and varied reading a good Arabic style, admired by all who met him. "And whosoever has considered what I have written in any of my books on some scientific discipline will recognise that."

"Then, after I had disciplined my mind by speculative sciences, especially geometry with its practical demonstrations I turned to an analysis of the differences between people in the matter of religion."

His religious experience had, up to that time, been first that of his own home; then that aroused through his interest in Islam, and particularly in the story of its founder. The Koran with its rhetoric enchanted him. "But the most powerful factor by which I was urged to enquire into the questions of religion was the material I came upon when I read the book of Bardawayh the Physician, in the book Kalīla wa-Dimna." Samau'āl has nothing to say about any theological training, or even reading. Kalīla wa-Dimna is the one and only source of his theological enlightenment that he mentions.

From that book he learnt that reason is the supreme faculty which must be set above all other human faculties. Religion is ancillary; for it is only by following the dictates of reason

that we can appreciate the call of religion, of a prophet, of sages and of tradition. In the last analysis, genuine adherence to a religion is based on our faith in it, and that faith, in turn, rests on our reasoning powers. All this, then, would mean that the final arbiter of all that we do and believe in life is reason. Our mental and spiritual life is tested by reason. Tradition rests upon the judgment of reason. Tradition is accepted, not because it has been handed down from generation to generation, but because, after having been tested by reason, it has been found to be true.

Tradition itself cannot be adduced as a proof of truth or the reverse; for there are many chains of tradition which contradict one another. Jews, Christians, Muslims, Majus - each and all of them adduce the rights of their own particular system of tradition to prove that it is true.

But the followers of Jesus and Muhammad, too, are well provided with *tawātur*; and this must be recognised. The ancestors of the Jews were neither superior nor more reliable than those of non-Jews.

No mortal being now living has ever yet had immediate, direct intimation of prophecy, nor witnessed miracles. Acceptance of them, then, is based on *tawātur*, which holds good equally for the founders of all three religions.

Obviously, a man can pursue another mode of reasoning - reject all the prophetic claims. "But, again, such an attitude

cannot be upheld by reason; for we find that all the prophets were of noble character; that they sought to impress upon mankind the highest virtues, and forbade all that is evil. We find, also, that they sought to govern the world by a policy which, throughout, aims at the good of men."

"In this way, I proved to my own complete satisfaction that the missions of both Jesus and Muhammad were demonstrably true, and I believed in them both. For some time I held this belief, but refrained from taking any step towards embracing Islam, out of respect for my father, who loved me dearly, and would have been unable to live without me, and in gratitude to him for the excellent education he had given me in the exact sciences, opening my mind, and developing my faculties to comprehend the laws of mathematics."

Nevertheless, he left his father, and wandered far from home, into many strange lands. Finally, he had visions. It was after he had been urged in a vision to renounce his old faith that he embraced Islam. The ru'ya took place at Marāgha (Adarbayjān) on the night of Friday, the 9th of Dū-l-ḥijja, 558 (8th November, 1163).

In his vision Samau'al met Samuel the prophet.

"I sat down facing him, and he held up to me the book he had in his hand, saying: 'Read what is before you.' And I saw before my eyes a verse from the Torah: Deuteronomy XVIII. 18: 'I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren,

like unto thee, and will put my words in his mouth'. Then it went on to say: 'In him shall they believe; for this is the word of God to Moses'. I knew that the Jews say that this verse refers to the prophet Samuel; for he was like Moses, who also was of the tribe of Levi. And as I read this verse from the Torah held out to me, I thought that the prophet Samuel, by holding the book out to me, wanted to impress upon me that God had mentioned him in the Torah, and had foretold his coming to Moses. But he looked at me frowning, and asked: 'Think you then that it is to me that God is referring here? O wise and learned man, of what use to you are the mathematical truths you have demonstrated for yourself?' So I asked: "O Prophet of God, to whom, then do the words refer?' He replied: 'To him of whom it is written that he shined forth from mount Paran' (Deuteronomy XXXIII.2). No sooner had he spoken than I realised he was referring to Muhammad; for he surely is the man from mount Paran . . . the mountains of Mecca. For in the Torah it is stated clearly that Paran is the dwelling-place of the sons of Ishmael, namely in the verse of Genesis (XXI.21) 'And he dwelt in the wilderness of Paran'.

"Then the prophet again turned to me, and said: 'Do you not know, then, that God did not send me to abrogate any part of the Torah, but only to remind men of the Law, to revive its commandments, and to save them from the Philistines? . . . Why, then, should God command people to follow one who was

neither to change nor to abrogate any part of their faith? Were they especially enjoined to accept the prophecy of Daniel, or Jeremiah, or Ezekiel?' I said: 'No, by my life! They did not need such an injunction.' Then he took the book from me angrily, and disappeared."

Samau'al woke up in terror, and lit his lamp. The vision remained with him, deeply engraved in his memory. He was sure that it had been vouchsafed to him by the mercy of God. He arose, performed his ablutions, and prayed fervently for the peace of the Prophet. While thus absorbed in pious meditation, he beheld another vision. This time he saw Muhammad, to whom he vowed allegiance. He repeated the creed (wa-annaka rasūl allāh). Deeply stirred, he wept with joy. In this state he awoke.

At early dawn, eager to make known his conversion, Samau'al went to his host, and told him that God had lifted the veil and guided him to Islam. His host was exceedingly glad, and told him how he had had a talk with the chief Kadi about him. "And we were both sorry that with all your knowledge and great virtues, you were not a Muslim."

Later, his host asked him how and after what manner God had guided him to see the true light. Samau'al, however, said nothing about his visions, but instead explained how his reasoning had led him to rational conclusions, and ultimately

brought conviction to him. It was only out of consideration for his father that he had hesitated about taking the final step. Now his doubts and hesitations were past.

His host happened to be in bad health at the time, and could not move about freely, but this great joy brought him new strength,

Instantly the place was in a turmoil. It was Friday. The people and the preacher were requested to remain at the Mosque. A procession was at once prepared. The tailors worked feverishly to make a new garment (jubba) for the convert. When all was ready, the party started for the Mosque, where Samau'al was received with acclamations of joy. The prayers were said. The Kadi rose and delivered a sermon, praising Samau'al, and thanking God for having guided the virtuous man toward conversion. "And for the most part, the service was for me."

In the evening, Samau'al began his treatise against the Jews. It gained wide popularity in Diyarbakr, Irak and Persia. Some time later, the author revised the text. "It became an excellent book, the like of which had never before been written in Islam, and was much used for polemics against the Jews."

"But as regards the two visions, I said nothing about them to my host nor anyone else in Marāgha, for about four years. There were two reasons for silence. First, I hated to speak of a thing for which I could furnish no proof, and which would

therefore, give rise to questions, open or secret. Secondly, I feared to excite envy; there were those who might use the story to bring hatred and contempt upon me. 'A man who forsook his own faith because of a dream, an illusion, a nightmare,' it might be said."

He consequently forbore to mention the visions "until the book, *Ifḥām al-Yahūd* ('Silencing the Jews') became popular, and many copies of it were spread abroad." Only thereafter could it be seen that "my conversion was the result of rational proof, based on arguments long known to me, but suppressed by me out of reverence for my father"; only then did he tell the story of his two visions. Then he also wrote to his father. The old man at once set out to meet his son, but died in Mosul on the way.

This, then is the remarkable story of the book *Ifḥām al-Yahūd*. The author became well known for his contributions to mathematical and medical studies. His descendants, too, for many generations, were men of science. Samau'al died some twelve years after his conversion, about 570/1175.

The pamphlet opens with a few introductory remarks, followed by a chapter on abrogation. This, in turn, is succeeded by another opening, dealing with the equal measure of tradition in favour of the founders of the three religions - the author's favourite topic; and this is followed by proofs of abrogation. Now this second opening begins with the words *Ifḥām al-Yahūd wa-n-naṣārā* (Fol.36a). Perhaps this is the beginning of the

older version mentioned by the author.

The pamphlet contains about 15,000 words. Its contents are:

1) Opening; 2) Abrogation; 3) Tawātur; 4) Abrogation; 5) The missions of Jesus and Muhammad; 6) The choice of Israel; 7) Criticism of the Bible; 8) History of the Bible; 9) Jewish views of Islam; 10) Mean aspects of Jewish law, levirate, segregation; 11) Rabbanites and Karaites; 12) Epilogue: sins and follies of the Jews.

The pamphlet deals with: repudiation of Jewish claims (on abrogation, on tradition, on being the chosen people); impeachment of their texts as bases of their arguments; discussion of their position, and the origins of its rise.

Samau'al quotes frequently from the Hebrew, in transcription and translation. Apparently he quotes from memory, for he is often inaccurate. He also brings in passages from the Targum.

In his foreword he says that, recognising the need for examining traditional beliefs, he set out to investigate and refute the Jewish faith; and that he has found the many previous efforts made in that direction to be unsatisfactory.

No Jew has seen the miracles with his own eyes. The Jews say that "all the other peoples testify to the miracles." But a similar tradition exists in favour of Jesus, and also of

Muhammad. There is no reason to reject it. A man's own tradition cannot be said to be better than any other, merely because it happens to be his. Infidels, too, can argue after that fashion; it is mere blind partisanship (ta'aṣṣub). An argument must be logical, without any taḳlīd.

"They left no traces behind them amongst the peoples that developed the exact sciences and systematized them for the generations that were to come after them. Whatsoever is ascribed to them in science, as well as that of which they availed themselves out of the stores of knowledge of other peoples, will not stand comparison with the scientific attainments of the scholars of the Greeks and Arameans; whilst the writings of the Muslims are so copious that it is impossible for a man to encompass them all, even in one particular field. But, if this be so, the contention that the forefathers of the Jews were the cleverest and most discerning of men is disposed of; and so they must be regarded as more or less the equals of other Semites" (S.fol.4a).*

Arguments for abrogation fall under three headings:-

1) Deductions from the Bible.

There was a law (Shar') before the Torah; e.g. the commandment to Noah not to spill blood (Genesis IX.6). The Torah,

* S. refers to Schreiner, M G W J, 42; Fol to MS.Cairo.

therefore, is not the first shari'a; it added to or subtracted from the previous enactments. (Otherwise a new dispensation was of no use.) But if it did this, only one conclusion can be drawn - that it meant to permit that which ^{had} previously been forbidden, and vice versa. Thus, the Torah may be said to abrogate some previous enactment; i.e. naskh does occur, and the Torah testifies to it. If this happened once, it might have happened again. Every separate case which points in its **favour** should be tested, but wholesale repudiation is out of place. The Jews should not insist so strongly on the illogicality of abrogation. Their own law includes a great many illogical things, e.g., the ashes of the red heifer as a means of purification (S.1b.; fol.2a,3b).

Another proof of inconsistency is that at first only the first-born were to serve the Lord; but later, it was only the Levites (S.174;fol.6d).

II.) The Jews abandoned the biblical regulations. To return to the red heifer. If that is the appointed means of purification, then in the absence of it the Jews must find themselves impure. If that be so, all their strictness in the observance of their laws serves no purpose (S.172; fol.4b,5a).

III.) The Jews instituted new laws of their own.

Their prayers are clearly non-biblical, and originated after their dispersion. That is why, in those prayers, they mourn for the fall of Jerusalem, pray for freedom, and so

on. The same is true of some of the fasts. Such regulations were added "according to the demands of the times" (S.173, fol. 5b,6a).

Therefore, abrogation is practised in the Bible and in Jewish law, and there is no escaping it.

JESUS. The Jews cannot deny that it was after the time of Jesus that they were deprived of their kingdom and their power, and were forced to submit to the rule of strangers. This is consistent with the prediction in Genesis XLIX.10, that until the Messiah comes "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah"; i.e., Jesus really was the Messiah.

The Jews hold that Jesus was not a prophet but a scholar, and wrought his miracles by the aid of the Ineffable Name which he had read on the wall of the Temple. They base this on tradition. But God wanted Jesus to perform miracles. (In this connection St. Matthew XII. is quoted by the author.)

Another argument put forward by the Jews is that since their prophets are accepted by all peoples, they are merely holding to what is incontrovertible. That is a fallacy. Firstly, because "the Muslims and Christians accept the mission of Moses merely because their respective books testify to it. Their belief in Moses is, then, to them a part of their belief in their own books. Secondly, because if this argument is accepted, it is difficult to see why the Jews should not also accept the unanimous opinion of Muslims and Christians that the

Jews are "in error".

The reference in Deuteronomy XVIII. cannot be to Samuel. (Here the argument from the vision, quoted above, is brought forward.)

Genesis XVII.12. The numerical value of the Hebrew $bi-m'e'od\ m'e'od = 92 = Muhammad$ is emphasized. It is by the merciful intervention of God that this verse escaped alteration by the Jews. Samau'al, as if not quite sure of his ground, dismisses the anticipated retort. "It cannot be said that this interpretation is arbitrary; for the passage in question is a crucial text on Ishmael."

Deuteronomy XXX.2 is quoted from the Targum Onkelos with additional proofs: Genesis XXI.21 Paran the abode of Ishmael (S.175 f.; fol.8a,9b).

If the Jews will not see these things, it is because they are obdurate. Indeed, they are described in Deuteronomy XXXII. 28, as "a nation void of counsel" and understanding. They persist in asserting that prophecy is confined to their own people, and that therefore Muhammad could not have been a prophet. They contend that God bears them special love. But there is actually in the Bible the case of a non-Jewish prophet, Job; and the Bible also tells of God being wroth with the sinners amongst them. And what about the fate of the lost $9\frac{1}{2}$ (?) tribes? Furthermore, the Bible (Numbers XV.15-16) stipulates that "one law and one manner shall be" for Jew and non Jew

(S.177 f.; fol.9b,10b). Therefore it is folly to believe, as they do, that God loves them, as they do, that God loves them, as they state in their daily prayers. In those prayers they describe themselves as God's children, and say that their foes are utterly routed by God. They liken themselves to the vine, and others they liken to the thorn - a ridiculous claim, seeing that they are oppressed.

No less ridiculous is their Messianic belief. They will wait until the wolf and the lamb lie down together (Is. II.6); for they are incapable of grasping anything but the gross, literal interpretation of a prophecy. They cannot imagine that the world can be saved before all the other peoples have been got rid of (S.178 f.; fol.II.).

Samau'al then turns to the Jewish scriptures.

"Because of the vexation brought upon them by humiliation and unfulfilled expectations, the Jews fall into absurdities, and in their scriptures express foolishness, sometimes even a kind of unbelief (tazanduk)" (Fol.IIb).

For example, in Psalm **XLIV**.23, it says: "Awake, why sleepest thou, O Lord"; and in Exodus XXIV.10, Moses sees God. There are too many such examples of gross anthropomorphism. True, under the beneficent influence of Islam, many rabbis are ashamed of such texts, and try to explain them away; e.g., Genesis VI.6, "And it repented the LORD", they explain as

(here the Targum is quoted) "God changed His mind", which is not only in contradiction of the text, but is also in direct opposition to their own ideas on abrogation (fol.12a).

Obviously, then, this is not the Torah of Moses, but is the result of subsequent alterations made in the text, of Tabdīl. To change the text was possible, since the people did not know it. Here Samau'al tells the same story which had been told by Ibn Ḥazm: all that the people knew was a mere half of Deuteronomy XXXII. There had been no established tradition. The invaders killed the priests who knew many chapters of the Law; but there was neither a sunna of studying it, nor an obligation to study it. The text known to the Jews is a mere patchwork affair, compiled ^{by Ezra} after the return from the Captivity from the fragments which still remained in the memories of some of the people, to which he added tendencious passages of his own. He is also to be held responsible for the anthropomorphism in the book. That is why his memory is so highly revered by his people, and pilgrimages take place to his tomb (S.215-7; fol.13).

At this point is inserted a refutation of the interpretation of Exodus XXIII.19, "Thou shalt not seethe a kid in his mother's milk". This refutation was of Karaite origin. It is brought forward to show that the traditional expositions of the text are no more reasonable or trustworthy than is the text itself (S.217; fol.14).

Samau'al also gives historical explanations of the alleged tendencious alterations in the text. The story of Lot and his daughters, to whose incestuous union is ascribed the origin of Moab and Ammon, is not merely shocking, but is palpably absurd and incredible on physiological grounds (Lot was too old). Furthermore, it contradicts another text, where Abraham declares that Sarah is his sister, meaning thereby that he was not her husband: how much less, then, was Lot's incest credible. Strangely enough, the Pentateuch mentions the ancestry of Ruth and David, which means that the Messiah was expected to spring from such a union.

Samau'al suggests that there is a tendency to disparage the House of David in favour of the Aaronides, to whom Ezra himself belonged (fa-inna 'indahum anna Mūsā ja'ala-l-imāmata fī-l-Hārūniyīna). At the same time, the story reflects the inveterate hatred of the Jews towards the two neighbouring peoples. The author, says Samau'al, achieved his object; for the second commonwealth was ruled by the Aaronides, and not by the House of David. The same tendency can be discerned in the story of Tamar (Pereš-David) (S.222; f.15b,17a).

The levirate, like the rite of the red heifer, is nonsense. The author comments on it that it drives people to subterfuge, since it threatens punishment for sins never committed, and exposes them to disparagement (S.254; fol.18).

How could a whole people have been so led astray?

Samau'al tries to explain, taking the historical approach to the question. "The clever inquirer must not exclude the possibility that this community (the Jews) easily fell into error and unbelief; for when the State of a people is on the decline, when it falls under the yoke of a conqueror, when its country is over-run - in such circumstances, the people are reduced to despair, their traditions are weakened, their past is obliterated, and it is difficult to study them. For the decline of a State passes through various stages, and is brought about by a succession of calamities, such as laying waste and burning; until at last ignorance stalks the land where the sciences flourished. The more ancient the nation, the more terribly it suffers from humiliation and tribulation, when it falls under the yoke of various conquerors; the more its history is exposed to the danger of obliteration. Now this community has, no doubt, been more unfortunate than any other in suffering such calamities (R.: ~~mimmā~~ dakarnāhu); for it is one of the oldest on record, and has been under the heel of many oppressors - the Chaldeans, Babylonians, Persians and Greeks, the Christians and Islam. Each and all of these were intent on the extermination of the Jews and repeatedly burnt and destroyed their country, and threw their books into the flames. The Muslims were the only people who did not treat the Jews in this way; for Islam found the Jews under Persian domination, when they had no city, and no army, excepting the Judaizing

Arabs of ~~Khal~~bar.

"But still worse befell the Jews, in that they suffered under their own God-defying kings, such as Ahab, Ahaziah, Amaziah, and Jeroboam the son of Nabat, and other Israelite kings who slew the prophets and persecuted them, served idols, honoured the priests they had set up for them and their cult for which they built huge temples. The kings as well as the people worshipped the false gods, and for a long period, for many successive generations, abandoned the laws of the Torah.

"Now, if this chain of calamities befell their religion at their own hands, how much more complete was the suppression of their religion under the succession of dominations by foreign rulers who slew their leaders, burned their scriptures, and prohibited them from observing their religious laws!"

For example, under the Persians they were often forbidden the free exercise of their religion, and were compelled to improvise, in place of their original prayers, all kinds of incantations called *ḥizāna* (*ḥazanut*), to circumvent their persecutor. But they made a virtue of necessity, and when Islam restored their rights to them, they retained their improvised prayers (S.218-220; fol.14a,15a).

Nor have they any means of escaping from the results of their national calamities. Instead of getting rid of them, they sink deeper and deeper into the slough. For there is a faction which has vested interests in keeping them in their

degraded state. These are the fuḳahā', the real curse of their people. They pretend they are the bearers of the prophetic heritage, and say they have a traditional basis for everything they do, ~~claiming~~ claiming that God Himself directs them. But as soon as it comes to solving a problem, they abandon their claim to naql, and bring logic to bear on the problem; they take up ijtihād and differ in their opinions. But contradictory judgments cannot be ascribed to the same divine origin (S.172 f fol.5a). This is the well-known Karaite argument.

The scholars are not sincere either. None of them believes that the Torah is the same as that revealed to Moses (S.215; fol.13a). Their activities are made to serve as an excuse for increasing the pressure of the burden upon the Jews. The rabbis led the academies in Palestine and in Babylon, and thousands of legists were active under the Babylonians, Persians, Greeks and Romans. Finally, the legists agreed to accept two books as authoritative - the Mishna and the Talmud. The former is the smaller, consisting of about 800 sheets; whilst the latter, the bigger, is a volume of about half the weight of a mule's load. The authors did not all live at one and the same time. The books were compiled, collected by generations of men, one following another. At last a generation arose which saw that this compilation, with its additions, was merely multiplying the number of contradictions with earlier authorities, and that unless they

prohibited further additions, the contradictions would become so glaring and multitudinous that the greatest ~~harm~~ would ensue. So they finally ceased from adding to the volumes (S.254 f.; fol.18-19). "The rabbis realised, however, that this people would not always accept the humiliation and enslavement of their position without protest; but they found a means of holding them down, chaining them to their religion. They imposed upon them all kinds of restrictions calculated to keep the Jews remote and estranged from their gentile environment. The first of these restrictions appertained to the food they were allowed to eat; the second to the marriages they were allowed to contract. In order to give their policy a valid content, they falsely ascribed it to God."

Samau'al enquires into the meaning of the scriptural prohibitions in regard to these matters, to prove that the rabbinical interpretations are wrong. The prohibition of marriage with outsiders was intended to prevent the nation from slipping into idolatry. The prohibition of certain foods was intended to prevent the Jews from partaking of the flesh of animals slaughtered according to pagan ritual which pronounced the names of idols. Further, Deuteronomy II.5-6 suggests the admissibility of purchasing food from non-Jews. But "what is the matter with those Jews who will not eat that which has been slaughtered by Muslims - the Jews living in Syria and Persia; some of them refuse to take from Muslims even milk and

cheese, sweet-meats and bread. They assert that such food is unclean. A **Babbanite** distortion is obviously present here. The Bible refers only to meat which has been torn and devoured by a wild animal (Genesis XXXVII.33). In place of the prescriptions natural to people who live in deserts, the scholars have imposed a ridiculous and complicated system of ritual slaughter. Furthermore, instead of ordering that the prohibited meat be given to the dogs (Exodus XXII.31), they maintain that it may be sold to the non-Jew, who is thus likened to a dog (S.254-8; fol.18-21a).

The second reason which makes for the segregation of the Jews is that, owing to their dispersion, they are exposed to the mockery and exploitation of adventurers. It is sufficient for a man to come into a community and to make a show of piety, of extreme strictness in the matter of food, for him to be assured of a high place for himself, of becoming a revered leader. Let him further forbid one or two things which have hitherto been regarded as permissible, and the people will follow him; so easily are they swayed by the imposition of new hardships (S. 407-9; fol.22).

It is true that not all Jews are so foolish as to submit to whatsoever their legists wish to prescribe. The Karaites, for instance, look upon the compilers of the Mishna and the Talmud as mere impostors, men who belied God and Moses,

authors of silly stories. The Karaites do not believe in the forgeries which are passed off as the "traditions" of the Jews.

When the followers of Anan and of Benjamin (Nihawandi) realised how objectionable and impossible those inventions and glaring fabrications were, they seceded from the legists and their followers. "The Karaites have their own scholars who are openly men of *ijtihād*, and make no claim to divine guidance. They prefer to follow the plain text of the scriptures. The majority, however, are followers of the Rabbanites who, above all Jews, evince "the most intense hatred for other people"; for the legist inventors diligently sowed the seeds of such hate by insisting that all the restrictions devised and imposed in the name of Moses by the rabbis are boons and blessings sent down to them by heaven itself. There are Jews who "regard the outsider, the man who does not belong to themselves, as though he were some sort of an animal." No wonder, then, that Jews will not partake of a meal with outsiders.

But the Karaites are not merely the superior Jewish element. "Most of them went over to Islam, and little by little their numbers have been reduced, until now only a few of them remain; for they are better prepared to accept Islam, being, as they are, safe from the follies of the Rabbanite legists, those inventors who lay heavier and still heavier burdens upon their own people" (S: 258-260; fol.21-2).

The notions of the Jews about Islam.

Muhammad had visions, in which his future power was shown him. He was in Syria on business on behalf of Khadija. There he met a number of learned Jews to whom he told his dreams. They instantly grasped their significance. They sent 'Abd Allāh b. Salām with Muhammad to instruct him in the Torah and fiqh. And it is to 'Abd Allāh that the eloquence of the Koran is attributed. 'Abd Allāh also prevailed upon Muhammad to introduce the regulation which says that, after the third divorce, the wife must marry another man before she can remarry her first husband. That is how the Jews, in their malice, tried to make bastards (mamzerim) of Muslims.

The Jews argue that the Koran contains many contradictions; but their own scriptures are much worse in that respect. They reject the i'jāz al-Ḳur'ān; but that is because they cannot appreciate the point, their knowledge of Arabic being too poor.

Amongst themselves, they call Muhammad pasūl (defective), and "the madman" (m^eshugga'), and the Koran, Ḳalōn - disgrace (S.253; fol.17).

Samau'al concludes his notes by enumerating the transgressions of the Jews of old (against Moses, Aaron, David, etc.) which they committed despite the favours and miracles God had vouchsafed to them. As to his contemporary Jews, he is disgusted with their silly belief in adventurers and pseudo-Messiahs.

Schreiner has already noticed (S.411, n.1) that Ḳarāfī's XIIIth century work, Al-Ajwiba al-fākhira, draws extensively upon Samau'al.

MS. B.M. Or.8986, p.54a of this book, has a remark by a reader: "Most of this is from the book Ifhām al-Yahūd, by al-Samau'al, who embraced Islam in the 5th century."

Another work having its origin in Ifhān is Hidāyat al Ḥayārā, by Ibn-Ḳayyim al-Jauziya (XIV century). It also plagiarises Samau'al's book: the passages on the Karaites, the Talmud, unclean meats, the levirate, the rabbis' attempts to segregate the Jews, etc. (as quoted by Goldziher in Kobak's Jeschurun, 1873, pp.18 seq., practically every word from page 30 onwards, with the result that all the remarks refer to Samau'al rather than Ibn-Ḳayyim). Ibn-Ḳayyim quotes without giving a name, but mentions "a converted Jew" as his source.

There is very little doubt but that even towards the close of the eighteenth century Samau'al's arguments are drawn upon by Muḥ. Mahdī Ṭabāṭabā'ī.

(Accordingly much of what Goldziher wrote in Z D M G, 32, and Fritsch in his book on anti-Christian polemic, really refers to our author.)

Samau'al's pamphlet has two aspects - the rationalistic and the Islamic.

Samau'al may have learnt from Kalīla wa-Dimma, if not from

better sources. The rationalist ideas were current in philosophical literature. There were both Muslims and non-Muslims who desired to reconcile themselves completely with the Muslim society by interpreting Islam as a universal, rational faith making for social progress.

Whatever the source of that side of Samau'al's tract, the other, the pious "testimonies" and exegesis, is evidently a mere reproduction of Muslim efforts. He admits he has read - without satisfaction - previous Muslim refutations. It cannot be ascertained whether he read Ibn Ḥazm but it seems not improbable. In Ibn-Ḥazm too he could find both aspects found in the *Ifḥām*.

The story of the conversion and the *a'lām* show that the author had but little expectation of being accepted into Muslim society on his own conditions; and that he therefore tried to conciliate that society by conforming to its demands. He had to compile a *'lām*, religious refutations, etc., in the usual strain. It is interesting to note that he quotes neither from the Koran nor from *ḥadīth*.

VIII. ḲARĀFĪ AND RĀZĪ.

The Egyptian mālikī legist, Aḥmad al-Ḳarāfī (d. 1285) wrote a refutation of Christianity, Al-Ajwiba al-fākhira 'an al-as 'ila al-fājira, which contains many extracts from discussions with Jews. Fritsch (p.22) says that this book seems to be the best apologetic achievement of Islam. The author made extensive use of Samau'al's tract. The argument from the greatness of Islamic science (31; Fritsch 54)* is repeated, with an addition to the effect that Islam inculcated new studies (jaddadat hiya 'ulūman lam takun lighayrihā) such as Arabic philology, with its branches, the sciences of tradition and the Koran. Islam is the most universal religion, and therefore the most perfect (wa-lā shakka anna-l-maṣāliḥa id 'ammat kānat akmalā fa-sharī'atunā akmalu wahuwa-l-maṭlūbu).

He also reproduces Samau'al on tabdīl: the aḥbār themselves do not believe in the divine origin of the Law; the Israelites knew of only half a chapter of the Bible; Nebuchadnezzar destroyed the text, and killed the Aaronides who knew it; Ezra forged the new text, full of anthropomorphism; the synagogue developed chants of its own, in place of the ancient prayers (53-54; Fritsch 59-60). Muslim historians, as being

* The former number refers to p. of H.M.MS.Or.8986, written in A.H. 1302.

more recent, are more reliable (li-ḵurbi 'ahdi zamāninā). He quotes some verses from the Bible, again transcribed from Samau'al.

But he must have drawn on some Christian source for his relatively sound biblical knowledge. Goldziher (Z D M G. 32 p.376 ff.) pointed out (ib. 378-9) that in some cases there is dependence on the Peshitta. It might be added that on one occasion (No.36, 123a), commenting on a verse from Isaiah, Ḳarāfī says about a certain usage that it is a peculiarity of the Greek tongue (iṣṭilāḥ lisān al-yūnān).

Ḳarāfī's book is a reply to Christian apologetics. ^{He} /~~Now~~ and then, however, begins a paragraph with the words: "The Jews say", or: "We tell the Jews".

His pronouncements on the blindness of Christians recall similar passages of Samau'al's on the Jews: They are blindfolded by their leaders, the bishops (2b).

He tells a story of how in Christian countries Jews are being pillaged and killed on three certain consecutive days every year (1 b; Fritsch 149. Read not Barkona, but Tarragona).

Our author may be placed by the side of Ibn Ḥazm, as a radical critic of the Bible (Fr.62). But he fails to discover anything new. He points out contradictions, improper passages, and so on; and he says that learned Jews, like Ka'b al-Aḥbār, long ago testified to the truth of Islam.

On the story of Jacob's encounter with the angels (Genesis XXXII.) he remarks: They make angels and prophets fight like boys (106b). ~~The-verse-from-Buain~~ On the identification of Maryam as sister of Moses and as Mother of Christ, he replies that the name may have served as a family-name. Is not every human being Ibn-Adam?

Of another kind is the remark: How could the spirit of God have moved above the waters, before the waters were created? (102b). The only non-biblical reference (min ghayri-t-Taurāt) is that on the seventh day God lay on His back to rest (quoted also by Shahrastānī).

The discussion on Paradise is of more interest. The Jews say (49 ff., N 8) that the Muslim conception of Paradise is "crude"; it is impossible to think of Paradise in terms of food and drink and carnal relations. Ḳarāfī says that Baihaḳī wrote a tract on the subject, to explain why the Koran dwells so much on the subject of Paradise. But the Bible itself refutes this argument; for Adam and Eve were in the Garden of Eden and did not abstain from earthly pleasures. Whatever the Muslim conception of Paradise may be, that of the Jews, as revealed in their books, is that of a crude people (kaṭīfū-ṭ-ṭibā') which cares only about things close to their own skins (al-mubāshir fī jildihā). That is why they could only be induced to do as they ought by the promise of a country of their

own. Not so the Muslims. When they espoused the cause of the Prophet, they jeopardised their very lives without questioning and without asking for material rewards in return.

But by far the most interesting passages in the book are those concerned with abrogation.

Abrogation, says the author, is rejected by the Jews because they hold that it entails regret, repentance (*nadam*), which is impossible to God. Broadly considered, *naskh* would make truth impossible; for it purports to turn right into wrong, and vice versa (*Ḳalb al-ḥakā' ik*). Moreover, a law is either good or bad. If good, why should it be abrogated; if bad, why was it ever enjoined?

The reply is that *naskh* is not *badā'*, and regret is not its premise. Abrogation is a component part of God's prescience and omniscience (*'ilm fī-l-azal*). God knew that a certain commandment or code would be valid (*maṣlaḥa*) for a certain period, after which it would have to be superseded (*Ṡhr* opposite of *naskh*). He knew both the *nāsikh* and the *mansūkh*. This manifests the divine wisdom which takes into account the variability of conditions in space and time. Even the same person is different at different moments of his life, and it is thus not to be wondered at that commandments have to be altered to suit the different environment and conditions (*al-aḥkām tābi'a li-maṣāliḥ al-auḳāt wa-ikhtilāf al-umam*). Proof

texts follow. Now, if the Bible affords such proofs, the arguments of the Jews may be dismissed. Let us rely upon God's care for the well-being of man (ri' āyat al-maṣāliḥ).

The same question of abrogation turns up in the writings of Fakhr ad-Dīn ar-Rāzī, the famous theologian of the twelfth century. Schreiner analysed the development of this discussion, and his conclusions were as follows: In the oldest layers of the controversy (Sa'adia, Ibn Ḥazm), any alteration in nature, law, practice is conceived as a case of naskh; later, naskh covers religious law only (Juwaynī). Rāzī maintains that a religious system can be supplanted by another system. Some Jewish scholars (Abr.b.David) accept the idea of naskh without conceding that naskh has taken place; and Rāzī mentions Muslims who reject it. Schreiner pointed out that the Jewish apologetic here fructified Islamic thought, and contributed to its development from the first unyielding stages to a system into which the idea of God's prescience and of predestination fitted most conveniently.

Rāzī also touched upon the question of the scriptures in his commentary on the Koran. The Jews he says, combine error with misdirection (ḍalāl wa-idlāl; Mafātīḥ, III.337 top). Tahṛīf, though, is not a very clear idea. The Koran points to falsification in the Scriptures. This was not impossible; for only a few amongst the Israelites could read, and those few

might very well agree to mislead the rest (338). Another suggestion is that their interpretations were erroneous, because of the misconstruction put upon certain words (bi-wujūh al-ḥiyal al-lafẓīya), "like that practised by the heretics (ahl al bid'a) in our own time, on those Koranic verses which do not suit their systems." This latter view seems to Rāzī to be the correct one. But after all, he concludes, the Jews combined both kinds of distortion (jama'ū bayn al-amrayn); i.e., both of the text (lafẓ) and the interpretation (ma'nā) (cf. also I. 575). From ḥadīth he proves that the Jews concealed the truth, namely, the description of the Prophet in the scriptures (ṣifa, na't) (II.132). He quotes a few "predictions" from 'Alī aṭ-Ṭabarī's (I.486) which prove the authenticity of the "Book of Religion and Empire". He brands the Jews as a people given to anthropomorphism (wa-l-aghlab 'alayhim at-tashbīh).

Thus he leaves the impression of a stiff, pedantic knowledge of older refutations; but with the addition of some independence of judgment on the involved questions of principle. There may have been more thinking; there was no more learning.

Reading these "pronouncements", one asks oneself if any belief in them was held by anyone; or if they were mere reproductions from ancient works; or if they were merely the means of getting rid of problems suggested by the line of argument pursued. The opinion of Maimonides, in his Epistle to Yaman,

is important. He writes of the converts supplying material, or parading their belief in a 'lām.

"As regards what you say of the renegade who led people to believe that bi-m'od m'od refers to Muhammad - such ~~are~~ arguments are ridiculous, and the renegades who babble about them do not regard them seriously, and are not themselves deceived by them. Their object in making such statements is to gain the respect of the Gentiles, and to show them that they, the renegades, are trustworthy. . . . The Muslims themselves do not believe in these manifestations, do not accept the contentions, nor use them in argument; for they are too obviously fallacious. Since they cannot find in the whole Torah any support for their statements. . . they have recourse to the assertion: 'You changed the Torah and distorted it. You erased the name of Muhammad.'" (MS. B.M. Add.27542. p.111b).

IX. UNDER THE MONGOLS.

We have now reached the period of Mongol invasion and domination of the Middle East. The State was no longer Muslim, and had not been for decades, until the Ilkhān Ghāzān embraced Islam in 1295. The Muslims were reduced to equality with all the other subjects of the new conquerors. The Mongols, however, availed themselves of the services of non-Muslims whom they felt they could trust with more confidence. As a consequence, some remarkable men of Jewish origin rose to high places; and it was not long before a situation came into being which created animosity, anti-Jewish propaganda, and Jew-baiting, as in Spain in the time of Ibn Ḥazm.

Once again poetry was the vehicle of political journalism for anti-Jewish denunciation. The historian Waṣṣāf brings to light a poem (tr. E.G.Browne, L.HP, III.32 ff.), revived some two hundred years after it had first been circulated in Egypt:

The Jews of our-time a rank attain
 To which the heavens might aspire in vain.
 Theirs is dominion, wealth to them doth cling,
 To them belong both councillor and king.
 O people, hear my words of counsel true:
 Turn Jews, for heaven itself hath turned a Jew!
 Yet wait, and ye shall hear their torment's cry,
 And see them fall and perish presently.

100

All kinds of evil, in deed and thought, are attributed to the Jewish counsellor of Arghun Khān (1284-1291), Sa'ad ad-Daula. "He sought to persuade Arghun that the prophetic function had passed from the Arabs to the Mongols, who were divinely commissioned to chastise the disobedient and degenerate followers of Muhammad." He appointed Jews to high positions in the administration, especially in 'Irāk; sent Jewish officers, armed with black lists, to seize Muslim Notables, and so on (Ibn al Fuwaṭī, 461, in W. Fishel, 110):-

"In the year 689/1291, a document was prepared in Baghdad by respected individuals which contained attacks on Sa'ad ad-Daula, together with verses from the Koran, and the history of the prophets, which stated that the Jews were a people whom Allah had debased; and that he who would undertake to raise them would himself be brought low by God."

The execution of the hated minister in 1291 was the (Browne) "signal for a general persecution of the Jews, who were plundered and in many instances slain. . . . The collapse of the Jewish ascendancy was celebrated" in a long Ḳaṣīda (Browne, *ibid.*):

His name we praise who rules the firmament.
 These apish Jews are done away and shentI
 * * * *

God has dispersed their dominant accord
 And they are melted by the burnished sword.
 * * * *

O foulest race who e'er on earth did thrive
 And hatefulest of those who still survive

* * * * *

I penned this satire, hoping to attain
The Eternal Garden's lake-encompassed plain,
And to refute that poet's words untrue,
Who said: 'Turn Jews, for heaven hath turned a Jew'.

A few years earlier, two Muslim authors had each written a treatise against an author whom one of them calls the "Jewish Philosopher" (St.P.L. No30.p.47-48; No.86.p.107). Their works seem to be lost, but the book they wrote against is still extant. This is the Tanḳīḥ al-Abḥāt lil-milal aṭ-talāt, "Inquiry into the Three Faiths", by Sa'd b. Manṣūr Ibn-Kammūna (ibid. pp.37 ff), written in 679/1280. It makes use of the common Muslim eulogies of Muhammad (in Hebrew characters!), and thus gives the impression that it has been written by a Muslim. It is an inquiry into prophecy, the revealed religions, and their respective claims, and is written with such unusual objectivity that only a very close analysis of its subtleties (by D. Baneth) could bear out the contention of the Muslim polemicists that the author was a Jew. A chronicler shows how the agitation originated, and how it ended in an outburst of rage (Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, 441-2, tr. W.Fischel, p.134-5):-

"In this year (683/1284), it became known in Baghdad that 'Izz ad-Daula b. Kammūna, the Jew, had written a book. . . . The people rose up in excitement and gathered together, in order to penetrate into his house and slay him. Thereupon . . .

the prefect of 'Irāk . . . and a group of officials rose . . . and summoned the Supreme Judge and the teachers to him, in order to clarify the situation. They sought for Ibn Kammūna, but he kept himself hidden. When the Supreme Judge rode to prayer on this day, which happened to be a Friday, it happened that the crowds prevented his doing so . . . (The prefect) went forth to calm the crowds, but these showered abuse upon him, and accused him of belonging to the party of Ibn Kammūna, and of protecting him. Thereupon the Governor ordered, through an official, proclamation that they should assemble outside the walls of Baghdad the following morning, in order to witness the burning of Ibn Kammūna. Thereupon, the people calmed themselves, and no longer referred to him. Regarding Ibn Kammūna, he was placed in a leather-covered box, and carried to Ḥilla, where his son was secretary; there he spent his days, and also died."

Ibn Kammūna discussed without prejudice (*bilā tarjīḥ*) the three monotheist creeds. He is known by other works, philosophical and medical commentaries, and by a treatise on the difference between Rabbanites and Karaites. Doubtless the treatise displays the same characteristics as the "Inquiry". Ibn Kammūna appears as a reputed Jewish doctor of great scholarly attainments, and good social position. (He is called 'Izz ad-Daula, and also muftī al-farīḳayn, which would seem to designate him head of the Jewish community.) What is interesting about

him is his unique approach to the inter-religious controversy.

He was evidently well aware of his originality; for in his works he explains that he had not found his own point of view expressed anywhere in earlier works. The basic argument is: It is no good making a fuss about things which are undemonstrable; rather should the basic affinities shared in common by the various schools of thought be stressed, for the good of all; for tolerance is best for all.

An anti-Islamic trend can be discerned in the "Inquiry". (Baneth), whilst in the chapter on Judaism Leo Hirschfeld found indications of suppressed emotion. But it may be added that the author cleverly quotes Samau'al to indicate it. More than once, the author shows that he has drawn, in substance, from Yehuda Ha-Levi's 'Book al-Khazari'. In a sense, he reduced that volume to a treatise on the religions, without the philosophic and Judaistic components. But while he mentions Samau'al al-Maghribi, he says not a word about his own indebtedness to Ha-Levi. (Hirschfeld has even called him a plagiarist). But he was right in not mentioning a name unknown to, and of no interest or authority to the Muslim reader. In the treatise on the Differences, etc., he mentions Ha-Levi (H. Hirschfeld, Chrestomath, p.72); for the treatise was intended for Jews only, whilst the "Inquiry" was intended for Muslims.

The chapter on Judaism in the "Inquiry" is a concise account of the state of Muslim polemics against Judaism at the

end of the thirteenth century. One is tempted to remark that this chapter, although written by a non-Muslim, and despite its brevity, is the best work of Islamic polemics against Judaism.

It consists of: 1) an outline of Bible history (Leo Hirschfeld, 31-35); 2) a short catechism in which it is pointed out that the Jewish religion consists of: a) ethical laws, b) social laws, and c) things which cannot be explained rationally (ashyā'u lā na'kalu haḥnu fā'idata-t-taklīfi bihā; p.36; cf. Differences, p.74); 3) a special paragraph on the Jewish belief in resurrection (p.37. cf. Diff.p.95); 4) a discussion on abrogation (37 ff.).

There are seven arguments for naskh.

First; the defects of the chain of tradition (inḳiṭā' at-tawātur); the horrors of invasion, e.g., Nebuchadnezzar's, did not necessarily mean that the Torah was forgotten. Persia lived on under the Greeks; Arabs retained their identity under the Abyssinian yoke. The Jews had prophets a century after Nebuchadnezzar; which proves the persistence of the Law amongst them. As to later times - even a Samau'al al-Maghribī mentions the thousands devoted to the study of the Law at various academies.

Second argument: that only a minority knew the Law. This looks strange in face of the fact that the attitude of the Jews is strict and reverent, as expressed, e.g., in the

minutiae of the Masora.

The third argument: Anthropomorphism in the scriptures. The second commandment (no graven image), and the spiritual exegesis, are the reply. For example, Genesis VIII.21, "and the LORD smelled" is strange; but it must mean "accepted". Compare phrases like: "God listened to the prayer".

The fourth argument covers the case of the improper stories.

The fifth argument: the Torah does not mention resurrection and life after death. Reply: Every prophet teaches his own people in his own time. With the Jews, in the days of Moses, the main question was not that of resurrection but idolatry. Nevertheless, the Jews do profess faith in a resurrection.

The sixth argument: there is no permanent miracle to prove the teaching of Moses. But miracles are temporary, only to strengthen the faith, the latter being itself the main thing in religion.

Finally, the scriptures themselves demonstrate the fact of abrogation (there is no red heifer; new fasts are added, etc.). In the reply the doubts are settled, point by point.

The conclusion is: All these arguments could be valid only for one who is neither Christian nor Muslim; for a Muslim would have to accept, with the Koran, Moses and the Torah. "That is why Muslims assert that the Torah is falsified

For Islam can be explained and recognised only by doubting the genuineness and divine origin of the Torah.

They say: The dissidents amongst the Jews, i.e., the Christians, did not recognise the Law, whereas non-Muslims recognise the validity of the Law of Islam. The reply is: The one case is a mixing of the few with the many; the other case is the mixing of the many with the few. If there were non-Jews amongst Jews, they would of necessity accept the validity of the Jewish law. But Jews do not like admixtures; they are adverse to proselytism; their tenets are unknown to strangers; their books are written in an alien tongue. Jews living amongst Muslims scarcely know the elements of the teachings of Islam. Muslims themselves do not know all the differences between one of their own sects and another.

In this chapter too, the author pursued his favourite method of commenting upon a well-known text; in this instance, the *Ifhām* of Samau'al. Along with the one direct reference to that book, there are several indirect ones. The whole chapter of accusation, with its seven indictments (*I'tirāḍ*, also used by Samau'al) follows closely the arguments of Samau'al, even to his very words. (Fol.43b*); the study of the scriptures was neither obligatory nor customary; Ezra's forgeries; f.44a the destructive influence of the eclipse of the State; f.69a is a retort to Samau'al's jibes at the claim that the whole of

* MS. of the Bodleian.

Jewish learning is based on mere naql (Samau'al, f.5a), Ibn Kammūna asserting that only part of it is oral tradition, the rest being scriptural, speculative, and based on further research by later generations (ijtihād), whilst the claim that all the details of the Jewish tradition can be traced back to authorities (ṭiḳāt) is repudiated by the Jews.

F. 70a proves the reliability of the sages of the Talmud, on the same lines as the "Differences" (Ch.I., i.e., as Yehuda Ha-Levi).

F. 52b mentions the "later (modern) Jewish authors", who have clearly repelled the accusation of tajsīm.

X. UNDER THE MAMLŪKS.

The very opposite of Ibn Kammūna's work is a tract "Masālik an-naẓar fī nubūwat sayyid al-baḥar" by Sa'īd b. Ḥasan of Alexandria.

He claims to be a Jewish scholar. In 697/1298, whilst he was ill, he heard a voice urging him to read the sūrat-alḥamd. He went to a neighbour, a sworn witness, and repeated the Muslim creed. The people in the mosque appeared to him "like ranks of angels". He was quick to discover the i'jāz of the Koran; for in a few words that book revealed more than pages of the Torah.

Twenty-two years later, when he was living in Damascus, he wrote a "Muḥīṭ", of which the Masālik formed a part. The writing of this tract had a bearing on the agitation of A.H. 700. The turn of the century evoked new anticipations, as also did the approaching completion of 700 solar years from the Hijra. Feeling ran high, in connection with the hard fight Islamic Egypt had to wage against the Mongols.

Sa'īd suggests that the wrath of God was turned upon the Muslims for tolerating the cults of the unbelievers. When Ghāzān, having embraced Islam, began his reign with persecution, his armies proved victorious. So also did the Egyptians under al-Malik an-Nāṣir b. Ḳalā'ūn, a few years later, after the churches and synagogues had been closed down. Sa'īd, eager

to do his part, offered himself for a disputation against Christian and Jewish religious leaders; but these did not appear. Nor did his zeal for the purification of his faith suffer any diminution on that account. That which he was denied the opportunity of throwing in the teeth of his opponents, he imparted to his readers. One thus obtains a glimpse of the kind of arguments which were supplied to the agitators in the shadow of the mosque.

Sa'Id writes against the Jews; but he seems to hate the Christians still more. In the Torah a few "announcements" are still to be found; whilst the absolute lack of them in the Gospels is proof positive that the ^{Gospels} are forgeries. The Christians are simply idolators (Weston, 340). The "philosophers" fare no better at the hands of the author (Weston, 343-350). These materialists are an ancient school, with Jeroboam as their first master.

The language in which the tract is written is rather poor.

Sa'Id quotes passages from the Bible. But Zechariah is the last of the prophets (331); Isaiah is taken for Ezekiel; and a wrong quotation is given from the Psalms. The usual Ishmael passages are cited and commented upon. Muhammad's advent is traced back to an earlier date; the rainbow was set up in the firmament to bear witness to the cause of the Prophet. Genesis XVI.12 is a prophecy about the power of Islam. Genesis

XXII.2: "take now thy son, thine only son, Ishmael". Numbers
 XXIV.17: "there shall come a Star out of Ishmael". I.Kings
 XIII.2: "a child shall be born unto the house of Ishmael".

Thus the falsification is not only persistent, but elementary and unimaginative.

The Ḥanbalī Ibn Ḳayyim al-Jauziya (d.751/1350), wrote "The guidance of the perplexed to reply to the Jews and Christians" (Hidāyat al-ḥayārā fī ajwibat al-yahūd wa-n-naṣārā), borrowing freely from his master, Ibn Taymīya. Goldziher (Kobak's Jeschurun, IX., 1873) remarked that it was in the usual strain, so far as biblical criticism was concerned, but was better informed about later Jewish lore. In 1907 (Z D M G, 61) he remarked (p.867, n.4) that Ibn Ḳayyim seems to have taken some of his material from Samau'al, whose text had in part been made accessible, in the meantime, by Schreiner (1898).

Goldziher did not notice that the text about post-biblical lore was in its entirety just a reproduction of Samau'al's text. Samau'al is "the convert" quoted in some passages also published by Goldziher (N G W J, XX., 310 f.).

Ibn Ḳayyim also has a passage about the character of the Jews, which reads like an exercise in vilification. Perfidy, treachery, intrigue, usury, bribery, wickedness (ab'adu min ar-raḥma wa-aḳrabu min an-naḳma), stubbornness, hatred - these are the ingredients of the Jewish character. Nothing is sacred

to the Jew. There can be no relying on such people, to whom justice and fairness are unknown; and whosoever has dealings with them is in jeopardy, particularly those who take advice from them (ista' malahum . . . naṣī ḥatan). Amongst these people, the most degraded will be regarded as the cleverest; and the cleverest will prove to be the craftiest.

The author mentions meetings with learned, influential Jews. He asked **one** of them if Muhammad's triumph would have been possible without divine intervention. The Jew replied that Muhammad certainly was nabī ṣādiq. "I said to him: Then why do you not join his religion. He replied: But he was sent to the unlettered who had no book, whilst we have a book to guide us." Thereupon, Ibn Ḳayyim proceeded to **prove** the universal role of the Prophet.

Ibn Ḳayyim shows off his Hebrew. Why does the biblical verse, Genesis XVII.20, say bi-mōd mōd? If it meant, as the Jews contend, just jiddan-jiddan, there would be no place for the particle bi. But the words refer to Muhammad, which, of course, makes sense: making great through Muhammad (lā yuḳālu "u' azzimuhu bi-jiddan9jiddan", bi-khilāfi "bi-muḥammadin").

The author also quotes a curious accusation by a Jew against the learned Muslims, of sexual perversity, deceit, envy, stinginess, treachery and cowardice.

In the Mamluk empire, the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries are distinguished for the efforts made to crush the

enemies of Islam: the remnants of the crusaders and the new heathen power of the Mongols, who were in diplomatic contact with the Christian powers with the object of forming a joint force against the last stronghold of Islamic rule in Egypt. This struggle often assumed the character of a holy war, and Christians under the Mamluks were accused of making contact with powers outside the state. The religious divergences became more marked, discussions more vehement. At any rate, this was the case with the theologians and legists. A new wave of intolerance seems to have been breaking over the non-Muslims of the Mamluk empire, which found expression both in persecutions and new enactments, and also in literary productions. It is from this period onwards that the fatwa is frequently employed to expound the general principles underlying the status of the ahl ad-dimma, or their actual situation; to express the complaints against their insolence and assertiveness in public life; or as protests against their churches and synagogues. Usually the text begins with certain passages in the Koran and the Tradition directed against the unbelievers followed by anecdotes illustrating how the great men of ancient Islam knew how to deal with the unbelievers. Sometimes the authorities refused to yield to the demands of the populace, or at any rate tried to resist them; and, to support their authority, secured a fatwa from a well-known jurist. The dimmas, too, tried to prevail upon the legists to take up

their cause. The outcome of all this was a polemic between the Muslim legists themselves. Whenever the destruction of places of worship was demanded, a violent legal controversy ensued. If one faction insisted that the churches and synagogues should not be suffered to exist, since they were innovations contravening the "pact of Umar", another faction demanded proof that the buildings concerned had been erected before the Muslim conquest. And the "tributaries" had recourse to subterfuge to establish the fact that the buildings were far older than their enemies had said.

There is a collection of documents on the synagogues of Cairo in the beginning of the fourteenth century, which is a good illustration of the foregoing.

The Jews assemble in a big place which is, to outward appearance, only the house of one of them, and there they perform all their ritual. The wazir ordered an investigation (istikshāf) by the heads of the four madhabs. It was recommended that the Jewish service should be prohibited; for it introduced heathen ritual, and was, therefore, worse than wine-bibbing, or keeping a house of prostitution. Of course, there would be no objection to the Jews assembling in the modest, certified synagogues under the conditions of dimma. That being permissible, it might then be hoped that they would one day embrace Islam. Let them discover for themselves the

superiority of Islam. Muslims, however, must exact the poll-tax from the Jews, and also keep them in subjection, in order to induce them to embrace Islam. Indeed, this is the main object for which the Muslims leave them alone in the few recognised synagogues. Even these cannot be actually permitted, but merely tolerated. For permission (jawāz) implies a decision of the canon law; and how could such a decision be given in a case which implies the permissibility of unbelief?

If a man is not satisfied with this, desires to be more liberal, then he is showing too much generosity.

The Jews were given a hearing, and put forward their arguments. They demanded the reopening of the synagogues, which had been closed down, and asserted that their closing was a violation of the Jewish rights. "One of the best replies was that made by that great scholar Takī ad-Dīn b. Taymiya" (d. 728/1328).

His first proceeding was to repudiate the claims of the Jews. They claimed to have been wronged. Well, that was not the opinion (ijmā') of the Muslims. If the Imam decided to demolish all the synagogues to the glory of the true faith, even that, nevertheless, would be no injustice. If the Jews refused to obey the order, they would be violating the "pact", and their blood would be upon their own heads. But the Jews are trying to base their rights on the "pact". That is mere crude deception: Cairo was founded more than 300 years after Umar, and consequently the "pact of Umar" could not include

Cairo. Under the pact, the Jews are prohibited from erecting new synagogues, even on territory occupied under a peace treaty; still more in a town built by Muslims. Moreover, Egypt was a conquered territory, not one which was occupied in peace. Then the question arises: How did it come about that the Jews were allowed to build several synagogues in Cairo? The explanation is that for 200 years Egypt was under non-Muslim rule - that of the Fāṭimids; and no less a personage than Ghazālī himself exposed the contacts between it and the infidels.

To put an end to the difficult situation, stringent measures would have to be resorted to. The poll-tax must be exacted; and this would also alleviate the position of the treasury, "especially in these times, when it stands in need of the means to pay the expenses of the holy war". Surely it is only right that the Jews should be made to pay; for they are stubborn infidels.

This is the strict, consistent, though extreme attitude of a legist. But it is of interest to note that he has to stab at the unnamed opponents who avowed a more moderate and liberal attitude. The Jews, on their part, would date their synagogues from the time of Moses, Ezra and the Second Temple. One of them even expressed his "stubbornness" in the ironic retort: God imposed unbelief upon me, and yet is dissatisfied?

"If God wishes me to be an infidel,
Well, I am content this wish to follow."

At this period, the heads of the Jewish community in Egypt appear to have been prominent physicians. It is understandable, therefore, that attacks should have been made on Jewish physicians.

Earlier, a faḳīh from Fās, questioned about the elegant appearance of a Jewish doctor whom it was hard to distinguish from a Muslim, replied that the main thing is to persevere in humiliating the infidels: No turban for him, no horse to ride, no yellow-coloured garments (for it is the colour of the pious of ancient Islam).

Extravagant allegations are made in the K. al-Mukhtār fī-kashf al-asrār, by al-Jaubarī. The fifth chapter is "to disclose the falseness of the Jewish men of learning".

"Know that this people is most cunning, contemptible, unbelieving and hypocritical. They are the most virulent in all that they do, when they would appear to be the most humiliated and unfortunate. They are accursed, and bad luck is their portion. If they remain alone with a man, they will kill him; they put some sort of sleeping-draught into his food, and then murder him. . . (Full recipe) . . . They are the greatest of unbelievers, and also very treacherous. So beware, and keep clear of their company. They have no belief (? ḳaul), and no religion . . . (Jewish apothecaries) . . . Among them are the physicians. They know many secrets unknown to anyone else, e.g., how to make the distant near, and the strong weak. If one of them wishes to heal a man . . . he will

effect it in a couple of days; but if he wants to play a trick on him, he will first neglect to maintain the strength of the patient until it diminishes; then he will prescribe good medicine for him for three days, after which he will cause the patient to suffer from some other malady; and so on, thus reaping a rich harvest from the patient. If the patient has an heir, the latter will give the doctor a hint; for a certain remuneration the doctor will weaken the patient little by little, until he finally dies. Again, if the patient has a wife who wishes for his death, she will say to the doctor: 'Oh, doctor, by God, if my husband is dead, then give me the good tidings, and you shall be favoured.' The doctor: 'He will improve; but I could give him something to take which would weaken him until he perishes.' Then the woman, poor in reasoning power and faith, and bent on her husband's death, will say to the doctor: 'You do what you like, and you shall have from me whatever you desire'. The doctor, not satisfied with promises (wu'ūd), demands cash (nuḳūd)." In this way, the doctor is able to blackmail the woman, and even seduce her.

Wasiṭī, in Egypt, in the thirteenth-fourteenth century, tells the story of the Jewish physician who admitted that Jews are at liberty to shed the blood of those who desecrate the Sabbath. He even dramatises the story: The sick doctor, Mūsā (Maimonides ?) made the admission when he was moved by the kind visit of al-Ḳādī al-Fāḍil (p. 397/430).

The bitterest attack of this kind is that in Ibn Ḥajj's

al-Madkhal (d. A.H. 737) (IV.107-114, ed. 1348/1929). No good can come of treatment by unbelieving physicians or oculists. They think they betray their faith if they help a Muslim. Whosoever desecrates the Sabbath is in danger, if treated by one of them. They fool people by deceptive medicines which bring only temporary relief, and cause graver disturbances. They are eager to kill learned and pious Muslims in this way. Their advice is not to be relied upon. A drug cannot be tested: the dead tell no tales. Some people go to a Muslim doctor; but consult ^{a non-Muslim} at the same time. The matter is a real scandal where women and the examination of them is concerned. The argument that it is permissible to consult a non-Muslim doctor is wrong. It is allowed only in cases of necessity; but there are so many Muslim doctors. People rob the Muslim doctors of the opportunity of gaining experience, and thus prevent them from becoming experts.

Instructive stories are related. The unbelievers have a hold over the Muslims in three fields of activity: medicine, ophthalmology, and accountancy; with the result that they have at their disposal both the bodies and the resources of the believers.

Ibn Ḥājj advises: Buy Muslim. Do not help the unbeliever, help your brethren. The prosperous unbeliever employs Muslims, and is thus in a position to command them. In the matter of cleanliness, there is no confidence to be placed in a ḍimmī.

After all, they believe it is no sin to deceive a Muslim. But nowadays people do not see the difference between buying from a believer and from a non-Muslim; some even prefer to deal with Ahl-al-kitāb, under various pretexts, both nonsensical and illegal. People should beware about hiring a Jewish or Christian servant (re women) (164 f.). Meat may be bought from a non-Muslim only if it is of the kind the vendor himself is permitted to eat (184).

Wāsiṭī (p.397/430-1) relates anecdotes about the spiteful tricks of Jews, and asks (p.415/457): How can Muslims trust people whose religion permits them to rob the Muslims of their money by usury?

This agitation, it would seem, did not meet with success; but it was nevertheless carried on, and not only against Jewish doctors. Usually, it was aimed at Christians as well.

A century later, in A.H.852, a decree is mentioned prohibiting Jews and Christians from practising medicine amongst Muslims.

XI. THE MAGHRIB.

"God guided me, some sixteen years ago, to the belief in Muhammad. . . . Then, thank God, my family and children, and all upon whom God's mercy rested, embraced Islam, through me, and joined me.

"Then, when God bestowed upon me what, out of His great goodness, He was pleased to, some scholars of the town of Ceuta - may the Lord strengthen them, and protect their town! - advised me to compose a treatise on what the Jews - God's curse be upon them! - maintain in error: abominable infidelity, polytheism, and futile unbelief, such as the repudiation of the mission of our Master, Muhammad. This treatise was to wipe out the faith of the Jews. I asked for God's help . . . and set about the task, as a kind of devotion (taḡarrub ilā-Allāh). Accordingly, I made use of clear arguments and irrefutable proofs, to demonstrate the fallacies the Jews adhere to, and to counteract their insolence and lack of education. With this object in view, I confined myself to the matter contained in their forged scriptures, so that they might have no way of denying or belying it at all. Thus, the treatise will be the best refutation, the most eloquent in argument, and the best in polemics."

~~These~~ circumstances led the convert 'Abd al-Ḥakk al-Islāmī,

to write an anti-Jewish tract. It was written under the Merīnid prince, Abū Firās 'Abd al-'Azīz II. al-Muntaṣir (796-9/1393-6).

The advice to write came originally from Abū-Zayd 'Abd ar-Rahmān, the son of the ḥājib Aḥmad al-Ḳabā'ilī, whose whole family was put to death in 802/1400. The invocations were altered in the later version quoted above. The conversion, then, must have taken place about 1380, and the convert was in contact with the highly-placed family of the Ḳabā'ilīs.

There are five chapters: Announcements; abrogation; Jewish attacks on prophets and kings; anthropomorphism and forgery in the text of the Torah; the glory of the Prophet in the scriptures. The object is to put into the hands of Muslims who do not yet suspect the vileness of the Jewish faith, a short manual. If the Muslims knew that the Jews were not even monotheists, they would not consent to exacting the poll-tax, and maintaining the status of ahl ad-dimma for the Jews; and would do away with such practices as ritual cursing of the believers and their kings. The scriptures should be expurgated.

The Jews build their laws on Gematria-quistling. The author is quick to employ it for his own purposes. "I am going to cast back at them their own stones, and flog them with their own assertions, taking my arguments from their own books."

Here are a few examples:-

There was a righteous king in Israel called Ahab. He was of the faith of Muhammad; and that is precisely why the Jews hate him. A king of Rūm (Aram!) invaded his country, and demanded the surrender to him of the victory-ensuring banner on which the name of Muhammad was inscribed. A prophet urges Ahab not to surrender, and promises help, if the people will put their faith in Muhammad. This refers to I. Kings XX. 6, and the words: "maḥmad 'ēnekha" - "whatsoever is pleasant in thine eyes", are explained as "Muḥammad 'ināyatuka".

The "great lights" of Genesis I.16 are, in their numerical value, 98, which is the value of the name of the Prophet, plus 6 for Friday, the day of the mosque service. Incidentally, the text is a forgery; originally it said that God created the lights out of the Light of our Master, Muhammad.

Genesis XII.2: "I will make of thee a great nation" (wakhluḳu minka muḥammadan); for, evidently, the Jews being humiliated, the description holds true only for the people of the Apostle. In Genesis XII.9: "toward the south" (hannegba) = 65 = Mecca, i.e., Abraham went to Mecca, and the Muslims are his followers.

Abrogation. Deuteronomy XVIII.15-19 predicts it. The Jews added to the law, e.g., the benediction over the scroll of Haman. Haman lived a thousand years after Moses; so it is clearly a case of post-Mosaic addition. (The author forgot that in the Koran, XL.24, Haman is a contemporary of Moses, and

adviser to Pharaoh.) Or take the rules of 'erub, or kindling the fire of the Sabbath - they are inventions of the rabbis, proving the practice of abrogation of the scriptural word. As Jeremiah said (VII.28): ". . . truth is perished, and is cut off from their mouth."

The Jews have the crudest notions of God: Genesis I.26, man in God's image; Genesis VI.4, God's repentance; Genesis VIII.21, God smelling; Numbers XV.7, wine-offering to God; Genesis XVIII.21, God has to descend to see what is going on in Sodom; Deuteronomy XIV.1 and Exodus IV.22, children of God; Isaiah L.1, your mother's (the wife of God!) divorce; Exodus XXIV.9-10, God was seen; "Cherubims" is translated al-waladāni; Deuteronomy IV.24, God a consuming fire; the stories of Lot, of Judah and Tamar; Moses the offspring of an illicit marriage; Aaron and the golden calf.

Jews curse Muslims, particularly a Jew converted to Islam. They practise usury. They regard the Gentile as a dog, and throw to him the meat prohibited to them.

The tone is vulgar. Pretensions at strict logic abound, as do curses and eulogies. The material is mainly from the Pentateuch.

In the West we find a case of Muslims on the defensive. In Christian Aragon, many Jews were rich, educated and influential; whilst the Moriscos were not. In discussion, the Jews

were freer, of course, than in a Muslim state. Bitterness against them is expressed on this account, in "Strengthening the Faith" (Ta'yīd al-Milla), by Abū Zakariyā Yahyā ar-Rakīlī (Asin Palacios in Mélanges H. Derenbourg, P.1909, pp.343-59) about 1360.

"As I saw the changes wrought by time and the corruption caused, science vanishing in the absence of its carriers, especially in the pōlytheistic country, where we dwell cut off from our brethren, and devoid of knowledge; and when I saw . . . Jews loosen their tongues in lying and abuse against our prophet, Muhammad, denying his religion and prophetic call . . . I asked God . . . to assist me against them . . . I then read the Torah, the Psalms and the books of the prophets, and extracted from them passages and evidences by which to refute the Jews, to show how God had put them to shame and cursed them, and called them unbelievers for tampering with the scriptures, and violating the covenant . . ." (361-2). God chastised them by a permanent dispersion (al-ghālūt ad-dā'im), which means slavery and humiliation, in which they find themselves (365).

The book is a short manual for disputations against Jews. The Arabic is poor, and the author himself asks the reader, in moving phrases, to forgive him for his slips (fī mā laḥantu), as he is not equipped for his task, and it was only dire need, and the sight of the lights of knowledge going out, that drove him to write his manual ('adda li-l-munāẓarāt wa-l-ihhijāj).

"We ask God . . . that He may take us out of the land of polytheism to the Muslim countries" (366).

There are five chapters: On Ishmael, abrogation, scriptural evidences about the Prophet, the miracles of Muhammad, and the transgressions of the Jews.

Chapter I. The benediction (baraka) of Ishmael is better than the covenant ('ahd) of Isaac. Hagar was wife, not concubine to the patriarch. She was not a mean slave, but the daughter of an Egyptian prince. Even a slave can be a prophet. Joseph was a prophet whilst he was Potiphar's slave. Jacob laboured under Laban. Genesis XXXVIII., the descent of David disproves Jewish claim to nobility.

Chapter II. is very shallow. God repented having created man, and brought the deluge. This is a proof of abrogation. (The author does not realise the difficulty - taghayyur - stressed by others.) The sacrifice of Isaac was prevented. God promised to make of Ishmael a great nation, ~~and~~ so there is no reason why revelation should be withheld from it.

Chapter V. The Torah does not mention a future life, Paradise, or resurrection.

The admonition of the Torah has been fulfilled. "Your name has become a byword, and people swear: 'If not, then may God turn me into a Jew!'"

Probably the treatise served as a model for some Aragonese tracts for the use of Moriscos. Later, the more difficult

words were explained, and glosses added in Aragonese, written in Arabic characters.

Here the polemic seems to have come to a standstill. Larger books include chapters about Jews (e.g., Maḳrizī, Ḳalkāshandī, the historians, such as, for example, Ibn Khaldūn). But these are rather outside our scope. In the eighteenth century, there is to be noted the book of Ziyāda b. Yahyā, a very learned Christian convert who had a follower, maybe in the nineteenth century, who wrote a Risāla Sab'īya bi-ibtā l ad-diyāna al-yahūdīya, enumerating seven reasons for embracing Islam. Asked by Jews why he had embraced Islam, the author of the Risāla replied that the humiliation of the Jews compelled him to search in the prophets for explanations of that state, and of the greatness of the Muslim. He saw then that a man like Muhammad must have been foretold. Also, that the ancient foundations of the temple-sacrifice, purity, do not exist any more. Then it dawned on him that the Jews are accursed as predicted in Deuteronomy XXVII.-XXVIII., and fooled by their teachers. So nothing prevented him from embracing Islam. He had only to renounce the yoke of ritual, dietary laws, and utterances against Christ and his mother, to feel himself free. He had "to tear out of his heart the hatred implanted in it against the other nations". The Jewish faith is a dead corpse.

In 1211/1796 the Persian faḳīh Sayyid Muḥammad Mahdī al-

Tabātabā'ī held a disputation with the Jews of Dū-l-Kifl, a Jewish shrine. There is a short account of the disputation, which is unique in that it almost assumes the form of a dialogue, and is absolutely free from abuse.

The fatwā literature may, on closer examination, add something; e.g., a series of decisions was issued in 1252/1836 in Fās, and repeated in 1898. The subject was the building of a Jewish ḥammām. Twelve decisions were given, only one in favour of the Jews. The main theme is that Jews must be humiliated; life must be made so miserable for them as to force them into conversion. Therefore, a public bath being a pleasure, to allow it to be built would be against the policy pursued. The Jews are aliens, without any rights. A bath would be a generous grant, in contravention of the Koran, LVIII., 22. The argument in favour was: "It is beneficial to the state to retain the Jews and their money, as is done in Tunis. But let their ḥammām be inferior to that of the believers" (R M M, 1909, p.112 seq.).

XII. THE CONTROVERSY: AN OUTLINE.*

"It is surprising how little Muslim authors have to say about the Jews" ¹ "The Jews never seem to have provoked the same ill-feeling as the Christians. . . . Still their reputation was not altogether good. They were looked upon as an inferior people, who were occasionally allowed the crumbs that fell from their masters' table."²

"Jew" is a term of abuse.³ "Apes" is the usual epithet applied to Jews (X.37). Al-Jili (XIV. century) writes of them in a different strain; he is even afraid to tell the whole truth about their good qualities and laws, lest he create confusion in the mind of good Muslims.⁴ But he is a mystic and an exception. Elsewhere hatred predominates, even in such popular works as the Antar-romance.⁵

The polemic literature is based on very vague notions. "It is astonishing how little even well-educated Muslims know about other religions."⁶

* The number after X. refers to the page of the present study.

¹ Tritton, 92. ² Ib., 95. ³ J R A S, 1931, p.330.

⁴ Goldziher, Geiger's Zeitschrift, 1875, pp.68-79.

⁵ Goldziher, M G W J, 1880, 257 seq.; B. Heller, R E J, 1927, 113 seq.

⁶ E G. Browne, L H P, II., 529, n.3.

Beside Muslim scholars, such as Ibn Ḥazm and Ḳarāfī, we find converts writing on the subject: Sa'īd b. Ḥasan, al-Islāmī, foremost amongst them Samau'al al-Maghribī. These were but poor instructors, only too apt to be misleading. This lessens the value of polemic writings.

Early Islam was not anxious for conversions. The instructions to the army-chief, sent to Yemen, were "not to seduce a Jew from his Judaism".¹ But in later times, the fatwas repeatedly stress that humiliation opens the way to conversion (X. 114, 127).

Conversions were festive occasions and were celebrated both in the mosque and outside it, especially if the convert happened to be a prominent Jew. In 701/1301, in Cairo, a physician, dayyān-al-Yahūd, decided, with many followers, to embrace Islam. He went to the dār al-'adl, the mufti's office, where he was received with great honour; and at a reception held afterwards at his house the whole of the Koran was read.² He was given robes of honour, and when he walked in the streets he was greeted with tambourines and cheers and cries of "Allah akbar".³ A sermon was preached in Samau'al's honour (X.73).⁴

¹ an lā yuftana; Balādūrī, Futūḥ, 71.

² Goldziher, R.E.J. 43, p.1 seq. and v.60, p. 37 f.

³ Ibn Kaṭīr ap. Fagnan, Melanges Derenbourg, 113 f.

⁴ Cf. Benjamin's Acht Jahre, p. 74 f.

Frequently the convert took the name of the Kadi who accepted him into the faith and is known as Isrā'ilī or Islāmī.¹

In the stories of conversions emphasis is often laid on divine intervention, visions, impressions made by Muslim rites; e.g., by a Muslim funeral.²

The outlines of the discussion were fixed at a very early date, and were entirely theological. Nevertheless, it served practical purposes, when Jews played a prominent part in public life. The crusades and the Mongol menace sharpened the polemic, and altered its character from a literary to a practical one. The fatwas of that time are concerned with practical problems, such as the demolition of synagogues (X. 112). They circulated widely, and served to strengthen the morale of the people. The Muslims, it was said, had to make atonement for their sins by being punished. Ibn Taymiya said of Hūlāgū: he is to the Muslims what Nebuchadnezzar was to the B. Isrā'il.³

Whereas the Scriptures were the central point of the anti-Christian polemic, so that Fritsch (134 f.) has only scanty notes on abrogation, the anti-Jewish polemic centres round it. This was because of the Jewish opposition to revelations other than the Old Testament (P.L. 322 f.); for it

¹ Dozy, s.v. ² Goldziher R E J 30 & 43.

³ Rasā'il, 140; Goldziher, Z D M G 62, p.26.

was " a perpetual covenant throughout their generations". (Exodus XXXI.16). The Muslims tried to invalidate this by pointing to a text where the words "for ever" meant for the duration of a lifetime.¹

To Ibn Ḥazm, abrogation is a part of the problem of *tahrīf*: if the text is a forgery, there is no need to prove that it was abrogated. His comments on abrogation merely serve to show up the contradictions between passages. For example, the Jews do not offer up the Paschal sacrifices, because they are no longer in Palestine, and have no temple. Then they should also abolish the practice of eating only unleavened bread at the Passover.² But to Juwaynī³ the belief in *naskh* leads to belief in *tahrīf*.

Although authors frequently mix up the problems, it is nevertheless clear that in this problem the anti-Jewish polemic exercised a considerable influence on Islamic theology (X.96). Every compendium of theology has to treat of abrogation when dealing with the Koran, and the Jews are mostly referred to as opposing abrogation, for it implies change in God.

The formula of a Christian oath includes the threat that if the oath be found to be false, the Christian shall be punished by being made like the Jews. The oath of a Jew

¹ Goldziher, Die Sabbatinstitution, ch. IV.; Saadia, 128 seq.

² Gomez, par. IX.

³ Schreiner, Z D M G 42, pp.620,660 ff.; now/ed. Luciani of the *in* Irshād, p.175 seq.

threatens that if his oath be false, he will have to accept abrogation and change in God.¹

The Christian origin of the theory of abrogation is stressed by 'Alī at-Ṭabarī (135 f.): Christians had repudiated before Islam the sacrifices and the priests, circumcision, and "an eye for an eye".

A later development of Judaism is *bida*, unlawful innovation.²

Abrogation of the Mosaic Law is a necessary preliminary to accepting Muhammad as a prophet, but some Jews try to trick Muslims by recognising Muhammad without acknowledging such abrogation.

Baghdādī (9 f., 263) stresses the point. For many Jews³ resorted to subterfuge: Muhammad may have been endowed not only with kingship but also with prophecy; but he had been sent to those who had not yet received the scriptures.⁴

The acceptance of this view is even obligatory for tributaries. Mālik laid it down that tributaries may say that

¹ 'Umarī, Ta'rīf, 151 ff.

² Goldziher, Vorlesungen, 378.

³ And Christians: Fritsch, 132 seq.

⁴ Kirḳisānī, 309; Shahrastānī, 165. Rivlin, p.147; Friedlaender, J Q R NS.III., ch.I.-III.; Mittwoch, p.846.

Muhammad was not sent to them; but if they say that he was no prophet or apostle, or if they attack the Koran, they are liable to be put to death (which is also the law in the case of a Muslim).¹

Shaibānī (VII.c.) writes:

They cling to the formal text that Muhammad was sent to the unlettered. So, if any of them declares that Muhammad is the Apostle of God, it does not mean he is a Muslim. He becomes a Muslim only when he renounces his former faith, at the same time that he avows himself a Muslim, saying: "I am a Muslim", or "I embrace Islam". But until then he is not to be regarded as a Muslim. One must interrupt the faith-avowing Jew, and then (*fa-idā-stafsartuhu*) the Jew is sure to explain: Muhammad is the apostle for you, not for us.²

The notion that God sends different prophets according to the needs of different countries, etc., was widely held. This idea is elaborated in the Epistles of the Pure Brethren, IV. 22 seq. The prophet is the physician: different maladies call for different treatment. Yet the effort of all is directed towards healing. All the prophets and all the creeds teach the same lessons. People who deny abrogation show that they fail to distinguish between religion (*dīn*) and *sharī'a*, a system of canon law.³ There is a retort to this in Ibn Daud (p.74): even if a non-Jew has visions, it is only to glorify the Jewish people, as we find in the cases of Balaam and Cyrus.

The Epistles, IV.22, dwell on the Jewish-Christian

¹ Amar, I.327 f.

² R E J 28, p.91.

³ Cf. *Khayyāt* 25; Epistles, IV.178; *Ījī*, p.188.

objection to Muhammad's claim to prophecy: He was too much the earthly ruler. But the author rejects this view, for it is incorrect, as may be seen from the beginnings of Islam. True, in Medina kingdom was added to prophecy, but as a later element, and not because of the prophet's lust for power and worldly goods; but rather because, as Ardashir has already said, religion and empire are twins,¹ as we also learn from the examples of Joseph, David and Solomon.²

If Muhammad was a prophet, there must be references to him in the scriptures. These a'lām must be searched for, also in accordance with Koranic claims. Stories about the disputations of the Apostle were invented.³ Collections of a'lām have been preserved from the IX. century (X.12-14,34).⁴

Epistles, IV.172: Moses finds in the Taurāt the description of a people who are almost prophets in their subtle discernment, and wishes to belong to them, upon which he is assured by God that he, Moses, is a Muslim.⁵

¹ Goldziher, Z D M G 62, p.2, note.

² The dismissal of Muhammad as a temporal ruler is usual amongst Jewish authors. Cf. al-Fāsī's Lexicon, ed. Skoss, I.193; Maimonides' Epistle to Yaman; Shahrastānī, 165.

³ Hirschfeld J Q R 10, 100 seq.

⁴ Cf. Fritsch 76 seq.; W.St.Clair, Tisdall, Manual, 193 seq.

⁵ On later use of such testimonies, cf. Browne, L H P IV., 204, 214 n.; Goldziher, R E J 49; Schmidt Zapiski, 1916.

Playing about with "announcements" apparently gave rise to the proverb¹: "Be a real Jew; or else do not play about with the Torah".

These essays in exegesis demanded that the appropriate Muslim data be fitted into the biblical framework, and vice versa.² Ismail is brought in to connect Abraham with Muhammad, and frequently plays a role in the rivalries between Arab factions.³ "Thine only son", of Genesis XXII., is translated "thine elder son".⁴ After much doubt Ishmael was accepted by all Muslims as "the sacrifice". Then Abū-l-Fidā' became the usual kunya for those who bore that name.⁵

"Testimonies" raise the question whether or not use should be made of the scriptures. These do not come up to Muslim expectations, since they were falsified-tahrīf (Koran, II.39,73; III.64; IV.48; V.45; XLI.6). In this case, then, the Muslim should cease looking for testimonies in them. Ibn Ḥazm very nearly accepts this view. Yet even he could not resist the temptation to quote a few testimonies.

The theoretical approach was elaborated at a very early date (X.31 f.). Tabarsī (XII. century) puts the matter in a nutshell: "I acknowledge the prophetic call of Jesus and his

¹ Quoted by Goldziher, *Z A T W*, 1893, from Maidānī II., 101.

² Noeldeke, *Amalek*. ³ Goldziher, *M.St.* I., 99, 178 f.

⁴ Goldziher, *Richtungen*, 79 ff.

⁵ Cf. Ṭabarī, *Ann.*, 289-309; *St. P.L.* 270 f.

book . . . and I repudiate the prophecy of any Jesus who did not recognise the prophecy of Muhammad and his book, or did not announce to his own people the advent of Muhammad" (p.212).

The accusation of forgery of or in the holy books is an old one. Jews bring it against Sadducees; Christians against Jews; the Koran against the people of the book; and it was "soon enough visited upon orthodox Islam, against which the identical accusation was brought forward by Shiism".¹

The idea that only small portions of the scriptures are of divine origin is very old. The ten commandments were not included in the Jewish prayers lest the schismatics should say that they alone are of divine origin.² Ibn Ḥazm propounds a similar view - that only a chapter in Deuteronomy is of divine origin.

If the scriptures are forgeries, then the Apostle of God could not refer to them. The entire "biblical" structure of Islam (Ibrāhīm, Ismā'īl, etc.) is then undermined, and the testimonies are of no avail. Hence believing in the scriptures is of no use; nor is not believing more helpful. This is the problem for the Muslims, and it might have remained vague had it not been for the taunts levelled at them both by Jews and Christians.³ The Muslims, then, had to find some way out of

¹ Friedlaender, J Q R, N S III.13. Cf. St.P.L. 320; Khayyāt, 6,41,107; Schreiner, Z D M G 52, 466.

² A. Buchler, in *Judaica*, Festschrift H. Cohen, p.295; Bergmann, 65,109.

³ *Jāhiz*, 19-28; *Ḳirḳisānī* and 'Alī b. Sulaymān, Z A, 26.

the dilemma. Goldziher¹ classifies their efforts into three groups:- 1) The scriptures are from God, but only the Muslim interpretation is correct; 2) The scriptures are forgeries; 3) The major portion is authoritative, but many passages are distorted or forged.

The first view was held by many, and Ibn Ḥazm felt bound to contest it (X.58). Ibn Khaldūn thinks that if there was any distortion, it was not the deliberate action of the rabbis (ghayr mu'tamad). In general, the scriptures seem to him to be reliable.² The second view is represented by Ibn Ḥazm. The third view, whilst a hopeless conglomeration, is nevertheless the most common. Indeed, the weakness of the case seems to have been realised, and as a result the use of the scriptures was avoided. al-Bikā'ī (d. 1480) was accused of concealing the Koran by referring to the scriptures too often. He had to justify himself, and he proves that the leading authorities of Islam made use of the scriptures.³ It is not in the text but in the interpretation by the people of the book that the changes occur.⁴

There is a fatwa by Ibn Taymiya⁵ as to whether a Muslim is

¹ Z D M G, 32,365-370.

² K. al-'Ibar, II.,6,83.

³ St.L.P.,389 seq.

⁴ Cf. Shahrastānī 165.

⁵ Decisions, I.306, ed.1326.

permitted to curse the Bible. He says that a Muslim who cursed the Torah should be given the chance to repent; and if he did not repent, he should be put to death. But if it be proved that the accused cursed the faith of the Jews of his day, that is no sin (fa-lā ba'sa), for they and their religion are accursed. The same holds good if the Muslim cursed the Torah they possess, and it is clear that he implied that the Torah was distorted, as if he said: "This falsified Torah was abrogated". Conclusion: "God knows best". The vagueness of the severe Ḥanbalite is an illustration of the general confusion on the subject.

If forgery, either of the whole or merely of parts, be admitted, then the question arises, how, when, and by whom it was carried out.

The suggestion was put forward that, since the Jews had not been numerous, it was easy enough to mislead them,¹ and that, owing to the vicissitudes of their history, the original text was lost. Even Ibn Rawandī might be considered the forger. Usually, Ezra is branded as the man who reconstructed the text with forgeries, or gave it out that his inventions were the ancient text. Ibn Kammūna and al-Biḡā'ī argue against these views. The main point is the validity of tradition.

¹ Rāzī - ap. Schreiner, Z D M G, 42,641.

Sometimes the question is complicated by a discussion on the value of indirect evidence in general.¹ But the search for incongruities in the text was far more diligent than the search for solutions to the questions involved.

Muslim authors had vague ideas about the scriptures, and this, doubtless, explains the very low level of the discussion. The mistakes and falsifications of the quasi-translators only added to the confusion.² Maḳrīzī mixes up Deuteronomy, the Mishna, and perhaps the Mishne Torah of Maimonides.³

More abysmal was the ignorance of Jewish post-biblical lore. It is but rarely mentioned, and there is a Karaite strain in the arguments concerning it.

Muslims held that misconceptions which the Jews entertain about their scriptures are largely the result of their anthropomorphic beliefs. This view is corroborated by Koranic passages: V., 69, IX.30. The accusation is common, and has caused discussion among the Jews themselves.⁴

To bear out this contention, material was brought forward both from the Bible and the Haggada. Here again the Karaite strain can be discerned, though in all probability even older

¹ Cf. Fritsch, 59; Kraus, R S O, 19, p.101,104,120,125; Ibn Ḥazm I., 192 f, 197 ff.

² Goldziher, Z D M G, 32,348 seq.; Schreiner in the Kohut volume 498.

³ Khiṭ. II., 475.

⁴ Rawidowicz, Tarbiz. VI., No. 3, 46 ff., 74 f; Z. Zobel, E. J., s. v. Anthropomorphism.

material influenced the discussion (X.21-24). Yet sometimes the attitude is more fair. Jāḥiẓ (34 f.) at least distinguishes between different Jewish views on 'Uzair. Shahrastānī (169 f.) is aware of the tendency to avoid difficulties by introducing an intermediary between God and this world.¹

Anthropomorphism is discussed by all the authors.²

Zamakhsharī (II.406): it has been said that if there is any anthropomorphism in Islam, it was inculcated by the Jews.

One aspect of anthropomorphism is the objectionable stories of God's messengers and prophets. The stories of Lot and the golden calf are often quoted. Another point is that the Bible has nothing to say about the hereafter.

The triumph of Islam is a proof that it is true.³ The Jews have been abandoned and exposed to humiliation; and they are sinister in character. They are being punished by God. The Koran corroborates this: II.58,61; III.27; V.52,56,62. Let them remain in subjection, and pay the poll-tax (IX.29). This

¹ On Tafwīd cf. Friedlaender, J Q R, NS.III., ch.5; Ash'arī, Makālāt, 565; Khayyāt, 42,56; Poznansky, R E J, 50, 10 seq.

² Cf. Clair-Tisdall, Manual, 106-7; Sa'adia 86,59,14 f.

³ 'Alī Ṭabarī 46,50 ff., 104 f.,141.

attitude is strictly maintained in any legal decision.¹ It was emphasized in cases where the Jews occupied prominent positions, as in the Spain of Ibn Ḥazm, in the heathen Mongol Empire, and even under Christian domination (Raḳilī).

The virtue of generosity was shared out in the proportion of nine parts to the Arabs, and the remaining one to the rest of the world. The Jews received nine parts of humiliation (dilla), and the rest was shared out amongst all mankind. This notion seems to have been borrowed from a Jewish source (Ḳid-dushin, 49b) which allotted nine measures of lechery to the Arabs.²

The critic explains the fine poetry of a converted Jew as a "combination of two humiliations - that of love, and that of Judaism" (ijtima'a fīhi dullāni, dullu-l-'ishḳi wa-dullu-l-yahūdīyati).³

A convert of the XVIII-XIX century states that dull was the starting-point of his doubts (X.126).

The sale to Muslims of meat unclean to the Jews can easily be represented as a case of humiliation of the Muslim (St.L.P. 152 f., 332 f.; X.123). This also gave rise to

¹ Cf. Amar, by Ghazālī, Ihyā' II., 148.

² ~~Ḳid-dushin, 49b~~ Bacher, M G W J, 1873, 270 seq.; Ṭabari, I. 2514, lines 8 ff.

³ Maḳḳarī, II., 301.

squabbling amongst legists. When one of them compelled a Jew to pay a fine for selling unclean meat to Muslims, another held that the Jew was entitled to do so, and that the stricter kadi was liable to prosecution.¹

The Jews mostly resented the dull. They tried to reassure themselves by pretending that they had not yet lost every vestige of power (X.37 f., 44,124). Sa'adia (145): it would be too easy to adhere to a powerful faith. Ha-Levy (cap.143): Christians and Muslims are proud of their martyrs and sufferings. Maimonides (Epistle, MS.f. 124a, tr.ed.Holub,49): "And you, my brethren, know that on account of our many sins, God threw us among this nation of hostile Ishmael . . . Never has a nation arisen more injurious to us than this people; no nation has ever been so intent on humiliating and degrading us, and on hating us. That is why King David, when shown in a vision all the tribulations which were to overwhelm Israel, did not cry out, or ask for help for our people, until he saw what we were to suffer in the Kingdom of Ishmael; and then he exclaimed (Psalm CXX.5) 'Woe is me that I sojourn in Mesech, that I dwell in the tents of Kedar!' . . . Daniel also described our humiliation solely under Ishmael - may God crush him soon! (Daniel VIII.). We have to bear the humiliations they impose upon us and their lies which are beyond human

¹ X. ~~cent.~~, Amar, II.34 ff.; ib. I.163-8; Ibn Ḥājj, IV.184.

endurance. As the prophet says (Psalm XXXVIII. 13-14): 'But I, as a deaf man, heard not; and I was as a dumb man that openeth not his mouth . . . and in whose mouth are no reproofs!'

It was felt to be particularly humiliating that the "lady" should be oppressed by (the son of) the "maid", Hagar, as many Hebrew poems describe it. This reaction certainly contributed to the dissemination of the ancient tales of the collaboration of the Jewish elders in the composition of the Koran.¹

When Ibn Ḥazm and Samau'al sneer and jeer at the misfortunes of the Jews and their backwardness in scientific pursuits, they seem almost to be repeating some ancient Jew-baiter:

"A clear proof, according to him, that our laws are unjust and our religious ceremonies erroneous is that we are not masters of an empire, but rather the slaves, first of one nation, then of another, and that calamity has more than once befallen our city . . . (We) have not produced any geniuses, for example, in arts and crafts, or eminent sages" (Josephus, c.Ap., II.14,20; tr. Thackeray).

Chapter I.

Page 1.- I cannot see why Goldziher thought this literature extensive (J.E., VI., 657 f.). His bibliography is mainly one of the anti-Christian tracts.

Chapter II.

- 5.- This chapter offers a short recapitulation of what formed the background of the Muslim controversialist. It is not intended to serve an inquiry on the treatment of the Jews in the Koran and in the Tradition. It is based on such works (cf. bibliography) as those of Scheyer, Barth, Vajda (J A).
- 6.- Maghḍūb 'alayhim, cf. Ṭabarī, Tafsīr, I.61 f.
 - Neither believe nor disbelieve, etc.; cf. Musnad Ibn Ḥanbal, IV., 239; Bukhārī, Tauḥīd 51 (Juynboll, IV., 295) and Tafsīr 11 (III., 198).
- 7.- The Jewish queries; Hirschfeld J Q R, X.
 - Khālifūhum; disreputable practices ascribed to the Jews. Vajda, R S O, 17, p.209, n.1 mentions many examples added in Goldziher's copy of M.St. to those ~~given~~ given in the book I.1, 57, 203-5 and II.137.
- 8.- Ḳuṣṣāṣ; M.St. II.137, 149, 165 ff.; Goitein's studies on Isrā'īlīyāt (Tarbiz).
 - B M.Or.9737, fol.132b-138a contains a story in which Ka'b is converted to Islam by a talk with a rāhib who knew all about the prophet's forthcoming advent.

Chapter III.

- 9.- Cf. Amalek by Noeldeke; Goldziher. *M.St.* 178, 182, 186 f., 269.
- 10.- Tabṣirat al-ʿAwāmm, the Persian compendium, p.26. Maybe (revā bāshed) it was another Haman. Or it is one and the same person; but Pharaoh himself sailed from Persia. As to the thousand years, that is an invention. But even so why should the world have had only a single Haman - him of the days of Ardashir? They argue the Torah would have mentioned him. If all the laws and stories had been included in the Torah, there would have been no need for any further book, such as the Gospel, and the giving thereof would have been unnecessary.- From Ibn Ezra we learn that some Jews attempted to imitate the Muslim quibble about Haman, saying that Aaron the calf-maker and Aaron the priest were not one and the same person.
- 11.- For the Christian-Jewish controversy of. S. Krauss, L. W. Williams, J. Bergmann.

There is no study of the Arabic Christian polemic against the Jews. St.L.P. enumerates: NN.26 (IX.c); 91,106,119,129 (X.c.); 67 (XII.c.); 133c (XIII.c.); 37,146 (XIV.c.). Jewish retorts: ib.N. 58b; Gottheil in *Mélanges Derenbourg* (Geniza); Krauss in *R E J*, 63.

T. Andrae in *Der Ursprung d. Islams.u.d.Crhist.* p.198 f. says: "auch die Polemik Muhammads gegen die Juden im grossen

Umfange auf Argumente zurueckgreift, die vorher in der kirchlichen Judenbekämpfung verwendet worden waren." The view that the biblical "chains", i.e., the difficult, restrictive laws of the Pentateuch (e.g. the dietetic laws) were a kind of punishment to the Jews for their disobedience, was "auch bei den syrischen Theologen allgemein verbreitet". Their prototypes were works like the Epistle of Barnabas and Justin's Dialogue with Trypho. In the latter we find:

Ch. 18 - festivals, Sabbath, circumcision were enjoined on account of transgression and the hardness of the hearts of the Jews;

Ch. 19 - the law was given by Moses on account of the hardness of their hearts; for if it were necessary . . . God would not have made Adam uncircumcised;

Chs. 21-22 - Sabbath - for the people's sins; also sacrifices;

Chs 34, 64 - passages on Arabia in a universalist strain (barren becoming fertile = Gentiles turning Christians);

Chs. 71-73 - Jews falsify the scriptures;

Ch. 75 - "announcements" (cf. Williams, 3-8, 12, 35);

Ch. 82 - the gift of prophecy transferred from Israel to the Church.

Abū-l-Fidā' (d. 1331) trusts the Greek text (4 f., cf. 34) for in the Hebrew the Jews undertook some changes to do away with passages about Christ.

However we may view the case in regard to the Prophet and

to the Koran, it seems to me that the present study points in the same direction, i.e., to the Christian sources of later Muslim polemics. "Biblical testimonies" and collections of such are probably of Christian origin. It appears that Islam, broadly speaking, neither produced new polemical weapons of its own, nor did it use in its polemics the specific armoury of Jewish converts; it took over mainly Christian material for its needs. If the Muslims had had more information from Jewish sources, they would undoubtedly have dwelt more frequently on post-biblical lore. But even Ibn Ḥazm is very weak on that point.

Christian polemic was deeply rooted in old Hellenistic attacks on Jews and their tenets.

Naturally, the "testimonies" could not play their role in full in the Muslim-Jewish controversy for the Muslims lacked a premise - the knowledge and recognition of the texts, and thus the polemic necessarily tended to centre around another issue (that of abrogation).

12.- Ibn Ḳutayba is quoted in a book by Ibn-al-Jauzī, from which excerpts were given by Brockelmann in Beitr.z.Assyr. III., (1898), esp. pp.46 seq. Cf. the articles of Brockelmann, Goldziher, Bacher, and Poznanski in Z A T W, 13,15,16.

14.- 'Alī Ṭabarī, ed. & tr. A.Mingana; Fritsch, 6-12; F. Taeschner Margoliouth. As to authenticity - below, p.110. Schreiner, Z D M G, 42, p.645-6, note, contained the clue which was overlooked.

15.- Rawandī : Ritter, Kraus, Nyberg's introd. to Khayyāṭ.

17.- T. Andrae, Die Person Muhammads, p.103, says that the intensity of these doubts and moods must not be overlooked, notwithstanding that the works of those who entertained them have been lost.

Cf. the verses of aṭ-Ṭughūrī ap. Kraus p.112:-

"I wonder at Chosroes and his people, washing the face in
in the urine of cows;

I wonder at the Byzantine Emperor who adores what human
hands have wrought.

How strange are the Jews with their God who rejoices in
spilling blood and smelling incense;

And those people who flock from distant regions to shave
their heads and kiss the stone."

18.- Salmon on Rawandi: Poznansky in M G W J, 51 (1907), p.

731 f. Kindred passages in Goldziher in Z D M G, 62. Poznansky (Ha-Goren VII., 128) could not find anything about Ibn Suwayd. He overlooked Shahrastānī, 49 top: Muh. b. Suwayd was a Mu'tazili of the Muzdārīya school which was known for its firm rejection of i'jāz al-ḡur'an (cf. Ijī, 339).

Later even the forgery of the Bible, the act of taḥrīf, was ascribed to Rawandī: Goldziher-Sabbatinst.; cf. Ijī-Jur-jānī, p.217.

19.- Hiwi: Poznansky, I. Davidson, E. Stein, Darmesteter, Vajda (R E J, 99). Cf. Goldziher, Vorl., p.13 f.; Marmorstein in

H U C A v.VI.

20.- On the Baghdad circle - Goldziher, R E J, 47, p.43 f., and Z D M G 62. On the trend of this age - Mann in H U C A, 12-13; Friedlaender J Q R, NS, I.-III.; Obermann, Z.f.Semit, V., 54 f., 65.

The Geniza tract: J.Mann in H U C A, 12-13.

21.- On Sects: Friedlaender in J Q R.

- Kırķisānī is based in the review of sects on al-Muḳammiṣ.
- The idea of a demiurge to whom God transferred (f w ḍ II.) this world was cherished by some Shi'ites. For some found him in Muhammad, others in 'Alī (Ījī, 348).

22.- The Christ legend.- The Karaites seem to apply here the same method as Muhammad in the Koranic stories: they put their own history (- of Anan) into the story of Jesus. Cf. Krauss, Leben Jesu, 201.

- Ibn Sāḳawayh. - Asaf in Tarbiz, IV.

23.- Agobard: E J.s.v.; L. Williams, 348 ff.

24.- Salmon: ed. Davidson, N.Y. 1935, esp. 108 seq.

26.- Mas'ūdī, Murūj, II. 388 seq.; cf. Tabṣirat al-'awāmm, 23 bot. His discussions: Tanbīh, 112 f/159 f. The unclear word is badā', as Goldziher pointed out in E.J.s.v. badā'. Mas'ūdī probably wrote on the subject in one of his lost works; cf. Tanbīh, preface, p.VI. On page 212 f/285 he dwells on the contradictions between the versions (Hebrew, LXX., and Samaritan) of the scriptures. Cf. Murūj, I.89,100,118 f.

yadhabu ilā fasādi-n-nazari wa-l-ḵauli bi-takāfu'i-l-madhabi - en mettant toutes les religions sur la même ligne. The words fasād an-naẓar admit of several interpretations.

Chapter IV.

- 28.- Sa'adia, 4 ff., 122 ff., 140.
- 29.- Ib. 89-91. Tajsīm 89-107; contradictions 136 ff.; improper passages 140; computations 141.
- 30.- Ib. p.132, - miracles do not prove. "If the da'wā is from the start inadmissible we shall not ask for any proof, knowing there is no proof for the impossible." A man who claims a thousand dirhams will be asked to substantiate his claim. But if he claims the Tigris, his claim is dismissed without hearing.

On miracles cf. T. Andrae - Die Person, etc.

Paran - Mecca: cf. p.12 supra.

- 31.- L. Nemoy recently published v. I. of a full edition of *Ḵirḵisānī* (Yale). The translation given here is from his tr. in H U C A with some alterations.
- 34.- *Bīrūnī*: cf. Schreiner. The computation (1335) is given also in 'Alī Ṭabarī.
- 35.- Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a mentions the lost tract of a Jewish convert, the physician Ibn Ḵusīn (about 970). Māwardi (d.1058) wrote a volume of "announcements".

I could not obtain the Cairo edition. From the extracts

given by Schreiner in the Kohut volume, one sees that the similarity between Māwardī and Ibn Ḳutaiba, and still more between māwardī and 'Alī Ṭabarī is striking.

Chapter V.

The Nagdels: Dozy III.; Graetz; Ibn-Ṣā'id; Peres; Ibn-al-Khaṭīb, A'māl, 264 ff.; Iḥāṭa, I.272. ("One could not breathe without his (Joseph's) knowing of it".)

Ibn Ṣā'id, Ṭabaḳāt al Umam, p.90, end, on Samuel: "In knowledge of the sharī'a of the Jews and how to defend it, and repel attacks on it - nobody could equal him among those who had lived in Andalus before him."

37.- Maḳḳarī, II., 259. Cf. Peres, 240.

Elbīrī: Dozy, Rech.I., Peres, 270 ff., Ibn al-Khaṭīb, A'māl. (E. Levi-Provençal. Les memoires du roi Ziride 'Abd allāh, Andalus, 1935, p.33 seq.: tabarmaka-l-yahūdī.)

38.- wa-ṣārat ḥawā 'ijunā 'indahū wa-naḥnu 'alā bābihi ḳā'imūna,

Il nous a pris nos meubles. Rather: our affairs are referred to him, depend on him, and so we have to wait at his gates?

39.- The tract was published by Gomez. St.L.P. and Goldziher, Z D M G, 32 discussed the question of Ibn-Ḥazm's works against Jews. Apparently, there were three works: the tract; the book later incorporated in al-Fiṣal; and al-Fiṣal itself. Cf. Friedlaender in Or. Skizzen (Festschrift Noeldeke): E.I.s.v. Ibn-Ḥazm. Goldziher, Z D M G, 65, 349 seq. gives a review of the Milal literature.

Professor Tritton drew my attention to the divergence of the BM.ms. of al-Fiṣal from the printed text. It is indeed great. The ms. seems to give a much shorter text, and to start with the attack on the Jews.

44.- Ibn Ḥazm insisted on the impurity of the infidels; Goldziher, *Zāhiriten*, 61 ff.

- Another dispute took place in A. H. 420 (p.106).

46.- Circumcision: *Yebamot* 71a. Cf. Williams, 46 (Tertullian).

49.- Yosippon: *Fiṣal* 99 f. Asin Palacios, tr. p.212 f. (n.87) thinks Ibn-Ḥazm read the Antiquities of Josephus. That is incredible. What Ibn Ḥazm says fits in perfectly with a Jewish Yosippon text, e.g., ed. Gunzburg-Kahana p.183., col. 361. Cf. Krauss, *Leben Jesu*, 238 f., 300, n.6. An Arabic translation was made in the X.-XIth c. (E.J.s.v.). Non-Jewish versions contain passages on Christ, e.g., *Ta'rīkh Yūsīfūs al-Yahūdī*, p.211 f. (Beirut, 1872).

52.- On i'jāz cf. T.Andrae, *Die Person*, ch. on miracles; Abdul Aloem in *Isl. Cult.* VII. (does not know Schreiner's important appendix in *Z D M G*, 42, 663-673); *Ḳirḳisānī Z A*, 26, 106-110, *St.L.P.* 314 ff.; *Vajda R S O*, 17, p.223 (Tabarsī); Ibn al-Jauzī, 29 seq.; *Ījī-Jurjānī*, 175,188,198,200; Ibn-Taymiya, *Al-jawāb aṣ-ṣaḥīḥ* (C.1322), 172 (All the wisdom of the Torah in the Koran, but not vice versa). (*Taha Ḥusayn*, *Fī-ṣ-ṣayf*, p.13.)

53.- We accept a Moses who predicted Muhammad. If your Moses did not do so he is not the same man. . . . We do not believe

in Moses and Jesus and in Tora or Gospel if they do not contain the announcement about the apostolate of Muhammad and the description of his companions (p.104).

55.- St. Paul the seducer: cf. Krauss, *Leben Jesu*, 47 (61), 85, 121, 157; Fritsch; Levi della Vida. On Ibn Sabā': Friedlaender's article.

59.- J. Perles - R. Sal. b. Aderet; Schreiner, *Z D M G*, 48, p. 39 seq.; Zucker.

On the fate of Ibn Ḥazm's writings: Friedlaender, *Zur Komposition*, p. 268; Goldziher, *Z D M G*, 66, p. 166.

The biblical text Ibn Ḥazm uses is not one of the known translations. It is in many ways akin to the Vulgate. An old Palestinian Targum is taken to have been its prototype. I could not obtain Algermissen's book on the subject (Munster, 1933).

Chapter VI.

60.- Ibn Zafar: *G A L*, I. 351 and sup., I. 595, E. I. II., 429.

62.- "Golden mean". Indicated in the Koran already (II., 137):
ja'alnākum ummātan wasaṭan.

63.- Likening the Creator to the creature, - also Ibn al-Jauzī, *Talbīs* p. 75.

Chapter VII.

65.- Schreiner. *M G W J*, 42-43. I have used the MS. Cairo (VI.

113). Cf. E.J.s.v. Ibn Abbas.

On the MSS. and titles cf. G A L, I., 488 & Sup., I.892. The Cairo MS. has on its title-page the words: Hāda ifḥāmu ṭā'ifati-l-yahūdi, kātalahumu-llāhu, min āmālī . . . ma'a kiṣṣati ru'yatihi . . . The Hebrew account mentions the visions as being in the beginning of the book.

The copyist made a slip on fol. 25a where the date A.H. 555 is given. The copy was made in A.H. 732.

65.- The Hebrew account by the chronicler Sambari (XVII.c.) was published by Neubauer in R E J. V. (w^e 'asah sefer al-ifḥām shaḥor kappeḥam; he produced the book al-ifḥām which was black as coal.)

The "māh" after the name of Muhammad is not "probablement l'abbreviation d'une formule de devotion" but stands for the Hebrew m^eshugga' ish ha-ruah (The prophet is a fool) the spiritual man is mad, Hosea IX.7. I find now this indicated by Berliner in his ed. (1896), p.X.

- On the "Letter of R. Samuel" falsely ascribed to our author: Williams, 228 seq.

68.- The introduction to Kalīla wa Dimna as a rationalist work: Kraus, R S O, 14; Noeldeke, Burzoe, pp.3,15,17.

69.- On taqlīd, the following in the footsteps of the fathers: Ibn al-Jauzī, Talbīs, p.86; Burzoe, p.17.

71.- The prophet Samuel considered by the Jews equal to Moses: J.E. XI.7; Ginzberg, Legends of the Jews, III.228 f.

- 78.- Cf. Krauss, *Leben Jesu*, 40 f., 42 f., 53 f., 199.
- 86.- Jerome on Isa. 29 f. (ap. J.Parkes, p.21): . . . "Interpreters who delude the people with the most terrible traditions, labour night and day to deceive the simple, and cause men to sin about the word of God, so that they deny Christ to be the son of God."
- 89.- The Muhammad legend of the Jews: cf. Mann. (H U C A), Schwabe, St.L.P.; also the short Muslim history in Cat. Sassoon.
- On the abusive names of the Prophet: St.L.P. G. Margoliouth; pasūl to rhyme with rasūl.

Chapter VIII.

- 95.- The tracts of Ḳarāfī and Ibn Ḳayyim were printed on the margin of: Bachazada, -al fark bain al-makhlūk wa-l-khālik. I could not obtain this edition. That of Ibn Ḳayyim was also published separately.

On Ḳarāfī: G A L, I.385, Suppl., I.655.

- 97.- Rāzī on anthropomorphism: l'tikādāt furūk al-muslimin wa-l-mushrikīn, C., 1938, p.82.
- 98.- In the Hebrew ed. Holub, p.28.

Chapter IX.

- 106.- Comments on Samau'al: this is what I found when I examined the Oxford MS.

Chapter X.

109.- Goldziher, R E J, 30; Weston; Schwab; Fritsch.

It seems to me that Ibn Katīr refers to Sa'īd when describing how a convert vexed the Jews by the threat to engage them in disputations (Fagnan, Mel.Derenbourg, p.110).

110.- Cf. note to p. 95.

112. I discuss anti-dimmī propaganda under the Mamluks in an article I hope to publish shortly.

115.- Schreiner, R E J, 32, Z D M G, 45. Cf. a similar case of the Constantinople churches under the Turks: F.Giese, Islam 19, 273 seq.

115 end.- Schreiner quotes the verses of the Jewish poet Z D M G 45, p.299, n.1. from Sha'rāwī's Yawākīt I. 195.

In Taflīs Iblīs by 'Abd al-Salām b. Ahmad al-Makḍisī (d. A.H. 978), Cairo 1323, the verses appear with a lengthy retort, also in rhyme, by Ibn-Taymiya. This is the same poem as the one mentioned in G A L, suppl.II. p.125, NN.148-151. G A L erroneously gives the references as to different poems.

116.- Jaubarī: ed. Damascus (1885 ?). Cf. Meyerhof, Med.Jew. physicians, Isis, 1938, esp. 449,459.

119.- The decree: Abū-l-Mahāsin, Nujūm, ed. Popper, VII.160. Ibn-Ukhūwa, 165 seq.: too many legists, few doctors; some towns have infidel physicians only. Cf. Ibn 'Abdūn (VI.c.), 238 f., 248.

Chapter XI.

120.- I give an account of Islāmī's tract in an article in the forthcoming issue of the J Q R.

Material: lithography, two B M.MSS, MSS of Rabat and of the India Office Library, G A L mentions (suppl.,II.989) only a MS. in Fas. The lithography is entitled as-sayf al-mamdūd fī ar-radd 'alā aḥbār al-yahūd; var. al-majrūd.

124.- G A L, suppl.,II. 356. Add:MS.Rome (Levi della Vida Elenco, 262), and Palacios's article.

126.- On Ziyāda and his Jewish follower, cf. Schmidt in Z K V, v. V. The Library of the S O S. has a copy (Arab 26) of the second epistle of Ziyāda (queries and replies) with an interesting postscript by the copyist on the importance of supplying good Muslim books to Christians for guidance.

The Jewish convert's epistle is now mentioned also in the Princeton Cat.,1938, p.463,N.1541, where the name of the author is given as Ḥabīb. This is apparently an error, maybe originating from the words "alā yā ḥabīb".

A Muḥammad Ḥabīb, apparently a Jewish convert, published (1320 H., Cairo) a pamphlet Shahādat Isrā'īl li-Isma'īl with the title also in Hebrew. Hebrew texts are commented on. Christ is the prototype of Muhammad.

127.- I hope to publish the material I have collected on Ṭabā-ṭabā'ī's disputation.

Chapter XII.

129.- Kraus, Islam 19, gives some notes on the biblical knowledge of the Ismā'īlī doctor Kirmānī. The translations differ from the usual ones. Dan. XII.7 refers to al-Ḥākim. Goldziher (Geiger's Zeitschrift, XI., 1875) gave an account of a druze chapter on the Jews. But the material is disconnected, not does it give the impression of having any real relation to discussion with Jews. It is written for the edification of believers.

A Jewish convert composed a tract in defence of imamite Islam (Browne, Camb. Hand-List, p.236).

131.- Ījī, 348: some Shi'ites recognize badā' (badā'īya).

- Ṭabāṭī, Tafsīr I., 378 on the Arabic usage of 'naskh': copying a book, cancelling a rule, changing the wording. Cf. Suyūṭī, Itkān, II.21; Ījī-Jurjānī, 216 seq.

137.- Ibn Khaldūn. But in the Muḳaddima he dwells on the unreliability of the figures of the Bible.

- Jews had to carry an emblem of a calf's head, under al-Ḥākim's decrees.

141.- The virtues. Cf. Goldziher, Vorl. p.40.

- 100 parts of mercy (Bukhārī IV.115). I could not find this ḥadīth registered either in Wensinck's tables or in Rescher's art. in Z f S, I.).

142.- Shāmī, 48b ff. In the big towns the infidels should be prohibited from building places of worship. But what if a

village develops into a town? Then, if that village had been taken peacefully let the infidels retain their places of worship; but if the village had been conquered by force, then the infidels must forfeit those buildings.

142.- Ibn Daud's book was apparently entitled al-'Aḳīda ar-Rafī'a (as opposed to the "humiliated faith"; Bacher). Yeh. Halevi writes to defend the dīn dalīl.

143.- It appears that no mention is made in the polemical literature of the argument from the limited period set for the Jews to wait for the Messiah, after which, if he does not come, they are to embrace Islam. This was brought forward by the Murābiṭūn against the Jews of Lucena, 1105: 500 years set for the persuasion of the Jews had elapsed (Dubnow. IV. 348, 462). But the same argument had been put forward by al-Ḥākim, ib. III. 219 f. 'Abbās I. (1568-1629) is said to have set a period of 75 years; under 'Abbās II. (1642-1666) there began persecution of the Jews, who were then filled with Messianic expectations. Compulsory mass conversions followed (Ib. VII. 504 ff.).

There is an account of "the fatal and final extirpation and destruction of the Jews out of the Empire of Persia, begun in 1663, and continuing till 1666, with the occasion thereof", in Burton's *Judaeorum Memorabilia*, Bristol, 1796, pp. 197-202 (from Basnage ?).