

ELEVENTH-CENTURY ANDALUSIAN AUTHORS ON THE JEWS OF GRANADA

By M. PERLMANN

It is the purpose of the present study to survey the literary expressions of attitudes towards Jews and Judaism that came down from XI century Islamic Spain.

For the first time the Muslim West stepped into the domain of polemics which by then was well developed in the East. Moreover the polemics here are not merely theological, literary, bookish, but are related to public affairs, political conditions, social attitudes and resentments, and are centered on the personages of the two Nagids, Samuel and Joseph.¹ Pertinent material has been preserved in both prose and verse.

The extraordinary careers of Samuel Nagdela and his son Joseph, who for decades virtually conducted the affairs of the Kingdom of Granada and employed many Jews in government posts, enabled their adversaries to fan the hatred against Jews in general.² The high standard of life of the bulk of the urban Jews, and their conspicuous role in public life, made them convenient targets for attacks in a society which clung strongly to the view that the infidel should not meddle in affairs of the true believers, and should be kept in his proper place — outside the pale, in humbleness and humiliation³ (*ṣighâr, dull*).

¹ In this respect the Spanish discussions of the XI c. are reminiscent of anti-Christian writings in Mamluk Egypt with their protest against the employment of unbelievers as scribes in governmental offices. Cf. *BSOS* 1942, p. 843 sq. א. שטראוס, תולדות היהודים במצרים וסוריה תחת שלטון המטלוכים, ירושלים תש"ד, ע' 336-339.

² Cf. the articles of Ch. Schirrmann in קרית ספר י"ג (1936); ציון א': כנסת ב' (1937); מאונס 1939, ע' 48-58, and Y. Baer

תולדות היהודים בספרד הנוצרית ח"א (1945), ע' 26-29. These use the source mentioned in note 47.

³ A. S. Tritton, *The Caliphs and their non-Muslim Subjects*. L. 1930; G. Von Grunbaum, *Medieval Islam*, Chicago 1946, p. 177 ff.



The refutation of Jewish and Christian scriptures, originally a few pages in length (I, 98–116), grew with the incorporation of the earlier *Iẓhâr* into a sizable volume (I, 116–224, II, 2–91). As *Fiṣal* was written in 418–422/1027–1030, the treatise *Iẓhâr* must have been written still earlier, before Ibn Ḥazm reached the age of 30. In *Fiṣal*, Ibn Ḥazm refers to his disputes with Samuel b. Nagdela (135, 152 end), whom he calls Ismael (135), by which name he was known among Muslims. Samuel was to him “the most learned and most skilled in disputations” (*a’lamu-hum wa-ajdaluhum*) among Jews.⁷ One discussion with him took place in 404/1013, i. e. when both Samuel and Ibn Ḥazm were quite young. Samuel is mentioned as *Kâtib* but *Iẓhâr* (if it contained the passage) and *Fiṣal* could refer only to the earlier stage in Samuel’s career.

Even later, Ibn Ḥazm felt compelled to resume his polemics against Judaism, and this time directly against Samuel, for he heard that the latter had written a pamphlet against the claim of the Koran to divine origin.⁸

Thus, at present, of three works by Ibn Ḥazm which discussed Judaism, we still have two: *Fiṣal* and the pamphlet *Radd*, Refutation (or *Risâla*, Epistle).

In *Fiṣal* we have a unique document: its section on Judaism is the only extensive work written by a Muslim author on the subject; it is the only work of anti-Jewish polemics written by one of the great minds of Islam. A piece of theological writing, it narrows down to textual criticism of Jewish scriptures. But the ingenious notes soon raise historical problems of higher criticism and matters of principle regarding the Muslim attitude towards Judaeo-Christian scriptures. The book is written for

the title is supported by L. Gardet et M. M. Anawati, *Introduction à la théologie musulmane*, Paris 1948, p. 147 n. 2.

⁷ The contemporary Ibn Ṣā’id al-Andalusî wrote in *K. Ṭabaqât al-umam*, ed. Cheikho, Beirut 1912, p. 90. (Tr. R. Blachère, P. 1935, p. 160; cf. J. Finkel in *J. Q. R.* NS 18, pp. 45 ff.): “More than any Spanish Jew before him, he was learned in the law of the Jews and understood how to prevail in disputes on its behalf and to rebut its opponents. (*‘ilm bi-sharī’a . . . wa-l-ma’rifâ bi-l-intiṣâr lahâ wa-d-dabb ‘anhâ . . .*)

⁸ See Note 45.

Muslims, to refute the Jews and the Muslim's reverence for Jewish scriptures, not to persuade the Jews.⁹

The author quotes threescore passages which are analysed in detail. In case of doubt in translation or interpretation he withholds judgment.¹⁰

He dwells mostly on the Pentateuch (117–204), especially on Genesis (117–153), picks a few passages from other biblical books (204–216) and from post-biblical literature (216–224). He shows a good knowledge of the Pentateuch in Arabic, but less satisfactory knowledge of the other writings criticized.¹¹

He states he knew Christianity before studying the Jewish scriptures (116). He had many contacts with Jews, and the book still echoes the disputes he had with Jewish scholars. We mentioned two references to Samuel b. Nagdela. Possibly some of the other disputes also involved the Nagid. However, in all the other cases no name is recorded.¹² His impression of the Jewish disputants is unfavorable: he thought they were trying to explain away difficulties with tricks and lies.¹³ "It has happened to us so often in our disputes with their savants . . . They are prone to lie . . . whenever they want to wiggle out of difficulty in a dispute;" a contemptible trait.¹⁴ The author enjoys thoroughly the confusion, helplessness, defeat of his adversaries when pressed by his unrelenting critique.¹⁵

⁹ 155, 209, 224 end.

¹⁰ 117, 121, 144 end; 151; 165.

¹¹ E. Algermissen, *Die Pentateuchzeitate Ibn Hazms*, (Münster thesis), 1933.

¹² 141, 142 [اسر الله] 156, 174 top; 207 f.

205: Jos. 5, 2–3 versus Gen. 17, 14, circumcision neglected in the desert; Jew: on account of desert conditions; Ibn Hazm: a) The Israelites stayed over lengthy periods at certain stations in their wanderings, and b) it was not any easier to perform circumcision on the eve of the battles for the conquest of Palestine. — The Jewish argument goes back to Yeb. 71b: *שום חולשא דאורחא*.

¹³ 174; 208: a shameless person will not find it difficult to turn around any word to his own contentment, without any proof. But re-interpreting the text (*wasf al-kalām 'an mauḏi'ihī wa-ma'nāhu ilā ma'nān ākhar*) is permissible only if a true proof has been presented of admitted linguistic usage.

¹⁴ 213. *Fa-l-qaum lā mu'nata 'alayhim mina-l-kiḏb . . . idā tama'ū bi-t-takhalluṣ min majlisihim lā yakūn ḏālika illā bi-l-kiḏb*.

¹⁵ 174, 205

223: When a Jew suggested that Metatron is the name of an angel, the author

Another echo of the disputes is that he anticipates possible objections based on Koran passages not unlike the biblical passages under fire. Sometimes he merely admires the superiority of the Koran version of the biblical stories.¹⁶

The analysis of the biblical passages quoted persuades him that the biblical writings cannot be considered divinely inspired, nor can the claim of their ancient origin be maintained.

They abound in inconsistencies and contradictions inconceivable in God's words.¹⁷ Ibn Ḥazm is on the alert for inaccuracy in numbers, figures: divine data would be free from such mistakes. "I have never seen anybody more ignorant of arithmetic than the person who compiled the Torah for the Jews."¹⁸ The scriptures are found wanting also in matters of geography¹⁹ and history.²⁰

retorted: a) Why then does Metatron mourn and moan over the destruction of the Temple in the first person; b) Why does he regret the Lord's deed?

¹⁶ The four rivers of Eden in Genesis are an absurd concoction. The Koran also refers to rivers, but those are *celestial* streams. (119) 129, 131, 138, 155, 160, 161 ff., 182 f.

¹⁷ 121 (Gen. 4,2 and 4,20: 6,3 and the figures of longevity of numerous personages of the biblical story).

143, 144, 156 (If Moses had turned the waters of Egypt into blood, where did the Egyptians get water to show that they too could turn it into blood), 158, 160 (Ex. 16,31 and Num. 11,7-8.) 161 end (Deut. 4,12 and Ex. ch. 24) 168 f. (Ex. 6, Num. 1,3) 178 (the writer of such absurdities — on the numbers of Aaronids, Jos. 21 — deserves scourging, chains, branding), 182.

I. Di Matteo, *Le pretese contraddizioni della S. Scrittura secondo Ibn Hazm*, in *Bessarione*, v. 27 (1923), 77-127.

¹⁸ 150. Similarly 151, 179, 184.

Demonstrations: 121, 122 f. Methuselah, 124 Noah, 124 end 158 (Israel in Egypt), 144 (Joseph's place among his brethren), 149 f., (Jacob's house entering Egypt), 151 (data from Judges and I Kings): 165 (number of Israelites).

166-175: A dissertation on geographical impossibility of the large number of Israelites in antiquity and of the number of cities Jos. 15-19. This is followed by the argument of economic impossibility 176-7. The pages 166-177 foreshadow Ibn-Khaldūn's exposition in the opening of the *Muqaddima*. 178, 179 (from desert to Kingdom), 184 (length of Moses' life).

¹⁹ 118 Rivers in Eden.

²⁰ 128 Israel never reached the Euphrates — (on Gen 15,18)

136 Jacob has served Esau, despite Gen 25, 23

152 f. on Gen 49,10: The scepter did depart from Jacob and, except for

The contents of many biblical stories are so shocking, immoral and coarse that the revolted reader will reject the scriptures. The scriptures want us to believe that Abraham doubted God's word, Sarah lied to God, the daughters of the prophet Lot conceived by their father, Isaac and Esau were cheated by Jacob who in turn was cheated by Laban; Israel fought divine force; the chastity of the family life of the prophet Jacob was violated by outsiders as well as by his own children; the lineage of kings and prophets begins with incest and fornication; Moses doubted God's might.²¹

These stories are marked by crass anthropomorphism,²² plurality in the concept of deity (*shirk*), and characterizations of God and his prophets as weak, helpless.²³

The scriptures of the Jews, then, are mere forgeries, distor-

Zerubabel's days, was never regained. In 404 H. Samuel Nagrela pointed during a discussion to the exilarchs in the East as Jewish rulers (*wa-hiya qiyāda wa-mulk wa-riyāsa*). "But I said that was wrong inasmuch as the exilarch's command would not be carried out with regard to anybody, Jew or non-Jew. It is merely a title without substance." The Jews were ruled after their return from exile not by the House of David but by Aaronids. Ibn Hazm knows of the Agrippas of the House of Herod (Asin, *Abenhasam* II, 292 misunderstood this reference) and refers to ancient authors describing them as non-Jews (*min ar-rūm*). — 143 Cf. Goldziher, *REJ*, v. 8, 121 ff.

²¹ 129 on Gen 15,7-8, 130 f. on Gen 18 (Abraham addresses the three guests in singular; prostrated before men? . . . or else, if he knew these were angels, why the food; meat and dairy dishes offered simultaneously).

132 (Sarah). 133 on Gen 18-19 (Lot and his daughters). 137 on Gen 27 (Esau). 140 on Gen 29 (Laban); 141 the marriages of Jacob violate the law against marrying two sisters). 142 on Gen 32 (Jacob Israel. But if your angels eat and drink, they may fight too). 143 on Gen 34-35 (Jacob's family) 145 ff. on Gen. 38 (Tamar — Judah; Solomon should spring from such lineage) 181 ff. on Ex 32 (Aaron's role in the story of the golden calf); 185 on Num 11 (Why should Moses have doubted that the Lord would provide meat?)

Such stories make him shudder:

133 *taqsha'irr min samā'ihā julūd al-mu'minīn*. Cf. 141, 155.

²² 117 Gen 1 26; 120 Gen 3 22; 121 Gen 6 1-4; 153 Ex 4 22 (The Christians ascribe one son to God; the Jews claim that they are all God's sons); 159 f. Ex 15 1-3; 160 end, Ex 20 22-23; 161 Ex 24 9-11; 164 f. Ex 33; 205 Ps. 27, Ps. 82.6, 199-201;

208 Prov. 8 22-31; 209 Is. 66 8-9 (Worse than the Christian tenets concerning the Madonna and her child).

²³ 154, 155 end.

tions.²⁴ The Muslim attitude toward the scriptures should be one of absolute rejection. The Muslim accepts only the Koran, and only from the Koran he knows of previous revelations, among them one called Torah and one called Gospel, but he finds that the Torah of the Jews at best presents a text that has been tampered with extensively and has no validity.

Some Muslims ignorantly reject this concept of forgery (*tahrîf*) and believe in the transmission of the scriptures (*tawâtur*). Yet even the Koran teaches that *tahrîf* has taken place. This weakness of accepting the opinions of the Jews (about their scriptures) may lead to further acceptance of their claims and traditions. Can a Muslim use scriptural arguments? Only a few passages have been left, since they escaped the attention of the Jews, no doubt by Allah's grace, so as to serve as evidence against the Jews (*hujja*).²⁵ Such are the few *a'lâm*, predictions of Muhammad's advent.²⁶ Thus, beginning with total rejection of scriptural texts, our author ends with accepting some evidence of the texts, — an old contradiction of Muslim authors.²⁷

Ibn Ḥazm is quick to point out cases supporting the theory of abrogation (*naskh*) by divine will of one revealed precept by another. He is quite a dialectician in this matter: God gives life, and takes it (and grants revival); a dynasty's power is trans-

²⁴ 144 *mufta'ila*, *mubaddala* 158 *muḥarraf*, *muftara* 180 *musta'mala*, *maqdûba*.

²⁵ 203 f., 211, 212.

Muslims against *tahrîf* — 215.

Remaining sound passages for Muslim use 212, 213, 215.

104: We do not believe in any Torah or Gospel that does not contain a warning of Muḥammad's message.

²⁶ 104, 111, 112

In Ps. 72.16 יִצְיָצוּ מֵעִיר = they of the city — *min al-Madîna* — is an evidence for Islam (207). — Such *a'lâm* occur in the IX. century works of Alî Tabarî and Ibn Qutayba: Cf. Brockelmann in *Beitr. z. Assyriol.* III 1898.

²⁷ A century before Ibn Ḥazm this problem was discussed by Saadia [in *Amânât*, treatise 3] and Qirqisani (*K. al-Anwâr*, ed. Nemoy II, N. Y., 1940, p. 292 sq.; I. Friedländer in *Zeitschr. f. Assyriol.*, v. 26, 93–110). In comparison with earlier authors Ibn Ḥazm is neither consistent nor original in his exposition.

Goldziher's different impression *ZDMG* 32, pp. 363 ff. is based on comparison with *later* authors, and is due to the fact that at the time when he wrote (1878) earlier polemics were unknown.

ferred into the hands of humble subjects; converted enemies become part and parcel of the religious community. Transgression against the Sabbath would make forbidden violence against sinners obligatory. "Precepts are commands to perform certain acts for a definite period, and when the period is over the command may turn into its opposite."²⁸

The text of the LXX differs considerably from the masoretic text. It appears from a detailed analysis of biblical history that ancient Israel did not know the Torah, did not observe and preserve it, but rather did everything to make it extinct. Only the High Priest in Jerusalem was in possession of a copy which he used 3 times a year. The Northern Kingdom was cut off from Jerusalem altogether but even in the Kingdom of Judah matters were hardly any better than in the North; nor were the priests faithful. This clearly demonstrates (199: *aḏwa'u mina-sh-shams*) that there was no reliable transmission, and that consequently falsification was possible. Only Deut. 32.1-43 was a passage the Hebrews were enjoined to memorize. But it is an objectionable passage as it stands in the present text.²⁹ The oldest Jewish tradition goes back no further than the days of Hillel and Shammai, Simeon (the Just?) and Mar Akiba (II 83). Not so the Muslim tradition: close to us, it can be traced back in detail and verified by trustworthy witnesses [I 115 II, 81]. In Islam tradition goes back to divinely inspired evidence; whilst the Jews cannot bring evidence from anybody in direct and immediate contact with a prophet (II, 7 ff.; II 84).

Who then produced the present text? Who was the forger? He must have been a liar, a contemptible character, either an ignorant ass or a conscious, purposeful, malicious, arch-misleader; nay, he must have been a coarse atheist, scoffing and mocking at any belief or religious feeling, who viciously

²⁸ 100 . . . *Ash-sharā't' innamā hiya awāmir fī waqt maḥdūd bi-'amal maḥdūd. Fa-iḏā kharaja ḏālīka-l-waqt 'āda ḏālīka-l-amr manḥīyan 'anhu.*

101 Case of *badā'* sudden change in divine will, "which is the strongest abrogation": Moses' intercession for Israel changes a divine decision. On *badā'* cf. s. v. in Enc. of Isl. (Goldziher).

102, 141, 163 f.

²⁹ 110, 185, 198, 199. The Deuteronomy passage 199-202.

mixed truth and falsehood to the detriment of future generations.³⁰

The forger arose at a late date, in the days of the second commonwealth, in an age when there were no more prophets, and the sages were succeeding in implanting prayers and bookish study in the people.³¹

Ibn Ḥazm writes about this author-forger mostly *without* naming him. But in a few passages he names him definitely: Ezra, the Aaronid scribe who flourished sometime before the second destruction.³² From his memory he put together the pieces of old tradition, filling up the lacunae. This took place about 40 years after the 70-year captivity. Actually only under the Hasmoneans did the Torah spread and thus, 400 years after the destruction of the ancient kingdom, a new religion (*sharī'a jadīda*) arose, the work of the sages (*aḥbār*).

The survey of the biblical writings outside the Pentateuch is brief, sketchy, and abounds in mistakes. Here one does not have the impression of study and real knowledge of the text. Perhaps Ibn Ḥazm used a set of excerpts supplied to him?³³

The still shorter section on Talmudic material was of course

³⁰ 120 *kaḍḍāb mustarin*

179 "We have never heard of a more reprehensible character and more corrupt disposition — except those who follow him and believe him."

Stupid or misleading — 159, cf. 156/7, 182

162: *dalāl, talbīs, ishkāl, tadrīs*

The scoffer — 123 *min 'amal zindīq jāhil au mustakhiff mutalā'ib bihim*.

Similarly 128, 129, 134, 155, 162, 168, 171 end, 177, 184, 185.

140 end: *min taulūd zindīq mutalā'ib bi-d-diyānāt*. 135: *ṣifāt al-kilāb*.

Mixing truth and falsehood: 184 f.

³¹ 113, 192, 193, 196, 199.

Late origin of the Torah 209.

When a verse states that 'to this day' nobody has found the tomb of Moses, it testifies to the late date of composition.

³² 117, 198, 210 (Daniel was the last prophet.) Chronology: 197. For classical antecedents of this view of Ezra's role, cf. E. Stein, *Alltestam. Bibelkritik i. d. späthellenist. Litt.*, Lwow 1935.

³³ Mistakes: 204 Jos. 205 ff. Ps., 208 Eccl., 217 Is.

207 on The Song of Songs: *Kalām aḥmaq lā ya'qil wa-lā yadrī aḥad minhum murādahu* (The talk of a fool, and not one of them understands or knows its meaning).

based on such a set of excerpts.³⁴ It assaults aggadic material, exposing its anthropomorphism. Biblical passages appear here, evidently as a result of confusion of biblical and post-biblical material.³⁵ The stories remind the author of old wives' tales.³⁶ On such absurdities, and on their authors, the Jews base their religion. These authors were as bad at computations as the bible-forger. The Talmud was also compiled by atheists (*mulhīdūn lā dīna lahum*). They bribed Paul and sent him to mislead the early Christians by teaching them to believe in Jesus' divinity.³⁷ Now the Christians must have been, in the opinion of the rabbis, either right or wrong; if they were right — why did the rabbis want to mislead them? If they were wrong why did the rabbis want to deepen this error instead of putting matters straight? The Jews possibly wanted to corrupt Islam in the same way by fomenting schism by the propaganda of 'Abdallah b. Sabā'.³⁸

Ibn Ḥazm works himself up to fever-heat over the legends about R. Ismael meeting the Shekhina mourning the destruction of the Temple. The Jews, "that is the Rabbanites amongst them," glorify Metatron, the Little Lord (*ar-rabb as-ṣaghīr*), on the Day of Atonement.³⁹

This last passage might make us think of a Karaite source. Ibn Ḥazm mentions Ananites in Toledo and Talavera (99): they accept only what the prophets enjoined, repudiating the rabbis and their inventions. But it might well have been a

³⁴ This was first edited and translated by Goldziher in Kobak's *Jeschurun* v. VIII, 1873.

³⁵ Biblical passages: 218 ff.

³⁶ Old Wives tales: 218 *al kḥurāfāt allatī yataḥaddaṭ bihā an-nisā' bi-l-layl idā ghazalna*.

³⁷ 221 Shi'ur Qoma, Seder Nashim, Talmud. Paul the seducer — cf. Krauss, *Leben Jesu* 47, 85, 121, 157; E. Fritsch, *Isl. u. Christ. im Mittelalter*, 49–52; G. Levi della Vida in *RSO* 13, pp. 327–331.

³⁸ Corrupting Islam 222, cf. I. Friedländer, Ibn Saba, in *Zeitschr. f. Assyriol.* v. 23 (1909).

Ibn Ḥazm does not mention the stories of Muhammad's Jewish companions (such as those treated by J. Mann in *HUCA* XII–XIII, M. Schwabe in *Tarbiyā* II, Baneth ib. III, J. Leveen in *JQR* NS, 16).

³⁹ R. Ismael 222. Metatron 223. In Mas'ūdī, *Murūj* II, 388 ff. this material is cited (a century earlier).

Christian source that made use of some anti-Rabbanite material.⁴⁰ Indeed, he may have used some such excerpts even in the section on the Pentateuch, though there is no question as to his sound reading of that book, exceptional for a Muslim author.

Ibn Ḥazm, known for his vehemence, is blunt in these pages. Dirty, vile, filthy, stinking are epithets he frequently hurls against the Jews.⁴¹ Everyone who knows them, he contends, recognizes that they are the filthiest people, a villainous breed, false, mean and cowardly (202). Ps. 103,15–16 (“his days are as grass, as a flower of the field”) shows an atheist materialist concept, he says, “and indeed the religion of the Jews tends strongly towards that, for there is not in their Torah any mention of the next world, or of reward after death They combine materialism, plurality in deity, anthropomorphism, and every stupidity in the world.”

He judges not by chapter and verse only but by the qualities he ascribes to the Jewish people.

Jacob filched the blessing assigned to Esau: “By God, it is the way of the Jews. You will not find among them, with rare exceptions, but a treacherous villain (*al-ḡhabīṭ al-muḡhādī*, 138)”

“They, both the ancient and the modern, are altogether the worst liars. Though I have encountered many of them, I have never seen among them a truth seeker, except two men only” (156).⁴²

“They are the filthiest and vilest of peoples, their unbelief horrid, their ignorance abominable” (154). Among minds, theirs are like the odor of garlic among odors (180).

What a people, what a lineage! Abraham marries his own sister. Isaac is a thief. Jacob married Leah in error. Reuben fornicates with his father's wife, Judah with his son's. (A slip:

⁴⁰ 223 and 224 the months of the High Holidays are called September and October, which names would rather point to a Christian source. Christian writings against Jews produced in Spain are discussed by A. Lukyn Williams, *Adversus Judaeos*, Cambridge 1935, pp. 206 sq. Peter Alphonsi in XI century utilizes material similar to that of Agobard of Lyons (ib. 348 ff.), two centuries earlier.

⁴¹ 127, 154, 156, 148, 222, 223. Like the Shiites, Ibn Ḥazm maintains that the infidel is ritually impure: v. Goldziher, *Zahiriten*, 61 ff.

Joshua and Rahab). Amram married his aunt, which is against the law, and Moses was born from this union. David commits the crime against Uriah. Absalom defiles his father's wives.⁴³

Let them persist in their vain hopes for a glorious future; hopes that are the stock-in-trade of fools (138). Sometimes their leaders perceive the truth but will be stubborn against reason in blind fidelity to their ancestors (*taqlīd al-aslāf*), and group feeling (*'aṣabīya*), and the desire to perpetuate their worldly position (116: *istidāmatan li-rī'āsa dunyawīya*).⁴⁴

Ibn Ḥazm returned to this subject in the refutation of a pamphlet by Samuel ibn Nagdela that contained notes critical of the Koran. He had heard of the pamphlet but was unable to obtain a copy. Instead he found a refutation of it written by a Muslim, and having learned from it the arguments of Samuel, he set out to refute them with all the knowledge and skill he could muster.⁴⁵

The Refutation consists of an introduction, eight chapters, epilogue and conclusion. Each of the eight chapters refutes an argument of Samuel's: the latter is reproduced, followed by deprecatory remarks and a logical rejoinder. In a counterblast,

⁴³ Cf. 131, 213.

⁴⁴ Cf. 135, 147 f.

⁴⁵ 99 f. Some share the view of the 'Isawīya that Jesus and Muhammad also were prophets. "I often came across prominent Jews that were close to this view." From an ancient Aaronid's history Ibn Ḥazm concludes that prominent Jews of the first century had recognized the truth in the teachings of the Baptist and of Jesus. Asfīn Palacios (*Abenḥazam II*, 45, 212 f., n. 87) concluded that Ibn Ḥazm had read Josephus. This is improbable. Ibn Ḥazm used a Yosippon text. Cf. ed. Gunzbourg-Kahana col. 361. S. Krauss, *Leben Jesu* p. 238 f., 300 n. 6. The Christ passage occurs, e. g. in *Ta'rīkh Yūsūfūs al-Yahūdī*, Beirut 1872, p. 211 f.

In the passage on the Ananites (p. 99) Asfīn Palacios (v. II p. 211, and n. 85) evidently misinterpreted the القراس والمس of the text. The Jews could not call them the followers of Anan "the exilarch". Possibly, the Arabic conceals a distortion of קראים ומינים (i. e. "the Ananites whom the Jews call Karaites and heretics"). *Ib.* n. 86: Ibn Ḥazm does not identify the Rabbanites with the Essenes but refers to them as الأشعثية, followers of אששתתא — oral tradition. Cf. Mas'ūdī, *Tanbīh*, 112 f.

⁴⁵ E. García Gómez, *Polemica religiosa entre Ibn Hazm e Ibn al-Nagrīla*, in *al-Andalus*, v. IV (1936), 1-28.

the reader is also introduced to a weak spot in the bible, to show that it contains passages far more damning than the Koran passages to which Samuel has raised objections. The epilogue lists Jewish errors and sacrileges.

Thus the pattern used in *Fīṣal* appears here in reverse: first comes the defense of the Koran, then follows the critique of a bible passage. Again we find theological material, or rather critique and counter-critique of passages of sacred texts of Jew and Muslim.

The real difference between the two works (apart from size) is the specific tone of the introduction and the conclusion of the pamphlet. Here Ibn Ḥazm attacks the Jews, especially Samuel, for their domination of the country, the state and its resources. But even more bitter, perhaps, is his feeling against the ruler or rulers who allowed matters to reach such a stage. Muslim kings, absorbed in worldly matters, neglect their faith; building castles, enjoying pleasures; greed makes them neglect even the defense of the believers against infidels. The Jews, devoid of power, use fraud, hypocrisy, false submissiveness to work their way into high society, and know how to conceal their hatred for the Prophet and his community. In his impudence Samuel even dared to write against the Koran. Of him one might say with Mutanabbi:

“If nobly you act towards a noble man, you gain his fealty;
 But if nobly you act toward a villain, he will rebel.
 To greatness, generosity in place of the sword is as harmful
 As the use of the sword in the place of generosity.”

“Oh, God, we complain to Thee for the rulers of our faith absorbed in worldly affairs neglect the observance of their religion; absorbed in erecting castles — may they soon abandon these — they do not cultivate their sacred faith which accompanies them in the life to come, in their abode eternal; absorbed in piling up riches — sometimes with results fatal to their own lives, and helpful to their enemies — they are deflected from their faith and people which gave them strength in their earthly life, and can secure to them life eternal. Non-Muslims become arrogant, and infidels wag their tongues. If the powers temporal looked

Towards the end there is another 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 (Koran injunctions against Jews and Christians) 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 same 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 warning 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 arguments of the Jew are futile, his reasoning poor. And his is the leader (*'amīd*) of the Jews, their great man, their scholar. If he at least knew Arabic! He asks why the Koran ascribes healing power to honey (16.71) 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. He might have remembered that a biblical prophet (II. Kings XX.7) performed cures with honey; and in that hodge-podge (*ikhhtilāt*) which the Jews call the Torah, the highest praise given to Palestine is that it flows with milk and honey.

The epilogue lists biblical (and a few talmudic) passages, illustrative of anthropomorphism, contradictions, the coarseness and stupidity of the Jewish scriptures. The Jews were promised

a land of their own but find themselves under Muslim yoke. Their exilarchs are bastards, and so were their kings and Moses, all begotten in unions unlawful under their own law. A short review explains how the Torah was compiled by Ezra.

The theological scriptural section is thus sandwiched between attacks on Granada's ruler and his Jewish minister. The ruler is threatened with the people's discontent and Allah's wrath, while Samuel is denounced as a man blinded by wealth, arrogant, devoid of "the slightest knowledge of human nature, with no understanding of the resources of the Arabic language."^{45b}

The poetical counterpart of the publicist's motifs in Ibn-Ḥazm's Refutation can be found in the poem by Abu Ishāq al-Elbirī directed against Joseph b. Samuel.⁴⁶ It also threatens the ruler with popular discontent for employing a Jew in high office, and decries Jewish domination of the country. Several sources ascribe to the poem a role almost decisive in bringing about the outbreak of 1066 which put an end to the forty years of administration of Samuel and Joseph, and in which Joseph was killed among three thousand other Jewish victims. Yet recently discovered memoirs of the King of Granada who

^{45b} The Hebrew anti-Islamic treatise ascribed to Ibn Adret seems to draw on Ibn Ḥazm when quoting the Muslim view. (Cf. M. Schreiner, in *ZDMG* 48 (1894) pp. 39-42; M. Zucker, *ברורים בתולדות הובוכים הדתיים שבין היהדות והאיסלם*, 31-48 'ע' הרצ"ו, וינה. קמינקא, 1937.)

⁴⁶ The poem was first published by R. Dozy, in *Recherches sur l'histoire et la littérature de l'Espagne pendant le moyen age*, v. I (in the 3d ed. 1881 pp. 282-294, and app. LXI-LXVIII). The translation appears also in Dozy's *Histoire des Musulmans d'Espagne*, 2ed. . . . par E. Levi Provençal III 71 f. (Leyde 1932). The text is available also in Lisān ad-Dīn Ibn al-Khaṭīb's *K. A'māl al-A'lām*, ed. E. Levi-Provençal, Rabat 1934, pp. 265-7. Em. Garcia Gómez published the diwan of Elbirī: *Un alfaquí español Abu Ishaq de Elvira*, Madrid-Granada, 1944. Here the poem will be found under No. 25 pp. 151-3 (with notes on pp. 149 f. and on pp. 38-40 in the introduction where the background of the poem is discussed. It is now reprinted in *Selections from Hispano-Arabic Poetry*, ed. by A. R. Nykl, Beirut 1949, pp. 141-143. (Cf. H. Pérès, *La poésie andalouse en arabe classique au XI siècle* p. 1937, pp. 270 ff.) Nykl, *Hispano-Arabic Poetry*, pp. 197-200.

ruled in 1077–1090 after Bādīs, the master of the Nagids, give an authoritative picture of political relations and intrigue in Granada, without mentioning Elbīrī or his poem.⁴⁷ The poem was probably used in instigation, but was only a contributory factor in undermining Joseph's position and in whipping emotions against the Jews into a frenzy.⁴⁸

The poem contains 47 lines (meter: *mutaqārib*), is marked by concreteness of images, virulence, and forceful simplicity of expression, well fit to impress the Berber soldiery which could not be expected to appreciate the usual elaborate poetic idiom.

A sincere friend of the Ṣinhāja Berbers, the poet offers them advice. Here, too, from the very outset, responsibility for the evil of Jewish domination is placed squarely on the ruler.

Your lord has sadly erred
 And his foes are rejoicing
 He selected an infidel to be his Kātib
 Who, if your lord wished, could have been a believer . . .
 It was not even of their own (the Jews') making
 For from our midst arises the accomplice.⁴⁹

The king is also addressed directly; how could he, shrewd man that he is, overlook the evil while all over the land people deplore the rise to power of the bastard upstarts. This makes the prince unpopular. Appointing the Jew is also against the word of Allah. There is an undertone of intimidation and threat:

The earth trembles from their (the Jews') immorality
 And is almost heaving under us all.

Noble and glorious ruler, he is urged to act, and is reminded:

⁴⁷ E. Lévi-Provençal, "Les 'mémoires' de 'Abd Allāh, dernier roi Ziride de Grenade", in *al-Andalus* III (1935), pp. 232–344, IV (1936–9), 29–145, and VI (1941) 1–63.

⁴⁸ García Gómez, *Un alfaquí*, p. 30:

"Pero es más probable que la invectiva antijudaica del poeta de Elvira no fuese más que uno de tantos motivos concurrentes en la producción de la catástrofe; el más *brillante*, si se quiere, desde el punto de vista de la instigación y la propaganda."

⁴⁹ *Walākinna minnā yaqūmu-l-mu'in.*

You are responsible for what they are doing.⁵⁰ A plan of action is drafted, again both for the people and the prince. The Jews must be swept back into their proper place.

Bring them down to their place
Return them to the most abject station.
They used to roam around us in their tatters
Covered with contempt, humiliation, and scorn.⁵¹
They used to rummage amongst the dungheaps for
a bit of filthy rag
To serve as a shroud for a man to be buried in.⁵²

In those good old days, the low-race (*hijna*) infidels were not accepted in society. An end must be put to the present situation when

Many a pious Muslim is in awe of the vilest infidel ape.

The poet who knew that the Jews ('dogs') were held in contempt everywhere was overwhelmed by the situation he found in Granada. He turns away from the prince. He addresses the mob comparing their lot with that of the Jews.

They divided up Granada, capital and provinces
And everywhere there is one of those accursed
They seize Granada's revenues
Biting into and crunching them.
They dress in exquisite garments
Whilst you the basest wear.

Let the people hear what the prince, specifically, is urged to do. He should remember that the Jewish minister has become as rich as the prince himself, and

Therefore, haste to slaughter him as sacrifice
And offer him, fat ram that he is.

⁵⁰ *Fa-anta rahīnūn bimā yaf'alūn.*

⁵¹ *Waradduhum asfala-s-sāfilīn Fa-ṭāfu ladaynā bi-akhrājihim, 'Alayhim sikhārūn wa-dullun wa-haun.*

⁵² This line occurs only in the diwan: *wa-gammū-l-mazābila 'an khirqatīn mulawwanatīn li-dīṭāri-d-dafīni.* Why "a coloured rag"? For a badge —

The family should not be spared either: They all have treasures concealed. These should be confiscated, the prince being more entitled than the Jews to all this wealth.

Do not consider that killing them is treachery
Nay, it would be treachery to leave them scoffing.

The Jews have broken the covenant (i. e. overstepped their station) and compunction would be out of place.⁵³

They are in charge of your secrets
But how can the faithless be trusted.

Muslims are poorly fed while the infidels gather at sumptuous feasts. They slaughter animals in the town's market places and the Muslims eat what remains.⁵⁴ Above all rises the evil image of the Jewish courtier.

That ape of theirs had his home paved with marble
And made the purest of springs flow thither.
Our affairs are his charge
And we have to wait at his gate⁵⁵
While he ridicules us and our religion.

Proudly the Jews ride about the city; their prayers rise louder than those of the Muslims.

One of the texts preserving the poem mentions that in his insolence the courtier was emboldened to mock at certain Koran passages and to express openly what is called his atheism *ilhād* (probably some ironic remarks about matters Islamic).⁵⁶

Elbīrī lived to see the end of "Jewish domination." Ibn Ḥazm died two years earlier.

Elbīrī used the epithet 'ape' (*qird*) profusely when referring

diḡār? The above translation is based on reading *mulawwaṭatin* — soiled, filthy.

⁵³ Reference to "Umar's covenant".

⁵⁴ aṭrāf. Dozy: iṭrif = ṭrefa, i. e. what the Jews throw away "to the dog". Cf. Steinschneider, *Pol. Lit.* 152 f., 332 f.

⁵⁵ *Wa-ṣārat ḥawā'ijunā 'indaku wa-naḥnu 'alā bābihi qā'imūn.*

⁵⁶ Dozy, *Rech.* LXVIII, 289.

to Jews. Such indeed was the parlance. 'Swine' described Christians, but sometimes Jews too.^{56a}

To the contemporary royal memorialist, Joseph b. Samuel is invariably 'the pig' (*khinzār*). The prince believed that his father had been poisoned by Joseph who through his agents knew of every move in the royal household.⁵⁷ Joseph was master over all.⁵⁸ "My grandfather aged then considerably . . . and left the affairs of state to the Jew, as his deputy, and the Jew was able to command and forbid at will". There were intrigues against Joseph, and the king was told: "He devours your wealth, has become master over most of your possessions, and erected a palace better than yours. By God, remove him and gain the sympathies of the Muslims by getting rid of him."⁵⁹ Apparently, there was an attempt to rise against Joseph when rumor spread

^{56a} Cf. Pérès 240. This nomenclature is based on Koran passages: 2₆₁, 5₆₅, 7₁₆₆.

⁵⁷ *Memoires* (cf. Note 47) 265/283. Cf. Ibn Khaṭīb, *Iḥāṭa* 1/273 (Cairo 1901): "One almost could not breathe without Joseph knowing thereof." Ibn 'Idāri, *al-Bayān al-Muḡrib* v. III (Paris, 1930) p. 265.

⁵⁸ 266/285 (also *Andalus* vol. 6, p. 15) *tabarmaka-l-yahūdī*. Ibn-Daud mentions that Joseph, born into power, was unable to remain modest. See Note 64a.

It is remarkable that in the memoirs Samuel figures as the venerable Abū Ibrāhīm ash-Shaykh (*Andalus* v. 6), and only Joseph comes in for rough treatment. In an illuminating passage Samuel's appointment is explained (ib., 11 f. tr. p. 30):

There was in the Jew so much shrewdness and skill in handling people that was well suited to the time of Samuel and Badis and to the people who were intriguing against them. Badis therefore used Samuel out of distrust for (*istihāshan*) others, and because he saw the ill-will of his own kith and kin; further because Samuel was a Jew, a *ḡimmī*, not aspiring to any power. Nor was Samuel a Spaniard who might have become dangerous in a crisis by joining hands with a prince of another race (or: line). Badis needed monies with which to woo his kith and kin and to secure power (the editor translates *wayuhāwīlu bihā amra-l-mulki*: et de régler certaines affaires). Badis could not do without one like Samuel who would collect for him sums with which to carry out his plans (*(yajma'u lahu mina-l-amwāl mā yudriku ma'ahā-l-āmāl)*), without imposition, right or wrong, on any Muslim; and because the people of the city (Granada) and the treasury officials were mostly Jews, and Samuel would collect the monies from them and give them to Badis.

⁵⁹ 269/292.

that he had had the crown prince poisoned. Feelings ran high and his life was in danger "This was the foreboding of his destruction".⁶⁰ Aware of the intrigue against him, Joseph allegedly said:

"Our scoffing at the people has been for the sake of the sultan's glory. We have believed ourselves safe from them under his protection. Yet now there is no more hope: no sultan to grant us safety, while a vile rival is plotting against us at the court and the populace seeks our destruction. And we are few and weak upon the earth"⁶¹

Rumor had it that Joseph was plotting with a neighboring ruler in the hope of establishing a Jewish principality. "He betrayed us". A drunkard's shouting in this strain mobilized the mob, resentful of the unprecedented elevation of Jews in office.⁶²

There were also laudatory poems honoring the Nagids. In rhymed prose a Muslim says "I profess the religion of the Sab-bath openly when I am with you, and in secret when I am with my own people". This seems to be an exceptional case.⁶³ For that matter the Muslim sources recognize the high attainments of the Nagids, mention Joseph's wide intellectual interests, his excellent Islamic library, etc. Still the main point remains: the Nagids, infidels, ruled over Muslims. Joseph "did not know the humbleness of the *ḍimmī* or the filth of Jewishness".⁶⁴

It seems that the feeling pervading all the utterances of the Muslim authors was one of resentment at the sight of temporary suspension of *ḍull*, humiliation, through the rise of the Jewish courtiers.^{64a} It is also instructive that Jewish authors felt most

⁶⁰ 266/285.

⁶¹ 269/292.

⁶² *Ihāṭa*, p. 266 and *al-Bayān: wa-ḍālika anna hādā-l-la'īn ṭalaba an yuqīma li-l-yahūd daula* (This accursed one sought to establish a government for the Jews.) The undesirable recent elevation of the Jews — *Memoirs* 273/300 Betrayal 267/287.

⁶³ *Ib.* 269 f. Strangely Pérès speaks of a real conversion to Judaism.

⁶⁴ Ibn Iḍārī, *al-Bayān al-Mughrib* III, p. 264.

^{64a} Maqqarī, *Analectes*, II 351. The tender quality (*riqqa*) of a poet's (Ibn Sahl) verse is explained thus: there were combined in him the humility of the lover and the humiliation of the Jew (*ijtima'a fihī ḍullāni, ḍullu-l-'ishqi*

bitter on this point. In the 12th century Yehuda HaLevi wrote in defense of the *dīn ḡalīl*, the humbled faith; Abraham b. Daud writes on the exalted faith (opposite of humbled).⁶⁵ Maimonides writes:⁶⁶ "And you, my brethren, know that on account of our many sins, God hurled us amidst 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 when David, King of Israel, was shown in an inspired vision all the tribulations which were to overwhelm Israel, he 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 calumnies which are beyond human endurance. As the prophet says (Psalm XXXVIII, 14): 'But I am as a deaf man, I hear not; and I am as a dumb man, that openeth not his mouth' " . . .

wa-ḡullu-l-yahūdīyati). For the poet, Ibn Sahl (13th century), cf. Nykl *Poetry*, p. 344, where *ḡull* is translated *submissiveness*.

⁶⁵ Cf. Bacher, *Der arab. Titel d. religionsphil. Werkes Abr. b. Dauds*, in *ZDMG* 42.

⁶⁶ Epistle to Yemen, ms. B. M., f. 124a; Hebrew ed. Holub, p. 49.