

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

The canonicity of the Epistle is entirely independent of the question of authorship. It depends on canonical *function*. That the Epistle performs an important function in the organism of New Testament literature is self-evident, if the views presented in the foregoing pages as to its character and aim be correct.

A. B. BRUCE.

JEWISH CONTROVERSY AND THE "PUGIO
FIDEI."

(Conclusion.)

WE now come to the accusation against the *Pugio*, which Dr. Schiller-Szinessy divides methodically into three classes.

I. *Six proofs of forgeries pure and simple.*

1. The Midrash of R. Moses quoted in the *Pugio* (p. 354) is here composed of two different Midrashic pieces. In the first, as Dr. Schiller-Szinessy rightly points out, there is an even better reading in the *Pugio* than in our editions. The editions have Jeremiah xxx. 21, whilst the *Pugio* gives 22 as well; hence it is pronounced a forgery. Why so? Do we not find that scribes abridge quotations and others write them in full? The following passage in the *Pugio*, is fathered, according to Dr. Schiller-Szinessy, on R. Huna, who said it in the name of R. Iddi; but if it is so, Herr Epstein rightly observes that the author of the *Pugio* must have been an eminent Talmudic scholar, as he knew of these two names, which are seldom found together. Indeed, Dr. Schiller-Szinessy has misunderstood altogether the words of R. Huna; for the latter does not apply *geber* (Jer. xxxi. 22) to the Messiah, but *hadashim* as in the following passage of Psalm ii. 7: *This day I have begotten thee*, found in the Midrash Tillim. There the creation of the Messiah is called

a new creation, as is the case in R. Moses had-Darshan's passage. Thus the following, from Judges v. 8, "Elegit Deus nova" (A.V., *They chose new gods*), refers also to the Messiah. Moses put together two Midrashic passages for his purpose, like other later Midrashic authors,¹ and Martini also had a right to do the same, without being on that account a forger. Moses does not apply the passage of Jeremiah to the Virgin, but Martini does, and makes no mystery of it that it is his own interpretation.² The sneer of Dr. Schiller-Sziessy at Martini, because he did not know how to translate the words *אז לחם שערים* (Jud. v. 8), is somewhat out of place, since all commentators and exegetes are in the same case.

2. P. 397. The passage about the ten kings. In the Targum and *Pirqe* of R. Eliezer the ninth king is the Messiah and the tenth is God; in the Midrash of the *Pugio*, quoted in the name of R. Moses had-Darshan, the ninth king is Vespasian, and the tenth is the Messiah, identified with God Himself. "But," says Dr. Schiller-Sziessy, "such cannot be true when fathered on old Jewish tradition." Still, as Herr Epstein points out, the Midrash of the ten kings, edited from a Parma MS.,³ mentions Vespasian, and thus the Messiah must be the tenth king. Why should R. Moses not have had a similar text as the MS. of Parma? We mention, by the way, that Dr. Schiller-Sziessy's argument to the effect that from 1 Corinthians xv. 28 we may conclude that the

¹ Dr. N. Brüll's *Jahrbücher für jüdische Geschichte und Literatur*, viii. (1887), p. 124 *seqq.*

² This passage is already mentioned in *Controversies of the Twelfth Century* (see p. 94).

³ *Bibliotheca Haggadica*, ed. by Chajim M. Horowitz. Frankfurt am Main, 1881; i. pp. 38-55. The word *התשעי* (p. 55) ought to be *העשירי*: since Alexander is the eighth king, Vespasian the ninth, the last, the Messiah, must be the tenth king. Curiously enough, this Midrash ends with the following words: *וקמי אלפים שנה יתקבצו דרין שנאמר יחיינו מיומים ביום השלישי יקימו* (comp. *Pugio*, p. 877).

Midrash on the ten kings was already known in the middle of the first century A.D., is rather arbitrary.

3. P. 421. Martini translates תלמוד לומר by *docet docendum*, rightly, although not elegantly, and he does not give it as an interrogation. To say that the passage is a shameful concoction is rather hasty, since we do not possess the Midrash of Moses had-Darshan, to whom Dr. Schiller-Szinessy attributes an enlightened mind, without having the opportunity of reading his writings. We confess that it is indeed strange that *Yhvh* should be the name of the Messiah; but Moses of Narbonne is, to judge from the fragments of his Midrash, sometimes astonishingly strange. Still he is certainly not more strange than the *Zohar*, which Dr. Schiller-Szinessy considers genuine. In late *Midrashim* it is indeed mentioned that the Messiah is called *Yhvh*.¹

4. P. 759. Concerning the Redeemer having no father, with reference to the Midrash on Lamentations v. 2, Dr. Schiller-Szinessy says the chief force of the passage consists in the omission of the וְאִמּוֹ, "and mother," and that *goel*, redeemer, is applied to the Messiah. Well, Abrabanel had also the reading of this Midrash without וְאִמּוֹ, and *goel* is applied in the earliest Midrash to the Messiah.

5. P. 866. By Siphre Martini means *Thorath Kohanim* or the *Siphro*² (comp. p. 732). Dr. Schiller-Szinessy says of this passage, "Up to a certain point it certainly is to be found in *Siphro*." He admits also that there are variations in the quotation of it by various authors. Why then should Martini not have had an annotated copy, containing the variations he gives? Does Dr. Schiller-Szinessy forget that there was a *Siphro of another kind*?³ Why could Martini not have had this before him? Surely Martini

¹ See. A. Epstein in the *Beth Talmud*, V. pp. 160 and 212.

² Or *Siphra*.

³ ספרא של פנים אחרים.

wrote for the Jews, and he knew well that they would detect his forgery if it were not found in their books. Besides, the substance of this passage is to be found in other books, from which Martini could have taken it without forging. *Pugio*, p. 535; *Pesiqtha Rabbathi*, 37; comp. also *Zohar*, § ויקרה. Besides, according to Herr Epstein, Lorca has the same passage from the *Siphra*. Don Vidal Ferrer in his reply does not contest the authenticity of it, as he does in many other instances.¹

6. P. 877. Here Martini quotes a Midrash with an additional passage, saying, *Hucusque glossa*. On this Dr. Schiller-Szinessy says: "The *Hucusque glossa* is doubly untrue, for in lieu of the genuine piece a substitution is made." That is illogical. If Martini had intended to forge, he would not have said it was a gloss; it is because he found in his copy a gloss that he says so. How many glosses have entered into our present editions and MSS. of the Midrashim?

II. *Six proofs of the ignorance of the translators pure and simple.*

Of 1, I have disposed elsewhere.² 2 and 4 are excused by Dr. Schiller-Szinessy himself, since Jewish scholars have made the same blunder. 3. Martini translates בשרי (Hos. ix. 12) by *incarnatio mea*, whilst every child, says Dr. Schiller-Szinessy, acquainted with Hebrew knows that it means "When I depart from them." Martini had certainly the Vulgate at his disposal, where he found and gave the right translation *in recessu meo* (p. 697). But for his purpose he took the word as בשרי, "my flesh" (so it is rendered by LXX. and Theodotion), to which Dr. Schiller-Szinessy would not have objected if he had found it in a Midrash with the introductory words, אל תקרי, "do not read so, but so."³

¹ See p. 193.

² *The Academy*, September 17, 1887.

³ It was taken, for controversial purpose, in the same meaning in the eleventh

4 b. P. 859. Martini translates his passage as he found it in his MS. That two words were transposed in it did not concern him, for notwithstanding the nonsense thereby produced, like an orthodox Jew, he does not admit any scribes' blunders in holy books.

5. P. 861 is a mistake; but perhaps Martini had לבשרן in his text. Besides, there were no Buxtorf's, no Levy's Dictionary as yet. The same is the case with 6, where Martini found פה, and translated accordingly. We admit that he was not critical; but for all that he was neither an ignoramus nor a forger. How many *responsa* have been written by rabbis on difficult passages which could have been settled if they had had the right reading?

III. Six proofs of forgeries and ignorance combined.

1. P. 277. Martini mentions the reading כארו (Ps. xxii. 17), for כארי, as a Massoretic gloss, rubricated under the § of תקון סופרים, and reported from the Midrash of R. Moses had-Darshan. Now it is true that in the Massoretic rubric in our editions כארו is not to be found. But where is the proof that Moses had-Darshan did not give it? We know that he reported variations in the Pentateuch¹ of which we otherwise know nothing; why then should he not have variations in this Massoretic §? At all events there is a Massoretic gloss on כארי which is not quite clear, and early translators read accordingly. What Dr.

century, or even before. Judah Hadassi (see p. 95) says, in the expurgated § 102, the following: טענו וברו מלבם השלוחים חכמיך ותעו והטעו לעממיך. והפכו דברי אלהים חיים מתורתך ומסרו להם נאם יי לאדני לאדוני כי נם אוי להם בשרי מהם לחזק כי האלהים לבש בשר (according to the Oxford MS., *Catalogue*, No. 2371).

¹ See Herr A. Epstein's article in the *Monatsschrift für Gesch. u. Wiss. der Judenthums*, 1885, p. 295. Lorca (see p. 192) has also כארו סופרים, according to Herr Epstein's information. It is clear from Azariah de Rossi (*Ma'or Eini*), chap. 15) that the תקון סופרים varied in different authors. See also A. Geiger, *Urschrift* (Breslau, 1858), p. 309 *seqq.* Martini quotes from Ben Ascher's דקרוק, which varies in the MSS. (see the edition by Baer and Strack, Leipzig, 1879).

Schiller-Sziessy means by reproaching Martini for translating כָּאָרוּ by *foderunt*, which means "digging," as well as piercing, we cannot understand. On this particular point Solomon ben Adret refutes a controversialist who adduces a proof from the Massoretic rule. The controversialist is no other than Martini, which is in direct contradiction with Dr. Schiller-Sziessy's statement that Solomon, out of orthodoxy, would not keep a heretical work like the *Pugio* in his house. We may draw the attention of Dr. Schiller-Sziessy to the passages quoted by Dr. Graetz,¹ which will, we believe, convince him that Solomon ben Adret knew something of Martini. Why should Solomon be more orthodox than the Mishnah, in which it is expressly prescribed that the Jew should know what to answer to the *Epicuros* (or heretic), and therefore should be obliged to read heretical books. If Solomon did not know Latin, he could find some one who did. As to a connexion of Martini with Fray Pablo, on which account Solomon would have objected to have the *Pugio* in his house, we have proved that there could have been none so far as regards the composition of the *Pugio*.²

2. P. 563. Here Dr. Schiller-Sziessy exclaims: "Here is a passage which testifies no less to the incapacity than to the audacity of the forger. Can anybody who is in the least acquainted with rabbinical literature believe that any rabbi would teach so monstrous a piece of nonsense, ay, of idolatry, as is here attributed to R. Mosheh Hadarshan, that the Lord should have commanded the angels to worship the first man?" We quite agree with Dr. Schiller-Sziessy about the nonsense; but what can we do? We find the same in the Prague MS., with only slight variations.³

¹ *Op. cit.*, vii. p. 164 *seq.*, and Dr. Perles in his monograph *R. Salomo b. Abraham b. Adereth, etc.*, Breslau, 1863, p. 75, and the Hebrew part.

² See p. 103.

³ אדם הראשון יום שנתמכצה דעתו אלו אמר הב"ה למלאכי השרת בואו

3. P. 657. The Messiah is called "peace," as mentioned in the Midrash on Lamentations, according to Martini. Dr. Schiller-Szinessy is again right in saying that it is not to be found in our editions and even in MSS. ; but it is found in one of the small treatises printed with the Talmud called *Pereq hash-Shalom*. We cannot discuss here the age of this treatise, which Dr. Schiller-Szinessy supposes to have been composed at the end of the thirteenth century, and consequently to be contemporary with Martini, and to have been written perhaps by a convert! This must be left for another occasion, since it does not interfere one way or another with our argument.¹ Dr. Schiller-Szinessy says: "But one might ask, Why did the author of the *Pugio Fidei* quote a passage from a book where it is not to be found, when he could have quoted it from a book where it is to be found? To this we give the following answer. In the first place, because of the high antiquity and authority of the *Ekha rabbathi*, between the composition of which and that of *Pereq Hasshalom*, many centuries elapsed." This, of course, will have first to be proved. But what is astonishing is, that while Dr. Schiller-Szinessy charges the author of the *Pugio* with ignorance, he yet gives him credit for knowing that the Midrash on Lamentations is of such a high antiquity, a knowledge which has only been acquired by modern criticism. In Martini's time the Jews saw no difference of age between one Midrash and another. It would be much more reasonable to say that Martini found the passage in question in the Midrash on Lamentations,

. . והשתחו לו באו מלאכי השרת לרצונו של הב"ה השטן . . The introductory words in Martini, "Says Joshua ben Nun," are usually employed by Eldad the Danite, whose legends came to Kairowan, and from hence to Narbonne.

We may merely mention, on the authority of Herr A. Epstein, that Nahmani quotes the passage in question from an old source. He says in his *ואמרו ר' יוסי הגלילי אומר אף שמו של* : MS.) , chap. 2, the following : *כשיח נקרא שלום שנאמר אבי עד שר שלום*. Besides, the Targum on Isaiah ix. 5 has already "the Messiah of peace."

where a copyist might have introduced it, as is often the case. Or the *Pereq hash-Shalom* might have been irregularly bound together with the Midrash on Lamentations, as is also the case sometimes in MSS.

6. P. 852. The word רַאֵשׁ is omitted, but given in the margin, probably from a MS. Why is it then a shameless forgery? As to ignorance in this passage, Martini errs with Jewish scholars, and to his application to the crucifixion he has as much right as any other writer who might explain it with a view to his particular purpose. I should say that the *Zohar*, which is authentic in the eyes of Dr. Schiller-Szinessy is no better than Martini.

IV. *Proof of the irreverence of the forger.*

P. 419. Dr. Schiller-Szinessy objects to Moses had-Darshan introducing the Messiah as "loving the daughters of Israel"; so do we; but what can be done? it is the same in the Prague MS. Must this MS. become a forgery too?¹

We now come to the last point, that about the name of R. Rahmon, whose glosses are given in the *Pugio*. Dr. Schiller-Szinessy is not the first to be puzzled by this strange name. The late Dr. Zunz, who according to Dr. Schiller-Szinessy did not read the *Pugio*, has a more complete list of the Rahmon quotations than himself. Dr. Zunz suggested, and we believe rightly, that the word Rahmon is a Hebrew translation of the Aramaic רַחוּמַי, the name of an author who was in vogue with the Kabbalists of Catalonia in the thirteenth century. Azriel, the master of Nahmani, is the author of the *Bahir*,² and he often quotes רַחוּמַי; so does the *Zohar*, the author of which was a contemporary of Martini. In the margins of the MSS. which the Jews had to give up to Martini, the glosses of a Rahmon might

¹ ובתוך אפריון משיח בן דוד שהוא אוהב בנות ישראל שנאמר תוכן רצוף אהבה מבנות ירושלים. The Prague MS. has the passage on Gen. ii. 1, and the *Pugio* on Gen. ii. 9. Is this an argument for forgery, or for the use of two different texts.

² See *Israelitische Letterbode* (Amsterdam), vol. iii. p. 20, and above, p. 97.

thus have been found. These glosses are really of so little importance for Martini's purposes, that he would not have cared to invent them if they had not been there.¹ And had Martini intended to forge, surely he would have named a better known author, or not have given them at all as glosses. Dr. Schiller-Szinessy concludes dramatically: "This enigmatic Rachmon is no rabbi, but is none less than Rahmon, *i.e.* Ramon or Raymond, in full; Raymundus Martin himself, the supposed author of the *Pugio Fidei* in its totality! What would Zunz and Pusey, if they were here, say to this extraordinary *dénouement*!" We suppose that they would be as much amused by the joke as we are. On the one hand Ramon would be transcribed רמון, as in Nahmani's contemporary disputation, a word by the way which is genuinely Hebrew. If רמון is purposely given as רהמון, the latter name must have been of some notoriety, and if so, Dr. Zunz was right in comparing it with רהומאי.² On the other hand, if the rogue and buffoon Pablo had been the author of the *Pugio*, we could understand how for the sake of a joke or of flattery, Martini might appear as Rahmon; but Pablo is now out of the question, and it is Martini who must

¹ It is true that the quotations from Rahmon on pp. 854 and 928 of the *Pugio* are strikingly adapted for Christian purposes. But is it not the same with the passage on p. 538, quoted by Dr. Driver in *THE EXPOSITOR*, 1887, p. 267, note 1, which Dr. Schiller-Szinessy does not contest, probably because the substance of it is also to be found in the Midrash on Samuel, chap. 16? And how about the passage on p. 851, where the following words of the printed *Midrash rabbah* are quoted: "And Abraham took the wood of the burnt-offering and laid it upon Isaac his son" (Gen. xxii. 6), "like him who carried his cross on his shoulder"? Has Martini not a right to apply it to Jesus, although the Midrash does not mean it? If, by chance, the *Midrash rabbah* had been lost like that of R. Moses, Dr. Schiller-Szinessy would no doubt have proclaimed this passage as a forgery! Why, Dr. Schiller-Szinessy himself applies the passage in Isaiah liii. 8, "And with the rich in His death," to Joseph of Arimathea, of which no Jewish commentator ever dreamt, and which is even rejected by most of the Christian interpreters!

² See also *Beiträge zur jüdischen Alterthumskunde*, von A. Epstein, Wien, 1887; i. p. 110, note 2.

have invented the form Raḥmon, *i.e.* his own name. This is another *dénouement*.

No doubt Dr. Schiller-Sziinessy's article on the *Pugio* would have done great service to the critical study of the book, had he not employed such animated language against Pablo Christiani,—who certainly was a fanatic, but nevertheless not a rogue and a buffoon,—as well as against Martini, whom he accuses of ignorance. It would be going too far to say with Dr. Graetz that Martini understood Hebrew better than St. Jerome; but he must have known the language, having been one of the eight Dominican brothers who went to study Arabic, Hebrew, and Chaldee in the new school of Oriental languages instituted by Raymundus de Peñaforte. Peter Marsilio (who wrote at the end of the thirteenth century) said of him:¹ “Erat frater iste dignus memoria fr. Raymundus Martini persona multum dotata, clericus multum sufficiens in Latino, philosophus in arabico, magnus rabinus et magister in hebraico, et in lingua chaldaica multum doctus, qui de Sobiratis oriundus nedum regi, verum S. Ludovico regi francorum et illi bono regi Tunicensi carissimus et familiarissimus habebatur [qui talentum sue scientie non abscondens duo opera fecit ad convincendam perfidiam Judeorom, in quibus excellenter relucet sua sapientia. Fecit et diversa opera contra sectum Sarracenorum, eloquentia plena et veritate fundata, ut merito corpore mortuus, deo vivus ejus memoria non deficiat . . .]”² Most probably converted Jews were the teachers of Hebrew and Chaldee, and Pablo may have been one of them long before 1263. Martini made perhaps a dozen errors in the course of some hundred quotations, and on this account is charged with ignorance. If that however is to be the rule of judgment, very few scholars will be left for Oriental

¹ See *Die Entstehung der Universitäten des Mittelalters bis 1400*. Von P. Henrich Denifle, p. 496, note 1104.

² The words in [] were communicated to us by Pater Denifle.

philology at all. Unfortunately the Midrash of Moses had-Darshan is at present lost, and we cannot compare all Martini's quotations, but we have seen that where we have the means of confronting him with the remains of this Midrash he stands blameless. It is curious that most of his forgeries are reported to have been in this Midrash. Why did he forge on this and not elsewhere? Did he by chance know that this Midrash would be inaccessible to the Jews of the future in consequence of its loss? We have already mentioned the absurdity of forging his name under the disguise of Rahmon. As a matter of fact, Martini was neither ignorant nor critical, but he knew Hebrew and Rabbinical literature, and made a curious selection of the latter, for which alone he deserves the name of a learned man. The collection was made by him and not by Pablo who died four years before it was made. In order to judge Martini impartially, MSS. of the *Pugio* ought first to be examined;¹ only so shall we ascertain whether he is correctly given in print, and possibly by this process the dozen not very grave errors alleged against him would melt into nothing. Perhaps the article promised by Father Denifle on the newly discovered book of Martini will throw some light on the *Pugio* also.² Anyhow, the late Drs. Pusey and Zunz do not merit the reproaches of Dr. Schiller-Szinessy for not having read the *Pugio*, for as he himself will confess, he has judged the *Pugio* without having taken notice of what his predecessors have said. And why did a scholar, who blames his pupils for not following the Mishnah, transgress the Talmudic saying, "Do not reply to a lion after his death"?

¹ Through the courtesy of Pater Denifle, we are informed that there are MSS. of the *Pugio* in the libraries of Sevilla, the Escorial, Barcelona, and Toulouse. There is also one in Paris.

² Pater Denifle has had the goodness to inform me that this work of Martini is directed more against the Saracenes (Arabs) than against the Jews. Martini shows in it a remarkable acquaintance with Arabic writings. This work, as well as the *Capistrum*, were composed before the *Pugio*.

Soon after Martini (about 1336), another apostate with the name of Abner¹ or Alfonso of Valladolid, originated a disputation in that town, in which he naturally remained victorious. Abner composed a treatise against the Agadah with the title of *Teacher of Justice*,² which is only known by quotations, and two other works in Spanish with the title of *La Concordia de las Leyes*, and *Libro de las Gracias*. He also composed a refutation of Jacob ben Reuben's *Wars of God*,³ which he translated into Spanish by the wish of the Infanta Blanca. In it is mentioned a "History of Jesus,"⁴ composed in the Jerusalem dialect (Aramaic). This is possibly identical with a fragment of a MS. found in the Imperial Library of St. Petersburg. He also composed treatises in favour of astrology and fatalism, which, he says, were the occasion of his conversion, as well as some letters against the Jews.

Nicolaus de Lyra, author of the *Postils*, composed also a controversial treatise in 1309 with the title of "De Messia, ejusque adventu, una cum responsione ad Judæorum argumenta quatuordecim contra veritatem Evangeliorum." Nicolaus is treated by the Spaniard Hayyim ben Musa, of whom we shall speak later on, as a Jew by birth, but it appears without doubt, from various passages of his book, that he was born a Christian, more especially as he says that he knew only a little Hebrew.

The sources of the accusations brought against the Jews, and of the defence they made, are now exhausted. Every possible Biblical passage was collected by Joseph Kimhi, Jacob ben Reuben, and Meir of Narbonne; Nicolaus of Paris and Paulus of Montpellier brought forward all the blasphemies which, according to them, are contained in the Talmud and the Prayer-Book; and Raymundus Martini called to his assistance the Midrashim, old and new, as

¹ He is called jokingly אב חשך "father of darkness."

² מורה צדק

³ See p. 91.

⁴ See p. 81, note 2.

well as the Targum and the commentators. The following disputations, official or unofficial, contain no new matter; there is only a change in the names of the adversaries, of the localities and of the titles of their productions. Some of the defences are more philosophical than others: that is all the difference between them. We shall therefore speak of them briefly, as they have been already mentioned above. The convert John of Valladolid, author of a work with the title of *Concordia legum*, held a disputation at Burgos, and later at Avila in 1375, where the Jewish opponent is called Moses Kohen of Tordesillas. His answers are incorporated in a work entitled "The Help of Faith."¹ He has at the end a chapter against Alfonso (Abner).

About 1380 Shem-Tob ben Shaprut composed at Taragona an enlarged edition of Jacob ben Reuben's controversial work, with additional passages on the Agadah, and answers to Alfonso de Valladolid's book, as well as to Pedro di Luna, afterwards Pope Benedict XIII. It is divided into fifteen parts, and bears the title *The Tried Stone*.² The controversy is carried on between the Trinitarian and the Unitarian.³ Neither Moses nor Shem-Tob mention Martini, and they do not refer to the Midrashic passages in the *Pugio*.

The grammarian and mathematician, Profeit Duran (Isaac Levi), of Perpignan, who was forced to become a convert and to remain a Christian for a short time, wrote after 1391 a controversial treatise under the title of *Shame of the Nations*,⁴ and a satire in verse against some converts, which was commented on by Joseph Shem-Tob. About the same time the philosopher Hasdai Crescas of Saragossa wrote a controversial book in Spanish, of which only the Hebrew translation exists, by Joseph ben Shem Tob.⁵

¹ עזר האמונה (in MS.). The controversy is carried on between the הממיר the convert, and המאמיר the speaker. ² אבן בחן (in MS.).

³ המשלש and המסחר.

⁴ כלימת הנונים

⁵ See p. 194.

After the horrible massacre of 1399 in Prague, Lipman (Yom Tob) of Mühlhausen, rabbi at Prague, composed his controversial treatise¹ against the apostate Pesah, whose Christian name was Peter. Lipman was remarkable for his time as a German Jew, who had read the New Testament in Latin.

We shall only mention the name of the ambitious Rabbi Solomon of Burgos, called as a Christian, Paulus de Santa Maria (about 1400), who wrote additions to the *postils* of Nicolaus of Lyra, in order to oppose even the study of the rabbinical commentary of Rashi, recommended by Nicolaus.

In 1412, after the terrible massacre of the Jews in Spain, which produced wholesale conversions, the Pope Benedict XIII. (Pedro di Luna) ordered a disputation to be held at Tortosa, which was chiefly conducted by the convert Joshua Lorki (Lorca), called as a Christian Geronimo de Santa Fé. He mostly made use of Martini's *Pugio Fidei*, in order to prove from Jewish writings the Christian dogmas, and repeated the accusations brought against the Talmud as being a blasphemous book. Amongst the Jewish rabbis who had to attend the meetings, which lasted over a year (February, 1413, to November, 1414), was the famous Joseph Albo, author of the philosophico-theological book, called *Iqqarim* (or "roots"). The defence was the same as on previous occasions, viz. most of the rabbis rejected the authority of the Agadah. Victory remained with force, and bulls and restrictive laws were revived not only against the Jews, but even against the Marranos, or converted Jews, who were suspected, and not without cause, of clinging in their hearts to the old faith. An increase of polemical literature was one of the results of this disputation also; Geronimo composed two works under the title of (1) *Tractatus contra perfidiam Judæ-*

¹ ד' הַנְּצַחֵן, to be distinguished from an older treatise with the same title. Both are to be found in Wagenseil's *Tela ignea Satanae*.

orum et contra Talmud; and (2) *Hebræomastix*, which contains the agadic passages in favour of Christianity. This exists also in Hebrew (probably written by Geronimo himself in Hebrew), as we are informed by our friend Herr A. Epstein, who possesses a MS. of it, probably unique. Its chief importance is for the criticism of the *Pugio Fidei*, of which Geronimo made free use, and more especially for the additional passages which are to be found there from the Midrash of R. Moses of Narbonne. It is however doubtful whether Geronimo had a copy of this Midrash. The Hebrew title of it is *Sepher hap-Piqoorim*,¹ "Book of Apostasy"; and it was against this Don Isaac Abrabanel² wrote a refutation, and not against the *Hebræomastix*, as we believed formerly. It was Don Vidal (Ferrer) who wrote against the latter, naming his book *Qodesh haq-Qodashim*.³

Many poems were also written at this time with a polemical tendency, but of rather a personal character. The following compositions are worth mentioning. Joseph Albo, whom we have already noticed, wrote in Spanish an account of his controversy with a great dignitary of the Church. Don David Nasi, teacher and friend of Bishop Francisco Bentivoglio, published a treatise, in which he proves from the New Testament the truth of Judaism and the inconsistent character of Christianity.⁴ The author of the first biblical concordance, Isaac ben Qalonymos of the family of Nathan (Bongodas) composed two polemical treatises,⁵ and probably in order to make the Old Testament more accessible to Jews as well as Christians, both of whom naturally needed such a work for controversial purposes, decided upon the composition of his concordance. Isaac Nathan, as well as Joseph ben Shem-Tob, had frequent

¹ ס' הפקורים

² See p. 194.

³ קדש הקדשים, in manuscript.

⁴ הוראת בעל דין, Frankfurt à M., 1866.

⁵ מבצר יצחק and תוכחת מטה, both lost at present.

intercourse with Christian notabilities, and were obliged to discuss religious matters. Joseph wrote a philosophical commentary on Profet Duran's satirical poem against converts,¹ in which he gives his own short disputation (p. 9), with a learned Christian against the doctrine of the Trinity as a hypostasis of the Divine attributes. He refutes also the Christian application of Plato's theory of ideas by Occam and by Raymundus Lull in his *Philosophia nova*. He translated also Ḥasdai Cresca's Spanish controversy into Hebrew.

Ḥayyim ben Musa, of Bejar, was another polemical author, who deserves to be better known than he is. He chiefly refutes Nicolaus de Lyra in his work called *Shield and Sword*.² He gives the following advice to Jews who have to undertake religious controversy. They should keep always to the literal meaning of Scripture, and reject allegory, which latter is the Christian motto. They should not accept the Aramaic and Greek translations, which put weapons into the hands of the Christian controversialists. Finally, they should declare plainly that the Agadah has no authority in religious matters. Indeed, if these judicious rules are adhered to, no controversy is possible. The two Durans (Simeon and his son Solomon) at Algiers (both refugees from Spain) were the last authors of the Spanish school, unless we include in that school Don Isaac Abrabanel, who came from Portugal. Simeon's theological work, *Bow and Shield*,³ has chapters on Christianity and Islam, where he takes up the defence of the Thorah against the objections of these two daughters of Judaism. He was very well versed in the New Testament writings, which he read in Latin or perhaps in the Hebrew translation of Shem-Tob ben Shaprut. Solomon Duran wrote a refutation

¹ אגרת אל תהי כאבותיך, Constantinople, 1570.

² מגן ורמח, MS. See Dr. Graetz, *Op. cit.*, viii. p. 430.

³ קשת ומגן, Livorno, 1785.

against Geronimo Santa Fé's attack on the Talmud.¹ So did Don Isaac Abrabanel against Geronimo's *Hebræomastix* in Hebrew.²

Isaac Polgar and Joseph Shallum³ composed Refutations against Abner's⁴ polemical writings.

There were now no longer any Jews in Spain, Portugal, or France, who could be driven into controversy. The Inquisition had other methods to employ against the unhappy Marranos than peaceful polemics. Torquemada and his allies had no desire to increase controversial literature. The chief centre of the Jews was now in the Turkish provinces, where no controversy could be provoked by the Christians, in Poland, Austria, and Germany. Here it is true a convert of the name of Joseph Pfefferkorn, which he changed to Johannes on becoming a Christian, revived with the help of the Dominicans (about 1505), the old accusations against the Talmud and rabbinical writings, on behalf of which Reuchlin undertook a defence. No Jew was directly mixed up in this matter, and no disputation was arranged to take place; the controversy was confined to the Christians, and was conducted in Latin and in German.⁵

In Italy, where no early controversy is mentioned, we find in the fifteenth century a controversial treatise by Elijah Hayyim of Genzanno against the Minorite Francesco; in the sixteenth century by Abraham Ferrussol of Avignon at Ferrara, Jair ben Sabbetai of Corregio, Leo of Modena, Solomon ben Moses ben Jekuthiel, and in the eighteenth century by Joshua Segre, and some other minor treatises.⁶

¹ Printed as an appendix to his father's work.

² *ישועות משיחו*, Carlsruhe, 1820.

³ MS. De Rossi, 533.

⁴ See p. 190.

⁵ Dr. Graetz, *Op. cit.*, ix. p. 73, *seqq.*

⁶ See our Catalogue of the Hebrew MSS. in the Bodleian Library, 1886, s. v. *ויכוח* (second index).

In Poland there was, in 1572, some friendly controversy between the Unitarians and two Rabbis which produced a couple of books: (1) one by Jacob of Belziç, which is known from quotations; and (2) another¹ by the Karaite Isaac, son of Abraham Troki (of Trok near Wilna, composed about 1593). There is not much that is new here, all arguments against Christianity from the Old and New Testament being found in previous controversial books composed in Spain and mentioned above. But the Hebrew style of this book is more elegant, and it is written with more method than the older books of the kind. It had great success, so that it was translated into Latin, German, French and Spanish. It was admired by Voltaire, who says of the author:² *Il a rassemblé sous cent propositions toutes les difficultés que les incrédules ont prodiguées depuis. . . . Enfin les incrédules les plus déterminés n'ont presque rien allégué qui ne soit dans ce rempart de la foi du rabin Isaac*"; and Louis Duke of Orléans (died 1792), not being satisfied with the answer by Gousset, began more than one refutation of it, which however were left unfinished. With Isaac's book the important controversial literature in Hebrew ends.

Amongst the Marranos who took refuge in Holland we find some works in Spanish, by Orobio de Castro, under the title of *Prevensiones divinas contra la vana Idolatria de las gentes*, and *Tratado en qui se explica la prophesia de la 70 Semanas de Daniel*, 1675; by Saul Levy Mortera, in the book, with the title of *Providencia de Dios con Ysrael y verdad de la ley de Mosseh y Nullidad de las demas leyes*; by Elie Montalto, on the 53rd chapter of Isaiah; by Abraham Ger (Pelegrino?), under the title of *Fortaleza del Judaismo y confusion del estraño*, translated into Hebrew by Jacob Luzzatto; and by an anonymous author, the *Fuente clara*,

¹ Dr. Graetz, *Op. cit.*, ix. p. 490, *seqq.*

² De Rossi, *Bibl. Antichristiana*, p. 45.

printed in Hebrew characters. There is also a work in Italian, by Judah Briel, composed in the year 1702.¹

For 1800 years every word in the Bible has been turned and tortured for controversial purposes by Jews, Rabbinites and Karaites, as well as by Christians. The Talmuds and the Midrashim have been accused of being blasphemous, and of containing indecent matter, and have been several times condemned to be burned. There have been wholesale expulsions, massacres, and autodafés of the Jews in various parts of the world. Have those who tried in various ways to convert the Jews, succeeded in their task? No; for the Jews exist still, and are settled as peaceful and useful citizens in the lands from which they were once driven out. The drama is not yet finished; it still continues in some countries as a comedy under the name of anti-Semitism, and among the ringleaders are high dignitaries of the Church, whom we expect to preach the peace of religion, and semi-civilized, though eminent professors, whose duty is to educate as well as to teach. The fanaticism goes so far as to deny that Christians have received the Old Testament from the Jews,—to assert that Christians could dispense with it. The Jews, happily, have no longer to fear, even in barbarous and semi-barbarous countries, either wholesale massacre or expulsion. But they still suffer, and this is the last continuation of the controversies of the middle ages. The Talmud cannot now be burnt, it has been too often printed. But along with the rest of the rabbinical literature it is attacked by those who know the least about it, and who use expressions of vulgarity which we should not expect from men of the lowest class. For such writers the prophecy of Zephaniah (iii. 9), "For then will I turn to the peoples a pure language," is not yet accomplished.

A. NEUBAUER.

¹ See the preface of *The Fifty-third Chapter of Isaiah*, etc., Oxford, 1877, and our Catalogue of Hebrew MSS. in the Bodleian, 1886.