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CHAPTER 8

Polemical Transfers: Iberian Muslim Polemics and Their Impact in Northern Europe in the Seventeenth Century

Gerard A. Wiegers

Introduction

Between 1609 and 1614 the young Dutch scholar of Oriental languages, Thomas Erpenius (1584–1624), paid educational visits to various European countries. Having been awarded his master’s degree in the Liberal Arts (magister artium liberalium) in 1608 at the University of Leiden, at which he studied under such professors as Josephus Justus Scaliger (1540–1609), Erpenius’ plan was to make the acquaintance of important theologians and Oriental scholars. He began his visits by travelling to England to study with the Arabist William Bedwell (1563–1632). He then went to Paris, where he met the classicist Isaac Casaubon (1559–1614) and the French arabist Étienne Hubert (1576–1614). In Conflans, near Paris, he also unexpectedly met a learned Morisco, Ahmad b. Qasim al-Hajarī (1570–after 1640). In 1613 Erpenius would become the first scholar to

1 The research for the present essay has received funding from the European Research Council under the European Union’s Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007–2013) ERC Grant Agreement number 323316 CORPI project (Conversion, Overlapping Religiosities, Polemics, Interaction. Early Modern Iberia and Beyond), and the HERA funded project Encounters with the Orient in Early Modern European Scholarship (EOS) in which I participate as a principal investigator. I also wish to thank the staff and fellows of the Käte Hamburger Kolleg at the Ruhr University Bochum in whose midst I spent a fruitful time as research fellow in 2013–14. I am grateful to the anonymous reviewers and to Mercedes García-Arenal, Jessica Fowler and Rosemary Robson for their valuable comments.

2 Erpenius would make three journeys. During the first one he attempted to reach Constantinople but did not make it farther than Venice, see: Hans L. Jonge, ‘De Tractatus de Peregrinatione Gallica van de Arabist Thomas Erpenius (1584–1624)’, Leids Jaarboekje, 91 (1999): pp. 83–98. Erpenius would never travel to the Middle East, unlike his successor on the Leiden chair of Oriental languages, Jacobus Golius (1596–1667), on whom see further below.


4 He wrote to Casaubon that he had met ‘a certain Moroccan merchant’, viz. a common man, see Gerard A. Wiegers, A learned Muslim acquaintance of Erpenius and Golius: Ahmad b. Qasim al Andalusi and Arabic studies in The Netherlands (Leiden: Rijksuniversiteit, 1988), p. 48;
be appointed to the new chair of Oriental languages at Leiden University and in that capacity he won worldwide fame for his Arabic grammar.⁵ As I have shown elsewhere, al-Ḥajarī’s Arabic and Islamic learning proved to be vitally important to this Dutch scholar.⁶ He and Erpenius would have repeated meetings with each other between 1611 and 1613. During their encounters, al-Ḥajarī would share his knowledge of Arabic with Erpenius. In the summer of 1613, he even came to visit him in Leiden. Besides evidence of their co-operation discussed elsewhere, in that same summer Erpenius also read a grammatical commentary on Ibn Mālik’s *Alfiyya* with al-Ḥajarī. In a note on fol. 2r of an interleaved manuscript in his possession, Erpenius states that he had read it with his *amicus hispanus* (Spanish friend), Aḥmad b. Qāsim. His grammatical observations on the inter-leaved pages were the product of those meetings.⁷

However fruitful, their conversations were by no means limited to the study of Arabic grammar; religious polemics also occupied an important place in these discussions, as we shall see below.

---


⁵ Although he finished his work on the grammar in 1611, it was only printed in Leiden in 1613. The ambitious Erpenius had won the competition for the chair of Arabic, defeating a number of other students of Eastern languages in and around the university. On 8 and 9 May 1613, the Curators of the University stated in their records he was to become ‘professor of Oriental Languages, except the holy tongues Hebrew and Chaldaic’ (Juynboll, *Zeventiende-eeuwsche beoefenaars*, p. 74). On 9 November 1620, Erpenius was appointed professor of Hebrew as well.


⁷ Cambridge University Library, ms. Mm 6.23, fol. 2r. In the online catalogue of the Arabic manuscripts, Yasmin Farighi rightly notes the importance of this manuscript for the study of Arabic in Europe, see: <http://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/MS-MM-00006-00023/21> [accessed, 4 May 2015]. See on this manuscript also the discussion in Robert Jones, ‘Learning Arabic in Renaissance Europe (1505–1624)’, (PhD Diss., School of Oriental and African Studies, SOAS 1988), pp. 206–07.
Aḥmad b. Qāsim al-Ḥajarī

Al-Ḥajarī was a native of the Spanish village of Hornachos, whose Spanish Christian name was Diego Bejarano. He was a notable scholar and a serious student of classical Arabic (he had studied Arabic with the Granadan Morisco translator and physician Alonso del Castillo, himself a student of the Flemish arabist Nicolaes Cleynaerts (1495–1542). Al-Ḥajarī had fled Spain around 1599. When he met Erpenius in Conflans, he was serving as personal secretary and Spanish interpreter to the Moroccan sultan, Mawlāy Zaydān (r. 1608–27). Among his other accomplishments, al-Ḥajarī would translate several Spanish astronomical, military, and geographical works into Arabic. In 1637, he would also compose one of the most important polemical treatises ever written in Arabic by a Morisco, Kitāb nāṣir al-dīn ‘alā ‘l-qawm al-kāfirīn (The Supporter of Religion against the Infidel). In it, he extensively details his discussions with Christians and Jews during his travels in Spain, France and the Netherlands.

The goal of the present essay is not to focus in detail on this scholarly personal encounter, but to concentrate on the broader theme of the circulation of Iberian Muslim polemics in Northern Europe. In other words, I shall study the broader context of the meeting between these two scholars in the context of the religious, political, and scholarly interactions between Spain, the Muslim Mediterranean, and Northern Europe, in particular the Dutch Republic. Narrowing the field even more, I shall concentrate on the impact of a number of anti-Christian polemics, namely those by the Moriscos Muhammad Alguazir, the aforesaid Aḥmad b. Qāsim al-Ḥajarī, the anonymous Gospel of Barnabas, and the anti-Islamic polemic of the converted Mudejar faqīḥ (religious scholar) and imām of the Mudejar community of Xàtiva, whose Christian name was Juan Andrés.

My argument is that in the increasingly globalized early modern world these texts were not considered simply as sources of information about Islam and the Islamic world by European students of Islam, they also formed requisite tools in religious discussions between Jews, Christians, Muslims, and in the intra-Christian polemic, viz. among Christian denominations. The most important focus is on the circulations of these texts in transnational scholarly and religious networks. How did treaties between the Dutch Republic, Morocco, and the Ottoman Empire, allies in the struggle against Spain, influence the circulation of these texts? What was the interaction between religion and diplomacy and how did the circulation of texts across ‘mixed’, often overlapping, audiences (ambassadors, political authorities, scholars of Arabic and Islam) impact their reception and circulation? How were these polemical works utilized in a nascent ‘polemical public sphere’?
Public Space and Religious Diversity in Spain and the Dutch Republic

When Erpenius and al-Ḥajarī met, the Spanish Crown was in the process of expelling al-Ḥajarī’s co-religionists, the Moriscos, descendants of the Islamic minorities who had converted under duress more than a century earlier, the majority in the decades following the fall of Granada (1492). The process of banning the Moriscos, crypto-Muslims and sincere Christian converts alike from Spanish soil began in September 1609 with a public decree ordering the Moriscos of Valencia to leave for the coasts of North Africa. The Spanish decrees claimed that one of the reasons for ordering this expulsion was an alleged dangerous alliance between Moriscos, the Moroccan Sultan Zaydān, and the Dutch Republic. Although the authorities exaggerated the true dangers to the Spanish state in order to justify this highly controversial step, good relations between Moroccans and Dutch, allies in their struggle against Spain, unquestionably did exist. The Calvinist Netherlands had revolted against Habsburg Spain under William, Prince of Orange, and his successor Maurice. Although the Reformed Church achieved dominance, the Roman Catholics were not expelled. Instead, the country was pacified. In 1579 the Union of Utrecht was signed. Article Thirteen stipulated that every individual should be free to practise his own religion. In order to create a new relationship between the individual, state, and religion, a distinction was established between the private and public spheres. Roman Catholics, Jews, Lutherans, and other denominations such as the Anabaptists, were tolerated although their places of worship had to remain inconspicuous. Public space was the prerogative of the Reformed Church, the Republic was a Calvinist state.

In 1609 the Dutch Republic signed a truce with Spain that lasted twelve years. One year later, in 1610, a treaty of friendship was agreed with the Moroccan Sultan Mawlāy Zaydān and two years later, in 1612, with the Ottoman sultan. The driving motivation behind these diplomatic overtures was their

---


9 ‘dat een yder particulier in sijn Religie vrij sal moegen blijven ende dat men nyemant ter cause van de Religie sal moegen achterhaelen ofte ondersoucken’ (that everyone shall remain free in his Religion, and that no one shall be tried or investigated because of it); see Piet De Rooy, Openbaring en Openbaarheid (Amsterdam: Wereldbibliotheek, 2009), p. 12.
mutual war against Spain and, in both cases, Moriscos played instrumental roles. In the Ottoman Empire, Moriscos who had migrated to Istanbul via Amsterdam testified that the Protestant Dutch Republic was indeed markedly anti-Catholic and therefore a suitable partner with which to conclude a treaty.10 This is the context which explains why Erpenius called his Muslim acquaintance ‘his Spanish friend’.

All of these events also marked an important moment in the history of Habsburg Spain. The political decision of the Crown to agree a truce with the Netherlands created the situation that made the expulsion possible and initiated a political turnaround: in order to compensate for the ignominy of this concession to the Protestant heretics in the North, the Spanish Crown expelled the Moriscos in the South to prove a Roman Catholic victory against Islam.11 Also, this was the period in which the attention of the Spanish authorities shifted from the North and its Protestant heretics towards the (Muslim) southern shores of the Mediterranean and Spain’s own largely crypto-Muslim minority. Although the Expulsion of 1609 spelled the end of their existence in Spain for the Moriscos, the measure did not come as a bolt from the blue. Discussions about their assimilation or expulsion had been a constant topic for decades.

Bowing to increasing religious repression, some of the converted Muslims in Iberia had already begun migrating to Muslim territories as early as the end of the fifteenth century.12 By the end of the sixteenth and in the early seventeenth century, many Spanish and Portuguese Jews and Conversos would follow in their footsteps. Besides travelling to the Maghreb, the Ottoman Empire, and other parts of the Muslim world, many Conversos relocated from Spain to Portugal and from there to the Southern Netherlands and the Dutch Republic.13 Many of them would then return to Rabbinical Judaism, especially in cities in Holland, Amsterdam in particular.14

---

14 Yosef Kaplan, Judíos nuevos en Ámsterdam. Estudios sobre la historia social e intelectual del judaísmo sefardí en el siglo XVII (Barcelona: Gedisa, 1996); Kaplan, An Alternative Path to
Relations between the Netherlands and Morocco also facilitated the migration of Jews from Morocco to the Republic. A substantial number of the seventeenth-century Sephardic Jewish population of Amsterdam, about seven percent, came from a Moroccan background and many had family ties to Moroccan Jews.\textsuperscript{15} Examples of Jews with a Moroccan background include the Pallache family and Rabbi Isaac Uziel, all from Fez.\textsuperscript{16} The Jewish commercial networks in Spain, Portugal, the Mediterranean and beyond were particularly important to the economic development of the Republic, especially during the Twelve Years’ Truce with Spain.\textsuperscript{17}

**The Transnational Networks of the Iberian Muslims and Jews**

A number of recent studies have shown that, during the sixteenth century, transnational networks were utilized by Spanish Muslims to establish contact with various political, intellectual, and religious elites and indeed with state authorities in various parts of the Mediterranean and Northern Europe. The initiative for establishing these contacts seems to have originated among Morisco elites in such cities and villages as Granada, Hornachos and Pastrana.\textsuperscript{18} Repression and its political, military, and spiritual ramifications silenced almost any form of public debate. Islamic and Jewish religious texts had to be circulated clandestinely. Those who were found to possess them were punished severely. By this time, the public sphere, as it had existed during the


\textsuperscript{15} Bernfeld, \textit{Poverty}, p. 34.
\textsuperscript{17} Bodian, \textit{Hebrews}, p. 1.
Middle Ages, had almost entirely ceased to exist. Nevertheless, even in the teeth of growing repression and increasingly limited opportunities to discuss religious matters openly (some anti-Muslim polemics were even put on the index of prohibited books for fear that they might be used by Muslims to spread their faith), the crypto-Muslims of sixteenth-century Spain, the Moriscos, managed to preserve and circulate their religious heritage, including their polemical literature. Unquestionably, Muslim literary culture suffered from repression but, towards the end of the century, in spite of everything, a sort of revival seems to have occurred. Two pieces of evidence of this revival are what are known as the Parchment of the Granadan Turpiana Tower and the Lead Books of the Sacromonte in that city. The parchment was discovered in 1588 during the demolition of a tower, allegedly part of the ancient minaret of the great mosque, to make way for the building of the new cathedral which still stands there today. During the process, among the rubble workmen stumbled on a small chest. Inside the chest were some bones, part of a veil, and a parchment containing a prophecy about the end of time.

The prophecy (a forgery) was attributed to St John the Evangelist and predicted the ‘future’ Reformation, and the appearance of a Dragon, probably a reference to the Prophet Muḥammad. The prophecy itself was written in Spanish with a commentary in Arabic. The authorship of the prophecy was credited in a Latin sub-script to St John. The accompanying texts in Arabic and
Latin could allegedly be traced to a group of Christians who had lived in Granada in the first century. Among the group was a bishop called Cecilius whose name is mentioned on the parchment in Arabic script. The cloth was purported to have belonged to the Blessed Virgin who had used it to wipe away the tears of her son during the Passion. The bones were allegedly those of St Stephen.

In 1595, seven years after the discovery in the ancient tower, a series of lead tablets with Arabic and Latin texts were also found in caves in a hillock just outside Granada. These plaques were also accompanied by ashes and bones, allegedly the remains of other Christians who had been burned there as martyrs under the Roman emperor Nero. The texts, twenty-two books in varying sizes, all written on leaves of lead, contained prayers, acts of Jesus and the Apostles, and prophecies. They were said to have been written by two brothers from Arabia, Sāʾis al-Āya b. al-Raḍī (whose Latin name was Cecilius, the later bishop) and Tisʿūn b. ʿAṭṭār (Thesifon). A key objective of the Lead Books was to describe an alleged first-century Arabic-speaking Christian community in Spain which awaited the coming of a saviour who had all the characteristics of the Prophet Muḥammad (though without mentioning his name). The books cast doubt on Jesus' crucifixion and present him from an Islamic perspective. A particularly interesting aspect of the books is their prediction of a future council, a sort of majlis, to be held in Cyprus. During that council, to be presided over by a non-Arab king, the true religion was to be determined by a young man on the basis of his interpretation of the Lead Books. The predicted non-Arab king to whom the texts refer was probably the Ottoman sultan; hence the true religion would have been Islam. This is interesting for various reasons, among them the fact that throughout a large part of the sixteenth century Cyprus had been a Venetian possession. The island was the object of Ottoman campaigns in the sixties and had been finally conquered in 1570. These references to the Ottomans in the Lead Books are very intriguing, especially considering the long-standing Morisco-Ottoman relations in the late fifteenth and sixteenth century. They indicate a clear awareness of the Ottoman power among the Moriscos in Spain, a point I shall return to below. It


22 José Enrique López de Coca, 'Mamelucos, otomanos y caída del reino de Granada', En la España Medieval, 28 (2005): pp. 229–57; Tijana Krstić, 'The Elusive Intermediaries: Morisc-
is also important to note that difficulties in deciphering and translating the texts of the Parchment and the Lead Books led the Archbishop of Granada, Pedro Vaca de Castro y Quiñones (1534–1623), to seek the assistance of erudite scholars in Oriental languages from Spain and abroad. Among the Spanish humanists involved were such famous scholars as Benito Arias Montano (1527–98) and Pedro de Valencia (1555–1620), and also Eastern Christians, among them Marcos Dobelio. In 1623–24 Castro invited the aforementioned Dutch scholar Thomas Erpenius to travel to Granada to translate the Lead Books, but eventually nothing came of this plan.

These texts did not stand in isolation. At the beginning of the seventeenth century other polemical texts were produced. I shall discuss three of them in more detail on the basis of their influence in Northern Europe. The first work is a polemical text in Spanish written by a Morisco called Muḥammad Alguazir, which I have described and analyzed elsewhere. Alguazir was probably raised in Pastrana, an important Morisco intellectual centre. His work, as well as another by a converted priest, a certain Juan Alonso, were written in Spanish and became particularly influential among Moriscos in the Maghreb, especially Tunis, one of the preferred locations of Morisco refuge when their situation in Morocco deteriorated on account of civil wars there. In Tunis, we can observe important efforts by Morisco scholars to inculcate orthodox Islam in fellow Moriscos as well as a lively interest among them in anti-Christian polemics. It was at the end of the 1630s that the third intriguing text appeared, al-Ḥajarī’s polemical work *The Supporter of Religion against the Infidels*. It was first composed in Egypt in 1637 as a summary of a much larger travel account. After completing an initial version, the author continued work on it after settling in Tunis shortly after leaving Egypt. The origins of *The Supporter* can be traced to the Iberian Peninsula, Granada in particular. Its author, al-Ḥajarī, had

---


been invited by the Archbishop of Granada, Pedro de Castro, to translate part of the Parchment and some of the Lead Books found there in 1588.26 His readings made a profound and lasting impact on him and increased his interest in the Jewish and Christian scriptures.

The Notion of Muḥammad as the Messiah

A central element in all of these late-sixteenth and early-seventeenth century polemical works, in various mediums and literary forms, is the idea that the Prophet Muḥammad should be seen as the Messiah, as a Mahdi figure and universal saviour. This is a key concept in the Lead Books and in the polemical texts written by Juan Alonso and Alguazir. The same is true of the anonymous *Gospel of Barnabas*, a pseudo-epigraphical gospel text containing Islamic content, written by an unknown author, and extant in two undated manuscripts, one in Italian (GBV)27 and the other in Spanish (GBS).28 The first is the older of the two and was likely copied around the turn of seventeenth century in an Ottoman milieu. In it, ‘Barnabas’ tells about the life and ascension to heaven of Jesus from a Muslim perspective, claiming that Jesus is not God’s son but that he announces the coming of the messiah, Muḥammad, and that Judas was crucified instead of him. The text takes the form of a gospel harmony, a gospel text in which elements of the four canonical gospels have been rearranged (‘harmonized’) into a single encompassing narrative. There are textual relationships with Tatian’s *Diatessaron* and the *Vulgate*. The Spanish text includes a prologue (absent from the Italian manuscript), in which the authorial voice is a certain Fray Marin[o] (presumably a pseudonym) who claims he discovered the *Gospel of Barnabas* in the library of Pope Sixtus V (1585–90), whereupon he converted to Islam. The prologue, clearly a literary construct (an example of the *manuscrit trouvé* motif) but perhaps not entirely devoid of historical foundation, also mentions that the text was translated in Istanbul by Mustafá de Aranda, ‘a Muslim’ from Ambel in the kingdom of Aragon (Spain). There is no conclusive evidence to confirm the assertion of authors, among them Luigi Cirillo, who

27 GB [V]ienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Cod. 2662, containing marginal glosses in Arabic.
argued that the extant text builds on and preserves older, even ‘primitive’, Judaeo-Christian source material. Most scholars believe the text is a blatant forgery and point out its medieval or early-modern elements. While their claims might be just, the author did clearly build on earlier Muslim anti-Christian polemics and gave the text the outward appearance of a ‘proto-Qurʾān’. The historical milieu in which the Gospel of Barnabas originated seems, at least according to a number of researchers, to be one of Moriscos and Christian converts to Islam (at the time often referred to as ‘renegades’), who encountered each other before and after the expulsion from Spain. As do other texts written in such circles, it shares the assertion that Muḥammad is the Messiah.

The Gospel of Barnabas was cited for the first time amongst Moriscos in Tunis during the first half of the seventeenth century and then resurfaced in the late seventeenth century in the library of a resident of Amsterdam. The earliest traces of the text itself point to its origin in a Morisco milieu in Istanbul.

The Anti-Christian Polemics of Muḥammad Alguazir and Aḥmad b. ‘Abdallāh

We shall begin by discussing the text written by Muḥammad Alguazir. All we know about him is that, after migrating from Pastrana where he was born, he was a member of the entourage of the Moroccan sultan, Mawlāy Zaydān, in Marrakesh. Zaydān retained various Moriscos at his court. Besides the aforementioned Muḥammad Alguazir, whose official functions are unknown, we also hear about a Morisco from Cordoba, ‘Alī b. Ibrāhīm al-Qurṭubī, who was a court physician, Aḥmad al-Maṣyūb, the ‘court’ astrologer, and, of course, al-Ḥajarī himself, who was the sultan’s Spanish interpreter and secretary. We can assume (although there is no conclusive evidence) that it was no coincidence that Muḥammad Alguazir’s polemic was extensively used in a Spanish text presented to the Dutch Stadholder, Maurice, Prince of Orange, after he and his brother-in-law met the Moroccan ambassador, Aḥmad b. ‘Abdallāh al-Mārūnī, in The Hague in December 1610. This text presented by Aḥmad b. ‘Abdallāh is basically the first part of the text of Alguazir (as I have demonstrated elsewhere), but was presented to Maurice in the name of the ambassador. Of the

29 See Wiegers, ‘Gospel of Barnabas’, and the literature referred to.
original text sent to Maurice we only have a Latin translation; the Spanish text is no longer extant. The unique manuscript including this text later came into the possession of the English orientalist John Selden (1584–1654) and it was edited much later by Zacharias Grape, a Protestant theologian in Rostock. The Islamic arguments found in it served as a source of later Socinian, and Unitarian (that is, anti-Trinitarian) polemics against orthodox Trinitarian Christianity in England in the seventeenth and early eighteenth century.

There are a variety of ways by which to explain the production and diplomatic use of the Alguazir text. Most importantly, the exchange of polemical texts in the context of diplomatic encounters was not unusual. Secondly, we must take the social and political context I discussed above into consideration. Between 1609 and 1613 on various occasions plans were made for an alliance between the Ottomans, Moroccans, and Dutch against the Spanish, and the Moriscos played a role in each of these. In 1613, al-Ḥajarī personally discussed such an alliance with Maurice during a visit to The Hague, as he describes in his *Supporter*. Earlier in 1610, plans for an alliance had been discussed in a diplomatic letter from the Ottoman general, Khalil Pasha, to the States-General in which he listed various considerations to do with the potential conclusion of a treaty. The original letter was written in Turkish using Hebrew letters. Upon its arrival in Holland, it was first translated into Dutch by a Jew, probably Rabbi Joseph Pardo (see below), then into Spanish by the Amsterdam Mennonite inn-keeper and student of Hebrew, Arabic, and ‘Ethiopian’ (Amharic), Jan Theunisz (1569–1635/40), so that it could be used in deliberations with the Moroccan delegates. Theunisz had been studying and teaching Arabic and

---


Hebrew in Leiden where he worked in close collaboration with Franciscus Raphelengius (1539–97), one of the first students of Arabic in Leiden and a well-known printer of Arabic texts, for which he designed his own types, and the author of a *Lexicon Arabicum* (Arabic dictionary). Leiden was the first place in Europe after Rome in which Arabic was printed. As an acquaintance of the English Puritan, Hugh Broughton (1549–1612), Theunisz had translated the former’s polemic against Judaism into Dutch for use in discussions with the Jews of Amsterdam. The title of the Hebrew text was *Parshegan na-nishtevan ish ivri* (Copy of a Letter to a Hebrew Man) and was originally accompanied by a Latin translation. It was the Amsterdam rabbi and physician David Farar who challenged Broughton to a public disputation about it. Broughton was one of the first Protestants in the Low Countries to try to convert the Portuguese Jews of Amsterdam. At some stage, Theunisz dropped his studies of Hebrew and intensified his study of Arabic, probably in 1610 after meeting the Moroccan diplomat ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. Muḥammad. The encounter between the two was pure chance: they met accidently in the streets of Amsterdam and the diplomat decided to lodge with him for a time as a guest in his house in Amsterdam. Focusing on philological studies, but not overlooking religious dispute, Theunisz, in close collaboration with his Moroccan guest, prepared a polemical treatise in Arabic and Latin in which they expounded their Muslim and Christian views. In the summer of 1610, Theunisz presented it to the States-General and the University of Leiden as evidence of his capability as an Arabist.

In the autumn of 1610 the Moroccan ambassador, Aḥmad b. ʿAbdallāh al-Mārūnī, arrived in the Netherlands in the company of the Moroccan agent of the sultan, Samuel Pallache. The former inspected Theunisz’s polemical manuscript, spoke with him, and wrote a testimonial to his knowledge of written and spoken Arabic. This series of encounters (partly diplomatic, scholarly, and religious) formed the immediate antecedent for the banquet in The Hague in December 1610, during which Maurice and his Roman Catholic brother-in-law, Emmanuel of Portugal, discussed Muslim views of Jesus and which ultimately resulted in the sending of the text by Alguazir / Aḥmad b. ʿAbdallāh. Though there is no evidence to prove it, there could well have been a relationship between Theunisz’s polemical text and this debate.

---

37 Wijnman, ‘De Hebraïcus Jan Theunisz’, p. 16.
The Anti-Islamic Polemic of the Muslim Convert to Christianity,
Juan Andrés

So far, we have discussed the impact of Muslim polemics against Christianity in Northern Europe. Now let us turn to the case of an Iberian convert to Christianity, Juan Andrés (fl. 1510, conversion to Christianity 1487), who had previously been a faqih in Xàtiva and later became a preacher and canon of the cathedral in Granada. In 1515 this man published his *Confusión o confutación de la secta mahomética y del alcorán* (Confusion or Confutation of the Muḥammadan Sect and of the Qur’ān), a work that was translated into various European languages (including Dutch). One of the reasons for its popularity was undoubtedly the authority of its author as an ex-Muslim, with an unquestionable knowledge of Arabic and Islam. In Northern Europe it was viewed as an important source of knowledge about Islam and a useful aid in preparing Christians (merchants and others) who would encounter Muslims during their travels and risked being tempted to convert and join the ranks of the so-called renegades who were often involved in piracy. Two telling examples from the Republic are relevant here. This first is that, for a time, Erpenius’ student and successor to the chair of Oriental languages in Leiden, Jacobus Golius, worked on a Latin translation of the text. The manuscript which includes this work is still at Leiden University but remains incomplete. Secondly, Juan Andrés’ polemical work was also used extensively by one Johannes Maurus in his own anti-Muslim polemical works. In all probability, Johannes Maurus was the son of a Moroccan of high standing who took his Christian name from his role model and predecessor, Juan Andrés. Around 1640, Johannes’ father decided to relocate from Morocco to the Dutch Republic, allegedly attracted by its social and economic standards of living, to raise his son as a Christian. Johannes was baptised and lived as a student of Theology in Leiden where he frequently visited Golius, perhaps even living in his house. He wrote several anti-Muslim polemical texts. It is particularly interesting to observe that this Moroccan convert, besides studying theology with the objective of converting Muslims to Protestantism and as preparation for a career as a missionary pastor, also

---

38 See Chapter 6 in this volume by Ryan Szpiech.
39 Leiden University Library, ms. Or. 1272. I am grateful to Pier Mattia Tommasino for drawing my attention to this manuscript.
41 In one of his works he qualifies him as a second father. It is indeed well known that Golius was very hospitable and received many students.
studied Chinese. It is well known that Golius was interested in studying Chinese and that he even travelled to Antwerp to work with an expert missionary whose name was Martino Martini (1614–61). This proves that the study of Oriental languages and cultures could be a very far-flung enterprise and encompassed many languages of the still largely unknown Eurasian and Asian worlds.

Again al-Ḥajarī and Erpenius

Now let us return to the encounters between al-Ḥajarī and Erpenius in 1613, a few years later. Unquestionably, these meetings were important to Erpenius. He learned a lot about Arabic and Islamic culture and religion from the Morisco and the contacts between him and Erpenius were continued by the latter’s successor as Professor of Arabic at Leiden University, Jacobus Golius (1596–1667).42 In a recent article, Romain Bertrand uses the term ‘amateur’ philologists and manuscript collectors to describe students of Oriental languages in the Republic who distinguished themselves from professional scholars by their lack of a university education and by their possession of a combination of practical commercial skills.43 Among them he mentions Peter Floris van Elbinck, a Dutch merchant who travelled in South East Asia, including Southern Thailand, Northern Sumatra and Northern Thailand in the early 1600s.

42 Golius had spent time in Morocco and Constantinople for political and scholarly purposes in the twenties of the seventeenth century. See Juynboll, Zeventhie-eeuwse beoefenaars, p. 119 ff; Vrolijk and Van Leeuwen, Arabic Studies, p. 41 ff; Otto Zwartjes, ‘Jacobus Golius (1596–1667) and Martino Martini (1614–61). The Vocabularium Hispano-Sinense (Bodleian Library, ms. March 696) and the Study of Chinese in the Netherlands’, in The Sixth Fu Jen University International Sinological Symposium: Early European (1552–1814) Acquisition and Research on Chinese Languages (Fu Jeng: Wesolowski, 2011), pp. 307–46, esp. p. 310. We are well informed about his contacts in this period about Arabic manuscripts and learning Arabic with al-Ḥajarī in Morocco. It is from this period that we still have al-Ḥajarī’s editorial work on a copy of Kitāb al-Mustaʾīnī, a work written in the Andalusian tradition of botanical and medical scholarship (Leiden University Library, ms. Or 15); see Wiegers, A Learned Muslim Acquaintance; and Vrolijk and Van Leeuwen, Arabic Studies, p. 59 n. 22.

and studied the Malay language. Floris copied, wrote, and collected the Malay manuscripts which later came into the possession of Thomas Erpenius.\footnote{These manuscripts are now in Cambridge (with Erpenius’ other oriental manuscripts in Arabic, Hebrew, Persian and Turkish).}

Comparing the career of Peter Floris with that of Erpenius, Bertrand demonstrates that the early Orientalists’ skills: ‘were probably not the scholar’s privilege, but were distributed across a larger and moving field comprising men of all sorts.’\footnote{Bertrand, ‘The Making of a Malay text’, p. 6.} Indeed, around this same time in the Republic, as well as other parts of Europe, a number of pioneers began to devote themselves to the study of Arabic as part of the scholarly endeavour we now know as Oriental Studies.\footnote{Jan Loop, \textit{Johann Heinrich Hottinger: Arabic and Islamic Studies in the Seventeenth Century} (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), p. 79.} This study included a wide array of languages besides Arabic including Hebrew, Syriac, Turkish, Persian, Samaritan, Ethiopian, Malay, and even Chinese.\footnote{See note 42.} The most important of these were Hebrew and Arabic because the study of these languages was deemed imperative for scholarly, diplomatic, commercial, and religious reasons. Though Bertrand does not mention him, the Mennonite inn-keeper, Jan Theunisz, fits exceptionally well into the first stage. Erpenius and Golius, can be seen as representatives of a second stage of Arabic and Oriental Studies which began with the appointment of Erpenius to the chair of Oriental languages at the University of Leiden. Al-Ḥajari’s autobiographical texts serve as an excellent window on the religious and cultural atmosphere of those days. While in France and the Republic al-Ḥajari, secretary and translator at Zaydān’s court, introduced many individuals in France and the Republic to ideas and traditions current among his co-religionists in Spain and Morocco as well as his own personal religious convictions. I shall briefly touch upon four examples.

In his discussions of the Prophetic miracles, al-Ḥajari frequently refers to Qāḍī ʿIyāḍ’s \textit{Kitāb al-Shifāʾ}, a book which exalts the position of the Prophet Muḥammad and details the miracles he performed.\footnote{\textit{It was very popular in the Maghreb. See Chapter 7 in this volume by Soto González and Starczewska.}} His ideas about the Bible were shaped by his experiences with the Lead Books, which he believed to be genuine and a conclusive refutation of the Incarnation, in particular as it is outlined at the beginning of the Gospel of John. He was also able to convince his opponents that it was not sufficient to know only the Arabic text of the Qurʾān to understand Islam. To do this properly, they must also be familiar
with the vast Hadīth literature. Finally, both in France (Bordeaux) and The Netherlands (mainly Amsterdam), he conducted religious discussions with Jews. In the tenth chapter of his *Supporter*, entirely devoted to these discussions, he tells us that most of them had come from Portugal and Spain. He engaged in a discussion with an Amsterdam rabbi who ‘had come from the East’, probably Joseph Pardo (d. 1619), who had been born in Salonika, become a rabbi in Venice, and then travelled to Amsterdam. In order to refute the Jews, he tells us, knowledge of their own sources is necessary, and hence, besides polemical works against them such as ʿAbd al-Ḥaqq al-ʾIslāmī’s, *Al-Sayf al-mamdūd fī ʾl-radd ʿalā aḫbār al-yahūd*, he used a Spanish translation of the Bible, probably the Protestant Cipriano de Valera version, published in Amsterdam in 1602. Al-Ḥajarī does not mention anything about Jews who were critical of Rabbinical Judaism, were skeptical about religion in general, held deistic ideas, or were outright atheists, opinions known to have been held among them in later in the seventeenth century. Nor does he discuss the sort of criticism against the Roman Catholic veneration of images or the messiahship and divinity of Jesus which the Jews were known to have voiced.

Al-Ḥajarī also corresponded with Moriscos in Istanbul. As argued above, the *Gospel of Barnabas* was probably created in that city in the early seventeenth century. It was spread among Moriscos in the Maghreb in the thirties, and then appeared in Amsterdam, where it had probably already been in circulation at the end of the sixteenth century. As said, relations between Moriscos in Istanbul and Amsterdam were already close as they had migrated from Amsterdam to


50 Besides Amsterdam, Sephardi Jews also lived in The Hague. In Leiden there was no Jewish community at the time. Sephardic Jews who studied at Leiden University in the seventeenth century either lived in Amsterdam or The Hague (Yosef Kaplan, ‘Sephardi Students at the University of Leiden’, in An Alternative Path to Modernity, pp. 196–210); among the visitors were also Moroccans, as among them Salomon Levi Hebraeus and Zaadus Abraham (p. 197). The University was accessible to students of all religions, although its Faculty of Theology was not. Constantijn l’Empereur, who had become professor of Hebrew in 1620, was also appointed Professor *controversiarum judaicarum* in 1634 and paid an extra salary to engage in polemics with Jews; see Van Rooden, ‘Constantijn l’Empereur (1591–1648). Professor Hebreus en Theologie te Leiden. Theologie, bijbelwetenschap en rabbinse studiën in de zeventiende eeuw’ (PhD Diss., Leiden, 1985), p. 105.


Istanbul at the beginning of the seventeenth century. The Italian manuscript of the *Gospel of Barnabas* was seen there in 1709 by the deist and freethinker John Toland (1670–1722), who used it in his famous anti-Trinitarian work *Nazarenus*. According to an owner’s note on the flyleaf, at that time the manuscript was in the possession of Johann Friedrich Kramer, a jurist born in Steinfurt sometime after 1660. He lived in Amsterdam and The Hague as the Prussian Minister-in-Residence, and died in the latter in 1715. Toland said that the previous owner had been a man of ‘great name and authority in Amsterdam, who during his life, was often heard to put a high value on this piece, whether as a rarity or as a model of his own religion, I do not know’. Jan Slomp has suggested that this ‘individual of great authority’ was Gregorio Leti, the Italian chronicler of the city of Amsterdam. According to an auction catalogue, Leti’s library was indeed sold in 1701. Be that as it may, Leti was interested in the Jewish community in Amsterdam, as Jonathan Israel has demonstrated. Further study is still necessary to find a definitive determination of the identity of the Amsterdam owner of the Italian manuscript of the *Gospel of Barnabas*.

In Conclusion

During and after their forced conversions to Christianity and subsequent expulsions and migrations of the Muslim and Jewish minorities from Spain to other parts of the Mediterranean, the expelled minorities used their transregional and transnational networks to improve the conditions of their settlement and prepare for a possible return. These networks included contacts with the political and intellectual elite of the enemies of Spain, in particular Morocco, the Ottoman Empire, and the Dutch Republic. Moriscos in the Diaspora

---

55 John Toland, *Nazarenus, or Jewish, Gentile and Mahometan Christianity* [1718], (ed.) Justin Champion (Oxford: Oxford University, Voltaire Foundation, 1999), ch. 5, p. 143.
adapted themselves to the new circumstances in the Maghreb, Europe, and the Ottoman Empire. Through these networks the polemical texts discussed here, written in Spain and in the Diaspora, reached other places and influenced discussions elsewhere, including Northern Europe. These transregional contacts were facilitated by these new alliances. The Iberian sources discussed here were used by early students of the East for the study of Islam and missions among Muslims, but also by conflicting Christian groups in their intra-Christian polemics. Therefore the forced conversions in and migrations from Iberia influenced the development of new religious and intellectual debates in a public sphere being transformed by these migrations and by new commercial and diplomatic relations with the Muslim world. This held true for Istanbul and the Ottoman Empire as well as for France, England, and the Dutch Republic. Hence, these developments stimulated processes of change in the public sphere analyzed in a recent study by Jesse Lander. According to Lander, although the Reformation did irrevocably cause a social and religious rift, it also led to the formation of a public sphere in which writers used their agency to refute their religious opponents through the use of printed texts. In this new setting, the hitherto unknown term 'polemic' became a common designation. While disputations had been a regular phenomenon in Medieval Iberia, they were banned from the public sphere in Counter-Reformation Spain. Nevertheless, in Northern Europe, the polemics between Muslims, Christians and (Portuguese) Jews re-emerged, but this time in public spheres which were dominated by the polemics between Protestants and Roman Catholics. Furthermore, engagement in polemics on Roman Catholicism was not unusual among Jewish religious leaders in Amsterdam. However, even though they were not allowed to speak out in public against Calvinism, most of their polemics were directed against Calvinists, Remonstrants and anti-Trinitarians, whom they recognized as having freed themselves only from ‘material idolatry’ (as they called the veneration of crucifixes and statues of saints), but not from ‘spiritual idolatry’. The emergence of a polemical public space was

60 Lander, Inventing Polemic, p. 4.
61 Novikoff, The Medieval Culture of Disputation.
62 Bodian, Hebrews, p. 61. This prohibition was mentioned in Grotius’ Remonstrantie, drawn up in 1619.
63 Bodian, Hebrews, p. 68, p. 105. Polemical and apologetic authors mentioned by Bodian are Saul Levi Mortera, Menasseh b. Israel, Immanuel Aboab, Isaac Aboab da Fonseca, Isaac Orobio de Castro and Isaac Cardoso. As Bodian remarks, studies about the polemics
accompanied by an unparallelled interest in new worlds and new languages. In the Dutch Republic pioneers began to study a wide array of religions and languages from the Muslim world and beyond, as demonstrated by the interest of Golius, and that of the Moroccan convert Johannes Maurus, in Chinese. In addition to scholarly motives, the value of language to medicine, law, philosophy, mathematics, history, geography, and literary studies, religious and (Protestant) missionary objectives was strong, but these fields of interest were closely related to more mundane and practical matters: the interests of politics, diplomacy, and trade.

Without discussing all the details of the texts, I hope to have shown that there are reasons to assume that the Alguazir polemic, the works of Juan Alonso, the *Gospel of Barnabas*, and perhaps the Lead Books originated within networks of Iberian Muslims who maintained connections between Granada, Pastrana, Madrid, Hornachos, Istanbul, Fez, Tetouan, Marrakesh, Tunis, and other places. With the assistance of such networks, I suggest, these texts spread to Northern Europe. This transfer of ideas, texts, and persons was facilitated by the treaties between the Dutch Republic and Morocco (1610) and the Ottoman Empire (1612). The use of the texts themselves was not confined to nascent ‘academic’ Oriental Studies and studies of Islam, was also very apparent in religious polemics within Christianity, for example by Protestants against Roman Catholics, but also anti-Trinitarians and Trinitarians, Jews and Christians, and Roman Catholics and Protestants against each other.

between Portuguese Jews and Calvinists are still lacking. See also Van Rooden, ‘Constantijn l’Empereur’, p. 174.
PART 3

Conversion and Perplexity