Chapter Three: Previous Research and Identification of the Mudejar Polemical Sources to be Discussed in the Present Dissertation

In this chapter, I provide the reader with an overview of the most relevant approaches to the literature on the polemics of the Mudejars and an introduction to the polemical sources which will be studied in this dissertation. The preliminary examination of the internal evidence and the dating of these sources are a starting point from which to enlarge our knowledge about the production and consumption of polemical literature by the Mudejars, and about the authors of some of their treatises.

3.1. Twentieth- and Twenty-First Century Scholarly Views on Mudejar Manuscripts of Religious Polemics

a) Scholarship before 1950: Miguel Asín Palacios

Before the second half of the twenty-century, and apart from of the references in the catalogues of Gustav Flügel (1822-1870) and Moritz Steinschneider (1866-1907), the first and only scholar to discuss a polemic written by a Muslim living as a Mudejar in the Christian territories of the Iberian Peninsula was Miguel Asín Palacios (1871-1944). In 1909, Asín Palacios published a twenty-two page article about the Ta'yid al-Milla ['The Fortification of the Faith, or the Community'], an Arabic polemic against the Jews kept in the Real Academia de la Historia in Madrid as MS XXXI. The manuscript in the RAH is one of the four Arabic copies of this work known to us and it was copied in Huesca in 762 H (=1361 CE). One Arabic copy is bound together with the Arabic manuscript of the Kitāb al-Mujādala ma'a’-l-Yahūd wa-n-Naṣārā’ ['The Book of Disputation with the Christians and the Jews'] as MS AF 58 (Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna). Although Van Koningsveld and Wiegers refer to the Kitāb al-Mujādala, this polemic has not been previously studied. Besides the Arabic copies of the Ta'yid al-Milla, we know of five

---

2 Asín Palacios, 1939a.
3 Van Koningsveld and Wiegers, 1994, 196.
Aljamiado versions of this work. Even though the place and date clearly indicate that the
Arabic copy from Huesca is the work of a Mudejar, Asín Palacios argues that it was written
by al-Raqilī himself. He states that the manuscript was an autograph and that its author was
a Morisco.4 Van Koningsveld and Wiegers have argued pace Asín Palacios that this treatise
should be regarded as Mudejar instead and, considered in to the context of the Arabic and
Aljamiado manuscripts.

In the same year, Asín Palacios published another article with the Arabic
transcription and translation of a two-folio polemical argument (mas‘ala) against
Christianity written by a certain Muḥammad al-Qaysī. According to Asín Palacios, the
author of the argument was a late-sixteenth-century faqīh from Tunis,5 a hypothesis which
was based on the assumption that the mas‘ala was written by the same author as another
anti-Christian Muslim polemic in MS BNE 4944, whose incipit reads “Desputa de Muḥammad al-Qaysī”. Denise Cardaillac, pace Asín Palacios, argued that although the
mas‘ala was composed by a sixteenth-century North African, the “Desputa” was “a
projection into the past, stemming from the mind of a Morisco author”, hence the al-Qaysī
referred to in it was a Mudejar instead.6 The later scholars Van Koningsveld and Wiegers
have shown that there were not two “al-Qaysīs” but only one, in the person of the
fourteenth-century learned Tunisian faqīh and war captive in the Christian territories,
Muḥammad ibn Sirāj al-Qaysī.7

Returning to Miguel Asín Palacios, in my view Mikel de Epalza is right when he
underlines the importance of his theological views as a Christian priest to understanding
his scholarship on Islam. Epalza, following Henri Terrasse, argues that Asín Palacios was
very much interested in emphasizing the convergences (such as those between Christianity
and Islam), not the divergences.8 In the words of Epalza, Asín “generally judged positive all

4 Asín Palacios, 1909a, 345. It should be noted, however, that in the time of Asín Palacios, it was standard practice
to refer to the Mudejars as Moriscos.
5 Asín Palacios, 1909b, 342-343.
6 Van Koningsveld and Wiegers, 1994, 192, 185 n. 80 (with a short description of the contents of the manuscript
which was among the manuscripts found in Almonacid de la Sierra and was in the possession of the Arabist
Pablo Gil y Gil), and 186 for the references to Cardaillac, 1972. As Van Koningsveld and Wiegers note in n. 80 of
this article, the whereabouts of this manuscript is unknown.
7 Van Koningsveld and Wiegers, 1994, 192 and 195.
8 Epalza, 1992, 228 quoting Terrasse’s obituary of Asín Palacios, Necrologie: Miguel Asín Palacios (1871-1944),
“Hésperis” (Rabat) 32 (1945), 14: “Era contrario a todo lo que divide y partidario de todo lo que une.” No doubt,
such an attitude was well suited to his understanding of Islam, which Asín calls a “Christianity heresy” and most
probably underpinned his interest in disclosing the Christian influences on Islam, as illustrated by his study of
the mystic Ibn al-ʿArabi El islam cristianizado (1931) [The Christianized Islam], and his claims that Islam is not
superstitious idolatry but partly shares Christian beliefs. Epalza, 1992, 250 and n. 59-62 quoting two works by
Miguel Asín Palacios: El islam cristianizado: Estudio del sufismo a través de las obras de Abenarabi de Murcia.
Madrid: Plutarco, 1931; 22, 25, 27 and “Un aspecto inexplorado de los orígenes de la teología escolástica.” In
that was of Christian origin or appearance [in Islam, MCA], or had a Christian 'sense'. The same attitude also seems to be reflected in his publications on polemics such as those on the Andalusian Ibn Ḥazm or al-Qaysi just mentioned above, in which he "steps aside from all controversial tone and topic". Regardless of Asín's personal convictions, all credit is due to him for pioneering the study of the polemical literature of the Muslims living in Christian Iberia.

b) Scholarship after 1950: Leonard Patrick Harvey, Leon Jacob Kassin and Louis Cardaillac

One generation of scholars after Asín, in 1958 Leonard Patrick Harvey notes in one of the most extensive and comprehensive surveys of Morisco literature carried out to date that a number of Morisco works could have been composed by the Mudejars. He discusses the problems posed by some manuscripts containing religious polemics dated to the sixteenth and seventeenth century, but limits himself to quoting different views in this respect and does not offer conclusive arguments about whether or not the authorship of these works should be traced back to the Mudejars. The Ta'īd al-Milla is one of the various polemical works discussed by Harvey, who follows Asín Palacios and assumes that the Morisco ar-Raqqili was its author. He discusses the sources which al-Raqqili might have used and, unlike Asín, thinks that this author could have based his work on the well-known Franciscan friar who converted to Islam, 'Abd Allâh al-Tarjumân (Fray Anselm Turmeda, 1355–1423 CE). It was not until 1969 that the unpublished thesis by Leon Jacob Kassin re-examined the Ta'īd and provided a transcription and translation on the basis of two Arabic manuscripts (RAH, Madrid, MS XXXI and Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna, MS AF 58). Kassin discusses its authorship but he does not refer to Harvey's thesis. He claims that the catalogues compiled by Steinschneider and Flügel are mistaken and that al-Raqqili was not the author of this work but nevertheless concedes that Asín was probably
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9 “... juzgaba generalmente como positivo cuanto fuera de origen o de apariencia cristiana, de sentido cristiano.” Epalza, 1992, 241-242, emphasis in the original.
10 “Generalmente se aparta de todo tono y tema polémico, aun en sus publicaciones sobre polemistas, como la ya mencionada de Abénhażam de Córdoba o la polémica anticristiana de Muhammad Al-Caysí.” Epalza, 1992, 243.

Several times Epalza mentions the need for a comprehensive study of Asín Palacios' work and thought. See, for instance, Epalza, 1992, 295. Since then, various studies of Asín Palacios have been carried out, the latest being a publication of his correspondence with Julián Ribera. Los epistolarios, 2009, see n. 111 on p. 47 for a résumé of the various volumes dedicated to this author. I have not yet been able to discover whether his approach to Muslim polemical sources has been studied as an independent approach.

11 Harvey, 1958.
12 Harvey, 1958, 315-316.
right in saying that we are dealing with an anonymous author. However, Kassin does refute the hypothesis of Asín Palacios that this anonymous author was of Morisco origin; in his view, he was instead a convert to Islam from Judaism, who worked with an Arabic version of the Pentateuch by Saadia Gaon (882-942 CE) written in the Hebrew alphabet.\textsuperscript{14} Contrary to Asín Palacios, he claims that neither of the two manuscripts with which he was working for his edition was an autograph and, therefore, the original work was composed earlier and is unknown to us.\textsuperscript{15} Around the same year, Denise Cardaillac provided a transcription and study of the Aljamiado polemic against the Christians by al-Qaysī mentioned by Asín, MS BNE 4944. In 1977, Louis Cardaillac published what has been so far the most comprehensive work on Muslim–Christian polemics in the Iberian Peninsula from the Capitulation of Granada in 1491 CE until the mid-seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{16} Whether or not it has been because of the focus of their studies or of the arguments they wanted to adduce, all the authors have underestimated the Mudejars’ share in this textual corpus.

c) Recent Scholarship: Pieter Sjoerd Van Koningsveld and Gerard Albert Wiegers

Since the early nineties, these views have begun to change thanks to the important contribution of Pieter Sjoerd van Koningsveld to the identification and classification of Andalusian-Arabic manuscripts circulating in Christian territories.\textsuperscript{17} This scholar has shown that Muslims were not the only agents involved in maintaining and spreading Arabic knowledge from Muslim to Christian Spain. Members of the Jewish minority communities in the Iberian Peninsula also played a significant role in this process. The colophons of their manuscripts show that they were copied in urban centres, the majority located in Castile, rather than in the small villages in which most of the Muslim lived. This seems to indicate that the Jewish social and cultural milieu in which Arabic manuscripts were produced differed from that from which Islamic manuscripts came. Most of the Arabic manuscripts owned by Jews in Christian Spain dealt with philosophy, natural sciences or medicine, whereas those held by Muslims were devoted to jurisprudence or religious matters. In Toledo between 1182 and 1227 CE there were three Jewish institutions (\textit{khizanas}) in which Andalusī medical texts were stored. These included the works produced by various members of the Jewish Waqqār family, written by Moshe ibn Isaac ibn Waqqār. Yet it is not

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{14} Kassin, 1969, I, 4 and 6.
\item \textsuperscript{15} Kassin, 1969, I, 83 ff.
\item \textsuperscript{16} Cardaillac, 1977.
\item \textsuperscript{17} Van Koningsveld, 1991, 1992, and 1994a.
\end{itemize}
clear what other materials were also kept there.\textsuperscript{18} Jewish minority communities rapidly became involved in the transmission of ancient philosophy written in both Arabic and Judaeo-Arabic,\textsuperscript{19} but it was not until the end of the fourteenth century that the production of Hebrew translations in the Iberian Peninsula intensified. As will be demonstrated, the polemics under discussion were certainly in circulation among Mudejars and Moriscos, but also among Christians, and perhaps Jews.

A turning point occurred in 1994 when Van Koningsveld and Wiegers studied the Arabic polemic the Kitāb Miftāḥ ad-Dīn ['The Key of Religion'] and showed that it was the original of the Aljamiado version of MS BNE 4944 – studied by Denise Cardaillac in her unpublished thesis – and also found in other manuscripts in Spanish libraries.\textsuperscript{20} Cogently, these two authors argue that, contrary to Cardaillac’s supposition, MS BNE 4944 was most probably copied by a Mudejar. In the same year, Wiegers published a monograph on the role of the Segovian Mudejar faqīḥ Yça Gidelli in the Spanish literature written by Muslims in the Iberian Peninsula. Wiegers found historical evidence that Yça wrote an anti-Christian attack against the Christian Juan López de Salamanca. Be that as it may, the polemical works between Yça and Juan López de Salamanca seem to have played a role in Christian politics at the time, in particular in the struggle for power between Alfonso and King Enrique IV, under whose reign the Mudejars prospered.\textsuperscript{21}

Recent research has also led to new insights into the polemics of the Moriscos. Manuscript findings seem to undermine Cardaillac’s idea that, in comparison with the numerous prayer books or legal texts which have come down to us, the number of works in this genre is small and the manuscripts are in poor condition.\textsuperscript{22} Moreover, the latest studies on the contents of the Lead Books found in Granada in the late sixteenth century and on those individuals involved in the discoveries and the translation of the Books seem to

\textsuperscript{18} In this paragraph, I summarize Van Koningsveld, 1992, 89ff.
\textsuperscript{19} Ryan Szpiech rightly points out that it is necessary to differentiate between the Judaeo-Arabic, that is to say, the Arabic language written in Hebrew characters, with a Jewish influence and a content intended for a Jewish audience on the one hand, and texts which were written in Arabic with Hebrew characters on the other (Szpiech 2011a, 81). An example in Judaeo-Arabic written with the intention of promoting reconciliation between religious and philosophical views is Joseph ibn Abraham ibn Waqqār’s al-Maqāla al-Jāmiʿa bayn al-Falsafa wa-sh-Shariʿa ['The Treatise on Reconciliation between Philosophy and the Revealed Law'], Vat. Hebr. 203, c. 1400 CE, I have not had the opportunity to read this.
\textsuperscript{20} MS BNE 5302, MS RAH 11/9409 (Olím. T12), MS RAH 11/9446 (box 7; Olím. V7), MS RAH XXXI (11/9416, box 6; Olím. V6). See the details in Van Koningsveld and Wiegers, 1994, 186-188. These two scholars also note the important place assumed by the Ta’yīd and the Kitāb al-Mujādala in the polemical corpus of Mudejar religious polemics and announce their aim of publishing separate studies on these treatises. Op. cit., 196 n. 114. The present dissertation is part of this project.
\textsuperscript{21} Wiegers, 1994, 134-142, especially 139-140.
\textsuperscript{22} Cardaillac, 1977, 157: ‘les manuscrits de polémique sont peu nombreux [...] presque tous sont en très mauvais état et se réduisent à quelques pages de lecture difficile’.
suggest that the Lead Books were more a polemic against Christianity than an attempt to attain syncretism between Islam and Christianity. One of the first translators of the Lead Books, the seventeenth-century Oriental Christian Arabist Marcos Dobelio, mentions the *Ta’yid* and the *Libro de la disputa contra los judíos y cristianos* [‘Book of Disputation with the Jews and the Christians’] in his treatise *Nuevo descubrimiento de la falsedad del metal*, in which he describes the corpus of Arabic manuscripts in circulation among the Mudejars and Moriscos of the Castilian town of Pastrana, found in this city about 1623 CE. Dobelio argued that there was a strong connection between the Lead Books and the discoveries in Pastrana, but recent scholarship has shown that the discoveries should be read against the Muslim literary production in general. This tallies with the scholarship of Cardaillac, which shows that, although Morisco polemics were rarely written in Arabic, they appear to be strongly indebted to a corpus of Arabic originals.
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43 See Wiegers, 2011a and in the same volume Van Koningsveld and Wiegers, 2011.
44 The *Ta’yid* is referred to as the *Maṣāḥif muṭṭalayn* [‘Companion of the Jews’] and corresponds to MS Borgiano Arabo 163, Vatican Library, dated 786 H (=1384 CE), Van Koningsveld and Wiegers, 2016 (forthcoming), 4 n. 11. The reference to the *Libro de la disputa* by Dobelio, who claims that "se conoce que fue árabe español docto no sólo en la sagrada escritura, pero también de la lengua hebrea" [‘It is apparent that he was an Spanish Arab learned not only in the Sacred Scriptures but also in the Hebrew language’] is found in García-Arenal and Rodríguez Mediano, 2010a, 646 quoting Marcos Dobelio, *Nuevo descubrimiento de la falsedad del metal*, MS 285, Biblioteca de Castilla-La Mancha, ff. 8sff, and by the same authors 2010b, 296 and n. 77. On the figure of Marcos Dobelio, his activities as translator of the Lead Books and the contents of this work, see García-Arenal and Rodríguez Mediano, 2010b, Chapter Nine and Chapter Ten (251ff).
45 An example of this is the *Kitāb al-Anwār* [‘Book of Lights’] found in Pastrana written by the thirteenth-century author from Baṣra, al-Bakrī, Elz s.v. “al-Bakrī” (Rosenthal), which deals with the genealogy of Muhammad and was very popular among Mudejars and Moriscos. Dobelio often refers to it and claims that some passages in one of the Lead Books, the *Libro de los actos de nuestro Señor Jesús y de su madre María la Virgen* [‘Book of the Acts of Our Lord Jesus and of His Miracles and of His Mother the Virgin Mary’] are identical to passages in al-Bakrī’s *Kitāb al-Anwār*. García-Arenal and Rodríguez Mediano, 2010b, 291; and on 285 the books most quoted by Dobelio as support for his interpretation of the Lead Books and, as he claims, all belong to the Pastrana findings. See the critical edition of the *Kitāb al-Anwār* by Lugo Acevedo. Lugo Acevedo, 2008. The *Kitāb al-Anwār* is also contained in *J9*, a miscellaneous Aljamiado manuscript which also contains the polemical treatise against the Jews called the *Ta’yid al-Milla* [‘The Fortification of the Faith, or Community’]. Lugo Acevedo notes that *J9* contains an ‘independent version’ [‘versión independiente’] of the manuscripts which form the basis of her edition of *Kitāb al-Anwār* and that this version has been the object of study of Prof. María Teresa Narváez from the Universidad de Puerto Rico. Lugo Acevedo, 2008, 18 and n. 6.
46 Wiegers, 2011a; Van Koningsveld and Wiegers, 2011.
47 Cardaillac, 1977, 153-237, particularly 153-161 for the production in Arabic and Aljamiado. Also, Harvey, 1958, passim.
3.2. Mudejar Polemical Sources

We do not know much about who the individuals involved in the composition of the works of polemics which once circulated among the Mudejars were. In most cases, we do not have the names of the authors but, in the colophons, we do find those of the copyists instead. Occasionally the manuscripts are incomplete and the colophon is missing. The only historical name of a polemicist known to us is the author of the treatise just mentioned, the Kitāb Miftāḥ ad-Dīn ['The Key of Religion'], Muḥammad Ibn Sirāj al-Qāysi, who refers to an earlier, thirteenth-century Muslim polemicist called 'ʿAbd Allāh al-ʿAsīr (meaning 'the captive') in this work.28

The other names known to us are those of the copyists, most of whom copied manuscripts in smaller towns and smaller towns. The colophons of these manuscripts indicate that many of the copyists of this corpus were connected to the local mosques in which they were employed as ʿimāms, faqīhs, khaṭībs or khādīms.29 Often manuscripts were kept within a same family circle or in its immediate vicinity. In 892 H, Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad, the later holder (and most likely, the copyist) of a manuscript found in Caniles (Granada) which contains 'rogativas' (rogations), claims to be the brother of Ibrāhīm, the learned faqih in various sciences who authored the text in 885 H. The two men both claim to be inhabitants of Huesca.30 In her work, Kathryn Miller stresses the efforts of the leaders of the Mudejar and Morisco communities and their central role in the dissemination of Arabic texts, evidence of which is also found in the previously mentioned discoveries of manuscripts in Almonacid (Aragon) in the nineteenth century, and the Aragonese Mudejar manuscripts preserved in the Spanish National Library, the Library of the Escorial and the Real Academia de la Historia (Madrid).31

Set out below is an analysis of the five most important works of Mudejar polemics. The selection has been based on certain characteristics of the manuscripts, including the dates in their colophons, the kind of script and dactus, the language used by the authors and the relationships which some treatises show to one another. Taken as a whole all these characteristics demonstrate the circulation of such works among the Mudejar communities. The analysis focuses on extant works which address theological or dogmatic points in a setting occupied by two or more religious adversaries and, therefore, includes
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28 Van Koningsveld and Wiegers, 1994, 190.
30 MS RAH CLVIII, f. 36v.
31 Miller incorporates the contributions into the study of Arabic manuscripts by such scholars as Viguera Molins (1987; 1991; 1992/1993); Van Koningsveld and Wiegers, 1994; and Miller, 2008.
works which are not polemics *stricto senso* but, as will be argued below, are of a polemical nature – such as the ‘demandas de los judíos’. It provides an overview of the main physical and linguistic characteristics of the treatises and of their contents in an attempt to determine the date of composition of the Arabic originals of these works and the filiation of the Arabic and Aljamiado copies known to us. The goal of the analysis is to place the polemical sources under scrutiny in the Christian environment in which, it will be argued, these works seem to have circulated and, on occasion, seem to have been composed and, therefore, attention will be paid to the Christian discourses in some of these works.

a) The Kitāb Miftāḥ ad-Dīn

Kitāb Miftāḥ ad-Dīn *wa-l-Mujādala baynā l-Naṣṣārā wa-l-Muslimīn min Qawl al-Anbiyā’ wa-l-Mursalīn wa-l-ʿUlamā’ al-Rāshidīn alladhīna qara’ū l-Anājil*

[The Key of Religion or the Disputation between the Christians and Muslims from the Sayings of the Prophets, Messengers and Rightly-Guided Scholars Who Have Read the Gospels’.] Author: Muḥammad Ibn Sirāj al-Qaysī.

This section begins with a short résumé of *Kitāb Miftāḥ ad-Dīn*. This work has been thoroughly researched and, although it will be referred to below only indirectly, its contents and main characteristics offer important insights into other polemical treatises composed by the Mudejars.

The polemic against Christianity, the *Kitāb Miftāḥ ad-Dīn*, is preserved in MS BN Alg. 1557 (Algiers, National Library, ff. 49–90). This manuscript can be classified as Mudejar for two reasons: the resemblance of its Andalusian script to other Mudejar manuscripts and the double (Christian/Islamic) date in its colophon.32 The contents of the *Kitāb Miftāḥ ad-Dīn* can be divided into three main sections.33 The first section commences with a discussion of some passages from the Old Testament in which the coming of Muḥammad and the triumph of Islam are claimed to be foretold. This introductory part is followed by the reasons for the schism in Christianity whose blame is laid fairly and squarely at the door of Paul. The second section addresses the reasons for the dissolution of the Order of the Templars (1312 CE) and the military confrontations between Christian Iberia and Muslims, which began in the Naṣrid Kingdom of Granada in 1309–1310 CE. The third part describes

33 The next paragraphs summarize Van Koningsveld and Wiegers, 1994. Here these authors provide an account of the Arabic and the various Aljamiado versions of this work. For the Aljamiado version in MS BNE 4944 and the adaptor al-Gharib, see also, Colominas Aparicio, 2014a.
the feelings which these events evoked in al-Qaysī and his experience as captive in the lands of the Christians, in which he held a religious dispute with a monk in the presence of a Christian ruler. At the end of the polemic composed in 1309 CE, the author of the Kitāb Miżfāḥ ad-Dīn, Muḥammad al-Qaysī tells his opponent that the answer to the monk's questions about the anthropomorphic passages in the Qurʾān and the Sunna had already been provided in France by another Muslim, 'Abd Allāh al-Asīr (fl. 1267 CE).34

Al-Qaysī's Arabic polemic was most probably composed in the first half of the fourteenth century. Van Koningsveld and Wiegers give two arguments in support of their claim that the original of the Kitāb Miżfāḥ ad-Dīn and its adaptation were composed within a short time of each other during the first half of the fourteenth century: firstly: that MS V7 is dated to the end of the fourteenth century and, in it it is mentioned that 'Ali al-Gharīb was dead (‘rāḍiya-Īllāhu ‘anhu’); and secondly: that this adaptor knew about the vicissitudes of the author of the Kitāb Miżfāḥ ad-Dīn, Muḥammad al-Qaysī (fl. 1309 CE) in Lleida, namely: his polemics with the Christians. As these authors have shown, the Aljamiado adaptations became very popular among Mudejars and Moriscos. If this dating is correct, it is unlikely that the Arabic version of the Ta'yīd in MS XXXI (762 H/=1361 CE) is an autograph. Consequently al-Gharīb would have worked from an older original, as Kassin maintains. Therefore, the original Arabic of the Ta'yīd must have been compiled during the first half of the fourteenth century at the latest.35

b) The "demandas de los judíos" ['Questions [asked] by the Jews']
"demandas ke demandaron una konpaña de judios all annabī Muḥammad"
['Questions Posed to the Prophet Muhammad by the Jews']. Author: Anonymous.

"demandas de ' Abd Allāh ibn Salām" 
['Questions Posed by 'Abd Allāh ibn Salām']. Author: Anonymous.

The 'demandas ke demandaron una konpaña de judios' (henceforth, 'demandas de los judios') and the 'demandas de 'Abd Allāh ibn Salām' are two Muslim narratives about Jewish individuals and groups of Jews who approached Muhammad to ask him about the doctrine of Islam and subsequently converted. Countless variations of these narratives had been widespread since the beginning of the Muslim expansion. An Arabic copy of the questions posed by 'Abd Allāh ibn Salām, dated to the sixteenth century and in circulation among the Moriscos and perhaps also among the Mudejars, is preserved in the manuscript

34 The figure of al-Asīr is obscure. See Thomas, 2012.
35 See note 20 above in this Chapter.
MS 395 of the Biblioteca de Castilla-La Mancha (ff. 1r-41r). The narrative has escaped the attention of scholars, most probably because of the description found in the catalogue which reads: “Contestaciones de Mahoma por el Corán a cuestiones de teología, liturgia, derecho, ciencias naturales, etc” ['Answers by Muḥammad by means of the Qurʾān to Questions on Theology, Liturgy, Religious Law, Natural Sciences, et cetera'].

While it is true that these are answers by Muḥammad, the catalogue remains silent about the fact that they are replies to the questions posed by Ṭabd Allāh ibn Salām and are embedded in the story of his conversion to Islam. One Aljamiado version of this narrative is preserved, but only the beginning of the text is still extant. The narrative is interrupted at the point at which Muḥammad is attempting to answer the third asked by Ṭabd Allāh ibn Salām.

The ‘questions of the Jews’ ['demandas de los judíos'] to Muḥammad is a variation of the story in which it is not Ṭabd Allāh ibn Salām but a group of Jews who pose questions to Muḥammad instead. The narrative, in this form, is extant only in Aljamiado and in Latin scripts. Of the Aljamiado versions, the oldest seems to be the partial copy preserved in the manuscript kept at the Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris 774 (ff. 41r-73v) dating from the early sixteenth century. The Jews address such questions as why the prayers five times a day prescribed in Islam should be performed and what rewards would be bestowed on those who perform them. They are also interested in the reasons behind the obligation to perform the ritual ablutions and the fast of ṭamaḍān and they ask Muḥammad about the rewards for those who comply with these obligations.

The ‘demandas’ or ‘questions of the Jews’ have been so widespread that, on occasion, scholars have attributed this title to narratives which, after closer inspection, do not correspond to the ‘demandas’. This is the case of MS BNE 5390, ff. 136v-137v. This manuscript has a colophon with a double dating on f. 134r, 27th September 1012 H/1603 CE and at the beginning and end of the manuscript there are various dates. Hence, f. 2r has the year 1602 CE and some accounting items referring to ‘taranīj Qasṭiān’, or ‘Castilian oranges’. This suggests the probable circulation of the manuscript in the Christian

---

* In the online catalogue and in the catalogue of Esteve Barba, n. 305, 1942, 295. The manuscript is in very good condition, written in clear Arabic script in black ink with red ink for the vocalizations. The use of this manuscript by the Moriscos is suggested by the fact that some folia from the Gradual are written on the fly-leaves.


* The title has multiple variations such as “las demandas de los diez sabios judíos al annabī Muḥammad” ['The Questions of the Ten Jewish Sages to al annabi Muḥammad'], MS RAH n/9415 (Olim. T9), ff. 157r-168v.

* Rodríguez Rodríguez notes that MS BNP 774 was copied at the beginning of the fifteenth century but that, according to Sánchez Álvarez (1982), the “Racontamiento de los escándalos ...” in this miscellaneous manuscript was earlier than the fifteenth century. Rodríguez Rodríguez, 1987-1989, 4124 and 1434 n. 49.

* On f. 139r there is another colophon dated on 1015 H (=1606 CE).
territories and/or the contacts of its owners with the Iberian Peninsula. The contents of this manuscript have not been studied and, moreover, have been mistakenly described by Guillén Robles, also in the library catalogue. Indeed, it does not contain thirteen folia with the ‘preguntas de los judíos’ at the end, as this scholar claims, but instead we find on ff. 136v-137v the Arabic original of the conversion by Ka‘ab al-Abhār after having discovered the true (that is, the Qur’ānic meaning) of a number of verses from the Torah which had been kept secret by the Jewish sages and had been altered by them. The Aljamiado version with variations of this narrative is found in MS L 536-3 (Calanda, Fondo Documental Histórico de las Cortes de Aragón, ff. 14r-17v), which also contains the ‘demandas’ and an Aljamiado version of the polemic of the Ta‘yid al-Milla (‘Fortification of the Faith, or Community’) described below.

The relation of the manuscripts which contain one or other version of the ‘demandas’ is the following: a) MS BNE 6316, XVe.; Chapter 42; b) MS BNE 5374, XVe., No. 6 ff. 34-49v and 56r-78v. c) MS BNP 774, XVe., No. 3; d) MS RAH 11/9410; olím. T13 ff. 234r-248v, s.f., paper XVe.; e) J60, No. 5 ff. 122v-133v; f) MS BN Arg. 614 Aljamiado Bibliothèque Nationale d’Argélie, ff. 56-77, s.f.; g) MS RAH 11/9415; olím. T19, ff. 157v-168v (s.f., XVe); h) MS Junta 13, No. 11, ff. 67r-79r; i) MS No. 89 which corresponds with Manuscript D from the Appendix by Ribera and Asín, 1912, 267-268, No. 2, f. 100v, Unax demandax que demandaron una compañía de judíox á l’annabí Mohammad, preserved in the Archivo de las Escuelas Pías de Zaragoza; MS L 536-3 (Calanda, Fondo Documental Histórico de las Cortes de Aragón, 886 H (=1481 CE), ff. 8v-14r), and MS 395 (Biblioteca de Castilla-La Mancha), Arabic.

*a* Guillén Robles, 1889, 233, DLXIX.

*b* My intention is to publish an article on this subject, “Translation and Polemics in the Literature against the Jews of the Muslims of Christian Iberia”, in Adang, Camilla and Mercedes García-Arenal (eds) Translating Sacred Texts in Medieval and Early Modern Iberia. Leiden, Boston: Brill. In this manuscript we also find a ‘Jewish confession’, or Ashamnu, a fragment about the mistakes found in their Sacred Law, a fragment on the Prophet Elijah and an extract from the second-century chronology, Seder Olam Rabbah, [‘The Great Order of the World’]. See “Seder Olam” by Rosenthal in EJ.

*c* Here, there are “dieç çaçerdotes judios”[‘ten Jewish priests’], MS L 536-3, f. 8v.

*d* The references to the RAH and BNE are taken from the Apendix in Saavedra, 1878.

*e* Edited by Sánchez Álvarez, 1982, 156-170.


*i* According to Karima Bouras, today this manuscript seems to be lost (MS XIII, T18). Bouras, 2007, 132. Álvaro Galmés de Fuentes already notes this in his description of MS RAH 11/9410; olím. T13. Galmés de Fuentes, 1998, 94. Two of the four Aljamiado manuscripts which seem to have been preserved in this Archive were exhibited in 1994. See, Doscientos cincuenta años de la Provincia Escolapía en Aragón, 1994, 145.
c) The Ta’yīd al-Milla
[‘Fortification of the Faith, or the Community’. Author: Anonymous (ff. 1r–30v.)]

Consisting of about one hundred and ten folia, the Ta’yīd al-Milla is one of the lengthiest Muslim anti-Jewish treatises of polemics in circulation in the Iberian Peninsula known to us and it was widespread among the Mudejars and the later Moriscos. In the colophon of this work in MS AF 58 (f. 30v), the īmām Abū Zakariyyā’ Yahlī bn. Ibrāhīm Mūhammad al-Raqīlī (a less secure reading is ar-Raghilī) claims to have completed its copy in the town of Pīṭrūla (‘bi-balda Pīṭrūla’) in 808 H (=1405 CE). In a moment I shall return to the discussion of where Pīṭrūla should be located. In this work, al-Raqīlī also claims to have been working with a corrupt text of the Ta’yīd, which suggests that he had no access to the original. The dating of the manuscripts of the Ta’yīd discussed below shows that the original Arabic would have been composed during the first half of the fourteenth century at the latest. It has been noted in the preceding chapter that one of the main reasons which prompted the author of this treatise to compose the Ta’yīd was the attacks made by groups of Jews on Islam publicly in gatherings and privately in dwellings, most probably Muslim ones. The fact that the Jews “let loose their tongues with lies and calumnies and defame our prophet Mūhammad, may Allāh bless and keep him, and deny his Sacred Law (shar’ahu) and prophetic office” suggests that these groups might have had a certain knowledge of Islam and this knowledge compelled him to write this polemic “in preparation for debates and disputations (al-munāẓarāt wa-l-ḥitijāj)”.

In a work contemporary with the copy of the Ta’yīd, the Commentary on Avot, composed by Rabbi Joseph Ben Shoshan of Toledo (c. 1310-1380 CE), we read the following:

And when I went to Castile and I happened to be in a certain city, there was a certain youth from a big city and he ridiculed the honor of the Torah, using harsh words and rude gestures[...]. And when I saw the extent to which the reins were loosened, and those errands who loosened wished to draw support and help from certain matters and reasons they found in the writings of the above-mentioned rabbi of blessed memory in

---

50 In an earlier publication, Wiegers refers to “al-Raghilī (that is, from Regla)” and more recently he has amended it to al-Raqīlī, which in my view is the most secure reading (Wiegers, 1994, 64 cf. by the same author, 2008, 505). Both designations could have referred to the town of Ricla in Aragon, given that Regla does not seem to have not corresponded to a place name in the Iberian Peninsula.

51 Ms AF 58, f. 30v

52 Kassin 1969, I, 125; II, 373 (f. 1).

his commentaries, in them was fulfilled the saying: [When] a disciple is mistaken – his teacher is blamed.54

This shows us that the argument put forward by the author of the Ta'yiḍ could have been vehement, but not entirely original. Even though they might have been literary topoi, both works reflect the public display of polemics and suggest that, in the case of the Ta'yiḍ, that the Mudejars could have felt the need to defend Islam from the attacks by Jews as well as having to compete directly with them for the favours of Christian lords in the political arena.

The author of the Ta'yiḍ claims that the accusations of the Jews against Muslims are a lie which can be proven by an examination of the Jewish texts themselves. To show this, he divides the text into five sections, of which Miguel Asín Palacios gives an overview in his article about the Ta'yiḍ already mentioned.55 The first section deals with the pact made by God with Ismāʾīl and his offspring and explains how God withdrew His blessing from the people of Israel. The second section rebukes the Jewish denial of the possibility of abrogation of the divine law. The third section discusses all the passages in the Torah in which Muḥammad and Islam are announced and, in the fourth section, we find an account of the miracles of Muḥammad. The fifth and final section of the Ta'yiḍ al-Milla returns to the ideas expressed at the beginning and stresses the rebellion of the Jews against God (and, hence the breaking of the Covenant) and God’s punishments on the Jews. The author concludes that Jews should repent and convert to Islam, that is, accept ʿĪsā (Jesus) as a prophet and believe in Muḥammad and his revelation.56

The author of the Ta'yiḍ quotes from various other sources such as the Qur'an, the Torah, the Gospel,57 the Prophets and the Psalms, among other references, but it is the extensive use of the Torah which characterizes this polemic. It is worth noting that not all Muslims agreed with the approach to the Torah taken by the author of the Ta'yiḍ. Their objections become evident in one of the surviving Arabic copies of this polemic (MS Borgiano Arabo 163, Vatican Library), dated 786 H (=1384 CE). As has been noted above, Van Koningsveld and Wiegers argue that this is a sixteenth-century manuscript which belonged to the corpus of Arabic manuscripts from Pastrana described by Marcos Dobelio. In it the copyist, ʿAlī ibn Salama al-Tujibi, known as Mindīl,58 apologizes to his audiences

54 Ilan, 2012, 189.
55 Asín Palacios 1909a, see also above.
56 Kassin, 1969, I, 243; II, 434 (f. 1:2).
57 Muslim authors of polemics use the Gospel (injīl), which is regarded as the unaltered Revelation to Jesus by God, in the singular. Only sporadically do they use the plural (anājīl). This was also the practice among the Mudejar authors of polemics.
58 As it reads the colophon on f. 54.
because, in his view, the author of the Ta’yīd does not reproduce the Torah faithfully. He pleads for a Qur’ānic interpretation of God’s revelation to the Jews instead, and goes as far as to claim that the author of the Ta’yīd presents his work as a polemic when, in fact, it is a mean attack on the Jews and on the prophets of Allāh, Iṣmā’īl, Išhāq, Ya’qūb, Mūsā, Yūshū’a and Ashʿiyā’. Al-Tuji bi’s remarks are connected to the acquaintance with the Jewish sources of the author of the Ta’yīd and his Jewish origin, two aspects that will be discussed at length in Chapter Five.

c.1) The Arabic Manuscripts of the Ta’yīd

Besides the Arabic copy of the Ta’yīd preserved in MS Borg. Ar. 163, there are three more Arabic and five Aljamiado copies of this treatise. An analysis of these manuscripts sheds light on the changes in and dissemination of this polemic among the Mudejars and the Moriscos. The Arabic copies are MS RAH XXXI, MS AF 58 and MS BN Alg. 721. Kassin notes that the Arabic copy of the Ta’yīd in MS AF 58 (808 H/=1405 CE) is almost identical to that in MS RAH XXXI (762 H/=1361 CE). However, MS AF 58 was copied independently of MS RAH XXXI. This observation is derived from the fact that, in the colophon of MS AF 58, the scribe says that he is working with a corrupt copy. The copy of MS RAH XXXI, completed in the city Huesca, does not mention this fact. Kassin argues that this is indeed not the case: the common mistakes in MS RAH XXXI and in MS AF 58 are explained by the fact that they are copies of a more ancient common source. Nevertheless, they are independent copies, since MS AF 58 cites some verses from Deuteronomy (28: 55-69; 29: 9-1) and Leviticus (26: 14-17) cited in MS AF 58 – and, despite similarities in the versions of the Ta’yīd in these two manuscripts –  they are “inadvertently glossed over” in MS RAH XXXI.

In his study of transcription and translation of the Ta’yīd, Kassin does not use the MS Borg. Ar. 163. This manuscript was copied in 786 H (=1384 CE) and is therefore later than MS RAH XXXI 762 H (=1361 CE), and predates MS AF 58 (808 H/=1405 CE). It is difficult to establish the relationship between MS RAH XXXI and MS Borg. Ar. 163 without a critical edition of the Arabic manuscripts of the Ta’yīd, but we should not rule out the possibility that the verses quoted above were already present in MS Arabo Borgiano 163.

59 He claims, for example, that not Aaron but as-Sāmīrī (the Samaritan) was the person who made the Israelites worship the golden calf. Elż s.v. “as-Sāmīrī” (Heller and Rippin).
60 MS Borg. Ar. 163, f. 57r.
61 Kassin, 1969, I, 102 and 83-84.
This is the filiation between the Arabic manuscripts:

![Diagram showing the filiation between Arabic manuscripts](image)

### c.2) The Aljamiado Manuscripts of the Ta’ŷid

The data derived from the five Aljamiado manuscripts containing an adaptation of the *Ta’ŷid* can be summed up as follows:

a) The only copy which retains the chapter division of the Arabic version of the *Ta’ŷid* as found in MS AF 58 and MS RAH XXXI is MS L 536 (Calanda, Fondo Documental Histórico de las Cortes de Aragón). In the incipit of this manuscript copied in 886 H (=1481 CE), we read: “This is the book of disputation with the Christians and the Jews. The compiler of this book said that when he saw that the times had changed and knowledge was diminished because of the readers’ lack, all the more so in the land of Christians in which we are, and that on some days, when groups of Christians and Jews were in the squares and places, they denied the Prophet Muḥammad šallā-llāhu ’alayhi wa-sallam” (f. 123v).\(^{62}\) MS L 536 includes a summary of the five chapters which constitute the *Ta’ŷid*, the only exception being that the fourth chapter has disappeared and the fifth chapter has taken its place. Therefore, the fourth chapter on the miracles of Muḥammad is not included and instead we find the fifth chapter of the Arabic version of the *Ta’ŷid* which deals with the judgements visited by God on the Jewish people. Four chapters about polemics against Christians have been added.

---

\(^{62}\) MS L 536, f. 123v:

“este es el libro de disputación con los cristianos y judíos. diso el cubilador de-ste libro quando yo-ví que se demudaba el tiempo i-eran menguados los del saber por falta de leidores cuanto-mas en-la-tierra de cristianos en-la-cual allanos estamos hay algunos días quando eran presentes compañas de cristianos i de los judíos en las plaças i-en os lugares i negaban al-profeṭa muḥammad šallā-llāhu ’alayhi wa-sallam.” See Annex for a full transcription and translation of the introduction to this manuscript. The date on the colophon is on f. 159r.
after these first four chapters. As a result of these changes, the dispute with the Jews in the *Ta'ŷīd* becomes a dispute with the Jews and the Christians, as the title of this Aljamiado version announces. The four chapters of polemics with the Christians are mentioned in the introduction, but their contents have not survived because the copy is interrupted halfway through the story of the miracles of Muḥammad. The topics announced are: the divinity of Jesus (5th), the Trinity (6th), the death and passion of Jesus (7th) and the ordinances given by God to the people (8th). The influence of the *Ta'ŷīd* is readily perceptible in the first four chapters. Although the copyist sometimes confuses titles and chapters, which gives the impression that the text does not follow the order of the *Ta'ŷīd*, the content itself does retain the original order. The introduction to the work is adapted to these new contents: as sources the copyist mentions the Books of the Prophets and the Gospels, as well as books on philosophy and logic.

b) MS RAH XXXII (11/9416, box 7; Olim, V7) contains an adaptation of the *Ta'ŷīd*, most likely the work of the faqīh ʿAlī al-Gharīb. Here, we find only the end of “la desputacion con los judíos” (f. iv). After this comes a dispute with Christians in which ʿAlī al-Gharīb is mentioned. He tells the story of Paul, the Jew, as it was transmitted by “ibn ʿUmar al-Tamīmī (eighth century): “dixúʿ Alī al-Gharīb radiya-llahuʿ anhu” (f. 2r).

On the other hand, the adaptation of the *Ta'ŷīd* by al-Gharīb in MS BNE 4944 (probably dated at the end of the 15th c.) is not a literal translation of the Arabic version of this polemic. In MS BNE 4944, Arabic script is used to transcribe a passage from the Hebrew Torah, and it is said that Abraham married Sarah without “berajá”, or without a blessing (f. 8r). The use of an Hebrew word ‘berajá’, and of ‘atemar’ on f. 7v (see Annex), plus the fact that MS BNE 4944 begins with the phrase “Henceforth, I want to declare the blindness of the Goim” [“de aki adelante kiero declarar la ceguedad de los Goím”] suggests that ʿAlī al-Gharīb could have been a convert to Islam from Judaism, although this does not necessarily preclude a Muslim origin of this adapter, and the linguistic characteristics of the manuscript could be attributable to the later copyist of MS BNE 4944. In f. 7v we read that the Jews have been in captivity 1,300 or 1,400 years, suggesting that this is an older manuscript than MS J8 and J9 in which it says that the Jews had been in captivity 1,400 years.  

---

63 Van Koningsveld and Wiegers, 1994, 186.
64 Wiegers, 2008, 313.
65 Hebrew term for “blessing” used by the members of the Sephardic communities. See, Curso de Cultura Hispano Judía y Sefardí de la Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, 2008.
67 MS Jg, f. 24r. MS J8, f. 4r. It should be noted that the current foliation of these two manuscripts does not correspond with those provided by Laureano García and Fernández Fernández. In MS Jg, the first folio of the
created by Moriscos, it is highly likely the treatises contained in it were in circulation among Mudejars. Therefore, Van Koningsveld and Wiegers maintain that the dispute with Christians in MS BNE 4944 is the Romance version of an Arabic polemic written by Mudejars and preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale d’Algérie (MS BN Arg. 1557): the *Kitāb Miftah al-Dīn*. In both, the polemic with the Christians and in the polemic with the Jews in MS BNE 4944, we find the name of ‘Ali al-Gharib ([di][ṣ][e][n][o][s] ‘ali al-gharib, sepas que hājār madre de ismā‘īl; f. 1v lower margin). These two authors also argue that ‘Ali al-Gharib is the adaptor of the *Kitāb Miftah al-Dīn* and that *gharīb* must be understood to be a term synonymous with Mudejar. The Aljamiado adaptation of the *Kitāb Miftah al-Dīn* must have been the work of ‘Ali al-Gharib shortly after the persecution of the Templars in Christian Spain and France in 1307-1312 CE. This means that the Aljamiado adaptation of the *Ta‘yīd* would also have been the work of ‘Ali al-Gharib, written during the first half of the fourteenth century.

c) In MS J8 and J9, ‘Ali al-Gharib is introduced as the author of the text. It is my hypothesis that MSS J8/J9 are adaptations of the *Ta‘yīd* which do not depend on MS BNE 4944. There are several arguments to support this hypothesis. In neither of these two manuscripts do we find the fragment of the Torah in Arabic written in Hebrew characters which occurs in MS BNE 4944. In addition, while Sarah married without “berajá” in MS BNE 4944, in J8/J9 she is married without *as-sadaq* (this Arabic term appears in both these Aljamiado manuscripts). In two of the Arabic manuscripts of the *Ta‘yīd*, MS XXXI and MS AF 58, we read that Sarah married without a *taqdis* (or blessing). This makes clear that, between the making of the copy of MS BNE 4944 and that of the Aljamiado manuscripts J8 and J9, the adaptation of the *Ta‘yīd* had undergone a process of what can be called ‘re-Islamization’. What I mean by this is that, even though after the expulsion of the Jews from

---

*Ta‘yīd* is not f. 253r but f. 234v and so on. Cf. Laureano García, 2008, 445ff. In MS J8, f. 397v should read f. 396v and so on. Cf. Fernández Fernández, 1987, 376ff. I thank Prof. Juan Carlos Villaverde Amieva for having sent me a copy of these two dissertations.

48 Van Koningsveld and Wiegers, 1994, 192 n. 134. An additional suggestion for this anthroponym is found in Colomínas Aparicio, 2014, 43. The adaptation by ‘Ali al-Gharib had a wide circulation among the Mudejars and, besides MS BNE 4944, is also found in a partial form in MS BNE 5302, MS RAH 11/947α (Olim. T12), MS RAH XXXII (11/9416, box 7) and MS XXXI (11/9416, box 6; Olim. V6). Watermarks in MS BNE 4944 seem to date from the end of the fifteenth century. Van Koningsveld and Wiegers 1994, 186-188, quoting Wiegers, 1994, 178.


50 MS J8, ff. 396v-418r; MS J9, ff. 235v-223r.

51 Wiegers has argued convincingly that elsewhere other than in MS BNE 4944, ‘Ali al-Gharib is presented as the author, when in fact, he is only the adapter. Wiegers, 2008, 512. Here, we are probably dealing with the same phenomenon.

52 Kassin, 1969, I, 129; II, 315 (f. 13). See Annex for the transcription and the rendering into modern Spanish of this work in MS BNE 4944.
the peninsula in 1492 CE the polemics against this community continued to be cultivated by the Mudejars, the greater need to target their own community and not an external public might have led to changes in the articulation of their discourses. Another element which suggests that MSS J8/J9 do not follow MS BNE 4944 is the inclusion of a passage in which it says that, at the beginning of the world, the Jews were born on the planet Rajil, or Saturn. Therefore, we read that Saturn is one of the main planets in the sky, a wandering star which is contrary to all good, and this is why the Jews: “are always uncertain and unknowing in their belief and so they are stiff-necked” [siempre fueron ḍuḏosos i desconocidos en su creencia i así son duros ḍe cervizes] (ff. 211r-v). The identification of Jews with Saturn is a theme which often appears in the writings of anti-Jewish Christian polemics. Centuries earlier, Augustine had already considered Saturn the God of the Jews.73

A typical anti-Jewish treatise of this nature is Der Stern der Maschiach (Esslingen 1477 CE) by Petrus Nigri.74 This Dominican was born in Bohemia (1434-1483 CE) but was educated in the Iberian Peninsula where he found the materials for his polemics. In this work, Nigri includes opinions similar to those of our Muslim polemicist. This suggests that the ideas to which I refer here were probably in circulation in the immediate vicinities of the Mudejar and Moriscos.75

The explicit references to the Talmud and the identification of Jews with Saturn in MSS J8 and J9 strengthen the hypothesis that, after the adaptation of the Ta’ científico by ‘Ali al-Gharib, the text was adapted yet again. Therefore, the attitude towards the Jews in MSS J8 and J9 might echo the growing rejection of converts by the Christian society in the late Middle Ages and Early Modern times. On the grounds of their abandonment of the use of Hebrew and the reintroduction of Arabic terms, MSS J8 and J9 seem to be closer to the discourse of the Christian majority and they do incorporate themes and sources of the Jewish anti-Christian polemics of this time and might indicate a greater rejection of Jews by the Mudejars. I shall return to these issues in Chapter Five.

Taking into account what has been said so far, it is my hypothesis that there were three adaptations of the Ta’yīd in circulation in the Mudejar and the Morisco communities:

1) The version of MS L536 (Calanda, Fondo Documental Histórico de las Cortes de Aragón). MS L 536 is the only manuscript to keep the organization and contents of the Ta’yīd. The four extra chapters containing polemics against the Christians in MS L 536

---

73 The identification of Saturn with the Jews and the image of Saturn as representative of the medieval “lowest rung on the social ladder” has been thoroughly studied. Zafran, 1979, 1 quoting Kiblinsky et al., 1964, 273. Chapter One of Klibansky et al., 1964, deals with Saturn, both in Arabic astrology and ancient and medieval literature.

74 Zafran 1979, 17 n. 11.

75 EJ s.v. “Nigri (Niger), Petrus”. In Nuremberg in the early fifteenth century, we find the representation of Saturn dressed as a Jew and eating his children. This image seems to draw on the accusations made against Jews of killing Christian children in ritual offerings. Zafran, 1979, 17 and 23 ff.
could have been abstracted from the polemic against the Christians and the Jews, the *Kitāb al-Mujādala*. As said, this polemic is included after the *Taʿyīd* in MS AF 58. An argument which points to this possibility is the fact that all the subjects in the polemic against the Christians which the copyist of MS L 536 announces also appear in MS AF 58. This is not surprising, since they are *loci communes* in Muslim-Christian polemics. However, if we consider that: (1) the *Taʿyīd* and the *Kitāb al-Mujādala* are bound together in a single codex (MS AF 58); (2) that the contents of the *Taʿyīd* appear again re-ordered in MS L 536; and (3) that the polemics with the Jews have become an attack on Jews and Christians, it seems reasonable to argue that the materials for the sections against Christians in MS L 536 were borrowed from the *Kitāb al-Mujādala.*

2) The adaptation in MS BNE 4944 by ʿAlī al-Gharib was, as argued by Van Koningsveld and Wiegers, already in circulation alongside the Arabic original by al-Qaysi among members of the Mudejar communities. This suggests that there might have been two groups within these communities. One of these groups was an audience who belonged to the Muslim elite and were well versed in Arabic; the other an audience who no longer used Arabic as the language of literature, but kept their interest in the Muslim tradition of written polemics with the Jews. Converts from Judaism could have belonged to the latter group.

3) The third is another adaptation of the version by ʿAlī al-Gharib written after the copying of MS BNE 4944. This adaptation includes various materials from the version of al-Gharib in MS BNE 4944, such as the prophecy of the prophet Amos: “For three sins I will forgive the children of Israel, but for the fourth I will not forgive them.” Now ask them, “What is the fourth sin for which He threatened them that He would not forgive them?” Hence, the author of the *Taʿyīd* claims that the Jews killed Jesus and failed to show respect for his mother. His support of the Christians is in line with the special consideration in Islam for ʿĪsā as a prophet and for his mother, Maryam. However, MSS J8 and J9 disregard many other elements which are found in MS BNE 4944 (such as the passages in Hebrew, the story of Judah and Tamar, or that of Jacob and his slaves), and new elements including references to Saturn or to the Talmud have been added. The dating of these two manuscripts and the internal references suggest that this version is considerably later than MS BNE 4944.

---

76 See the Annex for a transcription and rendering into modern Spanish of the introduction to this polemic. After the discussion in Chapter Six, it will become clear that the main points announced in the polemics with the Christians (but as noted, not developed) seem to coincide with the subjects of polemics with the Christians to which the author of the *Kitāb al-Mujādala* pays the most attention.

77 Kassin, 1969, I, 271. BNE 4944, ff. 6v and 35v. Both MS J9 f. 214v as MS J8 f. 408 v refer at this point to Moses' prophecy.
This is the filiation between the Aljamiado manuscripts:

A final word about this survey of Arabic and Aljamiado adaptations of the *Ta'yīd* is that, in the Aljamiado adaptations, we observe the introduction of some rhetorical elements which seem to respond to a discourse of Christian polemic and adapt the contents slightly to the specific needs of the Peninsular Muslims. This does not mean that Arabic and Aljamiado copies show an increase in the influence of the Christian discourse, but instead that they follow a discontinuous trend which seems to have depended on the adapters. While the original Arabic of the *Ta'yīd* seems to have been the work of a Muslim, one of the three Aljamiado adaptations which I have identified suggests that its adapter, 'Alī al-Gharib, might have been a converted Jew. This adaptation (MS BNE 4944) has subsequently been 're-islamized', which is suggested by the analysis of the manuscripts J8 and J9. These two copies set aside the 'Jewish' elements and include a new topic of controversy: the relationship between the Jews and the planet Saturn. This topic was gaining strength in Christian anti-Jewish discourse of polemics in the late Middle Ages and Early Modern period and this allows us to argue at this point for a Christian 'origin'.

d) The *Kitāb al-Mujādala ma′a l-Yahūd wa-n-Naṣārā*  
[‘The Book of Disputation with the Christians and the Jews’]. Author: Anonymous.

The *Kitāb al-Mujādala* is a Muslim polemic against both the Christians and the Jews currently kept in the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek in Vienna. It has the signature MS AF 58. It is a miscellaneous manuscript and contains two treatises: an Arabic copy of the
Taʿyīd (ff. 1r-31r) and the Kitāb al-Mujādala (ff. 31v-62v). The language is Arabic in Andalusī script by one hand: that of the faqīḥ Abū Zakariyyāʾ Yahyā bn. Ibrāhīm al-Raqili, as he himself declares on f. 31v. The treatise has no colophon but, taking into account that al-Raqili completed the copy of the Taʿyīd in Piṭrūla in 808 H (=1405 CE) and that the Kitāb al-Mujādala is copied by the same hand and on the same paper and quires, it is possible to argue that this happened soon after the copying of the Taʿyīd and that it is very likely that al-Raqili also copied this second treatise in Piṭrūla. Unlike al-Raqili’s claim in the colophon of the Taʿyīd that he had to work with a defective copy of the text, here he announces that he is copying out (intasakha) a disputation with the Jews and the Christians, but this time he provides no details about the state of the manuscript from which he is copying.78 From a brief preliminary analysis of some passages, Kassin argues that the author of this treatise relied on the same version of the Judaeo-Arabic Pentateuch by Saadia Gaon as that used in the Taʿyīd and that the contents of the two treatises show close parallels.79 Moreover, he suggests that the same person composed these two works, namely: an anonymous Jew who had converted to Islam. A thorough analysis of the Kitāb al-Mujādala will serve to assess whether Kassin’s arguments are defensible. However, at this point, it should be noted that, although preserved in a fairly good condition, so far the manuscript has been hardly studied at all. It is for this reason I include a detailed description of it at the end of the present dissertation.

d.1) Language, Dating and Readership
Arabic is the main language in the Kitāb al-Mujādala but we also find many Aljamiado words and expressions in the sentences, which suggests the dating of the Kitāb al-Mujādala to the Mudejar period. The linguistic alternation of the copyist – and maybe that of the author as well – and the hybrid Arabic-Aljamiado in the sentences is characteristic of a linguistic situation of code switching and reflects the progressive changes in which Arabic would function as the dominant or matrix language and Romance as the minor or embedded language; a situation which some scholars already date to before 1455 CE.80 The following is an example of this use; we read: “wa-lādhi lā yāʿūdu dhe-lash kundisīyūnāsh (Sp. ‘de las condiciones’) al-akhar laysa yashbihahu ilā al-akhar” [‘the one who does not possess the same status as the other, does not resemble the other’]. The expression is something which is not entirely Arabic, nor is it fully Romance, but something in between

78 MS AF 58, f. 31v.
80 Wiegers, 1994, 67-68. See among the many studies on the subject, the two recent important contributions of López-Baralt, 2009; and, Barceló and Labarta, 2009.
and, moreover, the grammatical structure of the sentence is strikingly similar to that in modern Castilian “volverse de la condición del otro”.

Figure 1: Language Alternation MS AF 58, f. 60v

We find strong indications that the discourse in the Kitāb al-Mujādala was most probably fuelled by the Christians’ proselytizing campaigns, for instance, in the accusations of idolatry laid at the door of the Christians for wearing their robes (in Romance “abitosh”) not “for the sake of God” but “because of Paul, Francis, Saint Peter or Augustine” seem to suggest. Below, I shall enter into a discussion about to what extent it is an answer to Christian works of polemics against the Muslims. Also taking into account the mention of Muslim rulers, who should most probably be identified as Abū Zakariyyā’ Yahyā al-Awwal (1203-1249 CE), the founder of the Ḥafṣid dynasty in Tunisia, and his son Abū Ḥabīl Muḥammad al-Mustanṣir (1249-1277 CE) and the Marinid Abū Yūsuf Ya’qūb al-Nāṣir (1286-1307 CE), these references appear to lend strength to the idea that the work was in circulation among the Mudejars.

Nevertheless, we cannot exclude the possibility of a later Morisco ownership of the text. This is because, even though scholars agree on the Moriscos’ gradual loss of their command of Arabic, the claim that the members of their communities were no longer trained in reading and writing the Arabic language should be qualified. There is an increasing body of evidence that after the end of the fifteenth century Mudejars and Moriscos used Arabic until a late date, and among the books handed over to the Inquisition in 1526 CE by two fāqīḥs of Borja after their conversion to Christianity, we find a “quitebul mugedala”. Ana Labarta and Carlos Escribano note that this probably does not correspond to the Kitāb al-Mujādala by Abū Hanīfah. Although we have only the titles of the books which were in the hands of these fāqīḥs, the striking correspondence of the titles suggests that we might be dealing with the Kitāb al-Mujādala discussed here. Furthermore,

81 MS AF 58, f. 55v. See Chapter Two above for the full quote.
84 Labarta and Escribano, 2000, 358 and 365.
the manuscript has an annotation in another hand on the last folio (f. 63v) in which a certain qādī Manṣūr Ibn Yūsuf Abī as-Sayyid (in the text we read “qādī bilādī”, perhaps referring to the town in which the scribe lived). Although I have not been able to identify who this qādī was, this note provides evidence of a wider circulation of the Arabic text among Muslims after the copy was finished in 808 H (=1405 CE). The date is reinforced by the fact that, on the same folio, we find the following lines written by a different hand to either that of al-Raqīl or that of qādī Manṣūr as-Sayyid:

*Do not call one of you by his name if you are Muslims, only by your Christian names; call yourselves [instead, MCA] by the honorific names (kunya) and the surnames (laqab)!*

The reference to “Christian names” suggests that these three lines were most probably a later addition addressed to those Iberian Muslims who had been forcibly converted to Christianity. The exhortation of this nominal Christian, and covert Muslim, to his partners in misfortune places identity ahead of the concerns of the later Moriscos. Moreover, it shows that they knew and used the treatises of polemics composed and copied by their predecessors.

The manuscript could also have circulated in Aljamiado, as suggested by a reference to a *Libro de la disputa contra los judíos y cristianos* ['Book of Disputation with the Jews and the Christians'] in the inventory of Arabic books found in Pastrana mentioned above. The hypothesis that this Book of Disputation, now lost, could have been the *Kitāb al-Mujādala* is very tempting. Notwithstanding the temptation, there is no proof of this but the fact that a book with such a title circulated in Pastrana at the end of the sixteenth century alongside the *Ta’yīd al-Milla* does emphasize the level of knowledge of polemical works among the Moriscos. The most notable examples of anti-Christian polemics among exiled Moriscos are the *Apología contra la religión Cristiana* ['Apology Against the Christian Religion'] written in Morocco by a former resident of Pastrana, Muḥammad Alguazir,* and

---

* MS AF 58, f. 63v.

---

See note 24 above.

* The origin of Alguazir is provided by another exiled Morisco, ʿIbrāhīm Taybīlī. Wiegers, 1996a, 110-112ff. Taybīlī refers to Alguazir in his poems. Teresa Soto González from the CSIC is currently writing a thesis on the relationship between religious identity and poetics entitled “Poetic and Religious Forms in Late Morisco Poetry. Mohammad Rabadār’s *Discurso de la Luz*, in which among other sources the work of Taybīlī is discussed.
the polemic contesting Jewish and Christian views written in Tunis by Juan Alonso Aragonés.\(^8\)

Codicological analysis also reveals that the copy of MS AF 58 by a-Raqili was later annotated in Latin, Arabic and Hebrew\(^9\), and therefore that it had had at least two other readers. The Latin annotation to Genesis 49:10, “The sceptre shall not depart from Judah”, in the marginalia of the Kitāb al-Mujādala (“Non recedet sceptrum Iuda Gen 49” MS AF 58, f. 42v) suggests that the Kitāb al-Mujādala was probably later used by a Christian author, possibly a student of Oriental languages. This could reflect the Christians’ interest in Muslim arguments against the Jews arising from this particular verse. Perhaps an indication of their endeavour to enlarge their knowledge of Islam and to polemicize with and proselytize the Muslims and, eventually, to polemicize with the Jews.\(^9\)

d.2) Contents

Whereas nearly a third of the contents of the Kitāb al-Mujādala deals with Aristotle and Ibn Rushd (plus references to other authors among them Galen and Seneca, see Source Overview), a large portion is devoted to questions or masāʾil\(^9\) put by the Christians. References to Jewish beliefs and rituals are few, and address such issues as the purity of the Jews (MS AF 58, f. 43v). The Torah is frequently referred to but long quotations from this source are fairly exceptional. On only two separate occasions are the ‘Book of Kings’ and the ‘Books of Samuel’ quoted at length in a discussion of one and the same question, namely: the claims of by the Jews that the cause of the calamities in the world are the sins of their ancestors. This makes this treatise an exception in the Muslim literature of polemics; we

\(^8\) Garcia-Arenal and Rodríguez Mediano, 2010a, 627. Juan Alonso Aragonés also wrote Veintitrés tratados y romances de moriscos aragoneses contra los españoles y su religión ['Twenty-three Treatises and Romances by Aragonese Moriscos against the Spaniards and Their Religion'] composed between 1600-1620 CE. Ruvira Guilabert, 2010. García-Arenal and Rodríguez Mediano put forward the hypothesis that Juan Alonso Aragonés’ refutation of the Christians and the Jews might have been the already mentioned Libro de la disputa studied by Dobelio and among the books found in Pastrana. García-Arenal and Rodríguez Mediano, 2010b, 296-297. See for this text, Wiegers, 1995.

\(^9\) Although I have not been able to decipher its content, there is an annotation on the bottom left of f. 48v, MS AF 58, in a different hand which seems to be written in both Romance and Hebrew; the latter probably in the Italian style. I thank the Hebraist Irene Zwiep for giving me the information about the style probably used.

\(^9\) This verse was the most widely used biblical verse in Muslim anti-Jewish polemics to convince the Jews that the promised Messiah had come and that he was Muhammad (for example, by Samaw’al al-Maghribī, see Perlmann, 1964, 42), but it was often also invoked in Judaean-Christian confrontations. In a dispute held in Lleida between a Christian preacher and the contemporary Jewish religious leader of Aragon, Rabbi Solomon ben Abraham ben Adret (Rashba, 1235-1310 CE), the preacher’s Christological interpretation of this verse was effective in raising doubts among the Jewish community. Ben Shalom, 2003, 41. See for a detailed explanation of its meaning, Kugel, 1998, 468-469 and ff.

\(^9\) ELI s.v. ‘Masāʾil wa-Ajwibā’ (Daiber). In this work, however, we find indirect questions and answers, in the form of “if they say, say to them”.

have seen in the case of the Taʾyūd that the long quotations of biblical testimonies tend to prevail.

In fact, the author’s rebuttal focuses mainly on the central tenets of Christianity: God’s incarnation, filiation and hypostases. A close look at its contents reveals two sorts of passages: those in which rational methods of philosophy, logic and the natural sciences are used to inquire into theological issues, and those in which the knowledge derived from the Torah, the Gospel and the Qur’an’ are the author’s primary sources, as he himself states. More about the contents of the Kitāb al-Mujādala will be said below but at this point it is worth noting that the work lacks a clear structure. This is obvious when we look at the chapters of this treatise, which are:

ff.
31v-35r Introduction
35r-35v Chapter about Adam, when he sinned in Paradise, he and his wife Hawāʾ (Eve)
35v Chapter about what Christians claim, namely: that Yasūʿ was king on the throne of his father, Dāwūd (David), and that his Kingdom will have no end
35v-36r Chapter about Peter, he was Shamaʿ ʿūn, and Paul, he was Shawal, the Apostle of Yasūʿ, the Nāṣirī
36r Chapter on Paul
37r-37v Chapter in which the Christians tell Muslims that in the book of God, the Noble, temporal, physical wealth is promised in Paradise
37v Chapter on how Allāh will gather all the creatures the Day of Resurrection and of what kind of flesh they will be created because people in Paradise are eternal
38r Chapter about wine
38r Chapter about eating pork by the Christians
38r-38v Chapter about the Day of Resurrection
38v-39r Chapter about the many stories about Adam, peace upon him, in the vision of Ashī iyāʾ, in the sayings by

---

* Here, I only provide the chapters (bāb) explicitly referred to as such by the author. This does not mean that the bābs reflect all the contents in this polemic. The ‘Introduction’, for example, is confined to ff. 31r, after which the author discusses various Christian arguments and refutes them. On ff. 46v, between the treatises (maqālāt) by Aristotle and Ibn Rushd, we find a verse (bayt) by Ḥāʾil ibn Abī Ṭālib. Many parts are also introduced as questions (mas’ala) and also as stories (ḥikāya) on ff. 6r-6v which deal with pious subjects but in which we also find episodes of the wars during the Muslim conquest of the Iberian territory. Among the facts we are told is what happened to a Christian slave from Ashturiyash (Asturias) when he was taken prisoner by al-Manṣūr (f. 6r).
* Here there is an interruption in the bābs but the polemic about Paul and baptism continues.
Dāwūd in the Zabūr, in the book of the Torah and in the book of the Gospel

39v-39r  Chapter on what Abū al-Walid ibn Rushd said: the one who sleeps is like one who is dead, he does not recover his senses until he awakens from his sleep

39v-40r  Chapter on what Abū al-Walid ibn Rushd said in the Logic that the ignorant among the ‘ulamā’ among the Muslims do not know the explanation (tafsīr) of the words which are the text (nass) of the book of God, the Noble, and this is because they do not affirm that the books of logic are similar to God’s essence (ka-nafs Allāh)

40v-40v  Chapter about the Christians, who claim that Diosh has a son

40v  Chapter explaining that every man has three ways of assenting to something

40v-41v  Chapter on the purity of the Jews

41v  Chapter about predestination

41v-42r  Chapter about predestination

42r-42v  Chapter about the interpretation (tafsīr) of the Prophet

42v-43r  Chapter about Paradise in which Adam and his wife, Hawā (Eve), lived

43v-44r  Chapter about the controversy (tanāzi‘a) with Christians and Jews who claim that the tribulations and serious damage which are visited upon men were determined prior to the sins committed on Earth

44r-47r  Chapter on the treatises (maqālāt) of Aristotle and Abū al-Walid ibn Rushd

47v-47v  Chapter on the treatises (maqālāt) of Abū al-Walid ibn Rushd, called the ‘comentador’ in Logic by the Christians

48v  Chapter on the stories about the Prophet (upon him be peace) and on the Prophet (upon him the peace)

48v-49v  Chapter about the marriage of Hagar to Ibrāhim, upon him the peace

49v  Chapter about the phrase “we have made the human beings in Our likeness” and the explanation (tafsīr) of “in Our likeness”

49v-51v  Chapter about the question of the baptism (taghtis) of Christians

51v-53r  Chapter concerning predestination and divine decree (al-qadar wa-l-qadā’)

---

* Read taghtis.
Chapter on Abū al-Walid ibn Rushd’s assertion that common people should not attempt “to understand and know how things occur [...] because people are not rationalist.”

Chapter about the Christian claim that Ḥisā ibn Maryam was God and human

Chapter about the claim of the Christians that their Sacred Law (shari'ā) is the faith derived from Paul and other saints.

Chapter on the treatises (maqālāt) of Aristotēlis (Aristotle), the philosopher

Chapter about the Prophet, upon him the peace

Chapter about the Qur’ān

Chapter on the Résumé of Grammar (Kitāb al-Jumāl)

Chapter on the proverbs (al-amthāl)

Chapter on the polemic (mujādalā) about the shari'ā

---

§ fā: fe.

§ shantūsh: santos.

§ By Abū al-Qāsim Ḥab al-Raḥmān ibn Ishāq al-Zajjāji, in Ms AF 58 referred to as al-Nahlī (ca. 860-870/948-950 CE), Elz.s.v. "al-Zajjāji" (Versteegh). There might be a break in the text between ff. 61v and 62r. As noted above, on ff. 61r-62r we find some stories (ḥāāya).
Figure 2: Chapters MS AF 58, f. 40v
We can see that the Kitāb al-Mujādala appears to be divided into large sections which share similar characteristics. Generally speaking, these sections are easily distinguishable from each other, although they do not necessarily coincide with the chapters given by the author. Overall, the author of the Kitāb al-Mujādala tends to change his focus of attention quickly and, for example, on ff. 56r-62v he deals with such diverse topics as the treatises of Aristotle, the figure of the Prophet Muḥammad, the Qur'ān and some questions about language derived from the ideas of al-Zajjājī. The unfinished character of the manuscript suggests that the Kitāb al-Mujādala might well have been used in an educational context (teacher-student) or might represent an early stage in the composition of a more extensive work of polemics addressed to a learned audience.

The attribution of an educational purpose to this treatise might explain why the discussion of topics changes so quickly and would appear to have been made up of notes. It would also shed light on its pedagogical and also its indubitably polemical undertone in expressions as “if (they) say...say to them...”. It could also account for the fact that only one copy of it has been preserved, something which, on the other hand, is a feature of the kind of Arabic manuscripts owned by the Mudejars and the Moriscos: as Van Koningsveld has convincingly shown, most Arabic manuscripts owned by these communities were devoted to jurisprudence and religious matters, whereas the Arabic manuscripts owned by Jews dealt with philosophy, the natural sciences or medicine. This contrasts with the broader audiences who, David Nirenberg claims, possessed the translations and adaptations as many Mudejars and Moriscos gradually lost their command of Arabic (as I have argued above, all of them adaptations rather than translations) of the Ta’yyid. The latter conclusion does seem to be confirmed by the rather large number of Aljamiado manuscripts of this polemic.

3.3. The Sources of the Kitāb al-Mujādala

At the outset, the copyist al-Raqīl informs us that he is copying out (intasakha) a disputation with the Jews and the Christians conducted on the basis of the Torah, the Gospels and the treatises (maqālāt) of the qādī Abū-l-ʿAbbās Aḥmad al-Lakhmī al-Sharafī. These sources provide important information about the composition and circulation of this polemic against the Christians and the Jews. In what follows, I shall discuss the treatises (maqālāt) of the qādī Abū-l-ʿAbbās Aḥmad al-Lakhmī al-Sharafī which are mentioned at the beginning of the Kitāb al-Mujādala (f. 31v) by the faqīh al-Raqīlī as one of his sources 3.3.1.

---

98 Nirenberg, 2014, 32 and n. 42 where he refers to his earlier publication (Nirenberg, 1996, 196-198).
shall also discuss the Christian sources mentioned in this polemic which place the composition of the *Kitāb al-Mujādala* in the Christian territories 3.3.2.

3.3.1. The Muslim Sources of the *Kitāb al-Mujādala*: The maqālāt of the qāḍī al-Sharafī

The author of the *Kitāb al-Mujādala* mentions the treatises of the qāḍī Abū-l-'Abbās Aḥmad al-Lakhmī al-Sharafī as one of his sources, although he does not make explicit which passages belong to these treatises. The mention of the qāḍī al-Sharafī makes sense when read against one of the major challenges faced by the Mudejars: their submission to the Christian powers required by their legal status. This submission differentiated the members of their communities from their co-religionists but, as has been noted, the Mudejars were never denied membership of the *umma* to which they belonged.

The mention of the qāḍī al-Sharafī makes sense against this background and invests the polemical arguments in the *Kitāb al-Mujādala* with religious authority. In this work al-Raqilī, if he was a Mudejar, and perhaps other Mudejar religious leaders like him, might have found the perfect match between knowledge of the fundamentals of religion, the Christians and Jewish sources and the guidelines of a qāḍī. The author does not mention which parts of the *Kitāb al-Mujādala* belong to the maqālāt by al-Sharafī. We do not know who this qāḍī was, but it is very possible that he belonged to the well-known family of the Sharafīs. The Sharafīs were located in Toledo, in Castile, although we find members of this family in various areas of the peninsula, both in Christian Iberia and in al-Andalus. There is an Inquisitorial Report of 1573 CE from the town of Daimiel in which a Morisco from Granada, Diego Hernández Xarafí, is prosecuted for having said the following words to a Christian who called upon the name of Muḥammad: “Leave Mahoma in peace, since he is a good Old Christian, or a better Old Christian than you.” Documental and notarial archives attest to the existence of a faqīh called Faraix Sharafī who lived in Huesca during the fifteenth century. Some members of this family were qāḍīs or chief judges of the Crown of Castile — alcales or alcales mayores — and Abū-l-'Abbās al-Lakhmī al-Sharafī could have been one of these qāḍīs, and, particularly, the mid-fourteenth-century Toledan qāḍī ‘Hamete’ (or Aḥmad Sharafī).

---

99 Wiegers, 2008, 507 following Conte Cazcarro, 1992, 38 (AHPh pr. 399 98r-v) cf. 419. There could have been various branches of the same family, one living in Toledo and its surrounding area like Valladolid and the other settled in Huesca.

100 ‘deja a Mahoma, que es buen Cristiano Viejo, o mayor Cristiano Viejo que no vos’. AHN, Inquisición “Palabras escandalosas”, 204, exp. 14.

Following a suggestion by Van Koningsveld, Wiegers noted this possibility and argued that the author of the treatises could have been the qaḍī Abū-l-ʿAbbās Aḥmad al-Lakhmī al-Sharaḍī and that his works could have been slightly adapted later by an anonymous author. The possibility that Hamete was the qaḍī Abū-l-ʿAbbās Aḥmad al-Lakhmī al-Sharaḍī mentioned in the Kitāb al-Mujādala is reinforced by the fact that a certain Hamete Sharafī, or Xarafī, is mentioned in a letter of 1351 CE, in which it is said that he was ‘moro alcall de los moros’ [Moor, mayor of the Moors] and that he had houses in Alcalá. In this document Alcalá corresponds to Alcalá de Henares (Madrid), where the Muslim neighbourhood, the Jewish neighbourhood and the houses of the ‘Cabildo’, or Chapter of the Cathedral of Toledo were adjacent to each other. Moreover, in a recent publication the signatories to the minutes of meetings of a Muslim brotherhood in Toledo during the years 1402-1414 CE contain references to the faqīh and imām Abū-l-ʿAbbās Aḥmad al-Sharaḍī and to Aḥmad ibn Aḥbārīm ibn Muḥammad [al-Lakhmī] al-Sharaḍī. To my knowledge, this combination of nīsba (surnames) occurs on one more occasion in an article which refers to a lawsuit brought in the Chancilleria of Valladolid in 1501 CE, in which the name appears as the faqīh Ibrahim al-Lakhmī Xarafī.

The most important fact is that a good number of members of this family held high positions in the Christian administration of the aljamas and at times were even doctors who treated Christians. Documentation shows, for example, that in 1475 CE Abraham Xarafī worked as physician and servant of the Archbishop of Toledo, Alfonso Carrillo, and was appointed mayor [‘alcalde mayor’] of the Castilian aljamas and examiner-in-chief of the Mudejar physicians and surgeons, "alcalde mayor de los físicos y cirujanos mudéjares". On various occasions, the author of the Kitāb al-Mujādala reveals his
acquaintance with the medical sciences to such an extent it is possible to speculate that he was a doctor or that he at least took a keen interest in the subject.  

At the turn of the sixteenth century, Ambrosio Xarafi and his two sons, Bernardino and Íñigo Xarafi, were working as escribanos or notaries and as translators from Arabic into Romance for the municipal council of Granada, for the Catholic Monarchs and also for the King. Some Christians, who were contemporaries of MS AF 58, also quoted the Sharafis as sources. One example is Enrique de Villena (1383-1434 CE) who in his Tratado de la fascinación ['Book of Fascination'] criticizes the views of "a sabidor morisco" (a learned Muslim), "el Xarafi, el Viejo, de Guadalajara" ['the Elder Xarafi from Guadalajara'], and claims that he had supplied him with knowledge about some Muslim authors and their works. The Kitāb al-Mujādala contains elements which point to the possibility that this polemic might have acquired its perlocutionary force in such context. Evidence of the context of the circulation of this polemic is provided by one of the sources on which the Mudejar author claims to rely: Aristotle's Politics (referred to as al-Falsafati-l-Madaniyya). It is widely accepted that Aristotle's Politics was not translated into either Arabic or Hebrew, and that Plato's Republic was used instead as the primary source from which to discuss political issues. However, some scholars, such as Shlomo Pines, say that the philosopher Miskawayh (932-1080 CE) mentions two treatises by Aristotle in his Tartīb as-Sā'ādāt wa-Manāzil al-'Ulām ['The Order of Happiness and the Places of Science'] and that these could have been extracted from al-Fārābī (d. 950 CE). As the latter had no access to the Politics as a source for his thoughts on the government of the state, he used the theoretical model in Plato's Republic instead. The two treatises could also have belonged to the works by al-Fārābī as they are quoted by Ibn Rushd, who "follows him (namely: al-Fārābī) in the essentials of his thought". The attribution of the passages from the al-Falsafa-l-Madaniyya in the Kitāb al-Mujādala to Aristotle might be attributed simply to the

---

111 An example of this is his description of the growth of the foetus on MS AF 58, f. 57r. (see Colomínes Aparicio 234a, 123 for a translation), or when the author describes the theories of Galen on when and when not a phlebotomy should be carried out (MS AF 58, f. 48r). We shall also see that he uses medical examples to explain the authority of the sultān.  
113 Al-Xarafi seems to have been referring to Mushaf Alzimar el corto and Cantaf el Indiano, also quoted by Villena. Cooper Carr, 1971, 142-143.  
114 An element which points to the circulation of MS AF 58 among learned Muslims is the reference on the last folio of this codex to the qāḍī Mašṣūr ibn Yusuf Abī as-Sayyīd (f. 63v).  
115 The references on f. 59v. and f. 46r seem to be to this work.  
117 El2 s.v. "al-Fārābī" (Walzer). See also El3 s.v. "al-Fārābī, philosophy" (Janos).
author's ignorance or to the fact that, as claimed by some scholars, the Aristotelian influences on al-Fārābi's political writings could have been greater than has been acknowledged so far. Moreover, al-Fārābi's harmonization of the views of Aristotle and Plato seems to have extended beyond the *Harmony between the Views of Plato and Aristotle* to his political philosophy,\(^{116}\) which could explain the remarkable attribution in the *Kitāb al-Mujādala*. More about this will be said in Chapter Six.

In other parts of this work, the author of the *Kitāb al-Mujādala* refers again to Aristotle's *al-Falsafa-l-Madaniyya*. If he had been using an unknown version of Aristotle's *Politics*; it is unlikely he would have taken it from Muslim sources. A more likely scenario is that in this instance the author's knowledge of Christianity and contacts with the Christians played a role. I think it is very unlikely that the author of the *Kitāb al-Mujādala* knew enough Latin to translate parts of William of Moerbeke's (fl. 1255-1278 CE)\(^{117}\) Latin translation of the *Politics* into Arabic: in the *Kitāb al-Mujādala*, undeniably he does translate single Arabic words into what he calls 'Latin' but is actually is Romance. My hypothesis is much simpler. I believe that the most likely scenario is that the author of the *Kitāb al-Mujādala* used al-Fārābi, and ascribed its origins to Aristotle's *Politics* because he was aware of the interest in Aristotle among contemporary Christians. This is premise is plausible if the composition of the *Kitāb al-Mujādala* took place in the immediate circle of the Sharafi family: thanks to his close contacts with members of the Christian elite the author could have been very well aware of the developments within Christianity and of Moerbeke's translation of the *Politics*. The author's acquaintance with sources which might have been in circulation among the Christians of Castile also seems to be suggested by the claims of this author on f. 477 in this polemic, in which he claims that the Christians refer to Ibn Rushd as the 'comentador' ['commentator'] in the Logic (*al-Mantiq*). However, it is unclear to me whether Ibn Rushd was the 'commentator in logic' or whether he was was mentioned as such 'in the Logic'.\(^{118}\)

---


\(^{117}\) In 1265 CE, William of Moerbeke translated Aristotle's *Politics* from Greek into Latin for the first time. His translation was followed by a number of commentaries, among the most influential that of Thomas Aquinas. Dunhabin, 1982.

\(^{118}\) The *Kitāb al-Mujādala* includes fifteen references to the *Kitāb al-Mantiq, al-Mantiq* and the *Kitāb al-Darāra* (see the Source overview of the *Kitāb al-Mujādala* at the end of this dissertation). Ten times the work is attributed to Ibn Rushd and on four occasions to Aristotle. The title seems to indicate that the author could be referring to one of the earliest short commentaries (epitome) on Aristotle's Logic by Ibn Rushd, which, as Gerhard Endress notes, was written "on the model of al-Fārābi's compendia of logic" and in which the sections 'do not correspond precisely to the traditional division of Aristotle's Organon (Endress, 1999, 343-344). So far, only two Judeo-Arabic manuscripts of Ibn Rushd's short commentary on Logic have come down to us, but neither in Arabic. One is preserved in Munich (Cod. Hebr. 309/ Cod. Ar. 652a (previously 964), see Ibn Rushd, 1977, 5 n. 10; Steinchneider, 1895, 169. The other is in Paris (Cod. Hebr. 1308/1, previously 303), see op. cit., 5 n. 11 and Bibliothèque nationale (France). Département des manuscrits, 1866, 182. In his edition and translation of
3.3.2. The Christian Sources of the Kitāb al-Mujādala

The analysis of the polemics with the Christians in the Kitāb al-Mujādala only strengthens the previous arguments that the copy of the Kitāb al-Mujādala and the origin of one of its sources, namely: the treatises of the qāḍī al-Sharafī, should be located in the Christian territories. As will be revealed, it is likely that the philosophical-rationalist-based worldview in the Kitāb al-Mujādala struck a chord with individuals who had a solid intellectual formation in these issues, as those in the close environment of the Sharafī family would have had. As has been discussed above, the contents of the treatise in which Aristotle and Ibn Rushd assume a central place and expressions like “if they say/say to them” indicate the circulation of the Kitāb al-Mujādala in learned Muslim circles. Furthermore, they provide some evidence that a Mudejar could have undertaken the composition of the Kitāb al-Mujādala.

Turning now to the main arguments of the Christians which the author aims to refute, we see that they come from two types of sources: the oral attacks made by the Christians and their treatises of religious polemics. The questions or masā‘īl of the Christians are among the most compelling proofs of the circulation of this manuscript in a majority Christian environment. The liveliness of the formulae which introduce the three of these commentaries, Charles Butterworth agrees with the criticism of earlier scholars such as Moritz Steinschneider about the traditional title of the treatise, the Kitāb al-Darārī fī-ld-Mantiq [‘The Book of the Essentials in Logic’], first used by Professor Vadja. The Latin translation by Abraham de Balmes (d. 1523 CE) has Compendium necessarium Averroes totius logicae, a title which resembles the Arabic one. Butterworth provides a lengthy discussion on the title of Ibn Rushd's treatise and claims that the one found in the manuscript in Munich, The Short Commentary on Aristotle's Organon and on Porphyry's Introduction, might be more adequate than the traditional title, the Kitāb al-Darārī fī-ld-Mantiq. Butterworth adds three arguments to sustain his claim. The first argument is the discontinuous way in which the name of the treatise has been handed down within the Arabic tradition. The Syrian physician Ibn Abī Uṣaybi‘a (d. 1270 CE) was first in using it. The Kitāb al-Takmila li Kitāb as-Ṣīlah (a supplement to the biographical dictionary the Kitāb as-Ṣīlah of the Cordovan Ibn Bashkuwāl, d. 1183 CE) by the Valencian Ibn al-Abbār (d. 1265 CE) provides the only Arabic reference to the traditional title, calling it "al-Darārīf. However, the later supplement to al-Abbār’s work by al-Anṣārī does not include any reference to this work. Butterworth also claims, the historian and traditionalist Shams al-Dīn al-Dhahabī refers to it as the Kitāb al-Mantiq, while omitting the qualification of al-Darārī given by Uṣaybi‘a. The second argument put forward by Butterworth is related to the subtitle of this treatise provided by Uṣaybi‘a which, according to this scholar, does not provide an accurate description of the contents of the work. As a third argument, Butterworth posits that there is no evidence that Ibn Rushd ever referred to this work using Uṣaybi‘a’s title or subtitle. Op. cit., 1977, 5–13, particularly 5–7. I have not collated the fragments in the Kitāb al-Mujādala with the edition of the three commentaries by Butterworth [as far as I know, his edition of Averroes’ Short Commentaries on Aristotle’s Organon is unpublished, http://gep.uc.edu/sites/gep.uc.edu/files/cv/Ceb-CV.pdf] but the various references in the Kitāb al-Mujādala, the variety of titles and the fact that is ascribed to Ibn Rushd as al-Mantiq, and at least once as the Kitāb ad-Darāra, fit within the Arabic tradition described by Butterworth and suggest that parts of the “traditional” title could have been contemporaneous and used without any distinction to refer to this short commentary.

*The author of the Kitāb al-Mujādala is notable on account of his overall use of the imperative: “if the Christians say, too, ..., the answer to this is that you say to them ...” MS AF 58, F 34v.*
masāʾil – “if (they) say ... say to them...” or “say to them: I shall test you with your Gospel” – suggests that the author could have found his inspiration in the public practice of polemics in the Christian territories. This possibility is given added support by the insults levelled against the Christians, calling them dogs, quoted above. It is also strengthened by evidence in other polemics such as in the Taʿyīd, in which we find the expressions “los judíos dicen y alegan...la respuesta es que se les diga...” [Jews say and argue...the answer is to tell them...], or, “[n]ow what argument do you [that is, the Jews, MCA] have (to refute this)?”, accompanied by the reactions of the Jews after hearing the refutations their arguments by Muslims, such as “[t]hey are irked by that and say that...”, or “[n]othing has remained to them save rebuke and silence”. Also important are the references in the Taʿyīd to the places in which physical encounters between Muslims and Jews and oral attacks could have taken place, the ‘meetings and dwellings’. And, again in the Kitāb al-Mujādala, the accusations of idolatry made against the Christians for the way they wear their robes seem to provide further evidence that the discourse in this polemic was most probably an answer to the Christian proselytizing campaigns.

None of these attacks can be placed anywhere else than in the Christian territories, an environment in which the Mudejars were in direct competition with the Christians and the Jews, and in which the members of these two communities could have attacked the Muslims in public spaces. The interesting references to a multi-religious and, taking into account the date of composition of this polemic, I would argue Christian, Toledo, provide further grounds for this assertion. At this point it is important to add that the arguments that the origin and the copying of the treatises of the qāḍī al-Sharafī should be placed in the Christian territories.

The oral attacks of the Christians are not the only indicators for placing the Kitāb al-Mujādala in a majority Christian context. The language use, Arabic with intercalated
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120 MS AF 58, f. 34v.
121 MS AF 58, f. 41v. See the Introduction for the full quote.
122 MS AF 58, f. 55v. See Chapter Two for the full quote.
123 MS AF 58, f. 34v. See Chapter One for the full quote.
126 MS AF 58, f. 55v. See Chapter Two for the full quote.
127 Here I have in mind the punishments exacted on the members of the Cordovan Martyrs’ Movement for offending the Prophet of Islam in ninth-century al-Andalus. Recent studies challenge the idea that the death penalty was systematically enforced in cases of blasphemy. Christys, 2002, 53 and ff. This does not mean that the offenders went unpunished.
128 MS AF 58, f. 41v. See the Introduction for the full quote.
words and sentences in Aljamiado, is also significant. Evidence that the Iberian Christians might have been the recipients of some of the attacks made by this author is found in the discussion about whether Adam would not have died if he had not eaten from the fruit of the Tree of Good and Evil. The author points out that whenever someone asked the Christians to what genus this tree belonged, they simply answer that its genus are the designations ‘of life’ and ‘of good and evil’. In his view, this is a misguided and absurd way of reasoning: when someone refers to a cloak or ‘tabardo’ (in Romance) but does not mention if the cloak is made of wool or of linen, he can nonetheless divulge of what material it is made if he is asked about it. The argument is interesting here, since, although the etymology of ‘tabardo’ is unclear, this item of clothing was very common in all social layers in the Christian West during the thirteenth century, including Christian Iberia.

Against this it can be argued that, although the use of Romance was a common practice among Mudejars and Moriscos and provides evidence of the circulation of a work within their communities, it is not enough to prove that the work was composed in the Christian territories: the Romance could be a later addition. The following is an example of arguments in the Kitāb al-Mujādala which depend on a command of Romance. At one point, the Christians assert that, in the verses about the birth of Immanuel to a virgin, ‘el’ is one of the names of God. The polemicist contends that, if this were true, there would be many Gods on Earth because ‘el’ is commonly used to express ownership, or ‘señoría’. In his view this betrays the fact that the Christians do not understand the meaning of this word. What is important to the present case is that, because the argument presupposes the knowledge of the meaning and uses of the definite article in one of its Romance variants, it can only be persuasive if we assume that it originated in the Christian territories, in which Romance was spoken. Moreover, such a knowledge of Romance by the author tallies with his rendering of Arabic words and expressions into what he calls ‘Latīn’ but is in fact Romance. In one quotation from Aristotle we read “potency is in Latīn ‘en potencia’”. This provides evidence that the Kitāb al-Mujādala not only circulated among the Mudejars and used Mudejar sources but it could also have been composed by a Mudejar.

---

128 Castro, 1991, 177. It seems that ‘tabardo’ does not have an Arabic etymology and we are most probably dealing here with its Aljamiado rendering. [it’s one of those mystery words whose origin is unclear. In English it’s a tabard].

129 We find its use well into the eighteenth century. Menéndez Pidal, 1986, 65-70; Terreros y Pando, 1788, 564. The widespread use of this item of clothing also among Jews is attested in the predications of Vicent Ferrer, in which we read ‘é así se ordenó […] que los Judíos traxesen tabardos con una señal vermeja, é los Moros capuces verdes con una luna clara”, Fanjul, 2006, 64, quoting Galíndez de Carvajal, L. (ed.) “Crónica del serenísimo príncipe don Juan, segundo Rey deste nombre.” In Rosell, C. (ed.) Crónicas de los reyes de Castilla: desde Don Alfonso el Sabio, hasta los Católicos Don Fernando y Doña Isabel, Vol 2. Madrid: Atlas, 1953, 349.

130 Indeed, ‘el’ is the definite article in Romance. Think, for example, of the current Spanish expression of ‘el señor’.

131 MS AF 58, f. 5zr.
The author of the Kitāb al-Mujādala seems to have had recourse to another important Christian source: their treatises of polemics. The following claim is a strong indication that he is quoting from some of these works: ‘The Christians answer, yes, God is a man and we prove it with the book of the Torah in which it says: ‘We made man according to our image’, and we prove it, too, in this treatise (maqāla): [the verb conjugation, MCA] “nāṣna‘u” (we have made) is like the Trinity (thālathiyya).’ Various passages attributed to a certain Aghushtīn (also referred to as khālat-Aghushtīn) were probably taken from Christian treatises, perhaps from this treatise to which the Christians are referring. They discuss a triad of divine attributes – power, knowledge and will (qudra, ṣilm and irāda) which is compared to the Trinity.

Who was this Aghushtīn? The question is relevant since, in conjunction with the oral attacks just discussed, these are the only references in the Kitāb al-Mujādala which can be attributed without doubt to Christians. A later Christian reader also seems to have been concerned with this issue and, believing that Aghushtīn was Augustine of Hippo, he wrote S. Agustine in the marginalia, in Latin characters. Such an identification is in my view mistaken as the arguments set out to demonstrate next.

The first step is to mention the works of a certain Aghushtīn in conjunction with the polemics of the Tathlīth al-Wahdānīyya [‘Trinitizing the Unity of God’] referred to by the Muslim polemicist al-Qurṭubi, who will be discussed in the next chapter. Thomas Burman argues that these works were most probably composed by Arabic-speaking Christians and should be dated no later than the thirteenth century. Although scholars do not accept it unanimously, Burman maintains the view that the literature of these Arabic-speaking Christians is representative of “a tradition of Christian kalām in medieval Spain”. In this way, the Latin triad adduced by Peter Abelard c. 1120 CE (that is, potentia-
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132 MS AF 58, f. 33r.
133 Thomas Burman puts forward the possibility that the author was a converso. I use his translation of the title.
134 Burman, 1994, 163.
135 Burman argues that, on the basis of the content of the Maṣḥaf, it is clear that al-Qurṭubi erroneously identified Aghushtīn with Augustine of Hippo. It is much more likely that this person was one of his contemporary Mozarab called Aghushtīn. Burman, 1994, 8ff.
136 According to Aillet, the designation Mozarab is not found in Andalusī sources to refer to autochthonous Christians but in Christian sources in order to distinguish between the Christians of these kingdoms and those from al-Andalus. Because of these considerations, from now on I shall refer to them as Arabic-speaking Christians. Aillet, 2010, 2-5, particularly 3-4.
137 The Liber denudationis sive ostensionis aut patefaciens [‘The Book of Denuding or Exposing, or the Discloser’], of which only an abridgment in Latin has survived, should be included here. Burman proposes an Arabic title for this Christian polemic: (Kitāb) al-Tashrif aw al-Izhār aw al-Kashshāf. Burman, 1994, 38.
138 Burmann, 1994, 171.
sapientia-bonitas or potentia-scientia-voluntas) would have been translated by the Arabic-speaking Christians “into kalāmic Arabic and combined it with an Oriental Arab-Christian Trinitarian argument”.89 Using their own terminology, Arabic-speaking Christians would have referred to it as qudra, ʿilm and irāda;90 just as the Kitāb al-Muṣbada does.

The second step is to consider the purpose of the author of the Kitāb al-Muṣbada which, as he himself claims, is to demonstrate that, “the Trinity had been arranged by the ‘people of the Church’ and the Christians took it from them!”91 Pertinently some of the arguments he provides also indicate the milieu of the Arabic-speaking Christians. He quotes the views of Aristotle’s most famous commentator, the Cordovan Ibn Rushd (1126-1198 CE), known as Averroes in the Latin world. The discussion about God’s power, knowledge and will (qudra, ʿilm and irāda) by Ibn Rushd falls within the internal theological disputes in Islam about God’s attributes (ṣifāt Allāh) but, in this context, these views are used instead to dispute with the Christians. This makes sense because Ibn Rushd, as Burman notes, knew of the existence of Christian theologians, or mutakallimūn, in the peninsula and he was contemporary of the most probable date of composition of the Tathlīth al-Wahdāniyya, between 1153-1210 CE.92

Finally, it is strange that the author of the Kitāb al-Muṣbada did not call Augustine a saint, especially as he does use this term in other places in this polemic: one example is found in the arguments of polemics with the Christians already mentioned about the Agustinian Order of Preachers and the robes they wore. Nevertheless, the most decisive argument for arguing that the passages about Aghushtūn and the Trinity are taken directly or indirectly from the literary tradition of the Arabic-speaking Christians is that, in fact, qudra, ʿilm and irāda do not coincide with the triad used by the well-known Christian theologian but with that found in the Tathlīth al-Wahdāniyya.93

I would like to suggest the possibility that other passages in the Kitāb al-Muṣbada could have been derived from the same literary tradition. This would explain, for example, why in his dispute with the Christians the author constantly refers to Jesus as Yasūʾ: this is the Arabic name for Jesus as used by the Arabic-speaking Christians in the Middle East, North Africa and also in the Iberian Peninsula. Admittedly my argument does have some

89 Burman, 1994, 196.
90 Burman, 1994, 171 and 196; see also Chapter Five. The same observations are made by this scholar, Burman, 1996: 117 and Van Koningsveld, 1977.
91 MS AF 58, f. 53v.
92 Burman notes that it does not coincide with any triad on Oliver Du Roy’s list of triads by Augustine. See Burman, 1994, 172 and passim.
93 Burman, 1994, 172 and passim.
drawbacks since, even though the author of the Kitāb al-Mujādala refrains from calling Jesus by his Islamic name, ‘Īsā, and uses the Christian term Yasū’, remarkably he does use the Islamic name Yahyā for John the Baptist. On the other hand, the best preserved book of Mozarabic literature in Arabic is the codex of canon law known as [Hispana] Sistemática Mozárabe written by the priest Binjisiyus (Vincentius), the obscure bishop (‘al-Usquf’) Abd al-Mālik. In this work as it is preserved in the El Escorial (MS Escorial 1623), the Christian jurist employs many purely Islamic expressions, which also occur in the Mozarabic translations of the Scriptures as well. The questions about the sources of these latter passages cannot be resolved on the basis of evidence known to us at present and further research is needed.

At this point, I would like to discuss whether the Kitāb al-Mujādala could have provided an answer to works of Christian polemics, and I shall take Raymond Martí’s Pugio Fidei adversus Mauros et Judaeos ['Dagger of the Faith against Muslims and Jews'] as a case in point. Because its length made it barely portable, preachers could not easily carry the Pugio Fidei with them during their daily tasks. Hence shorter treatises partially based on Martí’s Pugio fidei such as those of the Franciscan Nicholas of Lyra (c. 1270-1349 CE) were more popular. As far as we know, the work had little influence outside Christian circles. Martí gives the Latin translations with their original sources in Hebrew and Aramaic, but neither Rabbi Solomon ibn Adret of Barcelona – who probably personally debated with Martí – nor any other Jewish leading figure in the Late Middle Ages relied on the Pugio. Although the Arabic quotations in the first section appear exclusively in Latin, in the third section of the Pugio some quotations are written in Hebrew characters. Ryan Szpiech argues that, although Martí knew Arabic perfectly, he uses the Hebrew alphabet to challenge what might be called the “Jewish perspective” of the Qur’ānic authorities. Taking this argument into account, it is safe to assume that Muslims did not use this work. However, it has been noted that on occasion Muslims and Jews were forced to attend the sermons of the Dominicans, a circumstance which opens up the possibility that, even without access to the written text, by oral transmission the members of these two communities were acquainted with the main arguments of the Pugio. The same has been noted about the references to Aristotle’s Politics in the Kitāb al-Mujādala and the acquaintance with the work in the close-knit circle of the Sharafī family, whose members

Miller and Kassis, 2000, 425 ff.

An exhaustive overview of the manuscripts of the Pugio fidei can be found in Szpiech, 2011a. For a complete overview of the sources of the first part of the Pugio mentioned below, see Robles Carcedo, 1992, 143-142.

Szpiech 2011a, 74-75. See also, Cohen 1985: 170-171 and 191; Chazan, 2006. Therefore it falls within the “movimiento retórico que se desarrolló a finales del s. XIII y que se basó en el uso cristiano de textos islámicos dentro de la polémica anti-judía” ['rhetorical movement which developed in the late XIII c and was based on the Christian use of Islamic texts in anti-Jewish polemics']. Szpiech 2011a, 81 and 85.
had close ties with the Christian elite. In this connection, it should be emphasized that, although the main thrust of Martí’s polemic was directed against the Jews, its first part relies on an important number of Arabic sources. Some of the authors mentioned in this part are Seneca, Archytas Tarentinus, al-Ghazālī, Horace, al-Rāzī, Ibn Khaṭīb, Aristotle, Augustine of Hippo, Marcus Tullius Cicero, Ibn Rushd, Galen, John Damascene, Boethius, Jerome, Bernard of Clairvaux and John Chrysostom. The majority of whom are the same authors referred to in the Kitāb al-Muṣāfara. Therefore it is reasonably safe to argue that Muslims might have felt it was addressing them directly.

Bearing this in mind, let us look at the correspondences between the Kitāb al-Muṣāfara and this particular part of the Pugio. The first thing which stands out is the fact that both works cite Seneca, al-Ghazālī, Ibn Sinā, Aristotle, Ibn Rushd and Galen. Among the Classical and Christian authors, Martí refers to Epicurus, Horace, Boethius, John Damascene, Jerome, Bernard of Clairvaux and John Chrysostom, whereas the Mudejar author opts for Paul or Francis of Assisi. They correspond to the Arabic and – according to the Pugio – ‘Gentile’ philosophers such as Aristotle or Seneca. This is not exceptional, since they were the most quoted philosophers of the Middle Ages. Nevertheless, it is remarkable to see their names appear together on a few pages and related to similar polemical issues. The questions addressed by Martí in the first part of the Pugio are undoubtedly central to the debate between theology and philosophy during the Middle Ages but they also coincide with the charges against the Muslim philosophers made by the theologian (mutakallim) al-Ghazālī (11th century) in his Tahāfut al-Falāšifā ['The Incoherence of the Philosophers']. As has been demonstrated, the Kitāb al-Muṣāfara has an important share in this discussion and devotes a large part to the discussion and defence of philosophical and logical reasoning.

Even though the Pugio and the Kitāb al-Muṣāfara have much in common, they also have many differences and the evidence to establish a direct link between these two works is insufficient. Nevertheless, the possibility should not be ruled out that the Kitāb al-Muṣāfara was a reaction to controversial Christian arguments, which could have been very similar to that developed by Martí, nurtured by or taken directly from a discourse spread by Christian missionaries. Although their authors are similar and examine similar issues, the Kitāb al-Muṣāfara and the first part of the Pugio actually place their emphasis on different aspects of their very similar sources. In fact they champion antagonistic views and seem to
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46 On f. 54v the Kitāb al-Muṣāfara also refers to ‘al-manṭiqī Bīṭr’, who should perhaps be identified as Petrus Hispanus (d. c. 1254 CE).

47 pp. 154-206 in the Pugio, see Martí, 1687. The eternity of the world in relation to the creation of the heavens is discussed on ff. 34v; 42v-43r; 44v-47r; and the bodily resurrection on ff. 31r; 37v; 38r; 41v; 58r-58v. Only God’s knowledge of particulars is not addressed in the Kitāb al-Muṣāfara.
be each other's mirror. Pertinently, Van Koningsveld has shown that an Arabic version of Martí's *De Seta* was used by Najm al-Din al-Tūfī (d. 716 H/1316 CE) in his *al-İntiṣārāt*, and this discovery opens up the possibility that the author of the *Kitāb al-Mujādala* was drawing indirectly from Martí through Arabic sources.

As a whole, the evidence suggests that the polemical discourse in the *Kitāb al-Mujādala* is close to that used by the mendicant orders against Muslims and Jews or that, at least, it could have been influenced by the polemical arguments produced in this sort of environment close to the Christians.

### 3.4. The Place of the Copying of the *Kitāb al-Mujādala*: The Geographical Location of Piṭrūla

After a careful reading, I am convinced that the analysis of this polemic will benefit not only from a better understanding of the place of composition of this manuscript but the same holds good for a knowledge of the place where it was copied. Therefore, in the next paragraphs, I am going to problematize the geographical location of Piṭrūla and argue that it can correspond with two towns very distant from each other: Pétrola, in the southeast of the Iberian Peninsula, in Albacete; and Pedrola, in the northeast of the Iberian Peninsula, in Zaragoza (Aragon). Wiegers, who is following a suggestion by Van Koningsveld, argues Piṭrūla is Petrola (Valencia).\(^{148}\) Van Koningsveld, in his turn, might have come across the catalogue which Francisco Guillén Robles made of the Arabic manuscripts kept in the present Spanish National Library. In his description of a Qur'ān most probably copied in the sixteenth or seventeenth century, Guillén Robles translates the colophon "bi-balda Piṭrūla" as "in his country Pétrola (province of Albacete?)".\(^{149}\) Rather than in Valencia, I have placed Piṭrūla elsewhere in Albacete and I have indicated some of the problems which the placing of Piṭrūla in the former location entails.\(^{150}\) However, closer inspection suggests that Piṭrūla might be identified as Pedrola, in the vicinity of Zaragoza. At this point, I aim to delve deeper into this possibility by making an analysis of both the internal evidence in the *Kitāb al-Mujādala* itself and of the particular socio-historical circumstances and cultural life of the Mudejar communities in Pétrola and Pedrola.

---

\(^{148}\) The diacritical mark in Pétrola is omitted by Wiegers. Wiegers, 2008, 575.

\(^{149}\) "en su país Petrola (Prov. de Albacete?), f. 81v MS BNE 5242 (Olim. 87). Guillén Robles, 1889, 42.

\(^{150}\) Colominas Aparicio, 2014b, 123 n. 22. At present Pétrola is a town in the vicinity of Albacete: as far as I know there is no town in Valencia called Petrola, and Pétrola (with accent) should therefore be located in Albacete. The territories of what would become the Kingdom of Murcia in 1266 CE were disputed by the Kings of Aragon and of Castile and, between 1296 CE and 1304 CE, were under Jaume II. Nevertheless, from that date and until 1833 CE they belonged to the Kingdom and later Crown of Castile. Rodríguez Llopis, 1997, 89ff.
The arguments for and against the location of Piṭrūla in one of these two towns are put together in three broad categories. The distinction between these three aspects is merely a heuristic tool: firstly, arguments related to the orthography of Piṭrūla (3.4.1.); secondly, arguments related to the socio-historical situation and intellectual milieu in Murcia and Aragon, respectively (3.4.2.); thirdly arguments related to the language use and language skills of the copyist al-Raqilī, and to the contents of the treatises (3.4.3.). I shall only glance at this last point as I discuss it later in full detail.

3.4.1. The Orthography of Piṭrūla

The orthography of Piṭrūla in MS AF 58 is prima facie evidence for placing this town in Albacete; after all, al-Raqilī uses an emphatic ‘ṭ’ and not a ‘d’ as would be expected had he been referring to Pedrola. Nevertheless, while keeping this rendering it is still possible to argue instead that he was working in the town of Pedrola in Zaragoza (Aragon). There are three main arguments to support this premise. Firstly, Pedrola does appear as Petrola in medieval Christian Latin documents.\(^\text{151}\) Secondly, al-Raqilī is not always reliable in copying the Arabic emphatic consonants.\(^\text{152}\) An example of this point is the dispute with the Christians, in which he consistently uses ‘taghtīs’ for ‘baptism’ and not the classical form ‘taghtītīs’ (with an emphatic ‘ṭ’).\(^\text{153}\) A third and final argument in favour of Pedrola is that the reading Pétrola is in itself problematic: the main stress in the Arabic word is placed on the second syllable (as shown by the use of the long wāw) and not on the first syllable, as in Pétrola.\(^\text{154}\) So, whereas orthographically Piṭrūla in MS AF 58 reads Petrola (and can correspond either to Pétrola or to the Latin form of Pedrola), phonetically Pedrola is the more likely reading. The most important point in the discussion is that the very fact that the two possibilities can occur shows that neither the copyist’s ductus nor his knowledge of Arabic provide enough evidence to establish beyond doubt where this town should be located.

\(^\text{151}\) One example is the reference to “Senior lope garceç peregrino in alagon et in petrola” (emphasis in the original) in a document written in Tudela (Navarre) in 1128 CE (or in 1172 CE) and kept in the Archivo Historico Nacional in Madrid. Mateu Ibars, 1991, 527–528, refers to the “ecclesias de Ricla, de Cappanis, de Epilia, de Rota, de Orrea, de Alagon, de Gallus, de Petrola cum omnibus pertinentiis suis”. Alexandre III, 1855; 868. Moreover, Pedrola is taken as the example of the change from the unvoiced to the voiced consonant in the documentation from Aragon. Sinaües Ruiz, 1986.

\(^\text{152}\) For obvious reasons, I always refer to the copyist and not to the author when I discuss issues related to how the manuscript is written.

\(^\text{153}\) This might be a linguistic trait in Andalusi Arabic (see, Corriente Córdoba, 1977).

\(^\text{154}\) This point is secondary since, although Pétrola is now accented on the first syllable, this does not always seem to have been the case. See for example the entry for this town in Miñano y Bedoya, 1827, 3.
3.4.2. The Socio-historical and Intellectual Milieu of Pétrola and Pedrola during the Later Middle Ages

In the examination of this topic, three elements need to be discussed: a) the presence of Mudejar aljamas; b) activities in the Muslim centres of knowledge; and, c) the Christian proselytism in these areas. The number of studies on the Muslim communities in the Crown of Aragon far exceeds those carried out on Murcia and, therefore, it seems appropriate to take the village of Pétrola as a starting point and to compare the findings with those about Pedrola in Aragon.

a) The Mudejar Aljamas

Discussing the Mudejar aljamas in the Kingdom of Murcia, Rodríguez Llopis notes the disappearance of a number of aljamas in the period between the thirteenth and the fifteenth century and the creation of new aljamas between the fourteenth and the fifteenth century. This does not mean that the Muslim population in this area increased; on the contrary, it decreased from the fourteenth century and grew steadily less than the number of Christians. The most relevant point to the present inquiry is that, even though the Mudejars' settlements did change over time, we know of no important Mudejar aljama in Pétrola. The Valley of Ricote is well known for having been one of the last regions with a Morisco population before the expulsions. However, the Mudejar activities in this place in the Later Middle Ages are much less documented. The same holds true for the Jews, for

---


156 In comparison to the Crown of Aragon or of Castile, the Reign of Murcia has been less studied. The essential task of cataloguing and making available the documentation of this region is currently being carried out by the Proyecto Carmesí (Catálogo de Archivos de la Región de Murcia en la Sociedad de la Información), www.regmurcia.com. Fernández y González, 1866; Ladero Quesada, 1969; Vilar, 1993-1994. For a general study of the region in which Pétrola is located, focused on the second half of the fifteenth century, see Pérez Viñuales, 1988; for its local elites in the period between the end of the fifteenth century up to the seventeenth century, see Molina Puche, 2007. Other relevant publications on Mudejars and Moriscos in the Reign of Murcia will be referred to in due course.

157 Rodríguez Llopis, 1986.

158 Ángel Luis Molina Molina and María del Carmen Veas Arteseros take as starting point of this process the Mudejar emigrations during the period of the minority of Ferdinand IV (1295-1301 CE). Molina Molina and Veas Arteseros, 1992, 91 and n. 1.

159 Veas Arteseros, 1992; Torres Fontes, 1986, 55-66. The number of Jews in Murcia seems to have been low throughout its history in comparison to their numbers in other peninsular regions. See for an overview of the most important Jewish aljamas in the Christian territories Lacave, 1986, 28, and for the Jewish aljamas and synagogues in Murcia, Lacave, 1992, 413-418.

160 See for the Morisco period Vilar, 1992; García Díaz and Otero Mondéjar, 2011; Gil, 2011.
whom no aljama is known. The absence of Jews is a strong argument against placing the copy of the *Kitāb al-Mujādala* in Pétrola. Although the anti-Jewish polemics in the *Kitāb al-Mujādala* seem to be less prominent than the polemics against the Christians, the copyist al-Raqili could have had an interest in refuting the Jews too, which can be deduced from the fact that the *Kitāb al-Mujādala* was bound together with a lengthy anti-Jewish treatise, the *Taʿyīd al-Milla*.

The lack of an organized Mudejar population in the town of Pétrola is very different to the situation in Pedrola in which we find both a Mudejar and a Jewish aljama. At this point, it is important to note that geographically Pedrola is very close to Huesca, where the oldest Arabic copy of the *Taʿyīd al-Milla* was completed in 762 H (=1361 CE). Moreover, Pedrola is also very close to the village of Ricla and this suggests the possibility that this was the native place of the copyist al-Raqili [or, as noted above, perhaps al-Raghilī] (in both cases, the one from Ricla). This supposition is reinforced by the fact that changes of residence in this area could have been relatively common as is evidenced by the restrictions imposed on such population displacements. For example, in 1363 CE the King ordered that a Mudejar woman from Pedrola, who had left the town because of the war with Castile, be set free. In 1407 CE, because of the regulations on this situation, a Muslim woman who was going to marry the amīn, or market surveyor, of Pedrola had arranged things in such a way as to protect her right to return to Borja in case she was divorced or widowed. Could this amīn have been al-Raqili who copied the *Kitāb al-Mujādala* in Pitrūla in 808 H (=1405 CE)?

---

161 Los judíos de Murcia, 1995.
162 Evidence that there was Jewish community in Pedrola is provided by the historian Amador de los Ríos, who refers to a privilege asked by Lope Ferrench de Luna (probably XIV century), who asked for the building of thirty commercial stands for the Jewish residents of Pedrola, preserved in Archivo de Aragon, Registros LXXVIII and LXXIX, Amador de los Ríos, 1876, 21. See also Pérez Viñuales, 2005; Muñoz Jiménez, 2003.
163 Both designations al-Raqilī and al-Raghilī are, nonetheless, very close and in a charter dated to 1124 CE we read that “Senior Enneco Galindez et Ato Orella in Sos et in Rigla”, by which Ricla is meant. Lacarra, 1947-1948, 523.
164 Ferrer i Mallol, 2005, 18. On this same page, Ferrer i Mallol also refers to other conflicts caused by Muslims who defended their right to change their residence, as those of Fraga did.
165 “una mora de Borja que debía casarse con el alamín de Pedrola, en 1407, se aseguró el reconocimiento previo de su derecho de volver a Borja si se quedaba viuda o se divorciaba” Ferrer i Mallol, 2002, 123.
166 It should be noted, however, that in aljamas such as that of Huesca, officials were not appointed by the King but by the aljama itself. A post such as that of Lieutenant could have been held on an annual basis. Conte Cazcarro, 1992, 92 and n. 45 following the views of Macho Ortega 1923, 160 who says that, “cuando el alamín es elegido, y no nombrado por el rey, su mandato es para un año” [when the alamín is elected, and not appointed by the king, his mandate is for one year] and of Basáñez Villaluenga, 1989, 18.
b) The Intellectual Activity

The intellectual activity in Murcia has been discussed by Wiegers in connection with the life of Muḥammad al-Riqūṭī (fl. c. 1250 CE) who he believes was very probably a Mudejar. Following Van Koningsveld, Wiegers convincingly refutes the hypothesis that there was an institution of higher education, a madrasa, in Murcia, built by Alfonso X after the conquest of the city in 1243 CE. Instead, there does seem to have been a Dominican convent. Wiegers partly bases his arguments on previous research on the reports of the Murcian Ibn Rashīq (d. after 674 H/1274-1275 CE) about contemporary polemics between Mudejars and Christian monks in Murcia. These episodes, he claims, must be dated prior to the establishment of a Dominican Studium Linguarum, which was established after the suppression of the Mudejar revolts by Jaume I in 1266 CE. This makes it improbable that this Studium was the madrasa mentioned in the historical reports about al-Riqūṭī dating from the year 1253 CE.

Locating Piṭrūla in Albacete is therefore problematical because, even if one opposes the views just outlined and argues that there was a madrasa in Murcia, a hub of intellectual activity in the thirteenth century, and that such individuals as Ibn Rashīq did witness some public Muslim-Christian religious polemics in Murcia in the second half of the thirteenth century, records are silent about any other literary activities carried out by Mudejars or Moriscos in this region. The intellectual life and any concomitant literary output of Mudejars in Murcia seem to have been fairly marginal, especially compared to that in Aragon (a point which will be developed in a moment). The Kitāb al-Mujādala seems to be the only treatise of Muslim polemics against the Christians and the Jews and no records have been preserved about public debates on theological issues at the beginning of the fifteenth century, when al-Raqiql claims to have copied this polemic. However, this does not mean that religious issues did not lead to conflict. An example is the order given in 1366 CE to free the faqīḥ and muʿadhhdhin of Asp for having sung the ṣalā and for having used the...

---

69 Granja, 1966. See most recent scholarship on his life and on that of al-Riqūṭī among others in a recent article on Muslim individuals who played a role in the regions of Valencia and Murcia in the transition period in Carmona González, 2008.
70 Elsewhere I shall discuss the possible similarities between the Kitāb al-Mujādala and the Sicilian Questions (al-Masāʾīl as-Siqiliyya) written by the philosopher and sūfī Ibn Sabīn of Murcia (1217–1270 CE). Ibn Sabīn lived in the period of transition of his birth-town, Murcia, from Muslim to Christian hands but he left the Peninsula to go to Muslim territories very early in his life. EI2 s.v. “Ibn Sabīn” (Faure).
naffir (Sp. ‘anafil’, a kind of trumpet) for the call to prayer. Nevertheless, these confrontations do not seem to have led to the composition of polemical tracts. The lack of centres of intellectual production in the area surrounding Pétrola stands in stark contrast to the literary and intellectual activity in Aragon, a region from which comes the greatest bulk of works written by Mudejars and by Moriscos who lived in large aljamas like those in Zaragoza or Huesca. This relative lack might explain why the Kitāb al-Mujādala was not transmitted any further in Arabic or in Aljamiado (we only have one unique copy of it), but, on the other hand, it does raise questions about the reasons a work of this kind should have been written precisely in this place. The most challenging point in this respect is that of the presence of audiences for such a treatise.

c) The Christian Missionary Activities

One can counter these arguments and claim that, even though Pétrola had neither a solid Mudejar community with an active literate elite nor a strong Jewish presence, the composition of the Kitāb al-Mujādala could have been prompted by the tireless and successful Christian missionary efforts of such individuals as Ramón Martí, Raymond Llull or Vicent Ferrer. However, many of these preachers were itinerant and carried out their activities throughout the Christian territories of the Iberian Peninsula and even beyond. Therefore it stands to reason that the Christian preaching could also have accounted for the composition of the Kitāb al-Mujādala in any town, such as Pedrola (Aragon).

One example who illustrates my point is the figure of Vicent Ferrer (1350–1419 CE). His activities are contemporaneous with the date of copying given by al-Raqīlī (808 H/=1405 CE). Vicent Ferrer, a native of Valencia, first worked as a teacher within the Dominican Order and was later employed by Cardinal Álvaro de Luna, who became the future Pope Benedict XIII. In 1398 CE, after having received a divine revelation Vicent Ferrer left the papal court in Avignon to become a preacher. Although the principal target of his

---

57 Ferrer i Mallol, 1987, 55 doc. 114; Basáñez Villanueva, 1989, doc. 77. Also, Constable, 2003, and the bibliography cited there for some of these regulations, especially 77.
58 Longpré relies on the studies of Berthold Altaner and identifies Ramon Martí with the friar who tried to convert the sultan al-Mustanṣir in Tunis in 1268–1269 CE. Longpré, 1969. As Harvey rightly notes, Llull differs in his views from Martí with regard how doctrine should be explained and that he refers to the meeting of Martí with the sultan in various of his works. Hames, 1995, 79–83. Longpré also adduces the hypothesis that while he was in Tunis Ramon Martí might have translated his Explanatio simboli apostolorum for this occasion. Longpré, 1969, 199–200.
60 Ferrer, 1956, 21-26 and 36-46.
preaching was the Christians, he also addressed the Jews and the Muslims.\textsuperscript{175} On occasion the members of these two communities were forced to listen to his sermons. This practice, to which we shall refer again later, seems to have been implemented both in Aragon and in Castile. Evidence shows that there were times when Vicent Ferrer’s sermons led to outbursts of violence against the Jews and that the King of Aragon rapidly took measures to stop these actions.\textsuperscript{176} Cogently, the very nature of Vicent Ferrer’s apostolic work took him to other regions of the Iberian Peninsula like Castile and Aragon, as well as to Italy.\textsuperscript{177} Everywhere he visited, his activities were intense and, writing about Aragon, the eighteenth-century prior of the Royal Convent of Preachers of Valencia, Francesc Vidal i Micó, noted that, “Father Fray Juan García [...] in the way that he undertook [his mission] throughout the Kingdom of Aragon he saw him [namely: Vicent Ferrer] convert to the faith of Jesus Christ the whole Synagogues of Daroca and Alcañíz, and a great part of the Jews of Zaragoza, Huesca, Calatayud and the surrounding places.”\textsuperscript{178} We know that all these places, also contained Mudejar aljamas. Moreover, the status of Vicent Ferrer in Pedrola (Aragon) is aptly illustrated by the fact that the church in this town, Nuestra señora de los ángeles, preserved various relics associated with Ferrer.\textsuperscript{179} Hence is it not just as likely, or even more likely, that these and previous, similar proselytizing efforts might have led an inhabitant of Pedrola to copy the Kitāb al-Mujādala in order to strengthen the faith of his co-religionists in the face of the onslaught of such Christian efforts?

\textsuperscript{175} Ferrer, 1956, 38.
\textsuperscript{176} Op. cit., 55. In Ávila, the King of Castile allowed two converts to oblige the Jews to listen to their sermons. These sermons took the form of disputes which lasted four days. Muslims were also required to attend them. Ben-Shalom, 2003, 39-40.
\textsuperscript{177} Vendrell Llagosta, 1953; Martínez Ferrando, 1955; Catedra García, 1994 (which contains the edition of the colection of sermons in the codex MS RAE 294, Real Academia Española); Ferrer edited by Perarnau i Espelt, 1996; Vidal Doval, 2010. He was in Italy between 1407–1408 CE. De Garganta and Forcada, 1956, 71. I did not consult Martínez Ferrando, J.E. San Vicente Ferrer y la Casa Real de Aragón. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1955.
\textsuperscript{178} “el Padre Fray Juan García [...] que en la vereda que emprendió por el Reyno de Aragón le vió convertir enteramente à la fè de Jesu-Christo las Sinagogas de Daroca, y Alcañíz, y gran parte de los Judíos de Zaragóza, Huesca, Calatayud, y Lugares circunvecinos” Vidal y Micó, 1752, 218.
\textsuperscript{179} “Aunque no es mi intento tratar las Reliquias, que ilustran a nuestro Reyno de Aragon, no puedo dexar de referir aquí algunas singulares, entre las muchas, que posee la Iglesia de la Villa de Pedrola, y son las siguientes: [...] Parte del Habito, Escapulario, y Tunica de San Vicente Ferrer”. Account provided by the Carmelite friar and rector of the Carmelite Colegio de San José in Zaragoza, Roque Alberto Faci. Faci, 1753: 37. This church still has its Mudejar apse. I do not know what happened to the relics.
3.4.3. The Internal Evidence in MS AF 58

One last point of importance to the present discussion is the languages used by its copyist al-Raqili. As noted earlier, although the bulk of the text is written in Arabic, there is a good sprinkling of Aljamiado words and expressions throughout the text, and these seem to have been influenced by the Navarro-Aragonese dialects. For example, on f. 63r/v, the manuscript is damaged and difficult to read but the first letters of the possessive pronoun "lures" (English 'theirs') is distinguishable. At the time when the copy of the Kitāb al-Mujādala was made (808 H/1405 CE), in the Navarro-Aragonese dialect "lur/lurs" had increasingly been substituted by the Castilian pronouns "su/sus" but its use had been retained in the Occitan and Catalan dialects. This linguistic evidence does support the arguments for the place of the composition of this work having taken place in both the northeast and the southeast of the Iberian Peninsula. On the one hand, it does fit in well with the hypothesis that the Kitāb al-Mujādala was copied in Pedrola, where the Aragonese dialect was dominant. On the other hand, during the Middle Ages and the Early Modern period the Aragonese and Catalan dialects also exerted an important influence on the language spoken in Villena, a village which was located in the seigneur, later the duchy and marquisate, of Villena – in which Pétrola was also located. This example suffices to illustrate the difficulties in determining which dialect al-Raqili used.

Evaluation

In conclusion, I would like to present an evaluation of the arguments, since I think that some of them are more compelling than others. This is the case with the lack of either a strong Mudejar or Jewish aljama in Pétrola, which casts doubt on the idea that the Kitāb al-Mujādala was copied in this town since there would have been no human infrastructure in which this could have happened. Nevertheless, the challenge the Christians’ preaching posed to the Mudejars can also be used as an argument for this polemic having been copied in Pedrola. Even more cogently, this religious propaganda provides a more coherent and plausible explanation for this work having been copied. The Mudejar communities in the Aragonese region were very active in copying and transmitting works of religion and controversy (it should be recalled that one of the Arabic copies of the Ta’yiḍ was completed in Huesca). There was a Jewish aljama in Pedrola and, in 1407 CE, in the town there was also a Mudejar amīn of marriageable age and, therefore fully capable of performing his duties and of holding another position in the aljama which would have allowed him to

---

engage in polemics. As noted, the relatively large size of MS AF 58 made it unsuitable to carry around and suggests its use in community services. The presence of Jews in combination with the Christians' intense proselytizing efforts in Aragon, for instance, those of Vicent Ferrer and the veneration of his figure in Pedrola, seem to give added support to the argument that Piṭrūla should be located in present-day Pedrola. Al-Raqili could have been a native of the nearby town of Ricla who moved to Pedrola and later married there a woman from Borja. Moreover, it has been argued above that one of the sources of the Kitāb al-Mujādala could have been connected to the influential Sharafi family who, as it has been noted, had branches in Castile and in Aragon among other places.

This notwithstanding, compelling evidence for either of these two towns is not conclusive and it also does not necessarily follow that the work was composed in Aragon.

Conclusions

From the sources examined here it appears that, although the production and consumption of works of religious polemics was kept up during the Mudejar period, the composition of the Arabic originals of these works actually seems to have taken place in the fourteenth century. The Arabic originals of the Ta'yīd and of the Kitāb al-Mujādala are virtually contemporaneous with the Arabic original and the Aljamiado adaptations of the Kitāb Miṣṭah ad-Dīn, and in more general terms we can say that the fourteenth century, a period in which the Christians seem to have made the most ardent efforts to proselytize both the Mudejars and Muslims, witnessed a peak in the production of the literature of religious polemics by Mudejars.182

There are strong arguments to situate the composition of the Kitāb al-Mujādala in the fairly immediate environment of the Sharafs, a Mudejar family with branches in several kingdoms of the Iberian Peninsula, who had close ties with the Christian elite of their time. Evidence has been provided that a work of the fourteenth-century Castilian qāḍī Hamete could have been one of the sources mentioned in this treatise, particularly, the qāḍī Abū-l-ʿAbbās ʿAbd al-Lakhmi al-Sharafi. If future discoveries confirm this hypothesis, Hamete will be the first Mudejar religious leader for whom we have documented evidence of polemical activities.

I have discussed whether the Kitāb al-Mujādala could have provided an answer to existing works of polemics written by Christians. The evidence available does not allow us as yet to probe any farther than to notice the important presence of the Christian

discourses in this polemic and some parallels with Ramón Martí’s treatise against the Muslims and the Jews, *Pugio Fidei*. However, beyond this we cannot establish a direct dependence on this work. Taking into account the differences between the Aljamiado manuscripts of the *Ta’ṣiʿ*, I have argued that they are adaptations, not merely translations, and that the increasing animosity towards the Jews found in some of them might reflect the Christian attitudes towards the Jews and the changes in power between communities in the Christian territories after the expulsion of the Jews in 1492 CE. The influence of Christian discourses in the *Taṣiʿ* is an aspect to which I shall return in the next chapters.

It also should be noted that some miscellaneous manuscripts in circulation among the Mudejars and the Moriscos seem to have been entirely devoted to the refutation of Judaism; indeed they seem to have been compiled as a kind of ‘manual’ for the refutation of Jews and Judaism. An example would be MS L 536 (Fondo Documental Histórico de las Cortes de Aragón), in which we find not just the *Taṣiʿ*, the ‘demandas’, the ‘ten lines of the Torah’, but also a ‘Jewish confession’, a fragment about the mistakes found in their religious law, a fragment on the Prophet Elijah and some excerpts from a Jewish chronology of the world.

Finally, the analysis of the polemical sources is consistent with the studies of Van Koningsveld which demonstrate that most works in circulation among the Mudejars were copied in small towns and cities. Compelling evidence has been provided that the copying of the *Kitāb al-Muṣādala* was carried out in the town of Pedrola (Aragon). The findings in this chapter buttress the arguments provided so far and confirm the active involvement of the Mudejars in polemics and their endeavours to transmit their polemical knowledge from one generation to the next. They show that treatises of religious polemics were not only used and adapted by Mudejars, but in all probability also composed by some members of their communities. The findings are also consistent with the scholarship by Wiegers that most Aljamiado manuscripts were copied after the last forced conversions of the Mudejars in 1526 CE.\(^1\)

---

\(^1\) Wiegers, 1994, 200.