

AḤMAD B. MUṢṬAFĀ ṬĀSHKUBRĪZĀDE'S (D. 968/1561)
POLEMICAL TRACT AGAINST JUDAISM *

EL TRATADO DE POLÉMICA CONTRA EL JUDAISMO
DE AḤMAD B. MUṢṬAFĀ ṬĀSHKUBRĪZĀDE
(M. 968/1561)

SABINE SCHMIDTKE

Free University Berlin

CAMILLA ADANG

Tel Aviv University

This article deals with a short polemical tract against Judaism written by the well-known Ottoman scholar Aḥmad b. Muṣṭafā Ṭāshkubrīzāde (d. 968/1560). The author uses the same arguments known to us from medieval polemics, viz. that the Torah, which was abrogated by Islam, contains references to the Prophet Muḥammad, despite the fact that it was tampered with by the Jews. In addition to the Bible, Ṭāshkubrīzāde quotes a number of later Jewish sources that add an important dimension to his tract. After a brief introduction in which the possibility of the author's indebtedness to Ibn Abī 'Abd al-Dayyān, a Jewish convert to Islam, is discussed, an edition and translation of the text are provided.

Key words: Muslim polemics against Judaism; Bible; Ottoman Empire; Aḥmad b. Muṣṭafā Ṭāshkubrīzāde; Ibn Abī 'Abd al-Dayyān.

Este artículo estudia un corto tratado de polémica en contra del judaísmo escrito por el conocido erudito otomano Aḥmad b. Muṣṭafā Ṭāshkubrīzāde (m. 968/1560). El autor utiliza los mismos argumentos que conocemos de la polémica religiosa medieval, tales como que la Torah, abrogada por el Islam, contenía referencias al Profeta Muḥammad a pesar de que su texto fue corrompido por los judíos. Además de la Biblia, Ṭāshkubrīzāde cita una serie de fuentes judías tardías que añaden una importante dimensión a este trabajo. Después de una breve introducción en que se discute la posibilidad de la deuda del autor respecto a la obra de Ibn Abī 'Abd al-Dayyān, un converso del judaísmo al Islam, se presenta una edición y traducción del texto.

Palabras clave: Polémica musulmana contra el judaísmo; Biblia; Imperio Otomano; Aḥmad b. Muṣṭafā Ṭāshkubrīzāde; Ibn Abī 'Abd al-Dayyān.

* This paper is part of a larger project involving the edition, translation and analysis of a number of polemical treatises by Ottoman authors against Judaism; see Adang, C., Pfeiffer, J. and Schmidtke, S., *Ottoman Intellectuals on Judaism: A Collection of Texts from the Early Modern Period* (forthcoming); see "Addendum" at the end of the paper. The present writers wish to express their gratitude to Judith Pfeiffer for helpful remarks on this article. Sections of this paper were presented by S. Schmidtke at the *Shlomo Pines Conference*, held at The Hebrew University of Jerusalem in March 2005. The authors wish to thank S. Stroumsa and W. Madelung for their help in interpreting various passages of the text.

1. Introduction

I

Aḥmad b. Muṣṭafā Ṭāshkubrīzāde (901/1495-968/1561) was one of the most prolific Ottoman scholars of the 10th/16th century¹ and authored numerous theological, encyclopaedic and biographical works. He is mostly renowned for his biographical work on Ottoman scholars, *al-Shaqā'iq al-nu'māniyya fī 'ulamā' al-dawla al-uthmāniyya*,² which later served Ḥājjī Khalīfa (or Kātib Çelebi, 1609-1657) as a major source when compiling his *Kashf al-zunūn*,³ and for his encyclopaedic survey of disciplines of knowledge, *Miftāḥ al-sāda wa-miṣbāḥ al-siyāda fī mawḍū'āt al-'ulūm*.⁴ What is less known is that his literary *œuvre* includes a brief polemical treatise against Judaism, apparently his only work in the field of interreligious polemics. Although the major biographical reference works do not mention the tract among his writings, its authenticity is beyond doubt; the text is extant in five manuscript copies, four of which explicitly mention him as the author.⁵

The doctrinal intention of the treatise reflects the characteristic Muslim perspective on Judaism; it is to prove that the Qur'ān, containing the final divine dispensation, abrogates the earlier revelations, including the Torah, and that accordingly the Jewish claim of the eternity of the Mosaic law is to be rejected (*faṣl 1: fī tazayyif dalā'il ta'bīd*

¹ On his life and work, see Brockelmann, C., *Geschichte der arabischen Litteratur*, 1-2. Zweite den Supplementbänden angepasste Auflage, Leiden, 1943-49, 2, 425-26; *Supplementbände*, 1-3, Leiden, 1937-42, 2, 633-34; Flemming, B., "Taṣḥköprüzāde," in *El*, New Ed. 1-11, Leiden, 1960-2004, 10, 351-52; Tāhir, B.M., *Osmanlı Müellifleri*, 1-3, Ankara, 2000, 1, 346-347; Uğur, A., *Taşköprüzāde Ahmed 'İşāmeddin Ebu'l-Ḥayr Efendi. Hayatı, Şahsiyeti, Eserleri ve İlmi Görüşleri*, Diss. Atatürk Üniversitesi, Erzurum, 1980; Köker, A.H. (ed.), *Taşköprülü zāde Ahmet Efendi (1495-1561)*, Kayseri, 1992; Sürün, A., *Taşköprüzāde Ahmed Efendi'nin Tefsir Risāleleri*. Diss. Marmara Üniversitesi, İstanbul, 2002.

² *Eṣ-Şaqā'iq en-No'māniyye von Taşköprüzāde enthaltend die Biographien der türkischen und im osmanischen Reiche wirkenden Gelehrten, Derwisch-Scheiḥ's und Ärzte von der Regierung Sultan Oṯmān's bis zu der Süleimān's des Grossen*. Mit Zusätzen, Verbesserungen und Anmerkungen aus dem Arabischen übersetzt von O. Rescher, Konstantinopel-Galata, 1927.

³ Ḥājjī Khalīfa, *Kashf al-zunūn 'an asāmī al-kutub wa l-funūn. Lexicon bibliographicum et encyclopaedicum a Mustafa Ben Abdallah Katib Jelebi dicto et nomine Haji Khalfa celebrato compositum*, 1-7, G. Flügel (ed.), Leipzig, 1835-58.

⁴ Kāmil Bakrī and 'Abd al-Wahhāb al-Nūr (eds.), Cairo, 1968.

⁵ See below, Section III.

dīn Mūsā); that the Prophet Muḥammad had already been predicted in the Bible (*faṣl 2: fī dalā'il nubuwwat nabīyīnā Muḥammad*); and that the divine revelation to Moses was later tampered with by the Jews (*faṣl 3: fī bayān mā yadullu 'alā taḥrīfihim al-tawrāt*).⁶

The characteristic doctrinal intention of the tract notwithstanding, Ṭāshkubrīzāde's polemic has a number of features that clearly set it apart from earlier Muslim polemical writings against Judaism. The range of sources the author used is wide and comprehensive, although the Biblical material he quotes or refers to is almost exclusively taken from the Pentateuch.⁷ Yet within this corpus he uses material that goes beyond the standard pool of verses that is typically adduced in Muslim polemical writings. In addition to Biblical material, the author seems to have been acquainted with a considerable number of Jewish religious texts and with the respective Jewish arguments relevant to the issues discussed. He frequently refers to and quotes from various commentaries on the Pentateuch; among them, the commentary of Abraham Ibn Ezra (d. 1167), one of the most esteemed authors among Jewish readers of the 16th Century Ottoman Empire,⁸ figures most prominently. In addition, he explicitly refers to the commentary of Moshe Ben Nahman (also known as Nahmanides, d. 1270) and uses other, not further specified exegetical literature. The author also has a nearly verbatim quotation from the Talmud (Baba Bathra), and his accounts of Jewish replies to Muslim charges and inner-Jewish

⁶ For a survey of the main topics of Muslim polemics against Judaism in their historical development, see Lazarus-Yafeh, H., *Intertwined Worlds. Medieval Islam and Bible Criticism*, Princeton, 1992; Adang, C., *Muslim Writers on Judaism and the Hebrew Bible. From Ibn Rabban to Ibn Hazm*, Leiden, 1996; *idem*, "Torah," in *Encyclopaedia of the Qur'ān*, 1-5, Leiden, 2001-06, 5, 300-11.

⁷ For lists of Biblical references typically adduced by Muslim polemicists, see Strauss, E., "Darkhe ha-pulmus ha-Islami," in *Sefer ha-Zikkaron le-bet ha-Midrash le-rabbanim be-Vinah*, A. Schwarz (ed.), Jerusalem, 1946, 182-97; Adang, *Muslim Writers*, 264-66 (Appendix Two: Biblical Passages Invoked as Testimonies to Muḥammad).

⁸ On the renewed interest in Ibn Ezra during the 16th century in the Ottoman Empire, see Lange, N. de, "Abraham Ibn Ezra and Byzantium," in *Abraham Ibn Ezra y su tiempo [Abraham Ibn Ezra and His Age]*. *Actas del Simposio Internacional 1989*, Madrid, 1990, 181-92; Miller, P.E., *At the Twilight of Byzantine Karaism. The Anachronism of Judah Gibbor*, PhD Dissertation, New York University, 1984. See also Ben-Menahem, N., "Mefarshei Ibn Ezra al ha-Miqra," in *Areshet*, 3 (5721/1961), 71-92; Simon, U., "Interpreting the Interpreter. Supercommentaries on Ibn Ezra's Commentaries," in *Rabbi Abraham Ibn Ezra. Studies in the Writings of a Twelfth-Century Jewish Polymath*, I. Twersky and J. M. Harris (eds.), Cambridge, 1993, 86-128.

discussions, particularly on the issue of abrogation and the theoretical possibility of *naskh* on rational grounds, echo arguments that can be encountered in Jewish writings such as Sa'adya Gaon's (d. 942) *Kitāb al-Āmānāt wa-l-i'tiqādāt*, al-Qirqisānī's (10th c.) *Kitāb al-Anwār wa-l-marāqib*, Maimonides' *Epistle to Yemen*, and 'Izz al-Dawla Ibn Kammūna's (d. 1284) *Tanqīḥ al-abḥāth li-l-milal al-thalāth*.⁹ The

⁹ See Sa'adya Gaon, *Kitāb al-Āmānāt wa-l-i'tiqādāt* (*Kitāb al-Mukhtār fī l-Āmānāt wa-l-i'tiqādāt*, J. Qāfīh (ed.), Jerusalem-New York, 5730/1970; *idem*, *Kitāb al-Āmānāt wa-l-i'tiqādāt* (*The Book of Beliefs and Opinions*). Translated from the Arabic and the Hebrew by S. Rosenblatt, New Haven, 1948 [repr. 1976], particularly Treatise III, Chapters VII to X; al-Qirqisānī, *Kitāb al-Anwār wa-l-marāqib*, L. Nemoy (ed.), New York, 1939-43, 1, 298-301; Friedlaender, I., "Qirqisānī's Polemik gegen den Islam," in *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, 26 (1912), 93-110 [containing an edition of chapters 15 and 16 of the the third discourse of Qirqisānī's *K. al-Anwār*]; Hirschfeld, H., "Ein Karäer über den [von] Mohammed gemachten Vorwurf jüdischer Torähfälschung," in *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, 26 (1912), 111-13; Maimonides, *The Epistle to Yemen*. Translated and annotated by A. Halkin in *Epistles of Maimonides. Crisis and Leadership*, Philadelphia, 1985, 91-131; Perlmann, M. (ed.), *Sa'd b. Maṣṣūr Ibn Kammūna's Examination of the Inquiries into the Three Faiths. A Thirteenth-Century Essay in Comparative Religion*, Berkeley-Los Angeles, 1967; *idem*, *Ibn Kammūna's Examination of the Three Faiths. A Thirteenth-Century Essay in Comparative Study of Religion*, Berkeley-Los Angeles 1971; Chapter Six of Nathana'el b. Fayyūmī, *Gan Hasekhalīm [Bustān al-'uqūl]*, J. Qāfīh (ed.), Jerusalem 1954; Ahroni, R., "From *Bustān al-'uqūl* to *Qīṣat* [sic] *al-batūl*. Some Aspects of Jewish-Muslim Religious Polemics in Yemen," in *Hebrew Union College Annual*, 52 (1981), 311-30. On Jewish reactions to Muslim polemics, see Ben-Shammai, H., "The attitude of some early Karaites towards Islam," in *Studies in Medieval Jewish History and Literature*, I. Twersky (ed.), Cambridge, 1984, 3-40; Fontaine, T. A. M., *In Defence of Judaism: Abraham ibn Daud. Sources and Structure of ha-Emunah ha-Ramah*, Assen, 1990, *passim*; Cohen, M. R. and Somekh, S., "In the Court of Ya'qūb Ibn Killis. A Fragment from the Cairo Genizah," in *JQR*, 30 (1990), 283-314; Somekh, S., "Fragments of a Polemic Treatise from the Cairo Genizah," [Hebrew] in *Shivtiel Book. Studies in the Hebrew Language and in the Linguistic Traditions of the Jewish Communities*, I. Gluska and T. Kessar (eds.), Tel Aviv, 1992, 141-59; *Duties of Judah by Rabbi Yehudah Ben El'azar*, A. Netzer (ed., transl. and intro.), Jerusalem, 1995, 537-45; Stroumsa, S., "Jewish Polemics against Islam and Christianity in the Light of Judaeo-Arabic Texts," in *Judaeo-Arabic Studies. Proceedings of the Founding Conference of the Society for Judaeo-Arabic Studies*, Amsterdam, 1997, 241-50; Sklare, D., "Responses to Islamic Polemics by Jewish Mutakallimūn in the Tenth Century," in *The Majlis. Interreligious Encounters in Medieval Islam*, H. Lazarus-Yafeh, M. R. Cohen, S. Somekh and S. H. Griffith (eds.), Wiesbaden, 1999, 137-61; Alfonso, E., "Los límites del saber. Reacción de intelectuales judíos a la cultura de procedencia islámica," in *Judíos y musulmanes en al-Andalus y el Magreb. Contactos intelectuales. Seminario Celebrado en la Casa de Velázquez (20-21 de febrero de 1997)*. Actas reunidas y presentadas por M. Fierro, Madrid 2002, 59-84; Frank, D., "'A Prophet like Moses'. Exegesis as Religious Polemic," in *idem*, *Search the Scripture well. Karaite Exegetes and the Origins of the Jewish Bible Commentary in the Islamic East*, Leiden, 2004, 204-47;

style of the treatise is very dense and concise, possibly because the author assumed his reader's familiarity with the arguments.

II

It is not clear whether Ṭāshkubrīzāde had immediate access to the sources he quotes from or refers to in his tract, or whether he relied only on secondary material. Following the introduction of Hebrew printing in Istanbul in 1504, prints of most of the sources he mentions or quotes were available in the Ottoman capital.¹⁰ However, it is hard to imagine that a Muslim scholar could have acquired such a high level of Jewish learning independently, seeing that it would require thorough familiarity with Hebrew. It is therefore most likely that Ṭāshkubrīzāde had secondary sources at his disposal.

The question of the originality of Ṭāshkubrīzāde's tract, which cannot be decided at present, is also relevant in light of another polemical treatise against Judaism that was composed in Şafar 1016/May-June 1607, i.e. some fifty years after Ṭāshkubrīzāde's death, and is written in Ottoman Turkish. It is extant in three manuscript copies.¹¹ This treatise, which was composed by a certain Yūsuf

Chiesa, B. and Schmidtke, S., "The Jewish Reception of Samaw'al al-Maghribī's (d. 570/1175) *Iḥām al-yahūd*. Some Evidence from the Abraham Firkovitch Collection I," in *JSAI*, 31 (2006). For Jewish reactions to the Muslim dogma of the inimitability of the Qur'ān specifically, see Sadan, J., "Identity and Inimitability. Contexts of Inter-Religious Polemics and Solidarity in Medieval Spain, in the Light of Two Passages by Moše Ibn 'Ezra and Ya'aqov Ben El'azar," in *IOS*, 14 (1994), 324-47.

¹⁰ Rozen, M., *A History of the Jewish Community in Istanbul. The Formative Years, 1453-1566*, Leiden, 2002, 250ff; Ya'ari, A., *Hebrew Printing at Constantinople*, Jerusalem, 1967. The commentary on the Torah by Abraham Ibn Ezra was printed in 1514 (YA'ARI, 70 n.º 24), the commentary by Nahmanides in 1522 (YA'ARI, 84 n.º 95). Also available in print were the commentaries by Rashi (d. 1105) (YA'ARI, 59 n.º 2) and Ya'aqov ben Asher (d. ca. 1340) (YA'ARI, 70 n.º 25), Sa'adya's *al-Amānāt wa-l-i'tiqādāt* in the original Arabic with Hebrew translation (YA'ARI, 112 n.º 164), and Maimonides' *Responsa* (YA'ARI, 83 n.º 87), to name just a few of at least 126 books in Hebrew that were printed in Istanbul between 1504 and 1566.

¹¹ MSS Giresun 102, ff. 128b-164a (copy dated Dhu l-Qa'da 1245/April-May 1830; see colophon f. 159a:12-15); Giresun 171, ff. 30a-45b (undated), Bagdatlı Vehbi Efendi 2022, ff. 101b-120b (copy dated 1177/1763-64; see colophon f. 120b:19). MS Giresun 171/2 contains a different version of the tract than is to be found in MSS Giresun 102 and Bagdatlı Vehbi Efendi 2022. Significant differences are particularly to be observed in Chapters 3 and 4 of the treatise. It is only at the end of MS Bagdatlı Vehbi Efendi 2022 (f. 120b:16-18) that a dated colophon of the author is to be found. For brief descriptions of MSS Giresun 102 and 171/2, see T. C. Kültür Bakanlığı Kütüphaneler Genel Müdürlüğü,

Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān,¹² a Jewish convert to Islam, is significantly longer and more detailed than Ṭāshkubrīzāde’s epistle; among other things, the treatise by Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān contains a detailed autobiographical introduction, brief introductory remarks to each of the four chapters, and the original Hebrew Bible quotations transcribed in Arabic script. However, apart from these features, both tracts are so similar in structure, contents and argumentation that there cannot be any doubt that Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān either had Ṭāshkubrīzāde’s tract in front of him when writing his own, or that both writings go back to a common, so far unknown, source. Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān even retains the Arabic rendering of the Biblical quotations as they appear in Ṭāshkubrīzāde’s tract without translating them into Turkish. Moreover, what is apparently a mistake in most of the manuscripts of Ṭāshkubrīzāde points likewise to the close connection with Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān’s treatise: in *faṣl* 2, Ṭāshkubrīzāde adduces five Biblical proofs (*dalā’il*) as predictions for the Prophet Muḥammad, which are numbered as *dalīl* 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6 – there is no *dalīl rābi’*. Comparison with Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān’s text shows that Ṭāshkubrīzāde’s proofs five and six indeed correspond to proofs five and six in the latter’s treatise. The scriptural testimony included in Proof Four of Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān’s text (Gen. 49:10) figures in Ṭāshkubrīzāde’s text as part of *al-dalīl al-thālith*.

III

In what follows, we present an edition and translation of Ṭāshkubrīzāde’s polemical tract against Judaism. No full analysis of the text is undertaken at this point, though parallels with a number of earlier sources are indicated. A more detailed discussion will be found in our forthcoming monograph, *Muslim Polemics against Judaism from the Ottoman Period. A Collection of Texts* (see above, first note).

Türkiye Yazmaları Toplu Kataloğu. The Union Catalogue of Manuscripts in Turkey, 2, Ankara, 1980, 86 n.º 209 and 210. For an edition, translation and analysis of this tract, see Adang, Pfeiffer and Schmidtke, *Muslim Polemics against Judaism*.

¹² The name of the author is mentioned explicitly in the introduction to and the concluding remarks of the text (MSS Giresun 102, f. 128b:10-11, 158b:9-10; Giresun 171/2, f. 30b:4, Bagdatlı Vehbi Efendi 2022, f. 101b:6) and, with a slight variation, as “Yūsuf b. ‘Abd al-Malik al-Dayyān” in Bagdatlı Vehbi Efendi 2022, f. 120b:3.

	Ṭāshkubrīzāde	Ibn Abī 'Abd al-Dayyān (MS Giresun 102, ff. 128b-164a)	Ibn Abī 'Abd al-Dayyān (MS Giresun 171, ff. 30a-45b)	Ibn Abī 'Abd al-Dayyān (MS Bagdatlı Vehbi Efendi 2022, ff. 101b-120b)
Autobiographical Introduction	./.	128b-131a:12	30b-31b:21	101b-103a:18
Overview of Contents	pp. xx-xx	131a:12-131b:3	31b:21-32a:7	103a:18-103b:5
<u>Faṣl 1</u>	pp. xx-xx	131b:3-144a:2	32a:7-[37a:10]	103b:5-111b:19
Introduction to <i>Faṣl</i>	./.	131b:3-132a:8	32a:7-16	103b:5-104a:4
<i>Dalīl</i> 1 (Deut. 4:2)	pp. xx-xx	132a:8-133a:3	32a:16-32b:16	104a:4-104b:7
<i>Dalīl</i> 2 (Num. 23:19)	pp. xx-xx	133a:3-135b:5	32b:16-33b:2	104b:7-105b:9
<i>Dalīl</i> 3 (Deut. 5:22-24)	pp. xx-xx	135b:5-136b:9	33b:2-34b:1	105b:9-107a:4
<i>Dalīl</i> 4 (Deut. 33:4)	pp. xx-xx	136b:9-137b:1	34b:1-21	107a:4-107b:5
<i>Dalīl</i> 5 (Deut. 34:10)	pp. xx-xx	137b:1-138b:7	34b:22-35a:15	107b:5-108a:16
<i>Dalīl</i> 6 (Ex. 31:16)	pp. xx-xx	138b:7-144a:2	35a:16-37a:10	108a:16-111b:19
<u>Faṣl 2</u>	pp. xx-xx	144a:2-152a:2	[37a:10]-41b:21	111b:19-116b:13
Introduction to <i>Faṣl</i>	./.	144a:2-10	37a:10-17	111b:19-112a:7
<i>Dalīl</i> 1 (Deut. 18:18-19)	pp. xx-xx	144a:10-146a:12	[37a:17]-38a:14	112a:7-113a:16
<i>Dalīl</i> 2 (Deut. 34:10)	pp. xx-xx	146a:12-147b:8	38a:14-38b:21	113a:16-114a:9
<i>Dalīl</i> 3 (Deut. 13:1-5)	pp. xx-xx	147b:8-148b:3	38b:21-39a:13	114a:9-115a:6
<i>Dalīl</i> 4	./.	148b:3-150a:1	39a:13-39a:13-39b:10	115a:6-115b:2
<i>Dalīl</i> 5 (Deut. 33:2)	pp. xx-xx	150a:1-151a:12	39b:10-40a:15	115b:2-116a:15
<i>Dalīl</i> 6 (Gen. 16:7-16, 25:12-16, 17:2, 17:20)	pp. xx-xx	151a:12-152a:2	40a:15-41b:21	116a:15-116b:13
<u>Faṣl 3</u>	pp. xx-xx	152a:2-155a:6	41b:21-45a:7	116b:14-119b:3
<u>Faṣl 4</u>	pp. xx-xx	155a:6-159a	45a:7-45b	119b:3-120b

The edition is based on the five known manuscript copies of the tract:

1. Veliyüddin (Bayezid) 3275/9, ff. 40b-44b, 23 lines per page, 13,6 × 21 cm [ج]. The author is mentioned in the table of contents (p. IIIa). The treatise itself is not dated, yet many of the thirty writings contained in the *majmū'a* (of 158 ff plus 3 unfoliated leaves at the beginning of the collective codex) are dated, ranging from Dhu l-Qa'da 963/September-October 1556 to Jumādā II 969/March-April 1562.

2. Hacı Beşir Ağa 666/33, 13 x 20,5 cm, ff. 197b-199b [ب]. The undated *majmū'a* was written by different hands. There is no indication as to the author.

3. Carullah Efendi 2098/2, 15,3 × 21,8 cm, ff. 79b-88a [ع]. The codex consists of 276 ff. and is written by different hands. This treatise

الفصل الأول²⁰ في تزيف دلائل التأييد وهي ستة

الدليل²¹ الأول: قال في التوراة ما ترجمته: {كل ما أمرتكم به لا تزيدوا عليه ولا تنقصوا منه}²². هم يقولون: إن أتبعنا شريعة أخرى يلزم أن نزيد على أحكام التوراة شيئاً وننقص منها²³ شيئاً، وإنه غير جائز بنص التوراة.

الجواب: المراد {لا تزيدوا عليه شيئاً ولا تنقصوا} من عند أنفسكم. صرح بذلك مفسرو التوراة²⁴ ويؤيده أسلوب هذا التعبير كما لا يخفى على الفطن اللبيب.²⁵ فلا يلزم منه النهي عن الاتباع لني أتى بالزيادة والنقصان من قبل الله تعالى. وما وقع في كلام بعض²⁶ المفسرين للتوراة: ومن ههنا قيل: لا يأتي نبي بأمر يحدث بعد، يشير ببطان ما حكاها بصيغة التمريض وبأسلوب التعبير، كما لا يخفى على الفطن الخبير.

الدليل الثاني: قال في التوراة: {ليس الرب رجلاً حتى يكذب وابن آدم حتى يصير نادماً}²⁷، ولا يخفى أن النسخ هو الندامة لما سبق منه من الشريعة وأنه باطل عقلاً وكذا نقلاً بنص التوراة، فلا نسخ بعد دين موسى عليه السلام. **الجواب:** معنى الندامة أن يفعل فاعل مختار فعلاً ثم رأى الخير في خلافه، وهذا محال في حقه تعالى عن ذلك علواً كبيراً. وإنما المراد من النسخ تبديل الأحكام بحسب تبدل²⁸ أحوال الناس²⁹ وأطوارهم، كما يبدل الطبيب المعالجة باختلاف أحوال المريض. وهذا ليس محال، بل هو عين الحكمة ومحض الرحمة، خصوصاً في تبديل دين موسى عليه السلام حكمة محضة مكشوفة على العلماء أيضاً وهي أن طائفة بني إسرائيل لاستيعاب الرقّ جميع أعمالهم ارتكز الغباوة في عقولهم وتقرر القصور في أفهامهم. ولهذا اقتصر في التوراة على الوعد والوعيد من جهة الدنيا فقط لكونهم معزول عن فهم الآخرة

²⁰ الفصل الأول. -، ج.

²¹ الدليل: -، ش ج ن و.

²² لا تسفوا على الدبر אשר انכי מצוה אתכם ולא תגרעו ממנו לשמר את מצות יהוה אלהיכם אשר انכי מצוה אתכם. (سفر التثنية 4: 2).

²³ منها: منه، ب ج ش ن و.

²⁴ راجع فירוש ראב"ע، سفر דברים، ע' לה: 'לא تسפוי מדעתכם ותחשבו כי היא עבודה לה'، גם כן 'לא תגרעו'.

²⁵ راجع فירוש ראב"ע، سفر דברים، ע' לה: וטעם 'למדתי אתכם' אחר שאמר אשר אנכי מלמד אתכם (פסוק א) להוסיף 'אשר צוני ה' כי המצוות הם מצוותיו שתעשו בארץ שיתן לכם ה' לירוש. ועוד כי יעז לכם תפארת במצוותיו על כל הגוים. והטעם، כי עיקר כל המצוות יבינם המשכיל וידע למה נתנו. انظر أيضاً: فירוש ראב"ע، سفر דברים، ע' רשב: והמסכיל יבין; فירוש ראב"ע، سفر בראשית، ע' ב: והמסכיל יבין. انظر أيضاً: فירוש רמב"ן، سفر דברים، ע' שכא: והמסכיל יבין.

²⁶ بعض: -، ج.

²⁷ לא איש אל ויכזב וכן אדם ויתנחם [ההוא אמר ולא יעשה ודבר ולא יקימנה]. (سفر العدد 23: 19)

²⁸ تبدل: تبديل، ب.

²⁹ الناس: مكرر في ن.

وأحوالها. ولما زاد في الناس الاستعداد لفهم أمور الآخرة بعد ذلك ورد أحوال الآخرة في الشرائع الباقية. على أن النسخ واقع في أحكام التوراة أيضاً، فما هو جوابهم فهو جوابنا.

الدليل الثالث: قال في التوراة: {هذه الكلمات التي يكلم الله بها إليكم بصوت عظيم وكتبها على لوحين من حجر وقتلتم: سمعنا صوت الله من قعر النار}³⁰. وجه الاستدلال أنهم، لما علّقوا إيمانهم بموسى عليه السلام بسماعهم كلام الله تعالى بأذانهم، أعطاهم الله تعالى ما راموه³¹ وذكر الآية المذكورة لإلزامهم، فيفهم منه أن الإيمان لا بد وأن يعلّق بسماع صوت الله تعالى، ولم يقع هذا السماع بعد موسى عليه السلام.

والجواب: إن بني إسرائيل اعتذروا لموسى³² عليه السلام: بأننا لا نقدر على سماع صوت الله تعالى³³ مرة أخرى وإلا هلك بالكلية، فاسأل ربك أن لا يفعل ذلك بعد هذا. ولهذا قال في التوراة: {قال بنو إسرائيل: إن سمعنا صوت الله مرة أخرى نموت}³⁴ {إذن أنت واسمع كل ما يأمر بك به}³⁵. ثم إن الله تعالى استحسّن كلامهم هذا³⁶ وقال في التوراة: {وقال الله تعالى³⁷: واحسنوا فيما قالوا}³⁸، والظاهر أنهم لم يقترحوا ما ذكر لأجل نبوة موسى عليه السلام، بل لأنهم كانوا منكّرين لأصل النبوة لأنهم كانوا متّبعين لحكماء هند، وهم كانوا يقولون لهم: إن البشر لا يقدر على سماع كلام الله تعالى. ولهذا كانوا يريون في نبوة موسى عليه السلام مع مشاهدة المعجزات الباهرة في يده، وقد فصلها⁴⁰ ابن عذرا في تفسيره. ثم إن الله تعالى قال في التوراة حكاية عن بني إسرائيل: {قد أعلمنا الرب إلهنا عزّته وعظمته وأسمعنا صوته من قعر النار رأينا اليوم أن الله يكلم ابن آدم وهو يبقى حياً}⁴¹. فيفهم من هذه الآية أنهم آمنوا بإمكان سماع

³⁰ את הדברים האלה דבר יהוה אל כל קהלכם [בהר מתוך האש הענן והערפל] קול גדול [ולא יסף] ויכתבם על שני לוחות אבנים [ויתנם אלי: ויהי כשמעכם את הקול מתוך החשך וההר בער באש ותקרבון אלי כל ראשי שבטיכם וזקניכם]: ותאמרו [הן הראינו יהוה אלהינו את כבודו ואת גדלו] ואת קלו שמענו מתוך האש [היום הזה ראינו כי ידבר אלהים את האדם וחי]. (سفر التثنية 5: 22-24)

³¹ راموه: راموهم، ب ج ش ن و.

³² لموسى: موسى، ب ج ش ن و.

³³ تعالى: -، ش.

³⁴ وעתה لמה نموت כי תاكلנו האש הגדלה הזאת אם יספים אנחנו לשמע את קול יהוה אלהינו עוד ומתנו. (سفر التثنية 5: 25).

³⁵ קרב אתה ושמע את כל אשר יאמר יהוה אלהינו ואת תדבר אלינו את כל אשר ידבר יהוה אלהינו אליך ושמענו ועשינו. (سفر التثنية 5: 27).

³⁶ هذا: -، ج.

³⁷ تعالى: -، ب.

³⁸ וישמע יהוה את קול דבריכם בדברכם אלי ויאמר יהוה אלי שמעתי את קול דברי העם הזה אשר דברו אליך היטיבו כל אשר דברו. (سفر التثنية 5: 28).

³⁹ كانوا: + منكّرين لأصل النبوة، ج.

⁴⁰ فصلها: فصله، ب ج ش ن و.

⁴¹ ותאמרו הן הראינו יהוה אלהינו את כבודו ואת גדלו ואת קלו שמענו מתוך האש היום הזה ראינו כי ידבר אלהים את האדם וחי. (سفر التثنية 5: 24)

البشر كلام الله تعالى واعترفوا بالنبوة. فإذا كان تعليق الإيمان بسماع الصوت في الإيمان بأصل النبوة لا في نبوة خصوص موسى عليه السلام لم تدل⁴² الآية التي احتجوا بها على مطلوبهم على تعليق الإيمان بسائر الأنبياء بسماع الصوت.

الدليل الرابع: قال في التوراة⁴³: {إن التوراة صار ميراثاً لجماعة يعقوب}⁴⁴، فيفهم من هذا الكلام اختصاص جماعة يعقوب عليه السلام⁴⁵ بالتوراة.⁴⁶

الجواب: إن المفهوم منه اختصاص أتباع التوراة ببني إسرائيل لا اختصاص بني إسرائيل باتباع التوراة.

الدليل الخامس: قال في التوراة: {ولا يقوم نبي مثل موسى من بني إسرائيل}⁴⁷ فيفهم منه أنه لا نبي بعده. **الجواب:** إن المذكور في التوراة لفظ ولا قم [ولاء قم] وهذا اللفظ موضوع في اللغة العبرانية للماضي فتفسيره الصحيح: ولا قام نبي مثل موسى⁴⁸ من بني إسرائيل. وتفسيرهم بمعنى المضارع منافي لقاعدة لغتهم، وإنما قصدوا بهذا التفسير التلبس في إثبات دعواهم الباطلة وهي تأييد دين موسى عليه السلام. وما أورده رجل مسمى بلوي في تفسير لفظ ولا قم أنه بمعنى المضارع وأيده بعدة كلمات من صحف الأنبياء، فمن قبيل التلبس لأن ما وقع في صحف الأنبياء⁴⁹ إنما هو لفظ ولا قام بألف بين القاف والميم، ولهذا يكون معنى الاستقبال بخلاف الآية المذكورة إذ ليس فيها الألف المذكورة فيكون بمعنى الماضي بحسب قواعد لغتهم. على أنه لو كان معنى المضارع أيضاً فلا يتم الدليل لأن في الآية قيد من بني إسرائيل. فمدلول الآية حينئذ نفي نبي آخر من بني إسرائيل خاصة لا مطلقاً، بل يدل على مجيء نبي من غير بني إسرائيل بطريق مفهوم المخالفة الذي هو مقبول عند علمائهم حتى بنوا كثيراً من أحكامهم الشرعية على تلك الطريقة.

الدليل السادس: قال في التوراة: {ليحفظ⁵⁰ بنو إسرائيل السبب في دهورهم أبداً}⁵¹. قالوا: فلو اتبعنا غير شريعة موسى عليه السلام⁵² يلزم عدم حفظ السبب مع أن حفظ السبب مؤيد في حقنا، فيلزم حينئذ أن نحفظ السبب وأن لا نحفظه في زمان واحد وأنه تكليف بما لا يطاق وأنه محال قطعاً.

⁴² تدل: يدل، ج ش ن.

⁴³ قال في التوراة: -، ج.

⁴⁴ تורה צוה לנו משה מורשה קהלת יעקב. (سفر التثنية 33: 4)

⁴⁵ عليه السلام: -، ب ج ن و.

⁴⁶ راجع فيروش رابع، سفر دברים، ع' שב: וכן היא מורשה לקהלת יעקב، כמו 'והנבואה עודד הנביא' (דה"ב טו ח). והיא מורשה קהלת יעקב.

⁴⁷ ולא قم נביא עוד בישראל כמשה [אשר ידעו יהוה פנים אל פנים]. (سفر التثنية 34: 10).

⁴⁸ موسى: + عليه السلام، ش.

⁴⁹ الأنبياء: مكرر في ن.

⁵⁰ ليحفظ: + حفظ السبب مع أن حفظ السبب (مشطوباً)، ج.

⁵¹ ושמר בני ישראל את השבת לעשות את השבת לדורתם ברית עולם. (سفر الخروج 31: 16).

Al-Qantara (AQ) XXIX 1, enero-junio 2008, pp. 79-113 ISSN 0211-3589

ويجاب بأن ما ذكر عموم الأمكنة وأنه لا يستلزم عموم الأزمنة، والأصل في ذلك أن أحكام التوراة بعضها مخصوص للقدس⁶² الشريف⁶³ وبعضها مخصوص لغيرها⁶⁴ وبعضها عام لجميع الأمكنة، ومعنى قوله: {في جميع مساكنكم} أن السبب من القسم الثالث.

وقد يقال: قد ورد لفظ عولام في حقه تعالى فلا احتمال لغير الأبدية. والجواب عنه: إن المذكور في حقه تعالى لفظ عولام مع قيد وهو لفظ واعظ [ועד]⁶⁵، والتأييد إنما يفهم من لفظ واعظ لا من لفظ عولام، واعتراض عليه بأن لفظ عولام جاء في الجزء العاشر من السفر الخامس⁶⁶ بلا قيد لفظ واعظ مع أنه في حقه تعالى أيضاً⁶⁷.

ونجيب بأن عامة المفسرين قالوا بأن لفظ عولام في ذلك الموضع ليس بمعنى الزمان ولا بمعنى المكث الطويل ولا بمعنى الأبد، بل بمعنى الكائنات، فيكون لفظ عولام لفظاً مشتركاً ولا فساد فيه. والمذكور في هذا الموضع هو {أن الله تعالى يقول في زمان أرفع يدي إلى عرش وكرسي وأقول بحق كوني حياً وقيوماً للعالمين في زمان أصقل فيه سيفي وأقبض قبضته للانتقام}⁶⁸ وأنتم [من] المشركين وأنتمصف من الأعداء⁶⁹ {فلفظ عولام ههنا بمعنى زمان مبهم لا غير.

ثم إن طائفة اليهود ينكرون النسخ⁷¹ أشد الإنكار مع أنه واقع في التوراة في كثير من المواضع، منها أن أكل اللحم كان حراماً في شريعة آدم عليه السلام⁷² ثم أمر⁷³ في زمن نوح عليه السلام⁷⁴ ومنها أن الختان كان واجباً لبني إسرائيل⁷⁵ ثم

⁶² للقدس: لقدس، ب ش ن و.

⁶³ الشريف: الشريفة، ج ن و.

⁶⁴ لغيرها: بغيرها، ن و.

⁶⁵ إشارة إلى: יהוה ימלך לעולם ועד. (سفر الخروج 15: 18).

⁶⁶ دברים לב 52-1 (פרשת "האזינו").

⁶⁷ إشارة إلى سفر التثنية 32: 40-41.

⁶⁸ للانتقام: الانتقام، ب ج ش ن و.

⁶⁹ الأعداء: الأعداء، ب.

⁷⁰ כי אשא אל שמים ידי ואמרתי חי אנכי לעולם אם שנותי ברק חרבי ותאחז במשפט ידי אשיב נקם לצרי ולמשנאי אשלם. (سفر التثنية 32: 40-41).

⁷¹ النسخ: للنسخ، ش ن و.

⁷² إشارة إلى ويأمر ألهام هנה נתתי לכם את כל עשב זרע אשר על פני כל הארץ ואת כל העץ אשר בו פרי עץ זרע זרע לכם לאכילה. (سفر التكوين 1: 29) انظر أيضاً פרוש ראב"ע, ספר בראשית, ע' לג: 'ויאמר אלהים הנה נתתי לכם'. התיר לבני אדם ולכל שיש בו נפש חיה לאכול כל עשב, וכל פרי עץ מותר לאדם, והעשב הירק לחיות ולכל רמש. ועד כה לא הותר הבשר עד אחר המבול.

⁷³ أمر: حرم، ش ن و.

⁷⁴ إشارة إلى כל רמש אשר הוא חי לכם יהיה לאכלה כירק עשב נתתי לכם את כל. (سفر التكوين 9: 3) انظر أيضاً פרוש ראב"ע, ספר בראשית, ע' קכא: 'כל רמש'. שם כלל לחית השדה ולבהמות הישוב ולכל עוף ולכל דג. והנה הכל מותר לאכלה.

⁷⁵ إشارة إلى וכן שמנת ימים ימול לכם כל זכר לדורתיכם יליד בית ומקנת כסף מכל בן נכר אשר לא מזרעך הוא: המול ימול יליד ביתך ומכנת כסף והיתה בריתי בבשרכם לבית עולם. (سفر التكوين 17: 12).

لُهي عنه في التيه ثم أمروا بذلك بعد أربعين سنة،⁷⁶ ومنها أن الميراث لم يكن للبنات أولاً ثم أمر بالميراث لهن، وإذا لم توجد⁷⁷ البنات يُعطى لإخوتهن، ومنها أن هرون عليه السلام كان مأموراً بالعبادة في داخل القبة كل يوم، ثم لُهي عن الدخول إليها إلا في السنة مرة.

الفصل الثاني⁷⁸ في دلائل نبوة نبينا محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم⁷⁹

الدليل الأول: قال في التوراة: {نبي أقيم لهم من قرابة إخوانهم مثلك وأعطي أحكامي في فيه يكلم إليهم كل الكلمات التي أمرت لهم والذي لا يسمع تلك الأوامر ولا يطيعها فأنا أسأله}⁸⁰. وفي هذه الآية دلالة على جواز إرسال الرسول بعد موسى عليه السلام وذلك ظاهر، وعلى أن ذلك النبي لا بد وأن يكون من أولاد إخوانهم لا من بني إسرائيل وعلى أن يكون ذلك النبي {مثلك} أي في إتيان الشريعة الجديدة بقرينة قوله: {وأعطي أحكامي في فيه}. ولا يخفى أن نبينا محمدًا⁸¹ صلى الله عليه وسلم⁸² من نسل إسماعيل⁸³ عليه السلام وهو أخ يعقوب⁸⁴ عليه السلام وأنه صاحب شريعة جديدة. ولا يخفى أن يوشع عليه السلام كان من بني إسرائيل وكذا سائر أنبياء بني إسرائيل لا من قرابة إخوانهم، وأيضاً كان خليفة موسى عليه السلام ولم يكن صاحب شريعة جديدة. وأيضاً لا يمكن أن يكون النبي عيسى عليه السلام إذ ليس في الإنجيل شريعة جديدة غير ما وقع في التوراة. فتعين أن يكون ذلك النبي نبينا محمد المصطفى⁸⁵ عليه الصلاة والسلام⁸⁶.

⁷⁶ إشارة إلى سفر يشوع 5: 2-5: عت ההיא אמר יהוה אליהושע עשה לך חרבות צרים ושוב מל את־בני־ישראל שנית: ויעשֶׁלוּ יהושע חרבות צרים וימל את־בני ישראל אל־גבעת הערלות: וזה הדבר אשר־מל יהושע כל־העם היצא ממצרים הזכרים כל אנשי המלחמה מתו במדבר בדרך בצאתם ממצרים: כִּלְמִים היו כל־העם היצאים וכל־העם הילדים במדבר בדרך בצאתם ממצרים לא־מלו: כי ארבעים שנה הלכו בני־ישראל במדבר עד־תם כל־הגוי אנשי המלחמה היצאים ממצרים אשר לא־שמעו בקול יהוה אשר נשבע להם בלילי הראותם את־הארץ אשר נשבע יהוה לאבותם לתת לנו ארץ זבת חלב ודבש:

⁷⁷ توجد: يوجد، و.

⁷⁸ الفصل الثاني: -، ج.

⁷⁹ صلى الله عليه وسلم: عليه السلام، ج ن.

⁸⁰ نبيا اקים لهم מקרב אחיהם כמוך ונתתי דברי בפיו ודבר אליהם את כל אשר אצוונו: והיה האיש אשר לא שמע אל דברי אשר ידבר בשמי אנכי אדרש מעמו. (سفر التثنية 18: 18)

⁸¹ محمدا: محمد، ج.

⁸² صلى الله عليه وسلم: عليه السلام، ج.

⁸³ إسماعيل: إسماعيل، ب ش ن و.

⁸⁴ يعقوب: كذا في كل المخطوطات.

⁸⁵ المصطفى: -، ب ش.

⁸⁶ عليه الصلاة والسلام: عليه السلام، ج.

الدليل الثاني: قال في التوراة: {لم يقم نبي من بني إسرائيل يعرفه الله تعالى وجاهاً}⁸⁷. اختلفوا فيه. قال بعضهم: لفظ لا قام [لا كس] في التوراة بمعنى: لم يقم في العربية، فيكون لنفي الماضي. وبعضهم قال: إنه بمعنى: لا يقوم، فعلى هذا يدل على تأييد دين موسى عليه السلام.

والجواب: إنه وإن كان بمعنى: لا يقوم، لكنه مقيد بكونه من بني إسرائيل فلا يدل على عدم قيام النبي من غيرهم. قال بعضهم: ذلك النبي يوشع عليه السلام⁸⁸، وإنه باطل لوجه، أحدها أنه عادة التوراة أن يوشع عليه السلام لا يذكر إلا بصريح اسمه، وثانيها أنه من بني إسرائيل، وثالثها أنه ليس له شريعة جديدة، بل هو خليفة لموسى عليه السلام، والمفهوم مما ذكر في الآية المذكورة من قوله⁸⁹ {يعرفه الله وجاهاً} أن يكون صاحب وحي وشريعة. وقال بعضهم: إنه بلعام بن باعورا، وذلك باطل لوجهين، أحدهما أن بلعام لم يكن نبياً، بل كان ساحراً، وثانيهما أنه كان كافراً قتل في زمن يوشع عليه السلام بالسيف وقد قتل على كفره.⁹⁰

الدليل الثالث: قال في التوراة: {إذا قام نبي من بينكم أو رأى في الرؤيا وأتى بالدليل والمعجزة وقال: هلموا عبدوا معبوداً غير الله لا ترضوه ولا تطيعوه فاقتلوه}⁹¹. قالوا: قوله: {لا ترضوه ولا تطيعوه} دليل على أنه لا نبي بالحق بعد موسى عليه السلام.

والجواب: إن قوله: {وقال: هلموا واعبدوا معبوداً غير الله} يدل بطريق مفهوم المخالفة على أنه لو قال: عبدوا الله، يقبل، ومفهوم المخالفة مقبول عندهم، ولا يخفى أن الأمر بالإطاعة إنما يكون إذا بدل الحلال الثابت في التوراة إلى الحرام⁹² وبالعكس، ويعلم دعوته إلى الله من صدق دعوته. وقال في التوراة في حق ذرية يهودا: {لا يزول الحكم والسلطنة من بين رجله حتى يجيء عظيم يجتمع إليه الأمم}⁹³، ويفهم من هذا الكلام أنه يزول الحكم والسلطنة من أولاد يهودا وقد زالت الحكومة منهم في زمن نبينا محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم.⁹⁴

⁸⁷ ولا كس نביא עוד בישראל [כמשה אשר] ידעו יהוה פנים אל פנים. (سفر التثنية 34: 10)

⁸⁸ راجع פירוש ראב"ע, ספר דברים, ע' קס: 'נביא מקרבך', זה יהושע. והעד, שאמר אליו תשמעון, וכתוב 'וישמעו אליו בני ישראל' (דברים לד ט). ועוד ראיה אחרת, כי לא מצאנו נביא שנכנס עם ישראל לארץ כי אם יהושע, גם כן יתכן להיות זה כלל לכל נביא שיקום אחר משה.

⁸⁹ قوله: قولهم، ب ج ش ن.

⁹⁰ إشارة إلى سفر العدد 22: 20-34، 31: 8.

⁹¹ כי יקום בקרבך נביא או חלם חלום ונתן אליך אות או מופת: [ובא האות והמופת] אשר דבר אליך לאמר נלכה אחרי אלהים אחרים [אשר לא ידעתם ונעבדם]: לא תשמע אל דברי הנביא ההוא או אל חולם החלום ההוא [כי מנסה יהוה אלהיכם אתכם לדעת הישכם אהבים את יהוה אלהיכם בכל לבבכם ובכל נפשכם: אחרי יהוה אלהיכם תלכו ואתו תיראו ואת מצותיו תשמרו וקבלו תשמעו ואתו תעבדו ובו תדבקון]. (سفر التثنية 13: 2-5)

⁹² الحرام: الحلال، ب ج ش ن و.

⁹³ לא יסור שבט מיהודה ומחקה מבין רגליו עד כי יבא שילה ולו יקהת עמים. (سفر التكوين 49: 10)

⁹⁴ صلى الله عليه وسلم: عليه السلام، ج.

الدليل الخامس⁹⁵: قال في التوراة: {إن الله جاء من طور سينا وطلع من جبل سعيم وأشرق من جبل فاران}⁹⁶، يعني جاء أحكام الله تعالى يعني التوراة. قالوا: إن الملائكة أطافوا التوراة كالعروس⁹⁷ وجاءوا بها أولاً إلى سعيم، وهو مملكة⁹⁸ عيسى عليه السلام، فلم يقبل قومها التوراة، ثم جاءوا بها إلى فاران، وهو مملكة إسماعيل⁹⁹ عليه السلام فلم يقبل قومها إياها، ثم جاءوا بها إلى سينا، وهو مملكة موسى عليه السلام فقبل قومه التوراة. فلا دلالة في الآية المذكورة على¹⁰⁰ ظهور نبي آخر بعد موسى عليه السلام.

والجواب: إن المفهوم من الآية خلاف ما ذكره لأن ترتيبها لا يوافق ترتيب هذه الرواية، فالحق ما أورده ابن عذرا في تفسيره وإن أورده بصيغة التعميم، وهو¹⁰¹ أن المراد من الأحكام التي جاء من¹⁰² طور سينا هي التوراة التي أتبعها قوم موسى عليه السلام ومن الأحكام التي طلع من سعيم هي الإنجيل الذي أتبعه النصاري وكون سعيم مقام عيسى عليه السلام مصرّح به في التوراة، ومن الأحكام التي أشرق من جبل فاران هو القرآن الذي نزل على نبينا محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم¹⁰³ وكان فاران مقام إسماعيل¹⁰⁴ عليه السلام وهو مصرّح به في التوراة، ونبينا محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم¹⁰⁵ من أولاد إسماعيل¹⁰⁶ عليه السلام.

الدليل السادس¹⁰⁷: فهو¹⁰⁸ أن أجبار اليهود يعتبرون حساب الجمل مثلاً قال الملك لهاجر حين حملها: ستجيء¹⁰⁹ اثنا عشر ملكاً من ذريتك، وأشار إلى هذا العدد بلفظ زه [זה] وهو اثنا عشر¹¹⁰. وأشار¹¹¹ في آخر الجزء الخامس من

⁹⁵ الخامس: كذا في ج ش ن و.

⁹⁶ ويأمر יהוה מסיני בא ורח משעיר למו הופיע מהר פארן ואתה מרבבת קדש מימינו אשדת למו. (سفر

الثنى 33: 2).

⁹⁷ פירוש ראב"ע, ספר דברים, ע' רצח: 'מרבבות קדש' הם המלאכים. והטעם על השכינה שירדה.

⁹⁸ مملكة: مكرر في ن.

⁹⁹ إسماعيل: إسماعيل، ب ش ن و.

¹⁰⁰ على: إلى، ب ج ش ن و.

¹⁰¹ راجع פירוש ראב"ע, ספר דברים, ע' רצח: וחסרי אמונה אמרו, כי טעם 'משעיר' על דת אדום, 'פארן'

על דת ישמעאל, ואלה תועים. הלא ראו, כי לא החל בתחילה כי אם לבורך ישראל לבדם ...

¹⁰² من: إلى، ب ج ش ن و.

¹⁰³ صلى الله عليه وسلم: عليه السلام، ج و.

¹⁰⁴ إسماعيل: إسماعيل، ب ش و.

¹⁰⁵ صلى الله عليه وسلم: عليه السلام، ج.

¹⁰⁶ إسماعيل: إسماعيل، ب ش ن و.

¹⁰⁷ السادس: كذا في ج ش ن و.

¹⁰⁸ فهو: هو، ج و.

¹⁰⁹ ستجيء: سيحيى، ج ش ن و.

¹¹⁰ إشارة إلى ويمצאה מלאך יהוה על עין המים במדבר על העין בדרך שור: ויאמר הגר שפחת שרי אימזה

באת ואנה תלכי ותאמר מפני שרי גברתי אנכי ברחתי: ויאמר לה מלאך יהוה שובי אל גברתך והתעני תחת ידיה:

السفر الأول¹¹² إلى أن زمان عمارة القدس الشريف لفظ بزات [زאת]¹¹³ وهو بحساب الجمل أربع وأربعمئة وكان كذلك،¹¹⁴ وأخير عن نبينا محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم بلفظ بمادامد [بماداد ماد] في ثلاث مواضع¹¹⁵ ولفظ بمادامد بحساب الجمل اثنان وتسعون، وهو عدد الاسم الشريف أعني اسم محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم¹¹⁶.

الفصل الثالث في بيان ما يدلّ على تحريفهم التوراة

وذلك في عدة مواضع لم يقدروا على توجيهها إلا بتعسفات باردة وتكلفات شاردة حفظاً لدينهم عن طعن العوام حتى قال بعض مفسريهم بطريق الوصية: من كان من العرفان يحفظ عرضه في هذه المواضع عن طعن العوام والجهال، منها {سار إبراهيم في الأرض إلى مقام شَحْم إلى ألون مُرّة والكنعاني كان حيثئذ¹¹⁷ في الأرض}¹¹⁸، والمراد من الأرض مملكة كنعان بن نوح ولم يزل أن يكون في أيدي الكنعانيين حتى فتحها يوشع عليه السلام والمدة أزيد من ألف سنة، وتلك الأراضي هي أرض قدس وألّون مُرّة من نواحي القدس، وإذا كانت تلك الأراضي في أيدي الكنعانيين عند مسير إبراهيم عليه السلام إليها يلزم أن لا يكون فتحها في يد يوشع عليه السلام مع أنه صرّح في التوراة أن تلك الأرض ستفتح في زمن يوشع عليه السلام. والظاهر أن مثل هذا التناقض لا يقع في كلام الله تعالى بل يكون ملحقاتاً.

ويأمر له ملائكة יהוה הרבה ארבה את זרעך ולא יספר מרב: ويأمر له ملائكة יהוה הנך הרה וילדת בן וקראת שמו ישמעאל כי שמע יהוה אל עניך: והוא יהיה פרא אדם ידו בכל ויד כל בו ועל פני כל אחיו ישכן: ותקרא שם יהוה הדבר אליה אתה אל ראי כי אמרה הגם הלם ראיתי אחרי ראי: על כן קרא לבאר באר לחי ראי הנה בין קדש ובין בור: ותלד הגר לאברהם בן ויקרא אברהם שם בנו אשר ילדה הגר ישמעאל: ואברהם בן שמנים שנה ושש שנים בלדת הגר את ישמעאל לאברהם. (سفر التكوين 16: 7-16) وأלה تلدت ישמעאל بن أברהام אשר يلداه הגר המצרית سפחת שרה لأברהם: وأלה سموت بني ישמעאל בשמתם لتولدتهم בכר ישמעאל نبית وقدر وأدבאל ومبشم: ومשמع ودומה ומשא: حדר وتימא יטור נפיש וקדמה: אלה הם בני ישמעאל وأלה سמתם בחצירהם ובטירתם שנים عشر נשיאם לאמתם. (سفر التكوين 25: 12-18)

¹¹¹ وأشار: وذكر، ب ج ش ن و.

¹¹² إشارة إلى سفر التكوين 23: 1-25: 18 (פרשת "חיי שרה"). وكذا في ب ج ش ن و.

¹¹³ إشارة إلى בזאת יבא אהרן אל הקדש בפר בן בקר לחטאת ואיל לעלה. (سفر اللاويين 16: 3).

¹¹⁴ راجع פרוש רש"י, ספר ויקרא, ע' קמג: 'בזאת' גמטריא שלו ארבע מאות ועשר, רמז לבית הראשון. פרוש רמב"ן, ספר ויקרא, ע' קמד.

¹¹⁵ إشارة إلى وאתנה בריתי ביני ובינך וארבה אותך במאד מאד (سفر التكوين 17: 2). והפרתי אתך במאד מאד ונתתיך לגוים ומלכים ממך יצאו (سفر التكوين 17: 6). ולישמעאל שמעתך הנה ברכתי אתו והפריתי אתו והרביתי אתו במאד מאד שנים عشر נשיאם יוליד ונתתיו לגוי גדול. (سفر التكوين 17: 20)

¹¹⁶ صلى الله عليه وسلم: عليه السلام، ن و.

¹¹⁷ كان حيثئذ: حيثئذ كان، ش ن و.

¹¹⁸ ויעבר אברהם בארץ עד מקום שכם עד אלון מורה והכנעני אז בארץ. (سفر التكوين 12: 6).

وقال ابن عذرا وهو رئيس مفسريهم: وفي هذا سر يسكت فيه العاقل¹¹⁹. وقال في موضع آخر: إن أطلعت على سرّ اثني عشر¹²⁰، وأراد بذلك اثني عشر آية مكتوبة في آخر السفر الآخر¹²¹ تدل¹²² كلها على أن تلك الآيات مكتوبة بعد زمان موسى عليه السلام.¹²³

ومنها إن موسى عليه السلام لما أتم التوراة أمر بحفظها في صندوق¹²⁴ يذكر وصفها في التوراة، وأمر في التوراة أن يجتمعوا في كل سنة ثلاث مرات ويقرعوا التوراة¹²⁵، ثم ذكر في التوراة أن موسى عليه السلام نادى العلماء أن يجتمعوا الكهنة وينصّحهم ويخبرهم أنهم يطغون بعد وفاته¹²⁶، وما ذكر من اثني عشر آية يدل منطوقها أن الله تعالى دعا موسى عليه السلام وأراه القدس وما حولها من الجبل، ثم مات هناك بأمر الله تعالى ودفن هناك ولم يعلم قبره إلى الآن وتبع قومه يوشع عليه السلام¹²⁷. قال ابن عذرا في تفسيره: إن أطلعت على هذا السرّ تصل إلى مرتبة الحقيقة¹²⁸. حتى قال يهودا:

¹¹⁹ راجع فירוש ראב"ע, ספר בראשית, ע' קנג: גם זה המקום 'שכס', משה קראו כן, כי שכס לא היה בימי אברהם. 'אלון'. כמו אלה, והם עצים, ו"א שדה, כמו איל פארן (יד ו). 'מורה'. י"א שהוא ממרא בעל ברית אברהם. ויתכן שהוא אחר. ויהי אלון מורה שם מקום. 'והכנעני אז בארץ'. יתכן שארץ כנען תפשה כנען מיד אחר. ואם איננו כן יש לו סוד. והמשכיל ידום.

¹²⁰ רاجע פירוש ראב"ע, ספר דברים, ע' ד: ואם תבין סוד (השדים) [השנים] עשר ...

¹²¹ إشارة إلى سفر التثنية 34: 1-12.

¹²² تدل: يدل، ن و.

¹²³ راجع פירוש ראב"ע, ספר דברים, ע' שיז: 'ויעל משה'. לפי דעתי, כי מזה הפסוק כתב יהושע, כי אחר שעלה משה לא כתב, ובדרך נבואה כתבו.

¹²⁴ إشارة إلى ויהי ככלות משה לכתב את דברי התורה הזאת על ספר עד תמים: ויצו משה את הלויים נשאי ארון ברית יהוה לאמר: לקח את ספר התורה הזה ושמתם אותו מצד ארון ברית יהוה אלהיכם והיה שם בך לעד. (سفر التثنية 31: 24-26).

¹²⁵ إشارة إلى שלש פעמים בשנה יראה כל זכורך אל פני האדון יהוה (שמות כג 17 / سفر الخروج 23: 17). שלש פעמים בשנה כל זכורך את פני האדון יהוה אלהי ישראל: כי אוריש גוים מפניך והרחבתי את גבולך ולא יחמד איש את ארצך בעלתך לראות את פני יהוה אלהיך שלש פעמים בשנה. (سفر الخروج 34: 23-24). שלש פעמים בשנה יראה כל זכורך את פני יהוה אלהיך במקום אשר יבחר בחג המצות ובחג השבועות ובחג הסוכות ולא יראה את פני יהוה ריקם. (דברים טז 16 / سفر التثنية 16: 16). ויצו משה אותם לאמר מקץ שבע שנים במעד שנת השמיטה בחג הסוכות: בבוא כל ישראל לראות את פני יהוה אלהיך במקום אשר יבחר תקרא את התורה הזאת נגד כל ישראל באזניהם. (سفر التثنية 31: 10-11).

¹²⁶ إشارة إلى הקהילו אלי את כל זקני שבטיכם ושטריכם ואדברה באזניהם את הדברים האלה ואעידה בסם את השמים ואת הארץ: כי ידעתי אחרי מותי כי השחת תשחתון וסרתם מן הדרך אשר צויתי אתכם וקראת אתכם הרעה באחרית הימים כי תעשו את הרע בעיני יהוה להכעיסו במעשה ידיכם. (سفر التثنية 31: 28-29).

¹²⁷ إشارة إلى ויעל משה מערבת מואב אל הר נבו ראש הפסגה אשר על פני ירחו ויראהו יהוה אל כל הארץ את הגלעד עד דן: ואת כל נפתלי ואת ארץ אפרים ומנשה ואת כל ארץ יהודה עד הים האחרון: ואת הנגב ואת הכנר בקעת ירחו עיר התמרים עד צער ... וימת שם משה עבד יהוה בארץ מואב על פי יהוה: ויקבר אותו בני בארץ מואב מול בית פעור ולא ידע איש את קברתו עד היום הזה ... ויהושע בן נון מלא רוח חכמה כי סמך משה את ידיו עליו וישמעו אליו בני ישראל ויעשו כאשר צוה יהוה את משה. (سفر التثنية 34: 1-3, 5-6, 9).

¹²⁸ רاجע פירוש ראב"ע, ספר דברים, ע' ד: ואם תבין סוד (השדים) [השנים] עשר, גם 'ויכתב משה' (דברים לא כב), 'והכנעני אז בארץ' (בראשית יב ו), 'בהר ה' יראה' (בראשית כב יד), 'הנה ערשו ערש ברזל' (דברים ג יא), תכיר האמת.

إن نزلت التوراة على موسى عليه السلام بتمامها¹²⁹ فكيف يصح ذكر خبر وفاته فيها؟ فيفهم منه أنها مكتوبة بعد وفاته عليه السلام كتبها يوشع عليه السلام¹³⁰. واعترض عليه شعون بأنه إذا صح إقام موسى عليه السلام التوراة وأمره بحفظها فكيف يصح من يوشع عليه السلام الإلحاق؟ وقال بعضهم: إن شعون يجتهد عندهم فكلامه نص عندهم¹³¹ فلا يصح ما ذكره ابن عذرا من أن فيه سرًّا. وقال بعضهم: مبنى كلام ابن عذرا أن هذا الإلحاق ليس من يوشع ولا من¹³² نبي آخر وإنما وقع من المتأخرين ولم يذكروا كيف كان الإلحاق.

الفصل الرابع في مطاعن اليهود في حق الأنبياء

منها إسنادهم الكبيرة إلى لوط عليه السلام بعد هلاك قومه مع أنهم قاتلون بأن الأنبياء لا يصدر عنهم الكبائر، وهذا الإسناد، وأي شيء هي¹³³، مذكور في الجزء الرابع من السفر الأول.¹³⁴ ومنها أنه قد ذكر في الجزء العاشر من السفر الأول إسناد الكبيرة إلى داود عليه السلام¹³⁵، وأمثال ذلك كثيرة فلا نطول بها الكلام.
تمت¹³⁶.

3. Translation of the *Epistle in Refutation of the Jews*, by Aḥmad b. Muṣṭafā Ṭāshkubrīzāde (d. 968/1561)

In the name of God, the Beneficent, the Merciful; praise be to God alone, and prayer over him after whom there is no [further] prophet and over his family and companions.

This epistle is made up of four parts. The first part exposes as spurious the declaration of the eternal validity of the religion of Moses (peace be upon him); the second part is about the proofs for the prophethood of our prophet Muḥammad (God bless him and grant

¹²⁹ بتمامها: مكرر في ن.

¹³⁰ عليه السلام: -، ن و.

¹³¹ راجع تلمود بابل، מסכת בבא בתרא، פרק א: ומי כתבן ... אמר ר' יהושע כתב ספרו ושמונה פסוקים שבתורה תניא כמאן דאמר שמונה פסוקים שבתורה יהושע כתבן דתני' וימת שם משה עבד ה' אפשר משה (מת) וימת שם משה אלא עד כאן כתב משה מכאן ואילך כתב יהושע דברי ר' ואמרי לה ר' נחמיה אמר לו ר' ש אפשר ס"ת חסר אות אחת וכתב לקוח את ספר התורה הזה אלא עד כאן הקב"ה אומר ומשה אומר וכותב מכאן ואילך הקב"ה אומר ומשה כותב בדמע כמו שנאמר להלן ויאמר להם ברוך מפיו יקרא אלי את כל הדברים האלה ואני כותב על הספר בדיו כמאן אזלא הא דא"ר יהושע בר אבא אמר רב גידל אמר רב שמונה פסוקים שבתורה יחיד קורא אותן לימא (ר"י היא) ודלא כר"ש אפילו תימא ר"ש הואיל ואשתנו אשתנו.

¹³² من: -، ש.

¹³³ هي: هو، ب ج ح ن و.

¹³⁴ إشارة إلى سفر التكوين 19: 30-38.

¹³⁵ إشارة إلى سفر صموئيل الثاني 2: 11-12.

¹³⁶ تمت: تم، ن؛ -، و.

him salvation); the third part is about the occurrence of corruptions in the Torah, and the fourth part deals with invectives [uttered] by the Jews.

Part One, exposing the spuriousness of the proofs [adduced] for the eternity [of the religion of Moses], which are six in number

The first proof [adduced by the Jews]

In the Torah is said what is translated as follows: “All that I command you, do not add to it, nor diminish from it.” (Deut. 4:2). [The Jews] say: If we would observe another sacred law (*sharī‘a*), this would require that we add something to the precepts of the Torah and detract something from it, and this is not admissible according to the text of the Torah.¹³⁷

The [Muslim] reply

What is meant by “do not add to it, nor diminish,” is “[do not add or diminish] of your own accord.”¹³⁸ The commentators of the Torah explain this clearly, and the wording of the expression confirms this, as is well known to the discerning and intelligent.¹³⁹ Hence it does not necessarily follow from this that it is forbidden to follow a prophet who produces an addition or omission on the part of God (exalted is He). What is stated by one of the commentators of the Torah, to the effect that “on the basis of this it has been said: ‘no prophet will come with a new commandment anymore,’” points to the falsity of what he has mentioned, by phrasing it in such a way as to imply that it

¹³⁷ See similarly Deut 12:32 (“What thing so ever I command you, observe to do it: thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it.”) This scriptural evidence is adduced, e.g. by Maimonides, *The Epistle to Yemen*, 112.

¹³⁸ Cf. *Ibn Ezra’s Commentary on the Pentateuch. Deuteronomy (Devarim)*, H. N. Strickman and A. M. Silver (transl. and annot.), New York, 2001, 21-22. That the quoted prohibition applies to man only and that God may indeed later on add precepts to those of the Torah was also maintained by al-Qirḡisānī; cf. Adang, *Muslim Writers*, 210.

¹³⁹ This and similar phrases echo the use of such expressions (e.g., *ve-ha-maskil yavin* – “the intelligent will understand”) by the Jewish commentators referred by Ṭāshkubrīzāde.

is doubtful¹⁴⁰ and by the wording of the expression [in the biblical verse], as is obvious to the discerning and perceptive.

The second proof [of the Jews]

It is said in the Torah, "The Lord is not a man, that he should lie, or the son of man that he should become regretful" (Num. 23:19). It is well known that abrogation is [God's] regret for a law given previously, and this is absurd from the rational as well as the scriptural point of view according to the text of the Torah. Thus there is no abrogation following the religion of Moses (peace be upon him).

The [Muslim] reply

The meaning of regret is that a free agent produces an act and subsequently realizes the benefit that is in its opposite. This is impossible with regard to Him,¹⁴¹ far exalted is He above this. The meaning of abrogation is merely the alteration of legal rulings according to the changing states and conditions of the people, just like a physician who alters his treatment according to the changing states of his patient. Now, this is not impossible, but sheer wisdom and pure mercy. In the alteration of the law of Moses (peace be upon him) in particular there is pure wisdom, which is apparent also to the scholars, namely that because slavery [negatively] affected all the actions of the Israelite nation, ignorance settled in their minds and deficiency was firmly imposed on their brains.

For this reason the Torah limits itself to promise and threat as far as this world is concerned, because they were precluded from understanding the hereafter and its conditions. When thereafter the people became increasingly disposed to understand the concerns of the hereafter, the conditions of the hereafter were reported in the other [i.e., later] revelations.¹⁴² However, abrogation occurs also among the rul-

¹⁴⁰ I.e., by using the expression "it has been said".

¹⁴¹ It would suggest that there are limits to the knowledge of the omniscient God.

¹⁴² That the Pentateuch does not give any details about the Hereafter and about reward and punishment but is limited to precepts applicable to this world only, is also reported by Ibn Kammūna as a Muslim polemical argument against Judaism (*Examination*,

ings of the Torah, so that their reply is in fact [identical to] our reply.¹⁴³

The third proof [of the Jews]

It is said in the Torah: “These are the words God speaks to you with a great voice and He wrote them on two tables of stone and you said, ‘We have heard God’s voice out of the midst of the fire’” (cf. Deut. 5:22-24). The[ir] way of argumentation is that when they made their belief in Moses (peace be upon him) conditional upon hearing the speech of God (exalted is He) with their own ears, God (exalted is He) gave them what they wished and spoke the verse referred to in order to force them [to believe]. From this it may be understood that belief is necessarily conditional on hearing the voice of God (exalted is He), and this has not been heard after Moses (peace be upon him).

The [Muslim] reply

The Children of Israel pleaded with Moses (peace be upon him) saying “We cannot hear the voice of God (exalted is He) another time, otherwise we shall completely perish; so ask your lord not to do that again.” Therefore He says in the Torah: “The Children of Israel said, ‘If we hear the voice of God one more time, we shall die. You go near, and hear all that He shall command you’” (cf. Deut. 5:25-27). Then God (exalted is He) approved of this saying of theirs and says in the Torah: “God (exalted is He) says: ‘They have spoken well’” (cf. Deut. 5:28). It is obvious, now, that they did not demand what has been mentioned because of Moses’ prophethood (peace be upon him), but because they denied the very principle of prophethood,¹⁴⁴ for they

ed. 40; transl. 63-64). The same motive is also to be found in al-Ḥajārī (d. after 1640), *Kitāb Nāṣir al-Dīn ‘alā l-qawm al-kāfirīn* (*The Supporter of Religion against the Infidel*). Historical study, critical edition and annotated translation by P. S. van Koningsveld, Q. al-Samarrai and G. A. Wieggers, Madrid 1997, 108 (Arabic), 165 (translation).

¹⁴³ That is, they, too, are forced to admit the existence of abrogation. The author later on enumerates Biblical examples that are interpreted as cases of abrogation within the Pentateuch; see below Part One, Proof Six.

¹⁴⁴ I.e., what motivated them was not their wish to see the prophethood of Moses confirmed, but they were merely challenging him, not believing that he could actually persuade God.

were following [certain] Indian philosophers who used to tell them: "Mankind is unable to hear the speech of God (exalted is He)." For this reason they were in doubt about the prophethood of Moses (peace be upon him), even though they had witnessed the brilliant miracles he worked. Ibn Ezra has explained this in detail in his commentary. In addition, God (exalted is He) said in the Torah, quoting the Children of Israel: "The Lord our God has shown us His might and His greatness, and has made us hear His voice out of the midst of the fire; we have seen this day that God talks with man, and that he stays alive" (cf. Deut. 5:24). From this verse it may be understood that they did believe in the possibility of mankind hearing the speech of God (exalted is He), and that they acknowledged prophethood. If believing in the possibility of hearing the [divine] voice is linked to the belief in the principle of prophethood [in general], not in that of Moses (peace be upon him) in particular, then the verse on the basis of which they argue in order to make their point does not prove that belief in the *other* prophets is conditional upon hearing God's voice [contrary to what they hold].

The fourth proof [of the Jews]

It is said in the Torah: "Behold the Torah became the inheritance of the congregation of Jacob" (cf. Deut. 33:4). From these words it may be understood that the congregation of Jacob (peace be upon him) was required to follow the Torah in particular [to the exclusion of other laws].¹⁴⁵

The [Muslim] reply

Is that what is to be understood from this is that following the Torah was specifically imposed upon the Children of Israel [and not on anyone else], not that the Children of Israel were required to follow the Torah in particular.

¹⁴⁵ What seems to be implied is that the Torah was given to the Jews as a *lasting* legacy. This scriptural evidence is adduced, e.g., by Sa'adya, *The Book of Beliefs and Opinions*, 158.

The fifth proof [of the Jews]

It is said in the Torah: “And there arises no prophet like Moses from among the Children of Israel” (cf. Deut. 34:10). From this may be understood that there is [to be] no prophet after him.¹⁴⁶

The [Muslim] reply

What is mentioned in the Torah is the expression *ve-lo qam*, and this expression indicates past tense in the Hebrew language, so that the correct rendering is: “and there *did* not arise a prophet like Moses (peace be upon him) from among the Children of Israel.” Their interpreting it as an imperfect¹⁴⁷ contradicts one of the rules of their language, and with this interpretation they merely intended to sow confusion when they asserted their false claims, namely about the eternity of the religion of Moses (peace be upon him). What a man called Levi¹⁴⁸ reported about the expression *ve-lo qam* having to be interpreted as an imperfect—which he backed with a number of sayings from the books of the prophets—this, too, is a kind of confusion, for what is found in the books of the prophets is only the expression *ve-lo qām*, with an *aleph* between the *qaf* and the *mim*. Because of this it has the meaning of a future tense, unlike the verse mentioned above, for there the *aleph* referred to does not appear, so that it has the meaning of a past tense according to the rules of their language, although even if it were an imperfect, the proof would still not be conclusive, for the verse contains a restriction to the Children of Israel. What is demonstrated by the verse, then, is [only] the rejection of another prophet [coming] from among the Children of Israel specifically, but not [of all future prophets] in the absolute sense; in fact, it points to the coming of a prophet from *outside* the Children of Israel,¹⁴⁹ on the basis of the method of *argumentum e contrario*, which

¹⁴⁶ Cf. similarly Maimonides, *The Epistle to Yemen*, 111.

¹⁴⁷ This grammatical interpretation can be found, e.g., in Japheth ben Eli’s (fl. 10 c.) *Commentary on Deuteronomy*; cf. Frank, “A Prophet like Moses,” 244.

¹⁴⁸ We were unable to identify this person.

¹⁴⁹ To this typical Muslim argumentation which can also be found, for example, in Ibn Qutayba’s (d. 889) *Dalā’il al-nubuwwa* (see Adang, *Muslim Writers*, 269), Japheth b. Eli has the following reply in his *Commentary on Deuteronomy* (tr. Frank, “A Prophet

is accepted among their scholars to the point that they have based many of their legal rulings on this method.

The sixth proof [of the Jews] it is said in the Torah: "The Children of Israel shall observe the sabbath throughout their generations forever" (cf. Exod. 31:16). They say: If we would follow a law other than that of Moses (peace be upon him), this would then require the non-observance of the sabbath, even though the observance of the sabbath is eternally binding on us. This then would imply that we observe the sabbath and not observe it at the same time. This is imposing the impossible, which is completely absurd.¹⁵⁰

The [Muslim] reply

This is an obvious lie, for "eternity" is not the sense in which the word *'olam* which occurs in the Torah can be understood. Rather, it has the meaning of a long duration in their language. Ibn Ezra has made this clear in his commentary on some verses and he corroborated this by what is found in the books of some of the prophets (peace be upon them), to the effect that [the word] occurs in the absolute sense of time, and he quotes what is found in the books of Solomon, son of David (peace be upon both of them), where past time is indicated,¹⁵¹ and what is found in the book of David (peace be upon him), where the meaning of a certain span of time is intended.¹⁵² Also, it is stated in the commentary on some verses of the Torah that

like Moses," 245): "'In Israel' does not signify that prophets like Moses will arise in nations other than Israel. It (indicates) rather, that since the nation of Israel is a 'special possession among all the nations' (Ex 19:5; Deut 7:6), the noble prophets who were sent (to them) go forth to other nations as well. Jonah ben Amittai was sent, for example, to Niniveh to encourage (its people) to repent, just as the prophets Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Amos, and Nahum all prophesied concerning the nations of the world. It was common knowledge among the nations that the true prophets came from the nation of Israel. Thus, the king of Aram sent Naaman to Elisha (2 Kings 5) and Hazael was sent to him likewise upon his entry into Damascus (2 Kings 8:8). And thus the king of Babylon sent to Hezekiah (2 Kings 20:12) that he might learn from him the significance of the miracle. For this reason (the verse states) 'in Israel'".

¹⁵⁰ For this argument, see, for example, Sa'adya, *The Book of Beliefs and Opinions*, 158.

¹⁵¹ Referring to Ecc. 1:10.

¹⁵² Cf. also *Abraham Ibn Esras Kommentar zur Urgeschichte*, Übersetzt und erklärt von D. U. Rottzoll, Berlin-New York, 1996, 105-106 (on Gen 3:7); *Abraham Ibn Esras langer Kommentar zum Buch Exodus*, Übersetzt und erklärt von D. U. Rottzoll, Berlin-New York 2000, 653-53.

'*olam* is another expression for *yovel*, and that *yovel* stands for a [moment in] time which is generally recognized among them and which falls once every fifty years, when commercial transactions and all other agreements are annulled and slaves are set free (cf. Lev. 25:10-17). Moshe ben Nahman reported that the maximum limit of '*olam* is fifty years,¹⁵³ whereas [another] one of them attested that with regard to the sabbath, it appears in the sense of eternity, also according to what is said in the Torah concerning the sabbath, where it says: "it is a sabbath for God in all your dwellings" (Lev. 23:3), that is, as long as you dwell in the land.¹⁵⁴

To this will be replied that what is mentioned here [refers to] *places* in general, which does not require that *time* in general is meant. The principle underlying this is that some of the rulings of the Torah are specific for Jerusalem, some are specific for other places, and some are generally applicable to all places. The import of His saying "in *all* your dwellings" is that [keeping] the sabbath belongs to the third category.

It may be said: The word '*olam* is mentioned in connection with the Almighty, and cannot, therefore, refer to anything but eternity.

The reply to this is that what is mentioned with regard to the Almighty is the word '*olam* together with a qualification, namely the expression *va-'ed*,¹⁵⁵ and eternity is only to be understood from the expression *va-'ed*, not from the word '*olam*.

¹⁵³ Cf. Ramban (Nachmanides), *Commentary on the Torah. Exodus*, Rabbi Dr. C. B. Chavel (transl. and annot.), New York, 1973, 348-49 (on Ex 21:6).

¹⁵⁴ On this issue, see Sa'adya Gaon, *The Book of Beliefs and Opinions*, 171, where the various positions are summarized: "Now some of the proponents of the theory of abrogation base their view on an analysis of the term 'forever' ('*olam*) concerning which they assert that they note that it has in the Hebrew language a variety of meanings. Our rejoinder is: Yes, it has three possible meanings. One of these is 'fifty years.' The other is 'the lifetime of the thing referred to.' The third, again, is 'as long as the world will exist.' Now when we apply this term to the Sabbath law, the first two possibilities are at once eliminated, only the last being retained. For we note that Jeremiah, although he lived something like nine hundred years after Moses and the lapse of many centuries and generations of the offspring of the Children of Israel, exhorted them to observe the Sabbath and to refrain from working on it. Thus Scripture says: *Neither carry forth a burden out of your houses on the sabbath day, neither do ye any work, but hallow ye the sabbath day, as I commanded your fathers* (Jer. 17:22). Since, then, the period of fifty years, as well as that of the lifetime of the individuals in question, is eliminated, the only one of the [different] types [of meaning that can be applied to the term '*olam*] that remains is [that of] the duration of the world."

¹⁵⁵ Referring to Ex 15:18.

It has been objected to this that the word 'olam occurs in the tenth part of the fifth book without the qualification of the expression *va-'ed*, even though here it also refers to the Almighty.¹⁵⁶

We reply that the commentators have stated in general that the word 'olam in this passage has neither the meaning of time, nor of a long duration, nor the meaning of eternity, but rather means [changing] events, for the word 'olam is equivocal, and there is nothing dishonest about this. But what is referred to in this place is that "God (exalted is He), shall say "In time I shall lift up my hand to the Throne and the See; by the truth of my being living and lasting *forever!*"¹⁵⁷ In time I shall whet my sword and grip it in order to take vengeance, I shall take vengeance from the polytheists and demand justice from the enemies"" (cf. Deut. 32:40-41).¹⁵⁸ Thus the word 'olam appears here in the vague sense of time, and nothing else.

Moreover, the Jewish sect rejects abrogation in the strongest terms, although it occurs in the [very] Torah in numerous places. Thus, for example, the consumption of meat was forbidden according to the law of Adam (peace be upon him),¹⁵⁹ whereas in the time of Noah (peace be upon him), it was ordered;¹⁶⁰ circumcision was first made incumbent upon the Children of Israel,¹⁶¹ then its practice was forbidden in the desert, and subsequently they were ordered [to perform it] again after forty years;¹⁶² at first, daughters were not entitled to inherit, but then it was ordered that they be made to inherit, and if there are no daughters, [the inheritance] should be given to their brothers;¹⁶³ Aaron (peace be upon him) was [at first] ordered to worship inside the tabernacle every day,¹⁶⁴ while later on he was forbidden to enter it except once a year.¹⁶⁵

¹⁵⁶ Referring to Deut 32:40-41.

¹⁵⁷ Hebrew: *hai anokhi le-'olam*.

¹⁵⁸ There are considerable discrepancies between the biblical text and the alleged quotation adduced here.

¹⁵⁹ Referring to Gen 1:29.

¹⁶⁰ Referring to Gen 9:3.

¹⁶¹ Referring to Gen 17:12.

¹⁶² Referring to Joshua 5:2-5.

¹⁶³ See Num. 27:1-9; 36:2.

¹⁶⁴ Referring perhaps to Ex. 30:7.

¹⁶⁵ Referring to Ex. 30:10; Lev. 16:2, 16:29-34. The intention of the argumentative strategy of adducing Biblical statements that were interpreted as early examples of internal abrogation was to force the Jews to admit the doctrine of abrogation in general, to undermine the authority of their Scriptures and to force them to acknowledge that the Qur'ān is the final divine dispensation; see Lazarus-Yafeh, *Intertwined Worlds*, 39ff.

Part Two, concerning the proofs of the prophethood of Muḥammad (may God bless him and grant him salvation)

The first proof [provided by the Muslims]

It is said in the Torah: “I will raise up a prophet for them from among their brethren, like you, and I will put my rulings into his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all the words that I shall command them, and he who will not listen to these commandments and will not obey them, I will demand [it] of him” (Deut. 18:18-19).¹⁶⁶ This verse contains proof for the possibility of [God’s] sending a messenger after Moses (peace be upon him), and this is obvious; and [proof] that this prophet must no doubt come from the offspring of their brothers, and not from the Children of Israel [themselves], as well as [proof] that this prophet must be “like you”, that is, in bringing a new revealed law, [all this is] connected with His saying “I will put my rulings into his mouth”. Now it is clear that our prophet Muḥammad (God bless him and grant him salvation) is of the offspring of Ishmael (peace be upon him), who is the brother of Jacob (peace be upon him), and that he came with a new revealed law. It is [likewise] apparent that Joshua (peace be upon him) was from among the Children of Israel, as were all the other Israelite prophets, and not from the kinship of their brothers. Moreover, [Joshua] was the deputy of Moses (peace be upon him), but he did not come with a new revealed law. In addition, it is impossible that this prophet was Jesus (peace be upon him), for the Gospel does not contain new legislation that differs from what is laid down in the Torah. Thus it has been established that this prophet is our prophet Muḥammad, the Chosen One, prayer and peace be upon him.

¹⁶⁶ On the use of this Scriptural evidence (and the similar verse Deut 18:15) for the advent of the prophet Muḥammad among earlier Muslim scholars, see Strauss, “Darkhe ha-pulmus ha-Islami,” 191-92; Lazarus-Yafeh, *Intertwined Worlds*, 18-19, 104, 125, 150; Adang, *Muslim Writers*, 144, 158, 160, 264, 269; Frank, “A Prophet like Moses”, 234ff; ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq al-Islāmī, *al-Sayf al-mamdūd fī l-radd ‘alā aḥbār al-yahūd (Espada extendida para refutar a los sabios judíos)*, E. Alfonso (ed., intro., transl. and notes), Madrid, 1998, 59ff (Arabic), 67ff (translation); al-Ḥajārī, *K. Nāṣir al-Dīn*, 114-15 (Arabic), 171-72 (translation).

The second proof

It is said in the Torah, “And there arose not a prophet from among the Children of Israel whom God (exalted is He) knew face to face” (cf. Deut. 34:10). They disagree about this [verse]. Some say: the expression *lo qam* in the Torah has the meaning of “*did* not arise” in Arabic, and thus conveys a negation in the past tense. Others say that it has the meaning “*will* not arise,” and as such indicates the eternity of the religion of Moses (peace be upon him).

[*Our*] reply is that even if it did have the meaning of “will not arise,” it is still qualified by his being from the Children of Israel, and does not prove that no prophet will arise from among others than themselves.

Some say that this prophet is Joshua (peace be upon him), but this is absurd for a number of reasons. First, Joshua (peace be upon him) is consistently referred to in the Torah by his proper name; secondly, he is from among the Children of Israel; thirdly, he did not bring a new revealed law, but was rather the deputy of Moses (peace be upon him); and what is to be understood from what is mentioned in the verse referred to, that is, His saying “whom God —exalted is He— knew face to face” is that he should be the recipient of a revelation and a religious law.

Some say that [this prophet] is Balaam the son of Beor, but this is untenable for two reasons. First, Balaam was not a prophet but a sorcerer; and second, he was an unbeliever who was killed by the sword during the time of Joshua (peace be upon him), killed because of his unbelief.¹⁶⁷

The third proof

It is said in the Torah: “If there arises a prophet from among you, or a seer of visions and brings a proof or a miracle, and he says, ‘Come and worship a deity other than God’, do not accept him and do not obey him, but kill him” (cf. Deut. 13:1-5). They say: His saying “do not accept him and do not obey him” proves that there is [to be] no prophet bringing the truth after Moses (peace be upon him).

¹⁶⁷ Referring to Num 22:20-34, 31:8.

The reply [to this] is that the words “and he says, ‘Come and worship a deity other than God’” proves by way of the method of *argumentum e contrario* that if he were to say “Worship God,” he would be accepted, and [the method of] *argumentum e contrario* is accepted among them. It is obvious that the order to obey him would only apply if he would exchange that which is positively allowed in the Torah for something prohibited and vice versa,¹⁶⁸ and his call to [obey] God would be known from the truthfulness of his call. It is said in the Torah, with regard to the offspring of Judah: “The rule and the power shall not depart from between his feet, until a powerful man shall come, and all the nations will gather to him” (cf. Gen. 49:10). From these words it may be understood that the rule and the power *will* depart from the offspring of Judah, and the government has [indeed] departed from them in the time of our prophet Muḥammad (God bless him and grant him salvation).

*The fifth proof*¹⁶⁹

It is said in the Torah: “God came from Mount Sinai, and rose up from Mount Seir, and shined forth from Mount Paran” (Deut. 33:2),¹⁷⁰ that is, the rules of God (exalted is He) came, meaning the Torah. The [Jews] say: The angels dressed the Torah like a bride, and took it first to Seir, which is the domain of Jesus (peace be upon him), but its people did not accept the Torah. Then they took it to Paran, which is the domain of Ishmael (peace be upon him), but its people did not accept it [either]. Then they took it to Sinai, which is the domain of Moses (peace be upon him), and his people accepted the Torah. Now, there is no indication in the verse mentioned of the appearance of another prophet after Moses (peace be upon him).

¹⁶⁸ Ṭāshkubrīzāde adduces this argument in support of his claim that the Torah has been abrogated.

¹⁶⁹ There is no “fourth proof”; see above.

¹⁷⁰ This verse is one of the most popular Biblical verses adduced by Muslim writers as prediction of the prophethood of Muḥammad. See Lazarus-Yafeh, *Intertwined Worlds*, 109; Adang, *Muslim Writers*, 264, 268, Frank, “A Prophet like Moses”, 229ff; see also Karājākī, Muḥammad b. ‘Alī, *Kanz al-fawā'id*, 1-2, ‘Abd Allāh Ni‘ma (ed.), Beirut, 1405/1985, 1, 205. For Jewish responses, see, for example, Sa‘adya, *The Book of Beliefs and Opinions*, 164ff.

The reply [to this is that] the meaning of this verse disagrees with what they have mentioned, for its sequence does not agree with the sequence in their account. The truth is what Ibn Ezra relates in his commentary, even if he phrases it in such a way as to suggest doubt, namely that what is intended by the rulings that came from Mount Sinai is the Torah which the people of Moses (peace be upon him) followed, and [what is intended] by he rules that rose up from Seir is the Gospel that the Christians follow, and the fact that Seir is the location of Jesus (peace be upon him), is clearly expressed in the Torah, and that [what is intended by] the rules that shine forth from Mount Paran is the Qur'ān which was revealed to our prophet Muḥammad (God bless him and grant him salvation), Paran being the location of Ishmael (peace be upon him),¹⁷¹ which is [also] clearly expressed in the Torah, and our prophet Muḥammad (God bless him and grant him salvation) is from the descendants of Ishmael (peace be upon him).

The sixth proof is that the scholars (*aḥbār*) of the Jews attach great importance to numerology; for example, the angel said to Hagar during her pregnancy: "Twelve kings will proceed from your seed,"¹⁷² and [elsewhere] He indicated this number with the expression *zeh*, which is twelve. In the fifth part of the first book the period during which the noble [city of] Jerusalem was inhabited is indicated with the expression *be-zot*,¹⁷³ which, according to numerology is 404, and it was indeed so; and it refers to our prophet Muḥammad (God bless him and grant him salvation) with the expression *bi-me'od me'od* (*bi-mād mād*) in three places, and the expression *bi-mād mād* is, in numerology, ninety-two, which is [also] the numerical value of the noble name, that is, the name Muḥammad (God bless him and grant him salvation).¹⁷⁴

¹⁷¹ Cf. *Ibn Ezra's Commentary on the Pentateuch. Deuteronomy (Devarim)*, Strickman and Silver, 276. For the midrash based identification of Seir with Christianity and Paran with the Arabs, see also Cohen, M. R., *Under Crescent and Cross. The Jews in the Middle Ages*, Princeton, 1994.

¹⁷² See Gen 16:7-16 and Gen. 17:20.

¹⁷³ Referring to Lev. 16:3.

¹⁷⁴ The numerical value of the expression "exceedingly" (*bi-me'od me'od*) had already been adduced by earlier Muslim writers such as Samaw'al al-Maghribī (d. 570/1175) and 'Abd al-Ḥaqq al-Islāmī; Samaw'al al-Maghribī, *Iḥām al-Yahūd. Silencing the Jews*, M. Perlmann (ed. and transl.), New York, 1964, 31 (Arabic text), 46 (transl.); *Iḥām al-yahūd. The Early Recension*, Marazka, I., Pourjavady, R. and Schmidtke, S. (eds.), Wiesbaden, 2005, 26-27; and 'Abd al-Ḥaqq al-Islāmī, *al-Sayf al-mamdūd*, 40 (Arabic), 60 (translation). It was also known to Ibn Kammūna, Maimonides and Rabbi

Part Three, explaining what points to their distortion of the Torah

This is [found] in a number of passages that they were unable to circumvent except by resorting to inane and incorrect language and far-fetched evasions, [attempting to] protect their religion from the criticism of the masses, to the point that one of their exegetes said, by way of directive: whoever belongs to those endowed with knowledge shall keep his arguments regarding these passages safe from the accusations of the masses and the ignorant, among [these passages] being: “Abraham travelled in the land to the place [called] Shekhem, to Elon Moreh, and the Canaanite was at that time in the land” (Gen. 12:6). What is meant by “the land” is the kingdom of Canaan, son of Noah, which remained in the hands of the Canaanites until Joshua ben Nun (peace be upon him) conquered it, and this period lasted more than 1,000 years. These lands are a holy land, and Elon Moreh is in the vicinity of Jerusalem. As these lands were in the hands of the Canaanites when Abraham (peace be upon him) travelled there, they cannot have been conquered by Joshua (peace be upon him), although it is clearly stated that that land would be conquered in the days of Joshua (peace be upon him). It is clear that such a contradiction cannot occur in the words of God (exalted is He), but has been added.¹⁷⁵

Ibn Ezra, who is their leading exegete, said: “There is a mystery in this on which those who are in the know keep silent.” In another place he says: “If you have grasped the secret of the twelve —meaning the twelve verses written at the end of the last book— all of them point to the fact that these verses were written after the times of Moses (peace be upon him).”

Among them is [the one stating] that Moses (peace be upon him), when he had completed the Torah, ordered that it be kept in a case whose description is mentioned in the Torah, and he ordered in the

Jehudah Ben El‘azar (see their detailed refutations in *Examination*, ed. Perlmann, 95; *The Epistle to Yemen*, 107-109; *Duties of Judah*, 537ff). For further references, see Lazarus-Yafeh, *Intertwined Worlds*, 107; Ahroni, “From *Bustān al-‘uqūl*,” 315. However, whereas earlier authors only adduced Gen 17:20 which refers specifically to Ishmael and his progeny, Tāshkubrīzāde’s statement that there are three instances in the Biblical text where this expression is found is unusual. He probably had in mind also Gen 17:2 and 17:6, both referring to God talking to Abram/Abraham about his prospective progeny in general.

¹⁷⁵ See also Spinoza’s explanation on this passage, below n. 179.

Torah that [the people] were to assemble three times a year and to recite the Torah;¹⁷⁶ in addition, it is mentioned in the Torah that Moses (peace be upon him) called upon the scholars to meet with the leaders and to advise and apprise them that they would corrupt themselves after his death.¹⁷⁷ What is mentioned in the twelve verses¹⁷⁸ literally points to the fact that God (exalted is He) summoned Moses and showed him Jerusalem and the mountains surrounding it. Then he died there by God's decree (exalted is He), and he was buried there, and [the location of] his grave is not known until now. His people followed Joshua (peace be upon him).¹⁷⁹

¹⁷⁶ Cf. Deut. 16:16, Ex. 23:17, Ex. 34:23-24.

¹⁷⁷ Cf. Deut. 31:28-29.

¹⁷⁸ Viz. Deut. 34:1-12.

¹⁷⁹ What Ibn Ezra labels as the "mystery of the twelve," specifically referring to Deut. 34:1-12 describing Moses' death and burial, was one of several cases in the text of the Pentateuch which suggest that the entire Torah cannot have been written by Moses. In his exegesis on Deut. 1:2, Ibn Ezra also lists the following verses among the "mysteries": Gen 12:6, Gen 22:14, Deut 3:11, and Deut. 31:22. This was later taken up in detail by Baruch Spinoza (d. 1677) in Chapter Eight of his *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*, (Gebhardt Edition, 1925, S. Shirley (transl.), Leiden, 1989, 162-63), although Spinoza's interpretation of Ibn Ezra's intention is evidently too far-reaching: "The words of Ezra in his commentary on Deuteronomy are as follows: 'Beyond the Jordan, etc.' If you understand the mystery of the twelve, and also 'Moses wrote the Law,' and 'the Canaanite was then in the land,' 'it shall be revealed on the Mount of God,' and again 'Behold his bed, bed of iron,' 'then shall you know the truth.' In these few words he gives a clear indication that it was not Moses who wrote the Pentateuch but someone else who lived long after him, and that it was a different book that Moses wrote. To make this clear, he draws attention to the following points. 1. The preface of Deuteronomy could not have been written by Moses, who did not cross the Jordan. 2. The Book of Moses was inscribed in its entirety on no more than the circumference of a single altar (Deut. ch. 27 and Joshua ch. 8 v. 30 etc.), and this altar, according to the Rabbis, consisted of only twelve stones. From this it follows that the Book of Moses must have required far less space than the Pentateuch. This, I say, was what our author meant by his reference to 'the mystery of the twelve,' unless he was referring to the twelve curses in the aforementioned chapter of Deuteronomy. Perhaps he believed that these could not have been contained in Moses' Book of the Law, because Moses bids the Levites read out these curses in addition to the recital of the Law, so as to bind the people by oath to observe the recited laws. Or again he may have wished to draw attention to the last chapter of Deuteronomy concerning the death of Moses, a chapter consisting of twelve verses. But there is no need here to give closer scrutiny to these and other conjectures. 3. Deuteronomy ch. 31 v. 9 says, 'And Moses wrote the Law.' These words cannot be ascribed to Moses; they must be those of another writer narrating the deeds and writings of Moses. 4. In Genesis ch. 12 v. 6 when the narrative tells that Abraham journeyed through the land of Canaan, the historian adds, 'The Canaanite was then in the land,' thereby clearly excluding the time at which he was writing. So this passage must have been written after the death of Moses when the Canaanites had been driven out and no longer possessed those lands. In his commentary

Ibn Ezra said in his commentary: “If you grasp that secret, you will reach the degree of truth.” [Rabbi] Judah even said: “If the Torah was revealed to Moses (peace be upon him) in its entirety, how, then, can the report that it contains of his death be correct? Thus it can be understood from this that [these verses] were written after the death of [Moses], peace be upon him, and that Joshua (peace be upon him) wrote them. [Rabbi] Shimon objected to this that if it is correct that Moses (peace be upon him) completed the Torah and ordered that it be preserved, how, then, can it be correct that Joshua (peace be upon him) added to it? Some say that [Rabbi] Shimon interpreted the law among them, and that his words are highly esteemed by them, so what Ibn Ezra mentions about there being a secret in it is not correct.”¹⁸⁰ Others say: the basis of Ibn Ezra’s saying is that this addition is not by

on this passage, Ibn Ezra makes the same point in these words: ‘And the Canaanite was then in the land.’ It appears that Canaan (the grandson of Noah) took the land of Canaan which had been in the possession of another. If this is not the true meaning, some mystery lies here, and let him who understands it keep silent. That is to say, if Canaan invaded the land, then the sense will be that the Canaanite was already in the land, as opposed to some past time when the land was inhabited by another nation. But if Canaan was the first to settle in that region (as follows from Gen. ch. 10), then the words are intended to exclude the present time, that is, the time of the author. This could not be Moses, in whose time the land was still possessed by the Canaanites; and this is the mystery concerning which Ibn Ezra urges silence.”

¹⁸⁰ See *The Babylonian Talmud*. Hebrew-English Edition. Translated into English with notes and glossary Chapters I-IV by M. Simon, Chapters V-X by I. W. Slotzki, under the editorship of Dr. I. Epstein, London-Jerusalem-New York 1976, 1, 15a: “Who wrote the Scriptures? [...] The Master has said: Joshua wrote the book which bears his name and the last eight verses of the Pentateuch. This statement is in agreement with the authority who says that eight verses in the Torah were written by Joshua, as it has been taught: [It is written], *So Moses the servant of the Lord dies there*. Now is it possible that Moses being dead would have written the words, ‘Moses died there’? The truth is, however, that up to this point Moses wrote, from this point Joshua wrote. This is the opinion of R. Judah, or, according to others, of R. Nehemiah. Said R. Simeon to him: Can (we imagine the) scroll of the law being short of one letter, and is it not written, *Take this book of the Law*? No; what we must say is that up to this point the Holy One, blessed be He, dictated and Moses repeated and wrote, and from this point God dictated and Moses wrote with tears, as it says of another occasion. *The Baruch answered them, He pronounced all these words to me with his mouth, and I wrote them with ink in the book*. Which of these two authorities is followed in the rule laid down by R. Joshua b. Abba which he said in the name of R. Giddal who said it in the name of Rab: The last eight verses of the Torah must be read [in the Synagogue service] by one person alone? It follows R. Judah and not R. Simeon. I may even say, however, that it follows R. Simeon, [who would say that] since they differ [from the rest of the Torah] in one way, they differ in another.” See also Israelsohn, I., “Les huit derniers versets du Pentateuch,” *Revue des Études Juives*, 20 (1890), 304-7.

Joshua, nor by any other prophet, but only occurred in the later generations, but they did not mention how this addition was [supposedly] implemented.

Part Four, on the Jews' defamation of the prophets

Among them is their attribution of a grave sin to Lot (peace be upon him) after the destruction of his people, despite the fact that they say that no grave sins can proceed from the prophets. This attribution, whatever it is, is mentioned in the fourth part of the first book.¹⁸¹ Among them is that it has been mentioned that a grave sin is attributed to David (peace be upon him) in the tenth part of the first book.¹⁸² Similar things are numerous, but we will not speak of them at length.

Finis.

Addendum

Shortly before this article went to the press, we obtained copies of a number of additional manuscripts of Ibn Abī 'Abd al-Dayyān's polemical tract, which will be discussed in the forthcoming monograph referred to in the first note.

Recibido: 13/03/06

Aceptado: 29/06/06

¹⁸¹ Probably a reference to Gen. 19:30-38.

¹⁸² The reference given by the author is wrong as he evidently has the story of II Samuel 11-12 in mind.

AḤMAD B. MUṢṬAFĀ ṬĀSHKUBRĪZĀDE'S (D. 968/1561)
POLEMICAL TRACT AGAINST JUDAISM

EL TRATADO DE POLÉMICA CONTRA EL JUDAISMO
DE AḤMAD B. MUṢṬAFĀ ṬĀSHKUBRĪZĀDE
(M. 968/1561)

SABINE SCHMIDTKE
Free University Berlin

CAMILLA ADANG
Tel Aviv University

Corrigendum - Fe de erratas

The text should read as follows (changes in **bold type**):

El texto que debe figurar es el siguiente (cambios en **negritas**):

1. Page 79, footnote (*) / Página 79, nota a pié de página (*)

* This paper is part of a larger project involving the edition, translation and analysis of a number of polemical treatises by Ottoman authors against Judaism **supported by the Gerda Henkel Foundation**; see Adang, C., Pfeiffer, J. and Schmidtke, S., *Ottoman Intellectuals on Judaism: A Collection of Texts from the Early Modern Period* (forthcoming); see “Addendum” at the end of the paper. The present writers wish to express their gratitude to Judith Pfeiffer for helpful remarks on this article. Sections of this paper were presented by S. Schmidtke at the *Shlomo Pines Conference*, held at The Hebrew University of Jerusalem in March 2005. The authors wish to thank S. Stroumsa and W. Madelung for their help in interpreting various passages of the text.

2. Page 84 / Página 84

- Last paragraph / Último párrafo:

A more detailed discussion will be found in our forthcoming monograph, *Ottoman Intellectuals on Judaism: A Collection of Texts from the Early Modern Period* (see above, first note).

- Note 11, last line / Nota 11, última línea:

For an edition, translation and analysis of this tract, see Adang, Pfeiffer and Schmidtke, *Ottoman Intellectuals on Judaism*.

3. Page 85 / Página 85

	Ṭāshkubrīzāde	Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān (MS Giresun 102, ff. 128b-164a)	Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān (MS Giresun 171, ff. 30a-45b)	Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān (MS Bagdathī Vehbi Efendi 2022, ff. 101b-120b)
Autobiographical Introduction	./.	128b-131a:12	30b-31b:21	101b-103a:18
Overview of Contents	p. 86	131a:12-131b:3	31b:21-32a:7	103a:18-103b:5
<u>Faṣl 1</u>	pp. 87-92	131b:3-144a:2	32a:7-[37a:10]	103b:5-111b:19
Introduction to <i>Faṣl</i>	./.	131b:3-132a:8	32a:7-16	103b:5-104a:4
<i>Dalīl</i> 1 (Deut. 4:2)	p. 87	132a:8-133a:3	32a:16-32b:16	104a:4-104b:7
<i>Dalīl</i> 2 (Num. 23:19)	pp. 87-88	133a:3-135b:5	32b:16-33b:2	104b:7-105b:9
<i>Dalīl</i> 3 (Deut. 5:22-24)	pp. 88-89	135b:5-136b:9	33b:2-34b:1	105b:9-107a:4
<i>Dalīl</i> 4 (Deut. 33:4)	p. 89	136b:9-137b:1	34b:1-21	107a:4-107b:5
<i>Dalīl</i> 5 (Deut. 34:10)	p. 89	137b:1-138b:7	34b:22-35a:15	107b:5-108a:16
<i>Dalīl</i> 6 (Ex. 31:16)	pp. 89-92	138b:7-144a:2	35a:16-37a:10	108a:16-111b:19
<u>Faṣl 2</u>	pp. 92-95	144a:2-152a:2	[37a:10]-41b:21	111b:19-116b:13
Introduction to <i>Faṣl</i>	./.	144a:2-10	37a:10-17	111b:19-112a:7
<i>Dalīl</i> 1 (Deut. 18:18-19)	p. 92	144a:10-146a:12	[37a:17]-38a:14	112a:7-113a:16
<i>Dalīl</i> 2 (Deut. 34:10)	p. 93	146a:12-147b:8	38a:14-38b:21	113a:16-114a:9
<i>Dalīl</i> 3 (Deut. 13:1-5)	p. 93	147b:8-148b:3	38b:21-39a:13	114a:9-115a:6
<i>Dalīl</i> 4	./.	148b:3-150a:1	39a:13-39a:13-39b:10	115a:6-115b:2
<i>Dalīl</i> 5 (Deut. 33:2)	p. 94	150a:1-151a:12	39b:10-40a:15	115b:2-116a:15
<i>Dalīl</i> 6 (Gen. 16:7-16, 25:12-16, 17:2, 17:20)	pp. 94-95	151a:12-152a:2	40a:15-41b:21	116a:15-116b:13
<u>Faṣl 3</u>	pp. 95-97	152a:2-155a:6	41b:21-45a:7	116b:14-119b:3
<u>Faṣl 4</u>	p. 97	155a:6-159a	45a:7-45b	119b:3-120b

4. Page 86 / Página 86

- Last paragraph before “Edition” / Último párrafo antes de “Edition”:

(...) were not specifically mentioned in the footnotes. **In the footnotes to the edition references to the exegetical works of Abraham Ibn Ezra and Nahmanides (Ramban) on the Torah are according to the following edition: *Torat Hayyim. Hamishah humshei Torah* 1-7. Mugahim ‘al-pi ha-massorah shel Keter Aram Zovah ve-‘al-pi ha-nusah shel kitvei-yad ha-qeruvim lo, ‘im Targum Onqelos. Jerusalem, Mossad ha-Rav Kook, 5757/1997.**