

## Additional Contributions of ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq al-Islāmī to the Muslim-Jewish Polemic\*

### Contribuciones adicionales de ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq al-Islāmī a la polémica judío-musulmana

Haggai Mazuz

Annemarie Schimmel Kolleg, Bonn, Germany

‘Abd al-Ḥaqq al-Islāmī, a fourteenth-century Muslim polemicist of Jewish origin, has been somewhat obscured in research due to doubts about the uniqueness and originality of his thinking and the extent of his Jewish education. This article, part of a broader research effort presently under way, attempts to surmount these doubts by demonstrating that ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq made a unique contribution to the oeuvre of Muslim anti-Jewish polemics, displayed originality in his extensive use of gematria and adaptation of source material to his agenda, and possessed no small amount of Jewish knowledge. The last-mentioned is reflected in his familiarity with the structure and messages of the Bible, at least a superficial acquaintance with parts of the Oral Law, and possibly some proficiency in Hebrew.

*Key words:* Polemics, ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq al-Islāmī, *al-Sayf al-Mamdūd*, *dalā’il al-nubuwwa*, ‘Uzayr, Midrash, gematria.

‘Abd al-Ḥaqq al-Islāmī, un polemista musulmán del siglo XIV y de origen judío, ha sido algo silenciado por la investigación puesto que existían dudas respecto a la excepcionalidad y originalidad de su pensamiento, así como respecto a la extensión de su educación en el Judaísmo. Este artículo, parte de un estudio más amplio, intenta superar esas dudas demostrando que ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq hizo una contribución única a las obras de polémica musulmana anti-judía, mostró una amplia originalidad en su extenso uso de la gematría y adaptación de las fuentes a su agenda, mostrando, asimismo, un gran conocimiento judío. Esto último queda demostrado por su familiaridad con la estructura y el mensaje bíblicos, por un conocimiento superficial de partes de la ley oral y por una cierta habilidad con el hebreo.

*Palabras clave:* Polémica, ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq al-Islāmī, *al-Sayf al-Mamdūd*, *dalā’il al-nubuwwa*, ‘Uzayr, Midrash, gematría.

\* I would like to thank the anonymous reviewers of this article, as well as Professor Esperanza Alfonso, for their invaluable comments and assistance.

## Introduction

Not much is known about Abū Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq al-Islāmī. He was an apostate Jew who probably lived in Ceuta in the late fourteenth century.<sup>1</sup> He testifies to having converted to Islam at the age of forty and having convinced his family to do the same. Sixteen years after that event, he wrote the polemical tract *al-Sayf al-Mamdūd fī l-radd ‘alā Aḥbār al-Yahūd* (*The Outstretched Sword for Refuting the Rabbis of the Jews*).<sup>2</sup>

The first to mention *al-Sayf al-Mamdūd* in the academic literature was Moritz Steinschneider, who described it and its author tersely and generally.<sup>3</sup> Almost seven decades later, Moshe Perlmann reviewed the gist of *al-Sayf al-Mamdūd* as set forth in three manuscripts. “There is hardly anything new in his [‘Abd al-Ḥaqq’s] arguments, i.e., in the passages he quotes for his case,” Perlmann concluded.<sup>4</sup> Elsewhere, he defined *al-Sayf al-Mamdūd* as “vulgar.”<sup>5</sup> Some fifty years after Perlmann, Hava Lazarus-Yafeh, seeing room for further discussion of the contents of *al-Sayf al-Mamdūd*, turned her attention to this pamphlet for the self-stated purpose of completing Perlmann’s overview.<sup>6</sup> Lazarus-Yafeh sorts ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq’s arguments into four (actually five) categories that correspond to what she considers his polemical methodologies: (1) Biblical verses and Midrashim, (2) gematria (calculation of the numerical value of Hebrew letters), (3) arguments that exhibit Karaite characteristics, and (4) Qur’ān commentary. She concludes that although he was not an educated Jew, ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq knew the Bible and Jewish customs better than Muslim authors (presumably polemicists who were born as Muslims) did.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See Alfonso, “‘Abd al-Ḥaqq al-Islāmī”, p. 6.

<sup>2</sup> ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq al-Islāmī, *al-Sayf al-Mamdūd fī l-radd ‘alā Aḥbār al-Yahūd*, ed. and trans. by E. Alfonso, pp. 9-11. Throughout the article, I refer to the Arabic text in Alfonso’s edition. The Bible translation that I use throughout the article is *The King James Version of the English Bible: An Account of the Development and Sources of the English Bible of 1611 with Special References to Hebrew Tradition*. In certain cases, the translation is slightly modified to reflect (in my opinion) the Hebrew text more accurately.

<sup>3</sup> Steinschneider, *Polemische und apologetische Literatur in arabischer Sprache*, p. 125.

<sup>4</sup> Perlmann, “‘Abd al-Ḥaqq al-Islāmī, a Jewish Convert”, p. 180.

<sup>5</sup> Perlmann, “‘Abd al-Ḥaqq al-Islāmī”, p. 176.

<sup>6</sup> Lazarus-Yafeh, “Contribution of a Jewish Convert from Morocco to the Muslim Polemic against Jews and Judaism”, p. 83.

<sup>7</sup> Lazarus-Yafeh, “Contribution of a Jewish Convert”, p. 89.

In 1998, Esperanza Alfonso published a critical edition of *al-Sayf al-Mamdūd* that included a translation into Spanish and resorted to more manuscripts than Perlmann accessed. Her introduction discusses important issues that surrounded the writing of *al-Sayf al-Mamdūd* as well as other matters such as the conversion of Jews, interfaith relations, and the Jews of Morocco. It also touches briefly upon the nature and contents of the pamphlet. In 2010, she dedicated a short entry to ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq that briefly describes his life and pamphlet.<sup>8</sup> Ryan Szpiech devoted a discussion to the conversion narrative of several Jews, of whom ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq is one, who wrote anti-Jewish tracts after their conversion.<sup>9</sup>

In a forthcoming article, I show that although some of ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq’s arguments appear to resemble those of Samaw’al al-Maghribī (1125–1175 CE) and Sa’īd b. Ḥasan al-Iskandarī (thirteenth–fourteenth century), with the exclusion of two examples, the former do not seem to have been inspired by the latter and his thinking was actually highly original and independent.<sup>10</sup>

Below, I intend to show additional manifestations of the originality of ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq’s work and demonstrate that Perlmann’s and Lazarus-Yafeh’s arguments regarding his lack of singularity, originality, and Jewish education should be circumscribed. The discussion will reveal further aspects of ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq’s contribution to the Muslim-Jewish polemic. It will focus on three topics: his presentation of *dalā’il al-nubuwwa*, his attitude toward ‘Uzayr, and his familiarity with Midrashic ideas and Jewish interpretive methods.

## 1. *Dalā’il al-Nubuwwa*

Perusal of *al-Sayf al-Mamdūd* shows ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq’s far-reaching reliance on Biblical verses, transliterated into Arabic and accompanied by a commentary. The transliteration is generally quite reasonable but the commentary is often incongruous with the verse that it interprets because ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq tailors it to his polemical agenda. Lazarus-Yafeh

<sup>8</sup> Alfonso, “‘Abd al-Ḥaqq al-Islāmī”, pp. 6-7.

<sup>9</sup> Szpiech, *Conversion and Narrative: Reading and Religious Authority in Medieval Polemic*, pp. 196-200.

<sup>10</sup> Mazuz, “‘Abd al-Ḥaqq al-Islāmī—An Independent-Minded Polemicist or a Mimic of His Predecessors?” (forthcoming).

assumes that ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq used Christian translations of the Bible into Arabic because they were more literal than the Jewish ones, hence richer in anthropomorphism (*tajsīm*).<sup>11</sup> However, by writing that there are twenty-four books in the Bible,<sup>12</sup> ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq implies his familiarity with the Jewish, not the Christian, division of the Biblical corpus.

One of the most frequent claims among Muslim polemicists is that the Bible alludes to Muḥammad’s name but that the Jews, jealous of the non-Jewish prophet, deleted the allusions and falsified the verses that contained them. This falsification, known as *tahrīf* in Islamic sources,<sup>13</sup> was, according to the Muslim sages, thwarted by Allāh in some cases, thus demonstrating the truth of their religion. Consequently, Muslim authorities often refer to these verses as “evidence of prophethood” (*dalā’il al-nubuwwa*) or “signs of prophethood” (*a’lām al-nubuwwa*). ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq seems to be very original in his *dalā’il*, both in his use of verses and in his interpretation of other verses that were invoked by previous polemicists. Below, I divide the verses that he uses as *dalā’il* into five types and explain that he interprets most of them through the technique of gematria, which he considers a cardinal principle in the Jewish religion.<sup>14</sup>

### *Use of common verses in the Muslim polemic with Judaism*

Muslim polemicists are specifically drawn to four Biblical verses (Gen. 17:20 and Deut. 18:15, 18:18, and 33:2); one may find them or their paraphrases in almost every anti-Jewish polemical Islamic tract.

<sup>11</sup> See Lazarus-Yafeh, “Contribution of a Jewish Convert”, p. 84.

<sup>12</sup> ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq, *al-Sayf al-Mamdūd*, p. 20.

<sup>13</sup> On *tahrīf*, see Adang, *Muslim Writers on Judaism and the Hebrew Bible: From Ibn Rabban to Ibn Hazm*, pp. 223-248; Lazarus-Yafeh, “Tahrīf”, *ET*<sup>2</sup>, vol. 10, pp. 111-112; Accad, “Corruption and/or Misinterpretation of the Bible: The Story of the Islamic Usage of *Tahrīf*”, pp. 67-97; Reynolds, “On the Qur’ānic Accusation of Scriptural Falsification (*tahrīf*) and Christian Anti-Jewish Polemic”; Nickel, *Narratives of Tampering in the Earliest Commentaries on the Qur’ān*; Griffith, *The Bible in Arabic: The Scriptures of the “People of the Book” in the Language of Islam*, pp. 175-177; Mazuz, *The Religious and Spiritual Life of the Jews of Medina*, pp. 17-21; Toenies Keating, “Revisiting the Charge of *Tahrīf*: The Question of Supersessionism in Early Islam and the Qur’an”, pp. 202-217; del Río Sánchez, “The Rejection of Muhammad’s Message by Jews and Christians and Its Effect on Islamic Theological Argumentation”, pp. 68-72.

<sup>14</sup> ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq, *al-Sayf al-Mamdūd*, p. 42.

‘Abd al-Ḥaqq is unusual in that he omits the last. Like many earlier Muslim polemicists, he explains the words *bi-me’od me’od* (exceedingly) in Gen. 17:20 as referring to Muḥammad, since their gematria, like Muḥammad’s name, is 92.<sup>15</sup> While many of his predecessors limited their commentary to gematria, he offers a new reading of the verse: “Your prayer for Ishmael is accepted and I shall bless him and multiply him and aggrandize him and descend from him Muḥammad, peace be upon him.”<sup>16</sup>

Deut. 18:15 and 18:18 appear in a passage that discusses the future of prophecy among the Israelites and the way to identify true and false prophets.<sup>17</sup> Muslim polemicists argue that the word *nabī*’ (prophet) refers to Muḥammad.<sup>18</sup> Only one of them, Samaw’al al-Maghribī, explains how he reached this conclusion<sup>19</sup> and ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq’s precursors generally state that the prophet at issue is Muḥammad, with no further comment. ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq, in contrast, proposes that the emphasis be placed on the word *be-fīv* (in his mouth, Deut. 18:18), which is 98 in gematria—the sum of Muḥammad (92) and Friday (6). In his view, then, the verse not only proves that the Bible alludes to Muḥammad’s future arrival but also that Friday will replace the Sabbath as the sacred day of the week.<sup>20</sup>

### Mecca

‘Abd al-Ḥaqq does not use Deut. 33:2, in which the word “Paran” is explained by most polemicists as referring to Mecca, thus implying Muḥammad.<sup>21</sup> Nevertheless, he explains two other Biblical verses as

<sup>15</sup> ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq, *al-Sayf al-Mamdūd*, p. 40.

<sup>16</sup> “ودعوتك لإسماعيل مقبولة. وأكثره، وأتميه، وأخرج منه محمدا، صلى الله عليه وسلم.” See ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq, *al-Sayf al-Mamdūd*, p. 40. Cf. the Biblical source: “וְיִלְשָׁמְעָאֵל, שְׁמַעְתִּיךָ הַנְּהָה בְּמֵאֵד מֵאֵד, שְׁנַיִם עָשָׂר נְשִׂאִים יוֹלִיד, וְנִתְמַתּוּ לְגוֹי קְדוֹל.” (emphasis added here and throughout the article).

<sup>17</sup> “נְבִיא מִקִּרְבְּךָ מֵאַחֶיךָ כְּמִנִּי יָקִים לְךָ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֶלְיוֹ תִשְׁמָעוּן.” “נְבִיא אֲקִים לָהֶם מִקִּרְבֵּי אַחֵיהֶם כְּמוֹךָ וְנִתְמַתּוּ דְבָרֵי כְּפִיו וְדָבַר אֱלֹהִים אֵת כָּל אֲשֶׁר אֶצְוֶנּוּ.”

<sup>18</sup> E.g. al-Rāzī, *A’lām al-Nubuwwa*, p. 195.

<sup>19</sup> See Samaw’al al-Maghribī, *Iḥām al-Yahūd* – Silencing the Jews, pp. 29-30 (7b).

<sup>20</sup> ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq, *al-Sayf al-Mamdūd*, pp. 59-60. Cf. “נְבִיא אֲקִים לָהֶם מִקִּרְבֵּי אַחֵיהֶם כְּמוֹךָ וְנִתְמַתּוּ דְבָרֵי כְּפִיו וְדָבַר אֱלֹהִים אֵת כָּל אֲשֶׁר אֶצְוֶנּוּ.”

<sup>21</sup> E.g. al-Rāzī, *A’lām al-Nubuwwa*, p. 195.

suggestive of Mecca. Gen. 12:9 reports that Abraham went *ha-Negbah* (southward). This word and Mecca share the numerical value of 65. Thus, according to ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq, the verse proves that Mecca is alluded to in the Bible and that Abraham went there.<sup>22</sup> He also claims that the word *heikhalō* (his temple) in Mal. 3:1 (a verse that I discuss again below) refers to Mecca on the grounds of equal numeration.<sup>23</sup> Now, the tally of *heikhalō* is 71 and that of Mecca is 65. However, the word *heikhal* alone, without *vav* (ו, 6), is 65. It is not clear why ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq argues in this manner but, as we shall see, this is not the only time he manipulates the letter *vav*.

### *Muḥammad*

‘Abd al-Ḥaqq finds allusions to Muḥammad in several verses due to words or expressions that add up to 92. Examples are *le-gōy gadōl* (a great nation, Gen. 12:2; 21:18),<sup>24</sup> *kī mī hū’* (for whom is this, Jer. 30:21),<sup>25</sup> and *havā ve-‘ad* (and came to, Dan. 7:13).<sup>26</sup> He also sees such an allusion in the word *amen*, which appears twice in Is. 65:16.<sup>27</sup> It is not clear to which occurrence he refers. In this example, he does not follow the Hebrew, in which the count of the word is 91; instead, he calculates according to his transliteration, in which he uses two *alifs* (ألأمن). An additional example is his use of the word *elōhīm* (God, 92).<sup>28</sup>

<sup>22</sup> ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq, *al-Sayf al-Mamdūd*, pp. 55-56. Cf. “וַיֵּסַע אַבְרָם, הַלּוֹךְ וְנֹסֵעַ הַנְּגִבָה.” On the agenda behind such an identification, see ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq, *al-Sayf al-Mamdūd*, p. 65 n.45 (translation). See further, Schussman, “Abraham’s visits to Ishmael: The Jewish Origin and Orientation”, pp. 325-345.

<sup>23</sup> ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq, *al-Sayf al-Mamdūd*, p. 119. Cf. “הַגְּנִי שְׁלַח מִלְאָכֶי, וּפְנֵה דָרָךְ לְפָנָי; וּפְתָאם יְבוֹא אֶל הַיְכָלִי הַזֶּה וְאֶשְׂרֵךְ אֶתְּם מִבְּקָשֵׁיכֶם, וּמִלְאָךְ הַבְּרִית אֲשֶׁר אִתְּם הַפְּצִים הִנֵּה בָּא אָמַר, יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת.”

<sup>24</sup> ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq, *al-Sayf al-Mamdūd*, pp. 48-49, 54-55. Cf. “וְאֶעֱשֶׂה לְגוֹי גָּדוֹל וְאַבְרָכָהּ.” The words וְאֶגְדֹּלָה שְׁמֶךָ וְהָיָה בְּרַכָּה. “;” “קוּמִי שְׂאִי אֶת הַנְּעֹר וְהַחֲזִיקִי אֶת יָדָךְ בּוֹ כִּי לְגוֹי גָּדוֹל אֲשִׁימֶנּוּ.” *le-gōy gadōl* recur in Gen. 17:20, a verse that ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq uses to prove that Muḥammad’s name is alluded to in the Bible. However, he uses the gematria of the words *bi-me’od me’od* only.

<sup>25</sup> ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq, *al-Sayf al-Mamdūd*, pp. 117-118. Cf. “וְהָיָה אֲדִירוֹ מִמֶּנּוּ, וּמִשְׁלוֹ מִקְרָבּוֹ.” “צֵא, וְהִקְרַבְתִּי, וְנִגַּשׁ אֵלַי: כִּי מִי הוּא זֶה עָרַב אֶת לְבוֹ, לְנִשְׁת אֵלַי נָאם יְהוָה.”

<sup>26</sup> ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq, *al-Sayf al-Mamdūd*, p. 116. Cf. “הָיָה הַיּוֹת, בְּהַזְוִי לִילֵיָא, וְאָרוֹ עִם עֲנָנֵי.” “שְׂמֵא, כִּבְר אֲנִש אֶתְהָ הַיּוֹא; וְעַד עַתִּיק יוֹמֵא מִשָּׂה, וּקְדֻמוֹהֵי הַקְרָבוֹהֵי.”

<sup>27</sup> ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq, *al-Sayf al-Mamdūd*, p. 122. Cf. “אֲשֶׁר הִמְתַּבְּרָהּ בְּאַרְצָא, וְתַבְּרָהּ בְּאַלְהֵי אֲמֹנִי.” “וְהִנְשַׁבַּע בְּאַרְצָא, יִשְׁבַּע בְּאַלְהֵי אֲמֹנִי: כִּי נִשְׁכַּחוּ, הַצְּרוֹת הַרְאִשׁוֹת, וְכִי נִקְטְרוּ, מִעֵינָי.”

<sup>28</sup> ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq, *al-Sayf al-Mamdūd*, p. 63 n.58.

Although he does not specify which verse contains this word, his argument appears in proximity to his transliteration of Deut. 18:15—which includes not *elōhīm* but *eloheikha* (your God, without the *mater lectionis vav*). If this is the verse that inspires him to see a reference to Muḥammad in the word *elōhīm*, then here too he manipulates the letter *vav*, since the word *elohīm* is spelled without a *vav*.

‘Abd al-Ḥaqq’s eagerness to enhance his *dalā’il* arsenal leads him to use verses in which no word adds up to exactly 92. Thus he argues that some verses refer to Muḥammad’s name and additional elements. The “extras” are actually attempts to stretch the relevant verses in order to accommodate his polemical intention. By doing this, he displays originality. For example, ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq interprets the word *magen* (shield, 93) in Gen. 15:1 as a reference to Muḥammad (92) and Allāh, the one.<sup>29</sup> Contemplating Gen. 1:16, he finds that *ha-gedōlīm* (the great [lights], 98) is suggestive of Muḥammad (92) and Friday (6), the Muslim holy day that abrogates the Jewish one. In the Hebrew text, the word appears without *vav*, as *ha-gedolīm*, which is exactly 92, just like Muḥammad’s name.<sup>30</sup> It follows that ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq had a different text in front of him or added the *vav*. By implication, he had some knowledge of Hebrew. This is the third time that he manipulates the letter *vav* to satisfy his polemical needs.

### Hebrew “cognates” of the word Muḥammad

The Bible uses the word *maḥmad* (pleasant) in several places. Given its homophonic similarity to Muḥammad’s name, especially if its vowelization is changed, ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq mobilizes it for his cause. Lazarus-Yafeh notes his unusual use of the root *ḥ.m.d.*<sup>31</sup> One example is I Kgs. 20:6: “Yet I will send my servants unto thee tomorrow about this time, and they shall search thine house, and the houses of thy servants; and it shall be, that whatsoever is pleasant in thine eyes

<sup>29</sup> ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq, *al-Sayf al-Mamdūd*, pp. 51-52. Cf. “אחר הדברים האלה, הנה דבר יהוה” אל אברהם, במחנה, לאמר: אל תירא אברהם, אנכי אִמְנֹךָ לְךָ שְׂכָרְךָ, תְּרַבֶּה מְאֹד.

<sup>30</sup> ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq, *al-Sayf al-Mamdūd*, p. 35. Cf. “וַיַּעַשׂ אֱלֹהִים, אֶת שְׁנֵי הַמְּאֹרֹת הַגְּדֹלִים: אֶת הַמְּאֹרֹת הַגְּדֹל, לְמַשְׁלַת הַיּוֹם, וְאֶת הַמְּאֹרֹת הַקְּטָן לְמַשְׁלַת הַלַּיְלָה, וְאֶת הַכּוֹכָבִים.

<sup>31</sup> Lazarus-Yafeh, *Intertwined Worlds: Medieval Islam and Bible Criticism*, p. 106.





Then ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq discusses Hos. 9:7: “The days of visitation are come, the days of recompense are come; Israel shall know it: the prophet is a fool (‘*evīl*), the man of the spirit (‘*īsh ha-rūaḥ*) is mad (*meshuga*’), for the multitude of thine iniquity, and the great hatred.”<sup>38</sup> He interprets the first hemiverse as speaking of the approach of days in which the Jews will get their just desserts for having troubled Muḥammad. Turning to the second hemiverse, he writes: “You said that he is an ignoramus and a fool who imagines visions (*maryāḥ*) and this is your gravest sin and the reason for your severe punishment and the reason you are at fault for your hatred.”<sup>39</sup> He does not specify where the Jews said this; this part seems less an interpretation of his own than a comment on a Jewish interpretation of Hos. 9:7 that associates the words “fool” (not necessarily ‘*evīl*, but *shōteḥ*) and “man of the spirit,” ‘*īsh ha-rūaḥ*, with Muḥammad. Several Jewish sources do suggest that such an interpretation existed. For example, the *Pereq Rabbī Shim ‘ōn ben Yōḥai* (Chapter of Rabbi Shim ‘ōn ben Yōḥai) reads: [...] “A fool prophet and a man of the spirit [...]”<sup>40</sup> In this text, as well as others, the word *shōteḥ* replaces ‘*evīl* and word *meshuga*’ does not appear.<sup>41</sup> In addition, other Jewish sources use the term *meshuga*’ to describe Muḥammad.<sup>42</sup>

If so, ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq is familiar with a Jewish interpretation of Hos. 9:7 and comments about it. What is more, he interprets one preceding verse as an omen of Muḥammad’s future arrival. While upbraiding the Jews for their use of Hos. 9:7, he uses it to demonstrate the existence of a reference to Muḥammad in the Bible, thus obliging the Jews to acknowledge him.<sup>43</sup> In other words, he reinterprets the verse.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. “באור ימי הפקודה, באור ימי השלום, ידעו, ישראל; אויל הנביא, משגע איש הרוח על רב עונך, רבקה משטמה.”

<sup>39</sup> ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq, *al-Sayf al-Mamdūd*, p. 31. On the meaning of *maryāḥ*, see ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq, *al-Sayf al-Mamdūd*, p. 56 n.16 (translation).

<sup>40</sup> “[...] נביא שוטה ואיש הרוח [...]” See *Batei Midrashōt*, vol. 2, p. 25.

<sup>41</sup> E.g. “[...] ועומד איש שוטה ובעל הרוח ומדבר על הקב”ה כזבים [...]” See *Tefilat Rabbī Shim ‘ōn ben Yōḥai* (The Prayer of Rabbi Shim ‘ōn ben Yōḥai) in *Beit ha-Midrash*, vol. 4, p. 119.

<sup>42</sup> E.g. *The Epistle of R. Sherira Gaon*, p. 100; Maimonides, *Epistle to Yemen: The Arabic Original and the Three Hebrew Versions*, pp. 14, 18, 36, 38, 80; Samaw’al al-Maghribī, *Iḥām al-Yahūd – Silencing the Jews*, p. 67 (17a); Samaw’al al-Maghribī’s (d. 570/1175), *Iḥām al-Yahūd: The Early Recension*, p. 39; *The Itinerary of Benjamin of Tudela*, pp. 54, 69. See further, Steinschneider, *Polemische und apologetische Literatur*, pp. 302-303; Avishur, “Hebrew Derogatories for Gentiles and Jews in Judaeo-Arabic in the Medieval Era and Their Metamorphoses”, pp. 98-103.

<sup>43</sup> ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq, *al-Sayf al-Mamdūd*, pp. 32-33.

*Aḥmad*

While most Muslim polemicists try to prove that the name Muḥammad appears in the Bible, in several places ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq does the same with the name Aḥmad, one of Muḥammad’s names in Islamic tradition.<sup>44</sup> Gen. 2:8 reads: “And the Lord God planted a garden (*gan*) eastward in Eden; and there he put the man whom he had formed.” The word *gan*, ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq asserts, refers to Aḥmad since the numerical value of both words is 53.<sup>45</sup> He does the same with the expression *hayah ke-aḥad* (become as one) in Gen. 3:22.<sup>46</sup>

In three other places he stretches his reasoning to claim that the numerical value of a word in a Jewish text refers to Aḥmad as well as additional Islamic elements. For example, he defines *ve-hinneḥ* (behold) in Gen. 1:31, which adds up to 66, as a reference to Aḥmad (53), Friday as the sacred day of the week (6), the five daily prayers (5), and the two festivals (2),<sup>47</sup> probably referring to *‘īd al-adḥā* and *‘īd al-fītr*. He explains the word *yeyahelū* (shall await, 64) in Is. 42:4 similarly, only omitting mention of the festivals.<sup>48</sup> He applies the same technique to the word *nogah* (brightness, 58), which appears in the Sabbath morning service, but links it only with Aḥmad and the five daily prayers.<sup>49</sup>

‘Abd al-Ḥaqq’s references to Aḥmad may represent an attempt on his part to refute Moses Maimonides’ (d. 1204 CE) rejection, in the *Epistle to Yemen*, of the argument that Muḥammad’s name is implied

<sup>44</sup> For an example of another Muslim polemicist who did so, see Weston, “The Kitāb Masālik al-Nazar of Sa‘īd Ibn Ḥasan of Alexandria: Edited for the First Time and Translated with Introduction and Notes”, p. 325; Halfi, “Sa‘īd b. Ḥasan al-Iskandarī: A Jewish Convert to Islam: *Editio princeps* of the Later Recension (732/1331) of His Biblical ‘Testimonies’ to the Prophet Muḥammad”, p. 285. See further, Mazuz, “Sa‘īd b. Ḥasan, Biographical Notes through the Prism of *Masālik al-Nazar*”, pp. 52-53.

<sup>45</sup> ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq, *al-Sayf al-Mamdūd*, pp. 38-39. Cf. “וַיֵּשֶׁע יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים, בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא מִקְדָּם; וַיֵּשֶׁע שָׁם, אֵת הַגָּדָם אֲשֶׁר יָצָר.”

<sup>46</sup> ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq, *al-Sayf al-Mamdūd*, pp. 41-42. Cf. “וַיֵּאמֶר יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים, הֵן הָאָדָם הַזֶּה. בְּאֵזֶר מִמֶּנּוּ, לְדַעַת, טוֹב וְרַע; וְעַתָּה פֶן יִשְׁלַח יְדוֹ, וְלָקַח גַּם מֵעֵץ הַחַיִּים, וְאָכַל, וַחֲיוֹ לְעָלָם.”

<sup>47</sup> ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq, *al-Sayf al-Mamdūd*, p. 44. Cf. “וַיִּרְא אֱלֹהִים אֵת כָּל אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה, וְהִנֵּה טוֹב. מְאֹד; וַיְהִי עֶרְב וַיְהִי בֹקֶר, יוֹם הַשְּׁשִׁי.”

<sup>48</sup> ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq, *al-Sayf al-Mamdūd*, pp. 66-67. Cf. “לֹא יִבְקֶה וְלֹא יִרְוֶן, עַד יָשִׁים בְּאָרְץ. מְשַׁפֵּט; וּלְחֹרְתוֹ, אֵינִים יִיחַלוּ.”

<sup>49</sup> ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq, *al-Sayf al-Mamdūd*, p. 121. Cf. “מְלֵאִים זֵיו וּמְפִיקִים נִגְה.”

in Gen. 17:20. Maimonides’ reasoning—that the Qur’ān (apparently 61:6) states that the name appearing in the Torah is Aḥmad, which is 53—deprives the Muslim polemicists’ argument of its value.<sup>50</sup>

## 2. Attitude toward ‘Uzayr

‘Abd al-Ḥaqq describes ‘Uzayr as one of the prophets who foretold Muḥammad’s arrival.<sup>51</sup> ‘Uzayr is a Qur’ānic figure that most Muslim and modern scholars identify as Ezra the Scribe.<sup>52</sup> ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq is strongly unique and original here because previous Muslim polemicists described ‘Uzayr-Ezra as the culprit behind the falsification of the Bible.<sup>53</sup>

‘Abd al-Ḥaqq ascribes to ‘Uzayr Mal. 3:1: “Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me: and the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to this temple, even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in: behold, he shall come, saith the Lord of hosts.” Interestingly, a passage in BT, *Megilla* 15a states that “Ezra is Malachi.” If so, this may be an example of ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq’s familiarity with a Talmudic idea.

<sup>50</sup> Maimonides, *Epistle to Yemen*, pp. 43-45. See further, Mazuz, “The Identity of the Apostate in the Epistle to Yemen”, p. 370.

<sup>51</sup> ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq, *al-Sayf al-Mamdūd*, pp. 118-120.

<sup>52</sup> For a summary of the classical attitude toward ‘Uzayr, reviewing all the relevant literature, see Lazarus-Yafeh, “Ezra-‘Uzayr: History of a Pre-Islamic Polemical Motif through Islam to the Beginning of Biblical Criticism”, pp. 359-; Lazarus-Yafeh, *Intertwined Worlds*, pp. 50-74. See further, Heller, “Ezra the Scribe in Islamic Legend”, pp. 214-217; Hirschberg, “Maqrūn—the Horned One—and Ezra-‘Uzayr is the son Allāh”, pp. 125-133; Comerro, “Esdras est-il le fils de Dieu?”. For a different view on ‘Uzayr’s identity, see Sharon, ‘People of the Book’, vol. 4, pp. 36-43. Cf. Sharon, “The Decisive Battles in the Arab Conquest of Syria”, p. 40; Sharon, “The Decisive Battles in the Arab Conquest of Syria”, p. 301; Segovia, “Response to Annette Yoshiko Reed, ‘Fallen Angels and the Afterlives of Enochic Traditions in Early Islam’”.

<sup>53</sup> E.g. Ibn Ḥazm, *Kitāb al-Fiṣal fī l-Milal wa-l-Ahwā’ wa-l-Niḥal*, vol. 1, p. 312; Ibn Ḥazm, *al-Radd ‘alā Ibn al-Naghrīla al-Yahūdī wa-Rasā’il Ukhrā*, p. 77; Samaw’al al-Maghribī, *Iḥām al-Yahūd* – Silencing the Jews, p. 51 (13a). See further, Whittingham, “Ezra as the Corrupter of the Torah? Re-Assessing Ibn Ḥazm’s Role in the Long History of an Idea”.

### 3. Familiarity with Midrashic ideas and Jewish interpretive methods

Although ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq made extensive use of Biblical sources, it is clear that he was also inspired by Midrashic texts. He specifically mentions having drawn on matters that the Jews claimed to appear in the Torah and “their other compositions from the Hebrew texts,” based on “interpretation by their ancient ones and elucidation by their sages” (*tafsīr qudamā’ihim wa-sharḥ ‘ulamā’ihim*).<sup>54</sup> Thus, it is very likely that these other compositions refer to the Oral Law.

Thus far, we have mentioned the possibility that ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq was familiar with a Jewish interpretation of Hos. 9:7 and the idea that “Ezra is Malachi” in BT, *Megilla* 15a. Lazarus-Yafeh correctly mentions the example of BT, *Sukka* 5b, where R. Abahū says that the *kerūbīm* (cherubs) are children, on which basis ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq accuses the Jews of idolatry. She also mentions BT, *Sanhedrīn* 102b (where *maḥmad ‘eineikha* is explained as denoting a Torah scroll).<sup>55</sup> It seems that ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq was inspired by another passage in Tractate *Sanhedrīn* on the Ahab story discussed above since, as he puts it, the Israelites considered Ahab one of the greatest of infidels because he believed in Muḥammad’s religion.<sup>56</sup> This brings to mind the dictum regarding the portion in the hereafter of the seven figures whom the Jewish tradition considers the vilest: “Three kings and four laymen have no portion in the afterlife.” One the kings listed is Ahab.<sup>57</sup> If so, ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq has reframed Ahab’s image.<sup>58</sup>

An additional Talmudic source that may have inspired ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq is BT, *Megilla* 14a. One of the Jewish fundamentals that ‘Abd

<sup>54</sup> ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq, *al-Sayf al-Mamdūd*, p. 14.

<sup>55</sup> Lazarus-Yafeh, “Contribution of a Jewish Convert”, pp. 84-85. For ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq’s remarks on the *kerūbīm*, see ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq, *al-Sayf al-Mamdūd*, pp. 89-90.

<sup>56</sup> ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq, *al-Sayf al-Mamdūd*, pp. 20, 25.

<sup>57</sup> “[...] שְׁלוֹשָׁה מְלָכִים וָאַרְבַּעָה הַדְּיוֹשׁוֹת, אִין לָהֶם חֵלֶק לְעוֹלָם הַבָּא” See Mishna, *Sanhedrīn* 10:2; JT, *Sanhedrīn* 50b (10:2), 53a (10:2); BT, *Sanhedrīn* 90a; *Abōt de-Rabbi Nathan* 36:6.

<sup>58</sup> Interestingly, Sa‘īd b. Ḥasan uses another king on this list, Manasseh, for his polemical needs, claiming that the monarch “cried out to Allāh, extolled and exalted, asking for help through Muḥammad” and was eventually rescued by Allāh (Weston, “The Kitāb Masālik al-Nazar”, pp. 332-333). If so, both quondam Jews invoke figures that are poorly regarded and rejected in Jewish tradition and present them as proto-Muslims. The reason for their doing so entails further study.

al-Ḥaqq criticizes concerns the festivals. The Jews, he claims, added festivals that do not appear in the Torah, such as Purim (which he calls the festival of Haman [*'īd Hāmān*]), and terms the Scroll of Esther (*megīllat Ester*) the Chapter of Haman [*sūrat Hāmān*]). Such a supplement, he states, contravenes the injunction neither to add to nor to subtract from the contents of the Torah.<sup>59</sup> His words may suggest that he was familiar with the following passage in BT, *Megīlla* 14a: “Our Rabbis taught: ‘Forty-eight prophets and seven prophetesses prophesied to Israel, and they neither subtracted from nor added to what is written in the Torah, with the exception of the reading of the Scroll [of Esther].’”<sup>60</sup> In Section 2, I raised the possibility that ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq was familiar with the idea in BT, *Megīlla* 15a, that “Ezra is Malachi.” The two contents appear only one page apart. This proximity raises the hypothetical possibility that ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq took much interest in this part of Tractate *Megīlla*.

As mentioned, ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq considers the gematria a cardinal principle in the Jewish religion.<sup>61</sup> The Jewish attitudes towards gematria and its function are varied. R. Eli‘ezer b. Yossei the Galilean numbers it among the thirty-two “measures” (*mīddōt*) in the study of Aggada (not Torah).<sup>62</sup> Mishna *Aḥōt* 3:18 terms gematria a “dessert” relative to “wisdom,” i.e., secondary in studying the Torah. The various attitudes toward gematria among Jewish sages remained controversial even in later generations. Maimonides, for example, considers gematria one of the things that one should believe.<sup>63</sup> Abraham b. Ezra (d. 1167 CE), however, regards it as a *derash* (exegetic) method only, meaning that it cannot explain the *peshat* (literal meaning) of the Biblical text.<sup>64</sup> Although the attitudes vary, it is clear that gematria has some place and importance in Jewish tradition. This may explain ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq’s

<sup>59</sup> ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq, *al-Sayf al-Mamdūd*, pp. 70-71.

<sup>60</sup> “ת”ר ארבעים ושמונה נביאים ושבע נביאות נתבאו להם לישראל ולא פחתו ולא הותירו על מה שכתוב בתורה חוץ ממקרא מגילה.”

<sup>61</sup> ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq, *al-Sayf al-Mamdūd*, p. 42.

<sup>62</sup> *Mishnat Rabbi Eli‘ezer ’ō Midrash Sheloshūm ū-Shtaim Middōt*. Hillel (Hyman) Gershom Enelow (ed.), p. 38.

<sup>63</sup> “דעו רבותי שאין ראוי לנו להאמין אלא באחד משלושה דברים: הראשון דבר שתהיה עליו ראייה” See Maimonides, “Letter on Astrology to the Rabbis of Montpellier,” vol. 2, p. 479.

<sup>64</sup> “[...] וחשבון אותיות אליעזר דרך דרש כי אין הכתוב מדבר בגימטריה כי יכול יוכל הרוצה להוציא” See Ibn Ezra, *Commentary on the Torah*, vol. 1, p. 169 (Gen. 14:14).

statement and, in turn, may demonstrate that he was familiar with or inspired by one or more of the sources that find gematria legitimate.

One of the categories into which Lazarus-Yafeh sorts ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq’s claims is “arguments with Karaite characteristics.”<sup>65</sup> The Karaites’ resistance to the Rabbanites centered on the Oral law. Such resistance requires, at least, some knowledge in sources such as the Mishna and the Talmuds or ideas from them. This again suggests ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq’s familiarity with such sources.

## Conclusion

Apart from the early polemicists, it is almost impossible to find a Muslim polemicist who did not absorb his predecessors’ teachings. ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq, apparently, is no exception in this regard; he fits the mold emphatically by accusing the Jews of anthropomorphism. Yet the existence of differences among the polemicists’ texts leaves ample room for comparative research.

Alfonso notes places in ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq’s writings where his arguments appear to resemble those of previous apostate Jewish polemicists such as Samaw’al al-Maghribī and Sa’īd b. Ḥasan, but states that these notes are not intended to be exhaustive, let alone to be used to reconstruct the genesis of *al-Sayf al-Mamdūd*.<sup>66</sup> I showed that, with the exclusion of two examples, it is unlikely that the former was inspired by the latter and ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq’s thinking was actually novel and independent.<sup>67</sup> One should not necessarily seek his sources of inspiration entirely in previous Jewish converts’ works. Actually, when viewed side-by-side with their reuse of previous polemical contents, apostate Jewish polemicists make an original contribution.<sup>68</sup> After all, ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq lived as a Jew until the age of forty and was probably part of a Jewish community. He must have absorbed something from this period and this milieu. Thus, some of the contents he discusses may reflect a piece of the spiritual “cargo” of his quondam community. It is also possible that

<sup>65</sup> Lazarus-Yafeh, “Contribution of a Jewish Convert”, p. 87.

<sup>66</sup> ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq, *al-Sayf al-Mamdūd*, p. 37 (introduction).

<sup>67</sup> Mazuz, “‘Abd al-Ḥaqq al-Islāmī”.

<sup>68</sup> E.g. Mazuz, “The Midrashic Sources of Sa’īd b. Ḥasan”, pp. 67-81; Mazuz, “Sa’īd b. Ḥasan”, pp. 49-57.

he was familiar with some of the Islamic arguments that he mentions from his Jewish, and not Muslim, milieu, since they were well-known topics of conversation among believers of both faiths.<sup>69</sup>

This discussion shows that the arguments regarding ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq’s lack of uniqueness, originality, and Jewish education are of limited validity. Taken together with my second article on this polemicist, it also demonstrates that, in many ways, ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq was an original thinker and made a unique contribution to the Islamic literature. He may even have known some Hebrew—possibly exceeding the purely ritual fluency that most Jews in the Islamic world possessed.

## Bibliography

### Primary Sources

- ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq al-Islāmī, *al-Sayf al-Mamdūd fī l-radd ‘alā Aḥbār al-Yahūd*, Esperanza Alfonso (ed. and trans.), Madrid, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1998.
- Batei Midrashōt*, 4 vols., Solomon Aaron Wertheimer (ed.), Jerusalem, M. Lienthal Print, 1894.
- Beit ha-Midrash*, 6 vols. Adolf Jellinek (ed.), Jerusalem, Wahrman Books, 1967.
- The Epistle of R. Sherira Gaon*, Benjamin Lewin (ed.), Haifa, Selbstverlag des Verfassers, 1921.
- Ibn Ezra, Abraham, *Commentary on the Torah*, 3 vols., Asher Weiser (ed.), Jerusalem, Rabbi Kook Institute, 1976.
- Ibn Ḥazm, Abū Muḥammad ‘Alī b. Aḥmad, *Kitāb al-Fiṣal fī l-Milal wa-l-Ahwā’ wa-l-Niḥal*, 5 vols. Beirut, Dār al-Jīl, 1985.
- Ibn Ḥazm, Abū Muḥammad ‘Alī b. Aḥmad, *al-Radd ‘alā Ibn al-Naḡhrīla al-Yahūdī wa-Rasā’il Ukhṛā*, Cairo, Maktabat Dār al-‘Urūba, 1960.
- Ibn Hishām, ‘Abd al-Malik, *al-Sīra al-Nabawiyya*, 4 vols. Beirut, Dār al-Kitāb al-‘Arabī, 1987.
- Ibn Kammūna’s Examination of the Inquiries into the Three Faiths: A Thirteenth-Century Essay in Comparative Religion*. Moshe Perlmann (ed.), Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1967.

<sup>69</sup> See *Ibn Kammūna’s Examination of the Inquiries into the Three Faiths: A Thirteenth-Century Essay in Comparative Religion*, pp. 49-50; *Ibn Kammūna’s Examination of the Three Faiths: A Thirteenth-Century Essay in the Comparative Study of Religion*, pp. 76-77; Sklare, “Responses to Islamic Polemics by Jewish Mutakallimūn in the Tenth Century”, pp. 137-161. See further, Lazarus-Yafeh, *Intertwined Worlds*, pp. 145-151.

- Ibn Kammūna's Examination of the Three Faiths: A Thirteenth-Century Essay in the Comparative Study of Religion*. Moshe Perlmann (trans., with intro. and notes), Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, University of California Press, 1971.
- The Itinerary of Benjamin of Tudela: Critical Text, Translation and Commentary*, Marcus Nathan Adler (ed. and trans.), London, Oxford University, 1907.
- The King James Version of the English Bible: An Account of the Development and Sources of the English Bible of 1611 with Special References to Hebrew Tradition*, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1941.
- Maimonides, Moses, *Epistle to Yemen: The Arabic Original and the Three Hebrew Versions*. Abraham S. Halkin (ed.) and Boaz Cohen (trans.), New York, American Academy for Jewish Research, 1952.
- Maimonides, Moses, "Letter on Astrology to the Rabbis of Montpellier," in *Letters of Maimonides*, 2 vols. Itzhak Shilat (ed.), Jerusalem, Ma'aliyot Press, 1987.
- Mishnat Rabbī Eli'ezer 'ō Midrash Sheloshīm ū-Shtaim Mīddōt*. Hillel (Hyman) Gershom Enelow (ed.), New York, Bloch Press, 1934.
- Al-Rāzī, Abū Hātim Aḥmad b. Ḥamdān, *A'lām al-Nubuwwa*, Tehran, Anjuman-e-Falsafa-ye-'Īrān, 1977.
- Samaw'al al-Maghribī, *Ifḥām al-Yahūd – Silencing the Jews*. Moshe Perlmann (ed. and trans.), New York, *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research*, 32, 1964.
- Samaw'al al-Maghribī's (d. 570/1175), *Ifḥām al-Yahūd: The Early Recension*. Ibrahim Marazka, Reza Pourjavady, and Sabine Schmidtke (eds.), Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz Verlag, 2006.
- Al-Wāqidī, Muḥammad b. 'Umar, *Kitāb al-Maghāzī*, 3 vols. London, Oxford University Press, 1966.

### *Secondary Literature*

- Accad, Martin, "Corruption and/or Misinterpretation of the Bible: The Story of the Islamic Usage of *Tahrīf*", *Theological Review of the Near East School of Theology*, 14 (2003), pp. 67-97.
- Adang, Camilla, *Muslim Writers on Judaism and the Hebrew Bible: From Ibn Rabban to Ibn Ḥazm*, Leiden, E.J. Brill, 1996.
- Alfonso, Esperanza, "'Abd al-Ḥaqq al-Islāmī", *Encyclopedia of Jews in the Islamic World*, Leiden, E.J. Brill, 2010, pp. 6-7.
- Avishur, Yitzhak, "Hebrew Derogatories for Gentiles and Jews in Judaeo-Arabic in the Medieval Era and Their Metamorphoses", in Yaakov Bentolila (ed.), *Hadassah Shy Jubilee Book: Research Papers on Hebrew Linguistics and Jewish Languages*, Jerusalem, Bialik Institute, 1997, pp. 97-116 [in Hebrew].
- Comerro, Viviane, "Esdras est-il le fils de Dieu?", *Arabica* 52, 2 (2005), pp. 165-181.



- del Río Sánchez, Francisco, “The Rejection of Muhammad’s Message by Jews and Christians and Its Effect on Islamic Theological Argumentation”, *The Journal of the Middle East and Africa*, 6 (2015), pp. 59-75.
- Griffith, Sidney H., *The Bible in Arabic: The Scriptures of the “People of the Book” in the Language of Islam*, Princeton and Oxford, Princeton University Press, 2013.
- Halft, Dennis, “Sa‘īd b. Ḥasan al-Iskandarī: A Jewish Convert to Islam: *Editio princeps* of the Later Recension (732/1331) of His Biblical ‘Testimonies’ to the Prophet Muḥammad”, *Mélanges de l’Institut Dominicain d’Études Orientales du Caire*, 30 (2014), pp. 267-320.
- Heller, Dov, “Ezra the Scribe in Islamic Legend”, *Zion: Collection of the Historical and Ethnographic Society of Israel*, 5 (1932), pp. 214-217 [in Hebrew].
- Hirschberg, Haim Ze’ev, “Maqrūn—the Horned One—and Ezra-‘Uzayr is the son Allāh”, *Leshonenu*, 16 (1947), pp. 125-133 [in Hebrew].
- Kister, Meir Jacob, “The Massacre of the Banū Qurayza: A Re-examination of a Tradition”, *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*, 8 (1986), pp. 61-96.
- Lazarus-Yafeh, Hava, “Ezra-‘Uzayr: Metamorphosis of a Polemical Motif”, *Tarbiz*, 55 (1986), pp. 359–379 [in Hebrew].
- Lazarus-Yafeh, Hava, “Contribution of a Jewish Convert from Morocco to the Muslim Polemic against Jews and Judaism”, *Pe‘amim*, 42 (1990), pp. 83-90 [in Hebrew].
- Lazarus-Yafeh, Hava, *Intertwined Worlds: Medieval Islam and Bible Criticism*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1992.
- Lazarus-Yafeh, Hava, ‘Taḥrīf’, *Encyclopaedia of Islam – Second Edition*, Leiden, E.J. Brill, 2000, vol. 10, pp. 111-112.
- Lecker, Michael, *Muḥammad and the Jews*, Jerusalem, Yad Ben-Zvi Press, 2014 [in Hebrew].
- Mazuz, Haggai, “The Identity of the Apostate in the Epistle to Yemen”, *AJS Review*, 38, 2 (2014), pp. 363-374.
- Mazuz, Haggai, *The Religious and Spiritual Life of the Jews of Medina*, Leiden, E.J. Brill, 2014.
- Mazuz, Haggai, “Sa‘īd b. Ḥasan, Biographical Notes through the Prism of *Masālik al-Nazar*”, *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, 68, 1 (2015), pp. 49-57.
- Mazuz, Haggai, “The Midrashic Sources of Sa‘īd b. Ḥasan”, *Revue des études juives*, 175, 1–2 (2016), pp. 67-81.
- Mazuz, Haggai, “‘Abd al-Ḥaqq al-Islāmī—An Independent-Minded Polemicist or a Mimic of His Predecessors?”, *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, 107 (Forthcoming, 2017).
- Nickel, Gordon, *Narratives of Tampering in the Earliest Commentaries on the Qur’ān*, Leiden, E.J. Brill, 2011.
- Perlmann, Moshe, “‘Abd al-Ḥaqq al-Islāmī, a Jewish Convert”, *Jewish Quarterly*

- Review*, 31 (1940–1941), pp. 171-191.
- Reynolds, Gabriel Said, “On the Qur’ānic Accusation of Scriptural Falsification (*tahrīf*) and Christian Anti-Jewish Polemic”, *Journal of the American Society*, 130, 2 (2010), pp. 189-202.
- Schussman, Aviva, “Abraham’s visits to Ishmael: The Jewish Origin and Orientation”, *Tarbiz*, 49 (1980), pp. 325-345 [in Hebrew].
- Segovia, Carlos A., “Response to Annette Yoshiko Reed, ‘Fallen Angels and the Afterlives of Enochic Traditions in Early Islam’”, Presented at the First Nangeroni Meeting of the Early Islamic Studies Seminar (EISS), Milan, June 15-19, 2015.
- Sharon, Moshe, ‘People of the Book’, *Encyclopaedia of the Qur’ān*, Leiden, E.J. Brill, 2004, vol. 4, pp. 36-43.
- Sharon, Moshe, “The Decisive Battles in the Arab Conquest of Syria”, *Cathedra*, 104 (2002), pp. 31-84 [in Hebrew].
- Sharon, Moshe, “The Decisive Battles in the Arab Conquest of Syria”, *Studia Orientalia*, 101 (2007), pp. 297-357.
- Sklare, David, “Responses to Islamic Polemics by Jewish Mutakallimūn in the Tenth Century”, in Hava Lazarus-Yafeh, Mark R. Cohen, Sasson Somekh and Sidney H. Griffith (eds.), *The Majlis: Interreligious Encounters in Medieval Islam*, Wiesbaden, Harrassovitz Verlag, 1999, pp. 137-161.
- Szpiech, Ryan, *Conversion and Narrative: Reading and Religious Authority in Medieval Polemic*, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013.
- Steinschneider, Moritz, *Polemische und apologetische Literatur in arabischer Sprache*, Leipzig, Brockhaus, 1877.
- Toenies Keating, Sandra, “Revisiting the Charge of *Tahrīf*: The Question of Supersessionism in Early Islam and the Qur’an,” in Ian Christopher Levy, Rita George-Tvrtković, Donald F. Duclow (eds.), *Nicholas of Cusa and Islam: Polemic and Dialogue in the Late Middle Ages*, Leiden: E.J. Brill, pp. 202–217.
- Whittingham, Martin, “Ezra as the Corrupter of the Torah? Re-Assessing Ibn Ḥazm’s Role in the Long History of an Idea”, *Intellectual History of the Islamicate World*, 1 (2013), pp. 253-271.
- Weston, Sidney Adams, “The Kitāb Masālik al-Nazar of Sa‘īd Ibn Ḥasan of Alexandria: Edited for the First Time and Translated with Introduction and Notes”, *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 24 (1903), pp. 312-383.

*Recibido*: 22/05/2015

*Aceptado*: 12/05/2016