

JEWISH CONTROVERSY AND THE "PUGIO FIDEI."¹

THE origin of Christianity and its early growth during the first century did not attract much notice in the schools of Jerusalem. The few passages we find in the Talmud concerning Jesus and some of His immediate disciples are, as is generally admitted, of a later date, and bear the stamp of party animosity. Let us mention at once that the book which goes under the title of the "Genealogy of Jesus"²

¹ See for the general literature: 1. *Jewish Literature from the Eighth to the Eighteenth Century, with an Introduction on Talmud and Midrash. A historical Essay from the German of M. Steinschneider.* London, 1857. §§ 15 and 24 (pp. 122 and 211 seqq.). 2. *Geschichte der Juden.* Von Dr. H. Graetz. 11 vols. (latest edition). 3. *Geschichte des Judenthums und seiner Secten.* Von Dr. Jost. 3 vols. Leipzig, 1857, 1859.

For the Talmudic controversy see, 1. Z. Frankel, *Zur Geschichte der jüdischen Religionsgespräche in the Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums*, iv. p. 241 seqq. 2. J. Derenbourg, *Essai sur l'histoire et la géographie de la Palestine d'après les Thalmuds et les autres sources rabbiniques.* Paris, 1867, i. p. 347 seqq.

For the bibliography of the controversial treatises, see B. de Rossi's *Bibliotheca Judaica Antichristiana.* Parma, 1800, 8vo. *The Fifty-third Chapter of Isaiah, according to the Jewish Interpreters.* Texts and translation by S. R. Driver and Ad. Neubauer. Oxford, 1876-7. Three additional authorities have since come to light, viz. David Kokhabi (of Estella), Joseph Kimḥi, and Jacob Tsahalon.

² יֵשׁוּ and other titles. For an Aramaic text see next article. The orthography of יֵשׁוּ, "Jesus," for יֵשׁוּעַ, in the Talmud and early rabbinical writings is according to the pronunciation, in which the guttural ׁ was not pronounced, and not a blasphemous formula וזכרו וזכרו שמו וזכרו, as Buxtorf thought; the abridged form is a very late one. We find in the Jerusalem Talmud sometimes יֵשׁוּעַ (see *Pugio Fidei*, ed. Leipzig, p. 744; in the edition יֵשׁוּ). The Karaites Jepheth and Judah Hadassi (see p. 95) write יֵשׁוּעַ and יֵשׁוּ; they however recognise Jesus in some measure as an authority, as can be seen from the following passage, § 103 of the *Eshkol hak-kofer* (not in the edition) יודעי תורה בני המקרא אומי כי ישוע איש מתוקן וחכם וצדיק בדבריו מתחלה היה לפני ישרים ומדרך צדוקים היה בלבו לגמרים ואסר גם הנירוש מהאשה כמו שאסרו

was composed before 1241, was always considered amongst the Jews as a spurious and mischievous work, and has never been quoted by the authors of controversial treatises. It was only in the second century, in the schools of Yabneh and neighbouring localities, that Christianity, or *Minuth*,¹ was referred to by the doctors of the Mishnah; sometimes in the matter of ritual precepts² and moral sayings, sometimes in that of more or less friendly controversy. The controversial references, which are not very numerous, we shall give here, as far as they are known, beginning with the first attempts of that kind of literature, so strongly developed afterwards in the middle ages. The *Dialogue* of Justin Martyr is too celebrated for a description of it to be needed here; the Jew Tryphon however has scarcely anything to do with the Mishnic doctor R. Tarphon or Tryphon, the Tryphon of Justin being most probably a fictitious person. About the second half of the second century we find R. Eliezer, the son of José, engaged in a friendly discussion with a Christian, who argued that the resurrection is not mentioned in the law. To this R. Eliezer replied that by the repetition of the word *karath* (cutting off) in the passage of Numbers xv. 31 (A.V. *that soul shall be utterly cut off*), it is meant that a man should be cut off from this world as well as from the next.³ This kind of deduction from apparently superfluous words and letters in the Hebrew text emanated, as we know, from the school of R. Aqiba, and it was on this method

צדוקיך. Anyhow the new solution of ישן ויתאבר in ישן, proposed by Prof. Paul de Lagarde (*Mittheilungen*, ii, p. 290), is incorrect. The *Hithpael* form of אבר is not used either in the Bible or in rabbinical writings, and syntax would require ויתאבר שמו, or another substantive after ויתאבר.

¹ מין or מינה is usually the name of the early Christians in the Talmud. It is probably the Syriac word מיניא, "heretics," "heathen" (Matt. v. 47, in the *Evangeliarum Hierosol.*, ed. Miniscalchi, p. 119). They are also found under the names of פיליטופא, צדוקי, כותי when the censor would not allow the word מין. מצרים is a late expression.

² M. Derenbourg, *Op. cit.*, p. 354.

³ Bab. Talm., *Sanhedrin*, fol. 90^b

that Aquila based his Greek translation. Some of Justin's arguments are found in the Midrashic literature; his argument, for instance, against circumcision, from the fact that Adam was created uncircumcised, is found in the *Midrash*¹ as a question put by a philosopher to R. Oshayah, who answered that there are many other things in nature which are improved and ennobled by the human hand. Another of Justin's remarks coincides with the following Talmudic passage. A *Mino* asked R. Ishmael son of José (who lived about 125-150), the following question:² "It is written (Gen. xix. 24), *Then the Lord rained upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the Lord out of heaven.* For the words 'from the Lord' we ought to read 'from Him,' unless it means two divinities." A laundry-man, who happened to be present, asked permission to reply. He said, "It is written (Gen. iv. 23), *And Lamech said unto his wives, Adah and Zillah, Hear my voice; ye wives of Lamech, hearken unto my speech.* Ought it not to be 'my wives' instead of 'Lamech's wives'? But such is the usual language in Scripture." Another controversial passage in Justin and in the Talmud will be noticed later on. In one controversy, a passage of the gospel is made the subject of discussion. The following anecdote is given in the Talmud:³ Emma Shalom, the wife of R. Eliezer, was the sister of Rabban Gamaliel. There was a philosopher in the neighbourhood who had the reputation of never taking a bribe. They wished to have a laugh at him, so she brought him a golden candlestick, came before him, and said, "I wish to have a portion of the property of my father." The philosopher said, "Divide it." R. Gamaliel said to him: "It is written in the law given to us by God, *Where there*

¹ *Bereshith Rabbah*, chap. 11.

² *Bab. Talm.*, *Sanhedrin*, fol. 38^b.

³ *Bab. Talm.*, *Shabbath*, fol. 116^a (*Studia Biblica*, Oxford, 1885, p. 58).

is a son, a daughter shall not inherit." The philosopher answered him: "From the day you were removed from your land the law of Moses was taken away and the *Evangelion* given, and in it is written, *The son and the daughter shall inherit alike.*" Next day, R. Gamaliel in his turn brought to him a Libyan ass. The philosopher said to him: "I have come to the end of the book, where it is written, *I am not come to take away from the law of Moses, but to add to the law of Moses as I come*; and it is written in it, *Where there is a son, a daughter shall not inherit.*" Emma said to him: "Let thy light shine in the candlestick." R. Gamaliel said: "The ass has come and knocked down the candlestick." There are two other colloquial interviews of a philosopher with R. Gamaliel, which depend so much on a play of words in Hebrew as to be scarcely intelligible in an English translation.¹ Besides it is possible that the philosopher in the two cases just mentioned was a heathen.

In spite of controversy there seemed to be a friendly intercourse between members of the new sect and the rabbis. A certain Jacob of Kafar-Secanyah,² whom some scholars identify with James the brother of Jesus, appears to have been so intimate with R. Eliezer son of Azariah, that the latter was suspected of entertaining Christian ideas. In explaining his intercourse with Jacob, he said, "I remember meeting Jacob at Sepphoris, where he communicated to me in the name of Jesus an opinion which gave me pleasure. 'In your law,' Jacob said, 'it is written (Deut. xxiii. 19), *Thou shalt not bring the hire of a whore, etc., into the house of the Lord.* If it is forbidden not to employ this money for a sacrifice, may it not be thrown away?' 'What can be done with it?' asked I. He replied, 'Baths or latrines could be built with it.' 'Thou art right,'

¹ Derenbourg, *Op. cit.*, p. 356.

² Midrash on Ecclesiastes i. 8. Neubauer, *Géographie du Talmud*, p. 234.

said I, for at that moment I did not recollect the *halakhah* about it.¹ As soon as he saw that I accepted his opinion, he added: 'Jesus said, Coming from impurity, the produce of it will be employed for impure things, as it is written (Mic. i. 7), *For they gathered it of the hire of an harlot, and they shall return to the hire of an harlot.*' This I approved again, and was therefore accused of adhering to Christianity." On another occasion Jacob performed wonderful cures in the name of Jesus, and had to prove to R. Ishmael that it was allowed to do so by the law. R. Joshua, the son of Hananiah, had still more intercourse with the Judæo-Christians (about 150). The Talmud relates the following story concerning him.² A *Mino* made R. Joshua understand by a sign in the presence of Cæsar, that God had turned away His face from the Jewish nation, to which R. Joshua also answered by a sign that *His hand is stretched out still* (Isa. v. 25) to protect it. When R. Joshua was dying, his disciples said, "What shall we do now in regard to Christianity?" Not only R. Joshua, but also other members of his family were in communication with Christians. It is stated in the Midrash³ that Hananiah, a nephew of R. Joshua, came to Capernaum, and had some intimate conversation (about soreery?) with *Minai*, who persuaded him to ride on the back of an ass on the Sabbath day. When he returned to his uncle, he gave him an ointment, by means of which he was cured. But R. Joshua told him, "Since thou hast heard the braying of the ass of this wicked man, thou canst not dwell in the land of Israel" (*i.e.* it is dangerous to remain with the Christians). Hananiah went therefore to Babylon, and died there. In general the Midrash on Ecclesiastes has many sayings about the *Minai*, of which the following is another example.⁴ A disciple of

¹ R. Eliezer kept strictly to the traditional *Halakhah*, and did not accept new ones from deduction.

² Bab. Talm., *Hagigah* 5^b.

³ *Midrash Koheleth* (or Ecclesiastes) i. 8.

Ibidem.

R. Jonathan (who lived in the first quarter of the second century) went to them, and was surprised by the master in conversation with them. [The master left the place], but the *Minai* sent after him, asking him to assist in making a contribution to a bride. He came back, and found there a young girl. He said, "Is this what Jews do?" They said, "Is it not written (Prov. i. 14), *Cast in thy lot among us; let us all have one purse?*" R. Jonathan hearing that, ran away. If this passage is authentic, M. Derenbourg says it must be an allusion to the sect of Nicolas or Prodicos in Palestine. The Midrash mentions also a certain R. Judah son of Naqoosa, who had frequent conversations with *Minai*, but no details are given about them.

In the third century R. Samlai's exegetical discussions are mentioned, about which we find the following:¹ The *Minim* asked R. Samlai, "How many gods have created the world?" He answered, "Why do you ask me? ask the first man; for it is written (Deut. iv. 32): *For ask now of the days that are past, which were before thee, since the day that God created man upon earth.* It is not written בראו, 'they have created,' but ברא, 'he has created'; the same is the case in Genesis i., where the verb 'created' is in the singular after the plural form Elohim." Thus R. Samlai said, "Whenever the *Minim* attack us from Scripture, the answer is found close by." Another question on the plurality of God was propounded from Genesis i. 26: *Let us make man in our image, after our likeness.* The answer was given from the next verse, where it is said: "God created man in *His* [A.V., *own*] likeness." The same is the case in Joshua xxii. 22: "The Lord God *Elohim*, *He* knoweth"; in Psalm l. 1: "God of Gods *hath* spoken"; in Joshua xxiv. 19: "For *He* is holy Gods"; in Deut. iv. 7: "Who has Gods so nigh . . .? we call upon *Him*." Some of these arguments are found in Justin.

¹ Jer. Talm., *Berakhoth*, ix. 1; *Bereshith Rabbah*, ch. 8.

Origen reports some disputations with Jews concerning the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah (disputations, as we shall see, which have produced volumes),¹ as well as concerning the expression, "the Word of God." Finally, the Talmud has preserved some controversies between R. Abahu and certain Christians in the time of Diocletian, when Christianity was making every effort to become the ruling power. R. Abahu, like R. Samlai, refuted the Christians with biblical passages. He said,² with reference to Numbers xxiii. 19: "If a man says of himself, I am God, he lies; if he says, I am the son of man, he will repent; if he says, I shall ascend to heaven, he will not perform it." He explained the passage³ in Genesis v. 24, *And Enoch walked with God, and he was not, for God took him*, which the Christians regarded as an allusion to Christ's ascension, as meaning "to die," a signification which the expression has in many other passages of the Bible. In another place it is related⁴ that R. Abahu praised R. Saphra as a very learned man, and in consequence he was freed from taxation for thirty years (through the intervention of R. Abahu, who had much influence with the Roman authorities). Once he met some Christians who asked him as follows: "It is written (Amos iii. 2), *You only have I known of all the families of the earth; therefore I will punish you for all your iniquities*. Is it right that when a person is angry he should punish his friends?" R. Saphra remained silent, and gave no answer; they threw a cloak round his head, and ill-treated him. They said to R. Abahu, who appeared just afterwards, "Is this the man you call a great doctor?" To which Abahu replied, "He is versed in Talmudic studies, but not in the Bible." "And you?" they said. He answered, "Since I am often with you, I have more reason to consider this subject than others." "Then give us the answer,"

¹ See next article.

² *Beresith Rabbah*, ch. vi.

³ Jer. Talm., *Taanith*, ii. p. 65^b.

⁴ Bab. Talm., *Abodah Zarah*, fol. 4^a.

they exclaimed. He said, "I shall explain the passage by a parable. Some one lent money to two persons; the one he liked, and against the other he felt antipathy. Of the friend he claimed payment by instalments, of the other he wanted payment at once." Abahu meant to say that the punishment of the chosen race was exacted gradually, in love and not in anger. There are a great many other passages of a controversial character in the Talmud, the meaning of which is not quite to the point; and we therefore think it better to omit them, since they would require too much explanation.

In the post-talmudic or Geonic literature, and in the early Karaitic writings, there is no trace of polemics against Christianity. We have even examples proving that Geonim had friendly intercourse with Christians.¹ The Karaites even recognise Jesus as in some respects an authority.² The Geonim teaching in Babylonia and Egypt, where Jews and Christians were equally oppressed, polemics amongst them were out of the question. The same was the case in Spain under Mohammedan rule. Saadiah Gaon,³ Judah hal-Levi,⁴ and Maimonides⁵ give their opinion on Christianity in their theologico-philosophical works, much as they do on Islam. In Christian countries, such as northern Spain, southern France, and the Rhenish countries, although numerous established there, the Jews were not learned enough to venture upon controversy. Perhaps there were no learned converts as yet, for it was they who provoked the official discussions. In Italy, where the earliest schools were in the southern parts, at Siponte,

¹ Haya Gaon asks an explanation of a biblical passage of the *Katolikos*. *Journal Asiatique*, 1862, I. i. p. 214.

² Judah Hadassi, in his *Eshkol hak-Kofer*, § 104 (omitted in the edition of Eupatoria, 1836, see above, p. 82); Ad. Neubauer, *Aus der Petersburger Bibliothek*, Leipzig, 1866, p. 59.

³ Tenth century, in his *Emunoth Vedeoth*, translated from the Arabic original.

⁴ Eleventh century, in his *Cusari*.

⁵ Twelfth century, in his *Mishneh Thorah*.

Bari, Trani, and later at Rome, strangely enough perhaps no controversial book was written—at least, none is known, not even from quotations.¹ Ecclesiastical authorities occupied themselves with framing exceptional and vexatious laws against the Jews, as can be seen from the records of the various Councils of Agde, Illiberis, Macon, Meaux, Narbonne, Orléans, Vannes, Toledo, and other places; but they left their books alone, and did not disturb their manner of learning. Indeed, before the attack of 1240,² of which we shall speak later on, we know of no work directed against the Jews except the treatise of Agobardus, Bishop of Lyons (in the ninth century), which bears the title of *De insolentia Judæorum*.³ Abelhard's *Dialogus inter philosophum, Judæum et Christianum*,⁴ is rather philosophical than controversial, and the controversy between king Chilperic I. and the Jew Priscus, as reported by Gregory of Tours,⁵ contains only a few sentences.

Narbonne, which was a great centre of Jewish learning in the eleventh century, produced, so far as is known, the first controversial book, most probably in the form of a friendly conversation with a curious and learned divine. R. Moses had-Darshan (the preacher), composed here a most singular Midrash, only known from extensive quotations and what is supposed to be a compendium, in which he made use of apocryphal Aramaic literature.⁶ To this Midrash we owe an Aramaic text of Tobit and of the History of Bel and the Dragon; the latter in the text of the Peshito. It is probable that the eastern schools of the Jews were in contact with the Syrian Christians, and borrowed from them apocryphal works, which they tran-

¹ See Dr. M. Güdemann's *Geschichte des Erziehungswesens und der Cultur der Juden in Italien während des Mittelalters*, Wien, 1884, in the index under *Religionsgespräche*.

² See p. 95.

³ Migne's *Patrologia Lat.*, t. 104, p. 70.

⁴ *Ibidem*, t. 178, p. 1610.

⁵ *Historia Francorum*, vi. 5.

⁶ The book of Tobit, a Chaldee text, ed. by Ad. Neubauer, Oxford, 1878, ix.

scribed and perhaps remodelled. There was indeed frequent communication between the East and Narbonne, by way of Kairowân and southern Italy. If we possessed the Midrash of R. Moses, we should perhaps find that he conversed freely with learned priests, and that some of their ideas have crept into his book, which seems to have been scarce from the beginning. In the thirteenth century a copy of it was known in Barcelona,¹ and in the fifteenth at Salonica,² but both are now lost. Don Isaac Abrabanel³ also did not possess a copy of it in his richly stocked library, nor could he procure one. At Troyes the book was known to the famous Rashi, who had received it most probably from the author himself, when he migrated with other rabbis from southern to northern France.⁴ Here, at Narbonne, Joseph Kamḥi (Kimḥi), the father of the famous David Kimḥi, who came from Spain to Narbonne, composed a polemical book in the form of a dialogue, under the title of the *Book of the Covenant*.⁵ Only fragments of it are known, which are intermixed with later productions of the kind. A controversy is carried on in it between the Believer and the Min (or Christian).⁶ It consisted most probably only of arguments on particular verses of the Bible.

Joseph ben Shem Tob (who flourished in the fifteenth century in Spain), gives the following division of the controversial literature of the Jews: (1) The refutation of the Christian exegesis of biblical passages, such as is to be found in the treatises of Jacob ben Reuben,⁷ and Moses Kohen.⁸ (2) The refutation of the application of Talmudic

¹ By Raymundus Martini. See p. 100 *seqq.*

² By Gedaliah ibn Yahya. See his glosses to the *Bereshith Rabbah*, ed. Salonica, 1594.

³ See next article.

⁴ See *Revue des Études juives*, i. p. 237.

⁵ מלחמת חובה. ספר הברית. Constantinople, 1710.

⁶ מין. מאמין. As such it is quoted in Joseph Kimḥi's grammatical controversy, with the title of ספר הגלוי, which is now being edited by Mr. H. J. Mathews, M.A., Exeter College, Oxford.

⁷ See p. 91.

⁸ See next article.

passages to prove the truth of Christianity, like the treatises of Nahmanides,¹ and some chapters of that of Moses Kohen. (3) Treatises, in which the difficulties of prophecy are pointed out unless applied to Christ; such are the disputation of Lorqi,² and some others of earlier date. (4) Controversies directed against passages of the gospel, as in the *Book of Shame*.³ (5) Against the articles of faith, composed in Spanish by Hasdai Crescas.⁴ (6) Refutations by philosophy, as in the epistle of Ephodi,⁵ not openly expressed however, and therefore requiring a commentary, which Joseph composed, and from which the present division is extracted.

We do not intend to give in this sketch a complete list of controversial treatises and notes; this would require too much space, for De Rossi, in his *Bibliotheca Antichristiana*, enumerates nearly 200 of them, written in various languages, Hebrew, Latin, Spanish, and German. A great number of them refer to the fifty-third of Isaiah, nearly all of which are given in the Catena of Jewish interpreters on this chapter. Besides, from the fourteenth century downwards, the arguments are mere repetitions, and differ only in form and division, in the titles and the names of the controversialists. We shall therefore speak with more detail of the treatises composed in the thirteenth century, and merely state the titles and authors of the most important written subsequently, with a notice of the occasion on which they were composed, wherever this is known.

Jacob ben Reuben composed, about A.D. 1170, a treatise with the title of Book of the Wars of *Yhvh*.⁶ He says in the preface, that he happened to be obliged to stay for some time in Gascony,⁷ and made the acquaintance of a very

¹ See next article.

² See next article.

³ See next article.

⁴ See next article.

⁵ See next article.

⁶ מלחמות ה' ד, MSS. in Oxford and Breslau (in the Library of the Rabbinical School).

⁷ Oxford MS. has גשיסוייא; Breslau קישוניא; (see Graetz, *Op. cit.*, vii.

learned priest who asked him: "How long will you and your brethren be blind, and not see the truth? Are you not diminishing daily, whilst we are increasing? And how low do the Jews stand in the eyes of the nations, whilst we are becoming more powerful daily. Now I shall put you a question, and you will answer me freely." "He took the books of Jerome, Augustine, and St. Paul, who are the pillars of the Christian religion, and out of whose works Gregory composed his music. And after having heard his questions, I made my answers, which I give in my work, divided into twelve chapters": (1) Philosophical and rational answers, not dealing with Scripture. This chapter deals chiefly with arguments against the Trinity and the Divine nature of Christ. (2) Questions from the Pentateuch. First come the following four questions concerning contradictory passages which can only be explained allegorically, as St. Paul and St. Jerome have done, both having been well acquainted with Jewish learning. (a) God commanded at first (Gen. iii. 16) the man, "Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat," and in the following verse it is said, "But of the tree of knowledge, thou shalt not eat of it." (b) It is said (Gen. i. 31), "And God saw every thing that He had made, and, behold, it was very good"; and in another passage (Lev. xi. 8), concerning the animals, "Of their flesh shall you not eat, and their carcase shall ye not touch; they are unclean to you." (c) It is said (Exod. xv. 24, 25), "An altar of earth thou shalt make unto Me. . . . And if thou wilt make Me an altar of stone, thou shalt not build it of hewn stone"; and when we come to the tabernacle, we find altars of gold, of copper, and of wood, with precise measurements. Is it possible that Moses, the truest of the prophets, should disobey the word of God? (d) God commanded (Deut. xxii. 10), "Thou shalt not

(second edition), p. 488. The controversy is carried on between the מוכח, the denier, and the מייחד, the Unitarian.

plough with an ox and an ass together," the ass being an unclean animal: ought it not to be forbidden to leave the ox and ass together in the stable and on the pasture? And why is it not forbidden to plough with a horse and ox together? The allegorical explanation follows, mostly according to Jerome, and Jacob's answers come next, which would occupy too much space to be given here, besides being useless for our purpose.

As to the passages referring to the Divine nature of Jesus, they are the following: (a) Genesis i. 1, "In the beginning God created," where God (*Elohim*) being in Hebrew a plural¹ and the verb created (*bara*) in the singular, the doctrine of the Trinity would be proved. The same argument is given from Genesis i. 26, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness"; (b) from Genesis xviii. 1, 2, 3, "And the Lord appeared unto him, . . . and, lo, three men stood by him, . . . and said, My lord"; and (c) in Genesis xv. 15 it is said, "And thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace," but not into paradise, since Abraham's fathers were idolaters, until the Messiah comes. The same was the case with Jacob, who said, Genesis xxxvii. 35, "For I will go down into *Sheol*" (which means Gehenna, גֵּהֶנֶם), as the doors of paradise were closed until the Messiah should come. Moreover Jacob alluded to the cross, by laying his hands across one another when he blessed Ephraim and Manasseh. Furthermore he says that the sceptre of Judah will cease when Shiloh (the Messiah) comes; and indeed since the advent of Christ the Jews have no king and they are without power. (d) In the second commandment it is said (Exod. xx. 3): "Thou shalt have no other gods before Me. Thou shalt not make unto thee any image," etc. "Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them," etc. How then did it come to pass that Moses made a serpent of

¹ לשון שנים, dual.

brass, and put it upon a pole, in order to cure those who were bitten by a serpent (Num. xxi. 8, 9), unless there is the following allegorical explanation? The serpent being the cleverest animal, and having caused the death of man, Christ, who is also the wisest of men, will save from eternal death, if we look fervently towards the pole, which is the symbol of the cross, when He rises. (e) Deuteronomy xviii. 18. It is said: "I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren," etc., "and He shall speak unto them all that I shall command Him." Which other prophet but our Messiah has given precepts and commandments? (f) The passage (Deut. xxxii. 39), "See now that I, *even I, am He, and there is no god with Me,*" etc., means no doubt, I am the Father, I am the Son, and there is no god with Me; I am one in Godhead and three in figure. "And His earth will atone for His people," [*sic*] viz. if we go to the other side of the sea, where the Messiah is buried and where He lived and died, our sins will be atoned.

(3) Psalms ii.; xxii.; xlv.; xlvi. 12; xlviii. 5; xlix. 8 to end; l.; lxviii. 19 to 22; lxxii. 5 to end; lxxxv. 7 to end; lxxxvii. 5, 6; cx.

(4) Jeremiah xi. 16; xxiii. 5; xxx. 21; xxxi. 15, 22, 31.

(5) Isaiah vi. 3 ("Holy" three times); vii. 14; viii. 23 and ix. 1; xi. 1; xxviii. 16; xxx. 20; xxxii. 16; xxxiii. 13; xxxv.; xl. 3 to 5, 10; xli. 19, 26; xlii. 1 to 4; xliii. 19; xlv. 8; li. 4; lii. 5; lii. 13 to end of liii.; lv. 3; lix. 15; lxi.; lxiii.; lxv; lxvi. 6.

(6) Ezekiel xliv. 1, 2.

(7) Minor Prophets. Hosea vi. 1 to 3; x. 12; xiii. 14. Joel ii. 1, 23. Amos i. 6. Micah v. Habakkuk i. 12; iii. 1. Zechariah ix. 9; xi. 12; xii. 10. Malachi ii. 6; iii.

(8) Daniel ix. 24, and other passages which he would not mention, since Jacob would not believe him.

(9) Job iv. 12 to 17; xix. 25.

(10) Proverbs iv. 1 to 4; xxx. 3.

(11) Jacob's sixteen objections to various passages of the gospels.

(12) Treats of proofs that the Messiah has not arrived.

It is remarkable how the Jews at all periods read the New Testament writings—some out of curiosity, others for the purpose of controversy. We shall see that they even made a Hebrew translation of them.

About the same epoch, the Karaite Judah Hadassi has a chapter on Christianity in his theological work, which bears the title of *Eshkol hak-Kofer*.¹ Although reproaching the Rabbanites with having condemned Jesus unjustly, he is not flattering to the Christian religion in general. Having composed his book at Constantinople, he chiefly refers to the Byzantine Church. This chapter is not to be found in the edition printed in Russia under the supervision of the censorship, just as was and is still the case with regard to editions of the Talmud and other rabbinical works.

In Paris and the neighbouring towns, Sens, Chartres, Melun, and elsewhere, the Jews were quietly settled, and often had friendly discussions with the clergy on the interpretation of biblical passages. All at once a convert of the name of Donin, which he changed to Nicolas when he became a Christian, denounced the Talmud as containing blasphemies against the Almighty, and more especially against Jesus and Mary, and obtained a papal bull, in 1239, to the effect that the Talmud should be given up to the flames. By the intervention of an archbishop, King Louis IX. restored the confiscated copies to their owners, but was forced to order a disputation between Nicolas and five rabbis, whose spokesman was R. Jehiel, of Paris. This seems to be the first accusation brought against the Talmud. The disputation took place on the 24th of June,

¹ See p. 81. It has also the title of ד' הפלם.

1240, in the presence of Queen Blanche.¹ The following are the chief accusations produced by Nicolas, according to the *Extractiones de Talmut*, as regards the blasphemy against Jesus and Mary, and against the Christians :

§ 26. De Xristo etiam dicere non verentur quod mater eius eum de adulterio concepit et quodam qui ab eis Pandera vulgariter appellatur.²

§ 27. Et quod idem Ihesus in stercore calido patitur in inferno, quoniam irridebat verba sapiencium prefatorum.³

§ 28. Adhuc dicunt quod quelibet verba polluta proferre, peccatum est, exceptis que in contemptum ecclesie vergere dinoscuntur.

§ 29. Et utuntur quibusdam vocabulis quibus romanum Pontificem et Xristianitatem dehonstant.

§ 30. In singulis diebus ter in oracione quam digniorem asserunt ministris ecclesie, regibus et aliis omnibus, ipsis Iudeis inimicantibus, maledicunt.

The defence, although successful from a literary point of view, had no effect. On Friday, June 6th, 1242, twenty-four wagons loaded with the Talmud and its commentaries were burnt publicly in Paris. How many more calamities Nicolas brought upon his former correligionists is not known. He disappears from the scene, and according to a MS. document died in 1252 by a violent death. Twenty-one years later, says the same document, the convert Paul (Paulus Christianus) arose in the south, repeating similar accusations.⁴ Strangely enough, only forty years later, we find Joseph Official at Sens, engaged in friendly contro-

¹ See M. Loeb's article in the *Revue des Études juives*, i. p. 247; ii. p. 279; iii. p. 39.

² This is one of the passages concerning Christ in the Bab. Tal., *Shabbath*, fol. 104^b; *Sanhedrin*, fol. 64^a. See on these passages, which are of a late date, Derenbourg, *Op. cit.*, p. 486. On the passage of the crucifixion of Jesus and His disciples, see *ibidem*, p. 203.

³ Bab. Talm., *Gittin*, fol. 57^a.

⁴ Oxford MS., No. 2149 (of the New Catalogue), p. 17.

versy with the Bishop of Sens and some others of the higher clergy.¹

In these controversies no use is yet made of the Agadah to prove the veracity of Christianity. This was evidently first the case in Provence, and perhaps the curious Midrash of R. Moses of Narbonne was the involuntary cause of it.

About 1245, Meir son of Simeon of Narbonne, composed a treatise on a controversy held before the archbishop of that town, with the title of the *War of Duty*.² Here the Jew is styled "holy," and the Christian "sodomite."³ It is divided into five parts, the first of which contains arguments on behalf of the civil rights of the Jews. The second part has 120 paragraphs, in which Meir refutes the Christian theories, and proves that the Jews deserve the misfortunes which came upon them, not because they observe the law, but because they commit sins against it. In the third part, Messianic passages in the Old Testament are explained according to Jewish conceptions. The fourth part treats of Agadic passages, which the Christians explain in favour of their religion, and to which the Jews assign mystical meanings. Here Meir, although believing to some extent in the Kabbalah, rejects the authenticity of the famous book *Bahir*, attributed to the Mishnic doctor R. Nehonyah ben haq-Qanah, which, he says, together with many rabbinical authorities, was recently introduced into Provence. He however does not mention the famous *Zohar*, attributed to R. Simeon ben Yoḥai. The fifth part explains the *credo* of the Jews, the *Shema* (Deut. vi. 5-10), and the passage of Exodus (xxxiv. 6-8) which enumerates the thirteen attributes of God.

¹ See the article of M. Zadoc Kahn, in the *Revue des Études juives*, t. i. p. 222; iii. p. 1 on 'יוסף המוקנה'.

² מלחמת מצוה. See *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, t. xxvii. p. 559 *seqq.*; and Dr. Gross, in the *Monatsschrift für Geschichte u. Wissenschaft des Judenthums*, 1881, p. 295.

³ קדוש in both cases.

The most animated controversies however, which display the bitterest hatred towards the Jews, were carried on, as we have already mentioned, by converted Jews, who liked to manifest their zeal and show themselves more Christian than the old believers themselves. Such was the case with the convert Paulus Christianus, or Pablo Christiani, probably of Montpellier, and pupil of R. Eliezer of Tarascon. His Jewish name is not given. He died in the year 1274, at Taormina, in Sicily,¹ where he had gone probably on the same errand as in 1273 to Provence. Pablo, having been brought up in Talmudic studies, was of course versed in the literature of the Talmud and the Midrash. The date of his conversion is not known, but in 1263 he was already a celebrated member of the Order of the Dominicans, and was deputed to hold a controversy at Barcelona in the presence of James I., King of Arragon (to whom Montpellier also belonged), and his confessor, Raymundus de Peñaforte, with the famous Rabbi Moses ben Naḥman or Naḥmani, in Catalan Bonastruch de Porta.² The disputation lasted four days, but not consecutively, and began July 20th, 1263. Naḥmani was allowed to speak out his mind freely, provided that he did not utter blasphemies. The dispute turned upon nearly the same questions as those raised by Donin, *viz.* concerning blasphemous passages in the Talmud against Jesus and Mary, and on Agadic passages which prove the Messiahship of Christ. Of course, the victory belonged to Pablo in the Latin documents, and to Naḥmani in his own account of the dispute, the publication of which caused his exile from Arragon. The chief point which is of importance is, that the great rabbi of Gerona held the Agadah to be a series of individual sermons, which were not at all binding upon a Jew in religious matters. Modern

¹ See *Histoire littéraire de la France*, t. xxvii. p. 566 *seqq.*

² See Graetz, *Op. cit.*, vii. p. 131 *seqq.* Pater H. Denifle in the *Historisches Jahrbuch* (Görres Gesellschaft, München, 1887), viii. p. 255 *seqq.*; M. Loeb in *Revue des Études juives*, t. xv. p. 1 *seqq.*

critics also have arrived at the same result from another point of view. Still, in order to swell their volumes, Christian divines of our time take every sentence of the Agadah as if it were the opinion of the Jews in general.

Not having quite succeeded at Barcelona, Pablo, under the protection of the king, went to the south of France, and resumed the tactics of Donin, by denouncing the Talmud, which contained, he declared, blasphemous passages against Jesus and Mary. Pablo next went to Rome, and caused Pope Clement IV. to issue a bull against the Talmud, in 1264, which he brought back with him. King James ordered all copies of the Talmud to be seized, in order that these blasphemous passages might be erased. The board of censors was composed of the Bishop of Barcelona, Raymundus de Peñaforte, and three other Dominicans, Arnoldus de Segarra, Petrus de Genioa, and Raymundus Martini. The last is generally recognised as a scholar who understood Hebrew, Aramaic, and Rabbinic, as well as Arabic. Indeed, he applied his knowledge to the conversion of Jews and Mussulmans, as we shall see later on. This passion for conversion most probably saved the copies of the Talmud from utter destruction, as was the case in Paris, for Martini wanted to prove to the Jews from their own book the truth of Christianity. Where Pablo brought misfortune and misery on the Jews between 1264 and 1269 we do not know. But in 1269 we find him in the south of France, where he tried by all kinds of vexatious means to convert the Jews, and among other causes of misery he brought with him an order from the pope that all the Jews should carry on their garments a round piece of red stuff. The inquisition was also introduced, more especially at Avignon; many Jews were imprisoned, and amongst them two notables, R. Israel and R. Mordecai son of Joseph. This latter rabbi composed a polemical work in 1274, probably after the death of Pablo, under the title of *The*

Confirmer of Religion,¹ which he divided into thirteen chapters, imitating thereby Maimonides, who reduced the catechism of the Jews to thirteen articles of faith. Its contents were as follows: (1) The three exiles—Egypt, Babylon, and the present. (2) Proof that the last exile will be of the longest duration. (3) The reason of this. (4) The epoch which Daniel gives for the redemption. (5) Proof that Israel is in trouble because the commandments are not observed. (6) That the Messiah of the prophets is a man. (7) That he has not yet arrived. (8) Discussion as to whether the Messiah is already born. (9) Of the two Messiahs, the son of David and the son of Joseph. (10) That he will collect Israel and not disperse it. (11) Of the glory of Israel at the advent of the Messiah. (12) The fall of the nations who persecute Israel. (13) Discussion as to whether the commandments and the sacrifices will be abolished by the Messiah or not.

Four years later, in 1278, Raymundus Martini composed a very powerful book, respecting quotations from the Rabbinic literature, against the Jews, under the title *Pugio Fidei*. He had procured for himself by royal authority all the books which the Jews possessed, in Catalonia at least, perhaps also in that part of Provence which was under the dominion of King James. He quotes from the following Jewish works: the Targum, the Talmud (Bab. and Jer.), the Midrash rabboth on the Pentateuch, the Siphra, Siphre, and Mekhiltha; the Seder Olam; the Midrash Tanhuma, the Midrash on Ecclesiastes, Lamentations, Canticles, Ruth, and Psalms; numerous extracts of the Midrash of R. Moses had-Darshan of Narbonne; the commentaries of Solomon of Troies, of Abraham ben Ezra, of David Kimhi, and Nahmanides; Maimonides' *Mishneh Torah*, and *Guide of the Perplexed* (in Arabic and Hebrew); finally, the *Yosippon* and the gospels in a Hebrew translation.

¹ מְחַזֵּק אֱמוּנָה. See *Histoire littéraire de la France*, t. xxvii. p. 565.

He composed another book, entitled *Capistrum Judæorum*, which is at present lost.¹ We shall mention a third work later on. His *Pugio* was the standard book of reference of the later Christian controversialists in Spain of whom we shall speak presently, as well as of more modern writers who seek to prove the Messiahship of Jesus from the rabbinical literature, such as Porchet, Peter Galatin, Dr. Pusey, and other scholars. The late Dr. Zunz,—whose works on rabbinical literature, whatever Professor de Lagarde may say against him through his anti-Semitic proclivities, still are, and will remain for a long time, the pillars of it,—gives Martini the credit of Jewish learning,² and does not doubt the authenticity of the greater part of his quotations, in spite of the fact that some of them are strange enough, and many others are found in another shape, or not at all in our existing editions and MSS. The late Dr. Pusey³ followed Zunz, and so do many living Jewish and Christian scholars. Only lately however two Cambridge scholars, in the appendix to their *Commentary on the Psalms*, Messieurs Jennings and Lowe, have been of another opinion. They say: "The reader is warned against accepting as genuine the citations from Jewish works in Schoettgen's *Horæ Hebraicæ*, and Raymund Martini's *Pugio Fidei*. Both works are utterly untrustworthy. Raymund Martini (ordinis Prædicatorum adversus Mauros et Judæos, fl. circ. 1250) is notorious for the questionable expedients which he adopted in endeavouring to refute the Jews from their own books. With that well-meaning dishonesty which too frequently marked the controversialists of his age, he alters the text of the Talmud, Midrashim, etc., to meet his occasion, and even devises whole passages where convenient. Martini

¹ Quoted in the *Pugio*, p. 290.

² *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden*, p. 287 seqq. Berlin, 1832.

³ *The Fifty-third of Isaiah, according to Jewish Interpreters*, vol. ii. p. xxxv. Oxford, 1877.

was a sound Hebrew scholar, and as his forgeries are generally clever adaptations and combinations from other parts of Hebrew literature, it is only by reference to the actual texts of these Jewish works that his impostures are betrayed." We tried to point out¹ to these two scholars, that many of the incriminated passages of Martini are to be found *verbatim* in existing MSS., and that the *Bereshith Rabbah* (Midrash Genesis major), quoted often in the *Pugio*, is not our printed Midrash, but that of R. Moses had-Darshan of Narbonne.² We see now, from Dr. Schiller-Sziinessy's article on the *Pugio*,³ that Messieurs Jennings and Lowe were only the mouthpiece of the learned doctor, their master in rabbinic, for he reproaches them with not having quoted the master's *ipsissima verba*, as the Mishnah prescribes, in which case they would not have said that Martini was "a sound Hebrew scholar." We shall not discuss here the question if two clergymen of the Church of England are obliged to conform themselves to the precepts of the Mishnah, but we must ask their pardon for having attacked them instead of Dr. Schiller-Sziinessy. He is much severer than they are on Martini, asserting that he adorned himself with a stranger's pen, Martini not being the author of the *Pugio*, but the convert Paulus Christianus. These are Dr. Schiller-Sziinessy's own words: "We shall trace some of the forgeries [of the *Pugio*], bringing proof positive that they are such. We will then show that Raymundus Martin, owing to his ignorance of Rabbinic and even Biblical Hebrew, could not have been himself the inventor of these forgeries, and we shall finally show that the perpetrator of these forgeries was not merely a rogue but a buffoon."

It is questionable whether a serious journal ought to have admitted such unparliamentary expressions based on

¹ *The Book of Tobit*, etc., p. xxi. *seqq.*

² See p. 104.

³ *The Journal of Philology*, vol. xvi. No. 31, p. 130 *seqq.*

doubtful suppositions. The following facts will perhaps shake the severe opinion of Dr. Schiller-Szinessy about the authorship of the text of the *Pugio*, for we believe that Martini is admitted as the translator of it. With all his accurate and minute reading, Dr. Schiller-Szinessy has overlooked the fact that the date of the composition of the *Pugio* is given by Martini as 1278 A.D.¹ Paulus Christianus, on the other hand, died in Sicily in 1274.² Thus unless Dr. Schiller-Szinessy can prove that the one or the other date is falsified, his terms rogue and buffoon are groundless. Or did Martini keep Pablo's work in his drawers for four years? Such a hypothesis is scarcely admissible. But before speaking of the forgeries in the *Pugio* and of Martini's ignorance, we must mention two other doubtful points in Dr. Schiller-Szinessy's elaborate attack.

1. He writes Martin instead of the usual Martini; so did Dr. Graetz³ already before him. The reason is given by Dr. Schiller-Szinessy in the following words: "The name of the reputed author of the *Pugio Fidei* was Ramon Martinez, and in his convent he was called Raymundus Martin, the name 'Martini' arose no doubt from the wrongly applied Latin genitive. A similar mistake is continually made on the Continent with respect to our Castle or Castell (some-time Professor of Arabic), who is called by several writers Castelli," etc. In no early biographical work is the name of Ramon Martinez to be found. Quétif, it is true, writes Martin, but Echard in the index calls him Martini. Besides, Antonio,⁴ who is more reliable than Quétif, calls him Martini. It is possible that Martini means the son of Martin, and hence his name. At all events Martini occurs in the follow-

¹ *Pugio*, p. 395 (we quote the Leipzig edition), already given by Dr. Graetz, *Op. cit.* vii. p. 163.

² See p. 98.

³ Probably on the authority of Diago's *Historia dela Provincia de Aragon*, etc. Barcelona, 1598, libr. i. cap. 2 and 15.

⁴ *Bibliotheca Hispana Vetus*, vol. ii. p. 89. Madrid, 1786.

ing title found in a MS. of the fourteenth century: *Esplanacio simboli Apostolorum ad institutionem fidelium a fratre R^o. Martini de ordine prædicatorum edita.*"¹

2. In speaking of the relation of R. Moses had-Darshan's Midrash to the Prague MS., Dr. Schiller-Szinessy is generous enough to admit that the *Pugio* "contains, by the side of numerous and most shameless forgeries, genuine matter"; from which we may suppose that it is admitted that Martini or Pablo had a copy of Moses' work, the correct title of which is *Midrash rabbah derabbah*.² The late Rabbi S. L. Rapoport, and after him the late Dr. Zunz, found an abridged copy of this Midrash in a MS. of a synagogue at Prague, and we call it therefore the Prague MS. Dr. Schiller-Szinessy denies emphatically this fact. He says: "Through the kindness of Mr. S. Buber of Lemberg, we have before us a copy of the so-called *Bereshit rabbathi* of Rabbi Moses Haddarshan. We can positively assure the reader that the late learned Rabbi S. L. Rapoport, in this respect, first deceived himself, and then deceived Zunz, who in his turn deceived many others in declaring the contents of this MS. to be Rabbi Mosheh Haddarshan's, although it is no doubt an early Midrashic commentary on the book of Genesis. In a general way we must caution the reader against the conjectures into which Rapoport's genius led him, against the notices of Zunz founded on these conjectures, and against the buildings reared by the idle on their idol's foundation. At all events, this so-called *Bereshit rabbathi* does not throw the least light on the *Pugio*; the only piece it has in common with it is on the death of Moses (MS. on xxvii. 17). Compare *Pugio*, 308, 309 (385)." We have been favoured with a detailed description of the MS. by our friend Herr A. Epstein of Vienna, who has made an exact copy of it

¹ Pater Denifle's article (see p. 98 note 2), p. 225.

² The Hebrew title מדרש רבה רבה in the Oxford MS. (No. 2339, 5) others have בראשית רבתי; Martini, *Genesis rabbah major* or *prior*.

for publication. Space will not allow us to translate (from the Hebrew) his learned and very interesting account of it, which, as we are informed, will appear shortly in a German translation. We shall only say that this MS., according to the extracts forwarded to us, contains not less than seventeen passages, many of them given *verbatim*, out of those quoted in the *Pugio* from the Midrash of Moses had-Darshan. They are on the following pages of the *Pugio*: 349, 350, 377, 385, 419, 535, 538, 563, 643, 695, 714, 728, 767, 771, 842, 850, 862, 937. The reason of the discrepancy between Herr Epstein's copy and that of Herr Buber, can only be explained by the supposition that the copyist employed by the latter could not always read the difficult writing of the Prague MS. With seventeen passages agreeing with the *Pugio*, one would rather think that this MS. throws some light upon it.

A. NEUBAUER.

To be continued.)

CHRIST'S USE OF THE BOOK OF PROVERBS.

THE teaching of our Lord is so unique, His method and manner are so original, that it hardly occurs to us at first to seek for sources which He may have used. And yet His own testimony to the ancient Scriptures gives us a warrant for reading them through, not only for the purpose of seeing their witness to Him, but also for the purpose of seeing how He made use of them Himself. It is a labour of reverence and love to read the Old Testament, if we may say so, with our Lord's eyes and to mark its influence upon His mind. In more senses than one the New Testament is latent in the Old. It is Christ's beautiful work to bring the New out of the Old; and then to make the Old patent in the New.