

# PREACHING PAUL TO THE MORISCOS:

THE *CONFUSIÓN O CONFUTACIÓN DE LA  
SECTA MAHOMÉTICA Y DEL ALCORÁN*  
(1515) OF “JUAN ANDRÉS”

Ryan Szpiech ✍

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

In 1487, a Muslim *faqīh*, or religious jurist, found himself in a cathedral in Valencia where, he claims, he heard a sermon that had a profound, catalyzing effect on him. His eyes were opened to the truth he felt he was missing, leading him to seek conversion to Christianity and to change his name to “Juan Andrés”. “Juan” tells the story nearly thirty years later in the opening to his Castilian anti-Muslim polemic *Confusión o confutación de la secta Mahomética y del Alcorán* (*Confusion or Confutation of the Muhammadan Sect and of the Qurʾān*), a little-studied but influential anti-Muslim treatise published in 1515.<sup>1</sup> In his opening narrative, Juan inserts his personal history into a description of the Muslim conquest of Iberia:

<sup>1</sup> For an overview of work on the *Confusión*, see the introduction by Elisa Ruiz García in her edition (1:11-12). Other sources include Bobzin (“Bemerkungen”; *Der Koran* 77-79); Yacine Bahri; El Kolli Cancel (109-21); Ribera Florit (xx-xxi); Larson (linguistic study only); López-Morillas (“The Genealogy” 276-78; *El Corán* 43-46); Magnier (138-54); Epalza et al., (108-11); and Drost (119-25, and 376-77 in Dutch).

[E]l falso propheta Mahoma . . . con sus malvados compañeros . . . comenzó a desviar las simples gentes de la cierta vía y fin de salvación . . . y dende, por sus califas y successors, passaron y convertieron toda la África y de allí las Españas, y ocupáronlas quasi todas y juntamente la ciudad de Xátiva, donde yo después de muchos años fuy nacido y instruydo y enseñado en la secta mahoméctica por Abdalla, mi natural padre, alfaquí de la dicha ciudad, por cuya muerte succedí yo en su oficio de alfaquí, en que mucho tiempo estuve perdido y desviado de la verdad, fasta que en el año de 1487 . . . a desora los resplandescientes rayos de la divinal luz . . . removieron y esclarecieron las tenieblas de mi entendimiento y luego se me abrieron los ojos de la ánima. Y por la noticia que tenía en la secta mahoméctica claramente conocí que no por aquélla, como perversa y mala, mas por la santa ley de Christo se conseguía el fin de salvación para que los hombres fueron creados. E demandé luego el baptismo. (89)

After his conversion, Juan was, he claims, sent to Granada by the Catholic Kings Ferdinand and Isabel to preach and try to convert Muslims remaining there after the conquest of 1492, working under the direction of inquisitor Martín García, bishop of Barcelona (d. 1521). As part of his mission, he states, he composed the *Confusión*, a vicious attack on Islam based on Islamic sources.

While the name “Juan Andrés” appears in a list of canons of the Cathedral of Granada from around 1516, no other testimonies of the author’s life and existence are known (Marín López 438). Gerard Wiegers, who considers the issue of authorship to be “crucial” for the interpretation of the text, has raised the vexing question of whether the “Juan Andrés” who claims to be the author of the *Confusión* could actually be shown by any other means to be a real person (“Review” 258-60; Cf. “Moriscos” 589 n6). Recent studies by Jason Busic (88) and Consuelo López-Morillas, in her recent edition of manuscript 235 of the Biblioteca de Castilla-La Mancha (a Romance Qur’ān copied in 1606, possibly on the basis of an earlier model), treat Juan as an existing figure. López-Morillas, moreover, argues that Juan displays certain knowledge of Muslim exegetical traditions, and notes numerous suspicious parallels between the characteristics attributed to the author of the *Confusión* and the Mudéjar author, ‘Īsā ibn Jābir (Yça de Segovia, fl. 1450), author of the *Breviario Sunnī*: both claim the title of *faqīh*, both allegedly translated



the Qurʾān into Romance, both make use of Muslim *tafsīr* with a preference for similar authors, both divide the text into four parts in the same way and at the same division points, etc. (*El Corán* 43-44). At the same time, she also notes that the *Confusión* includes different Qurʾān translations than those found in manuscript 235, which might represent a copy of Yça's text.

In what follows, I aim to distance myself from this question of authorship, not because I consider it unimportant from a historical point of view, but rather because I propose that conversion narratives like that found in the preface to the *Confusión* are more fruitfully read as literary or textual constructions, and that the narratives of “real” converts are, in any case, usually indistinguishable from those of imaginary ones. As is the case in most narratives of conversion found within polemical texts (such as those of Petrus Alfonsi, Alfonso of Valladolid, ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq al-Islāmī, and others), the function of a conversion story is never biographical, but is rather rhetorical, serving as a device to establish the authority of the voice of the author as an authentic witness to the tradition it aims to reject. It is thus little concerned with the true accuracy or reality of its story, but only with its verisimilitude and believability. I believe that it is a misstep of scholarly interpretation to plumb such texts only for scraps of fact, just as it is to evaluate such texts only on the basis of what scraps can be gleaned from the text or culled from external sources. Such accounts must be treated as fictive and constructed representations, regardless of what is known or not known of their accuracy.<sup>2</sup> My goal in this article is thus to approach Juan's narrative (I will call the first-person authorial voice “Juan”, since he is called thus in the text) not in order to evaluate its truth value –it makes no essential difference to my conclusions if Juan is real or was simply invented to look real– but according to its strategic function within the text as a tool of anti-Muslim polemic.

How, then, does “Juan” construct his story and why does he do so? Despite the sources used in his attack on Islam –drawn primarily from Islamic texts such as the Qurʾān and biographies of the prophet Muḥammad–

<sup>2</sup> For a comparison of the *Confusión* with these and other sources, as well as a more in-depth discussion of the fictive aspects of polemical conversion narratives, see Szpiech (9-27, 33-41).

the language and imagery of the narrative are unmistakably biblical, not Qur'anic. By mentioning how "suddenly the shining rays of divine light . . . opened the eyes of my soul", Juan directly evokes the New Testament model of the conversion of Saul of Tarsus, recounted in the book of the Acts of the Apostles, in which "suddenly a great light from heaven shone about" Saul (22:6), blinding him, until "something like scales fell from his eyes and his sight was restored" (9:18). Juan, in fact, names Paul as one of his models in his description of his ordination:

E recebidas sacras órdenes y de alfaquí y esclauo de Lucifér hecho sacerdote y ministro de Cristo, comencé, como sant Pablo, a repredicar y pregonar el contrario de lo que antes falsamente creya y afirmava, y con ayuda del alto Señor convertí primeramente en este reyno de Valencia y reduxe a la fin de saluacion muchas ánimas de infieles moros que perdidas se yuan al Infierno al poder de Lucifér. (90)

What place could these allusions to Paul have in an anti-Muslim treatise, one that, apart from this introduction, was based not on Christian sources but on Islamic authorities?

In what follows, I will consider Paul's importance to Juan's argument in particular and in the discourse of interreligious polemic between Muslims and Christians more generally. Of particular interest in exploring this question is how Juan may have been responding to the anti-Christian polemical writing of late-medieval Iberia that perpetuated a long discursive tradition against Paul. By placing Juan's work in this context, I will argue that the representation of Paul in Juan's introduction is not simply a repetition of a standard trope in medieval conversion narratives but is part of a specific argument that he sustains throughout his polemical work: that the figure of Paul the Apostle is, contrary to common Muslim tradition, not the corrupter of Christianity but is actually one of its messengers, a claim that he argues is affirmed in the Qur'an and other Muslim proof texts. In Christian-Muslim polemical literature, references to Paul such as those found in Juan's introductory narrative were never casual and always formed part of a larger argument about the nature of Christian-Muslim relations. In fact, the figure of Paul the Apostle was not only a model of conversion or an *actor* to



be cited, but also a key figure around which core theological battles were pitched and waged.

### **“Porque los ignorantes moros . . .”**

At first blush, the New Testament references in Juan’s prologue actually seem out of place in his work. This is because Juan explicitly affirms that his work is written for a Muslim audience, in particular for an audience of simple rather than learned Muslims:

Fue mi intención en componerla porque aun lo más simples juyzios alcançen cómo en la ley de Mahoma no ay fundamento nin razón para que pueda ser verdadera. Y porque los ignorantes moros, convencidos por testigo de su nación, conozcan el error en que están y en que su falso profeta Mahoma los ha puestos. Digo los ygnorantes porque de los sabios ninguno cree en mahoma, mas antes tienen su secta por falsa y muy bestial. Y finalmente porque todos vengan a la sancta ley y verdadero fin para que todos fueron creados. . . . (92)

One key part of this appeal to “los ignorantes moros” is his use of his own translation of the Qur’ân. Undertaking his translation, he says, at the behest of Martín García, “convertime a trasladar de arávido en lengua aragonesa toda la ley de los moros, digo el *Alcorán* con sus glosas y los siete [*sic*] libros de la *Çuna*”, i.e. *Sunna*, or books of Muslim tradition (91). This translation, like the polemical work in which his narrative of conversion was included, was undertaken with a deliberate missionizing, or at least polemicizing, intention. He completed his translation “porque en el cargo que tenía de sus Altezas de predicar a los moros pudiesse, con las auctoridades de su misma ley, confundirlos y vencerlos, lo que sin aquel trabajo mío con dificultad podiera hazer” (91).<sup>3</sup>

The basis of his attempt to “confundirlos y vencerlos” is his appeal to the authenticity of his written *auctoritates*, or proof texts, “las auctoridades de su misma ley”. Not only does Juan cite abundantly from Muslim authorities, but he also gives the original version of many of his citations by including transliterations of the Arabic text into Latin characters (a fact that also

<sup>3</sup> On Juan’s translation, see López-Morillas (“The Genealogy” 263-64, 268, 277-79); Epalza et al. (108-11); Vernet (“Traducciones” 697-98).

points to the link between his written polemical arguments and an oral delivery through preaching and sermonizing).<sup>4</sup> This appeal to authentic authorities in their original language is parallel to his appeal to his own conversion narrative, which serves to convince “ignorant moors” on the basis of an authentic testimony of a Muslim witness, a “testigo de su nación”. Juan conflates conversion and translation as like vehicles of proof and appeal, calling on Muslim readers to heed the words of their own people, both those written in their sacred texts and those spoken by their own intellectual leaders. As in the anti-Jewish writings of the late-thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries such as those of Ramón Martí (d. after 1284) and Abner of Burgos / Alfonso of Valladolid (d. ca 1347), in which linguistic authenticity and personal testimony play key roles as the basis of polemical attack and conversionary appeal, Juan’s description of his own conversion and translation play a strategic role as the foundations of his own authority. These elements also make it clear that Juan is directing his polemic to Muslim readers, just as his translation was intended for use in sermons directed at Muslim listeners.

Juan’s effort to speak directly to Muslims is also evident from the language within the text itself, which frequently speaks in a second-person voice to an imagined Muslim listener: “Nota pues y dime agora tú, moro, cómo se entiende aquel dicho de Mahoma . . .” (101). What begins as a description or summary of what the Qur’ān or other works say about Muḥammad or Muslim practice regularly switches to direct appeals: “Pues mira, moro, y considera . . . y verás . . . y conocerás tú, moro, que la generación de Jesucristo es mayor que la generación de Mahoma” (102). Such direct appeals, by which the polemical attack on the Qur’ān and Muḥammad is interlarded throughout, also define the concluding paragraphs of the entire work, when Juan makes one final appeal to his reader to heed the proofs of his work: “De manera te digo, moro, que mire[s] en todo lo susodicho, que todo lo dixere por darte luz y para que vengas a noticia de lo que no entendas, car de verdad muy pocos son los moros alfaquiyes que entiendan su ley . . .” (229). The intention of

<sup>4</sup> Cantarino also suggests that Juan is quoting from memory rather than from a written text, “transcribing a linguistically memorized image, more sound than picture” (30).



the work to appeal directly to Muslims, the stated reliance on “authorities of their own law”, and the need to prove that the author is an authentic “witness of their own nation” all make the opening use of a Pauline model of religious conversion seem strangely inappropriate. As I will argue below, however, the parallel treatment of Paul found at the beginning and the end of the work, in which Juan inverts the traditional Muslim image of Paul, serves as an important framing device of the entire text, one that embodies the overall strategy of the work of proving the truth of Christian belief through an appeal to “authentic” Muslim sources.

### **The Story of Ḥabīb the Carpenter**

After his opening narrative, Juan does not return to discuss Paul again until the penultimate chapter of the *Confusión*, which treats, “cómo la fe Cristiana está provada por buena y sancta y verdadera, y dada por Dios, por el mesmo *Alcorán* y en la *Suna* de Mahoma; y cómo faze testigo el *Alcorán* de Jesuchristo, Nuestro Señor, ser el más exellente propheta que en el mundo vino” (210). Among the many things proffered to establish the superior prophethood of Jesus (considered a prophet in Islam) are the miracles performed by his disciples. Such miracles, he claims, are attested in the Qur’ān itself in the story of Ḥabīb al-Najjār, or Ḥabīb the Carpenter, “la qual historia leen los moros y no la entienden” (214). The story of Ḥabīb developed in Muslim exegetical tradition on the basis of the following Qur’ānic passage about an unnamed city of unbelievers to whom God sends his messengers:

Strike for them a parable-[about] the inhabitants of the city, when the Envoys came to it; when We sent unto them two men, but they cried them lies, so We sent a third, as reinforcement. They said, “We are assuredly Envoys unto you”. They said, “You are naught but mortals like us; the All-merciful has not sent down anything. You are speaking only lies” [. . .] Then came a man from the furthest part of the city, running; he said, “My people, follow the Envoys! Follow such as ask no wage of you, they are right-guided. . . Behold I believe in your Lord; therefore hear me”! It was said, “Enter Paradise”! (Q. 36: 13-27; Arberry, 144-46, with my changes)

Because this passage is found within the sura Yā-Sīn (so named after the opening two letters of the book), this “prodigal people” are called “the people

of Yā-Sīn”. They have been associated in Qur’ānic *tafsīr* (exegesis) with the people of Antioch (on the Orontes) around the time of Jesus, although the name “Antioch” is not mentioned. Similarly, the name of Habīb, also not mentioned, has been interpreted in Muslim exegesis as the “man from the furthest part of the city” who urges the people of Yā-Sīn to believe in those sent to preach. As scholars have shown, the Qur’ānic passage and some of its exegesis seem to follow, at least in part, the representation of Antioch in the Syriac version of the Apocryphal Acts of Peter.<sup>5</sup>

The association of “the city” with Antioch and “the man” with Habīb appears in a majority of early Muslim commentaries, and traditions about him were absorbed into later works such as the voluminous history and *tafsīr* of Persian writer al-Ṭabarī (d. 310 AH / AD 923).<sup>6</sup> Al-Ṭabarī divides up earlier commentaries into two groups that offer two differing theories of the origin of the envoys: “The early authorities differ about their story. Some say these three . . . were prophets and messengers . . . others say: no, they were the apostles of Jesus, the son of Mary. They were not God’s messengers, but rather the messengers of Jesus” (*Tarikh*, 2:790-91; *The History*, 167-68). Islamic tradition, which accepts Jesus as a true prophet, believes that the early followers of Jesus followed the true faith uncorrupted by later Christian tradition. In this view, Ḥabīb represents one of the early true believers, one who “entered paradise” (i.e. was martyred and saved) on account of his faith before the unbelievers of Antioch. Exegetes describe a variety of horrendous deaths he may have suffered in the name of the true faith.

If the role of the envoys as disciples of Jesus was a point of difference among exegetes, their specific identities were even more debated. The apocryphal Acts of Peter, which provides the early template for the Qur’ānic version, claims that Peter and John went first to Antioch, followed later by Paul, and Arabic Christian authors largely follow this rendition. Among Islamic exegetes, however, Paul figures much less as one of the possible envoys. Al-Ṭabarī, among others, proposes the three were named Ṣadiq, Ṣadūq,

<sup>5</sup> Busse (157-59); van Esbroeck (64-68).

<sup>6</sup> On Habīb in Muslim tradition, see Busse (159-61); Vajda; Wheeler (318-20). For all subsequent Arabic dates, I will give AH followed by “/” and the corresponding AD dates.



and Shalūm (*Tafsīr* 22:156; *Tarikh* 2:790; *The History* 167-8). Eleventh-century Iraqi al-Māwardī claims they were Peter, John, and Jonas (Busse, 164), while Andalusī Exegete al-Qurtūbī (d. 671/1273) suggests the third was Peter and makes no mention of Paul (15:15). While Paul does figure in some Muslim interpretations, such examples do not constitute a majority tradition. Twelfth-century Shi'ite al-Ṭabrisī (d. 548/1153) seems to follow the Apocryphal Acts of Peter in naming Peter, John, and Paul, while Baghawī, also Persian, (d. 516/1122) lists Paul as the second, not the third (Busse, 164). Among the writers suggesting that the third envoy may have been Paul are the historian al-Mas'ūdī (d. 345/956) (*Murūj* 134) and exegetes Ibn Kathīr (d. 774/1373) (*Tafsīr* 11:351), al-Khāzin (d. 741/1340) (*Tafsīr* 4:5), Ibn 'Ādil (d. after 880/1475) (16:185), and al-Suyūṭī (d. 911/1505) (7:50).

Juan's interpretation of the story of Ḥabīb shows his direct consultation of Arabic sources from this tradition. He states:

En aráigo dize . . . cómo sanct Pedro y sant Matheo—algunos dizen que era sant Pedro y sant Juan—pero dizen que era sanct Pedro y otro apóstol, los quales fueron a la ciudad de Antiochía y fallaron de fuera de la ciudad a un hombre lleno de lepra, el qual se llama Habib Anatar, muy rico. Y por el mal que tenía estava echado de fuera de la ciudad, al qual dixieron los dos apóstoles que si él creyese en Jesucristo y en su fe que ellos lo sanarian y él fue contiento [*sic*]; el qual creyó y fue bautizado y luego se sanó . . . luego que se veyó sano, començó yr por la ciudad echando vozes y diziendo: “O mi gente, seguid a los mensajeros [ . . . ]” . . . Dice que por causa destas bozes que este hombre echava, tomolo el rey y martizirizolo . . . [y] tomó a los dos discípulos y púsolos en la cárcel. Y luego fueron ayudados con el tercero . . . Dizen los glosadores que este tercero fue sant Pablo sin duda. (214-15)

Juan is careful to show he is familiar with such Muslim commentaries on this passage by including details taken directly from this tradition, including the fact that his name was “Habib Anatar”, i.e. *al-najjār*, the carpenter (a tradition that seems to begin with al-Ṭabarī, and appears in many later commentaries), that he was “muy rico” (al-Ṭabarī specifies that he “gave alms”; Ibn Kathīr claims he “was very charitable, giving half of his earnings in charity”), and that he was “lleno de lepra” (al-Ṭabarī, like many after him, says “he was sick and had become leprous”) (Ṭabarī, *Tafsīr* 22:158-59; *Tarikh*

2:790; *The History* 157-58; Ibn Kathīr 11:352).

Given that Mas'ūdī and Ibn Kathīr, rather than al-Ṭabarī, are the most mainstream of the sources listing Paul as one of the envoys, we might surmise that Juan derived his knowledge at least partly from one of them.<sup>7</sup> Such a guess is complicated, however, by what follows in the text, in which Juan refers to what he claims is his source. Anticipating a skeptical response on the part of his Muslim readers, he insists that they go check their sources before they object to his argument. “Yo creo que muchos moros oyrán esta declaración y no la creerán, pero a qualquiere moro que tal nega dezidle que leya la glosa del Azamahxeri y la glosa de Buhatia. Y si no fallara en las dos glosas *verbo ad verbum* como aquí está, dezid que yo soy el mayor mentiroso del mundo” (216; cf. 165 and 182). These two names Juan cites as his sources are the Persian al-Zamakhsharī (d. 538/1144) and the Andalusī exegete Ibn 'Aṭīyya (d. 541/1146).<sup>8</sup> Al-Zamakhsharī does, in fact, tell the story of the envoys meeting Habīb outside the city and promising him health if he would believe in Jesus, and also includes the detail that the envoys were imprisoned by the king. Ibn 'Aṭīyya also specifies that Habīb was killed for his faith. Nevertheless, neither exegete makes any mention of Paul. Al-Zamakhsharī claims the third was Peter (*Shim'ūn*) (3:317) and Ibn 'Aṭīyya does not specify who he was (4:449).

It is hard to believe that Juan could get most of the details right but somehow confuse this point by accident. The confident language of this passage resembles other passages in the text where he insists that “todo esto lo dize el testo y la glosa *verbo ad verbum*” (165; cf. 182), and Juan also names these same exegetes together elsewhere in the text (184). Given that, as I have shown, there are other Muslim sources –albeit a minority of them– that

<sup>7</sup> Neither Ibn Kathīr or al-Mas'ūdī actually affirms that they believe Paul was the third, but only quotes earlier traditions, such as Ibn Jurayj (d. 150 / 767), suggesting this as one possibility listed alongside others.

<sup>8</sup> El Kolli analyzes Juan's discussion of Q. 36:12-17 in her thesis (165-69). She also speculates that the text often cites Zamakhsharī together with Ibn 'Aṭīyya in order to avoid any criticism of the former's Mu'tazilite ideas by associating him with the respected ideas of the latter (345-6). Busic also cites Juan's discussion of the envoys to Antioch, arguing that Juan “finds an affirmation of his Christian faith in Islam” (108).



could have supported what Juan says about Paul as the third envoy, and given the relative accuracy of Juan's other citations and allusions in the text, we must assume that Juan deliberately distorted the key details about the envoys to support his point.

What is significant here is that, notwithstanding his duplicitous citations, Juan clearly believes that his claims about Paul constitute a cogent refutation of Muslim attacks. In arguing this, Juan attempts to carry on a tradition—familiar since the thirteenth century in Iberia—of claiming that the truth of Christianity is found within the sources of its polemical enemies. Such sources included not only the Torah but also the Qur'ān and the Talmud, as well as traditions of Muslim and Jewish exegesis. Yet even when we recognize Juan's use of the methodology of earlier polemics, his attention to Paul is still noteworthy. Earlier anti-Muslim polemicists—including Petrus Alfonsi (conv. 1106), Peter the Venerable (d. 1156), Riccoldo da Monte di Croce (d. 1320), as well as the *Contrarietas Alfolica*, the epistle of al-Kindī, or the Qur'ān translations of Robert of Ketton or Mark of Toledo—say nothing about this Qur'ān verse, the story of Habīb, or the possible allusions to Paul in the Qur'ān. Likewise, more contemporary anti-Muslim polemicists from the fifteenth century, who seem familiar with parts of the Qur'ān but not with Muslim exegesis or anti-Christian polemics—figures such as Alonso de Espina (d. ca. 1491), Juan de Torquemada (d. 1468), or Pedro de la Cavallería (d. ca. 1458)—invoke Paul only as a proof-text and do not address the Muslim literature on Paul.<sup>9</sup> As far as I can find, the *Confusión* seems unique among Western anti-Muslim polemics in asserting that Qur'ānic exegetes discuss Paul's ministry and represent Paul as a faithful follower of Jesus. Even though it is unique, it is not out of place in Juan's text. His exegesis of the story of Habīb the Carpenter forms a natural link with his own conversion narrative presented in the work's opening. Together, these two references,

<sup>9</sup> For example, Espina states in the *Fortalitium*: “Sunt enim sequentes Machometum illi de quibus prophetavit Paulus ‘a veritate quidem auditum avertent ad fabulas autem convertentur” (190). [“They are followers of Muḥammad those about whom Paul prophesied, ‘They will avert their hearing from truth but will be turned toward fables’”. 2 Tim 4:4]. I can find no claims of possible Qur'ānic allusions to Paul or any Christian apostles in Espina's *Fortalitium*, Cavallería's *Zelus Christi*, or Torquemada's *Contra Principales Errores*. On these sources, see Echevarría (28-55).

which frame the whole work, suggest that the figure of the Apostle Paul is a critical part of Juan's missionizing affirmation of Christianity and polemical refutation of Islam.

### **Confronting the Muslim Anti-Pauline Tradition in Iberia**

Through his presentation of Paul as both a model of conversion and a messenger sanctioned in Muslim Scripture and tradition, Juan is trying to engage with and refute a long tradition of Muslim anti-Pauline literature. Such a refutation seems vital to the success of his polemical attack. By offering his own voice as a "testigo de su nación", Juan must take care to avoid anything that would undermine either his authority as a source of information about Islam or his authenticity as a faithful Muslim witness. (This makes his distortions of Qur'anic exegesis all the more surprising.) He presents his own conversion story as a model for adopting Christianity, and since such stories are, in Christian tradition, unavoidably based on a Pauline paradigm drawn from the New Testament, Juan's argumentative authority and missionizing appeal to his Muslim reader are both tied closely to a Christian image of Paul. On the other hand, the figure of "Paul the Jew" had long served as a figure of derision in Islamic tradition, one who was responsible for *corrupting* the true message of Jesus rather than spreading it, and so Juan's entire text hinges on a vindication of Paul as a messenger of the true religion. Because Juan has vowed to prove his arguments on the basis of "auctoridades de su misma ley" rather than on texts held to be authoritative in Christian tradition only, Juan must effect his vindication of Paul on the basis of authentic material drawn from the Qur'an and traditional commentaries.

In order to understand the critical importance of this strategy, it is necessary to comprehend the nature of the Muslim condemnation of Paul. Because Jesus is, along with Abraham, Noah, and Moses, revered in Islam as a one of the most important prophets after Muḥammad himself, Muslims believe that Jesus and his early followers received and taught the true religion revealed by God. Paul, by contrast, is often charged with being the corrupter of that true message. He became a byword of the standard Muslim polemical argument



of what is known as *tahrīf*, or the falsification of earlier prophecy among Jews and Christians that necessitated the revelation to Muḥammad. Rather than believing Islam simply “completes” the prophecies given to Moses and Jesus by adding to them –as Christianity holds about the fulfillment of the Old Testament by the New– Muslims have traditionally stressed the prophecy of Muḥammad and the rise of Islam as a perfecting and supreme clarification of what had already been given, a setting right of all the true prophecy already disclosed to mankind through prophets like Moses and Jesus but corrupted beyond repair and recognition by Jewish and Christian tradition. In order to revere Jesus as one of the most blessed of prophets, Islamic tradition came to vilify Paul –and to a lesser degree Constantine– as the cause of falsification, the primary source of Christianity’s *tahrīf*.<sup>10</sup>

While the notion of falsification of Scripture is an old one and is not exclusive to Islam, Islamic *tahrīf* can be traced back to the Qur’ān itself. Nevertheless, Paul is not named directly there, and the doctrine of his role as corruptor of Christianity, which later became widespread, was explicitly articulated in stages over a few centuries after the death of Muḥammad. Within Islamic literature, among the earliest explicit Muslim treatments of Paul was that of Iraqi author Sayf ibn ‘Umar al-Tamīmī (d. late 2<sup>nd</sup>/8<sup>th</sup> century), who provides an extensive discussion of Paul in his *Book of Apostasy and Conquest* (*Kitāb al-riḍḍa wa-l-futūḥ*). This work, which was long thought to be lost but which has been recently recovered, contains the story of King Paul, a flagitious villain who persecutes the earliest Christians and chases them from their land.<sup>11</sup> This Paul then feigns his contrition and gives up his “kingship” in order to fake his conversion in a convincing way. By thus winning the trust of the Christians, he is then able to wheedle them into accepting a corrupt version of the true faith that they had received from Jesus. When one of Paul’s four “disciples”, nicknamed “the Believer”, rejects Paul’s teachings, the others (who later become founders of the Jacobite, Nestorian, and Melkite

<sup>10</sup> On *tahrīf* in Islam, see Wansbrough (41-43); Lazarus-Yafeh (19-35); and Gaudeul and Caspar.

<sup>11</sup> The lost text was discovered in 1991 by Qāsim al-Sāmarrā’ī in Riyāḍ and is now available in a printed edition. See also van Koningsveld (201-02); and Anthony.

churches, respectively) fight against him. Eventually a small group of faithful Christians, followers of “the Believer”, rejects his innovations and flees to the desert, where they and their descendants live as hermits until the coming of Islam (1:132-35).<sup>12</sup>

Although al-Tamīmī’s text is among the earliest known Muslim attacks on Paul as the corrupter of Christianity, one of the most substantial treatments of the theme was that of tenth-century writer ‘Abd al-Jabbār (d. 415/1025), from western Iran, who includes a lengthy refutation of Christianity in one section of his *Confirmation of the Proofs of Prophecy* (*Tathbīt dalā’il al-nubuwwa*) (*Critique* 90-1, 98-105). ‘Abd al-Jabbār’s representation of Paul partly resembles al-Tamīmī’s.<sup>13</sup> It was followed by numerous later writers such as Ibn al-Qayyim al-Jawziyya (d. 751/1350), Ibn Kathīr, Ibn Taymiyya (d. 728/1328), and, it seems, the Baghdadi Jewish writer Ibn Kammūna (d. 1284).<sup>14</sup> Despite ‘Abd al-Jabbār’s popularity in the East, however, al-Tamīmī’s text curiously become a more popular source in the West, having circulated in al-Andalus as early as the eleventh century when it was used by Cordovan Ibn Ḥazm (d. 456/1064) in his foundational work on comparative religion, *The Book of Opinions on Religions, Heresies, and Sects* (*Kitāb al-ḥiṣāl fī al-milal wa-l-ahwā’ wa-l-niḥāl*). Copying al-Tamīmī, Ibn Ḥazm speaks of the “cursed Paul” (“Būluṣ al-la’īn”, *Kitāb* 2:70, my translation; cf. *Abenḥāzem* 3:108) who was the tool of the Jews used to dupe the early Christians into believing in the divinity of Jesus and to trick them into giving up their dietary laws. As Ibn Ḥazm concludes, “A person of religion cannot judge this

<sup>12</sup> The original manuscript account (62a-64b, reproduced in volume two of al-Sammarā’i’s edition), is edited on pp. 132-35 of volume one. A translation can be found in Anthony (174-80).

<sup>13</sup> Both his and al-Tamīmī’s ideas share many characteristics with the older Jewish anti-Christian *Life of Jesus* (*Toledot Yeshu*) tradition, on which see Newman (60 n7). On the debate about ‘Abd al-Jabbār’s sources, see Reynolds (1-18).

<sup>14</sup> On the reception of ‘Abd al-Jabbār’s work, see Reynolds (76-80). Reynolds does not mention Ibn Kammūna, but the latter’s statements about Paul do seem indebted to ‘Abd al-Jabbār. In his Arabic work *Examination of the Three Faiths* (*Tanqīḥ al-abḥāth li-l-milal al-thalāth*), Ibn Kammūna states, “Changes in the stipulations of the Torah . . . are told of the Apostles, not of Jesus Christ, for he adhered to the stipulations of the Torah until the Jews seized him . . . Most of this [breaking the Law] goes back to the Apostle Paul” (*Sa’d* 54; *Ibn Kammūna’s* 82-83).



action at all lightly” (*Kitāb* 1:221, my translation; cf. *Abenházem* 2:387).<sup>15</sup>

It was through Ibn Ḥazm’s rendition that al-Tamīmī’s ideas came to provide the source for later Iberian Muslim polemics against Christianity, including the work of Tunisian writer Muḥammad al-Qaysī (early fourteenth century), who claims to have been a captive in Christian Iberia. As Koningsveld and Wiegers have shown, al-Qaysī’s anti-Christian Arabic polemic, *The Key of Religion and The Conflict Between Christians and Muslims* (*Miftāḥ al-dīn wa-l-mujādala bayna l-naṣārā wa-l-muslimīn*), is based directly on al-Tamīmī’s text, citing it by name (Ibn Ḥazm does not) and including details taken directly from it. Although this text survives in an unpublished manuscript (MS 1557) in the national Library in Algiers that van Koningsveld and Wiegers have called, on the basis of script and dating style, “a genuine Mudejar manuscript” (163), it embodies the Muslim representation of Paul that would have been most familiar to Juan Andrés and his Morisco readers and listeners. It circulated in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth century in an Aljamiado version attested in four manuscripts or manuscript fragments, most important among which is BNE manuscript 4944, which is “probably to be dated to the end of the fifteenth century” (186). In surveying Mudéjar and Morisco polemical literature, including the work in BNE 4944, Wiegers has concluded that such works were mainly produced “before the conversions of 1499-1525 and after the expulsion of 1609” (Wiegers, *Islamic* 185). It was precisely this literature from the end of the fifteenth century that Juan Andrés is forced to confront and refute in his own polemical work.<sup>16</sup>

References to Paul appear in scattered places in fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Aljamiado manuscripts, such as the amusing *aljofo*, or Morisco prophecy, that tells fellow Muslims to take heart because one fine day, “darás çebada a tu kaballo en-el-altar de Pedro i de Pablo, antes ke tornes a koronarte a Gostantinoble i ayas sojudgado la-faz de la-tiyerra de Levante a Poniyente” (L. Cardaillac 417; cf. 309). We can similarly see a certain

<sup>15</sup> On Ibn Ḥazm’s use of al-Tamīmī, see van Koningsveld (210-12); and Ljamai (102-03).

<sup>16</sup> The fullest treatment of the Morisco-Christian debate is Louis Cardaillac. For his discussion of al-Qaysī, see pp. 145-53. On BNE manuscript 4944, see also Wiegers (*Islamic*, 185).

anti-Pauline sentiment in the claims of the Morisco *Gospel of Barnabas*, in which Barnabas claims to have received his teaching directly from Jesus, not any later perverter of his word.<sup>17</sup> However, the untitled Aljamiado text copied in BNE manuscript 4944, sometimes referred to as the “Desputa de los Kristianos”, and, in a later section, “Deskonkordamiento de los Kristianos”, provides the most direct link between the early ideas of al-Tamīmī and the polemical ideas circulating among Iberian Muslims at the end of the fifteenth century.<sup>18</sup> The text is drawn mainly from al-Qaysī, who is mentioned later in the text as “sabidor de la meçkida de Azeytuna de Tüneç i fu.e kativo en Lérida” (D. Cardaillac 1: fols. 59r-v). Although the compiler of BNE manuscript 4944, one ‘Alī al-Gharīb, also claims to draw from an author named ‘Abd Allāh al-Asīr (“the captive”), a name also mentioned in al-Qaysī’s work in Arabic, the identity and work of the latter are uncertain.<sup>19</sup>

What is known without a doubt is that the Aljamiado text in manuscript 4944 begins with a direct reference to al-Tamīmī.<sup>20</sup> While much of the polemic in BNE 4944 covers standard themes of anti-Christian polemic –arguments against the Trinity, critique of Christian belief in the death and resurrection of Jesus, contradictions between the four Gospels, etc.– the opening text

<sup>17</sup> The prologue begins in the voice of “Barnaba, diçípulo de Jesús” who claims that “escrivo aquella verdad que yo he visto y oydo en la conversación que he tenido con Jesús”. At the same time, it claims, “muchos engañados de Satanás, debaxo de pretexto de piedad, predicán iniqua doctrina . . . entre los quales uno, Pablo, del qual hablo no sin grande dolor, porque es engañado” (Bernabé Pons 58).

<sup>18</sup> On manuscript 4944, see Denise Cardaillac (vol. 1); L. Cardaillac (149-50); Chejne (85-92); Wiegiers (*Islamic* 63-6, 185). Other manuscripts with parallel content include BNE 5302, RAH T 12, RAH V 7, and RAH V 6, on which see Koningsveld and Wiegiers (186-8); and D. Cardaillac (1:5-11).

<sup>19</sup> Al-Qaysī claims to have drawn in part from “Abdu llahi el-kâtivo, ke fu.e kativo en Françi.a” (2: 59<sup>v</sup>). While many scholars have proposed that this second figure might be the convert to Islam Anselm Turmeda (‘Abd Allāh al-Tarjumān, d. 1423)– Asín Palacios, Harvey, D. Cardaillac, L. Cardaillac, and Chejne have all made this suggestion (Chejne 85)–such a reading would be chronologically impossible, as Koningsveld and Wiegiers have pointed out (193). Moreover, Turmeda’s *Gift of the Lettered One in Refutation of the People of the Cross* (*Tuhfat al-adib fī al-radd ‘alā ahl al-ṣalīb*) from ca. 1420, does not blame Paul alone for Christian *tahrīf*, but puts him in a group with the gospel writers as the falsifiers of the truth (378; cf. 452).

<sup>20</sup> “Dize en-el-çinkeno libro de la-estori.a ke fizo Çayfu bnu ‘Umar a.nnabi” (2: 36<sup>v</sup>).



focuses most directly on the figure of Paul and his role as a main source of *Tahrīf*, summarizing al-Tamīmī's story of King Paul:

‘Īçā ibnu Maryam estuvo en-la-ti.erra santa ent.re los Judíos tanto komo el-K.ri.ador kiso...estaba en g.ran porfidya kon lo Judí.os, kastigando i ped. rikando kada dí.a. Así ke se levantó Pablos el Judí.o, i.-era rey allí en akella ora, i p.legó g.ran weste, i peleyó kon akellos k.reyentes i desbaratólos, i sakólos de toda la-ti.erra santa, d’akí.-a los pu.ertos. I no-los pudo matar a todos...Así ke él dexó su-reísmo, i fu.ese para ellos, i vesti.óse tales ropas komo ellos. (D. Cardailac 2: 36<sup>v</sup>-37<sup>r</sup>)

Paul then deceives the early Christian believers by pretending to convert, telling a false conversion story based on Acts 9:

“Yo, ke despu.és ke yo torné de çaga de vosotros, yo enkont.ré a ‘Īçā almaçih [Jesús el mesías], i tiróme la-vista, i.-el seso, i.-el entendimi.ento, i.-el oír. Asi ke yo no oía, ni veía, ni entendí.a. I depuu.és, tornéme, i dexóme sano así qomo era de p.rimero. I yo prometí a Di.os ke yo serí.a kon-vosotros, i ke k.reyería en-vu.est.ra k.riyençi.a. (2: 37<sup>v</sup>-38<sup>r</sup>)

After Paul dupes the Christians into believing in him, he proceeds to set himself up among them as a sort of hermit-sage in order to “avezarlos ía l-attawrati” (2: 38<sup>r</sup>), or “teach the Torah”. Through a series of faked revelations, he directs the Christians to change the direction toward which they prayed, to give up kosher food laws, and, most egregious and perverted, to believe that Jesus himself is God, proclaiming, “Yo digo k-este onb.re ‘Īçā, k-es Allah” (2: 40<sup>r</sup>).

Following al-Tamīmī's text closely, manuscript 4944 states that Paul convinced various followers (Ya'qūb, Naḫtur, and Malqún, the founders of the Jacobite, Nestorian, and Melkite churches) to believe his perversions, but one noble resister, called “Mūmin el K.reyente” rejects the new teachings, exclaiming that “este falso no-vino sino a engañarvos” (2: 40<sup>r-v</sup>). When Paul and his henchmen try to murder Mūmin el creyente, the latter then led a group of true believers to some remote desert caves in Syria, where they remained faithful until the coming of Muhammad and, the text tells us, “muri.eron muçlimes” (2: 42<sup>r</sup>). After this lengthy introductory narrative about the corrupting influence of Paul the King on the true message of Jesus,

the text enters into a critical description of Christian beliefs.

### **Juan's Apostle Paul as a Fusion of Tropes**

The intense discussion found in this Aljamiado polemic makes manifest how the debate over Paul's role in history was an active one at the end of the fifteenth century in Iberia, and we can see this understanding as representative of the anti-Pauline view at the time Juan composed his anti-Muslim *Confusión*. The arguments of BNE 4944's discussion of Paul can be summarized as follows: Paul was not a true apostle of Jesus but an enemy of the Jews; Paul was the source of Christianity's *tahrīf*, initiating the changes that led to the perversion of Jesus' message and the proliferation of competing Christian sects; Paul was a liar who faked his "conversion" experience and other revelations in order to deceive the early followers of Jesus. In addition, a number of other conclusions are implied: Jesus was already dead at the time Paul committed these falsifications, and thus Paul could not have been one of the true "believers" sent to Antioch, as claimed by some exegetes about Qur'ān 36:13-14; thus, Paul is not mentioned in the Qur'ān. He is not a model of conversion to Christianity but an enemy of God.

In light of these claims about Paul circulating in Iberia, explicitly or implicitly, in the anti-Muslim literature of the late fifteenth century, a careful reading of Juan's presentation of Paul suggests that it is directly tailored to combat such Muslim objections. Juan is, in other words, directly working to counter the sorts of claims about Paul—indeed, perhaps the very same claims—made in BNE 4944 and similar polemics. His presentation constitutes a subtle fusion of Christian and Muslim polemical tropes. On the one hand, Juan counters Muslim doubts about Paul by appealing to a familiar Muslim trope of valuing the "core truth" free of falsification and distortion. Paul is, according to the highest Muslim authority, akin to "Mūmin el creyente", one who stayed true to God's revelation and who led others to do so as well. As "Mūmin el creyente", in BNE 4944, goes to Syria to preserve the true faith, so Juan claims that Paul is the "third" send by God to strengthen the Apostles of Jesus against the unbelievers of Syrian Antioch. By showing that Paul is actually discussed in the Qur'ān and is one of the true followers of Jesus, one



who led Muslim martyrs like Habīb to die for the true faith, he shows that he is actually a figure at the heart of Islam, a symbol of unadulterated revelation and true belief.

On the other hand, Juan blends this Muslim trope of rejecting falsification with a Christian view of cosmic paradox. In this view, Paul is, in addition to being at the core of truth, also a model for its ironic reversal. As the last shall be first and the weak shall be strong, so Juan, by following Paul, was transformed from a Muslim into a Christian. We can thus read more into his claim within his dramatic conversion narrative that after “recebidas sacras órdenes y de alfaquí y esclauo de Lucifer hecho sacerdote y ministro de Cristo comencé, como sant Pablo, a repredicar y pregonar el contrario de lo que antes falsamente creya y afirmava” (Andrés 90). Not only does he use the word “esclauo” here, the same word Paul uses (*dolos*) when he speaks of being transformed from “slaves of sin” to “slaves of God” (Rom. 6.18-22) and when he refers to himself as “Paul, a Slave of Jesus Christ” (Rom. 1.1). Juan also specifically claims that to follow Paul is “to preach the opposite of what I falsely believed before”. Juan’s allusion to his former post as *faqīh*, inherited from his father, evokes again the image of Paul as “educated strictly according to our ancestral law” (Acts 22.3). Indeed, Paul’s extensive discussion of the law and its role in salvation after the resurrection of Jesus from the dead clearly stands in the background of Juan’s description of Christianity and Islam as holy and evil “laws”, respectively. Likewise, Juan’s sudden ministry, in which he “guided back...many souls” evokes the language in Acts 26.18 in which God sends Paul to preach to the unbelievers in order “to open their eyes so they might turn from darkness to light and from the power of Satan to God” (Acts 26.18). He equates Paul to be the model of a “return” to the core truth while Islam is the error that deviated from –or, in Juan’s mind, falsified– the true message.

Juan logically expects these arguments to provoke his Muslim reader. After citing his sources and concluding his argument about Paul, he addresses his reader directly, admitting as much:

Todo el sobredicho de la presente historia dize el testo y la glosa del *Alcorán*.  
Pues dime tú, moro, que tenes devoción deste capítulo, el qual capítulo es a

los moros así como el *Evangelio* de sanct Juan a los christianos, pues dime qué te parece de lo susodicho y declarado, la qual cosa nunca supistes, y cómo faze mención tu *Alcorán* de los apóstoles ser santos y de sant Pablo fazer lo que fizo...pues ¿Qué esperas, moro? Sino fezte christiano y entrarás donde entró aquel mártir [Habīb]. (216)

This appeal to his reader, made near the end of the *Confusión*, makes most sense when viewed as a direct response to the negative presentation of Paul in contemporary polemical literature in Arabic and Aljamiado. Even though sources like BNE 4944 vilify Paul as having faked his conversion and turned away from the core revelation, the tradition represented by such sources, in Juan's view, ironically itself turns away from the Qur'ān, where Paul is shown to be a faithful disciple and a true believer. The implication is that Juan's belief is sincere and rightly guided and his conversion, like Paul's, is authentic. Any conversion that follows his lead –and the rhetorical function of Juan's conversion narrative is, as I have argued, to establish Juan as an authentic “witness”– will enjoy the same status. By distorting his sources and fusing opposing polemical tropes, Juan is able to invoke an authentic Muslim tradition, albeit not a representative or mainstream one, to support his refutation of the late-medieval attack on Paul and to justify his own conversion.

Although it is hard to find any traces of the impact of Juan's arguments on his intended Muslim readers, about whom we know little, it is clear that such arguments were well received by later Christian writers, among whom Juan achieved a broad exposure. Juan's text was very widely disseminated, including at least four Castilian editions in the sixteenth century, plus at least fifteen subsequent editions in six different languages.<sup>21</sup> Through this spread, his innovative approach had a visible impact on subsequent anti-Muslim writing. It is known that bishop Martín García, who employed Juan in missionizing to Moriscos after the conquest of Granada, copied Juan's information about Muslim *tafsīr*. (Indeed, given their close connection and similarities, one wonders if García had a hand in composing Juan's

<sup>21</sup> On the publication history, see the edition of Ruíz García (1:53-56). On the popularity of Juan's text, see Wiegers (“Moriscos” 589-90); and Bobzin (*Der Koran* 79).



text.) He included many citations of al-Zamakhsharī and Ibn ‘Aṭīyah in his sermons, including their discussion of Qur’ān 36:12-13, the verse about the three envoys interpreted by Juan to be a reference to Paul (Ribera Florit, 15-17; Vernet, “Le *tafsīr*” 308-09; “Traducciones” 698-705).<sup>22</sup> In addition, Juan’s discussion of Paul in the story of Habīb the Carpenter was copied in 1532 by the Erasmist Bernardo Pérez de Chinchón, in sermon eleven of his polemical *Antialcorán*, a work reprinted in 1595.<sup>23</sup> Juan was also a source for Lope Obregón, who included the same references in his *Confutación del alcorán y secta mahometana* in 1555.<sup>24</sup> A similar influence can be found in the writing of Manuel Sanz, who repeats them again in 1698 in his *Tratado breve contra la secta mahometana*.<sup>25</sup>

Juan’s arguments, formulated in response to late-medieval Muslim polemics, proved to be an important source for Christian anti-Muslim propaganda in the early modern period, even into the eighteenth century. Italian translator

<sup>22</sup> Juan claims to have included his discussion in the Qur’ān translation given directly to García (*Confusión* 216), and García’s sermons seem to bear out this fact (Vernet, “Traducciones” 699-705). In sermon 30, García states, “Isti tres missi ad predicandum non solum fuerunt christiani sed discipuli et apostoli Jesu Christi. Nam ut dicit Abuatia fuerunt Petrus et Joannes evangelista filius zebedei: et tertius missus ad liberandum istos fuit apostolus Paulus: et ut dicit azamachxeri primi duo fuerunt Petrus et Matheus evangelista et tertius missus ad liberandum eos fuit apostolus Paulus. Et sic in Petro et Paulo omnes doctores agarenorum concordant”. [These three sent to preach [in Antioch] were not only Christians but disciples and apostles of Jesus Christ. As Ibn ‘Aṭīyya says they were Peter and John the Evangelist son of Zebedee and the third sent to free these was the apostle Paul. As Zamakhsharī says, the first two were Peter and Matthew the Evangelist and the third sent to free them was the Apostle Paul. Thus about Peter and Paul all Muslim doctors agree”] (74b-c). On García’s sermons, see Cirac Estopañán; Ribera Florit (xxx-xliii) and throughout; and Echevarría (67-68).

<sup>23</sup> He states that the Qur’ān tells how, “sant Pedro y sant Pablo y sant Matheo hizieron dos milagros en Antiochía . . . Y vuestra ley lo cuenta, sino leed la glosa de un doctor vuestro que se llama Azamahxeri, y la glosa de otro que se llama Buhatia” (192-93). See also El Kolli (168-69); and Drost (127).

<sup>24</sup> Obregón states: “. . . Y los glossadores del alcoran dizen que este ayudador fue sant Pablo . . . esta historia declaran Azamahxeri y Abuatia en su glosa del alcoran” (15a). El Kolli, in part 3 of her doctoral thesis, provides a detailed comparison of the *Confusión* with Lope Obregón’s text, focusing on their treatment of Mary (132-59), Jesus (160-94), the Gospels (195-208), Muḥammad (209-54), and the Qur’ān and Sunna. (254-335). See also Drost (129).

<sup>25</sup> Sanz states: “Conviene à saber como San Pablo y otros dos Discipulos de Christo (que segun Alzahaxeri y Buhathia glosadores del Alcoran fueron San Pedro y San Matheo) . . . sanaron un Leproso . . .” (21 n1).

of the Qurʾān, Ludovico Marracci, in his *Alcorani Textus Universus* (1698, partly reprinted under a new title in 1721 by Christian Reineccius in Leipzig), is more careful than Juan in identifying the Envoys sent to Antioch, noting, “quidam Expositores volunt fuisse Petrum et Joannem, quidem vero Petrum et Thomam” (Pars Secunda 75<sup>a</sup>) (“Some commentators claim it to have been Peter and John, others Peter and Thomas”). Nevertheless, in a note within the *Refutatio Alcorani* (the second part of the work containing the text and translation) Marracci includes a commentary attributed to “a certain Muslim author” citing Paul as one of the first Envoys (580b-581<sup>b</sup>, *ad* Sura 36). In 1734, English orientalist George Sale, who seems to share Marracci’s circumspection on this point, nevertheless refers directly to Juan’s *Confusión* (but says he had not seen his translation) in the preface to his influential translation of the Qurʾān into English (vi). Juan’s trail of influence continues even to the end of the eighteenth century, when in 1793, the Discalced Carmelite Manuel Traggia (de Santo Tomás de Aquino) drew heavily from the *Confusión* in his *Verdadero carácter de Mahoma y de su religion*. In 1794, he expanded the text to include even more material from Juan Andrés, including (in the new third section), the entire multi-page passage from the *Confusión* about Paul as one of Jesus’ Envoys to Antioch, which he copied verbatim (191-92). Through Traggia, whom Mikel de Epalza calls “el mayor y más importante islamólogo en lengua española de su época (siglos XVIII-XIX)” (219), the reach of Juan’s anti-Muslim polemic comes dangerously close to overlapping with the origins of modern Peninsular Arabic studies.<sup>26</sup>

This long tradition of testimonies –from al-Tamīmī and Ibn Ḥazm to al-Qaysī and the author of BNE 4944, and from these to the sharp ripostes of Juan Andrés and his early-modern followers– makes it clear that the role of Paul was an enduring issue in Muslim-Christian polemic and was taken up by late-medieval defenders of Christianity like Juan against the attacks of Mudéjar and Morisco polemicists. Comparison of these sources

<sup>26</sup> A recent article by Busic has also connected the *Confusión* with modern studies of Christian-Muslim relations. Rather than seeing Juan’s text as being connected to the rise of early Arabic studies in the eighteenth century, however, Busic argues that Juan embodies a “hybrid” position that problematizes current debates about the place of Iberia more generally in the debate over orientalism (109-10).



shows that Paul's importance –in a way that was not unlike the importance of the disbelieving Hermeneutical Jew within the Christian apologetic tradition– derived from his inevitable positioning on the precarious fault-lines of supersessionist history, fault-lines that continued to quake across the Mediterranean throughout the long sixteenth century.

### Works Cited

#### Primary Sources

- ‘Abd al-Jabbār. *Critique of Christian Origins*. Ed. and trans. Gabriel Said Reynolds and Samir Khalil Samir. Provo, UT: Brigham Young UP, 2010.
- Andrés, Juan. *Confusión o confutación de la secta mahomética y del Alcorán*. Ed. Elisa Ruiz García and María Isabel García-Monge. 2 vols. Mérida: Editorial Regional de Extremadura, 2003.
- Arberry, A. J., trans. *The Koran Interpreted*. New York: Touchstone, 1996.
- Bernabé Pons, Luis F. *El texto morisco del Evangelio de San Bernabé*. Granada: U of Granada, 1998.
- Cardaillac, Denise. “La polémique anti-chrétienne du manuscrit aljamiado No. 4944 de la Bibliothèque Nationale de Madrid”. 2 vols. Ph.D. Diss. U of Paul-Valéry Montpellier III, 1972.
- Cavalleria, Pedro de la. *Tractatus Zelus Christi contra Iudaeos, Sarracenos et Infideles*. Venice, 1592.
- Espina, Alonso de. *Fortalitium Fidei*. Nuremberg, 1494.
- García, Martín. *Sermones eminentissimi totiusque Barchinonensis gregis tutoris accerrimi*. Zaragoza: Jorge Coci, 1520.
- Ibn ‘Ādil. *al-Lubāb fi ‘ulūm al-kitāb*. 20 vols. Beirut: Dar al-Kutub, 1998.
- Ibn ‘Aṭīyah. *al-Muḥarrar al-wajīz fi tafsīr al-kitāb al-‘azīz*. 5 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyah, 1993.
- Ibn Ḥazm. *Abnehāzam de Córdoba y su historia crítica de las ideas religiosas*. Trans. Miguel Asín Palacios. 5 vols. Madrid: Tip. de la *Revista de archivos*, 1927-32.
- . *Kitāb al-ḥiṣāl fi al-milal wa-l-ahwā’ wa-l-niḥāl*. 5 vols. Cairo: al-Maṭba‘ah al-Adabiyah, 1899-1903.
- Ibn Kammūna. *Ibn Kammūna’s Examination of the Three Faiths. A Thirteenth-Century Essay in the Comparative Study of Religion*. Trans. Moshe Perlmann. Berkeley: U of California P, 1971.
- . *Sa’d b. Maṣṣūr Ibn Kammūna’s Examination of the Inquiries into the Three Faiths: A Thirteenth-Century Essay in Comparative Religion*. Ed. Moshe Perlmann. Berkeley: U of California P, 1967.
- Ibn Kathīr. *Tafsīr al-Qur’ān al-‘aẓīm*. 15 vols. Giza: Mu’assasat Qurṭubah, 2000.

- al-Khāzin al-Baghdādī. *Tafsīr al-Qurʾān al-jalīl al-musamma lubāb al-taʾwīl fīmaʾānī al-tanzīl*. 4 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Maʾrifah, ca. 1970.
- Marracci, Luodovico (Luigi). *Alcorani Textus Universus*. Padua, 1698.
- al-Masʾūdī, Abī al-Ḥasan ʿAlī al-Ḥusayn. *Murūj al-dhahab wa-maʾādin al-jawhar*. 2 vols. Cairo: al-Maṭabʾah al-Azhariyah, 1885-7.
- Muḥammad al-Qaysī. *Miftāḥ al-dīn wa-l-mujādala bayna l-naṣārā wa-l-muslimīn*. MS 1557. Bibliothèque nationale d'Algérie.
- Obregón, Lope de. *Confutación del Alcorán y secta mahometana, sacado de sus propios libros y dela vida del mesmo Mahoma*. Granada, 1555.
- Pérez de Chinchón, Bernardo. *Antialcorano. Diálogos christianos. Conversión y evangelización de Moriscos*. Ed. F. Pons Fuster. Alicante: U of Alicante, 2000.
- al-Qurṭubī. *al-Jāmiʿ li-ahkām al-Qurʾān*. 20 vols. Beirut: Dār Iḥiyāʾ al-Turāth al-ʿArabī, 1985.
- Reineccius, Christian. *Mohammedis Filii Abdallae Pseudo-Propetae Fides Islamitica i.e. Al-Coranus*. Leipzig, 1721.
- Sale, George, trans. *The Koran, Commonly Called the Alcoran of Mohammed*. London, 1734.
- Santo Tomás de Aquino, Manuel de. *Verdadero carácter de Mahoma y de su religion*. Valencia: Francisco Burguete, 1794.
- Sanz, Manuel. *Tratado breve contra la secta mahometana*. Seville, 1693.
- al-Suyūṭī. *al-Durr al-manthūr fī al-tafsīr al-maʾthūr*. 8 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1983.
- al-Ṭabarī. *The History of al-Ṭabarī. Volume IV. The Ancient Kingdoms*. Trans. Moshe Perlmann. Albany: SUNY, 1987.
- . *Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī. Jamiʿ al-bayān ʿan taʾwīl āy al-Qurʾān*. 7 vols. Damascus: Dār al-Qalam, 1997.
- . *Tarikh al-rusul wa-l-mulūk=Annales quos scripsit Abu Džafar Mohammed ibn Djarir at-Tabari*. Ed. M. J. de Goeje. 15 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1879-1901.
- al-Tamīmī, Sayf ibn ʿUmar. *Kitāb al-riddah wa-l-futūḥ wa-kitāb al-jamal wa-masīr ʿĀishah wa-ʿAlī*. Ed. Qāsim Sāmarrāʾī. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Torquemada, Juan de. *Contra Principales Errores Perfidi Machometi*. Rome, 1606.
- Turmeda, Anselm / ʿAbdallāh al-Tarjumān. *Fray Anselm Turmeda (ʿAbdallāh al-Tarjumān) y su polémica islamo-cristiana*. Ed. and trans. Mikel de Epalza. Madrid: Hiperión, 1994.
- al-Zamakhsharī. *al-Kashshāf ʿan ḥaqāʾiq al-tanzīl wa-ʿuyūn al-aqāwīl fī wujūh al-taʾwīl*. 4 vols. Cairo: Mustafa al-Babi al-Halabi, 1966-8.

### Secondary Sources

- Anthony, Sean W. "The Composition of Sayf b. ʿUmar's Account of King Paul and His Corruption of Ancient



- Christianity". *Der Islam* 85 (2010): 164-202.
- Bobzin, Hartmut. "Bemerkungen zu Juan Andrés und zu seinem Buch *Confusion de la secta mahomatica* (Valencia 1515)". *Festgabe für Hans-Rudolf Singer zum 65. Geburtstag am 6. April 1990*. Ed. Martin Forstner. Vol. 2. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1991. 529-48.
- . *Der Koran im Zeitalter der Reformation. Studien zur Frühgeschichte der Arabistik und Islamkunde in Europa*. Beirut: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1995.
- Bunes Ibarra, Miguel Ángel de. "El enfrentamiento con el Islam en el Siglo de Oro: Los antialcoranes". *Edad de Oro* 8 (1989): 41-58.
- Busic, Jason. "Polemica and Hybridity in Early Modern Spain: Juan Andrés's *Confusión o confutación de la secta Mahomética y del Alcorán*". *Journal of Early Modern Cultural Studies* 12.1 (2012): 85-110.
- Busse, Heribert. "Antioch and its Prophet Habib al-Najjār". *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 24 (2000): 155-179.
- Cantarino, Vicente. "From Spoken to Written Language and Back: Some Cultural Considerations on Hispano-Arabic Phonetics". In *Perspectives on Arabic Linguistics VI*. Ed. Mushira Eid, Vicente Cantarino, and Keith Walters. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1994. 25-36.
- Cardaillac, Louis. *Moriscos y cristianos: un enfrentamiento polémico, 1492-1640*. Trans. M. García-Arenal. Madrid: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2004.
- Chejne, Anwar G. *Islam and the West: The Moriscos, a Cultural and Social History*. Albany: SUNY, 1983.
- Cirac Estopañán, Sebastián. *Los sermons de Don Martín García, Obispo de Barcelona, sobre los reyes católicos*. Zaragoza: La Académica, 1956.
- Drost, G.W. "De Moriscos in de publicaties van Staat en Kerk (1492-1609). Een bijdrage tot het historisch discriminatieonderzoek". Ph.D. Dis., Leiden U, 1984.
- Echevarría, Ana. *The Fortress of Faith. The Attitude towards Muslims in Fifteenth Century Spain*. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- El-Kolli (Cancel), Jeanne. "La polémique islamo-chrétienne en Espagne (1492-1640) à travers des réfutations de l'Islam de Juan Andrés et Lope Obregón". Ph.D. Diss., U of Paul-Valéry Montpellier III, 1983.
- Epalza, Mikel de. "Guerras y paces hispano-turcas. Algunas repercusiones teológicas en al obra de Manuel Traggia (fines del siglo XVIII)". *Anuario de Historia de la Iglesia* 16 (2007): 217-28.
- Epalza, Mikel de, Josep V. Forcadell, and Joan M. Perujo. *El Corán y sus traducciones: Propuestas*. Alicante: U of Alicante, 2008.
- Esbroeck, M. van. "La légende des apôtres Pierre, Jean et Paul à Antioche". *Oriens Christianus* 78 (1994): 64-85.
- Gaudeul, Jean-Marie, and Robert Caspar. "Textes de la tradition musulmane

- concernant le taḥrīf (falsification) des écritures”. *Islamochristiana* 6 (1980): 61-104.
- Koningsveld, P. S. van. “The Islamic Image of Paul and the Origin of the Gospel of Barnabas”. *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 20 (1996): 200-228.
- Koningsveld, P. S. van, and G. A. Wiegers. “The Polemical Works of Muḥammad al-Qaysī (fl. 1309) and Their Circulation in Arabic and Aljamiado Among the Mudejars in the Fourteenth Century”. *Al-Qanṭara* 15.1 (1994): 163-199.
- Larson, Everette. “A Study of the ‘Confusión de la secta mahomática’ of Juan Andrés”. Ph.D. Diss., Catholic U of America, 1984.
- Lazarus-Yafeh, Hava. *Intertwined Worlds. Medieval Islam and Bible Criticism*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1992.
- Légasse, Simon. “La légende juive des apôtres et les rapports judéo-chrétiens dans le moyen âge occidental”. *Year-book. Ecumenical Institute for Advanced Theological Studies*. (1974/5): 121-39.
- Ljamai, Abdelilah. *Ibn Hazm et la polémique islamo-chrétienne dans l’histoire de l’islam*. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- López-Morillas, Consuelo. *El Corán de Toledo. Edición y estudio del manuscrito 235 de la Biblioteca de Castilla-La Mancha*. Gijón: Trea, 2011.
- . “The Genealogy of the Spanish Qur’ān”. *Journal of Islamic Studies* 17:3 (2006): 255-94.
- Magnier, Grace. *Pedro de Valencia and the Catholic Apologists of the Expulsion of the Moriscos. Visions of Christianity and Kingship*. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Marín López, Rafael. *El cabildo de la catedral de Granada en el siglo XVI*. Granada: U de Granada, 1998.
- Newman, Hillel I. “The Death of Jesus in the Toledot Yeshu Literature”. *Journal of Theological Studies* NS 50.1 (1999): 59-79.
- Reynolds, Gabriel Said. *A Muslim Theologian in the Sectarian Milieu. ‘Abd al-Jabbār and the Critique of Christian Origins*. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Ribera Florit, José. “La polémica cristiano-musulmana en los sermons del maestro inquisidor Don Martín García”. Licentiate thesis, U of Barcelona, 1967.
- Szpiech, Ryan. *Conversion and Narrative: Reading and Religious Authority in Medieval Polemic*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2013.
- Vajda, George. “Ḥabibal-Nadīdjār”. *Encyclopedia of Islam*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. 3:12-13.
- Vernet, Juan. “La exégesis musulmana tradicional en los coranes aljamiados”. *Actas del coloquio internacional sobre literatura aljamiada y morisca (Oviedo, 1972)*. Madrid: Gredos, 1978. 123-45. Rpt. in *De ‘Abd al-Raḥmān I a Isabel II*. Barcelona: Instituto “Millás Vallicrosa” de la Historia de la Ciencia Árabe, 1989. 61-83.
- . “Le tafsīr au service de la polémique



- antimusulmanne”. *Studia Islamica* 32 (1970): 305-309. Rpt. in *De ‘Abd al-Rahmān I a Isabel II*. Barcelona: Instituto “Millás Vallicrosa” de la Historia de la Ciencia Árabe, 1989. 55-59.
- . “Traducciones moriscas de *El Corán*”. In *Der Orient in der Forschung. Festschrift für Otto Spies zum 5. April 1966*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1967, 686-705. Rpt. in *De ‘Abd al-Rahmān I a Isabel II*. Barcelona: Instituto “Millás Vallicrosa” de la Historia de la Ciencia Árabe, 1989. 35-54.
- Wansbrough, John. *The Sectarian Milieu. Content and Composition on Islamic Salvation History*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1978.
- Wheeler, Brannon M. *Prophets in the Quran. An Introduction to the Quran and Muslim Exegesis*. New York: Continuum, 2002.
- Wieggers, Gerard. *Islamic Literature in Spanish and Aljamiado: Yça of Segovia (fl. 1450), His Antecedents & Successors*. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- . “Moriscos and Arabic Studies in Europe”. *Al-Qanṭara* 31.2 (2010): 587-610.
- . Rev. of *Confusión o confutación de la secta Mahomética y del Alcorán*, Ed. by Elisa Ruiz García and María Isabel García-Monge. *Aljamía* 16 (2004): 254-60.
- Yacine Bahri, Raja. “Présentation critique de l’oeuvre de Mossen Juan Andrés intitulée Confusión y disputa de la secta mahomética y del Alcorán (Biblioteca Britania 6, 11724)”. *Famille morisque: femmes et enfants = Familia morisca: mujeres y niños. Actes du VIIe Symposium International d’Études Morisques (Zaghouan)*. Ed. A. Temimi. Zaghouan: Fondation Temimi pour la recherche scientifique et l’information, 1997. 314-32.

