Some years ago, I published *Hebrew Scholasticism in the Fifteenth Century*.\(^1\) The book’s very title was the first suggestion of the existence of a previously unnoticed historical phenomenon: a sort of Scholasticism in late medieval Jewish philosophy and thought, which was very similar, sometimes identical, and in any case parallel to contemporary Latin Scholasticism, that is to say, late medieval Christian philosophy and thought as expressed by many authors of the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries in western and central Europe. Other scholars, including Giuseppe Sermoneta, Shlomo Pines, Jean-Pierre Rothschild, Warren Zev Harvey, Yossef Schwartz, Tamar Rudavsky, Hava Tirosh-Samuelson, Ruth Glasner, Ari Ackerman, and Caterina Rigo, had studied aspects of this phenomenon in a number of articles,\(^2\) but there had never been an attempt to offer a general historical overview of it.

In fact, two different enterprises can be distinguished within this phenomenon: “Hebrew Scholasticism” and “Jewish Scholasticism.” We can speak of *Hebrew Scholasticism* when Jewish authors simply continued Latin Scholastic discussions in Hebrew, with no input from their own culture. They merely reproduced the structure and the concepts of their Latin colleagues, directly (and sometimes even openly) employing their works as sources. They merely exchanged the Latin for their own cultural language,

---


\(^2\) For a historical overview, based mainly on the contents of these works, see ibid., pp. 1–31. To the list one should add some more recent works, such as those by Monica Olalla Sanchez (Universidad de Granada): see, e.g., her “Estructuras argumentativas en el discurso científico: la Escolástica y la medicina hebrea del s. XIV,” *Miscelánea de estudios árabes y hebraicos. Sección de hebreo* 54 (2005): 77–96.
Hebrew. In so doing, they created a new language, a sort of “Scholastic-philosophical medieval Hebrew” that was full of Latin philosophical terms, translated more or less adequately into Hebrew and “adapted” for Jewish readers. I applied the term “Hebrew Scholasticism” to all the instances examined in my book and therefore used it as the title. By contrast, it seems preferable to speak of Jewish Scholasticism when the Jewish philosophers did not just translate and adapt the contents of Latin Scholastic philosophical texts and diffuse them among their coreligionists, but reacted to the Christian religious doctrines they expounded. In the latter case, they went beyond following Scholastic models in Hebrew and created a truly Jewish Scholasticism, which was sometimes anti-Latin and a reaction to certain aspects of contemporary Christian philosophy and theology. The difference between “Hebrew Scholasticism” and “Jewish Scholasticism” is that the former includes only general, philosophical discussions with no bearing on Judaism (except the use of Hebrew), whereas the latter applies philosophical tools derived from Latin Scholasticism to the rationalist examination of issues of Jewish faith and is thus a continuation of earlier Jewish philosophy.

Jewish Scholasticism as a historical phenomenon existed in the Aragonese domain (including Catalonia) between 1350 and 1492. There are some indications that, in the period 1350–1410, the Aragonese Jewish philosopher Hasdai Crescas, and probably also his teacher, Nissim of Gerona, were in contact with Christian scholars. (Crescas, in particular, may have interacted with the Christian author Bernat Metge while both of them were employed at the royal court of Aragon.3) Moreover, the fact that Crescas wrote a polemic against some aspects of Christian theology (the Refutation of Christian Dogmas) shows that he was acquainted with Christian theological doctrines in general, although he did not indicate his sources explicitly.4 Something similar seems to have been the case with another, almost unknown Jewish philosopher, David of Roca Martina, who may have been Crescas’ contemporary and countryman.5 Whereas neither of them


5 About David of Roca Martina, see his The Innocence of Adam (Zakkut ʿAdam) (published in the second part of Hoveretyein Levanon [Paris: Y. Brill, 1886]); the existence and importance of this treatise for Jewish Scholasticism were pointed out to me by Gad Freudenthal. On