in the *Tractatus* and the ClS that Riccoldo adapted from Martí's *De seta Machometi*. The motif occurs in the context of the splitting of the moon (sura 54:1), when both parts of the moon enter the sleeves of the Prophet.[9] It is not found in the *Liber denudationis*, a main source of ClS[10] that can be securely dated to 1300–1301,[11] nor in other known works of Riccoldo, even if they refer to the splitting.[12] Thus, the use of *De seta Machometi* suggests that the *Tractatus* was most likely written between 1300 and 1301.

STRUCTURE AND METHODS OF ARGUMENTATION

In the *Tractatus*, Riccoldo attempts to refute the prophethood of Muhammad by drawing on various sources, including not only the Western Christian polemics but also sources from the Islamic tradition in addition to the Qur'an. These include the Ḥadīth collections (Arabic *ḥādīṯ* – "report, narrative"; pl. *aḥādīṯ*), a biography of the Prophet (Arabic *sīra*) and exegetical commentaries on the Qur'an (Arabic *tafsīr*). However, these Islamic sources cannot simply be used as evidence or as a basis for argumentation without modifying the general approach and without being appropriately accommodated to the system of authorities (*auctoritates*) of Latin Christendom. The Dominican Ramon Martí (d. between 1285 and 1290) successfully incorporated Islamic sources into the argumentation of his work *De seta Machometi*[13] (written in the 1250s, probably before 1257),[14] which is why he can be considered Riccoldo's direct predecessor.[15] Riccoldo adapted and reworked Martí's treatise, which thus became the

9 *Tractatus* (ed. Pachurka 2016), p. 16, ll. 172f.: "una pars [lunae] intravit per unam manicam ipsius et alia per aliam". ClS (ed. Mérigoux 1986), ch. 4, p. 78, ll. 61ff.: "et cum sic fracta esset luna, uenit et intrauit in manicam camisie Machometi et ipse integrauit eam."

10 Cf. Burman 1994, pp. 225ff. and ch. 9.11, pp. 318ff. Burman provides an edition of the *Liber denudationis* (1994, pp. 240–384).

11 Cf. Panella 1986, pp. xxvff.; 1988, pp. 10ff.; Schiel 2011, p. 128; *Tractatus* (ed. Pachurka 2016), p. xvi.

12 Cf. *Tractatus* (ed. Pachurka 2016), p. 93, comm. 172f. Cf. Riccold de Monte Croce, *Pérégrination en Terre Sainte et au Proche Orient*, ed. Kappler 1997, pp. 180ff., according to whom the text refers to the splitting of the moon.

13 There are two editions of *De seta Machometi*: Hernando Delgado 1983; ed. Lavajo 1988, vol. 3, pp. 900–1027.

14 Cf. Tolan 2002, p. 236; Wiersma 2005, p. 15; 2015, p. 73.

15 Cf. Szpiech 2012, p. 176: "Although Martini implicitly characterizes Islamic sources as *auctoritates* in the *Explanatio*, this characterization becomes explicit in the *De Seta*. [...] This characterization is significant because in his later works he does not hesitate to designate his non-Christian sources as *auctoritates*."

main source and the textual *Vorlage* of the *Tractatus*, as Riccoldo retained about 90% of Martí's content.

Like *De seta*, the *Tractatus* can be subdivided into four major parts, which are shown in the table below. The first part describes in turn the four signs of a "true prophet", each of which has its own subsection.[16] The fourth sign about prophets as lawmakers additionally designates each law with its own heading.

I. Fructus seu signa, ex quibus cognosci potest propheta verus a falso, sunt quattuor.
- 1. Primum signum est, quod sit verax.
- 2. Secundum [...] quod sit virtuosus et sanctus, non malus et facinorosus.
- 3. Tertium signum est, quod faciat miracula.
- 4. Quartum signum est, quod legem afferat vel doceat sanctam inducentem populum ad Dei cultum et sanctitatem vitae et caritatem et pacem
  - a) Super matrimonio et mulieribus
  - b) Lex super repudio
  - c) Lex cognoscendi mulieres
  - d) Lex super conductione mulierum
  - e) Lex de effusione seminis extra vas debitum
  - f) Lex de modo comedendi
  - g) Lex super rapinis
  - h) Lex super transgressione iuramenti
  - i) Lex contra illud "non concupisces"
  - j) Lex super peccato sodomitico

II. Nunc agendum est contra Saracenos super eo, quod dicunt libros Veteris et Novi Testamenti esse corruptos et immutatos.

III. De secta Saracenorum et quando ortum habuit.

IV. De infelicitate et vili morte Mahometi.

16 The four signs are the reason why *De seta Machometi* is preserved under the name *Quadruplex reprobatio* (*Fourfold refutation*). Cf. ed. Hernando Delgado 1983, p. 9; ed. Lavajo 1988, vol. 3, pp. 871ff.; Daniel 2009, pp. 31 and 416. For a detailed discussion of the title, cf. Hernando Delgado 1991, pp. 98ff. and Wiersma 2015, pp. 73ff.

I. There are four signs by which one can distinguish a true prophet from a false prophet.
1. First sign: that the Prophet is truthful.
2. Second sign: that the Prophet is virtuous and holy, not evil and villainous.
3. Third sign: that the Prophet works miracles.
4. Fourth sign: that the Prophet makes and teaches a holy law to lead the people to worship God and to live holy lives, and to charity and peace.
a) About Matrimony and Women
b) Law about Repudiation
c) Law about Sexual Intercourse with Women
d) Law about Polygamy
e) Law about the Emission of Semen outside the Permitted Body Orifice
f) Law about Table Manners
g) Law about Raids
h) Law about the Transgression of Oaths
i) Law against "Thou shalt not covet"
j) Law about Sodomy

II. Defence against the Muslim's Objection of Forgery concerning the books of the Old and New Testaments.

III. The Sect of the Saracens and its Beginning.

IV. The Infelicity and Vile Death of Muhammad.

A comparison between Riccoldo's *Tractatus* and Martí's *De seta* shows that the former author altered the order of the text: his examination of the Prophet's death is placed at the end of the treatise, while *De seta* treats Muhammad's death right after the fourth sign and the numerous *leges*.[17] Riccoldo uses this modification to connect the defence against the Muslim objection of *taḥrīf* (i.e., the corruption of the sacred texts by Jews and Christians) with the biography of Muhammad. Consequently, any attack

17 Cf. *Tractatus* (ed. Pachurka 2016), p. xxviii, n. 99, and p. 112, comm. 276ff.; *De seta* (ed. Hernando Delgado 1983), pp. 50ff.; *De seta* (ed. Lavajo 1988), vol. 3, pp. 980ff. Cf. ed. Lavajo 1988, vol. 2, p. 690. Only the text of *De seta* in the manuscript of the Archivio Generale dell'Ordine dei Predicatori (AGOP), Rome, ms. XIV.28b, 200v–222r, shares this order with the *Tractatus*, but shows no changes made by Riccoldo.

on Muhammad that discredits him and his status as a prophet becomes an argument not only against Muslim objections and Islam itself, but also for the truthfulness of Christianity. The unholiness and human nature of Muhammad himself emphasize that the Christian Bible is textually uncorrupted, which is asserted in the conclusion of the analysis of sura 61:6 in the *Tractatus*:

> Et ex hiis patet, quod Mahometus nullo modo potest dici Paraclitus, cum non fuerit datus Apostolis. Inter eos enim et ipsum fuerunt anni 500 et ultra. Nec fuit consolator, sed potius desolator, nec fuit Spiritus Sanctus, qui videri non potest, sed corporalis fuit et visibilis et miserabilis, sicut patebit in hiis, quae inferius annotantur de ortu et fine eius.[18]

> From this it becomes obvious that Muhammad cannot be called a paraclete at all because he was not given to the apostles. In fact, 500 years and more lay between them and him. And he did not give consolation, but rather desolation, and he was not the invisible Holy Spirit, but corporeal and visible and miserable, as is evident from the following notes about his birth and death.

Riccoldo also modifies the general method of argumentation that he knew from his confreres. His contemporaries, especially *confratres* Ramon Martí and Thomas Aquinas, developed methods to encounter Islam. In his work *De rationibus fidei* (written after 1265 and after the completion of the *Summa contra Gentiles*),[19] Aquinas defines a method of argumentation against Islam based on reason alone, because the Muslim counterpart does not accept Christian authorities and "because it is in vain to use authorities against the ones who don't accept the authority."[20] Moreover, Aquinas explains that reason cannot prove the truthfulness of the Christian faith because its truthfulness exceeds reason. Vice versa, the truthfulness of faith cannot be refuted

18 *Tractatus* (ed. Pachurka 2016), p. 38, ll. 453ff. For Muhammad as paraclete, cf. Daniel 2009, pp. 73f. and 364, n. 18; Glei 2009/2010, pp. 106ff.; *Tractatus* (ed. Pachurka 2016), p. 133, comm. 442–457. Riccoldo also deals with sura 61:6 in ClS (ed. Mérigoux 1986), ch. 1, p. 67f., ll. 93ff., and ch. 3, p. 71, ll. 22ff., and in the *Liber peregrinationis* (ed. Kappler 1997), p. 188. Again, in his third letter, cf. Röhricht 1884, *Epistola III*, p. 282. The edition of the *Epistolae* by Röhricht is deficient, as shown by Panella 1989, pp. 23ff.; and Bauer 2016, p. 370, n. 1;. In 2021, Bauer published a new edition with a translation into German and a commentary, cf. Ricoldus de Monte Crucis. *Epistole ad Ecclesiam Triumphantem*, *Epistola III*, p. 130.

19 Cf. Thomas von Aquin, *De rationibus fidei*, ed. and trans. Ludwig Hagemann & Reinhold Glei 1987, pp. 16ff.; Roth 2017, pp. 172ff.

20 Translated from *De rationibus fidei* (ed. Hagemann & Glei 1987), ch. 1, p. 62. Cf. Tolan 2002, p. 244.

by reason.[21] It can be assumed that Riccoldo and Martí knew this work. However, Aquinas' method ignores that the Muslims partially accept the Bible, especially the parts that confirm the truthfulness of the Qur'an. On this basis, Christian *auctoritates* can be used to some extent after all,[22] as is demonstrated in the works of Riccoldo and Ramon Martí.

Although his works were composed at an earlier date, Ramon Martí's method, which he applies in the *Explanatio simboli Apostolorum*[23] (*c.* 1257) and in *De seta*, can be seen as complementary to Aquinas' approach.[24] Martí's method of argumentation draws on both *ratio* and *auctoritas*. He knows how to incorporate an authority into the argumentation. But how can his approach be based on authority when the Muslim counterpart, for example, does not accept Christian scripture? How can Islam be effectively combated in this way? Martí's answer is to treat Muslim sources as authorities, which enables him to prove the veracity of Christian authorities by transferring the Qur'an's claim of truth to the Bible.[25] On the one hand, this methodological approach makes it possible to maintain the general framework of the scholastic strategy. On the other hand, the Muslim counterpart must now accept the Christian authorities and the evidence coming from them. Ramon Martí thus acts as an intellectual pioneer among the Dominicans in the 13th century, for a remarkable shift takes place in the treatment of non-Christian sources as authorities that can also function as valid proof texts.[26] Overall, his strategy relies on three types of evidence: Christian authorities, non-Christian authorities and reason. *Prima facie*, the method seems to be well founded and to work effectively. The problem, however, is that the polemicists do not comprehensively reflect on their use of non-Christian authorities, but simply use them without discussing them in detail. Even if the polemicists focus on only a few sources, their assessment of whether a Muslim source is relevant to Islamic theology and there-

21 Cf. *De rationibus fidei* (ed. Hagemann & Glei 1987), ch. 2, p. 64; Tolan 2002, pp. 241ff.; Wiersma 2015, p. 22; Roth 2017, p. 175. Aquinas develops his method primarily in his *Summa contra Gentiles*, as the studies just mentioned show.

22 Cf. ed. Hagemann &Glei 1987, p. 144, n. 15.

23 Edited by Joseph M. March (1908). Cf. Wiersma 2015, p. 70.

24 Cf. Roth 2017, p. 174, who points out that Thomas Aquinas is well aware Martí's works but neglects them.

25 Cf. *Tractatus* (ed. Pachurka 2016), p. 53f.; Roth 2017, p. 181.

26 Cf. Szpiech 2013, p. 122 also p. 125: "In his *On the Sect*, although he [Martí] harshly attacks Muhammad and Islam as mendacious, he still cites the Qur'ān as an *auctoritas* [my italics]." Cf. Szpiech 2012, p. 176; Daniel 2009, pp. 68ff.: "[T]he Qur'ān must be judged by the standards applied to Scripture. [...] Much of Martí's argument pursued this parallel between Scripture and Qur'án; whatever could be used to argue the validity of the latter proved equally that of the former."

fore suitable for refutation is prone to error. In general, their use of sources thus echoes the polemical discourse of the time.

Riccoldo, who despite his experience *in Oriente* is no exception to this problem, is familiar with both Aquinas' and Martí's works. He generally adopts Martí's method in the ClS[27] and *Tractatus*,[28] but is able to expand it by redefining and reevaluating the sources. For example, Riccoldo deletes almost all references to Muslim philosophers from the text. Philosophers interfere with the strategy of refutation because they may be revered figures but have no (religious) authority in the debate. The following example is taken from the discussion of the third sign of a true prophet, the working of miracles:

De seta:

> Propter quod dicit Abenrost philosophus: *Res que facit ad hoc, ut ille qui dicit se esse Prophetam credatur esse uerax, est quod ueniat cum miraculo, quod non possit hoc facere per se, inquantum homo*.[29]
>
> That is why the philosopher Abenrost says: The condition is that the one who calls himself a prophet and wants to be believed as true, brings a miracle. He, a simple man, cannot do that.

Tractatus:

> [N]on ostendit se a Deo missum, quia miracula non potest operari homo in quantum homo.[30]
>
> He cannot prove that he is sent by God because he cannot perform miracles as a simple man.

It is apparent that Riccoldo retains the argument but removes the reference to Abenrost (Averroes/Ibn Rušd). Riccoldo's adaptation eliminates all sources that Muslims could use against his argument. Thus, the Muslims cannot raise the objection that an argument comes only from a philosopher or polemical source, not from a recognized

27 Cf. Tolan 2002, p. 252.
28 Cf. *Tractatus* (ed. Pachurka 2016), p. 54, comm. 8/12. Cf. Daniel 2009, p. 284.
29 *De seta* (ed. Lavajo 1988), vol. 3, p. 906. Cf. *De seta* (ed. Hernando Delgado 1983), p. 16.
30 *Tractatus* (ed. Pachurka 2016), p. 4, ll. 28f.

authority. Also, the word *philosophus* does not appear in the *Tractatus*, but is either replaced, for example, by *astrologus*, or omitted altogether.[31] There are only two exceptions, the first of which is found in the discussion of the splitting of the moon:

De seta:

> Et hunc sensum approbat et confirmat Caali, glosator Alcorani super predictum locum. Hoc eciam euidenter reprobat Aliquidius duplici ratione: Una racio est ... [32]
>
> And the Qur'an commentator Caali approves and confirms this view of the aforementioned passage. With a twofold rational argument, Aliquidius also apparently rejects the Qur'an text: One argument reads ...

Tractatus:

> Et hunc sensum approbat et confirmat Taali glossator Alchorani super praedictum locum. Hoc etiam irrationabile valde est ...[33]
>
> And the Qur'an commentator Taali approves and confirms this opinion of the aforementioned passage. This is also very irrational ...

It can be seen that Riccoldo removed *Aliquidius* but maintained the commentator *Caali/Taali*. Based on the forms of the name,[34] it seems likely that the scholar al-Ṯa'labī (d. 1035) may be meant. Al-Ṯa'labī is famous for his voluminous exegetical commentary on the Qur'an,[35] in which he confirms that the splitting is an event that will occur in the future, possibly—but not exclusively—on the Day of Judgement.[36] Since al-Ṯa'labī is neither a philosophical nor a polemical source, the reference to his commentary does not weaken the reasoning but rather supports it.

The second exception contains a crux and a lacuna on a philological level:

31 Cf. *Tractatus* (ed. Pachurka 2016), p. 16, l. 182.

32 *De seta* (ed. Lavajo 1988), vol. 3, pp. 958ff. Cf. *De seta* (ed. Hernando Delgado 1983), p. 40.

33 *Tractatus* (ed. Pachurka 2016), p. 16, ll. 180ff.

34 Cf. the additional forms in the critical apparatus of *De seta* (ed. Lavajo 1988), vol. 3, p. 960: *Cali* and *Cahali*.

35 Cf. Rippin 2000, p. 434.

36 Cf. *Tractatus* (ed. Pachurka 2016), p. 93, comm. 180f. Cf. Aṭ-Ṯa'labī, *al-Kašf wa-'l-bayān fī tafsīr al-Qur'ān al-ma'rūf bi-Tafsīr aṭ- Ṯa'labī*, ed. Saiyid Kisrawī Ḥasan 2004, vol. 2, pp. 31ff.

Tractatus:

> Quorum quidam, sicut dicit Aliquidius, intraverunt legem eius †tres [...].[37]
>
> Some of them, as Aliquidius says, obeyed his law [...].

The reference to *Aliquidius* most probably refers to the author of the well-known and influential *Epistula al-Kindī*.[38] The word *tres* does not appear in the text of *De seta*.[39] Since the *Epistula al-Kindī* points to three reasons why people followed Muhammad, one could assume that the lacuna is the result of defective tradition.[40] Perhaps it is a mistake by Riccoldo who unintentionally retained the name of the source, but in any case the exception confirms the rule. Riccoldo's method of adaptation has the effect of keeping in his text predominantly sacred authorities—Christian and Muslim. He selects among the sources those that he considers verified in Islam. Nevertheless, he uses arguments from non-sacred authorities without naming them.

THE QUR'AN

The main source he uses for his refutation is, of course, the Qur'an. In the *Tractatus*, Riccoldo adopts Ramon Martí's citation method with respect to the Qur'an:[41] a sura is usually called *tractatus* (*capitulum* only twice), and the suras bear Latinized Arabic names, usually followed by a Latin translation.[42] There is no numbering, but instead there are indications such as *in principio*, *ultimo capitulo*, and *XVI. capitulo* for orienta-

37 *Tractatus* (ed. Pachurka 2016), p. 44, l. 508.

38 Ed. González Muñoz 2005. Cf. Tolan 2002, pp. 60ff.; Daniel 2009, p. 22. We know that Ramon Martí was familiar with the *Epistula*, since in his *Capistrum Iudaeorum* he named the author and the work itself, cf. *Capistrum Iudaeorum* vol. 1 (ed. Robles Sierra 1990), Ratio VI, ch. 12, p. 254ff.: "Notandum quod Iacob Alqindi dicit in quadam epistola missa ad quemdam Sarracenum".

39 Cf. *De seta* (ed. Hernando Delgado 1983), p. 24 and *De seta* (ed. Lavajo 1988), vol. 3, p. 922.

40 Cf. *Epistula al-Kindī* (ed. González Muñoz 2005), p. 61; *Tractatus* (ed. Pachurka 2016), p. 146f., comm. 508. A possible emendation for *tres* could be *tribus de causis*.

41 Cf. Burman 2015, pp. 76ff.; *Tractatus* (ed. Pachurka 2016), pp. xlviff.

42 Szpiech 2012, p. 176 summarizes Ramon Martí's citation method of suras: "In the *De Seta* [...] Martini regularly follows the title with a brief, explanatory translation." For an overview cf. *Tractatus* (ed. Pachurka 2016), p. 171.

tion.[43] These indications refer to the decade divisions (i.e., groups of ten verses) of the Qur'an. Another indication, namely *in fine secundae distinctionis*, occurs only once in the text and refers to a division of the Qur'anic text called *ḥizb* (pl. *aḥzāb*), which is a sixtieth.[44] For example, Riccoldo refers to sura 77:41–43 with *ultimo capitulo*. The verses 41–43 are in the last decade of the sura, which has a total of 50 verses. The reference is therefore correct. For sura 7:157 the text gives *XVI. capitulo*, which refers to verses 150–160, the corresponding decade. The reference to a *ḥizb* (*In tractatu Vaccae in fine secundae distinctionis*) is made for sura 2:136. The end of the second *ḥizb* is formed by verses 75–141. The reference is largely correct, since verse 136 is more or less at the end of the second *ḥizb*, but the indication *in fine* is a rather unspecific reference.

Martí's *De seta* is not the only means through which Riccoldo came into contact with this method of citation and its terminology. The Arabic Qur'an preserved in the codex BnF MS Arabe 384 contains two sets of Latin glosses. The younger set is by Riccoldo's own hand, while the identity of the first scribe—Ramon Martí has been considered—is not yet clarified.[45] The MS Arabe 384 has decade markings (*ʿušr*) after every ten verses, and the older hand names the suras as *capitula*.[46] Although further research will have to show whether the decade markings in *De seta* and the *Tractatus* correspond to MS Arabe 384, it can be stated that Riccoldo had the option of developing his citation method from either an Arabic Qur'an or Ramon Martí's work.

Riccoldo cites extensively from the Qur'an. With regard to these citations, it is necessary to examine whether Riccoldo's translations are in accordance with the wording and meaning of the Qur'an. There is one passage in the *Tractatus* that contains a well-translated verse (sura 4:157) as authority, displaying the Dominican attitude toward Islamic *auctoritas*:

Tractatus:

> Item dicit [i.e. Mahometus] in Alchorano in tractatu Mulierum inducens Iudaeos loquentes de Christo: *"Nos interfecimus Messiam, Iesum, filium*

43 Cf. *Tractatus* (ed. Pachurka 2016), pp. xlvii. Cf. Cecini 2012, p. 118, who describes the identical terminology of Marcus of Toledo. A sura is called *tractatus* or *capitulum* and a decade *distinctio*.

44 Robert of Ketton and Marcus of Toledo also use the system of *ḥizb* divisions in their Latin translations of the Qur'an. Cf. Burman 2009, pp. 80ff.; *Der Koran* (trans. Bobzin 2010), p. 606; Cecini 2012, pp. 126ff.

45 Cf. Burman 2007, pp. 96ff.; Déroche & Martínez Gázquez 2010, pp. 1022–1024, 1039.

46 Cf. Burman 2009, p. 106, n. 4, who notes that Ramon Martí also refers to decade divisions (called *denarius*) in the *Pugio fidei*. Cf. Cortabarría Beitia 1983, pp. 285ff.; Burman 2015, p. 84.

> *Mariae, nuntium Dei." Et non interfecerunt eum neque crucifixerunt eum, sed assimulatum fuit eis.* Hic negat passionem et mortem Christi; et hoc patet esse falsum per libros Prophetarum, in Evangeliis per dicta Apostolorum, per revelationes antiquorum et per signum crucis, quod est memoriale passionis Christi. Item per sepulcrum Christi, quod ipsi Saraceni custodiunt. Confitentur enim illud esse sepulcrum, in quo corpus Christi mortuum requievit.[47]
>
> Adducing the Jews speaking about Christ, Muhammad also says in the Qur'an in the sura named 'The Women': *"We killed the Messiah, Jesus, son of Mary, messenger of God." And they did not kill him, nor did they crucify him, but it was made to appear so to them.* Here Muhammad denies the passion and death of Christ. This denial is false, as is evident from the books of the prophets, from the words of the apostles in the Gospels, from the revelations of the Fathers, and from the sign of the cross, which is a symbol of Christ's passion. Likewise, from the tomb of Christ, which the Saracens themselves guard. In fact, they recognize that this is the tomb, in which the dead body of Christ rested.

Ramon Martí's account of this aspect is different:

De seta:

> Item, quod dixit in Alcorano, in tractatu Mulierum, XVI c(apitulo), inducens Judeos loquentes sic: *Nos interfecimus Messiam Jesum, filium Marie, nuncium Dei*, et non interfecerunt eum neque crucifixerunt eum, sed assimilatum fuit eis. Hic negat passionem et mortem Christi, et hoc patet esse falsum per libros Prophetarum, Euangeliorum, et per dicta Apostolorum et reuelacionem multorum antiquorum, et per signum crucis, quod est memoriale passionis Christi.[48]
>
> Adducing the Jews speaking about Christ, Muhammad also says in the Qur'an in the sura called 'The Women', chapter 16: *We killed the Messiah, Jesus, son of Mary, messenger of God.* And they did not kill him, nor did they crucify him, but it was made to appear so to them. Here Muhammad denies

47 *Tractatus* (ed. Pachurka 2016), pp. 4ff.

48 *De seta* (ed. Hernando Delgado 1983), pp. 26ff. and *De seta* (ed. Lavajo 1988), vol. 3, p. 930. I emended Lavajo's "memomoriale passionis Christi".

> the passion and death of Christ. This denial is false as is evident from the books of the prophets and the Gospels, from the words of the apostles and the revelations of many Fathers, and from the sign of the cross, which is a symbol of the passion of Christ.

For comparison I cite sura 4:157 from the *Alchoranus Latinus* of Mark of Toledo:

> Et quia dixerunt: 'Cristum Ihesum, filium Marie, occidimus Prophetam Dei,' et non occiderunt ipsum nec crucifixerunt, sed uisum fuit eis.[49]
>
> And because they said: "We killed Jesus, son of Mary, Prophet of God", and they did not kill him or crucify him, but it seemed like it to them.

In the Islamic tradition, most commentators interpret the Qur'anic verse to mean that the outward appearance of the crucified man was that of Jesus. The question of the identity of the person remains. But the non-standard interpretation takes into account the Arabic verb *šabaha* and its form in the verse, which is the impersonal form of stem II—*šubbiha*. Thus, the verse can be translated as "but it was made to appear so to them."[50] The Latin translations in *De seta* and in the *Tractatus* follow the non-standard interpretation and therefore use an impersonal construction consisting of a past participle passive with a form of *esse*. Semantically, *assimulare* closely resembles the Arabic verb *šabaha*, which is why the translation of this verse can be called almost perfect.[51] By also using an impersonal construction, Mark of Toledo's translation confirms that the non-standard interpretation of the verse is known to some extent among Western scholars.

In the same passage, the controversial point of the *passio Christi* is also addressed. According to Islamic theology, Muslims deny the death of Christ because his death would mean that the Prophets have failed. By denying the death of Christ, the essential

49 *Alchoranus Latinus* (ed. Petrus Pons 2016), ch. 4, p. 70.

50 Cf. Robinson 2003, p. 19. Cf. *Der Koran* (ed. Khoury 1990–2001), vol. 5 (1994), p. 255.

51 Riccoldo also cites and refers to the verse in ClS and the *Epistolae*. Cf. ClS (ed. Mérigoux 1986), ch. 9, p. 102, ll. 64ff.: "Preterea, in capitulo *Elnesa*, quod interpretatur mulieres, dicit quod 'ipsi Iudei dicunt quod occiderunt Christum Iesum filium Marie nuncium Dei.' Hoc est expresse falsum;", ch. 1, p. 65, ll. 51ff.: "Asserit [Machometus] etiam quod Iudei non occiderunt Christum nec crucifixerunt, sed quendam ei similem." Cf. *Epistola III* (ed. Bauer 2021), p. 132: "Sed ecce in multis aliis imponit vobis [i.e., Evangelistis] mendacium Machometus in suo Alchorano. Vos igitur omnes scripsistis, quod Christus crucifixus est et mortuus; et ipse dicit 'Nequaquam, sed eius similis.'"

moment of the redemption of humanity, Muslims cannot be right in Riccoldo's view.[52] The two religions are incompatible. Riccoldo's arguments are not valid, however, because they are almost all based on Christian scripture, which is not accepted by the Muslim counterpart. Solely the Holy Sepulchre, preserved by the Muslims, presents a strong argument. Riccoldo himself has been to Jerusalem and visited the Holy Sepulchre, which is why he knows that it is guarded by the Muslims.[53] This point is not found in Ramon Martí's text, which demonstrates that Riccoldo is revising the text of his predecessor. According to Riccoldo's interpretation, the Muslims recognize Christ as the Messiah who died on the cross. Why else would they guard the Holy Sepulchre if Jesus never died? Whose tomb are they guarding then? Perhaps Riccoldo neglects the difference between Islamic theology and the guarding for practical reasons, but his argument is not entirely without validity.[54]

ḤADĪTH COLLECTIONS

To the same extent as from the Qur'an, Riccoldo and Ramon Martí cite from the Ḥadīth collections. The Qur'an terminology of the polemicists is also applied to the Ḥadīth collections,[55] which both Riccoldo and Martí—along with only a few other scholars—knew very well.[56] Even though Riccoldo most probably became acquainted with or studied the collections during his pilgrimage, in most cases he adapts Martí's *De seta* and only slightly reworks the Latin text. The collections from which Riccoldo mostly cites or refers to in the *Tractatus* are the so-called Ṣaḥīḥ al-Buḫārī and Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, both named after their 9th-century editors.[57] As indicated by the Arabic classification *ṣaḥīḥ* ("authentic", "true"), these two collections have the highest rank of authority in Islam because they preserve mainly reports that are considered authentic. The third collection that Riccoldo most likely used is the so-called Sunan Abī Dāwūd,

52 The *Summa totius haeresis Saracenorum* of Petrus Venerabilis (ed. Glei 1985), ch. 2, p. 2, gives a concise summary of the main points from the Qur'an about the divine sonship and the death of Christ.

53 Riccoldo does not explicitly mention the guarding in the *Liber peregrinationis*. Cf. *Liber peregrinationis* (ed. Kappler 1997), pp. 68ff.

54 Cf. *Tractatus* (ed. Pachurka 2016), pp. 61ff., comm. 46–52.

55 Cf. Burman 2015, p. 78; *Tractatus* (ed. Pachurka 2016), p. xliii.

56 In the ClS and the *Liber peregrinationis*, Riccoldo tells of the "thousands of words" collected in the *aḥādīṯ*, only some of which are true. Cf. ClS (ed. Mérigoux 1986), ch. 9, p. 108, ll. 249ff.; *Liber peregrinationis* (ed. Kappler 1997), pp. 178ff. Cf. Mossman 2007, p. 181; Burman 2015, pp. 73ff.

57 Cf. Robson 1960b, pp. 1296–1297; 1971, pp. 23–28; Juynboll 1993, pp. 691–692; Bobzin 2011, p. 29.

named after the editor Abū Dāwūd Sulaimān as-Siǧistānī (9th century). His collection is not of the highest rank, but it is important nonetheless.[58] Unlike the other two collections, it is cited in the *Tractatus* solely as a *glossa*, without being mentioned by name. The polemicists exploit the collections as extensive sources of material useful for refutation because they know about the status of these reports in the Muslim world.[59] The citation of the Ḥadīth collections is thus identical to that of the Qur'an:[60] the collections are referred to as *libri*, and the thematic books (Arabic *kitāb*) within the collection as *tractatus* and *capitula*, e.g., "dicitur in libro Bohari, quod Axa dixit in tractatu Expositionis Alchorani" or "in libro Bohari in capitulo Creationis."[61] A chapter within a thematic book (Arabic *bāb*) is also called a *tractatus*, e.g., "in tractatu Infirmitatis Prophetae."[62] According to this terminology and citation, it is obvious that the polemicists treat the Ḥadīth collections on the same level as the Qur'an. Therefore, the reports may also function as *auctoritates*.

The reports cited in the *Tractatus* may be authentic,[63] but not all of them are relevant to Islamic theology, so they cannot be used to refute Islam. In particular, Muhammad's personal life, which seems very indecent and scandalous to Western polemicists, has no theological relevance. In Islam, Muhammad is a simple man, which is why he can kill his enemies, have sex with women, and do things that a Christian prophet or saint would never do—this does not affect his status as a prophet. Despite their profound knowledge of Islam, Riccoldo and Ramon Martí did not understand this aspect. In the *Tractatus*, Riccoldo therefore repeats Martí's personal attack on Muhammad and his status as a prophet[64] based on the Prophet's personal life. This type of attack becomes all the more apparent as Riccoldo focuses on Muhammad's sexual morality and the practices he legalized for the benefit of himself and his followers.[65] Riccoldo selects episodes related to sexual laxity for both the second and the fourth signs of a true prophet. Almost all of the episodes Riccoldo cites in the context of the second

58 Cf. Robson 1960a, p. 114.

59 Cf. Burman 2015, pp. 73ff.

60 Cf. Burman 2015, p. 78. Ramon Martí terms the Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim as *historia* in his *Capistrum Iudaeorum* vol. 1 (ed. Robles Sierra 1990), Ratio VI, ch. 12, p. 258: "Hoc autem verbum 'mittar vivens', exposuit Machometus in historia Mozlim".

61 *Tractatus* (ed. Pachurka 2016), p. 22, l. 248, p. 40, l. 476.

62 *Tractatus* (ed. Pachurka 2016), p. 46, ll. 526f.

63 Cf. Tolan 2002, p. 238.

64 Cf. Szpiech 2012, p. 174.

65 The motif of the immoral and licentious Muhammad—from a medieval Christian-Dominican perspective—is very popular and widespread in the literature of the Latin West. Cf. Tolan 2002, p. 239; Daniel 2009, pp. 92, 124f., 270; *Tractatus* (ed. Pachurka 2016), pp. 75ff., comm. 106ff.

sign concern the prophet's sexuality. An example from Ṣaḥīḥ al-Buḫārī occurs at the beginning of the discussion of the second sign:

Tractatus

> Secundo non solum non fuit sanctus, sed malus et facinorosus. Dicitur enim in libro Bohari, quod *circuibat mulieres suas iacendo cum eis in una hora noctis vel diei et erant XI. Nam virtus XXX virorum fuit ei data in coitu.*[66]

> Secondly, not only was he not holy, but he was also evil and villainous. In the book of Buḫārī, it is said that he [Muhammad] visited his wives in turn to sleep with them within one hour during the night or day, and they were eleven in number. Indeed, he was given the power of thirty men for sexual intercourse.

Riccoldo modifies the Latin version of the *ḥadīth* that he took from *De seta* by eliminating the speaker as well as the parts of direct speech and by rephrasing the short text.[67] Thus, only the prophet and his sexual affairs remain. In the line of argumentation, the episode functions as an authority cited to prove, by means of an Islamic source, that the refutation is sound, correct, and justified. The *Tractatus* contains the most accurate translation of the episode among Riccoldo's writings, but Martí's translation is even better. Riccoldo most likely refers to the same *ḥadīth* in ClS:

ClS:

> Est igitur omnino irrationabile quod minister et propheta legis tante salutis, ut dicunt Saraceni, sit homo carnalissimus et inmundus qui etiam de hoc se iactat quod tanta sit eius uis et facultas libidinis in agendo quanta in quadraginta hominibus cum tamen Deus eum priuauerit fecunditate filiorum. Nam unam solam filiam legitur habuisse.[68]

66 *Tractatus* (ed. Pachurka 2016), p. 10, ll. 105ff.

67 Cf. *De seta* (ed. Hernando Delgado 1983), p. 34; *De seta* (ed. Lavajo 1988), vol. 3, p. 944.

68 ClS (ed. Mérigoux 1986), ch. 8, p. 92, ll. 62ff. Riccoldo also refers to the episode in the *Liber peregrinationis* (ed. Kappler 1997), pp. 196ff. His elaboration and the context of the episode are rather a listing of the misdeeds and lies of Muhammad that facilitate the refutation. The episode is written in the part of the *Liber peregrinationis* that resembles a handbook. Riccoldo himself tells of his intention to give some brief information, cf. (ed. Kappler 1997), p. 172: "Porro de lege Saracenorum aliquid uel sub breuitate ponamus."

> Therefore, it is completely irrational that the minister and prophet of such a great law, as the Saracens say, is a most carnal and impure man who boasts himself of having as much strength and energy in sexual intercourse as forty men. However, God has deprived him of begetting sons, but he is said to have had one daughter.

In the example cited, Muhammad has the strength of 40 men. The adjustment of the number is perhaps influenced by polemical tradition, but it does not affect the tenor or the statement of the episode itself.[69] In *Contra legem*, the development of Riccoldo's argumentation strategy becomes evident: the present argument is not one of scripture but of reason, as *irrationabile* indicates—the theologically irrelevant sexuality of Muhammad is not a subject of *auctoritas* but of *ratio*. It is probable that in writing ClS, Riccoldo took the episode from his earlier works or *De seta* or Ṣaḥīḥ al-Buḫārī, reworked it, and improved his strategy, with the result that—from his point of view—the Muslim counterpart must accept his reasoning. The *Tractatus*, by contrast, bases the refutation exclusively on the citation of an authority, but neglects rational argumentation.

THE BIOGRAPHY OF THE PROPHET

The life of the Prophet in general is the subject of its own literary genre, the so-called *sīra*. *Sīra* can be translated as "biography of the prophet". The biography used in *De seta* and the *Tractatus* is the *Sīra Muḥammad rasūl Allāh* by Ibn Isḥāq, which was reworked by Ibn Hišām, dates from the 9th century, and is the most important version of Muhammad's biography.[70] Riccoldo and Ramon Martí call the *Sīra Ciar* in Latinized Arabic and translate the title as *Actus Mahometi*, which is related to *Actus Apostolorum*.[71] The intention of the *Sīra* is to integrate Muhammad into the history of salvation and to emphasize that he is the Seal of the Prophets. Since the Qur'an does

69 Cf. *De seta* (ed. Lavajo 1988), vol. 3, p. 945, n. 4; Daniel 2009, pp. 118ff.

70 Cf. Raven 1997, pp. 660–663; Bobzin 2011, pp. 36ff. Different versions of the *Sīra* are known especially in the Iberian Peninsula, cf. Tischler 2008, pp. 43ff. Cf. Maser, *Die Historia Arabum des Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada*, 2006, p. 230. It is important to note that approaches to the *Sīra* vary: Rodrigo, for example, omits the Prophet's wife, Aisha, and the poisoned lamb that caused Muhammad's death in his *Historia Arabum*, but he gives a detailed account of the Prophet's night journey (*miʿrāǧ*), which is omitted by Riccoldo and Martí. There are also differences in style, diction, and detail. Cf. *Tractatus* (ed. Pachurka 2016), p. xlvf.

71 In his *Capistrum Iudaeorum* vol. 2 (ed. Robles Sierra 1993), Nequitia V, ch. 4, p. 176, Ramon Martí identically names and translates the *Sīra* as *Ciar* and *Actus Mahometi*.

not give much information about Muhammad's life, Ibn Isḥāq decided to write the biography of the founder of Islam in order to give Muslims a role model like Moses or Jesus.[72] In the Islamic tradition, the *Sīra* has a quasi-sacred authority and conveys such an impression of historical accuracy that Muslims themselves accepted the reliability of the *Sīra*.[73] As a result, the polemicists also treated it as *auctoritas*, although the *Sīra* is actually a literary text. For them, the *Sīra* became a treasure trove containing rich details about the biography of Muhammad that are useful for refutation. For example, Riccoldo makes use of the account of the first eight years of the Prophet's life:

Tractatus:

> Item dicitur in eodem libro [i.e. *Sīra*], quod, quando natus est, mater eius misit eum ad avum suum Abdalmutalib, qui erat idolatra, qui accepit puerum et obtulit eum diis suis gratias agens de tali dono et restituit eum matri. Post cuius matris mortem fuit cum avo suo praedicto. Et postquam fuit annorum VIII, mortuus est avus eius.[74]

> Likewise, the same book [*Sīra*] says that after his [Muhammad's] birth, his mother gave him to his grandfather ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib, who was an idolater. ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib took the boy and consecrated him to his gods to thank them for such a gift. Then he returned the boy to his mother. After his mother's death, Muhammad stayed with his grandfather. And when he was eight years old, his grandfather died.

Riccoldo summarizes the *Sīra* to prove that Muhammad originates from the time of paganism before Islam, the so-called *ǧāhilīya*, which is translated as "Age of Ignorance". The Prophet's grandfather was—*mirabile dictu*—an idolater. The faith of the Prophet's ancestors is important to the polemicists, on the one hand, because the paganism of Muhammad's forefathers and of Muhammad himself was used by the Christian authors as an argument against his true prophethood.[75] On the other hand, the entire family history of the Prophet could be utilized to create an anti-hagiography of Muhammad, even if substantial changes had to be made that did not exactly conform to the Islamic sources. In the *Tractatus*, Riccoldo decisively modifies the text of

72 Cf. Raven 1997, p. 662.
73 Cf. Raven 1997, p. 663.
74 *Tractatus* (ed. Pachurka 2016), p. 40, ll. 464ff.
75 Cf. Daniel 2009, p. 103, who gives examples from a variety of texts.

De seta and the *Sīra* by transforming Muhammad's grandfather ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib ibn Hāšim into an idolater who worshipped many gods.[76] But the *Sīra* is unambiguous in this regard, as is Ramon Martí's account, which contains no polemical interpolations. In the *Sīra*, ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib prayed solely to Allāh in the Kaʿba because he was grateful for the child.[77] Nevertheless, the general intention of the polemicists—which is reinforced in Riccoldo's account—may be to compare Muhammad with Jesus: the former leads a sinful life and is descended from idolaters—he is a false prophet, an *anti-propheta*—while the latter was born of a pure and holy mother and leads a holy life in every respect.[78]

COMMENTARIES ON THE QUR'AN AND LATIN POLEMICS

Information about the Prophet's life also comes from the Islamic exegesis of the Qur'an (*tafsīr*). Thus, the traditional exegesis of sura 66:1–2 is the basis for the episode of Muhammad, Maria the Copt (Māriya al-Qibṭiyya), who is a slave, and Ḥafṣa bint ʿUmar, who is the Prophet's fourth wife.[79]

Tractatus:

> Item tangitur in Alchorano in tractatu Prohibitionis in principio et in glossa, quae est ibi, quod quidam presentavit Mahometo quandam mulierem captivam nomine Meria; qui assumpsit eam in concubinam. Dum autem semel concubuisset cum ea in domo uxoris suae nomine Hafza, supervenit ipsa uxor et videns hoc redarguit eum, eo quod in loco suo talia faciebat. Qui respondens, volens placare eam: *Placet tibi, quod abstineam ab ea?* Que ait: *Ita*. Et ille iuravit, quod ad ipsam ulterius non accederet, et mandavit, quod secretum teneret. Postmodum iterum coivit cum ipsa concubina. Et dixit in Alchorano, quod Deus constituerat eis, scilicet Saracenis, satisfactionem iuramentorum suorum, hoc est, quod possunt venire contra iuramentum cum compensatione, de qua infra dicetur.[80]

76 Cf. *De seta* (ed. Hernando Delgado 1983), p. 18; *De seta* (ed. Lavajo 1988), vol. 3, 910ff.

77 Cf. *The Life of Muhammad* (trans. Guillaume 2007), p. 70, paragraph 103. The paragraph numbering refers to the pages of the edition of the Arabic text: *Das Leben Muhammed's* (trans. Wüstenfeld 1858–1860).

78 Cf. *De seta* (ed. Hernando Delgado 1983), p. 19, n. 2; *De seta* (ed. Lavajo 1988), vol. 3, p. 913, n. 1; Daniel 2009, pp. 108ff.; *Tractatus* (ed. Pachurka 2016), pp. 138ff., comm. 464–466.

79 Cf. Buhl 1991, p. 575; *Der Koran* (ed. Khoury 1990–2001), vol. 12 (2001), p. 158, on 66,1–2.

80 *Tractatus* (ed. Pachurka 2016), p. 12, ll. 126ff.

> Likewise, in the Qur'an, in the sura 'The Prohibition,' it is mentioned at the beginning and in a corresponding gloss that a man gave Muhammad a captive woman named Meria. Muhammad made her his concubine. Once when he slept with her in the house of his wife Ḥafṣa his wife caught them doing so and reprimanded Muhammad for doing such a thing in her house. He replied to appease her: *Do you want me to stay away from her?* She answered: *Yes, I do*. And he swore not to approach his concubine again and told his wife to keep the affair a secret. Later, he slept with the same concubine again. And he said in the Qur'an that God permitted the dissolution of oaths for them, i.e., the Saracens. This means that they are allowed to break an oath provided they atone for it. See below.

The above-mentioned verses of the Qur'an state that God made it lawful to dissolve oaths by expiation. The *Tractatus* returns to this discussion later. By mentioning the *glossa*, the *Tractatus* refers to Islamic exegesis, which traditionally links the Qur'anic verses to the episode of the Prophet's intercourse with Maria the Copt.[81] Here, too, Riccoldo's and Martí's elaborations of the episode differ. The *Tractatus* reduces the story to its essence, primarily by omitting direct speech, resulting in an encyclopaedic presentation.[82] The *Liber denudationis* also contains the episode and follows the translation of sura 66:1–2 with the story, but with different wording.[83] Riccoldo refers to the episode again in the ClS and in the *Liber peregrinationis*, both of which are influenced by the *Liber denudationis*.[84] Some detailed comments on these passages are in order. In the *Tractatus*, Maria is referred to as a captive (*captiva*) and not a Copt (*Capcia/Captia*), which is most likely due to an error. The participle *capta* for "captured woman" may have been misread in the textual tradition or replaced by the adjective *captiva*. Another change indicates the influence of the *Liber denudationis*: Riccoldo replaces the collocation *placere ei*, which occurs exclusively in *De seta*, with *placare eam*, which is found in ClS and the *Liber denudationis*. But ClS chapter 12 is also close to *De seta* and the *Tractatus*, as is evident from the phrase *ad ipsam ulterius non accederet*, which appears in all three works in slightly varied word order.[85] Riccoldo apparently knew the episode in different versions, one of which was taken from Martí's *De seta* and reworked in the *Tractatus*, the other from the *Liber denudationis*,

81 Cf. *Der Koran* (ed. Khoury 1990–2001), vol. 12 (2001), p. 158, on 66,1–2.

82 Cf. *De seta* (ed. Hernando Delgado 1983), pp. 34ff.; *De seta* (ed. Lavajo 1988), vol. 3, pp. 948ff.

83 Cf. *Liber denudationis* (ed. Burman 1994), ch. 7.1f., pp. 280ff.

84 Cf. ClS (ed. Mérigoux 1986), ch. 8, p. 91, ll. 22ff., and ch. 12, p. 116, ll. 49ff.; *Liber peregrinationis* (ed. Kappler 1997), p. 196; Burman 2015, p. 82.

85 Cf. *Tractatus* (ed. Pachurka 2016), p. 81f., comm. 126–132.

which was reworked in the ClS and the *Liber peregrinationis*. The textual differences between *De seta* and the *Liber denudationis* could be the result of a Latin variant or even an Arabic version of the latter that Ramon Martí could have worked with.[86]
In the Islamic tradition, the episode leads to tendencies in the exegesis of the Qur'an to make the Prophet appear less dishonourable, even though the story is neither part of the sacred text itself nor significant for Islamic theology.[87] Nevertheless, Riccoldo employs the episode as quasi-scriptural evidence, as *auctoritas*, because he sees the Christian point of view confirmed by Muhammad's behaviour.

CONCLUSION

As shown in the *Tractatus*, Riccoldo uses a variety of sources for his refutation of Muhammad's prophethood. The main source, however, is the treatise *De seta Machometi* by his Dominican confrere Ramon Martí, which Riccoldo adapts and reworks extensively. The Islamic sources mostly referred to in both texts are, besides the Qur'an, the authentic and thus most important Ḥadīth collections, the tradition of the biography of the Prophet (*Sīra*) and Islamic exegesis (*tafsīr*). Influences of the Western Christian polemic tradition, such as the *Liber denudationis* or the *Epistula al-Kindī*, are also discernible. All sources are interpreted according to Riccoldo's argumentation strategy, which relies on *auctoritas* and *ratio*. Thus, the refutation presented in the *Tractatus* is based on a threefold argumentation: Christian *auctoritas*, Islamic *auctoritas*, and reason. Riccoldo modifies Martí's strategy by removing all secular and/or philosophical authorities from the text, leaving only those that he considers the Muslim counterpart accepts. Nevertheless, Riccoldo still fails to distinguish whether a source is relevant to Islamic theology or not. In the Dominican Order, both polemicists played an important role in developing an innovative approach to non-Christian sources. The use of Islamic sources interacts with translations from Arabic into Latin. His experience *in Oriente*, and profound studies, language skills, and his expertise in the polemical tradition make Riccoldo a central intellectual figure in Latin Christendom. Given his intellectual authority, it would be a worthwhile task for future studies to examine how Riccoldo's use and understanding of sources influenced subsequent Dominican argumentative strategies.

86 Cf. Burman 1994, pp. 46ff., 225ff.; 2015, p. 76; *Tractatus* (ed. Pachurka 2016), pp. xxxiff.
87 Cf. Veccia Valieri 1971, p. 64.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Sources

Anonymous, *Liber denudationis*, ed. Thomas E. Burman, *Religious Polemic and the Intellectual History of the Mozarabs,* c. *1050–1200* (Brill's Studies in Intellectual History 52), Leiden: Brill, 1994, pp. 240–384.

Aṯ-Ṯa'labī. *Al-Kašf wa-'l-bayān fī tafsīr al-Qur'ān al-ma'rūf bi-Tafsīr aṯ-Ṯa'labī*, ed. Saiyid Kisrawī Ḥasan, 6 vols, Beirut: Dar al-Kotob Al-ilmiyah, 2004.

Bobzin, Hartmut 2010. *Der Koran*, new trans. from the Arabic, with the assistance of Katharina Bobzin, Munich: C.H. Beck.

González Muñoz, Fernando. *Exposicion y refutación del Islam. La versión latina de las epistolas de al-Hāšimī y al-Kindī*, critical ed. and trans., Spanish–Latin text, A Coruña: Universidade da Coruña, Servizo de Publicacións, 2005.

Guillaume, Alfred. *The Life of Muhammad. A Translation of Isḥāq's* Sīrat Rasūl Allāh *with Introduction and Notes*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Khoury, Adel T. *Der Koran*, Arabic–German trans. and scientific commentary, 12 vols, Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Mohn, 1990–2001.

Maser, Matthias. *Die Historia Arabum des Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada. Arabische Traditionen und die Identität der Hispania im 13. Jahrhundert*, study, trans. and commentary (Geschichte und Kultur der Iberischen Welt 3), Berlin: Lit Verlag, 2006.

Petrus Pons, Nàdia. *Alchoranus Latinus quem transtulit Marcus canonicus Toletanus*, study and critical edition (Nueva Roma 44), Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 2016.

Petrus Venerabilis. *Schriften zum Islam*, ed., trans. and commentary Reinhold Glei (CISC, Series Latina 1), Altenberge: CIS-Verlag, 1985.

Ramon Martí. *De Seta Machometi o De origine, progressu et fine Machometi et quadruplici reprobatione prophetiae eius*, introduction, transcription, trans. and notes Josep Hernando Delgado, *Acta historica et archaeologica mediaevalia* 4 (1983), pp. 9–63.

Ramon Martí. *Capistrum Iudaeorum*, vol. 1, critical text and trans. Adolfo Robles Sierra (CISC, Series Latina 3), Würzburg/Altenberge: Echter, 1990.

Ramon Martí. *Capistrum Iudaeorum*, vol. 2. critical text and trans. Adolfo Robles Sierra (CISC, Series Latina 5), Würzburg/Altenberge: Echter, 1993.

Riccold de Monte Croce. *Pérégrination en Terre Sainte et au Proche Orient*, Latin text and translation, *Lettres sur la chute de Saint-Jean d'Acre*, trans. René Kappler

(Textes et traductions des classiques français du Moyen Âge 4), Paris: Honoré Champion, 1997.

Ricoldus de Monte Crucis. *Tractatus seu disputatio contra Saracenos et Alchoranum*, ed., trans. and commentary Daniel Pachurka (CISC, Series Latina 9), Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2016.

Ricoldus de Monte Crucis. *Epistole ad Ecclesiam Triumphantem*, ed., trans. and annotated Martin Michael Bauer (Quellen und Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters 24), Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 2021.

Röhricht, Reinhold. 'Lettres de Ricoldo de Monte-Croce: Ricoldi de Monte Crucis Ordinis praedicatorum Epistolae V commentatoriae de perditione Acconis 1291', *Archives de l'Orient latin* 2 (1884), pp. 258–296.

Thomas von Aquin. *De rationibus fidei*, annotated Latin–German text ed. Ludwig Hagemann & Reinhold Glei (CISC, Series Latina 2), Altenberge: CIS-Verlag, 1987.

Wüstenfeld, Ferdinand. *Das Leben Muhammed's nach Muhammad Ibn Ishâk bearb. von Abd el-Malik Ibn Hishâm*. Aus den handschriften zu Berlin, Leipzig, Gotha und Leyden herausgegeben, vols 1–2, Göttingen: Dieterichsche Universitäts-Buchhandlung, 1858–1860.

Studies

Bauer, Martin M. 2016. 'Bekenntnisse eines Dominikanermönchs: Die "Epistole ad Ecclesiam triumphantem" des Ricoldus de Monte Crucis und ihr augustinisches Vorbild', *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch* 51, pp. 369–387.

Bobzin, Hartmut 2011. *Mohammed*, 4th edn, Munich: C.H. Beck.

Buhl, Frants 1991. 'Mārīya', in *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, *Second Edition*, vol. 6, Leiden: Brill, p. 575.

Burman, Thomas E. 1994. *Religious Polemic and the Intellectual History of the Mozarabs, c. 1050–1200* (Brill's Studies in Intellectual History 52), Leiden: Brill.

Burman, Thomas E. 2007. 'How an Italian friar read his Arabic Qur'an', *Dante Studies* 125, pp. 93–109.

Burman, Thomas E. 2009 [2007]. *Reading the Qur'ān in Latin Christendom, 1140–1560* (Material Texts), Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Burman, Thomas E. 2015. 'Two Dominicans, a lost manuscript, and medieval Christian thought on Islam', in Ryan Szpiech ed., *Medieval Exegesis and Religious Difference: Commentary, Conflict, and Community in the Premodern Mediterranean*, New York: Fordham University Press, pp. 71–86.

Cecini, Ulisse 2012. *Alcoranus Latinus: Eine sprachliche und kulturwissenschaftliche Analyse der Koranübersetzungen von Robert von Ketton und Marcus von Toledo* (Geschichte und Kultur der Iberischen Welt 10), Berlin: Lit Verlag.

Cortabarría Beitia, Angel 1983. 'La connaissance des textes arabes chez Raymond Martin O.P. et sa position en face de l'Islam', in *Islam et chrétiens du Midi (XIIe–XIVe siècles)* (Cahiers de Fanjeaux 18), Toulouse: Privat, pp. 279–300.

Daniel, Norman 2009 [1993]. *Islam and the West: The Making of an Image*, rev. ed., Oxford: Oneworld.

Déroche, François & José Martínez Gázquez 2010. 'Lire et traduire le Coran au Moyen Âge: Les gloses latines du manuscrit arabe 384 de la BnF', *Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, Comptes rendus des séances de l'année* 3, pp. 1021–1040.

Glei, Reinhold F. 2009/2010. '*Arabismus latine personatus*. Die Koranübersetzung von Ludovico Marracci (1698) und die Funktion des Lateinischen', *Jahrbuch für Europäische Wissenschaftskultur* 5, pp. 93–115.

Hernando Delgado, Josep 1991. 'De nuevo sobre la obra antiislámica atribuida a Ramón Martí, dominico catalán del siglo XIII', *Sharq al-Andalus* 8, pp. 97–108.

Juynboll, Gautier H.A. 1993. 'Muslim b. Al-Ḥadjdjādj', in *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition*, vol. 7, Leiden: Brill, pp. 691–692.

Lavajo, Joaquim Chorão 1988. *Christianismo e Islamismo na Península Ibérica: Raimundo Martí, um precursor do diálogo religioso*, Ph.D. thesis, 3 vols, University of Èvora, [Edition of *De seta* = vol. 3, pp. 900–1027].

March, Joseph M. 1908. 'En Ramón Martí y la seva *Explanatio simboli Apostolorum*', *Anuari del Institut d'Estudis Catalans* 2, pp. 443–496.

Mérigoux, Jean-Marie 1986. 'L'ouvrage d'un frère Précheur florentin en Orient à fin du XIIIe siècle. Le *Contra legem Sarracenorum* de Riccoldo da Monte di Croce', *Memorie Domenicane* 17, pp. 1–144.

Mossman, Stephen 2007. 'The Western understanding of Islamic theology in the Later Middle Ages: Mendicant responses to Islam from Riccoldo da Monte di Croce to Marquard von Lindau', *Recherches de Théologie et Philosophie médiévales* 74, pp. 169–224.

Pachurka, Daniel forthcoming. 'Ricoldo da Monte di Croce (d. 720/1320)', in Georges Tamer ed., *Handbook of Qur'ānic Hermeneutics*, Berlin: De Gruyter.

Pachurka, Daniel 2023. 'Review of "Ricoldus de Monte Crucis. *Epistole ad Ecclesiam Triumphantem*" by Martin Michael Bauer', *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* 118, pp. 359–364.

Panella, Emilio 1986. 'Presentazione', *Memorie Domenicane* 17, pp. v–xl.

Panella, Emilio 1988. 'Ricerche su Riccoldo da Monte di Croce', *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* 58, pp. 5–85.

Panella, Emilio 1989. 'Preghiera e protesta: la prima lettera di Riccoldo', *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* 59, pp. 17–88.

Raven, Wim 1997. 'Sīra', in *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, *Second Edition*, vol. 9, Leiden: Brill, pp. 660–663.

Rippin, Andrew 2000. 'Al-Tha'labī, Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm Abū Isḥāk al-Nīsābūrī', in *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, *Second Edition*, vol. 10, Leiden: Brill, p. 434.

Robinson, Neal 2003. 'Jesus', in *Encyclopaedia of the Qur'ān*, vol. 3, Leiden: Brill, pp. 7–21.

Robson, James 1960a. '"Abū Dā'ūd Al-Sidjistānī', in *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, *Second Edition*, vol. 1, Leiden: Brill, p. 114.

Robson, James 1960b. 'Al-Bukhārī, Muḥammad b. Ismā'īl', in *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, *Second Edition*, vol. 1, Leiden: Brill, pp. 1296–1297.

Robson, James 1971. 'Ḥadīth', in *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, *Second Edition*, vol. 3, Leiden: Brill, pp. 23–28.

Roth, Ulli 2017. 'Die Bedeutung der Rationalität in der mittelalterlich-christlichen Auseinandersetzung mit dem Islam', in Richard Heinzmann & Mualla Selçuk eds, *Glaube und Vernunft in Christentum und Islam*, Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, pp. 157–193.

Schiel, Juliane 2011. *Mongolensturm und Fall Konstantinopels: Dominikanische Erzählungen im diachronen Vergleich* (Europa im Mittelalter 19), Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

Szpiech, Ryan 2012. 'Translation, transcription, and transliteration in the polemics of Raymond Martini O.P.', in Karen L. Fresco & Charles D. Wright eds, *Translating the Middle Ages*, Farnham: Ashgate, pp. 171–188.

Szpiech, Ryan 2013. *Conversion and Narrative: Reading and Religious Authority in Medieval Polemic*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Tischler, Matthias 2008. 'Orte des Unheiligen. Versuch einer Topographie der dominikanischen Mohammed-Biographik des 13. Jahrhunderts zwischen Textüberlieferung und Missionspraxis', *Archa Verbi* 5, pp. 32–63.

Tischler, Matthias 2011. 'Die Iberische Halbinsel als christlich-muslimischer Begegnungsraum im Spiegel von Transfer- und Transformationsprozessen des 12.–15. Jahrhunderts', *Anuario de Historia de la Iglesia* 20, pp. 117–155.

Tolan, John V. 2002. *Saracens: Islam in the Medieval European Imagination*, New York: Columbia University Press.

Veccia Valieri, Laura 1971. 'Ḥafṣa', in *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, *Second Edition*, vol. 3, Leiden: Brill, pp. 63–65.

Wiersma, Syds 2005. 'Aquinas' theory on dialogue put into practice: Trinity in Raymond Martin', *Jaarboek Thomas Instituut te Utrecht* 25, pp. 9–41.

Wiersma, Syds 2015. *Pearls in a Dunghill: The Anti-Jewish Writings of Raymond Martin O.P. (ca. 1220–ca. 1285)*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Tilburg.

ANTHONY JOHN LAPPIN

Riccoldo's Use of the *Corpus Cluniacense* in the *Contra legem Sarracenorum*

Although much has rightly been made regarding Riccoldo's own personal experience of a Muslim *Sitz im Leben*, his discussion of Islam depended, to a large extent, on the previous Latin traditions. In the following analysis, I shall consider Riccoldo's debt in his *Contra legem Sarracenorum* to the corpus of texts connected to Islam associated with Peter the Venerable and translated by Robert of Ketton and Hermann of Dalmatia; in particular Peter the Venerable's own *Summa* of Islamic beliefs, together with the *Doctrina Mahumet*, and what he calls the *Liber narrationum*; and, possibly, the marginal glosses to the translation of the Qur'an, but not the *Alchoran latinus* itself.

Riccoldo's *Libellus* was a well-copied and influential text, with a survival rate of nearly 30 manuscripts and one edition (Seville: Stanislau Polonus, 1500).[1] Even more remarkably, it is also preserved in one manuscript with autograph corrections, additions and completion, which was originally held by the Dominican convent in Santa Maria Novella: Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale di Firenze, MS *Conv. soppr.* C 8.1173, foll. 185r–218r.[2] This Florence manuscript was edited by Jean-Marie

1 Mérigoux 1986, pp. 37–39; Panella 1988, p. 22. There are, further, ten manuscripts of Petrus de Pennis's *Tractatus contra Alchoranum*, which has been described by its editor as a "refundición" of Riccoldo's *Libellus*; González Múñoz 2017 (see, further, Rezvan 1998, and, for wider influence, Langeloh 2023). This notable diffusion offers a clear corrective to the widespread idea that the text was somehow unimportant, as found in Daniel 1960, p. 234 and Hopkins 1994, p. 59.

2 Riccoldo (according to Panella's codicological description) finished the last five pages of the manuscript (ff. 206v–218r) in his own hand.

Mérigoux,[3] and this edition, in turn, has been digitized and corrected by Emilio Panella (2001–).[4]

THE PROLOGUE

Riccoldo's dependence upon Peter's *Summa* is found immediately in the introduction or prologue to the *Libellus*, where the Frenchman's situation of Muhammad in a historical context is repeated by the Italian, but placed within a more explicitly eschatological context (the Ages of Persecution),[5] which thus explains why the elements taken from Peter are inverted by Riccoldo:

Libellus, Prol. 42	*Summa*
In hoc igitur tertio statu surrexit contra ecclesiam dei et contra ueritatem, scilicet *post tempora* beati *Gregorii,* **tempore Eraclii**	Fuit autem iste, sicut etiam chronica ab Anastasio romanę ecclesię Bibliothecario de greco in latinum translata apertissime narrat **tempore** imperatoris **Heraclii**, *paulo post tempora* magni et primi *Gregorii* romani pontificis, ante annos quingentos et quinquaginta …
And so in this third era, there rose against the Church of God and against Truth, namely after blessed Gregory's days, in the time of Heraclius …	It was this man, as Anastasius Bibliotecarius's Chronicle (translated from Greek into Latin) most clearly narrates, in the time of the Emperor Heraclius, a short while after the days of the Roman [pontiff], Gregory I, the Great, before the year 550 …

3 Mérigoux 1986, pp. 60–142.

4 Reference is made to the latter. Regrettably, Panella's web pages use frames, rendering direct reference to the electronic text rather cumbersome; he does, however, maintain the system of reference established by Mérigoux, with each paragraph noted by the line number of the latter's edition.

5 The first age, that of the pagans, between the death of Christ and the age of Constantine (Prol. 10); the second, that of the heretics, between Constantine and Gregory the Great (Prol. 20); and the third, that of the "false brothers", which will last until the End (Prol. 30). On the prologue, see Ferrero Hernández 2019.