Riccoldo's description (or, rather, classification) of Muhammad does not then follow the *Summa*'s depiction,[6] but rather shows his dependence upon the traditions which are found in the annotations to the *Alchoran latinus* itself.[7] The motif of Muhammad as oppressor of the Church is found already in II.26, adnot. "O creator" (Qur'an 2:154),[8] and, as we can see below, the close links between Muhammad, the devil and deceitfulness are already sketched out:

Libellus, Prol. 42	*Alchoran latinus* IV.7, adnot. "nec omnes" (Qur'an 2:253).
... surrexit quidam homo **diabolicus**, primogenitus sathane, homo **lubricus** et obscenis actibus deditus, ...	Nota quam uarius quam mutabilis quam uaria et diuersa coniungit in isto spiritus **diabolicus**, et quasi anguis **lubricus** per quot et anfractus sese miseris et stultis abscendit, ut possit subrepere et decipere.
... there arose a certain devilish man, the first-born of Satan, a slippery man and given to disgraceful deeds, ...	Note how many various, changeable, different and heterogeneous things the devilish spirit brings together, and wriggles up by wretched and stupid sayings like a slippery snake so that it might insinuate itself and mislead.[9]

6 For this and all subsequent citations, the translations provided are my own.

7 *Alchoran latinus I. Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal ms. 1162*, ed. Lappin 2022. References are to chapter and line of this edition.

8 "Quando enim hic apostata predicare sua deliramenta cepit, multi in terra illa Christiani erant, qui ei resistere. E contra ille, perditorum multitudinem paulatim sibi alliciens, et gladio etiam quibus preualebat legem diabolicam imponens, sepissime suos hortatur, ut et si qua eis detrimenta hac de causa contigerint, patienter ferant, et ipsi toto conamine et Christianos et quicumque legem eius non susciperint, expugnent" ("So when this apostate began to preach his delusions, many in that land were Christians, who opposed him. And in reaction to this, he, drawing the multitude of the damned slowly to himself and by the sword imposing the diabolical law on those he conquered, most often encouraged his men that if there was any loss that they sustained due to this reason, they should bear it patiently, and they should, with all their power, overcome the Christians and anyone who did not accept their law").

9 The despective term, *anguis lubricus*, is used throughout the middle ages with an emphasis upon deceitfulness (Martin 2016, par. 82, 97, ll. 209, 288; Palacky 1858, p. 260, l. 9), and it was used this way elsewhere by Peter the Venerable and his circle (Petrus Pictavensis, *Panegiricon*, fol. ā iiij va, l. 29; Petrus Venerabilis, *Contra Petrobrusianos,* fol. IIIvb, ll. 21–22). Riccoldo strips out the figurative and classicising language (this particular snake's pedigree stretched back to

The association with the devil (or with devilish deceitfulness) continues, echoing further glosses from the *Alchoran*, where the contents of the text are consistently equated with madness and deceit, and are understood as being designed to deceive.

Libellus, Prol. 42	*Alchoran latinus*, XXI.48 (to Qur'an 12:24)
… nomine Mahometus, qui consilio illius et auxilio qui mendax est et pater eius, **legem mendacissimam** et nefariam composuit quasi ex ore dei …	Nota insana *mendacia* et *mendax* insania. Admiscet tamen aliquam uelut umbram ueritatis, ad decipiendos infelices ac pecuales homines.
… called Muhammad, who—by the counsel and help of the one who is both deceitful and the father of deceit—put together a most deceitful and execrable law as if it came from the mouth of God …	Note the mad deceitfulness and deceitful madness. He mixes a certain (as it were) shadow of the truth in order to deceive the unfortunate and easily led.

The further trope, of Muhammad's being aided by the devil ("consilio illius et auxilio qui mendax est et pater eius", with its elegant riff on "the father of lies": John 8:44) is firmly rooted within a sensibility shared with the glossators of the *Alchoran latinus*; thus XIII.66, adnot. "Deus Ihesum" (Qur'an 5:110):

> scilicet non dei sed et hoc ubique dicit, sicut et Iohannem Babtistam, non babtistam semper appellat, spiritu diabolico baptismo nec mentionem facere uolens
>
> namely not *of god* but just as he says this everywhere, so with John the Baptist, whom he does not always call "the Baptist", not wishing to even mention baptism due to a diabolical spirit

Aeneid V.84). For a contested meaning of *lubricus* as "wanton, lewd, immodest", du Cange 1883–1887, V, 146 (a sense its romance offspring certainly, and at times exclusively, have); Riccoldo may well be playing with both senses in his description of Muhammad, given his subsequent mention of his habitual "disgraceful deeds" (or, equally possible as a translation for *obscenibus actibus*, "lewd acts").

Such a thought is similar to the comment on the Qur'anic terminology for the apostles ("those dressed in white": LXX.26, adnot. "albis indutos", to Qur'an 61:14; V.103, adnot "albis induti", to Qur'an 3:52).[10] However, Riccoldo does not go quite as far as one annotator, who equates Muhammad with a devil.[11] In the Dominican's further description of the Qur'an, however, he probably returns to the *Summa*: "Quam legem appellauit alchoranum, quasi collectaneum preceptorum dei" (Intro, 42; "This law he called *Alchoranus*, as it were 'the gathering-up of the precepts of God'"). Peter the Venerable had written "Alchoran quo nomine legem suam nuncupant, et interpretatur Alchoran ex arabico, collectio preceptorum" ("the *Alchoran*, by which name he entitled his law; *Alchoran* is translated from Arabic as 'the gathering-up of precepts'"). Peter himself had taken this directly from the original title of the *Alchoran latinus*: "Lex Mahumet que arabice Alchoran, id est, collectio preceptorum uocatur" ("Muhammad's Law, which is called in Arabic *Alchoran*, that is, the gathering-up of precepts").[12]

Riccoldo continues with a historical description of the actions of Muhammad which further excerpts Peter's own evocation of events:

Libellus, Prol. 42	*Summa*
Non enim uno modo, sed omnibus tribus generaliter efferatur;	Hic paulatim crescendo, et contiguos quosque ac maxime sanguinis propinquos,

10 "Viros uestibus albis indutos intelligi uult apostolos, diabolico instinctu nominare illos fugiens" ("By the men dressed in white he means that the apostles should be understood, avoiding naming them by the devil's instinct"); "Viros uestibus albis indutos apostolos Christi uult intelligi, spiritu diabolo nominare illos dissimulans, ne inde uideretur euangelium suscipere, in quo sunt eorum nomina" ("By the men dressed in white he means the apostles of Christ, feigning to name them by a diabolic spirit, lest thence the gospel might be consulted, in which are their names). The gloss continues, however, with a corrective observation from another annotator: "Vestibus albis indutos propter sanctitatem eorum uult dicere" ("He means that they are dressed in white clothes due to their sanctity").

11 *Alchoran latinus* XX.100, adnot. "Huth" (Qur'an 11:53): "Nota nomina prophetarum inaudita; quis enim umquam preter istum diabolum, tales prophetas inuenit? Quis amplius Hut, et Hat, et Scale et Scaibe audiuit? Istos ego non homines sed diabolos aliquos fuisse credo, quibus impletus iste sathanas, huiusmodi deliramenta" ("Observe the unheard-of prophets' names! Who other than this devil, ever came across such prophets? Who, besides him, heard of *Hut*, and *Hat* and *Scale* and *Scaibe*? These were not men but rather devils, I think, by whom this satan was filled by delusions in this same fashion"); XXIII.97, adnot. "alchitran" (14:50): "Alchitran locus inferni, secundum istum diabolum" (*Alchitran* is a place in hell, according to this devil).

12 For *collectio* as "gathering-up" rather than the flatter "collection" (which it can also mean, of course), see Lewis & Short 1879, s.v. *collectio*. Note also the gloss to "Alfurcan" (V.5, Qur'an 3:3): "Alfurcan id est discretorem preceptorum" ("the *alfurkan*, that is, the examiner of precepts").

unde modo per tyrannidem seuiendo,	insidiis, rapinis, incursionibus frequenter infestando, quos poterat furtim, quos poterat publice occidendo, terrorem sui auxit … ad regnum suę gentis aspirare cępit;
modo per *legem seducendo*,	cumque uniuersis pari modo resistentibus, eiusque ignobilitatem contempnentibus, uideret se hac uia non posse consequi quod sperabat, quia ui gladii non potuit, religionis uelamine, et diuini prophetę nomine, rex fieri attemptauit. Et quia inter barbaros barbarus, inter ydolatras et ipse ydolatra habitabat, atque inter illos, quos utpote pre cunctis gentibus tam quam *legis expertes, et ignaros*, faciles ad *seducendum* esse nouerat coniniquitati dare operam cepit.
modo per *hypocrisim simplices* subuertendo …	Et quoniam prophetas dei magnos fuisse homines audierat, prophetam eius se esse dicens, ut *aliquid boni simularet*, ex parte illos ab ydolatria, non tamen ad deum unum sed ad quam parturire iam cęperat, heresis fallaciam traducere conabatur.
iam fere dimidiam partem totius orbis seduxit *permissione Dei*, qui "**terribilis est in consiliis super filios hominum**".	Cum interim *iudicio* illius **qui terribilis in consiliis** dicitur **super filios hominum** et qui miseretur cui uult, et quem uult indurat dedit Sathan successum errori, et Sergium monachum, heretici Nestorii sectatorem, ab ecclesia expulsum, ad partes illas Arabię transmisit, et monachum hereticum pseudoprophetę coniunxit.
Not, though, in a single fashion, but in all three ways did he become a beast:	He, slowing growing in power, and frequently harassing his neighbours and above all those who were close to him by blood,
whence in one way raging with tyranny;	by betrayals, plundering, raiding, by killing those whom he could secretly, those whom he could in public, fear of him grew, he could grasp rule over his people;

	and thus, with all in a similar way opposing him, and disdaining his low birth, he saw that he could not gain what he hoped for by that route; since the power of the sword could not
in one way seducing [others] through the law	bring it about, by the cover of religion, and through the name of a divine prophet, he tried to make himself king. And because he lived as a barbarian amongst barbarians, as an idolater amongst idol-worshippers,
	and amongst those whom he knew were (as much those learned in as those who knew nothing about the law) easy to seduce, he captivated through giving the possibility for acting out their common iniquity.
	And since he had heard that God's prophets were great men, saying that he was their
in one way, undermining the simple through hypocrisy;	prophet, so that he might do something good he brought them from idolatry not so much to the One God but to that which he had already began to give birth, he exerted himself to betray them to a heretical falsity.
Now has he seduced almost half the globe by the permission of God, who is terrible in his counsels over the sons of men.	When the judgement of him who is called terrible in his counsels over the sons of men and who takes mercy on whom he will, and against whom he wishes he hardens, he gave Satan the advancement of the error, and the monk Sergius, the following of the heretic Nestorius, who had been expelled from the church, came to those parts of Arabia, and the heretic monk was partnered with the pseudo-prophet.

The account is closed by Riccoldo by the same allusion to the Psalms as Peter used, Psalm 65:5, but with a difference: the latter goes on to deploy the Sergius–Bahira story as an explanation for various Christian elements in the Qur'an; Riccoldo simply stops, and makes reference to himself, and so draws a parallel between himself, not

as the architect of Muslim doctrine,[13] but as the "minimus in ordine Predicatorum", who "de tanta dampnatíone condolens, cogitaui uias meas, et conuerti pedes meas in testimonia dei".[14] Riccoldus, then, casts himself as the anti-Bahira.

CHAPTER ONE

Peter's analysis is again used by Riccoldo in the first chapter to the *Libellus*, where the Cluniac's depiction of the Christian heresies that have flowed into Islam are taken up.

Libellus I.4	*Summa*
Et sciendum quod *omnium antiquorum hereticorum* **feces**, **quas** *diabolus* in aliis sparsim seminauerat, simul in Machometum *reuomuit*. Ipse namque Machometus **cum Sabellio** ***negat trinitatem***	*Omnes* pene *antiquarum heresum* **feces**, **quas** *diabolo* imbuente sorbuerat, *reuomens*, **cum Sabellio** ***trinitatem abnegat*** …
And one should be aware that the lees of all the former heretics (which the devil had sown one-by-one in others), he vomited all together into Muhammad. And so Muhammad, like Sabellius, denies the Trinity …	Vomiting forth almost all the lees of former heresies, with which the devil had filled him, he denies like Sabellius the Trinity …

And the Dominican inserts a numerological criticism of Qur'anic anti-Trinitarianism that was used by Peter as the opening observation of his *Summa*:

Libellus I.4	*Summa*
	In primis primus et maximus ipsorum execrandus est error quod trinitatem in unitate deitatis negant, sicque dum in una diuinitatis essencia trinum personarum numerum non credunt,

13 "Sergium monachum, heretici Nestorii sectatorem, ab ecclesia expulsum" ("The monk Sergius, an exile from the church, a follower of the heretic Nestorius").

14 *Libellus*, Prol. 54; "the least in the Order of Preachers … grieving over so much harm, thought on my ways, and turned my feet towards witnessing for God".

in unitate numerum euitantes, dum ternarium inquam omnium formarum principium atque finem, sicque rerum formatarum causam et originem atque terminum, non recipiunt, deum licet ore confitentes ipsum penitus nesciunt.

... ponit tamen in diuinis quendam ***binarium***, qui est numerus infamis ***et alteritatis principium***. Ponit enim **ipsam diuinam essentiam et eius animam; unde Deum pluraliter loquentem introducit** *in alchorano* ...

Ipsi autem deuii, ipsi uariabiles, ***principium*** uarietatis et ***alteritatis*** omnis, uidelicet ***binarium*** solum in unitate confitentur, scilicet **ipsam diuinam essentiam et eius animam**. **Vnde deum pluraliter loquentem, introducit** semper *Alchoran* ...

Firstly, the first and greatest of their errors to be condemned is that they deny the Trinity in the unity of the deity, and thus whilst they do not believe in the three-ness of the persons in the one essence of divinity, in unity avoiding number, whilst I would say the ternary is the beginning and end of every form, and thus they do not accept the cause and origin and the end of created things, although they confess God with their lips, they hardly know him.

... he foists upon the deity, though, a certain binary, which is a disreputable number and the principle of otherness. He alleges that same divine essence and his soul, whence he brings in God speaking in the plural in the Qur'an ...

So these inconsistently, these variably, confess the principle of the variety and otherness of everything, namely only the binary in unity, namely the very same divine essence and his soul. Whence the Qur'an constantly introduces God speaking in the plural ...

Now, Peter's understanding of God's "speaking in the plural" is drawn directly from the gloss (1.43, adnot. "fecimus"; Qur'an 2:35):

> Hic pluraliter deum loqui facit, secundum modum quo in eo duo esse heretice dicunt, deitatis essentiam scilicet et eius animam, assignantes creationem, motum.

> Here he makes God speak in the plural according to the mode in which they say in their heretical way that there is a binary in God, namely the essence of the deity and its soul, to which they assign creation and motion.

Yet it is clear from the citation above, however, that Riccoldo is directly dependent upon Peter's *Summa*. Nevertheless, Riccoldo's long section on the use of the plural (chapter XIII) certainly responds to the comparable interest found in the *Alchoran latinus*'s glossators for similar features of the sacred text: the programmatic annotation for the first words of the *fatihah* may be invoked (0.3, p. 447, adnot. 'Misericordi pioque deo' (Qur'an 1.1):

> ... Nam deinceps per totum librum quasi deus loquitur ad ipsum aliquando singulariter aliquando pluraliter, aliquando uero personarum uarietatem assumit ut quandoque quasi ipse propheta loquatur, quandoque boni deum inuocantes uel malos increpantes secundum locorum diuersitatem.
>
> ... Now hereafter throughout the whole book it is as if God should speak to him sometimes in the singular, sometimes in the plural, sometimes He assumes the variety of persons as when he speaks as it were like a prophet, or when the good invoke God or criticizing the bad according to the difference of the situation.[15]

Nevertheless, it is worth observing that such critical notes in the glosses to the *Alchoran* are not a condemnation of the literary style of the Qur'an itself: Robert of Ketton and Herman of Dalmatia were quite alive to the literary texture of the Arabic they were translating, even going so far as to provide distinct translations of the opening sura, and maintaining an elegant, high-styled Latin throughout (according to the norms

15 Further, XV.104 adnot. "tribuimus" (6:83): "Nota quotiens facit loqui deum aliquando singulariter aliquando pluraliter, cum ipse tamen trinitatem abneget, quid dicat nesciens" ("Observe how frequently he makes God speak now in the singular, now in the plural, when he himself denies the trinity, not knowing what he is saying"); XVII.8, adnot. "Quotiens enim" (38: 73–74): "Deo scilicet imputantes quando eis mala contingunt, et eorum a predonibus diripiuntur, et hoc maxime de Christianis dicit, qui ei credere nolebant, faciens deum loqui pluraliter pene assidue" ("Namely, imputing to God when something bad happens to them, and they are despoiled by pillagers; and this he says most about Christians, who refused to believe him, making God speak in the plural almost constantly"); I.231, adnot. "Nos quidem" (2:138–139): "Vox quasi suorum professorum, et hoc sepe facit mutando personas in locutione, ut uideatur quasi propheta loqui" ("The voice of his believers, and this he often carried out by changing the person of the verb when speaking, that it might seem as if he was speaking like a prophet").

of the 12th century, of course). Riccoldo was much less impressed by the cadences of the original, and became bored with the repetitious nature of the verses which were, instead, a particular challenge to the earlier translators.[16] His consultation of the *tafsīr* (Qur'anic commentaries) and living masters came about when he was reading the text piecemeal: this does not seem to have been his practice when actually translating.

The final element of the first chapter is an evocation of Qur'anic Christology, which is drawn, in the main, from Peter the Venerable's *Summa*.

Libellus, I.26, 35, 41	*Summa*
Machometus itaque ponit **Christum** hominem sanctissimum et uirtuosissimum *super omnes alios homines*. Et expresse in eo uidetur aliquid ultra ponere hominem. *Nominat* enim ipsum, **uerbum dei** et **spiritum dei** et animam dei. Quod autem *in ueritate dicatur* Deus, *omnino* **deridet**; ad quod confirmandum duo precipue inducit: unum, quia ipse Christus hoc de se nunquam asseruit nec dixit, aliud quia ipse uidetur dixisse contrarium. Vnde dicit	Sic plane impius ille fecit, quando et Christianam et Iudaicam legem collaudans, neutram tamen tenendam esse confirmans, probando reprobus reprobauit. Inde est, quod Moysen optimum prophetam fuisse, **Christum** dominum *maiorem omnibus* extitisse confirmat, natum de uirgine predicat, nuncium dei, **uerbum dei, spiritum dei** *fatetur*, nec nuncium uerbum aut spiritum, ut nos aut intelligit aut fatetur. Filium dei *dici aut credi prorsus* **deridet**.

16 *Libellus*, Prol. 54: "Et legem eorum diligentissime relegens, et studiose in scolis et cum magistris ipsorum frequenter conferens, magis ac magis per experientiam apprehendi peruersitatem predicte legis. Et cum inceperim eam in latinum transferre, tot inueni fabulas et falsitates et blasphemias, et eadem per omnia in locis creberrimis repetita, quod tunc attediatus dimisi" ("And reading and reading again their law [i.e., the Qur'an] with attention, and studiously checking glosses and their masters, by experience I learnt more and more the perversity of that law [i.e., the Qur'an]. And when I began to translate it into Latin, all I found was tall stories, and lies and blasphemies, and all those same things often repeated here, there, and everywhere, so that I then set it aside through boredom").

Machometus "Christiani dicunt Christum esse deum",[17] et ipse Christus dixit iudeis "Adorate deum meum et deum uestrum, dominum meum et dominum uestrum".

Hec igitur prolixius exposui ut manifeste sciatur quod illud quod diabolus in mundo *incepit* **per Arrium**, sed consumare non potuit, *postea* tepescente in ecclesia ferore et crescente malicia **per Machometum** *compleuit*;

denique tamen ad plenum consumabit maliciam *per antichristum*, qui suadebit mundo quod Christus *nec uerus* **deus** fuerit *nec* **filius dei nec bonus homo**.

... Quę quidem olim diaboli machinatione *concepta*, primo **per Arrium** seminata, *deinde* **per** istum sathanan, scilicet **Mahumet**, *proiecta*, per antichristum uero ex toto secundum diabolicam intentionem *complebitur*.

Cum enim dicat beatus Hylarius antichristi originem in Arrio extitisse, dum quod ille cępit, uerum filium dei Christum esse negando, et creaturam dicendo, *antichristus* tandem *non modo illum* **deum** *uel* **dei filium**, sed **nec** etiam **bonum hominem** fuisse asserendo consummaturus est merito impiissimus Mahumeth inter utrumque medius a diabolo prouisus ac preparatus esse uidetur, qui et Arrii quodam modo supplementum, et antichristi peiora dicturi, apud infidelium mentes maximum fieret nutrimentum.

17 Cp. *Alchoran latinus* XIII.88–90 (Qur'an 5:117), where Jesus addresses God: "Tu scis itaque me nil hominibus nisi mandata tua dixisse, scilicet quod te deum meum atque suum inuocent et adorent; quorum quam diu tibi placuit, testis affui" ("You know that I told men nothing but your commands, namely that they should invoke and adore you, my God and theirs"); XIV.7–8 (Qur'an 6:1), "Increduli uero alium ipsi deo consimilem et ęqualem ponunt", together with the gloss "scilicet christiani Christum" ("The unbelievers place another as equal and just like God himself—namely the Christians [do with] Christ").

Summa uero intentio Machometi **est** quod **Christus** *nec* **deus** *nec* **dei filius**, **sed homo quidam sapiens** et sanctus **et propheta maximus**, sine patre et de uirgine natus.[18]

Muhammad therefore states that Christ was a most holy and most virtuous man, above all other men. And explicitly in him may be seen something above the human. He names him the word of God and the spirit of God and the soul of God.

(the following is placed immediately before "Quę quidem…", above)
Summa uero huius heresis **intentio est** ut **Christus** dominus, *neque* **deus**, *neque* **dei filius** esse credatur,[19] **sed** licet magnus deoque dilectus **homo** tamen purus, et uir **quidem sapiens**, **et propheta maximus.**

18 The text continues with what can only be understood as something of a garbled paragraph: "Et in hoc conuenit cum Carpocrate heretico. Asserit etiam Machometus quod deus non potest habere filium quia non habet uxorem. Et in hoc conuenit cum Carpocrate heretico" ("And in this he is in agreement with Carpocrates the heretic. Muhammad also asserts that God cannot have a son because he has no wife. And in this he is in agreement with Carpocrates the heretic"). Carpocrates, however, regarded Joseph as Jesus's father (Irenaeus 1857, vol. I, pp. 216–218; 1885, p. 350; Thomas Aquinas, *De articulis fidei* 1954, pars I: "Decimus error est Carpocratis, qui hominem Christum de utroque natum putasse perhibetur" ("The tenth error is Carpocrates', who thought that one should believe that Christ-as-man was born from both parents"); possibly the reference to Carpocrates was originally marginal, and should have been included as a note after the mention of Christ's human perfection.

19 Cp. *Alchoran latinus* I.187, adnot. "uniuersitatis creatorem" (2:116): "Et hec est summa totius heresis huius, ut deus filium nunquam habuisse credatur, quod sepe iste diabolus repetit. Et sumpsisse dicit quasi deridendo" ("And this is the sum of all of this heresy, that is to believe that God never had a son, which this devil always repeats. And he says 'take up' as if mocking").

That he is said in truth to be God, he mocks completely, and to confirm this he brings up two main ideas: the first, that since Christ had never asserted nor said this about himself; the second, that since he himself would seem to have said the contrary. Whence Muhammad says: "The Christians say Christ is God", and Christ himself said to the Jews, "Adore my God and your God, my lord and your lord."

These things, therefore, I set out a length so that it might become obvious that that which in the world the devil began through Arrius but could not complete, afterwards, when the fervour in the church had grown lukewarm and malice was growing, he completed it through Muhammad; at length, then, the evil-doing will be fully complete through the antichrist, who will persuade the world that Christ was neither true God, nor the son of God nor a good man.

Muhammad's chief purpose is that Christus was neither God nor the son of God, but just a man, wise and holy, and a very great prophet, born of a virgin without a father.

Thus that impious man clearly do, when praising both the Christian and Jewish religion, however confirming neither as having to be kept, the reprobate, by commending, criticized. So it is, that the confirmed Moses was an excellent prophet, Christ the Lord the greatest of all that ever lived, preached he was born of a virgin, confessed he was the messenger of God, the word of God, the spirit of God, neither the messenger, nor the word nor the spirit, so that he might understand or praise us. He utterly mocks saying or believing in the son of God.

That which, long ago conceived through the machination of the devil, sown first through Arrius, thereafter brought on by this Satan, namely Muhammad, through the antichrist was wholly completed according to the devil's intention.

When blessed Hilary said that the antichrist's origin was in Arrius, so that what he began (denying Christ was truly the son of God, and saying that he was a creature), at length the antichrist, by affirming that he was not at all God, nor the son of God, nor even a good man, it will have been accomplished thanks to the most impious Muhammad, the mid-point between both, who seems to be supplied and prepared by the devil, who is in a certain way an addition to Arrius, and to the antichrist's worse statements, who fed greatly the minds of the unbelievers.

The chief purpose of this heresy is that it should not be believed that Christ the Lord was God, nor the son of God, but rather a great man, loved by God, and pure and a man who was wise, and a very great prophet.

It would be fair to say that Peter's discussion of Islam has essentially guided Riccoldo's hand in the prologue and the first chapter to the *Libellus*. Certainly, elements have been moved around, but the overall structure is kept. This may not simply be a question of unimaginative dependence. Riccoldo's text, and its presentation of the arguments, may have something of a resumé about it, a recapitulation of the key historical, Latin treatments of the Qur'an as an accompaniment to his more anthropological discussions elsewhere.

CHAPTER EIGHT

This observation may also be valid for the work referred to as the *Doctrina Mahumet*—a collection of popular religious sayings translated as part of the *Corpus Cluniacense* by Herman of Dalmatia—and which is referred to explicitly throughout chapter VIII, forming a crucial point of reference for his argument against Islamic conceptions of paradise. Two details are extracted at chapter VIII.150:

> In libro autem de Doctrina Mahometi, qui est magne auctoritatis, exponit ordinem comestionum, et dicit quod primum ferculum quod proponetur ibi erit iecur piscis albebuth, cibus summe delectabilis, et postea succedent fructus arborum. Et infra, in eodem capitulo, cum quererent ab eo si luxuriabuntur, et respondit quod non esset beatitudo si aliqua delectatio deesset ibi, immo cuncta essent frustra nisi et uoluptas luxurie sequeretur.
>
> In the book *Muhammad's Teachings*, which is of great authority, he sets out the order in which they will eat [in paradise], and he says that the first course which is to be offered there should be the liver of the fish called *albebuth*, a wholly delectable food, and afterwards would come the fruits of trees. And further down, in the same chapter, when they ask of him if they will [in paradise] be indulged with sexual pleasure, he replies that there is no blessedness if any pleasure should be lacking; on the contrary, it would be in vain if the pleasure of sex were not to be added.

The citation of the *Doctrina* as "magne auctoritatis" might seem to refer to his time in Baghdad, where he might also have come across the text; the evaluation has all the hallmarks of personal experience. Unfortunately, the appraisal is wholly literary, drawn from the title of the work itself in Latin translation: "Incipit Doctrina Machumet, quae apud Saracenos magnae authoritatis est" (Bibliander 1543: vol. I, p. 189; "Here begins the *Teachings of Muhammad*, which is of great authority amongst the Sara-

cens"). Riccoldo's citation of the work rearranges the material to maintain a focus on the specific detail and argument, with the descriptions being somewhat toned down, or perhaps rendered slightly more theological in conception.[20]

The second citation moves on from whether or not physical experience is an essential part of paradise to more precision, not over what we might expect to be the target (sex) but on the order of the menu—what to eat first, out of all the delights that are possible? (*Libellus* VIII.179):

> Constat enim quod cibos ad hoc assumimus ut corruptio que posset accidere ex consumptione naturalis humidi euitetur, et etiam ad augmentum. Sed ista duo non erunt ibi; nam omnes in debita quantitate resurgent, nec amplius poterunt mori nec aliquo modo deficere. Nam, sicut dicit Mahometus in sua Doctrina, postquam omnia mortua fuerint, Deus occidet mortem, et postea resurgent immortaliter et integri. Ergo cibi sumptio non erit necessaria aliquo modo; et eodem modo nec usus uenereorum, quia nec nunc est necessarius nisi ut conseruetur in specie quod non potest conseruari in indiuiduo.

> It is a fact that we eat foods so that the wearing-down that can come about through consumption of humid matter is prevented, and secondly for sustenance. But these two will not be there [in paradise]; for all in due number will come back alive, and neither will they be able to die or in any manner pass away. For, as Muhammad says in his *Teachings*, after all things will have died, God will kill Death, and afterwards they will come back to life, immortal and whole. Therefore the taking in of foods will not be necessary in any way; and in the same fashion, nor will sexual activity, since it is not now necessary other than for the continuation of the species which cannot be conserved in the individual.

20 Bibliander 1543, vol. I, p. 196, ll. 46– p. 197, l. 3 &—30 lines down, as Riccoldo indeed says, "infra"—ll. 34–37 ("Respondit, Primum quidem ingressis uescendum proponitur iecur piscis albehbut, cibus quam ultra mirari possis delectabilis. Succedunt fructus arborum, potusque defluentis paradisi, deinde quicquid affectarint, praesto erit. … Et ilud primum, quoniam comedent et bibent, si etiam *misceantur illic mulieribus*, idque qualiter, et qua lege. Respondit, Si ullum *oblectamenti* genus deesset, beatitudo minime plena esset. Frustra ergo deliciae adessent, si voluptas deesset" ("He replied: 'Certainly the first thing to be eaten is the liver of the *albehbut* fish [perhaps a whale, or Leviathan], then the fruits of the trees, drink from the streams of paradise, then whatever they desire, will be ready' … And the first asked him since they will eat and drink, whether they would have sex with women there, and how and by what law. He replied, 'If any type of pleasure were missing, beatitude would not be complete; it would be in vain for the delights to be there if enjoyment of them should be absent'").

The citation does little more than add a bit of local colour to the overwhelming theological point regarding immortality—with rather more Pauline hues than are communicated in the original, which foresees the angel of death committing suicide in order to fulfil a divine command.[21] The discussion, however, is already looking forward to cite Muhammad's further response from the same source (VIII.190; Bibliander 1543: vol. I, p. 197, ll. 3–8):[22]

> Ad hoc respondet Mahometus in libro de sua doctrina dicens quod non erit ibi egestio sordium sed purgatio per sudorem. Et ponit exemplum de puero in utero matris, qui, ut dicit, nutritur et non egerit. Sed exemplum et ratio eius nichil soluit, sicut patet inspicienti. Nam quedam sunt de perfectione imperfecti que in re perfecta essent imperfectiones magne.
>
> To this Muhammad in the book of his *Teachings* saying that there will be no expulsion of filth but purgation through sweat. And he uses the example of

21 Bibliander 1543: vol. I, p. 199, ll. 6–10, "Post haec uocabit angelum mortis, dicens: O Andreiel, estne quid superstes ex omni creatura mea? Dicet: Nihil, domine mi, pręter me seruum tuum imbecillem. Tunc dicet ei, Quoniam omnem creaturam meam occidisti, abi hinc inter paradisum et infernum, et occide postremo teipsum, ac morere. Abibit infelix, atque in praescripto interuallo proiectus humi, et alis suis inuolutus, seipsum suffocabit, cum tanto quidem mugitu, qui et coelestes spiritus et terrena animalia si uiuerent terrore exanimaret" ("After this he will call on the angel of death, saying, 'Andreiel! Has any of my creatures survived?' He will say, 'None, my lord, other than me, your useless servant.' Then he will say to him, 'Since you killed all of my creatures, go from here, betwixt paradise and hell, and kill yourself, and die'. He will go thence unhappy, and, thrown to the ground in the pre-established gap, wrapped in his wings, he will suffocate himself, with such roars that the heavenly spirits and living things of earth if they were still living would die from terror"). For Paul: I Corinthians 15:26, "The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death." Note also the antiphon for the feast of the Exaltation of the Cross: "O magnum pietatis opus mors mortua tunc est quando in ligno mortua uita fuit" ("O great work of mercy! Death was then brought to death when on the wood life was killed!"): for example, from Cambrai, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 38, f. 333v (saec. xiii med.).

22 "Ait: Dic ergo, cum quicquid influit, et effluere necesse habet, nonne ut comedent, sic et iam egerere oportebit? Respondit: Non sequitur. Nam et infans in utero dum uiuit, uescitur, *nec* tamen egerit. Et quam cito egerere incipit, mortalitatis legem subit. Quae et illos, si egererent, necessitas consequeretur. Si quid tamen superfluit, id per sudorem exit, odorem musti fragrantem" ("He said, 'So say, when something goes in, it must go out; surely as they eat, they will have to also defecate?' He replied: 'No so. For the infant in the womb whilst it lives, feeds but does not defecate. And as soon as it begins to defecate, it is placed beneath the law of mortality. And so for them, if they should defecate, necessity would catch up with them [i.e., they would be mortal, and would die]. If however anything is superfluous [from what they eat], that comes out as sweat, with the fragrance of new wine.'").

> the child in the mother's womb which, as he says, is fed but expels nothing. But the example and his justification solves nothing, as is evident on examination. For there are some perfections in something imperfect which in a perfect thing would be enormous imperfections.

Finally, in this chapter, the text is mentioned (without actual textual reference) to add further authority to Riccoldo's own citation of Aquinas.[23] Riccoldo's preference for the *Doctrina Mahumet* as a witness to Muslim belief places him in good company;[24] it was a widely known and much appreciated text for its apologetic resources, widely known because it circulated with the rest of the texts in the *Corpus Cluniacense*. However, in the fourth chapter, it is cited again yet with a new title: the "liber narrationum", from the same discussion of the delights of paradise:[25]

Libellus, IV.71	*Doctrina Mahumet* (Bibliander 1543: vol. I, p. 197, l. 41–p. 198, l. 16)
Item ipse Machometus in libro narrationum reddit causam quare *uinum sit illicitum*.	… Sed illuc recolens, quod dicis, praeter illicita: cum illic uini fluenta describas, quaero quid nam operis illic habeant, si *uinum illicitum est*? aut si licitum est, quid tibi causae assumis in hoc saeculo uini prohibendi? Respondit, Adeo quidem argute quaeris, ut necessario una quaestione geminam responsionem extorqueas. Vtrumque ergo exponam, et illic esse licitum, et hic illicitum.
Dicit enim quod *deus duos angelos misit ad* **terram** ut bene regerent *et* **iuste iudicarent**, et fuerunt isti angeli **Aroth et Maroth**.	Erant enim *angeli duo*, ***Arot et Marot***, *missi* olim *a Deo* de coelis *in* **terram**, gubernando et instruendo generi humano, tribus his interdictis, ne occiderent, *nec iniuste* **iudicarent**, ***nec uinum biberent***.

23 *Libellus* VIII.226, from Thomas Aquinas, *Summa contra gentiles* 1961), IV.83. Panella (1988, n. 13) suggests that the intended words from the *Doctrina* are "Ancillarum vero non erit numerus" (Bibliander 1543: vol. I, p. 197, l. 41; "there will be no counting the number of sex-slaves").

24 For Nicholas of Cusa, see Valkenberg 2014, pp. 201–204; for Hugo Grotius, see Klein 2005, pp. 162–163. Further, Ferrero Hernández 2011.

25 See Di Cesare 2012, p. 398.

Cumque uenissent, **mulier** *que habebat* **causam**

inuitauit eos **ad prandium** et dedit eis ***uinum*** quod Deus eis mandauerat ***ne biberent***;

et **inebriati** *requirunt eam de luxuria*,

et consensit hoc precio quod *unus docuit* eam *ascendere in celum* et *alius descendere*.

Et **ascendit** in *celum*. Cum autem **Deus uideret** eam, *audita* **causa** et modo, *fecit* **eam luciferum** ut esset ita *pulchra* in celo **inter** *sidera sicut erat* in terra **inter** *mulieres*.

Data autem optione angelis qui peccauerant ubi uellent puniri, hic uel in futuro, cum **eligerent** in presenti puniri, suspendit eos per pedes **in puteo** *Babilonia cum cathena ferrea* **usque** *ad* **diem iudicii**.

Multo itaque tempore sic habito nocti iudices essent per uniuersum orbem, uenit eis die quodam **mulier** prae cunctis foeminis omnino pulcherrima, **causam** *habens* adversus maritum. Quae ut parti suae accomodaret iudices, **inuitauit ad prandium**. Sequuntur. Illa satagens convivantibus inter epulas et pocula vini apponit. Adstat ministrans, offert crebro, instar ut sumant. Quid plura?

Vicerunt blandiciae mulieris. **Inebriati** poculis, in hospitam formosam incaluerunt, uicti, *accubitum postulant*. Spondet ea conditione: dum *alter* uerbum *doceat* per *quod ascendebant coelos*: *alter*, per quod *descendebant*. Placet condictio. Cum ergo didicisset, eleuata est subito et **ascendit** *coelos*. Quod cum **uideret Deus**, *explorata* **causa**, *posuit* **eam luciferum**, *pulcherrimam* **inter** *stellas*, *ut fuerat* **inter** *foeminas*.

Illis autem in iudicium vocatis, proposuit eis Deus, ut eligerent inter poenam huius sęculi et poenam alterius. **Elegerunt** hanc. Depensi sunt ergo *per cathenas ferreas*, demissis capitibus **in puteo** *bebil*, **usque** *in* **diem iudicii**. Quid ergo, Abdia? Nonne sufficiens videtur causa cur et illic licitum sit uinum, et hic illicitum?

And this Muhammad, in the *Book of narrations* gave the reason why wine is unlawful.

He says that God sent two angels to the earth so that they might rule well and might judge justly, and these angels were Aroth and Maroth. And when they had come, a woman who had a case invited them to eat and gave them wine which God had ordered them not to drink; and, drunk, they sought sex from her, and they agreed this price—that one taught her how to go up to heaven, and the other how to go down. And she went up into heaven. When God had seen her, having heard the why and the how, he made her the morning star so that she might be beautiful in the heaven amongst the stars just as she was on earth amongst women.

"But going back over to where you said, regarding unlawful things—when you describe the wine flowing there [in paradise] I ask what troubles they have there, if wine is unlawful? Or, if it is lawful, for what reason do you suppose that wine is to be prohibited in his world [rather than the next]?" He replied, "Now you ask something clever, so that by necessity through a single question you will extort a double response. And so then I will set out how both there it is lawful, and here unlawful.

There were two angels, Arot and Maroth, sent long ago by God from the heavens to the earth, to govern and instruct the human race, with three things forbidden them: they should not kill, nor should they judge unjustly, nor should they drink wine. And so for a long time having by night been judges for the whole world, there came to them by day a certain woman who was utterly beautiful, above all other women, who had a case against her husband. She, so that she might bring the judges to her side, invited them to eat. They accepted. She, fussing over her guests between the courses set out bowls of wine. A servant stood by, pouring out more as soon as they drank. What else? The woman's blandishments won them over. Drunk by the wine, they were aroused by the beautiful hostess;

overcome, they suggested they should go to bed. She agreed, with a condition: that one should teach her the word by which they ascended into the heavens; the other, that by which they came down. There was agreement. When she therefore said the word, she was lifted up of a sudden and ascended into the heavens. When God saw this, having ascertained the reason, he set her as the morning star, the most beautiful amongst the stars, as she had been amongst women.

For the angels, however, when called to judgement, God proposed that they might choose between a punishment in this world or in the next. They chose this one. So they were punished with iron chains, set down with their heads in the well of Bebil, until the day of judgement. What more would you need, Abdia? Is not this enough to see the reason why wine is both lawful there and unlawful here?"

When the angels who had sinned were given the option as to where they wished to be punished, either here or in the world to come, when they chose the present for their punishment, he suspended them in the well of Babylonia with an iron chain until the day of judgement.

The best we can say about the use of the title *Liber narrationum* is that it is generic, as generic as 'Book of Stories' would be; it is also unusual that Riccoldo, even though he was taking the material from exactly the same place he quarried in chapter VIII, did not use the same title. The question thus arises whether he was consulting the texts at different times, possibly in different recensions. Although the collection we refer to as the *Corpus Cluniacense* was indeed brought together at Cluny at some point, it had had a limited circulation in parts within the Cistercians, since the texts had been sent to Bernard of Clairvaux piecemeal as they were finished, a process that was made clear in Peter's delayed letter, sent to Bernard only with the final *pièce de resistance*, the *Alchoran latinus*. It may well have been that Riccoldo had first come across the *Doctrina Mahumet* in this Cistercian version, which was un- or differently-titled—certainly the current title was appended to the work as part of the subsequent assembly of the

Corpus itself, as can be seen from the difficulties experienced by the rubricator of Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, MS 1142, fol. 19r (the earliest of the manuscripts of the *Corpus*) in inserting the rather verbose title into what was a too-small space left by the copyist of the work: the latter was clearly expecting a rather more succinct heading to be used (see Lappin 2021). Riccoldo's knowledge of Peter's *Summa* may thus also be traced to his becoming aware of the other elements of the *Corpus* beyond the 'Liber narrationum', and only then using it to shape his introduction. The numerous cross-references throughout the *Contra legem*, and the strikingly staccato development of topics, would suggest a period of compilation over a number of years, perhaps with the introduction being written last of all. Particularly noticeable is the absence of any reference to the letter of pseudo-al-Kindī,[26] although due to a material loss in an early codex, the *Corpus* often circulated without this text.[27]

Numerous aspects of Riccoldo's view of Islam can be found mirrored in the concerns of the glossators: that violence was an inescapable element of the religion;[28] that the evident contradictions lead to disbelief which may then be held back only by threats;[29] the contradictions themselves are intrinsically linked to violence towards

26 Edited in González Múñoz 2005.

27 d'Alverny 2004.

28 *Libellus* X.99: "Ex his igitur aperte patet quod lex saracenorum est lex occisionis et uiolentie" ("From this it is absolutely clear that the religion of the Saracens is the religion of murder and violence").

29 *Libellus* VIII.261: "Ego autem pro certo comperi quod maxime litterati et sapientes inter saracenos dictis alchorani non adhibent fidem, sed fictionem doctrine aduertunt" ("I also have certainly verified that the most learned and knowledgeable men amongst the aforesaid Saracens show no trust in the Qur'an, but draw attention to the make-believe of the teachings"). The same is placed in a historical frame by the *Alchoran* XVI.27, adnot. "callidos et astutos" (6:123): "Nobiliores et doctiores erant, qui nolebant ei credere. Qui enim primo illi credere rustici et miseri et uiles homines erant, magisque timore gladii et fatuitate bestiali, quam aliqua ratione tracti ei adquiescebant" ("Those who refused to believe him were the more noble and learned; those who first believed in him were rustic and poor and lowly men, and more from the fear of the sword and animalistic stupidity than convinced by a certain degree of reason and so acquiescing to him").

others;[30] that much of the precepts of the Qur'an are motivated by lust;[31] the claim to prophethood is motivated by dishonourable desires;[32] that this prophethood is not only *not* vouchsafed by miracles, it is also ridiculous.[33] Riccoldo, then, worked within

30 *Libellus* VI.23: "Item ipse mandat eis quod non altercentur cum hominibus alterius secte uerbis asperis sed uerbis mansuetis; non enim pertinet ad hominem dirigere sed ad deum solum, et unusquisque habet de se solo reddere rationem et non de alio. Et postea mandat in pluribus locis quod occidantur et expolientur qui non credunt donec credant uel soluant tributum" ("And again he orders them to not argue with men of another religion with harsh words, but with humble speech; it does not belong to man to dispose but to God alone, and each one is to give, for himself alone, an account and not for anyone else. And afterwards he orders in many places that those who did not believe are to be killed and pillaged until they believe or give tribute"). Cp. *Alchoran* XIII.41, adnot. "Mala et insipida" (5:100): "Nota quam tortuose et quantis modis se uertit, et non sibi coherentia dicit, more scilicet diabolico" ("Observe how tortuous and in how many ways it twists and turns, and speaks without any coherence in itself, namely in the habit of a devil"); V.36, adnot. "dic" (3:20): "Facit sibi deum prohibere ne unquam disputet cum aliquo de lege, sciens utique nullam se habere rationem, utpote conscius sibi tot mendaciorum. Et hoc sepe facit" ("He makes God prohibit for him lest anyone should dispute with anyone else about the religion, knowing that he has not good reason, aware that it is all lies. And this he often does").

31 *Libellus* VI.38: "Item in capitulo de *Vacca* concedit sodomiam tam cum masculo quam cum femina" ("Again, in the chapter 'The Cow', he allows sodomy, as much with a male as with a female"). Cp. the more limited concession in *Alchoran* III.53, adnot. "Mulieres uobis subiectas" (2:226): "Nota. Turpissimum preceptum, pro quo solo debuisset incendi, et uide quam uersute statim de dei timore loquitur, ut operiat turpitudinem quam dixerat" ("Observe: a most obscene precept, for which alone he ought to be consumed by fire, and look how cunningly he immediately begins to talk about fear of God, so that he might commit the obscenity that he had spoken of"); on the latter annotation, see Hanne 2013, p. 276; de la Cruz Palma 2021, p. 115.

32 *Libellus* XV.264: "Videtur igitur Machometus ex talibus non solum dare deo participem sed facere se Deo participem et consortem" ("It therefore appears that Muhammad from such sayings not only wishes to give a partner to God, but to make himself God's partner and consort"); XII.67: "Item quia Mahometus erat homo carnalissimus et frequentissime intendebat operi luxurie, in capitulo *Elnur, Elhazeb*, inducit Deum loquentem quod non intrent in domum nisi inuitati et uocati, et nisi perstrepant deforis" ("Again, since Muhammad was a most carnal man and most frequently planned deeds of lust, in the chapter *Elnur, Elhazeb*, he brings in God saying that none should enter the house unless they are summoned and called for, and if not, they should remain outside"). Cp. *Alchoran* XXXIII.39, adnot. "Vir bonus": "Nota: dicit ut nullus ingrediatur domum nisi suam propriam, non tamen repente ingrediatur, sed ante aduentu suo nunciato, timens uidelicet deprehendi cum uxoribus alienis, quas assidue scortabat lecator pessimus" ("Take note: he says that no-one should enter a house except his own, not however coming in of a sudden but should be announced before his arrival, since he feared to be caught with others' wives, with whom the dreadful lecher constantly consorted").

33 *Libellus* XV.229: "Machometus autem nullum omnino miraculum fecit, secundum Alchora-

the same tradition of analysis of Islam as the glossators, yet without showing any particular degree of textual dependence; unsurprising, since the original marginalia was rapidly excised from transmission of the text. Further, his exposure to the *Corpus Cluniacense* probably occurred over at least two or three moments; his familiarity with Peter's *Summa* possibly came later than with the other texts, assuming, here, that the introduction and first chapter were written later. Certainly the current ordering of the sections of his text is no overall guide to any chronological progression at all.

One of the features that is most important in Riccoldo's adaptation of the Cluniac material is the added salience that he gives to apocalyptic accents in his description of Muhammad. This, of course, is already present in Peter the Venerable; but Riccoldo brings it up to date and makes the connections more obvious. It was in this apocalyptic light, however, that both clerics sought to understand and present Islam. Peter's labour of erudition in identifying the heresies was not a mistaken means of Christianizing Islam, nor a self-glorying exercise in theological learning.[34] Both Peter and Riccoldo understood the importance of the density of heretical beliefs in Islam: not in a superficial sense, that Islam was wrong on all sorts of counts, and that the recitation of long-forgotten names could prove it; but that the reactivation of early heresies—which had previously appeared via disagreement over one or two elements of dogma at a time—specifically within one single organization, religion or *secta* was historically significant. The same approach, shorn of an evaluation against a self-evident orthodoxy, is still the dominant approach for modern historians inquiring after the causes and influences on the rise of early Islam within Late Antique cultural milieux:[35] however wrapped-up Peter and Riccoldo seem by theology, their approach is also, perhaps primarily, historical, using those historical tools which were available to them.

In both of our authors, Muhammad is portrayed consistently as the instrument of the devil, and as doing the devil's bidding. This, again, is not simply Christians degrading the seal of the prophets because of their feeling threatened by the Other. The devil's

num; et si de eo quedam dicantur, aut sunt impossibilia et absona ut quod lunam reintegrauit fractam, aut inutilia ut camela locuta fuit aut omnino occulta" ("Muhammad also performed no miracle at all, according to the Qur'an; and if some are recounted about him, either they are impossible and in bad taste—such as when he put the moon together when it had split—or they are useless—such as when the camel spoke—or wholly secret"). The thought is repeated at *Libellus* VIII.215. We might compare these with the ironic exclamation at *Alchoran* XLIII.74, adnot. "plurima pars incredula" (54:27): "O quam mirabiles narrationes" ("Oh, what marvellous stories!"), or LXVIII.43, "Nota quod impudens mendacium" ("Look: what shameless lies").

34 Malcolm 2019, p. 47.

35 See, for example, Shoemaker 2021, who provides an intriguing characterization of the Qur'an as a late antique apocryphon.

involvement is crucial, since both the Cluniac and the Dominican see a turning-point in world history with the arrival and rise of Islam. Muhammad, essentially, was the vessel by which the devil could prepare for the arrival of the antichrist; the wealth of Christian heresies found within Islamic belief was a sign that an important threshold towards the End Times had been crossed, and that, sooner or later, those apocalyptic Last Days would descend upon the whole world, Christians included. The appreciation by both authors that Islam (rather than Christianity) dominated the globe was important in this respect as well. A Christian victory over such a powerful, overpowering, and dominant antagonist could only be by supernatural intervention. Now, both our authors are clear: Muhammad is not the antichrist. That equation would have to wait for when the terror of the Ottoman Turks threatened to sweep away all of Christendom. Nevertheless:

> Hic Mahometus fuit antichristi precursor, qui filio perditionis uiam preparauit in mundo (*Libellus* IX.25).
>
> This Muhammad was the precursor of the antichrist, the one who prepared the way for the son of perdition to come into the world—cp. Matthew 3:3.

A John-the-Baptist figure, then, for the dark side. The heresy-count was an important measure by which one might establish just how far down the slide towards the final trumpet the world had reached. For these writers, the law of the Saracens was not to be feared in itself, but feared rather for what it portended, and it was therefore to be combated within that frame, a struggle with something seen and understood as an apocalyptic foreshadowing, but certainly not the real thing.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Sources

Alchoran latinus I. Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal ms. 1162, ed. Anthony John Lappin, Rome: Aracne, 2022.

Bibliander, Theodore. *Machumetis saracenorum principis eiusque successorum vitae ac doctrina …*, 3 vols, Basel: Johannes Oporinus, 1543.

Irenaeus. *Libri quinque adversus haereses*, ed. W. Wigan Harvey, 2 vols, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1857.

Irenaeus. *Libri quinque adversus haereses*, Engl. trans. *Against the Heresies*, in A. Roberts & J. Donaldson eds, *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 1, *The Apostolic Fathers, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus*, New York: Christian Literature Publishing Company, 1885, pp. 315–567.

Riccoldo da Monte di Croce. *Contra legem Sarracenorum—Confutazione della legge islamica*, BnF, Conv. soppr. C 8.1173, ff. 185r–218r, ed. & trans. Emilio Panella, online resource: archivio.smn.it/emiliopanella/riccoldo/index.htm (home page); archivio.smn.it/emiliopanella/riccoldo2/cls011.htm *et seqq.* (the edition of the text) 2001–, accessed 5 June 2019.

Petrus Pictavensis. *Panigericon ad Petrum Venerabilem*, ed. Pierre de Montmartre, *Domini Petri Venerabilis … Opera*, Paris: Damian Hichman, 1528, foll. ã iii ra–ã [5]vb.

Petrus Venerabilis. *Contra Petrobrusianos*, ed. Pierre de Montmartre, *Domini Petri Venerabilis … Opera*, Paris: Damian Hichman, 1528, foll. Iivb – XXXVIIIra.

Riccoldus Florentinus, O.P. *Libellus intitulatus contra legem sarracenorum editus a fratre Ricoldo florentino de ordine predicatorum, sacre theologie professore*, Seville: Stanislau Polonus, 1500.

Thomas Aquinas. *De articulis fidei*, online resource: www.corpusthomisticum.org/oss.html 1954, accessed: 9 May 2019.

Thomas Aquinas. *Summa contra gentiles,* online resource: https://www.corpusthomisticum.org/scg4079.html 1961, accessed: 17 March 2024.

Studies

d'Alverny, Marie-Thérèse 2004. 'Deux traductions latines du Coran au Moyen Age', in Charles Burnett ed., *La Connaissance de l'Islam dans l'Occident médiéval* (Variorum Collected Studies Series CS 445:1), Aldershot: Variorum, pp. 69–131.

du Cange *et al.*, 1883–1887. *Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis*, 8 vols, Niort: L. Favre.

de la Cruz Palma, Óscar 2021. 'Robert de Ketton, *traditore*: Manifestations of anti-Islamic Radicalism in the First Latin Translation of the Qur'an', in Cándida Ferrero Hernández & John Tolan eds, *The Latin Qur'an, 1143–1500: Translation, Transition, Interpretation*, Berlin: De Gruyter, pp. 111–122.

Daniel, Norman 1960. *Islam and the West: The Making of an Image*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Di Cesare, Michelina 2012. *The Pseudo-historical Image of the Prophet Muhammad in Medieval Latin Literature: A Repertory*, Berlin: De Gruyter.

Ferrero Hernández, Cándida 2011. 'Difusión de las ideas islámicas a partir del *Liber de doctrina Mahumet*', in Clara Elena Prieto Entrialgo ed., *Arabes in patria asturiensium*, Oviedo: Universidad de Oviedo, pp. 191–204.

Ferrero Hernández, Cándida 2019. '*Lectio et disputatio* en el prólogo del *Contra legem Sarracenorum* de Riccoldo da Monte de Croce', *Mélange de la Casa de Velázquez* 49, pp. 141–155.

González Múñoz, Fernando 2005. *Exposición y refutación del Islam: La versión latina de las epístolas de al-Hašimi y al-Kindi*, A Coruña: Universidade da Coruña.

González Múñoz, Fernando 2017. *Petrus de Pennis: Tractatus contra Alchoranum*, online resource: https://www.academia.edu/25589460/Petrus_de_Pennis._Tractatus_contra_alchoranum, accessed 18 March 2024.

Hanne, Olivier 2013. 'Le mariage coranique vu à travers l'Alcoran de Robert de Ketton', in Martin Aurell, ed., *Les stratégies matrimoniales dans l'aristocratie (Xe–XIIIe siècles). Actes du colloque du CESCM, Poitiers (25–26 mai 2012)*, Turhout: Brepols, pp. 267–290.

Hopkins, Jasper 1994. 'Islam and the West: Ricoldo of Montecroce and Nicholas of Cusa', in Jasper Hopkins, *A Miscellany on Nicholas of Cusa*, Minneapolis: Arthur J. Banning Press, pp. 57–98.

Klein, Dietrich 2005. 'Hugo Grotius' position on Islam as described in *De veritate religionis christianae*, liber VI', in Martin Mulso & Jan Rohls eds, *Socinianism and Arminianism: Antitrinitarians, Calvinists and Cultural Exchange in Seventeenth-Century Europe*, Leiden: Brill, pp. 149–174.

Langeloh, Jacob 2023. 'Simplify and Doctrinalise, Historify and Personalise: How Two Less-Known Works of Anti-Islamic Polemic from c. 1370–1440 Adapted their Sources', *Journal of Qur'anic Studies* 25.2, pp. 186–210.

Lappin, Anthony John 2021. 'On the Genesis and Formation of the Corpus cluniacense', in Cándida Ferrero Hernández & John Tolan eds, *The Latin Qur'an, 1143–1500: Translation, Transition, Interpretation*, Berlin: De Gruyter, pp. 27–56.

Lewis, Charlton T. & Charles Short 1879. *A Latin Dictionary, Founded on Andrews' Edition of Freund's Latin Dictionary Revised, Enlarged, and in Great Part Rewritten*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Malcolm, Noel 2019. *Useful Enemies: Islam and the Ottoman Empire in Western Political Thought 1450–1750*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Martin, Jean-Marie 2016. '*Petri Diaconi Altercatio pro Romana Ecclesia contra graecum quendam* (1137): édition, traduction et commentaire', in *Le saint, le moine et le paysan: mélanges d'histoire byzantine offerts à Michel Kaplan*, Paris: Éditions de la Sorbonne, 2016, pp. 407–454.

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

Palacky, Franciscus ed. 1858. '*Johannis de Ragusio tractatus, quomodo Bohemi reducti sunt ad unitatem ecclesiae*', in *Monumenta Conciliorum Generalium saeculi decimi quinti. Conclium Basilense. Scriptores*, Vienna: Officina Typographica Aulae et Status, vol. I, pp. 113–286.

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

Rezvan, Efim A. 1998. 'The Qur'an and its World VIII/1: *Contra legem Sarracenorum*: the Qur'an in Western Europe', *Manuscripta orientalia* 4, pp. 41–51.

Shoemaker, Stephen J. 2021. 'A New Arabic Apocryphon from Late Antiquity: The Qur'ān', in Patrice Brodeur, Alexandra Cuffel, Assaad Elias Kattan & Georges Tamer eds, *Judaism, Christianity and Islam: Tension, Transmission, Transformation*, Berlin: De Gruyter, pp. 29–42.

Valkenberg, Pim 2014. 'One Faith, Different Rites: Nicholas of Cusa's New Awareness of Religious Pluralism', in Peter C. Phan & Jonathan S. Ray eds, *Understanding Religious Pluralism: Perspectives from Religious Studies and Theology*, Eugene, Oregon: Pickwick.

JOSÉ MARTÍNEZ GÁZQUEZ

Topics of Riccoldo da Monte di Croce's Latin Glosses to the Arabic Qur'an (BnF Arabe 384)*

INTRODUCTION

It is well known that there are Latin glosses by two different authors in the Qur'an manuscript Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS BnF Arabe 384, which take the form of commentaries on or direct translations of the Qur'anic text.[1] These annotations are highly significant in that they were written by Christian scholars who could read the Qur'an in Arabic and who recorded their reactions in Latin in the marginal notes.

It is not well known, however, that these glosses are fragments taken from Mark of Toledo's *Alchoranus Latinus*, which was a literal translation produced in 1210 at the behest of Cardinal Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada and Bishop Mauricio as part of the preparations for the war against the Muslims that culminated in the Battle of Las Navas de Tolosa in 1212.[2]

The Latin glosses are written in the margins of the Arabic text and on the opening folios of the manuscript, and they vary with respect to both their content and their authorship.[3] Nadia Petrus has undertaken a survey to determine their number and the topics they address. According to her results there are more than 500 glosses, more than 400 of which can be attributed to the hand of Riccoldo da Monte di Croce

* This work has been financed within the framework of the projects FFI2015–63659–C2–1–P, MINECO–FEDER, UE; 2017 SGR 1787; and 2019–2022 PGC2018-093472-B-C31.

1 Déroche 1985, p. 53, no. 344 and pl. 17.

2 Petrus Pons 2005; *Alchoranus Latinus quem transtulit Marcus canonicus Toletanus*, ed. Petrus Pons 2016, pp. xxv–xcii.

3 Déroche & Martínez Gázquez 2010, p. 1024.

(*c.* 1243–1320). This is an exceptional group of glosses for studying the perception of the Qur'an and Islam among Christian scholars in medieval Latin Europe. The glosses deal with a variety of topics, though the focus is on the Bible, with the following topics being repeatedly addressed: Christ (3:52–54); the Crucifixion (4:157); the Annunciation (3:42–48, 19:16–32); Adam, Abraham and the rest of the Patriarchs (2:131–136); the Prophets (21), with a special emphasis on Moses in a number of passages; the precepts of Islam, such as fasting (2:183–187), ablutions before prayer (4:43, v 6), pilgrimage to Mecca (22:27–29), and the prohibition against wine and games of chance (2:219); the role of women in Islam (2:223); the Last Judgement (84:1–6); Hell and its punishments and Paradise and its rewards (88:1–7); and the figure of the Prophet (33:40–48).[4]

Regarding the author of these commentaries, in the catalogue of Qur'an manuscripts in the Bibliothèque nationale de France (BnF) published in 1985, François Déroche highlighted the need to distinguish between two groups of glosses, because there are clearly two different hands, which can be dated to the 13th or 14th century.[5] These two groups are also completely different from each other in the letter size and script used, which leads us to assume that they were inserted into the margins at different times.

As for their contents, both groups include:

- glosses
- fragments from the Qur'an in a literal Latin translation that were taken from Mark of Toledo's *Alchoranus Latinus.* These fragments, which make up the majority of the corpus of glosses, sometimes copy Mark of Toledo's text word for word, and sometimes the glossator corrects and adapts this text.

ANONYMOUS GLOSSES IN LARGE SCRIPT (+)

In the first, smaller group, the glosses are written in a larger script (indicated here by (+)), and go up only to aleya 60 of sura 2, with a few more dispersed throughout the manuscript. In the same hand there are several annexed annotations referring to a listing of Christian topics—such as the Trinity, the Virgin Mary, the death of Christ, etc.—that occupy the manuscript's opening folios, 1v–2r, preceding the text of the Qur'an. In each of these glosses, following the heading, the author has added the numbering of the sura to which the text belongs, accompanied by "C", the initial

4 *Alchoranus Latinus*, ed. Petrus Pons 2016, pp. lviii–lix.

5 Déroche 1985, pp. 53–54.