THE CONCEPT OF ISLAM IN LATIN WRITERS. from the beginning of the twelfth century to the middle of the fourteenth

N. A. DANIEL

Thesis presented to the University of Edinburgh



CONTENTS

General Prefatory Note 1

PART I. REVELATION: QUR'AN AND SCRIPTURE

Prefatory Note 6

Chapter 1. Notions of Islamic Revelation 9
- Muhammad only a prophet 10
- The prophetic sequence 14
- The Law and the Gospel 20
- Islam the religion of Abraham 25
- General statements 32

Chapter 2. The Nature of the Qur'an 38
- Authorship of the Qur'an 39
- Recognition of the Qur'an as unique 49
- Statements of doubtful interpretation 55

Chapter 3. The Qur'an and the Scriptures 60
- The historical defence of Scripture 61
- The Qur'anic endorsement of Scripture 70
- The Qur'anic accusation against Scripture 78
- The authority of Scripture 84
- Conclusion 91

Chapter 4. The Alien Quality of the Qur'an 93
- Incongruity in style and order 94
- Incongruity in content 104
- Conclusion 117

PART II. TRUTH AND FALSITY

Prefatory Note 123

Chapter 5. The Prophethood of Muhammad 128

Chapter 6. The Divine Witness of Miracles 143

Chapter 7. Truth in the Qur'an 158
Good and bad in Islamic teaching 159
Common ground in minor matters 165
The unity of God 167
Note on the imputation of idolatry 179

Chapter 8. The praise of Christ as ʿĪsā the Messias 185

Chapter 9. Trinitarian Heresy 209

Chapter 10. Islam and Heresy 230
The heretical sequence 231
The religions of the world 240
Heresy and schism 251
Conclusion 254

PART III. THE HISTORICAL TREATMENT OF MUHAMMAD

Prefatory Note 258

Chapter 11 The Jāhilīyah: Arabia before Muhammad 260

Chapter 12 The Early Life of Muhammad 285

Chapter 13 Revelation: the Call to Prophethood 305

Chapter 14 The Early Muslim Community 321

Chapter 15 The Household of the Prophet 344

Chapter 16 The Death of Muhammad and Events Associated with it 367

Chapter 17 The Historiography of the Life of Muhammad 387
General considerations 388
San Pedro's attitude to Islamic authorities 397
Editorial selection 404
Conclusion 414

PART IV. ISLAM IN THE WORLD:
THE DUTIES AND REWARDS OF RELIGION 417

Prefatory Note

Chapter 18	The Place of Violence and Power		422
	Attitude to Crusade	423	
	Toleration of Islam	430	
	Attitude to jihād	449	
	Problems of Providence	462	
	Conclusion	473	
Chapter 19	Lata et Spatiosa Via		475
	Marriage Law and Divorce	476	
	"Quicunque actus venerens"	491	
	Types of rebuttal	504	
	Laxity in general	514	
	Practice of virtue by Muslims	524	
	Conclusion	540	
Chapter 20	The Practice of Religion in Islam		545
	Islamic reverence	546	
	Islamic ritual	550	
	Shī'ah Islam	572	
	Churches and images	575	
	Ramaḍān	584	
	Zakāt	587	
	Church and clergy	591	
	Ḥajj	596	
	Various practices	604	
	Conclusion	606	
Chapter 21	Islamic Eschatology		609
	Fatalism and Determinism	610	
	The Last Day	618	
	Paradise	624	
	Conclusion	638	
Chapter 22	CONCLUSION		643
	Summary of ground covered	644	
	The durability of mediaeval concepts	649	
	The peculiarly mediaeval element	654	
	The sense of hostility	660	
Bibliographies			667
Appendices			690

Errata.

p. 173. For Michael Choniates, read Nicetas Choniates.

(In some places only) For MS. Supra Selden 31, read MS. Selden Supra 31.

WATERSTON
BOND

General Prefatory Note.

At about the beginning of the twelfth century Islam began to be treated seriously in works written in the West. Some of these were treatises wholly or largely concerned with Islam, and some dealt with the subject incidentally. By the end of the thirteenth century there was a considerable literature, and by the middle of the fourteenth century the ideas that it expressed were widely spread. In Britain, for example, Matthew Paris made use of important material in the thirteenth century, but in the fourteenth Higden and Mandeville gave material of similar importance a still greater circulation. In the East this period covers the whole history of the Latin States, together with that of practical adjustment to their loss, which may be said to be marked by the establishment of the Franciscan guardianship of Terra Santa and by the resumption of trade with the Islamic powers, under licence. In Spain the period includes the greater part of Murābit, and the whole of Muwaḥḥid rule, as well as the chief effort of actual Reconquest, and also a period of assimilation of the conquered areas. The middle of the fourteenth century is an arbitrary but convenient date which allows the consequences of the military events of the thirteenth to appear.

My subject is how Latin Christian literature represented and misrepresented Islam during this period. I have been concerned with the attitudes and opinions of Latin Christians, and not primarily with the data available to them. On the other hand, the use they made of their data has been treated as a valuable indication of their attitudes. What an author omits or asserts sometimes allows us to recognise that he has made a deliberate choice between alternative data, perhaps that he has positively rejected accurate knowledge, or shown an obvious preference for the absurd. Fantasies to which ignorance of Islam gave rise are interesting, but the use to which authentic information was put is more so. Broadly, the same attitude underlay both, but the detailed study of real facts produced apparently convincing and circumstantial evidence to serve polemic ends. The general attitude of educated men was informed and supported by the Islamic experts of the day.

Men took it for granted that an alien society was dangerous, if not hostile, and the spasmodic outbreak of warfare was one manifestation of this. Under the pressure of their sense of danger, whether real or imagined, a deformed

image of their enemy's beliefs took shape in their minds. By misapprehension and misrepresentation an idea of the beliefs and practices of one society can pass into the accepted myths of another society in a form so distorted that its relation to the original facts is barely discernible. Doctrines that are the expression of the spiritual outlook of enemies are interpreted ungenerously and with prejudice, and even facts are modified (in good faith) to suit the interpretation. In this way is constituted a body of belief about what another group of people believes. A "real truth" is identified; this is something that contrasts with what the enemy say they believe: they must not speak for themselves. This doctrine about a doctrine is repeated widely, and confirmed by repetition in slightly varying forms. The experts, perhaps because their proximity to the facts is a constant stimulus to their zeal, contribute most to the process, and they are themselves wholly convinced by it. The absorption and deformation of Islam by the Latin West, and the creation of a canon of what (according to the Latins) Muslims believe and do is the subject of this study.

My subject, however, is as strictly confined to matters of religion as I can make it. I have tried wholly to exclude philosophical questions, such as those that derive from Averroism, because the interrelation of what is specifically Islamic and what is specifically Christian in the transmission of philosophical thought from the one society to the other is an immense, and immensely difficult, subject needing special and separate attention. Equally I have not attempted to consider the cultural relations of the two societies for example in the field of scientific translations, or in that of art and architecture, or in any other aspect than religion; still less have I attempted to survey their cultural relations as a whole.

I have had to confine myself within narrow limits even within the field of religion. I have excluded all consideration of mysticism and of that speculative theology which is on the borders of philosophy. I have not been concerned with such men as al-Ghazzālī or ibn al-ʿArabī. On the other hand, I have dealt with all the identifiable sources of information that were used by Latin writers, and that were relevant to my purpose. I have indicated indebtedness to authentic Arab and Muslim documents, like the Qur'an itself, ibn Isḥāq or al-Bukhārī; and to translations of less authoritative Islamic material, like the De doctrina Machometi and the Liber Scalae Machometi. I have also indicated the influence of Christian sources of

genuine information, such as the Risālah and the Contrarietas. This I have done in order to try to determine the attitude of each Latin writer to his material; but in doing so I have not attempted to write a literary history, nor have I given any account of the relationships between writers, except in instances where it illumines their treatment of their data to do so.

I am aware that the subject, even within the limits indicated, is not as simple as the foregoing paragraphs might suggest. The issue was not a straightforward one between orthodox Christianity and orthodox Islam. There were important Jewish communities in Spain, and Jewish information from this source may have reached Christians at different points in Europe. Again, in Spain and in Syria Christians acquired ideas at a popular level from oral Islamic sources which were heretical, or simply ignorant of orthodox doctrine and of sober histories of Muhammad. To evaluate influences of this kind on the general outlook of Christendom would be a valuable undertaking, but it lies outside my present purpose.

I have taken religion in a narrower and stricter sense to mean both revelation and the duties laid upon men by revelation. I have considered first the Western treatment of revelation itself: the Scriptures, the Qur'an and the relations between them. Secondly I have considered questions that arise out of revelation - the treatment of Christ and of Muhammad, and the relation of truth to error which to the Latin mind was closely related to this treatment. I have next considered the legend of the historical Muhammad in its more responsible forms, and tried to see how this was integrated into the assessment of his religion, and how it reveals the methods and attitudes of the Western approach. Finally I have considered the duties and rewards of religion, that practical impact that Islam made upon the world, as Latin eyes saw it. Some of the general conclusions that I think it possible to reach are indicated at the end.

A note on terms.

I have used Latin in the sense usual in the East to-day, where for Christians (whether Uniate or dissident) it means a man whose rite is Latin. In the Middle Ages, this meant a Western European, what was also called a Frank. The word frangi was used by Muslims in the Middle Ages, and is familiar to us from its usage in Ottoman times. It was not, however, used in Spain, and the more technical expression seems more apt.

I have almost always translated the word Saracenus as Muslim. Wherever in a translation the word Muslim occurs it represents Saracen, unless I have explicitly stated otherwise; I have very occasionally used Saracen, because it was used by the author quoted in a sense which Muslim did not seem to me to render accurately. That it does so as a general rule I am convinced. In mediaeval usage it was possible to become a Saracen, or a Moor, just as later one could "turn Turk". (Maurus, and also Ismaelitus and Agarenus, I have equally translated Muslim, except where the sense made it necessary to distinguish.) Saracen means a man who holds the same religion as Muhammad, that is, a Muslim.

Lex I have sometimes translated law (as in the Mosaic Law) and sometimes religion (in the sense in which we say, the great religions of the world, or what is your religion?). Whenever in a quotation the word religion (or sometimes the phrase revealed religion) occurs, it is lex that it translates. I think that this is justified in the context of each separate case.

A note on translations from the Bible and the Qur'an.

Most of the quotations from the Qur'an are explicitly quotations from one mediaeval Latin text or another, and the English is meant to render these particular texts. Where it is a case of quoting the Qur'an itself, rather than one of the Latin renderings, I have used Sale's translation, as best expressing in English the meaning traditionally understood in Islam.

The Bible is always quoted by mediaeval authors in the Vulgate, and the English translation used is therefore from the Vulgate.

PART I.

Revelation: Qur'an and Scripture.

Prefatory Note.

The purpose of this section is to consider the Christian treatment of the crucial questions of revelation which divided Christianity and Islam. For Christians, the long prophetic preparation of the Jews, like the sacramental life of the Church, derives its significance from the Incarnation, which distinguished and united two ages of history. They would not be able to think of another scheme of revelation, except as made up of denial and assertion of what they themselves believed. It would not be easy for them to admit or remember the consistent alternative, that the religion of Islam, which has the meaning "submission" to the one God, was revealed again and again through successive prophets who, witnessing to its truth, submitted to God, that is, were Muslims. In the usual Western sense "Islam" denotes at best a separate religion; there can be little contact with the Qur'anic sense, by which what the West calls Islam would be only the final form and organisation of Islam under Muhammad, in whom God intends the prophetic sequence to end, but who is not more Muslim than Moses, or Jesus, or Abraham "who was neither a Jew nor a Christian" (1) (2). It would take too great an imaginative effort so to suspend belief that this association of familiar names, which included the most sacred of all, could seem anything but grotesque to the Latin. We shall see that in this matter it would be a mistake to imagine mediaeval writers to have been ill-informed, but there is evidence that they believed what they chose to believe.

The exact character of the Qur'an was less clearly appreciated, possibly because it is without parallel outside Islam. Christians have understood that the Qur'an contains moral instructions, laws which Muslims obey and enforce, and which allow what the Christian Church forbids; naturally bu erroneously, they have assumed that it is for Muslims what the Bible is for them. Short reflection will show that, even on the surface, there is little, in the New Testament especially, that resembles the Qur'an. What is not often

---

1. The prophets are listed in Qur'an VI.83-6 and IV.161; of these only some were apostles, who included Mūsā and ʿĪsā as well as Muhammad.

2. Q. III.60.

realised is that the Qur'an describes itself, and previous revelations also, as copies of parts of a heavenly prototype, so that it is really unlike anything known in the Christian religion (1). It is still less known that it is believed to be the pre-existing uncreated Word of God; this doctrine, which was reached comparatively late in the development of the consensus of Islamic opinion, was nevertheless generally accepted two centuries before the period with which we are concerned. The Qur'an is in Islam more nearly what Christ is in Christianity: the Word of God, the whole expression of revelation. To the failure to realise this we may attribute the persistent inclination to contrast Muhammad with Christ which so marks the distance between Latin and Islamic thought, and which to Muslims would seem more irrelevant than untrue. What was generally understood was the importance of attacking the high authority of the Qur'an, even while it was thought to claim to be rather the speech of Muhammad than the speech of God.

The Qur'an makes it clear that it not only confirms, but corrects, the Laws of the Gospel (Injīl) and the Pentateuch (Tawrāt). In so far as there is divergence between the teaching of these two earlier revelations and that of the latest and last, either the existing text of the Bible does not truly represent the revelation made to the Jews and Christians in turn, or (in other cases) the Qur'an abrogates the earlier law. It definitely asserts that both the Old Testament (of which the Pentateuch and Psalter Muslims believe to have been revealed) and the New (of which they only believe the Gospel to have been revealed) were committed to human care, without being verbally guaranteed by God, as, by contrast, is the Qur'an. They were revelations coming from the same source as the Qur'an, and, where the Christian canon of Scripture and the Qur'an seriously conflict, the Bible must have been corrupted by Jews and Christians. Prophecies of Muhammad have been suppressed. In the case of the New Testament, the Qur'an says that Jesus foretold "an apostle who shall come after me and his name shall be Aḥmad" (2). (The classic explanation is Aḥmad = Perikleitos = Parakletos.) Neither the Qur'an nor

---

1. This has been thought to resemble the attitude of some "Evangelical" Protestants, for whom the Bible is the Word of God in a special sense unacceptable to Catholic Christianity; yet it must still derive its significance from Jesus Christ, whereas Muhammad derives his from the Qur'an.

2. Q. LXI.6.

the consensus of Islamic tradition alleges any particular occasion when either Testament was, or might have been, changed. It is obvious that Christians would realise that the first requirement of their polemic must be to destroy the authority of the Qur'an by all possible means, and at the same time to establish the canon of Scripture. The weakness of Christian apologetic would be that Christians were so soaked in Scripture, particularly in the twelfth and fourteenth centuries, that even their arguments to establish Scripture were largely Scriptural.

It is not that purely dialectical possibilities of attack were ignored. The Qur'an itself it is that says that its form is its own proof, that issues the challenge to produce one revelation equal, in matter and expression, to those that it contains (1). This is a point that can only be appreciated by someone who understands and shares the Arab love for Arabic, the traditional attitude to both language and literature. Those who are not Arabs, and still more those who are unfamiliar with the conditions of Arab life now or when the Qur'an appeared, will do well to ignore the apparent polemic possibilities of this claim; but the idea itself was an offence to mediaeval and scholastic writers whom it led to overstate their case absurdly. Thus it was possible for what Muslims call a proof of the Qur'an to seem to Latins a disproof. Another point is that, although the Qur'an is the uncreated Word of God, revelations were in some cases (how many, Muslim commentaries do not agree) abrogated or supplanted by new ones. This gave the Qur'an to the unfriendly eye an appearance of being botched up which enemies in all ages have been quick to exploit. It was possible to treat it as inconsistent with itself, with Scripture, and even with philosophy, with a sort of philosophia gentium; and this was attempted very forcefully. This also was a form of criticism which depended on Christian pre-suppositions. To Muslims the basic assumptions of this criticism would appear pointless since they were wholly and exclusively Christian. It must also be said that Christian standards rarely escaped the Scriptural element, even for the sake of an argument.

It will be seen that up to a point Christians were quick to recognise the differences which divided their own from the Islamic point of view. Beyond that point they found it impossible to apply what they knew consistently, and, above all, were unable to find common ground from which to argue. This study explores the hopeless mediaeval attempt to replace the authority of the Qur'an over Muslims by that of Scripture; and also the complacency which could not recognise its failure.

---

1. Q.XVII.90.

Chapter 1.

Notions of Islamic Revelation.

Many mediaeval writers understood that a prophet is not the same in Islam as in Christianity. There were misconceptions of the Islamic scheme of revelation, especially in those matters of the spiritual life of a community which are not easily distinguished from the outside or without sympathy. Yet those who gave most thought to Islamic questions were able to see how differences of religious and moral practice derived from differences about the nature of revelation. It was usual to credit fantastic versions of the life of Muhammad and unrealistic ideas of the ordinary life of Muslim society; with casual writers these obscured the existence itself of those larger questions to which serious authors made them subordinate. A writer with pretensions to do more than amuse would always consider how a Muslim conceived the prophetic sequence.

1. Muhammad only a prophet.

Early in the period, a very clear statement was made by Peter the Venerable, who reveals in his work on Islam some pre-occupation with the prophetic aspect. He addressed his principal polemic work on this subject to an imaginary Muslim public, and, as they were not present to speak in person, conceived replies on their behalf at certain points in his argument. After he had contrasted them with those

who really understand "what is, and what is not," about God, and who worship Him as He wishes, and not according to the "phantasms of their hearts", he very fairly allowed the Muslims to point out that this is just what they believe that they do. They were supposed to continue:

> We have imagined nothing about God, and invented absolutely nothing. What we understand about him, and publicly confess about him, is not according to the figments of our hearts, but according to what our Prophet, who was sent by him, transmitted to us. As he was the last of the prophets in order, and like a seal of all the prophets, as he was not the author, but the bearer of the divine law, not the Lord, but the messenger, he received the heavenly commands which were sent to him by God through Gabriel, and nothing more nor less. What he had received he transmitted to our fathers and to us, to be observed . . . (1)

There was an uncommon appreciation here of a view opposed to the Christian view but not presented as absurd.

It is important to discover how widely Islamic beliefs about revelation and prophecy were understood. It is obvious that in this respect Peter the Venerable's mind was clear and well-informed. In the Cluniac translation of the Qur'an which he had commissioned from Robert of Ketton, the function of Muhammad in relation to revelation was allowed to appear unambiguously in the text. "Believe in the envoy sent to you with the divine truth."[2] Without the help of

---

1. C.S.S., II. 3.
2. Q. IV. 168. Ketton, Az. XII, Bibl. p. 37 line 32. Cf. "For (God) is almighty, and the wise ruler, maintaining power and strength over his people. There is no testimony greater than his; may he be witness to judge between you and me, who sent down this Qur'an to me, for your correction and admonition." Q. VI. 17-19. Ketton, Az. XIV, Bibl. p.45, lines 10-13.

any version of the Qur'an, Guibert of Nogent had already insisted with clarity that Muslims thought of Muhammad as one "through whom the divine laws are transmitted". Mark of Toledo, when he came to summarise the doctrine of the Qur'an which he had just translated, began, "As often as he preached, he said to them, I am the envoy of God; I expound to you the words which the angel puts in my mouth . . ." The sentence which we have quoted in Ketton's translation, Mark rendered, "Ye men, now an envoy has come to you with the truth of your Creator".[1] He thought he saw inconsistency in that Muhammad "sometimes called himself envoy of God (legatus), sometimes, however, prophet of God (propheta)",[2] but in either case there was a prophetic message. Muhammad's claim to be God's messenger was very generally understood. Propheta (with pseudo-propheta) was the word most often used, but words which more nearly translated rasūl rather than nabī were also used - messenger or envoy (nuntius) and apostle (apostolus). Combined phrases are found, propheta vel nuntius or propheta Dei et nuntius.[3] Sometimes the participle missus was used with propheta.[4] William of Auvergne showed understanding of the prophetic witness of the phrase, presumably derived from Cluny, hic ergo legis Abrahae latorem se dixit.[5] San Pedro Pascual reported Abū Bakr's

---

1. Cap. VI, MS. f. 38 v.
2. Pref. Q.
3. Respectively, quad. rep. I and passim, and Simon Simeon. Examples of these usages are cited throughout this chapter.
4. Will. of Tyr, I.I.
5. de leg. XVIII/18.Q. William of Tyre used the same phrase, legis lator, of Gabriel who bore the law to the Prophet.(XIX. XX).

insisting that Muhammad was "nothing but the messenger of God" and subject to death (non fuit nisi Dei nuntius). He spoke of the law (or religion) "which he transmitted by the command of God";[1] the use of the word trado was common, ab angelo traditam,[2] said Humbert of Romans. Richard Fitzralph described the Prophet's function as Dei precepta dare.[3] At a less rarefied intellectual level the same was true. One of the sources collected by Vincent de Beauvais added that "he said that he was a prophet sent from heaven for their salvation".[4] This last statement lacks precision, but we may say that no educated writer knew less.[5] Benvenuto da Imola drew attention to the Islamic view by correcting it: "many laws Muhammad transmitted - or ordered - to his people." James of Acqui used a more original term, consiliarius, with its suggestions of augury and the magical interpretation of

---

1. S.S.M., I. vi. 16, I. viii. 75.
2. Op. Trip. I. VI.
3. Arm. 21(22).
4. Vincent, 23/40.
5. The phrase legis lator was echoed by some versions of the most popular of the lives of Muhammad. (Hugh of Fleury; Gerald of Wales; St. Albans Chr.; Vincent de Beauvais, 23.39) The same story asserts that Khadījah (but not the Arabs generally) recognised a "concealed divinity" in Muhammad and that he claimed to be the Messias. It is not at all clear how these writers really understood his claim; primarily, they were only recounting a good story. The version in Cont. Chron. Isid. says propheta. In the version represented by Marino (III. II) and Dandalo, the magical side and the claim to be Messias are more prominent. These two also blend the two different stories given by Vincent. For the absurd literary versions, see below, p. 306 ff.

the divine will.

2. The prophetic sequence.

The Islamic concept of the prophetic sequence was more often referred to than closely defined. Partly the course of controversy was shaped by mistakes. Both Christians and Muslims have been deceived by the resemblance between their beliefs into neglecting the differences. From Adam to Jesus most of the persons of the story of divine revelation are the same, but their functions are very different. Yet it was widely known that Islam claimed to be the religion of all the Prophets. Robert of Ketton's Qur'an, which lay before Peter the Venerable, was widely distributed among the libraries of Europe,[1] and it rendered the classic verses without misrepresenting Islamic belief: "Certainly we have made a revelation to you, as to Noe and the Prophets succeeding him".[2] Mistranslation did not obscure the prophetic order:

> Therefore thou shalt preach faith in the Creator, utterly persuading men, so that they may hold a firm faith in the books sent down from Heaven to thee and to Abraham and Ismael and Isaac and Jacob and the tribes, and in the laws of Moses and of Christ and of the other prophets, among whom thou shalt not make distinctions; and they shall adore the Creator. (3)

---

1. See M. Th. d'Alverny, Deux Traductions.
2. Q.IV.161. Ket. Az.XI, Bibl. p.37, line 21 ff.
3. Q.II.130. Ket. Az.II, Bibl.p.13, line 30 ff. Cf. Mark of Toledo's more accurate translation: "We have indeed revealed to thee as we revealed to Noe and the prophets after him. . ." and "Say (ye): We have believed in God and in what was directed to us and to Abraham and Ismael and Isaac and Jacob and the tribes, and in what was given to Moses and to Jesus, and in what was transmitted to the Prophets by their Creator; I do not distinguish between them; and we are offered to him." Cap.II, MS. f.8r.

The phrase "the books sent down" is a paraphrase, and must therefore be intended to exclude any obscurity or ambiguity.[1] The Qur'anic statement that God's promise is attested by "the Law, the Gospel and the Qur'an", Ketton translated, "certainly nobody must doubt a thing that God has promised, which is confirmed by the Testament, the Evangel and Alfurcan (for Qur'an)".[2] The three short translations which were made at the same time, and which are never found separated from the Qur'an, all contained exaggerated statements of the prophetic sequence.[3]

There was great clarity in some short statements of what Muslims believed: "Among the Muslims there is an important article of belief," said William of Tripoli, "that Abraham is the friend of God, Moses again the spokesman of God, Jesus son of Mary the word and spirit of God, and Muhammad the messenger of God."[4] These descriptions were taken from the Qur'an.[5] Tripoli was followed by Mandeville.

---

1. Although Mark's translation is nearer to the Arabic, his id quod datum fuit Moysi et Jesu must be less informative to a reader ignorant of his subject than Ketton's inaccurate but informative legibusque Moysi et Christi (fidem adhibeant).
2. Q. IX. 112. Ket. Az.XVIII, Bibl., Az. XIX, p.67,line 21. "Alfurcan" here is gratuitous; the Arabic has Qur'an; Mark rendered the passage, "the pledges of God made in the Decalogue (= Arabic Tawrāt), the Gospel and the Qur'an". Cap. XI, MS.f. 73v
3. The doctrina Machumet, the de generatione Machumet, and the Chronica Mendosa. Bibliander, p.201 ff. For the MSS., see M. Th. d'Alverny, Deux Traductions.
4. LII.
5. Moses, however, should have been referred to as spoken to by God. (cf. Q.VII.139,141.)

He also pointed out how the Qur'an praised Jesus and Mary and all the "holy fathers of the Old Testament" and added that it claimed to be the fifth book sent down from heaven.[1] There is another late statement similar in tone, though less informative. James of Acqui noted the Islamic belief in Moses, as one to whom God said many good things, in Aaron, as one who received grace; and in Christ, as a good man, a greater prophet than Moses and enjoying greater grace than Aaron.

In the course of quoting texts to illustrate another matter, the quadruplex reprobatio summed up the verse of the Qur'an, already quoted above in Cluny's and in Mark's versions, which is one of the most important for the relation of the different prophets in Islamic belief; it was cited also by Fitzralph.[2] The Muslims are commanded to believe in God and the Law and the Prophets and the Gospel of Jesus Christ, and not to make any difference between them.[3] San Pedro described how Abū Ṭālib, Muhammad's uncle and protector, and the father of Muhammad's protégé, ʿAlī, found the Prophet teaching his first male convert, his own son ʿAlī, to pray; he asked him what religion this was. Muhammad replied, "This is the religion of God, of the angels, of the

---

1. The Law, the Gospel, the Psalter, the prophetical books, the Qur'an. In fact, the Qur'an does not recognise, or even mention, the latter. (i.e. the Prophetical books.)
2. Arm. 10/11.
3. Q. II. 130; quad. rep. XI.

apostles, of our father Abraham".[1] San Pedro was familiar with the Qur'anic expression of the sequence of revelations: "O ye of the Book, ye shall understand nothing until ye fulfil the Law and the Gospel and what descended to you from my God".[2] What dominated his mind in this aspect of Islamic religion was the inaccuracy of the Qur'anic versions of the stories of the Prophets, their divergence from the Scriptural canons.[3]

Ramón Lull's references to this doctrine are incidental; it does not seem to have interested him directly. He made a pagan (Gentile) argue that, if God had once gone on to improve his prophetic sequence by sending Muhammad, there was no reason why he should not continue to do so after him. This argument might attract Christians, who are not vulnerable to any similar argument. In fact, it would not be likely to strike a Muslim as damaging, or even, perhaps, as applicable. To do Lull justice, he did not attempt to extract much polemic advantage from it, but, like a good advocate, he was content to have put forward the suggestion and let it drop.[4] Elsewhere he imagined a Muslim who argued that if Islam possessed that place which the prophets of old possessed, Jerusalem, the Islamic religion must be "given by

---

1.S.S.M., I. i. 20.; Ibn Isḥāq, 159. San Pedro's knowledge of Muhammad's life seems to be based on the sīrat rasūl Allāh; see below, Part III, passim.
2.S.S.M., I. iii. 4.
3.C.F.M., III..i. ff., S.S.M., I. i. 59, I. iii. 1.ff., I. viii. 240 ff., I. v. passim.
4. Lib. de Gent., IV. IV.

God through Muhammad his Prophet", whom he best loved, and allowed to rule there.[1] Another of his fictional Muslims stressed the pre-eminence of Muhammad among the Prophets; this theme was connected with that of the intercession on the Last Day.[2]

Some statements, while they show no very close knowledge of Islam, yet convey some true notion of Islamic prophecy. Peter of Poitiers, in sending his Abbot, Peter the Venerable, the headings which would guide him in preparing his polemic and missionary work against Islam, thought it necessary to deny an aspect of the prophetic sequence which struck him as inviting ridicule. From one of the translations produced by the little group whom Cluny employed to make a body of Arabic literature available in Latin, he selected the fable of the light in the side of Adam, which after passed to the side of Noe, and so with all their successors up to Muhammad; this was "omnium risu dignissima".[3] There is no indication that he realised that the doctrine of nūr muhammadī, to which this must refer, was heretical within Islam;[4] in a very different age and place and social grouping, Joinville was able to recognise an incomplete version of the same idea as

---

1. Lib. de Tart., de T. et S., 8.
2. Lib. de Gent., VIII; see below, p.
3. Capitula, III. vi; de generatione Machumet, Bibl. 201.
4. See Massignon, E.I., under Nūr Muhammadī and Nuṣairī.

being Nusairi'.[1] Yet, however heretical, this is an authentically Islamic concept, and, if only as an image, it might have conveyed effectively to a Western reader an idea of the light of prophecy appearing again and again, and have thus interpreted Islam without undue risibility. James of Acqui, in common with Peter the Venerable, believed that the Arabs retained the practice of circumcision from the time of Ismael; this was probably a vestigial fragment of the Islamic doctrine of Abraham. Guido Terrena in a similarly vague way understood Islam to claim that Muhammad fulfilled the promise made to Abraham.[2]

---

1. Joinville, XC. What Joinville reported omitted Muhammad from the series, which then ran from Abraham to St. Peter. For Nusairi's, Shim'ūn (Simon) is the "silent imām" superior to the "articulate prophetic voice", 'Īsā (Jesus), as 'Alī is to Muhammad. King Louis' emissary understood very little, evidently; but the fragments he reported were authentic, and all the Franks realised that this was not orthodox Islam.

2. Primus error. My account omits Alexander III's "instruction" in the faith to the sultan of Konya. If this was based on a real knowledge of Islam, as its construction constantly hints, the writer knew the Qur'anic treatment of Christ as equal to Adam, and used it to develop his theme. This may, however, be simply a case of the traditional Christian parallel of Adam with Christ as "second Adam" in the theology of redemption. In the same way, Alexander's careful use of Old Testament authorities suggests a wish to speak chiefly in terms of prophetic revelation. The list of Biblical books which he said he knew to be acceptable to the sultan does not include all the books he himself proceeded to quote, and neither list corresponds with any Islamic reality. A mistaken idea that Muslims accept the existing texts of Old Testament books was not incompatible with some understanding of the Islamic idea of pre-Qur'anic revelations. (See below, p. 25) It is quite impossible to say how far this passage implies either that Muslims generally, or that the sultan in particular, was familiar with the Old Testament; or how far, if at all, its author had any firm idea of Islamic beliefs. (In Petrus Bles., and St. Albans Chr. (yr.1169) For Adam/Christ parallel, see Q. III. 52.)

Other statements, like Peter the Venerable's in the phrase, "the last of the Prophets in order and like a seal of all the Prophets", made the culmination of the series of prophets clear. Two other statements come from different generations in Syria in the thirteenth century. "They mendaciously affirm that (Muhammad) had the spirit of prophecy above all other prophets."[1] "The Muslims say of Muhammad that he is the seal of all the prophets, because, they say, he is the greatest of them, and because prophecy is sealed in that after Muhammad no other Prophet will arise."[2] The latter was more precise than the former, and more nearly correct than an assertion that Muhammad described himself as "over all the prophets"; this indefinite expression was used by a writer who said that it was Muhammad's mission to declare to Jews and Christians the Law which God had given Moses.[3] Ricoldo da Montecroce said that Muhammad claimed to be "the end and the seal and the silence of all the prophets". Never, Ricoldo protested, could the hand of God be so shortened as to cease to give the prophetic spirit.[4]

3. The Law and the Gospel.

There was a wide interest in, and some understanding of, Islamic belief about the relation of the Qur'an to the

---

1. Vitry, V.
2. Fidenzio, XIV.
3. Anon. Fior.. Cf. Higden: "summum Dei prophetam".
4. Disp.VIII, MS. f.170v.col.1. Ricoldo went on to argue that Christians, Jews and even Muslims claimed that the prophetic gift continued.

revelations which preceded it, that is, to those made to the Christians and the Jews. It came to be realised by several writers that according to Islam Muhammad's prophethood "corrected", in a popular phrase, the earlier revelations. Ketton's paraphrase of the Qur'anic text in no way obscured this point:

> . . . (the Jews) have the Testament that teaches the judgement of God, and shows the right way and light and wisdom . . . Then for the completion of your law we sent Christ the son of Mary, to whom we entrusted the Gospel, which is a light and confirmation of the Testament, and a cleansing and a right way for those that fear God. . . To thee also we sent the Book of truth, the confirmer of the commands to the others, with which it is thy office to judge . . . (1)

Mark of Toledo's translation, which was literal, could not have given an uninformed reader such a clear idea of what the Qur'an at this point was saying.[2] Ṣalāḥ ad Dīn's letter to the Emperor, often quoted by his Latin contemporaries, enshrined a succinct formula: "Our instructor and God's apostle (nuntius), Muhammad, whom he sent for the correction of the right religion: may he make it appear above all religions".[3] James of Vitry realised that the Islamic claim to correct former revelations was a denial of Christianity: Muhammad's mission was that he "should expound to the world and declare the laws given to the Jews through

---

1. Q. V. 48-52. Ket., Az. XII, Bibl. p.24, line 8 ff.
2. Cap. VII. MS. f. 42 v, 43 r. A literal translation without commentary is often difficult to understand in any Western language. Ketton's paraphrase was often quite wrong; but occasionally it was not only helpful but also reasonably accurate.
3. St. Albans Chr., yr. 1188; de expug. T.S. and Itin.Reg.Ric.

Moses and to the Christians through Christ, and should correct and instruct those who ill understood the commands of the law (the commands of religion)".[1] By the last period of the Latin Kingdom accurate information had come to permeate the fiercest war propaganda. According to Humbert of Romans in sermon material for the preaching of the Crusade, "Muhammad said that as Christ was greater than Moses and was sent by God for the correction of his religion, so he (Muhammad) was greater than Christ, for the correction and setting forth of his".[2] In a later work, intended to influence, not the general Crusading public, but the Fathers of the Council of Lyons, he spoke still more clearly: Muhammad gave his religion "especially for the destruction of Christianity", in that "he said that he was sent as a prophet of God to explain and correct the religion of the Christians and the religion of the Jews."[3] Ricoldo made a neat statement on this aspect of prophecy. "Therefore they say that the Qur'an succeeds, so to say, in the place of the Gospel, and that the whole of whatever was good in the Gospel is in the Qur'an, and that there is no further work for the Gospel (to do)."[4]

The accuracy of the impression given by Ketton's paraphrase of the Qur'an was tested when, two centuries after it was made, Richard Fitzralph, in very different circumstances,

---

1. V
2. De pred. S.C., XII.
3. Op. Trip. I. IV.
4. Disp. XVII (MS. f.183r. col.1).

used it in defence of the Scriptures in his Summa in quaestionibus Armenorum. His knowledge seems to have derived from this one source; he misunderstood the Qur'an's "correction" of the Scriptures, but he made no mistake about the prophetic sequence generally. He chose Ketton's version for quotation where it was unambiguous: the Qur'anic revelation claimed to be that which was delivered by God to "Moses and Christ and the other Prophets of God"; the Qur'an warns the Jews, "Know this book of my religion, sent by me from Heaven to be the prop of your religion," a phrase which Fitzralph repeated insistently, "that religion expressly says that it is given to the Jews as a prop of their religion".[1] He quoted passages from Ketton that we have quoted above, and similarly noted the phrase, which he found in his text, "No-one indeed should doubt about a promise from God which is confirmed in the Testament and the Gospel."[2] Of the opening of the third sūrah he said, "What could be

---

1. Q. II. 38; Arm. 10(11); Ket. Az. II, Bibl. p. 10 lines 5-9. Cf. Q. II. 77, Ket. II, Bibl. p. 15, lines 4-11; Arm., loc. cit.

2. Q. IX. 112. Arm. 12/(13); Ket. Az. XVIII, Bibl. XIX, p. 67, line 21-2. Passages from Ketton quoted both here in this chapter and also by Fitzralph, which illustrate the use of Muslim and related words in the Qur'an, are: Q. II. 130, Ket., Az. II, Bibl. p.13, lines 21-2; Arm. 10(11); Q. III. 17-19, Ket. Az. V, Bibl. p. 22, line 10 ff.; Arm. 16(17); Q. III. 58-60, Ket. Az. V, Bibl. p.24, line 8 ff.; Arm. 11(12), 16(17); cf. also Q. VI. 82-9, Ket. Az. XV, Bibl. p.47, line 45 ff., and the comment in Fitzralph, here quoted.

said more explicitly, than that God delivered right ways to men, first the Testament, that is, the Old one, and then the Gospel; or how could either Testament be more explicitly approved ?"[1] While these extracts interested him exclusively as "approval" (as he thought) of the Scriptural text, he was compelled to realise beyond the slightest doubt that Islam claimed the continuity of one true religion in all ages. This is true, too, of the Qur'an's identification of both Moses and Christ as Prophets, and of its claim to "announce nothing contrary to the past Prophets".[2] In fact, Fitzralph even found wearisome the phrases which seemed most useful to his own thesis; a verse which, according to Ketton, read, "We now teach the commands and rules of the laws as we revealed them to Noe and to thee and to Christ and to the children of Israel" provoked the comment, istud sepissime repetit.[3] He did not select his texts to illustrate the Muslim conception of prophecy, but his logic and the loving attention he paid to the written word compelled him lucidly to establish the Qur'anic claim to come at the end of a series

1. Arm. 10(11); Q. III. 1-2, Ket. Az V, Bibl. p.21,line 26ff.
2. Arm. 13(14); Q. XXIII. 46-53; Ket. Az. XXXII, Bibl.XXXIII, p. 110, line 29 ff.; and Q. XLI. 43, Ket. Az. L, Bibl. LI, p. 149, lines 20-1.
3. Arm. 13(14), where he omits the words nunc docemus from Ket. Az. LI, Bibl. LII, p. 150, lines 11-12; Q. XLIII. 11. Cf. Arm., passim, 10 - 15 (11 - 16).

of revealed and prophetic books.[1] "His Law, that is, the Qur'an, he affirms to be nothing but a completing of those (Old and New) Testaments . . ."[2] If every reader of Ketton's text had read it as carefully as Fitzralph did, there would have been no delusion on this point at least, among the scholarly and discriminating public, irrespective of how remote they were from Islamic sources.

There was general reluctance to recognise, and to keep it in mind, that the Qur'an claimed to "correct" the previous revelations. A large and well-informed school of thought, which included Ricoldo and Fitzralph, was pre-occupied with "proving" that the Qur'an guaranteed the Bible in its Christian form, a hopeless attempt which seems to imply a basic failure of comprehension.[3] Probably the reason for this attempt was the general dislike of the claim of Islam to be the religion of all the prophets.

4. Islam, the religion of Abraham.

The more clearly it was understood that it is Islamic doctrine that one true religion was known to Abraham as to all the Prophets, the more it was resented. In this connection it is important that Ketton failed to translate

---

1. Fitzralph also took particular care to record the Qur'anic endorsement of the Psalter.
2. Arm. 15 (16).
3. See p. 70 f.

the word "Muslim" and its related forms.[1] In consequence, his translation tended to obscure passages which define the religion of Islam and to thin the more specifically Islamic content of the Qur'an. Words like "surrendered" or "resigned" or "submitted" or even "Muslim" were never used; there was always some circumlocution, often based on the word "credere". In the very clear passage in sūrah II which describes the religion of Abraham and Ismael and Jacob, of which part has already been quoted, "credere" is used three times; the latter part of Ketton's wording, "hold a firm faith, adoring the Creator" seems to be particularly related to the word muslimūn; what Sale translates, "die not, unless ye also be resigned" becomes, obscurely enough, "ante mortem ne mitetis".[2] In sūrah III the phrase "the true religion in the sight of God is Islam" was completely lost, and almost immediately after, "If they dispute with thee, say, I have resigned myself unto God, and he who followeth me doth the same: and say unto them who have received the scriptures, and to the ignorant, Do ye profess the religion of Islam ? Now if they embrace Islam they are surely directed . . ." became "Say that you have turned your face to God, and so have his followers."[3] In doing this those who are learned in religion

1. "Arabico tantum semoto velamine", says Ketton of his own translation; this unhappily was one of the cases where the original sense disappeared with the velamen.
2. Q. II. 122-130; Ket. Az. II, Bibl. p.13, lines 12-13, 18-19, 21-22, 30-34; cf. Arm. 10(11).
3. This became the text for long passages of Peter the Venerable's contra sectam, see below, p. 452

as well as the uneducated follow the good religion".[1] In the passage a little later about the religion of Abraham, "credere" was again used, although the argument that Abraham preceded both Jews and Christians was presented clearly enough.

> . . . the Testament and the Evangel were delivered after him; you assert what you do not know. He certainly was not a Jew or a Christian, but a man faithful to God, and he did not live an unbeliever. (2)

Here "Dei fidelis et non incredulus vivere" represents ḥanīfan musliman wa mā kāna mina'l-mushrikīn, Sale, "of the true religion, one resigned unto God, and was not of the number of the idolators". In a very different revelation, we read, "Men or women vowing themselves wholly to God, believing, praying . . ."[3] Here he could not use "credere" for "Muslim", because in the Arabic al-mu'minīn (believers) immediately follows al-muslimīn. In the few examples quoted here, "se faciem ad Deum convertere", "Creatorem adorantes", "bonam legem sequi" and "se Deo penitus vovens" were used for "Muslim", as well as the different forms based on "credere" and the complete omissions. This was deliberately to ignore the claim of Islam to be and to have been the religion of all the Prophets, while accepting that Muhammad pretended that his prophethood belonged in the grand tradition.

These points will become more obvious if we compare Mark of Toledo's practice in the same passages. In

---

1. Q. III. 18; Ket. Az.V, Bibl. p.22, lines 10 ff.
2. Q. III. 58-60; Ket. Az.V, Bibl. p. 24, lines 8 ff.
3. Q. XXXIII. 35; Ket. Az.XLII, Bibl. XLIII, p. 132, lines 23 ff.

the first group quoted, he used "oblatus" for "Muslim" - et nos sumus ei oblati;[1] this, of course, is a very reasonable attempt at translation of exactly the sort so conspicuously absent in Ketton.[2] In the second group of passages, those from surah III, he used a variety of phrases which still constitute an unmistakable struggle for exactitude.[3] "There is no light with God except that of the Muslims" (Saracenorum), he said, in the phrase that Ketton omitted. In verse 18/19 his version and Ketton's approximate: "Dic, Contuli faciem meam Deo . . ." compared to "Dic te faciem tuam ad Deum . . . convertisse . . ." He continues, "And say to those to whom the Book is given and to the simple people, Be joined to the Muslims (ysmahelitas); and if they are turned, then they are guided aright . . ."[4] The later passage was rendered:

> O ye who received the Book, why do ye dispute about Abraham, when the Decalogue and the Gospels were not given until after him ? Do ye not understand ? Do ye not dispute about what you know; why then do ye dispute about what ye are ignorant of ? And God knows,

---

1. Cap. I. f.7 v.,8 r.; cf. p. 26 ,note 2
2. The phrase "die not , , ," etc. in the MS. available to me contains a straightforward error, whether the translator's or the copyist's: nolite timere priusquam sitis oblati. This does not affect the point here at issue; if it is the translator's mistake it must come from ignorance, not from any attempt to paraphrase or "improve".
3. Lux must surely be the copyist's mistake for lex; Mark's text should therefore read, there is no religion with God . .
4. Cap. IV. MS. f. 19v., 20 r.; cf. p. 27 , note 1
Cf. Maracci who uses addictus and Moslemus for Mark's oblatus and Ismaelitus. Cf. Q.122 ff.,Maracci, Refutationes in suram II.129 ff.(p.50 ff.): et nos illi sumus addicti (137); Q.III. 45 ff. Maracci ref. in sur.III, 51 ff.(p.129 ff.); or cf. LXVI.5 (Q. and Maracci):. . uxores meliores vobis, Moslemas, Fideles . .

and ye do not know. Abraham was not a Jew, nor was he a Christian, but he was a Muslim and not an idolator.[1]

The word that I have here translated "Muslim" was again "Ismaelite".[2] Thus we see that in Mark's case mistranslations and the omission of phrases show every sign of being simple mistakes, either of translation or in copying. There is no deliberate telescoping of dull or difficult verses, and the text proceeds phrase by phrase, free of the translator's interpretation, and of his personality. No doubt there is a real difficulty in translating these words; in each separate context it is necessary to decide between a rendering like "we are Muslims", which used the proper name, and one such as "we are resigned", which represented the traditional sense of the verb. Mark made his choice of words in each context, and he did not avoid a specific or identifiable word. It was Ketton's and not Mark's translation which achieved wide distribution in Europe, both in the Middle Ages and, thanks to Bibliander, at the Reformation.[3] There is no doubt that Ketton's text obscured, where Mark's did not, the identification of the Prophets as Muslim; but the

---

1. Ibid.(Alchoranum Machometi.) MS. f.22r. There are important mistakes which, however, do not affect the argument here. Gospels for Gospel (al-Injīl) suggests the four texts of the Christian evangelists, instead of the single revelation understood by the Qur'an. Hanīf was not translated in the description of Abraham.
2. In the final example of a Qur'anic use of Muslim, of which we quoted Ketton's translation, above, p.27 note 3, Mark had Saraceni.(Cap.XXXV, MS.f.151v.) There is no suggestion that Ismael may be connected with Muslim.
3. M. Th. d'Alverny has pointed out that it had the weight of the Cluniac recommendation behind it (Deux Traductions)and it was also more readable. Humanistic questions of style apart, the letter of the Qur'an unglossed is difficult to follow.

Prophetic sequence was perhaps clearer in Ketton's, although interpreted in Christian terms.

Not many writers were clear about this point; the experienced annotator of Ketton's text, however, wrote that the Qur'an "says openly that the Prophets were supporters and helpers of the followers of his religion"; this belonged to his introductory remarks, not to the marginal comment on the main text.[1] William of Auvergne explained the situation admirably: "He then called himself the bearer of the religion of Abraham, and in his religion he clearly claimed that Abraham himself was a Muslim".[2] The Islamic view was never more neatly put than by the Syrian Apology, cited by Godfrey of Viterbo and by the report to Pope Gregory which Matthew Paris published: "They also witness," this said, "that from the time of Noe all the Patriarchs and Prophets and Jesus Christ himself held the same religion which they themselves hold, and were saved by it."[3] Some writers were indignant that the Prophets should be termed Muslim (Saracen), and it seemed essential, in the Christian view, to rebut the Islamic claim to represent the true course of a single prophetic religion. That Islam should recognise either the old Prophets or the Apostles of Jesus Christ as Muslims was dangerous in its implications.

---

1. Bibl. p. 224 col.1; MS. CCCD 184, margin at foot left. Note also how the summula described Christ's return at the end of the world, when he would restore the true Islamic form of the religion he had taught. For Ricoldo on the same theme, see below, p. 469
2. de leg., loc. cit.
3. Viterbo, renuisse, must be tenuisse, as in Paris.

The quadruplex reprobatio said drily and almost with indifference that it is a true statement when the Qur'an calls the Apostles "helpers of God";[1] It is an untrue one, said Ricoldo warmly, that they were "Muslims and imitators of the envoy and messenger, that is, of Muhammad".[2] So, too, with the old Patriarchs, to whom Ricoldo applied his argument in more detail.

> (Muhammad) himself said that Noe, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and his sons were Muslims. Then he himself said that it was enjoined upon him that he was to be the first Muslim. How then were they Muslims, if Muhammad was the first ? (3)

This rationalist type of argument had a strong appeal, particularly for a certain type of school-trained mind.

> And, again, he says the same about Noe: that he was a Muslim, and that the reason why the Flood came to the earth was because he preached to men that they should become Muslims, and they refused. This, indeed, is undisguisedly false; for how could Noe, who preceded Muhammad by two thousand five hundred years, be a Muslim ? (4)

Ricoldo seems to have understood the Islamic position, although he subjected it to petty and pedantic arguments:

> Neither can the Muslims say that Abraham and Noe are Muslims because the Muslims are descended from them; for this interpretation is contrary to the Qur'an, where it says that Abraham was not a Christian and was not a Jew, but a pure Muslim. (5)

---

1. V; cf. Q. LXI. 14 and III. 45.
2. Disp., IX; cf. Ep. III. (Bart. Pic.: "Muslims, imitators and apostles of Muhammad.")
3. Disp., VI (MS. f.165 v. col.2); cf. Ibid., IX; cf. Ep.III.
4. Disp. IX.
5. Q. III. 58 - 60.

The subject had only a limited interest and offered little scope for controversial writing.

5. General statements.

It often happened that Christian ideas were confused. Either the concept of three religions - "laws" - given each to a different nation, or that of three universal religions, each valid in its own time, would tend to obscure the Islamic belief in one religion in all ages and nations. Sometimes Christians supposed that Muslims confined the sequence of Prophets to the "lawgivers", Moses, Jesus and Muhammad.[1] "Moses was a great Prophet, but Christ was greater, and the height of the Prophets before (Muhammad's) own times."[2] The notion of universal prophecy was modified in the Christian interpretation by the idea of national prophets, often to a greater extent than it is in the Qur'an itself. Thus, Moses and Jesus speak, each to his own nation, the Christians being for this purpose a "nation". Thomas of Pavia understood the Qur'an to teach "that Moses and Christ were both Prophets of God, but that Christ was sent by God to the Greeks and equally to the Romans, Moses,

---

1. The distinction between nabī and rasūl, between prophet and apostle or messenger, which was made by Muslim commentators on the Qur'an, was unknown or not seen as significant; but see above, p.12 , The idea that there were three great religions was widespread; see below, p.240 &
2. Vitry VI; cf. summula, inde est quod Moysen optimum prophetam fuisse, Christum Deum majorem omnibus exstitisse confirmat . . .; Leg. Aur.; Humbert, de pred.S.C., XII.

indeed, to the Jews". In this dispensation he supposed Islam to claim to be God's provision for the Arabs. To the Arabs alone, said Burcard, was Muhammad sent.

A combination of the national idea with the Islamic concept of one sole religion led naturally to the proposition that Islam replaced Christianity as Christianity had replaced Judaism, so that the common testimony of the Prophets became a mere superseding of each of the more ancient laws in turn. This appears in the fourteenth century statement of Ludolf of Sudheim:

> . . . this is how (Muhammad) wrote about Christ: We have known Jesus son of Mary well: . . . he gave a law to the Christians. And as Jesus put the Law of Moses in the shade, so are we sent by God to correct his law. (1)

The idea of the supersession of one law by another was also prominent in a passage from Ramón Lull, where a Muslim divine was made to say that God has sent Prophets at different times to different places to show his divine power; he gave a law to Moses and the Jews which was valid till the coming of Jesus, whose "law" was in turn valid till the time of Muhammad and the giving of the Islamic "law". Without these mutations of religion in different prophecies and times, a knowledge of the divine power would not so well illumine human wisdom.[2] The erratic second account of Islam published by Matthew Paris added, to a crude limitation of

---

1. Cf. the English pilgrim who thought that Muslims believe that in heaven Christ, the "most gentle" Prophet, sits at God's left hand, and Muhammad at his right.(Quidam Anglicus.)
2. Lib. de Gent., IV, III.

the number of Prophets to three, a subtler explanation of the one revelation which is within Islamic tradition. Muhammad preached

> that there were only three Prophets, and there would not be any more to come . . . Moses instituted those things which agreed with his own time, by means of the law which was given to him by God; Jesus, again, preached and transmitted by the Gospel the things that were to be done in his time; and in the same way Muhammad himself established the things that were fitting in his. (1)

This is intended to explain and illumine God's revelations and does so with a fine imagination. "When the time of the Law of Moses was exhausted, the Gospel succeeded; when the time of the Gospel was exhausted, the law of Muhammad succeeded, as though to supply a defect in the previous and bygone laws."

This explanation was taken in more detail by a passage from William of Tripoli.

> The learned men of the Muslims say: Almighty God, who wished to direct the human race into the way of salvation through knowledge of himself, gave a law after Abraham to the children of Israel by which he was known and worshipped as the true God. Since, however, they neglected to serve it, and abandoned it, he gave men knowledge of himself through the Holy Gospel, in which is made manifest the life and doctrine of Jesus Christ, who was given as a general master and teacher to the whole world, and whose followers are called Christians.
> Yet still the Arabs, who descended from Abraham, admittedly through Ismael, a great nation and an almost infinite people, greater than the people of the Jews, whose descent was through Isaac, remained without a prophet. The law of Moses did not reach them; nor did the Gospel, the law of Christ; now the decree went out from the court and fountain of divine justice that they should be sent a prophet of their own language and nation. (2) Hence it is that, as the Jews had to

---

1. Paris, al. scr.
2. Prutz, from the Paris MSS., has de lingua et gente memorata; the Vatican MS., propheta de lingua et gente memorata; Higden, copying the same passage, de propria gente propheta.

> follow Moses and the Christians Christ, so must the Muslims follow Muhammad. They put themselves before the Jews and the Christians in this, that they say that the Jews have broken the Law and the Christians the Gospel; and that they have served their divine law, the Qur'an, in its excellence and purity. (1)

Most essentials of Islamic belief are here, the revelation made after Abraham to the Jews, the failure of Jews and Christians to preserve in a pure state the revelations made to Moses and Jesus, the last revelation made in Arabic to the Arabs and observed by them in purity. It failed to state that the Arabic revelation made a universal and final claim on men; Tripoli, writing in ʿAkka immediately before the fall of the Latin Kingdom, contended that Islam approached its end and that already Muslims began to be converted in numbers. Often abnormally sensitive to shades of Islamic opinion, he was blind to its aggressive and triumphant aspects.

Substantially the same passage was repeated in the following century by Higden, who, in giving it the wide circulation of the Polychronicon, introduced it with a hodge-podge of sentences taken from another chapter in the same source: " . . . in his Qur'an (Muhammad) commends all the fathers of the Old Testament, especially Moses, and John the Baptist, Christ and Muhammad."[2] The long passage of

---

1. XXVII.
2. Higden also quoted Tripoli's statement that "five books have descended from Heaven for the instruction of men, namely the Psalter, the Law of Moses, the books of the Prophets, the Gospel and the Qur'an of Muhammad", as the assertion of the Qur'an. As far as the prophetic books of the Old Testament are concerned, this is mistaken.

Tripoli's that we have quoted he attributed to the Qur'an, not, as Tripoli more reasonably did, to the commentators or the 'ulamā'. Tripoli had argued that there was little mention and no praise of Muhammad in the Qur'an; Higden clearly did not believe this and made the "common-sense" but mistaken correction that inserted Muhammad's name among the Prophets the Qur'an praised. These are minor alterations to an unusually well-informed statement which in Higden's text stands out among other less authentic material.

There were some mistakes in most accounts of the basic beliefs of Islam, its concepts of prophecy and revelation and accounts very different in accuracy circulated together, often in the statement of a single author and without much critical guidance. In addition, nearly every writer, as we shall see later,[1] was impressed by the position of Jesus as a great Prophet in the belief of Muslims, and this drew attention to the idea of a purely prophetic revelation. Educated writers did not reverse this, or suppose that Muslims took Muhammad for God.[2] It is probably true that in proportion as Islamic doctrine was understood it was reinterpreted in Christian terms; thus writers who pondered greatly the relation of Islamic revelation to the Scriptures came to insist on a distorted view of the Qur'an as endorsing Scripture. This was a fault of excessive thought, not of

---

1. Below, p. 185ff
2. For belief that Muhammad and other gods were worshipped as deities, see below, p. 179ff

ignorance. It is important that accounts of a more or less adequate character, by Western standards, were available; and that, during the fourteenth century, thanks to such writers as Mandeville and Higden, they became readily available. It would be difficult to show that, until the writings of men like Maracci, Reland and Sale, there would be any considerable dissemination of more accurate information over Europe.

Chapter 2.

The Nature of the Qur'an.

The Qur'an was thought of as the "law" of the Muslims without a clear distinction from the system of jurisprudence that derives fromit. The whole corpus of law, both faith and practice, interested Christians because it revealed the alien thought and behaviour of Islamic society; but there was a failure to perceive the springs of that society, so long as the Qur'an was not treated as the spiritual source of Islam. Occasionally it was treated, however antipathetically, as an entity, although this was not an aspect of Islam that was popular. It would be useless, however, to look for an exact definition of how Muslims regarded the Qur'an among Christian views which were excessively vague.[1]

1. The authorship of the Qur'an.

Whatever the Qur'an was believed to claim, it was often thought of as pretending only to contain, rather than

---

1. It is clear that the part of the Qur'an in the life of Islamic peoples, and in consequence its very form, were unfamiliar to most Latins. The translation, as nearly as possible exact, of Qur'an by Mark of Toledo as lectionarius was unique. (Pref. Q.) He also defined the word al-furqan. It was normal to think of the Qur'an as a book (liber legis in Ketton); the summula mentioned volumes and Humbert of Romans a writing. In Spain at least, the word sūrah was well-known (see below p.44 note on precepta); Ketton's annotator, as well as explaining that it was a revelation, said that it might be translated as chapter (Bibl.,p.224,col.1; MS. CCCD 184, p.50, top left margin; MS. Supra Seld. 31, top middle right margin). In Syria, William of Tripoli used not only the word Qur'an but also masāḥif and ḥarām (meshaf; Prutz,harine, and Vat.MS. haracenorum, obviously a copyist's muddle),XXV, XXVI. He was followed by Mandeville. See also below, passim.

to consist in, revelations. It was part of the "pseudoprophet"'s pretence that he manufactured his Qur'an, as it was described in such repeated phrases as dicit in alchorano suo. There were few statements of the Islamic view, even to deny it. Where God was named as the speaker of a revelation, the word most often used was "introduced", so that to the mediaeval reader it must often have seemed that the Qur'an was a book into which Muhammad only sometimes "introduced" God as the speaker.

Some phrases of Peter the Venerable's are of interest: he spoke of Muhammad's "acknowledging certain truths in his Qur'an" when "pretending that God was speaking to him";[1] and of "that evil and lying man, introducing God speaking to him, like a poetic figment".[2] The words "poetic figment" do not seem particularly appropriate, and were no doubt called forth by the sense of theological irritation. There is an interlinear gloss on the opening of sūrah 2 in Ketton's text (liber hic absque falsitatis vel erroris annexu): vox Dei ad Mahumet.[3] This recurs marginally in places thought appropriate. The Annotator had a much clearer grasp of this problem than most writers, as we shall see later; but the effect of identifying any part of the text as God's must have made the whole appear a hodge-podge

1. C.S.S., I.23.
2. Ibid., II.13.
3. MS. CCCD. 184, p.50 col.1; MS. Supra Seld. 31,f.33r.

attributed to him only in part. San Pedro would distinguish particular passages of the Qur'an with such words as "loquens in persona Dei"[1], very much as Pedro de Alfonso had done. He also said that the law which Muhammad taught was derived "from the command of God" and in such a case it was obviously not identical with it.[2] Fitzralph used such phrases as facit Deum sic alloqui[3] to distinguish particular passages. Christian writers were fond of the story of the Prophet's marriage to Zaynab bint Jahsh, and of other stories, in which the details derived from the Traditions seemed to support their saying that Muhammad pretended to a revelation in order to justify doing what he wanted.[4] It was in this connection that one often repeated account spoke of a carta sent from heaven to order him to promulgate a commandment relating to divorce.[5] It was generally known that it was claimed that Muhammad received revelations ex parte Dei[6] through the angel Gabriel: "the words of God which Gabriel announced to him from God in heaven".[7] There was often gross simplification of the mode of revelation.[8] Even Lull was

1. S.S.M. I.iii.7, for example.
2. S.S.M. I.viii. 74,75.
3. Arm. 11(12), 12(13) etc.
4. Cf. below, p. 314 and p. 347
5. Vitry, V; Paris; Varagine; but not Viterbo in the text printed by Cerulli.
6. San Pedro, S.S.M. I.ii.2.
7. Mark, Pref. Q., and Fidenzio, XIV.
8. Cf. below, p. 305

capable of preferring a crude version to more accurate ones presumably as well known to him as to his predecessors in Spanish Islamic studies, adding that it was pretended that Gabriel "brought him words of God that are now in the Qur'an".[1] It is evident that Christians realised that a great deal of the Qur'an was directly revealed, but it is not certain that they understood that it was supposed to be so in its entirety. That, at least, is not the impression they gave.

There was some comment on God's "speaking plurally", an idea which derived from the Risālah of ʿAbd al-Masīḥ al-Kindi; Peter the Venerable thought that this was an admission of "Binity" in God, on the part of the protagonists of unity, consisting in "the divine essence itself and its spirit (anima)".[2] Ricoldo more traditionally saw the plural pronoun as an inadvertent and significant concession of the truth of the Trinity.[3] These arguments did not assume that the plural God was the author of the whole Qur'an in Muslim eyes.

The Qur'an was certainly often thought of as a collection of commandments - the phrase is Cluniac: "Alcoran is the name the Muslims give their law and it means collectio praeceptorum in Arabic";[4] the phrase was adopted by Fitzralph, who depended closely on Cluny,[5] and even by

---

1. D.P. 6,7.
2. Summula.
3. Disp. XV; and see below, p. 221
4. Summula.
5. Arm. 10(11).

Ricoldo;[1] and it is a good one, because it expressed a common attitude, not always articulate, which barely distinguished revelation from law. This is probably implicit in the use of Law to mean religion generally, lex Saracenorum or Christianorum, and the Revealed Book, that is, either the Gospel or the Qur'an.[2] The heading to Ketton's Qur'an associates the two: liber legis, not an uncommon definition of the Qur'an; lex seu liber was the phrase with which Tripoli chose to introduce the subject. Matthew Paris took the trouble to delete a passage in the St. Albans Chronicle and to substitute, after Alcoranus, "or Althoranus: al in Arabic is the same as the whole, and thoran means law".[3] This derivation is, of course, without basis. Ramón Lull was a commendable exception, when he spoke of the Qur'an as containing[4] the law.

In this matter the mediaeval literature can never have been clear to the contemporary reader. Sayings and commandments of God's could be "brought into" a book of law, without its being obvious that the whole book was revealed; at the same time, to talk of praecepta was not to preclude the possibility. A collection of commandments was not

---

1. In the form, collectaneum preceptorum. (Disp. prol., MS. f. 160 r. col.1)
2. Cf. the usage for "the People of the Book", viri legis in Ketton (cf. also summula) and homines legis in Vitry (VI). But cf. Mark, e.g. Alchoranum VI, MS. f.37v., "qui librum acceperunt". Mark's literalness would regularly prevent his falling into the use of stereotyped phrases.
3. St. Albans Chronicle, yr. 622.
4. Lib. de Gent.,IV.xii. To speak of the Qur'an as a revelation containing the law would correspond exactly with the reality of the Islamic claim.

necessarily just an anthology of aphorisms. On the contrary, the whole work might be a series of commandments, in which the term praeceptum had almost the connotation of revelation. The annotator of Ketton's text implied as much in explaining the alif, lām, mīm placed initially at the second sūrah.

> . . . elif is the first of the letters with them, both in order of letters and in the name of God; by lem in fact the majesty of God is meant, and by mim authority; so that they insinuate Almighty God, to whom belong this messenger and these commandments. (1)

The same commentator also used azoara (sūrah), preceptum and oraculum as synonymous and as meaning revelation.[2] His is not an isolated example.[3] No decisive picture can be drawn

---

1. Bibl.p.224, col.1; MS.CCCD 184, p.50, right-hand margin; MS. Supra Seld.31,f.33r.,margin at foot, left.
2. Loc. cit.,p.39 ,note 1 above; and ad az.58,Bibl.p.226,col.2.
3. The word praecepta was used by Pedro de Alfonso: haec universa praecepta idcirco sunt a Deo proposita. It was used by Ketton himself with a divine association; for example, he used it to translate ayat in sūrah XIX: Cum divinae virtutes praeceptaque . .(Q.XIX.59; Ketton, az.XXVIII, Bibl.XXIX,p.100 line 4.) The explicit of his Qur'an speaks of it as "Collectio of chapters or of praecepta". Some Spanish authors of the thirteenth century used the term. Mark of Toledo spoke of excerpting praecepta from the Old and New Testaments. (Pref.Q.) Archbishop Roderick described a sūrah as made up of praecepta; in the Spanish version this appeared as leys, while in another place zohara (surah) was explained as meaning mandamiento, and in another, laws of God.(Hist.Arab.VI; Cron.de Esp.CXXI/493, cf.CVI/478.) Fitzralph naturally followed Ketton in his use of the word. In Syria, too, the importance of what was meant by praeceptum is indicated; the report to Pope Innocent III spoke of "a written law . . called Alcoran, the commandments of which . ." Here the word is again praeceptum. (Pseudo-Vitriac, Vincent, 31.59 ff.; St. Albans Chr.,yr.1193.) Tripoli spoke of convincing Muslims that the Christian faith was the only praeceptum given to believers, which seems to imply its contrary and that Islam as a whole would be called by Muslims a praeceptum. (LIII.) It was also used in the sense of a divine command to justify some particular enterprise; a praeceptum from God to wage war under pretext of religious propaganda.(Higden). The exact sense with which Latins tended to endow it in this context must remain obscure, since it is likely that it was not being used with exactly the same connotation by all these writers; but, especially in Spain, the word seems closely associated with revelation.

from these considerations of the way the mediaeval reader would have understood his authorities.

The crux was that Christians could not recognise the distinction between God speaking (in the Qur'an) and Muhammad speaking (as was reported in his Life and the Traditions); or even, in purely Christian terms, between Muhammad speaking in propria persona in the Traditions, and in persona Dei in the Qur'an. A distinction was only made between different texts within the Qur'an: "sic facit Deum alloqui". Those Europeans who were able to distinguish between Qur'an and Traditions ignored the importance of doing so, and deliberately or otherwise, failed to recognise the immensely different authority of the two.[1] Inevitably authors speaking to a Christian public would take it for granted that it was Muhammad who gave the Qur'an authority, but in addressing Muslims, or in providing missionaries with material to do so, they argued "Muhammad said . . ." when they might more effectively have argued "You believe that God said . . ." Thus Oliver of Paderborn used the phrase, "Muhammad says in his Qur'an", when he was supposed to be writing to the Ayyūbid sultan in Cairo.[2] Thus, too, the Cluniacs, taking too seriously as evidence of prophecy the

1. An example of the almost certainly unintentional confusion of the two occurs when William of Auvergne attributes the prohibition of drinking wine to the supposed drunkenness of the angels Hārūt and Mārūt; this he probably thought to be authentically Qur'anic, rather than to belong to the commentators. (de universo, II. xxxvii; cf. Sale, note on Q. II. 96.)
2. Ep. Sal.

allegation that Muhammad had foretold his successors, "disproved" it by the supposed assertion of the Qur'an, that whatever did not conform to the Qur'an was untrue.[1] This makes it clear that they understood the Qur'an to possess outstanding importance, but only as being a work authentically attributed to Muhammad.[2] This was equally true of Pedro de Alfonso before them, and of Viterbo and the Gregorian Report after; these two also spoke of the scriptura of the Muslims in a context that probably refers to the ḥadīth.[3] Mark of Toledo remarked "albeit the words of Muhammad are of greater authority among the Muslims than the sayings of ibn Tūmart, since the Qur'an is accepted universally among all of them. ."[4] It was a lamentable failure of understanding to treat a theologian, however influential, as even comparable with the Qur'an; the Traditions at least refer to the Prophet. The author of the reprobatio gave equal authority to Qur'an and to Traditions, presumably because they seemed to him to be equally authentic sources. He was interested in Islam as he found it, and the Traditions often gave him more information

---

1. C.S.S.II.13.
2. The explicit of the Cluniac translation, de doctrina Machometi, by Hermann Dalmata, describes it as "of great authority" in a phrase very like that used by Ketton of the Qur'an. Peter the Venerable refers to works other than the Qur'an as much less authoritative. (C.S.S.I.16.)
3. The context is the belief that the name of Muhammad was written in Heaven from the creation. This is not Qur'anic; on the other hand nūr muhammadī has been given Qur'anic authority, but it is not likely that this is what is meant here, unless it is a question of Ismā'īlī or Fāṭimid influence. The theme was very popular as representing (for Latins) a special absurdity. It reached them through the Risālah. (Cf. Muir, p.88.)
4. Pref. ʿAqīdah.

(whether true or false by modern standards) than he could find in the Qur'an. His Qur'anic quotations were introduced with bare references ("it is said in the chapter such and such . . .", i.e., sūrah), and sometimes with the phrase "Muhammad said . . ." He was careful to give the references of quotations; this accuracy establishes minutely his knowledge of sources.[1] The Liber Scalae Machometi purported to be the direct work of Muhammad, and therefore it was apparently thought to be not unlike the Qur'an itself.[2] Even San Pedro failed to distinguish clearly between the Liber and Traditions proper and the Qur'an, and would refer to Muhammad's sayings in them all. He was aware of the peculiar importance of the Qur'an, and was careful to explain that the Traditions were collected by the followers of the Prophet, but in spite of this he treated all extra-Qur'anic material as a second, rather than as a secondary, source of

---

1. Op. cit., passim.
2. Lib. Scalae, cap. LXXXV (the end of the work): "Transactis autem supradictis, prout ego Machometus, Dei propheta et nuncius, dixi vobis . . ." and "Nos autem supradicti Halbubekar (abū Bakr) et Habnez (ibn ʿAbbās) testificamus corde vero et consciencia pura quod omnia que Machometus in precedentibus enarravit vera sunt . . ." (See Muñoz and Cerulli). It is no wonder that it was taken seriously, and that San Pedro took the trouble to quote long extracts. (Again, see Muñoz and Cerulli.) In his prologue, the translator himself stressed that this was Muhammad's: . . . fecit Machometus et imposuit ei hoc nomen.

"dichos".[1] In practice his quotations, not only from the Liber Scalae, but also from the sīrat rasūl Allāh, were much more faithful to the originals than those he made from the Qur'an. Ricoldo was prepared to base an argument on the assumption that a short and ambiguous phrase in the Qur'an must bear the meaning imputed to it by the commentators.[2] It was his opinion that what Muhammad had held secretly was explained openly by the commentators, whose writings thus acquired a share in the authority of the Qur'an;[3] and Lull similarly had recourse to expositores whom he treated as infallibly enunciating doctrines only adumbrated in the Qur'an.[4] The failure to distinguish between the authority of Prophet and of Qur'an was probably deliberate, intended to make it clear that the Qur'an was Muhammad's artifact.

---

1. S.S.M., I.iv. title: de las contrariedades que se fallan en los dichos de Mahomad, en el libro que los moros dizen Alhadiz; and ff.; I.viii.63; treatment of the mi'rāj generally, especially C.F.M. V., and S.S.M. I.viii.76 ff. See also below, p. 636
2. See p. 54, below. In the Itinerarium Ricoldo treated the "exposition" as though it were the text; in the Disputatio he more openly insisted that the text must be understood in terms of the "exposition", admitting thereby that they were not identical. He was, of course, working from a literary source (Contrarietas.) It is also interesting to note that Ricoldo repeated as his own assertion, not as a quotation the Cluniac statement that the de doctrina was "of great authority" among Muslims; this seems to emphasise his lack of discrimination among sources. (Disp. VIII.)
3. Disp. IX.
4. Lib. de Gent., vii, xii.

On the other hand, this attitude may almost be said to reproduce as a negative the Islamic claim that everything is contained in the single revelation of the Qur'an which other sources illumine but cannot modify.

2. Recognition of the Qur'an as unique.

The failure to see all the revelations as one, and as distinct from Traditions, even seems in some authors to have co-existed with a realisation that the significance of the Qur'an is peculiar, even unique. Peter the Venerable's was one such ambiguous attitude. Always aware of Muhammad's "making out that God was speaking to him in his Qur'an", he realised that this consisted of "heavenly injunctions sent to him by God through Gabriel"; these were conceived as a whole when to the Muslims themselves he appealed against "your law, which you are wont to boast was sent from Heaven".[1] Another word which he used for Qur'an was oraculum. In his sentence, falsum est ergo oraculum tuum, the rhetoric stresses the divine claim to which a statement, now "proved" false, pretended.[2] The phrase was borrowed by William of Auvergne,

1. C.S.S. I.24. Another indecisive author was Lull; compare with his remarks quoted above, his saying that it pleased God to choose Muhammad to illumine with wisdom and to reveal to him the Qur'an "which is the word of God", in order to humble human pride that goes with pride and vainglory. (Lib. de Gent. IV.iii.) Elsewhere he said that Muslims call the Qur'an "the law of Muhammad", a very obscure remark. (Hamar, sig.32).
2. See below, p.148.

to be used less ambiguously: ". . . the Muslim people holds and adores these lunacies which we read in its law as divine oracles sent to it through the Prophet of God, and obeys them as commands of God."[1] This certainly suggests a law entirely composed of revelations. The fact that the Qur'an descended in the month of Ramaḍān was mentioned by two widely separated authors, Peter the Venerable[2] and the fourteenth century Franciscan Simon.

Other writers seem still clearer. Ketton regularly used the words divinitus and celitus in his translation: in omnibus quidem (nisi) divinitus mihi mandatis . . .(for "that which hath been revealed to me"); hunc librum meae legis a me celitus missum (for "the revelation which I have sent down"); . . . et si testamenti simul et evangelii et celitus super eos missi precepta sequeretur (for "if they observe the Law and the Gospel and the other scriptures which have been sent down to them from their Lord").[3] In this context Mark more accurately used forms of the verb destino,[4] but Ketton's phraseology will have made the point clearer to a

---

1. de leg., XVIII/18.T.
2. C.S.S. I.16.
3. Q. VI.146, Ket. XVI, Bibl. p. 50 line 38; Q. II.38, Ket. II, Bibl.,p. 10 line 7; Q. V.70, Ket. XII, Bibl.p.41 lines 38-9.
4. That is, destinare was used for anzala, which is not the verb in the first example quoted above from Ketton: Mark,(id) quod mihi revelatum est (for ūḥiya); in the other two examples respectively he has id quod destinavi and quod destinatum est eis a Creatore suo. (Alchor. Mach. Cap. VII, MS. f. 54v.; cap. I, MS. f.3r.; cap.VII, MS. f.43v.

mediaeval reader lacking Islamic works of reference. The word *celitus* did not pass into common usage in this context. It was naturally familiar to Fitzralph, who actually quoted all the examples from Ketton's work which have just been quoted here.[1] He quoted, but did not remark on, another phrase of Ketton's, "this Book is composed by God, the merciful, the wise".[2] This word *celitus* was used independently by Guibert of Nogent and was also used by a few other authors unconnected with each other.[3]

---

1. The same three quotations appear in Arm. 12(13), 10(11), and 11(12) respectively. Ketton used *divinitus* and *celitus* generally to refer to revelation; in the following example they are used adjacently, although the texts of the Qur'an which they represent are actually separated by a verse which Ketton ignores: *Omnes hunc librum celitus missum* ("they to whom we have given the Book") *pro more debito aequanimiter legentes credent: increduli perpetuo punientur. Abrahae praecepta divinitus petita complenti . . .* ("When the Lord tried Abraham by.. words"). There are many examples that refer specifically to the Qur'an, of which Fitzralph, of course, only quoted a very few. Some others, ignored by him, are: *libris tibi divinitus missis* ("that which hath been sent down to us"); *liber hoc celitus missus* ("this is ordained to you from God"); *hunc librum tibi celitus missum* ("a book hath been sent down to thee"). Q.II.115, Ket.II, Bibl.p.13, lines 3-6; verse 130, Bibl. line 32; Q.IV.28, Ket.IX, opening, Bibl. p.31, line 6; Q.VII.1, Ket.XVII, Bibl. p.51 line 38.
2. Arm. 13(14); Q. XLI.42; Ket.L., Bibl.LI, p.149 line 19.
3. e.g. Oliver of Paderborn, William of Tripoli and Benvenuto de Imola. (Oliver, Ep. Sal.; Tripoli, XXVIII.) There are also examples of the use of *divinitus* by sundry authors; William of Tyre used it of Gabriel's mission, in his explanation of Shī'ah origins. (XIX. XX). The *libellus transmar.* used it in the phrase, *dicebat se esse prophetam ad eorum salutem divinitus missum*, (Vincent, 23.40) and Marino Sanudo did so, when he spoke of 'Ā'ishah's innocence (of what she was slandered of) *fuisse divinitus revelatum*. (III. iii.)

EX BIBL. UNIV. EDINBURGEN.

Some statements by the annotator of Ketton's text are exceptionally sound. He was both conscious of the constituent revelations of the Qur'an as separate, and puzzled to know how it could be thought to be revealed as a whole from a heavenly prototype. He commented that separate writings (cartae) were called sūrahs, and that Gabriel was supposed to have brought them from God, not all at once, but bit by bit.[1] "For through the whole of this Book no word is ever ascribed save to God conversing with Muhammad," he pointed out.[2]

> Readers of this Book should note that God himself, so Muhammad pretended, wrote this law with his own hand and delivered it to the aforementioned Prophet to preach to the world. He said that he had never been able to read, or to know letters, lest it should have been thought to have been composed by him. In spite of this, in speaking he assumed a variety of persons; now indeed he speaks in the person of God, now of the Prophet, now of good people invoking God and giving thanks to him, and even, occasionally, of those who upbraid the good people: all according to the difference of places. (3)

"Note," he added with finality, "that this book is the height of authority among them, so that whoever says something against it is killed immediately and without further delay." This was the most sensitive, but not the only, decisive statement. The Liber Scalae, itself treated as excessively

---

1. Ad. az.58.
2. Introductory marginal notes, Bibl. p.224, col.1 ff., MS. CCCD. 184, p. 50, mid left margin; Supra Seld. 31, right margin, low middle.
3. Bibl. pp. 223-4. MS. CCCD. 184, p.50, lower margin, left and at bottom, left, and p.51, bottom margin, right; MS. Supra Seld. 31, f. 33r., bottom margin, right, and 32v., bottom margin.

authoritative, represented Muhammad's receiving the Qur'an from the hand of God.[1] According to Tripoli, the Qur'an, divinum librum Alcoranum, announced by Gabriel "revealing and teaching" the divine will, was "the doctrine and law of God given through Muhammad to the sons of the Arabs of the descent of Agar and Ismael" and itself asserted its own divine origin: "four Books descended from Heaven . . . and the fifth, it says, was the Qur'an." A little unwillingly, Tripoli admitted that the praises of Christ were believed precisely because they were Qur'anic; praises which "the Muslims believe with the heart to be true, and profess with the mouth, as words of God written in their Qur'an".[2]

San Pedro remarked that Muhammad pretended the Qur'an was sent from Heaven, whereas actually it was written twenty years after he began to preach; this suggests that he thought that Muhammad claimed to have received a written text, or there would be no conflict between the two assertions.[3] Ricoldo treated the matter more plainly. The Muslims, he said, "are not content to say that it is the book of Muhammad,

---

1. L.S.M., cap. LXIX.
2. XXV, XXVI, XXVII, XXVIII, XLVII.
3. S.S.M. I.i.68; cf. also I.i.43 and similar vague comments. The admirable accounts of the actual events or process of revelation which the reprobatio and San Pedro took from good Muslim sources are described below (p.309). These, like the general but in detail ill-defined belief that Muhammad received revelations from Gabriel, are no clear indication of how the Qur'an was regarded.

but (say) that it is truly the Word of God"; again, they try to show it to be "the work of God and not of man"; it is testamentum Dei et verbum Dei.[1] Elsewhere he said of Muslim feeling about the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation: "and because these are contrary to the Qur'an, which they most constantly take to be the word of God, therefore they do not accept them, but laugh at them."[2] Ricoldo's interest was limited in this matter; Muslim reverence for the Qur'an as Word of God simply revealed the need to destroy its authority; revelation was worth attention when, by being inconsistent, it gave opportunities for polemic. Again, if the Qur'an were compiled after the death of Muhammad, it could not be true, what it made God out to say, "We have caused the reminder to descend and we shall be its keeper(s)";[3] this only makes sense if Ricoldo understood that the revelation was supposed to be integral. He was himself inconsistent; when he thought he could point out a Qur'anic passage as absurd, he liked to stress that it was said tanquam ex ore Dei;[4] this was borrowed and traditional terminology, implying the revelation of particular parts, and both he and

---

1. Itin. XXXIII, XXXV; Ep. I.
2. Disp. II.
3. Disp. XIII, discussed below, p.73 n. (Custodientes, for keeper, to agree with the first person plural of the verb, of which the subject is God.) For reprobatio on this point, see ibid.
4. Itin. XXXIV, Disp. IV, VIII, IX, etc.

San Pedro knew better. The fuqahā', Ricoldo said, teach that God revealed the Qur'an to Muhammad, and he wrote it from the mouth of God; but, he went on, the Muslims agree only that the Qur'an was given by God - totum enim est a nostro Deo - and will never agree about its explanation.[1] Finally, there is a statement of Higden's that seems to mean that Muhammad claimed divine authority for the whole Qur'an.[2] All these statements which seem to assert the Qur'an's claim to be wholly revealed prove either to be ambiguous, or else to have been made by writers who elsewhere state or imply the opposite.

3. Statements of doubtful interpretation.

Some references seem only to indicate the idea that the whole Book was thought to be revealed, without being decisive; others definitely imply a claim to revelation entire, but are absurd in some other respect. There is the

---

1. Disp. XIII. Ricoldo also said that the Muslims believe that "there is no one who knows the Qur'an or its exposition save God alone" (Itin.XXXII).(This actually refers only to particular verses) Ricoldo also said that"the Muslims agree" that the first author of the Qur'an was the Devil, but he did not elaborate this rather curious idea. (Disp.XIII)

2. "Then, in imitation of true prophets, he took to himself the person of God speaking; at the beginning of the books which he put out, he said, the Lord has spoken to Muhammad his prophet, so that what was deceitfully fabricated by him might in this way be believed to have the weight of divine authority."

reference in the summula to Gabriel's bringing volumes (tomi); and there is the curiously emphatic mention by Humbert of Romans of a book sent down in writing.[1] Peter de Pennis said, quasi verbum Dei ab eis colitur, a statement which the word quasi weakens.[2] Occasionally there were statements so vague that they are difficult to interpret. Sigebert said that Muhammad was called amiras and protosimbolus and the St. Albans Chronicle recorded that "he had the Book containing his law called Prothosimbolus". In another version this was rendered in Sigebert's form, and Matthew Paris wisely cut the whole statement out of the text.[3] There are other obscure references. In the legendary world of the romances the Qur'an scarcely figures; there is mention in the late English Charlemagne versions which date from the fifteenth century. There the Qur'an became one of the number of idols that poems of this class suppose Muslims to worship:

> He defyed Mahounde and Apolyne,
> Iubiter, Ascarot and Alcaron also.

With inconsistency natural to romance, the same poem, when it described a burial "by right of Sarsenye",

---

1. De pred. S.C.
2. XI, MS. f.37v.
3. "another version" - i.e., "Matthew of Westminster".

And songe the Dirige of Alkaron,
That bibill is of here laye . . . (1)

allowed an apparent intrusion of realism. We can only say that the importance of the Qur'an in Islamic belief found some reflection, ill-defined, in widely differing works, and even in literature naturally uninterested in exactitude.

This is true also of the most legendary and silliest stories, about tricks taught to animals to make them appear to bear a forged revelation to the false prophet and other frauds. In one way these came as near to the truth as certain sober "historical" accounts which described the collaboration of Jews and heretics with Muhammad in composing the Qur'an. In the latter case, the approach was an explaining away, and the authors had disinterested themselves in the Islamic attitude. Rationally much more absurd, the dove trained to take a grain of corn from the Prophet's ear (to simulate the Holy Ghost) and the holy calf to whose horns the divine book was fastened, both implied that Muslims set the inspiration of the Qur'an very much higher than the rationalised story troubled to assert. The dove, however absurdly, represented God speaking; the calf bore a text direct from Heaven; "behold your law", as one version had it, "written not with human ink, but by the hand of the angel, and sent down from

---

1. Sowdone of Babylone, lines 2761-2, 2271-2. It is perhaps remarkable that there are not more comparisons of Qur'an to Bible, however mistaken it might be to make the comparison. Occasionally they were treated as equivalent. Cf. Paris, al. scr.; Tripoli, XXVI.

heaven".[1] Marino, for example, who credited these stories, or expected his hard-headed but doubtless somewhat indifferent Venetian business-men to credit them, stated explicitly that Muhammad claimed revelation from the Holy Ghost;[2] this was, after all, the point of the dove story. Repellent as all this might prove to Muslims, it did at least suppose that they believed a heavenly text. As one of these accounts put it, "he seduced those who congratulated and acclaimed him and stubbornly inspired them to accept his law as divine".[3]

Writers who were able to lend belief to the more fantastic stories about Muhammad were infinitely remote from the real world of Islam; generally they would spare the subject only a momentary attention from other interests. Serious writers closely in touch with Islamic life, or, more often, in a position to study its religion and the means to controvert it academically, would deal with the actual form of the Qur'an, would criticise it textually and put their knowledge to a variety of polemic uses. The lack of precision in defining the Muslim attitude was almost universal. Yet, in spite of this, and of the failure to discriminate between the Qur'an and material merely attributed with varying authenticity to Muhammad, the Qur'an does appear

---

1. Higden. Cf. Guibert; Thomas of Pavia; Varagine; Vincent, 23.40; San Pedro, S.S.M., I.viii.27,28,59; Marino, III.ii; Dandalo; Ludolf, VIII; Clementinarum lib.V, gloss. Cf. also Hildebert; see Ziolecki and d'Ancona.
2. Loc. cit.
3. Vincent, loc. cit.

in mediaeval writings, and rightly, as almost synonymous with, because it is the book of, the Muslim "law". It was hated and misunderstood as Islam was hated and misunderstood. In the attack to which it was subjected, even the more knowledgeable writers only strengthened those prejudices which had already taken shape in the minds of those who knew very much less than they. The Christian view was informed by continuity and tradition.

Chapter 3.

The Qur'an and the Scriptures.

Inevitably the entire Christian case against Islam depended upon the validity of the New and Old Testaments, whose defence was crucial. Latins generally based much of their argument on Scripture. Some writers held that one error alone would invalidate Qur'an or Scripture, and that Scripture must be shown to be true in its entirety. Without its books in their canonical form there would be no reason to reject Islam, which claimed the truer devotion to the person of Jesus, a correction and clarification of belief in the Messias. The possibility of such a thing could not be allowed to arise, and a close examination must vindicate Scripture.

1. The historical defence of Scripture.

It was early realised in the West that the Qur'an, in speaking of the Gospel and the Pentateuch, in some way claimed their support. Sigebert said that Muhammad "confirmed his pseudo-prophecy in some things from the Scriptures". Major writers understood that Islam asserted that Christians and Jews had perverted the revelations made to them through Jesus and Moses (though not always sure that the Qur'an itself did so). There was a rough unanimity in interpreting the Muslim case.[1] Peter of Poitiers would

---

1. This type of argument appears as early as the Risālah; not in Vincent, but cf. Muir, p.114 and Tol.,MS. p.3

have had his abbot begin with this question, from which the whole great refutation of Islam which he planned would have proceeded. Neither Jews nor Christians could have falsified their Scriptures, he noted down: the Gospels had been distributed all over the world in many languages, yet one and the same Gospel had been preserved. If it had been falsified, it is impossible that men of so many languages and nations, scholarly and learned especially, could have hidden it, or allowed themselves to be deceived, or mistaken false things for true.[1] It was characteristic of Peter the Venerable himself first to state a Muslim case he would afterwards refute. ". . . one of your people would reply: I do not deny that the Jewish and Christian Books are of God, but(only) in the form in which they were written by their first authors". He simplified the Islamic view that the original documents have been lost in the course of time and the present Scriptures are reconstructions made partly from memory and partly from fancy; but "those things which were evidently true were collected by God and committed to our prophet, and included by him in the scriptures of our law". In this view the relation between the old dispensations and Islam would be one of salvage. The Muslim belief was understood in a form which presents an easy target for ridicule. Peter thought that the Muslims supposed that the Jews lost their law in the

---

1. Capitula, I. ii-vi.

return from Babylon, when the donkey which was carrying it strayed unnoticed from the throng of refugees who were travelling all at their own speeds. "Haeccine est, O viri, fama ? Haeccine est traditio . . ?" The rhetoric spared nothing: "Et qualiter, qualiter, inquam . . ."; but the argument amounted to saying that it is unlikely that the Jews would be so careless.[1] He rendered less frivolously a favourite mediaeval argument: the Scriptures were preserved, not in one copy only, but in many, and not in Jerusalem only, but in many cities of Syria; similarly, it was in many copies that the Muslims of his day preserved their Qur'an. Moreover, Esdras read the law to the Jews on their return to the Holy City, and he could not have invented a false one, so quickly, undetected. It is characteristic of these arguments against a corruption of the Bible to pre-suppose the accuracy of its historical information. Could it have been known to the Jews alone for a first thousand years and remained uncorrupted, and then have been published to the world in its falsified version ? Always in Peter's thought it would be impossible seriously to suspect the data of sacred history; one phrase summed up: "tunc aliquando sensus humanus obrutus ?"

It was similarly with the Gospel, which he understood was alleged to have been lost during the persecution

1. For the donkey, cf. Q.LXII. 5.

under the Empire. "Et hoc est totum ?" he asked, with an irony heavy with the affirmative answer, "hoc est, inquam, totum quod pretenditis . . ?" It was impossible that every copy should have been destroyed, when there was scarcely a city, a town, an estate, without its multitude of Christians mingled with the pagans, and the Christian religion had carried copies outside the boundaries of Empire to Persia, Ethiopia and the Indies, to the Muslims' own Arabia. He traced the history of the books of the New Testament from the moment of writing, individually; they were all quickly diffused and jealously preserved. It was impossible that all Christians would have agreed to corrupt them, or that the doing of it could have been kept secret: "the proverb of our Gauls is true, that what two know, all know".[1]

Vitry, rehandling similar argument, explained that, when Muslims were faced in controversy with something from the Scriptures incompatible with Islam which they could not otherwise escape, they asserted that forgers have corrupted the Scriptures, taking some things out and putting others in: "this is their last and miserable refuge".[2] He protested that this would involve the destruction of all "authority"; nothing could be proved, if it were possible to invalidate reference to every old and authoritative source; the Qur'an

---

1. C.S.S. lib.I. 15-28.
2. VI.

itself might be subjected to such a process, if it were legitimate, which in his view it emphatically was not. The books of the New Testament have been written in different parts of the world and in various languages, by different copyists and at various times, and they agree, sentence by sentence; they have been passed from one to another by all kinds of men up to our own times; it was obvious from such uniformity that they could not have been forged. "For how could so many forgers, as distant from each other in language as in place, agree perfectly in one ?"

Ramón Marti's treatment was impersonal and discreet and orderly.[1] It refined the familiar argument by insisting that Christians and Muslims accept their different historic traditions according to the same "logical and natural rule".

> You believe the Qur'an, and that your Book is whole and unchanged and uncorrupted, because you believe that he who delivered it to men was a seer (vates) and came speaking truth; and similarly that those who heard and received it from him, and wrote and published it, were speaking truth.

A Muslim would say that such a book could not be lost or corrupted, as much because God must have preserved it as because so many different men could not have agreed together to destroy or corrupt it, the wise in their wisdom, and the foolish not knowing how. Such a thing, if it were done, could not be hidden. The argument traced and defended the

---

1. This is the long section common to the quadruplex reprobatio and the explanatio symboli (introductory section, p. 450 ff. which corresponds to cap.X and XII-XV. of quad.rep.)

textual history of the Gospel in parallel form; more summary here than Peter's, it was yet so thorough as to establish "by the showing of many truthful Christians and Muslims and their books" that Christ existed, that He was truthful and had apostles who received the Gospel and a mandate to publish it; and that they were truthful and did preach it to a great variety of people over almost all the world, including judicious kings and princes, who before were entangled in the sin of idolatry. Not only would God have preserved such a book, but such people and so many could not have agreed to destroy it; the wording was chosen to apply equally well to a suppositious defence of the Qur'an. Both the imaginative application of one argument to the Gospel and the Qur'an alternatively, and the stress on providential preservation, were new.

Marti did not neglect detailed defence against textual criticism. He refuted at length a supposed objection against the Old Testament, that Nabuchodonosar burned the books of the law and the prophets, from historical evidence from the fourth book of Kings;[1] the argument recalls Peter's. After the first captivity of the Jews, and a hundred years before Nabuchodonosar, an Israelite priest was sent to teach the new Assyrian colonists in Palestine the (Mosaic) law "of the land", so that the law was in Palestine all the time

---

1. Cf. Vulgate, IV Kings (A.V., II Kings).

before Nabuchodonosar, who in his time destroyed only Jerusalem. His first expedition ended in a free surrender, with the prisoners moving in peace, and taking their books with them, as the Muslims did when they were expelled from the West and East of Spain. In the second, Jerusalem and its houses were burned, though it is not said that any books were; but some people were left to till the land; the rich from Jerusalem and other cities were sent to Babylon, but the other cities were not harmed. It is most likely (verissimile) that the law was kept both by those who remained and those who migrated; cases of judgements according to the law are recorded.[1] There were more general points also. From Ptolemy's making the Septuagint was argued that the Jews could not have altered undetected a law which existed among a non-Jewish people. The preaching of the Gospel to people from the ends of the earth, different in customs, languages and rulers, was again stressed. The zeal of Christians as much as comparison of manuscripts scattered among different nations would prevent any attempt to alter the Gospel. If the Muslims believe the text of the Qur'an, which exists only in one language, to be uncorrupted, or think the same

---

1. One argument consisted in barely more than the justification of the old law, which Christ came not to destroy but to fulfil; it is difficult to see what polemic value this was thought to have. Possibly it was intended simply to emphasise the agreement of the two Testaments with each other, in contrast with a Qur'an seen as in conflict with the doctrine of either.

of a single work of grammar,[1] they must accept the same principle for the Gospel, which is in many languages: quia de similibus simile est judicium. Finally, it was impossible to suppose anyone so presumptuous as to defy the scriptural warnings against meddling with the text of Scripture.[2] All these were variations of the theme first developed.

Ricoldo was less academic in his historical arguments; less careful, and stronger in the expression of prejudice, he had appropriate virtues: experience of the world, and an instinct which was often right. The argument that Christians could not have agreed to suppress an original took a new form from his knowledge of nations and religions.

> How could the Jews and the Christians, between whom there is so ancient a hatred, agree to corrupt the Pentateuch, the Prophets and the Gospel, which were written and published in all the world and in all languages ? And how could the Latins and the Greeks agree with the Chaldeans, who are Nestorians and Jacobites and were treated as schismatic and excommunicated by them before the time of Muhammad, and who are also opposed to each other ? The Nestorians were wholly opposed to the Jacobites before the time of Muhammad, and the Nestorians equally with the Jacobites were cut off from the Latins and Greeks before the time of Muhammad, and yet we find that they have the same translation and truth in the Gospel in Chaldean and in Hebrew that the Latins and Greeks have. (3)

An act of forgery would have had to be done secretly, in which case it could not have been done generally, and in some

---

1. Kitāb of Sībawayhi ?
2. Deut. XIV, Prov. XXX, Apoc. XXII.
3. Itin. XXXIV.

province the true Gospel would remain; or else generally and openly, and in that case it could not have been hidden, or even believed. If the Gospel which the Christians have everywhere is corrupt and changed, can the Muslims produce a copy of the original version ?

> For there was a studium in Baghdad and in Mecca from ancient times, where the most ancient books of the Muslims can be found, and are preserved, in the archives which they showed to us; and yet they could never show any Gospel other than like the one that we have.

In the much more elaborate Disputatio Ricoldo added little to these arguments. He put forward the traditional description of the geographical origins of the Gospels, and to complete their pedigree added the story of Jerome's translation.[1] The early Christians were persecuted for asserting the divinity of Jesus; if they had changed the content of the Gospel, they would have made it easier, not harder to believe; it was unlikely in the same way that they would invent a shameful death for Jesus if it were untrue.

In his turn Fitzralph blended much the same arguments in his own way, deriving some ideas closely from the Cluniac corpus, but apparently sharing others which Ricoldo and the Spaniards also exemplify. His thought was elaborate, detailed and painstaking, his manner scholastic, his approach, like that of his predecessors, profoundly Scriptural. He stressed the greater applicability to the

---

1. Disp. III. Cf. P. de Pennis, XII, MS. f. 39v.ff.

Gospel of any argument that might be brought to prove the integrity of the Qur'an. If there were falsification, when was it done ? The evangelists confirmed one another, Matthew in Judea, Mark in Italy, Luke (a traditional touch of classical learning) in Achaia[1] and John in Asia Minor; the Apostles carried the Gospel far and wide, Thomas in the East to India, Peter and Paul in the West to Rome, the two Jameses in "umbilical Judea", Matthew to the South in Ethiopia, Bartholomew in the North to Armenia, and the other Apostles all to different shores, so that it would have been impossible to forge after, any more than during, their time. How could the manuscripts of Books for which martyrs died, which for many people constituted a rule of life, be forged without its being noticed ? What motive could there have been to falsify ?[2] Fitzralph was treading a path already worn.

2. The Qur'anic endorsement of Scripture.

A group of quite different arguments remains to be considered. For the most part pilgrims and soldiers were

---

1. This was a not uncommon touch of affectation; Ricoldo used it (Disp.III) and Humbert had done so in a slightly different context, but still with reference to the evangelisation of the world in the apostolic age. (M.O.F.P.H., V, Lit. Enc., p.16ff.) For the divisio apostolorum, see p.423

2. Arm. 16 (17) - 20 (21); especially 17(18) and also 16(17) and 20(21).

sheltered from articulate contact with Muslims, but there were others, clergy responsible for morale, prisoners and travellers, both missionary and merchant, for whom the actual words of the Qur'an and arguments based on them would be of special use. In response to a largely clerical demand for the defence of the Bible on a Qur'anic basis, there was some theoretic study of the approach of the Qur'an to Christians, and to their Scriptures.

The Qur'anic recognition of earlier revelations induced in many Christian commentators a curious sense of reassurance which Robert of Ketton himself best summed up. "But although this law is in many places very amusing, it represents, to observers and to participants, the greatest witness to, and the strongest foundation of, the sanctity and excellence of our law".[1] Much the same attitude would be taken by later writers. Little more than a century after the Cluniac work on Islam, it was possible for the author of the reprobatio to exploit the Qur'an with sounder knowledge and greater ingenuity. His new arguments tried to show that the Qur'an necessarily pre-supposed the truth of Scripture. Three texts were taken from sūrah V which "introduces the Lord, saying about Jesus, we gave him, that is, Jesus, the Gospel, in which there is direction and light."[2] But God

---

1. Prefatio Rob. Translatoris.
2. Q. V.50.

could not have said that there was guidance and light in the Gospel if it were corrupt. "Until you establish the Law and the Gospel, you are nothing; there God is speaking to the Christians and Jews, as the Muslims say."[1] To a third passage the author gave prime importance, but he confused the Qur'an with the commentator.[2] He described how the Jews sent to Muhammad for a judgement, and how he sent them back, that they should judge their own people by their own law, and warned them to judge justly. But this was to admit that the Jews then had a law capable of containing the true judgement of God, and, therefore, incorrupt. Similarly, the command not to distinguish between the Prophets, and between the Law, the Gospel and the Qur'an must mean that the Law and Gospel were incorrupt.[3] It happened also that this author completely misunderstood, without misquoting, a text.

> In the tractate al-ḥijr, God is brought in saying: We have caused a reminder to go down, and we are its guardian. Yet, so the Muslims say, he calls the Law and the Gospel the reminder of God, which, as God himself guards it, is not corrupt, unless God himself is not a faithful guardian; quod absit.

Here the interpretation was mistaken on a point essential to the argument; the reminder in the Qur'an is the Qur'an

---

1. Q. V.72.
2. Q. V.52; Baydāwī, quoted by Sale.
3. Q. II.130.

itself.[1] Referred to the same chapter was the verse, "there is no alteration of the Word of God.[2] But the Word of God is the Law and the Gospel."[3] What stands out most clearly in this part of the work is the author's conviction that the Qur'an really did endorse the Scripture. The different forms of this argument seem to do little more than impose a logical dilemma on Muslims, but it had a very powerful appeal for mediaeval writers. Ricoldo, here heavily indebted to the Spanish schools, copied the Contrarietas, and possibly borrowed from the Cluniacs.[4]

---

1. Q. XV.9. The manuscripts vary; the translation here is composite, but the sense is not affected. (Berlin Qu.85, f.247v.; Fol.425, f.128r.col.1; B.N. MS. f.155v.col.2). This argument based on this text of the Qur'an, and similarly that based on the Jewish appeal to the Prophet, both appear in the Contrarietas. The reprobatio does not present these arguments in the same words as the earlier work; even the Qur'an it quotes in its own translation. Thus reprobatio has, Nos (dimisimus vel) fecimus descendere memoriale et sumus eius custodes; compare with Descendere fecimus recordationem Dei, et nos eandem custodiemus (Cont. MS. f.241r.). The sense of the arguments is exactly the same in the two cases. We may be dealing with a refurbishing by the author of the reprobatio of the argument known to him from the Contrarietas; but it seems at least equally likely that it is a case of a living tradition among Christian Spanish scholars which may or may not have originated with the Contrarietas.
2. Q. XLVIII.15 ?
3. He also quoted "in one chapter near the end" (VI.155) We gave the Book to Moses, a completion for him who does right, a discernment in everything, and direction and mercy. He concluded that a corrupt law does not direct, but causes to err.
4. Ricoldo (Disp.III) repeated the mistake about the reminder in the form in which the Contrarietas had given it (recordatio, not memoriale); MS. f. 162v. col.1. Pennis followed him (XII, MS. f. 39v.). The historical emphasis recalls the Cluniac approach.

Some of these considerations were reflected by San Pedro Pascual who may be thought to reproduce much that was current in the Peninsula towards the end of the century.[1] The Qur'an, he argued, refuted itself in respect of Christ, who, if he were the Word and Spirit of God as it maintained, could not lie; and yet so many of his precepts were contrary to those of Muhammad.[2] In many places the Qur'an affirmed that the Christians had a good law and were in the way of salvation; certainly those who believed in God and who served the law of the Jews, also the wise and the Christians, who believed in God and the Last Day, did well; they shall receive reward with God . . . Again, it had said of Christians and Jews, among them is knowledge of the Law and the Gospel.[3] San Pedro was aware that the Qur'an also contradicted these statements, at least in the sense that he understood them, but, like his predecessors and successors in this field of anti-Islamic polemic, he insisted that Muslims were bound by the Qur'an to the Christian canon of Scripture; the Qur'an agreed, too, in praise of the same prophets with the other two religions, and so Muslims were "compelled to accept the sayings of the Prophets, although contrary to themselves".[4]

---

1. Lull, however, does not exemplify this train of thought.
2. S.S.M. I.viii.240-4; as an example, that Christ forbade divorce and said that there would be no marrying in Heaven.
3. Ibid., I.iii.3-5; Q. II.59; it should be "those who believe", i.e., the Muslims; "the wise" should read, the Sabaeans.
4. C.F.M., III.2.

Richard Fitzralph, indebted to Cluny for the version in which he knew the Qur'an, and to many predecessors for his controversial scheme, kept closely to an examination almost verse by verse of the Qur'anic argument. In him the solid achievement of Scriptural and philosophical scholasticism brought these particular arguments to fruition. Like Peter the Venerable, his personal knowledge of the world of Islam was limited;[1] he shared with the later Spanish school his strong belief that the Qur'an indeed endorsed Evangel and Pentateuch. He claimed that it was possible to do for Christianity what could be done for no other religion, that is, to prove the case by the authorities of another religion; and this in contrast to the superficial appearance by which the Christian religion was the most repugnant to reason.[2]

A number of examples will illustrate his method. Commenting on sūrah II, as he worked his way through the Cluniac text, he remarked of verse 81 that it showed approval of Moses and the prophets generally, and truly asserted that the divine spirit was a testimony and a help for Christ; so, too, with verse 130, on which he commented, "this both approves Moses and Christ and the other Prophets, and counsels striving to follow them"; of verse 172 he said

1. Fitzralph's only known contact with the East was with the Armenians of the Romanizing party whom he met at Avignon; see Gwynne, in Studies.
2. Arm. 8 (9).

that in this list of good works (to give to relations and to the poor and beggars, and to redeem captives, and the rest) are enumerated objects of belief, God and the Last Day and the angels and the Books and the Prophets; of which the Books and the Prophets must be those already mentioned by the Qur'an, Christ, Moses and the others.[1] This is a fair indication of the severe limits he imposed upon his interests, rigidly excluding every extraneous point.

On text after text, with a repetition that wearied himself, he confined his comment to this unemphatic point: hic etiam approbat testamentum et evangelium.[2] Occasionally, the terms of this "approval" delighted him: qualiter posset utrumque testamentum expressius approbare ?[3] It is not likely that he would have thought differently had he had a more accurate translation before him. In an important chapter he summarised his findings about the Qur'anic endorsement of Scripture. The authority of the two Testaments was confirmed as prior to that of the Qur'an, "not only for the past, but for the present", by the Qur'an itself,[4] which was "nothing but a completing" of them.[5] By guaranteeing the Scriptures, it invalidated itself; and yet, "so far as the visions of

---

1. Ibid. 10(11).
2. Ibid. 12(13).
3. Ibid. 10(11).
4. Ibid. 15(16).
5. Ibid. 11(12).

such a man could", its confirmation of the Gospel held good.

> There is even greater confirmation of this, in that Muhammad, wanting to invalidate the same Gospel, like Caiaphas prophesying, inserted such things into his Law as would in every way make the truth of the Gospel clear. First, this is done by his affirming the Gospel of Christ to be given by God, as sūrah 66 says, quoted above; and sūrah 5 adds, as quoted above, that God gave the Testament and the Gospel as right ways to men; and surah 12 says that the Gospel is a light and confirmation of the Testament and a correction and a right way to those who fear God. It follows that the Gospel must contain the truth in all things, otherwise it would not be a light; it would not be a right way, but a wrong one; above all, it would not be given by God, who is the highest truth, to men, in order that salvation and grace should result, as it says . . . If indeed the Gospel contains the truth in all things, as this Muhammad admits in this Qur'an, it follows that the Qur'an contains falsity in all things which are repugnant to the Gospel; thus it is most rashly that he repeats endlessly that God has no son, when (this) is most often affirmed in the Gospel, and in the psalter, which he himself says was given by God to David . . . (1)

This was very carefully argued.

In addition, the Qur'an was committed to the praise of Christ and the Apostles; for if Christ were a just and true guide, those who adhered to him and to his doctrine could not be evil men.[2] The Apostles were themselves described in the Qur'an as <u>veri</u> and as <u>penitus obedientes</u>.[3]

---

1. Ibid. 15(16). The references to the Qur'an are all, of course, to Ketton's numbering.
2. Ibid. 16(17). Oliver of Paderborn had anticipated this argument; if Christ had lived an innocent, holy and just life, his religion must be blameless, respectable and wholesome. (Ep. doct.)
3. Ibid. 18(19) and 19(20).

They could not have falsified the Gospel; this was an historical argument from a Qur'anic hypothesis. "Whatever tends to confirm that religion tends also to confirm ours."[1] All these arguments may be reduced to the formula, that if the Qur'an were valid, the Scriptures would be too; but that it was impossible that both should be.

3. The Qur'anic accusation.

It was seen as crucial that, although the Qur'an claimed to support other revelations, "on the other hand, neither Testament approves, foretells or confirms the Qur'an."[2] Fitzralph seems to have had no very precise idea what exactly the Christians were supposed by Muslims to have done to the Gospel. He saw, however, that a corrected text would greatly aid the Islamic position. "No one indeed doubts that the Law of Muhammad would have greater authority than it has at present, if it were affirmed by statements in the Old Testament and the New, or in either."[3] Benedict of Alignan, deriving his ideas at third-hand,[4] similarly pointed out that God sent no prophet without prior "verification" in earlier Scripture. The allegation to this very effect, the assertion that (in particular) Christ did foretell Muhammad, naturally received special attention from writers who knew exactly what

1. Ibid. 20(21).
2. Ibid. 11(12).
3. Ibid.
4. From William of Auvergne, from the Cluniac corpus.

it is that the Qur'an says. If Jesus foretold Muhammad, the Gospel endorsed the Qur'an; it was always the Christian contention that the latter was quite unsupported by any exterior evidence.[1]

The position was stated, without discussion, as early as the twelfth century; "and they say that we perverted the Evangelical Law, and that we cut the name of Muhammad out of the Gospel."[2] This statement probably originated in the East. In the West this question was treated three times in the reprobatio,[3] which is a short book. The author quoted the exact form of words in the Qur'an: "In the sūrah aṣ-ṣaff, that is, of order, he said that Christ prophesied about him, saying, there will come an Apostle after me whose name is Ahmad ("Ahimez") . . ."[4] This is taken from a list of "untrue statements". With an ingenuity that suggests the experience of a whole school, he claimed that there could never have been a motive for removing the name of Muhammad from the Gospel. Had it been included as the name of some good thing to come, it would have been retained in the text as an agreeable prophecy; if as a future evil, it would have been necessary to preserve as much information as possible,

---

1. See below, p. 104 ff.
2. Viterbo; Paris. It is probably to this that Vitry refers when he speaks of Muslims who expound some things in the Scriptures perversely. (VI).
3. Cap. XI, XIII, XV.
4. V; Q. LXI.6.

as has been done in the case of Antichrist.[1] In a passage at the very end of this work which appears equally in the introduction to Ramon Marti's Explanatio Simboli Apostolorum the "Paraclete" form of the Muslim claim was considered. The author distinguished implicitly between what Muhammad claimed (under the name of Ahmad) and what the Muslims claimed for him (under the title of Paraclete): "they say that Christ foretold Muhammad in the Gospel, where he promised his disciples that he would send the Paraclete".[2] But the Paraclete was the Holy Spirit and was to teach the Apostles all things; Muhammad was not a spirit and did not teach the Apostles; the Holy Spirit was invisible, Muhammad was not; Paraclete means consolator, but Muhammad, who came with the sword, was desolator rather. There is a note of ecclesiastical humour.

San Pedro mentioned how a certain Jew of Medina converted many to Islam by saying that Muhammad was the Prophet foretold by Jewish law, and that his name was itself prefigured in it.[3] Lull did not stress the point, but he made it. Muslims lie (he said) in maintaining that the Old and New Testaments foretold Muhammad in many places, "and because in this time his name is not found written in any Testament, therefore they lay it upon us and the Jews that we altered the

---

1. XI.
2. XV; and see Exp. Sim., loc. cit.
3. S.S.M. I.i.51.

Testaments, deleting the name of Muhammad".[1] Ricoldo in the outline of the question which he drew in his Itinerarium made the Qur'an's attack on Christians depend largely upon the supposed suppression. "He commends Christ and the Gospel, and says that Christ in the Gospel says: I announce to you that the Messenger of God will come after me and his name will be Muhammad. But because this is not written in the Gospel, they do not receive the Gospel and say that we corrupted it".[2] This is a little more elaborate and a little less accurate than the reprobatio. Ricoldo in refutation urged historical arguments which echoed his forerunners: why should the name of Muhammad have been omitted when the names of Herod and Pilate and Anna and Caiaphas and Judas were retained ? In the Disputatio he added little to this argument; he again stated the prophecy that the Christians were supposed to have suppressed, both there and in his Epistolae,[3] and he explained a little more about the exact assertion of the Muslims, that "Moses and other prophets prophesied Muhammad, but Christ prophesied about him most clearly of all because he did so by name".

The precision with which these writers identified and rebutted the Qur'anic attack on the Gospel was far from

---

1. Hamar, sig.3.
2. Itin. XXXIV.
3. Disp. III; Ep. III. Cf. P. de Pennis, XII, MS.f.39r.

universal. It was a peculiarity of Peter the Venerable's to insist that the Qur'an does not speak at all of the falsification of the Scriptures by Christians or Jews; it is likely that his imprecision is the source of Fitzralph's. He thought that Muslims held their view contrary to their own best authorities.[1] This must be his own academic conclusion from his study of his texts; he could not have heard from Muslims or informed Christians that the Qur'an does not assert the corruption of Tawrāt and Injīl.[2] Unfortunately the plain fact is that this does not even tally with the text of the Ketton Qur'an, which is clear enough in its presentation of some of the verses which assert or imply the corruption of Scripture, taḥrīf. "And dost thou therefore expect the conversion of (the Jews) to thy religion? Definitely not. For they changed the word of God which they

1. C.S.S., I.16. There is nothing about it, he asserted, in the Qur'an, and nothing in those other books of the Muslims which are less authoritative. It is stupid, he added with ironic pertinence, to believe things on doubtful authority, and senseless to believe them on none. The authorities he quoted by name were his own commissioned translations, the Qur'an, the Liber Abdiae (= de doctrina Machometi) and the de genealogia Machometi (not the Chronica Mendosa).

2. The protagonist of the literal interpretation of tahrif, Abū Muḥammad ʿAlī ibn Ḥazm (d.1064) was a Spaniard, and it is not surprising to find Spanish Christians (followed by Ricoldo) arguing against a literal forgery. (E.I., under "taḥrīf".) It is Peter the Venerable's position which is unexpected. Whether or not literal taḥrīf be understood, there can be no doubt that the Qur'an asserts some kind of corruption of Scripture; and, as is clear from the argumentation that Peter devoted to the subject, he did not underestimate the importance of the allegation, whoever he thought made it and on whatever authority.

had heard and known, and they did not want anything from it to be effected."[1] The text was also unambiguous in places that refer to the Jews twisting the words of the Law - Judaeis verba legalia distorquentibus.[2] These phrases, irrespective of how they translate the Qur'an, are plain in meaning; yet Peter curiously insisted that it was in vain to search the Qur'an "from the first word to the last" for any such statement.[3] Above all, and most improbably, he ignored the Ahmad prophecy, which Ketton rendered unmistakably: "Christ the son of Mary, saying, O children of Israel . . . I announce an Apostle to you; they claimed with a lie that the Apostle who is to come after me, whose name is Muhammad, is a sorcerer."[4] Peter the Venerable's failure to understand this point contrasts with his real understanding of some other aspects of Islam. This particular fault was not typical of the West generally.

---

1. Q. II.70; Ket. Az.II; Bibl. p.11, lines 16 ff. The sentence three verses later, "woe to them who transcribe corruptly the book . . ." was not, however, intelligibly translated.
2. In a parallel phrase, qui verba distorquentes . . . Q. IV.48, Ket. Az.IX, Bibl. p. 32 line 11; Q. V.45, Ket. Az.XII, Bibl. p.40 line 24.
3. Muhammad "does not show that there is anything fulfilled by him." Cf. below, p. 130 ff.
4. Q. loc. cit; Ket. Az.LXX, Bibl. LXXI, p.171 lines 23 ff. This is a muddled translation, but it is not muddled about its main contention that Christ foretold Muhammad. There are still more examples of texts in Ketton that Peter missed. In sūrah III "men of the Law, why do you not believe the known commands of God; why do you keep quiet, knowing the truth ?" is clear, although III.17/18 was lost. (Q. III.64, Ket. Az. V, Bibl. p.24 line 14.)

4. The authority of Scripture.

What was typical was the practice of citing Scripture in anti-Islamic controversy where it could have no polemic validity. In the case of the Cluniacs this was deliberate. They argued that inescapable logical necessity compelled Islam to accept all the Christian canon or none; if any of the Prophets of the Bible, then all, and in their Biblical form. Acceptance of a part of Scripture alone was intolerable to them; it must be accepted or rejected whole.[1] This was the view of Peter of Poitiers, which his abbot would elaborate. If the Scriptures are divine, said Peter the Venerable, their contents must be preserved whole; if not, ex toto reprobandae sunt.[2] He thought that the Arabs should accept the Christian and Jewish version of the Prophets. He sought, like some negotiators, to impose an agreed basis for discussion; thus, when he conjectured an objection, "what is the Arab to the Hebrew, the Ismaelite to the Jew ?" he replied to himself that as well as the universal duty to accept prophets of any origin, whom the Holy Ghost inspired, there was the descent from Ismael and Isaac; and a common inheritance of the practice of circumcision from their father Abraham, "either by innate usages or by laws that have been handed down", and, in addition, common race and "almost common"

1. Capitula, I.vi.
2. C.S.S., I.14.

language, style, and "famous things of literature".[1] Within the circumambience of his second-hand knowledge, Peter would often return to his fundamental point: the Muslim had "either to abandon the Qur'an, because of the false things which have been taken out of Books which you call false and put into your Book; or, if you do not want to do that, to acknowledge that the Christian and Hebrew Books from which these things are taken are true".[2] This bears very strongly the mark of Peter the Venerable's humane and enthusiastic personality but also some lack of discrimination.

This argument pre-supposed the Bible to be the sole source of those stories, from Adam to Jesus, of God's mercies and warnings which fill the Qur'an, so that the Scriptures seemed as creditors to register the Qur'an's insolvency. This was also the explicit view of San Pedro Pascual: Christians, Jews and Muhammad agreed in praising the Prophets "whose Scriptures we receive and praise, just as they are contained in the Bible. Therefore the Muslims are definitely compelled to accept the sayings of the Prophets, although contrary to themselves . . ."[3] Ricoldo adopted the same idea

---

1. C.S.S. II.28.
2. C.S.S. I.24, 29; II.29.
3. C.F.M. III.2.

in the form in which it appears in the Cluniac armoury.[1] For the most part this is an assumption rather than an explicit assertion.

Alan of Lille can be presumed to echo the information generally available in the monastic schools in a generation younger than that of Peter the Venerable; his controversial approach was in some respects similar,[2] but he was more remote from Islamic sources. Like Peter he argued largely from the Bible, but unlike him knew no need to justify doing so. He assumed Islamic doctrine to be based on a non-Christian interpretation of the Christian Scriptural canon, and he was willing unhesitatingly to identify obscure Old Testament texts as the source of Islamic beliefs.[3] This approach was unique in degree, but not in kind. A similar use of Scriptural authorities by Alexander III is not conclusive, because it is not clear whether that pontiff thought his references acceptable to any Muslim, or only to his correspondent.[4]

---

1. "As Augustine said: <u>if only one lie were found in the Gospel, the whole Gospel for the same reason would be suspect and false</u>. The Qur'an indeed contains many true things which are contained in the Gospel and the Law of Moses and the Prophets; but Muhammad himself inserted so many obvious lies in his own, that almost the whole must be considered false and suspect, the work of one who is a liar, and of his father." (Disp. IX; cf. XVI.)
2. Cf. below, p. 243
3. IV.vii, for example, where he says that Muslims defend polygamy on Old Testament grounds.
4. Petrus Bles.,M.P.L.,CCVII; Paris, yr. 1169 (inserted).

Much later, Guido Terrena, representing the educated general public, used Scriptural authorities in just the same way; for example, he condemned the regulations governing the Ramaḍān fast by appeal to Isaias.[1] Verona, in a very different spirit, though quite inaccurately, said that Muhammad accepted little of the Old Testament except Genesis; perhaps, however, he meant Genesis to stand for the whole Pentateuch.[2] There had already been other only partially successful attempts to identify what parts of the Scriptures Muslims would accept. Oliver of Paderborn adopted a remarkable position; he realised that the New Testament, as known to Christians, needed to be proved by an external authority; but, believing the Old Testament to be acceptable, he used its prophecies, detail by detail, to prove the New.[3] Vitry wished to define carefully how much Islam accepted of either Testament but mistakenly thought the New Testament epistles acceptable.[4] Ricoldo and Peter de Pennis argued that Muslims must accept the doctrine of the Trinity because they accepted the Gospels, which taught that doctrine.[5] San Pedro said

---

1. 15, citing Isaias LXVIII.5.
2. XI.
3. Ep. doct.
4. VI. For other lists of Biblical books thought acceptable to Muslims, see p.35 . The Annotator, with prudent judgement, commented that, though the Qur'an mentioned the Psalter, he personally doubted if Muhammad had heard it, rather than just heard someone speak of it. (Ad. az.64, Bibl.p.227,col.1)
5. Disp.II; P. de Pen.,III. MS. f.19v.

that Muslims cannot reply to anyone who tells them that the words of Jesus Christ contradict those of Muhammad.[1] It has already appeared how Ramón Marti, as well as Peter the Venerable, Fitzralph and others, would defend Scripture on historical hypotheses provided only by Scripture itself. In practice the general use of the Bible to combat Islamic positions extended very widely.[2]

Ricoldo developed certain special arguments to justify the use of Scripture. Two repetitive passages of his were neatly combined by Peter de Pennis to clarify the fact that Muslims rejected Scripture just because it was contrary to the Qur'an,[3] and Ricoldo also phrased well the Muslim attitude to the relation of the Biblical text to the Qur'an: they think "the Jews corrupted the law of Moses and the Prophets, and the Christians the Gospel, and that nothing of the truth of the Law or the Gospel remains, except in so far as it is in the Qur'an".[4] In spite of this he felt able to insist on the use of the Christian Bible, and even, in the sentence immediately preceding, to ask why Muslims do not have and read

---

1. S.S.M. I.viii.292.
2. For example, Marti on matrimony, and many authors on Paradise (see p.[illegible]). St. Thomas Aquinas, however, interposed his conclusion (that the Jewish and Islamic ideas of Heaven are false) between the rational and Scriptural arguments, so that it does not depend on the latter. (Contra Gentes, IV.83). Ricoldo, followed by Pennis, realised that reasons must be used in preference to either Scriptural or philosophical authorities (p.[illegible] below).
3. Ric., Disp. I (MS. f. 161v. col.1) and VIII (MS.f.169r. col.2) and Pen. VIII(MS. f.31v.)
4. Disp. III, cf. XVII.

the Gospel and the Law which Muhammad commended and in which he said were salvation and guidance; contrast (said Ricoldo) how Christians read and study the Law, which they accepted, in the form in which they found it, from the Jews.[1] He also argued that the Prophet set up the Jews and Christians as depositories of faith with whom God himself had preserved and would continue to preserve the truth, and who were to be resorted to when there was doubt; yet in that case the Qur'an refers to a corrupt source and God is a liar if he really preserves it.[2]

> For it says in the chapter of Jonas: <u>If you are in doubt about the things which we have revealed to you, ask those who read the Book before you</u>. But those who read the Book before the Muslims are the Jews and the Christians. So Muhammad tells the Muslims to ask the Christians and the Jews about their doubts.

But Muhammad could not have sent to the authority of corrupt Books; the argument is closely related to that in the <u>reprobatio</u>.[3] What seems to have weighed most heavily in Ricoldo's mind was the idea of sending men to a "false testimony" and still more of making God a "false witness".

---

1. Disp. XVII; MS. f. 180v. col.1.
2. Disp. III, MS. f. 162v. col.1; Itin. XXXIV; Q. X.94.
3. Ricoldo's contribution was to insist, not only that the Gospel was, in Muhammad's time, by Qur'anic admission, incorrupt, as the <u>reprobatio</u> had done, but also that the Christians and Jews were guarantors, which established the authority of Scripture more permanently. It was at this point that he developed the historical arguments of the <u>reprobatio</u> and others. His argument is, of course, closest to that in the <u>Contrarietas</u>, but, in the present case, he seems to improve on it. (Cont.II). Ricoldo argued closely every alternative, almost as fully as Fitzralph; there was scholastic indulgence in balanced numbered arguments based on alternatives of the aut-aut type, sometimes treating the unlikely alternatives as seriously as the important ones.

In these passages he was defending Scripture rather than attacking the Qur'an. Ramón Marti put the same point in a simplified form when he said that on the subject of Christ the Christians were the best authorities; "anyone is to be believed in his own science or art, rather than another; it is foolish to believe a doctor about agriculture or a farmer about medicine".[1]

Ricoldo also thought that he could (in logic) force Muslims to accept Scripture, by contending, perversely, that in the Qur'an "the people of the Book" refers to them; apparently he was satisfied that this assertion, which Muslims would have ridiculed, had polemic value.

> In the chapter al-maidah, which means the Table, it says the people (familia) of the Book are nothing, unless they fulfil the Law and the Gospel. But the people of the Book are the Muslims; that is why it says, unless they fulfil the Law and the Gospel and what is revealed to you. By what is revealed to you is understood the Qur'an, which has been revealed, as they themselves say, to the Muslims alone. (2)

---

1. Quad. rep. XIII; Exp.Sim., introductory section cited.
2. Disp.III, MS. f.163v. col.1; (Q. V.72.) Here Ricoldo was apparently indebted to the reprobatio and not to the Contrarietas, but from the same Qur'anic citation the reprobatio drew only the single conclusion that in Muhammad's time the Law and the Gospel were demonstrably incorrupt. Ricoldo went on to claim that the Qur'an shows in many places that Muhammad meant the Muslims by the people of the Book; for example, "in the chapter al-nisā'. . .about the end" (Q. IV.169); the same thing is "shown explicitly in the chapter lem at the end of the book".(Q. XX.122,3 ? LXVI.12 ?) Ricoldo returned to the subject in two passages elsewhere that are largely repetitive. It was his temperament to insist on any point once he had taken it up. ("lem": Bert. Pic., "tulem".)

What is interesting here is that Ricoldo's case in logic is a perfectly good one, except that he assumes that he is entitled to make what he deems best from the Qur'anic text, without reference to the only possible sense in which Islam could understand it. This contrasts with his willingness to accept very doubtful commentators on the Qur'an when it suited him.

5. Conclusion.

The impression left by these long passages is of their rambling character and of the determination they reveal to impose a meaning on the Qur'an. The extraction of verses from their context and their dissociation from the traditional Islamic interpretation is typical of this class of polemic. Peter the Venerable, San Pedro and Ricoldo in particular, but in some degree all Christians, assumed the freedom to understand a Qur'anic authority in whatever sense pleased them; they would always prefer their own reading to that which is traditional in Islam. They would not allow their opponents to speak for themselves; yet their arguments, often ingenious to the point of brilliance, could never have been acceptable to Muslims, and were not ostensibly intended to be applicable to Christians.

It was never possible that Christians should understand how Muslims could accept Christ without accepting

the entire historical ministry from the canonical Gospels. The often exhaustive arguments only proved that if the Qur'an were true, the canon of Scripture would be so as well, in which case the Qur'an would have been false. In spite of this framework of unreality, the Cluniacs, the thirteenth century Spaniards, Ricoldo and Fitzralph, very different in the knowledge they possessed, but all familiar with some sort of version of the Qur'an, seem to reflect an unconscious impression of its reverence for the older revelations. Perhaps this is because the Qur'an was treated in scholastic fashion as an authority to be cited, if only for a special and inimical purpose; in renderings of its actual words, an unexpected note of religious authenticity is incidentally conveyed.

Chapter 4.

The Alien Quality of the Qur'an.

The starting-point and conclusion of much mediaeval argument consisted in the Qur'an's being shown to be incongruous with the other revelations which it approved. It was not only that by doing so it had condemned itself, but that it was incompatible with them in its inherent qualities, and equally so with philosophy and natural reason. In Western tradition it was viewed as a freak; its strangeness and unfamiliarity made it seem, both in content and form, to be absurd. The detailed development of this idea was naturally confined to authors whose learning was equal to it. Ricoldo, plundering these sources in order to make his polemic complete, gave particular attention to such themes, and collected arguments encyclopaedically with his characteristic lack of discrimination. Peter de Pennis re-arranged the same material in a form a little more concise. In all there was a formidable quantity of attacks on the Qur'an's form and style and on its reasonableness.

1. Incongruity in style and order.

A number of criticisms must seem frivolous now, although they were first put forward with an unattractive zeal. So small a point as the naming of the sūrahs was made the object of carping ridicule. The annotator of Ketton's translation of the Qur'an was at some trouble to explain it:

"separate chapters are called after something which is specially mentioned in (them)"; the second, for example, was named after a cow of which it "fabulously interwove mention".[1] For Ricoldo this nomenclature was more specifically a sign of irrationality. The Qur'an, he said, has special chapters for the ant, the spider and smoke,[2] unsuitable subjects for divine revelation. This was disingenuous; he must have been aware that the names of the sūrahs are not supposed to describe their contents. Some of the more petty of the criticism of the Qur'an which he amassed are most revealing of his approach to it. It is full, he said, of things that are not worth saying, nihil omnino notabile dicit - "just that God is great and high and wise and good, and that all things that are in Heaven, and that are on Earth, and that are between them, are his; and that he judges justly". Some such phrases, he insisted, were too often and unnecessarily repeated: "may he be praised", and then, "there is no God but God"[3] and "believe in God and his apostle", dicens se nuncium Dei antonomasite. God was not accustomed to say, as though of someone else, "God is great", and so on.[4] Moreover, the Qur'an was obscene,

1. Ad az.II; Bibl. p.224, col.2; MS. CCCD.184, p.50, bottom margin, right; Seld. Supra 31, f.33r., bottom margin, left.
2. Disp. VIII.
3. He treated "there is no God but God" as a proposition defective in logic; see below, chapter 7 p.175
4. Disp. IV.

in that it used such words as coitus and coeo.[1]

This excessively small-minded carping sprang from a genuine divergence of traditions. The form and the manner of the Qur'an remained always alien to the scholastic age which so specially honoured the systematic classification of arguments. It was supposed that its style gave a strong presumption of its human origin; in this way the attitude of the Arab Muslim and the assertion of the Qur'an itself were exactly reversed. The language, although it could not be appreciated across the barrier of translation, was yet felt to be antipathetic. The Cluniac summula mentioned various elements in the Qur'an that Muhammad "interwove in his barbarous way" and Peter the Venerable referred scornfully to a "barbaric and unnatural way of speaking", with which we should probably connect his hostility to "poetic figment".[2] We might naturally expect the translators of the Qur'an to resent the difference in genius between Arabic and Latin to the detriment of the foreign idiom. Robert of Ketton

1. Disp. IV, VIII. The passages making the accusation of obscenity are omitted from the manuscript of the Latin text and occur only in the Greek version by Demetrius Cydones and the Latin retranslation in Bart. Pic. The position is not clear, but it is on the whole easier to believe the Latin copyist prudish than Demetrius guilty of this particular embroidery.

2. See p. 40

may be inferred to have done so from the extent to which he introduced changes of sense into the text, or, as he put it himself, "changing nothing perceptibly, except only for the sake of understanding".[1] It was Mark of Toledo, however, perhaps under the influence of Mozarab ideas, who first voiced the full force of this criticism:

> . . . sometimes he speaks like a crazy man, sometimes however like one who is lifeless, now inveighing against the idolators, now menacing them with death, occasionally indeed promising eternal life to converts, but in a confused and unconnected style. But the confusion of this style is excused by some because they make out that he was invisibly troubled in soul and body, and tormented, by the angel . . . (2)

There seems as little appreciation here of the language of the Qur'an as understanding of the strength of Arab admiration for it. Mark knew that Muslims argued from the style of the Qur'an on the lips of an illiterate prophet to its divine origin; and the whole of his own summary of Qur'anic teaching which in paraphrase of the Qur'an he put into the mouth of the Prophet is a tour de force that makes it impossible to suppose him wholly insensitive to Arabic style.

---

1. Praefatio Rob. Translatoris. It seems likely that Peter the Venerable's attitude to the style of the Qur'an was formed by Ketton's, whom Peter trusted as (along with Hermann Dalmata) "utriusque linguae peritus", namely in Latin and Arabic. (Ep. de trans. sua).
2. Pref. Q.

Yet it was not just that good Arabic made bad Latin;[1] for Mark, the very words of the Qur'an were inherently and perniciously defective. Thus it was possible to imagine Ibn Tūmart's theological reasoning's being invalidated even, although in itself particularly sound, by his citation of the "disorderly and extremely confused" words of the Qur'an.[2]

Although it was a common-place to accept the idea that Muhammad was illiterate, in order to impute the composition of the Qur'an to other authors, it was very rarely realised that, for the Muslims from whom the West derived this idea, it was proof of the revelation of the Qur'an. "He wished the eloquence of the Qur'an to be considered a miracle," said Ramon Marti.[3] Lull spoke freely about this point. In one passage a Muslim teacher argues, for the benefit of one of Lull's mythical and ingenuous Tartars, that there is nowhere in the world such beauty of expression as there is in the Qur'an; "from this it appears that our Law is from God; for all men, as many as live, could not discover or compose in a more beautiful style".[4]

---

1. M. Th. d'Alverny has drawn attention to a contrast between Mark's style when he was translating and when he was composing freely; the implication is the same as that of Ketton's improvement of the text itself. (Marc de Tolède.)
2. Pref. ʿAqīdah.
3. Capistrum Judaeorum, in Cerulli's extract.
4. Lib. Tart., de T. et S., 10, 11.

To this the Tartar replied, with the precocity with which his creator endowed him, that "the whole virtue of words lies in their truth". So short a passage yet reveals a very clear lack of sympathy for the Arabic spirit.[1] Ricoldo's attitude, related more closely to Scripture, was based on a similar antipathy. The text of the Qur'an, that men and jinns could not produce the like, he exploited fully.[2] "He said that neither angels nor demons could make such a book." This provided an irresistible opportunity for facetiousness: angels would not write a book filled with lies, blasphemy

---

1. The difficult text, from a translator's point of view obscure, in which the Qur'an says that it would have been less acceptable if it had not been revealed in Arabic, came through even more obscurely in Ketton's version: "Qui si Latine notaretur, fieret quaestio, cur Latinis (for ʿajami) et Arabicis literis non distingueretur ?" Fitzralph, quoting the whole of the passage, found nothing in it worth remarking. (Q. XLI.44; Ket. Az.L, Bibl., LI, p. 149, lines 21-2; Arm. 13(14); cf. Q. XVI.105, Bibl. Ket. Az.XXV, Bibl.XXVI, p. 90, lines 12 ff.) Mark also translated ʿajami as latinus (cap.XLIII, f.170 v.).) It might be said of most authors that the chief interest in the words of the Qur'an lay in their being shown not to be true. The dictum about the virtue of words was essentially scholastic.

2. Q. XVII.90; Ric., Disp. IX, Itin.XXXV, Ep. III. The jinn have no parallel in Christian belief, and mediaeval translators were happy to be able to assume that, if they were not angels, they were demons: Ketton's words were similar, "Licet enim omnes homines atque diaboli ad unius talis compositionem causa venirent . . ." (Ket. Az. XXVI, Bibl.,XXVII, p.93 lines 38 ff. Mark similarly has "Dic, si convenirent homines et demones . . ."(cap.XIX, f.111v.).) Lull, undecided between the alternatives, used both, perhaps to neutralise each other: "all the men and all the devils and all the angels . . ."

and obscenity, but, of course, demons very well might. He pointed out that to the reader of Arabic it is obvious that the Qur'an is in verse, but that it is impossible to preserve the verse in translation.

> The Muslims and the Arabs glory in this especially, that the diction and the style of their law is rhythmical; and they say that it is clear from this that God made that Book and revealed it to Muhammad word for word, because Muhammad was an uneducated man and did not know how to contrive such style and such sentiments. (1)

This passage was pitched more strongly still in the rendering of Peter de Pennis: the style was in "so beautiful and adorned a way of speaking, that is, metrical" and the Muslims "argue from this that Muhammad was true Prophet" as well as that God made the Book; in small ways also he was more emphatic.[2] Ricoldo, however, followed by Peter, replied that in fact the very opposite is true: divine laws are not like this at all; neither the Old Testament nor the New is metrical; of "the other prophets who heard the voice of God", we are now told that "none said that God spoke in verse; which also the wise philosophers disdained".[3] The Qur'an itself admitted that the Prophet was accused of being

---

1. Disp. IV; MS. f.163v. col.2.
2. II. MS. f.17v.-18r. This passage of Pennis' is a blending of two passages of Ricoldo's, that just quoted, and that referred to immediately below here.
3. Ric. and P. de Pen., loc. cit. The Annotator of Ketton, in this against the usual stream of opinion, noticed without commenting on a superficial resemblance between the Qur'an and the Old Testament. Ad az.II, loc. cit.

a dreamer and a poet, and not a prophet.[1] This was not the only occasion when the scholastic took the same attitude as the Quraysh had done in Muhammad's own day.

To several authors the arrangement of the Qur'an seemed disorderly. Pedro de Alfonso early pointed out that the way that it was finally compiled made it impossible to tell what its original order had been. Vincent de Beauvais remarked, after he had read the description of the process of compilation in the Risālah, that this work showed how the Qur'an was "fabricated, torn about, disorderly".[2] It was again Ricoldo who most fully elaborated this theme, which he did by an analysis, of scholastic type, of the supposed lack of order. There was no order of time, by periods and kings, as there was in the Old Testament, he complained; no narrative order, in that beginning properly with the praise of God it then slips abruptly into the middle of things; no order of subject-matter, passing from one irrelevance to another, and no logical order, because it proceeds from true propositions to things unrelated, as when it says that God is good and the Qur'an the law of salvation. This final offence was apparently, for Ricoldo, the least forgivable of all, and he brought many examples, borrowed, like much that was most ungenerous in his work, from the Contrarietas:

---

1. Q. XXI.5; Ric. and P. de Pen., loc. cit.
2. Vincent, 23.40.

> Thus in the chapter elmeide, which means the table, it says, God established for you the house elharam, that is, of prohibition; this is the house of the mosque; and the month of the Muslims' fast; and this, that ye may know that God knows the things which are in Heaven, and which are on earth, and God is knowing of all that is. But who is so silly as to doubt that God knows all things? But, granted that it could be doubted, by what connection do the house of the mosque and the Muslims' fast of a month make it known that God knows all things ? (1)

For Ricoldo, recollecting Muslim Baghdad when he was at leisure at Santa Maria Novella in Florence, it was hard to refrain from making fun in ungenerous fashion of the Qur'an and the Prophet. "Very often he seems to speak like a man dreaming, and especially towards the end of the book, where there seem to be some words missing." This means, of course, the early sūrahs revealed in Mecca, and now thought of as more "religious".

> Thus in the chapter elkaferin, this is word for word what he says: O profane ones, I do not adore what you adore, nor do you adore what I adore, and I do not adore what you adore, and you do not adore what I adore. Your law is for you, and my law is for me. But every heretic can say as much, in order to cut short the matter, of which the truth is under examination. (2)

Confusion, thought Ricoldo, was itself confused;[3] there would be no book which he could remember which so offended

---

1. Disp. XI; MS. f.174v col.2; Q. V.98; Contrarietas IX. MS. f.250r., which is the source of both text and comment. The Arabic words here given in the Latin transliteration are elmeide for al-maidah, elharam for al-haram; of the mosque: mesque (mesquae).
2. Disp., ibid.; Q. CIX. Cf. also Itin.XXXI. Cf. Contrarietas, VIII, MS. f.248r.; in this case the argument is Ricoldo's, although the text is provided by the source.
3. Itin. XXXI.

the rules of logic and, ingeneral, that pedantic scholastic taste for a numbered and schematised presentation. It had no order at all, except the damning order of poetry "qui Deo non competit".

It often seemed to Christians that the literal sense of the Qur'an was so clearly contrary to religion that they had to fear that its defenders might shelter behind some "mystical" sense, comparable to that of Scripture which gave a spiritual meaning even to the Old Testament. William of Auvergne, after a lengthy attack on the idea of a material Paradise, said that learned Muslims saw that such ideas made Muhammad ridiculous before the whole world, and therefore taught that such promises should not be taken to the letter.[1] Lull, better informed, realised the importance of the verbal revelation of the Qur'an, and of literal interpretation in orthodox practice, when he said that those Muslims who believed the description of Paradise to be spiritual did not observe the letter of the Qur'anic law in other respects either.[2] Ricoldo remarked of a passage which he thought to be Qur'anic, "the Muslims do not expound this hyperbolically or by similitude or in any other spiritual way, as we do some things which are in the Apocalypse; but they expound

---

1. de leg. XVIII/18R.
2. Lib. de Gent. IV.xii.

all their expositions to the letter . . ."[1] Anticipating what he had to say of the letter of the Qur'anic text, the Christian polemist found this situation agreeable. This was, moreover, another of many modes of disparity between Qur'an and Scripture.

2. Incongruity in content.

Yet greater emphasis was generally placed on the incongruity of the Qur'an, with both Scripture and philosophy, in content. The annotator of the Cluniac Qur'an was very free with condemnation of the "fables" about Old Testament characters, that is, those stories in the Qur'an which do not agree in detail with the Scriptures. His vocabulary of abuse was irritated and repetitive. Of sūrah VII he remarked, "Here he unravels infinite fables of Adam and Eve and Beelzebub and certain unheard-of prophets; and, under the influence of an evil spirit, he does not cease from repeating the usual ravings and lunacies and most stupid words about Moses." This is the style of most of this marginal commentary - "solitas insanias dicit", "continet fabulas et mendacia de Ioseph", "nuges", "solitas fatuitates

1. Itin. XXXIII. Cf. Ludolf: in hoc libro multa posuit de lege Moysi et evangelio quod ad litteram intelligi debet sed mystice et referende non. Jacques de Vitry spoke of the literal interpretation of the Old Testament by Muslims "in the manner of the Jews". (Ludolf VIII; Vitry VI.) Ricoldo, in the passage quoted, refers to the "divided moon" miracle as if it were fully expounded in the Qur'an. See p. 153 ff

ineptissimas replicat". The favourite phrase, especially in reference to the latter part of the Qur'an was "vana, stulta et impia".[1] The commentary seems to nag at the Old Testament "fables". This sense of the unreliability of the Qur'anic version of Scriptural stories was very general. Among the Cluniacs it was probably associated with Talmudic Judaism; this presumably is the meaning of the attribution in the summula of the fabulous element to the Jews; Poitiers was explicit in this.[2] Peter the Venerable based much of his polemic on the contrast between Muhammad and the true or Old Testament prophets.[3]

With Mark of Toledo there began to appear in Spain a greater precision of statement and a less frenetic reaction. Mark explained the Qur'an's name "Alforcan, which means

---

1. Bibl., p. 225 ff. passim.
2. Capitula IV. v.
3. C.S.S. II.4 ff. This was not a new argument when the Cluniacs used it; the Contrarietas had spoken of fables interwoven into the base things of the Qur'an (VIII); and Pedro de Alfonso had stressed the difference between Old Testament stories and the related stories of the Qur'an. The Cluniac material was from any point of view partly fabulous. Peter of Poitiers thought the nūr Muhammadī something to laugh at, and Matthew Paris tells us that the company laughed when they heard the story of Noe and the prohibition of swine's flesh. This scorn was actually directed, therefore, at the de generatione and the de doctrina and not at the Qur'an at all. This reminds us how important the failure to distinguish between the authentic and the doubtful was in forming, and in confirming, the Western estimate of Islam. (Capitula III.vi; Paris, introducing the aliud scriptum; de doc. Bibl.p.197; de gen. p.201.)

distinct in Arabic, and which is a distinction between the Old Testament and the New, or, as some interpret it, between the profanity of the pagans and the faith which he himself taught".[1] He saw it to be important to deny the consonance of Islam with the earlier religions from which he wished to say that it was derived.

> The manner of his handling, as it is contained in the course of the book, is foreign from the others. For it does not agree with the Gospel, neither in its manner of speaking, nor in its precepts; neither does it agree with the Old Law . . . (2)

He specified the few exceptions which linked the laws of Islam and the Jews; it was necessary to reconcile a fundamental dissonance with superficial borrowings.

At the end of the century San Pedro Pascual condemned the "many contradictions, fables, lies and heresies" in the Qur'an and the ḥadīth; here again "fables" has the sense of renderings of Old Testament stories which do not agree with the Old and New Testaments, and San Pedro devoted a whole chapter to this theme. He felt deeply the conflict with the true Scriptures. It was the Qur'an's dissonance that marked it as false. "O Muhammad," said San Pedro, "I do not at all believe that thou hast received these things from God, because thou art peculiar in thy witness, and thou

---

1. Alforcan for al-Furqan.
2. Pref. Q.

dost not agree with any other scripture whatever." If Muhammad's was a law of profligacy, in consequence "this law of thine is not like the law which Moses wrote, nor to the law which by word and deed Jesus Christ our Lord taught."[1] What Muhammad claimed to have received from God must be rejected "because they are contrary to those things which were written by Moses and by the Prophets and after by the Apostles, by the inspiration and command of God . . ." Among the defences of the Christian position this thought was prominent in San Pedro's mind.

Ricoldo similarly contended that the Qur'an does not agree with the authentic revelations in what it recommends or in what it condemns and is full of tales obviously fabulous.[2] The Muslims themselves would realise this, if their learned men allowed them to see the Scriptures.[3] He was inclined to exploit their inherent absurdity rather more, their conflict with Scripture a shade less. He summarised the story of Solomon in the sūrah an-naml, and, assuming the brief Qur'anic text necessarily to imply the whole Islamic tradition subsequently attached to it, he

---

1. S.S.M., I.vii.12; I.v.; cf. I.ii.25; I.i.66 and C.F.M. V.4; S.S.M. I.viii.148, 203.
2. Disp. IV and V.
3. Disp. XV, MS. f. 180v. col.1.

related the death of Solomon and the story of Hārūt and Mārūt in a way which identified fabulous traditions as authentically Qur'anic, and the Qur'an as ridiculous.[1] Here he was followed by Peter de Pennis.[2]

This treatment leads on to another great field in which the Qur'an was thought alien to Western tradition; its inconsistency with reason, that is, both with natural philosophers in moral and scientific matters, and with itself in simple logic. This was inevitably how it would strike a mediaéval reader trained in the schools. For example, some of the material edited by Peter de Pennis was grouped under the head "that Muhammad speaks ignorantly of the nature and properties of certain things". This included legends from the de doctrina, once again a source of derision: stories of Creation and the Last Day, Noe and the swine's flesh again, and Hārūt and Mārūt.[3] Benedict of Alignan was more probably referring to morals when he said that "neither Scripture nor philosophy testifies to Muhammad". These

---

1. Disp. IV. For Hārūt and Mārūt (Q. II.96) cf. William of Auvergne (de universo. II.xxxvii), who notes but does not exploit the legend.
2. VI, MS. f.27v.-28r.
3. XI cap. (MS.f.37r.) Cf. also VIII, MS.f.29v. and the citation (probably following Ricoldo) of de doctrina by name. The germ of most of these legends, and in some cases details, are in the Qur'an; but the de doctrina greatly exaggerates the element that to the Christian would inevitably look fabulous.

were the conclusions of writers with no personal knowledge of Islam. Ricoldo in his two chief polemic works drew attention to the opposition of philosophic principles to the Qur'an: confutation "by the books of the philosophers and by the way of reason".[1] The Qur'an does not agree, he argued, in content or teaching with Aristotle, Christ or Moses; it "says practically nothing about the virtues, but (speaks of) wars and plunder . . ."[2] But the most important point was inherent logic: Muslims might deny Scripture and philosophy, but must still accept reason.[3]

The theme of self-contradiction in the Qur'an may be illustrated over a wide field of examples. Some such were noted, though not very frequently, in the margins of Ketton's Qur'an. "A little before, he said that those who were rich in this world will be lost in the next; but now he says that Abraham was rich in this world and yet is to be numbered among the good."[4] Why, he apostrophised the Prophet, did he contradict himself: sed ut mendax ubique tibimet ipsi contrarius existis. It was with San Pedro and with Ricoldo that this idea was most fully exploited.[5]

---

1. Itin. XXXV.
2. Disp. V, MS. f.164v., col.2.
3. Disp. VIII, MS. f.169r., col.2; Pen. 31v.
4. Ad az. 39, Bibl.p. 226, col.1.
5. Developed in the Contrarietas as well as in the Risālah, it had suffered some eclipse in the interval. The Cluniacs did not ignore the point, but did not insist on it.

In San Pedro's mind contradictions ranked as prominently as the "fables" we have already discussed. In the Qur'an and in the ḥadīth, he said, are found many fables and many things which are contrary to each other, so that if there were no other evidence, it would yet be known that what Muḥammad said was not of God.[1] He catalogued those inconsistencies which we must suppose him accustomed to use in controversy; they bear his personal brand and may not represent what the general experience of the Peninsula had found most useful. Thus, the Qur'an, he said, both asserted and denied that Islam should be enforced; that Christians might be saved; that God on the Last Day would not reprove the reprobate; it both forbade and permitted augury; it rightly asserted only the good to be from God, but sin from man, and then said that both good and evil were from God. It asserted equally irreconcileably that God would judge the world, and that good and evil were predetermined. Muḥammad had said that if there were contradictions in the Qur'an it would not be from God; but in this view it contained both inherent contradictions and contradictions of obvious good faith and morals.[2] It was its opposition to reason, immediate and obvious at the first glance, according to the Christian, that was most culpable in Islam. "The Muslims are more to

1. S.S.M. I.ii.25.
2. Ibid. I.iii.passim.

be blamed," said San Pedro, "because they believe the sayings of Muhammad, than because of the evil things they do, for Muhammad taught his followers more and greater evil things, in example and speech, than they perform when they try to imitate their master."[1]

This idea of contradictions exercised a special charm for Christian thinkers. ". . . in many things he is found to be contrary to himself," said Fitzralph wistfully, "as, if God gave us time to write about this, would be more clearly shown . . ."[2] It was in the examples chosen that individual preferences appeared. Ricoldo was given the time; his development of the argument was traditional and academic.[3] Inconsistencies noted by him were of all kinds, not always to the modern eye irreconcileable. Muhammad claimed to be a great prophet, and yet admitted that he had been born an orphan and an idolator; he said that God does not lead a man who wanders, and yet taught men to pray to be led from shadow to light; he said that he was a universal prophet,

---

1. S.S.M. I.iv.26; cf. C.F.M. V.4 ff.
2. Arm. 11 (12). This theme of contradictions would probably have appealed just as widely had Christians been aware (as apparently they were not) of the doctrine of abrogation in the Qur'an; it is not conceivable that they would have been favourably impressed by it.
3. A comparison of San Pedro's and Ricoldo's choice of examples and of the chapter in the Contrarietas to which Ricoldo was so heavily indebted and which, closely or remotely, must have influenced San Pedro, shows considerable latitude in working out the theme. (Contrarietas, cap. IX, MS. f. 249v.)

but that God had given the Qur'an in Arabic. Ricoldo also considered the idea that the Old Testament prophets were Muslim to be inherently self-contradictory, and, like San Pedro, he classed under the same heading the Qur'anic treatment of augury and also that of the People of the Book.[1] This does not exhaust the inconsistencies that he alleged; moreover, unlike the Contrarietas, Ricoldo in his arrangement separated the pure absurdities and "open falsities"[2] from the contradictions. An example is his ridicule of what he called the Qur'an's reiterated assertion that God did not create the world in play; for who would be fool enough to expect that he had ? This was classed with the falsa et fatua; indeed, the Qur'an, if true, would prove God to be fatuus.[3] The weakness of this manner of polemic will already be apparent, but it never appears more clearly than in the argument about the supposed phrase, "God prays for Muhammad". Instead of arguing that if this phrase is nonsense he must have mistranslated it, Ricoldo argued that it is another proof of Islamic unreason.[4] The polemic aim in all these points was

---

1. Disp. VI.
2. Cf. ibid., IX and XII.
3. Disp.XII; Itin.XXXII.
4. Ricoldo made very merry on this subject in Ep.III, having already raised it in Ep. I; here he gave his reference to "the thirty-third sūrah"; in the Disputatio, however, where he again took the matter up, though more shortly, he did so in reference to "the chapter al-aḥzāb". (Disp.IX: MS.f.172v. col.1. The Qur'anic reference is to Q.XXXIII.43,56.) The idea of God's praying derives from the Arabic use in this context ("God's blessing upon Muhammad" or "may God bless him")

to show that the Qur'an condemned itself. Muhammad "says in the chapter an-nisā', which means the women, if this

---

Note continued from preceding page:-

of the same word as is used for the ritual worship or prayer: in the Qur'anic verse cited by Ricoldo it is yuṣallūna, God and the angels bless Muhammad. It is obvious how ridiculous it is to insist that the word must mean "pray" on the grounds that it means "pray" (or something like it) in other contexts; this is an extreme example of the Latin custom of accusing Muslims of something that Muslims themselves would wholly disown; of claiming to know better than they what they themselves would or would not do, and then waxing as rhetorical as if the Muslims openly had admitted it. This is one argument that we cannot believe Ricoldo ever tried out intelligibly on Muslims in Baghdad, and it is another indication of the frontiers of his knowledge. It seems most likely that he never even asked a Muslim what was intended by the phrase.

In this connection we should note Mark of Toledo's practice when he refers to blessing the Prophet, not in the Qur'an, but in ordinary Islamic usage; Miss d'Alverny and Vajda discuss this in their notes on the translation of the ʿaqīdah (loc. cit. p.285). Oretur pro stands for ṣalawāt ʿala, but quem Deus acceptet for ṣallā allāhu ʿala. I do not follow the learned editors' endorsement of Mark's (presumed deliberate) distinction between these two cases, the noun and the verb. All the same arguments seem to apply to both of these. In oretur the change of mood suggests an intelligent man's compromise, when faced with irreconcileable facts; the quem Deus acceptet suggest his having discovered the Muslim interpretation, or, rather, the Arabic usage. In his earlier translation of the Qur'an, however, Mark, like Ricoldo, wrote oro; in the verses cited, (Deus) est qui orat pro vobis, and, Deus et angeli eius orant pro propheta. (f. 152r. and v.). The implication is clearly that Mark learned in the interval, or, perhaps, simply reflected.

Qur'an were not from God, many discrepancies would certainly be found in it. It is evident that many discrepancies are found in it."[1] Peter de Pennis gave these same arguments perhaps even greater prominence.[2]

There was a corollary, argued by some of the better-informed writers, that the quarrel between philosophers and religion, within Islam itself, was acute. Mark of Toledo seemed to take it for granted that Islamic philosophers were in conflict with the Qur'an, when he said of Ibn Tūmart, cum in nullam crediderit legem, utpote philosophus Algazelis didasculus.[3] Jacques de Vitry took it that educated Muslims, who followed his example, derided his doctrine.[4] William of Auvergne was shocked that the philosopher Ibn Sīna should expressly admit corporal delights in Paradise which the Qur'an had promised.[5] He was not prepared to admit that the Qur'an (which we must assume him to have known in the Cluniac text) could have been "declared" by anyone claiming

---

1. elnesa = al-nisā' = an-nisā'.
2. Q. IV.84; Disp.VI (MS. f.165v.); Pen.,XIV (MS.f.43r.)
3. Pref. ʿAqīdah. I am not sure that this cannot be understood as "a philosopher and disciple of al-Ghazālī" but Miss d'Alverny emends to read philosophi. Mark's attribution of this to Ibn Tūmart was not very apt.
4. VI.
5. de leg. XIX/19R. (cf. XVIII/18.0). Benedict followed William.

to be a prophet. No doubt the learned Muslims accepted Muhammad as the faithful prophet of God, but they "believe him rather to have permitted to that people, because of their ignorance and barbarity, than to have enjoined, those things in his Law which seem to be iniquitous". He supposed what he called the "absurd and ridiculous things" to have been inserted after Muhammad's time by enemies of truth, through the inexperience or negligence of his followers.

> In any case it is improbable and is likely to be far from truth that a man who called himself prophet of God, and his lawgiver, should have dared to propound such ridiculous ravings and such shameful tenets to any people, unless by chance he were obviously insane or in some other way bereft of sense. (1)

William, while he stressed this supposed unreasonableness, only seized on a few aspects of Islam which seemed to him of primary significance. The Islamic background was more clearly understood by Marti, by Tripoli, by Ricoldo and by Lull, who all, however, exaggerated the conflict between religion and philosophy in the Islamic world. Marti was at very great pains to show that in the matter of Paradise the great Arabic philosophers condemned the Islamic position.[2] The Muslim teachers despise the Qur'an, asserted Tripoli;[3] "their learned men," added Ricoldo in his Itinerarium, "entertain no faith in the sayings of the Qur'an, but deride it in secret; in public, however, they honour it on account

---

1. de leg. XVIII/18R.,S.
2. Cf. below, p.
3. L.

of fear."[1] The Caliph, he maintained, had been compelled to prohibit the teaching of philosophy in the schools, so that in Ricoldo's time, when he lived in Baghdad, only the study of the Qur'an had been enforced and encouraged. In consequence, he had found that learned Muslims knew very little of the truth of theology or the subtlety of philosophy.[2] He had received a strong impression that the learned Muslims disbelieved the Qur'an and therefore refused to dispute about it freely, or to allow it to be translated into other languages.[3] It is always difficult to be sure that Ricoldo's observations are his own; but if he does not depend on a written source here, he must still have drawn his inference on flimsy evidence. He contrasted the Christian attitude to the Bible. Lull also said that the teaching of logic and natural philosophy was publicly forbidden among the Muslims, because it led to heresy and to a denial of the prophethood of Muhammad. In different places he spoke of Muslims as difficult, and as easy, to convert; but in either case they were convinced of the error of Islam. He took it for granted that learned Muslims were in a state of doubt; in one of the fictional settings in which he liked to present his controversial writings in form of debate, he imagined a Muslim led by long study alone to doubt the

---

1. Itin.XXXIV.
2. Disp.XIII.
3. Disp.IX.

truth of Muhammad's claims.[1]

3. Conclusion.

It is pertinent to consider Ricoldo's attitude as representing that of his contemporaries in an extreme form. He was trying to construct, from all the polemic which he inherited (from the books and the living tradition of the Spanish Reconquest) an encyclopaedic refutation which would serve as vade-mecum for missionaries and which would miss nothing: no small argument that he had ever heard or thought of using might be omitted, and strong and feeble were jumbled together. The literalism, especially from passages which he adopted from the Contrarietas, went beyond the bounds of common sense; it was typical of this method to rejoice at the Qur'anic absurdity of God's "praying for" Muhammad, without stopping to consider what was the Islamic acceptance of the phrase thus literally translated. It is

1. D.P. 10,11; Lib. de Gent. IV.xii; Lib. de V sap., prol.; Blanquerna, 144.3 In the same general tradition was Benvenuto's reminder to his readers that concubinage, of which he could convict Islam, was against the laws of the Romans and of the philosophers. The mediaeval contempt for the Islamic world as unphilosophical is interesting to contrast with modern recognition that the sources of much of Western mediaeval learning - both philosophical and scientific - were Arabic. It seems likely to be a case of difficulty of seeing contemporary events in perspective, rather than one of deliberate hypocrisy. There was, however, another possible attitude to be taken to Islam, which was in conflict with the usual one: thus Humbert argued that Islam was a rational religion, as opposed, that is, to one that gave a proper place to supernatural things. This theme is obviously capable of being elaborated, but in fact it was not popular, and Humbert himself does not expand it. (Humbert, Op. Trip., I.vi.)

difficult to believe that in the schools in Baghdad he had ever in fact used with good effect, or even intelligibly put forward, nine-tenths of what he published in his books; and his remarks on Muslims' refusal to discuss the Qur'an freely suggest that in practice he was tactfully handled. Doubtless he liked, when in tranquillity in his Florentine cloister, to imagine using arguments that he wished he had actually used when he was in the East; many of these he had discovered subsequently in written sources. He was fortunate not to be brought down to earth by the answers he would have been likely to have received from a Muslim to most of these arguments, had he been able to convey them. He was also fortunate that he did not have to refute his own arguments applied to attack Christianity. He would hardly have appreciated being told that the Old Testament is often "metrical", and often concerned repetitively to praise God; that it contains words that in other contexts would be improper, and stories that a sceptic might consider fabulous, especially in their traditional interpretation; that it deals with wars, and fails to treat continuously of the virtues like a philosophical tract; that inconsistencies can be not irrationally alleged of it, and that it offends against the order of time and the order of subject-matter and logic. Ricoldo had collected a series of debating-points which in other circumstances he might have been engaged in answering. Much of his work was

indiscriminate because he was defective in his sense of humour. He did little to illumine for his contemporaries the significance of the Qur'an in Islam; but simply collected and elaborated the work of his predecessors and, in turn, provided material for his successors. San Pedro's work often seems more sober and responsible in detail. We may suppose it the fruit of a long life of which much was spent in actual controversy, and all in the atmosphere of the Reconquest. It corresponded to the realities of polemic. Yet in its general lines it follows the same traditional pattern as does Ricoldo's. The main attack on Islam was already determined in the thirteenth century, and in Ricoldo's work both its most and its least effective elements are represented. If the attack was excessive, it was yet sincerely felt: as often as he read the Qur'an, Ricoldo placed it on the altar and indignantly insisted to God that he should read it.[1]

So far as possible the controversial material amassed by 1300 isolated the Qur'an from every authority known to the writers - not only from the true revelations, the Scriptures, but also from reason, common-sense and logic.

---

1. Ep. III. (Ricoldo says, the Arabic Qur'an; but I do not take this as evidence of Ricoldo's fluency in Arabic.)

It was again Ricoldo who applied the text, "all men's hands against him".[1] Sometimes accurate, and even when accurate often misleading, this material supplied the missionary with the ammunition of serviceable quotations, and a battery of slick arguments that might in practice more probably gratify the Christians living in Islamic countries than cause dismay to the Muslims whom they were supposed to impress. Behind this ostensible purpose lay a pre-occupation, certainly defensive rather than proselytising in character, with the contrast between Qur'an and Scripture, and, in a wider context, between the Qur'an and the whole Western tradition. This produced a range of argument which positively asserted an absolute incompatibility, and was wider in intention than argument which only aimed to show that the Qur'an was unsupported by Scripture. "Our religion," said Fitzralph, "not only does not confirm, but despises and rejects and invalidates (theirs) . . . Whatever confirms our religion,

---

1. Itin. XXXIV; Gen.XVI.12; cf. p.
He also argued that Muhammad had himself asserted his own isolation from Christians: "he separates himself entirely from them and says, my religion (Arabic 'amil) is for me and yours is for you, and the rest; and after this, You will be free of the things which I do and I of those which you do." (Q. X.42; Disp. XV; MS. f.180v.) This in fact did not apply to the Christians at all and Muslim tradition does not make it do so. Ricoldo was here again following the Contrarietas; it is another example of the many things it is so difficult to believe he ever maintained in actual controversy with Muslims.

with the exception of that very religion of the Muslims, invalidates that very religion, because in many things it is contrary to ours; and thus no Muslim can deny that our religion has the weightier support (testimonium legis nostrae est gravius) . . ."[1] Finally, it is obvious that the alien qualities of the Qur'an, just because they were alien, gave a comfortable sense of reassurance to the Christian when he rejected it.

---

1. Arm. 20 (21).

PART II.

Truth and Falsity.

Prefatory Note.

The Qur'an had been attacked for failing to achieve what it did not attempt, but it was not only in the field of written Revelations that rigid Christian standards, based on notions conceived in purely Christian terms, would be applied. In particular it was difficult for Christians fully to realise the implications of the fact that Muhammad did not claim to be a divine founder, or any sort of founder, of Islam; and even when this was admitted its significance was rarely pondered. Besides the persistent supposition that Muhammad held Christ's place in the esteem of Muslims, there was also a tendency to see Muhammad's claim to prophecy, either as a falling short of the example of the Old Testament prophets, or as revealing the signs of the false prophets foretold in the New (1). In the Christian scheme there was no room for prophecy in a theological sense, which already knew the fullness of revelation.

The process of judgement is well illustrated by the thaumaturgical test which was then viewed very seriously. The attitude of the Qur'an was crucial in this matter. It is full of accounts of miracles worked by Moses and Jesus and "other" prophets, but for Muhammad it disowns miracles (2). When the Quraysh demanded certain wonders, Muhammad declared by revelation that "though a Qur'an were revealed by which mountains should be removed or the earth cleaved in sunder or the dead be caused to speak, it would be vain" (3). The Qur'an, as we have seen, was its own witness: "If men and genii were purposely assembled, that they might produce a book like this Qur'an, they could not produce one like unto it" (4). Nevertheless, as was natural, Muslims after the time of Muhammad began to invent miracles in the Prophet's honour, or to transfer them to his account; and their legendary character came to be accepted rather by the vulgar than by the learned. Christians pointed not only to the miracles of Christ, but to those of the saints which continued to be performed. The populations, formerly Christian or pagan, which accepted Islam had always in the past believed true religion to be marked by

---

1. Matthew, VII, 15.

2. For Moses, cf. Q. vii. 160, x.92, xl.24, xliii.45; for Christ, iii.43.

3. Q. xiii.30, cf. viii.23.

4. Q. xvii.90.

miracles; it is generally assumed that it is they who attributed miracles to Muhammad. The Latin critic found these legendary miracles easy to deride, and both they, and the Qur'an's total rejection of miracles on Muhammad's behalf, would be contrasted with the true miracles of Christ. The Qur'anic attitude could only be considered an unwilling admission of truth; it was not then possible in the Latin West to conceive a divine mission unconfirmed by miracles. Thus Christian standards applied to Muhammad were convincing, on Christian premises, and to a Christian.

In spite of this consciousness of superior (or "true") standards of judgement, or by their application, Christians were aware of sound elements of doctrine in Islam. Either side tends naturally to assume that if the other admits beliefs that they apparently share - in God himself, as Creator and Ruler of the world, in as many prophets as are common to Qur'an and Scripture, in the angels and other figures of both Islamic and Christian theology - in that case it must understand them in the same sense as itself. Equally easily, it may make the contrary mistake, and allow differences to obscure the real extent of agreement.

It seems to me to be a kind of romanticism which likes to speak of "Allāh" as though he were other than God, and a theological pedantry which identifies any erroneous concept of God as idolatrous. There is only one God, whose name in Arabic is "Allāh", so that Arabic-speaking Christians use the same word as Muslims. We might as well speak of the Pope's blessing in the name of the Pater and the Filius and the Spiritus Sanctus, as speak in English of "Allāh"; or a Frenchman might say that the Archbishop of Canterbury worships "God son Dieu". This treatment of Islam was not a mediaeval pre-occupation; in Latin, "Deus" was always used for the object of Muslim worship and belief, and the word "Allāh" was introduced, if at all, to be translated. The theological pedant, on the other hand, can be defended up to a point. There is no reason to prevent all from agreeing that they worship one and the same God under different names, but inevitably each group will make the reservation that the other has different and erroneous ideas about the God whom, at least in part, they worship in ignorance. This reservation was made in the Middle Ages, but not very widely. In less important beliefs similarly, Islam and Christianity, while they believe in the same things, believe different things about them. This was not always as clear as it might have been to those most nearly concerned. Even where the attitudes of Christianity and Islam are mutually exclusive, there is sufficient resemblance between them to make it difficult for

those who hold one exactly to appreciate without discolouring the definition of the other (1).

If for Christians the position of Christ is very different to the position of Muhammad for Muslims, for the Muslims the status of Muhammad and that of Christ are the same. The difference is only that Muhammad was the bearer of the last revelation from God, Jesus the Messias of an earlier one which is subsumed in the last. It would be simple for Christians to adopt an attitude of horror if this were all. The case is in fact more complex, because the Qur'an treats Christ with what one can only describe as a peculiar affection and respect. The actual number of words devoted to Moses may be greater, but there is nothing else in the Qur'an to parallel the warmth with which Christ and his Mother are treated. Even in comparison with "other" prophets, the Qur'an makes Christ appear to be a quite exceptional being. It is equally obvious that this remarkable being is not the Christ of the Christian Church, although it is possible that the hadīth preserves some genuine Christian traditions of Christ (2). Not only do no divine attributes appear in the Qur'an, but also little aspect of the historical Christ, or of those sayings which the Gospels record, survives. It is almost true to say that the personality of his Mother appears in the Qur'an more vividly than Christ's. It inculcates a spirit of devotion to her which Muslims might have made more of, if they had not needed to distinguish their own attitudes from those of contemporary Christians (3). Modernist Muslims do not like the unambiguity with which the Qur'an proclaims the perpetual virginity of Mary, and Protestants have at times liked to say that the Catholic Church borrowed the belief in the Immaculate Conception from Islam (4). The problem is not easy. The Christ of the Qur'an is not the Christ in whom the Christian believes, and yet he is not wholly different. There are times when the hadīth seems to be very close to the true Christ, the Qur'an to the true Mary.

In this matter the mediaeval writer was in a

---

1. cf. Maulvi Muhammad Ali, Holy Qur'an, 1917, for a Muslim view that "Allāh" is so exclusively the name of the God of Muhammad that it should be used in non-Arabic usage.

2. cf. Robson; Asin y Palacios, Logia.

3. cf. J.-M. Abd-el-Jalil, Marie et l'Islam, 1950.

4. cf. Maulvi Mhd. Ali. For the Immaculate Conception, see Sale, on Q. iii.31, and Gibbon, ch. L.

quandary, but it at least emerged clearly that denial of the divinity of the Messias was a denial of the Trinity. The Qur'an's few words on this subject are decisive, and have been productive of much controversy between the two religions. It states, and Muslims have therefore always stated, that Christians "say, God is the third of three" (1), that "there are three (Gods)" (2). This is a simple assertion that Trinity and unity are not compatible. On the Christian side it has just been assumed that Muhammad, whom they have supposed the author of the Qur'an, did not know what Christians really said, and that Muslims have ever since refused to understand what is meant by Trinitarian doctrine, in order to cover their Prophet's ignorance. This conviction was particularly strong in the thirteenth century, when faith in reason was at its height, when it was supposed that the Trinity and the Incarnation were susceptible of logical proof, and even that to believe in the unity of God without his Trinity is illogical. Moreover, throughout the Middle Ages, the enormous respect for the Biblical text extended to accepting as "proofs" arguments that are purely "mystical", that is, that do not accord with the literal meaning at all. On the Islamic side, the Qur'an is so full of warnings that God has no offspring (3), that for Muslims it is quite intolerable that the language of paternity should be used about God. The Qur'an may well be referring to pagan concepts irrelevant to Christianity; in practice there is always the likelihood of each side's accusing the other of anthropomorphism.

Islam was taught by the Qur'an to adopt a "tolerant contempt" for Christianity which thus has and always has had a place in the Islamic world-view: Christians received a revelation of the one religion, Islam, about which they somehow got into such error that they fail to recognise that Muhammad represents the same tradition as Jesus did before him. If Jesus were here he would lead his people into union with Islam; Muslims, if they have Christian friends, like to believe that the Christians will in fact be given a final chance, under the guidance of Jesus, to accept the one religion of God at the Last Day. Muslims have expressed surprise that Christianity has no comparable place for Islam, however contemptible. Actually the presence of so much "truth" in Islam, constituting part of a larger "untrue" doctrine, makes it appear very like heresy, a phenomenon which has its place, familiar, despised and feared, in Christian

---

1. Q. v.77.

2. Q. iv.169.

3. e.g. Q. xliii.81-2.

thought. The only alternative place of Islam is also traditional, but less well defined; this is within a natural threefold grouping which now is called that of the three Semitic revealed religions and which was formerly thought of as a group of three "Laws".

The Christian and Islamic doctrines of God and of the prophets produced confusion when similarity of belief was mistaken for identity. One clear consequence was the attempt to define the relation of Islam to Christianity. Muslims were given a place nearly parallel to that which Islam had always accorded to Christians.

Chapter 5.

The Prophethood of Muhammad.

Islam claimed the witness of a succession of prophets, and for Christians it would be necessary to attack both the notion of the prophethood of Muhammad and that of the prophethood of Jesus. The former was crucial. *Legis divinae non auctor, sed lator.*[1] Inevitably it was the object of all polemic to show that Muhammad was the author of his religion, because, if he were not, he would be a true prophet. "We concede", said Peter the Venerable "that a true prophet of God must be believed, and that a true messenger of God must be accepted".[2] The Islamic claim was taken sufficiently seriously for much energy to be devoted to finding proofs that Muhammad's claim was false. He was considered unlike other prophets, and more grateful than any other theme would be the contrast between him and Christ, in their lives and in their missions and in the claims made for them by their followers. "Indeed", said Pedro de Alfonso, "the signs of a true prophet are probity of life, the presentation of miracles and the constant truth of all his sayings". Those aspects of Islam which are most alien to the Christian tradition would always seem most characteristic of it to the Latin; and these three signs, put forward by Pedro, almost constitute a summary of mediaeval polemic against the prophethood of Muhammad.[3]

---

1. Above, p. 4
2. C.S.S., II.3
3. The general theme is common to Pedro de Alfonso, the *Contrarietas* and Peter the Venerable. The schematisation under three heads is Pedro's own.

Peter of Poitiers in preparing his Headings, which the surviving books of Peter the Venerable's work do not follow, preserved Pedro's three-part test in his plan more clearly than did his Abbot. He intended a second book to show that "Muhammad must not be said or believed to be a prophet for these reasons: that he was a robber . . . a murderer . . . a traitor . . . an adulterer . . " To these reasons which amount to personal charges against Muhammad were added the "shameful" and "Contradictory" teaching of the Qur'an and its failure to be confirmed by miracles. Except to show that Muhammad did not foretell the succession of Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, ʿUthmān and ʿAlī, the third book would have been devoted to the absence of miracles in the life of the Prophet and in the Qur'an.[1] This was in outline the scheme propounded by Pedro de Alfonso, in parts expanded, and unsystematically presented.

Less systematic, Peter the Venerable sought a definition of prophecy which would exclude Muhammad, and which in theory would command the unwilling respect of his imaginary Muslim readers.[2] "A prophet is a man, not instructed by human knowledge but inspired by the spirit of God, who publishes to mortal men things that are unknown, either of time past, or present or future".

---

1. Capitula, lib. II and III.
2. C.S.S., II.4. He claimed to derive this definition from II Peter 1, "For prophecy came not by the will of man at any time: but the holy men of God spoke, inspired by the Holy Ghost". He argued that the fame of the Prince of the Apostles and of his martyrdom in Rome must be universal, and his authority acceptable to his readers.

This is the sense with which we are familiar in everyday usage and popular Christian theology. It ignores a claim to prophethood which is based principally on the religious leadership of the community, and is tailored to exclude Muhammad. The phrase 'res ignota' would be taken to the letter to provide an almost mechanical test. Moses was a prophet of the past when he wrote about Creation, of the present, when he knew what was happening amid the distant multitude,[1] and of the future, when he foretold the plagues. Muhammad, on the other hand, was not made a prophet by saying he was one; in all the Qur'an, "no sūrah excepted", from the first word to the last, he did not prophesy anything unknown, not the slightest or most unimportant thing was foreknown or foretold. This was not like the prophets of the Old Testament.[2] This argument, following the Capitula, gave excessive weight to a tradition ("Chronica Mendosa") that Muhammad prophesied that he would be succeeded by twelve men of the Quraysh ('Chorais'), of whom he named the first three, Abū Bakr ('Abubacaram'), ʿUmar ('Aornar') and ʿUthmān ('Odmen'). Yet this was not in the Qur'an and Muhammad had said : "Whatever you find written about me, compare with the Qur'an, and if it does not agree with it, know that I am innocent of what is written, and that it is not mine."[3] Thus he had denied his own prophethood. This polemic insisted on a narrower interpretation of the prophetic function than the Christian view of the Old Testament really requires. The prophecies of the Holy Saturday liturgy

1. Cf. Numbers XVI. 46-9.
2. C.S.S., II.5-11. Cf. Risālah, Vincent, 23, 45; Muir, p.53.
3. Ibid., 12, 13. Chron. Mend., Bibl. p.218.

are a series of divine mercies which prefigure the final mercy, rather than prophecies within Peter's definition.[1]

Peter devoted considerable dialectical effort to the Muslim failure to justify prophethood by miracles, and then summed up his previous argument, maintaining that the principal sign of a prophet is prophecy; either he should be a prophet and admit to signs, or give up both signs and prophethood. The true prophet, he asserted, leaves it to his writings to establish his reputation, when the things he has foretold are fulfilled. Muhammad on the contrary asserted his prophethood,

> What I cannot repeat with enough astonishment, he calls himself prophet, introduces God in his writings where he calls himself prophet, and while he affirms himself prophet of God almost ad nauseam, and affirms it and repeats it, he says nothing about things to come, utters nothing prophetic; and he not only does not show that there is anything foretold or fulfilled by him, but preaches nothing that is to be fulfilled.[2]

The one thing he has prophesied is heaven and hell, which, as only those who are there can disprove what is said, anyone could do; Peter suggests that he might as easily himself set up as prophet. A true prophet, he concludes, must have living witnesses; he must prove himself with clear signs and miracles, and must make effective predictions which can be put to the test.

The remainder of the argument, based on a "new starting-point", was more securely set in Christian tradition.

---

1. Missale Romanum. This is even clearer in the old liturgy than in the new ceremonies of Easter Eve.
2. C.S.S., II.16. Cf. also above, p. §3

It began with an analysis of all the possible kinds of prophet:

> Of the prophets that there have been or that there have been said to be, some were good, some bad. Of the good ones, some preached universal things, some particular things. Of the bad ones, some were false, some true. Besides these, there are others who are not prophets, but who are called by the common name of diviners, such as augurs, seers, soothsayers, mages and fortune-tellers.

He said that he would take the different kinds of prophet in the order he had set them out, ignoring the final group. The good are those "whose life is praiseworthy and whose prophecy or preaching is truthful", the Hebrew prophets, for example; Christ himself, though the Lord of all prophets, made many true prophecies, and is rightly called prophet. The definition of the bad prophet is, of course, "whose life is reprobate, whose prophecy or preaching is false." Such were the prophets of Baal; despite his promise to take each of his classes in turn, the author never discussed the division of bad prophets into true and false. His great point was the kinds of good prophet: the universal, who prophesied the salvation of the human race in Jesus Christ, and the particular, who spoke prophetically to certain nations, as Jonas to the people of Nineve, or to individuals, as Samuel to Heli and to Saul.[1] The supply of prophets to the Jewish nation, until Christ the sole guardian of the divine law, wholly dried up after John the Baptist, because no object of universal prophecy remained. "Your Muhammad was not, then, as you say, the seal of the prophets, that is, the last." Prophets may still foretell "various events

---

1. C.S.S., 17-21.

of persons or of times", like St. Paul, who foretold the turning away from truth to fables which has been fulfilled in the Muslims' turning away from Christian truth to the fables of Muhammad, the Jews' to the fables of the Talmud. "Particular or personal prophecy, indeed, both was given to many before John, and is yet perhaps to be given to many." Muslims must accept the prophets of the Jews and the Christians in whole or reject them in whole; this point was cardinal to Cluniac polemic. All prophets, so many examples have shown, have a universal, or a particular or a personal gift; yet that book which is sacred for Muslims and which Christians must execrate contains no prophecy, universal, particular or personal, of past, present or future. "Non est igitur propheta"[1]

The later part of this argument of Peter's is less petty than the earlier; it was less inclined to impugn the Muslim faith directly than to set it against an alternative. To some people this will always seem a preferable mode of religious discussion. For Peter the Venerable the characteristic failure of Muhammad was not to have prophesied anything; yet as well as using the argument relating to miracles he touched on two other marks of a prophet, that what he says is true and that what he does in his life is good, without making them into a regular test. In being less systematic, Peter had followed

---

1. C.S.S., II. 22-26, 28, 29. St. Paul: II Tim. 4.

his secretary's Capitula; in setting the claims of Islam against the story of the Hebrew prophets, he followed the Risālah and Pedro de Alfonso. His originality lay partly in his thoroughness. He showed his insight into Islam in his occasional understanding of its tenets, rather than in his own replies. It was his weakness to put words into the mouth of an opponent, in order to catch him in some purely logical dilemma.

A greater schematisation marked the scholastic character of the quadruplex reprobatio clearly establishing from the first that the author's object was to show that Muhammad was not the Prophet or the messenger of God. He distinguished three elements in the evangelical warning: "Beware of false prophets, who come to you in the clothing of sheep, but inwardly they are ravening wolves. By their fruits you shall know them".[1] Thus there are the warning against false prophets, their description as wolves within and sheep without, and their recognition by their fruits.

Moreover, in order that we may more easily arrive at a notion of these fruits by means of a demonstration of opposites, we can say that a Prophet or messenger of God who wants to show the truth of his prophethood or mission, in such a way that those to whom he is sent cannot oppose, or reasonably doubt about him, must have four things, which are like fruit or signs by which a true Prophet or messenger of God can be known. . The first is that he be truthful, and this can be shown by reason and by authority . .[2]

1. Matthew VII.15,16.
2. Cap. I.

By reason, because no lie can derive from God, who is truth, and a messenger can only say what he who sent him inspires him to say; by authority, when Holy Scripture says, "Whatsoever that same prophet foretelleth in the name of the Lord, and it cometh not to pass: that thing the Lord hath not spoken, but the prophet hath forged it in the pride of his mind."[1] There was both reason and authority in the style of the schools for each of the "signs" or "fruits". The second sign was that the prophet must be "good and virtuous, not evil and villainous"; God is the highest good and cleanness, and uncleanness and sin are most far from him; all should imitate this, but especially prophets. "Ambulans in via immaculata, hic mihi ministrabat";[2] "for prophecy came not by the will of man . . "[3] The third sign was that he should work miracles, because many people are truthful and good without being prophets; the philosopher ibn Rushd says that the decisive sign is a miracle, "something, that is, that he cannot do by himself as man." The fourth sign was that the law by which he comes must be "holy and good, leading the nations to the worship of the one God, and men to holiness of life and concord and peace". "Lex Domini immaculata, convertens animas."[4] In this description we may recognise the laws of Moses and the Gospel. Whoever has fruits contrary to all these must be shunned as a false prophet and apostle.

---

1. Deut. XVIII.22
2. Ps. 100 (A.V.101).6
3. II Peter I.21
4. Ps. 18.8 (A.V.19.7)

This was essentially the same scheme as that put forward by Pedro de Alfonso, but it had been improved by the addition of the fourth head, to distinguish Muhammad's law from either his probity of life or his truthfulness. The arguments were brought forward as inherently compelling in reason and authority rather than as likely to persuade. The writing was careful and proceeded stage by stage. With his second chapter the author felt able to come to the point that he had been so obviously preparing. "Now, then, by the help of God, we shall show that Muhammad, who called himself the Prophet and messenger of God, not only did not have the aforesaid four signs, but, what is more, had their opposites."[1] The four-part test of prophethood constituted the bulk of this small book and gave it an admirable clarity. The author's originality lay in his use of direct sources for the life of Muhammad and the doctrines of Islamic religion, and in an evident desire to refrain from improving them. Although his manipulation of his material accorded with contemporary prejudice, he was one of those who did not first invent the religion they afterwards attacked. His outline of the career of Muhammad from birth until his call he summarised from the Traditions, and it contains nothing that is controversial, very little, indeed, unfavourable to Muhammad. The bulk of the lies of the Prophet

1. The printed text has non solum habuit for non solum non habuit, an obvious erratum which is not in the MSS (cf. the two Berlin MSS., Qu. 85, f.240v; Fol. 425, f.123r col. 1; B.N. MS., f.152r, col. 1).

which the author noted were different aspects of Islamic belief simply listed as statements from the Qur'an and from the Traditions and classified as "true" and "untrue". He employed against the holiness of the Prophet, against the holiness of Islamic religion, and against Muhammad's miracles, the same economy of method: the chain of genuine Islamic authorities chosen to define the state of things.[1] His work was intended for information. At the same time it is a skilled advocacy that does not over-state a case.

Humbert of Romans adapted the same scheme of attack on Muhammad's claim to homiletic purposes.[2] Other religions, a preacher was recommended to say, were delivered by holy men; but this, by a sensual adulterer who justified his sins by pretended revelations; this ribaldus has many shameful things in his religion. True laws of God have been confirmed by miracles. "The vileness of his religion is clear, then, as much from the vileness of the person teaching as from the shameful character of the things taught, and from the defect in divine evidence (ostensio) which God is accustomed to provide (facere) in the handing down of his laws."[3] Some other writers reflected the same ideas, or made use of them in other contexts, without schematisation. Thus it was one of Lull's favourite points that Islam does not teach enjoyment of the Divine Essence in Paradise:

---

1. The detail of the reprobatio's treatment of these subjects will be seen in the course of this thesis.
2. This applies chiefly to his sermon scheme; it is less to the fore in his material collected for the Council of Lyons (1274); this was less popular in appeal.
3. De pred. S.C., XII; cf. Op. Trip. I.vi.

"and thus it is impossible that he who excites his people to sensual things rather than to spiritual ones should be a true messenger of God."[1] That Muhammad was not what a Christian expected a prophet to be is implied by the fourteenth century English pilgrim's choice of phrase: simulator sanctitatis.[2] The schematic treatment was ignored by San Pedro Pascual, who stressed one aspect only: "in the matter of the use of women, no other prophet has so loosened the bonds and the laws as thou".[3] In his summing up of the life of Muhammad as it seemed to him that Muslims themselves presented it he spoke of "many other things which it is proper for no man to say or do who declared himself to be the messenger of God."[4] Sometimes it was as characteristically the deceiver that Muhammad was referred to - praestigiator animarum, said the second account of Islam cited by Paris; Guido Terrena identified him as false prophet in the evangelical sense.[5] The whole presentation of Muhammad's life by every Latin writer was intended to show its incompatibility with a prophetic vocation.

Ricoldo used the same arguments as those already surveyed in a scheme of controversy directed, both in the Disputatio and in the Itinerarium in its controversial sections, primarily against the Qur'an rather than the Prophet; thus he

---

1. Lib. Tart., de T. et S., 6.
2. Quidam Anglicus. Cf. Acqui's use of the word sanctity in the same context.
3. S.S.M., I. ii.12; cf. I.viii.48
4. S.S.M., I. vii.12.
5. 14. Guido also thought that Muhammad claimed to be the Messias and was at exceptional pains to disprove this. (11)

reversed the attack on the "lawgiver" by means of the "law". In this way, he devoted a good deal of attention to the aspects of the subject that we have been considering: to the irrationality of the law because it contradicts itself and lies, because it is iniquitous, because it is not confirmed by miracles, and because its institutor was "a wicked man, robber, adultered, a lewd man, a murdered and guilty of other sins . ."[1] This is not a calm statement, but it is representative of Latin reactions to the personality of Muhammad. Any other sin but sexual sin would be more tolerable in a prophet, said Ricoldo; "for the Spirit does not touch the hearts of prophets", he quoted, "in the sexual act, as Jerome says; and the Philosopher says that in that act it is impossible to have understanding".[2] This seems to be a misapplication of the authorities cited, since there is no question of prophesying during "that act", and they do not seem to bear a general significance.[3] This aspect seemed particularly important to Ricoldo, as to San Pedro;[4] "it is quite unreasonable that the minister and prophet of such a religion of salvation, as

1. Disp. VIII (MS. f. 167v col.1); cf. XIII; Itin. XXXV.
2. Disp. VIII (MS. f. 168r col.1).
3. Bibliander accepted Ricoldo's point, remarking marginally in the text, "libido a prophetico spiritu aliena" (col.145). We may think Ricoldo once again guilty of not reflecting whether what he said was not applicable to Christian prophets: cf. Osee (Hosea), passim, esp. III.1.
4. This is the point of hypocrite, in classifying Muhammad as tyrant, heretic and hypocrite. (Disp., prol.) Peter de Pennis, however, omitted a number of sentences here quoted from Ricoldo, while reproducing an intervening passage. Cf. his chapter IV (MS. f.21v-22r) with Ric., Disp. VIII.

they call it, should be a very carnal and unclean man . ." Ricoldo also classified and cited Muhammad's "lies", and among those de se the assertion that he was the seal of the Prophets; Ricoldo objected that the prophetic gift continued to be given.[1] In this he argued in harmony with Peter the Venerable, but reduced one of his principal arguments to a relative unimportance in the total polemic scheme. Ricoldo's presentation is sometimes something of a hodge-podge; a clear scheme was modified by a style which depended partly on the force of repetition. Apart from different emphases induced by minor differences of Scholastic technique, Ricoldo's arguments reveal no important change in the consensus of Western opinion.

The same scheme was repeated again in the fourteenth century by Marino Sanudo when he laid his thesis in favour of war before the governing class of Venice; a considerable part of his outline of Islamic religion adduced in support of it he based on Pedro de Alfonso, to whom also he owed his tests of Muhammad's authenticity. "The true prophet is known by three signs, by holiness of life . . by the working of miracles . . by an exact observation of future things." There were three radical sources of all sin which enable us to recognise Muhammad for a false prophet (he continued): Concupiscence of the eyes, by reason of robbery; pride of life, by reason of usurped power;

---

1. See above, p. 20

concupiscence of the flesh, by reason of carnal lasciviousness.[1] This second scheme would modify the first to which it does not provide neat opposites; it seems to oppose sanctity of life to robbery, sight of the future to lasciviousness and the omission of miracles to the use of force. The last is rational and was common; otherwise the classification is far from clear, and the contrasting epithets fail to contrast. This work did not normally pretend to do more than reuse familiar material of propaganda to support a crusading plea.

The arguments against Muhammad's prophethood were the same in systematic and in haphazard treatments of Islamic subjects. The lies imputed to Islam and to the Qur'an have been considered elsewhere;[2] and it will be seen later that the whole life of Muhammad was composed in terms that would show his human weakness and downright wickedness.[3] Here we have seen why these questions were particularly stressed. Finally, the sign of miracles must be considered apart from the other signs of prophethood. The major mediaeval writers thought it of very great importance.

---

1. III. IV.
2. See above, p. 104
3. See ~~above, p.~~ part III, passim.

Chapter 6.

The Divine Witness of Miracles.

We have seen that miracle-working was numbered among the decisive tests of prophethood. A characteristic element in the approach of Pedro de Alfonso, the converted Hebrew, was the contrast between the stream of Old Testament prophecy, which achieved its purpose in Jesus Christ, and the Islamic scheme, with its realisation which was final but not intended to be thought unique. For some writers it was in this connection that the matter of miracles would first be felt to be so important. In Pedro's dialogue with his former unconverted self, Moises, he referred to Muhammad :

> Peter . . . And certainly we do not know of . . any miracle of his, such as we have heard of in the cases of Moses, Josue, Samuel, Elias and Eliseus, who, we read, did many miracles.
>
> Moses. But we do believe in many prophets of whom we read of no miracles, such as Jeremias, Abdias, Amos, Osee and others.
>
> Peter. Miracles are not to be sought in their case, because they did not introduce any novelty of law, nor did they deny anything of Mosiac teaching; and the things which they preached in part, we know completed.

This question of miracles is cardinal to mediaeval thought about Muhammad's claims.

In this matter there was still no distinction between the Prophet's authority and the Qur'an's, but it was a favourite assertion of the Latins that the Qur'an (or "Muhammad in his Qur'an") denied that he was sent with miracles.[1] According to this argument, Muhammad had said that whatever contradicted the testimony of the Qur'an was false; itself, therefore, the

---

1. This is also discussed in chapter 18.

Qur'an was an "authority" which condemned the miracles alleged by the Muslims on their prophet's behalf. It appeared doubly effective to refute the modern Muslims, who contradicted their sacred book, and, at the same time, Muhammad, who, if he were really a prophet, would have had the power to work miracles that he was forced to deny. On the Latin side a tradition of argument was developed. Pedro was fully representative in insisting that Muhammad said that the prophets of the old dispensation and Jesus were confirmed by miracles and that he himself was not. Miracles which his followers claimed for him he himself had denied in advance, and in any case these were absurd in themselves, or unworthy of credence. To a list of the usual "worthless" miracles he remarked :

> Muhammad himself alleged no such thing in his Qur'an, but rather wholly forbade whatever was written about him to be believed true unless it was in the Qur'an. Many people, he said, have told many lies about everything that concerns me; only what is proved about me by the authority of the Qur'an is to be held as true. When he wanted to show why he did not do miracles, he brought God in, speaking to him, saying : the Lord said to me: For this reason I do not allow you to do miracles, that I fear that they will speak against you over miracles, as against the other prophets.[2]

The failure to work miracles seemed not merely important; it was a crucial failure on the part of Muhammad. In believing in the need for miracles, the Latins agreed with the first Quraysh against whom the Qur'anic revelations which refer to miracles were directed. It only remained in addition to deride the miracles claimed

---

1. The fullest list is that quoted by the "Syrian Apology", below.
2. This seems to refer to Q. X.40.

on Muhammad's behalf. Christians would be at great pains to refute each one.

Ketton in his Cluniac Qur'an innocuously paraphrased the passages which speak of the demand for miracles by the unbelievers of the Qur'aysh.

> . . many remained unbelievers, which is what would happen, even if this Qur'an flattened mountains, cut apart the earth and made the dead to speak . . we deferred the punishment of those who laughed at your predecessors, for a little time.[1]

In another classic passage he said,

> If all men and devils (sc. jinns) came in order to compose one such (Book), and helped each other, by no means could they do it. Although everything has been explained by parables in this Qur'an, many remain unbelievers, saying that they will never believe you, until you make a fountain flow in the earth, or a paradise of palms . . . or you ascend to heaven, or send them a Book from there to read: nor will they have faith in you first. Truly, pray God to free you, saying: I am not other than a man, an apostle . .[2]

These passages could not give a false idea of Islam, but it was not they that would form men's ideas. For the West the Islamic attitude to miracles would be defined in a more decisive form of words.

The ideas which Pedro had developed Peter the Venerable and his secretary elaborated more fully, without too close attention to the text of the Qur'an at their disposal. The Capitula reveal that considerable time and thought have been given to the theme of the foundation of Islam without miracles. It is something outside the tradition of prophetic revelation that there

---

1. Q. XIII.30. Ket. XXII, Bibl. XXIII, p.82, ll. 23-5.
2. Q. XVII.90-5. Ket. XXVI, Bibl. XXVII, p.93, l.37 ff. The translation of XXV.8 ff. also resembles the original; in these passages Ketton does not misrepresent, although he is not, of course, accurate.

should be a prophecy and a lawgiving without miracles which could prove it to be divine and holy.[1] It is by Muhammad's own confession that we know that these signs of prophethood were not given him; it is altogether against reason that he should claim that God said: "If we did not know that you would not be believed we should have given you signs and prodigies."[2] There is self-contradiction in claiming to be a prophet and denying having had one essential sign of prophethood; here was Peter the Venerable's argument plotted: a prophet has the signs, and a man who denies having the signs denies being a prophet.[3]

For Peter the Venerable, if the failure to prophesy seemed more significant, the rejection of miracles was still important. Thus, he says, God is introduced speaking to Muhammad in the Qur'an and saying, "By no means indeed shall you come to them with manifest miracles, for they have rejected those things as hateful and pernicious, and have spoken against the truth when it came to them"; and again, "We should send you signs and wonders, if we did not know that they would not believe you, as they did not believe others."[4] In one form or another this paraphrase was to become a favourite quotation of succeeding ages. This, said the author critically, is absurd;

---

1. II.vi.
2. III.iii.
3. IV.vii.
4. C.S.S., II.14,15.

the Arabs, the Persians, Syrians, Egyptians and a great part of the Africans believed him without miracles, who would not have disbelieved him with them; God, therefore, is made out to be a liar, or else at fault in his foreknowledge of events. Moreover, who were those other prophets who came with signs and were not believed? Moses came with signs and was believed; Christ came with greater signs and was also believed. The Qur'an, concluded Peter, contains things that are false: falsum est ergo oraculum tuum. He arrived with obvious pleasure at the grateful and expected conclusion. It was, perhaps, disingenuous to say that Moses, and much more that Christ, was believed by the people for whom he did miracles. Peter logically advanced the argument which he found ready for him, but only in certain aspects.

In the next few generations there was rather play upon the different familiar arguments than genuine development; further accounts of the supposed miracles of Muhammad circulated. The bare facts seemed significant, as when it was baldly stated that Muhammad "himself said that he did not have the power of doing miracles".[1] Alan of Lille derided Islamic failure: "Let them say also by what miracles their belief is distinguished. With them, miracles are worked by working no miracles (fiunt miracula per antiphrasim)."[2] Jacques de Vitry marvelled at the blindness of Muslims who believe miracles "which, boasting, they allege" of Muhammad, since he had admitted to not having the

1. Benedict of Alignan.
2. IV.14.

grace to work them.[1] Oliver of Paderborn thought that he could read the Qur'anic text as a double admission, that the Prophet "did not know letters or have the grace of miracles".[2] The Syrian Apology was another to insist that the miracles which Muslims allege, the wolf by the way-side, the ox that talked, the fig-tree that prostrated itself and came at the Prophet's call, the moon that was divided and rejoined, the poisoned leg of lamb that warned Muhammad not to eat, were all in advance denied by the Qur'an.[3] In this text Muhammad was also made to say, "I am not sent to you with miracles and signs, but to punish rebels with the sword".[4] This association of the attack on Islam as not working miracles and of that on it as based on force became very popular. Ramón Marti expressed this pithily in his Capistrum Judaeorum: the

---

1. V.
2. Ep. Sal.
3. Viterbo; Paris. This is the fullest list. Pedro de Alfonso lacked the wolf. The Risālah lacked the "divided moon" (Tol. MS.p.302 col. 2 ff.; Vincent 23.46; Muir, p.58); on the other hand it distinguished more variants among single or related stories. The Contrarietas was exclusively interested in the "divided moon". (IX, MS. f. 251v ff.) In a wholly different category are the miracles, fictitious from every point of view, which Latins alleged that Muslims claimed, but which they never did claim. These are the bogus miracles of the dove that whispered in the Prophet's ear to simulate the Holy Ghost, the bull that bore the Law in its horns, and so on. (p. 57). To Vincent de Beauvais they suggested the "model of Moses", but really they must belong to pagan myth; their sources seem to be literary, non-Arabic and non-Islamic. See Ziolecki.
4. Viterbo, homines; Paris, rebelles. It may indicate a copyist's inability to believe that the Qur'an renounces miracles that the text printed by Cerulli has, for Non sum cum miraculis . . missus, the contrary, Non solum cum myraculis . . . missus. I assume that Paris' text, which makes perfect sense, is correct.

place of miracles was supplied by the force of arms; not successfully, he pointed out, at Uḥud. The Prophet's wounds in battle were often rather spitefully contemplated, because they were a disproof of the claim in the Qur'an and the Traditions that he was protected by angels.

In Paris's second account the absence of miracles was set in a context of conscious fraud. The Prophet made out that God said,

> Muhammad, son of man, thou shalt not go by the ways of the other prophets who were before you, that is with miracles and signs and prodigies. He who wishes to believe, and, believing, to be saved, let him of his own motion enter into the law, not drawn by signs, so that, from a spontaneous will, a greater reward may be heaped up. - He devised this, knowing that his merit was not so great with God that God would do anything miraculous for him.

The authentic story of Muhammad's refusal to work miracles at the demand of Quraysh,[1] in contrast to this, was known to several writers; but the critical standpoint which they adopted was in no way different from that of the less accurate or more vague. Humbert of Romans said briefly that God confirmed the laws of Moses and Christ by miracles, which Muhammad could not do for his; "when some people asked him why he did not do like Moses and Christ, he replied that miracles were always calumniated, thus by his reply deceiving simple people".[2] San Pedro Pascual, insisting upon the same point, had a much closer knowledge of the Islamic

---

1. The Qur'anic texts in question are those cited above from Ketton, XIII.30 ff. and XVII.90 ff. For the story of the attitude adopted by the Quraysh, see Ibn Isḥāq 188 ff; Bayḍāwī, quoted by Sale, pp. 141, 203 (on Q.VIII.23 and XIII.30).
2. De pred. S.C., XII.

story; he told of the Prophet's encounter with the Quraysh in an elaborate version which is substantially close to the Arabic sources.[1] His summing up was the usual one: "he himself said to the men of Mecca that he was not sent to accomplish miracles; and henceforth Muslims can hardly say or boast that Muhammad worked miracles, for if they said so they would make their Prophet a liar."[2]

Perhaps even more than San Pedro the reprobatio added the convincing authority which it derived from an authentic use of sources. It gave most prominence to the account which we have already encountered in other authors: Muhammad's insistence that he is called to announce and warn, but unable to work miracles - to move mountains, to make the soil fertile or to raise up their ancestor Quṣayy (Kosai), for which "certain Arabs" - the Quraysh - had asked; the author stressed his own sympathy for the Quraysh, when he reported their saying that God ought to have foreseen his Prophet's quandary, and taught him in advance how to reply.[3] Next in his list of authorities was sūrah XVII: "Or thou cause the Heavens to fall down upon us, as thou hast given out, in pieces" - dicentes ei, ut faceret coelum cadere super eos, ut dixerat se facturum.[4] . .

---

1. S.S.M. I.i.24ff. and Ibn Isḥāq, loc. cit.; cf. S.S.M. I. viii.24 for the reaction of the Quraysh to the announcement of the miʿrāj (and see Liber Scalae, LXXXII ff.); for the Quraysh and the revelation of the Cave, see S.S.M. I.i.27ff. (cf. Ibn Isḥāq, 192 ff.)
2. S.S.M. I.vii.9.
3. Ibn Isḥāq (188, 189) is cited by the author.
4. Verse 94.

There seems to be here a slight but important distortion for controversial purposes; the original contains no threat by Muhammad that he would cause the Heavens to fall. Another authority was in fact more pertinent: "Am I other than a man, sent as an apostle?" - Tandem respondit quod ipse non esset nisi homo nuncius; the text could be glossed, "as though to say that he could not do what they asked him", that is, work miracles.[1] Last he quoted al-Bukhārī: Muhammad said that it was not given to him to work such miracles as might make men believe him, but to receive the inspiration by which God inspired him. From this admirable statement the same restricted conclusion was drawn : "It is obvious that he never worked miracles."[2]

With this it is interesting to compare what Ricoldo had to say. "The Qur'an is not the law of God", he wrote, "nor is Muhammad the Apostle of God, because there is no miracle to bear witness to him." This is traditional; generally Ricoldo was more prolix of arguments, and less discriminating in his use of his material, than his older contemporary. He could draw on a wide knowledge of Islam, but he preferred what he derived at second-hand from books to what he knew by experience. Within the scholastic range there was a great divergence between these two. This is Ricoldo's version of the Qur'anic authority to

---

1. Verse 95.
2. Quad. rep., VII. Bukhārī cited as in tractatu fidei (=II) but the passage cited is not there. Cf. Bu. CXVI. 1; but also Muslim, I.239.

deny the miracles alleged of the Prophet:

> Muhammad often declaims in the Qur'an that when men said to him, show us signs, such as Moses did, and Christ and the other prophets, he said that Moses came with signs, and so did the other Prophets, and the other Apostles, and especially Christ, who came with the greatest prodigies, and the world did not believe them, but said that they were sorcerers. Because of this, God did not permit me to work miracles, for they would not have believed them; but I came in the strength of arms.[1]

Ricoldo went on to contrast, on the one hand the Christian faith in the crucified incarnate Son, and in miracles, and on the other Muhammad's purely human reliance on force. The conversion of the world to the Christian creed of self-denial was effected either with, or without, the help of miracles; it was the greater miracle, if it was done without, by powerless and simple men.[2] "It is thus established in every way that the faith of Christians is based on astonishing miracles" - stupendis miraculis esse fundatam.[3]

It is particularly interesting to compare Ricoldo's treatment of the reported miracle of the divided moon which entered the Prophet's sleeve, with that in the reprobatio. Both treated it seriously.[4] The reprobatio distinguished carefully between what the Qur'an says and what Muslims assert; the tale was of course absurd: fabulose asserunt Saraceni . .

---

1. Disp. VII, MS. f. 166r col. 2 ff.
2. He pointed out that Christians had never ceased to work miracles; contrast Humbert, who spoke of miracles as no longer an effective instrument of the Church. (Below, p.429)
3. Disp. VIII; MS. f. 167r col.1. Cf. also XIV, MS. f.177v col.2. This derives verbally from Cont. XIV, f.263r ff.
4. The Q. reference is LIV.1; Ricoldo derives again from Cont.; here IX, MS. f.252r ff.

But the Qur'an says nothing of this tale when Muhammad gives orders to the moon, he informed his readers; it says only that the day is drawing near when the moon shall be divided, and this, to anyone who understands it correctly, means the Day of Judgement. "In the authority, the phrase when the Day of Judgement draws near is put first, and the moon is split follows after."[1] This was a fair and reasonable use of sources. Ricoldo, in his Itinerarium, began with assurance that masked inaccuracy. "Indeed Muhammad himself says in the chapter al-qamr which means moon, that the moon was cut up in his time, and half fell on one mountain . ."[2] In his Disputatio he admitted that the miracle was only clearly claimed by the commentators, and by the Qur'an itself just vaguely.[3] In both accounts Ricoldo blurred the distinction between the Islamic assertion and the Qur'anic denial, which is the only point of the story, from the Christian point of view; not only in the reprobatio but in many less well-informed works the point was made perfectly clearly. Ricoldo's version in the Itinerarium occurred in a chapter devoted to proving that the "law of the Muslims" was mendacissima; Ricoldo was not the first or the last to do this mendaciously.

His arguments against the truth of the supposed miracle, although so greatly indebted to the Contrarietas may still

---

1. Quad. rep. VII.
2. Itin. XXXIII.
3. Disp. IV.

represent actual controversy. It is not easy to imagine those theological discussions in the Baghdad of the second generation after the Mongol sack, in imperfect Arabic; yet, unless the Itinerarium cannot be trusted at all, they took place, in the house of some ʿālim, or even in the cloisters of the Mustansirīyah on the banks of the river. The Dominicans, already suspicious of the unfamiliar, uncongenial hospitality they received, were clearly fogged by discussion based solely on the Qur'an and its commentaries; philosophical debates had been debarred, but they hoped to find safe ground in arguments from reason.[1] How could the moon be divided? Is it a heavy body, that it should fall? And if it fell, how is it that it did not take up a great part of the earth? Or the sea and the waters not become troubled? How could so great a miracle be hidden from the whole world? These arguments, indeed, are closely comparable to the arguments with which the reprobatio concluded its treatment of the subject: as the moon is greater than the earth, how could it fall on a part of the earth, still less within a sleeve; and the event could not have happened at all without all the world seeing, or succeeding generations passing the story down, as happened in the case of the Flood.[2] These arguments are part of a general

---

1. Itin. XXI-XXVIII.
2. The author of the reprobatio quotes his source as Alcuandius, that is, the pseudonymous al-Kindi, author of the Risālah, which, however, does not mention the matter. Guido Terrena, always erratic in his information, knew of the "split moon" miracle and argued briefly against it. (loc. cit. 25).

and inexcusable contempt for Islamic natural science.[1]

Other themes were repeated and elaborated. In the fourteenth century Fitzralph stressed the authority of the Qur'an - ex ipsa lege sarracenorum apparet - for the special confirmation of the Gospel by miracles: nostra lex specialiter per miracula roboratur; this was in contrast to the revelation to Muhammad. This he concluded from the Qur'anic passage which warns the unbelievers, under divine authority, that they will receive no signs beyond the actual message of the Prophet:

> Again, he excuses himself from the idea of miracles, as by divine authority, as if God would not wish to occupy him in this way. From this it appears that he affirms that he was not sent to work wonders, but to bestow the precepts of God; and nevertheless he affirmed that Christ taught the book of the Gospel with many great miracles . . From the law of the Muslims itself it is clear that our law especially is strengthened by miracles, and that, he affirms, theirs is not so confirmed.[2]

The witness even of the apostles and disciples of Christ was fortified by miracles; and it was in this aspect particularly that the superiority of Christ to Muhammad showed.[3] In the same century, Marino Sanudo, repeating Pedro de Alfonso's description of the subject, added the phrase which by then had become regularly

---

1. Cf. above, p. 117 n. Peter de Pennis ignored Ricoldo's account of the "split moon" but reassembled other of his material of a similar character, in order to argue in contempt of Arabic science. (XI, MS. f.37r).
2. Arm., 21 (22); Q.110-3; Ket. Az. II, Bibl. p.12, l.40 ff.
3. Arm.,23 (24).
4. Arm., 22 (23).

associated with the theme, sed mitto te cum gladio et potentia.[1]

Every Christian critic was concerned to show that Islam did not work and had never worked miracles; this was an approach which took it for granted that Heaven would always endorse a genuine revelation with prodigies. This, said William of Auvergne, was the testimony that distinguished the Christian from other dispensations, pagan, Muslim or heretical; the language in which he defines his meaning curiously recalls the Qur'an itself: " . . unaccustomed operations contrary to the course of nature, such as raisings from the dead, giving sight to the blind, cleansings of lepers, cures of demoniacs, throwings out and bindings of demons and such . . "[2] These were the authentic mark of Christendom. The Qur'an's rejection of miracles, not for Moses and Jesus, but for Muhammad alone, was greeted with delight as an important admission, and ignored as a serious denial of any absolute necessity for miracles, such as Christians took to be axiomatic. The few authors who considered the idea that the Qur'an itself was a miracle derided it.[3] The faith in visible signs was based on the broad tradition of Christian, Jewish and pagan religion in which miracles are a normal element; the Latins felt that here they stood on self-evident data.

---

1. III.V. Note also the very debased form in which Simon Simeon understood the Islamic attitude to Muhammad's working (or not working) miracles: that his virile prowess was reputed a miracle. (loc. cit.)
2. Alv. de fide III; Q. III.43.
3. Cf. above, p. 96 ff.

Chapter 7.

Truth in the Qur'an.

The Qur'an, (the Christians argued) when it falsely asserted the prophethood of Muhammad, unintentionally revealed its own falsity; in asserting also falsely the prophethood of Jesus the Messias, it admitted elements of truth. Although it was said to be wholly invalidated by any one of the lies it contained, it yet witnessed to certain truths. If, in spite of its invalidity, it validated Scripture, equally it witnessed to a number of the facts of religion; it was partly by doing so that it had successfully deceived the Arabs.

1. Good and bad in Islamic doctrine.

The Cluniacs distinguished a mixture of good and bad which resembled the fancy of the poet Horace, which joined a horse's neck and birds' feathers to a human head. The Prophet "recommends the practice of alms and some other works of mercy, and praises prayers highly, in order not to be revealed as wholly shameful." He persuaded the Arabs to leave idolatry and to worship the one God; they were inexperienced rustics to whom this would have seemed something new. "Because this preaching was in agreement with their reason he was . . . believed by them to be the Prophet of God . . . Thus, mixing good things with bad, true things

with false, he sowed the seeds of error . . ."[1]

This truthful element in Islam might be treated in different ways. Most often it was seen as a deliberate trick to deceive the innocent: "smearing the mouth of the chalice with honey, and after with a deadly poison."[2] The annotator of his Qur'an, whose opinions received a wider circulation than his own, must have influenced not only Peter the Venerable, but many others, directly; they were not less forceful for being written concisely and in margins.

> In the first chapter (i.e., sūrah) he immediately praises prayers and alms, that is, in order that under the appearance of seeming good he might entice the unwary to believe in him. Notice throughout the whole book that with marvellous cunning, when he is going to say something ungodly, or recalls having said it, he soon puts in something about fasting, or about prayer, or praising God . . . (3)

---

1. Summula.
2. Ibid.
3. Bibl., ad az.2, in spite of the phrase "in hoc primo capitulo", p. 224, col.2. MSS. do not give much help: CCCD.184 has the passage at the foot of p. 51, left, where it is near neither the fātiḥah (p. 50, col.1) nor the passage II.40 to which these remarks might more fittingly apply. In MS. Seld. Supra 31 the passage appears on f.33r. in the top right hand corner of the margin, not very far from the fātiḥah; which, however, is barely relevant. The sentence immediately preceding, in this case as in Bibliander, belongs clearly to surah II. There is no real improbability in sūrah II's being numbered as the first; it has been treated as supernumerary even in Islamic history, and Mark certainly so treated it, beginning II as I.

It was the misuse of truth itself that convinced the "uncertain hearts"[1] of the half-converted Arabs. The Gregorian Report says that Muhammad "mixed some worthy things with the shameful, that he might the more cunningly pass the poison mixed with honey".[2] Jacques de Vitry thought that the infancy miracles were introduced into the Qur'an in order to attract innocent Christians by the praise of Christ.[3] This intention to deceive was also an early scholastic view:

> In that religion there are both many truths inserted into the lies, and good things mixed with the bad, even with malice to deceive, namely, so that the false things should be believed because of the true, or else that the bad things should be received because of the good. (4)

The same idea recurred frequently. It was as if "he offered them a deadly poison in a sweet apple", said Fidenzio, varying very slightly the usual metaphor.[5] A Spanish expression was that Muhammad preached the unity of God "in order to hide the venom of his malice".[6] Humbert said that he "cloaked evil things" by good,[7] and James of Verona, who thought that Islam justified polygamy as quietening concupiscence, that "he began by certain good lessons, in order to lead men to act ill under hope of good".[8] It is

---

1. Guibert.
2. Paris; not in Viterbo.
3. VI.
4. de leg. XVIII/18.T. This obviously derives from the summula; Benedict in turn derived it from Auvergne.
5. XIV.
6. Rod., Hist. Arab. V; Cron. de Esp. CXXI/493
7. Op. Trip. I. VI.
8. XI.

important to realise that it was never thought that truths in the mouth of Muhammad, a "corrupt witness" with a "perversion of the sacred page",[1] could be trusted. "Thy sins," said San Pedro, "so disordered thee, that wherever thou didst say something good, always thou didst mix in poison which corrupted it."[2]

Sometimes the presence of truth in Islam passed without comment. Vera quaedam falsis immiscens,[3] licet aliqua honesta contineat,[4] quaedam tamen falsa veris immiscebat:[5] these were neutral phrases. Some authors made non-committal references to the subject although elsewhere they stressed the intent to deceive. Vitry used the words vera quaedam falsis interserens and in hoc autem cum Christianis conveniunt,[6] without further comment; and William of Auvergne spoke of how "some other worthy things he established, and some shameful things forbade".[7] The reprobatio did not express the view that truth was inserted to deceive, but said baldly that Muhammad was "a liar, which is obvious from the words of the same, of which many were false, but some true". The author listed examples of both;[8] he did not say that the good was introduced for an evil end.

---

1. Cont. Chr. Isid.
2. S.S.M., I.i.72.
3. Leg. Aur.
4. Humbert, de pred. S.C. XII.
5. Higden.
6. VI; cf. Alan of Lille, IV. i.
7. de leg. XVIII/18.R.
8. Cap. V. Cf. P. de Pen., V, MS. f.23r. ff.

Most of these phrases about "truths inserted" into the Qur'an referred to statements about God the Creator and about Jesus, son of Mary, and his mother; more rarely they extended to the patriarchs, the apostles or even some aspect of morals. They were associated with the dependence of the Qur'an on Scripture: aliqua honesta extracta a legibus Moysi et Christi.[1] It would seem fitting that a sentence should begin, "Although they agree with us in many things . . .'[2]

In spite of the poison, the honey remained sweet. Peter the Venerable would always be deeply aware of those truths in the Qur'an which were "as if extracted" from Scripture: the patriarchs, Noe, Abraham and Lot, the Pharao, David and the others; from the Gospel, "Zacharias, Elizabeth, John, son of Zacharias, Jesus or Christ, son of Mary, Gabriel speaking to Zacharias or to Mary, the rise of John, the birth of Christ from the Virgin, and some other things".[3] Even in the Qur'an it was agreeable to encounter laudabilia de Deo.[4] Even in the Islamic context, the presence of the sacred names reduced the sense of distance between faith and faith. Almost there was a transitory sense of solidarity with Islam. "We Christians," said San Pedro Pascual, "and the Jews and the aforementioned Muhammad, we are

---

1. Humbert, loc. cit.
2. Ibid., IV.
3. C.S.S. I.14; refers sūrah III.31 ff.
4. P. de Pen., loc. cit.

consistent and agreed in the need for praising the prophets, whose writings we accept and praise just as they are contained in the Scriptures."[1] This was not correct, and yet it expressed the shadow at least of a real unity.

A very few mediaeval authors would see a positive value in such shared truths, even a possible approach by Muslims, if not by Islam, to the Christian faith. Oliver's letter to the Ayyūbid sultan had a consciously missionary intent and Tripoli's entire attitude was informed by his missionary experience and zeal. Of the Qur'an he said that it

> is really suitably likened to the crow that copied the feathers of different colours of the other birds, adorned with which it went into the meeting of the assembled birds, and was thought to be a heavenly bird coming down from heaven; but when it was realised that this was the crow adorned with the feathers of others, and when these were taken off, it provoked laughter. In this way the Book that we are talking about is black like the crow, having nothing of Muhammad except blackness and deformity, and yet adorned with the beautiful and luminous authorities of the divine Scriptures inserted into it . . . (2)

It was Tripoli's fortunate faculty to dwell more upon the coloured, borrowed plumes, than upon the blackness of the crow, and to see them as bright and untarnished. Mandeville, with wise choice of authorities, followed him. The classic reference was established by the reprobatio from Augustine:

---

1. C.F.M., III. 2.
2. XXV. See also below, p. 194

Nulla falsa doctrina est quae aliquid veritatis non immisceat.[1]

2. Common ground in minor matters.

In some minor matters it is clear that it was a sufficient community of belief to the two religions that made disagreement about details possible. We may consider very briefly the subject of angels. Their unsuitable employment in Paradise to wait upon the blessed was a point made against Islam which pre-supposed some common ground in the subject-matter.[2] William of Auvergne, following the Cluniac lead, quoted the story of Hārūt and Mārūt, which he took to be Qur'anic in its legendary form, to exemplify a failure of Muhammad's to understand the nature of angels, who cannot take flesh or feel libidinous.[3] On other occasions he referred to their identification with light, and the demons' with fire, apparently with approval.[4] Mark spoke in Qur'anic words of the creation of heavens and earth, of angels and men.[5] Ricoldo objected to the part allotted to angels by the Qur'an on several occasions, including their

1. Quad. rep., loc. cit. Cf. also Acqui's rather condescending comments: et satis bene doctrinam dedit populo; there was the denial of Christ's Godhead, sed in aliis multis bene dixit.
2. Cf. below, p. 624
3. de universo, II.II.37.
4. de leg., XXIV; de virtutibus, I. Cf. Q. VII.12, XXXVIII.76, XV.27, LV.15; also cf. E.I., under malā'ika.
5. Pref. Q.

creation from fire.[1] Verona, in words reminiscent of Mark's, included angels and demons in the essential formula of Islamic belief.[2] Generally a favourite target was the physical magnitude of the angel of the mi'rāj.[3] It seems clear that these criticisms derived from recognition of a shared faith in angels.

Several well-informed writers thought the praise of the Apostles in the Qur'an to be significant, both worthy of interest in itself, and important to establish the position of Christians as heirs to the true tradition of Christ, bearers of the prophetic revelation which Islam claimed.[4] This was an example of claiming greater common ground than really existed; the hawārīyūn of the Qur'an so little resemble the Apostles of the Gospels and the Acts that no argument ought to be based on their identification. It was more reasonable to treat the praise of Christians simply as appended in the Qur'an to the praise of their Master. It was going too far to expect, as Fitzralph did, that Muslims would recognise the miracles of the Apostles.[5] The position of John the Baptist was less widely noticed, though Fitzralph, impressed by the text of the third sūrah

---

1. Disp. IX; cf. XII.
2. XI.
3. Cf. below, p. 637
4. Vitry, VI; Oliver, Ep. Sal.; quad. rep. V; Tripoli, XLV; Ricoldo, Disp. IX; San Pedro? S.S.M., I.i.59; Arm. 14(15).
5. Arm. 23 (24).

in Ketton's version, stressed it: John was the precursor of Christ, and therefore yet another witness to the Gospel whom the Qur'an endorsed.[1] Vitry associated ritual ablutions with Islamic reverence for the baptism of Christ by John.[2] Burcard noted that there was a widespread cult of John among the Muslims by Jordan. The attacks on the Qur'anic "fables" about the Old Testament characters took it for granted that Qur'an and Old Testament spoke of the same people and therefore estimated them in substantially the same way. Finally we may note that it was sometimes admitted that Muhammad had prescribed some good works, and even some moral virtues.

3. The unity of God.

The recognition of the one God which to the modern Western world seems the striking characteristic of Islam, was generally admitted, but not so greatly stressed.[3] The clearest example of emphasis is to be found in the Annotator of the Cluniac Qur'an; this aspect of Islam would never be more clearly seen than by him. He recognised in the fātiḥah a thanksgiving to the Creator for the other revelations

---

1. Arm. 11(12); Q. III.34, Ket. V. Bibl, p. 22, line 47.
2. VI.
3. Cf. e.g. Guibert.

which it precedes; his account of the Muslim names of God, which constituted so full and so extraordinary a marginal comment at the beginning of the Qur'an, serves admirably to introduce it: "God is called by many names in this Book, on account of his manifold power." He continues, "He is called the Compassionate (misericors for ar-Raḥmān) because for all good men he magnifies what is good, and he lessens the punishment of all bad men, or returns only the same evil that they did. He is called Merciful (pius for ar-Raḥīm) because he hears all who invoke him and relieves all who wish . . ."[1] These names of God put beyond any misapprehension the Islamic concepts of his attributes and his works, and must have refined the ideas of many readers. ". . Abounding, for he wants nothing, possessing all things. Outpouring, as he distributes both temporal and eternal good. The Founder, because he alone created all things, and nothing is impossible to him. The Examiner or Seer, because nothing is hidden from him. Near, because he is everywhere present. Vast, because he contains all things, and is by none contained . . ."[2]

---

1. The same words were translated by Mark misericors, miserator, which the seventeenth century reader of one manuscript wished to reverse. The order chosen by Mark is at least arguably the best. (Mark, MS., libri prohemium, MS. f. 1 r.; cf. MS. B.N.lat.3394, where the numbering of surahs is corrected. The seventeenth century critic is by no means always right; he begins badly by correcting the first verse of sūrah II from in isto libro non est dubitandum to non est erratum.)

2. Bibl. p.223 col.1; MS. CCCD.184, p.52 (whole margin of col. 1); Seld. Supra 31, f. 33v., margins in upper part of page.

The distance between Muslim and Christian theology is least at this point, a difference of tone, not of fact; it would be difficult for a mediaeval reader to take notice and still to feel that an untrue notion of God was believed over the border of Dār al-Islām.

Muslim forms were not often allowed to stand alone; to believe in God was rather to "agree with the Christians". Thus Alan of Lille could say that the Muslims agree with the Christians in affirming one God, Creator of all things together; and with the Jews in denying the Trinity within the divine unity.[1] Again, Vitry said that Muslims, like Jews, reject pork and scaleless fish as food, "but agree with the Christians in this, that they believe in one only almighty God, Creator of all things."[2] Serious writers generally did not doubt what belief it was that Islam claimed to hold; to quote two authors who mentioned this without special interest, "the Muslims believe that there is one God of all", moreover, "idols they abominate by the teaching of Muhammad";[3] and "he zealously preached that there is one, true and only God, and effectually with the sword and vigorously he exterminated idolatry".[4] Similar phrases were often used. Where Muslims

---

1. IV.i.
2. VI. Scaleless fish: cf. al-Baydāwī, quoted Sale, p.42.
3. Paris: in printed text, multi Saraceni for Muslims; multi interlined and not in all MSS., says the editor. This seems to imply almost certainly a copyist who could not believe the fact true of all Muslims. The phrase is not in Viterbo at all.
4. Will. Alv. de leg. XVIII/ 18 R.

were brought into an historical narrative, their attitude might be fairly represented; Ṣalāḥ ad-Dīn wrote to Frederick "in the name of God the Compassionate, by the grace of the one God, powerful, excellent, victorious, enduring, whose kingdom is without end".[1] Muḥammad an-Nāṣir of Marrakesh was given a speech in which he emphasised a point by saying, "Almighty God, Creator of all things, from whom nothing is hidden, knows . . ."[2] This was not, like the Cluniac, a speculative approach, but independent, casual, a stereotype deriving ultimately from knowledge of life in Syria or Spain rather than from any academic interest in Islamic theology.

Mark of Toledo, as little typical of his age and as much a product of the Spanish Reconquest as the Annotator before him, chose Qur'anic phrases to quote directly: "Adore the living God . . . you should not adore gods who can do you no good and no harm."[3] He imagined historically Muhammad's planning how he could draw the nations to the worship of the one God. The Qur'an itself (he thought) was no satisfactory expression of what it attempted; it reproached idolators and threatened them with death, but in a confused way; it detracted, even, from the authority of Ibn Tūmart:

> The arguments and opinions which Ibn Tūmart uses in the little book on the Union are of more weight

---

1. De expugn.; Itin. Reg. Ric. I.xviii.; St. Albans Chr., yr. 1188.
2. Paris, yr. 1213.
3. Pref. Q.; Q. XXV.3,4; cf. pref. ʿAqīdah

> among discerning and knowledgeable Muslims than the words of Muhammad in the Qur'an, which are disorderly and extremely confused, and brought forward without any basis. This Ibn Tūmart, however, supported by the requisite postulates for proving the one God to be First and Last, puts his purpose on a sound footing. Yet he is blamed by some scholars because, although he proves God to be one and to be oneessence with efficacious reasons, yet he inserts reference to the Qur'an . . . (1)

Thus merely to refer as to an authority to so great a source of error might be thought to invalidate a work; yet that work, which in fact was very much informed by the spirit and teaching of the Qur'an, could be welcomed for its doctrine, provided, apparently, that its form was scholastic. Some of his translation is comparable to the Annotator's citation of the names of God; but the original is less characteristically Muslim because more characteristically scholastic, and therefore naturally attractive to a Christian scholastic: (God is the subject)

> The First, not limited by anything before; the Last, not limited by anything after; the Only, not limited by place; sempiternal, not limited by quality; glorious, not limited by any likeness; Whom minds do not grasp, nor the intellect conceive, nor thoughts comprehend, nor senses warm; Whom the apprehension of place does not define, nor motion, nor change and movement indicate, nor ignorance and necessity . . . (2)

Most scholastics were pre-occupied by differences in belief, especially such as involved the Trinity, and showed nothing like Mark's interest in the unity of God as Muslims saw it.

Fra Fidenzio maintained the non-committal tradition:

> For they confess there to be one God, Creator of Heaven and Earth, and of all things visible and

---

1. Bref. ʿAqīdah
2. "Unio gloriosi laudabilis": murshidah I.

> invisible, and they say that God is one, alone and true, Who is not multiplied and has no consort. (1)

It is obvious that the first part of this formula derived from the Nicene Creed, and that Qur'anic expressions lay behind its later phrases; but there was no subtle interpretation. San Pedro was ready to appreciate the Prophet's destruction of idolatry; he had "taught and appointed a law that they should believe in one God only, almighty, maker and creator of all things; this against the pagans who worship many gods was the best thing he said." He admitted the Islamic contrast between the living God and the mortal Prophet; but he was happy to point out that "once, a little, he praised the gods of the pagans", a reference to the false revelation of praise of Al-lāt, al-ʿUzzā and Manāt at diabolical suggestion.[2] Tripoli combined charity with due attention to Muslim error:

> The Book of the Muslims . . . contains much praise of the Creator, praising his power, knowledge, goodness, mercy, justice and equity. It also commends those who believe in God and do justice, but does not show or teach what the faith is, or who are the faithful or the infidels. (3)

It was also possible to attack the Muslim doctrine of the unity of God. Peter the Venerable, in recognising the profession of faith, the shahādah, wished to distinguish between what the Muslims believed and what they thought they believed. "I know that this is what you understand and what

---

1. XV.
2. S.S.M. I.viii.62; I.vi.16; I.i.44,60; Q. LIII.19.
3. XXV; cf. XLVIII.

you profess: that you truly believe in God, and the True God. But whether this is true, a later and unanswerable reason will show you also by the Spirit of God."[1] In the summula he spoke of Muhammad's traducing the Arabs "away from idolatry, yet not to the one God, but . . . to the error of his own heresies". The "unanswerable reason" with all the latter part of Peter's book, has failed to survive; by analogy from his argument against the Qur'an we may conjecture that he argued that because a belief about God was partly wrong, if, for example, it denied the Trinity, it must be wholly wrong. If so, there are examples of related arguments; but there is no other expression very close to his own. This subtle distinction has a Greek parallel, though it did not find great favour among Latins. The form for the reception of a Muslim convert to the Byzantine rite, preserved in a fragment of Michael Choniates, lays stress on anathematising "the God of Muhammad", i.e., he who "neither generates nor is generated".[2] This may also be Humbert's meaning when, although he knows very well that belief in one God is common to the two religions, he speaks of the need to expel the superstitious people from the Holy Land, and to introduce there the worship of God.[3]

---

1. C.S.S. II.23; cf. also C.S.S. I.11: "We are not unaware that you believe that you have a full knowledge of the Deity . . ."
2. Magna Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum, XXV.
3. Op. Trip. I.xiv..

It is possible that this is also what was meant by the unknown English pilgrim of the fourteenth century who said, "If they believed in God as they believe God (to be) . . .": si in Deum crederent, sicut Deum credunt . . .[1] These distinctions[2] sometimes seem to credit the heads rather than the hearts of those who excogitated them; it was more usual to recognise the wide range of common belief, particularly about the unity of God, and to assume that even what was said in error was said of the same God.

A great deal was said in criticism of such error, however. Ricoldo in this field contributed his impatience of truism, which led him to call it superfluous to assert the greatness of God, and his detestation of the shahādah, no God but God and Muhammad his Prophet, both because it would enable Heaven to be gained irrespective of sin, and because it associated the Prophet with God in one proposition. This last argument must certainly have given Ricoldo great pleasure, as reversing the Islamic accusations, deriving from the Qur'an, against Christians; what did Muhammad mean when

> so often - and how often! - he asserts and reasserts, writing about himself, believe in God and the Apostle, obey God and the Apostle, follow God and the Apostle. For we know that to God alone is owed the faithfulness

---

1. Quid. Angl.
2. This account omits one distinction, that of the report to Innocent from the Latin Patriarch: "they believe in God the Saviour"; it is difficult to guess what this was meant to mean; perhaps, in the saving power of God. (pseudo-Vitriac., etc.)

> of belief, the honour of worship, the working of obedience and the following of a way; for he alone is the Beginning and the End. Therefore no one has ever dared to say these things, so as to associate himself in such a way and in such matters with God, who can never have any partner or consort. (1)

This weary sense of confidence represents only one of Ricoldo's moods; for the doctrine of Islam he would sometimes feel a rising irritation which betrayed him into extravagantly unreasonable condemnation:

> And that word is to be noted which Muhammad puts in the Qur'an more than a hundred times, I believe: <u>There is no God except God</u>. For this proposition is true simply of everything: there is no dog except a dog; there is no horse except a horse. (2)

Within his own experience, however, Ricoldo was impressed as he travelled by the Muslim reverence for the name of God.[3] The desperate length to which he sometimes pursued his objections suggests that he felt and resented that the religions were here in agreement.

Lull constantly pre-supposed, but normally treated as superfluous to assert, the Muslim belief in God. He was conscious historically of the Prophet's claim to call the

---

1. Disp. XV, MS. f. 180v. col.2 - 181r. col.1
2. Itin. XXX; Disp. VIII, cf. IV. Arabic uses an article that is missing in Latin: "there is no god but the (one) God"; thus the parallel assertion would be "there is no dog but the one dog", which is obvious nonsense. Ricoldo has really no excuse for not realising this, in spite of his using a language without the article. The language only slightly masks the logical error. Cf. Mark of Toledo's criticism of the Qur'an (above) because its assertion of the unity of God is not in scholastic form.
3. Itin. XXVI.

Meccans away from paganism.[1] The sum of all the controversy that he maintained against Islam, through so long a life, asserted that the Christian doctrine of the Trinity and the Incarnation is more suitable to belief in the unity and power of God than Islamic doctrines are. The point of this argument was that Muslim belief about God implies the Christian creed. "The Muslims believe in one God, but they do not believe that the Divine Unity has infinite and eternal act in itself . . . The Muslim religion postulates that there is one God, but does not prove it."[2] According to Lull, the doctrine of the Trinity did prove it. The Muslim belief seemed to him incomplete rather than false, however. In the Book of the Gentile, where three religions compete for the soul of the pagan, the two items that are first in the Muslim creed were rendered as Credere in Deum and Creatorem, but were passed rapidly over as substantially the same as in the Jewish concept. The only addition shown as characteristically Islamic was that God's honour required that he should be creator of good and evil alike.[3] These were variations in a common belief.

When it came to debating about the existence of God in front of pagans, it was realised that there was community of belief with Islam. William of Rubruck

---

1. Lib. de Gent. IV.iii; D.P. 7.
2. Hamar, II.ii.1.
3. Treatment of the first two articles of belief in Book IV of Lib. de Gent. Cf. also below, p. 611

recounted how he had had to point out, "the Saracens agree with us in that they say there is one God; they would therefore be on our side against the tuins." When a pagan said that no god was omnipotent, "all the Saracens burst into loud laughter". These Muslims, when a Nestorian group wanted to dispute with them, refused to do so, accepting that "whatever is said in the Gospel is true, therefore we do not wish to argue any point with you". If the Muslim party thus glossed over their differences with the Christians, it seems like a case of tact and prudence and some real sense of natural alliance on their part; and on Rubruck's side, if not among the Nestorians, there was a practical recognition that one quarrel at a time is enough, and that over the existence of God there was none.[1] Especially in the later thirteenth and in the fourteenth century, there was an increasing quotation of Islamic formulas, the shahādah, and the fātiḥah, in the name of God the Compassionate, the Merciful[2] Occasionally there was oblique reference to Muslim attitudes to God; Tripoli referred in indirect speech to the nuntius Dei excelsi, and James of Acqui, similarly on behalf of

1. (Dawson, pp. 190-194) Although real debates with, and in front of, Muslims were not possible, debates in front of pagans, with Muslims present, at some times were. Yet there can hardly have been much debating with Islam, even in those conditions, because the apologetic of Christians shows so little sign of having been put to such a test.
2. Cf. below, p. 550 ff.

Muslims, to Deus magnus. There was no great quarrel over the existence of God; but there was the overflow of argument about the Trinity.

For the most part, any truth in the Qur'an and in Islamic belief generally was treated as an admission of Christian truth. This was claimed, not only before a Christian audience, but in competition for the world's conscience. The recognition of common ground did not, even so, lead to conversions from Islam. Mandeville paraphrased Tripoli, "Sarasyns have many articles of our truth, but it be not perfectly; and therefore it were the lighter to convert them . . ."; but this was a statement, so far as the result clause was concerned, contrary to universal experience. With the disappearance of the Latin States and the fading hope of material success against Islam, a note of bitterness would become more perceptible. Those truths which Christians and Muslims shared seemed to accentuate their differences; even the most limited sympathy was fragile. Every discussion of doctrine would tend towards the Trinitarian question which for that age had such general significance, and which emphasised and helped to define the "infidelity" of Islam.[1]

1. The account in this chapter of elements in Islam regarded as true by Christians is obviously not exhaustive. The subject of the Qur'anic Jesus is considered in the next chapter, and the doctrine of the Trinity in the next following. Apart from these, the identification of the Holy Ghost with the "spirit of God" in the Qur'an has been omitted, as bearing on them too repetitively.

4. Note on the imputation of idolatry to Islam.

There is a widespread impression to-day that the general mediaeval belief was that Muslims were idolators. The derivation of the English word "mommet" is well known, and the poets are full of the Saracen's worship of the idols, Mahomet, Tervagan, Apolin and Jupiter.[1] Chaucer very suitably gave the oath by Termagaunt to the giant Olifaunt in Sir Thopas.[2] Still in the fifteenth century, romances would speak seriously of these gods and idols.[3] This seems most reasonably to be explained as the requirement of a literary tradition; there is not much that is similarly wild, outside the poetic field.[4] At about the time of, and in association with, the First Crusade, propaganda evoked statements about idols of Muhammad in mosques, but this did not last long and better information was always available.[5] Whatever the origin of this series of ideas, there can be little doubt that its great literary impetus

---

1. Cf. Chanson de Roland, Chanson d'Aspremont, Chanson d'Antioche, Richard Loewenherz, passim, and cf. Busone da Gubbio. "Cette singulière confusion du mahométisme avec le paganisme qui règne dans toutes nos chansons de geste," said Gaston Paris (Légende de Saladin).
2. Canterbury Tales, ed. Robinson, p.199, lines 810, 2000. Robinson points out five cases of the oath in Guy of Warwick (p.844).
3. English Charlemagne Romances: Sowdone of Babylone.
4. The pseudo-Turpinus seems to be the only important example.
5. For the idol supposed to be in the Dome of the Rock in Jerusalem, see William of Malmesbury on the First Crusade.

came from the chansons de geste and the Turpinus History, all associated with Compostela. As such, it seems to represent a variety of war propaganda; it remains true, however, that both in its first main appearance and in its continuance it was literary.

In Spain, accurate information was never lacking, and in Palestine it was not lacking for long after the establishment of the Latin States; it began to circulate increasingly freely in the course of the Spanish Reconquest and after the beginnings of failure in the East. In the extraordinarily unreliable report sent to Innocent III by the Latin Church of Jerusalem the fabulous element contrasted with others of great accuracy; its reference to Baghdad "where Muhammad is God and the caliph is pope" may be thought one of the last fruits, not the least, of an old-fashioned type of propaganda.[1] Sober historians might occasionally admit an absurd remark; Sigebert was followed by Diceto in

---

1. However, it refers to the caliph's being "adored" as is the "Roman Pontiff" by Christians. Words relating to worship may often not imply divine honours even when they seem obviously to do so. Adorare was used of Christian worship of images and was certainly not used exclusively for God. The versified life of St. Francis refers to the turba deorum in Islam. (Gol., vol.i.) A little later an account of the siege of Damietta imagines Muslims who threaten Muhammad that they will no longer worship him (colere and adorare). (In obsidione Damiate, Quinti Belli Sacri SS. Minores, p.163.)

a bare assertion that Muslims offered Muhammad the worship of Godhead.[1] There was some magpie exploitation of diverse material by authors who knew better.[2] Wherever it was possible to insinuate that those who reproached Christianity with a polytheist tendency were themselves subject to the same tendency, this was done. The very vague statement lent itself to this purpose.[3] A knowledge of the facts, and some respect for them, might prevent an author from saying that an idol of Muhammad stood in the mosque; he could speak of "the idol of abomination, that is, the mosque of Muhammad", admitting the facts and yet maintaining the traditional emotional attitude.[4]

---

1. Diceto, yr. 633. This specifies exhibere cultum Deitatis.
2. Cf. Viterbo (Pantheon XVI. yr. 612) who repeats the vague and not very significant statement, made very commonly, "Machomet, quem hodie Saraceni colunt." Even if this is not significant, however, it is very poor information compared with what Viterbo was able elsewhere to offer, from the Syrian Apology. Vitry's imago is a similar case. Cf. p. 576, n.
3. Cf. Acqui, who spoke of Muhammad's being received quasi Deus. Contrast San Pedro's treatment of the interpolated and consolatory verses of the Qur'an; he does not make Muhammad himself reject the praise of the goddesses, but makes his followers force it on Muhammad. (S.S.M. I.i.44,60.) We may ignore the MS. phrase of Pennis, non est Deus nisi Machometus, as certainly not what the author intended to write; but the mistake may well be indicative of what a careless and inattentive copyist was expecting to find. (MS. f. 34r.) Guido is a possible exception. His use of the word idolatry is to my mind equivocal.
4. Fr. Antonio de' Reboldi speaks of the "ydolum abhominationis id est moscheta Machometi". (Itin. ad montem Sinai, in Gol. iii.) The letter from the Levant brought to the Abbot of St. Albans by a priest of the church of St. Thomas in ʿAkka, and included by Matthew Paris in his Liber additamentorum in 1257, is something of a mystery. (No. 183) The Chronicler only claims to have extracted a single passage that seemed interesting: de cujus certa relatione accepimus quod . . . The story recounts the destruction, by lightning, of the idol of Muhammad in Mecca during the previous year. The passage closely resembles the Patriarch's report to Pope Innocent and it may actually be a case of literary survival. We do not /

It was nevertheless well understood through this period by every author with some pretensions to accuracy, that is, by every writer in prose who gave the matter more than a passing glance, that Islam made a particular point of the unity of God, that Muhammad called the Arabs away from idolatry,[1] and that Islam stood as a third religion, distinct from paganism, as from Christianity and Judaism. The chivalric audience - nobles and their military retainers and their women - was naturally content with an unreal and romantic attitude which dehumanised the enemy, and which, while it ignored accuracy, by that means ignored also those questions of theology which appealed to the scholastic. The existence of contradictory versions within the work of any one scholastic author does not disprove the general position; it was common to repeat stories of different origin, irrespective of their being inconsistent.[2]

Note continued from preceding page:-
/know, since it is only an extract, what weight the priest of St. Thomas gave it.

1. Cf. Part III, Life of Muhammad, below.
2. It is curious to find Vitry, who on the whole was balanced in his presentation of Islam and well-informed, saying that the Prophet seized a camel and buried it in Mecca where "to-day it is adored by the unrighteous and deluded people". (VI). The indifference to inconsistency may apply, not only to the copying of inconsistent passages from other authors, but also to the adoption of inconsistent opinions. When Humbert of Romans speaks of 'stoning' the 'image' of Muhammad with dung, he may speak in metaphor; but it is also humanly possible to hold mutually exclusive views, believing (or at least repeating) both that Muslims championed the unity of God and that they were idolators. Humbert seems to have made use of idolatry in a general sense not unlike abomination. (de pred. S.C., II; cf. Dubois, 43/69).

I conjedture that the idea that Islam imputed Godhead to Muhammad derived in part from (and was certainly supported by) a misunderstanding of the relations of Jesus and Muhammad within Islam. A vague notion that the two were regarded as being in the same class may have led a few people to conclude, not that Jesus was a prophet, in the Islamic view, but that Muhammad was divine; this explanation goes some way to account for the tendency of authors who in passing references seem to imply errors of which they are free when they are explicit. It must also be considered that the Crusaders were in touch with Nuṣairī's and other Ismā'īlī sects, and we have seen evidence that the doctrine of the nūr muhammadī percolated into Christian circles; in that case both Jesus and Muhammad would appear as divine quite naturally, although there was little excuse for treating Assassins as orthodox or representative of Islam. Other possible partial explanations would take into account the use of terms like idolatry in imprecise senses apparently to evoke sentiment; this is associated with writing about Crusading, and is an abuse word arising in the context of warfare; in so far as this is so, it is a natural phenomenon that it would be a mistake to take very seriously. The idea that a Muslim God is defective may be present; any defective concept of God, even a concept in the mind of a

good Christian anxious to be orthodox, might technically be called idolatrous.

It will be seen that I am not attempting to examine this question thoroughly; it is one that awaits further discoveries by literary historians. I do not think it very important for my purpose; where we know that popular authors and poets believed that Muslims worshipped idols, we only know that they were ignorant of the matter and probably not greatly interested in it. It is the state of mind of well-informed and articulate people in which I have been interested. At the present day, the ignorant will still speak of Muslims as heathens, in precisely the terms of six centuries earlier: "the hethen folke to brynge downe".[1] It is doubtful if there is any clear idea involved; heathen almost means alien. In any case it must be accepted that in the Middle Ages it was never the opinion of informed authors that Muslims worshipped physical idols; and we have already seen that most authors who took the subject seriously were reasonably well-informed.

---

1. The present writer has had a Muslim friend described to him as a "heathen" by a well-intentioned Scot of limited education. The quotation is from Richard Loewenherz, line 340.

Chapter 8.

The Praise of Christ as ʿĪsā The Messias.

The acceptance of Jesus as a prophet and the denial of his Godhead seemed in the Middle Ages to be the most important aspect of the Qur'an mixture of truth and untruth. There was an analytic rather than an historical approach. Pedro de Alfonso, pre-occupied by the Mosiac Law which he had left, reflected that Christians and Jews were at least agreed that Christ really died, against Muhammad who "said they did not kill Christ, nor crucify him; but that it seemed to them that they did so". Interest in Islam was more usually at one remove, in its closeness to Christian faith, and the Qur'anic story of Christ was characteristically seen as the praise of Christ.

In the Cluniac summula the Qur'anic Christ was described as "greatly beloved of God, yet pure man, and a wise man and a great prophet"; he "lived without sin, preached truths and did miraculous things"; he was

> . . a good prophet, most truthful and immune from all lies and sin; son of Mary, born without a father and never dead because not worthy of death. On the contrary, when the Jews wanted to kill him, he escaped from their hands and ascended to the heavens; and there he lives now in the flesh in the presence of the Creator . .

The Muslim doctrine, like the Muslim history, was partly true:

> . . he preached (Christ) born of the Virgin, acknowledged him the messenger of God, the Word of God, the Spirit of God; he neither understood nor acknowledged him messenger, or Word or Spirit as we (do) . .

This important warning about the use of terms was generally neglected. The annotator of the Qur'an of Cluny, presumably Mozarab, was less impressed than the Abbot. Well aware that the Qur'an condemned the Jews for wanting without cause to execute

Christ, who was most just, best prophet, born of a virgin, sinless, as well as for killing other prophets, he despised the actual form of the Qur'anic story as "most lying and most stupid". He noted sūrah 19 as an "impudent lie" revealing total ignorance of the Scriptures. The story seemed to him at once shameful and heretical.[1] Yet even so, he accepted not ungraciously the fact that "the Qur'an admits that the followers of Christ are to be preferred to all others, just as Christ is placed above all the most holy prophets.[2]

This was not the most common reaction. The facts were known to Alan of Lille:

> They assert that Christ was born of the Virgin, and that Mary remained a Virgin, and that Christ was conceived of the Holy Ghost, that is, of the breath of God. However, they do not understand the Holy Ghost to be the third person in the Trinity, but rather a natural breath, such as we find in man, and in every other living thing. They say also that God breathed on the Blessed Virgin, and thus from that breath did the Virgin conceive.[3]

He knew the idea that Christ was not crucified: and misunderstood the reason:

> . . they assert Christ to be immortal and impassible, because he was conceived of the blowing of God, and so they say that he did not suffer or die, nor rise from the dead; but they claim that another man was put in his place, when the Jews wanted to fasten him to the Cross.[4]

He seems to have known the true reason when he said that this

---

1. Ad az. XXVIII (Bibl.XXIX, Q.XIX).
2. Ad az. IV.
3. He supposed Muslims to argue that as Mary did not conceive by herself, or by virile seed, or by divine substance, the agent can only have been the breath of God, as only medium above man and less than God; if material breath impregnates the earth, what was there strange if divine breath made Mary fertile? (IV.i) Alan over-simplifies a complex Islamic controversy naturally enough.
4. Ibid. IV.iii.

death was thought unfitting. Strangely, he argued that Christ could not have ascended to heaven if he did not die and rise.[1] In the circumstances, Alan's knowledge was more correct than otherwise, and gives a high impression of information generally available in monastic schools late in the century.

Mark of Toledo, by contrast, chose a Qur'anic passage not the most commonly quoted, to express the thought of Islam about Jesus: "You shall know", he imagines the prophet saying, "that Christ was the son of the Virgin Mary, the envoy of God and the Word of God, which God appointed for her, and his spirit." There is a subtle misrepresentation here of "Christ (i.e. the Messias) Jesus the son of Mary is the apostle of God, and his Word . . ."; Christus filius fuit Mariae instead of Christus filius Mariae fuit legatus . .[2] The Qur'an is not concerned to stress the maternity of Mary in this way in this passage; yet it was perhaps a neat enough adaptation to suit what was in fact a paraphrase and compendium in short. " . . nor did Christ disdain to be a servant to God, and certainly the near angels did not disdain it, and God strengthened him with his holy spirit."[3] This was a presentation designed to emphasise the Islamic

1. Ibid. IV.Xiv.
2. Or "which God appointed for her" - the verb is destinare, which in his Qur'an Mark used regularly for anzala; see above, chap. Nature, p.10. In the Qur'an itself this verse was put a little more emphatically: "And note that Jesus Christ is son of Mary, the Apostle of God and his Word, which he laid upon Mary (posuit ad Mariam), and his Spirit".
3. Pref.Q.

humanisation rather than the praise of Christ, and was so far untypical.[1]

With Vitry the direct experience of Syria reflected a warmer Muslim interpretation of Muhammad or the Qur'an:

> . . Christ was the greatest of the prophets before his time, born of Mary, virgin before giving birth, in giving birth and after it, the most holy of all women; he was conceived of the power of God, without seed of fleshly man. Afterwards, indeed, (Muhammad) added the poison of infidelity and made out that he was pure man.[2]

It was Muhammad's ignorance of the virtue of humility and of the mystery of the Cross that caused him to assert that some other man, like Christ, was crucified in his place; "Christ, however, as he had come from God, so he returned to God alive without any suffering of death; and he ascended to the heavens, to God, who had pity on him." Vitry, perhaps representing the common knowledge of Palestine rather than a reading acquaintance with the Qur'an, spoke of Muhammad's introducing the infancy miracles, teaching that "when Christ was a boy he brought birds into existence from the mud of the earth, and some other miracles which are not contained in the Gospels or accepted by the Church".[3] Other accounts originating in Syria at about that time were very similar; all were aware of the

---

1. Mark also supposed that Muhammad's opposition to Judaism was due to the fact that knowledge of Judas' betrayal of Christ was widespread in Arabia, and that there was suspicion of and contempt for the Jews in consequence. Since he also spoke of the Islamic belief that Jesus escaped death (and in the same passage) he presumably realised that it was the Jewish intention against Christ that aroused the Qur'anic condemnation, irrespective of God's having frustrated the intention. (pref.Q.)
2. VI.
3. Cf. Fitzralph 12 (13) for knowledge derived from reading Ketton.

principal facts about Christ in Islam.[1] The Damietta History stressed especially the identification of Jesus as word and spirit of God, his life without sin and his miracles. To the same passage belongs the story of the Muslim 'ulamā' who went up to Jerusalem during a truce and venerated the Gospel manuscripts, because of the cleanness of Christ's law, and "especially because of the Gospel of Luke, Missus est angelus Gabriel, which those of them who could read returned to, and took up again often."[2] The account in the Syrian Apology recognised in particular the Qur'anic parallel of the creations of Adam and Jesus; and in Matthew Paris's version, the report sent to Pope Gregory, the description of Muslim belief about the crucifixion explained how the abnormal darkness made possible the substitution of another for Christ. This was curiously circumstantial; it was omitted by Viterbo. To this widespread knowledge of the Qur'anic statements about the crucifixion should be related a strong attack by Humbert of Romans on the rejection of the Cross: "although they agree with us in matters connected with the praise of Christ, yet, not understanding the mystery of the Cross, but abusing it like most vile swine, they think that to

---

1. Dull but typical was the account sent to Innocent, listing in antithesis the true and the false statements of the Qur'an, e.g. the assertion of the Virgin birth and the Ascension, the denial of the death and burial, etc. (pseudo - Vitriac., Vincent 31.54 ff)
2. i.e., could read Latin characters; most readers must however have understood "could read" absolutely. Oliver, Hist. Dam.; cf. pseudo - Vitriacus, second part; St. Albans Chronicle; Paris, aliud Scriptum; see also Testimonia Minora de Quinto Bello Sacro.

confess that the Son of God was crucified is a fatuity and a scandal to the divine majesty . . "[1] Varagine, who had access to some sound sources of information, gave an account similar to that in the Syrian Apology; he knew the infancy miracles and, unlike Vitry, thought them an acceptable tribute.[2] In this group, one of the most interesting statements is Oliver of Paderborn's Epistola Salutaris to the sultan in Cairo.[3] Here there was both warmth and the missionary effort that argued from the Christian truth contained in Islam to the whole of Christian doctrine.

> . . in the conception, birth, Ascension (of Christ) and the Judgement to come you agree with us; you believe Christ the greatest of the Prophets and a most holy man who never sinned or could sin. The speech of God and the spirit of God, as you put it, I call the Word of the Father; he was conceived in the virginal womb by the breath of God, or, as I profess, by the Holy Ghost; you call him the power of God, and I do so too . .

Oliver was able to use the knowledge common to both religions, how, in particular, the Qur'an "bore lucid witness to the miracles and divine works of Jesus Christ". It was this that caused so deep an impression on Latin minds, how "Muhammad himself extolled the Lord Christ, son of Mary, above all men"; a Muslim seemed in this respect at least on the way to being a

---

1. de pred. S.C., IV.
2. Vitry thought the praise of Christ a trap and a deception (loc. cit.); Varagine put it, after mentioning the apocryphal infancy miracles, "but by denying the Passion and Resurrection of Christ he added poison."
3. See p. 436

Christian, if he could profess Christ the most holy of men and his Mother the Virgin the most holy of women. Associated with this idea was the contrast between Christ and Muhammad as the Qur'an revealed it; brought out more clearly by later writers, Oliver early pointed to contrasts in doctrine where with Ricoldo it would be rather a contrast in lives; Oliver for example drew attention to Muhammad's having cursed his enemies, where Christ had thought that they should be loved.[1]

We may infer from the attention which Ramón Marti devoted to proving the unity of God in Christian trinitarian belief that he took very seriously the Islamic rejection of the Incarnation; in this respect he contributed to the tradition to which later Lull would also very markedly belong.[2] The quadruplex reprobatio, so closely associated with Marti, said much what earlier writers had said, but it used almost exclusively the words of the Qur'an. The list in this work of the true contents of the Qur'an dealt largely with Christ and consisted of the verses: "The Lord our God is he who made the heavens and the earth in six days"; "God fore-chose Mary above all the women of the ages"; "Christ is the word of God which God placed in Mary, and a spirit from him"; "God breathed on the blessed Virgin by the Holy Ghost" - "where", he commented, "it gives him who understands aright to understand that Christ was

1. Ep. Sal.; cf. also Ep. Doctoribus, where the same points are brought out less clearly.
2. Marti, exp. sym. I; for Lull, see below, this chapter.

conceived of the Holy Ghost"; "In the Gospel is guidance and light and a sign to those who fear God"; "The Apostles themselves were the helpers of God".[1] He concluded curtly, "these and some other things he said, that were true". He had given equal attention to Christ and to all other subjects together.

In William of Tripoli were joined the direct experience of Syria, accurate use of the text of the Qur'an, and missionary enthusiasm. His story of how Muhammad "commended, praised and extolled Jesus, son of Mary, above all the sons of men, and Mary above all women" used most of the pertinent texts of the Qur'an, carefully edited and rearranged in a scheme which paragraphed consecutive passages and associated isolated verses. The resulting sequence is itself of interest. The author introduced each of his sections with a short phrase which barely hinted at the argument and which left the rearranged text to make its own effect. Omissions he had justified in advance: he intended to advertise only those borrowed plumes, "beautiful and luminous",

1. Cap. V. The Qur'anic verses in the order quoted are LVII.4 (the name of the sūrah, Iron, is misquoted by Berlin Fo.425, f; 124r, and printed text as Ione; Berlin Th. 85 has yaphe; f.242r); III.37, a summarised rendering : the reference, given as tractatus ambularii in all versions, should be Family of Imran; IV.169; LXVI.127; V.50, quoted as messie in all versions, should be mense. Printed text gives duratio for directio, which is correctly rendered in the MSS. The last quotation seems to represent LXI.14, since it can hardly refer to III.45; the name of the sūrah is given as "of the apostles". The B.N. MS. omits the list of "Veta" altogether, and substitutes a general statement that true things were said. (f.152r col.1.)

which concealed the dark deformity of the crow beneath.[1] The result was an anthology of passages in praise of Christ and his Mother and the Apostles, to contrast with the absence of praise of Muhammad and the Muslims. For the most part, such points would be made by dwelling on the text itself.

It is impossible to quote all this part of Tripoli's work. The first sequence is the history of Mary, and the prophecy of Christ's mission, from the third sūrah: how she was conceived, born, given food by God and instructed by the angels, how the annunciation was revealed to her before it happened, and she spoke with God and God exhorted her:

> They said to Mary: O Mary, thou knowest that God will send thee good tidings, the Word, from himself: his name, Jesus Christ, the first-born son of Mary, glorious in this world and the world to come; and he will be of those that come near to God, and he will speak as a little child from the cradle, and he will be a man, and one of the saints and the just . .
>
> And Mary said thus: O God, will I have a son, when I have not been touched by a man? And God said thus: God shall create what he wills, and when he decrees what shall happen and says "Be", it is. And we shall teach him the book and wisdom and the law and our Gospel, a messenger

---

1. See above, p. 164 The text is a reasonably close translation of the Qur'an; see appendix, [illegible]. Consecutive sections were paragraphed by Tripoli, in the sense that he inserted "in alio loco dicit", even when the passage was continuous. The headings belong to the text published by Prutz. A study of all the MSS is needed. Tripoli made little attempt to improve on his text: at one point in the sequence there is a long interruption to elucidate the meaning by reference to the "glossatores Alcorani". There was editorial omission, however, of passages which criticise Christians and the doctrine of the Trinity. Prutz' headings and the introductions and Qur'anic references are tabulated, p. The references of the passages quoted in the course of this chapter are: Tripoli, XXV - XLVI; Q. III. 31, 32, 40-44; XIX. 16-34; XXI. 91 and LXVI. 12; III. 48 (Prutz, discedunt for discredunt); V. 50 and LVII. 27; II. 254; IV. 154-6; XLIII. 57; LXI. 14; V. 112-5. Cf. Vat. MS. 110r, ff.

> to the children of Israel. And he shall say: I have come to you a sign from God, for I will create the likeness of birds from the very mud, and I will breathe on them, and they will be alive by the will of God . .

This sequence[1] was naturally followed by the story of the conception and birth of Christ and the Child's consoling his Mother, of her return with him to her people, of the accusation against her chastity and the Child's justification of her from the cradle. Two isolated chapters in defence of Mary's chastity followed. "Mary constituted her person like a castle and we breathed in her with our spirit and we established her and her son for a spectacle and a sign for all men." The section on the adult life of Christ began with the realisation of the earlier angelic announcement to Mary of those miracles which were the "authority which God gave to the son of Mary".[2] The remaining passages did not follow so clear an order. They established the death and resurrection: "God said, O Jesus, I am the sender of your death, and I will raise you to me"; and the sanctity of the Apostles and other Christians: "We have constituted his followers over those who disbelieve". Two passages "praise Christ and his Gospel, in which is direction and light", but one of these misrepresents the attack on monasticism. Another shows how Christ "excels all the envoys and messengers of God". Here the most prominent aspect was

---

1. The passage was completed by the other miracles of the Lord, weakened in that though the cure of the leper remained, the blind became the dumb and the raising the dead was omitted.
2. Here the cure of the blind and the leprous was omitted. The passage ended with an unimportant mistranslation, "I called the children of Israel to you, for you came with clear intentions": cf. Sale, "I withheld the children of Israel from killing thee, etcetera".

consideration "of the malice of the Jews and the ascension of Christ", which raised not only the wicked slander against Mary but also the denial of the crucifixion: "they lied a great lie about Mary and about Christ." This was the only place where Tripoli thought that elucidation of the text was necessary, and he resorted to the commentators of the Qur'an "on the false opinion of the death of Christ" so as to explain that Judas was crucified in the place of Jesus, whose appearance he received, in Islamic belief. The distinction between the Qur'an and its exposition was very rarely followed in this matter; Tripoli added that they also say that it would be contrary to the justice of God for the innocent to suffer. Other passages insisted on the infidelity of the Jews and their rejection of Jesus, and on the faith of the Apostles and the believers in Christ; finally, the passage of the Table reveals the "Sacrament of the table, which is the alter".

Tripoli saw nothing sinister in the praise of Christ, his doctrine and Gospel, his Mother and his followers, "which the Muslims believe with the heart to be true, and profess with the mouth as words of God written in their Qur'an"; "although these things are entangled with many lies and graced with fictions, yet already it appears clearly enough that they are close to the Christian faith and near to the way of salvation."[1] It is not that Tripoli was not sensitive to the specific attraction or to the religious strength of Islam; he believed that it was coming to an end, and that the strayed sheep were at last returning to the fold. Yet he also took pleasure in

1. XLVII.

recognising in the Qur'an the expression of truths in which he believed. It was the want of clear Christological formularies in Islam which seemed to him to make it possible to offer Muslims the Christian religion, as an exact definition and a clearer interpretation of their own. In a way, his attitude to Islam was not unlike the blended affection and contempt which a kindly orthodox Muslim may feel for Christians.

It is interesting to compare some Franciscan writers, to whom the subject appealed rather less and who were less concerned with what Muslims believe with the heart. Fra Fidenzio used the same method as Tripoli with a different bias; his chief interest was the Trinitarian controversy. He made use of the passage in sūrah III given at greater length by Tripoli, in a version which was also accurate.[1] "O Mary, God chose and purified thee and preferred thee over all the women of the nations." He omitted verses, but quoted such as fairly summarise the sense. Great concision was used. "And Mary said: how will I have a son, and no man has touched me? And it was said to her: Thus does God create what he wills." The apocryphal miracles were omitted from Christ's prophecy, but the summary of canonical miracles was rendered correctly: "I shall cure the born blind and the leprous and I shall raise the dead at the command of God". This author also noted briefly a passage which Tripoli ignored : "The likeness of Jesus Christ

1. Fid., de recup. T.S., XIV; Q.111. 37, 40-43, part 44, 52. If Tripoli is fairly represented by his manuscripts Fidenzio was more accurate in rendering the canonical miracles. Note also that in two cases Fidenzio marked his ellipsis by 'postea' and 'deinde'.

before God is as the likeness of Adam". He referred to Muslims' believing that Jesus only seemed to suffer, to die and be buried, and their saying "Far be it from Christ that he should endure such shames." This was a well-chosen account of Christ in Islam which lacked Tripoli's zeal, but which was enlivened like his by the use of the words of the Qur'an.

The Irishman Simon Simeon blended a literary and studious approach with personal observation. He was interested in the Islamic Christ, pure, prophet, born of the Virgin, in the denial of Christ and the Trinity, and in the malice of the Jews; he took the trouble, for these themes, to quote the authority of the Qur'an, in Ketton's version. There is also an unmistakable note of direct experience: although these fellows deny Christ's Godhead, they praise and revere him above all the prophets; they revere him ineffabiliter as the Messias the son of Mary (Messiach Ebyn Meriam, for masīḥ ibn Maryam), and never call him Ebyna Alla, that is Son of God (ibn Allāhi). Simon recognised that they held that God could have no son on the ground that he lacked wife or concubine and took no delight in such things. This Simon said without comment.

Most pilgrim records of the fourteenth century were less authoritative on these matters and not greatly interested. Burchard noted that Muslims thought Christ the Word of God but

---

1. The Qur'anic passages quoted are IV.155-6 and IV.169-70; Ketton, XI., Bibl. p. 37 l.7 ff. and l.34 ff.

denied his divinity, and added "they profess him the Son of God", a phrase of egregious peculiarity in the circumstances. Verona spared a large proportion of a short passage to include the substitution of Judas at the crucifixion; Muslims, he said, hate the Christians less than the Jews who wanted to kill Christ; people who blaspheme the Virgin Mary were severely beaten for it.[1] Ludolf was brief, uninformative, authentic: "a holy man and strengthened in his mother's womb by the Holy Spirit".[2] It is remarkable how the phrases of the Qur'an on this subject echoed and re-echoed. Of the popular writers of the same periods, Higden was cursory; the Judas story of the crucifixion in its Islamic form interested him. The author of Mandeville based his excellent and informed account so closely on Tripoli's that we need not consider it here; he added to it, "when they may get the Gospels written, they do great worship to them and namely the Gospel of Missus est . . " This is from the History of Damietta. James of Acqui reflected a point of San Pedro's the denial of the crucifixion made Jesus a cheat, subtilis et ingeniosus, to let another suffer in his place.

The general tendency of writers with a more intellectual or academic interest was to quote the Qur'an, not to give an idea of its thought, but to controvert it. This does not mean that the general theme was thought less important; it stood out prominently in the mind of San Pedro, for example. " . . in his Qur'an, and when he spoke to the people, he uttered

1. XI.
2. VIII.

great praises of our Lord Jesus Christ, and his mother St. Mary and his apostles . ." San Pedro's account of the miracles of Christ which the Qur'an recounts radiates an impression of the marvellous: "Muhammad said, moreover, and had it written in his Qur'an, that Jesus Christ when he was a young man fashioned birds from the mud of the earth, and that he accomplished many other miracles, and that whatever Jesus Christ said, instantly it was so (illico factum erat). All the teaching of the Qur'an about Jesus seemed to him inconsistent. It spoke of the birth of Jesus of the Virgin

> . . without seed of man by the power of God, as God formed Adam; Adam, however, was a man and died, and so Jesus Christ also, because he took flesh of Saint Mary, was man, and because he was man had to die; for this law is common to all men.

It seemed to him that Muhammad made Jesus out to be a man and yet not to die; made him out holy and sinless, yet thought he would allow another to die in his place; made him out to be born by the power of God only to deceive men, in a world already full of deceivers. He was oppressed by the thought of so many lies, of such great heresies in the Qur'an and the sayings of Muhammad which his followers had collected; by the thought of the loss of souls of those who died Muslim. In the latest recorded impression of the martyr's mind he reflected the common understanding of his age: simply that the prophet had praised Christ and called him the Word and spirit of God.[1]

---

1. S.S.M. I. i.59; viii, 63, 240, 205; C.F.M. III. 1,2.

Ricoldo would accept a charitable interpretation of Islam only if it fell within his direct experience. The respect and reverence for the name of Jesus which Muslims showed naturally impressed him: "And when among us they named Christ, they never did so except with fitting praise, such as, 'Christ, may he be praised', or something of the sort".[1] He seemed to think that this was done from affability to Christian strangers, not for a religious reason. In the Qur'an itself he could take no pleasure; the story of Mary, which Tripoli had welcomed, provoked a borrowed tirade against the anachronism, as he took it to be, of identifying her as daughter of ʿImrān and sister to Moses and Aaron.[2] It was his weakness to endow his opponents with a stupidity of his own imagining, which he would then condemn in an access of self-induced fury; in this he was gravely misled by his respect for the Contrarietas which he so often followed blindly. He admitted that Muhammad "above all things indeed commends Christ and his Gospel", but without gratification.[3] It was the denial that dominated his mind, the denial of Christ's divinity, of the Crucifixion.[4] He pointed out that the Qur'anic story of Christ is as hard to believe as

---

1. Itin. XXVIII.
2. Itin. XXXIII; Disp. IX ; cf. Ep. II. For the anachronism argument, which has been popular at different periods, see Reland and Sale. In our period, the annotation of Ketton's Qur'an, who was as little gratified by the Qur'anic story of Mary and Jesus as Ricoldo, did not refer to this point at all. Ketton mistranslated, or thought he should correct, the Sūrah "Family of ʿImrān" to "Family of Joachim". San Pedro used the same argument. (S.S.M. I.iii.11). For the Contrarietas, Ricoldo's source, see Cap. IX, MS. f.251r. cf. also quad. rep.,V.
3. Itin. XXXIV; Cf. Disp. IX.
4. Ep.III. Cf. Ep.I.

the Christian one.[1] He would use a passage which "praised Christ" solely to make a debating point of particular pedantry: the Jews did not claim, as the Qur'an said, to have killed the Messias Jesus, since they did not think him to be Christ, or even an apostle, but put him to death for blasphemy; the Qur'an, therefore, was in error.[2] This was tiresome and ungenerous. Like Oliver and others before him, he saw the Trinity implied in the Qur'an: "O people of the Book, do not hesitate in your (religion) and say nothing but the truth of God for Christ Jesus the son of Mary is the Apostle of God and Word of God, which he placed in her by the Holy Spirit; and immediately it added, and ye shall not say three, because God is one". "Behold", (he more kindly remarked) "how near it approached to that which is most difficult in faith".[3] It was the heart of Ricoldo's argument that Muhammad did not understand the truths he spoke; "Muhammad spoke the truth when he said that Christ Jesus is the son of Mary and that he was the Word of God; but he did not understand".[4] In comparing the Qur'anic treatment of Muhammad and of Jesus he followed earlier writers, especially Tripoli and, in particular the Contrarietas;[5] anything less than emphasis on the superiority of Christ would be contrary to Muhammad's own intention to constitute Jesus peculiarly and above all men.[6] The contrast was pursued in

1. Disp. XVII.
2. Disp. IX; cf. III
3. Disp. XV (MS. f. 178v col.2); Q.IV.169-70.
4. Ibid., f. 179v col. 2.
5. Cont., X, MS. f. 255r ff.
6. Disp. IX; cf. Tripoli, XL.

detail, since "opposites placed side by side give greater light".

> . . the Qur'an says that Christ was announced to his Mother by the angel and sanctified by the holy spirit, and conceived by the strength of God, not by the operation of nature, and was born of the most holy Virgin Mary who was purified above all other women. But of Muhammad it does not say any of these things, but that he was an orphan and that when he strayed he was brought back by God . .[1]

Again ungenerously, the comparison was fully worked out. Ricoldo admitted that, since Jews deny that Christ was either God or good, "as far as that goes, Christians agree more with Muslims".[2] He expressed in a phrase an almost universal feeling: "We know that never is there such valid witness . . as when he who is trying to offend speaks praise".[3]

Certain aspects of the comparison of Christ and Muhammad in the Qur'anic text and in general Islamic belief were widely popular at that time, for example the Islamic Christ alive in heaven while the prophet lay buried in Arabia. Lull used this, and also, a little less prominently, the arguments based on Christ as Spirit and Word and on the virgin birth; with him the detailed contrast between the two prophets was less thoroughly worked out.[4] All these questions interested Lull chiefly as they could be fitted into his fond Trinitarian speculation. This question bore upon the subject in two ways particularly. He was at pains to show that the dishonour done to our Lady in robbing her Son of his divinity outweighed the

---

1. Disp. XV, MS. f. 181r col.1; cf. XVI
2. Disp. III, MS. f. 163r col.1; Pen. XII, MS. f.41r.
3. Disp. SVI, MS. f. 182r col. 1.
4. Contemp. D., 34. 25; Hamar, sig. 32; Lib. de Gent. IV, III

praise of her as Virgin "before and after parturition", of her conceiving the Word, of saying she was good and without sin and calling her Son prophet. Similarly, he was fond of insisting that Muslims attempted the impossible, when they desired to praise the humanity of Christ, while denying his Passion and Death and his Godhead. "The Muslims love your humanity in that they believe and understand that it was conceived by the Holy Ghost, and that they believe that your humanity was in this world without sin; but, Lord, in another way they do not love your holy humanity" - as, that is, united to the Godhead and the means of salvation. More deeply idiosyncratic than Ricoldo, Lull shared with him the tendency to argue that the doctrines of Islam by an inherent logic destroyed each other. By rejecting the incarnation, Muslims honoured creation less, and if creation, then the Creator; this is an all but Chestertonian argument.[1]

Richard Fitzralph was more individual. Working over Ketton's paraphrased Qur'an with a scholarly care and a scrupulous attention to the letter which he could not give to the Arabic original, he formed the usual idea of Christ as "a pure soul and a blessed one",[2] but, in addition, he found that there were some special assertions of Christian truth. Thus he read

---

1. Contemp. D., 287. 10 ff., 278. 7 (cf. 326. 25) and 186.7.
2. Arm., 12 (13); refers to Ketton, Az. XIII, Bibl. p.43, xv, 48 ff Q.V.110.

the angelic greeting:

> O Mary, the joy of the highest news to you, with the Word of God, whose name is Christ Jesus, son of Mary, who is the likeness of all nations in this world and the next, suited to the old and to the infants in their cradles, propitious, wise the best man, who is sent by the Creator of the Universe.[1]

On these words he commented,

> This passage affirms not only that Christ is the best man, but that he is the likeness, which I think means exemplar, of all nations in this world and the next. Therefore any other is less than he, because exemplified by him.

His text continued,

> God shall teach your son, who will come with divine virtue, the book of the lawgivers and the knowledge of all government, and the Testament and the Gospel and the commission to the children of Israel.

To this he remarked, "there he affirms that Christ, the transmitter of the evangelical law, had the knowledge of all government. This Muhammad did not have, as he himself admits". In both these cases, Fitzralph, by a fatality natural enough in the circumstances, selected as significant phrases which the translator had invented from nothing.[2] It is not surprising that they seemed not only polemically telling, but really revealing of important truths.[3] Although in detail he was misled by the inaccuracy of the text from which he worked, it would not be true to say that his conception of the Qur'anic Christ was false as a

---

1. This world and the next, or, this age and the age to come. Propitious = praesens; Bibliander has prudens.
2. Arm. 22 (23); Q.III. 40, 41, 43; Ketton, Az. 5, Bibl. p.23, ll. 10 ff., 16 ff. The paraphrase here wholly omits part of the Arabic, as well as making additions.
3. Bibliander also thought this; his marginal comment reads, "Hold this, good Saracen men, and we shall easily restore agreement."

whole. It was naturally much coloured by his special interest in the confirmation of the Scriptures by the Qur'an. Commenting earlier on the same passage, he rightly concluded that Muhammad approved both the "mandate to the children of Israel" and the Gospel when (the Qur'an) spoke of Christ's teaching by divine power, and specified his confirming the Old Testament. It was perfectly sound to postulate as Islamic a sequence in which Christ approved the Old Law and Muhammad the New.[1]

Peter de Pennis reproduced many passages from Ricoldo, introducing them, summing them up or paraphrasing them in words of his own. Admittedly Muhammad "in his Qur'an wrote inadequately and falsely of our Lord Jesus Christ"; nevertheless this writer made an anthology of true and admirable verses, many of which we have already cited from other authors' works.

> In the chapter al-baqarah in the person of God he speaks thus, We gave to Jesus, son of Mary, that he should perform clear wonders and prodigies and perfected him through the holy spirit. Also at the end of the chapter al-maidah Muhammad states that Christ gave light to the blind, cleansed the lepers and raised the dead. Muhammad even asserted that Christ, when he was still a boy, gave existence to some birds out of the slime of the earth. Whence Muhammad in many places in the Qur'an extols Christ as a most holy man over all other men . .[2]

In this way Christ was shown in Qur'anic form in a happy light. This is more remarkable in that Ricoldo, Pennis' sole source here had avoided doing exactly that, by using every citation directly for some controversial purpose. Pennis, however, followed

---

1. Arm., 11 (12), commenting on Ketton, Az. ✓ , Bibl. p.23, l.14 ff., Q. III.42-4
2. V. MS. f. 23r ff.; cf. Ric., Disp. XV. MS has elbathera, surely a copying error for elbachera. Lower, perfecit for perfecimus.

rather the plan of the reprobatio, but at much greater length, by separating the true and the false statements, and treating the former quite simply as true. At the end of this group of statements he said, "but Muhammad, after he said many true things of our Lord Jesus Christ, did not remain in truth (in veritate non stetit). . " There follow, at considerably greater length still, the false assertions of the Qur'an, especially the attack on the Trinity (with its rebuttal), and the denial of the Passion, death and Resurrection of our Lord.[1] Pennis relied on a very few sources, for the most part well-chosen; another writer whose knowledge was wholly literary, Guido Terrena, was more often inaccurate. He went to great length to prove that Scripture prophesies Christ rather than Muhammad; he was out of sympathy with, or was ignorant of, the line of argument that Islam itself admitted Christ's greater sanctity.[2]

The Qur'an most interested Christians where it was concerned with Christian topics, of which Christ was naturally the chief. The denial of the crucifixion and the assertion of the infancy miracles were popular themes.[3] A perception of the Qur'anic feeling for the Messias and Mary as sacred persons was more rare; yet it penetrated by means of the translated words of the Qur'an, and occasionally, as in

---

1. Ibid.
2. 9, 10.
3. For the theme of Christ's part at the Last Day, see below, p. 618

Tripoli's work, was very marked. Mediaeval devotion to Christ and his Mother was too powerful and personal to grudge an alien devotion that was genuine. Yet partial truth was always a delicate matter to appreciate justly. Muslims revered the sacred persons but not as God and his Mother. On their part, Christians were equally reluctant, either to reject a reverence which resembled their own, or to appear to accept the doctrinal error that was implied. Orthodoxy in Trinitarian doctrine has always been the mark of true religion and Christians felt that it must not be treated lightly.

Chapter 9.

Trinitarian Heresy.

In Islam, as among certain heresies whose nature it seemed to share, the most important questions to the mediaeval Latin mind were those which related to Trinitarian and Christological doctrine. These would always be the first consideration, and they would seem in a special way characteristic of Muhammad's teaching. Guibert early pointed to the destruction of belief in the Trinity as being popularly the first thing to attribute to Muhammad; and much later Fitzralph remarked on "this pseudo-prophet . . . whose attempt was always and above all things to persuade (men) that there is no Trinity of persons in God and that Christ was not God . . ."[1] Muhammad's successful denial of the Trinity was seen, throughout the period, as characteristic of his work. He was "Muhammad who said to his people: there is no Trinity in God nor is Christ God".[2] His was primarily "that heresy by which he blasphemed the divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ; for in his law he denies openly and often the divine nature of the Lord Christ and eternal generation in God".[3] This was the point of Muhammad's participation in the diabolical plot that leads from Arius to Antichrist: "Nothing is so opposed to the enemy of the human race as faith in the incarnate God".[4] It was this matter that decided Oliver that

---

1. Arm. 11(12).
2. Lull, Hamar, prol.
3. Will.Alv.,de leg. XVIII/18.P; cf. ibid.,XIX/19.R.
4. Summula. The statement about Christ which Muhammad was to propagate with such disastrous effect had already been made under the same diabolical inspiration, but with less success, by the oracle which Porphyry consulted. (Ibid.)

any other name than heretic was wrong: of the denial of the divinity of Christ, he said, "hence they ought more truly to be called heretics than Saracens, but the use of the false name has prevailed".[1] This rejection of the Trinity can never seem so vastly significant to-day, even to an orthodox mind, as it did then. This may be illustrated by the emendations introduced by Matthew Paris into the St. Albans Chronicle. He knew, and wished to reconcile, different versions of the death of the prophet; he therefore supposed him dead from three causes, poison, epilepsy and excessive drinking, a single, yet triune death, specially devised by God as appropriate to his denial of the one and triune God.[2] It was general to put Islamic denial of the Trinity at or near the beginning of any account of doctrine.[3] This was indeed the cardinal and basic error in Islam as Christians viewed it.

That Augustinian cast of thought which marked so much scholastic writing led many authors along a road which would "prove" the Holy Trinity by reason, and so convict Islam of irrationality. In that age it was hard to conceive the Godhead except as a Trinity of persons, so that on this even the unity and existence of God was made to depend; the Muslim belief looked like a naive deprivation of essentials.

---

1. Hist. Dam.
2. yr. 622.
3. Cf. Viterbo; Paris; Fidenzio; Guido; others cited in the course of this chapter.

Guibert quoted the Christian supposition that Muslims imputed Godhead only to the first person of the Trinity, a characteristic way of regarding the Islamic profession of faith. Excessive rationalisation about the Trinity appeared early; it only needed to turn speculation and meditation that had already existed to apologetic purposes. Unity, argued Alan of Lille, begets itself, and between the begetting and the begotten unity is a certain equality, and thus there are three unities in one. There was, too, the vestige of the Trinity in the human soul which recollects and loves and in different ways understands; thus, too, two candles united burn with a single light.[1] The idea of the Trinity as a mystery co-existed with these rational considerations. Alexander III's development of the theme was classic. The ineffability of the Trinity which transcends the sight of reason "has so much more nicely the merit of faith that it is more difficult to believe". This simple statement would be illumined and elaborated by "elegantes comparationes" - the trinity of memory, intelligence and will, which are yet one mind; the sun, whose ray and heat and splendour are one. The eternal generation of the Son and procession of the Holy Ghost were illustrated by a light which gives light to a new light without itself being diminished. Alexander was

---

1. IV.1.; cf. III.iv, v.

most anxious to justify the Trinity by Scriptural authority, by the repetition of the name of God three times in one verse of the psalms, by the trisagion, Holy, Holy, Holy.[1] The limitations of reason, of which Alexander seems aware, would seem to recede with the later growth of scholasticism.

The authentic Qur'anic objection to the doctrine of the Trinity does not appear in these early examples of argument of scholastic type and Augustinian temper, but it was known to other writers contemporary with them.[2] In this earlier period those who did understand it did not usually attempt scholastic proofs of the Trinity. The Annotator of Ketton spoke of "Christians, who with astonishing folly he thinks worship three gods, because they say Christ and the Holy Ghost are equal to God".[3] He noted that in the last verses of sūrah IV the Qur'an "asserts . . . that God had no Son".[4] This was clear to any careful reader of Ketton's text. Muhammad, said the summula, "derides outright that

1. Ep. ad soldanum Iconii, in Paris, inserted under 1169; and in Petrus Bles.
2. The argument about the Trinity was dealt with fully in the Risālah (cf. Muir, pp.41 and 110) and in the Contrarietas both Muslim objections and Christian replies based on Qur'anic words appear. (Cap.X, f.256v.ff., 258r.ff.)
3. Ad az.III; sic MS. Seld.Supra 31 f.33v. left margin; Bibl. (p.224, col.2) has "credere" for "colere".
4. Ad az.XI, Bibl. p.225, col.1. What the Annotator did not do was to develop the arguments based on the Qur'anic "admission" of the Word of God and the Holy Ghost. In this he showed judgement: cf. ad az.XXXI, Bibl. p.225, col.2: De matre Domini vult dicere, sed impie atque heretice dicit, Deum scilicet insufflasse ei animam suam nescio quam.

(Christ) should be said or believed to be the Son of God" because his own bestial (vaccinus) intellect judged "the eternal birth of the Son of God according to the likeness of human generation". "Most foolishly" (since Gospel and psalter affirm the contrary), said Fitzralph, "he repeats innumerable (times) that God has no Son".[1] Mark of Toledo, in his short summary of Qur'anic doctrine, included the item, "do not say that there are three, but that God is one, nor did Christ disdain to be the servant of God . . ."[2] In this précis the actual words of the Qur'an are used.[3] The Syrian Apology, rather less explanatorily, said just "they have no knowledge of the Trinity (nihil sentiunt) which they thoroughly condemn."[4] Vitry understood the Islamic objection and diagnosed that it was worldly:

> They do not accept the Trinity, but abominate our faith, and laugh at us for adoring three gods, because they do not accept the ineffable generation of the Son by the Father, but (understand it) only carnally . . . because flesh and blood hath revealed it to them, and not our Father who is in Heaven . . . (5)

The real problem was thus defined simultaneously with the development of the scholastic type of argument.

---

1. Arm. 15 (16).
2. Pref. Q.
3. Q. IV.169,170.
4. Viterbo; Paris. Paris personally concluded from this and his other sources that Muslims objected to the Trinity as vain (frivolus). (See his additions to the St. Albans Chronicle, yr.622.)
5. VI. (Cf. Matt. XVI.17.)

Writers with knowledge of Islam or the Qur'an sometimes tried to present the Trinity in a way that, to them at least, seemed Qur'anic. Oliver of Paderborn is an early example in this genre:

> As God is simple in nature and there is nothing in God which is not God, and (Christ) was conceived by the breath of God, it is evident that he is God; and the breath of God is nothing else but the Holy Ghost, and the speech of God nothing else but the Word of God.

This seems to seek, in Qur'anic terms like "breath of God", common ground on which to build a case with scholastic logic. Muslims who felt that Christians were unbelievers, because they adored one God in Trinity and Trinity in unity, themselves, by plural reference to God in the psalm, unknowingly confessed the triune God.[1] This argument was first concerned to persuade Muslims that they already in ignorance believed in the Trinity. After a long experience of life in Syria the Muslim accusation might rankle: Fra Fidenzio recalled that "they say that God is one . . . and take it as very bad that the Christians speak of Trinity . ." There would be no need for the sake of the Christian reading public to insist that Islam misunderstood Christian doctrine about the Trinity; Fra Fidenzio wrote with the Muslim criticism so strongly in mind that he had to battle with an imaginary adversary. Perhaps some influence of memories

---

1.Ep. Sal. The reference to the psalm is to the threefold mention of the name of God in Ps. lxvi.7-8 (A.V.lxvii.6-7); an argument, if it was intended as more than rhetorical, which might seem flimsy to the Muslim reader. Note also that Oliver pre-supposed Islamic use of the psalm, and as quoted by him.

of arguments (at first or second-hand) with Muslims drove Fidenzio, as well as other later writers, to apply scholastic methods to Qur'anic data; the Muslim points required to be seriously analysed if they were to be refuted.

> . . . they do not understand the faith of the Christians: for they assert that the Christians say Trinity in a human manner, as though they said three Gods as one says three men. So Muslims even call Christians "partakers", as though they gave a part to God, as if, that is, the Father had a part, and the Son a part and the Holy Ghost a part. And they say that God is without any beginning.

On the surface, he commented, they seemed to say well, but they had failed to follow the Christian distinction between essence and person; better and more subtle than the Muslim was the Christian belief in one only God, unmultiplied, true, omnipotent, omnisapient, superbest, uncomposed, most simple, most pure, uncircumscribable and immense, there was Trinity only of persons, and unity of Godhead; there was no trinity in the way that there might be a trinity of human persons, Socrates, Plato and Cicero. In all this there was a detached, academic aspect which made prudent conclusions possible: "every comparison of a creature to God is called dissonant rather than suitable, as blessed Dionysius shows in the Mystical Theology; although affirmations are attributed to God, yet negations are more truly said of him than affirmations." Islamic misunderstanding of Christology, the indignation of Muslims that Christians should give God

a son, was similarly carnal.[1]

If Fidenzio's intention was primarily defensive and expository, Tripoli in a passage of almost poetic fire presented Christian doctrine, as Oliver of Paderborn had done, in terms which he believed would be accepted by Muslims whose conversion he claimed in numbers. These, he said, wonder at the mystery of the Trinity in which, if it be differently expressed, they can recognise what they already believe:

> For when they hear that God, whom they worship, is as they say Creator of heaven and earth and all creatures, who created all things from nothing, his Word being co-eternal with him, they joyfully concede that God has a Word, by which all things were created, and without whom nothing was made. Again, when they hear that God who is Verbal, that is, having a Word, is living and the life of lives, bestowing life on all living things, living in life, the fountain of unfailing life, from whom every bodily and spiritual creature draws life, they concede God to have a Life or Spirit whom we call Holy.

To reject the Trinity would, therefore, make it seem that God was dumb, and even dead: quod nefas est sentire de Deo.[2] If it was put to the Muslims, how the Word of God was the means of creation, prophecy, wisdom and knowledge of God, resurrection, judgement and retribution, "they exclaimed, 'Father, a great excellence of God is this Word,' and they concluded, 'he who does not know the Word of God, equally

---

1. de recup.T.S. XV.
2. Tripoli's argument was most original in that it did not base its "proof" of the Holy Ghost on the Qur'anic expression "the spirit of God" but upon this kind of natural theology.

does not know God himself' . . ."[1] There is not room to illustrate further this attractive train of thought and attitude to living Muslims. The passage, abridged and extracted from its context by Mandeville, was given a popular public which would never know the historical situation that impelled Tripoli to write as he did.

Some later scholastic writers ignored the possibilities of arguing on Islamic grounds. Ramon Marti devoted a great deal of attention to the "proof" of the Trinity.[2] Having first shown that Muslims must accept the Scriptures, he proved his object by Scriptural authorities; then in turn by "reasons", such as that good diffuses itself, or that power, wisdom and will are one in the human mind; and finally by "likenesses", such as those examples we have met before of the three candles shining with a single light, and of the sun, from which alone light proceeds, while from both sun and light comes heat.[3] This was a careful and comprehensive exposition of the scholastic defence of the Trinity which was then thought to be so weighty, to be both important and conclusive. It is possible that Marti felt that this approach, directly or indirectly based upon natural data, was surer than any that took into account the data revealed

---

1. LI, LII.
2. Cf. above, pp. 65, 71
3. Exp.Sim., primus art.

in the Qur'an.[1]

Tripoli's rationalism was tempered by his anxiety to persuade, Marti's was informed by a determination to convince; neither was exactly true of Ricoldo, who, from the traditional arguments of Christians living under Islamic rule, adopted, not usually with discrimination, the interpretation of verses of the Qur'an in whatever sense suited him best, without considering the Muslim interpretation.[2] He composed advice about arguments on the Trinity which were marked by good sense, but which he did not always follow. Muslims, he said, are very curious to hear about the Christian doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation, but, as these are above reason and intellect, they will not believe, and cannot understand them, and they laugh at them because they are contrary to the Qur'an, which they believe to be the Word of God. It was better, he advised, not to begin immediately from divine principle, but to show them one Christian law, and to be brief in all things. It was easier to show Islam false than Christianity true. What was necessary was only to defend the reasonableness of the faith, to accept the unity of God and insist also on his simplicity; and to point out that it does not follow that

---

1. This subject was not handled in the reprobatio. It is not treated by Marti according to the method of the reprobatio, except that of the part common to reprobatio and explanatio. That is the part which establishes the authority of Scripture, on which a third of Marti's arguments about the Trinity depends.
2. Ricoldo is in these passages indebted both to the Risālah and to the Contrarietas (cited above).

the discretion of persons is untrue because it is incomprehensible. It was similarly possible to question whether the Incarnation was unreasonable.[1]

Ricoldo was fond of the counter-attack upon Islamic interpretations of Christian teaching. To say that God has no son because he has no wife was like saying that he is not living because he does not eat or draw breath. Here Ricoldo is reacting directly to the authentic Islamic objection, but the scholastic temptation to explain the interior working of the Trinity was still strong. Christians believe in the generation of the Son in the way that heat comes from fire, splendour from the sun, or a word from somebody speaking. The heat and splendour of a fire are not separate from it, yet one can be communicated without the other, splendour without heat from the lamplight, heat without splendour from a fired iron. There were graphic images for the Incarnation, too: a king might send his words written in a book, and the book might be burned, but not his words. Equally it was false to say that if God had a son there would be danger to creation from the possibility of his rebellion "because it supposes that it is impossible for God to have a son who is not hostile,

---

1. In quoting the Gospel authority for Christ's revelation of his Godhead, Ricoldo agreed that the evidence was not satisfactory to Muslims, because it rested on apostolic assertion and not on a direct assertion of Christ's. This compares favourably with Oliver's ignoring of this point in the Epistola Salutaris. (Ric., Disp.II).

presumptuous and disobedient. We, however, say that the Son of God is the Word of God, and the knowledge of the Father, through whom all things are worked".[1]

Ricoldo also developed the argument that Trinitarianism is implicit in the Qur'an. Why did Muslims who defended the unity of God give him a kind of consort in speaking of the anima mundi ? What did it mean when God spoke constantly in the Qur'an in the plural ? What were the Word and Spirit of God ? They must be either accidental or uncreated; if the former, they were only as much as spoke in all the prophets, and the apparent praise of Christ was less than it seemed, which was not the intention of the Qur'an; but if they were uncreated, the Trinity followed necessarily. What else could the Holy Spirit sent to Mary mean ?[2] Not an angel, which could not sanctify.[3] From one phrase in the Qur'an he deduced a large conclusion:

> Dedimus spiritum sanctum et insufflavimus de spiritu sancto nostro. Therefore, as the divine essence is one and simple and cannot be divided, and as here there is a giver and a given - the giver who says "we gave" and the given the spirit which is said to be given and breathed - and as there must be a distinction between

---

1. Disp. IX; cf. Ep.I, II and III.
2. Disp. II, IX; cf. ibid. XV. The reference to the anima mundi is purely philosophical; this concept does not figure in the Qur'an. For Q., see II.81, 254; IV.169; V.109; XIX.17 XXI.91.
3. This is a calm dismissal, as impossible to believe, of what is actually the Muslim belief. Ricoldo argued that God has to sanctify without intermediary. All this passage throws doubt on the extent of his knowledge of Islam. The Qur'anic quotation immediately below (dedimus spiritum . .) is apparently a composite one; it seems likely that Ricoldo knew it best in Latin form.

> the giver and the given, it is necessary that God, the giver, and the Holy Ghost, the given and breathed, should be distinguished only as persons and not as essences. (1)

From the Qur'anic warning to Christians not to believe that God is three[2] he deduced that there could be no closer approach to the doctrine of the Trinity than to mention God and his Word and his Spirit in one verse and then to add immediately, 'and do not say three Gods, because God is one God'. Reference to the Qur'an will recall how ingeniously this perverts the intended sense. In all this discussion, much of what was said was repetitive, but what has been quoted will give some idea of the range of argument, whether intended to silence or to convert Muslims, or to fortify the faith of Christians. The characteristic was the extraction of a Qur'anic phrase to serve as foundation to a scholastic argument. Essentially this was a misuse of data; a Muslim would have been unable to accept the application of Qur'anic texts to the point, although the scholastic method as such might have been perfectly congenial. This treatment of the Qur'an assumed too much in common.

We do hear of arguments for the Trinity put forward in mission countries. William of Rubruck, during an episode described above, had to leave the defence of the

---

1. Q. II.81 or 254 with XXI.91 ? The manuscript reference for Disputatio here is f.179r. col.1. (cap.XV)
2. Q. IV.169.

Trinity to the local Nestorians, who explained the doctrine "by means of comparisons".[1] In an uglier episode a party of Franciscans, challenged about the Son of God, cum Deus uxorem non habeat, gave examples of the divine generation, the rays of the sun, the trees and the seeds of the earth.[2] It was Ramón Lull who more than any other really made the theme of the Trinity the spine of his missionary endeavour, as of his own theological speculation. With his wide eccentricity and narrow philosophical approach, he was obsessed by these questions, which became the key to his thought about the relation of Islam to Christendom. He took rationalisation about the Trinity further than any other writer and to a point remote from the Aristotelian atmosphere of some contemporary schools. The Trinity was the theme of his attempted martyrdoms and equally of his appreciation of the intellectualism of his own work, and his egocentric sense of special illumination. ". . . the Christians prove that Trinity of Persons is in the Divine Essence, the proof whereof by necessary reasons was, so I

---

1. Dawson, p. 193-4.
2. The Muslim objection is authentically rendered, since it is Qur'anic. The rest of the story is doubtful. It seems to be based on an outburst of fanaticism in the largely Hindu town of Bombay; the account, which is miraculous, does not apparently depend upon direct or reliable evidence. The only thing we can be sure of is that these arguments are such as it was thought likely might have been expressed.

heard the other day, revealed to a certain hermit, who received by Divine inspiration an Art which proves by reasoning how that in the simplest Divine Essence there is Trinity of Persons . . ."[1] This coyness cannot hide the seriousness of the claim.

This proof was devoted almost exclusively to problems of Trinity and Incarnation; and the arguments quoted in the Life are representative of many occurring elsewhere in his works, elaborated in complex detail according to philosophical preoccupations which would be beyond the scope of this study. A characteristic argument was that to deny the Trinity is blasphemously to postulate eternal otiosity of God. "The divine unity has in itself infinite and eternal act", and for this reason Christians believed God eternally diffusive, since the Father eternally generates the Son and the Holy Ghost is breathed by both. There is bonificativum, bonificabile and bonificare, and so on with other attributes.[2] The supposed record of Lull's debates with Hamar in prison in Bugia, which he wrote after his return to Europe, consists largely in a long argument, transposed in a variety of slightly different forms, which related to Trinity and Incarnation in turn every aspect of

1. Vita and Contemporary Life (Peers) IV.
2. Hamar, II.II.1 and Vita and Life, VI and IV.

what the Muslim representative called the seven conditions[1] essential to the "high and sublime God" and the eleven qualities,[2] neither substantial nor accidental, attributed to him. The method was scholastic, a series of numbered arguments answered in series.

Under the head of unity the Muslim maintained that there could be no plurality in a Being one by infinite and eternal unity; that if Father and Son and Holy Ghost were God, there were three Gods; that the Persons of the Trinity would have to be like the goodness, greatness, and so on, of God, which arise from his creating the good, the great. The Christian reply took the form of a general statement introducing numbered replies. To the points quoted, these were that in the Trinity is plurality of persons, not of essences, as hammer, pincers and nail are all iron; that there would be three Gods only if the Persons were differentiated in essence; that Christians do not count the Persons as equivalent to qualities of God. Of the Incarnation, under the same head, one argument allotted to the Muslim by the author was that it was unfitting for the one, infinite and eternal, to be united to only one man

---

1. Necessary entity, unity, singularity, infinity, eternity, simplicity and necessary life, all predicated of God in such a way that subject and predicate are interchangeable, an interchange found only in God. The Christian (Lull) added Natura and Substantia.
2. Goodness, magnitude, power, intellect, will, virtue, truth, glory, perfection, justice, mercy.

among many, finite, new and composed of many essences, more so than to join stone to plant or lion; it would be more suitable if God were incarnate in many human natures than in one. The Christian was able to reply that the first objection was valid in nature, but not above nature, that for God to be incarnate in many would destroy the likeness of the supreme Unity. It is not possible to give more than this slight example of this treatise; it will probably not be enough to show how the Muslim was given simplified arguments adapted in advance to the Christian's answers, which were complex and ingenious and rarely compelling.[1] Without detailed further study of this record of a debate in which one party is represented solely by his opponent, we can only assume that Lull translated Muslim arguments, in such form as he understood them, into the terms of his own philosophical system - a translation much more far-reaching than from Arabic into Latin.

In another work Lull admitted that it was not actual Muslim objections, but objections that he thought Muslims might reasonably have, that he was prepared to answer:

> . . .you Muslims, said the Latin, you think that we Christians believe many things about the Trinity and the Incarnation that we do not believe . . . if you object many opinions about these things which we do

1. Pars I and Pars II. Ia.

> not believe, words will be multiplied between us from which no utility will follow. (1)

Lull always showed the same irritated awareness, like Ricoldo and others before him, of Islamic misapprehension, the supposed belief in three Gods, the idea of divine change in the Incarnation. He regretted that Muslims should think Catholics capable of believing that God could suffer hunger and thirst and die.[2]

So convinced was he of the inherent contradictions within Islam and of the clarity of his own vision that his expression tended to become paradoxical: Muslims fear to believe the Trinity for fear of doubting the unity of God, and Christians fear to doubt the Trinity for the same reason. He repeatedly criticised Muslims who dishonour God when they try to honour him more, by dishonouring the Incarnation. Belief in the raising of human nature by the Incarnation, by highly honouring the creature, honours the Creator more. To think the Incarnation against nature was to deny the creation of the world, the resurrection and heaven and hell,

---

1. de V sap., dist.I. On this occasion, the unfortunate Muslim who tried to follow the argument would be forced along a path characteristic of Lull, by which he would prove the Trinity by first showing that plurality in God is necessary, that it must consist in Paternity, Filiation and Spiration, and finally that it must consist in neither more nor less than three persons. (de V sap.IV. Dist.1)

2. Contemp. D. 65.12; 54; cf. 346.17

all of which are equally contrary to nature.[1] The rejection of these high doctrines would have every-day results; thus Muslims, in denying the Trinity, deny intrinsic infinite and eternal acts in God, and in so doing lessen their own fortitude, for example, which consists in acts against temptations.[2] It was so easy for Lull, blinded by the light of his own speculations, to conclude that Muslims lacked only the will to believe. He was perpetually teased by their obscured perceptions, the failure to see what he had already explained. He thought that a weighty message sent by high authority was what was needed.[3]

It was characteristic of the best in his mind to think of the conversion of Muslims at once with the reunion of schismatics and heretics and the conversion of the Mongols.[4] This concept of general reunion seems to underlie much of his life and thought and to ennoble what would otherwise be self-satisfied eccentricity unrelieved. Generally unrepresentative of his age, he yet held much in common with contemporaries whom he caricatured rather than typified.

---

1. Contemp. D. 72.23, cf. 255.16, 17; 283.23; 186.7, cf. 278.7 ff.; 65.11.
2. Hamar, II.IIa; signum XX.
3. Contemp. D. 346.17.
4. Lib. V sap., prol; pro recup. T.S.

Thus it was that the mediaeval response to Islam very greatly emphasised the Trinitarian question. This marred the sense of community of belief over the existence and unity of God; Christians, far from feeling defensive, saw the Islamic doctrine as most obviously defective in this very respect. Pennis, presenting a selection of Ricoldo's arguments, said "as Blessed Thomas of Aquino says, all objections (rationes) brought against the Catholic faith are soluble".[1] At the same time, this rationalistic emphasis diminished the apparent distance between Christianity and Islam, in Christian eyes, on this very question of the Trinity. One result was to make Muslim attitudes less unfamiliar, another to reduce the seeming weight of Muslim objections. There was the insistence on interpreting the words of the Qur'an in a Christian sense; a tendency to see Islam as a travesty of Christianity, or a partial reversion to Judaism, rather than as wholly alien.

---

1. cap.III; MS. f. 18v.

Chapter 10.

Islam and Heresy.

Christian church and creed could expect little natural sympathy from orthodox Muslims, but oriental Christians themselves have always enjoyed the privileges marked out for them by the Qur'an. For Islam, the Christians would remain a privileged association which had somehow become diverted from the right way at a relatively early stage of the prophetic progress: Muhammad "called the Christians deviators because he thought they adored three gods as well as images".[1] Reversing the Muslim attitude to themselves, the Christians in their turn found a place for Islam as a deviation from the Church, to which, if it were a heresy, it would stand in a familiar and identifiable relation.[2] The proportion of Christian truth which Islam contained would make this form of recognition, which, far from conferring privilege, consecrated active hostility, the more easy. On the other hand, Islam as a heresy would be unique.

1. The heretical sequence.

At times, the Cluniac position took the term heresy for granted. The summula opened: "This is the sum of all the heresy and diabolical fraud of the sect of the Saracens or Ismaelites"; and, echoing his secretary's

1. Ad az. I; Bibl.,p.224, col.2; MS.CCCD184, p.50, right margin, high.

2. This happened very early; cf. St. John of Damascus, de haeresibus, M.P.G.94.

phrases, Peter the Venerable also spoke in his letter to St. Bernard of "this error of errors, these dregs of all the heresies, and of all the diabolical sects which have sprung up since the very advent of the Saviour and whose vestiges have flowed into one". This imagery was not just poetic fancy; an exact meaning could be defined: "regurgitating almost all the dregs of ancient heresies which, infected by the Devil, he had swallowed, with Sabellius he denied the Trinity, with his own Nestorius he rejected the divinity of Christ, with the Manichean he disavowed the death of the Lord, although he did not deny his return to heaven." There was a special relationship to Arius, who had denied that Christ was Son of God, and to Antichrist, who would deny not only that Christ was God, but even that he was a good man: "the most impious Muhammad, half-way between the two" was responsible for a stage in this scheme of damnation. These things which had been "first sown by Arius, and then advanced by this satan, that is, Muhammad, would indeed be wholly completed by Antichrist, according to the diabolical intention".[1] In the prologue to his principal polemic, Peter took one by one the famous heresies, only some of which could be supposed to have a relation to Islam; reasonably, he saw Nestorianism - Muhammad's "own" Nestorius -

1. Summula.

as the most closely relevant.[1] The summula attributed the denial of the divinity of Christ to Nestorian influence; the annotator of Ketton said, "in this man the Arian heresy lived again", haeresis Arriana revixit.[2]

The Devil's part in plotting and creating Islam by the refurbishing of ancient heresy was thought quite important by several writers. The Risālah had put forward this diabolical conception strongly: there were three dispensations in the words of Peter of Toledo's version, that of grace, which was divine; that of justice, which was human, (i.e.the Mosaic Law);[3] the third revelation could only be diabolical. The twelfth and thirteenth centuries were very conscious of the dangers of heresy and men were abnormally sensitive to those schemes of the Devil which lay behind every setback to the Catholic religion through the centuries. It was not

---

1. C.S.S., prol.2-9; the quotation, however, is from the summula. He referred in some detail to the Manichees, Arians, Macedonians, Sabellians, Donatists, Pelagians, Nestorians and Eutychians, to Jovinianus, Elvidius and Vigilantius. He was anxious to justify himself for writing against Islam at all, by the precedent of earlier writers against other heresies. Guibert before him had complained about the absence of polemic against Islam.
2. Ad az.III; Bibl. p.224 col.2. A little later he spoke of the belief in a carnal Paradise reviving ancient heresy. Haeresis originally bore the meaning of opinion; it seems to be used by the Annotator both for heresy in the technical sense and for erroneous opinion generally.
3. Tol., MS. p.306a-b ff.; Vincent 23.50; Muir, p.66. Reference to the Old Testament as a human revelation is curious; Muir has natural, the Arabic tabi'i.

only Peter the Venerable who was aware of this aspect of ecclesiastical history. Guibert before him had spoken of the heretical influence on Muhammad, to the Devil's piping. William of Tyre characterised the Prophet as "first-born of Satan" who "seduced" the Orient with his "pestilent" doctrine.[1] In a series of the Church's enemies, Gerald of Wales discussed Muhammad after Arius, and saw in the supposed lasciviousness of Islam the calculated cunning of the Devil's plan for a hot climate, in contrast to the avarice of the Patari, heretics of a frigid zone, whom he considered next. For Vitry the strong words thought suitable for the pulpit came tumbling out in their superlatives:

> . . . like another Antichrist and the first-born son of Satan, transfigured like Satan into an angel of light, Muhammad, upheld by God's great anger and special displeasure, with the co-operation of the enemy of the human race, perverted . . . more people than any other heretic before his time. (2)

His was the greatest abomination of desolation and the greatest scourge of the Church of God of times past or future. Ralph of Coggeshall, using emphatically the words heresy and heresiarch, cited the Abbot Joachim, in order to repeat the idea of Muhammad's intermediate position in the diabolic plot: the inexorable extension of infidelity from its first flowering under Arius to its completion by Antichrist, whose

---

1. I.i.
2. IV.

precursors were the successful Ayyūbid armies in the contemporary scene.[1] In Joachim's scheme of history, Muhammad and the Muslim "persecution" had succeeded, fourth in line, to those of the heretics, the pagans and the Jews, under Constantine, Nero and Herod; the series was to culminate in Antichrist, whose last predecessor was Ṣalāḥ ad-Dīn.[2] Even in a more matter-of-fact view, it was the Devil who introduced Muhammad to Christian heresy.[3] These instances illustrate the diabolical element in a stable conception of Providence which changed so little through those centuries.

In purely human terms Islam was, of course, reckoned the greatest enemy of the Christian Church, and must take the lead in recounting of the "persecutions". Partly this was quantitative. Muhammad's was the last of seven persecutions,[4] said Humbert of Romans, and the only serious

---

1. Chron. Anglicanum, de abbate Joachim, anno 1195.
2. Salimbene, yr 1249; M.G.H. vol. 32, p.440; cf. opinio abbatis Joachim, Bibl. III, p.56 As Alphandery points out, the Middle Ages were much less free with the identification of Antichrist than the Reformation period was. The reason was no doubt the exclusively eschatological connotation of Antichrist, a conception debased when he could be identified with any particularly evil person in polemic.
3. Anon. Fior.
4. By persecution is here meant something a little wider than a strict interpretation would suggest: in this sense any harm suffered by the Church might be termed persecution.

one remaining. It was naturally the worst of all: the longest, the most continuous, the most widely extended, the most through-going, the most obstinate, the most pernicious, the one with most agents.[1] Ricoldo represented it as the sum of three past persecutions, into which the past sufferings of the Church might conveniently be grouped. Until Constantine there had been the rabid persecution by the pagan tyrants; immediately after had arisen the persecution by heretics, which the great doctors, Hilary, Augustine, Jerome and Gregory had been called to answer;[2] immediately after Gregory's time had arisen the third plague, danger from false brethren, men of corrupt mind, the hypocrites; this tribulation would last until the old age of the Church. Muhammad's persecution was above all others; it was not confined to any one mode, but took place in all three. Sometimes it was effected by tyranny, sometimes by deception in religious doctrine (per legem), sometimes by subverting the simple people by hypocrisy. This was a subtler

---

1. Op. Trip. I. vi. passim.
2. The association of the heretics with the doctors of the Church was not original. Of authors already quoted in this chapter, Peter the Venerable stressed it, and it has a key position in Abbot Joachim's scheme. (Places cited above; cf. Vitry, VI.)

statement and nearer to fact than Humbert's; Ricoldo saw that Islam partook of the genuine doctrinal fascination of heresy, and of that apparent moral example which enables ostensibly exemplary men to lead into error.[1]

Ricoldo, writing after the final collapse of ʿAkka, also saw the older apologetic to be still alive and effective, and he worked out the relation of the classic heresies to Islam more fully than had been done before. Thus Muhammad taught with Sabellius the denial of the Trinity; with Arius and Eunomius that Christ was a creature excelling all others; with Carpocrates the impossibility of God's having a son without the medium of a wife; with Cerdonius and the Jews the idea that if God had a son there would be danger to the world from their dissension; with the Manichees the crucifixion of another in the place of Christ; with the Donatists the denial of the mysteries of the Church along with the mysteries of the Passion, and with Origen the salvation of demons; in his miʿrāj Muhammad spoke of touching God, and therefore taught with the Anthropomorphites that God has a body; he believed with Macedonius that the Holy Ghost is a creature; with Cerinthius in intemperate delights in heaven; with the Ebionites in circumcision , and with the Nicolaites in the plurality of wives and female slaves.[2] Whether or not this was worth doing, it was efficiently done;

1. Disp., prol. MS. f.159v. col.1 - 160r.
2. Disp. I.

it owed something to Cluny which it both echoed and improved. What the seducer, the Devil, could not accomplish in Arius he fulfilled in Muhammad and would yet confirm when Antichrist came to persuade the world to deny even the goodness of Christ. "The filth of many ancient heretics which the Devil scattered here and there among others, he renewed all at once in Muhammad."[1] It seems likely that for Ricoldo the sequence of familiar, formally condemned heresies was reassuring. The Devil's part was no less important for him than it was for earlier writers: it was at the prompting of that liar and father of lies that he "composed" his revelations;[2] it was the Devil who saw that with Heraclius' triumph over Chosroes he could no longer defend plurality of gods, and selected as his instrument the "diabolical man", Muhammad.[3] Problems of the dispositions of Providence, not as they affected individuals, but as they affected the Church of God, greatly interested and perhaps disturbed writers of the mediaeval Latin West; the identification of Islam as a heresy and its place in the sequence of heresies and of persecutions excogitated by the Devil were treated inseparably.

Yet in spite of this widespread image of Islam as the culmination or summit of all heresy, it was not at all

---

1. Ibid. MS. f.160v. col.1.
2. Ibid., prol., MS. f. 160r. col.1.
3. XIII, MS. f. 176r. col.1.

certain that it was technically a heresy at all. The clearest assertion that it was so was Oliver's; because of their Christological beliefs, he said, the Muslims ought to be called heretics instead of Saracens, but the use of the wrong name has prevailed.[1] This flat assertion is unique. Peter the Venerable, however, discussed it fully. It was in the context of the catalogue of the heresies of the past that he came to this problem. "I cannot clearly decide," he admitted, "whether the Muhammadan error should be said to be a heresy, and whether its sectaries should be called heretics or heathens."[2] There were so many reasons to prefer the name of heretic. It might be more correct to define as heretical nothing but what left the Church and acted against it, but ancient usage called any attack on some part of faith, even outside the Church, heresy; Muslims, in the usual way of heretics,[3] took what they liked from Christian doctrine and rejected what they disliked. Yet like pagans they rejected baptism, disdained the Christian sacrifice, derided penance and all the other sacraments of the Church. This question was never fully examined, in Cluny or elsewhere. The canonical position of a Muslim was not that of a heretic; he had not been baptised and was not liable to penalties for leaving the Church.[4] Yet men would remain always acutely

---

1. Hist. Dam
2. C.S.S., prol. 13.
3. haereticorum more.
4. The Codex Iuris Canonici clearly establishes orthodox Catholic doctrine: a persona in the Church of Christ (one who can plead in Church courts) is constituted by baptism. A heretic is a persona but an unbaptised person is not. (Canon 87)

conscious of the undoubted heresies that Islam contained in the form, especially, of errors about Christ and his Mother.[1] For Peter the question seemed perhaps otiose: on Augustine's authority, all error which attacked Christian faith should be combated, whether it arose within the Church, or, like that of Jews and pagans, outside it.[2] It is indeed certain that the term heresy came to be used carelessly and casually. Thus it was treated as a common noun to describe in passing the genus to which Islam belonged. For example, Mark of Toledo might speak of Muslims' enforcing "their heresy".[3] Heresy was used thus untechnically to mean little more than "erroneous doctrine"; we have noticed that it was so used in the marginal annotations to Ketton. Sigebert spoke of Muhammad's doctrine as his heresy, and much later San Pedro referred to the heresies which Islam contained.[4] It is hardly necessary to seek many examples of this. In practice Islam was assimilated to heresy both by its measure of agreement with some classic heresies and by the colloquial use of the word.

2. The religions of the world.

The Christian attitude was formed not only by the grand view of the drama of the sufferings of the Church of

1. Annotator, ad az. XXVIII (Bibl. XXIX = Q. XIX).
2. Loc. cit., with para. 14.
3. Pref. Q.
4. S.S.M., I.vii.12; I.viii. 63, 94, 187.

God through the ages, but also by what were thought to have been the specific historical events which went to the creation of Islam. It was universally seen to have arisen as a pilfering of Christian and Jewish orthodox and heretical doctrines. Gerald of Wales, before reproducing a passage about Islam popular at that time, put this in its simplest form: Machumetus enim quaedam a Judaeis sumpsit et quaedam a Christianis. Cluny had stated this more forcibly: "in order that the whole plenitude of iniquity should come together in Muhammad and that nothing should be lacking for the perdition of himself or others, to the heretic were added Jews".[1] "He took from the two Testaments what the Jews and the heretics taught him," the annotator of Ketton had explained.[2] Other writers put it that Muhammad constructed his own religion out of the Old and New Testaments; it was Mark's view that he invented a third religion using bits of the two existing religions.[3] He praised Christianity and Judaism and taught that neither was to be held, said the summula. This was the usual opinion, in one form or another; Matthew Paris even derived from the Risālah material the idea that the whole process of concoction from the two religions took place after the death of the Prophet.[4] Ad suum nutum, said Alan of Lille vaguely, ab utroque quaedam excipiunt.[5]

---

1. Summula.
2. Ad az. II, Bibl. p.224 col.2; MS. CCCD.184, p.50 bottom margin right; MS. Seld Supra 31, bottom margin, left.
3. Pref. Q. Cf. Fidenzio, XIV and Roderick, quoted below.
4. Additions to the St. Albans Chronicle, yr. 622.
5. IV. i.

Pedro de Alfonso and the anonymous thirteenth century writer who copied him attributed the Christian heretical element in Islam to Jacobite influence on Muhammad, and also insisted that Jewish influence on him was (from the Jewish point of view) equally heretical.[1] Varagine, following the same source, noticed that Sergius, the supposed heretical influence on Muhammad, had been reported both as Nestorian and as Jacobite. Nestorianism was the more reasonable suggestion and the more usual attribution.[2] Ricoldo, when, following the same source, he averred Muhammad's friendship with a Jacobite, did point out what Varagine had failed to do, that influence was more to be looked for from Nestorians, qui maxime conveniunt cum Saracenis.[3]

Islam would find a natural place in any general scheme of controversy in defence of Christianity. Guibert treated Muhammad after the heresiarchs and before the Grecorum errona doctrina. Peter the Venerable himself wrote against the Jews and against the Petrobrusians, the three

---

1. Pedro defined Jacobitism in terms of Islamic Christology, and clearly had no idea of what Jacobite doctrines really were; without direct contact in Spain, this is not surprising, although it leaves unexplained why the original assertion was made. The Jewish heretics are not Talmudists but Samaritans; is this an example of loyalty to his former co-religionists on Pedro's part ?
2. E.g., Pavia; Fidenzio XIV; Alv., de leg.XVIII/18P.; Benedict; Anon. Fior.; Benvenuto.
3. Cf. also the idea that Muhammad was personally an heresiarch in that he learned Christianity as a youth. (e.g. Tripoli,II; Ott. Comm.; and cf. Roderick, cited below). For a fuller discussion of the supposed influences on Muhammad, see below, chapter [illegible], pp. [illegible] Note also that the Syrian Apology spoke of Sergius (Sosius) changing his name to Nestorius.(Viterbo; Paris.) The reference from Ricoldo is to Disp.XIII (MS.f.176r. col.2).

works constituting the sum of his polemic. Islam made a third with heresy and Judaism; and the word perfidiae covered them all; the term expresses the attitude, but was not as widely used as might have been expected.[1] A generation later than the Cluniacs, Alan of Lille's de fide catholica contra haereticos sui temporis was conceived in the atmosphere of the great Lateran Councils and their preoccupatio with the defence of Christendom. The proportions of the work are significant: there was one book each against the Albigensians and Waldensians, of seventy-six and twenty-five chapters respectively; the book against the Jews contained twenty-one chapters, and in the fourth, against the Muslims, there were fourteen. What had been said in the earlier books, for example in defence of the Trinity, although relevant, was not repeated in the fourth book; yet it is not only the relative space given to Islam, but the focus of attention devoted to the better known and nearer perfidiae that places the anti-Muslim polemic as subsidiary. This final book was called contra paganos seu Mahometanos - "quos communi vulgo vocabulo Saracenos vel paganos noncupant". Alan himself generally preferred the term "pagan"; it is

1. Other examples of the use are to be found in Auvergne, de fide, praefatio; Roderick, Hist. Arab. I; Sermon attributed to Fulcher, see Ch. Kohler in bibliog.; Ricoldo, Disp. XIII, (perfidia antichristi: MS. f. 176r. col. 1). Another word used in the same sense, of a false faith, in parody of fides, is credulitas: cf. Liber Nicholay.

not clear why he did so, but it is abundantly clear from the body of the work that he did not mean "idolator" to be understood.[1] Credulous of unattractive and unconvincing legends of the life and death of the prophet, his choice of terms may be a mere expression of dislike. Fitzralph, after his consideration of the Qur'an, in his eighteenth book, went on to consider the damnation of the Jews during the apostolic age, in the book following (Book XIX).

It is clear that the Middle Ages saw the Jewish affiliation of Islam as similar to the heretical one, and this modified the concept of Islam as a heresy simple. Such things as food prohibitions and circumcision and the law for stoning adulterers were naturally thought to be things in which "they follow the law of Moses".[2] We have seen that Alan took it for granted that Islam accepted the whole canon of the Old Testament; and that Peter the Venerable argued that Islam must accept the Hebrew prophets because of the community of language, culture and race which derived from

---

1. Paganus might be used thoughtlessly, as occurred fairly frequently, or with a defining sense, as when Ludolf (VIII) spoke of Islamic divorce like pagan behaviour. It may illumine Alan's thought to add that he prayed that the heretics should leave their deformed dogmas and convictions, the Jews their carnal observances of the Law, the "pagans" their superstitious opinions. This seems to place the Muslims mid way; like the Jews their practice is vain and superstitious, like the heretics they have wrong-headed opinions.
2. For example, An. Min. 10.

Ismael and Isaac. One writer thought that Muslims bore Old Testament names because they received them at their Old Testament circumcisions.[1] Guido Terrena spoke of Muslims as "erring with the Jews" in respect of Christ and as "judaising" about the laws of circumcision and unclean foods.[2] It was occasionally recognised that the Jewish influence was by no means exclusively an Old Testament one; Peter of Poitiers identified the Talmud as a source of the errors of the Qur'an,[3] and Ricoldo said that ʿAbdallāh ibn Salām taught Muhammad "multa de veteri testamento et multa de Talmud".[4] Talmud and Qur'an might be paired as sources of error; a manuscript of Peter de Pennis contains consecutively his treatise contra Judaeos, nomine Thalamoth, and his contra Alchoranum.[5] Roderick of Toledo in his Historia Arabum described Muhammad's education by a Jewish astrologer, in both the Christian faith (a curious subject from such a master) and the Jewish perfidy. Roderick conceived that the destruction of the Christian faith in

---

1. Itin. Reg. Ric. I. III.
2. Error II, VI.
3. Capitula, IV.v.
4. Itin.XXXV.
5. MS. B.N.lat.3646; see Ch. Kohler, in bibliography. Benedict of Alignan included Islam with Judaism and a somewhat indiscriminate list of heresies. (Cerulli, p.491.)

Arabia was planned by Jewish malice.[1] On the other hand, in another concept adopted by Ricoldo, there was a real breaking through of the Gospel and the Mosaic Law into the world, when the Devil, no longer able wholly to deny them, concocted the Qur'an.[2] We have already seen the extent to which it was realised that Islam itself claimed to fulfil both the New and the Old Testament.

The legal treatment de Judaeis et Saracenis associated these two religions throughout the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. The collections of canons grouped them together; some individual canons treated them together, more treated them separately. Problems of Jews living in Christian territory had a much wider application than that of Muslims within Christendom.[3] The Jews and the Muslims were different in that the former were Scriptural and were harmless; in fact, toleration could be extended to Muslims when, as subject to Christian princes, they were as harmless as the Jews had become. The only essential difference between the two was that dār al-Islām existed, offering the security of a hostile society to protect and encourage error.

---

1. Hist. Arab., I, II; Cron. de Esp. XCV. In this view, Arabia was thought to have been torn between Catholic, Jewish, Arian and pagan religion at the time of the birth of Muhammad. See below, p.277
2. Disp. XIII, MS. f.170r. col.1.
3. See Decretum Gratiani and Clementinarum libri, de Judaeis et Saracenis; and also below, p.434

William of Auvergne describes two interesting comparisons of the three revealed religions that were current in his own day, among those reputed to be the sapientes in mundo. One view was that the religion of the Hebrews was the religion of Fortune, which the Jews might be said to worship, since their reason for holding their religion was that it brought them temporal prosperity; they were never promised anything but prosperity or threatened with anything but adversity. The religion of the Muslims was the religion of Nature, because it contained few requirements (positiones sive constitutiones); nature here meant corrupt nature, and the Muslims indulged those carnal delights for which they thirsted. The Christian religion was the religion of grace. This scheme William discards because it is based on an inadequate study of the religions concerned.[1] Other people said that the Hebrew nation lived under Saturn, whose sign was their avarice, their pertinacity and hardness, and whose appropriate day was Saturday, the day they kept holy. The Muslims lived under Venus, kept her day holy, and were very much given to venery. The only true religion, the Christian, was under the sun, the sign of spiritual things, observing Sunday and obeying the Pope who lived in the city of the sun. William was at great pains to discredit a view which blamed the influence of the stars for the diversity of religions;

1. de leg., XX/19.S,T.

he would have no part in astrology.[1] What most interests us here is the evidence for there having been some speculation based on the association and comparison of the three laws together, and in some detail.

It was common to speak of there being three revealed religions, three "Laws" in the world, not as an account of the Muslim claim, but as an observation of fact. This was the point of the relevant part of Lull's instruction to his son.[2] Peter the Venerable was to some trouble to prove that only two religions were revealed before the time of Muhammad;[3] the three were grouped by the Risālah, as we have seen, as of grace, of human nature and of devilish origin, in Peter of Toledo's version. Humbert of Romans actually spoke of three <u>laws</u> as having been given since the beginning of the world, the Judaic, the Christian and the Muslim.[4] His fellow-Dominican, Ramón Marti, with his more scrupulous accuracy, said that "those who have a law, or who arrogate to themselves the name of a law, are the Jews and the Christians and the Muslims".[5] This idea was general and is reflected by the Emperor Frederick's famous blasphemy

---

1. Ibid., XX/19.U ff.
2. D.P. "De les .III. ligs." The three chapters preceding that on Islam are on the Ley de natura, the Ley vella, and the Ley nova; it is followed by the chapter <u>de gentils</u>. (Cap.68-72.) Thus there are three laws, but a context widened by the lost state of nature, and by the existence of contemporary nations without a "law" at all.
3. C.S.S., I.8.
4. De pred. S.C., XII.
5. Pugio Fidei, I.iii.

about the three impostors. For the Christian, Islam was the third of three revealed religions and heretical in its relation to both the other two. Taking into consideration the peculiar relation of Christianity to the synagogue, this implied a double relation of Islam to Christianity, direct, and through the old Law, indirectly. This was illustrated by an argument of Oliver's, designed to show the relative position of Islam: in any assembly of a Christian, a Jew and a Muslim, the Christian and the Jew would alike regard Islam as the least of the three, the Muslim would put Christianity above Judaism.[1]

The simple patterns of heretics and Muslims, and of Jews, Christians and Muslims would be modified by time; heresy became temporarily less menacing in the West and the missionary opportunities of the East more prominent. The controversial literature would reflect this modification, and wider groupings of religious affiliations would be envisaged. William of Auvergne in an interesting phrase distinguished idolators and pagans from both the heretics and the gens Machometi.[2] Humbert contrasted Muslims with certain heretics, who wished only to corrupt faith; with certain Barbari, who wished only to kill the bodies of the

---

1. Ep. Sal. Cf. Gaston Paris on the Legend of Saladin, in connection with this grouping of the three. (Bibliog.) The impostors Legend has many forms and may be itself of heterodox Islamic origin. See M.Th.d'Alverny, Deux Traductions.

2. de fide, III.

Christians; and with the Mongols, who were said to wish only to subjugate their lands to them; needless to say, the Muslims did all three.[1] Ramón Marti, distinguishing those who had and had not revealed religions, said the latter were infinite.[2] Fitzralph also thought in terms of wide national groupings: Saraceni, iudei, tartari et gentiles.[3] Ricoldo described the populations of the East under four heads: Christians who were heretics, either Nestorian or Jacobite; Muslims; Jews; and Mongols or pagans, classifying them in order of increasing remoteness from the truth. The heretics had the revelations integral, but were in error about the mode of Incarnation; the Jews did not have the New Testament and were in error about the Old; the Muslims had no revelation and no understanding, but they had their devil's law with some useful things; the pagans had no law, understanding, worship or religion at all.[4] Lull portrayed Christian, Jew and Muslim in competition for a pagan's soul, in two works, and in another the dispute of a Latin with Greek, Nestorian, Jacobite and Muslim.[5] This

---

1. Op. Trip. I.VI. Cf. the earlier classification by the same author into rebels (who hear but do not obey the Church and kill the body), heretics (who neither hear nor obey and kill the soul), and Muslims (who do both). De pred.S.C., VIII.
2. Pugio Fidei, loc. cit.
3. Arm. 8 (9).
4. Nat. or., MS. f.61r. and v. This (he said) was also the reverse order of convertibility, which certainly exaggerates the ease of converting Muslims.
5. Lib.de Gent.,especially prol. and conclusion; Lib.Tart., passim; cf.D.P. and Lib.de V sap.,prol. In another work Latin and Greek competed for the soul of a self-converted Muslim. Lib.de S.S.; cf. also Disputatio Fidelis et Infidelis.

last work is entirely about the Trinity, over which each sect is in error; this was in the last resort to classify Greek Orthodox with Muslim, and to characterise both as heretics, although in the dialogue care was taken to set the Muslim apart from the others. The classification with other laws[1] and with nations without law modified the identification with heresy, and became commoner as Eastern travel increased.

3. Heresy and schism.

Where Lull might group the different sects of Christianity together in competition for the pagan or the Muslim soul, and might also group all the non-Catholic bodies, including Islam, together, according to his immediate purpose, William of Adam, Bishop of Sultaniyah, expressly excluded Islam from the same class as the Greek. He explained that the greater feebleness of the Greeks (who were yet equal in malice to the Muslims) derived from their having "left the Roman Church".[2] Humbert, too, classed the infidel as outside the riven unity of the Church; at the

1. Islam was rarely related to the errors of the ancients. Paris remarked, on the element of indulgence introduced into Islam, in eo Epicurus. Marti was more representative, in classing Islam with the laws, and distinguishing the lawless as Epicureans, Naturals and Philosophers. (Paris on St.Albans Chronicle,(additions), yr. 622; Marti, Pugio Fidei,loc.cit.
2. De modo extirpandi, IV.

Council of Lyons the Western half of the Church needed to reform its morals, the Eastern half its faith, in order to unite against the external menace of Islam.[1] It is useful to note examples of a line drawn between the divided Christians and the Muslims because there was also an opinion that made Islam itself a schism.

The idea that Arabia at the time of the Prophet's birth stood on the brink of choosing between Christianity and Judaism was sometimes extended by serious writers even to a supposition that it was part of Christendom. When Roderick said that it was divided between Arianism, Judaism Catholicism and paganism, he conceived Arabia as part of the Roman Empire, and Islam as the excuse for, and the spiritual aspect of, a political revolution.[2] This rather more than hints at the notion of schism. There is, however, one later, clearer and much more famous description of Islam as schism. Why Dante should have placed Muhammad among the schismatics rather than among the heretics is not immediately obvious.[3] The former place was a worse one, and theological odium is directed against the heresiarch as much for dividing the Church as for his error itself. Dante perhaps selected that aspect which he most disliked:

seminator di scandalo e di scisma. (4)

---

1. Op. Trip. I.ii.
2. Hist. Arab., loc. cit.
3. Cf. the versified life of St. Francis which speaks of schism and heresy together. (Col.i.)
4. Inferno, canto XXVIII, line 35.

The commentary of Benvenuto da Imola is enlightening here: the name Macomethus, he said, is like malus comitus, the pilot who has guided the Church of God to shipwreck, "for neither before nor after was there worse ruin in the Church."[1] He pointed out that the poet writes, not crudely as he seems to, but finely, when he says, "il tristo sacco/ che merda fa di quel che si trangugia".[2]

> For he wants by this to let us understand that all the food which through the mouth entered the stomach of this man was turned to foetid excrement; because all the doctrine which entered his mind produced horrible error with which he soiled and infected nearly all the world.

This brings out heresy, the idea of which is latent in the text of the poem, as the means of schism. At about the same late date another commentary described Muhammad expressly as "grande commetitore diresie" and "grande seminator diresie".[3] Another, in the course of a life of Muhammad which gave full force to the heretical influence of Sergius, stressed the characteristic Dantesque point; thus the miracle of the rising door-lintel, which enabled Baḥīrā to recognise the future prophet, foretold that he would "rend and open up the door of the holy church of Rome".[4] This did not exclude the other aspect, "dottrina falsa", which was complementary. The Ottimo Commento earlier commended

---

1. Benvenuto used the word, "He turned away many from the Catholic faith."
2. Lines 26,7.
3. Chiose sopra Dante.
4. Anon. Fior.

the appropriateness of Dante's choice of description of Muhammad. Its own phrase, "principe di questi scismatici" recalls Benvenuto's later "maximus princeps scismatis". This commentary, which was among those that credited the story of the heretic Sergius, spoke of Muhammad's having, with his schism, done "more harm to the Church of God and the Christian faith than anyone else, without comparison among them all". All this group of writers following Dante agreed that schismatic was the most appropriate title, evidently as being more than heretic, which in this case it is extended to include.[1]

4. Conclusion.

Treatment of Islam as a heresy was essentially analytic, founded on examination of its doctrinal content;

1. The early Chiose anonime commented Dante by repeating the cardinal story by which Muhammad, a Roman cardinal and missionary, disappointed of promised papal election, deliberately perverted his own converts to error; the Ottimo Commento also repeated this, but denied its truth. (Cf. Liber Nicholay and comments by M. Th. d'Alverny in Deux Traductions.) This was also the theme of Nicolo da Casola's contemporary poetic treatment. In this connection the poem of Waltherius and Alexandre du Pont's French version are relevant. Ziolecki pointed out that all these stories suppose the perversion of a Christian Arabia, whether traditionally Christian, or, as in the cardinal story, newly converted by Muhammad, who would himself be an apostate. As will be seen below, the vast majority of mediaeval writers knew Arabia to have been pagan, with a number of Jews, and this includes most of the commentators on Dante. The Ottimo Commento shared with Tripoli knowledge of the oriental Christian version of the Bahira story which made him an early Christian influence on Muhammad, but this does not imply a Christian Arabia. How far Dante himself was influenced by the idea that Arabia was Christian, or by the cardinal story, is far from clear. His words were perfectly appropriate to a more historically accurate view which took into consideration the countries of oriental Christendom lost to Islam. (For Casolo, see Ziolecki, Légende de Mahomet.)

it was only incidentally that it was presented in that rather dramatic historical sequence of diabolic assault on humanity. What was essentially historical was the relating of Islam as a "law", a revealed religion, on the one hand to Christianity and Judaism from which it derived, on the other to the pagans, the people of no law or revelation. It was true, but only partly so. Judaism had been wholly true up to the point immediately before the rejection of Christ. Islam, founded on a false pretence, was true only so far as it borrowed from the Scriptures. In the ultimate result, as heresy, or as law, Islam was exhibited as partly Christian.

This reversed the treatment of the Qur'an as alien to the Christian (including the pre-Christian Jewish) tradition. The Qur'an had been rejected as incompatible with the Gospel and the Law of Moses, as unlike them and therefore identifiably false. Now it was considered as only partly like them, but still as like them. It is a theological truism that all heresy contains truth, since it is corrupted truth by definition. Both these attitudes were maintained; Islam was disproved as being different from Christianity, but accepted as being different in a familiar and partial manner. Only those aspects of it which contradicted or supported Christian dogma interested Christians.

Islam is not a negation, nor a partial affirmation, of Christianity, but it came to seem to be either, when it was viewed exclusively from the position of the clerical, professional theologian, whose real interests were the effective exposition and defence of the Christian faith. In all mediaeval works, however accurate, it was to this that Islam was related. If it was barely studied as a scientific subject, the oecumenical exercise of treating it sympathetically and understandingly was equally rare. There was no serious sustained attempt to present it in terms that Muslims would recognise as their own. There was some reflection of Islamic spiritual life and some citation of authentic religious formulas, but usually as quaint, or to show their inadequacy; and sometimes they were stated only to ridicule, or were tailored to lead on to a statement of Christian faith. Some conception of the Qur'an's own strong character must have resulted from reading its translations, especially where, as with the life of Christ, the subject was sympathetic; but there are no signs of this in Christian critical comment. Islamic truth was never seen to be better than a falling away from the whole truth which the Christian Church preserved. In this way would be paralled the Muslim conception of Christianity, as a falling short from the whole truth which is contained in Islam.

PART III.

The Historical Treatment of Muhammad.

Prefatory Note.

The personality of Muhammad and the success of his mission fascinated the mediaeval Latin public. The horror with which Islam was regarded is a measure of how much interest was felt in the history of Muhammad, in infinitely distant people and events. Writers then were not equipped to use such anthropological terms as interest scholars at the present day. They did not wish, and their readers did not wish them, to reconstruct conditions which in an alien age and under strange climatic conditions had governed a tribal, mercantile and pagan society. On the contrary, they spoke in a way that was intelligible and welcome to nations that were still largely feudal and land-locked and devoted to the public observance of the entire Christian code of morals and ceremonial. They lacked the will, and would have failed to see any reason, to discard what they believed they knew, in favour of a disinterested and impartial appreciation of a society always imagined as hostile. Instead they would develop histories of Muhammad which they would think of as the real truth, known to them, but hidden from their duped enemies whose beliefs and stories in contrast were all deceits.

In these circumstances was established a basic presentation of Muhammad's life which was modified only by a range of variants. It often bore a recognisable relation to the historical facts accepted to-day, and diverged from them, or gave them a specifically "Christian" twist, or a theological explanation, whenever they were felt to be significant. Examination of the way the facts of Muhammad's life were presented, and of the selection of facts to include in the corpus, makes it possible to some extent to analyse the technical process of narration in the minds of theologians and philosophers. The treatment of legendary material was not very different from that of material which in the modern view was accurate or more nearly accurate. Information, genuine and bogus, was used to illustrate pre-determined themes, so that the selection, acceptance and arrangement of an historical canon of Muhammad's mission was an important part of Christian controversial literature. The impact of the discovery, or the admission, of historical facts upon the legends previously accepted resulted, not in

the annihilation of the legends, but in a blending of the two which attempted to preserve as much as possible of the legend. It is here taken as axiomatic that, leaving the authors of romances out of it, there was no writer who did not believe what he said; to make truth and fiction alike prove the same case was part of a process of self-persuasion, and there was no malice, except what was righteous. It is as though loyalty to the truth of religion imposed a self-deception.

It will be noted that the Prophet's humanity was a constant theme. The Latins thought that it was important to show that he was a bad man, acting under diabolic inspiration. They gave their attention to every offence against Christian morals that he committed, and they did not trouble to demonstrate that these things were offences which Muslims did not think to be wrong at all. Yet their main purpose was to indicate clearly that he had nothing to do with God, and in their view human weakness was almost as good a proof of this as downright wickedness.

It was perhaps crucial for them to prove that he did not receive true revelations. They never realised fully that it was the essence of Islam that a human being should be the vehicle of revelation. Thus Christians were anxious wherever they could to attribute human motives to Muhammad's formulation of doctrines which he claimed were revealed to him. In so doing they were, of course, wholly in conflict with Islam. They were not so, however, in so far as they simply said that some revelations came in response to special practical requirements of the Prophet's life. Revelations (in the belief of Islam) were sent down, sometimes at the Prophet's request, often to solve or to explain some particular, temporary situation in Mecca or Medina. This in no way affected their eternal character, since they were none the less taken from the Heavenly Book. This conception is alien to anything familiar to Christians, who never understood that Islam saw no inconsistency in it. Ad hoc revelation was thought to be its own condemnation.

The chapters that follow attempt to trace the course that historic fact was made to follow, in order to serve these polemic purposes.

Chapter 11.

The Jāhilīyah: Arabia before Muhammad.

The Arabia into which Muhammad was born is of crucial importance for the study of Muhammad's life. This is obvious now, and seemed equally so to mediaeval writers. They would be concerned to show that Muhammad was a low-born pagan upstart who pretended to receive revelations in order to maintain his rule, and whose power was spread by violence; whose lascivious practices, finally, were unparalleled. If Muhammad were such, it would be necessary to show how Arabia could have accepted him. A satisfactory explanation would depend not only on the cunning, the political skill and the religious devices of the Prophet, but also on the ignorance of the pagan Arabs and to some extent on the malice of the Arabian Jews.

It is remarkable that Christian and Latin writers, reflecting Muslim Arabic practice, emphasised the descent of Muhammad. The most popular account in the Middle Ages, constantly reproduced, began by saying that Muhammad, prince of the Arabs and pseudo-prophet, was of the race of Ismael, son of Abraham.[1] It would be difficult to exaggerate the wide distribution of this statement throughout this period, and its general sense in some form or other was almost universal.[2]

---

1. Hugh of St. Victor; Hugh of Fleury; Gerald; St.Albans Chr.; Martin the Pole; Vincent 23.39; Marino,III.2; Cont.Chr.Isidori; Dandalo.
2. Sigebert; Viterbo (XVI,yr.612);Vitry V; Alv.,de leg.XVIII/18M; Paris; Quad.rep.,II; Rod.,XCIV; Higden; Verona (XI); Ludolf (VIII); Guido,opening paragraph; Chiose s.Dante; Anon.Fior.; Tripoli,25,27; Humb.,Op.Trip. (I.VII)

Occasionally the whole lineage of Muhammad was given.[1] It was frequently associated with argument that 'Saracens' impudently and wrongly claimed their name from Sara, and should be called Agarenes, as, by writers of principle, they very often were.[2] The term Ismaelite was also used. This was not just an empty pedantry; the Ismaelite descent of the Arabs, and of the Prophet in particular, had its appropriate significance. For Peter the Venerable this was polemic. From the brotherhood of Ismael and Isaac, sons of Abraham by the maidservant and by the free woman, he inferred a community of blood and language among Arabs and Jews which he trusted would persuade Muslims to accept the Christian canon of Old Testament books.[3] William of Auvergne saw in Muhammad and the rise of the Arabs the fulfilment of the divine purpose: "I will make the son also of the bondwoman a great nation".[4] For William of Tripoli also, a promise to the seed of the unfortunate Ismael, but a very different promise, was fulfilled in Muhammad, who was "wild and powerful to pitch his tents against all men".[5] There is also the suggestion that

---

1. Paris; Cron.de Esp.,XCIV; not in Viterbo; cf. de gen. Machumet and Chr. Mendosa.
2. cf.Vitry V; Paris; Anon.Fior.; Higden; Verona,X,XI; Ludolf's more original argument did not jibe at the 'Saracen'; he explained that Sara in her nobility had adopted Ismael. James of Acqui found a similar explanation: the descendants of the slave were correctly named from the wife. He also suggested that it was part of the Islamic deception of the Arabs to promise them the name of Sara in place of that of Agar.
3. C.S.S.,II.27
4. de leg.XVIII/18M; Gen.XXI.13. See p. 463
5. II; Gen.XVI. 12.

the lawlessness of a class of men who followed customs unsympathetic to the writer was characteristic of the whole religion of Islam, which sprang from a desert milieu. Before him, Jacques de Vitry, bishop of William's own city of ʿAkka, had developed the same theme less fully.[1] San Pedro presented another similar view. He found it strange that Muhammad should wish to claim descent from the cursed and disinherited son; fitting that he should be three hundredth in descent from Abraham, a figure of thirty pieces of silver to betray the people of Christ.[2] It seemed to him, too, natural to argue that Islam fulfilled the evil destiny of the progeny of Ismael, whom Abraham had cast off for his depraved idolatry from tender years; the issue of the illegitimate had always struggled against the legitimate succession, and the Arabs might be expected to raise up enemies to the Church.[3] There was a strong sense of this great but evil destiny that lay behind Muhammad.

In Tripoli's remarks and in the works of other writers, there is something of the distrust felt by the citizen for the desert nomad, a matter which goes beyond religious differences, but which here served a polemic end. There was some sympathy for the Meccans who persecuted Muhammad, in spite of their paganism, and in contrast the simplicity of the people of Madina and the desert was often contemptuously specified. No doubt there was always some common cause with any opponent of the

---

1. V.
2. S.S.M., I.i.38.
3. ibid., viii. 2 - 8.

Prophet, but it was seen as natural that because of their simplicity the desert Arabs should be deceived, and perhaps that the Meccans, whose character as merchants was known, should disbelieve. The phrases of writers in the Latin States were nearly enough echoed by those writers who never saw an Arab in their lives. The actual differences in Muhammad's Ḥijāz between Mecca and Medina, and the presence of Jews, were often realised, but often very much confused.[1] There was some thought for the historical context. Arabia was thought to be in a free and general mercantile relation with Egypt and Syria. Muhammad was generally dated, following the Greeks, in the reign of Heraclius, and after the restoration of the True Cross in the victorious Persian campaign; where it was suitable the chroniclers also quoted the year of the Visigothic King of Spain, the Papal and other regnal years; the year of grace was often muddled.[2] Despite minor errors and occasional anachronisms,[3] the world situation at the time of the rise of Islam was more clearly understood than the situation within the Arabian peninsular.

---

1. Thus the Corozan text, so often reproduced, spoke of how Jews and Arabs flocked to him in a frenzy, as the Messias expected by the Jews. Fleury; Gerald; St. Albans; Vincent, loc. cit.; Marino, loc.cit.; Dandalo; Cont. Chr. Isid.
2. Anastasius Bibliothecarius is the principal source for this accurate dating which is clear in almost every author who made any sort of historical statement about Muhammad. Of Anastasius Hugh of Fleury said "pauca quidem locutus est, sed quibus temporibus fuerit lucide designavit". (M.G.H.)
3. The most masterly anachronism was that perpetrated by Hildebert of Mans who placed Muhammad in the fourth century; but so monumental a mistake occurred only among relations fantastic in every other respect also, and such extreme fantasy was confined to the literary tradition. Hist. de M.

Pedro de Alfonso, presumably representing a Jewish tradition, said that in Muhammad's time the inhabitants of Arabia were "for the most part soldiers and farmers, and almost all idolators, except for some who held the Mosaic law according to the Samaritan heresy, and others who were Christians - Nestorians and Jacobites."[1] This reflected very obscurely the state of things in Mecca and Medina, fused indistinguishably together. Godfrey of Viterbo, who imagined that Muhammad's mother was a Jewess, and his father a pagan, possibly reflected the same idea yet more dimly.[2] Mark of Toledo repeated a pun which may have circulated in different forms. Mecca means <u>adulteria</u> (<u>moecha</u>); the city "went away from the truth after strange gods; she worshipped empty idols, leaving God, her lawful husband, like a prostitute, and substituting many gods to herself, she perpetrated an impious adultery".[3] He also spoke of the Arabs as "rough and untaught" but he said that information about the Christian and Jewish religions reached Muhammad. Roderick of Toledo said that at the time of the birth of Muhammad Arabia and Africa were torn between the Catholic faith, the Arian heresy, the Jewish perfidy, and idolatry; Muhammad's father, he said, fluctuated between the Catholics and the Jews.[4] Mecca owed its importance in

---

1. V.; An. Min.,16.
2. XVI, yr. 612
3. Pref. Q. San Pedro Pascual gave a different version of this pun; Mecca means adulteress in Latin, "a deviation from the right law, and so Muhammad fulfilled the signification of the city". (S.S.M. I.i.l.)
4. Hist. Arab. I; cf. Cron. de Esp., XCV/467.

Arabia to its many idols;[1] this interesting statement was not more fully substantiated.

These accounts, most of which originated in Spain, show a marked interest in the Meccan situation, in contrast to works which particularised, if at all, about Medina. There is a description in the Historia Arabum of the rebuilding of the Kaʿbah in pagan times, which seems to derive, directly or indirectly, from ibn Ishaq. Roderick or his sources elsewhere thought of the Meccans as idolators, but here the Quraysh appear, as patrons and as participants, in the restoration of a church, the Kaʿbah being thus designated.[2] At the same time, the sanctity of the Black Stone was realised.[3] Although much of the story is confused, parts accurately reflect the Islamic source. Muhammad was chosen to put the Black Stone in position, because it was agreed that the next to enter by a particular door should do so. He suggested that four of the Quraysh should lift it in his mantle, while he as mason fixed it in place. This was greeted as a miracle,[4] and thus Muhammad was first recognised as a prophet. A Meccan critic was astonished that he should be preferred to so many elders, and foretold that he would bring trouble. Roderick thought that on this occasion Muhammad persuaded the Quraysh to pray towards the Kaʿbah.[5]

---

1. Cron. de Esp. CXXI/493
2. In view of the Catholic element in Arabia which Roderick imagined, this is not perhaps inconsistent.
3. The Spanish, but not the Latin text, showed misunderstanding of this sanctity, which it attributed to its magnetism, a confusion with the burial legend.
4. From this point the story is of course very much misunderstood.
5. Hist.Arab.III;Cron.de Esp.CXI; cf. Ibn Isḥāq 122-125. This supposes either that there could have been a qiblah before Islam, or that Islam began at this moment.

Here Christian and pagan and Islamic elements are curiously confused. Another point of interest is that the figures of the elders of the Quraysh appear in the discussion as a responsible Council, almost like City Fathers criticised for accepting the leadership of their junior. Mecca as a city of merchants of limited wealth was not an uncommon theme.

A great many authors of different origins reported Muhammad's travels as a youth with a merchant, or as himself a merchant or a merchant's camel-herd.[1] The conception of Mecca in the quadruplex reprobatio and in San Pedro's work was still clearer. In the former Muhammad was the most trusted agent of Khadīǰah, a rich female merchant accustomed to trade through agents.[2] From San Pedro's writings can be extracted an image of Mecca which within its limits is even more lucid. When he was speaking of the first Muslims he said that Abū Bakr was "a merchant, as all the rest of the inhabitants of Mecca were merchants"; the other merchants were disposed to listen to him, who knew their ways. When the "citizens" knew that their "fellow citizens" were beginning to be converted, they determined after disagreements and dissensions to challenge Muhammad, either to renounce his "madness", the demon who possessed him, which would bring wars on their city; or else to work miracles (to prove the spirit to be a good one) making the mountains which circumscribed them so closely to recede: "thou dost well know

---

1. Below, p. 294
2. Quad.rep., II. Cf. Ibn Isḥāq 119.

that no other people possesses a more confined territory or a more arid land than we". They were prepared to bribe him with riches and power.[1] A much simpler and less legendary version of the same episode in the reprobatio also left the most uninformed reader with an impression of the poverty of the cultivable land around Mecca, waterless and narrowly enclosed by mountains.[2] It does not, like San Pedro, impress us also with the sophisticated deliberations of the Quraysh, merchants of some substance, despite the poverty of their farming land. How closely San Pedro was able to follow Muhammad's fortunes is in contrast to a widespread vagueness.[3] An illustration of his treatment, still precise when it ceases to be accurate, is his presentation of events leading to the revelation of verses about the Seven Sleepers in sūrah 18. The pagans of Mecca sent to Medina to consult the Jews about the Messias they expected. The Jews set a threefold test, consisting in questions about the Seven Sleepers of Ephesus, Alexander the Great and the soul of man. Muhammad reserved his answer, promising it for the day following and not making it till much later, when he had taken secret advice. His final answer to the first two was fabulous,[4] and to the last brief and obscure, "because he did not know".[5] San Pedro was conscious

---

1. S.S.M.I.i.23,24. Cf. Ibn Isḥāq 188.
2. VII.
3. Below, passim
4. That is, the Qur'anic version did not agree with the current Christian fables.
5. San Pedro's account suits Ibn Isḥāq's (192-197). In al-Baiḍāwī (quoted Sale p.235,240) the Jews said that the true prophet would not be able to answer all three questions and the "obscurity" of the third answer was therefore part of Muhammad's triumph.

of much of the absurdity of his version, and reproached the Jews for not having given the true signs of the Messias. In this story the prudent Meccans contrast with the unorthodox Medinan Jews, whom San Pedro was inclined to blame for the early success of Islam.[1] He liked to dwell on the incredulity of the Meccans, their suspicion that Muhammad had a secret teacher, their rationalist ridicule of his mi'rāj, proclaimed before their assembly; "and I indeed," said San Pedro, "say to you, inhabitants of Mecca . . . that it would have been better if you had persevered in resisting Muhammad . . ."[2] He was willing to admit that Muhammad had done well to speak against the pagans who worshipped many gods.[3]

Jacques de Vitry also found it difficult not to appear to approve the Meccans for wanting nothing to do with Muhammad's empty words; he described too how the Prophet went to Medina where the greater part of the people were Jews and the rest "idolators, rough and untaught, who had never or rarely heard the preaching of the truth; seeing those poor and uneducated men easy to seduce . . ."[4] There was a distinct tendency to elaborate and extend what in the Risālah was only a hint.[5] The Syrian Apology, in very similar terms, spoke of "Arabs, villani, uneducated people, who had never seen a prophet".[6] They were

---

1. S.S.M.I.i.27 ff.
2. S.S.M. I.viii.220,221; cf. vii.10. Cf. Ibn Isḥāq, 264,5.
3. S.S.M. I.viii.62.
4. VI.
5. The Risālah spoke of Medina as a destroyed city inhabited by poor Jews. Tol. MS. p.295, col.2; Vinc.,23,42. Cf. Muir, p.44.
6. Paris; Viterbo.

"rough, uneducated, simple men, easy to seduce and fleshly, as in the poem:

Et nos in vitium caterva sumus".[1]

William of Auvergne had meanwhile taken it for granted that the Qur'an, in formulating Islamic law, had been compelled to endorse pre-existing ignorance and barbarity.[2] Fra Fidenzio, in an account which shares some of its sources with Mark of Toledo three generations earlier, and also perhaps with the Cronica de Espana, spoke of Mecca's being given specially to the worship of idols, and, confusing it with Medina, as inhabited by "two peoples, of which one was heathen and idol-worshipping, and the other in fact was Jewish". He too spoke of the simplicity and roughness of the people which made them easy to deceive.[3] Humbert of Romans spoke of "bestial people"[4] and Ludolf left no doubt of the practical observation which would appeal to the pilgrim, when he wrote, in a phrase much less formal than most, of "rough men wandering in the deserts".[5]

Lull had no deep interest in unphilosophical aspects of Islam; yet he had some sense of history, and was fond of calling Medina by its old name of Yathrib,[6] but he ignored or was ignorant of the Medinan Jews. He instructed his son how

---

1. Not in Viterbo.
2. De leg.,XVIII/18.R; Benedict in his précis omits.
3. XIV
4. Op.Trip. VI.6.
5. VIII.
6. Catalan: 'Tripe'.

"Yathrib and Mecca and all that province were full of people who believed in idols, and who adored the sun and the moon and the beasts and the birds, and had no knowledge of God, and had no King, and were people of little discretion and little understanding".[1] This nature worship, which lacks ground in fact, he owed to his imagination; but he owed, either to the same or to his experience of Islam, a remark of greater penetration, when he said that this "gross people" had no belief in anything after death, and described Muhammad's preaching (in a distorted form) as essentially of Judgement and the heavenly reward.[2] In another work, in which he imagined the learned men of different religions competing for the soul of a heathen, he conceived the Muslim representative's pointing out that at one time, in the city of Yathrib, where Muhammad was prophet, all the people were "bare of faith and the knowledge of God", like the potential convert to whom he was speaking.[3] Acqui noted that the "Saracens" had always been a nation, but had inherited no law save that of circumcision, as he supposed, from Ismael. Islam, he maintained, was successfully preached in the first place to crude and simple mountaineers to whom a promise of greatness would appeal. The Anonimo Fiorentino resembled Lull in stressing the "grossness of judgement and of customs" of the Arabians, who had no lord, no king and no law. He also

---

1. D.P., 71.3.
2. Ibid. 8 ff. His argument here recalls Humbert's.
3. Liber de Gent., IV.iii.

contrasted Medina (which he did not name) with Mecca (which he called Lamech), in that the former was inhabited partly by Jews and partly by pagans. In sum, authors who could not distinguish the societies of Mecca and Medina spoke of the Arabs as excessively simple idolators. Those who could distinguish thought of Mecca as pagan, but often as bourgeois and directly or by implication as superior to Medina, which was divided between Jews and the more illiterate pagans.

The idolatry of Arabia was seen always as a fitting background to Muhammad. The coming of his call relatively late in life and the admitted paganism of his youth were, to the Western mind, highly discreditable; this contrasts with the modern idea that it is more creditable to turn to monotheism by one's own genius than otherwise. Often associated with an idolatrous youth was, quite mistakenly, an ignoble birth, to make a bad beginning worse. Muhammad, the Cluniac summula tells us, was "base by birth, at first a follower of the ancient idolatry, as were all the other Arabs of his time;" and he "lived a barbarian among barbarians and an idolator himself among idolators". Pedro de Alfonso had quoted the Qur'an and was followed by other writers at scattered times; this is the Legenda Aurea version:

> Muhammad, deprived of both his parents, spent the years of his boyhood under the care of his uncle, and he served the considerable idol-worship of the Arabs with the whole of his people, as he witnessed in his Qur'an, that God said to him: thou wast an orphan and I received thee, thou didst remain long in the error of idolatry and I led you from it, thou wast poor and I made thee rich. 1.

1. Cf. Pedro de Alfonso, Higden, Benvenuto; but Varagine's is best. (Q.,XCIII,6-8). These followed Pedro. The same text was translated differently by Peter of Toledo. (MS.p.295.1.; Vinc.,23.41)

Mark of Toledo in terms that are not dissimilar spoke of the Prophet as sprung from demon-worshipping Arabia, but from a royal line; his parents were noble "secundum gradus seculi"; his father's name was "Habedileth, that is, the slave of the idol Leth".[1] Fra Fidenzio expanded the same framework, insisting again that Muhammad worshipped idols in his youth.[2] William of Tripoli imagined the Christian Baḥīrā's teaching Muhammad to "fly the worship of idols"[3] and the quadruplex reprobatio stressed that Muhammad committed "the sin of idolatry" until he was forty years of age, quoting the Qur'an in these terms: "it says that God found Muhammad in error - that is, in error about the laws of God - and directed him"; the point seemed so important as to need further support by reference to al-Bukhārī.[4] San Pedro represented the Satanic verses as an attempt by Muhammad to compromise with prevalent paganism.[5] He condemned equally severely the inconsistent Islamic treatment of incantations and other magic formulas and practices which existed in Arabia and which were sometimes forbidden, sometimes tolerated and sometimes said to have been used by Muhammad, "as old women are accustomed to do."[6] The devil, said Ricoldo,

---

1. Pref. Q.; that is, 'Habedileth' represents 'Abdullat' (ʿAbd al-Lāt); it is possible that the author had in mind the "Satanic verses" which purported to be revelations recognising Al-Lāt and other goddesses. San Pedro, and he alone, referred to these explicitly. (p. 3) But cf. de gen. Machumet, Bibl. p.206. Cf. M. Th. d'Alverny, Introduction, Marc de Tolède.
2. XIV
3. II
4. II. Q., loc. cit. Bu., 64.85? Not traced as cited.
5. See p. 181 n 3
6. S.S.M. I.i.19-21; I.iv.3,4.

chose an idolator for his purposes; and Ricoldo thought it inconsistent to claim to be a great prophet after spending a pagan youth.[1] He also attacked the Qur'anic attitude to magic.

There was also the question of Muhammad's immediate background: he was brought up by "a certain man, a heathen and an idolator", a "heathen priest" and an "idolator".[2] In those who knew the sources, there was some insistence also on the admission that various of Muhammad's relations, his parents, and those of his children who died before his call, died pagan and went to Hell. The reprobatio mentioned this specifically, and San Pedro noted in their turns the names of those who were heathens when they died.[3] Lull, too, pointed out that Muhammad's parents were idolators,[4] and that before he became Prophet he had sinned in ignorance.[5] Higden said that he served the cult of idolatry with all the Arabian people; by a curious irony Trevisa translated idolatry here by "mawmetrie".[6]

Although paganism was the formative influence upon Muhammad according to this view, there was little serious attempt to diminish his mission to summon the pagans from their idolatry. He "taught that . . . the multiplicity of gods should be left behind", said the summula; and, according to Mark of Toledo, "he considered within himself how he should

---

1. Cf. the phrase ritu idolatra. Disp., VI, XIII; cf. Pennis, XIV f. 43v.
2. Vitry (cf. Paris, Viterbo); Anon. Fior.; Marino.
3. Quad. rep., II; S.S.M.I.i. passim; Ibn Isḥāq, 121.
4. Hamar, signum 32.
5. Lib. de Gent., IV, VIII.
6. Rolls Series, as bibliography.

convert the Arabs and all other nations to faith in the one God, and how he should destroy idolatry, as far as could be, in those regions . . ."[1] This picture of Arabia recalls that idea of it as divided between different religions which was later described by Roderick, Mark's patron; Fra Fidenzio, using perhaps the same source as Mark rather than Mark's own version, reproduced substantially the same story.[2] Roderick was particularly interested by the unpopularity of Muhammad in Mecca: ". . . and there, in the course of many disagreements, by preaching that one God only should be adored, he very often quarrelled with those who were of the race of the Quraysh and adored idols . . ."[3] Although these statements all derive from Spain, there was a general awareness of the paganism which surrounded Muhammad in his youth and which Islam destroyed.[4]

The contrary fable that showed Islam as an apostacy from a recent conversion to Christianity was largely literary. In all its many varieties, this bizarre tale, which has received the attention of modern authors,[5] seems to derive from the idea that Islam was formulated out of Christian elements. The association with Nicholas the New Testament heresiarch,[6]

---

1. Pref. Q., p.262
2. loc. cit.
3. Hist. Arab., I. The Quraysh, said the same work later, wished to be left in peace with their idolatry. It was realised that, in the dispute, Abū Ṭālib protected Muhammad but himself remained a pagan. Ibid. VI.
4. Cf. e.g. Acqui: varia ydola from which Muhammad called the pagans. Cf. also William of Auvergne.
5. d'Ancona, Ziolecki.
6. Liber Nicholay; summula; Mark, Pref. Q.

the popular story which made Muhammad a disappointed cardinal, or the pupil of a disappointed monk or cleric, frustrated in his ambition, who perverted his own converts to spite the Roman Church:[1] these supposed that Islam arose in a Christian people, recently converted. The poems of Waltherius and du Pont, the story as Guibert told it, the even stranger fancies of Hildebert, seem to take for granted a Christian nation of long standing. The Continuation of the Chronicle of Isidore combined the themes of the grossness of the Ismaelites - "sicut bruta animalia quibus non est intellectus" - with that of renegade Christianity: "derelicta fide catholica . . ." The Ottimo Comento spoke of Muhammad as apostate, and San Pedro, when he came to give that Christian version of the Prophet's life whose authenticity he knew could be doubted but whose polemic value he was unwilling to neglect, described Maurus the apostate who perverted Muhammad and the recently converted Arab people.[2] This idea had its secular counterpart, by which the Muslims were conceived to have rebelled against the power of (East) Rome.[3] There was no other serious treatment of this theme. The idea that pre-Islamic Arabia was Christian must be connected with a series of interrelated ideas: the supposition that the Qur'an was a plagiarism of the New Testament and the Old; the idea that Islam developed historically as a heresy; the belief that the Apostles had converted the entire world;[4] and finally

---

1. See Ziolecki and d'Ancona.
2. S.S.M. I.viii. 2 ff.
3. Rod., Hist. Arab., III, IV; Cont. Chron. Isid. It was more usual to suppose a separate or external power which grew at the expense of Rome.
4. See p. 423

the memory of the actual loss to Christendom of such provinces as Syria and Egypt.

More often pre-Islamic Arabia was conceived to have been on the fringe of the Christian world and a natural refuge for Christian exiles or outlaws. Nearly every Christian author has held that Muhammad constructed his religion out of Christian and Jewish constituents; almost as general in the time with which we are concerned was the belief that he had actual Christian and Jewish teachers, or, in some cases, only a Christian one. This Christian was almost always identified as a heretic, and, except in William of Tripoli's idea of Baḥīrā, he was characterised as exceptionally malicious. Where his malice was directed against Rome, we may assume the influence of the Muhammad-cardinal story; at the other extreme of unreality was the hermit of Waltherius, whose motive was ignoble fear.[1] San Pedro, although he had doubts about the "Christian" Maurus legend, thought it most likely that certain episodes known from Arabic sources, for example, the delay in revelation about the Seven Sleepers of Ephesus, and the accusation made by the Quraysh that Muhammad had a foreign teacher, would best be explained if such a learned Christian mentor had existed as Muhammad might have consulted secretly.[2] There was plenty of apparently well-informed detail

1. Cf. also du Pont. The Alexandrian hermit of Guibert seems to link the "disappointed cardinal" with the Waltherius - du Pont hermit, since he shares some characteristics with each. Cf. also the Alexandrian ecclesiastical dispute in Tripoli, V. 2, S.S.M.,I.vii.14; cf. I.i.26.

about this person available.

A rapid conspectus of the true Sergius legend[1] will illustrate how the penetration of Arabia by Christian and Jewish missionaries was imagined. The true Sergius was a Christian monk or cleric who was expelled for heresy, or for crime and heresy, and having found Muhammad in Arabia, remained to teach him the Biblical material from which he compounded Islam. Variants portrayed Sergius alone, nearly always with some biographical material, or else in company with Jews who were sometimes identified and sometimes treated vaguely. William of Auvergne described Sergius as working alone, in a passage which seems to reveal a less clear idea of the Councils of the Church than of pre-Islamic Arabia:

> After Eutyches and Nestorius his master were condemned by the Constantinopolitan synod, actually for denying the double nature in Christ, that is, the divine and the human, this Sergius crossed into Arabia, where, simulating the eremitical life, he appeared to be of such piety and holiness that Muhammad wanted to make him his teacher; and sometimes he called him Gabriel the archangel, hiding and not daring to reveal that the lunacies which he delivered to the men whom he deceived he had learned from a man. [2]

The Syrian Apology spoke of a monk called Solus or Sosius who was expelled from the Church for heresy, who found Muhammad in a place where there were both Jews and pagans, and taught him from the two Testaments; he changed his name to Nestor (Nastoreus).[3] This version was accepted by Matthew who wrote

---

1. In discussing the Sergius legend I am excluding the Baḥīrā legend in its Muslim form, and I have already mentioned the more fabulous Christian forms. It is a question here only of the main story in a form which is strictly verisimilitudinous, however untrue in fact. The invention of Sergius is still really unexplained.
2. A confusion of Ephesus, Oec. III(431) with Constantinople III, Oec. VI(680)? de leg. XVIII/18P. Cf. Benedict.
3. Paris, Viterbo.

'Natoreus' over the text of the Flores.[1] Varagine, in the Legenda Aurea, preferred the alternative which made Sergius an expelled Nestorian monk to that in which he was the Antiochene Jacobite archdeacon whom Pedro de Alfonso invented.[2] Not only San Pedro, but also the reprobatio, cited the reproach made by the Quraysh that Muhammad had a foreign helper.[3] Lull gave Muhammad's teacher the name of Nicholas, and the character of a recluse in the country round Jerusalem.[4] Benvenuto, when he

---

1. Paris, yr. 622.
2. Thomas of Pavia wrote of a "Christian but Nestorian" monk, and alternatively of a cleric expelled from the Church; this part of his account is very close to Varagine's.
3. Q.,XVI. 10315; San Pedro,S.S.M.,I.vii.10; quad.rep. VII. The reprobatio quoted "a certain man of Armenia called Raḥmān", i.e. "a man from Yamāmah, named Raḥmān"=Musaylimah. The source is Ibn Isḥāq,200. The printed text of the reprobatio has Rahinet and Armenia. B.N.Ms. has Ramen and Armenia (f.193 v.2). In the Berlin Mss. Th. lat. Qu. 85 and Fol. 425 the form of the country is difficult to read; each has both Rahymen and Rahynet. (f.244 v. and f. 125 v. col.2 respectively)
4. D.P. 4. The choice of the name Nicholas seems to indicate that Lull was here influenced by the story relating Muhammad to the New Testament heresiarch, or, more probably, by some version ultimately deriving from it.

described the Nestorian refugee Sergius, said that Muhammad held this teacher secretly near himself, so that when he consulted him he could say he was speaking to the archangel Gabriel.[1]

Other variants distinguished Jewish informants in addition to Sergius, usually without identifying them. The summula tells us that Sergius, a Nestorian heretic expelled by the Church, crossed into Arabia and joined Muhammad, who was also joined by Jews who told him, not the truth of Scripture, but those fables of theirs which the Qur'an is full of, compounde "as much of Jewish fables as of heretical nursery-rhymes". The Annotator of the Cluniac Qur'an said, more vaguely, that the Qur'an misrepresented the Old and New Testaments by versions Muhammad had learned from Jews and heretics.[2] It was Talmudic

---

1. This seems to be related to the suggestion by William of Auvergne that Muhammad called his teacher Gabriel, which would give every Muslim statement about Gabriel an esoteric meaning to Christians. In giving these main variants many others have been ignored. Higden, puzzled by the existence of the variants, and also Varagine, preferred to explain Sergius as expelled Nestorian monk or archdeacon of Antioch or Patriarch of Jerusalem, than as spiteful Roman cleric. Peter de Pennis also put forward the two versions: that of the "famous cleric at the Roman court" and the less flamboyant story of the heretic Sergius, but expressed no preference. The gloss on the Clementine canons supposed that "a certain noble Roman cleric" who, disgruntled, apostatised, brought Muhammad up. James of Acqui associated two advisers, Nicolas and Sergius, but made Muhammad the leader in this gang of rogues. Marino inserted the Sergius story at its simplest into an account otherwise derived from the Corozan form. It was even possible to combine the 'cardinal' story with the normal Sergius one: Ludolf described Sergius as a monk of St. Benedict, expelled as usual for Nestorianism, but also as disappointed by the Roman court of coveted honours, so that in revenge he trained Muhammad and wrote the Qur'an for him. Alv. de leg., XVIII/18P; Marino, loc. cit.; Pennis, II (f.15 v.)

2. Ad az. 2 (Bibl. p.224; MS. CCCD 184, p. 50, foot col.2)

influence that the Cluniacs recognised in the inaccuracy of the Old Testament stories in the Qur'an.[1] Jacques de Vitry believed that there was an apostate and heretical monk expelled from Rome who found Muhammad not yet widely accepted as a prophet, and who, joined by a certain Jew, persuaded him like other prophets to give a law to his people.[2] Oliver of Paderborn spoke simply of a certain Jew and of Sergius, monk, apostate and heretic.[3] Fra Fidenzio's account, although it shares some passages with Mark of Toledo's, is much fuller. Both had thought that Muhammad chose Islam as being a mixture of Christianity, which was too hard for the Arabs, and of Judaism, which was unsympathetic to them. Fidenzio, unlike Mark, led up to this point by saying that Sergius, excommunicate Nestorian monk, had not only taught both Testaments to Muhammad, but perhaps made him a Nestorian; subsequently three malicious Jews, afraid that if Muhammad were Christian the Jews would suffer, had also tried to convert him. Thus it was natural

---

1. d'Ancona says that the Cluniac inclination to blame the Jews should be related rather to a contemporary outbreak of anti-Judaism than to any perception of historical reality. Since the influence of the Talmud at least on popular Islam is unquestioned and many Western scholars to-day suppose it to have been considerable on the Qur'an, the burden of proof should rest with him who claims that the Cluniac view was not based on the facts. Whether contemporary events or opinions drew their attention to the facts is another matter. Peter the Venerable was proud of Christian toleration of Jews. C.S.S. I. 12.
2. VI. The idea that Muhammad claimed to have received a revelation subsequently to making his claim to be a prophet is an indication of how far history might be reversed by too much interest in the Sergius tale.
3. Ep. Sal.; cf. Hist. Dam.

that he should have sought a third course.[1]

It was Pedro de Alfonso who in the beginning of this period thought he could identify the Jews concerned in the tuition of Muhammad. He said that a Jacobite archdeacon,[2] who was a friend of Muhammad's, was condemned by the Council for heresy; he joined Muhammad, and he and two Samaritans, Abdias and Cahbalahabar, between them concocted the Qur'an out of the two heresies, Christian and Jewish; this appealed successfully to the inhabitants of Arabia, some of whom already followed one or other of the heresies separately. The great majority of the people were idolators; any that did not choose to follow the new sect were compelled to do so. Pedro's sources may have been similar to those of the Contrarietas, which is here more summary, but from which much later Ricoldo borrowed, in this, as in so many other matters.[3] In this case Ricoldo wanted to make the authenticity of his own version particularly clear; "it is very well known in all the parts of the East that Muhammad had three teachers, that is, two Jews, the name of the

---

1. Fid., XIV; Mark, Pref. Q. Just as Ludolf managed to combine elements of the Muhammad-cardinal story with the usual story of Sergius working alone upon Muhammad, the Anonimo Fiorentino combined them with a version that included both Sergius and a Jew: "Golgare Sergio" was a disappointed magnate at the Roman court, who heard of and joined Muhammad, as did "in a similar way" (whatever that can mean) a learned Jew.
2. This author was more ignorant of Jacobitism than of Islam: he described the tenets of the former as belief in circumcision and in Christ's being a mere just man, conceived of the Holy Ghost, who neither was crucified nor died.
3. Cap. V. (MS. f.243 v.) Cf. also Herman's Doctrina Machumet (Bibliander p. 189). The Risālah, which gave a prominent position to Sergius, and asserted an interpolation of Jewish elements after the Prophet's death, does not here seem to be an immediate source. (Muir p. 70 ff.)

one being Salon the Persian[1] and of the other ʿAbdallāh, which means slave of God, the son of Sela.[1] These became Muslims and taught (the Prophet) many things from the Old Testament and from the Talmud". The Christian element he took from a different source, possibly a collation of Pedro de Alfonso with William of Tripoli: a monk, whose name was Baheyyin (for Baḥīrā) a Jacobite, who told him "many things from the New Testament and some things from a certain book of the infancy of the Saviour and of the seven sleepers; and these things he wrote in his Qur'an".[2] Although Ricoldo's sources were written and Spanish, rather than oral and Eastern as he claimed, this part of his work is nicely blended to convince. It was still impressive in Prideaux's day;[3] and the summary of apocryphal Christian elements is neat.

In these stories there was almost every permutation of a few basic versions. The teaching of Christian and Jewish doctrine to Muhammd was common to all, whether it was imparted by both Christian and Jewish teachers, or solely by a Christian

---

1. Salman the Persian, who was not a Jew, but who has often been identified as the man referred to by sūrah XVI.105; ʿAbdallāh ibn Salām was a Jew.
2. Ibn. XXXV, cf. Disp., XIII, VI. In his Disputatio Ricoldo pointed out that Nestorian was inherently more probable than Jacobite influence; he referred to Tripoli's legend of Baḥīrā as living with Muhammad till "as some say" he killed him. Cf. M. de V., Lib. de Pereg., p. 101 ff.; M. Th. d'Alverny, Marc de Tolède, Introduction.
3. Life of Muhammad, p. 178 ff, cf. p. 41

using the Old Testament. There was a persistent effort to reconcile the fabulous traditional Christian stories with the Muslim forms of stories about Muhammad. The sudden success of heretical Christianity and Talmudic Judaism in Arabia must greatly have strengthened in the minds of some readers the picture of ignorant and almost helpless paganism which had already been delineated; others would have retained the idea of a Christian pre-Islamic Arabia.

In the less fabulous writers Arabian society was fairly consistently represented. We may say that according to these pre-Islamic Arabia was wild and barbaric; a population illiterate and simple, everywhere or in the parts about Medina particularly, was largely ungoverned; and according to some authors reached its highest development in a merchant community in Mecca. The country was exposed to outside influences from the East Roman Empire, but in practice it was penetrated, not by the missionaries of orthodox Christendom, but by refugees from ecclesiastical conflict and by proselytisers of abnormal, eccentric religious opinions. The success of these missions was not among the superior mercantile community of Mecca which felt so much suspicion of Muhammad's claim, but with the rustic simplicity of the rough Medinan pagans, whose Jewish neighbours predisposed them to conversion. Muhammad himself, so much under their guidance, appeared as the natural and typical product of this world.

Chapter 12.

The early life of Muhammad.

Muhammad's personal origins as pauper et orphanus[1] were thought to be important, like the paganism of his upbringing. It was known that the Qur'an itself associated his early poverty, orphanhood and idolatry. The feudal West, with its strong sense of the propriety of secular lordship, added the reproach of low birth. This idea was rather less common than those of poverty and orphanhood from which it is presumably the unjustified inference. The impression of Muhammad's derelict[illegible]ion was very nearly universal and was associated with the marriage with Khadījah, by which he was "raised up from being an orphan and destitute": this one example will serve to represent a simple statement that it would be wearisome to repeat and that circulated very generally.[2] Very few writers would contrast gentle birth with this misfortune Mark of Toledo referred to Muhammad's royal line[3] and the quadruplex reprobatio, misquoting Ibn Isḥāq, to his noble family;[4] but some writers who lived equally close to Islam

---

1. Sigebert.
2. Cf. Oliver, Ep. Sal.; Guibert; summula; Pavia; Marino, III. II; Dandalo; Anon. Fior.; Benvenuto; Legenda Aurea; Ludolf.
3. Pref. Q.
4. Quad. rep. II; Ibn Isḥāq 120; Khadījah refers to "our relationship" in the latter, to "genus tuum nobile" in the former. (Sic Berlin MSS. and printed texts; B.N. MS. omits.) In the same chapter, earlier, Ibn Isḥāq is cited as the authority: in libro qui vocatur Ciar, id est actus Machometi= sirah (sīrat rasūl Allāh). B.N. MS. f.157 v.2. The printed text has Cyar, Berlin MSS. Cyas. (Qu. 85, f.240 v.; Fol. 425, f. 123 r.l.)

took the other view: "in fortune a poor man . . . base by birth and repute", said Ricoldo, and William of Tripoli, "the boy . . . was orphaned, sick, poor and low-class, a camel-herd".[1] In the more purely legendary aspect of the Prophet's life, du Pont's poem rendered the point about base birth with the most forceful expression. The most characteristic episode in the French poem is the fall of the well-born Khadījah from standards of gentility, rather than of morals, when her able but base-born steward Muhammad tempts her, with arguments that belong to the tradition of mediaeval satire on marriage, and overpersuades her into marriage with himself. Here the tragedy was misalliance and was sincerely felt. From so unholy a union, a "law" of heresy and sexual promiscuity sprang naturally, apparently of no less interest to the author than the initial disaster.[2] The majority opinion thus made Muhammad a poor orphan and an idolator, as the Qur'an says, and threw in the idea that he was base-born. All these were considered discreditable to him, chiefly, it seems, because he rose out of them. There was no feeling for the self-made man, save disapproval. There was, however, a sense of dramatic contrast between the poor orphan of humble origin and the princeps Saracenorum that he became.

About Muhammad's upbringing there were more sharply

---

1. Tripoli, II; Ric., Disp. XIII: fortuna pauperem . . . de genere et opinione vilis. (de genere not in MS.; supplied from Bart. Pic.)
2. Passim.

contrasting versions. The Muslim belief that he was illiterate is traditional and has served as an argument that the revelation of the Qur'an must be miraculous. To many Christians, to whom this seemed no proof of his mission, this same assertion appealed simply as derogation of the Prophet. He was often portrayed as a cipher, instructed by some more cunning, more malicious and better educated plotter. This was the scheme of the more fabulous stories, that reported as "Christian" by San Pedro, and those of Guibert and before him of Hildebert of Mans.[1] In prose alone the degree of Muhammad's tutelage varied in different versions from one extreme, according to which he was "brought up" by "a certain noble Roman cleric" apostate, to that which made him the most accomplished and knowledgeable of the conspirators.[2] The supposition that he was illiterate fitted into the idea that he was taught religion by heretical refugees from Christendom. The annotator of the Cluniac Qur'an took it for granted that what Muhammad owed to the Scriptures was under guidance of Jews and heretics.[3] The summula called him "almost entirely illiterate" and a "barbarian among barbarians". Mark of Toledo did not credit, but reported the claim to illiteracy.[4] William of Auvergne was not content that the Prophet should be called rustic: "it

---

1. S.S.M. I.viii.1 ff.
2. Clementinae; Acqui.
3. Above, p. 241
4. Pref. Q.; Q. VII. 156/158 Mark translated the word ummī twice, making certain of being both right and wrong, unless a word may be thought to contain alternative meanings simultaneously: "non novi litteras; maternus enim sum". This word is still the subject of discussion among orientalists. The traditional sense is illiterate. Motherly would not be impossible in another context. For Mark's Qur'an, see MS.f.

is, as one writer most truly said, clearly established that he was bovine or swinish".[1] Ricoldo, to whom alternative versions were certainly available, accepted the opinion that Muhammad was illiterate.[2] San Pedro pointed out that every Muslim not himself heretical in his own religion would maintain that the Prophet had not been educated; although he could not persuade himself to believe all the details which he reported of the "Christian" story of the monk who taught Muhammad, he was nearly sure that there was some such person on whom the Prophet depended for information about such erudite problems as that of the Seven Sleepers of Ephesus.[3] Ricoldo accepted the description of the Prophet as "homo ydiota";[4] Ludolf said that he was "rough and stupid", but showed his independence of usual sources by describing him as

> . . . known to no man, who himself knew nothing of his parenthood, but was an orphan left and found in the desert, sustained by strangers and finally made a camel-herd; and thus, as unknown to all, they believed him to have come from heaven.

This, no doubt, is some pilgrims' tale.

Learning about Christianity and Judaism from apostates of both religions in Arabia was compatible with either literacy or illiteracy, but stories not based upon these ecclesiastical refugees presumed Muhammad to have added craft

---

1. de leg., XVIII/18.0
2. Disp., XIII
3. S.S.M.,I.i.29; I.viii.237,246; cf. I.vii.14
4. Itin.,XXXV; Disp.,XIII

and learning, and very often magic, to a natural cunning. They attributed to him alone many characteristics which other writers divided between him and his corruptors. Early Waltherius (followed, of course, by du Pont) described his scholarship:

> Rethor, arismeticus, dialecticus et geometer, musicus, astrologus, grammaticusque fuit. 1.

He again appeared as highly educated in the Liber Nicholay. Mark of Toledo, and after him Fra Fidenzio, described how "in the period of his boyhood and adolescence he applied his mind to the study of letters, and gave his attention as far as he could in distant regions to becoming skilled in the mathematical arts".[2] It was "as a magician" that Mark said that he led astray the simple people.[3] Roderick believed that a Jewish astrologer and magician had been mentor to the Prophet's father as well as to the Prophet, who grew up instructed in the natural sciences and the Catholic Law and the Judaic Perfidy; this figure derived from the de generatione Machumet.[4] In the Cronica de Espana this learning became especially magical, and Muhammad became a figure famed for science:

> Este Mahomet era . . . muy sabidor en las artes a que llaman magicas e en aquesto tiempo era el ya uno de los mas sabios de Arabia et de Africa . . . 5

---

1. ~~Hist.~~ Arab. Hist., p. 379
2. Mark, Pref. Q.; Fid., XIV
3. Ibid.
4. Hist. Arab. II Bibl. p. 206 ff.
5. CVI/478

Later, some of the commentators on Dante thought of Muhammad as a necromancer, although Benvenuto spoke only of a natural astuteness and a knowledge of Scriptures.[1] Meanwhile, writers who used the Corozan story, like Hugh of Fleury and Geraldus and the St. Albans chronicler, knew him as "magus perfectissimus" or "nequissimus"; this was one of the items in the text represented in the precis of Martin the Pole.[2] For these and for some other writers Muhammad acquired magic in the course of travels. Higden said that he travelled and thus learned Christianity and Judaism and studied the magic arts.[3]

There was little authentically Islamic element in the stories of Muhammad's childhood. The quadruplex reprobatio was plain, straightforward and well-informed, except that its author chose to omit any reference to Abū Ṭālib.

> . . . his father was called ʿAbdullāh son of ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib, and his mother was named Āminah bint Wahb. His father died before his mother bore him, and after Muhammad reached the age of six, his mother died . . . After his mother bore him she sent to his grandfather ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib, (to say) that he should come to him. He came and took Muhammad his (grand)child, and entered his temple with him and adored his God, and gave thanks for such a blessing given to him, and returned him to his mother. After the death of his mother, however, he stayed with his same

---

1. Ott. Comm.; Anon. Fior.
2. Cf. also Vincent and Dandalo.
3. It is possible that these ideas were coloured by legends of Idrīs. Cf. E.I., Idrīs.

grandfather ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib, and when he reached the age of eight, that grandfather died. 1.

This comes direct from Ibn Isḥāq, but it is not obvious why the author selected the episode of the visit to the Kaʿbah. Perhaps it was because of the distant parallel with the Purification; every point where Muhammad's life seemed to try and to fail to emulate Christ's was popular. Otherwise these were bare bones. San Pedro was less accurate, but clothed the bones with material genuinely Islamic in origin. ʿAbdallāh died before Muhammad's birth, he said, but when Āminah sent to her husband's father, he replied that those who gave birth should bring up, and it was the maternal grandfather, named ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib, who gave the young Muhammad to the wet-nurse Halīmah.[2] The episode of the angelic visitation to cut out and wash the heart of the child who would become the Prophet he told separately from that of the wet-nurse's returning him to his mother, although the one derived from the other. He understood the angelic visitation to be alleged of the young Muhammad while he was with his foster-mother and herded

---

L. II. Ibn Isḥāq, 103. The B.N. Ms. gives an abbreviated version which is further from Ibn Isḥāq than that in the Berlin Mss. It speaks of his "giving thanks to his gods". The names are not badly transliterated in the surviving texts: Abdala, Abdalmutalib, Emina (Emma, Evina) filia Neph. Sic Berlin Mss.; B.N. Ms: el mina filia vehp.

2. The forms of the names were: Audalla, Hemina, Abdelautalip, Almiva. For abū Ṭālib, Avitalip (perhaps derived from the genitive, as in "ʿAlī ibn Abi Ṭālib").

sheep near the city. He pointed out that Muhammad was only two years and a few months old when he left Halīmah, and would have been too young to herd sheep while he was with her. He did not directly connect this episode with the foster-parents' having returned the child to his mother because (he said) they saw a devil possess him;[1] he knew that they made an excuse to the mother. He said that the mother died and the child stayed two years with his (paternal) grandfather, who left him at the age of eight to the guardianship of one of his sons, Abū Ṭālib, who educated him as the son of his brother: "whenever in the course of trading he took himself off somewhere, he took him with him, for he loved him very much".[2] The Historia Arabum gave a clearer account of the washed heart, but was most confused by names and dates in Muhammad's childhood.[3] Two angels came when the child was four

> and they cut out his heart, and they took a blackened clot of blood from it; and after they washed it in a bowl of snow; and they weighed his heart against ten hearts of his people, and after against a thousand, and it was found to be the heavier. One angel said to the other: 'If it were put in the scale with all the Arabs, it would outweigh them all.' He lied that he heard this in a vision from the angel Gabriel. 4

---

1. More accurately, because they feared a devil possessed him. Cf. Ibn Isḥāq.
2. S.S.M. I.i.3,4; I.vii.7; extracted from ibn Isḥāq, 103 - 115.
3. It gives ʿAlī as ʿAbdallāh's name; it says rightly that he died in Medina ('Hiatrib') but makes this happen after the birth of Muhammad. 'Halima' becomes the mother of 'Aemina', who when he was seven took him to see his relations, but she died, and another woman, 'Daymen', (Umm Aiman?) took him to Mecca. The parts of ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib and Abū Ṭālib are normal. Does the famine, said to have been when Muhammad was conceived, derive from the drought described by the true Halīmah ?
4. Hist. Arab. I; Ibn Isḥāq, 106.

Roderick, in spite of his confusion about these details, was aware that it was Abū Ṭālib who finally was responsible for the child, although, intruding the theme of the Jewish astrologer, he supposed him to have committed Muhammad to the latter as to a tutor.[1] William of Tripoli also realised that Muhammad was in the care of Abū Ṭālib when he travelled.[2] The author of the reprobatio was alone in ignoring Abū Ṭālib's part, among authors with real knowledge.

The presumption that Muhammad travelled in his youth was very widely spread, however; it could serve as an alternative explanation (to the "Sergius" story) of his supposed loans from existing religions, and it derived ultimately from genuine traditions, held by Muslims. The authors who employed the Corozan text held this alternative: "cum in prima aetate sua esset mercator . . ."; as merchant he often proceeded with his camels to Egypt and Palestine, where from Christians he learned some of the contents of the Old Testament, and also of the New.[3] Waltherius, most remote from accurate sources, had spoken of a journey to Ethiopia, Persia and the Indies.[4] Mark of Toledo, writing while the Corozan text was popular,

---

1. Hist. Arab. II; cf. Cron. de Esp., XCV/467, XCVII/469. He knew, too, that Abū Ṭālib protected Muhammad even later when the Quraysh attacked Islam, while himself remaining a pagan.
2. Below, p. 296
3. Hugh of Fleury; Geraldus; St. Albans; Vinc.; Leg. Aur.; Marino III.II; Cont. Chr. Isid.; Dandalo; cf. Martin the Pole.
4. 11.

spoke of Muhammad's travelling under pretext of being a merchant, and learning Syriac and Greek, and studying Christian sources.[1] The Cronica de Espana, incorporating the Corozan text, enlivened that unconvincing narrative with verisimilitudinous detail: ". . . wandering with his camels . . . from one part to another, laden with spices and other things, to make a profit . . ."[2] There was some variety in the descriptions of these journeyings; in a few cases they were told as having occurred after his marriage. Thomas of Pavia spoke of his using his control of Khadijah's wealth for merchant enterprise, "and going about everywhere from city to city, in a short time he became extremely rich". By contrast, Fra Fidenzio called him the hired servant of Khadījah. There was some late persistence of the idea that he was first employed by Khadījah's first husband, the faithful servant who later married the widow.[3] This note properly belonged to poetical romance.[4] Lull said that Muhammad learned from Micolaus (sic) the hermit in the country near Jerusalem,[5] and Higden said of him that ". . .by nature acute, he journeyed, thanks to trade, in many regions, and in repeated conversation with Jews and Christians learned the cult and rite of each religion. . ." James of Acqui spoke of

> a merchant and leader of animals, camels, that is, who was called Muhammad. This Muhammad mixed with all men generally, through trading, with both Christians and Jews, and also with pagans; he was extremely subtle by

---

1. Pref.Q., p.262
2. CVI/478
3. Anon. Fior.
4. As in Waltherius and du Pont.
5. D.P., 71.4

disposition, and well enough educated, and he knew the habits and circumstances of everyone in that country.

The point of these journeyings, as Christians recounted them, was nearly always that he had the opportunity to learn about Christianity and Judaism.[1]

The Muslim story of Baḥīrā was early converted by the Greeks into theirs of Sergius,[2] but there were some mediaeval Latin versions which relied recognisably on the Arabic source. William of Tripoli did so most fully, although he allowed other elements to intrude. He was influenced by the idea of a Christian Arabia, without definitely making it out to have been so. He had a strong impression of the spiritual constellations of monks in Egypt, "in cities and deserts like the stars of the firmament". The monk Baḥīrā lived a recluse in a monastery which was a natural stopping-place at the end of a day's stage on the road from the Ḥijāz.[3] There travelling

---

1. The most bizarre story of Muhammad's travels circulated in Spain. It occurs in the Cronica de España and in the Continuatio Chronicorum B.Isidori; according to this Muhammad travelled personally to Spain, where he taught heresy at Cordova, but fled away when summoned by Saint Isidore to account for himself. Cron.de Esp. CVI/478.
2. The Muslim belief was that there was a Christian hermit, Baḥīrā, who recognised the future prophet as a child when he called at his monastery, and foretold his future. The Greek belief in Sergius, or Nicholas, or some other Christian teacher who influenced Muhammad, is always presumed to be based on the story of Baḥīrā. This is true of modern historians (e.g. d'Ancona) and of earlier writers, e.g.Père Nau, in the 17th century. It is certain that the two legends tend to be associated, either as interdependent legends, or as mutually confirmatory versions of some actual fact; but it is not disproved that the two stories started life separately. Cf. Prideaux, and San Pedro himself. Nau, vol.i.,chaps. I and II, Prideaux, p.40 San Pedro, below, p. 397 ff.
3. The usual Muslim story made Muhammad travel northwards and placed Baḥīrā in Busrā; versions reported by Christian Arabs sometimes substituted a visit to Egypt which is clearly intended here. E.I., Baḥīrā.

merchants, Syrian, Arab and Egyptian, were accustomed to meet.[1] It had been revealed to Baḥīrā that one of these travellers would become ruler of a great and hardy nation which would afflict the Church of Christ. This prophecy has been substituted by William or by his source, for the Islamic version, but the next phrase belongs to the Islamic source from which the story ultimately derives: "on account of this he keenly desired that (the foretold visitor) should come, and daily he expected his arrival". Tripoli specifically referred the events of Muhammad's actual arrival to his Muslim authorities:[2]

> The Muslims regard this as the first miracle that God - as they say - worked for his servant while he was still young. They say that a small door of the courtyard of the monastery, through which they passed, when the child wanted to go through, by the divine impulse grew so much wider and higher like an arch at the presence of the boy, that it seemed to be the gateway to an imperial court, or the entrance to a home of royal majesty. 3.

Tripoli did not suppose Baḥīrā to be an apostate, but said that he remained a holy man, and taught Muhammad to believe in one God and to love Jesus Christ and his Mother. When the monks could no longer keep Muhammad he obtained the patronage of a rich

---

1. The text adds 'Christiani et Saraceni', a curious use of the latter word, since it is distinguished from and can hardly mean Arabs; apparently contrasted with Christians, it cannot in the context mean Muslims.
2. The mixture of phrases, sometimes almost alternating, favourable to Christians and to Muslims, suggests that the author was adapting as he composed, but this may in fact be a Christian Arabic version which he is reproducing.
3. The "first miracle" attributed to Muhammad by the Muslims, according to Roderick, was at the rebuilding of the Kaʿbah. (Above, p. 266)

merchant, acted faithfully as his agent, prospered in his service and often visited Baḥīrā. Ultimately, when Muhammad became rich and powerful, he sent for Baḥīrā and kept him as his adviser until his companions murdered him out of jealousy.[1] William of Tripoli was followed in a summary and modified form by the Anonimo Fiorentino, for whom the miracle of the doorway signified that Muhammad would rend and open the door of the holy Church of Rome. The essentials were unaltered. This form of the story reveals a very ill-digested mixture of Christian and Muslim elements, and possibly of ad hoc improvisations.

San Pedro Pascual also knew the Muslim stories of Baḥīrā, which he rendered without Christian accretions. Here Baḥīrā was shown as a solitary; Muhammad was taken by his guardian Abū Ṭālib on mercantile expeditions; Baḥīrā "exceedingly learned, well-known (to be) a friend of God" received the party of Meccans "kindly and courteously". He warned Muhammad's uncle

> that they should serve him and take care of him, because he would become a prophet and the lord of a great people, and that they should immediately protect him from the Jews, for the time would come when these would want to kill him, because he was going to say things contrary to the Law of the Jews.

Although he rendered the story with so little admixture of Christian elements he went on to speculate whether Baḥīrā might not prove to have been in fact the same as the monk whom the

---

1. I, II. This is related to an explanation of the prohibition of wine: the murder was done while the Prophet was drunk and he was told he had done it himself.

books of the Christians reported as Muhammad's evil influence.[1]

In the quadruplex reprobatio that astonishing historical sense which eliminated the fabulous element, whether Christian or Muslim in origin, is very noticeable in the part that concerns Muhammad's early travels. It described how Khadījah, herself a merchant and famed for nobility and wealth, did her business through agents who negotiated on her behalf. She sent for Muhammad to entrust him with a special commission, because of his reputation as true and faithful and most compliant. Together with a slave of hers, Maysara,[2] he left for Syria, taking her merchandise and her money. This Syrian expedition was particularly successful, and Maysara reported to his mistress how well Muhammad had represented her interests. She sent for him and said:

> O son of my (maternal) uncle, already I have desired thee, because of thy noble family and thy fidelity and thy good habits. So she bestowed herself on him, and finally he contracted with her that she should give herself a dowry of twenty young camels. She was the first wife Muhammad had and he did not marry another until she was dead. He had three sons by her, who died in idolatry, and four daughters who afterwards became Muslims. 3.

---

1. S.S.M. I.i.3-7; Ibn Ishāq, 115,116. Arabic names, San Pedro pointed out, were often very different in form from their Latin and Romance equivalents, but the examples he suggested (Eysa, Iusaf, Muca, Davut, Culeyma etc.) were hardly as radical as that which he now proposed. He also pointed to the different forms of Muhammad's name current in the West and to the possibility of one man's having two names. Cf. Matthew Paris (yr.1236) (addition in own hand). Not in Viterbo.
2. Berlin MS. 85, Magisar, margin, Maysar; Berlin MS. 425, Maysar; printed text, Mayzan.
3. Berlin MS. 85, obtulit, (tr. 'bestowed') preferred for its sense to Berlin MS. 425 and printed text, ostendit. B.N. MS. greatly curtails and somewhat adapts this passage. f.198 r.

This very closely represents sober Muslim accounts of Muhammad's marriage to Khadījah.[1] The original facts would be much more dimly reflected in the majority of cases.

A non-committal statement which was simple and unpolemic was Sigebert's: "joining himself to a certain very rich relation of his, by name Khadījah,[2] first as employee and after as husband, he was made great by her". When this story was somewhat expanded, it began to look discreditable. Already, Pedro de Alfonso hinted at an inordinate influence over Khadījah; as employee, he gained control over her, and as husband, control over her wealth. Vitry's account and that quoted by Viterbo and Paris are very close.[3] They associated the marriage to Khadījah with the mercantile journeyings, and ignored, at least at that stage, possibly significant meetings with Syrian or Egyptian Christians.

> . . . as now he could earn his living for himself laboriously by the exercise of his own body, after the manner of poor people, he became the employee of a certain widow woman. He looked after her ass, and he was paid, for her account, by certain travellers whom he guided on the ass to parts of Asia. Soon she committed her camels also to his

---

1. Quad. rep. II; Ibn Isḥāq, 119 ff.
2. Chadiga.
3. Vitry and Paris state that ʿAbd Manāf was the name of Muhammad's father, and that he was brought up in the place called Salingua where idols were worshipped. The two Venetians and the Anonymous of Florence followed these mistakes. Viterbo does not have ʿAbd Manāf, but does have "Calingua". Cerulli corrects to "(the place called) (arabi)ca lingua (B) et Alguze" = bayt al-ʿUzzā. (p.417). Peter of Toledo (p. 294) has different mistakes: 'pupillus fuit in sinu patrui sui Abdamanef, qui cognominatur Abdemutalla' and does not mention "Salingua". (Vincent, 23.41)

> care, and he was made her agent in neighbouring cities and towns roundabout, and made a profit. He was admitted to the grace and familiarity of the widow through his service, and all this commerce, and, desiring each other libidinously they lay together at first in secret and fornicating union; but afterwards that woman contracted matrimony with him publicly, and handed over to him an abundance of money. [1]

Other accounts were altogether less emphatic; some were different in emphasis. Ricoldo made little of Muhammad's marriage, which neither the summula nor Mark of Toledo mentioned. Fra Fidenzio particularly noticed Muhammad's cunning: "cautus erat et malitiosus": "because he was artful and crafty he knew how to act so that the woman made him her husband".[2] San Pedro made little comment on the marriage: he said that Muhammad married Khadījah at the age of twenty-five and noted that she was "of his own family and extremely wealthy".[3] Although several authors echoed the idea of Muhammad's having given faithful service, from which the marriage might proceed naturally, an element of trickery or persuasion was also popular, and the two might even co-exist.[4] It was common to stress Khadījah's wealth and often her social standing.[5] It is relevant to recall that Muhammad was sometimes supposed to have served Khadījah's husband both in his lifetime and finally by marrying

---

1. Vitry.
2. loc. cit.
3. S.S.M. I.i.11. This part of San Pedro's account is very close to the reprobatio, which quoted Muhammad's age at marriage as twenty-seven. San Pedro also specified that three sons died pagan and four daughters became in due course Muslim. Cf. Ibn Isḥāq 120, 121.
4. Cf. Reprobatio; Vitry; Paris; Viterbo; Ludolf; du Pont.
5. Cf. as well as the above, chiose sopra Dante.

his widow "according to their custom", said the Anonimo Fiorentino. William of Tripoli's idea was similar. When Muhammad attached himself to the rich merchant who treated him like a foster-son, he himself became rich, and when his patron died, married his relict. This essentially bourgeois romance, while it is not factually accurate, is not wholly absurd in it general framework.[1] We owe a strange variant to Lull, who apparently thought Khadījah the widow of Abū Ṭālib, whose heir Muhammad became when the widow brought her new husband the property of the old: this anachronism derived from Western feudal custom.[2]

There were some fabulous versions of the marriage. Roderick in the Historia Arabum and the Cronica de Espana had a confused story which split Khadījah's personality into two and wholly obscured the true story.[3] The story told and the attitude adopted by Alexandre du Pont we have already mentioned in discussing Muhammad's supposed humble birth.[4] The authors who used the Corozan text, including in this case Mandeville, Higden and James of Acqui, supposed that Muhammad by magic art deceived the Arabs generally, and Khadījah, since she married him, particularly.[5] His merchant enterprise had taken him to "the province of Corosan" whose lady and ruler was Khadījah.

---

1. loc. cit.
2. Hamar, signum 32.
3. Hist. Arab. II; Cron. de Esp. CIII/475, CVI/478.
4. p. 287
5. In addition to those mentioned, Hugh of Fleury; Geraldus; St. Albans; Leg. Aur.; Vinc.; Cont. Chr. Isid.; Dandalo.

It was by magic that he was able to get himself accepted as their Messias by the Jews, and that Khadījah recognised a concealed divinity in him. By his marriage he became ruler of the country. The wide extent to which most authors understood this marriage to be a crisis in Muhammad's life, enabling him to rise above his initial misfortunes and encouraging in him an inordinate ambition, is discussed below.[1]

There is a recurring theme in these stories of Muhammad's youth: low birth and early misfortunes led to success, first as a trader, and ultimately in politics and as a prophet. Even inaccurate versions echo however faintly the truth that he was helped principally by Abū Ṭālib and by Khadījah in this period of his life. His marriage received varying emphasis, but was always considered favourable to his fortunes, often decisively so. Abū Ṭālib, whose kindly patronage of the young Muhammad was so important in actual fact, was represented rather distantly, but recognisably, sometimes by name, sometimes under various forms of benevolent patron who were believed to have helped Muhammad. Within this rough scheme the stories varied greatly; Muslim stories were sometimes turned to polemic use and sometimes rendered non-committally; authors who believed wild tales of the prophet's mission had equally inaccurate ideas of his youth. Even in the more extreme cases elements of truth

---

1. p.323

obtrude, although the Muslim sources were not usually known directly. The general impression in the West of Muhammad's youth was not absurdly different from that which obtained among Muslims. We may say that the Islamic picture here seemed suitable to polemic use without great distortion.

Chapter 13.

Revelation and the call to prophethood.

Only rarely was Muhammad's assertion of his prophethood mentioned without some description of the manner in which he received his revelations. "He broke out into such madness", said William of Tyre, "that he dared to lie that he was a prophet, to say that he was sent by God . . ."[1] So bald a statement was rare, and it is not likely that William of Tyre did not elaborate it in his lost work on Islamic history. Very commonly Muhammad was said to claim to be a prophet sent by God.[2] It seems to have been generally accepted that there must have been something remarkable about Muhammad's inspiration, in order to explain the otherwise inexplicable credulity of Muslims. At the most fabulous end of the spectrum false, fabricated miracles were alleged; at the other extreme there was recognition that Muslim accounts must be made to fit some modification of the traditional explanations. There was almost unanimous recognition that the manner of these revelations was important.

The misrepresentation of Muhammad varied in its absurdity. That someone, not Muhammad, invented a prophetic claim in order to give effect to political ambitions would not be inherently absurd, as another opinion of Muhammad's claims would be in any context. The story as it appears in the

---

1. V.1.
2. Above, p. 12

'Corozan' version is a fairy-tale:

> . . . he began to fall down often in epileptic fits. Khadījah perceived this and grew exceedingly sad at having married a very impure epileptic. Wanting to propitiate her, he soothed her with these words: I gaze upon Gabriel the Archangel, who speaks with me, and not being able, as a fleshly man, to bear the splendour of his face, I fail and fall down. 1.

This is the classic expression of a view of Muhammad's inspiration which has shown great vitality among both Latin and oriental Christians. In the version just quoted, the seizures followed and were distinct from the claim to sanctity and religious leadership: Muhammad had already claimed to be the Messias expected by the Jews, and Khadījah had recognised a divinity latent in him, in consequence of his magic arts (either herself bewitched, or else convinced by his control over magical phenomena); for this reason she had made him her husband, and king of the province she ruled. Practically the same version was popularised by Guibert, Waltherius and du Pont. Jacques de Vitry introduced the note of a Judgement: Muhammad was stricken with epilepsy by the divine justice, Khadījah was distressed and wanted to divorce him, until the Gabriel story deceived her.[2] This story was also widespread in a severe and unromantic form which omitted Khadījah's part; thus, at its simplest, Muhammad fell sick with epileptic fits, which he

---

1. From Vincent, 23.39; cf. Fleury; Geraldus; St. Albans; Leg. Aur.; Cron. de Esp. CVI/478; Cont. Chr. Isid.; Marino III.II; Martin; Higden; Paris, al. scr.; Vitry V.
2. V.

explained away as angelic visitations intolerable to human flesh.[1] How, enquired Ricoldo, with reference to the mi'rāj, could he pretend on the one hand to have passed through the seven heavens, and on the other to have been worn out by a visitation on earth ?[2] Mark of Toledo had spoken more cannily of Muhammad's acting as though he suffered from epilepsy,[3] quasi morbum caducum patiens, and rising from his fits, rolling his eyes "quasi a demonio arreptus".[4] His view owed much to, but is clearly distinct from, the epileptic theory, to which he hesitated to commit himself. On the whole the more sensible

---

1. Sigebert; Ric., Disp. XIII,XIV; Ott. Comm.; Ludolf VIII.
2. Disp. XIV, MS. f. 178 r. col. 1. This derives from the account in the Contrarietas (cap. IV, MS. f. 242 v. ff.) On the whole, it seems that the Contrarietas in its turn draws on a common Spanish tradition on which the reprobatio and San Pedro also draw and with even greater fidelity to the Arabic source. (See below.) The Contrarietas says that Muhammad imitated, or perhaps actually suffered from, epilepsy; Ricoldo, like less pretentious writers, says that because Muhammad suffered from the disease (quia epilenticus erat), he explained his fits away as angelic visitations. (Disp.XIII, MS. f. 176 r. col. 2.)
3. M. Th. d'Alverny draws attention to his emphasis on medical details. (Marc de Tolède, Introduction).
4. Pref. Q.

and more learned writers did not mention the epileptic theory at all; even Ricoldo, whose characteristic it was to drag in every known argument, gave it little prominence. At the same time, he preferred it to more authentic versions.[1] It was popular, for the most part with writers whose contribution was meant to amuse as well as to instruct.

Some writers directly open to Arabic sources would present the beginnings of Muhammad's prophethood in a way recognisable to Muslims. This is one case where the author of the quadruplex reprobatio introduced a story for no very obvious polemic purpose.

> . . . that he said he was a prophet can be gathered from the words of his wife ʿĀʾishah placed in the book called Muslim;(2) these are the words of this ʿĀʾishah: it was given to Muhammad to love solitude, and he went away and was solitary in a certain cave of Hira, and there for many nights he gave himself to worship; and, returning to his wife Khadījah, he carried food thence to that place, and there he lived. When he was coming out of it, an angel came to him and said to him, Read. He answered, I do not know how to read. The angel took him and crushed him, by hugging him violently, and let him go. Again he said to him, Read, and he answered, I do not know how to read; and in the same way he crushed him. A third time he said to him, Read, and he answered in the same way, and a third time he crushed him. Then he said, Read in the name of the Lord thy God (3) who created man from congealed blood. Read, and the Lord thy God, he shall be honoured, who taught man with a pen what he did not know. (4) When he heard this, he went back to his wife Khadījah, of whom we have spoken, and

---

1. The account in the Contrarietas, to which he was indebted for some of what he said, is fuller and also more doubtful about epilepsy. Ricoldo certainly rejected authentic information when he ignored much of this source.
2. B.N. MS., Muzlim; Berlin MSS., noyum; printed text, Moium.
3. Berlin MS. Fol. 425 and printed text, God for Lord thy God.
4. Q., XCVI, 1 - 5. Muslim; 1. 252-258; cf. az-Zuhrī, quoted W.M. Watt, Mecca, p.40

> said to her, Cover me, and they covered him until the trembling went away from him. Also it says in the book which is called Bukhārī (1) - this also concerns the same ʿĀʾishah - that a certain man asked him how that inspiration came to him. He said, It was just like the sound of bells, and that was the more violent way for me. That sound receded from me when I yet retained what was said. And sometimes an angel came to me in the form of a man and I remembered what he said. Again, the same ʿĀʾishah said, I saw that inspiration descended upon Muhammad, and on a day of great cold it went away from him, and abandoned him in a perspiration. 2.

This account is of very great interest; it would be impossible to form an idea closer to the Muslim idea of how Muhammad received revelations. It was preferred with sound historical discrimination above all the alternative material, so that clearly the author rejected the more legendary. Ostensibly it only set out to show on Arabic and Muslim authority that Muhammad made himself out to be a prophet; one would have thought any proof, and least of all so long a one, excessive. It seems likely that the author's intention was to provide information to assist Christian controversialists to form a basic material for polemic, so far as it was possible to do so, from authentic and Muslim sources. At the same time, the

---

1. 'Bohari'.
2. Cap. III. The only vestige of so authentic an account as this in Ricoldo's work is a passing reference to Muhammad's having said that revelation seemed like bells, which, whether with medical significance, or accidentally, he associated with the supposed epilepsy. (Disp. XIII. MS. f. 176 r. col. 2) In the Contrarietas the account is similar to that in the reprobatio, but less close to the text of Bukhārī (1. 2)) It quotes the isnād but describes ʿĀʾishah as the daughter of the Prophet. (Cap. IV, MS. f. 243 r.)

manner of revelation seems always to have been of itself of interest to mediaeval writers; there may have been some idea that the "falsity" of the inspiration was self-evident. Mark of Toledo emphasised the confusion of style of the Qur'an in relation to the seizures which he said Muhammad suffered; it was these that were <u>like</u> epilepsy and <u>like</u> demoniac possession. He also showed Muhammad himself stressing the angelic force: <u>cogit me angelus</u>.[1] There may have been only a general intention to show the revelations as in some way or other synthetic.

Certainly these Muslim accounts of Muhammad's revelations did circulate in Spain and were used to support some Christian theories. San Pedro thought that the same tradition from ʿĀ'ishah about the Prophet's perspiring while he received a revelation showed that he was exactly what the Quraysh accused him of being, a soothsayer. His choice of authorities was only a little less discriminating than his predecessor's.

> When Muhammad reached the age of forty he discontinued the adoration of idols, and said that he was a prophet, and began to wander alone through mountains, valleys and hills, as if possessed by a demon; sometimes also for a month or longer he stayed alone in the mountain near Mecca which is called Hira. (2) Muhammad asserted that the angel Gabriel first appeared to him in the same mountain; and he first told it to his wife Khadījah . . .

The story continued: "the Muslims make Muhammad describe how he returned home to his wife after he had seen the angel Gabriel in the mountain, and sat in her lap and lay down over her . . ."

---

1. Pref. Q.
2. Sp. 'Yran'.

She asked him whence his "companion" came; this, pointed out San Pedro, was the form used to test diabolical possession. As she did so the angel appeared to Muhammad again; or, added San Pedro, so Muhammad said, but he, Pedro, certainly did not believe it. Muhammad told Khadījah that he saw "our companion Gabriel"; she made him sit, first on her left and then on her right knee, asking each time, "O Son of my uncle, dost thou see thy friend ?" and receiving an affirmative answer. Then she covered her husband with a veil, or, as some say, hid him between her shirt and her flesh, and this time he replied that he did not see the angel. Then she said, "Be comforted, O son of my uncle, for it is certain that this friend who appears to thee is not the demon, but, as I suppose, the angel of God; wherefore I hope that thou art the prophet to be of this Nation." Thus it was that Khadījah became the first Muslim. 1.

> - But I say to you, cursed Khadījah: you do not affirm that you saw that angel or demon; and if indeed you did not see him, why did you believe the futility that Muhammad told you ? Did you not know that he was a man, and therefore that he could lie ? But you and your husband seem extremely low and unclean in the experiments you made, beside the fact that experiments of this sort merit no faith; nor do they produce any certainty.

There was solicitude to question the basis of Muhammad's revelations rather than easy dismissal.

San Pedro also objected to this account of the first revelation because it was contrary to other accounts of Muslim origin, according to which Muhammad fell down at the appearance

---

1. S.S.M. I.i.13 - 16; Ibn Isḥāq, 150 ff.,154.

of Gabriel; so that they treated him like someone possessed by a devil: "they covered his head with a sweat-cloth and the rest of his body with a fine cloth, and he remained altogether soaked with sweat; but when he regained possession of his spirit he rose up and prophesied". In the same place this author mentioned that Muhammad attributed his infirmity to Gabriel's overbearing him; this seems to be an intrusion of the epileptic version, but it is not made so explicitly. He pointed out that really Muhammad was taught by a false monk, but himself always claimed that Gabriel appeared to him, and he flattered Khadījah by telling her that Gabriel ordered him to assure her of salvation.[1] In several places San Pedro referred incidentally to Muhammad as to one possessed.[2] He described, also, how ʿĀʾishah, when she was slandered, appealed to her husband to test her truthfulness by a revelation: "and on the spot he fell down to the ground, pretending that the spirit had entered into him, as he used to do, and they covered him with a fine cloth, and covered his head with a sweat-cloth, as was the custom, and after a little he got up . . ." San Pedro drew out the full significance that he saw in what he thought of as self-induced fits when he went on to describe the magic which Islam permitted. He described the fits thrown by professional diviners in his own time, who told fortunes for a

---

1. Ibid., 17 - 19. [San Pedro]
2. Ibid., 24 - 32.

penny:

> Indeed I say to you, O Muhammad, that you did not prophesy, but you said certain things, as to-day the diviners are accustomed to say them, by conjuration of demons, or some other way. Nor is this surprising, because there were and are and will be many diviners in the world, who say few truths and many lies. 1.

For San Pedro, this case, familiar in his own world, was precisely the case of Muhammad. The nearest he came to committing himself to a definite theory was when he summed up Muhammad's career and called him demoniacus.[2] It was enough to show with certainty that his apparent visions could be induced at will.

The classic point of reference for the "self-induced" revelation was the story of Zayd and Zaynab, which was widespread among better-informed writers, because the more reputable sources made much of it.[3] The details are considered in another section; the point so eagerly exploited was that a revelation was brought about to justify the personal desires of the Prophet. In some cases it was said that Muhammad claimed that Gabriel brought the exculpatory revelation, in others, which are

---

1. Ibid., ii. 2, 22.
2. Ibid., vii.9. Cf. also passing references, e.g. ibid.,i.32. In one episode where the Quraysh spoke to Muhammad they took it for granted (in San Pedro's story) that his familiar was either an angel or a demon. (I.i.23 ff.) Cont. Chr. Isid. says that it was reported as true that the devil appeared to Muhammad in the form of an angel of light, and foretold future events.
3. Pedro de Alfonso, loc. cit.; Contrarietas, VII,MS.f.246 v., ff.; Risālah, Tol., MS. p.299, col.1; Vinc. 23.44; Muir, p.50.

inter-related, that a letter was sent to the Prophet from Heaven.[1] Accounts varied in their clarity and in their distance from the original source. The quadruplex reprobatio quoted a tradition from 'Ā'ishah which is still popular with those who doubt the Prophet's sincerity; according to this she said, "I see that the Lord thy God hastens to fulfil thy desire".[2] This was quoted in an elaborated form by Ricoldo, who remarked that to justify adultery in the name of God was to hide the lesser sin by a greater.[3] San Pedro was astonished that the earth did not devour Muhammad for simulating these fits in order to obtain other men's wives.[4]

What gave most scandal to Latins was the Islamic inability to see anything scandalous in ad hoc revelations about immediate political or social problems. Adulteries apart, this Muslim attitude interested San Pedro. He said that whereas Muhammad pretended that the Qur'an was sent from Heaven, actually it was written twenty years after he began to preach.[5] This suggests that he thought that a "sent" text conflicted

---

1. Latin, carta; Italian, lettere.
2. VI; Bu., LXV.XXXI. 7.
3. Disp., VIII (MS. f. 167 v. col. 2); derived directly from Contrarietas, VII, 245 v.
4. S.S.M., I.ii.7.
5. Ibid. I.i.68.

with a claim to gradual or progressive revelation.[1] The idea of divine responses to the needs of the moment of either Prophet or Muslim community emphatically did not appeal:

> Other Muslims affirm that twenty-three years were given to writing the Qur'an, in which (Muhammad) introduced many things which happened to him and his companions during those twenty-three years; afterwards he asserted that he had received them from God; it is well-known to be true that many things in the Qur'an were written by the advice of ʿUmar . . . (2)

Among these things were, of course, the veiling and enclosing of women and the prohibition of wine. There is good Islamic authority for this, in the sense that revelations were given in response to suggestions from ʿUmar.[3]

A few authors preserved the idea of Muhammad's announcing his revelations to an assembly of the people,[4] and Vitry spoke of his preaching his revelations in the mosque at Medina.[5]

---

1. This almost suggests that he thought that a written volume was claimed to have descended. The dating also is obscure; it is not obvious whether he meant that the text was written twenty years after the call but in the Prophet's life-time, or after the Prophet's death. The latter fits the allegations of the Risālah; cf. below, p. The implications are also not consonant with San Pedro's own theory of demoniac possession. It would be a mistake to look for consistency.
2. S.S.M. I.i.43
3. E.I., ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb. The divine interest in temporary situations was perhaps in Acqui's mind when he derided the constant consultation of angels, the idea that Muhammad "had the Holy Spirit, and was in the counsels of God; and that angels of God attended on him continuously, and especially that the angel Gabriel was with him and listened to him continuously".
4. e.g. San Pedro, S.S.M. I.i.27 ff. and I.viii.219; Mark, Pref. Q.; Acqui.
5. VI. "constituit in civitate templum . . . in quo figmenta sua . . . praedicavit."

Of revelation it was generally known that Gabriel was the means; in a sound statement addressed by Peter the Venerable to the Muslims, the Qur'an was described as supposed to be "what was sent down from Heaven by God and delivered by Gabriel to your Prophet, not all at once, but bit by bit, through the parts of the month that among you is called Ramaḍān"[1]. With this we may contrast the vaguer and less accurate, but more typical phrase, "he lied that a Book was sent to him by the angels . . ."[2] It would be superfluous to quote every reference to Gabriel as the vehicle of pretended revelation, when there were so many.[3] References to revelation which ignored the angelic vehicle were very rare.[4]

---

1. C.S.S. I. 16.
2. Rod., Hist. Arab. II; cf. V, VI.
3. Pedro de Alfonso; Sigebert; Guibert; Fleury; Geraldus; Peter the Venerable, summula and C.S.S.; I. 16, II. 3,5; St. Albans; Waltherius; du Pont; Mark, Pref.Q.; William of Tyre, XIX. XX; Rod., Hist. Arab., II, V, VI, and Cron. de Esp., CVI/478, CXXI/493; Vinc., 23.39; Oliver, Hist. Dam., Hist. Reg., and Ep. Sal.; Alv., de leg., XVIII/18P; Benedict; Fid.,XIV; Paris, al. scr.; Leg. Aur.; reprobatio, loc. cit.; Tripoli, XXV; Ric., Disp. XIII; San Pedro, S.S.M., I.i.13 ff., I.i.68, I.ii.22, etc.; Lull, D.P., 5,6 and Hamar, sig. 9, etc.; Higden; Acqui; Pennis, I; Martin the Pole; Cont. Chr. Isid.; Marino III.II; Ludolf, VIII; Anon. Fior.; Ott. Comm.; Benvenuto. This list does not claim to be exhaustive.
4. Cf. Viterbo; Paris, scr. miss. ad Greg. Otherwise these were practically confined to versions based on fraudulent miracles (the dove whispering in the Prophet's ear, the bull with the Law on its horns, the pre-arranged fountains of milk and honey) whose machinery excluded angelic visitation. Mostly these are related by authors who also quote versions based on Gabriel: cf. Vinc.,23.40; Leg. Aur.; San Pedro, I.viii. 27 ff. and 59 ff.; Marino, loc. cit.; Higden; Ludolf, loc. cit.; but Thomas of Pavia does not give an angelic version.

There was one group of stories which did not mention Gabriel because there was no room for him among their fantasies. These are the stories which told of a dove taught to eat a grain of corn from the Prophet's ear to simulate the Holy Ghost, or a bull, or calf or camel taught to come at his call, bearing the book of the Law on his horns; these main "miracles" would be confirmed in some cases by secreted milk and honey discovered and made to flow.[1] The narrators cannot have given much thought to the difficulties of rigging these tricks up, but they did realise that a people would need to be quite abnormally gullible to be fooled in this way, and this explains the great patronising emphasis laid on the foolishness of the Arabs. There was some realisation that these stories were not reliable, even by those who repeated them.[2] San Pedro appears unconvinced by his own assertion of the "Christian", and fantastic, version of Muhammad's life; as well as seeking over-ingenious justifications for it, he liked to think that the Muslim version alone was sufficient condemnation.[3] These tales belong to a literary convention in historiography

1. See note 4, p. 317 The variant recounted by Thomas of Pavia is interesting. In this Muhammad's evil counsellor and guide, the false cleric who taught him the tricks with which he deceived the assembled people, stood in a dry well and simulated the voice of God. After he had spoken Muhammad called on everyone to cast in a stone, ostensibly to mark the sanctity of the occasion, and incidentally to silence his accomplice. This version does not seem to have been popular in the Middle Ages, but it survived into later times and is even alive to-day among credulous Christians.
2. See below, p. 404 fn.
3. S.S.M., II, 24.25 and elsewhere, cited below, p.

and it is far from clear how far they were intended to be believed, or how far they were believed by serious educated men. If San Pedro was in any way typical, it was hoped that they were true, rather than believed that they were. There was a certain clinging to them as being in a proprietary way the "Christian" version of the rise of Muhammad. It is interesting that authors who should have known very much better found it difficult to discard them altogether.

It is obvious how these stories of false miracles fitted into the tradition of the prophetic claim as fraudulent. They seem to have derived from, or to have been closely associated with, all that group of stories according to which Muhammad was misled by a malicious Christian, often a Roman apostate, and in which Muhammad himself, as often as not, was the lesser villain. These stories have an air of unreality which is certainly not confined to the series of bogus miracles which they include along with a great deal beside. It is clear that what interested their narrators was the answer to the problem, how could a populous nation have come to accept this obviously false prophet as true ? With this was associated the twin problem, of how so many people could have adopted so false a religion, which was explained by the seductive power of a licensed carnality and indulgence.

In contrast with the pre-occupations of these authors, all the others who discussed the manner of the revelations of

Muhammad seem to have been concerned with the simpler problem of explaining the apparent historical fact of Muhammad's supernatural inspiration. All these, from the well-informed Spaniards at one extreme, to the exponents of the epileptic theory at the other, took it for granted that something remarkable happened to the Prophet. In fact, they exaggerated the violence of his seizures, perhaps particularly to conform with the epileptic theory, or, rather less, with the theory of demoniac possession. What is interesting is that they were so sure that something happened to the Prophet which needed explaining, although, except for the Spaniards, in direct touch with Arabic sources, the details of what was supposed to have happened was made to suit the explanation. What was universal was an intense interest in the technique of Muhammad's revelations in itself, and a sense that it was of crucial importance in the controversy between the two religions.

Chapter 14.

The early Muslim community.

Mediaeval treatment of Muhammad's historical call to the prophethood generally supposed that his claim arose from one of two motives. At the more fantastic level it was conceived solely as a device to explain away the shame of epileptic affliction, but more often it was considered to have been quite baldly a cunningly adopted means to obtain power. "By the prestige of his heresy", said Sigebert, "he arrived at the kingship". Pedro de Alfonso's phrases about the eruption of his pride of mind, about his considering how me might be made king and deciding to pretend that he was a prophet, were echoed over the centuries.[1] The summula said specifically that Muhammad "attempted to become king under the veil of religion and the name of a divine prophet"; and a little later, introducing a contrasting suggestion of historical hazard, remarked that he was in fact raised to be king, as he wished, by the process of time and error. Once at least it was recognised how closely Muhammad stood to some aspects of Old Testament religion: "he obtained the kingship as envoy of God, and prophet, on the model of David and Solomon . . ."[2] Although this model was not often recognised, the prophetic claim was nearly always seen to be closely associated with the ambition for dominion.

---

1. Cf. An. Min.; Leg. Aur.; Benvenuto.
2. Mark, Pref. Q.

It was particularly the sudden elevation by marriage from poverty to riches which was supposed to have tempted his ambition.

> Indeed he, who up to that time had led a miserable and destitute life always, was suddenly made great, as though by accident and unexpectedly; in his own eyes he began to be exalted, and to boast vainly to himself, considering within himself and planning by every means how he could obtain the lordship over those peoples and their tribes, who had no king, and how he could be esteemed great among men. (1)

In the related Syrian Apology the sequence was rather more subtly developed:

> When he was thus raised up, he began to vaunt himself exceedingly, and he determined to have the lordship over all the tribes and over his nation; he would have presumed to be called king if those who were more noble and powerful than he had not resisted his usurpation. He therefore taught that he was a prophet sent by God, whose sayings every people should believe. (2)

Lull said that Muhammad was a poor merchant and that, pretending to be a prophet, he made himself lord of the city of Medina;[3] this was a simplification of the more complex explanations of earlier date. The suggestion that his political ambition was as improper as his religious pretensions were impious was

---

1. Vitry V; cf. authors cited immediately below, and Rod., Hist. Arab., III (vidualibus divitiis inclitatus, et falso miraculo lapidis a pluribus approbatus, coepit grandia cogitare); Ric., Disp. XIII; Anon. Fior. For the Risālah, cf. Tol. MS. p.294, foot of col. 2; Vinc. 23.41; Muir, p. 44.
2. Viterbo; Paris.
3. Hamar, sig. 11; cf. 8, 32; D.P. Cap. 71 passim.

persistent; "he broke out into such audacity that he got the idea to seize the kingship of the Arabs", said Benvenuto. What is always clear is that the prophethood was a political device; this stands out in versions otherwise irreconcileable. Some ideas of political history were very bizarre; Roderick said that Muhammad founded Islam to strengthen his rebellion against Roman obedience;[1] a view in a way similar was that of Thomas of Pavia who thought that Muhammad was looking for a people suitable to deceive and chose the Arabs. In every one of these cases religious deceit was the the implement of secular ambition.

Considered in its public aspect Muhammad's crime was a double one, religious in his pretensions to prophethood, and secular in his political ambition. The view that his original fault was ambition was maintained constantly, and thus his history was made to show two series of crimes, religious and political, which stemmed from the same source. This was well expressed by Fra Fidenzio, who said that Muhammad, because he had so few supporters, used a double contrivance, of <u>fiction</u> and of <u>oppression</u>, to gain a larger following.[2] With the fiction of the prophethood was always associated the oppression by force and violence which seemed inseparable from the "kingship" of Medina. Important as this was thought to be, detailed knowledge of the actual use of force by the first Muslims in Medina was relatively restricted.

---

1. Hist. Arab., IV, V.
2. XIV. Cf. Mark, "tum per predicationem eius fallacem, tum per bellicam cladem". (Pref. Q.)

Much of what knowledge did circulate apparently derived from the Risālah and reflected that idiosyncratic presentation of the life of the Prophet. The selection of events was important; the attacks on the Meccan caravans, and still more the assassinations of individual Jews, were stressed. These infractions of what Christians consider to be the natural law binding on any human being would have excited less horror had they been committed by someone who professed the Christian religion. Muhammad's kingship was seen in the light of his prophethood: the Risālah emphasised, for example, the disaster at Uḥud and the wounds suffered there by Muhammad himself; and pointed out how the Old Testament Jews in their wars were guided infallibly by the Lord. Muhammad, on the other hand, was clearly without guidance, because he experienced the usual ups and downs of warfare; and obviously he did not have the guard of angels that he claimed. This statement would equally well represent the Risālah itself, or either of two accounts related to it, the Syrian Apology, represented by Viterbo, and by the Gregorian report in Matthew Paris, or the story as it was rendered by Jacques de Vitry. Ricoldo neatly epitomised this point: Machometus autem vincebat aliquando, et vincebatur, sicut alii tyranni.[1] The summula seems to represent a reading

1. Viterbo and Paris, loc. cit.; Vitry V; Risālah, Tol. MS. p. 296, col. 1; Vinc. 23.42; Muir, p. 45; Ricoldo, Disp. VII, MS. f. 166 v 2. The point is just made in Marino's abridged version (op. cit., III. III). Ricoldo seems to owe his phrase to a sentence of Ramón Marti's (Capistrum Judaeorum) and the same point is made in the reprobatio (IX). Cf. Lull; Hamar, sig. 10.

of the same text.

> Energetic in individual matters and greatly cunning, he was advanced from lowliness and destitution to riches and fame. As this grew, bit by bit, he spread terror of himself, often pursuing his neighbours, and especially his blood relations, in ambushes, robberies, and forays, and killing as many as he could either secretly or publicly. (1)

The Arab Christian author of the Risālah pre-supposed a knowledge of the life of the Prophet and put forward a particular interpretation of it; he presented particular episodes, chosen for the purpose, in such a light as would expose Muhammad (he imagined) to a truer valuation than Muslim sources allow. This manipulation of known events belonging to a context that he took for granted, (for Latins, who read a translation or were supplied with information from the same source by oriental Christians,) became a source of knowledge of the events themselves. Naturally the historical sequence and the background were obscured. Certain facts had been selected, out of a widely-known mass of facts, to show that the Prophet and his companions behaved like robbers. Such a passage informed European writers of events they had no other means of knowing. What was intended as essentially critical exegesis of history became a statement that Muhammad collected a troop of bandits together. Vitry may speak for the impression

---

1. Nothing proves finally that the author of the summula - presumably Peter the Venerable - had read the Apology, but the two belonged to the same collection, and the passage quoted certainly reads like a summary. Peter of Poitiers must be referring to the same series of allegations when he says, a little absurdly, "proditor fuerit, incautos et dormientes saepe jugulans".

received by the Latins:

> He first gathered together men who were poor and needy and bound to him as foreigners, profane men, highwaymen, plunderers, murderers and robbers, so that, when he had collected a great deal of money, with their help, by violence and rapine, he might make a name for himself and be feared by all. (1)

In spite of the circulation in the West of Peter of Toledo's translated Risālah, and of the substantial extracts made by Vincent of Beauvais, it was chiefly in accounts derived from Syria that this aspect was stressed. Fra Fidenzio gave a similar account to Vitry's that he does not seem to owe to his Spanish source; it is not possible to say how nearly it may be indebted to the Risālah.

> He had forty of his men who guarded him from the other people of Mecca; as these were not enough, he gathered to himself men who were fugitives, pernicious men, corruptors of manners and oppressors of others, and also as many murderers as he could; and he became their prince. He sent them to woodland by-ways, to hill-tops, to roads frequented by travellers and to every other place, to rob men, both to plunder their goods and to kill those who put up opposition; and the fear of Muhammad fell upon all the men of those parts. (2)

The author evidently inferred a state of things in Arabia which he pictured, both socially and topographically, in Mediterranean terms. The same emphasis occurred in William of Tripoli, who owed little or nothing to the Risālah, who attempted geographical exactitude and who cast a Biblical flavour over the whole. "There came to join him families of Arabs, living in the deserts of southern Arabia." He explained

---

1. V.
2. XIV.

that he counted Arabia as starting at Aleppo, and distinguished "southern Arabia" from Syria. "Thus Muhammad increased, and his following, his band, his soldiery increased, and there began to fear him the provinces and the kings of the provinces, and all the peoples and princes and judges of all the land." Especially after the death of Baḥīrā the bandits of Muhammad spread terror and ruin until his death.[1] The whole of this tradition was summarised by Ricoldo, who was not greatly interested in it, in the phrase "factus princeps latronum".[2] It was natural that banditry should be conceived in contemporary terms.

The account which Viterbo and Matthew Paris's Gregorian report represent was very full, and the detail is of interest. The abundance of information brings out the absence of a clear temporal sequence. The Hijrah became part of the haphazard migration of a robber band in pursuit of opportunity. Muhammad regularly ambushed merchants travelling to Asia; after stealing the camel (for "caravan of camels") of Abū Jahl, he fled from Mecca,

---

1. III

2. Disp.,XIII, MS. f. 176 v 2.

whose citizens ejected him as a false prophet.[1] The worst of the confusion here was to make the attack on the caravan antedate the Hijrah. There is a suggestion of the unsuccessful confidence trickster expelled by the City Fathers. It was then, supposed the author, that Muhammad at last fell upon his feet in Medina, a place so much better suited to his schemes in that it was inhabited partly by Jews and partly by illiterate and poverty-stricken pagans. There it became possible to organise a new religion: "with his companions, Muhammad established a temple, in which he exhibited contrivances (figmenta[2]) to the simple people". There, too, it was

---

1. In Paris, this becomes to Mecca, which still further increases (and still better illustrates) the confusion. Abū Jahl ibn Hishām in Viterbo becomes Habigeamb filius Lisem and also Abi geheli filius Isem; in Paris, Habige Hely filius Hyesen and also Abige Hely filius Jesem (or, presumably, in the manuscript abigehely simply). Peter of Toledo and Vincent of Beauvais have Hebegel filius Hyssen. I have just quoted two forms of one man's name in both Viterbo and Paris; yet the author of the original Latin version of the Syrian Apology (known to Viterbo and Paris) must have known that they were the same, and so written them, because the second time the name is cited it is referred explicitly to the first. (". . . camelum viri nomine Habigeamb,. . . rapuit"; and "ille Abigeheli . . . cuius camelum rapuerat . . .") It follows that variations in, and travesties of, Arabic names must be assumed to be the fault of inattentive copyists. There is, therefore, no advantage in citing any further the forms used by Viterbo and Paris, and I do not do so, except where it is necessary to clarify some particular point.

2. It is improbable that this text should mean idols; it is integral, it goes out of its way to deny idolatry as Muslim, and is throughout too well informed.

possible to organise raids with a success which was nevertheless limited. Muhammad's men fled at the sight of an army of three hundred collected by Abū Jahl; Muhammad, who had failed to foresee this, was no prophet. When Sa'd ibn abī Waqqāṣ was sent to intercept a caravan of asses at Kharrār, the merchants had passed the day before. Obviously no prophet could thus be deceived in his plans. The account mentions the killing of Usayr ibn Rizām,[1] whom it characterises as a Jew, and adds, "also in the same way he ordered ibn'Umayr perfidiously to destroy abū Afak, an old man and enfeebled, who was slaughtered in his bed". This is similar to, but even more confused than, the Risālah; it is less forceful and, except by implication, omits to moralise. This is brought out more clearly by Jacques de Vitry, who introduced his own moralisation into a version which, item by item, particularised the various expeditions of the Muslims much less minutely: "he had his neighbours, of whom he was envious, secretly and treacherously slaughtered, and especially Jews, whom he very much hated". The affair at Nakhlah was rendered as the murder of the leader of a caravan by 'Abdallāh ibn Jaḥsh; this, and particularly the offering of the fifth part of the booty to Muhammad, obviously interested the author. For the surrender of the Banū Qaynuqā', as in the Risālah, was substituted, apparently, a reference to the conquest of the Banū Qurayẓah: "Similarly Sa'd ibn

1 or, al-Yusayr

Muʿādh (?), sent by him, went and killed the men, women and children of a certain town, and brought back to Muhammad a fifth part of all the spoils, saying, 'Such a part is owed to thee, Prophet of God' ".[1] The acceptance of plunder by the Prophet was, in every version, received with a shocked but gratified sense of scandalisation.[2]

Most appreciated of all was that Muhammad was personally disfigured in battles, his teeth on the right side knocked out, his upper lip split and his cheek gashed. He was protected by his companion Ṭalḥa who lost a finger; there was

---

1. The Viterbo text says that filius Fenyifa (Paris has Phenufei) was sent. Cerulli tells us that in the manuscript of Viterbo K is easily mistaken for F, which would give us filius Kenika (for filii Kenika), a reasonable form for Banū Qaynuqāʿ. The sentence is, of course, still nonsense; the copyist was expecting the proper name, parallel to the preceding sentences, of an emissary of the Prophet's, not of the objects of his anger. Nevertheless, the passage seems clearly to refer to the Banū Qurayẓah, of whom many were killed, rather than to the Banū Qaynuqāʿ, who were only exiled. The Risālah refers clearly to the Banū Qaynuqāʿ, and in Peter of Toledo's translation the episode in which the Prophet spares their lives at ʿAbdallāh ibn Ubayy's intercession is unambiguous. Vincent, however, (in texts seen by me) omits the passage, and that immediately preceding it, by a slip. (Tol., MS. p. 298 col. 1; Vincent, 23.42; Muir, p.48)

2. Cf. Vitry, V; reprobatio, VI.

no angel to minister to the wounds. This loving catalogue of hurts follows the Risālah closely.[1] Vague as the historical context of Uhud here became, to mock at the idea of a prophet's suffering such misfortunes was so popular that the episode was soon even further detached from the historical context and was rumoured about almost in a vacuum.[2] Doubtless the theme circulated, independent of any written version, among oriental Christians and among Mozarabs.

The vagueness about the historical sequence of events was very general. The reprobatio did not attempt a consecutive narration of Muhammad's life.[3] Lull referred without precision to his seizure of power in Medina and his war against the King of Mecca; this picture of a feudal rebel was not further clarified.[4] There is a clearer version in the Historia Arabum and the Cronica de España, and another, independent, and very much better, by San Pedro Pascual, who discussed almost the whole sequence of events, distinguishing clearly between Mecca and Medina. Elsewhere the absence of this distinction is most remarkable, since without it there can be no understanding of Muhammad's life, and in lesser matters many writers were much better informed. There were

---

1. The long account cited here from Viterbo and Paris is not a precis but extracts salient points.
2. See also above, p. 150; below, p. 369
3. This is more obvious in the B.N. MS., where not only are the portions of his life separated, but the early life is made to conclude the entire work.
4. Hamar, sig. 10.

many confusions of the two cities, as well as references to Mecca as the place of burial of the Prophet. This underlines the almost universal absence of a consecutive history. Apart from the apocryphal tales which have the narrative continuity of romance, but no relation to fact, there was no attempt to represent a sequence of events leading naturally from one to another. There is a marked contrast with the generally fuller presentation both of Muhammad's early life and of his call to the prophethood, and in cases where considerable detail was known there was often little attempt to put it in a clear sequence. The events between the first revelation and the death of the Prophet were for the most part recounted in a vacuum.

Here again it is the Risālah which must be seen as largely responsible, because Western knowledge was largely limited by the accident of its contents. The polemic value of Muhammad's failures was fully exploited, but it was not the purpose of the Risālah, or of any other product of Christians with access to authentic information, to mention such successes of the Muslims as did not seem to disgrace them. Western writers were wholly ignorant of the battle of Badr, which had so important an influence on the development of the early Islamic community. Muhammad's ultimate peaceful conquest of Mecca following the agreement at Ḥudaybiyah was equally little known. This ignorance of facts which seem to us crucial

extended to writers who had direct access to new information; their selection of facts also excluded those devoid of controversial value. Whether selected or copied, anything approaching a complete story was exceedingly rare.

It is instructive, however, to examine those few that do show some realisation of time and consequence. The Historia Arabum has a reasonably clear sequence in which Roderick speaks of Muhammad's lying hidden for three years in Mecca, his wanting in his fortieth year to declare himself prophet, the hostility of the Meccans, and his going away "as if from humility" to Medina, and finally his return 'resumptis viribus' to Mecca, his humiliation of the Quraysh who appealed to his generosity and courtesy; symbolically, his imposition of the adhan upon the city.[1] Taken by itself, this would be clear enough, however simplified, but in fact it did not stand alone. It was combined with an apocryphal story of Muhammad's war with the Romans and his capture of Syria and Mesopotamia which anticipated the victories of abū Bakr and ʿUmar. In the Historia Arabum a description of Muhammad's claim to revelation follows that of the conquest of Mecca and of the Romans, although it had been referred to indecisively before. This text is unique in talking about the conquest of Mecca at all, but it is never wholly clear how the Meccans were regarded in it. In the Cronica the Corozan story was also interpolated, so that

1. III; Cron. de Esp., CXIV

the part about revelation at the very end, in both cases following an account of the miʿrāj, is cut off from where it rightly belongs. In both books an episode involving abū Ṭālib was based on the story of his death-bed refusal to believe, lest the Quraysh should say he did so from fear; this was inserted, very much out of place, towards the end of the story of Muhammad himself, where its introduction would be confusing, especially to a reader who did not know that the original episode occurred before the hijrah.[1] The various chapters in the Cronica were interpolated among chapters dealing with Spain. Only a very confused impression could result from a reading of either book. There was telescoping, combined with an indiscriminate use of irreconcileable sources which obscured the effect of those that were accurate and sound.

Both the quadruplex reprobatio and San Pedro described the conversion of the first Muslims in Mecca. Khadījah was the first to believe; ʿAlī was the first male Muslim and he was followed by Zayd and abū Bakr; in both authorities the list continued.[2] The reprobatio telescoped all the history that followed, of the hijrah, and of Muhammad at Medina, into a few vague phrases. Thus it said that Muhammad claimed that it was his office to require men to confess no other than God and Muhammad his messenger; otherwise they should be killed or pay tribute. Some, deceived by the

1. Hist. Arab., VI; Cron. de Esp., CXXI/493
2. Quad. rep., IV; S.S.M. I. i. 20 -22.

devil, believed him out of a silly simplicity; others followed their relatives into the error, the blind leading the blind into the pit;[1] others followed him for honour and the multiplication of temporal goods. There is no suggestion here that the author was mistaken about questions of history, but what he has given us is a brief summary of facts together with their theological implications. San Pedro, however, composed a history that proceeded with moderate care from stage to stage. His is the most considerable and the clearest account, and it is without rival in fullness or accuracy.

He told a number of stories of the Prophet in Mecca. A curious error was to begin by adding to the list of the early Muslims the Jews of the Banū Qurayẓah, who, he said, although later they were killed, at that time believed freely.[2] It is a feature of his attitude to treat the Jews of Arabia as treacherous to their own beliefs, and supporters of Muhammad; this may reflect the Muslim attitude to their treachery to Muhammad which is traditional.[3] In his account of the

---

1. Matth. 15.14.
2. This can only refer to the relations of the Medinan Jews to the Prophet after the hijrah. They never believed, but original good relations deteriorated, as they not only refused to believe but came to jeer. San Pedro did not distinguish their three tribes, but spoke of the Banū Qurayẓah throughout. He described them as 'aliama, id est, sinagoga Beneccoraydae'. I have no explanation of 'aliama'.
3. Vitry (op. cit. VI) spoke of the great hatred of Muslims towards Jews, because they blamed them for attempting the death of Christ. (Q. IV 156/154 - 159/158)

Christian version of events, the Jews were shown as receiving their inevitable reward. He recounted at some length the development of opposition to the new religion of Islam in Mecca. He told the story of the challenge of the Quraysh that Muhammad should work such useful miracles as the fertilisation and expansion of the cultivable land, or the resurrection of their ancestors. More than the author of the reprobatio or Ricoldo, both of whom treated the same tradition, he set it into a particular historical context. He then described how the citizens of Mecca sent to the Jews of "Yathrib, the town where Muhammad later was buried", to ask about the Messias they expected. (We have seen that they set puzzle questions, which, after some significant delay, were answered by revelation.)[1] At this stage of his fortunes, San Pedro imagined the Prophet's holding a solemn assembly of the people to announce the revelation, rather more grandly than was at that time the case. The jeers of the Quraysh at the delay he silenced when he said that he had failed at first because he had promised to do a thing without adding the words, "if God wills", and revelation had been withheld from him as a warning. He meanwhile was still proselytising: "he frightened them with the threat of Hell or encouraged them with the promise of

---

1. Above, p. 268

Paradise". This is unsubtle, but not unfair, as a summary of Meccan teaching.[1] San Pedro exploited, too thoroughly, the "Satanic verses"; he made Muhammad out to be willing to allow the pagans to continue to serve their idols and to retain their customs unchanged, until his companions remonstrated that this was contrary to his preaching of the one God. This put the worst construction conceivable on the facts. The emigration to Ethiopia and the failure of the mission of the Quraysh to recover the emigrants, the deaths of Khadījah and of abū Ṭālib, these were adequately described, and made clear the difficulties of early Islam. Finally "the citizens of Mecca made a league against Muhammad, who was thrown out, and took himself off to live in the city which was then called Yathrib, where he was later buried; and henceforth the same was called Almedina, the city". The stages of Muhammad's relations with the Quraysh were simplified, but there was intelligible representation of the essentials of the Meccan period.[2] The issue between Muhammad and the pagans of Mecca was not made out to be about

---

1. Lull in his very short account in the Doctrina Pueril made much the same point when he represented Muhammad's first teaching as being of Paradise and Resurrection - admittedly a carnal Paradise and Resurrection - to people who did not believe in the immortal soul; at the same time his chronology was particularly confused, and he placed the prophetic claim in Medina. The section is highly compressed, and his many other references to the history of Muhammad are incidental, scattered throughout his works. D.P., 7.

2. San Pedro also gave a version of Muhammad's wrestling bout with Rukāna al-Muṭṭalibi (ibn Isḥāq, 258); at the end, it is barely intelligible, and its precise polemic purpose is obscure. (S.S.M. I. i. 45)

anything other than religion; San Pedro was rather self-consciously repeating what he regarded as a Muslim account; he thought it sufficiently disgraceful as it stood.

The Medinan story was less well recounted. San Pedro began his account with mention of a certain Jew who recognised Muhammad as the prophet foretold in Jewish Scriptures, and who deceived and brought with him to Islam some others.[1] This slight episode was given a prominence that fits San Pedro's emphasis on the help given by Jews in building Islam. From this he jumped to a brief mention of the battle of Uḥud; what interested him was the death of so large a proportion of the Muslims, and (as with most of his contemporaries) the personal hurts of Muhammad. At the same time there was no suggestion at all of the "band of robbers" concept, although San Pedro knew the Risālah; not only Badr, but every one of the early expeditions against the Meccans was ignored. What was brought more than ever into prominence was relations with the Jews. At Uḥud there was a Jew who wanted to persuade his people to fight, but they refused, because it was the Sabbath. This man made Muhammad his heir and was killed in the battle; Muhammad fell heir to his property, but not, remarked San Pedro with heavy sarcasm, to the four teeth he lost in the fighting.[2]

---

1. We may note that San Pedro does not say that the Jews recognised him as Messias, thus correctly reflecting Islamic belief.

2. The unfortunate Jewish testator was Mukhayrik, but he was not killed at Uḥud. The sabbatarian excuse was supposed to have been used by the Banū Qurayẓah at the Battle of the Ditch, for not supporting the Quraysh against Muhammad. The incident may be grafted on to two incidents at Uḥud of which elements seem recognisable; the refusal by Muhammad to allow Jewish clients of ʿAbdallāh ibn Ubayy to fight on the Muslim side, and the part played by ʿAbdallāh, the patron of the Banū Qaynuqāʿ.

This version was independent of others we have noticed, but the conclusion was much the same; the facts (he thought) were an extraordinary admission, the Muslims do not blush to recount all this themselves. It was at this stage, when there should have followed some version of the Battle of the Ditch, that San Pedro placed what sounds like the Battle of Badr:

> Then he heard that many merchants of Mecca were approaching that city from other parts, with a great column of laden beasts of burden; he hid in ambush with his companions, and killed seventy of the merchants and muleteers of Mecca, and took seventy more captive; and the whole caravan was plundered.

As though his account had dealt with the Battle of the Ditch in its proper order, he proceeded directly to the attack on the Banū Qurayẓah: Muhammad began to wage war on the inhabitants of Mecca and neighbouring towns who refused to be converted; and especially the Jews. It was the Jews who had first helped him and who now received a fitting reward; all the Banū Qurayẓah were killed and none left alive except the women and children, although they had been the first inhabitants of the city to follow him.[1] Thus Muhammad's people became rich, and he continued his war against the citizens of Mecca and the Jews who had fortresses until all the enemy fortresses had been reduced. One Jew persuaded the Meccans and the other Jews to resist Muhammad, but he killed him, and the others were stricken by fear of him, and accepted his lordship.[2] Once again the

---

1. Pedro almost certainly thought that these Jews became formal Muslims from the first, (in the Meccan period).
2. Referring to the death of Usayr ibn Riẓām ?

author was astonished that Muslim authors are not ashamed to recount these facts. Finally Muhammad attempted unsuccessfully to attack the Eastern Romans, but while he lived this was not repeated.[1]

While this account is not in any way fair to Muhammad, and while it shows by modern standards little discrimination between what should be considered probable and what improbable, it is based on recognisable Muslim sources, and its historical sense is more modern than any contemporary's. Its chief omission is the ultimate entry into Mecca. It owes no information to the Risālah or any Christian author; San Pedro dealt with Christian sources separately. It seems likely that the point about one single and unsuccessful attack on East Rome having been made before the death of the Prophet was in correction of the version represented among surviving literary sources by the Historia Arabum and the Cronica de España. The contrast between the Meccan and Medinan periods, the preaching, resulting in ostracism, of the one, and the essential military strategy of the other, are preserved in spite of many confusions of detail. Accounts based on the Risālah, despite a careful enumeration of the expeditions, left both these, and the assassinations, described because of their inhumanity, unexplained. San Pedro, in his use of Muslim sources, was muddled in many details, but unique in his sense of time and sequence, and of cause and effect.

---

1. S.S.M. I. i. 23 - 58 (covers both Meccan and Medinan history).

Writers who realised the original failure of the Muslim community in Mecca rejoiced in it and sympathised as far as possible with the Quraysh, who recognised Muhammad for a fraud. The Muslim community at Medina, in so far as the distinction of place was made, and otherwise the community generally, was seen by all those writers whom we have considered as a political association based on personal adherence to Muhammad, and revolutionary in respect of existing political institutions. It was a community of conquest, defying duly established authority; it treated the Meccans, whose mercantile interests, constantly referred to, were legitimate, in the way that, under Muhammad's successors and on a larger scale, it was to treat the East Roman and Persian empires. In many writers the "robber" theme drew attention to a socially disruptive aspect, and to the contrast between so small a nucleus of men and the great nation that developed from it. The dramatic rise of Islam was explained by Muhammad's 'prophetic pretence', by his apparently indulgent legislation, and more particularly by his employment of trickery and force.

Muhammad appears here as subject to the fluctuations of fortune of ordinary humanity. He could have received no divine mission if he lost the battles that he fought; if, above all, he himself suffered physical hurt. It was for this reason that his difficulties in Mecca, his failure

to convince his compatriots, gave such gratification to those who knew about them. The days of his success, and the triumph of the Islamic community in his lifetime, were almost wholly ignored. Muhammad's violence was thought of as characteristic, just as violence was thought of as characteristic of the whole religion of Islam; in the same way, lasciviousness was imputed both to Muhammad and to Islam generally. The prophet was the law-giver of his community, and although he did not permit to his followers everything he permitted himself, he did legislate in conformity with his own practice and his followers' desires. Thus his personal history was significant for his social and religious institutions.

Chapter 15.

The Household of the Prophet.

Certain episodes in Muhammad's private life seemed to make it impossible that he should be messenger of God; in Christian writings they recur like a chorus. They were connected with a marital licence that was thought to be peculiarly Islamic, and which the Prophet seemed to have initiated. Shocked horror was echoed by narrators who, one after another, were able to believe none but the most discreditable stories. Such stories enjoyed a success uninhibited by squeamishness; and it seemed that, if they were fully exploited, they alone were ample finally to exclude from the Prophet's life every pretension to sanctity as the Christian West understood it.

One of the most popular was a tradition about the Prophet's faculty for coition[1] which it will be most convenient to cite in its most accurate Western form, that is, as it was given by the quadruplex reprobatio:

> Dicitur in libro Bohari III capitulo locutionis, Emus filius Elech (=Anas ibn Mālik) dixisse quod Machometus circumibat mulieres suas, iacendo cum eis in una hora noctis vel diei, et erant undecim. Et dictum fuit isti Emus, numquid potuit facere ? Qui dixit, nos dicebamus inter nos, quod potestas seu virtus triginta virorum data fuerit Machometo in coitu. (2)

---

1. In the form generally cited, Bukhārī 6. xii; it recurs in Bukhārī in a shortened form citing nine wives.
2. Cap. VI. (Berlin MSS. sic. The B.N. MS. has a poorer and incomplete rendering.) The reference is wrong (III for VI and locutionis for lotionis) but the mistake may well not be the author's. "in una hora noctis vel diei" is a mistake: Houdas/Marcais, "dans le seul espace de temps d'un jour et d'une nuit".

This is a simple translation of Bukhārī. The ḥadīth was quoted by San Pedro in the same general form[1] but more vaguely: (dicunt Mauri quasi in Mahometi laudem and cum undecim cubare possit).[2] For these authors and for most Latin Christians there would be no questioning the statement's validity.[3] It entered the Western consciousness not only directly from Arabic sources but also through Pedro de Alfonso and the Risālah. The Risālah gave it prominence, and it circulated, in Vincent de Beauvais' long extracts in the Speculum Historiale, as well as in complete form in some copies of the Cluniac collection, in the more common form "non erubuit ut diceret datum suis renibus a Deo, XL viros in coitu potentissimus fortitudine libidinis adaequare". This form was usually quoted in different translations; it is likely to have been a commonplace of Arabic-speaking Christians in both Spain and Syria, and to have passed orally with the easy negotiability of near-pornography exempt from censorship into the tradition of the West.[4] It was soon believed that "Muhammad's boast" was in the Qur'an: "Ipse enim gloriatur in lege sua quod data sit

---

1. The form is distinguishable by the phrase "in one hour" and by the number XXX, instead of XL, men.
2. S.S.M. I. ii. 14; later quoted, as by most writers, in the form nine wives: ibid., I. viii. 148.
3. Cf. Muir, p. 50, "an objectionable passage . . . based on a weak tradition."
4. Risālah, Tol., MS. p. 298, col. 2; Vincent, 23.44; Pedro de Alf., loc. cit.

sibi potestas in lumbis . . ." said Humbert.[1] This mistake had a vague authority in the Risālah ("in scriptura prophetiae suae") and was aggravated by Fidenzio's greater precision in the phrase "in libro suo". Ricoldo cited the point in the common form, and in connection with the Prophet's supposed intention physically to fill the world with Muslims. Both he and San Pedro regarded Muhammad's failure to produce sons that lived as a divine judgment.[2] Marino had read both Pedro de Alfonso and Vincent de Beauvais.[3]

The episode in the actual history of Muhammad which was most gratifying to his detractors was his marriage to Zaynab bint Jaḥsh after her divorce from Zayd ibn Ḥāritha.[4] "He was not ashamed," said Pedro de Alfonso, "to pollute a strange bed with adultery, as if commanded by God to do so."[5] This is a neat summary of the way Christians would interpret this story; a typical presentation was that which Vitry and the Syrian Apology shared. According to this, his slave had a beautiful wife and, suspicious of his master's lust, he warned her to avoid him. One day Muhammad called at Zayd's

---

1. De pred. S.C., 12.
2. Ric., Itin. XXXV; Disp. VIII; S.S.M. I. ii. 15.
3. III. III. There is a particularly muddled version in Simon Simeon: ". . . eum inter alia laudant clamoribus vocibus et magnificant, quod una nocte, cum mulieribus novem, nonaginta vicibus turpiter operatus est . . ."
4. See also above, p. 314
5. This episode was publicised also by the Risālah, loc. cit., and by the Contrarietas, VII, MS., f. 246 v - 247 r. It may be said to have achieved maximum popularity.

house, saw and spoke to her, Zayd divorced her and Muhammad married her. To avoid the accusation of adultery he feigned a justificatory revelation, which he erected into a general law, "that if anyone repudiated his wife, and if anyone else wished to take her, she should be the wife of him who received her".[1] We should recall that there would be question of adultery only from the Christian point of view which does not recognise divorce.[2]

This general law seems to be an obscure reflection of that actually promulgated by the relevant revelation of the Qur'an, that it would be no crime to marry the divorced wife of an adopted son.[3] Both more and less precise Latin versions referred to the murmurings of the people; this may be a Christian assumption that those Arabs who doubted whether the prophet ought to marry his adopted son's divorced wife (on grounds of a false consanguinity) were really angry at what Christians called adultery.[4] This confusion of two incompatible attitudes is borne out by the contrast within San Pedro's rendering. The traditional Christian dondemnation was represented by his own introduction to it, where he said that the Prophet showed himself a fornicator, a man of false

---

1. Vitry, V; Viterbo; Paris.
2. Zayd was a former slave whom Muhammad had redeemed and adopted and brought up as a son. This version follows distantly that traditional in Islam (cf. Sale, p. 349) while omitting every particular which might mitigate guilt in the eye of a Christian reader. To a Muslim reader the whole presentation would seem grotesque.
3. Q. XXXIII. 37.
4. Cf. Leg. Aur.

faith and ill truth. He was content to relate the history itself in terms intelligible to an Islamic reader. This seemed bad enough: how Muhammad fell in love (Sp. enamorara, Latin, eius amore captus) and how the Muslims blamed him for a marriage which was contrary to their own law, because Zayd was his adopted son.[1]

The story was given in greater detail by Fidenzio, who, while he cast a romantic colour over it, allowed something of the ultimate Muslim source to appear.

> There was a certain man called Saidus, and he had a wife called Sebib, who was one of the most beautiful women who lived on the earth in her days. However, Muhammad heard of the fame of her beauty, and burned with desire of her. Wanting to see her, he came to the home of the woman in the absence of her husband and asked for her husband. She said, "O Messenger of God, what do you want, what are you here for ? My husband has gone to deal with his affairs." This was not hidden from her husband. When he came back to his home, he said to his wife, "Was the Messenger of God here ?" She replied, "He was." He said, "Did he see your face ?" She replied, "He did see it and he watched me for a long time." He said, "I cannot live with you any longer."
>
> While Muhammad was sitting with his companions, suddenly he fell on his face, as he was accustomed to do in pretence. His companions said, "The angel Gabriel has come to real something to him." After an hour he raised his head and said to his companions: "The Lord appeared to me and confuted me about the wife of Saidus." His companions answered, "And what is that, O Messenger of God?" As he wished to take her to wife, Saidus said to him, "O Messenger of God, and dost thou wish to appropriate my wife whom I have divorced ?" Muhammad answered him, "Saidus, God has confuted me from Heaven on behalf of your wife, and wishes that I should take her for myself. The witnesses to this thing are the angels of God, Michael and Gabriel." After this Muhammad got up hastily and went to the home of the woman and took her for himself. She blushed when she saw him but he said to the woman, "Do not

---

1. S.S.M. I. ii. 5.

> blush, woman, for God has given me to you for a husband, and has ordained this marriage from Heaven. The witnesses of this thing are the angels of God, Michael and Gabriel." So he took her as wife, and afterwards she used to glory in front of Muhammad's wives, saying, "You were given to the Messenger of God as wives by your friends on earth, but God married me to the Messenger of God from Heaven." (1)

This is obviously derived from Arabic. It seems as though a passage has been rather disingenuously omitted, after the divorce and before the revelation, in which Muhammad expressed reluctance to take Zaynab even when she was offered to him. Lull's version shows signs of direct Arabic influence, and also of a curious romantic psychology. Treating of offences against the commandment not to covet a neighbour's wife, he described how one of Muhammad's servants, when he realised that Muhammad had seen his beautiful wife, offered her to him: "I have a beautiful wife, have her at your will." He said this cunningly (cautelose) so that Muhammad should refuse, and he did indeed reply, "Because you speak so courteously (curialiter) I give her back to you." The man was overjoyed, but prematurely so, because in the morning he learned that Gabriel had visited the Prophet and asked why he had not taken the woman when he desired her.[2] Other late versions have

---

1. loc. cit.

2. Hamar. sig, 9,

no great additional interest.[1] Although the bare facts were often embroidered, and the background, naturally enough, entirely misunderstood, it remains true that what Muslims admitted amounted to a confession of adultery in Christian terms; the popularity of so authentic an admission is not surprising.

Another matter, more or less closely connected with the Zaynab story, arose out of the same sūrah and received a generally confused presentation. It is best to cite first the quadruplex reprobatio, which is clearer and closer to the original than others, although as tendentious as any:

> In the tractate of the Qur'an which is called al aḥzāb (2) in the fourth chapter, Muhammad said that God spoke to him and said: We allow thee thy wives, to whom thou shouldst give dowries, and all thy slaves whom God gave to thee, and the daughters of thy paternal uncle and of thy paternal aunt, and the daughters of thy maternal uncle and of thy maternal aunt, who have followed thee. And every believing woman, if she offers her body or herself to the Prophet, and if the Prophet desires to lie

---

1. Ricoldo's principal account is in Disp. VIII; see below p. There is a reference in ch. XII. It adds nothing to the Contrarietas. The Anonimo Fiorentino concluded that Muhammad made a universal law that if a man made an unproved accusation of adultery against his wife, another man could have her. This engaging idea is a freak misconception which has no particular importance. James of Acqui's version of the "general law" resulting from the episode was that the Sultan or other head of the Muslim community might take any repudiated wife to be his concubine, provided that she was not pregnant. The proviso seems to reflect ordinary Islamic law of ʿidda in a confused way. He apparently thought that Zaynab was the Prophet's concubine, and probably he was confused about the distinction between wives and concubines in any case.
2. "elhazeb". *in text*

> with her, let it be permitted; but only to thee and not to the other believers. A few words later (he goes on) Thou shalt give hope to whom thou pleasest, that is, of those that offer themselves to thee, and thou shalt receive whom thou pleasest, and, if thou desirest, one whom thou hast sent away; and it is not a sin for thee. (1)

Comparison with the Qur'an will show how effectively this translation, with a minimum inaccuracy, gives an entirely erroneous sense. On the foundation of truth that the Prophet was allowed more wives than other believers he is shown as permitted promiscuous access to women, irrespective of their belonging to his household; what in the Christian presentation is a suggestive phrase about their offering themselves, in actual fact refers to offers of marriage without expectation of a dowry.[2] The final verse quoted should have been recognised as irrelevant. It refers to the Prophet's exemption from sleeping with his wives in strict rotation; it is not a concession of promiscuity, but a regulation of the rights of his wives.

It was to this question of the rotation of marital duties within the household that ʿĀʾishah referred when she said that she blamed her companions who offered themselves to the Prophet, and remarked that God hastened to satisfy his desires.[3] It is impossible to suppose that ʿĀʾishah spoke with the scepticism which, out of context, her remark suggests, and with which it was invested by the author of the quadruplex reprobatio.

---

1. Quad. rep., VI; Q. XXXIII. 49, 51.
2. Cf. commentaries quoted by Sale, p. 348.
3. Bu., 65. 33. 7.

His doing so was the natural consequence of his misconception of the revelation concerned.

> On account of this (revelation) many women offered themselves, which is proved by the book of Bohari in the tractate of the exposition of the Qur'an, where ʿĀ'ishah said: I was jealous of those women who offered themselves to the Messenger of God, and I said, the woman offers herself to the Prophet. But after God gave this law, that Muhammad should give hope to whom he willed, and should receive whom he willed, I said to Muhammad, "I see the Lord thy God quickly fulfils thy desire."

The story was rounded off by citation of the title which the Qur'an in the same sūrah gave to the Prophet's wives: the mothers of the believers.[1] As a Muslim admission this seems to offer no polemic utility in such a form, but it must have been thought, especially in association with what has just been quoted, to hint at a lewd connotation which was more crudely asserted by other Christian writers. Both Jacques de Vitry and the Syrian Apology[2] made out that among the Arabs Muhammad was notorious for his adulteries, and claimed that, as a concession to those who disapproved his way of life, he made adultery punishable by death, reserving to himself the right to go in to the wives of other men, in order to generate prophets and sons of virtue. This tale then seemed far from from absurd, on the contrary, well in character; it was copies by the Legenda Aurea and the Anonimo Fiorentino followed the same tradition. A form equally misleading but closer to authentic sources is

---

1. Q., XXXIII. 37
2. Paris; Viterbo; Vitry V.

illustrated by Humbert:

> As he loved the wife of a certain man and had prohibited adultery in his law, he invented this privilege, conceded by God to him as to the highest prophet, that any married woman who wished to subject herself to him freely could do so without sin, and he published this, saying that it was revealed to him, in order that he might thus entice (Zaynab) and other wives to his desire more easily. (1)

The use of the word 'gratis', which does not occur in other versions and is a good translation of the Qur'an, suggests a direct source. San Pedro spoke, in connection with Zaynab, of Muhammad's tricks designed to get him the 'wives' of others (plural). It was in conncection with the marraige to Maymūna bint al-Ḥārith, however, that he brought in the "special privilege" of Muhammad, who might, if he wished, accept any woman as a wife who offered herself to him;[2] this, he said, was the case with Maymūna, who offered both herself and her camel. He apostrophised the Prophet in a way that seems to refer rather to Zaynab than to Maymūna, and that drags in the subject of legalised forced adultery without much encouragement from the context.

> I indeed say to the, O Muhammad, that no prophet so relaxed the controls and laws concerning the use of women as thou didst; but thou didst never receive these laws from God, for how could a woman leave her husband and her sons, and, against the will of her husband, go away with another man, and that please God ? (3)

---

1. De Pred. S.C., 12.
2. The references in the summula and in the marginal comments to Ketton, although general, suggest an at least equally precise interpretation of the Qur'anic story: "multorum aliorum uxores ex responso divino adulterans"; "introducens Deum sibi loquentem ut cujusdam uxorem, quam valde amabat, licenter stupravet . . ." (Ad. az. 43). Cf. P. Pict., capit., lib. II. V: "adulteria perpetrare sibi a Deo concessum in Alcorano suo dicens."
3. S.S.M., I. ii. 7, 11, 12.

Ricoldo, and Vitry before him, supposed that it was the reproduction of believers which was claimed to justify the potestas in coitu.[1] Ricoldo's version of the Zaynab story had been particularly crude in its climax: "God commanded me to commit this adultery". He failed to realise how he reduced his own arguments to the absurd; in real debate they would have been ridiculed.[2] The view that what mattered was not the adultery, but its justification in the name of God, represented his more balanced moments.[3] Lull also voiced the familiar misinterpretation of sūrah 33: on account of his sanctity the Prophet was to be allowed whatever women he desired.[4]

It was less the practice of a moral code repellent to mediaeval authors, than its justification by religion which disturbed them; and they were not less disturbed by what was partly the product of their own imagination. Another incident, which Christians, shocked by these aspects of the Prophet's life, have exaggerated, is that of the slave, Marīyah the Copt, the mother of the Prophet's son Ibrāhīm, and the revelation of sūrah 66. Once again it is best to cite first the quadruplex reprobatio:

> Again, it is touched upon in the Qur'an, in the tractate Prohibition, in the beginning and in the gloss that

---

1. Itin. XXXV; Vitry, loc. cit.
2. This is one of many arguments which Ricoldo recommended to the use of missionaries, but which it is impossible to believe that he himself used in debate with Muslims.
3. The point derives from Contrarietas, but the actual wording and consequent emphasis are Ricoldo's. (Disp. XII).
4. Hamar, sig. 9.

> is there, that a certain Muqawqis presented to Muhammad a woman who was called Marīyah the Copt, and he took her as a concubine. It happened, however, that he lay with her in the home of his wife, by name Ḥafṣah, who was not present; but when she came, she saw them having intercourse, and this made her very angry. She reproached him saying, "O Prophet of God, was there none of your women lower than me ? Why did you lie with her in my home and on my bed ?" Wanting to placate her, he said to her, "Would it please you if I abstained from her ?" She said, "Yes." He swore that he would not lie with Marīyah again, and said to Ḥafṣah, "Do not tell these things to anyone else." After that, against this promise and oath, he lay with Marīyah again, and said in his Qur'an that God appointed satisfaction for the Muslims of their oaths, that is, if they wished to make some oath, and if they wished to go against it, that they could do so with expiation, without satisfaction. (1)

The same triple reproach as was made over the Zaynab affair is implicit here: Muhammad was promiscuous, and he justified himself by revelations which he then erected into general laws for the benefit of his followers. Also, the same author continued, "To reveal his uncleanness he caused it to be said in the Qur'an in the tractate al-Fatḥ that God forgave him his past and future sins".[2] There was some Arabic authority for associating this verse with both the Marīyah and Zaynab affairs,[3] and the Latin author must have been aware of this when he quoted it here. He discussed it again in relation

---

1. loc. cit.; Q. LXVI. passim; verse 2 verbatim. This translation from the Latin corrects the forms of names. Muqawqis appears as Machauipas (MS.) and Mathanaquim (MS. and printed text). B.N. MS. omits the name and gives only quidam. In the Muslim version Ḥafṣah told ʿĀ'ishah, despite the Prophet's contrary instruction, what had happened, and ʿĀ'ishah revealed her knowledge.
2. Q. XLVIII. 1.
3. Cf. authorities quoted by Sale, p. 413.

to the question of oath-breaking, and illustrated the general law of Islam by Muhammad's behaviour on this particular occasion.[1]

San Pedro was rather fuller in his treatment of the matter, which substituted ʿĀ'ishah for Ḥafṣah but was substantially the same. His selection from and quotation of sūrah 66 is interesting: "O Prophet, why dost thou prohibit what God has allowed thee ? God is righteous in sparing; now God remits our oaths for us, and absolves us from them; our God is compassionate".[2] The important point was the oath-breaking.[3] Ricoldo told a slightly different version, by which Ḥafṣah and ʿĀ'ishah joined in jealousy to attack Marīyah the Copt, or Jacobitess, as he calls her, and found the Prophet lying with her; this omits Ḥafṣah's bed and house and destroys the point of her objection.[4] He quoted the revelation of sūrah 66 even more fully than his predecessors: ". . . thou art seeking to please thy wives; now God has legislated for thee, to allow thee to be freed of thy oaths . . ." He mistakenly associated with this sūrah ʿĀ'ishah's remark that God revealed what suited the Prophet, which he quoted in an expanded form. He then quoted the remainder of the sūrah.

> (Muhammad) read to his two wives all that followed in the chapter of Prohibition and as though in the person of

---

1. quad. rep. cap. IX.
2. S.S.M. I. iv. 11; Q. LXVI. 1. 2.
3. Derived from the Contrarietas, loc. cit., f. 245 v ff.
4. The better explanation, that Marīyah was given Ḥafṣah's or ʿĀ'ishah's day, was never quoted; the mediaevals do not seem to have grasped the Prophet's system of rotation.

> God said: Be penitent before God, for your hearts have turned aside - referring to the calumny they had made against him of impurity. There immediately follows: If perhaps he repudiates you, God will give him better than you, Muslims, faithful, trusty, penitent, observant of ritual and prayer, hard-working and virgins. When they heard that, they said, We are penitent.

The point he wished to stress was that to pretend revelation was to add blasphemy to the other crimes.[1]

There are some minor points which add force to what has already been said. Traditionally associated with the Marīyah episode was the story that Muhammad swore to refrain from his wives for a month, but could not, thus combining lasciviousness with the breaking of oaths. "But when he was annoyed with one of (his wives) he swore that he would not lie with her for a month, but before the end of it he was defeated by the foulness of his desire, despised his oath and lay with her." The tradition that Muhammad observed a month of twenty-nine days' continence was independent of the Marīyah context in any Muslim version.[2] Vitry, from whom this

---

1. Disp. VIII; MS. f. 167 v 2 - 168 r 1. The text is a little obscure; cf. Bart. Pic., Bibl., col. 145. Cf. Disp. XIII; Q., LXVI, 1, 2 (part), 4 (part), 5 (incomplete). Cf. with these authors Acqui's muddled statement, which implies, of course, the same moral lesson as the more accurate versions. "Muhammad said, of himself, that by the licence of God he could go in to any woman, espoused, married or concubine, pregnant, virgin, deflowered or widowed, and to any other, whatever her condition or state, in order that they should make and give birth to better and more virtuous sons; since, being in a certain way joined to him, they received his holy spirit, which he had in his soul."
2. Cf. Bu., 83.20 et alibi.

quotation comes, noted also the jealousy with which Muhammad enclosed his wives; this Oriental practice was strange and unsympathetic to Latins.[1] At the Western end of the Mediterranean, the reprobatio noted the Qur'anic injunction against the remarriage of the Mothers of the Believers.[2] Earlier, the annotator of Ketton's Qur'an had remarked on the same surah, "how after so much care of his own women, immediately he took up the subject of chastity - in order to cover up his lechery, he who above all men was mad with the lust for women . . . "[3]

High among the immunditiae of the Prophet, the quadruplex reprobatio listed traditions from Bukhārī concerned with washings; this position may indicate, not so much the importance they were supposed to have, as their proximity in the source to another already quoted. "ʿĀʾishah said : I and the Prophet washed ourselves from the same jar, and we were polluted, and he told me to cover myself with a cloth, et sic iacebat mecum seu contingebat me et eram menstruata."[4] This could be immundus only if "iacebat mecum seu contingebat me" is a euphemism, but it is clear from Bukhārī, as well as from the Qur'anic text, that "lie beside or touch" is meant literally,

---

1. loc. cit. The reference is to sūrah 33; not, of course, to the matter of Zaynab, which is treated in the same sūrah.
2. VI.
3. Ad. az. 43. For some of these points, see also below, p.
4. loc. cit.; Bu. 6.5, cf. 6.4, 21, 22; cf. Q. II. 222. The Latin does not cite Bukhārī's heading accurately.

and the Latin preference for an unpleasant interpretation was gratuitous.[1] San Pedro, with rather less delicacy, made it abundantly clear how he understood these traditions:

> . . . ipsemet Mahometus, cum uxores eius impediebantur aegritudine qua feminae laborant, iuxta earum naturam, coibat cum illis vase praepostero. Ipsa Axa (= ʿĀʾishah) Mahometi uxor pessimum et vile testimonium contra Mahometum super hac re dedit, dicens, sic disponere naturam meam iussit me Mahometus dum mecum cubare volebat tempore menstruationis meae. Maymona quoque, alia uxor eius, narravit quod Mahometus dum cum aliqua ex suis uxoribus coire vellet eaque diceret menstruo laborare . . . tunc eam naturam cooperiri pannoque comprimere iubebat, et cum illa cubabat. (2)

These examples are worth quoting, because they were thought so important by Latins who created them out of so little. It is instructive, when we consider that so much more was extracted from the Islamic sources than they contained, to reflect how far a conviction of righteousness will encourage misrepresentation. It would be a mistake to suppose conscious malice, or any but the best intentions.

We may also glance briefly at the story of the accusations against and the vindication of ʿĀʾishah. It was recounted at length by San Pedro, but he did not suggest that there was anything disreputable beyond the manufacturing of a revelation, evidence of hypocrisy, or diabolical possession, or both; and the human fondness for ʿĀʾishah which was unworthy of a prophet.[3] The latter point was substantially that attributed

---

1. The author does not positively say, as does San Pedro, where the uncleanness is supposed to lie; whatever he meant, the context makes it clear that it was discreditable and not what Bukhārī meant.
2. S.S.M. I. iv. 18, 19. This seems to be a misapprehension of Bu., 6.5. Cf. Wensinck, Handbook, under "menstruation". Cf. Q. 2. 222.
3. Ibid., I. ii. 1 ff.; Q. 24.11 ff.; cf. Ibn Ishāq, 731 ff.

by tradition to ʿAlī himself[1] and was put into his mouth by the Risālah also, in much the terms derived by Bukhārī from ʿĀʾishah herself. In the Latin translation, however, and in the extracts made by Vincent de Beauvais, ʿĀʾishah was described as "libidini dedita"; she was asserted to have been beloved by Ṣafwān ibn al-Muʿaṭṭal es-Sulami ("a Zaphagan filio almuathin ethsulemi"), "qui et consuetudinarium cum ea stuprum gerebat, ipso Mahumet sciente et consentiente".[2] The credit for this distasteful invention must be given to the translator, Peter of Toledo; it is as absurd as it is gratuitous.[3] The Latin shows ʿAlī, "princeps et nobilis", in a light which emphasises the tendencies favourable to Shīʿah thought in the Risālah itself; in Latin terms he became something of a stoic misogynist. This same tradition appeared in the Gregorian Report, from which, however, the entire ʿĀʾishah episode, to which solely it referred, had disappeared. Making the best sense that in the circumstances it could, it showed ʿAlī reproaching the Prophet for his adulteries, and especially because he held the adulterous woman dear above all: "O Prophet of God, you incur much blame from men because of the woman you are keeping." The reader was compelled to suppose that the occasion was the Zaynab affair.[4]

---

1. Bu. 65. 24. 6.
2. Tol., MS. p. 299; Vincent, 23.44.
3. The summary in Marino (III.IV) may be thought to emphasise this point.
4. Paris, loc. cit.; Viterbo has the words "Dicens nunc de gestis Gaice, uxoris Machomethi, quod ei acciderit cum Zisuan filio Amuat" which are not explanatory, but do mark off the Zayd/Zaynab episode.

Another tradition that gave scandal is best cited from San Pedro: "Muhammad put on the purple and used scented oils, that he might smell sweet, and coloured his lips and eyes, as the leaders of the Moors and many others of both sexes are accustomed to do nowadays." Many of Muhammad's followers, he continued, thought this unsuitable and criticised him; he excused himself, saying, "it is given to me to delight in three things, the first, unguents, the second, women, and the third, prayer."[1] It is obvious how scandalous this sounded to the Christian ear. The Risālah had quoted a version that omitted the third element, prayer, and this appeared in the Latin as "he said that he delighted in scented things and women"[2] which was further coarsened when Marino rendered it "scented things and coition".

One other wife was known in mediaeval writings. From the Latin of the Risālah we learn that the other wives blamed Ṣafīyah bint Ḥuyaiy for her Jewishness[3] and Muhammad "taught her to glory above his other wives . . . and that she should say, "Aaron is my father, Moses my uncle and Muhammad my husband".[4] This passage was also quoted by Marino.[5] It is difficult to

---

1. S.S.M. I. ii. 16-18; cf. viii. 12. Cf. Wensinck, Handbook, under "Muhammad".
2. Tol. MS. p. 299 col. 1; Vincent, 23.44; Muir, p. 50.
3. "Judaismus": cf. Sale, p. 419, "O thou Jewess, the daughter of a Jew and a Jewess".
4. Tol. MS. p. 300 col. 1; Vincent, 23.44.
5. III. III.

see why this passage should have been worth repeating, unless boasting of Jewish parentage is a crime of the same order as adultery; probably it was by accident that it was retained. San Pedro knew a different story, more fitting in the series of the Prophet's marriages as Christian eyes saw them. He described how she was of high birth and "the lady" of the conquered Jews of Khaybar; first given, at his request, to one of the companions of the Prophet, he took her back, as wife, when he heard her beauty praised. The sneer at his supposed weakness for beautiful women was characteristic. San Pedro asked Muhammad if this were characteristic of politeness, or good fellowship, or fidelity or moderation.[1] Almost as much as is known of Ṣafīyah's life with the Prophet is implied in these two stories. Other wives were too virtuous, or their husbands too little uxorious in their regard, to attract attention.

The mere number of the Prophet's wives was in itself a sufficient scandal without any exaggeration or invention. San Pedro listed them one by one, sometimes with comment: after Khadījah, ʿĀʾishah, described as his favourite, and as the daughter of the most honoured of his sect and his successor, then Saudah, then Zaynab bint Jaḥsh; "Henioli" (- Zaynab bint Khuzaymah ?), Juwayriyah "who was a captive before her marriage" and Ḥafṣah bint ʿUmar; "Ranla" (- Umm Salima ?);

---

1. S.S.M., I. ii. 9, 10.

Umm Ḥabībah "who was (not "had been") wife of a Christian"; Ṣafīyah and Maymūnah, as described already. The order is generally incorrect, but excepting the two unidentifiable names the list is reasonably accurate. It was confused, however, by the author's adding, either from a separate source, or in misunderstanding of a second reference to the one wife, "another Zaynab"; he described her as having, like Khadījah before her, died before the Prophet's death, while the other wives survived him, and this is, therefore, Zaynab bint Khuzaymah. San Pedro added that there were two other wives to whom he was married without consummating the marriages; deliberately to contrast with this, which was from Muslim sources, San Pedro then asserted the authority of the Risālah, which had clearly not been his source before. This estimated fifteen wives and two concubines, Marīyah the Copt and Rayḥānah the Jewess who was captured after the conquest of the Banu Qurayẓah. San Pedro seems almost defiantly to press the authority of "al-Kindi", as Arab and Arabist, against that of admittedly Muslim sources.[1] The statement about fifteen

1. Ibid., I. ii. 1-13; iv. 12. The source for most of this may well be Ibn Hishām (note to Ibn Isḥāq: 1000 ff., Guillaume, p. 792 ff.) with which it agrees in many points. It disagrees in the order of wives and, of course, in the confusion about their identities. It is difficult to be more definite about what the author intended to say so long as we possess obviously corrupt forms of the names.

wives and two concubines was repeated by Vitry and by Viterbo and Paris;[1] the latter named and numbered the wives. Fidenzio repeated the same statement, adding the qualification "freeborn" to the wives ("ingenuae").[2] Lull quoted Muhammad's wives at nine, which was in fact the highest normal number at one time. He contrasted the permission to his followers to take four.[3] We may contrast Roderick of Toledo, who counted them at eighteen.[4]

In recounting the private life of the Prophet, Christian authors were for the most part content to keep in touch with the facts; they misrepresented the Arabic sources, often Muslim sources, but these often remained recognisable.[5] The facts themselves suited the Christian purpose. The worst possible construction was given to every event, and there was a good deal of manipulation of the historical context. The stories of Muhammad's personal life are almost inextricably muddled together, but the moral implications discerned in them are clear and consistent. What Christian and clerical writers

---

1. Viterbo's forms are slightly more recognisable than Paris's. For their identification, see Cerulli, p. 422.
2. loc. cit.
3. Hamar, sig. 6; cf. D.P., "hac viij mullers".
4. Hist. Arab. II.
5. This chapter has ignored the fabulous versions of Muhammad's life, especially those of Waltherius and du Pont, as also of Brunetto Latini. These are too remote from the rest of this literature; their only point of interest is that the general impression of licentiousness which they give is not so very different from the general impression given by incomparably better informed accounts.

chiefly feared was a doctrinal justification of the behaviour attributed to Muhammad. A forceful and impressive condemnation seemed necessary, This explains the virulence of Christian feeling about Muhammad,[1] to the exclusion of charity and often of truth, which is general through this period: Pedro de Alfonso's phrase *valde feminas diligit* was moderate;[2] *luxuriosus* was a common term, *libidinis ardore super omnes homines succensus* and *impudicus*, added Vitry; *prae cunctis hominibus in mulieres libidine insaniebat*, Ketton's annotator had already commented.[3] Waltherius in his poem said, *immunditiae totius amator*. *Ribaldus* and *vilissimus*, said Humbert[4] and there are many similar remarks: *in peccato luxuriae fetidissimus*, *porcus*, *amator mulierum*, *carnalibus vitiis totus brutalis* and *impudicus adulter*; these are phrases taken almost at random.[5] It seemed very obvious to these authors that Muhammad's behaviour with women alone made it impossible that he should have been a prophet. There was no common ground with Islam in this matter.

---

1. See also below, p. 542 ff.
2. e.g. Vitry; San Pedro, I. vii. 16.
3. cited above.
4. De pred. S.C., 12.
5. Fidenzio, loc. cit.; Simon; Marino, loc. cit; Benvenuto (respectively).

Chapter 16.

The death of the Prophet and events associated with it.

The deaths of saints were thought specially significant by hagiographers; and in mediaeval tradition the death of Muhammad, the antithesis of the saint, wasnconsidered to be a highly important subject. The stories told about it, varying between the fantastic and the accurate, tended to show at the one extreme that it was atrociously horrible, and at the other that it was only human. Very often it was seen in the context of false miracles that some Muslims claimed on Muhammad's behalf, and this invested the subject with a new and increased importance.

There were two or three streams of knowledge in the West about the miracles attributed to Muhammad. One group was known largely from the Risālah and the Syrian Apology: the wolf whose howling the Prophet understood and who departed at a sign from his three fingers, the ox that spoke, the fig-tree that adored the Prophet and moved across the earth at his call, these were circulated simply as fit for ridicule, and served no further polemic end.[1] The miracle of the divided moon[2] was known from Pedro de Alfonso and independently from the quadruplex reprobatio, and from the Contrarietas, which was

---

1. The accounts in Viterbo, in the Gregorian Report (Matthew Paris) and in Vitry are close but not identical, and are different from the versions of Peter of Toledo and Vincent de Beauvais; e.g. in Toledo and Beauvais the fig-tree adores the Prophet; in Viterbo and Paris it prostrates itself and moves towards him. There is a third version in Pedro de Alfonso, in which the tree simply comes to Muhammad. Vitry, V; for Risālah, see Tol. MS. p. 303 col. 1; Vincent, 23.46.
2. See above, p. 153

Ricoldo's source. The demand for miracles made by the Quraysh and Muhammad's refusal[1] and exact details of his definition of his mission as unmiraculous were well-known only to the more expert, to the reprobatio, to San Pedro and to Ricoldo, and only in vaguer terms to others.[2] Common to all groups were the argument that Muhammad was not protected by God or by his angels in battle, nor in his raids or other military ventures; the story of the poisoned shoulder of lamb which led finally to his death; and some allusion at least to supposed Muslim expectation that the Prophet's body would be carried to Heaven by angels. The most widely known, therefore, related to his death and mortality.

The story of the poisoning did exist in a non-miraculous version. San Pedro told how Muhammad, when he was lying in his last illness, said he was suffering from the poison that he and a companion had been given by a Jewess, who was very beautiful, and belonged to tributary Jewish tribes; Muhammad went to dine with her and she poisoned the shoulder of lamb, which she knew he liked. The Prophet tasted a mouthful, detected the poison and spat it out; but his companion died on the spot. When Muhammad asked her why she had done this,

---

1. See above, p. 157 bis.
2. Viterbo and the Gregorian report seem independent of Vitry, though dependent on a common source; they all mentioned, as the Risālah does not, the story of the divided moon. The order of miracles is not the same as in Pedro de Alfonso's presentation. Leg. Aur. draws on but does not seem to copy him here.

she replied that he had enslaved the Jews, and that she had argued to herself that if he were not prophet he would die, and the Jews would be restored to their former prosperity; but if he were prophet, he would know of the poison, she would be able to believe in him and no harm would be done. He ordered her not to be harmed for this.[1] All this fairly represents Ibn Isḥāq, but, extracted from its context, it leaves vague the interval between this episode and the Prophet's death; in the Latin it is not clear that this was a matter of years, especially as the Prophet was still complaining of the ill effects of the poison on his death-bed.[2] The account in the reprobatio is less full, but very similar, and more explicitly documented.[3] Marino and Dandalo said that Muhammad died of poison after deceiving the people for forty years, without mentioning any miracle; Ludolf, once again outside the main stream of thought, said that Muhammad was poisoned by his wife, again without suggesting any miraculous element. The miraculous versions of the same story were less authentic but also Muslim in origin. Vitry and the Syrian Apology cited very similar forms in which the shoulder of lamb spoke aloud to the Prophet: I have poison in me, be careful not to eat me

---

1. S.S.M. I. vi. 2,3; cf. vii. 14.
2. Ibn Isḥāq, 764, 765. Otherwise incomparably less accurate than San Pedro, the Legenda Aurea nevertheless specified the elapse of years.
3. IX.

in the food" or "See you do not eat me, for I am poisoned".[1] Why, asked Vitry, repeating an argument which appeared in the Risālah, did not Muhammad recognise the poison that eighteen years later he died of; why, asked the original of Viterbo and Paris, did he not save his companion while he had the opportunity ? This episode, in an independent and eccentric version, was all that interested James of Acqui in the death of Muhammad:

> Someone wanted to prove the holiness of Muhammad, the Muslims say, and offered him cooked lamb that had been poisoned to eat; and the lamb spoke to Muhammad, saying, Do not eat me, for I am poisoned. Yet Muhammad was killed by one of his (male) slaves, with the worst poison because he had offended him.

Acqui took no further interest in the subject; he was attracted apparently by the disproof of the miracle.

Many of the stories relating to the death of Muhammad seem in no obvious way discreditable; it was enough to point the contrast between what he did and the sort of thing expected, particularly on his death-bed, of a Christian saint. San Pedro stressed that ʿĀʾishah had described how great the Prophet's pain was, how he said that life displeased him. He noted particular points: there were only twenty white hairs in his beard, he died on a Monday in the home of ʿĀʾishah, and was buried there where he died, beneath the bed, in the middle of the night of the third day. Again according to ʿĀʾishah, he washed his face and poured water on it when he was at the point

---

1. Vitry, 'In me habeo venenum, cave ne me sumas in cibum.' Viterbo and Paris, 'Vide ne comedas ex me, venenosus enim sum.' Cf. Peter of Toledo, Vincent of Beauvais, 'Noli me comedere, quia veneno confecta sum'; Varagine, 'Cave ne me sumas, quia in me habeo venenum.' Acqui, 'non me comedas, quia in me est venenum.' loc. cit. in all cases.

of death; and Christians were accustomed to say, added San Pedro, that he was trying to baptise himself, but the devils prevented him.[1] For the author of the reprobatio Muhammad made a very profane death.[2] As he lay dying he abused the Christians and Jews for making oratories and churches at the tombs of their prophets; "note," said the author sedately, "that he sinned in the abuse; what he said following was in no way untrue."[3] There was also the story that the Prophet was under a spell, so that he thought he had known women when he had not.[4] Again, in his last illness he said:

> I will write a book, and ye shall not be in error after that book. Then some of them said: Muhammad is exceedingly oppressed by the pain of his illness; you have the Qur'an and it is enough for you. However, there was a dispute among those that were in the house. Some of them said: Come along, a book will be written for you, lest you be in error of the law after him. Some of them, however, said otherwise. When the abuse and the quarrelling grew too great, Muhammad said: Get up (and go).

Al-ʿAbbās[5] regretted that, by their noise, they had lost this book which the Prophet would have written; the Christian author remarked that it was possible to conclude that the Muslims have been, since Muhammad's death, and remain, in error.[6]

---

1. For Arabic sources, see Ibn Isḥāq, 1005 ff., 1018 ff.; Wensinck, Handbook, under "Muhammad".
2. loc. cit.
3. IX. Muslim (cited) 5, 19 - 23; cf. Bukhārī, 8.55, 23.96.
4. Bu., (cited), 76.49.
5. Text: Ibanabez (which could be read Ibanabet). This suggests ibn-ʿAbbās, which would not be correct.
6. Cites vita - ? Ibn Saʿd (II/II, 36 ff., etc.)? Cf. Bu. 3.39.

Muhammad died in ʿĀ'ishah's house, because it was then her day, which he should spend with her; when he died, his head was on her breast; his saliva and hers mingled and so he died.[1] This account shocked the Christian who repeated it, apparently not a little. There is nothing disreputable about it, something on the contrary rather touching; but it is not the Christian picture of an edifying death-bed. The mere fact that Muslims admitted Muhammad to be dead, whereas Christ had risen to Heaven, was felt to be an important admission, in spite of the Islamic attitude: "he died and he lies dead in the earth . . . and this the Muslims affirm".[2]

There was a mass of literature that gave Muhammad a very much worse and, one would have supposed, wholly unconvincing death of great melodramatic effect. A reader comes incidentally across references to his shameful death, which take it for granted that he knows that this was that Muhammad was eaten by dogs, or that he was eaten, or suffocated, by pigs.[3] Thus Alan of Lille referred to his monstrous life, more monstrous sect, most monstrous death; he believed him to have been devoured by dogs.[4] Pigs were more popular: Guibert believed in them, so did some of the authors who reproduced the Corozan

---

1. A slight misunderstanding: Muhammad was not in her house because it was her day; he had been staying in her room anyway since his illness, and it just happened to be her day. Bu. (cited) 57. 4.
2. Hamar, sig. 32. For comparison with Christ theme, see p.203
3. Humbert, de pred. S.C.
4. IV. I.

text. Gerald of Wales and Higden added that this happened when he was in a drunken stupor, and Gerald commented, "since he taught uncleanness and shame, it was by pigs, which are considered unclean animals, that he was devoured." Ludolf said that he was seized by an epileptic fit in the desert, and just that he was devoured by wild beasts.[1] The "aliud scriptum" copied by Matthew Paris supposed him suffocated by a sow and her litter in the course of an epileptic fit. In this genre the most impressive version is undoubtedly that worked over by Matthew Paris personally in the text of the St. Albans Chronicle, under the year 622. This allotted a triple death to Muhammad, combining all the less attractive possibilities that he had heard rumoured, and at the same time avenging the Prophet's Trinitarian heresy. The margin of the manuscript, according to its editor, shows this schematically:

epilenticus venenatus crapulatus	pecca- vit enim	in Patrem in Filium in Spiritum sanctum½

He was handed over to be torn to pieces by pigs by this threefold agency, drunkenness, poison and epilepsy.

San Pedro knew and wanted to believe a "Christian" version of the death of Muhammad which is a most ingenious reconciliation of several of the more improbable death stories.

---

1. Cf. also the version in Hildebert of Mans, and the fate of the "Mahumet" idol, Roland, 2590-1.

A cunning Jewess, whom Muhammad desired, insisted that he should come to her bed alone, by night. When he did so, her relatives, following a plan, killed him, and cutting off the left foot threw the rest of the body to pigs, who quickly devoured it. The woman anointed and scented the foot, explaining to people who came to look for Muhammad that, when he reached her, angels came to fetch him away to Heaven. She had pulled him back by the foot, which, after a tug of war with the celestial powers, was all of the Prophet that remained to her, and to his people.[1] With its curious circumstantiality this story combines the pig and Jew motifs, as well as an angelic ascension which the Prophet was supposed to have expected. The group of stories relating to this supposed announcement that his body would be carried to Heaven by angels was a large one. San Pedro recounted the tale and apostrophized the prophet:

> As to what thou didst say, that as thou wouldst ascend living to Heaven,

- this refers to the miʿrāj -

> so also the angels would descend and carry thy body to Heaven: I say to thee, O Muhammad, that so the angels will in fact carry thy body to Heaven, as thou didst ascend living to Heaven. (2)

That is, not at all. The result of this supposed prophetic error, in all these accounts, which are after all intended to

---

1. S.S.M., I. viii. 225 ff. On the murderess's advice, the foot was set by the Prophet's bereaved and credulous followers on a camel, and buried where the camel stopped. This explains why Muhammad was buried in the desert. (This legend is properly attached to Ḥassan.) San Pedro shows signs of crediting the true story of Muhammad's burial and can hardly have believed this one.
2. Ibid., I. vi. 8, 12.

cast the greatest possible discredit and unpleasantness on the memory of the Prophet, was that the body stank and had to be hurriedly buried. In some cases of authors who knew little about hot climates, or who failed to reflect upon physical facts known to them, this happened after twelve, or even fourteen, days.[1] The special value of this story was again the disproof of a supposed miracle and the contrast with Christ; moreover it was made to seem that Muhammad based his hopes on the Christian model and was disappointed.[2]

In Christian theories of the events about the Prophet's death the myth of the disappointed ascension was associated with an historical fact, that there was confusion and disturbance in Medina on the day Muhammad died. It is also true that some of the tribes which had submitted to Medina, without, perhaps, fully understanding the nature of Islam, broke away and were subsequently forced by battle to submit again to the Muslims. The religious element in their revolt is somewhat exaggerated by Muslim tradition when it is called the "Apostasy of the Arabs", and this was naturally further exaggerated by Latin writers, who had very little idea of the

---

1. Cf. Pedro de Alfonso; Viterbo; Vitry; Paris; Fidenzio, XIV; Anon. Fior.
2. The idea that Muhammad foretold that his dead body would ascend to heaven occurs in the Risālah (Tol., MS. p. 304 col.2; Vincent, 23.47; Muir, p.62). The contrast with Christ, and the idea that Muslims hoped for, and were disappointed in, a parallel with Christ, seem likely to have been favourite themes among Mozarabs and among oriental Christians.

historical context and understood a purely religious movement among the Muslims of the Ḥijāz and particularly of Medina. The fight against the "rival prophet" Musaylima may have strengthened this idea.

San Pedro, again a convenient guide, understood some of the events at the Prophet's death in a consecutive and sober form. He remarked first that there was delay in burying the Prophet for three reasons, the quarrel between Abū Bakr and ʿUmar; the episode in the Prophet's childhood of the angelic washing of his heart; and the expectation that angels would carry the body to Heaven. It stank, and was buried where it lay, the Muslims pretending that Muhammad had said that all prophets were buried where they died; in disproof San Pedro appealed to the known tombs of Moses, Abraham, Isaac, David and St. John Baptist. In this slightly twisted rendering of his source material, San Pedro seems to hint at the Christian motif of an ascension that failed, while using Ibn Isḥāq's facts. In particular, the fact that the Prophet was buried in ʿĀ'ishah's house seemed a partial admission of this truth.[1] The dispute between Abū Bakr and ʿUmar introduced a new factor. According to this, ʿUmar announced that he would decapitate anyone who said that Muhammad was dead.[2] He did this when the people

---

1. S.S.M., I. vi. 6; Ibn Isḥāq, 1019 - 1020.
2. The author here interpolated the remark that ʿUmar was the third king of the Arabs, who was killed by a Christian for the wrongs done to the Christians. The "wrongs done to Christians" are an embroidery; cf. E.I., ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb.

murmured at the death of the Prophet and wanted to desert his religion. Abū Bakr, however, said that ʿUmar was wrong, and that Muhammad was dead, and dead as he expected to die. His words are a clear statement of Muhammad's prophetic status, and a sound rendering of the source:

> . . . and if ye believe thus in Muhammad, know now that he is dead; and if ye believe in God, know that God lives and shall never die; and that it is true indeed that Muhammad was nothing but the messenger of God, and therefore he is dead like this, like the other messengers of God, as they killed him. If ye desert your faith in God it will harm, not God, but you.

These words quietened the people, but Abū Bakr's period of rule was a long contention with ʿUmar for power.[1]

What is San Pedro's invention, or his mistake, is the quarrel between Abū Bakr and ʿUmar; he can only have inferred it when he learned from Ibn Isḥāq that Umar harangued the people and would not believe that the Prophet was dead. Except for this imaginary quarrel, the account is excellent. Why he should have drawn the inference is not obvious. He naturally did not have any feeling for the loyalty or religious inspiration of the first Companions, and he was prone to believe that their behaviour would have been no better than that of weak Christians in difficult circumstances. We shall see that other accounts speak of Abū Bakr addressing the people and bringing them back to Islam, and it is possible that for

---

1. S.S.M., I. vi.14616; Ibn Isḥāq, 1012 — [illegible]. This account is without parallel in its age; the reprobatio did not discuss the subject at all.

San Pedro, as for less informed writers, the events that in Medina followed the death of the Prophet were not distinguished from the Apostasy of the Arabian tribes. We may also presume knowledge in San Pedro of those conflicts which were to break out in the caliphate of ʿUthmān and of which it may have seemed to him that there was question here. It will have been difficult for Latin writers, even when they were in possession of authentic material, to assess the significance of incidents without understanding the historical context or even, perhaps, the exact sequence of events. A confusion of connected or similar incidents would naturally result.

If San Pedro linked tenuously the ascension and apostasy themes, less informed accounts joined them more vigorously. Generally the disappointed expectation of the angelic ascension of the Prophet's body on the third day was said to have undeceived the people. When this happened, said Pedro de Alfonso, Abū Bakr on the fourth day "addressed the people winningly, and cunningly admonished them to believe; he told them that they had not properly understood what Muhammad had said". They should have understood, not a public ascension, but a secret one after burial. This rather thin explanation was supposed to have persuaded the Arabs after all to remain in their error. William of Tyre, followed by Oliver of Paderborn, spoke only of the conflict among the Muslims, that between the followers and the opponents of ʿAlī, of which in his own day he knew the living consequences.[1] Jacques de

1. Will. Tyr., XX. XIX; Oliver, Hist. Reg., 56.

Vitry, after he described the disappointed retention of the body for twelve days, and the ultimate burial in the earth without washing,[1] continued sensationally, "the more sensible among the Arabs realised the falseness of the seducer and, deciding that all that he had said was untrue and invalid, forsook his religion". The Prophet's relatives and companions, who had obtained honour and profit, were now very disturbed, but managed to regain the faith of the simple cum multis blanditiis at promissionibus. Thus they established the caliphate; and partly by blandishments and partly by fear and threats "brought a multitude of men together".[2] We may attribute the blandishments to the events in Medina and the fear and threats to the treatment of the revolting tribes. Vitry went on to describe the schism between the followers and the opponents of ʿAlī. He distinguished Achali and Haly, a division into two personalities which may derive either from the general confusion inherent in the subject, or from the particular confusion of its treatment in the Risālah.[3] The Syrian Apology

---

1. Does this reflect the statement that the body was washed through the clothes ? Cf. Ibn Isḥāq, 1019.
2. VII.
3. Vitry's source is presumably the Syrian Apology or some other version related to the Risālah. The same confusion is represented by San Pedro's muddle about Abū Bakr and ʿUmar; although it takes a different form, it arised at the same place. San Pedro knew, but made extremely little use of, the Risālah. It is only possible to say that a story naturally confusing was made more confused wherever the influence of the Risālah extended.

is, of course, very close to Vitry: when people found out the truth (on the fourteenth day !) the wise deserted Islam, but rough and simple men were deceived by the Prophet's relatives and disciples, who made a profit from religion.[1] Marino repeated the same story in wording very little different.[2] Matthew Paris summarised it, adding to the description of the simple men who agreed to remain in the Islamic religion that they were those who were prone to fleshly things.[3] William of Tripoli knew nothing at all of the "Apostasy of the Arabs"; he remarked, on the contrary, that Muhammad was succeeded by the first of ten companions, Abū Bakr, "through whose uprightness and fortunate successes the rule and power of the Arabs began to arise . . ."[4] There was widespread ignorance of the years following the death of the Prophet; Ludolf, for example, said that Abū Bakr reigned thirty-three years. Other writers said nothing, and presumably knew nothing, or felt no interest.

The compilation of the canon of the Qur'an was necessitated by the death of the Prophet. Something of this was widely known and largely misunderstood. Rather obscurely, the fact of compilation was thought to be unfavourable to Islam, and to tend to destroy the authority of the Qur'an. There was uncertainty of treatment. The Risālah, Pedro de Alfonso and the Contrarietas were all interested in the

---

1. Viterbo; Paris.
2. III. V.
3. Under yr. 622.
4. IV.

facts and it is not surprising that confusion resulted. Pedro said that the Qur'an was not written by the hand of the Prophet, but that his companions composed it after his death, each one surrendering his own reading. It was in this theme that William of Auvergne, and after him, in very similar terms, Vincent de Beauvais, apparently saw the chief value of the Risālah: "it speaks of the Book of his Law, which is called the Qur'an, how it was composed and how it was torn apart and disordered".[1] Matthew Paris, writing into the text of the St. Albans Chronicle, spoke of elements taken from the New and the Old Testament and introduced into the Qur'an after the death of the Prophet, in order to gratify Christians and Jews, and of other insertions, intended to satisfy the people.[2] This seems to associate this theme with the Apostasy. San Pedro said that the Qur'an was actually written twenty years after Muhammad began to preach and he referred to the gradual accumulation of revelations during twenty-three years of prophethood, but he does not seem to have given particular thought to the actual process of compilation or to the attack on the Qur'an on these grounds.[3] Tripoli contrasted with the simple Muslim version, that Muhammad's hearers after his

---

1. Alv. de leg., XVIII/18. S.; Vincent, 23.40. Risālah: cf. the chapter-headings introduced by Vincent de Beauvais into Peter of Toledo's text. These are: Qualiter Alchorani liber connexus sit. Qualiter eiusdem scriptura dilacerata sit. De iterata collectione illius, et dissipatione. Qualiter recollecta et dissipata sit. De vilitate stili eius et materiae. (23, 51 - 56.)
2. Loc. cit.
3. S.S.M., I. i. 43, 68.

death compiled the Qur'an, the "Catholic" truth, namely that fifteen years after the death of the Prophet his companions met to discuss the compilation of a book. They committed the job to ʿUthmān and, since he was unequal to it, they gave him for assistants "wretches who, from being Christians and Jews, had turned Muslim from fear of death". Finding nothing material in the Prophet's life and doctrine, they invented their own book.[1] This recalls Matthew Paris's notion that important Christian and Jewish elements were added to the Qur'an at this stage. Finally, Ricoldo inherited from his sources a complex version of the different recensions of the Qur'an. He described the protagonists of the different readings as "fighting each other to death"; this strange remark is one of those that he took on trust from the Contrarietas. This account is particularly confused when, after reaching the burning of all versions (but one) by ʿUthmān, it reverts to consider Abū Bakr's collection of Qur'ans then existing. There was also the statement that there was no Qur'an at Muhammad's death. The Muslims had agreed together to pretend that this disorderly collection should be accepted as of God, and Abū Bakr burned the rest. The most disorderly thing here is the Latin story adopted by Ricoldo; its intent was less to recount a straightforward or comprehensible history than to discredit the idea of divine revelation of the Qur'an.[2] It

1. XXV.
2. Disp. XIII; Contrarietas, VI; MS. f. 244 v - 5 r.

seems to be common to all the Christian references to the compilation of the Qur'an that it was considered, naturally enough, to be the final stage of the prophetic fiction. In some cases its historical context was supposed to be the reluctance of the Arabs to retain Islam.

As a good death marks the odour of sanctity, so the Latin writers anticipated and in imagination achieved a peculiarly and appropriately horrible death for the Prophet. The death by unclean animals has not the remotest origin in Muslim sources, unless it is calculated from their uncleanness. Christians sometimes associated it with the Islamic prohibition of eating pig's flesh, as explaining this prohibition; but this was also more appropriately attributed to the influence of the Mosaic Law. It is more likely that the story was arbitrarily attached to the Prophet and that if anything more degrading had been thought of, it would have been believed. Less imaginative representations, reproducing or reflecting closely the stories told by Muslims, robbed the matter of its grossest sensationalism. The truth of a climax so theologically satisfactory as death by swine must have been rejected with regret; the stories that Muhammad was poisoned were the best substitute available and were popular with those who realised that anything more dramatic was untenable. Here Christians and Muslims were once again at cross-purposes; for the latter, poisonings made martyrs, whereas for the former

their implications were sordid. There were also those stories, such as the death in ʿĀ'ishah's arms, which served to point the incompatibility with the classic death-bed of the saint.

The apostasy of the Arabs and all evidence of dissensions among the Muslims which could be gleaned from Muslim sources confirmed another Christian expectation. Muhammad's death, like a reflection of his life, had failed to receive that miraculous confirmation, by the ascension of his corpse, which it was thought the Muslims had desired. The Christians did not need this disappointment in order to explain the occurrence of a movement away from Islam. For them, only the absence of such a movement might have needed explaining. It was, in any case, gratifying to be able to show that force and trickery maintained at Muhammad's death what they had first procured under his direction. The compilation of the Qur'an was also seen as closely associated with the Prophet's death and the end of the series of revelations. Opportunities which this theme seemed to offer, further to discredit the Qur'an, were largely illusory, since anything to show that the Qur'an was written after Muhammad's death would damage the attack on what were thought of as his own personal fictions and inventions. At the most there might seem, to confused and perplexed Latin readers, to have been some continuation of the old inventive process; but this subject was widely ignored. What linked every treatment of the death of the Prophet to the next was a

clear acceptance of the idea that there was continuity over the period of Muhammad's death within the Islamic community. It was always believed, point by point, that Islam remained what Muhammad had made it.

Chapter 17.

Historiography: The Life of Muhammad.

1. General considerations.

It is natural to ask how writers who were neither fools nor rogues could have consistently misrepresented facts and solemnly repeated incredible fantasies. If their matter was believed by their readers, it was because they expected it to be believed, while their own intelligence and good faith were obvious. It might at first sight seem simple to attribute their fault to ignorance, and to substitute the question whether their ignorance was culpable. Certainly there was less misrepresentation and less indulgence in fancy by authors whose lives brought them close to Muslim sources. In some cases, writers were forced by actual debate with Muslims, or by a study of Arabic sources which might make debate possible, or simply by a climate of opinion formed by social intercourse between Christians and Muslims, to discard stories still popular among more remote or less serious authors. In these circumstances there was no choice but to admit a greater degree of truth, and to base polemic on histories which Muslims would accept, or at least recognise. Even so, whenever a choice between stories, or between interpretations of stories, occurred, well-informed and ignorant authors alike often accepted those which in fact were untrue, and which must have seemed to them highly improbable, had they been alleged

of Christians in the world familiar to themselves.

It is important to recall that for Latin writers Muhammad was the founder of a sect which had first thrived and still thrived at the expense of Christendom. The Crusades were considered a Muslim, not a Christian, aggression.[1] A cause would always be sought which was commensurate with its effect: an honest or a self-deluded founder was not easily conceived until the nineteenth century, when Islam was no longer felt to menace Western Europe. Fine shades of character and subtleties of motive were more a pre-occupation in the literary field than in the field of ecclesiastical history. If an act was bad enough, it seemed beyond common sense to suppose that the agent could personally be good and sincere; and the act in question was the creation of the most powerful instrument for the destruction of the Church, and for the loss of souls and provinces, then known.[2] It would be as easy to believe that Judas was sincere; there is nothing hyperbolic in a comparison that draws attention to the doctrine of the union of the suffering Christ with the suffering Church. The judgement of fact was theological, in a framework of exaggerated contrast; it was appropriate, and therefore true, that the enemy of Christ should be in every way and as much as possible unlike him.

---

1. Below, p.
2. In theory, the scholastic distinction between formal and material sin would make Muhammad's good faith not impossible to believe; but it was not to be expected that so nice a distinction would be drawn to the temporal disadvantage of the Church. For the loss of almost the greater part of Christendom, see also below, p. 423

The treatment of Muhammad was a reversal of hagiography, from his unpropitious birth to his bad death at the last. When two societies are at war, or fear or expect to be at war, they must become very strongly aware of whatever separates them, especially in religion and belief, in the practices of daily life and in the events of the past or contemporary history which they share. There is likely to be a tendency to exaggerate or invent differences. A society would have to be very tolerant to recognise the virtues, and make allowance for the faults, of the leaders of their enemies. The Latin West did sometimes admit the humanity and even admire the chivalry or the government of contemporary Muslim enemies; the legend of Saladin is an obvious case, and so is the attitude of William of Tripoli to Baybars.[1] In the same way the failings of the leaders of the Christians of the Crusades are known to us from the reports of their fellows; there were few saints produced by Crusade or Reconquest,[2] and Godfrey of Bouillon's heroic aura acquired only in retrospect a sacred connotation.[3] Worse was attributed to the

1. Cf. Below, p. 536 It is not possible to explain William's attitude to Muslims, his belief that the Arabs would be converted, or his suppositious significance as a critic of Crusading, one in terms of another; to do so is only to restate the question.
2. Apart from San Pedro, there is San Fernando; St. Louis is in no sense the product of Crusading.
3. The refusal to wear the Crown was a legend-bearing act which helped to build up a group memory of the holiness of former Crusaders, in contrast to the often manifest faults of contemporary ones. It might be possible to compare Livy's picture of the Republican virtues as similarly unreal.

long-dead Muhammad than to any living leader of Islam; partly because he was so distant in time, he could be made to impersonate all those things which seemed most wicked in Islam. The process was facilitated by the ease with which it is possible to believe in some vast conspiracy to deceive; people have believed in an exaggerated form in the conspiracies of Albigensians or Jesuits or Freemasons to suppress the truth and to preserve esoteric knowledge. It is still easier to believe that a whole body of facts is suppressed by an openly hostile society, and to substitute a "real truth" for an "ostensible" one: for the Prophet of the Hijaz, the magician devoured by swine.

No doubt the extreme case is less interesting than that which blended truth and fancy to a more credible effect. Here the same considerations apply with greater force, in that a more reasonable author may credit himself with a disinterested love of truth and in consequence acquire an unassailable conviction of rightness. Faced with a choice between alternative stories, more and less favourable to Muhammad, or asked without choice to swallow the camel of improbability, the mediaeval historians of Muhammad acted on the assumption that whatever seemed least creditable was most likely to be true. Theological standards did not supersede, but they helped to identify, the truth. Authors with didactic and moral intentions formed the belief that some "facts" about

Muhammad were true, because those "facts" served the meritorious purpose of exposing error. Other authors whose intentions were a little less lofty, in histories and treatises composed to instruct and amuse, naturally took it that a more instructive and more amusing alternative was true; in this case also, other things being equal, the version more discreditable to Muhammad was the more edifying and would have seemed the more probably true. It would be anachronistic to say that such an attitude showed an indifference to abstract truth; it was a question of the means of recognising what was true. It seemed more reasonable to decide that what suited the author's purpose was true, if his purpose was a laudable one, than to decide according to the source of his information. The authenticity of the sources of knowledge was judged according to the apparent probability of what was said, and not according to the authority of the speaker to say it. Between Christian and Muslim sources, it was natural to suppose that the latter were biassed and to treat them as sound only when they could be considered as unwilling admissions of the "real truth". This also, in dealing with the various Muslim sources, was thought to be a more reliable criterion than any evidence of the authority with which such sources spoke for Muslims. The authority of the Qur'an itself, of Ibn Isḥāq, of Bukhārī and Muslim, of the de doctrina Machometi and the Liber Scalae Machometi depended on their

utility to Christian polemic, more than on any other factor.

If it is sufficiently desirable that a thing should be true, it often seems so, not so much where personal advantage, fears or hopes are concerned, but in cases where the consuming good of a great society is thought to require it. A thing becomes true because it serves a higher end; men who would be horrified to assert that the end justifies the means may easily come to believe a means to be just in itself, if it leads to an end of sufficient moment to them, or, as they suppose, to the world. In this case, proof of the villainous character of Muhammad was of the very highest value to the faith of Christ. There seems often to have been the thought of controversy in mind, less perhaps to convert the Muslims than to convert the subject peoples, oriental Christians and even Jews, and the pagans, especially the Mongols, among whom Muslim proselytisation competed. It was almost universally in mind to confirm the faith of the Latin nations of Europe by condemnations of Muhammad which, though never tested, might be supposed to be valid in controversy against Muslims; and which would in any case impress Christians. The self-congratulatory thought of how effective, as arguments, these histories of Muhammad must prove would alone have done much to strengthen the faith of the Latin reader. It was, therefore, the usefulness of "truths" which ensured their selection from other statements. Writers would not think

in terms of truth for its own sake although they would have been sincerely annoyed at any suggestion that their "truths" were untrue. The whole good of true religion, of humanity, made a "fact" seem probable; and probability is a normal ground of belief.

The absurdity in our eyes of some of the more fantastic legends about Muhammad must not cause us to forget that a great deal of true information was available and was believed, so long as it did not conflict with the interest of true religion. It cannot be said that the general perception of the state of Arabia when Muhammad was born was wholly inaccurate. No doubt Western Europeans conceived what they read and repeated in terms of their own landed feudalism;[1] no doubt Spanish and Syrian Latins interpreted the jāhilīyah in terms, only a degree less anachronistic, of the Islamic society - often urban and scholastic - actually known to them.[2] The ancient destiny of the Arabs, the wild men sprung from Ismael, whose hands were against all men, and whose tents

---

1. The most extreme example is the Roman de Mahomet, which envisages a purely feudal world where a low-born steward aspired to marry a great heiress. Cf. also above, p. 287 In this connection it is interesting to note that the untypical fragment of a poem (published by Gaston Paris) which antedates the fall of Jerusalem and attacks Ṣalāḥ ad-Dīn, presents him in almost the same romantic context as du Pont does Muhammad (du Pont's poem is the later): as low-born, betraying his master by adultery and marrying his widow. This seems to be a villain type particularly obnoxious to the chivalric world which so soon afterwards made Ṣalāḥ ad-Dīn a hero. (La Légende de Saladin; see bibliography.)
2. A simple example is San Pedro's treatment of the Islamic attitude to magic; cf. above, p. 313, 4.

were pitched against all their brethren, had both Scriptural and Qur'anic authority, and fitted artistically into the picture of a civilised Christendom overwhelmed by rough and simple-minded men, in fact by savages. The whole Arabian scene was made to seem much more likely by supposing it accessible to the influence of heretical and Jewish malice against the Church and against the teaching of Christ. This is not a fair representation of pre-Islamic Arabia, but it is not an unrecognisable caricature. Muslim stories of the youth of Muhammad seemed interesting chiefly as lending support to belief in Christian and Jewish influence upon him: it was enough that there should be a hint in the Arabic at the truth of any story which seemed to discredit Islam. Misrepresentation, not less skilled for being innocent and well-intentioned, came into its own in dealing with the establishment of Muslim power by violence and fraud, by battle, banditry and assassination and by the authority of pretended visions; and with intimate and sometimes sordid details of the Prophet's personal relations. In war, unprotected by the angels, he suffered the ordinary vicissitudes to which soldiers and highwaymen are liable, and paid the final debt of humanity more cheaply than he deserved: the stories relating to his death served chiefly to confirm what had gone before. These were the ordinary beliefs of sensible writers thinking seriously.

It is important to supplement our appreciation of this

picture by remembering what it leaves out. It admits the pagan state of Arabia, but it refuses to see anything but a further deterioration in the acceptance of Islam. It omits the victory of Badr which to Muhammad seemed specially Providential. It was not possible in the Middle Ages to appreciate Muhammad as a secular lawgiver whose measures improved the public and social order of Arabia, or even to estimate scientifically the immediate effect of his religious innovations. His legislation was always seen as the false revelation which had formed a powerful contemporary religion, and inevitably its immediate effects in the Ḥijāz and Arabia generally were ignored. The Prophet's religious institutions in Medina, for example the establishment of the mosque, were only very occasionally mentioned, unless they related, like the appointment of the qiblah, to a continuing Islamic practice.[1] Even so, information that lacked polemic utility was not popular. The omission of any mention of Ḥudaybiyah, of the conquest of Mecca, of the final victories over paganism and the establishment of Islamic rule and religion, leaves the story of Muhammad absurdly incomplete. We may attribute the neglect of these subjects to their lack of significance in contemporary mediaeval Islam. There was no realisation of new political organisations, and readers in many cases were left with a picture of a country-side dominated by terror

---

1. See p. 567, 4. p. 563, p. 329

of a robber-band.[1] It was above all with Muhammad's personal qualities that mediaeval writers were concerned.

2. San Pedro's attitude to Islamic authorities.

The differences which were deeply felt were related to Christian faith and personal morals, and those aspects of Muhammad's life that affected these questions were the most discussed. The extraction, from Islamic sources, of information which would serve the high purposes of the Church may be usefully studied in a few individual writers. Of these the most rewarding is San Pedro Pascual, the only writer explicitly to contrast his Muslim and his Christian sources. Much that he said seems to give a clue to the editorial activities of other writers. His Christian sources were among the more fabulous and fantastic; but in saying that the bogus miracles of the bull and the dove, for example, were discovered solely by the efforts of Christian authorities,[2] he took the important step of admitting that they were denied by Islam. He was aware, too, that Arabic sources had a special value even when they were not Muslim: he referred a little

---

1. To an age that was insensitive to historical development, the idea that such a community could conquer the Persian and much of the East Roman empires did not seem incongruous. The startling advance of Arab dominion under the early caliphs was an inexplicable but an unquestioned stroke of Providence. No doubt it was assumed that, as was largely, indeed, the case, the older administrations continued under new rulers. The extent to which Arab and Islamic institutions, distinct from religious beliefs, affected the conquered societies, was very little considered, and with reason: contemporary Islamic society was seen to be at least alien in its political and economic institutions.
2. S.S.M., I. ii. 25.

defiantly to the authority of the Risālah - "Alquindus, who was from Arabia, and a Christian, extremely learned and skilled in the Arabic language" - without following it in his own text.[1] He was not prepared to discard the "Christian" stories, however absurd, and was fairly convinced that aspects were true; it seemed so likely, in particular, that the Baḥīrā of Muslim legend was really available to Muhammad, to consult in difficulty,[2] and he noted that confirmation of other allegations about the Prophet seemed to be suggested by Muslim (or, he added, Jewish) sources.

> Since, indeed, what is not found in authentic books no one ought to assert as certain, I neither affirm nor deny what I have written above about bulls and about Muhammad's death. -

This referred to the legend that Jews murdered Muhammad and threw his body to the swine -

> Yet the evidence that it is true that the Jews killed Muhammad is not lightly presumed; and it is made credible by what the Muslims themselves assert. -

This referred to the poisoning of Muhammad by Zaynab the Jewess of Khaybar -

> From another angle, it is certain that in their books is contained a certain Christian hermit, whose name, as they

---

1. Ibid., I. ii. 13. He also referred elsewhere (ibid., I. iii. 15) to "al-Kindi" in similar terms, stressing this time that he was learned in Christian as well as Arabic literature. It is, of course, "Kindi's" Christian presentation of events, and arguments, that made his influence over many writers so powerful; it was more troublesome to seek material in Muslim authors, and then arrange it oneself for Christian polemic purposes. It is in his having been prepared to do just this that San Pedro was so original.
2. Ibid., I. i. 29.

> themselves say, was Baḥīrā, (1) the one who said to Muhammad's uncle, who brought him up, that he should protect Muhammad from the Jews . . . (2)

For San Pedro "authentic" sources had a great attraction. It is not possible to say how far this lay in their quasi-confirmation of Christian legends. Earlier in the same work he had written that all those things which were alleged by Christian, and seemed to be referred to by Muslim, sources represented " a strong presumption, even certain proof" of Christian assertions. Yet he was not indiscriminate in accepting this confirmation. His usual practice in treating evidence was, as he had said, a refusal either to affirm or to deny. His summary of the stories he had selected from Muslim sources[3] to illustrate the life of the Prophet is instructive.

A consideration of what he had written that was taken from the Qur'an and other books of the Muslims, he said, would show that Muhammad was demoniac, and that he admitted to the Meccans that he was not sent to work miracles. It would show that the Meccans reproached him for claiming as a revelation from God what it was known that a certain man had taught him; that he killed one Jew treacherously, as well as other Jews who accepted his dominion; that he took as wife a beautiful Jewess, their "lady", after killing the men and making the women and children prisoners.[4] He called himself messenger

---

1. Text: Bayra.
2. S.S.M. I. viii. 236 - 7.
3. Chiefly Ibn Hishām and the Līber Scalae.
4. This summary also dealt with doctrinal matters, at this point.

of God, yet seduced the wives of his own people, and invented a law to justify, in God's name, his being allowed whatever he desired. In addition to this list, San Pedro selected a second list of what were to his mind significant confirmations of Christian assertions: Muhammad's having retired to solitude before he received the revelation from Gabriel, and the Meccan accusation that he had a secret teacher; the story that a Jewess, his concubine, poisoned him so that he sickened and died; the warning of the hermit (Baḥīrā) that he should be protected from the Jews; ʿUmar's inability to believe that he was dead, his burial under ʿĀ'ishah's bed, his death with her as the sole witness. The episodes in the second list seem intended to show only that stories about the Christian teacher, and about the Jewish murder of Muhammad, were justified by Muslim sources. Perhaps these seemed to San Pedro the two clearest cases, and that it might be presumed that if these Christian tales were true, all were true. The importance of Muhammad's having a Christian teacher is obvious; and San Pedro thought it important that the malice of the Jews encouraged Muhammad in the early days of Islam. A comparison of the two lists shows that the first is principally concerned with episodes inherently and obviously discreditable in the author's eyes.[1]

---

1. Ibid., I.vii. 9 - 14. San Pedro did not here mention another episode to which he drew attention elsewhere, and which belonged in the second list: when ʿĀ'ishah said that she and other wives poured water over the Prophet in his last illness. (Ibn Isḥāq, 1006; Bu., 4.45.4; see also Wensinck, Handbook, "Muhammad".) This "supported" the Christian story that Muhammad tried to baptise himself on his death bed. (S.S.M. I.vi.4.)

It is, of course, true that relatively few of the stories told by Christians were wholly without basis in Muslim thought, orthodox or legendary, accurately reported or completely misunderstood; it was from some Arabic seed of authenticity that there sprang these wild flowers of Christian fantasy in Latin or Romance. To San Pedro, unaware of the prejudices of modern historical method, this relation was reversed: the constant and elusive reflections of each other in the two series of statements could be no coincidence, and there must have been a watering-down, a thinning-out, an explaining away of the truth by the Muslims. San Pedro does not seem entirely to have accepted the more fantastic Christian assertions, and he must have supposed that the whole truth lay between the two. It is fairly clear that though he would not deny himself the pleasure of recounting a single tale derogatory of the Prophet's honour, he did not commit himself to the details of any, and those that found no apparent Muslim confirmation he was content, once told, to ignore.

He was even willing to envisage the possibility that none of them were true at all. The contents of the Muslim books were alone sufficient to condemn Muhammad. "Even if all these (Christian sources) are left aside, still it is obviously demonstrated that those things which he himself said are not from God . . ."[1] Doctrine culled from Muslim

---

1. Ibid., I. ii. 25.

sources, like information about Muhammad from the same place, was "enough and more than enough for the shame and ruin of his religion; and many things of theirs also which they have written they ignore, or openly deny, since those who hear them can only laugh".[1] Muslim sources were full of opportunities waiting to be exploited, apart from those obviously discreditable stories, which he extracted in his first summary already cited. Some events of Muhammad's life it was possible to treat with a radically destructive technique, as, for example, by indicating that Muhammad acquired a number of wives only after he became rich and powerful,[2] and by insisting on how he failed to try to stop the practice of magic among the Muslims, and thus retained aspects of paganism.[3] The fact that Muhammad's life was human without any of the characteristics which for Christians were inseparable from a divine mission could never (most Christians thought) be sufficiently emphasised. That orthodox Muslims were wholly in agreement; that they did not wish, and in the essence of their religion could not wish, to make Muhammad in any way more than human was impossible for the Christian to credit, still less take to heart.[4] Much energy was wasted on

---

1. Ibid., I. viii. 239
2. Ibid., I. ii. 1.
3. Ibid., I. ii. 20 ff.; I iv. 4.
4. The imaginative effort needed by the Christian was made more difficult by the inconsistency of Islamic popular fancy which invented the rather disreputable miracles so fiercely attacked by Christians.

self-congratulatory comments on Islamic admissions of points that told against the Prophet only in the Christian conception of him. San Pedro said that the Muslims wrote in their books that Muhammad

> . . . was affected by a great fear when there was thunder or lightning, or when it became gloomy or dark; and as they have written these things about him whom they are trying to praise as far as they can or know how, you can understand enough, leaving out many other things for which, if they were written down, Muhammad could be blamed. (1)

There is so great a gap between the Muslim ḥadīth and the Christian hagiography that this beating on air could continue indefinitely; nothing that Christians said would appeal greatly to anyone but a Christian.

To proving the humanity of the Prophet on Islamic authority was added every conceivable emphasis on his moral transgressions; San Pedro levelled the rationalist complaint that doctrines were adapted, or invented, to suit the Prophet's personal desires, and the requirements of the situation for which the Qur'an was legislating. "Because you were profligate and you knew that the peoples whom you taught were inclined to profligacy, you gave such a Law of Profligacy as pleased you and them."[2] Thus Muhammad became the <u>simulator sanctitatis</u>,[3] the hypocrite, although the things he had done were things which "profligate" Islam did not recognise as

---

1. Ibid., I. ii. 23.
2. Ibid., I. viii. 148.
3. Quid. Angl.; cf. Ricoldo, ~~above, p.~~ Disp., prol.

sinful. We have already seen that Muhammad "introduced into the Qur'an things that happened to him or his companions"[1] to the scandal of Christians; but this was a mode of revelation which seemed normal to Muslims. Had San Pedro's principal object been to enter into controversy with Muslims, rather than to fortify the faith of a Christian congregation surrounded by an Islamic society, he might have been more anxious to find common ground on which to argue. The version of the life of Muhammad which San Pedro claimed to have taken, and had actually taken, from Islamic sources, is the "best" mediaeval life, in the sense of the nearest to the sources. Yet to read Ibn Isḥāq and San Pedro one after another is a striking lesson in the way material can be selected from an original in order to give a totally different impression.[2]

3. Editorial selection.

The great variety of forms in which the "Christian" stories represented the life of Muhammad, and particularly of forms of the story attributing a teacher to him - Baḥīrā,

---

1. S.S.M. I. i. 43.
2. A glance at the cross-references from passages in San Pedro to passages in Ibn Hishām (Ibn Isḥāq) in the notes in the preceding six chapters will give an idea of the extent to which San Pedro depended on this source. What he took from it is, of course, only a minute fraction of the whole. Extracts could have been taken in such a way as to give the same general impression as the whole work. San Pedro did just the contrary.

Sergius, Nicolas and so on - is itself evidence of the kind of editorial selection that went on. There was widespread effort to find some combination of supposed facts which would be consistent and undeniable. We may compare the attitude adopted by San Pedro, whose daily life forced him into contact with Muslims, with the editorial activity of Vincent de Beauvais. Apart from material intended to illuminate the contemporary state of Islam in the Holy Land, all that he collected about Muhammad he concentrated.[1] The greater part of this is a series of extracts from Peter of Toledo's translation of the Risālah, formed, by the simple omission of the passages of abstract and theoretical theology, into a consecutive life of Muhammad.[2] This is preceded, first, by the Corozan text, which, of course, is extremely remote from reality, and might be supposed so irreconcileable with the Risālah for it to be pointless to publish the two together. Between them comes reference to the libellus in partibus transmarinis in which the false miracles of the bull and the dove and the springs of milk and honey are described. Either these miracles were credited by people actually living in Syria, or their credibility was boosted by their being attributed to Syrian authority. Vincent himself next indiscriminately introduced the Latin Risālah as giving

---

1. Book 23. 39 ff.
2. Followed by a history of the text of the Qur'an and an attack on Islamic practices.

further, when he might better have said conflicting, information. It seems probable that like San Pedro he could not give up the less likely and more gratifying for the sake of its reverse. Doubtless he was impressed by the self-evident value of the Risālah but, compared with San Pedro, he had less reason to be certain that the "Christian" stories which he repeated were unreliable. The encyclopaedist included whatever material was available. To some extent most chroniclers, as well as such writers as Geraldus and Caesarius, were encyclopaedic, but by making additions and alterations to the stories they used, and by preferring one version to another, they exercised more editorial activity than Vincent. Humbert of Romans collected an anthology of literature about the Holy Land, the Crusades and the Spanish Reconquest, for the use of preachers. It was completely uncritical and unselective.[1] Both Varagine and Higden quoted stories that they regarded as inconsistent, and for themselves preferred the better; as was the custom among chroniclers, they retained the rejected passage in the text. There is a very wide gap between the most sensible and the least sensible story in a single text.[2] There was a remarkable variety in the permutations and combinations of familiar items in Muhammad's legend, and the fact that many different stories existed is an indication of the amount of editing that took place.

---

1. De pred. S.C., cap. 29 - 43.
2. Higden includes the pseudo-Turpinus story of the great idol of Muhammad in Spain.

It is interesting to note how little the Cluniac corpus affected the situation. The life of Muhammad was not the chief concern of the collection. The summula relied for its account of the Prophet upon a sober Greek Christian source.[1] It contains little that it would have been hopeless to maintain in public debate with a Muslim before a sympathetic or neutral audience; clearly an editorial effort was made which is of real interest for its negative achievement in excluding the wilder elements. The matter is traditional and there is nothing that could have been written by anyone but a Latin.[2] Occasionally the summula seems to précis, but more generally ignores, the wealth of the material which the Risālah provided, and which in Peter of Toledo's translation belonged to the same corpus and normally the same manuscript. There is a presumption that the author felt that Latin and Greek sources were more reliable than Arabic ones, even Christian Arabic ones. The translation of the Risālah was the greatest Cluniac contribution to the subject. Yet it is not possible to attribute the enormous influence of the original over all intelligent discussion of

---

1. Anastasius Bibliothecarius Romanus; this translates the account in the Chronographica of Theophanes.
2. Monneret de Villard asserted oriental Christian authorship (Lo Studio) and was corrected by M. Th. d'Alverny (Deux Traductions). It is exceedingly difficult to see why he repeated this statement of Mandonnet's (in Pierre le Vénérable). He has now been copied in turn by Sweetman.

Muhammad's life solely to the Cluniac translation. It is true that William of Auvergne and Vincent de Beauvais referred to it expressly, as the 'pamphlet of the disputation of a Christian and a Muslim'; but they thought it important principally for its treatment of the textual history of the Qur'an.[1] On the other hand it seems likely that the matter in the Risālah relating to the life of the Prophet influenced many authors who may never have seen it in any written or complete form, in either Latin or Arabic. There is another Latin source of the information which the Arabic Risālah contributed to the subject of Muhammad's life; that is the "Syrian Apology", i.e. the work which Viterbo and Paris's Gregorian Report represent. This does not seem to be identical with, but must be closely related to, the original Risālah. Vitry, who was also particularly influenced by this, was directly in touch with possible sources in his city of ʿAkka. The very great influence of the Risālah, in one form or another, is likely to have sprung, as San Pedro's comment suggests, from its combination of authenticity with polemic utility.[2] The Cluniac Qur'an might also have been a source of knowledge of the Prophet's

---

1. Alv., de leg., XVIII/18. R/S; Vincent, loc. cit.
2. An interesting example of its wide acceptance and general authority is that the quadruplex reprobatio refers to it as authority which disproves the "divided moon" miracle, which it does not, in fact, mention. Since this is the author's only major fault in giving references, he may really be referring to a form of the Risālah which more closely approximated to the source of Viterbo, Paris and Vitry, which do all speak of the "divided moon" miracle. Vitry, VII.

life, but was not identifiably so; and some of the other translations associated with it were then, as they are now, of limited interest. The de doctrina Machometi was a rich source of largely legendary material.

The remarkable manuscript collection of the fourteenth century noted by Miss d'Alverny[1] contained, in addition to the whole Corpus Toletanum (including Peter of Toledo), the Qur'an of Mark of Toledo, a Prophetia and the Liber Nicholay. This is an unique association of documents, an entire library of authentic information on Islam. It cannot now be said how the original collector assessed the value of all these documents, but we may suppose that the Prophetia and the Liber Nicholay were included in a tolerant and comprehensive spirit rather than in a highly critical one. There is a clearer case in Mark's Preface to his Qur'an. That excellent translation appears to be the sole source of the paraphrase of some Qur'anic passages in which Mark, in the Preface, summarised the teaching of the Prophet; but a fictitious and very ordinary biography of Muhammad is given equal prominence and credit in this same short Preface.[2] Peter de Pennis includes fabulous stories of Muhammad, which only unpretentious

---

1. Deux Traductions, p. 111: B.N. lat. 14503.
2. Cf. M. Th. d'Alverny, Marc de Tolède. With this we may contrast the action of the summula in positively and with finality denying the truth of the legend of Nicholaus.

purposes could have excused, in a serious work derived largely from Ricoldo.[1]

William of Tripoli's work stands apart from that of other authors. He was considerably less well-informed than the Spaniards and was used very little by Ricoldo, although known to him.[2] His presentation of events, including his contributions to the life of Muhammad, is peculiar.[3] Except for the Bahīra legend, the source of which is known and is Arabic, there is no obvious written passage to which he was indebted. In turn, he was followed only by Mandeville, who himself exercised a remarkable editorial talent in recognising the value and interest of Tripoli's work. There is no reason against the presumption that Tripoli was dealing with written or spoken material in Latin or Arabic, available to him directly, or through interpretation, in the convent in ʿAkka. His material is remarkable for its lack of accurate detail, which is likely, in the light of the advantages for informing himself that he enjoyed, to have been deliberate. A point of greater interest is that in this new material, much of which is eccentric as to subject matter,

---

1. I (MS. f. 15 v.) The mere copying of minor entries offers further examples of lack of discrimination, but was so general and almost certainly so meaningless that it may be ignored. An example would be Godfrey of Viterbo's entry in his Pantheon under 612 . . . eo tempore Machomet, quem hodie Saraceni colunt, natus de stirpe Ismaelis . . . legem suam praedicabat. Colunt may mean nothing more than honour; nevertheless, by purely modern standards, this remark, copied by many other chronicles, was unworthy of the author who first transcribed into Latin the work we have called the Syrian Apology.
2. Cf. Monneret de Villard, Il Libro, ~~cited above~~ p. 101
3. I - IV.

and which is arranged to constitute a perfectly consistent whole, the events which he brings in have the same significance as those which make up the more ordinary lives of Muhammad. Tripoli was almost alone,[1] for example, in asserting that the Christians and Jews composed the Qur'an long after the death of Muhammad, at the demand of the Companions; but in doing so he only hoped to prove the same Christian and Jewish contributions as every other author attributed to an early stage in Muhammad's career.[2] Tripoli's Muhammad is very patchy in its approach to reality; his knowledge of the Qur'an and his appreciation of its treatment of Christian themes is as individual as his historical reconstruction of Muhammad and immeasurably superior. Once again we are astonished to find such accurate translations of long passages from the Qur'an in a setting only moderately authoritative. Nevertheless, Tripoli in fact did what San Pedro was a little later to recommend: he used stories authentically Muslim in origin to create new forms which might maintain the traditional criticisms of Muhammad, and which he may even have hoped would be able to command the assent of Muslims.

Two writers as well-informed as San Pedro, and equally in a position to make historical judgements, were the author of the quadruplex reprobatio and Ricoldo da Montecroce. Their methods constitute an interesting contrast. The conclusions

1. Matthew Paris understood the same thing. (Under the year 622
2. XXV.

reached by the reprobatio often seem for polemic purposes slight: a whole chapter of quotations from the hadith and other Muslim sources goes to show that Muhammad claimed to be a prophet. It is not necessary to suppose, and in fact it is most unlikely, that this material was supplied out of a disinterested love of historical truth. It may have been intended to form a source-book for missionaries and controversialists and those who had the cure of Christian souls under Muslim governments. The whole work lists and classifies quotations from Muslim books of high authority, al-Bukhārī and Muslim, for example,[1] relevant to the more popular polemic points commonly made against Islam; and it seems likely that its purpose was to make extracts of an authority, undeniable by Muslims, available in support of favourite lines of dispute, so far as that might be possible; they may also have been intended in restraint. In this and in other ways the reprobatio, though more concise in scope and method, has qualities in common with the work of San Pedro. In particular, its author used Muslim material to prove the humanity of the Prophet, the Islamic acceptance of which gave scandal although it was welcomed. Of the death in the arms of ʿĀʾishah he remarked: "from this it is clear that the death or end of

1. The detailed references which this work gives for each extracted passage is not the least remarkable thing about it. This strongly suggests that it was intended that the material should be identifiable by Arabic speakers who could refer to the sources.

Muhammad was vile, unclean and abominable, and such a death by no means suits a Prophet or messenger of God".[1] This would be excessive condemnation of ordinary humanity, were that not itself an offence in a recipient of a divine mission. In spite of, or because of, its economy and sobriety, this work remains more impressive polemically than most of its contemporaries; its copious use of extracts effortlessly effects its comparatively limited ends.

Ricoldo's treatment was in many respects the reverse. What he intended to be a compendium for the use of missionaries is less a collection of material for their use than an exploitation, in as many alternative ways as he could devise, of the whole material that he could bring together. There was a proliferation of arguments. Each point was made with so little discrimination between the serious and the petty that the former would lose their value by association with the latter. He would take over many of these, for example, the assertion that Muhammad was epileptic, apparently without reflection. He made no effort to limit the strong element of almost personal spite in passages taken from the Contrarietas. When in his turn Peter de Pennis came to edit Ricoldo's material, he made an obvious effort to re-arrange and simplify it. This was not wholly successful; and because he was more

---

1. IX.

remote from personal knowledge of Islam,[1] we could not expect great discrimination from him. He did not tone down such passages originating from the Contrarietas as he used, and he added fabulous forms of the Muhammad story on his own initiative.

4. Conclusion.

We may sum up by saying that those who could do so used authentic Muslim sources as being more effective in dispute. Yet there was no interest in what Muslims thought of their Prophet, or of Christian accusations against him; he was judged always by Christian standards. The points which were so avidly seized were those where he was in conflict with Christian ethics of which he was not aware; with the natural law, binding on every human being, in which Christians, but not Muslims, believe. Ad hoc revelations, particularly such as regulated Muhammad's personal affairs, were regarded as inherently shocking, although Muslims might never realise where lay the reproach. The telling of Muhammad's life was forced into a Christian shape that became classic, invariable over centuries. The best informed writers were still reluctant to relinquish the fantastic tales that continued

1. It is clear that Peter de Pennis was interested in the Middle East as well as in Islam, but there is no evidence that he had direct knowledge of either. (Compare Kohler, Le Libellus de locis transmarinis, de Pierre de Pennis.)

to circulate generally, but would be content to use authentic information to prove the allegations formerly served by fantasy. It was theologically certain that Muhammad's life was largely shameful and wholly human and there was a natural desire to select those facts which were most likely to be true; that meant those facts, so far as possible such as Muslims admitted, which most clearly revealed Muhammad's shame. It is instructive to note how little the popular image of Muhammad changed. Behind the differences, which were enormous, between intellectual and practical, serious and frivolous, knowledgeable and legendary, there was a common consent that the life of the Prophet must illustrate all that was most detested in Islam.

PART IV.

Islam in the World: Duties and Rewards of Religion.

Prefatory Note.

Suspicion of Islam was greatest, as we might expect, in matters of practical importance: in its power and its material success, in its neglect of asceticism, in its religious ceremonies, and finally in its claim that all these would be rewarded by salvation. Islam offered divine sanction for many things from which Christians try with only mediocre success to refrain. This "religion of the whole man" has attracted some moderns (1), but in the Middle Ages Islamic morals were inevitably presented as repellent to reason and contrary to nature. This attack followed the same pattern as accounts of the life of Muhammad; by showing that Muslim doctrine only reflected what the Prophet had practised, Christians stressed their conception of its human origin. They thought that worldly fear, deriving from the Prophet's use of force, and carnal licence, deriving from the indulgence he allowed himself and his followers, were the principal elements in the first rise of Islam and in its contemporary success.

In Islam the whole of jurisprudence derives, directly or indirectly, from revelations which were eternal, but which were sent down as need arose. Where it did not arise, there was no revelation; when in due course it did, there had to be appeal to what the Prophet had personally decided; and, where there was no relevant Tradition of what he had done, to what he would have done, which could be known either by the consensus of orthodox Muslim opinion, or by analogy. The whole of the sharī'ah, the Islamic equivalent to canon law, is interpreted according to four different schools, Ḥanafī, Shāfi'i, Māliki and Ḥanbali, each of which prevails in different regions of the world. The Shī'ah have their own system again. It follows that what is permitted is, in detail, different in different places, and that such differences derive solely from different interpretation of the single source of knowledge, which is revelation (2). Such an attitude to morals was inconceivable to mediaeval Christians who believed that the

---

1. Cf. Muḥammad Asad (see bibliography).

2. For the legal questions referred to in this note, cf. Schact, Origins, and articles Ūṣul, Sharī'ah and Mālik b. Anas in E.I., and articles in E.I. by other writers, on al-Shāfi'i, abū Ḥanīfa, Aḥmad b. Muh. b. Ḥanbal; under djihad, dār-al-Islām, dār al-ḥarb, dār al-ṣulḥ, shahid.

proper use of every material thing and institution is inherent in it, a natural law discoverable by unaided reason and one that God of his nature could not modify. Thus there was a clear divergence between the Christian and Muslim theoretic attitudes to all the obligations and rights of men in this life, and to what has saving power for the next. At the same time, a wide difference in theory was not always reflected in actual practice.

This may be illustrated. There is a contrast of Christian humility and asceticism with the general absence of either in orthodox Islam. In Christianity worldliness reappeared in disguise when religion was associated with the power of the State. This applies to the West in the Middle Ages. For example, the favour of Providence came to appear to Christians to underly material success, so that the victories of Islam created a serious problem of conscience and of speculative theology. Another example is that Christians practised and even justified the use of force to impose the predominance of their religion. There is no similar inconsistency in Islam, which has always taught that to be killed in the holy war, the jihād, is martyrdom, and entails special rewards in Paradise; and for Muslims it is a duty to take part in the jihād until the dwelling-place of Islam, dār al-Islām, includes the whole world. Roughly speaking, outside the dār al-Islām there is only the dwelling of war, dār al-ḥarb. This is rather theoretical; except at its first rise, and again during the Ottoman invasions, Islam has not been particularly aggressive against Europe. It remains a Muslim's duty to offer non-Muslim nations (1) a choice between becoming Muslim, or accepting tributary status as dhimmis, a sort of state composed of second-class citizens within the state of Islam; or, finally, of fighting. If the Muslims were successful, the vanquished might be enslaved with their families, and their property confiscated. A Christian in danger of being killed during the fighting, or of being executed for some reason after it, could in many cases save his life by professing Islam; from the Christian side, this choice would make him a martyr, but, from the Islamic side, it was a supererogatory mercy, not compulsion in religion at all. The government had discretion to accept ransoms instead of enslaving. One aspect of enslavement that acquired a particular importance in Christian eyes was the fact that the master of a female slave might take her as a concubine, and, if she were not a Muslim, a previous marriage was annulled

---

1. Strictly, the people of the Book only, i.e., Christians and Jews; in practice, a rather wider latitude has been allowed. Pagans were not entitled to toleration, and had a simple choice between Islam and death; and once a man was Muslim, the punishment of apostasy was death.

by the act of enslavement. An enslaved Christian woman who became a concubine, or a free woman who became a polygamous wife, would never be compelled to profess Islam, although the pressure of worldly circumstances might induce her to do so. Her children would be Muslims (1). These rules obtained in the fighting in the Middle Ages between Christians and Muslims. They derived, of course, from Muhammad's wars against the pagan Meccans and the Medinan Jews, and were tempered by his personal toleration of Christians and Jews who did not oppose him. It may be said that Christian theory and practice relating to the toleration of other religions came during the Middle Ages to approximate increasingly closely to the Muslim theory and practice (2).

In personal and individual morals a situation, only sometimes parallel, may be traced. Every Christian account of Islamic morals was largely obsessed by matters of sex, reflecting the attention paid to the Prophet's relations with women. No very careful assessment of what Islam forbade or permitted was attempted. Often the effect was to portray general promiscuity and sometimes even a perverted sensualism. Here there are two explanations. Christian doctrine confined sexual relations to monogamous, indissoluble marriage, and recommended celibacy, a theory which, whether successfully practised or not, contrasts with that of Islam, where marriage becomes a positive duty. In the Qur'an the forbidden degrees, and mutual obligations of spouses and rights of property on both sides are treated with great detail; in comparison, the number of wives is apparently not thought greatly to matter, but men are recommended to take up to four, as their circumstances allow. Husbands are allowed the one-sided right of divorce (talāq) which up to the third time they may recall but which then becomes definite. The Qur'an seems again chiefly interested to specify the conditions in which this may take place and the right disposition of property. Such a divorce has nothing at all to do with any legal offence committed by the wife. The whole marriage law seems much more concerned with equity than with sex (1). In a conception so alien to Christians, different points appealed to their imaginations in proportion as they were contrary to their own institutions. We may take it that the general behaviour of Muslims was often not very different from that of Christians, but the official attitude

---

1. Q., esp. II. 220 ff. and IV. 3 ff.

2. Islam in practice proved the more tolerant; the oriental Christians still flourish, but until modern times Muslim communities under Christian rulers did not last very long.

was so different that the Islamic family seemed to be an organised orgy, hardly more than a brothel, instead of the stable and respectable institution that it really is (1). It was difficult for Christians to realise that Muslims were, within their own system, fully as opposed to promiscuity and infringements of the law as Christians were in their own case. There was at any rate little estimate of the way Muslims themselves assessed the virtues.

It was fully realised that Islam taught some good things, but less generally that even virtues that were shared were not necessarily given the same importance by both religions. The brotherhood of believers is a doctrine which Muslims may be argued to have taken more seriously, and yet in practice to have infringed equally with the Christians. Vice versa, homosexuality is forbidden by both religions, and taken much more seriously by Christianity. There was strong Christian feeling that if Islam while forbidding this crime failed to enforce the law, it might just as well encourage it. In Christendom, only those practices were tolerated in public that Christian doctrine tolerated, and it was taken for granted that the same applied in Islam. The Christian Church was able to take independent action to enforce the requirements of canon law, at least in public, and it was considered a serious relapse if the civil power was in conflict with the spiritual courts, or failed to co-operate to put into effect the mandates of Church Councils. In Islam, with no church organisation, there is andwas nothing comparable. Islamic jurisprudence can be enforced just so far as the government of the day may wish; and an Islamic ruler, compared to a Christian one, had much greater latitude successfully and for a long time to neglect the precepts of religion. This misapprehension explains a part of the Christian attitude to Muslim practices, but, even so, Christians applied to Islam a standard they did not apply to themselves. In Christendom, men and women sinned privately, but because the Church denounced their doing so, Christendom was held guiltless of their actions. Islam was held responsible for anything that happened in Islamic society. It may well be thought that here Christian writers were guilty of measuring unlike things against each other. At its fairest, the Christian comparison was made, not between the ways people behaved under the two religions, but between the ways that in theory the two religions were prepared to see them behave. In the latter case it was allowed to appear that in practice there might turn out to be no enormous difference in everyday life. It was, of course, always

---

1. Roget's thesaurus contains, under "impurity" the entry "seraglio, harem, zenana; brothel, bawdy-house, house of ill-fame".

considered essential to prove that the Muslim promise of salvation was false, and that the licence Islam enjoyed must be rewarded by perdition.

Something similar is the case with purely religious obligations. The worship or prayer (ṣalāt) is nothing like prayer in the Christian sense of private prayer, and has not a great deal in common with the Christian liturgy; it is a fixed and communal ritual in which the whole Islamic society pays its due debt of worship, but one in which individuals at a distance can take a part. It cannot properly be described in Christian terms, and this is also true of the other "pillars" of Islam: the ḥajj, the pilgrimage to the Holy House of Mecca, which Abraham the Muslim built and which is the "place of assembly for mankind" (1); the fast of Ramaḍān, the month in which, on the night of power, the Qur'an was sent down; and the zakāt, the tax for the relief of the needy. These are not like Christian prayer, or fast, or pilgrimage, or even almsgiving, but they were judged very largely as though they were attempts to approximate.

Finally, Christian treatment of the Islamic beliefs about the Last Things seems to sum up many of these other matters. A material Paradise such as the Qur'an described seemed finally to define the irrationality of those who believed in it. The subtleties with which Islamic philosophers reconciled the demands of reason with a loyal interpretation of the revelations were largely unknown, and, where known, over-simplified or misunderstood. With the Beatific Vision in the Christian sense, couches and goblets and all kinds of fruits were definitely and finally incompatible. There was a more important consideration. The question of who shall be saved, and for what reason, is the hub of all religion, and this was the point at which there was maximum divergence. It was this that made the contrast between the two different systems of permissions and injunctions most vivid. In a sense, all these were differences of detail. For Muslims as for Christians the performance of specified religious obligations had power to save. For both it was essential to hold one faith and to belong to one religious community.

---

1. Quoted from E.I., under hadjdj.

Chapter 18

The Place of Violence and Power.

Violence in the relations of Christendom and Islam had a double significance; force was used by Islam and against it. The theoretical defence of the Crusade affects us here only so far as it relates to the whole attitude of Christendom to Islam. The use of force was almost universally considered to be a major constituent of Muslim religious, as well as political, practice and an evident sign of error. It was characteristic of the Christian approach that it took this view at the same time as it embraced the necessity for Crusading warfare.

1. Attitude to Crusade.

Of the preaching of the Crusade in general, it is enough to recall that it was seen as a Holy War primarily because it was intended to recover land that rightly belonged to the Christians. The test of true Christianity was doubtless loyalty to the Apostolic See, so that, increasingly, Eastern Orthodoxy as well as the Eastern heretical churches was coming to seem to be an aberration; in spite of this, Christians were still thought to be a single nation which in the rise of Islam had been robbed of a third of its best provinces.[1] Authors with some knowledge of Islam and

---

1. Cf. Urban's Clermont sermon, Malmesbury, under yr. 1095; cf. also Dana Munro, Speech of Pope Urban II. There is a very great sameness in all accounts of the rise of Islam. Cf. Guibert; Peter the Venerable, C.S.S.,prol.12; summula; Gerald; St. Albans Chr.; Alv.,de leg.,XVIII/18.N ff.; Paris, al.scr.; Vitry,IV; Humbert, de pred.S.C.,II; Tripoli,IV ff.; Leg.Aur.; Rod.,Hist.Arab.,VII ff.; Lull, D.P. and Hamar, sig.10; Higden; Marino,III.V; Anon. Fior. Cf. also the"divisio apostolorum" (above p. 70)and an unpublished work by D. Hay, at present in course of preparation.

chronicles from Byzantine sources would always trace the stages of loss to the early Caliphs who followed the example of Muhammad. Their general approach was here the same as that of the mass of writers who dealt with the Crusade without any special knowledge of Islam. Every Christian reference to lands that had once been Christian, and particularly to the Holy Land, must be understood to have been made on the assumption that these were lost provinces belonging to the Latin Church by right. This was more than a general way of thinking. It had juridical and liturgical expression: the Church of Jerusalem in the twelfth century celebrated the Feast of the Recovery of the city;[1] and an area conquered from Muslim rule was restored to the Church.[2] There is some parallel to the Muslim doctrine of dār-al-Islām and dār al-ḥarb.

To fight on the Crusade was itself a religious vocation, and the views of rigorous enthusiasts achieved a widespread popularity. For example, Caesarius tells us that it was St. Bernard's advice to a man who had failed to make good his monastic vocation that he should end his days fighting

---

1. The Collect of the Feast began: Omnipotens sempiterne Deus, qui virtute tua mirabili Jerusalem, civitatem tuam, de manu paganorum eruisti et christianis reddidisti . . . (Descriptio T.S. Johannis Wirziburgensis.)
2. Cf. for the earlier period a bull of Urban II which speaks of the restitution of the Church of Sicily (1093; edit. Taurinensis.) and for the thirteenth century, Gregory IX's speaking of the restoration of the kingdom of Majorca to the Christian cult. (M.O.F.P.H. vol. IV, 2, Raymundiana, XXXVIII). These are examples taken almost at random.

the infidel.[1] A century later, Joinville tells us that the Bishop of Soissons wished to be with God rather than to return to his native land, and so spurred against the enemy and was killed.[2] Thus he joined the number of the martyrs.[3] These two examples are typical of this enduring sentiment. The

---

1. op. cit., I.VI.
2. LXXVII.
3. The history of the Crusades is full of descriptions of Christians who rashly provoked fighting in which they were killed; the classic example is Reginald of Chatillon's provocation of the Hattin campaign. If after the fighting a prisoner was offered safety on condition of apostasy, he must presumably be deemed a martyr of a sort if he refused to apostatise, though certainly not a martyr to be set up as a model; and a prisoner who had not personally provoked battle in such a case would without question be a martyr. To call a man who was simply killed in the course of fighting the enemies of the Church a martyr was to adopt the Muslim doctrine of jihad. This was not the idea which prevailed at the opening of the Crusading period; Urban at Clermont recommended death, in the Christian tradition, primarily as an end to the exile of this life; he did not refer explicitly to the hope of martyrdom, but took it for granted that Crusaders who died would be saved.

In spite of the language used, it may be be doubted whether it was strictly martyrdom that was meant when that term was applied to Crusading casualties. Runciman, making a contrast with the Greek Church, has drawn attention to some ninth-century pontificates. (Hist. Crus., vol.1, p. 84) One of the most definite of these seems to be the fragment from Leo IV, who asserts that those who die fighting Saracens will receive a heavenly reward, since the Almighty knows that they die for the truth of the Faith, for the safety of their country and the defence of Christians. (Mansi, XIV, col. 888) It is difficult to imagine the Greek Church (if the matter were once raised) saying less, or encouraging oriental Christians not to do as much, without greatly disturbing the Emperors. The Pope's language seems to fall short of that suitable to theological pronouncement, and to express rather a pious hope. The other definite passage is in a letter of John VIII to the bishops of King Louis' dominions (MPL, 126; Ep. CLXXXVI). He is considering formally a query whether those who are killed in defence of the Church and of the Christian religion and state (pro statu Christianae religionis et reipublicae) may be absolved: utrum . . . indulgentiam possint consequi delictorum. He replies "audaciously by the clemency of

opportunity that the Crusade gave to acquire merit was, in fact, a justifying element in it, argued Humbert of [redacted] Romans, in his day the protagonist of Crusading theory.[1] His replies to

---

Note continued from preceding page:-

Christ" - audenter Christi Dei nostri pietate - that those who die fighting hard against infidels will be received into eternal rest. He cites Scriptural examples of the remission of sin, including that of the penitent thief. He then pronounces an absolution, by apostolic authority, "quantum fas est". Again this seems to me to fall short of martyrdom strictly understood.

Much later, a passage in Roland is reminiscent of this; it shows Christian soldiers confessing and being absolved before the battle, and being told for penance to strike the enemy. In this there is no note of martyrdom; but there is also another line which asserts that those who die will die martyrs. (LXXXIX) Even so, this seems rather to be a loose way of speaking than a positive theological assertion; Roland is not, of course, a theological treatise.

On the whole, it seems to me best to say that fighting the Muslims was regarded as a holy exercise, a good work which would count very strongly on the side of salvation if one were killed in the process; but not, technically, as martyrdom. It did not make absolution superfluous. There was, however, no shame in using the term "martyrdom", emotionally and evocatively, of death in battle. Runciman has certainly proved his main point, that in the West bellicosity was consecrated by Crusading in a way unknown to the Church before; but it can be argued that he slightly over-stated it. It may be certainly maintained that we are here concerned much more with sentiment than with theology proper.

1. Op. Trip., I. XII.

criticism of the preaching of the Crusade and to resistance of it are contained in two works, the Opus Tripartitum, intended to brief the Fathers at Lyons about the whole Crusading situation, and the earlier collection de praedicando Sanctae Crucis, a series of sermons fortified by a short anthology of passages relating to the Holy Land and to past wars against Muslims. Here he preached the Crusade after the auspicious invocation of the Lord God of Hosts.

In the Crusade, he maintained, it was not the innocent who were attacked, as only too often happened in the West, when poor farmers and hospitals and leper-colonies suffered; on the contrary, the Muslim nation was summa culpabilis. There was also a sufficient cause, not injured pride, avarice or vainglory; the army of God fought for more even than a material right, for the cause of Faith. Finally, a war that was fought on inadequate authority was not just, but the Crusade was fought on divine authority. Thus it was the just war par excellence, bellum justissimum.[1] The Church bore two swords, against heretics and against rebels; Muslims had the qualities of both these, since they destroyed the body like the latter, and also the soul like the former. Muslims already subject to Christendom were tolerated because they were not in any position where they could do harm, because

1. De pred. S.C., II.

they were useful and because they might be converted.[1] This attitude was not unlike that of Islam towards the Christians under Muslim rule. It will be seen that whereas Humbert's arguments for toleration were sensible, if reluctant, his arguments to justify the war were enthusiastic but not fundamentally rational. The culpability of Muslims, the defence of Faith, the divine authority were all treated as self-evident.

The best explanation seems to be that the use of violence against Muslims was seen as inherently or axiomatically just. This will appear more clearly from a consideration of some other arguments of Humbert's. When it was objected that on Crusade the innocent Christians might suffer more than the guilty Muslims, he replied that history showed more Muslims to have been killed, and he quoted with relish the first capture of Jerusalem by the Crusaders, when the blood of the killed came up to the horses' knees.[2] If objectors contrasted the shedding of blood and the behaviour of Christ and the Apostles, so did the writer contrast conditions in his own time and in the early days of the Church: the powerless Christian people had then proceeded by humility, but now that

---

1. Ibid., VIII; Op. Trip. I. XV. Muslims (other than those already subject to Christians) were to be tolerated, but not for any of the reasons that applied to Jews, that is, because Scripture promised their conversion; or because, to the strengthening of faith, they visibly fulfilled the fate the Scriptures foretold for them; or because they were not in a position to bear arms: the Opus Tripartitum in this respect was more fully argued than its predecessor.
2. Op. Trip. I. XII.; Gesta Francorum, p. 202.

it had become powerful, quite otherwise, by the power of the sword, and as possessing arms where it no longer had miracles. In the last resort the appeal was pragmatic; who was prepared, by not resisting, to see all Christians perish ?[1] All this argumentation, so much more emotional than ratiocinatory, was set in an historical perspective. There was the example of the ancients, Charles the Great, Turpinus, Godfrey of Bouillon.[2] The enthusiasm and the unreality of all this theorising stands out in contrast to the realistic politics of the Latins in the East, and to the reluctance in the West to treat Crusading seriously.

Humbert's attitude was shared by the intellectually unpretentious literature of the vernacular languages, with which it was linked by its appeal to the Latin "Turpinus" chronicles. The chansons de gestecontain many examples, but this characteristic was never more clearly revealed than by the chansonsarising directly out of the Crusade. The state of mind was simple, straightforward, almost simple-minded. Fighting anonymously in a tournament, King Richard at one point wore for a crest a red hound, with its tail hanging down to the ground:

---

1. Op. Trip. I. XI.
2. de pred. S.C., XVI, XXIX - XLIII.

That was synyfycacyoun
The hethen folke to brynge downe,
Them to slee for Goddes loue, (1)
And Cristen men to brynge aboue. (2)

Occasional comments of more serious writers reveal a similar attitude. Thus it was Fidenzio's whole intention to encourage the revival of the Crusade by practical suggestions, but his mind was most strikingly revealed by a chance comment on the unmentionable scelera carnalia which Islam encouraged: "And if there were no other cause but this, it would be the duty of Christians to fight against them, and to cleanse the earth . . ."[3] The Muslims, said Benedict of Alignan, were not worthy of disputing with, "but rather to be extirpated by fire and the sword".

2. Toleration of Islam.

Toleration of Muslims who resided outside Christendom under their own government, even negotiation with them, was liable to be strongly suspected. A well-known

---

1. Cf. the tone of the Chanson d'Antioche on the purpose of the Crusade:

. . .La deffaée gent ocire et afoler,
Qui Dieu ne voelent croire ne ses fais aorer . . .
(V. v.)

Cf. Roland, passim.

2. Richard Loewenherz, lines 339 - 42.
3. XVI.

example is the accusation of treachery against Raymund of Tripoli, for allowing al-Afdal's party to cross his territory when war was impending; not only was there contemporary criticism, but Raymund and others of the opposition to the Lusignan party passed into legend as traitors to Christendom.[1] Richard I was suspected because of his negotiations with al-ʿĀdil; in this connection even his friends reported that "it was a common saying that friendship with the Gentiles was a heinous offence."[2] Balian d'Ibelin feared to be described by the Imperial party as fonder of Muslims than of Christians. Among the crimes of Frederick II was his having had "the name of Muhammad cried in the Temple"; that is, he had agreed that the Qubbat as-Sakhrah, which had been built as a mosque and, except during the period of Latin rule, had always been used as a mosque, should continue so to be used, and that at a time when he was in no position to impose an alternative.[3] The language which it seemed suitable to use of those who dealt, despite the prohibitions of the Church Councils,[4] in war goods with Islamic powers, was very strong indeed - "wicked sons(of the Church)", said William Adam of Sultaniyah, "that

---

1. Cf. G. Paris, Légende de Saladin.
2. Itin. Reg. Ric., IV. 31. (tr. Archer.)
3. Cf. below, p. ?? Salimbene, yr. 1250. For Balian, see Novare, p. 14.
4. Conc. Lateranense III, 1179, Mansi XXII, col. 230; Conc. Lat. IV, 1215, ibid., col. 1066; Conc. Lugdunense I, 1245, XXIII, col. 631. Cf. Edit. bullarum Taurin., Gregory X, Anno 1272, II. See Heyd, vol. i. p. 386 ff.

is, false Christians, professing the faith of the Roman Church by word, but denying it in their acts." He was complaining about all kinds of trade with the "oppressors" who "destroyed the inheritance of the Lord".[1] The canons and papal bulls attempted to impose a strict blockade of war material; trade in arms, iron, and sea-going craft was forbidden at all times, and trade in food and any other useful material was forbidden in times of war. After the fall of ʿAkka, all trade absolutely was forbidden, as though the war footing were permanent; and, from about the middle of the fourteenth century, the adoption of a system of special licences became an important source of revenue to the Holy See.[2]

The way in which the thirteenth century system worked is illuminated by a reply of St. Raymund of Peñafort to the Friars Preacher and Friars Minor in Morocco.[3] His purpose was to define doubtful points in the practical exercise of the excommunication; this took effect automatically, and the missionaries had faculties to absolve only in certain cases. He began by repeating the essentials: the prohibition of trade in armaments at all times, and of trade in foods and other things only <u>in dispendium Terrae Sanctae</u>. The intention

---

1. de modo S. extirpandi, I.
2. Cf. Bulla Bonifacii VIII Pp. Anno 1299, XIII. Not only to trade, but even to travel as a pilgrim to the Holy Land at one required a licence. (Ludolf, ed. Deycks). For the licensing system in trade, as well as for the canonical legislation, see Heyd, vol.ii, p. 33 ff., esp. p. 44 ff.
3. With the express authority of the Holy See.

of the law was to avoid helping Muslims who were at war with Christians; this was interpreted to mean, with any Christian, and thus gave a wide meaning to what might be considered prejudicial to the Holy Land. If, in ignorance of the law, a man traded in the forbidden things, and if, when he was warned, he recovered the goods he had sold, he was still excommunicated, but the missionaries might absolve him. Similarly a man who became involved, even indirectly, in the forbidden trade, in grave economic need: his case was more serious, but he might be treated leniently.[1] In spite of so severe a law, both Latin and indigenous Christian communities flourished within Islam, and there were certain contacts with Muslims which were not commercial, or which at least did not come under the ban of the blockade, and so did not involve the automatic excommunication. Men who bound Christian to Muslim employers, as a result of which faith was endangered, were not excommunicated, but had committed mortal sin. The same was true of those who sold Christians as slaves, and even of those who sold Jewish and Muslim women, making them pretend, to the detriment of the Christian name, that they were Christians. There was only occasional licence for close association with Muslims. The relations, and particularly the parents, of renegades might still live with them, in order to reconvert[2]

1. Leniency was not suggested in the case of a man who sold his own arms to Muslims, even though his original purpose had been not trade, but his personal use.
2. causa correctionis.

them, or because they were dependent on them, or even out of charity.[1] In a marriage where one spouse became Muslim, they might remain together, dummodo sine contumelia Creatoris sit.[2] The intention seems clearly to have been to strengthen the belligerent attitude by reducing fraternisation to a minimum.[3]

Within Christendom, we have already noted, subject Muslims were tolerated.[4] The approach of canon law was careful and sober. The gloss on Gratian required that Jews and Muslims be recognised as neighbours in the evangelical sense.[5] In

---

1. Only one manuscript has this final point.
2. The reference actually is to one partner's "sliding into heresy" but in the context heresy must refer to Islam. (M.O.F.P.H., vol.iv.2. Raymundiana, XVIII) A provincial Council held in Spain some time after 1215 illustrates further the working of the canons (or their failure to work). (Conc. Incerti Loci, Mansi XXII, 1090 ff. Cap. XX). Every Sunday priests were to denounce all those who had incurred the automatic excommunications for trafficking with Saracens. Heyd has, of course, pointed out that the prohibitions were always to some extent a dead letter. Here, however, we are more concerned with the intention than with the actual achievement.
3. Yet the writer earned the reputation of Zelator fidei propagande inter Saracenos. M.O.F.P.H., Vol.I, Cron. Ord. (Cited by Monneret de Villard, Lo Studio.)
4. It is strange to reflect that Peter the Venerable recommended Muslims to introduce among themselves the admirable toleration of which Christendom presented the model; Christians permitted a multitude of Jews to live among them and to speak freely against the Christian faith, and they were not moved to anger, "sed audiunt patienter, respondent sapienter". C.S.S.,I. 12.
5. Grat. decretum, de Jud. et Sar., col. 1722.

practice this meant a very restricted freedom. A peaceful prince should not expel Muslims from his lands without cause; nothing inhuman should be done to them; it might even be possible to form alliances with presumably non-subject Muslims, if this were for purposes of defence.[1] These are licences of very limited effect. The Clementinae forbade the adhān[2] and pilgrimages[3] within the territory of Christian princes. Christians were forbidden to take service in Muslim or Jewish households on any pretext whatsoever.[4]

With this tradition which assumed that force was not only justified but a required duty it was possible for a missionary spirit to co-exist. There was a certain unreality in the attitude of Peter the Venerable, which derived from the literary form of his choice, a refutation of Islam addressed to Muslims in Latin; he considered it suitable for translation, but apparently did not arrange for a translation to be made.[5]

---

1. Durandus, Spec. jur., de J. et S.
2. It is not clear whether or not this refers to the hajj.
3. Clementinarum lib. V, de J. et S., Tit. II, cap. unicum.
4. Conc. Lat. III, Mansi XXII, col. 231. This was presumably also often not observed. Cf. for example, a bull of Gregory IX, XXXVI, Anno 1233 (Edit. Taurin.) Ultimately, but not in the period covered by this thesis, Gregory XI would authorise the Inquisitors to examine the cases of Muslims alleged to have led Christians (including converts from Islam) into error. (VIII, Anno 1372, ibid.)
5. C.S.S., I. prol. 16.

An excess of rhetoric suggests smugness but does not obscure a genuine apostolic fervour.[1] "I approach you, I say, not as our people often do, with arms, but with words, not by force, but by reason, not in hatred, but in love . . ."[2] A similar approach was that of Oliver of Paderborn in his letter to the King of Babilon.[3] The Christian Church, he pointed out, would prefer to send the "sword of the Word", but, finding no other remedy than the material sword, allows it to be used against the Muslim power for the defence of Christendom et iuris sui. Oliver, like Peter before him, was conscious of his originality in using the pen (in Latin) instead of the sword.[4]

This mood is related to that of St. Francis, whose

---

1. Peter wrote self-consciously in the tradition of St. Augustine's defence of orthodoxy. (Ep. de trans. sua; C.S.S., prol. 14) The style is better illustrated by a longer extract; the passage quoted is preceded by the following: "It seems surprising - and perhaps it is so - that I, a man who live in a place which is at a great distance from you, who am different in language and separate in profession, and whose customs and life are strange to you, should write from the furthest West to men who are situated in the regions of the East or South; and that I should approach men whom I have never seen, and whom perhaps I shall never see, so as to speak to them . . ." The effect of this sort of thing is cumulative.
2. C.S.S. I. 1.
3. That is, the Ayyūbid sultan in Cairo, al-Kāmil Muhammad, whom he addressed, "And so I turn my pen to (address) your benevolence and liberality, Mechi Memel, and I desire to address in writing one whom in person (viva voce) I cannot." Ep. Sal. (For alternative readings, see Hoogeweg.) Cf. also the Epistola doctoribus.
4. Of other long-range missionary efforts, Alexander III's letter addressed to the sultan of Konya claims simply to respond to a request; it never shows knowledge of Islam unambiguously, and is hardly important as an example of missionary zeal. ~~Cf. above, p.~~

unarmed incursion into Islam was made in person.[1] In some accounts of his appearance before al-Kāmil it is his solicitude for the sultan's soul that moves the latter's heart and makes him protect the saint and try to pour gifts upon him.[2] This episode is in some ways convincing. The Rule, moreover, encouraged suitable Brothers to go to Muslim lands. "Spiritually they can behave among other people in two ways. One way is not to make disputes and controversies, but to be subject to every human creature for God's sake, and to witness that they are Christians. The other way is, when they see that God pleases, to preach the word of God . . ."[3] They were to remember that they had given themselves and their bodies to Christ. If St. Francis himself once chose the second of these methods, the idea of silent witness was even more revolutionary. These new themes were added to, not substituted for, the old. At the battle of Damietta, we read in Bonaventura's Life how the saint "forbids the battle, foretells disaster"; but it is only because he has prophetic knowledge of defeat that he opposes fighting. The story is curious because, uncharacteristically, he is at first reluctant to appear a fool by acting Cassandra. Presumably he did not trust his own prophetic insight, but there is also an obvious suggestion that both he and Bonaventura, as might be expected,

---

1. Note, in Bonaventura's Life (XI.3) the phrasing, "aderat vir Dei, non armis, sed fide munitus".
2. Cf. sources cited by Gol., vol. I.
3. Reg. Prima, cap. XVI. Cf. Secunda, III.

disliked the worldliness which made the cause of God in the Latin Kingdom depend on material success. The actual passage to the East of so many friars created a new and important element in the Christian consciousness, but did not replace the old Crusading ways of thought.[1]

---

1. The friars themselves were very capable of reinforcing the old Crusading attitude. The rule for Tertiaries (approved by Nicholas IV in 1221) forbade them to carry arms nisi pro defensione Romanae ecclesiae, Christianae fidei vel etiam terrae ipsorum. Adam Marsh, exhorting the Holy See to encourage Missions, saw fit to stress the importance for the Church to wield the two swords, verbalis ad usum, ferreus ad nutrum. (Brewer, Epistola, p. 414 ff. - follows No.CCXLVI, but is unnumbered - cap.X.) Humbert himself is an outstanding example of the combination of the two attitudes. As Master-General of his Order he was the author of an encyclical letter to the Dominicans to enjoin the study of languages, in order to evangelise "schismatics, Jews and barbarous nations". (M.O.F.P.H., vol.V, p. 16 ff.) This, though it did not envisage Muslims as the chief objective, is a good example of the new approach. (Monneret de Villard (Lo Studio) discusses the foundation of their schools of languages, and also refers to Adam Marsh's remarks. For more general aspects of the missions, see Roncaglia, I Francescani in Oriente; C. Dawson, The Mongol Mission.) As far as the Holy Land is concerned, both Dominicans and Franciscans customarily preached the Crusade in Europe, and both were active in the last days of the Latin Kingdom. The influence of the Franciscans became greater in the fourteenth century with the confirmation of the custody of the Holy Places to the Minors. (For the episode at Damietta, see Bonavantura, XI.3 and Gol.vol.i.)

More strictly practical was the approach of some Spaniards.[1] San Pedro wrote explicitly to save the faith of the Christians under Islamic rule who were in danger of despair and apostasy.[2] Lull, ever eccentric, was in general more practical than his actions sometimes suggested. His Life tells the unattractive story of the Muslim slave who for many years had taught him Arabic, and whom, when he one day blasphemed the Holy Name, Lull beat on the face and head and body. After years of being a language master, explained Lull, the slave had become haughty; then he tried to kill Lull and was put in prison. Lull was then torn between fear of his release and reluctance that he should be executed. He attributed this reluctance, not to human affection for his old companion, but to respect for the means by which he had learned the language in which he proposed to evangelise the world. He felt relieved from his dilemma by the slave's suicide in prison. This unsympathetic story represents a general attitude; Islam could be tolerated only in silent subjection, the only final solution was its destruction. Lull's personal taste was for disputation rather than for the

---

1. This is not to assert that the Eastern missionaries were impractical. Ricoldo, both in his polemic writings and in his account of his journey to Iraq, envisaged a missionary effort, among Muslims, dissident Christians and pagans, which must be based on authentic local information. (Itin. and Disp., passim; especially Disp., prol.; Libellus ad nationes orientales, especially recapitulatio. MS. f. 77 r. ff.) Paris referred his "aliud Scriptum" to the authority of a missionary; it contains the Noe legend (cf. p.) and may be related to some source which was also known to Ricoldo, who (IX, MS. f.172v col.2), with Pennis (XI, f.37r), seems to paraphrase the de doctrina; the Paris version differs more considerably from the other examples than they from each other.

2. S.S.M., prol.

use of force. His account of his personal invasion of Bugia was that he went to defend the Trinity, a theme that he introduced by publicly attacking Islam in the market place.[1] This sort of defence seems parallel to treating military aggression in the Crusades as defensive. Lull's missionary fervour was genuine: "sorrow have I and pity," he says, in Professor Peers' translation of Blanquerna, "for the damnation of those innocent men."[2] At the same time he felt the obduracy of the Saracen; Muslims who disbelieved their own religion were still unwilling to receive the truth.[3] It would seem practicable to secure reunion with the Greeks and the conversion of the Tartars by the "necessary reasons" put forward in dispute; but it would be more useful in the case of the Muslims to "fight them and expel them from the land which is ours by right". It would not be possible to convert Muslims so long as they held power; it was only the conversion of subject Muslims that was practicable.[4] In this connection there is an interesting justification of missionary work sent by St. Raymund of Peñafort to his Master-General. The fruits in Africa and Spain were listed as, first, the care of

---

1. Vita, cap. VI. Cf. his rather more discreet behaviour on a previous occasion, cap. IV.
2. Cap. XLIII.
3. Ibid., XLIV.
4. Cf. De recup. T.S., in Atiya, Crusade in Later Middle Ages. For discussions of Lull's complex attitude to Missions and Crusades - in the course of a long life his views were not constant - see Atiya; Monneret de Villard; also Peers, Zwemer.

Christian knights, who thirsted for the Word of God; secondly, care of the indigenous Arabic-speaking Christians, who "desired the friars with a great desire"; thirdly, the recovery of the renegades whose apostasy derived from excessive poverty or from "the seduction of the Muslims" (this seems to imply motives of worldly advancement); fourthly, there was refutation of the calumny spread not only by Muslims but by some Christians duped by them, that Latins were idolators and image-worshippers; fifthly came the instruction and consolation of Christian prisoners; lastly, there was the excellent impression made upon the Muslims, including the very highest; it even happened that there were conversions, particularly in Murcia.[1] It is obvious how low in this list came communication of any sort with Muslims, and, even so, how small a hope there was of their conversion; this last was confined to areas where Christian arms were successful. A similar picture develops of serious missionary work in the East; thus in Cairo, in 1303-4, the Franciscan Angelo da Spoleto and his companions took the sultan's permission to succour Christian prisoners first, and devoted a season to spiritual and corporal works of mercy, distributing money and clothes, hearing confessions, giving absolution and Communion; even, secretly, reconciling Christians who had

---

1. M.O.F.P.H., vol. I, appendix.

apostatised from fear.[1]

Muslims themselves were thus rarely the direct objects of apostolic activity. We may recognise in this exemplary work among needy and suffering Christian groups, and also among the merchant communities, the silent witness recommended in St. Francis' Rule. The alternative suggested in the Rule, disputation, raises more complex problems. Serious claims to have disputed, in the proper sense, are rare. Ricoldo claimed to have disputed privately with Muslims in Baghdad, but his original contribution to Western knowledge is suspiciously small and he himself uses the adverb aliquantulum. His work is heavily indebted to literary Latin sources, and so many of his arguments against Islam are obviously unlikely to impress Muslims (however well suited to a Christian public) that it is difficult to believe that there was ever more than a limited interchange of ideas,

---

1. Gol., iii. (1303-4). Latin communities were organised in fondacos. These were equivalent to the factories of a later age. (The word is from funduq, a khan or public hostel.) Each trading nation, Venetian, Pisan and so on, had its own; wandering Franks, for example pilgrims, with no national fondaco of their own, would be the guests of whichever Latin Community seemed most suitable. There was no question of living independently in Muslim quarters. The "renegade" communities must have been almost entirely separated from the Latins, although, as we have seen, there might be one renegade in a family, and, if he were the bread-winner, the family might expect to remain with him. (p.434) It seems evident that segregation, together with the pre-occupation with commerce, effectively cut Latins off from Muslim society. Cf. Heyd, vol. II, p. 430.

based on a rudimentary knowledge of Arabic on Ricoldo's part, and a considerable forbearance on that of his interlocutors.[1] Lull's work is so individual that it is often impossible clearly to discern recognisably Islamic terms in the language or the thought of the Muslims whose arguments he represents in some of his disputationes. These were imaginary conversations in which the Muslim participants were never very successful; it evidently never occurred to him that in a public debate on neutral ground in real life they might have succeeded better than they did as creatures in his fictions.[2] There is something of the same unreality about Lull's accounts of his disputes in North Africa and about Ricoldo's of his in Baghdad.[3] Where, however, Ricoldo tells us the arguments he

---

1. Itin., XXI, cf. XXVIII.
2. The liber de gentili is an exception, both in putting genuinely Muslim arguments forward, and in not showing the triumph of the Christian speaker.
3. For Lull, see Vita, for his disputations in North Africa, and Hamar, the Prologue, the end of Pars Ia and opening of Pars IIa and Pars IIIa. Cf. also the Muslim participants in the other disputations listed in my bibliography. For Ricoldo, note in addition to the place cited above, his choice of arguments, passim, and his very great dependence on written Latin sources; these make it very doubtful that he was deeply involved in actual dispute. Even the more accurate among his quotations from the Qur'an are attributable to Latin sources, and his other translations are inaccurate. Much the same is true of his arguments in general. Monneret de Villard's statement, "egli lavorò sempre direttamente sul testo arabo" (of the Qur'an) antedates Miss d'Alverny's discovery of the Contrarietas. (M. de V., Ricoldo, p. 112.) Moreover, Ricoldo and his fellows (by his own statement, Itin. XXVIII) refused to eat when food was prepared for them in Muslim houses. Does this not imply, both that the Latins refused to progress far in friendship, and that dispute was never acrimonious enough to cause bad feeling, as it certainly would have, if a fraction of the Disputatio had been repeated ?

claims himself to have used, Lull puts into his opponents' mouths words which he says they used, but which sound more like that which Lull would have wished them to be, than like anything Muslims might be expected to have said.[1] There is, however, another and very different element in Lull's African incursions.

Where acts of war were out of the question there often developed a strange desire to provoke violence instead; missionaries were often not at all gentle even when they were non-violent. It was into this provocation that "disputation" seems most often to have degenerated. Lull exemplified this when he "defended" the Trinity by abusing Islam publicly; more sympathetically, Ricoldo showed no sign of zeal for the martyrs' crown. We find Lull in Bugia in Barbary, no wiser in his old age than St. Teresa in her childhood, the protagonist in a gratifying drama; "in the midst of the market-place, forgetful of the peril of death, he began to cry in a loud voice: 'the law of the Christians is holy and true, and the sect of the Moors is false and wrong . . .' "[2] After he had been three times expelled by the Muslim ruler, his courting of martyrdom

---

1. It is true that Lull defends what he knows to be an Islamic position, when he puts forward an argument as coming from a Muslim; but the reasons he puts into the Muslim's mouth fit his own highly individual philosophical position and method (e.g. in Hamar). A full examination of this aspect must await a study of Lull's philosophy in the light of modern research on scholasticism.
2. Vita, VI.

seems at last to have succeeded.[1] His behaviour is very far from isolated.[2] St. Francis, before his own journey to Egypt, had already despatched a party to Africa who successfully forced a most reluctant Muslim government to martyr them. Before they left Christian territory they announced, Deus nos vult in numero suorum martyrum computare. In Seville they tried to break into the Friday mosque, and, when they were driven away by the crowd, as "ambassadors of the King of Kings" they went and abused Muhammad and Islam outside the Royal Palace instead.[3] Arrested, they were moved from prison to prison in order to avoid publicity, but they continued in the same way, and were finally deported, at their own wish, to Morocco. There they still behaved in the same way and were twice deported, once by the local Christian community itself. When the government was finally stirred into action it put very heavy pressure upon them and

---

1. The three missions to Africa were spaced between his sixtieth and eighty-third years. There does not seem to be clear evidence of any great change in Lull's attitude during his last residence in Tunis (cf. Peers). Professor Peers, a sincere admirer of Lull, says of the unlikelihood of his ever being canonised, "The little that is known of his death makes it impossible for a Postulator to show that he was killed in odium fidei; and, since there is presumptive evidence that his vigorous methods of attack and the boldness of his character may themselves have antagonised the Mohammedans and caused the final attack on him, the burden of proof lies with the Postulator." (Ramón Lull, p.393; pp. 370-1.)
2. Likewise Muslim reaction to it; Lull's being treated as mad or irresponsible (so that he need not be punished), and the offer to him of wealth, women and honour for conversion to Islam, were often paralleled in other cases.
3. "multa turpia de Machomete et eius lege damnabili detexissent . . ."

they were in due course executed, after refusing every offer of wealth, women and honour as reward for conversion to Islam.[1] This behaviour recalls very closely the Martyrs Movement of the ninth century in Spain, but it served as exemplar to the friars for some time; St. Teresa's childhood exploit was perhaps the last flicker of the tradition. More than a century after St. Francis, Fr. Pasquale de Vittoria, in Central Asia, preached "the deceits and falsities and blindnesses" of the Prophet for twenty-five days at the doors of the mosque, at the time of the ʿĪd al-aḍḥā. In the unsettled conditions of Mongol rule, he escaped with insults and stones;[2] but again, this behaviour was a deliberate provocation to violence. A particularly interesting case was that of Fr. Livin, martyred in Cairo in 1345. Intellectually able, he had neglected theological study for prayer; his only ambition was martyrdom. At the time the rights of martyrdom were widely canvassed; the quaestio was disputed, an sit licitum Christiano secundum Deum intrare Saracenorum mesquitas ad praedicandum fidem catholicam et legem Machometicam impugnandum. Livin, "adducing the example of martyrs and saints" also pointed out that "many of our brothers entered mosques from the zeal of faith, and preached, confessing the Christian faith", and still

1. Cron. XIV Generalium.
2. Gol. iv. He finally achieved martyrdom; see Gol.ii.p.273; cf.p.543. Cf. a group of friars who did not start by seeking martyrdom, but achieved it by their intransigence before the qāḍī. Gol.ii, p. 70.

were not killed. Since his private intention was frankly to seek martyrdom, this seems disingenuous; he also argued that to tempt others to kill one was not suicide. He in any case followed his own recommendation, bursting into the Friday prayer in the presence of the sultan, and crying out in French against the mortiferam sectam: interpreters and renegades present understood what he said. This was explained to the Sultan, and the rumour ran round the mosque that the intruder had "Presumed to vilify religion and the Holy Prophet"; still the Sultan was reluctant to act and he quietened the people by saying that the friar was obviously unbalanced by too much poverty and fasting. In the course of a few days' imprisonment the would-be martyr made himself so objectionable that the Sultan was no longer able to resist the pressure put on him to secure to Livin the end he desired.[1] In all these stories the reluctance of the Muslim rulers to execute is obvious and it is difficult not to impute the ultimate violence to those who provoked it.[2] Theirs was a state of mind that could tolerate no relation between Christendom and Islam, save that of violence exerted or undergone.

Tripoli's attitude contrasts with those that we have so far considered and it is mysterious. Anxious to show Islam

---

1. Ibid.
2. Cf. Runciman's account of St. Francis' appearance before the Sultan. (Hist. Crus. vol.III, p.160) Arnold's description of the original Spanish Martyrs' Movement seems to apply only too well to these ill-advised missionaries: "a party . . . set itself openly and unprovokedly to insult the religion of the Muslims and blaspheme their Prophet, with the deliberate intention of incurring the penalty of death."(Preaching of Islam, p. 141) Cf. Menendez y Palayo, Heterodoxos Esp., p.

to be on the point of mass conversion, he was certainly making propaganda against the Crusade.[1] His motive is obscure; perhaps he was no more than original. Prophecies of the fall of Islam had long circulated and the fall of the ʿAbbāsid caliphate before Hulagu had made a great impression on the Western mind. "And when they hear that the doctrine of Christ contains a faith which is perfect and whole, the sole and only precept of God given to believers . . . They thus, by the simple word of God, without philosophical arguments or military arms, like simple sheep seek the baptism of Christ and pass into the sheepfold of God. He who said and wrote this, by the action of God, has now baptised more than a thousand."[2] However we should understand the statistical claim,[3] it is obvious that Tripoli's attitude reversed the usual one. His work was ignored by all writers who had an advanced knowledge of Islam or a close interest in missionary or Crusading operations.[4] It is as the exception that he

1. XXIII, XXIV, LIII.
2. LIII.
3. It is incredible that over a thousand adult Muslims should have been baptised, intending conversion, and knowing what they were doing (after a course of instruction). Adults for themselves and their children may have sought the protection of what they thought to be a magical ceremony; there may have been baptisms of dissident Christians under a misapprehension, and so on: these are possible but not very satisfactory explanations.
4. Mandeville alone used Tripoli, and Mandeville's purpose was unclerical and satirical.

illustrates the rule.[1]

3. Attitude to jihād.

It is evident that Christendom as a whole recognised a relationship of war which aimed primarily at the destruction of Islam and in which missionary endeavour held a subordinate place. For various reasons, moreover, it was the wish of the Church to reduce communications with Muslims to a minimum. It is with this in mind that we should consider the habitual condemnation of Islam for its inherent violence and for its refusal to allow rational disputation. Christians in this connection started from the example given and the practice taught by Muhammad in his lifetime. His government of Medina and his wars against the Quraysh and others had no accidental significance; force was a necessary part of the religion he taught. "They were ordered to rob, to make prisoner and to kill the adversaries of God and of their prophet, and to persecute and destroy them in every way", said Pedro de Alfonso. Servitude, he maintained, was the best alternative offered to

---

1. An example of the practical love of souls on the part of Christians who lived among Muslims similarly proves the general rule as an exception. One of the dubia propounded by the Friars in Morocco and resolved by Raymund of Penafort concerned Christian prisoners, men and women, who had dealings with the families of Muslims. Could they be advised secretly to baptise Muslim babies, in the hope that these would die (and be saved) before they reached the age of discretion ? It was realised that it must be assumed that if they did reach that age, they would be annoyed to learn what had been done (if they were told of it). The answer was affirmative (baptizati habentur tales). (M.O.F.P.H., vol. IV.2, loc. cit. For related problems (the treatment of churches and images) see below, p. 575

conquered Christians, and citation of the Qur'an proved that Muhammad, once again self-contradictory, had himself known this use of compulsion to be wrong.[1] The substance of his statement was often repeated. It was also often emphasised that the rapid expansion of the Muslims under the early Caliphs had been a matter of armed strength: vi armata maximas Asiae partes, cum tota Africa ac partem Hispaniae paulatim occupans, in subiectos sicut imperium, sic et errorem transfudit.[2] A slightly more sophisticated view would distinguish between converts attracted by fear of the sword, others by the offer of rewards or by the promise of Paradise; there was an inheritance of subtle distinctions from the Risālah and the Contrarietas.[3] With these more complex statements we may contrast Sigebert's brief assertion that Muhammad taught that he who killed or was killed by the enemy went to Paradise. This was part of the small body of facts that reached even the less well-informed. What was least clearly understood was the position of Christians living under Muslim rule. The word servitude does not accurately describe the tributary situation of the Mozarabs and the Oriental

1. This reflects the shift in the Qur'an's attitude to Christians. Cf. Bell, Origin of Islam.
2. Summula; cf. p. 423 above, text and note.
3. Cf. Risālah, Tol., MS. p. 112; Vincent, 23.56; Muir, p. 85 ff.; Contrarietas, Cap. II., MS. f. 239 r., ff.; Cap. IV, MS. f. 242v., ff.

Christians, although (in later authors) it can be understood rightly to define the state of some individual Latin prisoners captured in fighting, or at the sack of towns, at either end of the Mediterranean.[1]

In sūrah LXXXVIII[2] Ketton has "Tu namque doctor es, non coactor". To this the annotator remarks, "Why then dost thou teach that men are to be converted to thy religion by the sword ? If thou art not a coercer, but a teacher, why dost thou subject men by power, like animals and brute beasts, and not by reasoning, like men ? In fact, like the liar you are, you everywhere contradict yourself."[3] This early statement, while it emphasised the accusation of self-contradiction which many writers were later to bring forward, introduced another assertion which would also recur frequently, that Muhammad did not, and Islam would not, allow rational disputation.[4] This theme was taken up by Peter the Venerable at length. He admonished his imaginary Islamic audience that the Qur'an is alone in refusing to discuss religion, and contrary to the custom of the Greeks and Romans, the Persians and the Indians, who were all ever seeking after truth. Conversion of the

---

1. For Mandeville's and Acqui's more realistic estimate of the situation, see below p. 461
2. Verses 21, 22; Ketton, az. 97, Bibl. az 98, p. 185, line 1.
3. Ad loc. cit.; Bibl. p. 227
4. The Annotator also stated that he who attacked the Qur'an was immediately killed. Bibl., p. 224, col. 1; MS. CCCD. 184 p. 51, margin at foot, right.

world to Christianity had been peaceful; the conversion of the English was a case in point. For much of this section of his work, the method was to enlarge rhetorically upon isolated Qur'anic verses.

> For what is this ? 'If anyone wish to dispute with thee, say that thou hast turned thy face and the faces of thy followers to God.' O Muhammad . . . if . . . you make no other reply, except about turning your face and the faces of your followers to God, shall Inbelieve what you say to be true ? Shall I believe you to be a true prophet of God ? Shall I believe the religion which you delivered to your people to have been delivered to you by God ? I shall indeed be more than a donkey if I agree; I shall be more than cattle if I consent . . . (1)

We may take on other example briefly. "Nolite, inquit, disputare cum legem habentibus, melior est enim caedes quam lis. - And who does not see that this is hellish counsel ?" Peter asked the Muslims. If Muhammad had confidence in his own religion, why did he forbid his people to dispute ? If he was not confident, why did he write things that they could not defend ? "But he knew, or (what is said with apologies to you) Satan who spoke through him knew, that such was the strength of the Jewish and Christian religions . . ." Thus in his most humanistic style did Peter the Venerable warn Islam that only falseness seeks the shadows. While all his emphasis was upon the refusal to dispute, he did not

---

1. C.S.S., I. 5,6; Q., III. 18; Ketton, Az. V, Bibl., p.22, lines 10 ff.

neglect to exaggerate the physical actions of Islam: "words fail . . . at such bestial cruelty".[1]

Many of these elements reappeared in later writers. Godfrey of Viterbo and the Gregorian Report described the choice between conversion, death and tribute offered to the conquered, and the duty to wage war against the non-Muslims living beyond the dār-al Islām; enemies were to be killed and their women and children carried into slavery. They were the first writers to make prominent the idea that Muhammad claimed the power of arms in place of that of miracles. Oliver of Paderborn was adding nothing to Sigebert when he said that to kill or be killed earned Paradise;[2] he said, too, that Islam began by the sword, was maintained by the sword and by the sword would be ended,[3] and that it was upheld by "worldly and human fear";[4] and that Muslims refused to accept Christian preachers in their territories.[5] Vitry

---

1. C.S.S. I. 3,4,8,9,10. The quotation attributed to Muhammad may be composite; it has not proved possible to trace a verse of the Qur'an in exactly this form. Cf. Q.VIII. 60; Ketton az. XVII, Bibl. Az. XVIII, p. 61.
2. Ep. Sal.
3. Monneret de Villard (Lo Studio) drew attention to the popularity of this phrase. It may be associated with anticipation of the total collapse of Islam.
4. Hist. Dam.
5. Ep. Sal.

said that the use of force derived from Muhammad's practice; that, in his opinion, never from the infancy of the primitive church till its old age was there or would there be a greater abomination of desolation; nor would the Church of God ever be oppressed by a greater flail.[1] He quoted the matter from the Latin Syrian Apology more freely and less accurately than Viterbo had done.[2] Humbert of Romans, the apologist for the Crusade, still condemned Islam for aggression, and he found no difficulty in criticising Muhammad for forcing men to follow him by the sword, where Christ had accepted only voluntary believers.[3] The early Muslims forced Christians to become Muslim, and killed others, and Muslims have done the same ever since: "they are so zealous for their religion that wherever they hold power they mercilessly behead every

---

1. Muhammad was regularly allotted a special place in the series of persecutors of the Church. (Humbert, Op. Trip., IV. V; Ric., Disp., prol; prophecy of Joachim, in Salimbene.)
2. IV. We may summarise the information available from this source as follows: in order to prevent the success of holy missionaries, Muhammad ordered whoever wished to speak against his religion to be immediately killed. Whoever refused to accept Islam for himself must be killed or else forced to pay tribute as the price of unbelief; those who attacked Islam must be killed and their women and children taken into slavery. Both Viterbo and Vitry specified also the punishment of apostasy from Islam by death, after three days' grace for repentance. Matthew Paris followed the original closely, as Viterbo.
3. De Pred. S.C., IX; cf. II, VIII.

man who preaches against their religion."[1] (Just how true this proved in practice we have seen in dealing with the martyrdom movement.) In the long series of persecutors of the Church the Muslims were both the worst and the most persistent.[2] It is interesting to note that Tripoli, with the opposite purpose to Humbert's, equally made clear the basis of compulsion on which he took Islam to stand. It was part of his belief in its imminent collapse that it would fall, as it had arisen, by the sword.[3] Fidenzio stressed Muslim "cruelty" as a practical issue.[4] Varagine used an oddly non-committal phrase when he said that Muslims believed either spontaneously or from fear of the sword. The more usual expression of opinion was short-circuited by Verona who attributed the prohibition of argument by Islam directly to the remoteness of reason from sensualities.[5] On the whole there was a very general agreement, not only in the

---

1. Ibid., XII.
2. Op. Trip. I. IV, V.
3. XXIII, XXIV.
4. XVII.
5. XI.

substance of what was said, but in the way of saying it.[1]

Special emphases introduced into the common theme by the more individual writers must be noticed separately. The reprobatio proceeded as usual by the citation of texts from the Qur'an and the Traditions. Thus robbery, he said, was specifically permitted, on the authority of Bukhārī, by the lex super rapinis.[2] In this more detailed part of the work were quoted more accurately than elsewhere the verses that lay behind statements that we have already noted. Thus, Muhammad said that it was "given to him by God that he should kill or attack men until they witnessed that there was no other God and that Muhammad was the messenger of God, and that they should give him tribute or rates". He attributed the access of converts in the prophet's own time to genuine belief through fatua simplicitas, to family loyalty and to love of honours and riches. This diminishes the importance in the

---

1. We may note that, exceptionally, Auvergne found reason to praise the use of force, even by Muhammad himself, when it was used profitably: "ydolatriam potenter in gladio ac strenue exterminavit". (de leg., XVIII/18.R.) This particular argument was not general, although, as we have seen, everyone agreed on the use of force against Islam. An amusing example of the extent to which it was realised that Islam (like Christianity itself) could not tolerate apostasy is seen in the absurd, romantic and charming story of the death of Saladin, told with extraordinary verisimilitude by the Ménestrel de Reims (and pointed out by Gaston Paris). Saladin, dying, calls for a silver basin of water, and makes the sign of the Cross from side to side of the basin, saying, "It is as far from here to here as from here to here," He said this so that no one should realise what he was doing. Then he upset the water over his head and body and, in his teeth, he said three words in French which we did not hear, but as far as I could see, it looked as though he baptised himself.'

2. Cap. VI and VIII. Bu., LVII. VIII. 6.

rise of Islam of force, usually included among primary motives of conversion.[1] In that section of the work which is most probably Ramón Marti's there appears the pun about Muhammad, "nec fuit consolator, sed potius desolator", because he came with the sword, to force men to accept his religion.[2] In his Capistrum Judaeorum, Ramon Marti bracketed violence of arms with bestial attractions, and spoke of the Islamic substitution of military power for miracles. This last point, which several Latins mentioned, contrasts strangely with Humbert's assertion that the Crusaders similarly used arms in default of the miracles of the primitive Church.[3]

What, asked San Pedro, had Muhammad commanded, but fornications and robberies ?[4] He developed fully the point that the Qur'an inconsistently recommended both reason and war; and the hadith confirmed this.[5] He spoke of the heavenly reward that Muslims were promised for death in battle; of the promised beauty of their wounds on the Day of Resurrection.[6] He also repeated that confident hope of the

---

1. IV.
2. XV; explanatio symboli, prol.
3. See above, p.
4. S.S.M. I. i. 48.
5. S.S.M., I. iii. 3 - 5. He also said that the Qur'an asserted that Christians and Jews could be saved in their own laws, yet that only Muslims could be saved. This seems to show ignorance on his part of the doctrine of abrogation.
6. S.S.M. , I. i. 62.

collapse of Islam, in the form so general in the thirteenth century, that as it had begun and was maintained by the sword so it was bound to end by it.[1] His version of the jihād was to the effect that Muhammad had handed down the teaching that men who were not Muslim might be killed, their women dishonoured and taken prisoner with the children, their goods seized and their kingdoms occupied; this summary is unkind but (except that it omits the offer of tributary status) not really inaccurate.[2]

Even more than San Pedro, Ricoldo summed up the arguments used before him. His version of the prophesied fall of Islam was in the form that Muhammad taught that "that religion shall last only as long as the victory of its sword shall last".[3] Islam was the religion of violence, of murder: lex violenta[4] and lex occisionis et mortis;[5] the

---

1. S.S.M., I. vi. 18.
2. S.S.M., I. vii. 11
3. Itin., XXIX, XXXV; Disp. X. As with other authors, the end completed the beginning. Islam "is violent and was introduced by violence". The expression of the idea in the Disputatio is only a slight variant: the religion shall last as long as the victory of arms and the temporal power of Islam. This prophecy was one of three signs of Islamic violence, said Ricoldo, the other two being the sword bared when the khatib enters the mimbar (see below, p.[illegible]) and the (false) derivation of the name Ismaeli (=Assassin), directly from Ismael, son of Abraham. This enabled him to say that the violent Assassins were named Ismaelites (= Muslim) par excellence. (Disp. X. The passage in the manuscript is on f. 174 r. cols. 1 and 2. The parallel passage in Peter de Pennis is cap. X , MS. f. 36 r.)
4. Itin., loc. cit.
5. Disp. X.

Qur'an said that there was no compulsion in the religion of God; "yet there is no greater compulsion than to compel by killing".[1] It was one of the contradictions characteristic of the Qur'an;[2] and compulsion, together with the general approval of murder and robbery, was part of the carrying forward of Muhammad's personal practice into the future behaviour of Islam.[3] Several times Ricoldo spoke of force as substituted for miracles.[4] In spite of his own description of his disputations with learned Muslims, he several times asserted what by that time had become a Christian dogma, the refusal of Muslims to dispute.[5] He said that the wise among the Muslims did not believe, and refused to discuss the matter for that reason.[6] His analysis of the motives of Muslims who do believe resembles that of the motives of the first Muslims made in the reprobatio, but it gives greater prominence to the violent element.[7] With some show of reason he said that a failure to pay tribute is no just cause to kill; but this is not a fair way to present the

---

1. Ibid.
2. Disp., VIII.
3. Disp., V, XII.
4. Disp., I, VII, XIV; Itin., XXXV.
5. Disp. IX, XVI; Itin. XXXV.
6. Disp., IX.
7. The four classes of Muslim believers were, first, those who were forced by the sword to believe, secondly, the genuine believers, decepti a diabolo, thirdly, those who were loyal to the religion of their ancestors, and finally, those who sought a lax morality. This derives direct from Contrarietas (II, cit. supra) and was adopted direct by Peter de Pennis, X, f.36 r.ff.

Muslims' offer of war, tribute or conversion.[1] The fifth part of the spoil of war of which the Prophet disposed he represented as Muhammad's personal profit from robbery, and added that Islam did not require restitution to be made.[2] He took up again the element of contradiction in this connection which Pedro de Alfonso had first brought out; the Qur'an forbade bitter disputation with men of other religions, yet commanded the death of infidels: yet in reality God does not love forced service.[3] These were all more or less subtle restatements of Islamic doctrine, devised to point the contrast he wished to make. He recalled that the Gospel does not permit any violence at all: "if one strike thee . . ." - "him that taketh away from thee thy cloak . . ." Ricoldo added the pertinent rider: "Nor is it an objection if certain bad Christians do not observe these things."[4] It was even possible to strengthen the contrast between the religions by reversing the comment cn the practice of them; there was more fraternal love between the Muslims whose religion was the religion of killing, than between Christians, who followed the religion of love.[5] There was not in Ricoldo's case the

---

1. Disp., XII. For MS., see f.175 r. col.1.
2. Ibid. Statements of this sort caused Guido to believe that Islam permitted theft. (Error 7). See also below, p.
3. Disp.,VIII. For MS., see f.168 v. col.1; Itin., XXXV.
4. Disp. XVI, MS. f. 182 v. col.2.
5. Itin. XXIX; see also p.526 below.

inconsistency of also making propaganda for the Crusade.[1] He was alone in insisting that it was the theories of the two religions that he compared; on this subject he was fairer than most of his contemporaries, and fairer than the sources of which he made such extensive use.

To all this Lull contributed very little, in spite of his life-time of missionary pre-occupation. As others had done, he contrasted the peaceful conversion of the world by the apostles with the forceful seizure of so much of it by Islam.[2] More conscious of inconsistency than Humbert, and more aware of reality than Peter the Venerable, he went so far as to imagine a sultan sending to the Pope to complain that Christians used force when the Apostles did not do so.[3]

Most mediaevals assumed that a refusal to dispute arose from a fear of reason; it is perhaps more likely that it came, on the part of Government, from a desire to avoid trouble, and on the part of scholars, from a contempt for Christianity. None of the Latins whose knowledge of Islam was extensive made a point with which Acqui preceded the usual statement about the execution of any who publicly attacked Muhammad: whoever willed, Christians or Jews or people of any other faith, might live in the Muslim lands, so

---

1. If a passage contained in the Bart. Pic. version, but omitted in the B.N. MS. is authentic, Ricoldo objected to Muhammad's having encouraged bellicosity in his people by condemning desertion on the battlefield; but what sin, asks Ricoldo with engaging frankness, would it be for a man to run away if his life were in danger ? (Disp.VIII: Bibl. col.147; cf.MS. f. 168 v. col.2.)
2. D.P., 11, 12.
3. Blanquerna, LXXX.

long as they did not speak against the Prophet. Mandeville, too, said, "among the Saracens in divers places there dwell many Christian men under tribute";[1] but the Islamic toleratio of tributaries was not a favourite theme.[2]

4. Problems of Providence.

The seizure of power by Islam in the first place, the recapture of the Holy Land from the Latins and, in general, the successful tenure of Muslim power constituted a theological problem which would greatly exercise contemporary Christian thought. The loss of so many provinces, of so many souls, to Christendom, raised a painful question to which there was no easy answer. A partial solution was sought in the comfortable consideration that it had been prophesied. Islam was foreshadowed in the fate of Ismael; to Tripoli, for example, the promise about the posterity of Agar was obviously fulfilled in Muhammad, who was

> . . . by nation an Arab of the seed of Ismael, of whom it is said in Genesis XVI (12): "He shall be a wild man. His hand will be against all men, and all men's hands against him: and he shall pitch his tents against all his brethren." The reader may understand whether this prophecy is fulfilled in Muhammad, since it seems that no other of his sons is found thus wild and powerful to pitch his tents against all men, as this one alone about whom we are speaking. (3)

---

1. XIII.
2. It is contained, but is not explained, in Godfrey of Viterbo, Jacques de Vitry and Matthew Paris. For Ricoldo, see above.
3. II.

Another prophecy relating to the descendants of the "ferus homo" was fulfilled in the Holy Land: "Servants have ruled over us . . .", for the children of Agar are servants.[1] To William of Auvergne there was a special significance in descent from Ismael. He said of Muhammad:

> Know then first that he was of the seed of Abraham by Ismael, who was the founder of the Arab nation, as Josephus says, and it was from Ismael that the Arab nation received greatness, according to the promise of God saying to Abraham: "I will make the son also of the bondwoman a great nation." (2)

The prophecy of Methodius foretold that the Arabs, for the sins of the Christians, would leave the desert in such numbers and strength as to dominate the world until a king should arise to free the Christians and subdue the Ismaelites in their turn. This seemed to have been realised when merciful God scattered the Arabs by Charles the Great; if the prophecy were to be trusted, it could not happen again.[3]

This was cold comfort, and often there was frankly no answer to the problem of Islamic prosperity: "why these things should be permitted, only He knows to Whom no one can say, why dost Thou do so ? - and Who said that, of many who were called, few would be chosen."[4] A similar comment spoke

---

1. Humbert, Op. Trip. I. VII.
2. Alv. de leg. XVIII/18.M ff.; Genesis, XXI.13; Josephus, Antiquities, I. X.
3. For pseudo-Methodius, see Magna Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum, Tom. Tertius, p. 363 ff.
4. Summula. Cf. the same author, "nescimus quo Dei judicio..."

of God's "just, admittedly hidden, judgement".[1] Another comment attributed the original success of Islam to the heresy of Heraclius, when he "deviated from the Catholic Faith. Therefore, by the divine judgement" the Agarenes arose under Umar.[2] The failure of the Latin States was most often attributed to the sins of the Latins: tradidit nos Deus in manus barbarorum quia obliti sumus precepta Domini.[3] This explanation was generally accepted and it extended beyond historians of Crusade. Caesarius, on the authority of a fellow-monk who had been to the East in his youth, attributed to the Muslims themselves[4] the view that the Christians were punished for their sins by the success of Ṣalāh ad-Dīn. Later Lull made his Muslims boast that Islam held Jerusalem bedause, and to prove that, the Qur'an is of God.[5] It seems that the idea that the success of Muslim arms marked the divine approval of Islam was held at least as a joke, and no doubt half-seriously, by the general Western public. Salimbene describes how Dominicans and Franciscans preaching the Cross in France found people who would ostentatiously call over a beggar and give him money, saying, "Take this in the name of Muhammad, who is more powerful than Christ."[6] Humbert's

1. Vitry, IV.
2. Vincent de Beauvais, 23.39.
3. Prophetia, MS. B.N. 14503, f. 246 r. col. 2.
4. VIII. 27.
5. Lib. de Gent., IV.IV; Lib. Tart., de T. et S., 8.
6. yr. 1251, in MGH, p. 445, line 2.

work was closely related to the public feeling which it was his duty to combat, and it was thus that he became the apologist of the divine will, as he conceived it. With what is perhaps a representative weakness of the Schools, he was over-anxious to be the champion of Providence. Augustine had said that evil was permitted only when good might come of it; and Humbert was prepared to identify three goods which came from the Islamic evil, the manifestatio fidelium Christi, a sort of public confession of loyalty; the exercitio bonum, because God did not wish his people to be unemployed; and salutis facilitas, because many were willing to fight Saracens who would never consent to perform long or exacting penances.[1]

None of these arguments or statements could successfully suppress the fear that Muslim success did indeed show divine approval. There was only one answer, emotionally unsatisfying, but evangelical: if misfortunes were related to God's pleasure at all, they were a sign of His love; the Devil often triumphed, and no-one, Humbert suggested, would suppose that this was pleasing to God.[2] In this matter

---

1. De Pred. S.C., XV.
2. We may contrast with Humbert's views Fidenzio's much less theological approach to the failure of the Latins and the hopes of a new Crusade. He was much more concerned to remedy failing practically, and analysed the Christian collapse under headings: Infectio (this is the familiar theological point: peccata peccatis addunt); Variatio (that is, diversitas nationum); Effeminatio (Christiani qui habitaverunt in Terra Sancta perdiderunt cor et facti sunt vilissimi in bellando sicut mulieres); Indiscretio (in negotiis et pugnis suis . . . imprudenter se habuerunt); Divisio (inter paucos Christianos habitatores T.S. non fuit amor verus); Defectio (viz., unius capitis gubernantis); and Derelictio (Christiani transmarini non juverunt Christianos ultramarinos . . . sed potius eos /

Ricoldo's judgment was well-balanced and sensible. The Muslims could not claim that their success revealed the divine approval, because they themselves were most seriously castigated by the Tartars, who had no religion at all. In different ways, both the just and the impious are castigated by God.[1] It was necessary to hold both that the Christians were chastised as just, and that they were punished for their sins.

This problem became most acute when the sufferings of Christians and their subjection to prosperous Muslim rulers were observed directly. The most serious and sustained examination is Ricoldo's own in his Epistolae commentatoriae de perditione Acconis. Here it was chiefly the death of his own Dominican colleagues and the fate of other Religious that shocked him. The contrast with the wealth and beauty of the lands of Islam intensified his sense of oppression and provided the opportunity for a dramatic opening for his

---

Note continued from preceding page:-

dereliquerunt in maximis angustiis constitutos). It is obvious that in this very practical catalogue the success of Islam is not seen as some particularly unwelcome and evilly significant decision of Providence; the Providential attribution to the sins of Christians has pride of place, but does not constitute the chief part of an analysis that is largely scientific. (V - XII).

1. Disp., IX; MS. f. 171 r. col.1.

lament.

> It happened that when I was in Baghdad "in the midst of the captives by the river Chobar" - the Tigris - in one respect the pleasantness of the garden, in which I was, delighted me, because it was like Paradise, for wealth of trees and fertility and variety of fruits; it had sprung up irrigated by the waters of Paradise, and golden houses were built about it. In another respect, the massacre and capture of the Christian people and their overthrow after the lamentable capture of 'Akka drove me to sadness, when I saw the Muslims most joyful and flourishing, the Christians really neglected and mentally dismayed . . . I began more carefully than usual to reflect upon the judgements of God about the government of the world, and specially about Muslims and Christians . . . (1)

These letters may not less genuinely represent a sense of dereliction and the emotions of loneliness for their repetitiveness and artificiality. The problem, however, really existed and was intellectual rather than emotional. "From India to the regions of the West, peacefully and without opposition (the Muslims) at any rate possess the most choice and the most fertile kingdoms and those that are full of earthly delights." Theirs were ". . . mountains of salt, fountains of oil, manna of heaven, rivers of paradise, aromatic spices, precious stones, vines of balsam and the sweetest fruits".[2] The Muslims prospered in everything; even the Tartars, who came to destroy them, were now nearly all turned Muslim.[3] All this was permitted to Muhammad, homini scelesto et sceleratissimo;[4] his people multiplied

---

1. Prefatio. Ezechiel, I,1. cited.
2. Ep. I.
3. Ep. III.
4. Ep. I.

because he encouraged them to fornicate.[1] God had given power to the Muslims to kill Religious and to force Christians by torture to deny their faith. It was the Muslim custom not only to spare, but to reward apostates with women, wealth and honours;[2] the martyred Religious rejected this opportunity, but many seculares gave way,[3] and people generally preferred slavery to starvation.[4] Ricoldo was very conscious of the carrying away of the women and children as prisoners, and particularly of their being sold dearly, of their being first triumphantly paraded, and of the sending of a few as gifts to different kings; above all, of the use of nuns as concubines. They became the mothers, he several times insisted, of the worst Muslim tyrants.[5] Christian missions had proved useless; the projects of Dominic, of Francis, of Jordan had failed.[6] The Christians were jeered at by the Muslims who said that Jesus Christ could not help them against Muhammad; also the Jews and the Tartars jeered. "Now among the peoples they openly say, where is God, the God of the

1. Ep. III. It was quite often alleged that this was the purpose of the polygamous institutions of Islam (the extent of which was in any case exaggerated).(Cf. Guibert; St. Albans Chr.; note to illustration, yr. 622; Paris, al.scr.; Lull, D.P. 8.; Anon. Fior.
2. Ep. IV.
3. Ep. III.
4. Ibid.
5. Ep. I, III. E.g., ". . . circumducuntur per mundum et impregnantur a Sarracenis et ex eis generantur tyranni et satrape Sarraceni, qui contra Christianos in hostilitate alios Sarracenos excedunt." (Ep. III)
6. Ep. I.

Christians ?"[1] God was become the implementer of the Qur'an: factus executor alchorani.[2]

The Latins had not been able to believe that God would allow ʿAkka to fall.[3] Women wept in vain before the crucifix for sons or husbands killed or carried off into slavery.[4] As the Muslims said that Christ could not help, "the sophists" said that he could but would not; and while Ricoldo himself could not accept this, many Christians were converted to Islam.[5] If Christ went on as He had begun, complained Ricoldo, it looked as though He were really going to become a Muslim, as Islamic eschatology believed He would, at His return at the end of the world.[6] It seemed as if the age of miracles had returned, in favour of Islam, not of Christendom: "thou hast thus strengthened him by temporal power . . . and what is worse, his power . . . begins to be confirmed by miracles".[7] It was one of the "absurdities" of the Qur'an to speak of God's "praying for" Muhammad; but now it seemed as if this were really happening.[8]

---

1. Ep. I; cf. also Ep. II; and cf. the failure of the angels to protect churches and dedicated virgins, Ep. III.
2. Ep. I.
3. Ep. IV.
4. Ep. III.
5. Ep. I.
6. Ep. II.
7. Ep. III; cf. IV.
8. Ep. IV. Cf. p. 112 and p. 547

The interest in these eloquent epistles to the saints lies partly in the seriousness with which the problem was felt and partly in the absence, so unscholastic, of a neat and easy solution. The author was anxious also because he received no reply from God to his impetration; but this additional worry was answered by Gregory's Moralia: "semel loquitur Deus et secundo ad ipsum non repetit . . . Deus nobis ad omnia verba non respondit, id est, cogitationibus vel temptationibus singulorum . . ."[1] God's sufficient revelation was in Scripture, and it was there that Ricoldo was able to recognise the only answer to his original problem, with which (as we have seen) he would be content in his Disputatio: God punished some as enemies, others, that they might fear Him, as friends. Ricoldo's basic concern for Christianity in the East remained unappeased, and he had to learn to accept his anxiety.[2]

There is no other work comparable to the Epistolae of Ricoldo. Some aspects of it find an echo in other writers, and sometimes a dissimilar reaction. Thus Vitry spoke of the way Christian wives were accepted by Muslim princes, and of the toleration that was generally extended to Christians by the offspring of such marriages; even when allowance is

---

1. Ricoldo seems to have discovered this text with some sense of a special revelation made to him personally after a period of excessive religious anxiety.
2. Ep. V.

made for the less savage age in which Vitry lived, his attitude seems more realistic than Ricoldo's somewhat fanciful view of persecutors sprung from ex-nuns.[1] The obduracy of Muslims, who throughout the ages have proved almost unconvertible, was several times stressed and recognised both in theoretical exposition and in missionary practice. Such phrases as that Christ was crucified by Muslims and Jews in His members illustrated a sense of persecution which in modern eyes may seem exaggerated.[2] Fidenzio gave considerable attention to the cruelties of the Muslims against the Latins, and, writing like Ricoldo of the later military campaigns of the Mamlūks, he specified the same misfortunes, the killing and capturing, the reduction to slavery or beggary, the prostitution of women, the destruction of churches and their conversion into mosques.[3] He said that women and children were beaten to make them become Muslim.[4] Leaving aside terror which prevailed only at the sack of cities, the practical reasons given for actual apostasies from Christianity were most commonly a matter of worldly pressure of various kinds; in particular poverty was frequently mentioned.[5] Another

---

1. Vitry, VI.
2. Cf. Caesarius VIII. XXVII.
3. Cf. below, p. 578 88.
4. XVII, XXI.
5. Cf. Raymund of Peñafort, Fructus qui fit . . ., M.O.F.P.H., vol. I., Appendix; Memoria T.S., R.O.L., vol. 10; Joinville, LXXVII; Mandeville.

reason is suggested by a statement that in certain uncanonical marriages the spouses were to be separated only if this could be done "without scandal or fear of apostasy";[1] liberation from matrimonial tangles was no doubt often an element in attraction to Islam. Once they had apostatised, these converts to Islam were sometimes over-anxious to convince their new co-religionists of their good faith, even though many professed Islam with the mouth and still worshipped Christ in their hearts.[2] It even happened that the missionaries themselves apostatised, as did a Franciscan and two Dominicans, absolved by John XXII in 1334; the story behind this is unknown.[3] William Adam of Sultaniyah was also much pre-occupied, like Ricoldo, with the fate of prisoners, both women generally, and boys carried into Egypt and sold as catamites.[4] This last scandal was the product rather of Christians' trading than of warfare. Ricoldo had sought in detail to justify the ways of God which puzzled many. There was compulsion under Islamic rule, sometimes the compulsion of fear, but most often that of worldly circumstances, towards what Christians must believe to be evil. The loss of faith under compulsion, particularly when it accompanied an

---

1. M.O.F.P.H., vol. IV. 2, loc. cit.
2. Simon Simeon.
3. Gol. iv., p. 234.
4. See p. 561

involuntary loss of virtue, was a deeply felt tragedy.[1]

5. Conclusion.

It must be only too obvious that there was variation of only a few themes, and even phrases, whose repetition is a sign of how stereotyped the treatment of this subject became. This indicates in the writers, not a lack of interest, but a deep and unshaken conviction. There was little recognition that Christians were inconsistent to advocate the use of force against Islam, while condemning Islam for its theoretic approval of the use of force; and again, to cut themselves off from Muslim society, while despising the Muslims for refusing to dispute. It was a case of accepted attitudes which are never examined or questioned. In the condemnation of the Islamic attitude exaggeration had its usual place. The real interest of Christians was in their consciousness that the Providential dispensation accorded extremely ill with their own strong wish that worldly success should set a seal on religious truth. It was natural that they should resent bitterly that their failure should be attributed to their sins by anyone but the occupant of a Christian pulpit. Ricoldo, usually so derivative, here thought originally;

---

1. It is interesting to note that St. Louis' steadfast practice of religion during his captivity was said to have resulted in conversions from Islam. But, though the French courtly prisoners were often very worried, it is obvious that they were never devoid of hope, as must have been the people captured at the fall of Tripoli and of ʿAkka. (Paris, yr.1254. Cf. Guillaume de Saint Pathus, pp. 20-21. For the apprehensions of the French, see Joinville, LXII - LXXIV; cf. Guillaume, pp. 134-5.)

he spoke articulately for the unexpressed disappointment of many who were extremely reluctant to accept a situation in which Christians were powerless. Material success becomes too easily a criterion of divine justification, even for people whose religion is founded on the blood of martyrs. SEMEL LOQUITUR DEUS. The difficulty was to remember and to accept that Christianity was revealed once and for ever, and not as a religion of power. It was almost inevitable that the Christian attitude to Islam should here be inconsistent.

Chapter 19.

Lata et Spatiosa Via.

The moral and social institutions of Islam were considered by Western writers almost invariably with close attention, often with fascinated horror. Here we are concerned with the field of social intercourse and of private morals, which were viewed largely as the morals of sex.[1] It was felt that this subject was as important for the welfare of the whole Christian religion as it was inherently stimulating to the imagination of individuals. The Christian criticism and exaggeration of the licence attributed to Muslims was often excessive; there was great unanimity.

1. Marriage law and divorce.

It may be suitable first to consider the institution of marriage. It needs to be kept in mind that Latin Christians define the married relation as inherently indissoluble except by death. The word marriage could therefore hardly be used of any other sexual relation. It was universally known that in Islam, on the contrary, there was polygamy. Thus Pedro de Alfonso said that there might be four wives, who might be divorced and replaced so long as the number four was not exceeded at any one time; that remarriage with a divorced wife was allowed up to the third time, and that so were relations with any number of slaves, both such as were bought, and such as were taken in war,[2] with freedom to sell and buy again, so

1. Institutions based on religious obligations are considered in the next chapter.
2. emptitiae and captivae.

long as there was no pregnancy. This was the staple sound information available in the West until the increased knowledge of Islamic law in modern times; Pedro's presentation was unrepresentatively non-committal in tone. While many writers spoke of polygamy, many were less well-informed. In the extreme contrast, Guibert, with no source of authentic information, represented polygamy as completely unregulated. Odd pieces of authentic information would often be muddled with a shocked vagueness: there might be as many wives and concubines as a man could maintain, said Gerald of Wales, omitting to mention any limitation to the number of wives, but right to specify the obligation of the husband to provide a household. Other statements were less full than Pedro de Alfonso's, less vague than Gerald's.[1] The Patriarch's report to Innocent III, which received some publicity during the first half of the thirteenth century, in one version contained a passage which stated that seven wives were allowed, which added that by the marriage contract each must have her own household; and concluded by saying that in practice many Muslims were religious enough to be content with one.[2] Vitry, scarcely more precise about wives than Gerald, and modifying his source, said that there were "many" allowed, together with as many concubines as could be procured and kept in necessities; but that in his own day Muslims were mostly content with three or four wives. He was apparently unaware that the injunction

1. Cf. Oliver, Ep. Sal.; Marti, Exp. Sym. X; Lull, Hamar, sig.6.
2. Pseudo-Vitriacus in Bongars; omitted by Vincent 31.54 ff.

as to number was Qur'anic.[1] The same material, as it was utilised by Viterbo and the Gregorian report, was more exact. Tripoli misconceived the Qur'an, as it is traditionally interpreted in Islam, by adding together the numbers of wives that it recommends as alternatives; as he put it himself, "thou shalt have two wives and three and four and so up to nine . ." He may have been thinking of the number of Muhammad's own wives. He went on, in what purported to be the language of the Qur'an still, to refer to concubines limited only by the money needed to purchase them.[2] Fidenzio translated better: Contrahite cum hiis que placent vobis, secundo, tertio et quarto;[3] he also mentioned concubines.

San Pedro appealed to the same Qur'anic text as abominable, quoting it fully, but in a form that is really only a paraphrase. He was interested in the different interpretations which he understood to obtain among Muslims: he claimed that some said that nine wives and unnumbered concubines were meant, some that four wives were meant, and

---

1. This point is not affected by the possible ambiguity of the actual text of the Qur'an; in any case, there was no excuse for not knowing the usual Muslim interpretation. It seems likely that Vitry was trying to improve on his source; cf. Viterbo and Paris. He certainly does not depend on them verbally. Vitry: tot . . quot posset procurare et in necessariis providere; the other two: tot . . quot regere et pascere potest. This is the phrase about concubines; Vitry's remark about wives has no parallel in the others. (Op. cit. VI.)
2. XLIX. (Q. IV.3.) The mistake is to say buy for possess: quod poterit emere dextera manus tua. Cf. San Pedro, "by buying, or any other way". (loc. cit. inf.)
3. XVI.

others that no limit was intended; this last, he said, agreed with al-Kindi, but everyone was agreed that there was unrestricted permission for concubines.[1] This reads like an authoritative collection of Western beliefs about Muslims, rather than of opinions of Muslim jurisconsults. San Pedro included in his account the instruction, often omitted in these "quotations" from the Qur'an, that wives must be treated equally.[2] The Qur'an was most accurately represented by the reprobatio: marriage is contracted with the women that please you, and they may be twofold and threefold and fourfold; if you fear that you cannot provide for all equally, marry one, and take (some) of the women that your right hand possesses. The author explained that this was interpreted to mean as many concubines as a man can afford to buy and keep.[3] He commented that such a rule meant four wives and ten concubines, or a hundred, or a thousand, or more.[4] This was a lawyer's criticism; he meant that a moral theologian might understand the text to bear that meaning, not that that was what happened in practice. Varagine and Marino followed Pedro de Alfonso.[5] Peter de Pennis, in an

1. S.S.M., I.iv.16. For the Risālah ("al-Kindi") see Muir p.167; Tol., Vincent 23.63. San Pedro did less than justice here to a work which quotes the Qur'an in paraphrase but not inaccurately.
2. There is no indication how San Pedro understood this.
3. Without its traditional interpretation, the verse would not be very clear; Sale has "marry one only, or the slaves which ye shall have acquired".
4. VIII.
5. Leg. Aur.; Marino, III.IV.

account derived partly from Ricoldo and partly from Pedro de Alfonso, rendered his facts less exactly than either of his sources.[1] Paris' second account, Higden, Guido Terrena and Benvenuto were in varying degrees vague, somewhat in the tradition of Gerald of Wales.[2] There were a few new ideas but it cannot be said that there was growth in accuracy. Acqui thought that Muslims took Muslim wives, but non-Muslim concubines.[3] Mandeville somewhat reduced the confusion which he might easily have made worse, in copying from Tripoli; he understood that where the Qur'an allowed four wives, Muslims in practice now took nine, as well as whatever lovers they fancied.[4] Ludolf said "seven or more" wives. The most original statement was Verona's; he mentioned no limitation of number, and thought that polygamy was allowed in order to avert the possibility of adultery. It was a duty to take a wife, for any man who found that he coveted his neighbour's; he ought to choose one that was plump, fair, dark, small or large, so that she approximated to the wife that he coveted.[5] What was common to all these statements, most of them compounded of inaccuracy and vagueness, was a peculiar

---

1. VII, MS. f. 29r-v.
2. Guido, 5.
3. This is not true, but there may have been more Christian concubines than wives in the experience of his informants.
4. While simpilying the situation of concubines, Mandeville of course brought into Tripoli's material the total mistake of talking about nine wives.
5. Verona applied this doctrine particularly to journeys, so that what he says recalls mut'ah, the temporary marriage practised on journeys in Shi'ah Islam, except that there is no mention of a price paid. See below, p.488

sensitivity to the central fact that in Islam polygamy existed. To a slight extent this affected the Christian community. The greater freedom of the Islamic law was probably the cause of some apostasies among laymen, and perhaps among Religious. The offer of women, as well as of riches and honours, may have been the cause of temporary apostasies whose histories are unknown, as well as of more permanent conversions.[1] Yet it is likely that for the most part the strong interest of Christians was academic and theoretic. It is also obvious that some writers were anxious to be exact about the Islamic rules and that others were largely indifferent to detail.

There was one aspect of the Islamic law of marriage which gave possibly disproportionate scandal and was in consequence widely known and exaggerated. This was the law of divorce, and particularly the law which makes a fourth remarriage between the same spouses illegal, unless the wife shall meanwhile have completed and dissolved a marriage with a third party; it was in this sense that triple divorce is described as "definite". A practice, known as tahlīl, a sort of bogus third-party marriage,[2] existed, in order to nullify the effect of the definite divorce, and was disapproved of in Islamic jurisprudence. This tahlīl became almost an

---

1. ~~For lay apostasies, and for an unexplained instance of~~ clerical apostasy, see above, p.471-2. For the offer of women to Religious, see Ricoldo, Epistolae; Cron. XXIV Gen., for the Moroccan martyrs; fr. Pasquale; Lull's descriptions of his disputes, in the Vita and in Hamar. All these are cited in the course of ~~that same~~ chapter.9.

2. Bogus in the sense that it was not made in good faith; not in the sense that it was not consummated.

obsession with the Christian West.[1] One reason why this in particular, and divorce in general, gave rise to such shocked interest is the inability of a Christian author to think of a divorced wife as having ceased to be a wife. She was a legalised adulteress, ~~a good deal worse,~~ a good deal worse than an ordinary one with no authorisation; indeed, she was compelled to adultery by the law, as Christians saw it. It may be objected that there is no sound reason for Christians to disapprove more of divorce than of polygamy, which it represents in a consecutive, rather than a concurrent form. It may be that it seemed worse to Latin Christians because the marriage allowed by Islam is polygynous, whereas divorce creates polyandry, admittedly in a consecutive form. The special horror at, and fascination by, taḥlīl strengthens this interpretation, since it can only be its polyandrous character that aroused such strong feeling.

As usual, Pedro de Alfonso showed little sign of confusion, and spoke as one accustomed to the idea of marriage and remarriage, as of course he was. Presumably because he had been brought up under Muslim domination, he was so little shocked by taḥlīl that he felt no need to mention it. Alan of Lille introduced the subject unexpectedly casually: some

1. The Christian objection was pitched very strongly by the Risālah, which thus set the example. (Tol., Vincent, 23.59 and 63; Muir, p. 91n. and 107.

Muslims, he remarked, say that a woman who has been left by her husband cannot return to him, donec alter cum ea convenit.[1] The earliest clear statement is in Gregory of Viterbo's version of the Syrian Latin Apology:

> If after dismissing his wife a man afterwards regretted it, and wished her to be restored to him, by no means would he be allowed to take her as his wife, nisi prius alii viri copulata fuerit et ipsa redeundi causa consenserit.

The author evidently thought in terms of the causes for which a divorce could be granted: for example, because a wife displeased her husband, or there happened to be a disagreement or a quarrel or hatred between them. This information was put forward in order to show the slightness of cause permitted; but in fact divorce in Islam is in no way dependent on a cause of this sort, whether slight or weighty, and San Pedro more justly remarked on repudiation absque ulla causa.[2] Viterbo's source also took it that there existed a specific law that permitted a man to take another man's repudiated wife, which the author believed to have been promulgated because of the Zayd-Zaynab episode. Such an opinion pre-supposes an existing monogamous state of law which permitted divorce only without re-marriage of either party: otherwise the new decree would have been (as actually was the case) wholly unnecessary.[3] Guido Terrena put the Christian position unequivocally: Islamic law made a

---

1. IV.viii
2. S.S.M. I.iv.21; cf. quad. rep. VIII.; i.e. no legal cause: in Islam divorce without a reason is reprehensible but valid.
3. Even to conceive of divorce without re-marriage was to use Christian spectacles.

repudiated wife, the wife of the man who next took her; but in reality the first husband remained her husband while he lived.[1] Viterbo's information appeared in much the same form in Paris' Gregorian Report, and just identifiably in Vitry, who thought the taḥlīl was meant to cleanse the fault for which he assumed the original divorce to have taken place. A great variety of misconception derived from the single inability to imagine dissoluble marriage.[2]

Mark made a very similar statement, and included what he thought to be the form used in definite divorce, such as would necessitate tahlil before the resumption of marriage: latus tuum sit mihi prohibitum sicut latus matris meae.[3] This actually is the ẓihār, a form of divorce forbidden by the Qur'an and disused in Islamic practice. Tripoli summarised the law of divorce neatly, ". . . and if thy wife be displeasing in thine eyes, hand her a bill of divorce and let her go . . "[4] These actual words which, with their Scriptural flavour, are wrongly attributed to the Qur'an,[5] show once more that Christian reaction

---

1. 22.
2. In the same material there were still other mistakes; e.g., the statement that either spouse might divorce the other with equal ease; for other possible references to khul', see p. 488 The version in Paris included additions of a critical character, below, p. 516
3. Pref. Q. The most likely reason for quoting this form of words may be that it seemed inherently unpleasant. See Q. LVIII 1.ff.; cf. Schacht, Origins, and E.I., under "talāk" VI.
4. XLIX
5. The phrase abire permittas may possibly reflect the Qur'an's "dismiss them"; otherwise this is a deliberate use of Scriptural language, for no very obvious reason.

which drew attention to the slightness or absence of causes for divorce. The lex super repudio was described by the reprobatio and the explanatio symboli as requiring that before the fourth marriage uxor cognoscatur ab alio viro.[1] The choice of verb seems tendentious, especially if it be contrasted with that of Fidenzio, not normally indulgent to Islam, who said, donec cum alio viro nubat et contrahat.[2] San Pedro was also more careful: usque dum maura coeat cum alio, vel nubat, he said; and again, postquam vero nupserit et coiverit cum alio.[3] Ricoldo, however, also used the pejorative cognosco, rather than any word relating more strictly to marriage.[4] His account is interesting; part, which derives direct from the Contrarietas,[5] relates to details of jurisprudence, and another part echoes the gross folk humour which is universal, but which, in the case of Arabs, Western readers associate with the Thousand and One Nights. After speaking of the man's right to divorce his wife as often as he liked, and of the need for tahlīl after triple divorce, he continued, referring to the second husband:

> Quod si calcaret eam menstruosam, oportet quod cognoscat eam sine menstruis. Quod si etiam cognovit veretro non bene erecto, oportet ulterius quod cognoscat eam bene rigato membro.

---

1. Quad. rep. VIII; Exp. sym. X.
2. XVI
3. S.S.M. I.viii.73
4. Itin. XXXIV, Disp. VIII (MS. f. 168v col.2)
5. Like so much that is malicious; cap. VII, MS. f. 247r ff.

Here the first sentence may be a misconception of the Qur'anic injunction, "when ye divorce women, put them away at their appointed term"[1], which is usually interpreted to mean, during their periods of purity. There seems no point in quoting these details[2], except to assert the squalor of Islamic law; yet, if so, this was to use the casuistry essential to any system of jurisprudence, in order to discredit the system itself, a dangerous process that would reflect upon all moral theology. We may compare Mandeville, who chose to cite a more creditable point of jurisprudence: it is "lawful til her husband to put her away from him and take another in her stead; but him behoves give her a portion of his goods."[3] Ricoldo's choice of subject here is therefore a criticism of his method, and the more so, that he took the passage from another author.[4] He continued:

---

1. Q. lxv.1
2. The Qur'an forbids absolutely all sexual relations with women during their menstruation. The only evasion of this known to Islam has occurred in the Mālikī system; see below, p.493n. This system did not apply in any area known to Ricoldo, although it did in Spain, where the Contrarietas, Ricoldo's source, was written. Thus Ricoldo accepted, and put forward again, an assertion about a matter of which he could not even have personal second-hand acquaintance.
3. This statement is thoroughly inaccurate in detail, but does apparently reflect, although inaccurately, the return of the mahr, or dowry.
4. There is no doubt that Ricoldo took over passages, especially as here from the Contrarietas, without much exercise of discretion; but in this case he showed a greater sense of proportion than his source. The latter classed the present subject among <u>immunditiae</u> and <u>vilia</u>; Ricoldo, among the <u>irrationabilia</u>.

> Men who want to bring about a reconciliation of this sort

- this refers to the taḥlīl -

> pay a fee to a blind man, or some other low person, in order that he should know the woman carnally, and afterwards testify publicly, and say that he wants to divorce her. If he does so, the first husband can recomcile her to himself. Sometimes however it happens that (the new spouses) suit each other, and say that they do not want to be separated; and then the first husband, with both his wife and his fee lost, is disappointed of his hopes. (1)

It is clear that Ricoldo realised the second husband to have contracted some form of marriage, although he carefully avoided actually referring to the taḥlīl as a marriage. That word was always so far as possible preserved for the institution that both natural law and Church prescribed.

The repulsion induced by this theme sometimes led to further exaggeration of the facts. Lull, who should have known better, expressed this clearly: " . . si dimittit eam tertia vice, non possit eam recuperare nisi cum altero Saraceno habente rem cum ea, ipso sciente et existente in porta camerae, et forte illa mulier non vult luxuriari, sed coacta luxuriatur, et sic vir est contra praeceptum" (viz., non moechaberis). (2) After this, the accounts in the Legenda Aurea, in Higden and Marino, which derive from Pedro de Alfonso, give an absurdly sober impression, and Ludolf's remark that Muslims divorce the

---

1. Disp. VIII; MS. f. 168v col. 2.
2. Hamar, sig. 6. Cf. Joinville, where a vague form of the same idea occurs (LXXI). It is not clear whether the idea that the first husband must witness the taḥlīl is to be attributed to Joinville himself, or to the King's experts. A new confusion is introduced by the association of the idea of dishonour with divorce.

wives they do not want, "like the pagans", seems almost culpably casual.[1] The Anonimo Fiorentino, echoing or developing Vitry's thought, imagined that divorce took place for adultery, and that the second marriage, or sexual relation, happened in order to "purge" the original adultery. Verona, so often original in his information, mentioned a separation of spouses which was de consensu utriusque,[2] and had to be made good before the qadi. The impossibility that Christians experience in conceiving a second marriage in the life of the spouses is again illustrated by what Verona said of tahlīl: "Thus, if (the wife) observes chastity, (her first husband) cannot take her again, but if she acts the prostitute, then he can do so."[3]

Rarely, there seems to have been some knowledge of mutᶜah, the contract of temporary marriage.[4] Fidenzio said that the Prophet permitted fornication when the Qur'an said, Non inhibemur vobis affectus adimplere cum muliere, soluta sibi mercede.[5] A passage from Ricoldo is more elaborate:

---

1. VIII
2. This seems to refer to mubāraʾah, a form of divorce by mutual consent effected before the qadi. If so, Verona was mistaken in thinking that the tahlil had any connection. He seems to have been alone in knowing of any form of Islamic divorce, other than repudium. (It is less likely that this refers to khulᶜ.)
3. XI.
4. Apart from the examples here quoted, there are other possible references; Verona's has already been mentioned, p.480, and there is an obscure remark of Viterbo's and Paris', that Muslims give a dowry "non secundum legem, sed secundum morem"; this is so obscure that it might as well apply to nikāḥ as to mutᶜah.
5. XVI. This may paraphrase Q. IV. 28.

> . . it is written (in the Qur'an) that fornication is forbidden . . but a certain buying and selling is allowed, and it is also not forbidden that a man should do as he pleases with his won property. Look at the more perfect of the Muslims. They go to a brothel and they say to a prostitute: I feel desire but it is not allowed to fornicate. Sell thyself to me. She sells herself and, after he has paid the price, he says to her, thou art my property. When she agrees that this is so, he ends: I am allowed to do what I like with my own property, according to our religion. Then he lies with her untroubled. Muhammad in the Qur'an seems to want to say the same thing, when he pronounces openly and shamefully the phrase, Fatigate mulieres et non erit aliquod peccatum, dummodo dederitis precium quod promistis. (1)

It is obvious that this account was based upon hearsay, perhaps on the conversation of some oriental Christian.[2] There seems to be a confusion, not only of the Qur'anic text, which does not exist in the form quoted, but also of mut ah and slave concubinage.

Tripoli cited the Qur'an: "it is permitted to you to use, not to say to abuse, what your hand has bought, as it is allowed to use an ass or a hack".[3] There are other examples

---

1. Itin. XXXII. "It is also not forbidden that . .": licitum et non prohibitum et quod . . I assume that there has been a copying error, and that the second et should be etiam, or be omitted altogether. "His own property": de sua re. The false Qur'anic quotation seems to hint at surah IV. 28 and at the same time at surah II. 223. Ricoldo gives this citation in much the same form in his Epistolae. It is one of those examples that make it difficult that to believe that Ricoldo really did have first-hand knowledge of the Qur'an to any considerable extent. Latin sources of varying authenticity seem more likely.
2. It is possible that Ricoldo was in direct touch with Shī'ah either in Sāmarrāʾ or in Kaẓimiyah, and learned from them about mut ah, misunderstanding the detail of what he was told; but in view of his account of his refusing hospitality, a Christian source seems more likely. (Itin. XXVIII.)
3. XLIX.

of quotation of an imaginary Qur'anic text that permits a man to do as he likes with his own.[1] This probably derives from the position of the slave, mamlūk, in his function as chattel, as that is defined by Islamic law. It is to this that Ricoldo's remarks seem to relate, although the fictional episode that he describes sounds more like mut ah. Concubinage was in any case not at all well understood, and Latins did not always remember that it was an institution regulated by law, rather than a synonym for promiscuity. The limitation on the sale of the umm al-walad, for example, was mentioned only by Pedro de Alfonso and those who copied him.[2] We have seen that as many concubines were thought to be permitted, either as a man could afford to maintain, or, more crudely, as he could afford to buy;[3] perhaps the distinction can be over-stressed. They were, of course, acquired in another way, and Christians naturally were very sensitive to the fate of their women taken in war, especially during periods of general military disaster. There is no doubt that Ricoldo was confused on this subject, because, while noting that men had sexual rights both over their wives and over prisoners of war (concubitum tam cum uxoribus quam cum illis quas in bello ceperunt), he also complained because the Qur'an forbade only that women should

---

1. An example from Oliver, as well as that from Ricoldo, was quoted above.
2. Viterbo, Paris and Vitry (VI) asserted, mistakenly, that wives must be chosen from among free women. Cf. Acqui, above, p. 480
3. The Patriarchal report to Innocent has the less precise "habere".

be forced, and not that they should freely consent.[1] There was nowhere a clear perception of this alien institution.[2]

2. "Quicunque actus venerens."

It is probably clear already that everything that could be was brought to bear to disgrace Islam further: the choice of facts to report, the exaggeration of the least creditable of them and the discovery of uncharitable, of squalid and often unwarranted interpretations. This will be seen again in the Christian treatment of the Islamic attitude to sexuality in general and to sodomy in particular. Comment was exceptionally definite and widespread, although information about the fault condemned varied greatly. A mediaeval reader of all the material available could never have known what the attitude of Islam really was, or what the text of the Qur'an actually said. Islam was stated to encourage, to tolerate and to forbid homosexual sodomy, and also to commend or allow certain kinds of forbidden intercourse between men and women.

---

1. Disp. V, MS. f. 165r col.2; Q. XXIV.33. Sale has "compel not your maid-servants to prostitute themselves, if they be willing to live chastely", and this may be taken to be the traditional sense of the verse. Ricoldo has "perhibetur quod non compellant eas perdere castitatem"; he seems to understand this in a more general sense than the traditional interpretation which Sale gives it. He knew what happened to female prisoners, and is not likely to have been so cynical as to suppose that they were always fully consenting.

2. This account omits some questions related to concubinage. For the idea that incest might result, and the idea that there would be polyandry in the joint ownership of a single slave, see p. [illegible] San Pedro protested vigorously against the latter possibility (S.S.M. I.iv.24) although it is in fact forbidden. It was noticed (e.g, Vitry, VI) that the children of concubines were not illegitimate, perhaps because it reflected on Islamic marriage. This is related to the umm al-walad theme.

In the latter case reference was usually made to surah II.223, and it was interpreted in the sense desired by Christian critics, not that usual in Islam law.[1] One of the earliest assertions of this sort, apart from a vague remark of Guibert's, was made by Peter of Poitiers in his capitula and in his covering letter to Peter the Venerable. "Do not let the chapter that is there, de uxoribus turpiter abutendis,[2] scandalise you in any way, for it truly appears like this in the Qur'an, and, as I heard for certain in Spain, both from Peter of Toledo, whose colleague I was in translating, and from Robert, now archdeacon of Pamplona, all the Muslims do this freely, as if by Muhammad's command." It is true that this was probably permitted by Māliki law, which obtained in Spain. There was no possibility of knowing whether, or how far, such a practice actually obtained among Muslims. It is not difficult to

---

1. "Your wives are your tillage; go in therefore unto your tillage in what manner soever ye will." This according to Sale, who quotes his authorities, refers to postures; for a Māliki view, see below. Ketton translated, Mulieres vobis subiectas penitus pro modo vestro, ubicunque volueritis, parate; and Mark of Toledo had, Uxores enim vestre sunt vobis tanquam vinea, excolite ergo eas qualitercunque libuerit. (Ketton, III, Bibl. p.17, l.25 ff.; Mark, MS. f.13r, cap. II.) Sale's authorities say that "preposterous venery" is forbidden by the preceding verse, by the words, "as God has commanded you"; it is interesting therefore to note that Bibliander's marginal comment asterisked the words following "parate", that is, Deum timentes, to this effect: Violentius hic locus a nostris tortus est quasi nefaria permittat, quum adijciat, Deum timentes etc. This verse was very widely quoted and appears in many forms of which some are quoted in the course of this chapter.
2. The chapter heading reads: Quod insuper rem Sodomiticum atque turpissimam docuerit, praecipiens in Alchorano suo, ut velut ex persona Dei, sic loquens: O viri, mulieres vobis subjectas . . etc.

imagine the retailing of this malicious gossip, inspired by venomous feelings for Islam, among Christians who were perhaps Mozarabs in background, and were certainly living on the verge of dar al-Islam; and it is not an attractive picture. An uncharitable and unverifiable inference, from one item in a complex system of casuistry, as to the actual practice of thousands of men and women, was poured with an air of assurance into the ears of the over-literate, uncritical stranger from Cluny.[1] Even in the process of translation something similar

1. It may be suggested that this sort of malice is likely to be felt by "second-class citizens" towards their masters, especially when they may feel religious justification for it; and it would only be natural that they should wish to impress the leaders among the advancing victors from Latin Christendom with their own hatred of, or contempt for, Islam. This seems to me the most likely explanation for the malice undoubtedly present.

The actual facts upon which the allegation was based are not easy to determine. Such a thing as is alleged is certainly forbidden throughout most of Islam; see the note on the previous page. It apparently was permitted, however, by the Māliki madhhab, which obtains in the West, and obtained in Spain. Al-Bayḍāwī, on the verse with which Latins associated it (II. 223) states that the Mālikis permitted the act, as Spanish Christians asserted; it appears that this constituted the classic reproach, among other Muslims, against the Māliki madhhab. The permission does not appear in modern Māliki manuals or modern editions of Māliki law-books; I have not been able to trace a statement of it by a Māliki author. Cf. Perron (Précis de Jurisprudence . . selon le rite Malékite par Khalîl-ibn-Ishâk, etc.) e.g. I.83: "Il est défendu . . d'approcher maritalement de la femme en menstrues, de se permettre de la toucher (même pardessus les vêtements) a partir de la ceinture jusqu'aux genoux (mais il est permis de toucher a partir d'en haut de la ceinture vers la tête . . " (The Qur'anic reference is II.222.) No one asserts that the Mālikis encouraged this practice; and certainly no Christian had means of knowing from a reliable source what actual practice was.

By Latins this same alleged licence was also associated with the supposed Qur'anic authorisation to deal with property without restraint. Oliver said, "the religion of death teaches that no one can sin with his own property (in sua re). This doctrine of perdition teaches the sin against nature and cruelty towards slaves and servant-girls". Cf. p. 490 above.

occurred; Ketton was liable to heighten or exaggerate a harmless text, in order to give it a nasty, or at least a licentious, ring. There is some unnecessary use of words that may be thought improper. In a verse that describes the attractions of this world, Ketton has mulierum coitus et filiorum amplexus, where Sale renders, "the love and eager desire of wives and children" and Mark of Toledo has suadetur hominibus qui appetunt mulieres et proles . .[1] On one such occasion Sale was moved to protest; for his "when they saw him, they praised him greatly", Ketton has quo viso, omnes menstruatae sunt. "The old Latin translators have strangely mistaken the sense of the original word . . and then rebuke Mohammed for the indecency, crying out demurely in the margin, O foedum et obscoenum prophetam! . . " Although the comment in the margin is actually Bibliander's, the rebuke is deserved, because it well delineates the weakest side of the Cluniac and Latin Christian attitude. Sale points out that, by itself, it would be possible to give the word (akbara) the meaning alleged; it is the absurdity of choosing it in the context that shocks us. Mark has obstupuerunt, which is closer to Rodwell ("amazed") than to Sale.[2]

Vitry has a complex passage, which he must owe to a Spanish source.[3] He combines two references to the Qur'an, a

1. Q. III. 12; Ket. Az. V, Bibl. p. 21 line 46; Mark, cap. III; MS. f. 19v.
2. Q. XII. 31; Ket. Az. XXI, Bibl. XXII, p. 77 line 43; Mark, cap. XIV, f. 94v.
3. Based on Mālikī jurisprudence; not in Viterbo or Paris.

very exaggerated statement of Islamic practices, an often quoted passage from Scripture and an appropriate, horrified reaction.

> . . ipse aliis concessit modum turpitudinis, quo in propriis uxoribus abutebatur. Ait enim in libro suo quem vocat Alchoranum: si uxores vel ancillas habetis, ipsas pro modo vestro ad voluntatem vestram parate: pro quo execrabili verbo statim vivus deberet concremari. Per hoc enim latenter vitium Sodomiticum hortis naturae in populo suo introduxit; unde ipsi ex maxima parte non solum in utroque sexu, sed etiam in brutis turpitudinem abusive operantes facti sunt, sicut equus et mulus quibus non est intellectus. Asserunt enim ad perniciosam sui excusationem, quod re propria ad omnem voluntatem et voluptatem suam quilibet licite possit uti. (1)

This whole theme was extremely popular.[2]

Yet the Contrarietas found no following in one complete fabrication of which its author was guilty. Into verse 220 of surah II he interpolated nec etiam cognoscatis masculos participantes, donec credant.[3] It may be that this was not followed because it was well known to be false; but the practice of any form of unnatural vice received a good deal of attention. Some references associated, or did not distinguish between, heterosexual abuse and homosexuality.[4]

---

1. V.
2. Cf. Paris, all scr.; Op. Trip. I.vi, with a possible reference in de Pred. S.C. XII; Anon. Fior., and other cases cited in text. It should however be noted that Fidenzio quoted II.223 (in the form, uxores enim vestrae sunt vobis tanquam vinea, etc., i.e., in Mark's translation) simply as evidence of libidinousness in general, and not of "preposterous venery" in particular. (XVI).
3. Cap. X, MS. fl. 255v.
4. Fidenzio wrote ambiguously, "they do such things and so many as it is shameful to speak of; this much however I will say, that they perform such carnal crimes, such as the people of Sodom and Gomorra did once, that they are worthy of death." (XVI).

In the reprobatio the Qur'an was cited with characteristic accuracy,[1] but in part with doubtful application to the subject. The punishment prescribed for women in surah IV.19 for "whoredom" (al-fāḥishah) was here attributed to facinus inter se. This is not the usual interpretation.[2] The author commented that the number of witnesses required made conviction of the crime virtually impossible. Of the succeeding verse, where he was in fact on slightly surer ground, because it is really taken by some commentators to refer to male homosexuality, the author remarked that the slightness of the punishment imposed indicated that the crime was judged to be equally slight.[3] It was a principal criticism of Islam that, by not strictly forbidding, it encouraged vice in practice.[4] In the reprobatio, however, the author gave pride of place to his attack on the lex cognoscendi mulieres, and it was to this that he devoted the most detailed of his arguments. He understood the case to be as will now be familiar to the reader as the usual Christian interpretation:

---

1. VIII. The text has: Contra mulieres nostras quae committunt facinus inter se, inducatis quatuor testes ex vobis. Qui si testificati fuerint secundum hoc, retinete eas in domibus, quousque moriantur, aut donec Deus ponat eis aliquam viam, hoc est, det eis aliquod consilium.
2. The author apparently claimed the authority of the glossarius, but this is not the usual interpretation of the verse. Sale defines al-fāḥishah in the context as "adultery or fornication".
3. Ibid. Quod si reperti fuerint aliqui vestrum commiscentes inter se illud facinus, coarguite eos, et reprehendite. Super ista auctoritate dicit glossarius . .
4. Cf. below, pp.

> Dixit in Alcorano in tractatu vaccae, mulieres vestrae sunt aratio vestra, ergo intrate arationem vestram quocunque modo volueritis. Ubi dicit glossarius Sarracenorum, expositor Alcorani, super istud verbum: "Quocunque modo, id est, ante et retro". Hanc autem detestabilem turpitudinam . . (1)

Other accusations of sexual abnormality were rather better founded and equally well documented: the lex super conductione mulierum and the lex de effusione seminis extra vas debitum.[2] Here the reference was to Bukhārī and to Muslim; the author seems to have been aware that his glossarius, because he was anonymous, was relatively obscure. It is apparent that the attitudes of the ill-informed and more confused Latins were shared by the more learned and clearer-minded.

This is alos exemplified in San Pedro. He related how a man asked the Prophet utrum liceret eis cum uxoribus coire quomodocunque placuerit, relicta concipiendi seu pariendi natura? According to this story, it was to this enquiry that the Qur'anic reply was given, uxores vestrae terrae culturae adictae sunt, ideoque culturam vestram peragite quomodocunque vobis placuerit.[3] This has all the appearance of a genuine tradition, but it is

---

1. Loc. cit. It is clear that the words may well bear the meaning cited from Sale above, and relating only to postures; moreover this is the meaning established by the tradition in Bukhārī 65.39.2 and Bukhārī was a favourite authority of his when it suited him.
2. The text is: Dicitur in libro Muzlim, Machometum licenter concessisse suis, quod possint conducere mulieres, ad cognoscandas eas, usque ad certum terminum, et tunc ipsa dimittere pro voluntate sua. The other: Concessit suis quod possent cum mulieribus versari sic, ut effunderent semen extra vas debitum. De hoc . . in libro Muzlim et Boari. Cf. Bukhārī 57.96 and E.I., under umm al-walad: even here there is exaggeration of a restricted permission. See also Bu.82.4,97.18; Muslim 77.15-28. But Muslim 17.31 shows disapproval of ʿazl.
3. S.S.M. I.iv.18.

difficult to see how there could have been one so contrary to the usual Islamic teaching and to the obvious sense of the Qur'an, even in a Maliki area. If it is a fabrication, there is no indication who did it, except that it is not at all likely that it was not repeated in good faith by San Pedro. He also described how Muhammad instructed a man during his wife's menstruation: comprime femoralia eius super naturam, et quod reliquum est, scias te uti posse.[1] He believed this to have been Muhammad's own practice. In spite of the verisimilitude, it is impossible that there should be a sound tradition to this effect. San Pedro paraphrased fairly the verse that was thought to forbid male homosexuality, and his comment was moderate and traditional.[2] Quoniam Deus est poenitentiae acceptor, et misericors:[3] if God forgave so easily, he tolerated the crime.

Some writers did realise that in fact the Qur'an condemns sodomy, without regarding the condemnation as so gentle

---

1. See above, p. 360
2. The text is: Sexta licentia aliis omnibus vilior . . quia ubi egit de peccato Sodomitico dixit, "si vir cum alio inventus fuerit in sodomiae peccato, reprehendent eos de crimine, et si poeniterint et ab eo deinceps abstinuerint, nihil poenae iniungant eis, quoniam Deus est poenitentiae acceptor, et misericors." This, repeated alsewhere by the author in only slightly different words, is nothing like an accurate citation of the words of the Qur'an, but exactly renders the traditional sense. What apparently neither San Pedro nor the author of the reprobatio realised is that this verse is generally held to have been abrogated; sodomy ranks as zinā', and is therefore liable to be punished by stoning. Spanish authors should at least have known what was the actual legal position in Islam, and there is not much excuse for their not having done so; their knowledge was apparently often textual and literary solely. The objection that too severe a punishment is never put into effect was more reasonable and more relevant to the facts of the case.
3. San Pedro also spoke of licence . . ut quotiescumque voluerint extra feminae vas possint semen effundere. The quotiescumque is an exaggeration only too typical of Christian thought in such a matter. For all these points, see S.S.M., I.iv.22,25; cf. I.viii.52.

as to amount to permission. In one case it even happened that the strength of the prohibition was exaggerated. In Ricoldo's Disputatio the Qur'anic treatment of unnatural vice figures among the contradictions of the Qur'an: concedit sodomiam tam in masculo quam in femina, he said, quoting the Qur'an most obscurely;[1] yet in the same surah the sodomy of the contemporaries of Loth was condemned.[2] It was not just that Ricoldo realised that this condemnation existed in the Qur'an; he also knew that Muslims denied that the crime was permitted by those verses that he (like so many others, always willing to tell the Muslims what they believed) maintained gave it licence. Muhammad, he said, "seems to have accepted sodomy committed both with a man and a woman, in the chapter of the Cow; although they (the Muslims) cover it up with certain honourable explanations".[3] He would have been on safer ground to blame

1. For Ricoldo's confused Qur'anic citation, "Fatigate . ." see p.489 above. In the Epistolae (III) he quoted this supposed verse with reference to the angels who destroyed Sodom. In the present passage from the Disputatio he quoted unmistakably the locus classicus for alleged heterosexual sodomy, verse 223 of surah II: mulieres sunt aratrum vestram; arate eas ut vultis. Yet Fatigate, etc. is likely to be a remote version of the same verse. Here he also referred to verse 220 in these terms: dicit enim saracenis quod non polluant se cum infidelibus nisi credant. Probably the Contrarietas interpolation into this verse had him puzzled; he can only have supposed that it had anything to do with sodomy because he accepted the interpolation; but he hurried on to what must have seemed the surer ground of verse 223, and he did not quote the words of the interpolation; so he may have had his doubts about it. (Disp. VI; MS. f.165v, col.2) For still greater confusion, see Bart. Pic., Bibl. II. col.140.
2. This occurs in surahs VII, XXVII, XXIX, but not in II as Ricoldo says.
3. Disp. I; MS. f161r, col.2.

inadequate prohibition, like San Pedro. In his explanatio, Ramón Marti implied that Muhammad forbade unnatural vice, by arguing that if he once allowed any sort of sexual licence, he could not confine it to the use of women.[1] Others held simpler views. William of Auvergne, and, following him, Benedict of Alignan, understood the opposite of the more usual idea: sodomiticam spurcitiam interdixit, they said.[2] William recognised that the prohibition failed, in spite of the multitude of wives who might be expected to extinguish homosexual desire, but he accounted for it as springing from irresistible desire, rather than from the encouragement or toleration of religion.[3] According to Acqui, who took an extreme and uncommon view, Muhammad prescribed that whoever was found to commit an act against nature with (another) male should be burned with the greatest fire possible, just because many women were permitted, and there must be presumed to be less excuse. Verona was moderate and critical, and did the Prophet a little less than justice: peccatum contra naturam non contradixit et facientibus nullam poenam intulit. He was uncertain in his own mind; a little before he had put the case a good deal more strongly.[4]

There is something abstract and theoretical about most of the works we have just considered; but a very similar

1. Art. X.
2. Alv., de. leg. XVIII/18.R
3. Ibid., XX/19.X
4. Cf. XI and X

indignation was provoked by the consideration of Islamic practice, at least in certain countries at certain times. Writers so mild as Oliver of Paderborn and William of Tripoli praised individual Muslim rulers for their freedom from a vice which was regarded as typical of Islamic society.[1] William of Adam, Bishop of Sultaniyah, was more inclined to extreme views; his temperament was inclined to political rather than philosophical judgements. He wrote:

> In the Muslim sect any sexual act at all is not only not forbidden, but allowed and praised. So, as well as the innumerable prostitutes that there are among them, there are many effeminate men who shave the beard, paint their own face, put on women's dress, wear bracelets on the arms and feet . . . et sic sub peccato venumdati contumeliis afficiunt sua corpora et exponunt, et masculi in masculum turpitudinem operantes, mercedem iniquitatis et erroris recipiunt in seipsis. The Muslims therefore, forgetful of human dignity, are shamelessly attracted by those effeminates, and live together with them as with us husband and wife live together publicly . . (2)

What shocked the writer most deeply was that Catholic traders supplied this market, seeking and buying suitable boys, both Christian and pagan, and preparing them for their unsavoury profession. They dressed them in silks, ornamented them, washed them thoroughly and fed them up,

> that they should appear more plump and pink and voluptuous and in consequence more suitable and alluring to satisfy the desire of the Muslims. When . . the perverters of human nature see (the boys), immediately they are on fire with lust for them, and, like mad dogs, they hasten to run to these boys . . so as to be able to exercise their lewdness with them.

This was one of several examples of a complaint particularly levied against the Egyptians in the mamluk period. It

---

1. Oliver, Ep. Sal.; Tripoli, quoted below in this chapter.
2. De modo . . I.

delineates very forcefully that general picture of Islamic libidinousness[1] of which we have now cited many aspects. There was so little sympathy with a society which did not count chastity high among the public virtues.

Most Christians were aware that their differences with Muslims were not only over a few particular points of detail, but over the whole field of sexual life. This was apprehended even at a very popular level. It was one of the themes of the poems by Waltherius and du Pont:

> Conjugium solves, corrumpes virginitatem,
> judicioque tuo castus adulter erat . . (2)

Du Pont, with his fantastic conception of Islamic law, imagined that every man had ten wives and every woman ten husbands;[3] the only recognisable element here is the sense of general licence. The choice of Friday as the day of Public prayer was very generally thought to signify a voluntary or involuntary worship

---

1. Cf. Ludolf: viri sunt debiles et libidinosi, abutentes masculis. This comes from a passage which does not give the impression of close personal observation. (VIII) Verona's attack on the mamluk court seems better informed: the sultan continually commits this crime "execrabile et publice". At the Court he describes "mamalucos parvos juvenes qui sibi venduntur ad Kayram"; of these there were over five hundred from Tartary, Greece, Italy and all parts of the world; "et quum magni sunt effecti, facit eos armigeros suos, et sic ipse soldanus et admirati sui et comiter omnes Saraceni hoc horribile facinus sine omni Dei timore committunt . . (IX; cf. X)
2. loc. cit., ~~lines~~ p. 38) Cf. du Pont: Abateras saint mariage/. . Tu dampneras virginite/ Li chastes par t'iniquite/ Sera avoutres, et par toi/ La gens sera fole et sans foi.
3. Loc. cit.

of Venus; the hajj, also, was associated with Venus.[1] In Abbot Joachim's prophecy, just as the doctors of the church were opposed to the heretics, so Muhammad was opposed by the virgins.[2]

The special lubricity of Muslims was almost everywhere believed to be a fact. "Among the Muslims the foulness of lust is such as can hardly be expressed in words; for from the soles of the feet to the crown of the head they are so deep in the mud . . . "[3] Religion commended the sexual act itself: accedite, inquit, ad uxores vestras.[4] Muhammad regarded continence as an inexpiable sin, in one statement, which is supposed to have originated with a preacher in the East, and which was taken to be an expert view.[5] The two characteristic marks of the Islamic religion were sexuality

1. Vitry, VI; Alv., XX/19.U; San Pedro, S.S.M. I.viii.65; Varagine; Higden; Marino III.iv; Ludolf VIII; for the hajj, cf Risâlah, Tol. Vincent 23.60 and Pedro de Alfonso.
2. Salimbene, yr. 1249
3. XVI. Some other examples (not by any means intended to be exhaustive) are: legem . . carnaliter viventes in parte voluptatis firmiter observant (Oliver, Hist. Dam.); enervati et effeminati in libidine et immunditiam (Paris, al. scr.); dixit . . nullum esse peccatum omne peccatum carnale tam contra naturam quam cetera horrenda peccata carnalia (Verona, X).
4. Fid., loc. cit. Cf. also William Adam's "actus quicunque venerens . . licitus et laudatus (quoted above); and cf. the Christian reaction to marital relations during the fast (see p. below).
5. Paris, aliud scriptum, introductory phrases.

and violence: fornicationes et furta.[1] The general impression that this way of talking among the experts imparted during this period to an intelligent reader with no special knowledge may be gaged by what Guido Terrena says: "dicunt omnem turpitudinem carnalis coitus licitum quod Philosophus . . dicit peccatum bestialitatis . . coitus cum matre . .peccatum contra naturam . . (effusio seminis extra vas debitum) . . omnis fornicatio et carnis immunditia . ."[2] This represents an advance in precision, but certainly not in accuracy, on the statement made by Guibert, propagatur ubique gentium quasi coelitus veniens indifferenter coeundi nova licentia; the two are strictly comparable as representing the ideas of the best of the general public, each in his day.[3]

3. Types of rebuttal.

Some of the arguments that were used against this carnality, which seemed thus overwhelmingly important, are

1. San Pedro, S.S.M., I.i.48. Cf. Oliver's statement that Islam was based on terror mundanus and voluptas carnalis (Hist. Dam.); Martin's that some Muslims were forced to believe, others Muhammad per voluptatum licentiam vehementer attraxit (Epistr. Jud.); Fidenzio's non solum fuit . . humani sanguinis effusor pessimus sed etiam fuit in peccato luxurie fetidissimus (XIV); Ricoldo's "the Law of God forbids murder, robbery and concupiscense, all of which the Qur'an either commends or permits" (Disp. V); a casual description of Damietta as catena captivorum et scortum et domus Sodomorum (In obsidione Damiate, in Quinti Belli Sacri SS. Minores). All these examples, taken almost at random, show the tendency to think of the double iniquity of Islam, as licentious and violent.
2. Err. 8
3. Dubois, a specialist in Crusade, but hardly so in Islam, is probably also a fair example of the general impression made on the European mind; in his case this is tempered by realism and moderation: Vitam enim ducunt omnes divites et potentes intra ipsos luxuriosam, in prejudicium uxorum (who, he said, would turn/

also of interest. They fall under two headings, as derived from natural reason, and from Scripture, without being divided in the minds of their authors. Pedro de Alfonso said that marriage was justified only by the hope of procreation, as distinct from desire; this is a Christian outlook, although Pedro's personal formation was Jewish. It was typical of Alan of Lille that he took it for granted that Islam based its defence of polygamy on the authority of the patriarchs; against this he urged the binding example of Adam, in the pattern, at once rational and Scriptural, una dicitur esse unius.[1] He admitted that the patriarchs had been licensed, so that the earth might be replenished, but now chastity was needed, in

---

(Note continued from previous page)
Christian in order to have sole use of their husbands). (De recup. T.S., 43/69)

This account of aspects of sexual behaviour among Muslims which seemed significant to Christians ignores a number of minor questions. Viterbo said that adultery was never punished, nisi quatuor idoneis testibus fuerit comprobatum, ita scilicet, ut genitalia utriusque suis oculis viderint commisceri. (Not in Paris) On this point of adultery, Pedro de Alfonso stated the penalty without comment, and was duly repeated by the Anonymus Minorita: this was a theme that offered no polemic scope. There was occasional suggestion of a licence to commit incest. Pedro again said that Muslims were allowed to take their wives from their own families ut sanguinis proles accrescat; and also that the bond of affection might be strengthened. He was followed by Peter de Pennis (VII, MS. f29v (ut singulis proles . .) He also drew attention to the danger of incest involved in the sale of female slaves between father and son. (Islamic law is aware of and prevents this danger.) Possibly it is to this idea that Verona owed his idea that a father might give a wife of his own to his son. (XI) Acqui said without comment that Muslims preferred wives from their own families. None of these statements is of great interest.

1. IV.viii.

order to replenish heaven. The same theme was illustrated in other authors in variant forms. Viterbo and the Gregorian report pointed out thatbthere was no legitimate marriage in Islam at all,[1] but no one was content to say that the Christian and Islamic theories were so different as not to be comparable as versions of the same institution. The report criticised Islam Scripturally and with some humour: "according to Genesis, they shall be two in one flesh; it does not say, three or four."[2] The reprobatio argued that God, as institutor matrimonii gave Adam only one wife, although he might well have given him more, in order more quickly to populate the earth. The author of this work was often very brief, simply indicating the most profitable line of argument. Thus he was content simply to point out that the effusio seminis extra vas debitum was against divine law and bonum prolis; he treated the lex cognoscendi mulieres at greater length. Here his arguments were rational rather than Scriptural.[3] In the explanatio Ramon Marti used similar but

---

1. ideo fit quia inter eos nulli legitimum connubium fit: this seems a reasonable conclusion for a Christian to draw. (Paris)
2. Not in Viterbo.
3. Prevention of the fruits of marriage, offspring; the law of nature forbids such inordinatio as the brute beasts will not permit, etc. The scheme of the reprobatio, as it stands, is based on the same rational defence of Scripture, made in order to justify the author in thenceforward using Scriptural argument, as the explanatio, and many of the arguments, both rational and Scriptural, are the same. This is a case in point, and a very typical example. How far even the arguments based on natural law were expected to impress Muslims is not at all certain; the discussion, below, of the explanatio, applies also here.

much fuller arguments. He began by defining marriage as "a lawful society or bond of a male and female of the human race who retain their individual habit of life". This is hardly a definition likely to impress a Muslim favourably. "Thus, those who are joined by the bond of matrimony are made debtors of this society, one to another; so, by definition, it is clear that there must be one woman for one man, unica debet esse unius." The example of Adam was valid for all. Many animals - the lion, the bear - restrained their appetites, in order to be content with one wife. The vis generativa existed for the sake of offspring, not for pleasure, although admittedly there was an incidental pleasure. In fact, multiplicity of wives gave too much pleasure; pleasure intoxicates, softens, enervates and effeminates; it divides men from their proper spiritual ends. If desire were not to be refrained, it would not be limited at all, and any kind of unnatural vice would be permissible, which is manifestly false. Moreover, what is good for men must be good for women, whose desire is more vehement than men's. There must be equality of rights between them; a man could give full rights to many women only for a limited time to each. That marriage was a perpetual bond was shown also by many arguments from Scripture.

A series of more practical applications of these principles followed. If marriage could be ended for any light reason, such as anger, it should be terminable on either side; a wife was socia not serva. If a wife were sent away

because of illness or deformity, it would be against compassion; and if infirmity could terminate marriage, then old age would dissolve all marriages. As things were, women were deflowered and made pregnant, and then sent away, so that they were dishonoured by all men. This was a law of prostitution. No decent man or woman would tolerate the disgrace of the tahlīl, when even birds and animals could be faithful to a single spouse. Marti recommended any one who sent his wife away because of her fornication to live in continence; that is, he recommended "divorce" without remarriage.

These arguments, scholastic and even legalistic, are based on Christian assumptions, and within that framework seem to be of a highly rational character, making great use of natural reason. It is very difficult to imagine any of them impressing a Muslim, and the remarks about pregnant wives, cast off and dishonoured, do not correspond at all to the reality of Islamic law and life. On the other hand each one of these arguments seems effectively calculated to influence Christians, and might be expected to fortify the faith of those who were exposed to the temptation to apostatise, in order to enjoy the advantages of Islamic marriage law. It is reasonable to guess that it is as an exhortation of this sort that this work is intended.[1]

---

1. Exp. sim., art. X.

San Pedro was less concerned to argue than to demonstrate; thus, over the coitus interruptus, he stated Muhammad's answer to the objection that this impeded generation: no act of man's could impede God's decision to create a soul. It is not obvious whether San Pedro thought this answer foolish or wicked.[1] Ricoldo was on the whole less elaborate in his rather ostentatious appeal to reason than might have been expected; he did not trouble to develop arguments on this subject. Thus he said of the law of divorce that it "should be attributed not so much to men as to beasts who lack reason; and not to God who disposes all things rationally."[2] This omitted any discussion of the question itself. Much of Ricoldo's fuller argumentation in this connection related to the Islamic Paradise, although it was applicable to sexuality in the present world.[3] He liked to appeal to impartial tribunals in the abstract; to the Philosophers,[4] and to the Muslims themselves: "among all men, and even among the Muslims, it is thought more virtuous to abstain (from eating and copulating). They themselves have contemplatives and ascetics

1. S.S.M. I.iv.24
2. Disp. VIII; MS. f. 169r col.1
3. For example, his point that desire and pleasure were attached to eating and copulating in order to persuade men and animals to undertake what would otherwise be wearisome occupations; he also argued that if the happiness of men required many women, that of women required many men; but he did not apply this argument, as Marti and Lull did, to earthly marriage.
4. Disp. V; MS. f. 164v col.1

whom they especially praise."

One of Lull's arguments against polygamy was that it caused the women to sin mentally more than the Christian women, because their husbands, having many wives, were not able to satisfy them, so that they wanted many men for themselves.[1] This seems like a parody of Marti's argument; in some of what Lull says there is an almost clownish element, that seems to express a little absurdly what is put more soberly elsewhere. Lull's exposition of monogamous marriage is in a different class.[2] The will of one man and one woman, he said, are joined together to a single end, as are their intellectual, imaginative and sensitive faculties. Islamic marriage, however, was <u>difformatum</u>; one will, intellect, imagination and <u>sensitiva</u> on the man's part were put into relation to many intellects, wills, imaginations, <u>sensitivae</u>, on the part of his women; these women could not all be bound together to the one man, but each wished him for herself. Marriage was again deformed by divorce. Verona, who also attempted to read the psychology of the Muslim family, imputed to Islamic law a motive which has a modern and Romantic appearance: as he thought that polygamy was established in order to prevent adultery by arranging for the satisfaction of adulterous desire elsewhere, so he maintained that sodomy went unpunished because men were recommended to rid themselves of desire, when they were tempted, in the quickest possible way.[3] Dubois said that Muslim wives

1. Hamar, sig. VI.
2. Ibid., sig. XII.
3. XI

would willingly turn Christian for monogamy's sake.[1]

All of these arguments were intended to establish the Christian institution of marriage and the ascetic treatment of desire as normal and conformable to Scripture and reason and the general consent of the nations. For the most part, they are arguments of sense and moderation, which seem to try to take into account the Islamic reality which they oppose.[2] Islamic practices, whether official or unofficial, were an aberration, and should be made as clearly as possible to seem both ludicrous and nasty. Yet there was no attempt to deny that the institutions of Islam, and the licences in moral practice that it granted, were agreeable in a worldly and fleshly sense;[3] if anything, this was taken as an additional sign of error. The style of argument was markedly scholastic; and those authors who were not closely concerned with the schools, for example, chroniclers and some Crusade propagandists, simply stressed how scandalous these things were, without adducing proofs or disproofs in a matter they probably considered self-evident.

---

1. Loc. cit., (cited above.)
2. The arguments put forward by Guido Terrena have been ignored, not because they are untypical (they are, on the contrary, very typical, scholastic and Scriptural in tone); but because his ideas of Islam are so erratic that he cannot be considered with such knowledgeable writers as I have mentioned here.
3. It was understood that wealth, women and worldly honour would be the reward of apostasy (see above, p. 481 n); one wonders sometimes whether some renegades were not disappointed when they came to claim their rewards.

There was also a tendency among writers of all types, and not only among professional scholastics, to explain Islamic moral practice away as the product of lower nature among undisciplined barbarians, and of a peculiar time, place and society. We have seen that in the Latin lives, Muhammad was represented as founding his religion and his moral theology on his own bad example. Thus the summula said that, when he alloted eight wives to himself and committed adultery with the wives of many others, "he added a greater number of lost souls to himself, as though by the prophetic example". It was often said that the Prophet allowed plurality of women because he was libidinous for himself.[1] The Zayd/Zaynab and Mariyah episodes, because they did in fact result in revelations, were very widely thought of as examples of his inventing rules, in order to gratify his own passions, and endowing them with a religious sanction. Ketton's annotator asserted the calculated manufacture of doctrine when he said that Muhammad's talk of chastity was intended to cover his own lechery.[2] We may note in passing how Muhammad's personal indulgence was dovetailed into the system of licence that he was said to have granted to those who would follow his religion, in San Pedro's writings particularly.[3] It is not necessary to stress this theme

1. E.g. Vitry, VI; Fid. XVI; Higden; Benvenuto.
2. Ad az. XLII; Bibl. XLIII, p. 226 col.1; Q. XXXIII.30 ff.
3. E.g., S.S.M. I.iv.18 ff.

which was generally accepted.

Equally interesting is the view that Islam was calculated to suit the Arabs, the contemporaries whom Muhammad converted, by commending the vices to which they were already inclined. Seeking lust, given to gluttony, they would not otherwise have accepted his religion.[1] Alternatively, it was said that it was the Arabs who made Islam what they wished it to be. "They only assert (polygamy)," said Alan of Lille, "in order to satisfy lust: for the whole of their life is spent in the stench of lust."[2] Gerald of Wales maintained that Muhammad taught whatever he thought would best please, and especially lust, which was the particular temptation of orientals, who live in a climate of great natural heat.[3] It was often said that there was something brutish as well as carnal in the Arabs, or in the religion which was suited to their tastes.[4] It was enough to say that the broad way to perdition which Islam inculcated was easily followed by any human being, and was planned to that end.[5] Indeed Islam positively exploited universal human weakness: "the religion that he established and the commandments that he gave were such

---

1. Pedro de Alfonso, loc. cit.
2. IV.vii
3. For the effect of climate upon character in mediaeval thought compare also Urban's speech at Clermont.
4. Cf. Mark, Pref. Q.; Paris, additions to St. Albans Chr., yr. 622; Alv. XVIII/18.R; Marti, Capistr. Jud.; Verona, XI; Humbert, Op. Trip. I.vi (re Paradise); Anon. Fior.
5. E.g., Vitry, VI; for this theme, see also below, this chapter.

as men are prone to even without commandments.[1]

This idea that doctrine was adapted to the circumstances of the time and to the inherent tendencies of human nature was not worked out in great detail during this period;[2] it belonged rather to the climate of opinion. It might to-day be thought dangerous to account for the religion of Islam on the basis of these human considerations, since the enemies of religion itself, as well as of particular religions, tend to maintain that believers believe what they wish to believe. It was often nothing but this that the mediaeval Latin argued, in respect to Islam. It was the conviction that the loose morals of Islam were wholly exceptional that provoked and encouraged such an approach. The only alternatives were the arguments from Scripture and from natural law.

4. Laxity in general.

Some matters other than sexuality were thought to exemplify moral laxity, though not to nearly the same extent, nor by anything like the same number of people. Dress was thought to be significant by some; the suggestion seems to

---

1. Ric., Disp.VII; MS. f.164v; cf. Peter de Pennis IX, MS.f33r. Cf. Higden, who put it that Muhammad, in order that he might more strongly entangle the people he had seduced, decreed for law what he knew best pleased human concupiscence.
2. In passing it is relevant to note one other argument of Lull's that the Muslims' love for women in this world was their reason for believing that there would be the use of women in the next. ~~See below, p.~~ Contemp. D. 240. 12

to have been that it was a sign of hypocrisy. Thus Guido Terrena said, "They wear the monastic habit without the hood; the habit is not appropriate for them, as they are most sordid in their life, and it is well that their form of the habit lacks the head-covering, because they lack a true head, and for head they have the vile Muhammad".[1] There are several references to the monk-like habit, described as like the Benedictine,[2] the Franciscan,[3] or in summer the Canons Regular's.[4] Its adoption was attributed to the false monk, Sergius.[5] The "monastic" dress of Muslims was more often remarked without comment;[6] San Pedro spoke of the tonsure in Cistercian style being put to superstitious use;[7] but he also referred without comment. Verona, like Guido, and more nearly accurate, remarked that Muslims took it to be a sin to fo head uncovered; this was done, he said obscurely, as an anti-clerical and anti-Roman act.[8] Acqui referred to the cosmetic use of oils non-committally, and spoke of the cultivation of long and beautiful beards with understanding and perhaps with admiration.

---

1. Err. 13
2. Caesarius IV.xv; San Pedro, S.S.M., I.viii.68
3. Acqui
4. San Pedro, S.S.M., I.viii.68 again.
5. Cf. Varagine, Acqui.
6. Cf. Varagine; Quid. Angl.; Ludolf VIII; Acqui
7. S.S.M., I.viii.94
8. XI

We may note a few other points equally briefly. The reprobatio maintained, not only that Muhammad broke his oath when he could not refrain from Mariyah the Egyptian, but that he taught that oaths could be broken, when he made the satisfaction for infraction something easily performed.[1] This is another example of the Christian suspicion, and criticism, of lightly enforced prohibitions. San Pedro and Ricoldo utilised the same argument, and Ricoldo added that Muslims in fact did not keep their words.[2] Vitry said that Muhammad had taught that Muslims need not keep faith with enemies, and San Pedro warned that Muslims' oaths ought never to be trusted, since they would not be observed, nisi ibi propriam utilitatem videant.[3] This accusation, so common between enemies, was relatively rare. The regulations governing witnesses also gave offence; curiously, not those that made a Christian's witness unacceptable in many cases before the qāḍī.[4] The discrepancy between Islamic and Mosaic law in this matter of witnesses somewhat mysteriously irritated Ricoldo, who pointed it out with that triumphant air that was characteristic of his work when he felt that he or his model

---

1. VIII.
2. Disp. XII (MS. f. 175r-v); S.S.M. I.iv.6
3. Vitry V; S.S.M., I.iv.9. It is interesting to note that some Christians doubted whether ordinary morals applied to their relations with Muslims. Whether there was need to make restitution for theft from Muslims was a dubium propounded to Rome by the missionaries; the answer, of course, was affirmative. (M.O.F.P.H., vol iv.2; Raymundiana, XVIII.)
4. Cf. Viterbo, cf. Paris.

had unearthed some particularly conclusive and self-evident absurdity.[1] Among the things tolerated by Islam that most annoyed San Pedro was the practice of magic, a theme to which he recurred.[2] Strangely little noticed was the seclusion of women; Vitry remarked on it, and the Qur'anic passage which imposed seclusion on the wives of the Prophet was vaguely associated with lechery by the annotator of Ketton's Qur'an and presumably all his readers.[3] Perhaps a more important argument against the Islamic moral system was the criticism that it made no provision for restitution where injury of any kind was the consequence of a sinful act; but this was not widely raised.[4] San Pedro said that Muslims steal and rob and lie in the cause of religion and Guido Terrena thought that robbery was quite simply permitted.[5] None of these points loomed very large in the mediaeval tradition of writing about Islam; in morals, this tradition was wholly dominated by the perception of Islamic lubricity.

---

1. Disp. V; cf. Guido, err. 21
2. e.g., I.viii.11. It will be recalled that in his account of the life of Muhammad he thought the accusation that he was a sorcerer, or possessed, to be important. Ricoldo, also, referred to the use of magic as being one of the "contradictions" of the Qur'an. (Disp. VI.)
3. Annotator, ad az. 42 (Q. XXXIII; Bibl. az.43); cf. Vitry VI.
4. Ricoldo, Disp. XII; Lull, Hamar, signa 8, 25.
5. S.S.M., I.viii.249; Guido, 7.

At the same time, the West had not lost all power of generalisation in its obsession with sordid detail. The comprehensive contrast between the religion of indulgence and the religion of asceticism and sacrifice was a key consideration in the European attitude. It may be conjectured that it arose spontaneously, both in the East and the West, and in the earliest times, among Christians living under Muslim rule;[1] to such apostasy was a real temptation, both for the sake of worldy success and for that of a more flexible code of private morals, to which many succumbed. It has in any case been almost universally adopted, and the contrast may not be unacceptable to Muslims themselves, when it is not tendentiously worded. It was thus expressed by Pedro de Alfonso:

> Without doubt, this religion is wide, keeping many commandments of the delights of this present life . . If you seek the root of this religion, you will find it founded on a foundation (sic) of unshaken reason, namely, that God loves (men), and did not will to burden them with many commandments . . . (2)

At the extreme of ignorance, remote from authentic information, very much the same comment was made; thus Muhammad taught a return from Christianity to the state of natural (fallen) man:

> Utque loquar breviter, Adam veterem renovabis atque novas leges ad nichilum rediges. (3)

This might also be conceived as a return to the spiritual

---

1. For the East, cf. the Risalah (Tol. in Vincent 23.63, Muir p. 110); for the West, Alvaro of Cordova, in Indiculus Luminosus: Christus . . naturalem motum . . . constrinxit. . etc., paragraph 33.
2. op. cit.
3. Waltherius, ~~lines~~ p. 381

aridity and legalist understanding of the Old Dispensation:

> Circoncisions de pensee
> Iert par toi desacoustumee
> Et cele de char revenra (1)

Within this general theme a variety of different emphases is met. In this context sex has its place only as the chief among several symptoms of an underlying laxity. Peter the Venerable spoke of Islamic institutions as prudentes secundum carnem, as if to speak so were to make a concession to Islamic feelings;[2] by comparison the summula was harsh to refer to loosening the restraints of gluttony and desire.[3] Mark of Toledo described how Muhammad saw that the Arabs would not tolerate Christianity, because it was the religion of humility, and also of chastity and fasting.[4] To Muslims, said Vitry, the sweet yoke of Christ seemed severe and almost intolerable; it was the office of the Gospel to restrain desire from its carnal flow; but the fleshly and shameless Muslims believed that future beatitude was in no way hindered by temporal rewards and earthly desires and the delights of this present life. Indeed, they believed that it was meritorious to provoke filthy appetites. Muslims who were not taken up with

---

1. Du Pont, op. cit.
2. C.S.S. I.10
3. gulae ac libidini frena laxavit.
4. Pref. Q. A little later Mark has, ob sui (Christianity's) difficultatem rigoris; Fidenzio, in his remarks taken from Mark, has the same point a little differently expressed (quod lex Christianorum gravis est) in a place parallel to Mark's second remark. The part in which the fuller explanation, quoted by me in my text here, occurs, is missing in Fidenzio. (XIV)

the pleasures of the flesh sought baptism. Thus it was that in the hot regions of the East especially "rough and lustful" men found the straight way and narrow gate intolerable; and instead it was the fatal wide and broad way which they chose to follow.[1] Paris, in the additions he made to Wendover, remarked that those early Muslims, who (he asserted) borrowed from the Bible in order to revise the Qur'an, omitted the hard parts:[2] and elsewhere he added the phrase in eo Epicurus. Vincent de Beauvais understood the sources which he marshalled in the same sense: Muhammad, he concluded, tempered the excessive rigidity and severity of the Jewish and Christian religions "by the promulgation of gentler commandments".[3] Humbert actually argued that many Christians who could do so became Muslim in order to escape the austerity of their own religion.[4] One section of San Pedro's principal work on Islam treated turn by turn the licentiae which Islam permitted - plurima pessima.[5] He made the very sensible comment that the Muslims ought rather to be blamed for what they believed than for doing the things that their beliefs allowed.[6]

This whole them came gratefully to Ricoldo, who took it up with enthusiasm. Citing the Gospel, broad is the way,

---

1. VI.
2. St. Albans Chronicle, loc.cit.
3. 23.40
4. Op. Trip. I.vi. Note also the phrase (ibid.): nec precepit etiam aliquid magnae austeritatis, imo concedit voluptuosa . .
5. S.S.M., I.iv passim.
6. Ibid., I.iv.76

and many there are who go in . ., he commented, "it is obviously established that the religion of the Muslims is broad, and many are the Muslims who go by it . . "[1] The Qur'anic prohibitions, of robbery, as of oath-breaking and sodomy, were feeble, and so stressed God's forgiveness that they were tantamount to permission, a theme that we have encountered in several connections:

> Although the Qur'an sometimes forbids robbery and perjury and some other evils, yet that prohibition is a kind of permission (est quaedam permissio). For ti says, do not do such and such evils, which are not pleasing to God; but if ye do them, he is compassionate and merciful and he will easily forgive you. (2)

It was an essential point that salvation in Islam was to be had by repeating the shahādah[3] and that it was the reward of faith without works. Islam was the **lex salutis antonomasite**, in the sense that it was the law of easy salvation.[4] Many were Muslims for the sake of an easier life with a multitude of wives and other pleasant things;[5] in the case of educated Muslims it was not so much that they were believers as that "the vehemence of delight carries away the judgement of reason".[6] Finally, there was the idea, a development of Mark's, that

---

1. Disp. V; MS. f. 165r col.1
2. Disp. XII; MS. f. 175r col.2; cf. Itin. XXXI and Ep. I.
3. The confession of faith, there is no God but God . .etc.
4. See below p. for some discussion of this, and the references in full. Antonomasite because Muslim was thought to mean saved.
5. This statement belongs to the fourfold analysis (deriving from Contrarietas (II, MS. f. 239r ff.) of the motives for which people followed Islam; I have already quoted from this, above p 459
6. Disp. X; MS. f 173v col.2

Islam accepted the Gospel as a divine revelation which proved too hard and was remitted in favour of the Qur'an, which it was not beyond man's capacity to observe. Muslims claimed that " . . the Gospel contains such difficult and such perfect things that the world was not great enough to achieve them . ." Who could love his neighbour, for example, or pray for his persecutors? "Because it was not a religion that could be commonly observed, God provided for the world - with a religion of salvation - and tempered the commandments; he gave the world the Qur'an, which does not contain[1] these difficult things, but things that are easy for salvation . ."[2] Against this position Ricoldo had no difficulty in arguing the impossibility of God's not having known what he was doing when he gave the Gospel to men; but he was only attacking a position that he had stated himself on behalf of his absent adversary. Unwilling to let well alone, he also argued that the Islamic religion, though so much easier than the Christian, could fairly have been made easier yet: even in being easy it was imperfect.[3] This last point is interesting because

1. Here the word not has been supplied as obviously required by the sense; the error in the manuscript is also supplied in Bart. Pic. Cf. MS. f. 183r col.1; Bart. Pic., Bibl. col.182
2. Disp. XVII; MS reference as in note 1
3. This refers to the laws of fasting, praying, etc.; the argument is that it would be still easier to have still less fasting, praying, and so on, than has actually been made binding on Muslims. Ricoldo then denied that these were in practice observed any way; but cf. his own judgement cited below in this chapter.

it indicates that its author, in spite of himself, did not really think Islam a mere system of licence at all.[1] That it imposed a real, though alien, hierarchy of rules, we could hardly expect to find stressed or even fully formulated in this period.

Some of these ideas occurred in the reprobatio. Among the objects of the author's attack was this citation of Bukhari: "God forgives my people the passage of the sin of the heart, so long as it does not come to act or word. That is to say that no Muslim is punished for a sin of the heart."[2] The author was before Ricoldo in seeing danger in the belief that God's forgiveness is to be had too easily. He claimed to quote the Qur'an,[3] "God permits robbery to you; for he sees your weakness and your shortcomings and he allows them to you"; but he did not at all insist upon this point. Fitzralph derived from his study of the Cluniac corpus one idea of the Qur'an which is parallel to Ricoldo's concept of the Muslim claim: Muhammad "affirms that the Qur'an is nothing but a completion and a certain mitigation of the Testaments . ."[4] He did not develop a critique on these lines, and other late writers added little or nothing to the theme, while they still exemplified the same general tendency.[5]

---

1. Ricoldo's original contribution to the general attitude does not occur in his more discursive and ratiocinatory passages, where he preferred to follow a model; cf. the next section of this chapter.
2. Quad. rep. VIII, MS B.N.195r col.1; Berlin Qu.85, fl 246r; Fol.425, f. 127r col.1; these agree with each other, but not wholly with the printed text. Bukhārī, refer Wensinck, in E.I. under khaṭī'a.
3. See above, p.
4. Arm. 15(16).
5. For Lull, cf. D.P., and Contemp. D. 240.

5. The practice of virtue by Muslims.

There is a certain unreality about some of the material that we have been considering. Much of it was concerned with what Islamic law allowed, rather than with what Muslims - or Christians - actually do. Every Latin author would seek to dig out from the Qur'an, and identify, those immoral teachings which constituted a great part of the proof of its falsity. It was assumed, often without evidence, that Muslim behaviour was as bad as the law permitted. Despite this, it was possible, in certain aspects, to praise Islamic practice from the point of view of Christian morals, or even of the natural law, or the jus gentium. Usually this was done with a satiric or homiletic intent; its purpose was to castigate Christian practice, and it was done, sometimes with more, and sometimes with less, eye to Islamic realities. "Many educated Christians (literati) do not observe the Gospel religion which, however, they believe absolutely to be true and good. Rather do they imitate the way of the Qur'an, which actually they believe to be false."[1] This is the thought that underlies this theme. With it sometimes went an inclination to stress Christian delinquency by showing how Muslims practised Christian (rather than Islamic) virtues.

It is apparently this satiric intention that governed Ricoldo in his praise of various Muslim practices and

1. Ricoldo, Disp. X; MS. f. 173v col. 2

institutions, as he personally found them in Baghdad. His is the best example of realistic satire, since what he praises in Muslims are really Muslim virtues:

> They received us indeed like angels of God, in their schools and colleges and monasteries, and in their churches or synagogues (i.e., their mosques), and their homes; and we diligently studied their religion and their works; and we were astounded how in so false a religion could be found works of such perfection. We refer here briefly to some of the works of perfection of the Muslims, rather to shame the Christians than to commend Muslims. Who will not be astounded, if he carefully considers how great is the concern of these very Muslims for study, their devotion in prayer, their pity for the poor, their reverence for the name of God and the prophets and the holy places, their sobriety in manners, their hospitality to strangers, their harmony and love for each other . . (1)

Here observed fact is expressly required to serve the satiric purpose; the facts, indeed, are generously interpreted. Most of the qualities praised are such as Arabs and Muslims have always been famous for, and the appreciation may be taken at its face value.[2] Some of these qualities are considered elsewhere; here we may note three. The first is gravitas: the absence, we are told, of raised heads or waving arms, even among small boys, and of recrimination in public. Ricoldo claimed "in many years" in Baghdad never to have heard a profane song instead of religious ones.[3] All this must be exaggerated, presumably by the satiric intention, although based in truth. Even in Islam the gravitas of serious and religious men, and of well-brought-up

---

1. Itin. XXI, XXII.
2. See p.
3. Itin. XXVII.

children, cannot extend over the whole city. More disinterested was the account of Arab hospitality which the Christian Religious apparently refused so far as they could. What Ricoldo meant by concordia Saracenorum proves on examination to be the sense of brotherhood and solidarity within Islam. Thus the army of legitimate authority can say to the army of the rebel chief, "Are we not all Muslims? It is not allowed to fight among ourselves. Let only he who rebelled against his lord be given up and let us all be in peace." This was Ricoldo's comment: "Indeed thay so nourish harmony and love among themselves that they really seem to be brothers; for talking among themselves also, especially to strangers, one says to another, O son of my mother . . " Again there was exaggeration; thus he said that a Muslim might always travel safely among Muslims. Again the purpose was edification: "they who have a religion of killing and death do not wish to kill each other, and the wretched Christians, who have a religion of life and commandments of peace and love, kill each other without any mercy". Ricoldo also repeated that he wrote in order to shame Christians "who do not wish to do for the law of life what the damned do for the law of death".[1] "See how much concord there is among the

1. Cf. Ricoldo's statement elsewhere: the Jews have a law but no understanding and no works; the Muslims have works, but no law or understanding; Christians have a law and understanding, but have no works. (Ep. II) In another mood he imputed to Muslims the hypocrisy of pretended virtue calculated to deceive the unwary. (Disp., prol.) He was never so generous as in the Itinerarium, and he was always least generous when most literary (especially when we treat all his copying as literary).

children of iniquity . . so that the Muslims can say to Christians, Be thou ashamed, O Sidon, the sea speaketh."[1]

Very much the same reaction was shown by St. Bonaventure, when he learned of Muslim charity to some Franciscans. Here we see the impact of facts, really representative of Islamic society, upon a man whose assumptions, however outstanding his personal attainments, were those of the general public. He described how two of the Brothers arrived in Islamic territory, and how a Muslim who saw that they were needy was moved to pity; he offered them money to buy food, which, in obedience to their Rule, they refused. He then understood that for the love of God they wished not to possess money, and offered to maintain them for as long as he had the means. "What incalculable value poverty has", commented Bonaventura, "when by its wonderful virtue the mind of barbarous savagery is changed into such sweet commiseration. Equally, it is a dreadful and abominable crime that a Christian should trample upon this noble pearl, which a Muslim exalts with so great a veneration."[2]

Different in kind but similar in purpose is the story told by Caesarius of the benevolent Muslim noble in the port of

---

1. Itin. XXIX. Perhaps Ricoldo's most sober estimate of the virtues of Islam is that found in his libellus ad nationes orientales, where he said that Islamic religion contains multa utilia. (MS. f.61)

2. Vita, IV.7

ʿAkka, after Ṣalāḥ ad-Dīn's advance in the summer of 1187. This is an earlier and more probable version of the story which provided Mandeville with the satire of his secret conversation with the sultan.[1] The purpose of both is again to shame the Christians, but this time it is not so much the specifically Muslim virtues that are brought forward, as the worse observance by Christians of virtues which, implicitly in the story, are recognised by both religions (including chastity among these virtues). The Muslim noble, learning French au pair in Jerusalem in his youth, had observed the Christian way of life: omnis vita Christianorum bene et optime mihi nota est. Now in ʿAkka he asked how the Christians behaved in Europe, and those whom he was talking to, "not wishing to tell the truth", replied, "Well enough". This did not tally with the Muslim's experience in Jerusalem:

> There was no citizen in Jerusalem so rich that he would not expose his sister, his daughter or, what was detestable, his wife, for money, to the lust of the pilgrims whom in this way he cleared of the rewards of their labours. Thus everyone was given to gluttony and the enticements of the flesh; in no way were they different from the cattle.

Equally they were obsessed with vanity about their clothes. Caesarius' informant, the monk William, who in his youth had been present at this conversation in Akka, described how the Muslim continued:

---

1. A slightly different story of Muslim reproof is that of thirty Dominicans before the sultan in Cairo, Vitodurani, Gol.ii, p.145.

> Consider how loose and full my clothes and shoes are, how simply and humbly shaped. - As William described it to us, he had open, wide sleeves like a monk, and there was no multiplicity of pleats in his clothes, no fancy work, although the material itself of the clothes was precious enough. (1)

These were the vices (said the Muslim) for which the Christians were expelled from the Holy Land. In Mandeville's story the mamlūk sultan was kept informed about what went on in Europe by an extensive system of spies; it was not a case of what happened in the Latin States only. There were priests who set no good example, people who drank at taverns when they should be at church, who drank and squabbled and fought, followed constantly changing fashions in clothes, sold their womenfolk out of covetousness. In my personal view, Mandeville's story is less good than Caesarius'; it lost both in the lesser probability of its setting and in the more generalised nature of its satire. Both castigate the sins of Christians without praising Islam otherwise than by implication; Caesarius, like Ricoldo, has verisimilitude, and his Muslims are real or realistically imagined.

Rather different is the story of Joinville's where John the Armenian falls into argument with an old Muslim in the Damascus suq. John resents a suggestion that the sins of the Christians are less than the sins of the Muslims; then the

---

1. IV.xv. "Consider how loose . ." The word that I have translated loose is rotundus. I think that the point is to contrast a loose robe with the waisted garments of the Christians (stringerent et cultellarent).

Muslim asks if he has any children, and then again asks whether he would be more upset to be hit by his own son or by the Muslim he is talking to. God was more angry with the small sins of the Christians than with the great sins committed by Muslims in ignorance.[1] It is not credible that any Muslim should speak like this, but there is something convincing about the earlier parts of the narrative, which may be a much "improved" version of an actual event. It has the same purpose as the others we have recounted; it is less forceful, because it relies only upon the reproaches, and not on the better example, of the Muslims, in order to make its point, but it accords better with the traditional Christian attitude to Muslims' morals. Joinville was conservative by temperament.

Another type of story is that of the two Cistercian monks who were taken before Ṣalāḥ ad-Dīn as prisoners. Through an interpreter, the sultan questioned them about the Rule of St. Benedict, and particularly about the permission to take meat only in special cases, but wine, in moderation, always. He gave them their freedom and had them served with water and meat by two handsome girls; they resisted temptation and stuck to prayer. Then he had them served with fish and wine, to help them forget their troubles; they soon became very gay, and fell upon the girls (irruerunt in foeminas illas). The next day Ṣalāḥ ad-Dīn criticised the

1. LXXXVIII. Cf. also the comparison of Italy and Syria in the Vita S. Francisci versificata, Gol.i, p. 23.

Rule and dismissed the monks to expiate their sins among their own people. This assumes that both sides share the same view of fornication, but the full implication is critical of monastic and therefore Christian theory.[1] Doubtless the basic intention was amusement, to which edification came second. What is common to all these stories, even Joinville's, is the existence of standards in Islam by which Christians could be judged, and judged justly; and in every case except Joinville's a reader might acquire the idea that Christians and Muslims behaved in much the same fashion. This is emphatically not the impression that a reader of the polemical literature would derive from it.

There was also, though not commonly, an extreme of uncritical appreciation of Islam which served the purpose of edifying Christians, without any close approximation to fact. The English pilgrim said, "They refrain from all harmful appetites of the world". If they had the true faith, he continued, and loved divine charity as they loved their own charity with its servant, equity; and if Christians were at one with them, and loved true charity as now they loved iniquity and its handmaid, vanity, there would be no lack of present grace, nor need to despair of future glory, for either Christians or Muslims. The writer hoped that his hearers

---

1. This account is from Higden, who commented with propriety in defence of his Rule.

would not complain about this opinion of his; it was justified by the example of the noble lion who was corrected by means of a base dog; as well as by the words of St. Paul, I write not these things to confound you . . [1] In this passage the dog seems rather nobler than the lion. It is possible that what lies behind it is the author's surprise, when he reacked the Holy Land, to find that the Saracen had been much maligned; but, if so, he was more percipient than most pilgrims.

A number of references to historical persons bear upon the same question. The reputation of Ṣalāḥ ad-Dīn was so high, almost from his first appearance, that it survived into modern times very much in its original form.[2] In the Middle Ages there was an absurd, and literary, legend of Saladin, that was certainly satirical: the legend of his travelling incognito in Europe, convinced by Christian doctrine, and then deterred by the behaviour of clergy and pontiffs:

> . . Spurcitiam, mores pravos, vitam(que) palustrem
> Luxuriam, fraudem, invidiam, scelus atque rapinam
> Et fraternum odium, cupidi quoque pectoris estum . . (3)

There is, too, Busone's anticipation of Boccaccio's Jew: such was the avarice of the Roman court, said "Saladin", that the

---

1. Quid. Angl.; I Cor. IV.14.
2. Gaston Paris published, and discussed, a highly unfavourable legend that began to develop, and was reversed after the fall of Jerusalem. This was copied by only a very few writers. See bibliographies.
3. Gilles de Corbeil.

Lord who suffered it must be the mildest, most merciful, most just and wise, and his religion better than any other.[1] Admittedly this fantastic Saladin was also the hero of purely romantic adventures; and there are examples of similar satire in which it is some non-Muslim infidels - barbarians in general - who are scandalised.[2] Yet it remains true that the satire, however common-place in itself, was in many instances specifically related to Islamic disapproval, and the bare fact is significant. Moreover, it may have been connected with the admission by some writers that Muslims exercised the virtues opposed to the Christian vices, on occasions; and Busone's choice of epithets which Saladin applies to God is distantly suggestive of Qur'anic language.[3]

There was also a legend of the true Saladin of history. It would probably be true to say that this legend was known over a wider area for a longer period than that of any political figure of the mediaeval West, and almost always favourably. The famous Europeans - Frederick II, Louis IX,

---

1. Busone (ed. Nott, p. 352)
2. This is discussed by Gaston Paris in his articles on the Legend of Saladin.
3. The resemblance is certainly not very close; it is perhaps nearer to Ketton than to the original, and even to Ketton it is not very close. The epithets quoted above are in the Italian text: piu umile e piu misericordioso e piu giusto . . e piu saggio. Umile in conjunction with misericordioso may conceivably represent ar-Rahmān, in the basmala. The phrases would be very curious if they stood alone, without some far echo of Islamic language to explain them.

for example - had all in some ways a more provincial reputation than Saladin.[1] This must be attributed largely to his own exceptional character, and particularly to his generous treatment of many defeated Christians, his equitable treatment of many more. We know that his military success was attributed to a divine judgement upon the sins of Christians; it might easily have been explained in other ways, for example, by making him a precursor of Antichrist.[2] There is no full explanation of why the legend developed as it did, except that it was rooted in the actual facts. In its original formation there may have been an element of satire in the sense of an exaggeration intended to serve a purpose of moral criticism by means of contrast.

If the sins of Christians were punished, was it implied that Muslims were receiving in success the reward of virtue? The implications of the subject were dangerous, but it remained a practice to revere individual Muslim leaders. Al-ʿĀdil - Safadin - shared in his brother's high standing: "rare and praiseworthy virtue, although in an enemy".[3] In the story told by Caesarius, there is a passing reference to Nūr ad-Dīn, the son of Ṣalāḥ ad-Dīn, as vir naturaliter pius et beneficus.[4] An outstanding example of satire occurs in Paris'

1. For an equally widespread legend in Europe, perhaps the bette: comparison would be with the saints, St. Bernard, or St. Francis,
2. Cf. the prophecy of Joachim, which almost does this (Salimbene yr. 1249

account of King John's embassy to Muḥammad an-Nāṣir in Marrakesh.[1] In this story the Muslim monarch contemptuously rejected the proposition of his unworthy Christian colleague, whose morals and social circumstances he assailed with all the indignation and enthusiasm of one of John's subjects.[2]

The image of a man good, ripe for conversion, came easily to Oliver of Paderborn's mind, although in his address to the sultan al-Kāmil in Cairo there is doubtless an element of that flattery with which it would be normal to approach the great: tu, quem Deus ingenio ditavit, patientia multaque urbanitate moribusque laude dignis ornavit . .[3] Oliver was not writing as a client at the Ayyubid court, and his flattery was voluntary. Neither was it insincere or unreal; he wrote out of gratitude for the unusual generosity with which al-Kāmil had treated his Frankish prisoners. They had not felt that he was a tyrant, not even that he was their lord, but rather that he was their father, helper and colleague, patient even before their acts of insolence: rightly called Kāmil, id est consummatus, as above other princes. He was to be praised in particular as opposed to that homosexuality which, publicly displayed, was the characteristic vice of his people.[4]

---

1. As told, the episode would follow the Muslim defeat at Las Navas de Tolosa, and just precede an-Nāsir's death.
2. yr. 1213
3. Ep. Sal.
4. Consummatus is a good translation.

An even more interesting example of the treatment of an historical situation occurs in Tripoli's contemporary estimate of the rule of the mamluk aẓ-Ẓāhir Baybars, who more than any other man worked for the final destruction of the Latin States.

> He detests and hates wine and prostitutes, saying that these make strong men silly and effeminate them. For five years, therefore, in virtue of his proclamation, no brothel with prostitutes has been found in the land that is subject to him, and no one dares to drink wine, except secretly. When he was told that his predecessors were accustomed to emply five thousand mercenaries out of the rate, or farm, on wine and prostitutes, he replied, "I prefer to have a few chaste and sober soldiers, rather than many who are baser than women, and who war for Venus, rather than for Mars, the god of wars and battles." (1) He praises marriage and has four wives, of whom the fourth is a young Christian girl from Antioch, whom he always takes about with him. He disapproves of having concubines and condemns the sin against nature. He requires his subjects to live justly and in peace, and protects the Christians subject to him, and especially the monks who are on Mount Sinai; and in the various parts of his dominion he appears to be favourable (to Christians), and hears their causes immediately, decides them and concludes their suits. His own monks, who are called fuqarāʾ, he willingly hears and honours . . (2)

This surprising and eirenic picture of an anima naturaliter Christiana has probably a purpose primarily political; it tends to show that Muslim rule was tolerable and favourable to Christians. Taken in its context in Tripoli's argument, it supported the theory of the approaching conversion of the Muslims. Tripoli thought they were good people, in that they realised their lack of faith and morals.[3] Ultimately,

---

1. The phraseology of classical Rome is the only unconvincing part of this passage.
2. For mamlūk favour to the monks of Mount Sinai, see below, p. 578
"He protects": mandat ad sibi subiectos christianos - ? (Prutz and Vat. MS. agree.) Cap. XXI; MS. f.109r.
3. XLVIII.

Tripoli's aims remain obscured; but it is obvious that he surveyed Islamic society over the border with equanimity, in the light of some morality common to the two religions.

The existence of favourable comparison, for various motives, in a number of different writers, must not seem to suggest that such was an universal, or even a common attitude. Hatred of the religion of Islam often extended to Islamic society, not only in the case of those who knew nothing about it, but also when there was direct and prolonged experience. It may be superfluous to give examples of something that is obvious enough. The attitude of St. Louis and his fellow-prisoners is an excellent illustration, near at hand, of the normal reaction of the military and clerical élite of France at a fairly late period, when a great deal of more or less reluctant interchange with Islam had taken place. The account in Joinville of the deliberations of the Muslims, both the sultan Turān-Shāh and the mamlūk amīrs, and of their treatment of the prisoners, is wholly unfavourable, and in the last degree suspicious.[1] No doubt the circumstances were extremely difficult, but it does appear that the French were at the mercy of interpreters' rumors, and that they felt their inability to judge soundly what was happening. To take another example, much of Fra Fidenzio's book is theoretical and analytical, but certain faults which he regards as typically Islamic he illustrated in examples about which he obviously felt strongly. In urging in particular

1. LXIV - LXXIV

the cruelty of Muslims this author had signally failed to reflect upon the savagery practised by Muslims, Christians and Mongols alike.[1] This lack of sympathy is universal in conditions of war, and it must be regarded as the normal attitude of the Latins, but it remains necessary to make allowance for the satirical element, associated with some recognition of the virtues of Muslims. This in no way affected the Western attitude to Islamic religion, but it did positively modify the Western estimate of Islamic society. Praise of Muslims has continued to co-exist with condemnation of them from that date.[2]

Serious estimates over the whole field of morals were rare, and on any comprehensive scale did not exist. Both the polemic treatment of the subject and what was written for the reproof of Christians preclude dispassionate and disinterested examination. There are only fragments. Mark put into the Prophet's mouth a summary of the moral teaching of the Qur'an which has no tendentious purpose: "Be humble, patient, chaste, except with your wives; avoid adultery, murder, theft . . "[3] This corresponds with the reality of Qur'anic doctrine. Higden praised the "sobriety in food and drink" of Muslims, in plain history as well as in fiction. Verona numbered among the

---

1. Fid. passim; esp. cap. XVII.
2. A possible example of the penetration of the fame of real Muslim virtues into Christian literature is the hospitality offered by the Sowdan of Surrye in the Man of Law's Tale.
3. Pref. Q.

praiseworthy things taught by Muhammad that "men must beware of sins, namely, anger, pride, hatred and ill-will . ." Some Muslims were disgusted by the libidinousness of their religion, he said, "as I have heard from many".[1] Every reader of the Qur'an, in Ketton's translation or in Mark's, must have received a strong impression of piety and moral injunction; it was just this that was so often denounced as a trap for the unwary.[2] Because a great proportion of what was written about Islam in the Middle Ages consists in attacks on the teaching of the Qur'an, it is possible to forget that what was objected to was not altogether self-evident. The Qur'an more than any book needed a commentary; surah 33 which refers to the Zayd/Zaynab story and surah 66 relating to that of Mariyah would not seem nearly so objectionable without the explanations of a Christian guide, based on some kind of Islamic source. As Muslim writers described the occasions of different revelations, which were naturally interesting and important to them, so Christians explained the immoral significance of the Qur'an in the discreditable context of the Prophet's life as they conceived it to have been. Except where this could be done, the Qur'an must have seemed overwhelmingly pious, and after all not so really unlike the later prophecies of the Old Testament. It seems probable that much of it, read in

---

1. XI
2. Cf. above, p.

translation, gave none the less a good impression, which it must certainly have been an important part of the purpose of polemists to obliterate.[1] Even so we can say that there was in the West some knowledge that Islam was a system of positive requirements, and not only (by Christian standards) a series of relaxations.[2] At the same time it cannot be said that there was a general consensus to this effect, as there undoubtedly was in condemnation of laxity in general and of sexual laxity in particular.[3]

6. Conclusion.

If we review the Western approach to Islam over the whole field of morals, we shall be struck by the theoretical,

---

1. Obviously some passages, such as some of those quoted above which deal with marriage and divorce, are plain in their meaning and objectionable to the most unprepared Christian reader; but two (for example) on which many of the attacks described above were based, II.223 and IV.16, would never have been noticed unless they had been interpreted. Itwas certainly by the selection of certain verses for concentrated attack that the gneral effect likely to be caused by the Qur'an was reversed.
2. A few authors commented on how Muslims observed their own laws. Ricoldo was the most explicit, but unfortunately he was in this, as in his view of their observance of natural virtues, himself self-contradictory. He denied that the Qur'anic law was observed; if the translated version is correct, he added, "as he who has had the experience of living among them knows". (Disp. XVII, Bibl. II. col.183; cf. MS. f. 183v.) On the other hand, he said, "Would that the Gospel were held in as much reverence among the Christians as the Qur'an is among the Muslims". (Ep. II; actually "Tartars and Saracens", an untypical usage for Saracen, since the Mongols are here by hypothesis Muslim.) This seems lkiely to refer to the moral observance of the laws taught by the two books. Tripoli (above) and Mandeville spoke of secret, and Verona of public, infringement of the law against drinking.
3. This account has ignored a very important subject, which, however, the West itself largely ignored - taqīyah. Although he was in the West and not in touch with the Shi'ah most closely associated with this doctrine, it is only San Pedro who refers tomit clearly. (S.S.M., I.iv.8; cf. I.i.69; cf. Q. XVI.106.)

and almost legalistic, character that it assumes. This draws attention to the inexactitude of the theoretical information so determinedly stated. In their assertions of Islamic jurisprudence Christian writers were perhaps more often wrong than right, yet it was characteristic that they insisted on specifying minutely, for example, the number of wives and concubines permitted, and the regulations governing divorce and remarriage. Of Muslim practices there was practically no detailed information available. Thus it was the number of wives allowed that was the focus of interest, rather than the number that Muslims mostly had; it was generally implied, with some simplicity, that they enjoyed in practice as many as they could by law. It was the permission for divorce which received attention, rather than its actual frequency; it was the very idea of a wife's legalised infidelity in the tahlīl, or of coitus interruptus and reservatus, or, in Spain, of the abuse of wives, rather than knowledge of the actual occurrence of these things, which gave such scandal. On the other hand, it seems to have been actual observation of the relative toleration extended to homosexuality by Islam that gave rise to exaggerated accounts of its being encouraged. Indignation has often been allowed to outstrip the facts. In any case, theory can never have been confirmed by direct access to educated Muslims, even in the rare case of writers who claimed

to have taken part in active discussion, for example, Ricoldo or Lull; or where there was a close knowledge of written sources and some personal contact with Islamic society - the Cluniac translators, Mark of Toledo, Ramon Marti, or San Pedro. It is the same with those who lived among or near to Muslims, Vitry, Tripoli or Fidenzio; and, more obviously, with the pilgrims, who often, however, exercised a more lively curiosity than the Latin residents in the East, sometimes with startling results. While we attribute this partly to lack of enterprise or of interest, we must remember the obvious impossibility of observing much of Islamic moral practice at first-hand. The life of the ḥarīm precluded any personal acquaintance with family life, and it is absurd to imagine any reliable, confidential discussion of such things between a Christian and a Muslim.[1]

The decisive influence in forming the Christian canon must have been the tendency of misconceptions to snowball, and to confirm as well as to add to each other. Once it was asserted that Islamic teaching was sexually lax, every example of laxity would be noticed from that moment, and, once noticed,

1. The ease with which different societies co-existing side by side can misunderstand each other is illustrated to-day by the conviction of oriental Christians that Muslims are lax and simultaneously of Muslims that Christians are so. Anyone who has both talked with oriental Christians and enjoyed the confidence of old-fashioned Muslims must be aware of this.

attributed to the doctrine. If we suppose that there were an equal number of similar offences among Christians and among Muslims, in the former case they would be seen as occurring in spite of doctrine, and every case would therefore be an exception. Moreover, if it were not a matter of seeking examples to prove a thesis, each would be less likely anyway to be noticed in the first place. When for some special reason it was convenient to show Islamic society or morals in a favourable light, it was allowed to appear that life was not greatly different in the various societies based on the two religions. We may almost say that what shocked the mediaeval was more the toleration than the commission of the sins in question.

The clerical point of view (and our authorities were almost all clerical) is less concerned with society as a whole, than with principles and with individuals. It is self-evident that in matters of principle the vital connession is toleration rather than encouragement; and those who have experience of individual souls generally associate a loss of Christian faith with the coarsening of private morals and with self-indulgence generally. It is not possible to exaggerate the horror that the clergy felt for a doctrine which, contrary to reason, either permitted or encouraged passion and gratification, things that men in any case would not give up "for any terrors

or tortures or even for human shame, which for many is harder than death."[1]

It is the fact that, in private morals, only subjects connected with unchastity aroused strong interest in Western writers. The use of force, which belongs largely to the public field, was the one other subject to receive comparable attention. Within the field of sex most mistakes seem to have been made in the direction of greater salacity. If the most sordid and nastiest explanation was usually preferred, this was not altogether without provocation. Christians had neither the training nor the disposition to estimate degrees of abomination among forbidden things. To them, restraints imposed by the Qur'an were genuinely negligible; they could conceive only Christianity or unlimited licence. Christian institutions were always seen to be the norm from which everything else was a deviation. A divorced wife who had made another marriage was still her first husband's wife. Into a world where institutions were stable and fixed, an element that was both capricious and disturbing was interposed by every consideration of Islamic morals. Perhaps this was chiefly a danger to the imagination. Yet though the moralist sometimes exaggerated Muslim virtue to shame Christian vice, it was true that Christians often practised what they believed Muhammad to have preached. It is easy to see why these matters had the fascination both of attraction and repulsion.

---

1. Ramon Marti, Capistr. Jud.

Chapter 20.

The Practice of Religion in Islam.

This chapter is concerned with the four "pillars" of Islam which are more strictly religious practices, and also with the profession of faith considered as an act of religion. Misunderstanding and, even more, lack of interest in this subject in Christian accounts mark a failure to perceive that religious stream which springs from the Qur'an and from which Islam draws its spiritual life. A negative image was often substituted for the truth.

1. Islamic reverence.

It is not that the authentic Islamic accent in religion was unfamiliar. It sometimes seems almost as if the phraseology of an alien piety were relished, but if so, it is very mildly. The seriousness, and perhaps the fervour, of Muslim devotion were known, but faintness of interest defined the limits of knowledge. There was some sense of the religious formulas with which Islam would speak of God and of holy persons. These penetrated chiefly from literary sources, the rare translations from Arabic. "They reject," said Pedro de Alfonso, "whatever is not consecrated in the name of God."[1] Those phrases which always strike Western ears as exotic occur in Mark's ibn Tūmart: " . . . It is said of ʿĀ'ishah (may God spare her) that she said: The Prophet of God (may

1. It is not clear from the context whether this author is referring to foods only or to all objects generally. In either case he is speaking of the basmala.

God accept and save him) . . ."[1] Ricoldo had been gratified at mention of the name of Christ by the expression "may he be praised".[2] The Arabic expressions are recognisable in Mark's Qur'anic paraphrases: "Adore the living God who created the Heavens and Earth, angels and men and all that are in them; do not adore gods who cannot do you good or harm you . . ."[3] The principal source of Qur'anic language was, of course, the Qur'an itself; Fitzralph, lacking any personal contact with Islam and using Ketton's translation two centuries after it was written, noticed the characteristic phrases without indicating that he found them in any way outlandish: "God, the clement and merciful, the living and most high, beside whom there is no other . . ."[4] The usual Mozarab translation of the basmala seems to have been <u>in nomine Dei misericordis miseratoris</u>; Ketton's <u>in nomine Domini pii et misericordis</u> was a deliberate stylistic "improvement".[5] Other translations also carried the authentic note of Islamic piety: Ketton's annotator's notes on the names of God[6] and the widely known

---

1. 'Aqidah. For his phrase "(Deus) . . . oretur pro Mafometo" and Ricoldo's "Deus <u>oret</u>", see above, p. 112, n.
2. Itin. XXVI
3. Pref. Q.
4. Arm., 10/11; Ket., az. V, Bibl. p. 21, ll. 26-7; Q. III.1. For <u>vivus</u> the printed text of Fitzralph has <u>unus</u>, which is wrong, but suggests an enlightened conception on the part of either copyist or printer. "Clement": <u>pius</u>.
5. Fatihah; see Q. I. i.; Ketton, see note, p. 554 below; compare for Mozarab practice Mark, Qur'an, MS. f. 1 r.; and the marginal alternatives to Ketton quoted below; (see also M. Th. d'Alverny, "Deux Traductions").
6. Cf. above, p. 168

letter of Ṣalāḥ ad-Dīn to the emperor: "In the name of God, the merciful (miserens), by the grace of the one God, the powerful, the victorious, the conqueror, the everlasting . . . We beseech him that he should pour his prayer over his prophets and especially over our instructor, his messenger, the Prophet Muhammad . . ."[1] Tripoli nearly expressed in a sentence the Islamic summary of belief, the Creator, the Day of Judgement, God's speaking through the prophets.[2] Sometimes, too, there was a use of phrases that were Islamic and that were self-consciously used as being thought Islamic; James of Acqui repeatedly referred only in an Islamic context to "the great God": gratia Dei magni, amicus Dei magni; the weight of invisible inverted commas can be felt. A similar phrase

---

1. e.g. St. Albans Chr., yr. 1188.
2. XLVIII; cf. Mandeville. Cf. also Lull's summary of the Muslim creed; this is genuinely Islamic in origin; cf. the Tratado segundo de los Articulos, que tudo buen Muslim esta obligado a creer y tener por Fe, quoted by Reland and translated by Morgan ("Mahometism Explained"). Lull's creed reads: Credere unum Deum (2) Creatorem, (3) Mahometum esse Prophetam, (4) Alcoram esse Legem a Deo datam, (5) Interrogare ab homine mortuo in sepulchro per Angelum, an Mahometus fuerit Propheta, (6) Quod morientur omnia, excepto Deo, (7) Resurrectionem, (8) Mahometum in die Judicii exaudiri, (9) Deo in Die Judicii reddere rationem, (10) Quod ponderabuntur Merita et Culpae, (11) Quod transibunt per viam, (12) Paradisum et Infernum. Lib. de gent., prol.

is "the messenger of the high God" used by Tripoli;[1] so is Verona's Deus celi.[2] Ricoldo, followed by Peter de Pennis, was singularly ungenerous in his abstract treatment of the Qur'an,[3] referring to "one whole sūrah in which he says nothing remarkable except that God is great, high, wise and lovely, and that his are all things which are in Heaven and on Earth and between them; that he judges justly; and at every phrase it repeats 'may he be praised' . . . "[4] Less than temperate in his theoretic dealings with Islam, he rendered to its practice that justice on which travellers in later ages would more often insist:[5]

> The Muslims indeed have the greatest reverence for the name of God, and for prophets and saints and holy places. It is especially their practice to do or say or write nothing important without beginningin the name of the Lord. So in all written things that they send each other they reverently write the name of God first, and for this reason they diligently see to it that no written thing is torn up or thrown down on the ground. However, if they do find on the ground a piece of paper that has been written on, they reverently pick it up and put it high up in cracks in walls, lest the name of God be trampled on. Whenever they come across the name of God,

---

1. VIII.
2. XI. The frequent Arabic use of the proviso "if God wills" did not strike the Middle Ages as forcefully as it has in later times. San Pedro thought its omission a poor explanation for delay in revelation; see above, p. 268
3. Cf. above, ch. 4 passim.
4. Disp., IV (MS. f. 164 r col. 1); P. de Pen., IV (MS. f.19 v)
5. It was usual for travellers to stress Islamic reverence and devotion, not only in recent times, but in the seventeenth century; in the Middle Ages experience was narrower and had a shorter history. (For examples of later travellers, see bibliography.)

> either reading or speaking, they never dare to pronounce it alone, but always with some word of praise, such as, "God, may he be praised" or some such. (1)

Rather more grudgingly, Lull spoke of the great devotion of Muslim preachers and congregations.[2]

2. Ritual and other worship.

It was in this context of dimly apprehended strangeness that the public profession of Islamic faith was considered. The shahādah was widely known and was quoted in different forms; the simplest, with slight variations, was the commonest: "Non est deus nisi Deus, Mahomad est nuncius Dei."[3] It was also quoted, in indirect speech especially, and in paraphrase.[4] It was the form of words, remarked Tripoli, which was used to make a Muslim, as was the baptismal formula to make a Christian.[5] It was best known as part of the adhān. The call to prayer seemed a highly significant and intolerable symbol. Roderick said that Muhammad instituted it after his conquest of Mecca, so that a Muslim would proclaim the call where it had been the custom that the bells should sound; and

---

1. Itin. XXVI.
2. Blanquerna, 88.
3. San Pedro, S.S.M., I. viii. 198; cf. Ric., Ttin., XXX; Disp., VIII, IX, XII; Tripoli, VIII.
4. Direct speech: Non est Deus praeter unum; indirect: Deum esse tantummodo . . . , Deum qui nullum aequalem vel similem habeat , . . , unum Deum sine compari . . . , nil aliud posse, nisi Deus . . . San Pedro, S.S.M., I. viii. 75; Pedro de Alfonso; Leg. Aur.; Benvenuto; Rod., Hist. Arab.; Clementinae, gloss (G. d'Andrea); Fitzralph, Arm., loc. cit.
5. Mandeville, in a passage apparently distinct from those passages that he took from Tripoli, spoke of the use of the Shahadah to receive a convert into Islam.

that this remained the custom of the Muslims.[1] He derived this statement from, or had earlier imparted it to, his protégé Mark, who also, by stressing the substitution of mu'adhdhin for bells, implied the substitution of Islam for Christianity in Arabia.[2] Within its own territory, on the other hand, Christendom would not tolerate the call to prayer. In the early fourteenth century a canon of the universal church forbade the Christian princes to allow this public profession of faith on their territories; that the name of Muhammad should be used in the course of calling the Muslims to prayer was said to be an offence against the divine name and a reproach to the Christian faith.[3] In the Latin States the adhan was apparently thought of as a proclamation of the law of Muhammad; Vitry used this phrase,[4] and the de expugnatione T.S. described the return of the Qubbat as-Ṣakhrah, known to

---

1. Hist. Arab., III.
2. Pref. Q. The bare contrast of mu'adhdhin for bells has, of course, been a commonplace of travellers' reportage, but it is rare in the mediaeval period. An unknown Englishman said that "five or six fellows" (ribaldi) made the call "to the three corners of the world, leaving out the East", "in place of bells" (Quidam Anglicus). The adhān is actually made facing the qiblah, i.e., in the direction of Mecca, the mu'adhdhin turning left and right at the phrase "come to prayer". The East could be omitted, therefore, only at a point East of Mecca, which is not possible in this case.
3. Clementinarum, lib. V, de Judaeis et Saracenis in Con. Vienn.
4. VI. He said that it was heard "everywhere at night".

Crusaders as the Temple of the Lord, to Islamic worship by "calling the law of Muhammad with horrible moanings and shouting Allāhu akbar, Allāhu akbar." This sounds like the ordinary adhān.[1] Among fourteenth century pilgrims, Verona only distinguished the repeated word "Allāh" ("quod idem est quod Deus"), but said that the call continued, "I bear witness that Muhammad was a great prophet of God". Here the phrase "I bear witness" is an accurate detail not mentioned by earlier or contemporary writers, although the other words are incorrect.[2] Simon Simeon saw only the external picture, at every mosque the high tower, like a campanile, the exterior gallery round it and "priests . . . like look-outs" who "at certain times" cried the praises of the Prophet, and stimulated the peoples to praise him. There was an impression of the sound - clamoribus vocibus - and this quite mistaken idea that both adhān and prayer were in praise of Muhammad. The best account is in Giovanni d'Andrea's gloss on the Clementine canons; he had it from a Frenchman who bad been a prisoner in Egypt.[3]

> . . . every mosque has . . . one minister who is called the mu'adhdhin, which means a crier, who supplies

---

1. In the text, Halla haucaber, Halla haucaber. The auditory effect of this transliteration is so true as to suggest a very good manuscript; it stresses and lengthens the first syllable of "akbar" just as to a non-Arabic listener it seems to be. "Moanings" (mugitus) no doubt expresses theological contempt conjoined to the difficulty in distinguishing the other words. Another version of the same event said that the "superstitions of his error were proclaimed from the four corners of the Temple with a great cry". (St. Albans, yr. 1187.)
2. Verona, XI.
3. Gloss at place cited.

> the want of bells. . . The office of this crier is this: at the times that I shall describe later he climbs the square tower of the mosque, which has a big window on each side, and at each one of these, blocking his ears with his fingers, so that his voice may carry more strongly, he cries aloud in his own language words which have this meaning: that there can be no other than God, and Muhammad is his messenger; come to make the prayer for the revelation of your sins. Then he adds, Lā ilāha illā Allāhu, which is to say, There is no conqueror other than God; these are the words that every soldier of the Muslims carries on his shield; and to this he adds: God is almighty.

Despite its mistakes, this is an intelligent description; the detail of the hands to the ears is misinterpreted but well observed.[1] It is evident that the observer had some feeling, as living in social isolation in Muslim surroundings he might be expected to have had, for the Muslim ritual. What is suggested by all these accounts is something that has been felt by some travellers at all times, that the public nature of the call to prayer makes it a great and solemn symbol of the unity of the Muslim community. It could not be distinguished from the prayer itself, which was the act of the whole quarter in which the mosque was situated, and no doubt it was therefore a "reproach to the Christian faith" and particularly unbearable, in the mind of the Christian church, where, as in Aragon, Muslims and Christians lived in the same quarter.

---

1. In the text, for mu'adhdhin, Muetdem. "The revelation of your sins" for al-falāḥ is wrong, but the whole phrase is not easily translated, as many different versions attest. In the text Legalip ille Halla (for La ilaha illa Allahu) is better than first sight supposes; if g and p are copyists' errors, it is not far out. "Victor" is a fiction of the author's; "omnipotens" for "akbar" is a not impossible translation. The final phrases have become transposed, doubtless in the memory of the observer.

Another Islamic formula which penetrated Western literature through and beyond the translations of the Qur'an was the fātiḥah. Different mediaeval translations have attracted the attention of historians.[1] The best of them is doubtless that cited by the annotator of Ketton's Qur'an: "In the name of God, the compassionate, the merciful. Thanks be to God, the Lord of the universe, the compassionate, the merciful, the Judge of the Day of Judgement. We pray to thee and we confide in thee; put us on the right way, the way of those that thou hast chosen, and not of those with whom thou art angry, or of the unfaithful."[2] In contrast, Ketton's, as usual, was too much a paraphrase, chiefly concerned with Latin style; in one word he was more accurate than the alternative in the gloss, just quoted: he had "erronei", those that are led astray, instead of "infideles".[3] The annotator explained that those on whom God's anger came were the Jews, and those that were led astray, the Christians. This was the Muslim tradition. It was the same writer who assessed the importance of the fātiḥah: "this first chapter is called for short the mother of the book, for the reason that the whole

---

1. M. Th. d'Alverny (loc. cit.) prints the textual and marginal versions from the Cluniac corpus, together with Mark's. Bibliander prints the two Cluniac translations. (See also the MSS. concerned.) Peers translates and refers to Lull's translation. ("Ramon Lull", p. 91) Ludolf's translation does not seem to have attracted attention. Its beginning and end recall Mark's strongly, but the inaccurate middle is certainly his own.
2. Bibl., p. 8 line 34 ff. MS., CCCD 184 p. 50 (left margin): Seld. Supra 31, f. 33 r (right margin).
3. Ibid.

Law draws its origin from it, as does our Law from the Lord's prayer; and it is the foundation, and the beginning and the height of all their prayers."[1] The versions of Lull, which he put into the mouth of a pious Muslim about to undertake an important work, and of Ludolf, are too free, and are incomplete.[2] The great interest in Lull's version is its context; it was with prayer that his Muslim approached a serious matter, and these were its customary words. This brings us to consider the ṣalāt, the ritual prayer proper, which is linked to the profession of faith by the adhān and the iqāmah.

It is striking that the preliminary ablutions impinged more heavily on the Latin mediaeval mind than did the prayer itself. The expectation that in Islam there would be little more than a parody of Christian practices, and some sort of false substitute for the sacraments, was not obviously fulfilled, and there was pre-disposition to recognise the sacrament of baptism in ablutions whose function was only dimly apprehended. Usually wild, in this Hildebert of Mans was not untypical of the Christian approach:

> Quare pollutis haec sit via prima salutis
> Ut post peccata quisque lavetur aqua . . .

Also early, a matter-of-fact, detailed statement passed into Western tradition from Pedro de Alfonso. He described the

---

1. Bibl. p. 224 col. 1 (ad Az. 1) MS. CCCD 184 p. 50 (top margin); Seld. Supra 31, f. 33 r (right margin). These MSS. do not have "as does our Law from the Lord's prayer".
2. Lull, Lib. de Gent., IV. IV.

parts of the body that Muslims wash before they pray "that they may have perfect cleanliness". He subjoined the classic Christian criticism: "the relevant thing for prayer is to be cleansed internally, not externally".[1] In this writer and in most after him there was a confusion of the ghusl with the wuḍū', and thus almost universally it was stated that all the body must be cleaned before the prayer, including the private members. This is true, but unless there had been an effusio seminis there would only be minor impurity, and therefore no need for major ablutions, which it is certainly not customary to perform at each time of prayer. The Annotator of Ketton, while sharing the confusion, realised something of the Islamic sense of the impurity which necessitated washing: "Et praecepta quaedam stulta, sicut post coitum et egestionem antequam orent, lavent culum, et cetera verenda".[2] There was considerable unnecessary emphasis on the washing of the verenda.

The theme that Muslims assert that washing in water is for the remission of sin was developed by Alan of Lille, who took his disproof, in appropriate terms, to the point of

1. A remarkable point in a Jew by upbringing was to argue, as this author did, that ritual washings were an effeminacy, and properly belonged to the worship of Venus; and therefore were appropriately prescribed by Muhammad. His statement was repeated ad litteram by the Legenda Aurea, and it constituted the opening passage of the extracts edited by the Anonymus Minorita, much of whose interest was devoted to questions of Islamic ritual and law.
2. Ad Az. 9. Bibl., pp. 224-5.

considerable detail.[1] It was unusual to mention the fact of washings as preliminary to prayer, as Mark did, without comment,[2] or almost with admiration, as Lull did in his description of a Muslim praying,[3] and Ricoldo did in his Itinerarium;[4] these were spontaneous reactions from observation rather than theoretical disquisitions. Most writers developed the themes already noted. The idea that this was a case of false baptism, or of imitation of baptism, was naturally closely associated with a reproof that penitence, or interior,

---

1. He thought it necessary to show that there was no remission of sins in water without invocation of the Trinity, an essential part of the form of baptism; that such remission could never be repeated (an argument used by others after him); that the baptism of John, which was not Christian baptism, was not for the remission of sins, and so on. None of this, of course, has any real relevance to Islamic religion. (IV. 9, 10.)
2. Pref. 6. Fr. Simon also made no comment except to say - erroneously - that purity was required in order to enter the mosque, instead of saying, in order to perform the ritual worship.
3. Lull's description is correct for the wudū', except that he mentions vaguely, after listing the parts actually washed, "and other members of the body". This suggests a description of what he had in fact seen, with the indeterminate addition in deference to written or other second-hand sources. (loc.cit.)
4. Ricoldo added that the "Hanefa" (Ḥanafites ? - This is not Hanafite doctrine. Neither, probably, is ḥunafā' relevant, nor the fact that ḥanīfi was the original name of the Muslims) had to wash in fifteen hundred rotuli of water, as being more perfect than the others; thus, he said, they needed a river. Further, "digitum in anum infigit, et si sentit aliquid fetoris, non est aptus ut oret, sed in fluvium revertitur, et hoc totiens fecit, infigendo digitum et ponendo ad nares, quousque nihil fetoris sentiat, et tunc est aptus orare." (Itin. XXIV). rotulus normally means a roll (register); can it here represent the Arabic ratl, which is not, however, a liquid measure ? Surely this quaint story represents a misunderstanding ?

not exterior, cleanliness, was really required; the Muslims were even corrected for having thought that baptism, not confession, was for remission of habitual sin.[1] In the light of this extreme example of interpretation in exclusively Christian terms, the curious stress upon the cleansing of genital organs should perhaps be understood to reflect the stress given to sexual sins among the enormities of Islam that were traditionally attacked.[2] Ricoldo's theoretical attitude, revealed by his Disputatio, was unoriginal, and he made the usual point that it was unreasonable to wash the body rather than the heart.[3] It was an indiscretion, typical of his poor discrimination between arguments, to add that it was even more irrational to substitute ablution in dust for ablution in water where water was lacking.[4] Acqui's "lavant genitalia sua, et homines et mulieres" strongly suggests ghusl post coitum; he accepted this as a genuine tribute to baptism, without condemning it. The strangest statement is

---

1. Cf. Alan, loc. cit.; Paris, al. scr.; Joinville, LXXXVIII; San Pedro, S.S.M., I. viii. 70; Marino, III. IV; Higden; Acqui. Lull, alone, spoke of wudū' as intended by Islam to symbolise the cleansing of the heart from original sin; more charitable, this is still purely Christian terminology. (loc. cit. In a story of Joinville's, Muslims expect to be absolved by water on their death-beds. (LXXVIII.) A good enunciation of the more general theme is Higden's; he specifies the copying of the Christian sacrament.
2. Pedro de Alfonso (quoted above); An. Min.; Leg. Aur.; Paris, al. scr.; San Pedro, S.S.M., I. viii. 70; other authors cited in text and notes.
3. His details are correct, except for the usual insistence on washing the testicles. He did not here repeat his own story from the Itinerarium.
4. Disp., VIII.

Verona's:

> . . . wherever they are, whether in the mosque, or the field, or on a journey, before the prayer they observe this most shameful instruction which he gave them: for first they wash the hands, then the feet, then the face, and after, virilia sua et membrum genitale, and this they do in the presence of all, and in no other way will they pray, without first performing this enormous washing, which is abominable in nature and in every law . . . (1)

He quoted Noe's drunken nakedness; it was out of contempt for Christian baptism that Muhammad made this law. The emphasis in so many writers on the washing of the whole body culminates in Verona's assertion, which is quite extraordinary in a man who had made the pilgrimage to Jerusalem under Muslim rule, and who must often have seen the prayer of individuals away from mosques - unless he regularly averted his eyes. The sermonising about internal cleanness was probably inevitable, particularly as there is relatively little Christian ritual of impurity and cleansing.[2] This subject reveals some familiar aspects of the Christian legend of Islam, for example, interpretation in Christian terms and unwillingness to consider the actual intentions of Islam, and, finally, indignant and horrified scandalisation at a fiction of the Christians' own making.

---

1. op. cit., XI.
2. On the other hand, the lavabo of the Roman Mass and other Latin rites was very familiar to most of the writers concerned; a large proportion will have used the Dominican rite, in which it is, of course, included.

The ritual worship itself was interesting to some writers as another contrivance betwixt and between the Jewish and the Christian; Pedro de Alfonso pointed out that prayer five times a day was the mean of the Jews' three and the Christian seven.[1] Acqui thought that there seven times of prayer in the day, but he was right to specify the mid-day hour as "post meridiei recessum", where Verona wrongly had "at noon", unaware how scrupulously Islam had avoided any semblance of solar worship. The informant of Giovanni d'Andrea was the most detailed. He said that the first prayer at dawn was called ṣalāt as-subḥ, meaning morning prayer.[2] The second was at terce, the third at vespers, the fourth at compline and the fifth at twilight, "which in their language is called in darkness".[3] That the prayer began with the fātiḥah the Annotator had pointed out - it was "the beginning and the end of all their prayers".[4] We have also already noted Lull's description of the Muslim who begins his work with prayer; it

---

1. Followed by Marino. (loc. cit.)
2. Text, Zalarazobh. The commentator suggests that this word may explain the description of the mu'adhdhin (in the Clementinae) as "commonly called Zabazala" (sacerdotes eorum Zabazala vulgariter nuncupati . . . nomen Mahometi . . . alta voce invocant).
3. Loc. cit. Ṣalāt al-'Ishā', i.e., at nightfall. The fourth prayer (counting, as here, Christian fashion; Muslim fashion, the first, or sunset prayer = in completorio) "quae resonet in coenam".
4. ~~See p.~~ Bibl. p. 224, MS. CCC. D. 184, p. 50, left margin.

is a whole rak'ah that in fact Lull very loosely described:

> After this, laying his head to the earth and in a kneeling position kissing the earth, he three times rested his head upon it, and raising his heart and his eyes to Heaven, he said these words, In the name of the most high, the merciful Creator . . . (1)

The only part of the prayer that he could quote was the fātiḥah. On this evidence he had seen, but not discussed the ṣalāt with a Muslim; yet the ritual was less well observed by others.[2] In many minds there must have been still vaguer concepts; the recurrent reference (especially in Crusading chronicles) to Muhammad's being "adored" in the mosques probably means that the prayer was thought to be primarily an offering to the Prophet of the worship that Christians give to saints; we have noticed Friar Simon's speaking of the prayer as consisting in the praises of Muhammad. Even Mark of Toledo repeated an assertion that in mosques which had once been churches, now "wicked men devote supplications to the execrable Muhammad".[3]

Vitry described what is evidently communal, not individual, ṣalāt. He confused the adhān with the iqāmah, and

---

1. "Kissing": the forehead, not the mouth, touches the earth. The raising of hands and eyes to Heaven is the interpretation given to the ritual by the Christian observer; it is not Islamic. Lull used it to defend the use of images, since God is actually present in neither crucifix nor sky, and therefore both Christians and Muslims pray to God through images. (loc. cit.)
2. It is remarkable how, among travellers of much later periods also, vague accounts vastly exceed those with a claim to exactitude. For the number of prayer times in the day, cf. also Muhammad's bargaining with God, in the mi'rāj, to reduce the number to five. This theme was specially popular in Spanish sources. Rod., Hist. Arab., V; San Pedro, S.S.M., I. viii. 76 ff., and C.F.M., I. 2, 3 and V. 1 ff.; Cf. Cerulli, pp. 265. 302; Liber Scalae, cap. L.
3. Pref. Q.

both with the prayer proper and with the ceremonies preceding the khuṭbah, and had no very clear idea of any of these; yet his idea of the prayer was congregational, and thus perceived an important point which generally escaped Christian notice. He said that the mu'adhdhin proclaimed "in the ears of all" that Muhammad's law is holy and just, and that he is the highest prophet sent by God; "all the others in response affirm it to be so; and this they believe to be enough for them for salvation."[1] Varagine in the Golden Legend and Benvenuto both began their accounts of the adhān, already quoted, "when they pray, they profess . . . " (orantes profitentur), and in their minds, as in Vitry's, was the close association of the profession of faith and the prayer.[2] Ricoldo had understood better what happened in the mosque. "When they assemble for preaching, and in order that the Law may be explained to them, the Khaṭib, whose duty it is to hold forth, first bares the sword, and he holds it in the hand while he preaches, or else puts it in a prominent place, in order to frighten."[3] The fault here is to dissociate the khuṭbah and the prayer, although the sermon is integral to

1. VI. The khuṭbah is the address or sermon which takes place at the Friday prayer. The adhān is the call to prayer made from the minaret. The iqāmah is the repetition of the call within the mosque. Vitry's mention of congregational response suggests responses made at the khuṭbah; this is certainly not a case of intimate observation.
2. Varagine and Benvenuto are not likely to have heard the adhan themselves.
3. Disp., X; MS. f. 174 r col. 1; cf. P. de Pen., IX, f.36 r. Khatib: magister Saracenorum.

the Friday prayer; at the same time the detail strongly suggests personal observation. The fact is that, though the prayer in unison in the mosque is characteristic of Islamic communal devotion, this was not understood by the Latins, who were never present at the prayer.

Even the fact that there was a special communal prayer, intended to bring together, not small groups, but the whole people, the Friday prayer when the entire Muslim community attended the same mosque, was barely known and rarely appreciated. That Muhammad had addressed the assembly of his own people was occasionally referred to, but not in this connection; it was not realised that this was the origin of the Friday prayer.[1] Only the superficial facts were understood, and they were more often misunderstood, and even elaborately embroidered. To the Latins the salient point about the Friday prayer was often that Friday was the day once sacred to Venus, and in this view the Muslims had once worshipped her and still treated her day as holy, or even still worshipped her on that day; or, more simply, it was said that it was appropriate that the religion which chiefly served venery should celebrate the day of Venus.[2] There was less fantastic explanation too;

---

1. Cf. above, p.396
2. Alv. de leg., XX/19.x; Leg. Aur.; San Pedro, S.S.M., I. viii. 65; Higden (an important passage); Ludolf; P. de Pen., I f. 16 r.; cf. Vitry, loc. cit.; Lull, Hamar, sig. 2.

both Lull and Verona said that Friday was chosen because that was the day that Adam was created; also because it was the day of Abraham's sacrifice, said Verona; also because it was the day when man entered Paradise, said Lull;[1] but he added that Christians reject it because it is the day of the first sin and the loss of Paradise, as well as of the Passion.[2] The way that Friday was observed was most often obscured.[3] It was usual to treat it as nothing more than, and in no way different from, the obvious parallel of the Christian Lord's Day and the Jewish sabbath, which are more closely related to each other than either is to the Muslim Friday; this was yet another case of false parallels hiding true differences. In some cases Friday was simply spoken of as "celebrated". San Pedro, however, said with greater truth that "Muhammad established that the Muslims pray in a special way" on that day,[4] and Lull criticised Muslims for the shortness of their prayer, only for one hour on Friday.[5] James of Acqui was quite wrong to say that the Muslims do not work, but feast, on Friday; James of Verona, however, had noted what actually happened with exceptional accuracy: " . . . they work every day of the week (continuis diebus), but they have a great

---

1. These arguments are Islamic in origin.
2. Lull, Contemp. D., 257; Hamar, sig. 2; Verona, X, XI.
3. Cf. Vitry, VI; Leg. Aur.; Ludolf; Higden; Acqui; P. de Pen., loc. cit.
4. S.S.M., I. viii. 65.
5. Hamar, loc. cit.

devotion for the day of Venus . . . and on that day . . . they close their shops, and all go to their mosques to pray, and stay there for one or two hours, and afterwards return to their work."[1] Friar Simon spoke of the extraordinary care with which the city of Alexandria was policed during the hour of prayer, and remarked on the curfew imposed for that hour on the Christians. He was scandalised because after the prayer some men hurried back to their businesses;[2] others, however, went more properly to the cemeteries to pray for the dead. Others, again, never went to the prayer at all. Lull also disliked the return to work.[3] Only in some passages is there any suggestion of the almost urban character of the Friday worship, of the absence of festivity, of the alternation of business and prayer, and of the functioning of an expressly Muslim community. Missionaries set on self-immolation frequently chose the Friday worship (or the ʿīd worship at the Friday mosque) as the most public occasion in Islamic life, a time of assembly of the citizens, on which to denounce Islam.[4]

Observation of praying Muslims often suggested a Christian parallel rather than a Christian contrast, and there was thought to be a connection between the ṣalāt and Christian monachism, just as there was between the ordinary dress of

---

1. Loc. cit.
2. " . . . velut canes ad vomitum ad opera servilia . . ."
3. Loc. cit.
4. Cf. above, p. 444 - p. 447

Muslims and the monastic habit. San Pedro said that under the secret influence of his monk adviser "Muhammad taught his people by what devout and ordered method they should pray, and should most often kneel; all which things the Muslims most punctiliously observe, as though they were monks; in other things, however, they observe monachism very badly indeed . ."[1] The theme was surprisingly well known. "Ad similitudinem monachorum multum ornate valde orant", said Peter de Pennis; the copyist, surely, mistaking "ordinate".[2] Ludolf, too, spoke of their genuflexions like those of monks; Higden said only that Muhammad taught them to pray with many genuflexions; and the French prisoner quoted by Giovanni d'Andrea in his Clementine gloss remarked that "at each of these hours the Muslims make certain genuflections, as we do at evening in praise of the Virgin".

It may already have appeared that it was not only the ritual acts, but the interior devotion of Muslim prayer, which willy-nilly impressed not only the ingenuous pilgrim but even the professional critic. The anonymous Englishman said: "Wherever they are on earth, at certain hours of the day with bended knee and prostrated to the earth they adore God devoutly".[3] This note of ubiquity has already been remarked;

1. S.S.M., I. viii. 69.
2. I. f. 15 v.
3. Quid. Angl.

Mark, too, said that the prayer was to be "in the mosque or at home".[1] San Pedro remarked contradictions in the ḥadīth relating to devotion, as that Muhammad had said that three things, a woman, an ass and a dog, interrupted the prayer; and yet that it was of such virtue that not even Satan could hinder it.[2] But this was theoretic criticism. In Lull's romance Blanquerna, the Pope's Arabic secretary told him that as one of "heathen birth" he was familiar with how at sermons Muslims weep, because they "preach of devotion and of considerations upon the glory of Paradise and the pains of Hell . . ."[3] The most remarkable testimony was Ricoldo's:

> And what indeed shall I say of their prayer ? So great is their scruple in prayer, and so great their devotion, that I was astonished when I saw and proved it by experience. For three months and a half I travelled with and accompanied Muslim camel-men in the Arabian and Persian desert, nor once did the camel-men break up for any danger, without praying at the set hours both by day and by night, and especially morning and evening. They claim such devotion in prayer as to dismiss all other things utterly . . . (4)

He described, too, the early training in reverent behaviour in mosques that the children were given, squatting on their heels.[5] This is not the witness of a philarab.

On a technical point it was taken for granted that the Prophet had adopted a contrary-minded attitude to Christian and Jewish practice: the choice of qiblah, of the direction of prayer. Roderick, in a confused version of a Muslim

---

1. Pref. Q.
2. S.S.M., I. iv. 1.
3. Blanquerna, XCIII; cf. LXXXVIII.
4. Itin. XXIV.
5. Ibid., XXVI.

tradition, spoke, quite mistakenly, of Muhammad's teaching the direction of Mecca independently of his preaching Islam.[1] This contrasts with the almost universal statement of those who mentioned the subject that the qiblah was to the South.[2] This was nearly always ascribed to the attempt to be different from, while still copying, the Jews (supposed to face West) and Christians (who faced East).[3] Higden said that the qiblah was chosen because "there is plenitude of light" to the South, which is explained by Verona, who said that it was because God would judge in the South, and was to be worshipped in the light of noon.[4] This conflicts flatly with Islamic avoidance of apparent sun worship at sunrise, noon and sunset; a point on which the general ignorance is quite remarkable.

---

1. See above, p. 266
2. Viterbo; Paris; Higden; Quid. Angl.; Acqui; Verona, X, XI; P. de Pen. I. MS. f 16 r.; Leg. Aur. Vitry, VI; San Pedro, S.S.M. I. viii. 69; Benvenuto. Rod., (Hist. Arab. II, Cron. de Esp. CXI) however, was right in saying that the Ka^{c}bah was the qiblah, though wrong about its institution. Cerulli bases an argument that Viterbo's source was Syrian on his statement that the qiblah was South. In many writers there was copying without thinking, but Viterbo's date is so early that he must be close to the original source, and this is at least likely to be Syrian (as Cerulli says) or, perhaps, Egyptian. It is customary with only approximate accuracy to describe the qiblah as South in Egypt (cf. Lane, Manners)and it is obviously so in Syria. It is very curious that San Pedro, in Spain, should also have said South; he may have preferred a Syrian written source to his own observation.
3. Vitry, VI; Leg. Aur.; San Pedro, S.S.M., I. viii. 69; Benvenuto. Strictly, the places where a Muslim (who actually faces Mecca) faces South, where at the same time a Jew (who actually faces Jerusalem) faces West, are few; the only such ever regularly inhabited by Latins must surely be Oultrejourdain a fief unlikely so profoundly to have affected Christian literature.
4. Loc. cit.

It is remarkable, too, how mention of the reading aloud of the Qur'an was scanty, considering the importance of readings of the Qur'an in the life of a Muslim city. Possibly it was of this that one author was thinking when he contrasted Christian psalmody with the abhominabilis melodia of Islam.[1] Mark translated the word Qur'an as lectionarius and Ketton before him had started to number the earlier surahs according to the divisions used for reading.[2] San Pedro alone was explicit, and then incidentally, in an unimportant matter: the Muslims read the story of the rehabilitation of ʿĀ'ishah in their Lent, as Christians in theirs do that of Susanna.[3] The reverence with which the Qur'an was taught is beautifully described by Ricoldo and Lull, both authors who had contemptuously insisted on the extrusion of all teaching of philosophy in Islam, for the better safeguarding of the Qur'an.[4] In one of Lull's fictional debates, one of his favourite characters, an imaginary good and earnest pagan seeking truth, approached a Muslim:

> The Tartar found the Muslim reading the Qur'an to his students, and, saluting him and the students, he was going

---

1. Galvano de Levanto, de recup. T.S., R.O.L., vol.vi, 1898.
2. Mark, Pref. Q.; Ket., for sūrah divisions, Bibl.pp.13-49 (Azoara XVI = surah VI). The MSS. diverge at azoara XVII: MS. XVII = Bibl. XVII and XVIII; XVIII = XIX, etc. Mark divided the second sūrah - but that only - in this way. Thus, Ketton Az. III = Mark, cap. II (he does not count the fātiḥah) = Q., II. 199.
3. S.S.M., I. ii. 2.
4. Above, p. 114ff.

> to tell them the cause of his coming, only the Muslim spoke to him first, and said: I ask you if you will not mind waiting until I have brought this reading to an end; and immediately the one fell silent, and the other in fact began again the interrupted reading. (1)

What was so much appreciated was a certain seemliness and dignity which have always marked the places of study and worship in Islam. This applied to the ordinary mosques. Lull would have liked actually to copy the segregation of sexes[2] and Giovanni d'Andrea, in his Clementine gloss, remarked on the same thing with favour, and also on the way people entered a mosque with bare, washed feet, "et cum certa devotione".[3] Friar Simon remarked how "cleanly and really reverently" mosques were kept. It was understood that for Christians to enter a mosque was considered a serious defilement. Ricoldo did justice also to the ordinary reverent treatment of mosques, where men were barefoot and there was no spitting. Of the schools, however, he spoke more elaborately, and named the two great foundations in Baghdad, the Niẓāmīyyah and the Mustanṣirīyyah. He admired the provision of board and lodging for provincial students from public funds, and he admired, too, the monastic spirit of these foundations, the austerity of a bread and water diet, the students themselves who "content with these, in the greatest poverty pursue contemplation and study". He was convinced that the Qur'an was despised by those Muslims who followed philosophical studies which the caliphal government had, for that very reason, forbidden; and even that

---

1. Lib. Tart., de T. et S.
2. Blanquerna, LXXI.
3. Loc. cit.

the learned Muslims derided secretly the Qur'an in which publicly they professed their faith. In spite of all this he did justice to the atmosphere of learning:

> But in their common schools, where the Qur'an is expounded . . . they never enter, except barefoot. Therefore the master who expounds, as much as the pupils who listen, leave their shoes outside, and go into the schools barefoot; and there they read and dispute with the greatest gentleness and moderation. (1)

There was only a very occasional perception of the Islamic virtues, propriety, moderation and learning; a sometimes more, sometimes less grudging admission of the popular strength of Muslim devotion, and some appreciation, in a dim form, of the details of Islamic ritual worship were commoner. Apart from these, the realities of the Muslim religious scene are only distantly represented by these writers. They naturally knew very little about Muslim worship, which does not tolerate the attendance of non-Muslims; but in this instance they invented relatively few legends in place of missing facts. The prayer of individuals, which many writers had had daily opportunity to watch, was scarcely better known than the prayer in the mosque. There was so little curiosity, although there was generally a marked taste for the fantastic and the scandalous. In detail much was discoloured by the interpretation of Islam in the light of Christian practices. Facts were ignored, such as those relating to the Friday prayer

---

1. Itin., XXIII; cf. Disp. XIII; P. de Pen., II, f. 17 v.

and the qiblah, because it was taken for granted that these were indistinguishable replicas of Christian models; in the imaginary pseudo-baptism there was a forced misinterpretation of the facts; there was some invention of "facts", as over the details of the ablution. Christian comparisons always shadowed every point considered, the equation of the hours of salat with those of the Christian office, the absence of sacrifice and sacrament. Any reasoned contrast, over a large field, between Christian and Muslim ritual was, however, wholly lacking; there was a very limited interest. It may be that a subject which could scarcely be brought to show Islam in a disgraceful light, which even led to praise of Muslims, was ungrateful to the mediaeval writer, and he may have thought it unprofitable to his public.

3. Shī'ah Islam.

Between the fall of the Fāṭimids in Egypt and the rise of the Ṣafawis in Persia there was no state professing Shī'ah principles to attract the notice of Christians. Ḥaṣṣan, Ḥusain and the drama of Karbalā', were unknown. Pedro de Alfonso had wild, confused ideas, natural in the Sunni society of the maghrib, Africa and Spain, which those who exploited his material ignored. It has been pointed out[1]

---

1. Donaldson, The Shi'ite Religion.

that it was in heterodox, Ismāʿīli form that the Crusaders knew Shīʿism: the Assassins, who greatly intrigued them, and who have enjoyed a tremendous legend in Western literature;[1] and, less extreme, the Fāṭimids. Both were powers affecting policy in the Latin States. It is not possible here to consider the wide question of Latin treatment of Ismāʿīli religion. William of Tyre described the foundation of the Fāṭimid dynasty, quoting the descent of ʿUbaydullāh correctly, except for large omissions;[2] and Vitry described its extinction.[3] Neither knew much about the religious character of Shi ism. William thought that al-Mahdi (as ʿUbaydullāh's title) meant complanans, the Leveller,"he who directed all things to quiet, and without trouble made the ways level for the people".[4] William and those who copied him quoted the idea that ʿAlī had been intended by God to receive the message which Gabriel by error gave to Muhammad; this is an extreme view which most Shīʿah would consider heterodox.[5] Vitry was aware that religious differences existed, but without being definite he exaggerated them: ʿAlī and his followers had taught "other rites and other institutions and another mode

---

1. Cf. The Talisman, for this legend, as for Saladin's.
2. "Abdalla, Mehemet" (then omits doubtful ancestors and, more seriously revealing confusion, Ismāʿil) "Japhar, Mehemet, Hali, Hussen, Hali major"
3. Will. Tyr., XIX. XX;cf. I. IV; Vitry, VIII.
4. al-Mahdi: should be, the guided one.
5. Will. Tyr., loc. cit.; cf. Oliver, Hist. Reg.

of praying" than Muhammad's.[1] Joinville, who was particularly confused, supposed ʿAlī to have been Muhammad's uncle and despised by him, and to have taught another religion.[2] Tripoli, however, although he was interested in the caliphate, treated it solely as a political institution so far as the existence of rival caliphs was concerned: the Fāṭimid caliphate was suppressed by Ṣalāh ad-Dīn for reasons of state.[3]

Essentially, Shīʿism seems to have been thought of as a schism simply, even though one of implacable hatred; ʿAlī was its anti-prophet, as Oliver of Paderborn's simplified version of William of Tyre's citation of Shīʿah doctrine brings out.[4] Shīʿah forms of religious expression were quite unknown. So was quasi-orthodox, or moderate, Jaʿfari Shīʿah Islam, either as a temperate, respectable form of religious practice, or as the religion of the oppressed that it has often been in the course of history. This may be hinted at by Ricoldo, who knew Iraq and passed through Sāmarrah, where, of course, he was told that quidam filius Ahali, i.e. the Mahdi (the twelfth Imam) would return and where he heard of the mule, held ready harnessed on Fridays in expectation of the Mahdi's coming. He said, "some Muslims follow Muhammad, and they are

---

1. Loc. cit.
2. XC.
3. XIV. In the chapter dealing with the caliphate as a religious institution, the existence of caliphs other than at Baghdad is not mentioned. (XI).
4. Hist. Reg. 56.

many; and some follow ʿAlī, and are fewer and less evil, and say that Muhammad by tyrannical power usurped what was ʿAlī's."[1]

4. Muslim treatment of churches and images.

It is interesting to consider the fluctuations of the Christian legend of Muslim treatment of churches. There was some confusion about the Qubbat as-Ṣakhrah, which, as Templum Domini, was thought to have been, and during the period of Christian rule in Jerusalem became, a Christian church. Vitry thought that Muslims held the Temple of the Lord to be sacred because they held Jesus to be sacred: "also in many places they honour the churches of Blessed Mary the Virgin"; equally the site of the burning bush, but not, he did realise, Calvary or the Holy Sepulchre.[2] For him, the Islamic

---

1. Itin. XVIII; Disp. XIII; P. de Pen. 17 r/v.
2. VI. The actual facts were known to some but ignored by most. William of Tyre gave an admirably clear statement of the erection of the Dome of the Rock, the designation of funds and the convocation of craftsmen, and also of the ornamentation and the inscription in mosaic which dated it. (I. II) Sigebert, at a very early date, had spoken, with some legendary detail, of the building of the Dome by (he thought) Umar.(yr. 644) Cf. Marino, III. I. In spite of this knowledge that only the site belonged to the Temple, the Dome continued to be considered a Christian monument. It is superfluous to stress here so well-known a fact as the extraordinary importance given to the Temple throughout the different periods of Crusade: as a popular song put it, one of the principal objects was templum Dei adquirere. (du Méril, poés. pop. lat. ant. au XIIe. s., p. 298.) Cf. Fulcher, 1.1.29 and R.O.L., vol. 8, 1900-01, Ch. Kohler, Un Sermon etc.

Writers who were less well-informed than those quoted above knew that Christians were not admitted to the Temple when it was in Muslim hands; Malmesbury puts this forward as a grievance when he is speaking of the First Crusade, and seems to think that Christians were excluded lest they see the "idol" of Muhammad erected there. (No Christian writer /

(note continued on next page)

treatment of churches was related to the development of Christian themes in the Qur'an. This was also the spirit in which were described the Muslim divines who so lovingly handled the manuscript Gospels, Missus est angelus . . [1] There were other stories of Muslims honouring holy things and places of the Christians. There is the story of the Damascene ruler who had fallen blind in one remaining eye; he went to the shrine of a miraculous image and "entered the oratory and, although he was a heathen, had faith in the Lord, that his health would be restored by the image of his Mother". Such behaviour is quite probable, although contrary to the spirit and the letter of Islam.[2] Falling down, "he prayed prostrate a

---

Note continued from preceding page:-
purported to tell of the overthrow of the idol when the "Temple" was consecrated to Christian use.) After the fall of Latin Jerusalem, it was a grievance that Christian pilgrims, as unbelievers and unclean, were not admitted to the Qubbat as-Sakhrah. (Oliver, Ep. Sal.) We have seen above how it was a crime of Frederick II's to have agreed that Islam might continue to hold this shrine (p.431). The most remarkable fact of all, perhaps, was the failure to realise why the "Temple" was sacred to Muslims. Even Vitry, who was well-placed to know better, was quite mistaken. He spoke of the ancient tradition of the sanctity of the Rock, but in one place he said that it was sanctified for Muslims by the Gospel story, in another that they brought an imago of Muhammad there to worship secretly. This may only imply veneration as given to saints; idolum is avoided. What is needed is a modern study of Vitry's sources. (VI and LXII, misnumbered in Bongars.)

1. Hist. Dam.
2. In our own day superstitious Muslims are alleged to resort to the shrine of St. Teresa of Lisieux in Cairo; and to the Maronite tomb of Sharbel at Anaya in Lebanon. In a Muslim actions normal for Christians must necessarily in some cases be superstitious. Cf. Hasluck, Ch.VI, and Lane, Manners, Ch. X. (Everyman, p.241).

long time. When he rose up from prayer he saw the fire burning in the lamp which hung before the image of Mary the Mother of God . . ."[1] Particularly interesting is the association in this episode of the enemy who is a good enemy because he seems to admit the Christian faith, with that language of orthodoxy (genetrix Dei) which is most alien, both objectionable and incomprehensible, to the Muslim. On the whole, Latins were surprised by the presence of Muslims in their shrines. They were not (as people are where different religions are tolerated) familiar with the willingness of each sect to seek a cure at the shrines of all. We notice that there seemed to the Western Latin hagiographer to be something specially wonderful about two Muslim women cured of a fever at the tomb of a holy Dominican.[2] There was failure to realise that a request for baptism might fall into the same category; Caesarius tells the story of how the Bishop of Beauvais, in his captivity after Damietta, baptised a young man, a sick Muslim, who had dreamed that baptism would cure him. He was cured, and the smiles of the Muslims standing around turned to wonder. The author piously - and pathetically - hoped that the youth persevered in his faith; the purely superstitious significance which, in perfectly good faith, a Muslim would see in the ceremony can never have occurred to him.[3] Vitry, however, understood what was happening; Muslims, he said, had

1. St. Albans Chr., yr. 1204.
2. M.O.F.P.H., vol. I, p. 296.
3. X. XLIII.

their children baptised, not from faith, but in superstitious hope of longer life or of cure from illness.[1] Also alien to the Latin conception was Islamic generosity to Christian churches. Several writers of different periods remarked on the economic support traditionally given by the Egyptian sultans to the Greek monastery on Mount Sinai.[2]

This subject was most often considered as a matter of profanation; there was, in particular, resentment for the use of churches as mosques. For Mark of Toledo, for example, this was connected with the Conquest of Spain: where "formerly many priests offered the divine obsequy to God, now villainous men devoted supplications to the execrable Muhammad, and churches which had once been consecrated by the hands of bishops were now reduced to profane temples".[3] Humbert spoke in a way which leads ludicrously to anticlimax; with his own eyes, he tells us, giving us to expect some horrible sacrilege, he has seen, not, it turns out, the atrocity itself, or any evidence of the atrocity, but only the scene where it was alleged to have been committed. "These filthy Muslims," he said, "polluted and profaned not only the Temple of the Lord, but even the Sepulchre of the Lord, and all the holy places in that region, and innumerable holy churches dedicated to the

---

1. VI.
2. Tripoli, XXI; Ludolf; Angelo da Spoleto, Gol., vol. iii.
3. Pref. Q. It will already be clear that this does not imply that Mark supposed Muhammad to be prayed to as a deity; the very mention of his name in prayer was sufficient offence. Cf. Clementinae, cited above.

cult of the living God and of our Lord Jesus Christ. I myself with my own eyes saw the holy chapel, in which the Muslims who were on their way to the lord Frederick (II) quartered themselves; and it was said as certain (pro certo) that they lay there at night with women before the crucifix . . ."[1] This is bad-tempered and irresponsible and implies much more than it asserts; it was calculated to provoke the outbreak of war, and was intended for the eyes of the Fathers of the Council at Lyons. What is significant is the state of mind which encouraged the repetition of these stories. Profanation in the angry last stages of the Latin States produced strong feeling. The tendency was already sharp as early as the loss of the"Temple of the Lord" in 1187; we have seen why the loss of this site was specially resented. The accounts of its restoration to Muslim worship and of the ceremonies of cleansing it, and also - rather less stressed - of the profanation of true Christian shrines in the city, marked a bitterness on the Christian side which the thought of past profanation of mosques was not enough to temper.[2] This was a question which varied according to the accidents of warfare and local and temporary ill-feeling on either side.

It must be remembered that the Christian feeling for mosques was at least equally intolerant. They were apt to be

---

1. Op. Trip. I. VII.
2. Note Fidenzio's comments: sometimes churches were destroyed, sometimes used as mosques; these are very similar to Ricoldo's. (Fid., XVII; Ric., Ep., passim).

described by a commentator not particularly extreme as "synagogues of Satan",[1] and the mere presence of one - itself idolum abominationis[2] - desecrated the holy mountain Sinai. "The Temple of the Lord" had been turned from Muslim to Christian worship at the first capture of Jerusalem. There was nothing remarkable in referring, as Walter of Coventry does, to the conversion of fana Maumeti into churches.[3] A really noteworthy episode is recorded by the Gestes des Chiprois, which asserts that when the Prince of Antioch and the King of Armenia, in conjunction with Hulagu, took Damascus in 1258, Mass was sung and bells were rung in the Ummayad mosque, which originally had been a church"of the Greeks",[4] pour despit des Sarazins et pour lor honte; in"the other mosques of Muhammad, there where the Muslims worshipped" the Prince had chargers and donkeys brought in, the walls splashed with wine and anointed with fresh and salted pork fat, and he ordered his men to make excrement and "they made ten (heaps)".[5]

The closely related question of images was not only exacerbated by the bitter last stages of Crusading warfare in Syria; it was at all times an offence to the pious Muslim. Even when effective warfare had somewhat subsided, the

---

1. Simon Simeon.
2. Antonio de' Reboldi, Itin. ad montem Sinai, Gol.,vol. iii. 3. p. 333.
4. This was exact, although the Greek Christians had been compensated; it was a case of compulsory purchase.
5. A.O.L., vol.V; yr. 1258.

exhibition of images and holy medals might give rise to a threat of riot, as happened to Friar Simon at the Alexandrian customs house. In consequence, this was at all times felt to be a serious reproach that needed to be refuted. Christian worship of images, and of three gods, were associated, said the marginal annotation to Ketton.[1] Usually Christians reacted more sharply than this to the Islamic objection. Alan was the first to take the question at length. In his usual delusion that the same arguments could be aimed at Jews and Muslims, he imagined that the placing of images of cherubim in the Temple would impress the latter. The classic form of argument was "that men may be attracted though the things they see to invisible things, that through the symbols they may venerate what is symbolised; for, as written things are the letters of the clergy, so are pictures those of the laity."[2] This attitude, opposing rationalist to revealed religion, was defensive. The worship of saints themselves was associated with that of images; Alan carefully explained the difference between latria and dulia. In all this part of his argument he was followed by Oliver of Paderborn.[3] Ramón Marti did not add much to the Christian case, but it is interesting that so discriminating and so learned a

1. Ad. az. 1; Bibl. p. 224, col.2; MS. CCCD. 184, p. 50., right margin (high); MS. Seld. Supra 31, foot of margin at left
2. IV. 12.
3. Ep. Sal.

controversialist should have thought it advisable to contradict at length the accusation that Christians worshipped Mary, the Cross and images of Mary and the saints "as God".[1] Similarly, it was necessary in San Pedro's experience that the matter should be taken separately and dealt with, however indignantly, with care.[2] Raymund of Peñafort considered that the vindication of the Latin practice, the dispelling of misapprehension, was an important function of the Christian missionary.[3] The learned traveller and bishop, Giovanni de' Marignolli, explained, almost with sympathy, how all the orientals opposed the Latin beliefs, not only Jews, Tartars and Muslims, but also Christians, who venerated icons (picturas) but abominated carvings.[4] Yet to the untravelled Latin, it was all Christendom that adored the images of Christ and the saints.[5]

Muslim abuse of holy images was noted at every loss of Christian territory. The de expugnatione T.S., describing Ṣalāh ad-Dīn's conquest of Jerusalem, made considerable play with the throwing down of the golden cross on the Dome of the Rock, by attaching ropes, and of other crosses in the city, "to the shame of the Christians, with great cries . . ."[6]

---

1. Exp. Sym., primus art.
2. S.S.M., I. xiv. (Titulo de las imagines).
3. M.O.F.P.H., vol. I, App.
4. Gol. iv., p. 291. Lull also had a certain sympathy for suspicion of images. Cf. Blanquerna, LXXXIV.
5. Galvano de Levanto, de recup. T.S., R.O.L., vol.vi, 1898.
6. Cf. St. Albans Chr., yr. 1204.

In the West, stories circulated of a crucifix dragged through the streets at the end of a rope at Damietta.[1] With increasing Christian losses, atrocities against churches and images increased. Ricoldo gave many examples in his lament for ʿAkka,[2] A little earlier, in Fidenzio's account of the fall of Tripoli, the strength of Islamic feeling appears still more clearly. The Muslims put holy pictures to an insulting use, subjected images to various insults, and dragged a crucifix through the streets of the city at the tail of an ass. Fidenzio himself followed the victorious army of the sultan as it retired to Damascus, in the hope of helping Christian prisoners. Some of the Muslims, with the events of the capture of the Christian city fresh in their minds, asked him why the Christians adored pictures and images. It was not, Fidenzio of course replied, the images, but the saints in heaven whom they represented, that the Christians venerated. "They were silent, not knowing what else to say." Mutual incomprehension made discussion sterile indeed. Fidenzio, however, was particularly sensitive at least to the strength and reality of Muslim hatred of images; the Christian children who were captured, he reported, were made Muslim and taught to spit upon the crucifixes.[3]

In this dark picture of warfare and mutual contempt, there was little room for charitable, even for academic,

---

1. Cf. Caesarius, XX. XXVII.
2. Epistolae, passim.
3. XV.

interest in the positive preferences of Islamic worship. Yet the puzzlement of the victorious Muslim soldiers, curious to discuss the matter with Fidenzio, clearly implied those different ideas of prayer from which their iconoclasm sprang. The defence of images, which were characteristic of orthodox Latin worship, helped to preclude any very clear conception of worship that lacked both images and sacraments. There was "no altar, no image, no picture" in mosques, said Verona, and he was almost alone in thinking it worth while to make even so slight a mention of mosque furniture as this.[1]

5. Ramaḍān.

It is natural that Christians and Muslims should despise each others' ideas of fasting. The mediaeval Latin attitude was that of all Christians in touch with Islam, at all times. The Christian theory of a long debilitating fast, to strengthen the spirit by weakening the flesh, requires no period when nothing at all may be consumed; it is not interested in the discomfort incurred by the Muslim who eats nothing, not even a drop of water, from sunrise to sunset, and who is doubtful if he may swallow his own saliva; nor does it promote sympathy with those nights of Ramaḍān which by contrast restore the Muslims' strength and become a festive occasion.[2]

---

1. XI.
2. The Christian cannot respect what has no weakening effect, or the Muslim what seems to require no intense discomfort at any particular moment. Nowadays the Muslim refrains from smoking if he fasts at all, the Christian usually not.

The feeling that a fast which is unlike the penitential period of Lent is not a fast at all was very clearly propounded by Pedro de Alfonso; it did not debilitate, he objected, but rather strengethend the flesh: no Latin ever conceived that it might not be intended to debilitate. Vitry put it even more strongly, even exaggerating grossly. He said that the night feasting was conducted to the point of drunkenness and vomiting. It is not surprising to find Guido Terrena expressing the same idea.[1] Christians, said Vitry, called the month of fast the "pagan (=Muslim) Lent"; this thought of contrast would always sharpen the Christian criticism.[2] Obtusely and maliciously, San Pedro Pascual said that Muslims failed to fast at night because they hoped in darkness to deceive God;[3] elsewhere he had shown awareness of those Qur'anic readings which are typical of Ramaḍān, once again with the Lenten comparison in mind.[4] Lull compared the two modes of fasting in simple terms of the easy and the hard.[5] That the sexual act was permitted during the nights of Ramaḍān heightened the scandal given by the alternation of festival and fast by night and day; Viterbo and the Gregorian Report

---

1. 15.
2. VI.
3. S.S.M. I. viii. 71.
4. S.S.M. I. ii. 2.
5. Hamar, sig. 36.

and Vitry all stressed it,[1] and so did as wholly unrelated an author as Friar Simon, who spoke, not of wives, but of women; Fidenzio, with more restraint, quoted the Qur'an correctly "(your wives) are your garments, and you are their garments".[2] Marino, using occasional phrases of Pedro de Alfonso's, paraphrased his traditional argument forcefully.[3] Verona put the same case less strongly, but said that Ramaḍān was constituted in order to obliterate the thought of Lent from the hearts of Muslims.[4]

There was some mention of facts, or of supposed facts, without critical comment. Roderick was more interested in facts than condemnation; he mentioned Muḥarram as well as Ramaḍān.[5] Mark was interested to explain that a rich man might redeem the fast he owed, if he had been prevented from fasting at the right time, by alms; a poor man, by a voluntary fast.[6] Viterbo and the Gregorian Report were partly accurate;

---

1. Viterbo and Paris both say that coition was taken to be a meritorious act in Ramaḍān. Marital coition actually follows exactly the same rule as eating. It was the Contrarietas, not the Risālah, which started, or most strikingly among the sources, typified, the use of this theme: it substituted "estote soliciti ut impregnetis mulieres" for "it is lawful for you . . . to go in unto your wives". (Q., II. 183; Contrarietas, IX, f. 253 r.)
2. Fid., XVI.
3. III. IV.
4. See X and XI. He thought Ramaḍān a solar date ("the first moon of the month of May") like Easter.
5. Hist. Arab., III; Cron. de Esp., CXIV.
6. Pref. Q.

they knew that the sick and travellers were excused in Ramaḍān the fast that they must later make up.[1] Varagine, the Anonymus Minorita and Peter de Pennis followed Pedro de Alfonso in his factual statement about Ramaḍān, and not in his comment; and by doing so they achieved at once the most accurate and the least committed statement.[2] This is even more striking in Higden's summary, and in Mandeville's brief extract. Ricoldo counted both fast and prayer as serious burdens of religion in Islam.[3] We may note that the contrast between the fasts of the two religions was often in mind, even when it was not explicitly developed.[4]

6. Zakāt: the poor-rate.

Ketton's translator, to whom Muslim practice was familiar, first drew attention to the Qur'anic stress on alms

---

1. The impression apparently left on Matthew Paris himself was vague: he wrote into the St. Albans Chronicle the remark that Muslims, under pretence of Muhammad's authority, maintained that such afflictions of men as fasting were unpleasing to God.
2. P. de Pen., XI, MS., f. 38 r-v. The information about Ramadan from this source was exceptionally accurate and included the fact that day-time was recognised at the moment when the black and the white thread could be distinguished.
3. Disp. XVII.
4. James of Acqui, whose statement is omitted here, was another vague writer, saying just that Muslims, when fasting, ate nothing in the day, and that they had "many Lents". This last is strange; on a numerical basis Christians, with Lent, Advent and Ember Days, would be bound to exceed Muslims. He may be thinking of voluntary Muslim fasts, but this seems on the whole unlikely and would apply equally to Christians.

joined with prayer;[1] the point was picked up and slightly elaborated in the summula: "he commended zeal for alms and certain works of mercy". Ketton's own translation was very inexact without minimising Islamic charity in general.

> To pour out prayers to the East or the West by no means makes men faithful and true; but to believe in God and to bear faith in the coming of the next world, and in the angels and the books and the prophets, and to bestow their money in kindness on their relations, on orphans, on the poor and on beggars who ask in requital and on prisoners; to pay debts to God, to have faith and constancy in words; in an unpleasant time to put up with evil and dispute: all these things, I say, make perfect those who fear and are faithful to God. (2)

Especially in the latter part, this passage is one of Ketton's less happy translations, and it omits the phrase referring to payment of poor-tax as distinct from voluntary alms. Thus the inheritance from the Cluniac corpus was true in its general accent, since it cited authentic and Qur'anic praise of alms, and stressed Islamic charity up to a point; but it was careless and vague in that the specific obligation of zakāt was ignored.[3]

This set the almost universal tone. Vitry's genuine interest in Islamic practice fell short of enquiry into the

---

1. In Az. 2; Bibl. p. 224 col. 2; MS. CCCD. 184, p. 51, margin at foot, left; Seld. Supra 31, f. 33 r, right margin at top.
2. Q. II. 172; Ketton, II; Bibl. p. 15, lines 4-11.
3. Fitzralph so often links the beginning and end of our period, because his thought was contained by the knowledge conveyed by Ketton and as many of his collaborators as may have been available on the manuscript. In practice he did not stray beyond Ketton's text and there deliberately confined his interest. He cited the whole of the passage quoted above and commented only on the phrase "and the prophets", thus showing interest exclusively in that "endorsement" of Scripture which he so pertinaciously sought to prove. (Arm., 10/11).

accuracy of his own material. He said that Muhammad "much commended alms and prayers" and yet that Muslims "do not pay tenths". Presumably he meant that alms were not prescribed in canon law, but, if so, he was mistaken.[1] Humbert spoke of the "certain praiseworthy works of piety, of alms, prayers, fasts and suchlike . . ." inserted into Islam.[2] In his mind, in Vitry's, and also in the Cluniac view, was the thought that these virtues served to conceal the true wickedness of Islam.[3] The vague general impression given by these writers was carried forward by their successors. Thus James of Acqui said that Muhammad taught the Muslims to make "many and great alms, for the love of God and of his friend the Prophet Muhammad". In this vague sense Islamic generosity - the practice of charity as a religious exercise, but distinct from specific zakat - made a general impression; to a Franciscan in the Holy Land, the example of the sultan in freeing a slave at his servant's request came perfectly naturally to mind to illustrate quite a different case with which no Muslim had anything to do.[4]

Greater precision did exist. Mark of Toledo made only a passing reference: "Yield the tenths and the first-fruits to God, to the king, who among them discharges the office of priest, and to his agent, [illegible] and [illegible] avoid sins";[5] but

---

1. VI.
2. Op. Trip. I. vi.
3. See above, p.
4. M.O.F.P.H., Vol.II. Fasc.1, Cron. O.P., 112. 28, p. 77.
5. Pref. Q.

it was an accurate one, in that he clearly understood that zakāt was a tax as well as an act of virtue. Yet only Ricoldo, in that unique group of passages in his Itinerarium which expresses personal observation, did the subject that justice which most of his work denied to Islam.

> On the subject of pity for the poor, it ought to be known that Muslims are most generous of alms. They have a strict command in the Qur'an to give a tenth; and they are required to give a fifth part of such things as they acquire by force of arms. Yet beyond these things they make great legacies, and put them in a treasury, and at an established time they open them, and give them to a trustworthy Muslim, who goes off to the different provinces and redeems prisoners and Muslim slaves who are held prisoner among Christian or other nations. They even often buy Christian slaves who are held prisoner among the Muslims themselves, and take them to the cemetery and say, "I redeem so much for the soul of my father, and so much for the soul of my mother", and give them letters of freedom and send them away. But for the poor, who cannot redeem a slave, these Muslims carry wild birds in cages, and cry, "Who wants to buy these birds and free them for his father's soul ?"

Equally astonishing were testamentary gifts to feed dogs and river birds, and, finally, the existence of an agreeable hospital with medical provision for the mentally deficient.[1] It is obvious that Ricoldo was constrained by an awed admiration. At the same time it is curious that he should only barely have mentioned gifts to religious trusts (awqāf) for purposes more familiar in the West, not only the redemption of captives, but also the endowment of mosques, hospitals and hostels. Lull, in contrast, went so far as to make a fool of himself, first stressing Christian gifts of churches,

---

1. Itin. XXV.

monasteries and hospitals for the poor, the sick and travellers, all things for which Islam is noted, and then adding, "But I never heard that the Muslims have more than two hospitals, one Tunisian and the other in Alexandria".[1] The zakāt, in particular, and gifts of alms in general, were frequently realised to be important in Islam, but the subject was very little understood in detail; it would come to attract more notice when travellers in Islamic countries - like Ricoldo - became more common.[2]

7. Church and clergy.

The payment of tenths draws attention to the differences between the ecclesiastical establishments maintained by Christians and by Muslims. There is an interesting contrast in Humbert. He reproached the tepid Christian clergy for grudging to God, i.e., to the Crusade, those unearned tithes which farming men paid out of the greatest labour and sweat, cultivating their lands. Thus in the Christian picture the decimae were paid in Islam to the poor, and in Christendom, not just to the clergy, but to clergy who would not employ it for the work of God.[3] For Lull, however, who, in his eccentric way, gave this problem more thought than did most of his predecessors, contemporaries or

1. Hamar, sig. 35.
2. Cf. bibliography.
3. Op. Trip. I, xviii.

successors, the Muslim failure to maintain a clerical establishment on a scale comparable to the Christian was inherently another evidence of the inferiority of Islam in the worship of God. In this connection he combined a somewhat modern perception which stressed the absence of sacraments in a priestless religion with that intellectual clowning in which he so often indulged. .The Christian church, he said, had ten clerics for every Muslim cleric; and for every prayer made by the Muslim cleric ten or more were made by the Christian.[1] This quantitative assessment of prayer ignores the orisons of the laity, possibly as statistically negligible. Similarly, he claimed that Christians honoured their church; they had Pope, Cardinals, Archbishops, Bishops and so on, whose excommunications the rich, the powerful and the people all feared. It was not so with the Muslims: "their Bishops are poor men, and so are their priests; and they have wives and children, and really the greater part takes part in trades . ."[2] What this author so obviously reveals, while with his thinking mind he misses it, is the popular character of Muslim worship, the organisation of those religious duties which constitute it, communally rather than clerically.

The relation of Muslim "clergy" to the ordinary "laity" was not generally formulated although it was referred to

---

1. Lull, Hamar, sig. 33, 34
2. Ibid, Sig. 3; cf. 15, 38.

remotely or implicitly. Friar Simon assumed that the mu'adhdhin was a priest or cleric. Thus too, the informant of the commentator on the Clementinae spoke of two kinds of Islamic "clergy"; those who served the mosques, he said, were Foqua, in the singular Foqui;[1] they were equivalent to the Christian secular clergy, but they were married and resided in the mosques.[2] The fuqahā' were better described by Ricoldo as "great doctors and expositors".[3] These are references to the Arabic word; there were many references to the sapientes Saracenorum, i.e., fuqahā' or 'ulamā'; the phrase generally implies men learned in the law or authoritative in defining it.[4] These were all men living in the ordinary Islamic community, lawyers, rather than clergy, in a Christian view. Christians recognised also among the Muslims "religiosi", either in vague terms, or as itinerant ascetics. The fuqarā', said Verona, "are held in great reverence among them; and they go about preaching and teaching

---

1. Fuqahā', faqīh.
2. Loc. cit.
3. Disp. XIII; cf. P. de Pen., II, f. 17 r. MS. el fochaha.
4. For example, Oliver, Hist. Dam.; St. Albans Chr., yr. 1118; Alv., de leg. XVIII/18R; Viterbo (p. 424); Paris (de fide Sarac.); Ric., Itin., XXXIV; Disp. X; San Pedro, S.S.M., I. viii. 242; Lull, Hamar, Prol.; de V sap., prol.; lib. Tart., 1,2; vita, 4,6; P. de Pen., XI, f. 38 r. This is not an exhaustive list, either of authors who used the phrase, or of examples of its use in single authors.

the law and the wonders of Muhammad".[1] Some of these people were bizarre in their activities; Ricoldo said that there were "religiosi" in Baghdad so desperate as to do away with themselves by walking in fire barefoot "that men may admire"; and who ate scorpions and snakes, not only raw, but raw and living.[2] These were true miracles of Antichrist's precursors. Ludolf described men who constricted their naked bodies in iron rings and beat themselves in expiation for not having had many wives; and others who lived like beasts in the deserts, and would not look at the faces of women, but whom women were accustomed to consult about the state of their loved ones' souls. After a night of watching and flagellation they would reply, according to the money they had received, in Heaven, or in Hell.[3] This hodge-podge of pilgrims' tales possibly reflects the eccentricites of darwishes; Ricoldo's account is certainly authentic.[4] It seems obvious that in each case

1. Loc. cit. Fuqarā', faqīr. In Verona, Facher, pl. facheri; in Tripoli, focara (Vat. MS): "suos religiosos, qui focara dicuntur . . ." Cap. XXI, MS. f. 109 r. Contrarietas defined El foquera as perfecti. (f. 249 r.) Ricoldo used "religiosi" to cover a wide field of different functions. He used it of "sapientes" teaching in the schools, which he greatly admired (see above) and equally of eccentrics here described. Itin., XXI. Ricoldo admired ecstatic prayer in ordinary men (above, p. 567). It is not clear what class of men he was thinking of in another instance; it was to "Focarii" from ʿAkka that he owed the mournful relic of a pierced and bloodstained Dominican habit. (Ep. IV). Cf. also W. Adam, IV.
2. Itin., XXXVI.
3. Loc. cit.
4. These are phenomena associated in some turuq with the dhikr. Possibly in this case Rifāʿīyah ?

the Christian is thinking of the Muslim holy man as a false religious in the Christian sense.[1]

There was some attempt at the equation of Islamic and Christian figures at a higher level. Thus it was widely known that the caliph was the "successor" of Muhammad, and, as was inevitable, he tended to be equated with the Pope; he received the same worship, the same homage of kings.[2] The quasi-theocracy of the mediaeval West superficially approximated to the Islamic refusal to separate the functions of government from religion. In the same way, the qāḍī was identified in the West with the bishop;[3] sometimes the "Cadini" were thought to form a caste of higher clergy.[4] When Lull referred to a qadi as magnus litteratus, he realised that sapientes and Cadini overlapped.[5] It was sometimes realised

1. The account in Giovanni d'Andrea's commentary on the Clementine constitutions contrasted with the "secular" "foqui" the "religious" "alhages" in specifically Christian terms. The alhages were certainly ḥajjis - "isti semel accedunt ad sepulchrum Machometi" - but he misconceived their function and described them as generally unmarried, having relinquished the world, and distinguished by their dress. The latter two points are applicable to hajjis, but not, of course, in a way comparable to monasticism.
2. There was widespread knowledge of the title. Cf. passim, the literature chronicling the rise of Islam under the first four caliphs, and Crusading literature generally, especially Will. Tyr., XIX.XX, and Oliver, Hist.Reg., and the Patriarchal report sent by Haymar to Innocent III, St. Albans Chr., yr.1193; pseudo-Vitriacus (lib. tertius Vitriac., Bongars); and Vincent 31.54 ff. Cf. also Chanson d'Antioche. Ricoldo was specially well-informed on this point. Cf. Disp. XIII, Itin. XXI.
3. E.g., Lull, in Vita, 6; Fr. Pasquale. Cf.also Gol.ii.p.70.
4. Chron. XXIV Gen. Cf. Gol. iv, Passio fr. Livini Gallici.
5. Hamar, prol.

that the Islamic attitude was consciously not priestly; Mark of Toledo, for example, spoke of the king as performing among Muslims the function of a priest.[1] Ricoldo, duly followed by Peter de Pennis, referred with clarity to the Qur'anic condemnation of Christians for making their clergy "lords"; he pointed out that there was a confusion of the Chaldean term used suitably of men, and the Arabic word used only of God.[2] Verona actually believed that the ordinary dress of Muslims was chosen in order to obliterate the distinction between clergy and laity.[3] Two tendencies co-existed, the interpretation of Islamic institutions in Christian terms, and the condemnation of Islam for not enjoying Christian institutions; the first, indeed, could conveniently lead to the second. In this, as in every practice of religion that we have considered, the communal and unhierarchic aspects of Islam eluded the Christian observers.

8. The ḥajj.

The pilgrimage to Mecca was early illuminated by Pedro de Alfonso, who took a close interest, both in the ḥajj itself, and in the history of the Kaʿbah. He knew something

---

1. Pref. Q.
2. Q., IX. 31; Disp. IX; P. de Pen. VII, MS. f. 28 v - 28 r. Cf. Rodwell on Q. IX. 31.
3. XI.

of the actual ceremonies of the ḥajj, of the iḥrām dress and the stoning (rajm), and he described the foundation of Bayt Allāh, Domus Dei, the House of God, by Adam, and its restoration by Ismael and Abraham.[1] He stressed the "truth" (as opposed to what he supposed the Islamic pretence) that the Kaʿbah had been a centre of idol worship until purged by Muhammad himself. He established an anti-Islamic pedigree for the Kaʿbah: two holy stones, black and white, were named Mercurius and Chamos respectively, by Amon and Moab, the sons of Lot. These were worshipped by the Arabs, each at a separate solar festival yearly, and Muhammad, unable entirely to destroy their worship, had the Saturn stone set backwards in the wall of the Kaʿbah, and the Mars stone, which was carved back and front, buried in the ground.[2] Miss d'Alverny has suggested that this account explains in part the obscure and fanciful references with which Mark of Toledo opens his Preface to his translation of the Qur'an.[3] The Anonymus Minorita exemplifies the widening publicity which Pedro's reasonably accurate and somewhat detailed account of the Islamic view received, but it omits his rationalist

---

1. He apparently failed to realise that the Islamic precept is to make the ḥajj, not annually, but once in a life-time. For the foundation of the Kaʿbah, his is one Islamic interpretation, not the only one; another makes Abraham the founder, not the restorer. (E.I. "Ka ba"). Pedro also referred to the sacrifice of Abraham, but not, Islamic fashion, to Ismael vice Isaac.
2. There is an Islamic belief that the stone was originally white and that sin during the pagan time turned it black. (E.I. loc. cit.)
3. Pref. Q.

explanation,[1] as do also the Legenda Aurea[2] and Peter de Pennis.[3] Marino Sanudo, explicitly citing Pedro de Alfonso[4] as his authority, paraphrased both relevant passages of Pedro's in one clear and consecutive passage.[5] He elaborately improved his source, suppressing the suggestion which in Pedro was unmistakable, that Muhammad as far as possible destroyed the pagan worship; he introduced another motif, by which the lapidation became a conscious form of Venereal worship.[6] For Pedro, the worship associated with the Kaʿbah was invalidated by a pagan history which was contrary to its Qur'anic pedigree; but this point of view was moderate in comparison with Marino's, according to which, wildly, Muhammad intended to preserve paganism there.[7] Of course, Marino knew better than that.

---

1. Loc. cit., 3. That is, he repeated the speech made by "Moses" in Pedro's dialogue; this put forward a view favourable to Islam; he omitted the speech given to "Peter" which attacked it.
2. Higden's version seems to be a very corrupt form of the same.
3. P. de Pen., Cap. XI, f. 38 v.
4. Pointing out that Pedro, as Iudaeus conversus, would be a likely authority to know about the children of Lot.
5. III. IV.
6. Possibly suggested to him by the account in the Risālah; it is possible that the Risālah influenced Pedro de Alfonso also.
7. Pedro's interests and those of the author of the Risālah ran closely parallel to those of modern critics who have speculated about the solar festival from which they suppose the ḥajj to derive. (E.I. "hadjdj".) It would be amusing, but irrelevant here, to compare in detail the mediaeval with the modern form of rationalism; we may note that the Scriptural setting took the place that would later be filled by the scientific in "explaining" the ḥajj.

The Risālah, here faithfully represented both by Peter of Toledo and by Vincent of Beauvais, recognised in the practices of the ḥajj customs that were known among pagan Indians: there was circumambulation, lapidation and the howling of the crowd. The whole thing (in this version) was in fact related to paganism in Jewish times, and to the worship of Venus.[1] For no obvious reason, the Risālah, speaking on this subject with its usual apparent authority and more than its usual probability, was less than usually influential. We may contrast with it a short paragraph of San Pedro's which is not wholly accurate and yet reflects better than others the spirit of the ḥajj.

> Muhammad also taught them that every year they should betake themselves to the House of God, which is in the city of Mecca, to pray and give thanks, and that they should make the circuit of it, wearing seamless garments; and should throw stones between their trouser-legs, to roll over the pavement of the House, so that by them, as they say, the demon should be stoned. (2)

Most of the features of this passage, mistaken ones like the idea that there was a duty of annual pilgrimage which lay upon the Muslims, and the backwards act of lapidation, and true ones, such as the seamless garment, the circuit, the stoning of the demon, are common to San Pedro and to his converted Jewish namesake and predecessor, and those who followed him. Yet the terms used by them are markedly unlike. This, as well as the presence of new elements (such as the fictional

---

1. Tol., MS. p. 316, foot of col.1, ff.; Vincent, 23.60; cf. Muir, p. 92 ff.
2. S.S.M., I. viii. 72.

stoning over the Pavement), guarantees the independence of San Pedro's sources; it is most likely that he drew upon a living and oral tradition of Islamic beliefs that circulated among Spanish Christians. The really original element, which alters the whole tone of the comment, defines a reasonable and even religious intention: . . . ut . . . se conferant ad Dei domum . . . ad orandum et gratias agendas . .

Outside the influence of Pedro de Alfonso, and the Risālah, and whatever was San Pedro's source, the ḥajj was ill comprehended.[1] There was some knowledge of the doctrine that Abraham founded the Domus Dei,[2] and some evidence that the devotion of the pilgrims had made an impression. The ḥajj, like the adhān, was forbidden by the Council of Vienne, as a public reproach to Christendom, when it was performed by subjects of Christian princes.[3] Humbert, as Crusader and moralist, had already noted that "there is not thought to be one Muslim who does not pay a visit to the tomb of this fellow Muhammad".[4] The devotional element is reflected by Mark's brief statement that Muslims were taught to "go up to

1. The account in the Contrarietas (cap. XI, f. 260 v(foot) ff.) claims to be an eye-witness one. It is not very clear and does not sound authentic. It had remarkably little influence. It was ignored by Ricoldo.
2. Annotator on Ketton; ad Az. 32, Bibl. p. 225, col.2.
3. Clem. lib. V, loc. cit.
4. De pred. S.C., XIV. See below.

the temple of Mecca because of prayer"[1] and in James of Acqui's confused version of familiar stories: "once in two years they go to the House of God, which is in Mecca, to pray".[2]

A few late writings showed more interest in the ʿĪd which throughout Islam celebrates the ḥajj than in the ḥajj itself. Lull, when he insisted upon the numerical and hierarchic inferiority of Muslim acts, pointed out that Muslims sacrificed only once a year, a sheep, in signification of the sacrifice of Abraham, whereas Christians sacrificed daily in signification of the union of the Divine and Human Natures.[3] Incidental reference to the ʿĪd as pascha eorum occurred in the fourteenth century.[4] James of Verona reported the ḥajj with a practical rather than a theological emphasis; what he said is of considerable interest. He knew that a caravan crossed all Arabia, carrying its food supply with it; ʿĪd al Aḍḥāʾ he dated from the end of Ramaḍān.[5]

> They make a great feast - he continued - in such a way that whoever is able to buys a live ram, and on that day cuts off its head, and eats it, together with all his household and family; and he calls in all the poor men

---

1. Pref. Q.
2. He added that they did so because "this House was made by God for love of Muhammad", which reveals ignorance of the Islamic doctrine of its first erection by Abraham, although it stresses a concept not unlike the true one.
3. Hamar, sig. XIV.
4. Fr. Pasquale.
5. He said forty days from the end of the fast. This must be a confusion of ʿĪd al Aḍḥāʾ with ʿĪd al Fiṭr; the former follows two months and ten days after the latter; but possibly the muddle is of 10th Muḥarram, which falls thirty days after 10th Dhu al-Ḥijjah.

> of the neighbourhood, and gives them to eat of the same ram; and thus on that day they make their Pasch in memory of Abraham. (1)

This is well observed and implies intelligent questioning; it brings out that social character which we have already seen to be present in almost every aspect of Islamic religious practice.

There were also accounts in which the influence of truth can be only dimly discerned. Vitry spoke of Muhammad's contrasting the holy cities of Mecca and Jerusalem to the unholy Antioch and Rome; he was more interested in Muslim pilgrimage to the "Temple of the Lord" than in that to Mecca, where he believed the object of pilgrimage to be the Prophet's tomb.[2] Vitry might well have known better, but this was a common howler: "quem frequentare solent in peregrinationibus suis".[3] This error is found in a fine variety of forms; Roderick said that the Muslims made a mosque in Mecca of the house where Muhammad was born; probably he interpreted the Ka^{c}bah in terms of Christian shrine-making.[4] Peter de Pennis reproduced the same excellent passage from Pedro de Alfonso as Varagine had done, but he inserted the phrase, <u>ubi iacet corpus Machometi</u>,[5] at mention of the <u>domus Dei</u> at Mecca.

---

1. X.
2. VI.
3. <u>Innocento missum</u> - report from the Patriarch Haymar, loc.cit. In the same work is a reference to the Prophet's bones in Mecca; this was frequently copied; see A.O.L., Testimonia Minora . . .
4. Hist. Arab. III.
5. Cap. XI., f. 38 v.

Guido Terrena seems more obviously to reveal the same admixture of fable and fact. He knew that the domus Dei was claimed to have been founded by Adam and to have been the place of prayer of Abraham and Ismael; in the same sentence he asserted that Muhammad was buried there.[1] He knew about the stoning of the Devil,[2] but he thought the purpose of the pilgrimage was to "adore Muhammad with shameful idolatry".[3] This suggests that he took the passage from Pedro de Alfonso in the form in which Pennis rendered it, heightened the effect in his own account, and then, like a Church Council, extracted propositions for condemnation.[4] The mistake about Muhammad's tomb being in Mecca had extraordinary vitality. Lull appealed to the witness of converted Muslims to deny the legend of the tomb magnetically supported in the air,[5] but he twice insisted that

---

1. He objected to this that no place of prayer was erected before the time of Solomon (yet another example of argument against the Qur'an based on Old Testament chronology).
2. He objected to this that the Devil was put to flight by the words of Christ, not by human blows.
3. This was not an assertion of the existence of an idol; there is, at least, no proof that it was so and the indications of the context are that it was not. The idolatry intended was no doubt rather loosely thought to be implied in any worship (whether latria or dulia) applied to Muhammad.
4. op. cit., 16 - 17 - 18.
5. As reasonable an author as the Anonimo Fiorentino made howlers, including a definition of the ḥajj as directed to the tomb suspended by magnetism, without any saving accuracies. This story of the magnetised tomb was one of those literary fables, comparable to the more absurd fables about Muhammad's life, which have not even the remotest historical basis, and which have never carried much conviction, despite their curious persistence. Yet "Mahomet's tomb" could be used as a literary reference in the nineteenth century as being as natural a metaphor as, say, the wings of Pegasus. For the origins of the legend, see Ziolecki. (Refer bibliography.)

Muslims made Muhammad out to be buried in Mecca, a fact which casts some doubt on the directness of his communication with his witnesses. For himself, he made it clear that the object of devotion was the Temple which Muslims believe Adam founded, and which Muhammad taught should be adored. The disinterested character of Verona's or Ludolf's reportage will be obvious when we consider the Franciscan pilgrim, Simon, who said that the pilgrimage was to Mecca, ubi jacet corpus illius porci vilissimi.

9. Various Islamic practices.

Of some aspects of Islamic religious practice that remain to be considered more was made than their significance in Islam would justify. Circumcision and the prohibition of eating pig's flesh are the most important examples. Circumcision was occasionally represented as a false baptism (confirmation might have been a happier, though not more useful comparison);[1] but both of these were usually treated as examples of the derivative character of Islam, supposed to be compounded of Christian and Jewish elements.[2] Only the

1. As was in fact generally made by seventeenth century Christian travellers and critics.
2. See, for example, Guibert; Peter the Venerable, C.S.S.,2.27; Itin. Reg. Ric. I.III; Vitry VI; Paris, al. scr.; Leg.Aur.; Ric., Disp., XVII; Lull, Hamar, sig.11; P. de Pen., VII, MS. f. 29 r; Higden; Acqui; Ludolf. Some writers, perhaps not realising that they were agreeing with the Qur'an, thought of circumcision as inherited from the ancient times of Abraham and continuing among Arabs throughout the Christian period, rather than as a concoction of Muhammad's. Acqui, for example, naturally enough spoke of it as more Abrahe; cf. Peter the Venerable on Jews and Muslims, above, p. 84

quadruplex reprobatio noticed that rules that governed eating existed. Here the technique of exaggeration with the object of ridicule was used. The Hanbali canon that black dogs cannot be eaten because they are jinn was referred directly to the authority of Muhammad;[1] and the rule that the fingers must be licked before they are washed after eating was so stated as to lead to the supposedly logical conclusion, which seems, even so, excessive, that this is "unclean, bestial and ridiculous".[2] The prohibition of certain foods, particularly pig, and of wine, gave rise to legends purporting to explain their origin, of a kind then fashionable, inherently picturesque or curious and repeated for their amusement value.[3] It would be unreasonable, however, to criticise Christian writers for giving these subjects an importance which reflects rather the popular practice of Muslims than the religion of the fuqahā'. Some food prohibitions, notably that of swine's flesh, have always been taken very seriously indeed in Islam;

---

1. Cap. V.
2. Cap. VIII. Bu.,52.53; and see Wensinck, Handbook, under "Eating". Cf. the same author's treatment of the fly in the food. (Quad. rep. loc. cit.) Bu., 76.58; cf. Wensinck, loc.cit.
3. Cf. Pedro de Alfonso; Vitry VI; Mark, Pref. Q.; Alv., de universo, II. XXXVII; Leg. Aur.; An. Min.; Ric.,Disp.XVII; Marino III.IV; Verona, XI; Acqui; Higden; Ludolf; Lull, Hamar, sig.26. Again, this does not claim to be exhaustive. We have already noticed examples of that other popular genre, the moral story, in this connection; fables either explained away, as in Tripoli's famous account of the prohibition of wine, or claimed to reproduce Muslim legend, as in the case of Noe and swine's flesh. Tripoli, III; for the Noe legend,see de doctrina Machometi, Bibl., p. 197; Paris, al. scr.; Ric., Disp. IX; P. de Pen. XI, MS.f.37r.; for another explanation see Gerald, connecting it with Muhammad's supposed death from swine (above, p. 374).

and the customs of the populace have generally given circumcision a significance that Muhammad never did. Strictly, circumcision is related to ritual purity, and the rules governing food to questions of impurity; but these matters were never discussed in connection with ablutions, because a religious impurity other than sin was not understood by Christians.

Conclusion.

It will be noticed that the authors who were interested in Islamic religious practice were almost exclusively those who, either directly or at second-hand, had been in touch with Islam at some point in their lives. Their interest was a very moderate one. It thrived most on contrast: some writers drew attention to the absence of any sacramental system in Islam;[1] even more commonly, Islamic practices were supposed to be poor imitations of Christian sacraments. With this should be associated the widespread notion that Islam was a religion of outward forms; particularly was this so in connection with the ablutions before the prayer. The French Franciscan Livin, seeking a short formula in which to denounce Islam in the mosque in the presence of the sultan, chose to stress the vanity of the prayer offered there.[2] On this point,

---

1. Cf. summula; C.S.S., prol.; Lull, Hamar, sig. 11-17; Ric., Disp., I (Peter de Pennis, V, MS.f. 26 v.) connected this with the denial of the Passion, since all sacraments derive their efficacy from Christ's death. (MS.f.161r. col.1. Bart. Pic. has mysteria for sacramenta ecclesiae.)
2. Chron. XXIV Gen., loc. cit.

as on so many, there was misinformation rather than lack of information. The same may be said of observance of Ramaḍān and of the ḥajj. Of the zakāt there was generally more ignorance than misrepresentation. There was little systematic comparison of the life of prayer in the two religions. Practical experience of Islam created the interest in the subject where it existed at all, but the theoretical attitude very largely determined the detail of what was remembered and reported, and almost wholly defined its scope.

Ricoldo's statement, "for who is not astounded, if he carefully considers how great is the Muslims' anxiety for study, their devotion in prayer, their pity for the poor, their reverence for the name of God and for the prophets and for the holy places . . ." is unique; Ricoldo himself was an indiscriminate collector of arguments that fail to do Islam justice. It would be possible for a reader already familiar with Islam to recognise not only the obvious statements that sometimes accurately represented Islamic practice, but also the many reflections of it that appeared more or less dimly. For us the interest in such material lies in the interpretation that was put upon information, rather than in the fabrication of fables. Islam was considered chiefly as it seemed to approach Christian practice. Its highly characteristic forms of worship, which have shaped both the aspect of Islamic

society and its inner thoughts for so many centuries, were largely ignored. There was a genuine, but very limited, interest in the subject. Christendom was relatively indifferent to what did not touch immediate Christian interests.

Chapter 21.

Islamic Eschatology.

1. Determinism.

The fatalism of Islam in everyday mundane matters and misfortunes which later in Europe came to seem most typical of the East does not seem particularly to have impressed Western Christians of the Middle Ages. In the period with which we are concerned only that powerful moralist Jacques de Vitry noted exactly the sense of fatalism which was in a later age so greatly stressed. "For he said that death was not to be feared, since God has foreseen the last day and the end of everyone, which no one can escape; nor can man in any way prevent or anticipate the end which God infallibly foresaw."[1] More often this problem was seen in purely theological terms as concerning the mysteries of election.

In this belief of Islam, said Lull, God was made the author of men's sins;[2] the Judgement became false, and man was relieved of moral responsibility. The reprobatio quoted Bukhārī.

> . . . he said that God wrote over every man his share of lust and that by necessity he must follow his share. In this way, by these and many other things, he attributed it to God, that he put men in error, so that they fornicate by necessity; and this is false and blasphemous . . . Against this same a certain wise man

1. VI.
2. Hamar, sig. IV. 2; cf. Disputatio Fidelis et Infidelis, 8.

> of the Muslims said finely enough, If God does not forbid me to sin, and requires me to do it, and damns me because of it, I am the first to say that he who does so is not God but the Devil. (1)

This was a straightforward argument developing naturally as a criticism of the mechanics of predestination. San Pedro Pascual, who alone of mediaeval authors gave much attention to this matter, said expressly that his interest sprang out of his actual controversial practice.[2] This can hardly have been the common experience. There is some resemblance between San Pedro's interests and Lull's; Lull had seen and rejected the Islamic attribution of the authorship of evil acts to God as part of a refusal to conceive any limitation to his power; San Pedro's arguments also centred round the qualities of God.

It was the detraction from God's goodness, his mercy and the justice of his judgement implicit in predestinarian belief which was to San Pedro's mind the decisive condemnation of it. This could be seen in the notion that the good and evil that a man will experience in this life and the next are "written" beforehand, and in the notion that God judges as he pleases, almost as the fancy takes him.[3] If it were possible

---

1. Quad. rep. V; Bu. LX.I.? See Wensinck, Handbook, under decrees, for other possible references.
2. C.F.M., I.1.
3. Of those things that Islamic traditions have taken to be predestined, some relate to physical happenings which are morally indifferent, some to moral actions and to the eternal destiny of souls. It was these that interested San Pedro. See Montgomery Watt, Free Will, pp.17-19 for the traditions.

that God should just write a man saved, he failed in goodness if he did not write all saved; he could not reward good actions or punish evil ones; he could not with mercy hear the penitence of the sinner. The Christian asserted that the free will of men was proved both by Scripture and by reason: God willed that Heaven should be earned, and men willed their own damnation; these are the commonplaces of scholastic theology. It seemed to the Christian disputant that experience of controversy proved the usefulness of a logical quandary which might be set to trap a Muslim: challenged to say whether Heaven was reward of goodness, and pain the punishment of sin, he must either agree, and contradict Muhammad,[1] or else assert the doctrine of God's writing the fate of the soul in advance. In that case he might be refuted by Scripture, by arguments of natural reason("which anyone may find for himself") and by arguments from Muhammad's own contradictory sayings. The Prophet had said that Paradise rewards fidelity to the law, and that the damned suffer for disobedience to God; from these views belief in free will would follow. God is shown in Islamic belief as governing the ordinary affairs of the world, and hearing prayers, although this is incompatible with a belief in a "written" future. Finally, Muhammad sometimes made it seem that the

---

1. As supposed author of predestinarian belief, because ostensibly the author of the Traditions; particularly as apparent author of the Liber Scalae.

world is ruled and disposed, not by the providence of God, but by chance.[1] Essentially, this is a critique of the Liber Scalae Mahometi.[2]

San Pedro was sufficiently perturbed by the problem itself to examine difficulties and objections to a belief in free will which might arise in any Christian community.[3] At the end of his "disputation" he was anxious to point out that he wrote in order to instruct Christians in their religion.[4] Much of his thought in the matter seems to escape altogether from the Islamic context.[5] Predominantly he hoped to show the inconsistency of Islam with the (Hebrew) prophets; the idea that no one can add to or decrease his days conflicts

1. C.F.M., V, 1-4, 8-11, 13-29; VI, 4-11; cf. S.S.M. I.viii. 93.
2. For the relation of San Pedro's work to the Liber Scalae Machometi, see Cerulli and Muñoz.
3. C.F.M., Part VII passim; Part VIII.
4. Ibid., VIII.4.
5. In the seta mahometana, San Pedro described one brush with Muslims that actually took place in this connection. Popular ceremonies to influence the angelic fates who visited a child on the night of its seventh day (in order to foretell his or her future) were unsympathetic to him; it was a wrong opinion (heregia), silly and something to be ashamed of. He had asked the more learned and the elders if these fates had ever been seen or ever left signs of their coming behind them, and how people knew what fate had been accorded to the child. His interlocutors could not answer and he told them that they did not know about it because there was nothing to know about. All this, he pointed out, contradicted the idea of the angel of death who wrote the eternal destiny of each man to heaven or hell from the beginning. (S.S.M. I. viii.94.)

with the commandment, honour thy father and thy mother, that thou mayest be long-lived upon the land;[1] again, it seemed to him not enough to argue that Islamic doctrine here detracted from goodness, mercy and justice in God, because it needed also to be seen that it was revealed by the prophets that those qualities were indeed God's.[2] On the whole it can hardly be said that he misrepresented the Islamic position in the matter of predestination although he did not of course deal with it in fine detail, or reflect the subtlety of orthodox Asharite opinion; he did not improve upon his source. It remains true that Islam does take God to be the creator of men's evil acts, and it was against this proposition that so much of San Pedro's argumentation was directed, on the assumption that creator meant author.[3] He was also willing to admit the difficulties of the Christian position. As he had pointed out that the Muslim belief in predestination could not be reconciled with the goodness of God, so he admitted that it was hard to reconcile with it his own Christian belief in God's creation of souls whose

---

1. C.F.M. III.2 ff.; Exod. XX.12. Cf. Watt, loc. cit. One of the few aspects of predestination unconnected with the eternal destiny of the soul noticed by San Pedro; clearly it did not interest him intrinsically in any case.
2. C.F.M. V.7 and passim.
3. In the seta mahometana, he summed up the position thus: Muhammad had rightly said that we should attribute the good in us to God alone, and quite wrongly that good and evil alike "proceed from God". (S.S.M. I.ii.9; cf. C.F.M. VIII.2)

damnation he foresees. He found answers only partly satisfactory to him; he had in the last resort to fall back upon pious agnosticism. God gave men as much understanding of things as pleased him, and all knowledge he did not give; Jesus Christ said we were not to know times or moments,[1] and spiritual creatures can know of the future only as much as God has made manifest; this is universal experience. Such a view is consistent if it implies that Islam refuses this agnostic humility of ignorance by rejecting the free will in human acts. In conclusion San Pedro perhaps has it in mind that Islam has claimed better to have preserved the prerogatives of God; he stresses that Christians say, and "everyone ought to know", that men can do nothing without prevenient and consequent grace; that "everyone must say and believe" that if he finds any good on himself, it comes from the mercy and the grace of God. The point was to establish that human free will did not belittle the dignity of God.

Although there was little explicit consideration of predestination, there was general detestation of determinism in morals. There were two allied perceptions. There was the sense of Islam as a body holding itself apart and promising exclusive salvation to its adherents; this point was frequently remarked, although Christianity does the same. There was also the accusation of an amoral Judgement which

---

1. Acts I. 7.

rewarded faith and not works. These questions were all closely related; thus San Pedro had first argued against predestination and in favour of free will, and from there in favour of works and against faith alone.[1] It was recognised that this salvation of Muslims because of their faith was a matter of repeating the shahādah, and then again, was the result of the intercession of Muhammad for his people. "For those who do not believe in the true God or in Muhammad . . . there will be endless pains of hell."[2] The first part of this formula is the direct reflection of the shahadah. It was also generally realised that in Muslim eschatology the assembly of the Islamic people was saved by the intervention of their own prophet, Muhammad, ad preces eius.[3] "(Lex) promittit ad preces Mahumeti omnes suos finaliter salvandos";[4] as accounts deriving from Pedro de Alfonso put it, Magumetho interveniente. It was Ricoldo who insisted, and Peter de Pennis repeated after him, that Islam was the lex salutis by antonomasia; he also said that the Muslims' name for themselves was Muslim, which, he

---

1. S.S.M. I.viii.248; and cf. arguments described.
2. Pedro de Alfonso; An. Min.; cf. Higden, Varagine, Acqui, Verona XI; cf. also Viterbo, Paris. For explicit statements about the shahadah, see Ric., Disp. I and VII; Itin.XXX; P. de Pen. VIII (MS. f. 31r.), IX (MS. f. 34r.); San Pedro, S.S.M. I.viii.75, 198, 248. Probably "God and Muhammad" (e.g. Guido, 23) distantly reflects the form of words.
3. Vitry VI.
4. Humbert, Op. Trip. I.vi.

maintained, meant salvati.[1]

Whatever dislike of the notion that Islam claimed to be a chosen people there might be, it was always the moral aspect that was stressed. "For them, nothing is necessary for salvation, except that they should say, there is no God but God and Muhammad is his messenger," said Ricoldo; "as a body, the Muslims maintain that if a Muslim says only this he will be saved, even if he has committed all the sins in the world." "Even if he had accomplished any sin whatever, even the worst," said San Pedro; and Guido Terrena said, "with whatever sins he was soiled".[2] This line of thought was carried further. Such doctrine was an actual encouragement to sin: "With this teaching he took away the fear of sinning from the people he had deceived, and, inciting his people to all infamies and profanities, he rendered them secure in iniquities."[3] This was the reason, contributed San Pedro, why Muslims steal, rob and deceive "for the increase

1. Disp.VII(MS. 166v. col.2), XVII (MS. f.183r. col.1); Pennis IX(MS.f.33v.) and X(MS.f.35v.). MSS. give melsamanini, messelamin, and Bart. Pic. has meselamini (Bibl.II.col.142); Pennis has messlani. Cf. Ric., Ep. I. The mistranslation of Muslim as saved survived till very much later than the Middle Ages. Related questions, like the Qur'anic attitude to the salvation of Christians and Jews, are omitted, as not strictly relevant to the main subject.
2. Ric., Itin. XXX; San Pedro, S.S.M. I.viii.75; Guido, Err. 23. Generalisations of this sort probably do not need to be explained as deriving from a particular source; but they may derive from, or be influenced by, Contrarietas IV, MS. f. 242r.
3. Vitry, VI.

of their law", and commit sins of lust.[1] In spite of this criticism, there was some recognition that works bore upon salvation in Islamic belief; thus, in a summary of Islam, Mark of Toledo said that there is resurrection and eternal life for those who believe and do good(bona faciunt); and Tripoli spoke of Paradise as reward for serving Muhammad's law well, not just for serving it.[2] Mandeville asserted that the good were to go to Paradise and the evil to hell, and Acqui spoke of pains of hell, not only for those who did not believe in Muhammad, but also for those who did not "serve his perfect law".

2. The Last Day.

These moral questions had the practical appeal which the pattern of eschatological events lacked. Although Muhammad's intervention at the Judgement was so celebrated, the actual scene was not a popular theme, whether because it was unknown or ignored. The summula was unusually well-informed,[3] but the author was interested only in the part attributed to Christ in Last Things by Muslim doctrines. Thus he said that in this belief Christ, who is now with the

---

1. loc. cit. I.viii.249
2. Mark, Pref. Q., followed by Fidenzio, XVI, "qui crediderunt et operati sunt bene"; Tripoli, XLIX.
3. It comes from the account in the de doctrina; it is surprising that this graphic account did not attract more attention; but it is, no doubt, another case of there being no sufficient polemical advantage. The summula was interested only so far as Christ was concerned.

Creator, when Antichrist[1] comes is to descend to earth to kill him; he is to convert the Jews and perfectly to teach his own followers, the Christians, who now have long lost the law he first taught them. At the sound of the trumpet of the Seraphim[2], by whom the Muslims understand an archangel, all will die, and Christ with them; after there will be the resurrection and the Judgement, at which Christ will be an assistant, but not the Judge; all the prophets will be intercessors for, and helpers of their peoples. This account is complete so far as Christ is concerned but would be grossly misleading as a complete picture of the Muslim Last Things. It is solely a contribution to pseudo-Christology. The passages in question led to the description and criticism of Paradise in Islam and to criticism of Muhammad for destroying sacramental religion. There was no direct comment on the Judgement itself.

Simon Simeon, quoting the passage in the Qur'an which describes how God took Christ to himself because he would not permit the Jews to crucify him, seemed to understand that Christ would speak for both Christians and Jews at the Last Day. Ketton's text, which he was using, is not clear: eorum saeculo futuro testis adstabit ille does not sound like an unfriendly witness, and Simon understood by viri legum here both Jews and Christians.

---

1. i.e., Dajjāl.
2. i.e., Isrāfīl, thought to derive from Seraphim.

This made the correct sense, by which Christ would witness against the Jews, impossible.[1] Fr. Antonio de' Reboldi understood the Muslim doctrine more clearly: he said that all the prophets at the judgement would admit that they had sinned, so that Muhammad would pray God to spare them. Christ would be accused by God of setting himself to usurping the divine glory, and admit his fault; only Muhammad would be recognised as faithful, and Jesus would be spared for his sake.[2] This puts Christ in a less favourable position than Islam usually alleges; it is normally said that Christ cannot pray to God for the people because his followers have set him up as God. The Syrian Apology said without comment that Christ is expected to reign for forty years at the end of the world; Ricoldo spoke bitterly of the idea that Christ was going to reign as a Muslim, in this Muslim conception.[3]

San Pedro made some comment here that is difficult

---

1. Simon, loc. cit.; Q. IV.157; Ket.XI.Bibl.p.37,lines13-14.
2. Itin. ad montem Sinai, Gol.iii.
3. Viterbo; Paris; Ricoldo, Ep.II. We may note in passing the curious version of the Judgement that was given by Verona who made Christ, present at the Judgement"in the presence of God", send the Christians to Paradise and the Muslims to hell. In this version, the Muslims will then appeal to Muhammad, saying that he promised that they should be saved if they served his law; he will pray God to reverse the situation, and this will be done, so as to leave of the Christians in heaven only Christ himself and his mother.

to follow. He said that the worst heresy of all prevailing in Muhammad's day and adopted by him, the root of all evil, is the doctrine that souls shall die "except the face of God", and again, that all souls shall die, and again, in the description of the mi'raj,[1] that all angels will die and nothing but God remain alive. It is not easy to see why this doctrine should have been given so peculiarly sinister a significance, or why it was supposed to conflict with Muhammad's belief in heaven and hell.[2]

Lull alone gave great emphasis to the stages and scenes of the Muslim Judgement in the Liber Gentilis, in an account that is rational and inclusive and more thorough than the sources on which other authors relied exclusively, the Liber Scalae Mahometi and the Doctrina Mahometi from the Corpus Toletanum.[3] In this work the arrangement and the

---

1. i.e., in the Liber Scalae Mahometi, of which Muhammad was ostensibly the direct author.
2. S.S.M. I.i.7. Cf. Annotator to Ketton: prosequitur suam fatuitatem de angelis, quos de igne creatos asserit, et mortuous, et tandem resurrecturos. (Ad az. 88.)
3. Cf. the Tratado segundo de los Articulos que tudo buen Muslim esta obligado a creer, already cited; translated by Morgan. The subject is not greatly indebted to the Qur'an. Lull's account includes the questions put in individual judgement by the angels to the soul in the tomb, and the consequent joy or pains of the tomb; the death of all things except God; the resurrection that follows the fertilising rain; the waiting (mawqif) and the sweating; the intercession of Muhammad, following the refusal of the prophets in turn, because of unworthiness, as men in terror apply to them, and of Christ, as last prophet but one, because his followers had made him out to be God; Muhammad's prayer that there shall be a judgement, and his begging the damned Muslims out of hell; the trials before judgement, weighing good and evil acts publicly; the attribution, to those to whom wrong has been done, of the reward of the good deeds of those who wronged them (and who, if they have no good deeds,

comment derive from a scheme, prepared beforehand, in which Islam, like Christianity and Judaism, is made to exemplify concepts of God's qualities, such as power, glory, mercy, goodness, which may be supposed to appeal to a pagan enquirer after truth.[1] The clarity of the story itself is thus broken by comments which are not spontaneous. Thus the examination, and the joy or straightening of the soul in the tomb is argued by the Muslim representative to show God's power and mercy and justice; if to the death of al living things[2] it be objected that angels cannot die, it is said that this all the more shows God's power, and, since they are purified like refined metal, his goodness also;[3] men as well must have a

---

Note continued from preceding page:-
/must bear the additional pains of other sinners); the Judgement of beasts and birds (strongly criticised); finally, the narrow way into Paradise over which all must pass, with speed and security in proportion to their sins, and from which the damned must fall into the hell prepared for them below.

1. It is outside the scope of this study to consider the special use of these and related terms in Lull's philosophy or even to consider how far his ideas of the Godhead were influenced by Islamic religious doctrine.
2. To the objection that this is contrary to God's goodness, the Muslim replies that this would only be true if there were no resurrection after.
3. One objection made is that, if the death of angels means that they cease to be, that non-being is contrary to God's being.

direct knowledge of death in order to be purified, and to fear and love God, whose perfection and immortality would otherwise be marred. Of the narrow way into Paradise, he said, the greater the peril, the greater the glory. It is obvious that this is not criticism which proceeds freely from the subject matter. We can only say that Lull conceived arguments to show that Muslim eschatology exemplifies qualities proper to God. The most remarkable thing is the importance with which he invested the subject, and the prominence within the creed of Islam that he allotted to it. In fact, everything cited belongs correctly to Muslim statements of faith, but it is cited fully, whereas many equally or more important doctrines are omitted.[1] Elsewhere, Lull made comments which again fitted into a preconceived notion. In one place, he wished to show that Islamic doctrine breaks each of the commandments; of theft, he says that Muhammad steals the rights of the true prophets,"the fame of holy men", when he makes them pass on the people's prayer for intercession, one to another, and lastly to himself.[2] More than other writers, Lull interested himself, not only in the description of Paradise, but in the details of Judgement in Islamic belief. There is little that is "gross" and nothing that is "immoral" in this subject, which

1. Lib. de Gent. Art. VI-XI.
2. Hamar, sig. 8.

may explain the general indifference to it, although there is much that critics might have exploited as "fabulous".

3. Paradise.

It is, however, the treatment of the question of Paradise itself that in so many ways sums up the whole Christian attack on Islam. Its object, however, was authentic, substantially the Qur'anic text, often without serious admixture of popular or other later Islamic accretions, or Christian misstatement or exaggeration. In this way it was, obviously, less typical. The catalogue of fleshly delights in Paradise was customarily described with a marked and complacent relish; Islam, the argument ran, is not a spiritual religion. Pedro de Alfonso's account became popular and may be described as the standard mediaeval version of the Qur'an's "promised Paradise, that is, a garden of delights": the flowing waters, the mild air in which neither heat nor cold could afflict, the shady trees, the fruits, the many-coloured silken clothing and the palaces of precious stones and metals, the milk and wine served in gold and silver vessels by angels, saying, "eat and drink in joy"; and beautiful virgins, "untouched by men or demons".[1] "Whatever (the blessed)

---

1. Q. LII.19 ff. and LV.74. Their number was variously reported. The idea of virginity daily restored appeared in Tripoli and therefore in Mandeville. (Tripoli, L.) There was other elaboration: "virgins . . and beautiful women with great eyes, of whom they will generate as many sons as they desire". (Vitry, VI.) Sigebert, however, Alan and Guido Terrena, while they speak of food in Paradise, make no mention of women; in this they are unique. (Alan, IV.v; Guido, err.4.)

desired would immediately be supplied."[1] This statement, which closely reflects the text of the Qur'an, may be paralleled by many others. It must be said that it was very common for the most severe Christians to allow themselves a rather purple rendering of the gardens and precious metals of Paradise, though usually not of the women. There is a genuine latinisation here, that recalls in one aspect the lapidaries, and in another some of the background of romance, and even the legend of the Reine Sibylle, a hint of the indigenous pagan idyll. Other versions were very close indeed to the Qur'an, notably that in the reprobatio,[2] which simply quoted three revelations shortly, and Ricoldo's,[3] which yet reveals some confusion. In spite of the enormous influence of the Liber Scalae it must be said that the Qur'an itself was the chief source of the picture of the Islamic Paradise.[4]

With this picture of material joy it was usual to contrast the concept of a purely spiritual apprehension of

---

1. Pedro de Alfonso; An. Min. 13; cf. for example, San Pedro, S.S.M.I.viii.74; Marino III.iv; Varagine; Higden. Simon Simeon's version is closely related. There is some mention of the Muslim Paradise in most writers who discussed Islam other than incidentally.
2. Cap. V.
3. Disp. VIII; Itin.XXXIV.(Cf. "the pupil of one eye black like ink and of the other like an ostrich egg". Q.xxxvii.47)
4. Cf. also appendix, below, p. iv.

God, the Beatific Vision of Christian doctrine.[1] It was not altogether realised that the religious orthodox Muslim believes that he will see God with the eyes of the body. Lull quoted the Islamic belief from tradition (the "proverbs" of Muhammad) that "men who are in Paradise will see God morning and evening; for by whatever place in the circuit they put their heads through the windows of the palaces in which they are, God will appear to them . . ."[2] This point was usually missed. It was felt sufficient barely to contrast an eternity of eating, drinking and copulating with the apprehension of beatitude by the intellect. "He described a Paradise, not of angelic society, nor of the divine vision, nor of that highest good that eye hath not seen . . ."[3] There was a clear note of contempt: this, said Alan of Lille, was no sufficient reward for a martyr's death.[4] In some cases the use of strong epithets marks the degree of disapproval, vanissimae fantasiae,[5] insaniae et deliramenta.[6] Such remarks tended to bring out the

1. It is interesting to note that the spiritual delights of the urbs beata Jerusalem (see Oxford Book of Mediaeval Latin Verse) which is roughly contemporary with Muhammad, are expressed in a carnal language, which Christians, of course, understand figuratively.
2. Lib. de Gent. Art.XII.
3. Summula. I Cor.ii.9; Isa. lxiv.4. Cf. Oliver: "non corporales sed spirituales in cognitione et dilectione Dei. ." (Ep. Sal.)
4. IV. vi.
5. Fidenzio, XVI.
6. Alv. de leg.XVIII/18M., cf.S.T.; cf. also Benedict. Phrases like this are characteristic of other members of the Cluniac group, to which Auvergne belongs by direct indebtedness; cf. Annotator, passim; summula : "insanissima deliramenta."

appeal to intellectual snobbery, whether an actual consideration of philosophical reasons followed, or not. Learned Muslims, William of Auvergne pointed out, realised that through these ideas Muhammad "was made ridiculous before the whole world"; later, Ramón Marti would insist, with a wealth of illustration, that even the Muslim philosophers, ibn Sīna, al-Ghazālī and al-Fārābi, made eternal beatitude consist in the knowledge and love of God.[1] This was a widely shared attitude: the carnal paradise caused the Muslim doctors to despise Muhammad's doctrine and to turn to that of Jesus, son of Mary;[2] it is repugnant not only to the words of Jesus Christ, but to reason and the sayings of the philosophers and wise men of Christians, Gentiles and Jews;[3] Muslims might ignore the Gospels and the prophets but must listen to philosophy.[4] The whole intention of the Qur'an and of Islam was that beatitude should consist chiefly in the acts of gluttony and lust; this was meant literally by the Qur'an which made no mention of the vision of God or of the perfection of the soul. The contrast, point by point, of the Christian and the Muslim heavens was a recurring theme of the last book of Lull's disputation with Hamar;[5]

---

1. de leg. XIX/19R; Marti, Exp.Sim.XII. Cf. Pugio Fidei, passage quoted by Cerulli, p.437. Auvergne, however, severely blamed ibn Sīna for accepting the Islamic view of corporal joys, as unworthy of a philosopher.
2. Tripoli, L.
3. San Pedro, S.S.M. I.viii.244.
4. Ric.,Disp.VIII(MS.f.169r. col.1); cf.V; Pennis, VIII, MS. f. 31r.
5. Signa 18 - 21, 26, 27, 34, 40.

it was always enough to cite the two concepts side by side.[1] Lull shared the view of the carnal paradise as dialectically negligible; his fictional Tartar, innocent enquirer, is made to be put off by, as well as to reject the idea.[2] With these attitudes of contempt was allied a sense of unreality sharply expressed by Benedict of Alignan: "what will Paradise be, but a tavern of unwearied gorging and a brothel of perpetual turpitude ?"[3]

Few writers were content to dismiss the subject of the carnal Paradise easily, as the author of the reprobatio did, who quoted the Qur'anic references with care, and concluded with simplicity that Muslims believe "eternal beatitude to consist in food and drink and coition and corporal delights . . . This is obviously false."[4] He did command an array of Scriptural arguments which in so experienced an author suggests a Christian rather than a Muslim audience, and which recalls that deployed by Ramon Marti in his Explanatio; if Marti was in fact the author of the reprobatio, he treated the matter much less fully in the latter case.[5] There is at least a strong similarity of

---

1. Lull took this further than was usually done by showing how Christian belief in bodily glory in each of the senses after resurrection is yet not "carnal".(Hamar,sig.40. Cf. Lib. de Gent.IV, end.)
2. Lib. Tart., de T. et S.
3. This is copied from, but slightly improves, Auvergne's "quid est paradisus iste. ."(de leg.XIX/19F.)
4. op. cit.V.
5. loc. cit.

attitude as well as a sharing of some of the same material in the two works, which certainly sprang from the same milieu. It was more often thought worth while to develop fully those arguments of the philosophers against the corporal heaven to which Islam might be expected to attend. It was both a strength and a weakness of scholastic method to treat seriously even a case thought contemptible. These arguments most often were painstaking in character, disposing point by point, in the style of the schools, of every argument conceivably attributable to the defenders of the corporal beatitude. Sometimes there was a simpler, common-sense type of argument, not unlike some modern rationalist arguments against religion in general.

We may take the latter first:

> Note that it is always this sort of Paradise he describes and promises; for the Muslims love such delights, that is, to be in gardens among trees and waters, to have beautiful women with them, to eat voluptuously, to lust and to lie with people indefinitely. (1)

Pedro de Alfonso had already remarked that wise men would not believe in fleshly, rather than spiritual delights; but they were what the coarse Arabs might be expected to believe in. Lull said that Muslims believe there will be use of women in the next world, because they have so great a love of them in this.[2] Thus Islam was seen as the natural

---

1. Annotator, ad az.65; Ketton 66.
2. Contemp. D. 240.12 (in translation by Peers.)

product of the historical development of Muhammad's Arabia, of its primitive social forms and of the supposed psychology of its peoples. Christians adopted the bland invulnerable superiority which would come to mark the nineteenth century rationalist in his turn. "Because the Muslims thus set their hearts on the foulness of lust . . they say that in the future they will have paradises . . in which they must have carnal delight . ."[1] Muhammad's cunning was seen as having nicely calculated his victims' folly; and it is evident that this sort of argumentation circulated widely: "since a carnal people, ignorant of spiritual things, is not easily moved except by carnal things, he preached that after resurrection . . " (the usual catalogue follows).[2] The promise of this crude felicity "gentem illam brutalem seduxit", said William of Auvergne. An odd phrase, rather than a whole argument, would sometimes reveal this train of thought: "such things as men, however bestial, can grasp. ."[3] Lull's short account in his Doctrina Pueril of the preaching of Paradise makes it clear that this author realised the importance of teaching resurrection to the Arabs of Muhammad's

---

1. Fidenzio, XVI.
2. Vitry, VI.
3. Humbert, Op. Trip. I.vi; cf. Verona, XI. Marti quoted al-Ghazālī as characterising the Arabs as "omnibus hominibus . . bestiis procipiores. ." (Capistr. Jud., quoted by Cerulli op. cit.) Higden put it almost epigrammatically: bestialibus, bestialis gloria promittitur.

own day, who, he said, had no knowledge of life after death. Like other writers cited, he estimated the sensual attractions of the after-life as important in the appeal of Islam to lower nature. By a slight twist, the same general argument could be varied to show the Qur'anic Paradise less as a bait calculated to ensnare the people of the Hijaz than as the inevitable product of a salacious mind: homo totus lubricus, he "promised for beatitude what was predominant in his most carnal mind".[1] It was also possible to have it both ways, "animalis iste homo animalibus loquens";[2] again, "he described such a heaven as flesh and blood, indeed the dregs of flesh and blood, desired, and such as he preferred should be prepared for himself. ."[3]

The full-dress scholastic disproof was characteristically undertaken with meticulous care. One of the most thorough of such examinations was one of the earliest that by William of Auvergne, who summarised the Islamic belief under three heads, the foods served by angels, the precious clothes and hangings, the embraces of women. The ramifications of his argument are perhaps excessive. His basic point was to attack as a deceit an eternal life which was not different from, was even worse than, life in this world. The method was academic; a single appeal to Cicero

1. Ric. Itin. XXXIV. Cf. Lull, D.P. 7.
2. Alv. de leg.XIX/19F.
3. Summula.

was barely humanist in character and was in any case overwhelmed. A few quotations will indicate the approach.

> Aut erunt fames et sitis in vita illa, aut non erunt. Si non erunt, aut erunt ibi evacuationes ventrium et consumptiones corporum . . aut non. Si erunt ibi . . . duo inconvenientia manifeste sequuntur. Primum . . . Secundum . . . Si vero fames et sitis sunt ibi, magna pars presentis miseriae ibi est . . . (1)

This is cited to show not the sense, but the style. There were the constantly reiterated alternatives and the flashes of common-sense interposed. This writer would consistently argue that if there were to be intensified worldly joys the sorrows of this world would also there be greater. A limitation of his attitude lay in the rigid literalism that was carried as far as possible. "Let us ask them whether there is digestion there . . " "Cum hominum digestiones et egestiones finem non habeant, non sufficit Paradisus illa etiam sola stercora egestionum capere."[2] Arguments based on the egestiones were popular, and had been brought to the attention of the scholars of the day by the circulation of the Corpus Toletanum.[3] There was with this an appeal to natural philosophy,[4] and also a certain sense of satisfaction in the discussion of physical and biological fact, and in the use of the appropriate jargon. Another and similar argument that occurred was also of a type that was generally popular; ex illo tanto usu mulierum, would there be generation ? If so,

1. op. cit. XIX/18.Z.
2. Ibid. XIX/19.E.
3. De doctrina Machometi.
4. sic in naturalibus didicisti . .

there would be no room in a finite paradise for an infinitely expanding and immortal population; if not, the desire would lack the fruit, and there would be incompletion where imperfection has no place.

Other passages seem less minute and suggest a less narrow sympathy. Either there would be spiritual delights, or not; if so, the spiritual would overwhelm the corporal, which would lose their savour; if not, the greatest of delights would be wanting.[1] Related lines of thought were exploited. Pleasures "swamp, weaken, inebriate and delude human minds" and induce them to forget God. Delights must be loved, or cease to delight; yet nothing ought to be loved, except for the sweetness of God shining in it: in Benedict's succinct precis, "culpabiliter amabitur creatura Creatore relicto". There could be only spiritual death in a heaven of material delights. Again, the more a man loves lust, the more he is carried away in it, and becomes incapable of acquiring, knowing or loving any other good, till he finally comes to mistake deformity for beauty, and black for white.[2] The application to the point is tenuous here. It is not possible to attempt to reproduce the range and variety of the argumentation, only to suggest both the method and the approach. The close dependence of Benedict of Alignan on William of Auvergne has been pointed

1. Cf. Benedict: . . modica scintilla spiritualis voluptatis totam mentem ita occupat quod nihil carnalis voluptatis sentire vel cogitare permittitur, etc.
2. Alv. de leg. XIX/19 F, Q.

out;[1] Benedict, in fact, achieved a very neat summary of Auvergne's very thorough treatment.

The conclusion to which Auvergne came is that the whole somnialis felicitas,[2] dreamed by a crazy man, is not only impossible, but ridiculous. What is characteristic is that he was never content to ridicule it; "quis non rideat ?" he asked, referring to the angels serving in Paradise; but he did not refrain from detailed argument. These doctrines, remarked Benedict, but only after he had said all that he had to say, are not worthy of dispute. It was wholly against the discipline of the schools to dismiss any subject of dispute, without first squeezing it dry; but the question of Paradise, although it gave rise to fury, touched the scholastic interest more nearly than any other aspect of Islamic doctrine. St. Thomas devoted a chapter of the Contra Gentiles to the disproof of the usus ciborum et venereorum.[3] His arguments were in the same tradition as those we have been considering.[4] He had no apparent interest in the Muslim religion, as distinct from the philosophy of some Muslims.

Ricoldo was very strongly influenced by the work of his predecessors on Islamic religion, and the influence of the

---

1. Cerulli. p. 412.
2. Ibid., 19.K.Q.R.
3. IV. 83.
4. Cerulli has drawn attention to the treatment, by Thomas of York, Roger Bacon and Richard of Middleton, of beatitude in Arabic philosophers, especially al-Ghazālī, ibn Sīna and ibn Rushd. Cf. also Ramon Marti, above, p. 627 and remarks in Cerulli, p.431.

his contemporaries is less obvious. His treatment of the subject in his Disputatio is not unlike Auvergne's work in some ways, but is much shorter; it was taken up again by Peter de Pennis.[1] Food and copulation imply imperfections and the absurdities of their physical consequences that we have already noted in Auvergne's treatment; the alternative, pleasure without its proper ends, preservation of the body and the procreation of children, would be even more inappropriate; in heaven there must be more and not less ordination to ends than on earth. Pleasure was given to encourage animals to undertake what would otherwise be heavy labour.[2] San Pedro and Lull both exemplify a slightly different emphasis. If, said the former, there were marriage and the use of carnal things, there would be the natural process of generation and decay, and "base and unclean things" that are in them, "desire and sorrow". Souls out of the body in fact have nothing to do with all this.[3] This was an individual selection from the familiar arguments. Lull taking the old difficulty about excretion in Paradise, supposed his imaginary Muslim doctor to argue from this to the power of God, which can make it unnecessary.[4]

---

1. He referred to, used and dismissed the discussion in the Doctrina Machumeti.
2. Disp. VIII; P. de Pen. VIII; MS. f.31v., 32r.,v.
3. S.S.M. I.viii.244.
4. Lib. de Gent. IV. XII.

The impossibility of a Paradise containing time and place, growth and decay, and so on, Lull developed in the language peculiar to his philosophical conceptions. His thought was complex and idiosyncratic but mature and widely ranging.[1]

> If it were true, what the Muslims believe about Paradise, namely that men there eat and drink and have women then the signification of Paradise would show the intellect that there was a defect in Paradise, because there would be present, past and future time in it, by reason of generation and decay of the potential and actual forms which would be in Paradise . . . and if the signification of Paradise showed a defect in Paradise, it would show . . . defect in God. (2)

Here, again, it is not possible to do justice to an original by selection, still less to summarise; it is only possible to suggest both manner and matter. Perhaps it will sum up the argument of all these writers to say that they objected that eternal life could not be a continuation of life in this world - sicut et nunc.[3] The consequence of such a thing, were it conceivable, would be less than human; William of Auvergne had insisted how much he had found Cicero apposite: ut ait Tullius, voces istae pecudum videntur esse non hominum.[4]

The enormous mediaeval popularity of the kitāb-al-miʿrāj[5] drew further attention to the Islamic heaven though less strongly to the carnal delights than to what seemed the

1. Contemp. D. 311.
2. Ibid. 243.
3. St. Thomas Aquinas, loc. cit.
4. De leg. XIX/18.U, 19.R.
5. Cf. Asin Palacios, Muñoz Sendino, Cerulli.

carnal misunderstanding of spiritual concepts and the fabulous treatment of the Prophets. In some descriptions of the type that we have been considering there occur references to the vast but finite distances in heaven, or to angels so big that there is a day's journey from one eye to the other; these are indebted to the Liber Scalae Mahometi.[1] Judging by the summaries reproduced by different writers, the attraction of the Liber Scalae to the West lay in its absurdity, the constant fabulous element, and, in particular, the arrangement of the heavens and the prophets, and their subordination to Muhammad. Interest in this theme in Spain antedates Abraham's translation; but it is not possible to consider this subject in great detail; despite its prominence in literary history and its popularity in that age, it is relatively unrevealing of ideological criticism.[2] Yet it is obvious how much the incidental detail appealed to the Christian reader who wished to feed his contempt for the gross and material things which he saw Islam as having substituted for the spiritual. "Octavum quidem celum superius nominatum ego Machometus et Gabriel invenimus quod totum erat de uno topacio . . . Habebat autem in spisso quingentorum annorum iter . . ."[3]

---

1. Cf. Varagine; Tripoli, L.
2. Contrarietas XII, (f.261 v. ff.); cf. IV (f.243r.); Rod., Hist. Arab. V, Cron. de Esp. CXVII/489; Ric., Itin. XXXV, Disp. I, VI, VII, IX, and esp. XIV; P. de Pen.,XIII f. 31v. ff.); San Pedro, C.F.M. passim and S.S.M.,I.viii.76 ff., and see Muñoz and Cerulli; cf. also Hildebert of Mans,11.
3. Lib. Sc. XIX.

4. Conclusion.

At this point it becomes necessary to review what has already been said, rather than to explore further a field which is capable of the most profound study. In this matter the Middle Ages had exceptionally marked prejudices. It cannot be said that as an aspect of Islam the theme of predestination particularly impressed mediaeval observers to whom the nature of Paradise seemed incomparably more significant. It was in the period between the Reformation and the Enlightenment that the Islamic sense of destiny struck Western commentators most powerfully. In that period the mysteries of election and reprobation were nearer to the heart of Christian theological preoccupation, but this does not seem to be the reason. This element of destiny was carried forward into the Romantic image of the East in which the fatalistic Turk was prominent. What appealed to the imagination of the post-mediaeval writer was less predestination to salvation or perdition than the destiny in ordinary events which made easy resignation both to misfortune and to danger, and prevented such common precautions as were usual in Europe, for example against the plague.[1] This is in contrast to the mediaeval interest which was markedly eschatological. San Pedro, and many of his contemporaries, were as fully interested as the Reformers in grace and in man's power to do good works to gain

1. Cf. Nau, État présent de la religion mahométane.

merit; but if they noticed anything remarkable in oriental resignation, they did not say so. It may be conjectured that the reason was that there was less difference between Western and Eastern attitudes in that age than later. The recognition of God's providence in dangers and misfortunes was probably most powerful when the chances of denying fate were fewest. It was after the Renaissance that men learned to control their destiny in sufficient instances to mask from themselves for long stretches the continuing uncertainty of their lives. Mediaeval men were more accustomed to trust in Providence. Yet in so far as this aspect of the Islamic creeds was recognised it was seen as a predestination to immoral acts.

San Pedro's interest in the predestination of individual souls to damnation was not generally shared. The mediaeval attitude to Islam here more closely approaches what would later be the Catholic reaction to the Lutherans. There was a strong sense of distaste for the idea of an act of faith that can remit sin, of admission to heaven without works and in a state of preoccupation with sinful things.[1] After the Reformation, Catholic travellers in the East would identify the Muslim belief with Protestant doctrines of faith without works, just as travellers belonging to one of the Reformed churches would see in the religious practices of Islam a dependence upon vain acts which could be called Papist.[2]

---

1. It does not seem to be the problem of election in a Calvinist sense that is in question.
2. Cf. especially, Febvre, Théâtre de la Turquie; Rauwwolf, A Journey to the East.

In this earlier period, the belief in a carnal Paradise consequent to an act of faith was given in particular an immediate moral significance. It encouraged in this life that carnality which it seemed only to reflect. The two recurring themes were this one of morals, and, in fewer writers, that other of concern lest Islam seem less than Christianity to limit the omnipotence of God.

Christian commentators in all ages, and certainly not least in the Middle Ages, have seen that beatitude to which the Qur'an invites believers as one of the most important disproofs of the Islamic religion. Christian thought and action is necessarily bound to the concept of eternal life and for this reason the irrationality of Islam propter finem quam promittit has seemed so clear and so important a mark of its invalidity. This final indication of unspirituality - eternal tavern, perpetual brothel - was conceived on the one hand as potentially a temptation to the fallen nature of Christians, and on the other as insulting both their intelligenc and their spiritual labours. It was this that brought about the use of a rationalist polemic which with a different psychology would ultimately be turned against the orthodox Christian positions. The argumentum ad hominem is usually capable of rebounding.

The common sport of setting up an opponent's arguments in a form suitable for knocking down was much pursued

in this connection. It is doubtful how far a Muslim would have agreed that some of what was said was relevant. On the assumption that the Qur'an asserted a paradise that was like this world, arguments against such a paradise were excogitated almost indefinitely, without consideration of how far or how strictly that definition applied. Even the Liber Scalae, although gross, portrayed a place of marvels which could hardly be confused with this world. It was without much sense of proportion that literalist arguments were brought forward in such a context. It is also important to note how often it seems to have been forgotten that the Paradise of the Qur'an is the reward of the just, after the resurrection, at the Last Judgement. Even if it be admitted that there is no marrying in the Christian heaven, or food, clothes or precious stones, or other "gross" things, yet some of the problems that a Muslim theologian must take into account when he considers eternal life are similar to those of a Christian who reflects upon the implications of the resurrection of the body. To deny those bodily functions which are most easily ridiculed is elementary. Still the theologian of either religion must finally admit that he cannot explain all that he believes, and it is evident that even the Qur'anic Paradise might have been given a more charitable consideration, had it been viewed in the light of what was common to the two religions, and not of what was

different. It would be anachronistic to demand that this should have been so. Speculation and charity are not incompatible, but the abiding interest in all these subjects was moral and was bound to adopt the form of condemnation.

Chapter 22.

Conclusion.

1. Summary of ground covered.

During the period with which I have been concerned there was established in the minds of the Western reading public some fair idea of the claim of Islam to be the one religion of the prophets, and certainly of its claim to be the third and culminating prophetic revelation. This last idea is generally sound, although it was often not formulated with precision. The Muslim belief that the Qur'an was sent down was understood in a general way, although all the implications of the doctrine were not fully grasped; there was a marked failure to distinguish between the Qur'an and other books thought to be authoritative. There was great objection to the idea that revelation might come down to solve problems of a transient nature. Much importance was attached to the defence of Scripture, both from the general charge of corruption, usually by arguments based on historical impossibility, and from the special charge that Christ's prophecy of Ahmad had been suppressed. Although the idea of this Muslim charge against the Christians, of having corrupted Scripture, was widely known, it was equally widely argued that the Qur'an expressly corroborated Scripture; and, inconsistently, it was taken for granted that this meant corroboration

of the Christian canon of Scripture. With a similar inconsistency, arguments to defend Scripture were often based upon that same Scripture. The real disproof of the Qur'an was seen to be its unlikeness to, or its contradiction of, both Scripture and philosophy, and also its being contrary to reason.

In a parallel way, the prophethood of Muhammad was seen as being alien to all other prophethood: non-prophetic, untruthful in utterance, evil of life, unverified by miracles. This absence of miracles was considered one of the most damning weaknesses in the Muslim case; on the one hand, the Christians said, Muhammad denied the need, because he had not the gift, and, on the other, his followers, embarrassed by the lack, attributed bogus miracles to him in spite of his denial. Always associated with the Qur'an's picture of Muhammad was the picture it gave of Christ; always contrasted with its falsity were the true elements it contained. It was agreed, with occasional exceptions, that as far as the unity of God was concerned, Islamic doctrine was sound; but its purpose in speaking truth was only to ensnare. This was the scholastic view; it was only in poetry that the idea that Islam was idolatrous was expressed to any considerable extent, and it seems to have been a purely literary convention.

It was the Qur'anic praise of Christ that was thought the most valuable thing in Islam; often this praise was quoted in words very close to the words of the Qur'an, and sometimes the very spirit of it was successfully conveyed, since the subject was congenial. It was not solely a question of the person of Christ, however; the high and difficult doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation were almost an obsession to Christians who argued both that the Qur'an really implied the Trinity, and that the Trinity could any way be proved by natural reason. This attitude resulted in Islam's being taken to be a heresy, and as the sum of all heresy it was often regarded. It was also regarded as one of the three great religions of the world, which were related historically and which competed contemporaneously for the pagan soul of the Mongols. Occasionally it was interpreted as a schism of Christian peoples.

The attack on Muhammad's prophethood was worked out in great detail; the creation of a legend of his life was a very important part of anti-Islamic polemic and of the Christian approach to Islam. The spectacle of Muhammad's acts was a sufficient proof that he was not a prophet; San Pedro's remark that Muslims were to blame, not for doing what Muhammad allowed, but for believing in him at all, represents the Christian attitude in its most

logical form. The background of Muhammad's life (the Arabia into which he was born), his own early life, his call to the prophethood and the circumstances of his death were all presented as human, fallible and so far as possible discreditable. Even to have lived in paganism till the age of forty was thought particularly disgraceful. Heretical Christian and Jewish influences explained the content of his teaching; and the manner of revelation alleged of Muhammad, and his solution of his immediate, temporary and often personal problems by revelations were all thought so suspicious as again to amount in themselves to a disproof of the prophetic claim. This was most true of revelations which allowed the Prophet marital privileges which to Christians, and expressed in Christian terms, were highly immoral. The two most important aspects of Muhammad's life, Christians believed, were his sexual licence, and his use of violence to enforce his religion. In order to preserve this picture, in which all the events of his life and death and the circumstances associated with them had inherent polemic value for the Christian side, it was often necessary to prefer a false account to a true one, and it happened that as many false elements as it was by any means possible to believe were accepted. Even so, there was wide variation between what it was possible to

believe about Muhammad at a very great distance from Islamic society, and at the borders of or from within dār al-Islām.

The salient elements in Muhammad's life, or in the Christian legend of his life, were reflected in the concept of Islam as a practical religion. It was said to be, like the Prophet himself, violent by nature; and this was said despite the reflection in Crusading theory of the Islamic doctrine on the holy war. There was especially bitterness in the East, where the Christians were unsuccessful and many were killed or enslaved; in Spain the misfortunes of war fell upon the Muslims. It was in connection with the defeats in the Holy Land that the favour of divine Providence which was apparently given to Muslims became most seriously a problem. Equally important in the Christian concept was the moral licence - and to an overwhelming extent this meant sexual licence - attributed to Islamic doctrine and practice, as to the Prophet in his lifetime; it is almost impossible to exaggerate how important this was felt to be. At the same time there was a less prominent, but still long-lived and persistent tendency to hold Islam up as a good example - in its practice - to the shaming of Christians. The more specifically religious duties inculcated by Islam

were also occasionally recognised as setting a good example to Christians; but more often these were misconceived, and interpreted according to Christian ideas, often according to some parallel among Christian institutions. Where there was a substitution of Islamic for Christian cult, as happened where Islam was successful, there was dismay and bitterness throughout Christendom.

Finally, the Islamic doctrine of the Last Things seemed to sum up the more important Christian objections to Islam: there was the gaining of Paradise irrespective of moral actions, often as a reward for death in a holy war; above all, there was the quality of the Paradise thus gained, which often seemed to Christian critics to be just a vast brothel, both disgusting and absurd, an offence against two things then very highly regarded (however well or ill served), chastity and reason.

2. The durability of mediaeval concepts.

This summary outlines the Christian canon as to what constituted Islam; this "canon" developed during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries and by the middle of the fourteenth was firmly established in the West.

In general the quality of information provided by learned Western orientalists would not improve to any significant extent until the late seventeenth and the eighteenth century,

with such writers as Maracci, Reland and Sale (1). Until then there was no great advance in knowledge of the doctrines of Islam, of the Qur'an itself, of prophecy, of the life of Muhammad. After that date there has developed progressively a study which is scientific in intention, of the sense of the Qur'an when it was first revealed, and of the life and times of the Prophet who enunciated it.

The present work is concerned primarily with the Latin interpretation of Islam; and here the durability of the great mediaeval themes is most impressive. A few aspects of the question of Islam can of their nature never be treated very differently: basically the relations between Judaism, Christianity and Islam are an example; these three must always be considered, as the Middle Ages considered them, three historically connected revealed world religions. What is astonishing is the number of aspects of the subject where the view of Islam accepted in the Middle Ages remained constant, while the European view of Christianity changed radically, and changed radically more than once. Of the points summarised above, most had a long life before them. The "fraudulent" or "hypocritical" character of Muhammad's claim to prophesy, while he was an ambitious rogue, a bandit and a lecher; the emphasis on Islam as a falling short from Christianity, a sum of heresy, particularly in connection with the Trinity; pre-occupation

---

1. For references to these and other authors cited below, see bibliographies. Maracci, as controversialist, belonged to the old tradition.

with the Qur'anic teaching of Christ; the general lines, if not always the details of the presentation of Muhammad's life, and particularly the weight given to the influence of Sergius upon him; the enormous importance given to two moral questions, the supposed public reliance on force and the supposed private laxity, particularly licence, or encouragement, to commit any sexual act; the interest in Islamic religious practices, the admission of Islamic reverence for God as a good example, but the treatment of the cult in general as vain; finally, the attention paid to predestination and the ridicule of the Qur'anic Paradise; all these, with some differences in emphasis, but with a great similarity in their attitude of intellectual contempt, long dominated Christian and European thought. In the later Middle Ages, for example, this is true of such writers as Nicholas of Cusa and Denis the Carthusian, and of an experienced traveller like Francesco Suriano; in the Reformation it is true of Luther and Melanchthon and Bibliander himself; and examples are to be found even in the era of scientific investigation. Prideaux was one of the last writers to belong almost wholly to the old tradition. Most of the travellers in the Levant and the Middle East in the seventeenth century, while they added some observations of their own, based their accounts of Islam as a religion, not on what they saw, but on the tradition they inherited from the mediaeval West. It is astonishing how even

the details of their criticisms, for example of the rules of Ramaḍān, were repetitions passed down over centuries.

We may go further and say that the attitude of the West was still firmly traditional, even while the substance of what was said and the methods of investigation became more prudent and more accurate; it can indeed be said that the Western outlook is still very much affected by this tradition, although the latest signs are of a real shifting of emphasis at last. The beginnings of change came slowly. Gibbon and Voltaire were perhaps more heavily indebted to their predecessors than they realised. "Enlightenment" was often unoriginal, and this appears still more clearly in writers of less genius; when Boulainvilliers and Savary used praise of Islam to attack Christianity, their strategy was not essentially different from that of mediaeval satirical usage. It is with Carlyle, representing the Romantics, that a fundamental change seems to occur. It is not difficult to recognise elements that are still unchanged to-day. With the fading of devotion and loyalty to Christianity, interest in the Qur'anic Christ has faded to some extent, but, thanks to the preponderance of believing Christians among orientalists of Christian origin, not entirely; yet a full study of Christ and his Mother as objects of cult in Islam is yet to write. Interest in the Qur'anic Paradise has certainly faded. The stress on violence and sexual laxity and the general attitude

of intellectual contempt remained strong in European writing till the end of the last century and the beginning of this; compare Muir and Lammens. There is now a greater religious sympathy among Christians for some aspects of Islamic worship, for Sufism (following Nicholson and Massignon) and even for Islamic religious practice generally (with Père abd el-Jalil).

There is now some recognition of a point made by Sale: Islam does not spread by force alone. The allegation that its attraction derives from the union of divine sanction to sexual tolerance is less strong than it was, but it survives, for example, when Christians attribute Islamic missionary success among pagans to the Muslim rules of marriage. A modern attitude which is anti-Christian is to welcome Islam precisely for its sexual width, as the "religion of the whole man". On almost every side the attitude of intellectual contempt is fading, partly from the desire to exclude criticism from scientific study, but partly from an increase in actual sympathy. When Pope Pius XII said that the Crusades were nothing to what Christianity has to face to-day, that they were a "simple quarrel between monotheists", he did not add to the substance of what had already been said of Christian-Muslim relations (1). In fact, a relation between separate monotheist religions is arguably less intimate than that between heresy and orthodoxy. What he did do was to mark the

---

1. Quoted in the Sunday Times, 27 November 1955.

new approach to the existing material; it is a question of stressing what is common rather than what is different, what separates rather than what unites. It can certainly be said that it is only in the mid-twentieth century that Western thought, whether Christian or unChristian, begins to become independent of the mediaeval Latin attitude which this work has tried to define in the form it first acquired.

3. The peculiarly mediaeval element.

The identification of an established canon of attitudes which survived so long extends to a very large part of the material which we are concerned with; nevertheless there were matters peculiarly mediaeval which lacked interest to later ages. What was most characteristic of the mediaeval, rather than of any later attitude to Islam, was the strong dependence on Scripture, the determination to defend Scripture from any attack, and the employment of Scripture to discredit the Qur'an. The use of Scriptural citations to prove Scripture might seem truly astonishing only if we do not reflect how difficult it is to discard the assumptions that we take most for granted. Scripture was the framework of all mediaeval thought; for no Latin writer was it ever possible to think himself into a position outside and independent of Scripture. It was just possible to realise, as a fact, that the Qur'an asserted the falsification of Scripture, but not to think of the Qur'an as the sole source of knowledge of the Prophets.

The Old Testament would always seem to be the primary source of this knowledge, and in practice, therefore, it was often by the Old Testament that the Qur'an was refuted.

Another characteristic of the Middle Ages was the extensive quotation from the Qur'an, which was then used as an authority, and was not so used again to a comparable extent until the modern age of scientific research. The whole training of mediaeval scholastic writers, and the technique of scholastic thought, were based upon respect for authorities; this, of course, is not true of poets. In every argument, the Scriptures were the prime authority, followed at a distance by the Fathers. In dealing with Islam, however, the Qur'an also became an authority; so did, with some writers, some other books which were thought either to explain the hidden but authentic meaning of the Qur'an (as was the case with Ricoldo and the commentators), or to be themselves "written by Muhammad", like the Liber Scalae. The Qur'an itself was thought to have been written by him. The infinite respect for authority did not extend in a modern fashion to the letter of the text. Verbal accuracy of quotation was not thought of at all, just as there seemed to be no need scientifically to establish the exact details of Muhammad's life.

What did seem important was that when the authority of the Qur'an was cited it should be to prove the untruth of Islam; if it did so, it was a true quotation. The words of

a quotation were often chosen, not as textually accurate, but as rendering correctly some true or supposed tenet of Islam, to which it was desired for polemic reasons to draw attention; for example, "I send you with a sword" or "in Paradise whatever you desire you shall immediately be satisfied". The whole long paraphrase of the Qur'an by Ketton is itself a case in point; and even Mark, with his literal translation, did not quote his own work with exactitude. Sometimes we can identify the use of Ketton's translation by other writers, as in the case of Fitzralph; but it is true to say that the Qur'an was quoted in almost as many versions or paraphrases as it was quoted at all. Thus the use of Qur'anic authority was to support the Christian case, and this alone gave it authenticity; any formula that met this need was correct. A non-Christian authority had meaning only in a Christian context and in Christian terms, but the frequent citation of the Qur'an, whether accurately or inaccurately, and the translation of Islamic religious works, testify to the felt need for such an authority. This also explains the extraordinary popularity of the Risālah; it was obviously a source of authentic information, and there was the added advantage that this information was already deployed in support of the Christian case against Islam. The influence of this book cannot easily be exaggerated; there are few arguments used by Latin Christians which are not contained in it fully or in germ. Yet even the Risālah

contained information about Islam which was rarely or never quoted, presumably because there was judged to be insufficient polemic value in it.

A revealing point in this connection is another peculiarly mediaeval aspect of this literature. Peter the Venerable insisted that the Latins - that is, the Cluniacs - could not be mistaken about the Qur'an because of the excellence of their translators. It would have been absurd to tell the Muslims this. He can only have been reassuring himself, and it is a sign of his greatness that he ever imagined Muslim objections at all. Most mediaeval literature about Islam failed to conceive the possibility that Muslims might be unimpressed. It is difficult to think that the confident and positive and often smug assertions of the Latins hide even a hint of uncertainty. Those who felt doubts did not express them, or, if they did, their doubts have not survived. There was always a Muslim "reader over the shoulder"; not a real one, of course, but one whom the Christian imagination created. He was unreal because he never objected to what was written. There was a remarkably wide use of the logical dilemma as a logical device, and there was more than a suggestion of the atmosphere of public challenge and debate. The mediaeval Latins seem always to be defending a public dissertation before favourable judges, judges whose approval has been assured in advance. It is a nightmare reversed: the opponent it is who cannot answer,

except in words set in his mouth; it is a race in which the jockey on the rival horse is a dummy. Much of the literature about Islam seems to consist of debating points triumphantly enunciated and, of course, never answered, because the real opponent is absent; and it is this which gives an air of unreality to so much of it. We know that it can never have been said to a real Muslim, because a Muslim would simply have laughed at it, would have disowned it, rather than denied it: to give just one example, the assertion that he said that God "prayed for" Muhammad. The academic and scholastic style in much mediaeval writing on the subject was very marked; the ideas would survive much longer than their scholastic expression (1).

It is a fair criticism to say that mediaeval Latin writers were creditably, and radically, anxious to base their assertions on sound authority, and that in this they signally failed; they pretended to have found, but did not find, authorities which they could have persuaded actual Muslims to accept, or arguments that would stand up to Muslims in debate. That is why Ricoldo disputed with learned Muslims only aliquantulum, and why his pages are filled from literary sources, and not from the fruits of actual argument. That is why missionaries gave their attention chiefly to Christians living under Islam; and those that turned to Islam sought martyrdom for themselves, and not the conversion of the Muslims.

---

1. For debates that really were held, not before Muslims, but before Pagans, with Muslims present, see above p. 176

Practical men did not often seek debate, and when they did so, it was very unsuccessful, as, on premises unacceptable to a Muslim audience, it was bound to be. Tripoli was almost unique in his attitude of encouraging Muslims to think that Islam and Christianity had much in common and that they themselves were already in a fair way to becoming Christians; and even so it cannot be said that he sought to understand Islam in itself.

There was always a tendency to neglect to find out what the Qur'an really meant, or what Muslims really thought it meant. It was only necessary to present it in a form that would convince Christians; and more and more extravagant forms would stand a chance of acceptance as the distance from the Islamic border increased. It was with very great reluctance that what Muslims said Muslims believed about Muhammad and about religion and morals was accepted as what they actually did believe. There was a Christian picture in which the details (even under the pressure of facts) were abandoned as little as possible, and in which the general outline was never abandoned. Thus there were shades of opinion, but only within a common frame-work.

It has been said of the Middle Ages that "we may doubt whether any but the finest spirits ever rose above a hazy group consciousness" (1). Indeed, it is true that we

---

1. Galbraith, Roger Wendover and Matthew Paris.

may seriously doubt whether in any age the majority can do this; those who are not original thinkers (and there were as many or as few of these in the Middle Ages as at any other time) always reveal minds filled with material heard and read - contemporary ideas, expressed generally in cliches which are equally contemporaneous. No one is wholly, few of us largely, exempt. Yet the Middle Ages were different in not even seeking originality; it was a case then, not of unrealised repetition of stale ideas and phrases, but of copying whole passages into new contexts, of forming old elements into new patterns. A thing once said well, the passage was used continually, like a tried and tested tool. In the field of writing about Islam there was a very great deal indeed of copying, perhaps because there was much ignorance of the subject, or because there was such strong feeling, or because there was a special craving for unanimity. If these were not the reasons, they were the results; they certainly existed. There were, of course, many cases of writers' correcting one another, but this was done to strengthen themes which, where the proofs had once been discredited, must then be maintained with different evidence. To a remarkable extent, all writers drew from a single kitty, to which they contributed again. The Christian concept of Islam was integral and self-sufficient.

4. The sense of hostility.

Many of these processes must seem to the modern

commentator to be very dangerous. It now seems obvious that arguments of cynical unbelief could be turned, mutatis mutandis, against Christianity, as has, in fact, been done. For example, there are the arguments that a revelation can be reduced to pre-existing natural elements, arguments based on rationalistic interpretations of a sacred text and psychological interpretations of its supposed author's mind, arguments that people believe what they want to believe, and arguments based on a ground that perpetually shifts between an attack on the theory and an attack on the practice of religion. It was the fervour of utter conviction that secured Christian writers from realisation of the dangers of their stand. It also obliterated all possibility of detachment, every glimmer of sympathy and all sense of proportion, so that Islam came to be treated as a parody of bad Christianity, rather than as enjoying an independent existence of its own.

We have seen already how the story of Muhammad was made to serve the purposes of doctrine; facts of history were believed to be true if, according to Christian notions, they tended to show Islam to be false. The Middle Ages, of course, were at one with other ages in inventing and rearranging the facts of history and the beliefs of opponents in order to suit some noble purpose. It is important to realise that the facts and doctrines thus rearranged were put into a form which primarily repelled, and must have been intended to repel,

Christians rather than Muslims. No doubt there was much that a Muslim, if he had been forced to take it seriously, would have had to resent; but the unpleasant image of Islam that the Christians drew was drawn to seem unpleasant to Christians, and to encourage in them their own faith.

That is particularly exemplified by the stress on such points as the humanity of Muhammad, which were significant as arguments against Islam only from a Christian point of view. Those things were stressed about Islam that would appeal to Christians as scandalous; not those that Muslims think important. All Muslim doctrine and practice were interpreted in Christian terms, sometimes so as entirely to obscure the true meaning, but more often only so as to twist it, more or less. A Muslim would inevitably have been struck by the Christian misunderstanding of his religion, even at the best that Christians achieved, and leaving the worst apart; but unless he were very intimate with Christians, he would not necessarily realise how closely the misrepresentations corresponded to Christian doctrine. Thus sometimes there was assimilation to Christian practice, as with the cult duties, prayer, pilgrimage, fasting, and the rest; these Islamic institutions were seen as failures to reproduce Christian institutions with the same names, and not as they should have been, as a particular kind of prayer, a particular pilgrimage

and fast, having only a few points in common with the generic Christian parallels. Less common than this was that deliberate rejection of fact for fancy which occurred very much in treatment of the life of Muhammad but not very much outside it. What happened most often was exaggeration, for example, of Qur'anic texts doubtful in application, which together with the greater toleration of offences were interpreted as official encouragement of homosexuality. Another is the erection of an unnatural act permitted by one school of jurisprudence into a crime committed by all Islam. Another kind of exaggeration was to exploit differences favourable to Christianity further than was just; for example to practise and to preach the same morality of war as Islam, and yet to contrast Christ's rejection of violence with Muhammad's use of it. Again, on the ever-popular theme of sexual morals, what was compared was Christian theory with Islamic practice, not Christian and Islamic practice; and it was also assumed that Islamic practice must be as licentious as Islamic law was supposed to permit, without the least evidence derived from direct knowledge. Peter of Poitiers asserted that he had been assured that a certain practice was general; but it is obvious that he leapt to welcome the assurance, otherwise he would have realised that it was most unlikely that his informants could have first-hand knowledge of the matter. For the most part, even such doubtful oral authority was not quoted; although an authority was needed for literary statements about Muslim "law"

it was apparently not needed for statements about what Muslims actually did. In one way or another Islam was shown as an offence against the most important Christian doctrines, and this was consciously or unconsciously the purpose of most writers.

The point of Pius XII's comment was that the things which divide Christendom from the rest of the world to-day are different from (and more important than) those which Islam and Christendom quarrelled about in the Middle Ages. The attitude adopted by a society in such a case is largely determined by the degree of hostility it feels, rather than by an impartial assessment of the importance of the quarrel. It is not suggested that hostile societies to-day feel more antagonism than hostile societies did during the Crusades. In fact, the attribution of so many crimes to Islam, those which most disgusted Christendom, was not just a means (even sincerely and confidently brought forward) to discredit a rival religion. It was also and more simply an expression of the hostility that Christendom felt for the civilisation at its borders. It may be that it is a human tendency for men to dislike other people's thinking differently from themselves. This would explain why a man often attributes to those who do think differently from him, a version of their opinions that they themselves cannot recognise, but which from his point of view is agreeably repulsive.

In the circumstances there is nothing remarkable about

the mediaeval Christian willingness to believe the worst about Islam. What is remarkable is the extent to which the basing of polemic upon hostility was open and admitted. Naturally, it was never admitted that what was said about Islam was exaggerated or silly, still less that it was frequently untrue. What was admitted and stressed was the point that Islamic religion was in many aspects unlike, alien to and incompatible with a Christian tradition of which the truth was taken for granted. This contrast co-existed with that close relation which was based on what was held in common, and was an admission of the fact of hostility, and a recognition of difference. Partly this was stressed with the conscious purpose of refuting the Islamic claim to fulfil the Jewish and Christian prophecies; but partly it was an admission that distinct identities separated the two cultures. The integrity of each required that the other should be rejected, and rejected whole. There was no question of compromise, of exchange of views or of intermixture of cultures. It may well be that the internal consistency and integrity of the Christian concept of Islam was one reason for its long survival.

At the same time, rejection did not cause the thing rejected to cease to exist: Islam was still at the frontier. For this reason it had to be admitted openly as an enemy, and presented in terms that did not make it necessary to change or adapt any single facet of Christian culture. This is why the

Latin West formed a more or less invariable canon of beliefs about Islam; it decided for itself what Islam was, and formed a view materially different from anything Muslims could recognise. There was nothing original about the view that it formed. Every idea probably existed among Christians subject to Islamic rule, and perhaps also among the Greeks, almost from the time of ʿUmar. The important thing was that it suited the West. It corresponded to need; it made it possible to protect the minds of Christians against apostasy and it gave Christendom self-respect in dealing with a civilisation in many ways superior to it. So much did this canon suit the need, that it survived many changes in the relative positions of Islam and Christendom and in the interior motions of Christian opinion. Within Christendom, the mediaevals preserved society by intolerance; Jews and Muslims subject to Christian princes needed to be protected, and heretics, as subject to the Church, to be extirpated. The same preservation of Christendom against the external enemy was provided by the development of the intellectual response to Islam; and it survived longer than the internal unity by many centuries.

BIBLIOGRAPHIES.

Bibliographies: General Remarks and Notes.

I have prepared separate lists:

A. Manuscripts consulted.
B. Original sources;
   i) Collections;
   ii) Anonymous works;
   iii) Alphabetical list by authors.
C. Writers on Islam subsequent to the period of this thesis, but earlier than the present age.
D. Modern works relating to the Latin sources.
E. Modern works on Islam.

Under the heading of original sources, translations from Arabic and Greek are listed under the names of the translators, as if they were the authors of original works. These names are marked "(tr.)". In the same section works that are cited under B (i) and to which I have not had occasion to refer by name in the course of my thesis are not also listed as individual works under B (ii) or (iii). In all sections the editions that I have specified are those that I have actually used. This is not to claim that they are the best; but they were the best available to me.

The recent revival of interest in this field seems to date from the publication of Ugo Monneret de Villard's Studio dell' Islam in 1944. This scholar's work ranged widely in search of material and it is an invaluable guide. He was not greatly interested in the opinions expressed by mediaeval writers and was more concerned with historical, geographical and linguistic aspects. M.-Th. d'Alverny then published two works of crucial importance. In the first she closely examined a key subject - the Toletano-Cluniac corpus - and she also announced her discovery of a later Toledan school. In the second she carried the latter question further and widened the scope of her enquiries. The material to which she has drawn attention profoundly affects our knowledge of the sources of the Western literature about Islam.

Her work was revolutionary, and Monneret de Villard was unfortunate enough to publish his books too early to benefit from this. Much that he says is in consequence out-dated. Miss d'Alverny incidentally cleared away a number of accumulated misconceptions which dated from Mandonnet's pioneer work on the subject, and which Monneret de Villard did not tackle. For example, the idea that the

summula (part of the Cluniac literature) could be a translation from the Arabic was natural in a scholar who was not an orientalist, but no one would have wished to maintain it who knew the East. It is not now possible to work in this field except on a basis of what Miss d'Alverny has established. In the meantime E. Cerulli and J.M. Munoz in their editions of the Liber Scalae Machometi published new material of great interest.

The material identified by Monneret de Villard remains to be fully exploited, and Miss d'Alverny's discoveries relating to Islamic studies in Spain in the thirteenth century are also awaiting long and detailed examination. Sweetman in England has recently paraphrased much of Monneret de Villard's work of 1944, but unfortunately he does not seem to have made use of later work done on the subject, and, in particular, he ignores Miss d'Alverny's. This invalidates much that he has to say on Latin treatment of Islam, but the primary purpose of his work is in any case oecumenical rather than scholarly.

Atiya has bibliographies particularly useful for pilgrim and late Crusading literature. Still earlier writers were interested in more purely literary aspects of the subject. The work both of A. d'Ancona and of B. Ziolecki is most interesting and bibliographically useful. Works of interest that are progressively more remote are those of Reinaud and Michel, ~~of Prideaux, and~~ of Fabricius (Delectus Argumentorum et Syllabus Scriptorum, Hamburg, 1725) and of Prideaux.

Apart from these books and articles I have been guided by more general sources; for example, by U. Chevalier's Sources Historiques du Moyen Age, Bio-bibliographie (Paris, 1903-4) and by the current catalogues of the British Museum Reading Room, the National Library of Scotland, the Bodleian Library, Edinburgh University Library and the London Library.

References and abbreviations.

When the reference is to a short passage, no reference has in fact been given in the text. The meaning of most abbreviations will be clarified by the bibliography. A few indications are inadequate; and the following references should be understood:

For Acqui understand, at the year 619
For Fleury, understand, from p.149 ff. of the edition cited in the bibliography.
For Gerald of Wales, understand, work cited in bibliography, I.xvii.
For Dandalo, understand VI.vii.5.
For Giovanni Andrea, understand, de Judaeis et Saracenis.
For Guibert, understand, I.iv.
For Higden, understand V.xiv.
For Hugh of St. Victor, understand I.ix.ix
For Mandeville, understand, chapter XV (Egerton text).
For Martin Polonus, understand, p.273 ff.
For Sigebert, understand under the year 630
For Varagine, understand CLXXXI (176).
For Wendover and "Westminster" understand under the year 622.

The following points may also need to be clarified: Reference to Paris means to the report to Gregory at the year 1236; al. scr. means to the same year, to the other account there entered; any other reference to Paris will be specified. Reference to Viterbo without further qualification means to the passage printed by Cerulli. Reference to the St.Albans Chronicle means to Wendover or "Westminster" or uncorrected Paris for the early periods.

References to Roderick's Cronica de Espana are given jointly with references to the Alfonso X version. References to William of Auvergne are given first to the later, and secondly to the oldest edition cited in the bibliography. Then umbers often but not always agree. References to Fitzralph are given first to the printed and secondly the manuscript text; there is always a difference of one. References to ibn Ishaq are to the Arabic text marked marginally in Guillaume's translation. (Ibn Hisham)

Other abbreviations: Q = Qur'an; Bu = Bukhari; C.S.S. = contra sectam Saracenorum; C.F.M. = contra los fatalistas mahometanes; S.S.M. = sobre el seta mahometana; M.O.F.P.H. = Monumenta Ord. Fr. Praed. Historica; M.G.H., M.P.L., M.G.H., and R.S. are all familiar (see list B.i); Alv. = William of Auvergne; Arm. = summa de questionibus Armenorum; Pref. Q. = Preface to the translation of the Qur'an; Pref. ʿAqida = Preface to the translation of ibn Tumart. Rod. = Rodrigo Ximenez.

All references to Dante commentaries are to Canto 28.

Bibliography A. **Manuscripts consulted.**

(I have used manuscripts in cases where no printed text exists, or where I could obtain none, or where the printed text was unsatisfactory.)

Berlin. (Held at Tuebingen).
MS. theol. lat. Qu. 85, s. 240 - 250.
MS. theol. lat. Fol. 425, s. 122v - 130r
See quadruplex reprobatio (list B ii).

Paris: Bibliotheque nationale.
MS. lat. 3394 f. 237v - 264r.
See Mark of Toledo (Contrarietas). (list B iii)

MS lat. 3646 f. 13v - 46v.
See Pennis, Peter de. (list B iii)

MS lat. 4230 f.151v - 183v.
See quadruplex reprobatio and Ricoldo. (list B ii and B iii respectively)

MS. lat. 14503 f. 245 - 247; 352 - 354.
See Prophetia and Liber Nicholay (list B ii) respectively.

Oxford. Bodleian Library.
MS. Can. Pat. Lat. 142
See Ricoldo. (list B iii)

MS. New College 90.
See Fitzralph. (list B iii)

MS C.C.C. D. 184
MS. Selden Supra 31
See Cluny. (list B iii)

Vienna. Oesterr. Nationalbibliothek.
Cod. 4297, f. 1 - 209v.
See Mark of Toledo (Alchorani liber) (list B iii)

Vatican: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana.
MS. lat. 314 f. 106r - 111r.
See Tripoli (list B iii)

(Foreign manuscripts consulted in microfilm.)

Bibliography B. Original sources (i): Collections

Acta Sanctorum quotquot toto orbe colentur. (ed) J. Bollandus. Venice, Antwerp, Paris, Brussels etc. 1734 -

Analecta Franciscana. Quaracchi, 1885-1912. (Vols 5)

Bibliander. Machumetis Saracenorum principis, eiusque successorum vitae, doctrina, ac ipse Alcoran . . . Haec omnia in unum volumen redact sunt, opera et studio Theodori Bibliandri. . . Bale, 1550. (Second edition).

Bongars: Gesta Dei per Francos, sive orientalium expeditionum et regni Francorum Hierosolymitani historia . . a Jacobo Bongersio. Hanover 1611.

Bullarum . . . editio Taurinensis (vols 1 - 4).

Clementinarum materia, etc. Paris 1513. See Sextus also.

Decretum Gratiani. Una cum glossis. Lyons, 1584.

du Meril, M. E. Poésies Populaires Latines antérieures au Douzième siècle. Paris, 1843. See also in D.

Golubovich, P. Girolamo. Biblioteca Bio-bibliografica della Terra Santa e dell' oriente Francescano. Vols i - v. Quaracchi, 1906 -

Laurent, J.C.M. Peregrinatores medii aevi quatuor. Leipzig, 1864.

Mansi, J.D. Sacrorum Conciliorum Amplissima Collectio. Florence and Venice 1759-98. (Facsimile edition.)

Michaud, Bibliotheque des Croisades. Paris, 1829.

Migne, Patrologia Latina.

Migne, Patrologia Graeco-Latina.

Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Hanover, 1826 -

Monumenta Ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum Historica. Louvain, Rome and Stuttgart, 1896 -

Muratori, L.A. Rerum Italicarum Scriptores. Milan, 1723-51.

Rolls Series.

Sextus decretalium liber, with Clementiae seu Clementi V Pont. Max. consitutiones . . Antwerp, 1573.

Societe de l'Orient Latin.

Archives de l'Orient Latin, vols. I and II, Paris 1881, 1884.

Quinti Belli Sacri Scriptores Minores. (ed) E. Roehricht, Geneva, 1879.

Testimona Minora de Quinto Bello Sacro. (ed) E. Roehricht. Geneva, 1882.

Itineraires a Jerusalem. (ed.) Michelant, H.V. and Raynaud, G. Geneva, 1882.

Itinera Hierosolymitana. (ed.) T. Tobler. Geneva, 1877-85.

Bibliography B. Original sources (ii): Anonymous works.

Aliud scriptum, in Paris, Chron. maj., yr. 1236.
Anonimus Minorita (?) de Saracenis et de ritu ipsorum in oratione et ieiunio et aliis moribus eorum. In Golubovich, vol.1. p.399.
Chiose anonime alla prima cantica della Divina Commedia di un contemporaneo del poeta. (ed.) Francesco Selmi. Turin,1865
Chiose sopra Dante testo inedito . . Florence, 1846.
Chronica XXIV Generalium, in Analecta Franciscana III.
Commento alla Divina Commedia d'Anonimo Fiorentino del secilo xiv. (ed.) Pietro Fanfani. Bologna,1866.
Continuatio Chronicorum B. Isidori S.Hildefonso falso adscript In MPL. 96 and in SS. PP. Toletanorum quotquot extant opera. Madrid, 1786.
de expugnatione Terrae Sanctae per Saladinum libellus; in R.S., 66 (see Coggeshall).
Gesta Francorum: Histoire anonyme de la Première Croisade, ed. L. Bréhier. Paris, 1924.
Gestes des Chiprois, (Les) in Recueil de chroniques françaises édités en orient. (ed.) G. Raynaud. (A.O.L.) Geneva, 1887.
Gregorian Report: Scriptum domino Pp. Gregorio Nono missum. In Paris, Chron. maj., yr. 1236.
Itinerarium peregrinorum et gesta regis Ricardi (ed.W.Stubbs); attributed to Richard, Canon of Holy Trinity. R.S. 38. London, 1864.
Memoria Terre Sancte: see Kohler, Deux projets de Croisade, in D.
Ménestrel de Reims, Récits d'un, (ed.) N. de Wailly, Paris, 1876.
Liber Nicholay; in MS. Bib. Nat. lat, 14503.
Ottimo Commento della Divina Commedia, testo inedito d'un contemporaneo di Dante. Pisa, 1827.
Prophetia: sciendum autem est . . ; in Bib. Nat. lat.14503.
Quadruplex reprobatio: in Berlin MSS. theol. lat. Qu. 85, s. 240-250
and theol. lat. fol.425, s.122v.-130r.
(In both these the work is attributed to Gallensis).
in MS. Bib. Nat. lat.4230, where attributed to Ricoldo.
printed, as Ioannis Galensis Angli de origine et progressu et fine Machometis et quadruplici reprobatione prophetiae ejus liber, in de Saracenis et Turcis chronicon, W. Drechslerus, Strasburg, 1550. This text corresponds roughly with the Berlin MSS. The Bib. Nat. MS. has omissions and is arranged in a different order. See also Appendix I.
(All references to the reprobatio are by chapters as numbered in the printed text.)

(Bibliography B. ii.)

Quidam Anglicus: Itinerarium cuiusdam Anglici Terram Sanctam et alia loca sancta visitantis; Gol. iv, appendice.
Scripta domino Pp. Innocentio (III) ab ecclesia Hieros. missa; in pseudo-Vitriac.; in Wendover and Paris, yr. 1193; in Vincent de Beauvais, Hist. Spec. 31. LIV ff.
Sowdone of Babylone: The English Charlemagne Romances, part v: the Romance of the Sowdone of Babylone (ed.) E. Hausknecht, London, 1881.
Turpinus, pseudo. Historia Turpini, in C. Meredith-Jones, Historia Caroli Magni et Rotholandi ou Chronique du pseudo-Turpin, Paris, 1936; and in The Pseudo-Turpin edited . . etc. by H.M. Smyser, Cambridge, Mass., 1937.

Anonymous poems

(Antioche, Chanson d') See Bibliog. B.iii. under Richard.
Aspremont: Chanson'Asprement. D'après un poème du XIIIe siècle, (ed.) L. Bréhier, Paris, 1919-20.
Cid, Poema del. (ed. and tr.) A. Reyes, B.A., 1938.
Horn, King Horn: text in W.H. French, Essays on King Horn, Ithaca, N.Y., and London, 1940.
Richard Loewenherz: Versroman ueber R.L. (ed.) K. Brunner, Vienna and Leipzig, 1913.
Roland: Chanson de Roland, (ed.) J. Bédier, Paris, 1937.
Sowdone of Babylone: see above in preceding section.

Bibliography B. Original sources (iii): Alphabetical list, under authors.

Abraham al-faquin and Bonaventura of Siena: (tr.)Liber Scalae Machometi. In Cerulli and in Muñoz. (see D.)

Acqui, James of: Chronicon Imaginis Mundi fr. Iacobi ab Aquis, in Monumenta Historiae Patriae Scriptorum, III, Turin, 1848.

Adam: William (of) Adam of Sultaniyah: Guillelmi Adae . . archiepiscopi Sultaniensis, de modo Saracenis extirpandi. In Recueil des histoires des croisades: Documents arméniens, tome 2; (Documents latins et français relatifs a l'Arménie, 1906)

Alan of Lille: Alani de Insulis de fide catholica contra haereticos sui temporis libri quatuor, in MPL 210.

Alexander III: Alexandri Pp III epistola ad soldanum Yconii, in Peter of Blois, MPL 107, and Matthew Paris, Chr.Maj. yr. 1169.

Alfonso X el Sabio, Crónica de España. (ed.) A.G. Solalinde, B.A., 1940 (see also Roderick).

Alvaro of Cordova: Alvarus Cordubensis de vita vel passione Eulogii . . . in MPL 115.; Indiculus Luminosus, ibid.; Epistolae, ibid.

Alignan, Benedict of: Tractatus fidei contra diversos errores. Extract in Cerulli, p.412 ff. (see D.)

Anastasius Bibliothecarius: Anastasii Historia Ecclesiastica in Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae, Theophanis Chronographica ex rec. Ioannis Classeni vol. ii.

Antonio de' Reboldi: Antonii de Cremona de Reboldis Itinerarium ad montem Sinai. In Gol. iii, p.338.

Aquinas: St. Thomas Aquinas, Summa contra Gentiles. Editio Leonina manualis, Rome, 1934.

~~Aspremont: Chanson d'Aspremont. D'apres un poeme du XIIIe siecle (ed.) L. Brehier, Paris, 1919-20.~~

Auvergne: William of Auvergne. Guillelmi Alverni . . doctoris eximii . . tractatus de fide et de legibus. In Opera Omnia: editions of Nuremberg, 1497; Venice, 1591; and Paris, 1674. The numbering of the two latter is identical.

De universo and
De virtutibus, both in the same editions.

Beauvais, Vincent de: Speculum historiale, in Bibliotheca Mundi, Vincentii Bellovacensis speculum quadruplex, 4 tom. Douai, 1629, and in other editions.

Benvenuto: Benevenuti de Rambaldis de Imola Comentum super Dantis Aldigherij comaediam. Florence, 1887.

Bonaventura, Saint: Sancti Patris Francisci Vita . . in B.P. Fran. Ass. Opera Omnia. See Francis.

Bonaventura of Siena: see Abraham.

(Bibliography B. iii.)

Burcard: Burchardi de Monte Sion Descriptio Terrae Sanctae. In Laurent.

Busone da Gubbio: L'Avventuroso Ciciliano (ed.) G.F. Nott, Florence, 1832.

Caesarius: Caesarius Heisterbachensis . . Dialogus Miraculorum. Rec. J. Strange. Cologne, 1851.

Catalani: Les Merveilles de l'Asie par le père Jourdain Catalani de Sévérac. (ed.) H. Cordier, Paris, 1925.

Choniates, Nicetas. Fragment representing the form for the reception of a Muslim convert, in Max. Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum, Lyons, 1677.

Cluny: the "Toletano-Cluniac corpus"; all writers associated with the Toletano-Cluniac corpus are listed here together. The Collection is fully examined by M.-Th. d'Alverny, in Deux Traductions. (Bibliography D.)

Annotator: annotationes eruditi cuiusdam. In Bibliander (I. p.223) and Oxford MSS. CCC 184 and Bodley Selden Supra 31. There is a great concentration of important annotations in the early pages of Ketton's Qur'an and I have checked all these in the two manuscripts, but I have had to rely on the printed text in Bibliander for occasional annotations throughout most of the body of Ketton's text. For the original MS. of the collection now held in the Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, see d'Alverny,

Corrigendum to paragraph beginning "J. Kritzeck . . "

On further consideration I am inclined to believe that Kritzeck's suggestion is not intended to go beyond that made by Miss d'Alverny, that Peter of Poitiers prepared the manuscript with expert advice from Robert of Ketton and Peter of Toledo; he would thus be the editor. This can only be a probable speculation, and I have thought it (for my purposes) more suitable to speak of the Annotator as unidentified.

Hermann Dalmata: (tr.) de doctrina Machumet
de generatione Machumet
published in Bibliander, pp. 189-212 of 1550 edition. (These are the names they are most often known by; for the Arsenal nomenclature, see d'Alverny, loc. cit.)

Peter of Poitiers: Capitula Petri Pictaviensis ad domnum Petrum abbatem. In MPL 189.

Peter of Toledo: (tr.) Epistola Saraceni with Rescriptum Christiani; i.e., Latin translation of the Risalah of "pseudo-Kindi" (see Bibliog. E.). I have been unable to see or obtain the edition by M.J. Muñoz to which Miss d'Alverny refers in her Marc de Tolède, and I have used MS. CCC 184. There are long extracts in Vincent de Beauvais 23.39 ff., reprinted by Bibliander II, col.1ff.

Peter the Venerable: Petri Mauritii Monboiseri cognomento Venerabilis abbatis noni Cluniacensis liber contra sectam sive haeresim Saracenorum. In MPL 189.

Summula quaedam brevis (Arsenal title "summa totius haeresis"). It is assumed that

this is in fact by Peter the Venerable to whom it is attributed. It is certainly by a Latin who views Islam with unfamiliarity and who has read the translations in the same corpus. In Migne and Bibliander.
Epistola de translatione sua. (Two forms, both in MPL 189; one only in Bibliander).
Robert of Ketton: (tr.) Liber legis Saracenorum quam Alcoran vocant.
Praefatio translatoris.
(In MSS. as quoted for Annotator; Bibliander, pp.8-200)
(tr.) Chronica mendosa (Bibl. p.213).

Coggeshall: Radulphi de C. Chronicon Anglicanum, ed. J. Stevenson in R.S.66, London, 1875.

Corbeil, Gilles de: Ierapigra ad purgandos prelatos; fragment quoted by Gaston Paris, Légende (Bibliog.D).

Dandalo: Andreae Danduli Venetorum Ducis Chronicon Venetum, in Rerum Italicarum Scriptores (Muratori) XII.

Dante: Inferno. Temple Classics (Italian and English) London, 1900.

Diceto, Ralph of: Radulphi de Diceto Abbreviationes Chronicorum, in Opera Historica, ed. W. Stubbs, R.S.68, vol. 1. London, 1876.

Dubois: Pierre Dubois, de recuperatione Terrae Sanctae. (ed.) Ch.-V. Langlois, Paris, 1891.

Du Pont: Roman de Mahomet. See Reinaud and Michel in Bibliog. D.

Elemosina: fr. Joannis Elemosina (?) Liber historiarum and Chronicon; extracts in Gol.ii. p. 103 ff.

Ernoul: Chronique d'Ernoul et de Bernard le Trésorier; (ed.) M.L. de Mas Latrie, Paris 1871.

Eulogius: S. Eulogii archiepiscopi Toletani Memoriale Sanctorum.
Liber Apologeticus Martyrum. (MPL.115)

Fidenzio of Padua: Fidentii de Padua liber de recuperatione Terrae Sanctae, in Gol. ii. p.9 ff.

Fitzralph: Richard Fitzralph, Archbishop of Armagh: Summa Dni Armacani in Questionibus Armenorum. 1512; also in MS. New Coll. 90.

Fleury, Hugh of: Hugonis Floriacensis Chronica. Munster, 1588.

Francis, St: Beati Francisci Assisiatis opera omnia, (ed.) von der Burg, J.J., Cologne and Brussels, 1849.

Gerald of Wales: Geraldus Cambrensis de principis instructione liber, R.S. 21, vol. viii, London, 1891.

Guibert of Nogent: Ven. Guiberti abbatis S. Mariae de Novigento historia quae dicitur Gesta Dei per Francos. In MPL 161 and Bongars.

Giovanni d'Andrea, gloss in Clementinarum lib. V.

(Bibliography B. iii.)

Hildebert of Mans: Hildeberti primo Cenomanensis episcopi etc Historia de Mahumete, in MPL 171.

Higden: Polychronicon Ranulphi Higden, R.S.41, London, 1865-86.

Hugh of St. Victor: Hugonis a Sancto Victore Excerptionum Allegoricarum libri xxiv. In MPL 177.

Humbert of Romans: Tractatus Solemnis fratris Humberti . . de predicatione Sanctae Crucis. Nuremburg (?) 1490.

Opusculum Tripartitum, in Appendix ad Fasciculum Rerum Expetendarum et Fugiendarum sive tomus secundus, London, 1690. (ed.) Edward Brown; précis by Mabillon, in Mansi, in Conc. Lugdun. II.

John of Damascus, Saint: De haeresibus liber

Disputatio Christiani et Saraceni

(Both in MPG. 94.)

John of Wales: see quadruplex reprobatio in Bibliog.B.ii.

Joinville, Jean de: Histoire de Saint Louis. (ed.)N. de Wailly, Paris, 1906.

Ketton, Robert of: See Cluny.

Levanto; Galvano de: Liber sancti passagii Christicolarum contra Sarracenos . . . in Kohler (Bibliog. D)

Ludolf de Sudheim (Suchem): de itinere terrae sanctae (ed.) G.A. Neumann in A.O.L., tome ii, Paris,1884; also (ed.) Dr. Ferdinand Deycks, Stuttgart, 1851, in a version which I do not mormally use. All references are to Neumann unless referred explicitly to Deycks.

Lull, Ramón. Vita Beati Raymundi Lulli.

Vida Coetania. (tr. English)

(Both in Peers, A. A Life of Ramon Lull, etc. London, 1927.)

Liber Contemplatiónis in Deum.

Disputatio Raymundi Christiani et Hamar Saraceni

Liber de Quinque Sapientibus.

Liber de Gentili et Tribus Sapientibus.

Liber super psalmum Quicunque Vult seu Liber Tartari et Christiani.

Disputatio Fidelis et Infidelis.

Liber de Sancto Spiritu.

(All in Beati Raymundi Lulli Doctoris Illuminati et Martyris Opera Omnia, ed. I. Salzinger. Mayence 1721 fi

Pro recuperatione Terrae Sanctae Petitio. (Printed by Atiya, see Bibliog. D)

Blanquerna: A Thirteenth Century Romance translated from the Catalan by E. Allison Peers, London, 1925.

The following vernacular versions have been consulted:

Libre de Doctrina Pueril,(ed.) M. Obrador y Bennassar, Barcelona, 1907.

Libre de Contemplacio en Deu, (ed.) M. Obrador y Bennassar, Palma de Mallorca, 1906.

(Bibliography B. iii.)

Lull: Livre de la loi au Sarrazin, in Reinaud (see Bibliog. D.)
Malmesbury, William of: de Gestis Regum Anglorum,(ed.) T. Duffus Hardy, 2 vols., London 1840.
Manuel, Don Juan: El Conde Lucanor, (ed.) F.J. Sanchez Canton. Madrid, 1920.
Marco Polo, Travels. (tr.) London, Everyman Library.
Marignolli, Giovanni de'. Chronicon (Itinerarium). Extracts in Gol. V. p.271 ff. *See also Yule, vol. iii. (Bibliog. D)*
Marino Sanudo: Liber Secretorum Fidelium Crucis super Terrae Sanctae Recuperatione et Conservatione . . . cuius auctor Marinus Sanutus dictus Torsellus Patricius Venetus In Bongars.
Mark of Toledo: Preface to the translation of the Qur'an ex collisione ferri ...
Preface to the translation of ibn Tumart translato ante triennium . . (both in M.-Th. d'Alverny and Vajda, see Bibliog. D)
(tr.) Alchorani Machometi Liber, in Austrian National Library MS.4297.
(tr.) Tractatus Habentometi de unione Dei, with murshidah I unio gloriosi laudabilis and II vinculum; Laudatio dei gloriosi and laus secunda. In d'Alverny and Vajda.
(tr.) Contrarietas Elfolica. Known only in MS Bib.Nat. lat.3394.
Marti, Ramón: Explanatio Simboli, in March, en Ramón Marti (Bibliog.D)
Pugio Fidei, Leipzig, 1687
and see quadruplex reprobatio in Bibliog.B.ii.
Martinus Polonus: Chronica. Antwerp, 1574.
Mandeville: Travels. (ed.) M. Letts, London, 1953. I have cited the Egerton text from Mandeville's Travels.
Marsh: Adae de Marisco Epistolae. In Monumenta Franciscana. (ed.) J.S. Brewer. R.S.4, London, 1858-82.
Methodius, pseudo-. Methodii Patarensis Ep. et Mart. . . Revelationes . In Magna Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum, tomi i-iii, Cologne, 1618.
Nicola da Casola, Li pavillon de Forest, extracts in Ziolecki. (Bibliog.D)
Novare, Philippe de: Mémoires, 1218-1243. (ed.) Ch. Kohler, Paris, 1913.
Oldenburg: Wildebrandi de Oldenburg, Peregrinatio. In Laurent.
Paderborn: Oliver (Scolasticus) of Paderborn:
Historia Damiatina
Historia regum T.S.
Epistola Salutaris regi Babilonis . .
Epistola doctoribus egipti transmissa . .
(All in Die Schriften des Kölner Domscholasters,

(Bibliography B. iii.)

(Paderborn) Späteren Bischofs von Paderborn . . Oliverus (ed.) Hoogeweg, Tübingen, 1894. (Hist. Dam. found also in pseudo-Vitriacus (Bongars, Vitriaci lib.III), Gesta Crucigerorum Rhenanorum, Quinti Belli Sacri Scriptores Minores and Wendover, yr. 1218. I do not suppose that this is exhaustive.)

Paris, Matthew: Chronica majora, (ed.) Luard, R.S. 57, London, 1872-83.
Historia Anglorum, R.S. 44, London, 1866-9.

Paul the Deacon: Historia Miscella, in MPL. 95.

Pavia, Thomas of: Gesta imperatorum et pontificum; complete section extracted in MGH SS 22; see also Gol.i.,p.309 ff

Pedro de Alfonso: Petrus Alfunsi. Dialogus V from Dialogi in quibus impiae Judaeorum opiniones . . confutantur. MPL.157.

Pedro, San: Pedro Pascual.
Sobre el seta mahometana.
Contra los fatalistas mahometanos.
(Both in Obras, ed. P. Armengol Valenzuela, Rome, 1905-08 in vols. iii and iv. Unable to obtain or see a copy in this country, I obtained microfilm of these two works, but I could not have the whole four volumes filmed.)

Peñafort, Raymund of. Fragments in MOFPH IV. 2. Raymundiana.

Pennis, Peter de: Tractatus contra alchoranum, in MS. Bib Nat lat. 3646. De locis ... See Kohler, (Bibliog. D)

Peter the Venerable: see Cluny.

Peter of Poitiers: see Cluny.

Peter of Toledo: see Cluny.

Plano Carpini, John de: Libellus Historicus etc., in "The Texts and Versions of J. de P.C. etc." (ed.) C.R.Beazley, London, 1903. These are taken from Hakluyt. Modern English version in Dawson, (see Bibliog. D).

Richard: la chanson d'Antioche composé par le pèlerin Richard (ed.) P. Paris, Paris, 1848.

Ricoldo da Monte Croce: Disputatio contra Saracenos et Alchoranum. This is the title given by MS. Bib.Nat. lat. 4230, indicated by M.Th. d'Alverny, and I have used it as the title of this work to indicate the original version which this represents. The old titles of Confutatio or Improbatio alchorani I have left for the Latin version of the Greek translation. The Greek of Demetrios Cydones is in MPG 104, together with the Latin translation which is also printed by Bibliander (II) under the translator's dedication, Bartholomaeus Picenus de Montearduo Ferdinando regi Aragoniae etc. (col.121 ff.)
Itinerarium, in Laurent.
Epistolae V de commentatoriae de perditione Acconis 1291 (in Roehricht, see Bibliog.D)
Libellus ad nationes orientales, in MS.Bodley, Can.Pat.Lat.142.

(Bibliography B. iii)

Roderick: Don Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada, archbishop of Toledo: Historia Arabum in PP. Toletanorum quotquot extant opera. Tom. tertius, Roderici Ximenii de Rada . . opera praecipua complectens. Madrid, 1793.
Crónica de España del arzobispo Don Rodrigo etc. tradújola in castellano, in colección de documentos inéditos para le historia de España, tomo CV, Madrid, 1893,
Estoria de los godos, coleccion para la historia, tomo LXXXVIII, Madrid 1887.

Rubruck, William of: Journey. (see Plano Carpini, English translation from Quaracchi text in Dawson; Hakluyt's text in Beazley.)

Rutebeuf: Onze poèmes de Rutebeuf concernant la croisade, (ed.) J. Bastin and E. Faral, Paris, 1946.

Saint-Pathus: Guillaume de, Vie de Saint Louis, (ed.) H.-F. Delaborde, Paris, 1899.

Salimbene de Adam: Cronica. In MGH. SS. 32

Sigebert of Gembloux: Sigeberti Gemblacensis Chronica. MPL. 160.

Simon Simeon: Itinerarium ad terram sanctam fr. Symon Simeonis et Hugonis Illuminatoris, in Col. iii. p. 246 ff.

Terrena, Guido: De heresibus ad dominum Gaucelinum . . . incipiunt errores Sarracenorum. Passages printed by Cerulli, p. 491 (see Bibliog. D).

Tripoli: William of Tripoli. Guilelmi Tripolitani . . tractatus de statu saracenorum et de mahomete pseudo-propheta et eorum lege et fide. In H. Prutz, Kulturgeschichte der Kreuzzuege, Berlin, 1883.
MS. Vat. Lat. 314, with much purer version of Arabic words, indicated by Monneret de Villard ("Ricoldo"): incipit liber de adventu et gestis infelicissimi machumecti et de introductorio fidei saracenorum et eorum lege moribus et vita. This is the MS. "editus a fr. Ricoldo etc." (see Monneret de Villard).

Tyre: William of Tyre. Historia rerum in partibus transmarinis gestarum . . . edita a venerabili Guillelmo Tyrensi archiepiscopo. MPL 201 and in Bongars.

Uberti, Fazio degli: Opera . . . chiamato Ditta Mundi. Venice, 1501.

Varagine: Jacobi a Voragine Legenda Aurea, (ed.) Th. Graesse, Dresden and Leipzig, 1846.

Verona, Jacopo da. Liber peregrinationis fr. Jacobi de Verona, in Le Pèlerinage, by R. Roehricht (see Bibliog. D) and also in Liber Pereg. di Jacopo da Verona a cura di Ugo Monneret de Villard, Rome, 1950.

Viterbo, Godfrey of: Godefridi Viterbiensis Pantheon sive Memoria Sanctorum, in Muratori VIII. Previously unpublished passage printed by Cerulli, p. 417 ff.

(Bibliography B. iii.)

Vitodurani, John: Chronica, in Gol. ii. p.143 ff.
Vitry: Jacques de Vitry: Historia Therosolimitana Abbreviata, in Bongars.
Waltherius: poema de Machomete, in du Méril, Poésies populaires (see Bibliog. D).
Wendover, Roger of: Flores Historiarum. R.S.84, London, 1886-9.
"Westminster, Matthew of". Flores Hist. R.S. 95, London, 1890.
Wurzburg, John of: Descriptio Terrae Sanctae Johannis Wurzburgensis in Descriptiones T.S. (ed.) T. Tobler, Leipzig, 1874.

Addenda.

Johannis Pp. VIII epistolae. In MPL 126.
Leonis Pp. IV fragmenta epistolarum. Mansi 14.
Odoric of Pordenone. Travels. English translation with Latin and Italian texts, in Yule, vol. ii (bibliog. D)

Bibliography C. Writers on Islam subsequent to the period of this thesis, but earlier than the present age.

(This is not at all an exhaustive list, but is intended to be sufficiently representative to justify some general conclusion reached in Chapter 22.)

Bibliander (Theodore Buchmann): Th. Bibliandri Apologia, in Machumetis Saracenorum principis . . doctrina, etc. See bibliography B.

Busbequius: Travels into Turkey. (tr.) Glasgow, 1761.

Boulainvilliers, Comte de. Vie de Mahomed. Londres, 1730.

Dionysii Cartusiani Contra perfidiam Mahometi, in Opera Omnia, tom. 36.

Febvre, M. Teatro della Turchia, Bologna, 1683. (and Théâtre de la Turquie, Paris, 1682.)

Gibbon. Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire.

Godinho, M. Overland Return from India. Extracts translated in Portuguese Voyages (ed.) C.D. Ley, London, 1947.

Herbert, Tho. Travels begun anno 1626.

Kinglake, A.W. Eothen.

Luther: Martini Lutheri epistola ad piorem lectorem, in Bibliander.

Maracci, L. Alcorani Textus Universus . . His omnibus praemissus est Prodromus; together with Refutatio Alcorani. Padua, 1698.

Mehemmed: Lettres Critiques de Hadgi Mehemmed Effendi. Paris, 1735.

Melancthon: Enerrationes in Evang. Ioh. XV; ep. prior. ad Tim. IV; in Ps. CXVIV; comm. in cap. XI Danielis; sermo, dom. XXV post Trin., etc. in Opera Omnia.

Nau, M. Religio Christiana contra Alcoranum pacifice defensa et probata. Paris, 1680.

Nau, M. L'Etat présent de la Religion Mahométane. Paris, 1684.

Nicolas of Cusa: Cribrationis Alchoran Domini Nicolai de Cusa, liber tertius. In Bibliander.

Ockley, S. History of the Saracens. London, 1857.

Philippe de la Tres-Sainte Trinite: Voyage d'Orient, Lyons, 1652.

Pitts, J. A true and faithful account of the religion and manners of the Mohammetans. Exeter, 1704.

Pius II: Epistola Pii Papae II ad Morbisanum Turcarum principem. In Bibliander.

Prescott, H.F.M. Jerusalem Journey. London, 1954.

Prideaux, H. The true nature of imposture fully display'd in the life of Mahomet. London, 1697.

Rabadan, Mahomet. Mahometism Explained. (tr.) J. Morgan. London, 1723.

(Bibliography C.)

Rabbath, A. Documents inédits pour servir a l'histoire du Christianisme en Orient. Paris, Leipzig and London, 1905-1910.
Rauwolff, L. Travels into the Eastern Countries. In Ray's Collection of Curious Travels, London, 1783.
Reland. Adriani Relandi de religione Mohammedica libri duo. Utrecht, 1705.
Rycaut, P. Histoire de l'état présent de l'empire ottoman. Amsterdam, 1670.
Sale, George. The Koran . . to which is prefixed a Preliminary Discourse. London, 1857.
Sandys, G. A Relation of a Journey. London, 1627.
Savary, M. Le Koran, precédé d'un abrégé de la Vie de Mahomet. Paris, Coll. Classiques Garnier.
Suriano: Il trattato di Terra Santa e dell'Oriente di frate Francesco Suriano. Milan, 1900, (ed.) Golubovich.
Tavernier, J.B. Les Six Voyages . . Paris, 1712-13.
Tavernier, J.B. Nouvelle Relation de l'interieur du Serrail. Paris, 1713.
Thevenot. Voyage du Levant, Amsterdam, 1727.
Vergil: Polydori Vergilii de rerum inventoribus libri VIII. Amsterdam, 1671.
Voltaire. Le Fanatisme, ou Mahomet le Prophète. Paris, 1877.

Bibliography D. Modern works relating to the Latin sources.

(General works that cover a wide field not closely related to my subject are excluded, except where their controversial point of view has to be taken into account. For example, Gilson's Philosophie au Moyen Age has been omitted, while Grousset's history has been included.)

Alphandéry, P. Mahomet-Antichrist dans le Moyen Age Latin. In Mélanges Martwig Derenbourg, Paris, 1909.

Alphandéry, P. La Chrétienté et l'idée de Croisade. Paris, 1954.

d'Alverny, M.-Th. Deux traductions latines du Coran au Moyen Age. In Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Age, annees 1947-1948, Paris, 1948.

d'Alverny, M.-Th. and Vajda, G. Marc de Tolède, Traducteur d'ibn Tumart. In Al-Andalus, Vol.XVI fasc. 1 and 2, vol. XVII, fasc.1, 1951-2.

d'Ancona, Alessandro. La Leggenda di Maometto in Occidente. seconda edizione, Bologna, 1912.

Asin y Palacios, M. Escatología musulmana en la Divina Comedia. Madrid, 1919.

Atiya, A.S. The Crusade in the Later Middle Ages. London, 1938.

Bedier, J. Les Légendes Epiques, third edition, Paris, 1927.

Cordier, H. Les Merveilles de l'Asie, etc. Paris, 1925.

Cerulli, E. Il "Libro della Scala" e la questione delle fonti arabo-spagnole della Divina Commedia. Citta del Vaticano, 1949.

Darbishire, R.S. Islam in the "Chanson d'Antioche". In Moslem World, XXVIII.

Dawson, C. The Mongol Mission. London, 1955.

Dondaine, A. Le dominicain français Jean de Mailly et la Légende Dorée. Paris, 1946.

du Méril, M.E. Poésies Populaires Latines du Moyen Age, Paris, 1847.

Galbraith, V.H. Roger of Wendover and Matthew Paris, Glasgow, 1944.

Gavigan, J.J. The Capture of Damietta. Philadelphia and London, 1948.

Grousset, R. Histoire des Croisades. Paris, 1934-1936.

Gwynne, A. Richard Fitzralph. Series of articles in Studies, 1933-1937, especially December, 1933.

Hatem, A. Les Poèmes épiques des Croisades, Paris, 1940.

Haskins, C.H. Studies in the History of Mediaeval Science, Cambridge, Mass., 1927.

Heyd, W. Histoire du Commerce du Levant au Moyen Age. Leipzig, 1885.

Kohler, Ch. Traité du Recouvrement de la Terre Sainte . . par Galvano de Levanto. Revue de l'Orient Latin. Paris, 1898 (vol. VI).

(Bibliography D)

Kohler, Ch. Un Sermon Commémoratif de la Prise de Jérusalem par les Croisés. R.O.L. 1900-01 (vol. viii)
Kohler, Ch. Le libellus de locis ultramarinis de Pierre "de Pennis". R.O.L. 1902. (vol ix)
Kohler, Ch. Documents relatifs a Guillaume d'Adam. R.O.L., 1903-04 (vol.x).
Kohler, Ch. Deux projets de Croisade en Terre Sainte. R.O.L., 1903-04 (vol x).
Kohler, Ch. Introduction, in Receuil des Historiens des Croisades, Documents Latins relatifs a l'Arménie, Paris 1906.
Kritzeck, J. Robert of Ketton's Translation of the Qur'an. In Islamic Quarterly, II.4. (Dated December 1955 but received later. See bibliog. B under Cluny.)
Lage, G.R. de. Alain de Lille, Paris, 1951.
Le Strange, G. Baghdad under the Abbasid Caliphate. Oxford, 1900.
Le Strange, G. Palestine under the Moslems, London, 1890.
Le Strange, G Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, Cambridge, 1930.
Mandonnet, P.F. Fra Ricoldo de Monte Croce. Revue Biblique, 1893.
Mandonnet, P.F. Pierre le Vénérable et son activité littéraire contre l'Islam. Revue Thomiste, 1893.
Menendez Pidal, R. Estudios Literarios. (reprinted) B.A. 1938.
Menendez y Pilayo, M. Historia de los Heterodoxos Españoles. (reprinted) B.A.
Monneret de Villard, U. Lo Studio dell' Islam in Europa nel XII e nel XIII secolo. Citta del Vaticano, 1944.
Monneret de Villard, U. Il libro della Peregrinazione nelle parti d'Oriente di frate Ricoldo da Montecroce. Rome, 1948.
Monneret de Villard, U. See also bibliog. B, Verona.
Munoz Sendino, J. La Escala de Mahoma. Madrid, 1949.
Munro, D.C. Urban's Speech calling for the Crusade. American Historical Review XI (1905).
Munro, D.C. The Western Attitude towards Islam during the Crusades. Speculum VI (1931).
Oliger, L. La caduta di S. Giovanni d'Acri. Miscellanea Pio Paschini. Rome, 1948.
Paris, G. Un poème latin contemporain sur Saladin. R.O.L., 1893 (vol. i).
Paris, G. La Légende de Saladin. Journal des Savants; May, June, July, August 1893.
Peers, E.A. Ramon Lull, a Biography. London, 1929.
Powicke, F.M. The Compilation of the Chronica Majora of Matthew Paris. London, 1945 (2nd edition).
Reinaud and Michel, F. Roman de Mahomet, etc. Paris 1831
Riant, P.E.D. De Haymaro Monacho Disquisitionem Criticam Facultati litterarum Parisiensi proponebat P.E.D. Riant. Paris, 1865.

(Bibliography D)

Roehricht, R. Lettres de Ricoldo de Monte Croce. Archives de l'Orient Latin II. Paris, 1884.
Roehricht, R. Le Pelerinage du moine Augustin Jacques de Vérone. R.O.L., vol.iii. 1895.
Roncaglia, M. I Francescani in Oriente durante le Crociate. Biblioteca bio-bibliografica, serie quarta, studi, 1954.
Runciman, S. A History of the Crusades. Cambridge, 1951-55.
Sage, C.M. Paul Albar of Cordoba.
Sweetman, J.W. Islam and Christian Theology, Part Two, Volume One, London, 1955.
Thery, G. Tolède, Grande Ville de la Renaissance Mediévale. Point de jonction entre les cultures musulmane et chrétienne. Oran, 1944.
Thropp, P.A. Criticism of the Crusade, a study of public opinion . . Amsterdam, 1940.
Ullman, W. Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages. London, 1955.
Vajda, G. See d'Alverny.
Yule, H. Cathay and the Way Thither. London, 1915.
Ziolecki, B. Alexandre dou Pont's Roman de Mahomet, ein altfranzoesische Gedicht des XIII. Jahrhunderts, neu herausgegeben; translated by Ch. Pellat and reprinted in En Terre d'Islam (troisième trimestre 1943) as La Légende de Mahomet au Moyen Age.
Zwemer, S.M. Raymund Lull, First Missionary to the Muslims. N.Y. and London, 1902.

ADDENDUM

March, J.M. En Ramon Marti y la Seva "Explanatio simboli apostolorum" in Anuari MCMVIII, Barcelona, Institut d'estudis Catalans.

Addenda.

Baldwin, M.W. History of the Crusades. Vol.i. The First Hundred Years. Philadelphia, 1955.
Leclercq, J. Pierre le Vénérable. Saint-Wandrille, 1946.

Bibliography E. Modern works on Islam and translations of Islamic works from Arabic.

The Encyclopaedia of Islam and the Shorter Encyclopaedia of Islam.

Abd-el-Jalil, J-M. Marie et l'Islam. Paris, 1950.
Abd-el-Jalil, J-M. Aspects interieurs de l'Islam. Paris, 1949.
Abu'l-Feda de vita et rebus gestis Mohammedis. tr. J. Gagnier Oxon. 1723.
al-Ash'arī: ed. and tr. R.J. McCarthy. The Theology of al-Ash arī. Beirut, 1953.
al-Bayḍāwī. Chrestomathie Baidawiana. D.S. Margoliouth, London, 1894.
al-Kindi (pseudo-Kindi). Risālah. (ed. Tien. London, 1880.
Arnold, T.W. The Preaching of Islam. London, 1929.
Asin y Palacios, M. Logia et agrapha Dni. J. apud Moslemorum scripta usitata, in Patrologia Orientalis, Paris, 1919.
Bell, R. The Origin of Islam in its Christian Environment. London, 1913.
Bell, R. Introduction to the Qur'an. Edinburgh, 1954.
Carlyle, T. On Heroes. The Hero as Prophet. Mahomet: Islam London, 1870.
Donaldson, D.M. The Shi'ite Religion. London, 1933.
Gardet and Anawati, Introduction a la Theologie Musulmane. Paris, 1948.
Gibb, H.A.R. Modern Trends in Islam. Chicago, 1947.
Hasluck, F.W. and M.M. Christianity and Islam under the Sultans. Oxford, 1929.
Ibn Ishaq: The Life of Muhammad, a translation of Ishaq's sīrat rasūl Allāh, with introduction and notes by A. Guillaume. London, 1955. (with Ibn Hisham)
Jeffery, A. Material for History of the Text of the Qur'an. Leiden, 1937.
Khalil ibn Ishaq: Précis de Jurisprudence civile et religieuse selon le rite Malékite par Khalîl-ibn-Ishâk, traduit . . par M. Perron, 1844.
Lane, E.W. Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians. London, 1908.
Lane-Poole, S. The Mohammedan Dynasties. London, 1894.
Massignon, L. Al-Hallaj, Martyr mystique de l'Islam. Paris, 1922.
Massignon, L. Les origines du lexique technique de la mystique musulmane. Paris, 1922.
Muhammad Asad. The Road to Mecca. London, 1954.
Muhammad Ali Maulvi. The Holy Qur'an with English translation and commentary. Woking, 1917.

Muir, W. The Apology of Al Kindy. London, 1887.
Muir, W. The Life of Mohammad. Edinburgh, 1923.
Nicholson, R.A. The Mystics of Islam. London, 1914.
Nicholson, R.A. Studies in Islamic Mysticism. Cambridge, 1921.
Nicholson, R.A. A Literary History of the Arabs. Cambridge, 1930.
Robson, J. Christ in Islam. London, 1929.
Schacht, J. The Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence. Oxford, 1950.
Tritton, A.S. Muslim Theology. London, 1947.
Tor Andrae. Mahomet, sa Vie et sa Doctrine. (tr. Gaudefroy-Demonbynes) Paris, 1945.
Watt, W.M. Free Will and Predestination in Early Islam. London, 1948.
Watt, W.M. Muhammad at Mecca. Oxford, 1953.
Watt, W.M. Muhammad at Medina. Oxford, 1956. (Publication announced; seen in typescript.)
Wensinck, A.J. A Handbook of Early Muhammadan Tradition. Leiden, 1927.
Wensinck, A.J. The Muslim Creed. Cambridge, 1932.

APPENDICES.

APPENDICES I - V.

I. A note on some doubtful attributions.

II. A table of Tripoli's "Praises of Christ".

III. Parallel texts of the "Praises of Christ" in surah XIX.

IV. Parallel texts: the Qur'anic Paradise.

V. Chronological and Geographical Summary.

Appendix I.

A note on some doubtful attributions.

An element of doubt attaches to the authorship of most of the known written sources of Latin knowledge of Islam in the period. This is true of the most influential of them, the Risalah of "al-Kindi" (the discussion of its authorship is summarised by Miss d'Alverny, Deux Traductions); but it is not in question that its author was an oriental Christian. Viterbo and the scriptum Gregorio nono missum copy a common source, on which Vitry also depends, but what this was exactly is uncertain; at least it closely resembled the Risalah. Less doubt exists in the case of Pedro de Alfonso; his own written sources are unknown, but we may assume that it was normal for Spanish Jewish circles to be reasonably well-informed about Islam. Obviously there was nothing doubtful about the acknowledged use of Anastasius' translation of Theophanes. There is considerable doubt about the authorship of the Contrarietas Elfolica (so often Ricoldo's preferred source) and there is some doubt about the authorship of those works which represent direct Latin knowledge of Arabic Muslim sources, that is to say, the works attributed to Ramon Marti and to San Pedro. (In passing we may note that doubt also attaches to the legendary story in which the Prophet married the "lady" of the "province" of "Corozan". This story was continually reproduced after Hugh of Fleury, but Hugh's sources await further study.)

Contrarietas Elfolica.

I should like to add some tentative remarks to Miss d'Alverny's exposition. The very great influence of the Risālah was not exercised only directly, by Peter of Toledo's translations. Its arguments appear and reappear wherever there is informed Christian treatment of Islamic subjects, so that it seems hardly possible to distinguish these arguments from those of a living tradition among oriental Christians and Mozarabs which the Contrarietas in its own time also exemplifies. The Contrarietas claims to be written by a convert from Islam, but it seems to me possible that it is really by a Christian who wished to give it greater authority by a fictional claim. It is often difficult to imagine that a convert, however much he hated his old religion, could take quite the line that the author takes; and the Mecca pilgrimage that he claims to have made is unconvincing. On the other hand, his knowledge of Islam and of the Qur'an is sound, and he must have lived among Muslims for many years, and have been reasonably intimate with them.

It seems likely that the arguments of the Contrarietas,

like those of the Risālah (to which it is distantly related), circulated generally among Christians who lived in Muslim areas. If, therefore, the attribution of the translation to Mark depends on a statement of only limited authority, the issue will yet very little affect general problems of lierary indebtedness. What is of course certain is that the Latin text was available when Ricoldo wrote his Disputatio, which depends literally on the Contrarietas in many important passages.

Quadruplex reprobatio.

I have used this name to speak of the work hitherto attributed to John of Wales. Monneret de Villard did not question this attribution, although the work is certainly Spanish so far as the sources of its information are concerned: for example, Axa transliterates A ishah. Miss d'Alverny pointed out that parts of it are identical with parts, notably the introductory part, of Ramon Marti's explanatio simboli, and she has suggested that Marti may be the author. If Marti is not the author, it seems likely that it sprang from his immediate milieu. I have treated it separately because, while the attribution remains uncertain, most of it is unique, and it would have to be considered apart from any other work, whoever its author.

San Pedro Pascual.

San Pedro's authorship of the works on Islam attributed to him has been questioned by E. Cerulli, who did not, however, come to any very definite conclusion, and who proposes to wait until the definitive edition of the saint's work is published. Until there is something more definite, it has seemed to me best to continue to treat San Pedro as the author. I have not been concerned with the details of the author's life, and there is no question about the approximate milieu, date and place of the works. I should have nothing to change but the name, if it were finally proved that the author was not San Pedro. Subject to newevidence of a convincing character, I am persuaded that the author was a Christian priest of Latin birth, because it seems to me that all his pre-occupations, interests and prejudices indicate as much.

Appendix II. Table of Tripoli's "praises of Christ". The text of the Qur'an, the headings and introductions are Tripoli's. (From Prutz, pp. 591 ff. Compared with different version of MS. Vat. lat. 314, ff. 110r.-v., not reproduced here.)

Heading.	Introductory phrase.	Text.
How Mary was conceived and born. (XXIX)	None.	The wife of Amran said: O God I have vowed to thee . . I guard her by thee from the cursed devil . . rear her an accepted shoot. (III. 31, 32 part.)
(same chapter) How blessed Mary was given food.	In another place it says that Zacaryas gave food to the blessed girl that was born, namely Our Lady Mary; it says this:	Zacaryas took her . . God gives a good thing freely to whom he pleases; there is no reason to seek. (III. 32 part)
How blessed Mary was instructed. (XXX)	Again in another place it says that she was instructed by the angels; and it says this:	They said to Mary: O Mary, God has chosen thee and purified thee and forechosen thee above all the women of the world. Therefore worship God, adore him, bend the knee to him with those who bow to God. (III. 37, 38.)
How the conception was revealed to her. (XXXI)	Again in another place it says how the annunciation was revealed to her before it happened; it says this:	They said to Mary, O Mary . . he shall be one of the saints and the just. (III. 40, 41.)
(same)	In another place it shows how Mary spoke to God and God exhorted her. And Mary said thus:	O God, will I have a son, when I am not touched by a man ?
	And God said thus:	God shall create what he wills . . . a messenger to the children of Israel.
	and he shall say (i.e. Christ)	I have come to you a sign from God . . Therefore obey him, for this is a pleasing way, namely the most right way. (III.42, 3, 4.)
On the praise of the Virgin Mary and how she conceived. (XXXII)	Again in another place the conception of a son is shown; it says	Let Mary be remembered, who separated herself from her people . . and it is a thing decreed. (XIX. 16-21.)
How she gave birth and the child that was born consoled her. (XXXIII)	Again in another place it shows how she bore the son whom she had conceived, and how the son that was born of her consoled the mother; and it says:	Mary conceived a son and went away with him to a distant and remote place . . Say, I have sworn a fast to the merciful God; and you shall speak to no one, because you hold a secret. (XIX. 22-27)
How she was blamed and her son excused her. (XXXIV)	Again in another place it shows how, when the boy was born, Mary returned with him to her people, and he excused his mother when they blamed her; and it says:	Mary went to her people carrying the child . . Salvation and peace upon me on the day when I was born, and on the day when I die, and when I shall rise again alive. (XIX. 28-34.)

Heading	Introductory phrase.	Text.
On the chastity of blessed Mary. (XXXV)	Again in another place Mary is praised under these words:	Mary constituted her (person) like a castle. . a sign for all men. (XXI.91.)
How Mary conceived, being chaste.(XXXVI)	Again in another place our Mary is praised thus:	She fortified her (person) . . and she was of those that worship God. (LXVI.12)
On the authority which God gave to the son of Mary.(XXXVII)	On the power and strength of Our Lord and his praises:	God said, O Jesus son of Mary . . and raise the dead by my authority. . you came with clear indications. (V. 109,10.)
On the praises of Christ and of those who follow him.(XXXVIII)	Again, on the praises of Christ and of his followers it said thus:	God said: O Jesus, I am the sender of your death . . at the Judgement all will return to me and I will judge between them. (III.48)
Christ and the Gospel are praised. (XXXIX)	Again on the praises of Christ and his followers, this is what is said:	We directed the footsteps of those who came first by our messengers. . in the hearts of those who follow him, piety, and pity and religion; and they expanded and multiplied.
(Qur'an LVII.27; the attack on monasticism is avoided by mistranslation.)		
How Christ excels all the messengers and envoys of God. (XL.)	Again Christ is praised and is said to be the most excellent among all the prophets and over them all; and this is what is said:	Our messengers are many; we have preferred one to another . . But God does what he wills. (II.254.)
Christ and his Gospel are praised. (XLI)	Again the Lord Jesus and the Holy Gospel are praised; and it says:	In the footsteps of the preceding prophets we directed Jesus, son of Mary . . and those who do not believe those things that God sent down from heaven, they indeed are impious. (V. 50, 51)
On the malice of the Jews and the ascension of Christ. (XLII)	On the malice of the Jews against Christ and his blessed Mother it says:	Not a few of the Jews did not believe . . God is precious and wise. (IV. 154-6)
On the false opinion of the death of Christ. (XLIII)	The lie of the Muslims and the fable of the death of Christ and of his cross. The glosators of the Qur'an say here . .	(interposed chapter)
On the infidelity of the Jews and the praises of Christ. (XLIV)	Again on the infidelity of the Jews and the praises of Christ, it says:	Jesus, son of Mary, was placed as a sign . . and we have made an example for the children of Israel. (XLIII. 57-59)

Heading.	Introductory phrase.	Text.
	(no break) (Qur'an XLIII.63-4)	And when Christ came, he said . . . worship him, because this is the most right way.
Those who believe in Christ are praised. (XLV)	Again the faith and the victory of the disciples of Christ are praised; it says:	(God said:) O you, who believe . . . we comforted those who believed over their enemies, and they were made manifest victors and the enemy perished. (LXI.14)
Recommendation of the table of Christ, which is the altar, and of his food. (XLVI)	Again, the sacrament of God's table, which is the altar, is shown, where it says:	Al-ḥawārīyūn, that is, the disciples of Christ, said to Jesus . . . I will make the table descend upon you, and I shall torment him who shall remain unbelieving after you, and punish him with a pain greater than that with which I shall punish anyone in the world. (V.112-115)

Q. XLIII.64: the most right way, "via directissima"; the Latin text adds, "which is called strata in Greek and in Arabic sorat". i.e., late Latin strata for via strata, ~~from~~ Greek strotos; Arabic, ṣirāṭ.

Q. V. 112: al-ḥawārīyūn: Prutz: Prutz, Anarion; Vat. lat. 314, Auarion.

Appendix III. A comparison of three mediaeval versions of the "praises of Christ" in surah XIX (16-35), preceded by Maracci's Latin version to provide a standard. In addition to inaccuracies, note resort to explanatory phrases and paraphrase; note also stylistic differences. (Maracci italicises phrases supplied, as A.V. for Bible.)

Maracci: Ref. in suram XIX alcor.	Mark of Toledo: MS. Vienna 4297 f.116v.-117r.	William of Tripoli: Prutz cap.XXXII-XXXIV. (MS.Vat. lat. 314 f.110r. compared but no corrections adopted.)	Robert of Ketton: Bibliander p. 98 lines 40 ff. MS. Selden Supra 31 f.116v.-117r. does not vary significantly.
Et commemora in libro Alcorani Mariam, quando secessit a familia sua ad locum orientalem. Et accepit clam ipsis velamen, quo se tegeret, et misimus ad eam spiritum nostrum (id est Gabrielem) et assimilatus est ei homo perfectus. Dixit Maria: Equidem confugio ad Misericordem, ut tueatur me a te: si es timoratus, abstinebis te a me dum confugio ad Deum. Respondit Gabriel: Certe ego sum legatus Domini, ut donem tibi puerum sanctum. Dixit illa: unde erit mihi puer, cum non tetigerit me homo (id est maritus) neque fuerim meretrix ? Respondit Gabriel: Ita erit. Dicit Dominus tuus: Hoc apud me est facile, et, ut ponamus eum (id est puerum) in miraculum hominibus, et in misericordiam ex nobis. Et hoc est	Et recole Mariam in libro quando secessit a propinquis suis ad locum orientis; et suscepit absque eis velamen et misimus ei spiritum nostrum, et suscepimus hominis formam perfecti. Dixitque defendat me Misericors a te, timeo ne eum. Dixit, ego quidem creatoris tui legatus existo, ut concedat tibi puerum perfectum. Dixit, quomodo puerum habebo et non tetigit me vir ? nec incesta extiti ? Dixit: sic dixit creator tuus, facile quidem est mihi ut ponam hominibus in miraculum et misericordiam a me, et factum est.	Sit memor Maria que se segregavit a suis et se receptavit in loco versus orientem et occultavit se ab eis, et nos misimus ad eam nostrum spiritum. Et apparuit ei similitudine viri et dixit Maria territa: Invoco Deum misericordem, si tu es Taquius. (Glosa Saracenorum: Taquius erat quidam incantator qui subito intrabat super virgines . .) Et dixit: Ego sum nuncius Dei tui: donabitur tibi filius innocens et purus. Dixit autem Maria: Eritne mihi filius ? Non tanget me vir et generabo ? Et dixit ille: Si decrevit Deus tuus hoc leve erit et faciemus eum signum hominibus et misericordiam a nobis, et res est diffinita.	Hic item liber minime praetermittit, qualiter Mariae versus locum orientalem, a sua gente discedenti, suisque velamen et intercapedo contigit. Cui spiritum nostrum, qui verum imitaretur hominem coram ea, quod et vere fecit, misimus. Cuius visu, illa pavefacta, Deum obsecrat, ut se ab illo, si Deum timeat, tueatur. Contra quam ipse sic fatus est: Nil nisi Dei nuncius sum, qui tibi puerum optime crescentem promittit. Respondit ipsa: Cum virum non tetigi, nec hoc opus nunquam dilexi, filium qualiter habebo ? Inquit ille: Hoc quidem Deo leve est, atque possibile ut hoc hominibus mirandum unicumque miraculum, nostraeque pietatis munus appareat. Istud quidem firme constanterque dijudicatum est.

(Maracci)

negocium definitum a nobis. Concepit igitur illum, et discessit cum eo in utero ad locum longinquum. Supervenit igitur ei dolor partus juxta truncum palmae. Dixit: O utinam ego mortua essem ante hoc, et fuissem, quid derelictum, oblivioni traditum. Et inclamavit ad eam Gabriel, qui erat sub eam (id est e loco inferiori): Ne contristeris; Jam posuit Dominus tuus sub te rivum. Et excute ad te truncum palmae: cadere faciet super te dactylos maturos colligibiles. Et comede, et bibe, et tranquilla oculum. Porro si videris ex hominibus aliquem, qui interroget te de puero, dic: Ego sane vovi Miseratori jejunium, ideo nullo modo alloquar hodie hominem. Veniet ergo cum eo (id est puero) ad gentem suam, et portabat eum. Dixerunt ei: O Maria, jam sane effecisti rem miram. O soror Aaron, non fuit pater tuus vir malus, et non fuit mater tua scortatrix. At illa innuit ad eum (id est puerum, dicens, loquamini cum eo.) Responderunt: Quomodo alloquemur eum, qui est in cunabulis infans ? Dixit puer: Certe

(Mark)

Et concepit eum et secessit cum eo in locum remotum et affuit partus ad radicem palme; et ait, Utinam morerer prius et essem oblita, obliviosa. Et vocavit eam qui erat sub ea, dicens: noli contristare. Possum enim creator tuus sub te; et concute ad radicem palme et cadent super te dattuli maturi; et comede et letare et delectare; ac si videris aliquem hominem, dic quidem votum vovi Misericordi et hodie non loquar homini.

Et tulit eum ad propinquos in qua manebant suos. Dixerunt, O Maria, quam rem quidem fecisti calumpniosam; soror Aaron,

non fuit tuus homo pravus nec mater tua fuit incesta et innuit eis. Et dixerunt quomodo loquar puero in cunabulis ? Dixit, Sum ego servus Dei; trinuit in librum, et constituit me

(Tripoli)

Concepit Maria filium et abiit eo in locum longinquum et remotum. Et cum advenisset tempus partus, peperit sub palma. Et tunc dixit: O ut mortua fuissem antequam hoc evenisset mihi et oblivioni fuissem tradita. Et mox natus de ea dixit: Ne tristeris ait, posuit sub te Deus secretum. Trahe ad te ramum palme cum fructu et super te cadet fructus electus maturus; comede ex eo, et bibe et esto leta. Et cum apparuerit tibi quispiam et dicet: Comede, dices: Ego vovi ieiunium misericordi Deo, et nemini loquaris, quia tenes secretum.
Maria ivit ad suos gestans natum ex ea, et dixerunt ei: Maria, rem grandem egisti. O soror Aaron, genitor tuus non fuit homo

malus et mater tua non exposuit se. Illa vero tacens monstravit puerum et dixerunt: Quomodo loquitur infans in cunabulis ? Et ipse puer dixit: Ego sum servus Dei, et Deus dedit

(Ketton)

Illa igitur impregnata, cum eo longinquum in locum aufugit. Tandem menstruo partum praecedente distillante, cum iuxta palmam consisteret, inquit: Utinam morti oblivionique succumberem, antequam hoc mihi contigisset. Christus autem subtus eam egressus, ipsam consolans inquit: Ne timeas, en ego tecum assideo. Deinceps Deus ipsam allocutus iniunxit, ut palmam excuteret, sicque super eam arruteba recentia caderent, unde ipsa comedens et bibens cor suum corroboraret, atque mitigaret: nemini vero viso colloquium praeberet, singulis innuens, se Deo dies abstinentiae ieiunijque vovisse.
Eam deinceps afferentem puerum, sui non mediocriter increpabant, dicendo: O Maria, cum tuorum parentum neuter malus existeret, cur

rem adeo malam perpetrasti ? Illa vero puerum ostendens, ut ipsum inde convenirent signis innuebat. Quibus qualiter infantulum huiusmodi convenirent sciscitantibus, ipse prius

(Second copy)

(Maracci)

ego sum servus Dei; tradidit mihi Librum (id est Evangelium) et constituit me Prophetam. Et fecit me benedictum, ubicunque fuero, et praecepit mihi orationem, et eleemosynam, quandiu permansero vivus. Et pium fecit me erga genetricem meam, et non fecit me superbum infelicem. Et pax super me die, qua natus sum, et die, qua moriar, et die qua resuscitabor vivus. Iste est Jesus filius Mariae: dictum veritatis, de quo dubitant (nimirum utrum sit filius Dei, nec ne).

(Mark)

prophetam, et statuit me benedictum ubi fueram, et castigavit me ut orarem, (et) ut decimas darem quamdiu viverem; et honorarem matrem meam; et non fecit me superbum, laboriosum. Et pax sit super diem in qua natus extiti, et die qua migravero et die qua vixero. Ille est Jhesus filius Marie, verbum veritatis, in quo dissentiunt.

(Tripoli)

mihi librum et me fecit benedictum prophetam, ubicumque ero, et precepit mihi semper orare et servare innocentiam, dum vita durat, iustificando matrem meam, ne inveniar rebellis passibilis. Salus et pax super me die, qua natus sum, die, qua moriar, et die, qua vivus resurgam.
(cetera desunt.)

(Ketton)

in vocem erumpens, inquit: Ego sum Dei serviens, qui mihi librum tribuens me prophetam constituit, et loco quocunque meliorantem et utilem posuit. Mihi quidem orationes fundere, et eleemosynas ac beneficia distribuere, et meam matrem honorare, dum inter homines conversarer, iniunxit: nec me virum difficilem, sed malorum expertem creavit. Et super me est divina salus in die meae nativitatis et mortis, et qua vivus iterum accedam. Hoc est de Christo Mariae filio verbum verax: in quo tamen plurimi dissentiunt homines.

Appendix IV

THE QUR'ANIC PARADISE: SURAH LII 17-25 and SURAH LV 46-78 in Mark's and Ketton's versions, compared with Pedro de Alfonso's abstract.

Mark, cap. liv. MS. f. 185r

. . . Metuentes in paradisis sunt et amenitatibus, vescentes fructibus quos eis Creator tribuit eorum, et custodivit eos a supplicio inferni; et dicetur eis: Epulamini et bibite in pace, pro bonis quae fecistis, in pace in thronis recumbentes ordinatis; et copulavimus eis mulieres oculos grandes et pulchros habentes. Et si fidelium proles sequuntur eos in fide, dabimus eis in premium paradisum, et nihil de operibus eorum minuemus. Et quidquid acquirent(ur) erit in pignore, et largiti sumus eis: fructus et carnes quas concupiscunt; et discurrent inter eos ministri, sicut aurum fulgentes, cum sciphis planis mero, propinantes illis; in quibus non erit ebrietas, necque peccatum. Et circumibunt eos pueri quasi margarite et mulieres in castitate fulgentes. Et accedent alii ad alios interrogantes sese adinvicem . . .

cap. lxvii. MS. f. 188r
(verses 46, 62 and 64 are missing at least in this MS)

. . . habentem frondes:
Quaenam igitur beneficia Creatoris vestri quasi falsa repudiatis?
In quibus duo fontes emanabunt:
Quaenam igitur beneficia Creatoris vestri . . ?
De omni fructu vinos habentes fructus:
Quaenam igitur beneficia . . ?
Recumbent in eis super lectos quorum supellectilia erunt purpurea et colligent fructus ortorum quippe:
Quaenam igitur . . ?
Inerunt puelle verecunde oculis quas non polluit homo unquam nec delusit demon:
Quaenam igitur . . ?

Ketton Az. lxi, Bibl. lxii p. 162 line 23 ff.

Timentibus autem, paradisum possessuris et ab igne penitus liberandis, dicetur: De fructibus omnimodis vobis datis, optimoque victu comedite atque bibite, ob actus vestros optimos: et super vestium stramenta formosissima pro modo vestro discumbite, ducturi virgines decentissimas, cum oculis immensis atque pudibundis, nusquam nisi tantum ad maritos suos flectendis. Credentium quoque filios credentes secundum opera sua sufficienter remunerabimus. Illis fructus et carnes pro sui voti modo multiplicaturi, qui pueris suis speciosis, ut margaritae constipandi, potum sument, nec verbi fetidi nec immensi peccati participem. Et horum alii sic alios alloquentur . .

Az. lxiv, Bibl. lxv p. 165 line 26 ff.

Qui timuerit, coram Deo stans, duas paradisos (sic) rerum multiplicium omnimodique boni foecundas, fontiumque fluxu iocundas, haereditatem accipiet: Ubi sunt omnium pomorum pariles. An aliquid horum factorum Dei contradicitis? Illic quidem credentes accubabunt tapetis sericis, stramentisque purpureis, omnibusque sibi dilectis perpetuo potientur, ducentque puellas formosissimas, ut hyacinthus et margaritae, ab hominibus atque diabolis nunquam devirginatas, nec menstruatas. An horum aliquid abnegatis? Bonorum solum praemiorum bonum est occasio. An hic aliquis contradicit? Erunt et illic arbores colore inter viridem croceumque nitentes, fontesque

Petri Alfunsi Dialogus Quintus.

Promisit . . paradisum, id est hortum deliciarum, praeterfluentibus aquis irriguum, in quo sedes habebunt perpetuas. Proteget eos arborum umbra, nec frigore affligentur, neque calore. Omnium fructuum, omnium ciborum vescentur generibus. Quidquid appetitus cuique suggeret, coram se confestim inveniet. Sericis induentur vestibus omnicoloribus. Accubabunt in deliciis, et angeli pincernarum ministerio inter eos cum vasis aureis et et argenteis deambulabunt, in aureis lac, in argenteis vinum offerentes, et dicentes: Comedite et bibite in omni laetitia, et quod vobis Deus promisit ecce completum est. Jungentur virginibus, quas nec humanus, nec daemoniacus violavit contactus, hyacinthi coraliique splendore forma praestantioribus.

Cf. the more romanticised version of Lull as it appears in the vernacular of his Liber de Gentile: Livre de la loi au Sarrazin (from Reinaud and Michel).

Quasi ipsi sunt iacinthi et coralli:
Quaenam igitur . . ?
Numquid retribuetur bonum pro bono?
Quaenam igitur . . ?
In quibus erunt duo fontes scaturientes:
Quaenam igitur . . ?
In quibus erunt fructus et palme et mala punica:
Quaenam igitur . . ?
In quibus bona pulchra:
Quaenam igitur . . ?
Puelle oculis magnis ac pulchris sub cortinis existentes:
Quaenam igitur . . ?
Quas non prius sordidavit aut polluit homo neque demon:
Quaenam igitur . . ?
Recumbentes super cloram pulchram et tapetia preciosa:
Quaenam igitur . . ?
Benedicatur nomen Creatoris tui magnifici et honorandi.

fortiter emanantes, et poma ac palmae, pomaque punica. Quod horum verum esse non creditis? Illic quidem erunt mulieres optimae, et speciosissimae, in umbraculis sedentes, cum oculorum albugine candidissima, pupillisque nigerrimis, in virore splendido iacentes, ab hominibus atque diabolis intactae. An horum aliquid falsum esse dicis? Deus est totius bonitatis multiplicator sublimis, largusque atque munificus.

Nos creons que home aura biaus palès et beiles chambres qui seront d'or et d'argent et de pierres précieuses . . . et por le reluisement et la diversité des qoleurs des pierres précieuses qui seront aussi granz que montegnes, sera mout beile chose et mout deliteuse de veoir ces palès et ces chambres . . . Et y aura mout biaus liz coverz de dras et de qovertors d'or et d'argent et de soie. . . Et en ce palès aura mout de nobles fames et mout noblement vestues et mout pleisanz à regarder. Par les rivières et par les prez aura mout de beiles fonteinnes et de biaus arbres bien charchiz de feuilles, de flors et de fruiz qui donront grant hombre. Et la biauté de ces choses, qui la porroit escrire ne raconter?

It is not possible to include all the descriptions of Paradise in the Qur'an here. It can be seen that Pedro de Alfonso's description derives from the Qur'an itself. Lull's is more indebted to the Liber Scalae and represents the work of the mediaeval imagination, both Arabic and Latin.

Appendix V

CHRONOLOGICAL AND GEOGRAPHICAL SUMMARY: the principal writers on Islam 1100–1350. (Some well-known travellers, who are not important as writers on Islam, have been included for the sake of the comparison of their dates.) In column three Europe stands for more than one single European country, excluding Spain; West stands for Spain, together with another country or countries; T.S. means Holy Land, and East means East of Syria. ep. = bishop; aep. = archbishop.

Pedro de Alfonso	layman (convert-	Spain	converted 1106	+1110
Hugh of Fleury	monk	France	chron. till	1108
Sigebert of Gembloux	monk	France	chron. till 1111	+1112
Guibert of Nogent	monk	France	b. 1053	+1124
Hugh of St. Victor	Victorine	France	b. c. 1097	+1141
Toletano-Cluniacs			translations made	1141–43
Peter the Venerable	monk	West	b. c. 1092	+1156
Robert of Ketton	cleric	West		+1147?
Hermann the Dalmatian	cleric	West		
Peter of Toledo	Mozarab	Spain		
Peter of Poitiers	monk	West		+1160
Historia Turpini		West		c. 1140–50
Waltherius	monk	France	mid saec. XII	
John of Wurzburg		T.S.		1165
Alexander III	Pp. 1159	Europe		+1181
William of Tyre	aep.	T.S.		+c.1190
Godfrey of Viterbo	cleric	Europe	chron. till 1186	+1191
Alan of Lille	monk (Cist.)	Europe	de fide wr. after 1185	+1203
Gerald of Wales	cleric	Europe	bk. I of de reg. pr. after 1190	+c.1220
De expugnatione . .		T.S.		after 1190
Scripta Innocentio Pp. (IIIo) missa ab ecc. Hieros.				c. 1200
(Haymar Monaco.	Patriarch	T.S.	1194–1202)	
Wildebrand of Oldenburg		T.S.		1211
Itin. reg. Ricardi		T.S.		c. 1220
Mark of Toledo	cleric	Spain	translations 1210 and 1213	+c.1216
Gilles de Corbeil				+c.1220
St. Francis				+1226
Oliver of Paderborn	ep. card.	Egypt Europe		+1227
Roger of Wendover	monk	Britain		+1236
Caesarius of Heisterbach	monk (Cist.)		b.c. 1180	+1240
Jacques de Vitry	ep. card.	T.S.	b. c. 1181	+1240
Roderick of Toledo	aep. 1209	Spain		+1247
William of Auvergne	ep. 1228	France		+1249
John of Plano Carpini	O.F.M.	East		+1252
Matthew Paris	monk	Britain (Europe)		+1259?
(Scriptum dom. Pp. Gregorio nono missum, and aliud scriptum, entered				1236)
William of Rubruck	O.F.M.	East		fl. 1253–55
Alexandre du Pont		France		fl.1258
Vincent de Beauvais	O.P.	Europe	wr. Spec. 1244	+1264?
Liber Scalae Machometi				tr.1264
Benedict of Alignan	monk and OF.M., ep.	Europe & T.S.		+1268
St. Thomas Aquinas	O.P.	Europe		+1274
St. Raymund of Penafort	O.P.	West		+1275
Humbert of Romans	O.P.	Europe & T.S.		+1277
William of Tripoli	O.P.	T.S.		fl.1273
Martin the Pole	ep.			+1279
Ramon Marti	O.P.	Spain		+1284
(quadruplex reprobatio certainly contemporary with if not written by Marti.)				
Burcard of Mount Sion	O.P.	T.S.		fl.1283
Rutebeuf				fl. 1250–85
Salimbene de Adam	O.F.M.	Europe		+c.1288
Fidenzio of Padua	O.F.M.	T.S.		wr. 1291
Thomas of Pavia	O.F.M.			fl. 1279–83
James of Varagine	O.P. aep. Genoa			+1298
Menestrel de Reims			saec. XIII	
Anonymus "Minorita"	O.F.M.? (O.P.?)	T.S.	saec. XIII	
Continuation Chron. B. Isidori, etc.		Spain	saec. XIII ?	
San Pedro Pascual	Merced. ep.	Spain		+1300
Ricoldo da Monte Croce	O.P.	East	Baghdad c. 1290	+1309
Angelo di Spoleto	O.F.M.	East, Egypt		+c.1314
Ramon Lull	O.F.M.	Spain, Africa East?		+1315
Joinville	layman	Egypt, T.S.	ded. hist. 1309	+1317
Busone da Gubbio			wr. Avv. Cic.	1311
Dante				+1321
Pierre Dubois	lawyer	France		+c.1321
Chiose anonime			early XIV saec.	
Marco Polo	Venet. layman	East	Travels wr. c.1299	+1324
William of Adam	O.P. ep. Sultaniyah	East		+1329
Symon Simeon	O.F.M.	T.S.		fl. 1322–24
Ranulph Higden	monk	Britain	1st edition Polychron.	1327
				+1363–64
James of Acqui	O.P.		chron. till	1330
Antonio de' Reboldi	O.F.M.	T.S.		fl.1330
Odoric of Pordenone	O.F.M.	East		+1331
John of Monte Corvino	O.F.M.	East		+1332
Jordan Catalani	O.P.	East		+1336?
Peter de Pennis	O.P.	Europe	T.S. visit doubtful. mid-century?	
Ottimo Comento				wr.1333–34
John Elemosyna	O.F.M.		chron. till	1336
Pasquale da Vittoria	O.F.M.	East		+1340
Guido Terrena of Perpignan	Carm. ep.	West		+1342
Marino Samudo	Venet. layman	Medit.	wr. 1306–21	+c.1343
James of Verona	August.	T.S.		fl.1336
Livin the Frenchman	O.F.M.	T.S.		+1345
Giovanni d'Andrea	canonist	Italy		+1348
John Vitodurani (de Winterthur)	O.F.M.		chron. till	1348
Ludolf of Sudheim	cleric	T.S.	1336–41	+c.1350
Quidam Anglicus	O.F.M.	T.S.		fl. 1336–41
Andrea Dandalo	Venet. layman	Medit.	b.1310 doge 1343	+1354
John Marignolli	O.F.M. ep.	East		+1359
Richard Fitzralph	aep.	Europe	in touch with Narses and Armenian party at Avignon in	1339–44
Mandeville			mid saec. XIV	+1360
Anonimo Fiorentino			mid saec. XIV	