RELIGIOUS POLEMIC AND THE INTELLECTUAL HISTORY OF THE MOZARABS, c. 1050-1200

BY

THOMAS E. BURMAN

E.J. BRILL
LEIDEN · NEW YORK · KÖLN
1994

But if some of these eleventh- and twelfth-century works have disappeared over the centuries, a small but extremely valuable corpus of them has been preserved. Four complete or fragmentary Mozarabic apologetic and polemical treatises have survived to our day, together with a remarkable polemical Latin commentary on the first part of the Qur'ān. These five works, moreover, can be supplemented by occasional passages of other works which happen to shed light in one way or the other on how Mozarabs thought about and approached Islam.

Liber denudationis (alias *Contrarietas alfolica)*

The earliest of the surviving Mozarabic religious-controversial works from this period is also the longest: the anonymous treatise known as *Liber denudationis siue ostensionis aut patefaciens* (*The Book of Denuding or Exposing, or the Discloser*). This treatise, however, presents at the outset a number of serious difficulties. Not only must such questions as its date and authorship be dealt with, but even the question of the title must be settled. That the work is a medieval Latin translation of a lost Arabic original must likewise be reckoned with: does the Latin translation in the form it has come down to us reliably impart the contents of the Arabic original?

While most of these questions can be answered only after examining the contents of the work, the problem of the title can be addressed directly. Though *Liber denudationis* has not received an enormous amount of scholarly attention, it did figure prominently in Norman Daniel's *Islam and the West: The Making of an Image.* He and a few other scholars, including the cataloguer of the Bibliothèque National in Paris which contains the only known manuscript of the work, have referred to it by the peculiar title of *Contrarietas alfolica.*[18] Quite apart from the thorny problem of

[18] See *Bibliothèque Nationale. Catalogue général des manuscrits latins* 5 (Paris, 1966): 339; cf. N. Daniel, *Islam and the West*, passim; M.-Th. d'Alverny; "Deux traductions," 125-127; Id., "Marc de Tolède," pp. 43-48; M.-Th. d'Alvery & G. Vajda, "Marc de Tolède, traducteur," pp. 124-32; and C. Lohr, "Ramon Llull, Liber Alquindi," pp. 154-58; I must include myself among this group as well: T. Burman, "The Influence of the *Apology of al-Kindī*," pp.

explaining exactly what this title might mean (*The Alfolic Opposition*? *The Mutual Contradiction of the Alfolica*?), the difficulty with it is that the Latin text itself quite clearly tells us that the title of the work is *Liber denudationis siue ostensionis aut patefaciens*,[19] which is doubtless the Latin counterpart of some such Arabic title as *(Kitāb) al-tashrīf aw al-iẓhār aw al-kashshāf*. It was the manuscript's seventeenth-century annotator who entitled it *Contrarietas alfolica*, apparently because this striking phrase is used once in the text.[20] D'Alverny and others have quite rightly argued that *alfolica* here is a corruption of the Arabic *al-fuqahā'*, plural of *al-faqīh*, meaning "legist," or "jurisconsult." The phrase, therefore, as it is used in the text, would mean the "mutual contradiction of the (Muslim) jurisconsults."[21] But there is nothing in the manuscript and no external evidence to suggest that this should be the title of the work. The seventeenth-century annotator who, as I argue below in part two, had no other manuscript of the work to hand while he commented on the text, adopted it as the title for reasons which cannot be ascertained, and later scholars have followed him. I would hesitate to depart from this practice were it not that the work has a much clearer and more useful title which ought to be employed.[22]

197-228.

[19] *Liber denudationis* 1.2.

[20] See *Liber denudationis* 1.2 ("et contrarietate *elfolicha*," = "and the contradiction of the *elfolicha*") and commentary.

[21] M.-Th. d'Alverny, "Deux traductions," pp. 125-26, Id. "Marc de Tolède," p. 44; M.-Th. d'Alverny & G. Vajda, "Marc de Tolède, traducteur," p. 125; cf. C. Lohr, "Ramon Llull, Liber Alquindi," pp. 158. *Contrarietas* normally means something like "opposition," or "obstinancy," but the contexts of its use here (see previous note) and in another passage of *Liber denudationis* (2.3) clearly indicate that "contradiction" is the intended meaning.

[22] It should be noted that the problem of the title is complicated still further by the fact that Ramon Lull, who knew and used the work in his own writings, referred to it simply as *Telif*, which is very likely his rendering of the Arabic *ta'līf* meaning simply "composition" or "compilation." *Telif* is probably, therefore, the first word of a longer Arabic title which disappeared in his Latin citation of it. See his *De fine* 2. 6, *Raimundi Lulli opera latina* 9, CCCM 35:283, ll. 1084-87; for Lull's use of *Liber denudationis* see C. Lohr, "Ramon Llull, Liber Alquindi," pp. 153-58, and T. Burman, "The Influence of the *Apology of al-Kindī*," passim.

The content of the work, which provides our only clues with which to resolve these several other difficulties, has been very briefly outlined by both d'Alverny and Lohr,[23] but a more thorough examination is needed here. The work is divided in the manuscript into twelve chapters, each of which has its own short chapter heading, and these chapter headings have been written in our manuscript by the same copyist who wrote the rest of the text. But it is almost certain that these divisions and chapter headings were added sometime after the work's translation into Latin because several of the divisions seem fairly arbitrary, some even doing violence to the text. For example, according to its title (*De peregrinatione et lapide nigro*) chapter eleven is about the Ḥajj and the Black Stone of the Kaʿbah, but the last quarter of it, in which the Islamic prohibition of alcohol is discussed, has nothing to do with this topic at all.[24] The clearest example, however, occurs at the division between chapters eight and nine. Chapter eight ends with the author commenting that "Muḥammad knew nothing of his state and <the state> of all Muslims or of what would happen to him after death (8.7)." In the manuscript a sentence fragment follows—*dicentem nos creauimus caelum et terram*, and then the title for chapter nine appears. There is no way to construe this fragment as part of the previous sentence in chapter eight, but it does fit nicely in the syntax of the first sentence of chapter nine. Placing it together with the first four words of that chapter we have *Dicentem nos creauimus caelum et terram inducit autem Deum pluries*, meaning "Now many times he (Muḥammad) introduces God <into the Qur'ān> saying, 'We created heaven and earth (9.1).'"[25] Moreover, the sentence thus construed fits well within the context, for at the beginning of chapter nine the author is attempting to show that the Qur'ān contradicts itself when it says in some places that God created the heavens first and

[23] M.-Th. d'Alverny, "Deux traductions," p. 127; Id., "Marc de Tolède," pp. 44-46; Ch. Lohr, "Ramon Llull, Liber Alquindi," p. 157.

[24] *Liber denudationis* 11.1-8; section on prohibition of wine: 11.7-8.

[25] The *autem* occurring late in the sentence (rather than second, as the grammarians insist) should not concern us overly; the translators are not great stylists; they use *autem* in this way elsewhere as well; see *Liber denudationis* 4.2 ("*est praecedentibus* quibus autem fuerit intellectus").

then the earth while in other places the order is reversed. Here, therefore, the chapter title actually seems to break up a sentence. The fact that Petrus Alfonsi's dialogue on the Muslims is attached to *Liber denudationis* in the manuscript as chapter thirteen suggests that perhaps the divisions were made by the copyist when the manuscript was compiled, but there is no way to be certain.[26]

Though they probably are not part of the original work, the chapter titles are, nevertheless, useful in dividing up the text since they generally do reflect natural divisions in the argument. I have, therefore, maintained them in my edition and will refer to them for practicality's sake throughout.

Chapter one is strictly introductory, beginning with a Christianized (and of course Latinized) version of the *Basmalah*: "In the name of the Father . . . and of the Son . . . and of the Holy Spirit." In the manner typical of Arabic works, the author then praises God for His gifts and grace toward himself and asks that He lend His aid to the writing of the treatise to follow (1.1). The author then explains that he came to write his apology when he had converted to Christianity after living "in blindness and stupidity" in Islam, and asks God to make the reader understand this book which he calls *<Liber> denudationis siue ostensionis aut patefaciens*. He will attempt therein to make clear "the infidelity and error of those who oppose us." All this he will do by arguing on the basis of the Qur'ān itself and the Ḥadīth (1.2).

Chapter two discusses the foolishness of those who adhere to the law of Muḥammad, these adherents being divided by the author into four categories: those compelled by the sword; those duped by the devil; those who are children of earlier believers and who recognize that Muḥammad is not a prophet, but adhere to Islam because it is at least better than paganism; and those who choose it because of the laxity of behavior and looseness of morals condoned by the Prophet (2.1). The author then notes, citing the first of the many ḥadīths included in the work, that Muḥammad himself said that his people would divide into seventy-three groups after him, of whom only one group would be saved. Nevertheless,

---

[26] For more on this and related issues see the introduction to my edition of *Liber denudationis* below in part two.

every Muslim, the author asserts, considers himself to be part of the one saved group (2.2). Changing topic suddenly, the author then observes that Muḥammad gave his followers "the Qur'ān which contradicts itself," adding that even its many commentators contradict each other regarding its meaning (2.3).

Chapter three is a defense of the integrity of the Christian scriptures against the Islamic accusation that Christians and Jews have corrupted them. The author first insists that Muḥammad's mission was not attested by either of the Testaments or any miracles. Christ's coming was proclaimed by all the prophets before him; Muḥammad's mission was not (3.1). Muslims, moreover, cannot claim that references to him have been effaced by Christians since the Qur'ān itself, in such verses as 10:94, 5:42-43, and 15:9, demonstrates that the Bible was uncorrupted in Muḥammad's time (3.2-4). Moreover, Jews and Christians who are dispersed throughout the world could not have falsified their scriptures in such a uniform way. If Holy Scripture does mention Muḥammad, it does so only when it describes false prophets (3.5).

Since neither miracles nor prophets testify to Muḥammad, the author argues in chapter four, his only alternative was to raise the sword, forcing people to follow, and to concoct false visions, duping them into the same. Here the author quotes two typical ḥadīths justifying the Jihād (4.1), and then recounts several further traditions which demonstrate that the Prophet worked no miracles (4.2). He then narrates several false accounts of the conversion of famous Muslims ('Umar, for example) under duress (4.3), and recounts further traditions which describe Muḥammad receiving revelations in ways that seem to indicate the falsity of the whole enterprise—Muḥammad breaking out in a sweat and falling on his face in convulsion, for example (4.4-5). Yet we are to believe, the author observes sarcastically, that this man, who could not endure a visitation from Gabriel without having an epileptic attack, nevertheless was transported without any such physical reaction into heaven on his famous Night Journey (4.6-7).

Chapter five is a brief account of Muḥammad's education based loosely on passages of Ibn Isḥāq's *Sīrah* of the Prophet and other works. The author describes Muḥammad's association with the

heretical monk Baḥīrā (*Boheira*) and the two Jewish rabbis often mentioned in this context, and cites a ḥadīth which seems to demonstrate that they instructed the Prophet (5.1-2).

In chapter six the author describes how the Qur'ān was put together after Muḥammad's death by his followers, who disagreed widely among themselves regarding its contents. Here the author mentions the seven early Muslims who were said to have possessed the seven accepted readings of the Qur'ān, and quotes the ḥadīth which was used to justify the existence of these several readings (6.1-2). The author asserts that although there were great variations in their versions of the Qur'ān, Abū Bakr had one version preserved and burned the others, even though large portions of some sūrahs were thereby omitted (6.3). Moreover, the Prophet himself (in verse 3:7) said that he did not understand the Qur'ān, which of course makes sense, the author remarks, since it is full of obscurity and fatuity (6.4).

The Qur'ān also contains many unseemly things, the author argues in chapter seven, here citing several well-known Qur'ānic passages and commentaries on them: the jealousy of Muḥammad's wives arising out of his love for his servant Māriyah the Copt (7.1-2, 7.5, 7.8); the Prophet's repudiation of his wife Sawdah bint Zamʿah referred to in verses 33:50-52 and the commentaries thereto (7.7); his infatuation with Zaynab the wife of Zayd, who repudiated Zaynab so that Muḥammad could marry her (7.9-10). The marriage practices of Islam so shocking to medieval Christendom likewise receive considerable attention (7.11), and the almost blasphemous (to Medieval Christian eyes) Qur'ānic mixture of Biblical prophets such as Lot and Job together with non-Biblical ones such as Sāliḥ and Hūd is described (7.13). Interspersed among these topics is more material of the same kind.

Chapter eight is a refutation of the Islamic belief in the miraculous nature of the Qur'ān and the universality of Muḥammad's mission. The author first points out that the Qur'ān is laden with material borrowed from the Bible and is laced with offensive tales (8.1), and contends further that the Arabic itself of the Qur'ān is defective as well (8.2-3). Moreover, if Muḥammad were a prophet sent to all nations, why did he speak only one language? The truly universal missionaries were Christ's disciples to

whom the Holy Spirit gave the ability to speak all languages (8.4-6). Muḥammad, in fact, did not even know what was to become of himself, the author notes; how therefore could he be considered a prophet (8.7)?

Chapter nine is the longest, dullest, and most petty of the whole tract, its twenty-five paragraphs describing the internal contradictions of the Qur'ān with a view to undermining its credibility. The author begins by noting that in some passages God is said to have created heaven first and then earth, while in other passages this order is reversed (9.1-2). In a similar fashion he attempts to demonstrate that the Qur'ān's statements about *inter alia* the day of judgement (9.3, 9.23), God's omniscience (9.4), paradise (9.6, 9.18, 9.20-21), and Satan (9.7, 9.10) are somehow inconsistent or merely foolish from the Christian point of view. Nevertheless, in the middle of this lengthy, literalist exercise there is one markedly interesting passage in which the author refutes the Islamic belief, based on verse 54:1, that Muḥammad caused the moon to split one night and fall on a mountain near Mecca. In addition to relying on the Ḥadīth and Qur'ānic commentaries here, as he does so frequently elsewhere, the author argues against the possibility of this miracle on the basis of Aristotelian physics and contemporaneous scientific principles (9.11-16).

After exposing what he believes are the Qur'ān's internal contradictions, the author then, in chapter ten, contrasts the Qur'ānic portrayals of Muḥammad and Christ in order to demonstrate through this evidence that Christ is the Son of God. Muḥammad spent his first forty years as a sinful idolator while Christ is referred to in the Qur'ān as the Word and Spirit of God (10.2-4). Christ is the heir of God's promise to Abraham while Ishmael, father of the Arabs, was excluded from this heritage. Muḥammad's parents were idolators; Christ was born of a virgin. Christ healed the sick and the blind, while Muḥammad worked no miracles at all (10.5-7). After this point by point contrast, the author then attempts to demonstrate Christ's divinity by means of a Christian interpretation of verse 4:171: "<Jesus> is the word of God which he infuses into Mary, and a spirit from Him (10.8)." In this passage (10.8-13) our author relies heavily on an Oriental Arab-Christian writer, as I will show in the next chapter.

By means of this argument he is able to conclude, on the basis of *Qur'ānic* evidence, that Jesus was the *verus filius Dei* (10.13). Attached to chapter ten are two short appendices in which he refutes two common Islamic objections to the Incarnation: how could God, whom heaven and earth cannot contain, become incarnate in the womb of a woman (10.14-17)? and how could God deserve to be crucified and ridiculed on the cross (10.18-22)?[27]

Chapter eleven consists of a string of legends about the building of the Kaʿbah, and the origin of its Black Stone, together with a brief account of what the author says was his own experience on the Ḥajj, or pilgrimage to Mecca. Here he relies in part on Ḥadīth material, in part on sources of unknown origin (11.1-6). After thus showing the Ḥajj in an unfavorable light, the author suddenly changes course and attacks the Islamic prohibition of wine, here relying on Qur'ān and Ḥadīth (11.7-8).

The twelfth and final chapter is a retelling of Muḥammad's famous Night Journey based on what is surely an authentic Islamic account similar, for example, to that of the twelfth-century Andalusī Muslim Qāḍī ʿIyāḍ (12.1-6).[28] Most of *Liber denudationis*' account of this event is also reproduced, almost verbatim, in Riccoldo da Monte di Croce's *Contra legem Sarracenorum*.[29] Though he does not submit this miracle to any systematic criticism, the author of *Liber denudationis* intended for this narrative to appear shocking and ridiculous *per se* to a Christian audience. At the close of the work the author reiterates his assertion that Muḥammad worked no miracles and only convinced the greater part of his followers to adhere to his religion through force (12.7-9).

There is little doubt that the first ten chapters of *Liber denudationis* are all one work by one author, for chapter ten, in

---

[27] The ninth century Syrian Christian ʿAmmār al-Baṣrī responded to the first of these objections in his *Kitāb al-masā'il wa-al-ajwibah* 4. 11, p. 194 [Arabic]; and mentions an objection very like the second in his *Kitāb al-burhān* 8, p. 79 [Arabic].

[28] See Qāḍī ʿIyāḍ, *al-Shifā'* 1. 3. 2; 1, pp. 231-35.

[29] For more on Riccoldo's use of *Liber denudationis* see the introduction to my edition of *Liber denudationis* below in part two.

addition to covering the points outlined above, also quite clearly is meant to sum up many of the points made earlier in the work.[30] But the two appendices to chapter ten and the last two chapters (eleven and twelve) of the work appear in some ways to have been arbitrarily added to the first ten chapters; and since most of chapter twelve is found in Riccoldo's *Contra legem Sarracenorum*, it may have circulated separately. Despite these facts, however, there is good reason to assume that all twelve chapters are probably the work of one author. Both chapters eleven and twelve contain abundant references to the Ḥadīth and other traditional Islamic material, just as the earlier chapters do. The beginning of chapter twelve, with its annotated quotation of verse 17:1 together with language suggestive of an exegetical source ("The explanation of these verses . . ." [12.2]), is particularly similar in structure to many passages in earlier parts of the work.[31] The end of the same chapter, with its reiteration of one of the work's important earlier themes—that the Qur'ān itself indicates that Muḥammad worked no miracles and this in itself is proof that he was not a prophet (12.9)—is further evidence that it was written by the author of the earlier chapters. Both the sources and the central thrust of the last two chapters, therefore, are the same as those of the first ten sections of the work.

The sources of *Liber denudationis* are almost completely Arabic. It contains some seventy-five explicit citations of the Qur'ān, and in almost all of these cases the sūrah is specified by name. At least thirty separate ḥadīths are cited, sometimes with the *isnād*, or chain of authorities testifying to their validity, attached.[32] Because the many Ḥadīth collections and Qur'ānic commentaries often repeat slightly different versions of the same ḥadīths, it has not been possible to establish exactly which collections and commentaries the author used. Nevertheless, as I will make clear in chapter four, most of these ḥadīths can be traced to one or several of the main collections, while others can be found

[30] See 10.5-7 and commentary thereto.

[31] The use of of Qur'ānic commentaries by the author of *Liber denudationis* will be discussed in detail in chapter four below.

[32] This will be discussed in more detail in chapter four below.

in the main Qur'ānic commentaries. It is clear, moreover, that the author used both kinds of source, since some ḥadīths are cited in isolation from Qur'ānic verses (as they usually are in the Ḥadīth collections), while others are cited in order to give the traditional explanation of verses of the Qur'ān, just as they are in the commentaries. Furthermore it is likely that the author took some of this traditional material from early Islamic historical and biographical works such as those of al-Ṭabarī and Ibn Isḥāq.[33] The only other sources used by the author are the Bible (available by this time in Arabic), the Oriental Arab Christian mentioned above,[34] and perhaps Aristotle (9.15) and a letter of Pseudo-Dionysius (9.12), these last two appearing only briefly. These works also would have been available to the author in Arabic.[35] Part of section 10.12 may be based on a specifically Latin source originating in the school of Laon, but this is far from certain.[36]

Although *Liber denudationis* is anonymous, what we know about the circulation of the work together with certain features of its contents indicate that it was surely written in the western lands of Islam and almost certainly within the Mozarabic community.[37] First of all, it was doubtless translated somewhere in southern Italy, Sicily, or Spain since those were the areas where Arabic works were most commonly translated into Latin.[38] Moreover, Ramon Lull (1232-1316) and Ramon Martí (d. c. 1285)—Spaniards both—read this treatise during the second half of the thirteenth century. Though it is not clear whether Lull read it in

---

[33] See chapter four below.

[34] And discussed at some length in the next chapter.

[35] Graf notes that at least some of Pseudo-Dionysius' works were translated into Arabic in the Middle Ages; see G. Graf, *Geschichte der christlichen arabischen Literatur* 1, pp. 370-71.

[36] See commentary to *Liber denudationis* 10.12.

[37] See here also M. Th. d'Alverny, "La connaissance," p.592, Id., "Deux traductions," p. 126; Id., "Marc de Tolède," pp. 43-47; and C. Lohr, "Ramon Lull, Liber Al-Kindi," pp. 157-58.

[38] D. Lindberg, "The Transmission of Greek and Arabic Learning," pp. 58-67. The Crusader states, the other important Latin enclave bording on the Islamic world, may be ruled out as a place of translation since, as Joshua Prawer has pointed out, interest in such endeavors never developed in Outremer; see his *The Crusaders' Kingdom*, pp. 529-30.

Arabic or Latin, he fairly clearly was familiar with it by at least 1299.[39] Martí knew the work as early as 1256 or 1257 when he wrote his *Explanatio simboli apostolorum*.[40] Both this work and his *Quadruplex reprobatio*[41] (whose dating is unclear) show the influence of the *Liber denudationis*,[42] and the *Explanatio simboli* does so in a way which strongly suggests that Martí knew the original Arabic version rather than the Latin translation. Among the passages of that work which point to this conclusion is Martí's refutation of the Muslim claim that Christians and Jews corrupted the original revelations of God to Moses and Jesus by changing words and adding heretical ideas.[43] Here Martí quotes several passages from the third chapter of *Liber denudationis*. But his versions of these passages, while they contain exactly the same content as the corresponding sections of *Liber denudationis*, are couched in rather different language. Compare the following passages from the two works:

> *Liber denudationis* 3.4:
> Sicut dicit in Alchorano in Capitulo *Elhagar* quod interpretatur "Lapis:" *Nos* inquit in persona Dei, *descendere fecimus recordationem Dei et nos eandem custodiemus*. Lex et Euangelium apud eos dicuntur *recordatio*.[44]

Explanatio simboli apostolorum, prologue:

---

[39] See my "The Influence of the *Apology of al-Kindī*," passim, and cf. the commentary to *Liber denudationis* 4.3; and cf. A. Bonner's review of my article in *Studia Lulliana (olim Estudios Lullianos)* 32 (1992):88 where he shows that Lull must have known this work as early as 1299, while I had argued that he first became familiar with it in 1305.

[40] See J. M. March "En Ramón Martí y la seva 'Explanatio simboli apostolorum,'" p. 447; and A. Berthier, "Un Maître orientaliste du XIIIe siècle," pp. 279-81.

[41] For more on this work and its attribution to Martí, and for more on Martí himself, see chapter six below.

[42] See below, chapter six.

[43] For more on this oft-used Muslim polemical strategy see chapter three below.

[44] Translation: *Just as he says in the Qur'ān in the Chapter of* Elhagar, *which is translated "the Stone:"* We, *he says impersonating God*, made the remembrance of God descend, and we will protect the same. *The Law and the Gospel are among them called* the remembrance.

> Item, in cap. *Hygr*, introducit Deum sibi loquentem. *Nos demisimus memoriale et sumus eius custodes*. Vocat autem legem et Evangelium *memoriale* Dei, ut dicunt Sarraceni.[45]

The two passages are obviously remarkably similar. Both quote the same Qur'ānic verse (15:9) for the same purpose (to demonstrate the validity of the Judeo-Christian scriptures); both passages observe, rather snidely, that the words of the verse as they appear in the Qur'ān are placed by Muḥammad directly in the mouth of God; and both verses include the same explanation of the word "remembrance" (Latin *recordatio, memoriale; dhikr* in the Qur'ān). It is hard not to conclude, especially in light of the other striking parallels between the two works,[46] that Martí had a copy of *Liber denudationis* open next to him as he wrote. Yet the actual Latin wording of the passages differs so much that we must either assume that Martí systematically reworked the Latin version of this treatise, a procedure that seems unlikely (why go to the trouble of changing *recordatio* to *memoriale*, or *nos eandem custodiemus* to *sumus eius custodes* when both sets of formulations seem equally [mis]understandable?), or that Martí was simply translating the original Arabic version of the same passage into Latin himself.

This latter, more plausible theory is supported, oddly enough, by the one significant difference between the two passages. In *Liber denudationis*, Sūrah fifteen is called *Elhagar* which the translators say means "the Stone;" Martí's version says that the sūrah's name is *Hygr*. The actual Arabic name is *al-Ḥijr*, which is the proper name of a region between the Hijaz and Syria. The translators of *Liber denudationis* misread this in their undoubtedly unvocalized Arabic manuscript as *al-ḥajar*, which does indeed mean "the stone," while Martí (fine Arabist that he was) recog-

---

[45] Translation: "*Likewise, in the Chapter of* Hygr *he introduces God speaking to himself:* We sent down the remembrance and we are the guardian of it. *Now he calls the Law and the Gospel the* remembrance of God, *as the Muslims say.*" Martí, *Explanatio simboli*, prologue, p. 454, ll. 39-40. The editor of the work, J. M. March, read *demissus* where I have read *demisimus*, the latter form being justified not only on the basis of sense, but also as a perfectly suitable translation of the Arabic verb *arsalnā* of the Qur'ānic verse in question (cf. *Glossarium*, p. 319 where *mitto* and *emitto* are defined as, *inter alia*, *arsila*).

[46] Which will be discussed later in this chapter.

nized the proper form and preserved it in transliteration. While it is possible that Martí could have corrected the Latin text of *Liber denudationis*, restoring the name to its proper form and dropping from the quotation the translators' incorrect explanation, the simplest explanation is that he was working directly from the Arabic text itself.

In any case, *Liber denudationis* was circulating in Spain, probably in both the Arabic and Latin versions, in the second half of the thirteenth century.[47] Moreover, at about the same time as Lull became familiar with the work, Martí's younger confrere, Riccoldo da Monte di Croce (d. early fourteenth century), likewise had read the work in Latin, presumably in Italy, and its influence is apparent in his two famous treatises, *Contra legem sarracenorum* and *Itinerarium*.[48]

But in addition to being translated somewhere on the Latin frontiers of the western Islamic world, and possibly in Spain, and in addition to having circulated in Spain and Italy in the second half of the thirteenth centuries, certain features of the work's contents also point to a western (and almost certainly Iberian) origin. In the first place, the author is conscious of being in the West. He refers to the Iraqī Dāwūd al-Iṣfahānī, founder of the Ẓāhirite *madhhab*, as "David the Oriental" (*Dauid Orientalis*, 2.3), and to the Iraqī Abū Ḥanīfah as *Eba Honeife theologus orientis* (11.8). Moreover, he argues that the Qur'ān mistakenly says that Christians and Jews call their religious leaders "lords" (verse 9:31) "since in the *Orient* they used to call priests and monks *rabban* [=the Arabic *rabbān*]," a word similar to the word for "lord"

---

[47] The author of an anonymous life of Muḥammad in thirteenth-century Spain may also have been influenced by *Liber denudationis*. See anonymous, "Vita Mahometi," p. 395 ("Et volumus enarrare vobis ea que ipse dixit de Xpo, dicens ipsum esse Spiritum Dei et eiusdem Verbum. Et dixit de beata Maria quod Deus misit ad eam angelum suum Gabrielem, et concepit de Spirito Sancto, Virgo in partu et ante partum et post partum, Virgo permanens et intemerata; et dixit etiam apostolos esse amicos Dei et fideles.") and cf. *Liber denudationis* 10.4, 10.13, 10.21.

[48] See J.-M. Mérigoux, "L'ouvrage d'un frère prêcheur," pp. 31-32 on the former and M.-Th. d'Alverny, "Marc de Tolède," p. 48 on the latter, and see also the introduction to my edition of *Liber denudationis*.

in Arabic (9.8).[49] Only an author living somewhere in or near the western Islamic lands would say such things.

Southern Italy or Sicily, however, can probably be eliminated as possible origins of the work because, although there were a certain number of Christian converts from Islam in these areas[50] (and the author of this work claims to be such a convert), the familiarity of the author of *Liber denudationis* with the Arab-Christian apologetic and polemical tradition presupposes his having lived within a fairly large Arabic-speaking Christian community such as could be found only in al-Andalus and North Africa.[51]

Furthermore, the fact that Dāwūd al-Iṣfahānī is mentioned at all, and especially the fact that the author perversely deems him the greatest of the commentators on the Qur'ān (2.3), suggests that the author was more likely from al-Andalus than North Africa because, as is well known, Dāwūd's *madhhab* flourished particularly in al-Andalus, principally because of the weighty influence of Ibn Ḥazm of Cordoba who was certainly Dāwūd's most important follower.[52] Moreover, the efflorescence of Ẓāhirite ideas in al-Andalus occurred at roughly the time when the *Liber denudationis* was probably written,[53] that is (as I will argue presently) sometime between 1085 and 1132. Furthermore, assuming that Mohamed Talbi is correct in his estimation of contemporaneous North-African Christianity, then that Christian community was

---

[49] Oriental Christians, at least, did indeed address priests with the honorific term *rabbān*; see commentary to *Liber denudationis* 9.8.

[50] See D. Abulafia, "The End of Muslim Sicily," pp. 109-12, and B. Kedar, *Crusade and Mission*, 51-52.

[51] See ch. one above, passim.

[52] On his place in the Ẓāhirite school, see I. Goldziher's lengthy study, *The Ẓāhirīs*, pp. 109-71; see esp. pp. 156-57 for a discussion of Ibn Ḥazm's immediate followers, most of whom were Andalusī.

[53] Asín outlines the careers of Ibn Ḥazm's immediate followers in M. Asín-Palacios, *Abenházam de Córdoba* 1:279-303. It should be pointed out, however, that D. Urvoy, on the basis of the evidence in the biographical collections, has argued that Ẓāhirism remained always a fringe phenomenon in a Spain dominated by Mālikism, though it enjoyed periodic renascences; see his *Le monde des ulémas andalous*, pp. 132-33. Cf. also D. Urvoy, *Pensers d'al-Andalus*, p. 82.

suffering a devastating collapse at just the time when *Liber denudationis* was written.[54] It is difficult to see how such a vigorous and, in its own way, learned work as this could have been composed under such circumstances.

Finally, the fact that *Liber denudationis* attacks the credibility of the Prophet and his book so unremittingly suggests that the work was written somewhere in Iberia outside the jurisdiction of Islamic law; for much of the treatise could be easily construed as calumny against the Prophet and therefore punishable by death especially in Mālikī Spain.[55] It is remarkable how rare such attacks are in Arab-Christian polemics against Islam written within the *dār al-Islām*; with the exception of the *Apology of al-Kindī*—which was probably written under a pseudonym for this very reason[56]—I know of no other work which so vigorously attacks Muḥammad and the Qur'ān. Much more common is the circumspect approach of the contemporary Nestorian Bishop Īlīyā al-Naṣībī who, when asked by a wazir about his views on the Qur'ān's use of metaphoric language, begged not to be forced to answer this delicate question; or the charitable attitude of the Mozarab al-Qūṭī who insisted that the religion of Islam was built on sound ethical principles and its revelation would only be completed by acceptance of the Christian mysteries.[57] Thus Toledo after its conquest by the Christians, when it became the center of the Mozarab community, would seem the natural place for such a work as *Liber denudationis* to have been written.[58]

---

[54] See M. Talbi, "Le Christianisme maghrébin," pp. 338, 343.

[55] See A. Turki, "Situation du 'tributaire' qui insulte l'Islam," pp. 61-64. It is worth noting that an extant *fatwá* indicates that in the tenth century a Christian in North Africa who insulted the Prophet was sentenced to death and the loss of his property unless he converted to Islam. See H. R. Idris, "Les tributaires en occident musulman médiéval," p. 175.

[56] See M. Hayek, *ʿAmmār al-Baṣrī*, p. 14.

[57] Īlīyā al-Naṣībī, "al-Majlis al-sādis," p. 373; al-Khazrajī 4, pp. 33-34; in this charitable attitude al-Qūṭī may well be following the example of the striking statements of the Nestorian Catholicos Timothy who in his disputation (an account of which circulated in Spain) with the Caliph al-Mahdī gave high praise to Muḥammad and the Qur'ān; see Ṭīmāthāwus, *al-Muḥāwarah al-dīnīyah* 2, pp. 373-74.

[58] M.-Th. d'Alverny came to essentially the same conclusion in her recent "Marc de Tolède," p. 47.

A chance comment within the text itself makes the problem of dating *Liber denudationis* considerably easier. At the end of chapter nine, the author observes that

> Muḥammad is reported in verified accounts . . . to have said that before one hundred years had passed away nothing would be living on the surface of the earth, and there is no one among his followers who doubted that the resurrection would be at the end of one hundred years. But we are already in the fourth century from that time.[59]

Assuming Muḥammad made this statement sometime during his prophetic career, that is, between 610 and 632, and that the author had a fairly clear idea of when this was,[60] it is necessary only to add 100 years to this period to arrive at the time when nothing was to be living on earth, that is, sometime between 710 and 732. Since, according this statement, the work was written *within* the fourth century after that time, the earliest possible date would be 1010, if the author wrote at the beginning of that fourth century after, the latest, 1132, if he wrote at the end of it.[61]

Furthermore, three factors suggest that the *terminus a quo* of 1010 suggested by this internal evidence is rather early. First, that Dāwūd al-Iṣfahānī is cited as the greatest of the commentators on the Qur'ān suggests that the work was written during the heyday of Ẓāhirism in Spain, after Ibn Ḥazm's adoption, adaptation, and propagation of Dāwūd's doctrines. Ibn Ḥazm died in 1064, which would suggest that *Liber denudationis* was written several decades later than 1010. Second, if it is true that this treatise was written under Christian jurisdiction, then we would expect it to have been

---

[59] *Liber denudationis* 9.23; the first sentence here is the translation of a ḥadīth of which Ibn Ḥanbal records several slightly different versions, see Ibn Ḥanbal 1, p. 93, and 2, p. 121.

[60] Note that a contemporary Latin translation of a series of Islamic traditions makes quite clear that 620 years separated Christ and Muḥammad. See anonymous, *Fabulae Sarracenorum*, fol. 5vb; cf. J. Kritzeck, *Peter the Venerable and Islam*, p. 78.

[61] It is possible, but not very likely given its position, that the phrase "from that time (*a tempore illo*)" refers to Muḥammad's life, this pushing the *terminus a quo* back to the early tenth century. But see M.-Th. d'Alverny & G. Vajda, "Marc de Tolède, traducteur," pp. 125-26, whose interpretation of this passage allows for this possibility, but whose dating of the work is, nevertheless, the same as mine.

written after the Christian conquest of Toledo in 1085 when the large Toledan Mozarabic community came under the rule of Alfonso VI. Therefore, while it is certain that the work was written sometime between 1010 and 1132, it is probable that it was written sometime after 1085.

The text of *Liber denudationis* tells us almost nothing explicit about its author other than that he claims to be a convert from Islam (1.2, cf. 11.6). Conversions from Islam to Christianity were certainly not unknown during the period when this treatise was written: as I mentioned earlier, the qāḍī of Toledo, for example, converted to Christianity in the immediate aftermath of its conquest in 1085.[62] Such a man as he might well have written a work of this kind, for in the unstable aftermath of Alfonso's occupation of Toledo, there would have been ample motivation for a convert to write a polemical work against Islam. He would have wanted both to justify his own actions and perhaps attract other converts who might be encouraged by the tumultuous political situation of the Peninsula to throw in their lot with the Christians.

Nevertheless, Norman Daniel and Marie-Thérèse d'Alverny have, without going into the matter in any detail, discounted this claim as a literary artifice designed to give the work more authority;[63] and indeed there is a good—though not ultimately conclusive—case to be made for the author's insincerity about his religious past.[64] First of all knowledge of the Qur'ān and Ḥadīth was

---

[62] On this and other possible Muslim conversions to Christianity in this period see chapter one above, esp. n. 62.

[63] N. Daniel, *Islam and the West*, pp. 6, 12; M.-Th. d'Alverny, "La connaissance," p. 591, n. 27; M.-Th. d'Alverny & G. Vajda, "Marc de Tolède, traducteur" p. 126; and M.-Th. d'Alverny, "Marc de Tolède," p. 47.

[64] Though I do not find Daniel's primary reason—that, "It is often difficult to imagine that a convert, however much he hated his old religion, could take just the line that the author of this work takes" (N. Daniel, *Islam and the West*, p. 12)—very convincing. It seems to me, on the contrary, that it is altogether possible that a convert should take a hostile and characteristically Christian approach to Islam. If nothing else, we have the example of ʿAlī al-Ṭabarī who, as a Christian convert to Islam, in no way moderated his attack on the Church in his famous polemic against Christianity; see ʿAlī al-Ṭabarī, *al-Radd ʿalá al-naṣārá*, eds. I.-A. Khalifé and W. Kutsch in their "Ar-radd ʿala-n-Naṣārā de ʿAlī aṭ-Ṭabarī," *Mélanges de l'Université Saint Joseph* 36 (1959):115-48.

certainly not uncommon among non-Muslims in eleventh- and twelfth-century Spain. At least one member of the Christian team who annotated Robert of Ketton's first translation of the Qur'ān used Qur'ānic commentaries with apparent ease, while the Mozarabs described by Ibn Ḥazm as well as the author of *Tathlīth al-waḥdānīyah* were all able to use the Ḥadīth collections to some extent.[65] One might add, moreover, that in the next century Ramon Martí repeatedly used the collections of al-Bukhārī and Muslim, the *Sīrah* of Ibn Isḥāq, and Qur'ānic commentaries in his anti-Islamic works, especially the *Quadruplex reprobatio*.[66] The extensive familiarity of *Liber denudationis*' author with these Islamic texts, therefore, is hardly proof of his having been a Muslim.

Furthermore, the author's knowledge of the Islamic thinkers whom he names in the work is not profound. Abū Ḥanīfah, Dāwūd al-Iṣfahānī, and al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, for example, are referred to by name in the text, but there is no evidence at all that the author is deeply familiar with the role that each of these very different men played in the religious history of Islam.[67] The author is clearly aware that Dāwūd took an extremely literalist approach to the interpretation of the Qur'ān, but appears to believe that there was nothing unusual about his doctrines. Rather, he gives every indication, especially when he calls Dāwūd *maximus apud illos*,[68] that he is ignorant of the fact that Dāwūd's views were considered completely unacceptable by most Muslims, particularly Andalusī Mālikīs. In effect he has lumped these and many other Muslim thinkers together as if they all represented precisely the same mistaken views, citing them indifferently whenever the thoughts of one served his polemical purposes, rather as if someone only minimally familiar with the Christian tradition gathered together quotations from Tertullian, St. Bernard of Clairvaux,

---

[65] See chapter four below, passim.

[66] See *Quadruplex reprobatio*, passim, and A. Cortabarría, "Fuentes árabes del «Pugio fidei»," p. 596; Martí, of course, had a wide knowledge of Islamic philosophy and religious thought as well, see Cortabarría, ibid., pp. 581-96.

[67] See *Liber denudationis* 11.8, 2.3, 9.20.

[68] *Liber denudationis* 2.3.

Martin Luther, and Paul Tillich, and used them to illustrate the characteristically Christian view of things.

Moreover, as Norman Daniel pointed out, the author's account of his pilgrimage to Mecca "is particularly unconvincing."[69] First of all, the events he describes here are a distortion of the activities that take place during only one part of the Ḥajj, the gathering at al-Minā.[70] Secondly, there is nothing here that he could not have learned from the Ḥadīth anyway, since most of the activities of the pilgrimage are described there in detail. Therefore, this account in no way demonstrates that the author was a convert.

All this would suggest that, rather than being a converted Muslim, the author of *Liber denudationis* was a well-educated Mozarab[71] who knew the basic Islamic religious texts well, and who had, as I will indicate in the next chapter, a good knowledge of the anti-Islamic literature in Arabic, but who did not know Latin with any proficiency.

Nevertheless, although there are several indications that *Liber denudationis*' author was only masquerading as a convert, the case is far from conclusive. Indeed, it is not impossible to imagine an Andalusī Muslim learned enough to read the Qur'ān, Ḥadīth, and Qur'ānic commentaries, but who remained rather hazy on other areas of Islamic religious history, and who, having never been on the Ḥajj, was unclear as to exactly what occurs at the holy places of Islam as well. Having converted, such a man as this could also very easily have been the author of *Liber denudationis*. As a result, while I tend to agree with Daniel and d'Alverny that the author's claim to be a convert may be an artifice, the real possibility that he was in fact a former Muslim cannot be discounted.

Finally, some comments need to be made about the Latin translation itself, for it is not immediately clear what its precise relationship is to the original, and now lost, Arabic version. The

---

[69] N. Daniel, *Islam and the West*, p. 12.

[70] *Liber denudationis* 11.6; and see commentary thereto.

[71] There is some evidence that the author may actually have been a converted Jew. See *Liber denudationis* 9.24 and commentary thereto. As I indicate in the commentary, this evidence is ambiguous, for it is possible that the Hebrew words used here were inserted by the translators.

single, extant manuscript of the Latin version ends with the following ambiguous colophon:

> I, by preserving the sense rather than the words, and by abbreviating many things, followed a translator who translated word for word.[72]

This sentence could be interpreted to mean two rather different things. It could have been written at the time of the translation of the work into Latin and then recopied by later copyists including the sixteenth-century scribe of this particular manuscript. In this case the colophon would seem to be the description of a team translation of the sort that were very common in twelfth- and thirteenth-century Spain.[73] In such team efforts, a Jew or Mozarab translated from Arabic into Romance, the Romance in turn being translated into Latin by another translator, in this case the author of the colophon. Alternatively, as M.-Th. d'Alverny has argued,[74] this colophon could have been written by a later redactor and abbreviator of the original Latin translation; if this is so, then the version which we now have is actually an abridgement of that original Latin translation. Short of finding such a longer, literal Latin version of the work—and to my knowledge no evidence of such a version exists—there is no way to decide which of the two interpretations of this colophon is correct.

Both interpretations, however, undeniably suggest that the original contents of the work have been substantially abbreviated—at the point of translation from Arabic into Latin according to the first, or at some time after the translation according to the second.[75] We are unavoidably forced to consider, therefore, how accurately the version of the work which we possess today reflects the views and methods of the original Mozarabic author. Since the Arabic version has been lost, it would seem to

---

[72] *Liber denudationis*, 12.9.

[73] See D. Lindberg, "The Transmission of Greek and Arabic Learning," 70.

[74] See her "Marc de Tolède," p. 47.

[75] They also both imply that the translation, as we have it, is the work of more than one hand. For the sake of convenience, therefore, I will refer throughout to "the translators" of the work in the plural rather than the singular, even though the original Arabic to Latin translation and the abridgement of it may well have happened at different times.

be impossible to answer this question. But we have more relevant evidence than we might imagine. First of all, Ramon Martí's *Explanatio simboli*, as I have already pointed out, appears to quote certain passages of the original Arabic of *Liber denudationis* in Martí's own Latin translation. These passages can be compared to the full Latin translation which has come down to us with a view to determining the extent to which *Liber denudationis* has been abbreviated. Second, the many passages of the extant Latin version of *Liber denudationis* which are quotations of the Qur'ān and Ḥadīth can be compared with the original Arabic of those works to the same end.

The impression gained in this way of the nature of the extant translation is that it is a rather literal, though occasionally sloppy, translation which shows some signs of abbreviation but almost no evidence of serious paraphrase. The strongest indication of abbreviation consists of a passage of Martí's *Explanatio simboli* which is probably another direct quotation of the Arabic version of *Liber denudationis*. Here, while defending the integrity of the Christian scriptures, Martí makes the following observation:

> Item, in cap. *mense*, quando iudei postulaverunt iudicium ab Ebihoreyra, quem posuerat Machometus iudicem, ut iudicaret inter homines, et ille diceret eis: Non iudico inter vos, donec interrogem Machometum; et ille ivisset ad Machometum et interrogasset eum, respondit Machometus et dixit: Deus misit super me in facto iudeorum, et dixit: *Si venerint ad te, iudica inter eos, aut avertere ab eis, et si avertaris ab eis, non nocebunt tibi in aliquo. Et si iudicaveris inter eos, iudica iuste; quia Deus diligit iuste iudicantes. Et quomodo*[76] *veniunt ad iudicium tuum et apud eos est lex et in ipsa est iudicium Dei?* Et ecce hic testatus est Machometus, quia tempore suo lex erat apud iudeos, in qua erat iudicium Dei; unde ex hoc patet quod ramanserat incorrupta; quia, si corrupta fuisset, verum iudicium Dei non contineret.[77]

---

[76] March reads *quando* here, but both the meaning and the text of the Qur'ān (*wa-kayfa*) suggest that *quomodo* is appropriate; in any case, the abbreviations of these two words in typical medieval Latin script are easily confused.

[77] Martí, *Explanatio simboli*, p. 454, ll. 30-38. Translation: "Likewise in the Chapter of the Table, when the Jews asked for judgement from Ebihoreyra whom Muḥammad had established as a judge in order that he might judge between men, and he said to them, 'I will not judge between you until I ask Muḥammad;' and [when] he had gone to Muḥammad and asked him, Muḥammad reponded, 'God has sent upon me [a message] in regard to the act of the Jews, and He said: *If they come to you, judge between them, or turn away*

The same argument based on the same verse (5:42-43) and the same Islamic tradition connected with it can be found in *Liber denudationis*, but in a considerably abbreviated form:

> Item cum dicat in Capitulo *Elmaiede*, id est "mensa," quod iudex eius Ebazoheite dixit Machometo quando Iudei quaerebant iustitiam et iudicium ab eo, et respondit, *Si uenerint ad te, iudica inter eos iuste, quia Deus diligit iustitiam facientes. Et quomodo petent ipsi a te iustitiam, cum sit apud eos Uetus Testamentum in quo est Dei iustitia?* Igitur iuxta verbum Machometi non erat lex corrupta ante tempus eius, sed neque post.[78]

As I show elsewhere, the story of the judge known here as Ebihoreyra/Ebazoheite[79] is based on the ḥadīths normally adduced to explain the occasion for the revelation of these verses, so it is possible that Martí was simply working from the same Qur'ānic exegetical sources as the author of *Liber denudationis*.[80] Yet this passage from the *Explanatio simboli* is but a part of a longer section of that work which follows *Liber denudationis* in content uncannily closely.[81] It seems more likely, therefore, that Martí records here a more complete version of what *Liber denudationis*

---

from them, and if you turn away from them, they will not harm you in anything. And if you judge between them, judge justly; for God loves those who judge justly. And how do they come to your judgement when [the Latin *et* literally, though awkwardly, translates the Arabic *waw* of accompanying circumstance used here in the Qur'ān] *they have the Law and in it is the judgement of God* (5:42-43)? And behold, here Muḥammad testified that in his time the Jews possessed the Law in which was the judgement of God. Whence, it is obvious from this that it had remained incorrupt, for if it had been corrupted, it would not have contained the judgment of God." I have added the italics which mark off his quotation of vv. 5:42-43.

[78] *Liber denudationis* 3.3-4. Translation: "Likewise when he says in the Chapter of *Elmaiede*, that is "the Table," that when the Jews were seeking justice and judgement from him, his judge Ebazoheite told Muḥammad, and he responded, *If they come to you, judge between them justly because God loves those who render justice. And how will they seek justice from you when they have the Old Testament in which the justice of God resides* (5:42-43)? Therefore according to the word of Muḥammad the <Biblical> law was corrupted neither before his time nor afterward."

[79] On the identity of this person see commentary to *Liber denudationis* 3.3.

[80] See commentary to *Liber denudationis* 3.3.

[81] See *Explanatio simboli*, p. 454, ll. 22-42, and cf. *Liber denudationis* 3.2-4.

said in the original Arabic than does the extant Latin translation of that work. This conclusion is also supported by the fact that Martí's version of the story of Ebibihoreyra/Ebazoheite, by explaining why this man was asked to render judgement and how he came to be in the position to do so, fills in the frustrating gaps in the shorter version of *Liber denudationis*. Moreover, in *Liber denudationis*' version the Qur'ānic verses are also cited in abbreviated form. The evidence, therefore, is strongly in favor of the view that this passage as it stands in the Latin translation of *Liber denudationis* is an abbreviated version of the original Arabic.

But notice that, while *Liber denudationis*' version of these events appears to be an abbreviation of what the original Arabic version said, it is nevertheless quite a literal rendering of those portions of the text that are translated. An analysis of the Latin translation of the abbreviated Qur'ānic verse makes this clear, for although a substantial portion of those verses has been left out, what remains is literally and carefully translated. The portion of the verses preserved in the extant Latin version of *Liber denudationis—Si uenerint ad te, iudica inter eos iuste, quia Deus diligit iustitiam facientes. Et quomodo petent ipsi a te iustitiam, cum sit apud eos Uetus Testamentum in quo est Dei iustitia*—is a word-for-word translation of two parts of these verses, with a large section left out between *ad te* (Arabic *-ka*) and *iudica inter* (Arabic *fa-uḥkum baynahum*): *Fa-in jā'ūka . . . fa-uḥkum bayna-hum bi-al-qisṭ. Inna Allāh yuḥibbu al-muqsiṭīn. Wa-kayfa yuḥakkimūnaka wa-ʿinda-hum al-Tawrāh fī-hā ḥukm Allāh.*

In short, this passage of Martí's *Explanatio simboli* provides strong evidence of some amount of abridgement of the original contents of the Arabic version of the *Liber denudationis* in the extant Latin translation; nevertheless, at least as far as the Qur'ānic verses themselves are concerned, this abridgement has not also involved radical paraphrase.

In general, a comparison of the Latin versions of the many other citations of the Qur'ān in *Liber denudationis* with the corresponding Qur'ānic Arabic yields similar results. Almost invariably the Latin follows the Arabic syntax and construction

quite closely. Sometimes we have almost completely verbatim translation, as in chapter nine, when the author cites verse 10:84, the Arabic version of which reads as follows: *Yāqawmi* (sic) *in kuntum āmantum bi-Allāḥ fa-ʿalayhi tawakkalū in kuntum muslimīn*. The translators rendered it in Latin in this way: *O populе, si uere credentes fueritis Deo, in ipso confidite si Sarraceni fueritis* ("O people, if you are believers in God, have faith in Him, if you are Muslims" [9.24]). Here the word order of the Latin matches the Arabic thoroughly; it is clear that the translators have endeavored to create a one-to-one correspondence between the Latin words and the Arabic words.[82] They did not, for example, translate *kuntum āmantum* with *credideritis*, the perfect subjunctive ("you believed") which would have been more natural in Latin, and would have communicated the meaning more economically, than the periphrastic *credentes fueritis*; adopting this latter alternative, however, allowed the translators to use one Latin word for each Arabic word.[83] A significant number of the Qur'ānic verses are translated in this literal manner—sometimes, as I have pointed out below in part two in some detail, to the point of confusion since the Latin syntax is often twisted to the breaking point to meet the needs of the Arabic.[84]

In many other cases the translation, though not crudely literal, still follows the Arabic carefully, as in the citation of verse 7:11 in chapter nine: *Nos creauimus uos; postea formauimus uos, diximusque angelis: Adorate Adam* ("We created you; afterwards we formed you, and we said to the angels: Adore Adam" [9.7]), which translates *wa-la-qad khalaqnākum thumma ṣawwarnākum*

---

[82] S. Brock has pointed out that such one-to-one correspondence was often a central concern of literalist translators. See his "Aspects of Translation Technique in Antiquity," pp. 81-84.

[83] It should be noted that the Arabic perfect *kuntum* (in both its appearances in the sentence) should not actually have been translated by the Latin perfect *fueritis* here since in conditional sentences the Arabic perfect has no explicit temporal meaning. The beginning of the sentence, for example, really means "If you are believing in God . . ." or "If you are believers in God . . ." In this case, however, as in so many others, the Latin translators had difficulty in translating the tenses of the Arabic verbs into the very different Latin verbal system; see the introduction to the edition and translation of *Liber denudationis* below.

[84] See the introduction to my edition *Liber denudationis* in part two below.

thumma qulnā lil-malā'ikah usjudū li-ādam. Here the tenses of the verbs and the order of the ideas are the same; but the twice-repeated *thumma*, "and then", is rendered first with *postea* and then left out altogether with little damage done to the sense, though the resultant Latin version lacks the rhetorical effect of the Arabic. The majority of the Qur'ānic translations show this kind of faithfulness to the word order, with slight deviations for stylistic reasons or lack of attention.

Though typically it is not possible to tell when a verse has been abridged in some way, there are a few instances in which this seems to be the case. When the author cites verse 10:15 in chapter eight we have the following Latin: *Dicent qui non sperant inuentionem nostram: "muta Alchoranum." Dic: "et unde hoc mihi ut immutem eum per me ipsum"* ("Those who do not wish to meet us will say: 'change the Qur'ān.' Say: 'and whence is it to me that I should change it by myself?' [8.6]"). This follows the Arabic closely except that *muta Alchoranum* is a paraphrase of a rather longer Arabic phrase: "bring a Qur'ān other than this one or change it" (*i'ti bi-Qur'ān ghair hādhā aw baddilhu*). It is very likely that the Arabic original of *Liber denudationis* contained the whole verse—quoting abridged and paraphrased verses in Arabic to a Muslim audience would be an ill-advised strategy for a Christian polemicist—and that this abbreviation was introduced at the point of translation or by some later reviser.

In general, therefore, while the translators appear to have abridged the contents of *Liber denudationis* to some extent—how much we cannot be certain—they otherwise seem to have adhered to the common practice of the Toledan translators of scientific and philosophical texts from Arabic: they too tended toward word-for-word literalism.[85] As a result, while we apparently have a shortened version of the work in its Latin translation, what we do have of it probably reflects the original Arabic contents quite faith-

[85] This is a much discussed phenomenon; see D. Lindberg, "The Transmission of Greek and Arabic Learning," p. 78, and T. Glick, *Islamic and Christian Spain in the Early Middle Ages*, pp. 273-74; S. Brock suggests that one reason for this may have been the perceived prestige of what he calls the "source" language; see his "Aspects of Translation Technique in Antiquity," p. 75.

fully.[86]

We have no clear evidence regarding who effected this translation. The second colophon added by the seventeenth-century annotator indicates that the Latin text is from the "version of the Canon Marc," and this led d'Alverny to suspect that it was translated by the famous Mozarab, Marc of Toledo, at the beginning of the thirteenth century.[87] But the ambiguity of this further colophon—it says nothing about this Canon Marc being from Spain or actually having translated it—and the fact that Marc's other translations are much more readable than *Liber denudationis* led her to doubt this attribution.[88] If Ramon Lull read *Liber denudationis* in its Latin version, then it must have been translated before about 1299; this also would have been roughly the time when Riccoldo was using the Latin version.[89] Other than that we cannot be certain when the work was translated.

In *Liber denudationis*, therefore, we have a Latin translation and abridgement of a fairly lengthy Christian polemic against Islam, consisting primarily of a rather strident attack on the Prophet and his Holy Book together with an apology for the doctrine of the Incarnation, written originally in Arabic and most likely in Spain by a Mozarab who may well have been a convert from Islam.

The Letter of al-Qūṭī

While the *Liber denudationis* was written sometime between 1110 (or more likely 1085) and 1132, the brief apologetic and polemical

---

[86] Now there are, not surprisingly, outright mistakes in the translation of Qur'ānic verses, such as when the Arabic *al-ʿālamūn*, "the worlds," in verse 21:107 was misread as *al-ʿālimūn*, "the scholars" or "the wisemen," and so translated *sapientes* (see *Liber denudationis* 8.4), and one must aware that these kinds of errors have marred the translation.

[87] "Superiora sunt ex Marci Canonici versione" (*Liber denudationis*, *apparatus criticus* to 12.9); M.-Th. d'Alverny, "Deux traductions," p. 125, and Id. "La connaissance," p. 592.

[88] See M.-Th. d'Alverny and G. Vajda, "Marc de Tolède, traducteur" p. 128-29, and cf. M.-Th. d'Alverny, "Marc de Tolède," pp. 40-41.

[89] See above in this chapter.