

IEE

**IBERIAN ENCOUNTER
AND EXCHANGE,
475-1755**

SERIES EDITORS
Erin Kathleen Rowe
Michael A. Ryan

The Iberian Peninsula has historically been an area of the world that fostered encounters and exchanges among peoples from different societies. For centuries, Iberia acted as a nexus for the circulation of ideas, people, objects, and technology around the premodern western Mediterranean, Atlantic, and eventually the Pacific. *Iberian Encounter and Exchange, 475-1755* combines a broad thematic scope with the territorial limits of the Iberian Peninsula and its global contacts. In doing so, works in this series will juxtapose previously disparate areas of study and challenge scholars to rethink the role of encounter and exchange in the formation of the modern world.

ADVISORY BOARD
Paul H. Freedman
Richard Kagan
Marie Kelleher
Ricardo Padrón
Teofilo F. Ruiz
Marta V. Vicente

OTHER TITLES IN THIS SERIES:
Thomas W. Barton, *Contested Treasure: Jews and Authority in the Crown of Aragon*

POLEMICAL ENCOUNTERS

CHRISTIANS, JEWS, AND MUSLIMS
IN IBERIA AND BEYOND

EDITED BY
MERCEDES GARCÍA-ARENAL
AND GERARD WIEGERS

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY PRESS
UNIVERSITY PARK, PENNSYLVANIA

PRISONS AND POLEMICS

Captivity, Confinement, and Medieval Interreligious Encounter

Ryan Szpiech

Introduction

In the spring of 1307, the Catalan polymath Ramon Llull, at the age of seventy-four, made the second of three missionary trips to North Africa that he would undertake in his lifetime. His biographical *Vita coetanea* (*Contemporary Life*; 1311) describes this scene upon arrival in the North African port of Béjaïa (Bougie), ruled at the time by the Hafsîd dynasty: "From there, Ramon . . . sailed to a certain Saracen land called Bougie. In the main square of the city, Ramon, standing up and shouting in a loud voice, burst out with the following words: 'The Christian religion is true, holy and acceptable to God; The Saracen religion, however, is false and full of error, and this I am prepared to prove.'" Ramon was nearly stoned to death by hostile crowds, and then he was imprisoned for six months. In jail, he discussed his faith and his argument for proving the truth of Christianity with various local intellectuals before being expelled from the city.²

The *Vita* was written in 1311 (some four years after the events), allegedly dictated by Llull to "certain monks who were friends of his," probably the Carthusian monks of Vauvert in Paris.³ Ramon had already described the same scene of his imprisonment and disputation in a contemporary work written in Pisa in 1308 just after his return from Tunis. Llull allegedly began

this work in prison, writing it in Arabic and sending a copy to the local Muslim “bishop,” prompting his expulsion from the city.⁴ However, during his return trip from North Africa, this Arabic original was lost in a shipwreck, and thus Ramon wrote the work again in Latin, finishing a second version, entitled *Disputatio Raimundi christiani et Homeri saraceni* (Disputation of Raymond the Christian and ‘Umar the Saracen), while staying in the monastery of San Donnino in Pisa. In this surviving Latin version, he describes his prison encounter in terms similar to those used in the *Vita* a few years later. The account in the *Disputatio* offers more details than that in the *Vita*, including the name of Llull’s principal Muslim interlocutor:

Ramon went to a certain city of the Saracens named Béjaïa in which, while preaching and praising the holy Catholic faith, he was captured in a street of the Saracens, beaten, and put in jail. While Ramon was in jail, a certain learned Saracen named ‘Umar came regularly with other Saracens to dispute with him about faith at the order of a Saracen bishop, who was said to be very learned, in order, with his arguments, to lead Ramon to the faith of Muḥammad. As the two disputed for a long time . . . Ramon said that each should make a book of disputation.⁵

Ramon and ‘Umar debated the nature of God and the Trinity according to the terms that seem to be taken from Ibn Sīnā, and Llull claims that his adroit argumentation won him an upgrade to a better prison.⁶ Llull’s imprisonment offered an opportunity that his public preaching alone did not, creating the circumstances in which he was able to debate with a Muslim about the merits of each faith and giving him the impetus to compose his polemical work against Islam.

Just two years after Ramon Llull began the account of his polemical disputation with ‘Umar while in a North African prison, a North African author from the Ḥafsid city of Tunis contemplated his own religion while in captivity in the Catalan city of Lleida. In 1309, Muḥammad al-Qaysī wrote the anti-Christian treatise *Miftāh al-dīn wa-l-mujādala bayna l-naṣārā wa-l-muslimīn* (The key of religion and the conflict between Christians and Muslims), which now survives in Arabic in manuscript 1554 of the Bibliothèque Nationale d’Algérie and also a subsequent *aljamiado* version preserved in at least four

other manuscripts.⁷ After a detailed presentation of what he claims are scriptural references taken directly from the Hebrew Bible and New Testament (although his quotes are taken from corrupt references in other sources) as well as the Qur’ān, al-Qaysī summarizes a lengthy debate he had with a local Christian priest while in captivity: “I was cast among the ‘band of Satan’ in the land of unbelief and oppression. I served the sinful Christians, as well as the priests and the monks in disputation and shame.”⁸ Al-Qaysī gives his name in the Arabic text, and further details about the author’s identity and situation are given in the *aljamiado* version of the text, which claims that al-Qaysī was “a learned scholar from the al-Zaytuna mosque” in Tunis and “was a captive in Lleida in the kingdom of Aragon.”⁹ Moreover, the author says he drew his material from an otherwise unknown anti-Christian polemic by an earlier author, one ‘Abdallāh al-Asīr bi-Ifranjah, or as it is rendered in the later *aljamiado* version, “Abdullahi . . . kativo en Francia,” a name that translates as “‘Abdallāh the (war) prisoner/captive in France.”¹⁰ Al-Qaysī relates that ‘Abdallāh’s polemic against Christianity was the product of his experience of being compelled to debate with a local monk about Jesus and the Incarnation. Al-Qaysī also suggests that he suffered from some degree of limited eyesight and also was more used to speaking the local Romance vernacular than his native tongue, requiring him to find an assistant to help him write his text in Arabic.¹¹ The *Key of Religion* thus presents us with not one but two stories of captivity, both telling of Muslim captives made to debate theology with their Christian captors and both leading to the production of written polemical material.

The parallels between al-Qaysī’s and Llull’s stories are striking: both Llull and al-Qaysī wrote in a single span of a few years (1308–10); both wrote of Christian-Muslim polemical encounters, presenting arguments defending the truth and superiority of their own religion and the false premises of their rivals; both describe not only theoretical or general polemical arguments but also a real-world debate they undertook with a member of the local religious intelligentsia; each figure gained some proficiency in the language of their captors (Llull learning Arabic from his Muslim captive, al-Qaysī learning Romance from his captors and those he encountered in Lleida); both texts were written in Arabic and also circulated in later versions in other languages; both works were disseminated from the time of composition in the fourteenth century into the early sixteenth century; and most important,

both men began writing their texts while facing captivity or imprisonment, and the experience of each seems to mirror that of the other (Llull, a native speaker of Catalan from Mallorca, writing in prison in North Africa; al-Qaysī, a native speaker of Arabic from North Africa, writing in captivity in Catalonia).¹² Van Koningsveld and Wiegers have even suggested the possibility (albeit remote) of a direct encounter between ‘Abdallāh al-Asīr or al-Qaysī and Llull himself, given their overlapping chronologies and Llull’s itinerary of travels in Spain and France in the same years.¹³

Yet at the same time, the depiction of confinement in their respective texts is not at all the same. Al-Qaysī presents captivity as a trial by God for the purpose of using the author as a tool to argue against the Christians and expose their erroneous beliefs. Llull, on the other hand, depicts his imprisonment as evidence of his own pious devotion to his cause and as evidence of the authenticity of his knowledge and arguments. While al-Qaysī laments his fate and even at one point desponds and hopes for death, Llull seeks his fate out and seems to relish his trials as following in the footsteps of earlier Christian martyrs.¹⁴ How can we understand this difference, given the many other similarities between the two cases? Asking this question leads to other, more general ones: What is the role of captivity in late medieval polemical writing, and how does that role differ, if at all, in works from different religious traditions? Why does captivity seem so important in Christian sources in particular?

In this chapter, I will offer preliminary answers to a few of these questions by considering the connection between captivity and medieval Christian polemical writing, focusing on the western Mediterranean in the twelfth century and after. Using the different reactions by Llull and al-Qaysī as a starting point, I note first that captivity and imprisonment served as a real and recurrent circumstance of concrete knowledge transfer that in fact may have facilitated and encouraged interreligious attacks and polemics. Secondly, I propose that in Christian writing, authors make reference to captivity, confinement, and imprisonment in metaphorical terms at least as often as they refer to these as real circumstances that stimulated and facilitated their writing. In fact, the mention of imprisonment in Christian polemical writing seems to be calculated as a strategic move by the authors, helping them express an essential logic of the polemical argument itself—that of polemical exegesis as a sort of capture or conquest of a rival scripture. Thirdly, by way of conclusion, I

will consider what might account for the particular character of Christian images of captivity. I propose tentatively that Christian notions of captivity can be explained as a direct effect of Christian notions of sin and redemption, which are quite different from those found in Islam and other religious traditions.

Captivity and Contact in the Later Middle Ages

Before turning to the metaphorical uses of captivity in Christian writing, it is necessary to establish more clearly the extent of real captivity before the sixteenth century. I am approaching the question without strictly distinguishing between terms for confinement—*slavery* and *captivity*—although some historians attempt to quantify and study these independently. My approach is justified for a number of reasons. Most importantly, medieval Latin and Romance sources that mention people in confinement, whether in physical or metaphorical terms, speak most often of “captives” (*captivus*, *cautivo*, *cattivo*, *catiu*, etc.). The term for “slave” (*sclavus*), derived from the Byzantine Greek *sklavos* (“Slav,” which in Arabic was rendered *ṣiqlabī* to denote captives of Eastern European origin), is less common. Moreover, there is not abundant evidence that a firm conceptual distinction between “ransom captives” and “labor slaves” existed in the medieval Mediterranean, and the term for “slave” becomes widespread only in the sixteenth century, when “slavery” comes to be consistently differentiated from “captivity.”¹⁵

Efforts to quantify Mediterranean captivity and enslavement have largely focused on the early modern period. Robert Davis has estimated, based on lists of ships taken captive, contemporary estimates of captives in various cities, and other sundry anecdotal sources, that “between 1530 and 1780 there were almost certainly a million and quite possibly as many as a million and a quarter white, European Christians enslaved by the Muslims of the Barbary Coast.”¹⁶ Salvatore Bono has by contrast estimated that “from the sixteenth to the nineteenth century at least two million slaves from the Muslim Mediterranean world entered European countries, while a million European slaves and at least double that number of black slaves crossed over (directly or indirectly) into the Islamic world—giving a total of five million.”¹⁷ Nabil Matar has questioned the size of such figures, although there is no easy way to confirm or deny them.¹⁸ If one assumes even half those amounts to be

credible, that would constitute more than a million people, Muslims and Christians, who were taken captive in the early modern Mediterranean region between 1500 and 1700. Such numbers would imply that before 1700, Mediterranean captive trade was a larger enterprise than the contemporary Atlantic slave trade. In any case, as Daniel Hershenzon has established in detail, captivity was an important feature of the early modern Mediterranean economy, and historians have partially documented and analyzed its importance in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century political and cultural history.¹⁹

Although the early modern captive economy was many times larger and more complex than that of the late medieval period, captive-taking and ransoming activities were persistent features of life around the Mediterranean in the later Middle Ages as well. Based on demographic guesswork, one might propose that captives of different types could have constituted perhaps 1 to 3 percent of medieval Mediterranean society.²⁰ Captivity was prevalent in the western half in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries due to Christian advances into Muslim territories in southern Iberia. As William Phillips has noted, slavery was a permanent feature of life in Iberia from the beginning of recorded history, from before the time of Carthaginian colonization through the period of Roman settlement and all the way to the eighteenth century.²¹ The first Christian redemption orders, the Mercedarians and the Trinitarians, were founded in the thirteenth century (in Iberia and France, respectively), although their period of greatest activity seems to have been the sixteenth century. Jarbel Rodríguez has pointed out that references to redemption activities appear in Aragonese archival sources from the twelfth-century period of conquest and settlement, including both royal documents and regional charters.²² Whatever the exact numbers, there is no doubt that captivity and slave trade were quotidian aspects of Iberian societies in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, and the majority of slaves and captives in Europe were, at least until the period of the Black Plague, of Muslim North African or Iberian origin (rather than sub-Saharan African, Greek, Slavic, or Tartar). Only in the latter half of the fifteenth century did this captive and slave trade begin to involve a significant number of black Africans, as Spanish and Portuguese explorers worked their way farther down the west coast of Africa.²³

Reports about medieval captives abound in Christian and Muslim sources, especially along the military frontiers between Islamic and Christian

lands. Among the many stories of captivity surrounding the Crusades, for example, perhaps the most famous figure is that of Reynald, an infamously aggressive aristocratic French crusader who fought against Saladin and who faced sixteen years of imprisonment in Aleppo.²⁴ Similarly, the thirteenth-century Armenian historian Kirakos Gandzaketsi, in recounting conflicts in the Caucasus involving Georgians, Armenians, Persians, and eventually Mongols, tells the story of Grigor, an Armenian nobleman captured in a local squabble and sold to the Persians, who executed him for blaspheming Islam.²⁵ It is possible to collect anecdotes of captivity from medieval writing from across the Mediterranean, elaborating the themes found in more abundant but more telegraphic archival sources and affirming the importance of captivity in the economic and religious activities of the region. Even narrowing the focus to the Iberian frontier, examples are numerous, including in polemical and apologetic texts, and it is not surprising that polemics such as those of al-Qaysī, 'Abdallāh al-Asīr, and Ramon Llull grew out of the experience of captivity. Such examples show how captivity could function as a vehicle of intercultural contact between Islamic and Christian worlds of the Mediterranean, providing a shared circumstance that forced people from different groups to confront each other and often providing both parties in such a confrontation with knowledge and linguistic skills. Captivity was, to use Robert Burns's words about medieval Mediterranean piracy, "an interface between Islamic and Christian societies—a point of regular contact for all classes."²⁶

A vivid portrayal from Iberian literature of the possible role of captivity in setting the stage for interfaith debate is found in the *Cantigas de Santa María* of Castilian king Alfonso X (reg. 1252–84), a collection of more than four hundred lyric songs in Galician Portuguese that portray miracles of the Virgin Mary in music and with abundant images. Among the eight or so songs to mention captivity at the hands of Muslims, two offer a depiction of cultural transfer resulting from the encounter.²⁷ Cantiga 265 tells the story of St. John Damascenus, Syrian monk and doctor in the Greek Church (d. ca. 754), who, according to hagiographic legend, was the son of a high-ranking official in the court of Caliph 'Abd al-Malik in Damascus. Alfonso's version of the saint's legend, which alters some of the key details from the Greek versions, claims that John was captured by Muslim soldiers and sold as a captive "in Persia." Because of his devotion to Mary, however, "she caused him to be loved by his

master so that he allowed him to enter at will into his house and to teach his son to read and write as he wrote, and they could scarcely recognize nor distinguish which of them wrote the better."²⁸ When John was returned to "Rome" (i.e., the Byzantine Empire), the son became envious and forged letters implicating John in treason against the emperor, who then had one of John's hands cut off, only to have it miraculously restored by Mary.²⁹ While the core of Alfonso's version of the story deals with Mary's miracle after John's unjust punishment by the emperor, the background and pretext of the miracle present a scene of captivity as cultural transfer: Forced into the house of a Muslim in Persia, John taught the Muslim's son to read and write in his own language. Although the Muslims are presented in a negative light, just as they are in most other *Cantigas* where they are mentioned, the trials of captivity are nevertheless depicted favorably as a vehicle for cultural transfer.

The contact and intellectual transfer resulting from captivity leads to theological disputation in one other song of Alfonso, *Cantiga* 192, which tells of a Muslim captive who belonged to a Christian.³⁰ The Christian loved Mary and "argued persistently for her sake every day, as I heard tell, with a Moor of Almería, who said that her power was worth nothing. This moor belonged to that man and was his captive and a confirmed disbeliever."³¹ The man locked his slave in a cave—a kind of double confinement—where he wrestled with the Devil, biting one of his fingers off. The Virgin appeared and encouraged him to convert to Christianity, and he was baptized after being released from the cave—a kind of double liberation. In this case, captivity provides the grounds for interreligious disputation and debate, as is depicted in the initial panel illustrating this encounter in the El Escorial "Códice Rico" manuscript of the *Cantigas*, in which Christian and Muslim face each other with an index finger raised, indicating that each is attempting to make a point to the other.³² Captivity also serves as the motive of the Muslim's conversion and liberation at the end of the poem.

Written only a few decades after the *Cantigas*, Ramon Llull's biography provides further evidence of this role of captivity as a vehicle of transfer. Decades before his own missionary trips to North Africa, Llull learned Arabic by purchasing a Muslim slave and studying with him for nine years. This example is significant for various reasons, including the fact that it portrays a transmission of knowledge from captive to master rather than master to captive, as we find in the *Cantigas*. In the *Vita coetanea* (*Contemporary*



FIG. 10.1. The "Códice rico" of the *Cantigas de Santa María*, El Escorial MS T-1-1, fol. 252v.

Life), Llull emphasizes how essential this was to his mission by telling of his visions and lamenting that he "had none of the knowledge necessary for his undertaking" because he was "totally ignorant of the Arabic language."³³ Llull's language resonates with details from al-Qaysī's text, in which the author claims that he debated with a monk who had some knowledge of Islamic texts and traditions. This monk's knowledge was striking enough to prompt al-Qaysī to ask where he learned such things, but he then warns the Christian not to proceed with the debate because it would require knowledge of Arabic, which he did not yet have. Al-Qaysī also mentions his own knowledge of the local vernacular (probably Catalan), attesting to the two-way effects of captivity.³⁴ In the *Cantigas*, which offer a relatively accurate portrayal of medieval social classes and divisions, captivity is sometimes a

circumstance that allows for people of different communities to come into direct contact with each other and a conduit that allows each side to learn the languages and cultural habits of the other. As Van Koningsveld has argued, "There is reason to suppose that Muslim prisoners who were thoroughly grounded in theology were forced to play, as teachers, a very important part in the earliest study of Arabic and Islam in Christian Western Europe during the late Middle Ages."³⁵

This understanding of captivity as a fortuitous circumstance that allowed for the transfer or discovery of knowledge as well as the opportunity for language learning is, however, only part of the significance of imprisonment in the history of polemical literature. While the exchanges facilitated by captivity allowed for the transfer of knowledge in both directions between captive and captor, this was, for the latter, always also a situation of violence and bondage imposed on him against his will. Thus beyond the questions of circumstance and the transfer of knowledge, captivity was often a source of anger and ill will, a bitter or difficult experience that could precipitate the polemical encounter itself. Llull's nine years of Arabic study with his slave in fact ended with a polemical "encounter" of a very concrete nature. When his Muslim captive one day "blasphemed the name of Christ," Llull, "impelled by a great zeal for the faith, hit the Saracen on the mouth, on the forehead, and on the face. As a result, the Saracen became extremely embittered, and began plotting the death of this master."³⁶ One might imagine that if the slave had had the opportunity and education, he could have channeled his blasphemy into a carefully worded polemical treatise against Christianity resembling the work of al-Qaysi.

Llull was forced by this conflict to confront the tension inherent in his employment of a captive for the augmentation of his own learning and edification. On the one hand, he was committed to disproving any possible arguments in favor of Islam, while on the other, the knowledge and ability to undertake this project—as he readily admitted—relied on his material support of and peaceful engagement with his Muslim slave. When the slave attacked Llull, he was torn between punishing and pardoning him: "For it seemed harsh to kill the person by whose teaching he now knew the language he had so wanted to learn, that is, Arabic; on the other hand, he was afraid to set him free or to keep him longer, knowing that from then on he would not cease plotting his death." When he found the slave "hanged

himself with the rope with which he had been bound"—a description that might be taken as a figurative metaphor for the Muslim's defeat in theological debate—Llull "joyfully gave thanks to God not only for keeping his hands innocent of the death of this Saracen, but also for freeing him from that terrible perplexity concerning which he had just recently so anxiously asked Him for guidance."³⁷ It was the unwanted altercation with his own slave that led Llull to retreat to nearby Mount Randa, where God granted him his first vision of the *Art*, his system for argumentation and conversion that he would later work to implement in his missionary work in North Africa. In a double sense, Llull's entire polemical project is the product of captivity, for it gave him knowledge of languages and also created the circumstances that led to the development of his polemical method.

This scene is not the only example in Llull's work of real flesh-and-blood captivity leading to polemical attack and even physical violence and crusade. In Llull's story *Blaquerna* (*Blanquerna*), the title character, after he becomes a bishop, addresses his canons on the subject of lamentation. He tells them the story of a woman, whose husband was in captivity, who went begging and weeping in public, together with four small children, to raise the money for his ransom. While this passage has been used by historians to highlight the economic realities of captives, it is told in Llull's text as an allegorical lament over the fact that "in captivity are the places where he—the Lord—was conceived and where he was born and imprisoned, crucified and died, because they are in the power of the Muslims."³⁸ Llull's writing contains numerous similar references to captivity in both a real and a metaphorical sense. In his examples, we see the wide variety of meanings and functions that writers could assign to captivity in late medieval Iberia, using it as a vehicle of cultural transfer as well as a provocation to polemical disputation.

Llull was not the only one to cast the Crusades to recapture the Holy Land as a task like the redemption of captives. The outrage provoked by witnessing captivity, rather than simple curiosity or a real need to missionize or debate, might be seen as one of the primary motives provoking polemical encounters. In his letters on the Fall of Acre in 1291, Llull's contemporary, the Dominican Riccoldo da Monte di Croce (d. 1320), bemoaned the successes of Islam, which he contrasted with the pleasures of Baghdad. He begins his first letter by stating, "So it came to pass that I was in Baghdad, 'among the captives by the river of Chebar' [Ezekiel 1:1], the Tigris. This

garden of delights in which I found myself enthralled me. . . . Yet I was saddened by the massacre and capture of the Christian people. I wept over the loss of Acre, seeing the Saracens joyous and prospering, the Christians squalid and consternated: little children, young girls, old people, whimpering, threatened to be led as captives and slaves into the remotest countries of the East.”³⁹ Riccoldo’s experience shows how his indignant response to the captivity of fellow Christians replaced his ambivalence over the splendors of the Islamic caliphate in Baghdad, pushing him into a career of polemical debate and attack. Riccoldo thus allegedly debated theology with Muslims during his subsequent years in Baghdad in the 1290s, and by 1300, he was back in Florence, where he finished his polemical attack against Islam, *Contra legem Sarracenorum* (Against the law of the Saracens). Not surprisingly, the polemical treatise begins with a direct reference to servitude, a quotation from Psalm 118: “How many are the days of your servant?”⁴⁰ A concrete experience witnessing the captivity of fellow Christians seems to have stoked his zeal and became a theme he would repeatedly evoke in his polemical argumentations.

While we can attribute Riccoldo’s polemical motivation at least in part to his confrontation with the captivity of others, we find more polemics like Lull’s and al-Qaysī’s in which the personal experience of being a captive is named explicitly as the reason for writing. This association is common enough that it was even falsified or embellished. One of the polemics attributed to the name “Pedro Pascual” is a good example of the invention of a story of captivity as a framing device. Although the figure of Pedro Pascual was long considered to be that of a real Valencian bishop—a figure who, after being taken captive, wrote various works of theology and polemic and was beheaded as a martyr in Granada around 1300—recent research has cast his existence into doubt. According to the pioneering study by Jaume Riera i Sans, the name “Pedro Pascual” (or Petrus Paschasius) was falsely attributed by friars of the Mercedarian order in the seventeenth century to a real bishop of Jaen who died in Granada around 1300, to whom a host of anonymous works from the fifteenth century were also falsely attributed. Such falsifications were made beginning in 1629 in preparations for a campaign of canonization that culminated in 1670, when Pope Clement X declared Pedro a saint. After this moment, Pedro’s life was embellished in a hagiographic biography, and the various works now attributed to him were published under his name.⁴¹ Not

surprisingly, given his alleged association with the Mercedarian order, which was dedicated to the redemption of captives, the *Disputa del Bispe de Jaen contra los jueus* (Dispute of the bishop of Jaen against the Jews) begins with an evocation of the circumstances of captivity allegedly suffered by the author. The first-person voice attributed to Pedro says,

Since I was taken prisoner by the power of the king of Granada, I saw many Christians as captives, not knowing letters and unfamiliar with the faith of the Christians, every day one and another turning to the evil sect of the Moors. Seeing this, and with faith in God’s help, I began to search the books of the Bible and all the Prophets that speak of the Incarnation and the Birth . . . and other things having to do with Jesus Christ . . . Showing this to the Christians who were captives here, many Jews who were here came every day to urge and enjoin them to believe in the false sect of the Moors. When I criticized those who did and said this, that is, who did what the Jews did to the Christians (who believed them on these matters [about Islam]), a few tricky Jews, especially two [known] as rabbi Moses and rabbi Jacob Moses, knowing that I argued against the league of the Jews and Moors to maintain the Catholic faith, were moved by great ill will and malice to write works that they sent to me. In these, they made many different demands, not least that they wanted to dispute with me.⁴²

While the content of the polemic that follows is unremarkable in its arguments or use of sources—formulaic anti-Jewish material based on standard biblical *testimonia*—this opening frame makes a unique and surprising claim: arguing with Jews about theology was motivated by the threat that they posed in leading innocent Christians to convert to *Islam*. The Jews are seen as being “in league” with the Muslims, who present a grave threat as captors. While such a scenario certainly strains credulity, it is not surprising to find it in a text made as a post hoc hagiography to shore up the legend of Pedro Pascual.⁴³ Because Jews themselves were never captors, and yet the figure of Pedro Pascual was associated with missionary work and martyrdom in Islamic Granada, the topos of captivity is adapted in a unique way to fit an anti-Jewish rather than an anti-Muslim argument.

Captivity as a Claim to Authority and Authenticity

Captivity as a vehicle of knowledge transfer and a provocation to polemical engagement can be seen in both Christian and Muslim texts, as the two examples of Lull and al-Qaysī show. At the same time, the mention of captivity seems to have signified different things in texts from the two traditions. In Christian texts like Lull's, captivity served as a guarantee of the authenticity of one's polemical arguments. Lull's claim to have been imprisoned for his polemical activity and to have debated theology while in prison is meant as more than an explanation of the circumstances under which his text was developed. It also serves as proof that his arguments had been tested in the real trenches of interreligious disputation, a fact that is highlighted in the later reception of the text in the sixteenth century, when the title page of the first printed edition of 1510 was decorated with a woodcut depicting Lull debating with his Muslim captors from behind bars. In this context, captivity is not merely a circumstance but also evidence of the authenticity of Lull's arguments.

A few decades after Lull wrote, this appeal to captivity as a sort of badge of knowledge or a proof of the authenticity of one's claims is even more apparent in the polemical treatises of the Dominican Alfonso Buenhombre (d. ca. 1353). What little is known of his life has been pieced together from a few surviving shreds of evidence including a document written by Pope Clement VI, dated January 5, 1344 (*nonis ianuarii*), in which Buenhombre was appointed "Bishop of Morocco."⁴⁴ Buenhombre was the author of various polemical texts, and he states specifically that they were the products of his imprisonment in North African jails. In the prologue to his *Historia Ioseph* (History of Joseph), he claims to have written the text while in jail in Cairo:

When I, your servant, brother Alfonso Buenhombre was sold by the Sultan of Babylon [i.e., Cairo], I was thoroughly deprived of human aid, stripped of books and many things. . . . When I was in the beginning of the aforesaid desolation, I asked the head jailer to lend me some little book or other, and God granted that I found favor in the man's eyes, and he brought me the *History of Joseph*, which coincides [in its details] with many of our calamities and miseries, above all the fact that we as explorers were captives and afflicted with the



FIG. 10.2. Ramon Lull, *Disputatio Raimundi christiani et Homeris saraceni* (1510), book cover. Biblioteca Nacional de España, Madrid, MS R/3108.

fear of death, just like the brothers of Joseph, who sought food for their families [in Egypt], not to spy out the country. When I had read through this story, I translated it from Arabic to Latin.⁴⁵

Curiously, although the author invokes a certain parallelism between his situation and that of Joseph, he identifies in his captivity not with Joseph himself but with Joseph's brothers, who had plotted to kill him and whom Joseph himself imprisons on accusations of spying when they come to Egypt seeking grain. In this detail, one wonders if the reasons for Buenhombre's real imprisonment were actually related to charges of espionage.

If this story of an Arabic book discovered in captivity and translated into Latin were to have appeared only here and in no other text, readers may not

have called its credibility into question. However, Buenhombre's initial account is parallel to another tale of captivity that he tells in the prologue to another work, a captivity allegedly endured by the author a second time a few years after the first. Miraculously, this captivity, through a similar experience of receiving books from his jailer, leads the author to discover an Arabic polemic against Judaism and Islam, which he also alleges to have subsequently translated into Latin. In the opening to his *Disputatio Abu Talib* (Disputation of Abu Talib), a text made up of letters between a Muslim and a Jew who come to affirm, through friendly dialogue, the truths of the Christian faith, Buenhombre affirms, "I am brother Alfonso the Spaniard and this most ancient little book came by chance into my hands when I was in captivity of the Saracens in Morocco. It was formerly hidden for a long time by a Jew, and I now pass on a new translation made by me from Arabic into Latin."⁴⁶ He uses very similar language, mentioning a "very old text" coming "by chance" into his hands when introducing yet a third text, the *Epistola Rabbi Samualis* (Letter of Rabbi Samuel). The *Epistola*—which took the form of a letter written by a rabbi known as "Samuel the Moroccan" to another rabbi, "Isaac of Sijilmasa"—is certainly his best-known work, surviving in more than 250 manuscripts, translations into at least six languages, and abundant early printed copies, easily making it one of the most popular and widely copied anti-Jewish polemics of the later Middle Ages in the Latin West.⁴⁷ The prologue states, "I send to you as a small gift this very old little book, which by chance came into my hands, having been previously hidden for a long time, in a new translation done by me from Arabic into Latin."⁴⁸

Although, as Antoni Biosca i Bas and others have shown, Buenhombre's reliance on contemporary Latin authors such as Jiménez de Rada and Nicholas of Lyra belies Buenhombre's claims to have used an old Arabic text (as does his repeated use of the same account of a miraculous discovery), Buenhombre's corpus is most striking in its use of captivity as an authenticating device.⁴⁹ Like Llull and pseudo-Pedro Pascual, the story of captivity endows the polemic that follows with the authority Buenhombre allegedly gained from the hard experience of being a captive. As in Llull's texts, captivity is, as it were, worn like a badge of honor and a seal of proof. Unlike earlier models, however, Buenhombre's text also uses captivity to give the text a greater authenticity. By claiming his books were lost and hidden and came to him only in the hidden recesses of the captor's jail, Buenhombre

suggests that the texts themselves, and not just their author, were in a kind of "captivity" in a foreign land. By emphasizing the antiquity of the texts, he implies that they had languished "in captivity" for some time. By claiming that both texts were originally written in Arabic, he further suggests that this metaphorical captivity was not only physical but also linguistic. By presenting himself as the text's discoverer and translator rather than simply its author, Buenhombre casts himself as both captive and redeemer, at once discovering the text through his own captivity and also freeing the text from its own "captivity" to its old and foreign state by copying and translating it into a "new" and familiar Latin.⁵⁰

The Christian Topos of Captivity

The evidence of forging—or at least fudging—stories of captivity, as we see in the texts of pseudo-Pedro Pascual and Alfonso Buenhombre, underscores the power of captivity as a justification for writing, a symbolic power that derived from the fact that captivity was a traditional and long-running metaphor of Christian polemical writing—in particular, of Christian anti-Jewish polemic. Captives appear in many biblical narratives, from Abraham's freeing of Lot (Gen. 13–14), to Joseph's captivity in Egypt (Gen. 37–47), to Daniel's captivity in Babylon (Dan. 1, etc.), to the captivity of the Israelites themselves (Exod. 1–13; 2 Kings 25), whom the Lord repeatedly brings out of captivity (*sheboot*) and exile (*galut*) as part of his covenant with them. These biblical stories, on the one hand, provided a motif for Jewish writers to evoke their longing for liberation from the burden of diaspora—consider the frequent mention of captivity in figurative terms by Iberian Jewish poets⁵¹—but they also served as models for medieval Christian writers, who found in the history of redemption from captivity a metaphor for the liberation from sin and freedom from the "old Law" of the Jews.

The story of Abraham's freeing of Lot was of particular significance for medieval Christians, beginning in the patristic period. In Genesis 14, Abram's nephew Lot is taken captive by a local chieftain, Chedorlaomer, in a conflict between local kingdoms, and Abraham leads a raid to redeem him and his family. Not only is this the first story involving both war and captivity in the Bible; it is also the first act of redemption, literal or metaphorical.

Early Christian exegetes interpreted Abraham's freeing of Lot allegorically as the freeing of the soul from the captivity of sin and doubt. In the fourth century, Ambrose of Milan read this story as a tale of sin and salvation in which the local kings are like the five senses and Lot is the soul itself. He explains, "And so the various lords wish to hold us in slavery. The devil presses on, his servants work their wickedness, the passions and movements of the body stir restlessly like internal enemies within the house."⁵² Ambrose's younger Iberian contemporary, Prudentius, saw fit to begin his *Psychomachia* with a meditation on Abraham's act of redemption: "It chanced that insolent kings overcame Lot and took him captive when he was dwelling in the wicked cities of Sodom and Gomorrah." This provides him with a rich paradigm for an allegorical meditation on the battle waged by the soul against sin: "This picture has been drawn beforehand to be a model for our life to trace out again with true measure, showing that we must watch in the armour of faithful hearts, and that every part of our body which is in captivity and enslaved to foul desire must be set free by gathering our forces at home."⁵³ Here, the tension between virtue and sin is expressed in terms of foreignness and domesticity. Being taken captive is likened to being carried off to the foreign land of sin, while redemption is seen as a defense against invasion "at home."

The Christian model of captivity included the images of Abraham as faithful redeemer from sin and Paul of Tarsus as one who suffered captivity for the faith. Already in the New Testament itself, captivity appears in a double guise as a metaphor for both sin and faith. Paul wrote of himself as a "prisoner" (Phil. 1:1)—various Pauline epistles, including Philippians and Philemon, were actually penned in captivity—as well as a "slave" or "servant" (*doulos*) of Jesus (Rom. 1:1), who redeemed him from being a "captive to the law of sin" (Rom. 7:23). Paul uses captivity to highlight the power of faith to triumph over sin, boasting, "We take every thought captive to obey Christ" (2 Cor. 10:4). In this way, captivity was represented through a set of two distinct metaphors: on the one hand, as the trammels of sin, and on the other, as the righteous suffering and martyrdom that one must endure to be redeemed from such sin. Such double metaphors—which all give voice to the inherent love of cosmic irony and the paradoxical inversion of order in the Christian message (the last are first, the weak are strong, the captive are free, the dead are risen)—allowed captivity to function in medieval Christian polemics alternatively as a characterization for infidelity as well as

faith. Like the Israelites enduring the captivities of Babylon and Egypt, suffering captivity—whether real captivity at the hands of infidels or metaphorical captivity to sin and carnality—was proof of Christian fidelity.

At the same time, the long-standing medieval image of the hermeneutical Jew, who serves to testify to Christian truth by virtue of his own blindness and infidelity, was built on the language of captivity and redemption. Misreading is itself a kind of captivity to error, as Augustine insists in *De Doctrina Christiana*: "It is, then, a miserable kind of spiritual slavery to interpret signs as things, and to be incapable of raising the mind's eye above the physical creation so as to absorb the eternal light."⁵⁴ The Jews, as the prime example of "corporeal" readers too tied to the flesh and not able to lift their eyes to the spirit, are captives to their blindness. As keepers of the divine text of the Hebrew Bible, who are at the same time unable to understand its deeper meaning, the Jews are *capsarii nostri*, "our book-carrying servants"—that is, they are like "servants when they carry books of their lords to class and then wait outside for them."⁵⁵ There are many hundreds of references to *Iudaeorum captivitas* (the captivity of the Jews) in medieval Latin literature. Bernard of Clairvaux's famous statement about Jews as "letters" of the Law also reiterates the theme of their hermeneutical captivity: "The Jews are indeed for us the living letters of scripture, constantly representing the Lord's passion . . . dispersed and subjugated they are; under Christian princes they endure a harsh captivity."⁵⁶

The motif of captivity is thus at the center of the medieval Christian doctrine of supersessionism. The "captivity of the Jews" is part of a divine process of salvation history that prefigures the liberation of the Christians. Augustine states, "We also must know first our captivity, then our liberation: we must know Babylon, in which we are captives, and Jerusalem, whither we long to return."⁵⁷ The hagiographic praise of the early saints' own real martyrdom imprisonment was easily inverted into anti-Jewish condemnation of the Jews' captivity to sin and blindness, and medieval polemics against Jews alternate between these opposed readings. In the twelfth-century *Dialogue against the Jews* of Petrus Alfonsi, the Christian voice of Peter can assert paradoxically to his Jewish interlocutor and former self, Moses, that "Christ's death is the cause of your captivity."⁵⁸ He then adds, "This long captivity has occurred on account of the death of and malevolence toward Christ . . . you will not escape it until you correct the sin of your fathers, that is, until



FIG. 10.3. Alonso de Espina, *Fortalitiū fidei*, copied by García de San Esteban de Gormaz (1464), parchment, 365 x 276 mm. El Burgo de Osma, Biblioteca y archivo capitular, MS 154.

you believe what they did not believe.”⁵⁹ Abner of Burgos, known as Alfonso of Valladolid after his conversion around 1320, starts his Hebrew-language anti-Jewish polemic with a reference to the captivity of the Jews as the initial cause of his despair and conversion: “I saw the burden of the Jews, my people from whom I am descended, who are, in this long captivity, oppressed and broken and burdened heavily by taxes.” But this appeal to a Jewish notion of captivity in the Diaspora, in the land of Edom, quickly morphs into a Christian polemical assault, in which “the Jews have been in this captivity for such a long time because of their folly and stupidity and for lack of a teacher of righteousness through whom they may know the truth.”⁶⁰ Abner/Alfonso goes even further, not only attributing the captivity of the Jews to their sin in rejecting Jesus, but also claiming that God spares the Jews excessive suffering as a way to keep them in that captivity for the remainder of history: “The curse and everlasting captivity that was cast upon you is that you have tribulations with gentleness and without a great harshness. For if you had captivity with great harshness in such a way that you could not endure or that

you were wiped out with one blow, in this way your dishonor, which was to be ongoing, would be ended.”⁶¹ A telling depiction of the ongoing figurative captivity of the Jews appears in oldest manuscript copy of the *Fortalitiū fidei* (*Fortress of Faith*), of fifteenth-century polemicist Alonso de Espina (d. 1491).⁶² The detailed image on the opening folio (1r) shows a towering castle being besieged from all sides by various enemies—Jews, Muslims, heretics, and devils—and depicts the Jews as clustered in a group, blindfolded and bound in the chains of captivity.⁶³

The image of Jewish captivity to blindness and sin thus equates sight and insight—belief with freedom from the bondage of misunderstanding. Liberation is synonymous with exegesis itself, making Christian *allegoresis* a kind of liberation from literal reading, a freeing of the text from its historicism and its “carnality.” The link between reading and liberation in Christian thought—which has been preserved in modern Western philosophies of interpretive reading, even to the present day⁶⁴—is made in both a military and a sexual sense. On the one hand, reading as liberation from captivity appeals to an ancient metaphor for language translation as cultural conquest and *translatio imperii*, an image that persisted through the Middle Ages.⁶⁵ In exegetical terms, the link between liberation and reading is evident in the perennial image of Christian reading of pagan authors and the Old Testament as “gold carried out of Egypt” upon liberation from bondage. Augustine favored this metaphor over the more overtly sexual and militaristic connotations of the inverse image of exegesis as a taking captive of another. The reading-as-capture motif appears in image of the “fair captive” taken in battle, another metaphor for Christian reading of classical texts, which likened the text to a female war captive who, following Deuteronomy 21:11–13, must be shaved and cleaned before being taken as a wife.⁶⁶ This conflation of sexual conquest and cultural transfer is built on Horace’s classical construction that compares the Roman imitation of the Greeks to a captor being seduced by his captive concubine: “Greece, the captive, made her savage victor captive, and brought the arts into rustic Latium.”⁶⁷

The combination of sexual and exegetical images to represent cultural contact and conquest is evident in the legend of La Romía, the name given to the fifteenth-century Christian girl from Castile, Isabel de Solís. She was taken captive in raids on the border with Granada and eventually ended up as concubine of the sultan, Mulay Hasan, who called her Zoraya and married

her (making her stepmother of Boabdil, the “last Moor” of Nasrid Granada). Given her young age upon being taken captive, it is hard to say accurately if she converted to Islam or simply was raised in the faith from the age of reason, but later Christian chroniclers such as Hernando de Baeza (fl. late fifteenth century) depict her Islamic identity as a conversion and link it with what is perceived as her sexual treason. When, in 1492, she allegedly returned to a Christian life under the name Isabel de Solís, her “reversion” of faith is similarly linked to the just Christian reconquest of Nasrid Granada.⁶⁸

While there are abundant examples of the real-world intersection of captivity and sexual conquest in archival references to interfaith concubinage, the explicit characterization of captivity in sexual terms is evident in various literary examples as well.⁶⁹ The best-known early modern example is certainly Cervantes’s “Captive’s Tale,” inserted as a frame story within the narrative of *Don Quijote* (I.39–41), in which the captive’s escape accompanies the conversion and marriage of Zoraida, against the dictates of her culture and the heartfelt pleas of her father.⁷⁰ This tale has numerous medieval parallels and precedents in stories of captives falling in love across the divisions of religious identity. The Old French *chante-fable* of *Aucassin et Nicolette*, for example, tells of the Saracen girl Nicolette, a “captive maid . . . from far country” and “a little child when men sold her into captivity,” who became the love fancy and wife of the noble knight Aucassin.⁷¹ A similar text is *Floris and Blancheflor*, a twelfth-century tale surviving in numerous versions (*Floire et Blancheflor* in the French version; *Flores y Blancaflor* in the Castilian, among others) and telling the story of two children, the Muslim boy Floris born to the “Queen of al-Andalus” and the Christian girl Blancheflor, born to her captive lady-in-waiting. As they grow up, they fall in love, and Floris eventually converts to Christianity after they marry (against the wishes of the Muslim king). After the king’s death, they rule al-Andalus as Christians, leading their subjects to conversion as well.⁷² In such widely circulating narratives, captivity is a gateway to conversion and sexual conquest. Similar Romance examples abound, from the *Roman de la Rose* (*Romance of the Rose*) in the thirteenth century, to Juan Ruiz’s *Libro de buen amor* (*Book of Good Love*) in the fourteenth, to Diego de San Pedro’s *Cárcel de amor* (*Prison of Love*) in the fifteenth, among numerous others. These sources underscore the importance of considering the metaphor of captivity in gendered as well as religious terms. The opening words to the *Libro* most explicitly combine the

parallel topoi of sexual desire as prison and Jewish perfidy as captivity: “Lord God, who once delivered from their long captivity / In Pharaoh’s power, the Jews, a nation cursed by destiny, / and from the pit in Babylon, delivered Daniel free / Now from this evil prison deliver wretched me.”⁷³

The double representation of exegesis as both a liberation from captivity and a taking of captives reflects the double meaning of captivity itself in medieval Christian thought as both sin and salvation. Captivity appeared as a common topos in Christian polemical writing in part because it played this multivalent role at once as a physical circumstance that facilitated interreligious encounter, as a proof of struggle in such circumstance that legitimated the works that it generated, and as an operative metaphor of both sin and salvation that served to express the very essence of Christian polemical argumentation—a “taking captive” of Hebrew scripture, an arrogation of prophecy through a supersessionist *translatio scripturarum*. As Paul writes in Galatians (4:22, 4:31), “Abraham had two sons, one by a slave woman and the other by a free woman . . . brothers, we are children, not of the captive but of the free woman.”

Conclusion: Metaphors of Captivity in Christian Sources

For Ramon Llull in the early fourteenth century, captivity was determined in every way by the themes identified here: Llull’s polemics against Islam were facilitated by the knowledge he gained by purchasing a captive Muslim slave, and his arguments were tested, honed, and proven during his direct engagement with Muslim audiences while in captivity in North Africa. Llull, like many Christian authors, invokes captivity in two almost diametrically opposed ways. By invoking the symbolism of religious conversion, which implies both a turn from sin and a turn to truth, Llull implies that captivity symbolizes both the sin from which one must turn and also the commitment of fidelity that motivated and sustained that reforming turn.

The notions of captivity expressed by Llull’s direct contemporary, the Muslim al-Qaysī, are notably different, despite shared circumstances and experiences. Although the common Mediterranean context of physical captivity did in fact serve as a real and recurrent circumstance of concrete knowledge transfer that often provoked interreligious encounters and facilitated

language learning and cultural comparison between Muslims and Christians, the *meaning* of captivity for Christians was often determined—indeed, was “overdetermined”—by theological metaphors in a way it was not for Muslim writers. Thus while al-Qaysī makes explicit reference to his captivity as the circumstance, ordained by God, that led him to know Christian culture and language and provoked him to write against Christian belief, he does not represent that captivity as a symbol of either his sin or his spiritual redemption. Rather, he depicts it as an opportunity for reflection on God’s mercy in providing relief from the misfortunes of life: “I longed for my death and that of my family. I wished that he would make us their ransom. Then I pondered over God’s saying, ‘And certainly We shall try you, till We know those among you who strive hard [. . .]’ The lives of the Muslims are certainly a salutary gift to him who looks at them and a satisfactory lesson to him who meditates about them. So let him who will read this book of mine or to whom it will be read know that the bounties of God are a gift to him.”⁷⁴ Polemical sources like al-Qaysī’s are not unique. Van Koningsveld, who has explored other examples of Muslim polemics by captives in medieval Iberia such as al-Khazrajī (b. 1125) and Muḥammad al-Anṣārī al-Andalusī (fl. fifteenth century), remarks that “the example of the learned slave of Raymundus Lullus does not stand alone.”⁷⁵ Nabil Matar has surveyed accounts of Muslim captives in the late sixteenth to early eighteenth centuries and offers the same assessment.⁷⁶

Yet at the same time, as Matar notes about sources from the Maghreb, not only were Muslim captivity accounts sometimes more terse and less dramatic than Christian accounts; Muslim writers often

did not have, like their European Christian counterparts, the theological imagery (and vast iconography) of a suffering Christ whose pain the captive was willing to emulate—and to describe to others. They did not have a theological legacy where torture, humiliation, and defeat/crucifixion were part of the victory over the wicked. Captivity was not a matter in and by itself, revealing personal tribulation leading to salvation and ‘redemption’ . . . but part of the larger narrative of the Muslim in his submission to Allah. Captivity was God’s will, and every Muslim had to accept it and not make too much of it. It was an episode in Allah’s mysterious destiny for His followers, and His followers had to submit without trying to turn themselves into heroes.⁷⁷

According to Matar’s characterization, captivity for Muslims was meaningful as an individual experience but was not described to prove the theological superiority of Muslim belief or the abrogation of Christian and Jewish Law in the revelation of the Qur’ān. While not all historians agree with Matar’s differentiation of the “terseness” of Muslim and Christian representations of captivity, it is certain that captivity carried a notably different theological value in each tradition.⁷⁸

While limitations of space and scope do not allow a lengthy consideration of medieval Muslim notions of captivity and redemption—such a project remains a major scholarly desideratum—this distinction between theological traditions might allow for a few tentative observations. Where al-Qaysī seems only to reflect on captivity in theological terms as a reflection of God’s will, Christian accounts of captivity like Lull’s—and one can say the same for contemporary conversion stories as well—cast individual experience as exemplary of larger trends in Christian experience and thus dramatize in miniature the narrative arc of Christian salvation history writ large. Christian notions of sin—like those evident in Lull’s account—lead Christian writers to characterize imprisonment as a prefiguration and foreshadowing of future redemption, thus allowing captivity stories to express a core narrative of Christian salvation history. The particular characterization of captivity in such accounts is determined above all by particularly Christian notions of sin, salvation, and sacred history. Although the history of Muslim captivity remains to be studied in greater detail, the picture of the Christian side given here can provide a preliminary framework for comparison. Given the particularity of the Christian representation of captivity in physical as well as figurative terms, historians should not approach captivity as a transhistorical reality comparable across historical periods and vast ideological boundaries. Rather, they must treat it, along with other related theological phenomena, as a culturally determined metaphor whose meaning varied considerably according to context and period.

Notes

This research was undertaken as part of the project “Legado de Sefarad. La producción material e intelectual del judaísmo sefardí bajomedieval. 2ª parte” (principal investigator: Javier del Barco, FF12015-63700-P), supported by the “Proyecto excelencia I+D convocatoria 2015

del Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad del Gobierno de España.” Earlier versions of this chapter were delivered at the Polemical Encounters conference in Madrid (2014), the University of Chicago (2014), and the University of Minnesota (2016). I am grateful to those who offered me helpful feedback at these presentations, especially to Nabil Matar for his questions and to Daniel Hershenzon for his comments on an earlier draft.

1. “Hinc Raimundus . . . transfretauit ad quandam terram saracenorum, quae uocatur Bugia. In cuius ciuitatis sollempni platea stans Raimundus, clamabat alta uoce, prorumpens in haec uerba: ‘Lex christianorum esse uera, sancta et Deo accepta; lex autem Saracenorum falsa et erronea. Et hoc sum paratus probare.’” Lull, *Opera Latina VIII*, 297. Translation in Lull, *Doctor Illuminatus*, 35.
2. “Cui episcopus dixit: ‘Si ergo credis legem Christi esse ueram, legem uero Machometi falsam consideras, rationem necessariam, hoc probantem, adducas.’ Erat enim episcopus ille famosus in philosophia.” Lull, *Opera Latina VIII*, 297; Lull, *Doctor Illuminatus*, 35.
3. “Raimundus, quorundam suorum amicorum religiosorum deuictus instantia, narrauit scribique permisit ista.” Lull, *Opera Latina VIII*, 272; Lull, *Doctor Illuminatus*, 24, and see also 10 for remarks on the identity of the monks.
4. “Raimundus christianus posuit in arabico praedictas rationes. Et facto libro misit ipsum ad episcopum Bugiae, rogando quod ipse et sui sapientes hunc librum uiderent et ei responderent. Sed post paucos dies episcopus praeccepit, quod praedictus christianus fuisset eiectus a terra Bugiae.” Lull, *Opera Latina XXII*, 261. “The Christian Ramon put the aforesaid arguments down in Arabic. And the book being made, he sent it to the bishop of Bijaia, asking that he and his wise men look through this book and respond to him. But after a few days the bishop ordered that the aforesaid Christian [Ramon] be thrown out of the land of Bijaia” (translation mine). For an overview of these events and how they are reflected in the *Vita* and *Liber disputationis Raimundi christiani et Homeri saraceni*, see Fidora and Rubio, *Raimundus Lullus*, 101–4.

5. “Raimundus iuit ad quandam ciuitatem Saracenorum, cuius nomen est Bugia, in qua ipse praedicando et laudando sanctam fidem catholicam, in platea Saracenorum fuit captus, percussus, et in carcerem positus. Raimundo sic in carcere existente, ad eum quidam Saracenus litteratus, qui uocatur Homer, cum aliis Saracenis frequenter ueniebat, ad disputandum cum eo de fide ex parte praecepti episcopi Saracenorum, qui dicitur esse magnus litteratus, ipsis opinantibus Raimundum deducere ad fidem Mahometi. Dum sic diu disputauerunt inter se . . . Raimundus dixit, quod ambo facerent unum Librum de disputatione.” Lull, *Opera Latina XXII*, 173.
6. The later reference to the experience in the *Vita* claims that the Muslim recommended not putting Lull on trial before other Muslims because “he will bring up arguments against our religion that we will find difficult or impossible to answer . . . they therefore changed him to a less severe prison,” where he allegedly stayed for six months until he was expelled from the kingdom. On the resemblance of the arguments to those of Ibn Sinā, see Daiber, “Raimundus Lullus,” 157.
7. Algiers, Bibliothèque nationale d’Algérie (BNA), MS 1557, fols. 49–90. The most important *aljamiado* manuscript is Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional de España (BNE), MS 4944. For an overview and discussion of the *aljamiado* manuscripts, see Van Koningsveld and Wieggers, “Polemical Works,” 186–88; Cardaillac, “Polémique anti-chrétienne”; García-Arenal, *Moriscos y cristianos*, 149–50; Thomas, “Al-Qaysi,” 732–36; and Colominas Aparicio, “Disputa con los cristanos,” 43–48. See also Colominas

Aparicio, “Religious Polemics,” 78–79, 131–32.

8. “Wa-ramāni bayna hizb al-shaytān fī dār al-kufr wa-l-ṭughyān akhdimu al-naṣarā al-isyān wa-l-qīṣṣīn wa-l-ruhbān fī l-mujādalati wa-l-hawān.” BNA, MS 1557, fol. 81. Van Koningsveld and Wieggers, “Polemical Works,” 178n61 (my translation).
9. “Era sabidor de la meçkida de Azeytuna de Tüneç i fu.e kativo en lerida del reyno de aragon katalunia.” BNE, MS 4994 fol. 59r–v, reproduced in Cardaillac, “Polémique anti-chrétienne,” vol. 1. Al-Qaysi identifies himself by name twice in the Arabic manuscript, including at the end of a Zajal poem about the Aragonese siege of Naṣrid Algeciras and Almería in 1309–10. BNA, MS 1557, fol. 79. The poem was published and translated by Lévi-Provençal, “Zajal’ hispanique,” with al-Qaysi’s name on p. 392. For reference to the second mention of his name, see Van Koningsveld and Wieggers, “Polemical Works,” 183.
10. BNA, MS 1557, fol. 87. See also BNE, MS 4944, fol. 59v, which speaks of “Abdullahi el kativo,” who was a “kativo en Francia.”
11. Van Koningsveld and Wieggers suggest that this assistant may have been the same person who made the subsequent *aljamiado* version, a mysterious figure referred to as one “‘Alī al-Gharīb,” a name that likewise suggests a Muslim living in Christian lands “in the ghubra, viz. outside Dār al-Islām.” Van Koningsveld and Wieggers, “Polemical Works,” 192n104. The authors also suggest that ‘Alī al-Gharīb may possibly have been the same person who assisted al-Qaysi in writing down his Arabic text (179). See also Colominas Aparicio, chapter 3 in this volume.
12. Al-Qaysi’s text survives in one Arabic text and in various *aljamiado* copies, including one estimated to be from the early fourteenth century and others as late as the sixteenth, bringing the text to bear on the Christian conflicts with both Mudejares and Moriscos; Lull’s work now survives in some eighteen manuscripts or fragments from the fourteenth to the seventeenth centuries as well as an early printed edition from 1510 (of which more than a dozen copies are extant). The 1510 edition was printed in Valencia, a center of Morisco-Christian encounters in the early sixteenth century, by Juan Jofre, who would print only five years later the anti-Morisco polemic of the ostensibly real convert Juan Andrés, *Confusión o confutación*.
13. Lull was in Montpellier and Lyon various times in 1305 and possibly in 1306. He was in Montpellier in May 1308 and again from October 1308 to April 1309 and in Paris by fall 1309. On Lull’s itinerary of travels, see Lull, *Selected Works*, 1:45n167. Bonner’s overview is reprinted in condensed form in Lull, *Doctor Illuminatus*, 1–44.
14. On al-Qaysi’s characterization of his captivity, see his words in BNA, MS 1557, fols. 81–82; and Van Koningsveld and Wieggers, “Polemical Works,” 177–78. On Lull’s image of captivity, consider the scene when he is warned by the Muslim “bishop” that blaspheming Islam in public is grounds for death, and he replies, “Verus Christi seruus expertus fidei catholicae ueritatem mortis corporalis pericula timere non debet, ubi uitae spiritualis gratiam potest animabus infidelium adipisci.” Lull, *Opera Latina XXII*, 297. See the translation in Lull, *Doctor Illuminatus*, 35: “The true servant of Christ who has experienced the truth of the Catholic faith should not fear the danger of physical death when he can gain the grace of spiritual life for the souls of unbelievers.”
15. Pace the claim of Jarbel Rodríguez that “the two terms meant different things, even if the difference was a subtle one.” See Rodríguez, *Captives and Their Saviors*, 38. For the classic historiographical distinction between the terms, see Verlinden, *L’esclavage dans l’Europe médiévale*, 2:999–1010. On the subsequent debate over the

- terminology, see Fontenay, "Esclaves et/ou captifs," 15–24; Rotman, "Captif ou esclave?," 25–46; Meillassoux, "Esclaves, vénacles, captifs et serfs," 367–73; and the introduction to Ferrer Abárzuza, *Captius i senyors*, which cites these sources and provides data for the predominant use of the word *captive* before 1500. I also leave aside the question of hostageship, the exchange of prisoners as surety, on which see Kosto, *Hostages*, especially the discussion of terminology on 11–18.
16. Davis, "Counting European Slaves," 118. See also Davis, *Christian Slaves, Muslim Masters*.
 17. Bono, "Slave Histories and Memories," 105. See also his longer studies, Bono, *Schiavi musulmani*; and Bono, *Schiavi*. See also Rotman, "Forms of Slavery," 263–78. For an overview of this scholarship, see Hershenson, "Para que me saque," 11, 31n3.
 18. Matar, *British Captives*, 9–14. I am grateful to Professor Matar for his comments to me on this question and on the general topic of this paper.
 19. See Hershenson, "Para que me saque"; and Hershenson, "Political Economy of Ransom."
 20. If one accepts the demographic estimates of Josiah C. Russell (which are, admittedly, no more than informed guesswork), the population of the regions bordering the Mediterranean around 1340 (before the Black Death) may be estimated to between 35 and 50 million people, of which a total captive population of 1.0–1.5 million would represent about 3 percent. See Russell, *Late Ancient and Medieval*, 148. Such a guess, although not precise or verifiable, is not out of sync with Braudel's estimate that the population of the Mediterranean region around 1600 was "60 or 70 million." See Braudel, *Mediterranean World*, 1:394–95.
 21. Phillips, *Slavery in Medieval*, 15–17. González Jiménez, "Esclavos andaluces."
 22. Rodríguez, *Captives and Their Saviors*, xv–xvi. See also Phillips, *Slavery in Medieval*, 19–20. On Mercedarians, see Brodman, *Ransoming Captives*.
 23. See Austen, "Mediterranean Slave Trade."
 24. On his captivity and release, see Hillenbrand, "Imprisonment of Reynald." On Christian captives in the context of the Crusades, see Friedman, *Encounter between Enemies*.
 25. See the bibliography provided by Cowe, "Kirakos Ganjakec," 438–42.
 26. Burns, "Piracy as an Islamic-Christian Interface."
 27. Cantigas mentioning captivity include 83, 95, 158, 176, 192, 227, 265, 325, and 359.
 28. "Pois cativou / de mouros, e levado foi en prijon . . . / a Perssia; e un mouro rico deu por el seu aver, e ficou servo sseu / . . . E ela o fez a seu sennor amar, / assi que o leixou entrar a baldon . . . / En ssa casa e amostrar a ller / a seu fill' e outrossi a escrever / com' el escrevia, que sol connocer / non podian nen fazer estremaçon . . . / Qual deles escrevia mais nin mellor." Alfonso X, *Cantigas de Santa María*, 3:19–20. Translation in Kulp-Hill, *Songs of Holy Mary*, 321.
 29. The traditional legend tells the story differently. John's father, according to this legend, purchased a captive Christian from Italy named Cosmas to educate John. John later fell out of favor after criticizing Byzantine emperor Leo III (the Isaurian) for his iconoclasm, prompting the emperor to have a letter forged in John's hand criticizing the caliph. When the caliph subsequently had John's right hand cut off in punishment for the false crime, the Virgin Mary, in response to John's faith, had his hand restored and made sound again. For an overview of the legend of John and his restored hand, see Louth, *St. John Damascene*, 17–18.
 30. On captives in the *Cantigas*, see Bagby, "Moslem in the *Cantigas*"; and O'Callaghan, *Alfonso X*, 91–93. On Cantiga 192 in particular, see Bagby, "Moslem in the *Cantigas*," 184–86.
 31. "Muy gran porfia / por ela prendia / sempre cada dia / com oy dezir / con un d'Almaria / un mouro que dezia / que ren non valia / o seu poder. / Aqueste mour' era / daquel om' e seu / cativo, e fera- / ment' era encreu; / e ja o quisera / de grad' e fezera / chrischão e dera- / lle de seu aver." Alfonso X, *Cantigas de Santa María*, 2:219. Translation in Kulp-Hill, *Songs of Holy Mary*, 229.
 32. See El Escorial MS T-I-1, fol. 252v. Here the finger indicates the freedom to debate, denied the devil when he lost his finger but maintained by the man in the cave.
 33. Llull, *Doctor Illuminatus*, 12–13. "Ad tantum negotium nullam se habere scientiam . . . cum ipse linguam arabicam, quae Saracenorum est propria, penitus ignoraret." Llull, *Opera Latina VIII*, 275.
 34. Van Koningsveld and Wieggers, "Polemical Works," 180.
 35. Van Koningsveld, "Muslims Slaves and Captives," 12. Hershenson has similarly provided numerous examples of Christian captives learning Arabic from their Muslim masters.
 36. Llull, *Doctor Illuminatus*, 16–17. "Saraenus ille . . . nomen Christi blasphemaret. Quod um reuersus cognouit Raimundus ab his, qui blasphemiam adiuerant, nimio fidei zelo motus percussit illum Saracenum in ore, fronte ac facie." Llull, *Opera Latina XXII*, 279.
 37. Llull, *Doctor Illuminatus*, 17. "Severum namque uisum sibi fuit illum perimere quo docente sibi linguam multum optatam, scilicet arabicam, iam sciebat. Dimittere uero illum uel tenere diutius netuebat, sciens, quod ipse non cessaret ex tunc in mortem ipsius machinari." Llull, *Opera Latina XXII*, 279. "Invenit quod ipse fune quo ligatus fuit iugulauerat semet ipsu. Reddidit ergo Raimundus gratias Deo laetus, qui et a nece praedicti Saraceni seruauerat manus eius innoxias, et eum a perplexitate illa graui, pro qua paulo ante ipsum anxius exorauerat, liberauerat" (280). Llull's phrasing is similar to the common trope of "slaying you with your own sword," evident in Gregory of Tours and Petrus Alfonsi, among others. See Szpiech, *Conversion and Narrative*, 92.
 38. "Qui es qui faça son poder en honrar son creador, recreador, benefactor, senyor de quant es? Aquest senyor es pus amable que no es lo marit de la dona; en catiu es lo loch on fo concebut e nat a crucificat, cor sserrays lo tenen en poder." Llull, *Blaquerna*, 318. For use of this passage to discuss the economics of captivity, see Rodríguez, *Captives and Their Saviors*, 149.
 39. "Et factum est cum essem in Baldacto in medio captivorum iuxta fluvium Chobar (Ezek. I, 1) Tigris, et me ex una parte delectaret amenitas iridarii, in quo eram . . . et ex alia parte me urgeret ad tristiciam strages et captura populi christiani atque deiectio post flebilem captionem Accon, cum viderem Sarracenos letissimos atque florentes, christianos vero squalidos atque mente consternatos, cum puelle eorum et parvuli et sense cum rumoribus ad partes remotissimas orientis inter barbaras nationes captive et sclavi minabantur gementes." See Röhrich, "Letres de Ricoldo," 264; text corrected by Panella, "Presentatione." On the letters, see Shagrir, "Fall of Acre."
 40. "Quot sunt dies serui tui?" Méricoug, "L'ouvrage d'un frère," 60. For the most recent study of Riccoldo with full bibliography, see George-Ivrtković, *Christian Pilgrim*.
 41. See Riera i Sans, "Invenció literària"; and the critical introduction by González Muñoz in Pseudo Pedro Pascual, *Sobre la seŕcŕta mahometana*, 63–70. While we know from papal correspondence of Boniface VIII that Jaen did have a bishop named Pedro between 1296 and 1300 and that this figure was in fact taken captive by Muslims in Granada during pastoral work in Jaen in 1297 or 1298 and ransomed along with other Christians for the sum of five thousand gold doblas, as González Muñoz argues, this could not be the same author of the text itself, which seems datable to the latter half of the fourteenth century. On the forgeries in support of a wave of petitions for canonizations of

Mercedarian figures in the seventeenth century, see Taylor, *Structures of Reform*, 407–11. See also Franco Llopis, chapter 8 in this volume.

42. Barcelona, Universitat de Barcelona BU, MS 75, fols. 2r–v.

Com yo religios, e bisbe per la gracia de deu de la ciutat de Jaen del Regne de Castella . . . com per mia ventura fos pres en poder del Rey de Granada, e vehent molts dels Christians esser catius, no sabents letres ne be dela ffe dels christians, tot die qui un qui altre se tornaven a la mala secta dels moros; e vehent yo aço, fiantme en al ajuda de Deu, misme a incercar los libres dela biblia, e de tots los profetes, qui parlat havian dela encarnacio e del naximent . . . e dela adoracio e de les altres coses de Iesu Christ. . . . Mostrant ho yo als christians, qui aqui eran presos, los quals per molts iuheus, que aqui eran, tot dia venian per ells amonestar e endinar a creura la falsa secta dels moros. E yo reptant aquells de ço que fahian e dehian, ço es los iuheus als christians, qui daço los crehien, alguns suptils iuheus, specialment dos assi anomanats, primerament Moxi rabbi e Jacobi Moxi rabbi, saben que yo contradehia ala lig dels iuheus e dels moros, e aço per mantenir la fe christiana catholica, moguts de gran fellonia e malicia, feren scrits, e aquells trameteren a mi; en los quals scrits havia moltes e diverses demandes, e no res menys a mi e devant mi volguer an disputer.

See also the faulty printed edition in Pascual, *Obras de S. Pedro*, 2:1.

43. About missionaries in Tunis, Vose says, “These missionary pastors were interested above all in ministering to the needs of Christian captives, mercenaries and merchants. Conversion of Muslims was evidently less of a concern.” See Vose, *Dominicans, Muslims and Jews*, 208.
44. For the text, see Archivo Segreto Vaticano, Clementis VI Registra, #157, ep.

171 (fol. 37); and Registra Avenionensis 74, fols. 507v–508, which has been printed in López, *Memoria histórica*, 57–58; and again in Beltrán de Heredia, *Bulario de la universidad*, 1:354–55. See also Eubel, *Hierarchia Catholica*, 1:327; and Meerseeman, “Chronologie des voyages,” 77, 96n58.

45. “Cum ego, seruus uester frater Alfonsus Bonihominis, Hispanus, essem per Soldanum Babylonicum occasionibus quas scitis carceri mancipatus, satis humano auxilio destitutus, libris exspoliatus et rebus multis . . . supplicui preposito carceris quod michi de libello aliquo mutuo prouideret, deditque michi Deus gratiam in conspectu eius, michique portauit historiam Ioseph, que in multis calamitati nostre et miserie congruebat, illud maxime quod nos tanquam exploratores fuimus capti et timore mortis afflicti, sicut fratres Ioseph, qui alimenta pro suis querebant, non patriam explorare. Hanc ergo historiam cum perlegissem, de Arabico transtuli in Latinum.” Alphonsus Bonihominis, *Opera Omnia*, prologue to *Historia Ioseph*. I am very grateful to Professor Biosca for providing me with an advance copy of his edition.
46. “Ego frater Alfonsus, Hispanus, libellum hunc antiquissimum qui nuper casu deuenit ad manus meas cum essem apud Marrochium in captiuitate Sarracenorum, et fuerat prius multis temporibus occultatus a Iudeis, noua translatione de Arabico in Latinum per me interpretatum uobis transmittito, legentibus maxime qui Arabicarum peritiam habetis litterarum, quia in eis ipsi Arabi Iudeis et Christianis sibi notis scribunt confidenter secreta sua que ab aliis uolunt occultari.” Alphonsus Bonihominis, *Opera Omnia*, prologue to *Disputatio*.
47. On the manuscripts of the work, see the introduction by Biosca i Bas to his edition of the *Opera Omnia*. See also Robles, *Escritores dominicos*, 120–35; and Kaeppli, *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum*, 1:48–55, 4:22. On the popularity of the work, see also Limor, “Epistle of Rabbi Samuel,” 184–85.
48. “Hunc libellum antiquissimum qui nuper casu deuenit ad manus meas, et fuerat in antea tot temporibus occultatus, noua translatione de Arabico in Latinum per me interpretatum paruuum excennium transmittito uobis.” Alphonsus Bonihominis, *Opera Omnia*, prologue to *Epistola*.
49. On Buenhombre’s sources, see Biosca i Bas, “Anti-Muslim Discourse.”
50. There are surviving accounts of Muslim rulers “rescuing” Arabic books held in Christian lands. See, for example, Van Koningsveld, “Andalusian-Arabic Manuscripts,” 78–79.
51. Judah Ha-Levi’s best-known poem provides a good example: “Libi be-mizrah ve-anokhi ve-sof ma ‘arav. / Eikh et ‘amah et asher okhal ve-eikh ye‘erav / . . . be‘od / Sion be-heel edom ve-ani be-khevel ‘arav?” (My heart is in the East and I am at the edge of the West. / How can I taste what I eat and how enjoy it / . . . while / Zion is in the realm of Edom and I am in Arabia’s chains?). See Haim Shirman, *Ha-Shirah*, 1:489 (#208.2). Also, Moses Ibn Ezra: “Eshme ‘ah na ‘akat sheviyah teyelil / miklu‘ei edom u-ma ‘sar ‘aravim” (I hear the sigh and wail of the gazelle / from Edom’s prison and jail of the Arabs). Shirman, *Ha-Shirah*, 1:405 (#163.2). For a study of the concept of exile in medieval Sephardic literature, see Alfonso, *Islamic Culture*, 52–82. For a more general study of *galut* in Jewish thought, see Baer, *Galut*.
52. “Diuersi ergo domini in seruitute nos uolunt tenere: incessit diabolus, infestant angeli eius, passiones motusque corporis velut domestici atque intestine hostes inquietant.” Ambrose of Milan, *Hexamerum, De paradiso*, 616. On this reading, see Smith, *Prudentius’ Psychomachia*, 226.
53. “Loth inmorantem criminosis urbibus / Sodomae et Gomorrae, quas fouebat aduena / pollens honore patruelis gloriae. / (l. 16–18) . . . haec ad figuram

praenotata est linea, / quam nostra recto uita resculpat pede. / uigilandum in armis pectorum fidelium, / omnemque nostri portionem corporis, / quae capta foedae seruiat libidini, / domi coactis liberandam uiribus (l. 50–55).” Prudentius, *Aurelii Prudentii Clementis Carmina*, 167–69. Translation in the preface to Prudentius, *Daily Round*, 275–79.

54. “Ea demum est miserabilis animae seruitus, signa pro rebus accipere et supra creaturam corpoream oculum mentis ad hauriendum aeternum lumen leuare non posse.” See Augustine of Hippo, *Doctrina Christiana*, 140–41.
55. “Nobis seruiunt iudaei, tamquam capsarii nostri sunt, studentibus nobis codices portant.” (The Jews serve us as if they were our book-carrying servants, they carry books for us students.) *Enarrationes in Psalmos 40:14* in Augustine of Hippo, *Enarrationes in Psalmos I–L*, 459. Also, “Quomodo serui, quando eunt in auditorium domini ipsorum, portant post illos codices et foris sedent, sic factus est filius maior filio minori.” (Like servants, in the classroom of their lords, carry books behind them and then sit outside, thus an older child does for a younger). See Sermo 5.5 in Augustine of Hippo, *Sancti Aurelii Augustini*, 56. Both texts are translated in Cohen, *Living Letters*, 36n32. On Christian supersessionist typology, see Biddick, *Typological Imaginary*.
56. “Vivi quidam apices nobis sunt, repraesentantes iugiter Dominicam passionem . . . ita factum est dispersi sunt, depositi sunt; duram sustinent captiuitatem sub principibus christianis.” *Epistola 363* in Bernard of Clairvaux, *Opera*, 8:316–17; quoted in Cohen, *Living Letters*, 238.
57. “Debemus et nos nosse prius captiuitatem nostram, deinde liberationem nostram; debemus nosse babyloniam, in qua captiui sumus, et ierusalem, ad cuius reditum suspiramus.” See 64:1 in Augustine of Hippo, *Enarrationes in Psalmos I–L*, 823.

58. "Mors Christi captivitatis vobis causa exstitit." Pedro Alfonso, *Diálogo contra los judíos*, 59. Pedro Alfonso, *Dialogue against the Jews*, 107.
59. "Probatum indubitanter arbitror esse, tam longevam hanc captivitatem ob Christi mortem et malevolentiam evenisse. Concluso autem quod propter Christum sit captivitas facta, consequitur quod et vos de ea non exhibitis, donec patrum vestrorum in vobis peccatum emendabitur, id est, quod non crediderunt, credetis." Pedro Alfonso, *Diálogo contra los judíos*, 69. Pedro Alfonso, *Dialogue against the Jews*, 119.
60. "Caté la premia de los judíos, el mi pueblo donde yo era, que sson en esta luenga captividad que xados e quebrantados e angustiados en ffecho de los pechos . . . los judíos están desde tan grand tiempo en esta captividad por su locura e por su nesgedad e por mengua de 'Mostrador de Justicia' donde conoscan la verdad." See Paris BNF, MS Esp. 43, fol. 12r, in Abner of Burgos / Alfonso of Valladolid, *Mostrador de Justicia*, 1:13.
61. "Esto es de la maldicion e captiuidad perdurable que ffue sse[n]tenciada ssobre uos en que ayades las tribulaciones con manssedumbre e ssin grand graueza. Ca ssi la ouiesseades con grand graueza, en guisa qu las non pudiessedes sofrir o que ffuessedes astragados en vna uegada, seria la uuestra desonrra otrossi acabada, que auie a ser perdurable." See Paris BNF, MS Esp. 43, fol. 336v, in Abner of Burgos / Alfonso of Valladolid, *Mostrador de Justicia*, 2:434.
62. MS Burgo de Osma 154.
63. For a discussion and reproduction of the Burgo de Osma image, see Rodríguez Barral, *Imagen del judío*, 53 (and cover). A color reproduction can be found in Alfonso et al., *Biblias de Sefarad*, 312–14.
64. In the "Task of the Translator," Walter Benjamin likens translation as a redemption and a liberation: "It is the task of the translator to release in his own language that pure language which is exiled among alien tongues, to liberate the language imprisoned in a work in his re-creation of that work." See Benjamin, *Illuminations*, 80. In "Ulysses Gramophone," Jacques Derrida speaks of being "captive in a network of language, writing, knowledge, and even narration." See Derrida, *Acts of Literature*, 281. Fredric Jameson fittingly describes Derrida's discourse as itself "imprisoned": "His philosophic language feels its way gropingly along the walls of its own conceptual prison." See Jameson, *Prison-House of Language*, 186.
65. For example, early twelfth-century abbot Baudri de Bourgeuil writes, "Hostili preda ditetur lingua Latina, / graecus et hebreus seruiat edomitus" (Let the Latin tongue be enriched by enemy booty. / Let the vanquished Greek and Hebrew serve). On this passage, see Szpiech, "Latin as a Language," 67.
66. For Augustine's comments on the "Gold out of Egypt" motif, see *On Christian Doctrine*, bk. 2, pt. 40, pp. 124–25. On the motif of the "beautiful captive," see Lubac, *Exégèse médiévale*, 1:290–304.
67. "Graecia capta ferum victorem cepit et artes / intulit agresti Latio" (Epistles, bk. 2, epistle 1, lines 156–57). See Horace, *Satires. Epistles*, 408–9. On this passage in the context of exegetical ideas, see Szpiech, "Latin as a Language," 69.
68. On Baeza and the sources and legend relating to Isabel de Solís, see López de Coca, "Making of Isabel de Solís," 225–41; and Szpiech, "Conversion as a Historiographical Problem," 24–38.
69. On sources in the Cairo Genizah mentioning converted captive concubines, see Perry, "Slave Women"; and see also Friedman, "Captivity and Ransom," 121–39; and Friedman, *Encounter between Enemies*, 162–86. On captive concubines in Iberia, see Barton, *Conquerors, Brides, and Concubines*, 99–108; and Nirenberg, *Communities of Violence*, 185–87.
70. Among the many studies of the captive's tale, see Garcés, "Zoraida's Veil."
71. See Kahf, *Western Representations*.
72. See Grieve, *Floire and Blancheflor*, 196–98.
73. "Señor Dios, que a los jodíos, pueblo de perdiçión, / sacaste de captivo, de poder de Farjaón], / a Daniel sacaste del poço de Babilón / saca a mí, coitado, d'esta mala presión." Edition and translation in Ruiz, *Book of True Love*, 20–21.
74. BNA, MS 1557, fols. 71–72, translated in Van Koningsveld and Wiegiers, "Polemical Works," 175–76.
75. Van Koningsveld, "Muslims Slaves and Captives," 12.
76. Matar, *Europe through Christian Eyes*, 27. Matar surveys this material on pp. 27–71 and translates his sources in part 2 of his study. Matar also refers to numerous accounts of Ottomans held captive abroad. See the sources listed on p. 256n59 and selected essays in Dávid and Fodor, *Ransom Slavery*.
77. Matar, *Europe through Christian Eyes*, 40–41.
78. See Hershenzon, "Plaintes et menaces," 441–60. Hershenzon offers numerous examples of detailed and dramatic accounts of captivity by Muslims. He notes, "Cette séparation en deux objets distincts a pour conséquence l'occultation dommageable d'un grand nombre de liens que les réalités de la captivité tissaient entre le Maghreb et l'empire des Habsbourg" (442).