

Ryan Szpiech/Katarzyna Starczewska/Mercedes García-Arenal
Rodríguez

“Deleytaste del dulce sono y no pensaste en las palabras”. Rendering Arabic in the *Antialcoranes*

<https://doi.org/10.1515/jtms-2018-0005>

Abstract: This essay studies the translations of the Qur’ān into Romance languages in anti-Islamic treatises written by Christians in the Iberian Peninsula in the sixteenth century. It compares three such works (here called *Antialcoranes* or ‘anti-Qur’āns’) that contain citations of the Qur’ān in Arabic, either in Arabic script or in transliteration, or both. These include the *Confusión o confutación de la secta Mahomética y del Alcorán* (1515) of Juan Andrés, the *Lumbre de fe contra la secta mahometana y el alcorán* (1521) by Martín de Figuerola and the *Confutación del alcorán y secta mahometana* (1555) by Lope de Obregón. It also considers glosses found in the Latin Qur’ān made at the behest of the Italian cardinal Egidio (Giles) da Viterbo (1518). We argue that these works merit detailed study, along with more studied Latin translations, as part of a history of the translation of the Qur’ān in the early modern period.

Keywords: Romance translations of the Qur’ān, Juan Andrés, Lope de Obregón, Martín de Figuerola, Juan Gabriel

1 The Earliest Surviving Romance Qur’ān

Scholars of the reception of the Qur’ān in medieval Europe possess multiple manuscript witnesses of the first two Latin translations – that commissioned by abbot Peter the Venerable and made by Robert of Ketton in 1142/1143 (30 manuscripts), and that commissioned by archbishop Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada and completed by

Corresponding authors: Ryan Szpiech, Departments of Romance Languages and Literatures and Judaic Studies, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, USA, E-mail: szpiech@umich.edu;

Katarzyna Starczewska, Centro de Ciencias Humanas y Sociales, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Madrid, Spain, E-mail: katarzyna.starczewska@cchs.csic.es;

Mercedes García-Arenal Rodríguez, Centro de Ciencias Humanas y Sociales, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Madrid, Spain, E-mail: mercedes.garciaarenal@cchs.csic.es

Mark of Toledo in 1209/1210 (seven manuscripts).¹ Those scholars focusing on the Romance production of subsequent centuries (fourteenth to sixteenth), however, face a different situation, because the first translations into Romance languages made among the Mudéjar population (Muslims living in Christian lands in Iberia) are generally undated and, with only one exception, are not complete.² In addition, those made by or for the Christian population have not survived and are known today only through tantalizing fragments or obscure descriptions. Thus among the two-dozen or so manuscripts of Qur’āns in “aljamiado” Castilian (including two in Latin script), only a handful are thought to date to the Mudéjar period (before 1500).³ One of the earliest Romance Qur’āns – if not the earliest – is a translation made from Latin into Catalan in 1382 at the behest of king Pere III “el Cerimoniós” (Peter IV of Aragón, d. 1387).⁴ Although nothing of this translation has survived, it was certainly completed, as we not only possess the king’s request for the translation in November 1381, but we also know the name of the translator (Friar Francesc Pons Saclota) and possess evidence of the translation’s receipt by the king and of his payment for the final copy in September 1382.⁵ Similarly, of the multi-lingual

1 For bibliography on the manuscripts of the Ketton translation, see D’ALVERNY 1947–1948, p. 108–113; D’ALVERNY 1956; BURMAN 2007, p. 240 with n. 1; TISCHLER 2011, p. 337 sq. On Marc of Toledo’s translation see MARCUS TOLETANUS *Alchoranus latinus*; CECINI 2012.

2 See MARTÍNEZ DE CASTILLA MUÑOZ 2014a; MARTÍNEZ DE CASTILLA MUÑOZ 2014b; MARTÍNEZ DE CASTILLA MUÑOZ. For an overview of translations of the Qur’ān in Iberia see ARIAS TORRES 1998; ARIAS TORRES 1999; ARIAS TORRES 2007.

3 Consuelo López-Morillas gives a list of 25 manuscripts, suggesting only four (Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional de España, Ms. 4938; Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Ms. arabe 1163; Madrid, Real Academia de la Historia, Ms. 9402 and a section of Ms. 9409), might date to the fifteenth century (LÓPEZ-MORILLAS 2011, p. 46). All are copied in “aljamiado” and none are complete.

4 TISCHLER 2011, p. 340 with n. 31. Mikel de Epalza and others have suggested that a (partial) translation of the Qur’ān was made into Castilian at the behest of Alfonso X (DE EPALZA e. a. 2008, p. 100; TISCHLER 2011, p. 344 sq. with n. 46). However, this suggestion is based only on the catalogue of translations made by Ismet Binark and Halit Eren (BINARK/EREN 1986, p. XXXV), which claims that 70 Surāhs were translated by Abraham of Toledo and on the basis of this, Bonaventure of Siena made a French translation. This assertion, otherwise unsubstantiated, seems clearly to be based on a misunderstanding of the facts surrounding the translation of the *Kitāb al-mi’rāğ* (*Muhammad’s Ladder*), which was indeed translated by Abraham of Toledo at Alfonso’s behest and which was then translated again into Latin and French by Bonaventure of Siena: *Liber Scale Machometi*. To date, there is no evidence of any project to translate the Qur’ān at the court of Alfonso X, thus leaving the translations made for king Pere in 1382 as the earliest Romance translation.

5 The four archival documents attesting to this translation – Barcelona, Arxiu de la Corona d’Aragó, Reg. 1274 (fol. 192v), 1276 (fol. 91r), 1438 (fol. 168v) and 1105 (fol. 172r) – are summarized and reproduced in DE EPALZA e. a. 2008, p. 100 sq. Similarly, in the inventory of moveable goods left by king Martí I of Aragón to his wife Margarida de Prades upon his death in 1410, there appears a reference to “vn altre libre appellat de ‘Mafumet’ en castella scrit en

Qur’ān commissioned seven decades later by the Spanish theologian Juan de Segovia (d. 1458) and made by Mudéjar Muslim ‘Īsa (Yça) de Segovia, which included Latin and Castilian translations presented alongside the original Arabic text, only the Latin prologue and short fragments have survived, although we are certain this full translation was realized as well.⁶

Notice of a third Romance Qur’ān made in a Christian context survives from only a few decades after Juan de Segovia’s death. It comes from a figure known as Juan Andrés, who describes himself as the son of an “alfaqui” (“faḳīh” – ‘religious jurist or authority’, and in a Spanish context, “imam” – ‘community leader’) from Xàtiva who converted to Christianity in 1487. He alleges in his 1515 anti-Islamic polemic *Confusión o confutación dela secta Mahomética y del Alcorán* (*Confusion or Confutation of the Muḥammadan Sect and of the Qur’ān*) that, at the behest of Martín García, bishop of Barcelona, he made a full translation of the Qur’ān ‘into the Aragonese language’ together with many books of “ḥadīṭ” (sayings about the deeds of the Prophet Muḥammad). However, as in the case of the Qur’āns made by Francesc Pons Saclota for king Pere and ‘Īsa de Segovia for Juan de Segovia, Juan Andrés’ alleged translations for Martín García (which, if real, would have filled volumes) have similarly not survived. Although serious doubts about Juan Andrés’ alleged Qur’ān – as well as about his claims to his identity and biography⁷ – persist, and although Juan Andrés was the latest of the three early Romance translators of the Qur’ān, it was he who has paradoxically come to wield the most influence on the reception of the Qur’ān in the early modern period. This is because Juan’s *Confusión* does survive and it is filled with scores of passages from the Qur’ān, copied both in transliterated Arabic and in translation. In fact, although not the

pergamins ab posts de fust cubert de cuyro vermell empremtades sense tancadors lo qual comença en vermello ‘Este libro es clamado’ e en lo negre ‘Al primer capitulo’ e faneix ‘E mes auant Amen’”, listed in MASSÓ TORRENTS 1905, p. 424 and cited in DE EPALZA 2002, p. 112 n. 17. There is no indication that this is a translation of the Qur’ān, and although it is called a Castilian book, the word “clamado” would seem to point to an Aragonese text.

6 MARTÍNEZ GÁZQUEZ 2003; ROTH/GLEI 2009; ROTH/GLEI 2011. Despite these lamentable losses, Juan’s ideas about Islam and his collaboration with the Iberian Muslim Yça de Segovia have received scholarly attention in recent years; see WIEGERS 1994, p. 98–115 and 230–235; MADRIGAL TERRAZAS 2004; SCOTTO 2012; ROTH 2014; WOLF 2014.

7 SZPIECH 2016 gives an overview of the doubts concerning Juan’s real identity. Mònica Colominas Aparicio recently has pointed to the document Arxiu del Patriarca, Antoni Lulià, n° 1201 referenced by Eulàlia Duran i Grau, in which Alfonso de Jaén, in March 18, 1489, purchases silk from “Johannes Andreu filius alfaquim morerie civitatis Xative”, see DURAN I GRAU 1998, p. 461 with n. 18; COLOMINAS APARICIO 2018, p. 63 sq. with n. 37 sq. We are grateful to Dr. Colominas for sharing her paper with us ahead of publication.

first source to be written, Juan Andrés' polemical book can be considered the earliest surviving source with a certain date of the translation of the Qur'ān into Romance.⁸

The goal of this article is to consider the dissemination and influence of Juan Andrés' qur'ānic material on subsequent Castilian writing against Islam in the sixteenth century, the century of the anti-Islamic polemical works known as the *Antialcoranes*, or *Anti-Qur'āns*.⁹ Because the spread of Juan Andrés' arguments and ideas has been considered elsewhere, we will focus here on the influence of Juan Andrés' particular translation and transliteration choices as our basis for sketching out the paths of Juan's influence on the *Antialcoranes* genre. By looking at a few examples of how Juan Andrés cited and translated the Arabic text of the Qur'ān, we can gauge in concrete terms his influence on subsequent anti-Islamic writing in the Iberian Peninsula. Juan Andrés' *Confusión* can be taken as the foundation of the *Antialcoranes* genre, and subsequent examples in the sixteenth century can logically be divided into two broad groups, those that relied on Juan Andrés as a model of how to handle Arabic material from the Qur'ān, and those that recognized Juan Andrés only as the founder of this line of polemical writing but that did not copy his Arabic material directly. Many in the first group followed him by handpicking qur'ānic quotes for the purpose of their argumentation but still displayed a limited knowledge of and scarce interest in the Arabic text.

2 Juan Andrés, Model of the *Antialcoranes*

The basis of Juan Andrés' influence on later anti-Islamic writing is, in the first instance, its wide dissemination in print. After the first edition of the *Confusión*¹⁰

8 The validity of this assertion relies on the lack of knowledge about the dates of early Mudéjar translations and about the possible antiquity of texts copied in later manuscripts such as Toledo, Biblioteca Capitular, Ms. T-235, edited by Consuelo López-Morillas: *El Corán*. See also WIEGERS 2015, p. 127 sq. It is certainly possible that some of the translations copied in "aljamiado" were made in the fifteenth century, but none are dated.

9 This denomination, based on the title of Bernardo Pérez de Chinchón's *Antialcorano* (1532), is first used in historiography by DE BUNES IBARRA 1989a. See also DE BUNES IBARRA 1989b, p. 203–217.

10 This is the title given to the text by the modern editors of the text, Elisa Ruiz García and María Isabel García-Monge: JUAN ANDRÉS *Confusión*. The title page of the 1515 edition reads *Libro nueuamente imprimido que se llama confusion dela secta mahomatica y del alcoran compuesto por mossen juan andres*, while the work itself begins by giving a slightly different title: *Obra llamada confusion o confutacion dela secta mahometica compuesta por Juan Andres quondam Alfaqui de xatiua agora por la diuina bondad christiano y sacerdote*.

came out in 1515, the text was subsequently reprinted thrice in Castilian (València 1519, Seville 1537 and Granada 1560) and was printed in translation at least fifteen times.¹¹ The name and ideas of Juan Andrés enjoyed a wide popularity and influence as a direct result of the printing and translation of his work. The effect of printing on Juan Andrés’ popularity was similar to its effect on the fame of Robert of Ketton, whose twelfth-century Latin translation found a wide readership in the sixteenth century through its publication by the Swiss Arabist Theodore Bibliander. In a similar way, the name of thirteenth-century Dominican Riccoldo da Monte di Croce, whose polemic against Islam also included Qur’ānic material, was similarly disseminated through early sixteenth-century printings and translations.¹² Numerous authors of the sixteenth century whose work includes citations of the Qur’ān in Arabic and/or in Romance translation also mention Juan Andrés and seem to make use of his work. Knowledge of his work can be traced in works on Islam written across Europe into the eighteenth century, and references to his name by Christian writers on Islam continue to appear even into the twentieth century.¹³

Before Juan Andrés’ name came to enjoy fame abroad, his influence was also immediately felt within the Iberian Peninsula. This influence went beyond the reprinting of his work. Within the half-century after the *Confusión* was first published, Juan Andrés’ polemic was used in a handful of catechisms and polemics discussing the Morisco population, all of which include citations of the Qur’ān in Castilian translation and, in some cases, citations of the original Arabic text as well, either in Arabic script or transliterated into Latin script. Of those writings known from before 1567 – when the prohibition of the Arabic language, initially promulgated by Carlos I in 1526 but delayed by a moratorium of forty years, was implemented anew by his son Felipe II¹⁴ – the principal ones include the sermons of Martín García, published in Zaragoza in 1520, Joan Martín de Figuerola’s *Lumbre de fe contra la secta mahometana y el alcorán* (unpublished, finished in 1521), the *Antialcorano* (1532) and *Diálogos Cristianos* (1535) of Erasmist Bernardo Pérez de Chinchón and the *Confutación del alcorán y secta mahometana*,

¹¹ These include six Italian editions (1537, 1540, 1541, 1543, 1545 and 1597), at least three in Latin (1595, 1600 and 1656), three in German (1598, 1647 and 1685) and one each in Dutch (1651), French (1574) and English (1652). For an overview of most of the editions see RUIZ GARCÍA/GARCÍA-MONGE 2003, p. 53–56.

¹² On Bibliander’s publication of Ketton’s translation see BURMAN 2007, p. 111–121. On Riccoldo see GEORGE-TVRTKOVIĆ 2012. On Riccoldo’s dissemination in Castilian translation in the sixteenth century see FERRERO HERNÁNDEZ 2015.

¹³ For an assessment of the extent of this influence see SZPIECH 2016.

¹⁴ HARVEY 2005, p. 104 sq. and 211 sq.

sacado de sus propios libros, y dela vida del mesmo Mahoma (1555) by Lope de Obregón, priest in Ávila.¹⁵ These can be considered apart from other non-polemical Christian texts from this period that contain Arabic.¹⁶

While the general influence of Juan Andrés on each later writer can be easily established by a comparison of their ideas, the comparison of translations and transliterations is more complicated and less work has been done in this area, with the exception of a recent study by Teresa Soto González and Katarzyna Starczewska on the Arabic citations of Martín de Figuerola.¹⁷ This is in part because, except in the case of Martín de Figuerola, we do not possess manuscript copies of the *Antialcoranes*, and thus certain differences in spelling or errors in citation might simply be explained as products of different editorial handling. However, some details about translation and reading habits can be discerned regardless of questions of typesetting, layout and printing, and these details are quite telling, offering a good basis on which to trace the influence of Juan Andrés on subsequent writers. By loosely following a Lachmannian-style method of grouping readings by shared errors, we can discern the different branches of the *Antialcoranes* tradition.

15 These works all lack modern critical editions. Martí de Figuerola's *Lumbre de fe* (held in Madrid, Biblioteca de la Real Academia de la Historia, Colección Gayangos, Ms. 19–36) was being edited by Elisa Ruiz García and others, but this edition has been delayed and no further notice of its prospects are available. Manuel Montoza Coca has currently finished a full edition of García's sermons for his doctoral dissertation. As there is no manuscript, the edition is based on the 1520 edition: MARTÍN GARCÍA *Sermones*. The work of Pérez de Chinchón has been published by Francisco Pons Fuster: BERNARDO PÉREZ DE CHINCHÓN *Antialcorano*, but this simply reproduces the texts without any apparatus, cross-referencing or index. The 1555 work of Lope de Obregón: LOPE DE OBREGÓN *Confutación*, is currently being edited by Cándida Ferrero Hernández and Ryan Szpiech.

16 Thus we will not consider here the linguistic works of Pedro de Alcalá, *Vocabulista arauigo en letra castellana* and *Arte para ligeramente saber la lengua arauiga*, both from 1505, which focus on language, or the *Doctrina christiana en lengua arabiga y castellana* of Martín Pérez de Ayala from 1566, which says nothing about the Qur'ān or Islam in particular.

17 SOTO GONZÁLEZ/STARCZEWSKA 2016. Also GARCÍA-ARENAL RODRÍGUEZ/STARCZEWSKA 2014 study the link between Martín de Figuerola and Juan Gabriel, the translator who aided Egidio da Viterbo with his Latin translation of the Qur'ān made after his visit to the Iberian Peninsula in 1518, showing that Juan was almost certainly Martín's assistant in preparing the qur'ānic material in the *Lumbre de fe*. STARCZEWSKA 2015 has also noted parallels between Juan Andrés and Juan Gabriel, suggesting that both were drawing from a shared exegetical tradition familiar to intellectual Moriscos (especially those considering how to convince their peers of Christian dogma). EL KOLLI 1983 was the first to compare Juan Andrés and Obregón, but her work did not focus on the use of Arabic. SZPIECH 2012; SZPIECH 2016 has considered a few parallels between Juan Andrés and both Martín de Figuerola and Lope de Obregón, but more work remains to be done to assess their translation strategies.

Dealing directly with transliteration of Arabic focuses the question and excludes some works from consideration. While all of the *Antialcoranes* make reference to Juan Andrés and cite some of the same Qur’ānic verses and exegetical commentators as the *Confusión* (the Persian az-Zamaḥṣārī and the Andalusī exegete Ibn ‘Aṭṭyya were two perennial favorites), the earliest *Antialcoranes* that include Qur’ānic material in Arabic – either in transliteration or in Arabic characters or both – include the *Lumbre de fe* of Martín de Figuerola and the *Confutación* of Lope de Obregón.¹⁸ Of the Christian anti-Muslim texts from these years (1500–1567), these three are the only treatises known to us to contain original Arabic text from the Qur’ān. For this reason, they merit comparison in terms both of their handling of Arabic sources and in terms of their translation choices in rendering Qur’ān passages in Romance.

To the comparison of these three authors, we can add the work of a fourth figure, that of a Muslim convert named Juan Gabriel, who helped Martín de Figuerola by providing him with knowledge of Islam and the Qur’ān, as the latter himself acknowledges in his *Lumbre de fe*. While a Muslim, Juan Gabriel was most probably called Alī Alayzar and was an “alfaqui” of the local Muslim community. The accepted hypothesis is that he was forced to convert with the other Muslims of Aragón in 1502. Upon his conversion, he began instructing Figuerola in Islamic theology and Arabic language so that the Catholic preacher had solid, first-hand arguments to argue against. As far as we know from Figuerola’s text, this collaboration was based on oral teachings, occasional conversations and Juan Gabriel’s lending of books to Figuerola. This Juan Gabriel, as Mercedes García-Arenal Rodríguez and Katarzyna Starczevska have shown, is the same Johan Gabrielis Terrolensis (from Teruel in Aragón) who is at least in part responsible for the Latin translation of the Qur’ān commissioned by the Italian cardinal Egidio da Viterbo (1518).¹⁹

18 The sermons of Martín García lack citations in Arabic, giving the text only in Latin, although certain words are occasionally inserted, see SOTO GONZÁLEZ/STARCZEWSKA 2016, p. 203 n. 16. In the work of Pérez de Chinchón, verses of the Qur’ān also appear only in translation, but these usually follow directly after blank spaces and begin with the phrase “que quiere dezir” – ‘which means ...’. Thus, we can assume that the author intended to give the Arabic text and was somehow prevented from doing so, most certainly by limitations of printing Arabic characters at the printing house. CARDAILLAC 1979, p. 317 notes García’s reliance on Juan Andrés. This reliance had been previously explored by RIBERA FLORIT 1967; GARCÍA-ARENAL RODRÍGUEZ/STARCZEWSKA 2014, p. 426; SZPIECH 2016, p. 177–187; SOTO GONZÁLEZ/STARCZEWSKA 2016. The edition of Martín García’s sermons by Montoza Coca includes extensive comparison with Juan Andrés as well: MONTOZA COCA 2018, p. XXIV–XXXII.

19 GARCÍA-ARENAL RODRÍGUEZ/STARCZEWSKA 2014.

Thus two of the three works that cite the Qur'ān in Romance, the *Confusión* of Juan Andrés and the *Lumbre de fe* of Martín de Figuerola, show the knowledge and the participation of converts whose native tongue was linked with the Romance dialects of Aragón and València. As a native of Xàtiva, Juan Andrés would have spoken the dialect from around València, although he claims to translate into 'Aragonese'. While this claim seems suspect given the effacement of Aragonese by Castilian in the fifteenth century, it can also be noted that Juan claims to have lived in Zaragoza for some years before the publication of the *Confusión*, where vestiges of Aragonese were maintained among the Morisco population. As Everette E. Larson has shown, the *Confusión* does evince certain features of late-medieval Aragonese (in the process of Castilianization).²⁰ In the same way, Martín de Figuerola's collaborator Juan Gabriel was a native of Teruel, and his language would have retained features of Aragonese that were preserved among sixteenth-century Moriscos of the region.²¹

Comparing the use of the Qur'ān by these authors, we can see that, as Jane El Kollí observed, Lope de Obregón relied heavily on Juan Andrés for content and often followed his lead in citing and translating Arabic material as well, even though he also made some additions and changes, showing that he may have consulted personally with someone knowledgeable in Arabic.²² Martín de Figuerola, on the other hand, seems to have worked independently from Juan Andrés, even though it is certain that he knew of Juan, crossing paths with him and even called him an 'expert' in Islamic questions.²³ Although the glosses to Egidio's Qur'ān, which we believe were

20 On the use of Aragonese in the *Confusión* see LARSON 1981, p. 21–26. It can be further noted that Juan has been associated with the book on accounting, *Sumario breve de la practica dela arithmetica de todo el curso del arte mercantil* (*Brief Summary of the Practice of Arithmetic in the Course of the Mercantile Art*), published by the same publisher in València (Juan Joffre) in the same year 1515, and this text further presents numerous examples of Aragonese ("car", "ensemble", "fablar" etc.) On the connection between the *Confusión* and the *Sumario* see SZPIECH 2016, p. 176–183.

21 DE BUNES IBARRA 1989a, p. 47 notes that there is a palpable shift in the genre around the middle of the sixteenth century, thus supporting the logic of viewing the polemics from the first half of the century as a more coherent generic group.

22 EL KOLLI 1983, p. 159 observes about Obregón that "pour ses références coranique, il reste toujours tributaire d'Andrés. Les rares textes qu'il transcrit sont les siens, et dès qu'il se détache de lui, qu'il en cite de nouveaux, comme s'il trouvait qu'il ne tirait pas tout le parti possible de ce type de références, il fait montre d'une grande maladresse qui a du [!] mettre en joie les alfaquís qui se seraient penchés sur son texte pour le réfuter".

23 Martín de Figuerola states that "lo que se dira sera de un libro que hizo Mossen Johan Andres antiguo alfaqui de Xativa y que por ser persona experta", JOAN MARTÍN DE FIGUEROLA *Lumbre*, fol. 30r.

authored by Juan Gabriel (who relied on sources he shared with Juan Andrés), are clearly very similar to Martín de Figuerola’s citations in the *Lumbre de fe*, the connection between Juan Andrés and Martín de Figuerola is not direct and the latter does not rely on the former for citations of Arabic text or for his translations into Romance. Finally, it seems certain that Obregón did not copy anything from Figuerola and in fact may not have known of his work at all. Each of the three writers renders translations and transliterations in their own unique ways, often reflecting, as Soto González and Starczewska note, a ‘carelessness in transcription’.²⁴ Yet errors and misreadings can offer a good basis for comparison and a consideration of a few telling examples allows us to establish a clear link between Juan Andrés and Obregón and the lack of such a link between these writers and Martín de Figuerola. Their works can nevertheless be regarded as a coherent cluster of sources, providing valuable, albeit fragmentary, evidence of the translation of the Qur’ān in the first half of the sixteenth century.

3 Comparing “Ḥadīṭ” Passages in Juan Andrés and Lope de Obregón

In his polemical arguments, Juan Andrés shows direct use of the Arabic text and gives no sign of relying on existing material in translation. His direct use of Arabic sources includes not only the Qur’ān and its exegesis but also passages in Arabic taken directly from “ḥadīṭ”, passages that were certainly not available in translation. For example, in chapter one of the *Confusión*, he speaks about the custom of fasting on the day of “Āṣūrā”, the tenth day of the month of “Muḥarram”, which he claims is a custom held over from idolatrous pre-Islamic times. “Muḥarram”, the first month of the Islamic calendar, is one of four ‘prohibited’ months, in which war and hunting are disallowed. Juan Andrés traces this prohibition to the legendary second son of Ishmael, Qaydār (the biblical Kedar), being “mandado por Caydar y por sus descendientes en reverencia del dicho ídolo” – ‘ordered by Qaydār and his descendants in reverence for the said idol’. This prohibition is one of a number of elements connecting Islam with pre-Islamic idolatry, about which Juan Andrés asserts:

²⁴ SOTO GONZÁLEZ/STARCZEWSKA 2016, p. 209.

Próvolo por un dicho de Mahoma en los seys libros de la ‘Çuna’ que dize que los coraxistas y la gente de Mequa ayunavan este dezeno día siendo ydólatras. Las palabras en arávigo dizen así: ‘guaquenet coraysin teçomo yaumihasora filgehilia’²⁵

I prove it with a saying of Muḥammad from the six books of the Sunna, which says that, being idolatrous, the Qurayš and the people of Mecca fasted on this tenth day. The words in Arabic read thus: ‘wa-kānat qurayšun tašūmu yawm al-‘āšūrā’a fi l-jāhiliyya’ – ‘The Qurayš fasted on the day of ‘Āšūrā’, in the pre-Islamic period’.

Juan Andrés is here correctly citing a standard “ḥadīṭ” about the origins of the recommendation to fast on the day of “‘Āšūrā”, the tenth day of the month of “Muḥarram”.²⁶ The transliteration does not follow strict divisions between words but instead reflects the natural clustering of phrases (e. g. in rendering “yawm al-‘āšūrā’ fi l-jāhiliyya – ‘the day of ‘Āšūrā’, in pre-Islamic times’ – becomes “yaumihasora filgehilia”). This seems to suggest that the transliterations were copied on the basis of an oral pronunciation, a fact that would correspond to claims made recently about the importance of preaching and orality in all of the *Antialcoranes*.²⁷ The fact that Juan Andrés includes Arabic text not only of the Qur’ān but also from other canonical sources of Islamic tradition, like the “ḥadīṭ” cited here, supports his own claim that he translated “el ‘Alcorán’ con sus glosas y los siete libros de la ‘Çuna’”.²⁸ While he was not the first Western Christian writer to cite “ḥadīṭ” passages in Arabic – the Dominican Ramon Martí did so in the *Pugio fidei* in the thirteenth century – Juan Andrés’ use is original and much more varied than any previous engagement.²⁹

Juan Andrés’ rendering and translation of this “ḥadīṭ” can be compared to the discussion of the same passage in Lope de Obregón’s *Confutación*, which similarly connects the custom of fasting to Qaydār and to pre-Islamic idolatry. Obregón notes:

Mando mahoma que se ayunasse su ayuno, e guardassen las ceremonias y mandamientos de Caydar que guardauan sus tios de mahoma los Coraxistas y Haximistas ... en esta luna moharan principia su año, y guardan su ayuno como le guardauan los idolatras de Meca

²⁵ JUAN ANDRÉS *Confusión*, p. 106 (fol. 14r/C I).

²⁶ *Ağ-Ġāmi’u ’ş-şahīḥ* 31 § 117, AL-BUḤĀRĪ *ağ-Ġāmi’u ’ş-şahīḥ* 3, s. v. English translation: ‘(The tribe of) Qurayš used to fast on the day of ‘Āšūrā’ in the pre-Islamic period’.

²⁷ SOTO GONZÁLEZ/STARCZEWSKA 2016.

²⁸ JUAN ANDRÉS *Confusión*, p. 91 (fol. 3v/A III).

²⁹ On Martí’s “ḥadīṭ” passages in Arabic, copied in Hebrew letters along with some passages from the Qur’ān, see SZPIECH 2011.

Muḥammad ordered that they fast their fast and keep the ceremonies and commandments of Qedār that Muḥammad’s uncles the Qurayš and Ḥašimī kept ... in the month of ‘Muḥarram’ their year begins, and they keep their fast as the idolaters of Mecca kept it.³⁰

Here, Obregón’s content is very close to Juan Andrés’ and he seems to be following his argument directly, but he does not present the “ḥadīṭ” passage cited by Juan Andrés. This single example suggests that Obregón possibly did rely on Juan Andrés but did not copy his text word-for-word in all cases. A comparison of Qur’ān passages will help confirm this with more certainty and will clarify the relationship both between Juan Andrés and Lope de Obregón and between these authors and their contemporaries Martín de Figuerola and his collaborator Juan Gabriel.

4 Comparing Qur’ān Passages in Juan Andrés, Juan Gabriel, Martín de Figuerola and Lope de Obregón

In order to gauge how closely Lope de Obregón relied on Juan Andrés for his Arabic material, we can compare their citations of the same Qur’ānic material. One notable fact that emerges from even a superficial comparison is that most of the numbers of Qur’ānic Surāhs given by Obregón correspond to those given by Juan Andrés, while neither author follows the standard, modern system for numbering books. Instead both authors divide the Qur’ān into four ‘books’, each with a variable number of ‘chapters’. Juan Andrés’ numbering system seems to define ‘book one’ as Surāhs two through six, ‘book two’ as including Surāhs seven to eighteen, ‘book three’ as including nineteen to thirty-seven, and ‘book four’ as including the rest of the Qur’ānic text. In addition, the division of ‘chapters’ in book four does not correspond to the normal distribution of 114 “ayāt” in the Qur’ānic text, and instead Juan Andrés ends up with a total of 211 chapters, including 175 in book four.³¹ While this four-book system does vaguely resemble the division of Qur’āns in North Africa into four parts, Juan Andrés’ system of division in book four is peculiar. Obregón follows these same divisions (for example, both identify Qur’ān 3, 35 as ‘book one, chapter two’;³² Qur’ān 8,

³⁰ LOPE DE OBREGÓN *Confutación*, fol. 26v.

³¹ JUAN ANDRÉS *Confusión*, p. 126 sq. (fol. 25v–26r/D III–D v). See also BOBZIN 2014.

³² JUAN ANDRÉS *Confusión*, p. 211 (fol. 76v/K VII); LOPE DE OBREGÓN *Confutación*, fol. 18r. Lope de Obregón numbers Surāh 3 as book one, chapter two, in all cases except one, where the text

22 as ‘book two, chapter two’;³³ Qur’ān 25, 4 as ‘book three, chapter seven’;³⁴ or Qur’ān 39, 68 as ‘book four, chapter two’.³⁵)

Even more telling than simple numbers, however, are the close parallels between Andrés’ and Obregón’s texts. As an example, we can compare each writer’s discussion of the accusation that Muḥammad was first received by some as ‘crazy’ or possessed. In a reference to Muḥammad’s physical state during moments of revelation, Obregón states:

Muchos de los dichos idolatras dixeron que ellos le auian visto endemoniado tendido en el suelo y sin sentido, como mas largamente lo dize la Suna en arabigo assi. ‘Meginum agehele alalihete illehen guahiden/inhede ille cehirun quedeb’. Que quiere dezir, que mahoma era hombre endemoniado, nigromantico y mentiroso, y no mensajero de dios y que como tal hombre no podia dezir verdad, y que en menosprecio de sus dioses mandaua adorar vn solo dios. y todos los idolatras dixeron que mahoma era hombre ‘Meginum’, [!] Que quiere dezir endemoniado, y quel diblo le ayudaua a dezir lo que dezia, y que jamas se apartaua del.³⁶

Many of the idolatrous sayings said that they had seen him possessed, stretched out on the ground and without sense, as the ‘Sunnah’ says at greater length thus: ‘Maḡnūn aḡa’ala al-ālihata ilāhan wāḡidan inna hādā illā sāḡirun kaḡḡāb’ – ‘Possessed – has he made the gods one god? Indeed, this one is nothing but a magician and a liar’. This means that Muḥammad was a possessed man, a necromancer/sorcerer and a liar, and not messenger of God, and as such a man he could not say the truth, and in disrespect of his gods he ordered people to adore only one god, and all the idolaters said he was a ‘maḡnūn’ man – ‘a possessed/crazy man’, which means ‘possessed’, and that the devil helped him say what he said and never separated from him.

The passage cited by Obregón is a mix, in reverse order, of Qur’ān 38, 4 sq. (‘He is a lying sorcerer. Does he reduce the gods to One God?’) to which he has affixed the word “maḡnūn” – ‘possessed’ or ‘crazy one’. This past participle is used eleven times in the Qur’ān, all in reference to Muḥammad, but none of these instances are found in Surāh 38. Not only does Obregón conflate and reorder the verses, but he also claims incorrectly that the text is from the “Sunnah,” i. e. the “ḡadīḡ”, not the Qur’ān.³⁷

reads “libro primero azora III” (fol. 52v), although he elsewhere names and cites Surāh 3 as book one, chapter two (fol. 18r, 59r etc.) and cites Surāh 4 as book one, chapter three (fol. 20r, 27v etc.).

³³ JUAN ANDRÉS *Confusión*, p. 147 (fol. 38r/F); LOPE DE OBREGÓN *Confutación*, fol. 71v.

³⁴ JUAN ANDRÉS *Confusión*, p. 114 (fol. 38r/C v); LOPE DE OBREGÓN *Confutación*, fol. 8r.

³⁵ JUAN ANDRÉS *Confusión*, p. 135 (fol. 30r/E); LOPE DE OBREGÓN *Confutación*, fol. 70r.

³⁶ LOPE DE OBREGÓN *Confutación*, fol. 28v–29r.

³⁷ Obregón explicitly distinguishes between the Qur’ān and the “Sunnah”, such as Lope de Obregón: “y la Suna lo declara assi, y lo mesmo torna, a dezir el alcoran”, LOPE DE OBREGÓN *Confutación*, fol. 16r.

Obregón’s source is evident if we compare his text to a similar passage in Juan Andrés’ *Confusión*:

Todos los de Mequa lo tenían por loco y por endemoniado; y por esso lo dexaron con su locura. Y desto está lleno l’Alcorán: cómo los tíos de Mahoma y todos los de Mequa lo tenían por loco y por endemoniado, diziendo en arávigo así: ‘agele al alihete jlehengua-hiden inhede jlle cehirun quedeb’, que quiere dize [!] cómo Mahoma mandava que adorassen un solo Dios y que no era sino hechizero mentiroso; que en otros capítulos dize “meginum”, que quiere dezir que Mahoma era ‘endemoniado’. Y así digo que pocos son los capítulos que no fazen mención cómo dezian de mahoma que era hichezero, mentiroso y endemoniado matricador.³⁸

All of those in Mecca considered him to be a crazy and possessed man, and thus they left him in his folly. About this the Qur’ān is full (of examples), of how Muḥammad’s uncles and all those of Mecca considered him crazy and possessed, saying in Arabic thus: ‘aja’ala al-ālihata ilāhan wāḥidan inna hādā illā sāḥirun kaḏḏāb’, which means that Muḥammad ordered them to worship only one god and that he was nothing but a liar and sorcerer. In other chapters it says ‘maḡnūn’, which means that Muḥammad was ‘possessed’. Thus I say that few are the chapters that do not mention how they said that Muḥammad was a sorcerer, a liar and a possessed versifier.

Given that the passage cited by both Juan Andrés and Lope de Obregón is not found as such in the Qur’ān itself strongly suggests that Obregón copied this new, altered combination from Juan Andrés, and this suggestion is supported further by the fact that the transliteration of the artificial passage is nearly identical in each work. Similarly, the following of this passage with the discussion of the term “maḡnūn” lends further support to the interpretation that Obregón had Juan Andrés’ text near at hand as he composed his own.

Similar, albeit shorter, glosses can be found in the Latin translation of the Qur’ān commissioned by Egidio da Viterbo, inserted most probably by Juan Gabriel himself. The first gloss makes reference to Qur’ān 38, 4 and it states as follows:

dixit Zamakhsharī quod Deus dixit hoc de Coraxistis qui admirati sunt de Machoma qui uenit ex eisdem admonitor et qui dixerunt quod erat ueneficus mentiens³⁹

Zamakhsharī said that God said this about the Qurayš who wondered how Muḥammad who came from among them was an admonisher and so they said that he was a lying sorcerer.

This annotation is immediately followed by the one referring to Qur’ān 38, 5:

³⁸ JUAN ANDRÉS *Confusión*, p. 113 (fol. 17v–18r/C v).

³⁹ *Liber Alcorani*, p. 806.

dixit Zamakhsharī quod Deus dixit hoc quod Coraxistae reprobaverunt Mah. qui posuit ut et omnibus diis non esset nisi solus unus sicut dixit libro 3 capite 19 uers. 4⁴⁰

Zamakhsharī said that God said that the Qurayš reprimanded Muḥammad who stated that instead of all the gods there was just one as it is said in book 3, chapter 19, verse 4.

Like Juan Andrés before him and Lope Obregón after him, Juan Gabriel indicates that according to the dwellers of Mecca, Muḥammad was a sorcerous liar, and all three authors link that accusation with the fact that he was preaching monotheism. Nevertheless, although Juan Gabriel was certainly familiar with Juan Andrés' gloss on this passage, the former discusses the verses in the correct order whereas the latter reverses them. While Juan Gabriel and Juan Andrés, at least part of the time, consulted the original Arabic text of the cited passages (as shown by Andrés' citation of "ḥadīṭ" passages in Arabic), Obregón does not seem to have done so – at least not in most cases – and instead copies garbled passages directly from Juan Andrés. Based on the transliterations and loose translations offered by Obregón, we can surmise that he did not possess a level of Arabic sufficient to read and understand the Arabic text directly without the help of other translations like that of Juan Andrés, and he may not have consulted the text directly at all. Juan Gabriel, by contrast, read the text in the original and did not need to rely on Juan Andrés, even if he did consult his text.⁴¹

Thus we can find telling passages where Obregón repeats idiosyncrasies and errors found in Juan Andrés' text, errors that probably resulted from Juan Andrés' practice of citing texts at least partly by memory.⁴² For example, in speaking about the doctrine of the resurrection of animals as expressed in Qur'ān 6, 38,⁴³ Juan writes the following:

El ochavo argomento es lo que dize libro primero capítulo cinqueno y libro quarto 'capítulo de quoguerat', donde dize que todos los animales brutos resucitarán en el día del juicio y que Dios juzgará entre ellos ... las palabras del 'Alcorán' en arávigio dizen así: 'guame mindebetinfiler di guale tayrin⁴⁴ yatiro bigeneheyhi ille umemun amçelquuum me farratne filquitebi min seyn çumen ile rabihim yohsarum, que quiere dezir que todas las bestias de la tierra y todas las aves que con sus alas bolan resucitarán en el día del juicio.⁴⁵

40 Ibid.

41 STARCZEWSKA 2015, p. 225 sq.

42 LARSON 1981, p. 26.

43 'There is no creature that crawls on the face of the earth, no bird on the wing, but they are nations like you. We have not neglected any matter in this Book, and then to God they shall be mustered'.

44 In JUAN ANDRÉS *Confusión*, p. 147, the editors mistakenly transcribe this word on fol. 37v/E VIII as "cayrin".

45 JUAN ANDRÉS *Confusión*, p. 147 (fol. 37v/E VIII).

The eighth argument is what is said in book one, fifth chapter, and book four in the ‘Quogerat chapter’, where it says that all the brute animals will be resurrected on the Day of Judgment and that God will judge among them ... the words of the Qur’ān in Arabic read thus: ‘Wa-mā min dābbatin fī l-arḍi wa-lā ṭā’irin yaṭīru bi-ḡanāḡayhi illā umamun amṭālukum mā farraṭnā fī l-kitābi min ṣay’in ṭumma ilā rabbihim yuḡṣarūn’, which means that all the beasts of the earth and all the birds that fly with wings will be resurrected on the Day of Judgment.

Obregón seems to follow Juan Andrés closely here, writing:

Dixo en su alcoran libro primero y capitulo quinto, y en el libro quarto y capitulo de Cogerat, que enel dia del juyzio resucitaran todos los animales y todas las aues, lo qual va diziendo el testo en arabigo assi. ‘guame min debetin filerdi guale tayrin yatiro bigenehe yhi ille vmenun / amçelquuum / mefarat nefilquetebi / min / seyn çumen ille rabihih yoh sarum’. Que quiere dezir, quel dia del juyzio resucitaran todos los animales y aues.⁴⁶

He said in his Qur’ān, book one fifth chapter, and in book four, ‘Cogerat chapter’, that on the Day of Judgment all the animals and birds will be resurrected, which the Arabic texts says thus ‘Wa-mā min dābbatin fī l-arḍi wa-lā ṭā’irin yaṭīru bi-ḡanāḡayhi illā umamun amṭālukum mā farraṭnā fī l-kitābi min ṣay’in ṭumma ilā rabbihim yuḡṣarūn’, which means that all the animals and birds will be resurrected on the Day of Judgment.

Again, Juan Gabriel also leaves a comment on this Qur’ānic passage, although the gloss as we presently have it is almost certainly a result of a later copyist’s abridgement:

Dicit multa ridicula in hoc uersu, quod omnia animalia resurgent in die iudicii una cum homine, et quod hoc est scriptum in libro Dei; et ratio huius, inquit Azam., quod animalia sunt similia hominibus (?) in anima, uita et opere, et quod ouis sine cornibus aut alio modo imperfectum animal queretur cuilibet (?) diu (?) quod eo modo factum sit⁴⁷

He says many ridiculous things in this verse, that all the animals will resurrect on the day of judgment together with mankind, and that this is written in God’s book; and the reason for that, according to Zamaḡṣarī, is that the animals are similar to men as far as their soul, life and deeds are concerned, and that a sheep without horns or an animal handicapped in other way will complain at length to whomever it happened this way (?).

It is impossible for us to know what the original gloss contained, but what is worth noticing is that all three authors decide to pick this particular Qur’ānic doctrine for commentary.

⁴⁶ LOPE DE OBREGÓN *Confutación*, fol. 71v. Similarly, Pérez de Chinchón copies this same passage from Juan in sermon seventeen of his *Antialcorano*: “Y dize mahoma en el libro primero capítulo quinzeno, y libro quarto capítulo de cogerat: que todas las bestias vernán a juyzio: y que dios juzgará entrellas”, BERNARDO PÉREZ DE CHINCHÓN *Antialcorano*, p. 281.

⁴⁷ *Liber Alcorani*, p. 803.

Juan Gabriel's annotation does not include Arabic text (although the Arabic text of the Qur'ān is preserved together with the translation) but Obregón's transliteration, like Juan Andrés', approximates the Arabic text, presenting no obvious misreading or distortion. Both transliterated texts reflect a graphic rendering of an oral pronunciation, and like Juan Andrés, Obregón transliterates "tūmma" – 'then' as "çumen". But what is most telling is the repetition of the phrase "libro cuatro capítulo de quoguerat", inserted by Juan Andrés. Although the editors of the *Confusión* could not identify this reference, Juan Andrés is clearly naming Surāh 49, called "al-ḥuḡarāt", and given his numbering system, 'book four' (which would begin at Surāh 38) would indeed include this Surāh. Nevertheless, nothing in "al-ḥuḡarāt" speaks of animals or resurrection at the Day of Judgment, making Juan's reference unclear. Obregón, however, copies his words, naming "libro quarto y capitulo de Cogerat" despite its apparent irrelevance here. The close correspondence of the transliterations and the repetition of errors strongly suggest that Obregón relied on Juan Andrés for many of his Arabic passages and translations, while also following his lead on many interpretations and arguments. He did not double check such references but merely repeated what Juan himself wrote.⁴⁸

5 Juan Martín de Figuerola's Independence from Juan Andrés and Dependence on Juan Gabriel

How does this compare with Martín de Figuerola? On the surface, certain similarities between Martín de Figuerola and Juan Andrés might indicate that the former followed the latter, and this would be logical, given their direct contact and Figuerola's praise of Andrés' expertise. The system for numbering qur'ānic Surāhs, for example, seems to correspond in all the authors considered here, as it is also how Egidio da Viterbo's Qur'ān and Martín de Figuerola's *Lumbre de fe* use the same a four-book system divided at the same places. A closer look at the texts in these cases, however, shows a separation between the authors because many of the telling errors or idiosyncrasies in Juan Andrés that are repeated in Obregón are not found in Figuerola or in Juan Gabriel's glosses.

To take the example of the resurrection of animals cited above, Figuerola does include the same passage named by Juan Andrés, Qur'ān 6, 38, which he also numbers as "libro primero capitulo cinqueno", adding the details "alea

⁴⁸ This conclusion reiterates, on the basis of a more direct comparison of Arabic translation and citation, the finding of EL KOLLI 1983, p. 328 and elsewhere.

treinta y nueve” as well. Figuerola, however, fails to add the second reference found in Juan Andrés referring to “libro quarto ‘capítulo de quoguerat’” (which was repeated by Obregón as “capítulo de Cogerat”). The transliteration in Figuerola is similarly quite different from the other two authors. After giving the Arabic in Arabic letters, he transliterates the text thus:

Guamemin debatin filardi guale tibirin yatiru bigane aille himamum amcelatum meffarrat nefi ylcquitabi mixain çuma ilarabirim yacxaruna’ quiere dezir ‘y no ay ningun animal en la tierra ni ave volando con sus alas que no sean resussitados como vosotros y nos no avemos faltado en el libro cosa alguna y después seran a su criador resucitados⁴⁹

Wa-mā min dābbatin fi l-arđi wa-lā ṭā’irin yaṭiru bi-ḡanāḡayhi illā umamun amṭālukum mā farratnā fi l-kitābi min ṣay’in ṭumma ilā rabbihim yuḡṣarūn’, which means ‘there is no animal on the earth nor bird flying with wings that will not be resurrected like you and we have not left anything out of the book, and afterword they will be resurrected to their creator.

As expected, this text is closely related to Juan Gabriel’s translation of Qur’ān 6, 38:

Et nullum animal est in terra neque auis uolans alis suis, quibus non sint generationes sicut uobis; et nos nihil detraximus de libro. Et postea erunt resuscitati a creatore suo⁵⁰

There is no animal on earth nor bird flying on its wing that would not have generations like yours; and we left nothing out of the book. They shall after be resurrected by their creator.

Like Martín de Figuerola’s text, Juan Gabriel’s translation leaves out the telling details found in Juan Andrés and Lope de Obregón (such as mention of the “Cogerat” chapter) while accurately translating other details left out by these authors (considered below).

The details of transliteration reveal fewer differences between the authors than the additions and deletions, although they still point to Martín de Figuerola’s independence. Like Juan Andrés and Lope de Obregón, Martín de Figuerola transliterates the letter “ṭā” in “ṭumma” as “ç”, but nevertheless he more accurately renders the word as “çuma”, despite the fact that the word itself was in fact mistakenly left out of the corresponding text in Arabic letters given just before the transliteration. Yet whereas Andrés and Obregón approximate “wa-lā ṭā’irin” – ‘no bird’ as “guale tayrin”, Martín de Figuerola renders this as “guale tabirin”, which does not correspond to any known word form (the verb “ṭabara” – ‘to leap upon or hide oneself’ would yield “ṭabran”, which in any case would make no sense here). However, this error could possibly be

49 JOAN MARTÍN DE FIGUEROLA *Lumbre*, fol. 16v–17r.

50 *Liber Alcorani*, p. 170 sq.

explained as a mistaken reading of the Arabic text based on confusing the “hamzah” below the line with dot below, which would mark the letter “bā” (and indeed the “hamzah” in the Arabic text of the manuscript is quite small and unclear and could easily be mistaken for a dot). Such a misreading seems to point to a limited understanding of the Arabic text by the transliterator.

Despite this transliteration error, however, Martín de Figuerola seems to understand and translate the passage properly, thus giving credit to Juan Gabriel as a good explicator of the Qur’ānic text. In their translations, Figuerola and Gabriel actually adhere closer than Juan Andrés to the Arabic text leaving out the term ‘Day of Judgment’, which is not mentioned in this verse, and simply including “después”, “et postea” in the Latin translation (‘afterward’, ‘then’) to match the Arabic “tūmma”. In addition, both include the phrase – not found in Juan Andrés and Lope de Obregón – ‘we have not left anything out of the book’. Finally, where Juan Andrés follows this passage with a reference to two specific “ḥadīṭ”-s supporting the idea that God will judge among the animals, both of which Obregón reproduces in identical order, Martín de Figuerola and Juan Gabriel include neither reference, and the former instead moves on to a direct appeal to his readers: “Mira hora proximo mio de moro y levanta los sentidos de tu alma y conose este error ...”. Careful comparison of Qur’ānic passages cited by all four authors shows a clear dependence of Lope de Obregón on Juan Andrés and, at the same time, Martín de Figuerola’s and Juan Gabriel’s closer reliance on actual content of the Qur’ān.

Another example of this divergence between, on one side, Martín de Figuerola and Juan Gabriel, and on the other, Juan Andrés and Lope de Obregón, can be found in the last chapter of Juan Andrés’ text (chapter twelve), which discusses the worldly success of Islam. Juan Andrés discusses the theme of martyrs in battle, stating:

Promete el ‘Alcorán’ que los moros que mueren en la pelea que no son muertos, antes dize que son bivros, los quales comen y beven. Esto lo dize capítulo primero, libro primero, y capítulo segundo, libro primero, en arávigo dize así: ‘gualte tehçibenne alledine cutelu ficebili jllehi am guetun bel ahyehun hinde rabbihim yorzacon’, que quiere dezir: ‘Non pensáys que los que mueren en la pelea que son muertos, antes son bivros con su Criador comiendo y beviendo’, por la qual cosa los moros quando pelean tanto quiren morir como bivir.⁵¹

The Qur’ān promises that the Moors who die in fighting are not dead, rather it says that they are alive, and they eat and drink. It says this in chapter one, book one, and in chapter two of book one, which in Arabic says: ‘wa-lā taḥṣabanna al-aḍina qutilū fi sabīli allāhi amwātan bal aḥyā’un ‘inda rabbihim yurzaqūna’, which means: ‘Do not think that those

51 JUAN ANDRÉS *Confusión*, p. 225 (fol. 84v/L VII).

who die while fighting are dead. Rather, they are alive, eating and drinking with their creator’. For this, the Moors, when they are fighting, want to die as much as to live.

Juan Andrés names both, “capítulo primero, libro primero, y capítulo segundo, libro primero”, by which he refers to Qur’ān 2, 154 and 3, 169, yet he actually only cites the latter. Lope de Obregón, however, follows Juan Andrés so closely here that he reproduces the latter verse in Arabic, he confuses Juan’s reference and mistakenly identifies it by the former number:

Les prometio su gloria a los que muriessen en las batallas, y despues desto se lo torno a prometer otra vez por otro capitulo que esta copilado enel libro primero y capitulo primero de su alcoran en arabigo dize assi. ‘gualc teħçibne alledine cutelu fiçebili illehi amguetun bel ahie hun hinde rabihin yorzacon’. Que quiere dezir, ‘no penseis que los que murieren en las batallas que seran muertos, antes estaran biuos con su criador comiendo y beuiendo’.⁵²

He promised glory to those who should die in battle, and after this he repeated it again in another chapter copied in book one, chapter one of the Qur’ān, which in Arabic says: ‘wa-lā taħsabanna al-ađina qutilū fi sabīli allāhi amwātā bal ahyā’u ‘inda rabbihim yurzaqūna’, which means ‘Do not think that those who shall die in battle will be dead. Rather, they will be alive, eating and drinking with their creator’.

Not only does Obregón copy Juan Andrés’ numbering in part, only to confuse it with the verse he and Andrés actually do cite. Obregón also adopts Juan Andrés’ particular additions that were included in his translation.

A fair rendering of Qur’ān 3, 169 is ‘Do not imagine those killed in the path of God to be dead. Rather, they are alive with their Lord, enjoying His bounty’.⁵³ Juan interprets ‘in the path of God’ as ‘those fighting’, and renders “yurzaqūna” – literally ‘they are given provision’ – logically as ‘eating and drinking’. Obregón adopts both of these interpretations in his own translation. Moreover, the verse that Juan Andrés cites just one page before this passage, is Qur’ān 48, 18, a verse that Lope de Obregón similarly cites just before this passage. If that were not evidence enough, both Andrés and Obregón follow the citation of Qur’ān 3, 169 with reference to the same “ḥadiṯ”, affirming that Muslims who die natural deaths wish to return to the world to be able to die fighting. Once again, Obregón’s reliance on Andrés, not only for general content but also as a model for choices in translation, is abundantly in evidence.

Surprisingly, Juan Gabriel also makes the same comment on Qur’ān 2, 154:

Dicunt quod Machom. asseueravit sancte Mauris quod illi qui moriuntur in bello, non reuera interficiuntur sed uidetur tantum, et edunt et comedunt cum Deo⁵⁴

⁵² LOPE DE OBREGÓN *Confutación*, fol. 40v.

⁵³ *The Qur’an*, p. 58.

⁵⁴ *Liber Alcorani*, p. 782.

They say that Muḥammad's dutifully assured the Moors that those who die in battle are not really killed, although they seem to be, «rather» they eat and feast with God.

But then Juan Gabriel provides a different gloss for Qur'ān 3, 169:

Dicitur in Zunna quod illi qui moriuntur in bello pro amore Dei, quod caro eorum lucebit ut sol in paradiso. Propterea prohibet ne laentur corpora eorum, et multa alia deliria addunt, inter quae dicunt quod illi qui iam sunt in paradiso uellent iterum redire ad mundum ut iterum morerentur propter amorem Dei. Et Alfachini in proeliis canunt semper istos uersus et illa alia ex Zunna cum ineunt proelium contra Christianos⁵⁵

They say in the 'Sunnah' that those who die for God's sake in battle, that their flesh will glow like the sun in paradise. For this reason, he forbids them to wash their bodies. And they add many other nonsensical things, among which they say that those who are already in paradise want to come back to Earth and die again on account of their love for God. And the 'faqīhs' ['Fuqahā'] always sing those verses and other «fragments» from the 'Sunnah' in battles when they go to fight against Christians.

Apart from this “ḥadīṭ”, we can further distinguish Martín de Figuerola from Juan Andrés and Obregón in the former's different presentation of Qur'ān 3, 169. After citing the Arabic text in Arabic letters, he transliterates and comments upon the text, which he numbers as 'book one, chapter two, verse 167', thus:

'Guale taxibuna aladina qutilu fiza bili yllia anguetu bala ayeu ibda rabiduru Juḥamuna'. Y no penseis que aquello que son muertos por amor de dios que son finados; ciertamente ellos son bivos con su creador mantenidos, aquí dizen los glosadores que estos se entienden que mueren en las peleas defendiendo su secta.⁵⁶

'wa-lā taḥsabanna al-aḏīna qutilū fī sabili allāhi amwātā bal aḥyā'u 'inda rabbihim yurzaqūna'. Do not think that those that are dead for love of God are dead. Truly they are alive with their Creator, sustained. The glossers say that these are understood as those who die in fights defending their sect.

Martín de Figuerola renders the passages in transliteration differently from Juan Andrés and Lope de Obregón, in particular in the last word “juḥamuna”, a rendering of “yurzaqūna”, in which the “rā” in the first syllable is confused with the “zāyn” that follows it (so “yurza-” becomes “juḥara-”) and the “qāf” that follows that is misread as a “mīm” (so “-qūna” becomes “-muna”). While this presents its own problems of interpretation and again suggests a disconnection between the oral reading offered by Martín de Figuerola and the comprehension of the text, it in any case also points again to the fact that he did not rely on Juan

⁵⁵ Ibid., p. 794.

⁵⁶ JOAN MARTÍN DE FIGUEROLA *Lumbre*, fol. 22r.

Andrés for his transliterations and he was not followed in his transliterations by Obregón. Despite his garbled transliteration, and despite the fact that he does mention “comer y beber” before giving the Arabic text, Martín de Figuerola more correctly translates “yurzaqūna” as “mantenidos”, thus carefully distinguishing the qur’ānic text from what the ‘glossers’ interpret – a distinction that Juan Andrés and Obregón do not observe when discussing this word.

If these comparisons leave any doubt about our argument that Juan Andrés and Lope de Obregón form a coherent group while Martín de Figuerola operated apart from them with assistance of Juan Gabriel, one further example, unmistakable in its implications, can be found in the case of a confused qur’ānic citation about Jesus offered by Juan Andrés. The passage, which appears in the work of all three authors, is a portion of Qur’ān 5, 45 sq. (“al-Mā’idah” – ‘The Table Spread’), which in the modern English can be rendered as follows (with the key words to be discussed underlined):

45 ... Whoso judges not in accordance with what God revealed, these are the wrongdoers.
 46. Following upon their tracks We sent Jesus son of Mary, confirming what he already possessed of the Torah. To him We revealed the Evangel in which there is guidance and light, confirming what was in his hands of the Torah, a guidance and homily to the pious.⁵⁷

Juan Andrés offers a garbled version of the two parts of this passage given underlined, with which he mixes at least one other verse from elsewhere in the Qur’ān. His text reads:

En el cuarto capítulo libro primero, dize en arávigo así: ‘gua atenne hice bunu mariama aligile nuron guahunde y sifebu lineci guamen leniyahuquum bime anzale allah favley que hunmu adalimon’, que quiere dezir: ‘Nos, Dios, avemos dado los ‘Evangelios’ a Jesucristo, camino de luz y saludo para los hombres y los que no sometrán a lo que Dios decendió, aquéllos serán dannados’⁵⁸

In the fourth chapter, book one, it says in Arabic thus: ‘wa-ataynā ‘isā ibnu maryama [!] al-inğīla nūrun wa-hudan wa-šifā’un li-n-nāsi wa-man lam yaḥkum bi-mā anzala llāh fa-ulā’ika humu z-zzālimūn’, which means ‘We God have given the Gospels to Jesus, path of light and healing for men, and those who do not submit to what God handed down, they will be damned’.

In order to make sense of this passage, we have to rearrange the two corresponding verses underlined, putting Qur’ān 5, 45 after Qur’ān 5, 46, and also reverse the expression “hudan wa-nūrun” – ‘guidance and light’. We also need to tweak some verses, delete others, and add a phrase from elsewhere in the Qur’ān. First, in the

⁵⁷ *The Qur’an*, p. 89.

⁵⁸ JUAN ANDRÉS *Confusión*, p. 211 (fol. 76r/v/K VII).

Arabic text, Juan Andrés puts the name of Jesus after the verb “wa-ataynā” – ‘we gave’, yet leaves out the preposition “bi-“ – ‘to’, although Jesus is the indirect object in the translation. This makes the passage ungrammatical (akin to saying ‘we gave he’). Second, he adds the words “wa-šifā’un li-n-nāsi” – ‘and a healing to the people’, taken from a different verse. This expression can be found in Qur’ān 16, 69 (“an-Nahl” – ‘The Bee’) as a description of honey. The word ‘healing’ is associated with ‘guidance’ in yet another verse, Qur’ān 41, 44, in which the Qur’ān itself is a “hudan wa-šifā’un”. Juan Andrés has strung together Qur’ān 16, 69 with Qur’ān 5, 45 sq., perhaps by ways of associating words through Qur’ān 41, 44, rearranging the text along the way.

It is thus very telling that this same construction can be found in Lope de Obregón, whose rendition reads:

Se copilo en su alcoran libro primero y capitulo quarto: y va en arauigo diziendo assi. ‘gua atenne biçebun mariame / nuron guahunde / hisefebu lineçiguamen limiahquun / ançelne allah faule / y quehummu adalimon’. Que quiere dezir (como que Dios lo dezia) nos Dios auemos embiado a Iesu Christo hijo de Maria con los euangelios, luz, salud y buen camino para las gentes: y los que no se someteran alo que Dios embio, seran juzgados y castigados.⁵⁹

They wrote in their Qur’ān book one chapter four, which says in Arabic ‘wa-ataynā bi-‘isā ibnu maryama [‘al-inğīla’ missing here] nūrun wa-hudan wa-šifā’un li-n-nāsi wa-man lam yaḥkum [‘bi-mā’ missing here] anzala llāh fa-ulā’ika humu z-zzālīmūn’, which means (as if God were speaking) ‘we God have sent Jesus Christ son of Mary with the Gospels – light, healing and a good path for the people. And those who do not submit to what God sent, will be judged and punished’.

As the translation above makes evident, Obregón repeats Juan’s particular combination of verses, including both the inversion of pieces of Qur’ān 5, 45 and Qur’ān 5, 46 and the introduction of “hisefebu lineçi” that is “wa-šifā’un li-l-nāsi” – ‘healing to the people’. These telling details can only be explained by recognizing that Obregón relied on Juan Andrés as a model for incorporating Qur’ānic material. The few missing words from Obregón’s text (‘the gospels’) might indicate that Obregón did not understand the Arabic material he was citing, although his translation does reflect the idea that Jesus was sent ‘with the Gospels’ (“auemos embiado a Iesu Christo ... con los euangelios”) and not that the Gospels were sent to Jesus.

⁵⁹ LOPE DE OBREGÓN *Confutación*, fol. 11r. Pérez de Chinchón repeats this same string of adjectives in sermon eleven and thirteen, betraying his reliance on Juan as well: “el mesmo libro [sc. “primero”] capítulo quarto dize ‘ ... ’ que quiere dezir ‘nos dios havemos dado los evangelios a Iesu christo camino y luz y salud para los hombres: y los que no se someterán a lo que dios descendió aquéllos serán condenados””, BERNARDO PÉREZ DE CHINCHÓN *Antialcorano*, p. 190 (our emphasis underlined) and repeated virtually word-for-word *ibid.*, p. 215.

By contrast, Juan Gabriel’s translation of Qur’ān 5, 45 sq. yet again adheres closely to the Arabic text:

Et qui non iudicant per ea, quae Deus detulit, illi sunt iniuriantes. Et misimus post eos Iesum, filium Mariae, uerum cum quod habet in manibus de lege, cui dedimus Euangelia, quae sunt uia et lux et ueritas legis, et uia et admonitio iustis⁶⁰

And they who do not judge by what God revealed, they are wrongdoers. And we sent after them Jesus, son of Mary, true with what he had in his hands of the law, to whom we gave the Gospels, which are a path and light and truth of the law, and a path and warning to the just.

Martín de Figuerola and Juan Gabriel, in contrast to both Juan Andrés and Obregón, do not cite Juan Andrés’ peculiar combination of verses, even though they do cite, fairly accurately, the first part of Qur’ān 5, 46. Figuerola’s Arabic text of this passage likewise corresponds to the standard qur’ānic text, although it can be seen that his numbers are the same as Juan Andrés’ and Obregón’s, albeit with the added details of the “ayāt” numbers (“libro primero capitulo quarto ‘alea cinquenta’”). Figuerola transliterates and translates this passage thus:

‘Guacafayne ala exiriim bi isa abnu mariama muçadi felmine bayna yadai mina altaurata gaetyne ulingili’. Quiere dezir: ‘y havemos enviado empues dellos a Jesus hijo de María verdadero en la que truxo en sus manos de la Thora y de los Evangelios’⁶¹

‘Wa-qaffaynā ‘alā itārihim bi-‘isā ibnu maryama muşaddifan [sc. ‘muşaddiqan’] li-mā bayna yadayhi min at-ttawratī wa-ataynāhu al-inğīla’, which means ‘we have sent after them Jesus, son of Mary, true in what he brought in his hands of the Torah and the Gospels’.

Martín de Figuerola’s translation (unlike Juan Gabriel’s) does not take account of the last phrase, ‘we gave him the Gospels’, instead conflating this with the previous phrase. However, this defect in Figuerola’s translation does not spring from any misquotation of the text itself. Unlike Juan Andrés before him and Lope de Obregón after, Figuerola copies the verse in order both in Arabic letters and in transliteration. Most importantly, neither Martín de Figuerola nor Juan Gabriel adds the detail found in Juan Andrés and Lope de Obregón that God sent a ‘healing’ (“šifā’un”/“salud”) as well as a path and guidance.

The only strange exception to Figuerola’s correct citation and translation is the confusion of a letter “fā” for a “qā” in the word “muşaddifan” – ‘confirming’, rendering it senseless (as “muşaddifan”) in transliteration. The problem springs from the Arabic text itself, which not only confuses the letters, but also splits the word over two lines leaving the “-fan” – which should be “-qan” – at the start of a

⁶⁰ *Liber Alcorani*, p. 149 sq.

⁶¹ JOAN MARTÍN DE FIGUEROLA *Lumbre*, fol. 50v.

new one. This leads Martín de Figuerola to link the sound with the next word in his transliteration, yielding “muçadi felmine” rather than “muşaddiқан li-mā”. This link between errors in the Arabic script and the transliteration suggests again, as did the example cited above of the misreading of the “hamzah” below the line as a dot indicating the letter “bā”, that the transliteration depended on the Arabic script as written in the manuscript. It thus seems most likely that the manuscript was copied in the order it is presented, with the Arabic text being written down and then the transliteration and translation following it, rather than the Arabic text being added in at a later time after the rest of the text. The fact that the Arabic script always seems to fit perfectly in the space between other text also supports this interpretation. As Soto González and Starczewska have noted about the *Lumbre de fe*, ‘the inaccuracy of the Arabic script and the poor quality of the transcription’ are striking,⁶² especially given the reliance of the transliteration on the Arabic text as copied. In any case, Martín de Figuerola’s error in the Arabic text and transliteration is not reflected in either Andrés’ text or in Obregón’s, just as the errors that these latter two share are not reflected in the former. All evidence seems to point to Martín de Figuerola as an outlier among the *Antialcoranes*, a faithful copier of the Qur’ān, assisted by the knowledgeable convert Juan Gabriel, who himself does not reproduce Juan Andrés’ error.

6 The Aura of Aurality

Juan Andrés is unique in comparison with previous translations of the Qur’ān and with much earlier anti-Muslim polemical texts because he includes abundant material in transliteration, paying explicit attention to the sound of the text when read aloud. The way he renders that sound provides a concrete basis on which to determine his alliances with and divergences from other authors citing the same material. Numerous critics have affirmed the oral basis of his Arabic texts, although the reason for this use of transliteration is not certain and continues to be debated. Shifting and peculiar transliterations might indicate that Juan Andrés was citing everything from memory, but the abundant references to ‘book’ and ‘chapter’ numbers (and not only Surāh names) also point to the consultation of a written copy.⁶³ However, the preponderance of Arabic

⁶² SOTO GONZÁLEZ/STARCZEWSKA 2016, p. 215.

⁶³ Everette E. Larson has studied the transliteration system in the 1515 Castilian edition of the *Confusión* of Juan Andrés, proposing that Juan Andrés was transcribing based on an oral presentation of the text, that the text was cited from memory and not according to a written copy of the Qur’ān, that the transliteration system is ‘regular and follows the established

terms and phrases that would be familiar to practicing Muslims is not limited to Qur’anic textual material, but also makes reference to his general discussion of aspects of Islamic faith and history, in which Juan Andrés regularly includes Arabic terms. Already in the first chapter, he names the “Sunnah” (“Çuna”) which includes “ḥadīṭ” material, and the *Sīra* or early biography of Muḥammad, “un libro que se llama ‘Azear’, un libro muy auténtico entre los moros”.⁶⁴ He not only includes text from the Qur’ān, but also constantly peppers his writing with other Arabic terms from Islamic belief and practice that would be familiar to virtually any Muslim – for example “Alcabba y Alquible” – “al-ka’bah and “al-qiblah”, the central shrine in Mecca and mosque structure indicating the direction toward it, respectively – or “Beytillah alharan” – “bayt al-ḥarām”, another name for the Great Mosque of Mecca, or “alhage” – “al-ḥaḡḡ”, the obligatory pilgrimage to Mecca.⁶⁵ Juan Andrés includes dozens of such words in transliteration (“jadde alarab”, i. e. ḡadd al-‘arab – ‘grandfather of the Arabs’; “Quiteb alannar”, i. e. “kitāb al-anwār” – ‘book of flowers’; “çufefe”, i. e. “sufahā” – ‘fools’; “alhagera alazhade”, i. e. “al-ḥaḡar al-aswad” – “the black stone” etc.).⁶⁶ In this way the text aims to represent what his Morisco audience, even an illiterate or semi-literate one, could have recognized from an experience of Islamic practice and prayer. The presence of Arabic certainly functions as, in Soto González and Starczewska’s words, an ‘authoritative rhetorical token’,⁶⁷ a manner of evoking an aura of Islamic authenticity, even though it is made in the service of an anti-Islamic argument. It captures the fundamentally aural reality of Islam for Moriscos, a reality of hearing and repeating snippets of Arabic but less often producing it out of whole cloth. Juan’s evocation of the sound of the names and terms plays as important a role in his polemical strategy as his demonstration of knowledge of Islamic history and text.

patterns of Arabic’ (LARSON 1981, p. 190) and that the transcriptions follow what seems to be a regular pronunciation that betrays certain characteristics such as a consistent identification of classical Arabic’s long vowels but not always the short ones. Larson concludes that the transliterations offer ‘an insight into the phonological transcription of [classical Arabic] as pronounced by a Valencian native speaker’ (ibid., p. 197). We do not disagree, but doubts about Juan Andrés’ identity lead us to wonder whether that native speaker must be assumed to be a former Muslim from Xàtiva and could not have been, just as well, a Christian from the area who learned Arabic from such a native speaker in this context.

64 JUAN ANDRÉS *Confusión*, p. 91 (fol. 3v/A III) and p. 98 (fol. 8v/B III).

65 Ibid., p. 98 (fol. 9r/B III) and 100 (fol. 10r/B v). These were noted by SOTO GONZÁLEZ/STARCEWSKA 2016, p. 208.

66 JUAN ANDRÉS *Confusión*, p. 101 (fol. 10r/B v), 101 sq. (fol. 10v–11r/B v) and 105 (fol. 13r/B VIII).

67 SOTO GONZÁLEZ/STARCEWSKA 2016, p. 209.

Juan Andrés in fact explicitly addresses the importance of sound in the Qur'ān, recognizing it as a key element in Muslim experience and practice. Rather than insulting or dismissing its sound, he mimics it, trying to give the same flavor to his own text through transliterations not only of Qur'ānic text, but also of words from daily practice among Muslims. And he confronts the value of the sound of Arabic not by rejecting or criticizing it, but by presenting it as a first step to understanding beyond which a learned Muslim is obliged to progress. He addresses the Muslim who is carried away by the sound of the Qur'ān without thinking about what the text says:

Pues dime tú, moro y leydor del 'Alcorán', ¿quántas vezes leeste este passo y deleytaste del dulce sono del dicho passo y no pensate en las palabras? Pues mira de oy adelante y lee y considera en lo que leerás, que muchas cosas fuera de razón y justicia fallarás⁶⁸

Tell me, Muslim, reader of the Qur'ān, how many times have you read this passage and enjoyed the sweet sound of the passage but did not think about the words? Look from now on and read and consider what you are reading, and you will find many things beyond the limits of reason and justice.

This turns out to be another key point on which Juan was not followed by Martín de Figuerola, who, as Soto González and Starczewska note, 'sees in [the Qur'ān's] versified form a clear sign of its inauthenticity, engaging again with classical Christian polemical debate, commenting that 'it looks like at the end of the world God turned into a songster'.⁶⁹ In disparaging the Qur'ān only as a sing-song of verses with authority but lacking appeal, he does not recognize the aura the Qur'ān's sound and thus did not incorporate it in his missionizing strategy. In this, Martín de Figuerola resembles the way that the thirteenth-century Dominican Ramon Martí treated the authorities he proffered from the non-Christian sources – while Juan Andrés, to follow the comparison, might be compared to Martí's contemporary and rival, Ramon Llull, who went so far as to even compose some of his texts in Arabic to better speak to his desired audience. Interestingly, Juan Andrés' recognition of the power of the sound of Arabic was also not something much copied by Lope de Obregón.⁷⁰ When he cites the same verse that led Juan Andrés to remark on the "dulce sono", he

⁶⁸ JUAN ANDRÉS *Confusión*, p. 169 (fol. 51r/G v1).

⁶⁹ SOTO GONZÁLEZ/STARCZEWSKA 2016, p. 218. The passage they refer to is "Parece que dios en la fin del mundo se hiciera copleador", JOAN MARTÍ DE FIGUEROLA *Lumbre*, fol. 9v.

⁷⁰ EL KOLLI 1983, p. 328: "La première constatation qui s'impose à nous, c'est le manque de textes arabes transcrits dès qu'Obregón fait preuve d'originalité par rapport à Andrés. La deuxième c'est l'exploitation différente que chacun d'eux firent des énoncés qui autorisaient l'emploi de la force vers les Incroyants".

makes no such appeal, and no similar attitude toward the power of sound is found in any of Obregón’s remarks. This is not surprising in a writer who had limited or no ability in Arabic, it also points to Martín de Figuerola’s limited competence in this language and his absolute reliance on Juan Gabriel’s translations and explanations. Therefore, like Ramon Martí, who knew his languages, but who only recognized the authoritative power held by their content, Martín de Figuerola ignored the aural appeal of his many qur’anic quotations.

7 Conclusion. The *Antialcoranes* as a Source for Qur’ān Translation History

The abundant Arabic found in the *Antialcoranes* literature deserves to be studied not only in the context of the history of polemical writing against Muslims, but also as an important source informing the translation of the Qur’ān in the early modern period. Despite certain evidence of Romance translations of the Qur’ān among Christians in the late fourteenth to mid-fifteenth century, the earliest surviving translations of the Qur’ān into Romance are those circulating among Mudéjar and Morisco populations. Bridging the gap between these two separate streams of Romance translation, the Christian and the Muslim, is the figure of Juan Andrés, the converted “alfaqui” who worked in the service of undermining Islam as part of the Christian evangelization effort of the early sixteenth century. While Juan Gabriel’s translation is almost certainly based on a previous Romance version, it is Juan Andrés’ anti-Muslim *Confusión* that offers to a vast group of polemical writers transliterations and translations of Arabic material. All of the *Antialcoranes* of the sixteenth century and beyond, including those that do not include Arabic text, recognize Juan Andrés as a foundational source.⁷¹

⁷¹ A question remains about whether Muslim authors knew of or made any use of Juan Andrés or any other of the *Antialcoranes*. While direct evidence for such reliance is scarce, one interesting point of comparison could be the Qur’ān translated and written in Latin characters by the Morisco Ibrahim Izquierdo in the so-called ‘Qur’ān of Thessaloniki’ (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Ms. arabe 447), which is only one of two known Morisco Qur’āns copied in Latin characters. Because the text is dated to 1569, it falls outside of the period of composition of the *Antialcoranes* (which ended with Obregón’s *Confutación* in 1555), but the possible knowledge of the author of earlier anti-qur’anic texts – unlikely in the present authors’ opinion – remains uncertain. On the text see MARTÍNEZ DE CASTILLA MUÑOZ 2010.

A comparison of Juan's treatment of Arabic with that of subsequent Christian authors – in particular Martín de Figuerola and Lope de Obregón, the two other authors of the period who include Arabic and Qur'ān translations in their anti-Muslim writing – shows that the *Antialcoranes* make use of Juan Andrés' text in divergent ways. While Lope de Obregón, writing four decades after Juan Andrés, relies on Juan's *Confusión* throughout his work for Arabic material and for translations, Martín de Figuerola, an extremely belligerent and polemical writer,⁷² prefers to rely on sources from Islamic tradition provided to him by Juan Gabriel. Despite his advanced knowledge, Martín de Figuerola's treatment of Arabic material, both in attitude and in method, is strikingly different from Juan Andrés'. This marks Figuerola's *Lumbre de fe* apart from the rest of the texts in the *Antialcoranes* genre, including not only the *Confutación* of Lope de Obregón but also the sermons of Martín García and the *Antialcorano* of Bernardo Pérez de Chinchón. Juan Andrés' long-lasting fame among writers on Islam in subsequent centuries contrasts with the total oblivion into which Martín de Figuerola disappeared. It is significant that his text was never printed. This was in part a result of the technical impossibility of printing such extensive Arabic texts. However, it was also due to the fact that Figuerola wrote in a very aggressive manner – aggressive both for Muslims themselves and also for the noblemen in Aragón and València who wanted to preserve their 'Moors' in Islam. He wrote in favor of the compulsory conversion of the Muslims of Aragón, which was officially decreed to the dismay of many, soon after he finished writing his book. Because of such factors, Figuerola has never obtained the attention that he and his work merit. Nevertheless, he, no less than Juan Andrés and his followers, deserves a prominent place in the history of the translation of the Qur'ān. Although their works were received quite differently, both Juan Andrés and Martín de Figuerola, as well as those who worked with them or copied them, stand at the center of a long tradition of translation that runs from the first Latin text of Robert of Ketton to the late proto-orientalist writings of figures such as Ludovico Marracci, Gonzálo de Santalla and Juan Manuel Traggia de Santo-Tomás de Aquino.

72 See GARCÍA-ARENAL RODRÍGUEZ 2018.

Bibliography

Texts

BERNARDO PÉREZ DE CHINCHÓN *Antialcorano*

BERNARDO PÉREZ DE CHINCHÓN: *Antialcorano*, ed. FRANCISCO PONS FUSTER: *Bernardo Pérez de Chinchón, Antialcorano. Diálogos cristianos*. Conversión y evangelización de Moriscos. Estudio preliminar, transcripción y notas, Alicante 2000, 71–383.

AL-BUHĀRĪ *ağ-Ġāmi‘u ‘ş-şahīḥ*

MUḤAMMAD IBN ISMĀ‘ĪL IBN IBRĀHĪM IBN AL-MUĠĪRA AL-BUHĀRĪ AL-ĠU‘FĪ: *ağ-Ġāmi‘u ‘ş-şahīḥ*, trad. MUḤAMMALD MUḤSIN KHĀN: *The translation of the meanings of Şahīḥ al-Bukhārī* 1–9, Riyadh 1997.

El Corán

El Corán, ed. CONSUELO LÓPEZ-MORILLAS: *El Corán de Toledo*. Edición y estudio del manuscrito 235 de la Biblioteca de Castilla-La Mancha (Bibliotheca Arabo-Romanica et Islamica 5), Gijón 2011, 135–557.

JOAN MARTÍ DE FIGUEROLA *Lumbre*

JOAN MARTÍ DE FIGUEROLA: *Lumbre de fe contra la secta mahometana y el alcorán* (Madrid, Biblioteca de la Real Academia de la Historia, Colección Gayangos, Ms. 19–36, fol. 1ra–247rb).

JUAN ANDRÉS *Confusión*

JUAN ANDRÉS: *Confusión*, ed. ELISA RUIZ GARCÍA/MARÍA ISABEL GARCÍA-MONGE: *Juan Andrés, Confusión o confutación de la secta Mahomética y del Alcorán*. Estudio preliminar, edición y notas (La Biblioteca de Barcarrota 5), Mérida 2003, 87–237.

Liber Alcorani

Liber Alcorani, ed. KATARZYNA STARCZEWSKA: *Latin translation of the Qur‘ān (1518/1621) commissioned by Egidio da Viterbo*. Critical edition and case study (Diskurse der Arabistik 24), Wiesbaden 2018, 5–813.

Liber Scale Machometi

Liber Scale Machometi, ed. JOSÉ MUÑOZ SENDINO: *La Escala de Mahoma*. Traducción del árabe al castellano, latín y francés, ordenada por Alfonso X el Sabio. Edición, introducción y notas, Madrid 1949, 251–488.

LOPE DE OBREGÓN *Confutación*

LOPE DE OBREGÓN: *Confutación del alcoran y secta mahometana*, ed. *Confutación del alcoran y secta mahometana, sacado de sus propios libros y de la vida del mesmo Mahoma*, Granada 1555, 5v–72r.

MARCUS TOLETANUS *Alchoranus latinus*

MARCUS CANONICUS TOLETANUS: *Alchoranus latinus*, ed. NĀDIA PETRUS [I] PONS: *Alchoranus latinus quem transtulit Marcus canonicus Toletanus*. Estudio y edición crítica (Nueva Roma 44), Madrid 2016, 5–399.

MARTÍN GARCÍA *Sermones*

MARTÍN GARCÍA: *Sermones*, ed. *Sermones eminentissimi totiusque Barchinonensis gregis tutoris acerrimi, necnon immarcessibilis sacre theologie paludamento insigniti Martini Garsie*, Zaragoza 1520, 1–477.

The Qur'an

The Qur'an, trad. TARIF KHALIDI: *The Qur'an*. A new translation (Penguin Classics), London 2008, 3–525.

Studies

ADANG e. a.

Translating sacred texts in medieval and early modern Iberia, ed. by CAMILLA ADANG e. a., Leiden (forthcoming).

D'ALVERNY 1947–1948

MARIE-THÉRÈSE D'ALVERNY: “Deux traductions latines du Coran au Moyen Âge”, in *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Âge* 16 (1947–1948) 69–131 [repr. in D'ALVERNY 1994, n° I].

D'ALVERNY 1956

MARIE-THÉRÈSE D'ALVERNY: “Quelques manuscrits de la ‘Collectio Toletana’” in CONSTABLE/KRITZECK 1956, 202–218 [repr. in D'ALVERNY 1994, n° IV].

D'ALVERNY 1994

MARIE-THÉRÈSE D'ALVERNY (t): *La connaissance de l'Islam dans l'Occident médiéval*, ed. by CHARLES BURNETT (Collected Studies Series 445), Aldershot 1994.

ARIAS TORRES 1998

JUAN PABLO ARIAS [TORRES]: “Apuntes para una historia de traducción del Corán al español”, in *Trans. Revista de traductología* 2 (1998) 173–176.

ARIAS TORRES 1999

JUAN PABLO ARIAS [TORRES]: “Apuntes para una historia de traducción del Corán al español (II)”, in *Trans. Revista de traductología* 3 (1999) 131 sq.

ARIAS TORRES 2007

JUAN PABLO ARIAS TORRES: “Bibliografía sobre las traducciones del Alcorán en el ámbito hispano”, in *Trans. Revista de traductología* 11 (2007) 261–272.

BOBZIN 2014

HARTMUT BOBZIN: “Observaciones sobre Juan Andrés y su libro ‘Confusion dela secta mahomatica’ (València, 1515)”, in FERRERO HERNÁNDEZ/DE LA CRUZ PALMA 2014, 209–222.

BINARK/EREN 1986

ISMET BINARK/HALIT EREN: *World bibliography of translations of the meanings of the Holy Qur'an*. Printed translations 1515–1980 (Research Centre for Islamic History, Art and Culture. Bibliographical Series 1), Istanbul 1986.

DE BUNES IBARRA 1989a

MIGUEL ÁNGEL DE BUNES IBARRA: “El enfrentamiento con el islam en el Siglo de Oro. Los Antialcoranes”, in *Edad de oro* 8 (1989) 41–58.

DE BUNES IBARRA 1989b

MIGUEL ÁNGEL DE BUNES IBARRA: *La imagen de los musulmanes y del Norte de África en la España de los siglos XVI y XVII*. Los caracteres de una hostilidad, Madrid 1989.

BURMAN 2007

THOMAS EARL BURMAN: *Reading the Qur'an in Latin Christendom, 1140–1560* (Material Texts), Philadelphia (Pa.) 2007.

CARDAILLAC 1979

LOUIS CARDAILLAC: *Moriscos y cristianos*. Un enfrentamiento polémico (1492–1640) (Sección de obras de historia), Madrid e. a. 1979 [México D.F. 2004].

CECINI 2012

ULISSE CECINI: *Alcoranus latinus*. Eine sprachliche und kulturwissenschaftliche Analyse der Koranübersetzungen von Robert von Ketton und Marcus von Toledo (Geschichte und Kultur der Iberischen Welt 10), Berlin 2012.

COLOMINAS APARICIO 2018

MÓNICA COLOMINAS APARICIO: “Profecía, conversión y polémica islamocristiana en la Iberia tempranomoderna (siglo xv). Alfonso de Jaén y el círculo del obispo Don Martín García”, in GARCÍA-ARENAL RODRÍGUEZ/PASTORE 2018, 51–77.

CONSTABLE/KRITZECK 1956

Petrus Venerabilis 1156–1956. Studies and texts commemorating the eighth centenary of his death, ed. by GILES CONSTABLE/JAMES KRITZECK (Studia Anselmiana 40), Roma 1956.

DURAN I GRAU 1998

EULÀLIA DURAN [I GRAU]: “Una singular narració coetània del procés d’unió de les corones de Castella i Aragó sota els Reis Catòlics en clau de fauna d’animals”, in *Miscehània Ainaud de Lasarte* 1998–1999, 1, 459–468.

EL KOLLI 1983

JANE EL-KOLLI: *La polémique islamo-chrétienne en Espagne (1492–1640) à travers les refutations de l’Islam de Juan Andrés et Lope Obregón*, Diss. phil. Montpellier (Université Paul Valéry Montpellier III) 1983.

DE EPALZA 2002

MÍKEL DE EPALZA: “Catalan translations of the Qur’ān”, in GIRALT I BALAGUERÓ 2002, 101–113.

DE EPALZA 2003

MÍKEL DE EPALZA: “Antecedentes islamocristianos concretos de la traducción del Corán al catalán”, in *llu. Revista de ciencias de las religiones* 8 (2003) 213–223.

DE EPALZA e. a. 2008

MÍKEL DE EPALZA: *El Corán y sus traducciones*. Propuestas. Con la colaboración de JOSEP VICENT FORCADELL [SAPORT]/JOAN MARIA PERUJO [MELGAR] (Publicaciones de la Universidad de Alicante. Monografías). Alicante 2008.

FERRERO HERNÁNDEZ 2015

CÁNDIDA FERRERO HERNÁNDEZ: “De la ‘Improbatio Alcorani’ a la ‘Reprobacion del Alcoran’ de Riccoldo da Montecroce, o la fortuna hispana de un texto apologético”, in MUÑOZ GARCÍA DE ITURROSPE/CARRASCO REIJA 2015, 537–543.

FERRERO HERNÁNDEZ/DE LA CRUZ PALMA 2014

Vitae Mahometi. Reescritura e invención en la literatura cristiana de controversia, ed. by CÁNDIDA FERRERO HERNÁNDEZ/ÓSCAR DE LA CRUZ PALMA (Nueva Roma 41), Madrid 2014.

GARCÍA-ARENAL RODRÍGUEZ 2016

After conversion. Iberia and the emergence of modernity, ed. by MERCEDES GARCÍA-ARENAL [RODRÍGUEZ] (Catholic Christendom, 1300–1700), Leiden/Boston 2016.

GARCÍA-ARENAL RODRÍGUEZ 2018

MERCEDES GARCÍA-ARENAL [RODRÍGUEZ]: “The double polemic of Martín de Figuerola’s ‘Lumbre de fe contra el Alcorán’ (1519)”, in GARCÍA-ARENAL RODRÍGUEZ/WIEGERS 2018 (forthcoming).

GARCÍA-ARENAL RODRÍGUEZ/PASTORE 2018

Mundos y tiempos nuevos. Profetismo e imperios globales en la edad moderna temprana, ed. by MERCEDES GARCÍA-ARENAL [RODRÍGUEZ]/STEFANIA PASTORE, Madrid 2018.

- GARCÍA-ARENAL RODRÍGUEZ/STARCZEWSKA 2014
 MERCEDES GARCÍA-ARENAL [RODRÍGUEZ]/KATARZYNA KRYSZYNA STARCZEWSKA: “‘The law of Abraham the Catholic’. Juan Gabriel as Qur’ān translator for Martín de Figuerola and Egidio da Viterbo”, in *al-Qanṭara* 35 (2014) 409–459.
- GARCÍA-ARENAL RODRÍGUEZ/WIEGERS 2018
Polemical encounters polemics between Christians, Jews and Muslims in Iberia and beyond, ed. by MERCEDES GARCÍA-ARENAL [RODRÍGUEZ]/GERARD WIEGERS (Iberian Encounter and Exchange, 475–1755), University Park (Pa.) 2018 (forthcoming).
- GEORGE-TVRTKOVIĆ 2012
 RITA GEORGE-TVRTKOVIĆ: *A Christian pilgrim in medieval Iraq*. Riccoldo da Montecroce’s encounter with Islam (Medieval Voyaging 1), Turnhout 2012.
- GIRALT I BALAGUERÓ 2002
Written jewels. Arabic bibliographical sources of Catalonia (Exhibition catalogue), ed. by JOSEP GIRALT [I BALAGUERÓ], Barcelona 2002.
- GLEI 2012
Frühe Koranübersetzungen. Europäische und außereuropäische Fallstudien, ed. by REINHOLD FERDINAND GLEI (Bochumer Altertumswissenschaftliches Colloquium 88), Trier 2012.
- HARVEY 2005
 LEONARD PATRICK HARVEY: *Muslims in Spain 1500 to 1614*, Chicago (Il.) 2005.
- KÖPF/BAUER 2011
Kulturkontakte und Rezeptionsvorgänge in der Theologie des 12. und 13. Jahrhunderts, ed. by ULRICH KÖPF/DIETER RICHARD BAUER (Archa Verbi. Subsidia 8), Münster in Westfalen 2011.
- LARSON 1981
 EVERETTE EUGENE LARSON: *A study of the ‘Confusión de la secta mahomática’ of Juan Andrés*, Diss. phil. Washington D.C. (Catholic University of America) 1981.
- LÓPEZ-MORILLAS 2011
 CONSUELO LÓPEZ-MORILLAS: “Estudio preliminar”, in EAD. (ed.): *El Corán de Toledo*. Edición y estudio del manuscrito 235 de la Biblioteca de Castilla-La Mancha (Bibliotheca Arabo-Romanica et Islamica 5), Gijón 2011, 9–128.
- LÓPEZ-MORILLAS 2012
 CONSUELO LÓPEZ-MORILLAS: “Secret Muslims, hidden manuscripts. Spanish translations of the Qur’ān from the fifteenth to the seventeenth centuries”, in GLEI 2012, 99–116.
- MADRIGAL TERRAZAS 2004
 SANTIAGO MADRIGAL TERRAZAS: *El pensamiento eclesial de Juan de Segovia (1393–1458)*. La gracia en el tiempo (Publicaciones de la Universidad Pontificia Comillas, Madrid I. Estudios 90), Madrid 2004.
- MARTÍNEZ DE CASTILLA MUÑOZ 2010
 NURIA MARTÍNEZ DE CASTILLA [MUÑOZ]: “Corán de Salónica”, in MATEOS PARAMIO/VILLAVERDE AMIEVA 2010, 228.
- MARTÍNEZ DE CASTILLA MUÑOZ 2014a
 NURIA MARTÍNEZ DE CASTILLA MUÑOZ: “The copyists and their texts. The Morisco translations of the Qur’ān in the Tomás Navarro Tomás Library (CSIC, Madrid)”, in *al-Qanṭara* 35 (2014) 493–525.
- MARTÍNEZ DE CASTILLA MUÑOZ 2014b
 NURIA MARTÍNEZ DE CASTILLA MUÑOZ: “Qur’anic manuscripts from late Muslim Spain. The collection of Almonacid de la Sierra”, in *Journal of Qur’anic Studies* 16, 2 (2014) 89–138.

MARTÍNEZ DE CASTILLA MUÑOZ

NURIA MARTÍNEZ DE CASTILLA MUÑOZ: “An Aljamiado translation of the ‘Morisco Qur’ān’ and its Arabic text (ca. 1609)”, in ADANG e. a. (forthcoming).

MARTÍNEZ GÁZQUEZ 2003

JOSÉ MARTÍNEZ GÁZQUEZ: “El Prólogo de Juan de Segobia al Corán (Qur’ān) trilingüe (1456)”, in *Mittelateinisches Jahrbuch* 38 (2003) 389–410 [repr. in MARTÍNEZ GÁZQUEZ 2009, 321–342].

MARTÍNEZ GÁZQUEZ 2009

JOSÉ MARTÍNEZ GÁZQUEZ: *‘Eum legentem vidimus’*. Selección de artículos y estudios 1, Bellaterra 2009.

MASSÓ TORRENTS 1905

JAUME MASSÓ TORRENTS: “Inventari dels béns mobles del rei Martí d’Aragó”, in *Revue hispanique* 12 (1905) 413–590.

MATEOS PARAMIO/VILLAVERDE AMIEVA 2010

Memoria de los Moriscos. Escritos y relatos de una diáspora cultural (Exhibition catalogue), ed. by ALFREDO MATEOS PARAMIO/JUAN CARLOS VILLAVERDE AMIEVA, Madrid 2010.

MisceHània Ainaud de Lasarte 1998–1999

MisceHània en homenatge a Joan Ainaud de Lasarte 1–2 (Biblioteca Abat Oliba. Sèrie il·lustrada 14–15), Barcelona 1998–1999.

MONTOZA COCA 2018

MANUEL MONTOZA COCA: *Los Sermones de Don Martín García, obispo de Barcelona*. Edición y estudio, Diss. phil. Bellaterra (Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona) 2018.

MUÑOZ GARCÍA DE ITURROSPE/CARRASCO REIJA 2015

Miscellanea latina, ed. by MARÍA TERESA MUÑOZ GARCÍA DE ITURROSPE/LETICIA CARRASCO REIJA, Madrid 2015.

RIBERA FLORIT 1967

JOSÉ MARÍA RIBERA FLORIT: *La polémica cristiano-musulmana en los sermones del maestro inquisidor Don Martín García*, Lic. thesis Barcelona (Universitat de Barcelona) 1967.

ROTH 2014

ULLI ROTH: “Juan of Segovia’s translation of the Qur’ān”, in *al-Qanṭara* 35 (2014) 555–578.

ROTH/GLEI 2009

ULLI ROTH/REINHOLD FERDINAND GLEI: “Die Spuren der lateinischen Koranübersetzung des Juan de Segovia – alte Probleme und ein neuer Fund”, in *Neulateinisches Jahrbuch* 11 (2009) 109–154.

ROTH/GLEI 2011

ULLI ROTH/REINHOLD FERDINAND GLEI: “Eine weitere Spur der lateinischen Koranübersetzung des Juan de Segovia”, in *Neulateinisches Jahrbuch* 13 (2011) S. 221–228.

RUIZ GARCÍA/GARCÍA-MONGE 2003

ELISA RUIZ GARCÍA/MARÍA ISABEL GARCÍA-MONGE: “Estudio preliminar”, in EAD. (ed.): *Confusión o confutación de la secta Mahomética y del Alcorán* (La Biblioteca de Barcarrota 5), Mérida 2003, 9–78.

SCOTTO 2012

DAVIDE SCOTTO: “‘De pe a pa’. Il Corano trilingue di Juan de Segovia (1456) e la conversione pacifica dei musulmani”, in *Rivista di storia e letteratura religiosa* 48 (2012) 515–577.

SOTO GONZÁLEZ/STARCZEWSKA 2016

TERESA SOTO/KATARZYNA KRYSZYNA Starczewska: “Authority, philology and conversion under the aegis of Martín García”, in GARCÍA ARENAL RODRÍGUEZ 2016, 199–228.

STARCZEWSKA 2015

KATARZYNA [KRYSZYNA] STARCZEWSKA: “‘No es esto sino hystorias de los antiguos’. Between medieval and early modern narrations in Juan Andrés’ ‘Confusión’”, in *Medievalia* 18, 1 (2015) 217–227.

SZPIECH 2011

RYAN SZPIECH: “Citas árabes en caracteres hebreos en el ‘Pugio fidei’ del dominico Ramón Martí. Entre la autenticidad y la autoridad”, in *al-Qanṭara* 32 (2011) 71–107.

SZPIECH 2012

RYAN SZPIECH: “Preaching Paul to the Moriscos. The ‘Confusión o confutación de la secta Mahomélica y del Aalcorán’ (1515) of ‘Juan Andrés’”, in *La Corónica* 41 (2012) 317–343.

SZPIECH 2016

RYAN SZPIECH: “A witness of their own nation. On the influence of Juan Andrés”, in GARCÍA ARENAL RODRÍGUEZ 2016, 174–198.

TISCHLER 2011

MATTHIAS MARTIN TISCHLER: “Transfer- und Transformationsprozesse im abendländischen Islambild zwischen dem 11. und 13. Jahrhundert”, in KÖPF/BAUER 2011, 329–379.

WIEGERS 1994

GERARD [ALBERT] WIEGERS: *Islamic literature in Spanish and Aljamiado*. Yça of Segovia (fl. 1450), his antecedents and successors (Medieval Iberian Peninsula. Texts and Studies 8), Leiden e. a. 1994.

WIEGERS 2015

GERARD [ALBERT] WIEGERS: “Translations of the Qur’ān in medieval and early modern Iberia”, in *Medieval Encounters* 21 (2015) 121–130.

WOLF 2014

ANNE MARIE WOLF: *Juan de Segovia and the fight for peace*. Christians and Muslims in the fifteenth century (History, Languages, and Cultures of the Spanish and Portuguese Worlds), Notre Dame (In.) 2014.

Note: The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Research Council under the European Union’s Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007–2013) for the project ‘Conversion, Overlapping Religiosities, Polemics, Interaction. Early Modern Iberia and Beyond’ (CORPI; AG 323316). Szpiech also received support from the Spanish Ministerio de Economía, Industria y Competividad for the project “Fuentes medievales y modernas para el estudio de las relaciones transculturales en el Mediterráneo. Redacción y transmisión” (“Proyecto excelencia I + D convocatoria 2015”, FFI2015-63659-C2-1-P [MINECO/FEDER]).