

ARTÍCULOS

Latin Transcriptions of Islamic Formulas in Medieval Iberian Texts on Muḥammad

Transcripciones latinas de fórmulas islámicas en textos
ibéricos medievales sobre Muḥammad

Grant Kynaston

University of Cambridge

ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7132-1288>

Abstract

This paper examines an oft-neglected linguistic feature of Christian polemic on Muḥammad in medieval Iberia: the transcription of Islamic formulas from Arabic into Latin. Having outlined a framework for assessing these expressions within the broader multilingual context of al-Andalus, it considers two Latin polemics from the region that contain substantial transcriptions of similar formulas. First, this paper considers the rendering of the Islamic declaration of faith in the 13th-century *Liber scale Mahometi*, and identifies a pattern of vernacularisation and distortion in the text's presentation of Arabic phrases. Second, it analyses a transcription in the 9th-10th-century *Tultusceptru*, deemed corrupt by prior scholars: evaluating the phrase's phonological data, this paper argues for a novel reading, which, in turn, indicates a greater awareness of, and sensitivity towards, Islamic thought on the part of the polemicist than previously hypothesised. Finally, these readings are corroborated by comparing the texts' renderings of the *takbīr*.

Key words: Arabic-Latin transcription; multilingualism in medieval Iberia; Christian polemic on Islam; biographies of Muḥammad.

Resumen

Este artículo examina una característica lingüística a menudo olvidada en la polémica cristiana sobre Muḥammad en la Iberia medieval: la transliteración de fórmulas islámicas del árabe al latín. Tras esbozar un marco para evaluar estas expresiones dentro del contexto multilingüe más amplio de al-Andalus, examina dos polémicas latinas de la región que contienen transcripciones sustanciales de fórmulas similares. En primer lugar, se examina la transcripción de la declaración de fe islámica en el *Liber scale Mahometi*, del siglo XIII, e identifica un patrón de vernacularización y distorsión en la presentación de frases árabes en el texto. En segundo lugar, analiza una transliteración del *Tultusceptru* de los siglos IX-X, considerada corrupta por estudiosos anteriores, y evalúa los datos fonológicos de la frase. Este artículo defiende una lectura novedosa que, a su vez, indica una mayor conciencia y sensibilidad del pensamiento islámico por parte del polemista. Por último, estas lecturas son corroboradas comparando las interpretaciones de los textos del *takbīr*.

Palabras clave: transcripción latino-árabe; multilingüismo en la Iberia medieval; polémica cristiana contra el Islam; biografías de Muḥammad.

Citation / Cómo citar: Kynaston, Grant, "Latin Transcriptions of Islamic Formulas in Medieval Iberian Texts on Muḥammad", *Al-Qanṭara*, 44, 1 (2023), e01. doi: <https://doi.org/10.3989/alqantara.2023.001>.

Received: 05/11/2021; *Accepted:* 18/06/2022; *Published:* 19/06/2023

Beyond their role in Christian intellectual history, polemical Iberian texts on Islam also reflect a less well-understood aspect of medieval interreligious relations: the *linguistic* contact between Christian communities and their Muslim neighbours. One such phenomenon is the transcription of Islamic formulas from Arabic into Latin. In particular, polemical texts concerning the Islamic prophet Muḥammad deploy transcriptions to bolster their empiricising tone and enhance the verisimilitude of their narratives; in so doing, composers inadvertently provide linguistic data on contact paradigms, and on their informants' linguistic milieu.

This paper focuses on two such texts: the 13th-century *Liber scale Mahometi* ('LSM'), and the brief 9th-10th-century *Tultusceptru de libro domni Metobii* ('*Tultusceptru*').¹ These texts both feature substantial transcriptions of similar Islamic formulas, permitting a controlled comparison of their approaches; further contemporaneous transcriptions of Arabic are noted where of use. This paper first presents a linguistic model for assessing medieval Iberian transcriptions, considering known multilingual contact, contemporaneous Ibero-Romance phonology, and regional Arabic diglossia. It then applies this model to each text. First, this paper assesses the LSM's various transcriptions of the *ṣahāda*: it shows that its author relied primarily on Andalusian dialectal sources for their Arabic quotations, but purposefully exoticised the Latin renderings as part of their polemical project. Second, it builds on this analysis of the LSM's equivalent transcription in order to consider an apparent formula in the *Tultusceptru*: through phonological and textual reasoning, this paper argues that, contrary to its usual identification as the *ṣahāda*, the phrase is rather an honorific, referring to Muḥammad. This reading imputes to the Christian author a greater awareness of, and sensitivity to, Islamic honorifics and Qur'ānic language than previously ascribed, and justifies a re-examination of this oft-neglected text. Finally, these readings are corroborated by each text's transcription of the *takbīr*, the phrase *Allāhu akbar* ('Allāh is great(er)'). Overall, these transcriptions reveal previously overlooked aspects of each text's polemical goals, and their sources' language. Moreover, the consistency of linguistic

data derivable from these texts highlights the usefulness of the methodology for interpreting transcribed Arabic, and so for understanding Christian-Muslim interchanges more generally.

1. The Texts

Both the *Tultusceptru* and the LSM align with a broader trend in Christian polemic on Islam: the composition of putative biographies of Muḥammad.² Following Di Cesare,³ works with "apologetic, polemical and proselytizing intents" typically depicted a "pseudo-historical" Muḥammad: authors, adopting a historiographical modality, constructed an (exaggerated) biography, which was then censured in order to discredit Islamic claims. This model — variously labelled "counterhistory",⁴ or "anti-historiography"⁵ — was established in the Eastern Mediterranean in the 7th century,⁶ and characterises the earliest Iberian representations of Muḥammad. Transcriptions were key to this genre: for one, the inclusion of 'real' Arabic phraseology improves the history's objective tone, by suggesting access to Muslim informants or Islamic texts; conversely, transcriptions highlight the foreignness of the other, in foregrounding the linguistic and cultural distance between the reader and the subject-matter. Both texts introduced here deploy polemical approaches drawn from this genre.

The first — the *Tultusceptru* — is found in the Códice de Roda from Navarre, on a single page between two longer texts. I rely here on my inspection of a digital copy of the manuscript.⁷ The text concerns Ozim,⁸ a Christian monk,

² See generally Hoyland, *Seeing Islam as Others Saw It*; Daniel, *Islam and the West*, pp. 67-130; Tolan, "Réactions chrétiennes aux conquêtes musulmanes"; Tolan, *Saracens*, pp. 3-169, especially pp. 137-147; Di Cesare, *The Pseudo-Historical Image of the Prophet Muḥammad*; Di Cesare, "The Prophet in the Book".

³ Di Cesare, "The Prophet in the Book", p. 11.

⁴ Wolf, "Counterhistory", pp. 13-14.

⁵ See generally Tolan, "Anti-Hagiography".

⁶ See, e.g., John of Damascus (d. ca. 750), *Liber de haeresibus* 100.

⁷ = MS Madrid, Real Academia de la Historia 78, 185v. All references to the *Tultusceptru* follow the manuscript's lineation. For full editions, see Díaz y Díaz, "Los textos antimahometanos más antiguos en códices españoles", pp. 163-164; Gil Fernández, *Scriptores Muzarabici Saeculi VIII-XI*, vol. 2, pp. 1215-1216; Wolf, "The Earliest Latin Lives of Muḥammad", pp. 99-100; González Muñoz, "La nota del códice de Roda", pp. 52-54; Yolles & Weiss, *Medieval Latin Lives of Muhammad*, pp. 10-13.

⁸ Hoyland correctly identifies Arabic *'aẓīm* ('great') as the name's underlying form: *Seeing Islam as Others Saw It*,

¹ This transmitted title is clearly corrupt. Vázquez de Parga restores *tultum* (= *sublatum*) *excerptum de libro domini Metobii* ("An excerpt taken from the book of Lord Metobius"): "Algunas notas sobre el Pseudo-Metodio y Españas", p. 152.

who, while travelling to evangelise in Erribon,⁹ encounters an “angel of temptation” (*angelus temptationis*). Re-naming Ozim *Mohomad*, the angel teaches him a phrase for converting the satraps, which, unbeknownst to Ozim, invokes corruptive demons. Now, González Muñoz argues that the text should be treated as “un apólogo que pone en guardia sobre la naturaleza perversa del rito de conversión al islam”, rather than as biographical or polemical.¹⁰ Conveying this moral message is certainly the text’s *aim*, as is made clear in its concluding sentence (ln. 24-25): *unde omnes <qui> in errore conversi sunt et eos qui persuasione suaserunt manipula incendii nuncupantur* (“For this reason, all who converted in error, and those whom they induced to do so by persuasion, are said to be bundles of hay for the fire”).¹¹ However, the *Tultusceptra*’s argumentative *form* (putatively narrating the beginning of Muḥammad’s prophetic career), and the claims implicit in its narration (that Muḥammad’s claim to prophethood is invalid), situate the text within the broader genre of polemical biography. This is not to say that the text’s polemic is straightforward: rather, Wolf notes that the *Tultusceptra* implicitly confirms Islam’s monotheistic basis, ascribing divine (albeit corrupted) revelation and (underlying) Christian faith to Muḥammad.¹²

Determining the *Tultusceptra*’s provenance is difficult. The Códice de Roda was completed in the late 10th century,¹³ and the text’s scribal hand is dateable to 1030-1060.¹⁴ The brief text shares a geographic and generic connection with the *Istoria de Mahomet*, the first Iberian pseudo-history of Islam, which was sourced in Navarre by Eulogius of Córdoba (d. 859) for his *Liber apologeticus martyrum* in 848-850.¹⁵ On this basis, Wolf proposes a 9th-century Navarran *Vorlage* for the *Tultusceptra*.¹⁶ However, this comparison is insecure: the *Tultusceptra*’s narrative — warning about the spiritual dangers of conversion to Islam, and making limited concessions to Islam’s monotheistic genealogy — would recommend an origin within a Christian minority; moreover, the text reflects polemical tropes of 9th-century Christian writings from Córdoba,¹⁷ as well as those of the Greek-speaking East.¹⁸ These factors support a provenance in the Muslim-majority *south* of the Iberian Peninsula, and a date between the late 9th and late 10th centuries.¹⁹

The second, more substantial text — the LSM — was composed within the 12th-13th-century Toledo translation movement, and provides a detailed narrative of the *isrā*’ and *mir*’ *āğ* (Muḥammad’s night journey to Jerusalem, and ascent to heaven). According to the work’s preface (105c.9-d.5),²⁰ the Latin text is Bonaventure of Siena’s contemporaneous translation of a now-lost Castilian original, produced by Don Abraham, King Alfonso X’s Jewish physician, between 1260 and 1264. Abraham’s text relies directly on Arabic Islamic sources — including the Qur’ān, *aḥādīṭ* (prophetic traditions), and biographical works like the *Kitāb al-mir*’ *aj* of al-Quṣayrī (d. 1072) — as well as Mozarabic and Jewish commentaries, while Bonaventure’s text incorporates Christian Latin commentaries.²¹

p. 516. As corroboration, this epithet describes the Prophet’s character both at Qur’ān 68:4, and in the work of the Iberian biographer al-Qāḍī ‘Iyād (d. 1149): *al-Šifā*, vol. 1, pp. 462-463. Moreover, Latin <o> here reflects the expected vowel change before an emphatic consonant (here, /ðʕ/): see n. 121 *infra*. Wolf, followed by González Muñoz, suggests underlying *Hāšim* (referring to Muḥammad’s clan, the Banū Hāšim), based on a contemporaneous transcription *Escim*: Wolf, “The Earliest Latin Lives of Muḥammad”, p. 95; Wolf, “Falsifying the Prophet”, p. 116, n. 27; Wolf, “Counterhistory”, p. 18, n. 25; González Muñoz, “La nota del códice de Roda”, p. 57. This is phonologically tenuous: the <e> of *Escim* corroborates the Arabic vowel raising expected before *non-emphatic* /Ci/, while <sc> only assists if the <z> of *Ozim* in ln. 8 is read as <c> (despite the character’s clear descending lunate stroke there).

⁹ Likely from Arabic *Yatrib* (via Greek Ἐθριβός), a pre-Islamic name for Medina at, e.g., Qur’ān 33:13: Vázquez de Parga, “Algunas notas sobre el Pseudo-Metodio y Españas”, p. 152.

¹⁰ González Muñoz, “La nota del códice de Roda”, p. 63.

¹¹ Compare Qur’ān 72:15: *wa-amma l-qāsiṭīna fa-kānū li-ğahannama ḥaṭabā* (“And as for the unjust, they are firewood for Hell”). See also George Monachus (fl. mid-9th-century), *Chronicon*, vol. 2, p. 701, 21-23: [ἔφη] τοὺς δὲ Ἰουδαίους καὶ Χριστιανούς ξύλα τοῦ πυρὸς γενομένους ὑπολειφθῆναι (“He [Muḥammad] said that the Jews and the Christians were left to become timber for the fire”).

¹² Wolf, “The Earliest Latin Lives of Muḥammad”, pp. 95-96; Wolf, “Falsifying the Prophet”, pp. 109-110; Wolf, “Counterhistory”, pp. 18-19.

¹³ de Carlos Villamarín, “El Códice de Roda”, pp. 121-123.

¹⁴ Díaz y Díaz, “Los textos antimahometanos más antiguos en códices españoles”, pp. 160-161.

¹⁵ Díaz y Díaz, “Los textos antimahometanos más antiguos en códices españoles”, pp. 165-168; Wasilewski, “The ‘Life of Muḥammad’ in Eulogius of Córdoba”, pp. 333-353.

¹⁶ See Wolf, “Counterhistory”, p. 17; Wolf, “Falsifying the Prophet”, p. 108.

¹⁷ González Muñoz, “La nota del códice de Roda”, pp. 55-57.

¹⁸ See, e.g., n. 9 *supra*; n. 121 *infra*.

¹⁹ See Gil Fernández, *Scriptores Muzarabici Saeculi VIII-XI*, vol. 1, pp. 124-125; González Muñoz, “La nota del códice de Roda”, p. 63.

²⁰ All references to the LSM follow the folio and column numbering in MS Paris BnF Lat. 6064.

²¹ Roelli, “Zu den Editionen des Liber scalae Machometi?”, pp. 315-317; Echevarría, “Eschatology or Biography?”, pp.

The preface indicates the author's intention to make known "those rash undertakings by Muḥammad against Christ" (105c.42-44: *Machometi ... contra Christum temere attemptata*) and so reaffirm Christian faith; this polemical aim was likely informed by Alfonso X's desire to undermine — both textually and politically — Islamic claims of legitimacy, in order to justify his rule over incorporated Andalusian Muslims.²² Notably, however, the text itself is largely bereft of sceptical commentary, with any polemic left largely unstated.²³ This may be ascribed to the text's inherent absurdity to its intended Christian audience, or to its role as a source for other writers seeking to cite a putatively accurate statement of Islamic beliefs.²⁴

Two 14th-century manuscripts print Bonaventure's Latin text: MS Vatican Lat. 4072, and MS Paris BnF Lat. 6064; of these, the latter exhibits significantly less corruption, including in the transcriptions.²⁵ A third manuscript — MS Oxford Laud. Misc. 537 — prints Bonaventure's French translation of the Castilian text: the transcriptions here usually match those in MS Paris, notwithstanding certain changes motivated by Old French phonology.²⁶ This consistency between MS Paris and MS Oxford suggests that Bonaventure's transcriptions, in both translations, were copied directly from Abraham's Castilian text. However, to ensure clear cross-linguistic comparisons based on Ibero-Romance and Latin diglossia, the focus here remains on the Latin text's transcriptions, with variations in the French text noted only where of interest. I have inspected both Latin manuscripts digitally, and the Old French manuscript personally; where uncontroversial, I have followed the Latin text provided by Besson and

Brossard-Dandré, the most recent critical edition,²⁷ and the French text printed in Wunderli.²⁸

2. Transcribing Arabic in the Iberian Context

Before considering the transcriptions in the *Tultusceptru* and LSM, it is necessary to provide a model for assessing the general phenomenon.

Transcription here denotes the representation of one language's phonemes using the graphemes — and phoneme-grapheme alignment — of another.²⁹ This interchange entails cross-linguistic acoustic perception, whereby non-native phones are assimilated to native phonemic contrasts.³⁰ Thus, Latin transcriptions of Arabic phrases entail three primary variables: Arabic phonemes, and their allophonic realisations (acoustic input); Latin phonemes (perceptual input); and Latin graphemes (graphic output). This paradigm is applicable only where transcriptions are not standardised,³¹ but rather reflect synchronic perception; this is justified here by the external and — within the LSM — internal variation in transcribing the same formulas.³² Moreover, the perceptual model assumes primarily acoustic, not graphic, input. This condition is satisfied here, as correlation between the Latin and Arabic graphemes (for example, in word boundary placement) is weak, and variation is often phonologically justifiable, but orthographically inexplicable.

This model's application relies on the particular multilingual environment. Arabic and Ibero-Romance co-existed in the south of the Iberian Peninsula throughout the period of Muslim rule, subsisting even in reconquered territories until

136-149; Besson & Brossard-Dandré, *Le livre de l'échelle de Mahomet*, pp. 18-21, 39-59; Longoni, *Il libro della scala di Maometto*, pp. xviii-xxi.

²² Echevarría, "Eschatology or Biography?", pp. 143-144. See generally Tolan, *Saracens*, pp. 186-189; Daniel, *Islam and the West*, p. 233.

²³ But see the comment of Muḥammad's kinsmen at 126a.4-14: *ha! mendax, quomodo audes talia enarrare? ... nos autem bene scimus quod abhinc usque ad Templum iam dictum est iter unius mensis ad minus*. ("Ha! Liar, how do you dare to relate such things? ... But we know well that, from here to the aforementioned Temple, it is a journey of at least one month!").

²⁴ See Hyatte, *The Prophet of Islam in Old French*, pp. 22-25; Echevarría, "Eschatology or Biography?", pp. 135-136.

²⁵ Roelli, "Zu den Editionen des Liber scalae Machometi", pp. 315-316; Longoni, *Il libro della scala di Maometto*, pp. lxxiii-lxxvi; Besson & Brossard-Dandré, *Le livre de l'échelle de Mahomet*, p. 61.

²⁶ See, e.g., *razur* (114a.19) = *raçur* (MS Oxford 20v.b.24).

²⁷ See *Le livre de l'échelle de Mahomet*. Other editions include: Longoni, *Il libro della scala di Maometto*; Werner, *Liber Scalae Machometi*; Cerulli, *Il Libro della Scala*; Muñoz Sendino, *La escala de Mahoma*. Of these, only Besson and Brossard-Dandré, and Werner before them, pursue high text-critical standards: Roelli, "Zu den Editionen des Liber scalae Machometi", pp. 317-320.

²⁸ See *Le livre de l'eschiele Mahomet*.

²⁹ Philologists usually consider this interchange only in passing: see, e.g., Cantarino, "From Spoken to Written Language and Back", p. 25.

³⁰ For further linguistic discussion of this perceptual model, see Best & Tyler, "Nonnative and Second-Language Speech Perception"; Best, "A Direct Realist View of Cross-Language Speech Perception".

³¹ Compare Price & Naeh, "On the Margins of Culture", pp. 261-262.

³² For this broader variation, see the collection of excerpts from contemporaneous polemical texts at de la Cruz Palma, "Machometus", pp. 672-772 (an index of names, places, and other Arabic terms included in the Latin texts).

the 12th-13th century.³³ Whereas the *Tultusceptra* likely arose among communities continuing to use Romance languages during the territory's progressive Arabisation, the LSM was composed as part of Alfonso X's translation movement in Toledo following its reconquest, which relied on incorporated bilingual communities.³⁴ In either case, the texts' Latin transcriptions constitute attempts to transmit Arabic phonological information, obtained from Arabic speakers in al-Andalus, to a putatively monolingual Christian reader. Greater specificity as to the sources for the two texts' transcriptions is elusive, apart from perhaps a Toledan basis for the Arabic used by Abraham.³⁵

The model must also account for the diglossia during the applicable period.³⁶ In al-Andalus, the dominant low ('L') register was the Andalusian Arabic dialect bundle ('AA'), and the high ('H') language, Classical Arabic ('CA').³⁷ AA comprised a spectrum of registers, with the 10th-century Andalusian philologist al-Zubaydī distinguishing an 'educated' L form from the general vernacular.³⁸ Conversely, CA reflects the standardised 'proper Arabic' appropriate to literary texts and religious contexts, which crystallised around the 10th century.³⁹ While normative CA phonology is well-known,⁴⁰ speakers often assimilate CA formulas into vernacular phonological paradigms,⁴¹ a phenomenon evident in AA.⁴² As the AA phonological interference in a given interchange is

unclear without analysis of the output forms, this paper presents acoustic inputs, in the first place, as *phonological ranges* between classicising and vernacular realisations.

Diglossia also affected Ibero-Romance speakers. Up to the 11th century, no clear distinction between the standardised and vernacular language is readily determinable (both labelled *Latinus*); indeed, Wright argues that Ibero-Romance in this period amounted to "complex monolingualism" with conservative Latin orthography representing innovative phonetic realisations.⁴³ Notably, in al-Andalus, the significance of written Arabic saw a decline in written Latin literacy during the 9th and 10th centuries,⁴⁴ while forms of Ibero-Romance — collectively 'Mozarabic' — remained a spoken language.⁴⁵ By the 12th century, however, this situation had progressively given way to diglossia, with a distinction between the scholarly, typically written, H language (here, 'Latin') and the L languages (the Ibero-Romance group, including the Castilian dominant in Alfonso X's Toledan court).⁴⁶ While this complex linguistic environment problematises Latin phoneme-grapheme alignment in both texts considered here, few relevant graphemes raise diglossic issues, and novel Ibero-Romance phones are noted. Moreover, the relevant Ibero-Romance phonology is sufficiently conservative to negate diachrony between the *Tultusceptra* and LSM.

3. The Šahāda in the LSM

Throughout the LSM, the author repeatedly transcribes and translates the *šahāda*, the two-limbed Islamic declaration of faith: *lā ilāha illa lllāh / Muḥammadun al-rasūlu lllāh* ("There is no god but Allāh, [and] Muḥammad is Allāh's

³³ The precise relationship between Romance and Arabic across al-Andalus remains a fraught question: see Zwartjes, "Andalus"; Corriente, *Árabe andalusí y lenguas romances*, pp. 125-142; Ferrando, "The Arabic Language among the Mozarabs of Toledo during the 12th and 13th Centuries", pp. 45-48.

³⁴ Echevarría, "Eschatology or Biography?", pp. 150-151; Longoni, *Il libro della scala di Maometto*, p. xiv. On the translation movement, see Procter, "The Scientific Works of the Court of Alfonso X of Castile"; López Álvarez (ed.), *La escuela de traductores de Toledo*.

³⁵ On the use of Arabic within the Jewish community of Toledo, see Gutwirth, "Asher b. Yehiel e Israel Israeli".

³⁶ See generally Gallego, "The Languages of Medieval Iberia".

³⁷ Corriente, *A Grammatical Sketch*, pp. 6-9; UZ, *Grammar*, pp. xi-xii. See also al-Maqqarī's (d. 1632) account of 10th-century Andalusian diglossia: *The History of the Mohammedan Dynasties in Spain*, vol. 1, pp. 142-143.

³⁸ Krotkoff, "The *Laḥn al-'awāmm* of Abū Bakr al-Zubaydī", p. 7.

³⁹ On the development of CA from Hijazi Arabic, see van Putten, *Quranic Arabic*, pp. 215-231, especially pp. 227-230.

⁴⁰ See Fischer, *A Grammar of Classical Arabic*, pp. 16-34.

⁴¹ For examples, see Piamenta, *Islam in Everyday Arabic Speech*, pp. 10-15.

⁴² See, e.g., AA formulas concerning Allāh: *DFDAA*, pp. 68-69.

⁴³ See Wright, "Plurilinguismo nella Penisola Iberica (400-1000)", pp. 115-118, 122-129; Wright, *Late Latin and Early Romance in Spain and Carolingian France*, especially pp. 151-161 (on the situation in al-Andalus). See, e.g., the Latin-Romance graphemic variation in 12th-13th-century Iberian codes: Emiliano, "Latin or Romance?".

⁴⁴ See generally Wright, "La muerte del ladino escrito en Al-Andalus". See also Paulus Albarus (d. ca. 861), *Indiculus* 1667-1680, especially 1677-1678: *heu pro dolor, legem suam nesciunt Xpiani et linguam propriam non advertunt Latini* ("Alas, for shame! Christians do not know their own law, and Latins do not attend to their own language").

⁴⁵ See Galmés de Fuentes, *Dialectología mozárabe*, pp. 14-17, 25.

⁴⁶ Lapesa, *Historia de la lengua española*, pp. 156-161; Sayahi, *Diglossia and Language Contact*, pp. 215-218; Lloyd, *From Latin to Spanish*, pp. 171-180; Penny, *A History of the Spanish Language*, pp. 20-22.

Prophet”).⁴⁷ The formula pervaded the Muslim world during this period, including al-Andalus.⁴⁸

As transcriptional input within the Iberian context, however, the underlying CA *šahāda* may exhibit AA interference. In CA, *-V(n)#* (in *ilāha*, *Muḥammadun*, and *rasūlu*) is a case ending, while *Allāh* exhibits zero ending in pausa. The first syllable of *Allāh* is, effectively, prodelided after *V#*;⁴⁹ this in turn causes univerbation, shortening the final vowel of underlying *illā* in the impermissible word-medial syllable *CVC*.⁵⁰ Moreover, at least in Qur’ānic recitation, the final nasal of *Muḥammadun* assimilates with */#r/*.⁵¹ AA diverges from this schema. Like most spoken Arabic dialects after the 8th century,⁵² AA lacked case endings,⁵³ and, with decay of */#ʔ/*,⁵⁴ permits more prodelision than CA,⁵⁵ including before *Allāh*.⁵⁶ However, prodelision in the environment */a:#ʔi/* lacks a clear parallel: word-medially, */ʔi/ > /y/* is expected,⁵⁷ while in the poetry of al-Ḥillī (d. 1349) — an oeuvre featuring AA influence⁵⁸ — the collocation *illā idā* exhibits no word juncture phenomena.⁵⁹ Further, AA often lost final */h/* (even if retained orthographically),⁶⁰ including in *Allāh*,⁶¹ and likely maintained the CA phonemic difference between */l/* and */ʎ/*.⁶² Finally, AA lost phonemic vowel length, re-allocating the metrical

stress accent to the previously most quantitatively prominent syllable.⁶³ Thus, the hypothetical range of each limb of the vernacularised formula runs:

(1) CA */la:#ʔi. 'la:.ha#ʔil.laʔ. 'ʔa:h/* ~ AA **/la#ʔi. 'la#ʔil.laʔ. 'ʔa/*

(2) CA */mu. 'ham.ma.dur#ra.su:.luʔ. 'ʔa:h/* ~ AA **/mu. 'ham.mad#ra.su.laʔ. 'ʔa/*

This paper focuses on the LSM’s transcriptions of the first limb, which the text attests eight times. Almost all cases comprise three words (hereafter denoted ‘(A)’, ‘(B)’ and ‘(C)’ respectively), and are consistently of the form *le hVlIV hVlalla*. The forms in MS Paris are as follows, with variations in other manuscripts provided for comparison:

110c.30: *le hille halla hilalla*⁶⁴

110c.32: *le halla hilalla* (MS Vatican 253r.24
le halla hillalla)

111d.50-51: *le halille zoham hille bille*⁶⁵

112a.2: *le hilella helalla* (MS Vatican 256v.3
om. *helalla*; MS Oxford 16r.b.1-2 *le hilella
helella*)⁶⁶

112b.41-42: *le hille halalla* (MS Vatican
258v.3 *le hille hallalla*)

113a.13: *le halla hilalla* (MS Vatican 260r.3
le halla hall hahalla)⁶⁷

114a.18: *le halla hilalla*

123c.56-57: *le halla hilalla*

As both Latin and Arabic accentuation is culminative even where it acquired phonemicity,⁶⁸ the Latin word boundaries may be aligned with the three

⁴⁷ See Qur’ān 37:35, 47:19 (first limb); 48:29 (second limb).

⁴⁸ See, e.g., 10th-century Córdoba conversion formularies: Safran, “Identity and Differentiation in Ninth-Century al-Andalus”, pp. 586-587; Chalmeta, “Le passage à l’Islam dans al-Andalus au Xe siècle”.

⁴⁹ The underlying CA form may be **llāh*, which gains */#ʔV/* when phrase-initial, preventing impermissible **#CC*: Gadoua, “Consonant Clusters in Quranic Arabic”, pp. 64-65; Coetzee, “The Phonology of the Two *Hamza*’s of Qur’ānic Arabic”.

⁵⁰ See Al-Ani & May, “The Phonological Structure of the Syllable in Arabic”.

⁵¹ Alfozan, *Assimilation in Classical Arabic*, pp. 59-60, 96-97.

⁵² See Dévényi, “I rāb”; Blau, *A Grammar of Christian Arabic*, p. 317.

⁵³ UZ, *Grammar*, p. 64; Corriente, *A Grammatical Sketch*, p. 86.

⁵⁴ Corriente, *A Grammatical Sketch*, p. 58.

⁵⁵ UZ, *Grammar*, p. 34, n. 76.

⁵⁶ See, e.g., the formula *law* (or *ma*) *ša llāh*: DFDA, pp. 744-745.

⁵⁷ UZ, *Grammar*, pp. 8, 35. See also Blau, *A Grammar of Christian Arabic*, pp. 94-95.

⁵⁸ See Zwartjes, *Love Songs from al-Andalus*, p. 133.

⁵⁹ al-Ḥillī, *Kitāb al-‘āṭil al-ḥālī* 209.2.

⁶⁰ UZ, *Grammar*, p. 33; Corriente, *A Grammatical Sketch*, pp. 57-58.

⁶¹ See, e.g., Ibn Quzmān (d. 1160), *Dīwān* 21.13.1: *ya ‘fīk al-lā n-naḡā* (“May Allāh grant you salvation”).

⁶² UZ, *Grammar*, p. 21.

⁶³ UZ, *Grammar*, pp. 36-39; Corriente, *A Grammatical Sketch*, pp. 60-66; Janssens, *Stress in Arabic and Word Structure in the Modern Arabic Dialects*, pp. 158-159.

⁶⁴ This rendering exhibits both attested variations of (B).

⁶⁵ This transcription omits (B), with *halille* reshaping (C) in line with the (B) form *hille*. In the novel extension *zoham hille bille*, close examination of the connectors indicates that both MS Paris and MS Oxford (at 16r.a.25) read *zoham*; MS Vatican 256r.28 is insufficiently clear at that point, but cf. Besson & Brossard-Dandré: *zohani*. Adopting *zohani*, however, this extension appears to integrate the Qur’ānic phrase *subḥāna llāh* (“The glory of Allāh!”), a cognate accusative: e.g., Qur’ān 23:91) into the devotional formula *lā quwwata illā bi-llāh* (“There is no power except in Allāh”, with accusative of negation: Qur’ān 18:39). However, such a combination is not attested elsewhere. Besson and Brossard-Dandré’s tentative proposition *subḥānahu* (“His glory!”) explains only *zohani*: *Le livre de l’échelle de Mahomet*, p. 165, n. 56.

⁶⁶ The trisyllabic rendering of (B) is likely an interpolated (C) form, with its vocalism adapted to match Arabic *ilā(ha)* (following the more usual (B) form *hille*). The MS Oxford reading provides two (C) forms, anomalously ending in *-ella* (only here in the three manuscripts, possibly by analogy with the (B) form *hille*).

⁶⁷ The MS Vatican reading, in addition to misspelling (C), features a mistaken, incomplete repetition of (B).

⁶⁸ On the two systems’ similarity, see Allen, *Accent and Rhythm*, pp. 155-157.

perceived Arabic prosodic groups. The following schema shows this alignment, along with the hypothetical CA-AA range and regular Latin variants:

(A) Arabic /la:/ ~ */la/ = Latin *le*

(B) Arabic /ʔi. 'la: .ha/ ~ */ʔi. 'la/ = Latin *halla* ~ *hille*

(C) Arabic /ʔil.laʔ. 'la:h/ ~ */ʔil.laʔ. 'la/ = Latin *hilalla* ~ *halalla* ~ *helalla*

The disyllabic form of Latin (B) suggests an AA source, given that elision of the case ending /a#/ before /#ʔi/ is impermissible in CA. Indeed, the LSM's transcriptions of Arabic *Muhammad(un)* and *rasul(u)* in the second limb also lack case endings: each Latin rendering terminates at the stem's final consonant, while the word-initial <(h) a> in Latin *razur halla* (114a.19) and *razul Alla* (123c.57-58) indicates the absence of prodelision.

Three aspects of the Arabic-Latin linguistic interchange are determinable from this schema.

First, initial <h> in both (B) and (C) is anomalous. The status of <h> in contemporaneous Latin and Ibero-Romance is contentious: while Classical Latin /h/ was itself unproductive in the vernacular even when represented by <h>, ⁶⁹ [h] was the pre-vocalic allophone of Ibero-Romance /f/, with the phoneme causing graphemic alternation <f> ~ <h> around the 10th and 11th centuries;⁷⁰ thus, if used purposefully, <h> here should represent a true phone [h]. However, in the Arabic, /h/ appears only in the CA (B) form (albeit at the onset of the *second* syllable), not the AA form underpinning the Latin (B) form. If the AA (B) form did in fact retain word-final /h/, re-syllabification across the word boundary could have caused word-initial aspiration of (C), subsequently applied to the Latin (B) form by analogy. Alternatively, word juncture hiatus — a feature common in CA on account of phonemic /#ʔ/, but absent in Latin and Ibero-Romance⁷¹ — may justify h-insertion. However, internal Ibero-Romance phonological processes usually remedied hiatus by inserting a glide, not /h/.⁷² Moreover, Arabic /#(?)V/ did not regularly become /#hV/ in Ibero-Romance: Arabic loanwords beginning *al-* rather produce unaspirated Ibero-Romance *al-* <al>.⁷³

Further, h-insertion affects almost *all* transcriptions of vowel-initial Arabic words in the Latin LSM,⁷⁴ with the Arabic definite article *al-* commonly transcribed by Latin <hal>.⁷⁵ Curiously, this process may occur prior to the attachment of prefixes, causing apparent word-*medial* h-insertion: thus, for *vhalkaforat* (118a.16-17, 18) < *wa-l-kaffārāt*, the transcriber's identification of the definite article causes insertion of the sequence <hal>, notwithstanding perceived [wal] (expected <val>).⁷⁶ In all these cases, the LSM appears to generalise <h> for /Ø/, a graphemic use occasionally seen in medieval Spanish texts.⁷⁷

H-insertion here may also emphasise lexical foreignness. Comparably, the LSM transcribes *Muhammad* as *Muahgmet* in the second limb,⁷⁸ and once elsewhere as *Muhagmet* (111a.40), but as *Machometus*, a common Latinate standardisation, in unmarked prose.⁷⁹ The <g> in these transcriptions is anomalous. If *Muhagmet* is preferred, perhaps, just as Classical Latin <gn> [ɲn] ultimately produced Late Latin [nn], the sequence <gm> may have represented [mm], via *[ɲm].⁸⁰ Conversely, <hg> in Andalusian works transcribes /h/ directly;⁸¹ this may suggest corruption (whether by perception or scribal error) of underlying **Muhgamet*. In either case, the non-native use of <g>, as well as word-initial h-insertion, likely emphasise transcriptional distance.

⁷⁴ The only exceptions are *unzila* (117d.41) < *unzila* (but MS Oxford 30r.a.5 *huncila*); *Alla* (123c.58) < *Allāh* (but 114a.19 *halla*, a form consistently used throughout MS Oxford).

⁷⁵ The only exceptions are *alborak* (e.g., 107a.15) < *al-burāq*; *azirat* (114d.45) < *al-širāt*; *arauka* (119b.1) < *al-ramkā*; *arre* (119b.3) < *al-rīh*.

⁷⁶ Compare perhaps Paulus Albarus' insertion of <h> in Hellenised Hebrew names: *Ihesus* (e.g., *Epistole* 4.744, 8.146); *Iherusalem* (e.g., *Indiculus* 332). Whereas *Ihesus* may mimic Greek majuscule ΙΗΣΟΥΣ (compare *Xp̄s* for ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ), the spelling of Jerusalem (which in Greek begins <IE>, not <IH>) suggests h-insertion by analogy.

⁷⁷ Dworkin, *A Guide to Old Spanish*, p. 31, n. 25.

⁷⁸ See 114a.19 (cf. MS Vatican 262r.26 *tonahgmet*), 123c.57.

⁷⁹ Compare de la Cruz Palma, "Machometus", pp. 703-705. While the French text draws a similar distinction, the forms do not reflect the same foreignising motivation: *Muhagmet* (13r.a.30, absent in Latin; 44v.a.1 = 123c.57); *Muagmet* (14r.b.25-26 = 111a.40; 20v.b.24 = 114a.19); *Mahomet* (in standard prose). See also the *Tultuseptru*'s distinction between marked *Mohamet* (ln. 20), and unmarked, prosaic *Mohomad* (ln. 18).

⁸⁰ See Lloyd, *From Latin to Spanish*, pp. 81, 140; Allen, *Vox Latina*, pp. 22-25, especially p. 25.

⁸¹ See, e.g., Eulogius, *Memoriale* 2.15-16: *Habdarrahgman* < 'Abd al-Rahmān.

⁶⁹ Allen, *Vox Latina*, pp. 43-45.

⁷⁰ See the discussion at Lloyd, *From Latin to Spanish*, pp. 212-223; Penny, *A History of the Spanish Language*, pp. 90-94; Dworkin, *A Guide to Old Spanish*, pp. 23-24.

⁷¹ Lloyd, *From Latin to Spanish*, pp. 190-191; Penny, *A History of the Spanish Language*, pp. 60-61.

⁷² Cf. possible h-insertion in hiatus in Old French: Klausenburger, *Morphologization*, pp. 67-68.

⁷³ See Kiesler, "Ibero-Romance".

Second, the word-medial transcription of the Arabic lateral approximants — consistent across the Latin forms, notwithstanding the MS Vatican spellings of (C) as *hVllalla* — is atypical: Arabic /l/ is rendered by geminate Latin <ll>, as is emphatic geminate /ħ/; however, non-emphatic geminate /l/ is rendered <l>. Now, by the 13th century, Latin /ll/ had phonemicised as palatal /ʎ/ in Old Spanish, distinct from /l/.⁸² Therefore, the (C) form may exhibit assimilation of the Arabic distinction /l/ vs. /ħ/ to /l/ <l> vs. /ʎ/ <ll>, mapping velarisation to palatalisation by Ibero-Romance interference.⁸³ Conversely, the inconsistent gemination between the (B) and (C) forms may suggest that the variation arises from the mere difficulty in distinguishing simple and geminated laterals. Further, the Latin gemination (and word boundaries) appear to purposefully obscure the Arabic accentuation: while Classical Latin accentuation was no longer productive in this period, Ibero-Romance usually accented the equivalent syllable;⁸⁴ as such, gemination would occasion paroxytone accentuation of the Latin (B) and (C) forms (*hVllV* and *hVllálla*). However, the Arabic accent aligns with these forms' *ultimas*.

Finally, the Latin vocalism shows artefacts of *imāla* (Arabic vowel raising), whereby [e(:)] results from underlying /a(:)/. In CA, *imāla* usually affects /a(:)/ in the environments i(:)C(C)___ and ___C(C)i(:), but is precluded where any C is emphatic or guttural.⁸⁵ Accordingly, Latin <e> in *hille* likely exhibits *imāla* of Arabic /a(:)/ syllabically adjacent to /i/, aligning the raised phone with Latin /e/,⁸⁶ while the <a>'s in *hVllalla*, and in (*h*)*alla* in the LSM transcriptions of the second limb, exhibit the inhibiting function of emphatic /ħ/ in the name *Allāh*. However, in most dialects, including AA,⁸⁷ [e(:)] is the *default* representation, with [a(:)] *only* arising in emphatic or guttural consonantal environments. Thus, the transcriptions may disclose the underlying register: the <e> in

Latin *le*, and the <e> of *Muhagmet* in the second limb, can only be dialectal *imāla*, as they lack the CA conditioning environment. This patterning recommends the vocalism *le hille hilalla* as the closest reflection of the underlying Arabic-Latin interchange, with the common (B) variant *halla* arising by analogy with (*h*)*alla* in the second limb, or by homeoteleuton with (C).⁸⁸ More significantly, the rendering of vowels confirms that the transcriptional input was an AA variant of the formula, or else exhibited a high degree of AA interference.

Overall, the LSM's *šahāda* provides insights into the text's composition, and the processes underpinning its transcriptions. First, its AA basis — evident in the absent case endings and the non-classical *imāla* — implies that, despite his CA Islamic sources, Abraham followed the vernacular phonology of Toledo. This election to adopt the vernacularised pronunciations of his milieu, rather than the formalised expressions of the Islamic texts, reflects a previously overlooked aspect of Abraham's text. Further, the transcriptional mode adopted alienates, rather than acclimates, the Latin reader to Arabic phraseology: far from nativising the foreign forms, the renderings introduce non-Latinate graphemic patterns and obscure the prosody of the original Arabic. This, in turn, disrupts access to the underlying forms, and thereby to the original Islamic formulas.

4. A Possible Formula in the Tultusceptru

The preceding analysis of the *šahāda* in the LSM suggests a novel reading of the transcription in the *Tultusceptru*, facilitating recovery of the underlying Arabic input. This expression follows the angel's explanation for his appearance to Ozim (ln. 16-19):

sic locutus est angelus malignus dicens ei: "... dicam tibi verba quem predices satrapum eorum at quos missus es." et dixit ei: "non vocaris Ozim sed Mohomad." et illi inposuit nomen angelus qui se illi ostendit et precepit illi dicere ut credant.

Thus the evil angel spoke, saying to him: "... I will tell you words which you will preach to those satraps to whom you have been sent." And he said to him: "You are not called Ozim but Muḥammad."

⁸² Lloyd, *From Latin to Spanish*, pp. 243-244; Penny, *A History of the Spanish Language*, p. 71; Dworkin, *A Guide to Old Spanish*, p. 28.

⁸³ Cf. rare Ibero-Romance <tl> for Arabic /ħ/ in a rendering of *Allāh*: UZ, *Grammar*, p. 21.

⁸⁴ Lloyd, *From Latin to Spanish*, p. 115; Dworkin, *A Guide to Old Spanish*, pp. 21-22.

⁸⁵ Levin, "The Authenticity of Sibawayhi's Description of the 'Imāla'", pp. 77-80; Owens, *A Linguistic History of Arabic*, pp. 201-202.

⁸⁶ See Torreblanca, "On Hispano-Arabic Historical Phonology", pp. 38-39, 44-45.

⁸⁷ Owens, *A Linguistic History of Arabic*, p. 213; UZ, *Grammar*, pp. 1-5; Corriente, *A Grammatical Sketch*, pp. 22-26.

⁸⁸ In particular, the (B) form *halla* likely arose from (C) by analogy, while the first <a> in the (C) form *halalla* arose by metaphony. While the <i> of *hilalla* better renders Arabic /i/, <e> occasionally transcribes Arabic /i/ in loanwords into Ibero-Romance: Corriente, *A Grammatical Sketch*, 27; UZ, *Grammar*, pp. 5-6.

And the angel who appeared to [Ozim] imposed a name on him, and ordered him to speak, so that they might believe.

The subsequent text at ln. 20 — although clearly transcribing Arabic — is presented as an incomprehensible incantation: unlike in the LSM, the author neither acknowledges the foreign phrase as sensible speech, nor provides a translation. Its meaning is further obscured by the possibility of textual corruption: missing words throughout the manuscript betray a poor copyist.⁸⁹ Despite minor disagreements among prior editors on the word-spacing, inspection of the text itself confirms the reading recently provided by Gil Fernández (here printed with the interpuncts on the manuscript): *alla occuber · alla occuber · situleilacitus est · mohamet · razulille*.

Scholars usually assume that the *Tultusceptra*'s transcription reflects the *šahāda*: this conclusion relies on the phrase's similarity to the *adān* (the call to prayer), which — as performed in al-Andalus⁹⁰ — also begins with repetition of the *takbīr*, followed by the *šahāda*.⁹¹ However, while *Mohamet razulille* clearly reflects the *šahāda*'s second limb, it is unclear how the sequence *situleilacitus est* could align with the Arabic of the first limb. Wolf and Hoyland propose that Arabic *lā ilā(ha)* is discernible in medial *le ila*; indeed, the Latin does resemble the (A) and (B) forms in the LSM's *šahāda*, with similar — if inconsistent — *imāla*, and without word-initial <h>. However, the surrounding *situ ... citus est* remains obscure. Wolf proposes that *situ* represents *ašhadu* ("I testify"), or that *situ citus est* is Latin (perhaps "was cited in place") that merged with the Arabic in transmission.⁹² Díaz y Díaz, assisted by Vázquez de Benito, instead proposes corruption of Arabic *šalātuhu 'alaykum* ("His [A]llāh's] blessing be upon you").⁹³ None of these suggestions are wholly satisfactory. Arabic *ašhadu*

fits the formula, but the putative transcription *situ* is phonologically difficult: whereas Latin <ɿ> is a possible, if unlikely, rendering of Arabic /d/,⁹⁴ syncope of the initial stressed syllable is anomalous. Further, although *-tus est* militates in favour of Latin influence, the presence of these segments appears unmotivated. Díaz y Díaz's Arabic, while semantically clear, is not used formulaically or devotionally in any core Islamic text.⁹⁵

A neater, hybrid approach may be suggested. Given copyist's errors elsewhere, the sequence <situle> may be corrupted from underlying *siletu* by syllabic metathesis — as Díaz y Díaz implicitly proposes — possibly with interference from Latin *situ*. The form *siletu* suggests underlying Arabic *al-šalātu* ("the blessing"), with regular assimilation of the liquid before the solar consonant /sʰ/, and loss of initial unstressed vowel before CC. If the Latinate *citus est* is then isolated, remaining <ila> suggests Arabic *'alā*. On this reading, the transcription and surrounding text represent not the *šahāda*, but the following:

et illi inposuit nomen angelus qui se illi ostendit et precepit illi dicere ut credant: "alla occuber, alla occuber." "siletu [MS: situle] ila," citus est, "Mohamet razulille."

And the angel who appeared to [Ozim] imposed a name on him, and taught him to say, so that they might believe: "*A]llāhu akbar, A]llāhu akbar.*" He was invoked as: "*al-šalātu 'alā Muḥammad(in) rasūli llāh.*" ("Blessing be upon Muḥammad, A]llāh's Prophet!")

This approach has three strengths.

The first is its alignment with known Islamic honorifics. The collocation *al-šalātu 'alā Muḥammad* represents a common formula, attested in a range of contemporaneous texts, often following *al-ḥamdu li-llāh* ("Praise be to A]llāh").⁹⁶ Signifi-

⁸⁹ Díaz y Díaz, "Los textos antimahometanos más antiguos en códices españoles", pp. 161-162.

⁹⁰ See, e.g., the long-held unanimity among 12th-14th-century Andalusian jurists on the *adān*'s text: Dutton, "*Sunna, Ḥadīth and Madīna 'Amal*", pp. 8-9, 16-19.

⁹¹ See, e.g., Gil Fernández, *Scriptores Muzarabici Saeculi VII-XI*, vol. 2, p. 1216, n. 28/29; Wolf, "The Earliest Latin Lives of Muḥammad", p. 95; González Muñoz, "La nota del códice de Roda", p. 128. Others, though in general agreement, are more cautious: Tolán, "Tultusceptra de libro domni Metodii", p. 84; Hoyland, *Seeing Islam as Others Saw It*, p. 515.

⁹² See Wolf, "The Earliest Latin Lives of Muḥammad", p. 95, n. 19; "Falsifying the Prophet", p. 116, n. 24; Wolf, "Counterhistory", p. 18, n. 23.

⁹³ Díaz y Díaz, "Los textos antimahometanos más antiguos en códices españoles", pp. 162, n. 19, 163.

⁹⁴ Intervocalic voicing of underlying /t/, implemented inconsistently across Mozarabic dialects, may recommend a Latin pronunciation /d/ <ɿ>: Galmés de Fuentes, *Dialectología mozárabe*, pp. 25, 91-100 (Toledo), 175-178 (Murcia), 201-202 (Seville), 236-239 (Granada). Conversely, there is evidence of an infrequent AA interchange /d/ ~ /tʰ/: Corriente, *A Grammatical Sketch*, pp. 38-39. Notably, however, only Arabic /d#/ is regularly transcribed by Ibero-Romance <ɿ>: UZ, *Grammar*, p. 16. Compare LSM *haxedu* (110c.32).

⁹⁵ This rare collocation does appear in continuous prose in al-Biqā'ī (d. 1480), *Naẓm al-durar*, vol. 3, p. 360: *li-yahfaza šalātahu 'alaykum* ("... so that [A]llāh] may preserve His prayers upon you").

⁹⁶ See, e.g., al-Bazzār (d. 905), *Musnad al-Bazzār*, vol. 10, p. 477, no. 4681, vol. 11, p. 339, no. 5155; al-Ṭabarī (d. 923), *Tārīḥ al-rusul wa-l-mulūk*, vol. 8, p. 540; al-'Askarī (d. ca. 1010), *Mu'gam al-furūq al-luḡawīya*, p. 3.

cantly, the related (and common) *taṣliya* — the phrase *ṣalla līlāhu ‘alayhi* [= ‘alā al-nabīy] *wasallam* (“May Allāh grant him [i.e., the Prophet] blessings and salvation”)⁹⁷ — is transcribed by Eulogius, with accompanying translation: *zalla allah halla anabi va zallen*.⁹⁸ This contemporaneous awareness of the *taṣliya* provides corroborating context for the appearance of the nominal variant *al-ṣalātu ‘alā Muḥammad* in the *Tultusceptru*.

Importantly, attestations of this version are often followed by a predicative epithet for Muḥammad, including — as here, and in the *ṣahāda* — the title *rasūlu līlāh*.⁹⁹ Paired with the prophetic epithet, this formula justifies the Latin verb *ciere*, here not “to cite”, but “to call upon (by name), invoke”,¹⁰⁰ or else “to proclaim”.¹⁰¹ The former sense is common in Classical texts,¹⁰² including with the explanatory ablative *nomine*.¹⁰³ This usage subsisted into Medieval Latin,¹⁰⁴ including to introduce direct exclamations.¹⁰⁵ The transcribed text *siletu ila ... Mohamet razulille* should then be understood as direct speech providing the content of the invocation, or else in apposition with the subject of *citus est*, with the author identifying Ozim with his honorific ‘title’. The insertion of *citus est* into the midst of the transcription — between the Arabic preposition and its governed noun — is perhaps unexpected; however, this parenthetical use of verbs introducing direct speech was certainly not unknown in later Latin,¹⁰⁶ and here justifiably separates the

name *Mohamet razulille* from the introductory *siletu ila*.¹⁰⁷

Second, this reading is recommended by the text’s internal logic. By inserting a sentence break after the second *alla occuber* (justifying the manuscript’s interpunct there), the author identifies two separate moments within the angel’s Arabic speech: the teaching of an incantation, and the naming of Muḥammad. This treatment of the *takbīr* as an invocation of plural godheads was a common polemical device across Iberia and the Christian East.¹⁰⁸ Thus, a separation after the two *alla occuber*’s is necessary to isolate these as the operative curse, as deployed at ln. 21-22: *quia omnis alla occuber advocatio demonum est* (“because every *alla occuber* is a summoning of demons”). Indeed, if the author deemed *alla occuber* of special significance, reading the transcription as a cohesive whole renders its second half otiose and unmotivated.

Likewise, this separation also neatly fits the narrative context: beyond clearly evoking the *ṣahāda*’s two limbs, the pair of distinct Arabic sayings parallels the bipartite structure of the angel’s prior explanation, that he had come to teach words (*dicam tibi verba*), and to rename Ozim (*non vocaris Ozim sed Mohomad*). Given the clear shift from the angel’s Latin to his Arabic, this earlier framing is better read as the author’s pre-emptive Latin gloss of the Arabic actually spoken by the angel. Moreover, the narratorial introduction of the transcriptions — *et illi inposuit nomen ... et precepit illi dicere ...* — presents the same division of the angel’s act, albeit chiastically: on this reading, the phrase *illi inposuit nomen* does not refer *back* to Ozim’s naming, but rather *anticipates* the subsequent Arabic invocation introduced by *citus est*.

Finally, the vocalism of Latin *razulille* offers a linguistic proof. Final Latin <e> shows uninhibited *imāla* of Arabic /a:/, contrasting with the *Tultusceptru*’s transcription *Alla*, the LSM form (*h*)*alla* in the *ṣahāda*’s second limb, and even Eulogius’ *zalla allah*. Exceptionally, therefore, the Arabic lateral approximants here are *unemphatic*, as is

⁹⁷ See, e.g., the phrase’s occurrence in 9th-10th-century inscriptions at the Great Mosque of Córdoba: Calvo Capilla, “The Visual Construction of the Umayyad Caliphate”, pp. 47-48.

⁹⁸ Eulogius, *Memoriale* 2.82-84. Compare Paulus Albarus, *Indiculus* 1255-1256.

⁹⁹ See, e.g., al-Hakīm al-Tirmidī (d. ca. 910), *al-Manhīyāt*, p. 23; al-Ṭa’ālibī (d. 1039), *Tahsīn al-qabīh*, p. 14.

¹⁰⁰ See *OED* s.v. *cieo*, def. 6; *Firminius Verris* s.v. *cieo*.

¹⁰¹ See *DMBLS* s.v. *ciere*, def. e.

¹⁰² See, e.g., Livy, *Ab urbe condita* 22.14.7.

¹⁰³ See, e.g., Suetonius, *Nero* 46.3.

¹⁰⁴ See, e.g., the 7th-century *Vita beati Leudegarii martyris* 1.606: *inde virum quendam crebrata voce ciebat* (“Thereafter he was calling on a certain man with strengthened voice”); Saxo Grammaticus (d. ca. 1220), *Gesta Danorum* 2.7.17.5-6: *quid me Rolvonis generum ... tanta voce cies?* (“Why do you invoke me, Rolf’s son-in-law, with so great a voice?”).

¹⁰⁵ E.g., Frithegod (fl. ca. 950-958), *De vita Sancti Wilfridi* 26.4: *euge ciunt cives certatim protinus omnes* (“‘Hurrah!’ eagerly exclaim all the citizens at once”).

¹⁰⁶ The use of direct speech markers — especially *inquit* — in mid-position without an earlier verb of speech is attested throughout later Latin: Mikulová, “Verbs Introducing Direct Speech in Late Latin Texts”, pp. 130-133.

¹⁰⁷ An alternative reading is *ila<c>* [< ‘alayk (“upon you”, in pausal form)], by haplographic omission preceding *citus*. In this case, *citus est* instead stands neatly after the complete sentence *al-ṣalātu ‘alayk*. However, the transcription <a> for Arabic *ay* is difficult: UZ, *Grammar*, pp. 7-9; Corriente, *A Grammatical Sketch*, pp. 29-31.

¹⁰⁸ See the examples at González Muñoz, “La nota del código de Roda”, pp. 56-57; Gil Fernández, *Scriptores Muzarabici Saeculi VII-XI*, vol. 1, pp. 119-120, 124-125.

regular in CA where *Allāh* is prodelided after /i(:)#/, and the construct phrase unverbated.¹⁰⁹ Thus, the text must transcribe the Arabic noun phrase in the *genitive* case, CA *rasūli llāh*, with Latin <i> reflecting Arabic /i/ (as expected). The new reading explains this morphology, by proposing that the noun phrase stands in apposition with the genitive referent *Muhammad(in)* after the preposition *‘alā*.

Based on this solution, two further aspects of the honorific formula require comment. First, the case endings *-tu* (on *al-ṣalātu*) and *-i* (on *rasūli*) imply a CA source. Thus, the transcription *Mahomet* — lacking the expected endings *-in* — likely reflects the author’s differential perception, severing the known name from surrounding unfamiliar text; indeed, their familiarity with the pausal form *Muhammad* is evident in their use of *Mohomad* in ln. 18. Second, Latin *ila* for Arabic *‘alā*, and *siletu* for *al-ṣalātu*, exhibit dialectal *imāla*. The latter provides Latin <e> for Arabic /a:/ outside the CA conditioning environment, and both forms exhibit <i> for underlying unstressed Arabic /a/, reflecting the high vowel raising that pervaded all stages of AA.¹¹⁰ While CA /s^s/ and /ʃ/ usually inhibit *imāla*, AA dialects often obscured the phonemic distinction between /s^s/ and /s/, and lost the phoneme /ʃ/, particularly in lower registers.¹¹¹

Thus, the *Tultusceptru*’s transcriptions reflect an Arabic idiolect characterised by AA phonology, but CA morphology. This constitutes a concession to fossilised religious terminology within an otherwise dialectal environment.¹¹² The phenomenon’s appearance here highlights the dynamism of Arabic in al-Andalus, and models the diglossic interweaving of linguistic features.

As for the *Tultusceptru*’s author, their transcription practice — unlike that of the LSM — is sympathetic to the underlying Arabic forms, paying close attention to Arabic vowel quality and prosodic groupings. The transcriptions show that the original author, far from a crude polemicist, had some knowledge of Islamic honorifics, and transcribed the Arabic forms with care. Identifying the polemicist’s greater awareness of Islam brings other elements of their polemic into focus: for example, the author’s depiction of Muhammad as a corrupted monk — a duality emphasised at

ln. 23-24: *dum esset vas Christi factum est vas Mamone* (“All the while being a vessel of Christ, [Ozim] became a vessel of Mammon”) — may be ascribed to a desire to justify similarities between Islamic thought and Christian doctrine that the author *themselves* had identified.

5. Transcribing the Takbīr

The texts’ approaches to one further formula usefully corroborate these results. Both texts transcribe the *takbīr*: common in al-Andalus,¹¹³ the expression *Allāhu akbar* occurs in the *adān*’s opening, as part of the prayer, and as a devotional formula. In light of the AA features outlined above, its phonological range is:

CA: /ʔaʔ. 'lɑ:hu# 'ʔak.bar/ ~ AA: */ʔaʔ. 'lɑk.bar/¹¹⁴ or */ʔaʔ. 'lɑ# 'ʔak.bar/

The *Tultusceptru* provides the clear rendering *alla occuber* three times (ln. 20 (x2), 21). Conversely, the LSM produces it once, as *halla huha kybar* (110c.28), translated in text as *magnus est Deus* (“God is great”).¹¹⁵

Both texts transcribe *Allāh* as expected (with environmental /h/ inhibiting *imāla* of either vowel), and the LSM exhibits its usual word-initial h-insertion. The LSM transcription’s word boundaries, however, are anomalous. In particular, the final syllable of CA *Allāhu*, and the first of *akbar*, have merged to produce Latin *huha*. The intervocalic <h> further evidences the LSM’s generalised word-initial h-insertion, suggesting that it adhered to perceived Arabic /#ʔ/ before word boundary placement.¹¹⁶ Conversely, the word-initial <h> of *huha*, though perhaps automatically inserted, may reflect the original CA aspirate, an ambiguity highlighting the infelicity of the foreignising transcriptions. As in the LSM’s *ṣahāda*, the Latin word boundaries obscure the underlying Arabic accents, which here align with the ultimas of Latin *halla* and *huha*. Given the rarity of multisyllabic oxytone words

¹¹³ See, e.g., Ibn al-Šabbāt’s (d. 1282) account of the Muslim conquest: Clarke, “Medieval Arabic Accounts of the Conquest of Cordoba”, pp. 54-55.

¹¹⁴ The AA elision here is hypothetical: see UZ, *Grammar*, p. 34.

¹¹⁵ Cf. MS Vatican 253r.21 *halla huha kibar*; MS Oxford 13r.a.21 *halla hua kibar* (the word-spacing, marked on the manuscript by interpuncts, agrees with the Latin texts; cf. Wunderli’s reading *hallahu akibar*: *Le livre de l’eschiele Mahomet*, p. 54). Given the following discussion, the suggestion that *kybar* represents a (phonologically obscure) transcription of Arabic *ḡabbār* (“mighty”) may be ruled out: cf. de la Cruz Palma, “Machometus”, p. 379.

¹¹⁶ Contrast the French *hua*, without internal h-insertion.

¹⁰⁹ Al-Nassir, *Sibawayh the Phonologist*, pp. 48-49.

¹¹⁰ UZ, *Grammar*, p. 2.

¹¹¹ Corriente, *A Grammatical Sketch*, pp. 48-50, 56-57; UZ, *Grammar*, pp. 25-27, 32.

¹¹² On the practice among modern Arabic speakers, see Hallberg, *Case Endings in Spoken Standard Arabic*, pp. 64-65, 176-196.

in Ibero-Romance,¹¹⁷ this consistent patterning suggests either disregard for Arabic accentuation, or else emphasis of the transcriptional gap.

The *Tultusceptru* also reflects CA *-hu*. The <o> in *occuber* anomalously renders the first /a/ in Arabic *akbar*. In loanwords into Ibero-Romance, this reflex normally requires environmental emphatic or guttural consonants in the underlying Arabic.¹¹⁸ Thus, Latin /o/ <o> here must be perceptual. From CA input /a:.hu#ʔa/, the form suggests perceived [a:.hʷa], whereby the Latin hearer, in disregarding the non-native hiatus at word break, omits the intervocalic glottal stop, and so reinterprets /u/ without syllabicity (i.e., /a:(h)wa/). This non-Latinate sequence is then resolved as /a#o/, with the vowel following the labialised consonant undergoing rounding (as is typologically common).¹¹⁹

Further, the anaptyctic vowel /kVb/ in both Latin transcriptions disrupts the non-native Latin sequence */VkbV/.¹²⁰ The *Tultusceptru*'s choice of the high back vowel /u/ in *occuber* is conditioned by the [+high][+back] features of environmental <c> [k].¹²¹ Moreover, the spelling with geminated <cc> provides the correctly aligned accentuation *óccuber*. These spellings together suggest a false etymology with Latin *occubare* or *occumbere* ("to lie dead"),¹²² referring to the deathly effect of conversion identified at ln. 24-25. Conversely, the epenthetic <y> in the LSM form *kybar* in MS Paris, apparently to represent Latin /i/ (as in MS Vatican and MS Oxford *kibar*),¹²³ appears unmotivated; however, taken together, the <y> and <k> (rendering

both Arabic /k/ and /q/ throughout the LSM),¹²⁴ suggest a foreignising transcription.

Overall, both texts' transcriptions here directly reflect a CA source; this suggests that AA interference hardly affected the *takbīr*, or else that the CA case morphology was fossilised within the vernacular. More significantly, these cases confirm the earlier conclusions on transcriptional style: the LSM again uses non-Latinate features to obscure the underlying Arabic, while the *Tultusceptru* provides a more representative rendering of the Islamic expression.

6. Conclusion

This study's methodology establishes a general schema of the parameters — both phonological and socio-linguistic — that affect transcriptions of Islamic formulas on the Iberian Peninsula; this facilitates a closer reading of the previously neglected transcriptional evidence in Mozarabic and other Iberian bilingual texts considering Arabic phrases.

The model's effectiveness is evident in its previously unrecognised capacity to extract consistent linguistic data from the transcriptions, as well as in the novel perspectives it provides on the surveyed texts. For the LSM, the AA aspect of the Arabic input belies the text's sophisticated reliance on Islamic sources, with the purposeful vernacularisation suggesting a duality between the author's bookish research and linguistic exposure. However, the transcriptions also obscure the underlying Arabic, rendering phrases in a way that highlights Islam's foreignness, rather than accurately conveying phonological information. In the *Tultusceptru*, the model remedies a prior misreading of the underlying Arabic. The text transcribed — an honorific of Muḥammad — reflects the author's greater exposure to Islamic sources, while its integration into the surrounding narrative indicates their awareness of the two-fold structure of the Islamic faith, encompassing both God and Prophet. Moreover, the author's more accurate rendering of Islamic formulas reflects a desire to engage substantively with Islamic thought, which in turn should prompt a re-examination of the text as a significant witness of Christian-Muslim relations in al-Andalus.

¹¹⁷ Dworkin, *A Guide to Old Spanish*, pp. 21-22.

¹¹⁸ Corriente, *A Grammatical Sketch*, p. 25; UZ, *Grammar*, p. 6. See generally Bakalla, "Tafṣīḥ".

¹¹⁹ Padgett, "Consonant-Vowel Place Feature Interactions", pp. 1761-1776.

¹²⁰ Cser, *Aspects of the Phonology and Morphology of Classical Latin*, p. 48.

¹²¹ Compare the anaptyctic mid-high back /o/ at Paulus Albarus, *Indiculus* 1074: *quem illi Cobar vocant, hoc est, maiorem* ("... which they call Cobar, that is, 'greater'). See also the anaptyxis of /u/ in George Monachus' 9th-century Greek transcription (*Chronicon*, vol. 2, p. 706, 8-9): Ἀλλά, Ἀλλά, Οὐά, Κουβάρ, Ἀλλά. This Greek form and the *Tultusceptru*'s transcription likely resulted from distinct perceptual events: whereas the univertised Latin *occuber* includes a treatment of perceived [a:.hʷa] with environmental rounding, the Greek transcriber perceived the semi-vowel as the syllable onset (i.e., /a#wa/). Cf. Gil Fernández, *Scriptores Muzarabici Saeculi VIII-XI*, vol. 1, p. 125.

¹²² See *DMBLS* s.v. *occubare*, s.v. *occumbere*, defs. 3-5; *Firminus Verris* s.v. *cumbo*.

¹²³ This mapping of <y> to /i/ is standard in Latin: Allen, *Vox Latina*, pp. 52-53.

¹²⁴ See, e.g., *vhalkaforat* (118a.16-17, 18) <wa-l-kaffārāt, kodem (111a.39-40) <quddām. However, <c> is used for both phonemes at syllable coda: *halmacfiuf* (122a.56-57) <al-makfūf; hacrop (111a.39) <aqrib.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- al-‘Askarī, Abū Hilāl, *Mu‘ḡam al-furūq al-luḡawīya*, Baytullāh Bayāt (ed.), Qom, Mu‘assasat al-našr al-islāmī, 1991.
- al-Bazzār, Abū Bakr Aḥmad, *Musnad al-Bazzār*, Medina, Maktabat al-‘ulūm wa-l-ḥikam, 2009, 18 vols.
- al-Biqā‘ī, Burhān al-Dīn, *Nazm al-durar fī tanāsub al-āyāt wa-l-suwar*, Cairo, Dār al-kitāb al-islāmī, 1984, 22 vols.
- Eulogius, *Memoriale Sanctorum*, in Gil Fernández, *Scriptores Muzarabici Saeculi VIII-XI*, vol. 2, pp. 739-862.
- Frithegod, *De vita Sancti Wilfridi*, in Jacques Paul Migne (ed.), *Patrologia Latina, Tomus CXXXIII*, Paris, Migne, 1853, cols. 979-1012.
- George Monachus, *Chronicon*, in Carl de Boor (ed.), rev. ed., Stuttgart, Teubner, 1978, 2 vols.
- al-Ḥakīm al-Tirmidī, *al-Manḥiyāt*, Muḥammad ‘Uṭmān al-Ḥašt (ed.), Cairo, Maktabat al-Qur‘ān, 1986.
- al-Hillī, Ṣafī al-Dīn, *Kitāb al-‘āṭil al-ḥālī wa-l-murahḥaš al-ḡālī*, Wilhelm Hoenerbach (ed.), Wiesbaden, Franz Steiner, 1956.
- Ibn Quzmān, Abū Bakr, *Dīwān*, in James Monroe (ed.), *The Mischievous Muse: Extant Poetry and Prose by Ibn Quzmān of Córdoba (d. AH 555/AD 1160)*, Leiden, Brill, 2017, vol. 1, pp. 22-877.
- John of Damascus, *Liber de haeresibus*, in Bonifatius Kotter, *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos IV: Liber de haeresibus. Opera polemica*, Berlin, De Gruyter, 1981, pp. 19-67.
- Liber scale Machometi*, in MS Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France Latin 6064, 105v-126v, [online], available on: <https://archivesetmanuscrits.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cc65091j> [consulted 17/06/2022].
- Liber scale Machometi*, in MS Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Latin 4072, 241v-289v, [online], available on: https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Vat.lat.4072 [consulted 17/06/2022].
- Livre de l’eschiele Mahomet*, MS Oxford, Bodleian Library Laudensis Misc. 537.
- Livy, *Ab urbe condita, Libri XXI-XXV*, Charles Flamstead Walters & Robert Seymour Conway (eds.), repr., Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1974.
- al-Maqqarī, Aḥmad Ibn Muḥammad, *The History of the Mohammedan Dynasties in Spain*, Pascual de Gayangos (trans.), repr., New York, Johnson Reprint Company, 1964, 2 vols.
- Paulus Albarus, *Epistole*, in Gil Fernández, *Scriptores Muzarabici Saeculi VIII-XI*, vol. 1, pp. 425-584.
- Paulus Albarus, *Indiculus luminosus*, in Gil Fernández, *Scriptores Muzarabici Saeculi VIII-XI*, vol. 1, pp. 585-645.

- al-Qādī ‘Iyād Ibn Mūsā al-Yaḥṣubī, *al-Šifā’ bi-ta’rīf ḥuqūq al-Muṣṭafā*, 2nd ed., Amman, Dār al-Fayḥā’, 1987, 2 vols.
- Saxo Grammaticus, *Gesta Danorum*, Jørgen Olrik & Hans Raeder (eds.), Copenhagen, Levin & Munksgaard, 1931, 2 vols.
- Suetonius, *Nero*, in Henri Ailloud (ed.), *Suétone: Vies des douze Césars*, Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 1931-1932, vol. 2, pp. 150-201.
- al-Ta’ālibī, Abū Mansūr, *Taḥsīn al-qabīḥ wa-taqbīḥ al-ḥasan*, Nabīl ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Ḥayāwī (ed.), Beirut, Dār al-Arqām Ibn Abī l-Arqām, 2002.
- al-Ṭabarī, Muḥammad Ibn Ġarīr, *Tārīḥ al-rusul wa-l-mulūk*, 2nd ed., Beirut, Dār al-turāt, 1967, 11 vols.
- Tultusceptru de libro domni Metobii*, in MS Madrid, Real Academia de la Historia 78, 185v, [online], available on: <https://bibliotecadigital.rah.es/es/consulta/registro.do?id=101> [consulted 17/06/2022].
- Vita beati Leudegarii martyris*, in Ludovicus Traube (ed.), *Poetae Latini Aevi Carolini*, Berlin, Weidmann, 1896, vol. 3, pp. 1-37.

References

- Al-Ani, Salman & May, Darlene, “The Phonological Structure of the Syllable in Arabic”, in Salman Al-Ani (ed.), *Readings in Arabic Linguistics*, Bloomington, Indiana University Linguistics Club, 1978, pp. 113-126.
- Alfozan, Abdulrahman Ibrahim, *Assimilation in Classical Arabic: A Phonological Study*, unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Glasgow, 1989, [online], available on: <https://theses.gla.ac.uk/1144/> [consulted 17/06/2022].
- Allen, W. Sidney, *Accent and Rhythm – Prosodic Features of Latin and Greek: A Study in Theory and Reconstruction*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1973.
- Allen, W. Sidney, *Vox Latina: The Pronunciation of Classical Latin*, rev. ed., Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Al-Nassir, Abdulmun’im Abdulamir, *Sibawayh the Phonologist: A Critical Study of the Phonetic and Phonological Theory of Sibawayh as Presented in His Treatise Al-Kitāb*, London, Kegan Paul International, 1993.
- Bakalla, Muhammad Hasan, “Tafxīm”, in Lutz Edzard & Rudolf de Jong (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics*, 2011, [online], doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1570-6699_eall_EALL_COM_0333.
- Besson, Gisèle & Brossard-Dandré, Michèle, *Le livre de l’échelle de Mahomet: Liber Scalae Machometi*, Paris, Librairie générale française, 1991.
- Best, Catherine, “A Direct Realist View of Cross-Language Speech Perception: New Directions in Research and

- Theory”, in Winifred Strange (ed.), *Speech Perception and Linguistic Experience: Issues in Cross-Language Research*, Baltimore, York Press, 1995, pp. 171-206.
- Best, Catherine & Tyler, Michael Douglas, “Nonnative and Second-Language Speech Perception: Commonalities and Complementarities”, in Murray Munro & Ocke-Schwen Bohn (eds.), *Language Experience in Second Language Speech Learning: In Honor of James Emil Flege*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 2007, pp. 13-34.
- Blau, Joshua, *A Grammar of Christian Arabic, based mainly on South-Palestinian Texts from the First Millennium*, Leuven, Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1966.
- Calvo Capilla, Susana, “The Visual Construction of the Umayyad Caliphate in Al-Andalus through the Great Mosque of Cordoba”, *Arts*, 7, 3 (2018), no. 36, [online], doi: <https://doi.org/10.3390/arts7030036>.
- Cantarino, Vicente, “From Spoken to Written Language and Back: Some Cultural Considerations on Hispano-Arabic Phonetics”, in Mushira Eid, Vincente Cantarino & Keith Walters (eds.), *Perspectives on Arabic Linguistics VI: Papers from the Sixth Annual Symposium on Arabic Linguistics*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 1994, pp. 25-36.
- Carlos Villamarín, Helena de, “El Códice de Roda (Madrid BRAH 78) como compilación de voluntad historiográfica”, *Edad Media*, 12 (2011), pp. 119-142.
- Cerulli, Enrico, *Il Libro della Scala e la questione delle fonti arabo-spagnole della Divina Commedia*, Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1949.
- Chalmeta, Pedro, “Le passage à l’Islam dans al-Andalus au X^e siècle”, in *Actas del XII Congreso de la U.E.A.I. (Málaga, 1984)*, Madrid, Union Européenne des Arabisants et Islamisants, 1986, pp. 161-183.
- Clarke, Nicola, “Medieval Arabic Accounts of the Conquest of Cordoba: Creating a Narrative for a Provincial Capital”, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 74, 1 (2011), pp. 41-57.
- Coetzee, Andries, “The Phonology of the Two Hamza’s of Qur’ānic Arabic”, *Theoretical Linguistics*, 24 (1998), pp. 219-244.
- Corriente, Federico, *A Grammatical Sketch of the Spanish Arabic Dialect Bundle*, Madrid, Instituto Hispano-Árabe de Cultura, 1977.
- Corriente, Federico, *Árabe andalusí y lenguas romances*, Madrid, MAPFRE, 1992.
- Cruz Palma, Óscar de la, “Machometus: La invención del Profeta Mahoma en las fuentes latinas medievales”, *Medievalia*, 20, 2 (2017) pp. 1-772.
- Cser, András, *Aspects of the Phonology and Morphology of Classical Latin*, Budapest, Akadémiai doktori értekezés, 2016.
- Daniel, Norman, *Islam and the West: The Making of an Image*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 1960.
- Dévényi, Kinga, “I’rāb”, in Lutz Edzard & Rudolf de Jong (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics*, 2011, [online], doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1570-6699_eall_EALL_SIM_vol2_0029.
- DFDAA = Federico Corriente, Christopher Pereira & Ángeles Vicente (eds.), *Encyclopédie linguistique d’Al-Andalus, Vol. 2: Dictionnaire du faisceau dialectal arabe andalou: Perspectives phraséologiques et étymologiques*, Berlin, De Gruyter, 2017.
- Di Cesare, Michelina, *The Pseudo-Historical Image of the Prophet Muḥammad*, Berlin, De Gruyter, 2012.
- Di Cesare, Michelina, “The Prophet in the Book: Images of Muhammad in Western Medieval Book Culture”, in Avinoam Shalem (ed.), *Constructing the Image of Muhammad in Europe*, Berlin, De Gruyter, 2013, pp. 9-32.
- Díaz y Díaz, Manuel, “Los textos antimahometanos más antiguos en códices españoles”, *Archives d’histoire doctrinale et littéraire de Moyen Age*, 37 (1970), pp. 149-168.
- DMLBS = Ronald Latham & David Howlett (eds.), *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2018, 3 vols.
- Dutton, Yasin, “Sunna, Hadīth and Madinan ‘Amal’”, *Journal of Islamic Studies*, 4, 1 (1993), pp. 1-31.
- Dworkin, Steven, *A Guide to Old Spanish*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2018.
- Echevarría, Ana, “Eschatology or Biography? Alfonso X, Muhammad’s Ladder, and a Jewish Go-Between”, in Cynthia Robinson & Leyla Rouhi (eds.), *Under the Influence: Questioning the Comparative in Medieval Castile*, Leiden, Brill, 2005, pp. 133-152.
- Emiliano, Antonio, “Latin or Romance? Graphemic Variation and Scripto-Linguistic Change in Medieval Spain”, in Roger Wright (ed.), *Latin and the Romance Languages in the Early Middle Ages*, London, Routledge, 1991, pp. 233-247.
- Ferminus Verris = Brian Merrilees & William Edwards (eds.), *Firmini Verris Dictionarius: Dictionnaire latin français de Fermin le Ver*, Turnhout, Brepols, 1994.
- Ferrando, Ignacio, “The Arabic Language among the Mozarabs of Toledo during the 12th and 13th Centuries”, in Jonathan Owens (ed.), *Arabic as a Minority Language*, Berlin, De Gruyter, 2000, pp. 45-64.
- Fischer, Wolfdietrich, *A Grammar of Classical Arabic*, 3rd rev. ed., New Haven, Yale University Press, 2002.
- Gadoua, Abdulhamid Hadi, “Consonant Clusters in Quranic Arabic”, *Cahiers Linguistiques d’Ottawa*, 28 (2000), pp. 59-85.
- Gallego, María Ángeles, “The Languages of Medieval Iberia and Their Religious Dimension”, *Medieval Encounters*, 9, 1 (2003), pp. 107-139.
- Galmés de Fuentes, Álvaro, *Dialectología mozárabe*, Madrid, Gredos, 1983.

- Gil Fernández, Juan, *Scriptores Muzarabici Saeculi VIII-XI (Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis LXV A/B)*, Turnhout, Brepols, 2020, 2 vols.
- González Muñoz, Fernando, “La nota del código de Roda sobre el obispo Osio y el monje Ozim”, *Collectanea Christiana Orientalia*, 10 (2013), pp. 51-63.
- Gutwirth, Eleazar, “Asher b. Yehiel e Israel Israeli: actitudes hispano-judías hacia el árabe”, in Carlos Carrete Parrondo & Alisa Meyuhas Ginio (eds.), *Creencias y culturas: Cristianos, judíos y musulmanes en la España medieval*, Salamanca, Servicio de Publicaciones, Universidad Pontificia de Salamanca, 1998, pp. 97-112.
- Hallberg, Andreas, *Case Endings in Spoken Standard Arabic*, Lund, Lund University Faculties of Humanities and Theology, 2016.
- Hoyland, Robert, *Seeing Islam as Others Saw It: A Survey and Evaluation of Christian, Jewish and Zoroastrian Writings on Early Islam*, Princeton, The Darwin Press, 1997.
- Hyatte, Reginald, *The Prophet of Islam in Old French: The Romance of Muhammad (1258) and The Book of Muhammad's Ladder (1264)*, Leiden, Brill, 1997.
- Janssens, Gerard, *Stress in Arabic and Word Structure in the Modern Arabic Dialects*, Leuven, Peeters, 1972.
- Kiesler, Reinhard, “Ibero-Romance”, in Lutz Edzard & Rudolf de Jong (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics*, 2011, [online], doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1570-6699_eall_EALL_COM_vol2_0040.
- Klausenburger, Jurgen, *Morphologization: Studies in Latin and Romance Morphophonology*, Tübingen, Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1979.
- Krotkoff, George, “The *Laḥn al-‘awāmm* of Abū Bakr al-Zubaydī”, *Bulletin of the College of Arts and Sciences, Baghdad*, 2 (1957), pp. 1-14.
- Lapesa, Rafael, *Historia de la lengua española*, Madrid, Gredos, 1981.
- Levin, Aryeh, “The Authenticity of Sībawayhi's Description of the *‘Imāla*”, in Aryeh Levin (ed.), *Arabic Linguistic Thought and Dialectology*, Jerusalem, Institute of Asian and African Studies, 1998, XIII.
- Lloyd, Paul, *From Latin to Spanish, Vol. I: Historical Phonology and Morphology of the Spanish Language*, Philadelphia, American Philosophical Society, 1987.
- Longoni, Anna, *Il libro della scala di Maometto*, Milan, RCS Libri, 2013.
- López Álvarez, Ana María (ed.), *La escuela de traductores de Toledo*, Toledo, Diputación Provincial de Toledo, 1996.
- Mikulová, Jana, “Verbs Introducing Direct Speech in Late Latin Texts”, *Graeco-Latin Brunensia*, 20, 2 (2015), pp. 123-143.
- Muñoz Sendino, José, *La escala de Mahoma*, Madrid, Ministerio de Asuntos Exteriores, 1949.
- OED* = P.G.W. Glare (ed.), *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, 2nd ed., Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Owens, Jonathan, *A Linguistic History of Arabic*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Padgett, Jaye, “Consonant-Vowel Place Feature Interactions”, in Marc van Oostendorp, Colin Ewen, Elizabeth Hume & Keren Rice (eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Phonology*, Malden, MA, Wiley-Blackwell, 2011, vol. 3, pp. 1761-1786.
- Penny, Ralph, *A History of the Spanish Language*, 2nd ed., Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Piamenta, Moshe, *Islam in Everyday Arabic Speech*, Leiden, Brill, 1979.
- Price, Jonathan & Naeh, Shlomo, “On the Margins of Culture: The Practice of Transcription in the Ancient World”, in Hannah Cotton, Robert Hoyland, Johanthan Price & David Wasserstein (eds.), *From Hellenism to Islam: Cultural and Linguistic Change in the Roman Near East*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2009, pp. 257-288.
- Procter, Evelyn, “The Scientific Works of the Court of Alfonso X of Castile: The King and His Collaborators”, *The Modern Language Review*, 40, 1 (1945), pp. 12-29.
- Putten, Marijn van, *Quranic Arabic: From its Hijazi Origins to its Classical Reading Traditions*, Leiden, Brill, 2022.
- Roelli, Philipp, “Zu den Editionen des Liber scalae Machometi”, *Mittelateinisches Jahrbuch*, 54, 2 (2018), pp. 315-323.
- Safran, Janina, “Identity and Differentiation in Ninth-Century al-Andalus”, *Speculum*, 76, 3 (2001), pp. 573-598.
- Sayahi, Lotfi, *Diglossia and Language Contact: Language Variation and Change in North Africa*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- Tolan, John, “Anti-Hagiography: Embrico of Mainz's *Vita Mahumeti*”, *Journal of Medieval History*, 22 (1996), pp. 25-41.
- Tolan, John, “Réactions chrétiennes aux conquêtes musulmanes. Étude comparée des auteurs chrétiens de Syrie et d'Espagne”, *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale*, 44 (2001), pp. 349-367.
- Tolan, John, *Saracens: Islam in the Medieval European Imagination*, New York, Columbia University Press, 2002.
- Tolan, John, “Tultusceptru de libro domni Metodii”, in David Thomas & Alexander Mallett (eds.), *Christian-Muslim Relations: A Biographical History, Volume 2 (900-1050)*, Leiden, Brill, 2010, pp. 83-84.
- Torreblanca, Máximo, “On Hispano-Arabic Historical Phonology: Latin and Romance Evidence”, in

- Mushira Eid, Vincente Cantarino & Keith Walters (eds.), *Perspectives on Arabic Linguistics VI: Papers from the Sixth Annual Symposium on Arabic Linguistics*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 1994, pp. 37-62.
- UZ, *Grammar* = University of Zaragoza (ed.), *A Descriptive and Comparative Grammar of Andalusī Arabic*, Leiden, Brill, 2013.
- Vázquez de Parga, Luis, “Algunas notas sobre el Pseudo-Metodio y Españas”, *Habis*, 2 (1971), pp. 143-164.
- Wasilewski, Janna, “The ‘Life of Muhammad’ in Eulogius of Córdoba: Some Evidence for the Transmission of Greek Polemic to the Latin West”, *Early Medieval Europe*, 16, 3 (2008), pp. 333-353.
- Werner, Edeltraud, *Liber Scalae Machometi: Die lateinische Fassung des Kitāb al-mi`raj*, Dusseldorf, Droste Verlag, 1986.
- Wolf, Kenneth Baxter, “The Earliest Latin Lives of Muḥammad”, in Michael Gervers & Ramzi Jibran Bikhazi (eds.), *Conversion and Continuity: Indigenous Christian Communities in Islamic Lands, Eighth to Eighteenth Centuries*, Toronto, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1990, pp. 89-101.
- Wolf, Kenneth Baxter, “Counterhistory in the Earliest Latin Lives of Muhammad”, in Christiane J. Gruber & Avinoam Shalem (eds.), *The Image of the Prophet between Ideal and Ideology: A Scholarly Investigation*, Berlin, De Gruyter, 2014, pp. 13-26.
- Wolf, Kenneth Baxter, “Falsifying the Prophet: Muhammad at the Hands of His Earliest Christian Biographers in the West”, in Martijn Icks & Eric Shiraev (eds.), *Character Assassinations Throughout the Ages*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 2014, pp. 105-120.
- Wright, Roger, *Late Latin and Early Romance in Spain and Carolingian France*, Liverpool, Francis Cairns, 1982.
- Wright, Roger, “La muerte del ladino escrito en Al-Andalus”, *Euphrosyne*, 22 (1994), pp. 255-268.
- Wright, Roger, “Plurilinguismo nella Penisola Iberica (400-1000)”, in Piera Molinelli & Federica Guerini (eds.), *Plurilinguismo e diglossia nella Tarda Antichità e nel Medio Evo*, Florence, SISMEL Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2013, pp. 149-166.
- Wunderli, Peter, *Le livre de l'eschiele Mahomet: Die französische Fassung einer alfonsinischen Übersetzung*, Bern, Francke, 1968.
- Yolles, Julian & Weiss, Jessica, *Medieval Latin Lives of Muhammad*, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press, 2018.
- Zwartjes, Otto, *Love Songs from al-Andalus: History, Structure and Meaning of the Kharja*, Leiden, Brill, 1997.
- Zwartjes, Otto, “Andalus”, in Lutz Edzard & Rudolf de Jong (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics*, 2011, [online], doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1570-6699_eall_EALL_COM_0016.