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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.
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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.
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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 Muhammad 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’). 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 šahāda: 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 considers an apparent formula in the Tultusceptru: through phonological and textual reasoning, this paper argues that, contrary to its usual identification as the šahāda, 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 sensitivity to, Islamic honorifics and Qur’ānic language than previously ascribed, and justifies a

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. Following Di Cesare, 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”, or “anti-historiography” — was established in the Eastern Mediterranean in the 7th century, 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. The text concerns Ozim, a Christian monk, 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 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.


5 See generally Tolan, “Anti-Hagiography”.

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


8 Hoyland correctly identifies Arabic ʿaẓīm (‘great’) as the name’s underlying form: Seeing Islam as Others Saw It,
who, while travelling to evangelise in Erribon, 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. Conveying this moral message is certainly the text’s aim, as is made clear in its concluding sentence (In. 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”). However, the Tultusceptru’s argumentative form (putatively narrating the beginning of Muḥammad’s prophetic career), and the claims implicit in its narration (that Muhammad’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 Tultusceptru implicitly confirms Islam’s monotheistic basis, ascribing divine (albeit corrupted) revelation and (underlying) Christian faith to Muhammad.

Determining the Tultusceptru’s provenance is difficult. The Codice de Roda was completed in the late 10th century, and the text’s scribal hand is dateable to 1030-1060. 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. On this basis, Wolf proposes a 9th-century Navarran Vorlage for the Tultusceptru. However, this comparison is insecure: the Tultusceptru’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, as well as those of the Greek-speaking East. 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.

The second, more substantial text — the LSM — was composed within the 12th-13th-century Toledo translation movement, and provides a detailed narrative of the isrāʾ and mirʾāǧ (Muhammad’s night journey to Jerusalem, and ascent to heaven). According to the work’s preface (105c.9-d.5), the Latin text is Bonaventure’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 Qurʾān, ahādīṯ (prophetic traditions), and biographical works like the Kitāb al-mirʾāj of al-Ṣayyīrī (d. 1072) — as well as Mozarabic and Jewish commentaries, while Bonaventure’s text incorporates Christian Latin commentaries.
The preface indicates the author’s intention to make known “those rash undertakings by Muhammad against Christ” (105c.42-44; Machomet ... 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 polemical 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 an putatively accurate statement of Islamic beliefs.\(^{24}\)

Two 14\(^{th}\)-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, and the French text printed in Wunderli.\(^{27}\)

2. Transcribing Arabic in the Iberian Context

Before considering the transcriptions in the Tulitusceptru 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.\(^{28}\) This interchange entails cross-linguistic acoustic perception, whereby non-native phones are assimilated to native phonemic contrasts.\(^{29}\) 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, but rather reflect synchronic perception; this is justified here by the external and — within the LSM — internal variation in transcribing the same formulas.\(^{30}\) 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

---

\(^{22}\) See generally Tolan, Saracens, pp. 186-189; Daniel, Islam and the West, p. 233.

\(^{23}\) But see the comment of Muhammad’s kinsmen at 126a.4-14: ha! mendax, quomodo audes talia enarrare? ... nos autem bene scimus quo adhiberc usque ad Templum iam dictum est iter unus 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!’).


\(^{26}\) See, e.g., razur (114a.19) = raça (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 Brossand-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’eschele 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, “Nomnative and Second-Language Speech Perception”; Best, “A Direct Realist View of Cross-Language Speech Perception”.


\(^{32}\) 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. Whereas the Tultusceptru 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. 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.

The model must also account for the diglossia during the applicable period. In al-Andalus, the dominant low (‘L’) register was the Andalusian Arabic dialect bundle (‘AA’), and the high (‘H’) language, Classical Arabic (‘CA’). AA comprised a spectrum of registers, with the 10th-century Andalusian philologist al-Zubaydī distinguishing an ‘educated’ L form from the general vernacular. Conversely, CA reflects the standardised ‘proper Arabic’ appropriate to literary texts and religious contexts, which crystallised around the 10th century. While normative CA phonology is well-known, speakers often assimilate CA formulas into vernacular phonological paradigms, a phenomenon evident in AA. 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. Notably, in al-Andalus, the significance of written Arabic saw a decline in written Latin literacy during the 9th and 10th centuries, while forms of Ibero-Romance — collectively ‘Mozarabic’ — remained a spoken language. 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). 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 Tultusceptru 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 ills / Muḥammadun al-rasūlu lāh (“There is no god but Allāh, [and] Muḥammad is Allāh’s...”)

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-Maqqari’s (d. 1632) account of 10th-century Andalusian diglossia: The History of the MohammediANK Dynasties in Spain, vol. 1, pp. 142-143.
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 Piantema, Islam in Everyday Arabic Speech, pp. 10-15.
42 See, e.g., AA formulas concerning Allāh: DFDA4, pp. 68-69.
44 See generally Wright, “La muerte del ladoño escrito en Al-Andalus”. See also Paulus Albarus (d. ca. 861), Indiculus 1667-1680, especially 1677-1678: heu pro dolor, legem suam nesciant Xp̄ iani et linguam propriam non advertant Latini (“Alas, for shame! Christians do not know their own law”).
45 See Galmés de Fuentes, Dialectología mozárabe, pp. 14-17, 25.
The formula pervaded the Muslim world during this period, including al-Andalus. As transcrip
tional input within the Iberian context, however, the underlying CA šahāda may exhibit AA interfer
eence. In CA, -V(ŋ) (in ilāhā, Muḥammadun, and rasālu) is a case ending, while Allāh exhibits zero ending in pausa. The first syllable of Allāh is, effectively, prodelided after V#,¹⁴ this in turn causes univerification, shortening the final vowel of underlying illā in the impermissible word-medial syllable ČVC.⁵⁰ Moreover, at least in Qurʾānic 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, and, with decay of /ʔi/,⁵³ permits more prodelision than CA, including before Allāh.⁵⁶ However, prodelision in the environment /aː#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 iḏā exhibits no word juncture phenomena.⁵⁹ Further, AA often lost final /h/ (even if retained orthographically),⁶⁰ including in Allāh, and likely maintained the CA phonemic difference between /ʔ/ and /ː/.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 /laː:#ʔi. laː:haː#˘il. laː:h/ ~ AA */laː#ʔi. laː#˘il. laː/
2. CA /mu. ham. ma. dur#ra. su.:lu. laː:h/ ~ AA */mu. ham. mad#ra. su. laː/

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 hVl/IV hVlalla. The forms in MS Paris are as follows, with variations in other manuscripts provided for comparison:

110c.30: le hille halla hilalla⁶⁴
110c.32: le halla hilalla (MS Vatican 253r.24 le halla hallalla)
111d.50-51: le halllle zoham hille bille⁶⁵
112a.2: le hillel helalla (MS Vatican 256v.3 om. helalla; MS Oxford 16r.b.1-2 le hillel 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 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

---

¹⁴ See Qurʾān 37:35, 47:19 (first limb); 48:29 (second limb).
¹⁶ The underlying CA form may be *ṭālāh, which gains /#ʔV/ when phrase-initial, preventing impermissible *CCC: Gadoua, “Consonant Clusters in Quranic Arabic”, pp. 64-65; Coetzez, “The Phonology of the Two Hamza’s of Qurʾānic Arabic”.
¹⁷ See Al-ABI & May, “The Phonological Structure of the Syllable in Arabic”.
¹⁸ Alfozan, Assimilation in Classical Arabic, pp. 59-60, 96-97.
²⁰ UZ, Grammar, p. 64; Corriente, A Grammatical Sketch, p. 58.
²¹ Corriente, A Grammatical Sketch, p. 58.
²² UZ, Grammar, p. 34, n. 76.
²³ See, e.g., the formula law (or ma) ša illāh: DFDDA, pp. 744-745.
²⁴ UZ, Grammar, pp. 8, 35. See also Blau, A Grammar of Christian Arabic, pp. 94-95.
²⁵ See Zwartjes, Love Songs from al-Andalus, p. 133.
²⁶ al-Ḥillī, Kitāb al-ʿāqīl al-ḥālī 209.2.
²⁷ UZ, Grammar, p. 33; Corriente, A Grammatical Sketch, pp. 57-58.
²⁸ See, e.g., Ibn Quzmān (d. 1160), Dīwān 21.13.1: ya ʿīk al-lā n-nāgā (“May Allāh grant you salvation”).
²⁹ UZ, Grammar, p. 21.
perceived Arabic prosodic groups. The following schema shows this alignment, along with the hypothetical CA-AA range and regular Latin variants:

(A) Arabic /laː/ ~ */laː/ = Latin le
(B) Arabic /ʔI. laː.haː/ ~ */ʔI. laː/ = Latin halla ~ hille
(C) Arabic /ʔIl.lal. ’a.hː/ ~ */ʔIl.lal. ’a/ = Latin hilala ~ halalla ~ helalla

The disyllabic form of Latin (B) suggests an AA source, given that elision of the case ending /aʔ/ before /#ʔi/ is impermissible in CA. Indeed, the LSM’s transcriptions of Arabic Muhammad(un) and rasūl(υ) in the second limb also lack case endings: each Latin rendering terminates at the stem’s final consonant, while the word-initial <h> 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 /θ/, 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-Romance 71 — may justify h-insertion. However, internal Ibero-Romance phonological processes usually remedied hiatus by inserting a glide, not /h/. 72 Moreover, Arabic /#(ʔ)V/ did not regularly become /#hV/ in Ibero-Romance: Arabic loanwords beginning al- rather produce unaspirated Ibero-Romance al- <al>.

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-medium h-insertion: thus, for vhlkaforat (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 /θ/, a graphemic use occasionally seen in medieval Spanish texts. 77

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

69 The only exceptions are unzila (117d.41) < unzia (but MS Oxford 30ra.5 huncila); Alia (123c.58) < Allâh (but 114a.19 halla, a form consistently used throughout MS Oxford).
70 The only exceptions are alborak (e.g., 107a.15) < al-burâq; azirat (114d.45) < al-ṣirât; averka (119b.1) < al-rākâ; arre (119b.3) < al-rih.
71 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 ἸΗΣΟΥΣ), the spelling of Jerusalem (which in Greek begins <ΙΕ) is preferred, perhaps, just as alborak, al-rīḥ, arre, al-ṣirāt etc., not <h>-.
72 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: Muḥagmet (13r.a.30, absent in Latin; 44v.a.1 = 123c.57); Muhgamet (14r.b.25-26 = 111a.40; 20v.b.24 = 114a.19); Mahomet (in standard prose). See also the Tultusceptru’s distinction between marked Mohamet (ln. 20), and unmarked, prosaic Mohomad (ln. 18).
73 See Lloyd, From Latin to Spanish, pp. 81, 140; Allen, Vox Latina, pp. 22-25, especially p. 25.
74 See, e.g., Eulogius, Memoriale 2.15-16: Habdarrahgman < Ab’d-Ab-Rahmān.
Second, the word-medial transcription of the Arabic lateral approximants — consistent across the Latin forms, notwithstanding the MS Vatican spellings of (C) as hVlalla — is atypical: Arabic /l/ is rendered by geminate Latin <ll>, as is emphatic geminate /lh/; however, non-emphatic geminate /l/ is rendered <l>. Now, by the 13th century, Latin /ll/ had phonemised as palatal /ɻ/ in Old Spanish, distinct from /l/. Therefore, the (C) form may exhibit assimilation of the Arabic distinction /l/ vs. /ɻ/ to /l/ <ll> vs. /ɻ/ <ll>, mapping velarisation to palatalisation by Ibero-Romance interference. 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 gemmination (and word boundaries) appear to purposefully obscure the Arabic accentuation: while Classical Latin accentuation was no longer productive in this period, Ibero-Romance usually accentuated the equivalent syllable, as such, gemination would occasion paroxytone accentuation of the Latin (B) and (C) forms (hVl/V and hVl/ll). However, the Arabic accent aligns with these forms’ ultimas.

Finally, the Latin vocalism shows artefacts of imāla (Arabic vowel raising), whereby [e(ː)] results from underlying /a(ː)/ in CA, imāla usually affects /at(ː)/ in the environments i(ː)C(C)_ and _C(C)i(ː), but is precluded where any C is emphatic /a(ː)/ in the environments i(ː)C(C)__ and __C(C). In CA, /a(ː)/ mapping velarisation to palatalisation by the 13th century, Latin /ll/ had phonemised as palatal /ɻ/ in Old Spanish, distinct from /l/. Now, by the 13th century, Latin /ll/ had phonemised as palatal /ɻ/ in Old Spanish, distinct from /l/. Therefore, the (C) form may exhibit assimilation of the Arabic distinction /l/ vs. /ɻ/ to /l/ <ll> vs. /ɻ/ <ll>, mapping velarisation to palatalisation by Ibero-Romance interference. 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 gemmination (and word boundaries) appear to purposefully obscure the Arabic accentuation: while Classical Latin accentuation was no longer productive in this period, Ibero-Romance usually accentuated the equivalent syllable, as such, gemination would occasion paroxytone accentuation of the Latin (B) and (C) forms (hVl/V and hVl/ll). However, the Arabic accent aligns with these forms’ ultimas.

Finally, the Latin vocalism shows artefacts of imāla (Arabic vowel raising), whereby [e(ː)] results from underlying /a(ː)/. In CA, imāla usually affects /at(ː)/ in the environments i(ː)C(C)_ and _C(C)i(ː), but is precluded where any C is emphatic or guttural. Accordingly, Latin <e> in hille likely exhibits imāla of Arabic /a(ː)/ syllabically adjacent to /i/, aligning the raised phone with Latin /e/, while the <a>’s in hVllalla, and in (h)alla in the LSM transcriptions of the second limb, exhibit the inhibiting function of emphatic /l/ in the name A[l]āh. However, in most dialects, including AA, [e(ː)] is the default representation, with [a(ː)] 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). 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 basis — evident in the absent case endings and the non-classical imāla — implies that, despite his CA basis, 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 imposuit nomen angelus qui se illi ostendit et precepti 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 Muhammad.”

---

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. 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 *Tultusceptru*'s transcription reflects the *ṣahāda*: this conclusion relies on the phrase’s similarity to the *adān* (the call to prayer), which — as performed in al-Andalus also begins with repetition of the *takbīr*, followed by the *ṣahāda*. However, while *Mohamet razulille* clearly reflects the *ṣahāda*'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 *ila*; indeed, the Latin does resemble the (A) and (B) forms in the LSM’s *ṣahāda*, with similar — if inconsistent — *imāla*, and without word-initial <i>. However, the surrounding *situ ... citus est* remains obscure. Wolf proposes that *situ* represents *asḥadu* (“I testify”), or that *situ citus est* is Latin (perhaps “was cited in place”) that merged with the Arabic in transmission. Díaz y Díaz, assisted by Vázquez de Benito, instead proposes corruption of Arabic *ṣalātu ṣalaḥykum* (“His [Aًlāh’s] blessing be upon you”). None of these suggestions are wholly satisfactory. Arabic *asḥadu* fits the formula, but the putative transcription *situ* is phonologically difficult: whereas Latin *<t>* is a possible, if unlikely, rendering of Arabic /d/, *sycope of the initial stressed syllable is anomalous. Further, although *tus est* militates in favour of Latin influence, the presence of these segments appears unmotivated. Diaz y Diaz’s Arabic, while semantically clear, is not used formulaically or devotionally in any core Islamic text.

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-salātu* (“the blessing”), with regular assimilation of the liquid before the solar consonant /s/, and loss of initial unstressed vowel before CC. If the Latinate *citus est* is then isolated, remaining *ila* suggests Arabic *‘alā* on the first reading, the transcription and surrounding text represent not the *ṣahāda*, but the following:


And the angel who appeared to [Ozim] imposed a name on him, and taught him to say, so that they might believe: “Allāhu akbar, Allāhu akbar.” He was invoked as: “al-salātu ‘ala Muḥammad(in) rastili lāh.” (“Blessing be upon Muḥammad, Allāh’s Prophet!”)

This approach has three strengths. The first is its alignment with known Islamic honorifics. The collocation *al-salātu ‘ala Muḥammad* represents a common formula, attested in a range of contemporaneous texts, often following *al-hamd li-llāh* (“Praise be to Allāh”).

---

94 See, e.g., the long-held unanimity among 12th-14th-century Andalusian jurists on the *adān*’s text: Dutton, *Sinna, Hadith and Madinan Anāl*, pp. 8-9, 16-19.

---

95 This rare collocation does appear in continuous prose in al-Biqa’ī (d. 1480), *Naẓm al-durar*, vol. 3, p. 360: *Ihyā’ al-salāatu ‘ala quyum* (“… so that [Allāh] may preserve His prayers upon you”).
cantly, the related (and common) tasliya — the phrase salla lāḥu alayhi [= alā al-nabī] was-sallam (“May Allāh grant him [i.e., the Prophet] blessings and salvation”) — is transcribed by Eulogius, with accompanying translation: zalla al-lah halla anabi va zallen.98 This contemporaneous awareness of the tasliya provides corroborating context for the appearance of the nominal variant al-ṣalātū 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 sahāda — the title rasīlu lāḥ.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

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 takbir 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 sahāda’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 precepti illi dicere ... — presents the same division of the angel’s act, albeit chaotically: 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 Allā, the LSM form (h)alla in the sahāda’s second limb, and even Eulogius’ zalla allah. Exceptionally, therefore, the Arabic lateral approximants here are unemphatic, as is:

98 Eulogius, Memoriale 2.82-84. Compare Paulus Albarus, Indiculus 1255-1256.
100 See OED s.v. cieo, def. 6; Firmínio Verrius 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 Leodegarii martyrvis 1.606: inde virum quemand celebrata 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 ciant cives certatim proton us ones (“‘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<e><a> [<a> altar (“upon you”), in pausal form] by haplographic omission preceding citus. In this case, citus est instead stands neatly after the complete sentence al-ṣalātū alayhi. However, the transcription <e> for Arabic ay is difficult: UZ, Grammar, pp. 7-9; Corriente, A Grammatical Sketch, pp. 29-31.
regular in CA where Allāh is proclitics after /i(ː)#/, and the construct phrase unverberated. 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 Mahomет — 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 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 /aː/ outside the CA conditioning environment, and both forms exhibit <i> for underlying unstressed Arabic /aː/, reflecting the high vowel raising that pervaded all stages of AA. While CA /sˤ/ and /ʕ/ usually inhibit imāla, AA dialects often observe the phonemic distinction between /sˤ/ and /ʕ/, and lost the phoneme /ʕ/, particularly in lower registers.

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. 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 vocal 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, 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: /ʔal. la.ḥu#ʔak.bar/ ~ AA: */ʔal. la.ʔak.bar/ or */ʔal. la.ʔak.bar/

The Tultusceptru provides the clear rendering alla occuber three times (ln. 20 (x2), 21). Conversely, the LSM produces it once, as hallahu akibar (110c.28), translated in text as magnus est Deus (“God is great”). Both texts transcribe Allāh as expected (with environmental /ʔ/ 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. 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 sāhāda, 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

---

110 Al-Nassir, Sibawayh the Phonologist, pp. 48-49.
112 On the practice among modern Arabic speakers, see Hallberg, Case Endings in Spoken Standard Arabic, pp. 64-65, 176-196.
113 See, e.g., Ibn al-Šabbāṭ’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 huha 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 kibar 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.
in Ibero-Romance, this consistent patterning suggests either disregard for Arabic accentuation, or else emphasis of the transcriptional gap.

The Tultusceptru also reflects CA -hu. The <ο> 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. Thus, Latin /ο/ <ο> here must be perceptual. From CA input /aː.hu̯a/, the form suggests perceived [aː.hua], 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., /aː.(h)wa/). This non-Latinate sequence is then resolved as /aːθo/, with the vowel following the labialised consonant undergoing rounding (as is typologically common). Further, the anaptyctic vowel /kVb/ in both Latin transcriptions disrupts the non-native Latin sequence */VkbV/. The Tultusceptru’s choice of the high back vowel /u/ in occuber is conditioned by the [+high][+back] features of environmental <c> [k]. Moreover, the spelling with gminated <cc> provides the correctly aligned accentuation occuber. These spellings together suggest a false etymology with Latin occubare or ocumbere (“to lie dead”), 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), appears unmotivated; however, taken together, the <y> and <k> (rendering both Arabic /k/ and /q/ throughout the LSM), suggest a foreignising transcription. Overall, both texts’ transcriptions here directly reflect a CA source; this suggests that AA interference hardly affected the takbir, 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 Muhammad — 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.

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 ili Cobar vocant, hoc est, maiorem (‘… which they call Cobar, that is, ‘greater’). See also the anaptyxis of /u/ in Paulus Monachus’ 9th-century Greek transcription (Chronicon, vol. 2, p. 706, 8-9): Αλλά, Αλλά, Οὐδέ, Κοσβάρ, Αλλά. This Greek form and the Tultusceptru’s transcription likely resulted from distinct perceptual events: whereas the universalised Latin occuber includes a treatment of perceived [aː.hua] with environmental rounding, the Greek transcriber perceived the semi-vowel as the syllable onset (i.e., /aː(h)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; Firminius 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., vhalkafarat (118a.16-17, 18) < υ-λ-καφάρα; kodem (111a.39-40) < quddām. However, <c> is used for both phonemes at syllable coda: halmacif (122a.56-57) < al-makfif; hacrop (111a.39) < aqrib.
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