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2. Latin-Arabic Entanglement:
   A Short History

As linguistic systems comprising a large variety of written and oral registers including derivate languages and dialects, Latin and Arabic have been of paramount importance for the history of the Euromediterranean since Antiquity. Due to their long-term function as languages of administration, intellectual endeavours, and religion, Latin and Arabic are often regarded as cultural markers of Europe and the (Arabic-)Islamic sphere respectively. With regard to Latin, this conviction was already formulated by the humanist scholars Lorenzo Valla (d. 1457) and Juan Luis Vives (d. 1540). It also lay at the basis of the Finnish government’s proposal, during its EU-presidency in 2006, to reintroduce Latin as a pan-European medium of communication. In Islamic(ate) societies, in turn, the Qur’ānic message of Islam is intrinsically tied to the Arabic language. The latter is still used as a medium of communication in a region stretching from Morocco to Iraq. Adherents to the idea of pan-Arabism have highlighted repeatedly that Arabic has to be regarded as an essential cultural feature of this area. In the 1950s, in particular, they underscored the necessity of upholding a standardized form of Arabic in the various national Arab schooling systems and media, rather than adapting the latter to the colloquial realities of an Arab world marked by diverging dialects. It is questionable, however, whether Latin and Arabic really constitute cultural identity markers of a clearly defined European and an (Arabic-)Islamic sphere. Latin boasts an important extra-European history in North Africa and has long ceased
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3 See Qur’ān 2:2; 13:37; 46:12, which mention Arabic as the linguistic medium of Qur’ānic revelation.
4 This debate is very well documented in the almost contemporary book by Anwar G. Chejne, The Arabic Language: Its Role in History (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1969), 13, 123, 158–159, 165–166.
to be a defining feature of cultural activity in European societies.\(^5\) Arabic, in turn, was never used exclusively by Muslims.\(^6\)

In Chapter 1 of this volume, Benoît Grévin offered a structural comparison of Latin and Arabic as linguistic systems. The present contribution, in turn, recounts the entangled history of Latin and Arabic from a macro-historical perspective. This entangled history can be divided into three phases. In Phase One, both linguistic systems came into contact in the ancient Roman Near East, in a time in which Arabic as a standardized supraregional language had not yet fully emerged. In Phase Two, the Arabic-Islamic expansion into the western Mediterranean, dominated linguistically by Latin and Romance, ushered in a period of intensive Latin-Arabic entanglement. Lasting approximately from the seventh to the fifteenth century, this period was particularly dynamic: the expansion of so-called “Latin-Christian societies” into Mediterranean regions hitherto under Muslim rule considerably transformed the geopolitical equilibrium of linguistic interaction. In Phase Three, i.e. from the late medieval and early modern periods onwards, the interaction of Latin and Arabic progressively receded into the sphere of academic endeavours. This was mainly due to the rise and fully fledged development of Romance languages. The latter successively replaced Latin in its various fields of interaction with different forms of Arabic.\(^7\) Today, at the (preliminary?) “end” of this long history of entanglement, Latin and Arabic mainly seem to meet within an academic framework, both in Europe and the Arab world.

Tracing this macro-history of Latin-Arabic entanglement is interesting for several reasons. On the one hand, its reconstruction proves that the interaction of so-called “Latin-Christian” and “Arabic-Islamic” societies produced a large number of diverse Latin-Arabic milieus in which Latin and Arabic merged to some degree. Although research on many of these milieus boasts a long tradition, this historical-linguistic evidence has rarely been used to counter the dichotomizing master narrative juxtaposing and often opposing “Islam” and “the West.” Such a macro-history of what we could define as “Latin-Arabic transculturation”\(^8\) traces how different Latin-Arabic


\(^8\) The conceptual term *transculturación* was coined by Fernando Ortiz in his study on processes of cultural reconfiguration in early modern Cuba. Ortiz used the term to highlight that processes of interaction between groups of different cultural origin not only result in processes of transmission, reception, adaptation,
forms of entanglement came into being over the centuries, thus creating shared spaces between spheres framed by a different religious system and reference language, that are generally considered culturally apart. Since the chronological scope of this chapter covers the period from the Roman intrusion into the ancient Middle East up to the twentieth century, it is possible to provide an overview on very different forms of entanglement and to acquire a typological understanding of the subject. Forms of Latin-Arabic entanglement range from descriptive and analytical comments on the other language to linguistic policy statements, and from different forms of transformation and appropriation—e.g. oral and written translations, bilingual word-lists, glossaries, loans, and calques—to graphic, literary, or systemic forms of linguistic hybridity. The identification and specification of different forms of entanglement gives rise to the question—not systematically answered here—why particular forms of entanglement appeared in a specific historical setting, and not in another. Studying processes of Latin-Arabic transculturation thus gives us the possibility of explaining the link between specific entangled forms and their respective milieu of origin, and consequently allows for defining factors that encouraged such processes.

On the other hand, the history of Latin-Arabic entanglement can also be read as a history of cultural segregation. Many forms and milieus of Latin-Arabic entanglement that resulted from the above-mentioned processes of transculturation succumbed to destructive pressures or retreated into the recesses of academia. We can often explain the disintegration or academic isolation of Latin-Arabic milieus as an effect of different manifestations of religious and cultural othering, intolerance, and even violence. An analysis of the driving forces of Latin-Arabic segregation shows, however, that concomitant processes are too manifold and too intertwined as to support dichotomizing master narratives which draw clear boundaries between Christians and Muslims or between “Islam” and “the West,” not least because the disintegration of many Latin-Arabic milieus resulted from the rise of the Romance vernaculars.

Simultaneously tracing the macro-histories of Latin-Arabic transculturation and cultural segregation thus allows us to highlight the complexity of cultural processes in the Euromediterranean. This two-pronged approach deconstructs culturalistic narratives of Euromediterranean history formulated, for example, by proponents of Orientalist and Occidentalist ideologies. At the same time it explains, rather than substantiates, why certain voices feel justified in assigning Latin to a “European,” Arabic to an “Islamic” cultural heritage, rather than regarding both as intrinsic elements of a shared Euromediterranean history.

and assimilation, but also lead to the transformation and amalgamation of previously distinct cultural elements within a new cultural synthesis. See Fernando Ortiz, Contrapunteo cubano del tabaco y el azúcar (Havana: Jesús Montero, 1940); Fernando Ortiz, Cuban Counterpoint. Tobacco and Sugar (New York: Knopf, 1947). Daniel G. König, “Islamic Studies: A Field of Research under Transcultural Crossfire,” Transcultural Studies 2 (2016), 101–135.
2.1 Early entanglement: Rome in the Middle East

Cultural ascriptions that assign Latin to the European, and Arabic to the Islamic sphere play no role, as soon as we turn to the beginnings of Latin-Arabic entanglement in Antiquity. In this period of Roman imperialism spanning three continents, the term Europe did not yet represent a cultural category, while the interfaith rivalries of Jewish, Christian, and Muslim interpretations of monotheism were still inexistent and thus irrelevant for the interaction of Latin and Arabic.

2.1.1 THE ROMAN TAKEOVER

The earliest forms of Latin-Arabic entanglement came into being thanks to the Roman military intrusion into the ancient Middle East of the first century BCE. The political constellation of this period was marked by the disintegration of the Seleucid Empire, the expansionist ambitions of the Armenian ruler Tigranes, and the rivalry between Hyrcanus and Aristobulus, two pretenders to the throne in Judaea. All this provided the pretext for Pompeius's interference in Syrian affairs and led to the creation of the Roman province of Syria in 64 BCE, to be followed by the military expedition of the proconsul Aemilius Scaurus against the Nabataeans in 62 BCE.

The political unrest that followed the murder of Caesar in 44 BCE strengthened Rome's foothold in the eastern Mediterranean and thus produced various forms of interaction between Romans and various Middle Eastern populations. Octavian's victory over the joint forces of Marcus Antonius and Cleopatra in the Battle of Actium (31 BCE), for example, was supported by the Nabataean ruler Malichus and brought Egypt under full Roman control. Cooperation between Romans and Nabataeans seems to have been a precondition for the earliest Roman expedition into the Arabian Peninsula, led by Aelius Gallus in 25 BCE. Roman-Nabataean relations oscillated between cooperation and confrontation in the next century: Nabataean troops under Aretas IV seem to have unilaterally taken control of Damascus in 37–40 CE, but supported the emperor Titus during his conquest of Jerusalem in 70 CE. Under Trajan, the Nabataean realm was integrated into the Roman Empire in 106 CE. From around 111 CE onwards, a new Roman road, the Via Nova Traiana, connected the Syrian city of Bostra with the city of Ayla at the Gulf of 'Aqaba.10

Under the Severan dynasty, the Roman East began to play an important role in imperial politics. In 198 CE, Septimius Severus re-established the province of Mesopotamia, a territory already held under Trajan for a short time. He gave support to the city of Palmyra, which, in the early third century, brought forth a Roman senator named Septimius Odaenathus. In addition, Septimius Severus married Julia Domna, an aristocratic woman

from the Syrian town of Emesa, whose great-nephews Elagabalus (r. 218–222) and Severus Alexander (r. 222–235) were soon to rule the empire. Backed by Irfan Shahîd, Glen Bowersock claimed that, thanks to the influence of the house of Septimius Severus, “Arabs reached the pinnacle of Roman government.”

This seems corroborated by the epithet “Arabs” ascribed to the emperor Philip I (r. 244–249) in Latin and Greek sources of the fourth and fifth centuries CE. It seems dangerous, however, to attribute too much significance to this ethnic category. Considering the divergent living conditions of Arab groups in the ancient Middle East, many of which remained independent of Rome, the rise to power of a number of Romanized Syrian families cannot be regarded as an “Arabization” of the imperial elite in the third century CE. Later Arabic-Islamic historiography never defines Severan emperors or Philip I as “Arabs.”

From a historical socio-linguistic point of view, however, the Roman intrusion into the Middle East produced a large variety of relations and thus set the stage for various forms of linguistic interaction, including forms relevant to the early and later history of Latin-Arabic entanglement.

2.1.2 ROME’S LINGUISTIC IMPACT

Rome exerted cultural and linguistic influence on the Middle East and a number of its Arab inhabitants from the first, and especially from the second century CE onwards. Latin inscriptions could now be seen in many parts of the region, ranging from the city of Palmyra, via the forty-two milestones of the Via Nova Traiana from Bostra to Ayla, the Nabataean city of Hegra in the north of the Arabian Peninsula, to the Farasan islands in the southern part of the Red Sea. Roman army units used a form of Latin as a means of internal communication, with Latin ranks and certain Latin orders surviving far into Byzantine times. The settlement of recruits

11 Bowersock, Roman Arabia, 118.
14 David F. Graf, “The Via Nova Traiana in Arabia Petraea,” in Rome and the Arabian Frontier: From the Nabaeans to the Saracens, ed. David F. Graf (Farnham: Ashgate, 1997), art. VI, 1–33.
and veterans created a number of Latin-speaking communities in some parts of the region. Most notable in this context is the city of Beirut. At the end of the second century, it became a centre of Roman legal culture, giving a home to such important Roman jurists as Aemilius Papinianus (d. 212 CE), Domitius Ulpianus (d. ca. 223 CE), and Modestinus Herrenius (d. after 228 CE), whose legal reasonings contributed to establishing Roman precedence in matters of jurisdiction throughout the ancient and late antique Euromediterranean. However, Rome’s linguistic influence on the Middle East should not be exaggerated. In the eastern Mediterranean, Greek remained the dominant elite language up to the Byzantine era. In the Greater Syrian region, Aramaic held the ground well into the Islamic era in its Judaeo-Aramaic and Syriac variants, the latter increasingly put into writing from the second century onwards. In Egypt, Greek retained comparable dominance alongside Coptic, increasingly put into writing from the second century CE onwards.

Defining the regional Latin influence on Arabic in the period after the first century BCE is made difficult by the fact that Arabic as a language of regional importance only began to emerge in this same period. A very rough chronology places the fusion of several northern Arabian dialects into a form of Old Arabic in the period between the seventh and the third century BCE. Old Arabic seems to have acquired regional significance because it was used as an oral vehicular language within the Nabataean trade network. Until the fourth century CE, the latter used a particular form of Aramaic in its written documentation that features various Old Arabic terms. Eventually, the stele of Imru l-Qays, dated 328 CE, presents us with a clearly readable Arabic text, represented graphically in the Nabataean variant of Aramaic. Its claim that Imru l-Qays was ruler of all Arabs suggests that this form of Arabic meanwhile facilitated communication between various tribal confederations of Late Antiquity. It then developed to become a poetic prestige language used at the courts of Arab confederations that served as a buffer between the Byzantine and Sassanid empires of the sixth century, i.e. the Ġafnids/Ghassanids and the Naṣīrids/Lakhmids. With the rise of Islam in the early seventh century, this form of

Arabic additionally acquired the status of a sacred language and slowly but surely received the graphic form known today.\textsuperscript{22}

Latin influence on this emerging Arabic language becomes manifest in around forty to fifty loanwords identified by scholarship of the last century. Among these loanwords, listed in Table 2.1, we find ethnonyms and toponyms, ranks and titles, military and administrative terms, terms from the sectors of logistics, transport, finance, commerce, and measurement, and finally a number of terms pointing to forms of higher culture and defining objects of daily life.

The list raises a number of problems. First and foremost, the etymologies are often based on speculation and cannot be substantiated. In most cases, scholars established equivalents between Latin, Greek, Aramaic, and Arabic terms to show how a Latin word moved into the Arabic orbit via Greek and Aramaic. It is often doubtful, however, if the respective Latin term is really of Latin and not, for example, of Greek origin. Christoph Luxenberg went as far as to invert some of the etymologies after pointing out that, in a Mediterranean landscape characterized by several centuries of linguistic interaction between Greek, Latin, Phoenician, and other so-called Semitic languages, it is often impossible to identify the origin of a word.\textsuperscript{23}

Even if we assume that the Arabic terms listed in Table 2.1 are of Latin origin, it is generally impossible to pinpoint where and when they were borrowed. Some terms, such as the ethnonym \textit{Romani} > \textit{al-Rūm} or the title \textit{caesar} > \textit{qayṣar} must have entered the one or the other form of Arabic relatively early, as is confirmed in the case of the term \textit{centurio}, which is already attested in a Nabataean inscription.\textsuperscript{24} Other ranks and titles may have only entered the Arabic language later, e.g. during exchanges between Byzantine Constantinople on the one hand and the Ġafnīds/Ghassanids, Umayyads, or even Abbasids on the other hand.


\textsuperscript{23} Christoph Luxenberg, \textit{The Syro-Aramaic Reading of the Koran: A Contribution to the Decoding of the Language of the Koran} (Berlin: H. Schiler, 2007), 226–229.

\textsuperscript{24} David F. Graf, "The Nabataean Army and the \textit{Cohortes Ulpiae Petraeorum}," in David F. Graf, \textit{Rome and the Arabian Frontier. From the Nabataeans to the Saracens} (Farnham: Ashgate, 1997), art. V, 289.
### Table 2.1: Latin Loanwords in Arabic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethno- &amp; Toponyms</th>
<th>Romani &gt; al-Rūm [Romans]; fossatum [trench, ditch] &gt; al-Fusṭāt [Old Cairo]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>sigillum [seal] &gt; siǧill [document]; signum [sign, signal, military unit] &gt; siǧn [prison]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“High Culture”</td>
<td>balneator [bather] &gt; ballān; conditum [sweet wine] &gt; qindīd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the case of Latin military, administrative, and logistic terminology, it seems quite plausible that Roman imperial presence in the Middle East manifested itself in the linguistic surroundings of the emerging Arabic language. A case in point may be the word *sirāṭ*. Probably deriving from the Latin word *strata*, it could attest to the impression Roman roads such as the *Via Nova Traiana* made on Arabic speakers of the Middle East.

---

East, before becoming a theological keyword in the first Qur’ānic sura, i.e. }sūrat al-fātih}{\text{a}}, one of the most frequently recited Muslim prayers worldwide. The Roman presence also had an economic dimension, in that it involved the paying of taxes as well as connections to producers, markets, and consumers farther west. Consequently, the borrowing of financial and commercial terminology also seems plausible. Much more difficult to explain is how certain terms connected to daily life may have entered the Arabic language: it does not seem credible that Middle Eastern populations had to wait for the Romans to become acquainted with such basic objects as buckets, soap, napkins, cloaks, mirrors, and—given the long history of literacy in the Middle East—writing materials!

In retrospective, it is impossible to prove, trace, and explain every instance of terminological borrowing implied by the apparent relationship between approximately forty to fifty Latin and Arabic words. It is clear, however, that—between the Roman intrusion into the Middle East in the first century BCE and the rise of Islam in the early seventh century—Latin and Arabic became entangled in such a way that it becomes possible to imagine complex forms of linguistic interaction, the details of which are lost to us today.

One should note that early forms of Arabic were not only at the receiving end. Various terms of Middle Eastern origin already became part of the Latin language in Antiquity, as is attested in a number of ancient Latin texts. Certain parts of the Arabian flora and fauna were assimilated into the Latin vocabulary, a prime example being Middle Eastern terms for “camel,” predating the Arabic form ǧamal, which form the basis for the Greek and Latin terms κάμηλος and camelus. This also applies to a number of ethnonyms such as Arab > Arabes, Ṭamūd > Thamādeni. More disputed is the hypothesis that the (pre-)Arabic root š-r-k stands at the basis of the Latin term Saracenus which, in the course of the early medieval period, became the most frequently used term for Muslims in Latin texts. In addition, Table 2.2 shows that both Latin and Arabic adopted a number of Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek terms, many of which originated in the orbit of Judaism and early Greek Christianity, others designating miscellaneous objects.


Table 2.2: Latin and Arabic Loanwords Derived from Hebrew, Judaeo-Aramaic, or Greek

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew and Judaeo-Aramaic Impact on Latin and Arabic Forms of Monotheism</th>
<th>amen &lt; Heb./Jud.-Aram. &gt; amin; dies Sabbathi &lt; Heb./Jud.-Aram. &gt; yawm al-sabt; gehenna [hell] &lt; Heb./Jud.-Aram. &gt; gahannam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greek Impact on Latin and Arabic Christianity</td>
<td>ecclesia &lt; ἐκκλησία &gt; qalīs/kanīsa; episcopus &lt; ἐπίσκοπος &gt; usquf; evangelium &lt; εὐαγγέλιον &gt; inġīl; paradisus &lt; παράδεισος &gt; firdaws; diabolus &lt; διάβολος &gt; Iblīs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-religious Latin and Arabic Terms of Probable Greek Origin</td>
<td>caminus [furnace] &lt; κάμινος &gt; qamīn; charta [writing material] &lt; χάρτης &gt; qirṭās; cucuma [kettle, pot] &lt; κουκούμιον &gt; qumqum; drachma [coin, currency] &lt; δραχμή &gt; dirham; gypsum [white lime plaster] &lt; γύψος &gt; qiṣṣ; thorax [breast, armour, breast covering] &lt; θυρεός &gt; turs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important to highlight that this early period of Latin-Arabic entanglement cannot only be reconstructed by drawing on loanwords. Two bilingual Latin-Nabataean inscriptions from the first century CE found in Rome and Puteoli not only attest to the presence of Nabataeans in Italy, seen in conjunction with the aforementioned Nabataean inscription bearing a transcription of the term centurio, they point to the existence of a certain degree of Latin-Nabataean, if not Latin-Old Arabic bilingualism.

All this evidence, however, cannot obscure the fact that the majority of speakers of Latin and of various early forms of Arabic were separated from each other geographically. This geographical distance was overcome only temporarily thanks to the creation of a trans-Mediterranean Roman imperial sphere in the first century BCE. It began to increase again when the western and the eastern part of the empire began to drift apart irrevocably, at the latest at the end of the fourth century. Latin still played a certain role in the emerging Byzantine Empire of the fifth and sixth centuries: a number of historiographical texts, legal compendia such as the Codex Iustinianus, and Latin military commands in the Strategikon of Maurikios attest to its lingering impact. Despite this, the political separation into a western and eastern Roman Empire, both subject to very different
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29 Again going by Fraenkel, De vocabulis; Fraenkel, Fremdwörter.
31 Graf, “Nabataean Army,” 289.
experiences between the late fourth and the seventh century, radically diminished the influence of Latin on the societies of the eastern Mediterranean. In this period, Latin was again relegated to the Roman and post-Roman West, extending its influence to the north and northeast, whereas Greek retained its status and gradually affirmed its influence as the language of political power in the Roman-Byzantine East.33

2.2 The creation of a linguistic contact zone in the western Mediterranean

The geographic distance between the majority of Latin and Arabic speakers was again overcome in the seventh and the early eighth century with the Arabic-Islamic expansion into the western Mediterranean. The establishment of Arabic-speaking Muslim elites in North Africa and on the Iberian Peninsula created a linguistic contact zone that, from then on, facilitated the intensive interpenetration of the linguistic systems of Latin and Arabic.

The Arab groups that had been called together under the banner of Islam, either by Muhammad (d. 10/632) or by his successors Abū Bakr (r. 10–12/632–634) and ʿUmar b. al-Ḥaṭṭāb (r. 13–23/634–644), had been in touch with different languages before they moved westwards to Egypt, North Africa, and the Iberian Peninsula.34 This is attested frequently in Arabic-Islamic works describing this early period. Arab groups in the border zone of the Byzantine Empire, some of them Christianized, were certainly acquainted with Syriac and Greek.35 However, Arabs from Mecca and Medina were also in touch with other linguistic groups, either thanks to their exposure to Jewish and Christian scriptural traditions,36 or because of relations connecting the Ḥiǧāz to Syria and Egypt.37

For further reading, see Fergus Millar, A Greek Roman Empire: Power and Belief under Theodosius II (408–450) (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006), 84–116; Scott Fitzgerald Johnson, ed., Languages and Cultures of Eastern Christianity: Greek (Abingdon: Routledge, 2016).


Hoyland, Arabia, 204; Fiema et al., “Provincia Arabia,” 395–399.


Documented, for example, in Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam, Futūḥ Miṣr wa-aḫbāruhā, ed. Charles Torrey (Cairo: Madbūlī, 1999), 46–48 (exchange between Muhammad and the Coptic patriarch resulting in the prophet's marriage with the Coptic woman Māriya), S3 (pre-Islamic visit of ʿAmr b. al-Ṭāṣ to Syria and Egypt).
2.2.1 LATIN IN THE MULTILINGUAL SITUATION OF POST-CONQUEST EGYPT

Coptic and Greek skills may have been lacking occasionally among the Arab conquerors who ventured into Egypt in the 640s. According to Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam (d. 257/871), a group of invading Arabs drew on a Byzantine interpreter whom “they ordered to speak to them in Arabic.” However, the fact that the earliest Greek-Arabic papyri date from the 640s, i.e. the years immediately after the conquest, proves that linguistic mediators must have been available. Ensuing bilingualism is attested by many bilingual Greek-Arabic and Coptic-Arabic papyri of the seventh and the eighth century. While we could assume that, aside from Greek, some form of Aramaic may have played a role in facilitating exchanges between Egypt and the Syrian Levant, Latin seems to have been almost of no relevance in Egypt at the time of the Arab conquest.

Papyrological evidence shows that Latin had still been studied in some parts of Egypt in Late Antiquity, e.g. in the oasis of Dahla in western Egypt. Monastic literature of the late fourth and early fifth century suggests that some Egyptian monks were capable of receiving and dealing with Latin-speaking pilgrims from the western parts of the Roman Empire. Up to the fifth century, Latin seems to have played a certain role in the military as well as in the legal sphere, its influence diminishing continuously, however. Even if we believe Joseph Karabacek, who claimed that post-conquest Egypt produced a number of Latin-Arabic coins featuring Latin versions of the Islamic creed (al-šahāda), the latter mainly feature Greek characters open to different interpretations and do not indicate a flourishing Latin
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39 Adolf Grohmann, “Aperçu de papyrologie arabe,” Études de papyrologie 1 (1932), 41–43, plate IX.
45 Sijpesteijn, Shaping a Muslim State, 34; Papaconstantinou, “Introduction,” 4–5.
culture. Petra Sijpesteijn, in turn, claims that the Arab conquerors of Egypt, rather than being confronted with the remnants of a partly Latinized administration, actually—and probably unconsciously—reintroduced the originally Latin terms *siǧill* (*sigillum*, i.e. "seal," "document") and *barīd* (*veredus*, i.e. "postal service") to the multilingual Egyptian bureaucracy.

A recent find by Dario Internullo, the British Library Papyrus 3124, may still slightly modify our picture of Latin-Arabic entanglement in Egypt in and after the period of the Muslim conquest. The papyrus is unique in that it contains five lines of vulgar Latin, followed by eighteen lines of Arabic text in Latin letters. According to Internullo’s paleographical analysis, the document dates from the seventh or eighth century. In the Latin portion of the text, the sender asks about the addressee’s health in a rather clumsy and repetitive manner. Given the difficulties of reconstructing an early medieval Arabic text written in Latin letters, the Arabic portion has only been partially deciphered so far by Arianna D’Ottone Rambach. It is obvious, however, that this part of the letter deals with business matters. Phrases such as “uktubuli bihabar elbida” could be interpreted as “uktubū lī bi-ḫabar al-biḍā’a,” i.e. “write to me about the merchandise.” Written on an Egyptian writing material and also found in Egypt, the letter seems to have been produced in that country. In addition, the internal reference to something coming “from Jerusalem” indicates that its sender operated in the eastern Mediterranean. The phrasing “min Ierusalem” represents a curiosity in itself in that it uses an Arabic preposition, but not the usual Arabic(-Islamic) term for Jerusalem, i.e. *Īliyā’* and *Bayt al-Maqdis* in the seventh and eighth centuries, *al-Quds* or *al-Bayt al-Muqaddas* in later periods.

---


49 British Library P. 3124, line 7.

50 British Library P. 3124, line 15.

Another interesting but ambiguous feature of the letter is that the sender uses the term “Allāh” six times, three times in the form “insalla,” i.e. “in Šā’ Allāh,” “if God wills,”52 once in the form “sellimu alla biramati,” possibly to be transcribed as “sallimu llāh bi-raḥmati[hi],” i.e. “may God bless through his mercy.”53 In spite of these indicators, one cannot be completely sure if this document has to be assigned to a Muslim environment, given that the term “Allāh” was not only used by Muslims, but also by the Meccans of pre-Islamic times.54

As interesting as this unique document may be, it neither shows that Egypt of the early seventh century constituted a primary location for Latin-Arabic encounters, nor does it imply that a form of Latin used in Egypt may have facilitated acts of communication during the ensuing Muslim conquest of North Africa.

2.2.2 THE EXPANDING MUSLIMS AND THE LINGUISTIC CONSTELLATION OF NORTH AFRICA

In pre-Islamic North Africa of the late sixth and early seventh century, we can distinguish three major linguistic groups, i.e. the Greek-speaking Byzantine authorities, the Latin-speaking Romanized African population, and the Berber-speaking autochthonous non-Romanized populations,55 which may have even retained some remnants of the Punic language.56 For the eve of the Arab conquest, i.e. the first half of the seventh century, we may add a sizeable number of Armenians57 as well as various Middle Eastern groups from Syria, Palestine, and Egypt, fleeing first from the Persian invasion of Egypt, then from the Byzantine religious policies vis-à-vis Judaism and certain interpretations of Christianity, and finally from the Arab invasion of Egypt.58 Thus, in the Romanized milieus of North Africa, the invading Arabs must have encountered a rather large group of people able to speak one of the languages also current in the Middle East.

---

52 British Library P. 3124, lines 8, 14, 15, 19.
57 Kaegi, Muslim Expansion, 102.
Considering that late antique North Africa had been a flourishing centre of Latin rhetorics and literature,\(^59\) and Latin continued to be used under Byzantine rule,\(^60\) one would surmise that Latin was still widely used at the time of the conquest, thus making some kind of Latin-Arabic encounter inevitable. This is certainly valid for the urbanized coastal areas. It is quite difficult, however, to reconstruct how far the Latin language had penetrated into the coastal hinterland, which, in the seventh century, constituted an immense dialect continuum of so-called Berber languages reaching from the Western desert of Egypt to the Atlantic.\(^61\) Linguists such as Hugo Schuchardt and Otto Rössler pointed to the large number of Latin or Romance loanwords in modern Berber dialects.\(^62\) Maarten Kossmann, however, has recently emphasized the difficulties of distinguishing between “Latin loans” from the Roman period, “African Romance loans” from the post-Roman period, “precolonial non-African Romance loans” dating from the medieval and early modern period, and “colonial and post-colonial Romance loans.”\(^63\) From the viewpoint of the historian highlighting the intensive interaction between Romans and non-Romans in ancient and late antique North Africa, Yves Modéran argued for a sizable population of Romanized Africans in the cities and the connected countryside who used a vulgar form of Latin as their dominant language on the eve of the Arab conquest.\(^64\) Against this backdrop, we can probably assume that (partly) Romanized Berber groups displayed some knowledge of a vulgar form of Latin, a fact not lacking relevance, considering that such Berber groups may have participated in the invasion and settlement of the Iberian Peninsula after 711.

Much of the evidence for Latin-Arabic entanglement in North Africa of the conquest period is difficult to interpret. The supposition that the Arabic term *al-Barbar* derives from the Latinized *barbari* or the Greek *βάρβαροι*, says little more than that the Arab conquerors adopted an ethnocultural distinction prevalent among the Romanized elites of North Africa, regardless of their speaking Greek or Latin.\(^65\) An Arabic merchant letter, probably written in al-Qayrawān in the seventh century on a fifth-century parchment containing a fragment of the Latinized Book of Exodus, only tells us that the Arab conquerors reused local writing

\(^{59}\) Leonhardt, *Latein*, 88–89.


\(^{63}\) Kossmann, *Arabic Influence*, 63–64.


We do not know, however, if and to what extent the Muslim takeover entailed the systematic destruction of Latin writings. Leo Africanus, a North African Muslim convert to Christianity who wrote an Italian history of Africa at the papal court of the sixteenth century, claims that the Arabs only encountered Latin texts during their conquest of North Africa. This statement is of no help to reconstruct concrete linguistic encounters and seems highly doubtful, considering the role of Greek in seventh-century North Africa. Leo’s ensuing claim that the majority of “African books” were burnt with the aim of squelching any ideas that might question Islamic doctrine, when North Africa seceded from the authority of Abbasid Baghdad, smacks of Christian anti-Islamic polemics and finds no corroboration in other evidence. 

Finally, al-Idrīsī’s (d. 560/1165) remarkable description of the twelfth-century inhabitants of Gafsa (in modern-day Tunisia) as “Berberized, the majority of them speaking the African Latin language,” strongly suggests that—in spite of the penury of evidence for continuous Latin literacy in Muslim North Africa—pockets of Latin speakers continued to exist long after the Arab conquest. However, al-Idrīsī’s statement is too late to enable a reconstruction of Latin-Arabic encounters in the period of conquest. Only numismatic evidence from the late seventh and the early eighth century confirms clearly that the Arab conquerors of North Africa consciously began to engage with the Latin language in a linguistic landscape also marked by Greek.

The coins can be divided into four series.

Series 1 adapted the local Byzantine iconography. It bears neither date, nor the name of the mint, but was probably produced after the final Muslim seizure of Carthage in 79/698–699. As in the North African Byzantine model, the legends are in Latin, but formulate either variations of the
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Islamic creed (*al-šahāda*) or monotheistic invocations to God.\(^70\) One of the earliest specimens, for example, features the inscription “DeUS TuUS DeUS ET AliUS NON Est,” i.e. “God is your God, and there is no other,” in a mixture of Latin and Greek letters.\(^71\)

Series 2 represents a Latin epigraphic type without images that dates the coin according to the current year of the Roman tax-cycle (*indīctio*), making it possible to assign these coins to the governorship of Mūsā b. Nuṣayr.\(^72\) It was minted in three phases, from 84–87/703–706, then from 89–92/707–711, and finally, from 95–96/713–715. The coins bear abbreviated monotheist inscriptions in Latin, e.g. “eternal God” (*deus eternus*), “great God” (*deus magnus*), or “God, the creator of all” (*deus omnium creator*) in the first phase. From the second phase onwards, they contain a Latin variation of the *basmala*, e.g. the abbreviated inscription “in the name of the merciful Lord, this *solidus* was made in Africa” (*in nomine domínis misericordis solidus feritus in Africa*), as well as abbreviated Latin versions of the *šahāda*, e.g. “there is no God but one, who does not have a similar associate” (*non est deus nisi unus cui non socius alius similis*), i.e. a rough Latin translation of the Arabic “lā ilāha illā llāh waḥdahu lā šarīk lahu.”\(^73\)

Series 3 represents an Arabic-Latin bilingual type that was struck between 97/715–716 and 99/717–718. Coins now feature the Arabic version of the Islamic creed, an often highly corrupted Latin version of the *šahāda*, as well as a Latin indication of the place and date of minting, exchanging the dating by tax-cycle with a date in *hiǧrī*-years. That empty spaces in the Latin legend are often filled up with meaningless repetitions of groups of letters from the first part of the legend, suggests that the responsible mints reproduced Latin formulae rather than retranslating them.\(^74\) Finally, series 4, not relevant for this study, abolished Latin epigraphy and merged with the post-reform coinage minted in the eastern parts of the Umayyad caliphate.

In view of this evidence, Northwest Africa constitutes the earliest area in which a respectable number of direct Latin-Arabic encounters took place after the initial contact of both linguistic systems in the ancient Middle East. The late seventh and early eighth century witnessed intensive Arab-Berber engagement and the Muslim establishment in the former Roman provinces of North Africa. Here, Latin, Greek, Berber, Arabic, and maybe even other linguistic elements mingled in such a way as to bridge the linguistic divide between Arabic-speakers on the one side, and Romanized groups using a late antique or early medieval form of Latin on the other side. While it is
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difficult to gauge the extent to which Berber groups had been Romanized in linguistic terms, it seems plausible that a number of Latin or Romance speakers came from their ranks and not only from the more strongly Romanized urban population of the coastal regions. The numismatic evidence proves that Latin and Arabic occasionally became highly entangled in what seem to be the earliest Latin versions of Islamic formulae of faith. Although intermediate languages may have played a role here and elsewhere, it seems possible that some forms of Latin-Arabic bilingualism emerged before Arab and Berber groups crossed the Straits of Gibraltar in around 711. Much speaks in favour of the hypothesis that people from North Africa constituted the mediators who facilitated this crossing in linguistic terms.

2.2.3 LANGUAGES OF THE IBERIAN PENINSULA

Contemporary Latin and later Arabic-Islamic sources describing the Muslim invasion of the Iberian Peninsula affirm that the Berber- and Arabic-speaking groups crossing the straits, fighting their way north, and establishing themselves in the former Visigothic kingdom were assisted by various people and groups. Among those who helped them to enter and find their way around the Iberian Peninsula in and after 711, we find a North African noble (uir illustris) either called “Urbanus” or defined as a city-dweller (urbanus), as well as the highly stylized count Julian, allegedly Visigothic governor of Ceuta, both of them Christians. North African and Iberian Jews may have also supported the invasion. The Seventeenth Council of Toledo, held in 694, accuses the Jews of the kingdom of collaborating with their brethren overseas, whereas later Arabic-Islamic sources claim that Jewish groups in Granada and Elvira were immediately accorded special treatment by the Muslim invaders. Finally, the sources also mention various inhabitants of Visigothic Iberia who supported the invasion, ranging from undefined locals to the sons of the former Visigothic king Witiza (r. 701–710).
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77 Aḥbār maḏmū’a, ed. Lafuente y Alcántara, 7 (AR), 21 (ES); Ibn al-Qūṭiyya, Tārīḫ iftitāḥ al-Andalus, ed. Ibrāhīm al-Abyārī (Beirut: Dār al-kitāb al-lubnānī, 1989),
Unfortunately, all of these sources fail to mention in which languages the Berber and Arabic conquerors communicated with the inhabitants of the Iberian Peninsula, be they shepherds or nobles. One wonders in which language the wife or daughter of the former Visigothic king spoke to the early governor 'Abd al-'Azīz b. Mūsā b. Nuṣayr, allegedly convincing him—as Latin and Arabic sources relate—to crown himself king of Spain. In view of the evidence collected in the preceding section, however, it seems fairly probable that the advancing Muslim troops could draw on linguistic mediators from North Africa. These would have included Latin-speaking North African Romanized city-dwellers such as the aforementioned “Urbanus,” who, depending on their respective region of origin, had had the possibility of adjusting to Muslim rule for several decades. In view of the partial Latinization of North Africa’s coastal hinterland, we can assume that some of the Berbers fighting on the side of the Muslims spoke a form of African Latin and thus encountered no unsurmountable communication barrier when facing the inhabitants of the Iberian Peninsula. The contemporary Hispano-Latin *Chronica muzarabica*, for example, mentions no communication problems when it reports that the Frankish *dux* Eudo of Aquitaine concluded a marital alliance by giving his daughter to a Berber leader named Munnuz in around 731.

Concrete evidence for early encounters between Latin and Arabic is again numismatic. Muslim coins with Latin inscriptions were produced in 93/711–712, giving rise to the idea that Mūsā b. Nuṣayr had brought one or several mobile mints along from North Africa, which struck several coins along the lines of the aforementioned second series of North African coins produced in the second phase. They bear the mint name “Africa” and are dated to 91–92/710–711. A second series of Iberian coins was then produced between 93–95/712–714. It differed from the North African model in that it introduced a star and added the hiǧrī date to the indiction date, but contains Latin words and phrases already known from the North African models. A third series of bilingual Latin-Arabic dinars was then produced in al-Andalus in the sole year of 98/716–717. Scholarship believes that these bilingual coins were issued in an independent Andalusian mint in Cordoba installed by the governor al-Ḥurr (r. ca. 97–100/716–719). Their Latin
inscription “this solidus was made in Spain in the year 91” (FERITOS SOLIdus IN SPANia Anno XCI) is accompanied by the Arabic text “Muḥammad, messenger of God” (Muḥammad rasūl Allāh) as well as an Arabic legend bearing a different date, i.e. “this dīnār was coined in al-Andalus in the year 98” (ḍuriba ḥādā l-dīnār bi-l-Andalus sana ṯamān wa-tisʿīn). In spite of these new elements, the coins do not differ from their North African predecessors enough to force us to believe that the minting of them necessarily involved renewed efforts of translating from Arabic to Latin.

Although we cannot assume that communication between the conquerors and the conquered posed no problems in the immediate wake of the Muslim invasion of the Iberian Peninsula, it seems very plausible that the issue of bridging the linguistic divide between Latin and Arabic speakers was less novel on the Iberian Peninsula than it had been in North Africa. In certain cases, Greek may have been used as an intermediate language. Greek skills are attested for parts of the Jewish population of the Iberian Peninsula, evidence being provided by various inscriptions in and beyond the region, some of which also feature Hebrew and even Aramaic. Greek skills may also have played a role in those southern and southeastern coastal regions that had been under Byzantine rule until the reign of Suinthila (r. 621–631), and which seem to have maintained sporadic contact with Greek-speaking communities until the first half of the eighth century. It seems very plausible, however, that forms of vulgar Latin would have been used rather frequently by mediators, initially probably of North African origin, to facilitate interaction between conquerors and the conquered until new generations of bilingual mediators had come into being.

2.3 Exchange and hybridization in the linguistic contact zone

The Arabic-Islamic expansion to the west thus created a linguistic contact zone that would, from then on, continue to connect Latin and Arabic, understood here—this should be emphasized again—as linguistic systems comprising a large variety of written and oral registers including derivate languages and dialects. All Latin-Christian territories affected directly by the Arabic-Islamic expansion—i.e. North Africa in the seventh, the Iberian Peninsula and southern France in the eighth, the Mezzogiorno in the ninth century—were not (yet) subjected to the Carolingian reform of Latin liturgy that, according to Roger Wright, created a clear and conscious distinction between written and spoken Latin on the one side, and spoken Romance on the other, in all territories under Carolingian control from around the late eighth century onwards. It is necessary, however, to distinguish between the different parts of the linguistic contact zone: North Africa, Sicily with the southern parts of mainland Italy, southern France, and the Iberian Peninsula differ clearly with regard to the documentation and intensity of Latin-Arabic entanglement.

2.3.1 THE SUPPOSED DEMISE OF LATIN AND LATIN-ARABIC ENTANGLEMENT IN NORTH AFRICA

As we have seen in section 2.2.2, North Africa of the seventh century must have still featured a sizable population capable of speaking and writing a form of Latin. However, much evidence speaks in favour of a certain destruction and then demise of autochthonous Latin culture in North Africa in the period following the Muslim conquest. Neither the fifth-century Latin parchment re-employed as an Arabic business letter in al-Qayrawān in the seventh century, nor Leo the African’s claim that religious fanaticism led to the burning of non-Islamic books provide sufficient evidence for this process. Decline, rather, is suggested by the fact that there exists no definite proof for the continued production of Latin or Afro-Romance texts in North Africa up to the high Middle Ages. Al-Idrīsī (d. 560/1165) claimed that the Berber population of Gafsa still spoke an African form of Latin in the twelfth century. However, apart from this, there exists only scant concrete evidence that a productive Latinized culture continued to exist. Among this evidence we find a limited number of

87 Roger Wright, Late Latin and Early Romance in Spain and Carolingian France (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1982), 261.
90 Al-Idrīsī, Nuzhat al-muštāq / Opus geographicum, ed. Bombaci et al., 278.
Moreover, Dominique Valérian lists several Latin sources, all of them written north of the Mediterranean, which mention African Christians and even African bishops for the period between the eighth and the early thirteenth century. Their relations with Rome imply that they shared some language of communication with the Roman church, presumably Latin. Some of the references, especially the earlier ones, imply that we are really dealing with autochthonous African Christians, and not with Latin-Christian merchants from the northern Mediterranean. The fact remains, however, that we possess no substantial Latin document produced in North Africa in the early medieval period. Consequently, scholarship tends to support the theory of the demise of a written Latin culture in North Africa, without denying the existence of individual pockets of, so to speak, mainly oral “linguistic resilience.” References to early medieval acts of communication between Christians from Salerno and Amalfi on the one hand, and North African Muslims on the other hand, imply that ongoing exchange in the western Mediterranean contributed to the mingling of Latin and Arabic in North Africa in the early medieval period. In addition, there is agreement on the matter that Latin-Christian culture would be revived in North Africa from around the late twelfth century onwards, when large numbers of expatriate Latin Christians from the northern shores of the Mediterranean sought a living in and around North African *fondachi*, i.e. legally protected urban enclaves of European-Christian merchants.

2.3.2 ORAL ENTANGLEMENT IN SICILY, SOUTHERN ITALY, AND SOUTHERN FRANCE

Given the lack of sources, reconstructing Latin-Arabic entanglement in early medieval Sicily, southern Italy, and southern France—three regions that only witnessed temporary Muslim rule—is fraught with difficulties.

94 The tenth-century *Chronicon Salernitano*. A Critical Edition with Studies on Literary and Historical Sources and on Language, ed. Ulla Westerbergh (Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1956), § 110–111, 122–123, for example, quotes conversations between a North African Muslim (*Agarenus*) and the duke Guiafar (r. 861–880) in Salerno, as well as between the same Muslim and Amalfitan merchants in an unnamed place in North Africa.
95 See section 2.4.3.
As opposed to North Africa, these regions retained a strong Latin- or Romance-speaking population throughout the period of Muslim dominance. We must thus assume that speakers of Arabic and Latin/Romance found some kind of *modus vivendi*, but can mainly infer this from contemporary narrative sources, which refer to acts of communication without mentioning the language(s) employed.

When Sicily gradually came under Muslim rule in the course of the ninth century, the Muslim conquerors of Berber and Arab stock encountered groups of Greek- and Latin-speakers. In his linguistic study of Siculio-Arabic, Dionisius Agius supposes that many of the island’s inhabitants were already bi- or multilingual before the Muslim takeover, but assigns a preponderant position to Latin. To him, “it seems clear that Latin or some early Latin type was essentially the spoken and official language of the island, if not on the coast line [. . .].” Muslim Sicily produced no sources that allow us to reconstruct specific milieus of Latin/Romance-Arabic entanglement. However, the reports of foreign visitors such as Ibn Hawqal (d. after 378/988), who harshly criticized the practice of rearing Christian girls and Muslim boys among Muslim-Christian couples of the Sicilian countryside, describe an atmosphere of intensive social interaction that must have had linguistic implications.96 Agius confirms that Arabic had a lasting impact on the island’s linguistic landscape, also to the detriment of Berber.97 Nevertheless, he assumes that, as soon as relations in the field of artisanship, trade, and administration had been established and a certain degree of intermarriage had taken place, “a portion of the Muslim colonizers were Arabic and Romance speakers.”98

The Italian mainland, in contrast, never witnessed the same degree and intensity of Muslim settlement as Sicily. However, contemporary Greek, Latin, and Arabic sources attest to intensive communication between Christian and Muslim inhabitants of the region. Arabic-Islamic authors such as al-Masʿūdī (d. 345/956) confirm that Muslims from al-Andalus temporarily took control of and lived in cities such as Bari (Bārī), Tarent (Ṭārniyyū), and Salerno (Šabarāma), until they were reconquered by what he defines as Langobards (al-Nawkubard).99 In his travel account, the monk Bernard reports how he sought out the emir of Bari around 867 to demand travel documents to Egypt and the Holy Land,100 Referring to the same emir, Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos (r. ca. 913–959) even claims “that the nobles of Capua and Benevent used to go to the sultan [of Bari] and ask

him questions about the treatment and care of cattle and other matters because of his age and experience.”

In several letters, Pope John VIII criticizes the bishop of Naples and Christian rulers in southern Italy for cooperating with the “Saracens,” only to negotiate the payment of tribute with Saracen raiders around 878. The tenth-century *Chronicon Salernitanum* mentions Muslims spending time in various cities of southern Italy such as Salerno and Naples. In one case, the Latin author quotes a Muslim (*Agarenus*) swearing “by the son of Maria whom you venerate as God,” clearly a Latin translation of the Arabic-Islamic epithet “Ibn Maryam” that emphasizes Jesus's human nature. According to a twelfth- or thirteenth-century medical treatise from Salerno, Constantine the African decided to translate medical books from Arabic to Latin and to settle in Italy when, during a commercial visit to Rome around the middle of the eleventh century, Saracen slaves translated the diagnosis of a local physician to him. Even if we do not believe such anecdotes in detail, they do convey an impression of the many and highly varied instances of communication in early medieval southern Italy between Christians and Muslims, some of whom must have been bilingual and proficient in the language usually not associated with their respective religious allegiance.

With regard to southern France, the extant sources provide much fewer details. It is not likely, however, that Muslim troops held Narbonne for almost four decades, i.e. approximately between 719–720 and 759, without communicating with the local population at least occasionally. At the end of the ninth century, Muslims established the so-called raider colony of Fraxinetum and subjected the surrounding countryside to frequent raids, until the colony was destroyed at the end of the tenth century. Latin sources credit the Saracens of Fraxinetum with speaking to their
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103 See e.g. *Chronicon Salernitanum*, ed. Westerbergh, § 99, 100.


kidnapped prey,\textsuperscript{107} claim that they intermarried with local women,\textsuperscript{108} and accuse them of sheltering political dissidents and of collaborating with king Hugh of Italy.\textsuperscript{109} Here again, we must assume, but cannot prove that Latin-/Romance-speaking and Arabic-speaking groups mingled to such a degree that certain oral forms of Latin-Arabic entanglement were inevitable.

2.3.3 THE EFFECTS OF PARALLEL LINGUISTIC ARABIZATION AND ROMANIZATION ON THE IBERIAN PENINSULA

In comparison to North Africa, Sicily, southern Italy, and southern France, the Iberian Peninsula provides the best documentation of early medieval Latin-Arabic entanglement by far.\textsuperscript{110} As has been shown in section 2.2.3, the Arab-Berber invasion of the Iberian Peninsula around 711 involved various acts of communication between North Africans and Iberian locals. Sources of the eighth and early ninth centuries do not contain explicit references to linguistic developments, but allow us to reconstruct an ever-increasing number of acts of communication that accompanied the processes of transculturation involving the conquerors and the conquered. Contemporary Latin as well as later Arabic sources, for example, provide a detailed account of the administrative measures taken by the early Arab governors between 713 and 756 and the first Umayyad emir ʿAbd al-Rahmān I (r. 138–172/756–788) to ensure that fiscal revenues were extracted from the Romance-speaking Christian population.\textsuperscript{111} Marital alliances between Arab conquerors and Romance-speaking Christian women are attested from the early eighth century onwards, thus implying that the initial separation between conquerors and conquered was slowly thawing.\textsuperscript{112} A letter written by Pope Hadrian I to the bishops of Spain between 785 and 791 complains about many Christians who interacted with Jews and non-baptized
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\item \textsuperscript{108} Ekkehardus IV, \textit{Casuum Sancti Galli continuatio}, ed. D. Ildephonsus ab Arx, 
\item \textsuperscript{109} Liutprandus Cremonensis, \textit{Antapodosis}, ed. Joseph Becker, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores in folio 2 (Hanover: Hahn, 1829), 110.
\item \textsuperscript{110} For an extensive analysis, see Cyrille Aillet, \textit{Les Mozarabes. Christianisme, islamisation et arabisation en péninsule Ibérique (IXe–XIIe siècle)} (Madrid: CSIC, 2010), 131–244, under the title “Latinité et arabisation.”
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heathens and even chose to give their daughter(s) in marriage “to the infidels” (*cum infidelibus*), the latter “thus being delivered to the pagan people” (*sic populo gentili traderetur*).  

Approximately from the middle of the ninth century onwards, the sources begin to provide information on linguistic issues. The phenomenon of the so-called “martyrs of Cordoba,” a comparatively large number of Christians executed by the Muslim authorities either for denigrating Islam or for apostasy from Islam in the 850s, sheds light not only on the religious, but also on the linguistic effects of intermarriage. The highly stylized lives of the martyrs, written by extremely biased members of the martyr movement, mention young people, such as a certain Aurelius, who were obviously bilingual. Son of a Christian mother and a “pagan father,” he was educated in what the hagiographer Eulogius (d. 859) calls “Arabica litteratura.” Aurelius was strongly influenced by his Christian aunt and eventually joined the martyr movement, where he intensively engaged with the biblical scriptures, presumably in Latin, under the tutelage of a certain Albarus of Cordoba (d. ca. 861).

Conveniently compiled in the *Corpus Scriptorum Muzarabicorum*, the bulk of Latin literature produced on the Iberian Peninsula under Muslim rule is clearly confined to texts written in the eighth and ninth centuries. Since the middle of the ninth century, various sources suggest that Arabic was beginning to supplant Latin/Romance in those parts of the Iberian Peninsula under Muslim control. Engaging in fierce polemic against Islam, Albarus of Cordoba harshly criticized the Christian youth of his time for abandoning the Latin literature of the Church fathers (*uolumina [...] doctorum Latine*), for not regarding themselves as Latin-speakers anymore (*linguam proprium non aduertunt Latini*), and for not being able to write a respectable letter (*litteras*). Instead, the Christian youth collectively received recognition for its Arabic skills (*harabico eloquio sublimati*), boasted of its knowledge of what he polemically defines as “Chaldean words” (*Caldaiicas verborum*), and engaged enthusiastically in what he calls “pagan erudition” (*gentilicia eruditioni*), “the works of the Chaldeans” (*uolumina Caldeorum*), and the complex rhythms of “the poetry of these peoples” (*ab ipsis gentibus carmine*).

In approximately the same social environment and period, i.e.


the urban Iberian milieu under Muslim rule around the end of the ninth century, the Psalter was translated from Latin into Arabic. The translator, a certain Ḥafṣ b. Albar, explains in the prologue to his translation that he regarded this task, supported by some and criticized by others, as necessary. Criticizing the shortcomings of an earlier translation, he takes great pains to explain why he used the Arabic metre raǧaz to translate the Latin iambus and describes his problems with translating certain terms and expressions.\footnote{117} 

The evidence presented so far implies that, by the late ninth century, Arabic had successfully supplanted a hitherto flourishing Latin-Romance linguistic landscape in those parts of the Iberian Peninsula under Muslim rule, even in the sphere of Christian liturgy.\footnote{118} However, this process of linguistic Arabization was complemented by a parallel process of linguistic Romanization. The unequal distribution of native Arabic-speakers in al-Andalus,\footnote{119} outweighed numerically by Berbers and local Romance-speakers, did not lead to an establishment of Berber languages, but certainly guaranteed the survival of some forms of Latin or Romance, not only in the lower echelons of society. Al-Ḥušanī’s (d. 371/981) History of the Judges of al-Andalus contains references to Muslim judges understanding and speaking “the non-Arabic language” (al-‘aḡamiyya).\footnote{120} According to the Middle Eastern geographer al-Muqaddasi (d. after 380/990), two languages were spoken in al-Andalus—a form of Arabic as well as “another language similar to the Roman” (wa-lahum lisān āḫar yuqārib al-rūmī).\footnote{121} One may even gain the impression that, by the eleventh century, most Arab and Berber settlers on the Iberian Peninsula had learned to express themselves in the local Romance idiom. This would explain why Ibn Ḥazm (d. 456/1064) regarded it as noteworthy that neither the women nor the men of the Arab group of Bali north of Cordoba were able to speak Latin, but only Arabic (lā yuḥsinūn al-kalām bi-l-laṭīniyya lākin bi-l-ʿarabiyya faqat).\footnote{122} 

In the scholarly discussion about Latin/Romance-Arabic bilingualism on the Iberian Peninsula, a specific form of Andalusī literature known as muwaššah-poetry constitutes an additional important corpus of sources.

\footnote{118} Ángeles Vicente, El proceso de arabización de Alandalús: Un caso medieval de interacción de lenguas (Zaragoza: Instituto de Estudios Islámicos y del Oriente Próximo, 2007), 45–82. 
\footnote{119} See the settlement patterns reconstructed by Chalmeta, Invasión e islamización, 159. 
\footnote{120} Al-Ḥušanī, Tārīḫ quḍāt al-Andalus / Historia de los jueces de Córdoba por Aljoxani, ed. and trans. Julián Ribera (Madrid: Imprenta Ibérica, 1914), 111–112, 139 (AR). 
\footnote{121} Al-Muqaddasi, Aḥsan al-taqāsīm fī maʿrifat al-aqālīm, ed. Michael de Goeje (Leiden: Brill, 1877), 243. 
Approximately between the tenth and the fourteenth century, this genre was used to express love, desire, and praise. Around three hundred and seventy specimens are known to have been written in Arabic; around seventy additional poems feature a final stanza called ḥarǧa which is written in Arabic letters, but either in Romance or a garbled mixture of Arabic and Romance. This corpus, however, raises several problems of interpretation. In twentieth-century Spain, the origins of this poietical bilingualism were fiercely debated in a general discourse revolving around the effects of the Muslim invasion of 711 on Spanish national identity. In this context, it made a great difference if the so-called Romance ḥarǧas represented a kind of “autochthonous” native lyric poetry, a manifestation of “Spanishness” (hispanidad) that had survived the establishment of Muslim elites, or rather an expression of “domestic loyalty” and “folkloric interest” on the part of Muslim and Jewish poets. Obscuring further research on the social context and significance of the Romance ḥarǧa, the debate on origins was not able to explain why the fifth stanza containing the Romance ḥarǧa is generally attributed to a female using “the non-Arab language” (mantiqin ʿaġamiyyi), who responds to the four preceding stanzas sung by a male in Arabic. At first sight, the relationship between Arabic and Romance characteristic of this genre seems to express a power-asymmetry between Muslim males and Christian females, especially considering that enslaved non-Muslim singing-girls formed an integral part of Arabic-Islamic courtly culture in and beyond al-Andalus. This interpretation cannot go unchallenged: in fact, muwaššah-poetry featuring Romance ḥarǧas came into being in the tenth century, the heyday of Umayyad power on the Iberian Peninsula. However, the greater number of poems stem from a period when Muslim rule was increasingly threatened by the takeover of more and more Muslim territories by Romance-speaking Christians. Moreover, the same linguistic and gender characteristics that seem to imply clear hierarchies between Islam and Christianity, also apply to muwaššah-poetry written by Jews. This should caution us against exaggerating the cultural and ideological implications of this poetic genre. The latter’s existence

124 On this discourse, see García Sanjuán, La conquista islámica.
127 García Gómez, Las jarchas romances, muwaššaḥa XXXVIII, 401.
proves, in any case, that Latin and Arabic—understood again as linguistic macro-systems—mingled creatively in the linguistic and literary landscape of Muslim al-Andalus. The latter certainly reflected prevailing socio-cultural hierarchies. Seen in a wider context, however, the relationship between literary landscape and religious hierarchies cannot be framed in terms of clear-cut socio-cultural and socio-linguistic dichotomies.

Scholarship has proposed different hypotheses with regard to the balance between Latin/Romance and Arabic in al-Andalus. Some scholars believe that an Iberian form of Romance remained the primary language of communication throughout the period of Muslim rule, with Arabic in the position of a superficial superstratum. Others opt for Romance-Arabic bilingualism, whereas a third group proposes that a Romance-influenced form of Andalusian Arabic slowly but surely replaced Romance as the majority language of communication. Considering the uneven distribution of Arabic-, Berber-, and Latin- or Romance-speakers in the different parts of the Iberian Peninsula in the post-invasion period, differing linguistic conditions in urban and rural settings, and an ever-changing geopolitical situation that clearly affected processes of linguistic Arabization or Romanization, one has to account for great local and regional differences as well as an evolution of the linguistic landscape. In linguistic terms, the early expansionist period of Arab-Berber settlement must have differed considerably from the period of establishment in the Umayyad emirate and caliphate, or the time when the growing impetus of the so-called Reconquista subjected great numbers of Muslims to Christian Romance-speakers entering and settling territories hitherto under Muslim rule.

It is undeniable, in any case, that the regional Andalusian form of Arabic was considerably influenced by Romance elements. This is already attested by the Middle Eastern geographer al-Muqaddasī, who described Andalusi Arabic as “difficult to comprehend” (munağaliqa) and “different from what we have mentioned concerning [other] regions” (muḥālifa limā ḥakarnā fi l-aqālim). In the fourteenth century, Ibn Ḥalḍūn (d. 808/1406) explained that, in al-Andalus, interaction between Arabs, Galicians, and Franks had led to the emergence of a “mixed language. The non-Arab element in it was dominant and it had diverged considerably from the original language,” which he defined as “the language of the Mudar,” a tribal group from the Arabian Peninsula associated with the prophet Muhammad. According to Federico Corriente, such evidence proves that “Andalusi Arabic soon became the main linguistic link between all the

129 Agius, Siculo-Arabic, 97: “Proportionately their number [of Romance speakers among the colonizing Muslims] is smaller than the Andalusi Muslims who were primary speakers of a Romance dialect.”
131 Al-Muqaddasī, Aḥsan al-taqāsīm, ed. de Goeje, 243.
inhabitants of al-Andalus, if due allowance is made for the initial stages of that historical entity and for remote areas where Romance monolingualism might have lasted longer.”

Whereas the logic of contact linguistics permits the formulation of plausible theories about how Andalusī Arabic came into being, the constellation of sources makes it extremely difficult to reconstruct this particular dialect. Andalusī Arabic was rarely written down by native speakers and generally documented rather late. Some terms feature in Arabic-Islamic treatises on botany recording local plant names, the aforementioned Arabic-Romance ḥarğas, and in bilingual Latin-Arabic treaties of the late medieval period. Often, however, Andalusī Arabic is documented in the latest phase of the Reconquista by Christians intent on conveying oral Arabic skills to facilitate the conversion of Muslims to Christianity. Consequently, it is very difficult to trace if, why, when, and to which extent a Latin or Romance word became part of this regional dialect.

Vice versa, it is also very difficult to trace the early medieval impact of Arabic on the emerging Romance languages of the Iberian Peninsula. Again, the problem lies in the lack of documentation, which, in the case of the many Iberian variants of Romance, is only available in respectable quantities from the thirteenth century onwards. Linguistic scholarship claims that Romance languages borrowed more nouns than other word-types from Arabic, that—in spite of centuries of daily interaction between

135 See the list of sources listed in Federico Corriente, Dictionary of Andalusi Arabic (Leiden: Brill, 1997), xiii-xvii. Also see Chapter 3.1.
136 See Corriente, Dictionary of Andalusi Arabic, 2, 42, 44. Although rich in material, it is difficult to gauge the relevance of many entries in this dictionary for the development of Andalusī Arabic. A term such as (BRKN), said to mean “musket” and to be a late derivation from Castilian “robadoquin,” the latter deriving from French “ribaudequin,” obviously only entered the Arabic language in the late medieval period in connection with the introduction of firearms. The term (PSTLY), with the meaning “formal letter,” obviously derives from the Latin “epistola.” Given that Arabic possesses an equivalent term, i.e. “risāla,” one wonders if this Andalusī Arabic term was ever used outside a Christian or missionary milieu, dealing, for example, with the Pauline epistles. Given the precedence of Arabic over Latin in medicine before the modern period, it is doubtful that Andalusī Arabic would have used a Latin-derived term for “navel,” i.e. (MLQ), unless it was in a Christian context, e.g. when describing Jerusalem as “navel of the world” (umbilicus mundi). Other terms, such as (BRBR), meaning “to speak Berber” cannot really be classified as characteristic of Andalusī Arabic. Speaking Berber was described in the same terms in North Africa. The term (BRD), i.e. “barīd,” for postal service was already part of the Arabic lexicon before the expansion to the west, as has been shown in section 2.1.2.

137 See the scarcity of early medieval primary texts as documented in Ramón Menéndez Pidal, Documentos lingüísticos de España I: Reino de Castilla (Madrid: Sucesores de Hernando, 1919), as well as the importance accorded to a “cheeselist” written in the late tenth-century Leonese form of Romance in Wright, Late Latin and Early Romance, 173-175.
Romance- and Arabic-speakers!—many loanwords were appropriated via medieval Latin rather than through direct contact, and that the attested loanwords mainly include toponyms, names of plants, and terms for food, clothes, artisanship, and social organization, as well as weights and measures, but few terms from the semantic field of emotion.\textsuperscript{138} However, such estimates of how many and which types of words of Arabic origin form part of Castilian, Catalan, Portuguese, etc. are based on texts written after the initial period of intensive contact between the eighth and the twelfth century. This makes it difficult, not only to trace the chronology of the Arabic impact on Ibero-Romance languages, but also to judge how strong this impact was in the early centuries of linguistic encounter. Considering that we lack approximately four hundred years of documentation, such results can obviously only provide a fleeting impression of linguistic contact between Romance and Arabic on the Iberian Peninsula before the period of intensified Latin-Christian expansionism.\textsuperscript{139}

2.3.4 ARABIC ENGAGEMENT WITH LATIN TEXTS ON THE IBERIAN PENINSULA

In this early medieval Iberian environment of flourishing, but mainly oral Latin/Romance-Arabic entanglement, Latin texts also soon entered the fray. Already mentioned above, Ḥafṣ b. Albar’s Arabic translation of a Latin version of the psalms mainly catered to the needs of an Arabicized Christian community under Muslim rule. Although this is occasionally also said of the second important Latin-Arabic translation produced in al-Andalus, the “Book of Orosius” or \textit{Kitāb Hurūšiyūš},\textsuperscript{140} one must acknowledge that the latter received a much larger Muslim audience. The \textit{Kitāb Hurūšiyūš} is a restructured version of the late antique Euromediterranean history by the Hispano-Latin historiographer Orosius of Braga (d. ca. 417). Working in the late ninth or early tenth century, the unknown compiler-editor expanded the book’s chronology, covering the period from Orosius’s death to the Muslim invasion in 711, and added more sources, including excerpts from


\textsuperscript{139} Nevertheless, note the impressive efforts at synthesis by Kontzi, “Zusammentreffen,” 387–450; Kontzi, “Arabisch und Romanisch,” 328–347; Ineichen, \textit{Arabisch-orientalische Sprachkontakte}.

a variety of other Latin texts, such as works by Isidore of Seville (d. 636). Although the conditions that facilitated the production of this work are highly disputed, there is no doubt that it introduced masses of information on the Roman and post-Roman West to Arabic-Islamic textual culture and opened the way for a more intensive engagement with the contents, if not the language of Latin literature.

After the translation, several Arabic-Islamic scholars from al-Andalus began to mention and even comment on the Latin language: Ibn Ḥuqlul (d. after 384/994), who gives one of several explanations of how the Kitāb Hurūšiyūš became available to Andalusian Muslim scholars, mentions “Latin’s able to speak the Latin language” (al-Laṭīniyyīn man yaqra’uhu bi-l-lisān al-latīni) in al-Andalus, capable of translating the book “from Latin to Arabic” (min al-latīni ilā l-lisān al-ʿarabī). After several centuries, during which Arabic-Islamic scholars had regularly mixed up Greek and Latin and used the terms “rūmī,” i.e. “Roman,” or even “ifranġī,” i.e. “Frankish,” to describe Latin, Śāīd al-Andalusī (d. 462/1070), qaṭṭī of Toledo, made a clear distinction between an ancient language of the Greeks (al-Yūnāniyyīn) called “al-iġrīqiyya,” and a language of the Romans (al-Rūm) called “al-laṭīniyya.” His contemporary al-Bakrī (d. 487/1094) quoted “experts of the Latin language” (ahl al-ʿilm bi-l-lisān al-latīni) and even tried to transcribe the correct Latin pronunciation of the toponym “Toledo” (ma’nā Ṭu-lyaytula bi-l-latīni Tūlāẓū). In probably the most detailed Arabic description of the Latin language in pre-modern times, Ibn Ḥazm (d. 456/1064) commented thrice on certain particularities of the Latin language, which he compared to their Arabic equivalents in a treatise on Aristotelian logic. Thus, the textual entanglement of Latin and Arabic as written languages also reached its first apogee in al-Andalus of the ninth to the eleventh century.

2. LATIN-ARABIC ENTANGLEMENT: A SHORT HISTORY

2.3.5 LANGUAGE CONTACT IN THE RELATIONS BETWEEN ARABIC-ISLAMIC AND LATIN-CHRISTIAN SOCIETIES

Latin-Arabic entanglement cannot only be regarded as an intrasocietal phenomenon characteristic of multi-religious and multi-ethnic societies under Muslim rule. It also formed part of economic, diplomatic, and other relations between Latin-Christian and Arabic-Islamic societies that were established in the wake of the Arabic-Islamic expansion of the seventh and eighth centuries. The emerging Christian realms on the Iberian Peninsula maintained regular exchanges with Umayyad al-Andalus and the early ṭāʾī-fa-principalities. This is also valid for the Carolingian Empire, whose rulers additionally engaged with Muslims in Italy and even established short-lived relations with the Abbasids. The eastern Frankish ruler Otto I exchanged embassies with al-Andalus and, by taking control of parts of Italy in the 950s, involved his successors in dealings with the Muslims of southern Italy. Last but not least, Italian cities such as Venice, Amalfi, Naples, and Salerno established and maintained commercial and other relations with the Muslims of southern Italy and North Africa, with Genoa and Pisa entering the scene in the early eleventh century.\(^\text{148}\)

In view of these relations, Arabic and Latin anthroponyms, ethnonyms, and toponyms inevitably became part of the respective other textual culture, challenging authors and scribes with the problem of transcription. Mentioning a Muslim delegation from the northern parts of al-Andalus to the court of Charlemagne in 777, the *Annales regni Francorum* Latinize Arabic anthroponyms, defining the envoys as “Ibn al-Aʿrābī and Ibn Yūsuf, who is called Joseph in Latin” (*Ibin al Arabi et filius Deiuzefi, qui et latine Ioseph nominatur*).\(^\text{149}\) Aside from acknowledging that interaction led to such rather simple forms of Latin-Arabic entanglement, one must consider the linguistic implications of these intersocietal relations.

Older scholarship propounded the hypothesis that intersocietal relations were facilitated linguistically by Jews and Christians under Muslim rule. It acknowledged a few Muslim merchants, sailors, and harbour officials with a “working colloquial knowledge” of Romance languages, but placed them at “a low level of society with little or no cultural influence.” This was explained by asserting that, among Muslims, “knowledge of foreign languages was not an esteemed qualification,” but rather “a specialized craft belonging to the non-Muslim communities and, like some other occupations, marked with a stigma of social inferiority.”\(^\text{150}\) A more nuanced approach shows, however, that the linguistic facets of intersocietal
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exchange between Latin-Christian and Arabic-Islamic societies cannot be reduced to a situation characterized by the alleged linguistic inertness of adherents to Islamic religion and culture, the latter buttressed and enhanced by the general availability of non-Muslim linguistic resources in societies under Muslim rule.

Taking on the perspective of those scholars who believe that Romance idioms were an integral feature of Jewish, Christian, and Muslim lifeworlds under Muslim rule in the western Mediterranean may explain better why early medieval sources either imply or describe acts of communication between Muslims and Christians pertaining to different societies without mentioning any form of linguistic mediation. Such acts of communication are frequently attested, e.g. when a certain Solinoan, Muslim governor of Barcelona and Geronda, submitted to the Carolingian King Pippin III in 752, or when the Umayyad dissident ʿAbd Allāh and his two sons sought refuge at the court of Charlemagne in 797. A panegyric to Louis the Pious dating from 829–830 features a “Moorish” raider (maurus) who effortlessly speaks with a Frankish man from Aquitaine named Datus, whose mother he has taken captive. One wonders if Ġamīla, the sister of the renegade rebel Maḥmūd b. ʿAbd al-Ġabbār had to acquire Romance skills when her brother was killed in 226/841 and she was allotted to a Christian noble and baptized, later to become ancestor of an archbishop of Santiago de Compostela. When a certain Frankish Christian named Bodo converted to Judaism and moved to al-Andalus in 847, he allegedly incited the Muslim authorities to forcibly convert their Christian subjects, thus triggering Hispano-Christian complaints to the Frankish court. After his defeat around 871, the emir of Bari is said to have communicated intensively with Louis II of Italy as well as with the local rulers, e.g. of Benevent. The duke Guaifar of Salerno (r. 861–880) is reported to have spoken to an “Agarenus” on the marketplace of Salerno, who—upon his return to North Africa—asked an Amalfitan merchant to warn the prince of an upcoming Aghlabid attack.

2. LATIN-ARABIC ENTANGLEMENT: A SHORT HISTORY

In the period between 899 and 906 a North African Muslim captive named ʿAlī interacted with Bertha, the Carolingian wife of the margrave of Tuscany, providing her with information about the Abbasid caliph.\textsuperscript{158} The Leonese King Ordoñó does not seem to have needed an interpreter to instruct renegade Muslim scouts in 303/915.\textsuperscript{159} Merchants from Verdun, known for their profitable export of completely castrated eunuchs to the Iberian Peninsula,\textsuperscript{160} were chosen as guides for the Ottonian envoy to the Umayyad court in 953 because they were known to have experience in the country.\textsuperscript{161} In 1076, Pope Gregory VII wrote to the Ḥammādid prince al-Nāṣir of Bejaia in Latin, maybe surmising that local Christians such as the bishop of Carthage, addressed in another letter from the same period, might inform the prince of the letter’s content.\textsuperscript{162}

Not all of these sources can be taken at face value. They show, however, which acts of communication between Christians and Muslims pertaining to different societies were deemed possible by contemporary authors. Consequently, they support the supposition that the western Mediterranean of the early Middle Ages constituted a linguistic sphere in which oral forms of Latin, i.e. various Romance idioms, had maintained a certain currency shared by Christians, Christian converts to Islam and their descendants, some Berbers, and even families of Arab stock. We can also assume that several centuries of commercial, political, and military interaction with Arabic-Islamic societies gave Christians from Romance-speaking societies a certain degree of knowledge about Arabic. This is implied in the description of a raid on Narbonne at the beginning of the eleventh century executed by “Moors from Cordoba” (Cordubensis Mauri). The author, Adhémar of Chabannes (d. 1034), seems to have expected that these Moors would speak Arabic: he is astonished that the captives taken during the raid do not speak “the Saracen language” (loquela Sarracenisca), but “speak like puppies and seem to bark” (sed more catulorum loquentes, glatire videbantur).\textsuperscript{163}


\textsuperscript{160} Luitprandus, Antapodosis, ed. Becker, lib. VI, cap. 6, 155–156.


\textsuperscript{163} Ademarus Cabannensis, Chronicon (recensiones beta et gamma), ed. Pascale Bourgoin, Richard Landes, and Georges Pon, (Turnhout: Brepols, 1999), lib. III, cap. 52, 171.
If it is accepted that bi- and multilingualism were an integral feature of Christian-Muslim interaction in the early medieval Mediterranean, then it becomes necessary to explain why linguistic obstacles and mediators are mentioned at all.\textsuperscript{164} It seems obvious, for example, that it was much more difficult to find human resources bridging the linguistic divide between Latin/Romance and Arabic in the eastern than in the western Mediterranean. Thus, instances of linguistic mediation are occasionally addressed: an Anglo-Saxon pilgrim, imprisoned in Syria around 724 by the Umayyad authorities, needed the help of a “homo hispanus,” i.e. a person from the western Mediterranean, who acted as mediator.\textsuperscript{165} Reports on Pippin III’s and Charlemagne’s diplomatic exchanges with the Abbasid caliphs al-Manṣūr (around 765) and Hārūn al-Raṣīd (around 801), in turn, do not mention interpreters.\textsuperscript{166} Then again, a letter sent by Bertha, wife of the Margrave of Tuscany to the Abbasid caliph al-Muktafi bi-illāh in 906, is said to have been translated first into Greek by a “Frank” working in the caliph’s wardrobe, then into Arabic by the Syrian Christian Ishāq b. Ḥunayn.\textsuperscript{167} Obviously impressed by their linguistic skills, the Abbasid geographer Ibn Ḫurdāḏbah (d. c.300/911) explains that the so-called Radhanite Jews were able to move goods from the western Mediterranean via the eastern Mediterranean to China and back again because they were able to speak “Frankish” (\textit{al-ifranǧīyya}) and “Andalusian” (\textit{al-andalusiyya}), presumably Frankish and Iberian forms of Romance, in addition to Slavonic, Greek, Arabic, and Persian.\textsuperscript{168}

While it seems plausible that exchanges between the Christian societies of Western Europe and the Middle East needed to be mediated linguistically, this should not imply that linguistic obstacles and mediators were inexistent in the western Mediterranean. When they are mentioned, however, this is generally done because linguistic issues played a preponderant role for the narrative. As opposed to the Carolingians of the western Frankish realm, the Ottonian court of the 950s, for example, had practically no experience in dealing with the Muslim sphere. After receiving a letter from the Umayyad caliph, ‘Abd al-Raḥmān III (r. 300–350/912–961), the Ottonian court was in the dark about how to deal with this unexpected “pagan” effort to establish contact. Consequently, it handled its first embassy to a Muslim ruler rather ineptly. Considering how strange Muslim al-Andalus

\textsuperscript{164} See König, \textit{Arabic-Islamic Views}, 66.
\textsuperscript{165} Hugeburc, \textit{Vita Willibaldi}, ed. Oswald Holder-Egger, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores in folio 15 (Hanover: Hahn, 1887), cap. 4, 95.
seemed to the protagonist of the *Life of John of Gorze*, the Ottonian envoy to ʿAbd al-Raḥmān III in Cordoba, it comes as no surprise that both John and the author of his *Life* seemed impressed by the fact that the influential Umayyad courtier Recemundus was a good Catholic and possessed firm knowledge of both Latin and Arabic literary cultures.¹⁶⁹

The most important Arabic-Islamic chronicler of early medieval al-Andalus, Ibn Ḥayyān (d. 469/1076) mentions several occasions in which the Umayyad caliph al-Hakam II (r. 350–366/961–976) received delegations from Iberian Christian rulers, but only refers to the services of interpreters twice. In connection with a delegation in 360/971, the interpreters seem noteworthy because linguistic mediation is facilitated by important Christian authorities from Cordoba and Seville, including a certain Aṣbaġ b. Nabil, judge (*qāḍī*) of the Christians in Cordoba.¹⁷⁰ In connection with a Leonese delegation that took place in 363/973–974, Ibn Ḥayyān describes how the caliph punished this individual for having translated the delegation’s vituperative attacks against the caliph verbatim.¹⁷¹ In the case of ʿAlī, the son of Muǧāhid, the eleventh-century Muslim ruler of the ṣaʿīf-principality of Denia, linguistic issues were of relevance because the future ruler of Denia may not have been capable of speaking Arabic before his accession to power. According to Ibn al-Ḥaṭīb (d. 776/1375), ʿAlī and his Christian mother had been taken captive during a raid of Muǧāhid’s troops on Sardinia. When he was released around 423/1031, after seventeen years of captivity, he was only able to speak the language of his (probably Pisan) captors.¹⁷² One of the sources on the biography of Constantine the African, the translator and author of various medical treatises in Salerno of the second half of the eleventh century, proposes to explain why and how the latter became a translator. It claims that Constantine was a Saracen merchant who, during a visit to Rome, allegedly conversed with a local physician through the mediation of the latter’s Saracen slaves. Thanks to this conversation, Constantine became aware of the Latins’ penury in medical books, moved to Italy, converted to Christianity, and began translating. It seems evident that his successful efforts to study “the Roman

---


and Latin language” (*romana [et] latina lingua*) would be highlighted in this context.¹⁷³

All this evidence for communication between members of societies under Latin-Christian or Arabic-Islamic rule respectively shows not only that communication was frequent, but also that it was not regarded as problematic. The small number of references to interpreters in narrative sources suggests that either bilingualism or linguistic mediation were considered normal, and the activity of interpreters only deemed noteworthy in particular circumstances.

### 2.4 Linguistic effects of Latin-Christian expansionism

The evidence compiled in section 2.3 of this chapter served to provide an overview of the different variants of Latin-Arabic entanglement that resulted from the Arabic-Islamic expansion into the western Mediterranean. From the late eleventh century onwards, new milieus of linguistic entanglement emerged as the Mediterranean power balance between Latin-Christian and Arabic-Islamic societies was gradually reversed. Latin-Christian expansion into the Mediterranean sphere as represented by the Norman conquest of Sicily, the so-called *Reconquista*, the Crusades, and the commercial enterprise of European-Christian maritime powers considerably enforced the spread of Latinate languages into Mediterranean regions hitherto under Muslim and Byzantine control.

Although Latin played a role in this process of linguistic expansion, Romance languages, increasingly put into writing from the thirteenth century onwards, became more dominant than before, at least in the written documentation. Two corpora of sources allow us to trace the rising impact of Romance languages.

Bilingual commercial and political treaties concluded between European-Christian maritime powers such as the Crown of Aragon and the Italian republics with North African Muslim polities constitute the first corpus.¹⁷⁴ Treaties of the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries were generally formulated in Latin and Arabic. Although such Latin-Arabic treaties were produced until the fifteenth century, Catalan and—slightly later—Italo-Romance versions begin to appear and to increase in number from around the middle of the thirteenth century onwards.¹⁷⁵

Arabic transcriptions of European-Christian titles and anthroponyms in Arabic-Islamic historiography of the thirteenth to the fifteenth century constitute the second corpus. The transcriptions “ray dā Farans” or “rawā Farans” obviously derive from the French “roi de France.” The transcription
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¹⁷³ See the edition in Kreutz, “Ehrenrettung,” 40–41. See also Ricklin, “Fall Gougenheim,” 128.

¹⁷⁴ On such documents, see the contribution by Daniel Potthast in Chapter 3 of this volume.

¹⁷⁵ König, “Unkempt Heritage,” 441 fn. 83.
“rayd Araḡūn” possibly leads back to the Catalan “Reis d’Aragó” or the French “Roi d’Aragon,” whereas the toponym “Inkaltīra” for England, ruled by a king called “al-Inkitār” possibly derives from the Anglo-Norman variant of the French “Angleterre” or the Castilian “Inglaterra.” The title “malik al-Almān,” i.e. “king of the Germans,” clearly originates in the French denomination “Allemands.” The technical term “ḥukm kumūn,” i.e. “communal government,” obviously derives from an early Italian variant of the term “comune.” We even find distinctions between a formal and a colloquial pronunciation of the imperial title, contrasting “al-inbaraḏūr” (imperator, imperador) to “al-anbarūr” (empereur).  

Apart from these generalities, European-Christian expansionism took on different forms, and thus affected the respective target regions differently. For this reason, it is necessary to approach the associated linguistic effects of expansionism in regional order, thus dealing separately with Sicily, the Iberian Peninsula, North Africa, and the eastern Mediterranean.

2.4.1 SICILY

The Norman conquest of Sicily in the last third of the eleventh century was facilitated by linguistic mediators working to the advantage of the Normans. These were recruited from among Christians hitherto under Muslim rule as well as from among the occasional Muslim renegade. A fourteenth-century French version of the Latin history of the Normans by Amatus de Montecassino (d. after 1061 or 1078) mentions a deacon called Pierre who, because “he understood and talked very well like the Saracens” (entendoit et parloit molt bien coment li Sarrazin), was sent out as a spy by Robert Guiscard (r. 1059–1085). In addition he refers to (presumably Arabic-speaking) Christians “who did not wish to live subjected to the pagans” and consequently joined Robert’s forces. That the Normans employed Christian Arabic-speakers is confirmed by Gaufredus de Malaterra (d. after 1101). He mentions that a certain Philipp, son of the patrician Gregorius, was sent out to reconnoitre the Saracen fleet “since he and all the sailors who set out with him were fluent in their language as well as in Greek.” In some cases, even Muslims seem to have defected to the Norman camp.

As soon as Sicilian territories had come firmly under Norman control, the island seems to have received new “Latin” settlers. This is implied by a diploma issued by Roger II in 1133 in response to a legal dispute between the inhabitants of Patti and Bishop John of Lipari-Patti. The diploma refers to an earlier *memoratorium* and states that Ambrosius of Lipari, “the first abbot under the consuls of Roger I [d. 1101], the land’s conqueror, ordered men of Latin language into the fort Patti.” Ironically, the descendants of these “men of Latin language” (*hō[m][i]nēs q[u]ic(qum)q(ue) sint Latine linguę*) were not able to understand the Latin *memoratorium*: its contents were explained to them “in the vulgar language (*vulgariter*)”.

At the end of the twelfth century, the influential monastery Monreale took the decision to translate its Arabic land registers “de saracenico in latinum” or, as the Arabic version states, “min al-ʿarabī ilā l-latīnī.” In this context, the Greek word for official registers, i.e. διϕθέρα, appropriated in Arabic as *daftar* pl. *dafātir*, was Latinized as *deftarii* / *deptarii*.

Against this backdrop, neither is it surprising that Stephen of Antioch (second quarter of the twelfth century) referred the readers of his trilingual glossary of medicaments as documented in Dioscorides’s pharmacological treatise to Sicily and Salerno, where they would find Greek- and Arabic-speakers able to define those plants and herbs which he had been unable to identify. Nor does it seem exaggerated to speak with Petrus de Ebulō (d. before 1220) of Palermo as a “happy city endowed with a trilingual people” (*urbs felix populo dotata trilingui*). When Pope Innocent III wrote to “all the Saracens established in Sicily” in 1199, and to various judges (*quḍā*, pl. of *qāḍī*, transcribed *Archadio*) and leaders (*quwwād*, pl. of *qāʾid*, transcribed *Gaietis*) in 1206, he probably did not need to worry that his call for supporting the young Frederick II would not be understood.
Frederick II is described by Ibn Wāṣil (d. 697/1298) as having conversed—without reference to an interpreter—with the qāḍī of Nablus during his sojourn in Jerusalem in 1229. Ibn Naẓīf al-Ḥamawī (d. after 631/1233) cites the emperor’s Arabic letter sent to the Ayyubid sultan al-Malik al-Kāmil and Fāhr al-Dīn b. Šayḥ al-Ŝuyūḥ around 627/1230. The letter is perfectly structured and phrased, partly in prose, partly in verse. However, in spite of these strong indicators of Frederick II’s interest in Arabic-Islamic culture and even linguistic skills, he seemingly failed to interact, in cultural terms, with the Arabic-speaking population of Sicily and the Mezzogiorno. Although Frederick sponsored a number of Arabic-Latin translations, including works of Aristotle, Avicenna / Ibn Sīnā, and Averroes / Ibn Rušd, he did not seek for the necessary human resources among the Muslims of Sicily, but drew on Christian translators from other regions: Michael Scot (d. ca. 1235) came from Toledo, Theodore of Antioch (d. before 1250) from the Syrian Levant.

Frederick’s choice to import Arabic-speaking Christian intellectuals may have been due to a constant decrease in Arabic skills among the population of Sicily, already noticeable during the emperor’s reign. In the transitory period of Muslim, Norman, and Staufen rule, population movements and processes of acculturation transformed the linguistic landscape of Sicily. Many Muslim intellectuals had emigrated to North Africa during and in the wake of the Norman conquest. In addition, Alex Metcalfe has detected onomastic shifts from Arabic to Graeco-Latin names among Christians in Collesano, which suggest that Arabic-speaking Christians were slowly succumbing to a linguistic and cultural process of “Latinization.” Finally, Frederick II’s deportation of thousands of Muslims from the island to Lucera in Apulia from the 1220s onwards contributed further to leaving the island devoid of Arabic speakers. In 659/1252, Frederick II’s son, Manfred, still seems to have been surrounded by a certain number of Muslims and, according to the report of Ibn Wāṣil, had
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even ordered the construction of a building dedicated to the theoretical sciences.\textsuperscript{191} Arabic-Latin translations effected under Manfred, however, were also produced by Christians, not by Muslims, in this case William of Luna.\textsuperscript{192} After Manfred's death and the Angevin takeover in Sicily and southern Italy, documented translators from Arabic to Latin were all Jews.\textsuperscript{193} Some of them, such as Farağ b. Sālim of Agrigento, seem to have been sufficiently fluent in Arabic and Latin to translate al-Rāzī's treatise on medicine, procured by Charles I of Anjou from Tunis.\textsuperscript{194} Another translator, Moses of Palermo, seems to have been capable of reading Arabic, but in need of a teacher "to teach and inform him about Latin literature."\textsuperscript{195} As late as the fifteenth century, Jews in Sicily and the Mezzogiorno seem to have constituted the prime mediators between Latin and Arabic, within Sicily as well as in relations with North Africa, as is attested repeatedly in archival documents collected by Henri Bresc and Shelomo D. Goitein.\textsuperscript{196} According to Henri Bresc and Alex Metcalfe, this evidence suggests that, by the late thirteenth century, Muslim converts to Christianity and the Christian-Arabic population of Sicily had adapted so thoroughly to the Latinized culture of Staufen and Angevin Sicily that they were no longer able to fill the linguistic void left by the departed and deported Muslims


\textsuperscript{196} Henri Bresc and Shelomo D. Goitein, "Un inventaire dotal de Juifs siciliens (1497)," Mélanges d’archéologie et d’histoire 82 (1970), 903–917.
of Sicily. Consequently, Arabic-speaking Sicilian Jews, enriched numerically by Arabic-speaking immigrants from Almohad al-Andalus and North Africa, fulfilled the task of linguistic mediation and translation in Angevin and Aragonese Sicily and even influenced the early humanist study of Arabic in Italy. At the same time, they also succumbed to the process of Latinization as is proven by onomastic shifts in the form of calques, e.g. in the substitution of the Judaeo-Arabic name “Ḥabīb” (i.e. beloved) with the name “Amatus” (i.e. beloved), a process either enforced or interrupted, when the Aragonese authorities forcibly converted or expelled the Jewish population from Sicily in 1492. Thus, at the end of the fifteenth century, Sicily was probably not completely devoid of Arabic speakers, but was certainly not able to compete with the new, humanist-influenced centres of Arabic studies that had meanwhile emerged in mainland Italy.

2.4.2 IBERIAN PENINSULA

When Christian conquerors took over territories hitherto held by Muslims in the course of the so-called Reconquista, this usually entailed an administrative arrangement. The latter was often spelt out in Latin or Romance documents that allow us to identify specific forms of Latin-Arabic or Romance-Arabic entanglement. After his conquest of Menorca in 1231, for example, the Aragonese King James I granted certain rights to the Muslim inhabitants of the island. Acknowledging the internal organization of the Muslim community, he was obliged to employ certain Arabic terms in the Latin document he issued, not only anthroponyms such as Aboabdille Abenixem (probably Abū ʿAbd Allāh b. Hišām), but also administrative titles such as alfaqui (al-faqīh, i.e. jurist), alcayd (al-qāʾid, leader), and almoxariff (al-mušrif, i.e. overseer). The Castilian King Alfonso X (r. 1252–1284), in turn, obviously deemed it necessary to create a legal framework for the commercial interaction of Romance- and Arabic-speakers not able to understand each other. This may have become a rather

197 Henri Bresc, Arabes de langue, juifs de religion: l'évolution du judaïsme sicilien dans l'environnement latin, XIIe–XVe siècle (Saint-Denis: Éditions Bouchène, 2001); Metcalfe, Muslims and Christians, 23–117.
201 Bresc, Arabes de langue, 43–44.
202 Bresc, Arabes de langue, 42.
203 See Chapter 4 in this volume.
frequent problem as soon as Romance-speaking settlers from the Iberian north, without previous contact with Muslim al-Andalus or Arabic, moved into former Muslim territory in what Spanish scholarship usually defines as repoblación. In his legal compilation known as the Siete Partidas, the Castilian king obliged such people to use an interpreter accepted by both sides.205

The Siete Partidas form part of a large body of Castilian texts, many of which had been commissioned by Alfonso X. According to L. P. Harvey, Alfonso X’s commitment transformed Castilian, formerly “one relatively uncultivated vernacular Romance dialect among many” into “an established medium of expression in which was available a large body of writings both original and in translation.”206 The development of Castilian to a language fully operative in all fields of knowledge was achieved partly by translation, mainly from Latin, but also from Arabic.207 According to Don Juan Manuel’s (d. 1348) El libro dela caza, the king “commissioned the translation of the entire sect of the Moors [sic] so that, in this way, the errors into which their false prophet Muhammad pushed them and which they still adhere to today, would appear.”208 The universalist Christian approach to Islam which becomes apparent in this project of translating Islamic religious texts also led to the production of other documents of linguistic interest, most notably linguistic manuals serving the aim of proselytizing among the newly subjected Muslim populations. Ramón Martí’s Vocabulista in Arabico, written around 1275, provides an example of a Latin-Arabic and Arabic-Latin dictionary that could be used to spread the Christian faith among Muslims. Given its lexical breadth, however, it was certainly not confined to this function.209 A more pertinent example is Pedro de Alcalá’s Arte para ligera mente saber la lengua arauiga, an introduction to the Arabic dialect of Granada published in 1505, i.e. three years after the Castilian monarch had obliged the Muslims of the kingdom to either depart or to convert to Christianity. Pedro de Alcalá states in the prologue that “the time of fulfilment or the fulfilment of time has come in which it pleased the Sovereign Piety to extricate this newly converted people from darkness.”

208 Don Juan Manuel, El libro dela caza, ed. Georg Baist (Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1880), 1–2: “Otrosi fizo trasladar toda la secta delos moros, porque paresçiesse por ella los errores enque mahomad el su falso propheta les pus e enque ellos estan oy en dia.”
209 Vocabulista in Arabico, ed. Celestino Schiaparelli (Florence: Tipografia dei successori Le Monnier, 1871).
His manual contains an introduction to the Arabic alphabet and tables of Arabic verbs, as well as a dictionary restricted to nouns.210 While such documents seem to imply that studying Arabic was on the rise among speakers of Latin and Romance, other documents show that the Reconquista also destroyed infrastructures of Arabic learning,211 paradoxically creating further variants of Romance-Arabic entanglement. In a Castilian text interspersed with Arabic religious terms, the “wise and honoured muftί and faqίh of the aljama of the Muslims of the noble and loyal city of Segovia,” a man known under the various names ʿĪsā b. Ġābir, Iça Jedih, Yça Gidelli, etc., produced a Castilian summary of Islamic norms around 1462. The reason he gives is as follows:

“Because the Muslims of Castile, given that they suffer from great subjection, heavy tribute as well as many toils and labours, have declined in their wealth and lost their schools of Arabic […] very many of my friends […] begged me to compile in Romance a short text on our Holy Law and Sunna, of all that which every good Muslim ought to know and to follow […].”212

Considering that he produced a Castilian translation of the Qurʾān in Burgundy under the supervision of Juan de Segovia, to whom he even wrote a Latin letter,213 ʿĪsā b. Ġābir certainly occupies a special place in the history of Latin-Arabic entanglement. However, ʿĪsā b. Ġābir was not the only one to use mixed forms of Arabic and Romance to ensure the survival of basic Islamic ideas among the (crypto-)Muslim population of the late medieval and early modern Iberian Peninsula. Luís F. Bernabé Pons cites texts which explain that they contain extracts of the Qurʾān and the šarīʿa "in the letters of the Christians" (en letra de cristianos) to enable those who “cannot read the letters of the Muslims” (no [saben] la letra de los muslimes),

210 Petrus Hispanus, De lingua arabica libri duo, ed. Paul de Lagarde (Göttingen: Diederich, 1883), 1 (prologue): “Venido el tiempo del complimiento o el complimiento del tiempo, enel qual plugo ala soberana piedad sacar a esta gente nueuamente conuertida delas tiniebras”; also see p. 3 (alphabet), 75 (table of verbs), 89 (glossary of nouns).


212 Içe de Gebir, Suma de los principales mandamientos y devedamientos de la Lez y Çunna, ed. Pascual de Gayangos, Tratados de legislación musulmana (Madrid: Real Academia, 1873), 247–249; re-edited in Gerard Wiegers, Islamic Literature in Spanish and Aljamiado. Yca of Segovia (fl. 1450), His Antecedents and Successors (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 236–237: “Y porque los moros de Castilla con gran sujeçion y muchos tributos y grandes fatigas y trabajos an descaeciido de sus riquezas y an perdido las escuelas y del arábigo, […] muy muchos amigos míos […] me rrogaron que en romance yo quisiese copilar vna tan breue escriptura de nuestra sancta ley y açuna de todo aquello que todo buen moro deuia saver y vsar […]” ; Catlos, Muslims of Latin Christendom, 198.

to understand them. Other texts transmit their contents in the regional Ibero-Romance idiom, but in Arabic letters. This fusion of a Romance idiom with the Arabic alphabet, already known from the earlier Romance ḥarğas of Andalusī muwaššah-poetry, came to stand at the basis of an entire corpus of literature known as Aljamiado. Produced until around the seventeenth century, it covers such diverse genres as Qur’ānic exegesis, Islamic juridical texts, and Islamic hagiography, but also notarial forms, contracts, and profane literature.

Accessing Arabic and Aljamiado literature constituted a challenge for the Spanish Inquisition, intent on eradicating all traces of Islam after the forced conversion of the Muslims of Castile in 1502 and of Aragon in 1526, which seems to have been accompanied by the burning of Arabic books.

Ana Labarta’s study on the translators recruited by the inquisition in Valencia between 1565 and 1609 distinguishes between translators and interpreters with active and/or passive skills in written and/or oral Arabic. The case of Hiéronymo de Mur, a Jesuit involved in thirty-two trials between 1575 and 1601, presents us with an “interpreter of the Arabic language and a qualifier thereof” (intérprete de la lengua arábiga y calificador della). Among other things, his function was to distinguish between religious and profane texts. Although classified as “able to read, write, and speak the Arabic language and letters” (por saber leer y screvir y ablar la lengua y letra arábiga), an analysis of his translations shows that he was more competent in the Valencian dialect than in the written form of Arabic.

The anti-Christian polemic and travel account of Aḥmad b. Qāsim al-Ḥaǧarī (d. after 1640), a Morisco who had left the Iberian Peninsula around 1599, i.e. around ten years before the official expulsion of the Moriscos in 1609, provides a good example of the linguistic make-up of an Iberian crypto-Muslim who successfully managed to flee and to establish himself in North Africa. Still in Spain, Ahmad b. Qāsim hesitated to reveal his Arabic skills for fear of being burned, but also mentions that the reading of profane Arabic books was permitted to the inhabitants of Valencia and encountered two “Andalusian interpreters” who “had the excuse that they had learned Arabic in their youth, close to the Islamic period.”

Sent as an envoy to France by the Moroccan sultan Mawlāy Zīdān

215 See section 2.3.3.
216 Bernabé Pons, “Manuscritos aljamiados,” 33.
217 See José Martínez Gázquez, The Attitude of the Medieval Latin Translators Towards the Arabic Sciences (Florence: SISMEL, 2016), 177–180.
(r. ca. 1012–1039/1603–1628), he sojourned in Holland around 1615, where he confided to Prince Maurice that he was able to speak Arabic, Castilian, and Portuguese, and to understand French.²²₀ Aḥmad b. Qāsim’s precarious youth in Catholic Spain, in combination with his settlement in North Africa and his travels to France, had certainly enhanced his linguistic versatility in Arabic and several Romance languages.²²¹

2.4.3 NORTH AFRICA

Iberian Muslims fleeing the Reconquista arrived in a North African linguistic landscape that still seems to have featured some linguistic remnants of the Roman past apart from Latin inscriptions on architectural remains from the Roman period. Ibn Ḥaldūn (d. 808/1406) claims that the inhabitants of Ifrīqiya believed that the “Franks” of the pre-Islamic period had buried treasures, to the effect that, in his time,

“Berber petitioners approach well-to-do people with papers that have torn margins and contain either non-Arab writing or what they claim to be the translation of a document written by the owner of buried treasures containing indications on them with regard to their location, hoping by this to receive their sustenance from them by means of what they spend on excavating.”²²²

In addition, high and late medieval North Africa was home to large numbers of Romance-speakers from the northern shores of the Mediterranean. Throughout the medieval and early modern periods, Christian-European captives were brought to North Africa.²²³ In the twelfth century, the Almoravids deported entire Christian communities from the Iberian Peninsula

²²₀ Aḥmad b. Qāsim, Kitāb Nāṣir al-dīn, ed. and trans. van Koningsveld et al., 226 (AR), 225 (EN).
to North Africa. From the twelfth century onwards, various expatriate professionals from the northern shores of the Mediterranean made a living in or at the margins of the Muslim societies of North Africa. These included European-Christian mercenaries working for Muslim overlords, and, of course, large merchant communities of mainly Aragonese and Italian origin. Soon headed by a consul, the latter organized their sojourn in North African countries within the physical and legal space of the urban fondaco. They employed European-Christian notaries as well as Jewish, Christian, and Muslim interpreters to facilitate their communication with the local Muslim authorities, while mainly Franciscan and Dominican chaplains administered to their religious needs and ensured relations with the papacy. Vice versa, the Latin documentation also attests to the presence of “Saracens,” i.e. Muslims, in the economic hubs of the northern Mediterranean, e.g. in Venice.

Commercial diplomacy gave rise to milieus of Latin-Arabic and Romance-Arabic interaction that flourished between the late twelfth and the beginning of the sixteenth century when the Ottoman expansion and the increase in piracy considerably modified the conditions of trade and diplomatic interaction in the western Mediterranean. Late medieval Arabic-Islamic texts from North Africa provide only a few glimpses into the linguistic effects of this European-Christian presence in North Africa, e.g. Ibn Ḥaldūn citing a late twelfth-century magic spell that transcribes Romance


229 E.g. Mas Latrie, Traités de paix et de commerce, vol. 1, § 25, 205 [Venice-Tunis, a. 1271]: “omnes Saraceni qui Venecias venient, erunt salvi in personis et havere.”

words such as “Alfonso,” “Barcelona,” and “French king,” subsuming this under the category “Rūm.” Fortunately, however, the archives of the Crown of Aragon and the Italian maritime republics of Genoa, Pisa, and Venice have preserved dozens of letters and treaties in Arabic, Latin, Catalan, and several variants of Italo-Romance that allow the linguistic dimensions of this intensive exchange to be understood.

A large number of bilingual Latin-Arabic and Romance-Arabic letters and treaties provide the most important evidence. They attest to the flow of Latin and Romance loanwords into Arabic, most of them administrative terms serving the function of identifying forms of authority particular to the republican systems of Italy’s maritime cities, as can be shown in Table 2.3.

Table 2.3: Examples of Latin and Romance Loanwords in Arabic Documents of Commercial Diplomacy (twelfth–fifteenth centuries)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin / Romance Original</th>
<th>Arabic Transcriptions and Adaptations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>archiepiscopus</td>
<td>al-ark (Amari, DA, I, p. 1: 10.07.1157; Amari DA, II, p. 7: 23.04.1181); al-ark bišafqah (Amari IV, p. 14: 01.06.1184); al-arğabāsiga (Amari, NR, II, p. 6: 1188); al-aršafāšk (Amari, DA, VI, p. 23: 09.09.1200); al-arsifāsk (Amari, DA, IX, p. 33: 11.09.1200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corsarius</td>
<td>kursālī, kursāliya (Amari, NR, III, p. 11: 1290)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dux / doge</td>
<td>duğğ (Wansbrough, p. 204: 1473)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comminis / commune</td>
<td>ḥukm Kumūn (Amari, NR, III, p. 15: 1290)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vicecomes</td>
<td>al-faskundu (Amari, DA, XXVII, p. 81: 29.03.1215)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capitano, capitania</td>
<td>al-kabṭāniyya (Amari, NR, III, p. 13: 1290)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consoli di mare</td>
<td>qanāṣira baḥrihā (Amari, DA, IX, p. 33: 11.09.1200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potestas / podestā</td>
<td>al-bistār (Amari, DA, XXVII, p. 81: 29.03.1215); al-buḏistā (Amari, NR, III, p. 13: 1290)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Moreover, these documents often provide the earliest testimony for the introduction of Arabic loanwords into medieval Latin and Romance languages. Table 2.4 shows that these are often terms for hitherto unknown goods and products, as well as North African forms of administration facilitating trans-Mediterranean commerce.

Table 2.4: Examples of Arabic Loanwords in Latin and Romance Documents of Commercial Diplomacy (twelfth–fifteenth centuries).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic Original</th>
<th>Medieval Latin / Italo-Romance Transcriptions and Adaptations</th>
<th>Later Adoptions and Adaptations in other European Languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tarīfa</td>
<td>MLAT/IT tariffa (Pisa 1215–1216, Siena 1358)</td>
<td>Early New High German tariffa (16th c.), EN tariff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diwān</td>
<td>MLAT dogana, doana, etc. (Pisa 1154; Venice 1207–1208; Liguria 1290)</td>
<td>IT dogana, ES aduana, FR douane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maḥzan</td>
<td>MLAT magazeni (Pisa 1214, 1229, 1234) &gt; IT magazzino (1340, 1348)</td>
<td>Early New High German magatzin, Magazin (1558, 1641)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lakk</td>
<td>MLAT lacta, laca, lacca (1163, 1271, 1400) &gt; IT lacca (14th c.)</td>
<td>Early New High German lacca (1508, 1527) &gt; DE Lack (1727)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tarsīʿ</td>
<td>IT tarsia (13th c.)</td>
<td>DE Intarsie, EN intarsia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maṭraḥ</td>
<td>MLAT matarasi, matoracium, matorazum (Palermo 1248; Venice 1255; Messina 1268; Bologna 1274) &gt; IT materassa, materasso, materazzo (14th c.)</td>
<td>Early New High German materatz, matratzen (1470, 1480) &gt; DE Matratze</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, these documents often mention interpreters and describe their procedure and techniques of translating the respective texts in detail. Thus, a treaty of 1264 was translated “de lingua arabicha [sic] in latina,” whereas the Arabic text of a Genoese-Mamluk treaty of 1290 was furnished with a “Frankish” interlinear translation reviewed by two Mamluk interpreters. The text of a treaty of 1313 was read aloud in Arabic, then translated word for word (de verbo ad verbum) to Catalan, and then written out in Latin. An Arabic letter written in 1452 was translated “de moriscu in latinu” in Genoa, the translation reviewed by a second translator.

234 Mas Latrie, Traités de paix, vol. 1, 47.
235 Amari, Nuovi ricordi, 16–17 (AR), 63–65 (IT).
236 Mas Latrie, Traités de paix, vol. 1, 189–192.
237 Mas Latrie, Traités de paix, vol. 1, 147.
Taken together, the many bilingual Latin/Romance-Arabic documents produced between North Africa and the northern shores of the Mediterranean prove that professional linguistic mediation involving Latin, various Romance languages, and Arabic became a regular feature of commercial diplomacy in the western Mediterranean of the late twelfth to fifteenth centuries. Many bilateral treaties condition the legal validity of commercial transactions on the use of officially accredited interpreters, impose various rules on the interpreters themselves, and regulate the latter’s payment.238 In official letters, interpreters feature as agents who try to de-escalate tensions,239 or even advertise their skills and loyalty to potential protectors and employers.240 In one case, we even find a letter that is written in a rather unusual form of “Aljamiado.” In the letter, dated 30 Ramaḍān 767 or June 10, 1366, the Hafsid ruler Abū l-ʿAbbās Aḥmad b. Abī ʿAbd Allāh Muhammad from Bejaia addresses Giovanni dell’Agnello de’Conti, the doge of Pisa, capitano generale, and governor of Lucca, in a letter written in Arabic script, but in the Pisan variant of Italo-Romance.241

Juxtaposing the extant Latin, Romance, and Arabic versions of specific treaties and letters allows us to evaluate the quality of the respective translations. This includes observing procedures and techniques of translation as well as the liberties occasionally taken or not taken by the translators.

In letters, transcriptions of honorary titles allow us to understand the extent to which the political symbolism of the respective addressee was understood by the sender and vice versa. A letter by the ruler of Tunis ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abd al-ʿAzīz b. ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq b. Abī Ḫurasān addressed “to the exalted and most noble archbishop, the archbishop of Pisa” (ilā l-ark al-ǧalīl al-akram ark Bīsha), dating from July 10, 1157, extensively describes the former’s victory over the Almohads in strong religious language full of typical Islamic idiomatic expressions. The Latin version enlarges and thus corrects the archbishop’s title, thus addressing “the archbishop of the Pisans, the primate and vicar of Corsica and Sardinia” (Archiepiscopo Pisanorum [. . .], Corsice et Sardinie primati atque vicario). It eliminates the rhythmic rhyme prose of the Arabic original as well as all Islamic idiomatic expressions,

239 Amari, I Diplomi, 39: In this Arabic letter, dated 597/1201, ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Abī l-Tāhir, overseer of the diwān in Tunis (al-nāẓir bi-dīwān Tūnis), reports to the archbishop and the commune of Pisa that Pisan scribes residing in Tunis harshly criticized the captains and crews of two Pisan ships which had attacked a Muslim ship in the harbour of Tunis.
240 Amari, I Diplomi, 75–76: In this Arabic letter, dated 604/1207, Aḥmad b. Tamīm from Bejaia asks the Pisan Lamberto del Vernaccio for a letter of reference to the diwān.
241 Amari, I Diplomi, doc. XXXIII, 119–122, here: 119: [transliteration of the Arabic text] “Îmm d디 ki bîtûs mzkrdâyyûs daura bir suwâ msaḥMḥmd lkrîyyûs wa-br’tūt lswâ knbâni al-suwa skâš qirmâr salîtâm / da ‘Abd-Allâh lunbaradûr subra lswâ sârayîn rîyā [. . .].”; transcribed in Italian by Amari as: “In nome di Dio che, pietoso, misericordioso, darà pel suo messaggio Maometto il grazioso, e per tutti i suoi compagni e i suoi seguaci, general salute. Da Abd-Allah, l’imperatore sopra [la sua] Saracineria [. . .].” This Arabic-Pisan Aljamiado version is preceded by the Arabic original, doc. XXXII, 115–118.
but retains the idea that the ruler of Tunis overcame the Almohads “by the
grace of the Creator” (gratia Creatoris). As opposed to the Arabic original,
the Latin version additionally defines the defeated enemy as belonging
to the tribal confederation of the Maṣmūda. Moreover, it legitimizes the
report on this victory by stating that the author of the letter deemed it
proper to inform his “true friends, whom I treasure more than anyone else
in the Christian sphere” (veris amicis meis quos pre ceteris mundi christiani
diligo) about his current state of affairs.  

A Pisan letter to the Almohad ruler Abū Yaʿqūb Yūsuf, dated April
23, 1181, features a Latin transcription that reflects an understanding
of Almohad political ideology. The addressee, Abū Yaʿqūb Yūsuf (r. 558–
580/1163–1184), had succeeded ʿAbd al-Muʿmin (d. 558/1163), who had
been designated as caliph by the Almohads’ founding figure, the mahdī
Ibn Tūmart (d. 524/1130). Respecting these political-theological claims, the
Pisan letter addresses Abū Yaʿqūb Yūsuf as “Commander of the faithful by
the grace of God” (Dei gratia, elmire Elmomini), as “son of the Commander
of the faithful” (filio domini elmire Elmomini), and as “venerable priest of
the Mahdī” (venerabili sacerdoti Elmachadin). Both the Latin original and the
Arabic version pursue the objective of demanding the liberation of Pisan
citizens held captive in Almohad territory, but differ decidedly in tone. In
the Latin version, the archbishop of Pisa “humbly pleads with your Maj-
esty” (majestam vestram humiler exoramus) for the captives’ liberation. The
Arabic version is considerably enriched with Islamic formulae describing
God and expresses the archbishop’s humility within an honorary address
to “our kind lord, the Commander of the faithful, may God support him
to the effect that his high command be executed” (fadl sayyidinā amīr
al-muʿminīn ayyadahu Allāh li-yunfaḏ amruhu l-ʿalī). As opposed to the Latin
original, however, the Arabic version does not merely plead, but firmly
insists on the Almohads’ legal obligation to guarantee the security of Pisan
citizens and their property, according to “the binding command and the
concluded treaty to be implemented” (al-amr al-multazim wa-l-ʿahd al-nāfiḏ
al-muhkam).

Such examples of considerable divergences show that translators
obviously adapted the language, style, and even the tone of a letter to
the addressee, probably with the aim of making the letter more effective.
One would expect that the different versions of legally binding bilateral
treaties would not feature comparable distortions—especially considering
that many treaties describe mechanisms of control that aim at ensuring a
precise rendering of the treaty’s wording in both languages. A general
survey of existing bilingual treaties conveys the impression that sim-
ple and uncontroversial issues were formulated as closely as possible in
both languages. In some cases, however, slight variations in the Latin and

242 Amari, I Diplomi, doc. VI, 255 (LAT) = doc. I, 1 (AR).
243 Amari, I Diplomi, doc. XIII, 269 (LAT) = doc. II, 7–9 (AR).
244 See König, “Übersetzungskontrolle,” 480–481.
Arabic text seem to reflect disagreement on certain rights and obligations. A treaty concluded June 1, 1181 between the lord of Mallorca, Abū Ibrāhīm Isḥāq b. Muhammad, and the Genoese ambassador, Rodoanus de Moro, for example, deals with the rights and obligations of both parties in the case of a Genoese shipwreck off the Mallorcan coast. The Arabic version of the treaty guarantees the Genoese possession of all flotsam and jetsam, i.e. goods floating to the coast, and allows the Genoese to recover their sunken goods, i.e. lagan and derelict, with the help of rented hands.\(^{245}\) The Latin version of the treaty also guarantees the Genoese possession of flotsam and jetsam, and also discusses the issue of paid help to recover lagan or derelict. However, its formulations oblige the Mallorcans not only to respect Genoese property rights, but also to actively save shipwrecked persons and their goods.\(^{246}\) The divergent translations thus show that the Muslims of Mallorca were not prepared to render the exact same services demanded by the Genoese.

In view of this evidence, it is clear that different degrees of Latin-Arabic and Romance-Arabic entanglement were a recurring feature of communication in the western Mediterranean, in spite of the fact that North African Arabic-Islamic literature rarely comments upon these phenomena.\(^{247}\) North African exposure to Romance languages was probably reinforced by the emigration of Muslims and Moriscos from the Iberian Peninsula to North Africa in the late medieval and early modern period. According to Ibn Ḥaldūn, this emigration also had linguistic effects in that Andalusian emigrants imposed their (Arabic) writing style on North African chanceries, e.g. in al-Qayrawān, al-Mahdiyya, and Tūnis.\(^{248}\) The linguistic skills displayed by Ahmad b. Qāsim al-Haḍārī, the Morisco emigrant and later Moroccan envoy to France mentioned at the end of section 2.4.2, implies that the influx of Andalusian Muslims also increased the number of Muslim Romance-speakers in North Africa of the same period.

Against this backdrop, it is not surprising that the so-called “Lingua franca” became an important means of communication in the western Mediterranean. Attested among Christians and Muslims until the nineteenth century, it represents a pidgin or vehicular language that is made

---


\(^{246}\) Mas Latrie, Traités de paix, vol. 1, 111–112 (LAT): “quod homines sui eos salvare naufragos et eorum bona nec inde auferre vel minuere, sed quicquid inde habere possent restitutere; excepto si de pecunia qui jacet in fundo recuperanda ullam inde conventionem cum Sarracenis [et] Christianis fact[a esset] que conventio, si intercederet, firma sicut equum est servetur.”


up of various linguistic elements joined together in a flexible mixture. Scholarship on the Lingua franca disagrees on many points—e.g. if the Lingua franca constitutes a proper language or only a form of “broken” Italian, French, Catalan, or Castilian; if it dates from the high and late medieval or from the early modern period; and if its origins and strongest diffusion are to be sought in the western or in the eastern Mediterranean. Regardless of their respective stance on these issues, scholars agree that exchange in the early modern Mediterranean was facilitated by a flexible linguistic medium made up—in its majority—of Romance, but also of Arabic, Turkish, Greek, and other elements.249

2.4.4 THE EASTERN MEDITERRANEAN

The scholarly dispute presented in the preceding section about the origins and diffusion of the Lingua franca in the western or eastern Mediterranean shows that it is also necessary to consider the eastern Mediterranean as a region relevant to the history of Latin/Romance-Arabic entanglement. European-Christian expansion of the high and late medieval period had a strong linguistic impact in that it led to a diffusion of Romance languages as well as to the production of Latin and Romance documents in that region. Different variants of French, Italian, and Catalan were imported into the eastern Mediterranean by crusaders, various Italian merchants, and mercenary groups such as the so-called Catalan Company, as well as the military orders—all of them taking control temporarily over territories, trade, and shipping routes in the Syrian Levant, the Peloponnese, various eastern Mediterranean islands, Byzantium, and the Black Sea from the First and, particularly, from the Fourth Crusade onwards.250 The Chronicle of Morea, which recounts the establishment of the duchy of Achaia (1204–1432) on the Peloponnese, provides an excellent example in that the existence of Middle Greek, French, Italian, and Aragonese versions clearly attests to the linguistic Romanization brought about by European-Christian expansion.251 It is against this backdrop that some scholars also regard


the eastern Mediterranean as an alternative breeding ground for the early modern Lingua franca.\textsuperscript{252}

Multilingual lifeworlds in the eastern Mediterranean involved various forms of Romance-Arabic entanglement. One may surmise that much linguistic mediation was effected by local Christian groups who were invited to settle in Jerusalem after 1101,\textsuperscript{253} intermarried with crusader families,\textsuperscript{254} and seemingly fulfilled various administrative functions within crusader administrations, e.g. in the commercial tribunals (cour de la Fonde),\textsuperscript{255} or as scribes in tax-stations.\textsuperscript{256} Although communication problems are attested, e.g. between the Syrian-Arab Muslim noble Usâma b. Munqiṣ (d. 584/1188) and a Frankish woman,\textsuperscript{257} or between Dominican monks and ʿulamāʾ at the court of the Ayyubid governor al-Manṣūr Ibrāhîm in Ḥimṣ in 1245,\textsuperscript{258} we also find miscellaneous evidence for language learning and multilingualism connecting Muslims and European Christians. Intermarriage, shorter or longer bouts of captivity, and defections to the other camp, as well as occasional conversions, seem to have opened up possibilities for native speakers of Arabic or Romance to learn the other language.\textsuperscript{259} The attested crusaders’ employment of Oriental Christian, Jewish, and Muslim physicians may serve as an


\textsuperscript{254} Fulcherus Carnotensis, Historia Hierosolymitana, ed. Heinrich Hagenmeyer (Heidelberg: Winter, 1913), lib. III, cap. 37, 3–5, 748.


\textsuperscript{258} Karl-Ernst Lupprian, Die Beziehungen der Päpste zu islamischen und mongolischen Herrschern im 13. Jahrhundert anhand ihres Briefwechsels (Città del Vaticano: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1981), ep. 24 (1245), 162–163. In his letter to Pope Innocent IV, al-Manṣūr Ibrāhîm observes an “impediment in the Arabic language” (impedimentum lingue arabice) among these Dominican monks, “because they are only used to engaging in disputes in the Latin or Gallic language” (quia nisi in lingua latina sive gallica disputandi consuetudinem non habebant).

\textsuperscript{259} E.g. Usâma b. Munqiṣ, Kitāb al-ʿItībār, ed. Hitti, 129–131, on a woman from Šayzar capturing three Franks, a Frankish woman preferring a Frankish shoemaker to a rich Muslim, and a Muslim Frankish family reverting to Christianity; Guillelmus (Willelmus) de Tyro, Chronicon, ed. Huygens, vol. 2, lib. 18, cap. 9, 823, on a Muslim political refugee among the crusaders who begins to learn “Roman letters” (litteras iam didicisset Romanas); Le livre au roi, ed. Auguste-Arthur Beugnot, Recueil des Historiens des Croisades, Lois, vol. 1: Assises de la haute cour (Paris: Imprimerie royale, 1841), cap. 23, 622, on crusaders who move to Muslim territory and convert to Islam.
indicator of various forms of cross-lingual communication in the crusader milieu.\(^{260}\) We even possess anecdotal evidence describing a form of tandem language learning in which the son of a “pagan” noble is sent to the court of the king of Jerusalem to learn “the Gallic language” (Gallicum), while the king’s son is sent to the noble’s residence “to learn the Saracen language” (ad discendum idioma Sarracenicum).\(^{261}\) In addition, we find references to several noble crusaders able to speak Arabic,\(^{262}\) to “Saracen scribes” in the service of the Kingdom of Jerusalem or the Order of the Temple,\(^{263}\) to interpreters ensuring communication between Muslim rulers such as Saladin and foreign kings such as Richard the Lionheart,\(^{264}\) as well as to the linguistic challenges of setting up a treaty in Arabic that would fulfil the stylistic requirements of trained Arabic scribes and simultaneously conform to a previous oral, and thus linguistically less-sophisticated agreement with “the Franks.”\(^{265}\) In view of the relevance of Romance languages in the late medieval eastern Mediterranean, autochthonous groups seem to have made efforts to acquire some working knowledge of these languages. Evidence is provided by two documents from Egypt—an Arabic-Old French glossary in Coptic letters that seems to have been produced for Coptic travellers visiting Acre in the course

---


\(^{261}\) Caesarius Heisterbachensis, Dialogus miraculorum, ed. Joseph Strange, 3 vols. (Cologne: Heberle, 1851–1857), vol. 1, cap. IV, 15, 186–187, speaks of a “certain pagan noble, sufficiently versed in the Gallic language” (quendam nobilem paganum, in lingua Gallica satis expeditum), who claims: “My father was a noble and powerful man, and he sent me to the King of the Jerusalemites, so I would learn the Gallic language with him. The latter, in turn, sent his son to my father to learn the Saracen language.” (Pater meus erat vir nobilis et magnus, et misit me ad Regem jerosolymitanorum, ut Gallicum discerem apud illum, ipse vero versa vice misit patri meo filium suum ad discendum idioma Sarracenicum.)


\(^{264}\) Ibn Šaddād, Al-Nawādir al-sulṭāniyya, ed. al-Šayyāl, 246–247, 300–301; Behā ad-Dīn, Life of Saladin, trans. Wilson, 252, 321, on Saladin’s insistence on the use of an interpreter in his planning of a meeting with Richard the Lionheart.

of the thirteenth century,\textsuperscript{266} and the Geniza-fragment of an Arabic-Castilian glossary in Hebrew letters, compiled between 1424 and 1430.\textsuperscript{267}

The evidence suggests that, in the eastern Mediterranean of crusader times, Romance languages played a much more preponderant role than Latin, even in the written sphere: the legal code known as the Assises de Jérusalem,\textsuperscript{268} or the account of the fall of Acre by the so-called Templar of Tyre that is included in the so-called Gestes des Chiprois, were written in French.\textsuperscript{269} Latin text production in the eastern Mediterranean seems to have been limited to the ecclesiastical sphere, to the acts of Church councils such as the councils of Nablus (1120) or Nicosia (mid-thirteenth century), or to such authors as William of Tyre (d. 1184) and William of Tripolis (mid-thirteenth century). In the latter’s treatises on Islam one finds several Arabic words, including a Latin transcription and translation of the šahāda, the Muslim creed.\textsuperscript{270} In addition, some translation activity also seems to have taken place in crusader principalities such as Antioch, attested by the trilingual glossary of medicaments taken from the pharmacological treatise of Dioscorides, produced by Stephen of Antioch (or Pisa) in the second quarter of the twelfth century.\textsuperscript{271}

All in all, it is difficult to evaluate the extent to which Latin/Romance-Arabic entanglement in the eastern Mediterranean had a long-term impact on the Romance languages used in Europe and Arabic as used in the Middle East. Older scholars such as Arnold Steiger supposed that the crusading movement contributed greatly to enriching European languages with Arabic loanwords, but admitted that is was difficult to distinguish between Arabic loanwords of western and of eastern Mediterranean origin.\textsuperscript{272} Cyril Aslanov’s judgement that some Arabic words were adopted in what he calls “le français d’Outremer,” and, via this variant of French, survived in modern French, seems more modest and, ultimately, more realistic. Vice versa, the Arabic-Islamic documentation of the crusading period only contains a few

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{270} Wilhelm von Tripolis [Guillelmus Tripolitanus], Notitia de Machometo et de libro legis qui dicitur alcoran et de continentia eus et quid dicat de fide domini nostri Iesu Christi, ed. and trans. Peter Engels (Würzburg: Echter, 1992), cap. 3, 204–205: “The way, by which somebody becomes and is acknowledged a Saracen, is by declaring in any kind of manner: ‘lā ilāha illā llāh, Muḥammad rasūl Allāh’, which means: ‘there is no God but God and Muḥammad is the messenger of God.’” (Forma vero talis est, per quam quis judicatur et efficitur Saracenus, quocumque modo eam proferat: Le Ellech ella Alla Machomet resol Alla, quod est: Non est deus nisi Deus et Machometus Dei nuntius.)
\textsuperscript{271} Burnett, “Antioch as a Link,” 38–39.
\end{flushleft}
loanwords of Latin or Romance origin. Apart from the transcribed titles of European-Christian rulers mentioned at the beginning of this section, the unparalleled Arabic transcription of the French term “bourgeois,” i.e. “burğāsī,” as found in the memoirs of Usāma b. Munqiṣ, has to be counted among the most spectacular finds. In spite of the fact that the eastern Mediterranean certainly became a sphere of Latin-Arabic and, in particular, Romance-Arabic entanglement between the twelfth and fifteenth centuries, the area’s contribution as a mediator of words and texts seems less important than that of the western Mediterranean.

2.4.5 ANNEXATION OF A SCIENTIFIC HERITAGE? ARABIC–LATIN TRANSLATIONS (TWELFTH–SIXTEENTH CENTURIES)

The age of European-Christian expansionism into the Muslim Mediterranean closely correlates with the age of Arabic-Latin translation. It is true that the earliest attested efforts to appropriate knowledge available in the Arabic-Islamic sphere lead back to a period preceding the Norman conquest of Sicily, the first intensive phase of the so-called Reconquista, and the Crusades. Gerbert of Aurillac, usually the first Latin-Christian scholar associated with “Arabic science,” acquired his knowledge in tenth-century Catalonia—itself a Carolingian zone of expansion into territory previously held by Muslims. Constantine the African, said to have been a North African who decided to translate Arabic books to Latin when he noticed the dearth of such material in Italy of the mid-eleventh century, can certainly not be regarded as an exponent of European-Christian expansionism. It is undeniable, however, that the greatest quantity of Arabic-Latin translations was produced at the height of European-Christian expansion into regions that had previously been under Muslim control—i.e. the Iberian Peninsula, Sicily, and southern Italy, as well as, to a much more limited degree, the crusader states.

In the very early stage, medical issues seem to have aroused most interest, as is attested by the translations of Constantine the African in Salerno of the late eleventh and Stephen of Pisa in Antioch in the second quarter of the twelfth century. From the twelfth century onwards, translators on the Iberian Peninsula, particularly in Toledo, began to take the lead and to enlarge the thematic scope of translated texts. At the beginning of the twelfth

century, Ibn ʿAbdūn of Seville advised the readers of his manual for market inspectors not to sell any scientific books to Jews and Christians, since they would translate them and then ascribe the authorship to one of their co-religionists.  

Independent scholars such as Adelard of Bath, translator of Euclid from Arabic to Latin, certainly valued the possibility of citing new Arab authorities in an intellectual landscape that only accepted knowledge invested with the prestige of past authorities. While rather independent translators such as Hermann of Carinthia (d. ca. 1155) and Robert of Ketton were enthusiastically extracting knowledge “from the depths of the treasuries of the Arabs” (ex intimis Arabum thesauris), the influential abbot of the monastery of Cluny, Peter the Venerable (d. 1156), grasped the chance of drawing on these two translators to “transfer the writings on the origins, life and teaching of this damnable person [i.e. Muḥammad] as well as his legal book, the Qurʾān, from Arabic to Latin,” a task completed around 1143.  

The lasting impact of this first Latin translation of Arabic texts defining and describing Islamic dogma should not obscure the fact that most translators did not pursue a religious or polemic agenda. According to the obituary composed by his students, Gerard of Cremona (d. 1187), probably the most prolific translator from Arabic to Latin, allegedly went to the Iberian Peninsula because he was searching for Ptolemy’s “Μαθηματικὴ Σύνταξις,” generally known under the Latin version of its Arabic title “Almagest.” This book “he could not find at all among the Latins.” In Toledo, however,

“seeing the abundance of books in Arabic on every subject, which he could not find at all among the Latins, and regretting the poverty of the Latins in these things, which he knew well, he learned the Arabic language in his desire to translate [. . .].”


Karl Sudhoff, “Die kurze ‘Vita’ und das Verzeichnis der Arbeiten Gerhards von Cremona, von seinen Schülern und Studiengenossen kurz nach dem Tode des Meisters (1187) in Toledo verfasst,” Archiv für Geschichte der Medizin 8, no. 2–3 (1914), 76: “amore tantum almagesti, quem apud latinos minime reperit,
In the thirteenth century, royal courts in Castile and southern Italy became important centres of translation activity—be it from Arabic to Castilian under the patronage of Alfonso X (r. 1252–1284), or from Arabic to Latin under the patronage of Frederick II, Manfred, and later Charles I of Anjou. However, royal courts did not monopolize translation activities. We find a large number of translators outside the royal sphere, e.g. in southern France, Italian cities, or—in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries—in the orbit of the Venetian consulate of Damascus.

Muslims only rarely participated in these translation activities, even though they are occasionally attested, e.g. in connection with Peter the Venerable’s translation of the Qur’an in around 1143, the Arabic-Portuguese translation of al-Rāzī’s tenth-century history Aḥbār mulūk al-Andalus in the thirteenth century, and a later Castilian translation of the Qur’an commissioned by Juan de Segovia around 1454. Many Latin-Christian translators seem to have drawn on Arabic- and Romance-speaking Christians and Jews, and, especially in the earlier period, to have produced the final Latin text with their help by translating word for word from Arabic via Romance to Latin. This does not preclude that many translators also demonstrated independence in their approach to the text and language of the original—abbreviating the original and publishing works based on available translations such as Michael Scot, being native speakers of

---

283 Harvey, “The Alfonsine School of Translators.”
284 Kulturtransfer und Hofgesellschaft, ed. Grebner, Fried.
287 König, Arabic-Islamic Views, 162–164.
Arabic themselves, such as Theodore of Antioch,291 or engaging explicitly and didactically with Arabic grammar, such as William of Luna.292 As we have seen in sections 2.4.1 and 2.4.2, the Arabic-speaking population of southern Italy and the Iberian Peninsula continuously decreased from the thirteenth century onwards. Emigration, deportation, or linguistic assimilation made it increasingly necessary to draw on the linguistic skills of recent immigrants, such as Jews from the Almohad realm in Sicily,293 or on people who had acquired Arabic as a second language, such as Jesuits working for the Spanish Inquisition.294 In consequence, it became expedient to produce Latin and Romance works that would serve as aids to study Arabic, a necessity that contributed to the gradual academic institutionalization of Arabic studies in Christian Europe that will be addressed in more detail in section 2.5.

The Arabic-Latin translation movement of the twelfth to the sixteenth centuries thus featured various intellectual milieus of Latin-Arabic entanglement which differed with regard to the environment of patronage, the topics and works chosen for translation, and the concrete techniques of transferring texts from Arabic to Latin. The debate on the effects of the Arabic-Latin translation movement on European cultural and intellectual history has elicited highly polemic contributions ranging from statements that attribute a large part of developments in European cultural, intellectual, technical, and scientific history to Arabic or Islamic influence,295 to statements that explicitly negate and discredit any impact of Arabic texts on the Latin-Christian intellectual landscape of the later medieval and early modern period.296 The extant prefaces to Latin translations of Arabic texts leave no room for doubt that the translators themselves were fascinated by the range of new literature that had become available to them in Arabic.297 From the historical sociolinguistic point of view chosen in this chapter, it is clear that the intellectual repercussions of the Arabic-Latin translation movement often had little to do with concrete forms of Latin-Arabic entanglement because they drew on the existing Latin translations. Thomas Aquinas’s (d. 1274) Latin refutation of Averroist thought contains few traces

---

297 Martínez Gázquez, *Attitude of the Medieval Latin Translators*. 
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of Arabic, as does the condemnation of “pagan books” by the bishop of Paris in 1277. Roger Bacon’s (d. after 1292) exhortation to study Arabic for scholarly purposes does little more than mention important exponents such as al-Fārābī, Ibn Sinā, Ibn Rušd, and others, as does Guy de Chauliac’s (d. 1368) *Chirurgia magna*, which lists the works of various Muslim physicians. Starting with Petrarca (d. 1374) and continuing up to the sixteenth century, Graecophile humanist polemics were directed against the corpus of Latin translations from Arabic, but rarely engaged with the Arabic texts themselves. Among the “Arabists,” meaning either propagators of the Arabic scientific heritage lacking Arabic skills, or the emerging group of Arabic philologists, only the latter continued to deal with Arabic texts. As opposed to the Graecophile humanists, however, the “Arabists” referred positively to the contributions of the Arabic-Latin translation movement to the advancement of science in Christian Europe.

Although dictionaries of Arabic loanwords in European languages list a number of scientific terms adopted from the Arabic language in the fields of mathematics, chemistry, astronomy, pharmacology, etc.—frequent

---

examples being algorithm (<al-Ḫwārizmī>, cipher/zero (<ṣifr⟩), alcohol (<al-kuḥūl⟩), zenith (<samt⟩), syrup (<šarāb⟩)—the long-term impact of the Arabic-Latin translation movement on European scholarly vocabularies is smaller than one would expect. With regard to mathematics, for example, André Allard has shown that mathematical innovations produced in or transmitted via the Arabic-speaking sphere could easily be expressed in Latin, which also featured a wide lexical range of expression in this field.305 Danielle Jacquart, in turn, not only emphasized the point that the Arabization of scholarly vocabulary varied from field to field,306 but analysed a number of medical texts to see when individual translators opted for the transliteration of an Arabic term and when they replaced it with a Greek or Latin equivalent.307 Her analysis of Renaissance corrections of earlier medieval Arabic-Latin translations shows that terms of Arabic origin were often systematically replaced, either with calques, i.e. loan translations whose Arabic origin is difficult to recognize, or, considering the increasing impact of humanist thought, with Greek and Latin terms.308 These processes of substitution affected scientific language in early modern Europe to such a degree that, in the nineteenth century, the Egyptian traveller and intellectual Rifāʿat al-Ṭahṭāwī (d. 1290/1873) observed during his sojourn in France between 1826 and 1831 that,

“when the French became proficient in the sciences, they took their scientific terms from the languages of the respective people, most of the specialized terms being derived from Greek.”309

Thus, Arabic was only granted a short period between the twelfth and sixteenth centuries during which it was able to temporarily influence the scientific language(s) of European-Christian societies.

2.5 Retreat into academia (I): Studying Arabic in Europe

The rise of Romance languages as written languages considerably influenced the fate of Latin-Arabic entanglement from the late medieval period onwards. Latin remained an important means of supraregional communication and intellectual endeavours in early modern Europe and was even commended for its potential in unifying Christian Europe by contemporaries. It is clear, however, that the European vernaculars slowly but surely replaced Latin in all fields of communication. Latin managed to retain a foothold in ecclesiastical and academic circles where most encounters of Latin and Arabic have to be situated in the early modern period. In the protected zone of European academia, Latin-Arabic entanglement flourished in various forms, until, in the course of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, even the most conservative sectors of society abandoned its use in favour of what were now defined as “national” languages.

In direct relations with the Arabic-speaking sphere, Romance languages and the Lingua franca—rather than Latin—became the prime means of communication aside from Arabic itself. The prestigious but secondary status of Latin is exemplified by the following text, written by the royal Spanish interpreter Diego de Urrea when he signed his adscription in Arabic and slightly corrupt Latin to become a member of the Accademia dei Lincei of Naples in 1612. The translation of the Arabic text, roughly equivalent to the Latin version, reads:

Diego of Urrea Conca, private secretary to the great sultan of Spain concerning the issues of North Africa and Asia in the languages Arabic, Turkish, Persian, a Linceus at the age of 50 in the year of the incarnation 1612 on 2 February in Naples, with my own hand.

Deicwa ذى اوريه قونقه كاتب السر للسلطان الأعظم سلطان / اسبانيا في مسايل الأفريقيه واسيية باللسان العربي، والتركي، / والفارسي لنحيوس عمرى خمسين سنة من عام التلحيم الف / وستماية وأثنى عشر ثانى يوم شهر فبرارس في نبلس / بخط يدي

Ego Didacus de Urrea Conca Joannis Aloy / sij filius lynçeus neapoli / tanus a se / cretis epistolarum Africae et Asiae in lingua arabica tur / cica et persica Regnis / ispaniarum aetatis maee [sic] anno 50 salutis / 1612 die 2 februariy neapoli manu mea scripsi.

311 Leonhardt, Latein, 1–6, depicts this development much more positively than is usually expected from a Latin philologist.
This is one of the few extant texts in which the truly multilingual Diego de Urrea had recourse to Latin, a language he had only learned at the rather late age of thirty after growing up in North Africa. In the adscription, Diego de Urrea seems to have employed Latin to demonstrate intellectual prowess in a distinguished academic milieu. In his actual working environment as an interpreter and translator of Arabic, Turkish, and Persian, Castilian and Italian played a much more important role than Latin.

2.5.1 PROSELYTISM AND INTELLECTUAL ENGAGEMENT: THE EMERGENCE OF ARABIC STUDIES IN LATIN

Outside the direct sphere of personal, commercial, and diplomatic interaction, Latin retained an important role as an intellectual means to access the Arabic language and its literature. Intellectuals who were engaged in institutionalizing the study of Arabic in the academic centres of European-Christian societies of the early modern period employed and cherished Latin as an established language of intellectual endeavours. Their engagement continued a medieval tradition of engaging with Islam and Arabic literature. It is interesting to note, however, that early modern centres of Arabic studies in Europe were no longer situated in the former linguistic contact zones of the Iberian Peninsula and southern Italy, but were located farther north in places such as Rome, Milan, Paris, Leiden, and Oxford, i.e. places that had never witnessed Muslim rule.

The early beginnings of Arabic studies in Latin are usually associated with the first Latin translation of the Qur’an commissioned by the Cluniac abbot Peter the Venerable around 1141, as well as with the Arabic-Latin translation movement of the same period. Both involved and resulted in the intensive engagement of Latin-trained intellectuals with Arabic texts from the twelfth century onwards. Ideas of institutionalizing Arabic studies in Christian Europe first came up in the late thirteenth or early fourteenth century in an ecclesiastical milieu keen on spreading the Roman-Catholic faith among Muslims, Oriental Christians, and peoples farther east. Already in 1248, Pope Innocent IV informed the chancellor of the University of Paris that he would send ten boys raised in Arabic or another Oriental language who were to be taught sound doctrine to the effect that they “would then be able to teach others in the territories

314 Also compare the biographies of other Spanish interpreters in José Manuel Floristán Imízcoz, “Intérpretes de lenguas orientales en la Corte de los Austrias: tres notas prosopográficas,” Silva: Estudios de humanismo y tradición clásica 2 (2003), 41–60.
beyond the sea the way to salvation.” In another letter, Humbert of Romans, Master General of the Order of Preachers, informed the Dominican friars at the University of Paris in 1256 of the progress achieved by certain brothers in the study of Oriental languages. This had facilitated their preaching among the Arabic-speaking Oriental-Christian Maronites as well as among the Muslims of Spain, where certain friars “now for many years have studied Arabic among the Saracens.” Between 1285 and 1314, masters from the University of Paris argued vis-à-vis the Pope that the establishment at Paris of a studium in the Greek, Arabic, and Tartar languages, taught by six regent-masters and attended by twenty students, seemed extremely profitable to them, given that such students could either become missionaries or translate hitherto unknown Arabic and Greek texts. Another appeal, directed by Ramón Llull (d. 1315–1316) to the staff of the University in 1298/1299, urging them to win the king of France’s support for the aforementioned project, was followed by several full-fledged plans to prepare missionaries linguistically for preaching outside Latin Christendom.

In 1305, Ramón Llull proposed setting up four monasteries, one each dedicated to the study of Arabic, Syriac, Hebrew, and what he defined as “Tatar.” Staffed with native speakers, to be lured to the respective monastery with the promise of receiving a salary, each monastery should train twelve future missionaries to be sent to the relevant missionary ground after completing their linguistic education. One year later, Pierre Dubois (d. ca. 1321) proposed an alternative way to expand the influence of the Roman Catholic Church in a treatise discussing strategies to regain the Holy Land, lost to the Mamluks in 1291. In this treatise, Pierre Dubois explained the procedure of recruiting Oriental-Christian children in the Middle East, of providing them with a thorough dogmatic and linguistic education, and of sending them back to the Middle East as missionaries. Both plans were
not implemented immediately, but bore fruit to a certain extent and, seen in connection with previous efforts of promoting the study of Arabic, thus contributed to the establishment of Arabic studies in various European-Christian centres of learning, many of which already boasted universities.

Ramón Llull’s idea was modified and developed by the ecclesiastics present at the council of Vienne (1311–1312). They decreed the establishment of two chairs each for the study of Arabic, Aramaic, and Hebrew in all residences of the Roman curia as well as at the universities of Paris, Oxford, Bologna, and Salamanca. The chair-holders were to translate foreign books and to impart the linguistic skills necessary to “teach the infidels in the holy commandments and to join them to the community of Christians through the teaching of the faith and the reception of holy baptism.” In this way, they would create human resources, who, “sufficiently taught and educated in these languages, can bring forth fruit with the grace of God and spread the faith among and for the salvation of infidel peoples.”

Outside the sphere of the early universities, various actors made additional contributions to the promotion of Arabic studies. Ecclesiastics such as Riccoldo da Monte di Croce (d. 1320) and Juan de Segovia (d. 1458) engaged with the Arabic language either directly or with the help of a translator. Their aim was to arrive at a better understanding of Islam in order to refute it more efficiently. Jewish converts to Christianity such as Guglielmo Raimondo Moncada used their skills in Hebrew and Arabic to impress papal and humanist circles in Italy of the late fifteenth century. Interest in the Arabic language became great enough to produce the first book printed in Arabic, a Christian devotional “Book of Hours,” printed at the behest of Pope Leo X (Fano 1514), several years before the latter became acquainted with Leo Africanus, alias al-Ḥasan al-Wazzān al-Fāsī.

---

ed. Bridges, vol. 1, pars tertia, 95, on the necessity to study Oriental languages to be able to communicate with Oriental churches subject to Rome.


324 As related in Il diario romano di Jacopo Gherardi da Volterra dal 7 settembre 1479 al 12 agosto 1484, ed. Enrico Carusi, Rerum italicarum scriptores 23.3 (Città di Castello: Scipione Lapi, 1904), 49. See section 4.2.3 in this volume.

The printing of the Arabic version of the Lord’s Prayer, as well as the repeated production of polyglot bibles containing parallel Greek, Latin, Syriac, Arabic, and other versions of the New Testament, testify to an early modern urge of engaging linguistically with eastern forms of Christianity. The idea, formulated by Pierre Dubois in 1306, of spreading Roman-Catholic influence among Arabic-speaking Christians had not been lost. The establishment of the Collegium maronitum in Rome as well as several efforts to recruit missionaries among and for Christian groups of the Middle East may not have been successful in every sense. Nonetheless, such efforts created various links between European and Oriental Christians that are of utmost importance for the history of Latin-Arabic entanglement. Not only the aforementioned polyglot bibles, but a large corpus of Latin-Arabic translations of Christian devotional, liturgical, historiographical, and other explicitly Christian texts, produced between the fifteenth and nineteenth centuries by Oriental Christians and European missionaries, provide definite proof for the emergence of numerous, specifically Christian Latin-Arabic milieus. By the middle of the seventeenth century, Roman-Catholic influence on Oriental Christians had become so great that the Anglican protestant Arabist Edward Pococke (d. 1691) felt the need to translate Hugo Grotius’s (d. 1645) protestant treatise On the Truth of the Christian Religion (De veritate religionis Christianae) into Arabic, published in 1660.

2.5.2 ACADEMIC ENGAGEMENT WITH ARABIC IN EARLY MODERN UNIVERSITIES

By the middle of the seventeenth century, the study of Arabic boasted a number of chairs at various European universities. However, the latter had not been established in the wake of the council of Vienne (1311–1312), but seem to have emerged gradually in the course of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. These chairs came into being in an academic environment that treated Arabic as one among several Oriental languages worth studying—in Latin, of course.

---

329 These translations are listed in König, “Unkempt Heritage,” 449–455.
Guillaume Postel (1510–1581), for example, was appointed a royal lecturer for Greek, Arabic, and Hebrew in 1538 by the French King Francis I in the orbit of what was to become the future Collège de France. His famous Grammatica Arabica, a short introduction to the Arabic language, actually constitutes an extended version of a chapter within a larger oeuvre dedicated to the alphabets and grammars of twelve languages of North Africa and the Middle East.

Joseph Scaliger (1540–1609) held a chair for Oriental languages at the University of Leiden. His major contribution to the discussion about the calendar reform of 1582, On the Emendation of the Times (De emendatione temporum), draws on dating systems in various Oriental languages, including Arabic. In his funeral oration, held in 1609 by Daniel Heinsius, Scaliger was commended for his extensive knowledge of several languages, initially of Greek and Hebrew, to which “he added Chaldean, Syriac, Arabic, soon also Ethiopic, Persian, and Punic.” Heinsius excels in hyperbole:

There was, there was that time, when in a single house of this city one man was master of more languages than any one in Europe. There was, there was that time, when the house of one man in this city was the museum of the whole world: distant Maronites and Arabs, Syrians and Ethiopians, Persians, and some of the Indians had in this city the man to whom they could unfold their thoughts through the interpretation of language.

Scaliger’s successor, Thomas Erpenius (1584–1624), could build on the collection of manuscripts that Joseph Scaliger had bequeathed to the university’s library. Author of another Grammatica Arabica, Erpenius held

a chair for Hebrew and Arabic, and legitimized the study of the latter by pointing to the uses the study of Arabic could bring to the understanding of Hebrew in his *Three Orations on the Dignity of the Hebrew and Arabic Languages (Orationes tres de linguarum Ebraeae atque Arabicae Dignitate).*

In England, Edward Pococke first studied Hebrew before he received his initial training in Arabic around 1624–1626 at the hands of Matthias Pasor, an exiled mathematician from Heidelberg. As a minister of the Anglican church, he then spent several years in Aleppo, where he catered to the spiritual needs of English merchants, improved his Arabic skills, began learning Syriac, and engaged in buying manuscripts in various Oriental languages. He returned to England when the archbishop of Canterbury, William Laud (1573–1645), instituted a chair for Arabic studies at the University of Oxford and offered him this post in 1636.

These examples show that, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the study of Arabic was carried out in an increasingly academic environment that engaged with Arabic as one of several Oriental languages. However, all above-mentioned scholars highlighted that Arabic was worth studying in its own right. Guillaume Postel, for example, explained in an extensive Latin passage why knowledge of Arabic was needed, underscoring how much knowledge had been acquired thanks to the Arabic-Latin translation movement, and presenting Arabic as a means to various ends:

> With its help, we can transmit the most excellent authors and disciplines to our men, we can destroy all the enemies of the Christian faith with the sword of the scriptures, we can participate in the commerce of the entire world through the knowledge of one single language.

In his *De emendatione temporum*, Joseph Scaliger accorded a special relevance to Arabic texts which had played a major role in allowing him to correlate Graeco-Latin and extra-European chronologies. In the
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340 Scaliger, *De emendatione temporum*, vii: “All these things have come to light for the first time from the writings of the Arabs, and to such a degree that this entire treatise is new to our men [meaning European-Christian scholars].” (*Omnia nunc primum ex Arabum scriptis prodeunt: atque adeo omnis tractatio nostri hominibus nova est.*)
introduction to his Grammatica Arabica, Thomas Erpenius lists the uses of Arabic, a language he describes as “extensive, extremely old, and very elegant” (longè & antiquissima & elegantissima), knowledge of which seemed “useful and necessary to the highest degree” (summe utilem & necessarium) to him, because it procured the advantages already mentioned by Postel.  

2.5.3 LATIN-ARABIC ENTANGLEMENT AND THE DEMISE OF ACADEMIC LATIN

These early studies of the Arabic language and its literature were all written in Latin, which, in the early modern period, still represented the most important language of academic endeavours. One tends to forget that, in terms of quantity, the great mass of Latin texts was produced, not in Roman times, but in the medieval and early modern periods, when Latin still fulfilled the function of a lingua franca—occasionally even outside of Europe. The modern period, however, also witnessed the successive replacement of Latin by the European vernaculars in all sectors of textual production. In this context, Latin was also ousted from the field of Oriental and Arabic studies. Although it is not possible to trace a simple linear development, bibliometrical analysis of Orientalist and Arabist works produced in Western Europe between the sixteenth and twentieth centuries shows that the study of Arabic and Arabic texts—the primary field of Latin-Arabic entanglement in early modern Europe—was increasingly executed in the vernaculars.

Between the sixteenth and early eighteenth centuries, renowned European scholars interested in Arabic texts and the Arabic language generally used Latin as their only, or at least their favoured language of scholarly activity. Leonhard Fuchs (1501–1566), Thomas Erpenius (1584–1624), and Johann Elichmann (ca. 1601–1639) published their entire scholarly oeuvre in Latin, whereas Guillaume Postel (1510–1581), Edward Pococke

341 Thomas Erpenius, Grammatica Arabica (Leiden: In Officina Raphelengiana, 1613), i.
344 Leonhardt, Latein, 144–146.
345 See e.g. Leonhart Fuchs, Paradoxorum Medicinae libri tres, in quibus sane multa a nemine hactenus prodata, Arabum aetatisque nostrae medicorum errata non tantum indicantur sed & probatissimorum autorum scriptis [...] confutantur [...]. (Basel: Bebelius, 1535); Thomas Erpenius, Historia Saracenica. Qva res gestae Musulmonorum, inde a Muhammede arabe, Vsque ad initium Imperij Atabacei per XLIX Imperatorum successionem fidelissimè explicantur. [...] Arabicè olim exarata a Georgio Elmacino (Leiden: Ex typographia Erpeniana linguarum orientalium, 1625); Johann Elichmann, Literae Exoticae Scriptae Arabice (Jena: Philipp Lippoldt, 1636); Johann Elichmann, Tabula Cebetis graece, arabice, latine: Item aurea carmina Pythagorae, cum paraphrasi arabica (Leiden: Typis Ioannis Maire, 1640).
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(1604–1691), and Johann Jakob Reiske (1716–1774) chose Latin for their more scholarly works and translations, the respective vernacular either for more popular and didactic writings in the case of Postel, non-Arabist commentaries on Holy Scripture in the case of Pococke, or scholarly correspondence in the case of Reiske. In this early period, the only Orientalist and Arabist of any name who eschewed publishing in Latin was Barthélemy d’Herbelot (1625–1695), whose encyclopaedia Bibliothèque Orientale was directed at a larger public.

Between the eighteenth and twentieth centuries, one notices an increasing tendency to publish in the vernacular. If Latin was used, it either served to demonstrate a scholar’s ability to move within a Latin tradition of academic endeavours—such as early dissertations—or to guarantee a durable international reception of a scientific achievement considered fundamental—e.g. in the case of manuscript catalogues. Although he still seems to have used Latin as a working language, Antoine-Isaac Silvestre de Sacy (1758–1838) wrote important works in French, and only seems to have published in Latin in a German context. The scientific production of his German pupil, Heinrich Orthobius Fleischer (1801–1888), in turn, is still entirely in Latin. This seems to confirm the Latinist observation that German-speaking academia retained Latin slightly longer than other Western European academic circles. From the second half of the nineteenth century onwards, it is possible to note a functional difference between Latin and vernacular publications: in France, Ernest Renan (1823–1892)


348 *Theological Works of the Learned Dr. Pocock*, ed. Leonard Twells.


352 See e.g. Antoine-Isaac Silvestre de Sacy, *Mémoire sur l’origine et les anciens monuments de la littérature parmi les Arabes* (Paris: Imprimerie royale, 1805); Antoine-Isaac Silvestre de Sacy, *Commentatio de notione vocum tenzil et tawil in libris qui ad Druzorum religionem pertinent* (Göttingen: Dieterich, 1805).


published his PhD thesis in Latin in the same year in which his well-known French work *Averroës et l’Averroïsme* became available on the market in French. In Germanophone regions, Moritz Steinschneider (1816–1907) only published manuscript catalogues in Latin, his other scientific production being in German. Later generations exclusively used the vernacular, Ignaz Goldziher (1850–1920) publishing in Hungarian and in German, Carl Heinrich Becker (1876–1933) and Gotthelf Bergsträsser (1886–1933) only in German.

In the nineteenth century, it became increasingly necessary to justify writing in Latin. Published in 1831, Fleischer’s introduction to his critical edition and Latin translation of the pre-Islamic section of the historiographical work *al-Muḫtaṣar fī aḥbār al-bašar* by Abū l-Fidāʾ (d. 732/1331) provides an example. Fleischer explains that he had started out with the aim of producing a French translation after having studied with Antoine-Isaac Silvestre de Sacy in Paris. However, his publisher counselled him to produce a Latin translation to ensure a wider diffusion of the work. Fleischer received a partial Latin translation by Silvestre de Sacy with the latter’s notes, which he took as the basis for his work. Here, he mentions his difficulties in finding the right Latin style to render the not very elegant, but nonetheless sophisticated Arabic style of Abū l-Fidāʾ. He describes his Latin style as impure, full of non-Latin words, and lacking coherence, but emphasizes that it was necessary to use neologisms given the inadequacy of Latin as opposed to Greek or the modern European vernaculars. After claiming that Cicero—had he been in Fleischer’s position—would have also used

360 Fleischer, *Abulfedae historia*, v: “Confecto igitur utrique negotio, quum bibliopola versionem gallicam minus e re sua fore judicaret, de latina facienda cogitandum fuit.”
neologisms, he ends with an explanation of how he Latinized certain Arabic letters and patronyms.

As late as 1890, Theodor Nöldeke (1836–1930) published a critical edition of pre-Islamic Arabic poetry with the help of August Müller (1848–1892). This edition is framed by an introduction, a critical apparatus, and comments in Latin. In the Latin introduction, Nöldeke justifies his use of this language in the following way:

We have been asked to use the Latin language. For since many of those growing up, of whom we hope that they find this book useful in the future, will, without doubt, not be proficient enough in our languages, it seemed necessary, either to produce two or better three editions, or to content ourselves with the Latin language. We have made a great effort, however, to be understood by everyone as well as to please the imitators of Cicero. Some things I have written in the foreign way (barbare): I have generally not declined Arabic names, but have occasionally added the case endings i, o, um to avoid ambiguities as in Zaid, Zaidi (gen.); Abû Bekr, Abû Bekrum (acc.).

Fleischer's and Nöldeke's introductions are among the latest texts that employ Latin in Arabist scholarship. In the course of the nineteenth century, Latin as a language of scientific analysis was given up in European
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362 Fleischer, Abulfedae historia, v–vi: “Quod denique ad versionem latinam ipsam attinet, eam talem facere studui, ut Abulfeda meus, si non eleganter, si non urbane, at certe non incondite, non barbaro loqueretur. Quare, ubi altera lingua longius ab altera discedebat, sententiam reddidi, verba non pressi. Ceterum quod a novis vocabulis, qualia nunc in scholis frequentantur, non plane abstini, haud puto esse quod apud peritos et aequis harum rerum arbitros multis me excusas. Equidem sic statuo, non in eo positum esse orationis romanæ proprietatem et puritatem, ut multis latinis verbis antiquis vix adumbres, quæ uno novo aut graeco perfecte exprimi poterant. Habet sua quæaque disciplina vocabula, quibus latine loquentem et scribentem, ubi usu veniunt, non ut, id vero mihi putidum videtur. Multa Cicero ipse inter suos novavit: plura, si nunc viveret, nobiscum novaret.”

363 Fleischer, Abulfedae historia, vi–vii: “Sed inest, fateor, in latinis meis multa dictioris inconstantia, asperitas et peregrinitas, insunt aperta vitia: quae ne gravius feras aut iniquius exagites, ex Oriente modo in Latium redux ab humanitate tua me imperaturum esse spero. Reperies etiam multa non eodem ubique modo scripta: ut literam ꞓ primum per t redditam, deinde, ut equidem puto, rectius per th; nomina patronymica Arabum interdum in idae terminata, multo sapienter, ut fieri solet, in itae, quamquam in ilis quae vere a nominibus humanis fluxerunt, e lege linguæ graecæ illa ratio sola probanda est.”

364 Delectus veterum carminum arabicorum, ed. Theodor Nöldeke and August Müller (Berlin: Reuther, 1890), xi–xii: “Latina lingua usi sumus invitii. Sed quum sine dubio multi ex adolescentibus, quibus hunc librum utilem fore speramus, nostrae linguae nondum satis periti sint, aut duas vel potius tres editiones fieri aut nos in lingua latina acquiscere oportuit. Magis autem studuimus, ut ab omnibus intelligeremur, quam ut Ciceronis aemulis placentem. Nonnulla prudentes barbarae scripsi; sic nomina arabica plerumque non declinavi, sed, ut obscuritate seminare evitarem, nonnunquam terminaciones i, o, um addidi ut Zaid, Zaidi (gen.); Abû Bekr, Abû Bekrum (acc.).”
societies, with the exception of the Latin-based fields of ancient and medieval history. This development was deplored by no less a person than Arthur Schopenhauer, who wrote in 1851:

The abolition of Latin as the common language of scholars and the petty-bourgeoisie of national literatures that has been introduced instead, has been a real disaster for the sciences in Europe, first and foremost because a common European scholarly public only existed because of the Latin language. [...] Barbarism is coming again, in spite of trains, electric wires, and hot-air-balloons.

For the earliest Arabists working in a universitarian framework in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, there had been no alternative to using Latin in their scholarly output: it was the established language of scholarship that opened up centuries of rich literary culture and investigative efforts. Slowly but surely, Latin was substituted by the increasingly powerful and expressive national vernaculars, earlier in France and England than in Germany, first in popular works, then in individual studies, finally in theses necessary to acquire academic degrees as well as in the most durable and fundamental works of text-based scholarship, i.e. manuscript catalogues and critical editions.

2.6 Retreat into academia (II): Studying Latin in the Arab world

The academic situation in the Arab world of the same period was completely different: Latin was not studied systematically in the Arabic-speaking sphere until the early twentieth century. In spite of the fact that Arabic-speakers had established rule over populations with a Latin literary tradition when they took over regions in the western Mediterranean in the late seventh and early eighth centuries, it took a long time until a clear concept of a Latin language emerged in Arabic writings. Middle Eastern Arabic texts of the ninth to eleventh centuries do not feature an Arabic transcription of the term “Latin” and refer to the primary language of the
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365 The *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, for example, the multi-volume edition of late antique and medieval primary sources regarded as being connected, in one way or another, with the history of the so-called Germanic groups of Late Antiquity and their medieval legacy, produced Latin paratexts until the beginning of the twentieth century.


Roman and post-Roman West as either “Roman” (al-rūmiyya) or “Frankish” (al-ifranǧiyya). The term “Latin” (al-luǧa l-latiniyya) was first transcribed in Andalusian texts produced between the late ninth and the tenth centuries, and then more frequently used in various texts of the eleventh century written by such scholars as Şā’id al-Andalusī (d. 462/1070) and al-Bakrī (d. 487/1094). Among the Andalusian scholars of this period who mention the Latin language—e.g. explaining that it was the language of the Romans, distinguishing it from Greek, referring to the pronunciation of Andalusian toponyms as provided by experts on the Latin language, etc.—Ibn Ḥazm of Cordoba (d. 456/1064) left the most detailed and sophisticated comments. In a treatise on logic, he compares Latin and Arabic with regard to their respective ability of giving expression to certain Aristotelian categories.\(^368\)

In al-Andalus in the following four centuries, slowly succumbing to the pressures of the so-called Reconquista, this basic knowledge of Latin was not cultivated.\(^369\) Some of it was diffused to North Africa and the Middle East from the twelfth century onwards, thus leaving traces in the Arabic works of such scholars as Ibn Abī Uṣaybiʿa (d. 668/1270), Ibn Ḥalikān (d. 681/1281), Ibn Ḥaldūn (d. 808/1406), al-Qalqašandī (d. 821/1418), al-Maqrīzī (d. 845/1442), and even the Ottoman polyhistor Haǧǧī Ḥalīfa or Kātip Çelebī (d. 1068/1657).\(^370\) However, such traces do not amount to a systematic study of Latin, let alone an establishment of Latin studies that could in any way be compared to the emergence of Arabic studies in European universities of the same period.\(^371\) Apart from a few intellectuals at the Ottoman court involved in translating European scientific writings in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries,\(^372\) the only group of people within the Islamic(ate) sphere that intensively engaged with Latin texts between the fifteenth and nineteenth centuries were Oriental Christians such as the Maronites. Maintaining intensive relations with the Roman-Catholic church, they translated large numbers of explicitly Christian writings—including conciliar decrees, devotional texts, and theological tracts—from Latin into Arabic.\(^373\)

---

\(^{368}\) König, “Unkempt Heritage,” 428–436.

\(^{369}\) In reaction to the ideological claims of the so-called Reconquista, Arabic-Islamic scholars from the Muslim West seem to have lost interest in the Iberian Peninsula’s pre-Islamic heritage. See König, Arabic-Islamic Views, 182–185.


\(^{371}\) Fück, Die arabischen Studien, 25–129.

\(^{372}\) Pinar Emiralioğlu, Geographical Knowledge and Imperial Culture in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014), 149–151.

2.6.1 LATIN AS AN ELEMENT OF ARAB ENGAGEMENT WITH EUROPEAN MODERNITY

In the course of the seventeenth to the nineteenth century, the occasional traveller to Europe observed the use of Latin in the educational establishments in Spain, the Kingdom of Naples, and France. The writings of Muhammad b. ʿAbd al-Wahhāb al-Ǧassānī (d. 1119/1707), Muḥammad b. ʿUṭmān al-Miknasī (d. 1213/1799) and, of course, Rifāʿat al-Taḥtāwī (d. 1290/1873) provide evidence for an increasing interest in the role and function of the Latin language in European systems of education. However, the systematic study of Latin in the Arab world only began in the twentieth century.

In the French-dominated Maghreb, an intensive engagement with French intellectual culture—including French scholarship on Roman history—had already taken place before the actual colonial takeover in the course of the nineteenth century. An example is provided by the Ottoman-Tunisian reformer Ḥayr al-Dīn al-Tūnisī (d. 1307/1890) who, in his political treatise on the “modernized” countries of the world published in 1867, quoted French historical literature by the pageful. In the treatise, he also commented on the Roman institution of the dictatorship. The French colonial powers then seem to have introduced Latin as part of a multifaceted colonial education system. One wonders how the Algerian reformer Ahmad al-Ṭīfānī, alias Abū l-ʿAbbās Ahmād b. al-Ḥāšimī, was inspired by knowledge about the Latin language—diffused as part of French-Maghrebian relations within a colonial framework—when he justified the use of the Arabic popular dialect for the purpose of religious teaching in 1936. In an article entitled “After the Alienation of the Arabic Language, We Have Begun Fearing for the Dialect” the author compares the difference between Latin and the Romance languages with that of standard Arabic and the local Arabic dialects, thus displaying some superficial knowledge about the history of Latin and the evolution of Romance languages.

Whereas manifestations of Latin-Arabic entanglement in the Maghreb seem to have been closely associated with the French colonial project, the search for “autochthonous” efforts to promote the study of Latin leads to Egypt of the 1920s. Egypt boasts the first secular university of the Arab world. Founded in 1908, it was known as “The Egyptian University” (al-ǧāmiʿa l-miṣriyya) between 1908 and 1940, then as “King Fuʿād I University” (ǧāmiʿat al-malik Fuʿād) between 1940 and 1952, and finally as König, “Unkempt Heritage,” 455–460.

“Cairo University” (ǧāmiʿat al-Qāhira) after the July revolution of 1952. As opposed to the traditional al-Azhar University, the early Egyptian University recruited a large part of its teaching staff from European countries. The latter exerted strong influence until the end of the 1920s, when Egyptian graduates returning from various European countries with doctorates were increasingly employed. Latin was introduced into Egyptian academic curricula in this atmosphere of establishing a new, European-influenced education system and the resulting discussions on the correct education policy. This process is described in great detail in Ţāhā Ḥusayn’s treatise The Future of Culture in Egypt (Mustaqbal al-ṯaqāfa fi Miṣr). Published in 1938, this book contains a review of Egypt’s cultural history as well as an entire programme of educational reform.

On the one hand, Ţāhā Ḥusayn wishes to put Egypt on par with the colonial powers in terms of cultural history and historical importance. Emphasizing that the past is the key to the future, he describes Egypt as a millennia-old society that maintained intensive relations with ancient Greek civilization, thus receiving as well as providing important cultural stimuli. With regard to the late antique and medieval periods, he emphasizes that Christian and Islamic thought displayed an equal affinity to philosophy. Consequently, Ţāhā Husayn argues, European and Islamic thought were not only on par, but the latter’s concept of education had even been adopted by the Europeans thanks to the Arabic-Latin translation movement of the medieval and early modern periods.

On the other hand, Ţāhā Ḥusayn urges Egypt to implement reforms deemed necessary to make up for strongly felt discrepancies between the education systems of Europe and Egypt. Explaining why Egypt suffered from underdevelopment in this sector, he underscores that—given Islam’s long tradition of learning from other civilizations—adopting European specificities would neither endanger the Islamic nor the national identity of Egypt. He points to the necessity of fully understanding the factors that made modern European civilization possible. Since culture and science were the basis for civilization and independence, significant

377 On its foundation and history see Raʿūf ʿAbbās, Taʿrīh ǧāmiʿat al-Qāhira (Cairo: al-Hayʾa l-miṣriyya l-ʾāmma, 1995); Donald Malcolm Reid, Cairo University and the Making of Modern Egypt (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).
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387 Husayn, Mustaqbal al-ṯaqāfa, 13–16.
advances could only be made by giving attention to primary education, which Tāhā Husayn defines as “one of the fundamental pillars of democracy” (rukn asāsī min arkān al-dīmūqrāṭiyya). However, education continues on a secondary level, the details of which he discusses in several chapters, including the rights of teachers, the role of exams, the appropriate school books, etc. Turning to higher education, Tāhā Husayn elaborates on the role of the university in educating specialized school teachers, and discusses the deficiencies of the existing system of higher education, including the religious schooling received at al-Azhar University and among the Copts of Egypt. Tāhā Husayn underscores that the responsibility for promoting cultural productivity is not confined to educational institutions and elaborates on the role of intellectuals, the theatre, and the media (radio, cinema, journalism) in this regard. Promoting education, he concludes, should not only be a national agenda, thus addressing Egypt’s responsibility towards other Arab countries.

In the parts of this treatise dealing with secondary and higher education, Tāhā Husayn also addresses the need to study foreign languages. He dedicates one large and a smaller subchapter to the study of Greek and Latin and their potential role for the Egyptian education system and the culture of Egypt.

The subchapter on Greek and Latin begins with a short historical sketch of the failed introduction of both languages to secondary and academic curricula. Tāhā Husayn explains that the Egyptian minister for education from 1924 to 1926, ʿAlī Māhir Bāšā, initially pursued the idea of introducing Greek and Latin to secondary schools so as to prepare future students for university. However, ʿAlī Māhir Bāšā committed a cardinal mistake by employing Belgian and French instead of English teachers. His decision was taken in consideration of anti-colonial sentiments against the British, but had the negative effect that, because of their linguistic deficiencies in French, students were not able to follow Greek and Latin classes taught by Francophone teachers. Consequently, this project was abolished, the employed teachers either sent to the faculties of law and letters to continue their teaching of Greek and Latin there, or re-employed as French teachers in various secondary schools.

In the faculties of law and letters, Greek and Latin were only studied for a limited period. In the faculty of law, the influential French professor Léon Duguit opposed the study of Latin and ensured that students of law were soon dispensed from learning Latin. In the faculty of letters, Greek and Latin were taught for another few years. Then, however, the teaching

388 Husayn, Mustaqbal al-ṯaqāfa, 71, also see 71–90.
390 Husayn, Mustaqbal al-ṯaqāfa, 243–244.
391 Husayn, Mustaqbal al-ṯaqāfa, 237–244.
392 Husayn, Mustaqbal al-ṯaqāfa, 263–284.
394 Husayn, Mustaqbal al-ṯaqāfa, 207–212.
of both languages was shifted to the faculty of languages, but successfully returned to the faculty of letters in 1934. Thus, after a promising start, the teaching of Greek and Latin was abolished in secondary education and in the faculty of law. Because neither the ministry of education nor Egyptian intellectuals grasped their importance, Greek and Latin were only taught at the faculty of letters at the time of writing, i.e. in 1938.\footnote{Husayn, Mustaqbal al-ṯaqāfa, 171–173.}

Against this backdrop, Ṭāḥā Ḥusayn sets out to explain this failure to introduce the study of Greek and Latin to institutions outside the faculty of letters. In a first step, he ties the problem of establishing Greek and Latin in secondary education to the political fate of ʿAlī Māḥir Bāšā, unfortunately without explaining the exact reasons for his downfall. With regard to the faculty of law, still dominated by Europeans, he points to the political disposition of Léon Duguit. A radical French democrat, Duguit belonged to a faction of French society that wished to promote the study of living languages at the expense of dead languages in the interest of opening up education to all social classes.\footnote{On Léon Duguit see Marc Malherbe, La faculté de droit de Bordeaux (1870–1970) (Bordeaux: Presses universitaires de Bordeaux, 1996), 229–230.}

In Ṭāḥā Ḥusayn’s opinion, Duguit failed to understand that the situation in Egypt differed completely from that in France. Personal animosities with Henri Grégoire, dean of the faculty of letters and fervent advocate of Greek and Latin studies, further impelled him to assert his authority. In addition, Duguit’s stand on linguistic education found favour among the latter’s Egyptian colleagues in the faculty of law. According to Ṭāḥā Ḥusayn, they were in fear of soon being confronted with a new and better educated generation of students that would be able to read Roman law in the original language. He explains that many Egyptians who had received a European academic education obstructed the study of the classical languages in Egypt because they had been negatively influenced by inner-European debates about the status of the so-called dead languages.\footnote{On the inner-European debate about dead and living languages, Ṭāḥā Ḥusayn cites Gustave Le Bon, Psychologie de l’éducation. L’éducation est l’art de faire passer le conscient dans l’inconscient (Paris: Ernest Flammarion Editeur, 1910), 13th ed. [originally published 1902], book III, chap. II, § 2 (“Les résultats de l’enseignement du latin et des langues vivantes”).}

For Ṭāḥā Ḥusayn, however, the study of Greek and Latin stood at the core of every modern education system. No system of higher education deserving that name dispensed with the study of Greek and Latin. Egypt would be put to shame abroad if it taught Roman law at its faculties without an academic staff capable of dealing with Latin texts. Scientific

\footnote{Ḥusayn, Mustaqbal al-ṯaqāfa, 172–175.}
specialization, he claims, can only be achieved by studying Greek and Latin, both of which furnished the terminology of the natural sciences, technical education, and the study of living languages. He emphasizes accordingly:

I am utterly convinced, nonetheless, that Egypt will not succeed in establishing a true system of higher education and will not be able to bring about important concomitant cultural phenomena if it does not tend to these two languages.  

2.6.2 NATIONALIST AND PAN-ARAB DIMENSIONS OF ENGAGING WITH LATIN

Ṭāhā Ḥusayn's argument also has a nationalist and anti-colonial note. He regarded the study of Greek and Latin not only as the basis of every true scientific education, but also as the basis of Egypt's independence. If Egypt failed to master these languages, it would not even be able to study, interpret, and understand its own history and archaeological heritage:

Those who oppose the teaching of Greek and Latin among us should observe, think, and take stock of themselves; for their opposition entails sentencing the Egyptians to ignore their history, which they cannot get to know except by drawing on foreigners.

Seeking the advancement of Egypt, Ṭāhā Ḥusayn thus proposes to create a department for Greek and Latin studies offering academic degrees at all levels, and again emphasizes the necessity of restructuring secondary education with the aim of allowing at least a certain percentage of potential university students to prepare for the study of these languages.

The question we have to confront and which we have to answer with honesty, openness, clarity, and simplicity, is the following: do we want to create a climate for respectable academic research in Egypt that resembles its models in every one of the highly or moderately developed European countries or not? If we decide for the second option, then the affair is already doomed to failure, then Egypt needs neither Greek nor Latin, nor a university nor faculties. […] But if we decide for the first option, […] then there is no alternative

---

399 Ḥusayn, Mustaqbal al-ṯaqāfa, 173: “wa-ana ma’a ḏālik mu’min ašadd al-ʾīmān wa-a’maqahu wa-agwāhu bi-anna Miṣr lan tazfar bi-l-taʾālim al-ḡāmi’ī l-ṣaḥīḥ wa-lan yafliḥ fī tadbīr ba’d marāfīqihī l-ṯaqafiyya l-hāmma illā iḏā ʿaniyat bi-hā-tayn al-luqīṭayn […]”

400 Ḥusayn, Mustaqbal al-ṯaqāfa, 181: “fa-llaḏīna yumāniʿūn fī taʿlīm al-yūnāniyya wa-l-lātīniyya ʿindanā yaraw wa-yuṭfakkirū wa-yurāqīlī anfusahum; li-anna ma’nā hāḍīlī l-muqāḏama innāmā huwa l-qaḍāʾ ālā l-Miṣrīyīn, bi-an yaḥhalū tariǧāhun wa-allā yaʿrifūhu illā min ṭarīq al-aḏānīb.”

to nurturing these two languages, not only in the university, but also in the public schools.\textsuperscript{402}

Ṭāhā Ḥusayn was not the only Arab author who endowed the study of Greek and Latin with a political dimension. This has to do with the fact that the period between the 1920s and the 1960s also witnessed intensive discussions about the present state and the future of the Arabic language. In the course and in the wake of colonial rule, this issue had become highly politicized. A contemporary observer to these debates, Anwar Chejne (1923–1983) has shown that discussions revolved around three main topics.\textsuperscript{403}

The first topic concerned the problem of absorbing the large number of foreign loanwords that flooded into the Arabic language due to the dominance of Western influences in many branches of human activity. This was solved partially by creating several commissions for the Arabic language in various cities of the Arab world, which then provided the forum for further discussions on the reform of the Arabic language.\textsuperscript{404} The second topic concerned problems linked to the Arabic script, which was not easy to print, deficient in its lack of a permanent vowel system, and thus difficult to read. Some reformers proposed to follow the lead of the Turkish republic that had opted for the Latinization of the Turkish alphabet in 1928–1929. Others, however, were strictly opposed to changing the alphabet, pointing to the fact that this would cut the new generations off from a 1400-year-old literary heritage including the sacred text of Islam. Both of these topics were intrinsically linked to the third topic, the extremely large gap between classical and written standard Arabic on the one hand, and colloquial Arabic on the other hand. In the quest to create a modern system of education in societies suffering from rampant analphabetism, reforming the Arabic language was an issue of utmost political relevance: reform policies would affect the relationship to current or former colonial powers and the system of national education, as well as relations to other Arabic-speaking societies.

In the debates about the reform of the Arabic language, Latin played a modest, but distinctive role. In a conference of the Academy of the Arabic language in Cairo held at the beginning of the 1950s, the intellectual Muḥammad Ridā l-Šabībī (1889–1965) polemicized against people who drew a parallel between Latin and Arabic and accused them of using this


\textsuperscript{403} Chejne, Arabic Language, 145–168.

comparison to classify Arabic as a language destined to disappear some
day. This idea was taken up by Mahmūd Taymūr (1894–1973), a renowned
Egyptian author, poet, and playwright. Taymūr came from a rather wealthy
Egyptian background and was well acquainted with European affairs: his
brother Muhammad had sojourned in France, whereas Mahmūd Taymūr
himself spent two years in Europe, mainly Switzerland, between 1925
and 1927, before he became involved in Egypt’s literary scene. In 1947,
he received an award from the Arabic Academy of Language, was then
appointed a member of this academy in 1949, and was officially welcomed
by no other than Tāhā Husayn in 1950. Maḥmūd Taymūr published
a treatise on the problems of the Arabic language in 1957. A moderate
reformer, he opted for a regulated introduction of neologisms, a simplifi-
cation of grammar, and the introduction of permanent vowels in the Arabic
script, but refused radical proposals of giving up either the entire Arabic
alphabet or even written standard Arabic in favour of graphically Latinized
written dialects. Refuting and developing al-Šabībī’s idea, Maḥmūd Tay
mūr explains in his treatise why it is admissible to draw certain parallels
between Latin and Arabic:

We can excuse people who claim that there is a parallelism between
Arabic and Latin, for Latin has once been an indigenous language
that was written and spoken. Then it branched out into various dia-
lects after the Roman conquests. These developed into indepen-
dent, developed, and living languages. Thus, Latin was relegated
to the sphere of writing. When its derivate such as French, Italian,
and Spanish won the upper hand, the horizon of its usage was con-
stricted, it languished, dried up, and lost its liveliness. It ended up
isolated between the dusty pages of old books.

Arabic, Taymūr asserts, will be spared the fate of Latin, however, because
it is superior to Latin in one important feature. Being the language of a
revealed sacred book endowed with linguistic inviolability, generations of
Arabic-speakers had and would continue to contribute to its conservation.
Not possessing this quality, Latin failed to receive the same care:

405 Muḥammad Riḍā l-Šabībī, “Bayna l-fuṣṭā ḫā wa-lahḡātīhā,” Maǧallat al-risālā 952
(February 4, 1952), 127–130; Courreye, “Une Défense,” 517.
406 Jan Brugman, An Introduction to the History of Modern Arabic Literature in Egypt
(Leiden: Brill, 1984), 254–263.
407 Chejne, Arabic Language, 165.
408 Maḥmūd Taymūr, Muškilāt al-luḡa l-ʿarabiyya (Cairo: Maktabat al-ādāb, 1957),
5–6: “fa-li-l-nās ūghrumū fīmā yaqūlūn min al-muwāzana bayna l-ʿarabiyya
wa-l-lātīniyya, li-anna l-lātīniyya kānāt luḡa ʿašliyya li-l-mukātaba wa-l-kalām,
ṭumma tafarraqat baʿda l-futūḥāt al-rūmāniyya lahǧāt ʿāmmiyā šārat fīmā
baʿda luḡāt mustaqqilla muṭatawwarahay hayya, wa-baʿqiyyat al-lātīniyya luḡat kitāba,
iḏ taqālalabat ʿalayhā muṣṭaqāṭuḥā kā-l-faranśiyya wa-li-tṭālīyya wa-li-ibšāniyya,
fa-dāqa muḥīṭ istīlmālīhā, wa-zallat tatadāʾīl wa-taqāmmad wa-taqfād ḥayya-
wiyyatīhā, wa-intāhā biḥā l-amr ilā l-ʿ uzla bayna l-ṣaḥārīf al-māṭwiyya min al-kutub
al-qadīma.”
If we reflect upon this issue, it will become clear to us that Arabic differs from Latin in one essential trait, which leaves it in a place where it is safe from what happened to that language. And this is that Arabic is the language of a revealed [i.e. “heavenly” (samāwī)] religion of great significance [. . .]. This is truly the most important reason that protected Arabic from vanishing in the past and in the present, and it is the reason which has endowed it with the factors of remaining existent in the future. Latin, in turn, was not granted the characteristic of being a language of a revealed sacred book endowed with linguistic inviolability which would have contributed to its conservation and care. Consequently, it fell prey to the law of nature.  

This exchange of arguments on the possibility and legitimacy of drawing parallels between Arabic and Latin in the 1950s suggests that the introduction of Latin to Egyptian university curricula from the 1920s onwards had contributed to diffusing some knowledge about the history of Latin in Egyptian intellectual circles. Thanks to the intricate relationship between linguistic issues concerning the Arabic language, and political debates touching upon the topics of colonialism, nationalism, and national education, this knowledge became part of politicized linguistic debates. These debates took place in a country that, by the 1950s, had become the most important centre for the propagation of Pan-Arabism. And it was Tāhā Husayn himself who highlighted the anti-colonial and pan-Arab lessons to be learned from the history of Latin. In a speech directed at the audience of a conference organized by the Arabic academy of Damascus in 1957, Tāhā Husayn harshly criticized reformers who argued for the textualization of regional Arabic dialects.

They attempt to expose Arabic to what has happened to Latin in the past, and want to divide the Arab world into different linguistic shades so that if the Syrian wrote, his writing would have to be translated to the Iraqi, the Egyptian, the North African, and so forth.  

---


In the huge discussions about the necessity of reforming the Arabic language that took place in the decades following the establishment of Latin studies, superficial knowledge about the history of the Latin language and its relationship to the Romance vernaculars acquired the force of an argument. In these discussions, the historical fate of Latin was repeatedly juxtaposed to the potential fate of Arabic, should the latter succumb to the aims of those wishing to substitute a common pan-Arab linguistic high register (al-fushā) with regional or national dialects (al-ʿāmmiyā) not only in the oral, but also in the written sphere. In this context, the historical fate of the Latin language stood for the fragmentation and division of a supraregional linguistic unity. It could thus be used as an argument and a warning to preserve the unity of the Arab world against internal and external, i.e. colonial, forces of division. In addition, the fate of Latin served to highlight Arabic’s status as the language of divine revelation, regarded in this context as a safeguard against linguistic fragmentation. Arab unity and the Arabic literary heritage, including the Islamic heritage, cannot be preserved if standard Arabic is given up in favour of the regional dialects. This is the lesson Maḥmūd Taymūr, Ṭāhā Ḥusayn, and others seem to have learned from the history of Latin, and which they propagated among all those interested in the fate of the Arabic language. Thus, although Latin played a peripheral role in the aforementioned discussions, this role sheds light on important issues of cultural identity that have been and, in some ways, still are at stake in Arabic-speaking societies.

2.7 “European” vs. “Islamic” heritage? Between transculturation and cultural segregation

In spite of his diatribes against an establishment deaf to his arguments, Ṭāhā Ḥusayn and other agents promoting the study of Greek and Latin in Egypt were ultimately successful. Egypt today hosts probably the most lively departments for Greek and Latin studies in the Arab world. In and beyond Cairo University, Egypt produces a respectable number of specialists of the Latin language, albeit with a focus on classical rather than on medieval and early modern Latin texts. 411

The biography and works of an Egyptian scholar of Greek and Latin, Ahmad ʿItmān, may serve to illustrate the status and role of Latin in at least one contemporary Arabic-speaking society. When Ahmad ʿItmān died in a car accident in Cairo on August 15, 2013, two obituaries acknowledged him as one of the most renowned classicists in the Arab world. According to Adīb Ṣaʿb, the author of his obituary in the Arabic newspaper al-Nahār, he had produced “pioneering works in classical Greek and Latin studies.

as well as in comparative literature.”\textsuperscript{412} In the \textit{Classical Receptions Journal}, Lorna Hardwick praised him as “an international authority on the history of classical scholarship in Egypt and on the role of the transmission of Greek texts through Latin and Arabic translations,” who engaged in “cross-cultural exchange through discussion of the histories of classical scholarship and translation,” also contributing to this through “his courteously ironic and even-handed dismissal of simplistic polarities between ‘Orientalism’ and ‘Occidentalism.’”\textsuperscript{413}

Born in 1945 in a village in the Egyptian governorate of Banī Suwayf, Aḥmad ʿItmān received his bachelor’s degree in classical studies at Cairo University in 1965, then his PhD in Greek and Latin literature at the University of Athens in 1973. He was active as a researcher, but also as a theatre critic and playwright, as a translator, and as member and founder of various academic societies in Egypt. He wrote several studies on the Greek and Latin literature of the classical age, and translated Homer, Sophocles, Euripides, and Virgil into Arabic. He served several official functions, e.g. heading the department of classical studies at Cairo University and the Egyptian association for comparative literature for several years, as well as founding the Egyptian association for Greek and Roman studies. His obituary in \textit{al-Nahār} concludes:

He made a good choice opting for classical studies as the topic of his academic specialization and academic work, given that Egypt is a rich source of Greek civilization. On its soil, Neoplatonic philosophy as propagated by Plotinus and his peers came into being. At the same time, it gave life to a large number of Oriental-Christian church fathers and monks. And although the greater Syrian region was also involved in Greek culture, not only from a theological, but also from a literary and philosophical point of view, this part of the Arab world has unfortunately failed to produce academic organizations dedicated to the care of Greek and Latin literature in Syria following the model of Aḥmad ʿItmān who, without contestation, has to be regarded as the pioneer and master of classical studies in the Arab sphere.\textsuperscript{414}


The focus of both obituaries is on Ahmad 'Itmān's Greek specialization as well as on the reception of "the Classics" in the Arab world in general, a topic which has already received some scholarly attention in recent years.415 However, Aḥmad 'Itmān also explored the field of Latin studies: it would have been interesting to see what the author of Latin Literature and its Civilizational Role (Al-Adab al-latīnī wa-dawruhu l-ḥaḍārī)416 would have said on the entangled history of Latin and Arabic.

In the course of this chapter, we have seen that the earliest encounters of Latin and forms of Old Arabic took place in the Middle East of Antiquity, but are difficult to reconstruct in detail. The Arabic-Islamic expansion into the western Mediterranean of the seventh and eighth centuries has to be held responsible for the creation of a linguistic contact zone between societies employing Latin and/or Arabic. Linguistic interaction and interpenetration in various milieus created different forms of entanglement and even hybridization. The number and variety of Latin-Arabic milieus was enlarged and modified when European-Christian societies began expanding into Mediterranean territories hitherto under Muslim rule from the late eleventh century onwards. However, due to the increasing substitution of Latin by the vernaculars in these societies, the latter's expansion mainly contributed to a linguistic Romanization, rather than a linguistic Latinization of the Mediterranean. Latin-Arabic milieus of interpreters and translators continued to form part of trans-Mediterranean political and economic relations until about the fifteenth century, and sprouted during the so-called Arabic-Latin translation movement of the twelfth to the sixteenth century that made many Graeco-Arabic works of science and philosophy available to European-Christian intellectuals. Increasingly, however, the Latin-Arabic dyad was replaced by various combinations of Romance languages and Arabic, and successively receded into the scholarly sphere. In Christian Europe, the emerging universities provided an institutional setting that permitted parallel engagement with Latin and Arabic in various branches of learning until around the nineteenth century, when Latin was replaced by vernacular languages even in conservative branches of academia. In the Arab world, in turn, knowledge of Latin remained rudimentary until secular institutions of higher education modelled on their European equivalents were introduced to the Arab world of the late colonial period. In this context, the study of Latin received a place in the specialized niches of


academic endeavours related to the study of the ancient and medieval history of the Mediterranean. During a short period, approximately between the 1930s and the 1960s, the history of Latin played a minor role as part of anti-colonial, nationalist, and pan-Arabic discourses. In the great discussions about the future role of the Arabic language for Arab societies, the history of Latin was branded as the example not to be followed. Today, Latin-Arabic milieus are confined to academic spheres both in Europe and the Arab world. The entangled history of Latin and Arabic seems to have lost any political, economic, or social significance. But is this entirely true?

Recent debates show that the history of Latin-Arab entanglement actually does play a role in discussions that try to define the role of Islam as part of the European cultural heritage. Throughout the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, scholars have debated the impact of Islam on European culture, in each case discussing the effects of the Arabic-Latin translation movement. They have continued an often rather polemic debate already led in the sixteenth century between Arabists and humanists, in which the former emphasized, and the latter denied the relevance of Arabic-Latin translations for European intellectual history. This debate was reinvigorated considerably when, reacting against a new educational policy formulated by the European Union that demanded a presence of Islam in European history books, the French medievalist Sylvain Gouguenheim negated the impact of Arabic-Latin translations on the development of European intellectual history in his book Aristote au Mont Saint-Michel, published in 2008. Gouguenheim’s contribution provoked a debate led in academic publications and the American, European, and Arab press, as well as in various blogs. Among the counter-reactions, some of them equally ideological, the world-touring exhibition 1001 Inventions defines its task as raising “awareness of the missing 1000 years of the Muslim contributions to our shared scientific and technological heritage.” By highlighting Arabic or Islamic contributions to the history of science, this exhibition reiterates positions formulated in Europe by Arabists since Guillaume Postel, and in the Arab world by educational reformers and policy-makers since the nineteenth century. Reformers of the nineteenth century—such as Rifāʿat al-Ṭahṭāwī, Ḥayr al-Dīn al-Tūnisī, rather secularist Arab intellectuals of

the twentieth and twenty-first centuries such as Ṭāhā Ḥusayn and Adonis,⁴²⁰ and fundamentalist thinkers such as Sayyid Quṭb or Maḥmūd ʿAkkām⁴²²—have all highlighted and often over-emphasized Europe’s “debt” to the Arab or the Islamic world, depending on the respective author’s ideological background.

It is characteristic of these discourses, both in Europe and in the Arab world, that they juxtapose, sometimes even oppose two civilizational entities. This is a typical feature also of scholarly literature on the Latin language. In Europe, Latin philologists have regarded Latin as “a ferment of European culture”⁴²³ and—with the exception of a few specialists interested in loanwords and translations⁴²⁴—have either dealt with Latin and Arabic from a comparative perspective,⁴²⁵ or tended to ignore the Arabic language: there exists a philological monograph on the “Graeco-Latin Middle Ages,”⁴²⁶ but none on the Latin-Arabic Middle Ages. A tendency to disregard Latin-Arabic entanglement as an essential part of Euromediterranean history also exists in the Arab world. In Latin Literature and its Civilizational Role, for example, Ahmad ‘İtmân, the Egyptian Classicist mentioned at the beginning of this section, calls for an engagement with Latin by describing it as useful to access the history of a different civilization.

The necessity of following up [on the post-classical history of Latin] until these later periods derives from the fact that Arabic-Islamic civilization came into much closer contact with the Latin language of the later centuries than with classical Latin [...] and we hope that we have succeeded in [...] creating, among the interested reader, an atmosphere of yearning and suspense with regard to

---


⁴²⁴ For the field of loanwords, see the publications of Latham cited in this chapter, for the field of Arabic-Latin translations see the individual publications of Bernet and Hasse.

⁴²⁵ Leonhardt, Latein. See index for comparisons with Arabic.

the link between our Oriental, Arabic-Islamic civilization, and the civilization of Europe from its ancient origins to its contemporary tendencies.

Although acknowledging links, ʿItmān juxtaposes two civilizational entities called “Oriental” or “Arabic-Islamic” on the one side, and “European” on the other side, and thus reinforces rather than breaks up cultural dichotomies. Although he is well aware that Rome ruled almost the entire area that is considered Arabic-speaking today, Aḥmad ʿItmān, “the pioneer and master of classical studies in the Arab sphere,” did not appropriate Latin for the Arabic-Islamic sphere, but clearly marked Latin as the manifestation of a civilizational Other.

One wonders why this prolific intellectual, who—as a scholar, a translator, a playwright, and a commentator on contemporary issues of cultural policy—contributed so much to the diffusion of knowledge about classical cultures in the Arab world, could make such a clear distinction between civilizations. In a series of quasi-Socratic dialogues entitled Our Way to Freedom (Ṭarīqunā ilā l-ḥurriyya), which ʿItmān conducted with the Egyptian philosopher Zakī Naǧīb Maḥmūd on a large range of political and cultural topics, the much-respected philosopher clearly positions the Arabic-Islamic sphere at the crossroads between a Western civilization marked by rational Greek thought and a Far Eastern civilization marked by a specific kind of spirituality. Did Zakī Naǧīb Maḥmūd, a scholar clearly sympathetic to ancient Greek philosophy and a strong proponent of rationalist education, thus reiterate culturalist clichés known, among others, from Orientalist discourse? Or did he try to urge his readers to accept that “Arabic-Islamic civilization” cannot be separated from Greek thought? Did Ahmad ʿItmān only reproduce or did he endorse the positions of Zakī Naǧīb Maḥmūd? Did he believe that the Greek heritage was closer to Arabic-Islamic civilization than the Latin heritage? Did he understand Latin-Christian and Arabic-Islamic civilization as two, ultimately equal continuators of ancient Greek civilization? Ahmad ʿItmān’s Graeco- and Latinophile scholarly and literary engagement remains ambiguous. It supports the same dichotomous civilizational categories defended by Sylvain Gouguenheim. Its objective, however, is not to construct a conception of European history that is “free” of any Arabic or Islamic influence, but to encourage Arab intellectual engagement with European culture and to re-define the Arab world as a cultural

428 Ṣāʿ, “al-Duktūr.”
transit zone between East and West that encompasses the best of both worlds.

The questions raised in the preceding paragraphs show that the history of Latin-Arabic entanglement forms part of the wider debate on Orientalism and Occidentalism. The short sketch of this history given in this chapter has shown that forms of Latin and Arabic have interacted and interpenetrated in a period exceeding two millennia. Again and again, processes of transculturation created new Latin-Arabic milieus, leaving us with masses of documentary evidence that defy any effort at clearly separating “Orient” and “Occident.” At the same time, the history of Latin-Arabic entanglement has been characterized repeatedly by processes of cultural segregation: Latin-Arabic milieus withered away or were even consciously destroyed, although the ultimate demise of this linguistic dyad was chiefly caused by the rise of the Romance vernaculars and their replacement of Latin in most direct relations with the Arabic-speaking sphere. Finally, in spite of all historically documented milieus of Latin-Arabic entanglement, some of them promoted actively, Latin and Arabic have repeatedly been understood as markers of two distinct cultural spheres and heritages.

In conclusion, the two-pronged macro-historical approach to the history of Latin-Arabic entanglement chosen in this chapter defies simplistic interpretations that reduce this history either to a macro-history of transculturation or to a macro-history of cultural segregation. Oscillating between these two poles, the historical, geographical, and cultural scope of Latin-Arabic entanglement regularly questions the categories of geography, culture, ethnicity, and religion, which are often used to draw clear boundaries between “Islam” and “the West.” It can inspire us to transcend culturalist categorizations, not by negating their existence and historical impact, but by depriving them of their status as indisputable paradigms of historical interpretation.