

the same author based on their structural resemblances; these pericopes are all *asbāb al-nuzūl* on a similar topic, thus it might be a topos. For skeptics, it may seem that he too often relies on textual similarities to justify claims about transmitters in the *isnād* and then uses those very transmitters to make claims about the textual similarities. I share that kind of skepticism, but I chose the word “quibble” above intentionally. Motzki is well aware of the skeptical approach; he often asks the skeptic’s likely questions (and then answers them). Much of what he presents may seem at times more circumstantial than definitive evidence, but Motzki does present a preponderance of evidence that makes for a compelling and convincing argument: Muḥammad b. Abī Muḥammad was a source for some of Ibn Ishāq’s *asbāb al-nuzūl* material.

And there is no shortage of skepticism from Motzki himself. A comparison of variants by Muḥammad b. Sāʿib al-Kalbī (another source for Ibn Ishāq) and Muḥammad b. Abī Muḥammad shows that each had different sources and were not dependent. Each may have had an older, aural or oral source in common. More importantly, differences suggest that Muḥammad b. Abī Muḥammad is not a *fictive isnād label*, but a real source. But Motzki is not willing to go much beyond that claim and the one to having shrunk the gap between events and its earliest discernible narrative to a century. There is no “methodological certainty” about the chains that claim Ibn Jubayr or ʿIkrima as Muḥammad b. Abī Muḥammad’s source(s)—though Motzki is also not willing to exclude the possibility. He even provides some indications that they might have been, but ultimately admits that the claim that the two were his sources is merely an “educated guess.” And, indeed, whether Ibn ʿAbbās was really their source “cannot be answered.”

To conclude, Motzki asks, can Muḥammad b. Abī Muḥammad be used as a source for history? He points out that sources chronologically and spatially closest to events about which they report deserve preference over later sources. Thus, he comes close to assuming that chronological proximity implies (greater) historical accuracy, which others who have used *isnād-cum-matn* analysis often claim. But Motzki seems to accept that at least in this case it is not possible to “penetrate the political and kerygmatic glorification.” After all, Muḥammad b. Abī Muḥammad is interested only in *asbāb al-nuzūl* material—finding plausible reasons for quranic passages, particularly in identifying Muḥammad’s opponents. Their portrayal gives “the impression of having been protocoled. It is hardly probable that such detailed knowledge [. . .] would still be discernible a half century later” (pp. 124–25). Those opponents would have been long dead or become affiliated with Islam. Moreover, the link to Ibn ʿAbbās inspires little confidence since he was not born at the time and that part of the *isnād* is employed “stereotypically.” All we can know for certain is that Ibn Ishāq did not invent this material and that it existed much earlier than has been suggested. In addition, we learn something of the Quran in this early period, for it was the basis for the accounts of Muḥammad b. Abī Muḥammad. As for using him as a source for history, Motzki urges “utmost caution.” Such skepticism is refreshing.

The value of Motzki’s analysis lies both in its understanding of how Ibn Ishāq’s material was transmitted and in discovering what amounts to a new source for Ibn Ishāq, Muḥammad b. Abī Muḥammad. There is still much for skeptics still to be skeptical about—after all, one hundred or even fifty years can do much to “history” when there are strong theological and political imperatives at play, as evidenced both within Islam and other religions. But Motzki and his *isnād-cum-matn* analysis have shown that uncritical skepticism is untenable (and I dare say, “radical” in the negative sense of the word). Moreover, even those who doubt the merits of this type of analysis need to become proficient with it—if they wish to challenge its conclusions.

HERBERT BERG

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA WILMINGTON

Latin Translation of the Qurʾān (1518/1621): Commissioned by Egidio da Viterbo. Critical Edition and Case Study. By KATARZYNA K. STARCZEWSKA. Diskurse der Arabistik, vol. 24. Wiesbaden: HARRASSOWITZ, 2018. Pp. cxxiv + 828, illus. €138.

The Quran once owned by Egidio da Viterbo, its pages divided into four columns giving the Arabic original, a transcription of the Arabic in Roman characters, a Latin translation, and glosses by the

translator, was first properly studied by Thomas Burman in the sixth chapter of his *Reading the Qurʾān in Latin Christendom, 1140–1560* (Philadelphia, 2007). Now Katarzyna Starczewska has prepared an edition of the Latin translation based on the two surviving manuscript copies of the lost original, one (incomplete) at Cambridge University Library and the other (complete) at the Biblioteca Ambrosiana in Milan.

The history of Egidio's Quran is long and not always entirely clear. Egidio, a learned Augustinian, vicar general of Rome, and three times prior general of his order, delivered the opening sermon at the Fifth Lateran Council (in which he was an active participant) in 1512. In 1515 he was dispatched by Pope Leo X to the emperor Maximilian and three years later to Charles V in Spain in an effort to organize a crusade against the Turks. In 1517 Leo X made him a cardinal and in 1523 another pope, Clement VII, appointed him Latin Patriarch of Constantinople and bishop of Viterbo. Besides his glorious career as a churchman and a diplomat, Egidio was renowned as a scholar—as a humanist, a theologian, a Biblicist, and a Hebraist particularly versed in the Kabbalah. He shared this last field of interest with the Renaissance philosopher Giovanni Pico della Mirandola. As in the case of Pico, Egidio's curiosity extended to other kindred languages and he began studying Arabic. He did so in Spain during his diplomatic mission to Charles V, and in Spain he acquired a couple of grammatical works in Arabic and ordered a Quran with a Latin translation. Although he may have wished to improve his Arabic with the help of the Quran, we have no indication as to how far he got. He never appears to have used the Quran in anti-Muslim polemics.

The Latin translation—or at least the first part of it—was by an Aragonese Morisco or converted Muslim, Juan Gabriel from Teruel, Iohannes Gabriel Terrolensis, who was assisting Fray Joan Martín Figuerola in preparing anti-Islamic sermons intended to evangelize the Muslims. Juan Gabriel's approach to the Quran, Starczewska argues, was almost identical to that of another, better-known Muslim convert to Christianity, Juan Andrés, who, in turn, was assisting Don Martín García, the bishop of Barcelona with whom Figuerola was closely connected, for the very same purpose. Their common goal was to select passages from the Quran that seemed to be in favor of Christianity. By comparing their selection Starczewska demonstrates what might be a reciprocal influence and a similar procedure.

Juan Gabriel added to his translation numerous glosses. If he helped Figuerola select quranic passages proving the truths of Christianity and to be used against Islam, Starczewska claims that his glosses served a different purpose. "It is possible to infer," she writes, "that what Juan Gabriel is struggling to achieve here is in a certain sense directly opposed to what he was working on with Figuerola. When the convert was collaborating with the Spanish preacher, he was providing Islamic exegetical material to be used in a polemical anti-Muslim context; here he uses the same quotations but in a tentatively pro-Muslim light." His object, she continues, was to "blur the boundaries between Christianity and Islam" and "to demonstrate that the biblical personages venerated by his Catholic patrons were also held in high esteem by Muslims" (p. lxxxix).

Some years after Egidio's return to Italy, when he was living in Viterbo in 1525, he showed his Quran to Leo Africanus, the Moroccan scholar celebrated for his work on Africa, whose godfather Egidio had been at the time of his conversion from Islam to Catholicism. Highly critical of the translation, Leo added to Juan Gabriel's glosses others of his own. The route followed by the manuscript at this point becomes more tortuous. First it was sent to the vicar apostolic Filippo Archinto, librarian of the Augustinian Biblioteca Angelica in Rome, to which Egidio had bequeathed his manuscripts. From Rome it somehow made its way to Spain, to the library of the Escorial, where it was discovered by the Scottish librarian David Colville. In 1621 Colville himself embarked on the study of Arabic and copied out the entire manuscript, together with the glosses by Juan Gabriel and Leo Africanus, adding notes in which he criticized Leo Africanus. He left the Escorial for Italy in 1627, taking the copies he made with him. Two years later he was in Milan, the guest of Cardinal Federico Borromeo. In gratitude he bequeathed to him some twenty manuscripts, which included the copy of Egidio's Quran. It has remained in the Biblioteca Ambrosiana to this day. But there was another copy of Egidio's Quran, which, for reasons and via channels that remain obscure, reached Cambridge. At first there was some doubt about the author of the marginal notes, but Anthony Grafton and Joanna Weinberg proved in their *"I Have Always Loved the Holy Tongue": Isaac Casaubon, the Jews, and a Forgotten Chapter*

in *Renaissance Scholarship* (Cambridge, Mass., 2011) that it was the great Huguenot scholar Isaac Casaubon, known for his editions of classical texts and his attack on the champion of Catholicism, Cesare Baronius. Casaubon too was engaged in the study of Arabic and the copy of Egidio's Quran served his purpose.

But what about Juan Gabriel's actual translation of the Quran? It is often fairly literal, but rarely elegant and not always accurate. If we take the important verse 3:7, in which a distinction is made between the verses of the Quran that are binding and "decisive in meaning" (*muḥkamāt*) and those that are obscure and susceptible of different interpretations (*mutashābihāt*), we see that the translation fails entirely to capture the significance of the original. Nevertheless, Juan Gabriel avoids some of the somewhat tendentious translations that had entered the Christian tradition. An example is *yūṣallūna* in 33:56. According to translators such as Marco de Toledo, God and the angels were "praying for" the Prophet, and this was considered highly blasphemous. In the Muslim tradition, on the other hand, God and the angels "called down blessings" on the Prophet. Juan Gabriel chose the Muslim version: *Et quod Deus et angeli eius dant salutationem super prophetam* (glossed, however, either by Leo Africanus or Colville, as *Orate pro eo*). This helps to substantiate Starczewska's claim that Juan Gabriel was in fact upholding an Islamic tradition.

For the edition of the text of the Latin translation Starczewska deserves high praise. It is the result of patient and meticulous work. In the critical apparatus below the Latin text we are given all the annotations, glosses, and variants in the two manuscripts, and in an appendix the glosses made by Juan Gabriel. Despite the number of question marks that raise some doubt about the accuracy of the transcription, this last addition, of the greatest interest, is an important contribution to the study of the Quran in Spain and, more generally, in Europe, where students of Islam owed so much to Qurans of Spanish origin.

Starczewska's introduction, on the other hand, as well as the entire presentation of the text, is open to certain criticisms. The introduction of over 120 pages is omitted from the index. What index there is is most unsatisfactory and gives an impression of amateurishness. It is limited to names appearing in the Quran, but the same name is repeated in different Latin cases as if each case were a different person. We thus get separate entries for Maria, Mariam, and Mariae. There is also no index of the suras, an essential instrument in any edition of the Quran.

Starczewska is evidently far more interested in the history of the Latin translation—its authorship, its transmission, its different readers, and its historical context—than in its relationship to the Arabic Quran itself. A certain amount of information is given about Egidio da Viterbo, Juan Gabriel, Leo Africanus, David Colville, and Isaac Casaubon, but little attempt is made to engage with the translation, to compare what it contains with the Arabic original, or to insert it in a tradition of quranic scholarship. Virtually no attention is paid to the use of *tafsīr*. We are given the tantalizing piece of information that "among the authors whose texts circulated in medieval and early modern Spain were al-Zamakhsharī and Ibn 'Aṭīyya al-Gharnaṭī, and these are the names mentioned not only in Egidio's Quran but also in Figuerola's *Lumbre de fe contra el Alcorán*" (p. lxxxv). Nothing further is said about these important sources, which should have been discussed at greater length and which, as we see from his glosses, Juan Gabriel was using the whole time. Although Starczewska provides a table of thirty pages comparing the translation of the Quran by Juan Gabriel with that of Juan Andrés (which only survives in passages in his *Confusión o confutación de la secta Mahomética* published in 1515), she would have done well also to compare Juan Gabriel's rendering with those of Robert of Ketton and Marco de Toledo. For a truly informed discussion of Juan Gabriel's use of the *tafsīr* literature and a thoroughly competent assessment of his translation, scholars should turn to Burman's *Reading the Qurʾān in Latin Christendom*.

ALASTAIR HAMILTON
THE WARBURG INSTITUTE, LONDON