

Óscar de la Cruz Palma

# Robert de Ketton, *traditore*: Manifestations of anti-Islamic Radicalism in the First Latin Translation of the Qur'an

**Abstract:** The first time the foundational texts of Islam (in this case the Qur'an) were translated, with the goal of providing the Latin world with direct access to its supposedly erroneous doctrines, was a cultural watershed moment. This distinction notwithstanding, Robert of Ketton brought to bear a series of prejudices in his translation of the Qur'an that resulted in an exaggeratedly anti-Christian text that sometimes diverges – as the Arabic commentaries demonstrate – from the text's original meaning. For example, some precepts that originally targeted Jewish customs were made in the Latin translation to look like Islamic condemnations of Christian customs. In this way, the Qur'an that was introduced into Latin Christendom was riddled with incorrect content, and this content was still circulating in the humanist period by virtue of the success of Bibliander's printed recension (1543).

## 1 Introduction. The Thinking behind the First Latin Translation of the Qur'an

Research in recent years has pointed out some undeniable features of the first Latin translation of the Qur'an – which was essentially the work of Robert of Ketton as commissioned by the abbot of Cluny, Peter the Venerable, between 1142 and 1143 – and I need to begin by highlighting some of these features in order to define my point of view in this study. In itself, the translation of the Qur'an constitutes the inauguration of a new polemical strategy spearheaded by the abbot of Cluny: the strategy of appealing directly to Islamic sources in order to expose (*denudare* is the word used) the errors of the infidels. The prologue to the translation of the Qur'an makes clear that the intention was to acquire an *armarium arabicum* – that is, a group of Arabic sources translated into Latin as an “arsenal” of raw material that would make it possible to refute Islam *from within*, by “unveiling” (*arabico semoto velamine*, as Peter the Venerable also says) the errors that needed to be destroyed. The studies that have been published to date are in agreement about the polemical usefulness of Ketton's translation. Indeed, Peter the Venerable himself was the first to make use of it by drawing on material from it, as well as from other works by his collaborators,

to write his *Liber contra sectam*. As the texts make clear, the habitual way of thinking was that the Qur'an contained the main proof of Islam's "deviation" from Christian doctrine, and thus Islam went from being considered a heresy to a sect – that is, a different "confession" or "religion," and this change was also a cultural watershed. The Christian content that the readers of the Latin translation imagined that they encountered in the Qur'an provided abundant proof of the erroneous nature of Islam, and numerous passages were "exposed" and provoked outrage. This is the case, for example, with the rejection of the Trinity (in the interpretation of Q. 4, 169: "do not say 'Three'"), the use of apocryphal sources (as in Q. 3, 43, about the clay bird into which Jesus breathes life), or legal precepts contrary to Christianity (such as divorce laws, as in Q. 4, 24 or 33, 48; and the taking of multiple wives, as in Q. 4, 3). Moreover, the fact that the Qur'an contained claims that were acceptable from a Christian standpoint (for example, the sanctity of the Virgin Mary, as in Q. 3, 37–41) was hardly consoling; in fact, it was cause for indignation that these claims should be mixed in with statements that were intolerable to Christians.

What has been said up to now provides only a brief and superficial overview of the mentality behind the first Latin translation of the Qur'an, but it gets us to what will be the focus of this study. This is the idea is that Ketton's translation sought to show the Latin world (the *latinitas* of which Peter the Venerable spoke) the errors of Islam vis-à-vis Christianity. However, the issue becomes more complicated when we consider the large number of allusions to Judaism in the Qur'an. Thus, by treating the Qur'an as "raw material" for refuting Islam, Ketton finds himself in a debate with Judaism as well. At least in theory, the confirmation of Christian truths was strengthened by opposing them not only to the purported errors of Islam but also to the customs of the Jews. In other words, and this is reflected in Peter the Venerable's *Adversus iudaeorum inveteratam duritiam*, the Christianity-Islam polemic was incorporated into the ongoing Judaism-Christianity polemic.

It is necessary to examine how elements shared by Judaism, Christianity, and Islam deviate from the biblical tradition. Though the expression "Mahometan Bible" does not appear until the modern period, it seems to be a fitting title for how the Latin world at the time – and especially the early translators of Islam's holy book – thought of the Qur'an.

There are several cultural reasons for making sure that the Latin reader of the Qur'an recognized – with a sense of shock – the presence of the Bible in the Qur'an. The allusions to Moses, Jesus, and Mary, for example, put the wary Christian reader on his guard. However, the continuity between the biblical text – especially the Torah and the Gospels – and the Quranic text appears *expressis verbis* in the Qur'an. The Islamic tradition distinguished between three different

levels of commentary:<sup>1</sup> *tahrīf* (in Arabic, ‘to twist, distort, skew’), which describes an accusation against the Jews and Christians for falsifying the Islamic revelations by replacing them with paraphrases of the Hebrew or New-Testament tradition;<sup>2</sup> *tabdīl* (‘substitution’), in which a ‘change’ of one word for another is identified;<sup>3</sup> and thirdly, they speak of *kitmān*, ‘concealment’ when referring to words or passages from Scripture so that Muslims do not know them.<sup>4</sup>

---

1 *tahrīf*: Pilar González Casado, *Introducción a la literatura árabe cristiana* (Salamanca, 2017), 301–302, identifying the term used by Ibn Ḥazm (d. 1063) in his *Libro de las sectas*, and according to Gabriel Said Reynolds, *The Qur’an and the Bible* (Yale University Press, 2018), 161: “the term used by Islamic tradition to describe the accusation that Jews and Christians falsified Islamic revelations allegedly given to them (the Torah and the Gospel, respectively) and wrote in their place the Hebrew Bible and the New Testament”. This can be seen in the passage: Q. 4, 46 Ketton: “Iudeis uerba legalia distorquentibus et in lege multa mala proferentibus et se quidem audisse et non credidisse fatentibus, commodius atque melius esset nobis credidisse et paruisse. Sed horum paucissimi fidem assequuntur, cum Deus ipse gratiam suam atque pietatem ab illis penitus retrahit” [Yusuf Ali, Abdullah, *The Qur’an. Text, Translation and Commentary* (New York, 2001): “Of the Jews there are those who displace words from their (right) places, and say: ‘We hear and we disobey’; and ‘Hear what is not heard’; and ‘Rā’inā’; with a twist of their tongues and a slander to Faith. If only they had said: ‘We hear and we obey’ and ‘Do hear’; and ‘Do look at us’: it would have been better for them, and more proper; but God hath cursed them for their Unbelief; and but few of them will believe”], in connection to Deut. 5:24–27: “ecce ostendit nobis Dominus Deus noster maiestatem et magnitudinem suam uocem eius audiuimus de medio ignis et probauimus hodie quod loquente Deo cum homine uixerit homo (25) cur ergo morimur et devorabit nos ignis hic maximus si enim audierimus ultra uocem Domini Dei nostri moriemur (26) quid est omnis caro ut audiat uocem Dei uidentis qui de medio ignis loquitur sicut nos audiuimus et possit uivere (27) tu magis accede et audi cuncta quae dixerit Dominus Deus noster tibi loquerisque ad nos et nos audientes faciemus ea”. The same for Q. 3, 72.

2 Reynolds, *The Qur’an*, 161. Thus, for example: Q. 10, 94 Ketton: “Si de mandatis tibi missis, quicquam dubitas, antecessorum tuorum lecciones perlegendo ueritatem tibi missam agnosces, ne sis ambiguus nunc negans nunc affirmans.” – Yusuf Ali, *The Qur’an*: “If thou wert in doubt as to what We have revealed unto thee, then ask those who have been reading the Book from before thee: the Truth hath indeed come to thee from thy Lord: so be in no wise of those in doubt”.

3 For example: Q. 2, 58–59 Ketton: “Cumque diximus uillas ingredientes cibos undelibet sumite et per portam intrantes humili uoto grates reddite. Sic enim malis ueniam, bonisque statum meliorem Deus annuet. (59) Malis ipsis hoc abutentibus uerbo sicque sibi nociuis, non nobis uindictam celitus intulimus.” – Yusuf Ali, *The Qur’an*: “And remember We said: ‘Enter this town, and eat of the plenty therein as ye wish; but enter the gate with humility, in posture and in words, and We shall forgive you your faults and increase (the portion of) those who do good’. (59) But the transgressors changed the word from that which had been given them; so We sent on the transgressors a plague from heaven, for that they infringed (Our command) repeatedly”.

4 For example, Q. 2, 146 Ketton: “Hoc etenim agens, iam ueraci notitia tibi monstrata malis connumeraberis. Ipsi tamen fillique sui ueritatem agnoscunt, licet eorum plerique negent.” – Yusuf Ali, *The Qur’an*: “The people of the Book know this as the know their own sons; but some of them conceal the truth which they themselves know”.

Ketton was, therefore, aware – I don't know to what extent but at least from his having read the Qur'an – that Islam maintained a textual continuity running through the Torah, the Gospels, and the Qur'an; however, the idea was untenable from the perspective of his Christian culture. In fact, Ketton knew that some parts of the Qur'an were acceptable to Christianity. However, in his translation we do not find any treatment of the text that invokes biblical parallels. As he himself says in the prologue to his translation, Peter the Venerable is also aware of the existence of acceptable material in the Qur'an:

*Lex tamen ista, licet letifera, multis in locis maximum testimonium argumentumque firmissimum sanctitatis et excelentie nostre legis uidentibus et electis prebet. Istud quidem tuam minime latuit sapientiam (. . .)*

This law, though deadly, offers in many passages the highest testimony and the greatest argument for the sanctity and excellence of our law for those who understand it and are chosen. But this is not in the least hidden from your wisdom (. . .)

## 2 On the Anti-Jewish, now Anti-Christian, Contents of the Qur'an

Ketton's translation, then, was to be used to reveal the putative errors of Islam. However, it should be pointed out that the conclusions that a Latin reader might come to about its anti-Christian content were in large measure due to the translation and not necessarily to the essential meaning of the Qur'an.

In what follows we have two examples of how, when the text of the Qur'an rejects Jewish customs – that is, where there is a doctrinal or moral confrontation between Islam and Judaism – Ketton's translation creates an opposition to Christianity.

Let us first take a look at what happens in the following famous passage:

Q. 2, 223 Ketton: "Mulieres uobis subiectas penitus pro modo uestro, ubicumque uoueritis perarate, Deum timentes, ad quem omnium fit reeditus, qui bonis premia, malis crutiatus tribuit." [apud Bibliander (1543)]

Yusuf Ali (2001): "Your wives are as a tilth unto you; so approach your tilth when or how ye will; but do some good act for your souls beforehand; and fear God, and know that ye are to meet Him (in the Hereafter), and give (these) good tidings to those who believe."

In this *aya*, Yusuf Ali provides a correct translation that includes the expression: "your wives are as a tilth unto you", whereas Ketton's text translates literally as:

Till the women who are subject to you how and where you will, fearing God, who takes stock of everything, [and] who rewards the good and punishes the wicked.

This is, moreover, the only passage for which I have found a version different from Ketton's: among the items that Peter of Poitiers sent to Peter the Venerable regarding his *Liber contra sectam*, we find partial quotations of this aya, with some significant variants:

Q. 2, 223 (*apud* Petrus Pictavensis): "o viri, mulieres vobis subiectas ex quacumque parte vobis placuerit perarate."<sup>5</sup>

This aya sparked outrage (*turpissimum praeceptum*, says one of the glossators), not only because of what is suggested about sexual relations but also on account of the presence, in the midst of all of this, of the *Deum timentes*, as if the act referred to were lawful for believers. This is, to say the least, the interpretation of the glossator who is transmitted in Bibliander:

Violentius hic locus a nostris tortus est quasi nefaria permittat, quum addiciat Deum timentes, etc. Non assumendum nomen Dei in uanum.

Ketton's translation, which uses the participle 'fearing God', situated the sexual act in the present, whereas Mark of Toledo is closer to the original Arabic, translating it in the imperative form: *timete Deum*, in a sentence added to the first. Ketton's reading, then, agrees with part of the marginal note in MS Arsenal 1162 (fol. 30va):

Nota. "Turpissimum preceptum pro quo solo debuisset incendi. et uide quam uersute statim de dei timore loquitur, ut operiat turpitudinem quam dixerat."<sup>6</sup>

Norman Daniel's analysis of this passage,<sup>7</sup> based on his compilation of numerous Latin versions, leaves no doubt that it was adopted by the Latin tradition as an ideal passage for demonstrating the alleged obscenity and, Bibliander adds, violence inherent in the laws sanctioned by Muhammad. The passage has commonly been commented upon because of its discussion of sexual relations with "your wives" (literally 'your women', *nisā' ukum*, confirmed in the sense of 'your

---

5 Ed. Reinhold Gleib, *Petrus Venerabilis Schriften zum Islam* (col. Corpus Islamo-christianum (CISC): Series Latina 1, Altenberge, 1985), 234: *apud* "Capitula Petri Pictavensis", liber II, cap. VI.  
6 Ed. José Martínez Gázquez, "Glossae ad Alchoran Latinum Roberti Kettenensis translatoris, fortasse a Petro Pictaviense redactae: An Edition of the Glosses to the Latin Qur'an in BnF MS Arsenal 1162," *Medieval Encounters* 21 (2015), 98.

7 Norman Daniel, *Islam and the West* (Edinburgh Univ. Press, 1958), 320–322.

wives' according to the translation of Q. 4, 15: *mulieres*; and also according to, for example, Mark of Toledo's interpretation: *mulieres enim vestrae*). However, I think I see two other levels of commentary: first, note that Ketton makes the reference to women more comprehensive by adding *subiectas*, resulting in an interpretation that includes more than just women with the status of wives. The phrase, *mulieres vobis subiectas*, agrees with the broader meaning that Ketton also gives to Q. 23, 6 *propriis uxoribus aut sibi subiectis et ancillis*, where the pair of terms *propriis uxoribus/sibi subiectis* is given as the translation of the single word *azwājihim*, for 'wives', next to *malakāt 'aymānuhum*: 'ancillis – slaves'. The use of *subiectas*, then, may be a device of Ketton's. It is highly significant, moreover, that he also omits the idea of 'land under cultivation', *ḥarthun* in Arabic: "Your wives are as a tith unto you" (Yusuf Ali, 2001), and the use of the metaphorical verb in Latin *perarate* without this antecedent effectively gives the phrase a sexual meaning.

If we accept hypothetically that the Latin reader would not have been able to easily deduce the possible ways of rendering the original that Ketton had to choose between when translating the text, it can be argued that his version led to this passage being understood to be literally about 'subjected women', which may have included slave women or women under Islamic rule. With this – however aware or unaware Ketton was of his deviation from the original meaning – he caused or allowed the reader to be misled away from the allusion to marriage and to understand the meaning instead as 'any subjected woman', contributing to the perception that there was danger and violence in the sexual treatment of women 'subjected' by Islam.

A second issue affecting the proper interpretation of this passage about wives has to do with 'taking' (remembering the original image of land under cultivation, without which the verb *perarate* implies a sexual meaning) wives "where you will" (*ubicumque uolueritis*), which evokes sexual depravity. The nuance in the variant used by Peter of Poitiers, *ex quacumque parte vobis placuerit* – that is, "where it pleases you" – succeeds in exacerbating this *res turpissima*, as Daniel says. The reader's imagination might suggest an even more obscene interpretation: that the passage allowed for "de tergo" sexual relations, including the anal option if the husband so willed(!). This interpretation is supported by an interlinear annotation in the Arsenal manuscript mentioned above: "scilicet in uulua uel ano. quot sequitur maxima pars sarracenorum ab utens ano."<sup>8</sup>

However, if we look at some commentaries from the Muslim tradition on this passage, we find that this aya is actually interpreted in opposition to the sup-

---

<sup>8</sup> Ed. Martínez Gázquez, "Glossae", 98.

posed Jewish superstition that held that sexual intercourse from behind engendered children who were cross-eyed or suffered from strabism.

cf. Muslim 3535: “Les juifs disaient: “Si l’homme a des relations intimes avec son épouse dans le vagin, par derrière, l’enfant sera bigle”. C’est alors que fut révélé: “Vos épouses sont un champ de labour pour vous; allez à votre champ comme vous voulez”.<sup>9</sup> [Q. 2, 223]

However, the closest thing that we find to this in the Talmud is Rashi’s interpretation:

cf. Nedarim 20b (en las *Extractiones de Talmud* 1676): “Dixit quaedam mulier ad Rab: Rby, posui mensam viro meo et ipse vertit eam –id est, abusus est me–. Respondit Rab: Lex concedit ei”)

where the expression “posui mensam” and also “flip the table” is explained by Rashi as an allusion to *de tergo* vaginal coitus.

The Qur’an was translated in a way that projected Muslim ideas about a Jewish superstition (that is referred to at several times but is difficult for us to document) onto Muslims themselves. There are no commentaries from the Latin world that make this connection with Judaism; rather, to the contrary, there are a group of interpretations, all of them compiled by Norman Daniel, intended to feed prejudice against Muslims by implying that obscenity is sanctioned by the Islamic precepts. As a result, the Latin translation of the Qur’an was used to contrast Christianity’s decent sexual mores within marriage to the alleged depravities practiced by Muslims with “subjected women/wives”, forgetting the “real” meaning of the Quranic precept.

Let us take a look at a second example. This one relates to the accusation against Muslims of failing to understand (the truths of Christianity). If we look at some examples where Ketton uses the word *velamen*, we find polemical translations that would also have been useful for refuting Islam, translations that from any objective standpoint diverge from the meaning of the Quranic text, and this is especially true in passages that refer to Jewish customs. For example, we have the Latin translation of the following passage, which seems to match the Arabic text up to a point:

Q. 17, 45–46 Ketton: “intercapedinem atque uelamen in legendo Alchoran interponemus, (46) sigilla suis cordibus imprimendo, ne scire queant, auribusque suis plumbum infundendo, unde fugiendo se retrahunt, cum eos audire contingit in Alchoran te nominantem Deum solum.”

---

<sup>9</sup> Also in al-Bukhāri 4528.

Yusuf Ali (2001): “When thou dost recite the Qur’an, we put, between thee and those who believe not in the Hereafter, a veil invisible. (46) And We put coverings over their hearts (and minds) lest they should understand the Qur’an, and deafness into their ears: when thou dost commemorate thy Lord –and Him alone– in the Qur’an, they turn on their backs, fleeing (from the Truth).”

The topic touched upon by this quote seems complex: here is the theme of the veil that God interposes when the Qur’an is recited. In this aya, the Arabic text distinguishes between a “heavy curtain” or a “separation” (*intercapedinem – ħikhāb*) between believers and non-believers, and a “veil” (*velamen – akinna*) that covers the hearts of those who do not believe while the revelation is being read.<sup>10</sup> The commentaries point out a parallel between this veil and the one that Moses puts on after he received the commandments from God and promulgated them to his people (thus, Ex. 34:29–35 parallels Q. 42, 50: *per velamen interpositum*). This gesture was preserved in the Jewish custom of covering oneself with a veil, called the *talit*, when saying prayers or reading the sacred texts. However, Saint Paul (II Cor 3:14–16)<sup>11</sup> inverted this meaning of the custom (*id ipsum velamen in lectione veteris testamenti manet*) by taking up the idea that the veil used by the Jews prohibited them from understanding the sacred text correctly and that it would be removed at the moment of their conversion (*cum autem conversus fuerit ad Deum aufertur velamen*).

Therefore, the Qur’an confirmed for the Christian reader that this *velo* was present at the moment when a believer recognized the true message of the sacred text, in this case the Qur’an.<sup>12</sup> This passage can also be linked to accusations against Islam – also based on passages in the Qur’an – regarding manipulation of the Sacred Scriptures (whether belonging to the Jewish or the Christian tradition), an idea that cannot be developed here, however. The interesting thing is that Ketton’s translation succeeds in extending to Islam Saint Paul’s idea that “when [Israel] converts to the Lord, the veil will be removed”, which had referred explicitly to the Jews. In my view, this connection between ideas is guaranteed if we

<sup>10</sup> Reynolds, *The Qur’an*, 430–440.

<sup>11</sup> 2 Cor. 3:14–16: “sed obtusi sunt sensus eorum usque in hodiernum enim diem id ipsum velamen in lectione veteris testamenti manet non revelatum quoniam in Christo evacuatur (15) sed usque in hodiernum diem cum legitur Moses velamen est positum super cor eorum (16) cum autem conversus fuerit ad Deum aufertur velamen.”

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Q. 42, 51 Ketton: “Non accidit cuiquam hominum quod cum eo Deus sublimis et sapiens loqueretur nisi per uisionem uel per uelamen interpositum uel per internuncium omnia pro uelle suo preceptoque dicentem.” – Yusuf Ali, *The Qur’an*: “It is not fitting for a man that God should speak to him except by inspiration, or from behind a veil, or by the sending of a Messenger to reveal, with God’s permission, what God wills: for He is Most High, Most Wise”.

recall the expression used in the prologue to his translation of the Qur'an: *arabico tantum semoto velamine*, which has been correctly interpreted as the translator's desire to produce a text that is faithful to its original,<sup>13</sup> but that now takes on more complex implications. Peter the Venerable also applies to Islam the topos of the veil as an obstacle in his *Liber contra sectam*, where he develops a comprehensive refutation of the idea that the Jews and Christians have manipulated the scriptures (*Liber contra sectam* I, chaps. 5 and 6):

*Summa* I, 5: "Cumque universis pari modo resistentibus eiusque ignobilitatem contemnentibus videret se hac via non posse consequi quod sperabat, quia vi gladii non potuit, religionis velamine et divini prophetæ nomine rex fieri attemptavit."

Likewise, as there were opponents everywhere, as well as those who criticized him because he was not of noble birth, when he understood that he would not get what he hoped in this way, and because he was not able to do so by the power of the sword, he attempted to become king, using the veil of religion and the name of the divine prophet.

In this broader perspective, other passages using the word *velamen* that are rendered much less literally with respect to the Quranic text are able to pick up on this idea of 'confusion'. In a way that is in my opinion clearly polemical, Ketton reinforces the idea of the *velamen* as an obstacle when he uses it in conjunction with 'darkness':<sup>14</sup>

Q. 6, 39 Ketton: "Nostris preceptis contradicentes, surdi mutique obscura gestant uelamina, Deo quibus uult rectam uiam monstrante, quos uult aberrare faciente."

Yusuf Ali (2001): "Those who reject our Signs are deaf and dumb, –in the midst of darkness profound: whom God willeth, He leaveth to wander: whom He willeth, He placeth on the Way that is Straight."

This lexical choice was not strictly necessary. In any case, it seems to me that the expression *obscura gestant uelamina* is connected to Ketton's choice (which he

<sup>13</sup> José Martínez Gázquez, "El lenguaje de la violencia en el prólogo de la traducción latina del Corán impulsada por Pedro el Venerable," *Cahiers d'études hispaniques médiévales* 28 (2005), 251.

<sup>14</sup> Let us leave aside the last passage in Ketton's translation where the word *velamen* appears: Q. 10, 27 Ketton: "Peccatores autem equum sibi simileque premium suscepturi dedecore premeddi, nullum tutorem seu saluatorem habituri uelamen quasi noctem nigram faciebus suis apponent. Et hii sine termino ignis ministri manebunt." – Yusuf Ali, *The Qur'an*: "But those who have earned evil will have a reward of like evil: ignominy will cover their (faces): no defender will they have from (the wrath of) God: their faces will be covered, as it were, with pieces from the depth of the darkness of Night: they are Companions of the Fire: they will abide therein (for aye)!".

makes on several occasions)<sup>15</sup> to translate “deafness” with the expression ‘having lead in one’s ears’, which is the case in the passage mentioned above, Q. 17, 48: *auribusque suis plumbum infundendo*. In this case, it seems to me that *velamen* and *plumbum* when used together suggest the same accusation: if deafness can be avoided by removing the lead that impedes listening and understanding correctly, the same is true of the veil, which, according to Saint Paul, will be withdrawn at the moment of conversion.

### 3 By Way of Conclusion

Although two examples are not enough for reaching reliable conclusions, I have approached Ketton’s translation keeping in mind that its Latin audience was for the most part ignorant of the language of the Qur’an and, furthermore, generally lacked interest in the original version. The deviations in Ketton’s translation that I believe I have made clear here are certainly detectable if compared to the original, but this is something that we should not expect of the average reader until more recent times. Thus, the references to Jewish traditions that can be found in the Qur’an are made into attacks on Christianity, but this change can only be detected if the translation is compared to the Arabic version. In other words, the spin that Ketton gives to his translation – probably deliberately, given that he was not ignorant of Arabic commentaries on the Quranic text – results in a text that is much more insufferable to Christianity than what the Qur’an objectively is. Ketton transforms the original text, making his *Alchoran* an ideal instrument of refutation, an instrument that is much more effective as evidence of the dangers that inhere in Islamic doctrine (*Lex Sarracenorum*) than would be a translation that hewed close to the original. Reading his translation apart from the Arabic text – and yet having detected his deviations by comparing it to the original – one better understands the usefulness that his translation had for subsequent texts, going up to the humanist period.

---

<sup>15</sup> He makes this choice also in Q. 6, 25 Ketton: “eisque parentium oculis repagulum auribusque plumbum immisimus”; Q. 18, 57 Ketton: “Eorum corda ne sapiant, sigillis inclusimus, auribusque suis plumbum infudimus”; Q. 41, 5 Ketton: “dicentes: ‘Corda quidem nostra contra id quod tu predicās clauduntur, auresque nostre plumbo sigillantur.’”

# Bibliography

## Sources

- Biblia Vulgata latina, ed. Robertus Weber *Biblia sacra iuxta vulgatam versionem*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1969.
- Al-Bukhāri. *Hadiths*, ed. and trad. franc. O. Houdas – W. Marçais, Paris: Maison d'Ennour, 2016.
- Extractiones de Talmud*, ed. Ulisse Cecini – Óscar de la Cruz, *Extractiones de Talmud per ordinem sequentialem*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2018.
- Robert de Ketton. *Alchoran latinus*, ed. Theodorus Bibliander. s.l. [Basilea], 1543.
- Marcos de Toledo. *Alchoranus latinus*, ed. Nàdia Petrus Pons, *Alchoranus Latinus quem transtulit Marcus canonicus Toletanus*. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas (CSIC), col. “Nueva Roma” n. 44, 2016.
- Yusuf Ali, Abdullah. *The Qur'an. Text, Translation and Commentary*. New York: Tahrike Tarsile Qur'an, 2001.

## Studies

- Daniel, Norman. *Islam and the West*. Edinburgh Univ. Press, 1958.
- Glei, Reinhold. *Petrus Venerabilis Schriften zum Islam*. Col. Corpus Islamo-christianum (CISC): Series Latina 1, Altenberge, 1985.
- González Casado, Pilar. *Introducción a la literatura árabe cristiana*. Salamanca: Sígueme, 2017.
- Martínez Gázquez, José. “El lenguaje de la violencia en el prólogo de la traducción latina del Corán impulsada por Pedro el Venerable,” *Cahiers d'études hispaniques médiévales* 28 (2005): 243–252.
- Martínez Gázquez, José. “*Glossae ad Alchoran Latinum Roberti Ketenensis translatoris, fortasse a Petro Pictaiense redactae*: An Edition of the Glosses to the Latin Qur'an in BnF MS Arsenal 1162,” *Medieval Encounters* 21 (2015): 81–120.
- Said Reynolds, Gabriel. *The Qur'an and the Bible. Text and Commentary*. Yale University Press, 2018.

