



HAL
open science

An Indirect Usage of the Qur'an in the XVth century. Jean Germain's *Débat du chrétien et du sarrasin*

Irene Reginato

► **To cite this version:**

Irene Reginato. An Indirect Usage of the Qur'an in the XVth century. Jean Germain's *Débat du chrétien et du sarrasin*. The Latin Qur'an, 1143–1500, De Gruyter, pp.205 - 224, 2021, 9783110702637. 10.1515/9783110702712-013 . hal-03954620

HAL Id: hal-03954620

<https://hal-nantes-universite.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-03954620>

Submitted on 24 Jan 2023

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Irene Reginato

An Indirect Usage of the Qur'an in the XVth century. Jean Germain's *Débat du chrétien et du sarrasin*

Abstract: This paper focuses on an indirect use of the Qur'an in an inedited text, the *Débat du chrétien et du sarrasin*. The *Débat* is a religious treatise written by the bishop Jean Germain (1396 ?–1461) for his patron Philip the Good of Burgundy. Although Germain claims that he relies on some “extraits de l'Anchorant”, he draws all his Qur'anic material from two intermediate texts: The *Titulus V* of Petrus Alfonsi's *Dialogi contra Iudaeos* and Peter of Toledo's *Epistula Sarraceni et Rescriptum Christiani*, the Latin translation of the Arabic *Risālat al-Kindī*. Through the analysis of Germain's translation choices, this paper shows the attitude the author has towards his sources and brings out a still stereotyped image of Islam and its Prophet.¹

1 Jean Germain's *Débat du chrétien et du sarrasin*: Direct and Indirect Sources

Bishop of Nevers and Chalon-sur-Saône, Jean Germain (1396?–1461) was a leading figure in Burgundian court in his time, and the first chancellor of the prestigious Order of the Golden Fleece. Throughout his career, Germain supported Philip the Good's role as *defensor fidei*, both in the *intramarina* crusade against the Hussites and in the *ultramarina* crusade against the Turks.² The most significant proof of Germain's commitment to Philip's projects is represented by his literary work, especially the *Débat du chrétien et du sarrasin*. Composed between 1447 and 1451,

¹ This article is part of a project that has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (SyG grant agreement no. 810141), project EuQu “The European Qur'an. Islamic Scripture in European Culture and Religion 1150–1850”. Thanks to Florence Ninitte and John Tolan for proofreading this paper.

² For a detailed account on Jean Germain's life and an exhaustive bibliography, see Jacques Paviot, “Jean Germain, évêque de Nevers et de Chalon-sur-Saône, chancelier de l'ordre de la Toison d'Or,” *L'Église et la vie religieuse des pays bourguignons à l'ancien royaume d'Arles* 50 (2010): 109–127.

the *Débat* is a complex and still unedited text³ that combines an interreligious dialogue, an anti-Muslim polemical pamphlet and a *summa* of Catholic history and doctrine.

Opening with a dedication to Philip,⁴ the first prologue declares the *causa scribendi*, the title, the structure and the sources of the work. Germain complains that crusade projects have long been neglected and that Oriental Christians tend to convert to Islam because of their ignorance of Catholic doctrine;⁵ his text aims therefore to provide an illustration and refutation of Islam as well as an apology for Christianity.⁶ Despite the commonly used title *Débat du chrétien et du sarrasin*, Germain actually entitles his work *Trésor des simples*,⁷ a designation which shows that the targeted audience were the lay and *illiterati* members of Burgundy's court. The *Trésor* is divided into five books: only books I and II (the

3 The *Débat* is extant in eight manuscrits: Bourg en Bresse, *Bibliothèque municipale*, ms 007; Chicago, *University Library*, ms 988; Moulins, *Bibliothèque municipale*, ms 7; Paris, *Bibliothèque Nationale de France*, mss fr. 69, 70, 947, 948; Sainkt-Peterburg, *National Library of Russia*, ms fr. F v I 8. The most recent list is in Eric Burkart, "La production littéraire de Jean Germain," in *Jean Germain (v.1396–1461) – Évêque de Chalon, chancelier de l'ordre de la Toison d'or*, ed. Delphine Lannaud, Jacques Paviot (Charnay-Lès-Mâcon: Société d'histoire et d'archéologie de Chalon-sur-Saône, 2019), 129–136. All quotations are taken from ms Paris, BnF, fr. 948, the most studied one, see in particular: François Avril, Nicole Reynaud, *Les Manuscrits à peintures en France: 1440–1520* (Paris: Flammarion, 1998), 956; David J. Wisley, "Jean Germain's *Debat du Crestien et du Sarrasin*: Illumination between Multi-Confessional Debate and Anti-Conciliarism," in *The Social Life of Illumination. Manuscripts, Images, and Communities in the Late Middle Ages*, ed. Joyce Coleman et al. (Turnhout: Brepols, 2013), 177–205; Tristan Vigliano, *Parler aux Musulmans* (Paris: Droz, 2017), 23–75. The transcription follows the criteria established in Françoise Vielliard, Olivier Guyotjeannin, *Conseils pour l'édition des textes médiévaux – Fasc. I. Conseils généraux* (Paris: Éd. du CTHS, École des Chartes, 2001).

4 "Tres puissant, illustre et victorieux prince, mon tres redoubté seigneur et maistre Phelippe de France le second, par la grace de Dieu duc de Bourgoingne (. . .)" (f. 1r).

5 "(. . .) a l'occasion des guerres civiles entre les princes crestiens ou de nonchaloir, les sains voyages d'Oultremer, croysiés et armees pour la foy, depuis environ deux cens ans en ça ont esté peu entreprises (. . .), au grant reboutement de la Crestienté et avantaige des Sarrazins." (f. 1v); "[Les Chrétiens orientaux] par deffault de cognoissance (. . .) ont depuis advouhé et prins la loy de homme tant vil et deshonneste Mahumet, afin de plus habandonnement sans reprehension poursuivre leurs plaisances charnelles, pour ce qu'elles ne leur sont seulement en ladicté secte souffertes ains commandees." (f. 2r).

6 "(. . .) il m'a semblé estre expedient de feablement mettre avant l'entention de ladicté dampnable secte, et de point a point y respondre et justifier la nostre sainte foy par voyes raisonnables, a la gloire de Nostre Seingneur Jhesu Crist legislateur d'icelle, et perpetuelle confusion de Mahumet et de ses adherens." (f. 2v).

7 "Et a ceste achoison appellerons nostre dit euvre Tresor des Simples, car de luy pourra un chascun trouver la richesse de nostre foy, adverree par Vielx et Nouvel Testamens (. . .)" (f. 4r).

shortest ones) concern Islam, while books III-IV-V deal almost exclusively with Christian doctrinal history.

In the same prologue, Germain asserts that he follows the most accredited sources on Islam, namely “des extraitz de l'Anchorant fais par reverends docteurs Pierre Venerable”, Petrus Alfonsi and Thomas Aquinas.⁸ The mention of the “Anchorant” made Georges Doutrepoint declare that Germain drew directly on the Latin Qur'an by Robert of Ketton,⁹ showing he believed a well-known declaration by Philip's envoy, Bertrandon de la Broquière, that Germain had received a copy of “l'Alkoran” that he brought back from his journey to the East.¹⁰ Actually, as first proved by Yvon Lacaze,¹¹ the real source of the Qur'anic “extraitz” mentioned by Germain is not the Latin Qur'an by Ketton but another text contained in the same *Corpus Cluniacensis*, i.e., Peter of Toledo's Latin translation of the *Risālat al-Kindī*, a 9th- or 10th-century Arabic work in the form of a (probably fictive) epistolary exchange between a Muslim and a Christian at the court of the Abassyd caliph al-Ma'mun (r. 813–833).¹² It is true that the Latin version of the *Risāla* quotes some Qur'anic passages, but – as we shall see – its formulation differs from Ketton's and, conversely, can be found *ad litteram* in the *Débat*. Germain's reception of the Qur'an is therefore a second-handed one, always filtered through the intermediation of the Latin *Risālat al-Kindī*. This work, however, does not appear among the sources quoted in the prologue.

8 “(. . .) me suis travaillié de extraire de pluseurs docteurs et saiges ce qui m'a semblé proffitable et bien servant au reboutement de ladicte secte et a l'exaulsement de nostre sainte foy; et especialment des extraitz de l'Anchorant fais par reverends docteurs Pierre Venerable, jadiz abbé de Cluny, Pierre Alfunse de la nation des Espaignes et saint Thomas d'Aquin en ung sien petit livre contre l'eresie de Mahumet (. . .)” (f. 2v).

9 Georges Doutrepoint, *La littérature française à la cour des ducs de Bourgogne: Philippe le Hardi, Jean sans Peur, Philippe le Bon, Charles le Téméraire* (Paris: Honoré Champion, 1909), 249.

10 “(. . .) [Je] luy [= au Duc] baillay tous mes habillemens, ensamble l'Alkoran et les fais de Mahomet que le chappellain du consul des Venissiens à Damas m'avoit baillés par escript en latin, qui contenoit beaucoup d'escripture, lequel mondit seigneur bailla a maistre Jehan Germain, docteur en théologie, pour le visiter et oncques puis je ne le veys.” (Bertrandon de la Broquière, *Le voyage d'Outremer*, ed. Charles Schefer (Paris: Leroux, 1892), 260–261.

11 Yvon Lacaze, “Un représentant de la polémique antimusulmane au XV^e siècle. Jean Germain, évêque de Chalon-sur-Saône 1400?-1461. Sa vie, son œuvre” (PhD diss., École Nationale de Chartes, 1958). Unfortunately inedited, Lacaze's dissertation also offers an edition of some chapters of the *Débat*.

12 It is generally agreed that the disputation is fictitious and that it was entirely written by a Christian (probably Nestorian) author between the IX and the X century. For this text, see Fernando González Muñoz, ed., *Exposición y refutación del Islam. La versión latina de las epistolas de al-Hasimi y al-Kindi* (La Corogne: Universidade da Coruña, 2005).

With regard to “Pierre Alfonse de la nation des Espaignes et saint Thomas d’Aquin”, we will focus only on the first one, who is cited at the very beginning of the *Débat*. The first chapter of Book I begins with a summary of the *Titulus quintus* of Petrus Alfonsi’s *Dialogi contra Iudaeos*, an extremely successful autobiographical dialogue where the newly converted Petrus explains to his Jewish *alter ego*, Moses, why he converted to Christianity. Alfonsi’s *Titulus quintus* has long been one of the most exploited and accredited sources of Islam, and that is why Germain explicitly mentions it when presenting his text. In fact, the *Titulus quintus* itself was largely derived from the Arabic version of the *Risāla*.¹³

2 The Use of Sources in the First Chapter of Book I

The first chapter of Book I,¹⁴ which is the shortest in length, is nonetheless quite significant when studying the sources of the *Débat*. Indeed, this chapter combines a summary of the *Titulus quintus* followed by a quite literal French translation of the Latin *Risāla*.

2.1 Les *Dialogi contra Iudaeos*

The first book of the *Débat du chrétien et du sarrasin* begins with another explicit reference to Petrus Alfonsi. In particular, Germain declares that, since Alfonsi has been mentioned in the prologue, he will sum up (he uses the expression “insérer en bref”) the content of Alfonsi’s work before beginning the debate between his two characters.¹⁵ The *Dialogi contra Iudaeos* appears, therefore, as a sort of introduction that remains outside the narrative frame of the *Débat*. However, the *Dialogi*’s connection with the extra-diegetic level is unsteady, as shown by the use of deixis. As a matter of fact, Germain begins his text reporting the *incipit* of

13 For the tradition and the huge success of Petrus Alfonsi’s *Dialogi*, see John V. Tolan, *Petrus Alfonsi and his Medieval Readers* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1993).

14 It is worth mentioning that we do not know which source-manuscript(s) Germain used to produce his text. Consequently, all changes and differences in this analysis may have arisen from the antigraph(s) he had under his eyes.

15 “Pour ce que en nostre prologue a esté faite mention de Pierre Alfonse, jadis juifz, avant que je viengne a mettre l’epistre principale, est mon intention de *insérer en bref* ce que a mis par escript le dessusdit Alfonse.” (f. 12r) [Emphasis mine].

the *Dialogi* using third person narration (see Table 1, passage [a]: “ledit Pierre Alphonse”), but immediately shifts to first person narration, where Petrus Alfonsi himself plays the role – as he does in the *Dialogi* – of narrator/character (see [b]: “oster de *mon* entendement” [emphasis mine]):

Table 1: Petrus Alfonsi’s *Dialogi* between extra- and intra-diegesis.¹⁶

	<i>Dialogi contra Iudeos – Prologus and Titulus V</i>	<i>Débat du chrétien et du sarrasin</i>
a	Dixit sequentis operis compositor: omnipotens suo nos spiritu inspiravit et me ad rectam semitam direxit, (. . .).	(f. 12r) Dont, est a savoir que <i>ledit Pierre Alphonse</i> , en ung sien livre qui encomance: “Omnipotens Deus suo me spiritu inspiravit et me ad rectam semitam dixerit” (. . .).
b	(. . .) tenuem prius albuginem oculorum et vit et post grave corrupti animi velamentum removens. (. . .) [Cum itaque divine miserationis instinctu ad tam excelsum huius fidei gradum pervenissem, exui pallium falsitatis et] <i>nudatus sum tunica iniquitatis</i> et baptizatus sum in sede Oscensis civitatis et baptizatus sum in sede Oscensis civitatis in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti, purificatus <i>manibus Stephani</i> , gloriosi et et legitimi eiusdem civitatis episcopi.	(f. 12r) Et après ce qu’il lui a pleu oster de <i>mon entendement</i> ce qui m’empescheoit de cognoistre la verité de la foy crestienne, comme <i>homme despoillié de sa vielle robe</i> , j’ay prins le saint Baptisme en la cité d’Oste en Espagne <i>de la main de Estienne</i> , evesque de ladicte cité (. . .).

Alfonsi’s text is highly synthetized and reworked. Some passages are literally translated (“*nudatus sum tunica iniquitatis*” / “despoillié de sa vielle robe”, “*manibus Stephani*” / “de la main de Estienne”), but many words are left out (see passages in square brackets). However, the main changes Germain makes to his source are structural. Indeed, as in other versions of the *Dialogi* (especially in the *Schäftlarn* version and in the version in chapter XXVI of Vincent of Beauvais’ *Speculum historiale*), the dialogue between Petrus and his *alter ego* Moses disappears and becomes a monologue. As shown in Table 2, this helps avoid the repetitions between answers and replies:

¹⁶ Emphases in this and in the following tables are all mine. Passages in square brackets were not translated by Germain and have therefore no connection with the *Débat*.

Table 2: Structural changes.

<i>Dialogi contra Iudeos – Titulus V</i>	<i>Débat du chrétien et du sarrasin</i>
Moses : Signum est, quod <i>quinquies tantum in die orare eos precepit</i> , (. . .). Petrus (8 th reply): Quod <i>quinquies Mahometum in die orandum precipere</i> dicis, ideo utiquefecit, quia consilio doctorum suorum usus, mediatrix inter Iudeorum et Christianorum legem effici voluit suam (. . .).	(f. 12r) (. . .) [<i>Dieu</i>] n'a point voulu charger les hommes de grans faiz, ains, en compassion de leur fragilité, pour choses legieres a faire leur promet son paradis. Et premierement [<i>Dieu</i>] ordonne qu'ilz feront leurs oroisons V foiz le jour, et de ce sera plus amplement parlé en l'epistre du sarrasin ou chapitre des oroisons. Et ce afin qu'il ne samblast la loy sarrazine suyr les loys des Crestiens et Juifz (. . .).

This example highlights a peculiar feature of both Alfonsi's and Germain's representation of Islam, which can be found in the entire text of the *Débat*. Indeed, the regulative aspect of Islam is constantly emphasized, as shown by the *verba comandi* “precipere” and “ordonne”. In this specific case, the reduction of Alfonsi's text in the *Débat* changes the subject of the verb, who is Muhammad in the *Dialogi*, and God in the French text. However, we will see that elsewhere, and more often than not, Germain considers Muhammad as the source of the Islamic law and principles, showing that Europe's idea of Islam had not really progressed from the 12th to the 15th century.

Besides this structural reworking, Germain uses two other techniques to synthesize his source. The first consists in summing up long digressions in a few lines, and the second in completely skipping some passages. In Table 3, for instance, he sums up a digression concerning idolatry before the advent of Muhammad (example [a]), and totally omits another one concerning polygamy (example [b]: words in square brackets). The comparison of the two texts also shows two contradictory features of the *Débat*. On the one hand, Germain translates his source literally: see for instance the lexical calques “Licet” / “donne licence”, “legitimas uxores” / “legitimes femmes” (with the adjective preceding the noun) and the syntactic structure with left dislocation “empticias (. . .) atque capticias” / “des chamberieres et esclaves”. On the other hand, Germain's view of Islam introduces some slight but significant changes. For example, the addition of the explicit subject “*Mahumet* leur donne licence” in translating the impersonal Latin sentence “Licet” shows once again that Muhammad is systematically considered as the source of all permissions and prohibitions.

Table 3: Synthesis and literal translation.

	<i>Dialogi contra Iudeos – Titulus V</i>	<i>Débat du chrétien et du sarrasin</i>
a	<p>Petrus (8th reply): (. . .) Antequam enim legem predicasset, domus hec ydolis plena erat. Sed, si tu, o Moyses, scires, qualis esset domus illa et quod secretum ibi inesset (. . .).</p> <p>Petrus (9th reply): (. . .) Duo filii Loth, Amon et Moab, hanc domum honorabant, et duo ydola ab eisdem ibi colebantur, alterum ex albo, alterum ex nigro lapide patratum (. . .). Alterum, quod ex nigro erat lapide, in honore Saturni, alterum, quod ex albo, in honore Martis erat edificatum (. . .).</p>	<p>(f. 13r) (. . .) avant Mahumet, illecques estoient honnorez deux ydoles: Saturne et Mars.</p>
b	<p>Moses: <i>Licet</i> preter hoc eis eodem tempore quatuor <i>legitimas uxores</i> et qualibet repudiata aliam semper accipere, ita tamen, ut nunquam quaternarium numerum transeant. (. . .). <i>Empticias vero atque captivas</i>, quotcumque voluerit, habere licitum erit (. . .).</p>	<p>(f. 13r) <i>Mahumet leur donne licence</i> de chascun avoir quatre <i>legitimes femmes</i>, et icelles repudier a son plaisir et en prendre des autres, sans excéder le nombre de quatre. (. . .). Et <i>des chamberieres et esclaves</i>, en prendre a son plaisir.</p>

Despite this quest for synthesis, Germain sometimes enriches his source-text with three types of additions that are listed in Table 4: prolepses, negative comments, and new information. Regarding prolepses, he announces, in the first chapter, several key topics concerning Islam. However, instead of examining them by translating Alfonso's explanations, he declares that they will be discussed later. The quotation in [a], for example, deals with prayers and, using a systematic formula, states that “quant a la maniere de prier, sera enaprès parlé plus amplement” (emphasis mine). As we can see, Muhammad is once again depicted as the legislator of Islamic precepts (it is Muhammad who orders – “ordonne” – that Muslims should pray that way).

The quotation in [b] is an example of a negative comment accompanied with a moral judgment: in particular, after saying that Muhammad seized power under the sign of Venus, Germain adds that he is entirely subjected to the goddess of love (“elle estoit sa singuliere maistresse”). This negative portrayal of Muhammad also influences the following sentence: “il ordonna en son Anchorant ceste maniere de adorer” (emphasis mine). First, it should be noted that, according to a common idea in anti-Muslim polemics, Muhammad is the author of the Qur'an (“son Anchorant”). Second, since Muhammad has already been portrayed as entirely dominated by passion and irrationality, the Qur'an itself appears devaluated by the evil nature of its author.

The excerpts in [c] and [d] propose two examples of additions containing new information but with no correspondence in the Latin text. In [c], Germain blames ritual ablutions (as he will also do later on in the text): using an aggressive tone, he insists on their lack of decency (see the contrast between “honteuse cerimonie” / “hontueux membres” and “impudiquement”) and describes them as a repelling and inhuman habit (“toute bestialité et coustume de chiens”), pointing out, using a hyperbole, Muslims’ luxurious nature (“la grande fureur de luxure”). As for [d], this surprising passage evokes the presence of little birds in the mosques, a picturesque and mysterious addition whose source is unknown:¹⁷

Table 4: Additions.

	<i>Dialogi contra ludeos</i>	<i>Débat du chrétien et du sarrasin</i>
a	Petrus (9 th reply): (. . .) Alterum, quod ex nigro erat lapide, in honore Saturni, alterum, quod ex albo, in honore Martis erat edificatum. (. . .).	(f. 13r) (. . .) avant Mahumet, illecques estoient honnorez deux ydoles: Saturne et Mars. <i>Et quant a la maniere ordonnee par Mahumet de illecques adorer, sera enaprès parlé plus amplement.</i>
b	Petrus (8 th reply): Quia vero puncto stelle Veneris rex effectus est, ideo hoc precepit.	(f. 12v) Et car Mahumet obtint son royaume au point de la constellation de <i>Venus</i> et, aussi comme sera dit, pour ce qu’elle <i>estoit sa singuliere maistresse, il ordonna en son Archorant ceste maniere de adorer</i> (. . .).
c	–	(f. 12v) Et quant a la <i>honteuse</i> cerimonie des Sarrazins de laver publiquement leurs <i>hontueux</i> membres, et iceulx <i>impudiquement</i> baisier, c’est toute <i>bestialité et coustume de chiens</i> , et notoyre argument de la <i>grande fureur de luxure</i> dont ilz et leur Mahumet sont diffamez.
d	–	(f. 13r) Ilz ont belles mesquites et nettes, et en icelles ne seuffrent aucunes painctures ne ymaiges elevees, esquelles ilz font oblations de petiz oyselés vifz, les laissant courir par icelles.

¹⁷ I have not been able to find other texts referring to this detail. Lacaze raised the same question: “à quoi correspond l’allusion de notre auteur aux petits oiseaux que les Musulmans laisseraient courir dans leurs mosquées?”. (Lacaze, “Un représentant de la polémique antimusulmane”, III, 784).

2.2 The *Risālat al-Kindī*

Contrary to the *Dialogi*, Germain never mentions the *Risālat al-Kindī*. In his second prologue, the author illustrates the narrative frame enclosing his argumentation and evokes a public *disputatio* between a Christian and a Muslim in front of a caliph.¹⁸ Surprisingly enough, he presents this as a device he invented himself (“ay mis avant”) to structure his refutation of Islam and apology for Christianity (“pour avoir forme de proceder en icelluy”): never does Germain acknowledge that he borrowed this from the *Risālat al-Kindī*, despite the fact that the Latin *Risāla* is the actual source-text of Book I (and part of Book II) of the *Débat*, and that it is often translated *ad litteram*. In quotation [a] of Table 5, for example, he replicates the triple left-dislocation syntactic structure of the Latin text (“De mulieribus [. . .],” “Legitime uxores [. . .],” “De ancillis [. . .]”). In [b], the lexical choices in the *Débat* are very close to those in the *Risāla*: there are several calques (“reuerentia et deuotione” / “reverence et devotion”), as well as several accurate translations (“gardent” / “obseruent”, “dies indulgentie” / “jours de perdon”, “qualiter” / “la maniere comment”, “studebant” / “mectent leur entente”). The same can be said for the two last quotations. In [c], the proverb-like sentence “Tous communs en une foy sont freres” is a non-literal but effective translation for “Fideles omnes fratres habentur”. In the same way, the synonymic couple “ferme et non divisé” is a perfect *ad sensum* translation for “singularem et solidum”:

Table 5: A faithful and effective translation.

	<i>Risālat al-Kindī</i>	<i>Débat du chrétien et du sarrasin</i>
a	(21, § 24) <i>De mulieribus</i> uero habeas quantum uolueris sine ulla contradicione uel ignominia. (. . .). <i>Legitime</i> uxores non sint tibi amplius quam quatuor, ex quibus dimittes quamcumque uolueris, quandocumque uolueris (. . .) <i>De ancillis</i> tibi coniunges quantum manus tua possederit.	(f. 26r) <i>Des femmes</i> , tu en pourras avoir tant comme il te plaira sans point de contradicion et de reprouche (. . .). <i>Des legitimes femmes</i> , tu n’en auras plus que de quatre et toutes et quantes fois que bon te samblera tu les pourras laisser (. . .). <i>Quant aux chambelieres ou concubines</i> , tu en auras tant que ta faculté le pourra souffrir.

¹⁸ “(. . .) pour avoir forme de proceder en icelluy, ay mis avant ung dyalogue de deux personnages, chevaliers et princes en l’ostel de l’empereur des Maures, l’ung sarrazin et l’autre crestien, mettans avant ung chascun l’entencion de sa loy. Et soubz umbre et occasion de leur debat et question, me suis déterminé de sommerement et en brief comprendre en ung volume le grant exploit de nostre foy par maniere d’une descripcion de temps, dez Jhesu Crist, acteur de nostre dicte foy, jusques a present (. . .)” (f. 3v).

Table 5 (continued)

	<i>Risālat al-Kindī</i>	<i>Débat du chrétien et du sarrasin</i>
b	(7, § 8) <i>Observant quoque dies afflictionis, quos et dies indulgentie uocant, in quibus etiam nudis pedibus incedunt, (. . .). Vidi quoque qualiter faciebant panem sacrificii et cum quanta reuerentia et deuotione preparationi eius studebant, quantumque prolixo orabant (. . .).</i>	(f. 18v) Et en oultre gardent certains <i>jours d'affliction</i> lesquelz ilz appellent jours de <i>perdon</i> , esquelz ont acoustumé d'aller nuz piez (. . .). En oultre j'ay veu <i>la maniere comment</i> ilz font leurs sacrifices de pain et en quelle <i>reverence et deuotion</i> ilz <i>mectent leur entente</i> a eulx preparer et aussi leurs longues oroisons (. . .).
c	(20, § 22) De hoc dixit Deus, gloriosus et excelsus, et sermo eius uerus: " <i>Fideles omnes fratres habentur.</i> "	(f. 25v) (. . .) et qu'il soit ainsi, Dieu le glorieux le tesmoigne, qui dit: " <i>Tous communs en une foy sont freres.</i> "
d	(10, § 11) Vocauit omnes ad colendum unum Deum <i>singularem et solidum.</i>	(f. 20r) (. . .) il appelle tous a croire ung seul Dieu <i>ferme et non divisé.</i>

Given that he exploits the *Risāla* to his own ends, Germain does not exclude several adjustments and changes, both in the structure and in the style and content of his source-text. As shown in Table 6, in fact, he divides it into chapters and gives each chapter a heading. These descriptive titles are primarily neutral, but they sometimes adopt a pejorative connotation, especially through the use of negative adjectives and adverbs (such as “honteuses”, “folement” and “faulse” in [a]). Chapter division does not always adapt to the original syntactic structure of the Latin *Risāla*. In case [b], for example, Germain begins a new chapter in the middle of a sentence and adds the hypothetical clause “se tu faiz les choses qui s'ensuiuent” to conclude the first half of the split sentence. Some chapters also have a further internal division: for instance, chapter 5, which illustrates “les articles de la secte de Mahumet”, has a subheading for each precept (“*Le premier article*”, “*Le second article*” etc., see [c]):

Table 6: Structural changes.

	<i>Risālat al-Kindī</i>	<i>Débat du chrétien et du sarrasin</i>
a	–	(f. 21v) Le VII ^e chapitre qui parle des <i>honteuses</i> cerimonies de loy des sarrasins. (f. 26v) Le XIII ^e chapitre parle que les crestiens <i>folement</i> croyent Jhesu Crist estre dieu (. . .). (f. 27v) Le XV ^e chapitre parle de la finable intention du sarrazin de traire son compaignon a sa <i>faulse</i> loy.

Table 6 (continued)

	<i>Risālat al-Kindī</i>	<i>Débat du chrétien et du sarrasin</i>
b	(8, § 10) Ero enim tibi certa fideiussione fideiussor paradisi et securitatis ab igne, (. . .). (. . .) si colueris unum Deum, qui est singulariter unitas atque soliditas (. . .).	(f. 19v) (. . .) je te presente et offre d'estre ton pleige et caution d'avoir paradis et te asseure d'estre quicte des painnes du feu <i>se tu faiz les choses qui s'ensuivent</i> . <hr/> (f. 19v) Le cinquiesme chapitre, qui contient les articles de la secte Mahumet. <hr/> (f. 19v) <i>Le premier article</i> . Et premierement, se tu adores ung Dieu qui est singulier et seul Dieu (. . .).
c	(9, § 11) Rursus igitur inuito te ad testificationem et professionem <i>Domini et domini mei</i> , qui creaturis Dei est melior et sigillum prophetie filii Adam (. . .), Mahumet, filius Abdalla, alchoresi natione, (. . .)	(f. 19v) <i>Le second article</i> . Je te inhorte que tu vueilles reconnoistre et confesser <i>nostre singulier seigneur Mahumet</i> , la meilleur de toutes les creatures de Dieu, le vray prophere et qui porte le signet de prophecie de tous les enfans de Adam (. . .). <i>Le tiers article est</i> qu'il fut filz de Abdalla natif de Arcorezi (. . .)

In [c], the already mentioned confusion between God and Muhammad as the author of the Qur'an reaches its peak. The repetition of the word “dominus” in the Latin text – the first in reference to God and the second to Muhammad – makes it easy for the French translator to replicate the traditional superposition between God and his Prophet. He condenses thus the two “dominus” together, omits the reference to God and keeps only the reference to Muhammad: “reconnoistre et confesser nostre singulier seigneur *Mahumet* (. . .).”

From a stylistic point of view (Table 7), Germain also uses some typical features of Middle French prose in his translation. We can mention three of them: the first one is the tendency to produce synonymic pairs (examples in [a]). This is a constant stylistic feature of vulgarised texts and actually helps the translation process by converting one foreign term into two familiar terms,¹⁹ typically a lexical calque and an actual translation (e.g. “Adiutorium” / “aide et confort”, “insinuo” / “insinuer et declairer”, “laboraui” / “labouré et travaillée”). These synonymic pairs play both an explicative and a rhetoric role: by stressing the

¹⁹ The production of synonymic pairs is considered as a typical device in the meta-language of translation, due to the “nécessité de rendre la compréhension du texte possible par approximations successives”, see Giuseppe di Stefano, “La langue des traducteurs: langue ou meta-langue?”, in *La traduction vers le moyen français* (Actes du II^e colloque de l'AIEMF, Poitiers, 27–29 avril 2006), ed. Claudio Galderisi and Cinzia Pignatelli (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007), 376.

concept expressed, they are particularly coherent with the *Chrétien*'s teaching *ethos*, as well as with Germain's preaching attitude. The second stylistic feature involves placing emphasis on the ways that the Muslim addresses the Christian, especially using the formula "(mon) chier frere" (examples in [b]). Finally, the *Débat* also shows a complex syntax; in the passage quoted in [c], for example, Germain replaces the Latin parataxis of the *Risāla* (coordinated sentences introduced by "enim") with an intricate hierarchy of dependent clauses (introduced by "car" et "attendu que"):

Table 7: Stylistic changes.

	<i>Risālat al-Kindī</i>	<i>Débat du chrétien et du sarrasin</i>
a	(1, § 1) <i>Adiutorium</i> tuum, o Domine. (3, § 4) (...) nostre fidei regulam (...) manifeste <i>insinuo</i> (...).	(f. 13v) En nom de Dieu (...) son <i>aide et confort</i> soit avecques nous. (f. 14v) la reigle de nostre foy (...) Et icelle en toute bonne exhortation <i>insinuer et declairer</i> (...).
	(4, § 5) In scripturis denique (...) multum <i>laboraui</i> .	(f. 16v) (...) j'ay singulierement mout <i>labouré et travaillé</i> en voz escriptures (...).
b	(4, § 5) Non ignores me multitudinis annorum etatem percucurrisse (...). (10, § 11) Hoc enim est testimonium uerum, glorificet te Deus, quod (...). (13, § 16) Iterum inuito te ad confessionem Dei (...).	(f. 16r) Pense tu <i>chier frere</i> que j'aye ja passé si grant nombre de ans (...). (f. 20v) Le X ^e article est, <i>mon chier frere</i> , Dieu te vueille glorifier, que Dieu (...). (f. 22r) Enaprés, <i>mon tres chier frere</i> , je te prie et admoneste que tu te vueillez encliner et croire et confesser (...).
c	(23, § 29) Item: "Quam male credunt qui dicunt Deum trinum, id est, tres deos. <i>Non est enim deus nisi unus Deus</i> . Quod si penitentiam non egerint illi, qui infideles sunt et hoc sentiunt, tradentur certe igni perpetuo, eo quod apropinquare nolunt Deo excelso et eius indulgentiam postulare. <i>Deus enim est misericors et propitius</i> ".	(f. 27r) Et derechief dit: "O! Que folement croyent ceulx qui appellent Dieu trine, c'est a dire triple Dieu ou trois dieux, <i>car pour vray il n'est que ung Dieu</i> . Et ceulx qui ainsi mauuaiselement croyent s'ilz n'en ont penitence ilz seront condampnez en feu perpetuel comme infideles pour ce qu'ilz ne vueillent reconnoistre ung souverain Dieu et ly demander pardon, <i>attendu que Dieu est propice et misericors</i> ."

As far as content is concerned, we can distinguish between additions that simply reformulate information already present in the text and additions that actually convey new information. The former (Table 8) consist primarily of paraphrases (examples in [a]) and meta-linguistic comments ([b]). Paraphrasing the source text, Germain adds some contextual references or explains implicit notions. In the first

example quoted, the gloss “empereur et seigneur des Maures” aims to provide the reader with useful information about the caliph. Elsewhere, Germain’s rewriting reveals his inability to abandon his prejudices and accurately interpret the source text. In the second quotation, for example, seeking to elucidate the subject of the sentence, he translates the words “magnus et gloriosus, in sacro suo eloquio dixit” by “le grant et glorieux *prophete Mahumet, en son Archorant*” (emphasis mine). Once more, he assigns to the Prophet the epithets reserved to God and the redaction of the Qur’an. It is interesting to note, however, that this misunderstanding is present elsewhere in the Latin text of the *Risāla*,²⁰ and may therefore be considered as one of the most resistant and prevalent ideas of Christian anti-Muslim polemics.

Meta-linguistic comments listed in [b] all refer to the translation activity and are introduced by “c’est a dire”. The last example quoted is the most interesting one, because Germain gives three meanings of the term “alahatama”, but only two of them are present in the source-text:

Table 8: Explicative additions.

	<i>Risālat al-Kindī</i>	<i>Débat du chrétien et du sarrasin</i>
a	(1, § 1) Tempore Abdalla Helmemun Emirhelmomini (. . .).	(f. 13v) Au temps de puissant prince Emirhelmomini dit Admiromini, <i>empereur et seigneur des Maures</i> .
	(3, § 4) Rursumque, <i>magnus et gloriosus, in sacro suo eloquio dixit</i> : “qui nostris signis crediderunt et sarraceni fuerunt”.	(f. 15v) Et autrepart <i>le grant et glorieux prophete Mahumet, en son Archorant</i> : “Qui croiront a nostre loy, pourteront le signe et seront sarrazins seront guerdonné.”
b	(9, § 11) (. . .) possesor uirge (. . .).	(f. 20r) Le quatriesme article est qu’il fut possesseur de la <i>verge, c’est a dire du fouet</i> .
	(12, § 14) Iterum inuito te ad domum Dei illicitam, que in Mecha sita est (. . .).	(f. 21v) Enaprés chier frere, je te exhorte que tu te vueilles incliner a considerer les merueilleuses choses qui se font en la maison de Dieu illicite, <i>c’est a dire en laquelle ne se doit faire chose qui ne soit licite</i> (. . .).

²⁰ See this example from the Christian’s epistle: “(. . .) Ipse uero postea cultor fuit idolorum, que uocantur Elleth et Alaze in Mecha, cum omni domo et generatione sua, sicuti *in sua scriptura* testificatur dicens ita dictum sibi fuisse : ‘Nonne tu fuisti pupillus et collectus es? Et in errore et iustificatus es? Et pauper et ditatus es?’” (González Muñoz, *Exposición y refutación del Islam*, 43, § 49. Emphasis mine.)

Table 8 (continued)

<i>Risālat al-Kindī</i>	<i>Débat du chrétien et du sarrasin</i>
(10, § 12) (. . .) in prima cena ante comestionem due, post cenam, que uocatur ultima, quando iam est <i>alahatama</i> , id est <i>densitas tenebrarum</i> , due. De hoc prohibuit Dei nuntius ut hec hora non uocetur <i>alahatama</i> . Dicit enim: “ <i>alahatama nichil aliud est quam genuflexio camelorum</i> (. . .).”	(f. 20v) (. . .) après le dernier soupper que l’on dit envers nous la dernière cenne autrement banqueter deux. Ainsi sont XVIII. Et la dernière l’on l’appelle en arabic <i>Alahathamach</i> , c’est a dire <i>souper en tenebres</i> . Et ceste heure a tesmoigné le message Dieu qu’elle soit appelee <i>Alahathamach</i> , c’est a dire <i>heure de tenebres</i> , et dit que <i>Alahathamach</i> n’est autre chose que la <i>genuflection des chamoys</i> (. . .).”

Additions that enrich the text with new information revolve around two main topics: anti-Muslim polemics and the illustration of Christian doctrine, and history and precepts. Table 9 groups a series of negative comments about: [a] the ritual praying in Mecca, the repelling nakedness of the faithful (“sont tous nuz”) and, as noted before, their lewdness (“atouchent leurs membres, lavent et baisent leurs mains”); [b] the aggressive and violent nature of Islam, which, most importantly for Germain, justifies the organization of crusades against them; [c] the denial of the divine nature of Jesus as the root of the ancient alliance between Islam and Nestorianism:

Table 9: Anti-Muslim polemical comments.

<i>Risālat al-Kindī</i>	<i>Jean Germain, Débat du chrétien et du sarrasin</i>
a (12, § 14) (. . .), et inuolutionem linteoli circa renes, et quomodo osculatur angulus domus illius, et uidere loca illa sacrata et multa mira, que ab hominibus appetuntur.	(f. 21v–22r) Et aussi comme eux qui font ce sacrifice <i>sont tous nuz</i> excepté qu’ilz ont a l’entour de leurs rains ung linceul pour eux enveloper et <i>atouchent leurs membres, lavent et baisent leurs mains</i> et aussi comme les pelerins baisent volontiers les angles d’icelle maison de Mahumet, comme ilz sont curieux de veoir les lieux sains et merveilleux que naturellement desirent a veoir hommes.
b (12, § 15) Iterum inuito te ad expeditionem diuinam, quod est contra inimicos et aduersum incredulos proficisci et expugnare participatores et hereticos (. . .).	(f. 22r) En oultre je te enhorte que en recevant ma loy <i>tu vueilles devenir chevallier de Dieu et prandre charge et estre chief de guerre contre les ennemis de nostre foy et toy mettre en champ contre ceulx qui ne vueillent croire et bataillier contre les heretiques participateurs</i> (. . .).

Table 9 (continued)

	<i>Risālat al-Kindī</i>	<i>Jean Germain, Débat du chrétien et du sarrasin</i>
c	(5, § 7 Veneratus est enim eos et pactum cum eis iniit, proposuitque tam ipse quam socii eius ut eos inter se cum beniuolentia et modestia tractarent.	(f. 16r) Et la secte des nestoriens nostre prophete Mahumet a louee par dessus toutes autres et tous jours les a honoré et a fait alliance avecques eulx et a conclut avecques ses complices qu'ilz le souffreroient entre eulx et les tracteroient en toute douceur et benivolence, <i>pour ce qu'ilz dient Jhesu Crist estre nez pur homme de la vierge Marie et ne la confessent estre mere de Dieu.</i>

The association of Islam and Nestorianism reveals a typical feature of Germain's text, namely the assimilation of Islam to heresy. This view of Islam is hardly new, but it is particularly in line with Germain's religious beliefs,²¹ developed in a period where the Western Church was threatened by the Turks, the Hussites and even by conciliarism. In Germain's monolithic and papist religious conception, there was no place for outer or inner enemies, and all dissidents were to be fought as they were perceived as dangerous and heretical.

Heresies and councils are the object of the additions collected in Table 10. The two quotations in [a] add some details about the council of Ephesus (431); the second one is particularly interesting, because the digression is marked by the caption "L'acteur", which specifies that the text reports the author's words. Quotations in [b] offer some form of catechism compendium: Germain defines the concept of Trinity ("trois personnes en une deité supple"), mentioning its components ("trois compaignons egaulx: Pere, Filz et Saint Esperit") and pointing out that only those who believe in the divine nature of Christ are "vrais crestiens". Muslims, however, refer to them as "infeaulx crestiens" and "heretiques partici-pateurs" (a calque of "participatores" in the Latin text) because they believe that God exists in three distinct hypostases.²²

²¹ The image of the Muslim as heretic was at least two hundred years old when Germain wrote his *Débat*. Following Islam's assimilation to idolatry shown in the *Chansons de geste*, this image appeared in the XIIth century and perpetuated thereafter with almost no variation, see John V. Tolan, *Les sarrasins* (Paris: Flammarion), 364–365. In his *Contra sectam siue haeresim Saracenorum*, for exemple, Peter the Venerable both attacks Islam and ancient heresies.

²² It is clear that Germain does not understand the sense of the Latin term "participatores" and translates it therefore by the calque "partici-pateurs". However, the confusion dates back to the Latin text itself. As a matter of fact, "participatores" corresponds to the Arabic *al-mušrik* ('associators') which in the original *Risālat-al-Kindī* indicates the "Quraysh", the politeistic tribe of which belonged Muhammad. The Latin text wrongly applies this term to Christians, see

Table 10: Germain's catechism.

	<i>Risālat al-Kindī</i>	<i>Débat du chrétien et du sarrasin</i>
a	(5, § 6) Tertia quoque heresis nestorianorum est, qui tibi proximi sunt (. . .).	(f. 16r) Et la tierce heresie est des nestoriens, pour ce qu'ilz sont de la secte de Nestorius jadiz evesque de Constantinoble, qui fut condempné a Ephese par les dessusdiz evesques au temps de l'empereur Theodose le jeune (. . .).
	(6, § 7) Nos uero confitentes et non negantes hoc, huic operi fauemus, hanc legem sequimur, in hoc testamento perseuaramus, huic ueritati obedimus.	(f. 18r) Et nous autres Sarrazins, qui confessons la doctrine des dessus diz heretiques, ensuyvons leur loy, favorizons leurs fais, adherens a ceste verité et perseverons en ce testament. <i>L'acteur. Est a sçavoir que le sarrazin appelle en ce chapitre "heresies" premierement la decision faite ou grant concile de Calcidoinne soubz Marcian l'empereur et Leon pape de Rome l'an IIII^e LIII, ou fut condempné Utices le heretique. Et l'appelle la pire, pour ce que l'eglise de Rome et tout le monde approuva icelle. Secondement, appelle "heresie" la determination ou concile d'Ephese, ouquel fut condempné leur maistre Nestorius par Cyrille Alexandrin, et autres au temps de l'empereur Theodose le josne l'an IIII^e XXXVIII. Et les dessus dictes condempne pour ce que c'est la vraye declaration de Nestorius, pour ce qui lui semble qu'elle approche plus la secte des sarrazins.</i>
b	(12, § 15) (. . .) et expugnare participatores et hereticos in ore gladii (. . .).	(f. 22r) (. . .) bataillier contre les heretiques participateurs qui confessent trois personnes en une deité supple qui sont vrais crestiens et les destruire par force de glaive (. . .).
	(17, § 19) <i>Infideles uero, qui participes faciunt Deo et pares illi attribuunt et prophete Dei non credunt</i> (. . .).	(f. 24rv) Au contraire les infeaulx crestiens qui sont appelez participateurs et qui baillent a Dieu trois compaignons egaulx, Pere, Filz et saint Esperit, et qui ne croient au saint prophete de Dieu Mahumet (. . .).

Let us conclude our comparison with a last example of meta-linguistic addition. A particularly interesting passage describes the Islamic paradise according to a famous Qur'anic passage present in the Arabic and Latin versions of the *Risālat al-Kindī*. The addition involves a surprisingly positive remark by Germain, which emphasises

the poetic nature of the Qur'an and draws attention to the chorus on the fascinating description of paradise: "opera Dei uestri semper in ueritate manebunt" / "Les oeuvres de Dieu tous jours demourront veritables". When this chorus first appears, it is announced by a meta-linguistic comment (which is underlined in ms. Bnf fr. 948) comparing the sura to a canticle: "Parle l'Archoran par maniere de reprinse d'ung cantique". In subsequent appearances, the chorus is accompanied by the metrical caption "reprinse". It is worth noting that Germain does not simply assign this strophic structure to his source-text but to the Qur'an itself ("Parle l'Archoran (. . .)"). However, while this is true for the Arabic Qur'an (and therefore for the Arabic and Latin versions of the *Risāla*), it is no longer true for Robert of Ketton's Latin translation, which substitutes the chorus with a rhetorical question, repeated fewer times and always in a varied form. As a consequence, the comparison between Ketton's Qur'an, the Latin *Risāla* and the *Débat* offers further proof that Germain's Qur'anic quotations were taken from the Latin version of the *Risāla*:

Table 11: The Qur'anic paradise.

<i>Alchoran Latinus (ed. Lappin 2011)</i>	<i>Risālat al-Kindī</i>	<i>Débat du chrétien et du sarrasin</i>
Qui timuerit, coram Deo stans, duas paradisos rerum multiplicium omnimodique boni foecundas, fontiumque fluxu iocundas, haereditatem accipiet: Ubi sunt omnium pomorum pariles. <i>An aliquid horum factorum Dei contradictis? Illic quidem credentes accubabunt tapetis sericis, stramentisque purpureis, omnibusque sibi dilectis perpetuo potientur, ducentque puellas formosissimas, ut hyacinthus et margaritae, ab hominibus atque diabolis nunquam deuirginatas, nec menstruatas. An horum aliquid abnegatis? Bonorum solum praemiorum bonum est occasio. An hic aliquis contradictis? (. . .).</i>	(17, § 20) Dixit iterum Deus, gloriosus et excelsus, in descriptione paradisi: "Sunt in eo duo fontes currentes – <i>opera Dei uestri semper in ueritate manebunt</i> – Sunt in eo de cunctis fructibus bis bina – <i>opera Dei uestri semper in ueritate manebunt</i> – Sunt in eo speciosissime, quas nec homines nec demones attigerunt, ut margarite fulgentes – <i>opera Dei uestri semper in ueritate manebunt</i> – An possunt retribui pro bonis nisi bona? – <i>opera Dei uestri semper in ueritate manebunt</i> – (. . .)."	(f. 22v–23r) En outre plus a plain et clerement a parlé Dieu le souverain et glorieux de la maniere de paradis, c'est assauior que en icellui a deux fontaines de courans. <i>Parle l'Archoran par maniere de reprinse d'ung cantique et dit: "Les oeuvres de Dieu tous jours demourront veritables."</i> Et paradis aura de tous fruiz double paire. <i>Reprinse: "Les oeuvres de Dieu tous jours demourront veritables."</i> En ce paradis sont tres belles femmes lesquelles hommes ne dyables ne toucherent oncques et sont leurs corps plus plaisans de marguerites. <i>Reprinse: "Les oeuvres de Dieu tous jours demourront veritables."</i> Et raison veult que pour faire bien bien soit retribué de Dieu. <i>Reprinse: "Les oeuvres de Dieu tous jours demourront veritables (. . .)."</i>

3 Conclusion

Even though the prologue of the *Débat du chrétien et du sarrasin* mentions “des extraitz de l’Archorant”, the real sources of Germain’s work are the Latin version of the *Risālat al-Kindī* and Petrus Alfonsi’s *Titulus quintus*. While the former is never mentioned, the *Dialogi contra Iudaeos* are explicitly quoted. An undisputed authority at Germain’s times, Alfonsi’s text acts as a guarantee of the strong foundation of the *Débat*. However, Alfonsi also drew his *Titulus Quintus* from the *Risāla* (in its Arabic version), and he also avoided mentioning it. As we can see, because of the lack of information on Islam, the same sources are repeated in the same manner across the centuries, but they are not always awarded the status of *auctoritates*.

Germain does not use these two texts in the same way. He produces a free and personal synthesis of the *Dialogi* which, more than as a source-text, he uses as a reservoir of information. He removes the dialogical structure, omits entire sections and sums up long passages in a few lines, isolating some key-issues that he develops later, in the translation of the Latin *Risālat-al-Kindī*. Although he never mentions it, he draws the fictional frame of his entire work from the *Risāla*. The French bishop moulds the *Risāla* into a new structure and uses a new style, but he always sticks to its contents. Sometimes, he translates it *ad litteram*; other times, he uses the content as a basis for personal additions to refute Islam and illustrate Catholic dogmas.

Although the *Débat* drew more on the *Risāla* than on the *Dialogi*, the two texts did not enjoy the same prestige. As previously mentioned, the *Titulus quintus* was one of the most accredited sources about Islam. Therefore, even at the risk of appearing repetitive, Germain summarized it in order to provide his work with an unfailing *ex auctoritate* argument. This was meant to be valid not only for the textual section actually taken from the *Dialogi*, but for the entire work as well. In this sense, prolepses like “après sera parlé plus amplement” extend the value of Alfonsi’s *auctoritas* to all which comes after the summary of the *Titulus quintus*: the translation of the *Risāla* in Books I and II, but also the *Débat* as a whole.

Throughout his text, Germain shows, especially when mentioning the Qur’an and Muhammad, a lasting misunderstanding regarding the assigning of the redaction of the Qur’an to the Prophet himself. While the emphasis on the *verba comandi* offers a regulative image of Islam, the negative portrait of Muhammad undermines the value of the precepts prescribed in “son Archorant”.

Bibliography

- Burkart, Eric. "La production littéraire de Jean Germain." In *Jean Germain (v.1396–1461) – Évêque de Chalons, chancelier de l'ordre de la Toison d'or*, ed. Delphine Lannaud and Jacques Paviot, 129–136. Charnay-Lès-Mâcon: Société d'histoire et d'archéologie de Chalons-sur-Saône, 2019.
- Di Stefano, Giuseppe. "La langue des traducteurs: langue ou metalangue?" In *La traduction vers le moyen français* (Actes du II^e colloque de l'AIEMF, Poitiers, 27–29 avril 2006), ed. Claudio Galderisi and Cinzia Pignatelli, 369–378. Turnhout: Brepols, 2007.
- Doutrepont, Georges. *La littérature française à la cour des ducs de Bourgogne: Philippe le Hardi, Jean sans Peur, Philippe le Bon, Charles le Téméraire*. Paris: Honoré Champion (Tome VIII de la Bibliothèque du XV^e siècle), 1909.
- González Muñoz, Fernando ed. *Exposición y refutación del Islam. La versión latina de las epistolae de al-Hasimi y al-Kindi*. La Corogne: Universidade da Coruña, 2005.
- González Muñoz, Fernando. "Consideraciones sobre la versión latina de las cartas de al-Hašimi y al-Kindi", *Collectanea Christiana Orientalia* 2 (2005), 43–70.
- Lacaze, Yvon. "Un représentant de la polémique antimusulmane au XV^e siècle: Jean Germain évêque de Nevers et de Chalons-sur-Saône 1400 ?–1461, sa vie e son œuvre". PhD diss., École Nationale des Chartes, 1958.
- Lappin, Antony J., ed. *Alchoran Latinus. Vol. III, Editiones Theodori Bibliandri (1543 & 1550)*. Rome: Aracne, 2011.
- Klaus-Peter Mieth. "Der Dialog des Petrus Alfonsi: Seine Überlieferung im Druck und in den Handschriften. Textedition." (PhD diss., University of Berlin, 1982), 249–300.
- Paviot, Jacques. "Jean Germain, évêque de Nevers et de Chalons-sur-Saône, chancelier de l'ordre de la Toison d'Or." *L'Église et la vie religieuse des pays bourguignons à l'ancien royaume d'Arles* 50 (2010): 109–127.
- Bertrandon de la Broquière. *Le voyage d'Outremer*. Edited by Charles Schefer. Paris: Leroux (Recueil de voyages et de documents pour servir à l'histoire de la géographie depuis le XIII^e jusqu'à la fin du XVI^e siècle), 1892.
- Tolan, John V. *Les sarrasins*. Paris: Flammarion, 2003.
- Tolan, John V. *Petrus Alfonsi and his Medieval Readers*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1993.
- Vigliano, Tristan. *Parler aux Musulmans*. Paris: Droz, 2017.
- Wrisley, David J. "Jean Germain's *Debat du Crestien et du Sarrasin*: Illumination Between Multi-Confessional Debate and Anti-Conciliarism." In *The Social Life of Illumination. Manuscripts, Images, and Communities in the Late Middle Ages*, ed. Joyce Coleman, Marl Cruse and Kathryn A. Smith, 177–205. Turnhout: Brepols, 2013.

