The Qur'an as Chrestomathy in Early Modern Europe*

Alastair Hamilton

One of the more mystifying aspects of the grammars of ancient and Oriental languages produced in the West during the Renaissance is how students were expected to proceed. They were obviously intended to memorise the tables and there seems to have been an assumption that to advance any further the help of a teacher was essential. But what about the chrestomathies, the texts frequently added to the grammars as linguistic exercises? In his study of early Greek grammars Paul Botley wrote that 'the language was approached through Greek texts that the pupils already knew by heart in their Latin translations: the Greek Scriptures and the liturgy.'¹ In the case of Arabic a similar approach seems to have been adopted, particularly in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. The Lord's Prayer remained a favourite text, together with Arabic versions of the Psalms. Thanks to the manuscripts which Guillaume Postel had pawned with the Elector Palatine in Heidelberg, the German authors of early Arabic grammars who frequented the Palatine library – Jacob Christmann, Ruthger Spey and Peter Kirsten – could use the Arabic versions of the Epistles and Acts of the Apostles. Otherwise knowledge of Arabic literature was highly limited, and the most obvious text to choose, the one regarded as the perfect expression of the Arabic language, was the Qur'an.

Postel, who compiled the first proper grammar of classical Arabic to appear in the West, set a precedent.² His *Grammatica arabica*, published in about 1539,³ gave as reading material, in Arabic and Latin, the Lord's Prayer and the

* In writing this article I depended heavily on the help and advice of Jan Loop at the Warburg Institute, Arnoud Vrolijk at Leiden University Library, and Alasdair Watson at the Bodleian Library, Oxford.

1 P. Botley, *Learning Greek in Western Europe, 1396–1529. Grammars, Lexica, and Classroom Texts*, Philadelphia, 2010, p. 75.

2 [J.] R. Jones, 'Learning Arabic in Renaissance Europe (1505–1624)', unpublished PhD dissertation, School of Oriental and African Studies, London University, 1988, pp. 149–53.

3 C. Fr de Schnurrer, *Bibliotheca Arabica*, Halle, 1811, pp. 18–19, no. 38.

fātiḥa, the first sura of the Qur'an. To the *fātiḥa* he added his own translation⁴ which is striking for the rendering of the Arabic *ʾiyyāka*, often rendered as 'thee alone', as 'o vos omnes', 'oh ye all', and *ṣirāt*, 'path', as 'punctum', 'point'. Although these translations gave rise to a prolonged debate among scholars and cast doubt on Postel's competence as an Arabist,⁵ his version was added by Theodor Bibliander to the medieval Latin translation of Robert of Ketton⁶ and another

4 G. Postel, *Grammatica Arabica*, Paris [c.1539], sig. E10^r: 'In nomine Dei misericordis, pii. Laus Deo, regi seculorum misericordi et pio. Regi diei iudicii: O vos omnes illi serviamus certe adiuvabimur. Dirige nos domine in punctum rectum, in punctum inquam illorum, in quos tibi complacitum est, sine ira adversus eos, et non errabimus.'

5 The debate can be said to have started in the eighteenth century with the publication of Jacob Christof Wilhem Hoste's *Dissertatio inauguralis de prima Alcorani sura*, Altdorf 1743, in which a detailed comparison was made between all the translations of the *fātiḥa* to date. It was revived in the early twentieth century when E. Nestle, 'Geschichtliches zur ersten Sure', *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, 60, 1906, p. 246, pointed to Postel's mistranslations and wondered to what they were due. This drew a sharp reply by A. Fischer, 'Miszellen', *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, 60, 1906, pp. 245–54, esp. pp. 249–50, who said that they were simply due to Postel's limited knowledge of Arabic which had already been observed by Scaliger. Three years later the debate was resumed by C.F. Seybold, 'Kleine Mitteilungen', *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, 63, 1909, pp. 625–6, who suggested that *punctum* was a misprint of *pontem* and that Postel was referring to the bridge to hell stretching from the Temple of the Mount to the Garden of Olives over the valley of Jehosophat, over which all souls will have to pass on their way to the Last Judgement. J. Fück, 'Die Arabischen Studien in Europa vom 12. Bis in den Anfang des 19. Jahrhunderts', in *Beiträge zur Arabistik, Semistik und Islamwissenschaft*, eds R. Hartmann and H. Scheel, Leipzig, 1944, pp. 85–253, esp. p. 125, agreed with Fischer that Postel's translation 'zeigt, daß die arabischen Kenntnisse Postels einer soliden Grundlage entbehrten.' In his *De orbis terrae concordia libri quatuor*, Basel, 1544, pp. 157–8, Postel repeats the translation *punctum* and translates *ayāk* as *heus* or 'hail', while in his *De la République des Turcs*, Poitiers, 1560, pp. 50–51, he translates *ayāk* as 'O bons humains' and *al-ṣiraṭ al-mustaqīm* as 'le point ou certitude'. More recently, however, Postel has been reassessed as an Arabist by H. Bobzin, *Der Koran im Zeitalter der Reformation. Studien zur Frühgeschichte der Arabistik und Islamkunde in Europa*, Beirut, 1995, pp. 447–75. Bobzin argues (p. 451) that some Muslim interpreters explain *al-ṣiraṭ al-mustaqīm* as referring to the Qur'an. 'Von hier aus wird auch Postels Textauffassung erklärbar: durch die Gleichsetzung von صراط مستقيم mit قرآن wird den "Weg" auf den einen "Punkt" des Korans reduziert.'

6 *Machumetis Saracenorum principis, eiusque successorum vitae, doctrina, ac ipse Alcoran ...*, ed. Th. Bibliander, Basel, 1543, p. 8: 'Misericordi pioque Deo, universitatis creatori, iudicium cuius postrema dies expectat, voto supplicii nos humiliemus, adorantes ipsum: suaeque manus suffragium, semitaeque donum et dogma, quos nos ad se benevolos, nequaquam hostes et erroneos adduxit, iugiter sentiamus.'

anonymous rendering probably of Mozarabic origin⁷ in the edition of the entire text of the Qur'an which appeared in Basel in 1543. Postel, like his successors in the early modern period, provided no more than a translation of the first sura in his grammar. He made no attempt to elucidate any linguistic problem or to explain to students how they should apply to it the knowledge they had acquired from the rest of his *Grammatica arabica*.

Other compilers of Arabic grammars and type specimens in the sixteenth century avoided the Qur'an as a linguistic exercise, preferring, as we saw, Biblical texts. Jacob Christmann, in his *Alphabetum arabicum* of 1582, chose the Lord's Prayer and the Epistle to the Philippians; in the following year Ruthger Spey preceded his *Compendium grammatices arabicae* with the Epistle to the Galatians, and added the Ten Commandments and the Lord's Prayer; Franciscus Raphelengius gave the text of Psalm 50 (51) in the type specimen he published in 1595; Bartholomeus Radtmann used Psalm 146 (147) in his Arabic grammar of 1590; and Giovanni Battista Raimondi has the texts of the Lord's Prayer, the Hail Mary, Psalms 112 (113) and 116 (117) and John 1:1–9 in his *Alphabetum arabicum* of 1592. But this approach changed with the author of the best Arabic grammar of his day which was to remain unsurpassed until the nineteenth century – Thomas Erpenius in Leiden. It was not, however, in his Arabic grammar, the *Grammatica arabica* which first appeared in 1613,⁸ that he provided any chrestomathy, but in his edition of the twelfth sura, *Yūsuf*, the *Historia Iosephi Patriarchae*, published in 1617,⁹ one of the first products of the new 'Oriental' press he had just set up in Leiden with his own Arabic types. Printed together with his *Alphabetum arabicum*, it was indeed intended for students of Arabic who had used his grammar.

Erpenius had long been interested in the Qur'an. We can follow this concern in his correspondence with Isaac Casaubon.¹⁰ In 1610 he was still trying to procure a copy of the Arabic Qur'an and Casaubon generously decided to present him with one of his own. Casaubon also seems to have transmitted to

7 Ibid.: 'In nomine Dei misericordis, miseratoris. Gratias Deo domino universitatis misericordis, miseratori, iudicii. Te adoramus, in te confidimus: Mitte nos in viam rectam, viam eorum quos elegisti, non eorum quibus iratus es, nec infidelium.' See Bobzin, *Der Koran im Zeitalter der Reformation*, p. 235; M. d'Alverny, 'Deux traductions latines du Coran au moyen-âge', *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen-âge*, 22–3, 1947–1948, pp. 69–131, esp. p. 101.

8 Schnurrer, *Bibliotheca Arabica*, pp. 28–9, no. 49; Jones, 'Learning Arabic', pp. 187–212.

9 Schnurrer, *Bibliotheca Arabica*, pp. 30–31, no. 52.

10 For their friendship see A. Hamilton, 'Isaac Casaubon the Arabist: "Video longum esse iter"', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 72, 2009, pp. 143–68, esp. pp. 150–51, 158–9.

him the notes made by Adriaen Willemsz, the former student at Leiden who had joined him in Paris in 1602. These consisted of an index of suras and marginal notes giving variations with respect to another manuscript in the French royal library.¹¹ Erpenius became aware too of the importance of the *tafsīr*, the Islamic commentaries, and seems to have discovered one at the library of the Sorbonne in 1611.¹² His acquaintance with the Qur'an led him to dismiss out of hand Peter Kirsten, the Arabist and physician from Breslau. Kirsten had given his own translation of the *fātiḥa* in the type specimen he published in 1608,¹³ but Erpenius claimed that he had not so much as read the entire text.¹⁴ Despite his discovery in Paris, Erpenius's subsequent search for *tafsīr* proved vain, and his death in 1624 put paid to further plans to edit parts of the Qur'an.

In the *Historia Iosephi* Erpenius added to the Arabic an interlinear word by word Latin translation. In the margin he gave a more fluent and readable Latin rendering intended to explain the obscurities entailed by a literal version.¹⁵ The bilingual text of the sura is then followed by Robert of Ketton's Latin translation. By far the largest part of the book is devoted to notes which clarify the

- 11 A. Hamilton and A. Vrolijk, 'Hadrianus Guilielmi Flessingensis. The Brief Career of the Arabist Adriaen Willemsz', *Oriens*, 39, 2011, pp. 1–15, esp. p. 5.
- 12 I. Casaubon, *Epistolae*, ed. T.J. van Almeloveen, Rotterdam, 1709, p. 66i: 'Sed nihil est Alcoranus absque suo commentario, et libris سنه, qui continent acta, dicta et responsa Muhammedis [...] Commentariorum autem in Alcoranum pars quaedam etiam extat in Bibliotheca Sorbonica, ubi non singulae solum sententiae, sed et verba familiariter explicantur.'
- 13 P. Kirsten, *Tria Specimina characterum arabicorum*, Breslau, 1608, pp. 9–10: 'In nomine Dei misericordis miserantis. Laus ad Deum Dominum seculorum Misericordem miserantem. Regem diei Iudicii. Eho serviamus, et eho adjuvabimur. Deduc nos viam rectam. Viam [sc. Illorum] quibus delectaris super eos. Sine, [sc. Illis quibus] irasceris, super eos, et non errantes.' But here the interjection 'eho', 'hail!', is a mistaken translation of 'ayāk'.
- 14 Ibid., p. 66z: 'Petrus autem Kirstenius nuper reliquos duos Grammaticae suae libros evulgavit; qui quales sint, vis uno verbo dicam? Non merentur legi. O inscitiam homines et audaciam! Nec نص quidem conjugare scit, nec Alcoranum nunquam legit (quod certo scio) et tamen Grammaticam Arabicam audet edere [...] Quater hac aestate Alcoranum perlegi, singula accuratissime expendens; sed semper nova adhuc multa in Grammatica observatu digna occurrerunt [...]'
- 15 T. Erpenius, *Historia Iosephi Patriarchae*, Leiden, 1617, sig. D1v: 'Cum phrasis Arabica tantopere a Latina distet, ut de verbo ad verbum aut verti vix possit, aut si vertatur, adeo sit dura, et insolens, ut a linguae Arabicae imperitis intelligi plerumque nequeat: visum nobis fuit, interlineari versioni nostrae, aliam Latiniorem Paulo, et phrases Arabicas obscuriores explicantem in margine adjicere: quanquam nec ea apposite, ubique mihi licuit verba singula Arabica singulis Latinis, et aequipollentibus exprimere, ne plane absurda, et non cohaerens oratio videretur.'

grammatical forms. Erpenius ends the book with the *fātiḥa*. In addition to his own interlinear Latin translation¹⁶ he gives Robert of Ketton's Latin version, then Postel's, and finally one he describes as 'closer' to his own but which in fact is the Mozarabic version added by Bibliander. Here too he adds notes explaining both grammatical points, for example that *maghḏūb* is the passive participle of *ghaḏiba*,¹⁷ and the significance of the Arabic. The note to 'creaturarum', *'ālam*, is of particular interest since it raises the question of a Muslim belief in a plurality of worlds suggested by the plural *rabb al-'ālamīn*, sometimes translated as 'lord of the worlds'. Erpenius points out that it does not refer to worlds in the plural but to the creatures of which the world consists.¹⁸

Erpenius opens his explanatory notes with a brief essay on the Qur'an and the terms used – *qur'ān* itself, *sūra*, *āya*. The choice of *sura* 12 was a sensible one. It contains remarkably few obscurities. If we look at Ludovico Marracci's later translation and explanatory notes (to which we shall return) we see that his quotations from the *tafsīr* of al-Bayḏāwī, al-Zamakhsharī and al-Jalālīn do not illustrate arcane linguistic points but simply expand the more or less obvious meaning of the passage in question. Erpenius limits himself almost entirely to pointing out grammatical constructions. These range from the simple indication of a broken plural, as in the case of *aḥādīth*, the plural of *ḥadīth*,¹⁹ or a comparative (*akthar* as the comparative of *kathīr*),²⁰ to the indication of the form of the verb – the fourth form of *falaḥa*,²¹ for example, or the tenth form of *'aṣama*²² – to more complex constructions. He occasionally corrects the errors of his predecessors, noting that Postel was wrong in his translation of *īyyāka* in the *fātiḥa*²³ and that Franciscus Raphelengius, the compiler of the first Arabic-Latin dictionary to be published, mistakenly translated *'ir* as 'city' rather than

16 Ibid., sig. S3^r: 'In nomine Dei miseratoris misericordis. Laus Deo domino creaturarum. Miseratori misericordi, regi diei iudicii. Te colimus et te invocamus. Dirige nos in viam rectam, viam eorum qui gratus es erga eos, sine ira adversus eos, et non errantium.'

17 Ibid., sig. S4^r: 'Sumitur مغضوب pro مغضبه vel غضب, id est forma Participij Passivi pro Nomine Verbalis, sicuti et alibi, regiturque Casum sui Verbi غضب, et regitur a غير.'

18 Ibid., sig. S3v: 'عالم est mundus, Universum a Deo creatum, Plurale autem sit, non ad significandam mundorum pluralitatem, sed entium creaturarum, ex quibus mundus constat, diversitatem, itaque عالمون est entia creata omnia, creaturae omnes. quas lingua Hebraea vocat exercitus, itaque رب العالمين idem est quid צבאות יהוה dominus exercituum.'

19 Ibid., sig. M3^r.

20 Ibid., sig. O3^r.

21 Ibid., sig. O4^r.

22 Ibid., sig. R2^v–3^r.

23 Ibid., sig. N4^v.

as ‘company’ or ‘band’ (12:82).²⁴ In fact subsequent translators of the Qur’an have translated it as ‘caravan’.

Even if Erpenius made no direct use of a *tafsīr* he does at one point refer to an ‘ancient interpreter’ in connection with 12:32²⁵ when the women of Potiphar’s wife are so overcome by the beauty of Joseph that they cut themselves and bleed. This passage has been interpreted variously. According to one interpretation the bleeding was menstrual. This is what we find in Robert of Ketton.²⁶ Erpenius dismissed it as totally erroneous. According to the eighteenth-century English translator of the Qur’an George Sale (who also criticizes Erpenius) it was a peculiarity of ‘the old Latin translators’ who had misunderstood the Arabic *akbarnahu*, usually rendered as ‘they exalted him’.²⁷ Some *tafsīr*, however, such as that of al-Ṭabarī,²⁸ which Robert of Ketton may well have known, give an ambivalent interpretation of the term.

Although the first edition of Erpenius’s *Grammatica arabica* had no chrestomathy, it did contain a brief passage from the Qur’an (44:51–5) as an example of Arabic script.²⁹ In far later editions, the first of which appeared in 1636, long after Erpenius’s death, a chrestomathy was added consisting of the fables of Luqmān which Erpenius had already edited independently, and some Arabic ‘adages’. Each text was followed by explanatory notes elucidating the meaning and the grammar. In 1620, on the other hand, Erpenius published a revised version of his grammar, the *Rudimenta Linguae Arabicae*, to which he added, as a

24 Ibid., sig. R3^r.

25 Ibid., sig. P2^r: ‘locus ita clarus et perspicuus, ut satis mirari nequeam veteris interpretis lapsus, qui haec vertit *et menstruatae sunt*, cujus quidem significationis nullum prorsus apparet vestigium.’

26 *Alcoran*, ed. Bibliander, p. 77.

27 *The Koran, Commonly called the Alcoran of Mohammed*, transl. G. Sale, London, 1734, p. 191: ‘The old Latin translators have strangely mistaken the sense of the original word *acbarnaho*, which they render *menstruatae sunt*; and then rebuke Mohammed for the indecency, crying out demurely in the margin, *O foedum et obscaenum prophetam!* Erpenius thinks that there is not the least trace of such a meaning in the word; but he is mistaken: for the verb *cabara* in the fourth conjugation, which is here used, has that import, tho’ the subjoining of the pronoun to it here (which possibly the Latin translators did not observe) absolutely overthrows that interpretation.’

28 Al-Ṭabarī, *Jāmi‘ al-bayān ‘an ta’wīl āya al-Qur’ān*, Cairo, 1979, vol. 6, pp. 4528–9. For the knowledge of al-Ṭabarī among early Latin Qur’an translators see T.E. Burman, *Reading the Qur’ān in Latin Christendom, 1140–1560*, Philadelphia, 2007, pp. 36–59.

29 T. Erpenius, *Grammatica Arabica*, Leiden, 1613, pp. 25–6.

linguistic exercise, sura 64 (*al-Taghābun*, 'mutual disillusion') in Arabic with an interlinear Latin translation.³⁰

Sura 64 has the advantage of relative brevity – it is far shorter than the *Sūrat Yūsuf* – and presents few linguistic difficulties. Erpenius's commentary, as in the case of the *Sūrat Yūsuf*, is entirely grammatical, but here he not only analyses every single word in the sura, but he also gives the precise reference (page and line) to that part of his grammar which deals with the construction in question.

• • •

While Erpenius's grammar was widely regarded as unrivalled in Protestant Europe, the Catholics south of the Alps had started to produce grammars of their own. Although the great missionary organization in Rome, the Propaganda Fide, would only be truly established by Pope Gregory xv in 1622, the religious orders had long needed tools with which to instruct their missionaries in eastern languages.³¹ In the first half of the seventeenth century the most important of these were the work of Clerics Regular Minor, also known as the Caracciolini (or Adorno Fathers) – Francesco Martelotto and Filippo Guadagnoli.³² Martelotto's *Institutiones linguae arabicae*, completed by Guadagnoli, was published posthumously in 1620,³³ and in 1642 there appeared Guadagnoli's *Breves Arabicae linguae institutiones*.³⁴ This was one of the very first studies of the Arabic language to include a long section on prosody.³⁵

By the time he compiled his grammar Guadagnoli had acquired an immense reputation. Professor of Arabic and Syriac at the Collegio della Sapienza in Rome, he was an esteemed collaborator of the Propaganda Fide, and had for

30 See Schnurrer, pp. 32–4, no. 55. The differences between the *Grammatica* and the *Rudimenta* are discussed in Jones, 'Learning Arabic', pp. 210–12.

31 See Aurélien Girard's article in this collection which emphasizes the general reluctance of Catholic Arabists to give examples from the Qur'an.

32 For the Orientalists in the Order see G. Pizzorusso, 'Filippo Guadagnoli, i Caracciolini e lo studio delle lingue orientali e della controversia con l'Islam a Roma nel xvii secolo', in *L'Ordine dei Chierici Regolari Minori (Caracciolini): religione e cultura in età posttridentina*, eds I. Fosi and G. Pizzorusso, Casoria, 2010, pp. 245–78.

33 Schnurrer, *Bibliotheca Arabica*, pp. 34–5, no. 56.

34 Schnurrer, *Bibliotheca Arabica*, pp. 47–8, no. 72. The two grammars are analysed by Aurélien Girard, 'Des manuels de langue entre mission et erudition orientaliste au xvii^e siècle: les grammaires de l'arabe des Caracciolini', in *L'Ordine dei Chierici Regolari Minori*, eds Fosi and Pizzorusso, pp. 279–95.

35 See Jan Loop's article in this collection.

years been working on the Arabic translation of the Bible which would finally appear in 1671. He was also appreciated as an anti-Islamic polemicist. His *Apologia pro christiana religione* was published by the Propaganda in 1631 and displayed a sound knowledge of the Qur'an, even if he was misguided by prejudice, ill-informed about Islam, and unreliable in his interpretations (but not in his translations) of the sacred text.³⁶

While he drew for the vocabulary of Arabic poetry in his *Breves arabicae linguae institutiones* on the Arabic monolingual dictionary, the *Qāmūs* (which he borrowed from the Vatican library),³⁷ Guadagnoli derived the rules of Arabic prosody from the thirteenth-century *Qaṣīda al-Khazrajīyya* and a poem by the Egyptian scholar al-Damāmīnī Badraddīn (to whom he refers as Aladinus), who died in 1424.³⁸ Guadagnoli also quoted a number of passages from the Qur'an, in Arabic and with a Latin translation, as examples. His first is 77:1–4 to illustrate a line of seven syllables, and then 53:1–6 to exemplify the so-called *carmen emissum* which is not limited to one particular metre but mingles lines of different syllables.³⁹ A little further on he quotes 77:8–12 as an example of octosyllabic lines.⁴⁰ There follow the quotations of 78:39–40 as an example of the first type of *carmen coniunctum*; of 76:17–18 to exemplify lines of ten and eleven syllables, the penultimate syllable of which is long; and of 78:1–4 to illustrate lines of seven and nine syllables.⁴¹ He also quotes 51:1–4 to illustrate repeated cadences and 55:1–7 as an example of quiescent consonants;⁴² 74:1–7, and 52:1–6 for lines of three, four and five syllables;⁴³ and the same verses in sura 55 again as examples of mixed syllables. Still further on he quotes

36 A. Trentini, 'Il Caracciolino Filippo Guadagnoli controversista e islamologo. Un'analisi dei suoi scritti apologetici contro l'Islam', in *L'Ordine dei Chierici Regolari Minori*, eds Fosi and Pizzorusso, pp. 297–314.

37 Girard, 'Des manuels de langue', pp. 289–90.

38 C. Brockelmann, *Geschichte der arabischen Literatur, Zweite den Supplementbänden angepasste Auflage*, vol. 2, Leiden, 1949, pp. 32–3.

39 F. Guadagnoli, *Breves Arabicae linguae institutiones*, Rome, 1642, p. 292: 'Secunda species, quae dicitur المنسرح *Carmen emissum*, non constat ex una certa mensura, sed ex plurius collectis, prout solent Itali in iis quae vocant *Cantilenas*: seu *Madrigale*. Et modo Versus admittitur septem Syllabarum, modo undecim, modo duodecim, et ut profecto dici posit المنسرح *ad voluntatem emissum quoque*: ut constat per totum fere Alchoranum, Mahumetem Carmina protulisse, prout in buccam caderet [...]'

40 Ibid., p. 293: 'Tertia species quae dicitur الخفيف, constat secundum aliquos ex octo Syllabis, eiusque mensuram faciunt فاعلاتن مستعلن, prout sunt Carmina Alchorani سورۃ المرسلات.'

41 Ibid., p. 296.

42 Ibid., pp. 323–4.

43 Ibid., pp. 337–8

95:1–3 as an example of lines of seven and five syllables, and 78:40 to illustrate lines of seven and nine syllables.⁴⁴

Guadagnoli's close acquaintance with the Qur'an points to the later translation of the entire text by his pupil and colleague Ludovico Marracci. Guadagnoli's short translations, however, have certain independent features. On occasion he supplies alternative translations of certain words. For 77:8–9 he gives 'quando stellae delebuntur, seu obscurabuntur. Et quando caelum scindetur, seu aperietur.'⁴⁵ Elsewhere what seems to be an attempt to translate into verse leads to slight mistranslations. 77:1 is usually taken to mean 'emissary winds, one after the other'. Guadagnoli, on the other hand, gives 'Per demissos crines, seu Nuncios probos' probably to rhyme with the following line 'et procellosos ventos'.⁴⁶

...

Like most German Arabists Matthias Wasmuth, professor of Oriental languages and theology at Kiel, was primarily a Hebraist, but, a former student of Jacobus Golius, Erpenius's successor at Leiden, he too published an Arabic grammar in Amsterdam in 1654.⁴⁷ He ended it with the *fātiḥa*, without any commentary, in Arabic with his own interlinear Latin translation followed by two of the Latin translations in Bibliander's edition, the one by Robert of Ketton and the Mozarabic one.⁴⁸ Then, in 1656, thirty years after Erpenius's death, Golius himself produced a new edition of Erpenius's grammar, *Arabicae linguae tyrocinium. Id est Thomae Erpenii grammatica arabica*, to which he appended a lengthy chrestomathy of his own.⁴⁹ In it Golius introduces Qur'anic texts with a brief essay on the history of the Qur'an, a definition of the terms (*sūra*, *āya*, etc), and speculations about the meanings of the mysterious letters at the beginning of so many of the suras. There follow sura 31, *Luqmān*, and

44 Ibid., pp. 339–40.

45 Ibid., p. 297.

46 Ibid., p. 292.

47 Schnurrer, *Bibliotheca Arabica*, p. 56, no. 80.

48 M. Wasmuth, *Grammatica arabica*, Amsterdam, 1654, p. 79. His translation runs: 'In Nomine DEI miseratoris misericordis. Laus Deo domino creaturarum. Miseratori misericordi, regi diei iudicii. Te colimus et te invocamus. Dirige nos in viam rectam, viam eorum qui gratiosus es erga eos, alienorum ab ira contra eos, et non errantium.' He chose the translation 'lord of the created' rather than 'lord of the worlds'. 'Alienorum ab ira contra eos' makes little sense.

49 Schnurrer, *Bibliotheca Arabica*, pp. 56–7, no. 81. For details see Jan Loop's article in this book.

sura 61, *al-Ṣaff*, 'the ranks'. The very last section of the chrestomathy is solely in Arabic and includes sura 32 of the Qur'an.

In contrast to Erpenius Golius had travelled and lived in the Arab world – first in Morocco and then in Syria – before settling in Leiden where he combined a professorship in mathematics with the professorship in Oriental languages.⁵⁰ As a result of his travels he had managed to create a network of contacts who would supply him with Arabic, Turkish and Persian manuscripts.⁵¹ He consequently had a large collection at his disposal, part of which was his private property and part of which went to the Leiden university library. These included a number of *tafsīr* which entailed an approach to the Qur'an very different from that of Erpenius. Quite apart from illustrating certain linguistic points, the *tafsīr* shed light on how the Qur'an was actually understood by Muslims.

Golius had at his disposal three of the main commentaries. He had bought al-Bayḍāwī's *Anwār al-tanzīl wa-asrār al-ta'wīl*, dating from the thirteenth century, for the Leiden library.⁵² The others, the *Kashshāf* of the twelfth-century Persian Mutazilite al-Zamakhsharī⁵³ and the fifteenth-century *Tafsīr al-Jalālīn*,⁵⁴ were in his private collection. But he also owned a Persian commentary on the Qur'an by the sixteenth-century scholar from Khorasan Ḥusain Wā'iz Kāshifī,⁵⁵ which he exploited thoroughly in his treatment of suras 31 and 61.⁵⁶ His procedure, however, was different in the two cases. In sura 31 he added to his Latin translation, in italics and in Latin, extracts from the Persian

50 A. Vrolijk and R. van Leeuwen, *Arabic Studies in the Netherlands. A Short History in Portraits, 1580–1950*, Leiden and Boston, 2014, pp. 42–8; W.M.C. Juynboll, *Zeventiende-eeuwse Beoefenaars van het Arabisch in Nederland*, Utrecht, 1931, pp. 119–83.

51 J. Schmidt, *The Joys of Philology. Studies in Ottoman Literature, History and Orientalism (1500–1923). Volume 2: Orientalists, Travellers and Merchants in the Ottoman Empire, Political Relations between Europe and the Porte*, Istanbul, 2002, pp. 9–74.

52 LUL, MS Or. 83, Or. 120.

53 *Catalogus... librorum m.ss.quos... Jacobus Golius... collegit*, Leiden 1696, p. 13.

54 Bodl. Oxf., MS Marsh 429.

55 In fact he owned two, one by Wā'iz Kashifī and the other by al-Isfarā'īnī, both of which are now in the Bodl. Oxf., MS Marsh 210 and MS Marsh 168–9. Cf. *Catalogus*, p. 8.

56 *Grammatica Arabicae linguae tyrocinium. Id est Thomae Erpenii grammatica Arabica*, Leiden, 1656, p. 183: 'Praefatione hac defunctus (venia digresso detur) nunc eiusdem Corani promissum exhibebo, cum uberiore explicatione: quam fere κατά πῶδα reddere visum fuit ex Persica paraphrasi, ad nos delata ex Mogolorum regno. Hanc quippe omnium, quas vidisse mihi contigit, maxime perspicuam iudico, et praecipuorum interpretum medullam.'

commentary.⁵⁷ This was a novel technique. Johannes Zechendorff, headmaster of the Latin school in Zwickau, had already published the entire *tafsīr* of al-Bayḏāwī to sura 61 in about 1647,⁵⁸ but it was presented as a *tafsīr* rather than as the Qur'anic text with quotations inserted from another source. Golius's Latin translation of *Luqmān* is printed opposite the Arabic, and the translation is framed by notes which contain references to al-Bayḏāwī and al-Zamakhsharī. Sura 61, on the other hand, has, opposite the Arabic, a Latin translation which does not contain insertions and which is framed by notes referring to al-Jalālain (and to neither al-Bayḏāwī nor al-Zamakhsharī). It is followed by a Latin translation of the entire text of Kashifi's commentary.⁵⁹ The notes to sura 31 are both grammatical⁶⁰ and elucidatory.⁶¹ In some cases Golius provides an equivalent in Hebrew or Aramaic. His references to the *tafsīr* are often the same as those of Marracci – in connection with the person of Luqmān (v.11), for example, where Marracci gives the full text of al-Zamakhsharī.⁶²

Not only was Golius innovative in his manner of inserting quotations from *tafsīr* in the text of his translation, a procedure that would be adopted by Marracci. He was also one of the first western scholars to make use of Persian material. Franciscus Raphelengius had encountered the Judaeo-Persian translation of the Pentateuch by Joseph ben Joseph Tavus when he was working on the Antwerp polyglot Bible in 1584. He subsequently drew up a Persian-Latin lexicon based on it. It was completed by Joseph Justus Scaliger in Leiden, where Raphelengius had been appointed professor of Hebrew. With the Persian transliterated in Hebrew characters, it remained in manuscript.⁶³ Also in Leiden, Louis de Dieu published the first Persian grammar in 1639. For his own Arabic dictionary, which appeared in 1653 and which, like Erpenius's grammar, remained unsurpassed until the nineteenth century, Golius used not only the main monolingual Arabic dictionaries but also Arabic-Turkish and Arabic-

57 Bodl. Oxf., MS Marsh 210, fols 407^v–412^r. For Wā'iz Kashifi see Travis Zadeh, *The Vernacular Qur'an. Translation and the Rise of Persian Exegesis*, Oxford and London, 2012, pp. 573–4.

58 J. Zechendorff, *Unius atque alterius suratae textus*, Zwickau, 1647.

59 Bodl. Oxf., MS Marsh 210, fols 544^v–546^r.

60 *Grammatica Arabicae*, p. 185. To لَكَم in verse 1 we get: 'LHACIMI vel active, pro ALHACIMI, judicantis, quid fas et nefas sit; vel passiv. pro ALMOHCEMI, certi, aut firmi et solidi, ubi nihil desit. Beid. Hos.'

61 Ibid., p. 189. To لَقْمَان in verse 11 he gives: 'Locmān cognomento ALHACIM Sapiens celebrerimi in Oriente nominis est, in primis apud Muhammedicas gentes. De quo pro diversis doctorum sententiis multa narrant Zamachsjaru, Beidaveus et Persicus paraphrastes, alique.'

62 L. Marracci, trans., *Alcorani textus universus*, Padua, 1698, pp. 546–7.

63 J.T.P. de Bruijn, *De ontdekking van het Perzisch*, Leiden, 1990, pp. 5–10.

Persian lexicons.⁶⁴ Golius himself prepared the first serviceable Persian-Latin dictionary. It was published posthumously in London by Edmund Castell in 1669, as an appendix to Castell's own *Lexicon heptaglotton*. By using Persian material in his work on the Qur'an Golius also prepared the way for a plan cherished in the first years of the eighteenth century of producing a polyglot edition of the Qur'an in Arabic, Turkish and Persian. Proposed by Andreas Acoluthus in Breslau, Georg Jacob Kehr in Leipzig,⁶⁵ and Antoine Galland in Paris,⁶⁶ it was never fulfilled.

Erpenius's grammars went through countless editions for the rest of the seventeenth and throughout the eighteenth centuries, and these editions would include his chrestomathy. Occasionally, however, an editor might add something of his own. Leonard Chappelow, professor of Arabic at Cambridge,⁶⁷ produced a new version of the *Rudimenta* in 1730.⁶⁸ He included sura 64 together with Erpenius's Latin translation and his notes, but he followed the Arabic text of the sura with a transliteration of his own indicating the pronunciation. Above the transliterated words he gave the number of the section of the grammar where that particular word or grammatical form was discussed.

In 1771 Erpenius's *Grammatica Arabica* was reissued in a German translation, edited by Johann David Michaelis at the university of Göttingen, widely acclaimed as one of the greatest Orientalists in Germany. Michaelis added the chrestomathy which had been appended to the text by Albert Schultens, and this did not include the Qur'an. Nevertheless Michaelis expatiated on the Qur'an in his long preface, saying that he would always choose it as the best introduction to Arabic for beginners and, somewhat surprisingly, adding how

64 Erpenius had already used the monolingual dictionaries and Arabic-Turkish ones when he prepared a corrective supplement to Franciscus Raphelengius's Arabic-Latin dictionary, first published together with Erpenius's own *Grammatica Arabica* in 1613. See A. Hamilton, "Nam tirones sumus": Franciscus Raphelengius' *Lexicon Arabico-Latinum* [Leiden 1613], in *Ex Officina Plantiniana. Studia in memoriam Christophori Plantini* (ca.1520–1589), ed. M. de Schepper and F. de Nave, Antwerpen, 1989 [= *De Gulden Passer*, 66–67, 1988–1989], pp. 557–89, esp. pp. 581–4.

65 A. Hamilton, "To rescue the honour of the Germans": Qur'an translations by eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century German Protestants', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 77, 2014, pp. 173–209, esp. pp. 178–80.

66 A. Bevilacqua, 'The Qur'an translations of Marracci and Sale', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 76, 2013, pp. 93–130, esp. p. 129.

67 A. Hamilton, 'Chappelow, Leonard', *ODNB*, 2004, vol. 11, pp. 80–81.

68 Schnurrer, *Bibliotheca Arabica*, p. 86, no. 98.

easy it was and that it was no more necessary to read it with the help of a *tafsīr* than to explain the New Testament from the writings of the Church Fathers.⁶⁹

...

Although Erpenius's grammars were unrivalled for so long, and although they were generally regarded as the standard texts for learning Arabic in Northern Europe, other Arabists continued to produce grammars, and these often included suras of the Qur'an in the chrestomathy. One example is the *Nucleus institutionum arabicarum enucleatus, variis linguae ornamentis atque praeceptis dialecti turcicae illustratus* published in Zeitz in 1695 and compiled by the twenty-three-year-old Johann David Schieferdecker.⁷⁰ Schieferdecker, from Weissenfels, had studied in Leipzig and had then lectured there in Oriental languages until he was summoned to the town of his birth in 1698 to teach at the local gymnasium. His work was an Arabic grammar, to which was appended a Turkish one. The Arabic grammar ends with a chrestomathy consisting of the *fātiḥa* followed by ten Arabic adages. While the adages are simply given in Arabic and in Latin translation, the *fātiḥa* is printed first in Arabic, then comes a Latin translation,⁷¹ and finally we have a word by word grammatical analysis.⁷²

Schieferdecker follows Erpenius's *Rudimenta* in providing the page in the grammar in which the various forms that appear in the sura are treated. But, although he added his Turkish grammar to his Arabic one, he treats Arabic as a language to be studied in conjunction with Hebrew, Aramaic and Syriac. He endeavours to give the Hebrew, Aramaic or Syriac equivalent of all the words in the *fātiḥa*, thereby exemplifying a tendency typical of Arabic teachers at German universities where pride of place was invariably given to Hebrew stud-

69 *Erpenii Arabische Grammatik, abgekürzt, vollständiger und leichter gemacht, von Johann David Michaelis nebst den Anfang einer Arabischen Chrestomathie, aus Schultens Anhang zur Erpenischen Grammatik*, Göttingen, 1771, pp. x–xiv. For Michaelis's attitude to the Qur'an and his contempt for *tafsīr* see Hamilton, "To rescue the honour of the Germans", pp. 201–02.

70 Schnurrer, p. 60, no. 86.

71 J.D. Schieferdecker, *Nucleus institutionum arabicarum enucleatus, variis linguae ornamentis atque praeceptis dialecti turcicae illustratus*, Zeitz, 1695, pp. 178–9: 'Laus Deo, domino creaturarum; miseratori misericordi; Regi diei iudicii. Te, o Deus, colimus, et te adoramus. Dirige nos in viam rectam, viam nempe eorum, erga quos gratus es, erga quos non iratus es, et in viam non errantium.

72 *Ibid.*, pp. 176–86.

ies. Arabic was treated as ancillary and its study suffered accordingly.⁷³ But there is one exception to Schieffermaker's painstaking and exclusively grammatical analysis: when he comes to the last two verses he recommends the French translation by André Du Ryer⁷⁴ which had first appeared in 1647 and had been treated somewhat dismissively by scholars.⁷⁵

• • •

Anybody who introduced a sample translation of the Qur'an into a chrestomathy after 1698 had to reckon with a landmark in the history of Qur'an translations, for it was in that year that the Italian Arabist Ludovico Marracci at last published his bilingual (Latin and Arabic) edition of the whole of the Qur'an in Padua.⁷⁶ A preliminary volume, the *Prodromus*, had already appeared, published in Rome by the Propaganda Fide, in 1691. There Marracci had displayed a wealth of sources with which no scholar in Northern Europe could possibly compete. Thanks largely to the missionaries and the Maronites, the various Roman libraries contained a variety of *tafsīr* to be found nowhere north of the Alps. For Protestant scholars, particularly Lutherans who had developed a somewhat proprietorial attitude to the translation of the Qur'an ever since Luther's involvement in the publication of the Latin translation in Basel in 1543,⁷⁷ Marracci's version was regarded on the one hand as by far the most reliable to date and one to which scholars could help themselves, and on the other as a challenge, stimulating scholars to do better.

73 J. Fück, *Die Arabischen Studien in Europa bis in den Anfang des 20. Jahrhunderts*, Leipzig, 1955, pp. 90–97; A. Ben-Tov, 'Studia orientalia im Umfeld protestantischer Universitäten des Alten Reichs um 1700', *Zeitsprünge: Forschungen zur Frühen Neuzeit*, 16, 2012, pp. 92–118; Hamilton, "To rescue the honour of the Germans", pp. 174–208.

74 Ibid., p. 186. Du Ryer's translation quoted by Schiefferdecker runs: 'Conduy nous au droit chemin; au chemin de ceux que tu as gratifié, contre lesquels tu n'as pas esté courroucé.'

75 A. Hamilton and F. Richard, *André Du Ryer and Oriental Studies in Seventeenth-Century France*, London and Oxford, 2004, pp. 104–08.

76 Marracci's sources were listed and discussed by C.A. Nallino, 'Le fonti arabe manoscritte dell'opera di Ludovico Marracci sul Corano', in his *Raccolta di scritti e inediti*, 6 vols, Rome 1939–48, vol. 2, pp. 90–134. See now, however, R.F. Gleis and R. Tottoli, *Ludovico Marracci at Work. The Evolution of his Latin Translation of the Qur'an in the Light of his Newly Discovered Manuscripts, with an Edition and a Comparative Linguistic Analysis of Sura 18*, Wiesbaden, 2016.

77 Hamilton, "To rescue the honour of the Germans", p. 180; id., 'A Lutheran translator for the Quran. A late seventeenth-century quest', in *The Republic of Letters and the Levant*, eds A. Hamilton, M.H. van den Boogert and B. Westerweel, Leiden, 2005, pp. 197–221.

An example of the first case is the twenty-three-year-old Johann Gottfried Lakemacher, professor of Oriental languages at Helmstedt,⁷⁸ who, in 1718, issued his *Elementa linguae arabicae*,⁷⁹ a brief and superficial work which could in no way hope to compete with Erpenius even if it was given to students of Arabic at Halle together with the grammar by Johann Christian Clodius.⁸⁰ The chrestomathy at the end consists of the Arabic version of the first chapter of Genesis taken from the London Polyglot Bible and the second chapter of Matthew's Gospel. In each case the Arabic has an interlinear Latin transliteration followed by a Latin translation. There then comes sura 15 of the Qur'an, *al-Ḥijr*, with an interlinear Latin translation (but no transliteration). The grammar ends with a short grammatical analysis of Genesis 1, but not of any other of the texts. Lakemacher's translation of sura 15 is striking for the omission of the mysterious letters (aliph, lam, re) in the first verse. He jumps straight to the second and gives a translation which is almost identical to that of Marracci including Marracci's insertions of the *tafsīr* of al-Jalālāin in the Latin text.

If Lakemacher used Marracci's version of the Qur'an as a convenient translation, Emo Lucius Vriemoet saw it as a challenge. Professor of Oriental languages at the university of Franeker, Vriemoet, from Emden, had been deeply influenced by Adriaen Reland and Frans Burman when he was studying at Utrecht, and he owed his reputation to his work on Jewish antiquity.⁸¹ Although the majority of his writings are in the field of Hebrew studies, in 1733 he produced his own Arabic grammar, *Arabismus; Exhibens Grammaticam Arabicam Novam, et Monumenta quaedam Arabica, cum notis miscellaneis et glossario arabico-latino. In usum studiosae iuventutis, omniumque qui vel proprio Marte in hisce studiis se exercere cupiunt*.⁸² The *monumenta* included a section from Pococke's edition of Abū l-Faraj, a Muslim confession of faith, a polemical tract the manuscript of which was in the Utrecht library, parts of the Old and New Testaments, a *maqāma* of al-Ḥarīrī, various poems, and five suras from the Qur'an – 32, 67, 86, 75 and 90. Suras 86 and 90 are solely in Arabic, while the others have a Latin translation on the opposite page. The chrestomathy ends with a detailed commentary of all the suras (including 86 and 90), but not of any of the other material.

78 *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, vol. 17, pp. 528–9.

79 Schnurrer, *Bibliotheca Arabica*, p. 61, no. 89.

80 F.E. Boysen, *Eigene Lebensbeschreibung*, 2 vols, Quedlinburg, 1795, vol. 1, p. 122.

81 J. Nat, *De studie van de oostersche talen in Nederland in de 18e en de 19e eeuw*, Purmerend, 1929, pp. 112–13.

82 Schnurrer, *Bibliotheca Arabica*, pp. 69–70, no. 101.

In his notes Vriemoet exhibits a vast learning and a close acquaintance with rabbinic texts. All his quotations from the *tafsīr* of al-Jalālāin are to be found in Marracci, and we can only conclude that he did not have a copy of the *tafsīr* of his own. He tries to argue with Marracci, but the only point on which he can be said to have won is the idea that the Muslims believed in a plurality of worlds. This, as we saw, had already been raised by Erpenius, who had pointed out that *al-‘ālamīn* referred to ‘creatures’ rather than to ‘worlds’. Marracci, on the other hand, together with a number of earlier interpreters, assumed that the reference was to more than one world.⁸³ This was challenged at some length, but with no reference to Erpenius, by Reland in the second edition of his *De religione mohammedica*,⁸⁴ which Vriemoet duly cited.⁸⁵ Elsewhere, however, Vriemoet’s criticisms are less felicitous. By and large his translation is close to that of Marracci and, like the later eighteenth-century German translators of the entire Qur’an, David Friedrich Megerlin and Friedrich Eberhard Boysen,⁸⁶ when he deviates from Marracci he does so at his peril. He claims, for example, that Marracci was wrong in translating *al-najm al-nāqib* (86:4) as *stella penetrans*, ‘the penetrating star’ rather than ‘ardent or burning star’.⁸⁷ Marracci’s translation would be accepted to this day. Similarly he criticizes Marracci for translating 86:11, *‘alā raġ’ihī la-qādirun*, as ‘resurrecting the body’ rather than as ‘resurrecting the soul’.⁸⁸ Marracci, however, has again been proved right by later translators. And finally there is Vriemoet’s translation of 32:20.⁸⁹ He translated the verse as ‘At vero, qui probi sunt, habitaculum eorum erit ignis’, that ‘the good will go to hell’, whereas the Arabic *alladhīna fasaqū* obviously means ‘the wicked’.

• • •

Together with Golius and Erpenius, Vriemoet was one of the few compilers of a chrestomathy which included learned notes to the Qur’anic texts chosen. The Qur’an, certainly, continued to be used by a number of authors of

83 *Alcorani textus universus*, transl. Marracci, pp. 2–3.

84 A. Reland, *De religione mohammedica libri duo*, Utrecht, 1717, pp. 262–8.

85 E.L. Vriemoet, *Arabismus; Exhibens Grammaticam Arabicam Novam, et Monumenta quaedam Arabica, cum notis miscellaneis et glossario arabico-latino. In usum studiosae iuventutis, omniumque qui vel proprio Marte in hisce studiis se exercere cupiunt*, Franeker, 1733, pp. 176, 185.

86 Hamilton, “To rescue the honour of the Germans”, pp. 185–6, 200–02.

87 Vriemoet, *Arabismus*, p. 172.

88 *Ibid.*, p. 173.

89 *Ibid.*, p. 95.

chrestomathies, but usually without any commentary. In 1776 Johann Wilhelm Friedrich von Hezel, who was twenty-two years old and had just finished his studies at Jena, and who would end his career as professor of theology at Dorpat, published his *Erleichterte arabische Grammatik, nebst einer kurzen arabischen Chrestomathie*.⁹⁰ First published in Jena, it would be reissued posthumously in Leipzig in 1825, the year after Hezel's death, but without the glossary that had been added to the chrestomathy in the original edition. The chrestomathy contained verses 1 to 20 of the second sura of the Qur'an and the entire text of suras 57 and 114, but solely in Arabic, without any commentary or translation. In 1798 (year 6 of the French Republican Calendar), Jean-Joseph Marcel, who had followed Napoleon to Egypt, published in Alexandria his *Exercices de lecture d'arabe littéral, à l'usage de ceux qui commencent l'étude de cette langue*.⁹¹ The work consists of five suras of the Qur'an, 1, 97, 109, 110 and 112. Each line of the Arabic has directly below it a transliteration, and below that a literal French translation. At the end of each sura there is a more fluent version of the translation. But there is no commentary.

The use of the Qur'an for linguistic exercises continued well beyond our period. In early modern Europe, however, it is of particular interest since it allows us to assess not only the degree of interest in the text, but also the various stages in translating it and the more general progress of Oriental studies. From a purely grammatical approach such as that of Erpenius, we see a marked advance with Golius, who drew on the *tafsīr* in order to add interpretations and who also introduced Persian material. Filippo Guadagnoli brings us into the world of Marracci – of the missionaries, the participants in the Arabic translation of the Bible, and the staff and consultants of the Propaganda Fide. By treating the Qur'an as poetry he foreshadowed developments in the eighteenth century and later.⁹² The German grammars of the eighteenth century demonstrate both the overpowering influence of Marracci's translation of the Qur'an, which would last well into the nineteenth century, and the predominance of Hebrew studies in the German academies which would in fact inhibit progress in Arabic. By the late eighteenth century, however, as more and more versions of the entire text of the Qur'an appeared in the European vernaculars, chrestomathies ceased to play a significant part in the actual history of Qur'an translations

90 Schnurrer, *Bibliotheca Arabica*, p. 82, no. 116.

91 Schnurrer, *Bibliotheca Arabica*, p. 96, no. 140.

92 J. Loop, 'Divine Poetry? Early modern European Orientalists on the Beauty of the Koran', *Church History and Religious Culture*, 89, 2009, pp. 455–88; Hamilton, "'To rescue the honour of the Germans'", pp. 189–91, 195–8, 204–09.