



# Riccoldo da Monte di Croce's *Libellus ad nationes orientales*

Introduction

by Kurt Villads Jensen, [kvj@hist.sdu.dk](mailto:kvj@hist.sdu.dk)

spring 1998

I Introductory remarks

II Riccoldo: a brief biography

III Riccoldo's works

IV *Libellus ad nationes orientales*

a) Dating of text

b) Content and division of text

1) prohemium

2) on the Nestorians and the Jacobites

3) on the Jews

4) on the Muslims

5) on the Mongols

6) general rules for missionaries

- c) Scope of the text
- d) Manuscripts
- e) Orthography

## I Introductory Remarks

The Florentine Dominican Riccoldo da Monte di Croce still deserves to be better known. So the learned scholar A. Dondaine wrote in 1967 and he added "although he is not among the first ranging personages." Dondaine repeated, without referring explicitly to him, the judgement expressed by one of the greatest modern Dominican historians, R.P. Mandonnet, in an article from 1893 on the life and works of Riccoldo.

Since the time of Mandonnet and Dondaine, our knowledge of Riccoldo, his life, and his different works has been very much expanded because of the studies and editions made by J.-M. Mérioux, E. Panella, and others. Much of the fundamental work has now been done to establish a chronology and to identify the sources that Riccoldo depended upon, and it has even been possible from meticulously conducted manuscript studies to give a much more soundly based characterization of Riccoldo's personality and exegetical methods than before.

The present study is an attempt to make more material on Riccoldo available by providing an edition of his missionary manual, the *Libellus ad nationes orientales* of which only a minor part has been published before by Dondaine. The present commentary upon the edition and the analysis of it attempt to supplement the common picture of Riccoldo, not to change it fundamentally. The only thing here that is new is, as far as I know, the claim that Riccoldo in his

description of the Eastern Christians was very unoriginal and totally depended upon the work of St. Thomas Aquinas.

This is, however, an important point because it provides us with yet another example of how Riccoldo actually worked and therefore another facet of his personality. It thus gives us a glimpse of a medieval, scholarly mentality. The history of mentalities has since the late 1960s focussed upon the presuppositions, the ideals, and the categorizations of medieval people but it is extremely rare to be able to actually link such concepts to individuals. Few have left so much written material to posterity that their understanding of those concepts and the change that these concepts underwent through the life of the individual can be followed.

One rare exception to this is the different versions of Fulcher of Chartres' chronicle of the First Crusade which has recently been compared by Verena Epp who has shown a clear change in attitudes through the life of Fulcher. She has thereby provided a much more detailed and dynamic picture of a person from the Middle Ages than it is usually possible. The same has been done with Riccoldo and could be done so in even more details. The aim of this article is to provide a basis for such studies.

This article has been published electronically as a web-document for the simple reason that it includes an edition of a complicated and long text which I hope will be commented upon, so that comments and suggestions might be included in a possible later printed edition. Riccoldo seems to have been a very impatient person to judge from his rash and often un-systematical manuscript corrections. He might therefore, if he had had the possibility, have refused to use computers which always fail at critical moments for some obscure technical

reason. On the other hand, he was clearly also open-minded towards new ways of thinking and he used the most modern universitarian discussion techniques of his time, so he might perhaps have been attracted by the possibility of electronic publishing and not affronted by the fact that his treatise on the nations of the East has taken the step directly from parchment to web.

## II Riccoldo: a brief biography

Riccoldo died the 31. October 1320 in the Dominican convent of Santa Maria Novella in Florence. He was called away from the present misery to everlasting glory on All Saints evening after having spent 53 years and five months within the Order of St. Dominique, and after having been prior and subprior of Santa Maria Novella. So tells the necrologium which also gives a short presentation of Riccoldo and his life: He was well educated and a lecturer in several convents. He had been an ardent preacher and more than usually well liked by the people. He had been a missionary to the Middle East and lived in Baghdad for at longer period where he learned Arabic so well that he could preach the word of God in that language. Eventually, he returned to Italy to clarify some dubious points at the Apostolic See. He had intended, however, to return to the Middle East for which reason he had let his beard grow, but weakness prevented him from working any further among the Oriental peoples and kept him to his convent for the rest of his life. <sup>(1)</sup>

Riccoldo must then have entered the Dominican order in 1267. It is very probable that he had then already finished his education in the liberal arts, <sup>(2)</sup> and he functioned as lecturer in some of the Italian convents already in the 1270s. In 1288, he got permission from the order's general master to undertake a pilgrimage to the Holy Land and

to preach to Muslims and Mongols. He must have been accredited with important ecclesiastical privileges as he -- according to his own relation of the pilgrimage -- received letters from the Jacobite patriarch acknowledging theological definitions of the Roman church. (3)

Having visited the holy shrines in Palestine, Riccoldo continued through Syria and Armenia to Baghdad, where he was when the news of the fall of Acre in 1291 reached the city together with the great number of Christian captives who were to be sold on the slave market in Baghdad. Later, Riccoldo had to flee the city and travelled around disguised as a Muslim camel driver. This might have happened in or after 1294 when the Mongol ruler Ghazan khan converted to Islam and began persecuting Christians. Riccoldo was called back to Italy at some time before 1301, when he occurs as witness in a Florentine document. (4)

### III Riccoldo's works

*Contra legem saracenorum*, of which the original version was first edited in 1986, (5) is Riccoldo's opus majus both in regard of its size and of the many extant manuscripts. It contains an elaborated refutation of Islam divided into seventeen chapters which are mainly concerned with the content of the Quran and claim that it is e.g. contradictory, not confirmed by miracles, irrational, and violent. The whole work is very much dependent upon an earlier, Spanish polemical work, the *Contrarietas alpholica*. In his *Libellus ad nationes orientales*, Riccoldo does not treat Muslims but simply refers to *Contra legem saracenorum*.

Riccoldo's refutation of Islam had an enormous influence on Medieval

and Renaissance attitudes to Islam. It was thoroughly studied by Nicolaus of Cues and used in his *Cribratio alcorani*.<sup>(6)</sup> In 1542 a German translation by Martin Luther was printed and later came in more reprints. In 1543 a Latin translation of an earlier Greek translation was published together with the twelfth century translation into Latin of the Quran.<sup>(7)</sup> Riccoldo's work became one of the most influential in shaping Western attitude to Islam, and it was widely circulated in the whole of Western Europe.

This was certainly not the case with his beautiful *Littere: Letters to God and Jesus, to the Holy Virgin, to the angels and saints in Heaven, and to the patriarch of Jerusalem, the Dominican martyr of Acre, Nicolaus*. In these letter, Riccoldo describes the missionary's doubts and contestations confronted with the Muslims' military success. Their Latin text is known from one manuscript only which is now in a deplorable state and very difficult to read.<sup>(8)</sup> The first of these letters was re-edited in 1989 based on the Latin manuscript and a fourteenth-century Italian translation.<sup>(9)</sup>

Riccoldo's *Liber peregrinationis* describes his pilgrimage to the Holy Land and the sites he visited there, and it is followed by a description of the peoples of the Middle East, their faith and customs. Riccoldo wrote about Turks, Mongols, Kurds, Jews, Jacobites, Nestorians, and he gave the first known description of the Sabeans. But the largest section of his *Liber peregrinationis* was devoted to a description of Muslims -- whom Riccoldo apparently came to appreciate as individuals -- and a refutation of Islam and the Quran. This last part of the work makes it certain that *Liber peregrinationis* is earlier than *Contra legem saracenorum*; whether it is written in the Middle East or back in Italy is difficult to say but the final revision of the text was most probably done in Florence.<sup>(10)</sup> The *Liber peregrinationis* was edited in 1864 from secondary and incomplete manuscripts and now

awaits a modern critical edition.<sup>(11)</sup>

Another work by Riccoldo, his *Super peryhermenias* with a commentary on Aristotle must be an earlier work probably written while Riccoldo was still lecturing in Italy. It was first mentioned in 1933 by Stosic but was not generally known to the scholarly Western world before Kaeppli referred to it in 1980. No thorough study of it has appeared yet, as far as I know.

Riccoldo's *Libellus ad nationes orientales* is the subject of this article, which to a very large extent is indebted to the results of these modern edition.

#### IV *Libellus ad nationes orientales*

##### a) Dating of text

In his refutation of the Jews, Riccoldo noted in four places that it was now thirteen hundred years since Christ came to earth.<sup>(12)</sup> If we believe it to be an exact reference, the *Libellus ad nationes orientales* was written in the year 1300 as E. Panella suggests.<sup>(13)</sup> This seems to be confirmed by the marginal note that Riccoldo added to a copy of the manuscript, writing that he was awaiting a papal decision about whether Jacobites and Nestorians in the Orient were heretics. If he was called back to Italy to declare some dubious point -- as the necrologium states -- and if these points related to his own definition of heretics, this note must have been added shortly after Riccoldo's return to Italy. We know that he was in Florence 21. March 1301, at which date he witnessed a document.<sup>(14)</sup> This could indicate that 1300 was the year of the redaction of *Libellus ad nationes orientales*. On the other hand, Riccoldo's return might have taken place much earlier than

1300 without it having left any marks in the sources.

What is more remarkable is, however, that *Libellus ad nationes orientales* must be later than *Contra legem saracenorum* to which it refers; and *Contra legem saracenorum* must be later than *Liber peregrinationis*, because the refutation of Islam in the latter work differs much from that of the former and is clearly much less dependent upon other written sources. If they are all written in Italy, Riccoldo has written three fairly long books in a very short time when he was waiting for the papal decision. It is, admittedly, possible to imagine that he wrote *Liber peregrinationis* in the Middle East, but the *Contra legem saracenorum* must have been composed in a library with access to Christian literature. It must have been written in Italy. So one of the most influential works in European culture was created in a very short time by an author who was probably under stress because of the accusation that had been raised against him.

#### IV b) Content and division of Text

*Libellus ad nationes orientales* consists of three distinct sections, the first containing a description of Nestorians and Jacobites; the second about Jews; and the third and shortest gives a picture of Mongols and their beliefs. These three chapters are introduced by a prohemium; and as a conclusion or an appendix is added five "General rules" for missionaries. Riccoldo claims in his introduction that he will also write about Muslims, but when it actually comes to them he only refers to his *Contra legem saracenorum*.

In order to facilitate references to the text, this edition has been supplemented with numbers. The five main chapters, Prohemium, Eastern Christians, Jews, Mongols, and Five rules, are counted I, II, ... V. The short reference to Riccoldo's *Contra legem saracenorum* has

not been counted as a separate chapter but added to that on Jews as III,184.

Within the chapters each paragraph is designated a number 1), 2), etc. This division into paragraphs follows to a very large extent that of the manuscript, although with a few exceptions which have not been referred to in the apparatus.

#### IV b) 1) *Prohemium*

"The harvest truly is great, but the labourers are few: pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that he would send forth labourers into his harvest" [Luke 10,2]. Such opens the missionary manual of Riccoldo, and he continues with a short discussion of the want of labourers that will go on mission because all seem to seek only what is their own in spite of the great need for working on the Lord's field, as the world is set in evil, especially the Eastern part of it.

Riccoldo then distinguishes between different kind of sinners according to how far they are from us. The Eastern Christians are closest, because they acknowledge both the Old and the New Testament. Jews are a little further from us as they have only the Old Testament. Even further apart from us are the Saracens because they have only a devilish and dangerous law, although it contains some usable things. The greatest distance is between us and the Mongols and Pagans who have no written law, no temple, and no spiritual life. But when it comes to conversion, Riccoldo remarks, the opposite is actually the case: Mongols are, experience proves, the easiest to convert while the Eastern Christians are the most difficult.

The intention with the work, the prologue ends, is to enable other brethren, who wish to go to the East, to lead the peoples back to truth by giving to the brethren a description of each people specifying in what they err and how they can be refuted.

#### IV b) 2) on the Nestorians and the Jacobites

The second chapter describes the beliefs of Nestorians and Jacobites. By far the largest part of the 103 paragraphs are devoted to a discussion of the divinity of Christ, in which the erroneous views of the Eastern Christians are exposed and refuted. This part of *Libellus ad nationes orientales* has been emphasised to substantiate the claim that Riccoldo had a remarkable knowledge of Scripture,<sup>(15)</sup> or it has been described as the formally educated logicians attempt to present in an orderly fashion his personal experience of Eastern Christians.<sup>(16)</sup> But this chapter on Eastern Christians is actually an almost verbatim copying or a close paraphrasing of St. Thomas Aquinas' *Summa Contra Gentiles*, lib. IV, c. 34-36 and 49. The words in themselves in this part of chapter II reveals absolutely nothing about Riccoldo's own missionary efforts among Eastern Christians or his experience with them.

These paragraphs will be included in this present edition, although it comes very close to publishing just another edition of a Thomas Aquinas text. They will be so in order to present the content of ADNO so close as possible to what its author Riccoldo intended it to be.

#### Use of Thomas Aquinas

Riccoldo follows the text of St Thomas closely with some changes of

the order of argumentation and with some abbreviations. A few examples are the following:

II,85-93 is a quotation or paraphrasing of *Summa contra gentiles* lib. IV, cap. 36; but the last argument of Thomas Aquinas is presented by Riccoldo as the first.

Some conclusions of arguments are only rendered as «ergo idem quod prius», as for example in II,11 and II,12, instead for St Thomas' *Ipsa igitur est persona et hypostasis illius hominis, quae est persona et hypostasis Verbi Deior Oportet igitur personam et hypostasim illius hominis loquentis esse personam et hypostasim Verbi Dei.*

Sometimes the conclusion is omitted if it has already been expressed in the preceding clause, as in II, 13, where Thomas adds *Oportet igitur esse eandem hypostasim Dei Verbi et illius hominis.*

Omissions and abbreviations are common in the quotations. In the following examples, the words in italics are omitted by Riccoldo:  
 II,17: Adhuc, uerbum Dei dicitur Dei Filius per naturam, homo *autem, propter inhabitationem Dei, Dicitur Dei filius* per gratiam adoptionis.  
 II,18: corpus illius esse corpus Filii Dei *naturalis, id est Verbi Dei.*  
 II,20: filio adoptiuo instead of *homine illo qui est filius adoptionis.*  
 II,20: ut sit factus ex muliere, *sed ita quod Dei filius qui est factus ex muliere* et sub lege ad hoc sit missus. Between II,32 and II,33, one longer paragraph from Thomas Aquinas is omitted. Between II,49 and II,50, four arguments are omitted. Between II,52 and 53, two arguments are omitted. From II,58 to II,59, four arguments are omitted.

There is a number of minor textual changes which shows that

Riccoldo deliberately worked with the text and not only copied slavishly. Examples are II, 17: "nec iterum Christus erit unus filius, immo erunt duo filii, unus naturalis et alius adoptivus." instead of *quod secundum proprietatem nativitatis, singulariter a Patre genitum est.* II,50: "et in Christo. Sed non constituunt personam et ypostasim et suppositum uerbi, que est eterna. Ergo aliud, igitur humana." instead of: *et in Christo ex unione anime et corporis constituitur suppositum, hypostasis et persona. Non autem suppositum, hypostasis et persona Dei Verbi, quae est aeterna. Igitur in Christo est aliud suppositum, hypostasis et persona, praeter suppositum, hypostasim et personam Dei Verbi, ut videtur.* The two short paragraphs II,73-74 substitute three longer arguments by Thomas Aquinas. In II,92, one whole argument in TA is reduced to a single reference to Scripture.

One reference to Boethius in II,82 is probably taken from Thomas Aquinas *Summa Contra Gentiles* lib. 4, c. 38, although it is not verbatim. It differs much in choice of phrases from the actual text of Boethius.

Apart from the *Summa Contra Gentiles*, Riccoldo makes use of Thomas Aquinas' Sentence commentary, to which he explicitly refers twice, in II,17 and II,63.

### The part of the second chapter that is not taken from Thomas Aquinas

The paragraphs II,35-39 might be influenced by Riccoldo's work with the chapter against Jews as they are based on the same scriptural evidence.

II,43 argues from the Syriac and arabic words for persona and

suppositum, *acnum* and *sciax*. This argument is expressed in more length in Riccoldo's *Liber peregrinationis* f. 14ua-14ub, but the substance of the argument is the same in both texts. In *Libellus ad nationes orientales*, Riccoldo refers explicitly to Heb. 1, which he does not in *Liber peregrinationis*. This argument might well be Riccoldo's own and formed during his stay amongst Nestorians and Jacobites in the Middle East.

II,66 sums up, that Jacobites believe there is in Christ «una natura, una uoluntas, una operatio, scilicet diuina». The same is expressed in *Liber peregrinationis* 12rb and 13ra and represents common knowledge among thirteenth-century Latins.

II,97 (that Nestorians and Jacobites divorce their wives and take others) and II,99 (that they do not confess) are also found in *Liber peregrinationis* 13ub and 12ua respectively and are probably to be understood as genuine Riccoldian observations. In neither of these cases are there any verbal congruence to indicate that *Libellus ad nationes orientales* was composed directly on the basis of LP.

### Scope of the second chapter

The second chapter is a long refutation of the view of Nestorians and Jacobites on incarnation and especially their view on the nature of Jesus. It consists almost exclusively of material drawn from the writing of Thomas Aquinas although this fact is nowhere revealed by Riccoldo himself. This is a surprise to a modern reader, especially viewed on the background of the possibilities of getting acquainted with Eastern Christians' views, that Riccoldo must have had during his years in the Middle East. Two explanations could be suggested to explain this discrepancy from what would be expected.

The first is the obvious that Riccoldo deemed Thomas Aquinas' words better suited for expressing the theological differences between Latins and Eastern Christians than his own would have been. This is understandable because of the great esteem, Saint Thomas was held in by his fellow Dominicans.

A second might be proposed although it can hardly ever be convincingly verified. According to the necrologium of Santa Maria Novella, Riccoldo returned to Italy from his stay in the Middle East "pro quibusdam dubiis articulis per sedem apostolicam declarandis." (17). Riccoldo's dubious views on some articles of faith might well have been his understanding of the Eastern schismatic as heretics. (18). In *Liber peregrinationis* (f. 12rb), Jacobites are designated unqualified as heretics, as are later the Nestorians (f. 14rb). In *Libellus ad nationes orientales*, Riccoldo found it necessary to explain in a marginal note, that when he used the term heretics, it was to be understood "opinative, et non certitudinaliter. Nondum enim definitum est per papam, utrum sint heretici illi iacobini et nestorini ..." (I,6). *Libellus ad nationes orientales* was then written while Riccoldo awaited a papal decision whether his opinions about Jacobites and Nestorians were acceptable or not. He might therefore cautiously have chosen merely to repeat a text whose content concerning schismatics could not be disputed, namely the chapters from Thomas Aquinas' *Summa Contra Gentiles*.

#### IV b) 3) on the Jews

The chapter "On the Jews and in how they differ from us" refutes in 183 paragraphs two Jewish positions: That Christ has not come yet;

and that he was not God or son of God. This is sought proved by reference to the prophesy of Jacob in Genesis (49,10), that the sceptre shall not depart from Judah until the Messiah comes, [\(19\)](#) but the Jews have no longer any ruler so Messiah must have come. It is sought proved by calculating the seventy weeks in Daniel's prophesy (9,23-24) that is given the Jews to repent, so that the time from Daniel to Jesus lasted exactly seventy weeks. And it is sought proved by a long range of references to Christological passages in the Holy Scripture. In between are given different answers and objections from the Jewish side which is then again refuted.

Riccoldo also asks the question why Jews will not accept Christ when his coming is manifestly foretold in the Old Testament. The main reason is that they are blinded so that they can not see truth; the Scriptural evidence for this is Isaiah 6,10.

A second reason for the lack of success in converting Jews is that they are difficult to argue with because of different translations of the Old Testament. Riccoldo refers to differences between the Hebrew, the Greek, and the Latin version and opts for the necessity of learning Hebrew. In spite of his discussions of Hebrew terms, it is difficult to ascertain the extent of Riccoldo's knowledge of Hebrew. Much of the argumentation can be derived from Riccoldo's sources; on the other hand it seems certain that he had learned himself Arabic while he was in the Middle East and he might therefore fairly easily have picked up some Hebrew also.

## Sources

Riccoldo relied very much on the *Capistrum Iudaeorum*, written c. 1267 by his fellow Dominican, the Spaniard Raymundus Martin, to

which he explicitly refers. The themes in Riccoldo's exposition are the same as in the much larger work by Raymundus, but the use of Raymundus is far from being a simple and unreflected copying. In many instances, Riccoldo incorporates other sources, and in some he expresses views that are not found in or even directly opposite to those of Raymundus.

III,27 and 31 (and some other places) refers to *alia littera*, i.e. to the Septuaginta, in connections where it does not seem to have been used or referred to by Raymundus, nor is it taken from the *Glossa ordinaria*. Riccoldo might have taken his references to different translations found in LXX from either Petrus Comestors *Historia Scolastica* (in which LXX is designated *alia translatio*) or from St. Augustin's *De civitate Dei*, but it has not been possible to trace the exact background for each reference.

The Septuaginta-translation of Is. 7,9, which Riccoldo referred to in III,27, was used and discussed by Jerome in his commentary on Isaiah, and it was used without referring to LXX by Gregory in his commentary on Job, [\(20\)](#) but it is uncertain whether Riccoldo actually used these works for this specific reference.

Riccoldo incorporated views, arguments, and paraphrases from also Augustin's *De civitate Dei*; Jerome's *Prologus in Pentateucho*, his *Prologus in Daniel*, and his *Commentariorum in Matheum*; from Gregory the Great's *Moralia in Iob*; and from Peter Comestor's *Historia Scolastica*.

Riccoldo refers to the *Glossa* a few places. One is to the *Glossa ordinaria* and is quoted from Raymundus Martin (III,7, slightly changed; and III,51). The others (III,35; III,63; III,149) are spurious

and have been impossible to trace. One of these (III,149) to Gal. 3,13 is quoted by Riccoldo as "Plus est, quam si dixisset maledictus," while the *Glossa ordinaria* actually has the opposite formulation: "Factus: Id est reputatus, non solum maledictus, sed etiam maledictum. Vel factus est rei veritate Maledictus, id est mortalis," *Glossa Ordinaria* IV p. 360.

### Scope of chapter on Jews

The chapter on Jews is based on a number of *auctoritates* from the classical Jerome and Augustine to the hyper-modern Raymundus, but they are very independently put together and used by Riccoldo. He has created a polemic work in the *anti-iudeos* tradition which presents meticulously the most important arguments of the genre, but which is still much more concentrated and usable in practise than the voluminous writings of Raymundus Martini. Riccoldo's work also reflects the thirteenth century's preoccupation with Biblical philology and the language training in Dominican convents although it is impossible to say if Riccoldo mastered any Hebrew himself. Riccoldo was convinced that the Jews had crucified Christ knowing what they did and that the diaspora was the punishment for that, but this question only occupies a minor part of the chapter. Riccoldo seems to have been more interested in theology than in guilt and punishment; and his polemical work against Jews is less aggressive and less harsh than that of many of his contemporaries.

### IV b) 4) on the Muslims

On the Muslims, Riccoldo simply wrote that "I will add nothing to what I wrote in the treatise entitled "Quot sunt dies servi tui" wherein their law is refuted by the law itself" (III,184).

## IV b) 5) on the Mongols

The "Tartars" seem to be further away from salvation than any other people because they have no religious law except the law of nature, which even has corrupted among them because of their bad habits. Riccoldo does not specify what these bad habits consist in, but he gives in the only seven paragraphs concerning Mongols a few of the most important observations he made on his travelling the Middle East and which he had elaborated much more in the *Liber peregrinationis* from which these remarks are clearly taken. Mongols do not have houses, temples, priests, any spiritual life. They have no affection for any particular place, they do not tilt the earth, etc. Many are already converted to Islam. The greatest impediment to their salvation is, however, some holy men in India who the Mongols hold in very high esteem. They should be refuted first by missionaries. And missionaries should attempt to convert first the wealthy and nobles, for "plebei et populares" will not convert except for a sum of money -- which they actually receive from the Saracens if they convert to Islam.

The chapter on Mongols ends with four short paragraphs about other peoples in the East which is no more than a simple list mentioning Armenians, Copts, Maronites etc. without describing them further. It ends with the Greeks who are very close to us in all respects. The greatest controversy between them and us is not about faith but about the rulership over Constantinople which the Greeks will not give to the Latin. "If the lust for ruling and the avarice for acquiring were removed, they would easily concord with us about the precession of the Holy Spirit", Riccoldo concludes.

## IV b) 6) General rules for missionaries

The last part of *Libellus ad nationes orientales* consists of five general rules that Riccoldo learned by experience when he was on pilgrimage to the Middle East and which he wants to hand on to brethren who will be sent to any of the nations outside Christianity, because Riccoldo himself had not known what he ought to, when he left, but had had to learn by practising.

The first rule is never to preach or discuss faith through an interpreter; it is simply necessary to learn the languages. The second is to know the Holy Scripture and not rely on Latin, exegetical works that are not accepted by the Eastern Christians; but all will accept arguments from Scripture. The third is to know the positions of the others in details and whether they are mistaken in essential dogmas of faith or only in minor questions. The fourth is always to begin discussion and conversion among the educated and influential, not among the common people. The fifth and ultimate rule is, that it helps nothing to be learned, to know Scripture, to know the other faiths, and to begin missionary work with the peoples in the top, if the missionary is not strong, convinced, and totally firm in his devotion to his task. He must be driven by love of God and salvation of souls and by nothing else.

#### IV c) Scope of the work

Riccoldo's main object in writing *Libellus ad nationes orientales* certainly was what he himself claimed in the prohemium: To provide the brethren designated as missionaries to the Middle East with a manual describing those peoples they would meet, and their aberrations from the catholic faith especially in the concept of Christ's divinity.

The work -- especially so the sections on Jews and Mongols -- was

intended for being used practically in mission more than being a thoroughly worked out theological treatise on Schismatics, Jews, and Mongols. The difference between these two genres becomes very clear if one compares Riccoldo's *Libellus ad nationes orientales* with his contemporary fellow Dominican Raymund Martin's *Capistrum Iudaeorum*.

Another object which might have influenced the choice of texts seems to have been Riccoldo's attempt to rid himself of the accusation of holding wrong beliefs concerning the Schismatics. This would explain why Riccoldo instead of formulating his own experience with Schismatics almost exclusively depended on Thomas Aquinas in his chapters on Nestorians and Jacobites.

This also means that *Libellus ad nationes orientales* was not the last work of the old missionary late in his life wherein he summed up his experience and passed it on to those who would carry on his work, as it has formerly been described as. It is written at least twenty years before Riccoldo died, it is probably written in haste, and it had an actual purpose -- almost a political one. Which of course does not exclude that it is a missionary manual of importance to other missionaries.

*Libellus ad nationes orientales* did not become a success in the sense, that it did not become widely diffused and has probably not directly influenced many other theologians. One explanation for this might be that the content simply appeared to disparate and unorganised, especially compared to the well composed and much more well written *Contra legem saracenorum*.

#### IV b) d) Manuscripts

*Libellus ad nationes orientales* is known in its entirety from three manuscripts. The present edition is of the ms. Firenze, Bibl. Nazionale, Conv. Sopp. C 8.1173 ff. 219r-244r, which was believed to have been lost since the late eighteenth century. It was not until 1976 during a revision of the library's collection that it was recognised to contain both Riccoldo's *Contra legem saracenorum* and his *Libellus ad nationes orientales*.<sup>(21)</sup>

The manuscript was copied in Florence in the early fourteenth century by a copyist whose hand is known to have given physical form to other Dominicans' work from the congregation of Santa Maria Novella.<sup>(22)</sup> Of special significance is it, that interlinear corrections and marginal notes in the manuscript with very great probability can be shown to have been made by Riccoldo himself.<sup>(23)</sup> The Florentine manuscript is thus obviously given predominance over any of the other extant manuscripts.

### The Oxford manuscript

The Oxford manuscript Bodl. Can. Pat. lat. 142 contains a copy of Riccoldo's text to *Libellus ad nationes orientales* on folio 61r-77v. This manuscript is certainly secondary to the Florentine which is easy to recognize:

One of Riccoldo's marginal notes is misplaced: the explanatory addition on fol. 227r of the Florentine ms.: "Nam que non conueniunt in naturam, non conueniunt in specie" is placed as conclusion of II,69. There are a number of examples of different word-order in Ox; and there are many homoeoteleuta. One of these have been corrected by Ox: III,118 "... ista duo sint in populo iudeorum, donec ueniat Christus. Et quia ista duo ...". An omission from ista duo to ista duo

been corrected into "quando ista duo", which must mean that there has been at least one manuscript between Firenze and Oxford. Also, there are a minor number of passages or words simply having been misread, e.g. Samuel for Talmud in III,99 (Ox. fol. 72u).

### Oviedo-manuscript

A third copy of the text is preserved in Oviedo, Biblioteca del Cabildo 24, ff. 69r-85r and ff. 113v-114v (Regule). This manuscript is described by A. Dondaine (1967), but in spite of several letters it has been impossible for me to get a copy of the manuscript or even an answer from the library in Oviedo.

### IV e) Orthography of the Florentine manuscript

The ms. gives examples of d>t, most consistently in the case of set for sed; but also Davit for David;

c>t, pautiora for pauciora; sotiorum for sociorum; solutio for solucio; ct>tt, sette for secte; t>tt, etterne for eterne; tt>ct, mictit for mittit; and promictit for promittit; remictit for remittit.

bd>dd, ex. suddit for subdit; bt>tt, suttrahitur for subtrahitur; bs>s, ostinatio for obstinatio (only one example);

gn>ngn, recongnoscunt for recognoscunt;

st>ss, ossensum for ostensum;

i>y, typyca for typica; solyo for solio, ymitantur for imitantur, dyabolicam for diabolicam, ynstrumentalem for instrumentalem etc.;

x>s, ex. testu for textu; x>xs, dexstris for dextris;

nct>nt, cunta for cuncta;

actor for auctor;

one example of appostolorum for apostolorum;

aspiration: few examples, hedificatum for edificatum.

This orthography have tacitly been changed throughout the edition to conform to a modern ideal of Medieval standard Latin.

Iuda or Iudam? Throughout the manuscript, Iuda and Iudam are used interchangeably. In many cases Iuda has been corrected into Iudam by the addition of a horizontal stroke ( ). To judge from the ink it is done by the same hand that has added the marginal and interlinear notes, probably by Riccoldo himself. This seems to have been done without any consequence or at least without any immediately apparent systematic reasoning.

1. S. Orlandi 1955, 1, 37-38; 308-19.

2. *LP* f. 1rb.

3. Patriarcha tamen eorum primo publica disputatione a nobis, imo a Deo totaliter superatus, tandem nobis cum plene in omnibus concordavit et fidem sua manu scriptam uobis tradidit, in qua aperte confessus est in Christo duas esse integras et perfectas naturas, diuinam uidelicet et humanam. *LP* f. 13ua.

4. E. Panella 1986; 1988.

5. By J.-M. Mérigoux, 1986.

6. Cf. edition of Nicolaus Cusa.

7. Cf. J.-M. Mérigoux 1986, 57-68.

8. Ed. Röhricht in 1894.
9. In E. Panella 1989.
10. Cf. E. Panella 1986.
11. In C.M. Laurent 1864, 103-41.
12. III,12; III,18; III,42; III,58.
13. E. Panella 1988, 10-11.
14. E. Panella 1988, 11.
15. A. Dondaine 1967, 140.
16. J.-M. Mérigoux 1986, 19.
17. S. Orlandi 1955, vol. 1, 37-38, 308-319.
18. As suggested by E. Panella 1988, 10-11.
19. The King James version differs a little from the Vulgata, which I have tried to render here.
20. Moralia in Iob II, 46.
21. G. Pomaro 1980-82.
22. E. Panella 1986; J.-M. Mérigoux 1986.
23. E. Panella 1986, xii.