

RAYMUNDUS MARTINI

AND THE

Pugio Fidei

A SURVEY OF THE LIFE AND
WORKS OF A MEDIEVAL
CONTROVERSIALIST

Dissertation submitted towards partial fulfillment of
the requirements for M.A. in Hebrew and Jewish
Studies, University College London

Submitted by Richard S. Harvey, December 1991

Contents

Key Dates in the Life and Times of Raymundus Martini.....	3
Introduction.....	5
Raymond de Peñafort and the Debate of 1263.....	7
Biography of Raymundus Martini.....	11
Was Martini Jewish?.....	16
The <i>Explanatio Symboli Apostolorum</i>	23
The <i>Capistrum Judaeorum</i>	29
Other Works.....	33
The <i>Pugio Fidei</i>	36
The Preface to the <i>Pugio Fidei</i>	41
<i>Pugio Fidei</i> - Philosophical Introduction.....	45
The Image of Jews and Judaism.....	52
Mistranslation, Misquotation and Misinformation?.....	56
Jewish Response to the <i>Pugio Fidei</i>	62
The <i>Pugio Fidei</i> and Christian Cabbalah.....	68
Conclusion.....	71
Select Bibliography of Works Consulted.....	74
Appendix - Frontpiece and Prologue to <i>Pugio Fidei</i>	

Key Dates in the Life and Times of Raymundus Martini

1180	Birth of Raymond de Peñaforte
1215(?)	Birth of Raymundus Martini
1229	Raymond de Peñaforte preaching in Provence.
1230	Raymond de Peñaforte confessor to Gregory IX Martini enters Dominican order
1235	Births of Ramon Lull and Solomon Ibn Adret
1240	Raymond de Peñaforte returns to Barcelona Disputation between Rabbi Yechiel and Nicholas Donin
1242	Talmud burnt in Paris by Donin
1245	Meir of Narbonne composes מלחמת מצוה.
1250	Martini sent to Tunis to found <i>Studium Arabicum</i>
1256/7	<i>Explanatio Symboli Apostolorum</i>
1261-64	Thomas Aquinas writes <i>Summa Contra Gentiles</i> (?)
1262	Martini returns to Barcelona
1263	Debate between Pablo Christiani and Nachmanides. Raymond de Peñaforte preaches in Synagogue.
1264	Martini appointed to Commission of Censorship. Nachmanides' report of debate circulated.
1265	Nachmanides brought before King on blasphemy charge
1266	Raymond Lull converts. Clement IV's letter to James I on suppressing the Jews
1267	<i>Capistrum Judaeorum</i> . Nachmanides leaves for Palestine
1268	Martini returns to Tunis for 1 year
1269	Martini to Paris to petition Louis IX and Thomas Aquinas
1270	Appointed head of <i>Studium Arabicum</i> in Barcelona
1274	Paulo Christiani dies R. Mordechai ben Joseph composes מחזק אמונה.
1275	Death of Raymond de Peñaforte.
1278	<i>Pugio Fidei</i>
1280	Martini appointed to Chair of Hebrew, St. Catherine's Priory, Barcelona
1283	Lull's <i>Blanquerna</i> vs Martini
1284-5	<i>Contra Mahometum</i> (?)
1285-90	Death of Martini(?)
1310	Adret dies

Introduction

The aim of this paper is to describe the state of studies on the life and work of Raymundus Martini¹ in the context of the encounter of Jews, Christians and Moslems in 13th century Spain.

No previous study² has attempted a comprehensive over-view of Martini and his work, although in recent years numerous studies have examined aspects of his thought and methods, tracing his influence on Medieval Christian philosophy, apologetics and understanding of Jews and Judaism. This present study summarises this work and describes the main features of one of the most impressive students of Judaism and Islam of his time.

In this thesis we shall outline the chronology of Martini's life, and examine the question of his possible Jewish origin. The identity of

¹ Referred to throughout as Martini. Also known as Rámon, Raimundus, Raymond; Martin, Martinus, Martí, Martinez. Schiller-Szinessy's conjecture (36.134) that "the name 'Martini' arose no doubt from the wrongly applied Latin genitive" is without any basis. If he was the son of a better-known "Martin", this may point to possible Jewish origin. See below.

² The present paper presents findings from a variety of books and articles, many of them not available in English. We have translated where necessary, with the aim of presenting this material as a preliminary to further study and original research. As such, the paper is largely based on secondary material. J.M. Llovera's "Raimundus Martini, un Teológico Español" in *Christiandad* 2 (1945) pp. 539-43, 3 (1946) pp. 4-7 surveys briefly Martini's theological contribution. For books and articles cited, see Bibliography. Works cited in full in notes were not available for consultation, or peripheral. References in **bold** type refer to numbers in Bibliography.

the Jewish disputant of Martini reported by Raymond Lull will be investigated.

We shall summarise the charge of forgery that has been levelled at Martini since the time of Abravanel and defended by modern scholars such as Saul Lieberman and Diago Machez. His major works will be described. We shall compare his apologetics to Moslems with his approach to Jews, and attempt to trace the lines of development of his thought during his life. We shall describe the nature of his approach to the Jews in the light of Funkenstein's fourfold classification of religious polemic.

We shall examine the *Pugio Fidei* and its use by later writers, including the literary and personal relationship between Martini and Thomas Aquinas. A subsidiary point will be how the disciples of Martini combined his work with their own interest in developing Christian interpretation of the Kabbalah.

Raymundus Martini lived in the heat of controversy, as both a participant and protagonist. The titles of his works - "Dagger of Faith," "Muzzle of the Jews," and "Summa against the Koran"³ indicate the polemical nature of his mission. On the seven hundredth anniversary of his death, the climate of Jewish-Christian and Christian-Moslem encounter has little improved. By examining Martini's life and work in the context of his times, we shall see how mediaeval approaches to Jews and Judaism were to develop into

³ *Pugio Fidei*(PF), *Capistrum Iudaeorum*, *Summa contra Alcoranum*.

forms of philo- and anti-semitism that have continued to the present.

The contribution of Martini to the course of Jewish-Christian polemic can not be underestimated. His use of rabbinic literature provided later Christian writers with both source materials and methods. His studies were to be used with and without acknowledgement by every Christian student of Judaism until the modern era. Likewise his approach forced Jewish respondents to find new defenses of their faith. The sharpening of the distinctives of Christianity and Judaism that emerged as a result of such detailed study of one tradition by another were to pave the way for critiques of the Christian tradition itself that fuelled the Renaissance and Reformation in Christian Europe. The philosophical issues involved in the Jewish-Christian debate whose agenda had been set and summarised by Martini were to pull the greatest minds in each tradition into the harness of polemic and propaganda.

Raymond de Peñaforte and the Debate of 1263

Medieval Spain was a point of convergence for Judaism, Christianity and Islam. Attempts to convert Jews and Moslems to Christianity had been made periodically and regionally up to the twelfth century. With the founding of the Franciscan and Dominican orders a new measure of organisation took place.² On a systematic basis attempts were made to train preachers of the Gospel in the literature and mores of Judaism and Islam, and papal and royal resources were put at the disposal of such activity.

A key figure in this new enterprise was the Dominican Raymond de Peñaforte. Born in Villafrance del Penades in Northern Spain between 1175-1180, he trained at the University of Bologna (1210). On graduation in 1216 he received his doctorate and teaching licence³, and returned to Barcelona where he became instructor in the Seminary. He entered the Order of Preachers⁴ in 1222.

In 1230 he was chosen by Pope Gregory IX to be his personal confessor, and remained in Rome where he influenced Papal policy towards Jews and Moslems, and the fortunes of the Dominican

² Chazan(8.7-24) surveys missionary activity prior to the thirteenth century. He suggests that organised missionising involved co-ordination of three elements: allocation of substantial ecclesiastical resources, including personnel; creation of opportunities and methods for confronting the Jews, such as forced sermons and debates; development of new argumentation geared to an external audience rather than merely buttressing the faith of Christians.

³ *Licentia ubique docendi*

⁴ *Ordo Praedicatorum* (*O.P.*) the latin title of the Dominican order.

Order. Whilst in Rome he edited Gratian's *Decretum* and compiled the *Decretales*, a comprehensive summary of previous ecclesiastic legislation on social interaction and missionary expansion amongst Jews and Moslems. This led to increased missionary activity and standardised new methods of approach⁵.

Peñaforde chose Raymond Martini to study at the *Studium Arabicum* founded in 1250 for the study of Arabic and Hebrew. Those who passed through the school received the *licentia disputandi* giving them the privileges, resources and protection necessary to itinerant friars wishing to engage Jews and Moslems in dispute on matters of faith. The first *studium* was in Murcia, with others in Jativa, Valencia, Barcelona and Tunis.

Raymond de Peñaforde regulated procedures against heresy, and petitioned James I of Aragon to support such activities. Peñaforde encouraged Thomas Aquinas to write the *Summa Contra Gentiles* as a means of attracting converts to Christianity⁶.

Whilst at Rome he edited and revised the constitution of the Dominican Order. In 1238 he was appointed Master General, but relinquished the post two years later, and returned to the convent at

⁵ For the development of legislation regulating Jewish-Christian relations see Chazan (7).

⁶ As Lukyn Williams remarks, "The moving spirit...of Gregory IX in all that affected the Jews was, no doubt, the famous Raymond de Peñaforde." (44.246). On the reasons for the composition of the SCG, and Martini's activity as courier between Peñaforde and Aquinas, see below.

Barcelona. In 1263 he was present at the Debate between Astruc Ben Porta (Nachmanides) and Paulo Christiani, and is referred to in the proceedings⁷.

Raymond de Peñaforte was responsible, with Paulo Christiani, for the organising and structuring of the debate as a test case for the new argumentation developed by the Dominicans. He presided over subsequent measures taken against the Jewish community of Barcelona and the marshalling of Christian missionary forces throughout Europe⁸. After the debate four decrees were issued by James I in compliance with the friars' aspirations. Jews were compelled to attend Christian sermons; blasphemies were to be expurgated from the Talmud and other Jewish writings; a censorship commission was established; and Paulo Christiani was empowered to continue and expand his missionising activities.

⁷ The question of Martini's involvement in the Barcelona Disputation has been frequently discussed and often assumed. The assumption has been based on the similarity of lines of argument in the *Pugio Fidei* and the records of the 1262 debate, rather than knowledge of Martini's whereabouts at the time. As he had returned from Tunis in 1262, it is not impossible that Martini was a silent onlooker, or even an invisible prompter at the debate. But no evidence has been put forward to support this view. Baer (1.1:154) suggests his presence. Célestin Douai ("**Essai sur l'organisation des études dans l'ordre des Frères Prêcheurs au 13e et au 14e siècles (1216-1342)**"), Toulouse 1884, microfilm from Bodleian Library, Oxford, 1983) also states he was present (p.138).

⁸ Cohen (13.162ff) follows Graetz's view of Raymond de Peñaforte as the co-ordinator of the event. "The Dominicans, it must be remembered, were not reputed to be ploor planners. They had conceived the debate. They had prepared the best men for participation." (13.166).

According to Nachmanides' report of events Raymond de Peñaforte was to be found in the Synagogue of Barcelona eight days after the debate of 1262 preaching on the Trinity⁹. He died in in Barcelona on the sixth of January 1275, having combined services to the Dominican Order and Catholic Church with a wealth of scholastic work and legal reform. Not only had he set the scene for Martini's activities, but had through his own endeavours laid down the overall strategy, if not the specific tactics, of the apologetic approach Martini would develop¹⁰.

⁹ His participation with James I in subsequent forced sermons in the Synagogue at Barcelona is referred to in Nachmanides' account, cf. Chaim Chavel, ed. *Kitvei R. Moshe b. Nahman*, Jerusalem 1971, vol 1, pp.319-20.(Chazan 7.258,334). Although we do not have any example of Peñaforte's own approach to the Jews, we can presume with Cohen that Martini and Paulo Christiani both exemplified his methods: "the similarity that two of his disciples brought to their anti-Jewish polemics serve well to elucidate his own ideology." (12.107)

¹⁰ Baer (1:1:167) links the appearance of the *Pugio Fidei* with Pope Nicholas III's commissioning of preachers to the Jews in 1278, and asserts that Martini was the spiritual director of Peñaforte's work in Spain.

Biography of Raymundus Martini

The primary sources for a biography of Martini are sparse, as we would expect for a minor figure of the 13th century whose significance is seen more in his thought and writings than in the events of his life. His works date themselves by internal evidence, but provide little information concerning the much-travelled and varied life of a missionary friar who crossed seas, learnt languages, lobbied kings and involved himself in the politics of the day in pursuit of his vocation as a member of the Order of Preachers.¹¹

The archival materials are to be found in the Acts of the Provincial Order of the Dominican Province of Spain¹² and the Acts of James I of Aragon.¹³ The 16th century historian Diago records some details of Martini's life in a short note

¹¹ Several attempts have been made to obtain an exact chronology, but have not met general acceptance. Voisin quotes many latin sources in his introductory notes to the Carpzov edition of the *Pugio Fidei*. In modern times Berthier(5), Lukyn Williams (44), Cohen (12), Willi-Plein(43) have sketched out biographical details, as has Peter Marc in his edition of Thomas Aquinas' *Liber de veritate catholicae fidei contra errores infidelium*, Tours, 3 vols, 1961-7. We rely chiefly on Berthier.

¹² *Acta Capitulorum Provincialium Ordinis Fratrum*, ed. C. Douai, Toulouse, 1894.

¹³ Collection of Unedited Documents of the General Archive of the Crown of Aragon (Spanish), ed. P. de Bofarull, Barcelona 1847-1859, p.167.

in his history of the Order of Preachers¹⁴. Diago uses material from Martini's contemporary, Peter Marsilius¹⁵, and documents from the archives of the Dominican monastery in Barcelona where Martini spent his later years. Some manuscripts of the *Pugio Fidei* contain biographical notes.¹⁶ The works and biographies of contemporaries such as Thomas Aquinas, Riccoldo de Montecroce, Albertus Magnus and Ramon Lull, furnish some information. From such materials we can trace the main stages of his life.

Martini was born in Subirats, a small village 25 kilometers west of Barcelona. Berthier estimates his birth between 1210-1215¹⁷, on the understanding that he entered religious orders no younger than 15, the minimum age required before a vocation could be tested in the Dominican Order. According to Diago he wore the habit of a monk for almost 50 years.

"Friar Raymundus Martini died some years after the forementioned Friar Cendra in the same Convent, wearing the habit of religion almost fifty years: for there exists amongst the acts of that Convent one signed by him on the first of July 1284."¹⁸

¹⁴ *Historia de la Provincia de Aragón de la Orden de Predicadores desde su origen hasta el año de 1600*, F. Diago, Barcelona 1599, p.137-199.

¹⁵ *Cronice illustrissimi Regis Aragonum domini Jacobi Victoriissimi Principis*, Bib. Central de Barcelona, ms. 1018, fl.161v.

¹⁶ *Bibliothèque Mazarine* 796, *College of Foix's* manuscript and *Bibliothèque Nationale*, Paris, Latin 3557.

¹⁷ Marc and Montane (33.175) reckon his date of birth between 1220 and 1230.

¹⁸ "Fratr vero Raymundus Martin habens fere quinquaginta annos habitus religionis mortuus est in eodem Conventu

His novitiate began, according to Berthier, c. 1235¹⁹ and he would have undergone the training in rhetoric, logic, natural philosophy, bible and Christian literature before furthering his studies in languages²⁰. As there is no record of the date of his entry into the order Berthier assumes he entered as a youth. The possibility of his Jewish origin, and rabbinic training will be examined below, but if Peter Negri's statement is correct, that he entered the order at the age of 40, we would expect some mention of this distinction. If he did enter the order at this age, the date of 1285 after 50 years in Holy Orders and 40 years as a Rabbi would make his birth date before 1195, and his age at least 90 on death. This remarkable age would also be worthy of comment.

In 1250 he was sent by Raymond de Peñaforte to found the *Studium Arabicum* in Tunis, alongside other seven other

aliquot annis post obitum dicti Francisci: Extat enim inter acta istius Conventus unum ab ipso signatum I. Julii die ann. 1284." quoted in Voisin's Introduction to the Pugio Fidei, Carpzov ed, p.104. Marsilius writes "ab ingressu ordinis quingagesimum annum agens, tam reverenda canitie dives, eius sensibus etiam propter tantum senium minime immutatis, Barcinione quievit." (33.175, referring to P. Marc, p.53.)

¹⁹ Marc suggests between 1237 and 1240. (Marc. pp.612). Montane (33.175) prefers 1238.

²⁰ Novitiates were enrolled in the study of arts (*studium artium*), natural sciences (*philosophia naturalis*) and bible (*studium scriptarum*). They were required, at the age of fifteen, to be examined to show their aptitude for further study, and to show evidence of a vocation to the monastic life.

promising Dominicans²¹. He wrote the *Explanatio Symboli Apostolorum* in 1256-7²², possibly completing it in 1258.

He returned to Spain in 1262, and his reputation as a teacher grew.²³ He is named in the act of March 27th, 1264 by James I as one of the examiners of Jewish books, alongside the Bishop of Barcelona, Raymond de Peñaforte and two other Dominicans²⁴. In 1266 he may have gone to the *Studium* in Murcia. In 1267 he composed in Barcelona the *Capistrum Judaeorum*, which is the first recorded response of the Dominican order to the mixed outcome of the 1263 debate between Nachmanides and Paulo Christiani²⁵.

In 1268 he revisited Tunis, and returned to Spain in September 1269. Diago recounts how on the occasion of his landing in Spain he had the opportunity of meeting James I, but avoided the king out of displeasure at his failure to give military support to the mission at Tunis. Instead he made

²¹ **33.175**. One version of the life of Raymond de Peñaforte says there were eight students in the first *Studium*, another twenty. (**44.248** note 3) Berthier (**5.272**) lists them as Arnau de Guardia (named as *prelatus*), Pere de la Cadireta, Pere de Canyelles, Petrus Are, Petrus de Puteo, Petrus de Sancto Felice, Didacus Stephani and Martini. Douai's list (p137) gives the french form of the names)

²² March (**25.203**), Berthier (**5.279**), Cavallera (**6.201**).

²³ Echard, 1, 397.

²⁴ It is assumed he was the mainstay of the Commission. The two other Dominicans were Fr. Arnoldus de Sagarra (the head of the *studium* in Tunis) and Fr. Petrus Janua.

²⁵ See Chazan (**8** and **9**) for analysis of the result of the debate.

haste to Paris, where he acted as Raymond de Peñaforte's emissary to Louis IX to urge his military intervention in North Africa as a preliminary stage in liberating the Holy Land, and to petition Thomas Aquinas to compose the *Summa Contra Gentiles*.

In 1270 he returned to Barcelona to supervise the *Studium Arabicum*, and in 1278 he produced his most comprehensive work, the *Pugio Fidei*.

In 1281 he was appointed as the first holder of the chair of Hebrew at the *Studium Hebraicum* at Barcelona, in which position he remained until his death.²⁶

²⁶ In 1285, 4 years later according to Berthier (5.268) 4-9 years (Cohen 12.129.) 4-14 years later according to Fumigalli(16.93), who assumes a later revision by Martini of the *Capistrum Iudaeorum* after the appearance of the *Pugio Fidei*.. As the *Studium Hebraicum* was officially combined with the *Studium Arabicum* in 1291 at the convent of Zatina in Catalonia, it may be presumed that Martini was no longer alive in Barcelona to preside over it, and the amalgamation of the two *studia* may have taken place in the light of his death. In 1308 there were eight students (Douai pp.138)

Was Martini Jewish?

The first known ascription of Jewish ancestry to Martini is made by Peter Marsillius, to be repeated by Petrus Negri and Paul of Burgos. It is challenged by most later writers such as Liebermann, Lukyn Williams and Cohen.²⁷ The statement in the Chronicle of Marsilius reads:

"There was a certain friar worthy of memory, Fr. Martini, an individual greatly endowed, a cleric most capable in Latin, a philosopher in Arabic, a great rabbi and teacher(*magnus rabinus et magister*) in Hebrew, and much learned in the Chaldaean language"²⁸

This tradition has been criticized on historical and literary grounds as the dates of Martini's life make his entering the Order of Preachers as a former Rabbi at the age of forty unlikely unless he lived beyond the age of ninety. It is argued that the standard of his knowledge of Hebrew was beneath that of one who had been trained

²⁷ Baron (2.298) summarises and accepts the arguments for Jewish descent. Zunz, referred to by Szennessy, also accepted Jewish background (Die Gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden, p287, Berlin 1832 in SZ 101.

²⁸ "Erat frater iste dignus memoriae Frater Martini persona multum dotata, clericus multum sufficiens in Latino, philosophus in Arabico, magnus rabinus et magister in Hebraeo, et in lingua Chaldaica multum doctus." Petrus Marsilius, *Chronice illustrissimi Regis Aragonum domini Jacobi Victoriissimi principis*, Bibl. Central de Barcelona, MS 1018, fl. 161v. The date of the chronicle is reckoned by Diago (Historia, II, cap, xvi, fl. 137 r.) as April 1313. So within the space of 25 years Martini's Jewish origin was assumed. As quoted in Huerga (18.553, n. 56).

to study Jewish literature from birth, and that later Christian writers misunderstood the term *rabinus*.

As regards his knowledge of Hebrew, Liebermann states

"The mistakes he sometimes (although very seldom) made either in reading or translation are of such a crude nature that a Jew who had studied the Talmud since his childhood could never have made them. Still we must ask how a Gentile mastered Jewish literature to such a degree....²⁹"

Liebermann answers his own question by reasoning that appropriate quotations were compiled for him by Jewish converts to Christianity, following G. F. Moore's hypothesis³⁰. The question then

²⁹ Lieberman(22.iv-v;43-47) supports his view with ten examples of mistranslation a Jew with talmudic training would not make. On Martini's acquisition of Hebrew, the best suggestion other than knowledge of Hebrew from birth is that of Rankin (32.160) that Paulo Christiani was his teacher, following the conjectures of Graetz and Schiller-Szinessy (Enc. Brit. 9th ed. articles on *Ramban* and *Talmud*). Baron argues charitably (2.298) "occasional misunderstandings of rabbinic texts and lapses in their translation would more likely be made by a man who had neglected his rabbinic studies for thirty or more years than by assistants who would have been competent in the field."

³⁰ Liebermann states without support "It can be assumed *a priori* that the appropriate quotations were compiled for him from the Jewish books submitted to the investigation of the board of censors." (22.V).

Moore assumes Martini's inability to distinguish between authentic Jewish literature and Christian interpolations inserted by less than sincere Jewish converts to Christianity. He relies on Martini's non-Jewish background to pin the blame for tampering with the rabbinic texts on Jewish Christian collaborators working under him. This serves to explain the issue of forgery, relying on the belief that Martini was not the expert in Hebrew that he should have been, had he been trained rabbinically.

"The texts as Martini quotes them sometimes differ materially from the manuscripts and printed editions in our hands, and his good faith has been called in question. Where the text has really been

remains how Martini's Jewish Christian collaborators could have made such mistakes in translation and quotation of Hebrew sources, whether deliberately or accidentally, and yet still be recognised (by Liebermann and Moore) as being Jewish.

One solution to the question would be to recognise that Jewish ancestry can not be defined merely by knowledge of Hebrew or rabbinic training. Alternative expressions of Jewish identity were available then as now. In another context Martini's ability in Hebrew has been commended. His renown as a teacher of Hebrew was well-known, and his use of innovative translations of the New Testament into Hebrew has been recognised as both creative and grammatical, whilst stylistically inconsistent with rabbinic views.³¹

tampered with in the Christian interest, it is more likely that copies he used had been interpolated by Jewish converts than that he falsified them himself. The judgement of recent Jewish critics is in general favourable to his honesty." (28.204, note 7)

The integrity of Martini is thus preserved by his ignorance of Hebrew. He was unable to adequately supervise the correct translation of certain passages, or prevent the insertion of bogus passages composed by his compilers and translators, who themselves knew enough Hebrew to know that they were deliberately tampering with the texts.

³¹ Graetz(History of the Jews, vol.3, p. 602, JPSA 1941) states that Martini "possessed a thorough knowledge of Biblical and rabbinical literature, and was the first Christian who was better acquainted with Hebrew than the Church Father Jerome." Martini himself refers to Jerome's difficulties with translation from Hebrew in the PF preface. Lapid(19.6, 13-15).cites Martini as an example of the fact that "whenever a Christian achieved any extensive acquaintance with the biblical language, it was due to his association with a Jewish teacher" alongside Origen, Jerome et al. Lapid thinks that the majority of New Testament quotations translated into Hebrew were to be found in "his lost work" (sic) the *Capistrum Judaeorum*, and mistakenly states that the greater part of the *Pugio Fidei* was

As regards the use of the term *rabinus*, Marsilius' appellation is repeated by Paul of Burgos in *Scrutinium Scriptarum*³² with greater certainty:

"Your rabbi Raimundus in his dagger"

Here he argues with Jewish readers that Martini is not only a rabbi, but that they acknowledge him as one. He is "your rabbi." According to Cohen the term *rabinus* "means no more than a great Hebrew teacher, which Martini evidently was." Cohen is sceptical of any Jewish background:

"the cogent arguments of Lieberman (Shkiin pp. 2, 43-5) that Martini's writings demonstrate a lack of familiarity with the Talmud in the original, testify against the likelihood of his Jewish origin." ³³

Cavallera sees the lack of Hebrew material in the ESA indicating that Martini only acquired his knowledge of Hebrew in the twenty years up to the time he wrote the *Pugio Fidei*:

"It is strongly likely that the idea of a Jewish origin and subsequent conversion has been suggested by the richness of teachings from

directed against the "Saracens and Infidels." He examines 10 examples of translation into Hebrew, comparing them with translations in Jewish apologetic works, and states "the author of the *Pugio Fidei* is probably the first Christian Hebraist known to us by name to have translated any substantial part of the New Testament into Hebrew (19.16).

³² "Raimundus rabbi tuus in suo pugione" in *Scrutinium Scriptarum* 1, distinction 8, cap 15, ed Mantua, 1475, fol M. 56. (12.130 quotes fo.105v)

³³ 12.130.

Hebrew sources which the *Pugio Fidei* presents. But the absence of analogous quotations in the *Explanatio* is hardly explained but by the fact that they were acquired by Raymond between the date of the composition of the *Explanatio* and that of the *Pugio Fidei*."³⁴

If the *Explanatio* was composed in 1258, and the *Pugio Fidei* completed in 1278, this gave Martini twenty years to acquire mastery of Hebrew and a knowledge of Jewish sources. One could argue that this was possible by analogy with his mastery of arabic language and literature during his time at the *Studium Arabicum* in Tunis (1250) and the composition of the *Explanatio Symboli Apostolorum* (1256/7) and the *Contra Mahometum* (1261-4?) but it is surely more likely that Martini knew Hebrew and Arabic from his earliest days.

A third possibility is that Martini was not a first generation convert from Judaism, albeit a Rabbi, but was a second generation Jewish Christian from a *converso* family³⁵, having some knowledge of Hebrew, but denied a full rabbinic training.³⁶ It would allow for

³⁴ Cavallera (6.201 note 1) "Il est fort possible .."

³⁵ Could the father have been well known as a convert himself, thus leading to the name Raymundus Martini (son of Martin/us)? Neubauer disagrees with Schiller-Szinessy (36.134) and says (30.103)"He writes Martin instead of the usual Martini; so did Dr. Graetz before him. The reason is given by Dr. Schiller-Szinessy in the following words:"The name of the reputed author of the *Pugio Fidei* was Ramon Martinez, and in his convent he was called Raymundus Martin, the name "Martini" arose no doubt from the wrongly applied Latin genitive.....' In no early biographical work is the name of Ramon Martiniez to be found....It is possible that Martini means the son of Martin and hence his name."

³⁶ Huerga(18.553, n. 56) "No han faltado quienes sospecharon que R. Martí tenía sangre hebrea en las venas, y que fue un "ex-judío", es decir, un *converso*, un "christiano nuevo". La supoción es infundada o, al más, fruto de un espejismo producido por la pericia con que

Martini's first 15 years to have been spent within the ambit of the Church whilst having at home a background knowledge of Hebrew and Jewish custom. This theory has not been fully examined. In its favour is the fact of a substantial *converso* population in Barcelona.³⁷ The pattern of accepting the sons of *conversos* into the monastic orders was common, and the village of Subirats could well have had a Jewish community that had become Christian, as had much of the community of nearby Barcelona by the following century³⁸. As no new information on Martini's origins is likely to be

manaja los obras árabes y judías en su propia salsa ligüística." (18.554)

Huerga also quotes an early writers belief that Raymond de Penaforte was of Jewish origin and made a policy of recruiting Jewish converts to the *studia*;

"Fuerunt qui ipsum Ex-Judaeum pronuciarent, etiam ex antiquioribus, [...] Suspicio potius quorumdam fuit, quia in librorum rabbinicorum lectione, si quisquam alius, fuit versatissimus. Illo enim tempore R. de Pennaforti [...] suos ad haec studiorum tractanda jussu regio excitarat. Ipse quoque R. noster cum Paulo quodam Ex-Judaeo codices hebraicos per totam provinciam conquisitos in usum suum convertit": J.A. FABRICII, Bibliotheca Latina mediae et infimae aetatis, tom. VI, Florentiae, T. Baracchi, 1858, pp. 344-355.

The offer of education of children was one of many encouragements given to conversion. As the Summa Contra Gentiles 1:4:1 and Gratian's Decretum D.44, c.3 (in 7.108) make clear, "blandishments" should be offered rather than the use of force. See Solomon Grayzel, "The Church and the Jews in the Thirteenth Century" Hermon Press, NY, 1966, section IV, C, pp. 129-136, for incentives offered to converts.

³⁷ Baer 2.1:40ff, 2:21-24, and map of communities of 14th century Spain..

³⁸ For theories on the expansion of the Marrano communities see B. Netanyahu, The Marranos of Spain, JPSA, 1966, and the hypothesis

found, and Jewish and Christian scholars have tended to claim or repudiate Martini's Jewish origins on an arbitrary basis, the question must remain at present undecided.³⁹ Ironically one must also notice that if Martini is to be held guilty of the charge of forgery, this would point to his Jewish origin. As Liebermann wrote⁴⁰:

"Only a Jew familiar with the *midrashic* style from his childhood could master rabbinic Hebrew to such a degree as to fabricate a new *Midrash* from fragments of genuine *Midrashim* and connect them adequately."

of Cutler, *The Jew as the Ally of the Muslim: Medieval Roots of Anti-Semitism*, A.H. and H. Cutler, University of Notre Dame, 1986,, which must be read with caution.

³⁹ Chazan (8.116) accepts Cohen's view without comment: "Jeremy Cohen has argued convincingly against the recurrent suggestion of Jewish origins for Friar Raymond." referring to Cohen's comments in the *Friars and the Jews*, p129, note2. Cohen only considers the statement of Paul of Burgos, and not the earlier statement of Marsilius that Martini was both *rabinus* and *magister*. The term *maestre* (*magister*) is acknowledged by Cohen himself to be a term used by the Jewish community to identify Ibn Adret. (Cohen 11.55) Cohen makes his case for non-Jewish origin on the basis of Liebermann's work in analysing 10 rabbinic quotations and their latin translations in the *Pugio Fidei* to show that Martini was by no means a perfect Hebraist. Had the same argument been used against Pablo Christiani's earlier and less successful attempt to marshal rabbinic sources to his cause, by the same token his Jewishness would be in question. The definition or degree of Martini's Jewish ancestry can not be assessed simply by an appraisal of his scholastic ability.

Similarly Christian scholars repeat previous assumptions: the encyclopaedist Hurter records:

"Subiratus natus, ante suam conversione inter Judeos rabinus. Ita legimus in OP P. Schwarz O. Praed. Stellae Messiae (Esslingen 1475. p. 25b s.)" in *Nomenclator Literarius* vol 2 col 400 n212, 1906 Innsbruck.

⁴⁰ 21.92. He goes on to say "Martini's knowledge of Rabbinics does not justify the charge."

The *Explanatio Symboli Apostolorum*

This was first published in excerpts by Denifle⁴¹, and in full by Joseph M. March⁴² from the manuscript in the library of the Cathedral Chapter of Tortosa⁴³. It was discovered by Denifle and Chatelain⁴⁴, and is 69 folios in length, written at the end of the 13th or beginning of the 14th century.

The work can be dated to 1257 as Article 3 of the *Symbolum* discusses the seventy weeks of years⁴⁵ and dates the time of fulfillment in the Christian calendar (a common device by which polemical works can be dated).

"Since therefore the seventy sevens have already been fulfilled, whether days, months or years, and furthermore 1257 years have passed.⁴⁶

Sancho observes that the date of 1256 is also mentioned.⁴⁷ The full title is:

"Explanation of the Apostle's creed for the instruction of the faithful edited by Friar R. Martini of the Order of Preachers."⁴⁸

⁴¹ Also *Symbolum*. Herein ESA.

⁴² "**Ramon Marti y la seva Explanatio Symboli Apostolorum**" *Annuari del Institutum d'estudiis Catalans*, 1908, pp. 443-496.

⁴³ *Bibl. de la Catedral*, ms. 6.

⁴⁴ "**Inventarium codicum manuscriptorum capituli Dertunensis**", *Revue des Bibliothèques* VI (1896) pp. 32-50.

⁴⁵ Daniel 9:24ff.

⁴⁶ "Cum igitur jam complete sint ille LXX ebdomade, sive sint dierum, sive mensium, sive annorum et amplius fluxerunt MCCLVII anni"

⁴⁷ ESA. 23.1 27-30 (35.396).

⁴⁸ "Explanatio symboli Apostolorum ad institutionem fidelium a fratre R. Martini de ordine Predicatorum edita."

The work is an exposition of the Apostles' Creed from an apologetic stand-point attempting to prove its twelve articles of faith by means of rational argument and scriptural quotation. The ESA contains some highly original formulations of Christian doctrine in the light of Martini's contact with Moslems in Tunis. We also find a reference to an arabic translation of the ESA and its use in debate, in the disparaging account of Martini in Ramon Lull's *Blanquerna*.⁴⁹ If the ESA was used directly in this way, it is possible that we have only an abbreviated latin summary of what was originally composed in Arabic or with substantially greater number of quotations from the Koran and arabic literature and philosophy.⁵⁰

The Prologue of the ESA states the primacy of faith as the means of mortal knowledge of God. Tradition attributes to the twelve apostles the compilation of the Apostles Creed. The scriptures, Old and New Testament, provided a united and indivisible witness to the revelation of God, and must not be altered. Anathemas are pronounced in scripture on any who would attempt to do so, thus guaranteeing the texts against forgery or misquotation, the common Moslem charge against the use of Old and New Testament by Jew and Christian. Earliest manuscripts, and manuscripts found in

⁴⁹ Discussed below.

⁵⁰ That the ESA was translated into arabic is the view of Pedro Ribes y Montane, and also Lavajo (20.171). P. Mandonnet also put forward the view that it was translated into Greek by Martini's disciple Riccoldo de Montecroce (P. Mandonnet, "Fra Riccoldo de Monte-Croce, pèlerin en Terre Sainte et missionnaire en Orient", *Revue Biblique* 2 (1893) 44-61, 182-202, 584-607. Referred to by Pannella (31.56 note 96).

different places confirm the Bible's authenticity, making its integrity more obvious than that of the Koran which Moslems affirm.

Article I of the ESA affirms belief in One God, answering Moslem charges that Christians worship Mary, and that the doctrine of the Trinity is unintelligible. Martini distinguishes between worshipping God, and honouring Mary. The one true God is adored, Mary is honoured, the Cross and other images are venerated.

God's nature is expressed in the doctrine of the Trinity, which must be interpreted correctly and from the stand-point of faith. It is a *mysterium* beyond human understanding. Martini then gives six proofs of the Trinity from Reason, following Abelard. He does not seek to prove the existence of God from reason, and rejects the Aristotelian idea of creation eternally existing (*creatio ab aeterno*). Beginning the work with a discussion of the Unity of God without recourse to proofs of His existence, but giving the argument from *creatio a nihilo* a strong defense, Martini argues issues from the Mu'tazila school of Islam with familiarity and acumen.

Article II affirms the existence of the Son of God from texts of Old and New Testament, without explanation. What will become the key issue of the final sections of the *Pugio Fidei* is left stated in the briefest possible way.

Article III gives proof that the Messiah has already come, and reasons for unbelief. The Jews do not accept Jesus because of unbelief, blindness (*excecationem*) and sin, and there is a curse upon them. Martini uses the traditional scripture passages of

Genesis 49:10, Daniel 9:26 and Isaiah 9:6. He refers to prophecies of John the Baptist, the miracles of Jesus, and the Gentiles coming to faith in Psalms, Zechariah and Isaiah.⁵¹

The virgin birth of the Messiah is demonstrated from Isaiah 7:14 and Canticles. Pagan witness to the Virgin birth is given from the Sybilline Oracles, Solinus' *De Mirabilis Mundi*, and other non-Christian authors. Original Sin is described as leprosy passed on to children, like the sin of Adam.⁵²

⁵¹ Berthier 5.280, Sancho 395, Cavallera 210.

⁵² Cohen asserts that Martini shifts from an Augustinian to a Thomistic view of original sin linked to the rabbinic concept of the *'צַר הָרַע* (evil inclination).

"Martini needed to discard an Augustinian view of original sin in favor of a Thomistic approach in order to advance his position, a change which accords well with the general development of Martini's religious thought. If in his earliest writings Martini did display Augustinian leanings in matters of theology,* he soon adopted a more propaedeutic and Thomistic mode of philosophic thought, having come under direct personal influence of the Angelic Doctor of Paris. Martini served as the emissary of Raymond de Penaforte to Thomas Aquinas in 1269/70, and he may have convinced his Dominican confrere to compose the *Summa Contra Gentiles*." (Cohen 10.503).

However, Cohen's note 28 (* above) refers to Berthier (5.299) and Cavallera (6.201-220), neither of whom discuss the notion of original sin as an Augustinian formulation with reference to Martini's work. Cohen also refers to the brief summary of the works of Martini in Tomas and Joaquin Carreras y Artau, *Historia de la filosofia espanol: Filosofia cristiana de los siglos xiii al xv* (2 vols: Madrid, 1939-43) 1, 153-4. No quotation from the *ESA* or later *Capistrum Iudaeorum* is provided to support the assertion of a fundamental shift in Martini's theological orientation.

Murphy points out (29.410)(referred to in Cohen's note 29, page 503, but not quoted directly) the identification of Martini's visit in 1269 and his apologetic concerns as a significant factor which led to

In Article IV the Passion of Christ is demonstrated from prophecies in the Old Testament. The tradition of eye-witnesses at the Crucifixion guarantees its historical truth, against the Moslem assertion that the crucifixion did not really take place. Martini tells of Moslem respect for the tomb of Christ in Jerusalem as shown in the report of a debate between a Jew and a Moslem before a judge.

Article V continues with the New Testament evidence for Jesus' resurrection, and his descent to Hell in illustration of the prophecy of Psalm 82. Further articles of the creed are demonstrated in like manner, the Ascension (VI), final judgement (VII), the person of the

the composition of the *Summa Contra Gentiles* goes against previous dating of the SCG given in the *Historia Ecclesiastica Nova* of Tolomeo of Lucca (c.1314) as between 1261-4. (29.405-6) That Martini quotes part of SCG 1,6, in the Capistrum (dated at 1267) shows, unless Aquinas borrowed from Martini, that the SCG was probably written between 1269-1273 following the views of P. Marc in *S. Thomas Aquinatis, Liber de Veritate Catholice Fidei contra Errores Infidelium qui dicitur Summa contra Gentiles, Vol. 1., Introductio*. Cura et studio P. Marc, C. Pera, et P. Caramello (Turin-Paris, 1967).

It should also be recognised that Martini and Thomas Aquinas were both pupils and colleagues of Albertus Magnus, and that the personal and literary contact between them had begun well before Martini's visit to Paris in 1269/70. On Martini's connection with Albertus Magnus, Ribes y Montane refers to the *Pugio Fidei* (III, II, p555) "Albertus, magister in Theologia, et philosophus magnus, frater Praedicator et Episcopus" as evidence of personal acquaintance, and quotes from Carreras y Artau (p148) "El que Ramon Marti fuera condiscipulo de Santo Tomas es muy probable, pero escapa al tema del presente estudio."

It appears that Aquinas was aware of the ESA before the 1269/70 visit of Martini. This is mentioned briefly in Ribes y Montane's article (33.167) referring to his earlier article "Conocio santo Tomas la "Explanatio Symboli de Ramon Marti?" *Espiritu* 26 (1977) 93-97.

Holy Spirit (VIII), the Holy Catholic Church (IX), Communion of Saints (X), Resurrection of the Body (XI) and knowledge of Eternal life (XII).

Article XII cites the Moslem philosophers Avicenna, Algazali and Al Farabi, demonstrating Martini's familiarity with the Aristotelian and Islamic views he was seeking to answer and appeal to in his presentation of the Christian faith. His encounter with the Aristotelian thought mediated through Islamic writers, and his choice of pre-Thomistic patterns of Christian response, give the ESA its chief apologetic value. The ESA was also a vehicle for the transmission of such Avicenist Aristotelianism into the mainstream of Christian thought which had began with Albertus Magnus and would be crystallised by Thomas Aquinas, Duns Scotus, William of Occam and others.

Berthier summarises the ESA by noting some 42 quotations from secular sources and 29 from church authorities, and stating that the work:

"reveals missionary intentions. The Jews and even more the Moslems are aimed at...it gives an outline of the apologetic work to which R. Martin dedicated his life."⁵³

⁵³ "révèle des intentions missionaires. Les Juifs et plus encore les Sarassins y sont visées....Il y a là une ébauche de l'oeuvre apologétique à laquelle R. Martin consacra sa vie."(5.281).

The *Capistrum Judaeorum*

This work was assumed lost by Quétif-Echard⁵⁴, but is known to us by two manuscripts⁵⁵. It can be dated from the statement

"It should be observed that the Jews count from the beginning of the world until now, and today is the year 1267 from the incarnation of the Lord."⁵⁶

The *Capistrum* is linked to the *Pugio Fidei*, and there are four references to it in the later work.⁵⁷ Similarly, the Paris manuscript of the *Capistrum* refers to the *Pugio Fidei*, suggesting that Martini revised it after the *Pugio* appeared in 1278.⁵⁸

⁵⁴ Scriptores, I, fol 397.

⁵⁵ Paris, BN lat. 3643, and Bologna, Bibl.Universitaria, 1675 (865) attributed to Thomas Hispanus (Cohen **12.131**, Robles **34.59**, Berthier **5.287.**).

⁵⁶ *Notandum autem quod Iudei computant ab initio mundi usque nunc et est hodie ab incarnatione Domini annus MCCLXVII.* (Paris, BN lat. 3643, fol. 36rb 12-18). A third manuscript mentioned by Berthier(**5.289**), Bib. Mazarine 892, uses passages from the New Testament to prove that the Messiah has come, and Berthier does not consider Martini to be the author.

⁵⁷ 1687 ed. pp 202, 271,287, 290. (**5.289**). Martini directs readers of the *Pugio* to fuller treatments of some issues in the *Capistrum*: "plenius est ostensum" (202), "His atque aliis plurimis" (271). and does not repeat in his later work what he has already demonstrated in the earlier.

⁵⁸ According to Martini's note, the relationship between the *Capistrum* and the *Pugio Fidei* is not as described by Cohen (**12.131**) "Martini, however, himself found the *Capistrum* ineffective for converting the Jews, apparently because they refused to accept as evidence biblical or rabbinic sources adduced in their latin translation." Nor is Cohen's statement on the relationship between the *Capistrum* and Martini's earlier *Explanatio Symboli Apostolorum* likely, bearing in mind the Moslem readership to which the ESA was addressed, and the probable translation of the work into arabic. Cohen sees a schematic development in Martini's thought in line with the overall development of Christian polemics ("The *Capistrum*

"This work which I have called the 'Muzzle of the Jews' shall hereby be completed. But whosoever wanted an alternative to this method of proof concerning the prophecies and the mystery of the Trinity and all matters of the articles of the Christian faith that is more copious, let him seek out and read and re-read the book to which I have given the name "dagger."⁵⁹

revealed signs of a growing recourse to propaedeutic rational argumentation on Martini's part, an approach entirely lacking in the earlier *Explanatio*" (12.131), but apart from his abandonment of certain philosophical positions, and a refinement in his use of Hebrew and Arabic sources, no grand shift of approach is noticeable. The secondary literature referred to by Cohen (13.131) referring in note 5 to Cavallera (6.201-220), Murphy (29.408-9) and Berthier (5.287-91, 299-300) does not give such an impression. It appears that Cohen's view of the development of Martini's thought is an arbitrary one, and that Cohen had not read Berthier's own article on the *Capistrum*, (Berthier, A., **Raymond Martin et son oeuvre inédite le "*Capistrum Iudaeorum*,"** Positions de Theses de L'Ecole de Chartres, 1930, pp. 13-18, 1931, pp. 5-13, cited in Robles(34.61) but not in Berthier's own article. Cohen is incorrect to say that the ESA is "entirely lacking" in such argumentation. On the question of proofs for the existence of God Martini follows the Augustinian position of seeing them as unnecessary. But on other points his reasoning is either implicit in his explanations of each article of faith, or explicit, coming in the classical form of *rationes demonstrativas*. In the light of Martini's revision of the *Capistrum* after 1278, it is clear that Martini saw the *Capistrum* not as obsolete, but as standing alongside the *Pugio Fidei* and a necessary component of his apologetic programme.

⁵⁹ "Hoc opus quod Capsitrum Iudeorum vocavi erit hic consummatum. Ceterum qui iuxta modum hunc et de predictis et de misterio Trinitatis et de omnibus etiam fidei cristianiae articulis voluerit probacionum talium copiam, librum cui pugionem nomen imposui querat ipsumque legat et relagat. Non enim credo quod sit aliqua contra dominum Iesum Christum Iudaica pravitas que ibi ipsorum Iudeorum scripturia iugulata non sit vel que de facili cum hiis que ibi sunt nequeant iugulari." (5.291, note 1).

The structure of the *Capistrum* is in two parts comprising of seven arguments to prove that the Messiah had already come, and seven responses to rabbinic objections. Such a structure of argument provided a useful initial response to the outcome of the Barcelona debate in 1263, taking up the subject matter of Pablo Christiani's agenda, and dealing with some of Nachmanides responses.⁶⁰ As Martini had been appointed one of the censors of Jewish books in 1264, and the official and unofficial accounts of the Debate were already available, the title *Capistrum*, "Muzzle" possibly reflects the immediate need to silence of Nachmanides' claims of victory in the Debate, and prevention of further damage being done by a "dangerous animal". The "Dagger" of attack would come later. The appearance of the *Capistrum* in the same year that Nachmanides was banished from Spain as a result of the circulation of his report claiming victory in the Debate may be more than co-incidental.

Martini bases his demonstration that the Messiah had already, the same first premise as Paulo Christiani, on discussion of seven passages from the Hebrew scriptures, Isaiah 66:7, Genesis 49:10, Daniel 2, Daniel 9:26, Malachi 3:1, Haggai 2:10 and Habbakuk 1:5.⁶¹

⁶⁰ For the Hebrew and Latin reports of the encounter, and analysis, see Chazan(8.67ff). Surprisingly Chazan does not refer to the *Capistrum* in his analysis of Martini's response to the Jewish reaction to the new missionary argumentation, apparently following Cohen's analysis.

⁶¹ Berthier(5.291) notes translations of Genesis 49:10 and Jeremiah 11:25 which do not follow the Vulgate: "La traduction citée ne semble pas être celle qu'on lit dans la Vulgate." The translation "Nec recedet sceptrum de Iuda et legumlator de infra pedes ejus donec quod veniat Siloth"(Gen. 49:10) is more literal than that of the

In his response to rabbinic objections Martini again confines himself to scripture, rather than marshalling rabbinic material in support of his position, using Jeremiah 11:25, Isaiah 11:1, Daniel 7:13, Zachariah 9:10, Deuteronomy 30:3, concluding with Matthew 5:17.

The *Capistrum* remains to be edited, but would appear to show Martini's initial response to the arguments of the Barcelona debate, and the setting of an agenda which would be taken up more fully in the *Pugio Fidei*.

Vulgate, and of many other medieval latin translations of this much disputed passage, and shows that Martini was already aware of the need for precision in his translations from the Hebrew, and was already able to offer his own translation. The PF uses a similar translation "Non recedet sceptrum de Juda, vel virga; et legumlator vel lator de medio pedum ejus, donec veniat Siloh"(Carpzov ed., pp. 312ff)

Other Works

In addition to Martini's three main works, reference should be made to others, some lost and others whose authorship is debated. As well as an Arabic version of the *Explanation Simboli Apostolorum*, two other works dealing with Islam are mentioned. The first is the *Summa Contra Alcoranum* ⁶². Peter Marsilius writes⁶³

"He also produced various works against the sect of the Sarracens, full of eloquence and founded on truth."

Berthier notes Diago's mention of the work⁶⁴ but reports it as is unknown. However, the work is given a variety of titles⁶⁵ and is now believed to be preserved in the works of a student of Martini, Riccoldo de Montecroce.⁶⁶ Emilio Panella⁶⁷, drawing on the researches of Dondaine⁶⁸ and Delgado⁶⁹ is aware of five extant

⁶² Summa against the Koran

⁶³ Chronicle, fl.161v. "Fecit et diversa opera contra sectam Sarracenorum, eloquentia plena ac veritate fundata."

⁶⁴ Diago, Historia de la Provincia de Aragón de la Orden de Predicadores desde su origen hasta el año de 1600, Barcelona 1599, p. 137, in 5.295.

⁶⁵ *Contra Machometum, Contra Legem Saracenorum*.

⁶⁶ Riccoldo entered the Order of Preachers in 1267 and died in 1320. He travelled to Florence (1272), Rome (1287) Lucca (1288) Israel (1289) and Baghdad (1291). He composes *Libellus ad Nationes Orientales* in 1300, and frequently acknowledged his debt to his former teacher, Martini. Like Martini his approach was to attempt to demonstrate the inconsistency of the *lex sarracenorum* by appeal to reason.

⁶⁷ 33.23-56.

⁶⁸ A. Dondaine, *Ricoldiana*, in Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum (AFP) 37 (1967) pp. 149-157.

⁶⁹ J. Hernando I Delgado, *Le "Seta Machometi" du Cod. 46 d'Osma, oeuvre de Raymond Martin (Ramón Martí)*, in "Cahiers de Fanjeaux" 18 (1983) 351-71.

manuscripts of the *Contra Machometum*. One particular manuscript of Riccoldo's work⁷⁰ is entitled

"Tractate or disputation of Friar Ricoldus of Florence of the Order of Preachers against the Saracens and the Koran"⁷¹

yet also contains the inclusion

"Here is another way of proceeding against Mahomet and his law, according to brother Raymundus the Spaniard of the Order of Preaching Brothers"⁷²

In the excerpts from the *Contra Machometum* given by Panella⁷³, we find Martini using the same methods used in the *Pugio Fidei* applied to different material to reach a different audience. He quotes frequently from Islam philosophers and commentators. He gives his own translations of Koran and Hadith (without quoting the original), using them to point to the truth of the Christian faith where possible.⁷⁴

⁷⁰ B.N. lat. 4230, ff. 151vb-159rb, Paris, (15.149)

⁷¹ "Tractatus seu disputatio fratris Ricoldi florentini Ordinis fratrum Predicatorum contra Saracenos et Alchoranum."

⁷² "Contra mahometum et legem eius alius modus procedendi secundum fratrem Raymundum yspanum ordinis fratrum predicatorum"(fol. 151b) in 20.150. Dondaine, following Mandonnet, accepts the identification of "Raymundus Hispanus" with Raymundus Martini (20.150, note 88).

⁷³ 31.27-38, where passages are compared with Martini's other works, and those of Riccoldo, the Koran, and William of Tripoli, Marc of Toledo and Robert of Ketton, all students of Islam and contemporaries of Martini.

⁷⁴ According to Douai the *Summa* was written in latin and hebrew, but this is most unlikely(Douai, p136). Pannella gives the date of composition as 1284-5, towards the end of Martini's life.

Also ascribed to Martini is the *Vocabulista in Arabico*,⁷⁵ but it is possible that the name of Martini was attached to it to give it greater value, and Berthier doubts that it was compiled by Martini himself. Berthier completely discounts another work, *De Erroribus Philosophorum*,⁷⁶ as inconsistent with Martini's views, and containing misunderstandings of their positions which Martini would not have made.⁷⁷

⁷⁵ Published for the first time from a codex from *Biblioteca Riccardiana di Firenze*, Florence, Le Monnier, 1871(5.292).

⁷⁶ "On the errors of the Philosophers."

⁷⁷ 5.293-4.

The *Pugio Fidei*

Since the reprint in 1967 of the 1687 Voisin:Carpzov⁷⁸ edition, the *Pugio Fidei* (PF) has come under renewed critical scrutiny.⁷⁹

Previously plagiarised without acknowledgement⁸⁰, lying unused⁸¹ and with few copies accessible⁸², accused of containing forgeries and mistranslations⁸³, it now stands, as scholars have noted, as the

⁷⁸ Referred to variously. J. Benedict Carpzov (1639-1699) studied Hebrew under Johannes Buxtorf II in Basel. In 1688 he was appointed professor of Theology and Oriental languages at Leipzig. He edited and translated rabbinic and exegetical works including those of Maimonides. Joseph de Voisin (1610-1685) was Doctor in Theology specialising in rabbinical studies in Bordeaux. He translated and edited Maimonides' *Hilkot Shemitah ve-Yobel*. The Carpzov edition went through three stages;

1642 Paris	Studio Jac. Phil. Maussaci
1651 Paris	Cum Observationibus J. de Voisin
1687 Leipzig	Cum Hermani Judaeo Opusculo de sua conversione, cura Carpzovii.

⁷⁹ The major studies of Cohen (10, 12), Chazan (8,9) and Willi-Plein (43) rely on the 1967 reprint. Only Fumigalli (16) and Merchavia (23) have compared other editions. Since 1967 some twenty articles have dealt with the PF. Previously, only Neubauer (30), Schiller-Szinessy (36) and Liebermann's first survey of the PF (21) appeared in English, alongside Yitzhak Baer's in "The forged Midrashim of Raymund Martini and their place in the Religious Controversies in the Middle Ages (Hebrew)" in "Studies in Memory of Asher Gulak and Samuel Klein (Jerusalem 1942), pp. 24-48.

⁸⁰ By Geronimo de Santa Fé in *Hebraeomastix* and Petrus Galatinus in *De Arcanis Catholicae Veritatis* (1520), exposed by Joseph Scaliger in 1604. cf. Moore,(28.206), Secret (38).

⁸¹ Noting that Pascal used the PF, Secret continues "Il s'en faut cependant que cet ouvrage considéré encore par Lukyn Williams comme 'a valuable introduction to the study of Jewish literature' ait dormi dans la poussière jusqu'à la découverte de la copie au Collège de Foix" (38.401).

⁸² Neubauer (30.189) knew of 5 extant manuscripts. Berthier writing in 1939 refers to seven (5.281). Fumigalli (16.95) knows of fourteen and is able to trace their relationship.

⁸³ In modern times Schiller-Szinessy and Yitzak Baer have continued the attack, with Martini's integrity defended by Neubauer,

"magnum opus of medieval Christian missionizing among the Jews"⁸⁴ and the "great monument of this endeavour."⁸⁵

The Carpzov edition, whilst making the work accessible, hides by nature of the extensive introduction and voluminous notes the "dagger-like" shape of this primer of apologetics for missionary preachers, which was intended to be their manual of reference rather than an open book for Jewish readers.

Summaries of the PF have been given by Lukyn Williams⁸⁶, Berthier⁸⁷ and Willi-Plein.⁸⁸ The material is organised into a prologue and three sections, loosely categorised as philosophical, scriptural and empirical, of which the third section is similarly sub-divided:⁸⁹

Lieberman and Diego Macho. For a summary of an important aspect of the PF which in this writer's view has been given a disproportionate weight in the light of Martini's overall contribution, see below.

⁸⁴ Chazan (8.115)

⁸⁵ G.F. Moore (28.203)

⁸⁶ 44.249-255

⁸⁷ 5.286

⁸⁸ 43.27-43. Aspects of the PF have been dealt with by Chazan, Cohen *et al*, but the desire of Lukyn Williams (44.255) has yet to be realised: "It is to be much wished that an abbreviated edition of the *Pugio Fidei* were published, incorporating the Jewish quotations, with some of Voisin's notes, and adding notes and explanations more suitable to our own day. It would form a valuable introduction to the study of Jewish literature."

⁸⁹ Whilst Martini's Prologue is a mere six pages, Carpzov's Introduction and Voisin's Notes take up some 308 pages. The "dagger" structure, with its philosophical tip, cutting edge of the creed explained, and hilt of proof of the Christian faith from Rabbinic literature, is seen when the sections of the PF are outlined:

PF page numbers	Martini	number of pages	Voisin/Carpzo v	number of pages
1-124			Introduction (C)	124
124-126			Contents (V)	2
1-6	Preface	6		
6-190			Observations (V)	184
191-258	Part 1	67	Notes (V)	1
259-478	Part II.	182	Notes (V)	37
479-548	Part III.I	60	Notes (V)	10
549-628	Part III.II	70	Notes (V)	10
628-958	Part III.III.	283	Notes (V)	47

The contents of the *Pugio Fidei* can be listed as follows⁹⁰:

Preface	Reasons for writing, methods, defense of accusations
Part I	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Errors of the Philosophers (ch.1) The Existence of God (2) Man's supreme good (3) The Immortality of the Soul (4) The sects of the Philosophers (5) The Creation of the world <i>a nihilo</i> (6-14) God's knowledge of particulars (14-25) The Resurrection of the Dead (26)
Part II	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> That the Messiah has come <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The division and rejection of the tribes (1) The division of Jews and Christians (2) The seventy weeks of Daniel IX (3) Genesis 49:10 shows the Messiah has come(4) The Dream of Nebuchadnezzar (5) The Messiah born on the Day of the Temple's fall(6) Christ the cornerstone of a new Temple (7) Christ destroyed the image in Daniel's dream (8) Malachi 3:1 shows the Messiah has come (9) Refutation of Jewish Objections <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The nature of the Talmud (10) Jewish objections to Christianity, and responses (11) That the Messiah has not yet come for the Jews (12)⁹¹ That the Messiah has not yet come, from Daniel (13) The same objection from Deuteronomy 30 (14) Reprobation of the Jews temporary and conditional (15)
Part III.i.	The Trinity (1-11)
Part III.ii	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Man made in the image of God(1-3) The Fall of man (4-6) Man's Redemption by the Messiah (7-9)
Part III.iii.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proofs that the Messiah is God (1-6) The Virgin Birth (7-8) The Genealogy of the Messiah (9) Messiah to be worshipped by the Gentiles (10) Christ has not destroyed the Law, but fulfilled it (11) On sacraments (12) Baptism (13), Penance (14), Eucharist (15) Passion (16) Descent (17) Resurrection (18)and Ascension (19) of Christ

⁹⁰ Carpzov and Voisin provide several summaries of sections and chapters. Our summary is a shortened form of Carpzov's Introduction (PF pp. 124-6).

⁹¹ That Jesus did not save himself from the Cross
That Jesus did not judge and rule the nations
That Jesus did not come on the clouds to restore Israel

The new law of the Messiah and the sending of the Holy Spirit (20)
Reprobation of the Jews and conversion of the remnant (21-23).

The Preface to the *Pugio Fidei*

Martini's preface to the PF is a mere four pages, but contains vital clues as to the motives and methods of the enterprise. He does not wish simply to "muzzle" his opponents (as with the *Capistrum*), nor to present his own beliefs in the form of the creed (the ESA), but to deprive his opponents of their weapons by using them himself. He wants to use the *traditiones* of the Jews to define their views and then disprove them.⁹²

Here begins the Preface of the "Dagger of the Christians"⁹³ to slit the throat of the perfidy of the impious; and especially of the Jews: composed by Friar Raimundus Martini of the Order of Preachers

I. In accord with the fitting and beautiful statement of the blessed Paul that a preacher of the truth "should be able to instruct the faithful in sound doctrine and refute those who contradict the truth"⁹⁴; and according to the blessed Peter "that one should always be prepared to satisfy all who ask him to give a reason for that which he believes and preaches in hope and faith"; ⁹⁵ the opposite indeed being shameful;

II. Secondly, in like manner the maxim of Seneca⁹⁶, "no plague is as harmful as an enemy who is close": the Christian faith has no enemy more familiar and unavoidable than the Jew;

III. It has been enjoined upon me⁹⁷ to compose from those books of the Old Testament which the Jews receive, and also⁹⁸ from the Talmud and the rest of

⁹² Sections 5-9 of the Prooemium are translated in Cohen (12.132,137-138) and the German translation is given in Willi-Plein (43.28-33.) Our translation is from the Carpzov edition. For latin text see Appendix.

⁹³ The unusual title is from the Majorca manuscript held in the Dominican library, which Carpzov had access to in compiling the 1687 edition. (Fumigalli 16.95)

⁹⁴ Titus 1.9.

⁹⁵ I Peter 3:15. ie. not to be able to give a defense of one's faith.

⁹⁶ Lukyn Williams points out that the quotation is from Boethius (44.251 note 1)

⁹⁷ Presumably by Raymond de Penaforte in the light of the Barcelona Disputation's mixed results.

their writings which are authoritative to them, such a work which like a Dagger would be on hand for preachers and nurturers of the Christian faith with which to pierce; to provide the Jews with the bread of the divine word in sermons; indeed, to slit the throat (*jugulare*) of their faithlessness and impiety, and their pertinacity against Christ, and to destroy their insane shamelessness. So I have relied for help on the Son of He who made the world from nothing, who did not fulfil his own will but the will of the Father, who prescribes obedience to Prelates, Princes and Superiors; such is the dagger I will fashion, although not as it should be ideally, but as I know and am able to make; principally against the Jews; then against the Saracens, and others who are enemies of the true faith.

IV. May my excuse for beginning such a bold and rash undertaking please be the encouragement of many brothers even to make something for the promotion of faith and the defense of devotion and also the official command of a Prelate, with no possibility of refusal, as my excuse. Wheresoever I shall have erred, I pray it may not be imputed to me as malice, but rather that it was written in simplicity and without skill, and let it be corrected by he who is able, and without any defense higher authority will be deferred to.

V. So the substance of this Dagger, as much as is chiefly against the Jews, is twofold; first and principally, the authority of the Law and of the Prophets, and of the whole Old Testament; then as secondary matters certain traditions, which I have found in the Talmud and the Midrashim (that is, glosses) and have brought them out as pearls from a very great dung-heap with no little rejoicing. With God's help I will translate them into latin, and put them in their places, as it should seem to me expedient so to do.

VI. These traditions, which they call *תורה שבעל פה* *Torah schebbaal peh* (oral law) they believe and refer to as handed down by God at the same time as the law of Moses on mount Sinai: then Moses, they say, gave them to his disciple Joshua: Joshua to his successors, and so on, until through the ancient Rabbis (*Rabinos antiquos*) they were committed to writing. By this it is clear that what they believed God to have handed down to Moses on mount Sinai should be considered nothing other than the insanities of a deranged mind, on account of the innumerable absurdities which the Talmud contains.

VII. Indeed they express in a very wonderful and incredible way some things which savour of the truth and smell of and present the teaching of the Prophets and the Holy Fathers, as will be apparent in this little book; they destroy and confound the perfidy of the Jews of today (*modernorum vero Judaeorum*)⁹⁹, I do not think it is to be disputed, but that they could have successively proceeded from Moses and the Prophets and the other holy Fathers (*sanctis Patribus*) down to those who wrote them down; indeed we can not think such things came from any source other than from the Prophets and the holy Fathers; since the traditions of this type are in every way contrary to

⁹⁸ Cohen's "and even" eisegetes an antipathy on Martini's part, or a measure of contempt for Jewish literature outside the scriptures.

⁹⁹ Contra Cohen's view (12.139) that Martini sees three groups of Jews. See below.,

those which the Jews from the time of Christ until now believe about the Messiah and many other things.

VIII. Indeed these <truths> were not to be refused because such matters are also found in the Law and the Prophets,¹⁰⁰ although such things have been rejected by these perfidious people as no-one of sound mind rejects. For a prudent man does not despise a precious stone, even were it to be found on the head of a dragon or toad. Honey also is the spittle of bees, who have something else perhaps less worthy, a poisonous sting¹⁰¹; but he who knows how to turn something in its uses to be helpful is not to be thought stupid, whilst at the same time knowing how to put aside the sting's capacity to harm.

IX. So let us not reject traditions of this type, but rather let us embrace them, first on account of those things which have been said, and then because nothing is devised that is so able to refute the shamelessness of the Jews, nothing is found as effective in proving wrong their evil. Furthermore, what could be more joyful to the Christian than if he can easily twist away the sword from the hands of his enemies, and then with his own blade strike the head of an infidel, or like Judith mutilate with a dagger snatched from another?

X. In addition, in introducing the authority of a text which shall have been selected from the Hebrew, I will not follow the Septuagint or another interpreter; and what will be seen to be of greater presumption, in this I will not even defer to Jerome himself, nor will I avoid the unsuitability of the Latin language; in order that I translate the truth word for word (*ex verbo in verbum*) of those things which are in Hebrew, as often as it could be observed. For on account of this a way that is broad and spacious for subterfuge is barred to the false-speaking Jews; and with my translation, the truth is introduced by us against them, and they will be very little able to say it was not contained in their versions.

XI. Moreover, perhaps he who listens to blessed Jerome will cease from devouring me, where in his commentary on Micah 1, "Tell it not in Gath" to

¹⁰⁰ Cohen follows the marginal reading *inveniat* for *inveniantur*, translating "Such things of this sort were thus not meant to be rejected, since nobody sane would reject what he finds in places like the law and the prophets" but this reading makes less sense to the argument that there is both good and bad in the *traditiones* of the *Judaei antiqui*.

¹⁰¹ Cf. Cohen's additional insertion which makes Martini's metaphor more anti-Jewish than it really is(12.139): "Honey is the spittle of bees, and how could there be anything less worthy of those having a poisonous sting!" As with all translation, but especially noticeable with the nuances of ecclesiastical latin and Jewish studies, "he who translates a verse with strict literalness is a falsifier, and he who makes additions to it is a blasphemer" (Tosefta Megillah 3:21). I have attempted to stay closer to the latin, at the expense of an idiomatic rendering. .

Paula and Eutochius he says "much of the Hebrew is in disagreement with the LXX, and in so many of those places my translation is overwhelmed in difficulties so that we need the help of the Spirit of God." He also speaks to Oceanus in these words: "I came again to Jerusalem, and Bethlehem, where I prized the value of my nocturnal teacher Bartemius the Jew in the work: for he was afraid of the Jews, and showed himself to me as another Nicodemus."¹⁰².....

There follows a section on the difficulties of translating accurately from Hebrew, and the need to defend oneself from the charge of mistranslation and misquotation.....(xii-xv)

XVI So the form of a dagger will be impolite and rough in many places so that excess may be avoided; but it is not, as I think, too little able to penetrate, if anyone has the skill and training, and knows the methods of defense and way of attack which he finds within.....

A section on the transliteration of Hebrew letters.....

XVIII May the son of God, Jesus Christ, who with the Father and Holy Spirit lives and reigns, God of all ages, who gave me the incentive to begin, give also to me his servant similar ease to complete, that it brings glory to God, and honour, to strengthen the faithful and defend the faith: and convert the infidels to what is true and good: and may it also be for my eternal salvation, who is the least of the Order of Preachers. Amen.

Martini shows that he is well aware of the difficulties of developing new lines of argumentation, in the light of the possible accusations of mistranslation. He does not cover the charge of forgery in the prologue, but by justifying his use of rabbinic literature before readers who would be tempted to dismiss it he stakes out the territory for a detailed examination of the Jewish teaching of past and present.

¹⁰² Although Martini does not admit the help of Jewish collaborators, reference to the use of a Hebrew teacher by Jerome suggests Martini knew he was following in the footsteps of other Christian Hebraists by receiving help in his work.

***Pugio Fidei* - Philosophical Introduction**

The structure of Part I¹⁰³ of the *Pugio Fidei* follows the order of the Thomas Aquinas' *Summa Contra Gentiles*, in many places word for

¹⁰³ The chapter headings of Part I are (Capzov ed. p124):.

1. On the diversity of errors from the True Faith
2. That God exists
3. That pleasure is not the greatest good.
4. That the rational soul is immortal
5. On the sects of the Philosophers. This chapter is in two parts.
6. Reasons for the eternity of the world from the character of God.
7. Solution to those arguments
8. Reasons for the eternity of the world from causality.
9. Solution to those arguments
10. Reasons for the eternity of the world from creation
11. Solution of those reasons
12. Reasons against the eternity of the world, and proof that they are not conclusive of necessity.
13. That the newness of the world is known by revelation, not by demonstration.
14. That Aristotle did not consider his reasons as proof of this.
15. Whether God knows anything other than Himself
16. Against the error that God does not know particulars: (by far the greatest argument, in which they strive to prove that God does not know particulars)
17. Destruction of that error in summary.
18. That God does have knowledge of singulars
19. That God knows the things which are not.
20. That God has knowledge from eternity of things that are contingent.
21. That God knows thoughts
22. That God knows things infinite
23. That God knows things worthless, and does it is not inconsistent with the nobility of his wisdom.
24. That God knows good and bad things
25. The view of Averroes on God's knowledge of singularities
- 25 Reasons against the resurrection of the dead, and solutions to them

word¹⁰⁴. The intention of Part I of the PF is to provide a general philosophical introduction and underpinning for the exegetical and ad-hoc arguments that will be introduced in Parts II and III. The philosophical controversies that raged between Jews, Christians and Moslems were over the works of Aristotle, and the relationship between reason and revelation, and a common language of discussion was available to thinkers within each tradition striving to adapt to the challenges of the new thought.¹⁰⁵

There are important links between Martini and the *doctor angelicus*, Thomas Aquinas, which shall be briefly explored here.

Aquinas was born in 1225, and at the age of six was placed by his parents in the Benedictine monastery of Monte Cassino, until 1239. He studied the arts at the University of Naples, and entered the Order of Preachers in 1244. He travelled to Paris and Cologne in continuation of his studies, and joined the *studium* established by Albert the Great (Albertus Magnus) in Cologne until 1252. He then returned to Paris, where he wrote his commentary on the Gospels and on the *Sententiae* of Peter Lombard. He received his licence to teach at the University of Paris in 1256, and taught at the Dominican convent. From 1259 to 1268 he taught at the Curia in Rome, and in Orvieto. He died in 1274.

¹⁰⁴ Berthier (5) lists parallels, as does (more comprehensively) Robles (34).

¹⁰⁵ Cf. Isaac Husik, A History of Medieval Jewish Philosophy, JPSA, 1916, ("Aristotle")

In 1263 Urban IV sought to foster the continuing work of translation of Aristotle from the original Greek, and the writing of detailed commentaries on Aristotle's work that would allow for a Christian interpretation of his work. Although Christian study of Aristotle remained controversial, it was less damaging to the Christian cause to re-interpret Aristotle in the light of Christian revelation than the previous interpretations of Aristotle coming from moslem commentators working with translations from the arabic. In producing a Christianised Aristotelianism¹⁰⁶ Aquinas was challenging the influence of Averroes¹⁰⁷ within the Church, whilst providing missionaries from the mendicant orders with a suitable philosophical basis for their apologetics amongst Jews and Moslems in Spain. There is debate as to which considerations most influenced the major apologetic work, the *Summa Contra Gentiles*¹⁰⁸, which was written between 1259-1264, partly at the urging of Raymond de Penaforte. As Peter Marsilio's Chronicle records:

"Furthermore, strongly desiring the conversion of unbelievers, Raymond asked an outstanding Doctor of Sacred Scripture, a Master in Theology, brother Thomas of Aquino of the same Order, who

¹⁰⁶ That Aquinas was following in the footsteps of Maimonides in this endeavour is well-known, as is his use of Maimonides "Guide for the Perplexed." Both in agreement and disagreement with Maimonides, Aquinas work is strongly reliant on the Jewish philosopher's use of Aristotle. (On the Truth of the Catholic faith, ed, A. Pegis, pp. ix-xxvi, NY, 1955, Image Books)

¹⁰⁷ The main premises of Averroes that concerned Aquinas (and Martini) were: the universe is an emanation of God; matter is eternal; God as first cause gave forms to matter; there is one active intelligence in the Universe by which all thought takes place; immortality belongs to that intellect alone. cf Berthier (5.299).

¹⁰⁸ Also known as *De Veritate Fidei Catholicae*. Herein SCG.

among all the clerics of the world was considered in philosophy to be, next to Brother Albert, the greatest, to compose a work against the errors of unbelievers, by which both the cloud of darkness might be dispelled and the teaching of the true might be manifest to those who refuse to believe. The renowned Master accomplished what the humility of so great a Father asked, and composed a work called the *Summa Contra Gentiles* held to be without equal in its field."¹⁰⁹

In attacking the position of Averroes in the first part of the *Pugio Fidei* Martini transposed or adapted some twenty chapters of the SCG, an example of which is given below:

¹⁰⁹ Translation from Pegis, introduction p.21. Cronice Illustrissimi Regis Aragonum domini Jacobi victorissimi principis, Ms. 1018, Bibiotheca Central de Barcelona, Lib. IV, cap 47, fl.179r, (cf. Lavajo 20.165 n. 57.)

PF 1.2.¹¹⁰

Omne quod movetur, ab alio movetur. Patet autem sensu aliquid moveri, ut solem.

Ergo alio movente movetur, aut non. Si non movetur, habetur propositum, videlicet quod necesse est ponere aliquod movens immobile, et hoc dicimus esse Deum.

Si autem movetur, ergo ab alio movetur. Aut ergo sequitur concatenatio, id est processus ad infinitum, aut erit deveniendum ad aliquod movens immobile.

Nota quod in hac ratione, quae quidem ab Aristotele sumpta est, sunt duae propositiones probandae, videlicet; quod omne motum movetur ab alio, et quod in moventibus et motis non sit concatenatio.

Nequaquam autem brevitatis patitur dicere hoc qualiter ista probantur. Quaerantur itaque uti a Philosopho in VII Physicorum sufficienter probantur. Et nota quod Algazel in libro, quem vocat Lampadem luminum et Abenrois in IV Metaphysicae suae, in libro Algemin, id est congregationum, dicunt impossibile esse motorem coeli stellati, post quod non creditur Aristoteles aliud esse Deum, sed causam eius, id est motorem ipsius coeli, post quem dicunt non esse aliam causam; esset enim superflua. Nihil autem superflua in natura.

SCG 1,13¹¹¹

Omne quod movetur, ab alio movetur. Patet autem sensu aliquid moveri, utputa solem. Ergo, alio movente movetur. Aut ergo illud movens movetur, aut non. Si non movetur, ergo habemus propositum, quod necesse est ponere aliquod movens immobile. Et hoc dicimus Deum.

Si autem movetur, ergo ab alio movente movetur. Aut ergo est procedere in infinitum: aut est devenire ad aliquod movens immobile. Sed non est procedere in infinitum. Ergo necesse est ponere aliquod primum movens immobile. In hac autem probatione sunt duae propositiones probandae: scilicet, quod omne motum movetur ab alio; et quod in moventibus et motis non sit procedere in infinitum.

Quorum primum probat tribus modis.

¹¹⁰ "Everything that is moved is moved by another. It is evident by sense that something is moved, like the sun. Therefore it is moved by something that moves it, or not. If it is not moved, we have a conclusion, namely that it is necessary to posit some immovable mover, and this we say to be God. If it is moved, then it is moved by another. So there follows either a chain, that is a proceeding to infinity, or some immovable mover must be found. Note that in this reason, which has been taken from Aristotle, there are two propositions to be proved, ie; that everything moved is moved by

The historical conditions that led to the composition of the SCG are still a matter of debate¹¹², as is Martini's involvement, but it is clear that the approach of the *Pugio Fidei* is very similar to that of Aquinas in dealing with the form of Aristotelian thought being transmitted through the writings of Averroes. There are also a brief references to Maimonides "Guide for the Perplexed" and the Talmud at the end of Part I of the *Pugio Fidei*¹¹³, and Martini may have had Jewish readers and those affected by the Maimonidean controversy in mind

another, and that there is no chain of connection between movers and things moved. Brevity is by no means evident to say how such things are to be proved. It is asked how such things are sufficiently proved by the Philosopher in the eighth chapter of Physics. And note that Algazel in the book which he calls the Light of Lights, and Averroes in the fourth chapter of his Metaphysics, in the book Algemin, that is congregation, say that it is a mover of the starry sky is impossible, so that Aristotle did not believe God to be other than the cause, that is the mover of the of the sky itself, after whom they say there is no other cause, for it would be superfluous. Nothing is superfluous in nature."

¹¹¹ Pegis, p. 86. "Everything that is moved is moved by another. That some things are in motion-for example-the sun- is evident from sense. Therefore, it is moved by something else that moves it. This mover is itself either moved or not moved. If it is not, we have reached our conclusion- namely that we must posit some unmoved mover. This we call God. If it is moved, it is moved by another mover. We must, consequently, either proceed to infinity, or we must arrive at some unmoved mover. Now, it is not possible to proceed to infinity. Hence, we must posit some prime unmoved mover. in this proof there are two propositions that need to be proved, namely that *everything that is moved is moved by another*, and that *in movers and things moved one cannot proceed to infinity*. The first of these propositions the Philosopher (Aristotle) proves in three ways."

¹¹² Murphy (29) summarises the issues involved.

¹¹³ PF pp. 233-4, 246. cited in Cohen (12.132)

as he wrote to correct the errors of pagan and moslem philosophers.

The Image of Jews and Judaism in the *Pugio Fidei*

The attack that Martini levels against the Jews in Parts II and III has yet to be analysed in detail, and without the rancours that have so often been found within such subject matter and its analysis.. The PF has been considered from the aspect of medieval anti-Jewish polemic depicting a particular image of Jews and Judaism that would encourage more severe forms of discrimination and persecution¹¹⁴. The arguments on particular issues, such as the doctrine of sin in Martini, Aquinas and rabbinic Judaism, have been studied¹¹⁵. But as yet no translation or edition of the PF has sought to cover the work as a whole. It is unfortunately beyond this study's capacity to do justice to the large amount of useful material to be found in the PF¹¹⁶.

Parts II and III of the PF are the attack and thrust of Martini's "dagger." Part II follows approximately the lines pursued by Pablo Christiani.¹¹⁷ By the end of the work Martini has surveyed the wide range of Talmudic and other Jewish sources, gathering as much

¹¹⁴ Bonfils' study (3).

¹¹⁵ see Cohen, 10.

¹¹⁶ An edited edition on the lines of David Berger's edition of the *Nizzachon Vetus* would be required. Perhaps a possible doctoral thesis!

¹¹⁷ See the extensive comparisons made in Chazan (8) and (9.ch 5-7). We do not intend here to cover the same material, as Chazan's analysis of Martini's strategy and debating tactics is both thorough in its survey and penetrating in analysis. The material is surveyed from different perspectives by Cohen (12.136-169) and Willi-Plein (43.27-83).

material as possible in his endeavour to prove the Messiahship of Jesus.

Cohen acknowledges that little work has been done on Martini's view of Jews and Judaism;

"Only one brief attempt has been made to penetrate the mass of material compiled by Martini and to discern the nature of his approach to Judaism., and although it discusses some important questions and insights, the brevity of the study, its resultant omissions, and some questionable conclusions mean that an analysis of Martini's polemical ideology still remains to be undertaken."

Bonfils work builds on the fourfold typology of Amos

Funkenstein¹¹⁸, and sees Martini as constructing an understanding of the Jews as satanic and

needing to be isolated and removed from Christian society. Bonfils sees Martini's work as

"the first systematic attempt to present an ideological basis for the supposed popular belief in the satanic nature of the Jews who, consequently, poison the Christian society, and to derive from this

¹¹⁸ **17.373ff.** Funkenstein suggests four categories:- 1. Stereotyped repetition of traditional arguments for internal church consumption. 2. Rationalistic polemics attempting to deduce the truth of Christian dogma and the philosophical superiority of Christianity. 3. Attack against the Talmud and post-biblical Jewish literature as blasphemy *in toto*. 4. The attempt to demonstrate the truth of Christianity through the use of Jewish literature. Funkenstien sees Martini's work as belonging to the fourth category. He writes "though less dangerous than the total condemnation of the Talmud, it nevertheless led to the habit of discerning "genuine" and worthless traditions within Jewish literature; the Midrash, and later especially the Kabbalah, were sometimes declared to be the only parts of Jewish tradition worth conserving." (**17.382**).

thesis the need to expel them from every social cadre and, needless to say, from all governmental functions."¹¹⁹

Cohen sees a three-fold categorisation of Jews and Judaism in the *Pugio Fidei*.¹²⁰ Speaking of different belief systems, Cohen identifies the first type as that which rightly interpreted would see that Christ is the fulfillment of Old Testament prophecy and law. There is truth in some of the *traditiones* which have been handed down from the days Moses to the Rabbis of the present day.

The second category of belief is that comprising the vast majority of the Talmud, full of "absurdities" and false beliefs. The third category is the wickedness and obtuseness of the Jews in determining to oppose the truth of Christianity. Cohen goes on to say that whilst this is implicit in Paulo Christiani's statements, Martini's longer and more explicit expression of this assertion is better evidence of the position of Raymond de Peñaforte and his school.¹²¹

Whilst this *schema* is possible, it would appear to that Martini is operating with a less complex fourfold typology of Jews and Judaism. We understand Martini to be using the Pauline schema¹²² of two groups, the remnant ("true Israel") the whole ("Israel in the flesh"). He does not make a hard distinction between the Jews of bible times and the Jews of his own day. Martini recognised Rabbinic Judaism as both preserving and developing the aspects of earlier *traditiones* in the light of later medieval philosophical and apologetic

¹¹⁹ 3.365ff.

¹²⁰ 12.139.

¹²¹ Cohen (12.137)

¹²² Cf. Romans 9-11, where a "remnant saved by grace" is contrasted to the majority of Israel.

challenges. The contrast he draws in the Prologue is between the Jews of the past (*antiqui*) and those of today (*moderni*), both having a mixture of truth and error.

With this typology of Jews and Judaism we can evaluate the place of the law in Martini's work¹²³. The law apart from the Messiah the Mosaic law is imperfect¹²⁴. It could not justify the sinner¹²⁵, was not intended to be eternal¹²⁶, and has now been abrogated.¹²⁷ The Messiah has brought in the New Law, the law of the age to come¹²⁸ as prophesied in scripture and speculated on by the Rabbis themselves¹²⁹. This law which existed before creation¹³⁰, and is the perfect and ideal law¹³¹.

It is important that the new law be held up for comparison with the old, and for this reason and others the preservation of Jews and Judaism is necessary to Martini. As Lukyn Williams comments:

"Some Christians indeed might urge their destruction,, but not he, for, as will be seen, the argument of his book requires their preservation. To him they are important witnesses to the truth of Christianity."¹³²

¹²³ **12.148ff.**

¹²⁴ PF. 124

¹²⁵ PF.131-140.

¹²⁶ PF. 121.

¹²⁷ PF 123.

¹²⁸ PF. 885-893.

¹²⁹ PF. 612,621-2,689,691,693-4 all deal with *midrashim* on the new law of the Messiah.

¹³⁰ PF. 415

¹³¹ PF. 416-7.

¹³² **44.248**

Mistranslation, Misquotation and Misinformation?

The question of Martini's alleged forgeries and distortions of rabbinic material has occupied a disproportionate amount of energies on the part of several scholars, few of whom have pursued their enquiries from a detached position¹³³.

The first recorded accusation is found in the accounts of the Tortosa Disputation of 1413-1414, and in the Don Isaac Abravanel's *Yeshu'ot Meshiho*¹³⁴. In one instance Hieronymus de Sancta Fide¹³⁵ was quoting the midrash Bereshit Rabbah on the chamber of Hewn stone for the Sanhedrin¹³⁶, and R. Astruc Halevi, his opponent, declared that the passage was not genuine. He then produced an

¹³³ Cf Liebermann (21,22), Diez Macho (24), Neubauer (30), Schiller-Szinessy (36) and Lukyn Williams (44.249). The accusations have been repeated without examination of the material itself, as in Jennings and Lowe Commentary on Psalms, Appendix to Psalm 110: "With that well-meaning dishonesty which too frequently marked the controversialists of his age, he alters the text of the Talmud, Midrashim, etc., to meet his occasion, and even devises whole passages where convenient. So too Baer (1:1:185) "The book is clearly the result of the failure of the formal Disputation held in Barcelona in 1263. After the author learned from experience that the talmudic sayings, in their original form, cannot be adduced in support of Christian dogma, he went to the trouble of creating - on the basis of the authentic Midrash, and by means of abridgements, combinations and additions of all sorts- a collection of forgeries of obvious Christological content, thereby to mislead the susceptible."

¹³⁴ Cf Baer (1.vol 2.ch 11pp. 170-243 and notes pp.478-485, esp. note 8-15)

¹³⁵ formerly Joshua HaLorki.

¹³⁶ PF 313, cf Chazan (8.121) who accepts it as genuine but observes that it does not appear in extant versions of the the collection.

alternative manuscript of the midrash, which Hieronymous removed from him and pretended to read from. But the passage in question was not there.¹³⁷ From that time on there has been dispute on the genuineness of Martini's quotations.

The work of S. Liebermann has, in the few of this unqualified assessor, done much to restore Martini's integrity, and the vitriol levelled at Martini by Sziller-Szennessy and others can now be largely discounted. Suffice it to say that the balance of opinion now appears to validate Martini's quotations from Jewish works as wholly adequate when understood in the light of the literary conventions of his day. We can now usefully employ his quotations to reconstruct some of the lost works, or differing manuscript traditions, of the works to which he refers.

On the question of the accuracy of his translations to and from Hebrew, whilst his translation into Hebrew is commended by Lapidé and others. the translations from Hebrew are sometimes curiously disjointed from the original text. This leads to the suggestions that the work of compilation of quotations, and the work of translations, were carried on by separate editors, or at different times by the same editor.

The *Pugio Fidei* quotes from a vast array of Jewish literature available in the medieval period, often from manuscripts no longer extant, and in some cases, from whole works now lost to us or

¹³⁷ 1.180ff.

edited in a different form with a different title.¹³⁸ The balance of scholarship today is weighted in Martini's favour.

Where Martini is alleged to have mistranslated passages from the Hebrew, it is now suggested that whilst he made some mistakes, as did rabbinic authorities of his day who were also unable to fathom some of the grammatical nuances of scripture, some of the time he was reading differenently from the massoretic text, as in *Pugio Fidei* pp.697 line XI. Martini translates בְּשׁוּרִי (Hosea ix.12) as *incarnatio mea* whereas "every child acquainted with Hebrew¹³⁹" knows that בְּשׁוּרִי מֵהֶם means "when I depart from them". Neubauer responds that Martini knew full well the meaning of the text, having the Vulgate before him, but is reading בְּשׁוּרִי as does LXX and Theodotion.¹⁴⁰

It is suggested that Martini misquoted from rabbinic literature, either from ignorance or irrverance, or to deliberately create new

¹³⁸ In addition to the Targums and Talmuds (Babylonian and Jerusalem) Martini quotes from the Midrash Rabbah on the Pentateuch, the Sifra, Sifre and Mekilta, The Seder Olam, Midrash Tanhuma, Midrash Kohelet, Midrash on Lamentations, Canticles, Ruth, Psalms, the commentaries of Rashi, Ibn Ezra, David Kimchi, Nahmanides; Maimonides Mishneh Torah and Guide for the Perplexed (in Hebrew and Arabic), and the Yosippon and Josephus.

¹³⁹ Schiller-Szinessy (36.142) provides six examples of "forgeries pure and simple", six "proofs of the ignorance of the translators pure and simple," six proofs of forgeries and ignorance combined" and "six proofs of the irreverence of the forger", all of which are answered (to this reader, very adequately) by Neubauer.

¹⁴⁰ 30.182

midrashim¹⁴¹ and "numerous and most shameless forgeries."¹⁴²

Neubauer counters that

"Martini made perhaps a dozen errors in the course of some hundred quotations, and on this account is charged with ignorance. If that however is to be the rule of judgement, very few scholars will be left for Oriental philology at all."

Neubauer answers the charge of forgery by suggesting, for example, that in *Pugio Fidei* page 354 line v, quoting the Bereshith Rabbah of R. Mosheh Hadarshan¹⁴³, the extra verse quoted from Jeremiah 30:22 can hardly be described as a forgery, as Martini is employing a free method of quotation in the midrashic style of his time by expanding the quotation to give the context of the verse.

Similarly the passage in the *Pugio Fidei* page 397¹⁴⁴ using the Midrash of Mosheh Hadarshan on the ten kings (also found with variations in the Targum on Esther 1:1 and Pirque de-Rabbi Eli'ezer). Schiller-Szinessy assumes that the Martini is misquoting by identifying the ninth king as Vespasian and the tenth as the King Messiah, when the Jewish sources identify Messiah as the ninth King, and God as the tenth. Schiller-Szinessy seeks to buttress his argument with an appeal to Martini's knowledge of 1 Corinthians 15:28, which as Neubauer comments, is "rather arbitrary". Neubauer

¹⁴¹ **36.142ff.**

¹⁴² **36.135**

¹⁴³ "If we possessed the Midrash of Rabbi Moses, we should perhaps find that he conversed freely with learned priests, and that some of his ideas have crept into his book, which seems to have been scarce from the beginning."
(Neubauer **30.90**)

¹⁴⁴ **30.180.**

accepts the midrash as an authentic variation on a well-known and much commented-on tradition.

Schiller-Sziinessy takes exception to Martini's translation of לומר תלמוד by *docet dicendum*.¹⁴⁵ on page 421 of the *Pugio Fidei*, but the translation whilst inelegant, is not inaccurate. Schiller-Sziinessy finds it "incredible" that Moses HaDarshan should have given the Tetragrammaton as one of the names of the Messiah, yet Neubauer points to parallels in the *Zohar* and late Midrashim.. It would be possible to catalogue such examples throughout Martini's work¹⁴⁶. Much of the blame for such alleged inconsistencies is levelled at the assumed Jewish Christian collaborators of Martini:

"It is clear that the translator of the forged passages can not have been the author of them. For although somewhat clumsily, they are yet too cleverly done to be the work of the translator. Whilst the author of the PF as such is perhaps the translator of these forgeries also the forger himself must be another person. Who then was he? We have not far to seek for him; there can be little doubt that it was Fray Pablo," still "smarting under the defeat inflicted on him in 1263 by Nachmanides."¹⁴⁷

In addition to the controversial quotations deriving from the non-extant Midrash of Moshe Hadarshan of Narbonne,¹⁴⁸ there is uncertainty as to the identity of the shadowy figure of Rabbi

¹⁴⁵ Mistyped in Neubauer p 181 as docendum.

¹⁴⁶ cf. Libermann's **Shkiin** (22), which itself serves as a basis for future work on the subject.

¹⁴⁷ 36.150.

¹⁴⁸ An eleventh century aggadist quoted by Rashi. see article in the Encyclopaedia Judaica 12:429.

Rachmon. Schiller-Szinessy assumes it is none other than Martini himself.

"This enigmatic R. Rachmon is no Rabbi, but is non less than Rachmon, i.e. Ramon or Raimond; in full, Raymundus Martin himself, the supposed author of the PF in its totality! "¹⁴⁹

However, Lieberman is unwilling to identify him as Martini himself, but considers him to be "a renegade Jew, one of Martini's collaborators and compilers"¹⁵⁰

The issue of Martini's quotations has not been brought to a conclusion. Chaim Wirzubski¹⁵¹ traces the use of them by Flavius Mithridates in his sermon before the Pope in 1481, arguing that

"a considerable part of the Jewish or quasi-Jewish evidence adduced by Mithridates derives, unless I am mistaken, direct from the *Pugio Fidei* of Raymund Martin."

Liebermann has a section in his article¹⁵² on the importance of the PF for Talmudic scholarship, where he disregards the views of Baer and others, accepting in almost every case the genuineness of Martini's references, and seeks to use him to reconstruct now lost collections of medieval midrashim.

¹⁴⁹ 36.151.

¹⁵⁰ 22.vi and 67-68. Apart from shifting the blame from Martini, a "non-Jew", to a Jewish collaborator, this theory does not shed much light on the figure of R. Rachmon. Could it be that his works were suppressed by others?

¹⁵¹ 45.13-19. Wirzubski himself is unwilling to accept the PF materials as genuine: although "purporting to derive from ancient Rabbinic sources, cannot as they stand derive from any source other than the *Pugio Fidei*." (43.13)

¹⁵² 21.98-102.

Jewish Response to the *Pugio Fidei*

According to Chazan¹⁵³, there is an imbalance in the materials available to assess Jewish response to the *Pugio Fidei*. Whilst we have the new Christian argumentation in written form, and historical accounts of encounters between Jews and Christians from the Christian perspective, we have little from the Jewish side. Chazan, following Cohen, analyses Solomon Ibn Adret's response to the developed argumentation of the *Pugio Fidei*. We do not question Adret's awareness of Martini's position, but examine and challenge here the identification of Martini as Adret's opponent.

In his article "The Christian Adversary of Solomon Ibn Adret"¹⁵⁴ Jeremy Cohen seeks to prove, from the writings of the Franciscan friar Raymond Lull, that Martini had debated in person with Solomon Ibn Adret, and not, as others had supposed, with Nachmanides.¹⁵⁵

Cohen draws on Lull's acquaintance with Martini and Adret as shown from his writings, in which Martini is mentioned anonymously but in a recognisable description, and Adret by the name "Denaret". Lull as

¹⁵³ 8.ch.8

¹⁵⁴ 11.

¹⁵⁵ Cohen cites Joseph Perles as the first to suggest the link between Martini and Adret, followed by Graetz. (11.48-9). Those accepting Nahmanides as debating partner with Martini include Longpré and S.W. Baron. Robert Chazan accepts Cohen's view, devoting a chapter of "Daggers of Faith" to Adret's response to Martini's work.

a Franciscan and Martini as a Benedictine had profound differences of approach in their missionary methods and theological systems, and the accounts Lull gives, altered and embellished over a period of time, present a somewhat distorted picture of Martini which must be evaluated with caution¹⁵⁶.

The primary source for Cohen's identification of Adret as the Rabbi debated with by Martini is a passage from Lull's *Liber de Aquisitione Terrae Sanctae* (1310) which we quote with two translations.¹⁵⁷

¹⁵⁶ Chazan realizes that Lull's seven accounts of the incident with King Miramoli are not to be given so much weight. "In a famous story found in seven different places in Raymond Lull's writings, Lull criticizes a Christian missionizer, identified by modern scholars as Friar Raymond, for disproving Islam but failing to offer positive proofs for the truth of Christianity. Whether or not this criticism was fair with regard to Friar Raymond's missionizing among the Muslims I leave to others to decide. It is certainly not fair to say that he restricted himself to the negative in mounting his arguments against the Jews." (8.202 note 13).

¹⁵⁷ Cohen (11.49), Lavajo (20.159ff). Lavajo cites all the passages in Lull's work which mention the incident. Although Lavajo's article does not have as its primary purpose the identification of Martini's Jewish opponent, it provides historiographical material which seriously calls into question the reliability of Lull's evidence. Lavajo identifies Martini's opponent as Nachmanides, without giving his reasons. "Since we do not wish to prolong this description, [of Martini's encounter with a learned rabbi], thus turning away from the Islamo-Christian controversy in order to enter the Judaeo-Christian one which deserves an independant study, we omit here the analysis of the penultimate paragraph which recalls "a certain Jew who was very learned and an expert in Hebrew"*... It is sufficient to say that this refers to the famous rabbi Moses of Gerona, that is Moses Ben Nahman, also called Bonastrug de Porta." Lavajo pp 169-170. Lavajo has studied the Lullian accounts of the event in greater detail, and his article was written in 1985, presumably after he had studied Cohen's article. It would be

It is told that a certain Christian religious, well schooled in Arabic, went to Tunis to dispute with the King, who was called Miramoli. The friar proved to him with precepts and examples that the law of Muhammed was false and erroneous. The Saracen king, who was knowledgeable in logic and science, realised that his arguments were true and so consented to his words, saying "I no longer wish to be Saracen; prove your faith to me, and I shall be made a Christian, and so I shall ordain concerning all people in my kingdom, that they be made Christian under penalty of decapitation." Then the friar said "The faith of the Christians cannot be proven, but here is the creed¹⁵⁸ set forth in Arabic - believe in it." The friar said this because although he was learned and moral, it [i.e., the creed, as set forth in Arabic] was only a positive assertion and not subject to rational proof.¹⁵⁹ The king then said, "I should not have dismissed one belief for another, much preferring to dismiss belief for true understanding. Hence you have done wrong, since the law which I used to have you refuted; yet thereafter you cannot rationally prove yours to me, so that I shall remain without any law." And he then had him and all his colleagues dishonourably expelled from his kingdom.¹⁶⁰

interesting to know his reasons for differing with Cohen's identification of Martini's adversary.

We quote Cohen's translation for the opening section.

¹⁵⁸ "Symbolum", referring to an arabic version of Martini's *Explanatio Symboli Apostolorum*.

¹⁵⁹ Lull is here attacking not the Creed itself, but the weakness of Martini's apologetic methodology, which did not conform to Lull's elaborate system of philosophical debate, which he believed could prove purely by reason the truth of the Christian faith. The apologetic system Martini had begun to develop in the ESA was more relevant to proving the falseness of Moslem beliefs.

¹⁶⁰ Lavajo dates this expulsion to 1269, the year when Martini was again in Tunis. Yet the ESA had been composed in 1257. The reasons Lull gives for the expulsion were that having failed to convert the King, Martini was dishonourably expelled. However, Martini's return from Tunis in 1269 should be linked to Louis (?) of France's abortive crusade of the following year. Diago recounts the story of Martini's return to Spain, and his sight of the King's ships in the harbour, waiting to sail to Tunis. Unimpressed at their delay, he avoided meeting King James of Spain, who was also in the harbour. Instead he made haste to France to petition the King of France to hasten his venture. (Diago, *Historia de la Provincia de Aragon*, p. 137, in Berthier p. 268)

Cohen¹⁶¹:

I myself saw this friar and his colleagues. Later on this friar learned to speak Hebrew¹⁶² and, among others, used to dispute rather frequently in Barcelona with a certain Jew, very learned in Hebrew and a Rabbi¹⁶³.

This Jew told me several times that on many occasions he said to this friar that if he showed himself to understand what he believed in his faith, he [i.e. the Jew] would make himself Christian. The Friar uses to reply that he could not [rationally] understand [his own faith]; wherefore the Jew remained as he was, despising our law as improbable and untrue¹⁶⁴.

Lavajo

I met this religious man and his companions. Besides all that has already been said, that religious man could speak Hebrew and frequently held discussions in Barcelona with others among whom there was a certain Jew who was very learned and an expert in Hebrew

This Jew sometimes used to tell me that he had frequently told that religious man that, if he would be able to make him understand in terms of his Faith what he believed in, he would become a Christian. The religious answered that he could not understand the reason why the Jew continued to despise our law as improbable and untrue

¹⁶¹ Istum fratrem et suos socios ego vidi. Ulterius sciebat loqui hebraice ille frater et inter alios cum quodam Judaeo, valde in hebraico letterato et magistro, Barcinone frequentius disputabat; qui judaeus aliquoties mihi dixit quod pluries dixerat illi fratri quod, si in fide sua promittebat se intelligere quod credebat, ipse se faceret christianum et frater respondebat quod intelligere non poterat, quare judaeus remansit, sicut erat spernendo legem nostram tanquam improbabilem et non veram.

¹⁶² Cohen's translation of *ulterius sciebat* as "Later on ...learned" is unlikely, as *ulterius* is rarely used as a temporal adverb, and more easily fits the passage as "besides, further." *Sciebat* as an imperfect should be translated "used to" or "began to know" rather than "learnt" as the following verb, *disputabat* is also in the imperfect, and should be translated "was in the habit of disputing."

Sciebat should be seen merely as Lull's narrative style, in parallel with the four other imperfects in the sentence. If Cohen's translation is correct, we have further evidence that Martini was not of Jewish origin. However, it is more likely that Cohen has translated the passage with such a debate in mind, which was not an issue to Lull.

¹⁶³ Cohen translates *valde in hebraico et magistro* as "very learned in Hebrew and a Rabbi" with the same degree of imprecision which he had levelled at the use of the term *rabinus* when applied to Martini. cf "Friars, p131, note 2: "Perhaps Paul of Burgos merely based his statement on Petrus Marsilius' *Cronicae*, cited by Quétif, 1;396

In the light of the bias in Lull's report of Martini, we find Cohen's use of Lull questionable. The evidence for Adret as the debating partner of Martini is further supported by a letter of Lull, catalogued but no longer extant, to certain Rabbis of Barcelona, including a Rabbi "Abram Denaret."¹⁶⁵ While this letter may well have been

which labels Martini a *magnus rabinus in Hebraeo*. This means no more than a great Hebrew teacher, which Martini evidently was."

¹⁶⁴ The passage in question contains a convoluted sentence, where the positioning of pronouns is some importance for the sense. It affects our interpretation of the Rabbi's response. Should we accept Lull's reportage as correct, in that Adret's failure to become a Christian was due to Martini's inability to furnish rational proofs of his faith?

If the rabbi had so frequently informed Lull of the defects of Martini's system, that Martini failed to give rational proofs for the truth of Christianity, and yet Lull was in possession of such proofs, should we not have expected the Rabbi to have become a Christian at Lull's suasion? It is more likely that Adret's reason for not accepting Christianity was not the genuine one, but rather one that was given to Lull by Adret, or more likely, one that Lull fabricated to fit in with the assumed superiority of his own system of rational proofs.. It seems implausible that Adret would have given as his reasons for not accepting Martini's presentation of Christianity the very reasons that Lull saw as the weakness of Martini's system, when all our other evidence of Adret's reaction to Martini's work (and as such, there is no direct link between the two, another factor that calls into question that such meetings took place between the Rabbi and the Dominican) points to Adret's concern to debate the use of scripture and rabbinic tradition that Martini had developed.

¹⁶⁵ Cohen, *Adversary*, pp. 54-5. Cohen uses Vallicrosa's identification of the three Rabbis named in the letter as Ibn Adret, Aaron Ha-Levi de na Clara and Judah ben Solomon. Coehn deduces that Adret was especially designated *Maestre*, and that this is referred to in the Lullian account of Martini's meeting by the phrase *valde in hebraico litterato et magistro*. Again Cohen overloads the use of a term, in this case *magistro*, to refer to Adret's special interest in combatting Martini's use of the Midrashim, of which he was an expert, or *magister* in the field. Lull himself had little

written to Adret, it provides no evidence that Adret debated Martini, or that Lull knew Adret personally. We know from Lull's biography that he avoided Barcelona in later life, but had moved in courtly circles before his conversion at a time when he was far more likely to have had friendly interaction with leading Jewish leaders. In fact, we find him at the court of King James at precisely the time when Nachmanides was there, between 1260-1267, before the latter left for Palestine. It is more likely that Lull's later account of events is a conflation of various events and personages, and cannot be relied upon as a definite identification of Martini's debating partner's.

knowledge of and no interest in the intricacies of the subject-matter of Jewish tradition, and is hardly likely to be using the word *magister* as technical term for such an area of competence.

The *Pugio Fidei* and Christian Cabbalah

One significant effect of the PF was to give source materials and a methodology to what later became the Christian use of the Cabbalah¹⁶⁶. This approach re-interpreted the developing Jewish mystical and esoteric tradition in the light of Christian trinitarian dogma, as an attempt to persuade Jews of the truth of the Christian faith. It also arose as a result of Christian curiosity fascination with an esoteric tradition with both biblical roots and occult practices. Its earliest practitioners were Jewish Christians such as Paul de Heredia (1405-1486), but the debt to Martini is clear.

Jewish mysticism developed in medieval Spain whilst Martini presided over the censorship of the Talmud and other Jewish literature, yet he seems unaware of the Zohar, Bahir and other works, and quotes sparingly from earlier rabbinic mystical speculation. Yet, as Gershom Scholem has observed¹⁶⁷, his influence on the writings of Pic de la Mirandole, usually recognised as the first Christian Cabbalist, is un-mistakeable.

¹⁶⁶ We have been unable to locate quotations from the Zohar in the PF despite Berthier's claim (5.310) "On trouve dans le *Pugio Fidei* des citations du Zohar."

¹⁶⁷ *Débuts de la Kabbale chrétienne*, (a revised translation of the earlier *Zur Geschichte der Anfänge der christlichen Kabbala* in *Essays Presented to Leo Baeck*, London, 1954) in *Kabbalistes Chrétiens* ed. Albin Michel, *Cahiers de L'hermetisme*, Edition Albin Michel, 1977, Paris. See also J.L. Blau, *The Christian Interpretation of the Cabbala in the Renaissance*, New York, 1944 .

"This affirmation (that the Kabbala could be used as an apologetic for Christianity) of Pic de la Mirandole and his spiritual heirs was merely a variation, applied to the Kabbala, of an idea already expressed in the thirteenth century, in the context of Catholic missionary propaganda, by Raymundus Martini in his voluminous treatise the *Pugio Fidei*.. According to this idea, the talmudic Aggadah, and in a general way the Midrash, already bore the mark of Christianity."¹⁶⁸

It is debatable how conscious Martini was of the Jewish mystical traditions, which came into circulation in his home territory of Catalonia amongst Jewish thinkers with whose lives and works he had dealings.

He may have chosen to ignore them as hampering the construction of his argument based on the Talmud. But the later Christian Cabbalists used some of his arguments, particularly in their speculations on the mystical significance of the name of God, the Tetragrammaton. One example is found in Arnaldo de Vilanova, the Spanish physician who became a Franciscan and wrote "Allocutio super Tetragrammaton". We are told by Arnaldo that he learnt Hebrew from Raimundus Martini. According to Arnaldo, the ך of יהוהך represents the Father and the existence of a "principle without beginning", ך signifying the Son as a "principle of beginning" and ך the Holy Spirit sent by the two first principles. Whilst Arnaldo claimed that such ideas were his own, they are traceable to the

¹⁶⁸ Débuts, p. 19, my translation.

Kabbal, and built upon the original deliberations on the name of God found in the *Pugio Fidei*¹⁶⁹

¹⁶⁹ PF. 690-1, where Martini records the Gematria on the divine name,

Conclusion

The *Pugio Fidei* represents the height of medieval understanding of Judaism for the purposes of missionising. Whilst it carries the standard Christian condemnation of the Jews for not accepting Christ, the effectiveness of its apologetic thrust was dependant on the continuing availability of Jewish literature, both ancient and contemporary. Had the Midrash of Moshe Hadarshan survived, and other manuscripts of works to which Martini refers, much of the attack on Martini's reputation and the continuing accusation of forgery would be unnecessary.

It would be incorrect to see Martini's work as a call for the destruction of the Talmud, as without the Talmud his approach, albeit frowned upon by work of his rival Ramon Lull with a more rational system of his own composition, would be rendered impotent. Rather its power depended on the sufficient training of preachers, marshalling of resources, and providing of opportunities, which diminished with each expression of anti-Semitism directed towards the Jewish people.

Whilst it is appealing to suggest that the Jewish opponent of Martini was Adret of Barcelona, the evidence is based on the biased account of an envious colleague, and is far from proved by Lull's report alone. More certain is the relationship between Martin and Aquinas, and the use of each other's works. That Aquinas should have relied

to some extent on Martini is but one example of the use of his work by many in years to come.

As Cohen has pointed out¹⁷⁰, the *Pugio Fidei* has been commented on more for its methodology than its "ideational depth", and more for its philosophical ideas as they affected Christians than its approach to Jews and Judaism. Yet it represents the development of one individual's lifelong attempt to spread his faith within an atmosphere of hostility and distrust to which he partly contributed. That his work paved the way for the moderating tones of the Renaissance by laying the beginnings of a biblical scholarship that was sensitive to the interpretation of texts was serendipitous, but hardly Martini's intention¹⁷¹.

The resources marshalled by Raymond de Peñaforte and wielded into the human instruments of Paulo Christiani and Raymundus Martini ultimately failed to address the key questions for the followers of all religions of that time - the challenge of Aristotelian thought. The issues of mission and conversion were to be exacerbated by other types of polemical approach - that ultimately led not just to the burning of the Talmud (an essential item of Martini's armoury) but to the eventual expulsion of the Jewish community from Spain. With such dark clouds brooding on the horizon of the Jewish community

¹⁷⁰ **12.139** note 17.

¹⁷¹ Berthier (5.311) "Le vrai mérite de R. Martin a été dans son effort de critique de la Bible et de la littérature rabbinique. Il a désiré étudier logiquement les textes, concevant déjà la science qui de nos jours se nomme philologie."

at all times, it is not surprising that the light of one man's learning should be little welcomed, and vigourously opposed.

Select Bibliography of Works Consulted

Martini O.P, Raymundus, *Pugio Fidei adversus Mauros et Judaeos cum Observationibus Josephi de Voisin et Introductione Jo. Benedicti Carpzovi*, Leipsig, F. Lanckisi, 1687, reprint ed. Gregg Press, Farnborough, 1967.

1. Baer, Yitzhak, **A History of the Jews in Christian Spain**. Translated by Louis Schoffman, 2 vols. Philadlephia, JPSA, 1961.
2. Baron, Salo W., **A Social and Religious History of the Jews**, vol 9, 1964, New York.
3. Bonfils, Reuben, **The Image of Judaism in Raymond Martini's *Pugio Fidei***, (Hebrew) *Tarbiz* 40 (1971) pp.360-375.
4. Berger, David, **The Jewish-Christian Debate in the High Middle Ages**, Philadelphia, JPSA, 1979.
5. Berthier, Andre, **Un Maître Orientaliste du XIIIe Siècle: Raymond Martain O.P.**, *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* VI (1936) pp.266-311.
6. Cavallera S. J., Ferdinand, **L'Explanatio Symboli de Raymond Martin O.P. (1258)**, *Studia Mediaevalia in Honorem R.J. Martin* Bruges, 1948, pp.201-222.
7. Chazan, Robert, **Church, State and Jew in the Middle Ages**, Berhman House, New York, 1980.
8. Chazan, Robert, **Daggers of Faith**, University of California Press, 1989.
9. Chazan, Robert, **From Friar Paul to Friar Raymond: The Development of Innovative Missionising Argumentation**, *Harvard Theological Review* 76:3(1983), pp.289-306.
10. Cohen, Jeremy, **Original Sin as the Evil Inclination - a Polemicist's Appreciation of Human Nature**, *Harvard Theological Review* 73 (1980), pp.495-520.
11. Cohen, Jeremy, **The Christian Adversary of Solomon Ibn Adret**, *Jewish Quarterly Review* 71 (1980-81) pp.48-55.

12. Cohen, Jeremy, **The Friars and the Jews**, Cornell University Press, 1982.
13. Cohen, Martin A., **Reflections on the Text and Content of the Disputation of Barcelona**, Hebrew Union College Annual 35 (1964) pp. 157-192.
14. Davies, W. D., **The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount**, Cambridge University Press, 1966, Appendix V, "**¿Cesará La Tora En La Edad Messiánica?**" pp.446-7.
15. Dondaine, A., **Ricoldiana**, Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum 38 (1967) pp.119-179. ("**Où l'on évoque Raymond Martin**" pp.149-157).
16. Fumigali, Peter Francisco, **The Original Manuscript of the "Pugio Fidei" of Raymundus Martini** (Hebrew), Proceedings of the Ninth World Congress of Jewish Studies, Jerusalem 1986, WUJS, Division B vol 1, pp. 93-98.
17. Funkenstein, Amos, **Basic Types of Christian Anti-Jewish Polemics in the Later Middle Ages (Reflections on Medieval Anti-Judaism:3)**, Viator 2 (1971), pp. 373-382.
18. Huerga, Alvaro, **Hipótesis Sobre la Génesis de la 'Summa Contra Gentiles' y del 'Pugio Fidei'**, (Spanish) Angelicum 51 (1974) pp. 533-557.
19. Lapide, P., **Hebrew in the Church**, Eerdmans, USA, 1984.
20. Lavajo, Joachim Ch., **The Apologetical Method of Raymond Marti according to the Problematic of Raymond Lull**, Islamochristiana II (1985) pp. 155-176.
21. Lieberman, S., **Raymund Martini and His Alleged Forgeries**, Historia Judaica ed. Prof. G. Kisch, New York, Vol. V., 1943, pp. 87-102.
22. Lieberman, S., **Shkiin: A Few Words on some Jewish Legends, Customs and Literary Sources Found in Karaite and Christian Works**, Wahrmann Books, Jerusalem 1970.

23. Merchavia, Ch., **The Hebrew Version of the *Pugio Fidei* in the Sainte Genevieve Manuscript** (Hebrew),. Kiryat Sepher 51 (1976) pp.283-288.
24. Macho, A. Diaz, **Reseña del Estado de las Cuestiones; Acerca de los Midrasim Falsificados de Raimundo Marti**, (Spanish) Sefarad 9 (1949) pp. 164-196.
25. March, Jose M, **Valor Apologetico de la "Explanatio Simboli Apostolorum" de Ramon Marti**, (Spanish) Razon y Fé 29 (1911) pp.203-210.
26. Martini, Raymundus, **Pugio Fidei**, Leipzig: F. Lanckisi, 1687. Reprinted by Gregg Press; Farnborough, 1967.
27. Merchavia, Ch., **The Talmud in the Additiones of Paul of Burgos**, Journal of Jewish Studies 16 (1965) pp. 115-134.
28. Moore, George Foot, **Christian Writers on Judaism**, Harvard Theological Review 14:3 (1921) pp.197-254.
29. Murphy S.J., Thomas, **The Date and Purpose of the *Contra Gentiles***, Heythrop Journal 10 (1969), pp. 405-415.
30. Neubauer, A., **Jewish Controversy and the "Pugio Fidei"**, The Expositor 38 (1888) pp. 81-105 and 39 (1889) pp.179-197.
31. Panella, Emilio O.P., **Ricerche su Riccoldo da Monte di Croce**, Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum 58 (1988) pp. 5-85. (pp. 23-56 "**Riccoldo, Guglielmo da Tripoli e Raimundo Marti**").
32. Rankin, Oliver Shaw, **Jewish Religious Polemic**, Ktav, 1970 (Reprint of Edinburgh University Press, 1956).
33. Ribes y Montané, Can. Dr. Pedro, **San Alberto Magno, Maestro y Fuente del Apologetica Medieval Ramon Marti**, Doctor Communis 33 (1980) pp. 169-193.
34. Robles, Laureano, **Dominicos Corona de Aragon**, Repertorio de Historia de la Ciencias Ecclesiasticas en España 3 Siglos XIII-XVI, pp. 58-67, Salamanca 1971.

35. Sancho, H., **La "Explanatio Symboli Apostolorum" de Raimundo Marti, O.P.**, La Ciencia Tomista 15 (1917) pp.395-408.
36. Schiller-Szinessy, S.M., **The *Pugio Fidei***, Cambridge Journal of Philology 16 (1888) pp.131-152.
37. Scholem, Gershom, **Zur Geschichte der Anfänge der Christlichen Kabbala**, Leo Baeck 80th Birthday Festschrift pp.158-175., revised by Scholem and translated by Paul Kessler as **Débuts de La Kabbale Chrétienne**, Kabbalistes Chrétiens, ed. Albin Michel, Cahiers de l'Hermétisme, Edition Albin Michel, Paris, 1979, pp.19-46.
38. Secret, F., **Notes Pour une Histoire Du *Pugio Fidei* A La Renaissance**, Sefarad, vol. XX, Fasc 2, (1960) pp. 401-407.
39. Secret, F., **Une Première Oubliée du "Pugio Fidei"**, Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum 36 (1966) pp. 449-455.
40. Secret, F., **Le Premier Emploi du *Pugio Fidei* en France au XVIe Siècle**, Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum 47 (1977) pp.169-182.
41. Vallicrosa, J.M. Millas, **Reseña Del Estado De Las Cuestiones: Nota Bibliographica Acerça De Las Relaciones Entre Arnaldo De Vilanova y La Cultura Judaica**, pp.149-153, Sefarad.
42. Vansteenkiste O.P., C., **Review of Lieberman's *Shkiin*** (French) Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum 10 (1939) pp. 379-382.
43. Willi-Plein, Ina, **Der "Pugio Fidei" des Raymund Martini als ein exemplarischer Versuch kirchlicher Auseinandersetzung mit dem Judentum**, in Glaubensdolch und Messiasbeweis, Die Begegnung von Judentum, Christentum und Islam im 13. Jahrhundert in Spanien, Neukirchener Verlag, 1980, pp. 23-83.
44. Williams, A.L., **Adversus Judaeos**, Cambridge University Press, 1935.
45. Wirszubski, Chaim, **Flavius Mithridates, Sermo de Passione Domini**, Jerusalem, Magnes Press, 1963.