Chapter 13
Translation, Transcription, and Transliteration in the Polemics of Raymond Martini, O.P.¹

Ryan Szpiech

The authority associated with a medieval auctor was not usually the product of just one particular text but often depended on the authenticity of the whole corpus of texts attributed to that auctor’s name. The auctor was seen as an authority because he embodied auctoritas, the wisdom to speak well, the authority to speak truly, and the believability to be trusted as a source. According to A. J. Minnis, auctoritas requires two things: intrinsic worth and authenticity. To have intrinsic worth meant that what one wrote did not contradict Christian doctrine; to have authenticity linked an auctor with a true and ancient source.² In polemical writing, the concept of auctoritas, traditionally based solely on biblical testimonia, began in the twelfth century to expand noticeably with the introduction of secular texts of philosophy that initiated a shift to argument that was based on ratione et auctoritate, on reason and authoritative textual proof. By the second half of the thirteenth century, this expansion of the concept of auctoritas in polemical writing, which itself can be understood as part of a broader shift in the meaning of the medieval auctor in light of new Aristotelian ideas about the “effective cause” of a text,³ came to involve the invocation as textual auctoritates those texts considered authoritative by Jews and Muslims, but not Christians, such as the Talmud, Qur’an,⁴ Midrashic exegesis, and collections of Muslim traditions about the sayings of Muhammad.

¹ This research is part of a collaborative project entitled “The Intellectual and Material Legacies of Late Medieval Sephardic Judaism: An Interdisciplinary Approach,” directed by Dr. Esperanza Alfonso (CSIC). I wish to thank the European Research Council for its support of this project with a four-year Starting Grant and to thank Dr. Alfonso for her ongoing coordination as Principal Investigator of the project. I also wish to thank Edward Casey for his editorial corrections.


³ Minnis, pp. 28–39.

⁴ Transliteration of Hebrew and Arabic has loosely followed the norms established by the Journal of Semitic Studies with simplified Hebrew vowels.
known as *ḥadīth*. This use of non-Christian texts as *auctoritates* evidenced the growing desire by Christian polemicists for authenticity, garnered at the expense of intrinsic worth.

This use of non-Christian texts as *auctoritates* became a labor dominated by the Dominican order, newly founded in 1215 for combating the heretics of Provence but quickly adapted to other anti-heretical struggles. The Dominicans embraced language study as a key part of their modus operandi virtually from their inception: the first Master General after Dominic himself, Jordan de Saxony, stated in 1236 that friars ought to learn the languages of those to whom they preached. Less than two decades later, Master Humbert of Romans specified that this should include Arabic and Hebrew. Dominican efforts operated in Murcia in 1266 to teach Hebrew and Arabic, as well as in Barcelona (1275, Hebrew), Valencia (1280, Arabic), and Játiva (1302, Hebrew and Arabic). Such efforts can also be connected to the emphasis on rhetorical effectiveness in preaching by Raymond of Peñafort, Master General after

---


6 “Monemus quod in omnibus provinciis et conventibus frares linguas addiscant illorum quibus sunt propingui [sic]” [We order that in all provinces and convents, Friars learn the languages of those around them]. *Acta Capitulorum Generalium Ordinis Praedicatorum ab anno 1220 usque ad annum [1844]*, ed. Benedictus Maria Reichert (Rome, 1898–1904), p. 9.


8 On the history of such movements, see José María Coll, “Escuelas de Lenguas Orientales en los siglos XIII y XIV,” *Analecta Sacra Tarraconensia* 17 (1944): 115–38; 18 (1945): 59–89; 19 (1946): 217–40, at 17: 121–4 and 18: 76–7; and Robin Vose, *Dominicans, Muslims, and Jews in the Medieval Crown of Aragon* (Cambridge, 2009). Such efforts, which can only loosely be called “schools” and represent the efforts of a few very small groups, were contemporaneous with those of Catalan polemicist and savant Ramon Llull, who helped establish chairs in Semitic languages at several universities. Llull, after himself learning Arabic with his Muslim slave for nine years, successfully petitioned king Jaume I of Aragon to support the foundation of the Monastery of Miramar in Mallorca in 1276, where Franciscans could study both Hebrew and Arabic. He went on in 1311 to petition the Pope’s help at the Council of Vienne at which two chairs each in Arabic, Hebrew, and Aramaic were ordered to be established at universities in Bologna, Oxford, Paris, Salamanca, and the Papal Court. On this history, see Sebastián García Palou, *El Miramar de Ramon Llull* (Palma de Mallorca, 1977), pp. 19–36.
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1 Jordan, following directly in the tradition of Pope Gregory the Great. The writing of
2 the Aragonese polyglot Raymond Martini (Ramon Martí, d. after 1284), well-known
3 for its impressive manipulation of non-Christian sources, fits within this trend of
4 Dominican attention to Hebrew and Arabic and, more importantly, within the larger
5 process of the transformation of auctoritas that accompanied it.
6 This essay examines the evolution of Martini’s approach to language over the
7 course of his career as a Dominican from the 1250s to the 1280s, specifically looking
8 at his use of translation, transliteration, and transcription as part of his understanding
9 of “authentic” textual authorities. As Martini focused more exclusively on anti-
10 Jewish rather than anti-Muslim polemic, languages and translation played an ever
11 more important role in his writing. As language came to constitute an essential part
12 of his polemical arsenal against Jews in a way that it had not in his anti-Muslim
13 polemic, Martini grew more concerned with the imagined Jewish responses to
14 his arguments. In response to this anxiety, he developed an increasingly careful
15 and punctilious methodology that corresponded to his mounting anxiety over the
16 authenticity of his sources. As his career progressed, Martini strove to approximate
17 to what he saw as the most authentic and familiar form of his cited authorities, first
18 through translation, then through transliteration, and finally through transcription
19 of original languages and alphabets. I propose that Martini’s use of language
20 formed part of a new rhetoric of authenticity in Christian apologetics in which
21 writers aimed to move ever closer to an elusive affirmation of theological identity
22 through the terms of non-Christian difference. In this, the theological expression
23 of Christian identity came to find its most apposite vocabulary in foreignness, and
24 authority increasingly depended, in its justification of that identity, on an appeal to
25 alterity. At the same time, a comparison of Martini’s evolving use of sources shows
26 how his appeal to authenticity was constantly in tension with his own interpretive
27 choices in the process of transcribing and translating his sources.
28 Before looking at Martini’s works, a word on terminology is in order. In this
29 essay, “translation” is used to describe Martini’s practice of interpreting and
30 rewriting his source citations in a language other than the original (usually this
31 meant translation from Hebrew or Arabic to Latin, but sometimes Hebrew and
32 Arabic were also languages of translation). This practice is to be distinguished from
33 “transliteration,” in which Martini includes representations of sounds or phrases
34 from Arabic or Hebrew sources in Latin characters (or in one case, Hebrew in Arabic
35 characters). Both of these practices are distinguished here from “transcription” of
36 original material in Hebrew and Arabic passages in their most common form (in the
37
38
39 9 Peñafort stated in his highly influential Summa de Paenitentia, “Debent, sicut ait
40 Gregorius, tam iudaet quam sarraceni auctoritatis, rationibus et blandimentis, potius
41 quam asperitatis, ad fidem christianam de novo suscipiendam provocari” (“Jews as well
42 as Muslims should, as Gregory (the Great) says, be provoked to take up ... the Christian
43 faith with authorities, reasons, and blandishments rather than asperities”) (ed. Xaverio
45 10 See Bedos-Rezak, pp. 1061–3, for other examples of the same phenomenon.
Hebrew or Arabic alphabets). As we will see below, Martini makes use of all three
techniques to varying degrees, often transcribing a passage in Hebrew or Arabic and
then translating it into Latin (or translating a Hebrew passage into Hebrew), within
which he sometimes intersperses examples of transliterated sounds or words.
Over the course of Martini’s polemical career, which spanned the time between
his entrance in the Dominican order (approximately in the late 1230s) until his death
sometime after 1284, he composed a spate of polemical and apologetic works that
included refutations of Judaism and Islam on the basis of non-Christian texts. His
first works, *Explanatio simboli apostolorum* [Explanation of the Apostles Creed],
composed around 1256/7, and *De Seta Machometi* [On the Sect of Muḥammad],
unknown date but probably from the same period, draw in various places from the
Qurʿān, ḥadīth, and Arabic philosophers such as Avicenna, al-Ghazālī, and Averroes.
While the *Explanatio* principally contains an apologetic, theological discussion of
the foundations of Christian belief into which Martini blended a polemical attack
on Islam, the *De Seta* focuses exclusively on anti-Islamic argument and includes
an *ad hominem* attack on Muḥammad and his status as prophet. Martini is also
often credited with a lengthy Arabic-Latin lexical list known as the *Vocabulista in
Arabico*, probably composed in the same years, although this attribution continues
to be debated and will not be considered in detail here.

Despite their different focuses, the *Explanatio* and the *De Seta* contain many
similarities and even share some identical passages. Both aim their polemical
apparatus against Islam rather than Judaism, making use of citations from Islamic
sources to buttress their arguments. More importantly, however, both works cite
Islamic sources in Latin translation only, and in some cases they notably change
or abbreviate the original text. For example, if we compare the well-known “Light
Verse” from the “Surah of Light” (Qurʿān 24:35) with the terse rendition of it in
the *Explanatio*, we see how Martini reduces it almost beyond recognition, stating,

---

11 J. March, “Ramon Martí y la seva *Explanatio simboli Apostolorum,*” *Annauri de
l’Institut d’Estudis Catalans* (1908): 443–96 at 462; and *De Seta Machometi o de origine,
progressu, et fine Machometi et quadruplici reprobatione prophetiae eius*, ed. and trans.

12 This work repeats many of the Qurʿānic citations of the *Explanatio* and expands upon
them, adding more references as well to the Sīra, an eighth-century work of biographical
lore about Muḥammad by the author Ibn Isḥāq, and the ḥadīth collections such as the *Ṣaḥīḥ
of al-Bukhārī and that of Muslim Ibn al-Ṭabarānī.*

13 On the *Vocabulista*, see the edition by Celestino Schiaparelli (Florence, 1871), and
the studies by David Griffin, “Los Mozarabismos del ‘Vocabulista’ atribuido a Ramón
Federico Corriente, *El léxico árabe andalusí según el ‘Vocabulista in Arabico’* (Madrid,
1989); Federico Corriente, “Notas de lexicología hispanoárabe. I. Nuevos romancismos en
Aaben Quzmán y crítica de los propuestos. II. Los romancismos del ‘Vocabulista in Arabico’:
de lexicología hispanoárabe. III. Los romancismos del Vocabulista. IV. Nuevos berberismos
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1 “Dicit in c. Luminis, quod Deus est lumen celorum et terre, et simililitudo luminis
eius sicut lampas olei incensa lumine” [“It says in the chapter Light, that God
is the light of the heavens and earth, and the likeness of his light (is) like an oil
lamp flaming brightly”]. As this passage continues, we see that Martini not only
condenses his sources but sometimes also alters the original sense in subtle but
significant ways. He continues (citing the “Surah of Abraham,” Qur’an 14:25):
“Item in C. Absraam: Dicit Deus, secundum credulitatem eorum. Inducit Deus
simililitudes hominibus ad hoc, ut recordentur” [“In the chapter Abraham: God,
according to their (mode of) belief, said, ‘God brings forth likenesses/similes to
humbankind in this (context), in order that they may remember’”] (462). The
original text reads, by contrast, “Allah sets forth parables (anthāl) for men,
in order that they be admonished / made to remember (yatadhakarānā).” He
translates the ubiquitous Qur’ānic word anthāl, meaning in both places “parables”
or “analogies,” in its literal meaning as “similitudines” (“likenesses” or “similes”) rather than “exempla” (as given in the Vocabulista) or “parabolae” (in the Gospels
and in the Pugio). Likewise, Martini’s literal rendering of the final verb removes
the explicitly admonitory sense of the verse by making men simply “remember”
rather than be “made to remember.” Although these changes seem slight, they shift
the focus of the verse to better fit Martini’s discussion of the Trinity according
to Augustine’s own image of the “analogy” (similitudo) of fire and its multiple
properties. Such changes are, in fact, part of a pattern of translation in Martini’s
eyar works, and may reflect the influence of the Arabic anti-Islamic polemic

\[\text{\footnotesize 14} \quad \text{J. March, “Ramon Martí,” p. 462.}\]

\[\text{\footnotesize 15} \quad \text{The text reads “recondentur,” which is clearly a scribal error.}\]

\[\text{\footnotesize 16} \quad \text{In the Vocabulista in Arabico (which, even if we do not concede it is Martini’s}
work, does shed light on contemporary usage and translation), mathāl/anthāl are given as
“exemplum/exempla” and “proverbium/proverbia” (pp. 177 and 541). Similitudo, by contrast,
is the translation of Shīb (p. 123). For an example of medieval Arabic translation of the
Gospels, see Bernard Levin, Die griechisch-arabische Evangelien-Übersetzung: Vat. Borg.
ar 95 und Ber. Orient. oct. 1108 (Uppsala, 1938). A very clear example of his translation of
anthāl as “parabolas” and not “similitudines” is found in his translation of a passage from
Maimonides’s Guide of the Perplexed (Dalālat al-Ḥārīn, text established by S. Munk, ed.
the passage from the prologue affirming that the “key” to the meaning of prophecy is “fāḥṣ
al-anthālī wa-ma’nahā wa-ta‘wil al-fāţīḥah” [“an understanding of the parables, of their import,
and of the meaning of the words occurring in them”] (Dalālat, p. 6; Guide, p. 10, all emphasis
mine). Martini translates this passage in the Pugio as “intelligere parabolas, atque metathoras,
similitudines atque aenigmata” [“to understand parables and metaphors, likenesses and
enigmas”] (p. 427, emphasis mine). Here Martini first renders anthāl as “parabolas” and
only thirdly associates it with “similitudines.” Moreover, he immediately follows this with a
translation of Ezek. 17:2, translating the biblical word maṣāli (the exact equivalent of the Arabic
mathāl) as “parabola.” Elsewhere in the Pugio (e.g., pp. 485, 505, 549, 552, etc.) he employs
“similitudo” to refer to God’s “likeness,” in which man was created, according to Gen. 1:26.

\[\text{\footnotesize 17} \quad \text{Martini’s reference to Augustine in the Explanatio comes from his Sermones ad
known in Latin translation as the Contrarietas Alfolicia and Liber demudationis. More importantly, although relatively minor changes in themselves, these details reflect a flexible approach to translation in Martini’s early works that contrasts sharply with his punctilious approach in his later anti-Jewish writing. Despite the similarities and repetitions in the Explanatio and the De Seta with regard to their sometimes loose approach to translation, there are important differences between the two works that also hint at more significant tendencies that develop in Martini’s later writing and, because of this, might suggest that the De Seta was composed after the Explanatio. Because the De Seta is explicitly polemical, whereas the Explanatio blends its polemical attack with apologetic explanations of Christian belief, De Seta cites much more material from non-Christian sources (more than twice as many citations as the Explanatio), including more references to hadith as well as citations from Ibn Ishaq’s biographical work on Muhammad, preserved in the rendition of Ibn Hisham, the Sirat Rasul Allah. Although Martini implicitly characterizes Islamic sources as auctoritates in the Explanatio, this characterization becomes explicit in the De Seta. In the former, he claims that the incorrupt nature of both biblical Testaments can be proven “per auctoritates” [by authorities], among which he includes the citations from the Qur'an, and this implicit characterization is also found in the De Seta when Martini repeats this passage (52). In the De Seta, however, he goes one step further and specifically names one citation from the Qur'an as an auctoritas (40). This characterization is significant because in his later works he does not hesitate to designate his non-Christian sources as auctoritates, a clear departure from the less explicit language of the Explanatio. Along with this move to characterize non-Christian sources as auctoritates, Martini demonstrates an increasing need to show his mastery of those sources by citing more widely from them and representing their language more carefully.

This shift is evident in the way Martini gives the titles of his sources in the Explanatio as compared with the De Seta. When a book of Qur'an or hadith is named in the former, there is no explanation of its translation. In the De Seta, by contrast, Martini regularly follows the title with a brief, explanatory translation. For example, in the passage shared by both texts, the book titles are sometimes translated and sometimes just transliterated, but no translation is given for the transliteration.

---

18 We can find another example of his subtle changes to the Qur'anic text in his translations in his citation of 93:6–7, “Did [God] not ... find you [Muhammad] astray and direct you?” In the De Seta, Martini makes an important addition to the text, stating, “Deus invenit Machometum erroneum, id est in errore legis Dei et direxit eum” (“God found Muhammad errant, that is, in error (concerning) the law of God, and directed him”) (p. 20). Here, Martini not only turns a question into a statement but also adds in the commentary explaining “errant” as in error over God’s law, placing additional emphasis on Muhammad's alleged “error.” Thomas Burman, Reading the Qur'an in Latin Christendom, 1140–1560 (Philadelphia, 2007), has noted that both the Explanatio and the De Seta show the influence of the Liber demudationis, possibly in its original Arabic form (pp. 47–9).

19 March, p. 452.

20 March, p. 454; and Martini, De Seta, pp. 54–6.
In various other citations from Arabic sources in the *De Seta*, by contrast, names are transliterated and then translated. For example, the text introduces its citations with statements such as, “Secundum quod legitur in libro qui vocatur Clari, id est, *Actus Machometi*…” [“According to what is read in the book called Siyar, that is, *The Acts of Muḥammad*…”] (18); or “Dixit in Alcorano, in tractatu Raharim [sic], id est, *Prohibitio* … item … in tractatu Zaf … id est, *Ordinis*…” [“It says in the Qurān, in the tract at-Tahrīm, that is, *The Prohibition* … also … in the tract al-Saff (The Row/Rank), that is, *The Order* …”] (26, and see also 30).  

Although these added details of transliteration within the translation also seem trivial, they intimate the first glimpse of what will become a much more common practice in Martini’s subsequent polemical works. Understood as part of a trajectory of development toward more precise use of original language sources, these differences point to an increased need to supplement his translations with more untranslated material and also suggest that the *De Seta* was composed later than the *Explanatio*. Between the two texts, Martini begins to focus on what will be a central concern of his later writing: how to characterize the authority of his sources and, more importantly, how to represent that authority in the most “authentic” form. As we have already seen through his burgeoning use of transliteration, the keynote of that evocation of authenticity is the representation of language.  

The *Explanatio* and the *De Seta*, and possibly the *Vocabulista* lexicon, represent the output of an early stage in Martini’s career. A second stage begins in 1267 with the anti-Jewish *Capistrum Iudaorum* [*Muzzle for the Jews*] and culminates 11 years later with Martini’s largest and best-known work, the *Pugio Fidei* [*Dagger of Faith*], an enormous polemical tome, amounting to more than 700 pages in the two seventeenth-century editions. In both works, Martini virtually abandons his former polemic with Islam and devotes himself to a refutation of books, noting that Martini, like his contemporary Dominican Riccoldo da Monte Croce, did not follow the idiosyncratic reorganization of the books found in the Qurān translation of Robert of Ketton (p. 97).

---

21 Burman has observed the importance of these translations of the titles of Qurānic books, noting that Martini, like his contemporary Dominican Riccoldo da Monte Croce, did not follow the idiosyncratic reorganization of the books found in the Qurān translation of Robert of Ketton (p. 97).


Judaism on the basis of biblical, post-biblical, Talmudic, and midrashic sources. Insofar as we can associate Raymond Martini with Raymond of Peñafort, we can date the beginning of this turn to Judaism around the time of the Disputation of Barcelona in 1263. We can situate Martini’s focus on Judaism among other Dominican efforts in the decade after the Disputation, such as the harangue of Friar Paul Christiani, the Christian protagonist at Barcelona, in Paris in 1272. As Martini states in the opening lines to the *Pugio fidei*, “Nulla pestis sit efficacior ad nocendum quam familiaris inimicus. Nullus autem inimicus Christianae fidei magis sit familiaris, magisque nobis inevitabilis, quam Judaicus” (“No plague may be more effective at harming than a familiar enemy. No enemy, moreover, may be more familiar to the Christian faith, or more ineluctable for us, than the Jew”) (2).

In Martini’s turn to anti-Jewish writing, his engagement with primary source materials intensifies dramatically, and with it, the task of translation becomes more than just a window into the sources of his adversaries—it becomes the weapon of his own rhetorical self-justification and his primary tool in polemical assault. As language became a more central issue in his argumentation, his attention to the details of the original text increased and his efforts to show his understanding and mastery of such details became more patent. The focusing of his attention on the original language of his sources is especially clear if we compare his citation of the same Qur’ān passages previously cited in the *Explanatio* and *De Seta*. For example, we can compare his citation of Qur’ān 4:171 in the *De Seta* and the *Capistrum*. The original text in Arabic can be translated, “The Messiah Jesus, son of Mary, is the messenger of God and [is] his word, which he put into Mary, and [is] a spirit from Him.” In the *De Seta*, the citation reads, “Christus est verbum Dei quod Deus posuit in Mariam et est Spiritus ex eo” (“Christ is the word of God which God put in Mary and which is a Spirit from him”) (24). The *Capistrum*, by contrast, reads, “Messias est Icne ibnu Maryam, id est Jesus flius Mariae, nuntius Dei, et verbum eius quod deposuit apud Maryam, et spiritus de ipso” (“The Messiah is Isā ibn Maryam, that is Jesus son of Mary, messenger of God, and is his word which he put into Mary, and a spirit from him”) (1:254). This rendering is more accurate, changing “posuit,” “he put,” as in the *De Seta*, into “deposuit,” “he deposited or gave to,” thus more accurately rendering the Arabic “alqāhā,” “He put or said it forth.” It is also more complete, adding back the detail that the Messiah is “rasūl Allāh,” God’s messenger. Perhaps most importantly, Martini makes an attempt in the *Capistrum*, albeit a feeble one, at transliteration by giving the name of Jesus phonetically as it is in the Qur’ānic text, “Isā ibnu Maryama.”


For the Hebrew account of this debate, see Joseph Shatzmiller (ed.), *La deuxième controverse de Paris: un chapitre dans la polémique entre chrétiens et juifs au Moyen Âge* (Paris, 1994).
This difference is indicative of a larger shift in the Capistrum in which Martini cites widely from the Babylonian Talmud and major exegete midrashim, and in many passages intersperses transliteration of Hebrew and Aramaic with Latin translation. In one example found within his calculations concerning the prophecy within the book of Daniel, he cites a Talmudic passage to support his understanding of the Hebrew words for day and year: "Legitur in Massakta Ros hasanah in principio… Wyom ehad hasanah id est dies unus in anno asah shah, id es computatur annus" ["It reads in the beginning of the Tractate Rosh Ha-Shanah ... we-yom eḥad ha-šanah, that is, the first day of the year, 'asah šanah, that is, is calculated as a year"] (1:172).26

In this very simple example, we see that he has moved from a transliteration of the title only to a transliteration of both title and text within his translation. While some of his attempts at transliteration in the Capistrum are simple and alternate coherently between original and translation, others involve a dense and sometimes confusing combination of transliteration, translation, and commentary, such as his citation of the gloss of French exegete Solomon ben Isaac (Rashi), on Isaiah 5:15, in which Rashi cites the Aramaic translation Targum Jonathan (2:264). In this and numerous other passages, Martini’s text ends up being a garbled combination of transliteration of Hebrew texts and of Aramaic translations from the Targumim found within those, all layered on top of his own translations, within which he inserts his own polemical remarks. Among the hundred-odd citations of Talmud and midrash in the Capistrum, not to mention the hundreds more from the Hebrew Bible itself, there are dozens of passages that go beyond translation and attempt to evoke the original in this clumsy way by means of interspersed and ever more abundant transliteration. Although the results most often muddle rather than clarify the meaning of the original text, they point to his increasing attention to the language of his citations and his growing dissatisfaction with mere translation into Latin.

This tendency toward increasing use of original languages in Martini’s work reaches its most developed form in his magnum opus, the Pugio Fidei. On the basis of more than 2,000 citations from the Hebrew Bible, as well as hundreds of post-biblical textual auctoritates drawn from a dizzying plethora of sources including both Talmuds, most major halakhic and aggadic midrashim, and dozens of works of commentary and philosophy from Jewish tradition, Martini concludes that rabbinical traditions themselves support the notion of Christianity as the New Israel in history.27 (For the cover page and frontispiece of the 1687 Leipzig edition, see Ch. Merchavia, “Pugio Fidei—An Index of Citations” [Hebrew], in Galuṭ aḥar Golah (Jerusalem, 1988), pp. 203–34.

26 The original Talmudic passage from BT Rosh ha-Shanah 2b reads: “we-yom eḥad ba-šanah ḥašuv šanah” (my emphasis). In citing from the edition of Robles Sierra, I have not copied his additions of diacritical marks into the edited text, but have added my own transliteration in the English translation.

27 For an index of Martini’s citations from Hebrew texts, see Ch. Merchavia, “Pugio Fidei—An Index of Citations” [Hebrew], in Galuṭ aḥar Golah (Jerusalem, 1988), pp. 203–34.

Fig. 13.1  Pugio Fidei, Leipzig, 1687, cover page and frontispiece.

see Figure 13.1.) While the *Pugio* multiplies the amount of sources at least fourfold compared with the *Capistrum*, it also moves ever closer to the original authorities of its adversaries by replacing interspersed transliteration with actual citation in original scripts. Thus, we can compare the relatively tangled transliterations in the *Capistrum* given above with the same citations as given in the *Pugio* (275, reproduced in Figures 13.2, and 954, respectively). In these and numerous other passages found in both the *Capistrum* and the *Pugio*, Martini dispenses with the clumsy recourse to transliteration and simply transcribes the original verse in full in its original script, and then follows this with his translation into Latin. By placing the *Pugio* alongside his other writing, we can see it as the culmination of this trend of representing non-Christian sources more and more accurately in what he understood to be their most "original" form.

We can also explain Martini's practices of transcription and transliteration with the help of his own comments about language within the *Capistrum* and *Pugio*, which suggest that the central motivation of Martini's increasingly frequent and precise engagement with original source material from Arabic and Hebrew is defensive, a way to forestall any claims by potential adversaries charging him with a lack of real knowledge of the original texts being cited. Martini in fact explicitly addresses such counter-claims of Jewish interlocutors in the opening of the *Capistrum*:
Fig. 13.2 Pugio Fidei, Leipzig, 1687, p. 275.
[There are two ways that the Jews impugn the accuracy of a text, either by using subterfuge or by introducing their own false ideas against it, namely, by saying that it is not thus in Hebrew ... or if they concede the text (is thus), by saying that it should not be understood or explained thus. With the help of God, therefore, I will translate these authorities word for word, and, against the first (point), I will sometimes put the commentary on the words of their Rabbis within (my text) or outside it in the margin. Against the second (point), I have collected from the Talmud and from other books held to be authentic among them certain sayings of their ancient teachers who adduce or expound authorities of this type ... like these which I will intersperse (in the body of the text) or put in the margin, translating them, word for word to the degree possible, in like manner ...] (1:54)

It is striking that Martini explicitly addresses his use not only of translation and placement of the citations (and transliterated passages) but also of the original, transcribed language of his sources. As he says, the language itself, not the understanding of the polemicist who cites it, is an effective response to the counter-arguments of Jews in debate. To counter such alleged Jewish "tricks" ("dolos"), "optimum erit si istud opusculum non solum in Latino, sed etiam in Hebraeo, et scientia legendi, etsi non intelligendi Hebraeum habeantur" ["It will be best if this treatise (be written) not only in Latin, but also in Hebrew, and that one have the knowledge of reading Hebrew, even if he cannot understand it"] (1:56). Martini thus specifically addresses the role of original language in his polemical argumentation, noting that it is a specific technique for responding to Jewish ripostes to Christian arguments. He here not only names his post-biblical sources as auctoritates and specifies that they come ex libris authenticis apud eos; he also specifically addresses the problem posed by their "authentic" perspective of doubt by advocating for both careful, literal ("word-for-word") translations and he recognizes for the first time in his writing the importance of original languages. His distinction between the ability to "read" and "understand" Hebrew—that is, between knowing how to read a citation out loud and knowing what that citation actually says—points to his increasing belief that the cited authorities themselves—and their authentic form as transcribed by him in the original languages—are more important for a polemical argument than the interpretation or commentary of the polemicist. Just as the evolution of his own textual practice suggests, Martini understood polemical conflict to be as much a war of words—including their sounds and shapes—as one of arguments and ideas.

The Capistrum is not, however, written in Hebrew, but in Latin, and shows that Martini clearly felt the need to continue developing his approach in the Pugio by supplanting transliteration with full transcription of original texts. In the prologue to the work, he specifically addresses the need for even more precise translations:
Translation, Transcription, and Transliteration  
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sunt, ex verbo in verbum, quotiescumque servari hoc poterit,\textsuperscript{28} transferam  
2
veritatem. Per hoc enim Judaeshis falsilioquis lata valde spatioasque subterfugiendi  
3
praecedet via; et minime poterunt dicere, non sic haberi apud eos.  
4
[Furthermore, in bringing forth the authority of the text, whenever the Hebrew  
5
text will be taken up, I will not follow the Septuagint or any other (translation).  
6
What will seem even more presumptuous, I will not revere Jerome in this, nor  
7
will I avoid the improper use, within tolerable limits, of the Latin language,  
8
so that, as often as possible, I will translate the truth, word for word, of those  
9
(passages) found in the Hebrew. In this way, the wide and spacious way of  
10
subterfuge is precluded to the false-speaking Jews. Hardly will they be able to  
11
say that (the text) is not thus among them.] (4)

12
While his biblical citations in Latin do show constant intersection with the  
13
Latin Vulgate, they do not, as the text itself implies, adhere only to it. In fact,  
14
it regularly deviates in syntax and word order, seemingly in an effort to better  
15
render the original Hebrew text.\textsuperscript{29} As Martini’s remarks in both the Capistrum and  
16
the Pugio make manifest, Martini came to see the original language of his proof  
17
texts as the most effective response to dissenting arguments in polemical debates  
18
with Jews. Although his statements do not prove that Martini’s primary focus  
19
was, as Chazan and others have affirmed, on “missionizing” rather than a kind  
20
of inward-looking apologetic writing that posits an imaginary Jewish reader or  
21
listener in purely formulaic terms,\textsuperscript{30} nevertheless, his focus is increasingly on what  
22
he describes as “apud eos authenticus,” “authentic among them” (Pugio 2, and  
23
see also 510, 808, and 859), a virtue interpreted not only in terms of content but  
24
also in terms of form.\textsuperscript{31} This focus is in line with the trajectory of use of his source

\textsuperscript{28} Consultation with the earliest manuscripts and consideration of the sense of this  

28
passage has led me to emend the Leipzig edition to read “poterit” not “potuit.” See also the  

29
abbreviation in Adriano Cappelli, Lexicon abbreviaturarum: Dizionario di abbreviature  

30

31
To get an accurate sense of Martini’s use of the Vulgate, one must avoid comparison  

32
with the seventeenth-century editions, which seem to insert changes back into the text, and  

33
instead compare directly with the Sainte-Geneviève manuscript. To give just one example  

34
of a change by Martini, we can quote Martini’s citation of Proverbs 23:29, which begins,  

35
“Who has woe? Who has sorrow?” [Le-mi ‘oi, le-mi ‘avoi, which might be freely translated  

36
as “Who has ‘alas’? Who has ‘alack’?”]. Many medieval Latin versions interpret ‘avoi  

37
as a conflation of ‘av [father] and ‘oi, and thus mistranslate this verse as “cui vae cuius  

38
pati vae” [“To whom woe? To whose father woe?”]. Martini avoids this distorted reading,  

39
translating the text more carefully as “Cui vae cui heu” [“Who has ‘woe?’ Who has ‘oh’?”].  

40

41
\textsuperscript{30} Chazan, p. 115.

42
On the question of Martini’s commitment to “missionizing,” see Harvey Hames,  

43
“Reason and Faith: Inter-Religious Polemic and Christian Identity in the Thirteenth  

44
Century,” in Yossef Schwarz and Volkhard Krec (eds), Religious Apologetics—  

45
Philosophical Argumentation (Tübingen, 2004), pp. 267–84; and the recent critique of  

46
material over the course of his career, and his increasing use of transliteration as a supplement to mere translation, and then of transcription as a supplement to transliteration, can be understood within this context.

Martini’s evolution from rough translation to translation interspersed with transliteration to full transcription led him to make a number of difficult choices about the meaning of “authentic” language in the Pugio. For example, although the bulk of Martini’s citations in the Pugio are from Hebrew sources—considering the Bible alone, Martini cites the New Testament around 150 times, but cites the Hebrew Bible more than 2,300 times—nevertheless, he includes a few citations from the New Testament in which he includes both the Latin Vulgate and a Hebrew translation. Even more curious are Martini’s Arabic citations of the Qurʾān in the Pugio. In the anti-Muslim polemics of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, including Martini’s own Explanatio and De Seta, it was commonplace to point to Muslim beliefs concerning Jesus and Mary in arguments against Islam. In the growth of anti-Jewish writing starting at the end of the thirteenth century, this attack on Muslim ideas took a strange turn and became, for a short period, part of an appeal to Islamic sources as support for Christian arguments made against Jews. The result is that in Martini’s Pugio, there appear in parts 2 and 3—the anti-Jewish sections of the text—a handful of citations of the Qurʾān and hadīth traditions concerning Jesus and Mary. Although these had been previously cited in the De Seta against Islam, they are here given as pro-Christian authorities against the Jews. In the citations in part 2 (Pugio, pp. 365–6; cf. Sainte-Geneviève MS 1405, f. 65v), he gives only the Latin translation. In the citations in part 3 of the text, however, he gives both the Latin translations and the Arabic original. Even more curiously, in part 3 he does not give these Arabic citations—the only Arabic citations, apart from a single Judeo-Arabic citation from Maimonides (Pugio 565), in his entire corpus of writing—in Arabic script, but transliterates them into Latin.

32 The examples I have found in the Leipzig edition of the Pugio include pp. 772, 776, 818, and 825 (also in the manuscript sources), two more examples in the Paris edition, and I have found three other examples in the manuscripts not in either print edition, e.g., Sainte-Geneviève MS 1405, ff. 281r, 282v, and 300r, Coimbra MS 720, ff. 230r (see in Figure 13.3), 231r, and 242v, and Salamanca, Biblioteca Universitaria MS 2352, ff. 216v, 217v, 231r (partly corresponding to Latin passages on 749 and 751 of the print edition). For a full study of these Hebrew citations, see Ryan Szpiech, “The Aura of an Alphabet: Interpreting the Hebrew Gospels in Ramon Marti’s Dagger of Faith (1278)” (forthcoming). On the differences between the Sainte-Geneviève manuscript and the Leipzig print edition, see Ch. Merchavia, “The Hebrew Version of the ‘Pugio Fidei’ in the Sainte-Geneviève Manuscript,” [Hebrew] Kiryat Sefer 51 (1976): 283–8.

33 Martini repeats a citation used in the De Seta from Qurʾān 3:42: “Item quod dixit in Alcorano, in tractatu Abram, quod Deus preelegit et sanctificavit et preelegit beatam mariam super mulieres seculorum” (“Also it says in the Qurʾān, in the book Abraham, that God chose and sanctified and chose the blessed Mary above the women of the world”) (De Seta, 24 and cf. Pugio, 750).
1 Hebrew characters with Tiberian vocalization.\footnote{The vocalization is not present in Coimbra MS 720, but is only present in Sainte-Geneviève MS 1405 and in the initial lines of Salamanca, Biblioteca Universitaria MS 2352. Despite the fact that the Arabic text in Hebrew characters is found in these three manuscript sources as well as the print edition, it has gone virtually undetected by scholars of Martini's work. It should be noted that these passages do not constitute an example of what is commonly termed “Judeo-Arabic”—a Middle Arabic register or dialect, usually written in Hebrew characters, particular to Jews—but rather represent a case of Classical Arabic transliterated into Hebrew letters. For an edition, translation, and study of both the Arabic citations and the Latin translation, as well as the Latin citations given in part 2 of the Pugio, see Szpiech, “Citās árabes.”} Folio 230v from Coimbra, 2 Biblioteca Geral da Universidade, MS 720, one of three medieval manuscripts 3 containing an example of both the Hebrew translation of the New Testament 4 (Lk. 1:47–8) as well as the transliteration of the Qurʾān into Hebrew characters 5 (but lacking the vocalization), is reproduced in Figure 13.3.
6 What sense can we make of these two final examples of translation and 7 transliteration, especially in light of our argument that Martini's language use 8 reflects his polemical strategy of establishing the authority of his text through his 9 appeal to authenticity? From a literal perspective, neither the Hebrew translations 10 of the New Testament nor the Arabic passages from the Qurʾān transliterated into 11 Hebrew characters represents the most “original” or “authentic” forms of these 12 texts. Nevertheless, both examples do provide examples of Martini's philosophy 13 of language in the context of his polemical project. In marshaling Arabic 14 authorities against Jews, he chose to give them not in the form most authentic 15 to Muslims, but in that form in which an Arabic-speaking Jew might approach 16 the Qurʾān. Similarly, in offering citations of the New Testament, he conceded 17 more authority to his citations as auctoritates by putting them on par with those 18 Hebrew proof texts “authentic among them.” At the same time, the transliteration 19 of the Qurʾān into Hebrew characters might represent an attempt to approximate 20 (in legible, Hebrew letters) a phonetic rendering of the text as it might sound when 21 read aloud. The presence of what look like pronunciation marks in the Sainte- 22 Geneviève manuscript (the atnāh, meteg, and the sof pasuq, for example) in both 23 the Hebrew Gospels passages and in the Qurʾān in Hebrew characters offers further 24 support to this interpretation. Equally notable is that Martini even includes some 25 of the original Arabic text—the same text already given in Hebrew characters on 26 the right side of the folio—in transliterated form within the Latin translation on 27 the left side, further suggesting the importance of representing the sound of the 28 original text, even within the translation itself.\footnote{The transliterated section, not reproduced in the printed editions but present in various manuscripts, reads “erat ipsa min alganītūn id est de illis quae amant silencium” \footnote{[“She (i.e., Mary) was min al-qāmitūn, that is, from among those who love silence”]. See Sainte-Geneviève MS 1405, f. 281v, Coimbra MS 720, f. 230v, and Salamanca, Biblioteca Universitaria MS 2352, f. 217r.}
As with these peculiar citations of the Qur'an in Hebrew characters and the New Testament in Hebrew translation, so his citations throughout the *Pugio* are guided by a conception of authenticity that is represented not as an abstract linguistic display, but as an *experience* of an imagined Jewish interlocutor of original Scriptures in seemingly "original" scripts. In his translations, he displays his mastery of the original text. In his transliterations into Latin script, he tries to make the sounds of the original available to Christian readers who might read them aloud to Jews, even if they do not understand them. In his transcriptions, he puts the text itself on display as a proof in service of his Christian polemical argument.
In his translation of Latin into Hebrew and his transliteration of Arabic text into Hebrew characters, he does not only proffer the imagined knowledge of his polemical enemy. By giving these non-Jewish authorities a Hebrew garb, a form that is implicitly non-Christian but still comprehensible, he also aims to approximate the imagined perspective of the imagined Jewish enemy by simulating the authority of an “original” (in this case, non-Latin) text.

These examples offer, on the one hand, an additional way to think about David Damrosch’s concept of “Scriptworlds,” which he defines as “the power of scripts to cross the boundaries of time, space, and language itself.” In this case, script also has the power to evoke identity, and in the context of supersessionist polemic, the invocation of a script constitutes the means for the hijacking of a whole Scripture, and the alphabet itself begins to take the place of the imagined Hermeneutical Jew (or Muslim) as a new theological witness to the historical triumph of Christianity. On the other hand, these two examples evince Martini’s response to a dilemma plaguing his own work and in essence troubling that of the entire Christian movement of appropriation and exploitation of original language sources in the twelfth to the fourteenth centuries: within the medieval Jewish-Christian logomachy over auctoritas, the quest for the polemical authority in authenticity required interpretive choices about what authenticity meant, about whether it was to be seen as an absolute, objective rule of translation or a phenomenal, subjective effect of presentation. By making his evocation of authenticity dependent on the ambiguities of translation, Martini begins to ground his entire polemical edifice on a perpetually unsteady foundation, one that makes language, like religious identity premised on abrogative supersession, seem unstable and ultimately untranslatable. Over the trajectory of the evolution of his use of language and translation, transliteration, and transcription, Martini became increasingly aware that, in the zero-sum game of religious polemic, “no plague is more effective at damaging” than a failure to marshal the necessary auctoritas and control its potentially undermining ambiguity.
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