

RAMON MARTÍ'S *PUGIO FIDEI*

STUDIES AND TEXTS



EXEMPLARIA SCHOLASTICA

TEXTOS I ESTUDIS MEDIEVALS

VOLUM 8

RAMON MARTÍ'S *PUGIO FIDEI*  
STUDIES AND TEXTS

Edited by  
GÖRGE K. HASSELHOFF  
ALEXANDER FIDORA



Santa Coloma de Queralt  
2017

**Martí, Ramon, 1230-ca. 1284. Pugio fidei**

Ramon Martí's "Pugio fidei". Studies and Texts / Ramon Martí ; edited by Görge K. Hasselhoff and Alexander Fidora. - Santa Coloma de Queralt: Obrador Edèndum, 2017.  
268 p, 21 cm. - (Exemplaria Scholastica; 8)

I. Martí, Ramon, 1230-ca. 1284. Pugio fidei II. Títol III. Col·lecció

1. Teologia--Història--600-1500. Edat mitjana. 2. Cristianisme--Obres apologètiques. 3. Judaisme--Obres de controvèrsia. 4. Codicologia.

*Primera edició:* desembre 2017

© d'aquesta edició: Obrador Edèndum SL, 2017

© dels textos: Philippe Bobichon, Alexander Fidora, Ann Giletti, Görge K. Hasselhoff, Ryan Szpiech, Eulàlia Vernet i Pons, Syds Wiersma, Yosi Yisraeli, 2017

*Publicat per:* Obrador Edèndum SL  
Plaça de la Llibertat, 5  
43420 Santa Coloma de Queralt  
[correu@obradoredendum.cat](mailto:correu@obradoredendum.cat)  
[www.obradoredendum.cat](http://www.obradoredendum.cat)

*ISBN:* 978-84-947566-1-0

*ISSN:* 0211-3473

*Dipòsit legal:* T 1407-2017

*Producció:* Laia Corbella

*Disseny:* Atipus Graphic Design

*Impressió:* Gràfiques Moncunill

*Maquetació:* Jordi Ardèvol



This volume was made possible by the ERC project «The Latin Talmud and Its Influence on Christian-Jewish Polemics at the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona within the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013 / ERC Grant Agreement n° 613694).

La reproducció total o parcial d'aquesta obra per qualsevol procediment (incloent-hi la fotografia i la informàtica), feta sense l'autorització escrita del titular del *copyright*, com també la distribució d'exemplars mitjançant lloguer, és prohibida sota les sancions establertes per les lleis.

## CONTENTS

<i>Preface</i>	9
GÖRGE K. HASSELHOFF, ALEXANDER FIDORA	
1. The Preface to the <i>Pugio fidei</i>	11
GÖRGE K. HASSELHOFF, SYDS WIERSMA	
2. The Projected Edition of Ramon Martí's <i>Pugio fidei</i> . A Survey and a Stemma	23
GÖRGE K. HASSELHOFF	
3. Le manuscrit Latin 1405 de la Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève (Paris). Autographe et œuvre d'un converti	39
PHILIPPE BOBICHON	
4. Weapons Against the Jews. Motives and Objectives of the Preface of the <i>Pugio fidei</i>	103
SYDS WIERSMA	
5. Early Witness: Thomas Aquinas, Albert the Great and Peter of Tarantaise in Ramon Martí's <i>Pugio fidei</i> (c. 1278)	121
ANN GILETTI	
6. Ramon Martí's New Testament Citations in Hebrew. A Transcription and Further Observations	157
RYAN SZPIECH	
7. <i>Iudei moderni</i> in the <i>Pugio fidei</i> . With an Edition of Texts Quoted from Jonah ibn Janah, David Kimḥi, Rabbi Rahmon, and Moses Nahmanides	175
GÖRGE K. HASSELHOFF	

8. Abraham Ibn Ezra in the <i>Pugio fidei</i> . Compilations, Variations, and Interpolations YOSI YISRAELI, Appendix: GÖRGE K. HASSELHOFF	209
9. Translating Ramon Martí's <i>Pugio fidei</i> into Castilian ALEXANDER FIDORA, EULÀLIA VERNET I PONS	241
<i>Index</i>	
Scriptures	261
Manuscripts	265
Names	267

## PREFACE

Within the series *Bibliotheca Philosophorum Medii Aevi Cataloniae* an edition of Ramon Martí's famous *Pugio fidei* (ca. 1280) will be published. For this reason, several years ago the Käte Hamburger Kolleg 'Dynamics in the History of Religion' at Ruhr-Universität Bochum<sup>1</sup> convened a group of scholars working on the Catalan Dominican friar in order to discuss, in the course of a conference, criteria for the edition planned. On that occasion, it was decided to edit the author's autograph kept at the Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève in Paris (= G), which includes both Latin and Hebrew text.<sup>2</sup>

The present volume is a pilot study for the edition of this work, which is fundamental for the history of Christian-Jewish and faith-reason polemics.<sup>3</sup> Ramon Martí's chef d'oeuvre is divided into three books with altogether five parts. The first book is a discussion of topics of philosophy and theology drawing on Arabic-written literature. The second and third books discuss questions of Christology (as a Christian messianology) and all topics of a Christian dogmatic out of sources of Judaism (and to a much lesser degree Islam). The main importance of these two books lies in the preservation and transmission of a huge number of – mainly – Hebrew texts accompanied by Latin translations.

This volume collects general studies, critical observations and text editions that are essential for the enterprise as a whole. The studies include a description of the autograph by Philippe Bobichon and reflections on a possible stemma of all manuscripts by Görge K. Hasselhoff. Further studies are intended to show the present state of research. Thus, so far, no agreement is reached as to how Ramon Martí worked, where and when he learned Hebrew, or why he wrote the *Pugio Christianorum* (as the work is called in the manuscripts). Syds Wiersma holds that Ramon Martí wrote the work on a request of the Dominican Order and relied on an uncertain number of helpers, whereas Philippe Bobichon argues, on the basis of a comprehensive analysis of the manuscript, that Ramon Martí came from a converso family (or was even a converso himself) and scrutinised all Hebrew texts on his own. Ann Giletti demonstrates how Ramon Martí employed texts by his Christian contemporaries Albert the Great, Peter of Tarentaise, and Thomas Aquinas. Ryan Szpiech examines what seem to be Ramon Mar-

<sup>1</sup> See '12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> Century Attempts to Translate Muslim and Jewish Texts into Latin, 19.03.2013 – 20.03.2013 Bochum', in: H-Soz-Kult, 27.02.2013, <[www.hsozkult.de/event/id/termine-21223](http://www.hsozkult.de/event/id/termine-21223)>.

<sup>2</sup> For the sigla of all manuscripts and editions, see p. 30.

<sup>3</sup> For another pilot study see Görge K. Hasselhoff (ed., tr.), *Raimundus Martini, Texte zur Gotteslehre. Pugio fidei I-III, 1-6. Lateinisch – Hebräisch / Aramäisch – Deutsch*, Freiburg i. Br. 2014.

tí's own Hebrew translations of Gospel texts. Yosi Yisraeli and Görge Hasselhoff collect and analyse some of the Hebrew texts by "modern" Jews, on which little research has been done so far. It seems that Ramon Martí sometimes relied on Hebrew-written collections. Alexander Fidora and Eulàlia Vernet i Pons explore a Castilian translation of Biblical verses which is contained in a manuscript of the *Pugio fidei* today kept in Coimbra (= C).

When looking closely at the manuscript tradition, several points call for our attention. Particularly striking is the fact that the preface of the work does not always precede the first book of the oeuvre (as it does, e.g., in G), but in some cases is placed before the second book (e.g., in C and S). For this reason, we decided to present the edition of the preface in this volume, instead of publishing it together with the edition of one of the work's first two books. Our edition of the preface is accompanied by minor editions of texts by Jewish authors collected by Ramon Martí, as well as a fragment of a bilingual manuscript (= L) which some years ago was discovered by Mauro Perani. The importance of that fragment is that it seems to have been written in exactly the same manner as the manuscript today kept in Salamanca (= S). Perhaps both manuscripts came from the same scriptorium.



The preparation of this volume was in part made possible by the ERC project «The Latin Talmud and Its Influence on Christian-Jewish Polemic» at the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona within the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013/ERC Grant Agreement n° 613694). The editors gratefully acknowledge the ERC's generous financial support for publishing this volume.

GÖRGE K. HASSELHOFF and ALEXANDER FIDORA  
Dortmund and Barcelona

RAMON MARTÍ'S NEW TESTAMENT CITATIONS IN HEBREW  
A TRANSCRIPTION AND FURTHER OBSERVATIONS

RYAN SZPIECH  
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan

Ramon Martí's *Pugio fidei* (*Dagger of Faith*) contains thousands of citations of the Hebrew Bible, which are mostly given in the original Hebrew alongside a Latin translation made by Martí himself. Beyond this, there are abundant citations from rabbinical literature in Hebrew and Aramaic and many citations from Islamic philosophy (given only in Latin translation), plus a few citations from Arabic (religious) texts in Arabic (written in Hebrew letters) and Latin. Apart from its citations from the Hebrew Bible, the text also contains approximately one hundred and twenty citations of the New Testament in Latin, which in all but a few cases reproduce the text of the Vulgate. Among these New Testament citations, Martí translates approximately ten of his Latin passages into Hebrew. Such material, which amounts to about thirty-five biblical verses (depending on how they are counted – some are given partially and a few are repeated), represents an important moment in the history of the translation of the New Testament into Hebrew, which was undertaken on a more extensive scale in the fourteenth and especially fifteenth centuries. The translations, which amount to the earliest substantive examples of Christian citations of the New Testament in Hebrew, deserve scholarly attention for their linguistic characteristics as well as for the information they shed on Martí's polemical project in the *Pugio*.

I have studied these citations in a previous publication, where I argued that they represent a telling example of Martí's philosophy of language and translation in action.<sup>1</sup> In this paper, I would like to return to that material in order to add some new details, provide a transcription of the text, and elaborate on a few aspects of that earlier discussion, such as the role of orality in the translations and their place in the context of the *Pugio* more generally. In addition to presenting a full transcription of the Hebrew and Latin texts as found in the Paris Sainte-Geneviève manuscript 1405,<sup>2</sup> I will also present an additional Latin passage, taken from the Athanasian Creed, that Martí renders into Hebrew. Together, these passages will shed light on Martí's approach to polemical argumentation and linguistic authority.

<sup>1</sup> Ryan Szpiech, 'The Aura of an Alphabet: Interpreting the Hebrew Gospels in Ramon Martí's Dagger of Faith (1278)', in: *Numen: International Review for the History of Religions* 61.4 (2014), pp. 334–63.

<sup>2</sup> Images of these texts can be found reproduced in Szpiech, 'The Aura', pp. 357–63.

Knowledge of these passages has been, like that of many issues surrounding the study of the *Pugio fidei*, limited by use of two faulty seventeenth-century editions of the text and a lack of systematic study of the manuscript tradition. Most scholars who have considered these passages have relied only on the printed editions, thus missing approximately half of the existing translated material.<sup>3</sup> Scholarly discussion of the passages began in the nineteenth century after Adolf Neubauer made notice of them.<sup>4</sup> In 1929, Alexander Marx speculated that Martí's translations were drawn from an existing Hebrew translation of the Gospels that was in circulation, and his theory was accepted and developed by later scholars such as Judah Rosenthal and George Howard.<sup>5</sup> Such arguments corresponded to the presentation of the texts in the 1687 printing from Leipzig (hereafter 'I'), which includes verses from Matthew 2:1-6 and 2:9-12 (the visitation of the Magi to Jesus), 3:13-15 (the baptism of Jesus by John the Baptist), 4:17 ('Repent for the kingdom of heaven is near', two versions), and 19:29 ('Those who leave families or fields for my sake will receive a hundredfold back'), and Mark 16:15-16 (Jesus appearing to his disciples after his resurrection). In 1976, Pinchas Lapide added some new examples that he found in the Paris 1651 edition (hereafter 'p', the first full printing, on which the Leipzig 1687 edition was based), including Luke 6:20 ('Blessed are the poor') and Romans 14:17 ('The kingdom of God is not food or drink but righteousness and peace'). Lapide rejected the argument that the texts were copied from existing Hebrew translations and suggested that, on the contrary, Martí made the translations himself.<sup>6</sup> Although Lapide does not offer definitive proof, he nevertheless asserts that the 'cumulative weight' of the evidence pieced together by scholars makes it almost certain that the author of the *Dagger of Faith* is probably the first Christian Hebraist known to us by name to have translated any substantial part of the New Testament into Hebrew.<sup>7</sup>

Since Lapide's study, Merchavia has demonstrated the critical importance of the Paris Sainte-Geneviève manuscript 1405 (henceforth called 'G') as representing the earliest,

<sup>3</sup> The following few paragraphs represent a partly rewritten version of Szpiech, 'The Aura', pp. 338-339.

<sup>4</sup> Adolf Neubauer, 'Jewish Controversy and the Pugio Fidei', in: *The Expositor* 7/3 (1888), pp. 81-105, 179-197, at p. 100.

<sup>5</sup> Alexander Marx, 'The Polemical Manuscripts in the Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America', in: *Studies in Jewish Bibliography and Related Subjects in Memory of Abraham Solomon Friedus (1867-1923)*, New York 1929, pp. 247-278, at p. 271; Judah Rosenthal, 'The Hebrew Translation of Matthew by Jacob ben Reuben: Early Hebrew Translations of the Gospels' [Hebrew], in: *Tarbiz* 32 (1962), pp. 48-65, at p. 50; George Howard, *The Gospel of Matthew According to a Primitive Hebrew Text*, Macon, Ga. 1987, p. 178. Howard removed this reference from a later edition of his study. Recently, Harvey Hames has referred to Martí's citations as possible evidence that Hebrew translations of the Gospels were in circulation in the thirteenth century. See 'Translated from Catalan: Looking at a Fifteenth-Century Hebrew Version of the Gospels', in: Anna Alberni et al. (eds.), *El saber i les llengües vernacles a l'època de Llull i Eiximenis. Estudis Icrea sobre vernacularització*, Barcelona 2012, pp. 285-302, at p. 289.

<sup>6</sup> Pinchas Lapide, *Hebrew in the Church. The Foundations of Jewish-Christian Dialogue*, Tr. Erroll F. Rhodes, Grand Rapids, Mich. 1984 [German edition 1976]), pp. 14-16.

<sup>7</sup> Lapide, *Hebrew in the Church*, p. 16.

most complete, and most original text. Based on this fact and various telling marginal notes highlighted by Damien Travelletti, numerous scholars have recently argued that this manuscript almost certainly represents Martí's autograph copy.<sup>8</sup> Comparison of manuscript G with other surviving manuscripts of the *Dagger* containing Hebrew text (C, S, L, Bas, and R) shows that G has more text than any other copy, and neither G nor Bas, which seems to be a late copy of G, was used for preparation of the printed editions p or l, which were instead based on other manuscripts, now lost.<sup>9</sup> Recently, Philippe Bobichon has studied the Hebrew translations in manuscript 1405 in the context of Martí's other citations of Christian sources.<sup>10</sup>

All of the citations previously studied are found in the surviving manuscript tradition (although Matthew 1:7-8 is omitted in the manuscripts) and the manuscripts also contain fifteen new verses in Hebrew that are given only in Latin in the printed editions, including Luke 1:26-28, 30-32, 34-38, and 46-48 (The Annunciation and the first lines of the Magnificat) and John 19:36 (quoting Exodus 12:46). Also, a second quotation of Matthew 4:17 in an alternative Hebrew translation is preserved in both the manuscript and printed editions, although it has previously gone unnoticed. All of the Hebrew material is vocalized in the three medieval manuscripts (G, S, C), whereas both the later manuscripts Bas and R as well as the editions p and l lack this vocalization for the New Testament passages in question here (Bas and R contain some vocalization elsewhere). Finally, a short excerpt from the Athanasian Creed in Latin is also given in Hebrew translation, and the translation is discussed within the text and is interspersed with a transliteration of the Hebrew version into Latin characters. An unvocalized Hebrew text of this passage is found in the printed editions, but the transliterated parts are lacking within the printed Latin version.

As I have previously argued, this material is significant for a number of reasons. Consideration of the manuscript tradition expands the body of evidence by adding sixteen

<sup>8</sup> Chen Merchavia, 'The Hebrew Version of the 'Pugio Fidei' in the Sainte-Geneviève Manuscript [Hebrew], in: *Kiryat Sefer* 51 (1976), pp. 283-288; Damien Travelletti, *Front commun. Raymond Martin, al-Gazālī et les philosophes. Analyse de la structure et des sources du premier livre du Pugio Fidei*, Ph.D. Diss. University of Fribourg, Switzerland, pp. 74-77; Görge Hasselhoff, 'Towards an Edition of Ramon Martí's *Pugio fidei*', in: *Bulletin de philosophie médiévale* 55 (2013), pp. 45-56, at p. 46; and Szpiech, 'The Aura', p. 339 n. 9. See especially the chapter by Philippe Bobichon within this publication. This view on the authorship of the manuscript has been questioned by Syds Wiersma in a recent doctoral dissertation, *Pearls in a Dunghill. The anti-Jewish writings of Raymond Martin o.p. (ca. 1220 - ca. 1285)*, PhD Diss. Tilburg University 2015.

<sup>9</sup> See Ryan Szpiech, 'Citas árabes en caracteres hebreos en el *Pugio fidei* del dominico Ramón Martí: entre la autenticidad y la autoridad', in: *Al-Qanṭara* 32.1 (2011), pp. 71-107, at pp. 76-80; and Hasselhoff, 'Towards an Edition', pp. 46-48.

<sup>10</sup> Philipe Bobichon, 'La "bibliothèque" de Raymond Martin au couvent Sainte-Catherine de Barcelone. Sources antiques et chrétiennes du *Pugio fidei* (ca 1278)', in: N. Bériou, M. Morard, and D. Nebbiai (eds.), *Entre stabilité et itinérance. Livres et culture des ordres mendians*, Turnhout 2014, pp. 329-366. Bobichon notes the presence of Martí's Hebrew translations of the New Testament on 336. I am grateful to Dr. Bobichon for sharing a copy of his publication ahead of schedule. See also Dr. Bobichon's study of G in this volume.

new verses to the twenty-one already identified. Whereas the verses already known were mostly from Matthew with a few from Mark, most of the other verses found only in the manuscripts are from Luke and also include a verse from a hitherto unrepresented book, John (albeit as a quote from Exodus that appears in John), showing that Martí actually cited from all four Gospels in Hebrew translation, as well as Romans.

This material also provides important evidence that Martí was not copying from an existing Hebrew translation but made the translations himself. The question of Martí's sources in the *Pugio* is a large and complex one, and scholars continue to add important information about what books Martí consulted in preparing his massive work.<sup>11</sup> The issue of Martí's Bible citations bears upon the larger question of the history of the translation of the New Testament into Hebrew. Apart from early references to Christian themes and literature in rabbinical writing from before the seventh century,<sup>12</sup> citations of the New Testament in Hebrew only seem to appear in medieval works from a few centuries after the production of the Talmud, such as the *Account of the Disputation of the Priest* (*Qisṣat Mujādalat al-Usquf*) and the *Life Story of Jesus* (*Toledot Yeshu*). Such citations and allusions become much more common in the twelfth century. Hebrew texts such as Jacob ben Reuben's *Book of the Wars of the Lord* (*Sefer Milḥamot Ha-Shem*, from ca. 1170) and the twelfth-century Hebrew translation of the *Qisṣat as The Book of Nestor the Priest* (*Sefer Nestor Ha-Komer*), followed by thirteenth-century texts such as Joseph ben Nathan Official's *Book of Joseph the Zealot* (*Sefer Yosef Ha-Meqanne*) and

<sup>11</sup> On Martí's Arabic sources, see Ángel Cortabarriá, 'Les sources arabes de l'Explanatio Symboli' du Dominicain catalan Raymond Martin', in: *Mélanges de l'Institut dominicain d'études orientales* 16 (1983), pp. 95-116; id., 'La connaissance des textes arabes chez Raymond Martin, O.P. et sa position face de l'islam', in: *Cahiers de Fanjeaux* 18 (1983), pp. 279-300; id., 'Los textos árabes de Averroes en el 'Pugio Fidei' del dominico catalán Raimundo Martín', in: *Actas del XII Congreso de la U.E.A.I., Málaga, 1984*, Madrid 1986, pp. 185-204; id., 'Las fuentes árabes del 'Pugio Fidei' de Raimundo Martí: Algazel (1085-1111)', in: *Ciencia tomista* 112 (1985), pp. 581-96; id., 'Avicenne dans le 'Pugio Fidei' de Raymond Martin', in: *Mélanges de l'institut dominicain d'études orientales du Caire* 19 (1989), pp. 9-16. Recently, P.S. van Koningsveld has claimed to have identified an Arabic work that served as Martí's main source for all Arabic citations in the first part of the work. His work is in preparation under the title 'An Arabic Source of Ramon Martin: *Al-Sayf al-murbaf fi al-radd 'alâ al-muṣṭaf*. (With Appendix: *Al-Sayf al-murbaf fi al-radd 'alâ al-muṣṭaf*. Reconstruction and Annotated Translation.) (I am grateful to Prof. Van Koningsveld for discussing his work with me ahead of its publication.) On Martí's citations of the Qur'ân and ḥadîth in Arabic in Hebrew characters, see Ryan Szpiech, 'Citas árabes'. On Martí's Christian sources, see Bobichon, 'La 'bibliothèque' de Raymond Martin'. For an index of Martí's rabbinical sources as they appear in the 1 edition, see Ch. Merchavia, 'Pugio fidei – An Index of Citations' [Hebrew], in: *Galut ahar Golab: Studies in Jewish History Presented to Professor Haim Beinart in Honor of his Seventieth Year*, Jerusalem 1988, pp. 203-234. On allegations that Martí forged some of his sources, see Yitzhak Baer, 'The Forged Midrashim of Raymond Martini and Their Place in Religious Controversies of the Middle Ages' [Hebrew], in: Simhah Assaf and Gershom Scholem (eds.), *Studies in Memory of Asher Gulak and Samuel Klein*, Jerusalem 1942, pp. 28-49; Saul Lieberman, *Sheqi'in*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Jerusalem 1992, pp. 67-72; and Ursula Ragacs, 'The Forged Midrashim of Raymond Martini – Reconsidered', in: *Henoch* 1 (1997), pp. 59-68.

<sup>12</sup> Discussion of Jesus in the Babylonian Talmud shows knowledge of all four canonical New Testament Gospels. See Peter Schäfer, *Jesus in the Talmud*, Princeton 2007, p. 123.

the *Nizzahon Vetus* (ca. 1280), all contain numerous direct citations of the New Testament in Hebrew.<sup>13</sup> Nevertheless, there are no complete Hebrew translations of any New Testament books that are known from before the fourteenth century, when the Iberian Jewish philosopher Shem Tov Isaac Ibn Shaprut included a full translation of the book of Matthew in Hebrew in his anti-Christian polemic, *Touchstone (Even Bohan)*, from ca. 1380-1385.<sup>14</sup> Similarly, there are no complete Hebrew translations of all four Gospels together from before the fifteenth century, when a translation was made, by a Jew or Converso, from Catalan (now preserved in Vatican Library manuscript Vat. ebr. 100).<sup>15</sup> The passages in the *Pugio fidei* offer a useful piece of evidence to be added to this history.

<sup>13</sup> On citations in the Nestor text, see the introduction to volume one of Daniel Lasker and Sarah Stroumsa (eds.), *The Polemic of Nestor the Priest*, 2 vols., Jerusalem 1996; and Christoph Ochs, *Matthaeus Adversus Christianos. The Use of the Gospel of Matthew in Jewish Polemics Against the Divinity of Jesus*, Tübingen 2013), pp. 29-90. On ben Reuben's citation of the New Testament, see Joshua Levy, *Sefer Milhamot Hashem, Chapter Eleven: The Earliest Jewish Critique of the New Testament*, Ph.D. Diss. New York University 2004; and Judah Rosenthal, The Hebrew Translation of Matthew by Jacob ben Reuben: Early Hebrew Translations of the Gospels' [Hebrew], in: *Tarbiz* 32 (1962), pp. 48-65; *Milhamot ha-Shem* [Wars of the Lord], ed. Judah Rosenthal, Jerusalem 1962-63; and Ochs, *Matthaeus*, pp. 91-126. For the thirteenth century, see Joseph ben Natan Officier, *Sefer Yosef ha-meqanne* [Book of Joseph the Zealot], ed. Judah Rosenthal, Jerusalem 1969-70; Ochs, *Matthaeus*, pp. 127-166; and on the *Nizzahon Vetus*, see David Berger, *The Jewish-Christian Debate in the High Middle Ages: A Critical Edition of the 'Nizzahon Vetus'*, Philadelphia 1979; and Ochs, *Matthaeus*, pp. 167-208. For a comparison of these and related citations, see Philippe Bobichon, 'Citations latines de la tradition chrétienne dans la littérature hébraïque de controverse avec le christianisme (XIIe-XVe S.)', in: Resianne Fontaine and Gad Freudenthal (eds.), *Latin-into-Hebrew. Texts and Studies*, vol. I, Leiden 2013, pp. 356-361. For other New Testament material discovered in the manuscripts of the *Book of Joseph the Zealot*, see Philippe Bobichon, *Controverse judéo-chrétienne en Ashkenaz (XIIIe s.). Florilèges polémiques: hébreu, latin, ancien français* (Paris, BNF Hébreu 712, fol. 56v-57v et 66v-68v). Édition, traduction, commentaires, Turnhout 2016 (I am grateful to Prof. Bobichon for sharing his text with me ahead of publication).

<sup>14</sup> On Ibn Shaprut's Hebrew Matthew, see Rosenthal, 'Targum'; Pinchas E. Lapide, 'Der "Prüfstein" aus Spanien', in: *Sefarad* 34 (1974), 228-272; William Horbury, 'The Revision of Shem Tob Ibn Shaprut's *Evan Bohan*', in: *Sefarad* 43 (1983), pp. 221-237; Libby Garshowitz, 'Shem Tob ben Isaac Ibn Shaprut's Gospel of Matthew', in: Barry Walfish (ed.), *Frank Talmage Memorial Volume*, vol. I, Haifa 1993, pp. 297-332; José-Vicente Niclós, 'L'Évangile en Hébreu de Shem Tob ibn Shaprut', in: *Revue Biblique* 106.3 (1999), pp. 358-407; James G. Hewitt, *A Philological Investigation of the Hebrew Vorlage of the Hebrew Version of the Gospel of Matthew in Shem-Tob Ben Shaprut's Eben Bohan*, Ph.D. Diss. Temple University, 2000; and Ochs, *Matthaeus*, pp. 259-256. For an edition of the text, see Libby Garshowitz, 'Shem Tov ben Isaac Ibn Shaprut's *Touchstone (Even Bohan)*, Chapters 2-10: Based on Ms. Plut 2.17 (Florence, Biblioteca medicea Laurenziana), with collations from other manuscripts', Ph.D. Diss. University of Toronto 1974; and Howard, *Hebrew Gospel* [= revised ed. of *The Gospel of Matthew According to a Primitive Hebrew Text*, 1987].

<sup>15</sup> On this text, see Delio Vania Proverbio, 'Vangeli. Ebraico', in: Francesco D'Aiuto, Giovanni Morello, and Ambrogio M. Piazzoni (eds.), *I Vangeli dei Popoli. La Parola e l'immagine del Cristo nelle culture e nella storia*, Vatican City 2000, pp. 372-374; Hames, 'Translated from Catalan'; and Pere Casanellas and Harvey J. Hames, 'A Textual and Contextual Analysis of the Hebrew Gospels Translated from Catalan', in: *Melilab* 11 (2014), pp. 68-81. Harvey Hames is currently preparing an edition of this text as volume thirty five of the *Corpus Biblicum Catalanicum*. Thus far, the concordances have been prepared. See Pere Casanellas (ed.), *Els quatre evangelis en hebreu traduits del català. Concordances provisionals*, Barcelona 2011.

Although Marx, Rosenthal, Howard, and others have proposed that Martí drew from an existing text, Lapide strongly suggested that he did not, offering proof by analyzing the way certain passages and words were translated as well and the way that the name of Jesus was spelled.<sup>16</sup> My work on the manuscript evidence was able to confirm these suggestions definitively by providing still more examples as well as showing that the Latin and Hebrew texts are closely linked, matching each other in places where the text was abbreviated or left out. Whereas Lapide noted that Jesus' name was spelled *Yeshu 'a* rather than *Yesbu*, as it is usually spelled in Jewish texts, the manuscripts show that Martí actually spelled the name *Yeshu 'ah*, literally 'salvation' in Hebrew, a rendering that would be avoided in Jewish texts for its Christian overtones and that is not found at all, to my knowledge, in any other translation.<sup>17</sup> It can further be noted that Martí's versions do not match any of the known citations of the New Testament in Hebrew found in earlier polemical works. Moreover, Martí's repetition of one verse (Matthew 4:17) in two different Hebrew versions suggests that he was making his translations on the spot and not copying from a text. Although Martí's renditions are relatively few by comparison with later texts that preserve whole Gospels or even the entire New Testament, they constitute one of the earliest examples of Christian translation of parts of this material from Latin into Hebrew.

In my earlier work on Martí's New Testament passages in Hebrew, I argued that these passages shed light on Martí's philosophy of language and his polemical strategy in constructing a polemical attack on Jewish belief. Most significant in this respect are Martí's own stated intentions in translating the Bible. In his earlier anti-Jewish text *Capistrum Iudeorum* (*Muzzle of the Jews*), written in the years following the 1263 Disputation of Barcelona and finished in 1267, he affirms that, 'With the help of God, therefore, I will translate these authorities word for word' (*Auctoritates igitur istas, cum Dei auxilio, verbum ex verbo transferam*).<sup>18</sup> In the *Pugio* itself, he makes the telling claim that

In bringing forth the authority of the text, whenever the Hebrew text will be taken up, I will not follow the Septuagint or any other [translation]. What will seem even more presumptuous,

<sup>16</sup> See the extended discussion in Szpiech, 'The Aura', pp. 340-344.

<sup>17</sup> This spelling *Yesbu 'ab* appears in one place in the letter of Isaac Pollegar written to Alfonso of Valladolid (Parma MS 2440/De Rossi 533, fol. 4b, in Jonathan Hecht, *The Polemical Exchange between Isaac Pollegar and Abner of Burgos / Alfonso of Valladolid according to Parma MS 2440 'Iggeret Teshuvat Apikoros'* and 'Teshuvot la-Meharef', PhD diss. New York University 1993, p. 333. Elsewhere in this letter, Pollegar uses the spelling *Yeshu 'a* (fol. 5a, 6a), while Alfonso of Valladolid's response curiously uses only *Yesbu* (21a, 23b, 35b, 41a, 47b, 49b). None of these references, however, involves a citation of the New Testament in Hebrew. It is not known what spelling was used in New Testament citations (fifty-two citations of the Gospels, one from I Corinthians, and one from Revelation) in the original Hebrew version of the *Moreh Zedek*, which now only survives in Castilian as *Mostrador de justicia*. At least some of the citations include the name of Jesus, such as Matt. 26:26 (BnF Esp. 43, fol. 182r).

<sup>18</sup> *Capistrum Iudeorum*, ed. and Spanish trans. Adolfo Robles Sierra, 2 vols., Würzburg; Altenberge 1990; 1993, vol. I, p. 54. English translation mine.

I will not revere Jerome in this, nor will I avoid the improper use, within tolerable limits, of the Latin language, so that, as often as possible, I will translate the truth, word for word, of those [passages] found in the Hebrew.

*Ceterum inducendo auctoritatem textus ubicumque ab ebraico fuerit desumptum non septuaginta sequar nec interpretem alium, et quod majoris praesumptionis uideitur, non ipsum etiam in hoc reverebor ieronymum nec tolerabilem latine lingue uitabo impropositatem ut eorum quae apud hebreos sunt ex verbo in verbum quotiescumque servari hoc potuit transferam ueritatem.<sup>19</sup>*

Here, Martí specifies that he does not plan to rely on existing translations to translate *ex verbo in verbum*. This approach is part of his argumentative strategy because

In this way, the wide and spacious way of subterfuge is precluded to the false-speaking Jews. Hardly will they be able to say that [the text] is not thus among them.

*Per hoc enim iudeis falsiloquis lata ualde spatioseque subterfugiendi precludetur uia, et minime poterunt dicere non sic haberi apud eos.<sup>20</sup>*

Given that his standard approach was to make all translations to Latin himself rather than rely on an earlier rendition, it is logical to assume that his approach to citing these New Testament passages in Hebrew would be the same.

Yet why did Martí choose to translate some passages but not others? Most of his Hebrew translations of the New Testament are found in the third and last section of the third and last part of the *Pugio*, which is dedicated to proving, on the basis of Jewish authoritative texts, the redemption of humanity through Jesus' Incarnation, Virgin Birth, Passion, and Resurrection. The citations given in Hebrew and Latin in this section are not the only references to the New Testament in the *Dagger* or even the only such references in this section of part three of the work.<sup>21</sup> In manuscript G, they seem to cluster between folios 281r and 336r, but four other New Testament references that are interspersed throughout these folios are given only in Latin. Either these texts were translated at random, sometimes being rendered into Hebrew and sometimes not, or Martí chose them in particular while leaving other verses untranslated.

There are some details in the text that suggest that the passages were not chosen at random but were rather part of a deliberate polemical strategy. Without a doubt, the content of the passages that are translated concerns themes of Christian-Jewish

<sup>19</sup> G f. 3r; 1 p. 4. All citations from the *Pugio* follow the G manuscript. See my previous consideration of these passages in Ryan Szpeiech, 'Translation, Transcription, and Transliteration in the Polemics of Raymond Martini, O.P.', in: Karen Fresco and Charles Wright (eds.), *Translating the Middle Ages*, Farnham, UK / Burlington, VT 2012, pp. 171-187, at pp. 181-84.

<sup>20</sup> G f. 3r; 1 p. 4.

<sup>21</sup> See Bobichon, 'La "bibliothèque" de Raymond Martin', pp. 334 and 336.

polemical debate. The passages discuss either Jesus' divine Incarnation and Birth, the Annunciation to Mary by the angel, and Mary's virginity (Luke 1, Matthew 2), or Jesus' baptism and ministry and his call to penitence and conversion (Matthew 3 and 19, Luke 6, Mark 3 and 16). The passage from Romans emphasizes the role of morality in salvation in line with this same message. The one passage that Martí attributes to John 19:36 is in effect a passage from Exodus 12:46, thus responding to Jewish doubts about the origins of the New Testament text by implying that the Gospels are themselves versions of the Hebrew Bible itself.<sup>22</sup> The passages about the divine birth (Luke 1, Matthew 2) address the divine nature of Jesus, regularly called into question by Jewish polemicists.<sup>23</sup> The Annunciation affirms Mary's virginity and counters Jewish depictions of Mary in the anti-Christian *Life of Jesus (Toledot Yeshu)* as a prostitute who conceived Jesus in filth and sin. At the same time, the Annunciation could address philosophical polemics against Christianity that argued against the divinity of the Incarnation narrative by claiming that God would never descend to pass through the body of woman, which was seen as degraded and corrupt.<sup>24</sup> Passages giving words from Jesus' ministry (Matthew 3 and 19, Luke 6, Mark 3 and 16), on the other hand, concern the legitimacy of Jesus' baptism and the moral imperative of his ministry, calling his listeners to penitence and conversion. Such themes are directly relevant to Christian efforts to refute Jewish counterarguments against Christian belief and to achieve the conversion of Jews through an appeal to familiar ideas and texts. The fact that some of these Hebrew translations appear on the same folios as some of Martí's citations of the Qur'ān in Arabic in Hebrew characters – which I have argued constitutes a similar linguistic phenomenon of proffering non-Jewish ideas cloaked in a pseudo-Jewish garb – further supports this interpretation of Martí's Hebrew translations.<sup>25</sup> All of the passages translated into Hebrew or transliterated in Hebrew characters serve to establish the authority of Christian scriptures and counter potential Jewish doubts about the legitimacy of Christian beliefs and traditions.

Further evidence that Martí rendered these passages into Hebrew in order to forestall Jewish counterarguments can be found in the brief passage from the Athanasian Creed that are rendered into Hebrew. These selections from the early medieval Latin prayer address the nature of the Trinity, affirming that Father, Son, and Holy Spirit should all be seen as divine aspects of God's single identity. Thus Martí declares,

<sup>22</sup> Unlike Martí's translation of Matthew 2:6, which contains a reference to Micah 5:2 that is not followed in rendering the passage into Hebrew, the citation of John 19:36, which Martí calls 'John 19' (*Iohannes XIX*) is a literal citation of Exodus 12:46. On Jewish arguments about the corrupt nature of the New Testament, see Daniel J. Lasker, *Jewish Philosophical Polemics against Christianity in the Middle Ages*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., London 2007, p. 4.

<sup>23</sup> For Jewish polemical arguments about Jesus' nature in the Trinity, see Lasker, *Jewish*, pp. 45-104.

<sup>24</sup> For Jewish arguments against the possibility of God entering the body of a woman, see Lasker, *Jewish*, pp. 153-56.

<sup>25</sup> For a study of these passages, see Szpiech, 'Citas árabes'; id., 'Translation'.

God is the Father, God is the Son, God is the Holy Spirit. Nevertheless, God is not three gods but one.

*Deus pater, deus filius, deus spiritus sanctus. Et tamen non tres dii sed unus est deus.*<sup>26</sup>

The fact that this passage is meant to address Jewish doubts or counterarguments is evident in the extended discussion of this statement that follows. Martí points out that the name *spiritus sanctus*, which can literally be translated into Hebrew as *ruah qadosh* ('according to the way that we call the Holy Spirit' [*iuxta modum quo nos nominamus spiritum sanctum*]) is expressed in the Hebrew Bible ('according to the way that the Jews name the same thing' [*iuxta illum uero modum quo iudei nominant ipsum*]) as *ruah ba-qodesh*, literally 'spirit of the Sanctuary' or as Martí says, *spiritus sanctuarii*.<sup>27</sup> Nevertheless, he insists that the number of letters of each expression in Hebrew is the same, yielding twelve Hebrew letters for *Av ben ve-ruah qadosh* and also for *Av ben ve-ruah ba-qodesh*, and yielding forty-two letters for the entire phrase of the Athanasian prayer (*deus pater deus filius deus spiritus sanctus. Et tamen non tres dii sed unus est deus*) when rendered into Hebrew, whether one uses *ruah qadosh* or *ruah ba-qodesh*. Martí argues that no matter which way you write 'Holy Spirit', 'it yields the same sum and the same number of letters' (*redditur eadem summa et idem numerus litterarum*).

The references to twelve and forty-two letters derive from Jewish traditions suggesting that God has a name that is four letters, twelve letters, forty-two letters, and seventy-two letters (among others) each with a different power or meaning. Although this tradition would become much more developed in later Kabbalistic thought, the mention of various names of four, twelve, and forty-two letters appears in the Talmud (BT *Kiddushin* 71a).<sup>28</sup> Martí brings up this question after referring to Maimonides's remarks about it in the *Guide for the Perplexed* (I, 62), and makes a point of showing how the spelling of *qadosh/qodesh* does not affect the total number of letters in either the phrase 'Father, Son, Holy Spirit' or the sentence in the Athanasian prayer about the Trinity. These different numerological manoeuvres offer proof of the Christological content of traditional Jewish ideas, creatively applying a Jewish esoterical/mystical interpretation to a Christian prayer. The translation of this prayer into Hebrew thus forms an essential part of the logic of his Christological argument and of the authority of its conclusions. It is clearly aimed at addressing Jewish counterarguments to Martí's

<sup>26</sup> G f. 243r; 1 p. 691.

<sup>27</sup> For a note on this distinction, see José Faur, *Homo Mysticus. A Guide to Maimonides's Guide for the Perplexed*, Syracuse 1999, pp. 200-201 n. 117.

<sup>28</sup> On the forms of the divine name in Jewish thought, see Moshe Idel, 'Defining Kabbalah. The Kabbalah of the Divine Names', in: R. A. Herrera (ed.), *Mystics of the Book. Themes, Topics, and Typology*, New York 1993, pp. 97-122, at pp. 100-104; David Patterson, *Hebrew Language and Jewish Thought*, Abingdon / New York 2005, pp. 34-35 and 224-25 nn. 1-3.

overall polemical project, which consists in making use of the Talmud and postbiblical literature to prove the truth of Christian ideas.

Although these passages are found in the printed editions of the *Pugio* as well as the manuscripts, they are corrupt in the former and have been overlooked by previous scholars (except for Bobichon, who recently pointed them out).<sup>29</sup> The Hebrew text is not voweled in the l edition and contains no transliteration within the Latin translation, making the distinction under discussion (*qadosh/qodesh*) incomprehensible. In the p edition, the Hebrew words *qadosh/qodesh* are distinguished but the definite article ‘ha’ is included on both words in Hebrew, whereas only *ha-qodesh* carries it in the manuscripts. This error similarly renders Martí’s numerological argument meaningless, ironically by making the Christian version of the prayer add up to more than forty-two Hebrew letters.

The manuscript evidence also provides other important details, lacking in the printed editions, that shed light on Martí’s strategy of engaging with Hebrew language in his text. In making his case for the numerical significance of the Athanasian Creed passage in Hebrew, he not only translates it into Hebrew, but also presents the Latin text as a kind of gloss that walks the reader phrase by phrase through the original Hebrew, mixing Latin and transliterated Hebrew words. He states first, in presenting the Christian form of the phrase, *Ab el pater deus ben el filius deus ue ruah qados el et spiritus sanctus deus. Ak tamen. enam non sunt selossa elohim tres dii qi im el ehad sed unus deus*, which might be rendered (translating only the Latin and leaving the Hebrew in italics), ‘*Ab el* The Father is God; *ben el* The Son is God; *ue ruah qados el* and the Holy Spirit is God’. *Ak* Thus *enam* they are not *selossa elohim* three gods *qi im el ehad* but rather one God.

The transliteration of the passage with the alternative translation of ‘Holy Spirit’ is the same, except for the statement *ue ruah haqqodes el et spiritus sanctuarii deus* (‘*ue ruah haqqodes el* and the Spirit of the Sanctuary is God.’) This blending of Latin text with the transliteration of the Hebrew translation is found in all the manuscripts containing this section of the text (G, S, C, P2, T, Mc, Bas, R, p, and l, and excluding P1, E, D, H, and L), including those that lack the Hebrew translation itself. Only the printed editions p and l eliminate the transliteration, thus obscuring Martí’s argument.

Apart from Martí’s remarks about the numerical significance of this Latin prayer in Hebrew, the manuscript evidence is of great interest because it shed light on how Martí imagined that the texts would be read and used. It is clear in his reference to how ‘we’ give these names (*iuxta modum quo nos nominamus*) that he is writing for a Christian reader, and his interspersed transliteration of Hebrew and Latin translation serve to facilitate comprehension by a reader of limited ability in Hebrew. This interpretation is supported by Martí’s use of transliteration in other passages as well, such as in his

<sup>29</sup> See Bobichon, ‘La ‘bibliothèque’ de Raymond Martin’, p. 336 n. 21.

Latin translation of the Qur'ān (Q. 66:12) found on G f. 281v (*erat ipsa min alqanitin id est de illis quae amant silencium*) or numerous Latin passages in the *Capistrum Iudeorum*.<sup>30</sup> The explanation also contains information that could be used to answer Jewish interlocutors who might disagree about a Christian translation of *spiritus sanctus* into Hebrew.

This blending of translated and transliterated text points to the role of oral reading in the text and the probable role of the text in supporting oral disputations of fellow Dominicans with Jews. As he tellingly remarked in the *Capistrum*,

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.

*Optimum erit si istud opuscolum non solum in Latino, sed etiam in Hebraeo, et scientia legendi, etsi non intelligendi Hebraicum habeatur.*<sup>31</sup>

This statement underscores the importance of original language citations in establishing the authoritative nature of Martí's arguments and presents the most important form in which these arguments will be made as oral disputation.<sup>32</sup> It is supposed that Martí intended a double display of authority by fellow Dominicans who could both pronounce the sounds of Hebrew and show the written text on display while pointing to the original-language quotations in the original alphabet. While the blending of transliteration and translation seems to aid the comprehension of the Hebrew by the preacher or polemicist himself, the inclusion of full vocalization of all Hebrew translations (as well as transliterations of Arabic passages into Hebrew letters along with stress and breath marks as well as Tiberian Hebrew vowels) seems to be intended to aid in the pronunciation of the text before a Hebrew- and Arabic-speaking audience, and in the case of Arabic citations in Hebrew letters, it may have served to allow preachers who did not know Arabic or Arabic script read the quotations to a comprehending Jewish interlocutor. In any case, the short passage and discussion of the Athanasian Creed in Hebrew confirms what is suggested by Martí's other citations of the New Testament in Hebrew translation: that his citation practices constitute a performance of his and his fellow Dominicans' polemical authority, representing tex-

<sup>30</sup> See Szpiech, 'Citas', p. 99 for the text; and id., 'Translation', p. 179.

<sup>31</sup> *Capistrum* I, p. 56. On the question of Martí's commitment to 'missionizing', see Harvey Hames, 'Reason and Faith: Inter-Religious Polemic and Christian Identity in the Thirteenth Century', in: Yossef Schwartz and Volkhard Krech (eds.), *Religious Apologetics – Philosophical Argumentation*, Tübingen 2004, pp. 267-284; and Robin Vose, *Dominicans, Muslims, and Jews in the Medieval Crown of Aragon*, Cambridge 2009, pp. 122-140.

<sup>32</sup> On the importance and structure of oral disputation by polemical writers, see Alex J. Novikoff, *The Medieval Culture of Disputation: Pedagogy, Practice, and Performance*, Philadelphia 2013.

tual *auctoritas* at once in visual form as Hebrew letters on the page and in aural form as the sounds of Hebrew (or Aramaic or Arabic) pronunciation read aloud before a listener.

The ten or so New Testament passages that Ramon Martí chose to translate from Latin into Hebrew are of scholarly value from a number of perspectives. Because nearly half of the material was left out of the printed editions, and those passages that were included were printed without vowels and with some errors, they offer further proof – if any were needed – of the importance of working directly with the manuscripts. Beyond this, these passages together are a valuable chapter in the history of the translation of New Testament into Hebrew. On the basis of Christian turns of phrase, the spelling of the name of Jesus, the use of vocalization, the close concordance of the Latin and Hebrew texts – including omissions in the same places – and the different translations of the same verse, it can be concluded that Martí did not draw his translations from an existing version but made them himself or had them made at the time of writing. There is no evidence to indicate that other translated material was available but left out, and Martí's choice to render only certain select verses while leaving many more untranslated underscores the importance for his polemical argument of those that he did translate, which mostly deal with Jesus' incarnation, birth, and ministry.

Analysis of the way the verses are translated is also of value in studying Martí's philosophy of language and translation. As is evident in Martí's remarks in the prologues to his anti-Jewish works, original languages – including their original sounds and alphabets – were critically important for establishing the authority of his arguments, and one can see increasingly elaborate strategies of polemical argumentation between his earlier and later works, moving from translation (of Hebrew, Aramaic, and Arabic) to occasional transliteration to full transcriptions of original-language text to, in the case of the material considered here, translations of non-Jewish material *into* Hebrew as well as, in some cases, transliteration into Hebrew letters. The passages of the Athanasian Creed that Martí translated into Hebrew are indicative of the importance of these linguistic strategies in constructing argumentative authority because they not only include transliteration of his own Hebrew translation interspersed within the Latin, but also contain a comparison of Jewish and Christian translations and a polemical argument about the Christological significance of both versions. This adaptation of esoteric numerological ideas to his own ideas evinces Martí's sophisticated understanding of the Jewish material he employed and reminds us that translation was in no way a neutral or perfunctory activity for Martí but was a critical component of his polemical project. No study of Martí's writings or polemical activity is complete without consideration of his philosophy of linguistic authority and his practices of transcription, transliteration, and above all, translation, which in context seem to stand out as more complex and elaborate than any contemporary writer.

## APPENDIX

*Edition of Citations of the New Testament and Athanasian Creed in Hebrew*

**Criteria:** The texts reproduced below are taken from the Ste-Geneviève manuscript in Paris (G) and are presented in the order they appear there.<sup>33</sup> The Basel manuscript (Bas) has been consulted for clarification of some obscure passages. The texts in Coimbra (C), Salamanca (S), Paris Mazarine (R) as well as the Paris and Leipzig editions (p and l) have been consulted where appropriate, but variants in text and vocalization are not noted except where text is missing from G or when the variants present otherwise significant data. The Latin texts in the Munich (Mc) and Tarragona (T) manuscripts have also been consulted in two instances: the first involves the alternate example of Matthew 4:17 (listed as text 9 below) where Latin text is missing from G, Bas, and Mc but present in C, S, and T, and present in a different version in R, p, l. The other case involves a phrase from the Athanasian Creed rendered into Hebrew (listed as text 12 below) in which the Latin text in G, C, S, Bas, T, Mc, and R contains a curious blend of translation and transliterated Hebrew that in p and l are only translated in a confused way. Punctuation in the G manuscript is ideosyncratic and has been ignored or modified to reflect modern usage. Quotation marks are absent but have been added in the Latin text for sense.

1. Luke 1:46–48 (G: f. 281r; C: f. 230r; S: f. 216v; Bas: vol. II, f. 249r)  
G: f. 281r:

Ait igitur, ‘Exultavit spiritus meus in deo salutari meo.  
Quia repexit<sup>34</sup> humilitatem ancille  
sue ecce enim ex hoc beatam  
me dicent omnes generationes.’

עלְצָה רוחַ  
בֵּין יְשֻׁעָה: כִּי הַקִּיט עֲנֹתָה  
אָמַתָּה הַפָּה בְּכָן יָאָשְׁרָנִי  
כָּל הַדָּוִרִים:

2. Luke 1:26–28, 30–32, 34–38 (G: f. 282v; C: f. 231r; S: f. 217v; Bas: vol. II, f. 251r)  
G: f. 282v:

¶ In mense sexto missus est angelus gabriel adeo in civitatem galilee cui nomen nazareth ad virginem desponsatam viro cui nomen erat Ioseph

בְּחַרְשָׁה הַשְׁשִׁי שְׁלַח הַמֶּלֶךְ  
גְּבָרִיאֵל מְאֹת יָיִן [ ] אֶל הַכְּתוּלָה  
הַמְּאוּרָשָׁה לְאֶשְׁיָה יוֹסֵף שָׁמוֹ  
מִבֵּית דָּגְדָּג וְשָׁם הַכְּתוּלָה

[ ] אֶל עִיר הַגָּלִיל  
<sup>35</sup> שְׁשָׁמָה נָצְרָת

<sup>33</sup> See note 2, above.

<sup>34</sup> *Sic.* This appears to be a scribal error for ‘respexit’.

<sup>35</sup> This is inserted in the margin. It is found in the main text in S and C, but with different vowels, and in the main text in Bas with no vowels.

de domo David et nomen virginis Maria.  
 Et ingressus angelus ad eam  
 dixit, 'Ave gratia plena dominus  
 tecum. Benedicta tu in mulieribus.'  
 etc. Et ait angelus ei, 'Ne timeas  
 Maria. Invenisti enim gratiam  
 apud Deum. Ecce concipies  
 in utero et paries filium  
 et vocabis nomen eius Iesum. Hic  
 erit magnus et filius altis-  
 simi vocabitur.' etc. Dixit autem  
 Maria ad angelum, 'Quomodo fiet  
 istud, quoniam virum non cognosco?'  
 Et respondens angelus, 'Dixit ei.  
 Spiritus sanctus superveniet in te  
 et virtus altissimi obumbrabit  
 tibi. Ideoque et quod nascetur ex te  
 sanctum vocabitur filius dei.' etc Dixit  
 autem Maria, 'Ecce ancilla  
 domini. Fiat mihi secundum verbum  
 tuum.'

3. Matthew 2:1–6, 9–12 (G: f. 298r; C: f. 241r; S: f. 229r–v; Bas: vol. III, f. 18r–v; R: p. 1265–1266; p: p. 603; l: p. 772)  
 G: f. 298r:

Cum igitur natus  
 esset Jesus in Bethleem Iudee in diebus  
 Herodis regis. Ecce magi ab orien-  
 te uenerunt ierosolimam  
 dicentes, 'Ubi est qui natus est rex  
 iudeorum? Vidimus enim stellam eius  
 in oriente et uenimus adora-  
 re eum.' Audiens autem Herodes  
 rex turbatus est et omnis Ieruso-  
 lima cum illo. Et congregans omnes  
 principes sacerdotum et scribas populi  
 sciscitabatur ab eis ubi Christus  
 nasceretur. Qui dixerunt ei, 'In

מרים: וְכִי בָא<sup>36</sup> הַמֶּלֶךְ אֶלְيָה  
 אמר לה: שְׁלֹום עֲלֵיכָה מֶלֶת  
 תְּנוּ יְהִי עָמָךְ: בְּרוּכָה אַתָּה  
 בָּנָים וְגַוְאָלָה הַמֶּלֶךְ  
 אֶלְיָה: אֶל תִּרְאֵי מְרִים כִּי  
 מִצְאָת תְּן אֶצְלֵינוּ: הַנְּהָרָה  
 בְּכָתוּן וְנִלְדַּת בָּנוֹ וְקָרָאת שְׁמוֹ  
 יְשֻׁועָה: זֶה יְהָה דָּדוֹל וּבָן  
 הַעֲלִיוֹן יָקָרָא וְגַוְאָלָה מְרִים  
 אֶל הַמֶּלֶךְ: אֵיכָה יַעֲשֶׂה  
 סְדָרָה תְּהִנָּה וְלֹא אָדָע אֲישׁ:  
 וְעַזְנוּ הַמֶּלֶךְ וְיַאֲמֵר לְךָ: הַרְוֹעָה  
 הַקָּדוֹשׁ בָּנָא מִפְּעָל בָּהּ וְבִבְרָה  
 הַעֲלִיוֹן מִצְלָת לְךָ: עַל כֵּן  
 וְהַקָּדוֹשׁ אֲשֶׁר יַלְדֵךְ מֶלֶךְ  
 יָקָרָא בָּנוֹ הַאֲלֵל: וְגַוְאָלָה מְרִים:  
 הַנְּהָה אָנְכִי שְׁפָחָת יְיִי יַעֲשֶׂה  
 לִי פְּרִירָה:

וְהִי כִּי יַלְדֵי יְשֻׁועָה  
 בְּבֵית לְקָהִים יְהֹוָה בִּימֵי  
 הַוּרְדוֹנָס הַמֶּלֶךְ הַנְּהָה  
<sup>37</sup> מְלָכִים חֲכָמִים בְּכוֹכְבִּים בָּאוּ  
 מַאֲرַץ קָדָם אֶל יְרוּשָׁלָם  
 אָוּמָרים: אֲנָה אֲשֶׁר נוֹלָד מֶלֶךְ  
 הַיְהָגִים כִּי רָאָנוּ אֶת כּוֹבָנוּ  
 בְּמִזְרָחָה וּבְאָנוּ לְגַנְשְׁתָּעָה<sup>38</sup> לְוָהָבָה:  
 וְכִי שָׁמַע הַוּרְדוֹנָס הַמֶּלֶךְ גַּבְרָל  
 וְכָל יְרוּשָׁלָם עָמוֹ: וַיַּאֲסֵף כָּל  
 רְאָשֵׁי הַפְּנִים וְסּוּפָרִי הַעָם  
 וְהָהָה שׁוֹאֵל מִקְּם אֲנָה מִלְּדָתָו  
 שֶׁל מְשִׁיחָה: וַיַּאֲמַרְיוּ לֹא בְּבֵית

<sup>36</sup> The dagesh has been added.

<sup>37</sup> Dagesh missing in bet; in this, Martí reproduces a Sephardic pronunciation.

<sup>38</sup> This seems like a scribal error for *לְהַשְׁתִּין*

Bethleem Iudee. Sic enim scriptum est per prophetam. Et tu Bethleem terra Iuda nequaquam minima es in principibus iuda. Ex te enim exiet dux qui regat populum meum Israel' etc. Cum au- dissenter regem abierunt. Et ecce stella quam uiderant in orien- te antecedebat eos usque dum ue- niens staret supra ubi erat puer. Videntes autem stellam gauisi sunt gaudio magno ualde. Et intrantes domum inuenient puerum cum Maria matre eius. Et prociden- tes adorauerunt eum. Et [...] obtulerunt ei munera aurum, thus, et mirram.

4. Matthew 19:29 (G: f. 300r; C: f. 242v; S: f. 231r; Bas: vol. III, f. 20v; R: p. 1273; p: p. 606; l: p. 776)  
G: f. 300r:

Omnis  
qui reliquerit domum aut fratres aut so-  
rores aut patrem aut matrem  
aut uxorem aut filios aut agros  
propter nomen meum, centuplum accipiet  
et uitam eternam possidebit.

5. Luke 6:20 (G: f. 300r; C: f. 242v; S: f. 231r; Bas: vol. III, f. 20v; R: p. 1273; p: p. 606)  
G: f. 300r:

Beati pauperes, quia uestrum  
est regnum Dei.

לְקַم יְהוָה כִּי כֵן גַּכְפָּב עַל יְד  
הַבְּבִיא: וְאַתָּה בֵּית לְקַם אֶרְץ  
יְהוָה אֲנִי צָעִיר בְּאֶלְוֹפִי<sup>39</sup> הַוְּהָה:  
מִמְּפָקֵל יְיַצֵּא לְדֹרוֹת מֹשֶׁל [בְּעֵמִי]<sup>40</sup> יִשְׂרָאֵל:  
וְגַם שָׁמָעוּ הַמֶּלֶךְ קָלְכָה:  
הַגָּהָה הַפּוֹכָב אֲשֶׁר רָאוּ בְּמִזְרָח  
הַנָּה הַוּלָה לְבִנְיָם עַד אֲשֶׁר  
בָּא<sup>41</sup> עַמְּד עַל הַמִּקְומָם אֲשֶׁר  
הַנָּה שֵׁם הַיָּלֵד: וְכֵן רָאָה  
הַפּוֹכָב שְׁמָחוֹ שְׁמָחָה גָּדוֹלָה  
מָאוֹד: וּבָאוּ הַבְּבִיא וּמְצָאוּ הַיָּלֵד  
עַם מְרִים אֱנוֹן וַיְשַׁתְּקוּ לוֹ  
אֲפִים אֲנָה: וְגַגְשׁוּ לוֹ מְנֻהָות  
זְהָב וְלֹבֶןָה וְמוֹרָה:

כָּל הַעֲזָב בֵּיתוֹ אוֹ אֲחִיו אוֹ  
אֲחוֹתָיו [sic] או אָב או אִם או  
אֲשֶׁה או בְּנָנִים או שְׁדִים<sup>42</sup>  
לְשָׁמֵי מְהָפָעִים יְהָה  
וְתִּתְּעַזְּמִים יְקָנָה:

אֲשֶׁר יְכַסְּעַם כִּי לְכָם  
מֶלֶכְוֹת הָאָלֹהִים:

<sup>39</sup> Dagesh missing in bet; this should read בְּאֶלְוֹפִי

<sup>40</sup> Inserted in margin. Found in main text in C, Bas, and S.

<sup>41</sup> Dagesh missing in bet; this should read בָּאָ.

<sup>42</sup> This seems to be an authorial error for שְׁדָותִין

6. Matthew 4:17 (G: f. 300r; C: f. 242v; S: f. 231r; Bas: vol. III, f. 20v; R: p. 1273; p: p. 606; l: p. 776)  
 G: f. 300r:

Incepit iesus praedicare et dicere  
 ‘penitentiam agite; appropinquavit  
 enim regnum celorum.’

וַיְחִלֵּל  
 יְשׁוּעָה לְהַגֵּד וַיֹּאמֶר: עַשׂْוּ  
 תְּשׁוּבָה כִּי קָרְבָּה מֶלֶכְתָּה  
 הַשְׁמִים:

7. Romans 14:17 (G: f. 300r; C: f. 242v; S: f. 231r; Bas: vol. III, f. 20v; R: p. 1273; p: p. 606)  
 G: f. 300r:

Non est regnum Dei esca et po-  
 tus sed iusticia et pax et gau-  
 dium in spiritu sancto.

אֵין מֶלֶכְתָּה הַאֱלֹהִים  
 אֲכִילָה וּשְׁתִיָּה כִּי אֵם אֶצְקָה  
 וְשָׁלוֹם וְשָׁמֶךָ בְּרוּךְ דָּקָנוֹשׁ:

8. John 19:36 (quoting Exodus 12:46) (G: f. 300r; C: f. 242v; S: f. 231r; Bas: vol. III, f. 20v)  
 G: f. 300r:

[...] facta sunt haec ut scriptura implere-  
 tur quae dicit, ‘os non comminuetis ex eo’.

וְעַצְם לֹא  
 תְשִׁבְרֵו בָּזֶן<sup>43</sup>

9. Matthew 4:17 (alternate version) (G: f. 336r; C: f. 267v; S: f. 256v; Bas: vol. III, f. 65v;  
 R: p. 1370; p: p. 643; l: p. 825)  
 G: f. 336r:

[No Latin text found in G]<sup>44</sup>

עַשְׂוּ תְּשׁוּבָה כִּי קָרְבָּה מֶלֶכְתָּה שָׁמִים<sup>45</sup>

<sup>43</sup> Dagesh missing in bet; this should read אֶצְקָה.

<sup>44</sup> Latin text is not present in G, Bas, or Mc (f. 178v), but is found in two versions in the other copies containing III-III, 14: In C, S, and T (f. 297r), the text reads: ‘facite penitentiam aproinqauit enim regnum celorum’; in R, p, l, the text reads, following the Vulgate, ‘agite poenitentiam, quia appropinquavit regnum coelorum.’ Very slight variants can be found in Hebrew text: G, S, and Bas all agree (apart from one vowel change in S and no vowels in Bas); C’s vocalization is also different and reads תְּשׁוּבָה תְּשֻׁבָּה rather than תְּשׁוּבָה קָרְבָּה and R, p, and l read קָרְבָּה rather than קָרְבָּה.

<sup>45</sup> Sic. One expects קָרְבָּה; see f. 300r in text 6 above.

10. Matthew 3:13–15 (G: f. 330v–331r; C: f. 264r; S: f. 253v; Bas: vol. III, f. 57v–58r; R: p. 1355; p: p. 638; l: p. 818)  
 G: f. 330v–331r:

Tunc ue-  
 nit Iesus a Galilea in iordanem ad  
 Iohannem ut baptizaretur ab eo.  
 Iohannes autem prohibebat eum di-  
 cens, ‘Ego a te debeo baptizari  
 et tu uenis ad me?’ Respondit  
 Iesus et dixit ei, ‘Sine modo.’

&lt;331r&gt;

Sic enim decet nos implere omnem  
 iustitiam.

אֹז בָּא יְשׁוּעָה  
 מִהָּגֵלִיל אֶל הַיּוֹרֶד לְיוֹחָנֵן  
 לְטָבֵל עַל דְּבָרֵי וְהָיָה יוֹחָנֵן  
 מוֹעֵד אָוֹתוֹ לְאָמֹר [sic] אָזְרִיךְ אָנִי  
 לְטָבֵל עַל יְצָקָה וְאַתָּה תָּפַא אָלִי:  
 וַיַּעֲשֵׂה יְשׁוּעָה וַיַּאֲמַר אֶלָּו הַנִּים  
 שְׁתָּה:

&lt;331r&gt;

כִּי כִּי רָאוּ בָנָנוּ לְהַתּוֹם [sic] כֹּל צְדָקָה:

11. Mark 16:15–16 (G: f. 331r; C: f. 264r; S: f. 253v; Bas: vol. III, f. 57v–58r; R: p. 1355–  
 1356; p: p. 638; l: p. 818)

G: f. 331r:

Euntes in mundum uniuersum predica-  
 te euangelium omni creature. Qui credi-  
 derit et baptizatus fuerit,  
 salvus erit. Qui uero non cre-  
 diderit, condempnabitur.

מַתְהַלְכִין בְּכָל הָעוֹלָם כּוֹל  
 הַגִּידו הַבְשֹׁרָה לְכָל בְּרִיאָה:  
 מֵי שְׁאָמֵן וּנְטַבֵּל יוֹשֵׁעַ  
 וּמֵי שְׁלָא יְאָמֵן יְעַנֵּשׁ:

12. Quotation from the Athanasian Creed in Hebrew (G: f. 243r; C: f. 203v; S: f. 187v;  
 Bas: vol. II, f. 197v; T: f. 237r [Latin only]; Mc: f. 140vb [Latin only]; R: p. 1105 [Latin  
 only]; p: p. 545; l: p. 691)

*Ab el pater Deus, ben el filius Deus  
 ue ruah qados el et spiritus sanctus Deus.  
 Ak tamen enam non sunt selossa elohim tres dii  
 qi im el ebad sed unus deus. Et hoc iuxta modum  
 quo nos nominamus spiritum sanctum. Iuxta illum  
 uero modum quo iudei nominant ipsum. Redditur eadem summa et idem  
 [numeris litterarum sic.]*

*Ab el pater Deus ben el filius Deus  
 ue ruah haqqodes el et spiritus  
 sanctuarii Deus. Ak uerumtamen  
 enam non sunt selossa elohim tres dii qi im set  
 el ebad unus deus.<sup>46</sup>*

אָב אֶל בָּן אֶל וּרוּחַ קָדוֹשׁ אֶל:  
 אָה אִינָם שְׁלֹשָׁה אֱלֹהִים כִּי אָם  
 אֶל אֶחָד:

אָב אֶל  
 בָּן אֶל וּרוּחַ קָדוֹשׁ אֶל: אָה  
 אִינָם שְׁלֹשָׁה אֱלֹהִים כִּי אָם  
 אֶל אֶחָד:

<sup>46</sup> The Hebrew text is not vowelized in the l edition and contains no transliteration in the Latin, although the terms *qadosh / qodesh* do appear on the previous page (p. 690). In the p edition, these Hebrew words are distinguished but the article ‘ha’ is included on both words, whereas only *ha-qodesh* carries it in the manuscripts.