

# RAMON MARTÍ IN CONTEXT: THE INFLUENCE OF THE *PUGIO FIDEI* ON RAMON LLULL, ARNAU DE VILANOVA AND FRANCESC EIXIMENIS

Alexander FIDORA

## *Abstract*

While it is generally agreed that Ramon Martí's (c. 1220-1284) *Pugio fidei* must be considered a landmark in polemic literature, shaping the Christian-Jewish discourse of the following centuries, there are very few analyses dedicated to establishing the extent and nature of its immediate reception. This paper studies the influence of Martí's apologetics on three major Catalan theologians. Starting with his contemporary, Ramon Llull (1232-1316), who was critical of Martí's intellectual project, the paper proceeds by focusing on the affirmative reception of Martí's ideas in Arnau de Vilanova's (c. 1240-1311) *Allocutio super significatione nominis tetragrammaton* and, particularly, in Francesc Eiximenis's (c. 1327-1409) *Lo Crestià*, which draws heavily on Martí's explanation of the Tetragrammaton.

Among the theologians of the thirteenth century, the Dominican friar Ramon Martí (or Raimundus Martini) stands out for his knowledge of both Arabic and Hebrew — crucial languages as far as missionary activity is concerned. Works such as the *Secta mahometanorum*, the *Explanatio symboli apostolorum*, the *Capistrum iudaeorum* and, above all, the *Pugio fidei*,<sup>1</sup> make of the Catalan Dominican the prototype of a well-trained missionary, who has first-hand access to the sources and traditions of his interlocutors, where he finds the argumentative resources for his polemics.<sup>2</sup> Therefore, the importance of Ramon

1 The *Vocabulista in Arabico* should be added to this list, even though it is not certain if it is authored by Ramon Martí.

2 About the knowledge that Martí had of Jewish sources, see the recent work of M. PEDRETTI, "Una 'ciència jueva' en el *Pugio fidei* de Ramon Martí?," in: A. ALBERNI *et*

Martí in the history of medieval Christian apologetics seems unquestionable, and this is reflected in the current historiography, which has accorded him the title of the first “Christian Hebraist.”<sup>3</sup> However, when one inquires into the genuine influence of his thought on writers contemporary and later than he, the matter is not so simple. In fact, some scholars have even argued that the *Pugio fidei*, the main work of Ramon Martí completed around 1280, “was cast into a void and went unnoticed for centuries.”<sup>4</sup>

One of the great difficulties in determining the historical impact of Ramon Martí’s apologetic thought is the lack of critical editions, not only of his own monumental *Pugio fidei* but also of some of the polemical works of his contemporaries. To date, the only printed text of the *Pugio fidei* is the *editio princeps* prepared by Joseph de Voisin in 1651 (Paris) and reedited by Johann Benedikt Carpzov in 1687 (Leipzig). Even though this edition was based on four manuscripts, it clearly does not live up to the demands of a modern critical edition. In fact, the transmission of the text itself is highly complex, which is witnessed by the fact that significant differences can be found among the texts contained in the thirteen extant manuscripts.<sup>5</sup> First, it should be noted that many manuscripts omit the quotations in Hebrew characters and offer only the Latin translation of the original texts provided by Ramon Martí. Moreover, the manuscript tradition offers two versions of the text: the one called *Pugio parvus* and the *Pugio*

al. (eds.), *El saber i les llengües vernacles a l'època de Lluïl i Eiximenis — Knowledge and Vernacular Languages in the Age of Lluïl and Eiximenis*, Barcelona 2012, pp. 315-330.

3 See, for example, J. COHEN, *Living Letters of the Law: Ideas of the Jew in Medieval Christianity*, Berkeley 1999, p. 343, who describes Martí as “the first genuine Christian Hebraist of medieval times.”

4 Cf. I. WILLI-PLEIN and Th. WILLI, *Glaubensdolch und Messiasbeweis. Die Begegnung von Judentum, Christentum und Islam im 13. Jahrhundert in Spanien*, Neukirchen-Vluyn 1980, p. 34: “So scheint es fast, als wäre der *Pugio*, auf mehrere Jahrhunderte gesehen, in einen leeren Raum hinein geschrieben worden.”

5 On the manuscript and print tradition of the *Pugio fidei* see G. HASSELHOFF, “Some Remarks on Raymond Martini’s (c. 1215/30 — c. 1284/94) Use of Moses Maimonides,” in: *Trumah* 12 (2002), pp. 133-148 (here 144-145), and, with some complementary information, R. SZPIECH, “Citas árabes en caracteres hebreos en el *Pugio fidei* del dominico Ramón Martí: entre la autenticidad y la autoridad,” in: *al-Qantara* 32 (2011), pp. 71-107 (here 76-80). To the twelve manuscripts described by Hasselhoff and Szpiech one has to add the manuscript from Chipiona, Biblioteca del Colegio-Santuario de Nuestra Señora de Regla, Ms. 15, which transmits portions of the *Pugio fidei* together with the *Vulgata* (I owe this information to Matthias M. Tischler).

*fidei* proper. The *Pugio parvus* contains only books I and II. The first book is devoted to classical dogmatic issues, such as the existence of God, the essence of the soul and the creation of the world, largely inspired by Albert the Great and Thomas Aquinas. The second book, on the other hand, can be considered “homegrown”: in accordance with his apologetic method, Martí expounds the doctrine of the Messiah basing himself on Jewish sources in order to prove that He has already come. The *Pugio fidei* proper adds a third book, which, in turn, is divided into three sections: on the unity and Trinity of God, about the creation and the redemption, followed by some paragraphs of anti-Jewish polemic. Among all the versions of the work, the Paris manuscript of the Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève, 1405 (thirteenth century), is not just the most complete, but it is also highly probable that it is an autograph or an author copy of the work. Although this manuscript is now in Paris, it is remarkable that many of the manuscripts of the *Pugio fidei* are of Hispanic origin.

In the following considerations, I will concentrate on the reception of the apologetic thought of Martí in the lands of the Crown of Aragon in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.<sup>6</sup> In general, historical studies associate the first reactions towards Martí’s work with the names of two great lay theologians from Catalonia: his contemporaries Ramon Llull and Arnau de Vilanova.<sup>7</sup> I will thus briefly and critically analyze Ramon Martí’s presence in the thinking of these two key figures. Against the commonly held opinion, I will argue that they do not reveal any significant degree of familiarity with Martí’s thought. In contrast, I will present Francesc Eiximenis as one of the first real (Catalan) readers and interpreters of Ramon Martí. To this

6 Due to this geographical and temporal focus I will not deal with further Hispanic authors such as Abner of Burgos/Alfonso de Valladolid (c. 1265-1346) and Alfonso de Espina (d. 1469). While the latter used the *Pugio* in his *Fortalitium fidei*, Abner’s direct knowledge of the *Pugio* is far from evident. As Walter Mettmann has stressed in the introduction to his edition of the *Mostrador de la justicia*, 2 vols., Opladen 1994-1996, here vol. I, pp. 7-8, Abner used hardly any Latin texts, and, indeed, it is not clear how familiar he was with the language.

7 See, for example, the respective works of E. COLOMER, “Ramón Llull y Ramón Martí,” in: *Estudios lulianos* 28 (1988), pp. 1-37, and “La interpretación del Tetragrama bíblico en Ramón Martí y Arnau de Vilanova,” in: J.P. BECKMANN *et al.* (eds.), *Sprache und Erkenntnis im Mittelalter* (Miscellanea Mediaevalia 13/1), Berlin/New York 1981, pp. 937-945, reedited in *El pensament als Països Catalans durant l’Edat Mitjana i el Renaixement*, Barcelona 1997, pp. 181-238 and 239-252.

end, I will focus specially on Francesc Eiximenis's interpretation of the Tetragrammaton in his main work *Lo Crestià (The Christian)*, showing that it is clearly dependent on Ramon Martí.

1. *Ramon Llull: Critic of Ramon Martí?*

It is quite well known that the Majorcan missionary and theologian Ramon Llull (1232-1316) was very reluctant to refer to other thinkers of his time. Although references to other authors and their works are rare, some contemporary sources of his thinking have been identified. Ramon Martí has been numbered among these sources since the 1930s, when Éphrem Longpré suggested an interpretation of a Lullian *exemplum* that made Martí look to be the likely source.<sup>8</sup>

The *exemplum*, which first appears in Llull's *Romanç d'Evast e Blaquerna* (c. 1283), presents us with a Christian missionary who first convinced a "Saracen king" of the falsehood of Islam but then claimed to be unable to prove to him the sublime truth of Christian faith.<sup>9</sup> In the various re-elaborations that Llull made in later works he added new information until he reached the full version of the story to be found in the *Liber de fine*, from 1305.<sup>10</sup> Here, in the chapter devoted to the mission among the Tatars, he retells the anecdote in a way that allows us to put the events in context: the "Saracen king" from *Blaquerna* is called here by his honorific title 'Miramamoli', that is, *amir al-mu'minin*; what we learn about the Christian is that he knew Arabic; and we can with confidence place the events to around the year 1270 in Tunis, at the time of the North African crusade of Saint Louis.<sup>11</sup> In the later versions of the anecdote, which Longpré examined in his article, Llull focused even more on the description of the Christian preacher. Thus, in the *Liber de acquisitione Terrae sanctae*

8 É. LONGPRÉ, "Le B. Raymond Lulle et Raymond Martí, O.P.," in: *Bolletí de la Societat Arqueològica Lul·liana* 24 (1933), pp. 269-271.

9 Cf. RAMON LLULL, *Romanç d'Evast e Blaquerna*, ed. A. SOLER and J. SANTANACH (NEORL 8), Barcelona 2009, p. 379.

10 For a precise analysis of the development of the *exemplum* in Llull's works, see H. HAMES, "Through Ramon Llull's Looking Glass: What Was the Thirteenth-Century Dominican Mission Really About?," in: M. RIPOLL *et al.* (eds.), *Actes de les Jornades lul·lianes en homenatge a J. N. Hillgarth & A. Bonner. Palma, 25 i 26 de febrer de 2010*, in print.

11 Cf. RAIMUNDUS LULLUS, *Liber de fine*, ROL IX, pp. 267-268.

and in the *Liber de convenientia, quam habent fides et intellectus in obiecto*, both of them from 1309, Lull says that even though this friar knew Arabic and history, he knew nothing of “natural philosophy” or “logic” and therefore in the discussion with the Muslim king he was confined to “moral arguments” in order to prove the falsehood of Islam;<sup>12</sup> whereas when it came to proving the truth of the Christian faith, he could do no more than “expose in Arabic the symbol of faith.”<sup>13</sup> The *Liber de acquisitione Terrae sanctae* and the *Liber de convenientia, quam habent fides et intellectus in obiecto* add yet another important bio-geographical element: this friar, who also knew Hebrew, often disputed with a learned Jew of Barcelona, possibly Salomon Ibn Adret, with whom, Lull says, he himself was in direct contact during the same period;<sup>14</sup> moreover, Lull even claims that he had personally met the missionary friar and his companions after their failed mission to Tunis.<sup>15</sup>

Indeed, as Longpré claimed, Lull’s anonymous missionary coincides in many respects with the life and missionary activity of Ramon Martí: we know that, at least in 1268-9, which is shortly before Saint Louis’s expedition to Tunis, Ramon Martí was in the North African kingdom;<sup>16</sup> and he probably explained to the king of Tunis the symbol of Christian faith — a conversation that could be related to his work *Explanatio symboli apostolorum* (c. 1256-7). It is also true that, later, he was active in Barcelona, at the Convent of Santa Caterina, where he was involved in the mission to convert the Jews, which is nicely described in his *Pugio fidei*. Nevertheless, there are some reasons to doubt that Martí was in fact the anonymous missionary

12 Cf. RAIMUNDUS LULLUS, *Liber de convenientia, quam habent fides et intellectus in obiecto*, MOG IV, p. 574, and *Liber de acquisitione Terrae sanctae*, ed. E. KAMAR in: “Projet de Raymond Lull *De acquisitione Terrae sanctae*. Introduction et édition critique du texte,” *Studia Orientalia Christiana* “Collectanea” 6, Cairo 1961, pp. 3-131, here 126.

13 Cf. RAIMUNDUS LULLUS, *Liber de convenientia, quam habent fides et intellectus in obiecto*, MOG IV, p. 574, and *Liber de acquisitione Terrae sanctae*, p. 126.

14 Cf. RAIMUNDUS LULLUS, *Liber de acquisitione Terrae sanctae*, p. 127.

15 Cf. RAIMUNDUS LULLUS, *Liber de convenientia, quam habent fides et intellectus in obiecto*, MOG IV, p. 574.

16 According to James I’s chronicle, Ramon Martí returned from Tunis in 1269, after having been there on a mission together with Francesc Cendra, Prior of the Convent of Santa Caterina in Barcelona. In fact, both Dominicans met the king in the port of Aigues-Mortes. Cf. chapter 490 of the *Llibre dels fets*, ed. Jordi Bruguera, 2 vols., Barcelona 1991, vol. II, p. 346.

whom Llull depicted. The first reason is chronological, since we have no data that would allow us to confirm that Ramon Llull and Ramon Martí met, either in Tunis or in Barcelona, after the mission failed. A second reason has to do with Llull's quite negative description of the intellectual capacities of the anonymous missionary. According to Llull, the missionary had knowledge of neither philosophy nor theology, which could hardly be an apt description of Martí, who studied in Paris with Albert the Great.

If one is disinclined to call into question the historical accuracy of the anecdote, as Lavajo and Serverat do in their works,<sup>17</sup> then one should look for another candidate for the anonymous missionary of Llull's *exemplum*. This is the route that Josep Maria Ruiz Simon followed. Ruiz Simon has suggested that the anonymous missionary should be identified with André de Longjumeau, who was in the service of Louis IX, for whom he carried out diplomatic missions in Mongolia, and who, according to some sources, accompanied the king during his expedition to Tunis.<sup>18</sup> This identification could explain why in the *Liber de fine* our anecdote is not in the chapter on Muslims but in the one on Tatars. The problem with this identification, however, is that it does not agree well with the fact that Llull's anonymous missionary should also have been active in Barcelona in the conversion of Jews.

Although I am unable to definitively resolve the issue, I would nonetheless like to bring into the picture yet another figure whose

17 Cf. J. CHORÃO LAVAJO, "The Apologetical Method of Raymond Marti According to the Problematic of Raymond Lulle," in: *Islamochristiana* 11 (1985), pp. 155-176, and V. SERVERAT, "La 'irrisio fidei'. Encore sur Raymond Lulle et Thomas d'Aquin," in: *Revue thomiste* 90 (1990), pp. 435-448. Lavajo and Serverat consider the story to be a general criticism of the Thomistic-Dominican mission.

18 Cf. J.M. RUIZ SIMON, *L'Art de Ramon Llull i la teoria escolàstica de la ciència*, Barcelona 1999, pp. 361-362, n. 501: "Hi ha elements per plantejar (també) una altra hipòtesi: que el religiós en qüestió podria haver estat el també dominic André de Longjumeau, que potser va acompanyar a Lluís a la seva expedició a Tunísia de 1270. Aquesta hipòtesi, si més no, té la virtut de concordar amb la versió d'aquesta anècdota que el Doctor Il·luminat ofereix al *De fine*, segons la qual 1) l'episodi va tenir lloc quan 'sanctus rex Franciae Ludovicus ivit tunc Tunicium cum exercitu suo magno' i 2) 'dictus religiosus non erat multum litteratus in philosophia nec in theologia' (cosa que no es correspon amb la imatge que tenien de Ramon Martí els seus contemporanis i sí amb la d'André de Longjumeau." On André de Longjumeau, see B. ALTANER, *Die Dominikanermission des 13. Jahrhunderts. Forschungen zur Geschichte der kirchlichen Unionen und der Mohammedaner- und Heidenmission des Mittelalters*, Habelschwerdt 1924, pp. 128-138.

testimony reinforces the historicity of Ramon Llull's story, namely Ramon de Penyafort, a friend of our two Ramons. Thus, around 1256, in a letter to the Master General of his order, Penyafort specifically emphasizes the willingness of Miramamolín to receive Christian missionaries. Unfortunately, this letter has not been preserved, but we can consult a summary that reads:

Among Muslims, and especially among the most powerful and even Miramamolín, king of Tunis, himself, the friars have brought so much of God's grace and favor that we cannot describe it here, and now the door seems open to immeasurable results.<sup>19</sup>

The willingness of Miramamolín that can be found in Llull's anecdote is clearly captured in this document, and it is reasonable to assume that the original contained more detailed information about the attempts to convert the king of Tunis. It is quite possible, therefore, that Llull's story had its origins in several sources, among which should be numbered his conversations with Ramon de Penyafort,<sup>20</sup> who could have provided him with first-hand information about the activities of his order's missionaries in Tunis.

If, on the other hand, one accepts the identification of the anonymous missionary with Ramon Martí, what can we say about the knowledge that Llull had of his works? I think that we can by no means claim that Llull had consulted Martí's writings, but rather had vaguely heard about them. The discrepancy between the description of the anonymous missionary's intellectual profile and the level of the reflections found in the works of Ramon Martí is too vast. First, it is unconvincing to accept about Ramon Martí Llull's judgment that the anonymous missionary had no knowledge of natural philosophy:

19 This summary is reproduced in J.M. COLL, "Escuelas de lenguas orientales en los siglos XIII y XIV (Periodo Raymundiano)," in: *Analecta Sacra Tarraconensia* 17 (1944), pp. 115-138, here 138: "Sextus fructus est inter Sarracenos, apud quos, et maxime potentiores et etiam apud ipsum Miramolínim sive regem Tunicii, tantam contulit eis Dei gratiam et favorem, ultra quam ad praesens expediat scribere, quod ianua videtur aperta quasi ad inaestimabilem fructum." On the date of the letter, see R.I. BURNS, "Renegades, Adventurers and Sharp Businessmen: The Thirteenth-Century Spaniard in the Cause of Islam," in: *The Catholic Historical Review* 58/3 (1972), pp. 341-366, here 343, n. 3.

20 As Miquel Batllori has indicated, it is possible that the first meeting between Llull and Ramon de Penyafort took place in 1256, that is, in the same year as the letter in question. Cf. M. BATLLORI, "L'entrevista amb Ramon de Penyafort a Barcelona," in: ID., *Ramon Llull i el Lul·lisme*, València 1993, pp. 45-49, here 48.

we should bear in mind that the first part of the *Pugio fidei* is filled with cosmological discussions.<sup>21</sup> Even more importantly, it seems highly unlikely that Martí would have categorically rejected rational arguments as a means of proving the truth of the Christian faith. The aforementioned *Explanatio symboli apostolorum*, a work to which Llull seems to allude when he says that the missionary explicated to the king the symbol of faith in Arabic, contains a long section on rational arguments. Demonstrating his familiarity with the philosophical tradition, Martí carefully developed a total of six strictly rational arguments in favor of the divine Trinity.<sup>22</sup> Finally, if Llull did know Martí's works, then it seems strange that he would not have taken the opportunity to evaluate positively some of the key themes of the anti-Jewish polemic from the *Pugio fidei*, such as the interpretation of the Tetragrammaton to prove the Trinity. The absence of this essential resource in the works of Llull is surprising, especially if one takes into account the reconstruction of a discussion between Ramon Llull and Salomon Ibn Adret presented by Harvey Hames, where Llull would use arguments based on Jewish authoritative texts, namely the Midrash, to prove the Trinity.<sup>23</sup>

In short, if one accepts the identification of the anonymous missionary with Ramon Martí, it has to be said that Llull's criticism of Martí was primarily intended to promote his own work, using Martí as a counterexample; it cannot be considered the result of a genuine familiarity with Martí's texts. Otherwise, it would also be difficult to

21 Martí tackles here an issue that was also important to Llull, which is the problem of the eternity of the world. On this question in the *Pugio fidei*, see the work of A.M. GILETTI, "The Journey of an Idea: Maimonides, Albertus Magnus, Thomas Aquinas and Ramon Martí (c. 1220-c. 1284/5) against the Eternity of the World," forthcoming in the proceedings of the congress "Pensar a natureza (séculos XI-XV)," June 17-18, 2010, Universidade do Porto.

22 See J.M. MARCH'S edition of the *Explanatio symboli apostolorum* in *Anuari de l'Institut d'Estudis Catalans* 2 (1908), pp. 443-496, here 459-462. Martí justifies his rational method as follows: "Verum, quia auctoritates sacrorum librorum non omnes recipiunt sapientes, tam fideles communiter quam infideles rationibus acquiescunt, rationes aliquas post auctoritates ad ostensionem Sanctae Trinitatis in medium proponemus" (p. 457).

23 Cf. H. HAMES, *The Art of Conversion. Christianity and Kabbalah in the Thirteenth Century*, Leiden/Boston 2000, cap. 5 (= pp. 246-283). A revised version of this important study, translated into Catalan, will be published shortly as part of the collection "Blaquerna" (Barcelona/Palma).



understand a verdict as sharp and angry as the one that Lull applies to the anonymous missionary in the *Liber de fine*: “We expect the divine judgment upon those who can do good, and have been commissioned to do it, and do not do it but have neglected it completely.”<sup>24</sup>

## 2. *Arnau de Vilanova: Disciple of Ramon Martí?*

If this really was Ramon Lull’s opinion of Martí, then it differs considerably from the evaluation of Martí offered by the Catalan theologian and physician Arnau de Vilanova (c. 1240-1311). We know that Arnau and Martí overlapped in Barcelona, during the last years of the Dominican’s life (1281-1284).

It seems that Arnau wrote his *Allocutio super significatione nominis Tetragrammaton*, completed in 1292 at the Dauphiné, as the result of his encounter with Martí. This is at the very least suggested by the initial lines of the work dedicated to the Prior of the Convent of Santa Caterina in Barcelona, Pere Puget:

I have tried hard, beloved father, that the seed of the Hebrew language, which the religious enthusiasm of friar Ramon Martí sowed in the garden of my heart, would not only be beneficial for me and my eternal salvation, but also for that of the rest of believers.<sup>25</sup>

Arnau fondly remembers the teaching he received from Martí, who was at that time in charge of the *studium Hebraicum* at the Convent of Santa Caterina; and when it comes to his initiation into the Hebrew language, Arnau clearly feels indebted to Martí. However, Martí is remembered not only as a great language teacher, but also as a distinguished apologist. Thus, Arnau continues with his emphatic praise of Martí:

Considering time and again how the knowledge of this language can be fruitful for the Catholic edification of the believing folk, since it illuminates and

24 RAIMUNDUS LULLUS, *Liber de fine*: “Et ideo conscientia spectet habere iudicium contra illos, qui possunt agere bonum, et ad hoc deputati sunt, et non agunt; nam quasi ab illis penitus est neglectum” (ROL IX, p. 268).

25 ARNALDUS DE VILLANOVA, *Allocutio super significatione nominis Tetragrammaton*, ed. J. PERARNAU, Barcelona 2004, p. 139: “Pluries affectavi, karissime pater, ut semen illud hebraicae linguae, quod zelus religionis fratris R[aimundi] Martini seminavit in ortulo cordis mei, prodesset non mihi solum, sed ceteris etiam fidelibus ad salutem aeternam.”

confirms the minds of the believers with regard to those things that the reading of the Gospels announces, I have realized how adequately this is taught and explained in this glorious work, which I firmly believe to have been written by divine inspiration and through the ministry and the effort of the aforementioned man. Indeed, it contains numerous clear testimonies in favor of the articles of our faith, which have until now been hidden in the Hebrew truth.<sup>26</sup>

Even though Arnau does not mention the work explicitly by title, there can be no doubt that the “gloriosum opus” of the “praedictus vir” is Ramon Martí’s *Pugio fidei*, which was completed shortly before Arnau’s arrival in Barcelona, and in which the explanation of the Tetragrammaton, which is at the centre of Arnau’s work, holds a prominent place.<sup>27</sup>

For Ramon Martí, the biblical name of God par excellence, YAHWEH, was crucial in order to prove on the basis of texts from the rabbinic tradition both the deity of the Messiah and the existence of the Trinity. He addresses this issue in the third distinction of *Pugio III*. In the second chapter of the third distinction, Martí begins his presentation with a long quotation from Maimonides’s *Guide for the Perplexed I*, 61 to show that the Tetragrammaton YAHWEH is the proper name of God, the name by which God presents himself, in other words, the particular and exclusive name of God, deprived of any immanent properties, which, because of its venerability, the Jews would not pronounce, but rather replace it with the term ‘Adonay’, ‘Lord’. Now, since the Old Testament also attributes the Tetragrammaton to the Messiah who is to come, his divinity is proven.<sup>28</sup>

26 ARNALDUS DE VILLANOVA, *Allocutio super significatione nominis Tetragrammaton*, p. 139: “Cogitans vero saepius qualiter notitia linguae huius potest fideli caetui fructum aedificationis catholicae parere illuminando et roborando mentes credentium erga fidem eorum quae praedicat evangelica lectio, comperi quam sufficienter id doceat et ostendat illud gloriosum opus, quod credo firmiter editum divino spiramine per ministerium et laborem praedicti viri, quia continet multa et clara testimonia pro articulis nostrae fidei, quae latuerunt hactenus in hebraica veritate.”

27 It is possible that Arnau de Vilanova had a copy of the *Pugio fidei* in his library. This is how Joaquim Carreras i Artau identifies a “Summa in pergamento et in hebraico scripta et glossata in latino contra judaeos” from the inventory of Arnau’s library. Cf. J. CARRERAS I ARTAU, “La llibreria d’Arnau de Vilanova,” in: *Analecta Sacra Tarraconensis* 11 (1935), pp. 63-84, here 69.

28 Cf. RAIMUNDUS MARTINI, *Pugio fidei III-III*, 2, ed. Leipzig 1687 (reprinted Farnborough 1967), pp. 648-650.

In the fourth chapter of the third distinction of the same part, Martí presents the exegesis proper of the four letters that constitute the Tetragrammaton. Here the Dominican applies the letters *yodh*, *he*, *waw* and *he* also to the mystery of the divine Trinity, pointing out that the first three letters, *yodh*, *he* and *waw*, “indicate the existence of three properties in God, differing from each other owing to the diversity of their figure [graphic form] and their name [sound].”<sup>29</sup> And, as he continues to explain, “the letter that is repeated at the end of the [divine] name [*he*], indicates the unity of the essence of the three properties or persons.”<sup>30</sup> This is how the Tetragrammaton leads to the Trinity. In the remaining sections of this chapter, Martí reaffirms his Trinitarian interpretation of the name of God by making reference to the two enigmatic divine names of the Jewish tradition composed of 12 and 42 letters respectively. Also these names, according to Martí, should be read as referring to the three divine persons: the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit.

How much of this material is actually found in Arnau de Vilanova’s *Allocutio*? Interestingly enough, and in contrast to what the initial praise might lead us to expect, Arnau draws very little on Martí’s work. He starts by referring to the Tetragrammaton as the proper name of God and he states that the Jews replace it with ‘Adonay’,<sup>31</sup> but the further development of his discourse quickly abandons Martí’s lines of exegesis. In fact, Arnau turns to yet another authority, the treatise *De semine Scripturarum* of Pseudo-Joachim of Fiore, on which

29 RAIMUNDUS MARTINI, *Pugio fidei* III-III, 4, p. 685: “[...] indicant in Deo [...] esse tres [...] proprietates a seipsis invicem differentes ex sua diversitate, quam habent tam in figura quam in nomine.”

30 RAIMUNDUS MARTINI, *Pugio fidei* III-III, 4, p. 685: “Una vero earum, quae repetitur et in fine nominis ponitur [...] indicat trium [...] proprietatum vel personarum unitatem essentiae.”

31 Cf. ARNALDUS DE VILLANOVA, *Allocutio super significatione nominis Tetragrammaton*, pp. 143-144: “Tetragrammaton omnibus notum fuit et adhuc a reprobo Judaeorum populo notum est, et in tanta reverentia apud eos habetur, quod legendo Scripturam nolunt ipsum proferre propter illam veram opinionem quam habent de eo veluti somniantes. Asserunt enim quod, cum a solo Deo sit inventum ad significandum excellentiam eius, propriissime significat solum illud quod convenit essentiae Dei. Cum enim solus Deus existat sui perfectus cognitor et etiam omnium rerum, rationabiliter tenent quod solus ipse scivit invenire signum inter voces propriissime conveniens ad significandum id quod soli congruit eius essentiae. Proinde, cum eius significatum sit excellentissimum, dicunt etiam ipsum nomen esse tam excellentis dignitatis, ut nulla creatura digna sit illum proferre, sed loco eius ubique dicunt: ‘Adonay’, quod interpretatur: ‘Dominus’.”

he had written a commentary not long before. Whilst referring to this work and its hermeneutical approach, Arnau provides us with an interpretation of the name YAHWEH based on the following three concepts: the *figura*, the *potestas*, i.e. the sound, and the *ordo* of the letters that compose it. The result can be described, following Eusebi Colomer, as an orthographic-phonetic interpretation of the Tetragrammaton.<sup>32</sup> In the first place, Arnau explains that the letter *yodh* is shaped like a small point with a line below; by itself it sounds like a vowel and it is the first letter in the proper name of God. It indicates, therefore, the unoriginated and efficient principle: the Father.<sup>33</sup> He says about the second letter of the Tetragrammaton, *he*, that it has the form of a line connecting the two sides; its sound is like aspiration and, regarding the order, it follows *yodh*; it therefore symbolizes an aspirated bond of unity: the Holy Spirit.<sup>34</sup> The third letter, *waw*, has the form of a line flowing out from a point; it may sound like either a vowel or a consonant, and it follows the other letters in the proper name of God. It seems to be a duplication of *yodh* and can therefore be interpreted as a principle that comes from the unoriginated principle: the Son.<sup>35</sup> The letter *he*, which follows *waw* and

32 Cf. COLOMER, *El pensament als Països Catalans durant l'Edat Mitjana i el Renaixement*, p. 245.

33 Cf. ARNALDUS DE VILLANOVA, *Allocutio super significatione nominis Tetragrammaton*, pp. 151-152: "Si primam consideraverimus litteram, scilicet *yod*, inveniemus quod figura eius describitur vel formatur ad instar puncti habentis aliquantum tractum infra se. Potestas vero eius grammaticalis apud Hebraeos, secundum quod sonat in dictione cuius est pars, est semper esse vocalem et nunquam transire in consonantem. Ordine vero, in alphabeto est decima, sed in hac dictione prima [...] *yod* significat in Deo esse principium sine principio principans."

34 Cf. ARNALDUS DE VILLANOVA, *Allocutio super significatione nominis Tetragrammaton*, pp. 152-153: "*He* vero ex parte figurae rationem habet anguli nodati continentis principium sine principio sub extremitate unius lateris. Est enim gnomon habens angulum nodatum, duo latera aequalia colligantem et habentem *yod* sub extremitate superiori. Potestas vero eius, in quantum pronuntiabilis est, tantum importat simplicem actum spirandi. Est etiam in alphabeto quinta [...], sed in nomine Tetragrammaton est immediate sequens post *yod*. [...] *He* significat in Deo esse angulum nodantem [...] procedentem ab eo per simplicem actum spirandi."

35 Cf. ARNALDUS DE VILLANOVA, *Allocutio super significatione nominis Tetragrammaton*, p. 153: "*Vau* quoque ratione figurae principium significat trahens originem a principio. [...] principium ex principio, quia ipsa formatur secundum rationem lineae fluentis a puncto ac si *yod* in se duplicaretur [...] Potestas vero eius, in quantum pronuntiatur in dictione, est vocalis et consonantis. [...] Ex ordine vero in dictione proposita, solum convenit ei ratio sequentis principium supradictum."

terminates the divine name, means that the Holy Spirit proceeds from both the Father and the Son. Arnau reaches the same conclusion after an orthographic-phonetic analysis of the Latin transcription of the Tetragrammaton; subsequently he applies his method to what he calls the Christian Tetragrammaton, namely, the abbreviations of Jesus Christ's name: "Jhs." and "Xps."

This brief summary clearly confirms Joaquim Carreras i Artau's opinion that the *Allocutio*, despite its emphatic praise of the figure of Ramon Martí, moved in a quite different direction<sup>36</sup> — an impression that is further corroborated by the treatise's recent critical edition by Josep Perarnau, where hardly any trace of the *Pugio* can be found.<sup>37</sup> Indeed, I would go so far as to question just how familiar Arnau de Vilanova was with the presentation of the Tetragrammaton in the *Pugio*. In fact, Martí's work contains some elements that, if they had been carefully studied by Arnau, would have served to substantiate the orthographic-phonetic analysis he presents. Thus, of the three key concepts that Arnau draws from *De semine Scripturarum* by Pseudo-Joachim, two, at least, can be found in the *Pugio* explicitly applied to the interpretation of the Tetragrammaton, namely, the *figura* of the letters and their *sonus*, which is equivalent to what Arnau calls their *potestas*.<sup>38</sup> Hence, there was no need for Arnau to have recourse to *De semine Scripturarum* to introduce these concepts, which he could easily have taken from the *Pugio fidei*, if he were familiar with the work.

In trying to explain the striking discrepancy between the programmatic statements that open the *Allocutio* and the subsequent development of the treatise, Josep Perarnau pointed out the wide disparity of interests of Martí and Arnau: polemics, when it came to the former,

36 Cf. J. CARRERAS I ARTAU, "Arnaldo de Vilanova, apologista antijudaico," in: *Sefarad* 7/1 (1947), pp. 49-61, here 59: "[The *Allocutio*] carece de antecedentes conocidos en la literatura cristiana."

37 See the very few references in the critical edition of the *Allocutio*, lines 104-105 and 105-106 (in addition, line 112 of the *Allocutio* can also be compared with the *Pugio fidei*, p. 650). — For more parallels, even though generic, between the works of Arnau and Martí, see ARNAU's *Philosophia catholica et divina* (1302) (edition by J. PERARNAU in *Arxiu de Textos Catalans Antics* 10 [1991], pp. 57-162).

38 Cf. RAIMUNDUS MARTINI, *Pugio fidei* III-III, 4, p. 685: "in hoc nomine sunt tres litterae [...] tam in sono quam in figura ab invicem differentes [...]" and "indicant in Deo [...] esse tres [...] proprietates a seipsis invicem differentes ex sua diversitate, quam habent tam in figura quam in nomine."

and prognostication, when it came to the latter.<sup>39</sup> Considering this difference, we may ask ourselves why Arnau mentions Ramon Martí at all. I am inclined to think that the praise of Ramon Martí could have been, rather than the expression of a doctrinal interest, a strategic maneuver to elaborate Pseudo-Joachimite doctrines, that is, teachings that, because of the fame of their alleged author, could be regarded as highly suspicious. Obviously, while presenting one's work to the Dominican Prior of Santa Caterina it was much more appropriate to mention, no matter how superficially, the great master of this Dominican convent than Joachim of Fiore.

In sum, I cannot agree with Eusebi Colomer's statement that "[Arnau's] laudatory allusion [to Martí] reinforces the possibility that [Arnau] was also in Martí's school."<sup>40</sup> By this I do not mean that the two of them had no productive intellectual contact, as Arnau's words clearly confirm they did; yet, I think that the *Allocutio* seems to offer very little evidence to turn Arnau into Martí's disciple. As in the case of Ramon Llull's apparent criticism, some reservations have to be made also regarding Arnau de Vilanova. Although we are facing two very different reactions to the work of the Dominican apologist, significantly enough both of them agree inasmuch as they reflect no profound interest in the thought of Ramon Martí. Thus, as far as the first reactions towards the great Catalan apologist are concerned, everything indicates that they were rather a result of the desire for self-positioning; they offer no proof of a genuine effort to understand his apologetic thought.

### 3. *Francesc Eiximenis, Reader and Interpreter of Ramon Martí*

If Ramon Llull and Arnau de Vilanova may be considered the most prominent thirteenth-century representatives of Catalan thought, Francesc Eiximenis (c. 1327-1409) is undoubtedly the most distinguished Catalan theologian and writer of the fourteenth century. His most important work is the great encyclopaedia *Lo Crestià* (*The Christian*). In *The Christian's* first book — completed around 1380 and

39 See the introduction in: ARNALDUS DE VILLANOVA, *Allocutio super significatione nominis Tetragrammaton*, p. 54.

40 COLOMER, *El pensament als Països Catalans durant l'Edat Mitjana i el Renaixement*, p. 239: "l'al·lusió encomiasta [...] avala la suposança que [Arnau] fou també en l'escola de Martí."

called simply “Lo Primer” or “The First” — Eiximenis describes the foundation of the Christian religion, while also entering into polemics against Judaism and Islam. These two religions occupied the Franciscan from Girona not only in his writings but also in other facets of his working life, as can clearly be seen both from his participation in a papal delegation in the crusade against piracy in North Africa and from his taking part in a commission to examine Jewish books during the year 1392.<sup>41</sup>

As some have remarked, the treatment of Judaism in “The First” (i.e., book I) of *The Christian* is particularly tough and negative.<sup>42</sup> However, it has to be said that Eiximenis does not limit himself to repeating the popular tropes; his criticism also seems to stem from reading the works of the great Hebraists of his time.<sup>43</sup> Thus, he refers to the *Postilla* of the converted Jew Nicholas of Lyra, of which he had a copy in his library;<sup>44</sup> furthermore, he explicitly quotes our Ramon’s *Pugio fidei* four times.<sup>45</sup> One has to be careful, however, because mentioning the name of an author does not prove anything, perhaps especially in the case of Eiximenis, who is very lax with his sources, so much so that he has been accused of inventing them.<sup>46</sup> Therefore, the passages where Eiximenis quotes Ramon Martí have to be analyzed carefully:

1) The first reference to Martí can be found in chapter 259 of “The First,” which tells the story of Ben Tamalion. According to the Talmudic treatise Me’ilah, Ben Tamalion helped the Jewish people in the time of

41 On this event see document 47 of Eiximenis’s *diplomatarium*: J. RIERA I SANS (ed.), *Francesc Eiximenis i la casa reial. Diplomataris 1373-1409*, Girona 2011, p. 34.

42 See L. BRINES GARCIA’s *La filosofía social i política de Francesc Eiximenis*, Sevilla 2004, pp. 304-322, where the author states that “la seua [i.e. Eiximenis’s] opinió envers ja no sols la religió judaica, ans també el poble jueu, és totalment negativa” (p. 305 and *passim*).

43 See D.J. VIERA, “The Evolution of Francesc Eiximenis’s Attitudes toward Judaism,” in: S. J. McMICHAEL and S. E. MYERS (eds.), *Friars and Jews in the Middle Ages and Renaissance*, Leiden 2004, pp. 147-159, esp. 155.

44 Cf. J. MONFRIN, “La bibliothéque de Francesc Eiximenis,” in: E. GRAHIT *et al.*, *Studia bibliographica*, Girona 1991, pp. 241-287, here 285.

45 This fact was first noted by A.G. HAUF, *D’Eiximenis a Sor Isabel de Villena. Aportació a l’estudi de la nostra cultura medieval*, València/Barcelona 1990, pp. 111-112: “Pel que toca al ‘Primer’, un dels aspectes més interessants, la refutació del judaisme, sembla basada en el *Pugio fidei* del dominicà fra Ramon Martí i en la doctrina del famós convers franciscà fra Nicolau de Lira.”

46 On this question of Eiximenis’s sources and their literary use, see C. WITTLIN, “Francesc Eiximenis i les seves fonts,” in: *Llengua i Literatura* 11 (2000), pp. 41-108.

the Roman emperors, who wanted to abolish some specific Jewish laws, including circumcision. Thus, as told in the section of Me'ilah 17a-b, Rabbi Shimon ben Yochai, while he was on his way to Rome in order to ask the emperor to annul the decree against the Jewish laws, met the demon Ben Tamalion. It was agreed that, in order to help the Jews, the demon would possess the emperor's daughter and that he would only surrender her on the order of the Rabbi. This story occupies all of chapter 259 and aims to show how the "Jewish duke or patron" was, because of this pact, the devil himself. The chapter begins in this way:

Sobre aquest pas qui tracta del duch o patró dels jueus te diré una cosa singular que sdevengué regnant Tiberi Cesar o segons altres en temps de Vespesiá o fort poch après la passió del fill de deu: e es açó posat en lo Talmut dels jueus en partida.<sup>47</sup>

Even though Eiximenis refers to the Talmud, he indicates later on that his source is, in fact, Ramon Martí; he says:

Recompta frare Pere (!) Martí de l'orde dels preycadors en lo *Pugio* qui feu contra los jueus, e yo mateix ne so informat per jueu o per jueus que entre ells eren molt reputats en sciencia, d'un mal cas qui·ls sdevengué lavors.<sup>48</sup>

Subsequently, the pact between Ben Tamalion and the Jews is described as follows:

Lo demoni los dix que ell entraria en lo cors de la filla de l'emperador ne exiria d'aquí sinó per manament de jueu [...] e que [...] aquell jueu a açó per ells deputat cridás axí: Vealmelion (!), hix d'aquesta donzella, car Vealmelion havia nom lo diable aquell, e axí fonch fet tot de punt a punt com lo diable ordená.<sup>49</sup>

<sup>47</sup> Quoted according to the edition of València 1483, prepared by the German printer Lambert Palmart, fol. 144rb. Translation: "At this point, which deals with the duke or patron of the Jews, I will tell you a unique thing that happened during the reign of Tiberius Caesar or, according to others, at the time of Vespasian or shortly after the passion of the Son of God; and it is partly written down in the Talmud of the Jews."

<sup>48</sup> Ed. València 1483, fol. 144rb. Translation: "Friar Pere Martí of the Order of the Preachers retells in the *Pugio*, which he wrote against the Jews, a very bad case that happened to them a long time ago, and I myself have been informed about the matter by a Jew or Jews who were held in high repute by their community for their knowledge."

<sup>49</sup> Ed. València 1483, fol. 144va. Translation: "The devil told them that he would enter the body of the daughter of the emperor and would only withdraw if ordered to do so by a Jew [...] and that [...] the Jew who was appointed by them for this purpose should shout: 'Vealmelion, get out of this maiden', because Vealmelion was the devil's name; and that is how it was done, exactly as the devil ordered them to do."



As Eiximenis claims, this story can be found in the *Pugio fidei*. Ramon Martí retells it in two chapters, first in chapter 14 of the second book, and later in chapter 11 of the third distinction of the third book, in both cases translating and commenting on the passage in question of the Talmudic treatise Me'ilah.<sup>50</sup>

It has to be emphasized that Eiximenis speaks of a two-way transmission by which he had come to know this story: by the written tradition, i.e. through the *Pugio*, which he attributes to Pere<sup>51</sup> and not to Ramon Martí, and by the oral one, when he says that he had heard the story told by Jewish masters. Indeed, the fact that Eiximenis was dependent upon the oral transmission of the story may explain the mangling of the name 'Ben Tamalion', which appears in the text as 'Vealmelion'.<sup>52</sup> However, the interpretation of Eiximenis's story clearly coincides with the use made by Martí: the Jews separated themselves from God while offering themselves to the devil.

2) Eiximenis's second reference to Martí's *Pugio fidei* can be found in chapter 268 of "The First." Again, the context is the validity of Jewish law: if the argumentative line of chapter 259 was to prove that the Jewish laws in question should have and were to have been repealed by the Roman emperor and that it was only because of a diabolical intervention that they remained, chapter 268 focuses on refuting the biblical texts that seem to postulate the perpetuity of Jewish laws. The passage begins with a reference to the aforementioned

50 Cf. RAIMUNDUS MARTINI, *Pugio fidei* II, 14, p. 456: "Vadat R. Simeon [...] Egressus est autem in occursum eius a Ben Tamalion, et ait: Estne beneplacitum vestrum ut vadam vobiscum? [...] Praecessit itaque Bentamalion, diabolus scilicet antedictus, et arripuit filiam Caesaris. Cum autem pervenissent isthuc, dixerunt Bentamalion egredere, Bentamalion egredere, cumque vocassent eum, egressus est et recessit. Dixit eis Caesar, postulate quicquid est vobis ad postulandum." See the same story, with minor changes in the rendering, in III-III, 11, p. 789.

51 This reading is confirmed by the manuscript from Madrid, BNE, 1790, fol. 180va. According to the *Tabula Scriptorum Ordinis Praedicatorum* of Louis of Valladolid, Martí called himself "fr. Petrus (!) Barchinonensis"; cf. J. QUÉTIF and J. ÉCHARD, *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum recensiti...*, vol. I, Paris 1719, p. 397; see also ALBERT OF CASTELLO, *Brevis et compendiosa Cronica Ordinis Praedicatorum*, ad a. 1292, no. 118: "Fr. Petrus (!) Barchinonensis scripsit librum notabilem contra Judaeos et vocatur *Pugio*," ed. R. CREYTENS, "Les écrivains dominicains dans la Chronique d'Albert de Castello (1516)," in: *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* 30 (1960), pp. 227-313, here 275 (I owe this information to Matthias M. Tischler).

52 Also in the manuscript BNE, 1790, fol. 180vb.

Nicholas of Lyra and his comment on Exodus 31. Following this author, Eiximenis states that the biblical verse that the Jews quote to prove the perpetuity of the institution of Sabbath is not valid:

Diu axí aquí lo dit doctor [i.e. Nicholas of Lyra]: que lá on nos havem ‘açó sia pacte perpetual’, los jueus hi han en lur ebraych ‘açó será pacte *beollam*’, lo qual *beollam* vol aytant dir com en nostre latí *in seculum*, ço es per lonch temps, e no significa pas temps perpetual o eternal.<sup>53</sup>

Thus, the biblical verse of Exodus 31.16-17 is claimed to be poorly translated into Latin as: “pactum est sempiternum inter me et filios Israhel”; in fact, the covenant that establishes Sabbath is not perpetual or eternal, but temporary, since *beolam* does not mean eternity but a certain amount of time. According to Eiximenis, this philological interpretation is also confirmed by Ramon Martí:

Ço amateix en sentència posa frare Ramon Martí de l’orde dels preycadors en lo seu *Pugio* longament donant sobre aytal translació gran culpa als transladadors de la biblia d’ebaych en latí, per aquestes matexes o semblants raons, e aquest frare Ramon es al·legat a aquest proposit sobre lo deseten capitol del libre de Genesis per frare Ponç Carbonell.<sup>54</sup>

Ramon Martí, who now appears under his correct name, indeed deals with this problem, as can be seen in chapter 11 of *Pugio* III-III. Apart from the Exodus verse discussed by Nicholas of Lyra and quoted by Eiximenis, Martí presents and discusses several other biblical passages such as Genesis 17.13, which seem to support the continued validity of the old law. In reality, however, these texts are the consequence of an erroneous interpretation and translation, since *beolam* does not in fact mean “sempiternum,” but “in saeculum.”<sup>55</sup>

<sup>53</sup> Ed. València 1483, fol. 149va. Translation: “And the aforementioned doctor [i.e. Nicholas of Lyra] says as follows: where we have ‘and this shall be a perpetual pact’, the Jews have in their Hebrew ‘this shall be a pact *beollam*’, *beollam* meaning much the same as our Latin *in seculum*, that is ‘for a long time’, but it does not mean perpetual or eternal.”

<sup>54</sup> Ed. València 1483, fol. 149vb-150ra. Translation: “Ramon Martí from the Order of the Preachers teaches the same thing in his *Pugio* where he, for the same and similar reasons, criticizes at length for this translation the translators who rendered the Bible from Hebrew into Latin. And this friar Ramon and his interpretation of chapter 17 of the Book of Genesis are referred to by friar Pontius Carbonell.”

<sup>55</sup> Cf. RAIMUNDUS MARTINI, *Pugio fidei* III-III, 11, pp. 776-778: “Et erit pactum meum in carne vestra ad pactum sempiternum, secundum eos — ad pactum vero saeculi secundum nos et secundum veritatem rei [...] Animadvertat ergo tua prudentia, lector, quam sit ex his quae dicta sunt manifestum quod ועולם non significat aeternum, nec perpetuum, nec sempiternum, sed saeculum et tempus aliquoties satis modicum.”

It is noteworthy that this explicit reference to Martí on this exegetical issue is connected to another exegetical source: although Eiximenis refers explicitly to the *Pugio fidei* on this point, at the same time he adds that this text was quoted, in turn, by the great biblical commentator Pontius Carbonell<sup>56</sup> (much as Eiximenis previously related his knowledge of the story of Ben Tamalion not only to the *Pugio*, but also to the oral tradition). This raises a question concerning Eiximenis's knowledge of the doctrines found in the *Pugio*: was that knowledge direct or indirect? In this context, it should be emphasized that both the story of Ben Tamalion and the exegetical considerations mentioned above can be found in chapter 11 of *Pugio* III-III, devoted to showing how Jesus Christ came to bring the law to its completion. The fact that both fragments refer to the same part of the *Pugio* can be considered a clear indication of the priority of this text over the other complementary sources mentioned.

3) From a doctrinal point of view, the most relevant quotation from the *Pugio fidei* in "The First" is in chapter 369, where, under the title "How the secret of the Holy Trinity was hidden from them [i.e., the Jews]," the Tetragrammaton is explained. Eiximenis presents his interpretation under eight "notes" or points. "The first [note]," says Eiximenis, "is this":

Segons que posa lo libre qui s'apel·la *Pugio*. E açó mateix se diu rabbi Mosse en lo libre qui s'apel·la *Endreçament dels duptes* en lo noven capítol de la primera part: tots los noms de nostre senyor deu son dits d'ell sots algun sguart que ha a les creatures, sinó un solament; e que los noms de nostre senyor se diguen d'ell per sguart de les creatures appar per clars exemples [...] emperó a ell cové un nom qui solament significa a ell axí purament que no li cové per negun sguart a creatura, sinó solament per la sua pura essencia e per ço que ell es intrinsecament, e aquest es aquest nom Tetragramaton.<sup>57</sup>

<sup>56</sup> On this eminent scripture scholar, who also was among Ramon Martí's readers, see H. SANTIAGO-OTERO and K. REINHARDT, *La Biblia en la península ibérica durante la edad media (siglos XII-XV): el texto y su interpretación*, Coimbra 2001, pp. 112-116.

<sup>57</sup> Ed. València 1483, fol. 196va. Translation: "According to the book that is called *Pugio*. And the same thing says Rabbi Moses in the book that is called the *Guide for the Perplexed*, in chapter nine of the first part: All the names of our Lord, except for one, are predicated of him because of some relation that he has with creatures; and that the names of our Lord are predicated in relation to creatures is clear from many examples [...] yet there is one name that designates only him in such a pure way that it is not predicated of him because of any relation with creatures, but only because of his pure essence and of what he is intrinsically, and this is the name Tetragrammaton."

This passage clearly takes up the quotation from Maimonides's *Guide for the Perplexed* I, 61 with which Martí commences his explanation of the Tetragrammaton in *Pugio fidei* III-III, 2.<sup>58</sup> In the same way, the second “note” or point of Eiximenis's exposition echoes the teachings of the *Pugio fidei*. Thus, when Eiximenis begins to discuss the meaning of the word ‘Tetragrammaton’ and the various forms under which it occurs, he says:

La segona nota si es que aquest nom Tetragramaton es nom grech qui en latí vol aytant dir com nom de quatre letres, e en ebraych es significat per diversos noms, car alcunes vegades aquest nom es significat per ‘adonay’. E pertal dix lo senyor, Exodi sexto: ‘Nomen meum adonay non indicavi eis’, ço es, lo meu nom adonay no los he encara ensenyat. Diu la glosa que aquí per aquest nom ‘adonay’ es entés aquest nom Tetragramaton.<sup>59</sup>

The etymological explanation of the expression ‘Tetragrammaton’, and the reference to the term ‘Adonay’, can be found in *Pugio* III-III, 2.<sup>60</sup>

According to the noted Eiximenis scholar David J. Viera, the parallels between Martí's and Eiximenis's respective descriptions of the Tetragrammaton do not go beyond these two “notes” or points.<sup>61</sup> Viera's

58 Cf. RAIMUNDUS MARTINI, *Pugio fidei* III-III, 2, pp. 649-650: “Omnia nomina creatoris benedicti inventa in libris omnibus derivata sunt ab operibus, et hoc minime latet, praeter unum, quod est יהוה, et est nomen appropriatum creatori altissimo. [...] Reliqua vero nomina ipsius gloriosa significant aequivoce, et cum mixtura, eo quod sint derivata ab operibus similibus eis quae reperiuntur in nobis. [...] Et istud nomen [...] ostendit essentiam creatoris absque mixtura et significatione altera.”

59 Ed. València 1483, fol. 196va. Translation: “The second note is that the name Tetragrammaton is a Greek name that in Latin means ‘a name of four letters’; and in Hebrew it is expressed by different names, for sometimes it is expressed by ‘adonay’. And therefore our Lord said in the sixth chapter of Exodus: ‘Nomen meum adonay non indicavi eis’, that is, I have not yet taught them my name ‘adonay’. And the gloss says that at this place ‘adonay’ stands for the name Tetragrammaton.”

60 Cf., *inter alia*, RAIMUNDUS MARTINI, *Pugio fidei* III-III, 2, p. 650: “[...] pro sui dignitate nullus praesumit Judaeus [Deum] suis quattuor litteris nominare, sed dicunt loco eius יהוה, ut supra [i.e., in the Maimonides quote] dictum est,” and III-III, 4, p. 685: “τετραγράμματον secundum Graecos, et quattuor litterarum secundum nos.”

61 Cf. D.J. VIERA, “The Names of God in the Catalan Works of Francesc Eiximenis,” in: *Recherches de Théologie ancienne et médiévale* 61 (1994), pp. 42-53, here 43: “Eiximenis took up Ramon Martí's *Pugio fidei*... which offers a translation and commentaries of chapters 61 and 62 of the *Guide* [...] He began by equating Adonay with the Tetragrammaton [...] and went on to show that one letter of the Tetragrammaton is repeated [...]. Therefore, the first three letters signify the three persons of the Trinity, while the last, the repeated ‘he’, represents the unity of the triune God. This reasoning does not appear in the *Pugio fidei*, but rather in the *Dialogus* of Pedro Alfonso.”

judgment is, however, based on only a partial reading of the *Pugio fidei*; if one limits oneself to the second chapter of *Pugio fidei* III-III, it is true that only two of the eight “notes” of Eiximenis’s exposition correspond to Martí’s work. However, if one compares Eiximenis’s explanations with the fourth chapter of the same distinction, which is what I intend to do subsequently, then it becomes clear that the similarities between the two expositions of the Tetragrammaton can be carried much further.

We turn, therefore, to analyzing the third “note” of Eiximenis’s exposition, which is at the heart of chapter 369. Here, Viera claims there to be a clear influence not of Ramon Martí, but rather of Petrus Alfonsi’s *Dialogus contra Judaeos*. The text in question runs as follows:

[...] aquest sanct nom Tetagramaton significava propiament la essència de nostre senyor deu star en tres persones; en significació de la qual cosa aquest nom se scrivia en ebraych ab quatre letres, ço es ab aquestes: *yod, he, vau, he*. Les tres primeres e distinctes letres signifiquen tres persones que son en la sancta trinitat [...] e la darrera letra, que es la quarta letra del dit nom e es repetida altra vegada [...], significa unitat de la divinal essència.<sup>62</sup>

As pointed out above, and contrary to what Viera claims, this interpretation of the Trinity was developed by Martí in the fourth chapter of *Pugio fidei* III-III, where it is said:

י ה ו ם indicant in Deo [...] esse tres [...] proprietates a seipsis invicem differentes ex sua diversitate, quam habent tam in figura quam in nomine [...] una vero earum, quae repetitur et in fine nominis ponitur [...] indicat trium [...] proprietatum vel personarum unitatem essentiae.<sup>63</sup>

It is obvious that Eiximenis’s quotation is a translation of this passage of the *Pugio* and does not depend in any way on Petrus Alfonsi, as Viera suggested. Petrus Alfonsi, in fact, adopts a radically different approach, indicating that the binary combination of the letters *yodh, he* and *waw*, two by two, leads to three names, which stand for the three persons of the Trinity.<sup>64</sup>

62 Ed. València 1483, fol. 196vb. Translation: “[...] this holy name Tetragrammaton signified correctly that the essence of our Lord subsists in three persons. And in order to signify this, the name Tetragrammaton was written in Hebrew with four letters, namely: *yodh, he, waw, he*. The first three letters, which are different, signify the three persons who are in the holy Trinity [...] and the last letter, which is the fourth letter of the name and which is repeated at the end [...], signifies the unity of the divine essence.”

63 RAIMUNDUS MARTINI, *Pugio fidei* III-III, 4, p. 685.

64 Cf. PETRUS ALFONSI, *Diálogo contra los judíos*, ed. K.-P. MIETH, Spanish transl. E. DUCAY, Huesca 1996, pp. 110-111: “Si tamen attendas subtilius et illud Dei nomen,

## Eiximenis's fourth "note"

es que segons opinió d'alcuns nostre senyor deu ensenyá aquest sanct nom segons son propi significat a Moyses lavors quan li mostrá en lo mont la sua essencia clarament, segons que diu sanct Agostí en lo dotzen libre sobre Genesis e en lo libre qui feu de veure deu.<sup>65</sup>

Although Ramon Martí quotes Saint Augustine several times in the context of his interpretation of the Tetragrammaton,<sup>66</sup> this particular passage seems to come from Eiximenis's direct reading of the works of the North African bishop or from a different source.<sup>67</sup>

The fifth "note" states that as far as God's name was concerned,

it was not known de cert com se devia pronunciar o qual vocal del nom se devia principalment attentar o si-s devien les letres o vocals doblar o simplement dir. En tant que-n eren grans oppinions entre los grans doctors lurs [i.e., the Jews].<sup>68</sup>

This passage proves to be the translation of a quote from *The Guide for the Perplexed* I, 62 cited in *Pugio fidei* III-III, 4. Maimonides, in Martí's translation, says:

Non erat autem omni homini notum qualiter proferebatur [nomen Dei], vel cum qua vocali sonabant quamlibet litteram eius, et utrum oportebat quod aliquae earum duplicarentur, vel simpliciter et leniter proferrentur.<sup>69</sup>

quod in *Secretis secretorum* explanatum invenitur, inspicias, nomen, inquam, trium litterarum, quamvis quattuor figuris, una namque de illis geminata bis scribitur, si, inquam, illud inspicias, videbis quia idem nomen et unum sit et tria. Sed quod unum est, ad unitatem substantiae, quod vero tria, ad Trinitatem respicit personarum. Constat autem nomen illud his quattuor figuris, *i* [י] et *e* [ה] et *v* [ו] et *e* [ו], quarum si primam tantum coniunxeris et secundam, *i* [י] scilicet et *e* [ה], erit sane nomen unum. Item si secundam et tertiam, scilicet *e* [ה] et *v* [ו], iam habebis alterum. Similiter, si tertiam tantum copulaveris atque quartam, *v* [ו] scilicet et *e* [ה], invenies et tertium. Rursum si omnes simul in ordine conexeris, non erit nisi nomen unum, sicut in ista patet geometrica figura."

65 Ed. València 1483, fol. 196vb. Translation: "[The fourth note] is that, according to the opinion of some people, our Lord has shown this holy name, according to its proper meaning, to Moses when on the mountain he revealed to him his essence, as says Saint Augustine in the twelfth book of *On Genesis* and in the book that he wrote on the vision of God." Cf. AUGUSTINUS, *De Genesi ad litteram libri duodecim* XII, 26-27, and Epistle 147: *De videndo Deo liber*.

66 Cf., for example, RAIMUNDUS MARTINI, *Pugio fidei* III-III, 4, pp. 683 and 690.

67 As Pilar Gispert-Saüch Viader has kindly pointed out to me, Eiximenis may be drawing on Nicholas of Lyra for this passage.

68 Ed. València 1483, fol. 197ra. Translation: "[It was not known] with certainty how this name should be pronounced or which vowel should be accentuated, and whether the vowels and letters should be doubled or pronounced with a simple value. Therefore there were discussions among the Jews."

69 RAIMUNDUS MARTINI, *Pugio fidei* III-III, 4, p. 687.

While Eiximenis's wording follows very closely Martí's translation of the *The Guide for the Perplexed*, Eiximenis commits some errors of translation which show that he did not know Hebrew: apparently he does not understand that all the letters of the Tetragrammaton are consonants to which the reader has to add vowels in order to pronounce the name. Instead he thinks that the controversy refers to how to accentuate the word's vowels.

The sixth "note" focuses on the already mentioned issue, which is, how to read the Tetragrammaton:

Aquest sanct nom per altra manera se scrivia e per altra manera se legia; car ell se scrivia axí com dit es ab aquestes quatre letres ebrayques: *yod, he, vau, he*, e legia-s ab aquestes altres quatre, ço es ab *alef, delech, nun, yod*, ço es ab 'adonay'.<sup>70</sup>

The fact that Eiximenis returns to the question of naming God as Adonay, which had already been treated in the second point, can be explained insofar as Maimonides's quotation in the *Pugio*, on which the previous "note" is based, goes in the same direction adding to the previous reflection "nos hodie per אדנא pronominaimus ipsum."<sup>71</sup> This seems to indicate that Eiximenis was not only taking different arguments from the *Pugio fidei*, but that he was closely following its structure.

The seventh "note" deals with the two enigmatic divine names formed by 12 and 42 letters respectively and which, in the Jewish tradition, were provided as the interpretations or explanations of the Tetragrammaton:

Lo primer [of these two names] es de dotze letres lurs [i.e., of the Jews] e es *bem, ve, maus, aus, quodes*. Lo segon conten quarantadues letres lurs e es aquest sanct e sanctificat.<sup>72</sup>

This explanation combines two passages of *Pugio fidei* III-III, 4, where the divine names of 12 letters and 42 respectively play an important role to show the number of persons in God. The 12-letter

70 Ed. València 1483, fol. 197ra. Translation: "This holy name was written in one manner, and it was pronounced in another; because it was written, as we say, by means of these four Hebrew letters: *yodh, he, waw, he*, but it was read with these other four, namely *aleph, dalet, nun, yodh*, that is 'adonay'."

71 RAIMUNDUS MARTINI, *Pugio fidei* III-III, 4, p. 688.

72 Ed. València 1483, fol. 197ra. Translation: "The first [of these two names] consists of twelve Hebrew letters and it is *bem, ve, maus, aus, quodes*. The second contains forty-two Hebrew letters and it means saint and sanctified."

name is interpreted by Ramon Martí as *abb*, which is the father, *ben*, the son, *veruach*, the spirit, and *hakkadosch*, the sanctuary; namely, the Father, the Son and the Holy (or Saint) Spirit.<sup>73</sup> Obviously, at this point Eiximenis had difficulties with the Hebrew words, which he reproduces incorrectly.<sup>74</sup> However, with regard to his explanation of the name of 42 letters, the text corresponds clearly to what can be found in the *Pugio*: “Nomen quadraginta duarum litterarum sanctum et sanctificans est.”<sup>75</sup>

The eighth and last “note” says that the Jews

deyen que aquest nom Tetagramaton era de tanta dignitat que tot hom qui ab reverencia e ab mundicia de cor e ab bona vida lo tingués e-l digués devotament segons sa possibilitat deu li dava per heretat aquest segle e l'altre. Per qué feyen axí que no l'ensenyaven sinó a persones fort honestes e ben acostumades.<sup>76</sup>

Also this passage corresponds literally to the *Pugio fidei*, which reads:

Et non erant docentes ipsum [nomen] nisi illum qui pudius et honestus erat [...] Quicumque vero sciebat illud, et habebat in reverentia, et servabat illud in munditia, erat dilectus a Deo, [...] et haereditate acquirebat duo saecula, saeculum istud, et futurum.<sup>77</sup>

Already with the analysis of these passages, and leaving for further research the tacit quotations that can undoubtedly be found in other parts of “The First,”<sup>78</sup> it must be said that Eiximenis had an excellent command of the *Pugio fidei*: Out of Eiximenis’s eight “notes” from chapter 369 about the Tetragrammaton, seven are taken from the work of the “great scholar in Latin and in Hebrew” (ch. 370), Ramon Martí.<sup>79</sup>

73 Cf. RAIMUNDUS MARTINI, *Pugio fidei* III-III, 4, p. 690.

74 The manuscript BNE, 1790, fol. 249va, confirms the edition’s transcription.

75 RAIMUNDUS MARTINI, *Pugio fidei* III-III, 4, p. 688.

76 Ed. València 1483, fol. 197ra. Translation: “[The Jews] held that the name Tetragrammaton was of so much dignity that everybody who approached it with reverence, pureness of heart and a good life, and who professed it with as much devotion as possible, was given by God this life and the next one as his heritage. Therefore they [i.e., the Jews] only taught it to people who were honest and had good manners.”

77 RAIMUNDUS MARTINI, *Pugio fidei* III-III, 4, p. 688.

78 For example, in chapters 108-116. Cf. D.J. VIERA, “The Rabbi Moises and the *Primer del crestià* of Francesc Eiximenis,” in: *Medieval Encounters* 5/2 (1992), pp. 184-197.

79 Ed. València 1483, fol. 197vb: “gran clergue en latí e en ebraych.”



*Conclusion*

Less known than Llull's alleged criticism of Martí or Arnau de Vilanova's intellectual debt to the Catalan Dominican, Eiximenis's interest in Martí's apologetics deserves our attention: as a matter of fact, one of the Iberian Peninsula's very first serious attempts to come to terms with the rich and complex intellectual legacy of the *Pugio fidei* was undertaken by none other than Francesc Eiximenis.

As we have shown, while writing "The First" of *The Christian*, Francesc Eiximenis must have had the *Pugio fidei* available to him in its complete version, translating arguments from various parts of the second and third books. These passages concern not only anecdotic or exegetical issues, namely the legend of Ben Tamalion and the interpretation of Exodus 31.16-17 and Genesis 17.13; they also include an accurate and consistent exposition of the complex doctrine of the Tetragrammaton that is at the core of Martí's apologetical approach. Therefore, Eiximenis must be credited for both the vernacularization and the systematic interpretation of this fundamental doctrine.

The statement quoted at the beginning of this article, according to which the *Pugio fidei* was cast into a void for centuries, is not sustainable. Although the reception was slow in the beginning, in the fourteenth century readers were genuinely interested and inspired by the work. From now on, the Franciscan from Girona, Francesc Eiximenis, should also be mentioned among these followers.

Alexander FIDORA  
Institució Catalana de Recerca i Estudis Avançats (ICREA) /  
Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona  
alexander.fidora@icrea.cat