

THE PREFACE TO THE *PUGIO FIDEI**

GÖRGE K. HASSELHOFF
Technische Universität Dortmund

SYDS WIERSMA
Thomas Instituut te Utrecht – University of Tilburg

The preface to the *Pugio* is included in most of the existing manuscripts and we have more textual witnesses of it than of any other part of the work.¹ This is remarkable because it means that it is not only related to those manuscripts that contain book I, but also to those manuscripts that leave out that book and start with book II (i.e. C and S). Therefore we have decided not to edit it with book I or II of the *Pugio fidei*, but in this separate publication.

In this preface, Ramon Martí explains the title of the book as it shall be a weapon in the fight against unbelievers. Ramon also indicates who ordered the book.² It seems that he wrote on demand of the Order, perhaps on Ramon de Penyafort's request. Ramon Martí further explains that the biblical writings are the main basis for his argumentation. Yet, he also wants to draw on rabbinical writings – the Talmud and Midrashim – that give information about the oral Torah.³ This remark is interesting for another reason as well: It does not relate to the first book of the *Pugio*, but to the second and third books. In the later course of the preface, Ramon Martí touches a further

* Introduction and text by Görg K. Hasselhoff (as part of the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) / ERC Grant agreement no. 613694 [CoG 'The Latin Talmud'] at the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona); Translation taken from Syds Wiersma, *Pearls in a Dungbill. The Anti-Jewish Writings of Raymond Martin O.P. (ca. 1220 – ca. 1285)*, PhD Dissertation Tilburg University 2015, pp. 150-154.

¹ The text of the preface may be found as follows: Bas: vol. I, f. 1r-4v; C: f. 1r-2r; D: f. 1ra-2rb; E: f. 1ra-2rb; G: f. 2v-4r; H: f. 1r-2v; Mc: f. 3ra-4rb(4va); P1: f. 1ra-2rb; P2: f. 2v-4v; R: f. 11r-16v; S: f. IIr-IIIr; T: f. 1r-2v. – For the abbreviations of manuscripts, see Görg K. Hasselhoff, 'The Projected Edition of Ramon Martí's *Pugio fidei*. A Survey and a Stemma', Appendix A, in this volume.

² On both aspects, the title and the commissioners, see Syds Wiersma's article in this collection.

³ Here is a connection to the (anti-)Talmudic activities of the Dominican Order in Paris in the 1240s, see, e.g., Alexander Fidora, 'Textual Rearrangement and Thwarted Intentions. The Two Versions of the Latin Talmud', in: *Journal of Transcultural Medieval Studies* 2 (2015), pp. 63-78; Yossef Schwartz, 'Authority, Control, and Conflict in Thirteenth-Century Paris. Contextualizing the Talmud Trial', in: Elisheva Baumgarten / Judah D. Galinsky (eds.), *Jews and Christians in Thirteenth-Century France*, New York / Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire 2015, pp. 93-110; Görg K. Hasselhoff, 'Der Talmudprozess von 1240 und seine Folgen', in: Jochen Flebbe / Görg K. Hasselhoff (eds.), *Ich bin nicht gekommen, Frieden zu bringen, sondern das Schwert. Aspekte des Verhältnisses von Religion und Gewalt*, Göttingen, 2017, pp. 155-169.

important point for his book, namely the translation of Old Testament texts which he will not take from Jerome's Vulgate, but translate himself. He gives arguments for his procedure from Jerome's works.⁴ Within the line of argument we find a wonderful example for Ramon's method in writing the *Pugio*. Like in modern scholarly works he puts a note into a quotation from Jerome in which he explains the meaning of a botanical term. This note has a story of its own.⁵ The full text of the note can be found only in G whereas its first part is copied in C, S, and T. Whereas in S and T it is copied with the same diacritical marker as it is in G (three dots in triangular form), in C this marker is missing. In all other manuscripts as well as in the print tradition the complete note is missing. The passage on translation theory ends with an example from the biblical book of Acts where the Latin text shows no dependence on the Old Testament rendering of the Vulgate.

Ramon closes his preface with some general remarks in which he on the one hand explains the arrangement of arguments within one chapter and on the other hand gives some information on the way he transcribes the Hebrew, thus explaining the usage of the letter 'ç'.

The preface ends with the invocation of the Holy Trinity.

Apart from the one marginal note mentioned, the text of the preface is stable in all manuscripts; only the word order sometimes changes slightly or the orthography varies. We have therefore decided to print here the version of G, but give the page references to I and the major differences to that print version.

PREFATIO PUGIONIS

[G f. 2v; l 2] Incipit proemium in pugionem
xristianorum editum ad fratre raymundo de
ordine predicatorum ad impiorum perfidiam
iugulandam, sed maxime iudeorum.
Cum iuxta beatum paulum ualde sit decens et
pulcrum, si pred[icator]⁶ ueritatis, potens sit
exortari fideles, in doctrina sana, et eos qui
ueritatj contradicunt arguere⁷.⁸ Et secundum
beatum petrum, si semper paratus sit ad
satisfactionem, omni poscentj eum reddere

Here begins the preface to the *Dagger of the Christians*, edited by friar Raymond of the Order of Preachers, to destroy the perfidy of the unbelievers, but most of all of the Jews. As it is, according to the blessed Paul, most fitting and beautiful if a preacher of the truth 'is able to instruct the faithful in sound doctrine and refute those who contradict the truth' [Titus 1:9], and according to the blessed Peter if one 'is always prepared to satisfy all

⁴ For his 'theory' of translation see also Ryan Szpiech, 'Translation, Transcription, and Transliteration in the Polemics of Raymond Martini, O.P. (d. after 1284)', in: Charles D. Wright / Karen Fresco (eds.), *Translating the Middle Ages*, Aldershot 2012, pp. 171-187.

⁵ See Ann Giletti's article in this volume.

⁶ Some letters are missing due to a hole in the parchment.

⁷ I redarguere.

⁸ Titus 1:9.

racionem, de ipsa quam credit et predicat fide et spe,⁹ contrarium uero perturpe.

Deinde cum iuxta sententiam senece, nulla sit pestis efficacior ad nocendum, quam familiaris inimicus,¹⁰ nullus autem inimicus christiane fidei, magis sit familiaris, magis¹¹ nobis ineuitabilis quam iudeus. Iniunctum est mihi, ut de illis testamenti ueteris, quos iudei recipiunt¹³ libris, necnon et¹⁴ de talmud ac reliquis scriptis suis apud eos autenticis, opus tale componam, quod quasi quidam pugio,¹⁵ predicatoribus christiane fidei atque cultoribus possit esse in promptu, ad scindendum quandoque iudeis in sermonibus panem uerbi diuinum, quandoque uero ad eorum impietatem atque perfidiam iugulandam eorumque contra christum proteruiam,¹⁶ et impudentem insaniam perimendam. Confusus igitur de filij eius, qui de nichilo mundum fabricauit auxilio, qui non suam uoluntatem sed patris uoluit adimplere,¹⁷ et qui prelatis¹⁸ ac maioribus precipit obedire; huiusmodi pugionem, etsi non talem, qualis descriptus est, talem tamen qualem sciueram atque potuero, principaliter contra iudeos, deinde contra saracenos et quosdam alios aduersarios uere fidei, fabricabo.

¶ Sit autem queso mihi, temerarij et audacis incepti excusatio, multorum fratrum exortatio

who ask arguments for the things he believes and preaches in hope and faith' [1Peter 3:15]; the contrary being very shameful, indeed. Moreover, since according to a maxim of Seneca, 'no plague is more effective to harm than an enemy who is close',¹² and no enemy of the Christian faith is more familiar and unavoidable to us than the Jew, it has been enjoined upon me to compose, from those books of the Old Testament which the Jews accept and also from the Talmud and the rest of their authentic writings, a work as might be available like a dagger (*pugio*) for preachers and guardians of the Christian faith – at some times to cut for the Jews the bread of the divine Word in sermons; at other times to slit the throat of their impiety and perfidity, and to destroy their pertinacity against Christ and their impudent insanity. So I have relied on the help of the Son of He who made the world from nothing, who [the Son] did not want to fulfil his own will but that of the Father, and who prescribes obedience to prelates and superiors. The dagger of the sort I will fashion, although not [precisely] as how it was prescribed but nevertheless of a kind I know and am able to make, is principally against the Jews, then against the Saracens and some other adversaries of the true faith. May now, I ask, my excuse to begin such a bold and rash undertaking please be the

⁹ Cf. 1 Peter 3:15. – The text differs from the standard version of the Vulgate.

¹⁰ Cf. Boethius, *De consolazione philosophiae*, III, prosa 5, 14 [CSEL 67, p. 55].

¹¹ I magisque.

¹² This quotation is difficult to retrieve. In book I of *De Ira* Seneca says about anger: *Nulla pestis humano generi pluris stetit*, 'No plague hath done mankind so much harm.' Certainly, Seneca argues that anger is a familiar enemy, but the maxim as it is submitted by Raymond is not literally part of Seneca's text. [SW]

¹³ I recipiant.

¹⁴ I vel etiam.

¹⁵ I add. quidam.

¹⁶ I pertinaciam.

¹⁷ I implere.

¹⁸ I add. Principibus.

et affectantis aliquid facere, ad fidei promocionem, atque defensionem deuocio, necnon et¹⁹ illicita iussionis prelatj recusacio. Sicubi uero errauero, non imputetur obsecro malicie, sed ascribatur pocius simplicitatj et impericie, et ab eo cui datum fuerit, corrigatur, et sine alicuius defensionis patricinio, subruatur.

Deinde materia pugionis istius, quantum ad iudeos maxime, duplex erit. Prima et principalis, auctoritates²⁰ legis [l 3] et prophetarum, tocusque ueteris testamentj. Secundaria uero, quedam traditiones quas in talmud et in medrassim, i.e. in tradicionibus et glosis antiquorum iudeorum repperi, et tanquam margaritas quasi²¹ de maximo quodam²² fimario sustuli, non modicum letabundus. Quas quidem in latjnum deo iuuante transferam, et inducam suis locis atque interseram, prout mihi uisum fuerit expedire.

Has autem traditiones, quas uocant thora sibbaalpe,²³ i.e. legem oretenus, deum moysi simul cum lege in monte sinay, credunt et referunt tradidisse. Deinde moyses ut ayunt tradidit eas iosue discipulo suo, iosue uero successoribus suis, et sic alterutrum²⁴ deinceps, donec per rabinos antiquos commendate sunt scripto. Hoc autem ujdlicet²⁵ quod deus huiusmodi²⁶ dederit²⁷ moysi in monte sinai, de omnibus que in talmud sunt credere, propter innumeras

encouragement of many brothers to make something for the promotion of the faith and the defence of devotion, and also the impossibility to refuse the official command of a prelate. Wheresoever I shall have erred, I request earnestly that it will not be imputed to me as malice, but rather ascribed to simplicity and lack of skill, and let it be corrected by he who is able, and without any defence higher authority will be deferred to. Now, the substance of this Dagger, especially inasmuch as it pertains to the Jews, is twofold: first and foremost, the *auctoritates* of the Law and the Prophets, and the entire Old Testament; second, certain traditions, which I found in the Talmud and Midrashim – that is, traditions and glosses of the ancient Jews –, which I gladly raised up like pearls out of an enormous dunghill. With the help of God I shall translate them into Latin and adduce and insert them at their proper places, insofar as shall seem wise to me.

These traditions, which they [the Jews] call torah shebbe-‘al peh – oral law –, they believe and state that God gave to Moses along with the Law on Mount Sinai. Then Moses, they say, transmitted them to his disciple Joshua, Joshua to his successors,²⁸ and so on, until they were committed to writing by the ancient rabbis. Yet it seems that to believe this, that God gave Moses on the Mount Sinai all that is in the Talmud, should be deemed – on account of the

¹⁹ Om. l.

²⁰ l authoritas.

²¹ l qvasdam.

²² Om. l.

²³ l תורה שבעל פה *torah shebbebaal peh*.

²⁴ Om. l.

²⁵ l videtur.

²⁶ Om. l.

²⁷ l tradiderit.

²⁸ The argumentation reminds of the beginning of the Mishna Tractate *Avot*.

absurditates quas continet, nichil aliud reputandum est, quam precipitate mentis insanja.

De quibusdam [G f. 3r] uero que ueritatem sapiunt, et doctrinam prophetarum sanctorumque patrum omnino redolent et pretendunt et xristianam fidem ut hoc in²⁹ libello patebit, miro ualde modo et incredibili exprimunt, modernorum uero perfidiam iudeorum destruunt ac confundunt, non arbitror discrendum,³⁰ quin et a moyse et prophetis et reliquis patribus sanctis, usque ad eos qui ea scripserunt successiue, potuerjnt peruenisse, ymmo nullatenus talia aliunde quam a prophetis et patribus sanctis cogitare possumus deuenisse, cum eiusmodi tradiciones, hijs que iudei de messia et de alijs quam plurimis a xristi tempore usque nunc sentiunt, sint omnino contrarie.

Hinc³¹ ergo ista talia non erunt respuenda, quamquam apud tam perfidos sint anbo reperta,³² ut nullus sanj capitis respuit eo quod apud tales inuenit,³³ legem atque prophetas. Lapidem etiam preciosum prudens nequaquam despicit, licet inuentus fuerit, in drachonis capite uel bufonis. Mel quoque sputum est apum, uel aliquid forsitan aliud minus dignum, habencium quidem uenenosum aculeum. Non tamen reputandus erit insipiens, qui illud in suos suorumne usus peritiles, conuertere nouerit, dummodo nocumentum aculei, sciuerit deujtare.

Non respuamus igitur tradiciones eiusmodi, sed pocius amplectamur, tum propter ea que dicta sunt, tum etiam quia nichil ad confutandam iudeorum impudenciam,

innumerable absurdities which it contains – nothing other than the insanity of a ruined mind.

Certain [traditions], however, which savour of the truth and in every way smell of and represent the doctrine of the Prophets and the holy Fathers, wondrously and incredibly bespeak the Christian faith too, as will become obvious in this little book. They destroy and confound the perfidy of modern Jews, and I do not think that one should doubt that they managed to make their way successively from Moses and the Prophets and the other holy Fathers to those who recorded them. For in no way other than from the Prophets and the holy Fathers do we think that such things descended, since traditions of this sort are entirely contrary to those regarding the Messiah and so many other matters which the Jews have believed from the time of Christ even until now.

Such things of this sort were thus not meant to be rejected, since nobody sane would reject what he finds in places like the Law and the Prophets, even though both these are rejected among those so perfidious [the Jews]. For a wise man never despises a precious stone, even if it might be found in the head of a dragon or a toad. Honey is the spittle of bees, and how could there be anything less worthy of it than those having a poisonous sting! Indeed he is not to be deemed foolish who knows how to render it fit for his own beneficial uses, as long as he knows to avoid the harm of the sting.

We therefore do not reject such traditions but embrace them both for those reasons already mentioned and because there is nothing so capable of confuting the impudence of the

²⁹ I ut in hoc.

³⁰ I discordandum.

³¹ I Hic.

³² I rejecta.

³³ I inueniantur.

reperitur tam ualidum, nichil ad eorum conuincendam nequiciam tam efficax inuenitur. Denique quid iocundius xristiano, quam si distortere facillime possit de manibus³⁴ hostium gladium, et eorum [l 4] deinde mucrone proprio capud infidele precindere, aut instar iudit ipsius arrepto pugione truncare? Ceterum inducendo auctoritates³⁶ textus ubicumque ab ebraico fuerit deujatum,³⁷ non septuaginta³⁸ sequar nec interpretem alium, et quod maioris presumptionis uidebitur, non ipsum etiam in hoc reuerebor ieronimum, nec tolerabilem latine lingue uitabo improprietatem, ut eorum que apud hebreos sunt, ex uerbo in uerbum quocienscumque seruari hoc potuit, transferam ueritatem. Per hoc enim iudeis falsiloquis, lata ualde spaciosaque subterfugendi precludetur uia, cum minime poterunt dicere, non sic haberi apud eos, ut a nostris contra ipsos, me interprete ueritas inducetur.

Porro mordere fortassis me desinet, qui beatum ieronimum audiet, ubi super illud³⁹ miche: in geth⁴⁰ nolite annunciare,⁴¹ ad paulam et eustochium dicit: Multum inquit hebraicum a septuaginta⁴² interpretacione discordat. Et tantis tam mea, quam illorum translacio difficultatibus inuoluta est, ut spiritus dei auxilio indigeamus.⁴³ ⁴⁴Ad oceanum etiam hijs uerbis ait: Veni rursum ierosolimam et bethleem, ubi labore precii

Jews; there is found nothing so effective for overcoming their evil. Finally, what would be more joyous for a Christian than if he could most easily twist the sword of his enemy from his hand and then cut off the head of the infidel with his own blade, or just like Judith butcher [the infidel] with his own stolen dagger?³⁵

Further, whenever I introduce the authority of a text taken from the Hebrew, I will not follow the Septuagint, nor another interpreter. And what may seem to be even a greater presumption, I will neither defer to Jerome himself, nor will I avoid the unsuitability of the Latin language by translating the truth of the things we find with the Hebrews word for word, whenever this serves [the truth]. For on account of this, a way that is broad and spacious for subterfuge is barred to the false-speaking Jews. With my translation the truth is introduced by us against them and they will hardly be able to say it was not contained in their versions.

Moreover, perhaps he who listens to blessed Jerome will cease from devouring me, where in his commentary on Micah 1, 'Tell it not in Gath', to Paula and Eustochius he says: 'Much of the Hebrew is in disagreement with the Septuagint, and mine as well as your translation is overwhelmed in difficulties, so that we need the help of the Spirit of God.' He also speaks [in the letter] to Oceanus in these words: 'Yet once more I came to

³⁴ l manu.

³⁵ Cf. Judges 13:6.

³⁶ l auctoritatem.

³⁷ l desumptum.

³⁸ G lxx^a.

³⁹ l 1.

⁴⁰ l Gath.

⁴¹ Micah 1:10.

⁴² G lxx^a.

⁴³ Hieronymus, *In Micheam* I:10 [CC.SL 76, p. 430].

⁴⁴ 'Ad ... nicodemum' in G add. in marg.