

esmenta Andreu (p. 282). Cal recalcar que, en aquest apartat, l'autora no s'ha pogut basar en una comparació textual entre l'exegesi dels victorins i els texts jueus analitzats, ans de contingut. Certament, molts dels comentaris dels rabins estudiats en el volum, en tractar-se de membres de la mateixa escola rabínica, i fins i tot parents, transmeten el mateix missatge, però és a través d'alguns detalls diferenciadors que poden compartir amb les exegesis dels victorins que Montse Leyra discerneix una font d'una altra.

En conjunt, és un treball ben meticolós, a fons, on tots els exemples són desenvolupats i el judici de l'autora es posa cada vegada en diàleg amb els treballs acadèmics previs que han tractat el tema de les fonts d'Hug i Andreu de Sant Víctor. Al meu parer, potser aquesta minuciositat desemboca en una innecessària repetició de conclusions: es troba l'anàlisi de diversos comentaris dels victorins que

conclouen amb un mateix resultat, que d'igual manera podria expressar-se amb l'estudi d'un de sol enumerant els comentaris bíblics dels autors llatins en què succeeix el mateix. A més, també s'incideix molt en la desconeixença dels comentadors de la llengua hebrea, la qual cosa queda bastant demostrada en els primers capítols del llibre. Això comporta que aquesta conclusió es vegi fins i tot repetida en els últims estudis de les fonts jueves (p. 228). Malgrat això, la cura de l'autora en l'anàlisi dels comentaris dels victorins i les seues possibles fonts, fent convenir la gran bibliografia que ha tractat el tema, és inqüestionable. Un volum fonamental i indispensable per a tots aquells estudiosos dels autors de l'Abadia de Sant Víctor, a més a més de les relacions intel·lectuals entre jueus i cristians durant l'edat mitjana i l'evolució, la correcció i la revisió del text bíblic en la cristiandat medieval.

*Isaac Lampurlanés*

Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona

<https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/enrahonar.1235>



VAN KONINGSVELD, Pieter Sjoerd (2018)

*An Arabic Source of Ramon Martí. Al-Saif al-Murhaf fi al-Radd 'alā al-Mushaf ("The Whetted Sword in Refutation of the Koran"). Introductory Study with Text and Translation of its Surviving Fragments*

Leiden: Aurora, 156 p.

ISBN 9789082597813

Here we have a remarkable publication, the brevity of which lies in inverse proportion to its wealth of thought-provoking insights on interreligious contacts, intellectual exchanges, and transmission of knowledge in the pre-modern Mediterranean. Students of Islamic-Christian polemics in particular should take note of the meticulously crafted and very persuasive argument by the Dutch emeritus

professor of Islamic studies in Leiden that *De Seta Machometi*, a refutation of Islam attributed to the well-known Catalan Dominican Ramon Martí (fl. 1280), was based upon a Christian work, *al-Saif al-Murhaf fi al-Radd 'alā al-Mushaf* ["The whetted sword in refutation of the Qur'ān"]; a text which is now lost but preserved indirectly and fragmentarily by the Muslim theologian Najm al-

Dīn al-Ṭūfī (d. 716/1316), a Ḥanbalite jurist from Baghdād who settled in Egypt. Van Koningsveld makes a strong case for this textual dependence by comparing Martí's Latin *De Seta* with the excerpts attributed by al-Ṭūfī to a certain Christian 'ilj (or "infidel") in the major anti-Christian work, *al-Intiṣarāt al-islāmīyya fī kashf shubah al-naṣrāniyya* ["Islamic defense in uncovering specious Christian arguments"], edited by Sālim ibn Muḥammad al-Qarnī (1999). To his credit, the distinguished Arabist presents the fragments to the reader in their original Arabic as an independent unit and makes them available in English translation, a very welcome contribution.

The new evidence raises a series of questions about particular aspects of the processes of production, exchange, and transmission of the text; about the identity of the unknown Christian of this polemic, and about how the work ended up on the desk of a figure such as Martí. Most of the discussion in the brief study that precedes the reconstruction of the Christian polemic is devoted to its authorship and the possibility previously discussed by al-Qarnī that there was a "Spanish connection." This would imply that the Christian author was of Andalusī or Maghrebī origin. Van Koningsveld, relying on the recent scholarship of well-known specialists on the subject, endorses the view that he was a contemporary of Martí from the East, probably from Egypt or Syria (following Schwarb and Demiri), and can possibly be identified as al-Mu'taman ibn al-'Assāl (d. after 669/1270), as the textual analysis—together with a reference by Ghāzī al-Wāsiṭī (d. 712/1312) edited by Richard Gottheil—strongly suggests. But if we are dealing with a Christian *dhimmī* from the Islamic East, how do we explain the quotations from sources connected to the Western parts of the Mediterranean, among which some works of Ibn 'Aṭīyya al-Gharnāṭī, Maimonides, and views

that seem to parallel those of Thomas Aquinas?

The "Spanish connection", according to Van Koningsveld, must be seen as an instance of scholarly collaboration between Martí and this Christian, ostensibly working at his request and with whom Martí would have shared his knowledge of Aquinas or entered into some form of collaboration to produce a composition targeting a Christian audience in a position of dominance like the one in the Christian territories of the Iberian Peninsula. So far, the evidence from the internal analysis of the texts does not allow us to ascertain beyond doubt who the audiences were for this poignant refutation of Islam and, most significantly, whether the two figures were in personal contact, or were even closely collaborating. Yet it is worth taking the invitation by Van Koningsveld seriously, not least because the identification of Martí's source has implications for our knowledge of his methods of work—an open issue on which no academic consensus has yet been reached (see on this point, and in particular on whether Martí had collaborators or not, the contributions to the recently edited volume by Göрге K. Hasselhoff and Alexander Fidora [*Ramon Martí's Pugio Fidei. Studies and Texts*. Santa Coloma de Queralt: Obrador Edèndum, 2017]).

In this regard, Van Koningsveld correctly points out that Martí's reliance on a contemporaneous Christian work suggests he had indirect access to Islamic sources for the elaboration of his *De Seta*, urging scholars to qualify the widely extended image of Martí as "il primo orientalista europeo" (Ugo Monneret de Villard). That this is the case appears to be particularly true with regard to the Arabic and, to a large extent, the Muslim sources quoted in the section of *De Seta* known as the *Quadruplex Reprobatio* ["Fourfold reprobation"]. It is in this part that Martí depends more heavily on his

Christian source. But beyond the question of whether Martí had the opportunity to work directly with Arabic sources, it should be emphasized that an intellectual exchange (such as that proposed by Van Koningsveld taking place as early as the thirteenth century) is consistent with the well-documented evidence of intensive contact between the Crown of Aragon and the Eastern parts of the Mediterranean, which furthered the traffic of goods, persons, and ideas discussed here, and, as Van Koningsveld reminds us, is also consistent with the evidence of the connectedness across the Mediterranean in Muslim-Christian polemical and literary activities. The evidence at hand could furthermore shed light on a recently studied phenomenon, namely the parallels between the uses of Scripture and of philosophy in polemical writings by Muslims in the Christian territories (Mudejars) and those by Eastern Muslims, something quite visible in the works of al-Ṭūfī.

It is precisely with regard to the transmission of the works by al-Ṭūfī (in particular those of *al-Saiḥ al-Murhaf*) that Van Koningsveld could have pushed his arguments a little further. In one miscellaneous manuscript, we find the only known reference to what he regards as the possible original title used by al-Ṭūfī when he began his endeavor to write against the anonymous Christian (*al-Radd 'alā kitāb ṣannaḥahu ba'ḍ al-naṣārā sammāhu al-Saiḥ al-Murhafī al-Radd 'alā al-Muṣḥaf* ["Refutation of a book composed by a Christian entitled *The whetted sword in refutation of the Qur'ān*]). Van Koningsveld works on the assumption that *al-Radd* is a different work than *al-Ta'liq*, the alternative title to this text in the same manuscript. Furthermore, it corresponds with an independent critical commentary on the Scriptures by al-Ṭūfī, which he used as preparation for the composition of his more extended work *al-Intiṣarāt (al-Ta'liq 'alā al-Anājil al-ar-*

*ba'a wa 'alā al-Ta'liq 'alā a-Tawrāt wa kutub al-Anbiyā'* ["Notes on the four Gospels and on the Torah and on the books of the prophets"]). That the *al-Radd* is mentioned here, is perhaps the result of the copyist's confusion because the two works were "so closely related but yet different in many respects" (p. 10). Indeed, according to the argument, *al-Radd* was discarded as a title when al-Ṭūfī elaborated his arguments and crystallized them in *al-Ta'liq*. The view of Van Koningsveld contrasts with that of the recent editor of *al-Ta'liq*, Lejla Demiri, who argues that the additional title of *al-Ta'liq* was copied by a different scribal hand (cf. Demiri, Lejla. *Muslim Exegesis of the Bible in Medieval Cairo. Najm al-Dīn al-Ṭūfī's (d. 716/1316) Commentary on the Christian Scriptures*. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2013, p. 79). Also, if they were indeed copied by the same hand, as Van Koningsveld claims, this would give even more strength to Demiri's hypothesis that we are dealing with one work that was given two different titles at a certain point in time. On the other hand, if we accept the possibility that *al-Radd* and *al-Ta'liq* are two different compositions, then how does *al-Radd*, the seed of al-Ṭūfī's anti-Christian polemical oeuvre, exactly relate to *al-Ta'liq*? Or to put it differently, how did the original arguments disassociate themselves from the later larger notes (if they were ever connected with them) and, more importantly, how and why did such knowledge "migrate" (did it?) and come to engross the text of the *al-Intiṣarāt*, leaving almost no trace in the *al-Ta'liq*? Considering that we find most of the references to the Christian work in *al-Intiṣarāt*, is it not then likely that al-Ṭūfī would have retained some references to *al-Radd*? It would have been a great addition if Van Koningsveld had pointed at some of the questions stemming from the argument of *al-Radd* as a work-in-progress, even if he had not addressed them at length.

Credit should certainly be given for this fine piece of scholarship. Those who are familiar with both Arabic and the recent scholarship on interreligious polemics in the period will find in this work a stimulating source for reflection and a very useful edition and translation of the *al-Saif al-Murhaf*. The evidence presented by Van Koningsveld opens up new directions for future research, not only on al-Tūfī and Ramón Martí, but also on the production—yet to be studied systematically—of anti-Muslim Coptic Christian writings (with the caveat rightly noted by Van Koningsveld that we are dealing with an Islamic interpretation).

The particulars of the transmission of the *al-Saif al-Murhaf* add to other examples of the preservation of Christian polemical sources in Muslim writings, as, for example, the treatise by al-Qūfī, the Goth, by the twelfth-century Cordovan al-Khazrajī (519/1125–582/1186) and the later al-Qurṭubī (578/1182–655/1258). It is an outstanding example of the entanglement between Christian and Muslim discourses in pre-modern trans-Mediterranean processes of intellectual exchange, collaboration, and intellectual dependence between scholars belonging to the same, and to different religions.

Mònica Colominas Aparicio

Max Planck Institute for the History of Science  
<https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/enrahonar.1240>



HASSELHOFF, Görg K. i FIDORA, Alexander (eds.) (2017)

*Ramon Martí's «Pugio fidei»: Studies and texts*

Santa Coloma de Queralt: Obrador Edendum. Exemplaria Scholastica, Textos i estudis medievals, 8, 268 p.  
 ISBN 978-84-947566-1-0

Catalunya és ara i ha estat sempre una terra de pas, de frontera. La presència simultània de diverses cultures és segurament una de les característiques històriques més destacades d'aquest nostre país. Aquesta situació ha estat molt propícia per a un tipus de literatura que, en funció de l'època, podríem anomenar *de controvèrsia, de confrontació o de diàleg*. Les obres d'apologètica i disputació religiosa tingueren un protagonisme especial durant l'edat mitjana. A Catalunya, durant el regnat de Jaume I, aquesta problemàtica era especialment viva. Recordem, per exemple, la disputa de Barcelona de 1263 entre Bonastruc de Porta i Pau Cristià o la campanya missionera de Ramon de Penyafort. La *Summa contra*

*gentiles* de Tomàs d'Aquino o el *Pugio fidei* del teòleg i pensador català Ramon Martí (Subirats, ca. 1220-Barcelona, ca. 1285) s'emmarquen i s'expliquen en aquest context cultural.

El *Pugio fidei* representa una fita en aquest tipus de literatura. És una obra vastíssima, que demostra un coneixement sense precedents —i potser mai no superat en l'àmbit llatí— de les fonts jueves i musulmanes. Per combatre les creences de jueus i musulmans i proposar-los la fe cristiana, Ramon Martí se serveix d'arguments filosòfics (a l'estil dels que podem llegir en la *Summa contra gentiles* de Tomàs d'Aquino), però també recorre a les mateixes autoritats teològiques de musulmans i jueus, és a dir, a l'Alcorà, els