



PROJECT MUSE®

Jewish Lullism around the Expulsion: A Spanish-Catalan
Fragment in Hebrew Characters from Ramon Llull's
Introductorium Magnae Artis Generalis

Ilil Baum

Jewish Quarterly Review, Volume 110, Number 3, Summer 2020, pp. 553-573
(Article)

Published by University of Pennsylvania Press



➔ For additional information about this article

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/763070>

Jewish Lullism around the Expulsion: A Spanish-Catalan Fragment in Hebrew Characters from Ramon Llull's *Introductorium Magnae Artis Generalis*

ILIL BAUM

1. INTRODUCTION

ONE OF THE HIGHEST EXPRESSIONS of Jewish integration in late medieval Spain is manifested in the translation and assimilation of the writings and the ways of thought of the surrounding Christian society. Translating, copying, and transcribing Christian works into Hebrew characters for Jewish internal uses signals at a minimum a desire for, and at a maximum the fact of, cultural and linguistic integration. We see this among fifteenth-century Catalan Jewry, through the reception of the writings of the thirteenth-century Catalan philosopher and missionary Ramon Llull.

A Hebrew manuscript in the Vatican Library (MS Vat. ebr. 375), which is estimated to be from the late fifteenth century and written by different Italian and Sephardic hands,¹ contains a fragment of seventeen philosophical definitions in a Catalanized Castilian in Hebrew script (folios 50r–51r). The definitions are of the concepts of “privation,” “infinity,” “comprehension,” “apprehension,” “capacity,” “existence,” “agency,” “faculty,” “object,” “act,” “necessity,” “regime,” “militancy,” “politics,” “preaching,” “prayer,” and “memory.”

Idan Pérez correctly attributes the definitions to the *centum formae*

I wish to thank Alexander Fidora for his insightful comments on a previous version of this study. I am also grateful to the anonymous reviewers of this essay for their thought-provoking comments.

1. See under Vat. ebr. 375 in Benjamin Richler, Malachi Beit-Arié, and Nurit Pasternak, *Hebrew Manuscripts of the Vatican Library Catalogue* (Vatican City, 2008), 317–18.

(hundred forms), a list of key concepts enumerated by Llull.² However, Pérez does not identify the exact origins of these particular definitions. Pérez comments that some of the philosophical definitions are “taken almost literally from Ramon Llull’s works *Ars brevis* (The short art) and *Ars generalis ultima* (The ultimate general art).”³ Some versions of these definitions are indeed similar to the ones in these two works of Llull. Nevertheless, after close reading of the fragments, I have identified their origins in the *centum formae* in Llull’s *Introductorium magnae artis generalis* (Introduction to the great general art; also known as *Liber de universalibus*, Book of universals).⁴

In the following, I contextualize Jewish reception of Christian thinkers such as Ramon Llull, while comparing and contrasting the Hebrew-letter fragment to the known Latin manuscripts. I expand on Jewish Lullian readership, mainly among Jewish physicians in the Iberian Peninsula and Italy around the expulsion, roughly between 1480 and 1520. A critical edition of the fragment including a comparison to its Latin sources and its translation into English appears as an appendix in the online edition of this essay.

The manuscript comprises fourteen fragments, which for the most part are related to medicine (four of which contain Italian words and terms). A couple of fragments are of prayers in Hebrew, and a few folios contain excerpts from the Qu’ran in Arabic in Hebrew characters.⁵ The fragment from Llull’s *Introductorium* and a second fragment of the same manuscript (folios 45r–46v) were written in Sephardic cursive letters that prove to be from the same hand.⁶ The two fragments are further connected. They share a similar content: philosophical writing related to the Catalan sphere that could have been part of a compilation of medieval philosophical-didactic essays. I have identified the philosophical treatise from folios 45r–46v as a Scotist treatise, a fragment from Petrus Thomae’s *De distinctione predicamentorum* (The distinction of categories).⁷ Time and time

2. Idan Pérez, “Las definiciones de Ramón Llull en un manuscrito judeocatalán de finales del siglo XV (Vat.Ebr.375),” *Iberia Judaica* 10 (2018): 155–70. For a diplomatic edition of this fragment, see Pérez, “Las definiciones de Ramón Llull,” 164–66; 168–70.

3. Pérez, “Las definiciones de Ramón Llull,” 156, my translation.

4. Henceforth, the *Introductorium*.

5. See Richler, Beit-Arié, and Pasternak, *Hebrew Manuscripts of the Vatican Library Catalogue*, 317–18.

6. Pérez, “Las definiciones de Ramón Llull,” 155.

7. Ilil Baum, “Traces of Jewish Scotism among Late Medieval Catalan Jews: A Catalan Translation in Hebrew Script of *De Distinctione Predicamentorum* by Petrus Thomae,” *Medieval Encounters* 26 (forthcoming, 2020). This interesting Sco-

again, Hebrew-letter manuscripts prove to be true treasures that restore lost philosophical, medical, and scientific works and their translations.⁸ This Catalanized-Castilian translation (in Hebrew script) is a *unicum*. It is the only known record of Llull's work in a vernacular language written in Hebrew script.

In this framework, I concentrate on the Lullian fragment. Notwithstanding, one must ask what the existence of these Lullian and Scotist pieces of writing says about Jewish involvement within the Christian society of late medieval Spain, and more concretely within Catalan society before the expulsion. Within a post-expulsion context, it illuminates the cultural and intellectual assets that Jews chose to bring along with them to their new communities. Some of these assets would last over time, and many others would be quickly lost and replaced by others more adequate to a modern Sephardic context.

2. THE *INTRODUCTORIUM MAGNAE ARTIS GENERALIS*

The Lullian definitions in our fragment are taken from the list of the *centum formae* in Llull's *Introductorium*. It is still debated whether this widely disseminated work was in fact written by Llull or rather in later Lullian circles.⁹ The Hebrew-letter fragment constitutes the earliest known translation of it into Castilian (highly influenced by Catalan in this case).¹⁰ The only known translation into Spanish thus far is that of

tist philosopher taught at the *studium generale* in Barcelona during the 1320s, and seems to have had an influence on Catalan Jewish philosophers. See Warren Zev Harvey, *Physics and Metaphysics in Hasdai Crescas* (Amsterdam, 1998), 138.

8. See, for example, the case of Averroes' Long Commentary on *De anima*. The Arabic original was considered to be lost for many years, and it was accessible only through its Latin version. Lately, some of the Long Commentary has been reconstructed via the Hebrew glosses, which appear in the marginalia of his Middle Commentary written in Arabic in Hebrew script from the mid-fourteenth century. Colette Sirat and Marc Geoffroy, "The Modena Manuscript and the Teaching of Philosophy in Fourteenth and Fifteenth Century Spain," in *Study and Knowledge in Jewish Thought*, ed. H. Kreisel (Beersheva, 2006), 185.

9. Lola Badia, *El "Libre de difinicions" opuscle didàctic lul·lià del segle XV* (Barcelona, 1983), 28–29. The author sees this work as a "para-Lullian" rather than a Lullian text; for the debate on dating this work, see Anthony Bonner, "Problemes de cronologia lul·liana," *Estudios Lulianos* 21 (1977): 47–48; Fernando Domínguez, "II. Works," in *Raimundus Lullus: An Introduction to His Life, Works and Thoughts*, ed. A. Fidora and J. Enric Rubio (Turnhout, 2008), 191.

10. See below on the possible Catalan origins of the translation. There is also a seventeenth-century French version of this book: *Livre de la différence de la corde et de la contrariété*.

Alonso de Zepeda y Aranda, published in 1663–64.¹¹ The two translations do not share a common origin, since the order of the definitions and some of the definitions themselves are different in the two translations.¹² Their independence from one another is also manifested by the different choice of words. Furthermore, the first translation reflects marked linguistic influences from the Catalan-speaking area, while Zepeda's seventeenth-century translation lacks these notable Catalan footprints.

There are thirty-eight Latin manuscripts of the *Introductorium*. The Catalan *Libre de definicions* (Book of definitions) is considered a Catalan version of the same work that came down to us in a single fifteenth-century manuscript.¹³ Badia points out that the difference between the two versions is that the *Introductorium* includes a first part, absent from the Catalan version of the *Libre de definicions*. They also differ in that the *centum formae* in the *Introductorium* are absent from the *Libre de definicions*. The Catalanized-Castilian fragment in Hebrew script from the Vatican Library contains precisely the part missing from the *Libre de definicions*. Badia explains that the didactic nature of this work may explain the numerous variations between the Latin and Catalan manuscripts.¹⁴ Lull's definitions are registered as a list of basic concepts taken from his philosophical course, a sort of a concise version of the *Ars brevis* used for didactic purposes.¹⁵

Although most of the preserved manuscripts of Lull's work are written in Latin, it is well known that Lull originally wrote many of his works in Catalan. Other works were translated into Catalan from Latin or even

11. Alonso de Zepeda y Adrada, "Introductorio de el Iluminado Maestro Raymvndo Lvlio traducido y explicado por el Teniente de Maestro de Campo General Don Alonso de Zepeda y Adrada, Governador de Thol-huys y dependientes," in *Árbol de la ciencia de el iluminado maestro Raymundo Lulio* (Brussels, 1663), j–cxxxv. Zepeda divides his translation so that each concept is brought in a few lines, then explained and commented on by him.

12. For example, they differ in the definitions of "agency," "faculty," and "act." Moreover, the definition of the term "regime" does not appear before "militancy," and the terms "prayer" (Lat. *oratio*) and "memory" are missing from Zepeda's translation. *Árbol de la ciencia*, j–cxxxv.

13. Badia, *Libre de definicions*, 16.

14. Badia, *Libre de definicions*, 20. The Catalan tradition preserved in this single manuscript edited by Badia is faithful to Ramon Lull's spirit, but it is also "full of free insertions," as explained by Badia, *Libre de definicions*, 33.

15. Badia, *Libre de definicions*, 28. It could have also been used as an introduction to the *Arbor scientiae* (The tree of knowledge) or other (Lullian) philosophical works. Indeed, Zepeda also used the *Introductorium* in his seventeenth-century translation into Spanish, right before the *Árbol de la ciencia* itself.

Arabic shortly after the original, by Lull himself or under his personal supervision.¹⁶ Out of 265 written works, fifty-seven have been preserved in Catalan. Twenty of these have only a Catalan version, while the other thirty-seven have a double version both in Catalan and Latin.¹⁷ The *Introductorium* is believed to have been originally written in Latin, but in view of the fragment in hand, written in Catalanized Castilian, the existence of the original in Catalan or an early Catalan translation of the work seems more than plausible.

3. ANALYSIS OF THE TRANSLATION: ORIGINS AND COMPARISON WITH LATIN MANUSCRIPTS

3.1 *The Lullian Definitions and Other Philosophical Lexicons for Jewish Use*

Lists of philosophical terms constitute, if not a genre, a large corpus in the Hebrew tradition.¹⁸ Samuel Ibn Tibbon's dictionary of terms (*Perush ha-milim ha-zarot*, Explanation of foreign terms), which was meant to elucidate his Hebrew translation of Maimonides' *Guide for the Perplexed*, served as a model for later dictionaries.¹⁹ Maimonides' *Milot ha-bigayon* (Treatise on logic), was a foundational work that explained key philosophical terms and served as an entryway for Jewish scholars into Arabic and Arabo-Andalusi philosophy. It also, in Moses Ibn Tibbon's Hebrew translation, helped revive Hebrew itself as a language of scholarship in the sciences during the Middle Ages. An example of glossaries and lexicons of philosophical terms within the Christian Iberian context is attested in a Hebrew manuscript from Parma (Biblioteca Palatina Cod. Parm. 2666), which was thoroughly studied by Michelle Hamilton.²⁰

While Hamilton's case study offers an interesting analogue of philo-

16. Domínguez, "II. Works," 128–29.

17. Albert Soler, "Editing Texts with a Multilingual Tradition: The Case of Ramon Llull," *Variants* 5 (2007): 56.

18. On Hebrew philosophical terms, see Mauro Zonta, "The Relationship between Hebrew and Latin Philosophical Vocabularies in the Late Middle Ages," in *L'Elaboration du vocabulaire philosophique au moyen âge*, ed. J. Hamesse and C. Steel (Turnhout, 1998), 147–56; Zonta, "Arabic and Latin Glosses in Medieval Hebrew Translations of Philosophical Texts and Their Relation to Hebrew Philosophical Dictionaries," in *Lexiques bilingues dans les domaines philosophique et scientifique: Moyen âge, Renaissance*, ed. J. Hamesse and D. Jacquart (Turnhout, 2001), 31–48.

19. Zonta, "Arabic and Latin Glosses," 31–32.

20. Michelle M. Hamilton, *Beyond Faith: Belief, Morality and Memory in a Fifteenth-Century Judeo-Iberian Manuscript* (Leiden, 2014), especially chap. 3, pp. 88–135, on the four Hebrew-Romance philosophical glossaries of Aristotelian terms in the manuscript.

sophical terms for Jewish use, the case of the fragment of the Vatican manuscript is somewhat different. First, the terms we are dealing with here were not quoted in the form of a lexicon, glossary, or synonym list. Rather, they were copied or translated as in the original, quoting not only the term but the whole definition according to the Lullian system of thought. This is an important difference. Furthermore, in the Hebrew-Romance and Romance-Hebrew lexicons and glossaries Hebrew is a central scientific language, whereas in this case it is the vernacular that is put into use (with a peculiar blend of Catalan and Castilian) as the language of philosophy. Hebrew here is used mainly as a means of orthographical representation (for those Jews who felt more comfortable reading the vernacular in Hebrew script). The use of Hebrew itself is scant, incorporated within the text merely in four instances:

- אלוּ הָרָא (=these four; 3:15),²¹ where the translator chooses to count using the Hebrew alphabet, as was common among Jews, here using the *dalet* (ד [d]) to designate the number four.
- בַּבּ צִדְדִים (= in two aspects; 2:18), for Lat. *actus est duplex*, which could have easily been translated into Castilian **en dos maneras*.²² Moreover, in 2:5, too, the translator translates the number ten (in Latin, *decem*) into the tenth letter of the Hebrew alphabet, *yod*, when referring to the “ten natural faculties.”
- רִל מֵהַמְאֲמָרוֹת (*r'l meha-ma'amarot*; 3:17) in the last sentence of the fragment seems to stand for רִצָּה לִּימָר מֵהַמְאֲמָרוֹת, “that is, from the articles,” to refer to the Hebrew translation of Aristotle’s *Categoricos* in *Sefer ha-ma'amarot*.²³
- דּוֹרֵשׁ (= preacher; 3:7) appears in Hebrew instead of the Romance *predicador* (Lat. *praedicator*).

The main difference, however, from other such lists, lexicons, or glossaries of philosophical terms lies in the way these two kinds of texts would

21. In the examples, I indicate in parentheses the page and line numbers where the examples are located. Hence, an example located at line 15 on the third page is indicated as (3:15). The page and line numbers are marked in the critical edition in the online appendix.

22. The abbreviations Lat., Cast., Cat., and Prov. denote words of Latin, Castilian, Catalan or Provençal origins, respectively.

23. At least two translations into Hebrew were made of this work during the thirteenth century: the first, from the Arabic version of Al-Fārābī (during the thirteenth century) and the second, from Averroes’ commentary. See Pérez, “Las definiciones de Ramón Llull,” 156–57.

have been used by Jews. The philosophical lexicons attested by Hamilton were linked with the translation of philosophical works. The lists of terms were meant as a complementary aid that facilitated the reading of the Hebrew translations of the philosophical text and, at times, even allowed the creation of new and original works.²⁴ Upon the absence of a parallel or an adequate Hebrew term, many Hebrew translations preserved the original Arabic or Latin terminology and their Romance parallels within the Hebrew translation or added them as marginal glosses.²⁵ In contrast, the Lullian definitions of the *centum formae* were formed a priori as a guiding reading tool within the Lullian *Art* (para-Lullian and pseudo-Lullian texts included), and not for the sake of translation. This didactic reading tool also aimed at reading in the vernacular. It seems to me that these definitions would have been copied, translated, and read as an introduction of basic concepts to Llull's *Art*, as among Christian contemporaries. As it turns out, this introduction to Llull's method was indeed used as such also by some Jewish readers.

3.2 From Spain to Italy: The Catalan, Castilian, Italian, and Jewish Angles of the Manuscript

The Hebrew-script fragment was probably copied, retranslated, or at least originated from a Catalan version that is lost today and was highly faithful to its Latin source. Only minor differences from the Latin manuscripts are to be found.

While the Castilian vocabulary (including verbal forms) is more salient, relatively, than the Catalan vocabulary,²⁶ it is hard to adjudicate regarding the true origins of the fragment at hand. Furthermore, it is possible that this presumed Catalan version was orally dictated by a teacher who was a native Catalan speaker while the student was a Jewish Castilian speaker, or the other way around.²⁷ A Catalan version as the

24. Hamilton, *Beyond Faith*, 93–94; Zonta, “Arabic and Latin Glosses,” 31.

25. Zonta, “Hebrew and Latin Philosophical Vocabularies,” 151; Zonta, “Arabic and Latin Glosses,” 31–48, and especially the case of Zerahyah ben Isaac H̄en (originally from Barcelona, but later he worked in Rome between 1277 and 1290), who used both Arabic and Romance glosses in his Hebrew translations. See Zonta, “Arabic and Latin Glosses,” 38–40.

26. Ilil Baum, “A Hebrew-Letter Fragment in Mixed Castilian-Catalan from Around the Time of the Expulsion and Its Implications for the Emergence of Judeo-Spanish,” in *Caminos de leche y miel: Jubilee Volume in Honor of Michael Studemund-Halévy*, vol. 2, ed. D. M. Bunis, I. Vučina Simović, and C. Deppner (Barcelona, 2018), 52.

27. It would of course be interesting to know whether Jews studied this material with Christian colleagues.

origin of this fragment seems more plausible than an attempt of the Jewish copyist to directly translate the Latin text into Castilian, while his native tongue was Catalan. Though I find it less probable, it also remains as a possibility that the Jewish scribe copied the text, which already contained such a Catalanized Castilian.

In any case, the final outcome of this highly hybridized text was the by-product of a long chain of transmission, whereby the text had been translated, copied, and recopied by many hands, or even orally dictated. Each of the copyists might have inserted some of his own unique linguistic traits. It is not rare to find Aragonese or Catalan footprints in Castilian texts of the time, and vice versa, either as a reflection of the original text or due to later additions by the copyists.²⁸ In this case, however, it is worth stressing that the Catalan character of the text is not merely manifested in sporadic Catalan traits. Rather, it is a key component of a highly hybridized language, which I call “Catalanized Castilian,”²⁹ and which lacks clear Aragonese traits.³⁰ Note, for example, that among the titles of the definitions in the fragment, five are written according to Catalan: *infinitat* “infinity,” *compresió* “comprehension,” *aprensió* “apprehension,” *capacitat* “capacity,” *oració* “prayer” (compare to Castilian: *infinitad*, *comprensión*, *aprensión*, *capacidad*, *oración*). Six other titles could be read either

28. See, for example, José Antonio Pascual Rodríguez, “Los Aragonismos de la *Visión Delectable* del Bachiller Alfonso de la Torre,” in *Actas del I Congreso Internacional de Historia de la Lengua Española*, ed. M. Ariza, A. Salvador, and A. Viudas (Madrid, 1988), 647–76. Pascual notes those Aragonisms which he attributes to the author of the *Visión delectable*, and those which he attributes to later copyists. The Aragonese character is further confirmed in the *aljamiado* version in Hebrew script studied by Hamilton, *Beyond Faith*, 6. The same manuscript (Parma 2666) contains a Hebrew-letter Castilian text of the *Danza de la muerte*, where Hamilton (*Beyond Faith*, 221–23) locates Aragonese and Catalan traits, supporting the hypothesis of Catalan origins of the *Danza de la muerte*.

29. For a detailed analysis of the phenomenon of linguistic contact in this fragment, see Baum, “A Hebrew-Letter Fragment,” 46–63. The corpus of Catalan texts in Hebrew script is also relatively limited; see a comprehensive study of these texts in Ilil Baum, “Judeo-Catalan, Jewish Multilingualism and Linguistic Contact in Late Medieval Catalonia” (Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 2018).

30. Aragonese traits are absent; for example, the Aragonese verb *clamar-se* is not attested, but rather the Castilian *llamar-se* “to be called” (2:9, *se llama potensia*, “it is called potency”). Also, the expression *ço és* “that is [in the explicative sense]” (see 1:1, 1:4, 2:5) is clearly a Catalan form, vs. the Aragonese formulation *es a dezir*. Moreover, the word designating “second (2nd)” appears in this fragment (2:19) according to Catalan feminine: *segona* and not Aragonese *segunda* (the same as in Spanish). I wish to thank Coloma Leal for her insights on the subject.

as Medieval Catalan or Castilian: *existencia* [Cast. *existencia*; Cat. *existència*] “existence,” *agencia* “agency,” *potencia* “faculty,” *milicia* “militancy,” *política* “politics,” and *memoria* “memory.” As for the five remaining titles, they are written in Castilian: *objecto* “object,” *acto* “act,” *necesidad* “necessity,” *regimento* “regime,” *predicación* “predication.”

In addition, the final three lines of the fragment (3:15–3:17) were probably not copied or translated from a previous manuscript but rather written as a commentary or note-to-self for the personal use of the Jewish translator regarding the Aristotelian categories (*praedicamenta*):

Calitat, ralació, e acció e pasió. Elu ha-iv poden esser sustanciales e accidentales en natura creada e todos los altres accidentes r'l meha-ma'amaro'(t).

Quality, relation, and action, and passion. *These four* can be substantial and accidental in created nature and all the other accidents, *that is, from (the Book of) the Articles* (i.e., Aristotle's *Categories*).³¹

The categories of *quality*, *relation*, *action*, and *passion* also appear in this very order in Llull's *Introductorium*.³² This short commentary might very well be the closest specimen of the translator's or the copyist's natural language. The language is Catalan with some (underlined) elements in Castilian.³³ Catalan seems to be the substrate, while Castilian is the (emerging) superstrate. The peculiar nature of this addition is also attested by the use of two Hebrew formulations (marked above in bold): אלו הדי ("these four"); and ר'ל מהמאמרו' (*r'l meha-ma'amaro'*), which, as explained above, refers to the Hebrew translation of Aristotle's *Categories*.

This being the case, I believe either that Catalan was the mother tongue

31. Aristotle's ten "categories" are referred to in medieval Hebrew as *ma'amarot* and his book the *Categories* is called in Hebrew *Sefer ha-ma'amarot*. In order to facilitate reading, the quotes here are transcribed according to modern Catalan/Spanish, whereas in the critical edition I have interfered as little as possible, without adding modern accents, etc.

32. See the ten *praedicamenta* in Ramon Llull, *Liber de universalibus*, ed. A. Madre, in *Raimundi Lulli opera latina*, v. XII (Turnhout, 1984), 150, lines 29–31: *Decem sunt praedicamenta: substantia, quantitas, qualitas, relatio, actio, passio, habitus, situs, tempus, locus*. See also the following definition of "accident" in *Liber de universalibus*, 152, lines 86–88: *Accidens est ens, quod non existit per se nec in se; sicut albedo, sanitas, uirtus, uitium, scientia, etc. Et sunt nouem genera accidentium, scilicet quantitas, qualitas, etc.* Manuscript B in Madre continues the sentence with *qualitas: relatio, actio, passio, habitus et situs*.

33. The forms *sustanciales*, *accidentales*, *accidentes* all end with the *-es* plural morpheme of Castilian (compare to Catalan: *substancials*, *accidentals*, *accidents*); and the Castilian *todo* is preferred over Catalan *tot*, "all."

of the translator or that he thoroughly controlled the language. This hypothesis is supported also by the aforementioned Scotist treatise of Petrus Thomae in the same manuscript, which was copied in a perfect Catalan of the time in Hebrew script by the same copyist. There is yet another fragment in the MS Vat. ebr. 375 that seems to have some Catalan origins as well: a treatise on surgery written by one *Mastre Salmon* (Master Solomon).³⁴ This treatise, or at least its translation, seems to be of Catalan origin.³⁵ All in all, there are three fragments in the same manuscript that relate to the Catalan-speaking area: a philosophical treatise in Catalan; a medical guide on surgery probably originally written in, or translated into, Catalan; and last, the translation into a much Catalanized Castilian of the famous thirteenth-century Majorcan polymath Ramon Llull.

Dating the manuscript to the late fifteenth century, or even the beginning of the sixteenth century, is convincing. We could easily imagine it as the work of a Catalan Jew or his descendants after the expulsion of 1492.³⁶ Moreover, the manuscript has a clear connection to Italy. As described by Richler et al., it contains some fragments written by Italian hands.³⁷ Also among its contents are four fragments with some terminology in Italian.³⁸ Furthermore, even the curious inclusion in the manuscript of parts of the Qu'ran in Arabic written in Hebrew characters

34. The original Hebrew title reads: זה ספר טוב ומעולה מרפואה השרורגייאה חברו (This is a fine and excellent book on surgery medicine composed by Mastre Salmon).

35. The word *mastre* (מאשטר, see Old Catalan *maestre*, and more modern *maestre*; Provençal *maestre*) stands for “master,” a common title used to refer to physicians. Moreover, the word for surgery שרורגייאה *šrwrgyy'b* is in Catalan or Provençal (compare Cat. and Prov. *cirurgia* or *cerurgia* to Cast. *cerugía*). Another medical treatise on surgery attributed to “Mast’(er) Salomon Macana” and which was written in Girona is found in the Russian State Library, MS Guenzburg 462, f. 143b: כלל קצר ממלאכת היד וחברו בעיר גירונא; הספר חברו מאשט' שלמה מאסאנא

36. There is also the less probable scenario, in which the fragment was written after the expulsion by a Jewish convert or a crypto-Jew. Such was the case of Alfonso de Zamora, a converted Jew (baptized in 1506) who was in charge of copying Hebrew manuscripts under Cardinal Francisco Ximenes de Cisneros. On Alfonso de Zamora, see Cecil Roth, “Alfonso of Zamora,” in *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 1:643.

37. Richler, Beit-Arié, and Pasternak, *Hebrew Manuscripts*, 317.

38. The first, second, eighth, and twelfth fragments include the use of technical terminology in Italian in a list of precious stones, medical and alchemical recipes, and a list of metals.

could be seen as pertaining to the Italian Jewish context.³⁹ Paudice demonstrates in another Vatican manuscript (Vat. ebr. 357)⁴⁰ how the use of the Qu'ran written in Hebrew characters should be understood in the context of "the cultural milieu of Jewish and Christian philosophers and scholars in the period of the Italian Renaissance."⁴¹

In view of all of the above, I suggest that the translator was most probably a Jewish exile who was expelled from Catalonia in 1492. I believe that the hypothesis of a Jewish translator of the text from a lost Catalan version to Castilian should be preferred over that of Latin into Castilian (with Catalan influence from the Jewish copyist). It also should be preferred over the alternative hypothesis of a mere copy made by the Jewish scribe. I come to the conclusion that this Jewish translator had mastered four languages to some degree:

Castilian—The target language of this translation. Though strongly influenced by Catalan, the translation shows a fair knowledge of the language.

Catalan—Probably the mother tongue of the translator. Both Catalan and Castilian show a highly learned and modern vocabulary, and the Jewish copyist proves to be Catalan-Castilian bilingual to some extent.

Latin—Presumably the source language of the text. The copyist either prepared a quite faithful translation from Latin or more likely kept in his translation Latinized forms and Latin terminology, which were already found in the lost Catalan translation.

Hebrew—Even though his writing is not free of errors, it seems to be the product of a well-educated Jew, accustomed to writing in Hebrew script (as evidenced by his handwriting) and with some acquaintance with Hebrew formulations.

At the end of the fifteenth century, Catalan was waning, and Castilian became the most prestigious Iberian language. The attempt to translate Catalan or Latin into Castilian should be understood in this context. But

39. Aleida Paudice, "On Three Extant Sources of the Quran Transcribed in Hebrew," *European Journal of Jewish Studies* 2.2 (2008): 215–17; 226–29. See also her similar essay, "Hebrew Translations and Transcriptions of the Qur'an," in *A History of Jewish-Muslim Relations: From the Origins to the Present Day*, ed. A. Meddeb and B. Stora (Princeton, N.J., 2013), 640–52.

40. For a short analysis of the fragment appearing in Vat. ebr. 375, see Ernest Mainz, "Koranverse in hebräischer Schrift," *Der Islam* 21 (1933): 229.

41. Paudice, "The Quran Transcribed in Hebrew," 229.

it could also be further explained by the large number of Castilian Jews who fled the Iberian Peninsula, whereas the number of exiled Catalan-speaking Jews was far smaller.⁴² The Jewish exiles carried their books along with their belongings and their cultural heritage, which they spread in their new communities throughout the Mediterranean, and many Catalan Jews found refuge in Italy. Striving to communicate with other Sephardic Jews, the majoritarian and more prestigious language of use would have been Castilian.

This multilingual capability should not come as a surprise. In elite Jewish circles, learned Iberian Jews were known for their multilingualism and their abilities as translators.⁴³ It should also be noted that the translator combined Latinisms that he was familiar with, assuming that these terms would also be appropriate to his colleagues' knowledge of Latin.

Indeed, over the course of the fifteenth century up to the expulsion in 1492, the Jews of Spain absorbed Christian culture, referring to and incorporating Christian scholasticism in their philosophical writings. Evidence of this can be seen in a better knowledge of Latin among the Jewish elite than in the preceding centuries,⁴⁴ perhaps due to the massive conversions following the 1391 pogroms and the continuous contact with the conversos.⁴⁵ Moreover, there are explicit references made by Jews to Latin scholastic authors and translations of Latin philosophical texts.⁴⁶ In

42. However, in the case of Italy, some Jewish-Catalan communities maintained a distinct identity and their own synagogues. Such is the case in Rome. In Salonica, different Catalan synagogues were also built; see Andreu Lascorz, *Cultura judeocatalana la comunitat de Tortosa* (Tortosa, 2013), 133; Ana María López Álvarez, "Los judíos de Cataluña vistos por sus 'hermanos de Sefarad,'" *La Cataluña judía*, ed. M. Companys (Barcelona, 2002), 196–97.

43. María Angeles Gallego, "The Languages of Medieval Iberia and Their Religious Dimension," *Medieval Encounters* 9.1 (2003): 116–18; 137–39.

44. On the knowledge of Latin among Jews in the Iberian Peninsula and Provence, see Mauro Zonta, *Hebrew Scholasticism in the Fifteenth Century: A History and Source Book* (Dordrecht, 2006), 8–9, 14, 23–24; Coloma Lleal Galceran and Jose' Ramo'n Magdalena Nom de Déu, *Aljamías hebraicoaragonesas (siglos XIV–XV)* (Barcelona, 1995), 95–96. For a comprehensive study of translations from Latin into Hebrew, see Alexander Fidora et al., ed., *Latin-into-Hebrew: Texts and Studies* (Leiden, 2013).

45. Gad Freudenthal, "Arabic and Latin Cultures as Resources for the Hebrew Translation Movement: Comparative Considerations, Both Quantitative and Qualitative," in *Science in Medieval Jewish Cultures*, ed. G. Freudenthal (New York, 2011), 99–100.

46. Zonta, *Hebrew Scholasticism*, 14.

Italy, the Jewish elite even attended Christian schools and had an extensive knowledge of Latin.⁴⁷

3.3 *Comparison with Latin Manuscripts*

The Catalanized-Castilian translation is quite faithful to the Latin. Nevertheless, there are a few orthographic errors or indications of negligent writing that suggest that the fragment served as a draft for personal use. The translation differs in three main aspects from the manuscripts in Latin (based on Alois Madre's edition):⁴⁸

(1) Order of definitions: Admittedly, this excerpt is only a fragmentary translation of seventeen definitions from the *centum formae* in the *Introductorium*. Nevertheless, they do not reproduce the original order. The fragment can actually be divided into two parts. The first part is f. 50; and the second part is f. 51r. The first fragment ends abruptly after f.50v, in the middle of the definition of "necessity" (the 57th form): *necessidad*⁴⁹ *es aquella cosa que no puede eser* "necessity is that which cannot be." Only when comparing it with the Latin manuscripts of Alois Madre's edition does it become clear that the definition is not complete: *necessitas est illud ens, quod aliter esse non potest*. The translation lacks the final part of "necessity is that which cannot be in another way."

The next folio in the manuscript, 51r, does not continue the definition that appears in the Latin manuscripts, right after *necessity* (the 67th form). The folios that probably appeared between them were lost over time. The next expected definition would be *necessary* (Lat. *necessarium*), but f. 51r starts with the end of the 99th form, the definition of *philosophy*. Therefore, there are 34 definitions missing in between the two fragments. Moreover, the next definition after *philosophy* is not the expected 100th form, defining *geometry*. It rather continues straight to the definition of *regime* (the 110th form). We are left puzzled by the missing forms between *necessity* and *philosophy*.

(2) Omissions, additions, and mistakes lacking in the parallel Latin manuscripts: One of the most notable examples is the definition of the term "apprehension." The Latin (in Madre's edition) is *apprehensio est similitudo finitatis, sicut gustus, qui cum gutta apprehendit mare*,⁵⁰ "apprehension is similarity to finity, just like tasting, in which (one) apprehends the

47. Zonta, *Hebrew Scholasticism*, 24–25.

48. *Liber de universalibus*, 149–169.

49. In the appended edition of the manuscript, I transcribe it as *neccidada*, according to the Hebrew script. See the criteria of transcription there.

50. *Liber de universalibus*, 162.

sea with a drop,” while the Catalanized-Castilian translation in Hebrew characters is *aprensió es semblança de finitat, así como el*⁵¹ *gusto el cual cuando gusta conoce e apreñde*⁵² *el mar el cual es salado*, “apprehension is similarity to finity, as for example regarding taste: when (one) tastes, he becomes familiar with and apprehends the sea, which is salty” (1:12–1:14).

First, there is a confusion between the word for “drop” (Lat. *gutta*, Cast. *gota*) and the verb “to taste” in the third person singular (*gusta*). This confusion is probably due to the use of the verb *gustar* earlier in the same sentence, and it either exhibits some lack of understanding of the sentence or a careless mistake in the translation process. It should be mentioned that later on the words *gustativa* (2:7) and *gusto* (2:13) are well written.

More interestingly, in the same paragraph there is also an addition which is absent from the Latin edition: a description of the sea, “which is salty” (*el cual es salado*). Curiously, we find a similar reference under the term *aprehension* in Zepeda’s Spanish translation, which might suggest a lost archetype shared by the Hebrew-letter and Zepeda’s translation:⁵³

Comprehension es semejança de la infinitad. E la Aprehension de la finidad: como el que gusta una gota de agua apreñde el mar salado.

Comprehension is similarity to infinity. And apprehension is similarity to finity: as the one who tastes a drop of water apprehends the sea, which is salty.

In contrast to the Catalanized-Castilian translation, Zepeda’s translation refers to the definition of *comprehension* and *aprehension* jointly. In addition, Zepeda does not add the verb “to know” (*conocer*) as in the Jewish translation.

(3) The translator or copyist’s personal commentary: As reiterated above, the final lines of this fragmentary translation are not attested in the known Latin translations. While the manuscript has no colophon or other indication of date, I estimate the copying date to be around 1480–1520, shortly prior to or after the expulsion. The paleographic assessment puts the copying of the manuscript in the late fifteenth century.⁵⁴ More-

51. The definite article is written לֵא *ol* and not לֵא *el*, with significantly large ל.

52. In the verb “apprehend,” *samekb* (ס) was confused with *peb* (פ), creating the nonexistent word *asreñde* for *apreñde*. The latter confusion is a very unexpected orthographical error.

53. Zepeda, *Árbol de la ciencia*, xci. This definition in particular might be useful for future studies of the manuscripts that served the translator.

54. See the aforementioned catalogue of Richler, Beit-Arié, and Pasternak, *Hebrew Manuscripts*, 317–18.

over, the extensive use of a learned Latinized vocabulary (such as *generable* “generable,” *gustativa* “gustative,” *imaginativa* “imaginative,” etc.) within the Catalanized-Castilian translation serves as evidence for the advanced date of the text. On the other hand, some linguistic characteristics fix the date of the text as no later than the beginning of the sixteenth century and prior to the writing reforms under the Catholic Monarchs that would only consolidate during the sixteenth century with the emergence of Modern Spanish.⁵⁵ There are also archaic forms, such as Castilian *fazer* “to do” (פִּזְיֵר *p’zyr*, 1:20).⁵⁶ Even more archaic, in the same sentence there appears the Catalan infinitive *far* (here nominalized, and with the sense of “doing”),⁵⁷ and not the more modern form *fer*, which was the widespread form in Catalan since the fourteenth century.⁵⁸

Supported by the linguistic evidence, the dating should be fixed toward the end of the fifteenth century or the beginning of the sixteenth century. The close proximity between the paleographic dating of the manuscript and my own estimation according to the linguistic traits seems to support the view that these fragments are a first-hand translation or a copy readjusted by this Jewish copyist, either upon dictation or for his personal use. Hence, the fragment should be seen as an original product, a *unicum*, rather than a mere transcription of a yet-to-be-found previous Castilian translation of this Lullian text.

4. LULLISM AMONG LATE MEDIEVAL CATALAN JEWS

4.1 *Jewish Lullism*

The Jews of Spain adopted a Hebrew form of scholasticism not only as a counter-move in defense of contemporary Judaism—mainly against

55. Such is the case of the separated adverbial morpheme *mente* (Cast.), e.g., *semblante mente* “similarly” (2:17–18, stands for Cast. *semblante mente*); *primera mente* “firstly, first” (2:18); *devota mente* “devotedly” (3:10). Toward the fifteenth century this was changed into the conjoined form.

56. Literary Castilian maintained the etymological Latin *f-* until the sixteenth century. And yet it seems that the phonetic shift ([f] > [h] > Ø) had already occurred beforehand. The case of *fazer* is especially interesting as it also reflects the medieval voiced affricative sibilant ʃ = [dz] that would end up as [θ] in Spanish by the seventeenth century (compare Cast. *fazer* with Mod. Sp. *bacer*).

57. The full definition is: *Agencia es esencia del agente de la cual sale el fazer que es acto suyo, así como el esclafar del caldo e el ben far del bueno* (Agency is the essence of the agent: from the agency comes out the action, which is its proper act, as for example heating out of warmth and good deeds out of goodness; 1:19–1:22).

58. Another archaic feature is the trace of Castilian [ts] in a final position, represented by the Hebrew grapheme of a final *qadi* [q̄]: קדי = Cast. *diez* “ten” (2:8); קפז = Cast. *capaz* “capable” (1:15). This might reflect an actual difference in pronunciation still present in some cases at the end of the fifteenth

Christianity—but also for the sake of adapting a new tool in European philosophical thought for their own needs.⁵⁹ Jews applied these methods as a point of departure in order to advance Jewish thought itself.⁶⁰ Thus, according to Zonta, their general approach to Latin sources tended to be freer than their Christian contemporaries, and translations were rarely very literal. At times we can even find an instance of new or modified Jewish terminology.⁶¹ The reception of Lull's work and the practical use to which it was put by Sephardic Jews, and most particularly by Jewish physicians, can be explained in light of the existence of what I identify as "Jewish Lullism" in the early Renaissance.

The Jewish intellectual elite were not oblivious to the work of great Christian thinkers of the time.⁶² Hames has already ascertained that Jews who were Lull's contemporaries were familiar with his work, debated it even if they did not mention him directly, and carefully studied his work in order to respond to his proselytizing attempts.⁶³ In this sense, Jewish Lullism is a form of adopting Lullian thought in a Jewish context.

There is further direct evidence of the reception of Lull's work by Jews of the Iberian Peninsula and Italy. I have traced three Hebrew manuscripts that are either translated from or attributed (falsely or not) to Ramon Lull by Sephardic and Italian Jews:

century. On the realization of ζ vs. z , see Marta Blanco, *Aproximación a la cronología de las transformaciones funcionales de labiales y sibilantes del español* (Santiago de Compostela, 2006), 45–60.

59. Zonta, *Hebrew Scholasticism*, 22–23.

60. Zonta, *Hebrew Scholasticism*, 22–23.

61. Zonta, *Hebrew Scholasticism*, 24. In relation to Italian "Hebrew scholasticism," Zonta (28) explains how it included much more literal translations than the ones made by the Jews of Spain. Their translations included not only "Hebrew Thomism" but also other works of other medieval Latin philosophy, such as Ramon Lull's *Ars brevis*. For the edition of this Hebrew translation, see Harvey J. Hames, *Ha-mela'cha ba-ketzara, A Hebrew Translation of Ramon Lull's Ars brevis* (Turnhout, 2012), 247.

62. See Zonta, *Hebrew Scholasticism*, 20–21, on the "eclectic" nature of the translations of philosophical works depending on the geographical area of the Jewish translator.

63. See Harvey Hames, "The Jewish Ramon Lull: Missionary, Mystic, Magician, Doctor and Alchemist," in *Actes de les Jornades Internacionals Lul·lianes: Ramon Lull al s. XXI. Palma, 1, 2 i 5 d'abril de 2004*, ed. M. I. Ripoll Perelló (Palma, 2005), 77–80, on Rabbi Solomon Ben Adret's responses and encounters with Ramon Lull. On Joseph Ibn Shem-Tov, see Hames, "The Jewish Ramon Lull," 81–86. Hames's compelling conjecture that Rashba debated Lull is rejected by Yair Lorberbaum, "R. Shlomo ibn Adret's Treatise against the Christians: A Reevaluation" (Hebrew), *Zion* 84.1 (2019/5779): 59–86.

- A Hebrew translation of a fragment titled *Passage from Master Ramon Llull on the compounding of drugs*, which is in fact a section of *Arbor scientiae* (fifteenth-century Sephardic script; Parma 2639/Parma de Rossi 339).⁶⁴
- A Hebrew translation of a fragment on the *quinta essencia* (fifth essence)⁶⁵ attributed by the copyist to “Raimon” (fourteenth-fifteenth century Sephardic script; Paris BNF 1207). According to Raphael Patai, this fragment, as well as a similar work, *De secretis*, are pseudo-Lullian works.⁶⁶
- A Hebrew translation of Ramon Llull’s *Ars brevis* (1476, Italy; NY JTS 2312).⁶⁷

Thus, this Catalanized-Castilian translation in Hebrew script serves as the fourth direct piece of evidence of Jewish readership of Lullian works.⁶⁸ There are also indications of Jewish buyers and sellers of Lullian

64. Parma 2639/Parma de Rossi 339; the title in Hebrew is (f. 99r): מאמר למאשטרי רמון לול בהרכב הסמים. On the recognition of this fragment, see Hames, “The Jewish Ramon Llull,” 86–91. This fragment was attributed at first by Moritz Steinschneider to the *Ars compendiosa medicinae* of Ramon Llull.

65. Paris BNF 1207; the title in Hebrew is (f. 155v): סוד גדול מהמהות הה' הנקרא בלשונם קינמה אישנסיאה, כתבו [. . .] רימון. “Great secret of the fifth essence, called in their language *quinta essencia*, written by [. . .] Raymon.” It will be noted that the first word *sod* “secret” is written with what could be interpreted as an added *yod* before it, making the word *yesod* “basis, element,” and the manuscript is thus catalogued as such in the catalogue of Institute of Microfilmed Hebrew Manuscripts (IMHM) of the National Library of Israel.

66. For the translation into English of this fragment and an introduction to its use in the medieval alchemical world, see Raphael Patai, *The Jewish Alchemists: A History and Source Book* (1995; Princeton, N.J., 2014), 204–17 (in the chapter “The Quinta Essentia in Hebrew”). This fragment was attributed at first by Moritz Steinschneider to *De secretis naturae sive quinta essentia* (On the secrets of nature or the fifth essence) of Ramon Llull. For an explanation of the *De secretis* as a pseudo-Lullian work, see Patai, *The Jewish Alchemists*, 205; Michela Pereira, “Lullian Alchemy: Aspects and Problems of the Corpus of Alchemical Works Attributed to Ramon Llull (XIV–XVII Centuries),” *Catalan Review* 4.1–2 (1990): 41–54. For a comprehensive discussion on the true identity of the writer as being Raymund of Tarrega, see Patai, “Raymund de Tarrega,” in *The Jewish Alchemists*, 175–203.

67. NY JTS 2312; the title in Hebrew is (f. 1r): מלאכה קצרה, attributed in the colophon (f. 50v) to Romandeinis (מרומנדייניש) זה הספר מרומנדייניש), to refer to Ramon Llull. For the edition of this Hebrew translation, see Hames, *Raimundus Lullus: Ha-melacha ha-ketzara*.

68. I have compared the handwriting of these three works to our anonymous translation, but no similarities were found. To these manuscripts we could add the mysterious Hebrew letters appearing in the marginalia of Llull’s *Book of the*

manuscripts, precisely in Italy, in Padua. Hames notes the case of Isaac ben Abraham Baruch Stradarzelo of Padua, who sold in 1465 a manuscript containing Llull's *De ascensu et descensu intellectus*.⁶⁹

4.2 *The Practical Use of Ramon Llull's Work by Jewish Physicians*

According to Hames, the interest the Jews took in Llull's *Ars brevis* was specially focused on their theological intention to approach the divine via nature or via creation.⁷⁰ This kind of Jewish interest in Llull could be attributed to Jewish Lullism. Yet another interesting and perhaps more practical aspect of the Jewish interest in Llull's work should be taken into account. All of the aforementioned manuscripts were used by Jewish physicians during the fifteenth century. The *Ars brevis* was copied in Italy in 1476 by Pinhas Zvi ben Nethanel shortly after the original translation was dictated.⁷¹ Pinhas Zvi ben Nethanel was probably a physician, as he refers to himself as a disciple of the "French doctors."⁷² The fragment from the *Arbor scientiae* was translated into Hebrew by the Jewish physician Haim Ibn Musa (born ca. 1380).⁷³ Hames further deduces that Ibn Musa belongs to the Catalan context of Barcelona or Majorca.⁷⁴ Finally, regarding the *Quinta essentia*, Patai concludes that its author was a Jewish physician-chemist who lived in Spain in the fourteenth or fifteenth century.⁷⁵

Did the manuscript Vat. ebr. 375 also serve Jewish physicians? There is no way to be certain. However, out of the fourteen different fragments composing the manuscript, no fewer than seven are of medical recipes

Gentile and the Three Wise Men in MS BP Mallorca 1025, f. 34a. See Anthony Bonner, ed., *Llibre del gentil e dels tres savis* (Palma de Mallorca, II, xxvii), 92; 214; for a digital reproduction of the manuscript see <http://bvpb.mcu.es/ca/consulta/registro.cmd?id=397919>. The letters, written in inelegant handwriting, could be read as: ⚗ followed below by: שְׂאֲרִיב / שְׂאֲרִיב. These make no coherent sense.

69. Harvey Hames, "Jewish Magic with a Christian Text: A Hebrew Translation of Ramon Llull's *Ars Brevis*," *Traditio* 54 (1999): 287, n. 18.

70. Hames, *Ha-melacha ha-ketzara*, XXXI. For a general discussion of the use of this work among Jews, see Hames's introduction to *Ha-melacha ha-ketzara*, XXVI–XLV; see also Hames, "The Jewish Ramon Llull," 92.

71. Hames, *Ha-melacha ha-ketzara*, XXVII.

72. For a discussion of the possible identity of the "French doctors" and more details on Pinhas Zvi ben Nethanel, see Hames, *Ha-melacha ha-ketzara*, XXIII–XXIV.

73. Hames, "The Jewish Ramon Llull," 88–91.

74. Hames, "The Jewish Ramon Llull," 91.

75. Patai, "The Quinta Essentia in Hebrew," 206, where Patai also explains the distinction between a physician and an alchemist.

and remedies.⁷⁶ In fact, the manuscript of eighty folios contains around forty folios of medical recipes (3r–14v, 24v–30v, 32r–35r, 40r–44v, 71r–80v). To these we should add the aforementioned treatise on surgery attributed to Salomon the physician (15r–24r). This fact alone is a strong indication that it was either written by or in the possession of a Jewish physician.

This kind of Jewish use of Lullian material could also be viewed as Jewish Lullism, in the sense that his *Art* or its principles would have been used by some Jews for studying scholastic medicine. It should be remembered that Jewish interest in scholastic logic during the fifteenth century could also be attributed to the growing Jewish interest in scholastic medicine.⁷⁷ In fact, as Manekin noted, by the fourteenth century the study of some aspects of scholastic logic was considered a practical necessity for the trained physician. This was especially true in Provence and the Crown of Aragon, where Jews received medical certification from a mixed Jewish and Christian tribunal. The tribunal required them to be knowledgeable in scholastic logic.⁷⁸ Moreover, some of Lull's works are specifically dedicated to the implementation of the *Art* in the field of medicine.⁷⁹ Lull's thought was not prevalent in the discourse of European scholasticism but Lullism was certainly integrated within the academic and scholastic spheres in Paris, Cologne, Padua, and above all in the Iberian Peninsula during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.⁸⁰ Most prominent were the Lullian School of Barcelona and the Lullian *Studium Generale* of Majorca.⁸¹

Of course, many of the Jewish authors and transmitters of philosophical texts were physicians by day, as was Maimonides, but that does not necessarily mean the texts were intended for use in the practice of medicine. This is true not only for Muslim Spain but also for Christian Spain (Nahmanides and Nissim of Girona, for instance, also practiced medicine). Their interests were far ranging and certainly included knowledge

76. Other fragments contain prayers, *piyutin*, a list of precious stones, and even, as mentioned before, a fragment of the Qu'ran in Hebrew characters. See Richler, Beit-Arié, and Pasternak, *Hebrew Manuscripts*, 317.

77. Charles H. Manekin, "Scholastic Logic and the Jews," *Bulletin de philosophie médiévale* 41 (1999): 129.

78. Manekin, "Scholastic Logic," 129; see also Zonta, *Hebrew Scholasticism*, 9.

79. See Lluís Cifuentes i Comamala, *La ciència en català a l'Edat Mitjana i el Renaixement* (Barcelona, 2006), 141–45.

80. Rafael Ramis Barceló, "La filosofía luliana en la universidad durante los siglos XV y XVI," *Anuario Filosófico* 49.1 (2016): 177–96.

81. Ramis Barceló, "La filosofía luliana," 179.

of logic and metaphysics, at times alongside other disciplines such as natural sciences and astrology.⁸²

In particular, the case of the Lullian philosophical definitions, which were didactic in nature and made for instructing and guiding Lull's readers in his *Art*, could have been perceived as practical knowledge, useful perhaps even for reading other philosophical and medical works. Even if this knowledge was not meant for the day-to-day practice of medicine, such texts would have been valuable in preparing for the medical exams, as well as for expanding one's medical training and medical standing. This would have been especially true among Jews who were excluded from universities and from the official scholastic discourse and hence found their own ways of learning with fellow Jews, whether in Hebrew, Arabic, the vernacular, or even Latin.⁸³ In this sense, Jewish Lullism formed part of the general education of the trained Jewish physician.

After the copyist of our manuscript, an exiled Jewish scholar or physician, reached Italy⁸⁴ he probably tried to preserve and to transmit the knowledge that he had brought with him from the Iberian Peninsula. This scribe made the draft or notes and translated/copied the parts that interested him the most, either for his own personal use or as a didactic tool for teaching or studying with his peers.

CONCLUSIONS

The Lullian definitions from the list of *centum formae* in his *Introductorium magnae artis generalis*, which are written in Catalanized Castilian in Hebrew script, are an outstanding document for the study of Spanish intellectual history and the history of the Jews of Spain, as well as of Jewish-Christian intellectual relations in the Iberian Peninsula.

The expulsion led to the destruction and loss of much of the rich culture of fifteenth-century Iberian Jews. The sociohistorical and linguistic contexts for the translation are set in pre- and post-expulsion Sephardic and Italian milieus. These circles probably included Jewish physicians who found Lullian material of interest and use, for sharpening their scholastic way of thought and also probably for practical reasons, such as preparing for the exams that allowed them to practice medicine.

82. Joseph Shatzmiller, *Jews, Medicine, and Medieval Society* (Berkeley, Calif., 1995), 37–38. Moreover, the use of medical metaphors was also common in Jewish philosophical writing. Maud Kozodoy, "The Jewish Physician in Medieval Iberia: New Directions," paper given at the 2010 Annual Conference of the Association for Jewish Studies.

83. Shatzmiller, *Jews, Medicine, and Medieval Society*, 36–48.

84. For example, Jews from Tortosa and elsewhere arrived by sea to Italy.

I have proposed the term “Jewish Lullism” to refer to the particular adaptation of the Lullian method and scholastic tools within a Jewish context, both for approaching the divine (as shown by Hames regarding the Hebrew translation of the *Ars brevis*) and as a practical tool for the trained Jewish physician, who could use Llull’s *Art* in his medical studies. We can only imagine how this particular manuscript arrived in Italy, and whether one Catalan Jew, a physician, played a part in preserving Lullian works within Jewish Lullian circles.

However, it is clear that there was a high degree of Jewish absorption and assimilation of current Christian cultural and literary trends, at least within the intellectual Jewish milieu of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries in Spain and Italy. Within the Catalan context, these trends included the renewed interest in Lullian works and possibly the unification of Lullian and Scotist thought,⁸⁵ as well as the passage from Catalan to Castilian and the linguistic hybridization between the two.

Jewish multilingualism and multiculturalism are here manifested among educated Sephardic Jews around the time of the expulsion, while exemplifying their access to Christian scholastics and to Latin and vernacular sources. This is a unique window into the life of Catalan Jews in the very midst of the traumatic transition of the pre- and post-expulsion period, in and outside the Iberian Peninsula.

ILIL BAUM is a research fellow at the Martin Buber Society of Fellows, Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

85. Baum, “Traces of Jewish Scotism.”

Copyright of Jewish Quarterly Review is the property of University of Pennsylvania Press and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.