

*Translat Library*

2024 | vol. 6, no. 2

A Catalan Fragment of  
the Christian-Jewish  
Disputation of Tortosa  
(1412–1414)

ALEXANDER FIDORA

University of Massachusetts Amherst

Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona

Departament de Filologia Catalana | Institut d'Estudis Medievals

Submitted: 10/19/23 | Accepted: 12/13/23 | Published: 02/18/24

*How to Cite this Article*

Alexander Fidora. “A Catalan Fragment of the Christian-Jewish Disputation of Tortosa (1412–1414).” *Translat Library* 6, no. 2 (2024).



This work is published under a Creative Commons license (CC BY 4.0)

DOI: [10.7275/tl.1992](https://doi.org/10.7275/tl.1992)

ISSN: 2604-7438

# A Catalan Fragment of the Christian-Jewish Disputation of Tortosa (1412–1414)

ALEXANDER FIDORA

*ICREA – Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona*

**ABSTRACT:** Manuscript 35 of the Biblioteca del Cabildo de la Catedral of El Burgo de Osma offers one of very few examples of the reception of rabbinic literature in medieval Catalan: a fragment titled “De sacrefiçis.” Although this text was discovered and published more than sixty years ago, its origin and significance have not been determined until now. Through close textual comparison, the article places this enigmatic Catalan fragment in the context of the infamous Christian-Jewish Disputation of Tortosa of the years 1412–1414. More specifically, it proves that “De sacrefiçis” renders parts of the anti-Jewish *Tratado* by Jerónimo of Santa Fe, the driving force behind the Tortosa proceedings.

**KEYWORDS:** Anti-Jewish Polemic, Rabbinic Sources, Disputation of Tortosa, Talmud, Benedict XIII, Jerónimo de Santa Fe, Hieronymus a Sancta Fide

In 1965, the Spanish Semitist Francisco Cantera Burgos drew attention to a miscellaneous codex from El Burgo de Osma which gathers anti-Jewish polemic texts from the twelfth century onwards.<sup>1</sup> Alongside

<sup>1</sup> The research giving rise to the current results has received funding from the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation (PID2020–112592GB–I00/AEI) and

well-known treatises from *adversus Judaeos* literature, such as Peter Alfonsi's *Dialogus* and Bernard Oliver's *Tractatus contra iudaeos*,<sup>2</sup> MS 35 of the Biblioteca del Cabildo de la Catedral contains some Aragonese and Catalan fragments of Jewish liturgical and rabbinic sources. A short Catalan fragment titled "De sacrefiçis" (fols. 201r-v) stands out among these vernacular texts, as it refers to an impressive range of traditional Jewish literature. The text, which I quote from Cantera Burgos's transcription, adding two corrections and a paragraph division,<sup>3</sup> reads as follows:

1) Diu rab Moy. d'Egipte en lo libre ap<sup>l</sup>t 'more' en lo perech primer defer quant parle de causar los manamens que los sacrefiçis dels animals en lo teple no se feyan per pus sino per separar lo poble de allo q. en aquel tems se acostumave; aço semle a un rey q. te un fill q. minge en pubilch [*deleted*] püljch viandas bentas [*MS reads: brutas*] e suzias e dix li lo rey: meo fill, no las menges en puplich, mengales a la mia taula doncs de q. lo mesias es vengut la ydolatria se es leuada e no sacrefican animals, percosezent leuada la causa es leuat lo causat.

2) del sacrefici del pa e del vi di en lo libre de 'beresit rabba' de Rabbi Moy. lo darsan sobre lo rest [*MS reads: test*] del 'genesis' XIII [Gen. 14,18] cp. q. diu Melchisedech rey Salem 'proferens panem et vinum' e diu rebbi Semuel bar Nahaman q. aquest Melchisedech ere fill de Noe e q. volge dir 'proferens panem et vinum' q. li ensya lo orde sacerdotal e aço es lo q. diu lo psalmista [Ps. 110,4]: 'tu es sacerdos in eternum secundum ordinem Melchisedech' etc. e quál es aquest? lo rey mesias per lo qual es escrit Zacarias IX<sup>o</sup> c. [Sach. 9,8] : 'ecce rex tus tuus [*sic*] venit tibi justus et saluator ipse', e quant dix: 'proferens panem et vinum' concorde ab lo psalmista q. diu [Ps. 72,16]: 'erit firmamentum in terra in sumis montium' e diu la traslacio caldayca sera sacrefici de pa en rera en los caps los mons de la sinagoga.

3) diu en lo libre de 'çanhedrin' e en lo de 'ahhauoda zara' en lo capitol q. comença tot Isrl. q dix Elias vuytanta c. v. jubileus durara lo mon en lo derrer

the Catalan Government (2021 SGR 00152, GRC). I thank Ulisse Cecini (Barcelona) and Göрге K. Hasselhoff (Dortmund) for their advice in writing this note, as well as the anonymous reviewers for their suggestions.

<sup>2</sup> Both works have appeared in several editions, most recently: Petrus Alfonsi (2018) and Bernardus Oliver (1965).

<sup>3</sup> Ulisse Cecini kindly shared with me the notes on the text he took during a visit in El Burgo de Osma.

jubileu lo fill de Daudid vindra e glosa rabbi salamo. (Cantera Burgos 1965: 143–44).

Within only a few lines, “De sacrefiçis” offers translations from Maimonides’s *Guide of the Perplexed*, from the exegesis of Genesis by the eleventh-century rabbi Moshe ha-Darshan from Narbonne,<sup>4</sup> from the Aramaic translation of the Psalms—that is, the Targum—and from two treatises of the Talmud, namely Sanhedrin and Avodah Zarah. Cantera Burgos did not comment on the text, but he did express curiosity about the fragment; and indeed, sixty years after its discovery, the text and its sources still arouse interest and curiosity. Who was the author of “De sacrefiçis”? What were the author’s intentions? Why did the author translate these rabbinic authorities into Catalan? And, not least, is this an original rendering of Hebrew and Aramaic sources, or rather a re-translation of an already-existing translation in a Western language? Not all these questions can be addressed here; I will try to answer the last of them, on the origin of “De sacrefiçis,” by providing philological evidence that the fragment should be read in the larger context of the Tortosa Disputation of the years 1412 to 1414.

The Disputation of Tortosa is part of a series of Christian-Jewish disputations which started in the thirteenth century, when Christians became increasingly aware of rabbinic literature and particularly of the Talmud. As a result, several disputations were staged, either to accuse the Talmud of blasphemy (Paris 1240) or to use Talmudic and other rabbinic lore to prove the Christian faith (Barcelona 1263 and Paris 1269). The Tortosa Disputation, convened by the Avignon Pope Benedict XIII, was not only the last of these proceedings, but also the longest. The Christian protagonist of the Tortosa events was Joshua Lorki, who after his conversion in the year 1411 took the name of Jerónimo de Santa Fe and became Benedict’s physician.

Two phases of this disputation can be distinguished, the first of these being a somewhat preliminary session which took place in Tortosa in August 1412. During this meeting, which has received scant scholarly

<sup>4</sup> His works have reached us only in fragments through Rashi, Ramon Martí and others. See Mack (2010).

attention, the pope intended to discuss with the Jews their replies and objections to Jerónimo de Santa Fe and his arguments, which presented rabbinic teachings as proofs of the coming of the Messiah in the person of Jesus. However, the rabbis refused to engage in discussion of Jerónimo's alleged proofs, asking instead for time to consider them. Accordingly, Benedict XIII postponed the meeting, while requesting that Jerónimo's arguments be put in written form and sent to the Jews in advance of the next meeting: this is the so-called *Tratado* (Aragonese version) or *Tractatus* (Latin version), originally titled *Ha-Ma'amar* in Hebrew.<sup>5</sup> Subsequently, on December 8, 1412, rabbis from numerous Jewish communities were again summoned to Tortosa to participate in the second phase of the disputation: in over sixty sessions, which lasted from February 7, 1413 until November 13, 1414, they engaged in discussions with a handful of Christians, led by Jerónimo de Santa Fe. Two Hebrew reports summarize the first sessions only, while the Latin account and its Aragonese translation (c. 1415) cover the entire second phase.<sup>6</sup> The disputation ended with the promulgation of Benedict XIII's bull *Etsi doctoris gentium* (May 11, 1415), which condemned the Talmud as a blasphemous and heretical work and strictly forbade its possession along with its private and public use (Orfali 1998: 132–36).

In what follows, I will argue that the fragment “De sacrificiis” from the Biblioteca del Cabildo de la Catedral of El Burgo de Osma is related to the first phase of the Tortosa Disputation, being in fact a very faithful translation of Jerónimo de Santa Fe's *Tratado*. More specifically, I claim that the Catalan text was prepared from the Aragonese, and not the Latin, version of Jerónimo's *Tratado*. As the records of the second phase of

<sup>5</sup> Only the Aragonese and Latin versions are extant; the Hebrew original is lost. Passages of *Ha-Ma'amar* which have reached us through indirect transmission show that the Aragonese and Latin text render the Hebrew rather loosely and occasionally provide additional material, which suggests that Jerónimo de Santa Fe himself was responsible for these versions, or at least oversaw them; see del Valle Rodríguez (2013: XLV–XLVI).

<sup>6</sup> These materials have been published recently together by del Valle Rodríguez 2021 (the Hebrew accounts are accompanied by Spanish translations). The Hebrew accounts have also been translated into Catalan in Riera 1974.

the Tortosa Disputation—in both their Latin original and its Aragonese adaptation—are close to and even overlap with the contents of the *Tratado*, I will refer to these texts as well in order to note some differences between them and the Catalan fragment which confirm the *Tratado* as the latter's source.<sup>7</sup>

1) I will start the comparison between our Catalan text and the Aragonese *Tratado* with the fragment's first paragraph (see the table below). “De sacrefiçis” and Jerónimo's *Tratado* here refer to Moses Maimonides's *Guide of the Perplexed* III, 32, which argues that the divine commandment to sacrifice animals in the Temple should not be understood as the instalment of animal sacrifices, but rather as a means of leading the Jews away from common idolatrous practices. Unlike the sacrifices of idol worshippers, their sacrifices should be dedicated exclusively to the God of Israel (Maimonides 1963: II, 529).

Compared to the *Guide* and its mid-thirteenth century Latin translation, that is, the *Dux dubitantium*, not only do “De sacrefiçis” and the *Tratado* agree in their semantic and syntactic choices when compared to other early renderings of Maimonides into Latin,<sup>8</sup> but they also both

<sup>7</sup> This textual proximity has led Jaume Riera to suggest, in passing, a possible connection between the second paragraph of the Catalan fragment and the records of the Tortosa Disputation, instead of with the *Tratado* (Riera 1989: 225).

<sup>8</sup> See the Latin translation of the *Guide* III, 32: “[Quia] ratio seruitii applicationum fuit propter intentionem secundam, et orationes et alia quae pertinent ad opera seruitiorum quia [*delete?*] fuerunt propinquiora intentioni primae et necessaria in eius esse, fuit posita differentia magna inter duo genera: quia illud genus seruitii, scilicet applicatio applicandorum, licet fiat ad honorem Creatoris, non praecepit nobis facere sicut prius faciebant ut applicaremus in omni loco, et in omni hora [...] Haec autem omnia prohibuit nobis et praecepit vt aedificaremus domum unam, sicut dictum est, in loco quem elegerit dominus. Non debent applicare in alio loco nisi in illo loco” (Maimonides 1520: 93r-v). See also Ramon Martí's paraphrase of Maimonides's text in the *Pugio fidei* I–III, 6: “Sacrificiorum vero illas sanguinolentas congeries, et ceremonias alias nunquam deum principali intentione aut propter se voluisse, sed propter idololatriam extirpandam probat r. Moseh filius Maimon in *Moreh Nebhouchim*, sive *Directione Nutantium*, distinct. 32 partis 3 circa finem per multas auctoritates” (Raimundus Martini 1968: 514).

<p>“De sacrefiçis” (MS Burgo de Osma)</p>	<p>Jerónimo, <i>Tratado</i> (Jerónimo de Santa Fe 2013: 99–101)</p>
<p>Diu rab Moy. d'Egipte en lo libre apelat 'more' en lo perech primer de fer quant parle de causar los manamens que los sacrefiçis dels animals en lo teple no se feyan per pus sino per separar lo pople de allo q. en aquel tems se acostumave.</p> <p>Aço semle a un rey q. te un fill q. menge en pupilch [<del>deleted</del>] püljch viandas bentas [<i>MS reads</i>: brutas] e suzias e dix li lo rey: meo fill, no las menges en pupilch, mengales a la mia taula. Doncs de q. lo mesias es vengut la ydolatria se es leuada e no sacrefican animals, percosezent leuada la causa es leuat lo causat.</p>	<p><u>Item scrive Rabí Moisés en el libro llamado Moré, en la partícula çaguera, quando fabla en cassar los mandamientos de la Ley, e así lo reçita sancto Thomás de Aquino in prima secunde. Dize que los sacrificios de los [animales] en el Templo non se fazían a primera entención sinon por separar al pueblo de lo que más en aquel tiempo se acostunbrava de fazer por las gentes, idolatrias a los signos e a las planetes. E mandóles Dios que así commo las otras gentes fazían los dichos sacrificios a aquellos ídolos que ellos lo fiziesen a Él, entendiendo que con esta manera los reduciría de grado en grado al servicio principal suyo. E a esta opinión se puede aplicar una auctoridad del Talmud, la qual se dize: <u>Semeja esto a un hijo de rey que acostunbrava de comer en público reptilias e viandas. Dixo el rey: Mejor es que las coma a mi tabla. Síguese de lo que avemos dicho cuándo el husar de los sacrificios de los animales será tirado totaliter de las gentes, en la manera que ha seydo después del advenimiento del Masías, que de allí adelant tirada es la causa por qué Dios mandó fazer os sacrificios en el Templo</u> e que non quedará otro sacrificio sinon solamente aquel por el qual dixo David que sería sempiterno, el qual es de pan e de vino al contrario de la opinión que al presente tienen todos los judíos que creen que el Massías ha de venir e hedificar el Templo material de Iherusalem e que se han a tornar a y todos los sacrificios de los animales por la mesma manera que eran en el tiempo antiguo.</u></p>



add to Maimonides's argument the purportedly Talmudic simile of a king and his son.<sup>9</sup> A closer look at "De sacrefiçis" shows that, for the most part, this Catalan text can be considered an extremely literal rendering of the *Tratado*, though it tends to abbreviate, e.g. "sino per separar lo poble de allo q. en aquel tems se acostumave" for "sinon por separar al pueblo de lo que más en aquel tiempo se acostunbrava de fazer por las gentes, idolatriás a los signos e a las planetes." In spite of this, a few peculiarities can be noted. For example, at the very beginning of the paragraph when for "partícula çaguera" (i.e., 'the last part[icle]') "De sacrefiçis" gives the more genuine "perech primer defer" (i.e., 'the very last *perek* [Hebrew for 'chapter']'). A few words later, also, the Catalan text offers "causar" where the *Tratado*, or at least the single extant manuscript which Carlos del Valle Rodríguez used for his edition,<sup>10</sup> reads "cassar" ('to cease'), which is not in line with Maimonides's original text nor with the Latin version of the *Tratado* which speaks of the "causae praeceptorum" (Jerónimo de Santa Fe 1677: 540). These differences suggest that the text of the *Tratado* in the manuscript which has come down to us does not represent the original, but a later (and partly modified) copy, whereas the Catalan translator drew on an earlier text.

2) The dependence of "De sacrefiçis" on the Aragonese version of Jerónimo de Santa Fe's treatise is further confirmed by the subsequent paragraph of the Catalan fragment, which reports a teaching by Moshe ha-Darshan. In the text from the *Tratado*, as in our Catalan fragment, this passage follows immediately on from the preceding fragment:

<sup>9</sup>This simile, which actually goes back to the Midrash Leviticus Rabbah 22:8, is also missing in the parallel passage of the records of the second phase of the Tortosa Disputation, both in the Latin and the Aragonese account; see del Valle Rodríguez (2021: I, 419–20 and II, 1108–09). It is found, however, in the *Mostrador de justicia* (c. 1322) by Abner of Burgos/Alfonso of Valladolid (1994–1996, vol. I, 92 = fol. 53r), though here the wording is different.

<sup>10</sup>Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional de España, MS 10276 (fifteenth century). See del Valle Rodríguez (2013: XLVI).

<p>“De sacrefiçis” (MS Burgo de Osma)</p>	<p>Jerónimo, <i>Tratado</i> (Jerónimo de Santa Fe 2013: 101–02)</p>
<p>Del sacrefici del pa e del vi di en lo libre de ‘beresit rabba’ de Rabbi Moy. lo darsan sobre lo rest [<i>MS reads: test</i>] del ‘genesis’ XIII [Gen. 14,18] cp. q. diu Melchisedech rey Salem ‘proferens panem et vinum’ e diu rebbi Semuel bar Nahaman q. aquest Melchisedech ere fill de Noe e q. volge dir ‘proferens panem et vinum’ q. li ensya lo orde sacerdotal e aço es lo q. diu lo psalmista [Ps. 110,4]: ‘tu es sacerdos in eternum secundum ordinem Melchisedech’ etc. e qual es aquest? lo rey mesias per lo qual es escrit Zacarias IX<sup>o</sup> c. [Sach. 9,8]: ‘ecçe rex tus tuus [<i>sic</i>] venit tibi justus et saluator ipse’, e quant dix: ‘proferens panem et vinum’ concorde ab lo psalmista q. diu [Ps. 72,16]: ‘erit firmamentum in terra in sumis montium’ e diu la traslacio caldayca sera sacrefici de pa en rera en los caps los mons de la sinagoga.</p>	<p><u>E el sacrificio del pan e del vino dixeron en ‘Berrexit Rabá’, id est, Génesi magno, de Rabí Mosé el Darsán, sobre el testo que dice en el Génesi, c. xiii: ‘Et Melchisedech rex Salem proferens panem et vinum. Erat enim sacerdos Dei altissimi.’ Dize Rabí Sim, fijo de Nahmán: Aqueste Melchisedech era Sem, fijo de Noé. E ¿qué quiso dezir proferens panem et vinum? Muéstranos que le enseñó los actos del sacerdocio, los quales eran sacrificar pan e vino. E esto es lo que dixo lo psalmista en el psalmo eix: ‘Iuravit Dominus et non penitebit eum, tu es sacerdos in eternum secundum ordinem Melchisedech.’ E ¿qual es aquél? Aquél es el rey Masías, por el qual es scripto: ‘Ecce rex tuus venit tibi justus et saluator ipse.’ E en quanto dixo ‘proferens’, proferens panem et vinum, concuerda con el psalmista que dixo, Ps. lxxi: ‘Erit frumentum in terra in summis montium.’ Et dixo la traslación caldaica: Será sacrificio de pan en la tierra en las cabeças de los montes de la sinagoga.</u></p>

At this point, “De sacrefiçis” renders the Aragonese *Tratado* with only a few omissions. Among the many lexico-syntactic agreements between “De sacrefiçis” and the Aragonese *Tratado* in this quotation from Moshe ha-Darshan, one can highlight the calque translation: “per lo qual es escrit” for “por el qual es scripto,” for which the Latin version of the *Tratado* has: “*de quo scriptum est*” (Jerónimo de Santa Fe 1677: 540). In some instances, the Aragonese *Tratado* even allows us to correct errors of both the transcription of the Catalan text by Cantera Burgos and the manuscript from El Burgo de Osma itself. At the very beginning, for example, Cantera Burgos misread the word “test,” which is difficult to read

in the manuscript, as “rest,” whereas “test” is clearly confirmed by the Aragonese “testo.” A copyist’s error occurs at the end of the fragment, in the quotation from the Targum to Psalms, where “rera” appears in the manuscript for the Catalan “ter(r)a,” that is “tierra” in Aragonese. This latter error suggests that the manuscript of El Burgo de Osma offers a copy rather than the original of the Catalan text. Finally, it must be noted that the version of the Targum that is quoted is only attested in the context of the Tortosa Disputation, the standard text of the Targum to Psalms 72:16 being: “Let there be the support of bread in the land on the top of the mountains; its fruit will quiver like Lebanon, and they will blossom from the city of Jerusalem like the grass of the earth.”<sup>11</sup> While the Targum is quoted elsewhere in Christian polemic literature, the specific reference to “sinagoga” (‘synagogue’) only appears in “De sacrefiçis,” Jerónimo’s *Tratado* and the Latin and Aragonese records of the second phase of the Tortosa Disputation; in the latter two, however, it occurs at a different place in the argument (del Valle Rodríguez 2021: I, 425 and II, 1114).<sup>12</sup>

3) The final passage of “De sacrefiçis” on the Talmudic *computus* of the ages of the world also goes back to the Aragonese *Tratado*, though it pertains to a different part of that work:

<sup>11</sup> Translation by Edward C. Cook: [http://www.targum.info/pss/tg\\_ps\\_index.htm](http://www.targum.info/pss/tg_ps_index.htm) (accessed September 27, 2023). See also Díez Merino’s edition of the Targum along with Alfonso de Zamora’s sixteenth-century Latin translation in Díez Merino (1982: 132 [Aramaic] and 257 [Latin]).

<sup>12</sup> While also referring (indirectly) to the Targum, Ramon Martí in his *Pugio fidei* II, 11 offers a different interpretation of Ps. 72:16: “[...] ‘Erit firmamentum in terra’, vers.16. Hebraica veritas habet: ‘Erit frustum vel placenta frumenti in terra.’ Ubi glossa r. Salomoh Jarchi habet: ‘Magistri nostri exposuerunt hoc in libro Ketuboth esse linguam, sive significationem placentarum ad dies Messiae; et totum istum Psalmum de diebus Messiae exponunt.’ R. vero David Kimhi in libro Radicum in *Radice* [...] dicit [...]: ‘Targum Ionatan pro eo, sicut manus unus viri habet [...] sicut vola manus. Et hoc dicitur in Psalmo 72 quod erit [...] in terra, quasi dicat, pecia sive pars frumenti’” (Raimundus Martini 1687: 420–21). It is worth noting that Martí also refers to Moshe ha-Darshan on Gen. 14:18, yet his lengthy quotation differs significantly in wording from “De sacrefiçis” and Jerónimo’s *Tratado*; cf. *Pugio fidei* III–III, 15 = Raimundus Martini (1687: 840).

<p>“De sacrefiçis” (MS Burgo de Osma)</p>	<p>Jerónimo, <i>Tratado</i> (Jerónimo de Santa Fe 2013: 31–32)</p>
<p>Diu en lo libre de ‘çanhedrin’ e en lo de ‘ahhauoda zara’ en lo capitol q. comença tot Isrl. q dix Elias vuytanta c. v. jubileus durara lo mon en lo derrer jubileu lo fill de Dauid vindra e glosa rabbi salamo.</p>	<p>Item se puede provar manifestamente que el advenimiento del Massías avía de ser en aquel tiempo por una auctoritat que es en el libro <u>del Çanhedrin en el capítulo que comiença ‘Todo Israel’ e en el libro de Aboda Zará, c. I</u>: Dízese así: Léyese en el estudio de Helías: Seys mill años es el mundo; II mil de vanidat e II mil de Ley e II mil de Massías. Pero por nuestros peccados ya son fuera gran partida.</p> <p><u>Item dizen en el mesmo capítulo: Dixo Helías a rab Jauda: Non es menos el mundo de ochenta e cinco jubileos; en el iubileo çaguero verná el fijo de David. Glosa rrabi Salamón: ‘Esto monta quatro mill e doscientos e çinquenta años.’</u></p>

Also in this case, Jerónimo’s *Tratado* helps to explain some of the difficulties of the Catalan text, to wit the somewhat sloppy reference in “De sacrefiçis” to two Talmudic treatises, Sanhedrin and Avodah Zarah, when the Talmudic text translated into Catalan referring to the prophet Elijah appears only in Sanhedrin 97b. Apparently, the translator took the reference in the *Tratado* to Sanhedrin and Avodah Zarah, which immediately precedes the text he translated, to extend to the subsequent passage he chose for translation;<sup>13</sup> this latter passage, however, is only included in Sanhedrin.<sup>14</sup> Another inaccuracy of the Catalan text that can be emended

<sup>13</sup>The centrality of these Talmudic proof texts for the Tortosa Disputation is also confirmed by the Hebrew accounts of the events; see del Valle Rodríguez (2021: III, 1607 and 1651).

<sup>14</sup>In the Latin and Aragonese records of the Tortosa Disputation the texts from Sanhedrin and Avodah Zarah are likewise mentioned, although for different sessions, consequently not giving any occasion for the above conflation. See del Valle Rodríguez (2021: I, 176 and 179 as well as II, 876 and 879).

with the help of the Aragonese *Tratado* concerns the expression “vuytanta c. v. jubileus durara lo mon,” where the numerical value of “vuytanta c. v.” is unclear. The Aragonese text shows that “e” (= ‘and’) should be read instead of “c.” (= ‘100’), i.e., the world will last for eighty-five jubilee cycles. The Catalan text ends rather unexpectedly, introducing a gloss by Rashi, which is contained in the *Tratado* but which was not translated or at least not copied in the manuscript of El Burgo de Osma.

The preceding textual comparison establishes Jerónimo of Santa Fe’s *Tratado* as the direct source of the Catalan fragment “De sacrefiçis.” Although similarities with other texts exist—above all with the Latin version of the *Tratado*, but also with regard to the records of the second phase of the Tortosa Disputation—there is clear evidence that the Catalan translator used the Aragonese version of Jerónimo’s work. Whether or not the extant Catalan fragment was part of a larger translation of the *Tratado* is open to debate. On the one hand, after translating two consecutive textual units from the *Tratado* (paragraphs 1 and 2), the translator added a paragraph (3) from a different part of the work; this, together with his general tendency to abbreviate the text, indicates that he did not intend to produce a full Catalan translation of the *Tratado*, but rather a selection. On the other hand, “De sacrefiçis” ends abruptly with a reference to Rashi which is left undeveloped. Moreover, the copyist’s errors in the extant Catalan text, such as “rera” for “terra,” prove that the manuscript from El Burgo de Osma does not contain the original text, but was copied from another codex, which may well have contained further translations from Jerónimo’s *Tratado*. In fact, the nineteenth-century historian Jaime Villanueva saw a manuscript with further Catalan fragments of the *Tratado*, which is now lost (Villanueva 1851: 178, 336–53).

Regardless of its original coverage, which may have been larger than what is preserved today, “De sacrefiçis” bears witness to the influence and wide diffusion of Jerónimo’s treatise, which was the blueprint for the Tortosa Disputation. Scholars knew of its Portuguese translation, published by the Archbishop of Goa, D. Gaspar Leão Pereira, in 1565 (Orfali 2014), which in turn was used by Fray Luis de Granada (Kaplan Szyld

2020).<sup>15</sup> To this we must add a Catalan translation or at least fragments of the *Tratado*, which seem to reflect its original text more faithfully than does the Aragonese manuscript from Biblioteca Nacional de España that transmits the work, as some of the differences between the Catalan and the Aragonese text suggest, e.g., Catalan “causar” for the faulty Aragonese “cassar.”

But “De sacrefiçis” does not only allow us to get closer to the historical events of Tortosa 1412–1414: no less important is the fact that the Catalan fragments of the *Tratado* feature one of very few surviving examples of the reception of rabbinic literature in medieval Catalan, comparable in importance only to the Catalan translation of Peter Alfonsi’s *Dialogus*.<sup>16</sup>

<sup>15</sup> Textual evidence suggests that also this translation—like the Catalan fragment—was prepared from the Aragonese *Tratado*, and not its Latin cognate.

<sup>16</sup> Unfortunately, only fragments of this translation, which must have covered the whole text, have survived. See Ainaud de Lasarte (1943) and de Puig i Oliver (2001: 502–03).

## Manuscripts Cited

El Burgo de Osmá, Biblioteca del Cabildo de la Catedral, MS 35.  
Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional de España, MS 10276.

## Works Cited

- Alfonso of Valladolid/Abner of Burgos. 1994–1996. *Mostrador de Justicia*, 2 vols., edited by Walter Mettmann. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Ainaud de Lasarte, Juan. 1943. “Una versión catalana desconocida de los *Dialogi* de Pedro Alfonso.” *Sefarad* 3: 359–76.
- Bernardus Oliver. 1965. *El tratado ‘Contra caecitatem Judaeorum,’* edited by Francisco Cantera Burgos. Madrid: CSIC.
- Cantera Burgos, Francisco 1965. “Textos de polémica antijudaica y judeo-catalano-aragoneses en un manuscrito de Burgo de Osmá.” *Revista de filología española* 48, no. 1–2: 135–44. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3989/rfe.1965.v48.i1/2.908>.
- del Valle Rodríguez, Carlos. 2021. *La Disputa judeocristiana de Tortosa: Edición crítica de las Actas en la versión latina y edición príncipe de la versión hispano-aragonesa, junto con los dos relatos hebreos contemporáneos*. Zaragoza: Institución Fernando el Católico.
- De Puig i Oliver, Jaume. 2001. “Més nous textos catalans antics de la Biblioteca Capitular i Colombina de Sevilla.” *Arxiu de textos catalans antics* 20: 453–510.
- Díez Merino, Luis. 1982. *Targum de Salmos: Edición príncipe del Ms. Villa-Amil n. 5 de Alfonso de Zamora*. Madrid: Instituto Francisco Suárez.
- Hasselhoff, Görge K. 2004. *Dicit Rabbi Moyses: Studien zum Bild von Moses Maimonides im lateinischen Westen vom 13. bis zum 15. Jahrhundert*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Würzburg.
- Jerónimo de Santa Fe. 1677. *Tractatus primus ad convincendum perfidiam iudaeorum*. In *Maxima Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum et Antiquorum Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum*, vol. XXVI, edited by Marguerin de La Bigne. Lyon: Apud Anissonios, 529–45.
- Jerónimo de Santa Fe. 2013. *El Tratado (ha-Ma’amar)*, edited by Carlos del Valle Rodríguez. Madrid: Aben Ezra Ediciones.
- Kaplan Szyld, Axel. 2020. “¿*Adversus iudaeos* o proconverso? Teología proconversa en la Cuarta parte de la *Introducción del símbolo de la fe* (1583).” *Hispania Sacra* 72: 377–89. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3989/hs.2020.026>.

- Mack, Hananel. 2010. *The Mystery of Rabbi Moshe Hadarshan*. Jerusalem: Mo-sad Bialik (Hebrew).
- Maimonides, Moses. 1520. *Dux seu director dubitantium aut perplexorum*, edited by Augustinus Iustinianus (Giustiniani). Paris: Ab Iodoco Badio Ascensio. Rpr. Frankfurt am Main: Minerva, 1964.
- Maimonides, Moses. 1963. *The Guide of the Perplexed*, 2 vols., translated by Shlomo Pines, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Orfali, Moisés. 1998. *Talmud y Cristianismo. Historia y causas de un conflicto*. Madrid: Riopiedras.
- Orfali, Moisés. 2014. *Tratado que fez mestre Jerónimo, médico do papa Bento XIII, contra os judeus*. Lisbon: Biblioteca Nacional de Portugal.
- Petrus Alfonsi. 2018. *Dialogus, vol. I*, edited by Carmen Cardelle de Hartmann, Darko Senekovic, and Thomas Ziegler, translated into German by Peter Stotz. Florence: SISMEL.
- Raimundus Martini. 1687. *Pugio fidei adversus Mauros et Judaeos*, edited by Joseph de Voisin, introduced by Johann Benedikt Carpzov. Leipzig: Sump-tibus haeredum F. Lanckisi. Rpr. Farnborough: Gregg Press, 1967.
- Riera i Sans, Jaume. 1974. *La crònica en hebreu de la Disputa de Tortosa*. Barcelona: Fundació Salvador Vives Casajuana.
- Riera i Sans, Jaume. 1989. "Literatura antijueva en català: textos i difusió." *Estudi General* 9: 215–36.
- Villanueva, Jaime. 1851. *Viage literario a las iglesias de España. Tomo XV*. Madrid: Imprenta de la Real Academia de la Historia.