

Otro tema es el de la Epístola farsa de San Esteban. La evidencia que aporta Haines pone de manifiesto el que sus ejemplos más antiguos van en lengua de oíl, pero puesto que el último que edita es de principios del siglo xv, tal vez hubiese valido la pena dar en lugar suyo alguno del siglo xiv con letra en catalán y no en francés antiguo, como es el caso. Hubiese sido una forma de enriquecer el marco lingüístico de esta curiosa pieza del repertorio musical sacro.

Todo lo cual no resta ni un ápice al valor de un trabajo erudito, riguroso y cuidado al detalle que aboga por la no discriminación de un repertorio de tradición oral que si apenas dejó huella no por ello merece ser olvidado. Si en el futuro se rompe lo que hasta ahora ha sido la tendencia general, buena parte del mérito le habrá correspondido a John Haines.

Maricarmen Gómez Muntané
Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona
 Carmen.Gomez@uab.cat



HARVEY J. HAMES (ed.), *Ha-Melacha ha-Ketzara, A Hebrew Translation of Ramon Llull's Ars brevis*, Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio medievalis 247. Raimundi Lulli Opera Latina. Supplementum Lullianum, Tomus III, Turnhout: Brepols, 2012, LIII+193 pp., ISBN: 978-2-503-54198-3.

It is well known that since Picco della Mirandola wrote his *Apology* Ramon Llull's relationship with the Jewish World acquired a particular turn. Since then the, so to speak, kabbalistic dimension within the Lullian heritage has been the object of extensive discussion yet a ghostly matter whose positive evidence remained for centuries as next to nothing.

Astonishing as it may appear the only witness to this cultural and religious meeting, *Ha-Melacha ha-Ketzara*, has been known to the researchers for more than a century yet it has been kept untouched. The history tells a lot about the intricate labyrinth these sort of studies has come to be sometimes. That's why it is really good news finally to see that an end is put to this sad delay. Great homage is then due to the great scholar Moritz Steinschneider (†1907) and to all those who have taken pains to make the survival of this great manuscript possible and come to light today.

These initial words were absolutely necessary to introduce in a proper way a publication which appears to our eyes as an event. The *Ars brevis* Hebraized as *Ha-Melacha ha-Ketzara* is a translation but also in a sense a new book as the

editor H. Hames rightly points out. And it is indeed a most significant composition because its content sheds new light on some aspects of the Kabbala during the Renaissance. Such a book is thus perfectly suitable to honor the *Corpus Christianorum* within the *Continuatio medievalis* and it may be not necessarily the last of this sort to appear.

The edition is due to Harvey J. Hames. He offers the Hebrew text and its translation face to face accompanied by the Latin original. A triple comparative job very few people would attempt with such success. His skill pervades the whole work giving to the reader plenty of welcomed and illuminating notes. The translation intricacies are many and each textual difference is extremely difficult to fix. Additions, blanks and mistranslations often appear to receive due treatment. Additionally, the text is sometimes purposely obscure and, this is no secret, Ramon Llull is far from simple even when summarizing himself. The result fares very well and few things remain to be clarified. Tables and figures are also excellent. Unfortunately the publisher has not felt compelled to print them. Real color images would have allowed the manuscript's idiosyncrasies to be easily grasped. It is indeed always a most welcomed effort.

The introduction includes a lengthy chapter about the way *Ha-Melacha ha-Ketzara* was understood and used. Assuming for Pinhas Zvi a strong closeness in interests with Johanan Alemanno, H. Harvey focuses on Alemanno's approach to Ramon Llull's doctrines since his activities and thoughts are much better known. The parallels found so far are striking and completely sound. Yet a slight objection should be posited to express some little concern for the way "magical activities" in general and Ramon Llull's doctrines are put together. Thus in some instances (p. xxv) the lines between these two areas seem to inadvertently blur whereas keeping these areas clear and distinct is capital no matter how much Alemanno and his circle fused and/or confused them. Of course such ideas are not in the author's mind. But let us be overcautious by saying that some crude reader might wrongly imagine that devoting oneself to read the *Ars brevis* and studying the *Summulae logicales*, is naturally coherent with performing magic. Indeed, the idea that "the *Ars brevis* also has magical potential" was, no doubt, assumed by individuals such as Alemanno. But it must be acknowledged too that this behavior would have appeared as something completely puzzling to Ramon Llull and his tradition. It should not be forgotten that he was particularly careful on this point, not allowing astronomical, alchemical and pneumatological practices to come to the fore.

At this point the concurrence of Abulafia triggers the interest for this introduction. A number of points are mentioned disclosing seemingly Abulafian influences in the Hebrew *Ars brevis*. They are generally convincing overall. But perhaps it might have been better to make clear first how difficult is to bridge from Llull

to Abulafia or vice versa, particularly in the way God's contemplation through the divine names is intended (p. xxxvi). In this sense the depicted Abulafian influence on Alemanno and his circle is one positive thing, its reaching subsequently also to Pico della Mirandola is a matter of some hesitation for us in terms of degree. Just to point out a single aspect about this very complex issue, Picco's so often quoted words about this, also recalled here by H. Harvey, say: "Unam quae dicitur *hokhmat ha-zeruf* id est ars combinandi et est modus quidam procedendi in scientiis et est simile quid sicut apud nostros dicitur ars Raymundi, licet forte diverso modo procedant." We are afraid of Mirandola might have been here less enthusiastic than it might seem at first sight. It is worth observing the very cautious ending of his statement: "they well may proceed in a very (literally: "strong") different way". But it is also equally important to realize that it is the *hokhmat ha-zeruf* which is compared with the *Ars* and not the other way round. The *quid* in this point makes clear that the "simile" is not exactly balanced; not $A : B$, but $A < B$. Abulafia's letter-combinatory Kabbalah is the thing matched against, reduced to or made "similar to just —note the stressing *sicut*— that which among us is called 'ars Raymundi'" and this requires some restraint in relation to the suggested Picco's Lullistic Abulafianism at least in the reviewer's opinion. Anyway, that's but an alibi to engage further discussions.

The differences between the *Ars brevis* and *Ha-Melacha ha-Ketzara* are carefully explained. Each dissimilarity, word by word, letter by letter, truly asks for a careful study. H. Harvey provides this here with seminal and sound information but surely because of lack of space he has been forced to limit his very interesting explanations. Let's hope that in the near future a new publication will expand appropriately on these important issues.

The amount of further research that this text may attract is important. For instance, it is noticeable that Roman names spelled throughout the *Ha-Melacha ha-Ketzara* betray neither a French nor a truly Italian speaker but rather an Occitan and/or other related languages tongue scribe. As an example: משטרא (p. 193, l. 15) reads: "Mestre", to be preferred to the Italian wording: "Maestro" or even to an alleged French one as: "Maître". The fascinating Hebrew Latin transliteration table (pp. 6-7) also contains signs of this: מגניטות for "Magnitut" against Latin "Magnitudo", or קונטרריתט for "contraritat" instead of "contrarietas", etc. By the way, it is to be noted that לוקאריי should be a scribe or ms. mistake for "luksuria". Anyway, this idiomatic point, whose full development would take the length of a monographic study, is far more important than it might seem at first sight.

Perhaps it is best to illustrate this point by means of a small case and also in order to expand the footnotes (p. xxvii, n. 3, and p. 192, n. 14) that refer to

Pinhas Zvi, the too little known first copyist of this manuscript and also to offer an illustrative example of its value for the history of the Renaissance. As a starting point, this name is to be identified first with the biblical Phinehas or Phineas, the grandson of Aaron (פִּינְחָס < פְּנָחָס) (Exod. 6, 25). Bearing in mind that the Tiberian reading is *Pinchas*, this last pronunciation may serve as a base to grasp the transformation it suffered when the *yod* was chopped off and the last two consonants were assimilated with the old Occitan Latin digraph, *nh* —which represents a palatal [ɲ]— giving as a result not just this odd reading to Phinehas but also producing a remarkable homophone with an Occitan word whose meaning is “pine-cone” in the plural. Such a virtue is shared and sought after by many Jewish in multicultural societies. The point here is that the Occitan Pinhas is very easily rendered and reversed into Catalan given the fact that *nh* = *ny*, thus Pinhas = Pinyes. And, curiously enough, that this is the name carried by a very old Jewish family in Majorca, credited even amongst the last surviving ones. May Pinhas Zvi perhaps have had somewhere Catalan-Majorcan roots?

Another possible clue gives some greater credence to this hypothesis. Pinhas Zvi himself, or his own father’s extended name, appears in the colophon this way: Abin Abat Ibn Tura Hafetz. This lengthy name displays easily recognizable Arabic trends that point to Islamic culture acquired only by living within its borders. But what is more interesting here is the family name *Tura* (אָטור). As a matter of fact, the old Semitic roots are already there: Aramaic/Arabic **tūr*, mountain. Again, its Catalan doublet means: ‘calcareous stone’ or ‘mountain’ and *Tur* as a family name of old is still well known today in Eivissa, the famous Balearic Island. Yet it is widespread too in the Occitan and Catalan speaking under the form *Tura*, and it is also found in Italy and —worse still— it is used everywhere as a shortening for long names, i.e.: Bonaventura > Ventura > Tura. All in all, the conflation of Arabic styled names, recognizable catalano-occitan idiomatic signs and a couple of Majorcan lineages such as Pinhas/Pinyes and Tura/Tur in a single Jewish person is striking even considering the tentative nature of the present perusal.

Still there is an amazing point to be considered. If *Tura* is read in Hebrew it means also: “column, row” rendered in Italian as *Colon*! This word can not be confused semantically with a ‘dove’ (French: *Colombe*). Did the Colon family previously translate their name? Did they have roots in Mallorca too? Might Pinhas Zvi be even related with Rabbi Joseph ben Salomon Colon?

Anyway, on the basis of several graphical particularities *Ha-Melacha ha-Ketzara* presents traces of Hebrew translators or scribes from Occitan stock still fresh whilst working in Italy. And even an older Catalan-Majorcan dimension may be posited if the hitherto mentioned genealogical considerations could be

ascertained for sure, making thus easier to understand how the *Ars brevis* came to be translated into Hebrew. No doubt *ha-Melacha ha-Ketzara* keeps more than one secret.

Víctor Pallejà de Bustinza
Universitat Pompeu Fabra
 victor.palleja@upf.edu



NINA IAMANIDZÉ, *Les installations liturgiques sculptées des églises de Géorgie (VI-XIII siècles)*, Brepols, Bibliothèque de l'Antiquité Tardive 15, 2010 304 pp., 173 ill., ISBN 978-2-503-53408-4.

Nos encontramos ante un trabajo clásico de catalogación de material disperso procedente de instalaciones litúrgicas de iglesias georgianas, con una cronología variable entre los siglos V y XIII. El estudio se organiza entre restos de conjuntos bautismales, altares, *templa* o cancelos y cierres corales, y un último apartado dedicado a las imágenes con las que se decoraron de los *templa* y sus singularidades iconográficas.

De este trabajo, llama muy especialmente la atención la amplitud cronológica, que nos hace toparnos ante dos hechos diametralmente opuestos. Por un lado, la pervivencia en los usos de un determinado tipo de material que había conseguido adquirir todas las constantes posibles para su proyección temporal. Muy especialmente en el caso de los cancelos y cierres presbiteriales que, desde los ejemplos más antiguos datables en el siglo IX, hasta los más tardíos, como el *templon* de Saṭ'xé, de pleno siglo XIII, habían solventado por completo el problema de la separación de ámbitos litúrgicos como el presbiterio y la nave del templo, sin plantear necesidades de cambio, esto es, dilatándose en formas y uso durante centurias. El otro factor a tener en cuenta parte de todo lo contrario. Desde las primeras piezas que integran el catálogo hasta las del siglo XIII, hay una variación estilística espectacular, que hace saltar desde los relieves baustismales más toscos a las más delicadas y tardías tallas de *templa*. En este mismo sentido, cabe destacar la clara organización de motivos iconográficos en relación a la funcionalidad de la pieza, con escenas de bautismo en las pilas bautismales, motivos eucarísticos en los altares y temas más dispersos en las placas de cancel y cierres corales, que van de los ángeles y predicadores más tempranos, a la Hospitalidad de Abrahán, ciclos narrativos de la vida de Cristo o escenas de Santos, como en los cuatro relieves del *templon* de Siomg'vimé, datado en el siglo XI. La complicación iconográfica es