

***The Ladino Istoriah de Iesus natsareno (EH 47 D 10)***  
***as the Vorlage of the Huldricus version of the Toledot Yeshu\****

IGNACIO CHUECAS SALDÍAS  
Universidad Finis Terrae, Santiago de Chile

My interest in the narratives linked to the *Toledot Yeshu* began a couple of years ago as a result of my work on an inquisitorial lawsuit brought by the Holy Office of the Ciudad de los Reyes (Viceroyalty of Peru) against New Christian Francisco Coronel de Acevedo, who brought his crime of Judaism before this tribunal in 1603.<sup>1</sup> In the course of his confessions, Francisco recounted how, in his native village of Salvatierra de Galicia around 1588, his own sister Felippa Cardosa convinced him that Jesus was not the Messiah (‘que xpo no hera el mexias’) and that the Law of Moses was the only way to salvation. In order to achieve her goal, Felippa had shown her brother a series of proofs that refuted traditional Christian arguments. As she put it, Jesus was not entirely a Jew (‘no hera judio entero’). What is more, he performed miracles—one of which was to climb up a ray of sunlight—because he had stolen some papers from the Temple of the Lord, hiding them in the flesh of his thigh or his arm. In a first instance, because I was interested in other subjects, this passage did not attract my attention. Only somewhat later did I realise that the mention of Jesus hiding some papers in his own flesh reminded me of something I had read many years before.

This article intends to take this interest a step further. In particular, I would like to add information to the question of the Iberian traditions linked to these narratives.<sup>2</sup> From my research on the case of Felippa Cardosa and her brother, it became evident

---

\* This article is funded by the Fondecyt Iniciación N° 11200876 project: ‘Portugueses entre los Reynos del Pirú y el Gran Reyno de la China (siglos XVI–XVII).’ I would like to thank the thematic section editor, Daniel Barbu, for his constant support during the writing process, the blind reviewers for their invaluable comments and the editing team for their excellent work.

<sup>1</sup> Inquisitorial trial against Francisco Coronel de Acevedo (1603–1604), Archivo Histórico Nacional de Madrid, Consejo de la Inquisition, leg. 1648, exp. 3, fols. 1r–28v; IGNACIO CHUECAS SALDÍAS, ‘Felippa Cardosa y el Sefer Toledot Yeshu: Agencia femenina y polémica anticristiana en un proceso ante el Santo Oficio de la Ciudad de los Reyes (1588–1603),’ *Memorias: Revista Digital de Historia y Arqueología desde el Caribe colombiano* 18, n. 47 (2022): 8–42.

<sup>2</sup> Among the few articles that deal with the Iberian traditions of the *Toledot Yeshu*: PAOLA TARTAKOFF, ‘The *Toledot Yeshu* and Jewish-Christian Conflict in the Medieval Crown of Aragon,’ in *Toledot Yeshu (“The Life Story of Jesus”) Revisited: A Princeton Conference*, eds PETER SCHÄFER, MICHAEL MEERSON, and YAACOV DEUTSCH (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 297–309.

that a series of characteristic versions of the *Toledot Yesbu* were in circulation among the Jewish communities of the Iberian Peninsula and later among Judaizing circles during the medieval and early modern period. Basically, they were the narratives that Samuel Krauss identified as belonging to the Wagenseil type,<sup>3</sup> and Riccardo di Segni to the Helena group.<sup>4</sup>

The most significant testimonies of these versions relating to the Iberian Peninsula include: the quotations of the *Pugio fidei* composed by Raimundo Martín (or Raymundus Martini) in Barcelona around 1280 and published in Paris in 1651;<sup>5</sup> the mention in the inquisitorial trial against Janto Almuli and his companions, again in Barcelona, in 1341;<sup>6</sup> the quotations in the *Eben Bohan* written by Shem-Tob Ibn Shaprut in Tarragona around 1385;<sup>7</sup> the quotations in the trial of Francisco Coronel de Acevedo that must date from around 1588;<sup>8</sup> and the quotations that appear in the *Relation of a Journey begun Anno Domini 1610* by George Sandys published in London in 1615.<sup>9</sup> One of the features linking these versions has to be the episode of the theft of the Holy Name guarded in the temple of Jerusalem by two magical statues of lions or dogs. In addition, these versions describe a series of miracles performed by Jesus following the model of the canonical and apocryphal gospels. Some of these descriptions mention Jesus climbing or riding on a sunbeam.

As can be seen, all of the sources relating to Iberia consist of fragmentary texts. However, in my search for complete versions of Judeo-Iberian origin, I came across two Ladino manuscripts kept in the Ets Haim library in Amsterdam which contain complete handwritten versions of the *Toledot Yesbu* in the language of Castile. The first is an Aljamiado text entitled *איסטוריה די ישׁו״ז נאצארינו* (*Istoriah de Iesus natsareno*) bearing the signature EH 47 D 10 folios 196r–206v, while the second is a text in Latin script with the title *Historia De x̃po: su Nasimiento Vida y Muerte*, bearing the signature EH 48 E 15.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>3</sup> SAMUEL KRAUSS, *Das Leben Jesu nach jüdischen Quellen* (Berlin: S. Calvary & Co., 1902), 27–31.

<sup>4</sup> RICCARDO DI SEGNI, *Il vangelo del Ghetto. Le “storie di Gesù”: leggende e documenti della tradizione medievale ebraica* (Rome: Newton Compton, 1985), 33–40.

<sup>5</sup> RAIMUNDO MARTÍN, *Pugio fidei adversus Mauros, et Iudeos; Nunc primum in lucem editus* (Paris: Mathurin Henault, Johannem Henault, 1651).

<sup>6</sup> JOSEP PERARNAU I ESPELT, ‘El procés inquisitorial barceloní contra els jueus Janto Almuli, la seva muller Jamila i Jucef de Quatorze (1341–1342),’ *Revista Catalana de Teologia* 4, no. 2 (1979): 309–53.

<sup>7</sup> JOSÉ-VICENTE NICLÓS, *Šem Ṭob Ibn Šaprut. La Piedra de Toque’ (Eben Bohan). Una Obra de Controversia Judeo-Cristiana* (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1997); ISRAEL BARUCH MESINGER, *ניטל ומאורעותיו חשיפת מקורות טעמים ונימוקים עם הערות וציונים עם אוסף אגדות* (Spring Valley: Israel Baruch Mesinger, 2000).

<sup>8</sup> Inquisitorial trial against Francisco Coronel de Acevedo, 1603–1604, Archivo Histórico Nacional de Madrid, Consejo de la Inquisición, leg. 1648, exp. 3, fols. 1r–28v.

<sup>9</sup> GEORGE SANDYS, *A Relation of a Journey begun An. Dom. 1610* (London: W. Barrett, 1615).

<sup>10</sup> Although a transcription of this text has been published (with some minor errors), the editors failed to recognise it as a version of the *Toledot Yesbu*: HARM DEN BOER and KENNETH BROWN, eds, *El barroco*

An initial inquiry into both texts shows that, without doubt, the second belongs to the tradition of the Wagenseil-Helena type. The first, on the other hand, is undoubtedly of the Herod type, in the nomenclature of Riccardo di Segni,<sup>11</sup> or *Huldreich* in that of Krauss.<sup>12</sup>

The manuscript of the *Historia De xp̄o: su Nasimiento Vida y Muerte* (EH 48 E 15) has a printed frontispiece, to which a handwritten title has been added (there is also a second variant of the same title in the heading of the first folio), as well as the date 1700 and the place of composition: Lisboa (Lisbon). Both the calligraphy and the frontispiece confirm its eighteenth-century origin. It is very likely, although more careful analysis is needed, that it is indeed a translation of the text published by Johann Christoph Wagenseil in 1681.<sup>13</sup>

This article is primarily concerned with the text entitled *איסטוריייה די ישׁו״ז נאצארינו* (EH 47 D 10). It is a manuscript that was bequeathed to the Ets Haim library in 1885 together with a set of 37 other documents following the death of their owner Jacob van Jacob Ferrares, rabbi of The Hague.<sup>14</sup> As for the origin of this manuscript, one can only speculate that Ferrares acquired it around the middle of the nineteenth century in the same city of Amsterdam or another place in the Low Countries.<sup>15</sup>

While it is practically impossible to account for the complexities of a text of this nature in such a short article, I nevertheless intend to cast light on two central aspects: first, the internal features of the text (dating, authorship and the cultural-literary context of its first redaction), and second, its relationship with the version published by Johann Jacob Ulrich in 1705<sup>16</sup> (I will refer to this version as *Huldricus*).

---

*sefardí. Abraham Gómez Silveira. Arévalo, prov. de Ávila, Castilla 1656–Amsterdam 1741. Estudio preliminar, obras líricas, vejámenes en prosa y verso y documentación personal* (Kassel: Edition Reichenberger, 2000), 264–77.

<sup>11</sup> DI SEGNI, *Il vangelo del Ghetto*, 40–41.

<sup>12</sup> KRAUSS, *Das Leben Jesu nach jüdischen Quellen*, 33–35.

<sup>13</sup> JOHANN CHRISTOPH WAGENSEIL, *Tela Ignae Satanae. Hoc est: Arcani et horribiles Judaorum adversus Christum Deum, et Christianam religionem libri anecdotoi* (Altdorf: Joh. Henricus Schönnerstædt, 1681).

<sup>14</sup> LAJB FUKS and RENA G. FUKS-MANSFELD, *Hebrew and Judaic Manuscripts in Amsterdam Public Collections*, 2 vols., vol. 2, *Catalogue of the Manuscripts of Ets Haim/Livraria Montezinos, Sephardic Community of Amsterdam* (Leiden: Brill, 1975), IX. Jacob van Jacob Ferrares (b. Amsterdam, 1805, d. The Hague, 1884), studied at the Jewish-Portuguese seminary in Amsterdam, his hometown, where he later served in the Kenéséth Abraham synagogue, before completing his studies in The Hague, where he served as chief rabbi until his death: PHILIPP CHRISTIAAN MOLHUYSEN, PETRUS JOHANNES BLOK, and FRIEDRICH KARL HEINRICH KOSSMANN, eds, *Nieuw Nederlandsch biografisch woordenboek*, 10 vols., vol. 7 (Leiden: A.W. Sijthoff, 1927), 433–34.

<sup>15</sup> There is evidence that Rabbi Ferrares acquired a series of manuscripts belonging to the estate of the broker Meijer Levien Jacobson (b. Rotterdam, 1782, d. Amsterdam, 1864) in Amsterdam in 1864, FUKS and FUKS-MANSFELD, *Hebrew and Judaic Manuscripts*, 89.

<sup>16</sup> JOHANNES JACOB ULRICH, *ספר תולדות ישוע הנוצרי Historia Jeschuae Nazareni, à Judæis blasphemè corrupta, ex Manuscripto hactenus inedito nunc demum edita, ac Versione et Notis (quibus Judæorum nequitia propius deteguntur, et Authoris asserta ineptiæ ac impietatis conuincuntur) illustrata* (Leiden: Johannem du Vivie, Is. Severinum, 1705).

**Dating EH 47 D 10**

The current copy of the text is a Ladino edition in cursive Mughrabi (מערבית) Hebrew script written around the middle of the seventeenth century by a scribe probably born in North Africa, but who may well have worked in Amsterdam or elsewhere in the Western Sephardic Diaspora.<sup>17</sup> If this dating is correct, then this version must automatically be considered to predate Huldricus and hence to be the probable *Vorlage* of the 1705 edition. A characteristic of the handwriting of EH 47 D 10 is the tendency to ligate letters, especially Yod, which is often linked to the accompanying consonants, especially Aleph, Tet, Mem, Nun, Pe and Qof. Something similar happens with Waw, but to a lesser extent. Then, of course, there is the common ligature of Aleph and Lamed. At the same time, the consonants Gimel, Kaf and Pe are often marked with the Rafe sign (רפה) in order to identify the fricative sounds typical of Spanish: Gimel (ג̣) = Ch, Kaf (כ̣) = J and Pe (פ̣) = F.

When looking for an analogous example in Ladino orthography, the closest printed text is undoubtedly the ריגימינטו דילה וידה by Moses Ben Baruch Almosnino (1515–1580), published in Thessaloniki in 1564.<sup>18</sup> Both works display the same continuous tendency to transcribe the usual characters in the Castilian text using exactly the same letter strands. For example, T is always Tet and never Taw. The Spanish feminine ending (-a) is frequently reproduced with the letter He (and not Alef) and the masculine (-o) with Waw. Perhaps the only important digression between the two writing systems lies in Almosnino's differentiation between the use of Bet and Waw to reproduce the Castilian B and V. EH 47 D 10, on the other hand, as a rule only employs Bet and never Waw (but a differentiation sometimes occurs when ב̣ is used to reproduce V). At the same time, our manuscript shows a clear preference for Samech when reproducing the letter S, unlike Almosnino's text which often uses Shin as well in this case.<sup>19</sup> An important feature of our text is the very frequent occurrence of words beginning with the letter He (on the first folio of the document one already finds:

<sup>17</sup> As happens to be the case of Isaac Ben Abraham Uziel, born in Fez, who arrived in Amsterdam around 1615 to assume the role of rabbi at the K.K. Neve Shalom, and died in that city in 1622. The repertory of manuscripts of the Ets Haim library preserves a collection of Hebrew poetry (EH 47 E 32) copied by this rabbi showing very similar North African cursive handwriting to EH 47 D 10. On this author, see also MARVIN J. HELLER, *The Seventeenth Century Hebrew Book. An Abridged Thesaurus*, 2 vols., vol. 1 (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 456–57.

<sup>18</sup> MOSE BEN BARUCH ALMOsnINO, ספר הנהגת החיים or ריגימינטו דילה וידה (Thessaloniki: Yosef ben Yishaq ben Yosef Yaabes, 1564).

<sup>19</sup> PASCUAL PASCUAL RECUERO, 'Nota para la historia del Ladino: una teoría vocálica desdeñada,' *Miscelánea de Estudios Árabes y Hebraicos. Sección Hebreo* 34 (1985): 113–45 (120). This does not mean that EH 47 D 10 does not sometimes also use Shin, as is the case of the word אירמוזישימה in the first folio.

הידאלגו, הירמוזו, האסטה, הויירון, היגוס אי היגאס and הירמון). As Aldina Quintana has shown, this is a common phenomenon in Ladino texts prior to the seventeenth century.<sup>20</sup>

In EH 47 D 10, the majority of the proper names preserve the original Spanish spelling, which is very striking, because Ladino texts generally tend to reproduce Hebrew proper names according to the Hebrew orthography. Some of the most representative examples include:

| EH 47 D 10 | EH 47 D 10    | EH 48 E 15 | Huldricus |
|------------|---------------|------------|-----------|
| Iesús      | ישׁוּעַ       | Jeosua     | יזו"ש     |
| Ieudah     | יאודה         | Jeudá      | יהודה     |
| Jerusalém  | כִּירוּסאַלַם | Jerusalaim | ירושלים   |
| Josefe     | כּוֹסִיפִי    | Josseph    | יוסף      |
| Simón      | סימון         | Simon      | שמעון     |

Table 1. Examples of spelling of proper names showing different orthographies.

As can be seen from the comparison in Table 1, the Huldricus version regularly follows the Hebrew variant, with the significant exception of the name of Jesus which seems to retain the original spelling of EH 47 D 10. Something similar happens in the Ladino version of EH 48 E 15 which in general, despite being written in Latin characters, tends to transcribe the proper names according to the Hebrew forms. A characteristic of our text is the consistent reproduction of the Castilian Jota (J), as in the case of Josefe (כּוֹסִיפִי) and Jerusalém (כִּירוּסאַלַם), with the consonant Kaf accompanied by a Rafe (כּ) to differentiate it from the K (כ) sound.

Similar phenomena occur in EH 47 D 10 with regard to the numerous institutions and terms proper to the Jewish tradition, nearly always referred to using the Castilian words and rarely the usual Hebrew ones (Table 2).<sup>21</sup> Once again, the comparison with EH 48 E 15 demonstrates the tendency of EH 47 D 10 to prefer Castilian variants over Hebrew ones. This is even more surprising considering that EH 47 D 10 is written in Hebrew characters (Aljamiado) while EH 48 E 15 uses the Castilian alphabet.

<sup>20</sup> ‘The regular spelling of the etymological voiceless labiodental fricative [f] in the initial word position with pe and he is characteristic of the 16th century, but in texts of the 17th century, he begins to disappear in word initial position, and after the 18th century, it is very sporadic,’ ALDINA QUINTANA, ‘From the Master’s Voice to the Disciple’s Script: Genizah Fragments of a Bible Glossary in Ladino,’ *Hispania Judaica Bulletin* 6 (5769/2008): 187–236 (207).

<sup>21</sup> Suffice it to compare the Ladino version of the Maʿasé Yeruśalmí published by Elena Romero, which is a very good example of Ladino narrative in the language used from the eighteenth century onwards in the Sephardic Jewries of East and North Africa. Indeed, the presence of Hebrew words is so recurrent in this text that for the uninitiated it becomes practically impossible to read. ELENA ROMERO, ‘Una versión Judeoespañola del relato hebreo Maʿasé Yeruśalmí,’ *Sefarad* 55, no. 1 (1995): 173–94.

|                         | EH 47 D 10                | EH 48 E 15             | Huldricus |
|-------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|-----------|
| Bastard                 | ממזר (only once)          | mamzer                 | ממזר      |
| Egypt                   | איכטו                     | -                      | מצרים     |
| Gemara                  | -                         | gemara                 | -         |
| Holy and ineffable name | נומברי סאנטו אי איניפאבלי | nombre grande ynefable | שם המפורש |
| House of learning       | קוליכיו                   | -                      | בית מדרש  |
| Law                     | ליי                       | ley and din            | תורה      |
| Marriage contract       | -                         | quedusim               | -         |
| Menstruation            | אריגלאדורה                | nida                   | נדה       |
| Mount of Holiness       | מונטי די לה סאנטידאד      | -                      | הר הבית   |
| Nazarene                | נאצארינו                  | -                      | נוצרי     |
| Sabbath                 | סאבאדו                    | sabat                  | שבת       |
| Sages                   | סאביוס                    | sabios                 | חכמים     |
| Talmud                  | -                         | talmud                 | -         |
| Trumpets                | -                         | sopharot               | -         |

Table 2. Examples of spelling of institutions and terms proper to the Jewish tradition showing different orthographies.

It was most probably the author of this transcription who Hebraised some terms, such as משה (Moses) and ישראל (Israel), in order to bring the text closer to the vernacular literature of the Sephardic communities which he frequented and for which his work was intended.<sup>22</sup> In this transcription process, the copyist misunderstood, or misinterpreted, some characteristic features of the original text, in particular the ligatures of some words, but in general no significant interventions seem to have been made.

The document is currently bound in a volume whose texts have usually been dated between the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.<sup>23</sup> Upon closer scrutiny, there is no doubt that EH 47 D 10 folios 196r–206v belong to the group of manuscripts copied in the seventeenth century, of which the copy of the ספר לקה טוב by Abraham ben Hananiah dei Galicchi Jagel (1553–1623) on folios 27r–43v, and the *Precepts for the Washing of the Deceased* on folios 207r–209v, are noteworthy examples. The first case is a work originally published in Venice at the end of the sixteenth century.<sup>24</sup> At the same time, a comparison with EH 47 E 37, a collection of texts by Shalom ben Moses Ben Şur

<sup>22</sup> However, it is also likely that the author read ישראל according to the Spanish pronunciation.

<sup>23</sup> FUKS and FUKS-MANSFELD, *Hebrew and Judaic Manuscripts*, 231–32.

<sup>24</sup> On this author see ABRAHAM BEN HANANIAH DEI GALICCHI JAGEL, *A Valley of Vision. The Heavenly Journey of Abraham ben Hananiah Yagel*, trans. and ed. by DAVID B. RUDERMAN (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1990).

copied in cursive Mughrabi Hebrew script at the end of the seventeenth century,<sup>25</sup> can demonstrate with certainty that our manuscript dates from earlier than these texts. In this regard, the phenomenon of vowel ligature mentioned above is revealing: not only is it closely related to the typical forms of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Hispanic procedural writing (*escritura procesal*), but in the case of the cursive Mughrabi script<sup>26</sup> it is a feature that tends to peter out over time, to the point of its near-disappearance from texts of the eighteenth century.

All the arguments listed above lead to the certain conclusion that EH 47 D 10 is a seventeenth-century copy (or perhaps transcription from the Latin to the Mughrabi alphabet) of an older Castilian text probably written in the mid-sixteenth century.

### **Narrative Features of the Text**

The text of EH 47 D 10 consists of a series of stories or accounts that could very well have an independent existence,<sup>27</sup> and in turn are part of larger ensembles that may be called cycles. In total, four of these cycles can be identified in the current text:

#### **First Cycle: The Birth of Jesus**

- (1) Miriam and Josefe Pandera
- (2) Jesus's bastardy

#### **Second Cycle: In the Desert of Ay (Rome)**

- (1) Jesus denies the law
- (2) The king and sages send Judas to Jesus
- (3) The shepherd and the maiden
- (4) Night at the inn
- (5) The woman with the pitcher
- (6) The men of Qeriates (קירייאטיים)

#### **Third Cycle: Death in Jerusalem**

- (1) Return to Jerusalem
- (2) Death of the disciples and Jesus
- (3) Wars between Jerusalem and Ay

---

<sup>25</sup> FUKS and FUKS-MANSFELD, *Hebrew and Judaic Manuscripts*, 231.

<sup>26</sup> On the origin of the Hebrew Mughrabi cursive during the medieval period, its relationship with Arabic script and the use of ligatures, see JUDITH OLSZOWY-SCHLANGER, 'Crossing Palaeographical Borders: Bi-Alphabetical Scribes and the Development of Hebrew Script – The Case of the Maghrebi Cursive,' in *Studies in Semitic Linguistics and Manuscripts: A Liber Discipulorum in Honour of Professor Geoffrey Khan*, eds NADIA VIDRO, RONNY VOLLANDT, ESTHER-MIRIAM WAGNER, and JUDITH OLSZOWY-SCHLANGER (Uppsala: Uppsala Universitet, 2018), 299–319.

<sup>27</sup> That is to say, each of them usually has an introduction, a climax and a denouement. However, this does not mean that they have an independent origin from the actual text, but rather that they function as units of meaning, like a collection of anecdotes relating to a main character.

**Fourth Cycle: Simon el Qalfoseo (סימון אל קאלפוסיאו)**

- (1) The king and sages send Simon to Ay
- (2) The new alphabet
- (3) The meaning of the beast in the Book of Revelation
- (4) Idolatry of Ay
- (5) Eradication of all the kindred of Jesus

The first cycle, which could be defined as the birth of Jesus, includes two different stories: (1) the story of the elopement of Miriam and Josefe Pandera and (2) a second story whose central theme is the bastardy of Jesus. The first story makes an evident allusion to a literary genre popular in sixteenth-century Iberia but of late medieval origin: the romances or chivalric tales in which a dashing young man rescues a maiden from the place where she is imprisoned (usually a tower) and the two flee to a foreign country where they are not known.<sup>28</sup> In the case of EH 47 D 10, the story is full of clichés from this genre: Miriam is very beautiful (אירמווישימה); her husband (or keeper) locks her in the house (די פואירה סיראבה קון לייאבי); Pandera is a nobleman (הידאלגו); both fall in love at first sight; they engage in a dialogue through the window; Pandera runs to look for a ladder (באסי אי בוסקה אונה איסקאלה); Miriam descends by means of this ladder (אי בהכר). At the same time, the second story reveals a deep interest and concern with the issue of bastardy, which is treated, as was the norm in sixteenth-century Spain, under the category of honour.<sup>29</sup> This second passage includes important elements taken from the religious culture of the sixteenth-century Spanish milieu, while showing the same traits of anticlerical critique as Iberian burlesque literature.<sup>30</sup>

Perhaps the most admirable feature in the narrative layout of these two stories, however, which in turn speaks for the compositional skill of the author, is the way these literary references are interwoven with material originating from Jewish sources, especially the Talmud.<sup>31</sup> In our case, nonetheless, access to the Talmudic sources most

<sup>28</sup> JOAQUÍN GIMENO CASALDUERO, 'El Abencerraje y la hermosa Jarifa: Composición y significado,' *Nueva Revista de Filología Hispánica* 21, no. 1 (1972): 1–22; JOSÉ LUIS ALONSO HERNÁNDEZ, 'El tema de "Hero y Leandro" en la poesía sefardí,' *Castilla: Estudios de literatura* 13 (1988): 7–16. A burlesque version of this motif is found in LUIS VÉLEZ DE GUEVARA, *El diablo cojuelo. Novela de la otra vida. Traducida a esta por Luis Vélez de Guevara* (Madrid: Imprenta del Reyno. A costa de Alonso Pérez, 1641).

<sup>29</sup> GRACE E. COOLIDGE, *Sex, Gender, and Illegitimacy in the Castilian Noble Family, 1400–1600* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2022).

<sup>30</sup> BILLY BUSSELL THOMPSON and JOHN KEVIN WALSH, 'The Mercedarian's Shoes (Perambulations on the Fourth *Tratado* of *Lazarillo de Tormes*),' *Modern Language Notes* 103, no. 2 (1988): 440–48; MICHEL BOEGLIN, 'Discours anticlérical et littérature au milieu du XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle. Le cas du *Lazarillo de Tormes*,' *Sociocriticism* 22, no. 1–2 (2007): 65–96.

<sup>31</sup> There is no doubt that the editions of the Talmud produced in Venice during the first half of the sixteenth century by the Flemish printer Daniel Bomberg were of central importance in extending the knowledge of this text to a wider public of Jews and Christians, and in the new wave of censorship and burnings in Italian territories: ANGELO M. PIATTELLI, 'New Documents Concerning Bomberg's Printing



likely did not occur through Hebrew editions of the text, but rather through the abundant material available in Spanish (and Latin) circulating among the Sephardic communities of the Western Diaspora as a result of the controversies surrounding the alleged mentions of Jesus of Nazareth in the Talmudic treatises.<sup>32</sup> As is well known, the link between the narratives of the *Toledot Yeshu* and the Talmud is longstanding and it is even probable that the Talmud is the origin of the first stories in the textual history of the *Toledot Yeshu*.<sup>33</sup> The novelty of this new composition lies in its evident linguistic and thematic connection to a new type of controversial and apologetic literature composed in the vernacular.<sup>34</sup>

The second cycle, here entitled ‘In the Desert of Ay (Rome),’ consists of a sequence of short stories, most of which are of a markedly picaresque, pastoral character:<sup>35</sup> (1) Jesus denies the law; (2) the king of Jerusalem and the wise men send Judas as a spy; (3) the lazy shepherd and the diligent maiden; (4) the night at the inn and the dispute over the only piece of food, mentioned as ‘a roasted bird’ (אָבִי אַסְסֵאדָה); (4)

---

of the Talmud,’ in *Meḥevab le-Menahem. Studies in Honor of Menahem Hayyim Schmelzer*, eds SHMUEL GLICK, EVELYN M. COHEN, and ANGELO M. PIATTELLI (Jerusalem: JTS-Schocken Institute for Jewish Research, 5779/2019), 171–99; KENNETH R. STOW, ‘The Burning of the Talmud in 1553, in the Light of Sixteenth Century Catholic Attitudes toward the Talmud,’ *Bibliothèque d’Humanisme et Renaissance* 34, no. 3 (1972): 435–59.

<sup>32</sup> One of the works of anti-Talmudic polemic published during the sixteenth century that had the greatest impact among Sephardic authors was the *Bibliotheca sancta ex præcipuis Catholicæ Ecclesiæ auctoribus collecta* published in Venice in 1566 by Dominican convert Sisto da Siena or Sixtus Senensis (1520–1569). The works written in Spanish which comment on numerous passages relating to the version of EH 47 D 10 include a manuscript by Saul Levy Mortera, numerous copies of which are currently preserved in different archives: *Respuesta a las ojecciones con que el Sinense injustam.<sup>16</sup> calumnia al Talmud*; *Compuesto por el muy Docto Señor Habam Saul Levy Mortera en Amsterdam anno 5406*, Varios Tractados, Oriental Manuscripts and Printed Books, The British Library, Or. 8698, 175–222. See also, MOISÉS ORFALI, ed., *Tratado que fez mestre Jerónimo médico do papa Bento XIII, contra os Judeus. Impresso em Goa por João de Emdem, 1565* (Lisbon: Biblioteca Nacional de Portugal, 2014).

<sup>33</sup> KRAUSS, *Das Leben Jesu nach jüdischen Quellen*, 181–94.

<sup>34</sup> The foundation of the community of Amsterdam at the beginning of the seventeenth century was the start of a true explosion of apologetic literature among the Western Sephardim in reaction to the Christian polemic. Undoubtedly this literary production finds its antecedents in works composed during the previous century in the Italian Sephardic communities (such as *Consolacam as tribulacoens de Israel* by Samuel Usque). How this vernacular production (mainly in Spanish and Portuguese) is linked to Jewish apologetic literature of medieval Iberia is still a matter for further study. When looking at a source like the *Respuesta a las ojecciones con que el Sinense injustam.<sup>16</sup> calumnia al Talmud*, written by Saul Levy Mortera, exactly the same employment of hispanised Hebrew names can be observed as in EH 47 D 10: ‘R. Eliezer,’ ‘hijo de Satada,’ ‘Egipto,’ ‘hijo of Pandera,’ ‘Papos hijo de Jeudah,’ ‘Jesus Nazareno,’ ‘R. Aquiba,’ ‘Jeosuah hijo de Perahia,’ *Respuesta a las ojecciones*, 176–77. For an excellent introduction to this type of theological-literary production, consult: CARSTEN L. WILKE, *The Marrakesh Dialogues. A Gospel Critique and Jewish Apology from the Spanish Renaissance* (Leiden: Brill, 2014).

<sup>35</sup> On the Spanish pastoral novel, see FRANCISCO LÓPEZ ESTRADA, *Libros de pastores en la literatura española* (Madrid: Gredos, 1974); JUAN BAUTISTA AVALLE-ARCE, *La novela pastoril española* (Madrid: Istmo, 1975). On the fusion of picaresque, courtly and pastoral genres during the Spanish Golden Age, see the doctoral thesis MISUN KWON, *La fusión de los géneros en las novelas picarescas femeninas del siglo XVII* (PhD diss., Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Facultad de Filología, Departamento de Filología Española II, 1993).

the woman with the pitcher of water; (5) the men of Qeriatas (קיריאתיים) and the dance of Jesus. The close connection between these comical narratives and the popular literature of the Spanish Golden Age can be seen in the great affinity between them and the stories that make up *La Celestina* or *Comedia de Calisto y Melibea* (1500), *La Lozana andaluza* (1528), *Cancionero de Romances* (1547), *El Lazarillo de Tormes* (1554), *Los siete libros de la Diana* (1559), *Guzmán de Alfarache* (1599), *Quijote de la Mancha* (1605) and *La vida del Buscón* (1626).<sup>36</sup> In many of these works, the result is always very similar in that they all portray the adventures or buffoonish situations experienced by an antihero in his wanderings through the wasteland, situations in which the protagonist does not seem to be aware of how ridiculous his actions are, while justifying them by resorting to arguments that in the end make no real sense (as Jesus does by quoting verses from Scripture).

These first two cycles demonstrate a high degree of homogeneity from a literary and cultural point of view. They both deal with typical themes, in a way typical of sixteenth-century Spain. As examples, suffice it to cite the classic picaresque topoi of the lovers' elopement, the problem of bastardy, the pastoral and the vagabond. In particular, the cycle of the desert of Ay demonstrates the evident intention to mock and scorn a Jesus who is continually ridiculed by the actions of others as well as his own. At the same time, what is striking in these first two cycles is the scarce development of the most characteristically Jewish themes, even to the point of it seeming unlikely that the author knew the Hebrew language well. For the most part, the typically Hebrew elements present in these cycles seem to be taken from the Talmud, and the Old and perhaps also the New Testament.

The third series follows what might be called the cycle of death in Jerusalem. It includes three stories: (1) the first tells how Judas organises the return of Jesus to the city; (2) the second tells of the condemnation to death, first of the disciples and then of Jesus himself; (3) finally, the third, concluding story is an account of the wars generated between the Jews of Jerusalem (led by the king and the sages) and the inhabitants of Ay (Rome), adherents to the new doctrines of Jesus. These accounts—in particular the topic of the death on the cross—seem to deliberately avoid the canonical versions of the Christian gospels.<sup>37</sup> At the same time, the central argument seems to be the rivalry

---

<sup>36</sup> On many of these works, see the introduction and especially the basic chronology of the picaresque novel, in BEGOÑA RODRÍGUEZ RODRÍGUEZ, ed., *Antología de la novela picaresca española. Introducción, selección y edición* (Madrid: Centro de Estudios Cervantinos, 2005). Perhaps these features are what Krauss is referring to when he notes the resemblance of the Huldricus stories to Boccaccio's *Decameron*: 'Künstliche Verwertung talmudischer, neutestamentlicher, legendarischer und lokalsangenhafter Momente, manchmal an den Decamerone erinnernd,' KRAUSS, *Das Leben Jesu nach jüdischen Quellen*, 34.

<sup>37</sup> In EH 47 D 10 the death of Jesus takes place on a fork (*borca*): אי אינהורקארון אה ישׁוֹז אין לה הורקה פואיראס: די לירוסאלם. On this topic, the *Istoriah de Iesus natsareno* coincides not only with the version of EH 48 E 15

between Jews and Christians, identified with the inhabitants of Jerusalem and Rome.<sup>38</sup> These motifs have to be seen in relation to the continuous recurrence in the text of EH 47 D 10 of other moments of criticism and denigration of institutions proper to Roman Christianity: baptism; clerical tonsure; the canonical gospels and the book of the Apocalypse of John; the papacy through the figures of Peter, Simon el Qalfoseo and the magistrate of Ay (Rome); the cult of holy images; and the veneration of Mary, mother of Jesus.<sup>39</sup>

The fourth and last cycle, which could be called the cycle of Simon el Qalfoseo (קאלפוסיאון (סימון אל קאלפוסיאון)) includes:<sup>40</sup> (1) the king and sages send Simon to Ay (Rome); (2) the story of the origin of the Christian alphabet; (3) an interpretation of the vision of the beast in the Christian book of Revelation (Rv 13:1–10); (4) the story of idolatry in Ay; (5) and an account of the eradication of the kindred of Jesus by Simon himself, who happens to be the uncle of all those exterminated. The centrality of the figure of Simon el Qalfoseo in the final cycle could be related to his mention in relation to Mary at the beginning of the story, in that the allusions to both Simon and Mary at the beginning and at the end act as a sort of framework for the whole story.

In general, in all the stories making up the text, the author expressly avoids treating the central motifs in the same way as in the canonical Gospels. This is evident not only in the case of the death of Jesus, but also in the way in which the stories of ‘miracles’ are told. In this connection, there is in turn an important difference in relation to the larger,

---

(‘lo condenaron a muerte de apedrearlo y despues ahorcarlo’) but also with a great number of testimonies from Iberian Judaisers, including the well-known case of Luis de Carvajal in New Spain (Mexico) whose autobiography written around 1595 refers to Jesus as the *ahorcado* (‘oyendo la campanilla, que sacan delante del ahorcado, q[uan]do lo lleban por las calles’: Manuscript of Luis de Carvajal alias Joseph Lumbroso, Mexico City: 1580–1596, available at <http://pudl.princeton.edu/objects/s7526g29j>). The forcefulness of the mentions of the fork in the Iberian versions seems to cast new light on the perspectives raised by Peter Schäfer on this subject within the traditions of the *Toledot Yeshu*. PETER SCHÄFER, ‘Agobard’s and Amulo’s Toledot Yeshu,’ in *Toledot Yeshu ... Revisited*, eds SCHÄFER, MEERSON, and DEUTSCH, 27–48.

<sup>38</sup> This evidently could hint at editorial activity on Italian territory or, in any case, in a place where the author came face to face with Roman Catholic institutions. In other words, such a massive presence of specifically anti-Catholic polemic would lose its significance in spaces such as the Ottoman Empire, North Africa and even territories with a majority of Christian Reformed churches.

<sup>39</sup> These are usually very heated issues among conversos, who continually have to generate arguments against these institutions. An example of how the *Toledot Yeshu* was employed during the sixteenth century by Judaising New Christians can be found in the inquisitorial trials involving members of the Coronel family: CHUECAS SALDÍAS, ‘Felippa Cardosa y el Sefer Toledot Yeshu.’

<sup>40</sup> As for the name קאלפוסיאון to indicate the uncle, then disciple of Jesus, it is very likely that the author invented it by blending the names of two different disciples mentioned in the canonical gospels: Simon Peter (שמעון כנפא) on the one hand and James, son of Alphaeus (יעקב אלפי), on the other, as they appear, for example, in the Hebrew version of Matthew’s gospel published in 1555: *Evangelium Matthaei ex Hebraeo fideliter redditum* (Paris: Martinum Iuvenem, 1555). The forms כנפא and אלפי would have given rise to the Castilian gentilic קאלפוסיאון. In general, the author of EH 47 D 10 shows the clear tendency to allude to the figure of the Pope of Rome by merging different biblical figures.

so-called Elena group of *Toledot Yeshu* variants.<sup>41</sup> In the argumentation of these texts, the narrator never questions Jesus's ability to perform miracles, which is explained through the story of the theft of the Holy Name from the temple of the Lord.<sup>42</sup> The author of EH 47 D 10 probably knows this story,<sup>43</sup> however, not only does he not develop it, the Jesus of this text performs practically no miracles. Indeed, this is what is ridiculed in the story of the woman with the pitcher.<sup>44</sup>

### The Original Author of EH 47 D 10

The original author of the text is undoubtedly an individual influenced by an Iberian Jewish background, writing in a Spanish very close to the Ferrara Bible (1553), but without the syntactic problems of the latter.<sup>45</sup> Hebrew terms are conspicuous by their absence (unlike in the Ferrara literature and later Ladino texts) and sometimes when the author makes etymological explanations of supposed Hebrew words or expressions it is difficult to extract a coherent interpretation (in spite of the narrative clarity) because the connection with the Hebrew is nonexistent or extremely weak. On the other hand, on the numerous occasions that one would expect the text to use Hebrew variants, the author surprises us with the use of Castilian.

The place in which the text was originally written could very well be some Italian republic or the pontifical state,<sup>46</sup> which is much more plausible than Castile or another kingdom of the Hispanic monarchy. It is also impossible to rule out that the author was somewhere in the East, that is, in the Ottoman Empire, although it must have been a

<sup>41</sup> DI SEGNI, *Il vangelo del Ghetto*, 33–40.

<sup>42</sup> The story of the theft of the Holy Name from the temple of the Lord, typical of the Helena version of the *Toledot Yeshu*, is a feature present in practically all versions attested to in the Iberian Peninsula from the medieval period to the early modern age: CHUECAS SALDÍAS, 'Felippa Cardosa y el Sefer Toledot Yeshu,' 22–31.

<sup>43</sup> EH 47 D 10 has a brief allusion to Jesus learning the Holy Name at the beginning of the story about his bastardy: קואנדו קריסיו ישוֹ איל באסטארדו סי פֿואי אה לִירוסאלם אי סי פוזו קון ר' יהושע איגו די פרחיה פארה: אפרינדיר לה ליי סאנטה די משה רבינו אי נו קידו קוזה גיקה ני גראנדי קי נו אפרינדיי האסטה לאס קוזאס סאגראדאס אי סיליסיטיאלים אי איל נומברי סאנטו אי איניפאבלי.

<sup>44</sup> 'She answered him, "oh fool if you can do miracles why don't you do them for yourself and you wouldn't need anyone (to do something for you)"' (נו ניסיטיטאראס די נינגונו לוס האזיס אה טי מיזמו אי ריספונדיי לי או ניסיי סי פואידיס האזיר מילאגרוס פורקי נו).

<sup>45</sup> On the language and style of the Ferrara Bible: IACOB M. HASSÁN, ed., *Introducción a la Biblia de Ferrara. Actas del simposio internacional sobre la Biblia de Ferrara, Sevilla, 25–28 de noviembre de 1991* (Madrid: Ediciones Siruela, 1994).

<sup>46</sup> Samuel Krauss had already pointed to a connection between the Huldricus text and the Italian milieu: 'Das Lokalkolorit ist völlig romanisirt: י = Rom, die Wüste di Campagna etc.,' KRAUSS, *Das Leben Jesu nach jüdischen Quellen*, 34. On the presence of Sephardic immigrants in Italy during the early modern age, see NELLO PAVONCELLO, 'Gli ebrei di origine spagnola a Roma,' *Studi Romani* 28 (1980): 214–20; RENATA SEGRE, 'Sephardic Settlements in Sixteenth-Century Italy: A Historical and Geographical Survey,' *Mediterranean Historical Review* 6, no. 2 (1991): 112–37; ANNA ESPOSITO, 'The Sephardic Communities in Rome in the Early Sixteenth Century,' *Imago temporis. Medium Aevum* 1 (2007): 177–85; FEDERICA RUSPIO, *La nazjone portogbese. Ebrei ponentini e nuovi cristiani a Venezia* (Turin: Silvio Zamorani Editore, 2007).

place where Sephardic and Ashkenazic traditions coexisted, as both seem to have left traces in the work. As already stated, the original author of the text must have composed it in the middle of the sixteenth century.

Despite knowing the fundamental texts of the Hebrew tradition and sharing a great number of the Jewish customs, the fact that the author's knowledge of the holy language appears to be rudimentary, and the familiarity with texts and themes of Roman Christianity, shows that the writer probably grew up as a convert, probably in Castile or Portugal, and only later in life immigrated to some community in the free lands.<sup>47</sup> In this same direction, it can be affirmed that the author must have received some kind of education (perhaps even at university level) because of the use of the cultured language of the time and the way the various narrative cycles that make up the work are elaborated. A good example of these traits is the original passage in the *Toledot Yesbu* literature about the origin of the Latin alphabet (or rather the Hispanic version of it). There are many examples throughout the text concerning the linguistic identity of the original author. And a very important factor is that the author of the Huldricus text was not able to eliminate this imprint, which emerges again and again in the Hebrew version, for example, in the way the letters of the Latin alphabet are reproduced.

### The New Alphabet

Within the cycle of Simon el Qalfoseo we find the story of the origin of the Christian alphabet, which is interpreted as a perversion of the original Hebrew alphabet.<sup>48</sup> At first sight it is evident that the version of EH 47 D 10 is more complex than that of Huldricus:<sup>49</sup>

he meant that everything he told them was false and in this way he arranged for them the letters א ב ג ד ז ט י כ ל מ נ ס ע פ צ ק ר ש ת = which mean for Hebraic *our father was a traitor and a murderer* and other letters א ב ג ד ז ט י כ ל מ נ ס ע פ צ ק ר ש ת = mean *they have faith that Jesus is alive as god* but they are to be very deceived because to be god it was necessary that he did not =

סיניפיקאן קי טודו לוקי ליס דיזייה אירה  
פאלסו אי אין איסטטה = פורמה ליס אינריגלו  
לאס ליטראס א ב ג ד ז ט י כ ל מ נ ס ע פ צ ק ר ש ת = קי סיניפיקאן  
פור אבראייקו נואיסטרו פאדרי אירה  
טראידור אי מאטאדור ~ אי די מאס ליטראס  
ס י כ א ל א מ אין = סיניפיקאן די קומו טיינין  
פי קי ישׁו אסטה ביבו קומו דיוס מאס באן  
מוי אינגאניאדוס פורקי פארה סיר דיוס  
אירה ניסיסארייו נו = טובייסי מאדרי פירו

<sup>47</sup> As is the case of Imanuel Aboab, author of the nomology *Nomologia o Discursos legales. Compuestos por el virtuoso Habam Rabì Imanuel Aboab de buena memoria* (Amsterdam: Estampados à costa, y despeza de sus herederos, 5389 [1629]).

<sup>48</sup> As an example of the interest in the interpretation of the letters of the Hebrew alphabet among Western Sephardic authors writing in the vernacular, see: *Discurso sobre a significação das letras Hebraicas, Pello Doctissimo Señor Habam Rabi Mosseh Rephael de Aguilar*, *Varios Tractados, Oriental Manuscripts and Printed Books*, The British Library, Or. 8698, 332–37.

<sup>49</sup> ULRICH, ספר תולדות ישוע הנוצרי, *Historia Jeschuae Nazareni*, 106–14.

have a mother but Jesus has a mother  
 ~ and other letters = א ו פ קו ר ס ת עו ~  
 א ו פ קו ר ס ת עו ~ signify that *he who has  
 such faith should not doubt that he denies  
 the blessed god* and they go wrong and  
 twisted and malicious ~ moreover the  
 said Simon wrote them many books  
 of vanity and called them גליון = אָנן  
 and they thought that the meaning of  
 this name signified *father and son and  
 holy spirit* and he meant that *all is false*  
 ~

ישׁוֹ טייני מאדרי ~ אי די מאס ליטראס = או  
 פֿ קו ר ס ת עו עיקש אי זָדָה ~ סינפיקאן קי  
 איל קי טייני טאל פי נו איה קי דודאר קי  
 רייניגה דיל דייו בינדיטו אי בה ייראדו אי  
 ריאטורסידו אי מאליסיוזו ~ מאס ליס  
 איסקריבייו דיגו סימין מוגוס ליברוס די  
 באנידאד אי לוס לייאמו אָנן = גליון איליאס  
 פינסארון קי איל סינטידו דיסטי נומברי אירה  
 סינפיקאנדו אה פאדרי אי היכו אי איספריטו  
 סאלטו אי איל קיגו דיזיר קי טודו איס פאלסו  
 ~

EH 47 D 10 divides the alphabet into three sections and each is understood according to a supposed meaning intended by Simon. The Huldricus version goes to pains to explain these interpretations.<sup>50</sup> However, the truth is that the Castilian text reveals how the original author interpreted the meanings starting from a series of misperceptions stemming from a precarious understanding of Hebrew.

According to EH 47 D 10, in Hebrew the first series of letters of the alphabet (א ב ג ד ה ו ז ח ט י כ ל מ נ ס ע פ צ ק ר ש ת יו יפ) mean ‘our father was a traitor and a murderer.’ In this first case, what seems to be happening is that the author presents an interpretation according to the order of the Hebrew alphabet (אבגדהוז), whose letters were read as [א] [ב] [ג] [ד] [ה] [ו] [ז] [ח] [ט] [י] [כ] [ל] [מ] [נ] [ס] [ע] [פ] [צ] [ק] [ר] [ש] [ת] [י] [ו] [י] [פ].

The second series (א ב ג ד ה ו ז ח ט י כ ל מ נ ס ע פ צ ק ר ש ת יו יפ) which the author interprets as ‘they have faith that Jesus is alive as god,’ and whose Hebrew sequence is similar to the Castilian except for the insertion of the letter Tet (חטיכלמנ), was probably read as ח י כ אלוהים or something similar.<sup>51</sup> As shown, it is very likely that in both cases the author was aware of some kind of explanation made on the basis of a Hebrew phrase.

In the following two cases the procedure followed by the author seems to be different. The third sequence (א ו פ קו ר ס ת עו עיקש אי זָדָה) is interpreted according to a more complex formulation ‘he who has such faith should not doubt that he denies the blessed god’ (איל קי טייני טאל פי נו איה קי דודאר קי רייניגה דיל דייו בינדיטו) which does not seem to originate from a Hebrew phrase. This situation may have arisen from the

<sup>50</sup> Johann Jacob Ulrich attempted to interpret the Hebrew terms by resorting to supposed allusions to Esau, son of Isaac (‘אבא Pater meus est Esau, ציד ועיף Venator & lassus ille erat’), and to Epicurus (‘sed Epicureus, Seducator, defraudator, et fervidus ille est instar Esau, qui comedit coctum’): ULRICH, ספר תולדות ישוע הנוצרי, *Historia Jeschuae Nazareni*, 108.

<sup>51</sup> In this particular case the Huldricus interpretation (‘et ecce filii ejus credunt in Jesum, qui ח י כאל vivit ut Deus; Suffocetur anima illorum, quia Deo אין אמ non est mater, Iesus vero habet matrem’) broadly coincides with the EH 47 D 10 version: ULRICH, ספר תולדות ישוע הנוצרי, *Historia Jeschuae Nazareni*, 108.

difficulty in finding a formula starting from the order of the Hebrew alphabet (סעפצקרשת). In this case, therefore, the author simply created a phrase in Spanish by choosing a section of the alphabet (פ קו ר), which was read as ‘fe que reniega’ (פי קי רייניגה).

Finally, the text concludes with an interpretation of the term Evangelium (אָנוֹ גֵּלְיוֹן) which the author claims that Christians understood as ‘father and son and holy spirit’ (פאדרי אי היכו אי איספריטו סאלטו), but which actually means ‘it is all false’ (קי טודו איס) (פאלסו). This way of disqualifying the Christian gospels seems to be directly inspired by the Talmud and later receptions of it, such as the *Sefer Nestor Ha-Komer*.<sup>52</sup>

Moreover, by making a comparison between the version of the alphabet provided by EH 47 D 10 and the Hebrew and Latin versions provided in Huldricus, new relevant background information emerges:

| Letter          | EH  | H-Hebrew | H-Latin | Letter | EH   | H-Hebrew | H-Latin |
|-----------------|-----|----------|---------|--------|------|----------|---------|
| a               | א   | א        | A       | O      | או   | אָ       | o       |
| b               | ב   | בְּ      | be      | P      | פ    | פִּי     | pe      |
| c               | צ   | צֵ       | ce      | Q      | קו   | קוּ      | ku      |
| d               | ד   | דְּ      | de      | R      | ר    | רְ       | er      |
| e               | ע   | עֵ       | e       | S      | ס    | סֵ       | es      |
| f               | יפ  | יִרְ     | ef      | T      | ת    | תֵּע     | te      |
| g               |     |          |         | U      | עו   | וּן      | u       |
| h <sup>53</sup> | ח   | ח        | cha     | V      |      |          |         |
| i               | י   | יִ       | i       | X      | עיקש | עִיקֶשׁ  | icx     |
| j/k             | כ   | כְּ      | ke      | Y      | אי   |          |         |
| l               | אל  | אֵל      | el      | β      |      | אֵינְד   | etzet   |
| m               | אמ  | אֵם      | em      | Z      | זדה  | זֵד      | zet     |
| n               | אין | אֵין     | en      |        |      |          |         |

Table 3. Comparison between the version of the alphabet provided by EH 47 D 10 and the Hebrew and Latin versions provided in Huldricus.

<sup>52</sup> ‘This pun is originally talmudic,’ DANIEL J. LASKER, *Jewish Philosophical Polemics Against Christianity in the Middle Ages* (Liverpool: Littman Library of Jewish Civilization and Liverpool University Press, 2007), 175, note 24; DANIEL J. LASKER and SARAH STROUMSA, *The Polemic of Nestor the Priest. Qisṣat Mujādalat al-Usqf and Sefer Nestor Ha-Komer. Introduction, Annotated Translations and Commentary* (Jerusalem: Ben-Zvi Institute for the Study of Jewish Communities in the East, 1996), 30 and 149.

<sup>53</sup> In EH 47 D 10 the series between the letters H and N are on the last line of the folio. This section is slightly water-damaged, causing some vowel signs to be a little blurred.

At first glance, it is obvious that both the author of EH 47 D 10 and Huldricus tend to reproduce the corresponding Castilian and German rather than Latin pronunciation of the alphabet. Conclusive arguments in this direction are the way EH 47 D 10 spells the letter X (עִקְשׁ) and the incorporation in Huldricus of the German ß (אִיְזֶד / etzet).

The absence of the letter G (ג) in all three versions is highly significant, because this letter is included in all four alphabets (Hebrew, Spanish, Latin, and German). However, a comparison of the composition of this section in EH 47 D 10 and in Huldricus shows that the Ladino version is much more complex. In EH 47 D 10, the alphabet is not reproduced only once in its entirety (like in the Hebrew and Latin versions of Huldricus) but is subdivided into three different blocks (A–F, H–N and O–Z) which are interspersed with texts explaining the supposed Hebrew meaning of these letters. In carrying out this operation, it seems evident that the author simply made a mistake leading to the omission of the letter G due to the gap between the first block (A–F) and the second (H–N). Since in Huldricus the alphabet is copied in a single run, omitting the G both times, we are clearly faced with new evidence of how in this its author follows the *Vorlage* of EH 47 D 10.

Finally, additional evidence is provided by the fact the name of the letter X (עִקְשׁ) appears in Huldricus in the exact same way as in EH 47 D 10. In this case the name of the letter must use the Castilian spelling, and certainly not the German or Latin one.

### A Hebrew Who Did Not Know Hebrew Well

The passage recounting Rabbi Aquiba's visit to the city of Nazariah (נֶאזָאֲרִיָּה), the hometown of Jesus, begins with the interrogation of the latter and the revelation of the false names that both adulterous parents have assumed in order to hide their true identity.<sup>54</sup> The rabbi then personally goes to the place to certify the authenticity of the facts:

... r' Aquiba asked the said Jesus which was the city of his birth, he answered that it was Nazariah and that his father was called *Misery* and his mother *Carajat* ~ then r' Aquiba went to Nazariah to investigate and certify how he was begotten in filth and the son of a harlot and bastard according to the proofs he

פריגונטולי ר' עקיבא אה דיגו ישׁוֹן קי קוואל  
אירה סיוודאד די סו נאסימיינטו ריספונדייו  
לי קי אירה נאזארייה אי קי סו פאדרי סי  
לייאמאבה מיזירייה אי סו מאדרי קאראלאט  
~ אינטונסיס פואי ר' עקיבא אה נאזארייה  
פארה איספיקולאר אי סארטיפיקאר אין  
קומו אירה יינלנדראדו אין אינמונדיסייה אי  
איכו די ראמירה אי באסטארדו סיגון לאס

<sup>54</sup> It seems evident that this account centring around the figure of Rabbi Aquiba must bear some relation to the text of the tractate *Massekhet Kallah*. However, in his thorough study of this work, David Brodsky concludes that 'it is very difficult from this one parallel to determine the relationship between these two sources,' DAVID BRODSKY, *A Bride Without a Blessing. A Study in the Redaction and Content of Massekhet Kallah and Its Gemara* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 148, note 74.



had = he entered Nazariah, asked for the house of *Misery* that has a woman called *Carajat*, they showed it to him, he entered the house...

מואיסטראס טינייה = אנטרו אה נאזארייה  
פריגוטו פור קאזה די מיזירייה קי טיני  
מוג'יר לייאמאדה קאראכאט סי לה  
מוסטרארון אנטרו אה קאזה

The text of EH 47 D 10, as befits the Huldricus-type manuscripts, provides names for the parents of Jesus without precedent in the *Toledot Yesbu* narratives. Perhaps the most surprising thing is that, in this Ladino version, unlike the rest of the Huldricus group, the new names are much more coherent with the plot of the story, making perfect sense to the reader. Josefe Pandera is called 'Misery' (מיזירייה) a name that needs no explanation. From this point on, the ironic tone introduced by the narrator when he makes Rabbi Aquiba inquire after the 'house of Misery' (קאזה די מיזירייה) is evident. At the same time, Miriam's new name takes on full meaning in this Ladino version: *Carajat* (קאראכאט) turns out to be the feminine form of 'carajo' (קאראכ'ו), a term already used in medieval Spanish with an extremely pejorative meaning.<sup>55</sup> Among the characteristic vocabulary of this passage, one has to mention the verb 'especular' (איספיקולאר) in the sense of investigating, which was very rare in Castilian but usual in the language of the Ferrara Bible.<sup>56</sup>

The passage concludes with a surprising explanation, put in the mouth of Rabbi Aquiba, about the etymology of both nicknames:

then he said to her: 'It was not in vain that the traitor was called *Misery* and you *Carajat* because these names mean in Hebrew *destruction* and *villainy*'

אינטונסיס לה דיכו נו אין באלדי סי לייאמו  
אל טראידור מיזירייה אי טו קאראכאט קי  
אסטוס נומבריס סיניפיקאן פור איבראייקו  
דיסטרואיסיון אי ביליאקירייה ~

How the narrator comes to link both names to the Hebrew roots 'destruction' and 'villainy' is certainly a paradox. Nevertheless, this factor seems to be of little importance to the thread of the narrative. What is very important is that the original author of EH 47 D 10 does not know Hebrew beyond perhaps some very rudimentary notions. In this, the author differs from the vast majority of the producers and translators of *Toledot Yesbu* texts, including the author of the closest text, EH 48 E 15.

<sup>55</sup> Although all authors, beginning with Johann Jacob Ulrich, have accepted the etymology of the word as deriving from the Hebrew קרחת, relying on the account of the tonsure of Jesus, the fact is that this link is not so evident, even in the Hebrew version of Huldricus. At the same time, it is also possible that the author of EH 47 D 10 intended to make an ironic allusion to the assonance between קאראכאט and קרחת.

<sup>56</sup> 'Yo Koheleth fuy rey sobre Ysrael e Yerusalaïm y di mi coraçõ para requerir y para especular enla sciẽcia sobre todo lo fue q fecho debaxo delos cielos' (Eccl 1:12–13), ABRAHAM USQUE and YOM-TOB ATIAS, eds, *Biblia en lengua Española traduzida dela verdadera origen Hebrayca por muy excelentes letrados* (Ferrara: a costa y despesa de Yom Tob Atias, 5313 [1553]), 393v.

The same technique of constructing pseudo-Hebrew appellatives from Castilian forms is observed in the name of the city that receives him warmly, קיריאטייס (*queriates* = ‘they love you’), and in the name of the inhabitant of Jerusalem ייבאר פורה (*llevar fuera* = ‘to take out’), in whose house Jesus is staying, alluding to the plan that Judas has hatched to get Jesus out of Ay and take him to Jerusalem.

In this same context, it is necessary to explain the use of another term that the Huldricus version, and later researchers, were not able to decipher. The term is what the Huldricus text introduces as מי בולט or *aquis Boleth*.<sup>57</sup> But before attempting an interpretation of the term, it is necessary to solve a palaeographic problem. It turns out that in all the quotations of the formula throughout the text of EH 47 D 10 (four in all), the first letter of the word that in Huldricus is read as בולט could actually be interpreted as a Bet (ב) or a Kaf (כ). From a thorough intratextual comparison, it is my opinion that in this manuscript the original term is כולאטי and not בולט as interpreted in Huldricus. Indeed, if it is transcribed in EH 47 D 10 as אגואס די כולאטי (and in one of the appearances as אגואס די כולאט), then it is highly probable that this is a witticism based on the Spanish ‘culo’ (like the present-day ‘culete’) and that the original formula, in conformity with the language and popular burlesque style of the author, is to be understood as ‘aguas de culo’ (‘ass waters’).<sup>58</sup>

So, if the original author did not know Hebrew well—indeed most of his etymological interpretations are based on Spanish—how could he translate a Hebrew text into Ladino? And if indeed this Ladino text is the *Vorlage* used by the Huldricus text, then it is evident that Johann Jacob Ulrich, who himself was not so comfortable in the holy language, was faced with the immense challenge of making sense of a text that had not been composed for a Hebrew-speaking audience.

### **The Lazy Shepherd and the Diligent Maiden**

Given the difficulty in carrying out an in-depth analysis of the entire work within the framework of this article, I have selected the passage that tells the story of Jesus’s encounter with the lazy shepherd and the diligent maiden as a case study. The reason for choosing this particular passage is the picturesque nature of the story and the narrative

<sup>57</sup> ‘Nominis quoque ratio in obscuro est,’ ULRICH, ספר תולדות ישוע הנוצרי, *Historia Jeschuae Nazareni*, 31.

<sup>58</sup> The topic of ‘water’ appears a second time in EH 47 D 10, in the story of the return of Jesus and his disciples to Jerusalem, in the form of the ‘forgetful waters’ (אגואס אולבידאדיראס) that Judas gives Jesus to drink. What is more, according to Daniel Lasker and Sarah Stroumsa’s version of this work, the baptismal waters already seem to be related to impure and malodorous notions in the *Qissat Mujádalat al-Usquf*: ‘... you approach the foul, filthy baptismal water, which, if the birds were to smell it, would make them fall ill from its odor. You believe that it is pure and can cleanse the impure, but in fact even an essentially pure person who approaches this baptismal water will in reality become impure,’ LASKER and STROUMSA, *The Polemic of Nestor the Priest*, 78.

coherence which, as will be seen, far exceeds the Huldricus version. The idea is to submit the text to a more detailed analysis, trying on the one hand to highlight its most relevant stylistic characteristics, while at the same time placing it in the context of other related texts. Then a comparison will be made with the same passage in Huldricus, quoting both the Hebrew and Latin texts.

The story of the lazy shepherd and the diligent maiden can be defined as the story of an anti-miracle.<sup>59</sup> It is a very well-structured, self-enclosed narrative. Basically, it can be split into four moments:

- 1) Meeting the lazy shepherd
- 2) Encounter with the diligent maiden
- 3) Jesus casts his blessing on the maiden
- 4) Peter's surprise and Jesus's response

The first two scenes are parallels that allow us to compare the behaviour of the shepherd and the girl in exactly the same situation. Two more parallel scenes follow: Jesus's blessing of the girl and the interpretation of the meaning of this blessing.

Below I analyse the four scenes, presenting the Aljamiado text and the translation of each one:

|  |  |
|--|--|
| And they were lost in the desert.                                | אי סי טראסיירארון אין איל דיזירטו                                |
| Walking along they came upon a shepherd lying in the road;       | אילייוס קאמינאנדו טופארון קון און פאסטור אקוסטאדו אין איל קאמינו |
| Jesus asked him if there was an inn nearby                       | לי פריגונטו ישׁוֹׁז קי סי אביה אלגונה פוזאדה סירקה               |
| and which way they should go along the road.                     | אי קי פור קואל פארטי אביאן די טומאר איל קאמינו                   |
| The answer he gave him was                                       | לה ריספואיסטה קי לי דייו פֹואי                                   |
| that there he, lying down, pointed his foot to show him the way. | קי אי איל אקוסטאדו לי טינדיו איל פי פארה מוסטראר לי איל קאמינו   |

The first scene opens with Jesus and two disciples, Peter and Judas, wandering in the wilderness of Ay. There they come across a shepherd lying in the middle of the road. The allusions to pastoral burlesque literature are evident. In this type of narrative, the figure of the shepherd usually appears as the epitome of laziness, theft, and cunning

<sup>59</sup> On the topic of burlesque miracles in early modern Spanish literature, see INMACULADA OSUNA, 'Las oraciones y coplas de ciego como motivo burlesco culto en la poesía religiosa del siglo XVII,' in *Eros Divino. Estudios sobre poesía religiosa iberoamericana del siglo XVII*, ed. JUAN OLIVARES (Zaragoza: Prentas Universitarias de Zaragoza, 2010), 335–65.

ignorance.<sup>60</sup> The picture of the shepherd lying in the road, rather than at its side, demonstrates not only his carelessness, but also his brazenness in the face of passers-by. At the same time, the fact that it is Jesus himself who takes the initiative to inquire about the way ironically demonstrates that he who is supposedly the son of God is as ignorant as anyone else and has to submit to shameful situations of dependence. The motif of the way is certainly important. The question of ‘which way they should go along the road’ (קי פור קואל פארטי אביאן די טומאר איל קאמינו) is not naive, and most probably should be confronted with the New Testament passages where Jesus assures that he is the only way (Jn 14:6). As can be seen in the following story, centred around the nocturnal events at the inn, the mention of the rural inn (פוסאדה) and the hunger that afflicts the wandering Jesus belongs to this type of literary genre.<sup>61</sup> The scene concludes, without the shepherd even opening his mouth (such is the extent of his laziness), with him pointing his foot at the road. This last gesture fits the context of similar stories in the literature of the Spanish Golden Age very well. As for the vocabulary, it is a literary Castilian that corresponds to the novelistic texts of sixteenth-century Iberia. Among the terms used, the verb ‘traserrar’ (טראסיירארון), of medieval origin and preserved in Judeo-Spanish literature in the Ferrara Bible and in later texts, stands out for its unusualness.<sup>62</sup> The expressions in the language of the time include: ‘toparon con’ (טופארון קון); ‘por cual parte’ (פור קואל פארטי); ‘habían de’ (אביאן די); ‘tomar el camino’ (טומאר איל קאמינו); ‘tender el pie’ (טינדיו איל פי).

|  |                                       |
|--|---------------------------------------|
| They went further on [and] came upon a   | פואירון מאס אדילאנטי טופארון קון אונה |
| maiden                                   | מוסה                                  |
| grazing cattle;                          | פאסיינדו גאנאדו                       |
| Jesus also asked her                     | לה פריגונטו ישׁוֹ טאמביין             |
| to show them the way.                    | קי ליס מוסטראסי איל קאמינו            |
| So, she went with them                   | קונקי פואי קון איליוס                 |
| until the division of the roads          | האסטה דיביסיון די לוס קאמינוס         |
| and showed them the way and turned back. | אי ליס מוסטרו איל קאמינו אי בולבייוסי |

The second scene is constructed as an antithesis of the first. What the shepherd is not, the girl is, despite their common traits in terms of their activity and social background. At the same time, perhaps for stylistic reasons, the girl is never expressly identified as a herderess, but as a ‘moza paciendo ganado’ (מוסה פאסיינדו גאנאדו). What the narrator achieves through this device is to identify the girl through her activity. Jesus’s question

<sup>60</sup> According to Peter Burke, ‘the Spanish nativity plays had their lazy shepherd and their quarrelling newly-weds,’ PETER BURKE, *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009), 185.

<sup>61</sup> JOSÉ ANTONIO NEGRÍN DE LA PEÑA, ‘La mesa del Dómine Cabra: comida y vino en la novela picaresca del siglo de oro español,’ *Estudios Avanzados* 18 (2012): 75–99.

<sup>62</sup> ‘y fue como traserraron a mi dioses de casa de mi padre’ (Gen. 20:13), USQUE and ATIAS, eds, *Biblia en lengua Española*, 8v.

marks a second point of irony in the story: the girl's activity is not only opposed to the shepherd's indolence, but also to Jesus's ignorance. Indeed, she knows the way well. The final sentence leaves Jesus facing a crossroads. A text that seems to function as a model for this scene is the passage from the narrative cycle of the patriarchs in the book of Genesis, in which Abraham's servant meets the young Rebekah at the well (Gen. 24). The analogy is quite evident: her activity as a herderess; the diligence with which she attends to the traveller; and the marriage of the young woman to Isaac as the conclusion of the story. The following section, when I compare this passage with the Huldricus version, will show how this passage can give clues about the relationship between the two texts and the translation process.

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Then Peter told Jesus to cast              | אינטונסיס דיכו פיטרו אה ישׁוֹן קי איגאסי |
| a blessing on that maiden for the good     | בינדיסיין אה אקילייה מוסה פור איל ביין   |
| which she did for them as she came with    | קי ליס היזו קי בינו קון אילייוס          |
| them                                       |  |
| to the point of even showing them the way. | האסטה מוסטראר ליס איל קאמינו             |
| Then he blessed her that she should marry  | קונקי לה בינדיכו קי סי קאזארה            |
| that lazy shepherd                         | קון אקיל פאסטור פיריזונו                 |
| who would not show them the way.           | קי נו ליס קיגו מוסטראר איל קאמינו        |

At the beginning of the third scene, Peter intervenes to request a blessing/miracle in favour of the maiden. The term used—to cast a blessing (איגאסי בינדיסיין)—is characteristic of the time. The irony of the helplessness of Jesus and his companions is expressed by their need for others to do good to them, in this case a girl (איל ביין קי ליס (היזו), rather than being the ones to do good to the miserable and afflicted. Indeed, the girl hardly needs the help of Jesus and his disciples.<sup>63</sup> This situation is then made clear in the content of the blessing: the marriage of the girl to the shepherd. It is a miracle that the girl has never asked for. This topic evidently has to be framed in the great importance attached by the family culture of the time to the duty of marrying daughters. This extreme social concern is reflected abundantly in literature and in both personal (e.g., testamentary dispositions) and institutional documentation (e.g., of confraternities set up to endow maidens). In the case of the Western Sephardim, a good example of the great importance of this obligation is the confraternities to endow orphan girls founded in Venice and Amsterdam.<sup>64</sup>

<sup>63</sup> Her self-sufficiency and know-how resemble the type of heroines in the *Lozana andaluza*, a picaresque novel that has often been suspected of having a converso origin: FRANCISCO DELICADO, *Retrato de la Lozana andaluza en lengua española muy clarissima. Cõpuesto en Roma. El qual Retrato demuestra loque en Roma passana y contiene munchas mas cosas que la Celestina* (Venice: 1528).

<sup>64</sup> MIRIAM BODIAN, 'The "Portuguese" Dowry Societies in Venice and Amsterdam. A Case Study in Communal Differentiation within the Marrano Diaspora,' *Italia. Studi e Ricerche sulla Storia, la Cultura e la Letteratura degli Ebrei d'Italia* 6, no. 1–2 (1987): 30–61; JESSICA V. ROITMAN, 'Marriage, Migration, and

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Peter answered:                              | ריספונדייו פיטרו                            |
| How could he have cast her such a blessing?  | קי קומו לה איגו סימיגאנטי בינדיסיון         |
| because it was not fitting for that shepherd | קי נו אירה קונבייניטי קי אקיל פאסטור        |
| to marry such a maiden.                      | קאזאסי טאל מוסה                             |
| <br>   |   |
| Jesus replied that since he was so lazy      | ריספונדייו ישׁוֹז קי סינדו איל טאן פיריזוזו |
| it was not convenient for him                | נו לי קונבינייה                             |
| to marry anyone other than that maiden       | קאזאר מאסקי אקלייה מוסה                     |
| who was very diligent;                       | קי אירה מוי דיליגנטי                        |
| that she should seek life for both of them;  | פאראקי אילייה בוסקי לה בידא פור אמבוס       |
| and that he was a merciful god and           | אי קי איל אירה דייוס פייאדוזו אי            |
| matchmaker                                   | קאזאמינטירו                                 |
| and that he was in charge of arranging and   | אי טינייה קארגו די אפאריגאר אי              |
| adjusting                                    | אקונגאבאר                                   |
| the husband to his wife according to their   | איל מארידו קון סו מוגיר סיגון סוס           |
| deeds,                                       | אובראס                                      |
| so that they may live with each other.       | די מודו קי פואידאן ביביר אוננו קון אוטרו    |

As might be expected, the narrative enables the absurdity of Jesus's blessing to be made explicit. In this case, the common sense is personified by Peter. Once again, the narrator uses the technique of contrasting the character of Jesus with a counterpart to highlight the ridiculousness of his actions. Contrary to what everyone (Peter and the readers) would deem logical and right, Jesus's response focuses on the lazy shepherd (נו לי קונבינייה). The irony goes so far that Jesus's actions seem to overturn the basic norms of traditional society: it is the girl who must procure a livelihood for the man and support their married life (אילייה בוסקי לה בידא פור אמבוס). Once Jesus has explained this ridiculous situation, with no rational sense regarding the social culture of the time, he makes a sort of theological substantiation according to the model of the Gospels. This consists of a series of affirmations taken from biblical passages, which also appear buffoonish. This is concluded by the recourse, usual in the Christian Gospels, to quotations from the Old Testament in order to explain his actions as the fulfilment of prophecies. In this context, Jesus begins by identifying himself as a merciful god (דייוס פייאדוזו). The motif of the matchmaking god (קאזאמינטירו), however, obviously does not correspond to traditional theology, but is much closer to Spanish burlesque literature, in particular to a text such as *La Celestina*.<sup>65</sup> The idea that Jesus also fulfils the function of harmoniser between couples seems to allude to another common topic in the literature of the Spanish Golden Age: the theme of the ill-married couple (*malcasados* or

Money: The *Santa Companhia de dotar orphãs e donzelas* pobres in the Portuguese Sephardic Diaspora, *Portuguese Studies Review* 13, no. 1 (2005): 347–67.

<sup>65</sup> FERNANDO DE ROJAS, *Comedia de Calisto y Melibea* (Toledo: Pedro Hagenbach, 1500).

*malmaridados*).<sup>66</sup> At the same time, with its intense focus on the theme of marriage and marital difficulties, and the ability of Jesus to act at this level, this passage appears extremely questionable in the light of the stories in the first narrative cycle, where the issue is marital infidelity, and Jesus's response is to end up killing his own father, Josefe Pandera.

|   |  |
|---|--|
| He said (even) more:                          | דִּלְכוּ מֵאִם                                 |
| that because of him King David prophesied,    | קִי פֹר אֵיל פְּרוּפִיטִיזוּ אֵיל רֵי דוד      |
| saying 'He diminished my strength through the | קִי דִּלְכוּ אֶפְלִיכוּ קוֹן לֵה קֵארִירָה מִי |
| race'   | פּוֹאִירָסָה                                   |
| because that was the reason                   | קִי אִיסָה פְּוֹאִי לֵה קֵאוּזָה               |
| they were wandering in the wilderness.        | אִיסְטֵאבֵאן רִיבֹלְטֵאנְדוּ אֵין אֵיל         |
|   | דִּיזִירָטוּ                                   |

Finally, the story concludes with a biblical quotation, taken from Psalm 102:24 (אֶפְלִיכוּ קוֹן (לֵה) קֵארִירָה מִי פּוֹאִירָסָה), in a textual variant very close to the Ferrara version.<sup>67</sup> Again, this has little or nothing to do with the theme of the passage, accentuating the sense of the absurdity of Jesus's arguments.

### Comparison with the Huldricus Text

After looking at the characteristic features of the Ladino version of the narrative, I will now compare it with the Latin and Hebrew versions of Huldricus. The idea, in this case, is not to go into superfluous details, but principally to highlight the main textual phenomena that appear in these versions and to try to explain the inconsistencies and major shortcomings that can be found.

|  |                                 |
|--|---------------------------------|
| Aberrantes vero de via in deserto                  | וִיתְעוּ בַּמְדָּבָר            |
| offendut pastorem                                  | וַיִּמְצְאוּ רוּעָה             |
| in terra recubantem;                               | שׁוֹבֵב עַל הָאָרֶץ             |
| alloquitur eum Iesus,                              | וַיֹּאמֶר יֵזוּ"שׁ אֶל הָרוּעָה |
| sciscitaturque an longe illinc distet diversorium, | הֲרֵחוֹק מִכָּאן לְבֵית מְלוֹן  |
| & quae via illuc ducat?                            | וְאֵיזוֹ הַדֶּרֶךְ              |
| Resp. pastor;                                      | וַיַּעַן הָרוּעָה               |
| en vobis viam quae prae oculis est,                | הִנֵּה הַדֶּרֶךְ לְפָנֵיכֶם     |
| ejusque indicium facit protenso pede:              | וַיִּרְמֵז הָרוּעָה בְּרֵגְלוֹ  |

<sup>66</sup> JOSÉ ENRIQUE LÓPEZ MARTÍNEZ, 'El entremés de *El juez de los divorcios* y otros infelicitísimos malcasados,' *Anales Cervantinos* 47 (2015): 289–322; ROBERT LAUER, 'Las enfermedades de las malcasadas en los dramas de honor del Siglo de Oro,' in *El matrimonio en Europa y el mundo hispánico. Siglos XVI y XVII*, eds IGNACIO ARELLANO and JESÚS MARÍA USUNÁRIZ (Madrid: Visor Libros, 2005), 55–63.

<sup>67</sup> 'Afligio en la carrera mi fuerza' (Ps 102:24). USQUE and ATIAS, eds., *Biblia en lengua Española*, 304.

|                                       |                          |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Eunt rursusque                        | וילכו                    |
| incident in puellam pastricem         | וימצאו נערה רועה         |
| ex qua iterum inquirat Iesus,         | וישאל יזו"ש אל הנערה     |
| qua eundem sit?                       | איו הדרך                 |
| Comitatur eos puella                  | ותלך הנערה אתם           |
| ufque ad Calceum                      | והביאם על הנעל           |
| aliquem viæ indicium                  | סימן הדרך                |
| <br>                                  |                          |
| Ait igitur Petrus ad Jesum            | ויאמר פיטרוס ליזו"ש      |
| Benedic puellae isti                  | ברך את הנערה             |
| quae nos hucusque deduxit             | שהביאנו הלום             |
| Benedixit ergo puellae Iesus, vovens, | ויברך יזו"ש את הנערה     |
| ut nuptui collocaretur pastori        | שתנשא לזה הרועה          |
| qui viam iis monstrare recusasset     | שלא רצה להראותם הדרך     |
| Ait Petrus                            | ויאמר פיטרוס             |
| quare benedicis pastori, vovens,      | למה תברך את הרועה        |
| ut puellam ducat quails haec est      | שיקח נערה כזו            |
| (indolis adeo probae?)                |                          |
| Respondet Iesus                       | ויאמר יזו"ש              |
| cum ille piger admodum sit,           | באשר שהוא עצל            |
| haec vero alacris singulariter,       | והיא זנזנת               |
| servare poterit maritum suum          | ותחיה את בעלה            |
| (inertia sua alias ruiturum:)         |                          |
| sum vero ego Deus misericors,         | ואני אל רחום             |
| connubia jungens iuxta opera hominum: | מזווג זיווגים כפי מעשיהם |
| & de me prophetavit David             | ועלי ניבא דוד            |
| debilitavit in via vim mean:          | ענה בדרך כחי             |
| Et hinc in devia nos defleximus.      | על כן אנחנו תועים בדרך   |

From the very beginning, a synoptic comparison of the Hebrew and Latin versions of the story of the lazy shepherd and the diligent maiden in the Huldricus text reveals two extremely striking phenomena: on the one hand, the desperate poverty of the Hebrew text, and on the other, the need for the Latin version to go beyond the Hebrew model.

Indeed, although some specialists have noted the precariousness of the Hebrew version,<sup>68</sup> it is also true that others do not seem to share this opinion.<sup>69</sup> A synoptic

<sup>68</sup> Krauss attributes this to the difficulty in deciphering the cursive characters of the original: 'Manche Unbeholfenheiten derselben haben vielleicht ihren Grund in mangelhafter Auflösung der Kursiv-Charaktere der Handschrift durch den Herausgeber,' KRAUSS, *Das Leben Jesu nach jüdischen Quellen*, 34. Riccardo Di Segni is even more radical in his judgement of the quality of the language: 'La forma ebraica del testo è peggiore delle altre che conosciamo, che peraltro non brillano per qualità di lingua,' DI SEGNI, *Il vangelo del Ghetto*, 40.



comparison between the Hebrew text, the Latin text and the Ladino version of EH 47 D 10 shows that the Hebrew text is indeed an extremely simple artefact, so much so that the reader must wonder how any sense could be made of it by means of the Latin, Ladino and even Judeo-German versions.<sup>70</sup> The Hebrew sentences are surprising not only for their extreme brevity (most of them only consisting of two parts) but also for the desperately basic vocabulary. The thread of the narrative is held up by the typical Hebrew parataxis, with no other even slightly more elaborate stylistic devices. In fact, the few phrases (or rather expressions) that show any degree of stylistic development turn out to be typical expressions of biblical literature.<sup>71</sup>

The Latin version must be considered in contrast to this somewhat bleak picture. Once again, it is not an exceptional text from either a stylistic or a narrative point of view. What is interesting, however, is that it clearly fulfils the function of contributing to the narrative coherence that the Hebrew text lacks.<sup>72</sup> In the face of the crude repetition of the appellative רועה in the Hebrew, and the narrator's failure to use to some other form, the Latin text at least employs the third person pronoun (*eum*) in order to create some variety. At the same time, the text is riddled with expressions that turn out to be unpolished translations into Hebrew.<sup>73</sup> In this same context, there is one passage that is clearly very confused, a matter which both the Hebrew and Latin fail to resolve. This is even commented on by Johann Jacob Ulrich himself in his notes. It is the text stating that the girl went with Jesus and his disciples, accompanying them on the road.

|                      |                |
|----------------------|----------------|
| Comitatur eos puella | ותלך הנערה אתם |
| ufque ad Calceum     | והביאם על הנעל |
| aliquem viæ indicium | סימן הדרך      |

The problem that arises in the formulation of both the Hebrew and Latin texts is the incoherent mention of footwear (*calceum* and נעל), from which it is practically impossible to extract any kind of meaning. However, this same gap in the text may help us to find an answer regarding the translation-redaction process that gave rise to these texts.

<sup>69</sup> Adina Yoffie, on the other hand, has a more positive opinion about the literary value of the Hebrew text: 'but the author of the Huldreich was also a talented writer of Hebrew,' ADINA M. YOFFIE, 'Observations on the Huldreich Manuscripts of the Toledot Yeshu,' in *Toledot Yeshu ... Revisited*, eds SCHÄFER, MEERSON, and DEUTSCH, 65.

<sup>70</sup> CLAUDIA ROSENZWEIG, 'When Jesus Spoke Yiddish. Some Remarks on a Yiddish Manuscript of the "Toledot Yeshu" (MS. Günzburg 1730),' *PaRDeS. Journal of the Association of Jewish Studies in Germany* 21 (2015): 199–214.

<sup>71</sup> Such as the expression הנה הדרך לפניכם which Huldricus, unlike EH 47 D 10, places in the mouth of the shepherd.

<sup>72</sup> For example, through the addition of 'indolis adeo probae?' and 'inertia sua alias ruiturum.'

<sup>73</sup> These include expressions like שובב על הארץ; רמז ברגל; שהביאנו הלום; היה את בעל

### The Huldricus Translation Process

The previous section concludes by mentioning the erratic presence in both Huldricus texts of the nouns *calceum* and נעל. This is an anomaly that results in both versions losing coherence, a situation that Johann Jacob Ulrich was apparently not in a position to remedy, beyond writing a note about it.<sup>74</sup> In order to try to find a solution to the conundrum posed by this situation, let us once again consider the same passage in EH 47 D 10:

|  |                                       |
|--|---------------------------------------|
| So, she went with them                   | קונקי פֿואי קון איליוס                |
| until the division of the roads          | האסטה דיביסיון די לוס קאמינוס         |
| and showed them the way and turned back. | אי ליס מוסטרו איל קאמינו אי בולבייוסי |

As can be seen, the Ladino version is quite clear, although very probably for a reader not accustomed to the Castilian language of the previous centuries, expressions such as ‘división de los caminos’ (דיביסיון די לוס קאמינוס) and ‘volvióse’ (בולבייוסי) could represent a problem. This fact demonstrates something obvious: a translator who was probably unfamiliar with the type of language of the text (sixteenth-century Castilian) would need a transcription into contemporary Spanish. It was this process, which in my opinion must have worked as follows, that generated the texts discussed in this article:

Original text > Contemporary Spanish > Latin > Hebrew.

As can be seen in the diagram, my theory is not only that Ulrich needed to update the text of EH 47 D 10 (or another very similar one), but at the same time that the direction of the translation shifted from Spanish to Latin and from Latin to Hebrew. This process must have occurred more or less according to the following pattern:

| E 47 D 10               | Hypothetical text              | Huldricus-Latin         | Huldricus-Hebrew |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| קונקי פֿואי קון איליוס  | Los acompañó la moza           | Comitatur eos puella    | ותלך הנערה אתם   |
| האסטה דיביסיון          | por la <b>calzada</b>          | usque ad <b>Calceum</b> | והביאם על הנעל   |
| די לוס קאמינוס          | hasta algún indicio del camino | aliquem viæ indicium    | סימן הדרך        |
| אי ליס מוסטרו           |                                |                         |                  |
| איל קאמינו אי בולבייוסי |                                |                         |                  |

Table 4. Possible pattern of translation from E 47 D 10 to Huldricus.

<sup>74</sup> ‘*Calceum*] על הנעל] Hebr. ambigua hæc sunt, & verti possunt, vel *ad claustrum aliquod* aut *pessulum*, vel *ad calceum aliquem*, quod malo, quia *calcens*, ut Symbolum quoddam hominis iter facientis, viæ signum accomodatius & vulgatius esse videtur *claustro*,’ ULRICH, ספר תולדות ישוע הנוצרי, *Historia Jeschuae Nazareni*, 50.

The Ladino text, already tricky in vocabulary and style for Ulrich due to its origin, and most probably necessitating transliteration from the cursive Hebrew into the Latin alphabet, gave rise to a new version in early eighteenth-century Spanish. This will surely have included the term *calzada* as a very usual synonym for road. Moreover, if we consider the Latin and Hebrew wording, the more complex formulation of EH 47 D 10 gave rise to a phrase that was probably something like: ‘the maiden accompanied them along the path (*calzada*) to some sign of the road.’ The problem that arose next is that the author of Huldricus, who probably did not know the Spanish language well, confused *calzada* (path, road, way) with *calzado* (sandal, shoe) giving rise to the impossible translation using the terms *calceum* and נעל.

### Conclusions

From a synchronic point of view, EH 47 D 10 is a complex but at the same time very well-articulated literary text. In general, the language and textual structure show a great coherence to the current style of the Spanish sixteenth century. The few hitches in grammar and syntax are probably due not so much to the original wording but to the composition history of the copy. From a diachronic point of view, the text does not appear to be the translation of a preexisting *Vorlage*, but an original composition. On the other hand, the organisation of the narrative, based on a succession of stories, makes it likely that not all of them were composed by the original author, but that they may already have existed (a common custom in those communities) and were accommodated to fit the general sense of the work. This process seems more evident in the cycle of Simon el Qalfoseo, which includes linguistic interpretations that the author does not seem to have fully understood.

At the same time, it is clear that the author is familiar with the traditional Iberian version of the *Toledot Yesbu* (Wagenseil-Helena type) but believes it necessary to present an alternative.<sup>75</sup> In this sense, from a diachronic point of view, EH 47 D 10 represents a rewriting process. There seem to be three main motives that led the author to undertake this task: (1) the problem of Jesus’s ability to perform miracles in the standard version; (2) the desire to develop a more intense polemic against the prevailing Roman Catholicism; (3) a great interest in the literary culture of sixteenth-century Spain, in which the author was probably educated.

The *Istoriab de Iesus natsareno* (איסטרייה די ישׁו״ז נאצארינו) corresponds to a type of cultured literature of sixteenth-century Spain, in which elements coming from the medieval substratum (romances of chivalry and pastoral genre) can be seen to blend with

---

<sup>75</sup> Samuel Krauss also hypothesised in the case of Huldricus a ‘bewusste Abweichung von den anderen Typen zum Zwecke schärferer und handgreiflicher Polemik,’ KRAUSS, *Das Leben Jesu nach jüdischen Quellen*, 34.

the new sensibilities proper to Spanish picaresque literature (e.g., *Lazarillo de Tormes*). From this perspective, it would be possible to affirm that this version of the *Toledot Yesbu* is not far from the classic novel *Don Quixote de la Mancha* written by Miguel de Cervantes at the end of the sixteenth century. At the same time, the author succeeds in blending elements that undoubtedly come from Jewish environments. The stories that he certainly uses as models not only include a Wagenseil-Helena version of the *Toledot Yesbu*, but also texts from the Talmud (probably in vernacular) and minor stories (such as the stories in the cycle of Simon el Qalfoseo) that probably circulated among the Jewish milieus that the author frequented.

As has been argued in the article, the author of EH 47 D 10 is probably a Jew coming from an experience of forced conversion in Castile, Aragon, or Portugal. The text was written around the middle of the sixteenth century, somewhere in the free lands, as part of the converso reaction against Christianity and therefore the work must be framed within the intense Judaising polemics against Roman Catholicism of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The collection in the Ets Haim library in Amsterdam also preserves other texts which, despite not strictly belonging to the tradition of the *Toledot Yesbu*, are without doubt good examples of this type of fashionable burlesque literature cultivated in Iberian environments by Judaising and Christian authors.<sup>76</sup>

The literary quality of this work, as well as numerous elements that emerge from a comparative analysis, point to the fact that the Huldricus version (1705) is undoubtedly a faulty translation of this text and not the other way around. On the other hand, it is quite possible that the originality of EH 47 D 10 stemming from the rewriting process hypothetically described throughout this article, whose purpose was to adapt the traditions of the *Toledot Yesbu* to the historical-social context of the author, was not so much a novelty but a common practice in medieval Sepharad, whose traditions concerning the life of Jesus the Nazarene remain largely to be discovered.

---

<sup>76</sup> The *Quintillas de Dn Gerónimo Cancer al Nacimiento* is copied following the text of the *Historia De xp̄o: su Nasimiento Vida y Muerte*, in manuscript EH 48 E 15. The *Quintillas* is a satirical Christmas poem published by Jerónimo de Cáncer y Velasco (1599–1655): *Obras Varias de D. Geronimo de Cancer y Velasco. Dedicadas al excelentissimo Señor D. Gaspar Alonso Perez de Guzmã el Bueno, Duque de la Ciudad de Medina Sidonia, Marques y Conde, &c. Gentil-Hombre de la Camara de su Magestad* (Madrid: Diego Diaz de la Carrera, 1651), 52–55v. On the other hand, in manuscript EH 48 B 07 it is possible to find a composition in rhyme entitled *Fabula Burlesca de Xpto j La Magdalena*. Its author is identified as Fray Antonio Márquez, prosecuted by the Inquisition, who is thought to have composed the poem in London in 1623. However, several specialists have disputed this identification of the author.