INSTRUCTIONS FROM AUTHOR TO LIBRARY FOR THESES AND PRIZE ESSAYS

AUTHOR Jeff Ronald

TITLE "WORD-FOR-WORD: The Ferrara Bible as a Judaizing Text for Emigrant Conversos"

TYPE OF THESIS: Ph.D. [ ] D.H.L. [ ] Rabbinic [✓]

Master's [ ] Prize Essay [ ]

1. May circulate [✓]) Not necessary
2. Is restricted [ ] for ___ years.) for Ph.D.) thesis

Note: The Library shall respect restrictions placed on theses or prize essays for a period of no more than ten years.

I understand that the Library may make a photocopy of my thesis for security purposes.

3. The Library may sell photocopies of my thesis. ✓ yes ___ no

03-17-87
Date

Jeff Ronald
Signature of Author

Library Record

Microfilmed
Date

Signature of Library Staff Member

WORD FOR WORD

THE FERRARA BIBLE AS A JUDAIZING TEXT FOR EMIGRANT CONVERSOS

J. N. Ronald

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for Ordination

Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion
Cincinnati School

1987

Referee: Prof. Isaac Jerusalmi

D I G E S T

One of the most significant chapters in the history of the printed Bible in modern European languages is the story of the first publication of the entire Hebrew Scriptures in Spanish translation at Ferrara Italy on March 1, 1553, by two Jewish emigres from the Iberian peninsula. While the manuscript antecedents for the text printed there can be at least indirectly traced back to the fourteenth century Escorial translation from the Masoretic Text, I-J-3 (which itself probably descends from a still more ancient Romance Bible version dating to the Middle Ages), the edition produced by the "Marrano Press at Ferrara" is unique in the legacy of printed vernacular renditions of Scripture.

An examination of the physical bibliographic characteristics of the Ferrara Bible exposes the publishers' attempt at cultural compromise as the "Hebrew truth" tentatively presents its bona fides to an ambivalent Christian audience. The titles, prefatory material and abridged replications of the Masoretic apparatus are colored by the exquisite caution of two former conversos who sought to publish a fully Jewish version of the Holy Scriptures which could simultaneously evade the church censor and not offend their ducal patron, whose political indulgence made the Ferraran biblical edition possible.

While the compilers of the volume may have been forced to temporize with the Zeitgeist which prevailed in northern Italy during the Renaisance, the Ferrara Bible nonetheless contains a text aimed more at Castilian-reading

Sephardim than toward a universal public. To be sure, Spanish Protestants and, later (in the 18th century when canon law was eased to permit translations of Scripture), Catholic scholars would rely extensively on the phraseology of the Ferraran version. But the influence of the Aramaic targumim and medieval commentaries, as well as centuries' old vernacular traditions among Judeo-Spanish Bible translators, molded the FB text into an implicitly sectarian rendition.

Hence, most researchers who have considered the textual and non-textual traits of the editio princeps of the typeset Spanish Bible have concluded that the book was designed to help re-educated the many Iberian anusim who had escaped the Inquisition in order to 'take shelter under the wings of the shekhinah' in the Ottoman Empire, Italy or the Low Countries. Whether or not such was the primary goal of the Ferrara Bible's editors, the liturgical and literary role of the initial printed Bible in Spanish continued and expanded, especially among Sephardim and Marranos who lived in western Europe. This pervasive influence may be documented well into the 1700's.

The Ferrara Bible thus emerges from the annals of Iberian Jewry in exile as a seminal work in the religious literature of Sephardic Israel: an Urtext for subsequent biblical recensions (both Jewish and Christian), a direct source of prooftexts by converso apologists, a liturgical resource for study and, most significantly in assessing the history of the Marranos, the primary text for re-introducing deracinated but highly-literate Jews to the faith of their ancestors.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The following study is the result of a topical search which I undertook two years ago while still in Los Angeles at the California School of HUC-JIR. Although I knew already that I wished to write on the subject of Marranism, focus was elusive until my cherished friend and colleague, Rabbi Ben Beliak, Director of the Hillel Foundation of the Claremont Colleges, referred me to Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi's biography of the Marrano apologist, Isaac Cardoso. The inspiration of the question, "How did a mature, fully Latinized Spanish university professor and court physician so successfully overcome decades of Catholic indoctrination, emigrate to the Venice Ghetto and author one of the most well-known apologias for Judaism of that period?" In short, what kind of Jewish texts did Cardoso and similarly situated converso intellectuals use to learn about Judaism, given their ignorance of Hebrew? Thanks to the fruitfulness of Rabbi Ben's suggestion, I found the direction I had sought.

From the moment I crossed the threshhold of the Klau Library in August of 1985, the staff of reference librarians of the Cincinnati School lent me unstinting support in tracking down obscure or misplaced books and periodicals. The staff's genial patience with my intermittant forays into the Rare Book Room bespeaks a solicitude far in excess of simple duty or courtesy.

Whether I would have wandered into the area of Sefarad without first having cast a gaze on one of her more recent Jewish emigres is a nice question indeed. The very least I can say is that my wife Cathy's presence spared me more than one trip to the diccionario. (She can always be counted on to remind me that marranos are not kosher.) Beyond that, the enchanting melody of her romantic canciones supplied fitting background music for this project. Her overall forebearance and willingness to do the dishes did not hurt either.

Harbeh hiskalti merabotai; and they are too numerous to mention all by name and contribution. But it would be remiss not to acknowledge the historical insight in heuristic questions offered by Dr. Joseph Hirsch, Rabbi of Brith Shalom Congregation in Erie, Pennsylvania.

'Aḥaron, va'aḥaron haviv. My thesis advisor, Dr. Isaac Jerusalmi, has been a superb guide for this literary odyssey. He gave orientation when the way was obscured; he allowed me to follow my own bearings when I had a hunch about a certain path. His sense for the crucial significance of subtle nuances in language provided for critical changes in course. His native feel for Sephardic culture and the Ladino parlance and literature made him the ideal navigator on the "tempestuous sea" of the rabbinic thesis.

Todo esto nos vino, y no te olvidamos;
y no falsamos en tu firmamiento.
No se tornò atrás nuestro coraçón;
ni declinò nuestro passo de tus caminos.
Porque nos majaste en lugar de culebros;
y cubriste sobre nós con tiniebla.

Si olvidamos nombre de nuestro Dio;
o estendimos nuestras palmas a Dio estraño.
Porque sobre ti sómos matados todo el día;
sómos contados como ovejas al degolleo.
Por qué tus fazes encubres;
por qué se aprimiò al polvo nuestra alma,
pegose à tierra nuestro vientre.

Psalm 44, FB, fol. 286b

This study is dedicated to the twenty-four martyrs of the Neve Shalom Synagogue in Istanbul, who were brutally cut down in the midst of prayer on Shabbat Shoftim, 2 Ellul 5746 (9-06-86). May they always be remembered as a faithful remnant of the geirush sefarad, who died 'al kiddush hashem and who lived de la verdad Hebráica.

CONTENTS

Chapter One:
The Ferrara Version as a Printed Bible

Oxford Librarian Stanley Rypins determined in his exhaustive bibliographical study of the Ferrara Bible over 30 years ago, that the premier Spanish printed version of the Hebrew Scriptures was the product of one setting-up-of-type, "and must consequently, be classified as a single edition."[1] Still, of the 49 extant editions examined by Dr. Rypins, he discerned two varieties: a large-paper, deluxe volume, intended probably for an elite clientele, and a small-paper volume, designed for more general circulation.[2] The two exemplars contained in the Klau Library of the Cincinnati School of the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion are both of the more typical, small-paper book.[2]

Both the deluxe and standard sets of the Ferrara Bible may each be further categorized into two subtypes: those with dedications to Hercules II, the Fourth Duke of Este in Ferrara, and those with an honorific to Doña Gracia Nasi, the former <u>conversa</u> patroness who no doubt subvented the Marrano press in her recent Italian haven. Corresponding to these two divergent dedicatories (although not always symmetrically in tandem with themaccording to the logic of religious identification) are the two alternate formulas of the colophon: those subscribed by Duarte Pinel and Jeronimo Vargas (the Christian names of the expatriate <u>converso</u> Portuguese and Spanish publishers, respectively) versus a disjunctive group of colophons bearing the Hebrew names of the identical

Sephardic bookmakers: Avraham Usque and Yom Tov Athias.[3] Only one of the two Klau specimens (which Rypins denominates A-11 in distinction from its companion, A-27) is sufficiently preserved so that the endpages are still intact. This very legible volume carries the Este dedication and Pinel/Vargas colophon.

Yet another variant which divides copy from copy is the official date of publication: some reflect the Julian calendar as the date when the Bible was finished, March 1, 1553, while the rest carry the anno mundi printed at the colophon's close, Adar 14, 5313 (the Feast of Purim according to the Jewish calendar). The one Klau exemplar which does contain a colophon follows the Christian dating.[4]

Following very precise bibliographical criteria, the dimensions and physical characteristics of the Ferrara Bible have been meticulously catalogued: each volume is impressed with Black Letter Print upon tall folio paper pages, the biblical text occupying 802 double 44-line columns with 88 lines on each recto and verso in the body of the text.[5]

Cecil Roth notes that every existing product of the Marrano press at Ferrara attests to the same typography: Gothic font with a slight Spanish cast.

> . . . (A)nd it is by no means unlikely that the matrices were imported from the Peninsula. In any case, the use of this type betrays an Iberian influence. In Italy, by now, the roman and italic had gained the day. In Spain they were indeed beginning to make headway, but the old style was still solidly established, expecially for works of a theological nature. The refugees in Ferrara were at some pains to uphold in this respect the tradition of their

native land,[6] even when strictly secular work was concerned.

Both Klau copies conform in all the particulars thus far enumerated.

Other classes of physical features which distinguish the converso-sponsored Spanish Bible differ according to the state of preservation for each surviving exemplar. While most FB specimens in prime condition contain 410 folios, including the preliminary and colophon endpages, Rypins found that no less than 18 out of 49 copies which he examined held two sheets of parashiot/haftarot tables, "insecurely slipped in between the first two folios of the preliminary gathering or the last two folios of the terminal gathering. . ."[7] yielding a maximum total of 412 folios. Even the more complete Klau specimen lacks the lectionary insert.[8]

With one highly conspicuous exception, the order of the 24 books of the Hebrew canon as set forth in the Ferrara Bible follows that of the Masoretic Text: Pentateuch, Prophets and Hagiographa, albeit the editors posit four divisions in Scripture rather than the traditional three.[9] A source which Rypins cites in this connection records the order of the FB canon without actually noting the anomalous position of the Five Scrolls; nor does their rearrangement to the close of the Writings (removed from their situation in the MT between Job and Daniel) draw comment in the Oxford Librarian's otherwise ~~meticulous study.~~[10] Indeed, the compilers of the Catalogue of the British and Foreign Bible Society erroneously state, "The books are arranged in the usual Jewish order, in five groups."[11] This is an assertion which--except for the

placement of the Festival/Fastday lectionary at the end of the Hebrew Bible--would, regarding the rest of the FB canon, be accurate. The miscollation of the ḥamesh megillot in the Ferrara edition is a feature common to all (including both Klau copies). This peculiarity may not be inadvertant, since the numbering of the signatures is not out of consecutive order with respect to these five books. It is a signal quirk of composition by Athias and Usque which will provide an opportunity for more extensive analysis below.

The order of the prefatory material, text and colophon are thus listed by Rypins:

> The title-page, upon the verso of which appears a signed dedication, is followed by a foreward (Al Lector; 2 pp.), a table of contents (Orden del número y nombres de los libros de la Biblia según los Hebreos y Latinos; 9 pp.), an historical chronology Catalogo de los juezes y reyes que reynaron en Ysrael y prophetas y sacerdotes mayores de sus tiempos: y sumario de los años desde Adam fasta año de .4280. del mundo sacado de Sedar Holam; 3 pp.); the biblical text (802 pp.); a lectionary schedule, often wanting, of Sabbath readings (the Haphtaroth) selected from the prophets (3 pp.); a variable calendar, likewise often wanting of Pentateuchal readings (Parashiyyoth) for the Sabbaths for the years A.M. 5313-80 (1553-1620 CE) (Número de los años en los quales se ayunten estas parsioth; 1 p.); and finally a single unnumbered folio (DDD 10), with register and colophon on its recto, and with verso blank.[12]

As Rypin's survey of the 49 FB copies became more concentrated, a greater number of particularities emerged, which further distinguished discrete sub-sets in the edition, up to the point of singularity in several instances. One of the more common of these errata is fol. 48b, which omits nearly ten verses from the book of Leviticus (7:36 to 8:7a).[13] Nonetheless, the most nearly perfect copy in existence does boast the full text of Leviticus, as well as a haphtarot

table and the original calfskin binding.[14]

At the University Library in Bologna, Rypins located the tallest copy (34.5 cm. x 25.4 cm.) in the survey, also the most elegant and unique, owing to the pale blue tint of its paper.[15] Both Klau FB specimens belong, however, to the small-paper rubric, all of whose members are characterized by lesser dimensions in length and breadth, with running-titles dropped closer to the text and the inter-columnar gap narrowed by 5mm.[16]

A non-textual feature of a Jewish nature occurs in the printer's logo which dominates the bottom-center of the title, a motif which Rypins describes thus:

> . . . a storm-tossed galleon, its shattered mainmast toppling over into a wind-lashed sea. This scene, allegorical of nothing Christian, may reasonably be considered symbolic of the Jewish people shipwrecked, so to speak, by the Spanish Inquisition. Furthermore, attached to the top of the still unbroken foremast of the battered vessel the artist has depicted a disproportionately large armillary sphere --an object which, thus situated. . .bibliographers will recognize as a fair representation of the printer's mark on certain sixteenth-century Jewish books issued at Ferrara from the press of none other than Abraham Usque.17

The Oxford Librarian noted further that historian Cecil Roth applied this pictoral metaphor to the story of Jonah, presuming the biblical legend might resonate with the Iberian refugees' own experience of a harrowing escape. Most certain to Roth was that the device of a suspended armillary sphere had its origin with the kings of Portugal, the globoid image having served as a royal symbol which had figured "on the title pages of many works printed there at this time."[18] Indeed, Rypins' associate, Prof. E. M. Wilson may have decoded the publishers'

cipher more exactly by linking the hostile waves in the woodcut to the "tempestuous sea stirred-up by detracting tongues" alluded to in the dedication of the FB. (However, rather than being a reference to supposed linguistic critics, the unnamed adversaries should more likely be the feared censors of the Holy Office. Those malevolent clerics may in fact be personified in the two angry-looking sea creatures observable at the bottom of the woodcut illustration, each of them snarling at the galleon amid the turbulent waters.)

Other bibliographical features which carry no obvious historical or religious implications distinguish the Ferrara Bible as an early printed Bible. These tracks of the printer's craft may be detected by a systematic perusal of the volume's 400-plus pages. For instance, while most of the columns manifest a solid, uninterrupted composition, in both places (Ex. 28:17-20a at fol. 38b and Ex. 39:10-13a at 44b) wherein the jewels of the High Priest's ephod are listed, they are arranged symmetrically rather than in linear continuity with the surrounding text: each row of three stones occupies one line of type, every stone name equidistant from its companion. Then, in the third division of the Latter Prophets, for no apparent reason, the "poem" of Hezekiah upon his recovery (Is. 38:9ff.) is introduced with a special, reduced-size typeface, setting off in isolation the textual editorial heading, "Writing of Hezekiah King of Judah in his taking ill and recovery from his sickness." Finally, in the fourth and last section of the Ferrara canon, the Hagiographa, the Aramaic portions of the books of Daniel and Ezra are puncutated

from the adjacent Hebrew text by boldface titles: "Thargum" "Desde aqui thargum," and "Fasta aqui thargum".

Yet another distinctive feature of the FB typesetting was the employment of ornamental initials for the beginnings of parashiyot, biblical books in the last three divisions of the FB canon and each of the five sections of the Psalter. Rypins' review of the text's corpus yielded three kinds of ornamental initials:

> (1) . . .most frequently very tall letters, about 35 mm. in height, either solid-black, arabesque lettres-tournes, (2) or 'two-line', white roman capitals with serifs on a ground crible; (3) less often, shorter letters, about 19 mm. high, these initials being both 'two-line' and historiated.[19]

A tabulation of the ornamental capitals throughout the Ferrara edition adds up to a total of 58 large, illustrated initials of either the arabesque or roman variety, mostly distributed in the first two FB divisions (viz. the Pentateuch and Early Prophets). The less-frequent, small, illustrated 19 mm. plain capital occurs only 30 times, and twice as often in the Books of Moses as in the rest of the printed biblical text. In addition, unadorned, bold letters sub-dividing each of the five Psalm books amount to 19 in all. The general tendency of this ornamented capitalization scheme would appear to simply reinforce the greater authority of earlier canon versus the latter, with conspicuous embellishment accorded to the Torah, as Jewish tradition would naturally sanction.

Occurring consistently throughout all the FB copies which Rypins scrutinized were seven distinct categories of printing error which the librarian felt buttressed his argument for a

single setting-up-of-type. The first and most prominent mistake was that of misfoliation: every copy examined to date (both Klau numbers included) indicates that the last 161 paginated folios are off by one digit (e.g. fol. 400 should be fol. 401). The other five classes of error resemble the first: a misnumbered signature, an inaccuracy in the register, a dittography of four lines of text (Ex. 12:48 at fol. 31b), the inter-change of the running titles for the first and second books of Psalms and the compositor's faulty copyreading, which left a series of misspellings that might easily have been avoided. The seventh genre of erratum actually belongs to the translator, as well as to the copy editor, in as much as the Spanish text has been thus impaired: Rypins cited four instances of careless interpretation.[20]

Stanley Rypins' greatest contribution to the knowledge accumulated on the Ferrara version is not, however, his thorough and comprehensive cataloguing of the volume's physical characteristics--invaluable though the feat was--as a printed vernacular Bible. Rather, the Oxford librarian marshalled this impressive array of data in a brilliant attack on the 'two edition theory' which still enjoyed currency when he published his study more than 30 years ago. Until "The Ferrara Bible at Press" appeared in 1955, FB studies which had been founded on, at most, a handful of specimens, were still concluding that the sectarian-specific dedications, colophons, datings and renderings of Isaiah 7:14 proved the existence of two separate editions, one for Christians and another for Jews, each selectively marketed by the Athias/Usque

partnership. Rypins' signal achievement lay in bringing positive and negative bibliographic data, gleaned from his systematic review of the 49 copies, to demonstrate once and for all the fallacies inherent in the dual-edition hypothesis; no one since has challenged his finding of a once-run single FB edition, which nonetheless included a special mid-run pressing of copies with virgen substituted at Is. 7:14 for the benefit of a sensitive Christian readership.

The bibliographer utilizes the indicia of the printing art to conclude that the three variants (ALMA, virgen and moça) attested to in the census of available exemplars were

> . . .beyond question, successive corrections of the original setting-up-of-type arranged while the sheet containing this verse was still passing through the press. . . .virgen, it can scarcely be questioned, was substituted either for moça or for ALMA in selected copies (presumably few in number) reserved for submission to the Inquisition. 21

Rypins also adduced the following arguments and evidence to establish ALMA as the first choice of the converso printers: a) R. Moshe Arrangel, in his largely Vulgatic compromise translation of 1430 opted to use such a neutral term rather than accept the virgen reading of the vetus latina; b) ALMA occurs as the preferred compromise in the majority of specimens surveyed; c) a correction of a misspelled "no" is attested only in twelve ALMA copies (suggesting that the change was effected prior to the substitution in wording) and other carefully substantiated arguments based on alterations and refinements which differentiate various FB specimens. The analysis of the printing house clues left on extant Ferrara Bibles leads to the ineluctable conclusion that,

> . . .La ALMA was the original wording of the key-word in this disputed passage, and that it was replaced first by virgen, probably in recognition of political necessity, and finally, as a compromise acceptable to readers less rigid in their orthodoxy, by moça.[22]

Most significantly, Rypins was the first scholar to observe that every authenticated virgen copy (out of eight in the sub-set) is dedicated to the Duke, albeit two of these carry the "Jewish" colophon and Hebrew date and three contain the haphtarot insert.[23] The plain implication of the Oxford librarian's massive case for a single-run edition, then, is that the main dissimulative intent harbored by the publishers was not so much to conceal their national origins or religious confession; rather they edited their translation so to avoid offending the theological sensibilities of the gentile readership and authorities.

In describing the physical aspects of the Ferrara version as a printed Bible, those otherwise missing features which typically characterize this category of religious text should be enumerated alongside its visible traits. To wit, the FB lacks verse numbers, chapter headings and printed marginalia[24] (unlike its Protestant stepchild, Casiodoro de Reina's Basel Bible of 1569). From a subjective view, it might also be registered that the heavy, Iberian Gothic typography did not allow the professional-looking finished copy that Christian printers would produce in Switzerland only 16 years later with their agile employment of italic and roman matrices

Having become thoroughly acquainted with the Ferrara versions as a printed Bible, it then becomes possible to shift our attention to the contents of this 'Sephardic vulgate'.

CHAPTER ONE NOTES

1. Rypins, Stanley. "The Ferrara Bible at Press." The Library: Transactions of the Bibliographical Society. 10 (1955) 269.

2. Ibid.

3. Op. cit., pp. 248-9. See also, Giovanni Bernardo De Rossi, De Typographia Hebraeo-Ferrariensi, (1780: Parmae), pp. 69-70. Cecil Roth, "The Marrano Press at Ferrara, 1552-55." Modern Language Review. 38 (1943) 309.

4. See sources in note 3 supra. De Rossi, loc. cit. Roth, loc. cit. (Rypins incorrectly identifies Adar as "the sixth Jewish month"). Also, the copy in the possession of the British and Foreign Bible Society agrees in all the heretofore mentioned particulars with the Klau's A-11: the cataloguers additionally list their copy's distinctions from the other FB variants, Historical Catalogue of the Printed Editons of Holy Scripture in the Library of the British and Foreign Bible Society, compiled by T. H. Darlow and H. F. Moule. 4:1428, Specimen no. 8467. (London: 1903). Interestingly, the FB copy turned up by Antonio Palau y Dulcet in trade, item no. 28940, carries an Este dedicatory and an Usque-Athias/Adar 14 colophon. Manuel del Librero Hispano-Americano. (Oxford: 1948), 2:212.

5. Rypins, op. cit., p. 244.

6. Roth, op. cit., pp. 307-8.

7. Rypins, op. cit., pp. 245; 245, n. 3; 251; 269. See also n. 3 on p. 251 regarding the distribution of the lectionary sheets according to the corresponding dedicatory and textual variation of Is. 7:14.

8. However, A-11 does attest demarcations of the haftarot lectionary (following the Sephardic rite) written on to the volume's pages by pen-and-ink in what must be a late 18th century or early 19th century hand.

9. The 24 books of the Hebrew canon "are divided into four parts: Torah, the Law. Nebijm Rishonim, Early Prophets. Nebijm Aharonim, Latter Prophets. Ketubim, Writings." FB, iia. The Venician Rabbinic Bible of 1517 follows the same divisional order.

10. Rypins, op. cit., p. 245, n. 1. This unique aspect of the collation did not escape the notice of De Rossi, op. cit., p. 81. (A physical inspection of pre-1553 Jewish and Christian Hebrew Bibles in the Klau Library's Rare Book Room revealed one edition with the identical postposition of the Scrolls as the FB, a 1546 MT and Latin Muenster OT printed at Basel. Also, Bomberg's 1544 miniature Mikra' K'tanah placed the lectionary after the humash.)

11. Idem., loc. cit.

12. Rypins, op. cit., p. 245.

13. Idem., op. cit., p. 246. Most of the researchers have observed this conspicuous textual lacuna. De Rossi, op. cit., pp. 82; 84-5. Clemente Ricci, La Biblia de Ferrara Facultad de Filosofia y Letras: Publicaciones del Instituto de Investigaciones Historicas. Casa Jacobo Peuser, Ltda. (Buenos Aires: 1926), pp. 44-5 and facsimile therein. Roth makes the same observation and further adduces the discrepancy as proof of two separate "issues," op. cit., p. 310. Rypins registered five copies in which the missing verses have been written into the margins by hand, loc. cit., n. 2. And, what must be no later than a nineteenth century hand has also penned the omitted lines onto the margin of Klau's better exemplar, "10 verses are missing, although not entirely, 3 from chap. 7 which is on this folio 48b and the other 7 from chap. 8. See concerning these Rossi, p. 82. ./. The 10 vv. may be read in the same Rossi, p. 85." In fact, only eight full verses are omitted, whereas the leadword "Que" from Lev. .7:36 is printed at the foot of 48b, while the last clause of Lev. 8:7 commences the left-hand column of 49a.

14. Rypins, op. cit., pp. 245-7.

15. Ibid. and n. 2, loc. cit., citing De Rossi, op. cit., pp. 79; 102. Rypins conjectures that this splendid exemplar "must have been especially designed for some princely patron, none being more likely than Ercole d'Este, fourth Duke of Ferrara, through whose intervention. . .its printers circumvented the Inquisition and to whom, we observe, it was dedicated."

16. Ibid.

17. Loc. cit.

18. Op. cit., p. 312.

19. Op. cit., p. 266. The bibliographer does not included in this inventory the unbordered extrabold initials which mark individual, ostensibly arbitrary, selections in the Psalms.

Most of the "historiated" figures depicted within the 'two-line' capitals evince no biblical thematic. Albeit diminutive and somewhat crude, the woodcut miniatures reflect the neo-classical motifs of the Italian Renaisance, with the figures clad in sixteenth century garb. Most frequent is the musician leaning against a tree, blowing on a wind instrument, inside the ornamented E

(see, for example, fol. 17b); the relatively rare S capitals (e.g. fol. 58b) exhibit, surprisingly, a pair of satyres; the V initials show a blacksmith wielding his hammer to the anvil (e.g. fol. 95a); the I capitals frame a bonneted lady seated upon a chair or throne (see fol. 89b); the sole illustrated Q (fol. 91a) features a knight on horseback; the two ornamented L's (fols. 269a and 302a) reveal an armored, walking gentleman with his right hand gesturing skyward; both of the B initials (fols. 286a and 392a) obscure a reclinate young woman handling a piece of fabric (?); the singular ornamental D (fol. 293a) is a unique negative print (white features on a black background) of a flower and its leafy branches; and the equally one-of-a-kind initial O (fol. 298a) portrays a finely-etched, seated figure of a playing violinist. Finally, the dedication page begins with an historiated capital A, in whose background hovers a chariot driven by an elderly man.

20. Op. cit., p. 267.

21. Op. cit., p. 255. Both Klau volumes are ALMA copies.

22. Op. cit., p. 257. See each of the arguments documented in great technical detail on pp. 255-65.

23. Op. cit., p. 263 and n. 5 there.

24. Darlow and Moule, loc. cit.

CHAPTER TWO
THE FERRARA BIBLE AS A JEWISH TRANSLATION OF SCRIPTURE

Once it has been established that the Ferrara Bible as a bibliographical artifact bears the marks of unmistakable Jewish provenance, the next logical stage of investigation should include examination of the text itself. In theory, a vernacular Bible, based on the Masoretic Text, and published during the Italian Renaissance in a religiously tolerant domain, could be the product of Christian Hebraists. After all, even though the 1430 Spanish edition of the Hebrew Scriptures, the so-called "Duke of Alba Bible", was authored by a Sephardic rabbi, the patron and intended audience of that primarily Vulgatic translation were all members of a Roman Catholic religious order.[1] Studied outside of its ostensibly Jewish margins, does the Athias/Usque Castilian version emerge as an authenticated vernacular rendition which mirrors the spirit, as well as the letter of the Hebrew Bible? When scrutinized independently of its tell-tale bibliographical framework, the FB text should allow us to determine how thoroughly the composers intended their work to reflect the Jewish Scriptures according to their advertisement, "word for word".[2]

A scientific approach to the question of "how Jewish is the text" requires certain objective criteria. First, material should be sought which could be probative of the translators' express original intention for their project. Thus, are there intra- or extra-textual statements or evidence by which

the editors disclose their interpretive procedure, their intended audience and their ultimate literary goal? Second, if a rearrangement of the existing data on the text is susceptible to new discoveries and inferences, such an avenue ought also be explored. So, does the comparison and contrast of the translators' notes expose inconsistencies, contradictions or obscured harmonies between the editorial plan and its final execution? Third, reference to similar versions in the same language preceding and following the publication of the edition under review might uncover a trail of textual continuities and innovations. Hence, depending on the proximity in time of companion Spanish versions, the degree of coincidence textually between the FB and them, as well as the amount of each version's reliance upon either the Vulgatic or MT traditions (or, conceivably, both) to what extent may we then conclude that the Ferraran version is a singular literary product in the stream of Spanish Bible translations?

The aforementioned methodology for assessing the Jewish character of the FB text can be applied to the various sections of the book: amid the prefatory material, these elements include the two dedicatories, the note "To the Reader," the Seder Olam summary of biblical history, as well as the Torah portion and prophetic lectionaries; in the body of the text itself, these aspects should be evaluated: the cryptic Masoretic notations, the <u>parashiot</u> markers within the Pentateuchal division (including the comments penned in by hand in the Klau exemplar), the names of the 24 books of the Hebrew canon as they are denominated in the FB, the literalness of the

grammar, syntax and diction, the archaism of the language, the phraseological parallels with earlier Judeo-Spanish Bible manuscripts and the text's disparities from proximate Catholic and Protestant versions of the Old Testament. When the analytical matrix of the investigation is brought to bear upon each of the discrete parts of the Ferraran text, it is hoped that the results will show that the Athias/Usque version can fully qualify for designation as an authoritative "Sephardic vulgate."[3]

The paratextual material which precedes and concludes the biblical books themselves offers many hints and insights into the nature of the Ferraran translation itself, especially when the goal of research demands weighing the matter of the translational enterprise. While scholars have doubted some of the claims set forth in the reader's note by one of the FB editors, the probable criteria by which Abraham Usque and Yom Tov Athias composed their Castilian rendition of the Hebrew Bible are not entirely opaque to the reader mindful of history.

In the Nasi dedicatory and in the preface to the reader the editors of the Ferrara Bible are adamant and guileless regarding one major principle of their interpretation: literalness. When the Usque/Athias team promised a "word for word" rendering of the MT, they delivered a Bible which conformed to this standard with utmost stringency. No student versed in biblical Hebrew who has reviewed the FB text has faulted the authors' intention (and fulfillment) of nearly servile adherence to the Hebrew original in tense, diction and word order. The operative issue anent the literalness of the translation

concerns the question of motivation: why did the two former anusim insist on an ultraprecise version of the Hebrew text?

An uncritical acceptance of one editor's official representations in the reader's note would lead one to believe that the literalness was intended strictly for the sake of accuracy,

> . . .thus I endeavored that this, our Bible in the Castilian language, might be the closest to the true Hebrew as could be possible (as the source and genuine origin whence all have drawn) making it follow, however, in every way possible the translation of Pagnino and his Thesaurus of the holy tongue, being word for word so much in conformity to the letter of the Hebrew.[4]

Yet it is when the author of this preface begins to defend conspicuously the doctrinal purity of the FB version that the scholars' suspicions are aroused. He proceeds to assure the reader that Pagnino's Thesaurus was recurred to because it is "so accepted and esteemed in the Roman Curia." Be that as it may, virtually everyone who has considered this rather strained explanation has immediately dismissed the possibility that the Jewish editors consulted the famous Catholic philologist. As Wiener astutely observed,

> It was a good stroke of policy to claim to follow Pagnino, who was regarded as an authority in the Roman Church. . .; besides, they could do so in most cases without any danger of heresy, for Pagnino himself in his Thesaurus Linguae Sanctae gives in every doubtful case the opinion of the Jewish authorities mentioned by Simon, viz. Ibn Ezra and Radak and Rashi.[5]

What the note's composer implies further on as an additional justification for what Verd terms the "materiality" of the literal FB version is more likely the main principle in the Ferraran criteria of interpretation. To Athias and Usque, the ancient Judeo-Spanish scholars really knew more about how

to connect the semantic bridges between the sacred language and the vernacular of Castile. Thus, the diction, syntax and grammar of the Ferrara text harks back to the method of the old Judeo-Spanish Bibles--not to the everyday speech of sixteenth century Spain. The reader's preface, remarks Verd, "is very interesting in its allusion to the gravity of the ancient language. Sacred language is always archaic."[6]

Howbeit the FB follows the literal pattern of translation by virtue of the composers' veneration for preceding generations of Sephardic Bible translators, the amount of the text's materiality is nonetheless relative when compared to the volume's Ladino successors. Haim Vidal Sephiha, by contrasting the FB version of Jeremiah with its Ladino recension from Salonika of 1568, found the Castilian precursor somewhat less attentive to the letter of the Masoretic original:

> We should note. . .that the version of Salonika is very much more literal than that of Ferrara, the latter of which--contrary to its principles--adds an article el without placing it in parenthesis which it forgets at other times: (F) "Toma el vaso de vino de la saña esta de mi mano."/ (S) "Toma a vazo de el vino de la ponçonia la esta de mi mano." We see that S attends exactly to the text, which it manages to do more than F.[7]

Those researchers who have compared the expressed criteria of translation, as set forth in the note to the reader, with the FB text itself, as well as reckoning with external factors (the manuscript history, church-synagogue relations, etc.) have distilled out of apologetic fog the likely original goal of Athias and Usque, i.e. to preserve the Sephardic vulgate which had coalesced over the centuries of Castilianization among Iberian Jewry. As Margherita Morreale, Professor of

Spanish Language and Literature at the University of Bari, concluded in an article on "Vernacular Scriptures in Spain,"

> The Ferrara translators tell us plainly that they had not tried to imitate the niceties of contemporary speech "The phrase" reproduces the venerable and sententious language that was so natural to the Jews of old. In this sense, the Ferrara Bible can be said to be the main link between the vernacular Bible in Spain before 1500 and the religious literature of Sephardic Jews outside Spain, perpetuating a biblical tradition much more conservative and stable even than that of the English version.[8] (Emphasis supplied)

As would naturally befit publishers printing under the Church censor, the Athias/Usque tactic of obscuring the true character of their work operates in other sections of the Ferrara Bible as well. For instance, in both dedicatories the two Marrano bookmakers assure their political patron, Hercules II, Duke of Este, and their financial patroness, Doña Gracia Nasi, severally, that their version of the Holy Scriptures will redound to the credit of each of the dedicatories' respective subjects. On the one hand, Vargas and Pinel promise the Duke of Ferrara that their Spanish Bible will "acquire much praiseworthy glory" by virture of the fact that this edition had been published "by mandate and consent of Your Excellency, being jointly seen by your scholars and inquisitor. . . ." On the other hand, from the pens of the editors' Jewish alter egos, basically the same paean is offered to their wealthy sponsor, landsman and co-religionist. The noble lady will attain "growing adornment" since she has "favored" the project of "the Bible in our Spanish," which project had been undertaken by those animated by "love of the homeland." While in a more liberal epoch, honoring both benefactors might also have been acceptable protocol, the urgency

to 'render unto Caesar' must have seemed particularly acute for these conversos provisionally harbored in a semi-tolerant Italian duchy.9

Just as the two variant dedicatories and the reader's note attest to the ambiguous status of the expatriate Sephardic printers, so the edition's table of contents and historical summary from the tannaitic Seder Olam bear witness to the Jewish nature of the Ferrara Bible as well as the compilers' simultaneous efforts to downplay this aspect of the work. The opening sentence of the index already commences with a half-truth, "Order and number of the books of the Bible following the Hebrews and the Latins." Of course, the preface had already acknowledged that the FB text does not include "the apocrypha that is not of the Hebrew canon," which thereby would exclude the Vulgate's biblical complement, in as much as the Catholic deutero-canon is effectively integral to the vetus latina. Moreover, the order of the Prophets and the Writings follow the MT, not the Vulgate's OT.

In the second sentence of the "Tabla", the editors implicitly recognize this contradiction:

> The Hebrews have another order in the names and in the number of the books than the Latins: hence they call this entire volume Arbah veheserim, viz. the twenty-four. Such are those that are found in the Hebrew Canon, which are divided into four parts, viz. Torah: the law; Nebijm risonim: early prophets; Nebijm aharonim: latter prophets; Ketubim: writings.

The table proceeds to enumerate within each of the four divisions the Latin and Hebrew titles of the various books, with the Hebrew of the Pentateuchal units translated (e.g. "I. Genesis: in Hebrew, Beresit. In beginning.") followed by the

the folio number corresponding to the book's first page. Interestingly, the table also includes a tabulation of each of the canonical sections (the Former Prophets contain four books: Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings, which are "the Latins' first and second kings"), notes that the "twelve minor prophets are counted as one book," and that the Writings include eleven books (since Esdras and Nehemias are compounded into the Hebrew Ezra and the Chronicles constitutea single canonical unit). Most significantly, the "Hames megilloth," the Five Scrolls, are set apart in a separate, fifth division--albeit a sub-section which is subsumed into the Writings' division, thus not accounted as discrete canonical division in the FB. Whatever the compilers' actual plan in their re-collation of of the festival/fastday lectionary to the conclusion of their volume, the identification of this sub-division of the Hagiographa--the group having been bound together by the order in which they are read during the synagogue liturgical year (Canticles, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes and Esther) could only offer meaning and utility to Jews.[10]

In view of the Ferrara Bible's physical and paratextual empirical documentation, it should be a well-founded conclusion which finds the first printed Judeo-Spanish edition to be Jewish in conception as well as in form. The success of the Sephardic vulgate to transmit a Jewish pshat understanding of the Written Law can only be evaluated in the light of the Ferraran biblical text itself.

CHAPTER TWO NOTES

1. Klenicki, Leon. "The Biblia de Alba." HUC-JIR Rabbinic Thesis. (Cincinnati: 1967), pp. 30 ff.

2. FB, "Note to the Reader," as found in B. Foster Stockwell's Prefacios a las Biblias Castellanas del Siglo XVI. Libreria "La Aurora." (Buenos Aires: 1939), p. 31.

3. Maeso, David Gonzalo. "La Exegesis Rabinica en Lengua Sefardi: Fuentes para su Estudio." Miscelanea de Estudios Arabes y Hebraicos. Vol. II. Anejo al Boletin de la Universidad de Granada. 1953, pp. 28-31.

4. FB, "Note to the Reader," Stockwell, op. cit., p.38. In his brief, FB glossary, published at the end of the nineteenth century, Leo Wiener already cited an earlier rejection of the editor's claim, which refutation may be found in the eighteenth century treatise of Rodrigo de Castro:

   "That his edition of Ferrara was made from manuscripts of ancient Spaniards is confirmed by the authority of Ricardo Simon in chapter 14 of his Disquis. crit. de variis. Bibl. edith. who assures that the Jews of Ferrara did not follow in their Spanish translation the version of Xantes Pagnino, as they say in the prologue, rather those of R. Zimchi and R. Abraham Aben Hezra, and other ancient Spanish Jews, who were public Teachers of the Law in the Synagogues of Spain." (Biblioteca Espanola, vol. i, pp. 208-409.)

   Although it is a nice question whether the eleventh century Spanish rabbi, Hebrew grammarian and exegete, Ibn Ezra, found a place in his prolific output for a Castilian Bible translation or lexicon, Simon, De Castro and Wiener are all probably on safe ground when they state that Athias and Usque relied on Jewish rather than Christian textual tradtions.
   If either Ibn Ezra's or Radak's putative translations were at one time current during the Golden Age in Spain, such texts are no longer extant and this writer has yet to uncover any other attestation to their supposed existence other than what has been alleged in the citations above. (This particular rumour seems to have its origins in the speculation of a certain eighteenth century Benedictine scholar, Fr. Martin Sarmiento, in the first volume of his Memorias published in Madrid in 1775 and cited by Stockwell, op. cit., p. 31.)

5. Wiener, Leo. "The Ferrara Bible II." Modern Language Notes. Vol. xi, No. 1, p. 27. In this opinion, the present-day Jesuit scholar, Gabriel Maria Verd concurs that thereferenceto the Roman Curia and Pagnino

". . .was probably to avoid misapprehensions. Pagnino could scarcely be used by them. More likely (were) the ancient Jewish translations, as he confesses later on, 'although for this purpose there is not lacking all the translations, ancient and modern, and from the Hebrews the very most ancient which could be found at hand'." "Las Biblias Romanzadas: Criterios de Traduccion." Sefarad. 31:2 (1971), p. 345.

6. Ibid.

7. "Versiones Judeos-Españolas del Libro de Jeremias Impressas en Ferrara y Salonika en el Siglo XVI: Influencia de los Commentaristas." Sefarad (1971) 31:1, pp. 182-3. Sephiha's observations about the relatively Latinized character of the FB would correspond well with Lorenzo Amigo's recent research which concludes that, "There exists a high number of coincidences between the Judeo-Spanish Bibles and the Vulgate. . . .Evidently the coincidences are more abundant in the medieval Bibles than in the Pentateuch of Constantinople." "La Biblia Romanceada y la Vulgata." Helmantica. (1983) 34:35-54, p. 54.

A comparison between the first printed Ladino editions of Ezekiel and the Twelve Minor Prophets, published by Y. Yabets in Salonika during 1571-72, confirm the tendency of Eastern Separdim to make their recensions of the FB even more literal than the Urtext. See, e.g. Ezek. 14:6-7, (FB text in parenthesis):

"Por tanto di a casa de Ysrael, ansi (assi) dice (dixo) .A. Dio: tornad (vos) y hacer (fazed) tornar de sobre vuestros enconancientos (ydolos) y de sobre vuestras aboriciones (abominaciones) tornad (fazed tornar) y vuestras fazes. (Por) que varon varon de casa de Ysrael del peregrino que morare (peregrinare) en Ysrael y se apartare de enpues (empós) mi, y subirá (hiziere subir) sus enconamientos (ydolos) sobre (a) su corazón y entropeço (estrompieço) de su delito, porná (pusiere) escuentra sus fazes, y vernáa (viniere) a el (al) propheta por requerir a él (del) en (por) mi, yo .A. responderé (faré ser respondido) a él en (por) mi."

Except for those choices of diction which are probably dictated by dialect and editorial taste, the divergence in the rest of the Ladino passages are accountable to a more precise rendering of the Hebrew, a simple future tense for the biblical imperfect instead of an attempt to replicate the hif'il as the Ferraran version does with its "makes to _____" or its penchant for conjugation into the Castilian subjunctive.

8. The Cambridge History of the Bible. G.W.H. Lampe, ed. (Cambridge: 1969). Vol. II, p. 476.

9. The reality of the publishers' tentative situation may be observed as well in the severable expressions of gratitude which distinguish the Jewish dedicatory from the Christian honorific. Whereas the Italian lord is thanked for his civil aegis ("protected by the favor of Your Excellency, for to such a sovereign Prince it has been deemly to preserve and favor all those who were needful of Your patronage and beneficence"), the Sephardic patroness is congratulated for her generosity ("you defend with the good will by which you always favored to this day all those who sought your assistance.") (Regarding Dona Gracia's brief sojourn in Ferrara and her philanthropic activities there, see Cecil Roth's The House of Nasi: Doña Gracia. JPS. (Phil.: 1947), pp. 65-81.)

10. Whether the anomalous placement of the Five Scrolls was a matter of convenience for those Jewish readers desiring ready access to these oft-read biblical books, or if the situation of the Festival/Ninth of Av lectionary at the close of the Ferrara Bible may reflect a fifteenth century bookbinding convention among Sephardim in their tanakh incunabula (as Dr. Ben Zion Wachholder has suggested to this writer), this remarkable feature surprisingly has not drawn the attention of more recent scholars.

Given the esoteric tendency which pervades the Athias/Usque endeavor, a hypothesis may be advanced, however unprovable in the light of current data. To wit, by placing the hamesh megilot at the end of the Hebrew Scriptures, the Marrano editors perforce made the final book the Scroll of Esther, rather than follow the Vulgate's tradition, which situates Malakhi at the close of its OT canon, or the Masoretic arrangement, which concludes the Jewish Bible with the book of Chronicles. By so ordering this most unusual collation, Athias and Usque (perhaps inadvertantly) focus attention on the story of Purim and the role of Esther (who became a particular folk heroine for the conversos--see Roth's "The Religion of the Marranos," Jewish Quarterly Review (1931-32), Vol. 22, pp. 26-7) wherein a Jewess/protagonist conceals her origins in order to rescue the Jews from a high position at court. Was not their conversa sponsor, Doña Gracia, a latter-day Queen Esther, who by means of her well-leveraged connections with the ruling Este family, secured Ferrara as a haven for her landsleit, and where she endowed many Sephardic educational, cultural and philanthropic institutions? By arranging the FB canon so that the Purim scroll has "the last word," the grateful editors were thus able--at least in such tomes that carried the Jewish dedicatory--to begin the Bible with with words of thanks to their aristocratic benefactress, as well as to finish the volume in a cryptic, knowing

tribute to Doña Gracia Nasi, the Queen Esther of the Spanish and Portuguese anusim. The possibility that such may have the the covert intent of the Marrano printers becomes tantalyzing as one shifts gaze from the text to the final page, where the colophon records the date of publication as March 1, 1553, which in the "Jewish" copies is rendered according to the Hebrew calendar: Adar 14, 5313, the Festival of Purim.

Chapter Three : The Ferrara Version as a Jewish Biblical Text

The overt or clandestine intent of the Ferrara Bible's Jewish publishers may have been to produce as Jewish a Spanish version as possible in the prevailing political atmosphere in the mid-sixteenth century Papal States. The degree to which the language of this first printed edition of the Hebrew Bible in the vernacular of Castile actually concretized that plan is a question which can only be answered by careful scrutiny of the text itself.

As recorded above, the FB's pages bear several formal markers which are characteristic exclusively of Jewish Scripture, whether in the original MT or in translation. From Genesis to Esther the reader observes textual pointers which are only traceable to the manuscript apparatus of the Masoretes. Every exemplar of the FB has the Pentateuchal section subdivided into the 54 portions of the annual Babyonian cycle of the lectionary. Interestingly, the parashiyot are numbered with arabic digits, yet do not head up the sections with the appropriate Hebrew titles for the sidrah.[1] As mentioned supra, the Klau's A-11 does have penned into the margins of the two prophetic divisions the corresponding passages which belong to the Sephardic haftarot lectionary, but only for the sabbath cycle; the festival and High Holiday readings are not noted. Still, it would be simply pointing out the obvious to observe that a notation of the synagogue schedule of Torah portions would be of small value to the non-Jewish reader.

In addition to such liturgical features within the text, many characteristics of the FB inicate an attempt by the compilers to imitate certain aspects of the standard Rabbinic Bible, albeit without the texts of the targumim and commentators. For instance, each book concludes with a Castilian version of the Masoretic notes found in mikraot gedolot. The FB summary will typically list the total number of verses in the given biblical book and, occasionally, where the midpoint of these verses is located within the body of the text.

Logically, the FB editors were unable to replicate the pietistic mnemonics which adorn the masorah. But at the close of each division of the FB canon, the compilers recapitulate the totals for each of the section's discrete units, and conclude with a sum total for the division as a whole.[2]

On the other hand, it would be unfair not to make mention of the non-Jewish elements found in and around the FB text. Among these are the booktitles which head up every folio of the Pentatueuchal text. As Rypins and others have observed, with the exception of the Is 7:14 revision, the textual details of each FB copy are identical. Thus, we may infer that all exemplars carried running-titles of the Latin denomination for the books of the Bible. Therefore, a Christian reader who might pick up a copy of the Ferrara version and leaf quickly through it, would in no way be nonplussed by the familiar sight of biblical titles identical to those of the Vulgate.

But it is when we examine the language of the FB text itself that the matter of the intrinsically Jewish character

of this version is tested. In her masterful treatment of the history of the "Vernacular Scriptures in Spain," Margherita Morreale focusses primarily on the FB as the recensional center of comparison between all the other Judeo-Spanish biblical editions. Yet, whereas the medieval renditions moderated their literalism in favor of readability, both the Constantinople Pentateuch of 1547 and the FB, "are slavish in their translations to the point of unintelligibility, reminding us of Aquila in antiquity."[3]

Various grammatical and dictional idiosyncracies distinguish the FB text. Morreale enumerates several of these unCastilian traits: postposition of the adjectives, omission of the copula and a present participle which imitates a similar form in Hebrew "has not yet been shortened to the oxytonic form so characteristic of Judeo-Spanish Bibles and rituals."[4] She also lists the interjection ahe (hineh), license in word formation, the unusual manner of introducing interrogative sentences, paraphrasing relative pronouns in doubtful cases and expression of the superlative by means of the genitive as other instances in which Spanish is bent to the service of Hebraic literalism:

> The preservation of the same number, whether it be singular (tiniebra vs. the Hieronymian tenebrae-tinieblas) or plural (piadades, 'mercies', faces, vidas, 'lives'), is another feature which makes the Jewish origin of theses bibles immediately apparent. . . .Fundamentally, however, faithfulness to the letter is a principle of translation inspired by respect for the sacred text.[5]

While the veneration which Usque and Athias held toward both the Hebrew Bible and the 'Sephardic vulgate' cannot be

doubted, the question of the very Jewishness of specific words and phrases employed within the FB text would still have to be evaluated. One of the most conspicuous verbal characteristics which differentiate both the FB and its Ladino counterparts printed in the Ottoman Empire, from Christian versions of largely Vulgatic orientation, may be found in the two main appellations for the OT Deity. Whereas the Tetragrammaton is rendered by ".A." in the Ferraran versions and its romanized recensions, and by a pair of yods subscribed with a patah in the Ladino Bibles published in the Islamic East, the equivalent of 'elohim, on the other hand, almost universally rendered as 'God' in germanic language translations, but as Dios in Spanish and its dialects, is nonetheless interpreted as 'Dio' in all the Judeo-Spanish prayerbooks and biblical editions until the eighteenth century. Verd considers this usage a censure of Spanish and Portuguese Christians since Iberian Jews took the term as a plural which referred to a multiple godhead, i.e. Dios for them connoted the Trinity.[7]

Beyond the formal linguistic and syntactic traits which make the FB in textual terms a Hebrew Bible manqué, several scholars have concluded that the Athias-Usque version had been Judaized in its phraseology and diction by means of its descent from Judeo-Spanish biblical manuscripts influenced by rabbinic hermeneutics. The interpretation of obscure words and was often guided by Jewish translators through recourse to the targumim and medieval Jewish commentaries, whereas Christian translators (or their Jewish retainees) in Spain were prone to rely on the Vulgate. In the most recent study

available on the subject of Romance Bible translations, Lorenzo Amigo of the University of Salamanca, compares those versions based on the vetus latina with biblical manuscripts derived from the MT and influenced by rabbinic exegesis and tradition.[8] After contrasting the Ferrara and Constantinople editions with their lineal and indirect textual antecedents, Amigo concludes, inter alia, that a) all Judeo-Spanish biblical translations tend frequently to the literal, sometimes to the point of petrification vis-a-vis the MT; b) the lexical distance between E3 and E8 (the most Hebraic versus the most Vulgatic of the old Castilian biblical manuscripts) is greater than any other comparison of the OT in Romance; c) while there are occasional coincidences in word choice between the official Roman Catholic translation and several Judeo-Spanish versions, the principal source of inspiration for the latter is the Jewish tradition (especially with reference to Onkelos and Rashi); and d) in the rare instances when the Hebrew and Latin traditions do intersect, the congruence is probably owed to a shared phraseology based on common semantic criteria utilized by most medieval Spanish Bible translators in an effort to make the OT text sensible to the reader.[9]

Of the more than twenty old Castilian versions still extant which preceded the Ferrara Bible, the recension which is closest to that text in language, Jewish pedigree and time of publication was the multi-lingual humash printed in the Ottoman capital by Eliezer Soncino seven years previous,[10] a work whose Ladino translation may have served as the Urtext for the Castilian edition printed in the Latin alphabet in 1553,

a real likelihood given the proximity of Ferrara to Constantinople by way of Venice. Of course, this Scriptural duo are not verbatim identical, since the literary needs of a the relatively "cosmopolitan" Jewish readership in the West were different than their more isolated brethren on the other side of the Adriatic:

> That the situation may have been this is probable. I suspect. . .that the Pentatueuch of Constantinople and the Ferrara Bible, united by a common tradition, and probably also by positive documentary relationships, were both translated directly from the Hebrew text, their translators impelled by distinct motives than what had already been manifested in the medieval Bibles: those of the Pentatueuch by a vulgarizing and esoteric style, those of the Ferrara Bible by an ambition more open toward the surrounding world and culture.

As Morreale indicates, the Ladino humash is in some ways a more particularistic document than the FB. Yet, if the latter's first canonical division is in fact a reworking of the prior version printed in the East, it is only logical to infer that the Pentateuch would impart to the subsequent recension some Jewish linguistic characteristics, at least to the extent that such sectarian language was not revised by Athias and Usque in their edition. For not only does the 1547 humash contain a Ladino rendition of the Five Books of Moses, but each page of text carries the MT, Targum Onkelos, Rashi and even a Judeo-Greek translation in Hebrew type.[12] So, in contrast to the Complutensian Polyglot published on the Peninsula in 1517,[13] or in positive comparison to the first printed edition of Mikrao't Gedolot published in Venice the same year, the orientation of the Constantinople Pentateuch is thoroughly Judaic. In the search for a shared lexicographic linkage

between both texts, it is perhaps indicative of the respective editors' discrete intents that the phraseology of the texts is sometimes totally the same (a proof of imitation by Athias and Usque) and often divergent (evidence of editorial discretion by the FB compilers).

The textual examples which Prof. Morreale brings from both mid-sixteenth century exilic Judeo-Spanish versions are illustrative of the shared wording, as well as the frequent variations between the two texts. Whereas the formulation of Gen. 13:9 ("si a la izquierda, y aderecharé, y si a la derecha, y izquierdara"), or Gen. 17:4 ("y daré mi firmamiento entre ti y entre mi") correspond verbatim one to the other, in most verses the Sephardim of Ferrara seem to have deliberately selected their own criteria by which to stick to the letter of the Hebrew original. Compare the Pentateuch's Gen. 12:9 ("y movióse Abran andar y moverse") with that of Ferrara ("y movisse Abran andando y moviendo") or the Ladino of Gen. 16:13 ("empués de mi vien") with the Castilian of the same verse ("después de mi veer").[14]

As part of the shared phraseology of the two editions, the FB and the humash of Constantinople both utilize distinctively Jewish Sondersprach for key cultic terms (e.g. alsación for 'olah and templación for nesakh.)[15] Moreover, both sets of editors harbor a common theological outlook which colors their interpretation of disputed OT passages:

> By collating some key passages from the Ferrara Bible and Constantinople Pentateuch one may group the earlier Spanish translations from the Hebrew and characterize them as unanimous in diminishing the messianic suggestions emphasized by Jerome (e.g. in

> using the abstact justicia or justedad instead of "the just" in Isa. xii. 3, xiv 8, etc.). They did away with the basis for the Mariological interpretations (c.f. Gen. iii. 15), and cut the ground from under the feet of those Christian theologians who saw in the Old Testament allusions to the Holy Ghost and his gifts (c.f. Isa. xi. 2).[16]

While Haim V. Sephiha is more involved with the lexical and semantic aspects of the FB and its Ladino counterparts, than with the texts' theological and sectarian implications, he has analyzed the linguistic nature of these Bibles and his research has yielded information which bears upon the use to which the Scritures in Judeo-Spanish were put by succeeding generations. As indicated previously, the underlying criteria of translation are the many cases identifiable by reference to rabbinic sources, whereas discrepancy in word choice between the FB and Constantinople Pentateuch can often be accounted for by divergent dialectical reservoirs from which conversos--as opposed to the pre-1492 Sephardi exiles--drew their language. To be sure, Sephiha holds that the Ferraran editors copied directly from the Ladino humash. Yet they retouched many words and phrases, partially under the influence of the Vulgate, but mostly in order to "rehispanize" the text.[17]

Nonetheless, the FB and most later Ladino or Judeo-Spanish editions are united by their pattern of conserving words with Jewish reference, especially those terms connected to Israel's ritual traditions. Such currency of the Sephardic lingua franca are simply transliterated: Debir "(Sancto Santorum)" (FB, fol. 156b), manzer (92a), Zizith (69b), pesah (30b), bamah (127b),[18] pasuchim (25b), sabbath (33a), purim (400b),[19]

Sophar (58a), Man (33a), Homer (33a), Ephah (33b), Cherub (37a), Sabbathoth (58a) and Yobel (58a). In addition to the aforementioned alçación (for the Hebrew 'olah) other cultic terminology of a calque nature are allegación (46a) from allegar, to bring close, rendered from the Hebrew of the same semantic valence, KRB, i.e. korban; and templación (68b) is taken from templazar, to mix opposites, for the MT's nesakh.[20]

Indeed, careful scrutiny of the FB and Constantinople texts of Deuteronomy found in Sephiha's study, Ladino, reveal the most minor divergences, consistent with the observations cited above, yet conspicuous exceptions which validate the general rule of a shared textual base. These discrepancies are significant only in so far as they expose the determinations of diction consciously made by the FB editors:

Verse	FB	CP
Deut. 6:21	Egypto	mitsrayim
" 7:26	destrucción	herem
" 15:1	dexadura	shmitah
" 17:10	semanas	shavu'ot
" 17:18	sacerdotes	kohanim
" 26:5	Syro	'arami
" 34:3	Meridion	darom
" 2:3	Septentrion	tsafon
" 10:17	cohecho	shohad

There are a handful of loci where even the Spanish diction of the Athias/Usque partnership differs from that of the editors of the Pentateuch:

Verse	FB	CP	MT
Deut. 22:28	virgén	escoça	betulah
" 3:17	collado	kuesta	pisgah

Deut. 19:10	ynocente	libre	naki
" 15:11	pobre	meckino	'ani
" 1:27	mano	poder	yad[21]

Yet neither the set of de-Hebraized terms found in the FB text, nor the curious variations in word choice within the Castilian verbal alternatives, amount to statistically meaningful samples which could support a contention that the Ferraran Pentateuchal division is anything more than a slightly modified recension of the Ladino humash which preceded it. This conclusion becomes inescapable when one considers the most glaring example of a rabbinic gloss in either edition. In the two verses in which the extremely recondite plural noun totafot appears in the text of Deuteronomy (at 6:8 and 11:18), both Judeo-Spanish texts render the Hebrew term with a Jewish interpretation established since the time of Onkelos: tephilim (FB, fols. 84b and 86b) and, in the humash, tefilin.

But the spectrum of Jewish coloration in the FB may be detected beyond its sectarian diction, Hebraoid syntax and literalistic imitation of indisputably Judaic biblical texts which antedated it. The premier Castilian version of the MT to be set in print is heir to a well founded Judeo-Spanish vernacular tradition, "The medieval Spanish bibles contributed in varying degrees to the formation of a unique phraseology, which we find consecrated in the Ferrara edition of the Old Testament and in the devotional literature surrounding it."[22]

This vernacular heritage of Judeo-Spanish Bibles is attested to within the FB text by a complement of Castilian words and phrases which form part of a lexical apparatus

handed down from the earliest schools of Jewish translators in northern Spain during the Middle Ages. Morreale refers to a "cluster of synonyms" which Jewish interpreters employed in their renditions of Scripture into the language of Iberian Jewry.[23] This special set of idioms is generally consistent between the several Jewish versions, but disjunctive from the Spanish wording utilized by Christian Bible translators, including those Christian versions which interpreted from the MT and not the Vulgate.[24] Her examples are drawn from the Psalms: whereas the Christian vernacular Bibles favor enemigos, obreros de maldat and asaynnadores for such biblical epithets as tsar or oyev, po'alei aven and son'im, the FB and its Jewish antecedents fixedly prefer anguistadores, los obrantes tortura and odiantes for these respective Hebraic expressions:

> These words . . . alien to the religious terminology of the Christian Bible show that the versions of the Jews belong to a totally different tradition, whether they be of Latin or vernacular derivation. The same may be said of the names and attributes of God (particularly of abastado for Saday, instead of Omnipotente), of the expressions used to signify God's countenance, mercy and anger, and of the words for sin and salvation, hope and despair, and for all the other great themes of the Holy Scriptures.[25]

Thus, the vast preponderance of textual evidence and analysis compels the conclusion that the FB text is substantially Jewish in diction, usage, syntax and lexical convention, a text which bespeaks the rabbinic/Masoretic biblical tradition in its content as well as in its external and formal design.

The next issue to be explored, given the Ferrara Bible's thoroughly Jewish character, is how this Judeo-Spanish version may have been utilized by the Latinized conversos who had escaped the peninsula to return to the faith of their ancestors?

CHAPTER THREE NOTES

1. The parashiot insert which is available in a few other exemplars might enumerate the sidrah titles with their Spanish equivalents--in the fashion of the bi-lingual listing of the biblical books in the table of contents --however this writer did not enjoy access to those copies which carried the lectionary index. The Menashe ben Israel humash of 1655 maintained this digit system of designating the parashiot, whereas Proops' 1762 bilingual tanakh translates the names in the table and transliterates the titles within the text.

2. See the summary at the close of the Pentateuchal division:

"The Deuteronomium has 1055 Pasuk.

End of the five books.

Genesis	1534.
Exodus	1209.
Leviticus	859.
Numerus	1288.
Deuteromium	1055.
Altogether	5545." (fol. 98a)

These computations do in fact agree fully with figures found in the Masoretic apparatus. Perhaps Athias and Usque had the four volume set of Bomberg's Biblia Rabbinica printed in Venice in 1517, or later, in 1525. (See Stanley Rypins' The Book of Thirty Centuries. MacMillan Company. (New York: 1951), p. 176.)

3. The Cambridge History of the Bible. GWH Lampe, ed. Vol. 2. (Cambridge: 1969), p. 476.

4. Ibid. While the FB text does not yield up many places where the relative pronoun 'asher has been paraphrased, the other six anomalies adduced by Morreale are relatively easy to locate: a) post-position of the adjective (En el día el esse for bayom hahu', Zech. 14:9); b) the present participle parallel to the Hebrew form (hacien fruto for 'oseh prei, Gen. 1:11); c) ẓhe is not nearly so common an equivalent for hineh as is just he (e.g. he barvéz for hineh ha'ayil, Gen. 22:13); d) an unusual interrogative sentence may be seen in Is. 50:1, "qual esta carta de quitança de vuestra madre embié?"; e) a superlative by means of a genitive appears at Job 1:30 (mis pequeños for tse'irim mimeni); and f) many instances of aribitrary word formation are documented infra.

Verd concurs in Morreale's observation about the interpretative difference between the medieval and Renaisance Bibles, "Any comparison between the Ferrara Bible and another older version evinces the rigid and servile character of the Sephardic edition." Op. cit., p. 347.

5. Ibid. I. S. Revah collected and systematized the various classes of grammatical and linguistic traits of the Ferraran version. Verd translates from Revah's French article, "Hispanism and Judaism of Spoken and Written Languages of the Sephardim," as found in the Acts of the First Symposium of Sephardic Studies. (Madrid: 1964), pp. 233-42 and pp. 444-53:

1) Absolute literalism, which is manifested in,
   a) the Hebraism of the syntax (almost all of the syntactical peculiarities of the Hebrew are petrified into Spanish);
   b) the Hebraism of the lexicographical derivation (once translated, a Hebrew term for a Spanish term, Spanish equivalencies are given to all those derived from the Hebrew term, verbs or substantives, never having existed in Spanish);
   c) the Hebraism of the semantics (the preoccupation to always translate a Hebrew term by a single Spanish term leads to attributing to this Spanish term all the conceptual variety of the Hebrew term, although some of these meanings may be unfamiliar in typical Spanish);

2) Utilization of homophonic translations: a Hebrew term is translated at times by a Spanish term (frequently of Arabic origin) which it resembles phonetically, although differing semantically;

3) Utilization of all the resources of Jewish exegesis (Aramaic paraphrase, or Targum, and commentaries of medieval rabbis) especially in difficult passages of the OT.

4) No translation of some Hebrew terms preserved in the Spanish version, in as much as they are an integral part of the living Jewish idiom, and since it would be difficult to determine their sense or because the translations of the Christians (e.g. those from the Latin Vulgate) do not seem to them satisfactory;

5) Archaism. To stay firmly established from the outset with the traditional version, school instruction maintianed through the centuries some archaic traits:
   a) in the phonics and lexicography: whence a form such as arnacio (=latin. generatio) conforms to the phonetic rules of popular Spanish, while Christians adopted a more erudite form;
   b) in the morphology: whence the conservation of present participles which are apocopated of the type of facién (contra the previous faziente and facient) and from the verbal endings in ádes, édes and ídes.

Significantly, Verd reports that Revah already uncovered some of these peculiarities in the Facienda de Ultra Mar, which causes him to think that Almerich or his Aragonic translator (in the event that the former may only have done a Latin version) had already consulted an anterior Judeo-Romance Bible. loc. cit.

See also Haim V. Sephiha's detailed analysis of the semantic and grammatical patterns in the FB and its 1569 Salonika recension (with the data base restricted to the book of Jeremiah) in "Bibles judeo-espagnoles: Litteralisme et commentateurs Ibero-Romania. Vol. 2 (1971), pp. 63-90.

6. C.f. the facsimilies of the earliest Ladino versions in Moshe Lazar's, "Targumei Ladino." 8 Sefunot 237-65, at pp. 243; 244; 247.

7. Note 72, "One should note that the use of Dio in the Ferraran version is not an Italianism. It was the custom of Spanish Jews, who had Dios for a plural (used Dio in the 'singular') to censure Christians as polytheists." Verd observes that this misunderstanding on the part of Sephardim was based on ignorance of Romance etymology. loc. cit.

8. "La Biblia Romanzeada y la Vulgata." Helmantica. 34 (1983) 35-54, Jan.-Dec. (103-105) Amigo relies upon the research and classification established by Fr. Llamas in the latter's seminal work on the subject of the Judeo-Spanish Bible, Biblia medieval romanceada judio-christiana, 2 vol. (Madrid: 1950-55) (Amigo supplemented Llamas' findings with material drawn from recently discovered mss.):
   "A) Pre-Alphonsine group: a translation of the Bible after the Vugatic tradition. It is contained in the Escorial manuscripts E6, E8 and E2;
   "B) Alphonsine group: the series of mss. which are included in the General Historia of Alphonso X ('the Wise' of the mid-thirteenth century). It is inspired by the Vulgate and is in the line of the historiated Bibles;
   "C) Judeo-Christian group: the mss. E5, E7, E4, that of the Academy of History 87 and Bible of Alba (1422-1433), composed by R. Moses Arrangel;
   "D) Jewish group: the mss. E19 and E3.
   "J. Llamas was not acquainted with the Facienda de Ultramar discovered by M. Lazar. Finally one could add the Ladino or Sephardic Bibles, above all the Pentateuch of Constantinople (1547) and the Ferrara Bible (1553)," pp. 35-6.

9. Op. cit., pp. 37; 45; 47; 49-50; 53-4.

10. Morreale, Margherita. "The Bible of Ferrara on the Pentateuch of Constantinople." Tesoro de los Sefardíes. 5 (Jerusalem: 1962) LXXV-XCI, p. LXXXVI.

11. Op. cit., pp. XC-XCI.

12. Op. cit., LXXXV.

13. Idem. "Vernacular Scriptures in Spain," op. cit., p. 465.

14. Idem., "The Bible of Ferrara. . .", op. cit., p. LXXXVIII.

15. Idem. "Vernacular Scriptures in Spain," op. cit., pp. 477-478. In his detailed comparative study of the FB and Constantiopla humash in Ladino, French linguist Haim V. Sephiha isolated other lexical inventions of Jewish coinage, e.g. the verb acuñadar, from the substantive cuñado (Heb. yavam) utilized in reference to the law of levirate marriage (Deut. 25:5) (FB, fol. 92b); acontemiento a calque of kerei in the sense of accidental pollution (Deut. 23:11) (FB, fol. 92a); or tercero dia with the specific meaning of the day-before-yesterday of the Hebrew shilshom (Deut. 4:42) (FB, fol. 82b), Le Ladino. Center for Hispanic Research. (Paris: 1973), pp. 112-13.

16. Morreale, loc. cit.

17. Sephiha, op. cit., p. 65. See, for example, his citation of a "number-calque" from Deut. 2:7 at the bottom of the the page, "esto kuarenta anios (c)/ estos quarenta años (F). C follows the Hebrew partially; F rehispanizes."

18. But cf. I Kings 11:7 at fol 161a where the bamah which Solomon built for the Edomite deity Chemosh is rendered as an "altar". Also, in I Kings 12:31, when Jeroboam constructed bamot in Dan and Beth-el to rival the Jerusalem Temple, these two are denominated as "altar"s.

19. Wiener, Leo. "The Ferrara Bible II." Modern Language Notes. Vol. XI, No. 1. (Jan. 1896), col. 13. One might add to the list the Hebrew word parasa, which, when followed by the appropriate cardinal number, marks off the beginnings of each weekly Torah portion.

20. See Sephiha, op. cit., pp. 254; 257 and 549 for the lexicography.

21. The discrepancies between the two columns may be attributable variously to the noticeable influence of the Vulgate on the FB, or simply to dialectical distinctions which may have already begun to creep into the literary language of Western versus Eastern Sephardim. Certainly the selection of meskino to render 'ani--instead of the more Ferraran pobre--may relect what Revah designated as a "homophonic" word choice. Even the FB itself employs mesquino in parallel to pobre at Eccl. 9:15b (fol. 396a) where the Hebrew in both cases is miskein (a word which occurs only in kohelet).

22. Morreale, op. cit., p. 479.

23. Ibid.

24. Ibid.

25. "If we add that in Ps. 5:11 transgression is called rebello, we have the three roots angust-, rebele- and tort or tuert-, i.e. the same roots which we find in such expressions as angustias, angustiador, angustiante, rebellar, rebellador and rebellante, tuerto, toricero in the medieval translations of the Bible made by Jews." Ibid.
Abastado is the FB equivalent for shaday at Gen. 35:11 (fol. 37a).

Chapter Four:
The Ferrara Bible as a Judaizing Text

In the light of the foregoing analysis, it should be well established that the Spanish version of the Hebrew Bible first printed at Ferrara in 1553 was as thoroughly Jewish in editorial design and bibliographical features as political caution would allow. But the next stage of investigation requires one to venture into territory not as well charted, since positive documentary evidence as to how the FB served the Sephardim is almost entirely of an inferential nature. While many indisputable recensions of the Ferraran version were produced in the centuries which followed its publication,[1] and several Judeo-Spanish authors must have relied on this preëminent translation when they cited Scripture,[2] independent sources which could attest to the book's specific value in Sephardic literature in general, or to Judaize Marranos in particular, are lacking. In other words, assuming that the editors planned their work for ex-conversos who were at most literate in Castilian, to what extent did the Ferrara Bible help these struggling neophytes attain a Jewish understanding of Scripture?

The initial course in the new literary diet of the former anusim who settled in northern Italy and the Netherlands was a biblical entree:

> Naturally, the first requirement of the Marranos was a translation of the bible. This was therefore among the earliest products of the Ferrara press, where one based upon the old traditional rendering current among Spanish Jews, literal to a degree, appeared. . . . This edition became classical. It

> was repeatedly republished, in full or in separate books, for many years to come. Frequent re-issues appeared at Amsterdam; and subsequent revised editions were invariably based upon it. It was from the Ferrara Bible that successive generations of the Marranos relearned their Judaism.[3] (emphasis added)

The matter of how the FB achieved the publishers' religio-communal objectives for the anusim in their midst is sometimes approached by certain clues in and around the text. One scholar has indicated that the literalness of the Ferraran version indicates that the volume was employed to teach the conversos Hebrew.[4] If such were the historical reality when the Marranos reintegrated into Sephardic communities, the Talmud Torah may have held classes wherein both a Rabbinic Bible and the FB (or one of its revisions) were available to the students to assist them in gaining an understanding of the Sacred Tongue. As Y. H. Yerushalmi has indicated, the Sephardic religious leaders were aware of the need to assume this task of cultural absorption:

> There was an obvious need for systematic instruction. In Venice Samuel Aboab called for a special brotherhood (hebrah) that would devote itself to this task. I do not know whether it was actually established. But even if it was, the returning Marrano remained essentially an autodidact, and like all autodidacts, he needed books to read.[5]

The question remains, however, whether religious books in vernacular translations which almost mechanically imitated the source language were actually intended to serve as Hebrew primers. A host of doubts and logical inferences from existing facts conspire to resolve the issue in the negative. First, the publishers of the FB avow a very different intention in their note, "To the Reader," in which they aspire to create

a faithful translation of Scripture like those available in other European languages, "since Italy, France, Flanders, Germany and England," did not lack Bible versions, "and even in Cataluña, in our Spain, it was translated and printed in the same Catalan language."[6] And it is highly doubtful that the plan of those other European publishers of vernacular Bibles, many of them based strictly on the Vulgate, was to teach their readerships medieval Latin![7]

Moreover, not only is there scant positive evidence to sustain the contention that Ferraran text's 'materiality' was designed to teach Hebrew in an inter-linear fashion, the ends to which the FB was historically put seem diametrically at variance with the goal of language learning. Samuel Usque employed the translation as an indirect source for Portuguese biblical prooftexts. Later Jewish recensions of the Athias/Usque Castilian version revise the text only to make the Spanish slightly more contemporary. And there is no obvious sign that converso apologist Isaac Cardoso had a confident grasp of the original Hebrew behind his Ferraranesque Scriptural citations.[8] Indeed it was not until 1762--more than two hundred years after the Ferrara edition left the press--that a dual-column Hebrew-Spanish Bible was published under Jewish auspices in Amsterdam. Even this bi-lingual volume betrays a format which assumes sub-literacy by at least some readers in the Holy Tongue, as witnessed by the transliterated "Verses to be said before and after studying the Bible," a series of passages made up of Scriptural excerpts from each of the four Sephardic divisions of the MT, with the Hebrew

original in the right-hand column, with a transcription on the left.[9] If the intent of Sephardic educators were to utilize even the eighteenth century Proops edition as an inter-linear 'pony,' why then confine transliteration to the recitation of Scriptural passages which in fact seem to constitute a tehinah before and after Bible study?

More to the point of Hebrew literacy, in Menashe ben Israel's 1655 humash with haftarot and lectionary calendar, he advertizes on the title page expressly, "A new work and of much utility, principally for those who do not understand the Hebrew commentaries." But the only real commentaries in this volume are a four-page innocuous "Mosaic Harmony" of the Five Books of Moses and the chapter summaries which precede every biblical chapter, in content similar to the summaries which preface the FB text, although somewhat more detailed. In style, these captioned glosses resemble those found in Protestant Bibles, indeed reminescent of the form and phraseology of the chapter summaries in Casiodoro de Reina's OT. Thus, what is presented in Menashe's Pentateuch is not a peirush in the rabbinic sense, such as his Spanish Conciliador had been; what the famous Haham means is that his humash renders the sense and spirit of the "comentarios Hebraicos," as he explains in the book's introduction, with the aid primarily of the classical Aramaic paraphrases, viz. the targumim.

By contrast, in 1727, when someone of R. Judah Leon Perez's erudition both in Hebrew and Judaism decides to compose a Jewish catechism in Spanish, he confines himself to the citation of rabbinic and biblical sources, while his translation

of Scripture is independent of the established phraseology of the Ferraran tradition. When Perez quotes a prooftext, whether from the Bible or the Rabbis, the Hebrew is printed in block letters first, with the chapter and verse citation italicized in the margin. His non-Ferraran equivalent follows immediately in the text. Such a pattern of prooftext citation leads the reader to infer that the Fundamento Sólido's author felt no need to depend on the FB textual formulation, his own command of Hebrew sufficing.

Thus, there is no denying the FB's ample resumé: as an Urtext for subsequent generations of Judeo-Spanish Bible translations in both the East and West, as a source of prooftexting in Spanish and Portuguese apologetics, as the lectionary text to accompany R. Menashe's glosses, and as the companion translation for bi-lingual editions of the Hebrew Bible published in 1762 for Sephardim in Amsterdam and, in 1945, for Ashkenazim and Sephardim in Buenos Aires. Yet, despite the manifold roles in which the FB served, there is no affirmative data to indicate that the text is literal for the purpose of Hebrew instruction. Concommitantly, for all the reasons outlined above, there is circumstantial evidence to form an opinion decisively to the contrary.

But if the literalness of the Ferrara Bible was not to teach Spanish-speaking initiates Hebrew, is there a motivation for semantic and grammatical fidelity which goes beyond simply the preservation of the Sephardic vulgate which had flourished for centuries prior to the Expulsion? A hint to this question may echo in the title to the book, "Bible in the Spanish

translated word for word from the **verdad Hebrayca**." These last two words call out, "interpret us!" even as they must have taunted the very Inquisition mentioned on the same page as having approved the Bible.

If indeed Athias and Usque had intended to reproduce a translation which had been rendered from linguistically true (i.e. authentic and original) Hebrew language, the editors would have said so in plain Castilian: either el verdadero Hebráyco or even la verdadera lengua Espaniola.[12] But with unmistakable calculation the two former conversos chose to make verdad the substantive and Hebráyca the adjective,[13]

Hence, the nature and scope of the Ferrara Bible's impact on the Judaization of ex-anusim turns on the axis of both language and faith. The subtle nuance between the "true Hebrew" and the "Hebraic truth" may distinguish the Athias/Usque text from those early medieval Christian versions, some of which were based on the MT.[14] The Ferraran translation is not only Hebraic in its diction and syntax, but quintessentially Jewish in its interpretation of Scripture.

That such a rabbinic authoritativeness was ascribed to the FB translation by the Marranos themselves may be deduced from the phrase, "the Hebraic truth," in contradistinction to another more or less fixed expression, viz. "the vulgate" or "the Latin" in reference to the Church of Rome's authorized translation of the Bible. While Cardoso, writing from an Italian ghetto, was not about to coin a diametrically opposite (but politically suicidal) term such as "the Latin falsehood" or "the distorted vulgate," his meaning, made explicit in the

course of his argument in different words, is expressly that the Church's official translations, both the Septuagint and the vetus latina, have tampered with the Hebrew Bible.

In a cogent and well-developed response to the Christian allegation that the Jews had corrupted the masorah, the author of the the Excelencias quickly turns the accusation around to rejoin that, no, it was Saint Jerome and the Church custodians of the LXX who bowdlerized the words of Scripture. Cardoso brings several examples which compare and contrast the Jewish and Christian traditions in understanding the text at the level of plain meaning. His biblical quotations are not only in the Ferraran formula, but the form of citation is only to to the chapter, without listing the verse number (even though his citation of other sources is very exact). This pattern of reference suggests that the writer worked from an editio princeps of the FB which may still have been in circulation among Sephardim in Italy as of the 1670's:

> And that the Latin vulgate is quite discrepant from the Hebrew source (la fuente Hebrayca) is proven by many places. In Ps. 18 the Hebrew says, "En toda la tierra salio su linea," (whereas the Vulgate tranlates kav with "voice".) In Chap. Two of Exodus, the vulgate puts that which is not in the Hebrew, "And he sired another son and called his name, 'Eliezer,' saying, 'The God of my father helped me, and freed me from the hand of Pharoah.'" None of this is in the original. (Eliezer is not mentioned in the MT until Ex. 18:4), "Y dos hijos suyos, uno de los quales se llamaba Guerson(. . .)otro Eliezer, porque el Dios de mi padre mi ayuda, y me libro de la espada de Parho."[15]

Cardoso's complaint against the Church's translations of the OT is not merely lexical, but theological as well. Not only did Jerome and the Christian Greek translators misrender important words and transpose entire verses, but they have

distorted the Bible's message in key passages. Echoing the debates over Jewish-Christian disagreements on the intent of Scripture which hark back to Justin Martyr in the the second century, Cardoso resumes the attack on Christian OT typology:

> In Is Ch. 12 vulgate says, "Y sacareis con alegria de las fuentes del salvador." The Hebraic truth says, "De las fuentes de la salvación." In Ch. 53, the vulgate says, "Fué ofrecido porque él quiso." In the Hebrew, "Está angustiado, y no porque él quiso." . . .In the final chapter of Hab., the Latin says, "Yo me agozaré en el Señor, y me alegraré en el dios jesu mío." The Hebrew, "En el Dios de mi salvación."

While neither Cardoso's arguments nor his selection of prooftexts may have been novel in the history of Jewish/Christian disputation, the timeliness of his defense of Jewish biblical interpretation by means of the Ferraran translation could have served to assuage the Christological doubts still lurking in the diffident hearts of conversos who had been reared in the oppressive atmosphere of Iberian Catholicism.

CHAPTER FOUR NOTES

1. Kayserling lists the following editions among Western Sephardim, i.e. those Judeo-Spanish Bibles printed in Castilian with romanized typeface:
--A folio edition printed at Amsterdam, May 3, 1611, which carried the same title as the FB and proclaims in the colophon, "to the praise and glory of God (the text) was reformed from the Ferraran impression without changing a letter of the original," but with a new "Reader's Note" and illustrated title page (a picture of the ark of the covenant).

--Two discrete printings, in 1630 and again in 1646, by the Dutch pressman Gillis Joost. Both mention, "By privilege of the most illustrious Lord Duke of Ferrara. Lazar (p. 345) claims that the text is unrevised from the FB. The cataloguers at the British and Foreign Bible Society state that these editions are "ascribed" to Menashe ben Israel (in which case they would have to reflect the handful of emendations he made in his versions of the Ferraran biblical formula).

--Menashe ben Israel, "The Marrano Rabbi," published a Humas with haftarot at his newly-founded Amsterdam press, utilizing the Ferraran translation and Nasi dedicatory, in 1627. Positive commandments ("M.A.", "mandamiento afirmativo") and negative commandments ("M.N.", "mandamiento negativo") are indicated ad loc. in the margins of the Pentateuchal text.

--The revised Amsterdam editions of Caceres and Athias in 1661 and that of Fernandes and Diaz from 1726 still rely substantially on the FB text from the Athias/Usque partnership.

--The folio edition of the brothers Proops, published in two columns, with the MT and a Spanish rendition virtually identical to the FB, in 1762 was clearly to be used as a liturgical text, as indicated by the transliterated Hebrew tehinah, "To be recited before the study of Scripture," which forms part of the prefatory material. Lazar (p. 347) concurs that the Urtext is the FB, with the revisions supplied by Lambroso's lexicon.

In addition to the aforementioned, Kayserling also found twelve Psalters based on the Ferraran translation of Psalms. Biblioteca Española-Portugueza Judáica. Ktav. (New York: 1971), pp. 29-30.

Besides the two FB exemplars and the single copy of Casiodoro de Reina's 1569 Protestant Bible, the Klau collection contains: the 1630 Joost edition, the 1661 Cassares/Athias revision, the 1726 Fernandez Bible, as well as the 1762 Proops bilingual recension.

Moshe Lazar concluded that most of the Ladino versions of Scripture published in the East in Salonika or Constantinople

were directly descended from the Ferraran Urtext (although he stresses that they are not more transliterations into Hebrew characters--p. 346). The changes which do appear in the Ladino recensions are not due to dialect (see n. 30 in the article listed, infra). These versions of the prophetic books and Hagiographa include:
--Two printings of the Latter Prophets and Writings, one from 1568 to 1572, the other from 1582 to 1585, which are bi-lingual editions with even the Ladino in square Hebrew print and fully vocalized.

--Interestingly, two variant ms. editions of the Former Prophets, Ezra and Nehemiah, published at Constantinople in 1580, follow divergent translations. Only the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, which Lazar denominates R-2, are exact copies of the FB text in Hebrew script. R-1 seems to be a rendition into Ladino with independent criteria of translation.

--A small Hebrew Bible printed in Venice in 1634 contains Spanish glosses in Hebrew letters printed in the margins which are based on the FB formula.

--R. Isaac Lambroso's 1639 biblical dictionary was consciously taken from Heshek Shelomoh, the Ladino lexicon printed at Salonika in 1588, in conjunction with the Ferrara text. Lazar also notes that all the biblical glosses in Spanish during this period which originated from Italy derived primarily from the FB, but also Lambroso (whom Lazar identifies as a pivotal figure in the separation of Eastern Ladino from Western Sephardic Spanish). (See n. 45, op. cit.)

--David de Castro Tartaz presented a bi-lingual Targum-Ladino version of the Song of Songs in Amsterdam in 1664, whose Spanish is but an updated Castilian version of the FB Canticles.

--A Hebrew humash with haftarot and megilot lectionary with Spanish glosses in Hebrew characters in the margins and at the foot of the columns. The percentage of the marginalia is greater than similar editions printed in Italy and which inspired the brothers Proops to publish this Amsterdam edition in 1775. The source of the glossary is the FB and Lambroso.

--A Ferraran-based volume of the book of Job in discrete Hebrew and Latin character versions, with R. Lambroso's revisions, "and following our custom to recite it in our Holy School," was printed at Leghorn in 1778.

In his analysis of the extant Judeo-Spanish Bibles, Lazar concludes of the FB, Salonika texts and Abraham b. Isaac Asa's 1739 tanakh: all share a common translational thread, which runs prevalently through the latter two Ladino versions (as one would logically expect from works composed in the more insular environment of Eastern Sephardim).
Lazar, Moshe. "The Judeo-Spanish Translations of the Bible." Itshak ben Tsvi Memorial Book. 8 Sefunot 337-75. Hebrew University Press. (Jerusalem: 1964), pp. 345-66.

The British and Foreign Bible Society survey of Spanish Bibles extant as of 1899 also listed:

--Similar editions to the Menashe ben Israel humash of 1628, published by various Dutch printers in 1643 and 1655; and
--A small-size Psalter translated by "Abraham Abenusque de Ferrara," in 1628 may be a resetting of the 1553 editio princeps no longer extant even in di Rossi's day. This Amsterdam version of the Psalms claims to be rendered "word for word from the Hebrew (verbo de verbo del Hebrayco) and divided up as it should be read. On each day of the month according to the practice of the Ancients."

It should be noted that the bibliographers of Judeo-Spanish Bibles have registered exemplars of a post-Ferraran translation which do not follow the Athias/Usque formulation (e.g. Mosseh Dias, whose translation and commentary in 1695 was done by Yosseph Serrano, Instructor in Hebrew at the Amsterdam Talmud Torah), but these alternative renditions do not seem to match the FB legacy as the preferred text for Sephardim who read Castilian.

The latest number in the long chain of the FB tradition appeared in 1945. A Jewish publishing house in Buenos Aires put out a four volume Hebrew-Spanish edition, with Avraham Usque credited as the translator, and Meir Levi Leteris listed as the Hebrew editor. The set, published by the Estellas Company, Ltd., is available in the Klau Library. The text follows the Ferraran formula as far as possible for twentieth century Spanish, except for the most archaic diction, which is eased out, albeit reluctantly.

2. One of the more conspicuous examples of secondary reference to the FB is Samuel Usque's Consolation for the Tribulations of Israel, the next item published on the Spanish language Jewish press of Abraham Usque (no relation to Samuel in the opinion of C. Roth, see "The Marrano Press at Ferrara," op. cit., p. 311).

Bertil Maler in his A Biblia na "Consolacam" de Samuel Usque (1553) vetted the Portuguese apologia for Scriptural citations to support his not-very-improbable thesis that Samuel Usque used the FB for his biblical support, there being no Portuguese translation at hand. Perhaps the most important apologetic for Judaism composed in the Spanish vernacular, Isaac Cardoso's Las Excelencias de los Hebreos (1679), written in Venice, but published in Amsterdam, draws its prooftexts almost exclusively from the FB or a recension thereof. In contradistinction to the two aforementioned books, a Castilian catechism composed by R. Yehudah Leon Perez, Fundamento Solido seems not to express the least acquaintance with the Ferraran vernacular formula of Bible translation.

3. Roth, Cecil. A History of the Marranos. Fourth ed. Hermon Press. (New York: 1974), p. 326.

4. Haim Sephiha asserts that the translators 'calquefied' the text for pedagogical reasons, i.e. "to initiate the Jewish child to the study of the Hebrew alphabet. . ." Le Ladino, p. 44. But the same rationale would have to apply to the adult Marranos a fortiori, since most had been completely educated in the Latin/Catholic milieu of Iberian schools and universities. (C.f. Yoseph Hayim Yerushalmi's "Re-education of Marranos in the Seventeenth Century," (1980) and his elaborate biography of Isaac Cardoso, From Spanish Court to Italian Ghetto (1971).) This writer is indebted to the thesis referee, Dr. Isaac Jerusalmi, for bringing Sephiha's argument to his attention.

5. "The Re-education of Marranos in the Seventeenth Century." The Third Annual Rabbi Louis Feinberg Memorial Lecture in Judaic Studies. Delivered March 26, 1980, p. 7.

6. Stockwell, B. Foster. Prefacios a las Biblias Castellanas del Siglo XVI. Libreria "La Aurora". (Buenos Aires: 1939), p. 37.

7. Rypins, Stanley. The Book of Thirty Centuries. MacMillan Co. (New York: 1951), p. 175. It is noteworthy that those editions of the MT printed under Christian auspices, although generally arranged according to the order of the Vulgate, were not bi-lingual, e.g. the Protestant Hebrew Bibles printed at Basel (1536) and Frankfort (1595).

8. While Maler demurs to Sephiha's contention that the FB was designed to teach Hebrew, he does maintain that the editors' main motivation was to prevent the loss of the Hebraically faithful Judeo-Spanish rendition. See op. cit., p. 7, n. 1.

   Both the Menashe b. Israel editions from the 17th c. and the Proops series of Bibles of the following century altered the translation but little, despite bold Judaizing innovations in format. (E.g. in contrasting the FB, 1655 printing of Men. b. Israel's humash with haftarot and the bi-lingual 1762 Proops tanakh, the constancy of the text is borne out. In Gen. 1:1-2, the wording is identical except that Proops has shifted to the more Castilian "Dios" instead of the Ladino "Dio". In Ex. 3:13-14, the verses are verbatim between Men. b. Israel's version and that of Proops, where the two of them have dropped the archaic vinien participle in favor of a present tense conjugation of the verb venir, i.e. vengo. On the other hand, Proops elected to keep the obsolete atemar in I Kings 8:54 even though the 17th c. translation had supplanted the FB diction with the more modern acabar. (Carominas identifies atemar as a peculiarly Judeo-Spanish form, found not only in the medieval Jewish mss., the Constantinople Pentateuch and FB, but also in medieval Judeo-Spanish secular literature, e.g.

"Coplas de Yoçef" from the the first half of the 14th c. The verb continues in Ladino to the present day--s.v. "Timar," Diccionario Crítico Etimológico de la Lengua Castellana. Editorial Gredos. (Madrid: 1954) 4:447.) Also, very significantly, Proops corrected both of the preceding versions to follow the Hebrew grammar even more mechanically by making the second demonstrative pronoun definite--which makes the phrase a Spanish solecism, i.e. la rogative la esta for hatehinah haz'ot.)

Isaac Cardoso, writing from Venice in 1679, almost certainly possessed or borrowed a FB copy since the prooftexts cited in his treatise in defense of the Jewish faith were transparently from that translation. Perhaps he had learned Hebrew by the time he penned the Excelencias; a few key terms (berit, torah) are printed in the Hebrew alphbet and integrated into the body of the text. Occasionally, the same Scriptural passage will be rendered with a variant formulation, e.g. Is. 54:7-8, on p. (iii) in the preface is translated, "Por punto pequeño te dexé; y por piadades grandes te apanaré. Con poco de ira oculté mis fazes de ti, y con merced de siempre te apanaré," whereas on p. 20 a wording much closer to the Ferraran is quoted, "Por momento pequeño te dexé, y por piadades grandes te congregaré. Con poco de ira encubrí mis fazes momento de ti, y con merced de siempre te apiadaré. Whether Cardoso had mastered Hebrew well enough to translate with confidence or not, the 'sententious phrases' of the old Judeo-Spanish version were relied upon implicitly throughout his famous apologetic.

Different from Cardoso's method for citing the Bible is the pattern evident in Yehudah Leon Perez's catechism, Fundamento Sólido, wherein the MT of the verse in Hebrew typeface is almost always printed before its Castilian equivalent, (a translation, incidentally, which bears no resemblance to the Ferraran tradition). Perez, at least, and possibly some of his audience, is comfortable with the source language of Scripture. However, Cardoso clearly assumes that his readership is ignorant of the Holy Tongue (as had Men. b. Israel in his Conciliador). Still, most of the catechism is in romanized Spanish, a datum which suggests a low level of Hebrew literacy among Western Sephardim, even in the 18th century.

9. Biblia en dos colunas Hebráyco y Español. Joseph, Iacob y Abraham de Salomon Proops. (Amsterdam: 5522) (1762), pp. 4-5.

10. See Roth, Cecil. A Life of Menasseh ben Israel. Jewish Publication Society. (Philadelphia: 1945), pp. 44; 66; 87 and ad. loc. "In this, the author endeavored to 'reconcile' those passages of the Scriptures which appeared contradictory. One of the objects of this work was, obviously, to minimize the objections which skeptical

Marranos might have against Judaism. It was written therefore not in Hebrew, the classical language of Jewish scholarship, but in Spanish," p. 87.

11. Such is not to deny the incongruous Latin and Catholic traits with which the Fundamento Sólido virtually bristles. On the one hand, the author has his disciples recite excerpts from Jewish Scripture, Talmud, Maimonides and other medieval Jewish philosophers--as well as such nearly contemporary rabbinic scholars as R. Hazcuny and even Menashe b. Israel; no one could accuse Perez of taking the lead of Uriel da Costa. On the other hand, the very notion of a formalized catechism is of Christian origin, while the text of his religious and moral inculcation sounds like an afterpatch of the Constantinople Creed. Y. H. Yerushalmi makes the same observation about the tract's "Catholic form," (op. cit., p. 12).

Compare the opening line of the classic Church doxology to the recitation composed by Perez:

Constantinople Creed: "I believe in one God, the Father almighty, Maker of heaven and earth."
(New Catholic Encyclopedia. S.v. "Creed" 4:435.)

Fundamento Sólido: "I am a Jew, and I worship only the Lord God of the heavens and the earth," p. 3.

12. C.f. the formula used in the 1628 edition of the Ferraran Psalms printed at Amsterdam, "verbo por verbo del Hebreo, supra, n. 1.

13. "I.e. word for word of/for the Hebraic truth! They did not care about calques for pedagogic purposes to teach Hebrew to kids; they were rather moved to get to the verdad Hebráyca, the Hebraic verity." Why might such a material translation be necessary? "A literal translation, as a substitute for the original text, is so crucial for Halakha, commentaries and foremost for preaching, such as the lecha of lech-lecha or the zachor of zachor tizkor." Memorandum from Dr. Isaac Jerusalmi to Dr. Werner Weinberg on the subject of Ladino. HUC-JIR, 12-14-86, p. 4. (This writer is indebted to Dr. Jerusalmi for bringing to my attention this critical aspect of the FB text.)

14. See Lazar's English précis of his article wherein he, too, differentiated between the "Christian Tradition" of translation, based mostly on the Vulgate, and the "Jewish Tradition," derived almost exclusively from the MT, op. cit., p. 27. See also Nahum Sarna's article on vernacular Bibles, in which he mentions the exceptional role played by Jewish interpreters in the medieval translation schools of Christian Spain. (S.v. "Biblical Literature: Spanish versions." Encyclopedia Britanica, 15th ed. 14:770.)

15. "And two sons of his, one of which was called Gerson. . . (the) other Eliezer, 'Because the God of my father (is) my help and freed me from the sword of Pharaoh'." Cardoso Isaac. Las Excelencias y Las Calunias de los Hebreos. Casa de David de Castro Tartas. (Amsterdam: 1679), p. 396.

16. Ibid.

17. Isaac Cardoso, a former professor of Philosophy at the University of Valladolid, had been well educated in Latin, but the LXX section of his defense against the calumny thatthe Jews are, "Corruptors of the Sacred Books," was dependent almost exclusively on Immanuel Aboab's Nomologia. (Yerushalmi, From Spanish Court. . .", p. 428.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Biblia en lengua Española traducida palabra por palabra de la verdad Hebráyca por muy excelentes letrados, vista y examinada por el officio de la Inquisición. Con privillegio del Yllustríssimo Señor Duque de Ferrara, con yndustria y deligencia de Duarte Pinel Portugués: estampada en Ferrara a costa y despesa de Jeronimo de Vargas Español: en Primero de Marzo de 1553.

Biblia en dos colunas Hebráyco y Español. Joseph, Iacob y Abraham de Solomon Proops. (Amsterdam: 5522) (1762)

Las excelencias de los Hebreos por el Doctor Yshac Cardoso. Impresso en Amsterdam en Casa de David de Castro Tartas. El año de 1679.

Fundamento Sólido. . .la Doctrina de nuestros Sanctos Padres. Por un methodo fácil, distinto, en forma de dialogo, en lengua Castellana, por Ribi Jeudah Leon de Josseph Perez. Como la enseña a sus hijos y discipulos. En Amsterdam Ano 5489 (1712). En la Oficina de Ishac Jeudah Leaon Templo.

Secondary Sources

Amigo, Lorenzo. "La Biblia en Romance y La Vulgata." Helmantica 34 (1983) 35-54. Jan./Dec. (103-105)

Coraminas, Joan. Diccionario Crítico Etimológico Castellano e Hispánico. Editorial Gredos. (Madrid: 1980)

Darlow, T. H. and H. F. Moule. Historical Catalogue of the Printed Editions of Holy Scripture in the British and Foreign Bible Society. Vol. IV. (London: 1903)

Di Rossi, Giovanni Bernardo. De Typographia Hebraeo-Ferrariensi. (Parma: 1780)

Kayserling, Meyer, et. al. Biblioteca Española-Portugueza-Judáica and other studies in Ibero-Jewish bibliography by the author and by J. S. da Silva Rosa. Ktav. (New York: 1971)

Klenicki, Leon. The Biblia de Alba. The examination of the methods and sources of translation of a 15th century illuminated Spanish Bible translation. Unpublished rabbinical thesis. HUC-JIR. (Cincinnati: 1967)

Lazar, Moshe. "Targumei hamikra' beladino." Sefer zikaron leyitshak ben-tsvi. Sefunot 8:237-65.

Maler, Bertil. A Biblia na "Consolaçam" de Samuel Usque (1553). Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis: Romanica Stockholmiensia, No. 6. Almquist and Wiksell International. (Stockholm: 1978)

Maeso, David Gonzalo. "La Exegesis Rabínica en Lengua Sefardí: Fuentes para su Estudio." Miscelanea de Estudios Arabes y Hebráicos. Vol. II. Anejo al Boletín de la Universidad de Granada. (1953)

Morreale, Margharita. "La Biblia de Ferrara y el Pentateuco de Constantinopla." Tesoro de los Judios Sefardíes. 5 (1962) lxxxv-xci.

_____. The Cambridge History of the Bible. G. W. H. Lampe, ed. 2 (Cambridge: 1969) "Vernacular Scriptures in Spain," pp. 465-91.

Palau y Dulcet, Antonio. Manuel del Librero Hispano-Americano. 2 (Oxford: 1948) 212, Item no. 28940.

Ricci, Clemente. La Biblia de Ferrara. Publicaciones del Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas. No. 35. Casa Jacobo Peuser, Ltda. (Buenos Aires: 1926)

Roth, Cecil. "The Religion of the Marranos." Jewish Quarterly Review. 22 (1931-32) 1-33.

_____. "The Marrano Press at Ferrara." Modern Language Review. 38 (Oxford: 1943) 307-17)

_____. Doña Gracia of the House of Nasi. Jewish Publication Society. (Philadelphia: 1948)

_____. "The Role of Spanish in the Marrano Diaspora." Hispanic Studies in Honour of I. Gonzales Llubera. Dolphin Book Co. (Oxford: 1959)

_____. The History of the Marranos. Hermon Press. (New York: 1974)

Rypins, Stanley. The Book of Thirty Centuries. MacMillan Company. (New York: 1951)

_____. "The Ferrara Bible at Press." The Library: Transactions of the Bibliographical Society. 10 (1955) 244-69.

Sephiha, Haim Vidal. "Bibles judéo-espagnoles: littéralisme et commentateurs." Ibero-Romania. 2 (1970) 56-90.

Sephiha, Haim V. "Versiones judeo-españolas de Libro de Jeremías impresas en Ferrara Y Salónica en el siglo XVI: influencia de los comentaristas." 31 Sefarad (1971) 179-84.

_____. Le ladino: Judeo-espagnol calque. Deuteronome. Versions de Constantinople (1547) et de Ferrare (1553). Edition, étude linguistique et lexique. Centre de Recherches Hispaniques. (Paris: 1973)

Stockwell, B. Foster. Prefacios a las Biblias Castellanas del Siglo XVI. Libreria "La Aurora." (Buenos Aires: 1939)

Verd, Gabriel María. "Las Biblias romanzadas: criterios de traducción." Sepharad. 31 (1971) 319-51.

Yerushalmi, Yosef Hayim. From Spanish Court to Italian Ghetto: Isaac Cardoso: a study in seventeenth century marranism and Jewish apologetics. Columbia University Press. (New York: 1971)

_____. "The Re-education of the Marranos in the Seventeenth Century." The Third Annual Rabbi Louis Feinberg Memorial Lecture in Judaic Studies. Delivered March 26, 1980. The Judaic Studies Program of the University of Cincinnati. (1980)

_____. Wiener, Leo. "The Ferrara Bible." Modern Language Notes. 11 (1896) cols. 24-42.