

THE *FAZIENDA DE ULTRAMAR* AND THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE VULGATE

*LA FAZIENDA DE ULTRAMAR Y LAS CONTRIBUCIONES DE LA VULGATA*

DAVE MCDUGALL  
Queen Mary University London  
<https://orcid.org/0009-0004-5675-1564>

*Abstract:* The first editor of the *Fazienda de Ultramar*, Moshé Lazar, was the first to determine that the Biblical parts included in this work were taken from a Hebrew original. In his pioneering 1965 edition of the *Fazienda*, Lazar included numerous footnotes in which he established correspondences between specific passages or words in the *Fazienda* and the Hebrew Bible. However, Lazar often skipped over those parts in which this work follows the Vulgate, obscuring the relationship between both works. This paper will prove that the *Fazienda*'s debt to the Vulgate is greater than has been previously indicated, suggesting that the passages from the Old Testament included in the *Fazienda* were taken from two different sources: the Hebrew Bible and the Latin Vulgate.

*Keywords:* Hebrew Bible; Vulgate Bible; *Fazienda de Ultramar*; sources; translation.

*Resumen:* El primer editor de la *Fazienda de Ultramar*, Moshé Lazar, fue el primero en establecer que el material bíblico de la obra provenía de un original hebreo. Para demostrar su hipótesis incluyó en su pionera edición de 1965 numerosas notas a pie estableciendo correspondencias entre determinados pasajes o palabras de la *Fazienda* y de la Biblia hebrea. Sin embargo, Lazar a menudo obvió aquellas partes donde la obra sigue la Vulgata, ocultando así las correspondencias entre ambas obras. En el presente artículo se demostrará que las contribuciones de la Vulgata a la *Fazienda* son mucho mayores de lo que se ha aceptado, sugiriendo que los pasajes del Viejo Testamento de la *Fazienda* provienen de dos fuentes distintas: la Biblia hebrea y la Vulgata latina.

*Palabras clave:* Biblia hebrea; Biblia Vulgata; *Fazienda de Ultramar*; fuentes; traducción.

SUMMARY

1. Introduction.– 2. The use of Vulgate citations.– 3. The form of proper nouns.– 4. The influence of the Vulgate on the *Fazienda* text.– 5. Conclusion.– 6. Cited bibliography.

1. INTRODUCTION

In the introduction to his 1965 edition of the *Fazienda de Ultra Mar* (henceforth *Fazienda*), Moshé Lazar convincingly established the work's debt to a Hebrew source. He states that the Hebrew text is the base text, with only occasional verses translated from the Vulgate. He describes references to the Vulgate as being sporadic and states that when there is a choice between the

---

Citation / Cómo citar este artículo: McDougall, Dave (2023), *The Fazienda de Ultramar and the Contribution of the Vulgate*, "Anuario de Estudios Medievales" 53/1, pp. 49-65. <https://doi.org/10.3989/aem.2023.53.1.03>

Copyright: © 2023 CSIC. Este es un artículo de acceso abierto distribuido bajo los términos de la licencia de uso y distribución Creative Commons Reconocimiento 4.0 Internacional (CC BY 4.0).

Hebrew text and the Vulgate text, the Hebrew text is always preferred. According to Lazar, *il ne fait aucun doute que c'est le texte hébreu de la Bible qui lui a servi de source principale*<sup>1</sup>. Lazar's assessment of the *Fazienda* has been accepted without question, and no one has subsequently provided any further detailed evidence to support this view. Requena Marco provides considerable evidence in favor of a Latin original for the itinerary portions of the *Fazienda*, but agrees with Lazar in regard to the source of the biblical parts<sup>2</sup>. Gemma Avenzoza<sup>3</sup>, as well as Andrés Enrique-Arias<sup>4</sup>, inform us that the majority of medieval Biblical translations into Spanish are based on the Hebrew text and they include the *Fazienda* among them. However, they also identify two texts that are based on a Latin original –the so-called pre-Alphonsine Bible comprising *E6* and *E8* and the Biblical sections of the *General Estoria*.

In this paper I would like to present the case for a greater involvement of the Vulgate in the Old Testament passages of the *Fazienda*. Enrique-Arias points out that the Bible is the only text for which there are versions produced at all stages of the language<sup>5</sup>. The *Biblia Medieval* parallel corpus allows one not only to study the development of the language, but also to consult both Latin and Hebrew sources. In order to support my conclusions, I shall make comparisons with items in this parallel corpus<sup>6</sup>.

Lazar's position is stated quite clearly: the Old Testament passages of the *Fazienda* are based primarily on the Hebrew text, with only occasional references to the Vulgate. Lazar makes a compelling case, using a variety of examples to justify his position. If we consider some of these examples carefully, however, it turns out that the conclusions that Lazar draws are not always as clear-cut as he presents them. For instance, Lazar identifies certain expressions in the *Fazienda* which mirror a Hebrew construction. For example, he states that the *por mano de* of the *Fazienda* in Example 1 reflects the Hebrew *beyad* (*par la main de*), whereas the Vulgate has simply *per Mosen*<sup>7</sup>.

(1) 1 K 8, 53. *Fazienda*: Ca tu los desleyst a ti por heredad de todos los pueblos de la tierra, cuemo fablest *por mano de Moysen* to sieruo quant tu saquest nuestro parientes de Egipto, ya Sennor Dios (f. 51ra)<sup>8</sup>. *Vulgate*: tu enim separasti eos tibi in heredita-

---

<sup>1</sup> Lazar 1965, p. 10.

<sup>2</sup> Requena Marco 1974, p. 20.

<sup>3</sup> Avenzoza 2012, p. 294.

<sup>4</sup> Enrique-Arias 2022, p. 9.

<sup>5</sup> Enrique-Arias 2012, p. 423.

<sup>6</sup> Enrique-Arias, Pueyo Mena 2008.

<sup>7</sup> Lazar 1965, p. 21, n. 38.

<sup>8</sup> Citations from the *Fazienda* are from my own transcription.

tem de universis populis terrae sicut locutus es *per Mosen* servum tuum quando eduxisti patres nostros de Aegypto Domine Deus.

While in this instance the *Fazienda* text clearly reflects the Hebrew construction rather than that of the Vulgate, I believe it is an oversimplification to regard it as necessarily being in all cases a literal translation of the Hebrew. Enrique-Arias<sup>9</sup> points out that Bibles translated from the Latin Vulgate can contain examples of Hebrew constructions, as the biblical Latin of the Vulgate can itself contain these Hebrew constructions. In fact, the Vulgate uses the construction “*per manum* + genitive” on 45 occasions and “*per manus* + genitive” a further 18 times. We also find the phrase “*in manu* + genitive” used even more frequently. This construction *por mano de* also occurs on 51 occasions in *E6/E8* and 27 times in the *General Estoria*, both of which texts are considered to be based on the Latin Vulgate. Given the widespread use of this construction in both Latin and vernacular texts, I would not consider this occurrence necessarily to be a direct translation of the Hebrew.

With reference to the form *Bersabee* in Gn 46, 1, Lazar points out that the Vulgate translates the meaning (“the well of the oath”), whereas the *Fazienda* uses the actual Hebrew word<sup>10</sup>. Again, the point that Lazar makes is perfectly valid. In this particular instance, the Vulgate uses a gloss of the name *Bersabee*, *puteum iuramenti*, rather than the name itself<sup>11</sup>. This gloss is used on just one other occasion (in Gn 46, 5). However, elsewhere in the Vulgate the actual proper noun *Bersabee* is used on a further 30 occasions. In addition, if we consult the *Glossa Ordinaria* in relation to this particular verse, we read: *in Bersabee, qui locus interpretatur puteus iuramenti*. So, although it is true that the *Fazienda*, in this instance, uses the proper noun rather than the gloss to refer to the location, generally so also does the Vulgate, and this form occurs as well in the corresponding verse in the *Glossa Ordinaria*.

In the *Fazienda* the proper noun *Bersabee* is used on four occasions which have a direct correlation to a Biblical passage. Of these, three correspond directly to the use of the form *Bersabee* in the Vulgate, as in the examples from Gn 28, 10, 2 S 24, 2 and 2 S 24, 15 (see Example (2)):

(2) a. Gn 46, 1. *Fazienda*: E ueno a *Bersabee* e fizo sacrificio al Dios de Ysaac so padre (f. 9rb<sup>35</sup>). *Vulgate*: profectusque Israhel

<sup>9</sup> Enrique-Arias 2011, p. 26.

<sup>10</sup> Lazar 1965, p. 20, n. 31.

<sup>11</sup> Gn 21, 31-32 provides an explanation of this name. Vulgate: “Idcirco vocatus est locus ille Bersabee: quia ibi uterque iuravit. Et inierunt foedus pro puteo iuramenti” (therefore, that place was called Bersabee: because there both of them did swear. And they made a league for the well of oath).

cum omnibus quae habebat venit ad *puteum Iuramenti* et mactatis ibi victimis Deo patris sui Isaac.

b. Gn 28, 10. *Fazienda*: Quando salio Iacob de *Bersabee* ad Aram, e ueno a Bethel e yogo alli, *que* allis puso el sol (f. 46vb<sup>14</sup>). *Vulgate*: igitur egressus Iacob de *Bersabee* pergebat Haran.

c. 2 S 24, 2. *Fazienda*: Estido .ix. meses e .xx. dias en contar los e conto de Dan troa *Bersabee* (f. 48rb<sup>33</sup>). *Vulgate*: perambula omnes tribus Israhel a Dan usque *Bersabee* et numerate populum ut sciam numerum ejus.

d. 2 S 24, 15. *Fazienda*: De Dan troa *Bersabee* murieron .lx. e .v. omnes (f. 48va<sup>14</sup>). *Vulgate* (2 S 24, 15): *Vulgate*: et mortui sunt ex populo a Dan usque *Bersabee* septuaginta milia virorum.

In addition, we can see that the actual spelling of *Bersabee* used in the *Fazienda* is identical to that used in the Vulgate. Of all the texts in the *Biblia Medieval* corpus, only those texts based mainly on the Vulgate—that is *E6*, *E8*, and the *General Estoria*—use this spelling consistently<sup>12</sup>. Other texts offer a variety of different spellings: *baersaba* (*E3*), *bersaua* (*E19*), *bersabel* *beersabaa* (*E5*), *bersaba* (*E4*), *bersabe* (*Arragel*)<sup>13</sup>. So, while Lazar’s comment is perfectly correct as it stands, I do not believe that the use of the proper noun in this particular instance can necessarily be regarded as a direct translation of the Hebrew text.

In order to support my thesis that the Vulgate has a greater influence on the *Fazienda* than that generally accepted, in the following pages I will refer to three factors: first, the use of Vulgate citations; second, the form of proper nouns, and, thirdly, the influence of the Vulgate on the *Fazienda* text.

## 2. THE USE OF VULGATE CITATIONS

In his introduction, Lazar notes the use of Hebrew words and the occasional citation in Hebrew. However, he fails to mention the appearance of the many Latin words and phrases that occur throughout the text. Altogether there are over 130 Latin Vulgate citations in the *Fazienda*, ranging from a single word to complete sentences. Some 50 of these occurrences correspond directly to Old Testament passages. Frequently, these appear as just part of the vernacular text as in Examples 3, 4 and 5.

<sup>12</sup> There is just one occurrence of this form in *Arragel* (*Am* 8, 14), but none of the other texts in the *Biblia Medieval* corpus show this form.

<sup>13</sup> The references to vernacular texts are those used in Enrique-Arias, Pueyo Mena 2008.

In Example 3, from Gn 24, 12, the *Dominus Deus* of the *Fazienda* echoes the *Domine Deus* of the Vulgate, although the direct address to the Lord using the vocative and the second person singular in the Vulgate has been changed in the *Fazienda* to the third person:

(3) Gn 24, 12. *Fazienda*: E dyxo: *Dominus Deus* de myo sennor Abraam me guye e faga misericordia con myo sennor Abraam (f. 3ra<sup>30</sup>). *Vulgate*: dixit *Domine Deus* domini mei Abraham occurre obsecro hodie mihi et fac misericordiam cum domino meo Abraham.

In Example 4, from Ex 3, 1, the *monte Dey Oreb* of the *Fazienda* reflects the Vulgate form *ad montem Dei Horeb*. All the other versions refer to the *monte de Dios*. This form occurs in the Vulgate on one other occasion, in 1 K 19:8, in the phrase *usque ad monte Dei Horeb*. However, on this occasion it is rendered as *fastal monte de Dios a Oreb* in the *Fazienda*.

(4) Ex 3, 1. *Fazienda*: e ueno a *monte Dey Oreb* (f. 12rb<sup>6</sup>). *Vulgate*: venit ad *montem Dei Horeb*.

In Example 5, in Ex 15, 1 the citation *Cantemus Domino gloriose enim* is taken from the Vulgate, even though the phrase *gloriose enim* makes little sense without the additional *magnificatus est* of the Vulgate.

(5) Ex 15, 1. *Fazienda*: Esto canto Moysen & fijos de Israel en cantar, & dixieron: *Cantemus Domino gloriose enim* (f. 16vb<sup>2</sup>). *Vulgate*: tunc cecinit Moses et filii Israhel carmen hoc Domino et dixerunt *Cantemus Domino gloriose enim magnificatus est* equum et ascensorem dejecit in mare.

Other Vulgate citations are introduced by phrases such as *onde diz* or *ond diz*, as in Examples 6 and 7, or by *ço es*, in Examples 8 and 9.

In Example 6, from Gn 40, 14, the citation *Memento mei dum bene tibi fuerit*, although it is not completely accurate, has been firmly embedded in the vernacular translation of the verse.

(6) Gn 40, 14. *Fazienda*: E estonz te mienbre de my. Ont de diz: *Memento mei dum bene tibi fuerit*. E que priegues a Pharaon quem saque desta carcel (f. 6vb<sup>10</sup>). *Vulgate*: tantum *memento mei cum tibi bene fuerit* et facies mecum misericordiam ut suggeras Pharaoni et educat me de isto carcere.

In Example 7, from Ex 34, 29, the citation *Ignoras quod cornuta esset facie sua* is also not entirely accurate and appears to be used more as a gloss on the vernacular verse. This citation reflects a supposed Vulgate mistranslation, which confuses the Hebrew *haran* (“to shine”) with the word *keren* (“horn”).

Medieval paintings often show Moses as being horned. Interestingly, *Arragel* appears to marry these two concepts and refers to *rrayos rretrogados commo amanaera de cuernos el cuero de su cara*:

(7) Ex 34, 29. *Fazienda*: E non sabia el pueblo que demuda era su faz, que luzia el cuero de su faz. Onde diz: *Ignoras quod cornuta esset facie sua* (f. 21rb<sup>23</sup>). *Vulgate*: *et ignorabat quod cornuta esset facies sua ex consortio sermonis Dei*. *Arragel*: Non sabia que resplandeçia asy commo *rrayos rretrogados commo amanaera de cuernos el cuero de su cara*.

In Example 8, a Vulgate citation, *Miserere mei Deus secundum magnam misericordiam tuam* is used as a gloss on a Hebrew citation which comes from Ps 51 (50), 3: *Miserere mei Deus secundum misericordiam magnam tuam*. This citation occurs in the *Fazienda* after the passage from 2 S 12, 13, where David admits his sin (namely, sleeping with Bathsheba) to Nathan. The relevance of the use of this citation here is clarified in the introduction to Ps 50/51 which reads: *Psalmus David cum venit ad eum Nathan propheta quando intravit ad Bethsabee*.

(8) 2 S 12, 13. *Fazienda*: E Dauid repintios del mal que auia fecho e chamo mercet al Nuestro Senor en ebrayco e dixo: Houeni heloym que hazdeha, ço es: *Miserere mei, Deus, secundum magnam misericordiam tuam* (f. 47vb<sup>11</sup>). *Vulgate*: *et dixit David ad Nathan peccavi Domino dixitque Nathan ad David Dominus quoque transtulit peccatum tuum non morieris*.

Example 9 presents another scenario: a Hebrew citation from Eccle 1, 2 is followed by a vernacular version, *anemigar las nemigas que dixo Coheleth*, which is then glossed with the Latin Vulgate citation: *uanitas uanitatum & omnia uanitas, dixit Ecclesiastes*.

(9) Eccle 1, 2. *Fazienda*: e fablo de la uanidad. On diz en ebray: Habel habalim amay Coheleth; *anemigar las nemigas que dixo Coheleth*, ço es: *uanitas uanitatum & omnia uanitas, dixit Ecclesiastes* (f. 51vb<sup>13</sup>). *Hebrew*: havel (הַבֵּל) havalim (הַבְּלִים) amar (אָמַר) qohélet (קֹהֶלֶת). *Vulgate*: *vanitas vanitatum dixit Ecclesiastes vanitas vanitatum (et) omnia vanitas*.

These various Latin citations confirm the active presence of the Vulgate in the *Fazienda*, although exactly what purpose they serve is not absolutely clear. With the exception perhaps of Example 8, they generally add little or nothing to what is already in the vernacular version. Perhaps they are meant to provide validity to the vernacular version and add a sense of authority to the text. Or they may simply reflect the *marginalia* of a previous version which have subsequently been incorporated into the text of the *Fazienda*.

## 3. THE FORM OF PROPER NOUNS

Lazar draws attention in his notes to those occasions when the form used in the *Fazienda* reflects a Hebrew proper noun. In Example 10, in his note to Gn 24, 10, Lazar comments that *arrama araim, suit le texte hébreu, la Vulgate écrivait: Mesopotamia*<sup>14</sup>.

(10) Gn 24, 10. *Fazienda*: e fue Arrama Araim, cibdat de Nacor, el ermano de Abraam (f. 3ra<sup>26</sup>). *Vulgate* profectusque perrexit *Mesopotamiam* ad urbem Nahor.

However, when the *Fazienda* clearly uses a Vulgate form, Lazar makes no comment. In Example 11, both the *Fazienda* and the *General Estoria* use the form *Mesopotamia*, as in the Vulgate. Clearly, the *Fazienda* follows the Vulgate in this instance. It seems inevitable that, if one highlights, as Lazar does, those occasions when the *Fazienda* follows the Hebrew text, but not those when it follows the Vulgate, it is very difficult to get a true impression of the relative contribution of these two sources.

(11) Gn 48, 7. *Fazienda*: Qvando yo vinya de *Mesopotamya* (f. 10ra<sup>7</sup>). *Vulgate*: quando veniebam de *Mesopotamiam*. *GE*: quando uinien de *Mesopotamia*. *E3*: E yo quando venja de *padan*. *E19*: & yo vinjendo del lugar de *padan*. *E7*: E yo quando vine de *padam aram*. *E4*: E yo en veniendo de *padan*. *Arragel*: ca vjn-jendo yo de *padan aram* [*mesopotania*].

Amos Dodi points out that some medieval Romance Bible manuscripts *show the influence of the Vulgate, for example, in the order of books in the Bible and the spelling of proper nouns*<sup>15</sup>. He examines how proper nouns are transcribed in Genesis in *E3* and compares his findings with the transcription in *Arragel* and the Vulgate. His examples indicate that the spelling in *E3* is closer to the Masoretic Text, whereas *Arragel* is strongly influenced by the Vulgate. I have examined the occurrence of a number of proper nouns in the *Fazienda* and compared their spelling with that in the other medieval Romance Bibles and that in the Vulgate. They consistently reflect the forms found in the Vulgate.

Dodi notes that, in the book of Genesis, whereas *E3* transcribes the initial Hebrew letter as *f* in *Faraon*, *Arragel* and the Vulgate transcribe it as *ph*. If we take the references to *Pharaon* in the *Fazienda* and compare them with the other Bibles in the *Biblia Medieval* corpus and with the Vulgate, a pattern begins to appear. In the *Fazienda*, the Vulgate spelling with an initial *ph*, rather than *f*, is

<sup>14</sup> Lazar 1965, p. 46, n. 23.

<sup>15</sup> Dodi 2004, p. 429.

used exclusively on 101 occasions. It is also the preferred form in *E6/E8* and the *General Estoria*. As can be seen from my figures, Dodi's observations are not entirely accurate with regard to *Arragel* as a whole. All the other Bibles based on the Hebrew text show a marked preference for an initial "f".

	PHARAO(N)	FAR(A)ON
<i>FAZIENDA</i>	101	0
VULGATE	95	0
<i>E6/E8</i>	59	1
<i>GE</i>	126	51
<i>E3</i>	0	197
<i>E4</i>	0	235
<i>E5/E7</i>	1	248
<i>E19</i>	0	207
<i>ARRAGEL</i>	53	188

I contend that the influence of the Vulgate is further evidenced if we consider other references to Pharaoh in the *Fazienda*, as in Examples 12, 13 and 14. In Example 12, from Gn 41, 33, the *Fazienda* uses the expression *el rey Pharaon*, which reflects the use of *rex* in the Vulgate. The Hebrew text simply refers to Pharaoh by name alone.

(12) Gn 41, 33. *Fazienda*: Agora demande *el rey Pharaon* vn omne bien menbrado e faga lo mayor sobre todos sos vasallos (f. 7rb<sup>15</sup>). *Vulgate*: nunc ergo provideat *rex* virum sapientem et industrium et praeficiat eum terrae Aegypti.

Similarly, in Example 13, from Gn 47, 10, the *bendixo Israel al rey Pharaon* of the *Fazienda* reflects the Vulgate form *benedictio rege*. The *General Estoria* has *bendixo al Rey*. There is no reference in the Hebrew text to the title "king", and Pharaoh is again referred to by name alone:

(13) Gn 47, 10. *Fazienda*: Bendixo Israel *al rey Pharaon* e partios delant el (f. 9vb<sup>3</sup>). *Vulgate*: et benedicto *rege* egressus est foras. *GE*: bendixo *al Rey* & fuesse.

Likewise, in Example 14, from Gn 41, 25, *el suenno del rey* of the *Fazienda* clearly follows the *somnium regis* of the Vulgate, where Pharaoh is just referred to as "the King" and there is no direct mention of him by name. This contrasts with the other Bible texts which follow the Hebrew and refer to him just by name and talk of *el sueño de faraón*:

(14) Gn 41, 25. *Fazienda*: E dixo Iosep: El suenno del rey todo es vno (f. 7ra<sup>27</sup>). *Vulgate*: respondit Ioseph *somnium regis* unum est.



*E3*: E dixo josep afaraon el sueño de faraon vno es. *E19*: E dixo josep a faron el sueño de faron es vno. *E7*: E dixo josep afaraon el sueño de faraon vno es. *E4*: E dixo josep afaraon el suenno de faraon vno es. *Arragel*: dixo joseph a faraon el sueño de faraon vno es.

The spelling of *Pharaon* with an initial *ph* in the *Fazienda* clearly reflects the spelling found in the Vulgate. In addition, the use of the title “king”, with or without the word Pharaoh, is further evidence of the contribution of the Vulgate to the *Fazienda*. A further examination of the form of other proper nouns in the *Fazienda* (for instance, Reuben, Galaad, Socoth, Sichem) shows a preference for the Vulgate form.

#### 4. THE INFLUENCE OF THE VULGATE ON THE FAZIENDA TEXT

I have identified a number of cases which clearly show the influence of the Vulgate on the text of the *Fazienda*. In Example 15, the *Fazienda* prefers the Vulgate reading for Gn 27, 39 to that of the Hebrew text. The *tu bendicion* of the *Fazienda* and the *la tu bendicion* of the *General Estoria* clearly reflect the *benedictio tua* of the Vulgate version, rather than the “dwelling place” of the Hebrew, which is reflected in all the other texts with the use of *morada*, *morança* or *asentamiento*. Isaac’s reply in this verse is in response to Esau’s plea in Gn 27, 38: *Num unam, inquit, tantum benedictionem habes, pater? Mihi quoque obsecro ut benedicas.*

(15) Gn 27, 39. *Fazienda*: De grossura de la tierra & del ruçio sera tu bendicion de los cielos sera *tu bendicion* (f. 4ra<sup>21</sup>). *Vulgate*: motus Isaac dixit ad eum in pinguedine terrae et in rore caeli desuper erit *benedictio tua*. *GE*: en la grossura dela tierra & en el ruçio del cielo de suso sera *la tu bendicion*. *E3*: he delas grosuras dela tierra sera *la tu morada* & del Roçio del çielo de ençima. *E19*: delas grosuras de la tierra sera *tu morada* & del rroçio de los çielos de desuso. *E7*: dela grosura dela tierra sera *eltu asentamjento* & del rroçio del çielo de arriba. *E4*: ahe en lo viçioso de la tierra sea *tu morada* & del rroçio de los çielos de arriba. *Arragel*: ahe las grosuras dela tierra sera *la tu morança [bendicion]* & del rruçio delos cielos de suso.

The Vulgate form *benedictio* is what Haywood refers to as an *exegetic translation*<sup>16</sup>—an expansion of and an explanation of the Hebrew. The “dwelling place” of the Hebrew (the *morada*) represents Isaac’s blessing of

<sup>16</sup> Haywood 2008, p. 9.

Esau. This is explicitly expressed in the *benedictio tua* of the Vulgate and also in the *tu bendicion* of the *Fazienda*.

Similarly, in Example 16 from Jdg 2, 3, the *enemigos* of the *Fazienda* reflects the *hostes* of the Vulgate. This is echoed in both *E8* and the *General Estoria*. This idea of “enemies” differs from the idea of “thorns” or “pokers” (*espinas* or *açotes*) of the other versions. It is yet another example of the Vulgate stating explicitly what is implicit in the Hebrew text. Rashi’s commentary on this verse explains: *As pokers in your sides with troops and marauders to plunder and spoil.*

(16) Jdg 2, 3. *Fazienda*: Por esso non los quebrantar delante uos, mas remasieron por uestros *enemigos* e en sos dias seran a ellos por confusion (f. 30va<sup>1</sup>). *Vulgate*: quam ob rem nolui delere eos a facie vestra ut habeatis *hostes* et dii eorum sint vobis in ruinam. *E8*: & por aquesto no los quis destruyr denat vuestra cara por que ayades *enemigos* los dios deillos & que sean avos en confondimiento. *GE*: et por que fezistes & fazedes desta guisa por esso non quis yo destruyr estas yentes ante uos. & que ayades uos *enemigos* toda uia. & que los sos dioses sean estruymiento pora uos. *E3*: & avn non desterrare a ellos ante vos & seran avos commo *açotes* & sos dioses seran avos por entrepeçamjento. *E19*: e non esterraria a ellos delante vos E seran avos por *espinas* & sus dioses seran a vos por entrepieço. *E7*: e tan bien dixे que non desterraria a ellos delante vos. E seran a vos por *espinas* & sus dioses seran avos por entropieço. *E4*: e avn yo dixе que non los desterraria delante vos & ser vos han *espinas* & sus dioses vos seran lazo. *Arragel*: por tanto yo agora digo que los non desterrare por vos otros & quedar vos han por *espinos* & los sus dioses vos seran entropieço.

In Example 17, the *Fazienda* and the *General Estoria*, with their use of *bellos* and *fermosos* in Gn 49, 12, adopt the Vulgate rendering. The association of beauty with the eyes that we find in the Vulgate *pulchriores oculi eius vino* is completely absent from all other text versions, which reflect the Hebrew reading of “red” with their use of *bermejo* and *ruuio*.

(17) Gn 49, 12. *Fazienda*: Plus *bellos* son sos oios de vino... Plus *fermosos* sos oios de uino (ff. 10va<sup>28</sup>, 83ra<sup>3</sup>). *Vulgate*: *pulchriores* (sunt) oculi eius vino. *GE*: Mas *fermosos* son los sus oios que uino. *E3*: tornnara *bermejos* los ojos del mucho vjno. *E4*: mas *bermejo* de ojos que vino. *E7*: *Ruijos* son los sus ojos commo el vino. *E19*: E *enbermegeçeran* sus montes con sus vjñas. *Arragel*: *bermejos* ojos mas que vjno.

In Example 18, the description of Issachar as *asno fuerte* in Gn 49, 14 in the *Fazienda*, and also in the *General Estoria*, reflects the *asinus fortis* of the Vulgate, rather than the idea of “bony” (*os(s)udo*) of the Hebrew.

Again, the choice of *fortis* in the Vulgate seems to state explicitly what is implicit in the Hebrew.

(18) Gn 49, 14. *Fazienda*: Isacar *asno fuerte* yazra entre las pasturas (f. 10va<sup>32</sup>). *GE*: Ysacar *asno fuerte*, ques echa acobdado entre los terminos dela tierra. *Vulgate*: Isachar *asinus fortis* accubans inter terminos. *E3*: ysçagar *asno osudo* que esta entre los camjnos. *E4*: Yçacar *asno ossudo* rrodillado entre los terminos. *E7*: Ysacar *asno ossudo* yaziente entre los estercoleros. *E19*: Ysacar sera commo *asno de buenos nerujos* que duerme entre los planos. *Arragel*: Issacar es *asno de buenos huesos* que se puede echar [yaze entre los terminos] con la carga & leuantarse con ella.

In Example 19, from Jos 7, 10, the *Fazienda*, along with *E8* and the *General Estoria*, express the idea of “lying on the ground” (*en tierra*), echoing the expression *pronus in terra* of the Vulgate, whereas the other texts express the idea of “lying on your face” (*sobre tu cara* or *sobre tus fazes*), as in the Hebrew text.

(19) Jos 7, 10. *Fazienda*: Dixo el nuestro Sennor a Iosue: Leuat. ¿Por que iazes *en tierra tendido*? (f. 29ra<sup>21</sup>). *E8*: & dixo dios aJosue, leuanta te por que Jazes *tendido en tierra*. *GE*: Respusol nuestro sennor. & dixol. Leuanta te dend o estas *en tierra*. *Vulgate*: dixitque Dominus ad Iosue surge cur iaces *pronus in terra*. *E3*: E dixo el señor a jusue leuantate por que estas tu *echado sobre tu cara*. *E4*: E dixo el señor ajosue leuantate para que estas *echado sobre tu cara*. *E7*: E dixo el señor ajosue leuanta te para que estas *echado sobre tus fazes*. *E19*: E dixo el señor a josue leuanta dende para que estas asi *echado en somo de tus fazes*. *Arragel*: Dixo el señor a josue lleua dende para que estas *echado sobre tus fazes*.

In Example 20, from Gn 37, 19, the use of *el sonnador* in the *Fazienda* and the use of the same form in the *General Estoria* reflect the *somniator* in the Vulgate, as does *Arragel*. The Hebrew talks about the “possessor of dreams”, and this is reflected in the *el duenno/señor de los suennos* of those versions based on the Hebrew text.

(20) Gn 37, 19. *Fazienda*: Afe el *sonnador* (f. 5va<sup>31</sup>). *GE*: Euad alli el nuestro *sonnador*. *Vulgate*: ecce *somniator* venit. *E3*: he el *dueño delos sueños* este que viene. *E19*: este que viene es *señor delos sueños*. *E7*: catad aquj el *dueño delos sueños* do viene. *E4*: he este *duenno delos suennos* viene. *Arragel*: he aquj el *soñador* que vjene.

There are also occasions when the *Fazienda*, as well as the *General Estoria*, reflects elements from the Vulgate which are absent from the Hebrew text and from those versions based on it. In Example 21, the *campo pleno* of

Gn 27, 27 in the *Fazienda* reflects the *agri pleni* of the Vulgate, and this is echoed in the *campo lleno* of the *General Estoria*. The Hebrew simply refers to “field” without any epithet. Lazar simply states *n’est pas dans la Bible*<sup>17</sup>.

(21) Gn 27, 27. *Fazienda*: E beso a so fijo & abraço lo e dixo: Olor de mio fijo como olor de *campo pleno* bendixo el Criador (f. 3vb<sup>24</sup>). *GE*: Atal es el olor del mio fijo, como el del *campo lleno* de todas las buenas oluras a que dios bendixo. *Vulgate*: ecce odor filii mei sicut odor *agri pleni* cui benedixit Dominus. *E3*: & dixo ved el huesmo de mj fijo commo el huesmo del *campo* que lo bendixo dios. *E4*: & dixo ved la olor de mi fijo commo la olor del *campo* que lo bendixo el sennor. *E7*: & dixo veo olor de mj fijo commo olor de *campo* que lo bendixo el sennor. *E19*: & dixo veo huesmo de mj fijo que huele commo el olor del *campo* que bendixo dios. *Arragel*: & dixo le veo el olor de mj fijo que tiene olor del *campo* el qual bendixo dios.

In Example 22, the *Fazienda*, the *General Estoria* and the Vulgate identify the potential cause of death in Gn 42, 2 as hunger (*fambre*) in the *General Estoria* and the *Fazienda*, and more generally as need or scarcity (*inopia*) in the Vulgate. The Hebrew and those versions based on the Hebrew simple refer to “not dying” (*non morremos / non muramos*) and omit any reference to the possible cause of death.

(22) Gn 42, 2. *Fazienda*: conprat nos dello e non muramos de *fanbre* (f. 7va<sup>19</sup>). *GE*: conprat nos ende lo que auemos mester. E non nos perdamos assi de *fanbre*. *Vulgate*: emite nobis necessaria ut possimus vivere et non consumamur *inopia*. *E3*: & conprat nos della & beujremos & non morremos. *E4*: & conprat nos dende & beuiremos & non morremos. *E7*: conprat para nos dende & biuamos & non muramos. *E19*: conprat çiuera para nos de y & bjuamos & non muramos. *Arragel*: conprat nos çiuera dende & beujremos & non moriremos.

In Example 23, the *Fazienda* rendering of Gn 43, 20 *Pregamos te, sennor, que nos oyas* reflects the Vulgate version *oramus domine ut audias*. The *General Estoria* has the same rendering: *Sennor, rogamos te que nos oyas*. This phrase is completely lacking in those versions based on the Hebrew text.

(23) Gn 43, 20. *Fazienda*: Dixieron al mayordomo de Iosep: Pregamos te, sennor, que *nos oyas*. Qvant uinyemos por la ceuera fallamos el auer en los sacos (f. 8va<sup>7</sup>). *GE*: Sennor, Rogamos te que *nos oyas*. *Vulgate*: locuti sunt oramus domine ut *audias* iam ante descendimus ut emeremus escas. *E3*: & dixieronle con Ruego señor desçender desçendimos enel comjenço a comprar çiuera. *E19*: E dixieron ya nos otros deçendimos otra vez aquí a comprar çiuera. *E7*: E dixieron señor quando venjmos la primera

---

<sup>17</sup> Lazar 1965, p. 47, n. 29.

vez a comprar de comer. *E4*: & dixieron sennor descendimos enel comienço para comprar çiuera. *Arragel*: Dixieron le, señor, bien sabes quela primera vez vñjemos A conprar çiuera.

In Example 24, from Ex 9, 4, the idea of something wondrous being performed by the Lord as in the *Et faciet Dominus mirabile inter possessiones Israhel* that we find in the Vulgate is echoed in the *fare marauilla* of the *Fazienda* and the *General Estoria*. This concept of “something wondrous being done” is completely absent from the Hebrew-based texts.

(24) Ex 9, 4. *Fazienda*: E *fare marauilla* sobrel ganado de fijos de Israel, que non morra ninguno (f. 14va<sup>11</sup>). *GE*: & *fare esta marauilla* quello delos fijos de israhel. Todo finque biuo & sano. *Vulgate*: et *faciet Dominus mirabile* inter possessiones Israhel et possessiones Aegyptiorum ut nihil omnino intereat ex his quae pertinet ad filios Israhel. *E3*: & apartura dios entre el ganado de ysrael & entre el ganado delos egipcianos & non morira de todo lo delos fijos de ysrael cosa. *E19*: E espartara dios entre el ganado de ysrael entre el ganado de egibto & non moryra de todos los fijos de ysrael cosa. *E7*: E apartara el señor entre los rrebaños de ysrael & entre los de egipto & non morra njnguna rres de todo lo delos fijos de ysrael. *E4*: & apartara el sennor entre el ganado de ysrael. & entre el ganado de Egipto & non morra de todo lo delos fijos de ysrael cosa. *Arragel*: & espartira el eñor entre el ganado de israel & entre el ganado delos egipcianos & non morira de lo delos fijos de israel cosa.

Example 25 illustrates how the *Fazienda*, as well as the *General Estoria* (*effrom etheo*) mirrors the syntax of the Vulgate rather than that of the Hebrew. The references to Ephron the Hittite in the examples from Genesis reflect the Vulgate form *Ephron Hetthei* / *Ephron Hettheo*, eschewing the use of the definite article of the Hebrew text which is reflected in all the other texts: *efron el hity* / *esron el hity* (*E3*), *efron el yteo* (*E4*), *efron el ety* (*E7*), *epron el hiti* (*E19*), *efron el hiti* (*Arragel*). In the *Fazienda* we find the following cases:

(25) Gn 25, 10: que conpro de *Effren Etheo* a la uista de Manbre (f. 3rb<sup>30</sup>). Gn 49, 29: & soterrarmedes con myos parientes en la cueua del campo de *Effreteo* (f. 11ra<sup>4</sup>). Gn 49, 30: e conpro la de *Effron oteu* por .cccc. marcos de p[lata] ... lo conpro Abraam en el campo de *Effren eteo* com pressura de sepulcros (ff. 1va<sup>33</sup>, 11ra<sup>8</sup>). Gen 50, 13: Soterraron lo en la cueua del campo de enuol-gadura que conpro Abraam de *Eftren etheo* (f. 11rb<sup>24</sup>).

Example 26 shows that the Vulgate rendering, which features the verb *exaudire*, is reflected in the use of *oir* in the *Fazienda*, *E6*, and the *General Estoria*. All the other versions based on the Hebrew text prefer to use the verb *responder*.

(26) Jon 2, 3. *Fazienda*: & dixo: Myembre te de mi angustia e oy me del uentre del infierno (f. 37vb<sup>29</sup>). *E6*: e oyo me. de dentro de uentre. *GE*: e oyome. Del vientre del infierno. *Vulgate*: et exaudivit me de ventre inferni. *E3*: & rrespondiome del vientre de la cueva. *E5*: Respondermea del vientre dela fuesa. *E4*: Responder mehas del vientre dela fuesa. *Arragel*: repondiome desde el vientre del infierno.

This same use of *oir* for *exaudire* in the Vulgate also appears in the *Fazienda*, *E8*, and the *General Estoria* in Example 27.

(27) 1 K 18, 37. *Fazienda*: & oyr me as, Sennor, e oy me, e sepan todo el pueblo que tu eres el Sennor Dios (f. 34ra<sup>10</sup>). *E8*: Oy me seynnor oy me porque sepa este pueblo que tu eres el seynnor dios. *GE*: Oyeme, Señor, oyeme, que aprenda este pueblo que tu eres Señor Dios. *Vulgate*: exaudi me Domine exaudi me ut discat populus iste quia tu es Dominus Deus. *E3*: rrespondeme sennor rrespondeme & conosçeran este pueblo que tu eres el sennor dios. *E19*: rrespondeme señor rrespondeme & conosçeran este pueblo que tu eres el señor dios. *E7*: E rresponde me señor rresponde me por que conosca este pueblo que tu eres adonay. *E4*: rresponde me sennor rrespondeme & sabran este pueblo que tu eres el señor dios. *Arragel*: responde me señor respondeme & cognoscan este pueblo que tu eres adonay el dios.

Lazar himself identifies some material from the Vulgate that is incorporated into the *Fazienda*<sup>18</sup>. In Example 28 he points out that in Dt 34, 7 the *Fazienda* follows the Hebrew text, translating *ojos* and *color*, and then adds a third element from the Vulgate, *dientes*. The Hebrew word לֶהְיֹהוּ (*leho*) clearly presents some difficulty, as can be seen by the variety of solutions found in the other texts (*vertud*, *carrillo*, *humjidad*, *claridad*). *E8* and the *General Estoria* simply reflect the Vulgate text, referring to two elements: eyesight (*oios* or *uiso*) and teeth (*diente* or *dientes*). The other Romance Bibles reflect the Hebrew and make no mention of teeth at all. The *Fazienda* has *oios* and *color*, but adds *dientes* from the Vulgate.

(28) Dt 34, 7. *Fazienda*: nos escalfaron sos *oios* ni non se fuso su color e nos le metieron sos *dientes* (f. 27rb<sup>5</sup>). *Vulgate*: non caligavit oculus eius nec dentes illius moti sunt. *GE*: mas njl oscuresciera aun el *uiso*. nil cayera *diente* njnguno. *E8*: no se le enturbio el *oio*, ni se mouieron los *dientes*. *E3*: non se turbaron sus *ojos* & non se perdio su *vertud*. *E4*: non se enturbio su *ojo* njn se arrugo su *carrillo*. *E7*: & non se le enturbio su *ojo* njn se le mudo su *humjidad*. *E19*: & non se escuresçio su *ojo* njn se mudo la *claridad* de sus façes. *Arragel*: non se le negreçio su *ojo* njn se le fuyo la su *humjdat* [*color*] [njn se moujeron sus *dientes*].

<sup>18</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 21, n. 35.

There would appear to be no particular reason for the *Fazienda* to borrow (as Lazar puts it) an extra element from the Vulgate in this context. However, it may well be that because of the difficulty of meaning of the Hebrew word the compiler of the *Fazienda* has chosen to add this extra element from the Vulgate by way of clarification. This example serves to further illustrate my contention, namely that the *Fazienda* draws on both the Hebrew text and the Latin Vulgate.

## 5. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I believe that the examples that I have provided from the *Fazienda* are clearly more than the mere *références sporadiques* referred to by Lazar. They indicate that the influence of the Vulgate can be seen throughout the *Fazienda*. The examples I have provided are not meant to be exhaustive: for instance, Enrique-Arias has drawn my attention to the use of *pedra aguda* in Ex 4, 25, echoing the *acutissimam petram* of the Vulgate.

Faced with a similar problem (that of the source of the Bible *E3*), Sachs adduces evidence to show that this translation was based on the Hebrew text, rather than the Vulgate (as Berger had initially maintained)<sup>19</sup>. He goes on to advise caution in pigeon-holing manuscripts as to their source. In his opinion, *el problema es mucho más complejo, porque el traductor ha usado, para suplementar el original, una serie de versiones y comentarios*<sup>20</sup>. Example 29 illustrates this complexity. In Gn 38, 14, the Hebrew states that Tamar had not been given to Shelah as a wife, as in *E3*, *non la auja dado a el por muger*, whereas the Vulgate *non eum accepisset maritum* states that she had not received him as a husband. In the *Fazienda*, the *non ge dauan por marido* incorporates both the idea of “giving” (*dauan*) of the Hebrew and the “husband” (*marido*) of the Vulgate.

(29) Gn 38, 14. *Fazienda*: uyo que crecia Seila e non ge dauan por marido (f. 6ra<sup>35</sup>). *Vulgate*: eo quod crevisset Sela et non eum accepisset maritum. *E3*: ca vido que cresçio selah & non la auja dado a el por muger. *AJ*: Ca vido que cresçio selah & non la auja dado ael por muger. *E19*: por que vido que era ya grande sela & non gela dauan el por muger. *E7*: ca vido commo era ya criado sela & non gela dauan ael por muger. *E4*: ca vio que cresçio zela & non gela dieron por muger. *Arragel*: ca ella vio que estaua ya cresçido sela & ella non gela aujan dado por muger.

---

<sup>19</sup> Sachs 1948.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 218.

The issue of the combination of sources has also been addressed by Lorenzo Amigo Espada<sup>21</sup>. He analyses numerous coincidences with the Vulgate in *E3*, *E4*, *E7*, *E19* or *Fazienda*, and even on Judeo-Spanish translations such as the Ferrara Bible or the Pentateuch of Constantinople. Amigo Espada argues that these coincidences do not necessarily imply a direct influence of the Vulgate: in many cases they have a clear explanation in traditional Jewish exegesis, such as the works of Onkelos and Rashi, Ibn Ezra, Nahmanides, Menahem, Radaq or Bereshit Rabbah. Amigo Espada ultimately attributes these coincidences with the Vulgate to the translators' attempts to clarify the meaning of the Hebrew text.

Another possibility to be considered is that it was the compiler, that is, the person who combined the translation from Hebrew with the Latin itineraries, and not the Jewish translator, the one who introduced readings from the Vulgate. The *Fazienda* is intended for a Christian audience, and it is to be expected that this would be reflected in the range of sources available to the compiler.

In sum, there is no denying the obvious influence of the Hebrew text in the *Fazienda* as demonstrated by Lazar and generally accepted. As Javier Pueyo Mena states, *de lo que no hay duda es que los fragmentos bíblicos de la Fazienda están traducidos directamente del hebreo*<sup>22</sup>. I believe, however, that it is now time to re-evaluate the contribution of the Vulgate to the *Fazienda de Ultramar*. The evidence presented in the preceding pages clearly suggests that the Old Testament passages in the *Fazienda* are a product of two sources –the Hebrew Bible and the Latin Vulgate.

## 6. CITED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Amigo Espada, Lorenzo (1983), *La Biblia romanceada y la Vulgata*, in Oroz Reta, José (ed.), *Corollas philologicas in honorem Iosephi Gvillen Cabañero*, Salamanca, Universidad de Salamanca, pp. 35-54.
- Arbesú, David (ed.) (2011), *La fazienda de Ultramar* [online], <http://www.lafaziendadeultramar.com> [accessed: 01/03/2023].
- Avenoza, Gemma (2012), *The Bible in Spanish and Catalan*, in Marsden, Richard; Matter, E. Ann (coords.), *New Cambridge History of the Bible. Vol. 2. From 600 to 1450*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 288-306.

---

<sup>21</sup> Amigo Espada 1983.

<sup>22</sup> Pueyo Mena 2008, p. 198.



- Enrique-Arias, Andrés; Pueyo Mena, F. Javier (eds.) (2008), *Biblia Medieval. Biblia Medieval*, <http://www.bibliamedieval.es> [accessed: 01/03/2023].
- Dodi, Amos (2004), *Transcriptions of Hebrew Proper Nouns in a Fifteenth-Century Spanish Bible (Ms. Escorial I.j.3)*, "Bulletin of Hispanic Studies" 81/4, pp. 427-452.
- Enrique-Arias, Andrés (2011), *Traduciendo la Biblia en la Castilla medieval. Nuevas perspectivas a la luz de la edición electrónica integral de los romanceamientos bíblicos medievales en castellano*, "Letras de Deusto" 133/41, pp. 13-41.
- Enrique-Arias, Andrés (2012), *Biblia Medieval: diseño y aplicaciones de un corpus paralelo y alineado del español medieval*, in Montero Cartelle, Emilio; Manzano Rovira, Carmen (coords.), *Actas del VIII Congreso Internacional de Historia de la Lengua Española (Santiago de Compostela, 14-18 de septiembre de 2009)*, vol. I, Madrid, Arco Libros, pp. 421-432.
- Hebrew-English Interlinear* [online], [http://www.scripture4all.org/OnlineInterlinear/Hebrew\\_Index.htm](http://www.scripture4all.org/OnlineInterlinear/Hebrew_Index.htm) [accessed: 01/03/2023].
- Hervey, Sándor; Higgins, Ian; Haywood, Louise M. (2008), *Thinking Spanish Translation: A Course in Translation Methods: Spanish to English*, London, Routledge.
- Lazar, Moshé (ed.) (1965), *La fazienda de Ultra Mar. Biblia romanceada et itinéraire biblique en prose castillane du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, Salamanca, Universidad de Salamanca.
- Pueyo Mena, F. Javier (2008), *Biblias romanceadas y en ladino*, in Hasán, Iacob M.; Izquierdo Benito, Ricardo; Romero-Castelló, Elena (coords.), *Sefardíes: literatura y lengua de una nación dispersa*, Cuenca, Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, pp. 193-263.
- Requena Marco, Miguel (1974), *La Fazienda de Ultra Mar: estudio de su problemática y correcciones al texto*, Barcelona, Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona (degree thesis).
- Sachs, George E. (1948-1949), *Fragmento de un estudio sobre la Biblia medieval romanceada*, "Romance Philology" 2, pp. 217-228.
- The Complete Jewish Bible with Rashi commentary* [online], [https://www.chabad.org/library/bible\\_cdo/aid/63255/jewish/The-Bible-with-Rashi.htm](https://www.chabad.org/library/bible_cdo/aid/63255/jewish/The-Bible-with-Rashi.htm) [accessed: 01/03/2023].
- Vulgate - Biblia Sacra. Iuxta Vulgatam versionem. Adiuvantibus B. Fischer, I. Gribomont, H. F. D. Sparks, W. Thiele* (2005), Stuttgart, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

Fecha de recepción del artículo: octubre 2022  
 Fecha de aceptación y versión final: abril 2023

