

La relatividad de las cosas: Heterodoxy and Midrashim in the First Chapters of Alfonso X's General Estoria

Francisco Peña Fernández
University of British Columbia

...que después que el rey don Alfonso regno dezia muchas [vezes] palabras de gran soberbia que si el con Dios estouiera o fuera su consejo que algunas cosas si lo Dios creyera fueran major fechas que commo las le fiziera [...] era verdad que lo dixiera e lo dezia ahun que si con el fuera en la criazon del mundo que muchas cosas emendara e corrigiera que se fisieran muy major que lo que estaua fecho.

(*Crónica Geral de Espanha de 1344*)

Manuel Alvar, in his article, “Didactismo e Integración en la *General Estoria*” published in 1985, summarized, illustrated, and explained many aspects of the *magna obra* of the learned king, stressing the strong and specific relation inherent between the Castilian universal history and the Bible. For the Spanish critic, the translation of the sacred text from the *Vulgata* is not only a main objective in the work of don Alfonso but conditions any other purpose (Alvar 26). From the many aspects –religious, political, encyclopedic, didactic- that he observes in this medieval universal history there is one of obvious theological, literary, and philosophical consequence I found especially insightful: the constant awareness and defense that the *General Estoria* has of *la relatividad de las cosas*, the relativity of things (75).

Manuel Alvar strongly believes that Alfonso’s relativistic approach results from the syncretism of his enterprise, which learns from the heterogeneity of knowledge¹. In his study, the critic firmly asserts that the theory of knowledge defended by don Alfonso should not be understood as ecclesiastical, but rather as universal, defending the integration and consultation of multiple sources of information (37). Recognizing that the *alfonsí* universal history demonstrates an understanding of the discrepancies and theological controversies of its time, the Spanish medievalist argues in his article that the Castilian king and his work did not deviate from orthodox Christianity. This is further supported by considering the heterogeneity of the royal workshop, consisting of a large number of translators from different cultural and religious backgrounds (37; 53; 72).

According to Manuel Alvar’s analysis, the syncretism of the *General Estoria* did not affect its orthodoxy. Since the work of the Castilian king always accepted the Christian Bible as a revealed book and as a reference and center of the life and history of man, it always maintains an *orthodox* approach to Scriptures in accordance with the doctrine of the Church Fathers (72-74). The acknowledgement by the king of God’s absolute truth, inspired by the Bible, and its accurate understanding of the dogma – through the consultation of many other Christian sources- were the reasons that led the author to defend that men possess relative truths (75).

¹ “Tanto leer, tanto colacionar textos, tanto buscar sentido a los elementos dispersos, ha llevado a la más alta condición del intelectual: la conciencia de la relatividad de las cosas. Y Alfonso intenta resolver las apariencias falaces con el sincretismo que aprende en la heterogeneidad de los saberes” (Alvar 75).

In the present paper, although I am interested in supporting most of the main arguments of Manuel Alvar's work, I will be expanding on and inquiring into one particular contradiction I find in these last statements. I propose that the *General Estoria* in its holding of the reading of the Bible as central, and also in its appreciation of the *relativity of things* clearly evident in many of its characters and episodes, necessarily contradicts the orthodox reading of the Bible –according to the doctrine of the Church Fathers. I will present this defense through a comparative analysis of the first chapters of Genesis set forth in the *General Estoria*.

In the first two sections of this article I will show that the defense of a *relatividad de las cosas* in the first chapters of the *General Estoria* could be considered a heterodox deviation. In validating this statement I will need to confront some fundamental questions: Is there a possibility that Jewish sources used –but not quoted- in the *General Estoria* influenced the rendering of the first chapters of Genesis? Is there a possibility that Alfonso's heterodox proposal of the relativity of things is closer to rabbinic exegesis than to a Roman Catholic interpretation? If so, how different is the use of rabbinic and pseudoepigraphic material in Alfonso's first chapters of Genesis from other *biblias historiales*? I will also use these aspects and questions to further argue a more than possible Jewish leadership among the translators and editors that incorporated the Bible in the composition of these first chapters of the *General Estoria*, even when the source of the biblical translations is obviously the Vulgata Latina. I will further develop and illustrate these theses in the last section of this article analyzing what I understand as an exercise of applied exegesis in the representation of the character of Cain.

1 From the *Historia Scholastica* to the *General Estoria*

Both the *Antiquities of the Jews* of Flavius Josephus, the historiographical model that inspired Medieval Biblical Paraphrases and Medieval Popular Bibles, and the *Historia Scholastica* of Petrus of Troyes, the first and most influential work in their respective genres, influenced a large number of pages of the masterpiece of the historical prose of don Alfonso. Secondary to the main task of translating the text of the Vulgate, the degree of importance or prominence in the work of the chancellor of Notre Dame or the *Antiquities of the Jews* in the redaction of this universal history is not constant, but is presented differently in their various books or chapters. In regard to the translation and expansion of the early chapters of Genesis, which are the ones I will discuss in this paper, it is safe to say that certainly Comestor's biblical history is not only more relevant but entirely essential to appreciate the obvious originality of the work of the learned king. Therefore, the proposal of a comparative analysis between the Castilian universal history and its French antecedent is practically obliged.

A first reading and contrast of the chapters describing the Creation in both works could contradict what I have just stated or be the most obvious reason of the necessity for a comparative approach because of the drastic difference in their lengths. While the sacred history of the chancellor of Notre Dame dedicates a total of nineteen chapters to introduce the reader to the story of Creation, the same material in the *General Estoria* is limited to only four, despite it being a much larger text. In these crucial first steps that initiate this ambitious undertaking, the redactors of the Castilian text decided to stay very close to the biblical account. To what at first seems a mere work of translation, however,

subtle but important differences are gradually incorporated, either through small inclusions or through nearly imperceptible exclusions.

Beginning at the sixth day of the Creation, Alfonso's account takes on a more creative tone than in the previous episodes. At this point, both Comestor's sacred history and Alfonso's universal history seem to share the challenging goal of reconciling some contradictory points –products of two different narratives of the creation of the world. The French and the Castilian texts certainly agree on the main questions to ask, ponder, or explain: Were man and woman created at the same time and in the image and likeness of God, or was Adam created first and then Eve?² Why were all the animals in Eden divided between males and females while the first man seemed to be left alone? How did the first human face this unfair circumstance? Were Adam and Eve already mortal before being expelled from paradise, or did they lose their immortality after eating the fruit from the tree of knowledge of good and evil?³ Was it only after being dressed in clothes made of animal skin that they were aware of their mortality?

While the questions in the Castilian and the French narrations are similar, the possible answers and attention that each author gives to the various biblical episodes of the first part of the book of Genesis are, in some cases, clearly different. There is an additional difference between the French Latin account and Alfonso's *romanceamiento* regarding the way the gaps or unclear episodes of the Bible are bridged. Peter Comestor in his *Historia* will often intervene, even assessing the culpability of the protagonist of the stories in morally ambiguous biblical actions (Carey 20). The narration of the *General Estoria*, on the other hand, does not intervene, but finds narratological strategies, such as the creation of fictional stories that help the reader to illustrate unclear passages.

In order to speak "of the people of Adam" the *General Estoria* demonstrates a growing interest in the personality of the protagonists and also an incorporation of apocryphal stories used on the service of the author's clear desire for a more creative and adventurous narration. In the story of Cain and the Cainites, the author's pen takes even more liberties, transforming and expanding information from numerous sources, and even venturing into creating his own narratives. In reviewing all of these episodes, it becomes more evident that the *Historia Scholastica* began serving as a structural framework and source of ideas and exegetical explanations, and at some point was left behind in the effort of the *General Estoria* to stay close to the words first and later to the meaning and interpretation of the biblical narrative.

² "The word man (*adam*), in Hebrew as in English, is ambiguous; it can mean a human being of either sex, or it can designate specially a male human being. To an ordinary reader it might seem that this verse is simply trying to stress the fact that human beings of both sexes were created on this sixth day. But another interpretation was possible: "Said Rabbi Jeremiah b. Lazar: At that time that God created the first human, He created him as an androgyne [a combination of male and female], as it is written *male and female He created them*" (Kugel 1998, 84s).

³ "This is hardly to say that Gen 1:26 was interpreted primarily as a clue to the nature of God; on the contrary, it was understood largely as a statement about human beings and their Godlike qualities. As described in Chapter 3, some ancient interpreters held that Adam and Eve were originally created to be immortal –so perhaps *this* was the sense in which they were made in God's *image*: 'For God created man for incorruption [or "immortality"] and made him in the image of His own eternity' (Wisd. 2:23)" (Kugel 1998, 81). Defenses of mortality as the punishment to Adam and Eve: Sir. 25:24; Philo's *Creation* 152 and *Virtues* 205; 1 *Enoch* 69:11; *Symmachus Gen.* 2:17; *Apocalypse of Moses* 14:2; Pseudo-Philo, *Biblical Antiquities* 13:10; *Sybiline Oracles* 1:39-41; 2 *Baruch* 17:2-3, 23:4; 2 *Enoch* 30:17 and *Pesiqta Rabbati* 41:2 (see Kugel 1998, 96s).

Until approaching the story of the first disobedience in the Garden of Eden, we did not see in Alfonso's accounts any significant changes from the biblical narrative apart from the obligation required in both Christian and Jewish traditions to identify the serpent of Eden with Satan or the Devil (1 *Enoch* 69:6; *Apocalypse of Moses* 16:4; 17:4; 4 *Macc.* 18:7-8; 2 *Enoch* 31:4-6; *Rev.* 12:9; 20:2; Justin Martyr *Dialogue with Trypho* 103; *Apocalypse of Sedrach* 4:5).

The first time the text incorporates a new episode is in order to answer a question that was not borrowed from Comestor: How, after the expulsion of Adam and Eve, did humans learn to till the ground without any help? In order to answer this, the Castilian universal history picks an apocryphal story filling this informative gap of the Scriptures: God, taking pity on his banished children, teaches them to farm. This story, not mentioned by its Christian sources, extols the generosity and compassion of God after the sin of the first couple⁴.

We detect here an interesting twist, since this legend presents not only a very human and magnanimous God but also a divinity that changes His mind, in this case, regarding the punishment of the first couple. Here the *General Estoria*, besides making evident its will of defending a relativity of things, uses a tradition present not in Christian but instead in rabbinic literature (*Genesis Rabba* xxiv; *Pes.* 564a). The narration avoids mentioning these specific sources, attributing it instead to "escritos de arávigos sabios."

Although Alfonso shares the same structural logic as Comestor's narrative in the second part of the Creation and both respond to similar issues as discussed in the sections that follow, their conclusions in many cases diverge. On the other hand, as I have already observed, in the first part of the Creation the differences are far more salient, both in relation to the biblical text and to the authorial intervention and exegetical additions. Yet the issue remains the same: the origin and persistence of Evil and therefore the perfection or imperfection of Creation. Obviously, the different conclusions about this relevant question would have to contend with the relativity of things, which will enable us to understand where this *relatividad de las cosas* originated.

2. *The relativity of living* in an imperfect universe

As stated by Jon D. Levenson in his work, *Creation and the Persistence of Evil*, the idea of the autonomy of humanity in relation to God, defended in the first chapters of the book of Genesis, is one of the most fascinating features of the Hebrew text. As a monotheistic text, there is another idea that has to be constantly supported: the independence of God from any other power that could challenge Him. The book of Genesis in its narration of the Creation of the universe never detected an active opposition to God's labor since there does not exist any other divinity that could interfere in His work and decisions.

⁴ "E segund que fallamos en escritos de arávigos sabios que fablaron en las razones d'estas cosas dizen que en aquella echada del paraíso que dio otrossí Nuestro Señor Dios a Adam e a Eva las simientes de los panes e de las legumbres e de las otras cosas que sembrassen en ela tierra e cogiessen dond se mantoviessen" (Libro I, III). Christian theology, from the Patristic era onward, viewed the banishment of the original couple as part of the economy of God's merciful salvation. A very early example could be seen in Irenaeus of Lyon (*Against Heresies*, Book III, chapters 1, 7).

As Levenson points out, the depiction of Creation in the Hebrew Bible contradicts its main polytheistic referent, the *Enuma elish*. The narration of Genesis begins where the action of the Babylonian poem ends, with the resolution of a total confrontation between gods (Levenson 122). On the other hand, the mention of the making of great sea monsters in Genesis 1:21 seems to be, with its monotheistic portrayal, a stage beyond the “Isaianic Apocalypse” (Isaiah 24-27) and also of Psalm 104’s demythologizing previous evil forces (Levenson 54). There are certainly some aspects in common in these biblical references of the primordial episodes, such as the strength of the divinity and the fact that the confinement of chaos rather than its elimination seems to be part of God’s plan. However, in the narration of Genesis we see that it is God who determines the limits of chaos, represented by these oceanic beasts.

These interpretations are consistent with many other specialists in biblical studies that defend the understanding that Genesis and the Pentateuch both depict creation as an *unfinished* process. The lack of perfection would not come from the incompetent work of divinity, but instead as part of a perfect divine plan that takes place in history⁵. This interpretation differs from the orthodox Christian reading of the origin and persistence of evil and this is the reason orthodox Christianity could not defend its interpretation exclusively through a literal reading of the first chapters of Genesis.

The proto-orthodox Christianity of the first centuries and the later orthodox doctrines of the Church clashed on numerous occasions with hypotheses about Creation that emphasized the idea of an imperfect Creation. In a great number of the writings of the Church Fathers (Tertullian, *Against Marcion*; Augustine, *The Literal Meaning of Genesis, Concerning the Nature of Good, Against the Manichæans*, and *On the Nature of Things*; or Athanasius, *The Incarnation of the World*) there is an easily detectable concern with those who defended, as the Christian Gnostics and Marcionites did, the Creation of the world as a flawed process. Theologians, such as John Chrysostom in his homilies concerning the power of demons, remained aware of the difficulty of reconciling the biblical apocryphal tradition and its idea of a fallen angel as originator of evil, with the biblical narrative, and they defended the position that Satan was not evil by nature, but by preeminence (Homily III, 3). From the perspective of Christian orthodoxy, Evil needs to be personified as an apostate whose wickedness was developed after his creation and incurred during an act of rebellion.

These main exegetical issues are the first substantial example of distance and difference between the postulates and perspectives of the *General Estoria* and Peter Comestor as representative of orthodox Christian thought. The *Historia Scholastica* begins his account of the creation of the world, quoting the Greek philosophers Aristotle and Epicurus in their relevant understandings of the primal contact between two opposing entities: matter and form, or lifeless matter and atoms (Liber Genesis I, 23-31)⁶ In his objective of further supporting the doctrinal postulate of detaching Creation from Evil, and detaching the presence of Evil as a consequence of an imperfect Creation, the author goes on to state emphatically that God, in exclusivity, is the architect and guarantor of the

⁵ “Though the persistence of evil seems to undermine the magisterial claims of the creator-God, it is through submission to exactly those claims that the good order that is creation comes into being. Like all other faith, creation-faith carries with enormous risk. Only as the enormity of the risk is acknowledged can the grandeur of the faith be appreciated” (Levenson 156).

⁶ Regarding Aristotle’s Cosmology and Metaphysics and the Christian concept of Creation, see Seidl.

authorship of the universe. Knowing the exegetic lines presented by Augustine in his work *De Genesi ad litteram*, Peter Comestor begins his story of Creation by quoting John Gospel's statement: "In principio erat Verbum, et Verbum erat principium." As stated by the chancellor of Notre Dame, only God is eternal, while the world and angelic creatures are everlasting. God created light and separated it from the darkness, and in the same way, He created angelic creatures that were later split between "stantes lux" and "cadentes tenebrae."⁷ This allegorical addendum on the creation and separation of light from darkness seeks to be consistent with a literal interpretation of the Scriptures and with the doctrine of the Church. The rebellion of the *cadentes* angels would then mark the specific moment of the entrance of evil into the world⁸. The French text chooses to offer a moral allegory about the myth of the fallen angels, arguing that this event would have taken place before the creation of man. Despite its apocryphal origin, this interpretation is not only completely orthodox but also assumed in much of medieval literature. This same allegory would help to explain the reason for the creation of "sea monsters" mentioned in Genesis 1, 21. To Comestor, in the same way that light and darkness already exist within the heavenly spheres, there would have been a parallel situation with the principles of good and evil when earthly beings were created: "Cum magis vere daemones dicantur boni angeli quam mali in suggillationem tamen promissionis forum, scilicet eritis Sicut dii, datum est eis hoc nomen" (Liber Genesis VII, 15). Other demonic beings, later in the text, were created as a result of human groups that were tainted by the blood of the race of Cain.

The *Historia Scholastica's* exposition seeks at all times to be in accordance with canonical proposals. As already mentioned, the *General Estoria* is, in its re-reading of the first two chapters of Genesis, limited to a literal interpretation of the Scriptures and omits entirely the use of allegorical and typological exegesis, which is absolutely essential for Comestor to give an orthodox explanation to one of the more relevant theological dilemmas: the entry, presence, and logic of Evil in the world.

The separation between light and darkness in the *General Estoria* is presented in the following way:

El primero día crió la luz e todas las naturas de los ángeles *buenos e malos*, que son las criaturas espirituales. E partió esse día a la luz de las tinieblas, e a la luz llamó día e a las tinieblas noche. (Libro I)

As in the *Historia Scholastica*, the creation of the angels in Alfonso's account takes place on the same day as the separation between light and darkness⁹, but we can

⁷ "Intelligitur etiam hic angelorum facta diuisio: stantes lux, cadenter tenebre dicti sunt," (Genesis III, 15). "It has been that v.2 is not an advance over the concise statement of v. 1, but it is almost a step backward. Earlier theologians sought to explain this break by means of an immense speculation, the so-called hypothesis of restitution. The assumption, however, of a cosmic Luciferlike plunge of the creation from its initial splendor is linguistically and objectively quite impossible" (Von Rad 50). "... where were the angels? Although all shorts of other biblical texts (and texts from outside the Bible) make mention of angels, nothing is said here about when they were first created" (Kugel 48).

⁸ "Quidam suspicantur quartum esse celum super empyreum, quia Lucifer, cum esset in empyreo, legitur dixisse: Ascendam in celum et cetera. Et in eo dicunt modo esse Christum hominem super angelos qui sunt in empyreo" (Genesis IV, 20).

⁹ "The Bible contained at least one indication for ancient interpreters that the angels had in fact been created *sometime* during the first six days. For, after the sixth day is completed, the Bible says: Thus, the heavens and the earth were finished, and all their hosts (Gen 2:1). [...] When during the six days were the

detect in the Castilian version two important differences: not only were the heavenly creatures created first, but God created them both good and bad before He separated the light from the darkness. While Comestor is faithful to a more dualistic reading where evil emerges as a consequence of an *apocryphal* rebellion against God, the Castilian narration is definitely not taking the same path. What is more surprising is the way this clearly heterodox proposal is presented with forthright simplicity but also with striking sophistication. Alfonso does not enter into a debate but, in contrast with the French account, he seems to be more logical and faithful to a literal reading of the Scriptures.

Is there any further evidence of Alfonso's non-dualism and heterodoxy in the account of Creation? A very significant one, in this case not an addendum but an omission of the overt statement that everything in God's Creation was good or beautiful (Hamilton 103-119). This is what patristic writings would never leave behind, unlike the *General Estoria's* translation of the Vulgate (Archelaus, *Disputation with Manes*; Agustin, *The Literal Meaning of Genesis*, Pseudo-Dionysus the Areopagite, *On the Divine Names*, etc).

Peter Comestor, within all his exegetical efforts, fails to reiterate God's affirmation that "It was good" and every point where the Bible does (Gen 1:4; 1:10; 1:18; 1:21; 1:25; 1:31) but he does assert the goodness of God's tasks three times: in the creation of light and its separation from darkness (Gen 1:4), in the creation of man (Gen 1, 31), and in one last place to confirm and emphasize the perfection of all creation¹⁰. None of this takes place in Alfonso's presentation, leading us to understand the significance of this conscious exclusion.

From my point of view Alfonso's account of Creation is, from a Christian perspective, clearly heterodox, even though it does not deny and in fact asserts God's omnipotence. In order to understand Alfonso's point of view we need to return to examples provided by the *Estoria* that do not come from his Christian sources, such as the inclusion of the midrashic story mentioned earlier, of God teaching Adam and Eve how to farm. The fact that our Castilian *romanceamiento* of the Bible talks about a God that changes His mind does not make Him weak or less powerful –from the point of view of rabbinical exegesis- but rather more conscious of compassionate toward human troubles. In the same way Alfonso's Creation is not defended as flawed –as Gnostics or Marcionites claimed- but as unfinished.

3. *Veritas Hebraica and Echoes from apocryphal literature*

In pseudepigraphic literature there is only one specific tradition about Creation that, as Alfonso's account, defends the omnipotence of God through a non-dualistic perspective: *The Testament of Adam*¹¹. As in the Castilian Bible, this text depicts God

angels created?" (Kugel 48, 49). As Kugel indicates, there are different interpretations and possible answers in pseudepigraphic and later rabbinical traditions. In *Genesis Rabbah*, for example, angels were created the fifth day (Gen Rab. 1:3)

¹⁰ "Igitur perfectu sunt celi et terra. Conclusio est hic operum sic, quia creati dispositi ornati, igitur perfecti" (Genesis XI, 1).

¹¹ "The three sections of the *Testament of Adam* were not written at the same time, but the final Christian redaction, in which the testament took on its present form, probably occurred in the middle or late third century A.D. (Charlesworth 1:990). It is important to note that although the ideas we detect in the account

creating both good and bad angels in the same way He also creates animals and monsters, and separates light and darkness. Evil, therefore, is part of Creation and God's plan.

Both in this pseudepigraphic text and in Alfonso's account of Creation the omnipotent God is responsible for all things, both good and evil and consequently both good and bad angels revere and obey Him (Charlesworth 1:991). It is important to stress that in the *Testament of Adam* and also in the *General Estoria* everything falls under God's power and will. The creation of evil creatures does not make God less omnipotent, nor does it demonstrate a flaw in His Creation, but rather, it suggests a different logic or plan. And in emphasizing the creation of both good and evil angels, the Castilian account avoids asserting that *everything* was good.

Coming back to the biblical episodes that supported the Christian interpretation of the creation and persistence of evil in the world, it is important to note that the idea of an eschatological combat myth –the mythological inspiration of the apocryphal story of the fallen angel - is rare in the Hebrew Bible and absent altogether in the Pentateuch. However, it not only survived in early Christian apocalyptic literature but also in Jewish literature that continued in the *aggadah* of Talmudic rabbis (Levenson 48). But there is an important difference between the Christian orthodoxy and rabbinic exegesis regarding their reading of the struggle between good and evil: the fact that rabbinic exegesis never understood it in a dual scheme.

Scholars like Daniel Boyarin have written extensively on how the ambiguity in many examples of midrashic literature strongly affirms the complexity and polyphony of the Torah (Boyarin 78), and how the ambiguity encoded in specific exegetical chapters or narratives remarks the functions of such ambiguities in their biblical references (Boyarin 79). Commentaries like *Genesis Rabbah* or the *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer* seemed to present a greater difficulty in making sense of the same biblical episodes that the patristic literature seemed to have no problems explaining through a Christological exegesis and typological interpretation. *Genesis Rabbah*, for example, asks why God decided to create something with so obvious an evil inclination as humans. In this sense the Midrashim refers to apocryphal traditions about the conflict between God and the angels over the creation of man. In order to understand the logic behind Genesis 1, 21 the text contemplates not only the logic of the creation of monsters but also the reason for their existence and persistence. Also, if the *nephilim* mentioned in the sixth chapter of Genesis were destroyed by the flood, who then are those giants who are subsequently referred to in Numbers 13:32-33 and the ones that are mentioned in Deuteronomy 3:11? (Caspi 104s). Regarding again the rabbinical interpretations of the biblical story of Creation, specialists like Luis Vegas Montaner also question the surprising omission of issues such as these (Vegas Montaner 31).

Returning to our medieval sources, we should start wondering what would be more important in a comparative study of the *General Estoria* and other Christian *biblias historiales* like Comestor's *Historia Scholastica*: the different sources –Jewish or Christian- or the way these sources were used? Can we assert, by the nature of their readings of the chapters of Genesis and the fact that neither mentions the Jewish origin of some of their sources, that both give the same level of respect to the Christian *auctoritas*?

of the Creation of the *General Estoria* are very close to the ones defended in this text, there is no explicit quote from the *Testament of Adam* in the Castilian account.

The contact with those sources outside of orthodox Christianity is clearly different in one case than the other. Scholars like Saralyn R. Daly have stressed the importance and the intellectual influence of the rabbinical school of Rashi in the ideas and exegesis of the followers of the school of Hugh of St. Victor (Daly 63). According to James Morey, “Peter used Hebrew traditions either through direct contact or as preserved in Andrew of St. Victor’s commentary on the *Octateuch* which was written *in consultation with Jewish teachers*” (Morey 14)¹². The Castilian scriptorium did not need to consult with outside Jewish teachers since renowned members of that group had an active and important role in the intellectual enterprise of the learned king.

The reference to or knowledge of Jewish traditions in many cases could come indirectly. Brian Murdoch, while scanning for the presence of apocryphal traditions regarding Adam and Eve in medieval European literature, expresses surprise at finding no clear evidence of the reception of apocryphal literature in the Iberian Peninsula (Murdoch, 34). I understand that a careful reading of the first chapters of the *General Estoria* can give us the foundation to argue that, without very much doubt, the knowledge of many of these traditions is more than evident in the scriptorium of the learned king. I would not dare to affirm if all those references came from existing copies later lost, or directly through the knowledge of and access to rabbinic literature. What is important to note, however, is that awareness of the many nuances in those legends found in our *Estoria* could not have been acquired through the reading of Josephus, Comestor, or other Christian writers alone. There is an additional important difference between French *biblias historiales* and the *General Estoria* in the role that pseudepigraphic and rabbinic sources played; in the first case, those references are appropriated and recycled without perhaps clearly knowing, or caring about, their origins (Morey 25). This does not seem to be the case in these first chapters of the *General Estoria*.

There is another differentiating factor that could be considered narratological. In his extensive work, Brian Murdoch also notes how different versions or collections of medieval apocryphal texts in England, France, and Italy are not limited to translating these ancient legends, but also dare to develop motifs and ideas that vary from one translation to another (Murdoch 38). We should also take into account that most of the *Biblias Historiales*, both in principle and following the example of Comestor, considered and borrowed from apocryphal traditions in order to build their narrative exegesis. However, this borrowing happens more often in the *General Estoria* than in any examples in the other works.

As Francisco Márquez Villanueva notes, the *General Estoria* is essentially narrative conditioned by what he understands as a proto-fictional criteria and will of entertaining (Márquez Villanueva 146). Alfonso’s narration of biblical passages does not dwell on explanations or clarifications. In its retelling of the first episodes of the history of humanity, the *General Estoria* combines its desire to shed light into gaps, silences, and contradictions of the Scriptures with the progressive tendency for making up stories. The historiographical enterprise of don Alfonso in its way of reading and expanding biblical literature would bear more resemblance to haggadic midrash, opting to replace personal

¹² “Currently, midrash and patristic exegesis and narrative are being compared for evidences of dialogue, symbiosis, and organismic interactions” (Visotzky 117). See Boyarin, Schwartz, Neusner, Wilken and Kugel 2001.

exegetical explanations with imagination and invention, completing what its sources left incomplete (Maoz 54). This similarity becomes even clearer in the way many of the main characters are approached. I will illustrate this similarity in a specific example of what specialists in midrashic literature have defined as “literary anthropology”, or the interest of showing the experiences and psychological process of their characters (Levinson 128).

4. *The relative versus the absolute evil of Cain*

In Hellenistic literature, Cain's name is accompanied by adjectives alleging his treacherous condition. He is a "child of wrath" (*Life of Adam and Eve*), the murderer of a devout believer (*Hellenistic synagogue prayer*), who hates, chases, and mortally beats his brother by treason. The cruelty against his murder victim is shown to a greater extent in stories in which the murderer even denies Abel a proper burial. In the *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan*, Cain is explicitly named as the firstborn of Satan. In the *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*, all actions of Cain are influenced by the actions of Evil, and in texts like *Pseudo-Philo* or *Jubilees*, his Satanic affiliation transforms him into a monstrous figure. In apocryphal literature, as in the *Apocalypse of Elijah*, the mark of the first homicide is that which distinguishes Cain as the Antichrist.

The *Gospel of Matthew* is the first Christian writing that will associate a particular group, the Pharisees, with the figure of Cain. This affiliation (Mt 23: 29), linked to a Christological reading of Psalm 118: 22-23, is used by the narrator to defend God's repeated rejection of Israel's people (Mt 23: 29; Mt 23: 34-36; 1 Jn 3: 12; Jud 1: 11). In the writings of Ambrose of Milan (*De Cain et Abel*) we find all these references along with the allegorical exegetical methods of Philo of Alexandria¹³ and the first explicit identification of the Jews as a *cainite* nation. As a representation of evil, Jewish people must be separated from that which aspires to the holiness of Abel, the Christian nation¹⁴.

Following Ambrose, Augustine of Hippo, Eugipio, Maximino Arrian, and Isidore of Seville all insist on this association. Of these, Augustine is obviously the most influential. As well, inside the *Adversus iudaeos* tradition, Isidore of Seville's *De fide catholica* was the most important Christian anti-Jewish text in the first part of the Middle Ages¹⁵. In his exegesis, Isidore expresses an attitude of constant accusation towards the

¹³ See Najman.

¹⁴ Using the study schemes of the American anthropologist Clifford Geertz, Miriam Taylor argues for what she calls a "symbolic Judaism" which served to define and shape the identity of the young Church and to illustrate what would be allowed and what would not be allowed in it. This anti-Judaism, according to Taylor, would have been essential in the early centuries as a mechanism to strengthen and unite Christianity from within. As also stated by François Blanchetière, Judaism, despite its divisions, could exist without reference to Christianity, but Christianity could not do the same in relation to Jewish religion due to its need to reaffirm an identity (Blanchetière 204). Reading both allegorically and typologically, Cain, not Abraham, is modeled in Christianity as the first and final patriarch of the Jewish people.

¹⁵ *De fide catholica* is where Isidore's opinion about Jews and Judaism are discussed more extensively (Castro and Peña 15). The Jews, in their “sacrilegious non-belief” are men "wicked," "heartless," who "pretend not to understand" in their constant "perfidy" (Book I, chapters 1, 1-2; II, chap. 6, 1, II, chap. 22, 1-2.), described later as "pernicious" (Book I, chap. 4, 12); "infidels who refuse to believe that Christ is the Son of God or the prophets say lie (Book I, chapter 1, 8; Book II, chap. 2, 11), are" stubborn "and "decide" (Book I, chap. 5, 9-10), "unbelievers" and "malicious unbelief" (Book II, chap. 4, 1; 6, 1; 6, 4; 7, 1), are characterized by the "stubbornness of his lewd mind", being "blind" (Book I, chap. 8, 2-3, II, chap. 5. 4, 13, 1, 19, 2) and "proud" (Book II, chap. 8, 2). Two particular works of Isidore establish a direct association

Jews, giving lengthy testimony of their infidelity, portraying a Church redeemed by the blood they shed in the fratricide of Cain and in the Jewish deicide of Christ. These same anti-Jewish ideas that, promoted by the influential bishop of Seville, forced conversions and persecutions in Visigothic Spain can be found echoing in the 13th century writings of the ecclesiastical authors of the *mester de clerecía*, and even in part of the literature written, commissioned, or supervised by the wise king¹⁶.

As David Nirenberg remarks in his recent work, *Anti-Judaism: The Western Tradition*, since the 12th century, secular power in Europe has never quite escaped Cain's conjoined signification as both "founder of the earthly City" and "a figure of the Jews" (Nirenberg 134). The roots of one of the most persistent and explosive themes of Christian political theology, as Nirenberg's work points out, is related to a typological connection that is rarely missed by the main Christian commentaries of the first chapters of Genesis nor by the patristic polemic literature and the anti-Jewish medieval tradition¹⁷.

This typological connection is not missed but stressed by the main Christian sources of Alfonso's universal story: Isidore of Seville, Augustine of Hippo, Bede, Remigius and even Petrus Comestor. One may wonder why it is absent in Alfonso's universal history.

In some cases, many of these references are part of chapters used and quoted by the wise king in his narration. This is the case in the reference to Bede's work, the *Hexameron*, which is followed closely by Alfonso X in its description of the Garden of Eden. At the presentation of the two sons of Adam, the *General Estoria* intentionally misses the comment made by the English monk where the younger son is identified with the Christians and the older with the Jews¹⁸. We see a very similar situation in the allegorical comment of Remigius of Auxiere in which he identifies the wickedness of Cain with that of the Jews (Burton 69). Even Petrus Comestor does not forget to clarify that "allegorice in scelere Cain malitia Judaeorum designator" (chap. IV). Such

between the figure of Cain and the Jewish people: *Allegoriae quaedam Sacrae Scripturae* and *Quaestiones in Vetus Testamentum*. In both texts the allegorical reading predominates over the other two models of biblical analysis proposed by the theologian from Seville: the historical-literal and the moral.

¹⁶ During most of the reign of Alfonso X, the intellectual relationship with leading figures of the Spanish Jewish community was certainly important. The enormous interest of the king in the collaboration with scholars of Hispanic Judaism was very recurrent (Sainz de la Maza 212; Simon 89; Roman 177). However, the evaluation of the image of the Jew in Alfonsine works is very complex. The discordance between positive and negative images not only is divergent in different genres, but also is related to their chronology. The preponderance of negative stereotypes and obvious anti-Judaism exuded by works like the *Cantigas de Santa Maria* does not have any equivalent in earlier texts (Santa Maria 209; Márquez Villanueva 102 and 105); it reinforces the view of many experts who distinguish in the work of the Castilian king two very distinct stages: the first, a chronologically quite extensive one, that takes a kind of hospitable position; and the second, a brief final undoubtedly aggressive one (Márquez Villanueva, 109; St. Mary 209-212).

¹⁷ John Chrysostom in his *Discourses against Judaizing Christians* does not portray Cain a completely evil Cain, asserting: "Where is your brother Abel? When Cain said he did not know, God still did not desert him but he brought him, in spite of himself, to admit what he had done" (Homily I, VII) Regarding Augustine, Paula Frederickson has defended a more positive image of the Jews in his writings and also has re-read the relation established by the early Christian theologian between Cain and the Jews. See Frederickson.

¹⁸ "Erat prior populus Judaeorum possessio Dei, sicut ipse ad Mosen, Filius, inquit, meus primogenitus Israel (Exod. IV, 22), secundus est populus gentium, pro cuius maxime vita Dei Filius et nasci in carne et mori dignatus est. Fuit Abel pastor ovium, et Dominus ait: Ego sum pastor bonus (Joan. XI, 14)."

connections between Cain and the Jews are never mentioned in the *General Estoria* but instead are systematically avoided.

But avowing the typological connection between Cain and the Jewish people does not mean that the portrait of the first born of Adam needs to be a positive one. Such a decision would have been impossible and illogical from a Jewish perspective as much as from a Christian perspective.

Abel, according to the *General Estoria*, was always "omne derecho" (VII), kind and just; his brother Cain, by contrast, was "un muy mal omne", greedy and distrustful. Alfonso continues along with Josephus in citing the selfishness of the firstborn son of Adam as the reason for most of his actions. To illustrate this, the Castilian text is based on the division that Peter Comestor offers of the seven sins of Cain. The concise descriptions of these faults made by the French history are expanded upon and explained extensively in the Castilian narrative. Although Alfonso illustrates Cain's evil actions in a way that is inspired many times by apocryphal stories, as Comestor does, he stops on a clarification where no other *Biblia historiale* or Christian commentator had previously stopped. In Chapter V, when the stories about the birth of the first children of Adam and Eve are described, the narration resumes a close following of the biblical text, distancing itself once again from its French precedent. It decidedly states: "Onde dixo Eva luego quel vió, assí como cuenta el cuarto capítulo del Génesis: - Herede omne (e conviene a saber que por Dios). E nació a Adam e a Eva con Caín d'un parto...". The text of don Alfonso wants to make thoroughly clear that Cain, contrary to defenses from many of the mentioned traditions, is not the son of Satan, but the son of Adam and Eve. More importantly, he wants to remind the reader that Cain's birth occurs not only with the consent of God, but also due to His intervention. Cain's evil nature is not the work of Evil, nor are his actions. In that sense, the humanity of the firstborn of Adam is stated here in a much more forceful way than in any other Christian text, as the New Testament echoes by defending and consciously bypassing any indication of an evil inherent in his person. Cain is more than a man who is born with an evil nature; he is a man who moves progressively to a state of sin, committing completely reprehensible evil actions.

But the reading that the *General Estoria* presents of Cain goes even further. One interesting example is the portrait of his sister and wife, Calmana. Genesis 5:4 informs us that Adam was the father of many children. This statement supported the idea, which is later explained in the apocryphal tradition, that by necessity Cain's wife had to be one of his sisters since it is the only possibility within the logic of the text (*Jubiles* 4, 1; *Testament of Abraham* 3, 5; *Genesis Rabbah* 22.2 and 7; PRE 21 and Yed 62a). Comestor's description follows these traditions¹⁹ just as many different copies of the *Vita* or Jacobo de Voragine do. But Alfonso's telling would add again something completely new by substituting the brevity of these stories for a narrative full of curiosity and imagination. This recreation of biblical episodes is a perfect example of what we earlier defined as "literary anthropology". In the particular case of the delimitation of the character of Calmana, the Castilian text proposes an almost proto-psychological sketch, speculating on how the "perfect companion" of the fratricide would be defined. Calmana has the potential to become such not only from the fact of being united to Cain in marriage, but because she is his sister and, above all, his twin sister. No other apocryphal

¹⁹ "Et anno creationis vitae Adam decimo quinto natus est ei Cain, et soror ejus Chalmana [...] Post alios quindecim annos natus est ei Abel, et soror ejus Delbora" (XXV, col. 1076C).

text or exegetical commentary on Genesis expressed before an interest in a character as marginal as the twin sister and wife of Cain. The murderer of Abel and his sister and wife are camouflaged with mimetic personalities through a story that develops in parallel. The story of Cain and his wife Calmana not only enters into uncharted territory by the apocryphal literature and Jewish and Christian exegesis, but also insists upon the humanity of Adam's firstborn, despite their evil acts.

Daniel Maoz and other specialists in rabbinical literature have noticed, how in Aggadic Midrash the reader is required many times to suspend rational consideration of certain episodes in the Scriptures. In other cases the reader is left to determine by itself the moral evaluation of the actions of even the most controversial protagonists of the Bible (Maoz 34, 107). There are two examples in midrashic literature where the consideration of the reader in condemning the character of Cain is suspended. The first one is in Genesis Rabbah 22, where a paradoxical and almost comic circumstance is portrayed: Adam realizes that if he had followed the example of his son Cain in his repentance -instead of blaming Eve for his mistake- he could have been granted God's forgiveness²⁰. The second and more extensive example is found in a considerably later text, the *Midrash Tanhuma Hanidpas* where, as Joel Duman has demonstrated, there is a more empathetic approach to Cain than in previous midrashic portrayals (Duman 18, 27).

I believe that the first chapters of the Castilian universal history respond to an exercise of "applied exegesis" that wishes to respond to issues contemporaneous to its writing. The most important one for an hypothetical Jewish author or authors working in the court of a Christian king of the 13th century could have been to respond to a question that rabbinic literature did not have the chance to solve: the Christian association in typological exegesis between the Jews and the figure of Cain and, therefore, the accusation of deicide of the Jewish people.

In its accounts of the beginning of humanity, the *General Estoria* selects legends found in both Christian and rabbinic sources, and eliminates extreme aspects in the character of Cain such as his satanic origin or even his evil nature. The Castilian narration scrupulously deletes any anti-Jewish readings of the Scriptures by which the firstborn of Adam and his lineage would be identified with the Jewish people. In the first chapters, the narrator almost completely avoids allegorical and typological exegesis in the literal reading of those passages, which is consistent with the distancing of the narrator from the text and the resulting lack of necessity of first person comments. The defense of a "relativity of things" with the onset of a non-dualistic Creation will certainly help the author to build a logic upon which even a character viewed as dualistically as Cain will be able to recover much of the relativity and even the elusive treatment he was given in the Hebrew Bible. But probably the gentlest gesture and the farthest the narrator would be able to go, would be to offer an alternative that also echoes another midrashic tradition mentioned in this paper: the one telling of the seeds given by God to Adam and Eve. This same compassionate God will wait unsuccessfully for the return and repentance of a loved son:

²⁰ "When Cain went abroad, after killing Abel, he met his father Adam, who expressed his surprise at Cain's life being spared. The son explained that he owed his life to the act of repentance, and to his pleading that his sin was greater than he could bear. Adam thus received a hint of his error in not having fallen back upon repentance instead of putting the blame on Eve." *Gen. Rabba* 22.

Aun sobre esto por guardar Dios a Caím de muerte esperandol que por ventura verníe por luenga vida a repentirse de tan grand mal como fizierae avrié él por y razón de averle merced e perdonarle...

5. Conclusions

After a comparative analysis of the first chapters of Genesis presented by the *General Estoria*, Manuel Alvar's defense of the non-ecclesiastic status of the Castilian universal history seems certainly reinforced. Reviewing the particular way the primordial episodes of the Bible are presented in the *General Estoria*, and the subtle way that the Castilian text follows and differs from the influential *Bible Historiale* by Petrus Comestor and its main Christian sources, I have intended to unveil an scenario of references, techniques, narrative methods, and exegetical conclusions that certainly do not follow the patterns of the Christian literature outside of the Peninsula. Francisco Márquez Villanueva was able to point to a similar scenario in many other examples of the intellectual work of the learned King (Márquez Villanueva 127). These first chapters show an evidently great knowledge of the Latin and ecclesiastical traditions but they still have a great deal of independence from it.

As Inés Fernández Ordóñez has pointed out, the fact that the *General Estoria* has not been exhaustively studied yet leaves open multiple possibilities of analysis and conclusions (Fernández-Ordóñez 9)²¹. Following the thesis of Diego Catalán and Francisco Rico, different studies have defended a strong connection between the historiographic work of the Castilian king and the Latin ecclesiastical tradition (see Martin 1995; Fraker; Fernández Ordóñez 1992; Saquero Suárez-Somonte; Salvo García). While I find convincing some of these studies that support a strong influence of the ecclesiastical tradition in some chapters or specific elements of the *General Estoria* or the ideological connections between this work and other historiographical works of don Alfonso²², I believe the same logic cannot be extended to many other sections of the work.

A comparative analysis of these first chapters of Genesis takes me closer to what Salvador Sánchez-Prieto has argued, in the sense that the universal history of don Alfonso cannot be analyzed with the same method used to study the national history written by the Castilian king (Sánchez-Prieto 2009, 85). It also supports Sánchez-Prieto and Américo Castro assertion that many of the chapters of this universal history demonstrate a clear lack of supervision by the Christian monarch (Sánchez-Prieto XLs).

Throughout the comparative analysis between the *General Estoria* and its precedent, the *Historia Scholastica*, we were able to appreciate important differences between the Castilian universal history and its most evident precursor. The main one is that, even though Petrus Comestor does not rely on allegorical and typological exegesis

²¹ “En lo que a la *General estoria* se refiere, ha faltado (y sigue faltando) la pesquisa minuciosa de todas las fuentes empleadas, muchas de las cuales permanecen aún sin identificar, y la especificación de los pasajes en que se aprovechó cada una. Tampoco sabemos con detalle cómo se produjo su acoplamiento en una estructura común. Igualmente, y puesto que el taller historiográfico alfonsí trabajó en equipos, es necesario averiguar qué puntos constituyen fronteras estructurales, es decir, dónde tuvo lugar el ensamblaje de distintas secciones elaboradas por equipos diversos.” (Note 27, 9)

²² González-Casanovas analysis of the prologues of both the *General estoria* and the *Estoria de España* (González-Casanovas 90) seems to be very convincing.

in his work as much as other medieval biblical commentaries, sermons, or preaching handbooks, or even other European biblical paraphrases, he needed to deviate from literal exegesis in all those moments where agreement with dogma required it²³.

Certainly Christianity in the Middle Ages combined different forms of interpretation of the Scriptures, adding literal exegesis to allegorical and typological. But as Julio Treballe argues, biblical interpretation was always regulated and limited by the *sensus fidei* and by the dogma. This is the reason that a literal interpretation of the Scriptures, as evident in Petrus Comestor's *Historia Scholastica*, must incorporate allegorical and typological approaches in those chapters where dogma and faith have to be reinforced or are almost entirely absent, such as in the first two chapters of Genesis or in his reading of the biblical character of Cain.

To Manuel Alvar's conviction of the non-clerical status of the *General Estoria*, and his intuition about a possible participation or protagonism of Jewish scholars in its production²⁴ we should add, it seems, its heterodox deviation.

I began the present article quoting the legend of the curse of Alfonso X, developed contemporaneously to the confrontation between the wise king and his rebellious son, Don Sancho (See Funes 1993; Pedrosa; González-Jiménez)²⁵ The sin that most of the propaganda *sanchista* attributed to Alfonso X was a classic sin of *hybris*²⁶. It responded to "palabras de gran soberbia" that showed a lack of respect to his mortality and submission to the divine commands, a common origin of curses of the classical tradition. The learned king was accused of blasphemy for saying that had he been the creator of the universe he would have done a much better job. The curse of Alfonso seems to originate in an episode that, despite being widely known, the specialists understood as having no documentary evidence (Funes 1993, 54). There is the possibility that this legend resulted from a close reading of the first chapters of the *General Estoria*. If this is the case my defense of the heterodoxy of the retelling of these chapters of Genesis would not be the first one.

²³ "Probably by Comestor's successor to the chair at Notre Dame, Peter of Poitiers, who certainly devised the *Compendium Historiae in Genealogia Christi*, an abridgement of the *Histories* to show graphically the descent of Christ from Adam" (Morey 71).

²⁴ Different scholars have stressed the evident relation between the *General estoria* and other previous Medieval *romanceamientos bíblicos* from Hebrew in Castille such as the Codex Escorial I.I.6. Manuel Alvar in his essay affirms: "Por otra parte, Alfonso el Sabio traduce la *Vulgata*, pero poseemos también la impresión del *Génesis* según el manuscrito escurialense I-j-3, que es 'la mejor muestra de castellano bíblico, con influencias hebraicas, que nos ofrecen los viejos manuscritos de El Escorial' y esto puede ser motivo de reflexiones para otro lugar" (Alvar 27). Other studies have found possible that translations from Hebrew such as these influential codexes could have been produced by the *scriptorium alfonsí*: "Entre los que se han planteado la cuestión hay tres posturas principales: a) son versiones compuestas en el *scriptorium alfonsí*, b) son *romanceamientos* que sirvieron como fuente en la composición de las partes bíblicas de la *General estoria*, c) son traducciones independientes a las producciones alfonsíes, realizadas con anterioridad y sin una relación directa con las mismas (Enrique-Arias 73).

²⁵ In Castilian historiography, this curse is explicitly referred in writing, for the first time, in the *Crónica General de Espanha* of 1344 –Castilian version of count Barcelos' *Crónica Geral*- and later, in the late 14th Century, in a brief chronicle written in Silos. (Funes 1993, 79; Funes 1994, 80-82; González Jiménez 464; Pedrosa 167).

²⁶ In don Juan Manuel's *El Libro de las armas* the curse is linked to the one the wise king set upon his son Sancho (Funes 1994, 83).

Works Cited

- Alvar, Manuel. "Didactismo e integración en la *General Estoria* (Estudio del Génesis)." Fernando Carmona Fernández and Francisco Flores Arroyuelo eds. *La lengua y la literatura en tiempos de Alfonso X*. Murcia: Universidad de Murcia, 1985. 25-78.
- Ballesteros Beretta, Antonio. *Alfonso X el Sabio*. Barcelona: El Albir, 1984.
- Berlin, Adele and Marc Zvi Brettler, eds. *The Jewish Study Bible*. Oxford University Press: New York, 1999.
- Blanchetière, Francois. *Studies in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity*. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Bohigas, P. "La Visión de Alfonso X y las Profecías de Merlín". *Revista de Filología Española* 25(1941): 383-398.
- Boyarin, Daniel. *Intertextuality and the Reading of Midrash*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1990.
- . *Border Lines. The Partition of Judeo-Christianity*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pensilvania Press, 2004.
- Burton, Edwards van. *Remigii Autissiodorensis Expositio super Genesim*. Turnhout: Brepols, 1999.
- Castro Caridad, Eva and Peña Fernández, Francisco. *Isidoro de Sevilla. Sobre la fe católica contra los judíos*. Sevilla: Universidad de Sevilla, 2012.
- Catalán, Diego. "Don Juan Manuel ante el modelo alfonsí: El testimonio de la *Crónica abreviada*." Ian Macpherson ed. *Juan Manuel Studies*. London: Thames, 1977. 17-51.
- Caspi, Mishael. *Jewish culture and the Hispanic world: essays in memory of Joseph H. Silverman*. Samuel G. Armistead and Mishael M. Caspi eds. Newark, DE: Juan de la Cuesta, c2006.
- Chazan, Bert. *Medieval Stereotypes and Modern Antisemitism*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.
- Charlesworth, James H., ed. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. New York: Doubleday, 1983-85. Volumes I and II.
- Cortezón, Daniel. *Crónica del rey don Pedro*. Murcia: Universidad de Murcia, 1998.
- Chrysostom, Saint John. Paul W. Harkins trans. *Discourses against Judaizing Christians*. Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1979.
- Daly, Saralyn R. "Peter Comestor: Master of Histories." *Speculum* 32.1 (1957): 62-73.
- Duman, Joel. "The Treatment of the Cain and Abel Story in Midrash Tanhuma." *Moed* 17 (2007): 1-28.
- Duna, Meter N. "The Structures of Didacticism: Private Myths and Public Fictions." Ian Macpherson ed. *Juan Manuel Studies*. London: Thames, 1977.
- Enrique-Arias, Andrés. "La traducción del código Escorial I.I.6 en el contexto de los romanceamientos bíblicos medievales." *La Biblia Escorial I.I.6. Transcripción y estudios*. Logroño: Centro Internacional de Investigación de la Lengua Española (Cilengua), 2010. 67-86.
- Fernández Ordoñez, Inés. *Las "Estorias" de Alfonso el Sabio*. Madrid: Ediciones Istmo, 1992.
- . "El taller historiográfico alfonsí. La *Estoria de España* y la *General estoria* en el marco de las obras promovidas por Alfonso el Sabio". J. Montoya y A. Rodríguez

- coords. *El Scriptorium alfonsí: de los Libros de Astrología a las "Cantigas de Santa María"*. Madrid: Fundación Universidad Complutense, 1999. 105-126.
- . "La historiografía alfonsí y post-alfonsí en sus textos –Nuevo panorama–". *Cahiers de Linguistique Hispanique Médiévale* 18-19 (1993-94): 101-132.
- . "Ordinatio y Compilatio en la prosa de Alfonso X el Sabio". Mónica Castillo Lluch y Marta López Izquierdo eds. *Modelos latinos en la Castilla medieval*. Madrid: Iberoamericana, 2010. 239-270.
- Fraker, Charles F. *The Scope of History: Studies in the Historiography of Alfonso el Sabio*. Ann Arbor MI: University of Michigan, 1996.
- Frederickson, Paula. *Augustine and the Jews: A Christian Defense of Jews and Judaism*. New York: Doubleday, 2008.
- Funes, Leonardo. "La blasfemia del rey sabio: Itinerario narrativo de una leyenda". *Incipit* 13 (1993): 51-70
- . "La blasfemia del rey sabio: Itinerario narrativo de una leyenda (segunda parte)". *Incipit* 14 (1994): 69-101.
- González-Casanovas, Roberto J. "The Bible as Authority in Alfonso X's *General Estoria*: A Historicist reading of the Prologue". *Democracy, Culture and Values*. Washington D.C: The Council for Research in Values and Philosophy, 2004. II: 113-130.
- González Jiménez, Manuel. "Unos Anales del reinado de Alfonso X". *Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia*. 192.3 (1995): 461-492.
- Gormly, Sister Francis. *The Use of the Bible in Representative Works of Medieval Spanish Literature, 1250-1300*. Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America. Studies in Romance Languages and Literature, XLVI. Microfilm Series, I, 1962.
- Hamilton, Victor P. *The Book of Genesis. Chapters 1-17*. Gran Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1990.
- Hindman, Sandra. "Fifteenth-Century Ducth Bible Illustration and the *Historia Scholastica*" *Journal of the Warburg Courtauld Institutes* 37 (1974): 131-144.
- Lachs, Samuel Tobias "The Source of Hebrew Traditions in the *Historia Scholastica*." *The Harvard Theological Review* 66.3 (1973): 385-386.
- Lida De Malkiel, María Rosa. "Tres notas sobre don Juan Manuel." *Romance Philology* 4 (1950-51): 155-194.
- Jacobs, Irving. *The Midrashic Process*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Kugel, James. *Traditions of the Bible: A Guide to the Bible As It Was at the Start of the Common Era*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1998.
- Kugel, James ed. *Studies in Ancient Midrash*. Cambridge MA: Harvard Centre or Jewish Studies, 2001.
- Lachs, Samuel Tobias. "The Source of Hebrew Traditions in the *Historia Scholastica*" *The Harvard Theological Review* 66, no. 3 (Jul. 1973): 385-386.
- Levenson, Jon D. *Creation and the Persistence of Evil. The Jewish Drama of Divine Omnipotence*. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1988.
- ...- "Genesis". *The Jewish Study Bible*. Oxford University Press: New York, 1999. 8-100.

- Levinson, Joshua. *Ha-Sipur she-lo' supar: Omanut ha-sipur ha-mikra'i ha-murhav be-midrash hazal* [The Twice-told Tale: A poetics of the Exegetical Narrative in Rabbinic Midrash] Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 2005.
- Maoz, Daniel. *Aggadic Midrash I*. Queenston (Ontario): The Edwin Meller Press, 2012.
- Márquez-Villanueva, Francisco and Carlos Alberto Vega, eds. *Alfonso X of Castile, the Learned King (1221-1284)*. Harvard: Department of Romance Languages and Literatures of Harvard University, 1990.
- Márquez-Villanueva, Francisco. *El concepto cultural alfonsí*. Madrid: Ediciones Bellatierra, 2004.
- Martin, Georges (ed.). *Historia Alfonsí. El modelo y sus destinos [siglos XIII-XV]*. Madrid: Casa de Velazquez, 2000.
- . "Los intelectuales y la Corona: la obra histórica y literaria." Manuel Rodríguez Llopis dir. *Alfonso X y su época*. Murcia: Carroggio, 2002. 259-285.
- . "Alphonse X ou la science politique. Septénaire, 1-11 (suite)." *Cahiers de linguistique hispanique médiévale* 20 (1995): 5-34.
- Migne, Jacques-Paul. *Patrologia cursus completes: Series Graeca and Latina*. Boston: G. K. Hall, 1883.
- Morreale, Margarita. "La *General Estoria* de Alfonso X como Biblia". *Actas del séptimo congreso de la Asociación Internacional de Hispanistas*. Roma, 1982. 767-773.
- Morey, James H. "Peter Comestor, Biblical Paraphrase, and the Medieval Popular Bible" *Speculum* 68.1 (1993): 6-35.
- Murdoch, Brian. *The apocryphal Adam and Eve in medieval Europe: vernacular translations and adaptations of the Vita Adae et Evae*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Najman, Hindy. "Cain and Able as Character Traits: A Study in the Allegorical Typology of Philo of Alexandria". *Eve's Children. The Biblical Stories Retold and Interpreted in Jewish and Christian Traditions*. Gerard Luttikhuisen ed. Leiden: Brill, 2003. 107-118.
- Neusner, Jacob. *A Theological Commentary to the Midrash. Genesis Rabbah*. Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, 2001.
- . *Judaism in the Beginning of Christianity*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.
- . *Judaism in the Matrix of Christianity*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.
- Niremberg, David. *Anti-Judaism: the Western Tradition*. New York: W.W. Norton, 2013.
- Del Olmo Lete, Gregorio. *La Biblia en la Literatura Española. I Edad Media. I/1. El imaginario y sus géneros*. Madrid: Editorial Trotta y Fundación San Millán de la Cogolla, 2008.
- Pedrosa, José Manuel. "Los padres maldicientes: Del Génesis, La Odisea y el Kalevala a la leyenda de Alfonso X, el Romancero y la Tradición oral moderna." Pedro M. Piñero Ramírez ed. *La Eterna Agonía del Romancero. Homenaje a Paul Bénichou*. Sevilla: Fundación Machado, 2001. 139-177.
- Rad, Gerhard von. *Genesis. A Commentary*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1973.
- Rico, Francisco. *Alfonso el Sabio y la "General estoria": tres lecciones*. Barcelona: Ariel, 1984.
- Roberts, Alexander and W. Rambaut, eds. *Ante-Nicene Fathers*. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1885. Vol. 1.

- Salvo García, Irene. "Los Mitos de la Creación de la *Metamorfosis* de Ovidio (Met, I, v. 5-162) en la *General Estoria* de Alfonso X". Mónica Castillo Lluch y Marta López Izquierdo eds. *Modelos latinos en la Castilla medieval*. Madrid: Iberoamericana, 2010. 201-222.
- Sánchez-Prieto Borja, Pedro. "Introducción. Alfonso X, el rey y el sabio". Alfonso X el Sabio. *General Estoria. Primera Parte. Génesis*. Madrid: Biblioteca Castro, 2009.
- . "Biblia e Historiografía en los códices medievales." Pedro M. Cátedra dir. Eva Belén Carro Carbajal y Javier Durán Barceló eds. *Los códices literarios de la Edad Media. Interpretación, historia, técnicas y catalogación*. Logroño: Cilengua, 2009. 71-90.
- . "La Biblia en la historiografía medieval." G. del Olmo Lete ed. *La Biblia en la Literatura española, I La Biblia en la literatura medieval*. Logroño: Cilengua, 2008. 77-194.
- . "La *General estoria* como obra de traducción (a propósito de GE3 Sab.)." *Actas del III Congreso de la Asociación Hispánica de Literatura Medieval (Salamanca, 3 al 6 de octubre de 1989)*. Salamanca: Biblioteca Española del Siglo XV (Departamento de Literatura Española e Hispanoamericana), 1994. II: 923-931.
- . "Sobre el concepto de original (el caso de la *General estoria* de Alfonso el Sabio)." Leonardo Funes y José Luis Moure eds. *Studia in honorem Germán Orduna*, Alcalá de Henares, 2001. 571-582.
- Saquero Suárez-Somonte, Pilar. "Alfonso X el Sabio y la tradición cultural occidental." Mónica Castillo Lluch y Marta López Izquierdo eds. *Modelos latinos en la Castilla medieval*. Madrid: Iberoamericana, 2010. 201-222.
- Schwartz, Daniel R. *Studies in Jewish Backgrounds of Christianity*. Tübingen: Mohr Sieberg, 1992.
- Seidl, Horst. "Is Aristotle's Cosmology and Metaphysics Compatible with the Christian Concept of Creation?" M. Treschow, W. Otten, and W. Hannam eds. *Divine Creation in Ancient, Medieval, and Early Modern Thought*. Leiden: Brill, 2007. 85-100.
- Seybolt, Robert Francis. "The Legenda Aurea, Bible, and Historia Scholastica." *Speculum* 21.3 (1946): 339-342.
- Simon, M. *Verus Israel. Étude sur les relations entre chrétiens et juifs dans l'empire Romain (135-435)*. Paris: s.i., 1948.
- Stone, Michael E. *Jewish Writings of the Second Period. Apocrypha, Pseudoepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian, Writings, Philo, Josephus*. Assen, Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.
- Teicher, J. L. "The Latin-Hebrew School of Translators in Spain in the Twelfth Century." *Homenaje a Millás Vallicrosa*. Barcelona: CSIC, 1956. II: 403-444.
- Trebolle, Julio. *La Biblia Judía y la Biblia Cristiana. Introducción a la Historia de la Biblia*. Madrid: Trotta, 1998.
- Treschow, Michael, W. Otten, and W. Hannam. *Divine Creation in Ancient, Medieval, and Early Modern Thought*. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Valdeón Baroque, Julio. "Las tensiones sociales en Castilla en tiempos de don Juan Manuel". Ian Macpherson ed. *Juan Manuel Studies*, London: Thames, 1977. 181-192.

- Vegas Montaner, “El primer relato de la creación en la tradición rabínica.” Luis-Fernando Girón Blanch coord. *Narraciones bíblicas de la Creación. Edición y Estudio comparativo. Ilu. Revista española de Ciencias de las Religiones. Anejo VII*, Madrid: Universidad Complutense de Madrid, 2002.
- Visotzky, Burton L. “Midrash, Christian Exegesis and Hellenistic Hermeneutic”. Carol Bakhos ed. *Current Trends in the study of Midrash*. Leiden: Brill, 2006. 111-132.
- Waugh, Scott L. and Peter D. Diehl, ed. *Christendom and its discontents. Exclusion, persecution, and rebellion, 1000-1500*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.