

Corrections, Suppressions, and Changes in Montalvo's *Amadís*, Book I*

Jules Piccus, University of Massachusetts Amherst

INTRODUCTION

This article anticipates some of the significant data and conclusions from the book I am currently writing on *Amadís de Gaula*, in which I demonstrate that the Hebrew *Amadís*, Book I, published c. 1540¹ is the translation of a lost *Amadís* probably used by Montalvo for his *edito princeps* refundition in 1508² and is *not*, as has been generally assumed³, merely one more among the many versions, adaptations or translations^{3bis} of Montalvo's refabricated *Amadís*. Whereas my book goes into detail in order to demonstrate and illustrate this claim, and reconstructs the pre-Montalvo Spanish text of Book I in its entirety, this article will be limited to showing that on the basis of the Hebrew translation of the pre-Montalvo Spanish text *six specific errors introduced in to the Montalvo refundition may be corrected* (see below, Paragraph I, a-c); that *three probable errors introduced into the Montalvo refundition may be corrected* (see below, Paragraph II, a-c); that *thirteen passages in the Montalvo refundition that have either been changed, suppressed, explained away, or purposely muddled there, due to feelings of propriety, may be clarified and restored* (see below, Paragraph III, a-m); and, finally that an apparent error in the Hebrew text turns out, after analysis, to conform completely to the spirit of the original text (see below, Paragraph IV).

* * *

Paragraph I. Six specific errors in Montalvo's *Amadís* corrected on the basis of Algaba's Hebrew *Amadís*.

Error 1 (paragraph Ia)

In this first example *Amadís* finds both his squire, Gandalin, and his dwarf, Ardián, in precarious situations due to the machinations of Arcaláus, the enchanter. In order to demonstrate the misreading in the Spanish text (the sequence of the five underlined words, below on the left) I will place, side by side⁴, the Montalvo version, the Hebrew version of Algaba, and my retranslation of Algaba's text [italics mine]:

* Reproduced from De Sepharad XLIV (1984), pp 33-74.

(<i>Montalvo-Place</i> , pp. 168-169, lines 550-560)	(<i>Algaba</i> , Z. M., p.116, lines 23-27)	<i>Translation</i>
<p>Estando assí oyó [Amadís] dar vnas bozes, y yendo allá halló al enano [Ardián] que dél se partiera [se había partido], colgado por la pierna de vna viga, y de yuso dél vn fuego con cosas de malos olores, y vio a otra parte a Gandalín [su escudero] <i>que ahún éste atándolo estauan</i>⁵, y queriéndolo desatar [Amadís] dixo[Gandalín]: - Señor, accored ante el enano. que muy cuytado es. Amadís así lo hizo;</p>	<p>הוא יושב שם שמע קולות גדולות והלך נגד הקולות ומצא הננס⁶ שהביאו שם תלוי מרגלו בקורה אחת ותחתיו אש בוער ובאש דברים באושים עד מאוד נשרפים וראה במקום אחר לגנדאלין שהיה אסור לעץ אחד והלך להתירו ואמר גאנדאלין: - לך קודם לננס שהוא בצער גדול. ויעש כן אמאדיש;</p>	<p>Estando allí oyó dar vnas grandes bozes, y yendo contra las bozes halló al enano que traxeran allí, colgado por vna pierna de vna viga, y de yuso dél vn fuego con cosas de malos olores que ardían, y vio a otra parte a Gandalín <i>que a hun árbol atado estaua</i>, queriéndolo desatar [Amadís] dixo Gandalín: - Accored ante el enano, que muy cuytado es. Amadís así lo hizo;</p>

There is obviously something radically wrong with the sequence in Montalvo's text «vio a otra parte a Gandalín [su escudero] *que ahún éste atándolo estauan*, y queriéndolo desatar [Amadís] dixo [Gandalín]...» If we divide this sequence into three parts, then the first part, «vio a otra parte a Gandalín» implies that Amadís is at this point at some distance from his squire Gandalín. The second part, «*que ahún éste atándolo estauan*» states that a number of people were in the act of tying up his squire while he was looking on, and the third part «y queriéndolo desatar [Amadís] dixo [Gandalín]...» places Amadís immediately near Gandalín, ready to untie him and in conversation with him.

Amadís would surely have attacked anyone or any group of people who were in the act of tying up his squire Gandalín, especially if the villain or villains were anywhere within reach. Why was there no battle between Amadís and the villains? What happened to the villains? How did they escape? The answer to these questions becomes abundantly clear when we read the Hebrew text. The Spanish text is mistaken. There are no villains still around tying Gandalín up. The Spanish source text has been misread either by Montalvo or by his editors. The translator into Hebrew, Algaba, has rendered the source text faithfully and correctly. Amadís sees Gandalín אסור לעץ אחד, which must have translated the Spanish expression of the source text «que a hun árbol atado estaua» or an expression very similar to it.

Error 2 (Paragraph Ib)

Darasión, a knight who does not like what Agrajes says to him boasts to the latter (*Montalvo-Place*, p. 338, lines 627-630, [italics mine]): «-Di lo *que* quisierdes –dixo Darsión-, que poco tardará en que *essa tu lengua sin el cuero* sea enbiada a casa del rey Lisuarte...» It is, of course, possible to interpret the underlined phrase *essa tu lengua sin el cuero* to mean «your tongue

without its skin will be sent to King Lisuarte», but in the *Amadís* tongues of enemies, no matter how many insults they may declaim, are not cut out. Heads of enemies are regularly cut off, the prime example being the head of Galpano, the Knight-Rapist (*Montalvo-Place*, pp. 60-61, lines 265-268). The equivalent phrase in the Hebrew *Amadís* (*Algaba, Z. M.*, p.225, line 32) לשונך בלתי הגוף attests to the error in Montalvo's text, which should therefore read «tu lengua sin el cuerpo».

Errors 3 and 4 (Paragraph 1c)

On two occasions in the Montalvo text the negative *no* has, for some unknown reason, been left out of the context, thus rendering the passages inexplicable, or at best equivocal. In the first of these two examples Amadís asks four peons why they have conducted a *donzella* to their *señor*, Galpano, to be raped by him. Their answer does not satisfy Amadís- it rather compels him to attack them. The answer given by the peons makes little sense in the Montalvo Spanish version, but in Algaba's Hebrew version one can readily see why Amadís's attack was provoked. As I have done previously, I will place side by side the passage from Montalvo, the passage from Algaba and my translation of the Hebrew passage. in order to illustrate the correction to be made in the Montalvo text [*italics mine*]:

(*Montalvo-Place*, p. 58, lines 48-55)

-Malos traydores, ¿por qué fezistes mal a esta donzella?
-Por quanto ouimos miedo – dixeron ellos- de vos dar derecho.
-Agora lo veréys- dixo él y metió mano a la espada y dexóse yr a ellos...

(*Algaba, Z. M.*, p.38, lines 18-20)

רשעים, למה הרעותם לאשה הזאת?
ויענו לו:
-מפני שלא פחדנו ממך.
ויאמר להם:
-עתה תראו אם תפחדו ממני או לא! וישלוף חרבנו וילך לקראתם...

Translation

-Malos traydores, ¿por qué fezistes mal a esta donzella? Y contestáronle:
-Por quanto *no* ouimos miedo de uos.
Y dixo él:
-Agora lo veréys si me hubiéredes miedo o no, y metió mano a la espada y dexóse yr a ellos...

Algaba's Hebrew version clearly calls for the insertion of the word *no* between the words *quanto* and *ouimos* in the Spanish text answer to Amadís's question.

The second of these two passages in which the word *no* has been left out of the Montalvo text occurs when King Lisuarte remarks upon the exploits of a *nonel cattallero* [Amadís] who has killed this same Galpano, the knight with a reputation for bravery and cruelty. The lack of the word *no* before the word *son* at the end of the passage renders the passage confusing. Furthermore, the word *otras* (feminine) is an additional mistake. The end of the passage should read «*extrañas no son de otros*». In the equivalent passage in Algaba, no such confusion exists. I again place the passages side by side in order to illustrate the corrections to be made here [*italics mine*]:

<i>(Montalvo-Place, p. 65, lines 124-127)</i>	<i>(Algaba, Z. M., p.43, line 30)</i>	<i>Translation</i>
-Cierito- dixo el rey-, aquél es el cauallero nouell que por aquí passó, que por cierto sus cauallerías extrañas son de <i>otras</i>	ויען המלך ויאמר : - בלי ספק שמעשי הגבור הם אלו המעשים	Y dixo [el rey]: -Sin dubda estas cauallerías son cauallerías del nouell cauallero

Error 5 (Paragraph Id)

An obvious error in Montalvo's Spanish text is correctly represented in Algaba's Hebrew text. An unknown knight, [he later identifies himself as King Perión] who has just terminated a battle against two *caualleros*, is about to embrace King Garínter. In order to illustrate the error in the Spanish text I will cite this short passage in *both* Montalvo's Spanish text and in Algaba's Hebrew text, together with a translation of Algaba's text [italics mine]:

<i>(Montalvo-Place, p. 12, lines 99-101)</i>	<i>(Algaba, Z. M., p.4, lines 13-15)</i>	<i>Translation</i>
El cauallero, <i>quintando el escudo y el yelmo, y dándolo</i> a su escudero le [al rey] fue a abraçar...	הגבור הסיב המגן מעליו והכובע של ברזל ¹ שבראשו ונתן אותם לעבדו ורץ וחבק את המלך...	El cauallero, <i>quitó el escudo y el yelmo, y diólos</i> a su escudero y fuesse a abraçar al rey...

It is clear that if the cauallero (King Perión) is going to embrace King Garínter he would necessarily have to rid himself of *both* his shield and his helmet, in which case the grammatical object would more correctly be rendered as *los* rather than *lo*. In Algaba's Hebrew version the grammatical object is correctly a plural, not a singular, as it is in Montalvo's Spanish version.

Error 6 (Paragraph Ie)

In a complicated series of events a *donzella* is bearing a message to Agrajes from Olinda, his beloved. The *donzella*, on her way, is raped by Galpano the knight, who obliges her to swear that she will have no other *amigo* while he[Galpano] is alive (*Montalvo-Place, p. 57, lines 27-30*). Amadís, of course, avenges her dishonor by battling with Galpano, defeating him and cutting off his head (*Montalvo-Place, p. 60, lines 250-252*). She wishes to take Galpano's head with her as testimony of his death, but Amadís convinces her to take Galpano's battered helmet instead (*Montalvo-Place, p. 61, lines 269-271*).

Later, when the *donzella* encounters Agrajes she gives him the battered helmet, explaining the gift to him. Since this explanation on the part of the *donzella* to Agrajes is very important for our purposes, we will place, side by side, Montalvo's Spanish version and Algaba's Hebrew version, together with a translation of Algaba's Hebrew [italics mine]:

(*Montalvo-Place*, p. 64, lines 105-113)

-Señor, tomad este yelmo en lugar de la cabecça de Galpano, y dovoslo de parte de vn cauallero nouel, aquel a quien más conuiene traer armas que a otro cauallero que en el mundo sea, y este yelmo vos embiá él porque deshonoró [Galpano] *vna donzella* que yua en vuestro mandado.

(*Algaba*, Z. M., p.43, lines 22-26)

-תקח⁸ הכובע הזה במקום ראש גלפאנו, ואני נותנה⁹ אותו בשם גבור אחד חדש והוא ראוי לגדולה וכבוד מכל הגבורים שבעולם. וזה הכובע הוא שולח לך מפני שבעל הכובע שכב את האשה ההלכה¹⁰ בשליחותך. ולא גלתה¹¹ לו שהיא בעצמה היתה כי נתבששה.

Translation

-Tomad este yelmo en lugar de la cabecça de Galpano, y dóvoslo de parte de vn cauallero nouel, aquel a quien más conuienen cauallerías y honor que a otro cauallero que en el mundo [sea], y este yelmo vos embiá él porque el dueño de este yelmo forzó a *la donzella* que yua con nuevas para vos. Y no le reveló que era [la forçada] ella misma, porque estaua auergonzada.

A comparison between Montalvo's text and Algaba's text here clearly demonstrates that they were both following the same source text or extremely similar source texts. Algaba's version definitely indicates that the *donzella* did *not* wish to reveal to Agrajes that she herself had been raped by Galpano, because she was ashamed. Thus, the implication in the Hebrew version, on the part of the *donzella*, is that the young woman carrying the message –the one raped by Galpano- is not she herself, but someone else, conveyed to Agrajes when the *donzella* relates to him that Galpano « deshonoró *vna donzella* [not further identified] que yua en vuestro [of Agrajes] mandado». It is thus evident to the reader of either text (Hebrew or Spanish) that although Agrajes knows that a *donzella* who was carrying a message for him was raped by Galpano, he can nevertheless in no way identify the raped *donzella* as the one who brought him the battered helmet of Galpano as a gift from Amadís.

Later on in the narrative (*Montalvo-Place*, p.86, lines 216-221) Agrajes meets up with Amadís and upon taking leave of Amadís tells him that he has received word from Olinda, his beloved, by means of the *donzella* to whom Amadís gave the battered helmet. At this point Montalvo, apparently forgetting that Agrajes does not know that the messenger from Amadís is the same person as the raped *donzella*, has Agrajes identify the messenger and the raped *donzella* as the same person. No such identification appears in the Hebrew version of Algaba, which doubtless follows the received text. Here, again, I place the Spanish text and Hebrew text side by side, together with a translation of the Hebrew text [italics mine]:

(*Montalvo-Place*, p. 86, lines 216-221)

Agrajes assimesmo se despidió dél [Amadís], diziéndole cómo la donzella a quien él dio la cabeça del Galpano^{12bis} *en vengança de la deshonrra que le hizo*, le traxo mandado de Olinda se señora, fija del rey Uauayn de Noruega, que luego le fuesse a ver.

(*Algaba*, Z. M., p.59, lines 14-17)

ויבא¹² אגראנגיש ויאמר
 "אחי, דע לך כי
 אותה האשה שהביאה לי
 ראש גאלפאנו
 כשהרגת אותו ושלתח
 אותו אלי על ידת,
 באה¹³ היום והביאה לי
 בשורות טובות מאהובתי
 אולינדה, בת המלך ואבאין¹⁴
 מנורוגא, ושלחה לי לאמר¹⁵
 שאלך מהרה לראות אותה".

Translation

Agrajes assimesmo se despidió dél [Amadís], diziéndole cómo la donzella a quien él dio la cabeça del Galpano *en vengança de la deshonrra que le hizo*, le traxo mandado de Olinda se señora, fija del rey Uauayn de Noruega, que luego le fuesse a ver.

Paragraph II. Three probable errors in Montalvo's *Amadís* corrected on the basis of Algaba's Hebrew *Amadís*.

Probable error 1 (paragraph IIa)

(Improper addition to the text on the part of Montalvo)

In discussing Montalvo's text here, it is necessary to indicate that Oriana has secretly previously given to Amadís permission to grant a boon to a donzella in distress (*Montalvo-Place*, p. 264, lines 115-120). It is also necessary to indicate that King Lisuarte, Oriana's father, unable to keep his promise to surrender a magical cloak and crown to an enchanter, is obliged to surrender his daughter, Oriana, instead (*Montalvo-Place*, p. 273, lines 57-113). When Oriana is forced to leave here father in order to go with the enchanter and this band, she sighs (*Montalvo-Place*, p. 274, lines 181-193, [italics mine]): «¡-Ay, buen amigo!, en fuerte punto se otorgó el don, que por esto *somos vos y yo muertos*».

Now, when Oriana says Now, when Oriana says *vos y yo*, she can only mean herself and someone else. In Montalvo's Spanish text we find an explanation of which person, along with Oriana, was meant. The explanation is as follows (*Montalvo-Place*, p. 274, lines 184-187, [italics mine]): Esto dezía [Oriana] por Amadís, que le otorgara la yda con la donzella, y los otros [que estaban allí] *gnydaron que por ella y por su padre lo dixera...*».

In Algaba's Hebrew version (*Algaba*, Z. M., p.187, line 26) the explanation of who, in addition to herself, she meant, is equivalent to Montalvo's explanation regarding Amadís, but does *not* include what the bystanders thought. Algaba's explanation is: וזה אמרה בעבור וזה אמרה עם האשה (Y esto dezía por Amadís, que se fue con la donzella). Let us now consider the second part of the explanation in Montalvo's Spanish version, namely what the bystanders thought, a totally inappropriate addition obviously inserted by Montalvo. It is of course possible to interpret Oriana's outburst «... en fuerte punto se otorgó el don, que por esto somos vos y yo muertos» as possibly applying *either* to Oriana and Amadís or to Oriana and her father. However, it would be unimaginable for Oriana to have addressed her father, even in the most uncontrolled of circumstances, as ¡Ay, buen amigo!; so that the idea that the

bystanders would even think that this expression could possibly apply to Oriana's father, King Lisuarte, is questionable, to say the least! Thus the shorter explanation in Algaba's Hebrew text seems, in this context, to be the more appropriate one. The possibility that Oriana's cry '*Ay, buen amigo*' might, in the minds of the bystanders, be thought as applying to Oriana's father seems to be an uncalled-for absurdity unjustifiably and inexplicably inserted her by Montalvo.

Probable error 2 (paragraph IIb)
(Probable error of omission by Montalvo)

Galaor charges a *donzella* to deliver an important message from hi to Amadís. The message consists, basically, of three parts (*Montalvo-Place*, p. 101, lines 175-180, [italics mine]):

Dezidle

- a) quel donzel que él fizo cauallero [that is, Galaor himself] se le encomienda, y
- b) que yo [Galaor] punaré de ser hombre bueno, y
- c) si le yo viere, dezirle he más de mi fazienda *y de la suya* que él sabe.

Now, when the message is delivered to Amadís by the *donzella* she will be expected to follow the same sequence of the message given her and will use the expressions, if not exactly the same as those given her, nevertheless quite similar to them.¹⁶

The first two parts of the message, as delivered by the *donzella* to Amadís (*Montalvo-Place*, p. 153, lines 51-61) conform to this expected pattern. They are:

- a) el hermoso donzel que fezistes cauallero... mándasevos encomendar, y
- b) embíavos dezir que él punará de ser hombre bueno...

But when we come to the third part of the important message, the most telling part of the significant third part has unaccountably been left out of Montalvo's version. It will be recalled that Galaor told the *donzella* to tell Amadís that if he [Galaor] sees Amadís «dezirle he más de mi fazienda *y de la suya* [of Amadís] que él sabe». [italics mine] The phrase «*y de la [fazienda] suya*» is the key phrase, for Galaor means to give Amadís information of utmost import to him [Amadís]: Galaor is going to tell Amadís what he himself [Galaor] has found out; namely that Amadís is a prince, the son of King Perión and Queen Helisena of Gaula and that Amadís and the young man that he made a knight [Galaor] are indeed brothers! The fact that Amadís, unbeknownst to Galaor, already possesses some of this important information does not account for the omission, in Montalvo's Spanish version, of the most significant portion of this third part of Galaor's message to him, which we will now examine even more closely. Galaor, instructing the *donzella* to speak to Amadís, as told her: «dezirle he [yo] más de mi fazienda *y de la suya* [of Amadís] que él sabe». The *donzella* speaking to Amadís, would be expected to say something like (changing the necessary subjects and objects of the utterance): «dezirvos he [más de su fazienda [of Galaor] *y de la vuestra* he [of Amadís] que vos sabéis» when she delivers the message to Amadís. Algaba's Hebrew version

renders exactly the anticipated message of this third part to Amadís, namely (*Algaba, Z. M.*, p.106, lines 15): הוא יאמר לך מעניניו ועניניך יותר ממה שאתה יודע (él [Galaor] vos dirá de su fazienda y de vuestra fazienda más de lo que sabéis [italics mine]). However, Montalvo, inexplicably, leaves out the phrase *de vuestra fazienda* (or *de la [fazienda] vuestra*) entirely. He writes (*Montalvo-Place*, p. 153, lines 64-66): [c] [Galaor] vos [to Amadís] dirá de su fazienda más de lo que ahora sabéys...

Probable error 3 (paragraph IIc)

When innocent, inflamed Helisena and her faithful, wise *donzella*, Darioleta, are planning for Helisena's rendezvous with King Perión in his room after the inhabitants of her father's palace are asleep, Helisena says to her *donzella* (*Montalvo-Place*, p. 17, lines 431-432, [italics mine]) «-pues a vos dexo el cargo de me *llevar* quando tiempo fuere»¹⁷. Now, while the verb *llevar* may appear quite reasonable in this context, it is very probable that Montalvo's received text read *llamar* here. Three considerations lead us to this conclusion:

[First consideration]: In the equivalent passage in Algaba's Hebrew version (*Algaba, Z. M.*, p.2, line 4, italics mine) we find: “השעה הנכונה, קראני. כשתראה” (quando vierdes la hora apropiada *llamadme*). The Hebrew verb קרא here calls for the Spanish verb *llamar* in the received text, which would appear enough like *lleuar* in a medieval Spanish text to be taken for it. It could be argued, of course, that were there a misreading of the verb that the misreading could very possibly be due to Algaba rather than to Montalvo. But-

[Second consideration]: Our experience with the *Amadís*, at least in Book I, is that complete or partial utterances with regard to a given topic or subject on one occasion are almost always repeated on another occasion in identical or very similar phrasing.¹⁹ Darioleta, speaking to Helisena with reference to the very same rendezvous with King Perión some 100 lines previously in the same chapter of the Montalvo text says (*Montalvo-Place*, p. 16, lines 341-434, [italics mine]): «... y quando sazón sea de salir²⁰ yo vos *llamaré*». In the equivalent passage in Algaba's Hebrew text (*Algaba, Z. M.*, p. 7, line 4) the verb utilized is again קרא (*llamar*). It thus appears that both verbs in the Spanish text should be *llamar* rather than *lleuar*, since on one of those two occasions *llamar* is used in the Spanish text.

[Third consideration]: On yet a third occasion that refers to Darioleta's arrival to fetch Helisena from Perión's room (*Montalvo-Place*, p. 20, lines 176-177) Algaba again uses the verb קרא (*llamar*) (*Algaba, Z. M.*, p. 9, line 23) although Montalvo has neither *llamar* nor *lleuar* here.

* * *

Paragraph III. Thirteen instances in which Montalvo's text either changes, suppresses, explains away or muddles his received text may be clarified and restored on the basis of Algaba's Hebrew text.

The main differences between the revised Spanish text of Montalvo and the Hebrew text of Algaba have to do with the fact that whereas the Hebrew text closely follows its putative source more or less slavishly (except for those contexts where Christian matters appear, or where an explanation of situations unfamiliar to his readers, such as the dubbing of knights or the situation of women witnessing battles was deemed necessary for his readers) Montalvo, the Spanish revisionist, in addition to inserting parenthetical *exempla* and moralizations (which do not at all appear in the Hebrew version) at times rewrites entire episodes or sections of episodes because these contexts are apparently not in harmony with what he considers to be *appropriate chivalric behavior* on the part of his heroes and heroines, or may not be appropriate to the subject matter at hand. Thirteen telling examples will bear this out. In all of these examples it is important for us to see how similar the Spanish and Hebrew texts are to each other except in those instances where Montalvo has changed the received text. Examples *a* and *b* reveal the kind of change introduced by Montalvo wherein he completely *alters* the received text. In example *c* Montalvo *explains* apparent improper behavior on the part of *a caballero* who would be expected to be faithful to his beloved. In example *d* Montalvo *suppresses* material found in his source-text for reasons of propriety. Examples *e, f, g, h, i* are evidence of instances where Montalvo apparently knew very well what was in the received text before him, but for reasons of propriety purposely *equivocates* or *muddles* the text, perhaps intending in this way to redeem the text from the «falta de los diferentes y malos escritores»²¹ who supposedly adulterated the text, but at the same time hinting indirectly at what is in the received text, translated faithfully by Algaba. In examples *j, k, l, m*, Algaba's text clarifies texts of Montalvo that would otherwise be unclear for the reader of the Spanish version.

Example 1 (Paragraph IIIa)
(change introduced by Montalvo)

Perhaps the most telling change introduced by Montalvo on account of propriety occurs in an episode where Amadís is battling against a knight and has gotten the better of the encounter, having succeeded in knocking the knight's helmet off his head. But his enemy demonstrates remarkable defensive skill with his shield, warding off Amadís's subsequent attack. It is significant to point out that until the final moments of this bout the basic elements mentioned in both Montalvo's Spanish revision and in Algaba's Hebrew translation coincide; namely a) the knight has his helmet knocked off his head by Amadís's sword, b) the knight raises his shield to protect himself from a blow from Amadís's sword, and c) Amadís stops and does not strike the final blow. Here, at the end of the encounter, the Spanish revisionist has Amadís perform a superhuman act of sinister dexterity, shifting his sword from right to left hand and knocking his opponent senseless

with the weapon. But the Hebrew writer, having no cause to introduce revisions, translates directly from his source text. When the opponent raises his shield to protect his head, the wily Amadís resorts to a tricky stratagem in order to vanquish him, hardly a proper act of so wondrously chivalric a hero as Amadís de Gaula. For when Amadís's able opponent raises his shield, Amadís pauses to consider how he may vanquish him. He resolves the problem by calling out to the knight, "To whom does that *donzella* behind you belong?" When the knight turns around in order to see the *donzella* to whom Amadís is ostensibly referring, Amadís strikes him in the groin with his lance, spilling his guts upon the ground [*italics mine*]:

(*Montalvo-Place*, p. 70, lines 267-279)

(*Algaba*, Z. M., lines 27-32)

Translation

y dexóse yr al otroque lo fería y dióle por cima del yelmo, assí que la espada ilegóa la cabeça..., y alço el espada por lo ferir y el otro alço el escudo y el donzel del Mar [Amadís]

detono el golpe y passando la espada a la mano siniestra travóle del escudo y tirógelo del cuello y dióle con él encima de la cabeçam que el cauallero cayó en tierra atordido.

וילך לקראת השני y fuesse al segundo

ויך אותו בראשו y dióle en la cabeça hasta
עד שנחתך הכובע של ברזל quebrárase el yelmo que estaua
אשר על ראשו en su cabeça y cayósele el
ונפל ארצה yelmo a tierra, y se esforço para
ויחזק עוד להכותו ferirle con el espada pero el
בחרבו cauallero se saluó con el escudo
ויתנצל הגבור que estaua en la mano, y
במגן אשר בידו uiendo esto el Donzel del Mar
וכראות נער הים *se detono* para uer cómo pudiera
זה, עמד ומתבונן²² vencerlo, diziéndole el Donzel
במה יוכל del Mar, «Cauallero, cuya será
לנצחו, ויאמר la donzella detrás de vos?» Y
נער הים, "גבור, volviéndose el cauallero [para
למי זאת האישה ver quién sería] le dió con la
אשר מאחריך?" ויפן lança en las ingles y
הגבור לאחריו derramáronse a tierra sus
ויכהו נער הים בחניתו entrañas
על החומש וישפחו
מעיו ארצה.

Example 2 (Paragraph IIIb)
(Change introduced by Montalvo)

Chapter XXXVI of Montalvo's *Amadís* in which Galaor with the aid of two knights Ladasín el esgrimidor and Guilán el cuydador (i.e., il penseroso) save King Lisuarte from certain death, is a chapter in which the Spanish revisionist has maintained the beginning and the end of the chapter (except for three short significant changes at the end, which will be discussed below) but has radically revised and enlarged the middle portion. Algaba's Hebrew version and Montalvo's Spanish version are strikingly similar at the beginning and at the end of the chapter except for the three short but significant passages because the small but significant sections strongly conflict with the revised middle portion of the chapter that Montalvo has introduced. Whereas Algaba has closely conformed to his received text,

Montalvo has changed and rewritten the middle portion, probably because he considered that here, again, he came across an example of the «falta de los diferentes y malos escriptores» (*Montalvo-Place*, p. 11, lines 6-7) who wrote in improper fashion about chivalrous acts. In order to show the striking similarities between Algaba's Hebrew version and Montalvo's Spanish version we will first of all cite the beginning of both, presenting side by side the complete continuous text of each, together with a Spanish translation of the Hebrew version.

(*Montalvo-Place*, p. 287-288,
lines 4-56)

(*Algaba*, Z. M., p.193, lines 1-
12)

Translation

Partido don Galaor
de Amadís su hermano
como ya oýstes, entró
en el camino
por donde lleuaban
al rey

ויהי כאשר הלך גלאור²³
מעם אמאדיש
הלך
באותו הדרך
שהראותו.

Partido Galaor
de Amadís
entró
en el mismo camino
que le auía
indicado.

Y cuytóse de andar
quanto más pudo, como
aquel que auía sobeja
cuyta de los alcançar,
y no tenía mientes en
cosa que vuese
sino en su rastro;
y assí anduuo hasta
hora de bísperas,
que entró en vn valle
y halló en él
huella de los cauillos
donde auían parado;
entonces suguió
aquel rastro
quanto el cauillo
lo podía lleuar,
que le semejó que no
podían yr lueñe; mas
no tardó mucho que
vio ante sí vn cauallero
todo bien armado
en buen cauillo
que a él salió, y le
dixo:
-Estad, señor cauallero,
y dezidme que quyta os
haze así correr.
-¡Por Dios! –Dixo Galaor-
dexadme de vuestra pregunta, que
me detengo con vusco, en que
mucho mal puede venir.
-¡Para Santa Maria!

והיה הולך
במרוצה גדולה

ולא היה מביט בדרך
שום דבר
כי אם היה הולך לדרכו, והלך

עד שנכנס בעמק אחד
וראה שם
רושם רגלי סוסים

והלך אחרי
הרושם

וראה בדרך
גבור אחר
מזויין

והגבור כשראהו
בא אצלו ואמר:
-גבור, עמוד
ואמור לי אנה הולך
בכל כך צער.
23bis- אמר הגבור,
תניח לי ואל תשאלני
שאני מתעכב
בשאלתך.
אמר הגבור, -
כה יעזרני האל

Y andaua
quanto más pudo
y en camino no tenía mientes
en cosa
sino andaua adelante hasta
que entró en vn valle
y halló allí
huellas de cauillos
y siguió
el rastro

y vio en el camino
cn cauallero
armado
y viéndolo el cauallero,
a él salió y le dixo
-Cauallero, estad,
y dezidme aonde os ydes
tan cuytado.
Digo Galaor:
-Dexadme y no me preguntáys
que me molesta sobremanera
vuestra pregunta.
Dixo el cauallero:
-¡Así me ayude Dios!

<p>-dixo el cauallero-, no passaréys de aquí hasta que me lo digáys, o vos combatáys conmigo. Y Galaor ho hazía en esto sino yrse; y el cauallero del valle le dixo: -Cierto, cauallero vos fuydes auiendo hecho algún mal; y agora os guardad, que saberlo quiero. Entonces fue a él con su lança baxada y el cauallo al más correr. Galaoe tornó; más echado el escudo a las aspaldas, quando lo sintió cerca ds sí sacó ayna el cauallo de la carrera y apartóse, y el cauallero no lo pudo encontrar, antes pasó tan rezió por él como quien traya el cauallo valiente y folgado; y assí fue vna pieça ante Galaor, y tornó a él tomando la lança a sobre mano y díxole: -¡Ay cauallero malo y couardel, no te me puedes mamparar por ninguna guisa que me no digas lo que te mando, o morirás. Entonces fue para él muy rezió...</p>	<p>שלא תלך מזה עד שתאמר לי או תלחם עמדי. וגלאור²⁴ לעולם היה הולך לדרכו והגבור אמר: - בלי ספק עשית איזו רעה, ועתה אתה בורח ועתה השמר²⁵ לך שעל כל פנים אני רוצה לידע אותך. והלך עם הרומח להכותו וגאלאור, כשראה זה וכשראהו²⁶ ככה הניס עצמו והגבור לא פגע בו ועבר לפנים וחזר עוד להכותו ואמר: -גבור רשע פחדן, אינך יכול להנצל²⁷ בשום צד בעולם או תאמר לי מה שאני שואל ואם אין מת אתה. והלך להכותו... que no passaréys de aquí hasta que me lo digáys o vos combatáys conmigo. Y Galaor vua siempre adelante y el cauallero dixo: -Sin dubda hizistes algún mal, y agora fuydes, y agora os guardad, pues commoquier que sea saberlo quiero. Y fue para ferirlo con la lança y Galaor, viendo esto tornó: y viéndolo desta manera apartósse y el cauallero no lo encontró y passó por él y tornó para atacarlo y dixo: -Cauallero malo couarde!, no te me puedes mamparar por ninguna guisa [del mundo] que me digas lo que te demando, o morirás. Y fue para atacarlo...</p>
---	--

At this point, *in this middle of a sentence*, Montalvo decides to introduce changes into the received text. What these changes entail will be discussed shortly, but before we discuss, these significant changes it is important to show that Montalvo returns to the received text toward the end of the chapter where again Montalvo's version and Algaba's version coincide except for the short segment *alluded to and discussed*, all of which proves beyond all doubt that Montalvo changed and enlarged the middle section of the chapter and that Algaba steadfastly followed the received text, the source for both Montalvo and Algaba. Interestingly, just as Montalvo departs from his received text in the middle of a sentence he again, at the end of the chapter, reverts to the received text *in the middle of a sentence*. Here, then are the similar endings to the chapter in both Montalvo and Algaba [italics mine].

(Montalvo-Place, p. 292, lines 354-410)	(Algaba, Z. M., p.194, line 25; p. 195, line 3)	Translation
...don Galaor sacó al cormano de Arcaláus de so el cauallo;	...וגאלאור הלך והקים קרוב ארקאלאוש שהיה תחת הסוס שעדין היה חי ושם הכבל בגרונו	...y Galaor fue y sacó al cormano de Arcaláus que estaua so el cauallo; que todavía bullía, y el puso la cadena en al garganta,
y quitando la cadena al rey. la puso a él; y tomaron de los caualleros muertos y el rey tomó uno	והמלך רכב על סוס אחד מהגבורים המתים וגאלאור רכב על סוס אחר מפני שהסוס שלו היה יעף ולא יכול ללכת וילכו	y el rey estaua montado an uno de los caualleros de los caualleros muertos y Galaor estaua montado en otro que el suyo estaua consado y no podía mouerse y fuéronsse
y commençáronse de yr camino de Londres muy alegres. <i>Ladasín contó al rey todo lo que con Galaor le aconteciera;</i>	לדרך לונדריש בשמחה גדולה מאוד. ²⁸ ולאדאשין ספר ²⁹ למלך כל הקורות לו עם גאלאור כשנלחם עמו.	camino de Londres muy alegres. <i>Y Ladasín contó al rey todo lo que con Galaor le aconteciera</i> AL LUCHARSE CON EL
<i>y el rey le preciaua mucho por se assí guardar según la demanda que leuaa, y Guilan assimesmo le dixo</i>	וגילאן גם כן ספר ²⁹ לו איך הפילו ארצה בהיות שהיה הולך וחושב באהובתו.	<i>y Guilán assimesmo le dixo cómo lo derribara [Galaor] seyendo cuydando [Guilán] en su amiga.</i>
<i>cómo seyendo cuydando en su amiga tan fieramente que en ál no metía mientes, que el cauallero le derribara sin nada le dezir.</i> Mucho rió el rey dello, diziéndole que ahunque muchas cosas hauía oydo que los enamorados por sus amigas hiziessen, pero no que a éste semejasse; y con gran causa, según veo, os llaman Guilán el cuydador. En estas cosas y otras de mucho plazer fueron hablando fasta llegar a casa de Ladasín, que muy cerca dende moraua;	כששמע זה המלך צחק ואמר : -דברים רבים שמעתי שעשו גבורים]ם] בעד אהובתם אבל ועתה; אינם דומים לזה רואה שהו בדיון שקוראים שמך גילאן החושב.	Oyendo esto riósse el rey, diziendo: -Muchas cosas he oydo qye han hacho caualleros por sus amigas, pero no seméjasse a ésta; y ahora veo que con gran causa os llaman Guilán el cuydador.
	ויהי בלכתם הגיעו לבית לאדאשין שהיה קרוב משם;	Yendo ellos llegaron a casa de Ladasín que muy cerca dende moraua;

y allí llegó a ellos
el escudero de Galaor
y Ardián el anano de Amadís
que cuydaua que su señor
yua por aquella vía
a le buscar. Galaor
contó al rey la forma
que él y Amadís se partieran,
y que decía embiar a Londres,
porque los leñadores dirían
las nueuas y con ellas
se mouería toda la corte.

-Pues que Amadís
-dixo el rey-
va en socorro de mi hija,
no la entiendo perder,
si aquel tryador
no le haze por encantamento
algún engaño. Y en esto
que dezís, bien será
que sepa la reyna
mi hazienda.

Y mandó a vn escudero
de Ladasín que sabía bien
la tierra, que se fuesse
luego con aquellas nueuas.
Pues allí aluergó el rey
aquella noche,
donde fue muy bien seruido.
Y otro día tornaron
a su camino, e ýuales contando
el cormano de Arcaláus
como todo lo pasado fuera
por consejo de Barsinán,
señor de Sansueña,
pensando ser
rey de Gran Bretaña.
Estonces se cuytó el rey
de andar más que antes
por le hallar ay.

ושם באו
נערו של גאלאור
וארדיאן הננס של אמאדיש
שחשב שאמאדיש
הלך משם ובא
הננס לבקשו. וגאלאור
ספר²⁹ למלך באיזה אופן
נפרד מאמאדיש
ואמר שהיה צריך לשלוח
לבשר ללונדריש טרם
ילכו החותבי עצים
ויאמרו שם איך נתפש
המלך ויקומו כל
הגבורים. אמר המלך – אם
אמאדיש הלך אחרי בתי
אני חושב שיצילה,
אלא אם אותו הרשע
ארקלאוש³⁰ יעשה לו
כשפים וירדמו. ומה
שאמרת לשלוח לבשר
ללונדריש, ראו
זה להעשות.³¹
וישלך המלך את נער
שהיה יודע^{31bis} לדאשין
הדרך.

והמלך ישב שם
אותה הלילה.
ועשו לו שם כבוד
גדול. ובבקר הלכו
לדרכם. והקרוב של
ארקאלאוש ספר²⁹ למלך
איך כל זה נעשה
בעצת גארשינאן
סר שאינשואינייא.
שהיה מבקש למלוך
בבריטאנייא.
כשמע זה המלך
³²רץ מאד
למצאו שם.

y allí llegaron
el escudero de Galaor
y Ardián el anano de Amadís,
que cuydaua que Amadís
se fue dallí y uino el
enano a le buscar. Y Galaor
contó al rey la forma que
se partiera de Amadís
y dixoque deuíá embiar a
Londres neuas antes que
fuessen allí los leñadores
y dixieran que fue tamado
el rey y se mouiera toda la
corte. Dixo el rey: -Si
fuere Amadís a buscar a mi
hija, pienso que la salvará.
Pero si estare con él
Aracláus el malo, le hará
encantamentos, endormeciéndolo.
Y en esto que dezís mandar
nueuas a Londres bien será
hazerlo.
Y mandó el rey a un escudero
de Ladasín, que sabía la
tierra

Pues allí aluergó el rey
aquella noche,
e hizieronle allí gran
honra. Y otro día fueronsse
su vía. Y contó al rey
el cormano de Arcaláus
como todo eso passó
por consejo de Garsinán,
señor de Sainsueña, que
pensaba reynar en
Bretaña.
Oyendo lo qual el rey
corrió rápidamente
por le hallar ay.

Now that we have shown how similar Montalvo's and Algaba's texts are at the beginning and at the end of the chapter (except for one significant excision and two significant additions to be discussed below) let us first of all return to the beginning of the chapter. What really did happen between Galaor and Ladasín, the first of the two knights who eventually help Galaor save King Lisuarte from certain death at the hands of Arcaláos the enchanter's band? We know the beginning of their encounter because both Montalvo's text and Algaba's text coincide:

- 1) Galaor, in a hurry, meets a well-armed knight (Ladasín) who asks him (*Montalvo-Place*, p. 287, lines 23-24)? «qué cuyta os haze así correr?»
- 2) Galaor is too much in a hurry to answer this question (lines 25-28).
- 3) The knight insists that either Galaor answer his question or else Galaor must fight him (lines 29-32).
- 4) Galaor does not pause but continues on his way (lines 33-35).
- 5) The knight decides that Galaor must have committed some wrong and challenges him and then attacks him, but Galaor escapes (lines 26-49).
- 6) The knight again threatens Galaor and attacks a second time (p. 288, lines 50-56).

At this point Montalvo revamps his received text. According to his revised version Galaor again evades Ladasín's charge (lines 56-59) and continues on his way, but Ladasín, who knows the countryside (line 66) takes a short-cut and soon catches up with Galaor «en vn passo» (line 68), berates him and offers Galaor three choices:

- 1) to fight
- 2) to go back the way he came
- 3) to answer his “demanda” (lines 72-75).

Galaor, to whom none of these three choices is acceptable, nevertheless offers Ladasín an option: he says to him (lines 81-84) «si queréys saber la priessa que lieuo, seguidme y verlo eys, porque me deternía mucho en vos lo contar, y a la cima [a fin de cuentas] no me creeríades; tanto es de mala ventura». Ladasín accepts Galaor's offer, expecting to know the facts of the matter within three days (lines 85-88) and follows Galaor at some distance because Galaor, who is in a great hurry, outdistances him. Thus, in Montalvo's revised version Ladasín and Galaor never really fight against each other, except for the two futile passes made by Ladasín against Galaor (lines 1-56), and Ladasín bows to Galaor's verbal entreaty, awaiting (within three days) the explanation of his *demanda*.

The supposed reasonableness of Ladasín; namely the acceptance of Galaor's offer to wait some three days for an explanation of Galaor's *cuyta* rather than immediate encounter with him occasions one of Montalvo's short interpolated explanations at the end of the chapter (not to be found in Algaba's Hebrew version); namely that when King Lisuarte heard from Ladasín what had happened between Ladasín and Galaor «el rey le preciaua mucho por ser assí guardar según la demanda que leuaua» (lines 364-366). But in Algaba's Hebrew version, unchanged from his received text, Ladasín relates to the king what had happened between Galaor and him עמו כשנלחם = *al lucharse com él*: in

other words, when he fought a battle with him (*ALgaba, Z. M.*, p. 194, line 21). For in Montalvo's received text, the one that he revised, when Ladasín attacked Galaor for the second time (liens 55-56) the pre-Montalvo sequence of that battle is as follows [italics mine]:

(*Algaba, Z. M.*, p.193, lines 12-19) *Translation*

<p>והלך לאדאשין להכותו וגאלאור כשראה ככה, השפיל הרומח כנגדו והכה אותו באופן שנפל האיש ארצה נבהל מאד ולא יכול לקום. כשראה זה גאלאור ירד מהסוס והלך לחתוך קשרי קובע הגבור והגבור אמר: -אדוני, עשה חסד עמדי ועל תהרגני! אמר גלאור: -לא אניחך עד שתשבע שלא תשתדל לידע דבר מאיש על כרחו ותבוא עמדי לעזור לי למקום שאני הולך. והגבור נשבע על הכל ויניחהו גאלאור ויקם האיש וירכב על הסוס, וילך עם גאלאור. ושמו של זה היה לאדאשין.</p>	<p>Y fue [Ladsín] para atacarlo, y uiendo esto Galaor baxó la lança contral él, y lo firió, de maner que cayósse el ombre a la tierra muy atordido, no pudiendo leuantarse. Uiendo esto Galaor diçió del cauallo yendo a cortarle los lazos del yelmo, y le dixo el cauallero: - ¡Señor, hazed merced comigo, y no me mayéts! Dixo Galaor: -No os dexaré si no me jurares que no quisierdes saber cosa de onbre contra su uoluntad y que uernás comigo para ayudarme aonde uo. Y el cauallero jurólo todo, onde lo dexó Galaor. Y se leuantó el ombre y caualgó en su cauallo, yendo con Galaor. Y el nonbre deste era Ladasín.</p>
---	---

Thus, in the pre-Montalvo version of the encounter between Ladasín and Galaor, a battle takes place between them, Galaor defeats Ladasín and *oblige* him to accompany him and to aid him. Let us now consider what happens to *án el cuydador* in Montalvo's revised version and in Algaba's pre-Montalvo version.

In Montalvo's revised version Ladasín is following the speeding Galaor to his encounter with Arcaláus the enchanter's band in order to save King Lisuarte. Both of them see an unhorsed knight and another mounted knight speeding away from the fallen one (lines 89-96). Ladasín recognizes the fallen knight as his cousin and asks him for an explanation (lines 96-102). It is significant to indicate that in Montalvo's revision Ladasín's cousin, *án el cuydador*, gives two reports of the encounter, one to his cousin Ladasín and the other to King Lisuarte later on.

Let us place these two reports (in their complete form) side by side in order to compare them [italics mine]:

Guilán's report to Ladasín
(lines 106-116)

Yo yua cuydando en lo que vos sabéys;
assí que sólo en mí no paraua mientes,
y no caté sino quando me dio aquel
cauallero que allá va vna lançada en el
escudo, tal que el cauallo
ynojó comigo, y yo caý en

Guilán's report to King Lisuarte
(lines 367-371)

seyendo cuydando en su amiga tan
fieramente que en ál no
metía mientes
que el cauallero
le derribara

tierra, y el cauallo fuyó;
 mas luego puse mano a la espada
 y llamélo a la batalla, pero
 no quiso venir, antes *me dixxo* *sin nada le dezir*
que otra vez fuesse más acordado
 en responder quando me llamassen.

From Guilán's report to the king we gather that Guilán was immersed in thoughts about his beloved when the unknown knight apparently unexpectedly attacked him without saying a word to him. But from Giulán's previous report to Ladasín concerning what had happened we learn that although án may not have been aware at the time of the attack that the unknown knight had said something to him, he had to consider the probability that the unknown knight had said something to him because when he (Guilán), shortly after the attack, challenged the unknown knight to fight, the unknown knight «*me dixxo que otra vez fuesse más acordado en responder quando me llamassen*». Thus án should without doubt have considered the probability that the unknown knight *had asked him a question* to which he (Guilán), deeply immersed in thoughts about his beloved, did not respond to and very probably did not even hear. What could this question have been? And what artistic or esthetic sense does it make, *in the Amadís*, to have an unknown knight who never again appears in any part of the book, attack a personage in the story on the basis of an unknown question that is never explained?

The Guilán el cuydador episode in Chapter XXXVI of Book I of Montalvo's revision of the *Amadís* appears to be muddled because Montalvo apparently wanted to change some, but not all, of what he found in his received text and in changing some parts and keeping others as they appeared in his source he neglected to maintain a reasoned and esthetic balance between what he kept and what he refurbished. Fortunately, due to Algaba's faithful rendering of the text we are able to recapture the pre-Montalvo version. We learn from Algaba's Hebrew translation that it is Galaor himself who comes upon án, deeply enmeshed in thought about his beloved and physically accompanied by her. Galaor is at this time, of course, deeply concerned with regard to the whereabouts of King Lisuarte and Arcaláus the enchanter's band of ten rebels who have the king in tow. He therefore reasonably asks the daydreaming án the first of two questions: namely, whether án has seen ten men with a prisoner in tow. When Galaor receives no response from the inattentive knight he, apparently justifiably angered, expresses his fury in the form of a second question: namely, "Are you alive or dead?" and immediately attacks án, unhorsing him. Here, then, is the pre-Montalvo of the episode together with retranslation into Spanish (*Algaba, Z. M.*, p. 193, lines 20-27): [The guilán episode immediately follows Ladasín episode without any intervening passage]

[italics mine]

ויהי בלכתם [גאלאור ולאדאשין] מצאו
 גבור אחד ושמו גילאן שהיה הולך אם
 אהובתו. וכשראהו גאלאור אמר, -
 גבור, ראית "י" גבורים שמוליכים
 תפוש אחד? והגבור לא השיב לו דבר.
 מפני שהיה הולך במחשבה גדולה על
 אהובתו ההולכת. כשראה זה גאלאור
 הלך אצלו ואמר, -חי אתה או מת? והכה
 אותו ברומח והפילו ארצה. גילאן,
 כשנפל נתבייש מאד מאהובתו, ונתאדמו
 פניו, אבל אם כל זה לא סר אהובתם ביניהם.
 ורכב על הסוס וגאלאור אמר לו: -
 צריך לך שתבוא עמדי למקום שאני הולך.
 אמר גילאן: -יהי כן. והלך גם זה עמו.

[italics mine]

Y quando se fueron [Galaor y Ladasín]
 encontraron a vn cauallero de nonbre Guilán
yendo con su amiga, y uiéndolo Galaor le dixo: -
 Cauallero, ayedes uisto a diex caualleros
 lleuando a vn prisionero? Mas el cauallero, que
 andaua cuydando en su amiga que estaua
 acompañándolo, no le tornó palavra. Uiendo lo
 qual fuesse Galaor a él y le dixoL -¿Estades vivo
 o muerto? Y lo firió con la lança, derribándol.
*Guilán, auiendo caydo, auía grand uerguença ante su
 amiga y embermegeciósele el rostro, mas no por esso
 falláronsse sus amores.*
 Pues caualgó en su cauallo y Galaor le dixo: -
 Deuedes acompañarme aonde uo, Dixo Guilán:
 -Ansí sea, y fuesse tanbién con él.

We now can see that Montalvo, for some reason not wishing to involve Galaor in the unhorsing of án, has *ex nihilo* brought in an unnamed knight, who is never heard from again, to attack án, apparently unjustifiably.

Let us now consider the circumstances of án's shame, which in the Hebrew *Amadís* is reasonably mentioned in an appropriate place; namely immediately after Galaor has readily unhorsed him in the presence of his *amiga* (*Algaba, Z. M.*, p. 193, lines 24-25) which I have rendered into Spanish as follows: «Guilán, auiendo caydo, auía grand uerguença ante su amiga y embermegeciósele el rostro, mas no por esso falláronsse sus amores». Since Montalvo has excised Galaor from the episode of the unhorsing of Guilán, and has gotten rid of the accompanying *amada* in the same episode, the mention of Guilán's shame would appear to be superfluous there (in Montalvo's revision) and, in fact, is not found there. However Montalvo, utilizing almost the same comments that are found in the Hebrew *Amadís* transfers these comments regarding Guilán's shame to a subsequent context where it does not seem to be as appropriate. King Lisuarte has just been saved from certain death at the hands of Arcaláus's band through the efforts of Galaor and the two cousins Ladasín and Guilán, recruited for this effort, as we have learned from the Hebrew *Amadís*. The two cousins, seeing the king, dismount and bow on their knees before the king, who recognizes them, and causes them to rise to their feet whereupon his first words to them are (*Montalvo-Place*, p. 291, line 336: p.292, line 340): «Por Dios, amigos!, a buena hora me acorristes! y gran mal me ahze la amiga de don Guilán, que me lo tira de mi compañía, y por su causa pierdo yo a vos, Ladasín». Here Montalvo has the king brusquely thank the two cousins for their help in saving his life and immediately thereafter has the king complain that Guilán's *amada* has caused Guilán to absent himself from the presence of the king (which is a reasonable observation) and that she is also responsible for the absence, presumably from King

Lisuarte's court, of Ladasín (the reason for which is, to say the least, not immediately clear). At this point, after the king has voiced his complaint regarding the absence (from his court) of the two knights, Ladasín and Guilán, Montalvo interposes the comment regarding Guilán's shame – not as result of having been readily unhorsed and the presence of his *amada*, but – apparently – because the king called attention to the fact that she caused the absence, from his court, of the two knights. He writes (*Montalvo-Place*, p. 292, lines 341-345) «Guilán ouo gran vergüença, y embermegecióle el rostro; mas no que [the word *que* appears to be superfluous here] por esso dexasse de amar aquella su señora duquesa de Bristoya, y ella amaua a él;...»

Example 3 (Paragraph IIIc)

(Explanation by Montalvo)

The worthy *cauallero* Agrajes has been romantically linked to Olinda. Yet, on one occasion when most of his people are aslepp, he noses around a room containing a group of unknown young women (he doesn't yet know that Olinda is among them) showing interest in them and in what they are doing. The Hebrew text, doubtless following its source closely, states this fact (*Algaba, Z. M.*, p. 98, line 12):

ואגראגגי הלך לראות מתוך פתחי הבית מה היו עושים [הנערות]
(y fuesse Agrajes para mirar, por entre las puertas de las casa, lo que fazían [las donzellas]).

But Montalvo feels called upon to explain this apparent unchivalric and improper behavior on the part of a knight supposedly faithful to his beloved (*Montalvo-Place*, p. 142, lines 55-61, italics mine): «*como cauallero mencebo desseoso de ver mugeres, más paralas seruir y honrrar que para fazer su coraçon sujeto en otra parte ante estaua, quiso por entre las puertas de la cámara mirar lo que fazían*».

Example 4 (Paragraph IIIId)

(Suppression by Montalvo)

This example reflects Montalvo's suppression of a singular detail of battle found in the received text for obvious reasons of propriety. Amadís is battling against King Abies of Ireland. Both Montalvo's Spanish text and Algaba's Hebrew text are in agreement regarding the general description of the entire battle between the two (*Montalvo-Place*, pp. 77-79, lines 105-261; *Algaba, Z. B.*, p. 53, line 22; p. 55, line 55), the breaking of the lances, the recourse to swords, the flowing of blood, the king's request for a pause to refresh himself, his praise to Amadís's worthiness as a warrior, the rebuke of the king by Amadís, the resumption of the battle, the king's last-minute attempt to end the battle by swinging his sword at Amadís's head, Amadís's escape from that blow and, finally, the king's death. However, one significant detail is predictably, for the sake of propriety, missing from Montalvo's Spanish version. During the battle, just before the pause that

refreshed the warriors, but after both warriors have broken their lances and have chopped their protective gear to pieces (all of these details appear in both the Spanish and Hebrew versions) the Hebrew text, sticking closely to the received text, reveals that (*Algaba, Z. M.*, p. 54, line 9): «they began to bit each other with their teeth until the blood flowed from them as from stuck animals» ויתחילו לנשך³³ עליהם עד שפוך עליהם הדם זה את זה בשיניהם (enpezaron a morderse el uno al otro con los dientes hasta que salía dellos la sangre come de [reses] agujereados).

Example 5 (Paragraph IIIe)

(Purposeful equivocation by Montalvo)

Shortly after being dubbed a knight by King Perión, the Donzel del mar [Amadís] saves the king from certain death at the hands of knights and peons who oblige all who enter castle to swear allegiance to King Abies of Ireland against King Perión of Gaula. The chief instigator of this demand is an uncle of King Abies, who cannot possibly do any fighting himself to help his nephew, for he is too old and infirm, and has thus decided upon this method of obliging other knights to help his nephew. The uncle is so old that he cannot move from his bed:

(*Montalvo-Place*, p. 52, lines 230-231)

y vio [el Donzel del Mar]
en vn lecho vn hombre tan
viejo que de allí no se
podía leuantar...

(*Algaba, Z. M.*, p.34,
lines 10-11)

וירא [נער הים]
במטה³⁴ אחת איש איד
זקן שוכב שם שלא היה
יכול³⁵ לקום משם

Translation

y vio [el Donzel del Mar]
en vn lecho vn hombre
viejo echado que no se
podía leuantar...

Amadís, or rather el Donzel del Mar, *knows* that the uncle is very old, for he says to him:

(*Montalvo-Place*, p. 52, lines 247-249)

-Viejo malo, estás en
al passo de la muerte y
tienes tal costumbre?

(*Algaba, Z. M.*, p.34,
lines 13-14)

זקן רע, אתה עומד
באחרית הימים והייתה
עושה המעשים האלה?

Translation

-Viejo malo, estás en tus
últimas días y todavía
hazes estas cosas?

Amadís tells the old man that if he [the old man] could bear arms then he [Amadís] would prove to the old man that he was a traitor to God (lines 249-252). Amadís thereupon threatens the defenseless old man with his sword. From Montalvo's sword we get the impression that Amadís *feigns* that he is going to kill the old man: «entonces hizo semblante que le Quería dar con el espada...» (lines 253-254). However, in Algaba's Hebrew version there is no indication that Amadís's threat is at all idle: “הקים החרב” (y alzó la espada para atacarlo) (*Algaba, Z. M.*, p.34, line 15). We begin to

suspect that Montalvo has changed some of the elements of this scene in order to preserve the propriety of Amadís's actions. This suspicion of ours is justified as the scene unfolds. The old man, believing that he is threatened with death by Amadís (although only seemingly so threatened, according to Montalvo) asks for mercy:

(<i>Montalvo-Place</i> , p. 52, lines 256-257)	(<i>Algaba, Z. M.</i> , p.34, lines 15-16)	<i>Translation</i>
-¡Ay, señor, merced; no me matéys!	אדוני, עשה עמי חסד ואל תהרגני!	-Señor, hazedme merced, y no me matéys!

Amadís then threatens to kill the old man unless he swears not to continue this bad custom:

(<i>Montalvo-Place</i> , p. 52, lines 258-261)	(<i>Algaba, Z. M.</i> , p.34, lines 10-11)	<i>Translation</i>
-Muerto soys –dixo el Donzel del Mar-, si no juráys que tal costumbre nunca más en vuestra vida mantenida será.	אמר נער הים : -לא אעזבך ³⁶ עד שתדור ³⁷ לי שלא תעשה עוד כאשר היית עושה עד אתה. שאנשיך היו הורגים את העוברים.	dixo el Donzel del Mar: -No os dexaré hasta que me jures que no continuaréys haziendo lo que auéys hecho fasta agora, pues vuestros hombres matan a los que pasan por aquí.

The old man thereupon swears that he will abide Amadís's request:

(<i>Montalvo-Place</i> , p. 52, line 262)	(<i>Algaba, Z. M.</i> , p.34, line 28)	<i>Translation</i>
El [viejo] lo juró.	וידור הזקן	El [viejo] lo juró.

Now that Amadís has caused the old uncle to desist from his evil practice and has granted him mercy (he will not kill the old man) he is, apparently, curious and wants to know from the old man why he has maintained this evil practice:

(<i>Montalvo-Place</i> , p. 52, lines 263-264)	(<i>Algaba, Z. M.</i> , p.34, line 18)	<i>Translation</i>
-Pues agora me dezid por qué manteníades esta costumbre.	ולמה היית עושה ככה?	¿Y por qué hazíades esto?

The old man gives Amadís his answer:

(<i>Montalvo-Place</i> , p. 52, lines 265-269)	(<i>Algaba, Z. M.</i> , p.34, lines 19-20)	<i>Translation</i>
<p>-Por el rey Abies de Yrlanda –dixo él-, ques mi sobrino, y yo no le puedo ayudar con el cuerpo, quisiérale ayudar con los caualleros andantes.</p>	<p>בעבור המלך אבייש מאירלאנדא³⁸ שהוא בן אחי, ואני לא הייתי יכול לעזור לו בגופי והייתי רוצה לעזור לו עם הגבורים העוברים.</p>	<p>Por el rey Abies de Yrlanda, ques mi sobrino, y no le he podido ayudar con el cuerpo, quisiérale ayudar con los caualleros andantes.</p>

Amadís is apparently greatly bothered by this answer, which undoubtedly indicates to him a traitorous and unreasonable attitude on the part of the old man towards knights:

(<i>Montalvo-Place</i> , p. 52, lines 270-273)	(<i>Algaba, Z. M.</i> , p.34, lines 20-21)	<i>Translation</i>
<p>-Veijo falso –dixo el Donzel-, ¿qué han de auer los caualleros en vuestra ayuda ni estoruo?</p>	<p>ענה נער הים ואמר : -זקן רע! מה לגבורים במלחמתך או בעזרתך?</p>	<p>Dixo el Donzel del Mar: -Veijo malo —, ¿qué han de auer los caualleros en vuestra guerra ni ayuda?</p>

Montalvo then writes, at the end of this scene (p.53, lines 275-277): «Entonces dio del pie al lecho y tornólo sobre él, y *encomendándole a todos los diablos del infierno se salió al corral* » [italics mine]. It would seem, from Montalvo's version, that Amadís kicked the bed, that the bed fell upon the old man, and that Amadís cursed him before leaving the place. But from Algaba, who has no reason to emend or to muddle the text, as Montalvo apparently feels he must, we see *definitely* that Amadís indeed *killed* the old man before leaving (*Algaba, Z. M.*, p. 34, linese 21-22 [italics mine]):

ברגלו ונהפך המטה³⁹ והכה במטה³⁹ על הזקן והרגו, ויצא לחוץ.
(Y dio del pie al lecho y tornóse el lecho sobre le veijo y *lo mató* y salió hacia afuera.)

In writing the ambiguous or equivocal phrase “encomendándole a todos los diablos” montalvo has, in a way suggested what really did happen, but in another way has led the reader to believe that Amadís merely cursed the defenseless although culpable old man rather than killed him. Montalvo apparently felt that killing a defenseless old man or even threatening him with death was not proper behavior in so chivalrous a knight as Amadís, and therefore emended the text.

Example 6 (Paragraph IIIf)
(Purposeful equivocation by Montalvo)

A second example of purposeful equivocation on the part of Montalvo for reasons of propriety, but devoted adherence to the letter of the lore on the part Algaba in the Hebrew text occurs when Amadís's faithful buy ugly dwarf, Ardián, tells as present men and women, that he wished to escape from the locale before the arrival of that devilish enchanter Arcaláus, who has previously strung the poor dwarf up by one leg (upon which he still has trouble walking) above stiflingly malodorous burning sulphur, the result being, as he says (*Montalvo-Place*, p.177, lines 283-285 [italics mine]): «que nunca he hecho sino esternudar y ahun otra cosa peor». What this *Ahun otra cosa peor* refers to may readily be imagined but it is not explicitly stated in Montalvo's revised *Amadís*. However, the Hebrew version true to the translator's intent, does not shirk from revealing the received text. The Jewish dwarf says to those assembled around him (*Algaba, Z. M.*, p. 122, line 10 [italics mine]):

שעד עתה הייתי יושב ומעטש וגם מוציא רוחות מלמטה
(que hasta agora me siento y me esternudo y me pedo).

Example 7 (Paragraph IIIg)
(Purposeful equivocation by Montalvo)

King Perión and Queen Helisena (previous to the time when Amadís finds out that they are his parents) come upon the Donzel del Mar (Amadís) red-eyed and in tears. Amadís, of course, has been pining away for Oriana, but his hosts the king and queen do not know that and thus the queen asks Amadís's faithful *escudero*, Gandalín: «Amigo, qué ouo vuestro señor, que me parece en su semblante ser en gran triesteza? ¿es por algún *descontentamiento* que aya hauído?» (*Montalvo-Place*, p. 72, lines 437-441 [italics mine]). Although the word *descontentamiento* may be equivocal for the reader here, Gandalín nevertheless apparently immediately understands the implication and answers (*Montalvo-Place*, p. 72, lines 442-443): «-Señora- aquí recibe él mucha honrra y merced...» It is evident from Gandalín's answer that her question regarding Amadís's possible *descontentamiento* must have something to do with *honrra* and *merced*, but exactly *what* we do not know. It becomes clear from Algaba's Hebrew version that it is not the queen who asks Gandalín a vague question about a possible *descontentamiento*, but the king who asks Gandalín a specific question, namely (*Algaba, Z. M.*, p. 50, lines 3-4): «[מה] זה ועל מה זה הוא בוכה, כי המלך חשב שהוא בוכה על שאינם מכבדים אותו כפי גבורתו» («¿qué será esto y porqué llora?, pues creía el rey que lloraría porque no le hauían honrrado conforme a sus caballerías»). Thus here again Algaba's Hebrew translation has clarified Montalvo's purposeful equivocation.

Example 8 (Paragraph IIIh)
(Purposeful equivocation by Montalvo)

Again, previous to the time that King Perión finds out that Amadís is his son, he finds out that the ring that he previously gave to Helisena somehow now belongs to the Donzel del Mar (Amadís). Thus he «ouo sospecha de reyna, que la gran bondad del Donzel del Mar, *junto con la su muy demasiada hermosura, no la ouissen puesto en algùn pensamiento indeuido* (Montalvo-Place, p. 84, lines 61-66 [italics mine]). With the euphemism *algùn pensamiento indeuido* Montalvo has changed the more direct suspicion expressed in Algaba's Hebrew version, namely (*Algaba, Z. M.*, p. 57, last line; p. 58, line 1 [italics mine]): המלך חשד על המלכה רעה: במעשי נער הים ורוב ויופי המלכה לא יבערי רשפי אהבה ביניהם: (el rey ouo sospecha de la reyna: con los fechos del Donzel del Mar y la gran hermosura de la reina, ¿no se ayan brotado chispas damor [entrellos]?)

Example 9 (Paragraph IIIi)
(Clarification based upon Algaba's Hebrew text)

El Donzel del Mar [Amadís] arrives at the castle of the knight Galpano «que era el más valiente y esforçado en armas que en todas aquellas partes se fallaua» (*Montalvo-Place*, p. 56, lines 492-494) but whose terrible custom was to rape all women, *dueñas y donzellas*, who happened to pass by and after raping them he obliged them to swear «que entanto que él biuiesse no tomassen otro amigo; si no lo hazían descaueçabalas» (*Montalvo-Place*, p. 56, lines 508-511). He also obliged each knight who passed by to fight against two of his brothers. If the knight defeated the brothers he was finally obliged to fight with Galpano, who was always victorious. If the defeated knight did not swear, from then on, to call himself «el vecino del Galpano», Galpano cut off his head and «*tomándoles quanto trayan* [from the ones who acceded to his demands] *se hauían de yr de pie*» *indeuido* (*Montalvo-Place*, p. 56, lines 518-521 [italics mine]). The underlined expressions *tomándoles quanto trayan* and *se hauían de yr de pie* suggest that Galpano took from these vanquished knights all of their possessions, including their horses, and kicked them out. But, apparently, that was not all, for from Algaba's Hebrew text we find that Montalvo's *quanto trayan* is insultingly all-inclusive, for Galpano היה לוקח נכסיו וכליו ומלבושו וסוסו והיה שולח אותו ערום על רגליו (*Algaba, Z. M.*, p. 37, last line; p. 38, line 1) or, in Spanish translation (tomáule [al caullero vençido] sus posesiones y sus armas y su traje y su cauallu y mandaualo yrse *desnudo* a pie) [italics mine].

Example 10 (Paragraph IIIj)
(Clarification based upon Algaba's Hebrew text)

When Darioleta is planning Helisena's amorous rendezvous with King Perión she tells her mistress that at the end of that rendezvous, «*qunado sazón sea de salir yo vos llamaré y [vos] tornaré a vuestra cama*» (*Montalvo-Place*, p. 16, lines 341-343 [italics mine]). Indeed, Darioleta «que vió ser sazón de yr de allí» enter's King's chamber and

tells Helisena «conuiene que os leuantéys y vayamos, que ya tiempo es» (*Montalvo-Place*, p. 20, lines 176-182 [italics mine]). Although nowhere in Montalvo's version of this episode is the appropriate time for Helisena to leave King Perión's chamber specifically indicated, it is specifically indicated in Algaba's Hebrew version when Darioleta enters the King's chamber in order to rouse Helisena and to lead her back to her own quarters; namely *at dawn*: *כי הגיע השחר* or in Spanish translation «pues ha salido la estrella matutina» (*Algaba, Z. M.*, p. 9, line 26). Thus from Algaba, but not from Montalvo, we are able to determine that Helisena remained all night with Perión in revelry.

In order to show that Algaba was no doubt following his source when he indicated that Helisena left Perión at dawn, and that Montalvo, possibly for reasons of propriety, did not choose to state definitively the time of Helisena's parting, let us consider a similar parting scene –specifically at dawn- that of Amadís when he takes leave of Oriana (*Montalvo-Place*, p. 129, lines 541-546) he having remained outside her window. Both of these parting scenes are so similar in language and content that they oblige us to accept readily the idea that Helisena's parting from Perión took place at dawn, as is indicated by Algaba.

Parting scene of Helisena and Perión (*Montalvo-Place*, p. 20, lines 176-182 [italics mine], complete sequence)

1. «Darioleta [donzella]
2. *que vió ser sazón de yr de allí*
3. dixo:
4. Señora, sé que otra vez *os plugo* conmigo más que no agora
5. mas conuiene que os leuantéys que *ya tiemp es»*

Parting scene of Amadís and Oriana (*Montalvo-Place*, p. 129, lines 541-546 [italics mine], complete sequence)

1. «Gandalín [escudero]
2. que la mañana vido llegar
3. dixo:
4. Señor, como quiera que *vos dello non plega*
5. *el día, que cerca viene nos* costríne a partir daquí»

In both of these parting scenes in Algaba's Hebrew version of the *Amadís* (*Algaba, Z. M.*, p. 9, lines 23-26 and p. 89, lines 18-19) specific reference is made to the morning star in the first *כי הגיע השחר* (pues ha llegado la estrella matutina) and in the second *כי עלה השחר* or in Spanish translation (pues se ha alzado la estrella matutina).

As if to call further attention to the appropriate time for Helisena to leave Perión's chamber, King Garinter, Helisena's father, unknowingly facilitates the illicit rendezvous by moving out of Perión's chamber (which he had shared with him) telling Perión: «Mi señor, yo tengo muchas cosas de librar en mi mazienda, y *leuántome a la hora de los*

maytines, y por vos no dar enojo tengo por bien que quedéys solo en la cámara» (*Montalvo-Place*, p. 16, lines 400-405).

Example 11 (Paragraph IIIk)

(Clarification based upon Algaba's Hebrew text)

Galuanes, on behalf of himself, his nephew Agrajes, and their men, has challenged the duke of Bristoya and his men to do battle. He thereupon says to his nephew, Agrajes: «Sobrino, nos hemos desafiado al duque, aguardemos aquí [in the *floresta que llaman Arunda*] y prenderlo hemos, y alguno otro que passare» (*Montalvo-Place*, p. 148, lines 505-508 [italics mine]). The latter underlined expression *y alguno otro que passare* is unintelligible or, at best, equivocal within the context for it seems to suggest that Galuanes and Agrajes intend to grab, in addition to the duke himself, anyone else who may pass by. But why grab anyone else unless he is part of the duke's band. If we interpret the underlined phrase *y alguno otro que passare* to mean «anyone else of the duke's band as he comes by» then we are indeed mistaken if Algaba's Hebrew text is to be given credence at this point for we find there the following (*Algaba, Z. M.*, p. 103, lines 17-18 [italics mine]):

ויאמר גאלבאניש לאגראנגיז : "אני נדרתי מלחמה עם השר : תמתין⁴⁰ בזה [בשדה שקוראים ארונדה] ונתפשה כשיעבור ובתוך זה נקבץ גבורים עמנו לעזרתנו"

(Y dixole Galuanes a Agrajes: «Yo he desafiado al duque. Aguardad y prenderlo hemos quando passare, y dentro desta [la floresta que llaman Arunda] *recojamos a caualleros que nos ayudaren*»).

Here Algaba seems to have unearthed auxiliaries for Galuanes and Agrajes *ex nihilo*. But again Alagaba has without doubt steadfastly rendered into Hebrew what he found in his Spanish source text and it is Montalvo who has introduced equivocations. For just such auxiliaries as are mentioned by Algaba here are referred to previously (*Montalvo-Place*, p. 147, lines 477-481 [italics mine]) where in his challenge to the duke Galuanes has specifically said: «Yo os desafío, por ende, por mí y por todos *los caualleros que me ayudar quisieren*».

Example 12 (Paragraph IIIl)

(Montalvo muddles the text, Algaba's text Clarifies)

Galaor asks a *donzella* (*Montalvo-Place*, p. 188, lines 92-95 [italics mine]), «¿por ventura vistas vn cauallero que va vn cauallo vayo y lieua vn escudo blanco y vna flor bermeja?» In Galaor's Spanish question the underlined phrase is equivocal and, as it turns out, elliptical. The meaning of the underlined phrase becomes clear when we consider the equivalent passage in Algaba's Hebrew text (*Algaba, Z. M.*, p. 130, line 9 [italics mine]):

הראית גבור אחד בדרך שבאת ויש לו מגן אחד לבן ובו שושן אחת אדומה?
 (¿por ventura vistas en vuestra trauesía cauallero que lieua vn escudo blanco y *en él* vna liria bermeja?)

The red flower is, of course, not carried by the warrior together with the shield but is, rather, *represented* on the shield. The pre-Montalvo text should probably read «vn escudo blanco y vna flor bermeja en él». If further evidence were needed we could refer to the shield of Florestán, the half-brother of Amadís and of Galaor, which is represented in Montalvo's text as «vn escudo bermejo y ods leones pardos *en él...*» (*Montalvo-Place*, p. 322, lines 123-124 [italics mine]) and in the equivalent Hebrew passage of Algaba we find: שני אריות מצויינים וְהָיוּ בְּמַגְנוֹ הֵיחָד אָדוּם (su escudo era bermejo y haviá dos leones grauados *en él*) (*Algaba, Z. M.*, p. 214, line 22 [italics mine]).

Example 13 (Paragraph IIIIm)

(A clarification found in Algaba's Hebrew text)

When King Lisuarte, father of Oriana, arrives in la Gran Bretaña as successor to his brother Falangriz's kingdom «halló algunos que lo estoruaron como hazer se suele en semejantes casos, y por esta causa no se membró de su hija por algún tiempo [nor did his wife Brisena, who accompanied him]...» (*Montalvo-Place*, p. 39, lines 28-32). The implication of King Lisuarte's (and especially Brisena's) lack of involvement with their ten-year-old daughter will be discussed below in Paragraph IV, but for now let us consider these enemies and what happened to them as a result of their opposition to King Lisuarte. Montalvo makes no further mention of what happened to them but his received text must have indicated what happened to them for in Algaba's Hebrew text we find the following details: וְהָרַג [לִישׁוּאֵרְטִין] מֵהֶם וּמֵהֶם אָסַר בְּבֵית הָאֶסְוֵרִים⁴¹ (dellos mató [Lisuarte] y dellos hizo prisioneros) (*Algaba, Z. M.*, p. 24, line 7).

Paragraph IV

(Plausability of the correctness of apparent errors in Algaba's text)

In Algaba's Hebrew text (*Algaba, Z. M.*, p.27, lines 10-21) in a passage wherein the Hebrew text coincides very closely with Montalvo's Spanish text except for the differences to be discussed below, there are three references to Queen Helisena of Gaula, who is distrougt over the disappearance of her son, Amadís. On all three occasions the references to Queen Helisena in Montalvo's Spanish refundition are two the sister of Queen Dueña de la Guirnalda; namely (*Montalvo-Place*, p. 44, line 354, “su hermana [de la reyna Dueña de la Guirnalda]”; lines 359-360, “essa hermana de la reyna [Dueña de la Guirnalda]”; and, finally, lines 372-373, “aquella hermana de la reyna Dueña de la Guirnalda”).

Whereas Algaba's first reference to Queen Helisena coincides exactly with Montalvo's reference to her (*Algaba, Z. M.*, p.27, line 12, אחותה = su hermana [de la

reina Dueña de la Guirnalda]) the second and third references seem strange indeed. For in the second reference, in a question directed at Oriana by Amadís (he does not yet know that Queen Helisena is his own mother), he refers to the queen as דודתך =vuestra tía [de Oriana] (*Algaba, Z. M.*, p. 27, line 13) and in the final reference to Queen Helisena in the answer to Amadís, Oriana refers to Queen Helisena as אמי = mi madre (*Algaba, Z. M.*, p. 27, line 17).

Now these two familial appellations are apparently completely incorrect for Oriana is without any doubt whatever the daughter of Queen Brisena and King Lisuarte who are not at all related by blood or by marriage to Queen Helisena or to Queen Dueña de la Guirnalda. Furthermore, although Amadís is, at this point in the narrative, unaware of his own genealogy he is nevertheless surely aware of that of Oriana. How, then, it may be asked, is it possible for such “errors” to have cropped up in Algaba’s Hebrew text? We have maintained, and shall continue to maintain, that Algaba studiously attempts to render into Hebrew a faithful translation of the Spanish text before him, except for some changes he introduces that have to do with Christian religious elements⁴² and explanations of a few terms and concepts for his Jewish readers⁴³. Thus one may be assured that the terms דודתך =vuestra tía and אמי = mi madre in this context already existed in the Spanish pre-Montalvo text and were not introduced by Algaba. The question at hand thus becomes: how is it possible for Amadís to speak of Queen Helisena as Oriana’s aunt and for Oriana to refer to Dueña de la Guirnalda as her own mother?

Let us first consider Oriana’s referring to Dueña de la Guirnalda as her mother. As has been mentioned above (see example 13, Paragraph IIIIm) King Lisuarte, Oriana’s father, was called to the throne of his brother, Falangriz, upon the latter’s death. He took with him his wife, Brisena, and their ten-year-old daughter, Oriana, and set out in a ship for his new kingdom. Before his arrival there he visited the land of King Languines and Queen Dueña de la Guirnalda. Since Oriana had become seasick on the trip, she was left with King Languines and his queen, Dueña de la Guirnalda, while Oriana’s father, King Lisuarte, took along his wife Brisena and went off to protect his newly-acquired kingdom against revolutionaries. The child, Oriana, remained with King Languines and Queen Dueña de la Guirnalda for a long time, because due to King Lisuarte’s pacification program «no se membró de su hija [Oriana] por algún tiempo» (*Montalvo-Place*, p. 39, lines 31-32) until he sent Galdar de Rascuyl to fetch her much later (*Montalvo-Place*, p. 66, lines 7-10). When Queen Dueña de la Guirnalda offered to keep Oriana and to bring her up during the time that her father was away protecting his kingdom she pointedly said to Oriana’s parents: «Creed que la yo guardaré como su madre lo haría» (*Montalvo-Place*, p. 39, lines 24-25 [italics mine]) or as the Hebrew version has it “תדעו באמת שאני = «Creed verdaderamente que yo la guardaré como su madre» (*Algaba, Z. M.*, p. 24, line 4). It is not difficult to imagine, under these circumstances, that the young Oriana would consider Queen Dueña de la Guirnalda to be quite like another mother and to refer to her as mi madre or, in Hebrew אמי. Amadís then, knowing that

Oriana called Queen Dueña de la Guirnalda «mi madre» would naturally refer to Queen Helisena the sister of Queen Dueña de la Guirnalda, as «vuestra tía» or, in Hebrew דודתך. The two apparent errors in Algaba's text explained and justified here, reinforce the idea that the Hebrew translator steadfastly maintained the pre-Montalvo text while Montalvo as is known, emended the text where it so pleased him.

SUMMARY

The Hebrew *Amadís*, Book I, published c. 1540 in Constantinople is not, as has long been generally assumed, one more among the many versions, adaptations or translations of Montalvo's refabricated *editio princeps* of *Amadís* of 1508, but is rather the Hebrew translation of the *Amadís*, Book I, probably used by Montalvo as the basis for his revised version, or is the Hebrew translation of an *Amadís*, Book I, very similar to Montalvo's lost source. This article is limited to showing that on the basis of the Hebrew translation *six specific erros* and *three probable erros* introduced into the Montalvo refundition may be corrected; that *thirteen passages* in the Montalvo version that have either been changed, suppressed, explained away or purposely muddles there, probably due to feelings of propriety, may be clarified and restored; and that an apparent error in the Hebrew text referring to the familial relationship of Oriana turns out, after analysis, to conform completely to the spirit of the narrative.

Notes

¹ For purposes of this study I utilized a microfilm copy of the work by Yaakov de Algaba, *Amadís de Gaula*, Book I (in Hebrew) (Constantinople [?] Eliezer Soncino, n. d., c. 1540, obtained from the British Museum. The title page of the work reads as follows:

אמאדיש די גאולה/ ספר כולל ספורים גדולים ונפלאים/
 כמו ענייני מלחמות וגבורות מאנשי השם/ ועסקי אהבה
 ודברי הימים ממלכים גדולים/
 ואני צעיר המחוקקים אליעזר בכר' גרשם/ שונצין ז"ל
 השתדלתי בהעתקתו מלעז ללשון/ הקדש והעתיקו הנכון
 הרופא בר' יעקב/ בכר' משה די אלגבה יצר

The British Museum identification numbers are: Department O. P. B. + MSS, Cat no. C. 50 b 29. No page numbers are discernable on the microfilm copy. I have therefore ascribed page numbers from 1-165, incl., to the work. Page 1 is the title page; p. 2 is the author's introduction; the text begins on p. 3 and ends on p. 165. After completing the transcription of the microfilm copy of the British Museum, I learned that Algaba's *Amadís* has recently (1981) been published in a second edition by Zvi Malachi (The Katz Research Institute for Hebrew Literature, The Rosenberg School of Jewish Studies, Tel Aviv University, Israel), a critical edition of the Hebrew text together with an introduction in Hebrew. The text adheres closely to the original text of Algaba: The editor has modernized the spelling somewhat, has corrected apparent errors, has resolved abbreviations, has added some notes to help the modern reader of the sixteenth century text, and has added modern punctuation. Since this second edition is, needless to say, more readily available than the original of c. 1540, references to and citations from the Hebrew *Amadís* will be from this second edition, abbreviated *Algaba, Z. M.*, followed by page number [and line number]. However, the original text of c. 1540 will, except where otherwise noted, be followed.

² For purposes of this article all citations from Montalvo's *Amadís* are from the accessible critical edition of that work by E. B. Place (ed.), *Amadís de Gaula*. Edición y anotación. Reimpresión aumentada [anastática] (Madrid, C. S. I. C., 1971), vol. I, abbreviated *Montalvo-Place*, followed by page number(s) and line number(s). For the mention of a possible 1496 edition see *Montalvo-Place*, p. xvii-xviii.

³ As far as I know all but one of the previous commentators who have concerned themselves with the Hebrew *Amadís* including Zvi Malachi (see note 1 above) have assumed or have argued that the Hebrew *Amadís* of Algaba is based on Montalvo's refundition of 1508. Until now the only commentator who claimed the Hebrew *Amadís* is a pre-Montalvo version was Theophilo Braga, «Versão hebraica do *Amadís de Gaula*» in *Trebalhos da Academia de Ciencias de Portugal*, primeira serie, tomo II, segunda parte, 1915, pp. 1-21; primeira serie, tomo III 1916, pp. 1-26, Coimbra, Portugal. Braga was correct in insisting that the Hebrew *Amadís* is based upon a pre-Montalvo version, even though the evidence he used to back up this assertion was faulty, to say the least. He was far off the mark when he stated that the Hebrew *Amadís* was begun in Leiria, Portugal, interrupted, and then brought to Constantinople to be finished. For a full discussion of Braga's relation to the Hebrew *Amadís* see my forthcoming book. Sir Henry Thomas, in his *Spanish and Portuguese Romances of Chivalry* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press 1920), pp. 61-63, sarcastically belittled Braga's opinions regarding the Hebrew *Amadís*, and since then nobody has sided with Braga until now.

^{3bis} For a list and a discussion of these additions, adaptations and translations, see *Montalvo-Place*, pp. xvii-li.

⁴ In this first series of side by side citations, as well as in all of the subsequent ones to be found in this article, all texts are complete (except where a three dot interruption is indicated) and all are in the proper sequence found in the original. In my attempt to show the correspondences among the texts I have, at times, allowed spaces to intervene between lines. In no instance does a space between the lines indicate that any part of the text has been transposed.

⁵ The *editio princeps* (Zaragoza , George Coci, 1508) reads *estana* here. E. B. Place, the modern editor of the critical edition (see note 2) apparently corrected the word *estatua* he found in the original edition to *estauan*, trying to make some sense out of the passage.

⁶ *Algaba, Z. M.*, corrects the text to read **ומצא את הננס**.

⁷ *Algaba, Z. M.*, corrects the text to **של ברזל**.

⁸ *Algaba, Z. M.*, modernizes the spelling to **תיקח**.

⁹ *Algaba, Z. M.*, modernizes the spelling to **נותנת**.

¹⁰ *Algaba, Z. M.*, reads **שהלחה** here.

¹¹ *Algaba, Z. M.*, modernizes the spelling to **גילתה**.

^{12bis} In both Montalvo's and Algaba's text there is confusion regarding the head of Galpano and his helmet, which clearly indicates that this confusion existed in the pre-Montalvo text.

¹² *Algaba, Z. M.*, modernizes the spelling to **ויבוא**.

¹³ *Algaba, Z. M.*, makes the obvious correction to the original text which read **בא** (*Algaba*, ed. of c. 1540, p. 40, line 13)

¹⁴ *Algaba, Z. M.*, incorrectly renders the name of the king as **ואצאין**. The name should read **ואבאין**.

¹⁵ *Algaba, Z. M.*, modernizes the spelling to **לאמור**.

¹⁶ For further illustration of this point, see Paragraphs IIc and IIIj, below.

¹⁷ For a full discussion of when that time comes about, see Paragraph IIIj, below.

¹⁸ *Algaba, Z. M.*, modernizes the spelling to **כשתיראה**.

¹⁹ See Paragraphs IIb and IIIj.

²⁰ Cfr. the expression *quando tiempo fuere*, above in this Paragraph IIb and Paragraph IIIj.

²¹ *Montalvo-Place*, p. 11, lines 6-7.

²² *Algaba, Z. M.*, corrects to **והתבונן**. Here, as again in Paragraph IIIb, Montalvo introduces significant changes in the middle of a sentence.

- ²³ *Algaba, Z. M.*, corrects the spelling to גאלאור.
- ^{23bis} The Hebrew reads הגבור here, but the context demands גאלאור.
- ²⁴ *Algaba, Z. M.*, corrects the spelling to גאלאור.
- ²⁵ *Algaba, Z. M.*, modernizes the spelling to הישמר.
- ²⁶ *Algaba*, ed. of c. 1540 p. 134 line 30, reads וכשראתהו here, an obvious error corrected by the modern editor, Zvi Malachi.
- ²⁷ *Algaba, Z. M.*, modernizes the spelling to להינצל.
- ²⁸ *Algaba, Z. M.*, modernizes the spelling to מאוד.
- ²⁹ *Algaba, Z. M.*, סיפר.
- ³⁰ *Algaba, Z. M.*, modernizes the spelling to ארקאלאוש.
- ³¹ *Algaba, Z. M.*, modernizes the spelling to להיעשות.
- ^{31bis} *Algaba, Z. M.*, modernizes the spelling to לאדאשין.
- ³² *Algaba, Z. M.*, modernizes the spelling to מאוד.
- ³³ *Algaba, Z. M.*, modernizes the spelling to לנשוך.
- ³⁴ *Algaba, Z. M.*, modernizes the spelling to מיטה.
- ³⁵ In *Algaba, Z. M.*, we find the two words, יכול היה reversed and rendered as יכול היה.
- ³⁶ *Algaba, Z. M.*, corrects to אעזבך.
- ³⁷ *Algaba, Z. M.*, corrects to תיזור.
- ³⁸ *Algaba, Z. M.*, changes the spelling to מאירלאנדה.
- ³⁹ *Algaba, Z. M.*, modernizes the spelling to מיטה.
- ⁴⁰ *Algaba, Z. M.*, corrects to נמתין.
- ⁴¹ *Algaba, Z. M.*, unaccountably misreads the text here, rendering אסר as שם אסר.
- ⁴² A typical example, among many, of Algaba's reluctance in mentioning elements that have to do with Christian practices or with Christians occurs where Algaba voids mentioning that King Perión brings together men of the cloth, *obispos* and *clérigos*, to interpret a dream he has had (*Montalvo-Place*, p. 25, lines 14 and 16). Algaba merely mentions that the men are merely חכמים = sabidores.

⁴³ Algaba explains the meaning of knighthood for his Jewish readers, a parenthesis that does not appear in Montalvo's version. Algaba writes (*Algaba, Z. M.*, p. 24, lines 22-24):

שבאותו הזמן היתה דת אחת ששום איש לא היה אוחז כלי מלחמה ולא נקרא גבור עד שמלך*
אחד יקימנו לגבור. ובעת הקמתו היו עושים משתה גדול ושמחה גדולה ומשם נקרא גבור.

* (*Algaba's* c. 1540 text has שהמלך where *Algaba, Z. M.*, reads מלך.)