

The Medieval Franciscans • Volume 2

Friars and Jews in the Middle Ages and Renaissance

Edited by

Steven J. McMichael

& Susan E. Myers



BRILL

FRIARS AND JEWS IN THE MIDDLE AGES AND
RENAISSANCE

THE MEDIEVAL FRANCISCANS

GENERAL EDITOR

STEVEN J. McMICHAEL

University of St. Thomas

VOLUME 2



FRIARS AND JEWS IN THE MIDDLE AGES AND RENAISSANCE

EDITED BY

STEVEN J. McMICHAEL

AND

SUSAN E. MYERS



BRILL
LEIDEN • BOSTON
2004

On the cover: illustration from the xvth century manuscript of Bonaventure's *Legenda Maior* in the Museo Francescano, Rome. © Museo Francescano.

Brill Academic Publishers has done its best to establish rights to use of the materials printed herein. Should any other party feel that its rights have been infringed we would be glad to take up contact with them.

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Friars and Jews in the Middle Ages and Renaissance / edited by Steven J. McMichael and Susan E. Myers.

p. cm. — (The medieval Franciscans, ISSN 1572-6991 ; v. 2)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 90-04-11398-3

1. Antisemitism—Europe, Western—History—To 1500—Congresses. 2. Jews—Europe, Western—History—To 1500—Congresses. 3. Friars—Europe, Western—History—To 1500—Congresses. 4. Christianity and antisemitism—Europe, Western—History—Congresses. 5. Europe, Western—Ethnic relations—Congresses. I. Myers, Susan E. II. McMichael, Steven J. III. Series.

DS146.E85F75 2004

261.2'6'09—dc22

2004046643

ISSN 1572-6991

ISBN 90 04 11398 3

© Copyright 2004 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

*Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910
Danvers, MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change.*

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

Introduction.....	vii
Contributors	xv
E. RANDOLPH DANIEL, Abbot Joachim of Fiore and the Conversion of the Jews	1
DAVID BURR, The Antichrist and the Jews in Four Thirteenth-Century Apocalypse Commentaries	23
WILLIAM CHESTER JORDAN, Archbishop Eudes Rigaud and the Jews of Normandy, 1248–1275	39
LARRY J. SIMON, Intimate Enemies: Mendicant-Jewish Interaction in Thirteenth-Century Mediterranean Spain	53
NANCY L. TURNER, Jews and Judaism in Peter Auriol's <i>Sentences</i> Commentary	81
GIACOMO TODESCHINI, Franciscan Economics and Jews in the Middle Ages: From a Theological to an Economic Lexicon.....	99
CHRISTOPHER OCKER, Contempt for Friars and Contempt for Jews in Late Medieval Germany	119
DAVID J. VIERA, The Evolution of Francesc Eiximenis's Attitudes Toward Judaism.....	147
MARK D. MEYERSON, Samuel of Granada and the Dominican Inquisitor: Jewish Magic and Jewish Heresy in Post-1391 Valencia	161
THOMAS M. IZBICKI, Leonardo Dati's Sermon on the Circumcision of Jesus (1417)	191
STEVEN J. McMICHAEL, OFM CONV., Alfonso de Espina on the Mosaic Law	199
ROBERTO RUSCONI, Anti-Jewish Preaching in the Fifteenth Century and Images of Preachers in Italian Renaissance Art	225
ARIEL TOAFF, Jews, Franciscans, and the First <i>Monti di Pietà</i> in Italy (1462–1500)	239
KENNETH R. STOW, Papal Mendicants or Mendicant Popes: Continuity and Change in Papal Policies toward the Jews at the end of the Fifteenth Century	255

JOHN EDWARDS, The Friars and the Jews: Messianism in Spain and Italy <i>Circa</i> 1500	273
ANNA FOA, <i>Limpieza</i> versus Mission: Church, Religious Orders, and Conversion in the Sixteenth Century	299
Index	313

INTRODUCTION

On October 26–28 of 1997, a conference was held at St. Louis University with the title “The Friars and Jews in the Middle Ages and Renaissance.” The idea for a conference originated in a conversation between Darleen Pryds, Deeana Klepper, and Steven McMichael at the Newberry Library in Chicago a year prior to the event. They were reflecting on the number of studies that had come out during the previous two decades on the theme of the friars and Jews, and how important it would be to gather some of the major scholars in this area of research in a conference form.

Clearly, gratitude should be extended to Jeremy Cohen, whose book *The Friars and the Jews: The Evolution of Medieval Anti-Judaism* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1982) became the foundation and catalyst for further research into the subject. His book asserts that the friars took an innovative approach to the question of the role of the Jews in Christendom in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

The enclosed articles represent the major areas in which scholars are working with regard to the friars’ preaching to and writing about the Jews in the Middle Ages and Renaissance. These articles span the time between the early years of the mendicant orders (around the turn of the thirteenth century) to the sixteenth century. They cover a wide range of topics, including preaching, theology, exegesis, economics, popes and papal legislation, and literature.

The volume begins with an examination of the career and exegesis of the late twelfth-century Abbot Joachim of Fiore. E. Randolph Daniel traces what can be known of the abbot’s life, and addresses the charge made by Gaufrid of Auxerre, contemporary of Joachim and secretary to Bernard of Clairvaux, that Joachim had been born a Jew but concealed this fact throughout his life. Daniel rejects the charge, but suggests that Gaufrid’s conclusions were reached in part by his knowledge of Joachim’s exegesis of the Hebrew Scriptures. Although Joachim is critical of Jews as “carnal” and believes they are blind to the correct, spiritual understanding of the scriptures, he saves his sharpest criticisms for “carnal” Christians who are desirous of things of the world. Unlike others in the late twelfth century, Joachim did not demonize Jews but held out the hope that Jews would be converted to Christianity at the end of time, according to God’s plan. Daniel’s essay draws attention to

a new trend in Franciscan apocalyptic literature in which the end was seen as dawning, and hope was held out for the conversion of Jews to Christianity.

David Burr continues this theme with an essay that examines four thirteenth-century commentaries on the Book of Revelation, at least two by Franciscans. Included in these commentaries is a view of the Jews as providing the ancestry for the antichrist in the coming apocalyptic crisis, a view that had become standard. In addition, however, these commentaries divide church history into seven periods, the sixth of which, the age of the antichrist, is present on the horizon. Burr's greatest contribution is his examination of the commentary by Peter John Olivi, who radicalizes the approaches of the earlier three. Like his predecessors, Olivi is actually more interested in castigating Christians than condemning Jews, and even assigns the role of the antichrist to the papal office. Olivi thought that the world was entering a new, more spiritual era, thanks to the rise of the mendicant orders and the exegesis of Joachim of Fiore. With Joachim, Olivi believed that the Jewish people would eventually find salvation through conversion to Christianity. Because of his criticisms of the papacy, Olivi's ideas were rejected and the idea of the Jews as the antichrist, present in the more popular illustrated manuscripts of the Book of Revelation, came to prevail.

William Chester Jordan responds to the recent scholarly assertion that there are two factors that point to a major negative shift in the representation and treatment of Jews in the High Middle Ages, the emphasis on the "reasonableness" of Catholic Christianity among scholastic theologians and the rise of the mendicant orders with their vitriolic denunciation of usury. Jews, according to this interpretation, came to be regarded as lacking in reason and therefore "less human" for their failure to convert, and the predominance of moneylending as an occupation among them in the thirteenth century undermined traditional ecclesiastical notions of their proper place in Christian society. Jordan examines the important scholastic theologian and extremely influential Franciscan archbishop of Rouen, Eudes Rigaud, concluding that Eudes' own attitudes do not support this assertion. Eudes dismissed the idea that Jews were innately irrational and therefore lacking full humanity, and rejected arbitrary anti-Jewish violence. Instead, he sought repeatedly to encourage the conversion of Jews to Christianity.

In an attempt to understand the daily interactions between Jews and members of mendicant orders, Larry J. Simon examines several docu-

ments from thirteenth-century Mediterranean Spain, focusing in particular on Mallorca. These texts reveal theological confrontations, various interactions, and a comparative lack of business relations between Jews and mendicants, living, as they did, in close proximity. Simon notes the exchange of property between Jewish individuals and mendicant orders, as well as disputes ranging from how to recognize the coming of the Messiah to the problems resulting from the construction of a new synagogue near a Franciscan church. The evidence indicates a great deal of interaction between Jews and the mendicant orders, and the tensions that resulted.

Nancy L. Turner turns to the fourteenth-century French Franciscan Peter Auriol, who presents a thorough and extensive discussion of many issues concerning Jews and Judaism in the course of his *Sentences* commentary. Auriol discusses at length when and why baptism came to replace circumcision, as well as whether and how circumcision conferred grace. Along with an explicit and in-depth examination of the superiority of the new law over the old, Auriol's commentary also contains an analysis of the first-century Jews' knowledge of Christ's divinity and argues that the Jews were motivated by unmitigated envy and malice when they called for Christ's crucifixion. As a result of Auriol's lack of respect for Judaism and Old Testament law as a religious system separate from Christianity, Auriol produces an excessively Christian-centric reading of nearly every aspect of Old Testament Judaism. Turner notes that it is perhaps not surprising, then, that Auriol refuses to take a clear stance against the forced baptism of Jewish adults or children by arguing that "interpreted consent" to baptism, regardless of the circumstances under which the consent is achieved, is sufficient for baptism to be considered valid.

Jewish moneylending is the focus of the essay by Giacomo Todeschini, who examines thirteenth- and fourteenth-century Franciscan economics and arguments on the socio-economic role of the Jews. In Franciscan writings from this period, the poverty of the Franciscan Order is seen as the economic ideal for Christian society. As a result, the Jews are stereotyped as enemies of Franciscan poverty, as supporters of a usury economy, and as dangerous to the Christian economic order because of their moneylending practices and abilities. There was, simultaneously, a prohibition of usury and an emphasis on usury as the only viable Jewish profession, since Jews were prohibited from jobs that could associate them with Christians. Todeschini concludes that the fifteenth-century Franciscan Observant preaching campaigns against

Jewish lending were the logical outcome of the Franciscan economic vision articulated earlier.

Christopher Ocker examines the relationships between Jews and members of the mendicant orders in late medieval Germany, and argues that the mendicant orders played no particular, unique role in the spread of anti-Jewish argument and feeling in that region. Rather, a wide range of popular beliefs and stories enflamed hostility toward the Jews, whose vulnerability in Germany was especially acute because of the fragmentation of political power in the Holy Roman Empire. The friars, for their part, were also on the defensive, trying to protect their prerogatives as a clerical group from clerical and secular opponents and reformers.

The work of the fourteenth- and early fifteenth-century Spanish Franciscan Francesc Eiximenis is the subject of David J. Viera's essay. Eiximenis defends Christianity over against Judaism by responding to Jewish criticisms of Jesus' origins and character. Writing in Catalan for a lay audience, Eiximenis avoids such subjects as the Trinity and transubstantiation, major issues in Jewish-Christian debates, by referring to their lofty nature. Although Eiximenis raises objections to Judaism, the most negative having been occasioned by reflection on idolatry, he rejects anti-Jewish violence, and became more tolerant of Jews and Judaism in his later years, when his emphasis shifted to apocalyptic concerns.

Mark D. Meyerson turns to the general topic of the Inquisition by examining the specific topic of charges of magic raised against the Jewish physician Samuel of Granada. Under suspicion in Valencia, Samuel was, nevertheless, a physician highly regarded by both Old Christians and New Christians. Accused of sorcery and necromancy, Samuel was also thought to be a baptized Christian who had relapsed and was now professing to be Jewish. Meyerson sets these events within the larger framework of the earlier initiatives of Dominican inquisitors against Jews and *conversos* in Valencia. The anti-Jewish measures reached their climax in the violence and forced conversions of 1391, but anti-Jewish sentiment then passed to the *conversos*. Meyerson notes that, despite this climate, witnesses in the case of Samuel were not antagonistic toward him, demonstrating a discrepancy between official Christian policy toward Jews and *conversos* and the practices of the general Christian population.

Thomas M. Izbicki examines the sermon of Leonardo Dati, delivered at the fifteenth-century Council of Constance on the Feast of the

Circumcision of Jesus, on the Lukan account of Jesus' circumcision, as well as several similar sermons on this topic. Dati addresses the topic of Jesus' circumcision, and of circumcision in general, as a sacramental sign, and builds on the ideas of others before him regarding circumcision as once having had validity but, with the coming of Jesus, rendered invalid and even harmful. Dati uses the circumcision of Jesus in order to make a moral claim: just as Jesus submitted to the divine law of circumcision, so also does it serve as a symbolic curb of concupiscence. In addition, Dati uses the theme of circumcision in order to criticize unworthy ecclesiastical leaders and claimants. Although circumcision is both a sign of God's faithfulness and a promised deliverance from sin, its lack of contemporary validity, except as a way of pointing Jews toward Jesus, suggests to Dati the attendant lack of validity of Judaism.

Another fifteenth-century author and preacher who attempted to address the question of the validity of Judaism was the Franciscan Alfonso de Espina, who gathered and synthesized the anti-Jewish writings of four centuries into his own polemic. Steven J. McMichael details the ways in which Alfonso focuses on teachings of the Hebrew Scriptures in order to prove to Jews the truth of Christian claims regarding Jesus and the superiority of the new covenant over the Mosaic law. In particular, Alfonso argues that the Mosaic law was no longer valid for Jews to observe; its purpose was to prepare for the coming of Jesus. Circumcision was not intended to be an eternal practice and its contemporary practice brought Jews under the wrath of God. The only positive value for the Mosaic law according to Alfonso was as a prefigurement of Christian claims.

The article by Roberto Rusconi provides a shift from textual evidence to the representation of Jews in Italian art of the fifteenth century. At this time there was a growing trend in religious paintings to represent preachers and preaching, and the saints of the first century of the Christian era were depicted in the style of contemporary preachers. The artwork depicts Christians listening with rapt attention to the preaching, in contrast to the hostile figures of neighboring Jews. Other artwork shows the rise of the antichrist, attended by obviously Jewish followers. The anti-Jewish orientation of the mainstream of popular preaching was reflected in Italian art of the fifteenth century in many, although often subtle and indirect, ways.

The essay of Ariel Toaff looks at the practice of banking and its relationship to Franciscan preaching in late fifteenth-century Italy, focusing

in particular on the example of Perugia, the site of the first *Monte di Pietà* and a city with a large and flourishing Jewish community. Toaff notes that the numerous *Monti di Pietà* in Italian cities were established after a prestigious Franciscan began preaching against the usurious activities of the local Jews. Upon threat of excommunication, the city would cancel their moneylending charters with Jewish bankers, at the same time establishing a *Monte di Pietà* to lend money without interest to the poor of the city. Despite apparent compliance by the city, the reality, as Toaff points out, was that the Jewish banks continued alongside the *Monti di Pietà*; indeed, the wealthy aristocratic families supported the Jewish bankers, investing in their banks and providing financial assistance to pay fines. Both *Monti di Pietà* and Jewish banks functioned side by side, each lending to a distinctive clientele.

In an examination of late medieval papal policies, Kenneth R. Stow asserts that there is no perceptible difference in the policies of mendicant and non-mendicant popes. He argues that the personal sentiment of popes was one thing, while policy, which was based on a venerable tradition that required safeguarding Jewish rights, was another matter. At Trent, in 1475, when the Jews were accused of murdering little Simonino, it was, indeed, a Franciscan pope and a Dominican cardinal who protested the Jews being denied due judicial process. Mendicant activity vis-à-vis the Jews was neither uniform nor extreme nor, with rare exceptions, was it innovative. Moreover, at Trent, those who sought to overturn Jewish rights were humanists and lawyers, as the contemporary Jewish historian Joseph ha-Kohen affirms—not mendicants. Nonetheless, constantly growing fears of an alleged Jewish social threat were testing the resolve of even the popes to preserve their traditional stance.

John Edwards traces, by examining surviving literary works as well as trial testimony, the rise in messianic fervor in Spain and Italy at the turn of the sixteenth century. On the political front, the rise to power of Isabella and Ferdinand in Spain was accompanied by an upsurge in political prophecy and messianism. Ferdinand was hailed as the future ruler of the world, who would establish Christianity and drive out non-Christians. The expulsion order of 1492 inspired Spain's Jews to messianic thought and action, while Christians, too, saw their era as part of the end of the age. The messianic movement seems to have been especially strong among *conversos*, who joined in the Jewish expectation that the Messiah would soon come. Spanish Franciscans also had strong

millenarian preoccupation with the New World discovered by Christopher Columbus. In Italy, the association of Rome, to which *conversos* from Spain were known to flee, with the Babylon of the Book of Revelation led to apocalyptic expectations. This is evidenced in Francisco Delicado's *Portrait of the Lozana*, which builds on the eschatological anxiety of the region.

The volume concludes with an essay by Anna Foa on the sixteenth-century practice in the Iberian Peninsula of *limpieza de sangre*, or the determination of the purity of blood of the New Christians of the region. Participation in ecclesiastical careers and entrance into colleges and religious orders was determined, not on religious faith, but on purity of blood, thus erecting a wall between Old and New Christians. The practice called into question the purpose of converting Jews at all, and was opposed by those who saw it as contrary to the universalist principles of Christianity. Foa notes that the Spanish and Portuguese Inquisitions did not originally adopt the policy of purity of blood, but it was the Jesuits who reconciled the opposed doctrines of conversion and its impossibility, as upheld by the idea of blood purity. While laws of purity were applied to membership in the Franciscan, Dominican, and Jesuit Orders, and the Dominicans were entrusted with the Portuguese Inquisition, it was, Foa argues, the contradictory policies of Ignatius and the Jesuits that ultimately dominated. Although Ignatius was personally opposed to laws of purity and supported conversionary efforts, he and other Jesuits defended the Inquisition, distinguishing between true and false conversions of Jews.

We wish to thank all those who made the conference and this book a possibility, especially those who financially supported the conference: Mrs. Wilma E. Messing, the Lucius N. Littauer Foundation, Rabbi Mark Shook and Temple Israel of Saint Louis, the Conventual Franciscans of Our Lady of Consolation Province, Aquinas Institute, and the Archdiocesan Ecumenical/Interfaith Commission of Saint Louis. We wish to thank the various jurisdictions of Saint Louis University who were so helpful and generous: The Marchetti Jesuit Endowment Fund, The Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, the History and Theological Studies Departments. Special thanks to certain individuals of Saint Louis University who supported the conference: Father Lawrence Biondi, S.J. and Shirley Dowdy, the Dean of College of Arts and Sciences, Michael Garanzini, S.J., William Shea and J.J. Mueller of the Department of Theological Studies, and Virginia Viehmann of Corporate and Foundation Support. Thanks to John Lamb of the

Theatre Department for his work on the programs and posters, secretaries Mary Boles and Lori Hunt of the Department of Theological Studies and Shirley Busch, secretary of the Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies. We wish also to thank participants at the conference whose papers are not included in this volume: Pamela Beattie, Jeremy Cohen, Marian J. Hollinger, John Y.B. Hood, Deeana Klepper, Philip D. Krey, Robert E. Lerner, and Franco Mormando, S.J. A special thanks goes to Philip Gavitt, who co-organized the conference and did so much to make the conference the tremendous event that it was.

This is the second volume in the series entitled *The Medieval Franciscans*, which was originally proposed by one of the senior editors of Brill Academic Publishers several years ago. A deep sense of gratitude is owed to the publisher who continues to inspire those of us who study the medieval Franciscan tradition to put down on paper what we are researching. We believe that this series will prove to be a major contribution to the world of Franciscan scholarship. Gratitude should also be extended to Marcella Mulder and Boris van Gool of the staff of Brill who were patient enough with us in the editorial process that we were finally able to finish this volume!

Steven J. McMichael and Susan E. Myers
Assisi and St. Paul

CONTRIBUTORS

David Burr is Professor of History at Virginia Technological University. He has published on the sacraments and the Spiritual Franciscans, including *Olivi and Franciscan Poverty: The Origins of the Usus Pauper Controversy* (1989) and *Olivi's Peaceable Kingdom: A Reading of the Apocalypse Commentary* (1993).

E. Randolph Daniel is Professor Emeritus of the University of Kentucky. His field is medieval history, especially Abbot Joachim of Fiore, the Franciscan Order, and medieval Apocalypticism.

John Edwards is currently a Faculty Research Fellow in Spanish at the University of Oxford. He has published extensively on the religious, social, and political history of fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century Spain, and most recently, *The Spanish Inquisition* (1999), and *The Spain of the Catholic Monarchs (1474–1520)* (2000).

Anna Foa is Professor of Modern History at the University of Rome, “La Sapienza.” She has published on sixteenth-century cultural history, the history of witchcraft, and problems of Jewish life and culture in this period. Her *Ebrei in Europa: dalla peste nera all’emancipazione XIV–XVIII secolo* (1992) appears in English as *The Jews of Europe after the Black Death* (2000).

Thomas M. Izbicki is Collection Development Coordinator at the Eisenhower Library, Johns Hopkins University. He specializes in medieval papalism, canon law, Nicholas of Cusa, and the Dominican Order. His recent publications include *Nicholas of Cusa and His Age: Intellect and Spirituality—Essays Dedicated to the Memory of F. Edward Cranz*, *Thomas P. McTighe and Charles Trinkaus*, ed. Thomas M. Izbicki and Christopher M. Bellitto (2002); *Three Tracts on Empire: Engelbert of Admont, Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini and Juan de Torquemada*, trans. Thomas M. Izbicki and Cary J. Nederman (2000).

William Chester Jordan is Professor of History and Director of the Program in Medieval Studies at Princeton University. Among his publications are *The French Monarchy and the Jews from Philip Augustus to the Last Capetians* (1989), *The Great Famine: Northern Europe in the Early Fourteenth*

Century (1996), which was awarded the Haskins Medal of the Medieval Academy of America in 2000, *Ideology and Royal Power in Medieval France: Kingship, Crusades and the Jews* (2001), and, most recently, *Europe in the High Middle Ages* (2001, 2003).

Steven J. McMichael, OFM Conv., is Assistant Professor in the Theology Department at the University of St. Thomas. He has published on the theology of Alfonso de Espina, and specializes in the relationship between Christianity and other religions, especially Judaism and Islam.

Mark D. Meyerson, Associate Professor at the University of Toronto, is author of *The Muslims of Valencia in the age of Fernando and Isabel: between coexistence and crusade* (1991), and, most recently, *A Jewish Renaissance in Fifteenth-Century Spain* (2004).

Christopher Ocker is Professor of Church History at the San Francisco Theological Seminary and the Graduate Theological Union. He is also an affiliated member of the History Department at the University of California at Berkeley and co-director of the Center for the Study of Religion and Culture. His most recent book, *Biblical Poetics before Humanism and Reformation*, was published in 2002, and he is currently working on a study of friars, parish priests, and towns in Central Europe in the late Middle Ages and the early Reformation.

Roberto Rusconi is Professor of the History of Christianity at the Università di Roma Tre. His publications in English include *Women and Religion in Medieval and Renaissance Italy*, ed. D. Bornstein and R. Rusconi (1996), and *The Book of Prophecies edited by Christopher Columbus* (as Historical and Textual editor; 1997). He recently published, in Italian, *L'ordine dei peccati: la confessione tra medioevo ed età moderna* (2002), and *Francesco d'Assisi nelle fonti e negli scritti* (2002).

Larry J. Simon is Associate Professor of Spanish and Mediterranean History in the Department of History at Western Michigan University, and Director of the Michigan State University Italian language and culture program in Florence. His research focuses on Muslim/Christian/Jewish relations in thirteenth-century Mallorca. He edited *Iberia and the Mediterranean World of the Middle Ages* (1995), just completed a five-year term as editor of the journal *Medieval Encounters*, and is editor of Brill's book series "Medieval and Early Modern Iberian World."

Kenneth R. Stow is Professor of Jewish history at the University of Haifa and the editor of the journal *Jewish History*. He has authored numerous books and essays on the history of the Jews in Italy and the history of the Jews and the church, among which are *Alienated Minority: The Jews of Medieval Latin Europe* (1992, 1994) and *Theater of Acculturation: The Roman Ghetto in the Sixteenth Century* (2001). His most recent work is *The Bread, the Children, and the Dogs, Continuities in the Jewish-Catholic Encounter* (forthcoming).

Ariel Toaff teaches Medieval and Renaissance History at Bar-Ilan University and is chairman of the Institute for Research on Mediterranean Jewish Communities. His books include *Gli ebrei a Perugia* (1975), *The Jews in Medieval Assisi* (1979), *The Jews in Umbria* (3 vols., 1993–1994), *Love, Work and Death: Jewish Life in Medieval Umbria* (1996), *Mostri giudei: L'immaginario ebraico dal Medioevo alla prima età moderna* (1996), *Mangiare alla giudia: La cucina ebraica in Italia dal Rinascimento all'età moderna* (2000).

Giacomo Todeschini is Professor of Medieval History at the University of Trieste (Italy). He specializes in history of medieval economics and Christian-Jewish relations. His recent publications include *Il prezzo della salvezza: Lessici medievali del pensiero economico* (1994), *I mercanti e il Tempio: La società cristiana e il circolo virtuoso della ricchezza fra Medioevo ed Età Moderna* (2002).

Nancy L. Turner is Associate Professor of History at the University of Wisconsin at Platteville. Her research focuses on issues dealing with Jews and Judaism in the writings of Christian theologians of the late Middle Ages. Her work also examines Christians' writings on Muslims during the high and late Middle Ages.

David J. Viera is a Professor of Spanish at Tennessee Technological University. He specializes in the medieval literature of Iberia. Among his publications are three books: *Bibliografía anotada de la vida i obra de Francesc Eiximenis* (1980), *Eiximenis y la dona* (1987), and *Medieval Catalan Literature (Prose and Drama)* (1988).

This page intentionally left blank

ABBOT JOACHIM OF FIORE AND THE CONVERSION OF THE JEWS

E. RANDOLPH DANIEL

Abbot Joachim died on March 30, 1202 at S. Martino di Giove (Canale), one of the most recent Florentian houses.¹ An anonymous companion, who had probably joined Joachim while the abbot was at Petralata in the Sila mountains in 1188 and who became a Florentian, wrote a life shortly after Joachim's death, based from 1188 onward on personal knowledge.² The beginning of the *Vita* is lost but Grundmann has argued convincingly that we can reconstruct its materials from a series of later lives.³ Luke of Cosenza first became acquainted with Joachim when the abbot was at Casamari, a Cistercian house near Frosinone, between 1183 and 1185, where Luke was one of the scribes to whom Joachim dictated. Luke remained devoted to Joachim during the rest of the abbot's life and dictated a memoir after Joachim's death.⁴ In the sixteenth century, Gioacomo Greco and Cornelio Pelusio, both Florentians, compiled collections of *Miracula* that have been recently edited by Antonio Maria Adorisio. The collections contain at least some materials that go back to Joachim's lifetime or to the early years after his death.⁵

¹ Herbert Grundmann, "Zur Biographie Joachims von Fiore und Rainers von Ponza," *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters*, 16 (1960), 437–546; reprinted in *Ausgewählte Aufsätze*, teil 2, Schriften der Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Band 25, 2 (Stuttgart, 1977), 255–360. (Hereafter cited as *zur Biographie*; all references are to the reprinted version.)

² The *Vita b. Joachimi abbatis* has been edited by Grundmann in *zur Biographie*, 342–352. On p. 281, Grundmann argues that the *Vita* could not have been written later than about 1209. Earlier, Cipriano Baraut had edited the same *Vita* in "La antiguas biografías de Joaquín de Fiore y sus fuentes," *Analecta sacra tarraconensia*, 26 (1953), 195–232. Grundmann discusses the author and the date of this work in *zur Biographie*, 294–297. Stephen E. Wessley has studied and heavily utilized the *Vita* in *Joachim of Fiore and Monastic Reform* (New York, 1990) 29–59.

³ Grundmann, *zur Biographie*, 281–297.

⁴ Luke later became archbishop of Cosenza. Grundmann has edited Luke's memoir in *zur Biographie*, 352–358.

⁵ Antonio Maria Adorisio, *Le "Legenda" del Santo di Fiore: B. Ioachimi abbatis miracula* (Rome, 1989).

Joachim was probably born in the 1130s. Celico, his birthplace, is a small town located on a hilltop across the river Crati from Cosenza. His father Maurus was a *tabellio*, a notary. Joachim was the sixth of eight children born to Maurus and Gemma but he was the oldest son to reach adulthood. He studied to be a notary and obtained a position in the court at Palermo where he was active as late as 1166–1167.⁶

Not long after this Joachim made a pilgrimage to Palestine during which he decided to become a hermit. After his return to Calabria, he became a monk at Corazzo and by 1177 was abbot. Corazzo had been founded about 1157 as a Benedictine house, but by 1177 possessed Cistercian privileges. In 1182 or 1183 Joachim went to Casamari, seeking to find a Cistercian house that would become the motherhouse of Corazzo and thus fully incorporate it into the Cistercian Order. During his eighteen-month stay at Casamari, Joachim began writing three of his chief works, the *Liber de concordia*, the *Expositio in Apocalypsim*, and the *Psalterium decem chordarum*. Joachim also went to the nearby town of Veroli to meet with Pope Lucius III (1181–1185) who gave Joachim permission to write. About 1186 Joachim began spending increasing amounts of time at a hermitage named Petralata, located not far from Corazzo. In 1188 Joachim went to Rome to visit Pope Clement III (1187–1191), who issued a bull urging Joachim to complete his *Liber de concordia* and his *Expositio in Apocalypsim*. According to the *Vita*, Clement also approved Joachim's decision to resign his abbacy at Corazzo, which at about the same time became a daughterhouse of Fossanova, thus gaining full incorporation into the Cistercian Order. The exact sequence of these events remains uncertain.⁷

Joachim went back from Rome to Petralata but he left there and moved up deeper into the Sila mountains in May, 1189, where he subsequently founded S. Giovanni in Fiore, the motherhouse of the Florentian Order. The new order proved immediately popular and gained official approval from Pope Celestine III (1191–1198) in 1196. Joachim's last years were devoted to his writings and to the needs of the Florentian Order.⁸

⁶ Grundmann, *Zur Biographie*, 297–299. For a brief sketch of Joachim's life, see the introduction to my edition of Joachim's *Liber de concordia*: Abbot Joachim of Fiore, *Liber de concordia noui ac ueteris testamenti: Books 1–4*, ed. E. Randolph Daniel (Philadelphia, 1983) xi–xxii. All subsequent references to Books 1–4 of the *Liber de concordia* are to my edition.

⁷ Joachim, *Liber de concordia*, x11–xviii. Clement's bull, *Rationis ordo suadet*, is edited there on p. 3. The bull is dated June 8, 1188, from the Lateran Palace.

⁸ Joachim, *Liber de concordia*, xviii–xx.

Why should we concern ourselves with Joachim's biography in an article on his attitude toward and thinking concerning the Jews? The answer is that Gaufrid of Auxerre stated that Joachim was born a Jew, converted from Judaism, and for the rest of his life concealed this, his supporters abetting him in hiding this fact.⁹

Gaufrid had been a pupil of Abelard at Paris. About 1140, he and twenty others became Cistercians after hearing Bernard of Clairvaux preach. Gaufrid became one of Bernard's personal secretaries, collected Bernard's letters as well as materials for his biography, and wrote the last three books of the *Vita prima*.¹⁰ His career was turbulent. In 1159 he was abbot of Igny and in 1162 was elected abbot of Clairvaux, a position from which he was forced to resign in 1165–1166. Pope Alexander III had urged Gaufrid's resignation and Herbert Grundmann has suggested that this may have been due to Gaufrid's friendship with King Henry II of England.¹¹ By the year 1171 Gaufrid was abbot of Fossanova from where he went to become abbot of Hautecombe about 1176. Grundmann thinks that Gaufrid was back at Fossanova from about 1188 until at least 1190 and that he was the Gaufrid who was censured by the General Chapter in 1196. If Gaufrid was at Fossanova in 1188–1190, he would have been there when Corazzo became a daughterhouse of Fossanova and Joachim resigned his abbacy. Moreover, Rainer of Ponza, who went with Joachim to Petralata in 1188, had formerly been a monk at Fossanova.¹²

Gaufrid wrote lives of several early Cistercian saints and commented both on the Song of Songs and on the Apocalypse. He also wrote a *Libellus contra capitula Gilberti* as well as a brief treatise on the same issue

⁹ Grundmann, *Zur Biographie*, edited Gaufrid's sermon (pp. 358–360) and discussed Gaufrid and the sermon at considerable length (pp. 325–338). Gaufrid's sermon is found in Troyes, Bibliothèque municipale cod. 503 on fol. 126v; incipit "*Viri Galilei, quid admiramini aspicientes in celum* [Acts 1:11]? Ego hodie vobis uereor ..." The key passage reads: "Ex iudeis orta persona est, in iudaismo, quem necdum satis euomuisse uidetur, annis pluribus educata, que, sicut per eos, qui cercius cognouerunt, tandem nobis innotuit, licet non solus ipse, sed etiam sui panes suos potissimum a vobis et suas actenus quam studiose poterant absconderint aquas. Nec mediocrem ei confert auctoritatem ipsum barbarum nomen; dicitur enim Ioachin. Quod de nullo diebus nostris meminimus nos audisse, ut in baptismo retinuerit nomen, quod in iudaismo prius habuerat." (pp. 359–360).

¹⁰ Grundmann, *Zur Biographie*, 325; Adriaan H. Bredero, *Bernard of Clairvaux: Between Cult and History* (Grand Rapids, 1996), 91–102. Bredero calls him Geoffrey of Auxerre.

¹¹ Grundmann, *Zur Biographie*, 325.

¹² Grundmann, *Zur Biographie*, 326–329.

in the 1190s.¹³ The sermon which begins *Viri Galilei* is one of seventy-two sermons found in a Troyes manuscript. It ends abruptly because the following folio was cut out before the codex was foliated in the fifteenth century.¹⁴ Grundmann argues that the sermon must have been preached between 1188 and 1195.¹⁵ Grundmann also thinks that it was Gaufrid who caused the 1192 General Chapter of the Cistercians to summon Joachim *dudum abbas* and Rainer to appear or be labelled fugitives.¹⁶ Finally Gaufrid was probably the Abbot Gaufrid to whom Joachim addressed his treatise *Intelligentia super calathis*, a brief commentary on Jeremiah 24:1–10, in which Joachim argued against papal plans to use military force against the emperor. Grundmann thought that this treatise dated from about 1190.¹⁷

Gaufrid quoted one of Juvenal's *Satires* to refer to Joachim: "For behold the fourth Cato to fall from heaven ..." Gaufrid had used the same quotation in his attack on Gilbert of Poitiers, which suggests that Gaufrid lumped the Parisian schoolman and the Calabrian abbot together as teachers of dangerous novelties.¹⁸ Ironically if Gaufrid's motive was to attack a theologian whose doctrines seemed to him to be too daring, he had chosen another disciple of St. Bernard, the Abbot Joachim, who in turn was to attack the Parisian schoolman, Peter Lombard, and then later draw criticism for his attack from the Fourth Lateran Council.¹⁹

¹³ Grundmann, *Zur Biographie*, 326–327.

¹⁴ Grundmann, *Zur Biographie*, 331–332. The manuscript is Troyes, Bibliothèque municipale Cod. 503, fol. 116v.

¹⁵ Grundmann, *Zur Biographie*, 333.

¹⁶ Grundmann, *Zur Biographie*, 330.

¹⁷ Grundmann, "Kirchenfreiheit und Kaisermacht um 1190 in der Sicht Joachims von Fiore," *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters*, 19 (1965), 353–396; reprinted in *Ausgewählte Aufsätze*, pp. 361–402. The treatise has been edited by Pietro de Leo in his *Gioacchino da Fiore: Aspetti inediti della vita e delle opere* (Soveria Mannelli [Catanzaro], 1988), 125–148 (hereafter cited as *Gioacchino da Fiore*).

¹⁸ Grundmann, *Zur Biographie*, 334, 359. "Ecce enim quartus e celo cecidit Cato, nouo genere prophetandi sine certa uel propheticis aliis simili reuelatione, ex habundanti scientia uel intelligentia scripturarum, quas sibi inuicem conferunt, de aduentu regni dei et prima quadam resurrectione his qui pruriunt auribus iam non modo susurrans, sed blasfemas disseminans nouitates." Gaufrid referred to Gilbert as the "tertius e celo cecidit Cato." The line is from Juvenal, *Sat.* II, 40. Rolfe Humphries translated the original line to read, "Rome may be decent again with this Cato descended from heaven." See Rolfe Humphries, *The Satires of Juvenal* (Bloomington, Ind., 1958), 27. All translations are my own unless otherwise credited.

¹⁹ On Joachim's treatise against Peter Lombard and Lateran IV, see Marjorie

Grundmann left the question about Joachim's religious origin *sub iudice* although he did not think that Joachim was born Jewish.²⁰ Beatrice Hirsch-Reich wrote a lengthy article that cast doubt on Gaufrid's charge without rejecting it completely.²¹ Recent scholarship has unanimously accepted that Joachim was born a Christian.²² I myself find it impossible to believe that anyone as prominent as Joachim could have so thoroughly concealed his conversion that neither the anonymous *Vita*, Luke of Cosenza, the popes with whom Joachim dealt, nor the rulers of the kingdom ever mentioned it. On the other hand, Gaufrid could easily have convinced himself that the name had to be Jewish and that, therefore, in spite of the absence of any other evidence, Joachim must have been born Jewish and converted. When Joachim used the phrase *nobis gentilibus* in his treatise *Adversus Iudaeos*, he clearly identified himself as a Gentile of Gentile birth.²³

The attitude toward the Jews and toward converts from Judaism that informed Gaufrid's sermon both explicitly and implicitly demands treatment because it sets a background against which to understand Joachim's own thinking about Jews and Jewish conversion. Gaufrid alleged that Joachim's parents were Jews and that Joachim himself was Jewish at birth. The only argument that he advanced in favor of this charge was Joachim's name, which Gaufrid said that he had never known as the name of a Christian. Grundmann pointed out that the name was rare in northern Europe but was used among Greek

Reeves, *The Influence of Prophecy in the Later Middle Ages: A Study in Joachimism* (Oxford, 1969; reprinted South Bend, Ind., 1993), 28–36.

²⁰ Grundmann, *Zur Biographie*, 337–341.

²¹ B. Hirsch-Reich, "Joachim von Fiore und das Judentum," *Miscellanea mediaevalia*, 4 (1966), 228–263. Reeves, *The Influence of Prophecy*, 14–15, clearly felt that the allegation was false but stated that Joachim's original religion could not be proven absolutely.

²² For example, Bernard McGinn, *The Calabrian Abbot* (New York, 1985), 18–19; Delno C. West and Sandra Zimdars-Swartz, *Joachim of Fiore* (Bloomington, Ind., 1983), 1–2. For my own discussion of the issue, see Joachim, *Liber de concordia*, xii.

²³ Joachim, *Adversus Iudeos*, edited by Arsenio Frugoni, *Fonti per la storia d'Italia*, no. 95 (Rome, 1957), 76: "... ut autem sciatis quod et nobis gentilibus, quos in ira futuris sui expulsi dominus uisus est, cum essemus et nos de semine benedicti Iaphet sicut et uos de semine benedicti Sem ..." Gioacchino da Fiore, *Agli Ebrei (Adversus Iudeos)*, trans. by Massimo Iiritano (Soverio Mannelli [Catanzaro], 1998) has an extensive introduction and a facing Italian translation, but the Latin text has numerous errors. Therefore, all references in this article will be to Frugoni's edition (hereafter cited as Joachim, *Adversus Iudeos*).

Christians, because it was the name of Mary's father according to the apocryphal *Protoevangelium of James*.²⁴

In his support of Pope Innocent II against Pope Anacletus II, Bernard had pointed out that Anacletus's family, the Pierleoni, had converted from Judaism and the Abbot of Clairvaux apparently believed that Anacletus II was still "not cleansed of his Jewish heritage."²⁵ Bernard believed that Jews were avid pursuers of money and material goods. He was the first writer to use the term *iudaizare* to refer to usury. Bernard was speaking in this instance of Christian moneylenders as judaizing and was suggesting that they be called "baptized Jews." Bernard was addressing himself to Christians and speaking as a reformist apocalyptic, but his anti-Jewish attitudes clearly informed his thinking about Christian usurers.²⁶ Persistent greed for material goods may or may not have been what Gaufrid meant when he preached that Joachim had not yet satisfactorily vomited up his Judaism. It is more likely that Gaufrid had in mind Joachim's emphasis on exegesis of the Hebrew Scriptures. Certainly Gaufrid is most likely to have been deeply soaked in the thinking of Bernard.²⁷ Mary Stroll argued that common opinion believed that "Jewish character could remain unaffected by conversion."²⁸ This notion that Jewish converts were likely to remain Jews at heart and thus to be half-hearted Christians is usually assumed to have become widespread in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, but Gaufrid and Bernard seemed to have had something of it even in the twelfth century and Gaufrid thought that his hearers would accept it as likely to be true of a supposed convert from Judaism.

The use of his Jewish ancestry against Pope Anacletus II and the notion that Jewish "sinfulness" and "materialism" would persist after conversion may have been implicit in Gaufrid's charge that both Joachim and his defenders concealed his ancestry and his conversion. A

²⁴ Grundmann, *Zur Biographie*, 333–334, 546. See the *Gospel of James or Protevangelium*, trans. by Montague Rhodes James, in *The Apocryphal New Testament* (Oxford, 1924), 39–48.

²⁵ Mary Stroll, *The Jewish Pope: Ideology and Politics in the Papal Schism of 1130* (Leiden, 1987), 164–167.

²⁶ Bernard, *Epistle 363, Sancti Bernardi Opera*, ed. J. Leclercq, C.H. Talbot, and H.M. Rochais, 8 vols. (Rome, 1957–1977) 8:316 (hereafter, this edition of Bernard is cited as *Sancti Bernardi Opera*). This is the letter that Bernard wrote in response to the monk Rudolph's anti-Jewish sermons.

²⁷ Grundmann, *Zur Biographie*, 359: "Ex iudeis orta persona est, in iudaismo, quem necdum satis euomuisse uidetur, annis pluribus educata ..."

²⁸ Stroll, *The Jewish Pope*, 167.

convert would have gone to such pains only if he had truly feared that revealing his Jewish origins would have been disastrous for a prominent abbot and the founder of a new monastic order. Similarly if Gaufrid wanted to bring down a prominent figure such as Joachim who had explicit and consistent papal and monarchical support, his allegation that Joachim was born Jewish could easily have been motivated by the belief that the popes and monarchs would turn against Joachim if they were convinced that he had been born Jewish.²⁹

Joachim would have called himself a disciple of Bernard of Clairvaux. He quoted Bernard's *Liber de consideratione ad Eugenium papam* at length and his views on simony, on clerical reform, on the papacy, and on papal military ventures were similar to those of Bernard.³⁰ Both Bernard and Joachim were reformist apocalyptics who derived their apocalypticism from Augustine of Hippo. Whereas Augustine had conceived of reform strictly in individual terms, effectively individualizing the apocalypse, Pope Gregory VII had begun to conceive of a total reform of the clergy that would end simony, abolish clerical marriage and concubinage, and would result in a holy church on earth. Gregory applied criteria usually associated with the end of history to this struggle to achieve reform. Hence that which had been individual in Augustine became corporate and historical. Like Augustine, the reformists postponed the end of history to the relatively distant future, emphasizing instead the imminent reform.³¹ Bernard took up the cause both in his *De consideratione* and in his *Sermones super Cantica*.³² Bernard in turn influenced the views of Gerhoch of Reichersberg. Hildegard of Bingen was thoroughly Augustinian in her *Scivias* but her reformism came through strongly in her later *Liber divinorum operum*.³³ All of the reformists

²⁹ On Joachim's relationships with the popes and on monarchical support for the Florentians, see Joachim, *Liber de concordia*, xviii–xx.

³⁰ E.R. Daniel, "Reformist Apocalypticism and the Friars Minor," in *That Others may Know and Love: Essays in Honor of Zachary Hayes, OFM*, ed. Michael F. Cusato, OFM and F. Edward Coughlin, OFM (St. Bonaventure, 1997), 237–253; Daniel, "Joachim of Fiore's Apocalyptic Scenario," in *Last Things: Death and the Apocalypse in the Middle Ages*, ed. Caroline Walker Bynum and Paul Freedman (Philadelphia, 2000), 124–139; Robert Lerner, "Joachim of Fiore as a Link Between St. Bernard and Innocent III on the Figural Significance of Melchisedech," *Mediaeval studies*, 42 (1980), 417–476.

³¹ On Augustine and Gregory VII, see my manuscript in progress, entitled "Bound for the Promised Land."

³² Bernard, *Sermones super Cantica Canticorum*, no. 33, *Sancti Bernardi Opera*, 1:233–245, esp. pp. 241–244 (hereafter cited as *Sermones*).

³³ On both Gerhoch and Hildegard, see brief treatments in Daniel, "Reformist

focused on reforming Christians, beginning with the clergy. Bernard's attitudes toward the Jews became explicit in the context of his defense of Innocent II and in his argument against the persecutor Rudolph. Bernard alluded to the final conversion of the Jews but he did not see it as imminent nor was he concerned to achieve it. Gerhoch and Hildegard were focused even more exclusively on clerical reform. As late as the death of Pope Eugenius III in 1153 and the accession of Hadrian IV in 1154, the reformists expected the popes to carry out the reforms. First Hadrian's pontificate and then the Alexandrian schism that began in 1159 caused Gerhoch, Hildegard and later Joachim to lose faith in the popes as executors of reform and to begin searching for another means to achieve renewal.³⁴

Reformist apocalypticism had competition in the eleventh and twelfth centuries from royal and imperial messianism. If the reformists went back to Augustine and supported papal reform programs, the messianists appealed to the *Tiburtine Sibyl* and to Pseudo-Methodius's *Revelations*, and expected a royal or imperial messiah.³⁵ Both of the above-mentioned texts predicted the coming of a Last World Emperor, a ruler who would defeat all the enemies of Christendom, reign over the world in peace, and whose reign would end when he surrendered his crown to God in Jerusalem, to be followed immediately by the onslaught of the antichrist. The *Tiburtine Sibyl* included a prediction that, after the emperor had reigned 112 years, the Jews would be converted and the sepulchre of Christ honored by all.³⁶ Adso incorporated the Last World Emperor into his scenario for the antichrist and cemented the figures together so that expectation of the final antichrist required a preceding Last World Emperor. Emicho of Leisingen was one of the princes who saw himself as an apocalyptic messiah, called to convert or destroy both Jews and infidels.³⁷

Apocalypticism and the Friars Minor," 243–245. They will be treated at length in "Bound for the Promised Land." On Hildegard and reformist apocalypticism, see Kathryn Kerby-Fulton, *Reformist Apocalypticism and Piers Plowman* (Cambridge, 1990) 26–75. The most thorough treatment of Hildegard's apocalypticism, from which both Prof. Kerby-Fulton and I draw, is Charles Czarski's unpublished dissertation, "The Prophecies of St. Hildegard Bingen" (Lexington, Ky., 1983).

³⁴ Daniel, "Reformist Apocalypticism and the Friars Minor," 243–248.

³⁵ On both these texts, see Bernard McGinn, *Visions of the End: Apocalyptic Traditions in the Middle Ages* (New York, 1998), 43–50, 70–76.

³⁶ McGinn, *Visions of the End*, p. 49.

³⁷ Adso of Montier-en-Der, *Letter on the Origin and Time of Antichrist*, in Bernard McGinn, *Apocalyptic Spirituality* (New York, 1979), 81–96. On Emicho, his crusaders, and

Joachim's main works include the *Liber de concordia novi ac veteris testamenti*, which he began writing no later than his stay at Casamari and which was presented to the papacy either in 1195 or 1198. The *Liber de concordia* is in five books, the first four of which are a prolegomenon to the rest of Joachim's works, while the fifth is a commentary on the Hebrew Scriptures.³⁸ The *Expositio in Apocalypsim* was also begun at Casamari and was finished by the time Joachim wrote his *Testamentum* in 1200.³⁹ The foundation of Joachim's thinking was the history of the Hebrews from Abraham to the return from Babylon. The *Expositio* continued that history from the coming of Christ in humility to his second coming in majesty and the ensuing eighth day of eternity. The *Psalterium decem chordarum* was begun at Casamari and finished within a couple of years after Joachim went back to Corazzo.⁴⁰ The *Psalterium* is a commentary on the trinitarian relationships that Joachim believed were symbolized in the musical instrument known as the ten-string psaltery. The unfinished *Tractatus super quatuor evangelia* were meant to cover the four gospels.⁴¹ It has usually been assumed that the *Tractatus* is a late work because it is not mentioned in the *Testamentum* but that may have been due to its being unfinished. Joachim had a visual mind and he conceived history in terms of organic and geometric symbols. Such *figure* appear in the main works cited above, except in the *Tractatus*, but a number of figures are collected in the *Liber figurarum*. Marjorie Reeves argued that the *figure* themselves were by Joachim but that the collection was put together within a couple of decades after Joachim's death.⁴²

the massacres of Jews in the Rhineland, see Norman Cohn, *Pursuit of the Millenium* (Oxford, 1970), 16–17, 61–70.

³⁸ For an introduction to the date, structure, and purpose of the *Liber de concordia*, see Joachim, *Liber de concordia*, xxii–xxvii.

³⁹ For an edition of Joachim's *Testamentum*, see Joachim, *Liber de concordia*, 4–6. Joachim dated the letter 1200. The *Expositio in Apocalypsim* was published in Venice in 1527 and that edition was reprinted in Frankfurt a.M. in 1964. Luke of Cosenza says in his memoir that Joachim "mansit autem in Casa-Marii sedulus quasi anno uno et dimidio, dictans et emendans simul librum Apocalypsis et librum Concordiae. Vbi in ipso tempore librum Psalterii decem cordarum incepit" (Grundmann, *Zur Biographie*, 353).

⁴⁰ Edited in the same volume with the *Expositio in Apocalypsim* at Venice, 1527, but reprinted separately at Frankfurt a.M., 1965.

⁴¹ Joachim, *Tractatus super quatuor evangelia*, ed. Ernesto Buonaiuti (Rome, 1930). Gioacchino da Fiore, *Trattati sui quattro Vangeli*, trans. Letizia Pellegrini and Gian Luca Potestà (Rome, 1999) contains a translation of the *Tractatus*.

⁴² Joachim, *Liber figurarum*, vol. 2 in *Il libro delle figure*, 2nd. rev. ed., ed. Leone Tondelli, Marjorie Reeves, and Beatrice Hirsch-Reich (Turin, 1953; reprinted 1990). Marjorie

The *De prophetia ignota*, a brief commentary on a Sibylline text that was originally done before Pope Lucius III, dates itself to 1184, but the other shorter treatises, including the *Adversus Iudaeos* are very difficult to date.⁴³

For Abbot Joachim, history was governed by two paradigms, the exodus and the exile. In his *prima diffinitio*, designated by the upper case Greek letter *alpha* or by the psalter and shaped like an equilateral triangle, the generation of the Son from the Father and the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father were represented by the two sides coming down from the top. The bottom side stood for the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son. Thus both the Son and the Holy Spirit came from the Father, just as the third *status* of the Holy Spirit proceeded from the *status* of the Father and of the Son. Moreover the second *status* belonged primarily to the Son but secondarily to the Holy Spirit, while the third *status* belonged to the Holy Spirit as the fulfillment of the Son. The three *status* also represented the three orders, the married, the clergy, and the monks, the last two of which came from the first.⁴⁴

The *secunda diffinitio* was represented by the lower case Greek *omega*, in which, as Joachim wrote, "one rod proceeded from the middle of two [rods]."⁴⁵ These two rods that merged into a third rod represented the Father and the Son, from both of whom the Holy Spirit proceeded. The two rods that became a third also stood for the first and second *tempora* and the Jewish and Gentile peoples from whom came the Spiritual men, the *viri spirituales*, who are the monks from Elijah through

Reeves and Beatrice Hirsch-Reich, *The Figurae of Joachim of Fiore* (Oxford, 1972) remains the indispensable study.

⁴³ Bernard McGinn, "Joachim and the Sibyl," *Cîteaux—Commentarii Cistercienses*, 24 (1973) 97–138 was the first edition. Recently Matthias Kaup has published a critical edition in his *De prophetia ignota: Eine frühe Schrift Joachims von Fiore*; MGH (Hannover, 1998) (hereafter cited as Joachim, *De prophetia ignota*). Kurt Victor-Selge, "L'Origine delle opere di Gioacchino da Fiore," in *L'attesa della fine dei tempi nel Medioevo*, ed. Ovidio Capitani e Jürgen Miethke (Bologna, 1990) 87–131, is the most comprehensive effort to date Joachim's works. Reeves, *The Influence of Prophecy*, Appendix A, pp. 511–526 is the standard list of the abbot's works but it has been updated by Kurt Victor-Selge in "Elenco delle opere di Gioacchino da Fiore," *Floresia*, 3–4 (1989–1990), 25–35.

⁴⁴ Daniel, "The Double Procession of the Holy Spirit in Joachim of Fiore's Understanding of History," *Speculum*, 55 (1980), 469–483; Daniel, "Joachim of Fiore's Apocalyptic Scenario," 132–134; Joachim, *Liber de concordia*, Bk. 2, Pt. 1, chaps. 9, 11, pp. 74–76, 80.

⁴⁵ Joachim, *Liber de concordia*, Bk. 2, Pt. 1, chap. 11, p. 80: "Secunda designatur in ω in quo una uirgula de medio duarum procedit."

Benedict and Bernard to the coming order that would fulfill the new exodus, already begun by the Cistercians.⁴⁶

The goal of the *concordia* was to equate the history of Judah between the reign of Josiah (640–609 B.C.E.) and the return from Babylon to the history of Latin Christendom from the pontificate of Pope Leo IX (1049–1054) to the period that would begin in 1200. Leo, like Josiah, had initiated sweeping reform, but then had led a military expedition that ended in disaster, Josiah's in defeat and death at the hands of Pharaoh Necho, and Leo's in defeat by Robert Guiscard. Joachim equated the pontificate of Alexander III (1159–1181) to the reigns of Jehoiachin and Zedekiah, under whom Joachim saw a division of the ancient Judeans, part of the people being taken with Jehoiachin to Babylon and part remaining in Jerusalem with Zedekiah. This division paralleled the one caused by the Alexandrian schism which occurred in the thirty-ninth generation since Christ (1140–1170). Joachim was living in the fortieth generation (1170–1200) during which the church was being subjected to unprecedented stresses because Popes Lucius III and Urban III had gone against the peace that had been made between Alexander III and Frederick I Barbarossa.

Joachim saw in front of him the culmination of the exile to Babylon shortly after 1200. In the second *tempus*, Babylon had a dual meaning for Joachim. The German emperors from Henry II to Henry VI who represented the “new Babylon” threatened and persecuted the church as their ancient counterparts had done. Primarily, however, Babylon comprised all those carnal Christians, especially the simoniac clergy, whose pursuit of worldly goods was the chief form of corruption. Soon after 1200, God would send two persecutors, the sixth and seventh heads of the apocalyptic dragon, whose assaults would purify the church. Then the new exodus, of which Bernard of Clairvaux was the Moses, Pope Eugenius III Aaron, and Cîteaux and its four daughter-houses the first five tribes, would culminate in the coming of two new orders that would be the two witnesses of Rev 11:3, who in turn would precede the final seven tribes, seen as an unnamed monastic order that would complete this last exodus.⁴⁷ This final exodus is the third *status* of the *prima diffinitio* which, therefore, would begin long before the end of history, and in fact had already begun earlier in the twelfth century. As

⁴⁶ Joachim, *Liber de concordia*, Bk. 2, Pt. 1, chap. 8, pp. 72–73.

⁴⁷ Joachim, *Liber de concordia*, Bk. 4, Pt. 1, chaps. 28–45, Bk. 4, Pt. 2, chap. 2, pp. 373–403, 408–422; Daniel, “Joachim of Fiore's Apocalyptic Scenario,” 124–126, 135–139.

I have already argued above, Joachim founded his *diffinitiones* on Augustine and, like Augustine, he relegated the final antichrist and the end of history to the distant future, focusing instead on the imminent reform of the clergy and the dramatic spiritual renewal that he saw as the goal of the last exodus.⁴⁸

Robert Lerner has argued for a drastically different interpretation, according to which Joachim's third *status* is the abbot's version of the post-antichrist final period of rest, originally suggested by Jerome and gradually developed during the intervening centuries. Thus the *status* of the Holy Spirit must follow the final antichrist and immediately precede the end of history. The seventh head of the dragon must be the final antichrist and the third *status* will not last very long. To my knowledge Lerner has not explained how his thesis would affect Joachim's expectation of the conversion of the Jews. Lerner's interpretation and mine are virtually antithetical, but even if I cannot accept his thesis, readers should be alerted to it.⁴⁹

According to my interpretation, Joachim's attitude toward the Jews and his hope for their conversion must be understood within the framework of the *secunda diffinitio*, although Joachim expected the conversion itself to take place at the end of the second *status* and the beginning of the third *status* of the *prima diffinitio*, or as part of the end of the "exile to Babylon" and "exodus from Babylon" that were the culmination of both *diffinitiones*.⁵⁰ Joachim's thinking went back primarily to

⁴⁸ See above, p. 8; E.R. Daniel, "A New Understanding of Joachim: The Concords, the Exile, and the Exodus," *Gioacchino da Fiore tra Bernardo di Clairvaux e Innocenzo III*, ed. Roberto Rusconi (Rome, 2001), 209–222. Relegating the end of history and the final, traditional antichrist to the distant future was characteristic of the reformists. One key reason may have been that the association was being made between the Last World Emperor and the final antichrist and, by removing the final antichrist to a time well beyond the present, the reformists were eliminating the Last World Emperor from a significant role.

⁴⁹ The thesis has been developed in a series of articles that include R. Lerner, "The Refreshment of the Saints: The Time after Antichrist as a Station for Earthly Progress in Medieval Thought," *Traditio*, 32 (1976), 97–144; "Joachim of Fiore's Breakthrough to Chiliasm," in *Cristianesimo nella storia*, 6 (1985), 489–512; and "Antichrist and Antichrists in Joachim of Fiore," *Speculum*, 60 (1985), 489–512. All of these articles are collected together in Italian translations in Robert Lerner, *Refrigerio dei santi: Gioacchino da Fiore e l'escatologia medievale* (Rome, 1995). For a survey of this and several recent editions of Joachim's works, see E.R. Daniel, "Joachim of Fiore: New Editions and Studies," *Cristianesimo nella storia*, 21 (2000), 675–685. Lerner has treated Joachim's attitudes toward the Jews in his *The Feast of Saint Abraham: Medieval Millenarians and the Jews* (Philadelphia, 2001), which appeared too late to be adequately treated in this article.

⁵⁰ E.R. Daniel, *The Franciscan Concept of Mission in the High Middle Ages* (Lexington,

Paul, expressed in Rom 9–11, where Paul himself confronted the Jewish rejection of the gospel and the Gentile acceptance of it and argued that the Jewish “blindness” would last until the *plenitudo gentium* has been converted and then the whole of Israel would be saved (11:25–26).

According to Paul,

It is not those born in the course of nature who are children of God; it is the children born through God’s promise who are reckoned as Abraham’s descendants ... But that is not all, for Rebekah’s children had one and the same father, our ancestor Isaac; and yet, in order that God’s selective purpose might stand, based not upon men’s deeds but upon the call of God, she was told, even before they were born, when they had as yet done nothing, good or ill, “The elder shall be servant to the younger”; and that accords with text of Scripture, “Jacob I loved and Esau I hated.” (Rom 9:8–13; cf. Gen 25:23 and Mal 1:2–3; trans. *The New English Bible*)

God’s promises to Abraham and their terrestrial or spiritual fulfillment are the starting point of Joachim’s two *diffinitiones*. Book Two of the *Liber de concordia* began by quoting Paul: “‘The first man,’ according to the apostle, ‘was earthly from the earth, the second celestial from heaven’” (1 Cor 15:47; my translation).⁵¹ Then Joachim put into the mouth of a Jew the objection: “I do not follow an earthly man, who indeed sinned in paradise; but I obey Moses, whom I know to be a just and holy man, thoroughly tested and a friend of God.”⁵² Joachim, however, went on to argue that the Jews traced themselves to Abraham as their lineal ancestor and they understood God’s promises to Abraham in terms of Canaan, the promised land. Christians, on the contrary, were descendants of Abraham by faith and understood those same promises spiritually to refer to the liberty of the church.⁵³ Hence Jews understood the

Ky., 1975; reprinted St. Bonaventure, 1992), focused on the motivation of and theology behind missions especially from the late twelfth century onward. The Jews are dealt with at various points. E.R. Daniel, “Apocalyptic Conversion: The Joachite Alternative to the Crusades,” *Traditio*, 25 (1969), 128–154; reprinted in Delno West, *Joachim of Fiore in Christian Thought*, 2 vols. (New York, 1975), 2.301–328. There I argued that apocalyptic conversion was motivated partly by disillusionment with the crusades.

⁵¹ Joachim, *Liber de concordia*, Bk. 2, Pt. 1, chap. 1, p. 51: “Primus homo,” ut ait apostolus, “de terra terrenus, secundus homo de celo celestis.”

⁵² Joachim, *Liber de concordia*, Bk. 2, Pt. 1, chap. 1, p. 53: “An forte dicturus est mihi Iudeus: ‘Ego non sequor terrenum hominem, quem peccasse constat in paradiso; sed obedio Moysi, quem scio esse uirum iustum et sanctum, uirum probatissimum et amicum dei.’”

⁵³ Joachim, *Liber de concordia*, Bk. 2, Pt. 1, chap. 1, pp. 53–57. This culminates in the following conclusion: “Multum ergo distat inter utrumque celum, multa inter

Hebrew Scriptures “literally,” were descendants of Abraham by blood, and expected the promises to Abraham to be fulfilled in a glorious and triumphant kingdom under a descendant of David whose capital would be Jerusalem. Christians, by contrast, understood those same Scriptures spiritually, descended from Abraham by faith, and expected the new Jerusalem, envisioned in chapter 21 of Revelation. Thus, when Joachim referred to the Jews as carnal, he meant their literalism and their insistence that they alone were Abraham’s heirs who must someday inherit the Land of Promise. Note, however, that Joachim was a reformist apocalyptic. Most Christians were more carnal than the Jews, even if the Christians pretended to be otherwise. Moreover, *carnalitas* for Joachim meant worldliness, being attached to and desiring the things of this world.

Joachim took up the issue of God’s rejection of the elder son of Isaac, Esau, and his election of the younger son, Jacob, in his *Dialogi de prescientia dei et predestinatione electorum*. The election of Jacob was not due to his merits but to the mercy of God. Esau was rejected because God knew that in pride he would reject God’s mercy. The humble embrace God’s mercy, the proud reject it. Thus Joachim argued that the Jews had been humble when they were in Egypt, but by the time of Jesus they had become proud, while the Gentiles were then in humiliation. By the 1180s, however, the Latin Christians had become proud and arrogant—effectively, they were “Babylon”—while the Jews had been humbled and would, therefore, be saved.⁵⁴ Gian Luca Potestà has described this type of proceeding as “*a spirale*.”⁵⁵ Both Potestà and Matthias Kaup agree that this same principle functioned in the *De prophetia ignota*.⁵⁶

utrumque testamentum differentia est. Differunt sane utriusque natiuitates; differunt uite; differunt bella; differunt et uictorie. Illi [Jews] enim ex carne, isti [Christians], ut iam dixi, ex aqua et spiritu nati sunt. Illi faciebant uxoris libellum repudii et simul habebant quot uolebant; isti in typo Christi et ecclesie singuli singulas tenere iubentur, quas etiam nec dimittere licet nisi ob solam causam fornicationis. Illi pro terrenis possessionibus pugnaverunt; siue ut optinerent non suas, siue ne in iam suis cedere hostibus uiderentur; isti non tam pro terra aut qualibet terrena substantia quam pro sancte libertate ecclesie et salute fratrum suorum preliasse noscuntur ...” Joachim’s Gregorian outlook is clearly indicated in his statement that Christians, or better truly “spiritual” Christians, struggle for the liberty of the church.

⁵⁴ Joachim, *Dialogi de prescientia dei et predestinatione electorum*, ed. Gian Luca Potestà (Rome, 1995), 10–22, 65–112. Pietro de Leo, *Gioacchino da Fiore*, pp. 51–123, had edited the *Dialogi* in 1988.

⁵⁵ Joachim, *Dialogi de prescientia dei*, 21.

⁵⁶ Joachim, *De prophetia ignota*, 22–25.

If we realize that pride is the underlying cause of carnality and possessiveness and that humility alone enables us truly to desire spiritual goods, then Joachim's arguments in the *Dialogi* were the same as those in the *Liber de concordia*. Joachim was both a disciple of Bernard and a forerunner of Francis of Assisi.

Joachim had two goals when he wrote his *Adversus Iudaeos*. By refuting Jewish objections against and criticisms of Christianity, the abbot intended to strengthen "those [Christians] whose weak souls might suffer shipwreck in their faith" if the Jewish arguments were not convincingly answered. Joachim also addressed the Jews "because he sensed that the time was near for mercy for them, for their consolation, and for their conversion."⁵⁷ Joachim limited himself to using "authorities" from the Hebrew Scriptures to refute Jewish denial of the triune nature of God, of the incarnation of the Son of God in Jesus, and of the spiritual understanding, "establishing the letter that kills" (cf. 2 Cor 3:6).⁵⁸ "You ought not to think that the holy evangelists handed down to us a new faith which might be alien from that of the prophets and contrary to the faith of your fathers, but [think that] those things have been spoken to you enigmatically, [while] these [same] things have been handed down to us more openly."⁵⁹

Joachim next quoted the opening of John's Gospel which describes the Word (*Verbum*) as the agent of God. *Dabar*, Joachim noted, was

⁵⁷ Joachim, *Adversus Iudeos*, 3: "Contra uetustam duritiam Iudeorum iccirco nonnulli agendum extimant auctoritatibus scripturarum quia, si eis aduersantibus fidei nostre non esset qui resisteret ex aduerso, daretur occasio inimicis crucis Christi insultandi de simplicitate credentium nomini christiano, et hi, qui imbecilles essent animo, paterentur naufragium circa fidem. Michi autem non modo propter istud eorum contentioni et perfidie obuiare pro uiribus uoti est, uerum etiam quia adesse sentio tempus miserendi eis, tempus concolationis et conuersionis eorum." Cf. *Adversus Iudeos*, p. 85, where Joachim wrote: "Sed ne forte fiant uobis in scandalum uerba uite, annuntio uobis adesse tempus concolationis uestre tantum ut afflicti pro peccatis uestris agnoscatis et confiteamini iniquitates uestras, scientes et intelligentes quod non absque cause abstulerit uobis deus sacerdotium et regnum et uentilauerit uos in terras inimicorum uestrorum."

⁵⁸ Joachim, *Adversus Iudeos*, p. 3. Joachim seeks to prove that God is triune according to the Hebrew Scriptures on pp. 4-9. On pp. 9-17 he argues that the Son of God appeared in those same Scriptures as an angel or messenger or as a deity and on pp. 17-21 that God is seen in them as Spirit.

⁵⁹ Joachim, *Adversus Iudeos*, 23: "Nec putare debetis nouam fidem tradidisse nobis sanctos euangelistas que sit aliena a prophetis et contraria fidei patrum uestrorum, sed quod illi in enigmate sunt loquuti, hoc isti nobis manifestius tradiderunt." One of Joachim's favorite texts was 1 Cor 13:12, "Videmus nunc per speculum in enigmate, tunc autem facie ad faciem ..." I believe that he was alluding to that text here.

the Hebrew equivalent of *verbum*. Joachim cited John 14:16–17 on the sending of the Holy Spirit, whose Hebrew equivalent according to Joachim was *ruah*.⁶⁰ Joachim then equated the *Verbum* of John with the *Sapientia* of Prov 3:19–20 which speaks of Wisdom as an agent through whom God founded the earth.⁶¹ Wisdom was the offspring of God, and thus the Hebrew Scriptures, speaking of Wisdom, described the Son of God.⁶² Joachim acknowledged that the incarnation of God through Mary scandalized the Jews.⁶³ Joachim explained that God's motive was to exhibit humility and to inspire love in us.⁶⁴

While Joachim was working his way through the prophetic texts that witnessed to the incarnation, he came to Daniel 2, the vision of the statue. According to the abbot, the golden kingdom was that of Nebuchadnezzar, the silver that of Alexander, the bronze that of the Roman Empire, and the iron that of the Saracens "by which many kingdoms have been and are daily conquered." The kingdom of Christ has begun among these, it descends from heaven without hands, and it will destroy all these kingdoms, "so that it itself alone may be spread on the earth and thus extended may remain everywhere in eternity."⁶⁵ The Jews denied, before Pilate, that Jesus was the Christ and from that moment ceased to be his people. For the most part they became blind and are about to receive the antichrist. Joachim meant by this that the Jews had become subject to the antichristian powers in the world as had the carnal Christians, not that the Jews were to embrace the traditional or final antichrist.⁶⁶

⁶⁰ Joachim, *Aduersus Iudeos*, 23–24.

⁶¹ Joachim, *Aduersus Iudeos*, 27. On the feminine personification of Wisdom as an agent of God, see Barbara Newman, *Sister of Wisdom: Hildegard's Theology of the Feminine* (Berkeley, 1987), 64–71.

⁶² Joachim, *Aduersus Iudeos*, 28: "Audite ergo et intelligite, et primoquidem quod dicit de se ipsa, ut intelliga is aperte dei prolem esse sapientiam, deinde eruditricem, omnium et creatricem cum deo omnium creaturarum."

⁶³ Joachim, *Aduersus Iudeos*, 29.

⁶⁴ Joachim, *Aduersus Iudeos*, 30.

⁶⁵ Joachim, *Aduersus Iudeos*, 44.

⁶⁶ Joachim, *Aduersus Iudeos*, 48–49. Cf. pp. 57–59, where Joachim argues that anyone who denies that Jesus was the Christ necessarily embraces the antichrist and compares the Jews with the Patarenes. Antichrist for Joachim did not necessarily mean the final antichrist described by Adso and, in fact, we probably understand Joachim better if we think of antichrist as an antichristian power, similar to the many antichrists of 1 John 1:18. For the tradition of many antichrists and its connection to clerical corruption, see the opening paragraph of Adso's letter, where he states that any cleric who violates his rule is an antichrist (McGinn, *Apocalyptic Spirituality*, 90) and Bernard of Clairvaux's statement that all the ministers are outwardly Christian but inwardly they

Then Joachim sought to prove that the coming savior promised by the Hebrew Scriptures was Jesus Christ. Joachim argued that the Jews of his day were still blinded by God and thus unable to understand passages from the prophets that demanded to be interpreted spiritually. Among other elements that demanded such understanding were the Sabbath, the law, and circumcision. Joachim insisted that the prophets intended neither the promise to David nor the promise to restore Jerusalem to be understood literally. Moreover, Abraham was promised that the Gentiles would be saved.⁶⁷

If, moreover, you say, O Jews, that Jesus, son of Mary, was not the Christ, because he does not save the sons of Israel according to the promise, we say: "That which he has not done, he will do yet in the end, when the years of your captivity will have been finished, [those days that are] designated in the forty days during which the prophet [Ezekiel] lay on his right side" [cf. Ezek 4:6]. But nevertheless even then some will be saved as Isaiah the prophet said: "If the number of Israel will have been like the sand of the sea, a remnant will be saved [Isa 10:22]."⁶⁸

Paul quoted the same text from Isaiah in Romans 9:27, arguing the same point, another indication that Joachim's approach to the Jews was fundamentally Pauline. Paul argued that Jewish blindness was temporary and would last only until the salvation of the Gentiles had been completed (Rom 11:1–32). Joachim likewise argued that all Israel would be saved after the Gentiles have become Christian.⁶⁹

And indeed we have learned from both the Old and New Testaments that these things [the completion of Gentile conversions and the conversion of all Israel] will happen in the future about the end of the world.

serve antichrist (Bernard, *Sermones* no. 33, Opera 1:244). On Joachim and antichrist see my forthcoming article, "The Double Antichrist and Antichrists in Abbot Joachim," to appear in a volume entitled *The Apocalypse in Word and Image*, being edited by Dr. Mildred Budney of the Research Group on Manuscript Evidence in Princeton, N.J.

⁶⁷ Joachim, *Aduersus Iudeos*, 56–79.

⁶⁸ Joachim, *Aduersus Iudeos*, 79–80: "Si autem dicitis, o Iudei, non fuisse Christum Ihesum filium Marie, quia non saluat filios Israel iuxta promissum, dicimus: Quod non fecit tunc faciet adhuc in fine, cum consummati fuerint anni captiuitatis uestre, designati in quadraginta diebus quibus iacuit propheta super latus suum dextrum, sed tamen et tunc saluabit aliquos sicut dicit Isaias propheta: 'Si fuerit numerus Israel sicut harena maris, reliquie salue fient.'"

⁶⁹ Joachim, *Aduersus Iudeos*, 87: "Quamuis etsi tunc non saluauit generaliter Israel eo quod non esset eo tempore aptus ad salutem, non ideo tamen minus saluator est, quia et mox ut ipse uenit salue facte sunt gentes, et ad ultimum per eius euangelium saluabitur Israel sicut et Apostolus dicit: 'Cum plenitudo gentium intrauerit, tunc omnis Israel saluus fiet'" (Rom 11:25–26). See also pp. 91–92.

But, desiring at the least to snatch some of you from the kingdom of shadows before that general time on account of the nearness of the light, we worked in this little book to give you advance notice, O Jewish man, about the sweet blessings [that are to come], imitating that dog that preceded the angel [Raphael], the leader of Tobias [who was] approaching his blind father so that [his parent] might receive the light.⁷⁰

Joachim concluded the *Adversus Iudaeos* by interpreting the book of Tobit as an allegory of the history of the Jews. At the end of this exposition, Joachim hinted that, just as Tobias had returned home after celebrating his marriage to Sarah, so after a spiritual marriage between the remnants of the Jews and the Gentile successors of the apostles, the rulers of the church would approach the Jews with true love.⁷¹

To understand Joachim's meaning, we must return to the *Liber de concordia*. Joachim expected that the "exile in Babylon" was about to culminate shortly after 1200. Then two persecutors, the sixth and seventh heads of the dragon, would attack "Babylon" and liberate the church.⁷² A new pope would lead the return from "Babylon," "coming back not by walking or moving from place to place, but because he will be given complete freedom to innovate the Christian religion and to preach the word of God."⁷³ This will inaugurate a Sabbath that will last until the distant final end of history.⁷⁴ This Sabbath is the third *status*, the culmination of the "exodus" that had begun with Bernard, Pope Eugenius III, and the five Cistercian motherhouses.⁷⁵ The Cistercians, however, have begun to rejoice in having more and more sheep and plough oxen, just as the Israelite tribes rejoiced in having larger families. Thus

⁷⁰ Joachim, *Adversus Iudeos*, 95–96: "Sed cupientes aliquos uestrum etiam ante tempus illud generale saltim pro ipsa uicinitate lucis de regno eripere tenebrarum, dedimus operam in hoc opusculo preuenire uos, o uiri Iudei, in benedictionibus dulcedinis imitantes catulum illum qui precedebat angelum ductorem Tobie appropinquantis ceco patri ut acciperet lumen."

⁷¹ Joachim, *Adversus Iudeos*, 96–99. Joachim concludes: "Sane celebratis nuptiis reuertitur Tobias, duce angelo, ad cecum patrem, quia peracto spiritali matrimonio inter reliquas Iudeorum et gentes successores apostolorum, qui usque hodie illorum uice regunt ecclesiam, ducti a Spiritu sancto, reuertentur animo et predicatione ad populum Iudeorum, ut ostendens illi affectum compassionis, qui designatur in felle, hec est enim uera dilectio et probatio caritatis, recipiat lumen quod iam dudum amisit, et confiteatur domino quam bonus, quam in seculum misericordia eius." See also Joachim, *Liber de concordia noui ac ueteris testamenti*, Bk. 5, chap. 88 (Venice, 1519; reprinted Frankfurt a.M., 1964) fols. 116va–117va.

⁷² See above, p. 12.

⁷³ Joachim, *Liber de concordia*, Bk. 4, Pt. 1, chap. 45, p. 402.

⁷⁴ Joachim, *Liber de concordia*, Bk. 4, Pt. 1, chap. 45–46, pp. 402–404.

⁷⁵ See above, p. 12.

the Cistercians must give way to a “likeness indeed of the apostolic life, in which no terrestrial possession will be acquired by heredity but rather will be sold,” just as the Christians in Jerusalem sold their possessions and deposited the proceedings in a common chest (Acts 4:34–35).⁷⁶ In this coming “order,” no one will rejoice in having sons, but they will want to have brothers, just as the pope addresses other bishops as brothers, because for fathers to minister to sons contradicts the rational order but for brothers to minister to brothers is natural.⁷⁷

Alongside the many goods that the Jerusalem Christians received came, however, “that deadly disease which would devour them, namely the zeal of pharisaical superstition and emulation of the Law.”⁷⁸ Joachim cited Acts 15 where Jewish Christians sought to insist that Gentile converts must be circumcised and obey the law just as the Jewish converts did (cf. Gal 2). Those Jewish Christians have a counterpart in the twelfth century, according to Joachim, in those monks “who put ancestral traditions ahead of the grace of God,” and who lacking charity, vaunt their own constitutions as holier than those of other orders.⁷⁹

For just as then Pharisees threw themselves before men on account of their righteousness, thus now some monks, thinking that the perfection of justice and eternal salvation [depends on] the religious habit and not rather on humility and love, justify themselves before men, paying no attention to what the Lord said about the two men who “went up to the temple in order to pray” [Luke 18:10].⁸⁰

But, Joachim added, the faith of the Pharisees was true, while that of the Sadducees was false, and Paul, Nicodemus, Gamaliel and many others were Pharisees.

I think, nevertheless, as I have already said, that in those men whom the world expects to come soon—another one being added about whom there is no manifest word—that the concord to Zechariah, John the Baptist, and to the man Christ Jesus will be consummated; in which manifestation there will also be, as we believe, manifest concord of the twelve apostles, especially moreover of John the evangelist and of the seven churches that were in Asia, or of the seven tribes that afterward received

⁷⁶ Joachim, *Liber de concordia*, Bk. 4, Pt. 2, chap. 2, p. 419. The translated phrase reads: “Necesse quippe est ut succedat similitudo uero apostolice uite, in qua non acquirebatur possessio terrene hereditatis, sed uendebatur potius ...”

⁷⁷ Joachim, *Liber de concordia*, Bk. 4, Pt. 2, chap. 2, pp. 419–420.

⁷⁸ Joachim, *Liber de concordia*, Bk. 4, Pt. 2, chap. 2, p. 420: “... non defuit uel ipse pestis que consumeret eam, zelus scilicet pharisyce superstitionis et emulatio legis ...”

⁷⁹ Joachim, *Liber de concordia*, Bk. 4, Pt. 2, chap. 2, p. 421.

⁸⁰ Joachim, *Liber de concordia*, Bk. 4, Pt. 2, chap. 2, p. 421.

their inheritance. "And the gospel of the kingdom will be preached throughout the entire world" [Matt 24:14]; and the spiritual understanding will come to the Jews and like a thunderbolt shatter the hardness of their heart, so that that promise that is written in *Malachi* will be fulfilled: "Behold I will send to you Elijah the prophet, before the great and horrible day of the Lord. And he will convert the hearts of the fathers to the sons and the hearts of the sons to the fathers; lest perhaps I come and I strike the land with anathema" [Mal 4:5-6].⁸¹

Who, in Joachim's thinking, were these three who would be the concords in this final exodus of the seven tribes that had received their inheritance last, of the apostles, and of the seven churches in Asia, and who would bring about the full conversion of the Gentiles and the salvation of all Israel? In the *Liber de concordia*, Joachim introduced a circle figure in which the three larger circles each contained three smaller circles. The third larger circle was labeled *tertius status* and, below this, "the spiritual men preach in the world so that they may gain some" and then "these spiritual men cross over to the harsher life lest they perish with the sons of the world." Finally, "those who believe the spiritual men enter into that rest about which the holy prophets spoke."⁸² In the *Expositio in Apocalypsim*, Joachim argued that the two witnesses of Revelation 11:3 would be two orders of spiritual men rather than individuals, one of which would preach while the other would contemplate.⁸³

Joachim dreamed of a future Christian world in which both the Jewish and Gentile peoples would flower as never before. He envisioned this dream in his figure of a vine from the stump of which, labeled as Noah, arise three shoots. The shoot named Ham soon ends but those of Shem and Japheth, representing the Jewish and Gentile peoples respectively, intertwine to form three circles, the last of which must represent either the *tertius status* or the Sabbath of the second *tempus*. In this circle, below which is written *Spiritus sanctus*, both shoots flower abundantly, filling and exceeding the limits of the circle.⁸⁴

⁸¹ Joachim, *Liber de concordia*, Bk. 4, Pt. 2, chap. 2, p. 422.

⁸² Joachim, *Liber de concordia*, Bk. 2, Pt. 2, chaps. 6-7, Figure Two, pp. 161-172. I have translated from the version of the Figure that is found in Vat. Lat. 4861.

⁸³ Joachim, *Expositio in Apocalypsim*, ad. 11:3, Pt. 3, fols. 146ra-149vb. See my forthcoming article, "The Double Antichrist and Antichrists in Joachim" cited in n. 66 above.

⁸⁴ Joachim, *Liber figurarum*, tav. xxii. See Reeves and Hirsch-Reich, *The Figurae of Joachim of Fiore*, 170-173.

Joachim's thinking about the Jews was both Pauline and reformist. The Jews played a key role in his version of salvation history and the reform of the church. The Jews were carnal, but this meant only that they expected God to fulfill his promises in literal, earthly forms, namely a Davidic ruler and the reconstitution of the kingdom in Palestine. Their blindness to the spiritual understanding had lasted until Joachim's time. Such blindness, however, afflicted carnal Christians also. Joachim could speak of the Jews as belonging to the antichrist but for him all those who were carnal belonged to the antichristian powers. Soon the coming spiritual men would liberate not only the church but also the Jews from carnality.

Joachim's thinking about the Jews stood in striking contrast to the prevailing trend in the last decades of the twelfth century. He did not focus on their role in the crucifixion, he did not demonize them and make them part of a devilish conspiracy against Christendom, he did not argue that they ought to be enserfed and treated harshly, and he certainly would have fought against massacres and forced conversions. Joachim assumed that the conversion of the Jews would take place only when the appropriate time came according to God's plan and he assumed that time was near. He also had a glimmering of the instrument of that conversion, an order or orders that would embrace genuine poverty, that would be characterized by true humility and love, and that would preach the spiritual understanding. Might the friars, both the Franciscans and the Dominicans, be just what Joachim had envisioned? Popes Innocent III, Honorius III and Gregory IX were all well aware of Joachim and may well have been sympathetic to his views.⁸⁵ Joachim created expectations among his followers that they hoped the friars would fulfill. He also gave both his disciples and the friars a model for their relations to the Jews.

⁸⁵ Grundmann, *Zur Biographie*, pp. 255–280, discussed the career of Rainer of Ponza and his possible influence on Innocent's, Honorius's and Gregory's attitudes toward Joachim. Michael Cusato, "*Non propheta, sed prophanus apostata*": The Eschatology of Elias of Cortona and his Deposition as Minister in 1239," in *That Others may Know and Love* (see above n. 30), pp. 255–283, discusses the question of Joachim and Gregory IX. Several papers at the recent 5^o Congresso sponsored by the Centro internazionale di Studi Gioachimiti dealt with Joachim and Innocent III (see above n. 49).

This page intentionally left blank

THE ANTICHRIST AND THE JEWS IN FOUR THIRTEENTH-CENTURY APOCALYPSE COMMENTARIES

DAVID BURR

The aim of this essay is a relatively limited one: to describe the apocalyptic role assigned to the Jews in four thirteenth-century commentaries on the book of Revelation. That is, to be sure, a rather small sample, since we know many more Apocalypse commentaries written in that period;¹ yet it is hard to imagine doing justice to any more in an essay of this length, and these four are related in some important ways.

We will begin by examining three commentaries together. The reason for considering them in this way is that they share a remarkable amount of common material, and they do so in a way that suggests a fourth, still undiscovered commentary that exerted influence on all three. At least two of them are by Franciscans. One may well be by Vital du Four, though there are suggestions to the contrary.² At any rate, we will call him "Vital."

A second commentary, also clearly Franciscan, was published in 1647 under the name of Alexander of Hales, then in 1773 among Bonaventure's works.³ Modern scholars have been unwilling to assign it to either Alexander or Bonaventure,⁴ and that seems unquestionable in

¹ For a more general overview, see my "Mendicant Readings of the Apocalypse," in *The Apocalypse in the Middle Ages* (Ithaca, 1992), 89–102.

² See Dionisio Pacetti, "L'Espositio super Apocalypsim di Mattia di Svezia," *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum*, 54 (1961), 297–299. It is attributed to Vital by MSS Assisi 66 and 71, and to both Vital and *Fratre Petro doctore sacrosancte romane ecclesie* (by different hands) in Assisi 358. A note inside the front cover of 358 argues for authorship by "Petrus," blaming the Vital attribution on confusion caused by the common *incipit*; yet the note appeals for support to the Vital attribution in Assisi 50, which is probably by Iohannes Gallensis. Most of the work found in Assisi 66, etc., is published in Bernardinus Senensis, *Commentarii in apocalypsim*, in *Opera* (Paris, 1635), vol. 3, but the edition turns to a completely different work at Rev 20:12 and thereafter echoes various authors, including Guilelmus de Militona and Nicholas de Lyra. In fact, it differs from the work in Assisi 66, etc., at specific points throughout. I shall cite from MS Assisi 66.

³ Alexander Halensis, *Commentarii in apocalypsim* (Paris, 1647); Bonaventure, *Sancti Bonaventurae ... Operum ... Supplementum* (Trent, 1773), vol. 2, 1–1037. I shall cite the former.

⁴ For manuscript evidence and comments on style and date see the analysis by the

Bonaventure's case, though somewhat more ambiguous in Alexander's. We will call the author "Alexander" here without implying that it was actually he who wrote it.

The third commentary, which begins with the words *Vidit Iacob*, has been assigned to Hugh of St. Cher by Robert Lerner.⁵ There is much to be said for the identification, since the commentary shares common material, not only with Vital and Alexander, but with another commentary beginning *Aser pinguis*, and the latter is probably by Hugh, or at least by a group of scholars working under him. If *Vidit Iacob* really is by Hugh, that makes it substantially earlier than the one presumably by Vital du Four, though not necessarily earlier than the one we are calling "Alexander." There is much to be done on these commentaries. The present essay represents no more than an initial foray into a complicated matter someone might profitably investigate.

What do we find in the commentaries? First, we find traces of an exegetical tradition that had been building almost from the beginning of Christianity, one that assigned the Jews an important though not particularly laudable role in the coming apocalyptic crisis. In this tradition it was suggested that the antichrist would be born of the Jews.⁶ In some versions this expectation became more specific: Some said he would be the son of a Jewish prostitute. Others insisted that he would be born from the tribe of Dan. It was widely believed that once he began his rise, the antichrist would be recognized by the Jews as the Messiah and they would flock to him. He would rebuild the temple and rule from Jerusalem. One could go on, but there is little point in doing so. The important thing is that by the thirteenth century such ideas had worked their way into earlier Apocalypse commentaries and exegetical aids like the *Glossa ordinaria* and Peter Lombard's *Glossatura magna*.⁷ Thus they were very hard to ignore, and commentators felt required to work them in somehow.

Quaracchi editors in their prolegomena to Bonaventure's Bible commentaries in *Opera*, (Quaracchi, 1882–1902), vol. 6, ix–xiii.

⁵ Robert Lerner, "Poverty, Preaching and Eschatology in the Revelation Commentaries of 'Hugh of St. Cher,'" in *The Bible in the Medieval World: Essays in memory of Beryl Smalley*, ed. Katherine Walsh and Diana Wood (Oxford, 1985), 157–189.

⁶ The following is covered well in Richard Emmerson, *Antichrist in the Middle Ages* (Seattle, 1981).

⁷ Thus the *Glossa* and the Lombard both mention that the antichrist will be born of the tribe of Dan, and the Lombard says that under him the Jews will rebuild the temple in Jerusalem. *Opera omnia Walafridi Strabi* in Migne, *Patrologiae cursus completus*, series latina (Paris, 1844–1866), vol. 114, 622a; *Glossatura magna* in Migne, *Patrologiae*, vol. 192, 317b.

Nevertheless, our three exegetes were also heirs to what seems to have been the standard approach to the Apocalypse at Paris (and perhaps elsewhere as well) during the latter half of the thirteenth century, an approach that had been taking shape at least since Bede.⁸ According to this interpretation, the Apocalypse was divided into seven visions, the first four of which were thought to recapitulate church history as a whole. Since church history itself was seen as divided into seven periods, that meant four runs through those historical periods. The last three visions were seen as dealing with the final times.

The sevenfold division of church history provided a framework in which the church proceeded through a series of distinct challenges, each countered by a specific group within the church. The Jews presented the first threat, and it was the apostles who checked it. Then came the pagans versus the martyrs; then the heretics were combated by the church fathers; then the hypocrites were countered by the monks. Thus, in the first four periods, the church was opposed by Judaism, paganism, heresy, and hypocrisy. By the fifth period, the devil, recognizing that one temptation at a time had not worked, tried combining them. The fifth period—which these commentaries saw as just underway—and sixth period that would follow it, instead of getting new temptations, would see the old ones intensify until they reached a climax in the persecution of the antichrist. The fifth period was dominated by the precursors of the antichrist, who prepared the way for him; and the sixth was the period of the antichrist himself. Then, once the antichrist was gone, the world would be granted a brief seventh period of peace before the final judgment.

The important thing for our purposes is that this framework limited the role Judaism could play in apocalyptic expectation. The Jews held center stage as adversaries only in the first period, bowing out the moment the pagan emperors began their persecution. They were, of course, still around and would play some role in the fifth and sixth periods, but they would be no more than one of several distractions. On the whole they shared the bill with the Muslims, heretics, and hypocrites, and of these groups the Jews were given least attention. Top billing was actually shared by the heretics and hypocrites. Of the former, two groups were given particular attention, the Cathars and “worldly philosophers.” Of these, the former are often mentioned, yet one gets

⁸ See Burr, *Olivi's Peaceable Kingdom* (Philadelphia, 1993), chap. 2.

the impression they are not the sort of thing these exegetes have in mind when they draw a close connection between the antichrist and heresy. In fact, the Cathars seem almost diametrically opposed to the sort of allure the antichrist will exert. The latter will tempt people away from Christ with worldly promises.⁹ He will offer a very material sort of temptation, one that takes the world and the senses seriously. Given the medieval Christian tendency to speak of the Jews as seeking a worldly messiah who would establish a worldly reign, one might expect our exegetes to speak a great deal about Judaism in this context; yet they do not. They find it much more congenial to identify the antichrist's material temptation with the one offered by philosophy in their own day, presumably in the form of heterodox Aristotelianism, although the connection is not explicitly made.¹⁰ In the final analysis the references to heresy in the time of the antichrist are suggestive but not terribly informative. Typical is Alexander's complaint that "today falsity and novelty seem more pleasing than catholic truth, and vain subtlety exciting admiration finds a more willing audience than useful truth leading to repentance."¹¹ One can do pretty much what one pleases with such statements, although they are clearly related to a widespread Franciscan unease concerning the sort of education disseminated at Paris under the impact of Aristotelian philosophy.

When we proceed from heresy to hypocrisy we find a great deal more with which to work. All three of these exegetes reserve their most withering scorn for the *praelati*, the corrupt church leaders of their time who are preparing the way for the antichrist and will presumably serve him when he arrives. If the antichrist promises material rewards he cannot fail with this group. It would be hard to overemphasize the detestation of contemporary ecclesiastics shown by all three exegetes. Other strata of the church are identified with the age of the antichrist from time to time, particularly princes;¹² but none of them really bears comparison with the prelates when it comes to putting a human face on corruption.

⁹ Alexander, 116.

¹⁰ See especially Vital, 60va–vb, 63rb–64va, 74ra–vb, 106rb, 117rb–va. This interest is also seen in *Vidit Iacob*, 405, and Alexander, 176 (which reflect the common source) and in Alexander, 301.

¹¹ Alexander, 159. Essentially the same statement is found in Vital, 77rb and *Vidit Iacob*, 397.

¹² E.g., Alexander, 234–237.

The question, of course, is how far up the hierarchy they think the corruption extends or will extend. Does it (or will it) extend to the pope? This is a crucial question. It is one thing to envisage a hierarchy that is largely corrupt despite the efforts of the pope, and quite another to imagine one in which the corruption will be directed from the top by the pope himself. Our exegetes are understandably unwilling to spend much time on the latter scenario, but two of the three are willing to entertain it, or at least seem to hint at it as a possibility.¹³

The principal effect of this concentration on heresy and ecclesiastical corruption is to shift attention from the enemies without to those within. If the antichrist's precursors have been working within the church throughout the fifth period to prepare the way for his arrival in the sixth, then it is hard to imagine how the Jews could play much of a role in the great upheaval. In fact, the most significant role played by the Jews in the apocalyptic scenario is not as agents of the antichrist but as converts to Christianity after the antichrist's demise.¹⁴

Having said so much, we must remind ourselves that a few other elements, the flotsam and jetsam of previous exegesis, occasionally bob to the surface. For example in dealing with Revelation 13:1, the beast rising from the sea, two of our three exegetes, Alexander and Hugh, interpret the sea as a reference to the Jews and cite the claim that the antichrist will be born of the tribe of Dan.¹⁵ Nevertheless, Alexander offers it as one of several possibilities and makes it clear that he personally prefers to interpret the sea as the Christian laity.

Again, in reporting a series of views concerning the identity of Gog and Magog (Rev 20:7), Alexander and Hugh say that, according to the Jews, they are people in the east who will come at the end to attack Jerusalem. They add that the Jews expect Jerusalem to be rebuilt at that time by their Messiah and look forward to living in glory for one thousand years, then being transferred into heaven.¹⁶

Another, more important anomaly occurs in the process of dealing with Revelation 16:2, in which the first of seven angels empties his vial, smiting those who bear the mark of the beast. Two of the three exegetes—again Alexander and Hugh—make this the only passage in

¹³ See my *Olivi's Peaceable Kingdom*, 47f.

¹⁴ Alexander, 204; *Vidit Iacob*, 416.

¹⁵ Alexander, 235; *Vidit Iacob*, 432.

¹⁶ Alexander, 374; *Vidit Iacob*, 493. Vital, 141r, offers as one current interpretation that they are a people heretofore imprisoned within the Caspian Mountains who will go to Jerusalem in the time of the antichrist, but he does not mention the Jews.

the entire Apocalypse in which the Jews as a group are directly related to the antichrist, not merely during the sixth period but throughout history.¹⁷ Both apply the passage to the punishment of the Jews in the first century and argue that, even though the antichrist did not even exist at the time, the Jews nonetheless showed themselves to be his followers by rejecting Christ.

So far the connection seems nothing more than the exegetes' effort to respect the logic of their own exegetical assumptions. The mark of the beast is a sign of the antichrist, yet the first angel must refer to the first period and thus to punishment of the Jews in the first period. Therefore the Jews in the first period must in some sense have been followers of the antichrist before he himself appeared. One might imagine these scholars saying the same thing of the Romans if those with the mark of the beast had been exterminated by the second angel rather than the first. Perhaps they would have, but the fact remains that Alexander and Hugh both go on to extend the exegesis in a dangerous direction. Both note that the Jews not only *were* but *will* in fact bear the mark of the beast, because they still await a messiah and when the antichrist comes they will think their expectations fulfilled. Thus they will become the antichrist's followers.

These passages demonstrate the peculiarly opportunistic nature of the exegesis carried out by our three commentators. They are willing to use bits of tradition as they come to hand, so their interpretation moves in several directions, often without much sense that it is doing so. The result is an apocalyptic scenario that contains a number of elements. These elements are not inconsistent, but neither are they all equally significant. The Jews are included in the general scenario, but in the final analysis their role is a minor one. The general tendency here is to see the apocalyptic tribulation as a result, not of outside threats, but of trouble within the Christian community.

When we turn from these three exegetes to our fourth commentator, Peter John Olivi, whose commentary was produced at the very end of the thirteenth century, what we find is in many ways not so much a departure from their reading as a systematization and radicalization of it. Like the other three, Olivi, while he mentions the Jews from time to

¹⁷ Alexander, 291; *Vidit Iacob*, 458f. Vital, 117f, is less clear. He says they "habent caracterem bestie, idest nomen antichristi profitendo, et in eos quod adoraverunt ymaginem eius, statuam edificando, ac per hoc idolatrando."

time, is more interested in the heresy and ecclesiastical corruption he sees within the church. Like the other three, he mentions the Cathars but does not portray them as a major factor in the temptation of the antichrist. Like them, he is more interested in the possibilities of heterodox Aristotelianism. Like them, he lays heavy stress on the decline of the church in the fifth period as a preparation for the antichrist in the sixth; and, like them, he gives a lion's share of his attention to the *praelati*.

Nevertheless, all of this fits together much more neatly in Olivi's commentary. The basic opposition leading to the persecution of the antichrist, one between carnality and spirituality, is defined by Olivi in such a way as to make it clear what the Jews, Muslims, Cathars, heterodox Aristotelians, and corrupt churchmen all have in common. All are characterized by an excessive evaluation of and reliance on the senses and the material world. His explanation certainly walks on all fours in the case of the Cathars, but at least he tries to work them into a consistent argument.

Moreover, he is much clearer than the others as to what will happen. The others speak of ecclesiastical corruption but cannot bring themselves to consider the possibility that the pope himself may become its chief proponent. Olivi is perfectly willing to consider that scenario. In fact his notion of the two antichrists, the mystical and the great one, allows him to suggest that not one but two popes may play the role of antichrist in the near future. He always states the matter tentatively—indeed he states most matters tentatively when he moves beyond his own time into the future—but the idea of a pope as antichrist seems very plausible to him.

Olivi's systematizing tendencies are aided by his devotion to a slightly different conception of the sixth period than that found in the prior three exegetes. They see it as the culmination under the antichrist of the corruption already increasing in the fifth period. Olivi sees it as that, but he also sees it as a time of positive change as well. From the days of Francis of Assisi and Joachim of Fiore, something radically new has been happening in the church. Olivi sees in the Franciscan rule and in Joachite exegesis two indications that the world is entering a new age with greater spiritual possibilities. It is entering the third age of history, that of the Holy Spirit. This third age will not replace Christ and the Bible, but it will see Christ's work in a slightly different way and the Bible read in a slightly different way. Olivi speaks of Christ's three advents: in the flesh, in the spirit, and in judgment. Christ comes in the

flesh at the end of the first age of history to usher in the second, and in the spirit at the end of the second age to usher in the third.

This sense of a clash between two tendencies in the sixth period helps Olivi to make sense of ecclesiastical behavior in his time. His own age is much like the first century, when Christ's advent in the flesh brought in the second age. At such key moments of historical change the old order, the religious establishment, is apt to prove itself inflexible. Hardened into the corrupt, carnal ways of the declining old era, it fails to recognize novelty as God's work and thus persecutes it. Thus Christ was persecuted by the priests and Pharisees, and thus adherents of the Franciscan rule will be persecuted by the new priests and Pharisees, the ecclesiastical hierarchy.

The result will be similar yet different. In the first century the apostles, rejected by Jewish leaders, turned to the Gentiles. In the near future the tide will be reversed. Adherents of the new age, persecuted by the Catholic hierarchy and the purported religious experts, will seek refuge outside the Latin church and will find the Greeks, Muslims, Mongols, and Jews more receptive to their message than the Catholic hierarchy was. The order is significant, since at one point Olivi seems to suggest that it represents the general sequence of conversion in the future;¹⁸ yet he also thinks the conversion is already underway, having begun symbolically with Francis's mission among the Muslims; and he expects to see substantial success, not only after the antichrist's death, but before it as well.

All of this gives Olivi's treatment of the Jews a particularly nonconfrontational quality. They represent, to be sure, one variety of carnality with their expectation of a messiah who will be an earthly ruler. They must, to be sure, become Christians if they are to be saved. Nevertheless, they will play a negligible role in the temptation of the antichrist and a very big one in the progress of the new age outside the bounds of Latin Catholicism. In other words, the Jews may be carnal, but they will prove no more so than the ecclesiastical hierarchy and a whole lot easier to convert.

Olivi does in fact allow a substantially greater role to external forces in the temptation of the antichrist than do the other three exegetes, but it is on the Muslims rather than the Jews that he lavishes his attention. However tentative and ambiguous his predictions may be, they seem to

¹⁸ *Lectura super apocalypsim*, in Warren Lewis, "Peter John Olivi: Prophet of the Year 2000" (Ph.D. diss., University of Tübingen, 1972 [hereafter LSA]), 974.

suggest that he anticipates first the temptation of the mystical antichrist, a persecution of the dawning new age by a pseudo-pope supported by a secular authority within Christendom; then destruction of these carnal leaders by a non-Christian army; then the temptation of the great antichrist, which will involve persecution by a non-Christian ruler who will be supported by a renegade Christian pseudo-pope. While he does not assert definitively that the non-Christians will be Muslim, he clearly favors that identification.¹⁹ Olivi's interest is symptomatic of the growing attention given to Islam by exegetes from the 1290s through the early fourteenth century.²⁰

Thus it is not surprising to find Olivi impatient with the idea that the antichrist will spring from the tribe of Dan. Earlier in his Genesis commentary he had seemed to accept it as one possibility,²¹ but in the Apocalypse commentary he asks rhetorically where Richard of St. Victor found any authority supporting that theory.²² In the process of examining the matter he does accept the notion that *some* Jews will adhere to the antichrist, but that hardly makes them unique. He will have a very big following.

Olivi's somewhat different attitude is seen in his handling of the angel of Revelation 16:2, who pours the first vial on the earth, wounding those who bear the mark of the beast. He too accepts the seven angels as punishing God's enemies in seven periods of church history, and so he too identifies this vial with punishment of Jews in the first century. Then he too faces the question of why they are described as having the mark of the beast. His answer is that "all the reprobate have some false estimation of him whom they depravedly follow and love and in whom they think their beatitude lies. Thus what they adore is a false image rather than the real truth of God. It is, however, really and truly bestial."²³ Interpreted in this way, the passage has nothing to do with the Jews in particular and everything to do with sinners in general.

When Olivi does speak of the Jews in particular it is almost always in connection with conversion. The peculiar flavor of his thought on this subject is seen in his exegesis of Revelation 7:4, in which the 144,000

¹⁹ See my *Olivi's Peaceable Kingdom*, chap. 6.

²⁰ See my "Antichrist and Islam in Medieval Franciscan Exegesis," in *Medieval Christian Perceptions of Islam: A Book of Essays*, ed. John Victor Tolan (New York, 1996), 131-147. It is recognizable in milder form in Vital's commentary, also perhaps from the 1290s.

²¹ MS Florence Bibl. Naz. Conv. sopp. G 1.671, 129vb-130ra.

²² LSA, 433-436.

²³ LSA, 794.

are said to be “from each tribe of the sons of Israel.”²⁴ Olivi notes that in an allegorical sense

Israel stands for all the elect, be they from the Gentiles or Jews, who ... see God through faith, as the Apostle says in his letter to the Romans, where he distinguishes the Jew according to the spirit from the Jew according to the flesh and circumcision of the heart in the spirit from literal circumcision of the flesh. Nevertheless, in the same letter he asserts that speaking of the Jews in a literal sense—that is, as a people distinguished from other people by lineage—all of Israel will be converted to Christ, and he proves this by citing the prophets. Thus even though some sealing of a spiritual Israel may occur among the Gentiles along the way, this scripture will not be fulfilled completely until the sealing described here takes place among the people lineally descended from Israel or from Jacob.

The juxtaposition of “allegorical” and “literal” should not lead one to believe that Olivi is more interested in the first meaning than in the second. On the contrary, he goes on to argue that when the literal sense points to some final benefit or event it is actually more spiritual than the allegorical fulfillment that precedes it. So the salvation of the Jews is not a divine afterthought. It is a major goal, an important end toward which history is tending.

Immediately thereafter, Olivi reveals the extent to which this notion is rooted in his acceptance of the Joachite three ages. He notes that “according to Joachim, just as the synagogue was propagated from twelve patriarchs and the Gentile church from twelve apostles, so the final church of the remaining Jews and Gentiles will be propagated by twelve evangelical men.” Olivi, of course, knows precisely what to do with this latter element. “Thus,” he says, “Francis had twelve sons and associates through which the evangelical order was founded and begun; and thus too Saint Benedict instituted twelve abbots of the first twelve monasteries in his order.”

In such passages we see the full significance of Olivi’s insistence that the dawning third age will witness a reversal of the first-century movement from Jews to Gentiles. His interest in this phenomenon is closely connected with his Joachite sense of the first age as that of the Old Testament, the second as that of the New Testament, and the third as that of the spiritual concordance of both testaments. Here the idea is of the first age as that of the Jews, the second as that of the Gentiles, and the third as that of the final church composed of both.

²⁴ LSA, 426–432.

This sense of a third age, an age of substantial length (Olivi anticipates something on the order of 700 or 800 years), an age different from the first age of the Old Testament fathers but also in some ways different from the second age as well, narrows the gap between his own conceptual framework and that of the Jews in his day. In his book on Jewish-Christian disputations, Hyam Maccoby makes an important distinction. He says,

The Christians contending that the Messiah had come, and the Jews insisting that he had not yet come, were thus arguing about an essential point of difference between the two faiths: the nature of salvation. To Jews, salvation was a social, political concept, involving the radical betterment of the whole of human society ... To Christians, salvation was a matter of the rescue of the individual soul from damnation. Human history did not enter into their concept of salvation. The function of the Messiah was to rescue humanity from history.²⁵

While Maccoby's distinction is generally true, it seems somewhat less so when applied to Olivi. His belief in Christ's second coming in the spirit in his own time to bring in a third age of history, an age of peace, justice, and illumination, an age that would endure around seven hundred years into the future, brought him closer than most of his Christian contemporaries to the Jewish notion of the Messiah. Thus it is no accident that he is the only one of these exegetes to cite Jewish thought, not as a foil to Christian thought, but as an authority backing his own position. He comments that his notion of a long third age extending to roughly the year 2000 is in harmony with the opinion of certain ancient masters of the synagogue who said that two thousand years before the law (that is, to Abraham), two thousand under the law, and two thousand under the Messiah would form three pairs of millennia according to a threefold pattern of nature, Scripture, and grace.²⁶

While it is impossible to say what Olivi thought he was citing here, something similar is found in the Talmud, Tractate Sanhedrin, and in certain mystical writings as well.²⁷ That is not to say that Olivi had been reading the Talmud. The reference had a life of its own in

²⁵ Hyam Maccoby, *Judaism on Trial* (Rutherford, 1982), 53.

²⁶ LSA, 919ff.

²⁷ *The Talmud of Babylonia: An American Translation. XXIIIC: Tractate Sanhedrin, Chapters 9–11*, trans. Jacob Neusner (Chico, 1985), 132. For the references both to the Talmud and to the mystical writings (the latter being the *Shiur Komah* and the *Zohar*), I thank Chaim Haims at Ben Gurion University.

Christian anti-Jewish polemic, going back at least to Alan of Lille.²⁸ The significant thing here is how Olivi employs it. Earlier in a quodlibetal question he had used it in much the same way Alan of Lille had, as a way of citing Judaism against itself.²⁹ Here it is simply one more authority for Olivi's own position.

Olivi's Apocalypse commentary was subjected to investigation and finally condemnation. His thoughts on the Jews were included in the process, but in an odd way. The objection to this part of Olivi's message is seen most clearly in the report of the first theologian asked to comment on his commentary, an anonymous scholar whose opinion is extant in a manuscript now at Paris.³⁰ His criticism on this score is directed at two aspects of Olivi's scenario: first, that the widespread conversions will begin before the death of the antichrist; and second, that the period after the antichrist will be long enough for the whole world to be converted to Christ. As for the first, the anonymous critic's objection hinges on the fact that he sees Enoch and Elijah as the key players in Jewish conversion. The antichrist will come, then Enoch and Elijah. The latter will be killed by the antichrist but will then be resurrected. Up to that point the Jews will accept the antichrist as their Messiah, but once they witness the resurrection of Enoch and Elijah, they will see they have been deceived and will desert the antichrist for Christianity. The assumption here is that up to that moment the Jews will support the antichrist more or less as a group, although the anonymous critic never explicitly says as much.³¹

But now we come to the second part of the objection, his rejection of Olivi's long third age of peace and enlightenment after the antichrist. The anonymous critic follows the traditional notion that the period will be forty or forty-five days long. By the end of the thirteenth century, there was ample precedent for accepting those forty or forty-five days as a minimum figure with the possibility that God would extend it considerably, and one of the commentators discussed earlier, "Alexander," seems to be preparing himself for a rather long extension.³² The anonymous critic will have none of it. He sees forty-five days as the scheduled

²⁸ Jeremy Cohen, *The Friars and the Jews* (Ithaca, 1982), 140ff.

²⁹ *Quodlibeta* (Venice, 1509), quodl. 2, q. 8, 16v, where he is asking whether the time of the Messiah's coming can be proved from the Old Testament.

³⁰ Paris Bib. Nat. lat. 3381A.

³¹ His strongest statement is at fol. 12r-14v, but see also 25r.

³² See my *Olivi's Peaceable Kingdom*, 183.

duration of the time between the antichrist's death and the final judgment.³³ Thus, he says, there will be insufficient time for the whole world to be converted.³⁴

The anonymous critic then pushes the argument to its logical conclusion: The total number of Gentiles converted to Christianity will be no other than the number converted *before* the time of the antichrist, and most of them will fall away during his temptation.³⁵ Moreover they will remain backsliders, so when Christ comes in judgment he will find all Israel saved and very few faithful Gentiles. In other words, however much the anonymous critic disagrees with Olivi's apocalyptic scenario, he agrees completely on the key point that the rhythm of conversion in the final period will reverse the flow from Jew to Gentile that characterized the early church. In fact, he accepts that idea in an even starker form. The composition of the church Christ finds when he comes in judgment will be the reverse of what existed a century after his death and resurrection.³⁶

In short, both Olivi and his anonymous critic take Paul seriously on God's ultimate conversion of the Jews, but Olivi interprets Paul in a more inclusive sense. He expects the Jews to be converted in the new age along with everyone else. Thus the church of the final time will be, in good Joachite form, a *concordia* of Jew and Gentile. The anonymous critic interprets Paul in a more exclusive sense. The church of the final time will be composed of converted Jews and only a small righteous remnant of Gentiles who remained immune to the antichrist's charms. Heaven, of course, will be a different story, since it will have been filling up with Gentile Christians for over two millennia.

One cannot help wondering if the anonymous critic, who was undoubtedly a man of some importance in the church, ever stopped to consider the implications of this scenario for western Europe where, slightly over a decade before he wrote, the Jews had once again been expelled from France and had already been banished from England for over two decades. This situation would have had little importance for Olivi's scenario, since he envisaged a final age in which universal conversion would be accompanied by a possible shift of the Christian

³³ See 14v–15r, 31v

³⁴ See especially 14v–15a.

³⁵ See 14v, 42v, 49r.

³⁶ See 15r for precisely that observation, backed by a stunning array of biblical and patristic citations.

capital from Rome to Jerusalem. This change might appear to be punitive in nature, divine retaliation against a papacy that not only supported the antichrist but in fact *was* the antichrist; yet Olivi saw it as more than that. In a world brought together by conversion to a single faith, the capital of that faith ought to be placed in the center of that world, and Olivi knew from his *mapa mundi* that the center was Jerusalem.

The anonymous critic offered a different scenario with radically different implications. He saw the church of the final time as largely composed of Jewish converts yet insisted against Olivi that in the time of the antichrist and thereafter the pope would remain faithful, remain in charge, and remain in Rome. Thus, if he took his own exegesis to its logical conclusion, that would mean that England and France would be practically devoid of Christians in the final period. The church of that time would be governed from Rome, yet most of its members would be wherever those exiled Jews had gone. Of course we can probably assume that he did not take his exegesis *that* seriously. Gordon Leff suggested years ago that it is dangerous for a historian to expect too much consistency from his or her subject matter, and in this case Dr. Leff was probably correct.

Where does all of this leave us? If the scholars considered here can be considered at all representative of their time, then that time was one in which those concerned with searching the Apocalypse for evidence of the antichrist tended to think the danger lay not outside the church but within it, that the antichrist would receive less help from Jews than from bishops. The Jews might join his movement, but they would hardly dominate it. Thus what mainly interested these exegetes was not the Jewish role in supporting the antichrist but Jewish conversions to Christianity in a peaceful post-antichrist world.

Those are the facts. The real question is: What do they mean? What, for example, should we make of the difference between the role played by the Jews in these commentaries and the one played by them in illuminated Apocalypses during the same period? And should hesitation to assign the Jews a major role in the temptation of the antichrist be taken as denoting a kinder, gentler attitude toward them on the part of our exegetes? Neither of these questions can be answered fully here, but some general suggestions are in order.

As for the first question, the close identification of Jews and the antichrist in illuminated Apocalypses might be explained by suggesting that the latter were produced with polemical intent, aimed by anti-

Jewish clergy at a segment of the laity that could do the Jews substantial damage. Beyond this it is worth noting that, unlike illuminated Apocalypses, commentaries were very academically *entre nous*, a genre written by clerics for clerical consumption. It would have been one thing for a cleric to criticize the *praelati* in a commentary and quite another for an illustrator to decide that the laity should see the minions of the antichrist wearing, not Jews' caps, but mitres; just as scholars today might agree among themselves that their university administrators are knaves and fools but would think twice about sharing that sentiment in a letter to the *New York Times*. In both cases the instinct for self-preservation is combined with an air of *pas devant les servents*, a feeling that the simpler folk must not lose their faith in the institution. Thus any work aimed at a lay audience might have some reason to stress external rather than internal enemies.

As for the other question, these commentaries could suggest a lessening, not of hostility toward the Jews, but merely of the sense that they were an important threat. One is reminded of a comment Olivi makes about the Cathars, whom Joachim had seen as an important factor in the apocalyptic scenario. Olivi rejects this notion, observing that, far from endangering Christendom, the Cathars are now *quasi sepulta*, just about buried.³⁷ He was, of course, wrong. If they were buried when Olivi wrote, in the years following his death they would rise like Dracula from the grave and terrify Catholics one last time, but that is not the point. The point is that a sense of the Jews as no great threat and thus not important in the apocalyptic scenario was perhaps more understandable at a moment when they were being harried out of England and France and their sacred books were being destroyed. Of course, whatever might have been happening in England and northern France, the Jewish community in Narbonne, where Olivi wrote the Apocalypse commentary, was still healthy in Olivi's time; yet it is dangerous to assume that his sense of history was formed by looking at that small a stage.

One might also argue that, in the final analysis, Olivi's neat distinction between a carnal Judaism/heresy/Islam and a spiritual Christianity trapped him in the same conceptual net that imprisoned his contemporaries, and the fact that he added carnal churchmen alongside these other groups does little to change that fact. Rosemary Radford Ruether,

³⁷ LSA, 524. See also 506–515.

lamenting the medieval Jewish-Christian dialogue that never occurred, notes that the differing ways in which Christianity and Judaism developed before the thirteenth century gave the latter strengths that were remarkable in their ability to complement those aspects where Christianity was becoming gnostic in spirituality and blunted in its sense of community. Yet the very possibility that Christianity could have learned some of these things through a continued interaction with Judaism was entirely ruled out and is still ruled out for most Christians today through the dogmatic insistence that Judaism was an obsolete and retrograde religion that had been superseded by the Christian gospel "of love."³⁸

In short, medieval Christian theologians rejected the opportunity to learn from Judaism because they assumed that the only contribution Jews—or Muslims or heretics—could possibly make was to listen docilely while the (Christian) truth was explained. In Olivi's case this assumption would have been especially ironic, since the church would soon place him among the heretics; yet we might ask whether Olivi actually shared it, or at least whether he shared it in as strong a form as most other theologians of his time.

If Olivi's scenario was anti-Jewish, it was at least the mildest form anti-Jewish rhetoric might be expected to take in the thirteenth century. Certainly he thought the Jews were wrong and the Christians right, but presumably the Jews held the same view in reverse. Agnosticism or religious relativism were hardly popular medieval stances, and one might ask how easy either is to attain in the twenty-first century. In the final analysis it is tempting to judge Olivi, not on the basis of whether he thought he was right, but on the basis of what he thought would happen to those who were wrong and what he felt should be done to them in the meantime. Here the evidence is unambiguous. In an age when secular and ecclesiastical institutions were prone to coercive behavior in dealing with the Jews, Olivi displayed greater distrust of those institutions than of the Jews and envisaged a universal conversion which depended, not on the power of church and state, but on a handful of poor preachers who would speak only to those who freely consented to listen.

³⁸ Rosemary Radford Ruether, *Liberation Theology: Human Hope Confronts Christian History and American Power* (New York, 1972), 81. Whether, in view of recent Vatican statements, Ruether is entirely correct in saying the possibility "still is ruled out" remains unclear.

ARCHBISHOP EUDES RIGAUD AND THE JEWS OF NORMANDY, 1248–1275

WILLIAM CHESTER JORDAN

Eudes Rigaud, the first Franciscan archbishop of Rouen, was one of the more remarkable men of the thirteenth century.¹ He was born sometime between 1200 and 1210 in northern France, on the outskirts of Brie-Comte-Robert,² a castle town that had been the scene of a terrible slaughter a decade or so before Eudes' birth.³ There in March 1192 King Philip II Augustus, recently returned from crusade, led an army and surrounded the town, which was not part of his demesne property, and in contempt of the jurisdiction of the local countess dowager seized as many as eighty adult Jews and summarily executed them. Only the Jewish children who fled were spared. The slaughter was carried out because Philip believed that the local comital authorities had unjustly executed a Christian servitor of his for murdering a Jew. The carnage at Brie made such an impression that it is described in both Jewish and Christian sources. The Jewish source laments the martyrs; the Christian source, the usually admiring contemporary biography of the

¹ For a very brief overview of Eudes Rigaud's life, see William Jordan, "Eudes Rigaud," in *Dictionary of the Middle Ages*, 13 vols., ed. Joseph Strayer (New York, 1982–1989), 4:519. This overview is followed closely, a trifle too closely, by that of Mark Zier, "Eudes Rigaud," in *Medieval France: An Encyclopedia*, ed. William Kibler and Grover Zinn (New York, 1995), 327–328. A word of caution: This essay was prepared as a conference paper several years ago and is substantially unchanged. Since that conference (1997), my former student, now Professor Adam Davis of Denison University, has undertaken a full study of Eudes Rigaud in his dissertation, which awaits publication. His work and other works would be relevant to a more comprehensive evaluation of Eudes' attitudes and policies towards Norman Jews. I have not tried to integrate the results of these works here, but doing so would not undermine the overall conclusion of the essay.

² Pierre Andrieu-Guitrancourt, *L'Archevêque Eudes Rigaud et la vie de l'église au XIII^e siècle d'après le "Regestrum visitationum"* (Paris, 1938), 9–10. See also *The Register of Eudes of Rouen*, trans. Sydney Brown (New York, 1964), xv.

³ On this incident, now to be narrated, see William Jordan, *The French Monarchy and the Jews from Philip Augustus to the Last Capetians* (Philadelphia, 1989), 35–37 (and the accompanying notes). See also Andrieu-Guitrancourt, *Archevêque Eudes Rigaud*, 11. The allegation that this incident occurred elsewhere than at Brie has been withdrawn by its once most ardent defender; see Robert Chazan, "Ephraim Ben Jacob's Compilation of Twelfth-Century Persecutions," *Jewish Quarterly Review*, 84 (1994), 402 n. 22, and Chazan, *Medieval Stereotypes and Modern Antisemitism* (Berkeley, 1997), 151–152 n. 19.

king by Rigord, himself no particular friend of the Jews, censures the king's rashness. It would scarcely be surprising if stories of the episode, endlessly retold, became part of the young Eudes' stock of tales.

At the very least, Eudes' family would have been concerned over the breach of jurisdiction, for the family was of knightly status and presumably served the countess in various capacities.⁴ It is speculation, of course, but Eudes' own meticulous attention to his jurisdictional prerogatives as archbishop of Rouen later in his life may be informed by the bitter legacy, for those in his circle, of Philip Augustus's infamous infringement on local rights in Brie. This is not to say that the region of Eudes' birth, in the "heart" of the Ile de France, using Oscar Darlington's expression, was determinedly hostile to the monarchy, merely that particular events may have made some inhabitants more or less sensitive to royal pretensions.⁵ It may be significant in this regard that none of Eudes' many relatives seems to have made a career in royal service.

Many members of the Rigaud family, in addition to Eudes, however, would later gain reputations for their devotion and labor for the church.⁶ The future archbishop's brother, Adam, became a Franciscan and served in the entourage of Eudes in the ecclesiastical province of Rouen for more than a quarter of a century. A sister, Marie, became a nun and the fifth prioress of the famed Convent of the Paraclete, founded by Abelard and once headed by Heloise. A nephew, also named Adam, was a canon, later dean, of the cathedral chapter of Rouen and served in full more than thirty years there. He first received the canonry from the hands of Eudes in 1263.

It has been supposed that by 1236 Eudes joined the Franciscan order, at the time, that is, of the order's early and very rapid expansion in northern France.⁷ It is also supposed that Eudes' devotion was highly marked because attraction to the order in the first generation of its expansion in the north promised no material benefits, merely poverty and overwork. It was only later that university chairs, let alone lofty

⁴ On the status of the family, see Andrieu-Guitrancourt, *Archevêque Eudes Rigaud*, 11, 13-14.

⁵ Oscar Darlington, *The Travels of Odo Rigaud, Archbishop of Rouen (1248-1275)* (Philadelphia, 1940), 11, stresses the region's "devotion" to the crown.

⁶ For the references, see Andrieu-Guitrancourt, *Archevêque Eudes Rigaud*, 13-16. All subsequent authors follow Andrieu-Guitrancourt without adding materially to his findings.

⁷ Cf. the tables on Franciscan and Dominican expansion in William Jordan, *Louis IX and the Challenge of the Crusade: A Study in Rulership* (Princeton, 1979), 234.

positions in the church hierarchy, became commonplace for Franciscans, a development that would profoundly upset the self-appointed keepers of the true spirit of the mendicant movement.⁸ That Eudes would benefit from this development, insofar as the heavy duties of the archbishopric of Rouen constituted a benefit, could not have been within his expectations in 1236.

Franciscans, however, were already penetrating the walls of the schools by the time Eudes joined the order. And the ugly young man of God (to use Salimbene de Adam's description) would prove himself to be an exceptionally gifted scholar.⁹ He is known to have been studying theology with Alexander of Hales at the University of Paris by 1240.¹⁰ He was lecturing on the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard a few years later, in the academic terms during the years 1243–1245. His three-book (unfinished) *Commentary* on the *Sentences* written about this time evinces thoughts, it has been said, at once "well-developed and doctrinally mature."¹¹ His discussion, which seems original, of the "role" of the Holy Spirit in the mutual love of God the Father and God the Son—which turns on the technical point of the meaning of the ablative in a descriptive formula of the love—is believed to have deeply influenced his greatest student, Bonaventure.¹² But Eudes' extraordinarily promising career as a scholar and teacher wound down after 1245. In 1246 he was sent to govern the young Franciscan Convent of Saint-Marc de Rouen which may have been founded only in that year; in late 1247 or early 1248, he was elected archbishop of Rouen and was consecrated in March of the latter year.¹³

⁸ The best study of the development is Williel Thomson's *Friars in the Cathedral: The First Franciscan Bishops, 1226–1261* (Toronto, 1975).

⁹ Salimbene de Adam, *Cronica*, 2 vols., ed. G. de Scalia (Bari, 1966), 1.629 (Latin); *The Chronicle of Salimbene de Adam*, trans. Joseph Baird et al. (Binghamton, N.Y., 1986), 441 (English translation).

¹⁰ For what follows on Eudes' academic career, see Andrieu-Guitrancourt, *Archevêque Eudes Rigaud*, 21–23, and Walter Principe, "Odo Rigaldus, A Precursor of St. Bonaventure on the Holy Spirit as *effectus formalis* in the Mutual Love of the Father and the Son," *Mediaeval Studies*, 39 (1977), 500–501 n. 14.

¹¹ Kilian Lynch, "The Alleged Fourth Book on the *Sentences* of Odo Rigaud and Related Documents," *Franciscan Studies*, 9 (1949), 135.

¹² Principe, "Odo Rigaldus," 498–505.

¹³ For these details, see Andrieu-Guitrancourt, *Archevêque Eudes Rigaud*, 33–38. The date of the foundation of Saint-Marc is taken from Andrieu-Guitrancourt, although he acknowledges that Franciscans "were established" in Rouen from an earlier date, 1224. Richard Emery's catalog of mendicant convents gives the date as before 1232 to

Could a man of Eudes Rigaud's stature, of noble stock, a Franciscan friar, a teacher at the University of Paris, and a major author, have been unfamiliar to the court of Louis IX? Would Louis IX have countenanced the election of an unknown to the head of the church in Normandy, a province still technically claimed by the man who was wearing the English crown and was willing, it had recently been learned, to field an army to try to make good that claim?¹⁴ All scholars who have raised these questions have answered in the negative, although little evidence has yet come to light that Louis knew Eudes face to face.¹⁵ The Italian Franciscan chronicler, Salimbene de Adam, says explicitly that "the king worked hard to see that he [Eudes] was made the archbishop of Rouen,"¹⁶ but Salimbene, even though he knew Eudes and the king in the years of the former's archiepiscopate, refers to Louis as Saint Louis, proof that his testimony was written down no earlier than the 1270s, that is, at a time when Louis was first being referred to as a saint.¹⁷ This was more than a quarter of a century after Eudes' election. Even so, the testimony may be accurate.

If the king did recommend Eudes, his wishes would have been made known to the cathedral chapter in whose hands the election lay either directly, when the official delegation begged the king's permission to choose a new archbishop, or through the good offices of his local representative, the *bailli* of Rouen, Etienne de la Porte.¹⁸ If it is conceivable that the king recommended somebody other than Eudes, we might imagine a different scenario. Since Eudes' election revealed some factionalism in the cathedral chapter, it is possible that the king's wishes for

the Franciscan house of Rouen; see *The Friars in Medieval France: A Catalogue of French Mendicant Convents, 1200–1550* (New York, 1962), 112.

¹⁴ On the last English invasion of France (1242) to try to recapture the western provinces, see Jean Richard, *Saint Louis: Roi d'une France féodale, soutien de la Terre sainte* (Paris, 1983), 115–119.

¹⁵ See, for example, Andrieu-Guitrancourt, *Archevêque Eudes Rigaud*, 37 (although he is wrong in accepting the truth of the legend that Louis IX was a Franciscan tertiary); Darlington, *Travels*, 10–11; etc.

¹⁶ Salimbene de Adam, *Cronica*, 1.629 (Latin); *The Chronicle of Salimbene de Adam*, 441 (English translation).

¹⁷ Darlington, *Travels*, 10; Jordan, *Louis IX*, 182.

¹⁸ On "permission to elect" (*licentia eligendi*), see Jordan, *Louis IX*, 87–88, and below (text to n. 53) for the application of the procedure following Eudes' own death. On the *bailli* Etienne de la Porte, see Léopold Delisle, "Chronologie des baillis et des sénéchaux," in *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France*, 24 vols., ed. Martin Bouquet et al. (Paris, 1738–1904) 24.102*.

a different candidate became a dead letter in the heat of the moment.¹⁹ In any case, Eudes was elected.

Most scholars who adhere to the surmise that Eudes and Louis were acquainted go even further and suggest that the king employed him as an *enquêteur* in Normandy in 1247. These *enquêteurs*, largely Dominican and Franciscan friars, were special investigators assigned to the provinces on the eve of Louis's first crusade to inquire into possible injustices perpetrated against the populace by the king's men.²⁰ In identifying Eudes as an *enquêteur*, recent scholars are following the views of Charles Petit-Dutaillis who, even if he was not the first to make the suggestion, certainly gave it classic formulation with that very French use of the rhetorical question: "Est-il téméraire de supposer que le Franciscain Eude Rigaud, qui devait être élu archevêque de Rouen l'année suivante, figure parmi les enquêteurs?"²¹ Several hundred of the complaints they received in Normandy in 1247 have survived.²²

Again, however, no single piece of documentary evidence has yet come to light to confirm Petit-Dutaillis's suggestion as to Eudes' presence among the investigators. This is doubly unfortunate in that the panel or panels of *enquêteurs* in Normandy received a small number of complaints involving Jews, especially those who were holding Christian estates in pledge.²³ Presumably this information, if Eudes had access to it, helped shape his own understanding of the place—proper or improper—of Jews in Norman society.

Their place, as Eudes would have found it at his enthronement in 1248, was already precarious and was becoming more so. Since the French conquest in 1204, Norman Jews had been subjected to the intermittent but ruthless wholesale confiscatory taxation which the French kings practiced: this occurred most generally in 1210, 1224–1226 and 1227. But after legislation in the 1230s forbidding usury (any charging of interest), confiscation became somewhat more restricted or selective. A few Jews (the royal government was somewhat too confident

¹⁹ On the election, see Andrieu-Guitrancourt, *Archevêque Eudes Rigaud*, 35–37, followed, as usual, by all other scholars (see, e.g., Darlington, *Travels*, 10).

²⁰ On the institution and results of the investigation, see Jordan, *Louis IX*, 50–63.

²¹ Charles Petit-Dutaillis, "Queremoniae Normannorum," in *Essays in Medieval History Presented to Thomas Frederick Tout*, ed. A. Little and F. Powicke (Manchester, 1925), 105.

²² Published in *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France*, 24.1–72; analyzed in Petit-Dutaillis, "Queremoniae Normannorum," 99–118.

²³ Petit-Dutaillis, "Queremoniae Normannorum," 11; and Jordan, *French Monarchy and the Jews*, index, under "Normandy."

that it was only a few) violated the law against usury or ineptly bribed local officials to enforce or turn a blind eye to usurious loans. They felt the sting of punishment. Enforcement was sufficiently rigorous that Jewish communities all through northern France, including Normandy, went into a steep economic decline.²⁴ Jewish intellectual life, too, was in danger of being extinguished in northern France after the crown moved to burn copies of the Talmud in Paris in 1242, as a book inimical to the Christian faith and a perversion of biblical Judaism.²⁵ (Eudes, recall, was in Paris when this event occurred.) Normandy may have suffered less from the assault on the Talmud than the region around Paris, but it could not have been unaffected.²⁶

Eudes became archbishop just as Louis IX's preparations for crusade were reaching a climax. Their effect on French Jews was also significant.²⁷ We have already seen that the *enquêteurs* were travelling through Normandy in 1247, as part of the king's preparations, in order to rectify wrongs and indemnify the victims of official misconduct in the province. The evidence turned out to be depressingly strong that many Christians, due to uneven enforcement of the anti-usury laws, were still being charged interest on loans, and that many local officials, having been bribed, were continuing to distrain Christians and their property to enforce repayment to Jewish moneylenders. The king in response prohibited these kinds of distraint and also authorized a taking of Jewish debts, that is to say, he directed that any Christians who owed or had repaid loans in whole or in part made by Jews were to be forgiven all interest payments (since these had been illegally exacted anyway since the 1230s). Jewish moneylenders who were identified were forced to remit this profit to the borrowers on all debts contracted since 1234. But the principal of still unpaid debts was to be paid directly to the crown and would be used to help it in its efforts to finance the Holy War.

²⁴ All these matters are comprehensively treated in Jordan, *French Monarchy and the Jews*, 56–104, 128–162.

²⁵ Jordan, *French Monarchy and the Jews*, 137–141.

²⁶ In conversation, Professor Haym Soloveitchik of Yeshiva University, on the basis of his research into Hebrew sources, has suggested that Jewish intellectual life in Paris essentially ceased in the aftermath of the burning of the Talmud, but here and there in Normandy sophisticated study (even study of the Talmud) persisted.

²⁷ The material summarized in the next several paragraphs is treated at greater length and with full documentation in Jordan, *French Monarchy and the Jews*, 144–146.

It was, of course, difficult to determine precisely how much interest was hidden by a bond. A Christian's promise in a bond to pay a Jew nine shillings, for example, said nothing about interest. Presumably, however, in order to disguise the interest the moneylender had only given the debtor part of the nine shillings. The crown decided (the evidence is from Normandy on this point) that all such bonds should be discounted by one-third. It presumed, in other words, taking up the nine shilling example again, that the moneylender gave the borrower six shillings on condition he repay nine. The absence of the language of interest was allegedly intended to protect the lender from charges of practicing usury, but the ruse, if it was a ruse, in fact failed.

The Jewish moneylenders, now under order to remit imputed interest paid by their debtors since 1234, suffered an immediate "cash flow" problem. Further directives from the crown authorized local officials to distrain Jewish property and auction it off if necessary to make these payments. Royal fiscal records touching Normandy show the process at work over the next several years.

What can we know about Eudes Rigaud's familiarity with these measures? If he served as an *enquêteur* before he became archbishop, he would have been completely familiar with the directives from the moment they began to be articulated by the government. Even if he had not occupied that office, he would have become familiar very quickly, and we can infer something of the process of this development from the record he has left us of his archiepiscopacy in Rouen. This is the famous *Register* of the archbishop's travels in which he records his official visitations of ecclesiastical institutions under his jurisdiction, his examinations of local clergy for competence, and myriad other undertakings.²⁸ The *Register* covers the period—day by day—17 July 1248 until 17 December 1269. "Of the 8,083 days covered by the twenty-one year period," according to Darlington's calculations, "only 56 days are omitted."²⁹ It is an amazing, and amazingly underutilized, source.³⁰ Penelope Johnson's recent book on French convents is one of

²⁸ First edited by Th[eodose] Bonnin under the title, *Regestrum visitationum archiepiscopi rotomagensis / Journal des visites pastorales d'Eude Rigaud, archevêque de Rouen, MCCXLVIII–MCCLXIX* (Rouen, 1852). The English translation (somewhat truncated, only the chronological parts and the reform statutes of Gregory IX being rendered into English) is that by Sydney Brown, referred to above in note 2. In future notes, reference is made to both, since the original edition is rare.

²⁹ Darlington, *Travels*, 27.

³⁰ It was as understudied as Eudes himself was at the time this conference paper was

the few to exploit its wealth of material; and, given her focus, she culls only a tiny bit of its voluminous information.³¹

The *Register* provides us with information, for example, of the eruption of the Pastoureaux in Rouen in mid-June 1251. The Pastoureaux, as is well known, were bands of people who decided to go on crusade after news reached France of the king's capture in Egypt. Their professed intention was to join the ransomed ruler who had gone to the Holy Land after his release. The bands were somewhat disorganized and did considerable damage in the towns through which they passed. Their targets of choice included Jews, which is not surprising, given the king's pre-crusade campaign against the alleged exploitation of poor Christians by usurious Jewish moneylenders, the seizures of their bonds and other property, and the (unofficial) anti-Jewish atmosphere associated with crusading. In Rouen they disrupted a provincial synod at which Eudes was presiding; and although they were dispersed, the mayor and aldermen of Rouen rendered a formal apology to the archbishop for not having acted effectively from the beginning. The archbishop graciously feasted the municipal officials as a gesture of reconciliation.³²

Eudes clearly detested the actions of the Pastoureaux in disrupting the synod, and as a well-trained churchman he could not have legitimately endorsed their violence against Jews. (To be sure, this kind of violence was probably not manifested in Rouen, although precisely contemporary outrages by bands of Pastoureaux against Jews are recorded at Bourges and Orléans and mention of them is made in the Norman chronicle record.)³³ Unlike at many other times in his archiepiscopacy, Eudes did not have the decisions of this synod set down verbatim in the *Register*, possibly because the situation was too hectic and confused at the time. But if the decisions were anything like those recorded elsewhere in the *Register*, Eudes himself contributed to the

prepared. A survey of the *International Medieval Bibliography* at that time (1997) found less than a half-dozen articles on Eudes in the previous thirty years.

³¹ Penelope Johnson, *Equal in Monastic Profession: Religious Women in Medieval France* (Chicago, 1991).

³² The *Register* entry (127–128; *Regestrum*, 112) is laconic, but the fuller story can be pieced together from a number of sources; see the discussion and references in Jordan, *Louis IX*, 113–116.

³³ Jordan, *Louis IX*, 115–116, especially n. 72 on Norman awareness of the anti-Jewish incidents. That a Norman, indeed a Rouennais, chronicler would note anti-Jewish violence in Bourges and not in Rouen is reasonably good evidence that the Pastoureaux in Rouen, whatever they might have said, did not attack Jews.

anti-Jewish atmosphere by including a provision (adopted from standard ecclesiastical conciliar legislation) “forbid[ding] any Christians, male or female, to work for Jews in their homes, or presume to dwell with them” and “order[ing] that Jews be compelled to wear visible signs by which they may be distinguished from Catholics.” This language (with only the slightest variants) is found in the decrees of the provincial synods held under Eudes’ presidency at Pont-Audemer (12 September 1257, 29 January 1260, 26 January 1261) and at Vernon (29 January 1264).³⁴

In fact, Eudes’ concern with the Jews went far beyond his issuance of by then stale conciliar decrees. It is hard, however, to get at the attitudes that underlay his concern, for although reputed to be a great preacher, the archbishop may or may not have been the author of several sermons that have been attributed to him.³⁵ Nonetheless the problems that Eudes faced in the archdiocese suggest at least the scope of his concerns. The indebtedness of ecclesiastical institutions that he visited, for instance, was clearly a troubling matter for Eudes and was never far from his thoughts. He was constantly chiding monasteries and convents to improve or just start keeping fiscal records.³⁶ When he made a visitation of the Monastery of Saint-Pierre-des-Préaux in the diocese of Lisieux on 14 January 1250, he discovered or was told that the monks who had an income of about eleven hundred pounds and regularly scheduled expenditures of at least three hundred also owed “four hundred pounds without interest [*de usura pura*]³⁷ to a certain Jew.” Would they have to repay this sum? The continuation of the *Register* entry provides some tantalizing evidence. Let us recall that the king’s campaign against Jewish usurious moneylending was in full gear and the principal of debts had been assigned for repayment to the crown. The monks, Eudes reports, were unsure at that time “whether they will be cleared of this debt or whether they will have to pay it,” that is to say, whether the crown would take pity on the monastery and acquit it or not.

³⁴ *Register*, 325, 407, 441, 550; *Regestrum*, 287, 357, 388, 482. All dates, here and elsewhere, have been converted to new style.

³⁵ See the excellent critical discussion of alleged collections of his sermons in Andrieu-Guitrancourt, *Archevêque Eudes Rigaud*, 23–32.

³⁶ *Register*, 4, 61, 66–68, 80, 98–99, 106, 110, 121, 126, 186, 218–219, 366, 395, 463, 513, 518, 686; *Regestrum*, 5, 56, 60–61, 71, 86, 91–92, 94–95, 105, 111, 169, 201–202, 320, 348, 408, 451, 455, 597.

³⁷ *Register*, 66; *Regestrum*, 59; alternatively, “of interest alone.”

Even years later when an extraordinarily vigilant local officialdom was effectively eliminating usurious Jewish moneylending, a startling reminder of the uneven administration of the medieval state came to light. On 18 March 1267, Eudes made a visitation of the Benedictine Priory of Villarceaux in the diocese of Rouen itself. The archbishop must have been flabbergasted to learn that the nuns there, of whom there were twenty, “owed one hundred pounds, and twenty pounds of this was owed at interest to the Jews and Cahorsins [Christian usurers] of Mantes.” He noted that if they were economical and expelled some young girls whose parents seem to have left them there for their upbringing (a thing that “displeased [Eudes] exceedingly”), they might have “enough wheat and oats to last out the year,” although he predicted gloomily that even with economic measures they would run out of wine.³⁸

The question of the conversion of the Jews was another of the archbishop’s concerns. It certainly loomed large in the kingdom, and as Eudes and Louis IX became close friends after the crusade, this question must have frequently come up in conversation, for Louis IX was supporting considerable efforts to induce Jews to convert, and he was doing so with modest success.³⁹ The continuing concern, of course, was not simply over the still rather limited extent of conversion, but also over the sincerity of conversion when it came about through inordinate pressure, even if the nature or intensity of the pressure did not necessarily meet the church’s standard of illicit force.⁴⁰ On 18 April 1266 the issue was joined in Eudes’ presence. On that day the archbishop handed over to the secular arm, in the person of Julien de Peronne, the royal *bailli*, a lapsed convert to be burnt. The *Register* makes clear that the sentence was carried out.⁴¹

The *Register*, in the same entry, also rehearses the chain of events that led to the execution of the “apostate and heretic” (*apostatam et hereticum*), as the entry calls him. He had been “converted from Judaism to the Catholic faith,” but “had again reverted from the Catholic faith to Judaic depravity” (*ad fidem catholicam conversum, et iterum de fide catholica*

³⁸ *Register*, 658; *Regestrum*, 572.

³⁹ Jordan, *French Monarchy and the Jews*, 148–150.

⁴⁰ Two valuable treatments of Christian understandings of forced conversion may be found in Gilbert Dahan, *Les Intellectuels chrétiens et les juifs au moyen âge* (Paris, 1990), 143–152, and Shlomo Simonsohn, *The Apostolic See and the Jews: History* (Toronto, 1991), 240–248.

⁴¹ *Register*, 618; *Regestrum*, 541.

ad iudaicam pravitatem reversum). Yet, efforts otherwise unspecified brought him back to Christianity, and he was “once again baptized” (*iterum rebaptizatum*). This is a crux. Baptism was normally indelible and not repeatable, save under the very exceptional circumstances of so-called conditional baptism. But perhaps Eudes shared the view that the efficacy of this Jew’s first baptism was in doubt if it had been forced (using a lower threshold definition of force than that which marked majority opinion in the church). “If a Jew,” as one canonist with this view put it later, “had been baptized despite complete opposition (*omnino inuitus*), namely by absolutely objecting and expressly refusing, he ought not to be considered as baptized.”⁴² Unfortunately Eudes’ views of baptism are irrecoverable. They should be found in his *Commentary on the Sentences of Peter Lombard*, but he never completed the fourth book of that work where he would have discussed the sacrament.⁴³

In any case, the now reconverted Jew “once more reverted to Judaism” (*iterumque ad iudaismum* [sic] *reversum*), the *Register* informs us, and remained “unwilling afterwards to be restored to the Catholic faith, although several times admonished to do so” (*noientem postmodum ad fidem catholicam reverti, licet pluries moneretur*). For Eudes, as he saw it, therefore, there was no alternative but to turn the apostate over to the *bailli* for burning.

Some months later, on the Feast of the Annunciation, 1267, Eudes was in Paris at a solemn meeting of the royal court where Louis IX, now one of Eudes’ closest friends, and three of the king’s sons took the cross.⁴⁴ A few weeks later Eudes himself would also take the crusader’s vow.⁴⁵ But the atmosphere created by the preaching that produced crusade enthusiasm was as dangerous to Jews in the late 1260s as it was in the 1240s. Eudes came face to face with the consequences a few months later when he had to order the punishment of a group of clerics who had despoiled the Jews of Gournay as well as committed other crimes (assault of burghers and poaching).⁴⁶

That the robbery of the Jews of Gournay was directly related to the atmosphere created by preparations for crusade may be doubted. After all, to judge from the career of one assailant, the perpetrators

⁴² The text is cited and discussed in Dahan, *Intellectuels et les juifs*, 148.

⁴³ Lynch, “Alleged Fourth Book,” 87–145.

⁴⁴ *Register*, 658; *Registrum*, 573.

⁴⁵ *Register*, 669; *Registrum*, 580.

⁴⁶ *Register*, 676; *Registrum*, 587.

were ne'er-do-wells who hardly needed an excuse to behave badly.⁴⁷ Nonetheless, preaching was whipping up popular enthusiasm for the coming war, and Eudes himself would preach the Holy War explicitly, as the *Register* reveals.⁴⁸ Of course, it is highly dubious that he would have directly or even implicitly encouraged violence against Jews. Some years before, in 1260, at a session of the Parlement of Paris held in the days following the feast of Saint-Martin in the winter (1260), Eudes had sat in judgment with the other masters of the king's court over a jurisdictional dispute concerning Haym, a Jew of Mâcon.⁴⁹ Rights over the Jew were remitted to the knight, Philippe de Chauvery, who claimed them (the Jew seems to have fled earlier to escape the knight's jurisdiction). But the court also exacted a promise from Philippe that he would not mistreat the errant Jew (*quod non tractaret turpiter ipsum judeum*). Whether Lord Philippe kept his word is unknown, but the intent of the judges seems clear enough. Violence against Jews—except judicially authorized—was absolutely forbidden.

Eudes went on crusade with the king in 1270.⁵⁰ He was at his side when the monarch died on 25 August outside of Tunis. Unlike so many of the crusaders (the king, one of his sons, the papal legate, and others), Eudes survived the difficult conditions. The archbishop accompanied the new king, Philip III, home in 1271, and resumed his archiepiscopacy. But the *Register* as we have it was not continued, and it is no longer possible to get as intimate a picture of the archbishop's activities, although we know something thanks to charters and to a few descriptions of the Second Council of Lyons which Eudes attended in 1274. At the council with his old pupil, now cardinal, Bonaventure, he worked on the problem of the reunion of eastern and western Christendom, which at that moment seemed to have a propitious future. Soon after he returned to Rouen where, probably in his mid-seventies, the aged

⁴⁷ This was *Reginaldus matricularius* ("Reginald, the sacristan's helper") who was known for his illicit nighttime jaunts (*Register*, 531, 536; *Regestrum*, 466, 471).

⁴⁸ *Register*, 687, 724; *Regestrum*, 597, 629.

⁴⁹ The case is reported in *Les Olim ou Registres des arrêts rendus par la cour du roi*, ed. Arthur Beugnot (Paris, 1839), 1.122–123 no. xiii. Beugnot transcribed the Jew's name as *vivens* in lower case, which suggests that he did not know it was a name. But it was a common translation of the Hebrew Haym. Eudes was in Paris presumably to attend Parlement as was typical for him, for several days after the feast of Saint Martin, 11 November (*Register*, 429; *Regestrum*, 378–379).

⁵⁰ The narrative skeleton of what follows, to the end of the essay, is drawn from Andrieu-Guitrancourt, *Archevêque Eudes Rigaud*, 434–438.

prelate died, “a holy man,” in Salimbene’s words, “devoted to God, and he came honorably to the end of his life.”⁵¹

Philip III received word of the death in a missive dated 7 July 1275 (five days later).⁵² The letter also introduced the delegation that would seek formal permission from the crown to elect a new archbishop, a task which, a subsequent letter informs us, was accomplished by 11 January 1276.⁵³

It would be good to know more about Archbishop Eudes’ attitudes towards and treatment of Jews and Jewish converts to Christianity. What we have learned places him at the middle of the spectrum of attitudes, a position that was not unusual for the incumbents of northern French sees of this period judging from the careers of Gautier Cornut (archbishop of Sens, 1222–1241) and Guillaume d’Auvergne (bishop of Paris, 1228–1249).⁵⁴ Eudes believed in the possibility of Jewish redemption by conversion. He saw nothing so innately irrational about being a Jew that it could make him or her subhuman. Certainly neither his Franciscan profession nor his adherence to scholastic philosophy produced such a radical departure from the traditional teachings of the Catholic faith. (Neither did the scholastic training of the former professor turned bishop of Paris, Guillaume d’Auvergne.⁵⁵) Indeed, Eudes was willing to try over and over again to bring Jews to the Catholic faith even when they lapsed after initial conversion. There was nothing about Jews or Judaism in themselves that justified extra-judicial violence. And one could go on.

Eudes preached the crusades; he knew first hand that the atmosphere created by this preaching could inspire unsavory elements within the Christian community to carry out violent acts of retribution against Christian clergy, nobles, and Jews. He denounced and punished the acts, insofar as it was in his authority and power to do so, but he did not

⁵¹ Salimbene, *Cronica*, 1.629; *Chronicle of Salimbene de Adam*, 441 (alternative English rendering).

⁵² *Cartulaire normand de Philippe-Auguste, Louis VIII, Saint-Louis, et Philippe le Hardi*, ed. Léopold Delisle (Caen, 1852), 199 no. 851.

⁵³ *Cartulaire normand de Philippe-Auguste*, 202–203 no. 861. In fact, the pope would soon quash this election.

⁵⁴ Lesley Smith, “William of Auvergne and the Jews,” in *Christianity and Judaism*, ed. Diana Wood (Oxford, 1992), 107–117.

⁵⁵ Lesley Smith, “William of Auvergne and the Jews.” For an excursus, in English, on Guillaume’s training, his career as a professor, and his philosophical writings, see Steven Marrone, *William of Auvergne and Robert Grosseteste: New Ideas in the Early Thirteenth Century* (Princeton, 1983), 27–134.

regard these acts as sufficient reason to reduce the intensity of his commitment to the "real" Holy War, any more than he thought that the susceptibility of royal administrators to bribery or abuse of the king's subjects argued against the legitimate existence of a royal administration.

Eudes Rigaud was one of the most influential Franciscans in the order by the time of his death. He had been a great theologian and spectacular teacher. He was a good preacher, so far as testimony goes, and as archbishop he was a superb, if stern, supervisor of the religious life of the ecclesiastical province of Rouen. He was a first-class member of the king's judicial councils, and the devoted spiritual guide of one of the greatest French saints. By the end of his life he had been a crusader and a principal counselor at a great ecumenical council. If anywhere, it is to a career like his—a career of wide authority, enormous power, and uncommon prestige—that we should turn to assess the genuine influence of scholastic thinking and the Franciscan mission on Jewish-Christian relations. Doing so does not suggest that that mode of thought or that mission inevitably (or, rather, consequentially) had the corrupting effects on Jewish-Christian relations in the thirteenth century that has sometimes been imputed to them.

INTIMATE ENEMIES:
MENDICANT-JEWISH INTERACTION IN
THIRTEENTH-CENTURY MEDITERRANEAN SPAIN

LARRY J. SIMON

On September 3, 1268, in the Dominican House of Barcelona, events transpired to bring together Jaume I of Aragon, the Dominicans Arnau de Sagarra and Ramon de Penyafort, and Rabbi Solomon ibn Adret (RaShBa), head of the Barcelona Jewish community and one of the foremost authorities of his day, evidenced by the almost one thousand *responsa* extant today. The occasion was not, however, a revisiting of the so-called Disputation of Barcelona, not a new royal command performance featuring some of the same luminaries present five years earlier—figures such as Pau Cristià (occasionally simply Crestià, also known as Pablo Christiani or Paul the Christian) and Rabbi Moses ben Nahman, Nahmanides (often known by the acronym RaMBan), the famed kabbalist, exegete, halakhist, and physician of Girona—to dispute mendicant interpretations of select talmudic passages within the strictest of confines. The occasion was that of a lawsuit brought by Solomon ibn Adret on behalf of his ward Belshom, son of the deceased Bonanat de Besalu. The suit was against the executors of the deceased Benvenist de Porta of Villafranca, namely Mosse Sullam, Samuel Sullam, Ismael of Tudela, and Perfet de Sa Real. Bonanat had died intestate, Ibn Adret charges, with half his goods going to his daughter Sara and half to Benvenist de Porta. The Crown had seized the property of Bonanat, releasing the legacy to Benvenist (then bailiff of Barcelona and Girona). With Benvenist also now dead, Ibn Adret argued, the legacy of Bonanat should go to Belshom. The trial went through numerous “maneuvers, objections, and responses,” and after having examined Crown documents and the will of Bonanat, the king concluded that Bonanat was not intestate—possessing a written document and being on the side of a former royal official makes for a persuasive combination—and Jaume dismissed Ibn Adret’s lawsuit.¹

¹ The document is published in its entirety by Robert I. Burns, S.J. in *Jews in the Notarial Culture: Latinate Wills in Mediterranean Spain, 1250–1350* (Berkeley, 1996), 146–148.

The nature of thirteenth-century mendicant polemic and disputation may or may not be fully understood, though I think we may be approaching closure on certain events and texts, but the specific nature of linkages between the mendicant missionizing program and the catastrophic expulsions, pogroms, popular libels, and increasingly restrictive legislation are far from being understood. Robert Burns, who edited the four documents detailing the testamentary trial of 1268 in his most recent volume, has pointed out on other occasions that the very Catalan society that produced Ramon de Penyafort, Pau Cristià, Ramon Martí, and Ramon Llull was a society that valued and protected its Jewish communities far more than contemporary northern Christian and southern Islamic, i.e., Berber, societies.² Rather than affirm or deny such various linkages, however, the purpose of this paper is perhaps a little less vital, a little more mundane, yet more than a catalog of curiosities found in summers in the archives. I wish to explore the nature of specific contacts and specific interactions between individual mendicant friars and individual Jews, whenever possible, or between individual communities and collectives, and to offer, perhaps, at a time when we are reminded of the converging interests and mutual influences of the personal and public, some new if modest insights into mendicant-Jewish relations.

On June 13, 1264, according to a registered document in the Aragonese royal archives, Jaume I donated to the Dominicans of Calatayud a garden that he had acquired, in Calatayud, from the widow Dueina Avincabra; the property is bounded by a public byway, a communal mill, property of the said Dueina, and the Dominicans themselves.³

² See Burns's article, reviewing Jeremy Cohen's *The Friars and the Jews* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1982), "Anti-Semitism in Christian History: A Revisionist Thesis," *Catholic Historical Review*, 70 (1984), 90–93. On the Disputation of Barcelona see, inter alia, Cohen; Robert Chazan, "The Barcelona 'Disputation' of 1263: Christian Missionizing and Jewish Response," *Speculum*, 52 (1977), 824–842; Chazan, *Daggers of Faith: Thirteenth-Century Christian Missionizing and Jewish Response* (Berkeley, 1989), esp. 71–103 and 170–173; and most especially Chazan, *Barcelona and Beyond: The Disputation of 1263 and its Aftermath* (Berkeley, 1992), with extensive bibliography. The general consensus of Catalan, Israeli, indeed almost all scholars who have studied Jews in the Crown of Aragon is captured well in the title of Yom Tov Assis's magisterial synthesis, *The Golden Age of Aragonese Jewry: Community and Society in the Crown of Aragon, 1213–1327* (London, 1997). See also Assis's *Jewish Economy in the Medieval Crown of Aragon, 1213–1327: Money and Power* (Leiden, 1997); and my review essay, "Jews, Jean Régné, and the Medieval Crown of Aragon," *Medieval Encounters*, 4 (1998), 285–317.

³ Barcelona, Arxiu de la Corona d'Aragó [hereafter ACA], Canc. Real, reg. 13, fol. 183v and 184v–185r; these are indexed in Jean Régné, *History of the Jews in Aragon*,

Jews and Dominicans in Calatayud, as Jews and Dominicans elsewhere, shared property lines. The size of medieval cities prescribed that Jews and mendicants, even when not engaging in forced disputations or listening to mandatory sermons, knew each other, passed daily on city streets, and lived in close proximity. On December 7, 1287, Alfonso III mandated that the bailiff of Barcelona suspend, temporarily, until receiving a further order, proceedings which he had initiated against certain Jews on the subject of the wall of the Dominican convent which is located contiguous to the Jewish quarter.⁴ Today, as a remnant of this proximity, one can stay at the Hotel del Call, located on the street Saint Dominic of the Call, and fall asleep while listening to the bells of the Barcelona cathedral wherein is buried Ramon de Penyafort.⁵

On November 24, 1290, Alfonso III of Aragon, conqueror of Minorca from the Muslims and Mallorca from his uncle (Jaume II of Mallorca, the second eldest surviving son of Jaume I), wrote to the royal bailiff of Mallorca, mandating that Maymon Bennuno, Çulema Bondia, and Isaac Braanam take charge of the assignment made on the question of the Jewish quarter by the aforesaid bailiff; this concerns a new or second quarter given to the Jews of Mallorca City, and it is described as "situated between the convents of the Franciscans to the north, and the sisters of Santa Clara to the south."⁶ Earlier, in

Regesta and Documents, 1213–1327, ed. Yom Tov Assis in association with Adam Gruzman (Jerusalem, 1978), nos. 266–267. Régné apparently worked as much from archival indices as from originals and summarized some 3,456 documents in fifteen years of installments between 1910 and 1924 in the *Revue des Études Juives*. Even his harshest critics—see David Romano, "Análisis a los repertorios de Jacobs y Régné," *Sefarad*, 14 (1954), 247–264—have, in their own work, relied extensively on his abstracts. Although I have systematically gone through all registers prior to 1300 searching for material on Mallorca, I have relied here on Régné to help locate non-Mallorcan material in these early pages. Unless I also looked at the original, however, I cite only Régné or at least cite him first. My personal concern with Régné and those who rely on him is his incompleteness for the reign of Jaume II of Aragon, an issue of importance later in this article. I have estimated ("Jews, Jean Régné, and the Medieval Crown of Aragon," 288) that, rather than a little over 1,000 documents for the reign of Jaume II pertaining to Jews, there are likely somewhere between 5,400 and 13,680.

⁴ ACA, Canc. Real, reg. 74, fol. 46v; Régné, no. 1825.

⁵ In Catalonia, Roussillon, and Mallorca a Jewish quarter was called a *call*; in Aragon and Castile it was called a *judería*; in Valencia both terms were used, while in Lleida it was called uniquely a *cuyraça*; some scholars attribute the origin of the term to the Latin *callum*, while others prefer the Hebrew *qahal* or community; see J.R. Magdalena Nom de Déu, "Etimología no semítica de 'call,'" *Calls*, 2 (1987), 7–16.

⁶ ACA, Canc. Real, reg. 81, fol. 216; Régné, no. 2252

January 1285 or 1286, Alfonso had conceded to all good men and the community of Mallorca City that all Jews of the said city must live in the same quarter, and he orders the Jews to group themselves within a determined place within a period of five years.⁷ This contravenes earlier legislation of Jaume I, confirmed by Alfonso himself, granting the Jews the right to buy and rent freely any urban or rural property. On December 2, 1290, Alfonso, when asked to confirm the site of the *call* fixed by Pere de Libian for Mallorca's Jews, lets the consuls, good men, and community of Mallorca City and Kingdom know that he is too busy with various affairs and that, because of this, the deputy of the community would have to delay his return to Mallorca too long and he permits him to return home, though the Jew Jacob Benonon, who has presented himself at court, may remain to help arrange this matter.⁸

Alfonso finally, on December 21, confirms the decree of his chief bailiff for the kingdom, assigning the site known as Temple and Calatrava, and authorizing the Jews to construct a synagogue and oven in the *call*.⁹ Four subsequent charters order Mallorcans and Mallorcan officials to cooperate with Alfonso's bailiff in the construction of a Jewish quarter, ordering the Jewish *aljama* and its secretaries to pay 12,000 *sous* for the privilege of its quarter, authorizing his bailiff to utilize force to collect this amount, and, lastly, urging all Jews to build their houses within the fixed site, as well as all that would be necessary to protect this single street and create a safe enclosure.¹⁰ I belabor this point because I will return to Mallorca and this particular Jewish quarter later. What is worth noting is that Mallorca's Jews, substantial at the island's conquest in 1229–1232, increased through immigration from both Christian and Muslim lands, enjoyed considerable favor and royal protection in the thirteenth century, profited by their skills in artisanry and moneylending, medicine and trade, and lived in both urban and rural areas.¹¹ In

⁷ ACA, Canc. Real, reg. 63, fol. 33; Régné, no. 1483.

⁸ ACA, Canc. Real, reg. 81, fol. 219; Régné, no. 2254.

⁹ ACA, Canc. Real, reg. 83, fols. 99v–100; Régné, no. 2267.

¹⁰ ACA, Canc. Real, reg. 83, fol. 100; Régné, no. 2268; ACA, Canc. Real, reg. 83, fol. 100; Régné, no. 2269; ACA, Canc. Real, reg. 83, fols. 100r–v; Régné, no. 2270; ACA, Canc. Real, reg. 83, fol. 100v; Régné, no. 2271.

¹¹ For general works on Mallorca's Jews, especially utilizing royal charters, see David Abulafia, "From Privilege to Persecution: Crown, Church, and Synagogue in the City of Majorca, 1229–1343," in *Church, and City, 1000–1500: Essays in Honour of Christopher Brooke*, ed. David Abulafia, Michael J. Franklin, and Miri Rubin (Cambridge, 1992),

Mallorca City, Jews lived from the first days of Christian rule in or near the Almudayna region, close to the Cathedral of Santa Maria and the Royal Palace of Almudayna, but closer still to the Dominican church and convent. One of the five gates of Mallorca City's first walls, the one closest to the Dominicans, was known as the gate of the *jueus*. The new Jewish quarter moved them only a short distance, to the southeast corner of the upper part of the old city, well within Mallorca City's second walls, not even to the newer developments in the northern part and the eastern, lower part of the city enclosed by the third and final medieval walls. The Jewish *call* was close to the Templars along the eastern wall, the Poor Clares cloistered along the sea wall to the south, and, as we shall see later, apparently too close to the Franciscans just north and slightly to the west.

The proximity of Jews and Jewish quarters to cathedrals, Franciscans, and Dominicans could be documented for almost all Catalan cities. The Franciscans and the Dominicans were not of course the only mendicant friars who flourished in the thirteenth century, and another charter of Alfonso III reminds the *justiciar* of Calatayud that the recently deceased Pere III of Aragon had mandated that the *justiciar* return to the Jew Isaac el Calvo lands which had formerly belonged to the Friars of the Sack, suppressed in 1274 at the Council of Lyons.¹² Property also moved the other direction, from Jewish to mendicant hands. On August 21, 1311, the abbess and the Poor Clare nuns of Santa Maria de la Serra, since the synagogue constructed illegally by the Jews of Montblanch had been demolished, petitioned the king for permission to acquire the demolished materials and utilize them in construction of

111–126; Abulafia, *A Mediterranean Emporium: The Catalan Kingdom of Majorca* (Cambridge, 1994), 75–102; Fidel Fita and Gabriel Llabrés, “Privilegios de los Hebreos Mallorquines en el Código Puyo,” *Boletín de la Real academia de la historia*, 36 (1900), 13–35, 122–148, 185–209, 273–306, 369–402, and 458–494 (only 13 of the 113 documents predate 1300); and A. Lionel Isaacs, *The Jews of Majorca* (London, 1936). See also J.N. Hillgarth, “Sources for the History of the Jews of Majorca,” *Traditio*, 50 (1995), 334–341; the initial exploratory studies by Ricardo Soto i Company, “La Aljama Judaica de Ciutat en el siglo XIII,” *Bolletí de la Societat Arqueològica lul·liana*, 94 (1978), 145–184; and Larry J. Simon, “Muslim-Jewish Relations in Crusader Majorca in the Thirteenth Century: An Inquiry Based on Patrimony Register 342,” in *Christians, Muslims, and Jews in Medieval and Early Modern Spain: Interaction and Cultural Change*, ed. Mark D. Meyerson and Edward D. English (Notre Dame, Ind., 1999), 125–140.

¹² ACA, Canc. Real, reg. 67, fol. 97; Régné, no. 1656. For background on this mysterious, then popular, order, see the early pages and notes, especially the citations of Richard Emery and Robert I. Burns, in my “The Friars of the Sack and the Kingdom of Majorca,” *Journal of Medieval History*, 18 (1992), 279–296.

their own monastery; Jaume II makes it known to the bailiff of Montblanch that he grants this petition.¹³

Some royal charters are fairly ambiguous, without further information beyond what is contained in the singular registered entry. Jaume I in 1265 granted pardon to Berenguer Durand, a merchant of Girona, who committed perjury by entering a Jewish house after swearing to the Dominicans that he would no longer frequent the house of any Jew, and also by claiming that a certain Jew of the town had paid cash to a royal porter.¹⁴ The king, furthermore, exempted the said merchant from the obligation to sculpt a wooden statue for the church of Santa Maria; connections between the two and explanations for either are unfortunately missing.

At least one document indicates warm, albeit business, relations between at least one Jew and some mendicants. While in Valencia on March 27, 1301, Jaume II, in consideration of the fact that Homer, a Jewish doctor of the city, had practiced faithfully his art for the benefit of the Franciscans of Valencia, conceded to him, at the specific request of the Franciscans, a letter stating that he was not liable for his insolvent co-religionists.¹⁵ A document concerning another individual who got on well with mendicants is interesting but open to conflicting interpretations. At the request of the Dominicans of Játiva, Jaume II freed Yom Tov, a Jew of Játiva, and all his property from the obligation to pay royal taxes for so long as he continued to function as Master of Hebrew for the Dominican House.¹⁶ Whether Yom Tov's co-religionists were happy for him or thought this was a decent arrangement is not recorded and highly dubious in any case.

The majority of the registered royal charters documenting mendicant-Jewish interaction relate to compulsory sermons, treatment of converts, and the investigation of Hebrew writings for blasphemy. The Aragonese monarchy clearly sought to curb the excesses of the mob and limit the likelihood of violence on occasions of compulsory evangelization—Jews were not required to listen to sermons except while in the Jewish quarter itself, and preachers were not to be accompanied by more than ten trustworthy Christians—yet the monarchy throughout the thirteenth century, not merely Jaume I but his three thirteenth-

¹³ ACA, Canc. Real, reg. 208, fol. 36v; Régné, no. 2933.

¹⁴ ACA, Canc. Real, reg. 13, fol. 276v; Régné, no. 339.

¹⁵ ACA, Canc. Real, reg. 196, fol. 296; Régné, no. 2750.

¹⁶ ACA, Canc. Real, reg. 195, fol. 94; Régné, no. 2669.

century successors as well, supported mendicant missionizing and conversionary efforts. In the aftermath of the Disputation of Barcelona, as Robert Chazan and Mark Johnston have pointed out, Jaume I sought in several of his decrees to reaffirm earlier rules and regulations.¹⁷ Mendicant-Jewish interaction was thus by no means limited to theological confrontation, but from the vantage point of the registered royal documentation, however, that remained the dominant theme.

It seems reasonable to ask if perhaps, at an even more prosaic level, a different picture of this interaction might emerge. Notarial registers for most Mediterranean Spanish cities are not extant, and, where extant, are not abundant until after the year 1300, and most Franciscan and Dominican archives have not survived.¹⁸ The Dominican Library of Barcelona survives as the core of the University of Barcelona's medieval manuscript collection, but all archival documentation was destroyed. In Mallorca, the Dominican Library was destroyed, but close to one thousand total charters, three hundred for the thirteenth century, are extant and were shipped to Madrid after confiscation by the Spanish state in 1835.¹⁹ A full range of Dominican activities, including their sale and purchase of Muslim slaves, is to be found in these materials. On July 30, 1295, for example, Pere Scuder, prior of the Dominican House, purchased from Ponç Feliç, a white baptized slave named Guillem for twelve Valencian pounds.²⁰ Later, on April 10, 1301, the Dominicans purchased another baptized slave, this one a mulatto or olive-skinned slave named Bertran, from Mateu de Truiars, a cleric of

¹⁷ See Chazan, as cited above in n. 2; Mark D. Johnston, "Ramon Llull and the Compulsory Evangelization of Jews and Muslims," in *Iberia and the Mediterranean World of the Middle Ages: Studies in Honor of Robert I. Burns, S.J.*, vol. I: *Proceedings from Kalamazoo*, ed. Larry J. Simon (Leiden, 1995), 3–37; see also Jaume Riera i Sans, "Les llicències reials per predicar als jueus i als sarraïns (segles xiii–xiv)," *Calls*, 2 (1987), 113–143.

¹⁸ Jill Webster's *Els Menorets: The Franciscans in the Realms of Aragon from St. Francis to the Black Death (1348)* (Toronto, 1993) can be read as an attempt to reconstruct, from royal registers (and to a lesser extent notarial records), Franciscan history in the lands of the Crown of Aragon. The extant documentation, richer for the Dominicans, has yet to be systematically explored. On the ecclesiastical and notarial archival riches of Mediterranean Spain, see Simon, "Jews, Jean Régné, and the Medieval Crown of Aragon," 311–315.

¹⁹ See Luis Sanchez Belda, *Guía del Archivo Histórico Nacional* (Madrid, 1958); these are in carpetas of twenty or so per carpeta in the Clero section.

²⁰ Madrid, Archivo Histórico Nacional [hereafter AHN], Clero, pergs., carp. 91, no. 12: "Sit omnibus notum quod ego Poncius felicitis vendo tibi fratri petro scuderi priori conuentus fratrum predicatorum maiorice et eidem conuenti unum baptizatum album nomine G. en talla precio duodecim librarum quas a uobis habui et recepi."

Barcelona, for fourteen Mallorcan pounds.²¹ These documents record a number of other sales of especially Muslim slaves, though usually not involving Dominicans; indeed, the majority of documents are relatively random notarized parchments whose ownership by the Dominicans is not immediately obvious.²² Interestingly enough, numerous documents concern Jews. A half-dozen documents record loans, and another half-dozen record Jewish property transactions in the Almudayna region of Mallorca City, next to the Dominicans, where most Jews congregated until a specific quarter was built in the 1280s. Two of the largest and lengthiest of these parchments concern Jews. As early as 11 July 1231, when the conquest of Mallorca was not yet complete, various Jews received properties not only in and around Mallorca City, but in several locations, including Inca, in the island's interior. On 6 July 1288, the Mallorcan Jew Salima (or Salema, perhaps Zalema) ben Aaron ben Aarde drafted his will, now edited by Burns, which shows his family in detail, his wife and executor Maymona, his married daughter Maazuga, his widowed daughter Axera, his brother Marçoch, his eldest son and partner Maymon, two minor children Abrafim and Carima, and numerous friends and witnesses.²³ Salima owned a black female slave, two hospices, and a set of buildings "fairly close to the buildings of the synagogue," and showed substantial signs of affluence: the minor children are each to get 15,000 Valencian pounds from Maymon within three years of Salima's death. Burns notes that the "names have a Judeo-Arabic flavor as a whole and suggest a family from the massive migration northward under the Almohad rule or a family assimilated after the large Christian conquests over Spanish Islamic lands." It is not readily apparent why a formal copy of this will is drawn up by the Mallorcan notary Arnau Sanmartí four years later, or why the Dominican archives should have preserved a copy; but since the minor children alone are to inherit sizeable fortunes and much of Salima's property presumably was located near the Dominican house, there may

²¹ AHN, Clero, pergs., carp. 94, no. 8: "Ego Matheus de truiaris clericus de barchinona vendo vobis fratri petro bennacor prior conuentus fratrum predicatorum maioricensis ementi nomine proprio et nomine dicti conuentus unum baptizatum laurum nomine Bertrandum precio quattordecim librarum regalium maioricarum minutorum monete perpetue quas numerando a uobis habui et recepi."

²² For further reference to some of the slave documents see my "The Church and Slavery in Ramon Llull's Majorca," in *Iberia and the Mediterranean World of the Middle Ages*, 345–363 (esp. 352–353).

²³ AHN, Clero, pergs., carp. 89, no. 10. The document is edited by Burns, *Jews in the Notarial Culture*, 170–173, and analyzed in detail on pp. 75–78.

have been an interlocking web of urban real estate interests. The wills the Dominicans were most likely to have preserved were usually those where they were beneficiaries.

What is missing in this documentation, however, is any example of Dominican-Jewish interaction. The Dominicans and the Jews of Mallorca lived at incredibly close quarters, conducted business with many of the same individuals, knew each other and each others' business well, but cooperated on apparently nothing, and conducted little business with each other, or at least not any that has left notable archival traces. The only documents that mention the Dominicans and the Jews together are several generic preaching licenses, beginning as early as the 1250s, for the Dominicans to evangelize Mallorca's Jewish and Muslim populations.

If the Dominican archival documentation yields two ships passing, not in the night but in broad daylight, barely acknowledging each other except for the occasions when they collide theologically and socially during compulsory sermons, one might ask if this fact finds expression in any sources indicating Jewish attitudes toward the mendicants.²⁴ Although Hebrew sources from thirteenth-century Mallorca are next to nonexistent, I think an accurate expression is found in a Latin, Christian source. In 1286 on Mallorca there apparently took place a disputation between Mallorcan Jews and a lay Christian merchant from Genoa by name of Inghetto Contardo. Inghetto's account, drafted after the fact, survives in seventeen manuscripts, was twice printed in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Venice, and has just recently been edited and published in Paris by Gilbert Dahan, and edited and published for the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* by Ora Limor.²⁵ This disputation, whose veracity is not doubted by any of the editors, though, unlike Barcelona's disputation, was not documented in other sources, apparently took place in Catalan, though all manuscripts survive in grammatical and straightforward Latin. One editor believes the text was originally written in Ligurian Italian but cannot point to any textual specifics, aside from a number of Italian proverbs which may have

²⁴ Studies of the Friars and the Jews are invariably the writings and preachings of the Friars on the Jews, rather than Jews on the Friars; or the story of their interactions.

²⁵ For the texts, see Inghetto Contardo, *Disputatio Contra Iudeos: Controverse avec les juifs*, ed. Gilbert Dahan (Paris, 1993), and *Die Disputationen zu Ceuta (1179) und Mallorca (1286): Zwei antijüdische Schriften aus dem mittelalterlichen Genua*, ed. Ora Limor (Munich, 1994). In addition to the editors' introductions, see also Limor's "Missionary Merchants: Three Medieval Anti-Jewish Works from Genoa," *Journal of Medieval History*, 17 (1991), 35–51.

influenced or at least lay behind the Latin text. The six major discussions of this 20,000-word disputation take place at the Genoese loggia on Mallorca, at the house of the “magister Judeorum,” and the final one, briefly, at Inghetto’s own house. If the disputation contains nothing polemically innovative—the word Talmud, for example, is not once mentioned in the text, though the Disputation at Barcelona is—and is, according to the classificatory typology suggested by my former teacher, the late Amos Funkenstein, a “traditional” work based mainly on the Bible, it is a text rich in historical particulars and spirited exchanges, enlivened by the personalities of the protagonists.

Unless one were to assume that the Latin text is a reworking by a secular clergyman whose disdain for the mendicants evidences clerical anti-mendicantism, and who cleverly inserts a few, choice anticlerical—that is, antiseccular-clerical—comments to help conceal his identity, the hostility of the Jewish disputants toward the friars is genuine and certainly palpable. In the second discussion, held at the house of a magister Judeorum, the mendicants appear in the third of eight subsections. The text reports that the two Jewish disputants said, “When Zacharias said: I am not a prophet at all, I am a man who works the land, and he who will have prophesied, his parents will curse him, it has to do with your Friars Minor, Preachers, and others of the same character [*isti sunt uestri fratres minores et predicatorum et alii huiusmodi*], who preach and seduce the crowds, saying: the Lord has said this and that, but, on the side, they live evilly, fornicate, and steal as much as they are able.”²⁶ Inghetto replies that the Franciscans and Dominicans and *alii boni viri* who preach God’s word do not call themselves prophets, but generally count themselves among the sinners. The Jews ask how this

²⁶ Contardo, *Disputatio*, 118–20: “Dixerunt Iudei: De hoc quod dicit: *Non sum propheta, homo agricola sum ego*, et maledicent ei parentes eius, si quis prophetauerit, isti sunt uestri fratres minores et predicatorum et alii huiusmodi, qui predicant et seducunt gentes et dicunt: Dominus dixit hec et hec, et quando fornicantur, malitiose uiuunt et rapiunt que possunt. Vbi hoc inuenitur quod pro maleficiis homo saluetur?”

Ingetus respondit: Vos debetis scire et scitis, o Iudei, quod fratres minores et predicatorum et alii boni uiri qui predicant uerbum Dei non dicunt se esse prophetas; ymmo comuniter se ponunt cum peccatoribus et peccatores se uocant et non prophetas, et ideo omnes dicunt Deo: Peccatores te rogamus, audi nos. Et uere uobis dico quod si quis diceret: Dominus locutus fuit michi, teneretur a sapientibus et fidelibus malus et stultus et in dementia sensus et non crederetur de uerbo de quo loqueretur.

Dixerunt Iudei: Quomodo hoc dicere potes? Nonne uos, Christiani, dicitis: Frater talis et frater talis sancti sunt et boni uiri; eamus ad sermonem, quia talis sanctus uir debet predicare? Et uide si bene dicis contra teipsum, qui dicis quod peccatores sunt et ab aliis tenentur sancti.”

can be so: "Do you not say, to other Christians, 'Such and such brothers are saints and good men, let's go to the sermon for the holy man will be speaking.'" The ensuing discussion mentions Jews as the killers of Christ, and Christians as abolishers of idols; although comparatively little space records the reactions of the Jews, they are certainly not, at this juncture, brought to a more favorable opinion of the mendicants.

One subsection of the fourth discussion concerns announcements of the coming of the Messiah. A unique argument is advanced by the Jews concerning why the prophets were not able to foretell that Christ, son of Mary, would arrive at a particular time. Inghetto eventually responds that "anger impedes the soul and sin suppresses the mind and intelligence" and until Jews remove anger from their hearts and repent of their sins they will not know the day of salvation heralded by the Messiah. The Jews reply, "We ardently desire to know it! But, if all the clerks, and the Friars Minor and Friars Preachers, the doctors and wise Christians got together, they could not do it, and you, who are a merchant, you believe yourself capable of doing it! You are blundering. You ramble on better and more audaciously than the Friars Preachers and Friars Minor whose business it is to discuss and deliberate on such matters. We want to tell you and affirm to you that, under the reign of Jaume, the good king of Aragon, who was the father of Peter and the grandfather of Alfonso, who is now reigning, the Friars Preachers and Friars Minor came to Girona, as well as brothers Pau, the former Jew, and many other very able Christians, some of them doctors in law, in great numbers and they disputed with my brother Jews. How this turned out, ask those who were present and you will know if the outcome was to the advantage of the Christians or not."²⁷ Inghetto

²⁷ Contardo, *Disputatio*, 188–190: "Dixit Ingetus: Ira impedit animum et peccatum tollit mentem et intellectum. Vnde ad cognoscendum et ad intelligendum diem aduentus Messie, remoueatir ira a cordibus uestris et de peccatis peniteamini et, hoc facto, intelligetis et cognoscetis diem salutis et aduentus Messie.

Dixerunt Iudei: Hoc nos scire multum desideramus! Sed si omnes clerici et fratres minores et predicatoros, doctores et sapientes Christianorum insimul essent, hoc facere non possent, et tu, qui mercator es, credis hoc facere! Teipsum decipis. Sed melius et audacius decet te fabulari quam fratres minores et predicatoros, quorum interest de istis disputare et consulere. Et uolumus dicere tibi et affirmare quod in tempore domini Iacobi boni regis Aragonum, qui fuit pater domini Petri et auus istius domini Alfonsi, qui nunc regnat, fuerunt apud Gironam fratres predicatoros et fratres minores et frater Paulus, qui fuit iudeus, et multi alii peritissimi Christiani et etiam quam plures legum doctores, et disputauerunt cum meis Iudeis. Finis qualis fuit, interroga eos qui fuerunt, et scies si finis fuit bonus pro Christianis an non.

Respondit Ingetus: De hoc numquam uerbum audiui. Tamen multum rogo uos

replies that he has not heard a "single word," of that disputation but that he desired to have a copy of it, to which the Jews reply that, yes, they have it, and have sent it throughout the world. Inghetto asks: "Why don't you help yourselves and use the arguments which, according to you, were presented to the Christians, and by which it seems that they found themselves beaten, according to what you say, but which I do not believe at all, because brother Pau was there?" The Jews respond that "it would not be decent to present such difficult concepts" as "you would understand nothing of it."

It is Inghetto who tells the story, and although he speaks far more than the Jews, the give and take in the extant dialogue is remarkable. Inghetto obviously takes considerable pride in his intellectual prowess, and makes a special point of the fact that the Jews have been defeated by a simple merchant. Substantially later in the work Inghetto indulges his pride further and has the Jews express their doubts about whether Inghetto was secretly a cleric or mendicant. Inghetto again vigorously denies this assertion and claims to have learned all he knows from disputing with Jews in various parts of the Mediterranean; although he mentions a number of Jews by name he identifies nobody in particular. It is the process, not any particular teaching, that made Inghetto what he is, since with Jews "what one says, the other denies." The Jews respond that such syllogistic fickleness sounds precisely like the Franciscans and Dominicans: "If someone proposes an argument to them, they answer with different words and each one speaks according to his own ideas."²⁸

quod, si in scriptis habetis disputationem illam, quod michi in exemplo tradatis, quia desiderio magno desidero ut habeam translatum ipsius.

Dixerunt Iudei: Bene habemus, et per uniuersum mundum eam misimus nostris iudeis.

Dixit Ingetus: Quare de ipsa non uos adiuuatis et cur non opponitis ea que opposita fuerunt Christianis, prout dicitis, et de quibus, ut apparet, quod Christiani remanserunt superati, a dicto uestro, quod non credo, postquam frater Paulus illic erat?

Dixerunt Iudei: Non decet nos de tam obscuris uerbis tecum loqui, quia non intelligeres.

Respondit Ingetus: Ego usque nunc responsionem a uobis haber non potui de aliquibus de quibus uobis opposuerim. Vnde, si ita esset ut asseritis, bene fecissetis responsionem. Sed, quia superati estis et contradicere non potestis, si ueritati consentire uelletis, ideo-nichil credo de toto hoc quod dixistis. Ne pro malo hebeatis! Vobis dedecus est quod ab homine simplici et mercatore superamini et uincamini. Videte quid faceretis si hic esset aliquis sapiens scripturam!"

²⁸ Contardo, *Disputatio*, 226: "Dixerunt Iudei: Bonus predicator esses, quia bene

The interests of space and theme limit me to these summary recapitulations,²⁹ but there is at least one other reference that must be mentioned briefly. Between the fourth and fifth discussions a Jew by the name of Astruc Israel arrives and elects to be baptized; Inghetto is cautious and counsels that a "false Jew will be punished less than a false Christian."³⁰ The persistent apostate is baptized at the cathedral, offered plenty of typical advice, and then taken to the Franciscans for catechism. This, interestingly enough, accords well with historical practice on the island. According to a constitution of Jaume II of Aragon, preserved in a manuscript extant in archives in Palma, all Muslims and Jews who converted to Christianity were to retain their property freely, they were to enjoy the same status and liberty of other Christians, no one was to criticize their conversions or refer to them as renegades,

scires ponere uerba et deauare ea, sed per Deum, dic nobis si fuisti frater minor uel predicator, uel si cericus es, et unde habes hec que nobis dixisti et dicis.

Ingetus respondit: Nec clericus sum neque fui nec alicuius religionis unquam fui, ymmo mercator sum. Sed hec que scio didici a iudeis et per gratiam Dei et Messie domini nostri Ihesu Christi. Et bene dico uobis quod in tempore meo, cum multis Iudeis conflictum habui, et specialiter in Prouincia et in Alexandria Egipti, cum illo Angelo, quem Iudei de Syria uocabant regem Iherusalem. Similiter cum illo Balaafec de Babilonia, qui est, si uiuit, maximus doctor inter Iudeos.

Dixerunt Iudei: Si cum illo tu unquam locutus fuisti, quid dixit tibi? Dic nobis, si Deus adiuuet te.

Ingetus respondit: Tantum dixit michi quod si essem incredulus seu hereticus in fide Christi, uerba sua et aliorum iudeorum cum quibus unquam locutus fuero facerent me credulum et fidelem, quia quod unus dicit, alter negat, sicut inter uos hodie fecistis.

Dixerunt Iudei: Ita faciunt uestri fratres minores et predicatorum, quia, si aliquis eis dixerit aliquam rationem, respondebunt ei uariis sermonibus, et unusquisque loquitur ad suam opinionem, et id simile faciunt omnes sapientes, quoniam graue esset quod omnes doctores essent unius opinionis."

²⁹ I have taught this work in a seminar, finished an English translation of the complete text, unfortunately of the Dahan text which we utilized for a variety of reasons, but with Ora Limor's approval (and perhaps, I hope, her assistance on points of polemic rather than history), I will revise this translation from her superior edition, and publish it for student use.

³⁰ Contardo, *Disputatio*, 260: "O Iudee, uos nescitis quid dicatis, quoniam, si baptismum accipietis, uocabimini 'canis filius canis' tam a Christianis quam a Iudeis, et in paupertate eritis, et qui hodie uobis dabit obolum, in toto uno anno non dabit alium, et sic multam necessitatem habebitis et forsitan in desperationem cito cadere possetis. Et ideo uobis consulo quod stetis sicut iam steistis, quia ut apparet, bene estis quinquagenarius, et notum facio uobis quod minus pene passus erit falsus iudeus quam falsus Christianus."

And later, at 268: "Et, hiis dictis, duxit eum ad locum Fratrum Minorum et tradidit eum guardiano et fratribus suis, decens eis: Docete eum in Testamento Nouo et in fide catholica, et unanimiter omnes in Christo pacem habeamus, quam ipse prestare dignetur, qui est benedictus in secula seculorum, amen."

though the neophytes were obliged to listen to and observe the dictates of the friars.³¹

One final, fascinating tale of Mallorcan mendicant-Jewish interaction has come to light from the archives. Several summers ago I found four intriguing charters among the Aragonese royal registers. None of the four, interestingly enough, is found in Jean Régné's catalog of Aragonese royal charters concerning the Jews in the lands of the Crown of Aragon between 1213 and 1327. It is often assumed, quite erroneously, that Régné contains all royal material from the Crown registers; this should not, however, be attributed to Régné himself, who acknowledges in a footnote his incompleteness.³² In the last few years, the Arxiu de la Corona d'Aragó has continued the process of cataloging and making available various *procesos* it possesses on sundry topics, surviving in various sizes, shapes, lengths, on both paper and parchment, and in wildly variant states of preservation. One of these, in eight, small, worm-eaten, now almost confetti-like folios, the writing radically abbreviated, the ink oxidizing, concerns the subject of these four registered documents—a dispute between the Franciscans of the City of Mallorca, present-day Palma, themselves in the process of constructing a new church, and the Jews of Mallorca City, building a new synagogue in their recently constructed *call*. The conflict came to involve royal officials, leading citizenry of the city, the Cistercian abbot of Santa Maria de la Real, cathedral canons, and the Dominicans as well.³³

On December 24, 1297, Jaume II writes from Valencia to Pere Bou, bailiff of Mallorca, communicating that the *aljama* of the Mallorcan

³¹ Régné, no. 2427, citing "Archives de Palma [today Arxiu del Regne de Mallorca], Libre d'en Sant-Pere, fol. 114."

³² See above n. 3; and Régné's own footnote, *History of the Jews*, p. 445, at the beginning of his Jaume II abstracts.

³³ The document is catalogued simply ACA, Canc. Real, Procesos en cuarto, año 1298, Sinagoga de Mallorca. My senior colleague and dear friend, the great Mallorcan scholar Gabriel Llompart, C.R., spoke about this document at the XVI Jornades d'Estudis Històrics Locals of the Institut d'Estudis Balearics devoted to the topic "El Regne de Mallorca a l'època de la dinastia privativa," December 10–12, 1997. I have endeavored to edit the document in full as an appendix; the sorry state of the document's preservation calls for multiple sets of eyes, I hope not resulting in the embarrassing exposure of too many of my own errors. Padre Llompart has an unrivalled knowledge of the local context and particulars surrounding this document and indeed almost all medieval Mallorcan history, but he has indicated to me that he considers the dispute of mainly local interest. I think it belongs to a universal genre of dispute among ethno-religious groups, and it and other documents like it need to be brought to the widest scholarly community possible, so their common particulars may be studied.

Jews has complained to him concerning the opposition raised against the building of the new synagogue in the new Jewish quarter, which the Jews had reminded the king was organized and granted by his brother Alfonso when he was king.³⁴ On December 31, Jaume writes again to Pere that the Franciscans are protesting against the construction of the new synagogue, alleging that the voices of synagogue officials are disturbing their liturgical celebrations in the church of San Francisco, and the king orders an investigation by Guillem de Gallifa and Guillem de Ultzina.³⁵ The Franciscans themselves had in just the previous decade initiated the building of a new church, and it is this edifice that survives today, a statue of Juniperro Serra adorning the front of the church, and

³⁴ ACA, Canc. Real, reg. 107, fol. 165v: "Petro bovis baiulo Maioricarum uel eius locum tenenti et seu alii [cuilibet] baiulo ciuitatis predictae qui pro tempore fuerit etc. Ex parte aliam iudeorum ciuitatis Maioricarum fuit conquerendo propositum coram nobis quod vos ad aliquorum instanciam contra concessionem factam aliam predictam per illustrem Dominum Regem Alfonsum fratrem nostrum felicitis recordationis et per nos ac etiam per Episcopum Maioricarum impeditis et prohibetis iudeos ipsos ne possint construere Sinagogam in nouo callo iudayco eorundem, unde mirantes de uobis quia concessionem dicti domini Regis Alfonsi et nostras ac prefati Episcopi ac mandata super hiis facta uidimus deducere in contemptum, vobis expresse [dicimus] et mandamus quatenus dictos iudeos Sinagogam predictam in callo predicto iuxta concessionem predictam construere libere permitentes nullum ad aliquorum instanciam super constructione ipsa prefatis iudeis impedimentum uel contrarium faciatis uel ab aliquibus fieri permitatis, immo defendatis iudeos ipsos contra quoscumque uolentes eisdem in constructione ipsa contra concessionem predictam iniuriam uel grauamen quia aliter vos habentes ne uideamus dictos iudeos ratione predicta coram nobis ulterius querelantes. Datum valencie, ix kalendas ianuarii, anno quo supra."

³⁵ ACA, Canc. Real, reg. 107, fols. 176v–177r: "Baiulo Ciuitatis Maioricarum uel ius locum tenenti etc. Licet nuper ad insta[n]ciam et supplicationem nobis per parte aliam iudeorum Maioricarum factam scripserimus uobis [et dederimus nostris literis in mandatis] quod iudeos predictos Sinagogam construere permetteretis in nouo callo iudayco eorundem iuxta concessionem factam dicte aliam per illustrissimum Dominum Regem Alfonsum clare memorie fratrem nostrum et per nos ac etiam per Episcopum Maioricarum nec permetteretis eisdem iudeis per aliquos super constructione dicte Sinagoge impedimentum aliquod fieri seu prestari quia tamen postmodum per Guardianum et conuentum fratrum minorum Maioricarum nobis extitit demonstratum quod locus in quo dicta Sinagoga construitur est adeo propinquus ecclesie dictorum fratrum minorum quod quando iudei in Sinagoga ipsa iuxta ritum suum celebrant [177] horas suas, officium diuinum in ecclesia dictorum fratrum propterea perturbatur necnon et fratribus ipsis alia tedia et gravamina inferuntur et nos super hiis per dilectum [nos] G. de gallifa et G. de ultzina mandemus certitudinem indagari et nos certificari per eos ut certificati possimus quod decencio fuerit ordinare, idcirco mandamus et dicimus uobis quatenus donec dicti G. de gallifa et G. de ultzina super predictis indagauerint certitudinem et nos inde informauerint nosque ordinauerimus quid in premisis fuerit faciendum et a nobis aliud receperitis in mandatis prohibeat iudeis predictis ne ad constructionem dicte sinagoge procedant. Datum valencie, ii kalendas ianuarii anno quo supra."

the earthly remains of one Ramon Llull, occupying one of the small chapels behind the main altar, constituting the church's prize possession.³⁶

In the Franciscan house, on January 19, 1298, Friar Ramon de Moraria, guardian of the Franciscan convent, with certain brothers of the convent, and Solomon Bennuno, Bolax Maymo, and Saydo ben Deuy, secretaries of the Mallorcan Jewish *aljama*, presented to Guillem de Galifa and Guillem de Ultzina a document of the illustrious king of Aragon. This document is copied into the *proceso*. A long list of officials was present: the lieutenant of the royal procurator Guillem de Belloch, episcopal official Pere Torrella, *veguer* or vicar Francesc de Cardona, bailiff Arnau de Cassa, six municipal consuls, Pere de Cardona, Bernat Guillem de Soriu, Bernat Sultzina, Francesc Cerdanus, Guillem Tuyr, and Arnau Garriga, the knight Fernan Rodriguez, the citizens of Mallorca Bernat de Verí, Guillem Robert, Guillem Ebrini, F. Picany, Jaume de Valespir, and many others called especially for this task, in the presence of the venerable knight Guillem de Galifa and the Tarragona judge Guillem de Ultzina.

Jaume of Aragon writes on December 31, 1297 that, since the Mallorcan Jewish *aljama*, with the permission of King Alfonso and indeed the bishop of Mallorca, built a synagogue in the *call*, the guardian and convent of the Franciscans claim that it was constructed so close to the church that when the Jews in the nearby synagogue "celebrate their rite and their hours" the voices of the Jews are audible in the Franciscan church and cause the brothers "other kinds of weariness and inconvenience." Jaume desires to have a fuller understanding or certainty of the matter, and orders that the church and synagogue be approached and inspected regarding how far the two stand apart from each other, if indeed the voices of the Jews singing their rite in the synagogue have enough volume to be heard during the prayers of the Franciscans or exhibit any other hindrance to the friars. Jaume asks to be notified in writing so that a reasonable and honest solution can be arranged.

The two Guillems, with the document having been presented and read, wishing humbly to obey the royal order, proceed immediately in the presence of all of the aforesaid deemed worthy of the task,

³⁶ For the Convent of San Francisco, see now the stunningly beautiful photographs by Donald G. Murray, text by Aina Pascual and Jaume Llabrés, *Conventos y Monasterios de Mallorca: Historia, Arte y Cultura*, "Introducción y Apéndices" by Gabriel Llompart, C.R. (Palma de Mallorca, 1992), 38–55.

and also in the presence of the venerable abbot of the Cistercian Monastery of Santa Maria de la Real. The Guillems measure *per aerem* the distance from the synagogue to the old Franciscan church at sixty *canes* and one *palm* while the distance to the new Franciscan church under construction at sixty-eight *canes*, two *palms*. And on the same day, the two Guillems, with the aforesaid abbot and a number of the aforesaid dignitaries and citizens approached the unfinished synagogue and *dischoperta* and also found it to reach a height of four *tapias*. They visited during vespers to determine if any murmur could be heard from the Franciscan church, and ordered at the end of the hour for the *Salve Regina* to be sung in the loudest tone possible. The voices were able to be heard, but none of the words could be understood; only the Cistercian abbot claimed that he could understand “*ad te clamamus exules fili Eve*” until the end of the antiphony. One official claimed he could understand only the words “*O clemens, O pia,*” and Bernat de Ultzina claims he could hear one or the other. But the majority declared that they did not understand the words, although they knew how to read and write, and said they could discern nothing more than the voices themselves.

After this, on Wednesday, January 22, the two Guillems, with a number of the officials, including the Franciscan lector Bernat Terroç, with his associate, Brother Bernat de Muntdey, present, along with the secretaries of the *aljama*, measure the length and width of the street in the direction of the old church, as well as the length and width of a number of other streets between the synagogue and the Franciscan complex, mentioning in passing some of the Jewish houses. There were clearly more streets in 1298 between the two houses of worship than exist today between the churches of San Francisco and the Jesuit church of Montesión, which was built on the site of the synagogue in question, long after the Jews of Mallorca had been converted and moved, yet again, this time to the street of the silversmiths north of Santa Eulàlia. And it may yet be possible to unravel this part of the text and identify all the streets in question.

On Thursday the 23rd, the two Guillems and their entourage visited the oldest part of the city, and arrived at the Dominican complex, which did not survive the events of 1835. The old synagogue in the Almudayna region of the city was close to the Dominicans; they measure and find that it stands apart a greater distance of eight *canes* than the new synagogue and the Franciscans, and observe that the old synagogue is near enough to one of the Almudayna palace walls as

to deflect noise between it and the Dominicans. They enquire if synagogue services ever interfered with Dominican activities. The prior answers, emphatically, that in the forty years during which he had lived in the Dominican community never had he heard the voices of the Jews in their synagogue, and other friars agreed that there had been absolutely no hindrance. The Dominican prior and friars also said that they had never heard the voices of the Jews even from a certain chapel almost half the distance between the church and synagogue. The magistrates and citizens present in this inspection pointed out, however, that there was not merely one Jewish synagogue near the Dominicans, as there would be near the Franciscans after the new quarter is built, and that Jews lived scattered throughout the city and congregated especially in the Almudayna and also on the street of en Nunyo Sanç (the count of Roussillon and royal official who played a major role in the resettlement of Mallorca), where they had another synagogue near the chapel of San Bartomeu.

On Friday, January 24, the two Guillems and their entourage visited the synagogue of the Almudayna to sample the pulse of activity near it, and also to determine relations between its patrons and those visiting the Cathedral of Santa Maria. They noted that the distance between the synagogue and the cathedral was half of that between the new synagogue and the Franciscans, and interviewed the cathedral canons and clergy, enquiring if ever the voices of the Jews disturbed or molested cathedral functions. They were told that they did not. Only when the canons were outside in the cathedral's cemetery were they ever able to hear the voices of the Jews.

On the same day and in a like manner, the last activity was to visit the church of San Andreu and assemble eleven worthy men whose names were not specifically written down, fearing displeasure of the disputants, and who were asked while under oath if, once the new synagogue was completed and roofed, they believed that the faithful gathered in San Francisco church would be able to hear songs from the synagogue. All but two of the aforesaid declared no. Three of the eleven, however, believed that, at the height of a stiff sea breeze, some murmur would be able to be discerned, but not to such a degree "that it would cause any hindrance to the said friars."

Guillem de Belloch, Guillem de Ultzina, and Guillem de Gallifa certified and submitted their report and attested to the truth of its contents. Jaume II of Aragon, apparently, if the reality was not a further financial shakedown of the Jewish community, embraced diplomacy

over the straight implication of the investigation. On the one hand, he wrote to both ecclesiastical and civil officials, with copies sent to the Jewish *aljama* and to Franciscans, that, based on the information in the report, the synagogue was too close to the church and he did not approve of continued construction; moreover, the Jews were not to hold services without his authority except at a site so remote from the church that the voices of the Franciscans and the Jews could not be heard by one other.³⁷ Jaume II also wrote separately to the Franciscans, however, indicating that no other site was readily available in the new *call*, and he asked that they therefore permit the building of the synagogue in the place where it was already being built.³⁸ The Mallorcan Franciscan

³⁷ ACA, Canc. Real, reg. 110, fols. 4r-v: "Ferrario abbati de Regali, Bernardo Guamir baiulo Maioricarum nec non vicario Maioricarum et oficiali venerabilis maioricensis Episcopi etc. Nuper quia iudei aljame ciuitatis Maioricarum ex concessione domini Regis Alfonsi clare memorie fratris nostri atque nostra et prefati maioricensis Episcopi Sinagogam in novo calle judaico construebant. Ex parte guardiani et conuentus fratrum minorum Ciuitatis predictae fuit expositum coram nobis quod locus in quo dicta Sinagoga construitur erat prop[inqu]a ecclesie dictorum fratrum adeo quod uoces eorum et iudeorum celebrantium horas sua audiri poterant hinc et inde et alia tedia et grauamina inferri fratribus supradictis. Nos uero uolentes habere de predictis certitudinem plenior, mandauimus dilectis nostris Guillemo de gallifa et Guillemo de ultzina ut ad dictam ecclesiam dictorum fratrum et ad locum ipsius sinagoge personaliter accedentes de omnibus predictis et aliis circumstanciis indagarent sollicite ueritatem et nos inde curarent per suas literas informare qui super predictis tam per literas quam per mensuram spacii intermedii nobis tr[an]smisissas nos certificare curarunt. Nos igitur iuxta mensuram et lieras supradictas sufficienter super dicto neg[oc]io informari cognouimus sinagoagam predictam fore nimis propinquam ecclesie supradicte et non debere in opere ipsius procedi nec permitti per dictos iudeos horas in sinagoga ipsa ulterius celebrari qua propter [uobis] dicimus et mandamus quatenus ad loca predicta personaliter accedentes ex parte nostra inhibeat et iniungatis iudeis predictis ne in opere dicte sinagoge procedant nec presumant horas ibidem ulterius celebrari sed auctoritate nostra assignetis alibi iudeis ipsis locum idoneum adeo ab ecclesia fratrum ipsorum remotum quod voces fratrum canencium et iudeorum audiri non valeant hinc et inde nec tedia seu gravamina aliqua fieri seu inferri fratribus supradictis. Nos enim arbitrio et ordinationi uestre hec omnia duximus comitenda [...] hiis comitentes [p]lenarie vices nostras habituri ratum et firmum perpetuo quicquid per uos super assignacione loci ... et aliis negocium ipsum [concernen]tibus actum fuerit seu etiam ordinatum mandantes [4r] presentes p[ro]curatori nostro baiulo vicario et aliis of[icialibus] et subditis nostris ciuitatis et Regni Maioricarum quod super omnibus predictis ordinandis et exequendis dent uobis auxilium consilium et iuvamen quodcumque inde fuerit requisiti. Datum valencie, ii idus marci anno Domini ut supra. R. Caprarii. Similis litera fuit facta et tradita nunciis aliam iudeorum Maioricarum cum prior litera fratribus minoribus tradita fuisset."

³⁸ ACA, Canc. Real, reg. 110, fol. 4v: "Guardiano et conuentui fratrum minorum Maioricarum etc. Cum nos ad instanciam uestram per alias literas nostras desisti et cessari mandemus a constructione operis Sinagoge iudeorum que in callo judaico Majoricarum de novo construebatur, et pro parte aliam iudeorum ipsius Ciuitatis

convent was of royal foundation, prospered under royal patronage, and clearly could do nothing other than acquiesce. When Jaume II of Mallorca, an enthusiastic patron of the Franciscans both in Mallorca City and at Miramar, regained Mallorca itself from Jaume II of Aragon as part of the international negotiations bringing the Sicilian vespers to a close and returned from year-round exile in Perpignan, his approval of the new Jewish quarter and its synagogues was decidedly not, as some historians may have assumed, a mere formulaic ratification of standard privileges and past custom. For the Jews of Mallorca, as for the Jews everywhere, there was no such thing as standard ratification of long-standing rights; each and every privilege was hard-won and often-times difficult to preserve. Jaume II was explicit that, whereas many Jews had transferred their homes from Almudayna and other parts of the city to a new neighborhood called the Temple and Calatrava and established their *call* there, it would cause them grave harm to compel them to leave, and he therefore conceded to them in perpetuity the site where it was then situated and the synagogues (note the plural) which, with the approbation of the bishop of Mallorca, they had commenced to build. He mandates further that, should it prove necessary to enlarge the quarter, it can extend to adjoining sites to the southeast, on the side of the Temple (closer to the city walls and sea, and thus away from the Franciscan complex and the parish church of Santa Eulàlia).³⁹

fuerit coram nobis expositum quod in calle predicta non est locus alius in quo dicti iudei sinagogam predictam comode construere valeant pro eo quia locus ipse tenetur pro nobis et loca alia que sunt in dicta calle ad censum pro aliis dominis tenentur et nobis humiliter suplicatum ut uobis super hiis nostras miti deprecatorias literas dignemur supplicatione ipsa benigne admissa vos rogamus quatenus si comode et absque srauamine uestro sustinere potestis quod dicta sinagoga construat in loco ubi ipsam iudei predicti iam construere incepterunt sinagogam eandem per dictos iudeos in loco predicto construhi permitatis. Datum valencie, ut supra.”

³⁹ See the document no. 15, reprinted from Villanueva, *Viaje literario*, vol. XXII, 332, in Antonio Pons, *Los Judíos del Reino de Mallorca durante los siglos XIII y XIV*, 2 vols. (reprint Palma de Mallorca, 1984; originally published in *Hispania*, 16, nos. 63, 64, 65 [1956], 163–255, 335–426, 503–594, and 20, nos. 78, 79, 80 [1960], 3–54, 163–266, 368–540; and printed as volumes in Madrid, undated though 1957 or 1958 and 1960), 2:213–214: “Noverint universi, quod nos Jacobus Dei gratia rex Majoricarum, comes Rossionis et Ceritanie et dominus Montispesulani, attendentes quod iudei civitatis Majoricarum, qui consueverunt morari et suas domos et habitationes havere intus Almudainam et in aliis locis civitatis Majoricarum transtulerunt se et sua domicilia in certo loco dicte civitatis Majoricarum transtulerunt se et sua domicilia in certo loco dicte civitatis, scilicet in quosdam vicos vocatos ‘partita Templi et Calatrave’ extendentes se versus domum seu castrum Templi civitatis Majoricarum, in quibus vicis dicti iudei suum callum et domos edificaverunt et construxerunt. Attendentes etiam quod, si dicti iudei

The mendicant-Jewish interactions in Mediterranean Spain which leave notarial traces are not easily subjected to psychodynamic analysis to reveal attitudes and how they may have shaped various behaviors. Still, I think that one need not be a clinician to acknowledge that warped evaluations, misassessments of fact, and vituperation often have their foundations in the emotions of the individual, in daily experiences, and reveal themselves most when one is in close company. Group attitudes and actions—whether base or inexplicably noble—are likewise often prompted and influenced as much by the mundane or the irrational as by the conscious and deliberative; similarly, mundane, prosaic actions may be revealing of the most deeply seated attitudes. If, as has been argued, the absence of contact with real Jews is a precondition for the most vicious and absurd of stereotypes, then Catalan mendicants knew better when they repeated, although rarely, false and inaccurate stereotypes; and they knew better when they perpetuated or permitted, very rarely, the spread of anti-Judaic libels so common to northern Europe and later centuries.

It was the Catalan mendicants who were forced to search for new arguments in their real missionary efforts. It is thus not at all surprising that it was the Catalans who, more than anyone else, focused on the rabbinical writings of contemporary Judaism. This is not to imply that all or even most Catalans necessarily followed this programmatic

compellentur ad alium locum dicte civitatis se et sua domicilia transferre, esset eis dampnosum, aboriosum et nimium sumptuosum et nobis habita deliberatione videatur, quod in aliquo loco dicte civitatis non possent dicti judei ita comode situari et callum suum habere, sicut in loco in quo dictum callum nunc edificatum est et constructo. Ideo per nos et nostros laudamus, concedimus et confirmamus dictis judeis et aljame eorumdem, presentibus et futuris, dictum callum et locum in quo dictum callum edificatum est, cum domibus, ediftiis et aliis pertinentiis omnibus loci dicti callie et cum sinagoga in dicto callo auctoritate venerabilis Majoricarum episcopi assignata et incepta edificari ibidem construenda. Ita quod dicti judei nunquam compellantur seu compelli possint ad transferendum se et sua domitilia nec habendum callum in alodio loco dicte civitatis, preter in loco in quo nunc est. Quoniam habitationem dictorum judeorum et sinagogam eorum in dicto loco esse volumus et statuimus ex certa scientia nunc et in perpetuum cum hoc nostro instrumento perpetuo valituro.”

Mallorca's Jewish community would, of course, suffer a tempestuous and extortionate relationship with King Sanç a mere fifteen years later, recover and prosper to an astonishing extent, only to fall victim to the anti-Jewish pogroms of 1391, undergo a very little studied period of transition, currently the subject of a doctoral dissertation in progress by Natalie Oeltjen of the University of Toronto, before being destroyed altogether in 1435, several generations before the events of 1492. The *xuetes* or *conversos* of Mallorca have not only an early and long, but also a relatively recent, history, and have been chronicled in a number of monographs.

line of anti-Judaism. A layman such as Inghetto Contardo may or may not have been conversant with the new missionizing, but a layman such as Ramon Llull certainly was; Llull, however, criticized methods of Ramon Martí in regard to the Muslims, and remained devoted to his universal art as the missionary key, seeking the moral reform of Christians and non-Christians alike. Rather than partake of a specific missionary program for the Jews, Llull's conversionary zeal was part of his own idiosyncratic program, itself grounded in a traditional salvation history. The Franciscans of Mallorca City may have been more exercised by the Hebrew prayers they imagined they were hearing, which perhaps they could hear if they strained hard enough, than by rabbinical teachings they found repugnant. The Dominican prior in Mallorca City, whatever his evangelical designs on the Jews may have been, felt no compulsion to perjury, and the entire enquiry in this Franciscan-Jewish spat seems to have been conducted in a spirit of matter-of-fact sobriety. The recovery of the more prosaic historical record of interaction is a task that ought to be, where possible, undertaken. Only by studying the daily and the millennial, the mundane as well as the profound, I would argue, will we more fully understand the relations between, to borrow a phrase from the title of a book about parties to a modern conflict, these intimate enemies.

APPENDIX

[fol. 1r] Excellentissimo ac magnifico domino Jacobo dei gracia regi Aragonum.

[2r] Anno domini m[c]cx[c] septimo, xii[ii] kalendas februarii. In presencia ven[erabilium] G. de belloch ten[entis locum] procuratoris maioricarum, P. de turricella, officialis domini maioricensis episcopi, Fr[an]cisci de cardona vicarii, A. de Cassano baiuli, P. de Cardona, Bernardi G. soriu, Bernardi sultzina, Francisci cerdani, G. tuyr et A. garriga consulum, Ferrandi rudrigis militis, Bernardi de uerino, G. Robert, G. [.]brini, F. picany, Jacobi de ualespir, ciuium maioricarum, et plurium aliorum ad hoc specialiter uocatorum, Coram venerabili G. de galifa, milite, et (G.) de ultzina iurisperito Terrachone comparuerunt frater R. de moraria Guardianus conuentus fratrum minorum maioricarum cum quibusdam fratribus ipsius conue[ntus] ex una parte et Salamo bennuno, Bolax maymo, Saydo ben Deuy[.] secretarii aliame iudeorum maioricarum, in domo dictorum fratrum ex altera, et dictus Guardianus presentauit eisdem [G. de] galifa et G. de ultzina quandam patentem literam in d[or]so sigillatam sigillo illustrissimi domini Jacobi regis aragonum. [2v] Cuius quidem litere tenor talis est:

Jacobus dei gracia Rex aragonum maioricarum [valencie] et murcie Comesque barchinone ac Sancte Romane Ecclesie [vexilla]rius ammiratus et capitaneus generalis, Dilectis suis G. de galifa et Guillelmo de ultzina, salutem et dileccionem. Cum aliama iudeorum maioricarum ex concessione illustrissimi domini R[egis] Alfonsi clare memorie fratris nostri atque nostra [ac] etiam Episcopi maioricarum in nouo calle judaico eorum construhent [si]nagogam et nunc ex parte Guardiani et conuentus fratrum minorum maioricarum sit expositum coram nobis quod locus in quo dicta sinagoga construhitur est adeo propinquus ecclesie dictorum fratrum quod quando iudei [in] sinagoga ipsa iuxta ritum suum celebrant horas suas uoces iudeorum ipsorum in ecclesia fratrum minorum audi[untur] necnon et fratribus ipsis alia tedia et gravamina infer[untur] et nos de predictis velimus habere certitudinem plenioram. Idcirco mandamus et dicimus uobis quatenus adhibitis uobis cum aliquibus [3r] fidedignis a[ccedatis p]ersonal[iter] ad domum seu ecclesiam dictorum fratrum minorum et ad locum in quo sinagoga dictorum iudeorum construhitur, et inspiciatis oculo ad oculum in quantum locus in quo dicta sinagoga construhitur distat a domo seu ecclesia dictorum fratrum minorum et si uoces iudeorum in sinagoga predicta

iuxta suum ritum dicentium horas suas [in] ecclesia dictorum fratrum audiri ualeant uel aliud impedi[mentum] predictis fratribus prestetur necnon et aliis omnibus circumstanciis in dagetis modis omnibus quibus poteritis certitudinem pleniorum de quibus omnibus curetis nos per uestras literas informare ut informati possimus super eo quod rationabile [et hone]stum fuerit ordinare. Datum valencie pridie kalendas januarii anno domini m.cc.xc septimo [-6-]

Quiquidem litera presentata et lecta dicti G. de Galifa et G. de Ultzina uolentes mandatis domini Regis humiliter obedire proces[erunt] [3v] in continenti in presencia predictorum ad h[oc] uo[catorum] et fidedignorum et etiam in presencia venerabilis et [...]s viri abbatis de Regali ad contenta in [pre]fata litera [domini] Regis ut sequitur.

Et mensurarunt per aerem predicti G. de Galifa et G. Ultzina in presencia predictorum in quantum locus in quo dicta sinagoga [construh]itur distat a domo seu ecclesia dictorum fratrum minorum anticha in qua nunc celebrant et ecclesia nouiter incepta in monasterio eorundem, cum quadam corda seu fune canipis ~~in capite cuius corda est aliquantulum de corda despart.~~ [Et] fuit inuentum quod dicta sinagoga distat ab ecclesia a[n]tica fratrum minorum per .lx. canes et .i. palm de montispeulani et quod dicta ecclesia cepta minorum distabat a dicta sinagoga cepta iudeorum plus quam dicta ecclesia antica [...] canes et i palm montispeulani, et sic distat dicta ecclesia cepta a loco ubi dicta sinagoga construhitur per lx.viii. canes et duos palmos.

[4r] Item eadem die dicti G. de galifa et G. de ultzina una cum [venera]bilibus abbate de [Regali] predicto, G. de pulcro loco et officiali predicto A. de cassano bajulo, Ferrando rudrigis milite, P. de cardona, Bernardo de Ultzina consulibus, Bernardo gomir, P. de Matis, Bernardo de uerino et pluribus aliis ciuibus maioricarum accesserunt ad sinagogam predictam iudeorum ceptam in nouo callo que sinagoga imperfecta est et dischoperta, et uersus ecclesiam fratrum minorum est tantum alta per iiii.or tapias, si posse[nt audire] voces dictorum fratrum minorum uesperas in sua ecclesia anticha celebrancium, et cum ipsos uesperos celebrant predicti q[ui erant] in dicta sinagoga congregati non potuerunt audire uoces dictorum fratrum a dicta sinagoga, et mis[erun]t nuncium ad dictos fratres quod cantarent altis uocibus in dicta ecclesia S[alve] Regina qui fratres exaltantes uoces suas [in] dicta ecclesia et [...] ut altius poterant inceperunt cantare et dicebatur [quod in]ceperant [4v] cantare Salve Regina, et audieba[n]tur in dicta sinagoga voces eorum et poterant di[s-5- u]oces puerorum qui cantabant in dicta ecclesia ut dictum est a uocibus maiorum non tamen

quod alias possent intelligi uerba que cantabant. Set dominus abbas de Regali dixit quod audiuit in predicto cantu a dicta sinagoga ad te clamamus exules fili eve usque ad finem dicte antiphene et officialis predictus dixit quod audiuit in dicto cantu hec uerba o clemens, opia. Set Bernardus de ultzina consul qui supra dixit quod intellexit tantum in dicto cantu unum de istis uerbis: uel o clemens uel opia. [Ali]i autem dixerunt quod non intellexerant uerba que [can]ta[bant] licet aliqui eorum scirent literas, set [tantum] audiuerunt dictas uoces, ut supra dictum est.

Post hec die mercurii que fuit .xi. kalendas februarii, dicti G. de galifa [5r] et G. de ultzina [una c]um Bernardo de ultzina A. garriga G. tuyr consulibus maioricarum, et [venerabili]bus Ferrando rodrigis milite Bernardo de uerino P. de Matis ciuibus maioricarum accesserunt ad dictum callem iudeorum, et presentibus fratre Bernardo terroc lectore fratrum minorum et fratre Bernardo de muntdey eius socio qui ibi erant ex parte dicti monasterii et presentibus dictis secretariis qui ibi erant nomine dicte aliame mensurarunt quendam uicum qui est in directo dicte ecclesie antique, set non noue fratrum minorum et dicte sinagoge, qui uicus est infra callum iudeorum, quiquidem uicus habebat in longum xxx.vii canes et mediam Montispesulani, et in amplum ia cana et ii palms montispesulani. Item inuenerunt quod inter [murum?] dicti monasterii fratrum minorum magis propinquum muro dicti calli uersus [dictum] monasterium [...] murum calli est extra ipsum callum quidam uicus p[ublicus in transver]so et habet in amplum duas canas et [] palmos [montis]pesulani.

[5v] Item infra callum sunt inter dictam [ecclesiam ueterem et] sinagogam duo vici intransuerso, quorum [vicorum] intransuerso primus qui est intra callum uersus murum ipsius calli habet in amplum duas canas et mediam montispesulani, et alius [u]icus qui est in transuerso iuxta locum dicte sinagoge habet in amplum duas canas et i palm montispesulani, et inter dictam ecclesiam minorum et dictam sinagogam a dicto pariete muri dicti calli usque ad dictam sinagogam sunt hospicia iudeorum satis alta [cum] solariis et aliqua eorum [cum] tegulatis bene altis continue ab ipso pariete muri usque ad dictam sinagogam, except[a ... alt]itudine dictorum vicorum intransuerso et dicto al[...] in longum ut dictum est, et predicta presenti die [] facta sunt infra spacium predictum quo distat dicta sinagoga ab ecclesia minorum predicta.

[6r] Item die jo[uis que] fuit x kalendas februarii, dicti G. de galifa et G. de ultzina accesserunt [absen]tibus dictis partibus ad ecclesiam

seu monasterium fratrum predicatorum maioricarum, [una] cum Bernardo de ultzina Bernardo G. consulibus et Ferrando rud[rig]is et Bernardo de uerino et P. de matis ciuibus maioricarum ad hoc uocatis prouidendo quantum distat sinagoga antiqua iudeorum que est in almu-dayna ab ecclesia fratrum predicatorum, et si uoces dictorum iudeorum in dicta sinagoga anticha dicentium oras suas poterant audiri ab ecclesia predicatorum uel impedimentum aliquod prestare in horis celebrandis in dicta ecclesia uel in studendo aut in aliis, ut posset per consequens haberi coniectura an uoces iudeorum oras suas dicentium in sinagoga nouiter cepta in nouo callo possent audiri ab ecclesia fratrum minorum, et fuit inuentum quod dicta sinagoga an[ticha] almu-dayune distabat plus per spacium viii canarum ab ecclesia predicatorum quam dicta sinagoga nouiter cepta ab ecclesia minorum, et est certum quod [dicta] sinagoga antica est intra murum castri maioricarum qui murus est satis grossus et [...] dictam sinagogam et ipsa sinagoga anticha est satis [in] loco infimo iuxta dictum murum per iii graons, et inter dictam sinagogam anticham [6v] et parietem ecclesie predicatorum non est aliqua domus uel hospicium in medio nisi tantum dictus murus et uia publica et ortus et monasterium ipsorum predicatorum. Item in presencia [predictorum] dicti G. de galifa et G. de ultzina interrogauerunt priorem et fratres predicores quos [ibi] congregategarunt, quos dicerent ueritatem in fide sua an uoces dictorum iudeorum dicentium oras suas iuxta ritum suum \\\in dicta sinagoga antica// possent audiri ab ecclesia dictorum fratrum predicatorum uel eis aliquod [impedi]mentum prestare in celebrando diuino officio uel alias, et dictus prior respondit in periculo anime sue quod ipse erat in ordine bene sunt .xl. anni, et pro maiori parte ipsius temporis stetit in dicto monasterio, et numquam audiuit dictas uoces iudeorum in dicta sinagoga anticha dicentium oras suas ab ecclesia seu monasterio, nec aliquod impedimentum fuit factum dictis fratribus propter dictas uoces, et idem dixerunt [alii] fratres [quan]tum ad dictum impedimentum. Dixerunt etiam dicti prior et [fratr]es quod etiam numquam audiuerunt uoces iudeorum a quadam capella que est infra dictum spacium qui est satis in medio vel quasi dicti spacii et si dicta capella esset per viii canas magis prope dictam [sinago]gam, esset satis in medio spacii distancie quod est inter ecclesiam predicatorum et sinagogam anticam predictam, dicti tamen consules et probi homines dixerunt quod omnes iudei non ueniebant ad dictam sinagogam, [7r] set aliqui eorum ibant ad quandam aliam sinagogam que est in callo d'en Nuno, iuxta capellam sancti Bartholomei, set credunt quod perfecta dicta sinagoga noui-

ter cepta in nouo callo omnes iudei maioricarum dicent oras suas in \\ipsa// sinagoga.

Item die veneris que fuit ix kalendas februarii prefati G. de gallifa et G. de ultzina, una cum G. tuyr et A. de garriga consulibus F[errando rodrigis Bernardo] de uerino G. Roberti et Jacobi company ciuibus maioricarum, pro habenda [coniectura de predictis accesserunt] ad dictam sinagogam almudayne et extimarunt [occulo ad oculum quod ecclesia] minorum distabat per medietatem magis a loco ubi sinagog[a nouiter construhitur in] callo iudeorum quam ecclesia Sancte Marie sedis maioricarum [a dicta sinagoga almuday]ne. Et postmodum in continenti predicti omnes accesserunt [ad dictam ecclesiam] Sancte Marie et ibi interrogarunt communiter clericos qui exhibant de [celebrandis uesperis si unquam au]diuerunt in dicta ecclesia dum celebrant diuinum officium voces iudeorum oras suas secundum ritum suum dicentium in s[in]agoga [almudayne predictae] et si prestabant eis per suas uoces aliquod impedimentum.

Et prefati clerici dixerunt quod numquam a dicta ecclesia Sancte Marie \\dum celebrant diuinum officum// audiuerunt uoces iudeorum oras suas in dicta [sinagoga dicentium] et etiam \\quod// credunt ipsi clerici quod si non celebrabant oras in dicta [ecclesia set escul]tarent uoces dictorum iudeorum dum dicunt oras suas [secundum ritum suum in] dicta sinagoga almudayne quod non posset eos audire. [... tamen dicti clerici] quod a cimiterio quod est extra ecclesiam ante ipsam [ecclesiam] audiuerunt multocius uoces [7v] dictorum iudeorum in dicta sinagoga \\almudayna// dicentium oras suas iuxta ritum suum.

Item dicti G. de galifa et G. de ultzina eadem die ~~cum predictis et cum venerabile G. de pulero loco~~ accesserunt ad ecclesiam beati Andree ciuitatis maioricarum et congregarunt ibi xi probos homines \\fidedignos// qui iam subposuerant oculis dictam ecclesiam fratrum minorum tam anticam quam nouam et locum in quo sinagoga in dicto nouo callo nouiter construhitur quorum proborum hominum nomina ad rogatum ipsorum proborum hominum hic specialiter scripta non fuerunt, timentes ingratitudinem alterius partis qui probi homines cum iura[ment]o interrogati fuerunt si uidebatur eis quod cum sinagoga iudeorum nouiter constructa erit cohoperta et perfecta an voces dictorum iudeorum \\dum dicent oras suas secundum ritum suum// possint audiri ab ecclesia seu monasterio fratrum minorum seu aliquod impedimentum eis prestare in diuinis officiis celebrandis seu etiam alias, et omnes predicti duobus exceptis dixerunt quod non, dixerunt

tamen iii eorum quod cum uentus esset alembat quod uoces dictorum iudeorum in dicta nova sinagoga \\\oras suas// dicentium audirentur a dicta ecclesia ut credebant non tamen in tantum quod prestaret dictis fratribus aliquod impedimentum.

Est tamen certum quod dicta die mercurii pars dictorum iudeorum presentarunt dictis G. de galifa et G. de ultzina, in presencia dicti lectoris et socii sui et aliorum proborum hominum, quandam cedula que nondum hic posita est, cuius tenor talis est: [8r] A vos, honrat senyor en G. de belloch, tenent loc de procurador del senyor Rey d'arago en lo Regne de malorches, e en G. de galifa e en G. sultzina, soplegen e requeren los secretaris delaljama dels jueus de malorches per nom de tota la dita aljama e de part de deu e del senyor Rey damunt dit, que dejatz certificar per veritat lo dit senyor Rey, aquela sinagoga que ara an en l'almudayna quant es pus prop de la seu e dels preycados e del castel e de la capela del senyor Rey que no es dels frares menors la sinagoga la qual es comensada de construy in lo cal juyc nou ab volentat del noble senyor D'amfos sanrere rey d'arago e del molt alt e noble senyor en Jacme ara rey d'Arago e ab volentat e ab licencia del senyor bisbe de malorches e de tot lo cominal de la ciutat e de la illa de malorches encara certifiquets uos ab los clerges de la seu e ab los preycados con los jueus dien lurs ores si destorben a els les lurs ores. E de totes aquestes coses uos certificant que.n dejatz certificar lo dit senyor Rey.

JEWES AND JUDAISM IN PETER AURIOL'S *SENTENCES* COMMENTARY

NANCY L. TURNER

Although Peter Auriol is widely acknowledged to have been influenced by the thought and theology of John Duns Scotus—indeed, many scholars have argued that he was a student of Scotus's in Paris¹—Auriol's treatment of issues concerning Jews and Judaism shows much independence from Scotus's approach. Auriol's discussion of Old Testament law and circumcision is easily as engaged and intense as Scotus's, yet Auriol's general attitude towards the Old Law and Judaism is strikingly more Christian-centric, and less positive, than the Scottish theologian's. While Auriol does not finally support Scotus's harsh stance on the specific issue of the forced baptism of Jewish children, Auriol's overall attitude towards Jews and Judaism is in many ways even harsher and less tolerant than the Subtle Doctor's.²

Our knowledge of Peter Auriol's biography remains sketchy. Scholars know Auriol was born around 1280 in a small town named Gourdon in extreme southern Aquitaine. There is strong evidence indicating that Auriol entered the Franciscan Order sometime before 1300, and scholars generally agree that it is likely Auriol was a student at Paris at some point before 1312.³ The next clear evidence of his activities tells us he was a lecturer in Bologna during the academic year 1312–1313 and was teaching in Toulouse beginning in 1313.⁴ We know Auriol

¹ See the discussion on this issue in A. Teetaert, "Pierre Auriol," *Dictionnaire de Theologie catholique* XII, 2 (Paris, 1935), col. 1812.

² For a recent analysis of John Duns Scotus's writings on Jews, see Nancy Turner, "An Attack on the Acknowledged Truth": Fourteenth-Century French, English, and German Christian Theologians on the Jews" (Ph.D. diss., University of Iowa, 1996), 53–105.

³ Although scholars agree that Auriol was a student at Paris in the first decade of the fourteenth century, *exactly* when he was there is still contested. A. Teetaert argues that he was there during the period from 1304–1306 when Scotus was teaching. Katherine Tachau insists that the evidence available allows us to conclude only that he was in Paris sometime before 1312; Katherine H. Tachau, *Vision and Certitude in the Age of Ockham* (Leiden, 1988), 88 n. 11; A. Teetaert, "Pierre Auriol," cols. 1811–1812; see also Werner Dettloff, *Die Entwicklung der Akzeptations und Verdienst Lehre von Duns Scotus bis Luther* (Werl, 1954), 23.

⁴ Tachau, *Vision and Certitude*, 89 n. 11.

was in Paris by 1316 where he delivered his *Sentences* lectures. He was then presented for the licenciate in Theology in the summer of 1318 by the recently appointed Pope John XXII,⁵ and remained in Paris to present his Bible commentary for two years beginning in 1318. In 1320 he was named provincial of the Aquitaine province of the Franciscan Order. By February 1321 we know he had been promoted to archbishop of Aix-en-Provence and was consecrated in the position by Pope John XXII. Peter Auriol's career as an ecclesiastic was short-lived, however, for he died in January, 1322 in either Aix or Avignon,⁶ less than one year after taking up the position of archbishop.

Peter Auriol's name and works are less well known to modern scholars than those of other thirteenth- and fourteenth-century theologians such as Thomas Aquinas, John Duns Scotus or William of Ockham. Yet Auriol was known and respected both by his contemporaries and by thinkers throughout the Late Middle Ages. Indeed, his skill with language and the thoroughness of his analysis earned him the names *Doctor facundus* (eloquent doctor) and *Doctor ingeniosus* (ingenious doctor) from his late medieval contemporaries.⁷ Katherine Tachau tells us that "Auriol's *Sentences* commentary was widely read and discussed in Paris from the moment of its composition; it was remarkably soon thereafter known in England."⁸ His fame and reputation was still considerable into the sixteenth century, inspiring the publication of an edition of his *Sentences* commentary in Rome as late as 1596.⁹

⁵ Tachau, *Vision and Certitude*, 89 n. 11.

⁶ Hugues Dedieu, "Les Ministres Provinciaux d'Aquitaine," *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum*, 76 (1983), 188–190; Dettloff, *Die Entwicklung der Akzeptations*, 23.

⁷ J.J. Przeczdzicki, "Peter Aureoli," *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, 2nd ed. (2003), 11:183–184.

⁸ Katherine Tachau, "The Response to Ockham's and Aureol's Epistemology (1320–1340)," in *English Logic in Italy in the 14th and 15th Centuries*, ed. Alfonso Maieru (Naples, 1982), 202.

⁹ For a quick summary of the evidence of Auriol's fame among late medieval thinkers, see Katherine H. Tachau, "The Preparation of a Critical Edition of Pierre Auriol's *Sentences* Lectures," in *Editori Di Quaracchi 100 Anni Dopo Bilancio E Prospettive*, ed. Alvaro Cacciotti and Barbara Faes de Mottoni (Rome, 1997), 205–208. See also William Duba, "The Immaculate Conception in the Works of Peter Auriol," *Vivarium*, 38 (2000), 5–7; Chris Schabel, "Place, Space, and the Physics of Grace in Auriol's *Sentences* Commentary," *Vivarium*, 38 (2000), 117; Russell L. Friedman, "Peter Auriol on Intentions and Essential Predication," in *Medieval Analyses in Language and Cognition*, ed. S. Ebbesen and R.L. Friedman (Copenhagen, 1999), 415–430; Chris Schabel, *Theology at Paris 1316–1345: Peter Auriol and the Problem of Divine Foreknowledge and Future Contingents* (Ashgate, 2000); James L. Halverson, *Peter Aureol on Predestination: A Challenge to Late Medieval Thought*, (Leiden, 1998), 172–173.

The modern scholar can glean much information about the attitudes, training, and milieu of a theologian from a close study of that theologian's *Sentences* commentary. A *Sentences* commentary was a standardized genre of theological work which all prospective theologians were required to produce in the High and Late Middle Ages in order to obtain their baccalaureate in theology. This work was a type of theological exercise that was based upon the template developed by a theologian at Paris, Peter Lombard (ca. 1100–1160). Around the year 1140 Lombard wrote a theological text which he called the *Book of Sentences* or (*Opinions*).¹⁰ In this work, Lombard collected the opinions of the major religious thinkers up to his own generation on a large number of questions concerning Christian doctrine. Lombard then categorized these questions and divided them into four “books.” The first of these books deals with issues concerning the nature of God and the Trinity. Book Two discusses doctrines concerning angels, creation, sin, and the fall from grace. The third book presents issues dealing with the nature of Christ and doctrines concerning virtues. Finally, Book Four examines and discusses issues concerning the Christian sacraments. Immediately upon its publication, Lombard's *Sentences* was, with a few exceptions, well received, quickly becoming and remaining a fundamental text in theology faculties for the next several centuries.¹¹

Lombard's collection and summary of opinions on Christian doctrine made his work a useful and valuable textbook and reference work for the generations of scholars who followed him. But the most influential aspect of his textbook, and the most wide-reaching legacy he would pass on to the scholars who followed, was the format he provided for presenting and examining these basic issues of Christian doctrine. Lombard presented the issues using the new *sic et non* debating method developed by Peter Abelard earlier in the twelfth century. According to this method, which became the standard form for all *Sentences* commentaries, the writer first stated a question of Christian theology for the reader. He followed this statement with several different and often opposing opinions on the issue, which he discussed in varying degrees of depth. These opinions were then generally followed by

¹⁰ Peter Lombard, *Sententiae in IV Libris Distinctae*, 2 vols. (Grottaferrata, 1971–1981).

¹¹ For a good general background on *Sentences* commentaries as well as theology programs at Paris and Oxford in the fourteenth century, see William J. Courtenay, *Schools and Scholars in Fourteenth-Century England* (Princeton, 1987), 41–45; G.R. Evans, ed., *Mediaeval Commentaries on the Sentences of Peter Lombard* (Leiden, 2002), *passim*.

that theologian's own arguments and conclusions on the question. From Lombard's generation on, all budding theologians at the advanced baccalaureate stage of their theology education were required to produce their own commentaries on the questions Lombard had collected, using Lombard's system for discussing and analyzing them. The commentary of each individual theologian was supposed to display his understanding of important theological issues, his knowledge of the opinions of previous thinkers, and his own ingenuity in coming up with intelligent and sophisticated answers to the issues under question.

Although the completion of a *Sentences* commentary was required of each theology student before he was allowed to proceed on to his master's degree in theology, a scholar's *Sentences* commentary was intended to be much more than simply an academic exercise or test. It was common for a theologian's *Sentences* commentary to be published and widely disseminated among universities throughout Europe soon after the author had finished lecturing on it at his own institution. In writing their commentaries, scholars in a given generation usually adhered to the same basic format and questions, but each theologian presented his own opinions and conclusions on the issues he was required by tradition to discuss. Thus, the issues a particular thinker chose to focus on, and the conclusions, solutions, or new problems he developed in his commentary were often quite idiosyncratic and came to be associated with that particular theologian by thinkers in the generations that followed.

Peter Auriol's treatment of issues concerning Jews and Judaism in his *Sentences* commentary is extensive and quite thorough. As is common in *Sentences* commentaries of the twelfth through the early fourteenth centuries,¹² Auriol discusses at length when and why baptism came to replace circumcision, as well as whether and how circumcision conferred grace. Auriol's commentary also contains an explicit and in-depth examination of the superiority of the new law over the old, an analysis of the first-century Jews' knowledge of Christ's divinity, and a discussion of the validity of the baptism of Jewish children against the will of their parents. The attitude that Auriol presents towards Judaism and the old law in his *Sentences* commentary is not markedly

¹² For an analysis of the teachings on Jews presented by various twelfth-, thirteenth-, and fourteenth-century theologians in their *Sentences* commentaries, see Turner, "An Attack on the Acknowledged Truth."

more or less hostile than the attitudes exhibited by Auriol's contemporaries at Paris or Oxford, yet Auriol's presentation is certainly different in tone. Auriol clearly has little respect for Judaism and Old Testament law as a religious system separate from Christianity. What is striking about Auriol's treatment of circumcision and the Old Testament is his excessively Christian-centric reading of almost every aspect of Old Testament Judaism. Auriol goes further than even Peter Lombard or Thomas Aquinas¹³ in stripping Old Testament rites and history of all Jewish meaning and in portraying the sacraments of the Old Testament solely as prefigurations of Christianity. In doing so, Auriol ultimately denies any independent meaning or purpose to Old Testament law and belief.

Auriol's insistence on imposing a Christian meaning upon the precepts of Judaism is especially evident in his treatment of circumcision. He follows Aquinas's lead by beginning his discussion of the issue with the question "whether circumcision was appropriately instituted."¹⁴ Auriol adheres to standard Christian doctrine and immediately pronounces in the affirmative. He then supports this argument by presenting ten reasons why circumcision was an appropriate religious rite for the Old Testament Jews. In the course of this enumeration, he provides an explanation for even the minutest detail of the rite, from why it is performed on the male sex organ to why a circular cut was chosen. What is striking about the reasons Auriol gives in support of the appropriateness of the rite is that, in each case, he concludes that the detail of circumcision under discussion was rightly instituted because of the way in which it prefigured the coming of Christ. In so doing, he ends up emphasizing, almost in the extreme, his view of circumcision as a rite whose sole purpose was to symbolize and prepare the way for the arrival of Christ.

Auriol begins by explaining that the act of circumcision entailed "the removal of the superfluous" and was appropriate because "by this it was known that he was to come who was to remove all superfluity of sin."¹⁵ Continuing along these lines, Auriol declares that the circular

¹³ For an excellent analysis of Thomas Aquinas's teachings on Jews and Judaism, see John Y.B. Hood, *Aquinas and the Jews* (Philadelphia, 1995). For an examination of Lombard's writings on Jews, see Turner, "An Attack on the Acknowledged Truth," 19–28.

¹⁴ Peter Auriol, *Commentarium in librum primum Sententiarum* (Rome, 1596), Bk. 4, d. 1, q. 2, a. 3, fol. 24a: "Utrum circumcisio fuerit convenienter instituta."

¹⁵ Peter Auriol, *Commentarium*, Bk. 4, d. 1, q. 2, a. 3, fol. 24a: "Et primo qui-

cut of circumcision symbolized the fact that the removal of sin would be accomplished by a "circular person," one who was "truly God, the alpha and omega, the beginning and the end, just as the same point in a circle is the beginning and the end."¹⁶ Auriol then presents several explanations for how the selection of the male sex organ for the rite of circumcision foreshadowed both the coming of Christ and the concomitant removal of original sin. Auriol declares that the penis was chosen because "original sin is passed down to posterity through the act of generation." Thus, circumcision is performed on "that member in which occurs the greatest rebellion, which is present [in that organ] due to original sin." Having drawn the connection between the penis and original sin, Auriol then states that circumcision is performed on the male sex organ "because Christ, who would bring a remedy against original sin, was to be born from [the Jews]."¹⁷

Auriol continues to depict circumcision as a prefiguration of Christ with a rather convoluted explanation for the type of instrument used to perform the ceremony of circumcision. He explains that the Old Testament Jews used a stone knife because it "prefigured the stone which was to be broken from the mountain without hands [i.e., the stone that was rolled back from Christ's tomb]."¹⁸ He concludes his discussion with the argument that circumcision paved the way for baptism by marking and obligating those who were circumcised to follow the faith in the same way that baptism marked and obligated

dem fuit congrue assignata quantum ad actum, qui erat amputatio superfluitatis, per quod notabatur, quod venire debebat, qui amputaturus erat omnem superfluitatem peccati."

¹⁶ Peter Auriol, *Commentarium*, Bk. 4, d. 1, q. 2, a. 3, fol. 24a: "Secundo fuit congrue instituta quantum ad modum actus: fiebat enim incisio circularis, per quod notabatur, quod amputatio culpae futura erat per unam personam circularem, quae esset vere Deus, qui est α et ω id est, principium, et finis, sicut idem punctus in circulo est principium, et finis."

¹⁷ Peter Auriol, *Commentarium*, Bk. 4, d. 1, q. 2, a. 3, fol. 24a: "Tertio fuit congrue instituta quantum ad membrum: fuit enim instituta in remedium peccati originalis, et ideo propter tria fuit quoad membrum congrue instituta. Primo, quia peccatum originale per actum generationis ad posteros transfundebatur. Secundo, quia in membro illo apparet maior rebellio, quae inest propter peccatum originale. Tertio, quia protestabantur, quod Christus, quia afferebat remedium contra peccatum originale, nasciturus erat ex eis."

¹⁸ Peter Auriol, *Commentarium*, Bk. 4, d. 1, q. 2, a. 3, fol. 24a: "Quarto fuit congrue instituta quoad instrumentum: fiebat enim cultro lapideo, qui figurabat lapidem illum abscindendum de monte sine manibus."

Christians.¹⁹ Yet, according to Auriol, circumcision is not the only rite of the Old Testament that served as a prefiguration of Christ. In his discussion of how original sin was deleted before the coming of Christ, Auriol states that there were many rites and ceremonies practiced in the period of the Old Testament, among which "some were called sacrifices." According to Auriol, these sacrifices "were done using live animals, and were performed to testify that through death would come our redemption."²⁰

Auriol's sentiment that the purpose of the old law was simply to pave the way for the new law is especially strong in Auriol's pronouncements on the question of whether and why baptism annulled circumcision. With very little discussion, Auriol pronounces that baptism did annul circumcision and was a right and proper replacement.²¹ According to Auriol, this is obvious; since circumcision's purpose was to prefigure the coming of Christ, the Old Testament rite was no longer necessary once Jesus arrived. He explains, "circumcision (as was said above) signified that Christ was to be born from a woman of the circumcised, and had as its signified, Christ—that he would be; that is, that he would be born, that he would suffer, and that by virtue of the passion, sin was to be deleted."²² He argues that, as a result, "from the instant of the demonstration of the passion of Christ, circumcision was a false sign."²³

Circumcision is by no means the only rite of the Old Testament which Auriol compares to the precepts of the New Testament. Indeed, Auriol is quite explicit and unequivocal in arguing that the sacraments of the new law are superior to the Old Testament sacraments, and, like Thomas Aquinas and Scotus, devotes several folios to a comparison of the two laws.²⁴ He repeats and supports the argument found in

¹⁹ Peter Auriol, *Commentarium*, Bk. 4, d. 1, q. 2, a. 3, fol. 24a: "obligabat enim circumcisio quemlibet de populo illo tunc temporis, sicut hodie obligat baptismus."

²⁰ Peter Auriol, *Commentarium*, Bk. 4, q. 3, a. 3, fol. 30b: "Ex his apparet differentia aliquorum sacrificiorum veteris legis. Quaedam enim dicebantur sacrificia, quaedam oblationes, quaedam decimae. Fiebant autem ista ex speciali causa et sacrifice. Nam sacrificia, quae fiebant de animalibus vivis, fiebant ad protestandum, quod ipse erat per mortem nos redempturus."

²¹ Peter Auriol, *Commentarium*, Bk. 4, d. 3, q. 4, a. 1 fol. 44b.

²² Peter Auriol, *Commentarium*, Bk. 4, d. 3, q. 4, a. 1 fol. 44b: "Circumcisio (ut dictum est supra) significabat Christum nasciturum ex femine circumcisorum et habebat pro significato Christum, ut futurum, puta, ut nasciturum, passurum, in virtute passionis peccata deleturum."

²³ Peter Auriol, *Commentarium*, Bk. 4, d. 3, q. 4, a. 1 fol. 44b: "pro instanti passionis Christi exhibitae circumcisio fuit falsum signum."

²⁴ Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* 3a.70.1–4, Blackfriars v. 57, pp. 155–171; Scotus, *In*

Aquinas and Scotus²⁵ that the sacraments of the new law are lighter and easier to bear than those of the old, as well as being fewer in number. He echoes Scotus with the statement that there are only seven sacraments of the new law which the faithful are asked to follow, "of which only one is actually necessary, namely, baptism."²⁶ In Book Four of his *Sentences* commentary, in his discussion of whether baptism annulled circumcision, Auriol again states that the sacraments of the New Testament "were fated to be easy to use." He also argues that baptism is an improvement upon circumcision because baptism "is general to the entire population," and "is common to both sexes."²⁷

Auriol complicates his pronouncement that the New Testament sacraments are easier and less burdensome when he presents the argument found in Scotus,²⁸ which concedes that there is no requirement found in the old law that is comparable to confession in difficulty.²⁹ Auriol likewise concedes that the command to love one's enemy found in the new law is also very hard to carry out.³⁰ The difficulties of confession and the command to love one's enemy are ameliorated, however, according to Auriol, through the "special aid" of divine grace that is conferred only in the new sacraments.³¹

In continuing his assertion that the new law is superior to the old law, Auriol presents the argument that the "old law was given in fear and therefore was a law of fear, while the new law was given in

Sententias 4, d. 1, q. 1-4, in *Joannis Duns Scotus opera omnia*, ed. Luke Wadding (1639; repr. Paris, 1891-1895), Vives XVI.

²⁵ Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* 1a2ae.107.4; Scotus, *In Sententias* 3, d. 40, q. 1, Vives XV, 1084-1097.

²⁶ Auriol, *Commentarium*, Bk. 3, d. 40, q. 4, a. 1, fol. 541a: "Put a septem sacramenta facilia, quorum etiam unum est simpliciter necessitatis, scilicet baptismus, qui est satis facilis."

²⁷ Auriol, *Commentarium*, Bk. 4, d. 3, q. 4, a. 1, fol. 44b: "Primo propter libertatem Legis Novae, cuius Sacramenta debent esse usu facillima. ... tum secundo propter generalitatem, quia sacramentum Baptismi debuit esse generale ad omnem populum, tum tertio propter sexum. Sacramentum enim Baptismi propter eius perfectionem debuit esse commune utrique sexui."

²⁸ Scotus, *In Sententias*, 3, d. 40, q. 1, Vives XV 1092b.

²⁹ Auriol, *Commentarium*, Bk. 3, d. 40, q. 4, a. 1 fol. 541a: "Sed de confessione videtur, quod sit magis difficile, quam aliquod ceremoniale legis antiquae."

³⁰ Auriol, *Commentarium*, Bk. 3, d. 40, q. 4, a. 1 fol. 541b: "Et si dicatur, quod additum est in Nova lege de diligendis inimicis, quod est valde difficile."

³¹ Auriol, *Commentarium*, Bk. 3, d. 40, q. 4, a. 1 fol. 541b: "haec quae sunt necessitatis, tamen leves sunt cum adiutorio gratiae, et ideo signanter dicit Christus: Iugum meum leve. Iugum enim est propter difficultatem, sed leve propter auxilium gratiae abundantis."

love.”³² In the same vein, he declares that the old law was a “law of slavery,” while the new law is one of freedom.³³ He follows these statements with two arguments that again emphasize the old law’s purpose as a prefiguration of the new law. He first declares “the law was given by Moses. Grace and truth were given by Christ.” Auriol then echoes Scotus’s references to Hebrews 10:1 and Colossians 12:17³⁴ when Auriol declares that the old law was “a shadow of the good things to come.”³⁵ Finally he states, “just as certain areas of knowledge are called introductions because they arrange and order those things which contain the conception of the truth, so was the old law in this way a preparatory introduction for the new law.”³⁶

Given his attitude toward the prefigurative meaning of the old law, it is not surprising to discover that Auriol insists that the Jews were not ignorant of Christ’s divinity. In the course of his discussion of whether Christ’s divine character was recognizable to human beings, Auriol makes it clear that he believes the first-century Jews easily could have and should have recognized Christ’s divine nature. Auriol explains that people in Christ’s time saw Christ perform many works that could only be considered to have been divine in origin. He states that people saw Jesus “raise the dead, open the eyes of the blind, and cure the sick.”³⁷ Many people at that time, according to Auriol, pronounced that these acts could only have been performed by someone “who was with God.” Auriol acknowledges that there were two ways to explain Christ’s ability to perform these miracles: either Christ received his power from the grace of God dwelling in him, or from a direct union with God.³⁸ Although, according to Auriol, both conclusions

³² Auriol, *Commentarium*, Bk. 3, d. 40, q. 4, a. 1 fol. 541b: “quia lex antiqua fuit data in timore, et ideo data est lex timoris; nova autem in amore.”

³³ Auriol, *Commentarium*, Bk. 3, d. 40, q. 4, a. 1 fol. 541b: “quia antiqua fuit servitutis. Nova dicitur lex libertatis.”

³⁴ For a discussion of Scotus’s use of this New Testament imagery, see Turner, “An Attack on the Acknowledged Truth,” 72–73.

³⁵ Auriol, *Commentarium*, Bk. 3, d. 40, q. 4, a. 1 fol. 541b: “Lex per Moysen data est; gratia et veritas per Iesum Christum facta est; umbram enim habebat lex futurorum bonorum, ut dicit Apostolus.”

³⁶ Auriol, *Commentarium*, Bk. 3, d. 40, q. 4, a. 1 fol. 541b: “unde sicut quaedam scientiae dicuntur introductoriae, quia disponunt ad illas in quibus est notitia veritatis ita antiqua lex ad modum pedagogi introducta fuit ad Novam legem.”

³⁷ Auriol, *Commentarium*, Bk. 3, d. 1, q. 1, a. 1. fol. 373b: “sed homines viderunt a Christo homine operationes mere divinas. ... sic suscitare mortuos, aperire oculos caecorum, infirmitates curare.”

³⁸ Auriol, *Commentarium*, Bk. 3, d. 1, q. 1, a. 1. fol. 373b: “sed esse a Deo est dupliciter

are possible and reasonable, all eyewitnesses, nevertheless, should have realized that Christ's miraculous activities were the result of his union with God, because Christ himself announced, "I and the father are one, and the father is in me."³⁹ According to Auriol, then, all of Christ's contemporaries should have deduced Christ's divine character from his works. Auriol then adds a comment in the very next sentence that is clearly intended to refer to the Jews; he states that one last reason to believe in the divine nature of Christ's works is that "his divinity was predicted going back a long time."⁴⁰ Based upon these arguments, Auriol pronounces, "it is clear to me that these arguments conclude very well that the Jews had no excuse, who did not believe those things demonstrated and proved by [Christ's] works."⁴¹

Later thinkers, such as Pierre d'Ailly, argue that the Jews did not recognize Christ's divinity because it was simply God's will that they not believe.⁴² Auriol, however, is not nearly so benevolent in assigning a cause for the Jews' refusal to acknowledge Christ or for their motivations in calling for his crucifixion. Auriol follows Peter Lombard's lead and makes direct reference to the Jews' involvement in the death of Christ in his discussion of whether human will is good only when it corresponds to divine will.⁴³ In the course of this summary, Auriol uses the dilemma that appears in Lombard's *Sentences* of "the good son who wants his father to live whom God, with good will, wants to die."⁴⁴ Auriol then imitates Lombard and uses as a second illustration the

vel a Deo per gratiam inexistentem, vel per unionem, et utroque modo potest quis elicere operationes Deo mediante."

³⁹ Auriol, *Commentarium*, Bk. 3, d. 1, q. 1, a. 1. fol. 374a: "Sic enim argumentando poterunt devenire in cognitionem divinitatis, quod patet. Christus dicebat, ego et Pater unum sumus, et Pater in me est, et ego in Patre, et ad hoc opera adducebat."

⁴⁰ Auriol, *Commentarium*, Bk. 3, d. 1, q. 1, a. 1. fol. 374a: "autem de Christo, cuius divinitas fuit praedicta multo tempore ante."

⁴¹ Auriol, *Commentarium*, Bk. 3, d. 1, q. 1, a. 1. fol. 374a: "Hoc viso apparet, quod rationes concludunt optime nec habent Iudaei excusationem, qui dictis non crediderunt probatis et approbatis per opera."

⁴² Pierre d'Ailly, *Quaestiones super libros Sententiarum cum quibusdam in fine adjunctis*, (Strasbourg, 1490; repr. Frankfurt, 1968), I, q. 14, E: "Tum quia habebant legem et prophetas in quibus potereant sectari testimonia de deo. Tum quia coram eis multa mirabilia faciebat. . . . Et tamen certum est quod eis non erat datum ut crederent. Et ita licet deus non vellet efficaciter quod crederent, tamen illa erant eis adiutoria ad fidem ad quam tenebantur." For more on d'Ailly's teachings on the Jews, see Turner, "An Attack on the Acknowledged Truth," 235–253.

⁴³ Lombard, *Sententiae in IV Libris Distinctae*, Bk. 1, d. 48, c. 1.

⁴⁴ Auriol, *Commentarium*, Bk. 1, d. 48. fol. 1113b.

Jews' crucifixion of Christ and the argument that it was a good action because God willed it to happen. The rhetoric and conclusions which Auriol uses in his commentary on this point, however, betray Auriol's views on the Jews' character and their motivations. Auriol begins by stating, "the Jews, indeed, wished the death of Christ with a wicked will, and they crucified him. Therefore, God wanted the passion of Christ, not, however, his active crucifixion by the Jews." At this point in his summary, however, Auriol appends his own telling comment: "this [the crucifixion] was done from envy, and with the greatest blame."⁴⁵

In Book Two of his commentary, Auriol repeats with great vehemence and condemnation his charge that the Jews killed Christ out of envy and then expands upon their crimes by attributing an additional sin to them. Near the end of Book Two, Auriol devotes an article to a discussion of sins against the Holy Spirit. He begins by discussing whether and in what way a sin against the Holy Spirit differs from a sin against the Father or the Son. He states that the sins against the Holy Spirit are presumption, desperation, obstinancy, final impenitence, envy of a brother's grace, and an attack on the known truth.⁴⁶ Auriol explains that the sins of desperation and presumption involve the underestimation and overestimation of God's mercy, respectively. He then explains that obstinancy and final impenitence can be considered to be sins in the disposition that an individual takes toward God. Final impenitence, Auriol states succinctly, is the refusal to repent one's sins. In discussing obstinancy he explains that to receive God's grace, one must express the disposition of turning one's heart toward God. The sin against this disposition, he states, is "the hardening of one's heart and obstinancy." It was not uncommon at this time to use words like obstinant and obdurate when describing the Jews in their attitude toward Christ. Yet, although Auriol does attribute these characteristics to specific individuals in order to illustrate his meaning, these are not the sins with which Auriol is most interested in associating the Jews; instead Auriol simply lists "Judas and Pharaoh" as so sinning.⁴⁷

⁴⁵ Auriol, *Commentarium*, Bk. I, d. 48. fol. 1113b: "Iudaei etiam, impia voluntate voluerunt Christi mortem, et eum crucifixerunt; voluit ergo Deus passionem Christi, non tamen Iudaeorum crucifixionem activam, quae fuit ex invidia, et cum maxima culpa."

⁴⁶ Auriol, *Commentarium*, Bk. 2, d. 43, q. 1, fol. 325a.

⁴⁷ Auriol, *Commentarium*, Bk. 2, d. 43, q. 1, fol. 325a: "et peccatum contra illam dispositionem dicitur Obduratio cordis, et obstinatio, quae fuit peccatum Iudae et Pharaonis."

The sin with which Auriol most strongly wants to associate the Jews is that of blasphemy in refusing to acknowledge Christ's divinity; it is for this sin that he reserves his most damning denunciation of the Jews. For Auriol goes on to explain that one manifestation of a sin against God's grace is with respect to it existing in one's neighbor. Auriol explains that one method of sinning against a neighbor's grace is called envy of a brother's grace (*invidentia fraternae gratiae*). Aquinas and Lombard also list this type of envy as a sin against God's grace;⁴⁸ Auriol, however, unlike either of these two thinkers, supplies a motivation for such a sin. Auriol states that an individual feels envy of another's grace "because it diminishes [the envier's] excellence."

Auriol explains that the sin of envy at grace given to a neighbor produces a purely interior effect upon the sinner only (*conatu effectus ad intra*). He juxtaposes this sin with a different but similar sin which results in an external effect (*conatu effectus ad extra*), that is, in which the sinner takes actual action against the neighbor in a state of grace. Auriol labels this sin "an attack on the acknowledged truth."⁴⁹ What is especially telling and significant about Auriol's discussion of this sin is that Auriol explicitly attributes the sin of attacking the acknowledged truth to the Jews. The specific act of the Jews that he uses to illustrate this sin, however, is not the Jews' involvement in the crucifixion of Christ. Rather, he refers to an incident narrated in Mark 12:24 in which Christ is described as ejecting a demon from the body of a man. The Jews who witness this act are described in the gospel as refusing to be persuaded of Christ's divinity through this act; instead of attributing this extraordinary act to God and his power, they choose to attribute it to the power of Beelzebub, prince of the demons. Auriol explains that the Jews reacted in this way to the display of Christ's power out of pure malice. He declares that they were moved, "not from habit,

⁴⁸ *Summa Theologiae* 2a2ae.14.3; Lombard, *Sententiae*, Bk. 2, d. 43, c. 1.

⁴⁹ Auriol, *Commentarium*, Bk. 2, d. 43, q. 1, a. 1, fol. 325a: "Secundo modo considerando gratiam Dei in proximo, sic oritur duplex peccatum contra gratiam, scilicet in proximo exisistentem. Potest tamen quis contra talem gratiam venire duobus modis, uno modo conatu effectus ad intra, alio modo conatu effectus ad extra. Primo modo oritur peccatum, quod dicitur Invidentia fraternae gratiae, nec invidere fraternae gratiae, quia diminuit suam excellentiam est peccatum in Spiritum sanctum; hoc enim est actus Invidiae, sed tristari de gratia proximo data a Deo absolute, hoc est peccatum in Spiritum sanctum. Si autem veniat contra gratiam, qua Spiritus sanctificat proximum conatu effectus extra, sic oritur peccatum aliud, quod dicitur Impugnatio veritatis agnitae."

nor from passion, nor from ignorance, but from pure freedom of the will." Auriol's outrage at this attitude becomes especially evident in the comment he appends concerning this sin. Auriol states at this point, "such a sin is very rare and difficult to find. It was, nevertheless, the sin of those very Jews."⁵⁰

Auriol's negative image of the Jews' character becomes even more apparent in the paragraph which follows in which he presents his explanation for the Jews' motivations in refusing to acknowledge Christ's divinity. He concedes that some Christian thinkers argue that the envy the Jews felt toward Christ was motivated by the passion they felt when they saw that the glory of Christ diminished their glory. This argument, Auriol points out, works in the Jews' favor, however, for according to Christian tradition, attributing the cause of a sin to passion or envy lessens the severity of the sin.⁵¹ Furthermore, as Auriol points out, envy, in itself, is not a sin against God's grace.⁵² Auriol clearly states that he does not agree with those who would explain the Jews' crucifixion of Christ as having arisen from the simple emotion [*passio*] of the envy they felt upon seeing that the glory of Christ reduced their status. Auriol contends that the Jews did not feel jealousy solely because Christ and his new message affected their own status, but rather that they were driven by pure and unmitigated envy that Christ had been bestowed with the gift of God. As he states: "I concede that in the beginning their sin was moved by envy, nevertheless, I think that in the end they came so far that they killed out of envy of the gift of God absolutely and as an attack on the acknowledged truth [*impugnatio veritatis agnitae*]."⁵³

⁵⁰ Auriol, *Commentarium*, Bk. 2, d. 43, q. 1, a. 1, fol. 325a: "Vocatur ergo peccatum ex malitia proprie, quando movetur quis non ex habitu, nec passione, nec ex ignorantia, sed ex mera libertate voluntatis, scilicet, quia sic placet; et hoc modo dicitur peccatum in Spiritum sanctum; sic tamen quod cadat circa materias praedictas, puta dolere, quod proximus habet agnitionem veritatis, quale fuit peccatum Iudaeorum contra Christum. Vel impugnando in effectu extra, sicut quando dixerunt: In Beelzebub principe daemoniorum eiicit daemonia; tale autem peccatum valde raro, et de difficili invenitur; fuit tamen peccatum ipsorum Iudaeorum."

⁵¹ See Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* 1a2ae.78.4.

⁵² Auriol, *Commentarium*, Bk. 2, d. 43, q. 1, a. 1, fol. 325a: "Putat si quis invidet proximo, quia bonum suum datum sibi a Deo diminuit excellentiam illius, nec sic loquimur in proposito [de peccato in spiritu sancto]."

⁵³ Auriol, *Commentarium*, Bk. 2, d. 43, q. 1, a. 1, fol. 325a: "Dices: Non sic est, nam Iudaei noti fuerunt ex passione, videlicet, quod fama Christi diminuebat famam eorum. Respondeo, concedo, quod initium unde motus peccati eorum fuit invidia, tamen puto, quod ultimo ad tantum venerunt, quod ceciderunt in invidentiam doni Dei absolute, et impugnationem agnitae veritatis."

What is also quite telling is the fact that, although Auriol is not the only Christian theologian to enumerate the sins against the Holy Spirit as he does, he is unique in associating the sins of “envy of a brother’s grace” and the “attack on the acknowledged truth” directly with the Jews. While other Christian thinkers such as Aquinas and Lombard speak in some depth about these two sins, neither explicitly accuses the Jews of having committed them. Auriol, however, is obviously compelled to associate these sins with the Jews because of his obsession with finding Christian meaning and purpose in the old law and its sacraments. It is because of Auriol’s constant emphasis on the Jews’ prefiguring and foreshadowing of Christ’s coming that his exasperation and outrage at their refusal to acknowledge and accept the rites and beliefs of Christ’s new message is especially strong.

What seems to infuriate Auriol the most about the Jews’ stance with respect to Christ is not their role in his crucifixion *per se*, but rather the Jews’ refusal to acknowledge the truth of the arrival of the Messiah in the form of Jesus—an event which, in Auriol’s mind, the Jews themselves had heralded in every aspect of their own religion and belief system for hundreds of years. Furthermore, by explicitly accusing the Jews of envying Christ’s divine gift, Auriol also supplies a motivation for their refusal to acknowledge his divine powers. Auriol sees the Jews as spiteful, envious people who refuse to acknowledge what they know to be the truth about Christ’s divinity because such an acknowledgement would lead to a reduction in their special status in relation to God.

Given Auriol’s image of the Jews as a stubborn and selfish people, it is not surprising to discover that he does not take a strong stand against the forced baptism of Jews, either as adults or children. Auriol devotes many folios to a discussion of who should receive baptism and how a valid baptism is to be performed. He poses the question of whether full consent is required on the part of an adult being baptized, or whether “interpreted consent suffices.” Auriol begins his discussion by presenting the argument concerning individuals who falsely consent, that is, “those who have no inward consent, but would pretend outwardly because of punishment, or would simply not protest.” Auriol acknowledges that there are those who argue that “such a one, would not be truly baptized, nor would he receive the character [of baptism], and by withdrawing from the falsehood, is to be rebaptized.”⁵⁴

⁵⁴ Auriol, *Commentarium*, Bk. 4, d. 4 q. 2, a. 1, fol. 55a: “Si vero aliquis esset fictus quoad consensum, puta quod nullum haberet consensum interius, tamen fingeret

Auriol makes it quite clear, however, that he disagrees with this stance—he states, “this I do not think is well said.” To support his stance, Auriol argues that if someone has been baptized, even against his will, “the Church supposes that he received the effect of baptism.” As a result, such an individual should not be rebaptized if he should later sincerely decide to accept Christianity. Indeed, according to this argument, as Auriol notes, if such an individual returns to his previous faith after having received baptism, “he would be called a heretic.”⁵⁵ Auriol further argues that a person must be held to practice Christianity after a baptism under any conditions because otherwise, “fraud could happen frequently in the Church. Anyone, when forced to agree to observe the faith, could say ‘I have not consented.’”⁵⁶

Auriol then concludes his discussion on the validity of forced baptism by declaring, “I think it should be said that so great is the special law of baptism that if an individual exhibited at least interpreted consent, that is, that he consented outwardly or did not protest, however much he would dissent inwardly, he would receive the perfect character [of baptism].” Auriol addresses the effect of such a baptism with the statement, “granted such an individual would not receive grace, nor virtues. He receives these, nevertheless, by withdrawing the falsehood.” Auriol’s final pronouncement on the issue is, “I say that, as far as receiving the character of baptism, at least interpreted consent is sufficient in adults.”⁵⁷

Despite this stance on the forced baptism of adults, Auriol does not ultimately advocate the forced baptism of Jewish children; yet he by

exterius propter poenas, vel non reclamando talis, inquirunt, non esset vere baptizatus, nec reciperet characterem, et recedente fictione esset rebaptizandus.”

⁵⁵ Auriol, *Commentarium*, Bk. 4, d. 4 q. 2, a. 1, fol. 55a: “Sed istud non puto esse bene dictum, conformiter determinatione Ecclesiae, nam *Extra<vagantes>* ‘de Baptismo, et eius effectus’ capitulo ‘Maiores’, dicitur, quod talis compellendus esset ad fidem, et si reinclinaret, ac relaberetur, haereticus diceretur, nec esset unquam talis postea rebaptizandus; ergo Ecclesia supponit, quod receperit effectum Baptismi.” Here Auriol is citing canon law.

⁵⁶ Auriol, *Commentarium*, Bk. 4, d. 4 q. 2, a. 1, fol. 55a: “Et praeterea posset fraus fieri in Ecclesia frequenter; posset enim quilibet, dum cogeretur ad fidem servandam dicere, non consensi.”

⁵⁷ Auriol, *Commentarium*, Bk. 4, d. 4 q. 2, a. 1, fol. 55a: “Ideo puto dicendum esse, quod tantum est privilegium baptismi, quod habens consensum saltem interpretativum, hoc est quod consentit exterius, vel non reclamatur, quantumcumque intra se dissentiat, recipiat perfecte characterem, licet non recipiat gratiam, nec virtutes, quas tamen recipit recedente fictione. Pro conclusione ista ergo, dico quod ad recipiendum characterem, sufficit in adultis consensus saltem interpretivus.”

no means condemns such an action, either. Auriol, like Aquinas and Scotus, devotes many pages to the specific question, “whether children of Jews are to be baptized against the will of their parents.”⁵⁸ It is clear from Auriol’s discussion of this question that, within two decades of Scotus’s death, discussions of this issue had come to be essentially nothing more than a comparison of Scotus’s and Aquinas’s stances on the question. Auriol starts his discussion on the baptism of Jewish children by stating that there are two opinions. The first, he explains, is supported by “the severity of justice” and holds that Jewish children are in no way to be baptized against the will of their parents, an argument developed and supported by Thomas Aquinas in his *Summa Theologiae*.⁵⁹ Auriol summarizes Aquinas’s argument by explaining that children should not be baptized against the will of the parents because, if the children are then returned to the parents, they will afterwards be raised by the parents in the error of the parents, which would make the children heretics. Auriol continues by presenting Aquinas’s complaint that, if such children are not returned to the parents, this would be a wrong against the parents, since children are the possession of the parents.⁶⁰

Auriol follows this with “another opinion” which he directly attributes to John Scotus. This second opinion, according to Auriol, is supported by “the piety of faith.” In Auriol’s summary of Scotus’s argument, he presents Scotus’s contention that private persons cannot baptize Jewish children against the will of their parents, but that public persons can. Auriol then presents Scotus’s argument that Jewish adults should also be baptized forcibly. Auriol explains that Scotus contends that even if the Jewish parents revert to their old faith after being baptized forcibly, a greater good still follows for the church and the children. This is because, according to Scotus, less evil results from

⁵⁸ Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* 3a.68.10; Scotus, *In Sententias* 4, d.4, q. 9, Vives XVI 487; Auriol, *Commentarium*, Bk. 4, d. 4, q. 2, a. 2, fol. 55a.

⁵⁹ Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* 2a2ae.10.12. Although Auriol quotes Aquinas nearly verbatim here, he does not cite Aquinas by name anywhere during this discussion.

⁶⁰ Auriol, *Commentarium*, Bk. 4, d. 4, q. 2, a. 2, fol. 56a: “Una opinio dicit, quod parvuli Iudaeorum nullo modo sunt invitis parentibus baptizandi; ratio eorum est, quia vel rederentur parentibus, et tunc baptismus eorum esset in contumeliam fidei Christianae, quia post nutrentur a parentibus in errore parentum, vel non redderentur, et tunc parentibus fieret iniuria, quia quamdiu sunt parvuli, sunt possessio parentum.” See also Solomon Grayzel, “Popes, Jews, and Inquisition,” in *Essays in Honor of Solomon B. Freehof*, ed. A.I. Katsh (Philadelphia, 1979), 160.

preventing the Jews from observing their law than from allowing them to practice their religion with impunity.⁶¹

Here Auriol presents the objection to this stance found in the pronouncement of St. Paul that "the remnant of Israel shall be saved" (Rom 9:27). In response, Auriol does not comment on this objection with his own argument, but rather recounts Scotus's argument that the reward for the church from the existence of Jews at the end of time will be too slight to justify permitting large numbers of Jews to continue to serve their faith.⁶² Auriol, interestingly, does not present or comment upon the Subtle Doctor's suggestion that, to ensure a remnant of Israel in the final days, a handful of Jews should be placed on an island and there be allowed to practice their faith.⁶³

Auriol's own pronouncement on this question, which follows directly after his presentation of Scotus's argument, is far from unequivocal. He ultimately states that he is most persuaded by Aquinas's argument supported by the "severity of justice" which says that children are legally the possession of their parents and thus cannot be baptized against the will of the parents.⁶⁴ Auriol also expresses agreement with Aquinas's insistence that, since the church has never encouraged the

⁶¹ Scotus, *In Sententias* 4, d. 4, q. 9, Vives XVI 487–489; Auriol, *Commentarium*, Bk. 4, d. 4, q. 2, a. 2, fol. 56a: "Alia opinio est Doctoris Moderni Subtilis, quod licet personae privatae non possint parvulos Iudaeorum invitis parentibus baptizare, tamen hoc possunt personae communes, scilicet principes terrarum, quorum dominio subdite sunt parentes; immo hoc non tantum licet eis, sed si fieret, esset eis utique meritum. Haec autem opinio habet pro se auctoritatem et rationem. Ratio est, quia in potestatibus ordinatis potestas inferior non obligat in eis, quae sunt contra superiorem, secundum Augustinum *De verbis Domini* homil. 6. Si illud iubet potestas, quod non debet facere, licet sane contemnere potestatem, timendo Potestatem maiorem. Similiter si essent sub eodem dominio ordinata, scilicet quod aliquis esset servus Titii, et Titus Petri, deberet Imperator magis cogere servum servire Petro, quam Titio: ergo a simili non solum potest princeps cogere filios servire Deo dimissum parentibus: sed debet, et tenetur eos auferre a dominio parentum volentium eos educare contra cultum Dei, qui est superior dominus, et secundum hoc quando posset cum bona cautela agere, ne parentes cogitantes hoc futurum, occiderent pueros suos." See John Duns Scotus, *In Sententias* 4, d. 4, q. 9, Vives XVI 487–489.

⁶² Auriol, *Commentarium*, Bk. 4, d. 4, q. 2, a. 2, fol. 56a–b: "Se obiiiciatur contra eos illud Apostoli ad Rom. quod reliquiae Israel salvae fient, ideo non oportet cogi Iudaeos ad relinquendum legem suam totaliter. Respondet, quod pro tam paucis convertendis, non oportet Iudaeos in tanto numero, ac tot terris permittere servare illicite legem suam, quia finalis fructus eorum erit Ecclesiae parvus valde."

⁶³ See Scotus, *In Sententias* 4, d. 4, q. 9, Vives XVI, p. 489a.

⁶⁴ Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* 2a2ae.10.12; Auriol, *Commentarium*, Bk. 4, d. 4, q. 2, a. 2, fol. 56b: "propter quod magis declino ad rigorem iustitiae, quia parvuli possessio sunt parentum."

forced baptism of minors under the direction of a powerful prince, it is unlikely that such an act is to be allowed.⁶⁵ Auriol ends his discussion, however, by refusing to condemn princes who do remove children from Jews and baptize them. Auriol ultimately states, "I think, nevertheless, that whoever would, inspired by the piety of faith, make a motion opposite [to the severity of justice], would not sin very severely."⁶⁶ Thus, Auriol, unlike Scotus, in the end, stops short of actively condoning the forced baptism of Jewish children or adults.

Yet on the whole, Auriol's attitude towards and depiction of Jews is not by any means more tolerant than Scotus's. Indeed, although Auriol acknowledges that circumcision had spiritual benefits for the Jews before the coming of Christ, Auriol expresses little respect for the precepts and practices of the Old Testament and instead presents Judaism as a belief system whose tenets and sacraments served only to foreshadow and prepare the way for the coming of Christ and the new sacraments of Christianity. Furthermore, according to Auriol, the first-century Jews recognized the messianic character of Jesus, but refused to acknowledge it out of jealousy and malice. Based upon these views, it is not surprising that Auriol takes a positive approach to the concept of forcibly baptizing Jews and thus simply compelling them to accept the belief system which, in his opinion, they should have acknowledged long ago but did not because they were simply too selfish and stubborn to do so.

⁶⁵ Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* 2a2ae.10.12; Auriol, *Commentarium*, Bk. 4, d. 4, q. 2, a. 1, fol. 56b: "praecipue autem movet me ratio illa de ecclesia, quomodo tantam salutem neglexisset, propter quod magis declino ad rigorem iustitiae, quia parvuli possessio sunt parentum."

⁶⁶ Auriol, *Commentarium*, Bk. 4, d. 4, q. 2, a. 1, fol. 56b: "Puto tamen quod qui pietate fidei motus oppositum faceret, non multum graviter peccaret."

FRANCISCAN ECONOMICS AND JEWS IN THE MIDDLE AGES: FROM A THEOLOGICAL TO AN ECONOMIC LEXICON

GIACOMO TODESCHINI

“To the man who has trust all the world is full of wealth, to the man who has no trust all the wealth of the world is never enough,” or, to say it in other words, “for the man *infidelis* the wealth has no real worth or usefulness.” This quotation from Proverbs (LXX 17:6b), as well as the related passages in Paul (2 Cor 6:10; Phil 4:11–14), Augustine (*ad Macedonium*), and the Fathers, through the *Decretum Gratiani* (XIV 4, 11), Rufinus of Bologna, Bernard of Clairvaux and the thirteenth-century scholastics,¹ is an apt beginning for understanding Franciscan

¹ Augustine, *Epistola 153 ad Macedonium*, PL 33, 665; Augustine, *In ps. 48 enarratio*, 3, in *Opere* 25 (Rome, 1967), 1196–1198: “Quod ait dives, ad terrigenas pertinet; quod ait, pauper, ad filios hominum. Divites intellige superbos, pauperes humiles. Habeat multas facultates pecuniarum; si in eis non extollitur, pauper est: non habeat aliquid, et cupiat et infletur; inter divites et reprobos eum deputat Deus. Et divites et pauperes in corde interrogat Deus, non in arca et domo. Nonne pauperes sunt qui accipiunt mandatum Apostoli dicentis Timotheo: Praecepte divitibus huius saeculi non superbe sapere? Quomodo eos qui divites erant fecit pauperes? Tulit illis quare quaeruntur divitiae. Nemo enim vult esse dives, nisi ut infletur inter eos inter quos vivit, et superior illis videatur. Cum autem dixit, non superbe sapere, aequales eos fecit non habentibus; ut fortassis pauculis nummis mendicus plus extollatur, quam ille dives qui audit Apostolum dicentem: Praecepte divitibus huius saeculi non superbe sapere. Unde non superbe sapere? Si faciant quod sequitur, Neque sperare in incerto divitiarum, sed in Deo vivo, qui praestat nobis omnia abundanter ad fruendum [1 Tim 6:17]. Non dixit, qui praestat illis; sed, qui praestat nobis. Numquid ipse Paulus non habebat divitias? Habebat plane. Quas divitias? De quibus dicit alio loco Scriptura: Fidei homini mundus totus divitiarum est [Prov 17:6, following the LXX]. Audi et ipsum confitentem: Quasi nihil habentes, et omnia possidentes [2 Cor 6:10]. Qui vult ergo esse dives, non haereat parti, et totum possidebit: illi inhaereat qui totum creavit. Simul in unum dives et pauper. Dicit in alio psalmo; Edent pauperes, et saturabuntur. Quomodo commendavit pauperes? Edent pauperes, et saturabuntur. Quid edunt? Quod sciunt fideles. Quomodo saturabuntur? Imitando passionem Domini sui, et non sine causa accipiendo pretium suum.” *Catalogus verborum sancti Augustini: II Enarrationes in Psalmos* (Eindhoven, 1979–1981); Rufinus Bononiensis, *Summa decretorum* (ca. 1157–1159), chap. XIV q. IV, ed. Singer (Paderborn, 1902), 342: “... *Fidei homini totus mundus divitiarum est*, i.e. etiamsi modicum possideat, ita reputat sibi sufficere, ac si totum mundum possideret; *infideli autem*, i.e. avaro, *nec obolus*, i.e. si totum mundum haberet, pro obolo computaret: adeo insatiabili cupiditate vexatur. Avaro enim tam deest quod habet quam quod non habet.” Bernard of Clairvaux, *Vita sancti Malachiae* (1149?), *Opere* 1,

economics and Franciscan arguments, from Bonaventure to Bernardino of Siena, on the socio-economic role of the Jews. In fact, the semantic history of this quotation seems to make more understandable the deep connection established by the Franciscan movement between the concepts of *fides/fidelis*, *infidelitas/infideles*, *divitiae/divites*, and *paupertas/pauperes* (*Christi*).

I

We can interpret the early Franciscan writings on the rule of Francis and on the poverty of the Order as a first step of Franciscan economics,² only if we see in these texts written between 1240 and 1260 a strong effort to make the poverty of the Order an economic ideal for Christian society as a whole. This attempt, in fact, is intelligible to us as a logical consequence of the complexity of the Gregorian and post-Gregorian Reform movement which, in its premises, had stated that collective or institutional property was the key to the separation between clerical and secular states of life.³ The individual poverty of monks and bishops for the Gregorian and post-Gregorian Reform leaders of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, from Peter Damian to Bernard of Clairvaux, was a fundamental attribute of the *libertas ecclesiae* from

702–703: “Dominus vero providit ut, etsi non speranti in pecuniae thesauris, pecunia non deesset. Quis enim alius fecit, ut thesaurus eo loci reponeretur, repositus non reperiretur usque ad tempus et opus Malachiae? Invenit Dei famulus in Dei marsupio, quod defuit suo. Merito quidem. Quid enim iustius, ut cui pro Deo non erat proprium, cum Deo iniret consortium, et marsupium unum esset amborum? Fideli denique homini totus mundus divitiarum est. Et quid ille, nisi quoddam marsupium Dei? Denique ait: ‘Meus est orbis terrae et plenitudo eius.’ Inde est quod Malachias repertos argenteos multos non reposuit, sed exposuit. Nam totum munus Dei in Dei opus iubet expendi. Non suas, non suorum considerat necessitates; sed iactat cogitatum suum in Domino, ad quem utique recurrendum non dubitat, quoties necessitas postularit ...” On the patristic use of the text, see V.R. Vasey, “Proverbs 17.6b (LXX) and St. Ambrose’s Man of Faith,” *Augustinianum*, 14 (1974), 259–276.

² First of all: *Expositio quatuor magistrorum super regulam fratrum minorum* (1241), ed. L. Oliger (Rome, 1950).

³ *La vita comune del clero nei secoli XI e XII* (Milan, 1962); *L’Eremitismo in Occidente nei secoli XI–XII* (Milan, 1965); *Povertà e ricchezza nella Spiritualità dei secoli XI e XII* (Todi, 1969); L.K. Little, *Religious Poverty and the Profit Economy in Medieval Europe* (London, 1978); M.C. De Matteis, “Tematica della povertà e problema delle ‘res ecclesiae’: notazioni ed esemplificazioni campione su alcune collezioni canoniche del periodo della riforma ecclesiastica del sec. XI,” *Bullettino dell’Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medioevo*, 90 (1982–1983), 177–226; *La conversione alla povertà nell’Italia dei secoli XII–XV* (Spoleto, 1991).

secular intervention and the ground of the church's right to possess goods and revenues. The *res ecclesiarum*, the *ecclesiasticae facultates*, the *pecunia ecclesiastica* as wealth of the church (meta-personal *corpus mysticum*) was justified by the individual and personal poverty of monks and priests.⁴ This poverty was a sign also of the non-simoniac nature of their religious identity. Individual poverty, in the age of Gregorian and post-Gregorian Reform, was presented, finally, as the most intimate character of a *perfectio evangelica* that only the *legitime consecrati* could own.⁵

From this point of view, the early Franciscan reflection on *pecunia*, *denarii*, *proprietas*, and *usus rerum venalium*, from the *Expositio quatuor magistrorum* to the *Apologia pauperum* of Bonaventure (1260),⁶ or, in general,

⁴ Fundamental texts in Peter Damian's works: *Epistola* 98 (1063: "contra canonicos regulares proprietarios"), in *Die Briefe des Petrus Damiani*, ed. K. Reindel (MGH *Epistolae* 2, *Die Briefe des deutschen Kaiserzeit* 4), vol. III (Munich, 1989), 92: "... cuius sunt facultates, ex quibus tibi licet habere peculium? Tuae videlicet sunt, an aecclesiae?" "Proiciam ergo Christum de arca pectoris mei, et loco eius pecuniam constipabo? Certe tam nobilis pecunia Christus est, ut consortium aspernetur omnino peculii, nec cum sorde pecuniae se patiatur includi. Ut ergo Christus pectoris tui loculum impleat, aereus ab eo nummus abscedat, ut Christus animae tuae suum caracterem inprimat, vile didragma Cesaris imaginem praeferens evanescat." *Epistola* 97 (1063: "cardinalibus episcopis apostolicae sedis"), *Die Briefe*, 67: "Nulla sane putredo vulneris in Dei naribus intolerabilius foetet, quam stercus avariciae. Et cupidus quisque dum sordentis pecuniae questus accumulatur, vertens exedram in latrinam quasi molem stercoris coacervat"; 69: "Si enim nichil est avaro scelestius [Eccles], nichil iniquius, non ergo melior parricidis, non prefertur incestis, aequatur hereticis, assimilatur idololatriis ... Sit ergo quilibet castus, sit sobrius, sit indigentibus alendis intentus, hospitalitati deditus, ieiunet, vigilet, diem nocti psallendo continuat: si tamen avarus est, totum perdit, ita ut inter omnium criminum reos nequiores se invenire non possit."

⁵ Bernard of Clairvaux, *Apologia ad Guillelmum abbatem* (1125), in *Opere* (Milan, 1984), 1.207–208: "Omitto oratoriorum immensas altitudines, immoderatas longitudines, supervacuas latitudines, sumptuosas depolitiones, curiosas depictiones, qua dum in se orantium retorquent aspectum, impediunt et affectum, et mihi quodammodo repraesentant antiquum ritum Iudaeorum. Sed esto, fiant haec ad honorem Dei. Illud autem interrogo monachos monachos, quod in gentilibus gentilis arguebat: 'Dicite, ait ille, pontifices, in sancto quid facit aurum' (Persius, *Saturae* 2.69). Ego autem dico: 'Dicite pauperes—non enim attendo versum, sed sensum—dicite, inquam, pauperes, si tamen pauperes, in sancto quid facit aurum? Et quidem alia causa est episcoporum, alia monachorum. Scimus namque quod illi, sapientibus et insipientibus debitores cum sint, carnalis populi devotionem, quia spiritualibus non possunt, corporalibus excitant ornamentis. Nos vero qui iam de populo exivimus, qui mundi quaeque pretiosa ac speciosa pro Christo reliquimus, qui omnia pulchreluentia, canore mulcentia, suave olentia, dulce sapientia, tactu placentia, cuncta denique oblectamenta corporea arbitrati sumus ut stercora, ut Christum lucrifaciamus, quorum, quaeso, in his devotionem excitare intendimus?'"

⁶ In Bonaventure, *Opera omnia* (Firenze Quaracchi, 1882), vol. 8.

up to the fight on the absolute poverty of Christ and the apostles,⁷ is at the same time a logical development of the post-Gregorian perfection model in light of the conversion policy promulgated by the Fourth Lateran Council (1215).⁸ It also provides the beginning of a vocabulary of economic theory within moral and theological contexts.⁹ Actually, “Franciscan Economics” (as Odd Langholm recently called it)¹⁰ can assume all its deep significance only when we restate it in its moral-theological language system. We must understand, also, that the attention to contracts, possession, property, and use which characterize the Franciscan School is the expression of the inflexible will of *pauperes evangelici* as charismatic Christian leaders to convert the *societas christiana* into a *societas fidelium*. In this sense the Franciscan writings on the poverty of the Order as a technique of the perfect use of goods (*usus pauper*) and the Franciscan writings on contracts, lending on interest, buying and selling, and usury are two faces of the same linguistic and conceptual making of an economic Christian lexicon.

From 1260 to 1380 we meet references to the Jews in Franciscan economic writings on three different semantic levels:

- 1) Jews as a stereotype of the enemies of Franciscan poverty;
- 2) Jews as a stereotype of supporters of usury economy in connection with the interpretation of Deuteronomy 23 and the related debate among canonists;
- 3) Jews as effective lenders and usurers, dangerous for the Christian moral and economic order.

1) The first aspect of this image of Jews, that of the Jew as a stereotyped enemy of Franciscan poverty, is rarely, if ever, noted by historians. We find it in apologetic Franciscan writings of the thirteenth century, first

⁷ R. Lambertini, *Apologia e crescita dell'identità francescana (1255–1279)* (Rome, 1990); A. Tabarroni, *Paupertas Christi et Apostolorum: L'ideale francescano in discussione (1322–1324)* (Rome, 1990).

⁸ *Constitutiones Concilii Quarti Lateranensis una cum Commentariis Glossatorum*, ed. Garcia y Garcia (Vatican City, 1981); V. Pfaff, “Die soziale Stellung des Judentums in der Auseinandersetzung zwischen Kaiser und Kirche vom 3. bis zum 4. Laterankonzil (1179–1215),” *Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, 52 (1963), 168–206.

⁹ G. Todeschini, *Il prezzo della salvezza: Lessici medievali del pensiero economico* (Rome, 1994); Todeschini, *I mercanti e il Tempio: La società cristiana e il circolo virtuoso della ricchezza fra Medioevo ed Età Moderna* (Bologna, 2002).

¹⁰ O. Langholm, *Economics in Medieval Schools: Wealth, Exchange, Value, Money and Usury According to the Paris Theological Tradition, 1200–1350* (Leiden, 1992); G. Todeschini, “Oeconomica Franciscana” and “Oeconomica Franciscana II,” in *Rivista di Storia e Letteratura Religiosa*, 12 (1976), 15–77; 13 (1977), 461–494.

of all Bonaventure's *Apologia pauperum*, as a logical semantic achievement of the anti-Jewish polemic contained in anti-simoniatic writings of the eleventh and twelfth centuries (*Libelli de Lite*).¹¹ As in some early Franciscan *opuscula* such as the *Francisci epistola toti ordini missa*, the image of Judas as *avarus* and therefore *traditor* is opposed to the perfection of the Friars *pauperes Christi* and *sacerdotes* celebrating the Mass *non pro ulla terrena re*.¹² In Bonaventure's *Apologia* the Parisian doctors who are fighting against the Order's *paupertas* are the equivalent of Judas as administrator *fur et avarus* of the goods given by *fideles* to Christ and the apostles.¹³ This double equation assumes a deeper meaning when

¹¹ Peter Damian, *Epistola* 98, in *Die Briefe*, 92: "Quisquis ergo clericus proprietati conatur habere peculium, non valet apostolorum tenere vestigia, quia non erit illi cum fratribus cor unum et anima una. Cum Juda siquidem loculos atque pecuniam habere potest, unanimitatem vero puramque concordiam cum apostolis habere non potest"; Gaufridus Vindocinensis, *Libellus VI: Quae tria aecclesia specialiter habere debet* (*Ad Calixtum papam*) in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, *Libelli de Lite*, vol. III, 694: "... Quando enim aecclesia venditur vel emitur, evacuatur fides, quia quod incomparabile factum est a Deo ab homine comparari posse estimatur. Praeterea qui vendit aecclesiam cupidum Iudam imitatur; qui autem emit illam Iudaicam avaritiam sectatur. Iudas utique cupiditati vendidit Christum, qui est caput aecclesiae, et Iudei avaritia emerunt illum." More specific references in G. Todeschini, "Judas mercator pessimus: Ebrei e simoniaci dall'XI al XIII secolo," *Zakhor: Rivista di storia degli ebrei d'Italia*, 1 (1997), 4-16; L. Dasberg, *Untersuchungen über die Entwertung des Judenstatus im 11. Jh.* (Paris, 1965). On the complex cultural atmosphere of the anti-Jewish polemic between the eleventh and twelfth centuries, see now G. Dahan, *Les intellectuels chrétiens et les juifs au moyen Age* (Paris, 1990); B.M. Bedos-Rezak, "Les Juifs et l'écrit dans la mentalité eschatologique du Moyen Age chrétien occidental (France 1000-1200)," *Annales*, 49 (1994), 1049-1063.

¹² Francis of Assisi, *Epistola toti ordini missa* 14-16, in K. Esser, ed., *Gli scritti di s. Francesco d'Assisi* (Padua, 1982), 309: "Rogo etiam in Domino omnes fratres meos sacerdotes, qui sunt et erunt et esse cupiunt sacerdotes Altissimi, quod quandocumque missam celebrare voluerint, puri pure faciant cum reverentia verum sacrificium sanctissimi corporis et sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu Christi sancta intentione et munda non pro ulla terrena re neque timore vel amore alicuius hominis, quasi placentes hominibus; sed omnis voluntas, quantum adiuvat gratia ad Deum dirigatur soli ipso summo Domino inde placere desiderans quia ipse ibi solus operatur sicut sibi placet; quoniam sicut ipse dicit: 'Hoc facite in meam commemorationem', si quis aliter fecerit, Judas traditor efficitur et reus fit corporis et sanguinis Domini.'"

¹³ Bonaventure, *Apologia pauperum*, in *Opera omnia* 10.304: "Omnium malorum radicalis origo, cupiditas, cum humanae mentis arcem invaserit, tam dura tyrannide premit, ut ad idolorum redigat servitutem et in bestialem transformet crudelitatem. Huius testimonium evidens esse constat Iudae proditoris nequitiam, qui, cum loculos haberet, de quibus cupiditatis suae voracitatem famelicam mitigare valebat; modicae tamen sibi repromissae pecuniae tanto est illectus amore, ut sitiret Salvatoris omnium sanguinem et auctorem vitae venaretur ad mortem. Hac peste laborans et hic pauperum calumniator tamquam Iudae discipulus primo eis *pacis osculum tribuit*, ipsorum simulatorie commendando pauperiem; dehinc *letaliter* percutit, dum loculis carentium pauperum professionem conatur arguere, non solum ut imperfectam, verum etiam ut erroneam, sim-

we reflect on the traditional Augustinian interpretation of Psalm 108¹⁴ and on its development between the eleventh and twelfth centuries during the hard clash between Gregorian Reformers and their adversaries who had given a new political and rhetorical objectivity to the connection between Jewish difference and dangers for the sacred goods and the charisma of the Roman church. In the writings of Hubertus de Silvacandida, Honorius Augustodunensis, Placidus Nonantulanus and others, as well as in the writings of Peter the Venerable and Peter Cantor and in Canon 67 of the Fourth Lateran Council, the Jews (regularly identified with the character of Judas) are described as typical enemies of the church and of her *facultates*.¹⁵ This Augustinian tradition does find a new actuality in the Franciscan School as the great thirteenth-century heir of a Reform which, during the pontificate of Innocent III, “waged campaigns against its various enemies, endeavors that evinced and promoted great feelings of hostility toward all who might be con-

ulatoriam et iniquam.” And some lines later: “Insuper, si quicumque membrum Christi est, cum Christo loculos habet, ut asserit; *a destructione consequentis* qui loculos non habet non est membrum Christi. Ex quo etiam sequitur, quod omnes pauperes nihil habentes et prorsus omnia relinquentes alieni sunt ab unitate corporis mystici, tanquam si is qui habere pecuniam noluerit, gratiam Christi habere non possit, ac per hoc beator fuerit Iudas, qui loculos habuit, quam Petrus, quam Petrus, qui dixit: *Argentum et aurum non est mihi*.” See, too, Bonaventure, *De perfectione vitae ad sorores* 7, in *Opera omnia* 10.114: “Si igitur inter Iudaeos duros et incredulos pascerebat Dominus discipulos suos sine omni sollicitudine; quid mirum, si pascat Fratres Minores eiusdem perfectionis professores, quid mirum, si pascat pauperes Sorores, paupertatis evangelicae imitatrices, inter populos christianos et fideles?” See, in another perspective, G. Dahan, “S. Bonaventure et les juifs,” *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum*, 77 (1984), 370–405.

¹⁴ Augustine, *In psalmum 108 enarratio*, in *Opere* 27 (Roma, 1976), 904: “... Sicut enim quaedam dicuntur quae ad apostolum Petrum proprie pertinere videantur, nec tamen habent illustrem intellectum nisi cum referuntur ad Ecclesiam, cuius ille agnoscitur in figura gestasse personam, propter primatum quem in discipulis habuit ... ita Iudas personam quodammodo sustinet inimicorum Christi Iudaeorum, qui et tunc oderant Christum, et nunc per successionem perseverante genere ipsius impietatis oderunt. De quibus hominibus et de quo populo possunt non inconvenienter intellegi, non solum ea quae apertius de ipsis in hoc psalmo legimus, verum etiam illa quae proprie de ipso Iuda dicuntur expressius ...”; B. Blumenkranz, *Die Judenpredigt Augustins: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der jüdisch-christlichen Beziehungen in den ersten Jahrhunderten* (Basel, 1946).

¹⁵ *Concilium lateranum IV*, c. 67: “... Iudaeos decernimus compellendos ad satisfaciendum ecclesiis pro decimis et oblationibus debitis, quas a christianis de domibus et possessionibus aliis percipere consueverant, antequam ad Iudaeos quocumque titulo devenissent, ut sic ecclesiae conserventur indemnes,” in *Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Decreta*, ed. Alberigo et al. (Bologna, 1973), 265. More quotations in G. Todeschini, “Judas mercator pessimus”; Todeschini, “‘Usura’ ebraica e identità economica cristiana: la discussione medievale,” in *Ebrei in Italia*, ed. C. Vivanti, vol. 1 (Torino, 1997), 291–318.

sidered threatening to Christendom.”¹⁶ But now, in the struggle about *usus pauper*, the poverty of the Order is suggested by the Franciscan intelligentsia to Christian society as the conceptual and political synthesis of Christian perfection and becomes even more defined as an economic tactic: its enemies, with their *carnalitas* (their avarice), are the postulate of an imperfection whose real name is *infidelitas*.

The Jews, in Bonaventure or in John Peckham, as we will see, are the typical and menacing leaders of this division within Christian society. First of all, they appear to the Franciscan *ratio* as symbol or metaphor of the enemies of Franciscan poverty. The struggle for *usus pauper* does appear as an appropriate language receptacle for beginning definitions of Jews as *infideles* from an economic point of view, or of economic analysis as a rational technique to discern *infideles* from *fideles*. The emphasis on poverty as a sign of perfect *fidelitas* in writings from Bernard of Clairvaux's *Apologia* to Peter John Olivi's *Tractatus de usu paupere* (which makes explicit quotations from Bernard's work)¹⁷ is to our historical vision the most evident religious aspect of the entire vocabulary of Christian perfection, in which the economic sections are inseparable from the whole. The mission for the conversion of the Jews with its apocalyptic implications, promoted at the end of the thirteenth century by the writings of Peter John Olivi, Ramon Llull or Roger Bacon, was in this perspective a consequence of the ideal of poverty or, in other words, of the imitation (*mimesis*) of Christ as a social model. The exaltation of the perfect Christian merchant in the writings, between 1280 and 1320, of the Franciscans Olivi, Llull, Alexander of Alexandria, and John Duns Scotus is therefore a civic implication of this general model:¹⁸ Judas and

¹⁶ J. Cohen, *The Friars and the Jews: The Evolution of Medieval Anti-Judaism* (Ithaca, 1982), 35.

¹⁷ D. Burr and D. Flood, "Peter John Olivi: On Poverty and Revenue," *Franciscan Studies*, 18 (1980), 18–58, with edition of the Olivi's *quaestio* XVI "de perfectione evangelica"; D. Burr, *Olivi and Franciscan Poverty: The Origins of "Usus Pauper" Controversy* (Philadelphia, 1984); J. Schlageter, *Das Heil der Armen und das Verderben der Reichen* (Werl/W., 1989), with edition of the Olivi's *quaestio* VIII "de perfectione evangelica"; D. Burr, ed., *Petri Johannis Olivi de usu paupere: The Quaestio and the Tractatus* (Florence and Perth, 1992); D. Flood, "Peter Olivi quaestio de mendicitate: Critical edition," *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum*, 87 (1994), 287–347.

¹⁸ On the general problem, P. Browe, *Die Judenmission und die Päpste* (Rome, 1973); on the Franciscan exaltation of the merchant's civic value, see Langholm, *Economics*; Todeschini, *Il prezzo della salvezza*; see now O. Limor, "Missionary merchants: Three medieval anti-Jewish works from Genoa," *Journal of Medieval History*, 17 (1991), 35–51; G. Dahan, *Ingetus Contardus, Disputatio contra Judeos* (Paris, 1993). The fundamental primary source on the problem of the "missionary merchants" is Ramon Llull's *Liber*

the Jews are, in contrast, presented as *perfidii* and *avarii*, as archetypes of actual businessmen accustomed to money and its accumulation, or as metaphorical archetypes of blindness and unbelief. (In patristic thought, *avaritia* and *tenacia* or *duritia* are synonyms and key words from Ambrose to Gregory the Great.) They are, in this representation, an obvious contradiction to mystical poverty and to the Christian ideal of wealth.¹⁹

2) Benjamin Nelson, Siegmund Stein, Robert Chazan, and, more recently, William Chester Jordan have all underlined the importance of the Christian-Jewish debate on *Deuteronomy* 23 and the prohibition to lend on interest to brothers and permission to lend on interest to strangers.²⁰ In the Franciscan economic writings between the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, it is possible to find allusions to stereotyped or actual Jews as supporters of an interpretation of *Deuteronomy* 23 as warranty of Jewish lending on interest to Christians. Especially in Olivi's *De usuris* and in the *Summa astesana*, which largely adheres to Olivi, the non-specific canonistic argumentation of Ramon de Penyafort, Innocent IV, and Hostiensis makes a meaningful change, as it explains *Deuteronomy*'s passage in terms of divine tactics *ad maiorem malum vitandum* (given as obvious the *Judeorum duritia* or *aviditas*).²¹ In Olivi and Astesanus the

per quem poterit cognosci quae lex sit magis bona (Turnhout, 1991). On Scotus's economics, see A.B. Wolter, *Duns Scotus Political and Economic Philosophy* (Santa Barbara, Calif., 1989).

¹⁹ P.J. Olivi, *Quaestio de usu paupere* (quaestio IX "de perfectione evangelica," 1279–1280), in *Petri Johannis Olivi de usu paupere*, ed. D. Burr, 40–41: "Credo tamen quod, etiam posito quod [Apostoli] essent simpliciter professores evangelii, quod collecte pro eis fieri potuerunt in casu tante necessitatis et utilitatis in quali tunc erant. Erant enim inter Iudeos, fidei et fidelium precipuos adversarios, et erant ibi pro communi utilitate totius fidei. Unde non poterant bono modo sustentari nisi a solis fidelibus qui ubique terrarum inter gentes erant dispersi ... Quod autem dicitur quod ipse [Paulus] sciebat habundare non est contra pauperem usum, immo summe spectat ad professores eius. Scire enim habundare non est aliud quam habere virtutem et discretionem bene et perfecte se regendi in habundantia sibi oblata."

²⁰ B. Nelson, *The Idea of Usury: From Tribal Brotherhood to Universal Otherhood* (Philadelphia, 1948); S. Stein, "A Disputation on Moneylending between Jews and Gentiles in Meir ben Simeon's 'Milhemet Miswah,'" *Journal of Jewish Studies*, 10 (1959); Stein, *Jewish-Christian Disputations in Thirteenth Century Narbonne* (London, 1969); R. Chazan, "A Jewish Complaint to Saint Louis," *Hebrew Union College Annual*, 45 (1974), 287–305; Chazan, "A Medieval Hebrew Polemical Mélange," *Hebrew Union College Annual*, 51 (1980), 89–110; W.C. Jordan, *The French Monarchy and the Jews: From Philip Augustus to the Last Capetians* (Philadelphia, 1989).

²¹ The typical text is Ramon de Penyafort, *Summa de poenitentia* II 7, 15–16, ed. Ochoa Diez (Rome, 1976), 554–555; *Decretales* (ed. Friedberg) X 2, 24, 25; X 5, 19, 5; X 5, 19, 8; X 5, 19, 12; X 5, 19, 18.

historical Jews are to search for justifications for their lending activity, so the explanation of the Torah's quotation does imply a direct confutation of a Jewish economic interpretation. Stein's and Chazan's studies clearly show that in thirteenth-century France, and principally in Narbonne, the location of the Franciscan *studium* in which Olivi was *lector* around 1270 and at the end of his life, there really was an explicit Jewish polemic against the usury policy of King Louis IX and, generally, against church usury doctrine. Its main characters appear in Meir ben Simeon's *Millhemet Mitzvah*. In the same years, from the fifties to the seventies, the "evolution of Capetian policy" regarding Jews (as William Chester Jordan called it) involved a transmission to Franciscan and Dominican investigators of an analysis of credit situations in which they argued for the ban of Jewish lending on interest or the ratification of non-restitution of interests by borrowers, especially when the borrowers were Crusaders. "Canon 17 of the First Council of Lyons, 1245, could be read to give some sort of license to the king to attach the profit of Jewish usury from crusaders."²² It is fundamental for the study of Franciscan economics to understand that explicit references to Jews as theoreticians of a credit economy first appear in the textual chain originated by Olivi's *De usuris*, a work whose author could not ignore the relations between Franciscans, Jews, and the monarch in Picardy and in the French Midi, nor the Narbonne Jewish polemic against usury in Christian legislation.²³

²² W.C. Jordan, *The French Monarchy*, 144.

²³ Peter John Olivi, *De emptionibus et venditionibus, de usuris, de restitutionibus*, in G. Todeschini, *Un trattato di economia politica francescana* (Rome, 1980), 69: "Sed forte dicetur sicut a quibusdam iudeis dicitur, quod accipere usuram non prohibetur in lege, nisi solum a fratribus suis idest a iudeis, ymo de aliis conceditur, Deuteronomii 23, sicut superius in argumentum est tactum ... Si autem [usure] sunt per se male, tunc semper et ubique sunt male ... quia naturalis proximitas et fraternitas est ad omnes homines, tam iure communis creationis et divine ymaginis et univoce speciei hominum, quam iure propagationis ex eodem primo patre ... quia aut usurarius contractus continet in se absolute iniquitatem aut equitatem: si iniquitatem ergo est per se et ubique apud omnes malum, si equitatem ergo non deberet a fratre prohiberi." The whole Olivian argumentation is more complex and articulated than the discussion from Ramon de Penyafort to Hostiensis: the *ius naturae* and not the unfruitfulness of money is the central point of Olivi's condemnation of usury. If, as now Sylvain Piron proves in his doctoral thesis (Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales, 1998) the economic treatise of Olivi was written in the nineties of the thirteenth century in Narbonne, it is easy to interpret the *quidam iudei* as a reference to the polemic on usury between Jews and Christians in Narbonne and Midi, well studied by Robert Chazan.

From this point of view, it is not surprising that, in the *Summa* of Astesanus, the Jews are presented as authors of a falsification in the Deuteronomy text on usury. Astesanus, in fact, writes explicitly that usury is absolutely forbidden in consequence of *ius naturae* and not principally (in the same terms of Olivi and Scotus) because money would not be fruitful. Usury is forbidden also in consequence of its uncharitable social sense. The argument concludes with the declaration that Deuteronomy's original and authentic text contained no references that allowed lending to strangers but that this reference was a Jewish interpolation as a justification of Jewish credit economy.²⁴ The Jewish *infidelitas* in Astesanus's text is directly connected to Jewish *avaritia* and therefore to Jewish falsehood in a circumscribed economic sense. Bernardino of Siena, around 1420, makes a textual quotation from Olivi's *de usuris* on this point in his *Sermo de usuraria pravitate* (the thirty-eighth sermon of his *De evangelio aeterno* and seventh sermon of his *De contractibus et usuris*).²⁵ So Bernardino will newly emphasize the role of Jews as supporters of usury in the urban business context of the fifteenth century and transmit the terms of this specific Franciscan charge to future economic debates.

3) In the Franciscan writings of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, we can also find implicit and explicit hostile allusions to the actual Jewish role in credit and trade economy. It is, however, very difficult to penetrate the complex significance of this theoretical and political antagonism if any aspect of an integral Franciscan economic project or of Franciscan economics would be denied. As I outlined in my earlier studies, and as was recently verified by Odd Langholm, it is possible to

²⁴ Astesanus, *Summa de casibus* (Venice, 1480) III 11: "... usura est prohibita quia est peccatum et secundum se est malum et contra dictamen iuris naturalis, ita quod nullo modo et nullo casu potest bene fieri et in ea non potest dispensari ... [Ad secundum] Iudeis prohibitum fuit usuram recipere fratribus suis scilicet iudeis. Per quod datur intelligi quod usuram accipere a quocumque homine est simpliciter prohibitum, quia quilibet homo debet haberi quasi proximus et frater, potissime in statu evangelii ad quem homines vocantur ... Quod autem ab extraneis usuram acciperent non fuit eis concessum quasi licitum sed permissum ad maius malum vitandum scilicet ne a Iudeis deum colentibus usuram acciperent propter avariciam cui dediti erant, ut habetur Isaia 56. Dicitur autem quod in vera littera non fuit illa additio scilicet 'alieno,' sed fuit per Iudeos apposita in sui excusationem talem qualem." On Olivi's and Astesanus's economics, see O. Langholm, *Economics*, 344–373, and *passim*.

²⁵ Bernardino of Siena, *Opera omnia* IV (Firenze Quaracchi, 1956), 255; G. Todeschini, "Teorie economiche francescane e presenza ebraica in Italia (1380–1462 c.)," in *Il rinnovamento del Francescanesimo: L'Osservanza* (Assisi, 1985), 195–227.

establish a strong correlation between the Franciscan doctrine on the absolute poverty of Christ and the apostles and Franciscan economic analysis. The struggle on poverty in the sixties through the eighties of the thirteenth century is readable in this sense as an actual Franciscan linguistic construction of an economic vocabulary for Christianity and, more than this, of an intellectual project that envisions an ethical and economic reform of the life of Christian entrepreneurs. Franciscan attention to the economic difference between use, property, possession, and usufruct of things and on the social significance of money is clearly observable in Franciscan writings, written before and after the *bullā decretalis*, *Exiit qui seminat* (1279), on the role of poverty in the Order, from the *Expositio quator magistrorum* (1241) to Bonaventure's *Apologia* and Olivi's *Quaestiones de perfectione evangelica*. This Franciscan characteristic attention to a particular economic sense of the act of human domination (*dominium, ius domini*) is especially helpful in making the derivation of Franciscan economic analysis from Franciscan pauperistic consciousness understandable.²⁶ The total privation of wealth, the contraction of human needs to simple use (*simplex usus facti*) of things necessary to daily life as an *imitatio Christi et apostolorum*, is founded in an inquiry of the social habits concerning ownership, which are presented but not systematically defined by canonistic and romanistic tradition. This economic categorization of the relative utility of things, this criticism of their effectual value or of their superfluousness, evident for example in Olivi's question nine "*de perfectione evangelica*" and in Olivi's *De usuris*,²⁷ is furthermore the logical postulate of the Franciscan evaluation of secular economy. It makes possible an accurate distinction between ethical, socially profitable contracts whose prototype is commerce, and deceiving, socially deleterious contracts whose prototype is usury. In this perspective, the *lucrum* and Christian wealth in general can be the product of a correct Christian lifestyle inasmuch as this wealth is assembled by *fideles* whose objective is the affluence of the city (*patria*) under the guide of Christian charismatic leaders. In the writings of Olivi, Alexander

²⁶ G. Tarello, "Profili giuridici della questione della povertà nel francescanesimo prima di Ockham," in *Studi in memoria di Antonio Falchi* (Milan, 1964); P. Grossi, "Usus facti: La nozione di proprietà nella inaugurazione dell'età nuova," (1972) in *Il dominio e le cose: Percezioni medievali e moderne dei diritti reali*, ed. P. Grossi (Milan, 1992), 123–189; G. Todeschini, "Oeconomica Franciscana"; Todeschini, *Il prezzo*; O. Langholm, *Economics*; R. Lambertini, *Apologia*; A. Tabarroni, *Paupertas*. See, too, L.K. Little, *Religious Poverty and the Profit Economy in Medieval Europe* (London, 1979).

²⁷ D. Burr, ed., *Petri Johannis Olivi*, 47–48; G. Todeschini, *Un trattato*.

Lombardus, John Duns Scotus, Astesanus, Giraldus Odo, and others, the moneyed and dynamic merchant (*pecuniosus et industrius*, in Olivi's *De emptionibus et venditionibus*) is, from this point of view, *fidelis* when the goal of his business activity is to benefit the *fidelium communitas* and only indirectly to increase his personal and family wealth. Franciscan economists proposed to Christian merchants that the legitimate way to be rich involved a detachment from avarice (*possidere immobiliter* in Olivi's question eight *de perfectione evangelica*)²⁸ as, i.e., from the accumulation of things, of objects, and of money as well as a consideration of the use of such wealth for the good of the broader community.²⁹ The flow of money and wares and the public utility of this circulation, together with a rejection of amassing property (*thesaurizare, thesaurizatio*), appear to provide the closest secular analogy to religious poverty. In this model as in religious poverty, the simple use (*usus*) of things is the actual, legal, and historical shape of Christ's *paupertas*. The ethical superiority of honest commerce and the justification of a merchant's wealth proceeding from good knowledge of city needs and prices for wares are recurrent elements in Franciscan economics, which was expressed in their argument against the Aristotelian-Thomistic thesis on the sterility of money. Religious poverty in its expression as "simple use" from Bonaventure to Scotus was founded on the idea of a possible separation of use and property in objects and also in money. This conception of money as an object, ethically dangerous when accumulated but useful when indirectly used and not owned, is clearly connected with the Franciscan legitimization of the Christian entrepreneur as a tradesman and money changer making use of money not to accumulate it, but to utilize it as a means of exchange. A mere consequence of this ethical and economic Franciscan conception of Christian merchant on a religious and civic level is the role assigned to Christian merchants in the writings of Ramon Llull, Roger Bacon and, a century later nearby, Francesc Eiximenis. In their writings, the perfect Christian merchants are the champions of *infideles*, namely Jews and Saracens, and the best representatives of civic virtues. Their task is to be, because of their linguistic and geographic knowledge and their religious education, a sort

²⁸ J. Schlageter, *Das Heil*; D. Burr and D. Flood, "Peter John Olivi: On Poverty and Revenue."

²⁹ The Franciscans also raised, in their consideration of the proper use of wealth, issues regarding the use of money as a means of exchange in the import and export of commodities and as a measure for the definition of prices.

of lay missionary among the *infideles*, and at the same time, because of their economic science, the major supporters of the affluence and good order of Christian towns.³⁰ Olivi's approval of an interest taken by merchants on their lending derives from his conception of the merchant's wealth and money. This wealth and this money, because they pertain to a subject *fidelis* whose economic custom is commercial investment, can produce immediately other money. It is not sterile as the money and the wealth of the Jewish usurer whose unfruitfulness derives not from the nature of money, but from its economic immobility, that is, from its wrong and depraved use.

So we can easily understand that, although we can find only a few, though remarkable, references to Jews as usurers in thirteenth- and fourteenth-century Franciscan economic writings, the whole Franciscan economics is understandable as the beginning of Christian economics, and has among its strong implications a definition of the economy practiced by businessmen *infideles*, particularly by Jews in terms of unfruitfulness and danger. This development is explicit, during the thirteenth century, in John Peckham's response to the Duchess of Brabant, *De regimine Judeorum*. This text³¹ is analogous to the concise but more famous *opusculum* by Thomas Aquinas. But if the writing of Aquinas does not reveal a great attention to the problem of a ruler's government over Jews living in his land, Peckham's brief treatise is a very interesting segment of the complex Franciscan ethical-economic structure. The text is explicit about the connection existing for the Franciscan writer between Jews and usury: the Jews are generally *usurarii manifesti* and it can be presumed that all their wealth would have originated from lending on interest. This statement, a heritage of the twelfth-century polemic, is now becoming a paradox: Jews must be compelled to do honest labor, but all the jobs that could associate

³⁰ Ramon Llull, *Quae lex sit magis bona* (op. 209) uersio latina I (Turnhout, 1991), 172: "Cum multi christiani laici sint mercatores et hac occasione uadant ad terras Saracenorum, et Saraceni interrogent eos de lege eorum et cum eis uelint disputare, et christiani eis nesciant respondere, quia de lege christianorum notitiam non habent, sed credulitatem, quia dubitant in lege Mahometi, idcirco nos facimus istum librum ad hoc, ut sciant cognoscere quod lex christianorum est magis bona, magis magna et magis uera, quam quaecumque alia lex; et hoc idem dicimus, quod scient disputare cum Iudaeis"; Llull, *Ars generalis ultima* 95: *De mercatura* (op. 128), (1986), 379: "Mercatura in homine fidei et virtuoso est habitus perfectus; in homine autem deceptore et peccatore est habitus imperfectus."

³¹ The text is found in a manuscript of the Bibliothèque Mazarine and cited by Gilbert Dahan, *Les intellectuels*, 215.

them with Christians—surgery, commerce, domestic service—are prohibited.³² The result is that the degenerate business, usury, is proscribed but remains the only practicable one for Jews. The prince can further reclaim his fiscal revenues from this vicious wealth because, first of all, he has a general right to impose taxes *ex pia causa et meritoria vel reipublice defensande*. Secondly, it is his privilege to obtain, as a sort of profit, part of the Jewish corrupted wealth precisely since he is formally the authority who compels Jews to return usurious money as a *procurator* of the Christian citizens. He consequently has a legal right to a portion of the sums to be reimbursed.³³

In Peckham's writing and later in the writings on usury and commerce by Olivi, Alexander Lombardus, Astesanus and other Franciscan economic authors, the Jews are the origin of a *contagium*, a contamination of the social life of Christians, insofar as their economic activity can only be a degeneration of the real useful business activity whose hero is the merchant *fidelis*. It is very important to understand that in John Peckham's response to the Duchess of Brabant, just as in the *Summa astesana*, usury becomes, more than a standard vicious economic contract, the sign of the economic activity of Jews as *infideles* and at the same time their unique, as well as forbidden, possibility of earning and living. The growth of Christian discussion on credit in the fourteenth century, and the great Franciscan participation in it, especially on the problem of public debt (as results from, among others, Santarelli's and Kirshner's studies),³⁴ clearly proves that the usury problem, in the four-

³² "Cogendi sunt iudei de proprio labore vivere vel exercitio mercature ita tamen quod preesse christianis in aliquo genere officii minime permittantur." See *Alia epistola cuiusdam ordinis minorum ad quamdam dominam super regimine Judeorum et quibusdam aliis* (Paris ms., 1652), ff. 78r–79v; f. 78v.

³³ *Alia epistola*, f. 78v. G. Todeschini, "Usura ebraica," 302–306. The *epistola* makes explicit reference to the anti-Jewish policies of King Louis IX and assumes that they provide a Christian political model regarding the Jewish question. G.I. Langmuir, "Judei nostri and the beginning of Capetian legislation," *Traditio*, 16 (1960), 203–239; W.C. Jordan, *The French Monarchy*.

³⁴ U. Santarelli, *La categoria dei contratti irregolari: Lezioni di storia del diritto* (Torino, 1984); J. Kirshner, "The moral theology of public finance: A study and edition of Nicholas de Anglia's *Quaestio disputata* on the public debt of Venice," *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*, 40 (1970), 47–72; Kirshner, "A Note on the Authorship of Domenico Pantaleoni's Tract on the Monte Comune of Florence," *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*, 43 (1973), 73–81; Kirshner, "Reading Bernardino's sermon on the public debt," in *Atti del simposio internazionale cateriniano-bernardiniano* (Siena, 1982), 547–622; Kirshner, "Storm over Monte Comune: Genesis of the Moral Controversy over the Public Debt of Florence," *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*, 53 (1983), 219–276; Kirshner, "Encumbering Private Claims to Public Debt in Renaissance Florence," in *The Growth of the Bank as*

teenth and fifteenth centuries, is not a generic moral problem, but a special problem concerning the economic attitude of non-Christians in a Christian market context. The prohibition of usury and the emphasizing of usury as a Jewish profession coincide in this period with the even more lucid assertion, especially in Franciscan economics from Olivi to Eiximenis,³⁵ of the legitimacy of credit activity by Christian merchants. The dawn of banking investigated by Raymond De Roover is, from this point of view, in the writings of jurists and Franciscan economic theorists, the dawn of Christian banking.³⁶ It corresponds, in the end, to the condemnation of usury as Jewish practice.

II

After having argued this, we can ask our sources if there is evidence of a connection between the fifteenth-century Franciscan Observant preaching campaigns against Jewish lending on interest and the preceding Franciscan economics with its implications seen above of the aforementioned condemnation of Jewish involvement in economics. This Jewish involvement was viewed as an archetype of an economy of heretics, synthesized by usury contracts.³⁷

Institution and the Development of Money-Business Law, ed. V. Piergiovanni (Berlin, 1993), 19–75.

³⁵ Francesc Eiximenis, *Regiment de la cosa publica*, 33–34, ed. D. De Molins De Rei (Barcelona, 1927), 167ff.; J.A. Maravall, “Franciscanismo, burguesia y mentalidad precapitalista: la obra de Eiximenis,” in *VIII Congreso de Historia de la Corona de Aragón*, vol. II: *La Corona de Aragón en el siglo XIV* (Valencia, 1969), 285–306.

³⁶ Raymond De Roover, *Money, Banking and Credit in Medieval Bruges: Italian Merchant Bankers, Lombards and Money Changers* (Cambridge, Mass., 1948); De Roover, *La pensée économique des Scolastiques* (Montréal and Paris, 1971); De Roover, *Business, Banking and Economic Thought in Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe: Selected Studies of Raymond De Roover*, ed. J. Kirshner (Chicago, 1974); *The Dawn of Modern Banking* (New Haven, Conn., 1979); see now, E.S. Hunt, *The Medieval Super-Companies: A Study of the Peruzzi Company of Florence* (Cambridge, 1994).

³⁷ A. Ghinato, “I Monti di pietà istituzione francescana,” *Picenum Seraphicum*, 9 (1972), 7–62; M.G. Muzzarelli, “Un bilancio storiografico sui Monti di pietà: 1956–1976,” *Rivista di storia della Chiesa in Italia*, 28 (1973), 175–183; V. Meneghin, *Bernardino da Feltre e i Monti di Pietà* (Vicenza, 1974); M.G. Muzzarelli, “Luoghi e tendenze dell’attuale storiografia italiana sulla presenza ebraica fra XIV e XVI secolo,” *Società e Storia*, 24 (1984), 369–394; A. Vauchez, *Ordini mendicanti e società italiana: XIII–XV secolo* (Milan, 1990); *Il rinnovamento del Francescanesimo; La conversione alla povertà; I frati minori fra '400 e '500* (Assisi, 1986); F. Lomastro Tognato, *Legge di Dio e Monti di Pietà: Marco da Montegalgo, 1425–1496* (Vicenza, 1996).

We can answer in the affirmative when we reflect not only on the well-known textual connection of Bernardino's *Tractatus de contractibus et usuris* to foregoing Franciscan economics, particularly to Olivi's *De emptionibus et venditionibus*, *De usuris*, and *De restitutionibus*, but even on the widespread consistent heritage of a Franciscan ethical-economic lexicon in the Franciscan Observant sermons and treatises concerning Jewish lending, from John Capistrano to Bernardino da Feltre and Marco da Montegallo.³⁸ The patrons and founders of the first *Monti di Pietà* placed within their doctrinal and linguistic pattern the whole tradition which, from Bonaventure to Olivi, Scotus, Francesco da Empoli and Eiximenis, had ingeniously constructed a School system and a policy regarding the Christian economic technique of perfection as a religious but also as a lay economic lifestyle. It is inside this lexical and theoretical tradition, founded on a distinction between fruitful use and unfruitful motionless possession of wealth and money, that Franciscan Observants can find the proofs and the technical language for their attack against the Italian Jewish communities.

One of the most important Observant arguments against Jewish lending on interest in the period from 1420 to 1460, the danger delineated for city economies from Jewish commerce of pledges, is evidently based on a development of the traditional Franciscan conception of the Christian market economy as an ethically allowed economy, insofar as it is a partnership between *fideles*, between brothers allied by the common will to increase the power and wealth of the Christian community. From this perspective the Jewish purchase and commerce of goods by way of acquisition of non-redeemed pledges is perceived by Franciscan economics as an extension of the usury technique, that is, as an artifice of *infideles* outsiders having as a goal the weakening of the inner religious and economic unity of the Christian city.³⁹

Consequently, the fifteenth-century Observant sequence of campaigns, sermons, and treatises against Jews and against usury as a

³⁸ G. Todeschini, "Usus raptus: Denaro e merci in Giovanni da Capistrano," in *A Ovidio Capitani: Scritti degli allievi bolognesi*, ed. M.C. De Matteis (Bologna, 1990), 159–188; Todeschini, "Osservanza francescana e politica economica delle città nel Quattrocento," *Quaderni Medievali*, 40 (1995), 21–49; on the Franciscan and Observant political theories, now see P. Evangelisti, "Per uno studio della testualità politica francescana fra XIII e XV secolo: Autori e tipologia delle fonti," *Studi Medievali*, 37 (1996), 549–623.

³⁹ The argument is common in the Observant anti-Jewish preaching and treatises, from John Capistrano to Marco da Montegallo and Bernardino da Feltre: see the works cited in the preceding footnote.

Jewish economic practice seems the most logical public outcome of the Franciscan economic vision which fixed the limits of authorized profit strictly inside the Christian community. It connected thereafter the legitimacy of economic practices with membership in the Christian community, firmly differentiating the economic identity of the Jewish entrepreneur from the economic identity of the Christian merchant and banker.

The Franciscan authorization of insurance contracts and of receiving (if not of bargaining) of interests determined by public debt procedures in the fifteenth century, for example in the *Summa* of Angelo da Chivasso, and the subsequent legitimization of investments and profits connected to a policy of credit, clearly prove that the contemporary condemnation of Jewish economic presence does not have the sense of a condemnation of banking and finance. It is, on the contrary, the explicit foundation of a distinction between a Christian and an alien (*alienigena*)⁴⁰ economy and the principle of the approbation of a profit economy as a method to use things and to manage the Christian world.⁴¹

⁴⁰ *Concilium lugdunense* II, canon 26, *Usurarum voraginem*, in *Decretales, liber sextus* V 1 = Friedberg, *Corpus iuris canonici* II, 1081.

⁴¹ Angelus Carletti de Clavasio, *Summa angelica de casibus conscientiae* (Venice, 1495), f. 134v: "... precium debet attendi secundum communem estimationem ... Quanto autem ista estimatio debet fieri quando non est communitas talis commertii, dico quod pensatis raritate laboribus et periculis iudicio boni mercatoris determinabitur quia alia regula non potest dari et hoc in re mobili. In immobili vero extimatur secundum fructus ..."; f. 501r: "... Quid de illo qui non solvit de culpa sua creditori solito mercari in termino debito. Respondeo quod tenetur ei ad lucrum cessans iudicio bonorum mercatorum. Et ideo talis creditor licite recipit ultra sortem. Idem dic de illo qui volebat negociari vel possessionem emere, quod licite recipit ultra sortem tantum quantum lucratus fuisset verisimiliter vel habuisset de fructibus possessionis aut alterius rei dummodo videlicet concurrant ..."; f. 454r: "... 7. Utrum tradere centum ducatos in societate cum pacto quod vult ipsum capitale salvum nec vult sentire aliquod damnum sed de lucro vult secundum discretionem socii quantum sibi placuerit dare licite faciat. Respondeo quod non sed est usurarius, c. *consuluit* ... Et propterea secundum Baldum in l. I q. V, III, ff. pro socio, talis quicquid accipit de lucro extenuat sortem quia tenetur compensare, vel si utrumque habuit tenetur restituere lucrum. Adverte tamen quod si quis nollet periculo capitalis se exponere et inveniret aliquem qui eum vellet assecurare pro aliquo sibi dato non esset usura se liberare a periculo per talem assecurationem licet pro lucro accipiat de capitali sic assecurato quod quidem lucrum parit negotiatio talis capitalis dati in societatem. Et idem dicerem quando socius accipiens ipsum capitale conveniret libere cum socio dante capitale de dando sibi tale modicum de lucro quod verisimiliter quilibet alius sic faceret si dans capitale retineret totum lucrum aliud quod deberet habere ex tali societate eo quod eum

It is not surprising if the *pauperes Christi*, the Franciscans, as religious masters and experts on use and possession techniques and on related lexical subtleties, appear to the urban, economically developed society of the fifteenth century (and today to the historians of the medieval economic thought) as perfect economists and ideal directors of Christian local economies.⁴² At the same time, it is quite understandable that their approach to the Jewish economic presence in Italian commercial cities at the end of the Middle Ages raises conflicts. This approach is deeply connected to an entire economic system based on two fundamental ideas: the notion of the flux of wealth or incessant use as

assecuret pro principali immo si nihil esset lucri solveret nihilominus assecurationem, utpote quando negotiatio est talis qualitatibus quod assecurationem inveniret solvendo tria vel quatuor pro centenario et tamen communiter pro lucro societatis esset recepturus VI vel VIII et aliquando plus, et sic conveniret cum socio quod solum daret sibi III vel quatuor pro lucro et eum de capitali assecuraret, et sic intelligo illud quod tam Ioh. Andreae in c. *per vestras, de donatione inter vivos*, et *Uxor de dote data mercatori* ... quia in isto casu pecunia posita in societate bene stat periculo ponentis licet illud periculum redimatur precio, quod licet. Et ideo non est privilegium dotis quia licite potest fieri in quocumque capitali sic dato, dummodo concurrant duo. Primum quod socius accipiens libere hoc velit facere non solum accipiendo tale capitale sed etiam si non acciperet pro tali modo assecuraret. Secundum quod tantum plus possit verisimiliter lucrari de tali societate ultra partem suam quantum esset illud quod (f. 454v) solveret pro tali assecuratione cuicumque communiter. Tutius tamen esset si conveniret cum socio de solvendo sibi tantum pro assecuratione capitalis quantum quilibet alius acciperet si vellet assecurare et in dividendo lucro prius solveret conventum pro assecuratione et quod superesset de lucro contingente illud retineret. Nec obstat capitulum *Naviganti* quia ibi aliter non mutuaret nisi periculum et lucrum pro periculo reciperet"; f. 510v: "an ... civis a quo communitas eius indigens pecunie accipit centum contra eius voluntatem, licite sine usura possit recipere certum quod puta VIII libras pro centenario quando sibi annuatim ipsa communitas constituit. Respondeo, diversi diversa scripserunt sed salvo meliori iudicio mihi videtur distinguendum quod aut communitas ipsa habet annuos redditus, aut non. Si habet sicut est civitas Ianue et de ipsis redditibus assignat certam partem tali a quo pecuniam habuit secundum proportionem pecunie habite, item quod tantum habeat omni anno de tali redditu ipse bene vel male responderet, sic licite talis accipit, quia talis communitas talem pecuniam accipit non nomine mutui, cum numquam velit eam reddere, sed pro precio talis partis suorum reddituum quos pro solutione pecunie habite vendit tali civi et sic est emptio reddituum civitatis que fieri potest sine usura ... Et secundum hoc loca Ianue, mons Florentie et imprestita Venetiarum sunt licita et sine usura ..." G. Ceccarelli, *Il gioco e il peccato: Economia e rischio nel tardo Medioevo* (Bologna, 2003); Ceccarelli, "Risky Business: Theological and Canonical Thought on Insurance from the Thirteenth to the Seventeenth Century," *The Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 31 (2001), 607–658.

⁴² Raymond De Roover, "Il trattato di fra sante Rucellai sul cambio, il monte comune e il monte delle doti," *Archivio Storico Italiano*, 111 (1953), 3–41; De Roover, *S. Bernardino of Siena and S. Antonino of Florence: The Two Great Economic Thinkers of the Middle Ages* (Boston, 1967).

a key to perfect Christian spirituality (*pecunia lucrosa*) for the Christian *fideles*, and the notion of motionless wealth (*pecunia mortua*), as a typical attribute of the carnality and avarice of the *infideles*.⁴³

⁴³ Bernardino of Siena, *Quadragesimale de christiana religione*, *Sermo* 46 "De peccatis vanitatum," III "Quod divitiae temporales in patriis ex superfluis vanitatibus multipliciter minuuntur" in *Opera omnia* vol. II (Firenze Quaracchi, 1950), 83–84: "... pecunia quae expenditur in superfluis indumentis, in iocalibus, in anulis, in coronis, in lapidibus pretiosis atque in aliis superfluis ornamentis, mortua perseverat; quae quidem posset esse lucrosa in mercantiis, in possessionibus, in animalibus, in artibus et in aliis quibuscumque lucrosis, et sic per consequens ad temporalem utilitatem civitatis et totius patriae redundaret ... Nam pretium quod in talibus vanitatibus possidetur communiter semper diminuitur, sive per talium vanitatum usus seu abusus, aut non usum. Nam saepe vanitatum mutatione, rerum talium pretium minoratur; immo indumentum quod hodie fit, cras sine minoratione pretii non poterit vendi et sic de singulis ... Nam postquam homo praedicta emerit, unde cessant lucra et crescunt damna, non tantum vendit vel derelinquit illa, verum etiam ad consimilia et correspondentia coartatur. Inde saepe oriuntur usurae, rapinae ac cetera turpia et iniusta lucra."

This page intentionally left blank

CONTEMPT FOR FRIARS AND CONTEMPT FOR JEWS IN LATE MEDIEVAL GERMANY

CHRISTOPHER OCKER

I

On the Wednesday before Easter in the year 1492, two Magdeburg Jews left town on horseback for Nürnberg pursuing unknown business. As they crossed a field they came upon two Franciscans. One was a priest, and one was a lay brother.¹ Riding up behind the priest, the first Jew put his hand on his sheath, talked proudly, and, tugging on his sword, asked his comrade if he thought he should kill the Franciscan. The lay brother approached, and so did the other Jew. “*Du narr sich das du unsz beyde ze schaden bringst*”: “you’re making an idiot of yourself that you bring us both into danger,” said the Jewish companion. And so chastened, they both rode off, having caused no injury.² The Franciscans continued to town and immediately brought

¹ Surely the priest’s *socius*, such as a teacher in the convent school or a friar licensed to preach and administer penance in the cloister’s *Terminierhäuser* would enjoy: the priest was not, therefore, a mere conventual of Magdeburg but, given his later activity, likely a convent preacher, so licensed by the bishop to give public sermons. Were he a master of theology one would expect the title to have been used.

² There are three accounts of this incident. One is from two presidents of the Jewish community, probably to be dated 19 May 1492: *Urkundenbuch der Stadt Magdeburg*, ed. Gustav Hertel, 3 vols. (Halle, 1892–1896), 3.450–451 no. 799 (hereafter cited as UB Magdeburg). Another is a report of the archbishop of Magdeburg’s bailiff in the city, the so-called Mollvogt (or “minor bailiff”), Hans Reynhart, to an unknown party identified only as *Achtbar und hochgelarter gunstiger herr und furderer*, probably some kind of counsel of the archbishop or the city council, and dated 25 May 1492. This account stresses his attempt to pursue the investigation for the sake of providing the Jews justice: UB Magdeburg, 3.451–454 no. 800. The third is a report by the same bailiff to the archbishop of his investigation of the Franciscans, dated 3 June 1492: UB Magdeburg, 3.455–456 no. 802. This last reference provides the details of the original assault. The earlier Jewish appeal to the archbishop, however, also indicates that the allegation against the Jews involves two traveling Jews and two Franciscans, one Jew threatening one of the Franciscans. The case is treated very briefly by Gudrun Wittek, “Franziskanische Friedensvorstellungen und Stadtfrieden. Möglichkeiten und Grenzen franziskanischen Friedewirkens in mitteldeutschen Städten

a complaint against the Jew to the archbishop's bailiff in the city, the so-called Mollvogt, Hans Reynhart.³ Reynhart later claimed that he learned of the event within an hour and a half and immediately rode out with his servant (*knecht*) to chase down the offenders and to bring them back to town. He came upon them not far from the city and chased them two miles into a village, where they hid and remained undiscovered.⁴ Back in Magdeburg, the archbishop instructed the bailiff to investigate secretly and to ask the two presidents of the Jewish community privately to give an account.⁵ But Reynhart soon learned the limits of discretion. The very next day a count complained of the threat against the Franciscan, the first indication that the Franciscans might use their patrons and public to manipulate the case. Reynhart asked him to keep the matter quiet, lest the guilty be forewarned and fail to return to Magdeburg, where, he assured the count, he was waiting to haul them into court to determine the truth.⁶ On Jubilate Sunday, three impatient weeks after Easter, the Franciscan revealed the affair from his pulpit and called upon his "brother" blacksmith and shoemaker journeymen, that is, members of confraternities at the cloister, to take vengeance.⁷ The obliging journeymen waited until the next Sunday, when fifty or sixty of them gathered in the hour after mealtime in the new market before the cathedral. There they attacked an innocent Jew, mortally wounding him and forcing the other Jews in the market to flee.

The two presidents of the Jewish community then made their own complaint, first to the city council, who referred them to the bailiff, and then to Reynhart, who now surely found himself in the potentially uncontrollable situation he had hoped to avoid by keeping mat-

im Spätmittelalter," in *Bettelorden und Stadt*, ed. by Dieter Berg (Werl, 1992), 167–168.

³ According to all three accounts.

⁴ UB Magdeburg, 3.455–456 no. 802. The Mollvogt claims that he came upon the two Jews a mere mile from the town, this one and a half hours after the event, which makes little sense as fact or distortion.

⁵ According to their appeal and Reynhart's report to an anonymous counsel. UB Magdeburg, 3.450–451 no. 799, 3.451–454 no. 800.

⁶ UB Magdeburg, 3.455–456 no. 802.

⁷ According to all three accounts, the bailiff's first account to an anonymous counsel being the most informative. UB Magdeburg, 3.451–454 no. 800. Easter was 22 April in 1492. Jubilate Sunday was 13 May. For journeymen and their increasing participation in urban communities in the fifteenth century, see the summary treatment by Eberhard Isenmann, *Die deutsche Stadt im Spätmittelalter* (Stuttgart, 1988), 326–335. The professions of baker, tailor, shoemaker, and smith were especially dependent upon relatively large numbers of journeyman laborers. Isenmann, *Die deutsche Stadt*, 327.

ters secret.⁸ He went to the blacksmith journeymen: "Why have you brought down the Jews who enjoy my lord's freedom?" Confidently, the youth told him about the sermon, "about which I formerly knew nothing," and they "pressed forward and said if I wanted to protect the Jews, I should give them ten Gulden, and I would be left alone." Reynhart "noticed their unreasonableness" and, by his account, gently reminded them of his duty: "dear young men, I think the Jews had scarcely anything to do with that [incident], but nevertheless I must determine this" and decide the case before the house of the mint or the Red Door (of the cathedral?) in conformity with the freedom of the new market and the rights of the archbishop.⁹ He withdrew to his court, the Molhof, and sent for forty armed men. The journeymen meanwhile figured they were in trouble and quickly sent an embassy to the Molhof asking that they not be expelled from the archbishop's territory but retain the right of free movement during the investigation, which Reynhart granted after gaining their promise to cease violence in the new market, promising in turn to bring the case to a close within fourteen days.

The city council came to Reynhart, after, we may safely assume, the blacksmith journeymen, having bought time, went to the Rathaus. The day after Jubilate Sunday, Reynhart left town on business. While he was gone, the council closed the Old City to the Jews, which cut the Jews off from the market located in the Old City next to the still incomplete, massive cathedral.¹⁰ When the bailiff returned on Thursday, he found a summons awaiting him to appear before three council members (*rethe*) and the city's prestigious and influential judges, the Magdeburg Schöppen. At the Rathaus they gave him a long harangue about his violation of the freedom of the new market when he took the case of the blacksmith journeymen. The tirade regressed into a four-hour debate about urban and archiepiscopal jurisdictions, at which neither bailiff nor council would compromise their authority.¹¹ The next morning, a

⁸ UB Magdeburg, 3.450–451 no. 799. The sole jurisdiction of the archbishop's court over the Jews was affirmed in conclusion to a conflict with the city in 1432. *Germania Judaica*, 3/2.774 and n. 54.

⁹ This and the following is from Reynhart's report to an anonymous counsel, UB Magdeburg, 3.451–454 no. 800.

¹⁰ *Germania Judaica*, 3/2.772 for Jewish settlement in the city.

¹¹ UB Magdeburg, 3.451–454 no. 800. This implies that Reynhart agreed with the presidents of the Jewish community that the council could have acted to protect the Jews. UB Magdeburg, 3.450–451 no. 799.

number of Jews tried to pass through town on their way to the nearby cloister of Berge, and they were attacked and chased. Again, Reynhart complained to the council. When the council answered with a lame apology and disclaimer of responsibility, the bailiff wrote to his lord the archbishop, assuring him that he did not cease to insist that the council respect the archiepiscopal jurisdiction.

It was only then, when the matter seemed hopelessly deadlocked, both to the peril of the Magdeburg Jews and to the peril of the fragile peace between city and prince, that Reynhart went to the Franciscans. There he received his fullest account of events and was confirmed in his belief that the Jubilate sermon “made the matter bigger than it really is” (*die ding grosser dan an sich selbsz ist gemacht*) or, he should have said, bigger than it really *was*.¹² He came to the guardian and other prominent men of the cloister, including the preacher, and told them he was astounded how such a thoughtless sermon could bring about a murder in the new market and all manner of evil. The guardian pardoned himself with a torrent of words (*mit etlichen Worten taliter qualiter*) and told how the Jew threatened the Franciscan. Reynhart responded by impounding the cloister’s property, to which the guardian responded, “like a prisoner’s mother” (*wie wol des gefangnen mutter spricht*), that he had nothing of his own and would appeal immediately to the archbishop’s chancery regarding both the cloister and the confraternity of blacksmith journeymen.

This was a well-practiced procedure. The guardian would appeal to the archbishop as “conservator” of the rights and privileges received from the apostolic see and carefully preserved in various Franciscan archives in Germany. His appeal, which, together with the archbishop’s response, is not extant, may well have included a request to republish notarized copies of documents stating juridical immunities.¹³ Thus his response to the bailiff amounted to an assertion of the propriety of all Franciscan actions and an acceptance of their popular effects. In other words, the conflict was now deadlocked, and the archbishop bided his time.

¹² UB Magdeburg, 3.455–456 no. 802, the last account to the archbishop, dated 3 June 1492.

¹³ Two surviving registers from the administration of Ernst of Brandenburg contain no additional documentation pertaining to this conflict. Magdeburg Staatsarchiv, Copiale 68 and Copiale 69, Litterarium des Administrators Ernsts, 2 vols., 1476–1491, 1492–1512.

Within months it seemed that new allegations confirmed Franciscan and popular fears of Jewish violence, namely the alleged host desecrations at Sternberg, a city several days' journey to the north of Magdeburg, where five hosts were believed to have been desecrated at a Jewish wedding in July of that same year. The archbishop now followed popular opinion and, in 1493, on the grounds of "unseemly activity against the church and its law," expelled the Jews from his territories. The synagogue meanwhile was converted into a chapel of the Blessed Virgin and the cemetery into a field.¹⁴ Events at Magdeburg lacked the power of legend; they were, as the bailiff noted, grossly exaggerated. But distant stories amplified the perceptions of local events. An account of the Sternberg allegation and the ensuing investigation by the two dukes of Mecklenburg between August and October of 1492 was published at Magdeburg along with a pamphlet more generally attacking the Jews.¹⁵ These stories conveniently suggested atrocities of great magnitude. Together with accounts of the alleged martyrdom of Simon of Trent, they constituted the first wave of a swelling cheap literature that would publish and republish the expansive repertoire of anti-Semitic themes in Germany.¹⁶ The Sternberg and Simon of Trent pamphlets publicized host desecration and ritual murder. A decade later there followed Johannes Pfefferkorn's popular accounts of the blasphemies of the Talmud and the dangers of Jewish books generally, which included his own aggressive, if not gleeful, "Open Letter on the Order of Emperor Maximilian to Confiscate the Books of the Jews," concluding with a threat against Jews written in German with Roman and Hebrew characters: "long ago was Messiah born, which you Jews won't believe, ridicule in consequence you must receive."¹⁷ By the 1520s, previously obscure legends were also published, telling of a race of Jews rising east of the Carpathian mountains under the leadership of the antichrist, whom they welcomed as Messiah, now moving west by way

¹⁴ The archbishop also ordered the city council of the Sudenburg to purchase the Jewish properties, which was never accomplished. *Germania Judaica*, 3/2.778.

¹⁵ *Germania Judaica*, 3/2.1413-1414: in Schwerin, upon the complaint of a priest of Sternberg, the dukes imprisoned "all" the Jews of Mecklenburg and extracted confessions from sixty-five of them. As a result, twenty-five Jewish men and two women were burnt to death before the Luckower Gate of Schwerin.

¹⁶ For Simon of Trent, Wolfgang Treue, *Der Trienter Judenprozess* (Hannover: Hahn, 1996), 285-392.

¹⁷ "Sendschreiben über das Mandat Kaiser Maximilians die Judenbücher zu konfiszieren," in *Ulrichi Hutteni Operum Supplementum*, ed. Edward Böcking, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1869), 2.73-74.

of the Ottoman Empire to terrorize Christians already fretting over the Muslim threat.¹⁸ It was stories such as these that exaggerated misdemeanors and created consensus between parties whose allegiance could by no means be taken for granted: an urban ruling class, rebellious journeymen, an archbishop, and a particular clerical community.

II

The factors that made life difficult for Jews in late medieval Germany went well beyond the evil genius of mendicant theologians. It was a haphazard polemical environment, first because there had been no consistent propaganda effort in central Europe. There seem to have been no preaching campaigns against Jews in Germany until the middle of the fifteenth century, with only one exception, and sermons were seldom compulsory in the same sense that they were in late medieval Italy and Spain, in spite of the Council of Basel's call for obligatory Jewish attendance at annual sermons.¹⁹ There were no formally staged

¹⁸ The notion that the antichrist is a person who poses as a messiah and is received as such by the Jews can be found in a fourth-century Sibylline text, translated and expanded in an eleventh-century Latin version from northern Italy, also in a tenth-century letter of Adso of Montier-en-Der, and in a variety of popular and theological texts (Peter Comestor's *Historia scholastica* playing a decisive role in distribution) since the twelfth century. Scholars have noted a particular florescence of imagery connecting Jews and the antichrist in the fifteenth century, including the belief that the antichrist will emerge from a region east of the Carpathian mountains after being acclaimed Messiah by a hideous race of Jews descended from the ten Jewish tribes that Alexander the Great was believed to have exiled there (identified with Gog and Magog in the Book of Revelation in the New Testament): Klaus Geissler, "Die Juden in mittelalterlichen Texten Deutschlands," *Zeitschrift für bayerische Landesgeschichte*, 38 (1975), 163–226. See also Trachtenberg, *Devil and the Jews*, 36; Andrew Colin Gow, *The Red Jews: Antisemitism in an Apocalyptic Age, 1200–1600* (Leiden, 1995), 103–130. For the belligerent descendants of the ten tribes in Central Asia in pamphlets: *Von einer grossen mennege und gewallt der juden, die lanng zeyt mit unwonnhafftigen graussamen Westen beschlossenn unnd verporgen gewesen, yetzunder ausgeprochen und an tag kommen sein* (published in two versions and warning of a Jewish-Turkish alliance without place or publisher in 1523); *Flugschriften des frühen 16. Jahrhunderts*, Fiche 1304 No. 3374 (with a woodcut title page showing the Jewish army under a banner marked with a Judenhut hiding in the mountains); Fiche 1044 No. 2636 (with a woodcut copying the previous item with very slight variation); Fiche 1659 No. 4279. The history of the legend is treated by Gow, *The Red Jews*. The Dominican Johannes Pfefferkorn was responsible for putting the traditional accusations against the Talmud, together with warnings against all Jewish literature, into the accessible form of pamphlets from 1507 to 1516. *Ulrichi Hutteni Operum Supplementum*, 1.55–90.

¹⁹ The Council of Basel, 6–7 September 1434, considered together and approved

disputations between theologians and rabbis.²⁰ There were no public proceedings against the Talmud, in spite of the Council of Constance's order that dangerous books be confiscated and burned.²¹ Pope Martin

decrees on the union of Byzantine and Roman churches and on the canonical restrictions of Jews. The council stipulated—along with distinct clothing, a prohibition of sale or pawn of church property, and prohibitions of Jews having Christian servants, of Christian participation in Jewish celebrations, and of Jewish possession of public offices—annual sermons to Jews at which attendance was compulsory; the preaching was to be reinforced by *alia humana officia* offered by preachers and bishops. Heinz Schreckenberg, *Die christlichen Adversus-Judaeos-Texte und ihr literarisches und historisches Umfeld* (13.–20 Jh.), v. 497 of *Europäische Hochschulschriften* (New York, 1994), 494–497. J. Alberigo, *Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Decreta* (Bologna, 1973), 483–484. *Concilium Basiliense*, 8 vols. (Basel, 1896–1936), 3.197–198.

²⁰ Peter Browe, *Die Judenmission in Mittelalter und die Päpste*, v. 6 of *Miscellanea Historiae Pontificiae* (Rome, 1942), 29–33, noted that, in contrast with Spain, there was very little compulsory preaching to Jews in Germany. Nicolaus III in 1278 ordered the OFM provincial in Austria and the *magister generalis* OP to select appropriate men to preach to the Jews, and to take recourse to the secular arm in order to accomplish this, which order Browe assumes must have circulated, e.g., it can be found noted in the *Annales Colmarienses* of the OP convent of Colmar under the year 1279. But there is no evidence that the order was followed to any notable extent. The only fourteenth-century example of such a sermon to Jews is from Prague, where the Augustinian canon Konrad Waldhäuser in 1360 is said to have attracted many Jewish men and women to his sermons.

²¹ The Council of Constance ordered the burning of dangerous books, meaning, most likely, the Talmud. See Schreckenberg, *Adversus-Judaeos-Texte*, 482. The order was followed outside of Germany. One Franciscan inquisitor, Pons Feugeyron, was thrice commissioned to censure those who used the errors of the Talmud to dislodge converts from Judaism from their new faith in France. See Simonsohn, *Apostolic See*, pp. 658–661 no. 583–584 (30 August 1409); pp. 667–669 no. 590 (3 February 1418); pp. 674–677 no. 594 (24 July 1418); pp. 824–826 no. 705 (24 February 1435). At the time of the Disputation of Tortosa (7.2.1413–13.11.1414), in 1413, the pope summoned Jews who had left, against papal instructions, to appear and to answer for the points at which the Talmud contradicts Mosaic law (Simonsohn, *Apostolic See*, pp. 574–576 no. 521); soon after (1415), the pope, in Valencia, ordered the collection of copies of the Talmud on the authority of decrees of Gregory IX and Innocent IV (Simonsohn, *Apostolic See*, pp. 594–595 no. 538). Later in the century, Sixtus IV admonished King Ferdinand I of Naples to aid a Dominican inquisitor there to inquire into and suppress the Talmud and Jewish challenges to Christianity, to act against Judaizing Christians and converts, and to require the support of Italian bishops (Simonsohn, *Apostolic See*, pp. 1244–1245 no. 998); the pope nevertheless granted permission for the publication of the Talmud at Venice in 1520. Simonsohn, *Apostolic See*, pp. 1601–1602 no. 1277, (Bavaria, 1476): Duke Albrecht IV donated forty-two Hebrew manuscripts to the Dominican cloister (where Peter Schwartz was prior); one would presume that the books had been confiscated by the duke when Jews were imprisoned in Regensburg in connection with the Simon of Trent affair (see also note 28, below), but this seems to have been an isolated incident. B. Walde, *Christliche Hebraisten Deutschlands am Ausgang des Mittelalters* (Münster, 1916), 74–82, with a list of the titles.

V reissued the papal bull *Sicut judeis* in 1422, with his famous prohibition of the excesses of mendicant and “other” preachers. The preachers were prohibiting all social intercourse between Christians and Jews and thus gave encouragement to “very many Christians” to accuse Jews of causing epidemics by poisoning wells and of mixing human blood into their Passover matzos. The document gives the impression that such preaching could be found everywhere. When Martin revoked his rescript just one year later, perhaps under the influence of the Observant Franciscan, John of Capistrano (he was a public preacher in Rome for the jubilee of 1422), the revocation was sent to the pope’s cardinal legate in Bohemia and parts of Germany. The dispatch implies at least an interest in minimizing obstructions of preaching aimed at Jews in one part of the Holy Roman Empire.²² Indeed, Rabbi Yom Tov Lipmann of Mühlhausen boasted that he debated Christians in Prague and various places of south- and east-central Europe. A disputant of 1399 was the Jewish convert known as Pesach Peter; the debate was conducted in German at an uncertain location. This debate, which has probably wrongly been assumed to eventuate a pogrom that took eighty Jewish lives at Prague, prompted Lipmann to write his *Sepher Nizzachon Yaśan* soon after, probably in Cracow, rebutting Christian arguments, if not to serve as an example to erstwhile debaters, at least to spread confidence in the theological grounds for Jewish resistance.²³ But Lipmann nevertheless does not give evidence of an organized Christian polemical campaign.

An interest of the early 1420s in organized preaching against Jews was very new in central Europe and not immediately consequential. It had most to do with fears of Hussites whose armies were at that very moment devastating churches throughout Bohemia and Moravia, where, as Israel Jacob Yuval has recently pointed out, there was wide-

²² Simonsohn, *Apostolic See*, pp. 711–713 no. 614 for Martin V’s *Sicut judeis*, dated 20 February 1422; pp. 720–721 no. 620 for the revocation. The revocation is cited as Rome, 1 February 1423, and is addressed to all prelates and sent to cardinal Branda, papal legate to Bohemia and parts of Germany. The reason: “Nos igitur, accendentes, quod in concessione prefatarum litterarum, si forsan a nobis emanasse reperiantur, ut prefertur, fuimus circumventi, et propterea eas, tamquam a nobis per huiusmodi circumventionem et importunitatem extortas, merito inefficaces et invalidas reputantes ...” For Capistrano’s influence, see Johannes Hofer, *Johannes Kapistrano: Ein Leben im Kampf um die Reform der Kirche*, 2 vols., 2nd ed. (Heidelberg, 1964), 1.107.

²³ Browe, *Judenmission*, 68–69. Schreckenberg, *Adversus-Judaeos-Texte*, 424–425. For the location of the disputation and the lack of evidence for its connection with the pogrom, *Germania Judaica*, 3/2.1146 n. 293.

spread fear that Jews were allying themselves with heretical armies.²⁴ In this defensive atmosphere, a compulsory sermon took place before the Jews of Vienna at the Habsburg capitol in 1420 at the invitation of Duke Albrecht V, and a new allegation of host desecration in Enns provided the convenient pretext for a very ineffective expulsion that was otherwise known to be provoked purely by the fear of Bohemian heretics.²⁵ Judging by subsequent papal rescripts, the original *Sicut judeis*

²⁴ This may have been a distortion of the Jewish reaction to the threat they felt by crusaders passing through Germany from Brabant; Jews thus applauded Hussite victories as evidence of divine protection of themselves, as vividly reported by Salman of St. Goar's *Gilgul bne Chuschim* (History of the Hussites): "they laid waste the churches of the entire land, burned the images with fire, and struck down with the sword the clergy who held fast the faith in a mere man. They sliced their tonsures with knives and poured pitch on the wounds. And they tortured them more, in the following manner: they took a big cask and loosened the rings, placed a group of clergy around it facing one another, naked, clamped their genitals between the boards of the cask and tightened the rings again; so did they remain clamped until they died. Such and sundry tortures were inflicted upon those who held fast to the faith in a mere man." Israel Jacob Yuval, "Juden, Hussiten und Deutsche nach einer hebräischen Chronik," *Juden in der christlichen Umwelt während des späten Mittelalters*, Beiheft 13 of *Zeitschrift für historische Forschung* (Berlin, 1992), 59–102, esp. 70–78, 66–67, 96–97.

²⁵ Yuval notes that this defensive posture accounts better for a shift in polemics from rational persuasion to compulsion at the Council of Constance that had been earlier observed by M.H. Shank, "*Unless You Believe, You Shall Not Understand*": *Logic, University, and Society in Late Medieval Vienna* (Princeton, 1988), 139–200. See Yuval, "Juden," 65–66 n. 25. Shank dated Langenstein's loss of confidence in rational argument to the early 1390s. There is evidence for the shift in views of biblical language that Langenstein develops in lectures begun in 1385. See Christopher Ocker, *Biblical Poetics Before Humanism and Reformation* (Cambridge, 2002), 169. The preacher of 1420 was the university professor Nicolaus Prunczlein of Dinkelsbühl. On 23 April 1421, some Jews were burnt in Vienna, but the exact connection with Nicolaus's preaching is not clear. We also know that Nicolaus pleaded with the duke for the confiscation of Jewish books. Alois Madre, *Nikolaus von Dinkelsbühl: Leben und Schriften* (Münster, 1965), 36 n. 164, 128–131. Schreckenberg, *Adversus-Judaeos-Texte*, 497. The danger of Hussitism as ground of expulsion was clearly indicated in a bull of Martin V granting license to convert the now vacant synagogue of Iglau into a parish church. The pope would have learned of this rationale from the city council's petition. Simonsohn, *Apostolic See*, pp. 748–750 no. 643 (1 February 1427, Rome): Martin V writes to the provost of the church of Mount St. Peter in Brno to allow the people of Iglau (Ihlava) to convert the local synagogue into a church. The Jews were expelled by Albert V, duke of Austria and marquis of Moravia, because of the risk of importing heresies from Bohemia. The petition was sent from the burgomaster, council, and city of Iglau. Duke Albert expelled the Jews from Iglau and gave their houses to the Christians of the town. The reason for the expulsion is that the Jews entertained in their houses people from nearby Bohemia, where heresy was rampant ("quod per Iudeos, qui in suis domibus in dicto opido, etiam inibi synagogam habentes, inter Christifideles moram tunc trahebant, communitati huiusmodi ac ipsius opidi habitatoribus et incolis, a regno Boemie, quo plerique perfidi et heresum erroribus implicati Christianique nominis inimici versantur, non longe distantibus, gravia possent

of Martin V could only obstruct anti-Jewish preachers in Italy, southern France, and parts of Spain.²⁶ Germany was of little consequence.

By the middle of the fifteenth century, there is scattered evidence that preaching against and debate with Jews increased. But we know

damna animarumque periculo detestabiliter instaurari"). Since the expulsion, the burgomaster, council, and people, who are many, converted the sumptuous synagogue into a chapel to the Body of the Lord, the Blessed Virgin, the ten thousand martyrs, and other saints, richly endowing it with benefices for the celebration of masses and divine offices for feast days, retaining the patronage rights; the burgomaster, council, and people also noted that many churches around the town were destroyed by the heretics and one parish church in the town was almost destroyed. The pope grants this. See Joseph Wertheimer, *Die Juden in Oesterreich* (Leipzig, 1842), 98–100, 155 n. 18a for the text of the condemnation of 12 March 1421, which notes that Duke Albrecht ordered that "Alle Jüdischait in seinem Lanndt oberhalb und nyderhalb der Enns zu seinen Händen zu nenen, der die untz Her in vankchnus gehalten hatt vor der hanndlung wegen, die sich laider an dem Heiligen Sacrament vor ettlaihen Jarn datz Enns vergangen hatt." It was, according to the document, the Messnerin's testimony, after she was brought to Vienna, that fingered a Jewish man and woman as purchasers of her hosts. She claimed they then distributed them to other Jews "Inner Landes und Ausser Lanndes"; the Jewish man and woman are also said to have confessed. "Und wann manigleich woll verstett, das einem zugleich Christen Menschen Müglichen sol zu hetzen gen, das die unere und Schmachhait, die got und Christenleichen glauben von den Juden, die da sind veint gots, ernstlichen und Strengigleichen gepesset werden, Al der obgenant Unser genadiger Herr alle Judischait allenthalben in seinem Landt auf hewtigem tag geschehen zu Richten mit dem prannt Actum in die Gregorii, Anno etc. MCCC-CXXI." Wertheimer already pointed out that the expulsion affected only Jews in ducal cities. Those subject to the country nobility were unaffected. In 1462, the Landfriede of Tulln stipulated the removal of Jews from the countryside. In the other Austrian lands—Steiermark, Kärnten, Krain—the conflict lasted until the year 1495. Wertheimer, *Die Juden in Oesterreich*, 103. And although the 1421 decree did not bring an end to Jews in the cities, not even in Vienna, it did mark a turn from the traditional privileges and freedoms they could previously and confidently claim. Wertheimer, *Die Juden in Oesterreich*, 105. In 1496, the lands of Steiermark, Kärnten, and Krain asked Kaiser Maximilian to expel all the Jews, which he did upon receipt of the sum of 40,000 Gulden from those lands. The Jews left Neustadt, Neunkirchen and all of Steiermark almost immediately. Jewish properties in Neustadt, Grätz, Judenburg, Marburg, Kärnten, and Krain were given by the king to the cities. Wertheimer, *Die Juden in Oesterreich*, 107–110.

²⁶ This includes a more cautious restatement of restrictions of abusive preachers in 1429, Simonsohn, *Apostolic See*, pp. 771–774 no. 658 (13 February 1429): Martin V prohibits preachers in Italy, including friars, from arousing the people against the Jews; privileges of Jews are confirmed; excommunication is threatened against transgressors. This document is clearly modeled on the *Sicut judeis* of 1422 (no. 614), repeating several of the complaints but omitting references to well poisoning and blood libel, adding allegations of compulsory sermons and baptism of Jewish children under the age of 12 without parental consent, compelling labor on the Sabbath, affirming the rights of Jews to have schools and cemeteries, as well as their right to purchase Christian property and interact with Christians ("*preterquam in casis a iure prohibitis, in quibus familiaritatem huiusmodi prohibemus*"—there is no reference to wet-nursing, so presumably the author is now better informed as to canon law). A similar rescript was issued by Pius II, 7

only two Christian preachers by name who programatically attempted to address Jews in the Holy Roman Empire, and that with limited success. One was John of Capistrano, who passed through Germany and Poland when he was sent north in 1451 as papal legate and inquisi-

July 1459 (Simonsohn, *Apostolic See*, pp. 1053–1054 no. 858) to the bishop of Spoleto and the vicars of the bishops of Bologna and Ferrara. It addresses a petition by certain named Jews of Bologna, Mutina, Ferrara, Urbino, Toschanella, complaining that mendicant and other friars are preaching in those cities that Christians should have no social contact with Jews, not bake them bread, not provide them fire, nor offer them service (as in the Martin V bull) under the threat of ecclesiastical penalties, thus inciting people to rob and persecute Jews. The bull alleges that the rights of Jews are to be respected on threat of excommunication. The bishop of Spoleto published this bull from Mantua, 27 July 1459, addressing all Italian clergy. Most rescripts, however, contradict the 1422 document. Simonsohn, *Apostolic See*, p. 757 no. 648 (3 August 1427): Martin V ordered the archbishop of Narbonne, the papal chamberlain and vicar general in Avignon, and the Comtat Venaissin, to confiscate bulls given to the Jews and to prohibit Jews from using them. On 5 September 1427, the archbishop published the document. Simonsohn, *Apostolic See*, pp. 866–869 no. 740 (on 8 August 1442): Eugenius IV published restrictions to be imposed upon Jews and Muslims in Castile and Leon. It abolished earlier charters in their favor and imposed all previous restrictions; it also included new prohibitions on social interaction, talking at some length about eating and drinking together, seeking medical care, employment of Jews and Saracens in various business arrangements, etc. Simonsohn, *Apostolic See*, p. 881 no. 745 (19 June 1443, Siena [and presumably aimed at Italy]): Eugenius IV revoked Martin V's privileges to the Jews because they were excessive, as, he said, Martin himself had revoked them (see note 22 above). Simonsohn, *Apostolic See*, pp. 915–917 no. 765 (23 June 1447, Rome): Nicholas V republished no. 740 with reference to Martin V and Eugenius IV's restrictions of Jews and Saracens in Italy; it adds a strongly worded revocation of contrary bulls by Martin V and Eugenius IV and orders "*et per aspersionem sanguinis Domini nostri Ihesu Christi exhortamur*," that archbishops, bishops, princes, temporal lords, *capitaneos*, barons, knights, nobles, communes, and all other Christian persons, ecclesiastical and lay, observe the aforementioned bulls (i.e., of Martin and Eugenius, restricting contact). Significantly, John of Capistrano is appointed the executor of this bull, being granted plenary power to himself and to any deputies he may appoint from his or another order to inquire, admonish, exhort, and solicit princes, prelates, and lords, ecclesiastical and secular, that the terms of the restrictions be followed strictly, and that they may proceed against those who fail so to do and demand observance effectually, imposing ecclesiastical penalties on those who resist with the help of both the ecclesiastical and secular branches. This and the following bulls were likely used to reinforce the activities of preachers who would carry copies of them. Simonsohn, *Apostolic See*, pp. 921–922 no. 768 (Rome, 6 December 1447): Nicholas V confirmed Eugenius IV's revocation of Martin V's *Sicut judeis*, at the petition of Franciscus de Eugubio, OFM. Simonsohn, *Apostolic See*, pp. 1023–1027 no. 837 (28 May 1456): Calixtus III confirmed annulments of Eugenius IV and Nicholas V and repeats restrictions of no. 740. The document refers to Jews and Muslims in Italy and other places. There is no indication of what prompted this document, in connection with the call of a crusade against the Turks. Simonsohn, *Apostolic See*, pp. 1027–1028 no. 838 (28 May 1456): to Petrus de Carchano OFM, *sacre theologie* professor, empowered with those appropriate people whom he might appoint to act against those who fail to comply

tor against the Hussites for Kärnten, Steiermark, and Austria. He addressed Jews in sermons at Vienna and Nürnberg, where they are said to have been compelled to attend, offering proof that Christ fulfilled prophecy.²⁷ Throughout his tour, Capistrano repeated the same themes he had put to good effect in Italy, stressing above all the dangers of any social contact between Christians and Jews and the evils of usury. He was also called upon to join an investigation of an accusation of host desecration that broke out during his tour of Breslau, but he joined the commission after the first executions had taken place and his subsequent role is not altogether clear.²⁸

The other preacher was a Dominican named Peter Schwartz. As a student at Salamanca, Schwartz was said to have studied Hebrew alongside Jewish children; he later studied theology and taught at several universities (Freiburg, Ingolstadt, and Buda, where he died as rector). While a professor of Ingolstadt in 1475 he was invited by the duke of Bavaria-Landshut to preach to the Jews in German in the open court of the residence of the bishop of Regensburg, which he did about a month after Easter over the course of a week (21 to 28 April), one month after the murder of Simon of Trent.²⁹ He also preached

with the previous bull. Johannes Antonio de Imola OESA *sacre pagine* professor was then empowered in the same way. Simonsohn, *Apostolic See*, p. 1029 no. 839 (circa 7 August 1456): Calixtus III wrote to all friars of religious orders that Christians should have no social intercourse with Jews and Saracens. Ludovicus de Fonolletto, *scrutiferus honoris* and papal familiar, would show the letters of restriction (i.e., the previous documents) to them. Simonsohn, *Apostolic See*, pp. 1047–1049 no. 854 (11 March 1459): Pius II to Michael de Morello OP and then to Johannes de Cernosa OFM to proceed against those selling forged indulgences, heretics, and Jews and Muslims who act against Christianity in Spain and France with extension of powers over converts, Christians, clergy, Jews, and Muslims.

²⁷ Browe, *Judenmission*, 29–33.

²⁸ Hofer, *Capistran*, 2.225 (for Capistrano's attempts to isolate Jews from Christians in various places, consider also 1.136, 2.5, 2.293; for his role in the prosecution and persecution of Jews in Breslau in conjunction with an accusation of host desecration in 1453, see 2.209–228, 414–424, which offers a useful presentation of sources, although it is glaringly apologetic). Capistrano joined the panel of judges on 9 July 1453, after 318 Silesian Jews were taken prisoner and two days after the first death sentence was carried out. Hofer, *Capistran*, 2.212. Wojciech Ketrzyski, "De persecutione iudaeorum Vratslaviensium," *Monumenta Poloniae Historica*, 4 (1961), 1–5.

²⁹ Schreckenbergh, *Adversus-Judaeos-Texte*, 544–547. B. Walde, *Christliche Hebraisten*, 70–152. Easter was 26 March in 1475. I know of no direct connection between these sermons and the accusations instigated by Bishop Heinrich IV of Abensberg against Regensburg Jews in the murder of Simon of Trent, although Schwartz would soon participate in the Trent delegation sent to Rome to represent the bishop of Trent's position in the conflict over the investigation between the bishop and the pope. See

in Frankfurt, Bamberg, Worms, and Nürnberg. A Nürnberg chronicle tells how this Dominican came to town, knew good Hebrew, spoke “jüdisch,” and could read the Jews’ books, which ability he flaunted from the high pulpit built just for him on the wall of the collegial church in a square called “unter den Linden.” The first sermon was held on Trinity Sunday (22 May), at which there was such a throng of listeners that a dyer’s journeyman was accidentally killed, preventing the sermon from taking place. Seventeen sermons followed, each delivered on a weekday: Sunday meetings were cancelled because of the crowd, and Saturdays because the Jews refused to come. So confident was he in his preaching, quoting Hebrew from Jewish books and explaining in German, that he was desperate every day after mealtime to dispute with the Jews. But the Jews did not want to dispute; instead they said, we are plausibly told, “he preached well; he says what he wants; no one contradicts him; we can find rabbis who interpret it differently.” They sent to Erlangen for the Rabbi Vogelein, who came but avoided a disputation. Then they brought the most learned rabbi from Bohemia, who came and said it would be nice to meet the monk, and he would love with all his heart to dispute with him, but this, too, came to naught. The monk was, as the chronicle reports, a clever doctor who, when he

Germania Judaica, 3/2.1200 and Treue, *Trienter Judenprozess*, 109. The sermons as such and Schwartz’s other writings do not give evidence of a special role of friars as a group in anti-Jewish polemic in fifteenth-century Germany. In fact, the refusal of rabbis to accept Schwartz’s challenge to disputation frustrated his efforts both at Regensburg in 1475 and at Nürnberg in 1478. The refusal of Jews to dispute, however, did not prevent Schwartz from representing such disputations fictitiously in his writings, by publishing his theses and arguments in the *Tractatus contra perfidos Judeos*, 1475, and by having a woodcut image printed facing the title page of *Der Stern Meschiah*, 1477, in which he is portrayed as a doctor, with two other doctors, disputing three Jews, presumably rabbis. Ernst Weil, “Zu Petrus Negrus Judendisputation,” *Soncino-Blätter*, 3 (1929), 57–62. Contrast R. Hsia, “Witchcraft, Magic, and the Jews in Late Medieval and Early Modern Germany,” in *From Witness to Witchcraft: Jews and Judaism in Medieval Christian Thought*, ed. Jeremy Cohen (Wiesbaden, 1996), 419–433, who points to the role of the Dominican Heinrich of Schlettstett, the famous author of the *Malleus maleficarum*, in assembling ritual murder verdicts from several German cities for the prosecution of Jews at Trent. It is not actually known whether Schlettstett actively preached to Jews. Hsia also noted that the preaching of the Observant Franciscan Bernardino da Feltre at Trent during Lent, 1475, aggravated anti-Semitic feelings there, but this is evidence of Italian influence, not a German mendicant campaign against Jews and Judaism. R. Po-Chia Hsia, *Trent 1475: Stories of a Ritual Murder Trial* (New Haven, 1992), 25, 33. Treue also noted the pronounced role of Observant Franciscans of the Venetian province in spreading Simon of Trent propoganda. Of German friars, he noted only three Dominicans: Heinrich of Schlettstadt, Peter Schwarz, and a certain friar Erhardus. Treue, *Trienter Judenprozess*, 222–224.

found no challenger, drew up and published a letter stating how no Jew would stand up to him.³⁰ Such a spectacle as Schwartz's bilingual sermons did not bear repeating in Germany, where in the 1470s his were very rare gifts indeed.³¹

Only three preachers' handbooks composed in Germany in the fifteenth century reveal an explicit intent to aid the preacher who would convert Jews. One was by a Palatine court theologian, Johannes of Frankfurt, who produced, around the anxious year 1420, a *Concordantiae contra Judeos* with proofs of the agreement of the Old and New Testaments. A second was written by Stephan Bodecker, Premonstratensian and bishop of Brandenburg, which offered rebuttal to Yom Tov Lipmann's *Sefer Nizzachon*. The third was by the Nürnberg Dominican Johannes Herolt, who presented arguments at mid-century against the Talmud and who advocated a tolerance that exceeded that shown to heretics, for whom there could be no tolerance but only extermination.³² None of this suggests anything like a concerted, native clerical effort against Judaism, much less a particular role of friars.

The decisive thing was southern influence. Capistrano brought popular Italian preaching to Germany, and took it with him when he left. Schwartz learned polemics in Castile and hoped to exploit a monopoly of skills by finding Jews for disputations, but to no avail, so he carried on alone. Nicolaus of Cusa passed through Germany as papal legate in 1451 and 1452, supporting and expanding John of Capistrano's campaign to reform mendicant cloisters wherever he went, presiding over ecclesiastical synods, and pushing through restrictions against local Jews that copied what he had seen and admired in Italian cities, including prohibitions of the practice of usury. This happened in the provinces of Cologne and Salzburg and in the dioceses of Bamberg and Würzburg. When Cusa left, emperor, bishops, and the two margraves of Brandenburg quickly appealed to Rome for revocation of the synodal decrees

³⁰ *Chroniken der deutschen Städte*, 10 (1872), 353–354; Browe, *Judenmission*, 69–70.

³¹ Peter Schwartz's *Tractatus contra perfidos Iudeos de condicionibus veri messie ... ex textibus hebraicis*, Esslingen 1475, claims to be a Latin version of the Regensburg sermons. It is presented in the form of a disputation, which, if a reflection of the sermons, would have presented quite a show. There was also an extended German version published in Esslingen in 1477, *Der Stern Meschiah*, which draws heavily from the *Pugio fidei* of Ramon Martí and also cites Paul of Burgos and various rabbis. The *Stern* adds a brief Hebrew grammar in 12 pages which served as an introduction to Hebrew until Reuchlin's *Derudimentis hebraicis*. Schreckenberg, *Adversus-Judaeos-Texte*, 544–547.

³² Schreckenberg, *Adversus-Judaeos-Texte*, 534–535, 502. Browe, *Judenmission*, 100, 293, 309.

and restitution of the common law, which Rome happily granted.³³ In this haphazard polemical environment, people learned that more consistent social policies could be found elsewhere, together with professional, specialized confrontations between Christian theology and Jewish error. Two friars, Capistrano and Schwartz, represented the more sophisticated apologetics of the south, but these two individuals marked no significant shift in Jewish-Christian relations.

Germans did not wait for friars to teach them how to disagree with Jews; they relied instead on a variegated transmission of anti-Jewish ideas and lore. This included a small number of mendicant classics, if you will: the *Epistola ad Rabbi Isaacum* by the Dominican Alphonsus Bonihominis, which was found in many mendicant and other libraries; Nicolaus of Lyra's *Questio de adventu Christi* and his *Responsio ad quendam Iudeum*; and the anonymous *Pharetra fidei contra Judeos super Talmuth*, which circulated widely.³⁴ It included an equally small number of orig-

³³ Simonsohn, *Apostolic See*, pp. 984–985 no. 805 (1 May 1452): a petition of Emperor Friedrich III on behalf of the Jews of Nürnberg, who were placed under ecclesiastical ban when they failed to conform to Cusa's decrees from the Synod of Bamberg on 30 April 1451. Simonsohn, *Apostolic See*, pp. 994–996 no. 812 (20 March 1453): a petition of Anthony of Rotenhan, bishop of Bamberg, who regretted that he published the decrees in the territories of the margraves of Brandenburg, since he believed that he could not enforce the decrees, as he says, without censure. Simonsohn, *Apostolic See*, pp. 1001–1002 no. 816 (15 October 1453): the bishop of Salzburg asked for papal confirmation of customary rights of the Jews in his territories. Simonsohn, *Apostolic See*, pp. 1008–1009 no. 821 (20 April 1455): Calixtus III confirmed Nicholas V's annulment of the Cusa constitutions in Brandenburg, in answer to a petition of Godfrey of Limburg, bishop of Würzburg. For Cologne, Simonsohn, *Apostolic See*, p. 510.

³⁴ Hans Butzmann, *Die mittelalterlichen handschriften der Gruppen Extravagantes: Novi und Novissimi*, v. 15 of *Kataloge der Herzog August Bibliothek Wolfenbüttel* (Frankfurt am Main, 1972), 99–100, for a codex of the middle of the fifteenth century with Lyra in fragment and the *Pharetra*, from a Carthusian monastery of the middle Rhine. See Powitz, for examples from the Dominican and Carmelite cloisters of Frankfurt; G. Powitz, *Die Handschriften des Dominikanerklosters und des Leonhardstifts in Frankfurt am Main* (Frankfurt, 1968), 139, 170 (the *Pharetra* and Lyra were once in the library of the Dominicans in Frankfurt). G. Powitz, H. Buck, *Die Handschriften des Bartholomaeusstifts und des Karmeliterklosters im Frankfurt am Main* (Frankfurt, 1974), 25, 222, 325, 366 (Alphonsus and Lyra were once in the libraries of Carmelites and a collegial church in Frankfurt). Schreckenberger, *Adversus-Judaeos-Texte*, 335–336. Gilbert Dahan, *Les intellectuels chrétiens et les juifs au moyen âge* (Paris, 1990), 413. Lyra's quodlibetals on Judaism circulated under various titles: *Contra judeos*, *Disputatio*, *Tractatus de Messia*. Dahan, *Les intellectuels chrétiens*, 415. Dahan is currently preparing a repertory of Christian polemical texts from the eleventh to the fifteenth centuries, which will permit conclusions more definite than mine. Dahan, *Les intellectuels chrétiens*, 406 n. 216. Of the fourteenth- and fifteenth-century manuscripts of Lyra's *Questio* with a German provenance studied by Deana Klepper, only four definitely originated with mendicant theologians. Deana Copeland Klepper, "Nicholas of

inal works by friars: a treatise *Contra judeos* said to have been written by the Carmelite Johannes of Hildesheim in the mid-fourteenth century; the preaching handbooks of the Dominican Johannes Herolt, written a century later; and the *Tractatus contra perfidos Iudeos* and the *Stern Meschiah* of the Dominican Peter Schwartz.³⁵ Secular theologians added much more to the polemical ballast, repeating biblical arguments and anti-Talmudic themes that had become common since the twelfth century: an anonymous *Disputacio wider die juden* of the fourteenth century that defends Christianity from the charge of idolatry; the sermons preached by Nicolaus Prunczlein of Dinkelsbühl to the Jews of Vienna in 1420, which were published at Strasbourg in 1496; the Concordance of Johannes of Frankfurt; the bishop of Brandenburg, Stephan Bodecker's rebuttal of Yom Tov Lipmann's *Sefer Nizzachon*; an anonymous *Tractatus de Antichristo* composed between 1460 and 1470 in Austria, which included offensive excerpts from the Talmud and a rendition of the eighteenth benediction against *minim*, a typical rabbinical term for Christians; an anonymous south German *Bewährung dass die Juden irren* from 1466, which draws on Jerome, Nicolaus of Lyra, and Nicolaus of Dinkelsbühl to rebut thirteen Jewish arguments; a section of Dionysius the Carthusian's *Dialogion de fide catholica*; the ninth, tenth, twelfth through nineteenth, and twenty-fifth chapters of an anonymous *Seelenwurzgarten* published 1483 at Ulm, which rebut Jewish beliefs and arguments, taking material from Nicolaus of Lyra, Nicolaus of Dinkelsbühl, Jerome, and probably Peter Schwartz (the treatise also includes a woodcut image depicting a Christian-Jewish disputation modeled on the fictional representation included in Schwartz's *Der Stern Meschiah*); and the *Liber de confutatione hebrayce secte* by the Jewish convert, Johannes Batista Gratia Dei, published in Strasbourg in 1500.³⁶ From this alone it is clear that German friars could not stand out as special opponents

Lyra's *Questio de adventu Christi* and the Franciscan Encounter with Jewish Tradition in the Middle Ages" (Ph.D. diss., Northwestern University, 1995), chapter 6.

³⁵ Schreckenberg, *Adversus-Judaeos-Texte*, 399, 534–535, 544–547.

³⁶ Schreckenberg, *Adversus-Judaeos-Texte*, 389, 497, 502, 515–518, 531–532, 532–533, 539–540, 569–571. *Oberrheinische Chronik*, ed. F.K. Grieshaber (Rastatt, 1850), pp. v–vi, for the fourteenth-century disputation. Walde, *Christliche Hebraisten*, 30–63, esp. 31 n. 1 for Stephan Bodecker. Dionysius Cartusianus, *Dialogon de fide catholica*, vii, *Opera omnia*, 42 vols. (Tournai, 1900–1913), 18.271–530, esp. 472–509. Weil, "Petrus Nigris Judendisputation," 57–61 for the *Seelenwurzgarten*. Browe, *Judenmission*, 100, 105, for the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. For the traditional themes (interpretation of prophecies, Trinity, advent of the Messiah, Christian cult and Eucharist, and the chronological limits of Judaism), see Dahan, *Les intellectuels*, 473–508.

of the Jews, nor did German polemicists contribute substantially to anti-Jewish apologetics; of this literature, only the works of Schwartz and Gratia Dei approached their task in any original way, making new arguments from the interpretation of prophecy in both the Talmud and Kabbalah.³⁷

A variety of other texts propagated a mixture of traditional polemic and anti-Semitic caricature, and these attest to the variety of media in Germany that communicated Christian hostility to Jews. Moral and lyrical poems, plays, and verse-legends established the theological superiority of Christian beliefs by repeating traditional apologetic themes, and they cultivated an image of the Jew as enemy of Christian society, giving popular momentum to the idea that they were a social problem, a question. Vernacular writers often pointed to usury as evidence of a Jewish role in the decay of human welfare, even in relatively nonpolemical works, like the long moral poem of Hugo of Trimberg, rector of the cathedral school in Bamberg at the turn of the thirteenth to fourteenth centuries. Satirical poems made their point less reluctantly, such as the anonymous *Des Teufels Netz*, a dialogue composed in the region of Lake Constance in the first half of the fifteenth century, in which a devil and a hermit attack the vices of all social groups in their turn, who are then systematically hauled off by the devil to hell in a net.³⁸

The dangers of usury were vividly depicted in a legend composed in the second half of the fifteenth century and first published at Bamberg in 1493. In an unnamed city of the northwest, a wealthy merchant, after foolishly wasting his rich inheritance, pawns a pound of fat from his side to a Jew, the first of several mistakes. He tries to repay when the term comes to its end, but the lender is suddenly nowhere to be found. Three days later, the Jew refuses to take the money, insisting instead on the fulfillment of the contract. The case goes to King Karl, known for his justice. The plot thickens. On the way to the castle, a child walks under the merchant's horse and gets killed. The father, who blames the

³⁷ But this form of argumentation was first developed in the twelfth century, as Amos Funkenstein first pointed out. Amos Funkenstein, "Basic Types of Christian Anti-Jewish Polemics in the Later Middle Ages," *Viator*, 2 (1971), 373–382 (in Hebrew, *Zion*, 33 [1968], 125–144).

³⁸ Schreckenberg, *Adversus-Judaeos-Texte*, 345–346, 486. For Trimberg, cf. E.G. Gudde, *Social Conflicts in Medieval German Poetry* (Berkeley, 1934), 54, who believed he had a "comparatively tolerant attitude toward the Jews." See especially Hugo von Trimberg, *Der Renner*, ed. G. Ehrismann, 2 vols., (Tübingen, 1908, 1909), 1.202–203, lines 4865–4908.

merchant, brings this crime also to the king, at the suggestion of the Jews. At the castle, waiting for the king, the merchant experiences a third misfortune: in his well-earned anxiety he falls asleep and plunges from a window onto a knight, whom he also kills. When the son of the knight seeks vengeance, the son is opposed by the Jew who is still waiting for his pound of fat. So the case comes to the wise king, who could scarcely deny the first creditor to have a claim to the knight's flesh. But Karl traps the Jew by decreeing his execution if he would cut out any more or any less than exactly one pound from the merchant's side.³⁹

Popular literature often associated the problem of usury with the nobility, who also stood to profit from the exploitation of simple Christians. In the story of the rich merchant, a Jewish attempt to take advantage of direct access to the king is turned on its head, but popular literature more commonly assumed a collusion of high nobility and Jewish moneylenders. Moral poems instruct the nobility to stop giving support to Jewish usurers, even though it is against their own interest to exploit so enriched Jews.⁴⁰ To this is added an insistence on the strict separation of Jews and Christians and demonstrations of the superiority of Christian doctrine over Jewish unbelief.⁴¹ The superiority of Christian faith

³⁹ Schreckenbergh, *Adversus-Judaeos-Texte*, 547.

⁴⁰ The *Evangelium Nicodemi* of the knight Heinrich von Hesler, writing in the first quarter of the fourteenth century. Schreckenbergh, *Adversus-Judaeos-Texte*, 360–361. Gudde, *Social Conflicts*, 40–41. The *Ritterspiegel* of Johannes Rothe, city scribe at Eisenach, head of the school connected with the cathedral school and later canon there and chaplain of the countess Anna, warned knights against Jews and Christian usurers, referring to both as *Blutsauger*. Schreckenbergh, *Adversus-Judaeos-Texte*, 497–498. Gudde, *Social Conflicts*, 96–97. The lyrical poet, Muskatblut, who was active in upper Franconia in the first half of the fifteenth century (he died sometime after 1438), addresses princes with an allegation that Jewish faith ruins Christendom and argues that every usurer should be required to wear a Judenhut. Schreckenbergh, *Adversus-Judaeos-Texte*, 501. A passion play from the middle Rhine, composed between 1330 and 1340, alludes to the same theme when it depicts the high priests of the gospel opposing Christ ostensibly on religious pretexts but truly out of the desire for political power. Schreckenbergh, *Adversus-Judaeos-Texte*, 369–370.

⁴¹ Heinrich of Hesler repeats traditional allegations of deicide and alleges self-cultivated resistance to belief in Christ's divinity. Schreckenbergh, *Adversus-Judaeos-Texte*, 360–361. The *Disputatz eines Freiheit mit einem Juden*, "A Disputation of a Vagabond and a Jew," attributed to the Nürnberg artisan and poet Hans Rosenplüt (active in the middle of the fifteenth century), seems surprisingly inconclusive and may be a parody of Jewish-Christian disputation. Schreckenbergh, *Adversus-Judaeos-Texte*, 520–521. For questions regarding Rosenplüt's authorship, see Jörn Reichel, *Der Spruchdichter Hans Rosenplüt* (Stuttgart, 1985), 96, 219. For calls for separation, consider *Des Teufels Netz* (note

was dramatically portrayed in fictional disputations, both in poems and in Passion and Corpus Christi plays. Barthel of Regensburg, a *Meistersinger* active from the Tirol to northern Germany in the early fourteenth century, who, with Seifried Helbling, carries the ignoble distinction of being one of the most anti-Semitic poets of medieval Germany, wrote a lyrical disputation called *Die blinden juden*. In this work, a Jew is called out to a tournament, a debate, by which medium the poet offers up standard proof-texts for the messianic identity of Christ and the virgin birth, interspersed with aggressive epithets: *Ich hazze iuch Juden sunder maze* ("I hate you Jews more than anything"), *ach Jud, wie bistu so versteinet* ("egads, Jews, how are you so hardened"), *Jud, du rehtes lastervaz, du rehter lasterbalk* ("Jew, you true fountain of vice, you vice-trestle").⁴² The Frankfurt *Dirigierrolle*, a scroll providing the rudiments of a Passion play performed over two days on the eastern side of the Frankfurt Römerberg, near the cathedral and close to the market, was produced sometime before 1350. It includes an introductory prophet play, hosted by Saint Augustine, which presents seven Old Testament prophets who offer standard messianic interpretations of scripture, while a chorus of Jews bearing contemporary names (such as Liebermann, Syzekint, Kalman, and Selegmann) jeer at them. In answer to the mockery, Augustine offers the play as evidence to support the prophets. The play is followed by a disputation between Ecclesia and Synagoga: the disputation produces converts when, at the end of it, a few members of the Jewish chorus accept baptism. The *Dirigierrolle* served as the basis of a Frankfurt Passion play in 1493. That play further exaggerated the original caricatures of Jews and their opposition to Christian teaching.⁴³ Likewise, a Corpus Christi play written in 1479 in the east Franconian dialect survives only in production notes. The performance would go over several days, covering all salvation history from the creation of the angels to the final judgment. The third part (from John the Baptist to the end of time) includes a disputation between Ecclesia and Synagoga, witnessed

37, above); the *Disputatz* of Rosenplüt (Schreckenberg, *Adversus-Judaeos-Texte*, 520–521); various songs of the Meistersinger Michel Beheim (d. 1474 or 1478), active at various courts in southern Germany (Schreckenberg, *Adversus-Judaeos-Texte*, 547–552); and the allegorical poem based on the pieces of a chess board, the *Schachzabelbuch*, composed in 1337 by Konrad of Ammenhausen, a monk who later became pastor in the canton of Schaffhausen (Schreckenberg, *Adversus-Judaeos-Texte*, 371–372).

⁴² Schreckenberg, *Adversus-Judaeos-Texte*, 355–356. Gudde, *Social Conflicts*, 71.

⁴³ Schreckenberg, *Adversus-Judaeos-Texte*, 387–388. R. Steinbach, *Die deutschen Oster- und Passionsspiele des Mittelalters* (Vienna, 1970), 141–164.

by a chorus of children from the Jewish school. One of the Jewish boys addresses, to the public, his doubts about the virgin birth and the divinity of Jesus, and another boy mocks the Christians for their confidence in the clergy. The church is represented by a *rector processionis* (in later versions, a *rector ludi*), who argues that Jesus' identity as Messiah can be known from Jewish books. Synagoga, apparently played by a man (there is a reference to circumcision) attacks the virginity of Mary. The rector answers with Isaiah 7:14 and an allegory of the burning bush (burning but not consumed, often taken to refer to Mary's perpetual virginity; cf. Exod 3:1–6). The disputation then treats typical apologetic themes, such as transubstantiation (allegory of Exod 16:1, manna), the Trinity (Gen 18:1ff., Abraham and the three men), and the expulsion of the Jews on account of five particular misdeeds: the sale of Joseph, the worship of the golden calf at Horeb, the murder of Jeremiah and Zachariah (with the penalty of seventy years of Babylonian captivity), and the killing of Jesus (destruction of the temple as penalty, leaving the Jews a subject people to this day, we are told). Synagoga remains steadfastly opposed to Christianity and declares that he would rather be burned than convert.⁴⁴ An Alsatian play from the end of the fifteenth century caricatures Jews as a synagogue that sings nonsensically, as the gruesome executors of the passion, and as participants in a disputation that takes place between the passion and the resurrection. In the disputation, Christiana calls for vengeance on the Jews for the death of Christ, and when her opponent, Judea, fails to be moved by the threat, she ties a blindfold over Judea's eyes and tears her flag, a black demon on a field of yellow.⁴⁵

It would be impossible to say that the clergy alone bore the responsibility for the production of anti-Jewish ideas and stories, much less any particular group within the clergy. Even legends and shrines associated with ritual murder and host desecration stories need not be associated with any particular clerical group, except perhaps the secular priests

⁴⁴ Schreckenberg, *Adversus-Judaeos-Texte*, 552–555. *Künzelsauer Fronleichnamsspiel*, a "Regiebuch" with additions from future performances with more than 6000 text pieces. The play was composed shortly after attempts to restrict Jewish settlement in Künzelsau (1475, 1476, perhaps prompted by the proceedings around the death of Simon of Trent). E. Wainwright, *Studien zum deutschen Prozessionsspiel* (Munich, 1974), 78 n. 110.

⁴⁵ The *Donauessinger Passionsspiel*, a play with extensive production notes and probably originating in Villingen between 1470 and 1500. It was based upon a Luzern play no longer extant. Written in the Alsatian dialect, it treats only New Testament events (that is, it omits the destruction of Jerusalem). Steinbach, *Oster- und Passionsspiele*, 215–222. Schreckenberg, *Adversus-Judaeos-Texte*, 567–568.

who usually served altars in the shrines: they would be the ones to meet pilgrims and tell the local legend. I know of only one instance in which friars actually gained ownership of such a shrine, and that was the church associated with the host desecrations of Sternberg, which came into the possession of the Augustinian Hermits over ten years after the trial.⁴⁶ After all, the advantage of stories of Jewish atrocities against Christian children and consecrated hosts was the ability of new shrines to bring new life to flagging churches.

III

The forces that made life difficult for Jews in late medieval Germany were encouraged by an extremely fluid and variegated political environment. The vulnerabilities born of Jewish reliance on liberties granted by a foreigner, someone acknowledged by townspeople reluctantly, when at all, as lord of the city, has been emphasized over and again as the reason for widespread persecution in Germany. The emperor, prince bishops, and dukes were particularly ineffective protectors of Jews in the fourteenth century, as the massive persecutions following the Black Death in 1349 and 1350 attest.⁴⁷ Only in the fifteenth century did rulers experiment with more efficient control of Jewish populations.

⁴⁶ Volker Honemann, "Die Sternberger Hostienschändung und ihre Quellen," *Kirche und Gesellschaft im Heiligen Römischen Reich des 15. und 16. Jahrhunderts* (Göttingen, 1994), 75–102. Likewise, the earlier foundation of an Observant Franciscan cloister at the site of a destroyed synagogue in Munich, for which license was granted on 4 October 1451, implies no direct involvement of Franciscans with its destruction; it has rather to do with the disposition of remaining property. *Repertorium Germanicum* (Berlin, 1916), 6/1.346 no. 3329.

⁴⁷ František Graus, *Pest-Geissler-Judenmorde*, (Göttingen, 1987), 341–351. Fritz Backhaus, "Judenfeindschaft und Judenvertreibungen im Mittelalter: Zur Ausweisung der Juden aus dem Mittelelberaum im 15. Jahrhundert," *Jahrbuch für die Geschichte Mittel- und Ostdeutschlands*, 36 (1987), 275–332; Ernst Voltmer, "Zur Geschichte der Juden im spätmittelalterlichen Speyer: Die Judengemeinde im Spannungsfeld zwischen König, Bischof und Stadt," in *Monographien zur Geschichte des Mittelalters*, v. 24, ed. A. Haverkamp (Stuttgart, 1981), 94–121. Consider also Langmuir's discussion of Capetian legislation, in *Definition*, chapters 6 and 7, and William C. Jordan's account of political vulnerabilities exacerbated by changing patterns of social interaction between Christians and Jews, *French Monarchy*, 128–259. It was the first persecution in Germany that entirely wiped out many Jewish communities and altered earlier patterns of settlement, as Michael Toch has pointed out. Michael Toch, "Siedlungsstruktur der Juden Mitteleuropas im Wandel vom Mittelalter zur Neuzeit," *Juden in der christlichen Umwelt während des späten Mittelalters*, ed. Alfred Haverkamp, Franz-Josef Ziwes (Berlin, 1992), 29–39.

This was partly inspired by the Council of Constance, near the conclusion of which Pope Martin V, at the request of King Sigismund, reaffirmed previous Jewish privileges. The papal vice-chamberlain added more specific stipulations regarding distinct clothing, freedom of worship, and a prohibition of forced baptism of Jewish children. The stipulations also ordered that no Jewish man or woman be compelled to appear before a spiritual judge of any kind (i.e., regular ecclesiastical judges or deputies), except in cases concerning the Catholic faith, the holy apostolic see, its laws, the king of Germany, the duke of Savoy, the cardinals, archbishops, bishops, and other superior spiritual lords (*alios dominos superiores spirituales*) of that region of the Holy Roman church. If, however, a Jewish man or woman wanted to bring a case against any of those people, it would go to the ordinary judge with competence over him or her.⁴⁸ This amounted to a circuitous reaffirmation of the traditional claims of the emperor, ecclesiastical princes, and one of many other secular high nobility to exercise lordship over Jews in non-religious cases, and it vaguely affirmed that Jews themselves would bring cases according to local customs, either to judges of a city council or to officers of various other courts, precisely those courts that had no power over the ecclesiastical princes just mentioned; the relevant courts would vary from city to city and, within cities, it changed over time. In the fifteenth century, as prince-bishops and dukes concentrated power and deprived towns and lower nobility of many liberties, they became no better protectors of Jews. Rather they discovered, however late, the usefulness of expulsion as a form of social tidiness (they already used the Jews as a source of revenue), a practice first explored by the Habsburg dukes and the archbishops of Mainz and Cologne in the 1420s, during the Hussite crusade, and perfected at the end of the fifteenth century and in the early sixteenth century by the archbishops of Mainz and Magdeburg, dukes of Austria and Steiermark, Mecklenburg, Bavaria, and Burgundy, not to mention south German towns and less exalted nobility that managed to retain or even to expand independence at a time when power was flowing up the ladder of estates.⁴⁹ Territorial princes came to exploit anti-Jewish feelings but they had little to do

⁴⁸ Simonsohn, *Apostolic See*, pp. 669–671 no. 591; the papal document is dated 12 February 1418 and the vice-chamberlain's clarifications are dated 22 February.

⁴⁹ *Encyclopedia Judaica*; see under "Germany," "Magdeburg." Wertheimer, *Die Juden in Oesterreich*.

with cultivating them.⁵⁰ And Jews were left to try to manipulate competing courts to their best advantage: their political circumstances did not change very much through the course of the fifteenth century, even as they suffered more frequent, if sporadic, expulsions.

The fate of the Jews had more to do with group conflicts on a popular level, where the gamut of anti-Jewish ideas and stories helped motivate and justify violence against them.⁵¹ The Franciscans of Magdeburg exploited these conflicts by taking recourse to their own blacksmith journeymen in the young segment of society from which urban rebellions frequently arose, at a time when the archbishop was completing his suppression of urban independence.⁵² The council was not likely to cooperate with the archbishop's bailiff, and the archbishop was not likely to compromise his own ambitions by insisting on his jurisdiction over the journeymen in a matter pertaining to Jews. On the strength of a century's popular insistence that Jews were a social problem, the archbishop chose expulsion. It was often easier for secular lords to answer a pogrom by believing the stories that justified it. An example of this occurred at Deggendorf in 1338, when, after the destruction of the Jewish community, the duke of Bavaria granted the property left behind to the town. Again, in Iglau in 1426, the duke of Austria granted to the town the Jewish houses that had been left empty after the expulsion of 1420.⁵³ An accusation of ritual murder at Diessenhofen instigated the burning of Jews in Schaffhausen and persecution in Winterthur and Nördlingen at the end of the fourteenth century. Wary of the migrating

⁵⁰ Graus has emphasized how the impetus came from towns. *Pest-Geissler-Judenmord*, 341–351.

⁵¹ Christopher Ocker, "Ritual Murder and the Subjectivity of Christ," *Harvard Theological Review*, 91 (1998), 153–192.

⁵² For the general tendency of guilds to rebel after sufficient increase of their power within a city, see Hans Planitz, *Die deutsche Stadt im Mittelalter* (Graz, 1954), 325ff. For the matter of youth rebellion, consider also the precautions of James A. Schultz, "Medieval Adolescence: The Claims of History and the Silence of German Narrative," *Speculum*, 66 (1991), 519–539.

⁵³ For Deggendorf, see G. Krotzer, "Der Judenmord von Deggendorf und die Deggendorfer 'Gnad,'" *Judenhass—Schuld der Christen?: Versuch eines Gesprächs* (Essen, 1964), 311–312. The accusation was made in 1337. The pogrom occurred on 30 September 1338. The relic was used in annual procession into the nineteenth century. *Germania Judaica*, 2/1.157. The city quickly appealed to the duke of Bavaria to forgive the massacre, and he responded by granting Deggendorf and Straubing the Jewish property and a tax exemption for the quarters of Straubing that had been burned down, on 14 October 1338, a mere two weeks after the massacre. *Germania Judaica*, 2/1.157. Rubin, "Imagining," 199. For Iglau, *Germania Judaica*, 3/1.580; Yuval, "Juden, Hussiten, und Deutsche," 65–66 n. 25.

conflict, the city council of Freiburg avoided it by expelling Jews in 1401, but only after they assembled information from the cities of Winterthur, Schaffhausen, and Diessenhofen and submitted a report to the city's lord, Duke Leopold of Freiburg, who then approved of the proposed action.⁵⁴ Ecclesiastical lords before the end of the fifteenth century may have been more reluctant to accept local pogroms; they did, however, harass subjects, who were an easy source of tax revenue. So, for example, when youth rioted against the Jews of Erfurt in 1349, at a time when the city council was warily trying to negotiate a neutral course between two rival contenders for the archbishopric of Mainz, the eventual winner of that contest required compensation for his Jews.⁵⁵

The dependence of Jews on ecclesiastical lords confirmed the impression that Jews and clergy were, in a way, alike. Both tried to claim immunity from urban jurisdiction, both were supposed to be unarmed; when either performed violence, according to the *Sachsenspiegel* and subsequent codes, they forfeited their immunity and would be treated as any lay person.⁵⁶ The principle of the equality of Jews and clergy before the law, once emphasized by Guido Kisch, could not have been easy for clergy to accept. They would feel like the canons of collegial churches in the city and diocese of Cologne, who united themselves for mutual protection and resistance against the violations of their immunity and complained that if the audacity of evil people should continue unchallenged, they, clergy, would find themselves in a worse position than serfs and Jews.⁵⁷ There was a likeness. Riots against

⁵⁴ Stobbe, *Juden in Deutschland*, 288–289.

⁵⁵ Ocker, "Ritual Murder," 173–175.

⁵⁶ *Sachsenspiegel Landrecht*, III.2, ed. Karl August Eckhardt (Göttingen, 1955), 1.195: "Papen und joden de wapen vuret unde nicht gescoren ne sint na erme rechte, dut men ene gewalt, men scal ene beteren als enen leien; went se ne scoln nene wapene vuren, de mit des koninges dagelekes vrede begrepen sin." *Sachsenspiegel Landrecht*, III.2, 1.104 n. 2; in the *Görlitzer Rechtsbuch*, 32.4, this is said only of clergy: "Ob ein phafe odir ein geistlich man wirt gesen mit wertliche hare unde mit wertlichin cleiderin, den sal man haldin vor einen leien." Guido Kisch, *The Jews in Medieval Germany* (New York, 1970 reprint of the 1949 edition), 107–128, argues that Jewish armament became problematic only after the first crusade; he also shows how the principle of forfeiture of rights by Jews and priests arming themselves is depicted in manuscript images of the *Sachsenspiegel* and the *Schwabenspiegel*.

⁵⁷ "Malitia et audacia pravorum hominum in tantum excrevit, quod si hoc tempore restitutum non fuerit, nos qui sumus clerici et religiose persone, peioris erimus conditionis quam servi vel Iudaei." Julius Aronius, *Regesten zur Geschichte der Juden im fränkischen und deutschen Reiche bis zum Jahre 1273* (Berlin, 1902), 286 no. 688 (from the year 1263), where the Stift of Xanten and various collegial churches of the city and diocese of Cologne unite for mutual protection and resistance to the violations they suffer. Taken

clergy could spill over onto Jews, as they did during the urban revolt of Würzburg at the end of the fourteenth century that concluded a long regression of urban rights. The city responded to new taxes and its intractable episcopal lord by looting churches, first in 1397 and then again in 1400.⁵⁸ According to a contemporary epic poem (it is sympathetic to the bishop's side), the revolutionaries of 1397 decided

from Anton Binterim and Joseph Mooren, *Die alte und neue Erzdiözese Köln in dekanate eingetheilt* (Mainz, 1828–1831), 3.294 no. 155.

⁵⁸ For the first attack, see King Wenzel's judgment of 21 January 1398 at the request of the warring parties: on the one side Bishop Gerhard of Würzburg, royal counselor, the provosts, deacons, chapters, and clergy of the cathedral and city together with the bishop's counts, lords, knights, and serfs, and on the other side the *Bürgermeister*, councils, and citizens of Würzburg together with other cities of the cathedral's territory. Wenzel determines evenhandedly and unsurprisingly that the bishop should retain his rights, courts, and slopes (presumably his vineyards), and the cities should retain their rights and freedoms. The king establishes a general *Ungelt* for the removal of the debts of the cathedral. Because Würzburg, with Mainz, is in an eternal alliance with the king of Bohemia, he puts in place a *Hauptman* over the city and territory for the next six years, without violence to the bishop's rights. All previous damages are declared invalid. All prisoners are to be set free, but in accordance with a decision (*Schied*) of Nürnberg, the fine and imprisonment appraisals not yet paid are to be considered as fulfilled. A decision about the *kleynot* robbed from the bishop and other implements (*geret*) remains open. The ban is lifted. W. Engel, *Urkundenregesten zur Geschichte der Stadt Würzburg (1201–1401)* (Würzburg, 1952), 383 no. 518. Wenzel issued this decision shortly after passing from Nürnberg through Würzburg to Frankfurt am Main. For Wenzel in Nürnberg, 20 November 1397 and Würzburg, 10 December 1397, see Wilhelm Engel, *Urkundenregesten zur Geschichte der Städte des Hochstifts Würzburg (1172–1413)* (Würzburg, 1956), 193–195 nos. 377–380. Apparently the *Hauptman* was not able to keep the peace and ensure satisfactory observance of these terms, for war broke out a year later. The details are recalled in a letter of 26 March 1401 by Pope Boniface IX, pope of the Roman obedience, to the new bishop-elect Johann von Egloffstein, repeating details that came with Egloffstein's supplication: In war with Gerhard of Würzburg and the cathedral chapter, the burgomasters, councils, and citizens of Würzburg, together with some other cities of the bishop's territory, seized church property, laid siege to the bishop's fortress looming above the city from across the Main river, the Marienberg, for several days, broke a year's ceasefire, burnt down the collegial church of St. Johann at the Haug and the cloister of St. Burkhard outside the city wall, for which they were penalized with ban and interdict. On 6 January 1400, 3000 armed men marched out of Würzburg in order to destroy the parish church of Bergtheim; they burned down and vandalized the church and cemetery, and in the battle, "*quasi mirabiliter*," the army of the nobility, vassals of the cathedral, and cathedral canons prevailed. Many citizens fell in battle, others were imprisoned, a few fled. Three days later, Bishop Gerhard reentered the city with some of his canons, but apparently never received full satisfaction from the town, over whom he left the ban and interdict. On 9 November of that year he died. Johann was elected, and wanted to remove the ban and interdict. The pope empowered him to do this, but ordered that cities and individuals who were found guilty should be required to make compensation by a court consisting of Johann and two or four trustworthy men chosen from his side and the side of the cities. Engel, *Urkundenregesten*, 390–391 no. 532.

to kill and plunder Jews soon after their decision to plunder first the clerical properties that they associated with the bishop of Würzburg.⁵⁹ Where were the friars? They could not be presumed to stand on the side of the town. At an earlier stage of the Würzburg affair, only some Dominicans and Augustinians and one Carmelite opposed the bishop; the Carmelites and the Franciscans as a body opposed the town.⁶⁰ The ambivalence of mendicant allegiances arose time and again, first during the years of Ludwig of Bavaria, when many cities expelled friars who remained firm in their observance of the papal interdict, and in other cities periodically thereafter.⁶¹ Rather than being identified

⁵⁹ Bernhard von Utzingen, "Vom Würzburger Städtekrieg," Rochus von Liliencron, *Die historischen Volkslieder der deutschen vom 13. bis 16. Jht.*, 4 vols. (Leipzig, 1865–1869), 1.171–172, lines 485–541. This may be the only record of the event; it is not mentioned in the compendious *Germania Judaica*, 3/2.1698–1705.

⁶⁰ On 21 March 1385, twelve canons of Neumünster, some Dominicans and Augustinians, and one Carmelite, were thrown out of the city for opposing a new wine tax of the bishop (who was also protector of the Carmelites, and perhaps of other orders). The Carmelites and Franciscans did not oppose the tax and were not penalized. It seems that the citizenry took sides with the Avignonese pope in opposition to Gerhard in pursuit of an anti-bishop. The position of the city worsened in the settlement of the Egerer Reichslandfrieden of 5 May 1389; the city turned to the Roman pope in search of confirmation of a thirteenth-century privilege of protection (Alexander IV, 1260). Gerhard held back the Roman confirmation, and the town then went to Avignon. On 31 January 1393, Gerhard published both confirmations, ordering all parties, including the Johanniterorden and the Teutonic Order, the four mendicant orders, and the parish clergy to observe the documents strictly, under threat of severe penalties. Finally, on 27 March 1395, the privilege of the city was confirmed by the bishop for a period of one year. Meinrad Sehi, *Die Bettelorden in der Seelsorgsgeschichte der Stadt und des Bistums Würzburg bis zum Konzil von Trient* (Würzburg, 1981), 340–341. H. Haupt, "Zur Geschichte der revolutionären Bewegungen in Würzburg unter Bischof Gerhard von Schwarzburg," *Archiv des historischen Vereins von Unterfranken und Aschaffenburg*, 34 (1891), 23–32, emphasizes the role of the conflict between Roman and Avignonese obediences, the appeal of the urban party to Clement VII. There is nothing on the role of friars or on Jews.

⁶¹ E.g., the expulsion of the Dominicans from Frankfurt and Speyer in 1338, for their opposition to Ludwig, and tensions between the friars of Trier and Archbishop Baldwin of Luxemburg, also related to the latter's support of Ludwig. Beck, *Dominikanerkloster*, 22–23. Schmidt, *Bettelorden*, 117–118, 120, 125–126. *Die Chronik Johannis von Winterthur*, ed. F. Baethgen (Munich, 1982), anno 1343, pp. 197–198. According to a 1341 letter from Dauphin Humbert to Ludwig, Dominicans had been expelled from eighteen cloisters. G.M. Lohr, "Die Mendikantenarmut in Dominikanerorden im 14. Jahrhundert," *Divus Thomas*, 18 (1940), 390. Consider also Adalbero Kunzelmann, *Geschichte der deutschen Augustiner-Eremiten* (Würzburg, 1969–1976), 2.163–182, for the Augustinians, and Joachim Smet and Ulrich Dobhan, *Die Karmeliten: eine Geschichte der Bruder Unser Lieben Frau vom Berge Karmel von den Anfängen (ca. 1200) bis zum Konzil von Trient* (Freiburg, 1981), 61, for the Carmelites. The Augustinian province of Saxony-Thuringia appears to have been the only mendicant province that officially endorsed Ludwig. Kunzelmann, *Geschichte*, 2.164–165.

as the spiritual vanguard of an urban population, friars often found themselves to be just one more urban group.

The things that identified the peculiar charism of the friars were, after all, the very things that their opponents turned against them.⁶² The polemics of Guillaume de Saint Amour, Jean de Pouilly, and Richard Fitzralph, and the insistence that mendicant poverty was a mendacious subterfuge that merited no tolerance of friars in society, were adapted and propagated by Konrad of Megenberg and the popular preachers Konrad Waldhäuser and Jan Milič of Kroměříž.⁶³ Hussites put a damper on this sharpest form of anti-mendicant preaching, by making it rather undesirable for Catholics to be heretics like them. But priests, bishops, and often entire towns remained convinced, until the very outbreak of the Reformation, that apostolic poverty did not guarantee special prerogatives, such as juridical exemptions. Many of the hundreds of conflicts between parish clergy and mendicant friars in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries attest to widespread preach-

⁶² The conflicts described in this paragraph are the subject of a book that I am currently writing, *The Friars, the Cities, and the Parish Clergy: Religious Conflict and Social Change in Central Europe, 1300–1530*.

⁶³ Konrad of Megenberg, *Planctus ecclesie in Germanium*, ii.2. Richard Scholz, *Unbekannte kirchenpolitische Streitschriften aus der Zeit Ludwigs des Bayern (1327–1354): Analysen und Texte*, (Rome, 1911–1914), 2.232. Konrad of Megenberg, *Lacrima ecclesie*, which I have seen in a manuscript misattributed to Konrad Waldhäuser, under the title, *Tractatus contra hereticos* Stuttgart, Baden-Württembergische Landesbibliothek, Thol. Fol. 322. This manuscript has been overlooked by the Megenberg literature, even though its relationship to the two otherwise known manuscripts of Konrad Megenberg's *Lacrima* were noted in 1931 by František M. Bartoš, "Husitika a bohemika několika knihoven německé a švýcarské" ("Some *Hussitica* and *Bohemica* in German and Swiss Libraries"), *Věstník královské české společnosti nauk, Třída filosoficko-historicko-jazykozpytná* (Journal of the Czech Royal Academy of Sciences: Philosophical, Historical, and Linguistic Section), 1931 (Prague, 1932), 32–33. The other two manuscripts of the *Lacrima* were discovered in Wolfenbüttel and Trier by Hermann Meyer. H. Meyer, "Lacrima ecclesiae: Neue Forschungen zu den Schriften Konrads von Megenberg," *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde*, 39 (1914), 471–503. Ibach, *Leben u. Schriften*, 113. Thomas Kaepfeli, "L'Oeconomica de Conrad de Megenberg retrouvée," *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, 45 (1950), 561. Robert Lerner, *The Heresy of the Free Spirit* (Berkeley, 1972), 57. For Waldhäuser, F.M. Bartoš, "Duě studie o husitských postilách" (Two studies of Hussite *postillae*), *Rozpravy Československé Akademie věd*, 64/4 (1955), 1–100, summary in German, pp. 97–100. For Milič, see Ferdinand Menik, "Milič a dva jeho spisy z r. 1367" ("Milič and two of his writings from the year 1367"), *Věstník královské české společnosti nauk, Třída filosoficko-historicko-jazykozpytná* (Prague, 1981), 309–336, here 317. Milicius, *Libellus de Antichristo*, ii., in Mathias de Janov, *Regulae Veteris et Novi Testamenti*, ed. Vlastimil Kybal, 4 vols. (Innsbruck, 1908–1913), 3.374. C. Ocker, *Johannes Klenkok: A Friar's Life, c. 1310–1374*, v. 83/5, *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* (Philadelphia, 1993), 88–92 and the literature noted there.

ing against them in terms identical to the milder heresy of Jean de Pouilly—mild compared to Fitzralph, Wyclif, and the Hussites. They, like Pouilly, made the priestly power of friars strictly subordinate to any half-lettered vicar serving in a village church. Nothing could demonstrate the growing doubts about the mendicant orders in Germany better than the assault on cloisters from the movement, known, a little too fondly, as Observant. In the process of getting monks to avoid meat, pray, and say mass consistently, and generally act more like monks, the reformation of a cloister also had the virtue of loosening it from its old regional jurisdiction within the order, installing an officer of the city council as procurator, and curbing a cloister's expansion of tax-exempt properties in a town.⁶⁴ It is not really surprising that all those offended by the friars' immunities—bishops and town councils most of all, along with a few other devout princes—lined up to support the reformation of cloisters.

Friars were one group among many. Their claims to privilege were increasingly challenged in the fifteenth century, a trend that grossly accelerated with the invention of popular print at the turn of the sixteenth century. They had no particular role in the cultivation of German hostility to Jews and Judaism in part because they had sufficient worries of their own. One of the Jewish boys at the disputation of the Corpus Christi play written in 1479 in the east Franconian dialect jeers,

Ir Cristen, ir seint all affen
und volgent ewern pffaffen,
Dy kunnen euch predigen wol,
Biss jn der bewtel wurtt vol.⁶⁵

You Christians, you're all monkeys
and trail behind your clergy,
who preach a pretty sermon,
'til their wallets are bursting.

He could have spoken for many Christians of the next generation. Contempt for friars was the most studied form of anticlericalism bequeathed to the troubles of the 1520s. The forces that made life difficult for Jews in late medieval Germany, therefore, relied all the more on rumor and folklore.

⁶⁴ C. Ocker, "Religious Reform and Social Cohesion in Late Medieval Germany," in *The Work of Heiko A. Oberman*, ed. T.A. Brady et al. (Leiden, 2003), 69–92.

⁶⁵ Schreckenberger, *Adversus-Judaeos-Texte*, 552–555.

THE EVOLUTION OF FRANCESC EIXIMENIS'S ATTITUDES TOWARD JUDAISM

DAVID J. VIERA

The Franciscan Francesc Eiximenis (1327–1409), a leading author of medieval Catalan literature, gave counsel and received favors from the last three Catalan kings of Aragon, the Avignon papacy, and government officials of the city of Valencia called *jurats*.¹ He also wrote lengthy treatises in Catalan for lay persons and shorter Latin works for the clergy. Included among the Catalan works is *El Crestià* (*The Christian*), his most ambitious work, a medieval Christian encyclopedia in the manner of Vincent de Beauvais's works.² This set of treatises which he planned to include in thirteen volumes—the number was chosen to represent Jesus and the twelve apostles—survives in only four volumes, the first three and a twelfth book. Some scholars believe he did not pen the remaining volumes but rather changed his focus, writing instead moral-didactic treatises, such as the *Llibre de les dones* (*Book About Women*), *Llibre dels àngels* (*Book About Angels*), and other devotional and ascetic works in Catalan, such as the *Vita Christi* and *Scala Dei*.³

In the *Primer del Crestià* (*First Book of the Christian*), written between 1379 and 1381, Eiximenis described the foundations of Christianity and the two other main religions of the western world at the time, Judaism and Islam. In the section on Christianity, he included several chapters (108–116) to defend this religion and its founder, Jesus of Nazareth, against the arguments of a certain rabbi, immediately discussing, after these

¹ Among the leading biographies on Eiximenis are: Martí de Barcelona, "Fra Francesc Eiximenis, O.M. (1340?–1409?): la seva vida, els seus escrits, la seva personalitat literària," *Estudios Franciscanos*, 40 (1928), 437–500; Andrés Ivars, "El escritor Fr. Francisco Eximénez en Valencia (1383–1408)," *Archivo Ibero-Americano*, 14 (1920), 76–104; 15 (1921), 289–333; 19 (1923), 359–398; 20 (1923), 210–248; 24 (1925), 325–382; 25 (1926), 5–48, 289–333; Martí de Riquer, *Història de la literatura catalana* (Barcelona, 1964), II, 133–196. For bibliography consult: *Studia bibliographica* (Girona, 1991); David J. Viera *Bibliografia anotada de la vida i obra de Francesc Eiximenis (1340?–1409?)* (Barcelona, 1980).

² I believe that Peter IV of Aragon commissioned Eiximenis to write *El Crestià* using St. Louis's example, in which this French king requested that Vincent de Beauvais compose certain works. See David J. Viera, "Francesc Eiximenis and the Royal House of Aragon: A Mutual Dependence," *Catalan Review*, 3 (1989), 184–185.

³ Ivars, *Archivo Ibero-Americano*, 19 (1923), 380–386.

chapters, his objections to Judaism (chaps. 117–125).⁴ In later years he became more tolerant of Jews, perhaps because of (1) pressure from his king, Joan I (1387–1396) and queen, Violant de Bar, the niece of Charles V of France;⁵ (2) the devastation he witnessed caused by the 1391 pogrom; (3) his emphasis on devotion, ascetic, and mystical works in his later writings; and (4) his hope to convert Jews.

In this paper I will review the content of these chapters, especially chaps. 117–125, attempt to identify the source of the attack on Jesus and Christianity, specify some sources Eiximenis may have consulted for his rebuttal, and indicate his attitudes against Jews in later works, especially the *Vita Christi* (1397–1399).⁶

In chapters 108–118 of the *Primer*, Eiximenis placed more passion and assertiveness regarding his defense of Christianity vis-à-vis Judaism than in any of his extant writings. He began chapter 108 by announcing that his purpose in the following chapters was to refute a great Jewish rabbi (*un gran rabbi jueu*) who believed Christianity was not founded (*instituit*) by Jesus, and who was not able to promote any good whatsoever. The rabbi also insisted that, if Christianity produced anything positive, it was not of Jesus' making. Basing his refutation on current messianic beliefs within Judaism, the rabbi believed that God would send a man who stood out by his manners, person, origin, and wealth. He would be revered by the Jews, who would humble themselves to him and obey his commands. Jesus, according to the rabbi, was contemptible and ignoble. More specifically—and these are the points Eiximenis attacks—Jesus was not of noble lineage, came from Nazareth, and kept company with humble people, beginning with his parents and friends, the apostles. As was his common practice, Eiximenis countered beliefs he considered erroneous or moral behavior he regarded as sinful by taking biblical examples, followed by illustrations from ancient and medieval knowledge, which included patristic, monastic, scholastic, and historical sources. When he wished to abbreviate his argument, he

⁴ *Llibre apellat lo primer del Crestià* (Valencia: Llabert Palmart, 29 Jan. 1483), chaps. 117–125, folios not numbered.

⁵ David J. Viera, "Francesc Eiximenis's Dissension with the Royal House of Aragon," *Journal of Medieval Studies*, 22 (1996), 249–261.

⁶ A Catalan edition of this work has not been printed although a Spanish translation with much additional information does exist: Jaume Massó i Torrents, "Les obres de Fra Francesch Eximeniç (1340?–1409?): Essai d'une bibliografia"; see reprint in *Studia bibliographica*, pp. 131–142; Martí de Barcelona, 471–475, reprint *Studia bibliographica*, 215–218.

resorted to canon law and especially the *Sententiae* of Peter Lombard, which he had read and from which he may have lectured during his studies at the University of Toulouse.

To the argument that a ruler or king always comes from noble lineage and a good moral background, Eiximenis stated that many rulers became the worst sinners and tyrants, a type of ruler he abhorred.⁷ Good clergy, kings, and princes do not all descend from the nobility or have their origins in noble cities. From the Bible he cited Moses and others whose backgrounds are unknown. Saul and David, he stated, came from peasant stock; furthermore, David's place of origin is Bethlehem, a small and simple town. The oriental emperor Nebuchadressar hailed from a vile place, information Eiximenis erroneously attributed to Isaiah 10; he had been a scribe, was ugly and a blasphemer, a grave sin, according to Eiximenis's moral theology, perhaps the worst sin because blasphemy was directly aimed at God, not at one's neighbor.⁸ In addition, Alexander, who was small and despicable, was not well-born, according to the rabbi's standards. Likewise, Caesar came from a small town, Nero was deformed and bald, and the emperor Constantine's mother had been an innkeeper and the emperor a leper until baptized. Eiximenis was able to resort to this kind of argumentation because he addressed a lay Christian audience.

Chapter 112 opens with the quotation from Josephus's *Antiquitatis Judaicae* 18.63–64,⁹ often cited in Christian polemical works to defend Jesus' character. Eiximenis continued insisting on Jesus' humility and virtue, contrasting these in a biased way with the vanity and pompousness that he ascribed to the Jews.

In his defense of Jesus, what obsessed Eiximenis the most was the question of lineage and identification with Nazareth. Citing "Dama-

⁷ Francesc Eiximenis, *La societat catalana al segle XIV*, ed. Jill Webster (Barcelona, 1967), 24–27.

⁸ *Terç del Crestià*, MS 1794, Biblioteca Nacional (Madrid), chap. 843.

⁹ "About this time there lived Jesus, a wise man, if indeed one ought to call him a man. For he was one who wrought surprising feats and was a teacher of such people as accept the truth gladly. He won over many Jews and many of the Greeks. He was the Messiah. When Pilate, upon hearing him accused by men of the highest standing amongst us, had condemned him to be crucified, those who had in the first place come to love him did not give up their affection for him. On the third day he appeared to them restored to life, for the prophets of God had prophesied these and countless other marvelous things about him. And the tribe of the Christians, so called after him, has still to this day not disappeared." Josephus, *Antiquitates Judaicae* 18.63–64; trans. Louis H. Feldman; LCL (Cambridge, 1981).

cenus" [John Damascene?])—and ultimately Matthew 1:1–20—on Jesus' genealogy, Eiximenis insisted that Jesus came from the line of kings that included David and Solomon. However, the Franciscan was especially concerned about the biblical passage John 1:46, in which Nathaniel/Bartholomew utters, "Can anything good come from Nazareth?"¹⁰ One infers here that the rabbi whom Eiximenis rebutted treated Nazareth in a derogatory way. The biblical passage has received much attention from scholars and theologians who have analyzed it from historical, linguistic, philological, and other perspectives.¹¹ Eiximenis, or perhaps the commentary (*glosa*) he was summarizing, followed the line of reasoning described above. Citing the adage, "the place does not make the man, but the man gives fame to the place," Eiximenis resorted to knowledge of scripture, reasoning that Jews should have abandoned David, who was from Bethlehem, and the prophet Jeremiah, from Anathoth, a small village. He then cited Jesus' words that a prophet is not honored in his own land, and Aristotle—from a commentary—that too much familiarity begets fools.

According to Eiximenis, Jesus chose Nazareth as his hometown, first, to show his humility, secondly, to cause its inhabitants to reject him, and thirdly, to allow him to live in solitude and contemplation. In addition, he introduced linguistic, allegorical, and historical motives. Nazareth means a sprout, and allegorically, this sprout will bear fruit, which signifies heaven. At this point he may have taken from his Christian sources information on a group of virtuous men who had lived a life of penitence (the Nazarenes).¹² He continued by quoting the Bible; the

¹⁰ Nathaniel was identified as Bartholomew by late medieval religious authors: John Mehemán, "Notas sobre Natanael = S. Bartolomeu (Jo 1, 45–51)," *Revista de cultura bíblica* (Brazil), 5 (1961), 337–342.

¹¹ Frederick J. Foakes-Jackson, *The Beginning of Christianity* (New York, 1924), I, pt. 1, pp. 426–432; J.A. Sanders, "ΝΑΖΩΡΙΟΣ in Matt. 2:23," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 84 (1965), 169–172; Gerald Sigal, *The Jew and the Christian Missionary: A Jewish Response to Missionary Christianity* (New York, 1981), pp. 77, 191; Otto Betz, "Kann denn aus Nazareth etwas Gutes kommen?" *Wort und Geschichte: Festschrift für Karl Elliger zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. Hartmut Gese and Hans Peter Ruger (Neukirchener, 1973), 9–16; Samuel Krauss, *Das Leben Jesu nach jüdischen Quellen* (Heldesheim, 1994), 253–255.

¹² Isidore of Seville, *Etimologías, edición bilingüe*, ed. José Oroz Reta (Madrid, 1982), I, 695, 835. Ramon Martí, *Raymundi Martini Ordinis praedicatorum Pugio fidei adversus mauros et judeos* (Leipzig, 1687, reprint Farnborough, 1967), Pt. III, dist. III, chap. XXII, pp. 776–779. It is unclear if Eiximenis is thinking here of a group of Christians who continued to observe the Jewish law (known as the "Nazarenes"), or if he has in mind the Hebrew group of Nazirites who consecrated themselves to God by taking an ascetical vow. See, for example, the story of Samson (Judges chaps. 13–16) or the description of Paul's vow

Nazarenes would become "purer than snow, whiter than milk ... more ruddy than coral ... like sapphire" (Lam 4:7). Lastly, he transformed his passage into christological terms; the Nazarenes are the sons of grace (*filis de gràcia*) of their prince, Jesus of Nazareth.

This christological reference led Eiximenis to the subject of the Trinity, a major issue in the Jewish-Christian debates. However, keeping in mind his lay audience, the Franciscan evaded a theological discussion of the Trinity, insisting that this topic is too lofty to comprehend.

In chapter 114, the focus of Eiximenis's polemic changes to the rabbi's charge that Jesus was mortal and suffered pain, to which he answered that this was due to his human and not his divine nature. To the objection that Jesus was born with original sin and had to be baptized, he answered that Jesus allowed John to baptize him to give an example of perfect humility. And the rabbi's accusation that Jesus broke the Law is answered with the simple assertion that "as God, Jesus did not have to follow the Law regarding the Sabbath," as well as with a linguistic argument, that the Jewish *be'olam* meant the Catalan *lonch temps* or Latin *inseculum* and not the Catalan *perpetytat* or Latin *in sempiternum*. Surely this argument came from Christian sources such as Isidore of Seville and Ramon Martí, perhaps through Nicholas of Lyra or a commentary on either of these authors. Eiximenis admitted the latter influence when he discussed *'olam* or *be'olam* later in the *Primer*, chap. 268.¹³

Eiximenis also takes up a numerical argument from medieval religious disputations: the majority do not believe in Jesus. He acknowledged that, in the world as it was known in the fourteenth century, it was only Europe, from the Iberian peninsula to Hungary,¹⁴ that believed in Christ. Here again he avoided a lengthy discussion with the common adage that the majority is not always right.

The Jewish accusation of idolatry regarding transubstantiation of the Eucharist goes without a specific reply, perhaps because, like the Trinity, it is a theological "mystery." However, Eiximenis was not the type to leave an objection unanswered. Here he seized upon the word

in Acts 21:23–26.

¹³ Herman Hailerin, "Nicolas de Lyra and Rashi," *Rashi Anniversary Volume* (New York, 1941), 131–323. Eiximenis's library also contained Stephen Langton's *Interpretacio hebraicorum nominum*: cf. Jacques Monfrin, "La Bibliothèque de Francesc Eiximenis (1409)," *Studia bibliographica* (Girona, 1991), 22, no. F14. Reprint of article in *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance*, 29 (1967), 447–487.

¹⁴ *Primer*, chap. 206; *Vita Christi*, IX, chap. 85.

“idolatry,” recalling a proverb of Cato, to the effect that one should not accuse others of one’s own faults. He therefore consulted the Old Testament and recalled examples of idolatry, a common practice in Christian polemical treatises and debates with Jews. To the claim of idolatry in the Catholic practice of placing statues in sacred places, he provided a traditional response: these are used especially in lay piety as reminders of the great sanctity of Christ and his saints. The statue itself is not worshipped.

Eiximenis’s last response to the “great rabbi” is introduced by an interesting anecdote supplied by John Beleth, author of a *Summa de ecclesiasticis officiis*, which Eiximenis owned.¹⁵ This twelfth-century religious figure stated that the Roman Emperor “Gay” refused Pilate’s request to have a statue of Jesus placed in the temple at Jerusalem because Jesus had preached that there was only one God and was crucified, “a shameful death.” Eiximenis then contested the words “a shameful death,” arguing again in simple terms for his lay readers that only sin and fault (*culpa*) are shameful, but Christ was not crucified for personal faults but rather that humans not perish. He also added that martyrs do not die a shameful death.

Given the general and even cryptic nature of Eiximenis’s polemic, it almost seems futile to specify his source, an effort compounded by the fact that he based his writings on commentaries that reviewed earlier commentaries of Latin apologetic and polemical works. The identification is further complicated because of polemical works now lost, such as the *Bereshith Rabbah*, attributed to Moses ha-Darshan.¹⁶ Given his insistence that he is rebutting a treatise by a great rabbi, we can eliminate anonymous and multi-author works such as the *Talmud* and the *Toledot Yeshu*. Since Eiximenis wrote the *Primer* between 1379 and 1381, we must discount the works of Shem Tov ben Isaac ibn Shaprut, Profiat Duran, and Hasdai Crescas.

Also complicating the identification is the question as to whether Eiximenis knew Hebrew. Rarely did he cite Hebrew texts, preferring Latin sources such as the *Pugio Fidei*, Pontius Carbonell’s *Commentaria in Universa Biblia*, John Beleth’s *Summa*, and Isidore of Seville’s *Etyimologiae*, among other Latin works. He also stated in the *Primer* that he deferred

¹⁵ Monfrin, p. 269, no. F42.

¹⁶ George Foot Moore, “Christian Writers on Judaism,” *Harvard Theological Review*, 14 (1921), 204.

to these sources since he did not know Hebrew,¹⁷ a statement Albert Hauf, a leading authority on Eiximenis, regards as a commonplace expression of humility.¹⁸ On the other hand, Joan I named Eiximenis as one of several friars to examine Hebrew books confiscated from Jews after the 1391 Valencia pogrom.¹⁹ Was he appointed because of his knowledge of Hebrew, or his knowledge of theology, or both? Hauf and other scholars in Spain are searching the sources of the *Primer* and finding much influence from Lyra's *Postilla*, including Eiximenis's paraphrase from the Frenchman's major work.

The main clue to Eiximenis's sources is his argument concerning Jesus' genealogy and especially his exasperation at the claim that Nazareth was a lowly place. Our identification of Eiximenis's sources must begin with the works of Jacob ben Reuben. In the *Milhamot ha-Shem*, this author took up New Testament gospels, claiming that they contained blasphemy, and specifically mentioned Nathaniel's pejorative comment about Nazareth (John 1:45–46), a procedure also repeated in the *Nizzahon Vetus*.²⁰ He did not, however, malign Nazareth itself because his purpose was to insist that Jesus was not the son of God but Joseph's son, upon whom Jesus' genealogy must be based.²¹ Studies by Isidore Loeb show that Jacob ben Reuben's writings were very influential in south-eastern Spain, and that the plan of works by Shem Tov Shaprut and Moses ha-Kohen de Tordesillas followed the exact plan of the twelfth-century Jew, and added to his polemic.²² Even if he did not read these polemical works, Eiximenis, who traveled in Europe and eastern Spain, could have been told of their content by friars at convents and friaries where he stayed.

A more plausible source for Eiximenis's writings is Nicolaus de Lyra's *Tractatus contra Iudaeum impugnatores evangelium secundum Matthaeum* (1334), also called the *Responsio*.²³ Eiximenis was basically an unoriginal writer

¹⁷ *Primer*, chap. 371; David J. Viera, "Francesc Eiximenis, O.F.M., y la lengua hebrea," *Analecta sacra tarraconensia*, 51–52 (1978–1979), 151–153.

¹⁸ *D'Eiximenis a sor Isabel de Villena* (Valencia, 1990), 74.

¹⁹ Francisco Bofarull y Sans, "Datos para la historia de la bibliografía," *Boletín de la Sociedad Arqueológica Luliana*, 22 (1888), 206–207, document 15.

²⁰ David Berger, *The Jewish Christian Debate in the High Middle Ages* (Philadelphia, 1979), 168–169, 301.

²¹ Jacob ben Reuben, *Milhamot ha-Shem*, ed. J. Rosenthal (Jerusalem, 1963), 141–142.

²² "La controverse religieuse entre les chrétiens et les juifs au Moyen Age," *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, 17 (1888), 333.

²³ *Responsio fratris N. de Lira contra Iudeum neguitiam argumentem*. Rawlinson manuscript Collection, Bodleian Library, MS G 40, fol. 38v–42r.

who freely copied content as well as context from his sources. Lyra's treatise begins with the words, "after I had written about each testament"—a reference to the *Postilla*—"there came into my hands a small book written by a Jew" (*venit ad manus meas quodam libellum Hebraice scriptum*), the purpose of which was to disparage the gospel and its author, Jesus. A. Lukyn Williams was unable to identify the author of this attack,²⁴ but in 1965 Bernhard Blumenkranz revealed that Lyra had in his hands the *Milhamot ha-Shem* of Jacob ben Reuben.²⁵ Lyra began the *Responsio* by stating that those trained in theology are in no danger of losing their faith from this work, but that the common people and those not schooled in theology could be upset by it. We must recall here that Eiximenis is writing for a lay audience, not those trained in theology.²⁶ I therefore conclude that the original author of what Eiximenis called blasphemies was Jacob ben Reuben, whose ideas came to the friar either through the treatise of Lyra or via a fourteenth-century polemical work in Hebrew or a vernacular language.²⁷ The disparaging inference to Nazareth, however, may derive, ironically, from Christian sources, since the word Nazareth is not mentioned outside of the New Testament.²⁸ This negative impression of Nazareth which so appalled Eiximenis may have stemmed in part from the words of Nathaniel/Bartholomew, perhaps indicating a saying of the time,²⁹ as well as from passages in all three synoptic gospels relating to the rejection of Jesus' preaching in Nazareth (Matt 13:54–58; Mark 6:1–6; Luke 4:16–30). In addition, Isidore of Seville's remark in the *Ety-mologiae* 7.14.2 could have contributed to a negative view of Nazareth: "In former times Jews, as an insult, called Christians Nazarenes as the

²⁴ "Adversus Judaeos": *A Bird's-Eye View of Christian Apologiae Until the Renaissance* (Cambridge, 1935), 412 n. 3.

²⁵ "Nicolas de Lyre et Jacob ben Reuben," *Journal of Jewish Studies*, 16 (1965), 47–51.

²⁶ Jeremy Cohen, *The Friars and the Jews: The Evolution of Medieval Anti-Judaism* (Ithaca, 1982), 187.

²⁷ The *Milhamot ha-Shem* was translated from Hebrew to Spanish at the request of Blanca de Portugal. The work is no longer extant; however, its contents influenced fourteenth- and fifteenth-century authors. See Carlos Sainz de la Maza, "El *Toledot Yeshu* castellano en el maestre Alfonso de Valladolid," *Actas del II Congreso Internacional de la Asociación Hispánica de Literatura Medieval* (Segovia, del 5 al 19 de octubre de 1987) (Madrid, 1992), II, 799, 808.

²⁸ Robert Herford, *Christianity in Talmud and Midrash* (Clifton, N.J., 1966), 52.

²⁹ Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John (I–XII)* (Garden City, N.Y., 1966), 83, 86.

Lord and Savior was known as the Nazarene from the town in Galilee of that name."³⁰

Up to this point (chaps. 118–119), Eiximenis's defense centered on Christian dogma and practices. With the mention of idolatry, Eiximenis began the most emphatic anti-Jewish section of his treatise. However, his negativism toward Jews who practiced Judaism lacks the harsh tones of Peter the Venerable and even Ramon Martí. He likewise avoided false claims, such as the blood libel, host desecration, blaming Jews for the Black Death, identification of Jews with the devil, and other anti-Jewish folk beliefs. He did, however, repeat claims *adversus Iudaeos*, handed down from patristic writers to medieval authors, that considered Jews responsible for Jesus' death, resulting in their loss of covenant with God and of their homeland.³¹ Following prophetic-apocalyptic views of the time, he believed Jews would worship the Antichrist and be converted to Christianity at the end of time.³² He also condemned Jews as well as Christians of being usurers,³³ a condemnation that reflects the reality of the times. Despite claims that Jews were cold, avaricious, and stubborn in their refusal to accept Christianity (*la perfidia jueva*),³⁴ he admired the solemnity with which Jews worshipped on the Sabbath, a day not characterized by eating and pleasure, and he contrasted their solemnity with the lack of respect that some Christians showed at Sunday Mass.³⁵ Besides admiring Jewish fasting,³⁶ he approved of the way Jews dealt severely with blasphemers,³⁷ as well as their long, loose clothing that covered the body, unlike the new fashions that had recently entered Iberia from France.³⁸

Some of these ideas are contained in the *Segon* and *Terc* (Second and Third Books of the *Crestià*). The *Dotzè* (Twelfth Book of the *Crestià*) and the *Llibre de les dones* (*Book About Women*) concern legal and social

³⁰ Isidore of Seville, I, 683.

³¹ *Vita Christi* (Archivo de la Catedral de Barcelona), MS 49, chap. 91, fols. 278r–332r.

³² *Dotzè del Crestià* (Valencia, 1484), chap. 469.

³³ In his *El "Tractat d'usura" de Francesc Eiximenis*, ed. Josep Hernando i Delgado (Barcelona, 1985), Eiximenis does not single out Jews for practicing usury.

³⁴ *Primer*, chaps. 118–119; *Terc del Crestià*, chap. 750.

³⁵ *Lo libre de les dones*, ed. Curt J. Wittlin et al. (Barcelona, 1981), I, 81.

³⁶ *Terc del Crestià: Edition and Study of Sources*, ed. Jorge J.E. Gracia (Ph.D. diss.: University of Toronto, 1971), 373–375.

³⁷ *Terc del Crestià*, chap. 845 (Biblioteca Nacional de Madrid), MS 14.

³⁸ David J. Viera and Jordi Piqué, *La dona en Francesc Eiximenis* (Barcelona, 1987), 75–88; Ivars, 25 (1926), 34. *Dotzè llibre del Crestià*, ed. Curt J. Wittlin et al. (Girona, 1987), II, pt. 2, pp. 375–381; *Lo libre de les dones*, I, 31.

issues, the former being a manual of government for the king or prince. Here Eiximenis's conviction regarding the separation of Jews, Christians, and Moors is evident.³⁹ Most prohibitions he cited follow directly from canon law and Peter Lombard's *Sententiae*. On the other hand, he opposed forced conversion and baptism of Jewish adults and of Jewish children unless their parents were deceased, confiscation of Jewish property, and the enslavement of Jews. He also believed that one could not force Jews to follow church law or constitutions, and rejected any attempts to injure, take possession of, or force work upon Jews, or desecrate their cemeteries.⁴⁰ Eiximenis, who wrote the *Dotzè del Crestià* in the mid 1380s, witnessed the 1391 pogrom in Játiva, a city which, in time, regained its Jewish quarter. He was immediately called to Valencia by the *jurats*, because its Jewish ghetto was devastated.⁴¹ In the years that followed, Eiximenis dedicated himself to writing books on angelology, devotional works, and a *Vita Christi*, in which he approved of and showed good will toward converts from Judaism, describing them as "good and proven Christians who venerate the great figures of the Old Testament," especially the patriarchs and prophets. He also added that the church and Christians gain much from the *conversos* and that the last pope and emperor would be converted Jews.⁴²

Eiximenis wrote his *Vita Christi* in his seventies. He seems to have become disillusioned with the royal family, except for the devout María de Luna, the niece of Benedict XIII, the last Avignon pope.⁴³ Albert Hauf is correct in describing Eiximenis as intransigent toward Jews even in the friar's last years.⁴⁴ However, the confrontational attitude and anti-Jewish tone of the *Primer*, especially chaps. 118–119, is not as pronounced in the *Vita Christi*.⁴⁵ What effect did the sight of the

³⁹ *Dotzè*, MS Biblioteca Nacional (Madrid), chaps. 156–170; *Dotzè libre del Crestià*, ed. Wittlin, II, pt. 2, pp. 371–381.

⁴⁰ *Dotzè* (Valencia, 1484), chaps. 167–169; *Dotzè libre del Crestià*, ed Wittlin, II, pt. 2, 383–384.

⁴¹ David J. Viera, "Sant Vicent Ferrer, Francesc Eiximenis i el pogrom de 1391," *Actes de sisè Col·loqui d'Estudis Catalans a Nord Amèrica* (Barcelona, 1992), 251.

⁴² *Vita Christi*, Tractat 3, fol. LXVII; Hauf, p. 74.

⁴³ Andrés Ivars, "Franciscanismo de la reina de Aragón Doña María de Luna (1396–1406)," *Archivo Ibero-Americano*, 36 (1933), 586–594.

⁴⁴ Hauf, p. 75.

⁴⁵ Rather than directly accusing Jews of being avaricious (*Terc*, chap. 750), Eiximenis interrupts his account of Christ's life (*Vita Christi*, tractate 7, chaps. 61–62) to point out how the Jewish law differs from Christ's teachings (New Testament): "The thirteenth law our Savior made is more profitable for it orders us not to ardently desire temporal wealth so that we incur evil and eternal damnation."

ravages in the Jewish *calls* of eastern Iberia have on him? On the other hand, forced baptism and the destruction of holy books of the Jews produced in Iberia a counter-reaction by the writings of Profiat Duran, Hasdai Crescas, among others, with whom Eiximenis may have come in contact.⁴⁶ Yitzhak Baer stated that, in his *Kelimat ha-goyim*, Profiat Duran wrote (*Hozefah* IV, p. 40), "Such was the answer I made to a certain Gentile scholar by the name of Buan[?], who came to me En Filis [?] and told me," etc. Baer abruptly stopped here and asked, "Is it possible this is a reference to Francesc Eiximenis?"⁴⁷ The latter, who served Joan I from Valencia and was named his confessor, may have known Profiat Duran and Hasdai Crescas for, according to written records, both were prominent astrologers in the court of John I and Violant de Bar.⁴⁸

In addition to anti-Christian polemical works by these authors, scholars cite a Hebrew work that both Benedict XIII and the Aragonese King Fernando I condemned in 1415.⁴⁹ Copies of the work were destroyed and the title that appears on the papal document is difficult to read: *Macellum, Mar mar Jesu, Mace Ihesu*.⁵⁰ Morris Goldstein, in his *Jesus in the Jewish Tradition*, suggests that the title *Masseh Yeshu* (*Deeds of Jesus*) was an alternate title of the *Toledot Yeshu*.⁵¹ No doubt this work was in circulation when Eiximenis wrote the *Vita Christi*, as evident from a strong condemnatory passage he included in his work.⁵² We can only speculate as to whether the existence of the *Masseh Yeshu* provided a motive for Eiximenis to write the *Vita Christi* (i.e., to combat the content of the former work). However, despite the circulation of the *Toledot Yeshu* and the polemical writings of Isaac ibn Shaprut, Hasdai Crescas, and Profiat Duran, Eiximenis did not, for the most part, take a defiant attitude toward Jews of his time in his later writings but rather blamed

⁴⁶ Philippe Wolf, "The 1391 Pogrom in Spain: Social Crisis or Not?" *Past and Present*, 50 (1971), 6.

⁴⁷ *A History of the Jews in Christian Spain* (Philadelphia, 1978), II, 467.

⁴⁸ Richard W. Emery, "New Light on Profayt Duran 'Efodi'," *Jewish Quarterly Review*, 58 (1968), 331–332.

⁴⁹ Yitzhak F. Baer, *Die Juden im christlichen Spanien: Aragonien, Navarre* (Berlin, 1929), I, 828, no. 513; H.H. Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden* (Leipzig, 1875), VIII, 123.

⁵⁰ José Amador de los Ríos, *Historia social, política y religiosa del los judíos de España y Portugal* (Madrid, 1960), 539; Hauf, pp. 74–75 n. 23.

⁵¹ *Jesus in the Jewish Tradition* (New York, 1950), 147. Carlos Sains de la Maza (pp. 800–805, 811–814) points out that a Spanish version of the *Toledot Yeshu* was read in Iberia from the time of Abner of Burgos.

⁵² *Vita Christi* (MS 172, Museu Episcopal de Vic), fols. 34–34v.

Jews of Jesus' age for Jesus' passion and death and those of his own age for resisting conversion. The lack of an abrasive attitude in the *Vita Christi*, a treatise that contains a substantial section on Jesus' passion and death, may be explained by his old age, his witness to the plight of the Jews in Iberia in 1391, pressure from Joan I, and/or his desire to convert them.

In summary, Eiximenis's attitude toward Jews was formed in part by his own interaction with them in Gerona, Barcelona, Valencia, and other European cities where he lived. In addition, shortly after receiving his Master of Theology degree from Toulouse, Eiximenis was commissioned by Peter IV of Aragon to write *El Crestià*. In the first book of this series, Eiximenis compared Christianity, Judaism, and Islam with the aim of convincing his bourgeois Christian readers that their religion was the true faith. To do so he wrote in Catalan and, in his early chapters, avoided complex explanations of doctrine that the church calls "mysteries of the faith," such as the Trinity and transubstantiation of the Eucharist. In later chapters of the *Primer* (202–372), Eiximenis presented a more systematic and thorough discussion of his belief that the church was superior to the synagogue. These chapters, whose sources are being studied by other scholars, seem to be directed to more sophisticated readers and perhaps to the educated clergy.⁵³ His irritation with a "great Jewish rabbi" who spoke in derogatory terms (*blasfemia*) about Jesus and Mary led to his short but poignant defense. The great Jewish rabbi to whom Eiximenis referred must be either Jacob ben Reuben or a commentator on his works, and Eiximenis's source of the great rabbi's polemic may be Nicholas de Lyra's *Responsio*. In works that followed the *Segon* (second book of the *Crestià*), which deals with sin and temptation, Eiximenis's writings became more social, and, with the *Dotzè*, political and legal in content. After the 1391 pogrom, beginning with the last treatise of the *Llibre de les dones* (1392), his works took on a devotional and ascetic character, due perhaps to several reasons, including the effects of social and political change, his age, the steadfastness of Jews who refused to accept Christianity, and the imminent millennium featuring Christ's second coming. He truly believed that the apocalypse would take place in 1400 and was preparing for the

⁵³ Nolasco del Molar, "Francesc Eiximenis y los Espirituales," *Miscel·lània Melchor de Pobladura* (Roma, 1964), I, 251–253.

ultimate conversion of Jews.⁵⁴ His emphasis, therefore, shifted between 1379 to the end of the century from convincing Christians that theirs was the true faith to a preoccupation with the approaching end of time.

⁵⁴ Pere Bohigas, "Prediccions i profecies en les obres de fra Francesc Eiximenis," *Franciscalia* (Barcelona, 1928), 31.

This page intentionally left blank

SAMUEL OF GRANADA AND THE DOMINICAN INQUISITOR: JEWISH MAGIC AND JEWISH HERESY IN POST-1391 VALENCIA

MARK D. MEYERSON

On 27 March 1416, Ramon Ermengaud, Dominican friar and lieutenant inquisitor, and Joan Gascó, vicar of the bishop of Valencia and his special judge for cases of heresy, dispatched a letter to the governor and bailiff general of the kingdom of Valencia demanding that these royal officials place in their custody Samuel of Granada, a Jew whom the royal prosecutor had denounced for administering poison to royal subjects with the counsel of a demon he had conjured.¹ Ermengaud and Gascó pointed out that such crimes against the faith fell under the church's jurisdiction. Lay magistrates had no business interfering; they could punish Samuel only after ecclesiastical judges determined his guilt. The governor and bailiff had to hand the Jew over within three days or face excommunication.²

¹ Joseph Shatzmiller, *Jews, Medicine, and Medieval Society* (Berkeley, 1994), 85–88, discusses cases of Jewish physicians accused of poisoning Christians and sometimes of necromancy as well.

² Arxiu del Regne de València [hereafter ARV]: Bailia [hereafter B] Procesos, Letra P, 2617. The original letter of Ermengaud and Gascó is on a single unnumbered folio separate from the rest of the dossier. The letter is copied by a scribe of the court of the bailiff general on folios 43r–45r of the dossier proper. It reads: “Quamquam cognoscere de criminibus fidei presertim heresim sapientibus manifeste ad nos pertineat pleno jure prohibitumque sit iudicibus secularibus sub interminatione divini iudicii ne de huiusmodi crimine se intromittant, tamen vos sicut vera didicimus informatione in vim cuiusdam denunciationis per fiscalem regium coram vobis de dicto crimine oblate contra Samuelem de Granata qui pro judeo se gerit adversus illum proceditis incessanter de dicto crimine vos iudicem constituendo. Ex quo sicut fertur in eadem denunciatione depingitur dictum Samuelem venena seu potula mortifera vassallis domini regis consilio invocati per eum demonis tradidisse. Quare procurator fiscalis noster et in dictis negotiis nos cum instantia requisivit ut cum dictum crimen sit exceptum et de maioribus divinam offendens magestatem de quo aliis si que vestre noscioni spectantibus idem Samuel comisit per nos primitus est cognoscendum ad remittendum nobis Samuelem ipsum compellere deberemus. Nos igitur huiusmodi requisitioni annuentes debite velut juste easdem circumspectiones vestras attentius deprecamur et requirimus in fidei favorem per presentes quatenus infra triduum a presentatione presentium vobis facta in antea computandum ... dictum Samuelem una cum libris et scripturis reprobate artis magice et aliis suscitationibus prohibitis penes eum repertis ad nos remittatis ut de dicto crimine heresis de quo apud nos extitit denunciatus per justiciam cognoscere

It is difficult, indeed impossible, to establish precisely what crimes Samuel had allegedly committed, exactly why the Dominican inquisitor and the episcopal vicar were so interested in his case, or even who Samuel really was.³ The extant dossier on Samuel contains only the testimonies of the sixteen witnesses that Pere d'Anglesola, the royal prosecutor, and García del Porto, a notary acting as Samuel's defense attorney, recorded at the behest of the bailiff general, the magistrate in whose court Samuel was first arraigned. Missing from the dossier are Anglesola's indictment of Samuel, the questions that the prosecution and the defense directed at their witnesses, and the sentence of the bailiff general. It is possible, however, that the bailiff never ruled on the case but instead remitted Samuel's case to the inquisitor's court. Yet on the question of the bailiff's obedience to the inquisitor's command, the dossier also leaves us in the dark. At the end of this essay, I will

valeamus." It is hardly surprising that in 1416 an inquisitor would have claimed jurisdiction over a case involving the "heresy" of a Jewish necromancer. For treatments of the process through which the church eroded the conceptual distinctions between heretics, sorcerers, and Jews, and brought all three within the purview of the papal Inquisition, see Edward Peters, *The Magician, the Witch and the Law* (Philadelphia, 1978), 138–161; Joshua Trachtenburg, *The Devil and the Jews: The Medieval Conception of the Jew and Its Relation to Modern Anti-Semitism* (New Haven, 1943); and Richard Kieckhefer, *Magic in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1989), 190–193. See also Nicolau Eimeric and Francisco Peña, *El manual de los inquisidores*, trans. Luis Sala-Molins and Francisco Martín (Barcelona, 1983), 80–85, for Eimeric's discussion of the invocation of the devil and demons and its relationship to heresy.

³ Fritz (Yitzhak) Baer, *Die Juden im christlichen Spanien: Urkunden und Regesten*, vol. 1: *Aragonien und Navarra* (Berlin, 1929; reprinted London, 1970), 1002, asserts that Samuel was probably from a Jewish family of Zaragoza. The documents Baer cites, however, say nothing about his origins, although they do suggest that his mother-in-law was from a family resident in Crown territories (see n. 24.) Arxiu de la Corona d'Aragó [hereafter ACA]: Cancilleria Real [hereafter C] 2451: 93r–95r (17 January 1415), the document Baer undoubtedly had in mind, does list a "Samuel de Granada" among other Jews of Zaragoza to whom the king was granting a moratorium on the payment of all outstanding debts. Our Samuel of Granada, however, was not in Zaragoza in January 1415, but in Valencia, where he had been since early December 1414 (see n. 25). Before that, he had been resident in Barcelona, at times under official detention, since at least 2 May 1414 (see n. 24). Of course, the debts in question could have been contracted prior to May 1414. In any case, I am not convinced that Samuel of Granada was a native of Zaragoza. Taking into account Samuel's toponymic and his ability to read and speak Arabic fluently, as well as the suspicions of the royal prosecutor and the inquisitor that he was a baptized Jew who had returned to Judaism sometime after 1391, I think that Samuel settled in Zaragoza and married the daughter of a local family—hence the mother-in-law—only after his return to Crown lands from "Granada" or North Africa, where he had relapsed into Judaism after forced conversion in 1391. See below at nn. 27–28.

nonetheless suggest an answer, but only after reconstructing the main charges against Samuel, and then locating Samuel's case within a history of jurisdictional conflict between crown and Inquisition regarding Jews and baptized Jews (*conversos*), itself part of a larger history of mendicant, especially Dominican, efforts first to confine the Jews and ultimately to remove them from the kingdom of Valencia. The reconstruction and contextualization of Samuel's case should shed some light on the nature of the mendicant assault on Jews and Judaism and its impact on the position of Jews and *conversos* in early fifteenth-century Valencia.

Even though royal and ecclesiastical authorities frequently squabbled over jurisdictional issues, they agreed often enough on the necessity of promoting the Catholic faith and ensuring the orthodoxy of its adherents. Both crown and Inquisition would have found cause for alarm in the allegations that the royal prosecutor was making about the activities of Samuel of Granada. There seem to have been two main charges against Samuel. The first was that Samuel was a sorcerer, conjurer of demons, and practitioner of evil and diabolic arts.⁴ This charge had little to do, however, with Samuel's alleged poisoning of royal subjects. Instead it was based on Samuel's efforts, through medicinal and magical means, to solve the problems of Old and New Christian clients seeking his assistance.⁵

Much of the case against Samuel as sorcerer centered on his dealings with Gil Blay, an elderly Old Christian carpenter who could not consummate his marriage with his young bride. According to Blay's own testimony, sorcery had caused his impotence, or his sexual incompatibility with his bride, and he therefore gladly took the advice of well-meaning female relatives who recommended that he pay a visit to "a Jew whom they call Master Samuel, [who] knows much about such things, as it is said that he has helped others." On his first visit to Samuel, Blay received perfumes with which to douse himself and his wife. Samuel also asked Blay and his wife to drink a bowl of water over which he made "signs of Solomon" and other things Blay "did not understand." Unfortunately these measures did not solve Blay's problem. On the next visit of his dissatisfied client, Samuel told him, "Sir,

⁴ Judging by the depositions of the witnesses, which are structured in accordance with their responses to specific (though no longer extant) questions, all of them were asked whether Samuel indeed practiced these various malefic arts.

⁵ By "New Christians" I mean converted Jews (or Muslims), and by "Old Christians" I mean Christians without Jewish or Muslim ancestry.

I need to go outside [the city] for a while [to see] a Muslim, my great friend, to learn about your bewitchment—how it was done and who did it.”⁶

When he returned to Valencia three days later, Samuel informed Blay as to the nature of his bewitchment: when Blay and his bride went to Mass on the day of their nuptials, there were two men standing on each side of the entrance to the church holding a chain; just after the couple and their party entered the church, the two men locked the ends of the chain together “in the name of Satan and Barabbas.”⁷ Despite Blay’s importunities, Samuel would not reveal the identity of the two men or the location of the chain. He could not, he asserted, because “the spirits would not consent” to it. Samuel did, however, tell Blay that the authors of the spell had acted out of envy, for they had wanted Blay’s bride to marry someone else. He assured Blay that he would cure him.⁸

⁶ ARV: B Procesos, Letra P, 2617: 3v–4v. The testimony of Gil Blay: “... ell dit testimoni pres per muller una fadrina ... e segons ell dit testimoni enteu de continent lo jorn de les noces lo ligaren en tal manera que james ell dit testimoni no es pogut pasar a consumir son matrimoni. Et stant axi ab gran congoxa per la dita raho, dues dones parentes e benvolentes dell dit testimoni complanyent dell li dixeren tals o semblants paraules: ‘En Gil voleu haver recapte de desligar a vos e vostra muller? Dit nos han que un juheu al qual dien maestre Samuel sap molt de semblants coses e aydarna a vos axi com se diu quen ha aydat a altres. Voleu quey anem?’ Et de continent ell dit testimoni ensemps ab les dites dones parentes e benvolentes sues anaren cercar lo dit juheu appellat maestre Samuel e trobaren lo e comtaren a aquell tot lo feyt ... e axi quelhi plagues de ajudarne a ell dit testimoni ... Et de continent lo dit maestre Samuel dix quell li daria bon recapte ... [Blay and Samuel then haggle over the fee, and agree on four florins.] ... lo dit maestre Samuel dona a ell dit testimoni dientli que sen perfumassen ell dit testimoni e sa muller. Et axi mateix li dona aygua de ques que fos e en una scudella lo dit maestre Samuel en esta forma, que en la dita scudella lo dit maestre Samuel feya senyales de Salamo e altres coses quell dit testimoni no entenia e puis destembravau ab aygua no sap ell dit testimoni quinya e donavau a beure a ell dit testimoni. Et axi mateix en altra scudella e feyau beure a la muller dell dit testimoni. Et les dites coses feu lo dit maestre Samuel per ben quatre vegades jatsia les dites coses valguesen fort poch a ell dit testimoni. Et veent ell dit testimoni que les dites coses no li valien res, ana al dit maestre Samuel ... Et lo dit maestre Samuel respos a ell dit testimoni: ‘Senyor, yo haure de necessitat anar de fora un poch a un moro, gran amich meu, per saber lo vostre ligament, com ses feyt e qui la feyt.’” The testimony of Maria (15r–17v), widow of the sailor Guillem Palma, corroborates Blay’s account. She was one of Blay’s two benevolent female relatives and had previously consulted Samuel about her own aches and pains.

⁷ For other cases in which Barabbas was invoked, along with Satan and other demons, see Juan Blázquez Miguel, *Eros y Tanatos: Brujería, hechichería y superstición en España* (Toledo, 1989), 251, 253, 265, 274, 276, 281, 285, 287, 305, 309. These are all sixteenth- and seventeenth-century cases.

⁸ ARV: B Procesos, Letra P, 2617: 5r–v. The testimony of Gil Blay continues: “Et ell

Blay never saw Samuel again and the marriage apparently remained unconsummated; hence Blay expressed disgruntlement that Samuel had kept the initial fee of four florins. Yet Samuel had told Blay's wounded ego just what it wanted to hear: that sorcery and jealous rivals were indeed the cause of the impotence. But he had not revealed too much. By remaining closed-mouthed about the names of Blay's enemies, Samuel hoped to perpetuate the delusion that salved Blay's pride and to keep him coming back for more of his ministrations. Samuel's performance as a benevolent yet inscrutable Jewish magician, privy to the secrets of King Solomon and aided by a mysterious Muslim friend, provided Blay with a kind of psychological therapy for a malady that did not admit of a medicinal cure. The circulation of rumors regarding his bewitchment and Samuel's efforts to cure him also enabled Blay to hold his head up in the neighborhood.⁹ His neighbors could not so easily mock him for having sexual problems of a supernatural origin.

Samuel's magical practices no doubt contributed to his "mystique" in the eyes of his Christian clientele.¹⁰ Still, Samuel was not merely posing; he really was a healer with genuine interests in magic and alchemy. Samuel was, in fact, a licensed physician, a "master in medicine" as King Fernando I referred to him in 1414.¹¹ Given the destruction of

dit testimoni dix, 'Senyor en Samuel prech vos quem digauu la manera com ses feyt lo meu ligament.' Et lo dit maestre Samuel li dix, 'Yous ho dire: Sapiau que que [sic] quant vos e vostra muller anas a missa lo jorn que fos novios dos homens stigueren a la porta de la sgleya, la hun a la una part del portal e l'altre a l'altra part, e tenien un cademat e com vos e vostra muller entras per la dita sgleya ells ajuniren la clau ab la boca del cademat et quant vench que vos e vostra muller e tots los quius acompanyaven a la missa fos entrats dins la dita sgleya ells tancaren lo dit cademat en nom de Baraban e de Satan ...' Et lladonchs ell dit testimoni dix al dit maestre Samuel, 'Senyor, vos me haveu a dir qui son los homens quen han feyt e per que ho han feyt'; e ell li respos que per enveja ho havien feyt que volien que altre hagues hauda sa muller e no ell dit testimoni. Et lladonchs ell dit testimoni dix, 'e donchs nos pot desfer?' e lo dit maestre Samuel respos, 'confie en dios que yo hi dare bon recapte ...' Et ell dit testimoni dix al dit maestre Samuel: 'Digau me on es lo cademat e qui son los homens. Digau me que vous pagare be.' Et lo dit maestre Samuel li respos que no curas dels homens que ab sagrament e homenatge ho tenia de no dir ho quels spirits non volien consentir quen digues."

⁹ The testimony of the knight Arnau Saranyó (ARV: B Procesos, Letra P, 2617: 18v–19r) shows that rumors had been circulating: "... havia hoyt dir a un hom, qui dien en Gil Blay, fuster ... quell era stat ligat ab sa muller e que alcunes persones lo haurien ligat per enveja e que era anat al dit maestre Samuel, juheu."

¹⁰ Shatzmiller, *Jews, Medicine*, 120, raises interesting questions about the "mystique" of Jewish doctors.

¹¹ ACA 2397: 162r–v (28 November 1414): "Samuelem de Granada, judeum magistrum in medicina."

Valencia's Jewish quarter in 1391, Samuel must have been the only licensed Jewish doctor working in the city.¹² His reputation for medical learning appears to have been widespread among local Christians, who thus usually called him "Master Samuel." Yet the cures of Samuel which are recorded—a poultice of cow dung and vinegar for a woman's aching shoulder, and the use of hares' teeth for toothaches—label him as an empirical practitioner who sometimes employed sympathetic magic.¹³

There was nothing at all unusual about a licensed physician practicing magic and alchemy. Many late medieval physicians, Jewish, Christian, and Muslim, were keenly interested in the "occult sciences" and their therapeutic utility.¹⁴ As impotence in particular was often deemed

¹² Luis García Ballester, Michael R. McVaugh, and Augustin Rubio Vela, *Medical Licensing and Learning in Fourteenth-Century Valencia* (Philadelphia, 1989), 68–121, document numerous instances of Jews being licensed to practice medicine in Valencia between 1378 and 1391. Luis García Ballester, *La medicina a la València medieval* (Valencia, 1988), 45–50, also discusses this question and shows that a number of *conversos* were licensed to practice after 1391. Jewish doctors, however, continued to work in other towns in the kingdom that still permitted Jewish residence, such as Castelló de la Plana. See José Ramón Magdalena Nom de Déu, "Estructura socio-económica de las aljamas castellonenses a finales del siglo XV," *Sefarad*, 32 (1972), 350.

¹³ Maria, the widow of Guillem Palma, recounted Samuel's suggestion as to how she might relieve the pain in her shoulder (ARV: B Procesos, Letra P, 2617: 16r): "madona, en lo mal de la spatla pondrets femta de bou e bolliſcla ab vinagre e metets vos ne un empaster en la spatla que aço'us levara la dolor." Joan Ysern testified (7r) about Samuel's response to officials when asked why he had hares' teeth in his house: "Et trobarenhi axi mateix quexals de lebre, los quals dix maestre Samuel que eren bons a dolor de quexals e de dents de homens." On sympathetic magic, see Kieckhefer, *Magic*, 67; and Joshua Trachtenberg, *Jewish Magic and Superstition: A Study in Folk Religion* (New York, 1939), 21, 134, who also notes (188) that parts of the hare were sometimes used in love potions, an application which would have been more appropriate in the case of Gil Bay.

¹⁴ Regarding Christian physicians, see, for instance, Nancy G. Siraisi, *Medieval & Early Renaissance Medicine: An Introduction to Knowledge and Practice* (Chicago, 1990), 149, 152; and Danielle Jacquart, "Theory, Everyday Practice, and Three Fifteenth-Century Physicians," *Osiris*, 2nd series, 6 (1990), 148–154. The Islamic background is explored by Danielle Jacquart and Françoise Micheau, *La médecine arabe et l'occident médiéval* (Paris, 1990); David Pingree, "The Diffusion of Arabic Magical Texts in Western Europe," in *La diffusione delle scienze islamiche nel medio evo europeo* (Rome, 1987), 57–102; and, for late medieval Spain in particular, Luis García Ballester, *Historia social de la medicina en la España de los siglos XIII al XVI*, vol. 1: *La minoría musulmana y morisca* (Madrid, 1976). In the case of Jewish physicians, the tendency to mix medical science, magic, demonology, and Kabbalah was perhaps even more accentuated in Renaissance Italy. See the study of Abraham Yagel by David B. Ruderman, *Kabbalah, Magic, and Science: The Cultural Universe of a Sixteenth-Century Jewish Physician* (Cambridge MA, 1988), 25–58; and the studies of Moshe Idel, "The Magical and Neoplatonic Interpretations of the Kabbalah

to be a result of bewitchment, Gil Blay chose wisely when he turned to Samuel, a physician conversant with magical techniques.¹⁵ Samuel's use of "signs of Solomon" to treat Blay was consistent with a tradition, by then widespread among adherents of all three faiths, that attributed power over demons and spirits to King Solomon and to those who acquired a mastery of Solomon's esoteric knowledge and methods.¹⁶ His consultation with a Muslim colleague must have fur-

in the Renaissance," in *Jewish Thought in the Sixteenth Century*, ed. Bernard Cooperman (Cambridge MA, 1983), 186–242, and "Hermeticism and Judaism," in *Hermeticism and the Renaissance: Intellectual History and the Occult in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Ingrid Merkel and Allen Debus (Washington, 1983), 59–76. While there is no evidence that Samuel of Granada was a student of Kabbalah, the point to be made is that his pursuit of the "occult sciences" was not atypical of Jewish physicians in the medieval and early modern periods.

¹⁵ James A. Brundage, "The Problem of Impotence," in *Sexual Practices and the Medieval Church*, ed. Vern Bullough and James A. Brundage (Buffalo, 1982), 135–140, shows that canon lawyers took seriously the possibility that impotence might be induced by witchcraft when handling the sexual problems of married couples. See also Henry E. Sigerist, "Impotence as a Result of Witchcraft," in *Essays in Biology in Honour of Herbert M. Evans* (Berkeley, 1943), 541–546; Danielle Jacquart and Claude Thomasset, *Sexuality and Medicine in the Middle Ages*, trans. Matthew Adamson (Princeton, 1988), 169–175; Jacqueline Murray, "On the Origins and Role of 'Wise Women' in Causes for Annulment on the Grounds of Male Impotence," *Journal of Medieval History*, 16 (1990), 237–242; Richard Kieckhefer, "Erotic Magic in Medieval Europe," in *Sex in the Middle Ages: A Book of Essays*, ed. Joyce Salisbury (London, 1991), 35–36, 43–45; and Michael R. McVaugh, *Medicine before the Plague: Practitioners and their Patients in the Crown of Aragon, 1285–1345* (Cambridge, 1993), 202–207. It is significant, then, that when Gil Blay found himself unable to consummate his marriage, he assumed that he had been *ligat*, that is, "bound by a spell." He therefore asked Samuel to *desligar* him and his wife, that is, "to free them from the spell" that had been cast upon them. Regarding similar beliefs among medieval Jews, see Peter Schäfer, "Jewish Magic Literature in Late Antiquity and Early Middle Ages," *Journal of Jewish Studies*, 41 (1990), 81, 84–88; H.J. Zimmels, *Magicians, Theologians, and Doctors: Studies in Folk-medicine and Folk-lore as reflected in the Rabbinical Responsa (12th–19th Centuries)* (London, 1952), 88; and especially Trachtenberg, *Jewish Magic*, 47–48, 127–130, who points out (127) that Jews used the Hebrew verb *'asar* ("to bind") when describing magical impediments to the sexual relations of a married couple.

¹⁶ Louis Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews*, 7 vols. (Philadelphia, 1913–1928), 4.142–144, 149–154, and 6.289, 291–292; F.C. Conybeare, "The Testament of Solomon," *Jewish Quarterly Review*, 11 (1899), 1–45, especially 25 and 36, regarding demons who cause problems for married couples; Lynn Thorndike, *A History of Magic and Experimental Science*, 8 vols. (New York, 1923–1938), 2.279–289; Ruderman, *Kabbalah, Magic, and Science*, 40–42; and Idel, "Magical and Neoplatonic Interpretations," 191–196. Joaquina Albarracín Navarro and Juan Martínez Ruiz, *Medicina, farmacopea y magia en el "Misceláneo de Salomón"* (*Texto árabe, traducción, glosas aljamiadas, estudio y glosario*) (Granada, 1987), 12–38, discuss the Solomonic tradition among Muslims in reference to an Arabic text redacted, with *aljamiado* glosses, by Castilian Muslims sometime between the mid-fourteenth and mid-fifteenth centuries. The text itself (143–145, 148–149, 151, 153, 165,

ther impressed Blay. Despite the erosion of Islamic high culture in the kingdom of Valencia during the centuries following the Christian conquest, Muslims continued to study and practice medicine, and they maintained a reputation among Christians for being effective practitioners of medicine and magic.¹⁷ Samuel “of Granada” knew Arabic and could thus profit from the expertise of his Muslim counterparts, whether through oral consultation or through reading Arabic texts in their possession.¹⁸

168, 186) treats various problems of conception, pregnancy, and childbirth caused by demons; impotence, however, is not specifically addressed.

The testimony of the knight Arnau Saranyó (ARV: B Procesos, Letra P, 2617: 19r) may shed additional light on the magical cures Samuel administered to Gil Blay. Regarding the bowl of water that Samuel had had Blay and his wife drink (4r-v), Saranyó added the detail, which “some persons had told him,” that “the said Jew had written [words of] the gospel of Saint John on a bowl and that he had mixed it with water (*hauria scrit lo avengeli de sent Johan en una taça e quen havia destemprat ab aygua*), and that he had given it to him [Blay] to drink, and that he had made him a pharmaceutical preparation (*letovari*) that he ate.” Trachtenberg, *Jewish Magic*, 123, notes the use of love potions concocted of written spells mixed in wine or water; and Ivan G. Marcus, *Rituals of Childhood: Jewish Acculturation in Medieval Europe* (New Haven, 1996), 36–41, discusses the “eating of texts” by Jewish children for pedagogic purposes. Why Samuel might have used the “gospel of Saint John” (if he did so at all) is unclear. Perhaps he did this to impress a Christian client, or perhaps Saranyó, an Old Christian, instinctively referred to a New Testament text. It would not in any case have been outlandish had Samuel asked his patient, in effect, to “drink texts.” See also Schäfer, “Jewish Magic Literature,” 87, on magic bowls.

¹⁷ García Ballester, *Medicina a la València medieval*, 31–45; and García Ballester, “A marginal learned medical world: Jewish, Muslim and Christian medical practitioners and the use of Arabic medical sources in late medieval Spain,” in *Practical Medicine from Salerno to the Black Death*, ed. Luis García Ballester et al. (Cambridge, 1994), 362–367. Ecclesiastical authorities in the kingdom of Valencia and in Catalonia tended to associate sorcery with the Muslim inhabitants of their regions, and they penalized Christians who had recourse to Muslim empirical practitioners and “sorcerers.” (They also punished Christian sorcerers.) See M. Milagros Cárcel Ortí and J.V. Boscá Codina, eds., *Visitas pastorales de Valencia (siglos XIV–XV)* (Valencia, 1996), 124–134, 154; M. Teresa García Egea, ed., *La visita pastoral a la diócesis de Tortosa del obispo Paholac, 1314* (Castelló, 1993), 78 (the diocese of Tortosa encompassed the northern part of the kingdom of Valencia); and Josep Perarnau i Espelt, “Activitats i fórmules supersticioses de guarició a Catalunya en la primera meitat del segle XIV,” *Arxiu de Textos Catalans Antics*, 1 (1982), 64–65.

¹⁸ The squire García Sánchez testified (ARV: B Procesos, Letra P, 2617: 32r) that he saw a former Muslim captive speaking to Samuel in Arabic (*parlava ab lo dit maestre Samuel en alguaravia*). Shatzmiller, *Jews, Medicine*, 40, 51–52, notes that Jews in the Crown of Aragon were still using Arabic scientific works in the mid-fourteenth century. García Ballester, “Marginal learned medical world,” 368–369, distinguishes between these Jews, who, over the course of the fourteenth century, gradually lost the ability to read Arabic and so increasingly relied on medical works in Hebrew, Romance, or even

Of the books that people witnessed Samuel receiving or discussing, however, only some were written in Arabic; others were written in Romance or Latin. Most apparently dealt with alchemy.¹⁹ Although Samuel read one book that offered amusing advice on how to “get women,” and allegedly sought to borrow another on necromancy for the purpose of finding treasure in France, alchemy seems to have been, aside from medicine, his greatest interest.²⁰ According to Joan Ysern, the *converso* tailor whose house Samuel rented, Samuel’s medical practice only supplemented his main livelihood as a metalworker, a craft

Latin, and their Castilian counterparts, who were still reading Arabic medical texts in the fifteenth century. Although, as Baer suggests (see n. 3), Samuel was probably not of Granadan origin, he must have spent some time there, thus acquiring his toponymic as well as his knowledge of Arabic.

¹⁹ The Valencian shoemaker Johan Grinau (ARV: B Procesos, Letra P, 2617: 24r–26r) had known Samuel four or five years earlier in Barcelona and there had seen a certain En Carmona, a member of the household of the archbishop of Tarragona, entrust to Samuel a book in which were “scrits algunes dolencies” that he did not want anyone else to see. The Valencian tailor Berenguer d’Alcanyis (35v–36r), who also witnessed this incident in Barcelona, heard Samuel and Carmona several times conversing about “the matter of alchemy,” which is suggestive as to the book’s content. The tailor Joan Ysern (29v–30r) saw Samuel receive another book “with parchment covers” in Valencia, but did not know anything about the contents except that it was probably the book that interested the royal prosecutor. The squire García Sánhez (32r–33r), who witnessed Samuel conversing in Arabic with a former Muslim captive (*un hom qui paria de aquests que ixen de catiù*), saw the latter entrust three books to Samuel. From what little García could understand of their conversation, he believed that the books dealt with alchemy. In one of the books he saw a diagram of three concentric circles in the center of which was a sword; there was a drawing of a man next to the circles. Thorndike, *History of Magic and Experimental Science*, has much of interest on late medieval alchemy in vols. 3 and 4; see especially 3.31–48, where Thorndike points out that, despite the decretal of Pope John XXII and the writings of the inquisitor Eimeric against alchemy, the opinions of most canon lawyers were lenient on the issue. Raphael Patai, *The Jewish Alchemists: A History and Source Book* (Princeton, 1994) is a very rich work. Among the observations he makes of relevance to this essay (pp. 95–317 deal with the medieval period) are that most Jewish alchemists were physicians, that they frequently deemed King Solomon to be the source of all alchemical knowledge, and that Christians tended to regard them as masters in the field.

²⁰ When Berenguer d’Alcanyis (ARV: B Procesos, Letra P, 2671: 35v) asked Samuel and En Carmona what was so funny about the book they were reading, Samuel answered, “rient nos de aquest libre qui parla de amos e de haver dones e tot parla de burles.” The testimony of Guillem Santa Línea (20v–21r): “... maestre Samuel interroga a ell dit testimoni si sabia art de igromancia [necromancy], car ell ho volia per traure un tresaur en Franca ... Et lo dit maestre Samuel demana a ell dit testimoni si tenia libres que fosen de la dita art.” On the medieval use of necromancy for locating hidden things, see Richard Kieckhefer, *Forbidden Rites: A Necromancer’s Manual of the Fifteenth Century* (Stroud, 1997), 96–125.

that fit perfectly with, or served as a cover for, his alchemical pursuits.²¹ When the royal prosecutor and his colleagues inspected Samuel's possessions, they found various tubes filled with powders and one containing quicksilver, a primary substance that alchemists utilized to transmute metals. Samuel maintained that these materials were "good for his office of metalworker" and for concocting the unguents he gave people for their aches and pains.²²

The royal prosecutor, as Samuel recognized, did not appreciate the potential benefits of alchemical experimentation. Yet, curiously enough, King Fernando did. Like his predecessors, Pere III (d. 1387) and Joan I (d. 1396), who had welcomed Jewish physicians to the royal court and had licensed Jewish alchemists to conduct experiments, probably in the hope that they might succeed in transforming base metals into gold,²³ Fernando prized Samuel for his skills as both a physician and an alchemist. Fernando himself acquitted Samuel after the royal prosecutor and Samuel's own mother-in-law had accused him of somehow using sorcery against the king.²⁴ Still enjoying the king's favor and no doubt pleased to escape his in-laws, Samuel was within the week en route to Valencia. There he was supposed to engage in alchemical work in behalf of the king and to receive for his labors a salary of eight sous per day for a maximum of one hundred days. King Fernando thus instructed the bailiff general to locate a secret place in the city or a nearby castle where Samuel, his wife, and two Muslims could live and work. Furthermore, the king, according to the noble Pere de Centelles, "for the friendship that he bore for him [Samuel],

²¹ ARV: B Procesos, Letra P, 2617: 6r-7r.

²² The testimony of Berenguer d'Alcanyic (ARV: B Procesos, Letra P, 2617: 9r): "Et veu ell dit testimoni que trobaren entre les altres coses uns canonets ab polvores e hun canonet altre ab argent viu [quicksilver] ... e dels canonets dix [Samuel] que los uns eren bons a son offici de batifulla ... e altres a medecines." The noble Pere de Centelles observed (llv), "maestre Samuel de Granada usava fer alquimia. Et que axi mateix practicava de medecina."

²³ Patai, *Jewish Alchemists*, 234-237; and Shatzmiller, *Jews, Medicine*, 58, 65, 73.

²⁴ ACA: C 2397: 162r-v (28 November 1414): "Informati veridice quod inquisitio que per vos [two lawyers of Barcelona appointed as judges by Prince Alfons] ... ad inquirendum contra Samuelem de Granada, judeum magistrum in medicina, delatum seu inculpatum de fatillis nobis per eum factis seu fiendis, et que extitit utique facta tam ad fisci nostri quam Bonanate judee socrus Samuelis eiusdem instantiam fundari minime valuit neque valet ad presens." Samuel was first arrested on the basis of these charges sometime before 2 May 1414, when King Fernando ordered Joan Marot, a jurist of Barcelona, to review the case (ACA: C 2369: 141v-142r).

commanded the bailiff of Valencia that if the said Master Samuel needed anything, he should give it to him.”²⁵

The king's friendship and pardon should have rendered Samuel practically invulnerable to prosecution by lay or ecclesiastical authorities. Yet there was Samuel, indicted by the royal prosecutor, arraigned before the court of the bailiff general, and targeted by the Inquisition. Pere d'Anglesola, the prosecutor, had his own agenda, and the bailiff general must have felt obliged at least to hear Anglesola's charges. After all, Samuel had not been on the king's payroll since mid-March 1415 and had since been practicing medicine, magic, and alchemy in the house he rented from Joan Ysern. Valencia, moreover, was not Barcelona, particularly with regard to affairs of the faith. In the kingdom of Valencia, as will be seen, the inquisitors had minds of their own and a history of defying kings, usually with the support of the bishop and sometimes with that of lay officials as well. However much protection King Fernando's goodwill afforded Samuel, it was but temporary. Less than a week after Ermengaud and Gascó sent their letter to the bailiff general, the king was dead.²⁶

In March, however, neither the prosecutor nor the inquisitor had any way of knowing that King Fernando would pass from the scene after only four years on the throne. What they did know and believe was that Samuel of Granada was a danger to Valencian Christians, Old and New. In their view, Samuel's alleged sorcery and necromancy were bad enough, but they assumed their full and disturbing significance only when combined with the other main charge against him: that he was a baptized Jew who had relapsed outside of Crown territories, perhaps in Muslim Granada, and then returned as a Jew. Given that, in the years

²⁵ ACA: C 2405: 58r (3 December 1414) is the king's letter to the bailiff general. For a summary of the contents of this letter, which I was, unfortunately, unable to consult myself, see *The Tortosa Disputation: Regesta of Documents from the Archivo de la Corona de Aragón, Fernando I, 1412–1416*, compiled by Gemma Escribà (Jerusalem, 1998), 131, no. 452. I am grateful to Gemma Escribà for sending me the recently published catalog. The testimony of Pere de Centelles (ARV: B Procesos, Letra P, 2617: 12r–v): “Et dix que ... havia hoyt dir ... que lo dit maestre Samuel de Granada ... havien pres en la ciutat de Barcelona, pero quen era exit ab sa bona justícia; hoc encara quel senyor Rey lo havia en amistat e que per l'amistat que li havia hauria manat al batle de Valencia que si res havia mester lo dit maestre Samuel que loy donas.” The testimonies of Joan Ysern (7v), Berenguer d'Alcanyis (9v), and Arnau Saranyó (19r) corroborate the statement of Centelles.

²⁶ Fernando I died on 2 April 1416.

after 1391, a number of Jews and forced converts departed Spain for North Africa and even Palestine, such an accusation was by no means incredible.²⁷

In their letter, Ermengaud and Gascó thus pointedly described Samuel as he “who claims to be a Jew.”²⁸ The prosecution and the defense both questioned the witnesses about Samuel’s religious identity. All stated that they believed him to be Jewish, and the *converso* witnesses were emphatic that Samuel was a fully observant Jew. The broker Andreu Gaçó, for instance, described Samuel kissing the fringes of his prayer shawl, and the tailor Berenguer d’Alcanyic noted that Samuel did not merely recite parts of prayers, as a crypto-Jew might do, but that he “finished his prayers.”²⁹

Even if the *converso* witnesses convinced the bailiff general that Samuel had never been baptized, their acknowledgment of their own frequent contact with this pious Jew must have concerned him. Uncertainty about the fealty of Valencian *conversos* to the Catholic faith had plagued lay as well as ecclesiastical authorities since the mass baptisms in 1391. The evidence contained in Samuel’s dossier would have fed this uncertainty and evoked disquieting notions of the blurring of reli-

²⁷ See B. Dinur, “A Wave of Emigration from Spain to Eretz Yisrael after the Persecutions of 1391,” [Hebrew] *Zion*, 32 (1967), 161–174; the corrections and further evidence presented by Joseph R. Hacker, “Links Between Spanish Jewry and Palestine, 1391–1492,” in *Vision and Conflict in the Holy Land*, ed. Richard I. Cohen (New York and Jerusalem, 1985), 114–125; H.Z. Hirschberg, *A History of the Jews in North Africa*, 2 vols. (Leiden, 1974–1981), 1.384–388; and below at n. 47 for specifically Valencian examples. That Samuel “of Granada” had a mother-in-law who was apparently of Catalan or Aragonese origin lends some substance to the suspicions of the inquisitor and the royal prosecutor. On the other hand, the Inquisition sometimes falsely accused Jews who had never been baptized of backsliding after conversion in 1391; see below at n. 57.

²⁸ See n. 2: “... qui pro judeo se gerit.”

²⁹ The testimonies of Andreu Gaçó (ARV: B Procesos, Letra P, 2617: 27r): “... lo interrogava si era juheu o crestia, lo qual li respos que juheu era e tota vegada de lavors ença ha tengut ell dit testimoni per juheu e li ha vist fer algunes cerimonies judayques axi com besar cint a manera de sobrepellir en aquelles hores que vestir lo devia e semblants abits usen los que son prohomens e bons juheus”; and Berenguer d’Alcanyic (34v–35r): “Es veritat quel coneix per bon juheu e li ha hoyt dir ses oracions axi com bons juheus deven e acostumen dir ... e aço sap ell dit testimoni per tal com diverses vegades entrava en casa del dit maestre Samuel e trobava aquell que feya oracio a la manera judayca no parlant trosus que aquell havia acabades ses oracions.” The portrait of Samuel as an observant and pious Jew that emerges from these and similar depositions was not incongruous with his practice of magic and alchemy. For useful methodological perspectives, though concerning later and earlier periods, respectively, see Ruderman, *Kabbalah, Magic, and Science*, 102–120; and Michael D. Swartz, *Scholastic Magic: Ritual and Revelation in Early Jewish Mysticism* (Princeton, 1996), 18–25, 217–229.

gious boundaries between Old and New Christians and Jews and Muslims, and of their mingling in a world of sorcery, alchemy, and Judaism, where seemingly everything but Catholicism was practiced.³⁰

These were precisely the kinds of developments against which the Dominican inquisitors were determined to defend the church. Were they to get their hands on Samuel's dossier, they would have more ammunition with which to attack the *conversos* and more evidence with which to make the case to the king that the very presence of Jews in the kingdom constituted a grave threat to the faith of Valencian Catholics. Imputing such designs to the Dominican inquisitors should not seem too much of an overstatement after a brief consideration of the history of mendicant, especially Dominican, initiatives against Jews and *conversos* in the kingdom.

Missionizing friars entered the newly conquered kingdom in the later thirteenth century. Although few Jews succumbed to the friars' new modes of persuasion, they still had to face the menacing Christian crowds and threats from the mendicants themselves entailed in the preaching campaigns.³¹ Mendicant preaching, moreover, pointed

³⁰ See, for instance, the case of Jacob Façan, a Jew of Morvedre, in which King Joan I makes similar associations and expresses similar fears; ACA: C 1906: 64r–66r (10 May 1393) (largely transcribed in Baer, *Die Juden*, 1.706–710); and my interpretation of this case in “The Jewish Community in Murviedro [Morvedre] (1391–1492),” in *The Jews of Spain and the Expulsion of 1492*, ed. M. Lazar and S. Haliczzer (Lancaster, Calif., 1997), 132–133. There is a large and growing historiography on the *conversos*. The great majority of the historiography, however, treats only Castile in the years after 1449. The *conversos* of the Crown of Aragon, including the kingdom of Valencia, and *converso* experience between 1391 and the mid-fifteenth century tend to be neglected. On *conversos* and the Spanish Inquisition in Valencia, see Ricardo García Cárcel, *Orígenes de la Inquisición española: El tribunal de Valencia, 1478–1530* (Barcelona, 1976), 37–108, 195–200; Stephen Haliczzer, *Inquisition and Society in the Kingdom of Valencia, 1478–1834* (Berkeley, 1990), 209–243; and Angelina García, *Els Vives: Una família de jueus valencians* (Valencia, 1987). There is very little on the early period, but see Jaime Castillo Sainz, “De solidaritats jueves a confraries de conversos: entre la fossilització i la integració d'una minoria religiosa,” *Revista d'Història Medieval*, 4 (1993), 183–205; and José Luis Luz Compañ, “Familias judías—familias conversas. Aproximación a los neófitos valencianos del siglo XIV,” *Espacio, Tiempo y Forma: Historia Medieval*, serie III, 6 (1993), 409–424. Mark D. Meyerson, *A Jewish Renaissance in Fifteenth-Century Spain* (Princeton, 2004), chaps. 1 and 6, presents a detailed discussion of the situation of Jews and *conversos* in the kingdom of Valencia, and their treatment by monarchs and papal inquisitors between 1391 and 1416.

³¹ Jeremy Cohen, *The Friars and the Jews: The Evolution of Medieval Anti-Judaism* (Ithaca, 1982), esp. 103–169; Robert Chazan, *Daggers of Faith: Thirteenth-Century Christian Missionizing and Jewish Response* (Berkeley, 1989); Yom Tov Assis, *The Golden Age of Aragonese Jewry: Community and Society in the Crown of Aragon, 1213–1327* (London, 1997), 49–63; and Jaume

toward a socioreligious order so different from the prevailing one, in which Jewish officials lorded it over Christians, that it must have contributed to the widespread demand for the ouster of Jewish bailiffs, a demand to which King Pere II acceded in 1283.³²

Ramon Despont, bishop of Valencia from 1289 to 1312, took further steps to put the Jews in their place, though it is striking that his anti-Jewish agitation began only after his entry into the Dominican Order in 1303. A reformer who addressed himself to the needs of the poor and who thus established the almonry of the see of Valencia, Bishop Ramon moved aggressively against usurers, Christian and Jewish.³³ Regarding Jewish lenders, the bishop and his Official were determined not just to restrain those who charged interest at a rate higher than that set by the crown but to suppress their activity altogether. They therefore enjoined notaries to take an oath not to redact credit instruments for Jews and Christians; they encouraged Christians to boycott Jewish lenders; and they censured and even excommunicated Christian officials who cooperated with Jewish creditors.³⁴ The bishop also called for the destruction of at least one synagogue that a Jewish community had built to

Riera i Sans, "Les llicències reials per predicar als jueus i als sarraïns (segles XIII–XIV)," *Calls*, 2 (1987), 113–143. Robert I. Burns, "Christian-Islamic Confrontation in the West: The Thirteenth-Century Dream of Conversion," *American Historical Review*, 76 (1971), 1386–1434, covers the case of the Muslims and provides much useful information on the context of the missionary campaigns among the Jews.

³² David Romano, *Judíos al servicio de Pedro el Grande de Aragón (1276–1285)* (Barcelona, 1983), esp. 175–178; Jerome Lee Shneidman, "Jews as Royal Bailiffs in Thirteenth-Century Aragon," *Historia Judaica*, 19 (1957), 55–66, and "Jews in the Royal Administration of Thirteenth Century Aragon," *Historia Judaica*, 21 (1959), 37–52; Baer, *A History of the Jews in Christian Spain*, 2 vols. (Philadelphia, 1961–1966), 1.166; and Robert I. Burns, *Medieval Colonialism: Postcrusade Exploitation of Islamic Valencia* (Princeton, 1975), 273, 291, and *Muslims, Christians, and Jews in the Crusader Kingdom of Valencia* (Cambridge, 1984), 133. For a different interpretation of the evidence, see Mark D. Meyerson, *Jews in an Iberian Frontier Kingdom* (Leiden, 2004), chap. 2.

³³ Vicente Cárcel Ortí, *Historia de la Iglesia en Valencia*, (Valencia, 1986), vol. 1: 92–93; and I. Pérez de Heredia, "Sínodos medievales de Valencia: edición bilingüe," *Anthologica annua*, 40 (1993), 617–697, for the synods held by Bishop Ramon. For a discussion of the approaches of church and western European monarchies to the problem of Jewish moneylending in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, see Joseph Shatzmiller, *Shylock Reconsidered: Jews, Moneylending, and Medieval Society* (Berkeley, 1990), 43–70, and esp. 45 and 189 n. 3, emphasizing the hard line taken by leading Dominican thinkers, such as Ramon de Penyafort and Thomas Aquinas, against Jewish usury.

³⁴ ACA: C 136: 119v (16 July 1305), 209r (7 September 1305); C 137: 63r (21 December 1304), 70v, 72r; C 235: 201v (26 March 1305); C 236: 11v–12r (30 July 1305); Cartas Reales Jaime II, caja 19, no. 2415 (13 August 1305).

accommodate its expanding population.³⁵ One effect of the actions of the zealous bishop was an intensification of anti-Jewish violence during Holy Week. The several Jewish complaints to the king, in the years after the bishop's conversion, about the marked zest with which Christians attempted to humiliate and harm them suggest as much.³⁶ The successors of Bishop Ramon were not mendicants, but they largely followed his line on the issue of usury and periodically caused problems for Jewish lenders, and thus, later in the fourteenth century, irritated the king.³⁷

Even if not friars themselves, the bishops of Valencia and their vicars usually cooperated and worked closely with mendicant inquisitors on cases concerning Jews. Valencian Jews first fell under inquisitorial scrutiny in 1325, and again in 1360, because of the aid and encouragement they gave to relapsed Jewish converts from Provence.³⁸ More controversial than the alleged ecclesiastical jurisdiction over Jews in such cases were the claims of inquisitors, most notably Nicolau Eimeric, that they could prosecute Jews for the crimes and heresies they committed against their own faith as well as for those committed against

³⁵ ACA: C 134: 268r-v (26 March 1305); and C 235: 213r (22 April 1305). The synagogue in question was that of the Jews of Morvedre.

³⁶ ACA: C 133: 125r (2 November 1304); C 134: 192r-v (26 December 1304), 268v (5 April 1305); and C 289: 57r (16 April 1308). See also Mark D. Meyerson, "Bishop Ramon Despont and the Jews of the Kingdom of Valencia," *Anuario de Estudios Medievales*, 29 (1999), 641-653.

³⁷ For instance, ACA: C 643: 63r-v (19 July 1346). See Meyerson, *Jews in an Iberian Frontier Kingdom*, chap. 4.

³⁸ Yom Tov Assis, "Juifs de France réfugiés en Aragon (XIIIe-XIVe siècles)," *Revue des études juives*, 142 (1983), 285-322; and Yom Tov Assis, "The Papal Inquisition and Aragonese Jewry in the Early Fourteenth Century," *Mediaeval Studies*, 49 (1987), 391-410. The work of Assis is especially useful regarding Catalonia and the kingdom of Aragon. For the procedure of the Inquisition against some Jews of Xàtiva in 1325, see Johannes Vincke, *Zur Vorgeschichte der Spanischen Inquisition: Die Inquisition in Aragon, Katalonien, Mallorca und Valencia während des 13. und 14. Jahrhunderts* (Bonn, 1941), 66, no. 17 (ACA: C 302: 241r [15 April 1325]). Although the document does not state why the inquisitor was taking action against these Jews, their assistance to baptized Jews from Provence is the probable cause, given the contemporaneous procedure against Jews of Calatayud for this cause (Assis, "Juifs de France," 313-314). ARV: B 1143: 2v-3r, 10r-v, 11v-12v, 22r-v, 24r-v, 34r-v, 46v, 48r-v, 49v-50r, 54r-v all concern the initiatives taken by the Franciscan inquisitor, Bernat Dezpuig, between January and May 1360 against several Jews of Borriana, due to their aid to relapsed Provençal converts. José Ramón Magdalena Nom de Déu, "Delitos y 'calònies' de los judíos valencianos en la segunda mitad del siglo XIV (1351-1384)," *Anuario de Filología*, 2 (Barcelona, 1976), 199-200, notes the confiscation of property from relapsed Provençal converts in 1360.

the Catholic faith.³⁹ The practice of magic and necromancy by some Jews, deemed a violation of both Jewish and Christian law, provided inquisitors with opportunities to realize their claims. In 1352 and 1360 the Inquisition prosecuted Valencian Jews for sorcery and for having recourse to Jewish diviners in order to locate lost and stolen property.⁴⁰ In 1384, it more ominously investigated Christian adoration of devils in the home of the Jew Salamies Nasci.⁴¹ King Pere III, who was frequently at loggerheads with the inquisitors, permitted them to proceed but asserted that punishment of the Jews, who were fined in these cases, was the royal prerogative.

When Joan I succeeded Pere in 1387, he moved decisively to hamstring the inquisitors. Taking advantage of the schism and his leverage with the Avignon papacy, Joan demanded that Pope Clement VII recognize the crown's exclusive jurisdiction in cases involving Jews and Muslims. The pope did not comply, however, and Joan found himself fighting the same battles as his father and with no greater success.⁴²

King Joan's own tendency to believe the inquisitors' most fantastic charges against Jews prevented him from taking too firm a stand. As prince he had zealously tortured and executed Jews for alleged host desecration, despite his father's disapproval.⁴³ As king he did not prevent the inquisitor from jailing Mahir Xuxen of Xàtiva on charges of fashioning and worshipping an image of metal and mandrake. Although

³⁹ *Inter alia*, see Cohen, *Friars and the Jews*, 96–99; Shlomo Simonsohn, *The Apostolic See and the Jews*, 8 vols. (Toronto, 1988–1991), 7:343–366; Josep Perarnau i Espelt, “El *Tractatus brevis super iurisdictione inquisitorum contra infideles fidei catholicam agitates* de Nicolau Eimeric: Edició i estudi del text,” *Arxiu de Textos Catalans Antics*, 1 (1982), 78–126; and Eimeric and Peña, *Manual*, 88–94.

⁴⁰ Vincke, *Vorgeschichte*, 83, no. 46 (ACA: C 1320: 188v [4 February 1352]); and Baer, *Die Juden*, 1:343, no. 249 (ACA: C 893: 124v [23 April 1352]). ARV: B 1143: 96v–97r (13 July 1360) concerns the procedure of the Official of the bishop of Valencia against *maestre* Menasse Turi, Jew of Valencia, because “aquell ana a una juhia fetillera o adevina per demanar a aquella si li sabria dir qui tendria una pedra preciosa ... la qual era stada perduda.” Considering the usual cooperation between the bishops of Valencia and the papal inquisitors, the latter were in all likelihood involved in this case as well.

⁴¹ Vincke, *Vorgeschichte*, 123, no. 112 (ACA: C 1662: 35r [30 September 1384]).

⁴² Perarnau, “*Tractatus brevis*,” 80–82; and Jaume de Puig i Oliver, “El *Tractatus de haeresi et de infidelium incredulitate et de horum criminum iudice*, de Felip Ribot, O. Carm. Edició i estudi,” *Arxiu de Textos Catalans Antics*, 1 (1982), 133–137.

⁴³ Joaquim Miret y Sans, “El proces de les hosties contra ls jueus d’Osca en 1377,” *Anuari del Institut d’Estudis Catalans*, 4 (1911/1912), 59–80; Baer, *History*, 2:85–92. See J.M. Roca, *Johan I d’Aragó* (Barcelona, 1929), on the “superstitious” character of King Joan.

Joan challenged the inquisitor, he did so not because of the absurdity of the accusations against Xuxen but on jurisdictional grounds, and in order to secure for the crown a share of the inheritance of Xuxen, who died in prison just months before anti-Jewish violence swept the kingdom of Valencia in July 1391.⁴⁴

The violence of 1391 created a markedly different socioreligious landscape in the kingdom. The huge Jewish community of Valencia city was destroyed; most of its members converted. There were also mass baptisms in Borriana, Castelló, and Xàtiva, and although small Jewish communities reemerged in these towns, only Morvedre, whose Jews mostly escaped the violence, continued to have a sizeable Jewish community.⁴⁵

For the inquisitors, all this signified the beginning of the end of Judaism in the kingdom. Like their famous Dominican confrere Vicent Ferrer, they were anxious to complete the proselytizing work begun in July 1391, a point of view not necessarily shared by the monarchy. Kings and inquisitors concurred, however, on the necessity of preventing the *conversos* from returning to Judaism, whether in the kingdom or abroad.⁴⁶

Throughout the 1390s King Joan and his successor Martí endeavored to stop the clandestine flight of *conversos* to North Africa. Material as well as religious concerns motivated the monarchs. Hence they pardoned affluent *conversos* apprehended on the beach or at sea, and they permitted *conversos* to trade with North Africa as long as they left

⁴⁴ Winfried Küchler, "Mosse Mahir Suxen: Ein Beitrag zur Inquisition und zum Judenregal in den Ländern der aragonischen Krone," *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kulturgeschichte spaniens*, 21 (1963), 175–186. Transcribed documents on this case can be found in Vincke, *Vorgeschichte*, 135–136, nos. 126–127 (ACA: C 1948: 30v [5 August 1390]; C 1873: 182r [12 December 1390]); and in Simonsohn, *Apostolic See*, 1.502–504, no. 472. Xuxen died sometime before 12 December 1390.

⁴⁵ Baer, *History*, 2.99–102; Philippe Wolff, "The 1391 Pogrom in Spain: Social Crisis or Not?" *Past and Present*, 50 (1971), 4–18; Jaume Riera Sans, "Los tumultos contra las juderías de la Corona de Aragón en 1391," *Cuadernos de Historia: Anexos de la Revista "Hispania"*, 8 (1977), 213–265; Eliseo Vidal Beltrán, *Valencia en la época de Juan I* (Valencia, 1974), 53–70; and José Hinojosa Montalvo, *The Jews of the Kingdom of Valencia: from Persecution to Expulsion, 1391–1492* (Jerusalem, 1993), 21–66. Meyerson, *Jewish Renaissance*, chap. 1, treats the impact of the events of 1391 on the Jews of Morvedre.

⁴⁶ I can provide here merely a sketch of the policies of Joan I and Martí I toward Jews and *conversos* in the kingdom of Valencia and their changing views of the anti-Jewish initiatives of the papal inquisitors and the bishop of Valencia. For a detailed analysis, see Meyerson, *Jewish Renaissance*.

their families behind and substantial securities with the bailiff general.⁴⁷ Lacking the machinery to patrol the coastline, the inquisitors played a minimal role here.

They were of course key players in the struggle against judaizing *conversos* and their Jewish accomplices inside the kingdom, though the freedom of action the kings were prepared to allow them changed over the years. King Joan ordered royal officials in November 1393 to cooperate with the inquisitor general Barthomeu Gaço in his procedure against “wicked” *conversos* holding “the erroneous sect [Judaism] in their depraved heart[s],” whom the king characteristically associated with “other wicked persons touched by heretical depravity who ... invoke evil spirits and adore and perfume them.”⁴⁸ Earlier that year the king had heavily fined a Jew of Morvedre for spiriting his baptized son to North Africa and for practicing “the diabolic art” along with Jewish, Muslim, and Christian sorcerers. The presiding official in this case was none other than the royal prosecutor Pere d’Anglesola, the nemesis of Samuel of Granada twenty-three years later.⁴⁹ In the minds of King Joan and Anglesola, where Judaism, sorcery, and devil-worship seem to have converged, the judaizing of *conversos* presented a dire threat to the Catholic church.

Still, in the interest of the royal treasury, to which Jews and *conversos* contributed, Joan could not allow either his imagination or the inquisitors to run too wild. Hence in 1394 he reproached the inquisitor Gaço for indiscriminately punishing *conversos* in Borriana and Valencia and precipitating their flight.⁵⁰ The question of the very jurisdiction of the papal Inquisition in cases involving Jews and Muslims, as opposed to New Christians, was, as far as the king was concerned, debatable. He therefore bade officials in Morvedre not to cooperate with the inquisi-

⁴⁷ Hinojosa, *Jews*, nos. 72, 82, 83, 94, 122, 152, 171, 185, 205, and 209; and ACA: C 2240: 27v (8 January 1398), 68r (15 March 1398); C 2194: 62r–v (16 September 1399); C 2193: 123r–124r (20 January 1400); C 2233: 9r–v (11 July 1400).

⁴⁸ Vincke, *Vorgeschichte*, 150, no. 144 (ACA: C 1927: 101r–v [7 November 1393]): “Com l’amat nostre religios frare Barthomeu Gaço mestre en la santa theologia enqueridor per nos deputat en lo dit regne de Valencia ... per fer alguns enantaments contra alguns malvats converses qui la secta erronea ... tenen en lur cor empravitada e aximateix per enquerir contra algunes altres malvades persones tocades de la heretical pravitat qui ... invoquen mals spirits e aquelles adoren e perfumen.”

⁴⁹ ACA: C 1906: 64r–66r (10 May 1393); see n. 30 for further details.

⁵⁰ ACA: C 1861: 34r–v (7 April 1394) [Hinojosa, *Jews*, 457, no. 219], for Borriana; and C 1862: 43r–44r (10 September 1394) [Hinojosa, *Jews*, 463–464, no. 232], for Valencia.

tors in their "daily" investigations of local Jews for heresy, lest the Jewish quarter be depopulated. Later, however, Joan had these same officials prohibit Morvedre's *conversos* from living and praying with Jews.⁵¹

Though given less to fantasy than his brother Joan, the pious King Martí I (d. 1410) was equally determined to end the Jewish practices of *conversos*, and he issued various proclamations to this effect.⁵² It was also Martí who, in 1397, terminated efforts to reestablish a Jewish community in Valencia, believing that the coexistence of Jews with the city's numerous *conversos* would result in "grave scandals and errors."⁵³ In 1403 he forbade Jews doing business in Valencia to stay there for more than ten days; nor could they be lodged in any *converso* parish or household. Yet this legislation applied only to the kingdom's Jews, those most likely to encourage baptized relatives and friends to judaize. In the interest of commerce, foreign Jews, like Samuel of Granada, were permitted longer visits.⁵⁴

Martí initially favored the Inquisition, and he commanded lay officials to work with it to extirpate the errors of *conversos* and to separate them from the Jews.⁵⁵ Believing that the "heresies" of the Talmud were responsible for the blindness of the Jews to Christian truth, Martí feared that some talmudic Jews were disseminating their ideas among *conversos* and thereby rendering them impervious to Christian teaching. He thus permitted the papal Inquisition to prosecute the guilty Jews, and even ordered royal officials to confiscate copies of the Talmud.⁵⁶

⁵¹ ACA: C 1906: 213v–214v (1 March 1394) [Hinojosa, *Jews*, 450, no. 209], regarding the inquisitors' activities; and C 1911: 46r (4 April 1396) [transcribed in Antonio Chabret Fraga, *Sagunto: su historia y sus monumentos*, 2 vols. (Barcelona, 1888; reprinted Sagunto, 1979), 2.341–342 n. 1], regarding the separation of Jews and *conversos* in Morvedre.

⁵² ACA: C 2229: 60r (4 February 1398); C 2173: 115r (12 August 1400). We still lack a thorough study of the reign of Martí I or an extensive biography of him, but see Rafael Tasis i Marca, *Pere el Ceremoniós i els seus fills*, 2nd ed. (Barcelona, 1980), 195–241.

⁵³ ACA: C 2209: 149r–150r (22 February 1397): "... unde inconvenientia quamplurima proveniunt aliasque scandala gravia et errores evenire proculdubio sperantur."

⁵⁴ ACA: C 2322: 43r (28 September 1403).

⁵⁵ ACA: C 2229: 60r (4 February 1398).

⁵⁶ ACA: C 2173: 115r (12 August 1400). To this letter, addressed to all royal officials throughout his realms and entitled "pragmatica contra neophytos ad evitandos judeorum ritus," Martí added, as almost a postscript, an order calling for the enforcement of the rulings of Popes Gregory IX and Innocent IV on the Talmud. (*Inter alia*, see Cohen, *Friars and the Jews*, 60–99; and Simonsohn, *Apostolic See*, 7.300–307, and the literature cited there.) This indicates that Martí wanted officials to confiscate copies of the Talmud for examination, if not burning. However, I have not encountered evidence that this order was carried out, certainly not for the kingdom of Valencia. Martí's *pragmat-*

By the end of 1401, however, the king had begun to sing a different tune because the inquisitors were exceeding the limits of their mandate. The inquisitors and their allies in the episcopal palace were not satisfied with correcting heretical New Christians and their Jewish accomplices; they were intent on harassing, punishing, and converting whichever professing Jews they could get their hands on. They imprisoned several Jews, mostly women, on spurious charges of having received baptism in 1391 and then abandoning the Catholic faith. Apparently their plan was to terrorize or starve these women into submission, in the hope that their demoralized kin would either follow them into the church or perhaps simply flee the kingdom. At least two Jewish women died in prison.⁵⁷

The inquisitors' excesses clearly disgusted King Martí and Queen María. In a letter of 1402 to the inquisitor Gaçó, Martí argued that, since the Jews are not members of the church, they could not fall under the jurisdiction of the Inquisition.⁵⁸ Despite this argument and other royal letters forbidding inquisitorial prosecution of Jews, the inquisitors would not relent. By the end of his reign, Martí had even begun to wonder about the inquisitors' initiatives against *conversos*, accusing them of ransacking *converso* homes on questionable grounds and causing *converso* emigration.⁵⁹ Also, in letters with ominous implications for the case of Samuel of Granada, Martí enjoined Valencia's criminal justice

ica was soon followed by a letter enjoining all officials to cooperate with "inquisitionis officium contra judeos et sarracenos inceptum seu etiam incipiendum per inquisitores heretice pravitatis seu commissarios eorundem"; ACA: C 2195: 68v (15 September 1400). A similar letter (C 2195: 68r) was sent to officials in the kingdom of Mallorca and in the counties of Rosselló and Cerdanya urging cooperation with the Dominican inquisitor.

⁵⁷ ACA: C 2175: 18r (5 August 1401) concerns the death of the wife of Saçon Najari, a Jew of Teruel, whom Gil Sánchez Munyos, a canon of the see of Valencia commissioned by the inquisitor, prosecuted and imprisoned. (The Aragonese town of Teruel fell under the jurisdiction of the Inquisition in Valencia.) ACA: C 2338: 1v (30 September 1401); and C 2174: 26r-v (20-21 September 1401) [Baer, *Die Juden*, 1.772-774, no. 474] treat the case of Mira, a Jewish woman of Morvedre, whom the inquisitor imprisoned and attempted to starve into submission. ACA: C 2236: 52v (23 November 1407); C 2156: 186v (12 September 1408); C 2186: 104r-v (16 September 1408); and C 2163: 82v (2 June 1409) deal with the procedure of the Inquisition against Samuel Suxen, Jew of Morvedre, his wife Jamila, and Jamila's elderly aunt Astruga, the widow of Salamó Abenmarvez. Astruga died either in prison or shortly after her release from an illness contracted in prison. See Meyerson, *Jewish Renaissance*, for further details.

⁵⁸ ACA: C 2174: 105r-v (8 August 1402) [Baer, *Die Juden*, 1.775-777, no. 476].

⁵⁹ ACA: C 2163: 23r (8 March 1409).

and other officials to cease arresting and remitting to the bishop's court North African Jewish, Muslim, and *converso* merchants.⁶⁰

During the short, eventful reign of Fernando I (1412–1416), Pope Benedict XIII staged the Disputation of Tortosa in 1413–1414 and both Pope Benedict and King Fernando issued restrictive laws against the Jews in 1415. Their actions owed much to the influence of the Valencian Dominican Vicent Ferrer.⁶¹ Intent on converting the Jews, Ferrer preached to captive Jewish audiences throughout Castile and the Crown of Aragon. Even though he criticized the violence and forced baptisms of 1391, his inflammatory preaching, which attracted large crowds of Christians, caused attacks on Jews. Ferrer was also very anxious about the ill effects of contact with Jews on Christians, especially *conversos*, and therefore called for the complete separation of Jews from Christians. He even demanded the excommunication of Christians who continued to mingle with Jews. Ferrer's ideas inspired the oppressive laws promulgated in Castile in 1412, the model for those issued by Benedict XIII and Fernando I in 1415. The aim of these laws, which, if fully enforced, would have reduced the Jews to the status of impoverished pariahs, was to pressure the Jews to convert. In Morvedre at least, all this anti-Jewish activity resulted, as hoped, in the conversion of several Jews and in the further confinement of the rest.⁶²

⁶⁰ ACA: C 2237: 86r (12 March 1409); and 84r–v (13 March 1409).

⁶¹ *Inter alia*, Baer, *History*, 2.166–243; Maurice Kriegel, *Les juifs à la fin du Moyen Âge dans l'Europe méditerranéenne* (Paris, 1979), 181–226; Francisca Vendrell, “La política proselitista del rey D. Fernando I de Aragón,” *Sefarad*, 10 (1950), 349–366; Vendrell, “La actividad proselitista de San Vicente Ferrer durante el reinado de Fernando I de Aragón,” *Sefarad*, 13 (1953), 87–104; Vendrell, “En torno a la confirmación real, en Aragón, de la pragmática de Benedicto XIII,” *Sefarad*, 20 (1960), 319–351; Bernardino Llorca, “San Vicente Ferrer y su labor en la conversión de los judíos,” *Razón y fe*, 151 (1955), 277–296; José M. Millás Vallicrosa, “En torno a la predicación judaica de San Vicente Ferrer,” *Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia*, 142 (1958), 189–198; Millás Vallicrosa, “San Vicente Ferrer y el antisemitismo,” *Sefarad*, 10 (1950), 182–184; and P.M. Cátedra, “La predicación castellana de San Vicente Ferrer,” *Boletín de la Real Academia de Buenas Letras de Barcelona*, 39 (1984), 235–309. I am grateful to Professor David Viera for allowing me to consult his unpublished paper, “The Treatment of the Jews in Vincent Ferrer's Vernacular Sermons.” See also his contribution to this volume on the Franciscan Francesc Eiximenis, whose views and writings were influential in the city of Valencia.

⁶² For example, ACA: C 2375: 173r–v (23 August 1415); C 2396: 196r–v (23 August 1415); C 2374: 190r–v (15 July 1415); C 2397: 182r (30 July 1415). See also the comments in Meyerson, “Jewish Community in Murviedro [Morvedre],” 136–137, and in Meyerson, *Jewish Renaissance*.

There was another key player in the case of Samuel of Granada: the municipality of Valencia. Concerned to promote Valencia's power and prosperity, which they linked to its demographic growth, and anxious to propagate an image of Valencia as a Christian republic, its ruling elites were perennially obsessed with the sins of the Christian population, which, they feared, might besmirch the city's image and bring upon it divine punishment, in the form of plague and famine. They often viewed Jews and Muslims as sources of temptation for Christian sinners, and when plague threatened or struck they issued orders, in almost ritual fashion, calling for their separation from Christians. In all this, the city government was seconded by the local ecclesiastical establishment and most notably by that preacher of penitence and apocalypse, Vicent Ferrer. A native Valencian, Ferrer functioned practically as an ideologue for the municipality. Through his preaching he widely disseminated his conception of a proper socioreligious order, one that accorded with and contributed to the urban image that the elites were so keen to project.⁶³

In 1391, violence and the cleansing waters of baptism had removed one large blemish from Valencia's socioreligious landscape: the Jewish community. Although the aldermen (*jurats*) expressed discomfort and regret about the violence, they also sacralized it by disseminating accounts of the miraculous replenishment of the chrism which had been exhausted through the baptism of so many Jews.⁶⁴ It was, moreover, the aldermen who sought from King Martí the "privilege" of never again having a Jewish quarter and who urged him to prohibit Jews from entering the city.⁶⁵

The destruction of the Jewish community had not, however, solved all of the city's problems with sin. Of this Vicent Ferrer reminded the citizens when he preached in Valencia during the Christmas season of 1412.⁶⁶ The city council reacted promptly to the friar's sermons. On 3 January 1413 it enacted prohibitions against gambling, prostitution, and

⁶³ Agustí Rubio Vela, "Ideologia burgesa i progrés material a la València del Trescents," *L'Espill*, 9 (1981), 11–38; Rubio Vela, *Peste negra, crisis y comportamientos sociales en la España del siglo XIV: La ciudad de Valencia (1348–1401)* (Granada, 1979), 82–101; and Rafael Narbona Vizcaino, *Pueblo, poder y sexo: Valencia medieval (1306–1420)* (Valencia, 1992), 79–121, on the activities and influence of Ferrer in Valencia.

⁶⁴ Arxiu Municipal de València [hereafter AMV]: Lletres misives [hereafter LM], g3–5: 20v–22v (14 July 1391) [Hinojosa, *Jews*, 332–334, no. 11].

⁶⁵ See note 53; and Agustí Rubio Vela, ed., *Epistolari de la València medieval* (Valencia, 1985), 276–277, no. 105.

⁶⁶ AMV: Manuals de Consell [hereafter MC] A–25: 127v (14 December 1412): the

blasphemy. It also outlawed diviners, sorcerers, and necromancers, and forbade persons "of whatever law [religion], estate, or condition" to consult them for any purpose whatsoever, whether to locate lost property or to obtain medicinal cures.⁶⁷ In addition to these transgressions, there were the "abominations, nefarious acts, and violations of the holy Catholic faith that are perpetrated by the New Christians of this city." Such sins threatened "to provoke our Lord to bring on us plague and pestilence."⁶⁸ "Moved by the holy teachings of the reverend Master Vicent Ferrer," the municipality took steps in April to disperse the clanish *conversos* among the city's Old Christian population as a means of facilitating their complete Christianization.⁶⁹ In the Dominican's ideal Christian republic, there was little room for Jews, sorcerers, and judaizing heretics.

Only three years later, Samuel of Granada was, then, in a precarious position: resident in a city whose government, at least according to its

councillors discuss the expense involved in "fer los cadafals e banchs al ort de preycadors per lo sermo de Mestre Vicent Ferrer."

⁶⁷ AMV: MC A-25: 141r-147v; specifically 143r-v regarding sorcerers and the like: "Consell han establít e ordenat ... que alguna persona de qualsevol ley, estament o condició sia no gos o presumisca recórrer o anar a devins o a divines, encantadors, sortílers o conjuradors o a altres de mal saber o art reprobada per saber o demanar consell o ajuda de coses perdudes o amagades ni per altra rao o specie de divinacions o encantacions, encara que fos per recaptar salut o medicine a qualque persona o per qualsevol altra colorada causa o rao, ne en alguna manera gos o presumisca invocar demonis ne fer o fer fer rotles o altres sortilegis, divinacions, encantacions o conjuracions que toque art de nigromancia o invocacions de demonis." Sorcerers, necromancers, and the like were to be whipped through the streets half-naked, while their clients were to pay a fine of fifty gold *morabatins* or be whipped as well. The councillors then listed all the misfortunes that could befall the city were such crimes left unpunished. Regarding the preachments of Vicent Ferrer on the matter of sorcery, see Miguel Llop Catalá, *San Vicente Ferrer y los aspectos socioeconómicos del mundo medieval* (Valencia, 1995), 111-112 and the sermons cited there.

⁶⁸ Thus did the *jurats* express themselves in a letter to King Fernando on 13 March 1413 (AMV: LM g3-11: 190v; 191r (13 March 1413), 204r-v (17 April), and 205r-v (19 April) are all letters of the *jurats* concerning the problem of judaizing *conversos* and the remedy. In 205r-v they note that they were "moguts per les sanctes doctrines del Reverent Mestre Vicent Ferrer." AMV: MC A-25: 179r-180v (12 April 1413) [partially transcribed in Hinojosa, *Jews*, 487-488, no. 288] is the actual legislation of the city council.

⁶⁹ AMV: LM g3-11: 190v, 191r (13 March 1413), 204r-v (17 April), and 205r-v (19 April) are all letters of the *jurats* concerning the problem of judaizing *conversos* and the remedy. In 205r-v they note that they were "moguts per les sanctes doctrines del Reverent Mestre Vicent Ferrer." AMV: MC A-25: 179r-180v (12 April 1413) [partially transcribed in Hinojosa, *Jews*, 487-488, no. 288] is the actual legislation of the city council.

official line, regarded him, a Jewish sorcerer and healer, as an abomination; prosecuted by a credulous royal prosecutor, Anglesola, who attempted to portray him as a diabolical relapsed Jewish convert; and sought by inquisitors who frequently ignored royal warnings, who had the cooperation of the bishop and many lay officials, and who probably hoped to use his case as further ammunition in their campaign against the kingdom's *conversos* and Jews. How in all likelihood did Samuel fare?

Despite the prosecutor's efforts, the sixteen witnesses—nine Old Christians and seven *conversos*—produced little damning evidence against Samuel.⁷⁰ Both Old and New Christians, as pointed out above, deemed him Jewish and said nothing about prior baptism. Being a foreign Jew in Valencia was still not a crime.

With the exception of one, the witnesses did not allow Anglesola to lead them to depict Samuel as a maleficent, demon-conjuring Jew. The one exception, Guillem Santa Linea, an Old Christian artisan, stated that "he heard" Samuel knew how to invoke devils. Yet Santa Linea probably wanted to deflect suspicion from himself, for the inquisitor had recently confiscated his own books on necromancy which Samuel had asked to consult for the purpose of locating treasure.⁷¹ None of the other witnesses regarded Samuel's interest in alchemy and his use of magic for medicinal purposes as synonymous with diabolical sorcery. Even Gil Blay did not view Samuel in this light. The worst things

⁷⁰ The Old Christian witnesses for the prosecution were Gil Blay, carpenter; the noble Pere de Centelles; the squire García Sánhez; Maria, the widow of the sailor Guillem Palma; the knight Arnau Saranyó; Guillem Santa Linea, carder; and Nicolau Millot, student. The Old Christian witnesses for the defense were Johan Grinau, shoemaker; Falquo Sánhez, furrier; and the squire García Sánhez, who testified for both sides. The *converso* witnesses for the prosecution were Joan Ysern, tailor; Berenguer d'Alcaniç, tailor; and probably Joan de Riusech, *donzell*. The *conversos* who testified for the defense, other than Ysern and Alcaniç who testified for the prosecution as well, were Andreu Gaçó, broker; Arnau Castellar, tailor; Jacme Rigolff, tailor; and Jacme de Sayes, tailor. I am grateful to José Luis Luz Compañ for permitting me to consult the prosopographical appendix of his *tesis de licenciatura*, "Evolución y estrategias de integración de las familias judeoconversas valencianas en el tránsito al siglo XV" (Universidad de Valencia, 1995), 177–210; this enabled me to identify the *converso* witnesses.

⁷¹ ARV: B Procesos, Letra P, 2617: 20v–21r: "Et dix que ... ha hoydes dir a alcunes persones ço es quel dit maestre Samuel sap invocar diables e que sabia molt d'art d'igromancia." In response to Samuel's question whether he knew anything about necromancy and whether he could see the books on necromancy in his possession (see n. 20), Santa Linea responded, "que veritat era quell dit testimoni ne havia usat alguns speriments [of necromancy] pero que ara non volia usar nin usaria ... e ... que non tenia [books on necromancy] que lo inquiridor los li havia presos."

that Samuel did, according to his testimony, were to fail to cure his impotence, and to inform him about the evil, incapacitating spell cast by his Christian rivals.

The uniformly favorable testimonies of the *conversos* are hardly surprising, although their admissions of frequent contact with Samuel entailed some risk.⁷² More remarkable are the approving statements of the Old Christian witnesses, and this in a city that had not housed a Jewish community for a quarter of a century and whose population had frequently been the object of Vicent Ferrer's charismatic preaching. The Old Christian witnesses came from all social ranks: noble, squire, artisan, student, and sailor's widow. Some said that Samuel was a Jew but not a "bad man."⁷³ The squire García Sánhez was a bit more effusive, describing Samuel as "a good man in his law, ... pacific and of good condition."⁷⁴

Samuel had acquired among Old as well as New Christians a reputation as a healer, as a source of empirical and magical cures and of a kind of practical wisdom which could put one's mind at ease. Despite the decrees of the city council, many came to Samuel with their aches and pains, including Maria, the sailor's widow, who learned of Samuel when other physicians could not treat her sore feet.⁷⁵ Women also flocked to Samuel's wife to obtain hair gel and cosmetics, or to be made up.⁷⁶

⁷² The *converso* witnesses who maintained that Samuel was indeed Jewish either testified to having seen him perform Jewish rituals or implied that they had. Given the prohibitions against *conversos* consorting with Jews, these witnesses risked coming under the scrutiny of lay and ecclesiastical authorities.

⁷³ For example, the noble Pere de Centelles, a witness for the prosecution (ARV: B Procesos, Letra P, 2617: 12v): "... ell dit testimoni nol te al dit Samuel com a juheu per mal hom com no sapia ell dit testimoni que aquell havia feytes malvestats."

⁷⁴ ARV: B Procesos, Letra P, 2617: 31v: "... ell dit testimoni [dix que] en tant com pot conixer lo dit maestre Samuel es bon hom en sa ley ... ell dit testimoni ... vol dir ni sap ni ha hoyt dir que aquell faça res de mal ni de males arts, ans lo coneix per hom en sa ley pacífich e de bona condició."

⁷⁵ ARV: B Procesos, Letra P, 2617: 15v-16r: "... quella dita testimoni ha e te mal en los peus ... e per guarir del dit mal ha cercat diverses metges e medecines, jatsia no sia guarida del dit mal. Et veent ella dita testimoni que no podia guarir, hoy dir que un juheu havia en Valencia al qual deyen maestre Samuel de Granada e que aquell sabia molt e moltes coses e que per ventura aquell li daria bon recapte, e tantost ella dita testimoni per cercar sanitat ana e troba lo dit juheu."

⁷⁶ The testimony of Joan Ysern (ARV: B Procesos, Letra P, 2617: 6v): "... vey a ell dit [testimoni] que alcunes persones avents alcunes dolors venien al dit maestre Samuel per demanarli si sabia alcunes coses per aguarirne ... que a vegades vey a venir diverses dones e sovent a casa del dit maestre Samuel e venien a sa muller per haver alcunes

Samuel's shrewd manipulation and assuaging of the frustration of Gil Blay has already been discussed.⁷⁷ His dealings with the Old Christian student Nicolau Millot provide further insight into his *modus operandi*. Nicolau went to Samuel believing that the Jew could identify the man who had stolen his coat of mail through reading certain verses in a psalter.⁷⁸ Samuel obliged the student, and when asked if a specific individual had committed the theft, Samuel replied, "no ... someone else did it." With this ambiguous response Samuel avoided identifying the thief himself while satisfying Nicolau and preventing him from possibly making erroneous accusations.⁷⁹

Nicolau then beseeched Samuel to cast a spell so that his girlfriend, whom he suspected of infidelity, could not sleep with another man. In contrast to his performance for the impotent Gil Blay, for whom he played to the hilt the role of Jewish magician so that Blay could endure his condition with the comforting illusion that he was the victim of sorcery, Samuel decided to give Nicolau some sound advice, the kind that a wise, old uncle might give to his nephew. "Nicolau my friend," said Samuel, "Were God to help me, I don't believe that such things could be done, nor, if God were to help me, would I do them. And so

olletes de pelaments e alguns affayts. Et la muller del dit maestre Samuel a vegades ella mateixa les pelava."

⁷⁷ Trachtenberg, *Jewish Magic*, 196, points out that rabbis occasionally permitted magical cures and incantations, not because of their direct effect on illness but because they set the patient's mind at ease. Although I think that Samuel of Granada believed in the efficacy of at least some forms of magic, for medical and other purposes, I also think that he was acutely aware of the psychological impact that his magical performances had on his clients. Thus, in the case of Gil Blay, while Samuel probably believed that his Solomonic incantations and medicine might effect a cure, he probably fabricated the story of Blay's rivals casting a Satanic spell upon him in order to make Blay feel better.

⁷⁸ Trachtenberg, *Jewish Magic*, 218, notes the use of Psalm 16 for disclosing the identity of a thief.

⁷⁹ ARV: B Procesos, Letra P, 2617: 22r-v: "E dix quell dit testimoni conex e ha conegut al dit maestre Samuel de Granada de un any ença poch mes o menys açi en la ciutat de Valencia en aquesta forma: ço es que a ell dit testimoni fou furtada una cota de malla e per aquesta raho com ell hagues entes a dir quell dit maestre Samuel sabia legir uns vesors del saltiri ab que podia hom saber quin havia furtat, ana a casa del dit maestre Samuel e pregal affectuosament quell dignes fer per manera quell dit testimoni sables qui li havia furtada la dita cota de malla. Et lo dit mestre Samuel a pregaries dell dit testimoni legi certs vesos del saltiri, los quals tenia scrits en un rotol de pergami, e nomenats per ell dit testimoni alguns en los quals havia sospita. Et lo dit maestre Samuel com ha acabat de legir los dits vesos e dita una oracio, lladonchs nomena un de aquells qui ell dit testimoni li havia primer nomenats en los quals havia sospita, pero no fou veritat que aquell hagues furtada la dita cota car un altre ho havia feyt."

I ask you not to believe in such things. Your whole problem is jealousy. Just let that woman be, let her do what she wants, and don't worry about a thing."⁸⁰ Samuel could not cure Blay's impotence; neither he nor Nicolau could stop the girlfriend from sleeping around if she wanted to, and Nicolau, after all, would probably move on to another girl and eventually marry. What Samuel did accomplish in both cases, through the application of magic or worldly wisdom, was to provide his clients with some psychological relief.

In the city of Valencia, circa 1416, there was yet a place for Jews, as long as they proved themselves useful. And this "Master Samuel," the healer, certainly did. That Gil Blay and Nicolau Millot were willing to turn to Samuel with their most intimate problems—impotence and an unfaithful lover, the sorts of problems that crushed the self-esteem of the Valencian male and dishonored him before his fellows—suggests something more about the role that a Jew like Samuel could play. In this agonistic society where Christians of all social classes frequently traded insults and blows in a constant jockeying for position, a Jew, excluded from such social competition by virtue of his faith, could appear as a kind of disinterested confidant and advisor.⁸¹ It was enough for him to be a good man—or "a Jew" but "not a bad man" as some witnesses put it.

It is unlikely that the Dominican inquisitor ever got his hands on Samuel of Granada. There simply was not enough damning evidence against Samuel himself for the royal prosecutor or anyone else to have made a case against him. The bailiff general, the hardheaded guardian of the royal patrimony and the king's interests, was not likely to have released a Jew to an ecclesiastical court on such flimsy charges.⁸² Fur-

⁸⁰ ARV: B Procesos, Letra P, 2617: 22v–23r: "Encara dix mes ell dit testimoni que com ell tingues una fembra per amigua e hagues oppinio que aquella se jagues ab un altre hom, ana altra vegada al dit maestre Samuel e pregal molt que si ell en alcuna manera podia fer que li ligas la dita fembra que no pogues jaure ab altra persona sinon ab ell dit testimoni que lin faria gran plaer. Et lladonchs lo dit maestre Samuel dix a ell dit testimoni tals o semblants paraules: 'En Nicolau, amich, si deu me ajud yo no creu que semblants coses se puxen fer ne yo si deu me ajud non se fer. Et axi prech vos que no creguau semblants coses e tot quant mal vos havets tot es çels. Et axi lexats star aqueixa fembra e lexatsli fer a sa guisa e no curets de res.'"

⁸¹ I have been investigating social competition and violence within the Christian, Muslim, and Jewish communities of late medieval Valencia and their distinctive honor cultures. My general comments are based on wide reading in archival sources.

⁸² In the kingdom of Valencia secular magistrates like the bailiff general sometimes demonstrated a remarkable respect for due process of law, even in the case of runaway Muslim slaves. See Mark D. Meyerson, "Slavery and Solidarity: Mudejars and Foreign

thermore, the new king, Alfonso the Magnanimous (1416–1458), was much more favorable to Jewish interests than his father Fernando, who had in any case been partial to Samuel.⁸³

Even the city fathers, notwithstanding their anxiety about the sins of the citizenry and divine wrath, would not necessarily have supported the Inquisition in its efforts to try Samuel. They were well aware that, although the Inquisition existed for the righteous cause of eradicating heresy, individual inquisitors had a tendency to cast their net too widely and prosecute the innocent. In 1388–1389 urban officials, incensed by Nicolau Eimeric's unbridled persecution of local Llullists and Beguines, had successfully striven for the deposition of the inquisitor, and as recently as 1414 they had raised questions about the procedures of the Dominican inquisitor Francesc Sala against *conversos* and other Christians.⁸⁴ They probably would have advised the bailiff general to proceed with circumspection.

Muslim Captives in the Kingdom of Valencia," *Medieval Encounters*, 2 (1996), 333, 340–343; and especially the Ph.D. dissertation of my student Debra Blumenthal, "Implementations of Labor, Instruments of Honor: Muslim, Eastern, and Black African Slaves in Fifteenth-Century Valencia" (University of Toronto, 2000).

⁸³ María Rosa Jiménez Jiménez, "La política judaizante de Alfonso V a la luz de las concesiones otorgadas en 1419 a la aljama de Murviedro," *IV Congreso de Historia de la Corona de Aragón* (Palma de Mallorca, 1959), 251–262, conveys the basic idea.

⁸⁴ For the confrontation between the municipality of Valencia and Eimeric, see Jaume de Puig i Oliver, "El procés dels lul·listes valencians contra Nicolau Eimeric en el marc del Cisma d'Occident," *Boletín de la Sociedad Castellonense de Cultura*, 56 (1980), 319–463; and José Hinojosa Montalvo, Pedro López Elum, and Mateu Rodrigo Lizondo, "Relaciones de la Ciudad de Valencia con el Pontificado durante el Cisma de Occidente (1378–1423): Regesta de los fondos del Archivo Municipal," *Boletín de la Sociedad Castellonense de Cultura*, 56 (1980), 585–645, which summarizes the contents of a number of interesting letters pertinent to the Eimeric affair. Relations between the municipality and the inquisitor Francesc Sala were uneven. On 9 November 1412 the *jurats* wrote to Pope Benedict XIII asking that he restrain Sala, who had been unduly vexing local *conversos* (ARV: LM g3–11: 128r–v). One month later, however, they asked the pope not to intervene, since Sala had appeared before them with records of his *processus* against the neophytes, which a law professor, Guillem Çuera, was about to examine (ARV: LM g3–11: 144v–145r). Sala apparently behaved himself for a while, but in 1414 he was again abusing his authority, to such a degree that he was bringing the local Dominican convent into disrepute and causing many benefactors to cease patronizing the Order. Of the local convent the *jurats* wrote: "Sustinet enim onus eorum humeris excessuum de fratre Francisco Sale, inquisitore heretice pravitatis, vexante nimie neophitos et alios quos, exigente justicia, post bonorum innocentum distraccionem non modicam, habuit absolvere ut innoxios christianos; novum etenim insolitum catholica patitur civitas nostra insimul cum fratrum predicatorum conventu" (ARV: LM g3–12: 155v–156r [26 June 1414]; and 156r–v for a similar letter to the master general of the Dominicans).

Samuel's dossier nonetheless contained much disturbing evidence about Christian belief in and practice of magic, and the close contact of Old and New Christians with Jews. But this is precisely the point. A Jew such as Samuel of Granada could survive and thrive in "Jew-free" Valencia because of the inconsistencies between the Christian façade that the municipality constructed and the unseemly realities that lay beneath, between the sermons that Vicent Ferrer and other friars preached and what Christians actually did, and between the rigidly Catholic society the inquisitors endeavored to create and what the monarchs and many of their Christian subjects were prepared to permit. The city of Valencia still had a large Muslim quarter, brothels, and gambling dens, and within its own jurisdiction the town of Morvedre, with a growing Jewish community. Outside of Valencia's jurisdiction, other smaller Jewish communities hung on and a very large Muslim population resided on the lands of the seigneurs, who constituted the main counterbalance to the political and economic weight of the capital city.⁸⁵ The inquisitors had their work cut out for them.

If Samuel of Granada did appear before the inquisitorial tribunal, he must not have been sentenced too harshly. For by January 1418 he was receiving remuneration from the royal court of Navarre.⁸⁶ By that time Alfonso the Magnanimous had begun to ease the pressure on the Jews that his father had applied. Alfonso and his successor Juan II would give the Jews, Muslims, and *conversos* of the kingdom several decades of reprieve, time enough for the Jews to recreate, under different conditions, a vital and prosperous community life. But the inquisitors would have their day in court again and ultimately their way with the kingdom.

⁸⁵ Meyerson, *Jewish Renaissance*, treats the history of Morvedre and its Jews under Valencia's jurisdiction and the reasons for the remarkable expansion of Morvedre's Jewish community over the course of the fifteenth century. For useful data on the kingdom's Jewish communities in the fifteenth century, see Hinojosa, *Jews*; and J.R. Magdalena Nom de Déu and J. Doñate Sebastià, *Three Jewish Communities in Medieval Valencia: Castellón de la Plana, Burriana, Villarreal* (Jerusalem, 1990); and for the Muslims in this period, Mark D. Meyerson, *The Muslims of Valencia in the Age of Fernando and Isabel: Between Coexistence and Crusade* (Berkeley, 1991).

⁸⁶ Joseph Jacobs, *An Inquiry into the Sources of the History of the Jews in Spain* (New York, 1894), 116, transcribes the relevant entry from the Archivo de Comptos (Pamplona), cajon 117, no. 1626 (4 January 1418): "Ordena que el Maestro Samuel de Granada que havia venido de su Reyno de Tierras estrañas por algunas cosas que le havia mandado tenga para su mantenimiento 5 fl. en cada mes."

This page intentionally left blank

LEONARDO DATI'S SERMON ON THE CIRCUMCISION OF JESUS (1417)

THOMAS M. IZBICKI

Leonardo Dati's name is unlikely to be well known to students of Christian attitudes toward Jews and Judaism in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. He is better known either for the financial relief he provided to his brother, the Florentine merchant and diarist Goro Dati, or for his role as the lone papal apologist at the Council of Constance (1414–1418).¹ His sermon for the Feast of the Circumcision of Jesus, delivered to that council on the first day of 1417, does have a papalist message; but it can be used to explore Christian ideas about a central Jewish rite as they appear outside of a polemical context.

When Dati, the Dominican master general,² rose to preach on the Feast of the Circumcision, the assembled fathers of the Council of Constance may have expected him to speak about Peter and the papacy, since he already had preached two sermons of this sort in 1416, one at the beginning of Lent (March 8) and one on the Feast of Francis of Assisi (October 4).³ The latter even inspired a polemical exchange in the form of memoranda.⁴ Dati did not disappoint his hearers, addressing Paul's rebuke of Peter for refusing, under pressure, to eat with uncircumcised converts (Gal 2:11–14).⁵ Nonetheless, the theme of the sermon

¹ See, respectively, Gene Brucker, *Two Memoirs of Renaissance Florence: The Diaries of Buonaccorso Pitti and Gregorio Dati* (New York, 1967), 129–130, 132, 137, 140, and Brian Tierney, "'Divided Sovereignty' at Constance: The Problem of Medieval and Early Modern Political Theory," *Annuarium historiae conciliorum*, 7 (1975), 238–256. For Dati's works, see Thomas Kaeppli, *Scriptores ordinis praedicatorum medii aevi*, 4 vols. (Roma, 1980), 3:73–77.

² On Dati as master general, see Daniel A. Mortier, *Histoire des maîtres généraux de l'Ordre des frères prêcheurs*, 8 vols. (Paris, 1909), 4:85–140; Paolo Viti, "Dati, Leonardo," in *Dizionario biografico degli italiani*, vol. 33 (Roma, 1987), 40–44.

³ For a poor edition of the former, see Christian W. Walch, *Monimenta medii aevi* (Göttingen, 1757–1764; London, 1966), vol. 1, pt. 4, pp. 3–45. An edition of the latter sermon is being prepared by Chris L. Nighman and the author.

⁴ *Acta concilii Constantiensis*, ed. Heinrich Finke et al. (Münster, 1896–1928), 2:705–729.

⁵ For a conciliarist use of this text, see Paul Tschackert, *Peter von Ailli* (Gotha, 1877), pp. [28]–[29]. See also the sermon on Peter and Paul delivered at the Council of Basel by Thomas de Courcelles in Vat. Palat. lat. 596 fol. 64v.

was Luke's account of the circumcision of Jesus, drawn from the festal lectionary. In particular, he chose to emphasize the passage, "After eight days were accomplished, that the child should be circumcised" (Luke 2:21), which was open to symbolic interpretations of the number eight, some derived from the Platonist tradition, and to theological reflections of the place of circumcision in the history of salvation.

The quotation from Luke appears in the protheme of the sermon, linked to an explanation of the nature of the boy to be circumcised: "Here, then, is the Son of God, Who was born in our flesh, Who was circumcised on the eighth day, to Whom alone, according to Daniel's prophecy, it is given to open the sealed book of mysteries ..." ⁶ Later in the protheme, the boy is identified instead with humanity, which is purified in baptism for the circumcision of vices. ⁷ A more symbolic reading, however, can be found shortly before that passage in a reference to Mary as "the advocate of our glorification ... on the eighth [day], that is, of those arising [from the dead]." ⁸ This combination of incarnational theology, moral message, and historical periodization is typical of the rest of the sermon.

The body of the sermon, following a restatement of the theme, begins with three questions concerning circumcision followed by brief answers. The first is why that rite was conferred. A related question, regarding why this remedy was not given at the beginning, but only "after eight days," is added. Dati, following Paul (Gal 4:4-5), speaks only to the latter point, saying that the fullness of time had not yet come. The second question concerns what determines the fullness of time, and Dati points to the incarnation. The third question posed, and the most interesting, is why Christ had to be under the law. Dati's reply, again borrowed from Paul, is that he had to be under the law in order to redeem those who are under it. ⁹

A full exposition of the nature of circumcision, "an expression of sacramental signs," follows, pointing—among other things—to the

⁶ Typescript edition, p. 2, "Hic est enim Dei filius qui in carne nostra natus est, qui octava die circumcisis est, cui soli, secundum Danielis prophetiam, est datum misteriorum librum aperire signatum ..."

⁷ Typescript, p. 4, "... ut scilicet circumcideretur puer, homo scilicet, baptisate purus circumcissione uiciorum, ut scribit Bernardus in sermone de eius purificatione."

⁸ Typescript, p. 4, "Ob hoc aduocata glorificationis nostre data est et sancte consequende rei *Postquam* scilicet *consumati sunt dies octo* in octava scilicet resurgencium, ut scribit Augustinus in sermone de eius in celum assumptione."

⁹ Typescript, pp. 5-6.

male member, "the member through which the original infection is transmitted,"¹⁰ as the active principle in the perpetuation of original sin. Thus, Dati says, quoting extensively from Thomas Aquinas, it had to suffer pain to evitate concupiscence, which helps perpetuate the cycle of infection, person corrupting nature and nature corrupting person. Furthermore, the shedding of blood in the rite was a sign of Christ's passion.¹¹ And so circumcision was given as a sign of God's fidelity, a sacramental promise of deliverance from sin.

It is this sacramental relationship that ties the subsidiary question, that of the fullness of time, into a grander historical scheme. The rite of circumcision was revealed to Abraham in the third age, which was symbolic of the Trinity but also a time when faith in redemption from sin was increasing in the world. (The first age, after the fall, and the second, after the flood, were not so rich in faith.)¹²

The nature of circumcision as a sacrament of the old law, pointing toward Christ, required that it cease, with other ceremonial and legal precepts, once the Messiah had come. The sacraments of the old law once were of saving value, but, under the law of baptism, they have become deathtraps.¹³ This is the hook from which Dati hangs his discussion of Peter and Paul, which lies outside the focus of this paper.¹⁴ Returning to the theme, Dati focuses on the second question, that of

¹⁰ Typescript, p. 9, "... nam primo quantum ad membrum per quod originalis transfunditur infectio." For Dati's explanation, based on Aristotle as commented by Albert the Great, of man as the active principle and woman as the passive source of matter for conception, see Typescript, pp. 10–11, "Sed a uiro, uelut a principio actiuo, infectio transfunditur, in qua eciam proprie fundatur ratio originalis peccati ..." [p. 11]. For the Aristotelian viewpoint and its reception, see Ian Maclean, *The Renaissance Notion of Woman* (Cambridge, 1983), 30–32. Dati also (Typescript, p. 11) cited the *Summa theologiae* to show that Adam, not just Eve, had to fall in order for original sin to afflict humanity; see *Summa theologiae* (Ottawa, 1941), 2.1161–1162.

¹¹ Typescript, pp. 9–10. For Aquinas's original text, in the commentary on the *Sentences*, see *Opera* (Parma), vol. 7, pt. 1, p. 468. For the Angelic Doctor's teachings on the law and its rites, see, John Y.B. Hood, *Aquinas and the Jews* (Philadelphia, 1995), 38–61.

¹² Typescript, pp. 8–9, "Sic enim, secundum processum temporis, crescente fide redemptionis a peccato, crescere debuit et signorum sacramentalium expressio ..." Thomas regarded circumcision and other rites of the old law as more reliable than natural law as a means of salvation; see M. Levering, *Christ's Fulfillment of Torah and Temple: Salvation according to Thomas Aquinas* (Notre Dame, 2002), 113–114.

¹³ Typescript, p. 12, "Sacramenta omnia ueteris legis ac legalia esse terminata, ita quod, sicut sub lege ueteri erant salutifera et de necessitate salutis, sic sub lege baptismatis sunt dampnabilia et mortifera utentibus eis, ut deducitur Act. xv c."

¹⁴ Dati refers back to the sermon on Saint Francis and his "declaratory" document in support of it; see Typescript, p. 16.

the timing of the establishment of the rite of circumcision. Here he undertakes an examination of the symbolic meaning of the number eight, which he ties to the eight "days" or ages of the world. The eighth day, symbolized by the timing of circumcision, is the day of the healing of sin's infection and "of the renewal of the creature."¹⁵ In this instance, Dati ties the preceding ages to calamities, the murder of Abel, the confusion of languages, the enslavement of Israel and its wandering in the desert, the spread of idolatry, the destruction of the temple, the vicissitudes of the true faith and, last, the death of all living, when the world is cleansed by justice. Only on the eighth day do the dead rise, and then the human being becomes a new creature.¹⁶

This symbolic interpretation of the number eight extends to Dati's reading of the moral message of the gospel text. He lightly touches upon the literal sense, referring to Maimonides' opinion that the child could not safely undergo circumcision before the eighth day.¹⁷ Then his sermon, founding itself on Macrobius and Boethius, and on Platonic numerology, treats eight as the number of perfection.¹⁸ The message here is one of purification and ascent. The seven days are associated with the virtues, leading to perseverance, which permits the human being to endure to the eighth day.¹⁹ Circumcision, in line with the ideas stated above, receives its moral interpretation, involving reform and the curbing of vice.²⁰ The remainder of that passage, however, with its reflections on the "deformation" of morals, especially through bad leadership, belongs in a study of Dati's ideas on reform and obedi-

¹⁵ Typescript, pp. 22–23, "Octo dies legis dies octo seculi designant, quoniam, sicut octaua die temporis, circumcisio a lege fieri iubebatur in carne. Ita dabatur intelligi ut omni infeccioni que in septem precedentibus diebus seculi secundum processum temporis homini ex peccato aduenerant circumcisio quedam spiritualis fieret in octaua et inouacio creature."

¹⁶ Typescript, p. 23. Dati's ideas on the last days are mild compared to those of many of his contemporaries; see Roberto Rusconi, *L'attesa della fine: crisi della società, profezia ed Apocalisse in Italia al tempo del grande scisma d'Occidente (1378–1417)* (Roma, 1979). Although the eight-day scheme had classical and patristic roots, Augustine had made the division of history into six ages the most common historical framework in the West; see Richard Landes, "Lest the Millennium Be Fulfilled: Apocalyptic Expectations and the Pattern of Western Chronography 100–800 CE," in *The Use and Abuse of Eschatology in the Middle Ages*, ed. Werner Verbeke et al. (Leuven, 1988), pp. 137–211.

¹⁷ Typescript, p. 24.

¹⁸ Typescript, pp. 24–25.

¹⁹ Typescript, pp. 25–26.

²⁰ Typescript, pp. 27–30.

ence.²¹ Dati, however, concludes this section of the sermon with another mention of the circumcised boy as humanity, "renewed by the purity of Christ's glory," with a risen body "spiritually circumcised of vices," sharing in the eighth day of those arising from the dead.²²

Dati then returns to the question of Christ's submission to the law. Christ is described, like any other legislator, as bound to obey the law "not of necessity but on account of fittingness."²³ Nonetheless, Jesus obeyed the law "lest the Son should seem to loose the Father's law."²⁴ Dati follows this discussion with an excursus on why a pope might be bound by charity to resign his office if the situation required it. He even refers to Celestine V as having set an example for this act.²⁵ This act of renunciation is described by Dati as a "civil circumcision," much in the line of his moral message in this sermon.²⁶ Concluding his sermon, Dati applied his moral lesson to the Council of Constance, which enjoyed the support of Sigismund, king of the Romans, in acting where claimants to the papacy—and here he points to Benedict XIII, although not by name—would not resign.²⁷ Dati even proved able to include his number symbolism in this sermon by noting that eight years had passed since the Council of Pisa. It had ordained civil circumcision, and John XXIII, "a boy of depraved morals," had undergone it.²⁸

²¹ Typescript, pp. 30–35. Thomas M. Izbicki, "Reform and Obedience in Four Conciliar Sermons by Leonardo Dati, O.P.," in *Reform and Renewal in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance: Studies in Honor of Louis Pascoe, S.J.*, ed. Thomas M. Izbicki and Christopher M. Bellitto (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 174–192.

²² Typescript, p. 35, "Nobis ergo circumcisis, *Postquam consumati sunt dies octo*, octaua scilicet resurgencium, circumcidetur puer, homo scilicet, puritate Christi glorie innouatus, quoniam tunc *reformabit corpus humilitate nostre, configuratum corpori claritatis sue* ad phil. 3, *humilitatis in quam nostre, idest illorum dumtaxat qui hic fuerunt a uiciis spiritualiter circumcisi, nam omnes resurgemus, sed non omnes immutabuntur*, prima ad cor. xv."

²³ Typescript, p. 36 "... leges quas in homines sanxit et ipse seruare decreuit non necessitate sed congruitate."

²⁴ Typescript, p. 37, "Et ex hoc factum est ut ipse, coeternus patri et consubstantialis filius, sub lege ex tempore factus, *Postquam consumati sunt dies octo ut circumcideretur puer*, ne legem patris uideretur filius soluere, qui illam uenerat adimplere, eo testante Mt' 5[17]."

²⁵ Typescript, p. 38.

²⁶ Typescript, p. 39, "Ex quo eciam Christi facto apud theologos sequi uidetur quod papa debet pocius circumcisionem sui officii ciuilem et libere uelle accipere quam scandalum in ecclesia et manifestum plebis malum dampnabiliter introducere, maximeque si est dubitatus, ut eciam super capitulo Nisi cum pridem de renunciatione [X 1.9.10] canoniste potiores annotauerunt." On the resignation of the pope, see John R. Eastman, *Papal Abdication in Later Medieval Thought* (Lewiston, N.Y., 1990).

²⁷ Typescript, pp. 41–44.

²⁸ Typescript, p. 44, "... rationabiliter inferre habemus quod operatione serenissimi regis nostri factum est quod *Postquam consumati sunt dies octo ut circumcideretur puer*, quoniam

Action against another such boy, Benedict, was pending.²⁹ It was in this way that the council was observing the law of circumcision, so that those under the law could be redeemed.³⁰

Throughout this sermon Dati presumes certain things, that circumcision once was valid, both as a sacrament of the law and as a sign of future redemption, that the coming of Christ left the rite without further sacramental value, in fact with negative results, and that its only present place was in moral discourse, signifying the curbing of concupiscence and the removal of leaders who failed to do the work of Christ. Most of these points could be found readily enough in the work of Thomas Aquinas and other mainstream theologians, and this is the academic theology that Dati took into the pulpit.

It remains, however, to be determined how typical Dati's sermon for the Feast of the Circumcision of Jesus is and to what extent it can be used to gauge the value of such sermons for the study of the attitudes of the friars and other late medieval preachers toward the Jews.

Another text worth treating, and based on the same excerpt from Luke's gospel, is a sermon of Jean Gerson, delivered in Paris in 1392.³¹ This sermon speaks of invoking Mary so that Jesus, himself circumcised, might circumcise the ears of the mind of the preacher, Gerson himself.³² The preacher is at pains, when dealing with the number eight, to distance himself from any reference to the rites of the Gentiles, even while invoking the image of *bifrons Janus*, namesake of the month of January, giving way to the true God.³³ Like Dati, Gerson speaks of the divine lawgiver submitting to the law by his own choice.³⁴ After mentioning the eight Beatitudes, the preacher settles into a discussion of circumcision itself. To Gerson, Jesus was circumcised in order to avoid scandalizing the Jews or seeming to reprove the law, for the consummation of which he had come into the world.³⁵ Aside from this theological reply, the sermon speaks of the moral meanings of circumcision, painful

postquam consumati sunt anni octo a concilio Pisano citra in quo hec ciuilis circumcisio ordinata est circumcisis est puer unus, hic Iohannes, scilicet, olim xxiii, puer certe moribus prauis."

²⁹ Typescript, p. 45.

³⁰ Typescript, p. 46.

³¹ Jean Gerson, *Oeuvres complètes*, ed. Palémon Glorieux (Paris, 1963), 5.xiv.

³² Gerson, *Oeuvres complètes*, 5.459.

³³ Gerson, *Oeuvres complètes*, 5.460.

³⁴ Gerson, *Oeuvres complètes*, 5.461.

³⁵ Gerson, *Oeuvres complètes*, 5.461–462.

but potent, warding against illicit pleasure and warning against excessive preoccupation with things of the flesh.³⁶ The remainder of the text is concerned with the name of Jesus, invoking it for aid and in triumph. Gerson, near the end of the sermon, describes himself as assailed by the vices, some of them the same vices against which he had spoken of being circumcised. And then he cries out: "... I say I have no king except You, Lord Jesus. Come, therefore, Lord, disperse them in Your strength [*virtus*]; and You will reign in me, because You are my king and my God."³⁷ Here again we are confronted with circumcision described as once potent but now consummated in Christ, as of no continuing sacramental value but teaching a moral lesson, linking pain to deliverance from evil.

A brief glance at some earlier sermons by friars on the Feast of the Circumcision of Jesus will have to suffice.³⁸ Bonaventure spoke of circumcision as instituted "for a time and for a place." Speaking of its time, he described it as instituted with Abraham, fulfilled by Christ and now prohibited. Preaching on a text from Galatians [6:15], this Franciscan luminary spoke of neither circumcision nor uncircumcision mattering in the time of grace and of humanity freed from servitude to the law.³⁹ He also preached on the circumcision of the heart, which requires spiritual renewal: "This spiritual renewal, however, begins from seven-fold grace and is consummated in deiform glory."⁴⁰ Eight days, in this sermon, reflect the removal of guilt and punishment due to sin, replaced by a single glory and seven-fold grace.⁴¹ In another sermon, Bonaventure, preaching on Luke's account of the circumcision of Jesus, affirmed that Jesus wished to be circumcised, although he was not obligated to do so.⁴² In others, he preached on various spiritual meanings of the eight days.⁴³

Albert the Great, preaching on Luke's text, spoke of the way in which the blood shed in circumcision signified Christ's saving effusion

³⁶ Gerson, *Oeuvres complètes*, 5.462–463.

³⁷ Gerson, *Oeuvres complètes*, 5.471.

³⁸ None of the texts used here contains exempla. Since many of these made mention of Jews, their absence may make these sermons seem more neutral in tone than they were in the pulpit; see Joan Y. Gregg, *Devils, Women and Jews: Reflections of the Other in Medieval Sermon Stories* (Albany, N.Y., 1997), 203–235.

³⁹ *Opera omnia* (Quaracchi, 1901), 9.134–135.

⁴⁰ *Opera omnia*, 9.137.

⁴¹ *Opera omnia*, 9.137.

⁴² *Opera omnia*, 9.140.

⁴³ *Opera omnia*, 9.143.

of blood. He also spoke of the circumcision of the body's senses to keep them from all varieties of sin.⁴⁴ In another sermon he spoke of the eight days of the week, including their spiritual meaning. These days culminate in the seventh day of rest and the eighth day of glory. On the eighth day, "we will be liberated from all misery and punishments by a glorious circumcision; and we will be called Jesus, that is, saved and freed from all tribulations."⁴⁵

Jacobus de Voragine, in *The Golden Legend*, celebrates the same feast as commemorating the first time in which Jesus shed his blood for all humanity. He also showed himself to be fully human and set an example for the work of purification. In a more polemical mode, Jacobus described Jesus, by allowing himself to be circumcised, as taking away from the Jews "any excuse for their actions toward Him." He also showed how he came not just to abolish the law but "to complete and to fulfill it."⁴⁶

These are only a few of the texts which might be investigated to show how the Feast of the Circumcision of Jesus, as represented by sermons and Jacobus's hagiographic work in support of preaching, reveal common Christian suppositions about circumcision and—by extension—the Jews. Circumcision, as in Dati's sermon, is fulfilled and thus no longer valid. Its chief role, except in showing the Jews that it points to Jesus, is moral, preaching the circumcision of hearts and minds. Any other use of it was seen as obsolete and deathdealing, thus worthy of condemnation.

⁴⁴ *Opera omnia* (Paris, 1891), 13.35–38.

⁴⁵ *Opera omnia*, 13.39–42.

⁴⁶ *The Golden Legend of Jacobus de Voragine*, trans. Granger Ryan and Helmut Ripperger (New York, 1969), 82–83. Jacobus mentions the cult of Janus among other pagan practices in *The Golden Legend*, p. 83.

ALFONSO DE ESPINA ON THE MOSAIC LAW

STEVEN J. McMICHAEL, OFM CONV.

Although Christians appealed to reason (philosophy), morals and history in their arguments against Jews, much of Christian anti-Jewish polemical literature of the Middle Ages focused on biblical and theological issues between Jews and Christians. Since theology was primarily shaped by the study of the Bible, and the Hebrew Scriptures were the common biblical text between the two faith communities, the battleground was the sacred page Christians call the Old Testament. If Christians were to prove to the Jews that the Christian doctrines of the messiahship and divinity of Jesus Christ were the truth, that the new covenant had replaced the Mosaic law, and that salvation was exclusively obtained by faith in Jesus Christ, they had to do so primarily from the Hebrew Scriptures.

One of the central issues of the Christian-Jewish debate of the early church and Middle Ages was the observance or abrogation of Mosaic law. It is no different today. For example, the vast amount of literature devoted to Paul's approach to the Mosaic law in the last ten years reveals that it is a problem that still seeks a definitive solution.¹ It was an issue that appeared in many medieval theological treatises and *summae*, and found a prominent place in virtually every Christian anti-Jewish text in the Middle Ages.² It was therefore not strange that the Franciscan preacher and writer Alfonso de Espina would devote many pages of his mid fifteenth-century text, the *Fortalitium Fidei*, to the subject of the Mosaic law.

Alfonso takes up the issue of the Mosaic law in both Books I and III of the *Fortalitium Fidei*. Almost one half of Book I (22 folio pages out

¹ For example, Terrance Callan, "Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People," in *Within Context: Essays on Jews and Judaism in the New Testament*, ed. David P. Efroymson, Eugene J. Fisher, and Leon Klenicki (Collegeville, 1993), 123–137; and Donald A. Hagner, "Paul's Quarrel with Judaism," in *Anti-Semitism and Early Christianity: Issues of Polemic and Faith*, ed. Craig A. Evans and Donald A. Hagner (Minneapolis, 1993), 128–150.

² For example, on Thomas Aquinas's approach to the Mosaic law, see John Hood, *Aquinas and the Jews* (Philadelphia, 1995). See also Kenneth Stow's discussion of exegesis in his *Alienated Minority: The Jews of Medieval Latin Europe* (Cambridge, 1992), 135–156, and, more recently, Jeremy Cohen, *Living Letters of the Law: Ideas of the Jews in Medieval Christianity* (Berkeley, 1999).

of 48) and a number of the theological arguments in Book III (five arguments in the Consideration Four, making up 8 1/2 folio pages) are taken up with the issue of the Mosaic law.³ As we shall see, there are no great innovations here; Alfonso was not an original thinker, but a master at gathering and synthesizing material for his Christian audience. The importance of his work, therefore, is in the quantity of theological data he has gathered and presents to his readers in the *Fortalitium Fidei*.

Book I

In Book I, after a discussion about the spiritual armor all Christians need in their fight against the enemies of the church and a consideration about preachers and their sermons in this war, Alfonso concerned himself (the third and last section, which constitutes the bulk of Book I) with the issues of the Mosaic law (and the messiahship of Jesus of Nazareth). Alfonso begins his discussion about the Mosaic law by arguing that faith in Jesus Christ is actually older, more stable, noble, perfect and useful than the Mosaic law. For example, in his argument that faith in Jesus Christ is older than the Mosaic law, Alfonso presents two reasons. First, he points out that Abraham was justified by faith before his circumcision, which the Apostle Paul had previously declared in Galatians 3. Not only was Abraham justified by faith before the arrival of the Mosaic law, but also Abel, Enoch, Jacob, Joseph and Moses were justified without the law, as stated in Hebrews 11. Secondly, four promises were given to Abraham by God which find their fulfillment in Christ: numerous descendants, the possession of the promised land, an offspring and the blessing of all people through Abraham. Concerning Abraham's descendants, once again Alfonso appeals to Galatians 3, where Paul states: "There were promises spoken to Abraham and to his descendant. Scripture does not say: 'and to your descendants' [*in seminibus*], as if it applied to many, but as if it applied only to one, 'and to your descendant' [*in semini tuo*], that is, to Christ." Alfonso concludes

³ This constitutes pages XI to XXV and XXXIV to XLII of the Anton Koberger incunabula edition (Nürnberg, 1494) of the *Fortalitium Fidei*. There are a few other places in Book III where Alfonso addresses the Mosaic law; for example, in the eighth chapter of Book III, Alfonso deals with Jewish falsities in regard to the Mosaic law and the prophets ("Quartus passus est de fatuitatibus Judeorum contra Legem Mosaicam et contra prophetas").

that the only one to whom these promises could be directed is Jesus Christ, who was a blessing not only for the Jews but also for all peoples (*omnes gentes*).

Alfonso moves on to argue that the Mosaic law is no longer a valid law for Jews to observe but it actually ceased to be law with the coming of Jesus Christ. Since the divinely intended purpose of the law of Moses was to prepare for the coming of the Messiah, God chose the Jews as a special people and gave to them the law, commandments and sacraments, until the time of correction arrived (cf. Heb 9). But the other peoples of the earth were given the natural law which was not written in tablets of stone nor in pages of papyrus or parchment but was written in their hearts (cf. 2 Cor 3). With the arrival of the new divine law that Christ writes in the hearts of all believers, Jews and Gentiles alike, the law of Moses lost its purpose. The natural law and divine law are now unified under the new law of Christ. The Mosaic law has been fulfilled (Matt 5), and those who continue to observe it are actually working against the divine will and therefore continue day and night to be enemies of God.

Next, Alfonso states that the continued practice of circumcision has put the Jews under the wrath of God and made them an abomination before God. The Jews claim that circumcision continues to be an everlasting sign of the eternal covenant between God and the Jews given to Abraham in Genesis. However, Alfonso believes that the Jews are mistaken when they claim that this was to be an eternal practice. He finds a parallel use of the term *sempiternum* which was used in Exodus 12 with reference to the observance of the feast of Passover, which the Jews say means that they were to observe this feast perpetually (*in eternum*): "This day shall be a memorial feast for you, which all generations shall celebrate with pilgrimage to the Lord, as a perpetual institution." However, Alfonso points out that Jeremiah stated at a later date that "the Days are coming, say the Lord, when they shall no longer say, 'As the Lord lives, who brought the Israelites out of the land of Egypt,'" which means that when "those days" arrive, the Passover will no longer be observed. The same goes with circumcision, which was to last only a period of time until the coming of the Christ, as a vigil lasts only until the time of the arrival date of a feast. Circumcision was intended, therefore, to be simply a symbol of a vigil or period of preparation for the coming of Christ and baptism (which is the *maximum festum*). Furthermore, just as property is limited by two boundaries, so also circumcision was limited between Abraham and Christ, since Christ takes the role of

God in the covenant between God and Abraham (*pactum inter me et te* of Genesis 17). Since the end of the Mosaic law has come in the arrival of Christ, the practice of circumcision should have come to an end also. The Jews who continue to circumcise are living in the greatest wrong (*magna iniuria*) and therefore they live in the wrath and hatred of God.

In the following section, Alfonso turns his attention toward the positive use of the Old Testament whereby Christians, who are now living in the period of grace/fulfillment and the evangelical law, can find positive value in the things that were written in the time of “prefiguration” and the Mosaic law. All things that happened in the Old Testament are examples (or types) for Christian instruction, as the Apostle Paul declares in 1 Corinthians 10; therefore in the Old Testament the main Christian truth claims are prefigured or foretold. These include the Trinity, the birth, passion, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ, and all seven sacraments. This is followed by an exposition on how twelve vices (pride, envy, avarice, guile, etc.), to be corrected in the age of grace, were foretold in the Old Testament. Implied in this exposition is the judgment that those presently living according to the Mosaic law are hopelessly stuck in the “prefiguration” stage of salvation history and are thus not able to enjoy all that is offered to true believers in this period of the fullness of grace which Christ inaugurated with his arrival.

The Mosaic Law in Messianic Doctrine

In the last section of Book I—composed of twelve “treasuries”—Alfonso is concerned with showing how all the things written in the Old Testament about the coming Messiah were fulfilled in Jesus Christ. The Third Treasury is concerned with the prophetic belief that the true Messiah was to be like Moses in giving a law based on the passage from Deuteronomy 18:18: “I will raise up for them a prophet, like you from among their kinsmen.” The argument is divided into four parts, the first of which asks the question: How was Moses unique in giving a law? Alfonso responds by showing how other lawgivers, like Theodosius and Justinian, were similar to Moses in giving (human) laws, but points out that there are two other types of law: the law of nature and the divine law.⁴ Moses was like no other in that he gave a divine law. Alfonso then

⁴ Alfonso derives this point from the *Etymologies* of Isidore of Seville.

shows how Jesus fulfilled the prophecy contained in Deuteronomy 18 about the rise of “another Moses”:

If, therefore, Moses was unique in giving a divine law, and if only “the prophet to be raised up from the midst” was to be made “like him” in that in which he was unique, it follows that this prophet was to give a divine law, which was fulfilled only in the case of Jesus Christ, our Savior, who gave the gospel law, which is a divine law and a new law, just as Moses gave the divine, ancient law.⁵

The second part asks: Was Jesus, the true Messiah, to give another law other than the law of Moses? Finding support for a positive response to this question in certain passages of Scripture and rabbinical commentaries, Alfonso proves that, according to Jewish belief, another law was to be established with the arrival of the Messiah.⁶ This is based on the interpretation of three verses from the Old Testament, the first of which is Isaiah 2:3: “The law shall come forth from Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.” Clearly Isaiah meant that the law of Moses came forth from Mount Zion, and “the word of the Lord from Jerusalem” refers to the word of Jesus and his disciples who began the word of preaching in Jerusalem, and continued to make public the word throughout the whole world. A review of Jewish writings on this theme—from the Midrash on the Psalms and the Song of Songs—shows that the Jews knew that there were two laws to be given in the course of history, one by Moses and the other by the Messiah. Alfonso quotes from the Midrash on the Song of Songs:

From ancient times then, Moses was teaching them the law, and those who were learning utterly forgot [it]. And they said: “As Moses is mortal and a transient, thus his doctrine is passing by us.” And the Rabbi said, “Would that God had wanted to be shown to us a second time, and now ‘would that he kiss me with the kisses of the mouth’ [Song 1:1], such that his teaching might be reaffirmed in our hearts.” And Moses said to them, “This cannot be now, but it will be in the time of the Messiah,”

⁵ “Si igitur Moyses id dando legem divinam fuit singularis et solus in illo quo singularis, fuit propheta suscitaturus de medio debebat ei assimilari, sequitur quod ille propheta debebat dare legem divinam, quod solum impletum est in Jesu Christo salvatore nostro, qui dedit legem evangelicam, que lex divina est et nova, sicut Moyses dedit legem divinam antiquam” (p. XXXVvb). The page numbers given in parentheses—and further citations from the text—refer to the Anton Koberger edition of the *Fortalitium Fidei*.

⁶ Our author draws upon many Christian anti-Judaic polemical texts for this argument, especially the *Acta* of the Tortosa Disputation, the *Pugio Fidei* of Ramon Martí, the *Postillae* of Nicholas de Lyra, and the *Contra Judaeos* of Gerónimo de Santa Fé.

because it is written thusly: 'I will give my law in their bowels, and I will write it in their hearts' (Jeremiah 31[:33]).⁷

This second law was the law David was requesting in Psalm 118:33: "Instruct me, O Lord, in the way of your statutes [*iustificationum*], that I may exactly observe them always." This second scriptural witness testifies to the fact that this law David was requesting was not the law of Moses, because this law was already promulgated. David says "the way of your statutes [*iustificationum*]" ; this law has to belong to the true Messiah, Jesus of Nazareth, because only his law justifies (*iustificat*). Furthermore, Alfonso makes the point that sacrifices were not established with the law, as the Lord says: "I did not speak to your fathers in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning the matter of burnt offerings and sacrifices" (Jer 7:22). Alfonso brings forth Rabbi Moses the Egyptian (Maimonides),⁸ who clarifies this point by stating: "These sacrifices were only given so that they would withdraw from the sacrifices of idols, and as a sign of this, they were not given to the people until afterwards when the people turned to idolatry by adoring the molten calf."⁹ These sacrifices, therefore, were intended by God only to divert the people from worshipping idols and, as such, they were never actually pleasing to God.

⁷ "Ex illo tunc docebat eos Moyses legem, et qui addiscebant oblivioni tradebant, et dixerunt, sicut Moyses est carnalis et transiens sic doctrina sua transit a nobis, et dixerunt Rabi, utinam vellet Deus secundo ostendi nobis et iam *oscularetur nos osculis oris sui* taliter quod sua doctrina refirmaretur in cordibus nostris, et dixit eis Moyses hoc non potest esse modo, sed in tempore messie erit, quia sic scriptum est *Hiere xxxi, dabo legem meam in visceribus eorum et in cordibus eorum scribam eam*" (p. XXXVra). Benzion Netanyahu points out that the sources for this quote are Gerónimo de Santa Fé, *Contra Judeos*, and the *Acta* of the Tortosa Disputation. See Benzion Netanyahu, "Alonso de Espina: Was He a New Christian?" *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research*, 43 (1976), 157 n. 2c.

⁸ Netanyahu ("Alonso de Espina," p. 157 n. 2d) states that the sources for this section of the argument are Gerónimo de Santa Fé's *Contra Judeos*, the *Acta* of Tortosa, and the *Pugio Fidei*.

⁹ "Ista sacrificia non fuerunt data nisi ut retraherentur a sacrificiis idolorum, et in signum huius non fuerunt data populo nisi postquam populus ad idolatriam declinavit vitulum conflatilem adorando" (p. XXXVra-b). Alfonso states that this passage is from Maimonides, although it actually is derived from Rashi. Herman Hailperin states that Rashi, in his commentary on this verse, "teaches that the Prophet historically and literally refers to Exodus 19:5, and that the Prophet wishes to say: At that moment I did not ask for sacrifices as a condition of My choice—I did not utter a single word about them—but only for the moral obedience towards Me and the Commandments which I was then to announce to you. Have you kept them?" Nicholas of Lyra followed Rashi in showing that "God did not command the Israelites in the day that they were

Furthermore, the sacrifices did not justify the sinner before the eyes of God, “because with their offering, the offering of the priest was always required, [which] is clear in Leviticus.”¹⁰ This is confirmed by another point:

But what if the priest was evil and unworthy—would he be heard by God? Certainly the whole sacrifice guaranteed nothing, and this is what the theological teachers say in the fourth part that the sacrifices had power not *ex opere operato* but *ex opere operante*.¹¹ Not so concerning the sacrifices of our true Messiah, Jesus the Nazarene, which have power *ex opere operante* and *ex opere operato*, as is clear in baptism which however evil and awful the minister—even a Jew or an infidel—whoever does what the Church intends, the baptism achieves its effect.¹²

The law David was requesting is the law given by Jesus the Nazarene on Mount Sion, which is that spoken of in Jeremiah 31—the third scriptural witness:

“Behold the days are coming,” that is, the times of the New Testament, “says the Lord, and I will make with the house of Israel and the house of Judah,” that is, with the faithful confessing Christ generally and especially the believers from the Jews—wherefore it is stated in Acts 13[46]: “It was necessary that the word of God should be spoken to you first,” etc.—“a new covenant,” that is, the new law, for the law is frequently called a covenant in the Old Testament; “not according to the covenant which I made with your fathers, in the day that [I took them by the hand] to bring them out of the land of Egypt, the covenant which they made void” [Jer 31:32] by transgressing against it repeatedly, as is clear from the books of the Judges, Kings and Paralipomenon [Chronicles].¹³

brought out of Egypt ‘concerning burnt-offerings or sacrifices’” (Nicholas de Lyra, *Postillae* on Jeremiah 7:22, IV, 627). See Herman Hailperin, *Rashi and the Christian Scholars* (Pittsburgh, 1963), 86.

¹⁰ “Item patet quod sacrificia legis Moysi non iustificaverunt, quia semper cum eorum oblatione requirebatur oblatio sacerdotis patet in Levitico” (p. XXXrb).

¹¹ That is, not by the power of the completed sacramental rite itself but of the subjective disposition of the recipient. Usually the last phrase is *ex opere operantis*. See Hailperin, *Rashi and the Christian Scholars*, 220, on Nicholas of Lyra’s discussion of this point in sacramental theology.

¹² “Sed quid si sacerdos esset malus et indignus utrum exaudiretur a Domino, certe nihil valebat totum sacrificium, et hoc est quod dicunt doctores theologi in quarto quod sacrificia valebant non ex opere operato sed ex opere operante. Secus est de sacrificiis veri nostri messie Jesu Nazareni, que valent ex opere operante, et ex opere operato ut patet in baptismo qui quantumcunque sit malus minister et pessimus, etiam Judeus et infidelis quicumque faciens quod ecclesia intendit baptismus complet suum effectum” (p. XXXVrb).

¹³ “Scilicet Hieremias ca. xxxi, dicit, *Ecce dies veniunt*, id est tempora Novi Testamenti, dicit Dominus et faciam domui Israel et domui Juda, id est fidelibus Christum confitentibus

Alfonso points out that this new law spoken of by Jeremiah must be a law of the promised Messiah, namely, of Jesus Christ, which cannot be the same as the law of Moses. To drive home the point that there is a radical difference between the two laws, our author lists twenty-five differences between the Mosaic law and the law of Christ, which he gathers from the writings of St. Paul. For example, "the law of Moses is the law of the flesh, the law of Christ is the law of the Spirit; the law of Moses is the law of fear, the law of Christ is the law of love."¹⁴ Alfonso then lists the special differences: the law of Moses is the law of the servant Moses whereas the law of Christ is the law of the Lord of the universe; the law of Moses was given to a particular people, whereas the law of Christ is universal; the precepts of Moses were also binding on a limited number of people, whereas the precepts of Christ are binding on all peoples; the law of Moses is limited to the land of promise, but the law of Christ is universal; the law of Moses was to endure in a limited period of time, the law of Christ eternally. Because of these differences, the law of Moses had to come to an end with the arrival of the new law of Christ. Therefore Alfonso states that

it is better stated that one law annuls the other totally; I mean to say that there cannot be a law of God directed to the salvation of souls by observing which the human being gains paradise except one alone which is the law of grace to which the law of Scripture is incompatible.¹⁵

He concludes this argument by stating: "And thus the law of Moses was to come to an end, as a particular law, with the advent of the law of Christ, which is universal and communal, like the lesser, as it were, giving ground to the greater."¹⁶

generaliter et credentibus de Judeis specialiter secundum quod dicitur Act. xiii. *Primum vobis oportebat loqui verbum Dei*, et cetera, *fedus novum*, id est legem novam, lex enim frequenter in Veteri Testamento vocatur fedus *non secundum pactum quod pepigi cum patribus vestris in die qua eduxi eos de terra Egypti quod irritum fecerunt*, ipsum multipliciter transgrediendo, sicut patet in libris Judicum Regum et Paralī (p. XXXVrb).

¹⁴ "Lex Moysi est lex carnis, lex Christi est lex Spiritus, lex Moysi est lex timoris, lex Christi est lex amoris" (p. XXXVIva).

¹⁵ "Melius dicitur quod una lex alteram totaliter annullat volo dicere quod non potest esse lex Dei ordinata ad salutem animarum quam observando homo meretur paradisum nisi una sola que est lex gratie cui est incompatibilis lex scripture" (p. XXXVIvb).

¹⁶ "Est ergo altera lex Christi a lege Moysi quia una particularis et altera universalis, igitur *non secundum pactum* et cetera, ut supra. Et sic cessare debuit lex Moysi sicut particularis adveniente lege Christi que est universalis et communis sicut minor dando locum maiori" (p. XXXVIvb-ra).

In the third part of the argument on the similarity of Jesus with Moses in giving a law, Alfonso asks if the Messiah was to write the law which he was destined to give and whether he ought to write that law on skins, rocks, or some other external material? He judged that this was an important question because "it seems that it would be exceedingly reasonable that he would write some book of Sacred Scripture, whose principal performer and writer was himself, because every discipline has its principal author, as grammar has Donatus, logic has Aristotle, [and] geometry has Euclid."¹⁷ Espina mentions that Thomas Aquinas had addressed this issue in his *Summa* and he borrows some of Thomas's material in this section. Alfonso states that there are five reasons why Jesus Christ did not write his own law, the first of which is that it would diminish his dignity, since, although he could write about his miracles and works of holiness without them being an occasion of pride, in the minds of human beings this might appear to be a sign of arrogance. Secondly, it would take away authority from the Holy Spirit, whose special authority is "the internal inspiration of human beings and of the writing of the Scriptures by holy individuals. Whence Gregory says in the prologue of the *Moralia*, that the agent of Sacred Scripture is the Holy Spirit, and the Apostle, in the Second Letter to Timothy 3:16, says that 'Sacred Scripture is divinely inspired and useful for teaching.'" Thirdly, it would diminish his unique excellence, because, although some excellent teachers wrote books,

the more excellent way is to impress the teaching in the minds [or hearts] of the hearers, as Christ did, than to write it in a book. Therefore he ought not write down his own law, like Pythagoras and Socrates and the ancient philosophers, who were the most outstanding teachers, [who] understood that way because they never wrote any books.¹⁸

Fourthly, because the Mosaic law was the law of fear, it was written in books and codes of law; because the new law of Christ was the law of love, it was written only on the hearts. The fifth and last reason why

¹⁷ "Videtur enim quod fuisset valde rationabile quod ipse fecisset aliquem librum sacre scripture cuius ipse fuisset principalis actor et scriptor, quia quelibet scientia habet suum principalem actorem sicut gramatica Donatum, loyca Aristotelem, geometria Euclidem" (p. XXXVIra).

¹⁸ "Sed excellentior modus est doctrinam in mentibus auditorum imprimere, sicut faciebat Christus quam in libro scribere, igitur non debuit scribere legem suam, unde Pitagoras et Socrates et philosophi antiqui qui fuerunt doctores excellentissimi, istum modum tenuerunt quod nunquam aliquos libros scripserunt" (p. XXXVIrb). For Thomas's discussion of this point, see his *Summa Theologicae*, III, q. 42, art. 4.

Christ did not write a law was that it would show forth the eminent kingship of Jesus, because “it behooves the royal majesty that his sayings and deeds would be written by his witnesses, not by himself, as was done by the four evangelists, the secretaries of Christ Jesus, the true Messiah.”¹⁹ Alfonso concludes: “So it is clear, therefore, that Christ ought not write a new law by himself on some external matter; but out of love, he wrote it in the hearts of the faithful, as is stated in the aforementioned source Jeremiah 31:33: ‘But, I will give my law in their bowels, and I will write it in their hearts.’”²⁰ Jesus was, therefore, like Moses in giving a law, but this was a new law that was “not on some external matter but in the bowels and in the hearts of the faithful, [on account] of all that has been fulfilled literally in Jesus Christ, our savior.”²¹

The fourth part of this argument, which concerns Jesus’ likeness to Moses in giving a law, deals with the question: What is the excellence of the new law in relation to the imperfect old law? Alfonso answers that there are six grades of perfection, which are as follows:

1) The new law is most excellent, based on its manifestation of the knowledge of God. In the old law there was not, as in the new law, an explicit knowledge of the one true God, the incarnation of Christ or the Trinity. There was a progression of knowledge from symbol to the reality symbolized. Alfonso states: “Under the symbol of this knowledge [which became explicit with the appearance of Jesus Christ], Moses spoke to the people with a veiled face, as is found in Exodus 34[:33–35], because the mysteries of our faith are veiled in symbols and riddles.”²² When the temple veil was torn in two during the passion of Jesus Christ the full manifestation of the mystery of the Trinity and incarnation was revealed. The veil of Jesus’ identity was lifted: He was Lord and the

¹⁹ “Et decet regiam maiestatem quod sua dicta et facta per suos notarios scribantur non per se sicut fecerunt quatuor evangeliste Christi Jesu veri messie notarii” (p. XXXVIrb).

²⁰ “Sic igitur patet quod Christus non debuit legem novam per se scribere in aliquibus extrinsecis sed ex amore scripsit eam in cordibus fidelium sicut dicitur in supradicta auctoritate Hiere. *sed dabo legem meam in visceribus eorum et in corde eorum scribam eam*” (p. XXXVIrb).

²¹ “... et quod illam non debuit scribere per se in aliquibus extrinsecis sed in visceribus et in cordibus fidelium que omnia ad literam impleta sunt in Jesu Christo salvatore nostro” (p. XXXVIrb).

²² “In figura huius Moyses loquebatur ad populum velata facie, ut habetur Exo. xxxiii quia mysteria fidei nostre erant figuris et enigmatibus velata” (p. XXXVIIva).

Messiah. Also the new law which Jesus proclaimed, which is perfect in understanding, is the “perfect gift descending from the Father of lights,” as was said in James 1:17.

2) The new law is shown to be most excellent from the reasonableness (*rationabilitate*) of its contents. Alfonso gives a lengthy presentation on how the old law is imperfect in its entirety, that is, in its moral, judicial, sacramental and ceremonial precepts.²³ For example, the moral prescriptions of the law of Moses are considered imperfect because they regulated the external acts of men only, wherefore the Apostle in Romans 3:27 calls the law of Moses “the law of works.” Concerning the interior acts, however, in which the moral good consists, the law regulated little or nothing. The ancient law is considered imperfect because the Mosaic law regulated external acts imperfectly, as is plain in Deuteronomy 23:19–20, which speaks thus: “You shall not demand interest from your countrymen on a loan of money or of food or of anything else, but do this to a foreigner.” Here, Alfonso points out, usury is allowed with foreigners, a thing which is illicit and against the voice of right reason. “And because of this imperfection, the Mosaic law is called ‘our tutor’ in Galatians 3[:24], that is to say, a rule of children and the imperfect, in the case of whom interior perfection is not aimed at, but who are constrained from unbecoming external acts by the fear of punishment.”²⁴ But the new law is perfect in its moral prescriptions, because it perfectly regulates human acts, not only external acts but also internal acts, and in this it makes good the imperfection of the law, wherefore the Savior says, fulfilling the imperfection of the law, in Matthew 5:21–22: “You have heard that it was said to the ancients, ‘Thou shall not kill’; and that whoever shall kill shall be liable to judgment. But I say to you that everyone who is angry with his brother shall be liable to judgment.” This text clearly indicates that Jesus was speaking primarily of internal reactions within the human person rather than of the person’s external behavior. Alfonso points out that Jesus therefore not only forbids an idle word to these people, but he also forbids consequently a harmful word, and much more stringently every evil act.

²³ Alfonso does not explicitly cite any polemical text from which he is borrowing in this section. Certain portions of the argument are derived from the *Acta* of the Tortosa Disputation, the *Pugio Fidei*, and the *Contra Iudaeos* of Gerónimo de Santa Fé.

²⁴ “Et propter hanc imperfectionem lex Mosaica dicitur pedagogus noster ad Gal. iii, id est regula puerorum et imperfectorum in quibus non queritur perfectio interior sed ab exterioribus inhonestis timore discipline reprimuntur” (p. XXXVIIra).

In Matthew 19, Jesus concludes his address to the young man who had faithfully kept the commandments of the law all his life, with the radical demand of evangelical perfection: "What one thing is yet lacking to you: If you wish to be perfect, go, and sell all that you have, and give to the poor, and you shall have treasure in heaven; and come, follow me."

3) The clarity of Jesus' miracles also shows the excellence of the new law. This section is basically a commentary on Augustine's presentation of miracles in *The City of God*. In a word, the miracles of Jesus simply confirm his teaching of the gospel and his teaching helps explain his miracles. The real miracle is not that Jesus was able to perform marvelous acts, but that the whole world has come to believe in Jesus as Lord and Messiah without experiencing any miracles.

4) The steadfastness of the church in both its head and members is also a witness to the excellence of the new law. Since the sacrifice of the new law is to endure to the end of time, the new law itself is to endure until the consummation of the world. Alfonso says:

In the same way, as long as the sacrifice of the new law remains, the new law also remains; but that sacrifice will endure until the end of time, is clear in the last chapter of Matthew [28:20], where the savior says: "Behold I am with you," namely, in the sacrament of the altar, until the consummation of the world. Therefore the law of Christ, in which such a sacrifice will be contained, will endure until the consummation of the world.²⁵

Since the church is the steward of this sacrifice, it too will endure until the consummation of the world. Thus the excellence of the new law is shown in the promise that the head, Jesus, will be present to the members of his church until the end of time.

5) The new law is shown to be most excellent because of the divine goodness which is given to those who believe. In this short section, Alfonso says that "this divine goodness is not lacking to those who seek salvation with their whole heart."²⁶ The conversion of many peo-

²⁵ "Item manente sacrificio legis nove manet et lex nova: sed usque ad finem istud sacrificium durabit patet Math. ultimo, ubi dicit salvator, *Ecce ego vobiscum sum*, scilicet in sacramento altaris usque consummationem seculi, lex igitur Christi in qua tale sacrificium continabitur durabit usque ad consummationem seculi" (p. XLIIva).

²⁶ "... ex divina bonitate, que non deest toto corde querentibus salutem" (p. XLIIva).

ple and the endurance of the martyrs proves that "God approved this law uniquely and without reserve and ordained it to salvation, as the most excellent and perfect law without which salvation cannot exist."²⁷

6) Finally, the delightful incomparability of the promises concludes Alfonso's argument that the new law is most excellent. Our author argues that the promises of the old law were imperfect in that they promised temporal goods, life, and peace.²⁸ For Christians, however, more excellent things are promised with the law of Christ, because he promised spiritual and eternal goods: grace in the present life, glory in the future life, and the kingdom of heaven.

Alfonso concludes the Third Treasury by summarizing how these six grades of perfection make clear the perfection of the new law of Christ. The law of Christ is more perfect because it is prior in both perfection and in time. Espina says that the new law is prior in time because it was revealed four hundred and thirty years before the law of Moses when Abraham came to believe in God.²⁹ The new law is the fulfillment of the divine law which is manifest in the Old Testament; therefore it is

²⁷ "Tormenta quoque per eam plures in magna exultatione spiritus et tristitias sunt perpassi, que non videntur probabilia nisi Deus hanc legem singulariter et irrefragabiliter approbaret et ordinaret ad salutem tanquam excellentissimam et perfectissimam legem sine qua salus esse non potest" (p. XLIIv-a-b).

²⁸ As for the law of Mohammed, Alfonso states: "But what does the law of Mahomet promise? Certainly it promises to its believers, as final blessedness, that which is owed to pigs and she-asses, namely, gluttony and sexual intercourse." But Alfonso does add a correction to this negative view of Islam by quoting Avicenna: "Our law, which Mahomet gave, speaks of another end, as it were, perfection, and it is more suitable to men, and it shows the condition of unhappiness and misery which belong to the senses of the body, and this is the other promise which is understood concerning the intellect." Avicenna continues: "To a much greater extent for the wise ones the desire was to attain this happiness [of the intellect] than of the body, which, although it was given to them, nevertheless, they did not give heed to it nor did they value it in comparison with the happiness which was connected especially to the truth" (p. XLIIv-b).

²⁹ In the second article of the Third Consideration, Espina states: "Abraham ante legem immo et ante circumcisionem iustus fuit et non fuit iustus nisi merito fidei, ut patet Gen. xvi [actually 15:6], *credidit Abraham Deo et reputatum est ei ad iusticiam*. Item merito fidei fuit sibi facta re promissio, et spiritualiter illa *semine tuo benedicentur omnes gentes*, ut patet Gen. xxii. Sequitur igitur ex his quod fides Christi fuit ipsa lege Moysi tempore prior. Et quamvis Apostolus hoc spiritualiter probet ad Gal. iii, exemplo Abrahe, tamen hoc idem probat ad Heb. x, per plura exempla sicut patet de Abel, Enoch, Noe, Sara, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph et Moyse. Isti enim et multi alii iusti fuerunt ante legem iustificati ut patet ibidem" (p. XIv-a).

entitled the “testament of the Most High,” the “recognition of truth,” and the “Book of Life.”³⁰ Concerning these titles, Alfonso states:

In truth, this is the “Book of Life” because the gospel words give life to the soul; indeed, it is also the “testament of the Most High” because the gospel words promise eternal rewards to those who deserve it; indeed also it is the “recognition of truth” because the Gospel words put to flight the darkness of errors from the mind.³¹

Book III

In the first five arguments of the Fourth Chapter of Book III (“On the War of the Jews by Arguments Taken from the Law of Moses”), Alfonso raises the issue of the Mosaic law in five propositions which he will dispute: That the law of Moses was to endure perpetually till the end of time; That the law of Moses has not been abrogated; That the divine sanctions of the Old Testament have not been altered with the coming of Jesus; That circumcision was intended by God to endure perpetually; That if the Sabbath ceased to be observed, the new law advocating this change is not from God.

1. That the law of Moses will endure perpetually

In the first argument on the permanence of Mosaic law, Alfonso reports that the Jews argue, “All works of God are perfect, but the ancient law was given by God; therefore it is impossible that imperfection is present in it, for which it should have ceased.”³² Alfonso points out that Christians do agree with the truth of the major premise because Deuteronomy 32:4 states: “The works of God are perfect.” Since God confirms the divine law by miracles, the principal issue centers on the miracles of the Old Testament (old law) in relation to the miracles that confirm the new law of Jesus Christ. Alfonso first states that even though “the works of God are perfect,” the law given was “made

³⁰ The first two titles are found in Ecclesiasticus (Sirach) 24:23: “*Hec omnia liber vite et testamentum altissimi et agnitio veritatis.*”

³¹ “Vere liber vite est quia verba evangelica animam vivificant, vere etiam testamentum altissimi quia verba evangelica eterna premia observantibus promittunt, vere etiam agnitio veritatis quia verba evangelica errorum tenebras a mentibus fugant” (p. XLIIrb).

³² “Omnia opera Dei sunt perfecta, sed lex antiqua fuit data a Deo, igitur impossibile est in ea dare imperfectionem, propter quam debuerit cessare” (p. LXXXIva).

according to the state of the people receiving the law.”³³ Clearly the Israelites were imperfect people as the rebellion of the people in the desert (who wanted to return to Egypt) reveals in the fourteenth chapter of Numbers and the golden calf incident (idolatry) reveals in Exodus 32–35. Alfonso then points out that

in the coming of the greater disposition in people a more perfect law was due to be given, just as the soul of a boy is not thus perfect as the soul of a grown person; so the law, having been given to an ignorant people in the age of Moses, was not thus perfect as was the law given in the time of Christ, and thus it is was not to endure perpetually.³⁴

He states that more miracles do not prove the perfection of the law. Rather, if many miracles were needed then these people were actually showing themselves to be less perfect. The Jews had many miracles performed for them and they still did not arrive at the truth. On the other hand, the people of the New Testament, having been made the more perfect, did not need a multitude of miracles but only a few miracles to arrive at the fullness of truth. The focus is not on the quantity of miracles, but their quality: “For it was a greater miracle to liberate the whole species of humanity from diabolic power, which Christ accomplished in the new law, than to liberate the Jewish people from Egyptian servitude.”³⁵ The Jews walked through the parted Red Sea, whereas Christ walked on water; Moses took a piece of wood and threw it into the water at Marah, making the bitter water sweet, whereas Jesus turned water into wine. Alfonso goes on to say that “the gospel law converts water into wine because it leads to the highest and perfect joy.”³⁶ The miracles of Jesus were, therefore, qualitatively better, but we can also claim that “when the miracles in the Gospels and in the Acts of the Apostles are gathered together there are many more in number than which have been performed in the Old Testament.”

³³ “Dico autem ad argumentum cum dicitur, *omnia opera Dei esse perfecta* quod Deus fecit legem antiquam ita esse perfectam sicut fieri potuit secundum conditionem populi recipientis legem” (p. LXXXIva).

³⁴ “Sed adveniente maiori dispositione in populo perfectior lex dari debuit sicut anima pueri non est ita perfecta sicut anima viri, ita lex data populo rudi tempore Moysi non fuit ita perfecta sicut lex data tempore Christi et sic nec perpetuo durabilis” (p. LXXXIvb).

³⁵ “Nam maius miraculum fuit liberare totum genus humanum a potestate dyabolica quod fecit Christus in lege nova, quam liberare populum Iudaicum a servitute Egyptica” (p. LXXXIvb).

³⁶ “... lex evangelica aquam in vinum convertit quia ad summum et perfectum gaudium perducit” (p. LXXXIra).

A comparison of the miracles proves that Jesus' miracles are therefore greater quantitatively and qualitatively in relation to the miracles of the Old Testament. The miracles of Jesus are so divinely sanctioned that

if the Jews are unwilling to accept these miracles, they would be damning themselves. Indeed in Isaiah 7[:9], God said to them: "If you do not believe you shall not be established"; therefore it is revealed that the law of Moses is not more perfect than the new law, and consequently, it will not endure perpetually.³⁷

Not only are the Jews wrong about the perfection of the miracles, they have, being envious of the miracles of Christ, blasphemed God by composing a book called the *Toledoth Yeshu*. This text, which Alfonso borrows directly from the *Pugio Fidei* of Ramon Martí, casts Jesus as "a figure with a certain pathos, driven to defiance by ill-treatment at the hands of Jewish authorities, who used magic by his willful, illicit misappropriation of divine power."³⁸ Alfonso adds no commentary to this long quote from the *Pugio Fidei* concerning the *Toledoth Yeshu*, probably figuring that it was enough simply to report what he claimed the Jews were saying about Jesus: that his miraculous power came from a type of sorcery. Alfonso wanted to make the point that the Jews hold that, if Jesus was a sorcerer, they would not have to listen to him or his disciples' teachings.³⁹

³⁷ "Si autem ista miracula Iudei recipere nolunt teneant sibi damnum. Dixerat enim eis Ysaïas, in ca. vii, *si non credideritis non permanebitis*, patet igitur quod lex Moysi nec est perfectior lege nova nec consequenter perpetuo duratura" (p. LXXXIra).

³⁸ Marc Saperstein, "Jewish Images of Jesus Through the Ages," *Proceedings of the Center for Jewish-Christian Learning*, 10 (1995), 25. Saperstein provides a good summary of the text: "In this story, Jesus, angered by the status of illegitimacy that was bestowed upon him by the Jewish authorities, seeks revenge by surreptitiously learning the true Divine Name, the most jealously guarded secret of the ancient Temple. With this name, he is able to work miracles: to fly through the heavens, to exorcise demons, cure lepers, even bring the dead back to life. This brings him into open conflict with the Sanhedrin. A man named Judah [Judas of the Gospels] is sent to infiltrate the circle of his closest disciples. He removes the Divine Name from Jesus' possession, enabling him to be captured, tortured, stoned, and then hanged upon a tree. As the story continues, Judah took the body from the cave and hid it in his own garden in order to prevent the disciples from making off with it. The disciples then claimed that it had ascended to heaven. Queen Helene, who had been impressed by Jesus' powers, believed in the claims of the disciples, and the sages felt their position to be precarious. At this point, Judah saved the day by producing the body, dragging it by the hair before the queen. That, we are told, 'is why the monks now shave their hair in the midst of their heads.'"

³⁹ Robert Chazan, *Daggers of Faith: Thirteenth-Century Christian Missionizing and Jewish Response* (Berkeley, 1989), 41–42. The Jewish defense against forced sermons being preached to them beginning in the 1240s was based on the principle that, since the

2. *That the law of Moses has not been abrogated*

The second question concerns whether the law of Moses has been abrogated or whether it still needs to be observed. The Jewish charge against Christians is that Christians do not observe all of the commandments that God decreed: "Cursed is the one who shall not have remained in all these things which have been written in the law" (Deut 27:26). The Jews claim that Christians observe only a part of the law and therefore they are being disobedient to God. Alfonso takes up Alan of Lille's argument that this passage of scripture, if interpreted literally, forces one into believing in a contradiction.⁴⁰ In other words, "the whole law could be obeyed if it were not observed literally."⁴¹ For example, if God created everything good (Gen 1:31), how does one explain the difference of clean and unclean food in the law? God commanded Moses to build the altar out of the earth (*de terra*) and yet, in a later verse of Exodus, one reads, "Moses made the altar of incense of acacia wood" (Exod 37:10). Another example is when God commands in Deuteronomy 22:10: "You shall not plow with an ox and an ass together," but the law permits them to pasture together. Furthermore, the law does not forbid the ox to plow with a horse or with another unclean animal. Alfonso responds by stating that:

If we truly accept the law in its intended meaning [*debito sensu*], we will be able to observe all the commandments of the law with due observance: by accepting that certain things have been said literally and without concealment of figures; and by understanding that certain things have been said literally and have been concealed with a darkened veil; certain things have been commanded to be observed for the time, certain other things without any determination of time: for those things were foretelling of another *sacramentum*, and they would reveal the figure of truth in its own time; with the manifestation of the thing [itself] and the presence of truth being evident, it was necessary that the prefiguration and the figure should not remain [at the same time].⁴²

Pharisees considered Jesus a sorcerer; to listen to anything concerning him would be to force Jews to trespass their own commandments.

⁴⁰ On the twelfth-century discussion on this point concerning the Mosaic Law, see Anna Sapir Abulafia, *Christians and Jews in the Twelfth-Century Renaissance* (London/New York, 1995), 98.

⁴¹ Abulafia, *Christians and Jews*, 98.

⁴² "Si vero legem debito sensu accipimus, omnia legis mandata debita observatione observare poterimus; quedam ad litteram et sine ullo velamine figurarum dicta esse accipiendo, quedam ad figuram et profundo velamine obumbrata esse intelligendo: quedam ad tempus observari iussa sunt, quedam sine ulla temporum determinatione.

In other words, when the anti-type or “truth” has come to be, the figure of that truth is no longer needed. This was a long-standing argument against the Jews in Christian anti-Jewish literature.

3. *That the divine sanctions of the Old Testament have not been abrogated.*

The third issue is the claim by the Jews that the divine sanctions (or commandments) of the Old Testament have not been abrogated. Alfonso (borrowing from the writings of Alan of Lille) holds that the divine word is not annulled in any way and the divine sanctions have not changed; he attempts to prove this in four ways. First, he responds that Christ came not to abrogate or end the law, but to fulfill it. In fulfilling the ancient law, Christ demands more than what is commanded in the Mosaic law: the Mosaic law prohibits homicide, Christ prohibits anger and hate; the Mosaic law prohibits the adultery of the flesh, Christ also prohibits the heart’s desire itself.

Second, Alfonso points out that the literal observance of the law leads to a contradiction. For example, kosher laws demand that Jews not eat pork, as the flesh of the pig was considered unclean and a sign of sinfulness. The Jews had to observe this law because only the figure of the present truth was present, and this figure had to be conserved until the truth of the figure arrived. The truth arrived in the person of Jesus Christ. There would be a contradiction in Scripture itself if one were to hold to the kosher laws pertaining to pork, because in the first chapter of Genesis it is written that “God saw all things that he made and they were very good.” How can pork be considered unclean when God declared that all things were good in the act of creation?

Third, Alfonso also points out that even during the period of time in which the Scriptures were being written, God was already foretelling the people of Israel that the covenant was going to be replaced by another, as God says through the prophet Jeremiah: “I will establish a new covenant with the house of Judah, with the house of Israel” (Jer 31:31). The new law is the gospel law and, because it has arrived, the old law must cease to be observed, for they both cannot remain at the same time, “because in the arrival of the truth, the shadow of the truth

Que enim alicuius sacramenti prenunciativa erant, et veritatis figuram faterentur, suo tempore, manifestata rei atque veritatis presentia, oportuit ut eorum non remaneret prenunciatio et figura” (p. LXXXIIIrb).

ceases.”⁴³ God desired the eventual cessation of the old law, as Isaiah 1:14, Psalm 51:16, Psalm 40:7, and Psalm 50:8–9 testify.

Fourth, Alfonso concludes this argument against the permanence of the old law with the statement that the Jews do not observe many elements of the law anyway:

We see also among the Jews that they have for the most part abandoned those things which pertain to the law: for there is not among the Jews the sacrifice or holocausts, nor prophets, nor king, no priests, no temple, no place for sacrifices; and what work operates through the singular? For the major part, the law has been abrogated. It seems, therefore, that the law of Moses does not now have a place.⁴⁴

This claim has a long history in Christian anti-Jewish polemic, and Alfonso includes it here as a concluding argument to show that God has indeed abrogated the divine sanctions of the Mosaic law.

4. *That circumcision is intended to endure perpetually*

The fourth issue is whether the practice of circumcision was intended by God to be a perpetual practice. The Jews say it was to be so based on Genesis 17, where circumcision is spoken of as a sign of an “eternal covenant.” Alfonso indicates that he has already addressed this issue earlier in Book I, but believes that a clearer presentation of Jewish blindness is needed; he therefore refuses to pass over this issue in silence at this point. He makes an initial distinction between carnal and spiritual circumcision:

It must be said that we discover a twofold circumcision in the old law, one carnal which they observe, and the other a spiritual one, of which it is said in Deuteronomy 10[16]: “Circumcise therefore the foreskin of your heart, and be no longer stubborn.” And in Jeremiah 4[4]: “Circumcise yourselves [to the Lord] and remove the foreskins of your hearts, O people of Judah.”⁴⁵

⁴³ “Adveniente enim veritate, dicitur umbra cessare” (p. LXXXIIIra).

⁴⁴ “Videmus etiam apud Judaeos in magna parte cessare que ad legem pertineat: non enim est apud Iudeos sacrificium, vel hostia, non propheta, non lex, non sacerdotes, non templum, non locus sacrificii, et, quid opus ire per singula in maxima parte abolita est lex: videtur ergo quod lex Moysi iam locum non habeat” (p. LXXXIIIra–b).

⁴⁵ “Dicendum ergo quod in veteri lege duplicem invenimus circumcisionem unam carnalem quam ipsi observant et aliam spiritualem de qua dicitur Deutero. x, *Circumcidite igitur prepucium cordis vestri, et cervicem vestram non induretis*. Et Hierie iiiii, *Circumcidimini et auferite prepucium cordium vestrorum viri Juda*” (p. LXXXIIIrb).

Alfonso points out that there is a difference in meaning between the words “eternal” and “everlasting” (*eterno* and *sempiterno*) when applied to the covenant:

Sometimes it is reckoned simply “eternity” as in Psalm [101:13]: “You however, O Lord, remain in eternity.” And that of Jeremiah 10[10], “But the Lord is the true God, he is the living God and the everlasting King.” Sometimes it is really taken in keeping with a finite duration: such is that of 1 Kings 27 [1 Samuel 27:12]: “Achish trusted David, saying, ‘He has done many bad things against the people Israel, therefore he will be my servant always’”; it is clear that here it is taken as everlasting in keeping with a finite duration: because this servitude could not endure more than their life; similarly one has Genesis 27[41], where it is said that “Esau hated Jacob always.”⁴⁶

When we apply the word “forever” in regard to circumcision, to which sense does it belong? Clearly when we speak of spiritual circumcision, as we find in Jeremiah 4:4, the intent is for an eternal object. But in regard to carnal circumcision, Alfonso states that:

it was prescribed for only one people (the Hebrews), the sign had to endure, by which that people were distinguished from the other nations; and when the law ceases, the sign also had to cease. And therefore it is said in Genesis 17 that circumcision was given as a sign. Because of which, as long as that people [the Israelites] was separated from other people in the desert, not one of them was circumcised; but entering the land of promise, full of diverse people, everyone at once was circumcised at Gilgal, as is read in Joshua 5.⁴⁷

⁴⁶ “Interdum enim ponitur pro eternitate simpliciter ut in Psalmo, Tu autem domine in eternum permanes. Et illud Hieremie x, *Dominus autem Deus verus est et ipse Deus vivens et rex sempiternus*. Aliquando vero accipitur pro duratione finita: quale est illud Primo Regum xxvii, *Credidit ergo achis david dicens, Multa mala operatus est contra populum Israhel, erit igitur mihi servus sempiternus*, manifestum est quod hic accipitur sempiternum pro duratione finita: quia non poterat plus durare ista servitus quam eorum vita. Simile habetur Gene. xxvii, ubi dicitur quod *oderat semper esau Jacob*” (p. LXXXIIIrb–LXXXVva).

⁴⁷ “Si vero loquaris de circumcisione carnali accipe similiter sempiternum secundo modo dictum: quod quamdiu lex duravit que soli uni populo precipiebatur debuit durare signum quo ille populus ab aliis gentibus distinguebatur et cessante lege signum etiam debuit cessare. Et ideo dicitur Gen. xvii, quod circumcisio data est in signum. Propter quod, quamdiu ille populus seperatus fuit ab omni gente in deserto, nullus eorum circumcisis fuit sed intrantes terram promissionis plenam diversis populis omnes simul fuerunt circumcisi in Galgalis, ut habetur Josue quinto capitulo” (p. LXXXVva).

5. *That if the Sabbath ceases [as the new law commands], the new law is not from God*

The fifth issue concerns the Jewish claim that if the Sabbath would cease, the new law of Christians is not from God, because the observance of the Sabbath, which God instructed in the old law, has been prohibited in the new law and therefore it is contrary to God and does not have a divine origin. Alfonso admits two positive things about the Sabbath at the beginning of his argument: that because of reverence for God, the people ceased from all servile work so that they could more freely have time for sacrifices, and this can be considered a moral act. Secondly, the gospel law does not take away this observance but it commands it, as is clear concerning Sundays and other arranged feasts in the new law.

The first point Alfonso wants to make is that the observance of the Sabbath falls within the realm of ceremonial precepts—precepts that could be changed because of a reasonable cause. Now the Jews observe the Sabbath on Saturday in memory of the day of rest God took on the seventh day of creation (cf. Genesis 2:3 and Exodus 20:8–11). But Alfonso argues that Christians not only remember the day of rest but also the spiritual renewal which has begun in the resurrection of Christ, and therefore the Sabbath has been changed from the seventh day to commemorate that event. Sunday also signifies that which was to happen on the eighth day, the eighth day of the resurrection on which we expect perfect rest. Christians are not bound to a specific day of Saturday for rest because Jesus is the Lord of the Sabbath: “This is the aspect of Sabbath observance that the Messiah our Lord Jesus Christ, thirty years after he was born, set free by curing the sick, by giving the sick man the freedom to carry a mat [on the Sabbath] (John 5[:10–13]) and by plucking heads of grain for the hungry disciples (Mark 2[:23–28]).”⁴⁸

Alfonso then states that the Sabbath was a sign of the exclusive covenant between God and the children of Israel (Exod 31:17). He presents a text from Jewish rabbinical literature, the book “Bima,” that claims that Christians do not need to observe the Sabbath because keeping Sabbath observance was intended only for the Jews and not

⁴⁸ “Hic est quod messias noster dominus ihesus christus postquam factus est, xxx annorum solvit quantum ad partem istam sabbatum curando in eo infirmos, et dando eis licentiam lectulos asportandi Johannis v, et spicas discipulis suis esurientibus confricandi Marci ii” (p. LXXXVvb).

Gentiles, based on Exodus 31:17 where God says, "It is a sign forever between me and the children of Israel."⁴⁹

Espina moves on to speak about the ten horns (or bounties) given to Israel, which, because of their sins, have been taken away from them and given to the Gentiles.⁵⁰ The proof text here is Psalm 75:10: "All the horns of the wicked I will cut off, but the horns of the righteous shall be exalted." The point is that, "since Israel had sinned these [ten horns or *cornu*] were removed from them and given to the Gentiles of that age."⁵¹ This was accomplished through the agency of the Romans, who removed the legal requirements of the Jews though an imperial edict. This fulfilled the prophecy of Daniel 7:7: "After this I saw in the night visions, and behold, a fourth beast, terrible and dreadful and exceedingly strong; and it had great iron teeth; it devoured and broke in pieces and stamped the residue with its feet, it was different from all that beasts that were before it; and it had ten horns," as well as Lamentations 2:3: "God has cut down in fierce anger all the horns of Israel." However, the Jews regained the practice of circumcision, Sabbath, and other elements of the Mosaic law through the agency of the devil, not through an angel, prophet, or holy person. This connection between the Mosaic law and the devil is derived from the Jews' own literature; according to Alfonso, the first of these texts is the Tractate Me'ilah, which has been summarized by Robert Chazan in the following manner:

The key element in the story concerns the visit of Rabbi Simon bar Yohai and Rabbi Eliezer ben Yose to the Roman emperor. On their way to this crucial encounter, they were asked by a demon if they would like his assistance, which was accepted. The demon then infected the emperor's daughter and was subsequently exorcised by Rabbi Simon bar Yohai. In gratitude, the emperor promised to grant any wish the rabbi might make. His request was for the annulment of the imperial edict against Jewish law, and this request was speedily granted.⁵²

Alfonso concludes this section by stating that the same devil seduced them into worshipping the golden calf and their following of the devil

⁴⁹ This text is borrowed from the *Pugio Fidei* of Ramon Martí.

⁵⁰ On the argument concerned with the ten horns in earlier polemical literature, see Chazan, *Daggers of Faith*, 131–133.

⁵¹ "Quando autem peccaverunt Israel, ablata fuerunt eis, et data fuerunt gentibus seculi" (p. LXXXVrb). This section is totally borrowed from Ramon Martí. The horns are Abraham, Isaac, Joseph, Moses, prophecy, the law, the priesthood, Levitical family, Jerusalem, and the King Messiah.

⁵² Chazan, *Daggers of Faith*, 132.

now shows to the Christians of Alfonso's day how "great is the foolishness and how great the insanity and how immense the senselessness of the Jews who do not cease to observe circumcision, the Sabbath, and other things which God removed from them and the devil restored."⁵³

The remaining sections of this argument concern the reasons why Christians rightly celebrate the Sabbath on Sunday. Borrowing from Johannes of Valladolid, Alfonso holds that the Jews claim that the Christians derived this change from the union of the sun and moon at the beginning of creation, which took place on Monday. Alfonso then makes the point that the change from Saturday to Sunday for the Sabbath ultimately stems from the fact that Sunday was the day of Jesus' resurrection. He then proceeds to show how significant Sunday is by presenting the list of twelve privileges of Sunday from the *Evangelio Eterno* of Bernardino of Siena (which includes that Sunday was the day the precepts were given to Israel and the day Christ was born). Next, Alfonso asks why the Jews consider Saturday to be the Sabbath day, and not any other day of the week. He shows, through the arguments of Johannes of Valladolid, that Saturday is associated with the astrological calculations concerning the union of Saturn with Jupiter and the movement of the planets. This connection between Saturn and the Jews is appropriate because the Greek astronomer Ptolemy claimed that misery, misfortune, and evil were characteristic of a captive people under the influence of Saturn. Who else but the Jews does this description fit?

Alfonso concludes his presentation on the Sabbath by stating that the Jews are wrong who claim that the observance of the Sabbath cannot change based on what is said in the Talmud. In fact, drawing from the convert Paul of Burgos, the Talmud actually states that it is not improper to say that all feasts, fasts, and acts of remission can be changed, based on the words of Leviticus 23:2: "These are the feasts of the Lord which you shall proclaim holy." The gloss of the rabbis highlights the phrase, "You shall proclaim," interpreting this to mean that they must reconsider from time to time what is considered to be holy. Thus it is not improper for those who have received the new

⁵³ "Evidenter [ergo] apparet, quod intentio, et studium diaboli, ac voluntas erga homines numquam est nisi mala: quare satis est manifestum, quam grandis est stulticia, et quam magna insania, et quam immensa Judeorum vecordia, qui Circumcisionem, et Sabbatum, et alia que Deus illis abstulit, diabolus vero reddidit, non cessant observare" (p. LXXXVlb). On this passage in the *Pugio Fidei*, from which text Alfonso is borrowing, see Robert Chazan, *Daggers of Faith*, 132–133.

law which the Messiah has promulgated to change the observance of the Sabbath, because the Messiah clearly indicated there was to be a change in the observance of the Sabbath, when he said, in response to those who said he was not allowed to cure on the Sabbath: “the Son of Man has power over the Sabbath” (Matt 7:10–14).

Evaluation and Conclusion

Alfonso de Espina has gathered together many arguments against the Jews concerning the Mosaic law. As I have argued elsewhere, Alfonso is a master gatherer and synthesizer of previous Christian anti-Jewish material.⁵⁴ Among his sources are the works of Alan of Lille (c. 1116–1202), Thomas Aquinas, Nicholas of Lyra, and Bernardino of Siena. These authors represent the three previous centuries and his own time period, the fifteenth century. There is very little original work found in his text and thus no substantial development in the history of polemical literature.⁵⁵ Because his sources are all Christian, even when he is quoting from a Jewish text, there is no actual engagement with the living Jewish community on their interpretation of the Mosaic law. Alfonso does refer to times in which Jews were present at his preaching, but there is no evidence of actual engagement with Jews over the issue of the Mosaic law and the new law of Jesus Christ. He accepts as authentic earlier “dialogues” with Jews, as if they were conversations in which Jews have been proven wrong and brought to Christian truth, e.g., the eleventh-century *Dialogi* of Petrus Alfonsi. His contribution to Christian anti-Jewish literature was to present an overview of all the arguments against Jews and Judaism, including the arguments against the continual acceptance and practice of the Mosaic law.

Besides his presentation of all the other ways in which Jews present a danger to Christians of his time, we have seen the attention he placed on the issue of the Mosaic law. This is the foundation of Jewish life and spiritual practice that Alfonso knew had to be addressed in a

⁵⁴ Steven J. McMichael, “The Sources for Alfonso de Espina’s Messianic Argument Against the Jews in the *Fortalitium Fidei*,” in *Iberia and the Mediterranean World of the Middle Ages: Studies in Honor of Robert I. Burns, S.J.*, vol. I: *Proceedings from Kalamazoo*, ed. Larry J. Simon (Leiden, 1995), 72–95.

⁵⁵ In fact, a comparison between the *Fortalitium Fidei* and the previous polemical material Alfonso used (e.g., *Pugio Fidei*) would show that Alfonso left out much of the more sophisticated and detailed argumentation of these earlier works.

comprehensive way. It is one thing to present the dangers that Jews posed to Christians in regard to other areas of theology and philosophy, and the way they acted against Christians in history, their devilish character, their trickery with words and magic, etc. But it is quite another to prove that the very foundations on which Judaism stood theologically have been destroyed with the coming of Jesus of Nazareth and his new law. This is what Alfonso attempted to do in the pages of the *Fortalitium Fidei*.

This page intentionally left blank

ANTI-JEWISH PREACHING IN THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY AND IMAGES OF PREACHERS IN ITALIAN RENAISSANCE ART

ROBERTO RUSCONI

The source for the inspiration of a subject is obviously quite relevant, but in the field of religious and devotional iconography a difference in aim is deeply influenced by the nature of the painted object: the public of a fresco cycle is wider, and different, from the single owner of an illuminated manuscript, and people paid a different degree of attention to a small predella than to the huge polyptych, not to mention single-sheet prints.

The anti-Jewish orientation of the main stream of popular preaching was reflected in the Italian art of the fifteenth century in many ways. Usually, the subject was not included in the representation either of a preacher or of a sermon; the direct inspiration, from spoken and written sermons, to give shape to anti-Jewish representations in art was possible, but not common. A quite different case is connected with the preaching activity in Germany by the Franciscan John Capistrano: at the same level of the raised hand of the friar standing on a pulpit, a Jew is forced to come and attend his sermon—a story which was reported in the records of the time¹ (fig. 1).

What is more important is that, in most cases, even an explicit anti-Jewish representation in art was not inspired directly by a theological or hagiographical source, but reflected only in the deep change of a specific iconography. That is exactly the case of the changing representation of preaching and preachers in the Italian art of the fifteenth century.

For these reasons, specific expressions and words will be used according to two competing systems of reference and meaning: the medieval

¹ See Roberto Rusconi, "Giovanni da Capestrano: iconografia di un predicatore nell'Europa del '400," in *Predicazione francescana e società veneta nel Quattrocento: Committenza, ascolto, ricezione*, 2nd ed. (Padua, 1995), 25–53 (48–49 and fig. 9). Color reproduction on the front page in *Der Bussprediger Capistrano auf dem Domplatz Bamberg* (Bamberg, 1989); see also Peter Schmidt, "Judenpredigt und Judervertreibung in Bamberg 1452–1479," 135–140.

anti-Jewish use and contemporary speech. Sometimes they will not fit very well together, of course.²

Mendicant Prosecution From The Pulpit

The fabricated charge of ritual murder in the case of the child Simon in Trent, brought against the Jews of the local community, and the active role in the propaganda, by the mendicant preachers, in order to promote the cult and canonization of the new martyr of the Christian faith needs no further summary.³ The contrasting opinions on the subject, and the reluctant attitude of some Roman officials at the time, did not allow any reference to the fact to enter the iconographical attributes of the Franciscan preachers deeply involved in an active propaganda from the pulpit. Such was clearly the case with the Observant Michele Carcano from Milan,⁴ and also with his fellow Bernardino da Feltre, the most active promoter of the foundation of the *Monte di Pietà*,⁵ the charitable institution whose beginnings were easily connected with vague anti-Jewish preaching. The lack of official recognition for the Franciscan preachers' personal sanctity gave a first stop to that chance; according to late medieval vocabulary, after their death they were venerated as "blessed," and not as "saints," and in the devotional paintings each of them had no halo, but only rays around his head. None of them

² Some information dealing with the subject of this contribution can be found also in Bernhard Blumenkranz, *Juden und Judentum in der mittelalterlichen Kunst* (Stuttgart, 1965), and Gabriella Ferri Piccaluga, "Ebrei nell'iconografia lombarda del '400," in *La Rassegna mensile di Israel*, 52 (1986), 357–395. More recently, see Sara Lipton, *Images of Intolerance: The Representation of Jews and Judaism in the Bible moralisée* (Berkeley, 1999).

³ See Anna Esposito, "Lo stereotipo dell'omicidio rituale nei processi tridentini e il culto del 'beato' Simone," in *Processi contro gli ebrei di Trento (1475–1478)*, vol. I: *I processi del 1475*, ed. Anna Esposito and Diego Quaglioni (Padua, 1990), 53–95; Anna Esposito, "Il culto del beato Simonino e la sua prima diffusione in Italia," in *Il principe vescovo Johannes Hinderbach (1465–1486) fra tardo Medioevo e Umanesimo*, ed. Iginio Rogger and Marco Bellabarba (Bologna, 1992), 429–443. See Ronnie Po-Chia Hsia, *The Myth of Ritual Murder: Jews and Magic in Reformation Germany* (New Haven, 1988), 43–50.

⁴ See Fabio Bisogni, "Iconografia dei predicatori dell'Osservanza nella pittura dell'Italia del Nord fino agli inizi del Cinquecento," in *Il rinnovamento del Francescanesimo: l'Osservanza* (Assisi, 1983), 229–255 (250–251, tav. 20).

⁵ See Roberto Rusconi, "Bernardino da Feltre predicatore nella società del suo tempo," in *Bernardino da Feltre a Pavia: La predicazione e la fondazione del Monte di Pietà*, ed. Renata Crotti Pasi (Como, 1994), 1–15. Information on Bernardino's iconography can be found in Vittorino Meneghin, *Iconografia del beato Bernardino Tomitano da Feltre* (Venice, 1967), and, more carefully, in Bisogni, "Iconografia," 251–255.

had any anti-Jewish "attribute," that is, a peculiar object to allow the immediate identification of the revered friar by the common unlearned faithful.

A solution was found with the representation of the most recent Franciscan saint, the Observant Bernardino of Siena, who was canonized as a preacher, in association with the image of the "blessed" Simon of Trent (fig. 2). The example can be found in a devotional fresco (i.e., paid for by some devout person), painted in the crypt of the monastic church of a Benedictine women's monastery, S. Ponziano near Spoleto, in southern Umbria, an area which had been reached by the wandering preacher of the Franciscan Observance, Bernardino da Feltre—a "second Bernardino" also in the name—during his preaching tours.⁶ As a matter of fact, the painting on the fresco was directly dependent on the northern Italian iconography on the subject.⁷

Conversion To The Gospel And The Wicked Jews

Since the beginning of the fifteenth century, a growing importance was connected, in the religious paintings, to the representation in art of preachers and of the performance of preaching. Also, the saints of the first century of the Christian era were represented more and more openly as preachers, according to an iconography that made contemporary preaching in the late medieval and Renaissance times correspond exactly to the first evangelization by the Christians.⁸

A major representative of this new orientation was Fra Angelico, that is, the Dominican painter and illuminator Giovanni da Fiesole. The friar painted in fresco the private chapel of Pope Nicholas V, inside the Vatican Palace, in the years between 1447 and 1450; on the walls he executed the stories of the Roman deacon, St. Lawrence, and the first Christian martyr, St. Stephen. The purpose was quite clear:

⁶ Roberto Rusconi, "'Predicò in piazza': politica e predicazione nell'Umbria del '400," in *Signorie in Umbria tra Medioevo e Rinascimento: l'esperienza dei Trinci* (Perugia, 1989), 113–141 (139–140, fig. 19).

⁷ Laura Dal Prà, "L'immagine di Simonino nell'arte trentina dal XV al XVIII secolo," in *Il principe vescovo Johannes Hinderbach*, 445–482. See also Dominique Rigaux, "L'immagine di Simone di Trento nell'arco alpino lungo il secolo XV: un tipo iconografico?" in *Il principe vescovo Johannes Hinderbach*, 485–496.

⁸ Roberto Rusconi, "Le pouvoir de la parole: Représentation des prédicateurs dans l'art de la Renaissance en Italie," in *La parole du prédicateur, Ve–XVe siècle*, ed. Rosa Maria Dessì and Michel Lauwers (Nice, 1997), 445–456.

to represent a visual parallel story, taken from the early church in Jerusalem and the Roman church at its beginnings.⁹

In the Roman fresco, St. Stephen is presumed to be actually preaching to the people in Jerusalem, according to the hagiographical legend, and disputing with the Doctors of the Law. The stage of his sermon is an Italian setting, and his audience is composed of faithful Christians. This is juxtaposed with, on the other side of the same fresco, the confrontation with the wicked Jews, who were going to decide to put him to death (fig. 3). In this image, there is not any trace of a major historical element: Stephen himself and his audience at the sermon were, of course, Jews. As a matter of fact, the ways in which the iconography of the first Christian preaching in Palestine has been modified allows one to measure the major changes in the attitude against the Jews: from lack of concern on the topic to open hostility.

A similar problem was related to the representation in Christian art of the Fathers of the church, e.g., St. Augustine and St. Ambrose of Milan, whose sermons, according to the sources, were directed to promote the conversion of the Gentiles. The Gentiles were usually, since the fourteenth century, represented wearing oriental dress, and not only in the iconography connected to these Fathers, but also in the representation of a recent Dominican saint.

Thomas Aquinas's sanctity was officially recognized in the year 1323, and on the right wall in the chapter chapel of the Dominican convent S. Maria Novella in Florence (the so-called Spanish Chapel), painted by Andrea di Bonaiuto in the years 1366–1368, St. Thomas holds an open manuscript of his *Summa contra Gentiles*, putting to desperation his opponents wearing "oriental" dress,¹⁰ understood, in this case, as medieval heretics (fig. 4). Oriental hats and long beards appear also in the iconography of the first saint of his order, St. Dominic, when he wins the confrontation with the Cathars in Southern France.¹¹

Here there is an association of ideas and images deserving attention, since in this case a very indirect message must be perceived: in the Western society of the Late Middle Ages, the only people living in Italy who were perceived as "orientals" were precisely the Jews.

⁹ Color reproduction in John Pope-Hennessy, *Angelico* (Florence, 1981), 61.

¹⁰ Color reproduction in *Santa Maria Novella: La Basilica, il Convento, i chiostri monumentali*, ed. Umberto Baldini (Florence, 1981), 106–107, 110.

¹¹ See Roberto Rusconi, "Immagini di predicatori e scene di predicazione nell'arte italiana all'epoca di fra Girolamo da Ferrara," in *Girolamo Savonarola: da Ferrara all'Europa*, ed. Gigliola Fragnito and Mario Miegge (Firenze 2001), 85–98.

The Child Cut Into Pieces And The Eucharistic Metaphor

Around the year 1460 the painter Colantonio was working at a polypych ordered by the Queen of Naples. She belonged to the Aragonese dynasty, and the painting was placed in the Dominican church of the capital town of the southern kingdom. The setting of the iconography was still a late medieval one: the saint friar, the Dominican Vicent Ferrer, was standing in the middle, more like a master of theology than a wandering preacher. On both sides, the story of his life was summarized in a series of scenes, whose source was the official legend written by a fellow, a Dominican from Palermo, in Sicily, Peter Ranzano, according to the proceedings of his very recent canonization (1455).¹² At the same level as his raised hand, a sermon in the open air was painted, delivered from a wooden pulpit standing outside the city walls, in front of an audience where some people clearly wear an oriental dress (fig. 5). "The power of his sermons was proved either by the repentance of the Christian people of both sexes and mostly by the conversion of many thousands of Jews and Muslims," according to the legend, and the historical place of the sermon could have been Murcia, in the Kingdom of Aragon.¹³ In the Aragonese kingdom of southern Italy, a real reference of that kind could be made only to the Jewish community, after their expulsion from the Kingdom of Aragon in the Iberian Peninsula—in that case, with no direct responsibility of Friar Vicent, who personally did not avoid preaching against the Jews, at least in an attempt to force them to a "spontaneous" conversion to Christianity.¹⁴

At the top right, in a distinguished position, the most famous miracle performed by the saint during his lifetime was represented: the child, cut in pieces by his crazy mother, whom the saint healed and, of course,

¹² General information is provided by Roberto Rusconi, "Vicent Ferrer e Pedro de Luna: sull'iconografia di un predicatore fra due obbedienze," in *Conciliarismo, stati nazionali, inizi dell'Umanesimo* (Spoleto, 1990), 213–233 (222–224). See also the general remarks by Mark J. Zucker, "Problems in Dominican Iconography: the Case of St Vincent Ferrer," *Artibus et Historiae*, 25 (1992), 181–193.

¹³ "Efficaciam sermonis eius ostendit, tum Christianorum hominum utriusque sexus diversorumque statuum poenitentia, tum multorum millium Judaeorum Sarcenorumque conversio": Petrus Ranzanus, *Vita S. Vincentii Ferrerii*, in *Acta Sanctorum, Aprilis*, I (Antwerp, 1675), 494F nr. 13. See Leandro Rubio García, "Documentos sobre la estancia de san Vicente Ferrer a Murcia," in *Miscel·lània Sanchis Guarner*, ed. Antoni Ferrando, 3 vols. (València, 1992), 3.167–183.

¹⁴ See F. Vendrell, "La actividad proselitista de San Vicente Ferrer durante el reinado de Fernando I de Aragón," *Sefarad*, 13 (1953), 87–104.

put together again. Once again, some people wearing oriental dress were a part of the attending crowd. This subject was almost never missing in his painted legends (and even in circulation on printed fliers in Germany after his canonization).¹⁵

This miracle was easily, and quickly, transformed in the iconography of St. Vicent Ferrer in order to carry a eucharistic allusion and a related anti-Jewish meaning. In another polyptych painted in the Aragonese Kingdom, on the island of Sicily, for the Dominican church of Castelvetro (a small town near Trapani, where a Jewish community was living at the time),¹⁶ the healed child is kneeling on a dish, whose shape reminds one of a liturgical paten, where usually the consecrated host would be set.¹⁷

The strong link between the Dominican friars, who could read the Latin legend of the recent saint of their order, and the actual presence of a Jewish community in the area was even more evident in the case of Modena (a brief reference could possibly be made to another polyptych from Bologna, painted by Francesco del Cossa and his workshop, in whose predella the stories of the new Dominican saint had the same orientation).¹⁸ Between the late 60s and the early 80s of the fifteenth century, the workshop of the Erri family painted four polyptychs for the Dominican church of the town, with the stories of the four male saints of the order (Dominic, Peter Martyr, Thomas Aquinas, Vicent Ferrer).¹⁹ In the case of Vicent Ferrer, the source for inspiration in a large choice of his stories was obviously the same official legend,

¹⁵ See Wilhelm Ludwig Schreiber, *Handbuch der Holz- und Metallschnitte des XV. Jahrhunderts*, 10 vols. in 11 (repr. Stuttgart, 1969), 201 nr. 1729. For a panel painting from Germany, now at the Metropolitan Museum in New York, see Albert Fries, "Albertus Magnus auf der Kanzel: Ein Andachtsbild," *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*, 35 (1965), 249–254 (incorrect identification for St. Vicent Ferrer).

¹⁶ Francesco Renda, "I marrani di Sicilia," in *Gli ebrei in Italia*, vol. I: *Dall'alto Medioevo all'età dei ghetti*, ed. Corrado Vivanti (Torino, 1996), 696.

¹⁷ See George Kaftal, *Saints in Italian Art: Iconography of the Saints in the Art of Central and South Italian Schools of Painting* (Florence, 1965), fig. 1324.

¹⁸ The predella painted by Ercole de' Roberti is now at the Vatican Gallery. The anti-Jewish orientation of its main subject has been disputed by Augusto Gentili, "Mito cristiano e storia ferrarese nel Polittico Griffoni," in *La corte e lo spazio: Ferrara estense*, ed. Guido Papagno and Amedeo Quondam (Roma, 1982), 563–576, and by Fabrizio Torella, "L'ombra della mezzaluna sull'arte italiana: Il polittico Griffoni," *Musei ferraresi*, 15 (1985–1987), 43–60.

Color reproduction in Monica Molteni, *Ercole de' Roberti* (Cinisello Balsamo/Milano, 1995), 116–117.

¹⁹ Complete color reproduction in Daniele Benati, *La Bottega degli Erri e la pittura del Rinascimento a Modena* (Modena, 1988). See also Rusconi, "Vicent Ferrer," 224–230.

and the final result was a major stress on the anti-Jewish meaning in the entire representation (in that large and full program were included some episodes never painted either before or since).

The story of the child cut in pieces looks like a horror movie in bright colors, with no overt anti-Jewish sentiment apparent (fig. 6). The adult couple, baptized inside the Dominican church of Modena (fig. 7), is obviously a matter of converted Jews, even—or mostly?—for the people who do not read legends in Latin (no doubts on that, if one looks at the many people in Oriental dress attending to the Christian ritual). The subject was not unusual at all, and a votive painting for the women's monastery of S. Domenico del Maglio in Florence, executed by Giovanni Francesco da Rimini shortly after Vicent Ferrer's canonization, had in its predella the baptism of a young man, possibly the commissioner himself, understood to be a converted Jew even in this case.²⁰

In addition, the main story in the polyptych, located under the standing figure of St. Vicent Ferrer, offers clear confirmation of a strong anti-Jewish orientation in the whole painting. According to the legend by Peter Ranzano, in the year 1415 the Dominican friar was preaching at Perpignan, and Benedict XIII, the pope of Avignon, was present, as were Ferdinand VII, the king of Aragon, and the Emperor Sigmund (fig. 8). The details of the written story have been kept, but the iconography chosen for the painting deeply modified the evident stress on special points of it. The historical and legendary event became a sermon delivered in the open air, on the square in front of the (quite recognizable) Dominican church of Modena. The "Three Powers" were only small figures in a balcony, and the saint friar was preaching to a devout audience on his preferred subject, the imminent end of this world. (This allusion is made with reference to the Dominican's iconographical "attribute," his finger pointing to a Christ-Judge mandorla). On the right side of the audience, in the foreground, three sitting persons wearing a distinctive oriental dress (not to mention their long hair and beards) were an unmistakable allusion to the Jews, who, according to the legend, had been forced to attend his sermons,

²⁰ Reproduction in Cesare Gnudi and Luisa Becherucci, eds., *Mostra di Melozzo: e del Quattrocento romagnolo* (Bologna, 1995), 70–71 and pl. 41B. On conversion to Christianity in Italy during the fifteenth century, see A. Toaff, "Conversioni al Cristianesimo in Italia nel Quattrocento, movimenti e tendenze: il caso dell'Umbria," in *Ebrei e cristiani nell'Italia medievale e moderna: conversioni, scambi, contrasti*, ed. Michele Luzzati, Michele Olivari, and Alessandra Veronese (Roma, 1988), 105–112.

and whose resistance had been broken.²¹ In the painting the power of the preacher's word is shown by a miracle performed in favor of the obsessed woman, jumping dishevelled into the middle of the white female audience.

The allusion made to the Eucharist was very clear to a large number of contemporary viewers, who easily connected the story of the child-cut-into-pieces to the sacramental symbolism, and were very likely able to perceive a hidden anti-Jewish meaning. In some way, this miracle was a sort of anti-miracle: on the one side, the wicked Jews' ritual murder had dismembered the poor child Simon in Trent; on the other side, the prodigious Dominican friar was able to put the pieces of a dismembered child together again.

At the end of the fifteenth century, a predella painted by Dominic Ghirlandajo's workshop for the Altare Maggiore in the Dominican church of S. Maria Novella in Florence had lost any fidelity to the written text of the legend, and did not represent a horror story in a kitchen, but a celebration of the mass: the saint is wearing liturgical clothes, and the healed child is standing on the altar table, near the chalice, as a living host²² (fig. 9).

In northern Italy, the blessed Simon was also painted in a fresco for the parish church of S. Maria di Nato (Vicenza, as early as 1479),²³ standing in a basin filled with his blood, whose shape had been transformed from a dish into a chalice. At the end of the fifteenth century, the martyred child was standing directly over an altar, in another fresco for the church of S. Stephen di Rovato (Brescia).²⁴

The Alleged Messiah: The Antichrist And The Jews

In the years between 1499 and 1503, Luca Signorelli painted the frescoes on the walls in the "new" chapel of the Orvieto cathedral, whose program had been started at the time of Fra Angelico and whose sub-

²¹ Ranzanus, *Vita*, 508E nr. 41.

²² A predella, possibly from the Altare Maggiore in S. Maria Novella in Florence, represented this peculiar subject; see Christian von Holst, *Francesco Granacci* (Munich, 1974), 54, fig. 4, and 129 (at that time: New York, Gallery F. Mont). For the same subject by Ghirlandajo's circle in Florence's Museum Stibbert, see George Kaftal, *Saints in Italian Art: Iconography of the Saints in Tuscan Painting* (Florence, 1952), fig. 1149.

²³ Color reproduction in Rigaux, "L'immagine," fig. 1.

²⁴ Color reproduction in Rigaux, "L'immagine," fig. 7.

ject was the representation of Christian eschatology.²⁵ The deeds of the antichrist were the subject of one scene; it was absolutely uncommon as a fresco in Italian art at that time.²⁶ Suggestive of an anti-Jewish inspiration of this section of his work, a Jewish moneylender has often been identified as a figure in the foreground (even if some arguments do not seem completely plausible) (fig. 10), and St. Vicent Ferrer has been suggested in connection with the disputing Dominican friar in the middle.²⁷

There is absolutely no doubt with reference to the iconographical source of the representation: a wood engraving by Michael Wolgemut, printed in Hartmann Schedel's *Liber Chronicarum* by Anton Koberger in Nürnberg in 1493. In the German print, on the right side, the last preachers are the Jewish prophets, Enoch and Elijah, but on the opposite side, in the middle of the audience of the antichrist's sermon, in the crowd of his followers, one could easily recognize some Jewish people, from their hats and beards.²⁸ In the case of this print, the allusions are more overt than in the Orvieto fresco, where the antichrist's figure is iconographically depicted as a perfect Christ-like figure, that is, a false messiah of Jewish origin.

The anti-Jewish orientation evident in the visual representation of stories of the antichrist is even more evident in some popular booklets, which appeared in print in France and in Milan, in Italy, at the end of the fifteenth century.²⁹ These booklets contained a line of development in content and illustration, which made them very different from

²⁵ See Jonathan B. Riess, *The Renaissance Antichrist: Luca Signorelli's Orvieto Frescoes* (Princeton, 1995); more recently, Steffi Roettgen, *Italian Frescoes* (New York, 1996–1997); also Giusi Testa, ed., *La Cappella Nova o di San Brizio nel Duomo di Orvieto* (Milan, 1996). Creighton E. Gilbert, *How Fra Angelico and Signorelli Saw the End of the World* (University Park, Pa., 2003) was published after the completion of this essay.

²⁶ Color reproduction on the back cover of Riess, *The Renaissance Antichrist*. Details in color by Roettgen, *Italian Frescoes* and Testa, *La Cappella Nova*.

²⁷ Stanley Meltzoff, *Botticelli, Signorelli and Savonarola: Theologia Poetica and Painting from Boccaccio to Poliziano* (Florence, 1987), 348, identifies the Dominican friar as Savonarola's follower Domenico Benivieni.

²⁸ See Riess, *The Renaissance Antichrist*, fig. 52. See also Ewin Hall and Horst Uhr, "Patrons and Painters in Quest of an Iconographic Program: The Case of Signorelli Frescoes in Orvieto," in *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte*, 35 (1992), 35–56.

²⁹ See Lamberto Donati, "La Vita dell'Anticristo," *La Bibliofilia*, 78 (1976), 37–65, and more recently Edoardo Barbieri, "L'Anticristo: vita, morte e (falsi) miracoli," in *L'oggetto libro '98: Arte della stampa, mercato e collezionismo* (Milan, 1999), 18–27, and "Dalla Francia all'Italia: 'La vita dell'Anticristo'" (forthcoming).

similar booklets written, illustrated, and printed in southern Germany.³⁰ The text was originally written in Latin, collecting the traditional theological sources on the topic, and quite soon translated into the vernacular, into French and Italian. The number of the issues was clearly the result of some popularity of the publication, whose purpose was to promote individual repentance, pretending that the end of the world was almost near (as one can read on its pages, which do not show any millenarian bias).

In the *Auctoritates de Antichristo* printed in Milan around the year 1490, the illustrations are decorating the story of the antichrist as the anti-“Last World Emperor” (in contrast, in the German series, the antichrist is represented as “completely opposed to Christ,” as one could read since the times of Adso in the tenth century).³¹ In a scene in which the antichrist is standing over a pulpit, he is rewarding his followers with money. In the foreground, impiety is represented on the right, where broken sacred images are lying on the floor (and not by chance, they are images of Saints Peter and Paul). On the left, once again, bearded men appear in the audience with oriental hats (fig. 11).

A major step in the final events, according to Christian eschatology, was connected to the role of the Jewish people in the final times, once again dangling between wickedness and conversion. The attendance of Jews at an ecclesiastical sermon was tightly connected to an eschatological hope, the idea that the final conversion of the people of Israel to the Christian faith was a last step before the end of this world and the beginning of the kingdom of heaven.

This theme was quite pronounced in the decoration of illuminated manuscripts in the fifteenth century. In a book of hours, the *Très Riches Heures* of the French Duke of Berry (1404–1416), Saints Peter and Paul are preaching from the same pulpit to an audience where two major figures are a black man and a Jew;³² a multi-ethnic audience is represented also in the Apocalypse (1428–1435) illuminated for the Duke of Savoy, Amedeo VIII (who became the Antipope Felix V at the

³⁰ See *Der Antichrist und die fünfzehn Zeichen*, ed. Heinrich Theodor Musper (Munich, 1970), and *Der Antichrist und Die Fünfzehn Zeichen vor dem Jüngsten Gericht*, ed. Karin Boveland, Christoph Peter Burger, and Ruth Steffen (Hamburg, 1979).

³¹ Adso Dervensis, *De ortu et tempore antichristi*, ed. Daniel Verhelst (Turnhout, 1976).

³² Chantilly, Musée Condé, Ms. 65, fol. 28r: reproduction in Millard Meiss, *French Painting at the Time of Jean de Berry, III: The Limbours and their Contemporaries*, II (London, 1975), fig. 563.

Council of Basel in 1439 and was renounced in 1449), where the text speaks of the angel of the Apocalypse.³³

Christian Devotion And Anti-Judaism

In a treatise on roguery, the *Speculum cerretanorum* written by Teseo Pini between 1484 and 1486, there is a special group of scoundrels, whose name is "Acconi" (the source of the name comes from the word icon) for the following reason, according to the author's explanation: "As a matter of fact, (I)con is the first term used to make reference to painted images of saints painted on wood. These people, I said, carry the images of the saints, and lay them down before the doors of the churches and on the churchyards, and in order to beg some money, they sing some hymns on the blessed Simon of Trent, and the so-called joys of the Blessed Virgin. When they had got money through begging with these images, they said to each other: 'We seized our birds.'" ³⁴

The prohibition issued by the papal letters in 1475 was not effective "against the people who paint the images of the child Simon and keep them at home," ³⁵ as we can see from the text of a Venetian decree of the same year; for instance, single sheets and illustrated books with the images of the supposed saint were widely circulated by these rascals.³⁶ At the end of the fifteenth century, the thieves of the piety of the faithful made use of the hymns of the Virgin Mary and of the story of the blessed Simon of Trent — making money, we may imagine, by giving them small prints. The way in which Christian devotion and anti-Judaism were deeply connected at the people's level is evident enough.

The audience of a sermon and the public of a painting are at the crossroads of a manifold story: on the one side, the real story of the personage, then the legend of the saint, finally the devotion of the

³³ El Escorial, Biblioteca del Real Monasterio, Ms. E. Vit. V, fol. 15v. Facsimile reproduction in *L'Apocalypse figurée des ducs de Savoie*, ed. Clément Gardet (Annecy, 1969), and *El Apocalipsis figurado de los duques de Saboya*, ed. C. Santiago Agut (Madrid, 1981).

³⁴ Original Latin text in Teseo Pini, "Il libro dei vagabondi: Lo 'Speculum cerretanorum,'" in *"Il vagabondo" di Raffaele Frianoro e altri testi di "furfanteria,"* ed. Piero Cam-poresi (Turin, 1973), 38–39.

³⁵ Gabriella Ferri Piccaluga, "Economia, devozione e politica: immagini di francescani, amadeiti ed ebrei nel secolo XV," in *Il Francescanesimo in Lombardia: Storia e arte* (Cinisello Balsamo/Milano, 1983), 107–122; see p. 118 n. 5: contra pingentes et habentes puerum Simonem in domibus suis.

³⁶ See some iconographical examples in Dal Prà, "L'immagine," figs. 1–8.

faithful; on the other side, the command of the commissioner, the work of the artist after it, the role of the iconographical models—not to mention the importance of the time and place, that is, when and where the paintings have been produced.

In the last decade of the fifteenth century, in the rural parish church of Pisogne, S. Maria in Silvis, where the image of the “blessed” Simon of Trent had been painted in the 80s, in a “Triumph of Death,” one can still read in Italian verses, “Death is leading to the infernal ranks/Tartars, Turks, Saracens and Moorish,” all the people who could be represented in an oriental dress.³⁷

The Franciscan Bernardino da Busti, an Observant wandering preacher active at the end of the fifteenth and at the beginning of the sixteenth centuries, wrote a collection of Latin sermons, a sort of encyclopedic handbook to be used by other preachers. In some way, the main themes of the friars’ preaching of almost a century could be found in his pages; for instance, included is a sermon “About the condemnation of the sects, of the heathens, of the Muslims, of the Jews.”³⁸

Conclusion

In the second half of the fifteenth century, something had changed in the basic Christian attitude to the Jews, as far as we are able to tell from the modified representation in Italian art of the story of St. Stephen, the first Christian martyr (and the first Christian saint to be murdered by Jews, long before any persecution of the faithful by the Romans).

Vittore Carpaccio executed, between the years 1511 and 1520, five big paintings for the Venetian confraternity which took its name from the devotion to the saint.³⁹ In the choice of the episodes, the “Dispute with the Doctors of the Law” had the central position, an importance stressed also by the attendance at the performance by the officials of the confraternity itself, as an audience contemporary to the events.⁴⁰ In

³⁷ Ferri Piccaluga, “Economia,” 118 n. 20.

³⁸ Ferri Piccaluga, “Economia,” 118–119 n. 20.

³⁹ See Patricia Fortini Brown, *Venetian Narrative Painting in the Age of Carpaccio* (New Haven, Conn., 1988), 296–298, and more recently Augusto Gentili, *Le storie di Carpaccio. Venezia, i Turchi e gli Ebrei* (Padua, 1996), whose arguments will be followed (see pp. 123–138).

⁴⁰ Color reproduction in Peter Humfrey, *Carpaccio: Catalogo completo dei dipinti* (Firenze, 1991), 115.

the whole series, St. Stephen is acting in an historical Jerusalem, that is, in a recognizable setting and location (the town in Palestine), where the population, and the audience of his deeds, was a mixture of Arabs and Jews and Byzantines, whose costumes were drawn according to reliable sketches already available in Venice (fig. 12).

St. Stephen is preaching in a real Jerusalem, and wearing his liturgical garments.⁴¹ His sermon comes after his consecration, his judgment comes before his stoning, the dispute is in the middle; the saint's gesture and the Jews' reaction strongly indicate a lively discussion (fig. 13). At the end, the choice in the sequence of the episodes makes clear that the images had the purpose, not to stress the victory of the preaching of the gospel, but to remind the viewers that the wicked Jews of that time had murdered the Christian preacher who addressed them.⁴²

⁴¹ Color reproduction in Humfrey, *Carpaccio*, 112.

⁴² An expanded Italian version of this text is in print in the journal *Iconographica: Studi di iconografia medievale e moderna*, 3 (2004).

This page intentionally left blank

JEWS, FRANCISCANS, AND THE FIRST *MONTI DI PIETÀ* IN ITALY (1462–1500)

ARIEL TOAFF

The years between 1462 and 1500 may be considered as the period when the institution of *Monti di Pietà* was established and spread throughout Italy. It is generally acknowledged that the *pio istituto*, the fruit of Franciscan preaching, was meant to put an end to the “iniquitous usury” of the Jews by replacing them in the small loans sector, which was directed toward the poorer segments of the population, among which they had hitherto enjoyed a sanctioned and almost total monopoly. As of 1462, the year in which the *Monte di Pietà* in Perugia was founded and generally deemed by scholars to be chronologically the first *Monte di Pietà*, the institution spread rapidly, especially in the Umbria and Marche regions of central Italy, as well as in the areas of Tuscany, Lazio, Veneto, and Abruzzi. It is thought that, between 1462 and 1470, approximately forty *Monti di Pietà* were founded in these regions and many more in the period that followed.¹ Their establishment was linked to the most prestigious names among the Franciscan preachers, such as Bernardino da Feltre and Andrea da Faenza, in addition to a host of other, less renowned friars, such as Barnaba Manassei of Terni, Michele Carcano of Milan, Giacomo della Marca and Fortunato Coppoli of Perugia, indefatigably active in promoting and spreading the “*pio istituto*.”

Alberto Ghinato, a well-known scholar in this field, observed that the foundation of the *Monti di Pietà* always followed a fixed scenario, every phase of which was repeated in each city.² It began with a sermon by a Franciscan friar against the usurious activities of the Jews, during the course of which threats of excommunication were pronounced against the governors of the Commune and the entire population: the first for having signed a moneylending charter with the Jews, who were

¹ See Stanislao Majarelli and Ugolino Nicolini, *Il Monte dei Poveri di Perugia, periodo delle origini (1462–1474)* (Perugia, 1962), 489, where we can find an almost complete map of the first *Monti di Pietà* in Italy.

² See Alberto Ghinato, “I Monti di Pietà, istituzione francescana,” in *Picenum Seraphicum*, 9 (1972), 7–62.

thereby allowed to enrich themselves by sinful usury, the inhabitants of the city as a whole, for having passively permitted the Jews “to suck their blood” and for not having rebelled against the decisions of their governors. In order to cancel out this mortal sin, which was purported to be the origin of wars and mortal epidemics, the cities had to free themselves of the presence of Jews, immediately and unilaterally annulling the moneylending charters that gave legal sanction to their activities. At the same time, so as not to harm the poor, who were obliged to have recourse to the onerous loans granted by the Jewish banks, it was imperative to establish the *Monte di Pietà*, which would provide credit at no interest whatsoever for the less affluent population. Following the friar’s preaching, there would be an emergency meeting of the municipal council (the Council of Priori), often in the presence of the friar, to discuss the annulment of the Jews’ moneylending charter, their removal from the city, and the foundation of a *Monte di Pietà*, using capital created out of public and charity funds. A citizens’ committee, presided over by the same preacher, was then elected in order to draft the new statutes of the *Monte*. At the same time, the decisions of the Council of Priori were presented to the Jews, who were commanded to cease their moneylending activities immediately and to set a date for the public auction of unredeemed pledges. As soon as they retrieved their capital, the Jews were invited to leave the city, never to return.

If this was the immutable pattern of events that recurred unchanged in every case, the question raised by historians, who ask what factors permitted the *de facto* continuation of Jewish moneylending activities alongside and, at least in part in competition with the *Monti di Pietà*, should seem surprising. In fact, if the establishment of the *Monti* was always preceded by the annulment of the moneylending charters with the Jews and followed by their expulsion, there would be no reason for the question to be raised. If the Jews were unable “to practice their usury” and, furthermore, could not be physically present in the city, they would certainly not be in a position to operate alongside the *Monti di Pietà* nor in competition with them. Last but not least, how could the friars and their supporters justify the *Monti di Pietà* activities, while in the city the awful usury of the Jews did not come to an end, which, according to their own words, automatically caused the Christian population to fall into mortal sin and excommunication?

In presenting the case study of the foundation of the first *Monti di Pietà*, I shall propose certain conclusions that could serve to shed light on these factors which, in spite of everything, even after the creation

of the *Monti di Pietà*, permitted the Jews to continue their lending practices. I shall endeavor, among other things, to identify, both within and outside the cities, the power groups that came to the aid of the Jews, and to investigate their motives for so doing. Ultimately, I shall try to reconstruct the real relationships between the friars and the *Monti di Pietà* on the one hand and the Jews on the other, going beyond stereotyped and widely accepted formulas which were derived from official documentation. All this in no way detracts from the theory stressing the different economic character and function of the *Monti di Pietà* as compared to the Jewish banks, for whom the less wealthy population constituted only a portion, and often the less important one, of their clientele.³ The most salient case, in many ways a paradigmatic one, that I intend to present, is that of Perugia, the historic birthplace of the *Monte di Pietà* and the seat of one of the most flourishing and large Jewish communities in central Italy, with about fifteen banks open to the public and operating with official authorization.⁴

In the spring of 1462 the Franciscan friar Michele Carcano of Milan was preaching in Perugia, having returned to Italy after a stay of over one year in the Holy Land. His demands, directed to the Priori of the city, were that the moneylending charter granted to the Jews be rescinded immediately to release "the above-mentioned city of Perugia from the bonds of excommunication" (*ad dictam civitatem perusinam liberandam a vinculo excommunicationis*) and that there be established a *Monte di Pietà* for the relief of the poor.⁵ The Council of Priori met and decided to comply with the friar's requests, approving officially his proposals. At the same time, the city's governors set up a plan to raise the funds, which were not easily available, needed for the new *Monte*. The solution, albeit a paradoxical one, was soon found. The Jews, seen as docile victims, were called upon to furnish to the pious institute the first means of subsistence, in the form of an interest-free loan amounting to the enormous sum of 3000 florins "to establish and expedite the above-mentioned Monte" as the institute for moneylending (*pro dictum Montem sive prestum exequendo et expediendo*). The Jews, presumably far from enthu-

³ See recently Viviana Bonazzoli, "Monti di Pietà e politica economica delle città nelle Marche alla fine del '400," in *Banchi pubblici, banchi privati e Monti di Pietà nell'Europa preindustriale* (Roma, 1991), 571–574; F. Pisa, "Attività bancarie locali nell'Italia dei secoli XIV–XVI," in *Zakhor: Rivista di storia degli ebrei d'Italia*, 1 (1997), 138–140.

⁴ See Ariel Toaff, *Gli ebrei a Perugia* (Perugia, 1975), 69–77.

⁵ See Majarelli and Nicolini, *Il Monte dei Poveri di Perugia*, 107. On Michele Carcano, see P. Valugani, *Il beato Michele Carcano da Milano* (Milan, 1950).

siastic about such a demand, asked that the sum to be lent be reduced and, at the same time, urged for a negotiated settlement regarding their new status in the city, limiting the damages and obtaining a confirmation of the rights they had acquired over two centuries. A first reduction of the loan *gratis et amore* to 2000 florins was followed by another, bringing the sum down to 1200 florins. Finally the sum was collected from the Jews of Perugia, who turned for help to the Jewish banks operating in Florence. At the end of March 1463, about a year later, the loan (that nobody really intended to pay back) was delivered by the Jews to the *Monte* officials and the pious institution was able—with Jewish money—to start its operations.⁶ At the same time the negotiations between the Jews and Berardo Erolì, bishop of Spoleto and papal legate in Perugia, reached a surprising settlement. The Jews were still prohibited from exercising moneylending activities in the city, but in exchange for the loan to the *Monte*, they obtained a confirmation of the privileges they had hitherto enjoyed, including those proceeding from their citizenship rights. Furthermore, they were granted anew the protection of the papal authority.⁷ The following April, Pope Pius II Piccolomini himself officially ratified the privileges of the Jews of Perugia, and this—the papal *breve* says it clearly—in exchange for the 1200 florins contributed by them to the creation of the *Monte*.⁸ In the autumn of 1463 the Jewish

⁶ Archivio di Stato di Perugia (= A.S.P.), Consigli e Riformanze, 98, cc. 22r, 24r, 58r, 78r, 112v; 99, cc. 6v, 29rv; Giudiziario, Jura Diversa, busta III, aa. 1451–1465; Camera Apostolica, 1, cc. 93v, 94v. See A. Fabretti, *Sulla condizione degli ebrei in Perugia dal XIII al XVII secolo* (Torino, 1891), 59–68; Majarelli and Nicolini, *Il Monte dei Poveri di Perugia*, 101–116, 142–150; Ariel Toaff, *The Jews in Umbria*, 3 vols. (Leiden, 1993), I.XXXV–XXXII.

⁷ A.S.P., Camera Apostolica, 1, c. 93v: “... et quia nostra mediante opera et inductione prefati hebrei ad dictam quantitatem milleducentorum florenorum mutuo concedendam subventionem et augmento dicti Montis sunt inducti, prout etiam iam dictam quantitatem per eos fuisse effectualiter solutam costare dignoscitur, ad quod mutuum nostre non fuisse intentioni eos cogere invitos, sed potius eos induximus volentes ad id faciendum allicientes eos sub spe nostre protectionis, ideo etiam dicta ordinamenta, in quantum favorem ipsorum hebreorum dignoscuntur, similiter ex certa scientia confirmamus ac grata habemus”: “... given that, thanks to our commitment and persuasion, the Jews were induced to make a loan of 1200 florins to help and increase the above-mentioned Monte, and it is known that they have actually delivered that sum and, given that our intention was not to force them to make this loan against their will, but on the contrary to persuade them to lend this sum willingly, relying on our protection; for that reason we officially, willingly, and in full awareness have decided to ratify those regulations that are in favor of the Jews” (or: “those regulations known to have been issued to favor the Jews”).

⁸ A.S.P., Camera Apostolica, 1, c. 94r. See Shlomo Simonsohn, *The Apostolic See and the Jews (492–1555): Documents and History* (Toronto, 1988–1991), 1101–1102 (no. 892).

bankers were requested to make an official statement in the presence of the Priori that they had ceased all moneylending operations in the city.⁹

Up to this point there is nothing new. We have the foundation of the *Monte di Pietà* (even though, paradoxically, with the basic help of Jewish capital) and we have, at the same time, the cessation of Jewish moneylending. The success of the friars' preaching, therefore, seems to be absolute and is often presented as such. But this is misleading.

First of all, let us ask ourselves what interest the Jews could have had to remain in Perugia once their principal and most lucrative activity was forbidden to them. A careful study of the available documentary sources helps us to answer this question, giving us a picture of the situation which is quite different from what we had been led to expect. From the autumn of 1462, in the months subsequent to the establishment of the *Monte*, until the end of 1464, a year after they had declared that they had complied with the order to cease all their loan operations, many Jews were arrested and fined for having disobeyed the order.¹⁰ Other Jews seemed to have been arrested from time to time in the following years, up to the end of the century. Thus it seems evident that the Jewish banks continued to operate in Perugia, albeit illegally, after the foundation of the *Monte*.

In October 1462 Friar Michele of Milan, the promoter of the *Monte di Pietà* of Perugia, accused the Jews of the city of doing their utmost—according to him—by means of pressures and machinations, to prevent the opening of the charitable institution: “the establishment of the said Monte was prevented in many ways until now and delayed, as we are told openly, mainly by the tricks, pleas and machinations of the Jews.”¹¹ It seems strange that the friar accused the Jews, the very people who were at the time, in spite of their uncertain and difficult political situation, raising the money necessary for the opening of the *Monte*. Furthermore in the statutes of the *Monte di Pietà* of Perugia in 1468, repeated to the letter in the statutes of other *Monti* (Assisi 1469, Terni 1472), there still appears a clause, stipulating the heavy fine of 200 golden florins for the Priori and other officials who, incited by the Jews,

⁹ A.S.P., Consigli e Riformanze, 99, c. 108r.

¹⁰ A.S.P., Notarile, Tancio di Niccolò di Tancio, 265, cc. 66r–67v; 266, cc. 19r, 105v, 106r, 107rv, 113v; Giudiziario, Podestà, originali B, 88, cc. 18v, 21r.

¹¹ A.S.P., Consigli e Riformanze, 98, c. 78r: “astutia maxime ac precibus et artibus ipsorum Ebreorum—ut publice dicitur—executio ipsius Montis varie impedita hucusque ac dillata fuerit.”

may have jeopardized the existence of the *Monte*, bringing about its bankruptcy: "many could be the machinations and corruptions carried out by the Jews and other vicious men, leading the citizens and other people to extinguish the above-mentioned Monte."¹² Who were these "*maligne persone*," certainly Christians, who, in cahoots with the Jews, strove to harm the new institution wanted by the Franciscans?

Friar Michele Carcano had been quite clear in this regard during his preaching in Perugia, when he accused many members of the local patriciate and commercial ranks of having clandestinely invested their capital in Jewish banks so as to derive illicit profits which were forbidden by Christian law. "In our times," the friar complained, "not only the Jews ... but also many Christians, making use [or: by means] of the Jews, secretly increase the usuries in number" (*nostris temporibus non solum Judei ... insuper et Christiani plures per Judeorum manus occulto usuras multiplicant*).¹³ It is not surprising, therefore, that in every case where, after the establishment of the *Monte*, Jews were arrested for having contravened the order prohibiting moneylending, they were speedily released, after their fines and bonds, often onerous ones, were paid on their behalf by merchants belonging to the richest aristocratic families of Perugia, such as the Ercolani, the Oddi and the Valeriani. At other times the names of the guarantors for the Jews were not explicitly stated in the notarial documents, but that they were people of influence in the city seems evident in the light of the deliberately obscure wording adopted by the notary: "somebody, whose name is omitted at the moment for good reasons" (*quisdam cuius nomen ad presens pro meliori partito tacetur*).¹⁴ Obviously appropriate pressures sufficed to make cautious even the most honest and courageous of notaries.

In fact, already at this point, we can present certain conclusions. The first is that the Jews, after the foundation of the *Monte di Pietà* and the annulment of their agreements with the Commune of Perugia, continued to lend money in semi-illegal conditions and without the protection of an official charter (*condotta*). I have said "semi-illegal"

¹² A.S.P., Monte di Pietà, Miscellanea 1, c. 49v: "perchè molte poriano essere le versutie et corruptele deli Judei et altre maligne persone ad inducere li cittadini et altre persone ad estintione del detto Monte."

¹³ See Michele Carcano, *Sermonarium de decem preceptis* (Venetiis, Giovanni e Gregorio de' Gregori, 1492), c. 168v.

¹⁴ A.S.P., Giudiziario, Podestà, originali B, 88, cc. 18v, 21r.

and not “illegal,” because it is likely that this occurred with the tacit approval of the Priori, who were interested in the continuation of their financial activity.

The second conclusion that seems to emerge clearly is that in Perugia (as well as in many other places in central and northern Italy), there were many Christians, patricians and merchants, who had invested their capital unofficially in Jewish banks.¹⁵ These Christians continued to have relations with the Jews even after the establishment of the *Monte*, affording them protection and guaranteeing the continued exercise of their loan operations in spite of the prohibitions.

Patricians and Christian merchants were not the only source of assistance on which Jewish bankers could rely. Also the popes, from afar and through their legate in Perugia, did not spare efforts to intervene in their behalf, so as to protect them and to guarantee *de facto* the pursuit of their financial operations. Pius II Piccolomini, on the 29th of April, 1463 approved with an official *breve* the *Monte di Pietà* of Perugia and the privileges of the local Jews, on condition that they cease moneylending. But the same pope, only ten days before, had granted to a group of Jewish bankers of Perugia the right to open their banks in nearby Deruta, in spite of the prohibition, at the same time absolving the Christian community from any danger of excommunication. The privileges granted to the Jewish bankers in Deruta were officially confirmed when the first charter expired ten years later.¹⁶ It was evident that the pope intended to allow circumvention of the order that, after the foundation of the *Monte di Pietà* of Perugia, forced the local Jews to cease their moneylending operations.

The case of Perugia is not an isolated one. When, in the autumn of 1474 the Commune of Terni, overwhelmed by debts to the Holy See and the local bishop, Tommaso Vincenzi, turned to the pope for his advice as to how to face their obligations, Sixtus IV della Rovere responded by warmly advocating the immediate reopening of the Jewish banks in the city, on condition that they not imperil the existence of the local *Monte di Pietà*, founded in 1467: “on condition that it will be clearly understood and declared that, in signing the agreements with the Jews, nothing will be done that could damage the city’s *Monte di*

¹⁵ On the deposits made by Christians in Jewish banks see A. Toaff, *Love, Work and Death: Jewish Life in Medieval Umbria* (London, 1996), 242–243.

¹⁶ A.S.P., Consigli e Riformanze, 99, c. 44r; 109, c. 84r. See Simonsohn, *Apostolic See*, 1094–1095 (no. 886).

Pietà” (*hoc tamen intellecto et declarato quod in conductione dictorum hebreorum non fiat in aliquo contra officium Montis Pietatis dicte civitatis*).¹⁷ This provision sounded like a formality, a lip service, rather than a sign of real concern for the welfare of the *Monte di Pietà*. In fact, several years later, in March 1479, a Franciscan preacher, probably Fra Nicola of Spoleto, a disciple of Bernardino of Siena, complained that the city of Terni should consider itself to be excommunicated, because it permitted Jewish usury even after the foundation of the *Monte*. One of the local Jewish bankers hurried to Rome, however, bringing back a *breve* from Sixtus IV, who unequivocally absolved the city of Terni of any sin of conscience or danger of excommunication: “The Jewish banker came to Rome, where he got a brief from the pope, granting to our community of Terni full impunity and absolution from any sin of conscience in occasion of the said loan” (*bancherius judeus accessit Romam et obtinuit per breve SSmi D.N. quod communitas nostra Interamnis impune et absque gravamine conscientie remaneat et remanere possit occasione dicti fenoris*).¹⁸

In Assisi, where a *Monte di Pietà* was founded in 1468 on the initiative of the Franciscan friars Fortunato Coppoli of Perugia and Giacomo della Marca, the policy of the Holy See to protect the Jewish banks’ activities manifested itself clearly.¹⁹ On July 16, 1469 a letter from Rome on this subject was addressed to the Priori of the city. It was signed by Angelo Fasolo, bishop of Feltre and pontifical treasurer, and Pedro Ferriz, bishop of Tarragona and judge in the Rota pontifical tribunal. The two high prelates expressed the pope’s displeasure at the illegal cancellation of the charters with the Jews and exhorted the governors of Assisi to respect them until their expiration. The letter also contained a stern admonition to the preachers, reflecting the official position of the Holy See in this matter: if they wanted to correct the behavior of the Christian people, they were free to do so, but they were not to harass or harm Jews who respected the law, simply because their customs differed from those of the Christians. “You have to warn the preachers to condemn the sins and exterminate them, but at the same time to permit the Jews to live according to their customs, because even

¹⁷ Archivio di Stato di Terni (= A.S.T.), Riformanze, 503, III, c. 69v.

¹⁸ A.S.T., Riformanze, 504, II, c. 31v. See A. Ghinato, *I primordi del Monte di Pietà di Terni*, II (Roma 1959), 93–94.

¹⁹ See A. Cristofani, *Le storie di Assisi* (Venezia, 1959), 357–359; A. Toaff, *The Jews in Medieval Assisi (1305–1487)* (Firenze, 1979), 73–78. On Fortunato Coppoli see A. Ghinato, *Un propagatore dei Monti di Pietà del '400: P. Fortunato Coppoli da Perugia*, in *Rivista di Storia della Chiesa in Italia*, X (1956), 193–211.

in our laws their presence among the Christians is tolerated” (*predicatores admonete ut peccata redarguant et exterminent, Judeos autem permittant suo more vivere, qui etiam secundum leges nostras tollerantur inter Christianos*). Paul II’s authoritative intervention enabled the Priori of Assisi to reinstate the validity of the cancelled contracts with the Jews.²⁰

Similarly in Trevi, in December 1463, with Franciscan friars preaching in the city and threatening excommunication, the rulers felt obliged to annul the loan charter signed with the Jews. But a month later the Holy See hastened to enjoin the Priori of Trevi to cancel their decision, reinstating the lending charter with the Jews.²¹ Ten years later it was Cardinal Giuliano della Rovere, later Pope Julius II, who wrote to the governors of Trevi, authorizing them to confirm the provisions of the moneylending charter with the Jews and absolving them explicitly from the danger of excommunication: “without any punishment, even of excommunication” (*sine aliqua pena etiam excommunicationis*).²²

Returning to Perugia, from which we started (if its case is paradigmatic, as it seems to me), the conclusions appear to be quite clear.

1) The creation of the *Monte di Pietà* was accompanied effectively by the cessation of officially authorized Jewish moneylending, as required by the Franciscans.

2) The Jews did not *de facto* desist from their activity and continued to make loans without chapters (*senza capitoli*), that is to say, without the legal protection constituted by the charter (*condotta*), enjoying the support of local patricians and merchants, which were connected to the Jewish banks as silent partners.

3) The Holy See, as I have tried to demonstrate elsewhere, was another of the “silent partners” in the Jewish banks, at least from the middle of the thirteenth century. In cases where it could not help to restore the validity of the loan charters, unilaterally annulled by local rulers (as in Perugia), the Holy See sought to open up alternatives, some more, some less attractive for the Jews, in nearby sites, so as to allow them to continue their financial operations with minimum inconvenience and,

²⁰ Archivio Comunale di Assisi (= A.C.A.), H, Riformanze, 17, c. 113v.

²¹ Archivio Comunale di Trevi (= A.C.Tr.), Tre Chiavi, busta 8, reg. 112, cc. 389r, 395r, 402v.

²² A.C.Tr., Tre Chiavi, busta 9, reg. 138, c. iv; 139, c. 1r.

presumably, with the wealthy population as their main clientele. The example of the bankers of Perugia, empowered to reopen their banks in neighboring Deruta, is certainly significant.

4) Those Jewish bankers, who did not intend to have any problem with the law, maintained their residence and citizenship in the Commune (in our case, in Perugia), continuing to exercise their profession in the centers outside the city district (*extra districtum civitatis Perusi*). This was the case of many Jews who, from their home in Perugia, directed their business in a multitude of banks, small and large, in every part of Italy—in Sangemini, Orte and Montepulciano, in Fossombrone, San Severino Marche and Urbino, in Castelnovo di Parma, Borgo San Donnino in Lombardy and in Fondi in Campagna.²³

At this point it should be quickly pointed out that, contrary to what we would expect, there were many cases in which the *Monte di Pietà* coexisted, from its inception, with the Jewish banks, in spite of what Franciscan preaching demanded as a *conditio sine qua non*. Thus in Assisi, where the *Monte* had been founded in 1468, Jews continued to make loans, sometimes with *condotta*, sometimes without, having among their clients the Commune, the San Pietro Abbey and the friars of the “Monastero di S. Francesco” themselves.²⁴ It is not without significance that, in 1469, Friar Fortunato Coppoli, the founder of the *Monte di Pietà* in Assisi, accused the Christian merchants in the city of diverting their money from the *Monte*, in order to make clandestine investments in the local Jewish banks.²⁵ In Amelia, where the *Monte di Pietà* had been established in 1470, on the initiative of the same Coppoli, Jewish bankers continued to operate without any interruption whatsoever, with an official loan charter, counting among their clients, in addition to the Commune, both the governor and the bishop of Perugia.²⁶ In Spoleto, too, where the *Monte di Pietà* began its operations in 1469, the Jews con-

²³ A.S.P., Notarile, Francesco di Giacomo, 196, c. 183v; 217, c. 186r; 225, cc. 6r, 113r; 130r, 168r; 323r, 333r; 500r; Angelo di Domenico, 227, c. 286r; Giudiziario, Jura Diversa, mazzo 3, aa. 1461–1465.

²⁴ A.C.A., Notarile, Mariotto di Ludovico, 56, fasc. 5, c. 17r; Ludovico di Giovanni di Angelo, S 24 bis; H, Riformanze, 9, fasc. 2, c. 43r. See Toaff, *Jews in Medieval Assisi*, 64–65.

²⁵ A.C.A., H, Riformanze, 17, c. 109v.

²⁶ Archivio Comunale di Amelia (= A.C.Am.), Riformanze, 42, cc. 155v–163v, 165r; 47, cc. 274r, 365v–366v, 368v–373v, 397v; 48, cc. 104v–106r; 49, cc. 51r, 84r; 51, cc. 134v–139r, 164v; 53, cc. 309r, 464r; 55, c. 569v; 56, cc. 345r–348r. See A. Ghinato, *Fondazione*

tinued their financial activity in the city with official authorization.²⁷ In Foligno the *Monte di Pietà* was founded in 1466 by Friar Giacomo della Marca.²⁸ Notwithstanding the repeated demands made by famous Franciscans, such as Fra Bernardino da Feltre, who still in 1487 clamored for the expulsion of the Jews and the consolidation of the *Monte* ("It has to be provided for the expulsion and removal of all Jewish moneylenders from the city of Foligno and its countryside ... and you have to increase the capitals of your *Monte di Pietà*" [*se habbia a provvedere de scacciare et mandare via fore della città de Fuligni et contado tutti li Judei che prestano ad usura ... et vogliate procurare de aumentare il vostro Monte de Pietà*]), the Jews continued to make loans undeterred, at times with an official *condotta*, sometimes without. In the latter case the arrests and fines of the bankers caught in the act, served above all to enrich the coffers of the Commune, but they certainly did not aim at putting an end to the phenomenon.²⁹

How, then, and why did the friars in many cases accept in practice the presence of the hated and reviled Jewish bank, alongside their *Monte di Pietà*? Furthermore, at least from the point of view of their ideology, how could a *Monte di Pietà* operate in a city that was in mortal sin and struck by excommunication because of the presence in its midst of usurious Jews who, on top of everything, were officially permitted to exercise their nefarious art?

The case of Trevi seems significant to me in answering these questions, casting a revealing ray of light on the real relations between the preaching friars, the *Monti di Pietà*, and the Jews, often more pragmatic in nature than one had been led to suppose. In 1469 the Franciscan Agostino of Perugia founded the *Monte di Pietà* in Trevi.³⁰ Surprisingly, the communal council did not decide, in accordance with the pattern

e statuti del Monte di Pietà di Amelia, in *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum*, XLVIII (1955), 345–360.

²⁷ Archivio Comunale di Spoleto (= A.C.S.), Notarile, Paride di Pierdonato, 112, cc. 176r, 186r: "Hebrei mutant denarios christianis ... cum nulla habeant capitula cum comuni Spoleti et ex quo est in civitate Spoleti ordinatum Mons Pietatis, ad quem Montem pauperes et egentes habeant recursum pro eorum necessitatibus." See A. Salzano, *Il Monte dei denari e il Monte del grano a Spoleto nella seconda metà del Quattrocento* (Spoleto, 1941); Toaff, *Love, Work and Death*, 190–192.

²⁸ Archivio Comunale di Foligno (= A.C.F.), Riformanze, 31, c. 286v; 34, c. 29r; 35, c. 118r; 36, c. 16r. See A. Messini, *Le origini e i primordi del Monte di Pietà di Foligno (1463–1488)* (Foligno, 1940).

²⁹ A.C.F., Riformanze, 39, c. 338r; 40, c. 160r.

³⁰ See Majarelli and Nicolini, *Il Monte dei Poveri di Perugia*, 411–418.

amply illustrated above, at the same time to annul the moneylending charter with the Jews of the city. Instead, it turned to the same Friar Agostino, assigning to him the task of coming to a new agreement with the Jews, which would enable them to continue their loan activity with official authorization. "The drafting of the agreements with the above mentioned Jews, regarding moneylending and usuries, will be committed to our Friar Agostino of Perugia of the Minors Order, and he may cancel, correct or restrict the agreements at his own free will" (*ordinatio capitulorum predictorum hebreorum et aliorum quoquomodo concernentium mutuum usurarium committatur predicatori nostro fratri Augustino de Perusia ordinis Minorum, ut possit predicta capitula cancellare etiam emendare ac minuere suo libito voluntatis*). Even more surprisingly, Fra Agostino accepted the task and set to work to draft, with the Jews' agreement, the conditions for proceeding with their loan operations in Trevi, alongside the local *Monte di Pietà*, which he himself had founded.³¹ The excommunication of the city and the mortal sin incurred by the Christian population did not appear unduly to concern the friar, who also appears as the founder of the *Monte di Pietà* in Terni years before.³² Several days later Fra Agostino presented the new agreements, undersigned by the Jewish bankers, for ratification by the Commune. In the preamble of the *condotta*, the drafting of which had certainly been previously agreed upon with the Jews, usury is defined as a necessary, and perhaps inevitable evil, in spite of its moral and legal condemnation, shared by both Jews and Christians: "because the vicious usury is prohibited by the natural law, the law of Moses and the prophets, the canon law and also the political and civil law, and very clearly by the evangelical law" (*cum nephande uxure sint radicatus prohibite per legem naturalem, mosaycam, propheticam, canonicam ac etiam politicam et civilem, saltem hodiernis temporibus et expressissime per legem evangelicam*). But custom and necessity appeared to be stronger than laws, be they civil, Jewish, or Christian, and thus the pious friar authorized the Jews to issue loans at an interest of one *bolognino* per florin per month, tantamount to 30% per year. The terms of the *condotta* stipulated that each year the officials of the *Monte di Pietà* would preside over the public auction of unredeemed pledges held by the Jewish bankers.³³ Friars and Jews *de facto* agreed to operate in different sectors of the local money market.

³¹ A.C.Tr., Tre Chiavi, busta 9, reg. 127, c. 3v.

³² A.S.T., Riformanze, 502, c. 219r. See Ghinato, *Monte di Pietà di Terni*, I, 127–136.

³³ A.C.Tr., Tre Chiavi, busta 9, reg. 127, c. 8r.

But according to the canonical law, at least, the solution adopted was quite unacceptable and liable to criticism and censure. Thus a few years later, in 1476, again at the suggestion of the Franciscan preachers, a different solution was adopted, one that was to endure through time. The Priori of Trevi decided to cancel officially the moneylending charter with the Jews, but at the same time they invited the bankers to continue their financial activity unofficially, on condition that they not stop paying the annual business tax and the usual contribution to the Commune for the traditional S. Emiliano *palio*: “if the Jews want to go on, continuing to lend money without any charter signed by our community, they are allowed to do so as they please; on this matter we will consult our preacher and according with his opinion we will act” (*si ipsi hebrei fenerationi et mutui artem voluerint sine capitulis communitatis exercere, id sit et remaneat eorum voluntate et de omnibus istis consilium habeatur et ratiocinium cum patre predicatore et secundum eius consilium procedatur*).³⁴ As for the religious norm, the appearances were saved with a compromise that, to all intents and purposes, satisfied both friars and Jews. Without any doubt also the Commune of Trevi appeared to gain by it.

The example of Trevi leads us to conclusions that seem valid for all the other numerous cases, where the *Monte di Pietà* carried out its operations alongside the Jewish banks, which continued their activities in spite of official bans. It was apparently accepted practice, suggested by the communal councils and approved by both, friars and Jews, that the cancellation of the loan charters was to be taken as a purely formal act, meant to solve, on paper, problems of an exclusively religious nature. The Jews continued to lend money without a *condotta*, with the tacit consent of the friars, as long as they did not compete unfairly with the *Monti di Pietà* and continued to pay taxes, levies, and contributions to the Commune on their banking business.

With the passage of time the relations between the *Monti di Pietà* and the Jewish bankers continued to be far less dramatic than what often is inferred from the official documentation. This holds true apart from the undeniable fact that the Jewish bankers and the *Monte* officials rightly thought themselves to be members of the same guild and felt barely hidden feelings of reciprocal professional esteem. We cannot, therefore, be unduly surprised by the fact that in Volterra a Jewish banker converted and, a year later, thanks to his financial experience

³⁴ A.C.Tr., Tre Chiavi, busta 9, reg. 141, c. 45r; busta 10, reg. 164, c. 20v.

and with his new Christian name, he was called upon by the municipal council to run the local *Monte di Pietà*, a task he carried out successfully for many years.³⁵ But there is more. There was no lack of Communes, such as Trevi, which, in order to pay their debts, had recourse both to loans from the *Monte di Pietà* and, in equal measure, from the Jewish bankers.³⁶ Then there were municipal councils that did not hesitate to withdraw the pledges from the *Monte di Pietà* in order to deposit them in Jewish banks, thereby obtaining new loans.³⁷ For their part, the Jews, such as those of Perugia in 1468, 1469, and 1493, did not shrink from pawning articles with the *Monte di Pietà* or acquiring from it large quantities of fabrics, unredeemed pledges that remained unsold in public auction.³⁸ These contacts should not be overestimated, but in my view they are of some significance. We can agree partly with the Franciscan scholar Mariano d'Alatri, who wrote recently, perhaps with excessive enthusiasm: "From many aspects the *Monti di Pietà* are a derivation and, one might say, a Christian version of the Jewish banks. What is more, this analogy, or rather, outgrowth of the *Monte* organization from that of the Jewish banks, did not escape the notice at the time."³⁹

Besides the famous case of Perugia, the Jews were, in special circumstances, called upon to finance the *Monti di Pietà* during the frequent crises that struck them. The motives underlying their intervention were always linked to the local political situation and were certainly not disinterested. But this phenomenon is not without significance and serves to play down the presumed irreducible hostility existing between the Jewish banks and the *Monti di Pietà* (completely unjustifiable, besides, on the strictly economic level, given the structural differences between their respective basic clientele). In Pisa in 1496 the Jews contributed to the *Monte di Pietà* more than half of the money needed to put it financially back on its feet, in addition to committing themselves to pay the rent of the building in which the institution planned to estab-

³⁵ See M. Luzzati and A. Veronese, *Banche e banchieri a Volterra nel Medioevo e nel Rinascimento* (Pisa, 1993), 140–142.

³⁶ A.C.Tr., Tre Chiavi, busta 17, reg. 256, c. 135v.

³⁷ A.C.Tr., Tre Chiavi, busta 22, reg. 343, c. 52r.

³⁸ A.S.P., Miscellanea di computisteria, 3, cc. 3r–18r; Notarile, Francesco di Giacomo, 227, c. 218r. See Majarelli and Nicolini, *Il Monte dei Poveri di Perugia*, pp. 337–358.

³⁹ See Mariano d'Alatri, *Francescani e banchieri ebrei nelle città d'Italia durante il Quattrocento*, in *Picenum Seraphicum*, IX (1972), 71–72.

lish its headquarters.⁴⁰ During the same years, the Macerata *Monte di Pietà* received an interest-free loan of 200 golden ducats from the local Jewish community.⁴¹ In 1515 the Franciscan friar Giacomo Ongarelli preached in Terni, obtaining such a success as to receive the unexpected gift of 100 florins for the *Monte di Pietà* from the Jews. "Friar Giacomo Ongarelli of the Observant Order of St. Francis, when he was preaching in the city of Terni, received from the Jews 100 florins as alms in favor of the *Monte*" (*frater Iacob Ungarelli Ordinis Observantiae S. Francisci, tempore sue predicationis in civitate Interamnis, recepit pro dicto Monte in elemosinis florenos centum quos habuit ab hebreis*).⁴² Thus, it does not seem paradoxical to me that in 1488, Angelo of Camerino, the well-known Jewish banker of Foligno, acted like his relative Manuele da Camerino, banker in Florence, and like Isach da Pisa, one of the most important Jewish bankers in Tuscany, leaving in his will an important bequest in favor of the *Monte di Pietà*, which was—at least officially and on paper—created to replace his activity.⁴³

⁴⁰ See P.M. Lonardo, *Gli ebrei a Pisa sino alla fine del secolo XV*, in *Studi Storici* dir. da A. Crivellucci, vol. VIII, fasc. 1 (Pisa, 1899), 74–76; L. Poliakov, *Les banquiers Juifs et le Saint Siège du XIII^e au XVII^e siècle* (Paris, 1965), 184.

⁴¹ See L. Zdekauer, *La fondazione del Monte Pio di Macerata e i primordi della sua gestione*, in *Rivista Italiana per le Scienze Giuridiche*, XXVII (1899), 127–149.

⁴² A.S.T., Riformanze, 511, II, c. 179v.

⁴³ A.C.F., Notarile, Taddeo Angelelli, 17/II, c. 21r. See Toaff, *Love, Work and Death*, p. 50. On the bequests of Manuele da Camerino and Isach da Pisa in favor of the *Monti di Pietà* of Florence and Pisa see U. Cassuto, *Gli ebrei a Firenze nell'età del Rinascimento* (Firenze, 1918), 74–75.

This page intentionally left blank

PAPAL MENDICANTS OR MENDICANT POPES:
CONTINUITY AND CHANGE IN PAPAL POLICIES
TOWARD THE JEWS AT THE END OF THE
FIFTEENTH CENTURY

KENNETH R. STOW

God alone—do we need reminding?—has a monopoly on the creation of something from nothing. Indeed, try as they might to infringe on this monopoly, challengers, like alchemists, have come up with empty hands. Accordingly, there is no choice but to put aside any thought of saying that there was a series of mendicant popes whose policies toward the Jews differed measurably from those of their papal colleagues. It would also be wrong to say that papal policies were cloaked with the strongest of mendicant animosity and intended to reify the aspirations of Franciscans such as Bernardino da Feltre, who called for amputating that limb—the Jews—whose gangrenous condition was about to infect the (Christian) heart.¹ To say that such policies existed would be to restructure history according to whim, much as did the mid-nineteenth century Comte de Falloux (so he signed his name) who wrote of Jewish cruelty and the Dominican Pope Pius V's salutary repressive actions, basing his case, in turn, on the *Vita ... Pio Quinti* of Girolamo Catena of 1647 (reprinted 1712) and the identically named *Vita* by Paolo Alessandro Maffei published in 1712.²

To understand papal policies properly, we should look to the sixteenth-century Joseph ha-Kohen, someone not known for his objectivity as a modern historian, and one who, speaking of Pope Julius III, said: "May the mountains burst into song, for Giulio de Monte is dead, the pope who burned our glorious books, the pope who sought to

¹ See Kenneth Stow, *Alienated Minority: The Jews of Medieval Latin Europe* (Cambridge, 1994), 210 and 212, citing Leon Poliakov, who confuses Bernardino of Siena with Bernardino da Feltre. Robert Bonfil, *Jewish Life in Renaissance Italy* (Berkeley, 1994), 24, brings the full citation, also referring to Bernardino of Siena. But see Stow, "The Good of the Church, the Good of the State: The Popes and Jewish Money," in *Christianity and Judaism*, ed. Diana Wood (Cambridge, Mass., 1992), 241.

² Le Comte de Falloux, *Histoire de Saint Pie V Pape* (Paris, 1851), 144; Paolo Alessandro Maffei, *Vita di Pio Quinto* (Rome, 1712), 487; Girolamo Catena, *Vita ... Pio Quinti* (Rome, 1647, reprinted 1712), 52–56.

pass us through the [baptismal] waters.” By contrast, when speaking of the Franciscan Pope Sixtus IV in connection with the blood libel at Trent in 1475, ha-Kohen was remarkably reserved, and informed.³ It was none other than Pope Sixtus who sent the legate de’ Giudice to investigate the Tridentine proceedings, and it was Sixtus who refused to have the “victim,” Simonino, canonized (or, it appears, beatified). One suspects that ha-Kohen may even have known Sixtus’s bull of 1478 which concluded the affair from the Curia’s point of view.⁴ On the one hand, the pope accepted the decision of a commission of cardinals, based on the legal opinion of the well-known Paduan jurist and auditor of the Sacred Rota G.F. Pavini, validating the (juridically irregular) proceedings of late 1475 and early 1476. On the other hand, the pope not only ordered that the children of those unfortunate ones who had been executed for their “crime” be restored to their (now baptized) mothers, but also that the mothers’ confiscated dowries be returned. More significantly, the bull reiterates the central clauses of the constitution *Sicut iudaeis*, forbidding any actions against Jews that were not the result of clear judicial decision. It also forbids the unwarranted expropriation of Jewish money or property as well as any attempt to cancel the Jews’ privilege to observe their religious rites.

The message seems straightforward: correct or incorrect, the proceedings and procedures at Trent were not to recur. About this message, Sixtus’s 1478 text leaves no doubt. To support his approval of the Tridentine proceedings, Pope Sixtus noted the bull of Innocent III that denies protection to Jews whose actions threaten Christian safety. He was, of course, referring to Innocent’s unique version of *Sicut iudaeis*, with its menacing codicil that even the Dominican Ramon de Penyafort must have considered potentially too inflammatory to be incorporated into the normative *Decretales* of Gregory IX.⁵ Paradoxically, the effect

³ Joseph ha-Kohen, *‘Emeq ha-Bakha*, ed. Meir Letteris (Cracow, 1895), 94–95, 131.

⁴ Shlomo Simonsohn, *The Apostolic See and the Jews: Documents, 1464–1521* (Toronto, 1990), no. 999.

⁵ The bull of Innocent III is found in Solomon Grayzel, *The Church and the Jews in the Thirteenth Century*, vol. 1 (New York, 1933, reprinted 1966) and vol. 2, ed. K.R. Stow, (Detroit, 1989), 1, no. 5. The special codicil repeats in the text of Martin IV, Grayzel, *The Church and the Jews*, vol. 2, no. 45. By contrast, R. Po-Chia Hsia, *Trent 1475* (New Haven, 1992), 127, mistakes the reference of Sixtus for the bull of Innocent IV concerning the libel at Valreas in 1247; recently followed by David Berger, “From Crusades to Blood Libels to Expulsions: Some New Approaches to Medieval Antisemitism,” *Second Annual Lecture of the Victor J. Selmanowitz Chair of Jewish History* (Touro College, March 16, 1997), 10–11. The bull of Sixtus IV as published by Simonsohn, note 4 above, says

of alluding to Innocent III's codicil in the dual contexts of Pavini's opinion and the principal clauses of protection in *Sicut iudaeis*—the very clauses Sixtus had reiterated—was to emphasize the perennial validity of the bull as a whole. The need, if there ever were one, to suspend its protection was momentary and fleeting. Sixtus would not subscribe to Pavini's position that painted the Jews as a constant danger, and, more importantly, he was not about to accept Pavini's break with tradition. For Pavini had claimed that the proceedings at Trent were valid on the grounds that Jews were true *servi*⁶ and, hence, persons deprived of normal legal safeguards. This was an argument that the mid sixteenth-century Udinese jurist Marquardus de Susannis, himself a Paduan by training, like Pavini, said was false according to the best medieval legal opinion,⁷ and which argument, as Pavini himself had admitted, none other than Thomas Aquinas had rejected. Sixtus IV rejected it as well.⁸

But, then, the position that Jews had no legal rights was a position that no pope had ever, or could ever have, espoused. Even Benedict XIII had warned against violating Jewish rights and privileges in his otherwise devastating *Etsi Doctoris* of 1413.⁹ The same applies to the revolutionary papacy of Paul IV, who was careful not to leave the Jews destitute of legal protection.¹⁰ The inherent danger to Jewish rights and safety was also no doubt a factor in the decision of the Franciscan Sixtus V, one hundred years later, to allow only the (local) cult of Simonino, not canonization.¹¹ And Sixtus V, as I have shown elsewhere, in stead-

clearly Innocent III, and, more importantly, indicates in *concilio generali editum*, which must refer to the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215, over which Innocent III presided. This is apparently confusion by the chancery, mistaking the council's decrees for material edited in the *Decretals*. But, whether the one or the other, this phrase cannot apply to the bull of 1247, which was not issued at a council. In any case, the described content of the bull leaves no doubt that the reference is to the *Sicut iudaeis* of Innocent III.

⁶ Diego Quaglioni, "I giuristi medeoevali e gli ebrei: Due 'consultationes' di G.F. Pavini (1478)," *Quaderni Storici*, 64 (1987), 7–18, esp. 13–14. See also Anna Esposito and Diego Quaglioni, *Processi contro gli ebrei di Trento, 1475–1478* (Padua, 1990), 1.41–51.

⁷ Marquardus de Susannis, *De Iudaeis et Aliis Infidelibus* (Venice, 1558 and 1568), 3.2, 6.

⁸ Diego Quaglioni, "Propaganda Antiebraica e Polemiche di Curia," in *Un Pontificato ed una città: Sixto IV (1471–1484)*, ed. Massimo Miglio, Francesca Niutta, Diego Quaglioni, and Concetta Ranieri (Vatican City, 1984), 262–265, esp. 264, and also "I giuristi medeoevali."

⁹ Kenneth Stow, *Catholic Thought and Papal Jewry Policy, 1555–1593* (New York, 1977), 278–289.

¹⁰ Stow, *Catholic Thought and Papal Jewry Policy*, esp. 167–170.

¹¹ See Hsia, *Trent 1475*, 132–133, and the text in the anonymous *Die Paepstlichen Bullen ueber die Blutbeschuldigung* (Munich, 1900), passim, including the opinion of Cardinal

fastly refusing to allow Jews to live outside the Roman ghetto, was anything but revisionist in his policy regarding Jews.¹² Sixtus V, indeed, remained always the Franciscan, to wit, his sermon on the Virgin found in ten copies in the Vatican Library and his appointment as cardinal by none other than Ghislieri, Pius V.¹³ Zeal for the Catholic faith thus was not *ipso facto* to be equated with zeal unconditionally to trample on the Jews.

One may object, of course. Why were both popes, Sixtus IV directly and Sixtus V indirectly, willing to accept an apparent reversal of the stance taken in 1247 by Innocent IV, who declared ritual murder libel inherently false, which it was in the case of Simonino?¹⁴ In fact, the situation was anything but transparent, which is precisely what Joseph ha-Kohen was indicating. More to the point, what Innocent IV could permit himself, Sixtus IV could not. For Innocent IV sat astride the institutions of the church, was himself a legist of distinction, and it was he who set the tone with respect to canon law and the Jews.¹⁵ In Innocent's day, this law was as balanced as it was restrictive, as also was the tone of the *ius commune*, the civil parallel of canon law. The dominant concept was that "appropriate" regulation, allowing law-abiding Jews to live peacefully within Christian society, could be found; the Jews, after all, were *fideles* of the Church Militant, *de popolo Romano*.¹⁶ The principal concern was to keep Jews at a safe distance from Christians, to avoid contamination through "excessive familiarity," namely through touch, or by eating at a common table, or sleeping under the same roof, that disqualified the potential communicant, a

Ganganelli, Clement XIV, 47. Robert Bonfil, *Jewish Life in Renaissance Italy*, 27, goes too far in saying "canonization."

¹² Kenneth Stow, "The Consciousness of Closure: Roman Jewry and Its Ghet," in D.B. Ruderman, *Essential Papers on Jewish Culture in Renaissance and Baroque Italy* (New York, 1992), 386–400.

¹³ Martine Boiteux, "Rivaltà festive: Rituali pubblici romani al tempo di Sisto V," *Roma e Lazio*, ed. M. Fagiolo and M.L. Madonna (Rome, 1982), 1:357, 374–375.

¹⁴ Grayzel, *The Church and the Jews*, vol. 1, nos. 113 and 114.

¹⁵ See B.Z. Kedar, "Canon Law and the Burning of the Talmud," *Bulletin of Medieval Canon Law*, 9 (1979), 79–82.

¹⁶ See Stow, *Catholic Thought*, 104. On issues of contact impurity, see James Brundage "Inter-marriage Between Christians and Jews in Medieval Canon Law," *Jewish History*, 3 (1988), 30–32; the problem derives from Paul in 1 Cor 10:16–18, who warns Christians to maintain eucharistic purity by having no contact with pagan altars, and he points to Jews keeping non-Jews away from the altar of the temple. By John Chrysostom's time, and certainly following, dining with Jews was as potentially contaminating as dining with pagans. Agobard of Lyons is beside himself with the problem.

concern that loomed ever larger once the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215 made taking the Eucharist at Easter obligatory.

Yet this search for balance had lost much ground by the time of Sixtus IV. To be sure, it had not ceded altogether: had not Sixtus IV reprimanded his Avignonese adjutants for violating custom by not judging the Jews *tanquam veri cives*?¹⁷ At the same time, an indignant letter to Saragosa clarifies that, between unconditional trampling and unconditional protection, lay the wide swath of heavy restraint. The pressure to increase that restraint was also growing, as Pavini's strident tones demonstrated. And Pavini represented an entire school, one centered, as I believe future research will confirm in detail, at the Law Faculty of Padua. Paduan legists had eschewed the theory of balance articulated in the fourteenth century by Perugian legists, and, in its place, they had adopted a theory concentrated almost exclusively on preventing contamination via social contact. This theory was typified by the remark of Dr. Tiberino, the chronicler of the events of 1475 and a fellow traveler of the Paduans, who wrote that, when Simonino was brought before them, the Jews of Trent began *ululare*, to bark like dogs. As the late fourth-century John Chrysostom had said, the Jews are dogs, while we Christians (alone) are the children of God. Chrysostom was commenting on Matthew 15:26, in which Jesus says he has brought the bread—eventually explained as the Eucharist—for the children, not the dogs; he was also referring to participants in Paul's eucharistic fellowship (of 1 Corinthians 10:16–18), to which only the pure might belong. The Jewish dogs, as Chrysostom saw it, were always seeking to steal the children's "bread." Clearly continuing this exegesis (there are many other examples), the "Jewish dogs" of Dr. Tiberino's tale thus were attacking not only a Christian child, Simonino, but Christian purity; indeed, they were attacking Christ and Christianity itself. It was in this spirit that Pavini had his opinion on the proceedings at Trent published alongside the noted *consilia* of the fourteenth-century Avignonese legist Oldradus da Ponte,¹⁸ *consilia* which insist, following the spirit of Paul in Galatians, that the son of Hagar (here understood as the Jews, not as Islamic Ishmael) might be expelled should they threaten irremediable damage, by which Paul intended contamination through adopting Jewish practices.¹⁹

¹⁷ Simonsohn, *Apostolic See*, no. 1007.

¹⁸ Diego Quaglioni, "Propaganda antiebraica," 262.

¹⁹ Oldradus da Ponte, *Consilia* (Rome, 1478), Cons. 51, c. 42vA–B; see, too, the *consil-*

My own reading of Oldradus is a more balanced one, but this is irrelevant. Here, it is Pavini's reading that counts, a reading that may well have anticipated what the Observant Franciscan Bernardino da Busti would write in 1490 of *l. nullus*, a civil (Roman) law enacted originally to protect the Jews, but which da Busti would imply sanctioned expulsion should the Jews threaten the Christian peace.²⁰ Pavini certainly knew the *consilium*, or rather a *statutum*, of John Capistrano—like Busti, a Franciscan—whose sole emphasis lies on the canons of exclusion: from table fellowship, from contact, from potential contagion, and, of course, from lending (*que autem conventio Christi ad belial* [2 Cor 6]).²¹ Pavini was also no doubt influenced by the four magisterial *consilia* of the Paduan Alexander de Nievo, which—in opposition to the stance of the classical Perugian school of Bartolus, Baldus, and, in particular, Baldus's Paduan student, Paolo di Castro, and the latter's son Angelo (Capistrano, intriguingly, was a graduate of Perugia)—forbid lending on all counts. They also refute the objections in favor of lending made by the Perugians, who had said that lending served “the needs of the poor.”²² The stand of the Franciscan Observants against lending and its supposedly deleterious effects was greatly strengthened. Sixtus IV, however, did permit lending. He absolved the people of Corneto from oaths that they had taken to a Franciscan preacher not to tolerate lending,²³ and, contrary to Nievo, he echoed the traditional reasoning about sustaining the Christian poor.²⁴ He also echoed the traditional argument perfected in thirteenth-century papal legislation balancing consent to lending, a

ium in which Oldradus states that the Jews are *peiores* than *sodomitis*, cited in Quagliione, “Propaganda antiebraica,” 264, a motif going back at least as far as Agobard of Lyons in the ninth century; and also Oldradus, Cons. 264 and 87, and the discussion of Norman Zacour, *Jews and Saracens in the Consilia of Oldradus da Ponte* (Toronto, 1990), 57.

²⁰ See Kenneth Stow, “Expulsion Italian Style: The Case of Lucio Ferraris,” *Jewish History*, 3 (1988), 51–61, here 55–58 C.1.9, 14, *nullus*.

²¹ Hélène Angiolini, “Cibus iudei”: un ‘consilium’ quasi inedito di Angelo di Castro sulla mecellazione con rito ebraico e una ‘reprobatio’ di san Giovanni da Capestrano,” 102–115, esp. 111–112; for the Capistrano text in *La Storia degli ebrei nell’Italia medievale: tra filologia e metodologia*, ed. M.G. Muzzarelli and G. Todeschini (Bologna, 1990).

²² Anna Esposito and Diego Quagliioni, *Processi contro gli ebrei di Trento*, 1.37–41, and Quagliioni, “I giuristi,” 12–13; and Diego Quagliioni, “Fra tolleranza e persecuzione: Gli ebrei nella letteratura giuridica del tardo Medioevo,” in *Gli ebrei in Italia, Storia d’Italia Annali 11*, ed. C. Vivanti (Torino, 1996), 661–665, on the Paduan school and Perugians, although Quagliioni himself does not draw a sharp distinction between “schools.”

²³ Simonsohn, *Apostolic See*, no. 954.

²⁴ Simonsohn, *Apostolic See*, no. 967.

consent voiced even at the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215, against the sharp prohibition of excess or openly taken interest.²⁵

In the late sixteenth century, Sixtus V, too, found a way to sustain lending by allowing ghettoized Roman Jews to remain in the small town of Lazio, but without granting them permanent right of residence.²⁶ The source of this solution could well have been the *de Iudaeis et Aliis Infidelibus* of Marquardus de Susannis (1558, 1568), whose meticulous discussion of lending favors the principles of the Perugians Bartolus and Baldus. De Susannis's sole reference to the *consilia* of Nievo is the perplexing "*quod habeo*," as though he had a random copy, despite the *consilia*'s repeated printings. This reference allows de Susannis cleverly to accept *de iure* the prohibition of Nievo, but, ultimately, to suggest a pragmatic stratagem allowing the pope to neglect to punish usury and its Jewish practioners.²⁷ This was, however, the same Marquardus de Susannis who professed belief in a host of Jewish crimes, that of Trent in particular. The 1568 edition of his *de Iudaeis* goes on about it at great length, as well as it declares that Jews poisoned wells in 1348. One would thus have expected de Susannis staunchly to support Nievo, but he did not. Likewise, he opposed the school of Duns Scotus that consented to the baptism of children *parentibus invitis*, an argument brought to bear in 1475 at Trent, with Pavini himself sanctioning the act. De Susannis did accept that improperly baptized children should not be returned to Jewish parents,²⁸ concerned that biological Jewish parents would teach their children to blaspheme. What de Susannis opposed was forced baptism, as did his near contemporary Cardinal Pier Paolo Pariseo.²⁹ Otherwise, de Susannis held that a thorough *rite de credal* passage was possible—precisely what so many, especially in the Iberian Peninsula, then doubted.

Accordingly, de Susannis (whom I view as emblematic) emerges as a legal traditionalist moved far to the right, a traditionalist prone to

²⁵ Simonsohn, *Apostolic See*, nos. 1005, 1024.

²⁶ Stow, "The Consciousness of Closure," 393–394.

²⁷ De Susannis, *De Iudaeis*, I.11, "in eius consilio quod fecit contra iudaeos fenerantes quod habeo et impressum reperitur post Pisanellum"; as though people did not even know it; others are referred to by precise references, assuming the texts are at every jurist's beck and call. Diego Quaglioni, "Fra tolleranza e persecuzione," 662, on Nievo and Di Castro.

²⁸ De Susannis, *De Iudaeis*, I.7.

²⁹ Discussed in Kenneth Stow, "Church, Conversion, and Tradition: the Problem of Jewish Conversion in Sixteenth Century Italy," *Dimensioni e problemi della ricerca storica*, 2 (1996), 28.

accept the worst as true, and a traditionalist out on the furthest branch of the tree.³⁰ And it is this rightward movement of even the exponents of tradition that provides us with a key to explain the acts of Sixtus IV and those of Sixtus V, or even of Pius V, the third mendicant pope of this period, as well as of Paul IV, the Theatine, who followed suit. It was not the individual pope, but the overall atmosphere, as represented by the shift in legal emphasis (heightened by other factors now to be mentioned), that was progressively undermining old postures. So threatened were these postures, that, as late as the eighteenth century, Cardinal Ganganelli (again a Franciscan and the future Pope Clement XIV) repudiated the blood libel. Nonetheless, he admitted to the homicide of Simonino—called, by him, *Beato*—at the hand of the Jews.³¹ The old medieval equilibrium stated in Gregory IX's *Decretales* and in Thomas's *Summa theologiae* was becoming ever more a pale shadow of its former self.³²

It was in this spirit of precariousness that Sixtus IV injected a highly emotional language into papal letters, calling for the strictest applications of the canons concerning Jews, a language far more strident than any of the actually formalized rhetoric found in thirteenth-century papal letters, instructing, for example, the Dominican inquisitor in Sicily to proceed against Jews who offend Christianity and corrupt Christians (“*ora sua spurcissima aperire, ac prava et obscena quedam diabolica figmenta, suis falsissimis dogmatibus confingere*”), deceiving, dogmatizing, and proselytizing (among converts?) to the detriment of the faith.³³ Charges long dormant on the part of the popes against the Talmud were also brought back to life. However much the context suggests that the pope really was quite ignorant of the Talmud,³⁴ the tone remained emotional. It was more emotional yet in the above-mentioned letter to Saragosa of 1479.³⁵ The pope was distraught about the “*contagione iudaica ... ut chris-ticolas a veritate seducere et se voluptatum suarum compotes facere valeant.*”

Charges were leveled that the Jews had built a new synagogue, taken down a statue of the Virgin, were supervising prostitution, fathering Christian children, eating with Christians, sleeping with them, and

³⁰ Stow, *Catholic Thought*, 225–278.

³¹ See the texts cited in n. 15, above.

³² Stow, *Alienated Minority*, 267–273.

³³ Simonsohn, *Apostolic See*, no. 972.

³⁴ Simonsohn, *Apostolic See*, no. 998; on this text, see Fausto Parente, “La Chiesa e il Talmud,” in *Gli ebrei in Italia*, ed. C. Vivanti, 524–634, esp. 567.

³⁵ Simonsohn, *Apostolic See*, no. 1002.

bathing with them in the public baths. Since they were not wearing distinctive clothing, they were taken for priests; there were even cases where sacraments had been offered in Jewish houses. Violations like these, which, since at least the times of the ninth-century Agobard of Lyons, had been felt by some to endanger Christian purity, and especially unity, “forced” the pope to demand restraint in the manner of Nievo and Pavini. But this demand also recalls Sixtus’s balanced 1478 resolution of the crisis at Trent. The foundations may have been tottering, yet the pope called for correction alone. He did not raise the prospect of expulsion, precisely as Nievo and Pavini might have preferred. Instead, Sixtus followed the lead of Innocent III, who in 1215 had ordered Jews to wear distinguishing clothing, yet, just one year later, insisted that he had not intended this order to expose Jews to physical danger.

It was perhaps this papal hesitancy to abandon tradition entirely that moved the three principal Hebrew chroniclers of this time to warn us to judge popes such as Sixtus IV circumspectly. Joseph ha-Kohen, Benjamin ben Elnatan, and Shelomo ibn Verga all report libels at Rome in which the pope eventually acts to derail Christian knavery. Were these libels really made, especially the fantastic story of the demise of a credulous cardinal in the always elusive plots of ibn Verga?³⁶ For our purposes it matters little. The issue is the type, the model, what all three authors wanted their Jewish readers to think. Even Joseph ha-Kohen, who, as we saw, has serious reservations about papal behavior in other situations, or who labels Pius V *impio*, and calls him the *meshugah*,³⁷ the mad man, reminiscent of references in Jewish literature to Mohammed, was led to qualify what should have been a universally pessimistic outlook.

Yet was not ha-Kohen, as well as the other two chroniclers, a keen observer? Even the truly draconian Pius V (one need but look at Prosperi’s recent treatment³⁸) who imprisoned and fined Bolognese Jews, had their remaining books burned, and then in 1569 expelled them, was compelled, together with his inquisitors, to accept legal limits. Thanks to this, the terrifying story of Ishmael Haninah, tortured by

³⁶ Solomon ibn Verga, *Shebet Jehudah*, ed. A. Shohat (Jerusalem, 1957), 162; Joseph ha-Kohen, *Emeq ha-Bakha*, ed. M. Letteris, 132; Isaiah Sonne, ed. *Mi-Pavolo ha-Revi'i 'ad Pius ha-Hamishi* (Jerusalem, 1954), 23–24.

³⁷ Joseph ha-Kohen, *Emeq ha-Bakha* 148–150.

³⁸ See Adriano Prosperi, *Tribunali di Coscienza* (Torino, 1996), 231 in particular for Pius V, and *passim*.

the Bolognese Inquisition in 1568 (in response, most likely, to charges of blasphemy made by the *neofita* Alessandro Giusti),³⁹ had a “happy end,” at least in the sense that Rabbi Ishmael was freed when he stood his ground. There were, so to speak, certain inviolable principles, the same principles that had informed Sixtus IV’s actions (albeit perhaps with greater real concern) in the aftermath of Trent. Ishmael’s fate was thus the opposite of the ferocious finish at Mantua in 1602, where, apparently with ducal connivance, seven Jews were hanged for mimicking a preaching friar and on charges of taking Christ’s name in vain.⁴⁰ However Jews understood, or misunderstood, what was going on (as I have suggested in the past), or however much they may have minimized the import of papal programs—verbally, at least—as they did before the Jewish rabbinic notaries at Rome,⁴¹ they could perceive that certain lines were never crossed. Pragmatic experience and knowledge may also have told them that popes were not truly free agents; papal actions were shaped by forces not always under exclusive papal control.

One glance at the bulls of Sixtus IV concerning the Spanish Inquisition is sufficient to reveal the pressure placed upon the pope by the Spanish clergy and royalty to approve the institution’s functioning.⁴² Yet, in contradiction (did he fear that the Inquisition might frustrate sincere conversion?), Sixtus also reprimanded that body for exceeding

³⁹ On these issues, see M.G. Muzzarelli, “Ebrei, Bologna e sovrano-pontifice: la fine di una relazione, tra verifiche, restrizioni e ripensamenti,” 19–54; Rossella Rinadli, “La giustizia in città: Indagini sulla comunità ebraica di Bologna tra ‘400 e ‘500,” 55–99, esp. 89–94, and Mauro Perani, “Documenti sui processi dell’Inquisizione contro gli ebrei di Bologna e sulla loro tassazione alla vigilia della prima espulsione (1567–1568),” 245–285. All of these essays are found in *Verso l’epilogo di una convivenza: gli ebrei a Bologna nel XVI secolo*, ed. M.G. Muzzarelli (Florence, 1996). See also David B. Ruderman, “An Apologetic Treatise from Sixteenth Century Bologna,” *Hebrew Union College Annual*, 50 (1979), 253–275.

⁴⁰ This episode is well detailed in Shlomo Simonsohn, *History of the Jews in the Duchy of Mantua* (Jerusalem, 1977), 32–39.

⁴¹ Kenneth Stow, *The Jews in Rome*, 2 vols. (Leiden, 1995–1997), vol. 2, nos. 1720 and 1723.

⁴² On all these matters, see A. Herculano, *History of the Origin and Establishment of the Inquisition in Portugal* (New York, 1972), 23, and the texts cited there. In particular, see the text of January 20, 1482: “quamplures alii, justo timore perterriti, in fugam se convertebant, hinc inde dispersi sint, plurimique ex eis se Christianos et veros Catholicos esse profitebantur, ut ab oppressionibus huiusmodi releverent, ad sedem prefatam, oppressorum ubique tutissimum refugium, confugerint, et interpositas a variis et diversis eis per dictos inquisitores illatis gravaminibus appellationes, huiusmodi querelas continentes, nobis presentaverint, earundem appellationum causam committi, de ipsorum innocentia cognosci, cum multiplici lachrimarum effusione humiliter postulantes.” (This text also appears in Simonsohn, *Apostolic See*, no. 1017.)

its privilege, for improper procedures, for violating the *ius commune*, and, in particular, for falsely executing the innocent.⁴³ In addition, in Italy, Sixtus directed the acquittal of a Jew accused of buying silver from a church and later tortured and tried by an inquisitor.⁴⁴ He also freely gave Jews licenses to practice medicine,⁴⁵ once even withstanding pressure to the contrary by Observant Franciscans, who had aroused the local populace in Terni.⁴⁶

Looking at these contradictions, Attilio Milano accused Sixtus IV of exemplifying those popes with an “*atteggiamento ondeggiante*.”⁴⁷ In fact, Sixtus’s policy toward Jews was typified by a consistent positioning, such as we have just seen, that involved balancing a will to restrain with a reverence for tradition. But this balance was also constantly buffeted. It was strained, in particular, by such ubiquitous political exigencies as those of the Papal State, whose unique nature virtually forced popes to flout legal and theological norms and which created pressures such as those that led Sixtus IV to sanction the Spanish national Inquisition. By contrast, it was no doubt the needs of the Papal State *qua* body politic that informed the issue of whether to grant Jews permits to practice medicine. In this, however, the pope could invoke the loophole (pointed out, for instance, by de Susannis) that, despite rigid prohibitions, Jews could medicate Christians, should the Jewish physician possess unique medical skills.⁴⁸ And, of course, the needs of the “secular” Papal State encouraged the papal policy of permitting Jews to collect *non immoderatasve usuras*.⁴⁹

Yet any such concessions were subject to challenge. And challenged they were in the internecine struggles within the papal Curia, Sixtus’s court, whose control was essential for all of his activities—not the least of which were the aggrandizement of his cardinal nephews—and where, among other things, Sixtus had to deal with pressures by humanists and their prelate allies.⁵⁰ In particular, and what concerns us

⁴³ Simonsohn, *Apostolic See*, nos. 1017, 1019, 1021.

⁴⁴ Simonsohn, *Apostolic See*, no. 966.

⁴⁵ Simonsohn, *Apostolic See*, nos. 945, 951.

⁴⁶ See the text in Ariel Toaff, *The Jews in Umbria*, 3 vols. (Leiden, 1992), no. 1824.

⁴⁷ Attilio Milano, *Storia degli Ebrei in Italia* (Torino, 1963), 158.

⁴⁸ De Susannis, *De Iudaeis*, II.7.

⁴⁹ On the nature of the Papal State, see Paolo Prodi, *Il sovrano pontifice: un corpo e due anime* (Bologna, 1982), and on the popes and Jewish lending, see Stow, “The Good of the Church, the Good of the State,” *passim*, and the literature cited there.

⁵⁰ The most recent studies on these matters are Egmont Lee, *Sixtus IV and Men of Letters* (Rome, 1978), 28–45, esp. 37–38, and also 193–204; and John D’Amico, *Renaissance*

most, Sixtus had to weather the pressures applied in 1475 and later by the humanist bishop of Trent, Hinderbach.⁵¹ Curial politics were thus influenced by those of the academy. They were also carried on in academic terms. The verbal fight, sometimes in the coarsest of language, between the Dominican legate de' Giudice, whom Sixtus IV had sent to Trent (despite squabbles between Dominicans and Franciscans), and Sixtus's *bibliothecarius*, the humanist Platina,⁵² was at once, at least in its overtones, a fight over rhetorical acumen, not to mention academic egos, as well as over principles and politics.

The late John D'Amico judged that the humanists in the Curia eventually, by the time of Julius II, were harnessed to papal needs,⁵³ but this does not seem to have been the case fifty years earlier. Paul II, before Sixtus, had once arrested Platina among other members of the so-called Roman Academy on charges of paganism, a paganism that included reading such sources as Tacitus, with his descriptions of what he saw as Jewish malevolence.⁵⁴ The link between a new kind of humanism and attitudes toward Simon of Trent seems quite clear. No wonder that Platina himself has been suspected of making a *de voto* to Simonino, or that humanists such as the Trentino Raffaele Zovenzoni—in addition to the physician Tiberino, whose description of Simonino's corpse and death was crucial—were closely allied, in opposing and defeating de' Giudice, with Bishop Hinderbach and with his major ally, the auditor of the Rota, Pavini himself.⁵⁵ The defeat, moreover, was in part of the pope, which may be inferred from the concessions to these humanists and their ilk made in the bull conferring legality on the Tridentine proceedings.

Also affecting this bull and, in fact, the whole affair at Trent, were mendicant vagaries, including the tension between Franciscans and

Humanism in Papal Rome (Baltimore, 1983), passim; and see esp. Charles L. Stinger, *The Renaissance in Rome* (Bloomington, 1985), 95.

⁵¹ See esp. Esposito and Quaglioni, *Processi contro gli ebrei di Trento*, 1.17–25.

⁵² See Lee, Sixtus IV, 110–119, and passim, but esp. Diego Quaglioni, *Apologia Iudaeorum, Invectiva Contra Plantinam* (Roma, 1987), passim.

⁵³ D'Amico, *Renaissance Humanism*, 220–240.

⁵⁴ Tacitus, *Histories*, 5.1–5; D'Amico, *Renaissance Humanism*, 92, and, in particular, on the involvement of humanists directly in anti-Jewish activity, using “anti-Jewish” in the literal sense, see Anna Foa, “The New and the Old: The Spread of Syphilis (1494–1530),” in *Sex and Gender in Historical Perspective*, ed. Edward Muir and Guido Ruggiero (Baltimore, 1990), 36–37.

⁵⁵ Quaglioni, “Propaganda antiebraica,” 253; and Esposito and Quaglioni, *Processi contro gli ebrei di Trento*, 1.78.

Dominicans. Sixtus, who was normally diffident about Franciscan demands, especially those concerning Jewish lenders and physicians (he did allow a *Monte di Pietà* in his own city of Savona⁵⁶ in Liguria), nonetheless chose to defend Giacomo della Marca, one of the most vociferous of the Franciscan preachers against the Jews, because della Marca was so prominent in the Franciscan-Dominican debate over the nature of Christ's blood.⁵⁷ This kind of interplay serves as background for what I believe to be a highly reasonable speculation.

There seems to be little question that somehow Sixtus, Papa Della Rovere, remained faithful to his original mendicant vocation. The observation of Luke Wadding that Sixtus wore his papal gown over a Franciscan habit,⁵⁸ however true or apocryphal, nevertheless may well capture the spirit of this pope,⁵⁹ who was a professor of theology, the author of theological tracts *De sanguine christi* (disputing the Dominicans) and *De potentia dei*,⁶⁰ and a priest who dwelt on his devotion to St. Francis as the source of his papal election.⁶¹ Yet, once again, Sixtus's responsiveness to Franciscan aspirations—he himself was a Conventual, although he was General of all three branches of the Order⁶²—was a function of political and religious tensions combined. Regardless of Sixtus's promotion of Franciscan piety, he had to be wary, not only of the degree to which the charismatic Observants were taking control of people's minds and religious piety through preaching, but also of the increasing mendicant influence worked through their penetration of those civic confraternities that often were the key to urban social life and order.⁶³ For this penetration implied a potent challenge to Sixtus's

⁵⁶ Simonsohn, *Apostolic See*, no. 1006.

⁵⁷ See here Concetta Bianca, "Francesco della Rovere: Un Francescano tra teologia e potere," in *Un Pontificato ed una città, Sisto IV (1471-1484): atti del Convegno, Roma, 3-7 Dicembre 1984*, ed. Massimo Miglio et al. (Vatican City, 1986), 19-57, esp. 32; also Egmont Lee, *Sixtus IV and Men of Letters* (Rome, 1978), 18-21.

⁵⁸ Lee, *Sixtus IV*, 42-43, citing Luke Wadding, *Annales Minorum: seu, Trium ordinum a S. Francisco institutorum Annales*, 32 vols. (Florence, 1931), 13.424.

⁵⁹ Charles L. Stinger, *The Renaissance in Rome*, 86, reports Sixtus's supposed oath never to remove his Franciscan habit.

⁶⁰ Bianca, "Francesco della Rovere," 32, and Lee, *Sixtus IV*, 24.

⁶¹ Stinger, *The Renaissance in Rome*, 86-90.

⁶² Lee, *Sixtus IV*, 18-24.

⁶³ Among the legion of recent studies on confraternities in the urban setting and relations with mendicants, see Nicholas Terpstra, *Lay Confraternities and Civic Religion in Renaissance Bologna* (Cambridge, 1995); Christopher Black, *Italian Confraternities in the Sixteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1989); and esp. Roberto Rusconi, "Confraternite, compagnie e devozioni," in *La Chiesa e il potere politico dal Medioevo all'età contemporanea, Storia di*

control over the *urbs*, the city of Rome itself, and over its noble families, a control that by definition was indispensable for Sixtus's rule, since he was representative of a new and non-noble family from distant Savona.

Toward enhancing this control, Sixtus had embarked on a major building program, the Ponte Sisto being one its most notable products, and he announced a Jubilee to make Rome a focus of international attention.⁶⁴ Yet this was all preparatory, or accompaniment, for his real project of subduing the nobility, marginalizing its power, and changing the entire governmental process of the city. This largely accomplished, however, Sixtus had to confront the accentuated role the nobility was assuming in Roman lay confraternities, that of the Salvatore, in particular,⁶⁵ creating within them a pseudo-governmental structure that was also dedicated to family aggrandizement. Within the confraternities, the nobility had established a kind of "civic-Romanity" or "Romanism," a political mentality akin to the mental constructions that Hans Baron, however mootly, called civic humanism in regard to Florence.⁶⁶ The mendicants' ever greater insertion into confraternal spiritual life at this time,⁶⁷ injecting it with a burgeoning sense of piety and mission, could only have encouraged the development of a mystical aristocratic political self-consciousness, as had happened constantly with ideologically motivated political bodies in the past. In response,

Italia, Annali 9, ed. G. Chittolini and G. Miccoli (Turin, 1986), 473–476, where Rusconi argues that, in rural sectors in particular, the lay confraternity is never purely that, but was heavily infiltrated by religious orders (473). Consult also Charles de la Roncière, "Les confréries en Toscane aux XIV et XV siècles d'après les travaux récents," 50–64, esp. 61–62 on confraternities as a mode of escape, or, alternately, a safe refuge for aristocrats from Medici pressures, and also Giulia Barone, "Il movimento francescano e la nascita delle confraternite romane," 71–80, Paola Pavan, "La confraternita del Salvatore nella società romana del Tre-Quattrocento," 81–91, Anna Esposito, "Le 'confraternite' del Gonfalone (secoli XIV–XV)," 91–136. All these articles are in Luigi Fiorani, ed., *Le confraternite romane: esperienza religiosa, società, committenza artistica. Ricerche per la storia religiosa di Roma*, 5 (Rome, 1984). Finally, see Paola Pavan, "Permanenze di schemi e modelli del passato in una società in mutamento," 304–315, in Miglio et al., *Un Pontificato ed una città*.

⁶⁴ Lee, *Sixtus IV*, 142–150.

⁶⁵ This fraternity is discussed fully in Paola Pavan, "La confraternita del Salvatore nella società romana del Tre-Quattrocento," 81–91; and see also Anna Esposito, "Le 'confraternite' del Gonfalone," 91–136 in Fiorani, *Le confraternite romane*.

⁶⁶ Hans Baron, *The Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance: Civic Humanism and Republican Liberty in an Age of Classicism and Tyranny* (Princeton, 1966); on which, see Edward Muir, "The Italian Renaissance in America," *American Historical Review*, 100 (1995), 109–111.

⁶⁷ See Roberto Rusconi, "Confraternite, compagnie e devozioni," *Storia di Italia, Annali* 9, 473.

papal apprehensions about unrestrained noble and mendicant intentions could only grow. This was not a propitious moment to make light of Franciscan preaching, for instance, that of Michele Carcano, on a subject so delicate as the libel at Trent.⁶⁸

Yet, we should not think that Sixtus only ceded to pressure. De' Giudice's apology—the apology of the pope's envoy, that is—written to counter his detractors, concluded by warning against false miracles and their ignoble proponents: namely, Hinderbach, Pavini, and Platina, very instigators at Trent, whom de' Giudice pronounced fit for nothing but a fiery furnace. These were the same people who had flouted papal rescripts. Had they also not sought to remove *spiritualia* from papal jurisdiction, to have them aired in civil courts, despising thereby the papacy itself?⁶⁹ For Sixtus IV to have fully acquiesced to humanist and mendicant pressure in the matter of Simonino would have meant seriously compromising papal prerogative. This Sixtus could not do, nor would he, which, I believe, is the true message of the bull of 1478 in its simultaneous restatement and curtailment of tradition and in its reflection of the forces and counter forces of curial political life.⁷⁰

The fate of the Jews in papal hands was thus entwined not only with the vicissitudes of tradition, in this case, its rightward movement. It was also inextricably bound up with urban politics, family aggrandizement, and issues of learning and faith. Or put otherwise, as in fact was said at the outset, there is nothing whatsoever in Sixtus's case that points to a policy of a Franciscan or Dominican pope specifically as such. If anything, Sixtus IV's policy demonstrates that the opposite was true.

The same, I believe, may be said of the mendicant pontificates of the sixteenth century, those of Pius V and Sixtus V, and by osmosis, if you will, of Paul IV. We may include here the other Franciscan pope, the thirteenth-century Nicholas IV; the too brief pontificates of the Dominican Benedict XI in 1303 and the Franciscan Alexander V in 1409 need not concern us. Contrasting Nicholas IV's policies to those of papal contemporaries such as Martin IV, Nicholas III, Honorius IV, and Boniface VIII, the differences are imperceptible. There was perhaps a greater involvement in the Inquisition itself, but a lack of notable innovations. Ominously for the future, Nicholas IV saw in the agreement of Jews to have their children baptized in order to avoid death,

⁶⁸ Hsia, *Trent* 1475, 126.

⁶⁹ Quagliioni, *Apologia iudaeorum*, 88–92.

⁷⁰ This idea repeats the essence of the *Summa Angelica* of the fifteenth century.

an act of consent to baptism by the parents themselves and, hence, a de facto admission of culpability for heresy should they continue as practicing Jews. But Nicholas also reissued *Sicut iudaeis*, took the part of Meir of Rothenberg, and importantly issued *Orat Mater Ecclesia*, warning against clerical mistreatment of Roman Jews.⁷¹ Nicholas's language, moreover, is far less rhetorically charged than that of Sixtus IV, relying on traditional, quasi-ritualized formulations of condemnation. Nicholas certainly never reached the point of accusations of magic found in the bulls expelling the Jews from the Papal State in 1569 and 1593.⁷²

In any case, the real telltale gap over the centuries in papal policies toward the Jews is that between the attitude bespoken by Nicholas's non-mendicant predecessor, Martin IV, and the one professed by Pius V nearly three hundred years later. Despite Martin IV's clear support of the Inquisition, he insisted that simple *familiaritas* with a convert is no sufficient reason to accuse a Jew of aiding and abetting apostasy.⁷³ Pius V turned the matter on its head.⁷⁴ It was this path, from legal balance to the presumption of threat, that the church had taken with the Jews over time, a path in which mendicant identity or membership played no visible or specific role. The willingness of Sixtus IV, for reasons at once political and religious, to accept, or at least to acquiesce to, radical arguments, namely, by declaring a condemnation for ritual murder legal, reveals that Sixtus had gone far down this path indeed.⁷⁵ At the same time, the papal robes he wore over a mendicant habit, at least figuratively, reminded him of the need to keep mendicant radicalism under close control and to cling, both principally and in principle,

⁷¹ Ramon Martí, *Pugio Fidei Adversus Mauros et Judaeos*, ed. J. Carpzov (Leipzig, 1687), Part three, dist. 3, 22: "ita agendum est de Christianis: Occidendi adhuc Christianos, e praecipitandi pueros ipsorum in foveas et puteos et etiam trucidandi quando occulte possunt," ref. to *avodazara*. For these references, I thank Jeremy Cohen.

⁷² See Kenneth R. Stow, "The Avignonesse Papacy or, After the Expulsion," in *From Witness to Witchcraft: Jews and Judaism in Medieval Christian Thought*, ed. Jeremy Cohen (Weisbaden, 1997), 292–297, and Stow, *Catholic Thought*, 34–35.

⁷³ Grayzel, *The Church and the Jews*, vol. 2, no. 45.

⁷⁴ See the text cited in Prosperi, *Tribunali*, 231, which indeed insists on *familiaritas* as a cause for suspicion and investigation by the inquisition.

⁷⁵ This is similar to the conclusion in the article cited in n. 72 (pp. 296–297) above, that a turning point in general was reached in the mid-fourteenth century, that pressures of various kinds were working against the equilibrium established by the medieval papacy, and that the results of these pressures created the apparent vacillations of papal policy. Nonetheless, on the whole, the popes remained faithful to tradition until Paul IV and Pius V, when the radical shift to ghettos and permanent suspicion make it difficult to say that tradition had not snapped.

to tradition, especially when doing so promoted papal power. It was perhaps this sense of papal continuity, of the predictability in papal behavior, that such sixteenth-century Jewish chroniclers as Joseph ha-Kohen, following the lead of Meir ben Simeon and the 1007 *Anonymous* in the thirteenth century, also saw, however much they realized that this predictability was being so menacingly challenged in their day.⁷⁶

To repeat, therefore: a mendicant papal program as such simply did not exist. Indeed, considering the truly active antagonists at Trent, the humanists and legists, Hinderbach, Pavini, Platina, and, by extension, Nievo, one may question not only the role of the mendicant popes in promoting radicalism, but whether the mendicants as a whole were radicalism's central proponents. As a text of none other than the author of the *Pugio Fidei*, Ramon Martí, strikingly reveals,⁷⁷ the friars had limits. Excoriating Jewish perversity, Martí reverts solely to Innocent III's accusation that Jews were wont to kill Christian children. Writing ca. 1278, Martí thus was sustaining—purposefully, beyond a doubt—the determination of Innocent IV, who, in the wake of the blood libel at Valreas in 1247, had said that, whatever else Jews might plot, including the murder of Christian children, their purpose was not to obtain Christian blood.⁷⁸ When Franciscan Observants preached the cult of Simonino, therefore, they were breaking with the mendicant, or at least the Dominican, past, making themselves the protagonists, although not necessarily the innovators, of the tone and tenor of Christendom as a whole. It was Christian culture, Christian jurisprudence, even that novel Christian expression “Renaissance humanism,”⁷⁹ not to mention humanism's potentially inflammatory, if limited, pagan aspect, that, at the dawn of the modern era, the Jews truly had to fear.

⁷⁶ On Jewish attitudes toward the popes expressed in medieval Hebrew texts, see Kenneth R. Stow, *The 1007 Anonymous and Papal Sovereignty* (Cincinnati, 1984), 27–47.

⁷⁷ Ramon Martí, *Pugio Fidei*, Part three, dist. 3, 22, where, despite saying that Jews kill their own children, Martí does not include the charge of ritual murder. This is especially noteworthy in the light of Martí's remarks about the sucking of blood during circumcision in his *Capistrum iudaeorum* 2.286–288. For this reference, too, I thank Jeremy Cohen.

⁷⁸ Grayzel, *The Church and the Jews*, vol. 1, nos. 113, 114; and also *Die Paepstlichen Bullen*, 47 (n. 11, above), for the opinion of Cardinal Ganganelli, Clement XIV.

⁷⁹ See again Foa, “The Old and the New,” 36–37.

This page intentionally left blank

THE FRIARS AND THE JEWS: MESSIANISM IN SPAIN AND ITALY *CIRCA* 1500

JOHN EDWARDS

In my vision, [the Lamb] then broke the sixth seal, there was a violent earthquake and the sun went as black as coarse sackcloth; the moon turned red as blood all over, and the stars of the sky fell on to the earth, like figs dropping from a fig tree when a high wind shakes it; the sky disappeared like a scroll rolling up and all the mountains and islands were shaken from their places. Then all the earthly rulers, the governors, and the commanders, the rich people and the men of influence, the whole population, slaves and citizens, took to the mountains to hide in caves and among the rocks. They said to the mountains and the rocks, "Fall on us and hide us away from the One who sits on the throne and from the anger of the Lamb. For the Great Day of his anger has come, and who can survive it?"

[Rev 6:12–17, Jerusalem Bible]

And then [Inés] told me how her mother, who was already dead, came there and took her by the hand and told her not to be afraid, because it was God's will that she should go up to heaven and see its secrets and see wonderful things. And at that moment her other hand was taken by another, a boy who had died a few days before, and the angel was flying around them, and in this way she said that they took her up to heaven, where she saw purgatory and the souls who were suffering in it, and in the same way how, in another remote part [of heaven], there were others on golden chairs, in glory. In the same way she told me that, while she was there, in another place higher up, it seemed to her that there was much marble, and she asked the angel who it was speaking up there, and the angel said, "Friend of God, those who are speaking up there are the ones who were burnt here on earth, who are there in glory. In the same way she saw angels of three kinds and other things ..." Thus I was left in such confusion and disturbance that I could not decide what was the truth or what I should believe.

[Evidence given by Juan de Segovia, a shoemaker, at the trial of Inés de Herrera, before the Inquisition in Toledo, in May 1500]¹

¹ Yitzhak (Fritz) Baer, *Die Juden im christlichen Spanien*, 2 vols. (Berlin, 1929, 1936), 1.528–529, translated by John Edwards in *The Jews in Western Europe, 1400–1600* (Manchester, 1994), 57–58.

LOZANA: Lord Silvano, what does it mean that the author of my portrait does not call himself a Cordoban, since his father was one, and he was born in the diocese?

SILVANO: It's because his most chaste mother and his cradle were in Martos and, as they say, "it's not where you're born but who you graze with." Lady Lozana, I can see some people coming, and if I'm here I shall be in your way. Let me go, and you decide when you want me to come and serve you.

LOZANA: My lord, let it not be tomorrow or Saturday, because I'll be in a rush, but let it be on Sunday at dinnertime, and the whole of Monday, because I want you to read to me, you who have grace, the verses of Fajardo, the Tinalaria comedy, and the Celestina. It's a long time since I've heard them read.

SILVANO: Have you got [the Celestina] in the house, your ladyship?

LOZANA: You can see it here, but they don't read it to me the way I like it, as you will. Bring your guitar, and we'll play my tamborine.

[Dialogue from the *Retrato de la Lozana Andaluza* ascribed to Francisco Delicado]²

The first in this apparently strange juxtaposition of texts is an extract from the book of the Apocalypse, or Revelation, composed in the latter part of the first century C.E., which purports to give the author's divinely inspired vision of the forthcoming judgment on the church and the world. The second is a piece of testimony from the trial by the Inquisition, in 1500, of a girl called Inés, from Herrera del Duque, to the north of Córdoba, who was accused of being a prophetess and of encouraging a messianic movement among the large community of Jewish Christians, *conversos*, in the city itself. The third passage comes from an anonymous, semi-dramatized novel, which has been attributed since its rediscovery in the mid-nineteenth century to an Andalusian priest named Francisco Delicado, and which is supposed to have been published in Venice in 1528. The passage in question forms part of a lengthy dialogue, between the eponymous "heroine" and a character

² Francisco Delicado, *Retrato de la Lozana andaluza*, ed. Claude Allaigre (Madrid, 1985) p. 399:

LOZANA: Señor Silvano, ¿qué quiere decir que el autor de mi retrato no se llama cordobés, pues su padre lo fue, y él nació en la diócesi?

SILVANO: Porque su castísima madre y su cuna fue en Martos, y como dicen: "no donde naces sino con quien paces." Señora Lozana, veo que viene gente, y si estoy aquí os daré empacho. Dadme licencia, y mirá cuándo miráis que venga a serviros.

LOZANA: Mi señor, no sea mañana ni el sábado, que terné priesa, pero sea el domingo a cena, y todo el lunes, porque quiero que me leáis, vos que tenéis gracia, las

named Silvano, who takes an increasingly large role in the development of her life as the book moves towards its conclusion. It should become clear, as this argument unfolds, that the story of Lozana is as much a part of the messianic and apocalyptic tendencies, which appeared so strongly in both Spain and Italy around the year 1500, as the trials of prophetesses and supposed “judaizers” in Córdoba during those years, or the New Testament Apocalypse of John on which so many of these developments, including the supposed activities of the prophetess Inés, were based. What, though, was the prophetic context of these messianic and apocalyptic movements in the two countries at the turn of the sixteenth century?

As far as the Iberian Peninsula is concerned, the accession of Isabella and Ferdinand to the thrones of Castile and Aragon, in 1474 and 1479 respectively, had been accompanied by an upsurge in political prophecy and messianism, which was matched by that of the Portuguese King Alfonso V, when he invaded Castile on behalf of his niece and wife, Joanna, the doubtfully legitimate daughter of Isabella’s brother Henry. As early as 1472, when Ferdinand was still little known, an Aragonese poet had hailed him as a future ruler of the world, while propagandists for Alfonso announced him in Castile as the “hidden” or “hooded” king (*rey encubierto*), who was prophesied in many sources as the coming deliverer of the kingdom from tyranny and evil. In 1486, during the Granada war, one of the leading Andalusian magnates, Rodrigo Ponce de León, claimed to have been assured, by “a very knowledgeable man and Catholic Christian,” that Ferdinand of Aragon would not only drive the Muslims out of Spain, but would go on to conquer the whole of Africa, destroy Islam completely, reconquer Jerusalem and the holy places, and become “emperor of Rome, and of the Turks, and of the Spains.” The Aragonese king seems to have believed until his last days, in 1515–1516, with the encouragement of the reforming Dominican nun and prophetess, Sor María de Santo Domingo, that he would not die until he had conquered Jerusalem.³

coplas de Fajardo y la comedia Tinalaria y a Celestina, que huelgo de oír leer estas cosas mucho.

SILVANO: ¿Tiénela vuestra merced en casa?

LOZANA: Señor, velda aquí, mas no me la leen a mi modo como haréis vos. Y traé vuestra vihuela y sonaremos mi pandero.

SILVANO: Contempláme esta muerte.

I am preparing an English edition and translation of the *Retrato*.

³ J.N. Hillgarth, *The Spanish kingdoms, 1250–1516*, vol. 2: 1410–1516: *Castilian hegemony*

For Spain's Jews, the expulsion edict of 31 March 1492 was not only a devastating blow but also an inspiration to messianic thought, and even action.⁴ The document stresses the crown's declared preoccupation with "certain bad Christians who judaized and apostasized from our holy Catholic faith, for which much of the reason was the communication of Jews with Christians." Thus Jews who had remained loyal to their faith were explicitly linked with those who had either converted to or been brought up in the Christian Church, and the evident hope was that Spain's remaining Jews would see the error of their ways and convert. On 15 May 1492, while Jews were still making up their minds whether to leave or convert, the inquisitor-general, Tomás de Torquemada, was instructed by the king to collect evidence from his subordinates on the recently converted, and take such cases into his personal care, so that they would not have their previous Jewish practice held against them.⁵ Whatever official hopes may have been, still prevailing images of the fate of Spanish Jews who refused to be baptized under the conditions offered by the government of Ferdinand and Isabella come not only from Jewish commentators, such as Solomon ibn Verga,

(Oxford, 1978), 363–364, 371–373, 571, 605–606; *Crónica incompleta de los Reyes Católicos (1469–1476)*, ed. J. Puyol y Alonso (Madrid, 1934), 31–39, 180–181; "Historia de los hechos de Don Rodrigo Ponce de León, marqués de Cádiz (1443–1448)," in *Colección de Documentos Inéditos para la Historia de España*, 106 (1891), 247–250; Richard L. Kagan, *Lucrecia's dreams: Politics and prophecy in sixteenth-century Spain* (Berkeley, 1990), 178n. For political prophecies concerning the "new David" and the "bat," as well as the "hidden king," see Alain Milhou, "'La chauve-souris,' le nouveau David et le roi caché (trois images de l'empereur des derniers temps dans le monde ibérique, XIIIe–XVIIe s.)," *Mélanges de la Casa de Velázquez*, 18 (1982), 61–78.

⁴ The text of the Castilian version of the edict (in this case addressed to the authorities of Burgos in Old Castile), is reproduced in Luis Suárez Fernández, *Documentos acerca de la expulsión de los judíos* (Valladolid, 1964), 392–393: partial facsimiles of the Simancas and Avila versions of the edict are reproduced in B. Netanyahu, *The Origins of the Inquisition in Fifteenth-Century Spain* (New York, 1995), opposite p. 811, and *Convivencia: Jews, Muslims and Christians in medieval Spain*, ed. Vivian B. Mann, Thomas F. Glick, and Jerrilynn D. Dodds (New York, 1992), 33. There is a good complete facsimile of the Avila version, with French translation, in Sarah Leibovici, *Christophe Colomb Juif: Défense et illustrations* (Paris, 1986), 58–65. The Castilian version is translated into English in *The Expulsion 1492 Chronicles: An Anthology of Medieval Chronicles Relating to the Expulsion of the Jews from Spain and Portugal*, ed. David Raphael (North Hollywood, Calif., 1992), 189–193, and by John Edwards in *The Jews in Western Europe*, 49–52. The version of the edict issued in Aragon, which differs in various details, is reproduced in Rafael Conde y Delgado de Molina, *La expulsión de los judíos de la Corona de Aragón: Documentos para su estudio* (Zaragoza, 1991), 41–44.

⁵ Conde y Delgado, *La expulsión de los judíos*, 179, translated in Edwards, *Jews in Western Europe*, 52–53.

but also, and vividly, from the Andalusian priest and chronicler, Andrés Bernáldez, who certainly had no love for Judaism or for those who adhered to it:⁶

In the six [*sic*] months of the edict, they sold and virtually gave away whatever they could of their estates. Young and old prepared themselves for the journey, demonstrating great courage and hope of having a prosperous departure and great happenings. And in everything they had perverse misfortunes. For Christians took their many estates, very many rich houses and landed properties for a few coins, and [the Jews] went about begging to sell them, but they could not find anyone to buy them. They exchanged a house for an ass, and a vineyard for a small piece of cloth or linen, because they could not take out either gold or silver. But it is true that they secretly took out an infinite amount of gold and silver, which they swallowed and carried out in their bellies through those customs posts at which they had to be searched, and in the ports [of passage], both inland and beside the sea. The women, in particular, swallowed more; a person might swallow thirty ducats at a time.

Earlier in this chapter, however, Bernáldez refers to the religious reactions of some Spanish Jews to the dilemma with which they were faced by the edict of 31 March 1492:

The Jews at that time, whether unlettered or educated, commonly held the opinion, and all believed, that just as with a strong hand and outstretched arm and with much honour and wealth, God through Moses had miraculously taken out the other people of Israel from Egypt, so too from these parts of Spain they would depart and return, with great honour, and without losing any of their property, to possess the Holy Promised Land, which they confessed to having lost because of their great and abominable sins, which their ancestors had committed against God.

It will be noted that Bernáldez here adopts the medieval Christian habit of equating the biblical Israelites with his own Jewish contemporaries, but the particular point to notice is that, if the chronicler is right (and he appears to be), then the heads of many of Spain's Jews in 1492 were filled with notions of the arrival of the messianic kingdom, as foretold in the Jewish Scriptures, for example by Micah [chaps. 4 and 5], Haggai and Zechariah [chap. 8]. Bernáldez gleefully records the suffering and disappointment of many of the exiles, but the revival of

⁶ Solomon ibn Verga, *Shevet Yehuda*, translated in Raphael, *The Expulsion 1492 Chronicles*, 91–104; Andrés Bernáldez, *Memorias de los Reyes Católicos*, ed. Manuel Gómez-Moreno and Juan de Mata Carriazo (Madrid, 1962), 254, translated in Edwards, *Jews in Western Europe*, 53–55.

messianic and apocalyptic belief in Spain between then and the 1520s was at least as strong among those Jews who became, or had previously become, Christians as it was among those who chose to leave the country rather than convert.

Some Jews were baptized as Christians during the four-month period allowed by the royal edict. In the Aragonese town of Teruel, the small remaining community is said by local Christian sources to have converted *en masse*.⁷ Elsewhere, for example in the documented case of the diocese of Soria and Burgo de Osma, in north-eastern Castile, Jews who had departed during the summer of 1492, often with smuggled possessions, to the neighboring kingdom of Portugal, began to trickle back to their homeland as baptized Christians. The crown actively encouraged this process by issuing a further edict, in Barcelona on 10 November 1492, that granted Jews a royal safe conduct to return home from Portugal as Christians, provided that they were baptized there or in the Spanish border towns through which they had originally departed (Badajoz, Ciudad Rodrigo, and Zamora) and had a certificate to prove it. Those who fulfilled these conditions were not only allowed to repatriate under safe conduct the goods which they had been allowed to take out of the country (though subsequent developments showed that many of these goods had been smuggled to Portugal),⁸ but were also entitled to enlist the help of the local authorities in their former places of residence in Spain, in order to regain the property that they had been forced to sell under the terms of the edict of 31 March. The New Christians were also given royal authority to obtain repayment of debts that had been owed to them before their departure to Portugal, with the customary formal proviso that the rates of interest should not be "usurious."⁹ Some of the consequences of the November edict, though not, unfortunately, the number of individuals involved, are recorded in surviving registers of the inquisitorial tribunal for the diocese of Soria and Osma. This fact, in itself, indicates the religious ambiguity of many of the returnees who, despite royal efforts to incorporate them easily into Christian society, continued to tangle with the Inquisition.¹⁰ The dilemmas faced by those who either accepted bap-

⁷ Baer, *Die Juden*, 1.569; Henry Kamen, "The Mediterranean and the expulsion of Spanish Jews in 1492," *Past and Present*, 119 (1988), 52–53n.

⁸ See note 10, below.

⁹ Suárez Fernández, *Documentos acerca de la expulsión*, 487–489, translated in Edwards, *Jews in Western Europe*, 55–56.

¹⁰ On the departure of Jews from Spain to Portugal in 1492, see *Fontes Iudaeorum Regni*

tism immediately after the issue of the "expulsion" edict or did so during the succeeding years is perhaps best indicated in a statement made in 1500, to the Inquisition in Guadalupe, in Extremadura, by a *converso* named Francisco de Torres:

If the king, our lord, ordered the Christians to become Jews, or else leave his kingdoms, some would become Jews and others would leave, and those who left, once they realized they were lost, would return and make themselves Jews, in order to return to their original state. And yet they would still be Christians, and pray like Christians, and would deceive the world. People would think they were Jews, yet inside, in their hearts and wills, they would be Christians.¹¹

While some of Spain's Jews were making a pragmatic settlement of their religious and social affairs, in and after 1492, other Jewish Christians, whether first-generation or more established, took a more apocalyptic view of the events of these years.

The interest of *conversos* in Jewish messianic prophecy had already come to the attention of the papally nominated tribunal of the Inquisition in Valencia, which, like others in Aragon and Catalonia, predated Ferdinand and Isabella's 1478 foundation, as early as 1464. In that year, a group of such converts, who, perhaps significantly, originated in Córdoba, arrived in the east-coast city claiming that they had had regular contacts there with Jews and believed, as Jews rather than as Christians, that the Messiah would shortly come, and lead them to the Promised

Castellae [FIRC], vol. 1: *Provincia de Salamanca*, ed. Carlos Carrete Parrondo (Salamanca, 1981), 52–54, 67–73 and Pilar Huerga Criado, *En la raya de Portugal: Solidaridades y tensiones en la comunidad judeoconversa* (Salamanca, 1993), especially 21–49. For sources on the activities of the Inquisition in Soria and Burgo de Osma, and Jews who returned to that diocese as Christians, see *FIRC*, vol. 2: *El tribunal de la Inquisición en el obispado de Soria (1486–1502)*, ed. Carlos Carrete Parrondo (Salamanca, 1985) and *FIRC*, vol. 4: *Los judeoconversos de Almazán, 1501–1505: Origen familiar de los Lainez*, ed. Carlos Carrete Parrondo and Carolina Fraile Conde (Salamanca, 1987). For an analysis of these sources, see José María Monsalvo Antón, "Herejía conversa y contestación religiosa a fines de la Edad Media: las denuncias a la Inquisición en el obispado de Soria," *Studia Historica: Edad Media*, 2 (1984), 109–138, and Edwards, "Religious faith and doubt in late medieval Spain: Soria *circa* 1450–1500," *Past and Present*, 120 (1988), 3–25 (the latter reproduced, with the succeeding debate with C. John Sommerville, "Religious faith, doubt and atheism," *Past and Present*, 128 [1991], 152–161, in Edwards, *Religion and society in Spain, c. 1492* [Aldershot, 1996]). On the returnees, see Edwards, "Jews and conversos in the region of Soria and Almazán: departures and returns," in *Religion and society in Spain*, no. VI.

¹¹ Baer, *Die Juden*, 2:545 [16 July 1500], translated in Edwards, "Jews and conversos in the region of Soria and Almazán," 13.

land, by way of Venice or Constantinople.¹² When it began work in 1480, the new Inquisition tribunal in Córdoba itself began to hear similar evidence, while the Toledo tribunal was told, in 1486, that many Cordoban *conversos* had believed, at the time of the riots directed against them in 1473, that the Turks, who had conquered Constantinople not long before, were the heralds of the Jewish Messiah.¹³ The messianic prophecies of Inés de Herrera, the daughter of Juan Esteban, from Herrera del Duque, led to her trial and that of thirty of her followers, before the Toledo Inquisition. Witnesses such as the Cordoban shoemaker Juan de Segovia, whose evidence has already been mentioned, and Luis Guantero (a glover), from Herrera itself, testify that Inés claimed to have gone up to heaven and seen those who had died at the hands of the Inquisition dining there in glory. She was said to have prophesied among the *conversos* that, in the words of another shoemaker, called Rodrigo Moreno, "Elijah would come to preach on a cloud, and the Messiah was to come to take all the *conversos* to good lands." The Toledo tribunal seems to have succeeded in repressing Inés and her followers within its jurisdiction, but it was with the attempt of the Inquisition to repress support for her ideas in Córdoba, after 1499 under the leadership of the soon notorious Diego Rodríguez Lucero, that the episode gained national importance, leading, in 1508, to the ousting of this inquisitor by a "Catholic Congregation" which had been specially convened by Ferdinand for the purpose in Burgos. The abuses committed by the Córdoba Inquisition, under Lucero, were so blatant and excessive as to be condemned in large measure even by those, at the time, who accepted without question the righteousness of the tribunal's cause. Thus the more exaggerated accusations of the setting up of synagogues in *converso* households in the city, and particularly in the house of the *jurado* (parish councillor), Juan de Córdoba, may safely be discounted.¹⁴ Nevertheless, the notion that *conversos* of all social classes

¹² Baer, *Die Juden*, 2.457.

¹³ On the 1473 anti-*converso* riots in Córdoba, see Edwards, "Massacre or ritualised violence? The riots against *judeoconversos* in Córdoba, 1473-1474," in *The Massacre in History*, ed. Mark Levene and Penny Roberts (New York, 1999).

¹⁴ Baer, *Die Juden*, 2.468-472, 513-515, 528-531, 533-536; Rafael Gracia Boix, *Colección de documentos para la historia de la Inquisición de Córdoba* (Córdoba, 1982), 31-134; Tarasio de Azcona, "La Inquisición española procesada por la Congregación de 1508," in *La Inquisición española: Nueva visión, nuevos horizontes*, ed. Joaquín Pérez Villanueva (Madrid, 1980), 89-163; Edwards, "Elijah and the Inquisition: Messianic prophecy among *conversos* in Spain, c. 1500," *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, 28 (1984), 79-94, and "Trial of an Inquisitor: the Dismissal of Diego Rodríguez Lucero, inquisitor of Cór-

in Córdoba, from municipal councillors to servants, took part in a messianic movement with strong Jewish overtones in the years either side of 1500, cannot but suggest a parallel with the extraordinary response of the wealthy Jewish community of Amsterdam, in the mid-seventeenth century, to the claims of Sabbatai Zevi.¹⁵ What, though, is the connection between all this and the friars?

There has never been any doubt that Christopher Columbus, before and during his voyages of discovery to the New World, was in contact with Franciscan friars. In recent years, though, increasing and, some might say, belated attention has been paid to his growing preoccupation with messianic and even apocalyptic ideas, which are not, of course, the same. Not all are convinced. Following in the footsteps of the discoverer's great biographer Samuel E. Morison, Felipe Fernández-Armesto, for example, begins the preface to his biography of Columbus with the robust statement that,

Considered from one point of view, Columbus was a crank. Even in his own lifetime he had a cranky reputation ... He claimed to hear celestial voices. He embarrassed the court of the Spanish monarchs by appearing provocatively attired in public, once in chains and regularly in a Franciscan habit.

These remarks, which no doubt guaranteed the author a sympathetic laugh when Reagan-Thatchernomics were in their pomp, may have caused greater unease at a time of change in the millennium. Fernández-Armesto, presumably for personal reasons, finds it difficult to believe that Columbus took seriously notions of Spain's role, and his own, in the preparations for the future coming of the antichrist and the Last Judgment. He rejects the notion that the future Admiral was already what he describes as a "millenarian fantasist" before his first voyage in 1492. Nevertheless, Fernández-Armesto acknowledges that, in Columbus's entail of his estate, drawn up in Seville on 22 February 1498, in response to the signal favour of the grant by the crown of permission

doba, in 1508," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 37 (1986), 240–257, both reprinted in *Religion and Society in Spain*, nos. VIII and IX.

¹⁵ Edwards, "El Mesías, los conversos y la expulsión de los judíos de España," in *Actas del Primer Congreso Anglo-Hispano de la Asociación de Hispanistas de Gran Bretaña e Irlanda*, vol. 3: *Historia: In memoriam Derek Lomax*, ed. Richard Hitchcock and Ralph Penny (Madrid, 1994), 105–112; Gershom Scholem, *Sabbatai Zevi: the Mystical Messiah, 1626–1676* (Princeton, 1973), 518–545; Jonathan I. Israel, *European Jewry in the Age of Mercantilism, 1550–1750* (Oxford, 1985), 210–212; Henry Méchoulan, *Amsterdam au temps de Spinoza: argente et liberté* (Paris, 1990), 174–175.

to establish a *mayorazgo*, Columbus referred to his long-standing campaign for the recapture from Islam of the “holy house” (temple) in Jerusalem, which Fernández-Armesto characterizes as an “esoteric reference to the millennial city.” He also suggests that Columbus’s statement (in his memorandum drawn up in 1500 for Ferdinand and Isabella under the title, “The reason I have in believing in the restoration of the Holy House to the Holy Church Militant”) that as author he relied “entirely on holy, sacred Scripture and certain prophetic texts by certain saintly persons who by divine revelation have had something to say on this matter,” may have overtones of “Franciscan tradition, which assigned a high value to holy simplicity and was mistrustful of the vanity of unnecessary learning.”¹⁶ John Larner, in his fine survey of writing on the Admiral up to the late 1980s, is similarly, though rather more moderately, skeptical of messianic and apocalyptic prophecy as a prime mover of Columbus’s activities, saying that what he describes as “mystical delusions” only appeared in 1500, and that “However important they are in any general assessment of Columbus’ character, it is perhaps too much to make them the mainspring of his enterprise.”¹⁷

It should also be pointed out that, during the years 1500–1502, when Columbus was actively propagating his views on his, and Spain’s, role in the forthcoming apocalypse, the main religious influence on him seems to have come, not from Franciscans, whether in La Rábida or elsewhere, but from Gaspar Gorricio, a Carthusian who originated in Novara in Italy, and was then in the order’s house of Santa María de las Cuevas, Seville. Nevertheless, it is undeniable that a strong thread of messianism and apocalyptic runs through the Admiral’s later works, and in particular what is commonly known as his *Book of Prophecies*.¹⁸ John Leddy Phelan demonstrated, some years ago, the strong millenar-

¹⁶ Samuel E. Morison, *Admiral of the Ocean Sea*, 2 vols. (Boston, 1942), 2:558, refers to Columbus’s “paradisiacal conceits”; C. Jane, *Select Documents Illustrating the Four Voyages of Columbus*, 2 vols. (London, 1930), 1:liii, states that “there was in him a profound strain of mysticism ... But it is not therefore to be concluded that Columbus was converted into a mystic by the misfortune which he suffered; on the contrary, it would seem that he was mystical by nature. That he was so is suggested by his marked attachment to the Franciscan order”; Felipe Fernández Armesto, *Columbus* (Oxford, 1991), vii, 34, 39, 118–121, 153–158.

¹⁷ John Larner, “The certainty of Columbus: some recent studies,” *History*, 73 (1988), 3–23 (quote from p. 22).

¹⁸ The best English edition is now *The Book of Prophecies edited by Christopher Columbus*, ed. Roberto Rusconi, trans. Blair Sullivan (Berkeley, 1997).

ian preoccupation that the Spanish Franciscans took to the New World in the wake of Columbus's discoveries.¹⁹ More recently, Alain Milhou, Pauline Moffitt Watts, and Valerie Flint have not only stressed the evident links between Columbus and Franciscan spirituality in general, but also pointed explicitly to the influence on the discoverer of the prophecies of the Calabrian Abbot Joachim of Fiore (ca. 1132–1202), whose works had strongly influenced the “Spiritual” strand of the Franciscan movement since the thirteenth century.²⁰ By taking up Joachim's ideas, Columbus fitted in easily with the prevailing current in Ferdinand and Isabella's court, which envisaged the general reform of the church under the aegis of the last emperor, as a preparation for the end of days. Not all that was published under the name of Joachim can in fact be ascribed to him, however, and the Spiritual Franciscan “Pseudo-Joachite” tradition was known, by 1300, to the Catalan physician and mystic Arnold of Vilanova (ca. 1240–1311), in the form of the earlier version of *Vaticinia de summis pontificibus* (“Prophecies concerning the supreme Pontiffs”).²¹ It seems that it was from Arnold that Columbus, or his religious advisers, obtained the Pseudo-Joachite prophecy that a Spaniard would achieve the restoration of Jerusalem to Christian rule, and the rebuilding of the Holy Places. In his “Lettera rarissima” to Ferdinand and Isabella, written during his fourth and final voyage, the Admiral stated that “Jerusalem and the Mount of Zion are now to be rebuilt by Christian hands, and God through the mouth of the prophet in the fourteenth psalm said so. The abbot Joachim said that this man was to come from Spain.”²²

¹⁹ John Leddy Phelan, *The Millennial Kingdom of the Franciscans in the New World* (Berkeley, 1970).

²⁰ Alain Milhou, *Colón y su mentalidad mesiánica en el ambiente franciscano español* (Valadolid, 1983); Pauline Moffitt Watts, “Prophecy and discovery: on the spiritual origins of Christopher Columbus's ‘Enterprise of the Indies,’” *American Historical Review*, 90 (1985), 73–102; Valerie I.J. Flint, “Columbus and the friars,” in *Intellectual Life in the Middle Ages: Essays presented to Margaret Gibson*, ed. Lesley Smith and Benedicta Ward (London, 1992), 295–310, and *The Imaginative Landscape of Christopher Columbus* (Princeton, 1992).

²¹ Marjorie Reeves, “The *Vaticinia de summis pontificibus*: a question of authority,” in *Intellectual Life in the Middle Ages*, 145–156; Robert Lerner, “On the origins of the earliest Latin Pope prophecies: a reconsideration,” *Fälschungen im Mittelalters, Monumenta Germaniae Historica Scriptores*, 33, pt. 5 (1988), 611–35.

²² Flint, *The Imaginative Landscape of Christopher Columbus*, 185 (Psalm 15 [Vulgate 14]: “Yahweh, who has the right to enter your tent, or live on your holy mountain?” is here interpreted as referring to the Christian, “whose life is blameless,” and who “does not ask interest on loans” [vv. 1, 2, 4]).

In the *Book of Prophecies*, which does not quote from Psalm 14 (Vulgate), he states, "We read that Joachim, abbot of Calabria, predicted that someone from Spain would recover the wealth from Zion."

In reality, this prophecy seems to come from Arnold of Vilanova's *Vae mundo in centum annis*, which had spread from radical Franciscan to Aragonese political circles by the end of the fourteenth century.²³ Thus Franciscan and Spanish monarchical prophecy were easily united, but there was no resolution of the question of the social and religious basis on which a general reform, led by Spain, was to take place. At this point, it is best to return to Lozana's dialogue with Silvano, which led them both to contemplate a skull.

Although one of the most prominent modern editors of the *Lozana*, Bruno Damiani, has published a biography of its supposed author, Francisco Delicado, to whom the book was first attributed by Pascual de Gayangos in 1857, almost nothing is known about this writer's life. The only evidence of his authorship is his claim to the book ("when I composed the *Lozana*"), made in the preface to his edition of the Spanish chivalric novel *Primaleón*, which he published under his own name in Venice, in 1534.²⁴ Aldonza, as the leading lady is known at the beginning of the book, was born in Córdoba, probably in about 1490. According to various statements put into her mouth, she came from a fairly wealthy family, which fell on hard times in the last years of the fifteenth century. She later told people in Rome that her father was an inveterate gambler and chaser after whores. He died leaving his wife and three daughters with a legal dispute over the family house, presumably because of his debts, and Aldonza later claimed that she acquired early legal experience by representing her mother in a legal action at the High Court (*Audiencia* or *Chancillería*) in Granada. This dates her activity to 1505 or after, as it was in that year that the southern tribunal of the High Court was transferred there from Ciudad Real; it also suggests that property of considerable value was involved. The case went against them, and Aldonza and her mother left Córdoba, travelling via Carmona to Jerez de la Frontera. Nothing more is heard of the other two sisters. Misfortune struck again, however,

²³ *Book of Prophecies*, ed. Rusconi, 31–33, 316–317, 390.

²⁴ Bruno Damiani, *Francisco Delicado* (New York, 1974); *Libros de caballería, con un discurso preliminar y un catálogo razonado por D. Pascual de Gayangos, Biblioteca de Autores Españoles* (Madrid, 1857), xl n. 4; *La Lozana andaluza*, ed. Bruno Damiani (Madrid, 1982), 9–10.

with the death of Aldonza's mother, after which the orphan moved in with her aunt, who lived in Seville. This aunt pushed her into the arms of a Genoese merchant called Diomedes (in classical mythology, "he who turns copper into gold"), but was shocked when the couple immediately eloped, without waiting for a legal marriage. This lack of circumspection turned out to be the beginning of Aldonza's problems.

She accompanied Diomedes on a huge voyage around the Mediterranean, including North Africa, the Middle East, and Greece, on behalf of her lover's family firm. There are references to children of the liaison, but, while Aldonza was, according to her own account, a sparkling hostess, who acquired at this time the name "Lozana," which in Spanish refers to beauty, power, and gallantry, Diomedes' father became determined that she should not be his daughter-in-law. He summoned his son to a business conference in Marseilles, and Diomedes, apparently in good faith, took Aldonza/Lozana with him, saying that, when he had sorted things out with his father, he would take her to Barcelona and marry her. But Diomedes' father came to Marseilles in disguise, had his son arrested and imprisoned, and hired a ship's captain to take Aldonza out to sea and drown her. Instead, the captain took pity on her and dumped her on a rock, from which she was eventually rescued by a passing ship. She was landed at Livorno, whence she managed to travel to Rome, apparently with the help of a gold ring which she had hidden in her mouth when she was stripped of her other possessions in Marseilles. She arrived in the "Eternal City" in March 1513, at the time of Pope Leo X's coronation, and stayed there for the next fourteen years, engaged in various trades, including prostitution, pimping, midwifery, and the disposal of unwanted babies, as well as the manufacture and application of cosmetics. In 1527, she fled from Rome, along with many of her compatriots, and, while the frontispiece of the *Portrait* [*Retrato*] suggests that her destination was Venice, the text states that she retired to the island of Lipari, to the northeast of Sicily.

In the sense of biographical incident, nearly all the "action" takes place at the beginning, with a mysterious change of lifestyle at the end. According to the author's reckoning, and "Auctor" plays an important role himself in the book, one hundred and twenty-five speaking characters appear in the *Lozana*. Their names indicate that the majority of them are more stereotypes than individuals. Some, including the Lozana herself after her change of name, indicate personal characteristics, such as Divicia (wealth) and Prudencia, while more than a third, like the surnames which were increasingly employed in Western Europe

at the time, refer to occupations. Some, like Diomedes, have classical names (the author prides himself on his knowledge of the classics), others are referred to by their place, region or country of origin, and still others are defined only as relatives of other characters, this being a common, and frustrating, practice in most, if not all, of the administrative institutions of the period. This almost total lack of characterization seems, like everything else in the book, to be deliberate. The entire book revolves round Lozana herself and is indeed, as indicated by its title, her *retrato*, in the sense of "portrait." This word was clearly very important to the author, as not only does it appear on the title page, but the preliminary "Argument" makes it plain that he saw his work as the equivalent of a painted portrait, though he produces conflicting statements on the "naturalness" of the result. But this is not all. Not only is portraiture the essence of the *Lozana*, but the meaning of the Spanish word *retrato* in the early sixteenth century was wider than it is today. Its more common meaning was "retreat" or "withdrawal," generally in a religious sense, and, indeed, the use of the word to describe a work of literature in the 1520s seems to have been innovative. But then, so was the painted portrait itself, and the author refers to the "picking up" of Lozana's portrait, as was commonly done with pictures at the time. One thing is clear: the modern editor, Claude Allaigre, is right to indicate a religious dimension to the use of the word *retrato* in the text.²⁵ Now, though, it is necessary to return to the already-quoted dialogue between Lozana and Silvano.

The text of the *Retrato* is effectively a "portrait" of Lozana in sixty-six chapters, ironically described as "tomes" (*mamotreto*s), surrounded by a "frame" of introductory and concluding material. At the beginning the author provides a prologue of dedication to an anonymous "lord," and sums up the plot of the book in an "Argument." He concludes with a series of "postscripts," which begin with a linguistic note on the origin of the name "Lipari." It continues with a letter, written by the author, which compares Rome at the time of the 1527 sack with Babylon, then the excommunication of a heartless woman by Cupid, a letter from Lozana to her successors as courtesans in Rome, which also refers to the 1527 sack, and, finally, an account by the author of

²⁵ Nicholas Penny, "Back to the wall," a review of *In Perfect Harmony: Picture and Frame, 1850–1920*, ed. Eve Mendgen, in *London Review of Books*, 21 September 1995, 12; Allaigre, *Retrato*, 45.

his departure to Venice. Within this “frame,” the “portrait” itself is divided into three parts, the first of which (chaps. 1–23) takes Lozana from her birth in Córdoba to her establishment as a successful courtesan in Rome, while the second (chaps. 24–40) sees her in her pomp, though the “Author” begins to warn her of the dangers of her chosen career. The third part is announced as containing “more gracious things than have happened” so far.²⁶ Given the nature of Lozana’s way of life, Claude Allaire, like other modern editors, assumes that this statement is ironic, but what exactly happens in the third and final section of this “word-portrait”? To begin with (chap. 41), Lozana sends away a group of women who have come to her for help with cosmetics. She then, remarkably, gets rid of her Neapolitan boyfriend Rampín, who had been her lover since soon after her arrival in Rome (chap. 14). In the next chapter, while she meditates in solitude, Lozana receives an unexpected visit from the Author (Auctor), and they discuss her future, as well as that of Rome itself, and Spanish political involvement in the matter. The Author tries to persuade her to abandon her interest in dreams and divination, but, at this stage, although aware that such things are contrary to the church’s teaching, she pleads that she must earn a living somehow. In chapter 43, it appears to be business as usual at Lozana’s house, with a ceaseless traffic of clients and provisions, but a change is heralded by the Author, who leaves to find his friend Silvano, and then returns to see her once again. The next four chapters (44–47) form a coherent block, in which Silvano and Lozana engage in dialogue; they are the hinge of the book. In effect, Silvano hears the Cordoban lady’s confession, and, for the first time, a Christian reference becomes explicit. Lozana begins to look towards an eschatological future, and mockingly (or seriously?) suggests that the retired prostitutes of Rome should be treated like the Roman soldiers of old, and even as martyrs of the church. Silvano is not averse to this idea, but is more concerned with the immediate danger to Lozana and her colleagues in prostitution, which is the scourge of syphilis (from which the supposed author Delicado is believed to have suffered). Resisting her confessor, Lozana puts forward her own, varied experience, including her time with Diomedes in the Middle East, but then admits that she has fallen on hard times again, and that she no longer has the trust she once had in her lover Rampín.

²⁶ Allaire, *Retrato*, 373.

After this confessional monologue, Silvano speaks, taking his “penitent’s” mind back to her native Andalusia, to Córdoba and the rock of Martos. It is at this point that, in the passage already quoted, Silvano is sent away on Thursday, and told to return on Sunday, when he will read to her from her favorite books.²⁷ The first of these is the popular collection of verses here called the *Coplas de Fajardo*, which is an obscene comedy, supposedly written by a friar called Montesinos, about the adventures of the penis of a knight called Diego Fajardo.²⁸ The second, the *Comedia Tinalaria* (*Tinellaria*) has so far been almost totally overlooked by editors, but is of great interest in the interpretation of the Lozana’s “portrait.” It was written by Bartolomé de Torres Naharro, a playwright from Extremadura, on the Spanish side of the border with Portugal, and was first performed, probably in 1516, in the presence of both Pope Leo X and of his own patron, Bernardino López de Carvajal, Cardinal of the Holy Cross of Jerusalem (Santa Cruz). The story, in which an all-male, multilingual caste attempts to communicate in the servants’ hall (*tinello*), largely concerns those preoccupations so typical of old-style Oxford and Cambridge colleges, the pecking order in hall, the prospect of obtaining ecclesiastical benefices, and women.²⁹ The third work mentioned by Lozana to Silvano, and the one with which the *Portrait* is explicitly linked on its original title page (“contains many more things than the *Celestina*”), is Fernando de Rojas’s *Comedy or tragicomedy of Calixtus and Melibea*, commonly known as the *Celestina*.³⁰

After contemplating the skull with Silvano on Thursday, and arranging for him to come back on Sunday, Lozana’s life seems, for a brief while, to continue as before. Customers come to benefit from her skills in cosmetics, and she continues to consort with those, both married and single, who exercise, or are on the fringes of, the trade of prostitution. She now starts to experience much stronger competition, however, and to doubt herself in a way not apparent before. Finally, in chapter 50, she suffers violent abuse from a client, apparently for the first time in her life, and resolves to abandon prostitution. The lessons of the Author

²⁷ Allaigre, *Retrato*, 373–399.

²⁸ *Caragicomedia compuesta por el reverendo padre fray Bugeo de Montesino ... dirigida al muy antiguo carajo del noble cavallero Diego Fajardo*, in the *Cancionero de obras de burlas provocantes a risa*, ed. Frank Domínguez (Valencia, 1978), 139–184.

²⁹ *Tinellaria*, in *Propalladia and Other Works of Bartolomé de Torres Naharro*, ed. Joseph E. Gillet, 3 vols. (Bryn Mawr, Pa., 1943–1961), 1.187–267 and 2.453–538.

³⁰ Among the many editions of this work see Fernando de Rojas, *Comedia o tragicomedia de Calixto y Melibea*, ed. P.E. Russell (Madrid, 1991).

and Silvano are beginning to be absorbed, and, as forebodings of the sack of 1527 come to dominate the remaining chapters, an increasingly mediative, and explicitly religious, tone prevails. In this final passage of the "portrait," Lozana's visions cease to concern profit-making divination and become apocalyptic. Pluto, the god of the underworld, rides over the Sierra Morena, above her native Córdoba, Balaam's ass speaks home truths about human society, under the name of Robusto, and Rome (or the world?) appears as the Tree of Vanity.³¹ What does all this mean?

Lozana's *Portrait* seems to have gone underground as soon as it was published, and only one apparently original copy has since come to light, in the Austrian National Library.³² Having been rediscovered, it was fairly soon excluded once again from the "canon" of Spanish literature, and placed on the secular "index of forbidden books," by the mighty editor and critic Marcelino Menéndez y Pelayo, who condemned it as "filthy" (*inmundo*) and "ugly" (*feo*) and declared its literary value to be "nil" (*nulo*).³³ Thus the *Lozana's* lack of success in the sixteenth century has largely continued into modern times, in both cases in sharp contrast to its supposed model, the *Celestina*. The French historian and critic, Marcel Bataillon, compares the *Retrato* unfavourably with Rojas's masterpiece, even in the realm of sexual morality, which seems to be fairly extensively depicted in the earlier work. It is not the customs of prostitutes, pimps, and ruffians which *in themselves* interest Rojas.³⁴

Despite this tradition of moralistic condemnation, editions and criticism of the *Lozana* have proliferated in recent years, and, in general terms, the book is commonly seen as a precursor of the Spanish genre known as the "Picaresque," in which low life is portrayed, with the lead-

³¹ Allaire, *Retrato*, 400–482.

³² Ferdinand Wolf, *Studien zur Geschichte der Spanischen und portugiesischen Nationalliteratur* (Berlin, 1859), 290. The Austrian National Library copy was published in facsimile by the Murcian bibliophile Antonio Péres Gómez, in a limited edition, in Valencia in 1950.

³³ Marcelino Menéndez y Pelayo, *Orígenes de la novela*, in the *Nueva Biblioteca de Autores Españoles*, 14, vol. 3, *Novelas dialogadas, con un estudio preliminar* (Madrid, 1910), cxciv, cxcvii. This view is perhaps unsurprising, given the overall historical, moral, and political views of that writer. Peter Linehan (*History and the Historians of Medieval Spain* [Oxford, 1993], 16) observes, "The Spain whose demise D. Marcelino had lamented was the Spain of the century after 1492: Spain evangeliser of half the world; Spain hammer of heretics; light of Trent: sword of Rome; cradle of St Ignatius"—hardly the world that "Delicado" and his leading lady inhabited.

³⁴ Marcel Bataillon, *La Célestine selon Fernando de Rojas* (Paris, 1961), 137.

ing rogue as anti-hero.³⁵ Until recently, despite Menéndez y Pelayo's admission that the book is a good source of information on prostitution in Rome in the years before the sack of 1527, historians have neglected the *Lozana*. The first historian to take the lady's story seriously was Angus MacKay, who, in his published work on the subject, firmly places the book in the context, not only of prophecy in general, but of the experience of Spanish Jews and *conversos* in particular. MacKay compares "Delicado's" treatment of Lozana, and her life in Spain and Italy, with the complaints made after the introduction of the new Inquisition in Spain, in the 1480s, by the *converso* royal chronicler Fernando del Pulgar, who is briefly quoted in the text. Pulgar was concerned that the new tribunals in Seville and in Lozana's birthplace, Córdoba, were being particularly cruel to the female members of the *converso* community who, for social reasons involving virtual incarceration in their houses, had received little or no instruction in the Christian faith.³⁶ Part of MacKay's thesis concerning the *Retrato* is, therefore, that Delicado's account of his "heroine" indicates her involvement in such circles, both because of her upbringing in Córdoba and because of her dealings, immediately after her arrival, with the Spanish Jewish and *converso* communities in Rome.³⁷ While MacKay sees the *Portrait* as favourable to the Spanish, and more particularly the Andalusian, *conversos*, Louis Imperiale has suggested, in a recent study, that the book is, in reality, anti-Jewish. On the basis of the presentation in the *Retrato* of the Jew Trigo (Goldcorn), who, when Lozana first arrives in Rome, sells her precious gold ring for her at an extravagant commission and provides her with clothes and lodgings in order to engage in prostitution, this critic states: "If we were to look for an 'ideal' model of the rapacious Jewish moneylender, false neighbor and hypocritical philanthropist, Trigo, the Spanish Jew, would definitely be the best-qualified candidate."³⁸

³⁵ See, for example, Augusta Espantoso Foley's critical guide, *Delicado: La Lozana andaluza* (London, 1977).

³⁶ Angus MacKay, "A lost generation: Francisco Delicado, Fernando del Pulgar, and the *conversos* of Andalusia," in *Circa 1492: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Colloquium: Litterae Judeorum in Terra Hispanica*, ed. Isaac Benabu (Jerusalem, 1992), 224–235, and "The whores of Babylon," in *Prophetic Rome in the High Renaissance period: Essays*, ed. Marjorie Reeves (Oxford, 1992), 223–232; Allaigre, *Retrato*, 169–170: "Y como dice el coronista Fernando del Pulgar, 'así dará olvido al dolor.'"

³⁷ For example in Allaigre, *Retrato*, 175–183, 188–201, 244–250.

³⁸ Louis Imperiale, *El contexto dramático de La Lozana Andaluza* (Potomac, Md., 1991) [= *Scripta Humanistica*, 84], 246.

There is no doubt that, by her own account, Lozana was proud of her Cordoban origins and recalled them frequently throughout her years in Rome. When she first arrived there, she told a widow from Seville, "I am Spanish, and from Córdoba," while towards the end of her time in the Eternal City she said to a group of her fellow prostitutes, "I give many thanks to God because he formed me in Córdoba rather than any other land, and made me a wise woman and not a beast, and of the Spanish nation and no other."³⁹

Damiani and Allaire have tended either to miss references to Córdoba in the text, or else, where they are undeniable, to interpret them as ironical, in accordance with these editors' overall interpretation of the *Retrato* as obscene and cynical. There is, however, more evidence in the book for MacKay's *judeoconverso* theory than he appears to realise, in one particular passage. Near the beginning of the Author's narrative account of her life, he has her say to her aunt in Seville, about her cooking skills, "concerning which [a particular dish of pickled meat, known as *adobado*], as many cloth merchants as there were in Fair Street [Calle de la F/Heria] wanted to try it."⁴⁰ Although both Damiani and Allaire identify this as a reference to the street of the same name in Seville, not only is this in fact one of a series of mentions of well-known places in Córdoba, including the Potro and the Plaza de la Corredera, but it places Lozana's upbringing in a highly significant spot. During her long years in Rome, she remembered the very streets in which, on 16 March 1473, at the corner known as the Cruz del Rastro, during a procession of the "Old" Christian Confraternity of Charity (La Caridad), the incident of a child spilling water on the statue of the Virgin led to a violent attack on the *converso* community of the city.

The result was, in the words of a hardly sympathetic cathedral document of the time, "great fires and robberies and scandals," and many further sufferings for Córdoba's New Christians, particularly in the period of Lozana's likely upbringing in the city.⁴¹ Some kind of Jew-

³⁹ Allaire, *Retrato*, 190: "Soy española, y de Córdoba," and 403: "Yo doy muchas gracias a Dios porque me formó en Córdoba más que en otra tierra, y me hizo mujer sabia y no bestia, y de nación española y no de otra."

⁴⁰ Allaire, *Retrato*, 177: "Sobre que cuantos traperos había en la cal de la Heria querían proballo."

⁴¹ Edwards, "Massacre or ritualised violence?"; Archivo Catedralicio de Córdoba, Actas Capitulares, 1473, fol. 165, in Manuel Nieto Cumplido, "La revuelta contra los conversos de Córdoba en 1473," *Homenaje a Antón de Montoro en el V centenario de su muerte* (Montoro, 1977), 49.

ish context for the *Retrato* thus seems undeniable, but it is questionable whether MacKay is right to suppose that Lozana and her Spanish friends in Rome, many of them very probably *conversos* or even Jews who had fled from Spain in 1492 rather than convert, had in reality abandoned religion altogether. In several of his works he has maintained, in agreement with Francisco Márquez Villanueva, that "Delicado's women are remarkably indifferent to any form of organised religion," and that "while, on the one hand, they never talk about anything that could remotely be called Christian, it can hardly be maintained that they are crypto-Jews."⁴² Instead, MacKay places Lozana, and her Spanish contemporaries in the prostitution, cosmetic, shirt-making, and laundry trades of High Renaissance Rome, in the category of religious skeptics which, following the inaccurate perceptions of the late medieval church, he associates with the Muslim physician, jurist, and philosopher Averroes (1126–1198).⁴³ He further states that "the indifference to religion is not based on a pre-meditated attitude which arises out of a knowledge of religious doctrines. On the contrary, the indifference seems to reflect theological ignorance coupled with a picaresque-type perception of how people behave."⁴⁴

In accordance with this view of Lozana and other characters, especially the females, MacKay contrasts the supposed sophistication of the "priest-author" Delicado, "who knows his scriptural texts," and is "a writer and linguist," with the apparently humble and unsophisticated life, aspirations, and religion (if any) of Lozana and her friends.⁴⁵ But are things that simple, or rather is it not the case that "for the religious person, doubt has always been an intrinsic part of faith"?⁴⁶ It seems that, as in so much of the debate which has flowed from this remark, scant attention has been paid to the weight of evidence for it in both

⁴² MacKay, "A lost generation," 226; Francisco Márquez Villanueva, "El mundo converso de *La Lozana Andaluza*," *Archivo Hispalense*, 56 (1973), 87–97.

⁴³ MacKay, "Averroistas y marginadas," in *Actas del III Coloquio de Historia Medieval Andaluza: la sociedad medieval andaluza: grupos no privilegiados* (Jaén, 1984), 247–261 and "The Hispano-converso predicament," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, fifth series (1985), 159–179, especially 176–179. These articles are reproduced in MacKay, *Society, Economy and Religion in Late Medieval Castile* (London, 1987). On the falsehood of late medieval Christian perceptions of Averroes, see Dominique Urvoý, *Ibn Rushd (Averroes)* (London, 1991), especially 127–131.

⁴⁴ MacKay, "Lost generation," 227.

⁴⁵ MacKay, "Averroistas," 253–258 and "The Hispano-converso predicament," 177.

⁴⁶ Edwards, "Religious faith and doubt," 3.

Scripture and hagiography.⁴⁷ If this applies to late medieval and early modern Spaniards in history, might it not also apply to Delicado and his characters in literature?

In the first place, Lozana's Cordoban youth will have been spent, not only under the shadow of the Inquisition but in the midst of messianic expectations, which seem to have gripped Jewish and non-Jewish Christians alike. The lists of prosecution witnesses in the notorious trials conducted by the inquisitor Lucero contain many names from the business community on and around the Calle de la Feria, for which Lozana did her famous cooking.⁴⁸ It is thus dangerous to assume that "averroism" was a general response of Spain's Jewish Christians (or Christian Jews?) to the tensions and disruptions of life which afflicted them in the years around 1500. A further point, which needs to be made at this stage, is that it is equally rash to assume that all references, in Spain in this period, to the Jewish Scriptures are necessarily to be linked to Judaism, when they were also basic texts of Christianity. This is the mistake that Sarah Leibovici seems to have made, with the backing of Shmuel Trigano, in her attempt to demonstrate that, despite his explicitly Christian *Book of Prophecies* and other writings, apart from his signature as *Christoferens*, the Christ-bearer, Columbus was in fact a Jew.⁴⁹ In any case, there can be no doubt that Lozana found herself, in the Rome of Leo X, Hadrian VI, and Clement VII, in a climate of explicitly Christian prophecy.

Although the Author states, at the beginning of part one, that he composed his work in 1524, the book is in fact studded with references, of growing intensity, to the sack of the city in 1527 by imperial troops, including Lutherans, at first under the command of the constable of Bourbon, and then, after his death, of the prince of Orange, to whom it has been suggested that the *Lozana* was dedicated.⁵⁰ In her *Letter*

⁴⁷ Edwards, "Faith, doubt and atheism"; Maureen Flynn, "Blasphemy and the play of anger in sixteenth-century Spain," *Past and Present*, 149 (1995), 48 n. 55; Sara Nalle, *God in La Mancha: religious reform and the people of Cuenca, 1500-1650* (Baltimore and London, 1992), 60-61. But see the comment by Nicholas Griffiths, in an unpublished paper entitled "Religious unbelief in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Cuenca": "In my view, the Conquense material bears out Edwards' interpretation" (8 n. 34).

⁴⁸ Edwards, "Trial of an inquisitor," 248-249 and "The *Judeoconversos* in the urban life of Córdoba, 1450-1520," in *Villes et sociétés urbaines au Moyen Âge: Hommage à M. le Professeur Jacques Heers* (Paris, 1994), 287-297, both reprinted in *Religion and Society in Spain*, XVIII.

⁴⁹ Leibovici, *Christophe Colomb Juif*.

⁵⁰ Giovanni Allegra, "Pequeña nota sobre el 'Ilustre Señor' de *La Lozana Andaluza*,"

to all those women who decide to come to see the *Campo de' Fiori* in Rome, Lozana begins: "It occurred in Rome that fourteen thousand Teutonic barbarians entered and castigated and tortured and sacked us."⁵¹ Apart from the 1527 sack itself, another theme that recurs throughout the *Portrait* is the equation of Rome with Babylon. As Silvio [not Silvano] puts it to his friend the Author, at the beginning of part two, "Do you think they say in vain, 'Babylon' instead of 'Rome,' if not because of the great confusion which liberty causes? Do you not see that they say 'Rome the whore,' since it is the capital of sinners?"⁵²

The equation between Rome and Babylon is, of course, to be found in the Revelation of John, the Apocalypse, in which the second angel prophesied, while the Lamb, or Christ, was on Mount Zion with the 144,000 redeemed: "Fallen, fallen is Babylon the Great, who has made all nations drink the wine of God's anger roused by her fornication" (Rev 14:8).

In the book of the Apocalypse, this punishment duly ensued, while in Herrera del Duque and Córdoba, in 1499 and 1500, the prophetess Inés used very similar imagery to describe the *conversos* of village and city who would be led by Elijah away from the persecution of the Spanish Inquisition to the messianic kingdom, and banquet, in Israel. The arrival of another Cordoban, Lozana, in Rome coincided with an upsurge of prophecy and messianic concern throughout Italy. The invasion of the peninsula by Charles VIII of France in 1494, and the subsequent defeat of the Dominican Girolamo Savonarola's attempt at spiritual and secular reform in Florence, had encouraged a yearning for reformation (*reformatio*), and a readiness to try to detect the "signs of the times." Apart from preachers, of the kind observed by Lozana and her boyfriend Rampín, on their first trips around Rome together in 1513, other portents caused concern, there and elsewhere in Italy, at the turn of the sixteenth century. A monster was said to have been found in the Tiber at Rome in 1496; it was held to be the "Papal Ass," and had female breasts, a scaly skin, a pig's trotter on one leg and a bird's claw on the other, as well as the face of an old man on its rump.⁵³ The Borja pope, Alexander VI, seems to have been

Boletín de la Real Academia Española, 53 (1973), 391–397; Allaigre, *Retrato*, 175, 214, 216, 242, 299, 383–384.

⁵¹ Allaigre, *Retrato*, 503.

⁵² Allaigre, *Retrato*, 299.

⁵³ The image was much appreciated in Lutheran circles: R.W. Scribner, "Demons,

the original target of this satire, but a further monster presaged the bloody battle of Ravenna, in 1512, while a monstrous birth occurred in Bologna in 1514, on 25 January, the feast of the Conversion of St. Paul. At the time of the Medici Pope Leo X's election and coronation, as well as the supposed arrival of Lozana in Rome, a short exposition of Psalms 14, 15, and 17 was published by an Augustinian friar, Andrea de Ferrara. The work attacked the former pope, Julius II, who died ten days after its publication, on 11 February 1513, and stated that the next pope, "if chosen according to human will and not according to God," would be no better, and would bring down divine punishment on the world.⁵⁴ Parallels with Andrea's Augustinian brother, Martin Luther, spring readily to mind, but what connection does all this have with the *Lozana*?

Having established that Lozana lived in a similar prophetic world to Inés de Herrera, but in an explicitly Christian context, it is necessary to return to the Cordoban lady's encounter with Silvano and a skull, in the forty-seventh "tome" of the *Retrato*, and to Torres Naharro's *Comedia Tinellaria*, which she hoped to hear Silvano perform, to the accompaniment of *vihuela* and *pandero*, the old forms of the guitar and the tambourine, when he returned from his occupations in the Triduum between Thursday and Sunday. Torres Naharro's patron, Cardinal Bernardino de Carvajal, is known to have been strongly influenced by a manuscript entitled the *Apocalypsis Nova*, which was attributed to a Portuguese nobleman, João Mendes de Silva, whose sister, Francisca de Bobadilla, was an intimate companion of Queen Isabella of Castile, and founded the convent of the Encarnación in Toledo. João took the name Amadeo, and was confessor to the Franciscan Pope Sixtus IV, who later, in 1478, issued the bull for the foundation of Isabella and Ferdinand's Inquisition. In 1472, though, João/Amadeo joined the Observant Franciscan congregation at San Pietro in Montorio, on the Janiculum. He lived as a hermit on the hillside below the convent, and founded what was known as the Amadean congregation. Cardinal

defecation and monsters: popular propaganda for the German Reformation," in *Popular culture and popular movements in Reformation Germany* (London, 1987), 282–285.

⁵⁴ Ottavio Niccoli, *Prophecy and People in Renaissance Italy*, trans. Lydia G. Cochrane (Princeton, 1990), 37, 52–56, 105–106. The psalms on which Andrea commented are: (14) "The fool hath said in his heart: there is no God"; (15) "Lord, who shall dwell in Thy tabernacle: or who shall rest upon Thy holy hill?"; (17) "Hear the right, O Lord, consider my complaint: and hearken unto my prayer that goeth not out of feigned lips." For Columbus's use of Psalm 15 (Vulgate 14), see note 22 above.

Bernardino, a former professor of theology and rector of Salamanca University, and confessor to Isabella, took a close personal interest in the Montorio community (the buildings now house the Spanish School in Rome), and was long aware of the *New Apocalypse*. Silva died in 1482, without the book having been opened, a book that is entirely within the Spiritual Franciscan tradition derived from Joachim of Fiore and mediated through Peter John Olivi. This was eventually done, in dramatic circumstances, and in the presence of Cardinal Carvajal, in the Church of San Pietro in Montorio, in 1502. Carvajal seems sincerely to have believed that he was the “angelic pope” of which radical Franciscan exegesis spoke.⁵⁵ His attempt, with some other, mainly French, cardinals, to set up a reforming council of the church, in Pisa in 1512, failed dismally, and by the time Torres Naharro’s *Timellaria* was performed in his hall, in 1516, he had no choice but to accept a very unreformed pope, Leo X, as his guest of honour.⁵⁶ This was the price of his rehabilitation, both in Rome and in his native Spain. By then, his ambitions must have largely withered away, though he remained patron of the reformed collegiate church of Husillos, in the Castilian province of Palencia, until his death in 1523, but it seems more than probable that whoever wrote the *Portrait*, and whoever Lozana was, their circles were not just Spanish but Christian, and not just Christian but reforming Franciscan.⁵⁷

From the time of Augustine of Hippo to the present day, commentators have attempted to find a structure in John’s Apocalypse, and the temptation has been to equate it with the past and future history of the church and the world.⁵⁸ It would hardly be surprising, therefore, given the circumstances in which it was apparently written, if the *Portrait of the Lozana* partook of the eschatological anxiety of the years around 1500, in both Spain and Italy. Some years ago, Pamela Brakhage suggested

⁵⁵ Anna Morisi-Guerra, “The *Apocalypsis Nova*, a plan for reform,” and Josephine Jungic, “Joachimist prophecies in Sebastiano del Piombo’s Borgherini chapel and Raphael’s *Transfiguration*,” in *Prophetic Rome*, 27–50, 321–343.

⁵⁶ On Carvajal’s involvement in the 1512 Council of Pisa, and its consequences, see José M. Doussinague, *Fernando el Católico y el cisma de Pisa* (Madrid, 1946), 123, 177, 221–224, 406–411, and *Historia de la Iglesia en España*, 3 pt. 1, ed. Ricardo García-Villoslada (Madrid, 1980), 107–113.

⁵⁷ On Carvajal and Husillos, see Edward Cooper, *Castillos señoriales en la Corona de Castilla*, 2 vols. (Salamanca, 1991), 2.1150–1151.

⁵⁸ David Burr, *Olivi’s Peaceable Kingdom: A Reading of the Apocalypse Commentary* (Philadelphia, 1993); Richard Bauckham, *The Climax of Prophecy: Studies on the Book of Revelation* (Edinburgh, 1993); A.J.P. Garrow, *Revelation* (London, 1997).

a Christian reforming context for the *Lozana*, but found it in the ideas of Erasmus and his circle.⁵⁹ The suggestion here, based on internal as well as contextual evidence, is that the source of the book's "message" is to be found in Observant Franciscan circles in Rome, with strong and highly placed Iberian connections. The problem is, of course, that, as Heiko Oberman has rightly pointed out, such reforming movements among friars, in Spain and Italy and elsewhere, tended to take up the eschatological imperative of converting Jews in all too literal and urgent a fashion.⁶⁰ If the "angelic pope," whether Cardinal Bernardino or some other, who seems to lurk behind events in this period in both countries, was a potential threat to the rich and powerful in the church of Leo X and Clement VII, Paul IV's bull of 1555, *Cum nimis absurdum*, which established the first ghetto in Rome, illustrates all too clearly the point that he was just such a threat to Jews as well.⁶¹

⁵⁹ Pamela S. Brakhage, *The Theology of La Lozana Andaluza* (Potomac, Md., 1986).

⁶⁰ Heiko A. Oberman, "The stubborn Jews: Timing the escalation of antisemitism in late medieval Europe," *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book*, 34 (1989), xi-xxv.

⁶¹ Kenneth R. Stow, *Catholic Thought and Papal Jewry Policy, 1555-1593* (New York, 1977).

This page intentionally left blank

LIMPIEZA VERSUS MISSION: CHURCH, RELIGIOUS ORDERS, AND CONVERSION IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY

ANNA FOA

During the sixteenth century, in the gray area situated somewhere between concerns for Catholic reform and Protestant schism, between Counter-Reform closure and what a more attentive historiography calls ecclesiastical “disciplining,” the Catholic world embarked on three diverse paths in its relationship with the Jews. The first was a drive to convert the Jews, which only toward mid-century was fully adopted by the church of Rome, to become one of the central moments of Catholic religious life.¹ The second was the Inquisition, born, as is known, in its “modern” form in Spain in 1478 and whose purpose was to ensure the religious fidelity of that country’s *conversos*.² The third, too, was Spanish, an ideology that erected a wall between Old and New Christians, and the side on which one fell was decided by the matter of blood. Blood, purity of blood, *limpieza de sangre*, no longer religious faith, would determine whether converts, or even their descendants, could enter the colleges, the religious orders, and ecclesiastical careers.³

The interrelationship between these three paths is complex. At first glance, the theory of *limpieza de sangre* appears diametrically opposed to a desire for conversion. This is certainly what was sustained by the theory’s opponents, who underlined its anti-Christian aspect. Nicholas V, in particular, explicitly recalled the universalist principles of St. Paul: “Non est distinctio Iudei et Greci, nam idem Dominus omnium,”

¹ See Kenneth R. Stow, *Catholic Thought and Papal Jewry Policy, 1555–1593* (New York, 1977); Stow, “Church, Conversion and Tradition: the Problem of Jewish Conversion in Sixteenth Century Italy,” in *Dimensioni e problemi della ricerca storica* (1996), 25–34. This special issue is entitled *Conversioni nel Mediterraneo*, ed. Anna Foa and Lucetta Scaraffia.

² See Henry Charles Lea, *A History of the Inquisition of Spain* (New York, 1966); Henry Kamen, *Inquisition and Society in Spain in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (London, 1985); *Historia de la Inquisición en España y América*, ed. Joaquín Pérez Villanueva and Bartolomé Escandell Bonet (Madrid, 1984); Francisco Bethencourt, *L’Inquisition à l’époque moderne. Espagne, Portugal, Italie (XV–XIX siècles)* (Paris, 1995).

³ See Albert Sicroff, *Les controverses des statuts de pureté de sang en Espagne du XV^e au XVII^e siècle* (Paris, 1960); Antonio Domínguez Ortiz, *Los judeoconversos en la España moderna* (Madrid, 1992), 137–172.

when he threatened anyone who supported the laws of discrimination with excommunication in a stern bull of 1449 entitled *Humani generis inimicus*.⁴ Nonetheless, despite the obvious contradiction of principles, such later popes as Clement VII and Paul III approved the Statutes—even though they both were outspoken proponents of Jewish conversion. *Limpieza* was also espoused by important members of the Spanish church, nagged by doubts about the religious fidelity of converts, and it was debated in the writings of ecclesiastics and theologians.

As for the Inquisition, the Spanish Inquisition, should we not best view it as the barricade erected by Spanish society to prevent the integration and assimilation of converts, far more than simply as an institution created to check the backsliding of tepid converts and crypto-judaizers?⁵ The primary objectives of the Inquisition were thus not proselytizing and could easily clash with the conversionary ideal. It is a fact that at the end of the fifteenth century, during the years preceding the expulsion of 1492, when the fires of the *auto-de-fe* were burning and many *conversos*, including churchmen, took refuge from the Inquisition in Rome, conversionary ardor in Spain was virtually spent. For the Spanish Inquisition had aligned itself with the supporters of the idea of the purity of blood and had started to consider every *converso* as a clearly marked suspect. Inquisition as opposed to conversion, therefore? Not so simple. Ignatius of Loyola, one of the major proponents of conversionary programs at Rome, possibly the very founder of the Roman *Casa dei Cathecumeni*, and certainly an opponent of the introduction of the norms of *limpieza de sangre* in his new Society of Jesus, was also one of the ideologues of the Roman Inquisition who took the side of the Portuguese court in its conflict with Rome over the institution of a Spanish-type inquisition in Portugal.⁶ This movement on Ignatius's

⁴ Sicroff, *Les controverses des statuts*, 61; Shlomo Simonsohn, *The Apostolic See and the Jews* (Toronto, 1989–1990), no. 1775, 24 Sept. 1449. The Bull stated: “sub excommunicationis poena mandamus ut omnes et singulos ad Christianam fidem conversos aut in futurum convertendos, seu ex gentilitate vel ex Iudaismo, ... ac eorum posteros,” should not suffer discrimination.

⁵ See Yoseph Hayim Yerushalmi, “Assimilation and Racial Anti-Semitism: the Iberian and the German Models,” *The Leo Baeck Memorial Lecture*, 26 (New York, 1982), 8–9; Maurice Kriegel, “La definitiva soppressione del pluralismo religioso nella Spagna dei re cattolici: limiti e efficacia dell’approccio ‘intenzionalista,’” in *Rassegna Mensile d’Israele* 58 (1992), 2. This special issue is entitled *Oltre il 1492*, ed. Anna Foa, Myriam Silvera, and Kenneth Stow.

⁶ See Sicroff, *Les controverses des statuts*, 270–90; James Reites, S.J., “St. Ignatius and the people of the book” (Diss., Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana, 1977); Francisco de

part, at first glance contradictory, in fact had its own internal logic, whose meaning and significance will prove a key to what I am about to say. Personally, I am convinced that at Rome during the sixteenth century, as well as in the church as a whole, including, of course, within the religious orders, a great match was being decided between those who sustained not only the possibility of conversion, but also its necessity, and those who considered conversion a mirage.

This conflict was precipitated by events in the Iberian peninsula, and by their theological and canonical repercussions: first, the mass forced conversion in 1497 (considered force even according to the most limited definition of force as defined by canon law and openly admitted to have been forced conversion by Rome) of the Portuguese Jews, followed almost immediately by widespread marranism; and, second, no less jarring, the spreading of the theory of purity of blood, so foreign to fundamental Christian principles. Add to these also the problem of the conversion of the Indians in America, it too pregnant with legal implications,⁷ and the whole official ideology of conversion had been plunged into crisis. The entire question of force in baptism had to be discussed anew, taking into consideration as well those who, at the end of the fifteenth century (not only in Spain, but also in the humanist curia of Rome at that time), denied that baptismal waters were sufficient to make a Christian out of a Jew.⁸ The opponents in this match were not limited, or at least not exclusively, to Rome and the Iberian courts, the pope and the Spanish and Portuguese Inquisitions. The borders were far hazier. At Rome in particular, concessions about the theory of *raza* (race) were frequent, although, as Adriano Prosperi has recently put it, they shook the “universalistic pretensions” of Rome, without actually destroying them.⁹ In 1595, for example, the inquisitional tribunal of Pisa furnished that of Palermo—a Spanish one, it should be remembered—with information about the *raza* of an aspiring candidate for the post

Borja Medina, S.J., “Ignacio de Loyola y la ‘limpieza de sangre,’” in *Ignacio de Loyola y su tiempo* (Bilbao, 1991), 583–615; Eusebio Rey, S.J., “S. Ignacio de Loyola y el problema de los ‘cristianos nuevos,’” *Razon y fe*, 153 (1956), 173–204.

⁷ See Adriano Prosperi, “America e Apocalisse: Note sulla ‘conquista spirituale’ del Nuovo Mondo,” *Critica Storica*, 13 (1976), 1–61.

⁸ See Anna Foa, “Converts and *conversos* in Sixteenth-Century Italy,” in *The Jews of Italy: Memory and Identity*, ed. Barbara Garvin and Bernard Cooperman (Bethesda, Md., 2000), 109–129.

⁹ Adriano Prosperi, “L’Inquisizione romana e gli Ebrei,” in *L’Inquisizione e gli Ebrei in Italia*, ed. Michele Luzzati (Bari-Roma, 1994), 80–82.

of inquisitional familiar.¹⁰ We, accordingly, find ourselves before two diverse positions, which, however approximately, we may call “conversionistic” and “anti-conversionistic,” although we should keep in mind that, in theory, both positions ultimately go back to a unified principle of conversion and that even among the most ardent supporters of the theory of purity of blood, there was nobody who would deny that all the Jews must be converted.

In this conflict, the church appears sometimes as irretrievably divided, sometimes as achieving a difficult unity through strenuous juridical and theological compromise. But in the long run, if somewhat cautiously, at Rome the necessity—and possibility—to convert the Jews would be sustained. And, as a result, a program of conversion would be launched, to become a fundamental plank in papal policy toward the Jews. One might say, moreover, that this conversionary policy became feasible only when the debate over the events that had taken place at the end of the fifteenth century came to a close, and the trauma of the forced conversions of 1497 passed, enabling the two originally intrinsically opposed doctrines of conversion and its impossibility to be reconciled.

The Jesuits played a fundamental role in this reconciliation. For they alone were in a position to weigh properly the Spanish and Portuguese experiences, to understand indepth the problem of *limpieza*, but also to integrate the discordant issues of *limpieza* and conversion into a decidedly proselytizing approach. Contemporaneously, Rome would not oppose the closure in the Iberian world of public and ecclesiastic office to New Christians, a decision facilitated by the concrete, indeed, banal, fact (to which perhaps too little thought has been given) that in the Iberian Peninsula conversion of itself was no longer an issue. That had already occurred, at least *de facto*; there remained only apostasy to unveil. The religious destinies of the Iberian Peninsula and that of the rest of the church each went its own way. Of course, the church had lost an historical opportunity to oppose a doctrine negating the universalistic principles on which it was founded. Events, indeed, seem to have repeated themselves nearly five centuries later, in the year 1938. In the face of the Nazi threat and the tide of growing anti-Semitism, Pope Pius XI ordered an encyclical to be prepared (one of whose collaborators was the Jesuit John La Farge) sharply condemning racism.

¹⁰ Prosperi, “L’Inquisizione romana e gli Ebrei,” 82.

Pius XI's death prevented this encyclical, which would have been called *Humani generis unitas*, from being published. One wonders whether the resonance with the title of the bull of Nicholas V (*Humani generis inimicus*) was more than mere coincidence.¹¹

The story of the fifteenth-century Statutes of *limpieza* is well known. Its principal lines were traced by Sicroff in his indispensable study of 1960. I will limit myself here to recalling those points that bear on our discussion of the politics of *limpieza* and the Inquisition as opposed to those of conversion.

The Statutes of *limpieza* preceded the institution of the Spanish Inquisition and in some measure determined its nature. This is the first point to keep in mind. The establishment of the Sentencia-Estatudo at Toledo in 1449, the work of Sarmiento, grew out of a popular revolt against royal taxation and against the *conversos*; it was founded on the presupposition that by nature *conversos* are untrustworthy and are, in reality, still Jews. This principle of indiscriminately segregating *conversos* (New Christians) due to their intrinsic nature led to the increase and diffusion of anti-*conversos* laws. In 1459, the *Fortalitium Fidei* of Alfonso de Espina accused the New Christians—all of them—of being secret Jews.¹² In this context, the establishment of the Inquisition may have been construed positively by the New Christians, who saw in it a unique instrument capable of distinguishing among the indiscriminate mass of *conversos* that proverbial fly in the ointment—the duplicitous crypto-Jews and judaizers as opposed to faithful Christians. They may have understood that the task of the Inquisition was to punish the guilty and proclaim the innocent free of guilt. “With a singular lack of foresight,” Yerushalmi has noted, “many conversos seem even to have welcomed the idea of an Inquisition in the hope that, if the judaizers could be weeded out, their own Catholic orthodoxy would no longer be impugned.”¹³ The ideological origins of the Inquisition thus were not those of the Statutes of Purity, whose single purpose was to segregate. It was, indeed, in this spirit that, in 1461, in the midst of violence and tumult against New Christians, the General of the Jerusalemite Order,

¹¹ Georges Passelecq and Bernard Suckecky, *L'encyclique cachée de Pie XI: Une occasion manquée de l'Eglise face à l'antisémitisme* (Paris, 1995).

¹² Sicroff, *Les controverses des statuts*, 74ff.; Yitzak Baer, *A History of the Jews in Christian Spain* (Philadelphia, 1978), 2.283–292.

¹³ Yerushalmi, “Assimilation and Racial Anti-Semitism,” 12. Sicroff, *Les controverses des statuts*, 66ff.

Alonzo de Oropesa, organized the first episcopal Inquisition in Castile and, immediately afterward, in Toledo.

Nonetheless, although the theoretical underpinning of the Inquisition—a commitment to search out individual guilt alone—was distinct from the assumption that all *conversos* were really Jews, in the end, both Inquisition and the Statutes of Purity were often mutually supportive. The trials of the Inquisition brought to light, partly because it wanted to believe it, but partly because it indeed was so, the depth and scope of crypto-judaizing, and this, in turn, fueled suspicions rather than limiting them. The Inquisition itself eventually took an active role in the ever wider dissemination of the purity laws. However, the exclusion of descendants of *conversos* from the actual institution of the Inquisition did not become generalized until the mid-sixteenth century. Some Inquisitors even wrote memorials against such laws. Even later, the Inquisition often found these laws to its dislike: the control of purity was relatively light, so much so, in fact, that the military orders, zealous advocates of purity, refused to consider acceptance by the Inquisition as a “familiar” (lay servant) as its guarantee.¹⁴

That the laws of *limpieza* contradicted the essence of the theology of universal conversion and baptism was repeatedly said by all their opponents. “All the prophets cried for the Jews’ conversion, and you alone remain deaf to their voice,” wrote a nameless author in the first years of the seventeenth century, accusing the Statutes of deriving from pagan inspiration.¹⁵ In response, proponents of the Statutes tried to show their consistency with tradition. However, since proponents found themselves running up against the Pauline text, which would never consent to such laws, time and again, the justifications were never theological, but practical: the *conversos*’ infidelity and untrustworthiness. The insistence on the latter, in particular, would become a leading motif, a constant theme that would sow the seeds of suspicion and diffidence with respect to conversion itself, and whose fruit is evident for a long time in so many expressions of religious culture. Thus, in the 1580s, during the debate within the Jesuit Order about whether to adopt the laws of purity, the Portuguese Jesuit Rodriguez (mindful of those Jesuit priests of distant Jewish descent) described converts as follows: “Where they live and carry on their lives, they are considered

¹⁴ Domínguez Ortis, *Los judeoconversos en la España moderna*, 167.

¹⁵ Sicroff, *Les controverses des statuts*, 154.

as Jews and suspect with regard to their faith, so ready to abandon it, in fact, that it takes but one old woman to have baptized men, learned and even considered scholars by Christians, convert to Judaism.”¹⁶ However, beyond the problem of reconciling the laws of *limpieza* and the doctrine of Christian universalism, there was another important problem: how to reconcile the contradiction of purity and mission. If conversion was intrinsically false, if the *conversos* continued to profess Judaism or were, in the best of cases, unable to resist the seductions of their old religion and truly to accept Christianity, why make efforts to convert them in the first place? Conversely, what Jew would accept conversion, knowingly exposing himself or herself to exclusion and want? In 1513, the Dominican Cardinal Cajetan (Thomas de Vio) spoke out on this theme. Responding to a request made to him by the Jerusalemites, he discussed the principle that “they should not be received in the Order simply because they are descendents of Jews” and argued that, apart from their evident injustice, laws like these gave the Jews “good reason not to convert to our faith (for their descendants will be permanently excluded from the community of the religious).”¹⁷

At the end of the fifteenth century, when the laws of *limpieza* had just begun to take hold and the option to create special inquisitorial tribunals to control the *conversos* was still fresh and even under debate, the religious orders, too, stood before a choice: whether to accept *conversos* as members. This choice had to be congruous with a conversionary tradition (fostered by these orders) that considered the conversion of the Jews a primary objective; and this was before Rome began to ponder how seriously it, too, should pursue the goal of conversion. But during the sixteenth century, the problem became urgent, especially when the laws of purity were applied with respect to membership in the Franciscan and Dominican Orders, particularly in the latter, which was more involved in the form and administration of the Inquisition, although not everywhere, and not always in the same way. Some monasteries opted for discrimination; others accepted *conversos*. The Inquisitor Torquemada obtained from Alexander VI approval of the Statutes of Purity for the Dominican monastery he had founded in St. Thomas di Avila, using monies confiscated from persons the Inquisition had condemned. Paul III issued similar privileges in 1542 to the Dominicans of Aragon

¹⁶ Borja Medina, “Ignacio de Loyola y la ‘limpieza de sangre,’” 584 n. 18.

¹⁷ Sicroff, *Les controverses des statuts*, 87 n. 97.

(although the limitations extended only to the fourth generation).¹⁸ The Statutes seem never to have taken hold throughout the Dominican Order, and among the Franciscans they were approved and annulled—on again, off again—during the entire sixteenth century.¹⁹ Many names of Dominican and Franciscan friars of *converso* origin appear on lists of those investigated and condemned by the Inquisition. At the theatrical *auto-de-fe* of Spanish *conversos* held at Rome in 1498, noted the Milanese ambassador, there was one *converso* Franciscan, clearly a refugee from the grip of the Inquisition in Spain, who, like others participating in this spectacle, had come to Rome in search of absolution and rehabilitation.²⁰ There were also a number of Franciscans and Dominicans who wrote tracts designed to combat the Statutes' application.

The Jesuit Order, too, was no less equivocal in its attitude toward *limpieza* versus mission. Ignatius of Loyola's opposition to the Statutes is well known. The Order did introduce them in 1593, but this was against a backdrop of polemics and opposition, not the least of which came from Pedro de Ribadeneira, despite his truly advanced age. Moreover, what was introduced was, to use the expression of Borja Medina, "a true statute of *limpieza*, among the most *excluyentes y exclusivos de cuantos existian en las ordenes religiosas de su tiempo*."²¹ Concerning the introduction of the Statutes into the Order, there has been in recent years a historiographical debate, especially among historians who are themselves Jesuits. Effectively embarrassed by the facts, they have underlined Ignatius's personal objections, including the absence, in the Constitutions that Ignatius drew up, of lineage as a reason for disqualification from membership. They have also pointed to the high rank achieved by certain New Christians in the Jesuit hierarchy, beginning with Laynez, Ignatius's successor as General, who was not himself a convert (his

¹⁸ Sicroff, *Les controverses des statuts*, 90; Domínguez Ortiz, *Los judeoconversos en la España moderna*, 150. The Bull of Paul III on the monastery of Avila is in Simonsohn, *The Apostolic See and the Jews*, no. 1963 (5 March 1540). For the Bull on Dominicans in Aragon see Simonsohn, *The Apostolic See and the Jews*, no. 2154 (3 June 1542).

¹⁹ Clement VII (19 March 1525) ratified the Statutes for the Observant Franciscans, whose discriminations applied until the fourth generation. The Bull was, however, valid only in Spain ("in regnis Hispaniarum tantum"). See Simonsohn, *The Apostolic See and the Jews*, no. 1334. See also Simonsohn, "La 'limpieza de sangre' y la Yglesia," in *Actas del II Congreso Internacional Encuentro de las tres Culturas* (Toledo, 1985), 299–310.

²⁰ Foa, "Un vescovo marrano: il processo a Pedro de Aranda (Roma 1498)," *Quaderni Storici*, 99 (1998), 533–551.

²¹ Borja Medina, "Ignacio de Loyola y la 'limpieza de sangre,'" 609.

Jewish descent was through one grandfather alone), and extending to Polanco, whose descent ultimately disqualified him from the generalship.²²

Indeed, strong opposition to this decree persisted. In 1608, during the Order's sixth General Congregation, the decree was moderated. But the changes concerned only the number of generations (since the original conversion) that qualified or disqualified a Jesuit from holding office, not the ideology itself, as Borja Medina emphasizes, citing the Portuguese Rodriguez, a strong supporter of exclusion: "*solo cambiò el anterior en quanto a la realidad cronologica, pero no en quanto a la ideologica.*"²³ The decree was thus seen as breaking with Ignatius's intentions, an infraction of the spirit of the Ignatian Constitutions. Ribadeneira, in fact, said as much on the occasions of the Statute's approbation in 1593: "*es contra nuestras Constituciones, las quales no excluyen a los tales, ni ponen por impedimento esencial ni aun secundario ser de tal o tal generacion.*"²⁴

All this notwithstanding, the fact is that from the very beginnings of the Order, there were pressures, especially from the Jesuit's Spanish and Portuguese provinces, to introduce the Statutes regarding the exclusion of candidates of New Christian descent from the Order. These pressures became very strong in the 1580s, as may be seen in the insistent letters sent to the General Aquaviva in 1586 and 1587 by Pablo Hernandez, consultant to the Holy Office in Granada, and by Salcedo, the Inquisitor of Granada.²⁵ The matter was not one of a split in the Order between one group faithful to the original ideas of Ignatius and a second that wished to rid the Order of *conversos*. The ambiguities actually go back to Ignatius himself. For in distinction to the ideological struggles carried on during the late fifteenth century by Dominicans and Franciscans, the Jesuit debate during the later sixteenth century was never one of principle. In the struggle that pitted Loyola against Siliceo from 1552 until his death in 1556, precisely on the subject of the refusal of the Jesuits to introduce the Statutes, Loyola adopted a policy of compromise. Taking into account the peculiarities of the Iberian situation, Loyola apparently turned a blind eye on the introduction of the Statutes—there. This is evident in his decision in 1553 to have members of the Order of New Christian descent posted elsewhere, mainly

²² Sicroff, *Les controverses des statuts*, 279–280.

²³ Borja Medina, "Ignacio de Loyola y la 'limpieza de sangre,'" 608.

²⁴ Rey, "S. Ignacio de Loyola y el problema de los 'cristianos nuevos,'" 196.

²⁵ Sicroff, *Les controverses des statuts*, 281.

in Italy, “where people were not so discriminating about their race.”²⁶ Or at least such Jesuits were to be sent to places where they were unknown—and their names changed.²⁷ Yet, was not this essentially the same resolution that Laynez, too, eventually would espouse, albeit his tone concerning such “*imaginaciones*,” that is, racial discrimination, was notably more strident? Writing, in 1564, eight years after Loyola’s death, about impediments to membership in the Society, Laynez said: “We do not accept persons stained by imperfections specified by the Law of God or the canons, but as far as those whose stains are figments of the imagination, it is sufficient to act with care, and moderately, in those countries where such humors *ad duriciem cordis eorum* dominate.”²⁸ There was no question, either here or with Ignatius, about legitimacy per se. The ideological clash between the party of conversion and the party of race seems simply to have disappeared and its place taken by a pragmatic line: One could simultaneously pursue conversion and accept the idea that somehow Jewish descent was a stain nearly impossible to wipe out.

No less complex was Loyola’s attitude toward the Inquisition. At the express desire of King John III, he petitioned, first in 1542 and then in 1544–1545, the pope and the Roman curia to approve the reactivation of the Portuguese Inquisition.²⁹ This petition was noteworthy indeed. It was made in the wake of the grand debate about the forced conversions of 1497, whose echoes were still reverberating in the halls of the Vatican, and, in fact, at a moment when the activities of the Portuguese Inquisition had been suspended at papal order on account of its excesses.³⁰ But what is most noteworthy about Ignatius’s petition was its reliance on the official justifications (emanating from Portugal) that the Inquisition was necessary to combat the heresy and apostasy of the New Christians. On November 4, 1545, Loyola reported on his activities to King John and his hope of having removed any roadblock that might impede “such a universal good.”³¹ In 1546, he wrote anew telling

²⁶ Borja Medina, “Ignacio de Loyola y la ‘limpieza de sangre,’” 601.

²⁷ Borja Medina, “Ignacio de Loyola y la ‘limpieza de sangre,’” 603. The letter is from Ignatius to Portuguese provincial Miron, February 1555.

²⁸ Sicroff, *Les controverses des statuts*, 283 n. 76.

²⁹ Reites, “St. Ignatius and the people of the book,” 255ff.

³⁰ Alexandre Herculano, *History of the Origin and Establishment of the Inquisition in Portugal* (New York, 1972), 570–602.

³¹ Reites, “St. Ignatius and the people of the book,” 262.

the king that matters had turned out well: "The Portuguese Inquisition could proceed as that in Castile, *ad perpetuam rei memoriam*."³²

That Loyola was wholehearted in his support of the Portuguese Inquisition seems undeniable. In May 1555, the Portuguese king asked Miron, the Jesuit Provincial, to have the Order take the helm of the Inquisition. Miron, who highly favored accepting the royal offer, asked Loyola's advice. "These New Christians," he said, "are odious. Their punishment is looked upon everywhere with favor, and, as a result, we will win esteem and even enhance our authority."³³ Nonetheless, Miron was also hesitant, for religious rather than political reasons, about linking the destiny of the Order with that of the Inquisition. Loyola, too, was hesitant, and he appointed six Jesuits, including Laynez and Polanco, to decide the matter. Over Laynez's sole opposition, the commission decided that "there is no reason to refuse the works which would serve the king and the purity of religion in the kingdom."³⁴ Loyola, moreover, gave his full assent. However, in fact, the Jesuits were not awarded the Inquisition. Instead, their numbers, at that time limited, convinced the king to entrust its control to Dominican hands.

Thus, as it confronted the collective tragedy engendered by the resort to forced conversion in Portugal, the church had to choose one of two paths. The first, actually taken into consideration for a number of years between 1530 and 1540, was to restate unambiguously the necessity of spontaneity for conversion to be valid, refining, in the process, the concept of forced conversion as it is found in the canons. The second path was that of the Inquisition: to evaluate the sincerity of conversion case by case. With certain reservations, it was this second path that carried the day. And the role of Ignatius and his Jesuit Order in reinforcing the Inquisition is beyond question. But what this really meant was that a new synthesis had been achieved which allowed reconciling respectively conflicting principles and discordant practices, a reconciliation that until then had appeared out of the question. Yet without this reconciliation, it would have been impossible to initiate freely a policy of mission and conversion at Rome, the heart of Catholicism. The Jesuits thus undertook a policy that responded well to the debate about the possibility of conversion that had taken place at Rome during the first half of the century, that reflected the hesitations

³² Reites, "St. Ignatius and the people of the book," 263.

³³ Reites, "St. Ignatius and the people of the book," 265.

³⁴ Reites, "St. Ignatius and the people of the book," 267.

about the nature of the *conversos*, and that led to a resolution of the conflict between those who held that conversion was possible and those who insisted on viewing the converted as still Jews.

This resolution made itself felt in the policies undertaken at Rome, in particular, in the founding of the *Casa dei Cathecumeni* in 1543, preceded, perhaps even more instructively, by the bull *Cupientes iudaeos* of 1542, in whose publication Loyola was instrumental, if not decisive.³⁵ This bull presages the launching of a true conversionary policy, combining, as it does, economic incentives, especially with regard to the possibility of a convert retaining his or her property, with the precept of religious instruction to ensure neophyte fidelity. But the bull is also severe on the subject of judaizing and apostasy. Taken as a whole, these themes, at once traditional with roots in long-standing canons, but also innovative in the concern for instruction, made envisaging the pursuit of conversion realistic. Indeed, a fully articulated search for conversion, already proposed in some circles, but only as a hope, would be elaborated at Rome in subsequent decades. Without these developments of 1542 and 1543, it might not have been.

Ignatius's resolution also allowed a remaining problem to be channeled, containing it, so that it did not overwhelm conversionary drives as a whole. It was, namely, the problem of doubt that, however much a thorn in previous centuries, had become the heart of the debate over conversion in Spain and certainly the principal *raison d'être* of the Inquisition. Doubts about the sincerity of the converts, in fact, not only justified the creation of the Spanish and Portuguese Inquisitions—providing grist for the mill of the proponents of *limpieza de sangre*. But now they became a leitmotif in tracts written to promote conversion, a constant preoccupation for whoever engaged in the mission to the Jews. Even one strongly in favor of conversion, such as the legist Marquardus de Susannis, carefully differentiated between true and false conversion and spoke of the need for constant vigilance to curb the latter.³⁶ Distancing himself from the papal letters of the 1530s that referred generically to the forcibly converted in Portugal as “those who should not be counted among the members of the Church,” since canonically their baptism was illegal, the fruit of absolute force,³⁷ de Susannis painted the

³⁵ Simonsohn, *The Apostolic See and the Jews*, no. 2119 (21 March 1542); Attilio Milano, *Il ghetto di Roma* (Roma, 1964), 283ff.

³⁶ Marquardus de Susannis, *De Judeis et aliis infidelibus* (Venice, 1558), 3:2-7-9.

³⁷ See Simonsohn, *The Apostolic See and the Jews*, no. 1601.

Pogrom of Lisbon in 1506 as the fruit of “duplicitousness” and insincerity.³⁸ Nor was this doubt a passing phenomenon. As late as the eighteenth century, one of the Rectors of the *Ospizio dei catecumeni* in Torino wrote: “*Fino ad oggi, nessun diavolo si e’ ben convertito*” (“those Devils [that is, the Jews] did never have sincere conversions”).³⁹

Thus a policy and doctrine of conversion could coexist with an active suspicion of converts themselves. Their sincerity might be put to the test in tribunals, and its suspected absence might provoke the reprimands of confessors and directors of souls. But this also means that the church had found a way to make peace with doctrines of exclusion and discrimination—even among its own clergy—without doing more than superficially disturbing its principle of universalism, the universal proclamation of the gospel word. Is it any wonder, therefore, that in Italy, cases of the papal Inquisition pursuing converts were few and far between? By contrast, in Spain, living so much in its unique, closed-in society, with paths and byways all its own, the obsession with purity could be developed without reserve, a lack of restraint that perhaps may best be ascribed to the simple fact that after 1492 and 1497 there were no more Jews in the Iberian Peninsula. Nobody was awaiting his or her turn at the baptismal font.

³⁸ Marquardus de Susannis, *De Judeis et aliis infidelibus*, 3.2.5.

³⁹ Luciano Allegra, *Identità in bilico: Il ghetto ebraico di Torino nel Settecento* (Torino, 1996), 96.

This page intentionally left blank

INDEX

- Abraham, 9, 13–14, 17, 33, 138, 193, 197, 200–202, 211
- Agostino of Perugia, Friar, 249, 250
- Alan of Lille, 34, 215, 216, 222
- Albert V, Duke of Austria, 127n–128n
- Albert the Great, OP, 197
- alchemy, 165–166, 169–171, 173, 184
- Alexander VI, Pope, 294, 305
- Alexander Lombardus, Friar, 109–110, 112
- Alfonso III of Aragon, 55–57, 68
- Alfonso de Espina, Friar, 199–223, 303
- Alfonso the Magnanimous, King, 188–189
- Alonzo de Oropesa, 304
- Angelo da Chivasso, Friar, 115
- Apocalypse, Book of, 23, 25, 27–28, 31–32, 234–235, 274–275, 294, 296
- Aristotelianism, 26, 29
- Arnold of Vilanova, 283–284
- Astesanus, Friar, 106–108, 110, 112
- Augustine of Hippo, 7–8, 12, 99, 104, 137, 210, 228, 296
- Auto-de-fé*, 300, 306
- Baptism, 49, 81, 84, 86–88, 94, 95–98, 137, 140, 156–157, 172, 177, 180–182, 184, 192–193, 201, 205, 231, 256, 261, 269–270, 278–279, 301
- Barthomeu Gaçó, 178, 180
- Basel, Council of (1431–1449), 124, 235
- Battista de' Giudice, 256, 266, 269
- Benedict XIII, Pope (Pedro de Luna), 156–157, 181, 195, 231, 257
- Bernard of Clairvaux, 3, 6–8, 11, 15, 18, 99–100, 105
- Bernardino da Busti, Friar, 236, 260
- Bernardino da Feltre, Friar, 114, 226–227, 239, 249, 255
- Bernardino of Siena, Friar, 100, 108, 114, 221, 222, 227, 246, Plate 2
- Black Death, 139, 155
- Blasphemy, 58, 92, 149, 153, 183, 264
- Bodecker, Stephan, *see* Stephan Bodecker
- Bonaventure, Friar, 23–24, 41, 50, 100, 101, 103, 105, 109–110, 114, 197
- Book of Sentences* (Peter Lombard), 83, 90
- Cajetan, Cardinal, OP, 305
- Carcano, Friar Michele, *see* Michele Carcano, Friar
- Casa dei Cathecumeni*, 300, 310
- Cathars, 25–26, 29, 37, 228
- Circumcision, 17, 32, 81, 84–88, 98, 138, 191–198, 200–202, 212, 217–218, 220–221
- Circumcision of Jesus, Feast of, 191–198
- Clement VII, Pope, 176, 293, 297, 300
- Columbus, Christopher, 281–283, 293
- Constance, Council of (1414–1418), 125, 140, 191, 195
- Conversos* (New Christians), 156, 163, 169, 172–173, 177–181, 183–185, 188–189, 274, 278–280, 290–292, 294, 299–310
- crusades, 39, 43–44, 48–52, 107
- Dati, Leonardo, OP, *see* Leonardo Dati, OP
- Decretales* of Gregory IX, 256, 262
- Delicado, Francisco, *see* Francisco Delicado
- Disputation of Barcelona (1263), 53, 59, 61
- Disputation of Mallorca (1286), 61

- Disputation of Tortosa (1413–1414), 181
- Eiximenis, Francesc, Friar, *see* Francesc Eiximenis, Friar
- Ermengaud, Ramon, *see* Ramon Ermengaud
- Eucharist, 232
- Eudes Rigaud, Friar, 39–52
- Eugenius III, Pope, 8, 11, 18
- Eugenius IV, Pope, 129n
- Expulsion of Jews from Spain (1492), 276–277
- Ferdinand and Isabella, “Catholic Sovereigns” of Spain, 275–276, 279, 282–283
- Fernando I (King of Aragon), 157, 165, 170–171
- Fortunato Coppoli of Perugia, Friar, 246, 248
- Fourth Lateran Council (1215), 102, 103, 259
- Fra Angelico, OP, 227, 232, Plate 3
- Francesc Eiximenis, 110, 113, 114, 147–159
- Francesc Sala, OP, 188
- Francesco da Empoli, 114
- Francis of Assisi, 29, 100, 103
- Francisco Delicado, 284, 290, 292
- Gaufrid of Auxerre, 3–5
- Gerson, Jean, *see* Jean Gerson
- Giacomo della Marca, Friar, 239, 246, 249, 267
- Gil Blay, 163–165, 167–168, 184, 186–187
- Giovanni da Fiesole, *see* Fra Angelico, OP
- Hasdai Crescas, 152, 155
- Herolt, Johannes, OP, 132
- Hildegard of Bingen, 7–8
- Host Desecration, 123, 127, 128n
- Hugh of St. Cher, OP, 24
- Hussites, 126, 127n, 130, 145
- Ignatius of Loyola, SJ, 300, 306, 308, 310
- Inghetto Contardo, 61–65, 74
- Innocent III, Pope, 104, 106, 256, 257, 271
- Inquisitions, 264, 269, 278–279, 294, 300–301, 303, 304, 308, 310
- Isabella and Ferdinand, *see* Ferdinand and Isabella
- Isidore of Seville, 151, 152, 154
- Jacob ben Reuben, 153, 154, 158
- Jacobus de Voragine, 198
- Jacopo della Marca, *see* Giacomo della Marca
- Jaume I of Aragon, 53–56, 58–59
- Jaume II of Aragon, 65–68, 70–72
- Jaume II of Mallorca, 55, 58, 72
- Jean Gerson, 196–197
- Jerusalem, 27, 36, 203
- Jesuits, 299–311
- Joachim of Fiore, Abbot, 1–21, 29, 32, 35, 37, 283–284, 296
- Joan I (King of Aragon), 148, 153, 157, 158, 170, 176–179
- Joan Gascó, 161, 172
- Johannes of Frankfurt, 132, 134
- Johannes of Vallodolid, 221
- Johannes Pfefferkorn, 123
- John III, King, 308
- John XXIII, Pope, 195
- John Capistrano, Friar, 114, 126, 129, 130, 132–133, 225, 260, Plate 1
- John Duns Scotus, Friar, 81, 88, 89, 96, 97, 98, 105, 108, 110, 114, 261
- John La Farge, SJ, 302
- John Peckham, Friar, 105, 111, 112
- Joseph ha-Kohen, 255, 256, 258, 263, 271
- Josephus, 149
- Judas, 91, 103
- Juan II, 189
- Julius II, Pope, 266
- Julius III, Pope, 255, 297
- Layne, SJ, 306, 308, 309

- Leonardo Dati, OP, 191–198
 Lipmann, Rabbi Yom Tov, 126, 132, 134
 Lombard, Peter, *see* Peter Lombard
 Louis IX, King, (Saint Louis), 42, 44, 48, 107
Lozana, 'Portrait of', 274–275, 284–297
 Lyons, First Council of (1245), 107
 Lyons, Second Council of (1274), 50
 Magical practices, 163–168, 176, 184–186, 189
 Maimonides, 194, 204
 Mantua, hanging of Jews (1602), 264
 Marco da Montegallo, Friar, 114
 Marquardus de Susannis (*De Iudaeis et Aliis Infidelibus*), 257, 261, 310
 Marti I, King, 179–180, 182
 Martin V, Pope, 125–126, 127n, 128, 129n, 140
Masseh Yeshu, 157
 Medicine, 163, 165–171, 184–185
 Meir ben Simeon, 107, 271
 Meir of Rothenberg, 270
 Messianism, 279–283
 Michele Carcano, Friar, 226, 239, 241, 243–244, 269
 Miron, SJ, 309
 Mongols, 30
Monti di Pietà (Volterra, Perugia, Trevi, Foligno, Amelia, Spoleto, Assisi), 226, 239–253
 Moses ben Nahman, Rabbi (Nahmanides), 53
 Moses ha-Cohen de Tordesillas, 153
 Moses ha-Darshan, 152
 Muslims, 25, 29, 30, 31, 170
 Nazarenes, 150, 151
 Necromancy, 169, 171, 183–184
 Nicholas V, Pope, 299
 Nicholas of Cusa, 132
 Nicholas of Lyra, Friar, 133–134, 151, 153, 154, 158, 222
 Nizzahon Vetus, 153
 Olivi, Peter John, *see* Peter John Olivi
 Pablo Christiani, *see* Pau Cristia
 Passion plays, 137–138
 Pau Cristia, 53–54
 Paul II, Pope, 247
 Paul III, Pope, 300, 305
 Paul IV, Pope, 262, 269, 297
 Paul of Burgos, 221
 Paul, the Apostle, 13, 17, 35, 97, 99, 191, 199, 206, 259, 299
 Pavini, G.F., 256, 257, 259–260
 Pere II, King, 174
 Pere III, 170, 176
 Peter IV (King of Aragon), 158
 Peter Abelard, 83
 Peter Auriol, Friar, 81–98
 Peter Cantor, 104
 Peter Damien, 100, 101, 102
 Peter John Olivi, Friar, 28–38, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 113, 114, 296
 Peter Lombard, 24, 49, 83, 85, 90, 149, 155, 156
 Peter Schwartz, OP (Petrus Niger), 130–134
 Peter the Venerable, 104, 155
 Petrus Alfonsi, 222
 Petrus Niger, *see* Peter Schwartz
 Pfefferkorn, Johannes, *see* Johannes Pfefferkorn
 Philip II Augustus, 39, 40
 Pierre d'Ailly, 90
 Pius II, Pope, 242, 245
 Pius V, Pope, 255, 258, 262, 270
 Pius XI, Pope, 302, 303
 Polanco, SJ, 309
 Profiat Duran, 152, 155
 Ramon de Penyafort, OP, 53–54, 106, 256
 Ramon Ermengaud, OP, 161, 172
 Ramon Llull, 54, 68, 74, 105, 110, 111
 Ramon Martí (*Pugio Fidei*), 54, 74, 151, 152, 155, 214, 271

- Revelation, Book of, *see* Apocalypse,
 Book of
 Richard of Saint Victor, 31
 Rigaud, Eudes, *see* Eudes Rigaud
 Ritual murder, accusation of, (at
 Trent 1475), 256, 262, (at Valreas
 1247), 270–271
 Rodriguez, SJ, 307
 Roger Bacon, 105

 Sabbath, 155, 219–222
 Salimbene de Adam, Friar, 41, 42, 51
 Samuel of Granada, 161–173, 182–
 189
 Schwartz, Peter, OP, *see* Peter
 Schwartz
Sentences commentaries, 41, 49,
 82–98
 Shev Tov ben Issac ibn Shaprut,
 152, 153, 155
 Simon of Trent, 123, 130, 226–227,
 232, 235–236, 256–258, 262, 266,
 269, 271, Plate 2

 Sixtus IV, Pope (della Rovere), 245,
 246, 256–271, 295
 Sixtus V, Pope, 257–258, 261–262
 Solomon, 163, 165, 167
 Solomon ibn Adret, Rabbi, 53
 Stephan Bodecker, 132

 Talmud, 33, 44, 123, 125, 179,
 262
 Thomas Aquinas, OP, 85, 88, 96,
 97, 110, 193, 196, 207, 228, 230,
 257, 262
Toledot Yeshu, 152, 214
 Tractate Me'ilah, 220
 Tractate Sanhedrin, 33

 usury, 43, 44, 99–117, 174, 209,
 239–253

 Vicent Ferrer, OP, 177, 181–183, 185,
 189, 229–231, 233, Plates 5–8
 Vital du Four, Friar, 23, 24