

The Roman Inquisition, the Index and the Jews

Studies in European Judaism

Editor

GIUSEPPE VELTRI

University of Halle-Wittenberg
Leopold Zunz Centre for the Study of European Judaism

Advisory Board

Bruno Chiesa (University of Turin)
Rachel Elijor (Hebrew University of Jerusalem)
Alessandro Guetta (INALCO, Paris)
Eleazar Gutwirth (Tel Aviv University)
Moshe Idel (Hebrew University of Jerusalem)
Hanna Liss (Hochschule für Jüdische Studien, Heidelberg)
Paul Mendes-Flohr (Hebrew University of Jerusalem)
Reinier Munk (Universiteit Leiden)
David Ruderman (Pennsylvania University)
Peter Schäfer (Princeton University and Free University of Berlin)
Stefan Schreiner (University of Tübingen)
Jonathan Webber (University of Birmingham)
Israel Yuval (Hebrew University of Jerusalem)
Moshe Zuckermann (Tel Aviv University)

VOLUME 9

The Roman Inquisition, the Index and the Jews

Contexts, Sources and Perspectives

Edited by

Stephan Wendehorst



BRILL
LEIDEN · BOSTON
2004

This book is printed on acid-free paper.



*Leopold Zunz Centre for the
Study of European Judaism
of the Martin Luther
University Halle-Wittenberg*



*Chair for Middle and
Modern Ecclesiastical
History in the Faculty of
Catholic Theology of the
University of Münster*



Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

LC Control Number: 2004058585

ISSN 1568-5004
ISBN 90 04 14312 2

**© Copyright 2004 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill Academic Publishers,
Martinus Nijhoff Publishers and VSP.**

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

PREFACE

For the Simon Dubnow Institute for Jewish History and Culture at the University of Leipzig, the opening in 1998 of the archive of the Congregation of the Doctrine of the Faith, the successor organization of the Roman and Universal Inquisition, constituted a new possibility of inquiry. It was the occasion that spurred collaboration with national and international partners in 2001 and 2002 to undertake sample probes in this archive and to organize a number of informal workshops on the attitude of the Roman Catholic Church, especially the congregations of the Inquisition and the Index, on Jews and Judaism. Participants came from diverse institutions, including the Ben Gurion University in Be'er-Sheva, the Centre for Jewish and Hebrew Studies, Oxford, Columbia University, New York, the Franckesche Stiftungen, Halle, the Jewish Historical Institute, Warsaw, the Leopold Zunz Centre for the Study of European Judaism of the Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg, the University of Haifa, Tel Aviv University, the University of Wisconsin at Madison, the University of Münster and the Simon Dubnow Institute for Jewish History and Culture at the University of Leipzig.

While the findings of the sample probes in the archive of the congregations has already been detailed elsewhere,¹ the present volume also contains the print version of the thematically focused lectures held within the framework of the workshops at the Simon Dubnow Institute. Altogether three workshops were organized in Leipzig, the first on 29 June–1 July 2001, the second on 5–6 July 2002 and the third on 23–24 October 2002.

I am greatly indebted to the Simon Dubnow Institute for Jewish History and Culture at Leipzig University and its director Dan Diner for providing institutional and financial backing for the archival research in Rome and the three workshops which have led to the publi-

¹ Stephan Wendehorst, "L'inquisizione Romana e gli ebrei: nuove prospettive della ricerca", in *Le inquisizioni cristiane e gli ebrei. Tavola rotonda nell'ambito della conferenza annuale della ricerca (Roma 20–21 Dicembre 2001)*, (Atti dei Convegni Lincei, 191), Roma 2003, 51–63, and "The Roman Inquisition, the Index and the Jews. Sources and perspectives for research", in *Jewish History* 17:1 (2003), 55–76 (with contributions by Claus Arnold, Antje Bräcker, Hanna Węgrzynek and John Tedeschi).

cation of this volume. The generosity of the Fritz Thyssen Stiftung für Wissenschaftsförderung which covered the expenses for the entire first workshop as well as travel grants is gratefully acknowledged. Working through the International Quality Network “History of the Jews within the Context of General History and Cultural Sciences”, the German Academic Exchange Service, the Ministry for the Sciences and the Arts of the Free State of Saxony and the Mosse Foundation at the University of Wisconsin at Madison provided the financial support for the second and third meeting. I owe a special debt of gratitude to Giuseppe Veltri, director of the Leopold Zunz Centre for the Study of European Judaism of the Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg for accepting this volume into his series Studies in European Judaism. I should also like to express my thanks to Hans van der Meij and Mattie Kuiper of Brill Academic Publishers for their patience, to Bill Templer for his exacting translations and to Christoph Böwing, Saverio Campanini, Carsten Schapkow, Annette Winkelmann and, in particular, Marianne Seegen-Reeg for their diligence in preparing the manuscript for publication.

Leipzig, Spring 2004

Stephan Wendehorst

CONTENTS

Preface	V
Introduction	IX

I CONTEXTS

The Fruit of Ambivalence. Papal Jewry Policies Over the Centuries <i>Kenneth Stow</i>	3
Cardinal Santoro and the Expurgation of Hebrew Literature <i>Piet W. van Boxel</i>	19
The Censor as a Mediator: Printing, Censorship and the Shaping of Hebrew Literature <i>Amnon Raz-Krakotzkin</i>	35
The Catholic Church and Jewish Books in the Polish- Lithuanian Commonwealth From the Sixteenth to Eighteenth Century <i>Hanna Węgrzynek</i>	59
Inquisition, Theology and the Realism of La Lozana Andaluza <i>Eleazar Gutwirth</i>	71
Tortured Memories. Jacob Rosales alias Imanuel Bocarro Francês: A Life from the Files of the Inquisition <i>Michael Studemund-Halévy and Sandra Neves Silva</i> . . .	107

II SOURCES

The Archive of the Roman Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (ACDF): An Initial Overview of its Holdings and Scholarship to Date <i>Claus Arnold</i>	155
The Series “Stanza Storica” of the Sanctum Officium in the Archive of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith as a Source for the History of the Jews <i>Antje Bräcker</i>	169
Jews and Judaizers in the Dispersed Archives of the Roman Inquisition <i>John Tedeschi</i>	177

III PERSPECTIVES

The Roman Inquisition, the Index and the Jews: New Perspectives for Research <i>Stephan Wendehorst</i>	201
The Politics of Conversion: Jews and Inquisition Law in Nineteenth-Century Italy <i>Ariella Lang</i>	215
The Good Friday Supplication for the Jews and the Roman Curia (1928–1975): A Case Example for Research Prospects for the Twentieth Century <i>Hubert Wolf</i>	235
Index of Names	259
Index of Places	263
Index of Subjects	265
Contributors	267

INTRODUCTION

Stephan Wendehorst
Leipzig

Drawing on ongoing research in the archive of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (ACDF), the successor organization of the Roman and Universal Inquisition, this volume attempts to present new perspectives for research on the encounter between the Roman Church, Jews and Judaism in the modern era and to place them within the context of the extant scholarship on papal policy, censorship and the converso milieu.

The opening to scholars in 1998 of the archive of the Congregation of the Doctrine of the Faith reawakened interest in a broad array of topics, including the attitudes of the Catholic Church, especially the congregations of the Inquisition and Index, regarding Judaism and the Jews. For the Simon Dubnow Institute for Jewish History and Culture at the University of Leipzig, it was the occasion that spurred collaboration with national and international partners in 2001 and 2002 to undertake sample probes in this archive and to organize a number of informal conferences. The present volume is concerned with the relations between the Catholic Church and the Jews and the potential of these archival holdings, now accessible, as a source of new light on this intricate relationship.

The discussion at the workshops of the Dubnow Institute concentrated on three areas: first, select thematic foci in the relation of the Catholic Church to the Jews and Judaism; second, the material relevant for the history of the Jews contained in the archive of the ACDF (Congregation of the Doctrine of the Faith); third, the conceptualization of new perspectives for inquiry.

The gamut of topics dealt with in the papers and the discussion ranged from uniformity and difference in the perception and treatment of the Jews and Judaism by the Catholic Church, censorship of Hebrew literature, conversion, the milieu of the Conversos, the impact of the Reformation and of overseas expansion on the attitude of the Roman Church vis-à-vis the Jews and the social and cultural history of the

Jews in Northern and Central Italy. The presentation of newly discovered source material from the ACDF pertaining to Jewish history proved to be a particular stimulus for the discussion.

One aim of these workshops was to create a forum where topics long the focus of inquiry could be discussed anew and new source material could be presented. Another concern was to critically interrogate the value of the newly discovered sources for historical research and to integrate them into the context of existing research. A third focus was to provide some insight into the first projects based on these now accessible sources and to draft agendas for further research.

In keeping with the thematic foci of the lectures and discussions at the conferences in Leipzig, the papers in the present volume can be divided into three sections: context, sources and perspectives. Part I of this volume starts with contributions on key areas of the encounter between the Roman Church and the Jews, providing background information and an overview over the extant scholarship. Part II moves on to the presentation of archival material from the Congregations of the Roman Inquisition and of the Index inside and outside Rome. Part III concludes with a sketch of promising prospects for further research and provides information on and insight into ongoing projects.

The first section opens with the paper "The Fruit of Ambivalence. Papal Jewry Policies Over the Centuries", in which Kenneth Stow describes the policy of the Popes toward the Jews from the medieval period to modern times. The subsequent five papers deal with two specific sections in the encounter between the Catholic Church and the Jews: the censorship of Hebrew books and the Converso Milieu. Both topics involve key areas in the dynamic interface between the Roman Catholic Church and the Jews in the early modern period. With the spread of printing and the crystallization of the early modern culture of knowledge, efforts for its control also intensified. Particularly characteristic for the early modern period was the milieu of the Marranos and New Christians with its ambivalent vacillating identities, difficult to classify, in part crypto-Jewish, in part strung between Judaism and Catholicism.¹

¹ For critical discussions on this complex milieu, see Miriam Bodian, *Hebrews of the Portuguese Nation: Conversos and Community in Early Modern Amsterdam*, Bloomington, Indiana 1997; Yosef H. Yerushalmi, *From Spanish Court to Italian Ghetto. Isaac Cardoso: A Study in Seventeenth-Century Marranism and Jewish Apologetics*, New York, London 1971; Anita Novinsky, "A Critical Approach to the Historiography of

This milieu was the product of the pressure for religious homogenization that had arisen as a result of the intersecting of the formation of the state and the Catholic Church on the Iberian peninsula. As a result of expulsion and migration, the milieu of the Conversos was also spread beyond the Iberian peninsula, to Italy and the New World, for example.² The topic of censorship is dealt with in the papers “Cardinal Santoro and the Expurgation of Hebrew Literature (1578–1583)” by Piet van Boxel, and “The Catholic Church and Jewish Books in Poland from the Sixteenth to Eighteenth Century” by Hanna Węgrzynek, and in “The Censor as Mediator: Printing, Censorship and the Shaping of Hebrew Literature” by Amnon Raz-Krakotzkin, each working from a different perspective. In his contribution, Piet van Boxel explores Cardinal Giulio Santoro’s involvement in the revision of Hebrew books. Hanna Węgrzynek examines the role of the Catholic Church in the censorship of Hebrew Books in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the early modern period at a time when no Inquisition existed in that polity. She explores the partly competing, partly cooperating actors involved, namely the Crown, local secular powers, university professors, the Catholic hierarchy and the diocesan synods, which had competence when it came to the censorship of Hebrew books. She also attempts to assess the priority which the censorship of Hebrew literature possessed for the Catholic Church in comparison to other literature. And she probes to what extent Jewish culture in Poland-Lithuania, which in the early modern period possessed by far the largest Jewish community, was affected by the censors’ interventions. Amnon Raz-Krakotzkin throws fresh light on the censorship of Hebrew literature by investigating it within the context of the emergence of print culture, highlighting the special role of censors who had converted from Judaism to Catholicism. Similar to the thesis put

Marranos in the Light of New Documents”, in Israel Katz, M. Mitchell Serels (eds.), *Studies on the History of Portuguese Jews from their Expulsion in 1497 through their Dispersion*, New York 2000; Robert Rowland, “New Christian, Marrano, Jew”, in Paolo Bernardini, Norman Fiering (eds.), *The Jews and the Expansion of Europe to the West, 1450 to 1800* (European Expansion and Global Interaction, 2), Oxford 2001, 125–148; and Nathan Wachtel, “Marrano Religiosity in Hispanic America in the Seventeenth Century”, in *ibid.*, 149–171.

² Paolo Bernardini, Norman Fiering (eds.), *The Jews and the Expansion of Europe to the West, 1450 to 1800* (European Expansion and Global Interaction, vol. 2), Oxford 2001; Jonathan Israel, *Diasporas within a Diaspora. Jews, Crypto-Jews and the World Maritime Empires (1540–1740)*, (Brill’s Series in Jewish Studies, vol. 30), Leiden, Boston, Cologne 2002.

forward by Benjamin Ravid that the formal establishment of the ghettos, its repressive quality notwithstanding, amounted to the recognition of a separate Jewish existence, Raz-Krakotzkin asks whether censorship also signified a kind of formal acknowledgement of Judaism. Although the delimitation of the boundaries of Jewish culture was contested and interfered with, a core remained. He argues that this core enjoyed legitimacy not only in the eyes of the Catholic Church, but was also crucial for the further development of an autonomous Jewish space.

The history of the Sephardic Jews and the Conversos has taken on a new importance in more recent research.³ In the present volume, two studies look in particular at the Converso milieu. In “Inquisition, Theology and the Realism of La Lozana Andaluza”, Eleazar Gutwirth explores the lifeworld of Conversas in sixteenth century Rome, a segment of the Converso milieu which arose there after the expulsion of Iberian Jews and New Christians and their emigration to Rome. The thematic focus of the paper by Michael Studemund-Halévy and Sandra Neves da Silva is the Converso Jacobo Rosales alias Imanuel Bocarro Francês, whose life is reconstructed from the files of the Spanish Inquisition.

The contributions of the second section of this volume are concerned with sources from the Inquisition and the Index Congregations that are relevant for the history of the Jews. Following on Claus Arnold’s account of the opening of the Archive of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (ACDF) and the checkered history of its holdings, Antje Bräker and John Tedeschi provide the reader with examples of the wealth of archival material left behind by the Roman Inquisition that is of interest to the student of Jewish history. While the former is concerned with holdings of the Sanctum Officium preserved in the ACDF, the latter deals with the scattered archival holdings outside of Rome. Antje Bräker summarizes part of the research undertaken in the ACDF during the year 2002; her findings animated several discussions at the workshops held at the Dubnow Institute.⁴ Her

³ See, for example, Yosef Katz, *An Alternative Path to Modernity. The Sephardi Diaspora in Western Europe*, Leiden 2000; Jonathan Israel, *Diasporas within a Diaspora. Jews, Crypto-Jews and the World Maritime Empires (1540–1740)* (Brill’s Series in Jewish Studies, vol. 30), Leiden, Boston, Cologne 2002.

⁴ For advance publications of pilot studies based on the archival work of Antje Bräker, Hanna Węgrzynek and Stephan Wendehorst from the relevant archival series in the ACDF, see Stephan Wendehorst, “L’inquisizione Romana e gli ebrei: nuove pro-

contribution presents several sources from the series *Stanza Storica* of the *fondo* Sanctum Officium of the ACDF, throwing fresh light, for example, on the ghettos in the Papal States, or the Roman Inquisition's struggle against magical practices. The latter example raises the question to what extent Jews attracted the Inquisition's attention because of its more general preoccupations, such as the eradication of magic.⁵ In his contribution "Jews and Judaizers in the Dispersed Archives of the Roman Inquisition," John Tedeschi points out the importance of archival sources belonging to the Roman Inquisition which are now housed in Trinity College, Dublin and the General State Archives in Brussels.

Part III of the present volume contains studies that make use of the archival material of the Inquisition and Index Congregations housed in the ACDF in Rome and explore the potential of this and other archives of the Roman Church for gaining new insights into the attitude of the Catholic Church towards the Jews. While the sketch "The Roman Inquisition, the Index and the Jews. New Perspectives for Research" deals primarily with the early modern period, Ariella Lang moves on to the nineteenth century and Hubert Wolf to the twentieth century. In "The Politics of Conversion. Jews and Inquisition Law in Nineteenth-Century Italy", Ariella Lang examines three trials centering on the issue of coercive conversions. In his contribution "The Good Friday Supplication for the Jews and the Roman Curia (1928–1975). A Case Example for Research Prospects for the Twentieth Century", Hubert Wolf provides a concrete example, highlighting the rich potential of the

spettive della ricerca", in *Le inquisizioni cristiane e gli ebrei. Tavola rotonda nell'ambito della conferenza annuale della ricerca (Roma 20–21 Dicembre 2001)*, (Atti dei Convegni Lincei, 191), Roma 2003, 51–63, and idem, "The Roman Inquisition, the Index and the Jews. Sources and perspectives for research", in *Jewish History* 17:1 (2003), 55–76 (with contributions by Claus Arnold, Antje Bräcker, Hanna Węgrzynek and John Tedeschi).

⁵ For a statistical breakdown of the preoccupations of individual Inquisition tribunals, see Jaime Contreras, Gustav Henningsen, "Forty-four Thousand Cases of the Spanish Inquisition (1540–1700): Analysis of a Historical Data Bank", in Gustav Henningsen, John Tedeschi (eds.), *The Inquisition in Early Modern Europe: Studies on Sources and Methods*, Dekalb, Ill., 1986, 100–129, and John Tedeschi, *The Prosecution of Heresy. Collected Studies on the Inquisition in Early Modern Italy* (Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, 78), Binghamton, New York 1991, 89–126; for an account of the interventions of the Roman Inquisition in Jewish matters from 1650 to 1653, see Hanna Węgrzynek, "On the Significance of the *Decreta* Series of the Sanctum Officium for Jewish History", in Stephan Wendehorst, "The Roman Inquisition, the Index and the Jews. Sources and perspectives for research", in *Jewish History* 17:1 (2003), 65–67.

archival material from the 1930s and 1940s that is currently being released.

This volume hopes to provide stimuli in two directions. It seeks to point up the salience of the archival holdings of the Congregations of the Roman and Universal Inquisition and the Index for the history of the relation between the Catholic Church, the Jews and Judaism. While whole libraries have been written on the Spanish and the Portuguese Inquisitions, comparatively little research has been done on the history of the Roman Inquisition. Intensified investigation into the history of this latter Inquisition can shed new light on several questions.

Simultaneously, this volume of essays underscores just how fruitful it is to embed research on the history of the relation of the Roman Inquisition and Index to the Jews and Judaism within comprehensive historical contexts. In order to work out the specific early modern and modern aspects of the encounter between the Roman Church, the Jews and Judaism, it is essential to consider developments such as the rise of a new culture of knowledge as a result of the spread of printing, confessionalization, the process of the formation of political states or the European expansion across the sea. Several of these structural changes bound up with the modern period were integrated into the interpretive frame of the papers in this volume. Others were touched on in discussions in the workshops in Leipzig and still await fuller scholarly description and analysis.

Part I

Contexts

THE FRUIT OF AMBIVALENCE. PAPAL JEWRY POLICIES OVER THE CENTURIES

Kenneth Stow
Haifa

The standard picture of papal Jewish relations up to modern times is dominated by two figures, Gregory the Great and Innocent III. This is a great historiographical paradox. Pope Gregory's letters set a pattern. Over twenty five of them have been preserved, and much of what they say has also been inserted into the canons, whether in Gratian's *Decretum* or in Gregory IX's *Decretals*. Their message is simple: various laws require that Jews be inferior to Christians and highly regulated toward this end; at the same time, Christians (and the Church) are held to respect Jewish rights, including the right freely to practice Judaism; nor may Jews forcibly be converted. This policy represents the papal standard of behavior through the sixteenth century, if not afterward.¹

However, and this is the paradox, Gregory's legacy was not continuous. Its persistence was really thanks to the activity of tenth- and eleventh-century canonists, not the innate staying power of the words of Pope Gregory himself. A search of all the legal and theological materials produced in the 350 years between 603, Gregory's death and a tract composed by Gerhard of Mainz in 938 reveals Gregory's letters on the Jews were not even cited once.² What remained was the ominous tone and implications of the ninth-century Agobard of Lyons: "Since, he said, they [the Jews] dwell among us, we ought not to be malignant toward them, nor should we threaten their lives, safety, or property". Otherwise, Agobard argued for nearly total Jewish Christian segregation.³

¹ The most succinct yet thorough discussion of the medieval popes and the Jews, especially on Gregory the Great, remains Edward Synan, *The Popes and the Jews in the Middle Ages*, New York 1965.

² Amnon Linder, *The Jews in Legal Sources of the Early Middle Ages*, Detroit and Jerusalem 1997, texts, no. 1140 and 1141, 622–631, and esp. text no. 1158, and the article of Friederich Lotter, cited there.

³ Kenneth Stow, *Alienated Minority: The Jews of Medieval Latin Europe*, Cambridge, Mass. 1992 and 1994, 35.

Innocent III is blamed for bringing this segregationalist policy to a head during the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215.

This Council did issue severe laws concerning Jews. It is responsible for the first demand that Jews wear distinguishing clothing. Innocent based his call on the commandment in the Torah that Jews are to wear fringes on their garments (as seen in the modern Tallit, or prayer shawl). What the Torah ordered should still be observed. However, only a few years after the 1215 Council, the demand was converted into the derisive sign Jews were forced to sew on their clothing; enforcement was not continuous, but enforcement there certainly was.⁴ It is because of this order to wear special clothing that the Fourth Lateran Council has acquired so bad a name. Yet the wording of the conciliar edict shows it was intended originally to prevent sexual relations between Christians and Jews, whose prohibition was traditional; Hrabanus Maurus, for instance, had forbidden them in the early ninth century, although we have little direct evidence on how real, or purely theoretical, the problem was.⁵ The infamy of the Jews' unique dress came later, perhaps from the mid-thirteenth century.

More important, the real beginning of laws calling for social separation is ancient. Paul, in I Corinthians, 10:16–22, implied that Christians were to dissociate themselves from the altars of all non-Christians and so avoid “pollution”—of themselves as members of the body of Christ, but also of (what would become) the Eucharist; on Christian purity, Paul was explicit. This concept was incorporated into the Roman law (C.T., 16, 7, 3.) *Christianorum ad aras*.⁶ Consequently, and with Paul's admonition frequently recalled, early medieval councils and church leaders issued canons seeking segregation, prohibiting, for example, Jews and Christians to dine together, as well as forbidding Jews to show themselves in public during Easter week. All social contact was condemned. Agobard of Lyons, in particular, was obsessed about Jews and Christians sharing the same table, lest the Christian thereby be sullied and made “impure”; he had metamorphized and metaphorized any meal into the table of the Eucharist: prohibiting

⁴ Ibid., 246–51; and Solomon Grayzel, *The Church and the Jews in the Middle Ages*, New York 1966, 278, 306–13.

⁵ James Brundage, “Intermarriage Between Christians and Jews in Medieval Canon Law”, in *Jewish History* 3/1 (1988), 31–32.

⁶ Linder, *The Jews in Legal Sources*, texts, e 224, 234, 235, 247, *Christianorum ad aras*.

“anyone who has become impure through fraternizing and dining with Jews from breaking bread with any of our priests”.⁷ Agobard was building on solid precedent. Chrysostom, commenting on I. Cor. 10, had likened Jewish sacrifice to idolatry and warned Christians to stay away, lest the Eucharist be sullied and, more, the unity of Christians in the Eucharist destroyed. Likewise, the Syriac Teaching of the Apostles, roughly contemporary to Chrysostom, said that “whosoever loves the Jews, . . . or the pagans, who worship creatures instead of the Creator, should not enter in amongst them, [and if he has already entered,] he should be separated”.⁸ Contact with Jews was infectious. This kind of thinking was brought to a head in a decree of the Council of Carthage (417/8/9), itself directly related to Corinthians, that “a person observing auguries and incantations must be separated from the Church’s communion (*conventu ecclesiae*); similarly, one who adheres to Jewish superstitions and holidays”. This decree was cited verbatim by the early tenth-century Regino of Prüm, and Regino—this is the central point—was already seeking a balance between this kind of thought and the principles of Gregory the Great.⁹ An important codicil here were the prohibitions, again Agobard took the lead, against Jews having Christian servants (or slaves) in their homes, where the fear of sexuality was acute.¹⁰

Underlying this concern for corruption, almost self-evidently, was a fear of Judaizing. Paul, in Galatians, 4 and 5, had argued that like the son of Hagar, those (Christians) who impugned their faith by practicing circumcision should be expelled. Paul, to be sure, meant either Jewish

⁷ *Alienated Minority*, 33–35; Agobard is best seen through the writings of his deacon Florus, cited in Linder, *Legal Sources*, 604–06.

⁸ This text amplifies the Syriac *Teaching of the Apostles*, cited on *NewAdvent.org*, Number 15. “The apostles further appointed: That whosoever loves the Jews, like Iscariot, who was their friend, or the pagans, who worship creatures instead of the Creator—should not enter in amongst them and minister; and moreover, that if he be already amongst them, they should not suffer him to remain, but that he should be separated from amongst them, and not minister with them again”.

⁹ Linder, *The Jews in Legal Sources*, Council of Carthage, text. 1139, 621, and Regino, texts 1130–39, 618–621.

¹⁰ John Gilchrist, “The Perception of Jews in the Canon Law in the Period of the First Two Crusades”, in *Jewish History*, 3/1 (1988), 9–24, on the history of early canons on the Jews, as well as various texts cited in Linder, *The Jews in Legal Sources*, such as the Council of Agde (506), Benevento, Southern Italy, (c. 900), and in the *Collectio Hispana, Excerpta*, the original about 656, and the excerpts in 700 and again 900; for these texts, see Linder, *The Jews in Legal Sources*, 466–67, 549–51, and 580–82, respectively. See again on Agobard, Linder, *The Jews in Legal Sources*, 604–08.

Christians or Gentile ones. By the Visigothic period, the Judaizers had become, in fact, the Jews themselves. The Visigothic kings, in collaboration with some ecclesiastics and with the reluctant consent of others, demanded that all Jews be baptized. Most apparently were, unwillingly, and quickly reverted to Judaism (as no doubt had other forced converts in this period; the mention in the letters of Gregory the Great of force at the hands of local bishops is not exceptional). The body of Visigothic law generated to halt this reversion also perceived Jews as a *genus*, a virtually racial category, so that the laws specify “baptized Jews”; that is, members of the Jewish stem who had been baptized, not a contradiction in terms.¹¹

From the ninth-century missives of Agobard of Lyons, it is clear that the Visigothic experience was traumatic. Indeed, well beyond Agobard’s day, the Visigothic trauma informed attitudes toward *conversos*, even in the fifteenth century and afterward. It also affected attitudes toward the many Jews who returned to Judaism after the forced baptisms that took place during especially the Crusade in 1096; this is a matter we shall revisit below.

However, in view of this long-standing anxiety about contact with Jews and its effects, we should *not* see the Fourth Lateran’s attempts at social segregation as innovative—except, perhaps, that what had previously been local or regional was made ecumenical, although by 1215, this point may have been academic; Gratian’s *Decretum* (1140) where most restrictive legislation was already found,¹² was known and consulted universally by 1215. Arguably, moreover, one may say the Lateran Council was pursuing an equilibrium between privilege and restriction: separation, distance, but also acceptance of Jews and Judaism—much, therefore, as Gregory the Great had specified. Indeed, in one realm, the council produced outright mitigation, that of lending at interest. Jews, unlike Christians, were permitted to take *non immoderatasve usuras* (X.5, 19, 18, *quanto amplius*); the right to do this was not papally abrogated until 1682.¹³

¹¹ Stow, *Alienated Minority*, 53; and Y.F. Baer, *Die Juden im christlichen Spanien*, Berlin 1936, 404–08; and Maurice Kriegel, “La prise d’une décision: L’expulsion des juifs d’Espagne en 1492”, in *Revue Historique* 260 (1978).

¹² John Gilchrist, “The Perception of Jews in the Canon Law in the Period of the First Two Crusades”, in *Jewish History*, 3/1 (1988), 9–24.

¹³ On lending and the popes, see. Kenneth Stow, “Papal and Royal Attitudes toward Jewish Lending in the Thirteenth Century”, in *AJS Review* 6 (1981), 161–84; also Stow, “The Good of the Church, the Good of the State: The Popes and Jewish Money (in

If anything, therefore, 1215 marks a culmination in the search for a Jewish-Christian equilibrium, of the kind expressed in the *proemia* to all papal bulls concerning Jews. Clauses saying “the Jews are worthy of hatred” were actually preludes to additional clauses saying that “nonetheless Jews should be privileged (*tolerare*)”.¹⁴ Vice versa, bulls saying that the Church accepts Jews were most often introductions to excoriation and restriction. The drive toward this equilibrium had been somewhat interrupted by the forced conversions and relapses following 1096. Still, through the thirteenth century, and in fact through the later sixteenth century, the drive toward balance prevailed.

The fundamental move toward balance, or better put, toward equilibrium, may be espied in the pre-Crusade texts of Burchard of Worms and Ivo of Chartres, who, alongside many restrictions, both cite Gregory the Great and also speak of murdering Jews as “destroying God’s image”. Regino of Prüm—notably in the light of the above citation from Regino promoting segregation—said the same.¹⁵

Alexander II, who (about 1063) made the first unambiguous statement on the legal and political place of Jews in European society (which was eventually incorporated into Gratian’s *Decretum* as the canon *dispar nimirum est*, C.23, q.8, c.11), did not cite Gregory. He said, rather, that Jews were *not* to be treated as enemies, much as the Muslims in Spain should be so treated (the Pope was clearly under Cluniac influence: the ideals of the *Reconquista* and the Just War—in the eleventh century, the wars between Christians and Muslims were only beginning to acquire the sense of a war between the faiths, the same sense that would fuel the imminent Crusades). Jews, Alexander continued, were passive, “everywhere ready to be subservient”, meaning to accept the dictates of the canons that consigned them to inferiority with respect to Christians.¹⁶ The notion that Jews did not consider,

Hebrew)”, in Menahem Ben-Sasson (ed.), *Economics and Religion*, Jerusalem 1994. Approx. 12 pp. Revised English version, *Christianity and Judaism: Studies in Church History*, vol. 29, Oxford 1992, 237–252.

¹⁴ Examples of these statements or variations on them are notably, *Sicut iudaei non*, Grayzel I, no. 5, p. 93, that begins with a negative and goes on to privilege, or *Etsi iudaeos*, Grayzel I, no. 18, 115, which reads the other way.

¹⁵ On these three, see Linder, *The Jews in Legal Sources*, 1130–39, 1145–1162, and 1163–1238, pp. 618–21, 633–37, and 649–70, respectively.

¹⁶ See Kenneth Stow, “Jewish Approaches to the Papacy and the Papal Doctrine of Jewish Protection, 1050–1150”, in *Studies in the History of the Jewish People and the Land of Israel*, 5 (1981), 75–90 (Hebrew); syncopated in Kenneth Stow, “The 1007 Anonymous and Papal Sovereignty: Jewish Perceptions of the Papacy and Papal Policy in

nor were they capable of, harming Christians (*nec sciunt, aut possunt contra Christianos*) was still being repeated by Humbert of Romans, a sometime general of the Dominican Order, in preparation for the 1274 Ecumenical Council of Lyons.¹⁷ This view was reflected in the thinking of Thomas Aquinas, who portrayed Jews as the necessary balance on a scholastic scale. They represented the fruits of bad faith, which were exemplified by the Jews' miserable presence in Christian society.¹⁸ The Jewish presence was thus necessary, and Jews were entitled to justice, but not to judicial equality, certainly in modern terms.

It was this thinking and tradition that motivated the policies of Innocent III, some of whose letters offer privilege and protection, while others effect enormous anger. If Jews forced (already illegal) Christian wet nurses of their children to spill their milk into a latrine following reception of the Eucharist, this insulted Christianity; to Jews, the object was no doubt to prevent the transmission of magically potent substances. Innocent, in his terms, was justly angered.¹⁹ But Jews were also entitled to a papal rescript saying that having asked for protection, they were entitled to receive it (the form of the text is the traditional *tuitio* charter between a ruler and dependent subjects, however in a formulation that apparently remained valid only for Jews). Nobody was to disturb their prayers, nobody was forcibly to baptize their children.²⁰

The decrees of the Fourth Lateran must also be viewed in this two-sided light; and even more the *Decretals* of Gregory IX, which closely followed on this Council's heels in 1234. Indeed, it cannot be overstressed that the edited law of the *Decretals* ultimately outlasts, because of its codified validity, any conciliar decree, not to mention any specific papal letter. Thus, the fundamental letter of protection, known as *Sicut iudaeis non*, achieved permanency (not requiring confirmation in further councils, as sometimes was the practice) by becoming X.5, 6, 9; so too did the conciliar decree on "not immoderate interest" enter the *Decretals* to remain always valid.

the Middle Ages" in *Hebrew Union College Annual Supplements*, no. 4, Cincinnati 1984, 9–20.

¹⁷ Solomon Grayzel, *The Church and the Jews in the Thirteenth Century, Volume II*, edited, arranged, and with additional notes by Kenneth R. Stow, Jewish Theological Seminary New York—Wayne State University Press Detroit 1989, no. 36, 127–30.

¹⁸ Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*. New York 1947, IIa, IIae, QQ, 10–12.

¹⁹ For *Etsi iudaeos*, see note 14, above.

²⁰ For *Sicut iudaeis*, see note 14, above.

Innocent IV, himself a canonist of note, sharpened the definitions of Jewish protection even further. He stated outright that the Jews were entitled to justice. He decried the blood libel at Valreas, and he also said Jews were entitled to hold onto their (rabbinic) literature, since that literature was necessary for them to understand their religion. Yet, when the pope and canonist Sinibaldo Fieschi said these things, he was well aware of a certain ambivalence. For as a canonist, he had written that Jews might be punished directly by the Church should their literature, the same literature he had said they might retain, impugn Christianity or should it pervert the Jews' own beliefs.²¹ This last, the charge of being a *Nova Lex*, was that laid at the feet of the Talmud in the early 1240s; and on these grounds, the Talmud was burned at least twice in Paris in those years. Innocent IV also—indirectly—approved what amounted to forced preaching to the Jews of Aragon.²²

It would be easy to attribute this seeming zigzag in papal policies to pressures applied by the mendicants, the Dominicans in particular, who led the attack on Jewish literature. Yet a much greater force pushing and pulling was the concept of *Caritas*, a term sometimes alternating with notions of *misericordia* toward the Jews, meaning that the very justice on which the world rested applied to Jews too, not only the faithful. One might prefer restriction, but restriction had its limits.²³ This principle of *Caritas* even affected Dominicans like Raymond of Penafort, as well as Humbert of Romans. It was, indeed, the Dominican General Raymond of Penafort, who, in editing the *Decretales* of Gregory IX and, in particular, the decretal of Innocent III that was to be known as the *Constitutio pro iudaeis*, the (above mentioned) bull *Sicut iudaeis non* (the text dates from sometime in the mid-eleventh century, but the version Penafort used was that of Innocent III in 1199), removed an opaque but clearly threatening addendum of Innocent III saying that the protections of this text applied only to those Jews who did not plot against nor threaten their Christian hosts.

²¹ B. Z. Kedar, "Canon Law and the Burning of the Talmud", in *Bulletin of Medieval Canon Law* 9 (1979), 79–82; on the Valreas accusation, see Grayzel, vol. I, nos. 113 and 114, 26–67.

²² On the concept of *nova lex*, see Stow, *The 1007 Anonymous*, 39; Grayzel, vol. I, no. 96, 241, and no. 104, 251–54; and on forced preaching in Aragon, no. 105, 254–56.

²³ See Marquardus de Susannis, *De Iudaeis et Aliis Infidelibus*, Venice 1558, Part I, chapter 2, for this term.

The Jewish right to live in Christian lands, even if one sought to convert them, expurgate their books, and keep a tight lid on their behavior, was beyond question. So much so that a late fifteenth-century Franciscan tried to have Jews expelled on the grounds that they had violated this trust, but he rested his case on Roman law, which offered similar guarantees (and, by implication, threats); the first to raise the question of expulsion in legal terms was the legist Oldradus da Ponte in the fourteenth century, but his consilium had no practical effect.²⁴ His argument, ominously, rested on Galatians 4–5, expelling the son of Hagar.²⁵ The equilibrium was being tested (just as the other, theological, ecclesiastical, and royal equilibria of the thirteenth century were similarly tested everywhere in the fourteenth)

Yet nobody, it seems, would ever frontally oppose the principle of *Caritas* as it was legally codified in *Sicut iudaeis non*.²⁶ Not even Benedict XIII—in 1415, in the bull *Etsi doctoris gentium*, one of the most drastic texts ever issued, who believed the force of law would bring Jews to the baptismal font—violated these doctrines. Nor, for that matter, did the mid-sixteenth century Paul IV, who followed Benedict XIII but added the notion of a ghetto (and in fact, much more).²⁷

The fingerprints, so to speak, of *Sicut iudaeis non* are visible even in matters that verged on disruption. It was on the grounds of *Caritas* that Innocent IV said flatly that justice demands the Jews be allowed the literature that preserves their faith. Similarly, Martin IV in 1281 stated that the inquisition may not deal arbitrarily with Jews. They were not to be charged simply for enjoying *familiaritas* with converts. Only true factors of apostasy (aiding Jews to return to Judaism) made Jews liable to inquisitional intervention.²⁸ Finally, the bull allowing Franciscans to preach to Jews, *Vineam Sorec* (1278) of Nicholas III, had an extraor-

²⁴ Kenneth Stow, "Expulsion Italian Style. The Case of Lucio Ferraris" in *Jewish History* 3:1 (1988), 55–64; Oldradus cited by Norman Zacour, *Jews and Saracens in the Consilia of Oldradus de Ponte*, Toronto 1990, 57 Oldradus de Ponte, *Consilia*, Roma, 1478, Cons. 51, c. 42^{A-B}.

²⁵ Gerson D. Cohen, "Esau as Symbol", in Alexander Altman (ed.), *Jewish Medieval and Renaissance Studies*, Cambridge, Mass. 1967.

²⁶ The bull itself uses the term *ex Christiane pietatis mansuetudine*.

²⁷ Kenneth Stow, *Catholic Thought and Papal Jewry Policy, 1555–1593*, New York 1977, chaps. 1 and 12 on Benedict XIII and *Cum nimis absurdum*. See Marquardus de Susannis, *De Iudaeis et Aliis Infidelibus*, Venezia 1558, I, 7, on di Nievo; and the discussion in Stow, *Catholic Thought and Papal Jewry Policy, 1555–1593*, New York 1977. Uldarici Zasii, *Libellus de Iudaeis, Quaestiones III* (1550), 173.

²⁸ Grayzel, vol. II, no. 45, 148–50.

dinary penalty clause. Jews not appearing for sermons would be reported to the Pope, who would “consider” a remedy.²⁹ No such empty penalty clause exists elsewhere, certainly not in bulls concerning Jews. However, most revealingly, in 1266, Pope Clement IV warned that any actions against the Talmud and its supporters—specifically, Moses ben Nahman—must not “violate[d] those privileges which the Apostolic See has conferred upon the Jews”.³⁰

To upset the norm required true extreme. In the early fourteenth century, John XXII had to resort to charges of Jewish necromancy to expel the Jews, very briefly it turned out, from Avignon.³¹ This charge was repeated in 1569 and 1593, in the Papal States, where the expulsion was definitive, except from Rome and Ancona. Even *Turbato corde*, the bull (1267) allowing inquisitors directly to prosecute Jews is limited, as Martin IV repeated in 1281, to Jews who provoke “apostasy”. For the popes the law of the Church was indeed the law. It was so much the law that in 1354, the Jews of Barcelona told Pedro IV of Aragon that if the king did not turn to the Pope to get a definition of when the inquisition might prosecute Jews, then they would do so themselves. They were most confident in the result, which possibly was the statement of Nicholas Eymerich in his later fourteenth century manual—namely that the inquisition could try Jews as Jews (with no reference to apostasy) only should they deny God.³²

Yet, as stated, something was undermining this balance and its stability. It was not the question of the Talmud in the 1240s. This was a local Parisian affair. And it was moved by the rebellious secular clergy, far more than by the mendicants, as is attested by the mostly secular signatures on the condemnation of 1248. The popes soon realized that the attack on post-Biblical rabbinic law was also a muted attack on their equally post-Biblical law mounted by those at Paris who still wanted to argue the primacy of the *Sacra Pagina*; and the popes seem to have limited their condemnation to questions of blasphemy in the Talmudic text (the rare frontal attacks on the Talmud after this time

²⁹ Grayzel, vol. II, no. 42, 142.

³⁰ Grayzel, vol. II, no. 26, 102.

³¹ Kenneth Stow, “The Avignonese Papacy, or After the Expulsions”, in Jeremy Cohen (ed.), *From Witness to Witchcraft: Jews and Judaism in Medieval Christian Thought*, Wiesbaden 1996, 275–298.

³² Louis Finkelstein, *Jewish Self Government in the Middle Ages*, New York 1964, 130–31, 338; Stow, “Ebrei e inquisitori: 1250–1350”, in Michele Luzatti (ed.), *L'inquisizione e gli ebrei in Italia*, Bari 1994, 6.

were promoted by royalty). Spanish Dominican campaigns against the Talmud also died down in the later thirteenth century. The apparent claim of Ramon Martí that current Judaism was a perversity, heretical unto its (biblical true) self, and a construct of the devil, never took hold; Judaism, of course, could never be a heresy in the sense of being heretical to Christianity, for obviously one cannot be a heretic before one joins the body of believers formally through baptism. So arcane, in any case, was Martí's *Pugio Fidei*, that when Petrus Galatinus plagiarized it wholesale in the early sixteenth century, it was a long time before the truth outed.³³ Finally, even Franciscan preaching, which took on quasi-apocalyptic dimensions in the fifteenth century, and which viewed interest, especially interest taken by Jews, as gangrenous, did not deflect the popes, who supported Jewish lending until 1682.³⁴

Nor was Observantine Franciscan support of blood libels effective. Sixtus IV, himself a Franciscan Conventual, but also General of the entire order, was ultimately angered by the ritual murder libel at Trent in 1475, warning that he could not reverse the chicanery of the trial and execution of the condemned Jews, but that there had better be no repetition of events. This he said, irrespective of other statements about the "filth" that came out of Jewish mouths and warnings against the "Jewish contagion", seducing conversos in Spain to apostatize.³⁵

As indicated earlier, the real movement toward instability began more subtly, in the wake of the Crusades. Jews who had converted, forcibly or not, all slipped back into Judaism. The then anti-Pope Wibert III protested bitterly. What the official Pope Urban II thought we do not know. However, various chroniclers were highly exercised by these events, for they reembodyed the Judaizing, apostasy and betrayal so feared and prominent in early medieval legislation. The anger is concentrated in condemnations of Emicho of Flonheim, whose unauthorized crusading, violence, and possible conversionary activity was blamed for bringing this apostasy about—it also challenged clerical

³³ See Kenneth Stow, "The Burning of the Talmud in 1553 in the Light of Sixteenth Century Catholic Attitudes Toward the Talmud" in *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 34 (1972), 449–50. Raymundus Martinus, *Pugio Fidei adversus Mauros et Judaeos*, Leipzig 1687, 956–57. Also Stow, *The 1007 Anonymous*, 39, 62–63.

³⁴ Kenneth Stow, "Papal Mendicants or Mendicant Popes: Continuity and Change in Papal policies toward the Jews at the end of the Fifteenth Century", in S. McMichael, L. Simon (eds.), *The Friars and the Jews in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*, Leiden 2002.

³⁵ Ibid.

control, first of the crusade itself, but also of sacral functions. Church institutions were likewise still too weak to control the so-called backsliding. From now on, in the heart of the Empire, there was going to be a question of who truly was a Jew, who an apostate and his or her descendant.³⁶

Not accidentally, these fears were paralleled by the growth, in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, of libels of ritual crucifixion, ritual murder, and eventually the host libel, not to mention a highly negative theology of the “irrational” Jew, as bespoken by such as Peter the Venerable and Guibert de Nogent.³⁷ All pointed—just like the Judaizing Paul mentioned in I Corinthians with respect to the Eucharist; and now as did the post-Crusade apostasies—to Jewish assaults on Christian integrity, especially on the mystical and real Corpus Christi. The libels unite in the story of Werner of Oberwesel (as told in 1287, embellished in the fourteenth, and perpetuated by the Bollandists in the seventeenth), who is at once named the *corpus mysticum* and the *corpus verum*, the blood and host libels, in other words, becoming one and interchangeable.³⁸

Even more, Jews were accused of destroying the body of Christ by resort to magic. The ritual murder accusation in the Milagros of the Virgin by the mid-thirteenth century Gonzalo de Berceo has the Jews vicariously destroying Christ by attacking a waxen image. This story is even more ferocious than that of Werner. There the Jews destroy a real body of Christ, who is personified in this single child. In Berceo’s poem, the waxen image is that of Christ, but (with a bit of reshaping) it

³⁶ Kenneth Stow, “Conversion, Apostasy, and Apprehensiveness: Emicho of Flonheim and the Fear of Jews in the Twelfth Century”, in *Speculum* 76 (2001), 911–33.

³⁷ Cited in John F. Benton (eds.), *Self and Society in Medieval France*, New York 1970, 115; Anna Sapir Abulafia, *Christians and Jews in the Twelfth Century Renaissance*, London 1995.

³⁸ Miri Rubin, *Gentile Tales, The Narrative Assault on Late Medieval Jews*, New Haven 1999, 25–26, discusses all this symbolism in detail; and see below the references to Mary Minty, “Kiddush HaShem in Christian Eyes in Medieval Germany” (in Hebrew), in *Zion* 59 (1994), 235–40, who also emphasizes the link between this story and Eucharistic imagery. On the concatenation of imagery concerning the Jews, see Kenneth Stow, *Alienated Minority*, 231–42. The Werner story is found in *ActaSS* April 3:699–700. Werner is called the *corpus mysticum* twice, and the second time, the Bollandists write: *ad martyrizandum corpus ipsum mysticum*, they emptied Werner of blood. Then, when they try to dispose of the corpse, they throw it into the Rhine, but it will not sink; see below on this water motif, on which Yuval, *Two Nations*, also comments, 188–98. Rubin, *Gentile Tales*, 25–26, brings this testimony in the mouth of two witnesses, citing it from a 1981 essay of Andre Vauchez, *La sainteté en occident*, Rome 1981, 107–08.

could also be a surrogate for any Christian; which is to say: through this image, the Jews are destroying—individually, yet collectively as well—every morsel of Christ's body, the bodies of all the individual faithful which unite eucharistically into the one body of Christ (and the Church), just as (again) Paul said in I Corinthians: The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? For we being many are one bread, and one body.³⁹

It is against this background of apprehension that the application to the Jews of Paul's dictum in Galatians 4 about expelling the son of Hagar, exegetically the Jews in Christian teaching, began to make sense, as the jurist Oldradus da Ponte had stated. Real expulsion in punishment for irreparable crimes was permissible. Once again it becomes apparent that what some have called grand vacillations in papal policy in the fourteenth and fifteenth century might really be (as in fact they were) a grappling with the question whether or indeed how were Jews still entitled to the protection of *caritas* or *misericordia*. It was precisely this problem that pushed Sixtus IV to extremes, condemning the "filth" of Jewish expression, yet also condemning the "violence done to justice" at Trient in 1475. Those who accepted ritual murder, blood-libel, and host desecration accusations saw no reason to grapple with the problem at all.

Seventy-five years later, Paul IV, heavily influenced by all that surrounded him, insisted that something radical had to be done. Grappling and balancing no longer worked. He may have been moved by chiliasitic motives, as is clear in a letter he wrote to his sister at the time. He may also have been moved to react to Protestantism, perhaps by the fears of new blood libels in Rome itself, and even more so by reforming documents like the *Libellus ad Leonem Decem* of 1513, which urged unprecedented missionary activity among Jews. However, *Caritas* would stand firm. The Jews would not be expelled. But they

³⁹ Gonzalo de Berceo, *Los milagros de Nuestra Señora*, in Brian Dutton (ed.), London 1971, 140–41, who writes that on the Feast of 15 August (Assumption Day) in Toledo, the Virgin announces to the crowd in the Cathedral that the Jews: (420.) "Otra vez crucifigan al mi caro fijuelo, (426.) Moviéronse los pueblos, toda la clereçía, Fueron a muy grant priessa pora la iudería, Güióslos Ihu Xpo e la Virgo María, ... (427.) Fallaron enna casa del raví más onrrado Un grant cuerpo de çera commo omne formado, Commo don Xpo sóvo, sedié cruçifigado, ..." and 1 Cor. 10:16–17: "The cup of blessing which we bless is it not the communion of the blood of Christ, The bread which we break is it not the communion of the body of Christ? For we *being* many are one bread, *and* one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread".

would live in a ghetto—expelled *into* a ghetto, not *out* of society—and law would persuade them, justly yet *piis verberibus*, through “pious lashes”, in the words of the *Libellus*, which Paul IV so clearly accepted, that the time to realize the vision of St. Paul in Romans 11 had arrived. Concurring, Pius V and Urban VIII thought that it also was necessary to expel the Jews from all other localities of the Papal State. Gregory XIII forced the Jews (quite illegally, as Nicholas III had recognized in 1278) to attend conversionary sermons.⁴⁰

This policy became static. The role of the Roman Inquisition in furthering it, is one that deserves focused consideration. After 1581 in particular, the Roman inquisition, through the bull *Antiqua Judaeorum improbitas*, was entrusted with supervising all legislation enacted to control the Jews. And there is growing evidence that this is precisely what the Inquisition did—or at least set out to do.

Yet, the sixteenth century was not the climax. Papal Jewry policy was to be made still weightier in the mid-eighteenth century. The threat of incipient modernity moved Benedict XIV not only to tighten the already burdensome ghetto restrictions, but also to rage at Polish Jews; they were, he said, “corrupting” Polish bishops by borrowing from the latter, who, themselves, then took a share of the Jewish profits (1751).⁴¹ Yet, Clement XIV, while still Cardinal Ganganeli, had repeated the thirteenth century papal condemnations of the blood libel.⁴² The old limits had not crumbled completely. And so matters continued. Papal policy toward Jews, now focused primarily but not wholly on the Jews of the Papal State, which remained fixed until 1870—some might add fanatically so and in virtual denial of reality, as witnessed by the price, the continuity of the Papal State, that Pius XI *claimed* he had paid for not releasing Edgardo Mortara to his parents in 1858.⁴³ On 20 September 1870, the Roman Ghetto and the Papal State fell simultaneously. Modernity, opposition to which was symbolized by the Mortara episode, and, of course, by the continuation of the Roman Ghetto, van-

⁴⁰ Stow, *Catholic Thought*, 19–20.

⁴¹ Marina Caffiero, “‘Le insidie de’ perfidi Giudei.’ Antiebraismo e riconquista cattolica alla fine del settecento”, in *Rivista Storica Italiana* 105 (1993), 555–81; *ibid.*, “Tra Chiesa e Stato. Gli ebrei in Italia nell’età dei Lumi e della Rivoluzione”, in C. Vivanti (ed.), *Gli ebrei in Italia, Storia d’Italia, Annali* 11, Torino 1996.

⁴² Anon., *Die Paepstlichen Bullen ueber die Blutbeschuldigung*, Muenchen 1900; Petrus S.J. Browe, *Die Judenmission im Mittelalter und die Paepste*, Roma 1942.

⁴³ David I. Kertzer, *The Kidnapping of Edgardo Mortara*, New York 1997, 257, and the references cited there.

quished the Pope (and his State) in the form of the Italian State—in which, to be sure, Jews became equal citizens, some of whom, furthermore, like Count Artom, were instrumental in this state's coming to be. Was this not a laicized Judaizing threat and assault on the purity and integrity of the corpus mysticum, the Church and its papal head? This threat and assault, moreover, were materially realized, bearing out in full the anxieties of the past.

Is this last claim an exaggeration? Perhaps. For only at this moment and shortly afterward, in response to the ritual murder libel at Polna, Deutschbrod, Bohemia in 1899, did Leo XIII make the total break. He refused to republish the letters of his medieval predecessors denouncing this libel (Gregory XVI may have actually preceded Leo at the time of the Damascus affair in 1840).⁴⁴ The old and the new had merged. For contemporaneously, Monsignor Lorenzelli, the papal nuncio in France, was condemning one Abbe' Pichot, a teacher of mathematics and science (in Limoges). Pichot, he said, was “il sacerdote piu' dreyfusardo e piu' giudaizzante che si conosca”. Pichot was also guilty of manifesting a spirit that was both “umanitario [he means lay and secular, and particularly ‘modern’] e dreyfusardo”. Dreyfus, secularism, Judaizing, and ritual murder were all one, embodying together the modernity the Church so feared. Jewish culpability for ritual murder—indeed, for well over one hundred cases, was also being touted in articles which appeared in the Jesuit (and papally overseen) *Civiltà Cattolica*.⁴⁵

Possibly, these articles were propelled by the writings of the seventeenth-century Jesuit Bollandists, who accepted the libels at face value. The simultaneous condemnation of these libels in the writings of such twentieth-century Catholic savants as Felix Vernet and Elphege Vacandard, as well as by other Catholic lay luminaries, and also by Francois Halkin and Hubert Delahaye, themselves Jesuits, and in none other than the *Analecta Bollandiana*, had no effect. Nor had the previous warnings of the great nineteenth-century Catholic theologian Ignaz Döllinger, to the effect the Church and Catholicism were wrongly using anti-Semitism as a foil for their own weaknesses.⁴⁶ The balance that

⁴⁴ Giovanni Miccoli, “Santa Sede, questione ebraica e antisemitismo fra Otto e Novecento”, a book length study found in C. Vivanti (ed.), *Gli ebrei in Italia*, Torino 1996, vol. 2, 1371–1574.

⁴⁵ Miccoli, “Santa Sede”, 1394–1401.

⁴⁶ See Tommaso Calì, “Antisemitismo e culto dei santi in età contemporanea: il caso del beato Lorenzino da Marostica”, in Paolo Golinelli (ed.), *Il pubblico dei santi, forme e livelli di ricezione dei messaggi agiografici*, Rome 2000, 421, 427, 412, in that

had endured for nearly fifteen hundred years, and in a highly tenuous and certainly remolded state during the three hundred years of the ghetto period, had finally been broken. This provides the background to understand suspicions about the intentions of the Church, or even the actions of Pope Pius XII during the years of the Second World War. Did the Church abandon the Jews in the 1930s in favor of a national Concordat with Adolf Hitler in 1933, and during the War, did the Church do enough to save Jews from the Shoah, the Holocaust? Hundreds of individual priests and nuns certainly did, and more, putting their own lives in jeopardy. Whether the hierarchy did the same has been the object of great debate, and the issue remains unsettled.⁴⁷

By contrast, in recent years, John Paul II, as, many feel, changed directions. By placing a prayer in the Western Wall in Jerusalem, perhaps Judaism's one truly holy place, he was declaring that what is sacred to Jews is sacred to God, fully legitimizing Judaism as a way of faith. In doing this and in preaching time and again against anti-Semitism, Pope John Paul has sought to overcome the past. The reactions of Cardinal Ratzinger, specifically to these winds of relativizing in his declaration of 6 August 2000 "Christus Dominus",⁴⁸ raise the question: will the new papal teachings prevail, or those of the past.

order. The support for these libels described by Calìo was repudiated by Elphège Vacandard, "La question du meurtre rituel chez les Juifs", in *Etudes de critique et d'histoire religieuse*, 2nd ed., 3d. series, Paris 1912, 311–77; see also Halkin and Delehaye in the *Analecta Bollandiana* 43 (1925), 211 e 44 (1926), 183; Delahaye was an editor of the *Analecta*; I wish to thank Tommaso Calìo for the references to Halkin and Delehaye. One can also note Petrus Browe, who wrote against the Host Accusation, "Die Hostienschändungen der Juden im Mittelalter", in *Römische Quartalschrift* 34 (1926), 167–97. Finally, there remains the renowned inaugural lecture delivered by the Catholic theologian Ignaz Döllinger in 1881 denouncing, among other things, blood libel, *Die Juden in Europa*, Berlin 1921. The internecine Jesuit dispute makes one wonder whether it should be investigated in terms of the ongoing debate in the 1920s, but begun in the sixteenth century, whether the Order should accept baptized Jews and especially whether it should allow them high office in the Order; on which, see James Carroll, *Constantine's Sword. The Church and The Jews, A History*, New York 2001.

⁴⁷ David Kertzer, *The Popes Against the Jews*, New York 2001.

⁴⁸ Statements attributed to Ratzinger in mid-2001 suggest an attenuation of this stance; www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc20000806_dominus-iesus_en.html.

CARDINAL SANTORO AND THE EXPURGATION OF HEBREW LITERATURE

Piet W. van Boxel
Oxford

Gustavo Sacerdote's article "Deux Index expurgatoires de livres Hébreux", published in 1895, remains an essential contribution to the subject of ecclesiastical censorship and expurgation under Pope Gregory XIII (1572–1585).¹ One of the manuscripts discussed is Neofiti 39, originally held in the library of the *Casa dei catecumeni e neofiti* in Rome, transferred to the Vatican Library in 1891 and recently catalogued as Vat. Lat. 14628. Sacerdote describes the manuscript as follows: "Started in 1578 and completed in 1583 it is the work of seven censors, recording the results of a severe revision of 27 Hebrew books, of which 20 were biblical commentaries. Whenever they found a passage, which they considered to be contrary to the Christian religion, they translated it into Italian or Latin adding a critical note as explanation of its condemnation".² Despite the fact that the collections of passages in Vat. Lat. 14628 do not bear any resemblance to a list of passages to be expurgated from Hebrew books as used by ecclesiastical censors at the end of the sixteenth century,³ Sacerdote claims that the endeavor was meant to produce such an *Index expurgatorius*.⁴ Since these collections of inadmissible passages needed the approval of Robert Bellarmine, the most prominent theologian of the Church in those days, and of the *Magister Sacri Palatii*, the official theological advisor of the Pope, the enterprise may indeed, as Sacerdote states, have enjoyed the warmest support of Gregory XIII.⁵ However, for no apparent reason the Index was never used or even completed.

¹ "Deux Index expurgatoires de livres Hébreux", *Revue des Études Juives* 30, (1895), 257–83.

² "Deux Index", 262.

³ For the characteristics of an *Index expurgatorius* see W. Popper, *The Censorship of Hebrew Books*, New York 1969 (First published in 1899), 81–89.

⁴ See "Deux Index", 269.

⁵ The names of Bellarmine and of the *Magister Sacri Palatii* appear in many of the prefatory headings of the collections in Vat. Lat. 14628, see "Deux Index", 280–283.

Sacerdote's outline of the endeavor under Gregory XIII has been almost unanimously accepted, the only disagreement among scholars being the question as to who was in charge of the undertaking. Sacerdote holds the Congregation of the Index, supervised by Robert Bellarmine and the *Magister Sacri Palatii*, as having final responsibility.⁶ Popper presumes that the operation was initiated by Cardinal Guglielmo Sirleto, who considered the compilation of an *Index Expurgatorius* the solution for the inadequacy with which censorship until then had been executed. But he shares Sacerdote's view that the actual expurgation was carried out by the Congregation of the Index.⁷ Berliner, however, claims that Cardinal Giulio Santoro (di Santa Severina), head of the Inquisition, was in charge of the expurgation of Hebrew books during the pontificate of Gregory XIII.⁸

That there is lack of clarity regarding the authorities responsible for expurgation is not surprising. By transforming the Congregation for the reform of the Index into the *Congregatio Indicis* with the task to arrange for the expurgation of books at the beginning of his pontificate, Gregory XIII had clearly expressed his intentions.⁹ Since, however, the creation of the Index Congregation had not been accompanied by a redefinition and limitation of the powers of the Roman Inquisition, the transformation caused confusion and rivalry right from the beginning. Having composed the first general Index of prohibited books in 1559, the Inquisition claimed authority over censorship and expurgation.¹⁰ The tension between the two Congregations came clearly to the fore when Clement VIII issued a new index on 27 March 1596. Immediately after its publication, Santoro announced on 13 April that

⁶ "Deux Index", 259 f.

⁷ Popper, *Censorship*, 62 f. Recently Fausto Parente, "La Chiesa e il Talmud", Corrado Vivanti (ed.), *Gli ebrei in Italia. Storia d'Italia. Annali 11*, vol. I: Dall'alto Medioevo all'Età dei ghetti, Torino 1996, 521–643, esp. 606.

⁸ A. Berliner, *Censur und Confiscation hebräischer Bücher im Kirchenstaate*, Frankfurt am Main 1891, 6. Recently Godman, who states that the expurgation was co-ordinated by Santoro, while Robert Bellarmine had the task "to assess the *censurae* produced by others, such as Mattia Aquario, professor at the Sapienza, consultant to the Congregation for the Index, and client of Santoro". See P. Godman, *The Saint as Censor. Robert Bellarmine between Inquisition and Index*, Leiden 2000, 59.

⁹ See G. Fragnito, *La bibbia al rogo. La censura ecclesiastica e i volgarizzamenti della scrittura (1471–1605)*, Bologna 1997, 115.

¹⁰ G. Fragnito, "La censura libraria nell'Europa del secolo XVI", in *Convegno Internazionale di Studi Cividale del Friuli 9/10 Novembre 1995* a cura di Ugo Rozzo, Udine 1997, 163–176, spec. 164; Fragnito, *La bibbia*, 122 f. See also Godman, *Saint as Censor*, 28 f.

none of the privileges and responsibilities of the Holy Office had been abrogated or changed by this Index. His main objection was the permission given by the Pope to Church leaders to authorize the reading of the Bible in the vernacular and to decide on new translations. This revoked the regulation included in the Index of 1559, which granted the reading of Bible translations only with permission of the Holy Office. Even after the Tridentine Index had replaced the Index of Paul IV,¹¹ this directive had remained in force. Due to Santoro's claim, the rules of the Index of 1596 were adjusted accordingly and the Index was finally promulgated on 17 May 1596.¹² It was not until 1606 that the ultimate authority of the Congregation of the Index in matters of censorship was established.¹³

Santoro's disapproval of the Index of 1596 should be considered in the light of his continual involvement in the censorship of Bible-related material. However, it is unclear whether he always acted in his capacity of Prefect of the Congregation of the Inquisition. In his *Roma Sancta*, a description of the religious life and the charities of Rome, where he had lived from late 1576 until the summer of 1578, Gregory Martin describes the various Congregations, and attributes to Cardinal Santoro the role of President of the Congregation of Hebrew books, and in particular, the Rabbinic commentaries.¹⁴ This Congregation was apparently not synonymous with the Congregation of the Inquisition, nor with the Congregation of the Index, of which Cardinal Sirleto, according to Martin, was President.¹⁵ Similarly, Mingarelli ascribes Santoro a

¹¹ The first papal Index was produced by order of Pope Paul IV in 1559, followed by the Index of Pius IV in 1564, in which a new category of prohibited books was introduced viz "those which are only provisionally condemned until they have been corrected", see Parente, *La Chiesa e il Talmud*, 598 ff. For the history of the Index, see further F. Zaccaria, *Storia polemica della proibizione de' libri*, Roma 1777; F. H. Reusch, *Der Index der verbotenen Bücher. Ein Beitrag zur Kirchen- und Literaturgeschichte I–II*, Bonn 1883–1885; J. Hilgers, "Indices verbotener Bücher aus dem sechzehnten Jahrhundert", in *Zeitschrift für Bibliothekswesen* 20 (1903) 444–56; A. Rotondò, "Nuovi documenti per la storia dell' 'Indice dei libri proibiti' (1572–1638)", in *Rinascimento*, IIa ser. 3 (1963), 145–211; V. Frajese, "La politica dell' Indice dal Tridentino al Clementino (1571–1596)", in *Archivio italiano per la storia della pietà* 11 (1998), 269–356.

¹² Fragnito, "La censura", 171 f; *La bibbia*, 179 f.

¹³ Fragnito, "La censura", 166 f; *La bibbia*, 124.

¹⁴ "[a]bout Hebrew books, the Rabbines commentaries, the Talmud, the preaching to the Jewes [originally written, but crossed out: and to take order for their conversion], where he is ordinarily present and president", Gregory Martin, *Roma Sancta* (1581), edited from the manuscript by George Bruner Parks, Roma 1969, 258.

¹⁵ *Ibid.* 257.

special role as censor of Hebrew books in his biography of Marco Marino da Brescia, who was called to Rome by Pope Gregory XIII “to correct the impieties of the rabbis regarding Christ and the Christians”. Marco stayed with Cardinal Santoro, who, according to Mingarelli, was in charge of the expurgation of Hebrew books.¹⁶

Apart from the Congregations of the Index and the Inquisition and possibly the Congregation of Hebrew books, the *Magister Sacri Palatii* could claim authority over expurgation and censorship on the basis of a *Motu proprio* of Pius V on 19 November 1570, which put him in charge of the expurgation of books.¹⁷ According to Fragnito, the Magister became a consultor *ex officio* of both the Congregations of the Index and of the Inquisition, and during the pontificate of Gregory XIII served as the channel through which they conveyed their decisions.¹⁸

From Vat. Lat. 14628, it appears that Robert Bellarmine was also involved. Since he became a member of the Index Congregation¹⁹ only in 1587, he is to be considered an outsider who could have acted in the undertaking only on an *ad hoc* basis.

From an examination of Vat. Lat. 14628 combined with other manuscripts in the Vatican Library, the *Archivio Segreto* and the *Archivio del Sant’Uffizio* we can verify which authority and which Congregation were responsible for the undertaking under discussion. Closely bound up with the question as to who was in charge is the reason as to why these collections were made. Were they, as Sacerdote suggests, drafts of an *Index Expurgatorius* or should they, given their unusual character, be looked at in a different way?

¹⁶ *Marci Marini Brixiani ... annotationes literales in Psalmos nova versione ab ipsomet illustratos nunc primum editae opera et studio D. Joannis Aloysii Mingarelli ... qui etiam auctoris vitam et Hebraeorum Cantorum explicationem addidit*, etc. Bologna 1756, XV.

¹⁷ See Fragnito, *La bibbia*, 114. Between 1571 and 1586 the Congregation of the Index, the Congregation of the Inquisition and the *Magister Sacri Palatii* equally claimed to be in charge of expurgation and censorship, see *ibid.* 127. The *Magistri Sacri Palatii* mentioned in Vat. Lat. 14628 are Paulo Constabile and Sisto Fabris. Paulo Constabile (1520–1583) who came from Ferrara, was as Dominican Inquisitor of Milan. In 1573 he was appointed *Magister Sacri Palatii*. In 1580 he was elected General of the Dominican order. Constabile’s successor was Sisto Fabri (1541–1594), who was born in Lucca. Fabri taught theology at the *Sapienza*, the University of Rome, from 1576–1580. After the death of Paulo Constabile he became general of the Dominicans. For Paulo Constabile and Sisto Fabri see further D. A. Mortier, *Histoire des maîtres Généraux de l’Ordre des Frères Prêcheurs* I–VII, Paris 1903–1914, V 509–610.

¹⁸ Fragnito, “La censura”, 167.

¹⁹ See *Archivio del Sant’Uffizio*, Prot. B f 21, 188 and Godman, *Saint as Censor*, 56.

Sirleto and Santoro

Illuminating information about the relationship between the cardinals Guglielmo Sirleto and Giulio Santoro and their respective responsibilities for the expurgation of Hebrew books is preserved in Santoro's diary, in which he usually made preparatory notes for his regular audiences with the Pope. In his diary notes of 27 July 1581, he records a memorandum from Cardinal Sirleto "about the Jews". Clearly in connection with this memorandum, Santoro makes a note of an earlier provision of the Pope that at the meetings of the revisers of Hebrew books a Jew should be in attendance, and that the notes made at those meetings should be reported to the Congregation.²⁰ Congregation in this context certainly signifies the Index Congregation, given its special role in matters of censorship according to the Pope's decision. Santoro then lists a number of issues which Sirleto had requested him to discuss with the Pope: the meetings of the Congregation in the presence of the *Magister Sacri Palatii* together with the Jews, their attempted subordination, their unwillingness to report and their lies, the (slow) pace of the Congregation, the Hebrew books, the costs involved and the efforts put into it.²¹ In other words, the expurgation of Hebrew books according to papal stipulation—namely, in cooperation with the Jews and with the final approval of the Congregation of the Index, including the *Magister Sacri Palatii*—had run up against obstacles. The Jews were not willing to participate and the Congregation was slow in its work. From Santoro's diary notes, it becomes clear that Sirleto as prefect of the Index Congregation was dealing with expurgation. Furthermore, it appears that Santoro, who was prepared to discuss the difficulties Sirleto continuously encountered with the Pope, wanted to participate in these negotiations.

²⁰ "N.S. ordinò che con li primi riveditori de' libri Hebrei, vi intervenisse alcun Giudeo; e quel che poi sarà notato, si riferisca in congregazione", in *Archivio Segreto*, Arm. LXX, t. 18, f. 87.

²¹ "[d]ella congregazione avanti il Magistro Sacro Palazzo, con gli Giudei; delle subornationi tentate; della relatione non fatta e delle bugie da loro esposte; del tempo della congregazione; de' libri Hebrei, e spese fatteci e fatighe tenute", *ibid.*

Index expurgatorius?

The note in Santoro's diary can be read in direct connection with Vat. Lat. 14628, which contains a collection of 17 passages from Kimhi's commentary on Isaiah which according to the prefatory heading were deemed material to be expurgated. The page is a clear illustration of the revision of Hebrew books as discussed by Santoro with the Pope on the request of Sirleto. The heading of this small collection reflects in detail the order of the Pope and the memorandum from Sirleto: "*Censurae* of what needs to be corrected in the commentary of David Kimhi on Isaiah by the Reverend Father frater Sisto Fabri, Master of the Sacred Palace who wrote it down in the Congregation during the past months in the presence of the Jews with the intervention of the deputies of the Neophytes and returned it on 7 September 1581".²² The challenged passages, as noted by the Magister, concur with the usual way Hebrew books were censored by the Church in the second half of the sixteenth century: wherever idolaters, heretics, the enemies of Israel or Rome are mentioned, the passage was to be expurgated. From internal evidence, it appears that the text scrutinized by the *Magister Sacri Palatii* was the third edition of the Bomberg Rabbinic Bible printed in 1546–1548. The Magister ordered that the expurgation had to be carried out "according to the newly printed editions", namely the Rabbinic Bible published by di Gara in 1568. Although the Venetian authorities had banned the 1568 edition almost immediately after it was published, because it did not accord with the regulations of censorship which they had established in 1559,²³ it apparently served as a blueprint for censorship and expurgation in the Pontifical State. Although expurgation was indeed carried out, as attested by one copy which bears the signature of the censor Laurenzio Franguello dated 1579,²⁴ the *Magister Sacri Palatii* refers to the 1568 edition as the

²² "Censura eorum quae visa sunt correctione digna in commentariis R[abbi] David Kimchi in Esaia R[everendi] p[atris] fr[atris] Sixti Fabri magistri sacri palatii qui notavit presentibus Judeis cum interventu Neophytorum deputatorum in congregatione mensibus praeteritis et reddidit die 7 septembris 1581", Vat. Lat. 14628, 250.

²³ Hebrew books could be printed under condition that the texts had been expurgated according to a papal *Index expurgatorius* prepared by Jacopo Giraldino, see Paul F. Grendler, "The destruction of Hebrew books in Venice 1568", in *Culture and Censorship in Late Renaissance Italy and France*, London 1981, XII, 108.

²⁴ The copy is presently held at the library of the Jewish Theological Seminary, New York.

model according to which certain passages from earlier Rabbinic Bibles had to be expurgated. Thus, the collection of 17 passages seems to confirm Sacerdote's suggestion that Vat. Lat. 14628 was meant to be an *Index Expurgatorius* produced under the aegis of the Congregation of the Index and the *Magister Sacri Palatii*.

However, the 17 passages are to be assessed in relation to another collection from Kimhi's commentary on Isaiah which is also part of Vat. Lat. 14628, and which differs considerably not only in size but also in form. While the list of 17 passages provides a brief summary of inadmissible explanations of the biblical text, sometimes explicitly stating that they have to be deleted, the other collection is more elaborate and contains literal translations of passages with marginal comments as to why certain passages are to be rejected. Unlike the list of 17 passages, this collection does not contain any instruction for deletion of passages. Its form is identical to all other collections in Vat. Lat. 14628, which, different as they are from the collection of 17 passages, are apparently not a straightforward draft of an *Index Expurgatorius*.

The connection between the two collections from Kimhi's commentary on Isaiah becomes clear when we compare their prefatory headings. The heading of the larger collection also dated 1581 reads as follows: "*Censurae* to the commentary of Rabbi David Kimhi on Isaiah, revised by the Reverend Father Frater Sisto, Master of the Sacred Palace with the intervention of the deputies of the Neophytes, the Jews having been giving a hearing, 1581 with a short remark (*cum censura brevi*) of what has not yet been corrected".²⁵ Being partly identical with the earlier quoted heading of the 17 passages, the addition "With a short remark (*cum censura brevi*) of what has not yet been corrected" refers to the list of 17 passages, which the *Magister Sacri Palatii* apparently composed while revising the collection of passages from Kimhi's commentary on Isaiah. Only these passages "needed to be corrected in the commentary of David Kimhi on Isaiah". The purpose of the larger collection from Kimhi's commentary on Isaiah and all the other similar collections in Vat. Lat. 14628 can be clarified by examining the methods by which they were composed.

²⁵ "Censurae in commentarios R[abbi] David Kimchi super Esaia. Revisae a R[everendo] p[at]re f[ratre] Sixto magistro sacri palatii cum intervento Neophytorum deputatorum presentibus, et auditis Judeis 1581 cum censura brevi, eorum quae nondum correcta erant", Vat. Lat. 14628, 290.

The procedure

Sacerdote's description of Vat. Lat. 14628 (Neof. 39) as the work of 7 censors—who collected passages mainly from Rabbinic commentaries on Scripture, which they translated into Italian or Latin adding a critical note as to why they were inadmissible—is based upon the headings that accompany the various collections of disputed passages in the manuscript. The complexity of the procedure, however, comes only to light when taking into account two other manuscripts, Vat. Lat. 14629 and Vat. Lat. 14630, formerly catalogued as Neof. 49 and Neof. 50, which I was able to identify as part of the undertaking. The two manuscripts give us an insight into the successive stages that the collections went through before they were given their final shape. Elsewhere I have shown in detail the relationship between the three manuscripts.²⁶ The exact procedure was as follows: in an initial phase, i.e. in Vat. Lat. 14630, inadmissible passages were collected from Rabbinic commentaries. Often more than one collection of passages of a biblical commentary were made, which apart from the usual inadequacy of the selection criteria shows the thoroughness with which the commentaries were scrutinized. The passages of these collections were translated into either Italian or Latin. In a next stage, represented in Vat. Lat. 14629, selections were made from these collections, which were then rendered into correct Latin and provided with censorial remarks. Here too, minute scrutiny of the commentaries took place. More than once, passages taken from other collections were added, as can be demonstrated by comparison of the manuscripts.²⁷ The result was the *exemplar archetypum*, i.e. a Latin translation of rejected passages provided with *censurae*. From such a collection, a final selection—Vat. Lat. 14628—was made, again by assessment of the selected passages and their Latin rendering.²⁸

What illuminates the distinctive character of the undertaking even more are the *censurae*. That they are an integral part of the collections appears from the fact that when in an early phase a *censura* to a particular passage was left out, the omission did not go unnoticed at a later

²⁶ See P.W. van Boxel, *Rabbijnenbijbel en Contrareformatie*, Hilversum 1983, 37–55. (A revised English edition is in preparation).

²⁷ The so-called *Suppleta*, see van Boxel, *Rabbijnenbijbel*, 37–39.

²⁸ See e.g. the Latin translation of Rashi's comment on Hosea 3, 13, which the revisor called an obscure translation *videntur obscure versa hoc loco verba R. Salomonis*, Vat. Lat. 14628, 135^v and 138.

stage, as demonstrated by such comments as *deest censura*²⁹ or *desideratur censura vel explicatio aliqua*.³⁰ The content and phrasing of the *censurae* were major points of discussion before the final text of a collection was approved. These discussions reveal the purpose of the undertaking. Remarks such as “the annotation (i.e. *censura*) seems to me (too) short and obscure”,³¹ “they could be phrased more elegantly and clearer”,³² and “in order to understand the error [i.e. the negation of demons], one has to presuppose the position of this Rabbi regarding the occupation of the angels”³³ indicate that the future user of a collection was to be apprised as to why the passages were inadmissible. Such understanding is by no means required for censorship and expurgation, but fits a context of explanation and discussion. That the collections were meant to be used in discussions with the Jews is explicitly stated in two *censurae*, which were revised “in order to convince the Jews”.³⁴ One remark in particular reveals the climate in which these discussions were to take place. It pertains to the collection from Levi ben Gershom’s biblical commentaries, to which the following remark is added: “They (the *censurae*) should be shorter in order not to make things hard and offensive for them”.³⁵ Thus, the precision with which the collections from Jewish Bible commentaries were composed and the accuracy in explaining why the passages under discussion were inadmissible clearly exceed the requirements for the composition of an *Index Expurgatorius*. The collections were meant to explain and to prove to the Jews their misunderstanding of Scripture.

The censors

The meticulous way in which selection and translation of the disputed passages were carried out and the *censurae* were added was due to the work of highly qualified and competent censors. Sacerdote calls all

²⁹ Vat. Lat. 14628, 138.138^v.159.263.263^v.

³⁰ Vat. Lat. 14628, 111^v.

³¹ Vat. Lat. 14628, 36^v.

³² Vat. Lat. 14628, 447.

³³ This is followed by a short summary of Levi ben Gershom’s view on the role of angels in the world as celestial intelligent beings, whose movements contribute to the perfection of the world, which does not leave any space for demons. See Vat. Lat. 14628, 238^v.

³⁴ Vat. Lat. 14628, 36 and 348.

³⁵ Vat. Lat. 14628, 240. The remark is from the hand of Cardinal Santoro. His role in the undertaking will be discussed later.

seven “anonymous Jewish converts who owed their appointment to their fanaticism rather than to their knowledge of Hebrew”.³⁶ Popper refers in the same terms as Sacerdote to five of the seven.³⁷ Porges mentions seven neophytes, without further comment.³⁸ Hoffmann expresses the opinion that not all of the seven were converts since some of them did not understand Hebrew.³⁹ Recently, Parente presupposes that the majority of the censors were Jewish converts.⁴⁰ None of these authors ascribe to them any knowledge of theology.

Only two of the seven can be identified as converts. One was Giovanni Paulo Eustachio, whose Jewish name was Elia ben Menahem haRoḥé di Nola. According to Bartolucci, he converted under the pontificate of Pius V around 1568. Because of his excellent knowledge of Hebrew and his expertise in transcribing Hebrew manuscripts,⁴¹ Eustachio became *scriptor* of Hebrew books in the Vatican library, a position he held until 1599. From 1576 onwards he taught Hebrew at the *Sapienza*.⁴² He died at the beginning of the seventeenth century.

The second convert was Marco Fabiano Fioghi de Monte Savino. Following a theological dispute with the Capuchin Paolo da Norcia, he embraced Christianity and played a prominent role in the conversion of his former co-religionists. He became the first lecturer in Hebrew at the *Collegio dei neofiti*.⁴³

The other censors were all cradle Christians and qualified theologians. Diego de Ahumada came originally from Cordova and had studied theology for twelve years in Salamanca and Sigüenza. After completing his doctorate he became member of the Congregation of the Index.⁴⁴

³⁶ “Deux Index”, 263.

³⁷ Popper, *Censorship*, 63.

³⁸ See N. Porges, “Der hebräische Index expurgatorius”, in *Festschrift zum 70. Geburtstag A. Berliners*, Frankfurt am Main 1903, 273–295, esp. 278.

³⁹ K. Hoffmann, *Ursprung und Anfangstätigkeit des ersten päpstlichen Missionsinstituts. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der katholischen Juden- und Mohamedanermission im sechzehnten Jahrhundert*, Münster in Westfalen 1923, 137.

⁴⁰ Apart from Marco Marino and Giovanni Paulo Eustachio Parente identified Fabiano Fioghi, see Parente, “La Chiesa e il Talmud”, 606.

⁴¹ See Hoffmann, *Ursprung*, 207, note 47.

⁴² See G. Bartolucci, *Biblioteca magna rabbinica* I–IV, Rome 1675–93, IV 33–35. H. Vogelstein and P. Rieger, *Geschichte der Juden in Rom* I–II, Berlin 1895–96, II 283–284. Hoffmann, *Ursprung*, 207–8.

⁴³ Vogelstein and Rieger, *Geschichte*, II 285.

⁴⁴ “Illustrissimo et Reverendissimo Domino Cardinali Sirleto. Memoriale per Dottore Didaco de Ahumada Cordubensis” (Ottob. Lat. 2452, 10^v). “Illustrissime et Rever-

The Dominican Mattia Aquario studied in Bologna around 1558 and became *Magister in theologia* in 1569. Between 1571 and 1575 he was lecturer in metaphysics in Naples. From 1575 onwards he was regularly in Rome, where in 1582 he was appointed *maestro di teologia* at the *Sapienza*. In 1587 he returned to Naples, dying there in 1591.⁴⁵

Adamantio or Adamo Fiorentino, an Augustinian monk from Florence, was an orientalist with a knowledge of Greek, Arabic, Hebrew and Aramaic. Moreover, he had also studied philosophy, theology, geography and mathematics. He received his *Laurea* in theology from the University of Florence. At the Council of Trent, he was the theologian of the papal delegate cardinal Madruccio. After the Council Pope Gregory XIII called Adamantio to Rome as a reviser and corrector of the Talmud.⁴⁶ He died in 1581 or 1582.

Of Diego Lopez little is known. At the end of one of the collections, which he compiled, he calls himself *Doctor theologus*.⁴⁷ He had been recommended to the cardinals of the Index Congregation,⁴⁸ of which he became a member.⁴⁹

After having supervised the censored Talmud edition, which was published in Basle (1578–1581), Marco Marino da Brescia joined the

endissime domine. Doctor Didacus de Ahumada cordubensis, qui per duodecim annos in sacrae Theologiae studio Salmanticence et postea Segunti versatus, abhinc tribus annis licentiae et doctoratus honorem in dicta Academia recepit, summo studio desiderat in librorum Indicis examine publicae utilitati inservire. Ideoque ab Illustrissima et Reverendissima Dominatione Vostra humillissime petit ut ad id ministerium dignetur illum admittere, qui in suis sacrificiis Deum optimum maximum pro salute Illustrissimae ac Reverendissimae Dominationis Vostrae continuo deprecabitur”, Ottob. Lat. 24452,3.

⁴⁵ See *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani* Vol. III, Roma 1961, 654–656.

⁴⁶ See Giulio Negri, *Istoria degli scrittori Fiorentini, ... con la distinta nota delle lor' opere, cosi' manoscritte, che stampate, e degli scrittori che di loro hanno con lode parlato, o fatta menzione*. Opera postuma, etc. Ferrara, 1722, 2. One of Adamantio's manuscripts listed by Negri is *Glossas et Interpretationes in Talmud Hebraeorum*. For a biographical note see also Christian Gottlieb Jöcher, *Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexicon. Erster Theil A-C*, Leipzig 1750, 79.

⁴⁷ Vat. Lat. 14628, 175^v.

⁴⁸ “Vostre signorie illustrissime si degnino d'ammetterci il dottore Diego Lopez per servire nella congregazione de indice delle cui parti e studii il illustrissimo Alciato et il padre Toledo ressero testimonio”, Vat. Lat. 6416, 31.

⁴⁹ See Vat. Lat. 6207, 93. Imbonatus in *Bibliotheca Latino-Hebraica*. Roma 1694, 35 erroneously identifies him with the Jesuit Didacus Lopez de Mesa, who left in 1572 for Mexico where he died on October 31, 1615, having been resident there, as the records of the Mexican Province of the Jesuits confirm, see F. Zubilage, *Monumenta mexicana I (1570–1580)* (Monumenta historica Societatis Jesu, Vol. 77), Roma 1956, 537 and A. et A. De Baeker, *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus*, Nouvelle edition par C. Somervogel, Paris 1932, IV 1960f.

undertaking in 1580. As already mentioned, he stayed with Cardinal Santoro while “correcting the impieties of the rabbis regarding Christ and the Christians”.

Thus, of the seven censors two were converts and specialists in Hebrew. The other five were well-trained theologians, of whom only two, Mattia Aquario and Diego de Ahumada, needed the help of the Hebrew expert Eustachio, who selected the excerpts from the Rabbinic texts, which he then translated into Italian. Mattia Aquario and Didacus de Ahumada translated the Italian renderings into Latin and added the *censurae*.⁵⁰ The others were apparently perfectly capable of dealing with the Hebrew commentaries themselves.⁵¹ However, the censors did not have the final say in the composition of the collections.

The Congregation of the Index and the Magister Sacri Palatii

In a number of prefatory headings in Vat. Lat. 14628, it is stated that the collections “were presented and read in the Congregation”.⁵² We have already established that this was the Congregation of the Index⁵³ presided over by the *Magister Sacri Palatii*. The headings of Vat. Lat. 14628 clearly define the different responsibilities of the Congregation and the Magister. With the exception of one collection, which was approved by the Congregation and the Magister,⁵⁴ the collections according to the procedures of the Congregation usually needed further revision, which was assigned to the Magister.⁵⁵ The expurgation of some of the (*libri*) *Theatri vitae humanae* may serve as a parallel. In the

⁵⁰ See Sacerdote, “Deux Index”, 281 III and VI, 283 XXIV and XXV.

⁵¹ We have biographical information about Marco Marino da Brescia and Adamantio; as far as Diego Lopez is concerned, we may presuppose that he had knowledge of Hebrew since he made the collections of Ibn Ezra (ibid. 281 II), Jacob Turim (ibid. 282 IX) and Levi ben Gershom (ibid. 282 XII).

⁵² Phrases like: “in congregatione lecti ... et redditi” (ibid. 281 VII), “lecta prius in congregatione ..., deinde exhibita” (ibid. 282 XVII and 283 XXII).

⁵³ The fact that Diego Lopez and Diego de Ahumada were members of the Index Congregation is further confirmation that this Congregation was in charge of the undertaking.

⁵⁴ Ibid. 282 XVIII.

⁵⁵ Some headings do not refer to the congregation and only mention the revision by the *Magister Sacri Palatii*, see ibid. 281 II VI and VII, 282 IX and X. This, however, does not necessarily mean that the congregation was not involved. The headings have for the most part no formal status; they are private and probably incomplete notes indicating the procedure the collections had gone through. The private character of the headings will be discussed later.

Protocols of the Congregation, which are kept in the *Archivio del Sant'Ufficio*,⁵⁶ the decision is recorded that the Magister would put the final touches to the expurgation, which were then to be conveyed to the Cardinal members of the Congregation alone, or to their consultants. They were not to be dealt with any further in the full assembly.⁵⁷ With regard to the first volume, it is even explicitly stated that the Magister could delete or change *censurae* according to his discretion.⁵⁸

Robert Bellarmine

Apart from the *Magistri Sacri Palatii*, Paulo Constabile and Sisto Fabri, one more reviser was involved, in most cases Robert Bellarmine. It was not unusual that the Magisters involved sought the expertise of an outsider. When Montaigne's works were censored, the *Magister Sacri Palatii*, Sixtus Fabri sought advice outside the Congregation because of the incompetence of its members.⁵⁹ Respectable theologians or experts in Hebrew or Jewish tradition as the censors may have been, not one of them possessed like Bellarmine both knowledge of Hebrew and Jewish Bible exegesis⁶⁰ and was erudite in theology. Bellarmine's knowledge of Hebrew and, more important, his acquaintance with

⁵⁶ Since in the Protocols of the first twenty years only meetings were listed, in which decrees were approved, the extant records do not give a full picture of the activities of the Index Congregation from 1571 until 1591. It was only from 1591 onwards that more ample and detailed records have been preserved, see Fragnito, *La bibbia*, 119, note 19. That in the Protocols no reference is found to the meetings under discussion does not imply that the Congregation did not deal with censorship of Hebrew books.

⁵⁷ "Decretum ex lectis censuris in aliquot theatri libros quod Magister sacri palatii incumberet in eandem censuram ut perficeretur cuius in posterum nil in plene congregatione referendum sed vel ad aures Illustrissimorum Cardinalium vel deputatorum ab ipsis", *Archivio del Sant'Ufficio*, Ind. I, 1 f 13 (?), dated 2 Sept. 1583. The "theatri libros" is *Theatrum vitae humanae: omnium fere eorum quae in homine cadere possunt, bonorum atque malorum exempla historica ... in XIX libros digesta* a Conrado Lycosthene ... jampridem inchoatum: nunc vero Theodori Zvingeri ... opera deductum, Basel 1565. For the actual censura of this work see *Archivio del Sant'Ufficio*, Prot. C, f 219 ff.

⁵⁸ "Decretum quod Magister sacri palatii suo iudicio deleteret et immutaret quae sibi videbuntur in censura facta ad primum volumen theatri vitae humanae", *ibid.* Ind. I, 1 f 12'. Godman suggests that when the Magister intervened, he did so as the head of the Inquisition, see Godman, *Saint as Censor*, 2. There is, however, no indication that the Magister intervened here in this capacity.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 45–46.

⁶⁰ For Bellarmine's acquaintance with Hebrew and Jewish exegesis, see my "Robert Bellarmine Christian hebraist and censor", in C. Ligota, J.-L. Quantin (eds.), *The History of Scholarship*, Oxford (forthcoming).

Rabbinic Bible interpretation, combined with his highly regarded theological erudition, was of essential importance for the enterprise of assessing Jewish biblical tradition. Many collections in Vat. Lat. 14628 contain Bellarmine's remarks in his own hand about the choice of passages from the various commentaries, with occasional correction of the translation, and about the marginal notes made by the censors. His notes were apparently given to the censor of the collection under discussion, who had the opportunity to respond to his comments. It was only at this juncture that the *Magister Sacri Palatii* came in. Scarcely contributing to the procedure, his main task consisted in making the final decision when censor and reviser disagreed. Remarks like *optima annotatio, non placet, magis placet annotatio P[atris] Roberti* reflect this involvement of the Magister.⁶¹

Santoro's involvement

According to the headings of Vat. Lat. 14628, the procedure ends here. But the handwriting of these headings reveals Santoro's involvement. After the last revision made by the *Magister Sacri Palatii*, the collections were apparently presented to him. He then added the headings in which he recorded names of censors, reviser and Magister, and the dates when they dealt with a particular collection. The very fact that the collections were handed on to him seems to indicate his authoritative position in the matter. And indeed, Santoro's role was not limited to drawing up a statement of affairs. On occasion, he interfered in the actual process. Vat. Lat. 14628 contains examples in which, like the *Magister Sacri Palatii*, he had the deciding vote in the discussion as to whether a passage should be included in the collection.⁶² His position becomes even more apparent in another manuscript in the Vatican library, Borg. Lat. 149, of which the heading reads as follows:

Errors from the book called *Zohar* on the Pentateuch and from the books entitled *Portae Lucis* and *Portae Iustitiae*⁶³ collected by the Reverend Father Marcus Marinus Canonicus regularis of the Congregation

⁶¹ For Bellarmine's role and that of the Magister, see further van Boxel, *Rabbijnen-bijbel*, 43 f.

⁶² Vat. Lat. 14628, 447.

⁶³ This is a reference to the works *Sha'arei Zedeq* and *Sha'arei Orah* of the thirteenth-century Kabbalist Joseph Gikatilla.

of the Holy Saviour,⁶⁴ who handed them over on 8 (?) June 1580. Father Belarmine saw them and gave them back on 5 October 1580 and handed them over to the Reverend Father the *Magister Sacri Palatii* on the same day. He, however, had the [collection] checked once more by Magister Mattia Aquario,⁶⁵ our theologian, and he gave it back to me [Santoro] on 1 December 1580.⁶⁶ This heading unmistakably shows Santoro's authority, which in this case even surpassed the central role of the *Magister Sacri Palatii*.

The Borgian manuscript is of further interest likewise because it contains two collections from the *Mahzor*, one containing whole passages of the prayerbook accompanied by censorial remarks,⁶⁷ and one consisting of a list of Hebrew words with the exact indication of page and line.⁶⁸ The date the first collection was presented by Magister Adamantius was 9 November 1580, and the revision by Bellarmine was completed on 22 December of that year. If we suppose that the second collection was compiled in the same period, we have an arrangement similar to that of the collections from Kimhi's commentary on Isaiah. The second collection is unmistakably an *Index Expurgatorius*, which may be considered a by-product of the main enterprise.

Thus, it was Cardinal Santoro who was ultimately responsible for the endeavor under Gregory XIII, but not in his capacity as Prefect of the Congregation of the Inquisition, since the undertaking came under the aegis of the Index Congregation, which was presided over by the *Magister Sacri Palatii*.

Did the discussions ever take place?

There is no proof that the collections preserved in Vat. Lat. 14628 were ever used in discussions with the Jews; nor is there any indication how these discussions were supposed to take place. However, Gregory Martin gives a pointer in his *Roma Sancta*. He speaks of the weekly sermons, which the Jews had to attend in the "Church of the Company of

⁶⁴ For the full title of Marco Marino da Brescia, see Parente, "La Chiesa e il Talmud", 604, note 177.

⁶⁵ Mattia Aquario is also mentioned as revisor of the *Sha'arei Teshuvah*, by Jonah ben Abraham Gerondi (died 1263), see Sacerdote, "Deux index", 283 XXV.

⁶⁶ Borg. Lat. 149, 1.

⁶⁷ Borg. Lat. 149, 45–86^v.

⁶⁸ Borg. Lat. 149, 87–94^v.

the Holy Trinity” (Trinità dei Pellegrini on the Piazza dei Pellegrini). According to Martin, the ceremony was always presided over by a cardinal “as it were, by office deputed to be president of this exercise ... and to make reporte to his Holinesse of al thinges”.⁶⁹ In a marginal note, the Cardinal is identified as *Cardinalis Sanctae Severinae*, i.e. Giulio Santoro. In his description of Santoro’s role in censorship and expurgation of Rabbinic (Bible) commentaries and the Talmud, Martin explicitly connects the revision of Hebrew books with these sermons and with the conversion of the Jews.⁷⁰ It is therefore not unlikely that the collections preserved in Vat. Lat. 14628 and Borg. Lat. 149 were composed as resources for those who had to deliver the sermons.

Santoro’s involvement in the revision of Hebrew books is apparently not a sign of friction between the Congregation of the Index,⁷¹ of which Sirleto was the president, and the Holy Office that was presided over by Santoro, but a task assigned to him as “President of the Congregation of Hebrew books”. Collections of inadmissible passages were collected by censors, approved by the Index Congregation, usually revised by Robert Bellarmine, ratified by the *Magister Sacri Palatii* and finally presented to Giulio Santoro, supervising the revision of Hebrew books and presiding over the weekly sermons aiming at the conversion of the Jews. It is in this capacity that he, briefed by the Prefect of the Congregation of the Index, Guglielmo Sirleto, discussed the process of the revision with the Pope.

⁶⁹ Gregory Martin, *Roma Sancta*, 77.

⁷⁰ See note 14.

⁷¹ Fragnito refers to a positive and intimate co-operation between Sirleto and the Holy Office, “La censura”, 174.

THE CENSOR AS A MEDIATOR: PRINTING, CENSORSHIP AND THE SHAPING OF HEBREW LITERATURE

Amnon Raz-Krakotzkin
Be'er-Sheva

The discussion on early modern censorship has significantly expanded in recent decades, and has become a fundamental element in the discussion of early modern culture. Following Paul Grendler and Antonio Rotondò's pioneering studies, many other scholars have contributed new dimensions to this issue, before and after the opening of the Archive of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (ACDF).¹ These studies point up the complexity of the process, and its important role in the formation of cultural boundaries and the advancement of new modes of control. This discussion can also be viewed as part of the revision in the historiography concentrated on early modern Catholicism, and, in particular, of new approaches to the study of the Roman Inquisition, its historical role, and its attitude towards different bodies of knowledge. The control of knowledge is one aspect that challenges the image of the Catholic Church as a monolithic body opposed to any form of knowledge.² It reveals the internal debate, the objection to a severe policy of prohibition, and also the role of censorship in establishing modern patterns of control. Within another dimension, the discussion of ecclesiastical censorship was also integrated into the continuous discussion on the "print revolution" and the study of the various agents associated with the transition to print. From this point of view, censors were examined vis-à-vis other agents who participated in the production of literacy through the transition to print.

¹ See the introduction of this volume.

² For a discussion see William V. Hudon, "Religion and Society in Early Modern Italy—Old Questions New Insights", in *American Historical Review* 101/3 (1996), 783–804; John W. O'Malley, *Trent and All That: Renaming Catholicism in the Early Modern Era*, Cambridge, Mass., London 2000. For a discussion on the attitude of the Church towards scientific knowledge see Rivka Feldhay, "Recent Narratives on Galileo in Context, or The Three Dogmas of the Counter-Reformation", in Jürgen Renn (ed.), *Galileo in Context*, Cambridge 2001, 219–238.

The study of ecclesiastical control over Hebrew literature may contribute another dimension and perspective to this discussion. The control over Hebrew literature is an exceptional case because of two factors: first, in that case censorship was explicitly associated with the other measures instituted against the Jews of that period: their frequent expulsions, ghettoization and economic restrictions, and the efforts to bring about their conversion. Another unique feature lies in the origins of this discussion in medieval Christian polemics against the Jews and their literature.

In spite of these unique factors, however, we may speak of the censorship of Hebrew literature only within the general framework of censorship established by the Catholic Church in this period. Censorship of Hebrew books was institutionalized as part of the general process, and according to principles similar to those that directed the establishment of surveillance. It developed in the same stages, by the same institutions (the Congregation of the Inquisition and the Congregation of the Index) and according to similar principles.³

Therefore, the Hebrew canon is a case study that provides us with the opportunity to reveal the dialectics of censorship as we can examine it on two different levels and in terms of two different discourses: the

³ For surveys see Abraham Berliner, *Censur und Confiscation hebräischer Bücher im Kirchenstaate: auf Grund der Inquisitions-Akten in der Vaticana und Vallicellana*, Frankfurt a.M. 1891; William Popper, *The Censorship of Hebrew Books*, New York 1899; Gustavo Sacerdote, "Deux Index Expurgatoires de Livres hébreux", in *REJ* 30 (1896), 257–283; Nathan Porges, "Censorship of Hebrew Books", in *The Jewish Encyclopedia* vol. 3, 642–650; Isaiah Sonne, "Expurgation of Hebrew Books", in *Bulletin of the New York Public Library* 46 (1942), 975–1014; Kenneth Stow, "The Burning of the Talmud in 1553 in the Light of Sixteenth Century Catholic Attitudes toward the Talmud", in *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 34 (1972), 435–59; Paul Grendler, "The Destruction of Hebrew Books in Venice 1568", in *PAAJR* 45 (1978), 103–130; Fausto Parente, "La Chiesa e il Talmud", in *Storia d'Italia*, Annali 11, Gli ebrei in Italia, Torino 1996, 521–643; P.C. Ioly Zorattini, "Censura e controllo della stampa ebraica a Venezia nel cinquecento", in Giuliano Tamani, Angelo Vivian (eds.), *Manoscritti, frammenti e libri ebraici nell'Italia dei secoli XV–XVI*, Giuliano Tamani, Angelo Vivian (eds.), Rome 1991; Marvin J. Heller, *Printing the Talmud: A History of the Earliest Printed Editions of the Talmud*, New York 1992; Mauro Perani, "Confisca e censura dei libri ebraici a Modena fra cinque e seicento", in Michele Luzzati (ed.), *L'inquisizione agli ebrei in Italia*, Roma, Bari 1994, 287–320; Fausto Parente, "The Index, the Holy Office, the Condemnation of the Talmud and the Publication of Clement VIII's Index", in Gigliola Fragnito (ed.), *Church, Censorship and Culture in Early Modern Italy*, translated by Adrian Belton, Cambridge 2000, 163–193; on censorship in Germany, see Stephen G. Burnett, "Hebrew Censorship in Hanau: A Mirror of Jewish-Christian Coexistence in Seventeenth Century Germany", in Raymond B. Waddington, Arthur H. Williamson (eds.), *The Expulsion of the Jews: 1492 and After*, New York 1994, 199–222.

terminology associated with print production, and that associated with Jewish-Christian theological polemics. Consequently, we can describe the participants in the process according to their religious identity (Christians, converts and Jews) as well as according to their professional activity in the printing process (printers, editors, censors). In this essay, I suggest viewing the convert censor as a mediator between different groups and as a participant in the transformation of Jewish literature into print and the transition of Jewish culture towards modernity. Censorship participated in the transition of Jewish discourse from polemics to a definition based on autonomous terms.

Furthermore, rather than being a measure directed against the Jews alone, censorship was initiated precisely because Christians were reading Jewish literature. Thus, it should be examined in the framework of the rise of Christian Hebraism in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries—that is, the growing interest of Christian scholars in parts of Jewish literature, and its role regarded as an essential for the understanding of the Scriptures and for the confirmation of the Christian faith.⁴ Although censorship should be seen also as part of the missionary efforts of the period, the primary aim of the Church in exercising censorship was to guard against the penetration of heresy and to prevent heretical readings. In its effect, censorship should be viewed as a means of incorporating Jewish literature into Christian discourse and into the category of permitted knowledge. The control over Hebrew printing, exercised through the application of the same categories that were employed in the examination of other literary corpora, provided a basis for the integration of Hebrew literature into the Christian corpus.

⁴ The literature on Hebraism is steadily expanding and moving in new directions. See recently Allison Coudert, Jeffrey Shoulson (eds.), *Hebraica Veritas?* See also Frank Rosenthal, "The Rise of Christian Hebraism in the Sixteenth Century", in *Historia Judaica* 7, 167–191; Jerome Friedman, *The Most Ancient Testimony*, Athens Ohio 1983; Stephen Burnett, *From Christian Hebraism to Jewish Studies: Johannes Buxtorf (1564–1629) and Hebrew Learning in the Seventeenth Century*, Leiden, New York, Köln 1996; Aaron Katchen, *Christian Hebraists and Dutch Rabbis: Seventeenth Century Apologetics and the Study of Maimonides' Mishneh Torah*, Cambridge, Mass. 1984. On Christian interest in the kabbalah, see François Secret, *Les kabbalistes chrétiens de la Renaissance*, Paris 1964; Chaim Wirszubski, *Pico della Mirandola's Encounter with Jewish Mysticism*, Cambridge, Mass. 1989; Frances Yates, *Giordano Bruno and the Hermetic Tradition*, Chicago, London 1964; Bernard McGinn, "Cabalists and Christians: Reflections on Cabala in Medieval and Renaissance Thought", in Richard Popkin, Gordon Weiner (eds.), *Jewish Christians and Christian Jews From the Renaissance to the Enlightenment*, Dordrecht 1994, 11–34; Joseph Dan (ed.), *The Christian Kabbalah: Jewish Mystical Books and Their Christian Interpreters*, Cambridge, Mass. 1997.

The first detailed discussion devoted by the Church to the question of the surveillance of print took place at the Fifth Lateran Council and did not mention Hebrew literature at all. However, in the decree “Inter solitudines” promulgated after the Council by Leo X in 1516, the Pope explained that the need for control was occasioned, among other reasons, because “in different parts of the world, books, some *translated* into Latin from Hebrew, Greek Arabic and Aramaic, as well as books written in Latin and vernacular languages, contain errors opposed to the faith ...”⁵ In other words, at first Hebrew literature, as well as literature in Arabic and other languages, was considered dangerous only when it became accessible to Christians. It was not until the 1550s, when methods and principles similar to those applied to translations from the Hebrew were applied to Hebrew literature itself. Various instructions demonstrate that Hebrew literature was forbidden to Christians and Jews alike. Yet also after the institution of a mechanism of surveillance over Hebrew literature, translations of Hebrew literature were forbidden in certain cases, while the Hebrew original was permitted, as was notably the case with prayer books and works of Biblical exegesis. The prohibition against reading Hebrew literature also applied to areas in which no Jews lived, such as in the Iberian Peninsula. Although we may relate this to the struggle against the *conversos*, from the point of view of the Roman Catholic Church in that period, the problem posed by the *conversos* was different, as the latter had accepted Christianity and become part of Christian society. This was a reflection of the ambivalent attitude of the Church towards converts, and the anxiety that they might spread heresy within the Christian world.⁶

⁵ “in diversis mundi partibus, libros tam Graecae, Hebraicae, Arabicae et Chaldaee linguarum in latinum tranlatos, quam alios, latino ac vulgari sermone editos, errores in fide, ac pernicioso dogmata etiam religioni Christianae contraria ... continentes”, Mansi, *Sacrorum conciliorum ...*, Paris 1907–1927, vol. 32, col. 912–13.

⁶ The Spanish Index of 1583 prohibited Muslim and Jewish literature opposed to Christianity, and rabbinic literature in particular (Reusch, *Die Indices Librorum Prohibitorum des sechszehnten Jahrhunderts*, Tübingen 1886. (Stuttgart Literarische Verein Bibliothek, vol. 176), 362. The Index also prohibited all books in Hebrew or in other languages dealing with Jewish rituals. Index Lisbon of 1581 explicitly prohibited the use of the Biblical commentaries of Rashi, Radak and the “Jerusalemite rabbis”, both in Hebrew and in their Latin translations, as well as The “Zohar Bereshit”. Reusch, *Die Indices*, 354. Similarly, the Latin translation of the Targum of Onkelos was also prohibited. The same holds true for the Index of Antwerp, published in 1571, which called for censorship of all Hebrew books, as well as books in other languages containing references to Jewish texts. Reusch, *Die Indices*, 320–28; Popper, *Censorship*, 55. On

Emphasizing the Hebraist framework of censorship neither excludes nor undermines the implications connected with the policy directed specifically towards the Jews, the main consumers of these books. However, it enables us to see the way censorship was integrated into the preparation of Jewish literature for printing. Censorship demonstrated the ambivalence inherent in the Hebraist discourse: the Hebraists created a cultural space in which Jews and Christians worked together on the basis of common principles and common cultural values. Hebraism contributed towards the redefinition of Jewish autonomy as part of the new definition of political and cultural space, and Hebraists often defended the Jews and their rights. Yet early modern Hebraism, in the Catholic as well as in the Protestant world, was fundamentally ambivalent in its attitude towards the Jews, and engendered contradictory images of Jews and Judaism. In fact, in many cases, it was associated with their exclusion and marginalization. The recognition of the value of Jewish literature also strengthened missionary tendencies, and was associated with anti-Jewish sentiments.⁷ The practice of censorship is bound up with all these aspects and demonstrates the interrelations between them. Hebraism is a discursive framework in which the transition of Jewish identity was made.

Within this process, there was a distinction made between the Talmud and the rest of Hebrew literature. Since the middle of the sixteenth century, the printing of the Talmud and its use were prohibited. In fact, the founding event of the surveillance over Hebrew literature was the public burning of the Talmud in several Italian cities.⁸ The Talmud was

censorship and the various indices in Portugal, see Bujanda, *ILI*, vol. IV. On the Index of 1581: Bujanda, *ILI*, 109–124, 427–552.

⁷ On the ambivalence embedded in the Hebraist discourse: Heiko A. Oberman, *The Roots of Anti-Semitism in the Age of the Renaissance and the Reformation*, translated by James I. Porter, Philadelphia 1984; idem, Andrew C. Fix, Susan C. Karant-Nunn (eds.), “Discovery of Hebrew and Discrimination against the Jews: The *Veritas Hebraica* as Double Edged Sword in Renaissance and Reformation”, in *Germania illustrata: Essays on Early Modern Germany presented to Gerald Strauss*, (Sixteenth century essays & studies, v. 18), Kirksville 1992, 19–34; Allison P. Coudert, “Seventeenth Century Christian Hebraists: Philosemites or Antisemites?”, in A. P. Coudret, S. Hutton, R. Popkin, G. M. Weiner (eds.), *Judaean-Christian Intellectual Culture in the Seventeenth Century*, Dordrecht 1999, 43–69.

⁸ For the text of this order and the report of the Inquisition on its execution, see Moritz Stern, *Urkundliche Beiträge über die Stellung der Päpste der den Juden*, Kiel 1893, 98–102. The order was reprinted in Simonsohn, *Apostolic See*, VI, doc. 3165, 2887–2890. On the burnings in Italian cities, see Popper, *Censorship*, 32–7; Stow, “The Burning of the Talmud”; idem, *Catholic Thoughts and Papal Jewry Policy, 1555–1593*,

also included, alongside hundreds of other books and writers, in the Index issued in 1559. The Talmud remained forbidden later as well. Indeed, in the Index of Trent issued in 1564, the printing of the Talmud was conditionally permitted “if (the composition) appears without its title ‘Talmud’, and without the attacks and injuries directed against Christianity, it will be tolerated”.⁹ However, this conditional permission did not lead to the republication of the Talmud. Several attempts to come to an agreement about printing an expurgated edition failed. The Talmud was again unconditionally condemned in the Index issued by Clement VIII in 1596.¹⁰

This prohibition had of course restricted and harmed the possibilities of study and reading for Italian Jews. Yet it is evident that it did not prevent the elites of Italian Jewry from becoming familiar with the Talmud. For this prohibition also included an explicit permission to possess most other Jewish books, including literature based on the Talmud. Hence a legitimacy was granted to many aspects of Jewish communal and intellectual autonomy. The application of censorship to Hebrew literature was an act of recognition of its legitimacy. The bull promulgated by Pope Julius III on 29 May 1554, which prohibited the possession and reading of the Talmud, also marked the application of the procedure of expurgation to the remainder of Hebrew books. This did not mean an intensification of repression, but rather an attempt at finding procedures that would enable most other works to be printed. In the following decades, we can observe the gradual development of a pattern of pre-publication censorship as well as supervision of Hebrew manuscripts and printed books. Following the order to ban the Talmud, the pre-publication censorship of Hebrew literature was first implemented at the Conti press in Cremona, which had been established in 1556. Later it was implemented in other printing houses. Following the establishment of the Congregation of the Index several commissions were appointed during the 1570s in order to determine the rules of censorship for Hebrew literature, including the possibility of reprinting an expurgated edition of the Talmud.

New York 1977; Benayahu, *Haskama ve-Reshut*, 27–30; Marvin Heller, *Printing the Talmud*, 227–240; Yaari, *The Burning of the Talmud in Italy* (Hebrew); Parente, “Chiesa”, 583–598, and the detailed bibliography on burnings in various cities mentioned there.

⁹ *Thalmud Hebraeorum, ejusque glossae, annotationes, interpretationes et expositiones omnes, si tamen prodierint sine nomine Thalmud et sine injuriis et calumniis in religionem christianam tolerabuntur* (Reusch, *Die Indices*, 279; Bujanda, *ILI*, VIII, 691). Emphases not in original.

¹⁰ Parente, *The Condemnation of the Talmud*, 169.

Parallel to this, a network of censors, composed almost entirely of converts, began to emerge as part of a mechanism of censorship designed to examine other literary corpora. It was not until the 1590s, within the framework of the publication of the new Index and the institutionalization of censorship under Clement VIII that a relatively coherent network of censors developed. The most important and influential censor active during this period (until his death in 1621) was Domenico Gerosolimitano, whose imprimatur can be found on numerous copies of manuscripts and printed books he checked, and who, according to his own testimony, had expurgated thousands of books.¹¹ Gerosolimitano was called Shmuel Vivas prior to his conversion. According to his own account he had been born in Jerusalem and studied in a yeshiva in Safed, the center of Jewish revival at the period, where he acquired a Talmudic and Kabbalistic education. Later in life, he apparently moved to Istanbul, where he dwelt at the court of the Ottoman emperor and studied medicine and other sciences. In the 1590s, he moved to Italy, and in 1593 changed his religion and along with it, his profession. Until his death in 1621, he was active as a censor, checking books in Mantua, and later in Monferrato, Milan and eventually Rome, where he also served as a Hebrew teacher in the Collegio dei Neofiti.¹² Thus, Gerosolimitano was a man whose biography encompassed most of the fields of knowledge of the period, and who certainly merits an independent study. He helped train a large group of censors and fixed their working rules. Several other prominent converts worked along with him—in the early stages, Franguello and Eustachio, and at a later stage—Camillo Yagel and Renato da Modena, one of the most promi-

¹¹ Porges, "Der hebraeische Index expurgatorius", 258; idem, "Censorship of Hebrew Books"; Sacerdote, "Codici ebraici". Earlier censors were Jacobo Geraldino and Andrea del Monte in the 50s, and Laurentius Franguelis and Eustachio in the 70s, following the establishment of the Congregation of the Index.

¹² He may have served, for a certain time period, as a censor in Venice as well. See Pier Cesare Ioly Zorattini, "Domenico Gerosolimitano a Venezia", in *Sefarad* 58 (1998), 107–115; A. M. Rabello, "Domenico Gerosolimitano", in *Encyclopedia Judaica* (197) vol. 6, col. 158. Domenico wrote a biography, parts of which were published by G. Sacerdote, "I Codici Ebraici della Pia casa dei neofiti in Roma", in *Atti della R. Accad. dei lincei*, ser. 4, 10, 188; Ignazio Guidi, "Domenico Gerosolimitano", in *Festschrift A. Berliner*, Frankfurt 1903, 176–179. Aside from the sections published by Sacerdote, Guidi added further details based on a document found in the archive of Santa Croce by Tomasetti, which he published. This passage demonstrates that Domenico converted to Christianity in 1593, as it was written shortly before his death in 1621, and he states there that he had been a Christian for 27 years. As the biography in Vatican Neofiti 32 published by Sacerdote states that he converted at age 40, he must have been born around 1553.

ment censors of the seventeenth century.¹³ The expurgation of works which had already been printed or manuscripts which were in the possession of individuals—was strictly a phenomenon of the transition period. This kind of censorship is particularly visible in the form of the black spots that “decorate” many copies of surviving books. Its main historical significance was, however, that this practice determined and disseminated the rules according to which later editions of the composition were edited.

In this period the activity of the censors was unsystematic and far from consistent. We may definitely state that a not insubstantial percentage of Hebrew books extant at that period was not affected by Church censorship; this demonstrates that such censorship consisted of a series of individual projects, carried out in various towns and territories. Censorship projects did not always originate in the Church establishment, but were also undertaken on the initiative of secular rulers who sought to establish their authority through independent action designed to implement the principles determined by the Pope.¹⁴ In this respect, the case of Hebrew literature was no different from that of European literature in general during that time.

The Hebraist context was at the core of the production of Hebrew print in this period. Most of the Hebrew publishing houses operating in Italy in the sixteenth century, the main transition stage of Jewish literature into print, were owned by Christians who were clearly motivated

¹³ The list of the various censors and a partial itemization of the towns in which they were active in their later years may be found in the appendix of Popper, *Censorship*, 131–144. Popper (*Censorship*, 95–99) names approximately sixty converts active in censorship work in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Some of the imprimaturs are in Hebrew and some in Latin or Italian. Their text is usually the same as that found in other books. See Beneyahu, *Haskama ve-Reshut*, 155 ff. Although many new details have come to light since then, the solid foundation provided by Popper enables us to trace the activities of censorship, while illustrating the provisional nature of the project.

¹⁴ Thus, in 1595, the Bishop of Mantua established a commission composed of three converts, headed by Gerosolimitano, and including Alessandro Scipione and Laurentius Franguello. The task of the Commission was to review the already published books and censor them. The censors erased certain words or replaced them with others, and sometimes tore out entire pages before returning the books to their owners. Their work continued for several years and included tens of thousands of copies. The commission later moved to Modena, at the invitation of the Duke, and subsequently to other places as well. Baruchson, “Sfarim ve-Korim”, 37–45, 37–45; Simonsohn, “Sfarim ve-Sifriot”; idem, *Mantua*, vol. 2, 504–7. The document on the establishment of the commission is cited by Stern, *HB.*, 165–6, doc 158. Popper, 68–77, 93. Domenico reported that he had checked twenty thousand books. While some dispute the accuracy of these numbers, the differences are inconsequential. On the activity of Scipione, see Simonsohn, *Mantua*, 688–692.

by Hebraist sentiments. The central role of Christians in the publication of Hebrew books, as publishers, printers and editors, opens up a new dimension in regard to the question of censorship. The Hebrew publishing house was an exciting place for meeting and concourse among people of different cultural and religious identities: Christian Hebraists, Jewish scholars and converts. The process of editing and publication took place within an atmosphere animated by dialogue and dispute among them. This was the framework in which Hebrew literature as we know it down to today was essentially shaped.

The converts who were employed as editors in the print shops continued to deal with the same corpus of literature that served as the basis of their previous identity. Text editing was, for them, a means of building the bridge between their past and present religious identities. However, their intention was to preserve the text, to create a common text for both Jewish and Christian readers. Converts involved in print worked in accordance with the humanistic principles of editing that were common to all involved in this activity, and shared the same conventions as Jewish editors.¹⁵

The fact that most of the censors were also converts illustrates the complexity and ambiguity of the distinction between the terms “editor” and “censor”. Like the editors, those converts who were appointed as censors by the Inquisition also continued to deal with the same literary corpus they had studied prior to their conversion. Thus, the starting point for many of the censors and editors was similar; they emended the text with the intention of rendering it acceptable, to their new religious affiliation. This is especially marked in cases in which converts worked at the same time both in censorship and in editing.¹⁶ The cen-

¹⁵ On the involvement of Jews in the discussion of censorship see Sonne, “Expurgation”. On the role of converts in Bomberg’s print shop, see H. Yelon, “Cornelio Adelkind”, in *Kiryat Sefer* (1939); Sonne, “toch kdei kria’ah”, in *Kiryat Sefer*, (1931), 278. The prevailing view today is that Adelkind converted at an early stage and that most of his editing work (including that performed in Jewish print shops) was done following his conversion to Christianity. Rabinowitz’s claim that the frequent signature “Adelkind of the House of Levi” indicates that he had not converted, is unfounded. On the contrary, as converts frequently preserved and emphasized their previous names, this serves as a support for the claim that he had converted previously (Haberman, *Cornelio Adelkind*, 10–11). Heller mentions also Fra Felice da Prato and Yeshayahu Parnas.

¹⁶ Among them were Paulus Eustacius, (Eliyahu ben Menachem of Nola, who converted after 1566), and Vittorio Eliano, in Conti Press in Cremona, and later in di Gara, Venice. According to his testimony in the colophon to *Bet Yosef, Tur Hoshen Mishpat* (Venice 1567): Vittorio Eliano, iusta la copia della correction de libri. Come e nel officio delli clariss. Esecutori contro la bestemmia.

sors were part of the debate that accompanied the editing of the printed book, and were an element in the power relations that underlay it. Thus, the censor helped shape the text, and his role was not substantially different from that of others agents whose activities we may read between the lines (or, more accurately, “between the words”) of the text. Censorship, in other words, became an immanent part of publication.

The censor’s guidelines were different from those of the editor: the censor turned to the Jewish text intending to erase all those passages that did not meet the criteria of the Church or that were perceived to be anti-Christian. The task of the censors was to protect the security of the souls of the faithful using the text, and to ensure that the Jews likewise adhere to the “universal” standards established by the Church. In several (although very few) cases, the censors’ erasures led to the omission of passages that might have been preserved had they not intervened. But it would be incorrect to say that the elimination of those passages limited the possibilities for the development of Jewish culture. In fact, they were compatible with the main line of editing that accompanied the printing of Hebrew literature from its beginning.

It is only natural that the converts—both editors and censors, hoped that the “leveling” of these works in accordance with these criteria would ultimately lead to the conversion of the Jews, and many of them said so explicitly.¹⁷ As already mentioned, this was also the desire of the Christian editors and of other converts who dealt with printing.

However, the actual result was quite different: the activity of the censors protected the autonomy of the Jewish community, and this left wide scope, in effect full permission, to practice its ritual according to the Jewish law, as long as it was not based on anti-Christian sentiment. A close reading of the practice of censorship within the texts clarifies

¹⁷ Andrea del Monte composed a series of works designed to convince the Jews to convert, employing Talmudic proofs, in ways that illustrated the place and influence of Christian polemic literature in the process of conversion. The most prominent censor in the late sixteenth century, Domenico Gerosolimitano (to whose activity we shall return) expressed it on several occasions, including in the introduction to his “Index Expurgatorius”, *Sefer Ha-Zikkuk*: “Turn to me, father and mother and Holy Spirit; may I possess the merit to be zealous for the faith of Jesus, His Messiah of valor, and enlighten the eyes of the nation who walks in darkness, His nation the children of Israel, so that they may see the right way, the way of eternal life, the way of our Lord Jesus, the anointed one of God”. (Vatican manuscript 273, Introduction). In other places as well, he emphasized that he saw his entire work as a mission, whose aim was to convince Jews to become Christians, on the basis of their own writings.

that the censor left most texts untouched, and that its rules followed the same line taken by editors, Jewish and Christian alike, in that period.

The interesting fact is that censorship developed at the same time as real literary revolutions that transformed Jewish consciousness and the Jewish way of life. The printing of kabbalistic literature and the appearance of the *Shulhan Arukh* took place in the course of the institutionalization of control, and as part of the same process. The very period in which the censorial discourse developed was characterized by a multifaceted and exciting cultural ferment. In this era, many different and often opposing tendencies arose, and the Jewish community was shaken by violent debates over printing: centering on the kabbalistic corpus and, in a different way, on Azariah de Rossi's *Me'or Einayim*. On the one hand, the relations between Jewish culture and the various expressions of Christian culture expanded during this period. On the other hand, this era witnessed the development of approaches emphasizing the essential uniqueness of the people of Israel. The role of anti-Christian sentiments in the construction of these approaches was relatively minor, since the emphasis of the uniqueness of the Jews was articulated in autonomous terms and not directed against Christianity. Furthermore, later on, when censorship eased, this ferment died down as well. While censorship was not the cause of this change, it was a prism through which we may discern many aspects of the modernization process.

The principles of censorship were summarized in the *Sefer Ha-Zikkuk*, the Index Expurgatorius composed by Domenico Gerosolimitano, the most prominent censor in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. The first manuscript dates back to 1596, and was subsequently continuously updated by the censor.¹⁸ Similar to other compositions in the genre, the *Sefer Ha-Zikkuk* consists of an introduction providing principles, followed by a detailed discussion of more than four hundred Hebrew books, including separate discussions of different editions of the same book. In some cases, the references also provide explanations for the erasures.

The introduction to the *Sefer Ha-Zikkuk* specifies the twenty rules that were to guide the censor's activities, determining the erasures that were required in the respective works. For the most part, these rules

¹⁸ Six manuscripts of this work have survived. They were extensively examined and discussed lately by Gila Prebor, *Sefer Ha-Zikkuk* (Dissertation, Bar Ilan University 2003, Hebrew).

derived from the main arguments which generally defined the Christian anti-Jewish polemic and the polemic against Hebrew literature (especially the Talmud), and are an echo of the arguments raised in polemic compositions written at this time. However, its implementation within a process of expurgation gave it a new meaning: the direct polemic claims were replaced by a detailed discussion of a long list of sentences and passages designed to neutralize the polemic and create texts that could be read by Christians as well. The arguments did not change, but the way in which they were employed did. In retrospect, this practice embodies an extremely wide-ranging change in the entire discourse: the public, declaratory polemic was replaced by a polemical dialogue over specific sentences, localized mainly in the print shops.¹⁹

The main concern of the *Sefer Ha-Zikkuk* was the elimination of attacks against Christianity, and of any possible anti-Christian reading. This included slanderous attacks against Christianity, passages denying the humanity of the nations of the world, or reflecting a desire for the destruction of the Christian world. Passages like “the nations of the world are not called human”,²⁰ “The best of Gentiles should be killed”, and a series of passages employing demonic metaphors to describe Christianity and the Church, and a call for revenge—were all eliminated completely, and were often excluded from later editions as well (although many similar expressions also remained in later printed Hebrew literature).

The central motive was the elimination of any term or passage that might be understood as harmful to Christianity. Among the phrases in this category we can also find the majority of the expressions that the *Sefer Ha-Zikkuk* demanded to be changed or erased. Words like *goy* (convert) (gentile), *meshumad* or *Edom*, i.e. words assumed to carry an anti-Christian significance (in general correctly so), appear time and again in Gerosolimitano’s “survey” of Hebrew literature; these are also the expressions that in practice were erased by the various censors from printed books and manuscripts, as a glance at those texts will demonstrate.

¹⁹ The Index called *Index Neofiti* (Censurae in Pentateuch), which is illuminated by Piet van Boxel in this volume, may be seen as an intermediate stage in the transition between the medieval polemics and the later index.

²⁰ *Tanhumot El*, (Saloniki 1558), 104a, 121a; *Sefer Akedah*, (Venice), 262a, and others.

These terms played a formative role in the shaping of medieval Jewish discourse and in the Jewish polemic against Christianity. They constituted the Jewish discourse of the time and had an essential task in determining the boundaries between Jews and non-Jews. In medieval Europe, they were clearly and explicitly directed against Christianity. The censor's intervention rejected a definition of Jewish identity based on an anti-Christian polemic. This was done with the intention of permitting the contents themselves to remain intact. Among the rules that deal with contents that might be understood as anti-Christian, we always find a clause permitting the use of the prohibited terms if the context makes it clear that they are not part of an attack against Christianity. Thus, for example, rule number 1, dealing with terms relating to idolatry states: "if, however, it is understood to refer to idolatry that existed prior to the coming of our Lord, it is acceptable". In this same spirit, in many editions the word *goy* was replaced by *aku"m* (worshipper of celestial bodies), *min* (heretic) was replaced by *epikoros*, *Edom* was replaced by *Bavel* [Babylon], and similarly terms like "Canaanite" or *elilim* were promoted in order to direct reading away from anti-Christian understandings and create a field of reading common to both Jews and Christians against *elilut* (pre-Christian "idolatry") or, in some instances, Islam. This was done through the use of a wide range of phrases, many of which are still in use today. The search for replacements testifies to the constitutive dimension of censorship. It demonstrates that the aim was not the restriction of Jewish readings, but the channeling of those readings in a direction that was not anti-Christian, while enabling Christians to read these works.²¹

The use of code words, on condition that they were not directed against a specific, real subject, demonstrates how censorship sought to define Jewish reading. The censor recognized the Jews' right to self-definition in practice (even if this was not his intention), but rejected the polemic definition directed against the Christian majority, and the

²¹ The special sensitivity toward some of the expressions used to refer to Christianity was increased in response to Protestant propaganda, which condemned Catholicism as idolatrous. This is particularly evident in rule 2: "Any mention of the word *tzelamim* ('idols') should be followed by the words *shel aku"m* ('of worshippers of celestial bodies')". manuscript Paris, Alliance 80H2 adds further: "likewise, when the word *tzurot* (idols) appears in the laws of idolatry, the words *shel aku"m* should be appended to it". These were the very terms that were employed in contemporary Protestant polemic literature to refer to Catholicism, and the censor was entrusted with the task of effacing these connotations, while defending Catholic forms of worship and faith.

faith that he had chosen to join. He created a literature that he can read and continue to possess as part of a permitted heritage, even as a kind of “trousseau” he brings with him into Christianity. The “other” implicated by the discourse is no longer a well-defined entity, i.e. Christians and Christianity, but is distanced from the contemporary polemic and becomes an abstract linguistic entity. In the process, he creates a common Jewish-Christian context, defined as opposed to *aku”m* (idolatry). The demand that the polemic be not directed against Christianity included the recognition that Judaism is not *aku”m* either. Of course, even after the changes were made, Jews could give an anti-Christian interpretation to the text if they so chose, as they often did.

The *Sefer Ha-Zikkuk* also explicitly states that the use of these terms is permitted in the context of halakhic discussion. Chapter 3 of the introduction states: “if, however, it deals with any of the laws of the Hebrews, such as the laws of the Sabbath or prohibited foods, or wine touched by a Gentile or such, it is acceptable”. In other words, the separation from the Gentile, as formulated in Jewish law, is explicitly permitted. The clear intention is the preservation of the halakhic discussion, even with respect to laws that were explicitly formulated in order to separate Jews from Christians. In fact, in the codification and responsa literature, the censor left such passages almost completely intact. For example, censors did not intervene in matters concerning prohibited wine, vessels made by Gentiles, etc., even if they sometimes required that the word *goy* be replaced. Their refraining from erasures here amounted to a recognition of the Jews’ right to maintain their separateness from Gentiles in the basic areas of life. The vast majority of the laws in these realms remained uncontested. The printing of the laws of *Avodah Zarah* (idolatry) was permitted in most cases, as long as the “other” was defined as the “worshippers of idols”.²²

To a certain degree, the main thrust of censorship concurred with central elements of editing, and with the Jewish culture that developed in parallel. Even prior to the institutionalization of censorship, and even when the print shops were Jewish-owned, numerous anti-Christian passages were often eliminated, and words directed against Christianity

²² Thus, for example, the passages of halakhic literature dealing with the “festivals (*eidehem*) of the Gentiles” and the prohibition to have any contacts with them in these days, were not prohibited, and *Sefer Ha-Zikkuk* merely demanded that the word *eidehem* be changed to *hageihem* (a term that thus not contain the negative meaning). *Sefer Ha’alfasi with Shiltei Gibborim*, 1581, 1.

were dropped or replaced. This tendency is already apparent in the editions of several works printed by Soncino in the late fifteenth century, and was even more common in Christian printing houses. In many printed books, we find frequent though certainly not systematic erasures or replacements of the words *goy*, *meshumad* or *Edom*—terms that contained anti-Christian overtones. Entire passages containing curses against Jesus and the Christian faith were also completely eliminated. Censorial activity certainly accentuated this tendency, but, in the end, it was only part of a broader process, which began prior to the invention of print and continued to develop subsequently.

A notable fact is that it is precisely those editions in which the changes caused through the intervention of censorship were strictly preserved that were considered preferable by both the contemporary public as well as by modern scholars. Good censorship demanded the adaptation of the composition to the new framework of readings, in which—just as in the literature of codification—the declarations were formulated positively. The elimination of particular words during the stage of the preparation of the composition for print required that the sentence be reformulated in such a way that the relevant field of readings would remain, but minus the polemic references to the “other”. We may thus conclude that the editions in which the level of censorship was high were those in which editing as a whole was stricter, and that the two aspects were integrated.

In addition, the *Sefer Ha-Zikkuk* required that many passages in which Jewish exegesis was formulated through conflict with Christianity and in debate with Christian interpretation also be erased, both in Midrashic literature as well as in Biblical commentaries based on the Midrash. The tenth paragraph of the introduction fixes explicit rules on this subject: “Any place in the Bible where there is a debate and disagreement between our faith and theirs, if a challenge be posed against our understanding, or if evidence be brought to support their understanding, even if the Christians and their scholars are not mentioned by name, the entire matter should be erased. But if the matter is explained according to their opinion, and no challenge is posed against our view, it is acceptable”.²³ Thus, a change in Jewish reading was required, but

²³ On this basis, *Sefer Ha-Zikkuk* required the omission of anti-Christian polemic passages from *Sefer Ha-'ikkarim*, but left the principles themselves intact. For example in Book One, Chapter 26, which summarizes the book, *Sefer Ha-Zikkuk* required the elimination of the passage denying Christianity the status of “a divine religion”: “The other

we may understand this change as a challenge, rather than merely an act of extreme control. “Their understanding” is permitted, as long as it poses no “challenge to our view”. In such cases, the matter clearly led to the omission of meaningful Jewish positions and claims, some of which (though definitely not all) were restored in later editions. This shows that their elimination was seen as damaging to the text and the formation of Jewish consciousness.

An area which may elucidate the multiplicity of factors pertaining to censorship is the editing and censorship of prayer books and festival prayer books (*maḥzorim*), a field partially examined by Benayahu.²⁴ The *maḥzorim* were the most popular products of the press, and they expressed many aspects of cultural and social change linked to the process of transition to print. In general, the scope of erasure required in this literature was minimal in Italian and Sephardic prayer books, compared to the more extensive censorship required of Ashkenazic *maḥzorim*, which contained explicitly anti-Christian *piyyutim*.

In all of the *maḥzorim*, the censor demanded changes in two basic prayers. The first was the *birkat ha-minim*, the prayer against the heretics, in which changes took place already in the first printed versions, in the aim of muting the anti-Christian tone of the prayer. In most *maḥzorim*, the words *meshumadim* (converts) and *minim* (heretics) (“for the *meshumadim* and the *minim* let there be no hope ...”) were replaced by the word *malshinim* (informers), a variant existing in earlier manuscripts of Sephardic *maḥzorim*.²⁵ In the *maḥzor* of the

laws, called divine, lay down other derivative principles under the fundamental ones, the removal of one of which makes the law fall. Thus the Christians put under the existence of God trinity and corporeality. But it is clear that this is opposed to the derivative principles which follow from the existence of God. Under reward and punishment they place the coming of the Messiah and the resurrection of the dead. Without these it is clear that their religion cannot exist ...”. (Joseph Albo, *Sefer Ha-ʿikkarim*, Isaac Husik, trans., Philadelphia 1946, vol. 1, 201). Domenico did permit, however, the publication of the remainder of the passage, as “it contains nothing against our faith, but against the faith of the Ishmaelites”. In the Bragadin edition (*Sefer Etz Shatul*), 1618, the passage was emended to “for others, instead of the existence of God, lay down [the principles of] duality and corporeality”, etc. (ibid, 38b). The Lublin edition of 1597 is uncensored. The other passages discussed there are also explicitly polemical. This holds true of the censor’s demands with respect to Maimonides’ *Guide to the Perplexed* (Venice) as well. Here too, the erased passages were those which formulated arguments in debate with the Christian faith. Many of these passages were left out of later editions as well. On this basis, Chapters 25 and 26 of Book Three were erased from many manuscripts, as they are an explicit polemic against the polemic claims of Christianity against Judaism, and argue against Christian principles.

²⁴ Benayahu, *Haskama ve-Reshut*, 168–189.

Roman Jews (Soncino), the phrase was eliminated completely. This is another example of editing that preceded the institutionalization of censorship, with the aim of removing the polemic element from Jewish prayer. In later editions, the word *malshinim* was the more common textual variant.

Another prayer in which censorship intervened was *'aleinu leshebeah*, which was also the focus of Christian dispute in previous centuries as well. In some prayer books and *maḥzorim*, the line “for He has not made us as the nations of the earth, for they bow down to vanity and nothingness, to a god that saves not” was eliminated, as is already attested in some manuscripts.²⁶ From the Middle Ages on, Christians correctly understood these verses as directed against Christianity.²⁷ Both in manuscripts and in several printed editions, we find a space of one or two lines where those sentences normally appear; this stemmed, in part, from the demands of the censors. By leaving this space, the editor clearly and permanently marked the fact that a line was missing there.²⁸ In the end, this line was restored to many *maḥzorim*, but left out

²⁵ For a summary, see Benayahu, *Haskama ve-Reshut*, 172–3. For example, in the Spanish prayer book *Temunot Tehinot* (1524), the prayer opens with the words *lamalshinim*, as was, apparently, the Sephardic version, rather than *lameshumadim*. This alteration was apparently incorporated into Ashkenazic prayer books at an early stage, even if originally, the prayer called for the destruction of the *minim*: “and for the *malshinim* let there be no hope, and may each and all of the *minim* be destroyed in a minute, and may all the enemies of Your people be speedily cut off, and may the evil kingdom be quickly uprooted; vanquish them speedily in our days” (Trin 1525). Similarly, Saloniki 1548 and Venice 1549: “and for the *malshinim* let there be no hope and may all the evildoers vanish in an instant and may all Your enemies be speedily cut off; vanquish them speedily in our days”. Similar formulations can be found in the Roman *maḥzor*, Venice (1521) and Bologna (1541). The expression “the enemies of Your people” was replaced by “Your enemies”.

²⁶ This sentence was already eliminated in *maḥzor Tmunot Thinot* (1524). Following “for they bow down ...”, we find a blank line. In other cases, the printers did not leave a blank line, and eventually all memory of this prayer was forgotten.

²⁷ On this, see Yaakov Elbaum, *Al Shnei Tikunei Nosah*, *Tarbiz* 42 (1973), 204–208. The *'aleinu* prayer was at the focus of Christian opposition already in the Middle Ages. Naftali Wieder, *Hitgabshut Nosah Ha-Tfila*, Jerusalem, Machon Ben-Zvi and Yad Ben-Zvi, 1998, 2, 453–468. Wieder sees the elimination of this line as a result of both external and internal censorship.

²⁸ Such spaces remained in several editions: Rimini 1521; Bologna, 1537, 1541; Mantua 1557, 1559—“for they bow down ... and pray *el el lo yoshia'* (to a god that saves not), but we bend our knees and bow down”. In the Italian *maḥzor*, (Oxford Bodliana 1067), the expression “to vanity and nothingness” was replaced with “idols” (*elilim*), and after the word “pray”, a blank space was left. The censor erased passages of Sephardic literature that dealt with the sanctification of the holy Name in Spain and Portugal, and which included anti-Christian passages, but these were not part of the prayer book.

in many others. At least at later stages, but also already in this period, this version caused discomfort and discontent among Jews as well. Consequently, the omission remained in other *mahzorim* that were printed later on, down to our times. The passage is completely omitted not only in the prayer books of the Reform and Conservative movements, but in various Orthodox ones as well. Thus we see that the censorial act heralded a consciousness that would later develop among Jews.

As mentioned, Ashkenazic prayer books and other compositions reflecting the Ashkenazi tradition were subject to much more thorough and wide-ranging censorial intervention. Unlike the minimalist censorship of Italian and Spanish prayer books and *mahzorim*, here censorship had a major formative influence. In the framework of this censorship, many explicitly anti-Christian *piyyutim* were deleted from the *mahzorim*, including those expressing the expectation of the political destruction of the Christian kingdom and the expectation of vengeance that would take place as part of the messianic scenario.²⁹

While several of those passages had already been dropped prior to the institutionalization of censorship, many were erased only through the intervention of the censors. As was demonstrated already by S. D. Luzzatto, and later by Benayahu, some of the *piyyutim* that aggressively attacked Christianity had already been omitted from the Soncino edition (Fano, 1506). In the Bomberg edition, there were further omissions, and six *piyyutim* were replaced. In the words of Luzzatto, in a letter to Leopold Zunz in 1852: “know, my dear friend and illustrious sage, that between 1536 and 1548, a *riforma* was carried out among the Ashkenazim living in Italy, for it seems that one or more of the Italian

²⁹ Benayahu correctly argued that the expectation of the political destruction of the Christian kingdom is present in Sephardic *mahzorim* as well, but without the expectation of vengeance characteristic of many Ashkenazic *piyyutim*. For example, on the High Holy Days, “and all evil shall dissipate like smoke, and may You destroy the evil kingdom from upon the earth”, which appears in the Sephardic *mahzorim* (*Imunot Thivot* 1524, 1544, 1581). With respect to this sentence too, we witness inconsistencies on the part of the censor and editor. For example, in the 1584 edition, in the prayers for the eve of Rosh Hashana, “for you shall cause the kingdom of sinners to pass from this earth” (*ibid.*, and in Sabionetta 1567 in the *Ne’ilah* prayer). This passage was erased by the censors, both in print and in manuscript, as in the *mahzor* for Sukkot and the High Holy Days, (Oxford manuscript, Bodliana 1067–7674 in the Manuscript Division, National Library, Jerusalem). On this, see Benayahu, 175–177. Benayahu described in detail the development of the prayer text versions, including the later expansion of the expurgation of *mahzorim*, demonstrating the inconsistencies in the process.

rabbis, perhaps the Mahara"m, were wise enough to purify the *Selihot* of anything that could provoke the anger of the nations against us, as they saw that the uncircumcised had begun to learn the holy tongue".³⁰ Some of the editorial changes led to radical changes in meaning. One such example was the change in the Hardenheim edition of 1546: the lines "they invent lies and falsehoods to accuse and attack us, may they be cast down from their councils and their thoughts, and may our eyes behold their downfall", were changed to "may Your goodness and the measure of Your mercy be bestowed upon us. May Your salvation, O God, exalt us". This is a clear example of the transition from one form of consciousness to another, in which the censorship of the Church is integrated into the internal process. We can cite a list of *piyyutim* that were eliminated both from early printed editions as well as from many manuscripts of the Ashkenazi *maḥzor* of the Middle Ages.

The question as to whether this deletion resulted from censorship or was done voluntarily is problematic. Making a clear distinction between the two is probably impossible. The process of printing the Ashkenazic prayer books was linked to a broader cultural change, which indeed, it marks. Censorship was undoubtedly one of the causes and motivations for these erasures, but it was only part of a larger process. Daniel Goldschmidt exemplifies this difficulty. He wrote that these *piyyutim* were eliminated or abridged in most *maḥzorim* as a result of "the fear of the censors, adding: 'it may well be that, in the course of time, the congregations found no reason for the reciting of these verses and found it inappropriate to inspire feelings of hatred and vengeance among the worshippers on the Day of Atonement'".

As in other places, the comment of the modern scholar is telling: he is uncomfortable with transferring the responsibility for such erasures to the censor, as he identifies with the values expressed by the erasure. He prefers to assume that "in the course of time" the deleted passages would have lost their significance.³¹ It appears that these two aspects

³⁰ *Igrot Shada'l* (S.D. Luzzatto), published by She'altiel Izik Graber, Cracow 1893, vol. 8, 1142–3. The letter to Zunz, of 31 May 1852, examines the development of the *selihot* according to the Ashkenazic custom. Luzzatto doubts that the first printing of the *maḥzor* took place in Ehrenheim. He remarks that "these emendations are not in the *selihot* that were customary in the Ashkenazic lands, but in *selihot* of Ashkenazim residing in Italy; the difference is quite evident in the Vienna edition of 1823, where one *maḥzor* was printed for Ashkenazim in Ashkenaz, and another for Ashkenazim in Italy ...".

were indeed integrated; censorship was integrated into the change of consciousness.

Thus we see that the modern historian bears an ambiguous relation to censorship, since, in the end, he wholeheartedly identifies with its virtues. The modern historian occupies a common ground, even if he arrived there from two opposing directions. He feels the need to justify the very existence of such passages as the consequence of persecution, rather than as an essential part of Judaism. For Goldschmidt, such comments were the basis of a Jewish self-definition that wholeheartedly rejects such expressions and was grateful that they had disappeared from the standard *mahzorim*. Although he collected and exposed all the passages that had been erased from the *mahzorim*, it was not in order to incorporate them into current liturgy. He preferred the “traditional” *mahzor*, i.e., the censored one!

Goldschmidt’s sensitive remarks reveal the basic role of censorship. Censorship clarifies the transition of Jewish discourse, and participated in the shaping of modernity in different respects. As to other areas of knowledge, censorship prepared the groundwork for the principles and values that developed later. In significant ways, the modern Jewish reading continues that of the censor, along with that of his Jewish contemporaries that together were part of the broader Hebraist context. Not only did “liberation” from the shackles of censorship not lead to the resurgence of the suppressed values. It in fact led to the internalization of those very principles. Goldschmidt reveals aspects characteristic of the entire Jewish discourse.

I do not wish to draw a direct line between the censor and the “modern Jewish historian”. The situation is more complex. The important point is that the discussion of censorship is essentially also a discussion of our own perspective. There is no other way to evaluate

³¹ Daniel Goldschmidt, “Hashlama Le-Mahzor”, in *Kiryat Sefer* 31 (1955), 146–151. Goldschmidt takes pains to point out that the content of the *piyyutim* may best be understood: “In light of the desperate situation in which medieval Jews found themselves in Christian lands. They could not react to the constant persecutions with physical force, so they turned to their Father in Heaven, that He would render to their oppressors their just recompense, and remove Israel from slavery to freedom and from darkness to light. The extreme expressions found here are a spontaneous reaction to the injustice they suffered, a response from broken heartedness and bitterness of the soul, which corresponds to the deep (and somewhat primitive) piety of their authors. Whoever wonders at their extreme nature and cruelty, let him not forget in what period and under what conditions they were written”. On these comments of Goldschmidt’s and their broader cultural significance, see in the final chapter.

censorship. I do not intend to ignore the repressive aspects of censorship, but rather wish to point to its presence in later Jewish discourse, most especially in the perspective from which Jewish history, including the history of censorship, was written. The point is not to “defend” the censor, or to ignore his intentions and motivations. The point is to enhance awareness of our own perspective, and thus improve our historical understanding.

The censors’ involvement goes hand in hand with other main aspects of Jewish culture at the time, influenced only partially by the restrictions of the Church.³² The evaluation of Jewish culture in this period has seen a remarkable revision during the last decades, following similar lines as the historiographical revision of early modern Catholicism. The traditional attitude that saw censorship as nothing but oppression was based on the perception of the Counter-Reformation as a period marking the decline and stagnation of Italian Jewry, which allegedly followed the ideal and harmonious period of the Renaissance. This perception has been challenged lately by several scholars.³³ As Robert Bonfil has demonstrated, not only was the idealistic image of Renaissance Jewry exaggerated and distorted, it is in the period of the Counter-Reformation and Baroque, the period of segregation and ghettoization, that Jewish culture had more intimate relations with the Christian world than before.³⁴ Although Bonfil emphasizes the restrictions that were imposed on Jews, he has also analyzed the internal development of Jewish culture. While remaining distinct from Christian culture, it followed similar directions at the same time, responding to similar issues and questions. According to Benjamin Ravid’s observations, the ghetto provided the Jews with a defined place within Christian society, allowing Jews to become an organic though marginal part of the larger Christian world.³⁵

³² Robert Bonfil, “Reading in the Jewish Communities”.

³³ See the evaluations of the shift by Reuven Bonfil, David Ruderman, and Hava Tirosh-Rothschild: David Ruderman, “introduction”, in *Essential Papers on Jewish Culture in Renaissance and Baroque Italy*, ed. David Ruderman, New York 1992, 1–32; Hava Tirosh-Rothschild, “Jewish Culture in Renaissance Italy: A Methodological Survey”, in *Italia*, 63–96;

³⁴ Bonfil, “The Historian’s Perception of the Jews in the Italian Renaissance Period—Towards a Reappraisal”, in *REJ* 14 (1984), 59–82; idem, “Change in Cultural Patterns of Jewish Society in Crisis: The Case of Italian Jewry at the Close of the Sixteenth Century”, in *Jewish History* 3 (1988), 11–30; idem, *Jewish Life in Renaissance History* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press 1994); idem, “Changing Mentalities of Italian Jews between the Periods of the Renaissance and the Baroque”, in *Italia* 11 (1994), 61–79.

The same claim may be made for censorship. While censorship did limit what Jews could read and in this sense had a negative impact, it also allowed for the creation of an autonomous Jewish sphere and identity that was not predicated on the polemics against Christianity. Furthermore, censorship was not simply just better than expulsion, it resulted in the validation of Jewish literature as a legitimate part of both Jewish and Christian culture. The dialectics of censorship thus contribute another dimension to the discussion of the shaping of Jewish culture in early modernity. They clarify the ambivalent attitude of the Church, an ambivalence embodied within the Hebraist discourse. The minimal censorship employed in dealing with halakhic legislative literature demonstrates the autonomous sphere defined by the censors. In this case, the lack of significant expurgation is a statement that ensures Jewish autonomy.

Censorship thus participated in the larger process of the transition of Jewish identity to modernity: from a discourse based on theological terms and embodied within the theological debate to a definition of Judaism in terms of “ethnicity” and “culture”, the concepts that were to dominate modern discourse. This was a long, multifaceted and complicated process, one in which Catholic censorship played only a limited role. But the printing press in general, and censorial discourse in particular, provide a unique opportunity to analyze the transition to modernity. As I have sought to demonstrate elsewhere, the entire Hebraist discourse embodies this transition.³⁵ Censorship became a constitutive element of the community, and part of the interactive framework in which the text and the reader were created simultaneously. It was a mediating factor between the book and its readers.

Thus, both in the act of conversion and in the act of censorship, the censors reveal aspects of modern Jewish discourse. The dialectics of censorship is part of the process of the redefinition of Jewish existence and Jewish identity in Europe. The censor participated in the definition

³⁵ Benjamin Ravid, “The Religious, Economic, and Social Background and Context of the Establishment of the Ghetto in Venice”, in Gaetano Cozzi (ed.), *Gli Ebrei e Venezia: secoli xiv-xviii*, Milano 1987, 211–59; idem, “From Geographical Realia to Historiographical Symbol: The Odyssey of the Word Ghetto”, in D. Ruderman (ed.), *Essential Papers*, 373–385.

³⁶ Amnon Raz-Krakotzkin, “The Return to the History of Redemption (Or, What is the ‘History’ to Which the ‘Return’ in the Phrase ‘The Jewish Return to History’ Refers)”, in S. N. Eisenstadt and M. Lissak (eds.), *Zionism and the Return to History: A Reappraisal*, Jerusalem 1998, 249–279 (Hebrew).

of Judaism as a “religion”, that is to say, as a set of rituals and beliefs that he himself rejected, and as an important textual tradition. While abandoning obedience to the Law, he continued to read the same corpus. Interestingly, through this approach, the censor dialectically prepares the foundation for the modern perception of Judaism and history. Dominant trends in modern Jewish thought were founded on the attempt to distinguish Judaism from polemics, and to locate Judaism as part of a “Judeo-Christian” culture. Jewish historians (including those who described censorship as an act of oppression) in fact shared the censor’s ideas, and rejected the very passages he omitted. They tried to describe Jewish history as autonomous, yet compatible with dominant values. However, they transferred these values, while adopting the Protestant perception of the Catholic Church as an expression of reaction and arbitrary oppression. The study of censorship is thus a means to criticize the different aspects of that perspective.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND JEWISH BOOKS IN THE POLISH-LITHUANIAN COMMONWEALTH FROM THE SIXTEENTH TO EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

Hanna Węgrzynek
Warsaw

The literature on the politics of the Catholic Church in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth towards the Jews is relatively extensive, a topic present in historical inquiry since the late nineteenth century. Several significant, solidly documented monographs have been completed recently both in Israel and Poland, including studies by Judith Kalik of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem and articles by Zenon Guldon and Waldemar Kowalski.¹

Jewish printing houses in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth have also been discussed in numerous works. However, these studies, published mainly in the early twentieth century, are now outdated and need to be revised. Research has generally focused on the beginnings of the history of Jewish printing in Poland in the sixteenth century and on the culmination of its development in the late eighteenth century, while the intervening period has scarcely been examined. Among the recent monographs, Krzysztof Pilarczyk's study on the Talmud and its printers (*Talmud i jego drukarze w pierwszej Rzeczypospolitej: z dziejów przekazu religijnego w judaizmie*) deserves special mention. This book covers the sixteenth century, the first half of the seventeenth century and the late eighteenth century. The missing interval of almost 150 years reflects the hiatus in Talmud printing from 1648 until 1783. Pilarczyk's monograph is the most extensive and insightful presentation of Jewish printing in pre-partition Poland. The author has

¹ Zenon Guldon, "Żydzi wśród chrześcijan w miastach małopolskich w XVI–XVIII wieku", in *Nasza Przyszłość* 78 (1992), 187; Waldemar Kowalski, "Ludność żydowska a duchowieństwo archidjakoatu sandomierskiego w XVII–XVIII wieku", in *Studia Judaica* 1 (1998), 177; Judith Kalik, *The Catholic Church and the Jews in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the Seventeenth–Eighteenth Centuries*, Hebrew University in Jerusalem, Ph.D. thesis, May 1998.

examined several aspects of the Catholic Church's policies on Jewish books, yet many questions remain open for further study.

Given the state of research, it is little wonder that no comprehensive monograph on the attitude of the Polish Catholic Church towards Hebrew printing has yet appeared. Our knowledge of the activity of the Inquisition and church censorship in Poland remains fragmentary. Not even the legal competences and procedures of these institutions have been properly clarified.

In theory, the Polish Church should have acted towards Hebrew books in accordance with the general church laws and regulations. These were determined by the resolutions of the Council of Trent and several papal bulls and *constitutiones*, including *Inter multiples* of Pope Innocent VIII promulgated in 1487, and *Inter sollicitudines* of Pope Leo X issued at the Fifth Lateran Council in 1515². The resolutions of the Council of Trent (1545–1563) were first authorized by the Polish king in 1564, and, several months later, by the Lvov ecclesiastical province and the diocese of Poznań. The ecclesiastical province of Gniezno did not approve the Trent proclamations until 1577,³ with the subordinate dioceses joining the decision afterwards.

The Council of Trent led to the publication of the new Tridentine *Index auctorum et librorum prohibitorum* (1564), the list of forbidden books. Its first Polish edition was issued in Kraków in 1603. Further editions were published in Zamość in 1604 and again in Kraków in 1617.⁴ The 1603 edition included an introduction by the bishop of Kraków, Bernard Maciejowski, recommending printers to follow the pronouncements of the Church contained in the index.⁵ He thus confirmed his determination to introduce the resolutions of the Council and have them implemented.

The Polish editions of the index included the regulations concerning Jewish books formulated by the Pope Pius IV in 1564 and by Clemens VIII in 1592. The issue was dealt with in two separate clauses entitled "De Talmud et aliis libris Hebraeorum", and "De libro Magazor". According to Pius IV, the title *Talmud* was not to be used and the text

² Krzysztof Pilarczyk, *Talmud i jego drukarze w pierwszej Rzeczypospolitej. Z dziejów przekazu religijnego w judaizmie*, Kraków 1998, 147–148.

³ Ignacy Subera, *Synody prowincji arcybiskupów gnieźnieńskich*, Warszawa 1981, 107.

⁴ *Index Librorum Prohibitorum cum Regulis Confectis per Patres a Tridentina Synodo delectos*, Kraków 1603, Zamość 1604, Kraków 1617.

⁵ *Index librorum*, Kraków 1603.

published had to exclude a number of passages considered by Catholic theologians hostile to the Christian faith. The regulations of Clemens VIII were more radical. The Pope prohibited the publication of any Talmudic books, or material relating to the Kabbala.⁶

The documents concerning the first Jewish printers, the Halicz brothers, indicate that the censorship of Hebrew books was introduced in Poland several decades before the Council of Trent. The Halicz brothers had set up a Hebrew printing house in Kraków about 1530. In 1537 they were baptized; two years later they published Martin Luther's German translation of the New Testament printed in Hebrew characters.⁷ The edition was probably initiated by Piotr Gamrat, bishop of Kraków. As converts the Halicz brothers faced problems in selling their books. Consequently, the king ordered the Jewish communities of Kraków, Poznań and Lvov to buy all the 3,350 copies that had been printed.⁸ The royal injunction of 1539 included the regulations concerning the censorship of Hebrew books. They were to be submitted to the bishop or the *voyevode* (governor). The law stipulated that all kinds of Jewish activities fell within the prerogative of the king. However, the monarch was ready to cede some of his powers to the church authorities.⁹ Which responsibilities connected with the censorship of Hebrew books rested with church officials and which with secular clerks? The division of functions was obviously not clearly defined. At least such a conclusion may be drawn from the conflict over the edition of the Talmud by the Lublin printing house of Zvi Kalonimos Yafe in 1628. When the *voyevode* of Lublin appealed to the king to appoint the censors, the ruler probably ignored the request. Eventually the censor was nominated by the bishop of Kraków.¹⁰

The reforms of the Council of Trent were implemented in Poland through the statutes issued by provincial and diocesan synods. While the legislation of the Polish church referred to the Trent resolutions until the late eighteenth century, it showed little interest in the censorship of Jewish books. No declaration on the topic was issued by a synod of a Polish ecclesiastical province. As for the dioceses, the synod

⁶ Ibidem.

⁷ *Historia i kultura Żydów polskich. Słownik*, Warszawa 2000, 111.

⁸ Helena Szwejkowska, *Książka drukowana XV–XVIII wieku : zarys historii*. 5th ed. Warszawa 1987, 138; Majer Bałaban, *Dzieje Żydów w Krakowie i na Kazimierzu*, vol. 1, Kraków 1931, 132.

⁹ K. Pilarczyk, *Talmud*, 147.

¹⁰ Ibidem, 155.

of the diocese of Kraków was the only one to pass appropriate resolutions in 1621. This was done on the initiative of Bishop Marcin Szyszkowski. The statutes of the synod stipulated that Jews were required to pay a penalty of 100 złotys if they printed any book without written permission of the church censors. Although the resolution's primary concern was the Talmud, which according to the synod contained anti-Christian passages, censorship extended to all Hebrew books. This blanket provision served to protect Christianity against calumny and any infraction of the royal laws.¹¹ For the most part, the statutes of the 1621 Kraków synod were determined by the Polish church's endorsement of the Trent resolutions and partly based on earlier papal legislation. Bishop Marcin Szyszkowski, a representative of a new generation of Catholic clergy, initiated the Kraków synod and its resolutions. His commitment to the renewal of Catholicism was coupled with his function as an administrator. A graduate of the Jesuit college in Pultusk, he had become the chancellor of Piotr Myszkowski and Bernard Maciejowski, his predecessors as bishops of Kraków.¹² Soon after his appointment to the see of Kraków, another edition of the index was published. Szyszkowski himself wrote an introduction, emphasizing that all books were to "be examined and approved of by our delegates".¹³ In practice, the prescription was not followed; Jewish printers ignored it. Their disobedience was not surprising, since the jurisdiction over Jewish-owned printing houses was not clearly defined. The above-mentioned conflict over the plans for a new edition of the Talmud at the Lublin printing house of Zvi Calonymus Yafe occurred early on, in 1628.¹⁴ The complicated legal status of Jewish printers is illustrated by the letters exchanged during the controversy. A letter of Bishop Szyszkowski sent to the king notes that according to the resolutions of the Kraków synod of 1621, any book, including Jewish ones, could be printed only after it had been investigated and approved

¹¹ *Reformationes generale ad Clerum et populum Dioecesis Cracovien. pertinentes Ab Illustrimo et Reverendis. Dmo D. Martino Szyszkowski Dei et Apostolicae Sedis Gratia Episcopo Crac. Duce Sever. In Synodo Dioecesisana Sancitae et promulgatae*, Kraków 1621, 174–175.

¹² Bolesław Kumor, *Dzieje diecezji krakowskiej do roku 1795*, vol. 1, Kraków 1998, 517 and following.

¹³ *Index librorum*, Kraków 1617.

¹⁴ The first Polish editions of Thalmud—Lublin 1559–1576, Kraków 1602–05; 1616–20; Lublin 1611–39—according to: Krzysztof Pilarczyk, *Talmud*, 171–175, 235–240; idem, "Reprodukcja *Talmudu* do połowy XVI wieku", in *Studia Judaica* 2 (1998), 157.

by the censors nominated by the bishop. Yet in the same letter, the bishop also recalled the privileges to sell and to print books in their own language which the kings Zygmunt August and Stefan Batory had granted to the Jews.¹⁵ The case thus serves to illustrate the inconsistent pluralism of ecclesiastical and royal legislation. It is difficult to clarify the intentions the bishop Szyszkowski pursued with his letter to the king. On the one hand, he was concerned to follow the church regulations. He suggested that the books be submitted to the censor's scrutiny to determine their supposed anti-Christian formulations, and be formally approved before they were released for sale. On the other hand, the moderate tone in which he had formulated his letter attested to his wish not to encroach upon the ruler's jurisdiction over the Jews. Pointing out the high printing costs, the bishop did not demand either the destruction or the confiscation of the copies of the Talmud edition in question.

The attitude of the responsible church official in Lublin towards Zvi Kalonimos Yafe and his printing house was characterized by an ostentatious lack of interest. That worked in effect to the latter's favour. From the correspondence of the Lublin *voyevode* Mikołaj Oleśnicki with the king, it is obvious that the church official was fully aware of the Jewish printers and their publications. Yet he did not find them in any way inappropriate, nor did he intervene in the printers' activities.¹⁶

Bishop Szyszkowski's intervention resulted in the submission of the Lublin edition of the Talmud to the scrutiny of Jakub Witelisz, a professor at the University of Kraków. The printed volumes were most probably delivered to him by a Jewish delegation. The Venice edition of the Talmud seems to have provided the yardsick for his censorship. This conclusion may be drawn from the note on the inside of the cover of the volume published by Bomberg's printing house in 1521, which is now in the Jagiellonian Library in Kraków.¹⁷ This is the only extant copy of the Talmud in Poland which contains any information about censorship. Jakub Witelisz stated that in December 1628, by order of Bishop Szyszkowski, he had looked through the Lublin edition published by Zvi Kalonimos Yafe and that he had found numerous mistakes.

¹⁵ K. Pilarczyk, *Talmud*, 149.

¹⁶ *Ibidem*, 150.

¹⁷ *Ibidem*, *Talmud*, 150–151.

The controversy over the publication of the Talmud without the censors' approval resulted in the closure of the Jewish printing house in Lublin. The order was given by the King. What were the immediate reasons for his decision? This has not been possible to determine. The bishop and the clergy of Lublin took a moderate view, as did the *voyevode*. There is no indication that any of the officials involved demanded such a radical measure. It may have been the case, however, that bishop Szyszkowski took the initiative after he had received Witelisz's report. Some historians argue that the closing down of the Lublin printing house was due to the intervention of the papal nuncio, though they can cite no sources to support their thesis.¹⁸ In a letter sent to the Pope from Kraków on 13 March 1629, Bishop Szyszkowski reported on his actions pertaining to the publication of the Talmud in Lublin. It notes that all copies had been seized and were checked for any blasphemous formulations.¹⁹ However, the crux of the letter was the bishop's uncertainty as to how to deal with an inconsistency of church legislation. According to Pope Pius IV, the corrected Talmud was admissible, while Clement VIII held that it must be condemned in its entirety. Bishop Szyszkowski turned to the Pope to resolve the discrepancy, while stressing his readiness to follow any papal instructions, including the burning of the copies containing controversial passages. The fate of the copies of the Talmud printed by Zvi Kalonimos Yafe is unknown. Most probably they were not destroyed, since such an occurrence would likely have been reported in the sources.

The Lublin edition of the Talmud gave rise to one of the principal controversies over the censorship of Jewish books immediately provoked by the Catholic clergy. In the event, the Lublin press was shut down for several years. Not until 1633, through a privilege granted by King Władysław IV, were the Jewish printers allowed to start printing again, to complete an edition of the Babylonian Talmud and to publish other works.²⁰

The history of Jewish printing in Poland in the second half of the seventeenth and in the eighteenth century has not to date received sufficient attention by scholars. During this period, printing houses publishing Hebrew books were active in several localities, among them

¹⁸ Ibidem, 154.

¹⁹ Archive of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, Rome (ACDF), Sanctum Officium, Stanza Storica CC1-b, f. 105.

²⁰ K. Pilarczyk, *Talmud*, 161.

Kraków, Kazimierz, Lublin and Żółkiew. The degree to which the Catholic hierarchy and clergy were concerned with and interfered in their activity also requires further study. It seems that Jewish printers were far more worried about foreign competitors, mainly from Italy and Amsterdam, than about interventions by officials of the Catholic Church. The books published abroad were of far better quality than the local production. The volume of book-selling can be gathered from the accounts of the customs tariffs, which very often mentioned "a trunk full of books" among other goods.²¹ The demand must have been great, considering that Poland was a major center of Talmudic studies.

In Poland, no actions against Jewish printing houses were initiated by the Catholic Church in the second half of the seventeenth and in the eighteenth century. The Catholic hierarchy focused mainly on the Talmud, which was not printed in Poland after 1648, although it was brought in from abroad. Anti-Talmudic works were published in Poland as early as the mid-sixteenth century. The list of their authors comprised not only clergymen, but also burghers, philosophers and statesmen. Criticism of the Talmud intensified in the early eighteenth century for several reasons. Converts often confirmed the existence of anti-Christian ideas in Talmudic tractates and even the alleged use of blood for ritual purposes.²² The verification of their claims was difficult. The level of education of the Catholic clergy had deteriorated as compared to the sixteenth century; Hebrew was not taught, which in practice ruled out any censorship based on the understanding of specific passages.

The increasing attacks against the Talmud in the eighteenth century should also be viewed in the context of the emergence of Jewish messianic movements and of the missionary efforts of the Catholic Church targeting the Jews as potential converts. The expansion of the messianic movements, which sprang from Sabbatianism and approximated Christianity in their teachings, roused hopes among the Catholic clergy for large-scale conversions from Judaism to Catholicism. Rejected and

²¹ Archiwum Główne Akta Dawnych, Warsaw, Archiwum Skarbu Koronnego III/1517 (1); III/1604 (19); see also Renata Żurkowa, "Udział Żydów krakowskich w handlu książką w pierwszej połowie XVII wieku", in Feliks Kiryk (ed.), *Żydzi w Małopolsce. Studia z dziejów osadnictwa i życia społecznego*, Przemyśl 1991, 59–78.

²² Archiwum Państwowe w Gdańsku, *Relatio vera Joannis Seraphinowicz baptizati Judaei*, 1719.

persecuted by the rabbis, the followers of the new movements not only sought the support of the secular authorities, but also turned to powerful representatives of the Catholic hierarchy. The engagement of the Catholic clergy grew strongest in the regions of Volhynia and Podolia, where the messianic movements attained their greatest influence and where their resultant struggles with the conservative rabbinate was most heated.

The notion that it was essentially the Talmud which prevented Jews from being persuaded to embrace Christianity was deeply ingrained in the minds of the Catholic clergy. The writings of Franciszek Kobielski, bishop of Luck, were typical of this viewpoint. In his pamphlet "The Enlightenment on the Unfaithful People" (*Światło na oświecenie narodu niewiernego to jest Kazania w synagogach żydowskich miane*), he propagated the rejection of the Talmud for containing illogical nonsense and superstitions obscuring the truth of Christianity.²³ The fight against the Talmud became an integral element of the Catholic missionary efforts in Volhynia and Podolia. One practical manifestation was the injunction issued by Bishop Kobielski that all Jewish books in synagogues be investigated by the archdeacons, in the presence of individuals well-versed in Hebrew. At the same time, the bishop banned the printing and the import of Jewish books without the censor's approval.²⁴ We do not know whether the bishop's ban was ever observed in practice. In one of his writings, Kobielski vaguely mentioned an order of his own to burn the blasphemous Talmud.²⁵ Since neither Jewish nor Christian sources reveal any hint of such an event, the bishop's words were probably just wishful thinking.

Another wave of anti-Talmudic attacks initiated by the Catholic clergy was connected with the emergence and expansion of the Frankist movement. The provinces most affected were once again Volhynia and Podolia. The bishops of Łuck, Kamieniec and Kiev, Dembowski, Sołtyk and Załuski played leading roles on the Catholic side in this encounter with Frankism. It led to two disputations between rabbis and

²³ Franciszek Antoni Kobielski, *Światło na oświecenie narodu niewiernego to jest kazania w synagogach miane oraz Reflexye y list odpowiadający na pytania synagogi brodzkiej*, Lwów 1746, 122, 156, 164.

²⁴ *Litterae pastorales ad Universum Clerum et Populum utriusq. Dioecesis*, [Lwów] 1742—republished as: "List pasterski biskupa łuckiego Franciszka Antoniego Kobielskiego do ludności żydowskiej, Łuck 10 V 1741", in Adam Kaźmierczyk (ed.), *Żydzi polscy 1648–1772. Źródła*, Kraków 2001, 55.

²⁵ F. Kobielski, *Światło*, 156, 164.

Frankists, who were portrayed as counter-Talmudists. The first was held in Kamieniec in 1756 and the second in Lvov in 1759. The disputation in Kamieniec ended with the verdict to burn the Talmud.²⁶ Two copies of the Talmud, probably purchased for this purpose by the bishop, were in fact burnt.²⁷ The event was significant for its symbolic message rather than for any immediate practical consequences. It apparently had none. The Jewish printing houses in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth were not affected. Beginning in the mid-eighteenth century, their number had grown rapidly, particularly in the south-eastern provinces, including Volhynia and Podolia. There were nineteen Jewish presses active in the Ruthenian areas of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth as compared to twenty Catholic printing houses.²⁸

In sum, Hebrew presses had been working without interruption throughout the history of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Depending on the period, their output was sometimes bigger, sometimes smaller. It seems, however, that the policy of the Catholic clergy was for the most part accidental to these fluctuations. The question remains: why, with the exception of the Talmud, which was imported into Poland but not printed there after 1648, did the Catholic Church not interfere with Hebrew printing? It focused exclusively on the formulations contrary to the teachings of the Church, which the Talmud supposedly comprised. The provincial and diocesan synods in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth did not concern themselves with Jewish books, the constant references to the resolutions of the Council of Trent notwithstanding. These were included in their documents until the late eighteenth century. It would be a mistake, however, to attribute this indifference on the part of the provincial and diocesan synods to a general neglect of publishing and censorship issues. Quite the contrary: the majority of the statutes of the synods included resolutions on books, but these targeted only heretical works, i.e. Protestant books. The ban on their reading was repeatedly renewed. In the second half of the sixteenth century, Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł “Sierotka” even issued an order to burn Protestant books, among them the so-called “Brześć

²⁶ Aleksander Kraushar, *Frank i Frankiści polscy 1726–1816*, vol. 1, Kraków 1895, 95; Jan Doktor, *Śladami Mesjasza—Apostaty*, Warszawa 1998, 163.

²⁷ J. Doktor, *Śladami*, Warszawa 1998, 163.

²⁸ Alodia Kawecka-Gryczowa, Krystyna Korotajowa i Wojciech Krajewski (ed.), *Drukarze dawnej Polski od XV do XVIII wieku, Zeszyt 6 Małopolska—ziemie ruskie*, Wrocław/Kraków 1960, 7–9.

Bible”.²⁹ It seems that the Catholic Church attached greatest importance to the ban in the sixteenth century, yet similar decrees were also issued in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.³⁰ At that later stage, with Protestant influence waning, the position of the Catholic Church in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was no longer endangered. The stagnation of the legislation of the provincial and diocesan synods reflected the passivity of the Church in this period. Synods were rarely convened and passed no new laws, merely repeating the existing ones. Occasionally resolutions concerning Jews were passed. These did not introduce any novel norms, but rather reiterated the previous legislation. It seems that Judaism was not perceived as a threat by the Roman Catholic Church on the same level as Protestantism, Orthodoxy or even the Uniate Church. Hence the comparatively marginal interest shown by the Catholic Church in Jewish matters.

Apart from the priorities of the Catholic Church in Poland, the specific legal status of the Jews inhabiting the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth played a key role in determining the history of Jewish printing houses. Originally the Jews had been subject to the king's exclusive jurisdiction, had held important positions at the royal court and had contributed a major part of the royal revenues. Consequently, they enjoyed the protection and support of the monarch. They could also count on the protection of some part of the nobility. In 1539, the jurisdiction over Jews living in private estates was ceded to the owners. Consequently, Jewish rights and liberties within such estates were framed by the nobility according to their best interests. The rise of aristocratic power had a great impact on the development of Hebrew printing. In the sixteenth century, Jewish presses had been established in royal cities with large and well-organized Jewish communities that had developed in important centers of Jewish study and culture, such as Kraków and Lublin. In the eighteenth century, with the decline of the king's power, the majority of the printing houses were set up in private towns. These were owned by the aristocracy. As the Jewish presses must have contributed considerably to the estate owners' incomes, their

²⁹ H. Szwejkowska, *Książka drukowana*, 130.

³⁰ E.g. constitutions of following synods: in Kraków 1532; in Piotrków 1539; in Piotrków 1542; in Piotrków 1577; in Warszawa 1634—I. Subera, 85, 87, 91, 107, 134; in Wilno 1633—*Constitutiones Synodorum Dioecesis Vlnensis*, Wilno 1633; in Wilno 1636—*Collectanea constitutionum synodaliūm*, Wilno 1690; in Warszawa 1643—*Synodus Provincialis Gnesnensis*, Warszawa 1646.

production was not restricted. The eminent position of the aristocracy and their far-reaching independence from the central authority, which were particularly pronounced in the south-east provinces of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, set limits to any interference in Jewish matters by the Church in the private estates. Jewish printing houses benefited from this relative immunity of the nobility. It facilitated the emergence of the famous Jewish printing presses in Żółkiew, Szklów and Korzec, as well as dozens of small enterprises in towns like Tarnaków, Połonne, Sławuta, Ostróg, Dubno, Sambor and Sokal, and many others.³¹

³¹ *Drukarze dawnej*, 7–9.

INQUISITION, THEOLOGY AND THE REALISM
OF LA LOZANA ANDALUZA

Eleazar Gutwirth
Tel Aviv

Vor dem Gesetz steht ein Türhüter. Zu diesem Türhüter kommt ein Mann vom Lande und bittet um Eintritt in das Gesetz.¹

It is generally assumed that Delicado's *Lozana Andaluza* was published around 1528 in Venice, about fifty years after the establishment of the Spanish Inquisition and some fifteen years before the bull that led to the establishment of the Roman Inquisition.² The *Lozana* is concerned with a particular world, which includes conversas from Spain who are in Rome. To explain this "anomaly", the author writes a brief but crucial line for one of his characters: When (Mamotreto IX) the *Lozana* asks:

Y cuanto ha que estais aqui?

Beatriz replies:

Señora mia, desde el año que se puso la Inquisición.

Immediately afterwards the *Lozana* asks:

Decime señoras mias hay aqui judios?

¹ Hartmut Binder (ed.), Franz Kafka, *Vor dem Gesetz*, Stuttgart 1993.

² See Bruno Damiani (ed.), Francisco Delicado *La Lozana Andaluza*, Madrid 1975; Claude Allaigre (ed.), *La Lozana Andaluza*, Madrid 1985; Bruno Damiani, "La Lozana Andaluza: Ensayo bibliografico", in *IberoRomania* (VI) 1980, 47–85. The connection between Pulgar and Delicado is in Márquez and McKay (cf. infra). Delicado invokes Pulgar's name in the prologue to his work. For the Spanish Inquisition, see for example Henry Kamen's recent *The Spanish Inquisition*, New Haven 1998; Eleazar Gutwirth, "Inquisición y sociedad en los umbrales de la modernidad", in J. Carrasco (ed.), *Luces y sombras de la judería europea (siglos XI–XVII)*, Tudela 1995, 197–209.

Within the logic of the narrative, then, there would be no story in this form without the Inquisition. In addition, there is a link with the history of ideas. One of the best known, earliest arguments against the practices of the Inquisition is a letter by Hernando del Pulgar of 1481. A main point of this fifteenth-century text (by an author who is explicitly mentioned by Delicado) is precisely the case of Andalusian conversas such as the Lozana.³ Thus, despite its frequently observed ambiguities, the Lozana is part of the history of the Inquisition, both by diegesis and by political argument. It is concerned with Rome, with its ecclesiastics and with conversas who were historically the targets of the Spanish Inquisition. This is more surprising than may initially appear.

At first glance, the realm of the Law, i.e., institutional history, would appear quite separate and perhaps even in opposition to the area of representations. Such differentiations have been at the forefront of recent discussions on the history of the persecution of minorities in pre-modern Europe. Around 1975, the canonist Garcia y Garcia refused to recognize his own discipline as a source for the exclusive explanation for historical problems such as the Catholic Monarchs' policy towards Jews and Judaizers. He emphasized that there were two factors. One was Renaissance *raison d'état* (itself based on canon law), the second was subjectivity.⁴ D. Nirenberg, for example, recently formulated the view that:

Medievalists have written books like Cohn's *Europe's Inner Demons*, Robert Moore's *The Formation of a Persecuting Society* and Carlo Ginzburg's *Ecstasies*, books that are exercises in psychoanalysis attempts to understand an assumed collective unconscious of modern Europeans. Carlo Ginzburg has argued that there emerged in the first half of the fourteenth century an irrational fear of conspiracy. It was this irrational mentality that led to pogroms ... the long view means that events are read less within their local contexts than according to a teleology ... they focus on collective images, representations and stereotypes ... transcend particularities of time and place.

Nevertheless, he believes that "inherited discourse about minorities acquires force when people choose to find it meaningful. Briefly, discourse and agency gain meaning only in relation to each other".⁵ The

³ Francisco Cantera Burgos, "Francisco del Pulgar y los conversos", in *Sefarad* (IV) 1944, 295–348.

⁴ See Garcia y Garcia's "Introducción" to Tarsicio de Azcona, *Juan de Castilla Rector de Salamanca*, Salamanca 1975.

⁵ David Nirenberg, *Communities of Violence. Persecution of Minorities in the Middle Ages*, Princeton 1996, 4–5.

problems of thirteenth-century Aragon and southern France may not be the same as those of the topic under focus here, namely fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Spain and Rome. But in recent years, the relation between legal institutional history and the imaginary has become a useful focus of research. Is the institutional approach precise, and the history produced rational, almost inevitable? By contrast, is the study of the imaginary at best unspecific, inconclusive?

A.M.Diz has investigated a foundational text in this sphere from thirteenth-century Castile. Berceo's representation of Jews and Judaism (in his *Milagros*) is a foundational text for one of the types of Christian Spanish discourse in the vernacular on these themes. Diz analyzes this by a constant movement between the realm of representations and that of the Law. Both the *Milagros* and the Law appeal to such precise notions as witnessing; both belong in the minority microculture of the thirteenth-century Castilian Christian literate. Both aim to construct *Historias de certidumbre*, narratives of certainty.⁶

I

From even before Juan Antonio Llorente's four-volume *Histoire critique de l'Inquisition d'Espagne*, published in Paris from 1817 to 1818, and down to our own day, there has been an uninterrupted historiographic tradition of Inquisition studies. Despite assertions to the contrary, this is a cooperative project. Frequently, it has a strong institutional and theological character, as one would expect given the nature of the sources. These sources, e.g. Inquisition files, may be (and frequently are) read critically, "against the grain" as it were. And yet the theological and institutional approaches may in themselves predetermine the direction of the history written on their basis. I prefer not to reopen here the rather sterile discussions on the *leyenda negra*. In the history of Spanish thought, as is well known, the Cuban war (and the attendant anti-Spanish campaign of the Hearst popular press) marks a turning point which is so significant that it led to the invention of the concept of the "generation of 1898".⁷ Usually, discussions of this

⁶ A.M.Diz, *Historias de certidumbre*, Newark 1995.

⁷ For the invention of the generation of 1898, see Joan Ramon Resina, "A spectre is haunting Spain: the spirit of the land in the wake of the Disaster", in *Journal of Spanish Cultural Studies*, 2, 2 (2001), 169–186.

period concentrate on the figure of the strongly confessional and nationalist Marcelino Menéndez y Pelayo and on his monumental works that aimed at the construction of a glorious past. But it also includes the invention of the concept of the *leyenda negra*. Associated with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Julian Juderías composed a lengthy book around 1914 (using some material previously published in *La Ilustración*), arguing that the image of the Spanish Inquisition had been tarnished by writings which were in the main Protestant.⁸ Around 1928, the view was being disseminated and effectively marketed⁹ that the Inquisition's *naturaleza* was *la misma que la de otros procedimientos inquisitoriales* of the time (p. 352), but that forensic practice was "perfected" by the Spanish Inquisition. The Inquisition's history had been deformed (or rather *difamada*) by enemies of Spanish *poderio*; by heretics, by Judaism and by Freemasons (p. 373); the Spanish Inquisition was based on the most advanced jurisprudence and it showed *maravillas de delicadeza* as well as an astonishing spirit of charity: *asombroso espíritu de caridad* (p. 374). Later writings referred to *Vidas por oficio*, i.e. to Inquisitors who were "doing their job".¹⁰ Which is to say that this avenue of argument is neither particularly innovative nor original.

Let us look briefly at the historiographic question. As is well known, one of the "models" of research in Inquisition studies is the work of Ernst Hermann Johann Schaefer. His extensive three-volume study on the persecution of Protestants, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des spanischen Protestantismus im sechzehnten Jahrhundert*, appeared in 1902. It may be argued that he is a model for present-day Inquisition scholarship because of his careful attention to archival material (at Madrid and Simancas in our case, although he also worked on material from

⁸ Julian Juderías y Loyet, *La leyenda negra. Estudios acerca del concepto de España en Europa*, Madrid 1914. Unlike his work on the criminality of children, that on Russia or even that on the Gibraltar problem, the *leyenda negra* theme was not forgotten; it was constantly popular, as witnessed by the reeditions of the book (for example Julian Juderías *La leyenda negra Estudios acerca del concepto de España en el extranjero* [it is the 9th edition] Barcelona 1943). Numerous publications were variations on this theme; see Lowell "Newton y la historia de la fuerza naval española. Algunos comentarios" in *Archivo Hispalense* (2 época), 1973, LVI, No. 171–173; William S. Maltby, *The Black Legend in England and the Development of anti-Spanish sentiment 1558–1660*, Durham 1971; Charles Gibson, *The Black Legend. Anti-Spanish Literature in the Old World and the New*, New York 1971.

⁹ *Enciclopedia Universal Ilustrada Europa y America*, Madrid 1928, tomo LXIV.

¹⁰ J. Caro Baroja, *El señor inquisidor y otras vidas por oficio*, Madrid 1970.

Seville). He is of interest for another reason as well. I suspect there is a further link between Schaefer and present-day Inquisition studies. Indeed, Schaefer could be associated with the holdings of the university library of Halle as a result of his use of the many volumes of MSS Yc. 20, 2°.

Anyone signing the pertinent register of the university library of Halle notices that the registry of readers of these MSS in the early 1920s included Fritz Baer. In 1936 he had published—admittedly brief—selections from the Halle MSS. His perspectives had a dialectical relation with the institutional and theological approaches. As is well-known, in the late 1960's and early 1970s, a tradition of discussions and publications about the so-called "Jerusalem School of History" was initiated. These formed the basis for today's extensive array of published work of "contextualizations".

The figure of Baer was linked to these. He had been closely associated with the History Departments of the Hebrew University. Through his teaching and influence, Inquisition studies were indelibly associated with the "Jerusalem School". His research introduced a new kind of rigor into Inquisition studies. It suffices to recall his laconic notes on Aramaic formulae in Inquisition documents or his identification of personalities, of religious and other concepts or texts appearing in Inquisition documents on the basis of Hebrew and Neo-Aramaic scholarly works inaccessible to many Inquisition students. Inevitably, such high demands met with opposition of the usual kind. Leaving aside the burning of his *Die Juden im Christlichen Spanien* in the 1930s, there were the criticisms in the 1940s stemming from the traditionalist, conservative philologists. They claimed that he did not pay sufficient attention to Midrash or Halakha in his studies on original and previously unpublished material from the fifteenth century. And there were those who accused him of projecting Weimar into medieval history. Nevertheless, and despite these criticisms, he was by no means "forgotten" or irrelevant to present Inquisition studies. All the while, of course, he was being imitated (with or without acknowledgement); and even today, widely marketed polemical writings against his work on the origins of the Inquisition in fifteenth-century Spain depend on an almost complete erasure of the evidence from Inquisition archives in which Baer had invested so much time and energy.

Some of his questions are still relevant, such as the question of the Inquisition's regionalism versus *Gleichschaltung* about 1482.¹¹ He also

¹¹ *A History of the Jews in Christian Spain*, Philadelphia 1968.

saw a certain coherence between the theological position (of the medieval Church on the Jews) and the institutional history of the Inquisition's activities against Judaizers. There is a certain ambiguity here. Although he repeatedly claimed to question institutional history, he was nevertheless a disciple of Vincke, a respectful reader of Schaefer and Lea, and his doctoral thesis leaned heavily towards the history of Jewish institutions in Aragon (as did some of his appendices to *Die Juden*). He was a contributor to *AHDE*. The resulting history was colored by these perspectives. One particular aspect may help to clarify my focus here. It is a focus which admittedly does not accept rigid distinctions between High and Low; nonetheless, it is not particularly informed by Bakhtin, Gramsci or even Burke. Rather, it reacts to Baer's view that "in serious history" there is no place for literary works or given his admiration for lyric genres, more precisely satiric genres, called "low jesting" by Baer.¹² Bearing this in mind, one must infer that the *Lozana* has no place in history.

Over against views of the theological and institutional rationalism and coherence of the Inquisition, one may restore balance by taking account of research and pointing to the variables in the theological and institutional histories and, paradoxically perhaps, the solid opportunities offered by a focus on "the imaginary".

II

In the 1940s and 1950s, Goñi Gaztámbide was engaged in innovative, original research, selecting and editing previously unknown documents from the Papal chancellery, more precisely the correspondence between the Crown of Aragon-Castille and the Holy See in the late 1470s and 1480s, at the time of the establishment of the Spanish Inquisition.¹³ What Goñi Gaztámbide's archival discoveries at the Vatican archives really meant was described decades later (and slightly euphemistically) by Roger Highfield: Spanish monarchy and Roman papacy were partners "constantly rubbing against each other and having tiffs"; their relationship is characterized as one of "strain".¹⁴ The bulls for the

¹² Op cit vol. 2, chapter 13, 301.

¹³ Jose Goñi Gaztámbide, "La santa sede y la reconquista del reino de Granada", in *Hispania Sacra* IV (1951), 43–80.

¹⁴ Roger Highfield and Frances M. López-Morillas (eds.), *Spain in the Fifteenth Century*, London 1972, 354, 364, 377.

establishment of the Spanish Inquisition (presented in the textbooks as its foundational origin) were the end result of a wider correspondence. The constant tension and struggles for control of funds were threads that ran through that discourse. All the while, however, there were mutual recriminations and conflicts on a variety of issues of which the Inquisition was only one item.

In the 1960s, at the time of the project of beatification of Queen Isabel, Tarsicio de Azcona was at work documenting the presence of the Inquisition plans in the diplomatic pouch of the Papal nuncio and its rejection by the chancellery of King Enrique IV in the 1460s.¹⁵ The strenuous negotiations, the haggling and tensions; the personal choices from among various options, the roads taken and not taken do not surprise us. Both Spain and the Papacy have long since been understood as forerunners of Renaissance diplomacy, most notably in the concrete and innovative practice of resident diplomats.¹⁶ If seen from the perspective of innovative archival research, the jurists and theologians appear to be justifying and legitimizing, by appeal to precedent, the decisions of individuals which are anything but inevitable.

Similarly, much more recent research on the Papacy tends to accentuate the difference between the continuity or logic of Papal pronouncements on the one hand and their implementation and execution on the other. Even if we do not adhere to D. Romano's theory¹⁷ that legislation was rarely carried out, recent work has shown quite clearly that Papal "policy" or legislation, or theological writing is one field; and that the study and research of the realities of execution and implementation is quite another, demanding different skills, different documentation, archives and approaches. This is the case with the Carta Real of 1450, its relation to Papal legislation and the need to investigate additional, non-Roman archives such as those of Seville or Toledo. Attention to the vernacular texts of legislative and other documentation is crucial in this field.¹⁸

¹⁵ Tarsicio de Azcona, *Isabel la Católica*, Madrid 1964.

¹⁶ Garret Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy*, London 1955.

¹⁷ D. Romano, "Marco jurídico de la minoría judía en la Corona de Castilla de 1240 a 1350", in *Actas II Congreso Internacional Encuentro de las Tres Culturas*, Toledo 1985, 261–292.

¹⁸ J. Castano, "El procurador de las aljamas de los judíos de Castilla y la Carta Real de 1450", in *En La España Medieval* 18 (1995), 183–205.

III

The global pronouncements of the Papacy, religious Orders, and faculties of Theology are not necessarily the same as the local realities of Jewish/Christian or Converso/Old Christian relations. One of the variables is that of localism or regionalism. The agendas of local historians are multiple and complex and present an interesting problem in historiography. Recent work has attempted to disentangle some of the strands and point to this type of historiography as it relates to Jews and conversos.¹⁹ In some cases, the problems are very closely related to the practices of Inquisition history. Thus, for example, regionalism and maps are interconnected—in our case to the history of the Inquisition. In the instance of Spain, one could find the places and dates of the establishment of Inquisition tribunals (Seville 1480, Cordoba 1482, Valencia 1482, Saragossa 1482, Toledo 1483, Barcelona 1484, Mallorca 1488, Valladolid 1488, Logroño 1489, Cuenca 1489, etc.). The most remarkable aspect in such cases are the absences. Here it may suffice to give one concrete example which is directly relevant to the history of the Inquisition's relations with Rome. It concerns the bishop of Segovia, Juan Arias Davila, who had traveled to Rome with the Count of Tendilla in the 1480s. He later escaped to Rome c. 1490. The accumulation of biographical facts was deemed important for the history of the place the Inquisition occupied in Spanish-Roman relations since at least the 1860s, when Gustav Adolph Bergenroth perceived it as central to the narrative of the Inquisition and the reign of Isabella.²⁰ A century later, historians were questioning the exclusive concentration on the anecdotal and sought to point to the neglect of other aspects. These included the economic side at the time of the negotiations between Rome and Spain and the question of episcopal election and reform. Tarsicio de Azcona emphasized this and attended to problems such as the different annual incomes of the individual bishoprics.²¹ Ladero Quesada studied the ecclesiastic fiscal machinery.²² Later, attention was paid to what this evidence meant (not in terms of individual biographies but) for the history of society.²³

¹⁹ See my remarks on regional historiography in *Zion* (Hebrew) 62 (1997), 79–87 and in *La Coronica*, 25 January 1996, 182–186.

²⁰ Gustav Adolph Bergenroth, "Prologue" to *Calendar of State Papers*, vol. I, London 1862.

²¹ Tarsicio de Azcona, *La eleccion y reforma del episcopado espanol en tiempos de los Reyes Catolicos*, Madrid 1960.

²² M. A. Ladero Quesada, *El siglo XV en Castilla*, Barcelona 1982.

The evidence itself could be the object of historical attention. Around 1980,²⁴ the study of the microfilm of the seventh legajo in AHN Inq. 1413 made it quite clear that this was not an original manuscript of the fifteenth century, i.e. the product of the Inquisitorial notary's activities (begun about 17 January 1486), in Segovia, in the case of Bishop Juan Arias Davila and his father Diego Arias Davila and other members of the family accused of Judaizing. Rather it was a sixteenth-century copy which contained selections taken from the *Libros* of the Inquisition of Segovia. It was also quite probable that these *Libros* had not survived. The ensuing publications drew attention to what seemed an important factor by referring not to the modern (and anachronistic) foliation but rather, as the Inquisitors had done, to the original sources i.e. the books of the Segovian Inquisition. The message was clear: the marginal glosses in the manuscript were not irrelevant. They could lead us to some awareness of the books of the Segovian Inquisition, their number (seven), their size.

It would be tempting to explain this belated sixteenth-century interest, selection and copying of these Inquisitorial sources by attention to the possibly related *legajo* 43.635 of the *Consejos* section at the AHN (apparently unnoticed by students of the Arias Davila Inquisition case). This is included among other legal papers of the litigation concerning the title and estate of the Counts of Puñonostro, created by Charles V for the bishop's nephew and homonym, Juan Arias Davila.²⁵ In any case, the common practice of erasure of Segovia from the map of fifteenth-century Inquisition tribunals needs to be reconsidered. The evidence produced in a series of publications shows quite clearly that the books of the Segovian Inquisition (non-existent according to some maps) are the *Vorlage* of AHN 1413/7.²⁶ I believe that something similar could be said about other Inquisition tribunals which have been erased from the record; and the case of Osma might be a further example.

²³ Eleazar Gutwirth, "Elementos étnicos e históricos en las relaciones judeo-conversas en Segovia", in Yosef Kaplan (ed.), *Jews and conversos*, Jerusalem 1985, 83–102.

²⁴ Eleazar Gutwirth, "Jewish-Converso Relations in XVth c. Segovia", in *Proceedings Eighth World Congress of Jewish Studies, B*, Jerusalem 1982, 49–53.

²⁵ Fernando G. Salinero "Introducción" in his edition of *Viaje de Turquía. La odisea de Pedro de Urdemalas*, Madrid 1980, 62 n. 68.

²⁶ See for example Eleazar Gutwirth, "On the Background to Cota's Epitalamio Burlesco", *Romanische Forschungen* 97:1 (1985), 1–14.

IV

Alongside geography or regionalism then, other variables are the historical differences between the age of manuscripts and that of print. Part of the “ethics of reading”, it also raises issues of access. This is relevant in the particular case of attempts to explain the “general principles to which the Inquisition subscribed”,²⁷ i.e. to reconstruct the theology behind it. The Venetian Inquisition, associated with the Roman in a number of ways, might seem a random example, but Venice in the 1530s is the destination of Delicado—author of the *Lozana Andaluza*—when he moves out of Rome. Here it may suffice to recall that one of these attempts to explain the theology is constructed by appeal to the peculiar notions concerning the Talmud: “In these years, too, the Talmud was bitterly attacked, and was burned in Venice as elsewhere not only for the blasphemies ascribed to it but also for its antisocial qualities [...] it teaches them to swear false oaths [...]” as formulated in the petition of Freschi Olivi in 1555.²⁸ The basic steps here are that it is not only possible but unproblematic to reconstruct the precise talmudic/anti-talmudic theology legitimizing the Inquisition.

In the particular case of the choice of anti-talmudism, there are major, older and non-Italian antecedents. The anti-talmudic statements appear as reenactments of postures and formulations which are not the product of Venetian circumstances in the 1550s. One of the major issues is that of access. Although access to Talmudic languages such as Aramaic is presented in some narratives as completely unproblematic, textual and philological work has different qualities. It suffices to recall three different areas of research on texts in the language of Jesus in the relevant period, the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries: a) the work on the translations of Hebrew and Aramaic religious and other texts into the vernacular in the fifteenth century, b) that on the early grammarians of Aramaic of the sixteenth century or c) that on the Aramaic columns of Montano’s Bible.²⁹ Their basic message is that

²⁷ Brian Pullan, *The Jews of Europe and the Inquisition of Venice 1550–1670*, Oxford 1983, XIV.

²⁸ Ibid. 19.

²⁹ The complexities of fifteenth-century translations into national European languages of Hebrew and Aramaic texts are beginning to be revealed in cases such as that of the Arragel Bible (1422–33?) written for don Luis de Guzman, Master of the Order of Calatrava. See on this, for example, Eleazar Gutwirth, “Daniel 1/4 y las ansiedades del cortesano”, in J. Carreira et al (ed.), *III Simposio Bíblico Español I Lusho-Espanhol*,

direct access to the language of Talmudic texts by, say, Inquisitors is problematic rather than a given and that a great deal of research is still necessary.

The *Pugio Fidei* is one of the better known antecedents. The *Pugio Fidei*, written by the Dominican Ramón Martí de Subirat (1230?–1284?), had been considered a central document for the Christian theological position on the Jews and the Talmud. It had been seen as an expression of Papal policy; that of Nicholas III (1277–1280), whose bull of 4 August 1278 aimed to convert the Jews of Europe. This view of his importance is not entirely new. Amador de los Ríos regarded him around 1875 as one of the authors of *muchas y muy señaladas obras contra la raza hebrea*.³⁰ It was his view that these were the product of converso pens and that the thirteenth-century anti-Jewish polemic of the Dominicans was conducted against a historical background where there were *no pocos desertores de la creencia mosaica*³¹ in the Dominican Order. In a chapter on Martí which may have been colored by polemic against his predecessor Jose Amador de los Ríos, Menéndez y Pelayo³² considered it a work of *catequesis*, a notion occasionally

Valencia-Lisboa 1991, 639–648. Another (slightly earlier) text which contains translations (Ibn Gabirol's poetry, Ibn Ezra's commentaries, etc) from Hebrew into an emerging national language is the Memorial or Tratado of the converso Maestre Juan el Viejo de Toledo. See idem, "Maestre Juan el Viejo and his Tratado, (Madrid MS)", *Proceedings of the Ninth World Congress of Jewish Studies*, B, Jerusalem 1986, 129–134. A related problem is that of the hellenists who at the beginning of the sixteenth century were involved in the Complutensian project. See A. Sáenz Badillos, *La Filología Bíblica en los primeros helenistas de Alcalá*, Estella 1990. As is well known, in the 1520's Münster claimed that in the case of Aramaic he was a teacher without having been a student. Münster's *Chaldaica Grammatica* printed by Frobenius is a year later than the Hebrew grammar of Alfonso. Kit Burmeister, *Sebastian Münster*, Basel 1963; idem, *Neue Forschungen zu Sebastian Münster*, Ingelheim 1971; idem, *Sebastian Münster's Briefe*, Frankfurt 1964. A recent interesting contribution is available on line at Heidelberg's Jewish Studies Homepage: Harmut Bobzin's Gastvortrag "Sebastian Münster in Heidelberg". While Münster's Aramaic still needs a great deal of study, Canini is the subject of an article in press by J. Weinberg (previously given as a lecture at the Warburg Institute). I have tried to analyze some of the issues in the scholarship on Montano's *Biblia*, particularly the question of originality and innovation in the editions of texts in Hebrew and Aramaic, in "Arias Montano's Hebrew" in *Proceedings Barcelona Congress* (Hebrew), Jerusalem: Brit Ivrit Olamit 1991, 116–124 and the notes *ibid.* for work on the question of Nebrixa's treatise on Hebrew orthography.

³⁰ *Historia Social política y religiosa de los judíos de España*, Madrid 1875. Introduction, 6–7.

³¹ *Ibid.* 12.

³² M. Menéndez y Pelayo, *Historia de los Heterodoxos*, Santander 1947, III, IV, 322.

repeated after him. For him, Marti was *gloria de las mas grandes ... de España*. In his eyes, it was a work of *todavía no igualada erudición hebreaica*. He admitted that the Paris 1651 edition, (with prologues by Maussac and Voisin), *es muy rara sobre todo en Espana*.³³ Baer believed that it had exercised direct influence on late fourteenth- and fifteenth-centuries Jewish intellectuals: it was “the instrument which brought masses of Jews to apostasy”.³⁴ Since these conversos were the cause of the Inquisition, the two issues are even further intertwined. Nevertheless, he admitted that it was “difficult to determine how wide a circulation the book attained at this time”.³⁵ That is to say that, by implication, Baer had formulated the tasks for future generations and provided a model: the *rezeptionsgeschichte* was to be a main focus of research. François Secret, among others, took up this project formulated by Baer and began to carry it out, albeit in a well-delimited field.³⁶ The study of the *Pugio's* influence on the arguments at Tortosa or on the apologetic manuscript of Alfonso de Zamora are other research projects which basically and more clearly derive from and follow the lines of the blueprint set by Baer.

On yet another level the *Pugio* belonged in that short-list of conveniently printed sources which could be adduced to reconstruct medieval and Renaissance theology concerning the Jews. The research of Amador's followers in the twentieth century seemed to buttress this view by showing its influence—not only on some of the most publicized and well-known figures and events in the Jewish-Christian debate in late medieval Spain (Alfonso de Valladolid, Arnaldo de Villanova, Pablo of Burgos, Benedict XIII, Jeronimo de Santa Fe at the Tortosa Disputation, the *Fortalitium Fidei*, the curious apologetic manuscript of Alfonso de Zamora), but also on other figures, possibly less familiar to the general public in the twentieth century (such as Maestre Juan el Viejo de Toledo³⁷) although demonstrably present in the libraries of those who wielded power in the fifteenth century. Thus, by the time of its influence on Renaissance writings, the *Pugio* had a long, late medieval Spanish history as a factor in the formation of theological

³³ Ibid. 319, n. 2.

³⁴ Baer, *A History*, I, 185.

³⁵ Ibid. 168.

³⁶ F. Secret has recently returned (albeit briefly) to the subject of the *Pugio* in the Renaissance in his *Hérmetisme et kabbale*, Napli 1992.

³⁷ Eleazar Gutwirth, “Maestre Juan el Viejo [...]” (cf. supra n. 28).

views on the Jews. It had been the practice to study or reconstruct this theology by quoting from the seventeenth century edition with an introduction by the Dean of the Leipzig Theological Faculty, Johann Benedict Carpzov.³⁸ However, Fumagalli's long and laborious inquiry into the manuscripts showed a less comfortable history of reception. His conclusion is that the reception of the manuscript of the work was not as uniform as the seventeenth-century printed edition. Any illusions as to the textual respectability of the twentieth-century practices of citation were shattered by Fumagalli's research, which showed that manuscripts were not identical with that edition and that there were widely different practices of copying and disseminating the book. The latter could be related to regional differences between Spain and Italy but also within different regions of Italy.³⁹

At a more profound level, there have been changes in the very approach to such evidence. Technological developments in the second half of the twentieth century have led to various projects of computerized research on manuscripts⁴⁰ (such as those carried out in Madison, Madrid, Berkeley) whose results inevitably disturbed the assumptions about the centrality of the widely and comfortably available, printed, edited and translated texts on the shelves as exclusive indices of mentality. Though their focus is generally on belles-lettres, there are also consequences for the study of the theologians' views on the Jews and conversos. With the realization of the size and importance of the textual corpus unavailable to nineteenth-century scholars (because it was not in print) comes an awareness of the variety of genres, languages, and, above all the possibilities for reconstructing the profile of the reading public. The influential policy makers were reading (or being advised by readers) in the Romance languages in the age of the "romancist project". At another level, the concept of the ethics of reading is relevant in as much as it postulates a respect for the "otherness" of (late) medieval

³⁸ F. Secret, "Une première édition oubliée du *Pugio Fidei*", in *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* (XXXVI) 1966, 449–455.

³⁹ Pier Francesco Fumagalli, "I trattati medievali *Adversus Judaeos*, Il *Pugio Fidei* ed il suo influsso sulla concezione cristiana dell'ebraismo", in *Scuola cattolica* 113 (1985), 522–545; Ch. Merhavia, "The Hebrew Version of the *Pugio Fidei* in the Sainte Genevieve Manuscript" (Hebrew) *KS* 51 (1976), 283–288. Görges K. Hasselhoff, "Some remarks on Raymond Martini's (c. 1215/30–c. 1284/94) use of Moses Maimonides", *Trumah* 12 (2002), 133–148.

⁴⁰ Ch. Faulhaber, "Philobibliion. Problems and Solutions in a Relational Database of Medieval Texts", in *Linguistic and Literary Computing* 6 (1991), 89–96; idem, "Textual Criticism in the 21st Century" in *Romance Philology* 45 (1991), 123–48.

(and Renaissance) reading modes with all that this implies in terms of attention to language, particular manuscripts, marginalia, glosses, privileged genres, within concrete, particular regional or national cultures. This is quite different from the passive acceptance of the “filters” or mediations of the modern printing press which leads to the almost exclusive concentration on the available printed books (the *Pugio*, *Fortalitium* or other texts which were selected by Migne, etc.) as exclusive sources for reconstructing the theological positions on the Jews.⁴¹

Inevitably, this recalls the problem of “lost literatures”. That is an area which seems to be particularly well represented in studies of medieval Spain. If the most spectacular cases are those of the epic (Menéndez Pidal), there has been work on other fields as well: homiletics (Deyermond, Catedra) lyric, historiography (Deyermond). This is relevant even in the case of converso theology, anti-Inquisition polemics as well as pro-Inquisition apologetics. Here too, scholarship has demonstrated that surviving printed works on the shelves today are by no means identical with the texts that existed in the past. Examples of studies on such texts (which will not be addressed here) are the cases of Lucena’s composition against the Inquisition (Di Camillo), those of Pulgar’s opponent (Cantera), and those on converso theology which led to Talavera’s *Católica impugnación* (Márquez Villanueva). There is another problem that may need recalling: the reconstruction of a lost literature of converso theology in Hebrew written in fifteenth-century Spain. The field of epistolography is particularly instructive because it offers so many cases proving the existence of this lost literature of converso theology. Bonet Bonjorn’s lost Hebrew conversionist letter was circulating in the 1390s. Pablo of Burgos’ Hebrew letter (in reply to Joshua Ha-Lorqi) justifying his conversion to Christianity has survived in a truncated version. His conversionist letter to Orabuena is another lost text. The case of the Francesch de St Jordi correspondence is an additional example. The *Sefer Ha-Piqurim* is by no means the only case of fifteenth-century Hebrew texts of Christian theology written by conversos.⁴²

⁴¹ For Levinas and Literature, see among others J.H. Miller, *The Ethics of Reading*, New York 1987; For the medieval Hispanic/ist context, see P.J. Smith, “Violence and Metaphysics: La Celestina and the question of Jewish Philosophy”, in *Michael* 11 (1989), 267–285; J. Dagenais, *The Ethics of Reading in Manuscript Culture. Glossing the Libro de buen amor*, Princeton 1994; A. D. Deyermond “La literatura en su contexto físico”, in *Donaire* 3 (1994), 9–21.

If this is the case in the study of theology, the concern with Jewish/Hebrew books by the Index is not entirely dissimilar. Recent work on Bellarmino has emphasized that although the Cardinal shared the same religion and the same theological tradition as others, the study of the manuscript (1577–1583) of his most important work reveals that he was frequently at odds with the censors: for example, in his assessment of Rashi.⁴³ Thus, the same theology produces widely different, extremely individual and even directly contradictory readings of one and the same text. As exemplified in the late Dov Font's recently published studies on the expurgation of Amatus Lusitanus' *Centuria*,⁴⁴ the careful examination of the practices of erasure in single copies of expurgated sixteenth-century prints does not support assumptions about the consistency of the expurgations. We have to conclude that censorship studies must take account of the concrete evidence of the single copy. Expurgation differs in individual cases, although the institution and the theology appear uniform, rational and consistent.

V

Andre Chastel's A. W. Mellon Lectures of 1977,⁴⁵ for example, are devoted to the study of the Sack of Rome in 1527. Chastel does not dismiss so-called "popular" manifestations as oral and, therefore, outside the historian's reach. On the contrary, the lessons of his work are that historians need to analyze and weigh different types of evidence: such as the dour retroactive prophecies about 1527; the pamphlets mentioning a comet seen in 1527; the woodcuts which served to propagate these notions; the songs sung in Valladolid about the events. In addition he examines a verbose treatise entitled *Scechina*⁴⁶ written by Cardinal

⁴² Eleazar Gutwirth, "Consolatio: Don Isaac Abravanel and the Classical Tradition", in *Medievalia et Humanistica*, NS 27 (2000), 79–98; idem, "Medieval Romance Epistolography: The Case of the Iberian Jews", in *Neophilologus* LXXXIV/2 (2000), 207–224.

⁴³ Peter W. van Boxel, "Roberto Bellarmino e la tradizione giudaica", in *Roberto Bellarmino, Atti Convegno Internazionale*, Capua 1991, 99–119.

⁴⁴ Font Dov, "The Expurgation of the books of Amatus Lusitanus Censorship and the bibliography of the Individual Book", in *Book Collector* 47/4 (1998), 520–536.

⁴⁵ A. Chastel, *The Sack of Rome*. Translated by Beth Archer. Princeton 1983.

⁴⁶ The work in question was edited by F. Secret (Rome 1959). See also John W. O'Malley, *Giles of Viterbo on church and reform. A study in Renaissance thought* (Studies in medieval and Reformation thought. Vol. 5.) Leiden 1968. Idem, *Religious Culture in the Sixteenth Century* (Variorum Collected Studies Series), Aldershot 1993.

Egidio da Viterbo. In this unfinished composition, the Cardinal draws on his lengthy studies of Hebrew language and texts and turns (7/1530) to esoteric Hebrew texts in order to understand the Scripture. In his book, *Scechina*, he addresses the Emperor in a long discourse on the symbolism of numbers, letters and names alluding to contemporary events, such as the Sack. "Rome ... abandoned itself to sin more than others ... *Scechina*: I pillaged it". Viterbo's conversion to the imperial cause was unqualified. The realm of literary representation is, thus, seen as commensurate with that of the theologians and jurists. The rarified air of Renaissance scholarship in the trilingual field (Egidio da Viterbo's Hebraism) is not incongruous with the strenuous reconstructions of Renaissance graphic art.

VI

The Roman Inquisition was established with the Papal Bull *Licet ab Initio* of July 1542, about sixty years after the Spanish Inquisition (itself preceeded by Inquisitions such as that of Valencia, quite active in the 1460s). As in Spain, it had some precedent in the medieval Inquisition; and as in Spain, it appointed members of the Dominican and Franciscan Orders as Inquisitors. The regulation of the lives of the Jews fell within their competence.⁴⁷ In 1986 it was possible to assert that:

The extent of our ignorance is still breathtaking. We are in the dark concerning such major questions as the nature of the continuity (between the medieval and modern forms of the Inquisition, and) between (the Inquisition's) Iberian and Italian branches.⁴⁸

And yet, in a statistical study, Tedeschi and Monter⁴⁹ speak of a degree of congruence between the two Inquisitions, even though they also stress the differences. The assignment of a *curator* for minors was a Spanish inquisitorial practice which was adopted by the Roman Inquisition in the later sixteenth century. The Roman *auto da fé* is discussed by Tedeschi in relation to the Madrid precedents. He considers it remarkable that several works of Spanish origin were printed in Italy in this period; that a significant number of the Inquisition manuals printed

⁴⁷ John Tedeschi, *The Prosecution of Heresy*, Binghamton 1991, 127.

⁴⁸ Gustav Henningsen and John Tedeschi, *The Inquisition in Early Modern Europe*, Illinois, 48; Tedeschi, *Prosecution*, (cf. n. 47), 93.

⁴⁹ Ibid. 93.

in Italy and used in Italian Inquisition courts were of Spanish origin; and that descriptions of the activities of the Spanish Inquisition were being compiled in Rome. A handbook composed by order of the Congregation of the Holy Office, preserved at the Vatican, contains sections on *De S. to Officio Hispaniarum*.⁵⁰ Attention is also paid to the realm of the imaginary: for Tedeschi, the Inquisitors created a poetic, metaphoric image of themselves as loving and forgiving fathers alluding to the prodigal son. God the Father was an *Inquisitore meraviglioso* when he punished Adam—and Jesus was the first inquisitor.⁵¹ The Inquisitions may be studied from the perspective of desire and the imaginary, that is, the array of images preceding the decisions which would lead to formulations by jurists and theologians.

VII

The wider issue of the relations between Italy and Spain needs to be seen in conjunction with the commercial, cultural and diplomatic contacts throughout the fifteenth century. In the sixteenth century, also Spanish military might has to be taken into account. In the realm of the imaginary, a careful look at the representation of Spain as a model and as an object of desire is necessary. Scholars coming from different backgrounds also differed in their treatment of the image of Spain. Menéndez Pidal, in a classic study, pointed to evidence on fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Italian images of Spain. Manuscripts at the Ambrosiana provided evidence of how Cardinal Bembo attempted to write Spanish verse. Valdés claimed that in Italy knowledge of Spanish was the mark of the gentleman. The *Cortegiano* reflects this situation and, according to Menéndez Pidal, the Italian language itself adopted such significant Spanish concepts as *buen gusto* and *desenvoltura*.⁵²

Writers outside Spain concentrated on images which are quite different from these five examples. One of these was the image of the *miles gloriosus* familiar in the ancient genre of comedy that is revived in Renaissance comedy. From Iacopo Nardi's *I due felici rivali* in 1513 on, the Italians expressed a certain image of Spain through the *Capi-*

⁵⁰ Ibid. 137, 152, 52, 130, 156.

⁵¹ See Gustav Henningsen and John Tedeschi, "Introduction" to *The Inquisition in Early Modern Europe* (supra n. 47), 5.

⁵² R. Menéndez Pidal, *La lengua de Cristobal Colon*, Buenos Aires 1942. Many of these assertions have been debated.

tano spagnuolo, the archetype of the braggart. They were following the model of the converso Rojas' *Celestina*. This particular image had been studied in part by Daniel S. Boughner.⁵³ M.R. Lida de Malkiel questions the repetitious old notions of the imitation of Greco-Roman antiquity and emphasizes the Spanish influence on Italian literature. However, she does not question the wide diffusion of this image of Spain in Italy. On the contrary, she writes: "tanto mas bienvenida debio ser esa degradación que permitia pintar al intruso español bajo los rasgos de la gente de mal vivir". For her, the characteristics of the *Capitano spagnuolo* are clear and unflattering.⁵⁴

It is thus no coincidence that a scholar who devoted so much time and energy to studying the relations between Spain and Italy, the comparatist Arturo Farinelli, was also the author of the classic study of romance philology: *Marrano: Storia d'un vituperio*.⁵⁵ The image of Spain in sixteenth-century Italy cannot be dissociated from this concept. Later studies amplify this basic premise. Corominas drawing on Farinelli's work claimed that by the thirteenth century, the originally Castilian term had been disseminated *per Europa*; that it was known in Italy in the fifteenth century and that eventually it was applied to all Spaniards by the Italians. Hurtado de Mendoza (1504–1575), scion of one of the great Castilian-Basque noble houses, was called *arcimarrano* by the Venetians and *Gl'Ingannati* (1531) calls a Spanish soldier a *marrano*. In *Orlando Furioso* (I, 26, 6–8), Argalia reproaches Ferrau because he is a *mancator di fe, marrano*. Constance Rose found additional evidence for the deliberations on and uses of the term in sixteenth-century Italy.⁵⁶ In 1553, Alfonso de Ulloa, editor of Urrea's translation of *Orlando Furioso* and Ariosto's commentator, wrote at length and in detail on the term in a long paragraph published by the Giolito Press in 1553. Here he is at pains to differentiate between Spaniards of Jewish origin and other Spaniards. According to Rose, "like many a Spaniard in Italy during the sixteenth century, Ulloa must have suffered from the hostility the reluctant Italian hosts displayed toward those on their soil".⁵⁷ More recently, Hugo Tucker studied

⁵³ Daniel S. Boughner, *The Braggart in Renaissance Comedy*, Minneapolis 1954.

⁵⁴ "Oficio de espadachin, no de militar, afición al juego, pujos de honra y alcurnia, sumisión ante su amiga, juramentos, bravatas, pretextos, cobardía", see Maria Rosa Lida de Malkiel, *Estudios de literatura española y comparada*, Buenos Aires 1966, 173 ff.

⁵⁵ A. Farinelli, *Marrano Storia d'un vituperio*, Genova 1925.

⁵⁶ C. Rose, "Spanish Renaissance translators", in *Revue de littérature comparée*, 45 (1971), 554–572.

⁵⁷ C. Rose, *ibid.* (see note 55), 568.

Alcyonius' attitude to the Marranos and the important manuscript glosses in one of the printed copies of Alcyonius' book. He related them to one of the preoccupations of Renaissance literature, the theme of exile, to the debates on Neostoicism and Platonism and finally to the local particularities of reception—in this case in Ferrara—of these apparently global concepts.⁵⁸

According to Alcyonius' *Legatus de exsilio* (Venice 1522),

In this court of our Priests ... shamelessness ... grows by the day ... ever since ... there was established in Italy a whole realm (regnum Exterarum gentium) of foreign peoples ... driven by their Kings from far flung Spain ... who mendaciously bear the name of Christians and are commonly called Marranos ... schooled in excessive flattery which the Ancients even considered to be the perpetual companion of shamelessness.⁵⁹

Alcyonius, himself of hybrid origin and writing a piece to ingratiate himself with Giulio de Medici is, according to Tucker, transferring himself into a *patria* of achievement in a desperate gesture of self-reintegration. Alcyonius' memory was very much alive and "nowhere more so than in the circle of Ricci and Giralda in Ferrara in the 1540s and 50s".⁶⁰ The problem, therefore, is related to the issue of the European reactions to the expulsions of the 1490s. Initial readings of this particular problem tended towards global generalizations based on broad concepts. The question was perceived from the perspective of whether the reactions were "positive" or "negative". More recently, inquiry on the primary sources available in this field has tended to emphasize the variables, this time in the realm of communication: oral versus written, dialogic versus authoritarian modes, learned versus national languages.⁶¹

⁵⁸ H. George Tucker, "Didacus Pyrrhus Lusitanus (1517–1599) Poet of Exile", in *Humanistica Lovaniensia* XLI (1992), 175–198; idem, "Exile exiled: Petrus Alcyonius (1487–1527?) in a Travelling Chest" in *Journal of the Institute of Romance Studies* 2 (1993), 83–103; idem, "To Louvain and Antwerp and Beyond: The Contrasting Itineraries of Diogo Pires (Didacus Pyrrhus Lusitanus, 1517–1599) and Joao Rodrigues de Castelo Branco (Amatus Lusitanus, 1511–1568)", in *Medievalia Lovaniensia* XXVI (1998), 83–113.

⁵⁹ Tucker, To Louvain, 83.

⁶⁰ Ibid, 91.

⁶¹ Eleazar Gutwirth, "The Expulsion of the Jews from Spain and its Political Uses: The Case of Baltasar Gracian", in *International Problems, Society and Politics*, 58/1–2 (1992), 25–35; idem, "Petrus Martyr en de vertrijving van den joden uit Spanje", in *Ter Herkenning* 4 (1991), 271–280; idem, "Petrus Martyr y la expulsion de los judios de Espana", in *Espacio, Tiempo, Forma* 6 (1993), 11–23; idem "Reacciones ante la expulsion: del siglo XV al XVIII", in A. Alcalá (ed.), *Judios, Sefarditas, Conversos*, Valladolid 1996, 195–217.

VIII

The *Lozana andaluza* seems to inscribe itself naturally in this framework. Let me summarize the work briefly. The book, in quarto, was published at a printing press in Venice, edited by the author c.1528. The heroine, native of a small village of Andalusia, near Cordoba, begins her career as traveler at a young age, when she moves to Granada, Carmona, Xeres. She falls in love with the young son of a merchant, travels with him through the Eastern Mediterranean, the Greek islands and is abandoned by him. She then moves on to Rome where she marries her pimp and finally leaves for Lipari. This summary however does not indicate that it is her Roman phase which is crucial to the narrative and takes up most of the book. Hers is the Rome extending from Alexander VI (1492–1503) through Julius II (1503–1513), through the coronation of Leo X (1513–1521) to just before the Sack of Rome. The choice of this specific time fits in with the general intention of works that sought to legitimize the imperial soldiers' Sack of Rome by interpreting it as a sign of Divine intervention castigating the city's licentiousness. In this particular case, the city's freedom allowed the presence of Jews and conversos, their relations with each other, and their perseverance in linguistic and dietary customs as well as memories of origins. On the other hand, this general direction explains only part of the characteristics of a work of such innovative technique and radical realism at so many levels.⁶²

There are numerous reasons for the interest in the *Lozana*. As an antecedent of the picaresque, it stands at the origins of the novel, one of the contributions of European culture to world civilization. Yet it seems to me that the major impetus for the present boom in *Lozana* studies (more than 50 publications since about 1966) derives from more than this one cause. Nor can it be explained solely in terms of famous twentieth-century intellectuals such as Benedetto Croce or Guillaume Apollinaire who studied Delicado's relation to Aretino. To my mind, much more decisive was the critique of Menéndez Pelayo. It was for him a work devoid of any literary merit, having only the value of naturalist photography, a medium he considered elementary and vulgar. The work was *de vergonzoso contenido*; the author, Delicado had led a *vida loca y desenfrenada*; its analysis *no es tarea para ningun critico*

⁶² On the *Lozana* see supra n. 2.

decente; the work was not “written” but “spoken” The *Lozana*, in short, *es un libro inmundo*.⁶³ Around 1943, the National Publishing house of Spain, Editora Nacional, came to the conclusion that it was a priority of national culture to republish the works of Menéndez y Pelayo in 63 volumes. It seems to me that this acted as a kind of paradoxical injunction. In the 1950s, there appeared a facsimile and an edition of the *Lozana*. In the sixties, Alfonso Reyes adapted it for the theatre. The sixties and seventies witnessed a revival and some progress, most notably in the works of Damiani and Márquez Villanueva. The concept of marginality, namely the emphasis on the marginal character of the social group treated by the author of the *Lozana*, is one aspect of this history. If, as I propose, we see the intellectual field of *Lozana* criticism as partly bearing traces of a discourse of resistance, we can understand the celebration of marginality.⁶⁴

As mentioned above, Menéndez y Pelayo’s cluster of critical images of naturalism depends on the analogy to photography: *instantáneas*. In the 1960s, despite apparent rejection, the visual image reappears. Augusta Foley at the University of Pennsylvania, author of a standard critical guide to *Lozana* studies, saw cinematography as the central crystallizer of explanations.⁶⁵ Angus McKay, at the Jerusalem congress of Sermoneta and Benabu (1984), goes a step further: for him, Delicado acts as if he were using a “tape recorder and a video”.⁶⁶ Imperiale’s extensive work of 1991, with its close analysis of light, the movement of characters across the stage, the very props, is evidently and intimately dependent not only on Menéndez y Pelayo and Foley, but deals with that mainstay of theatre and film studies, the *mise en scene*.⁶⁷ Photography, cinematography, video, *mise en scene*, are now joined by television. Beltrán’s recent study explores that new technology of the fifteenth and sixteenth century, the printing press. In his study of authorship in the *Lozana*, he looks in detail at its typography. For him, this introduction of the authorial persona into the text through the visual devices of sixteenth-century typography (the woodcut, the initi-

⁶³ Marcelino Menéndez Pelayo *Orígenes de la novela*, vol. III, Madrid 1915, 188–202.

⁶⁴ See for some bibliography Damiani supra n. 1.

⁶⁵ A. Foley, *Francisco Delicado. La Lozana Andaluza*, London 1977.

⁶⁶ Angus McKay, “A Lost Generation: Francisco Delicado, Fernando del Pulgar and the conversas of Andalusia”, in Isaac Benabu (ed.), *Circa 1492*, Jerusalem 1992, 224–235.

⁶⁷ Louis Imperiale, *El contexto dramático de La Lozana Andaluza*, Potomac 1991.

als, the face of the author, etc.) lead, somehow, to critical metaphors of television.⁶⁸ In brief, we have one framework which leads to the *Lozana*, namely, the world of Jews and conversos (and thus the origins of modern Inquisitorial activity) as one of the main themes in the *Lozana*. On the other, there is the question of the *Lozana*'s relation to reality, its use for historians and the contribution of historians to its understanding. This is implicit in the visual metaphors that range from photography to television.

At first glance, such extreme realism in which the text aspires to the visual may be unrelated to theology. And yet Delicado is writing in an age of religious turmoil, he was a *vicario* and claimed Clement VII's patronage. There is no lack of theological readings. Surtz, for example, saw female hagiography (e.g. Mary Magdalen) as a main precedent or model for the *Lozana*.⁶⁹ Pamela Brakhage's doctoral thesis⁷⁰ sought to argue not only for elements of theology in the text but for the centrality of theology to the work's significance. The reading is allegorical. For her, the *Lozana* was a whore not only because Rome was a harlot in Revelations 17, but because in the works of Savonarola, Erasmus, Luther and other contemporary representations of Rome and the Church, this is a key image. It is useful here to recall the repeated attention given to the image of the Mount of Venus in Egidio da Viterbo's writings on the hilly city. She travels in the Near East or Eastern Mediterranean because the early history of the Church is associated with the Thessalonians, Corinthians, etc. Her Jewish past is the Jewish past of Christianity. Like Peter and Paul, she goes to Rome. Similar (and rather unconvincing) attempts are made to integrate Kabbalah into the reading of the book. The doctoral thesis seems to have renewed the trend of theological readings of the book. As will be recalled, in 1944 Cantera had argued against the attempts to see converso and regional difference as marginal to the literary productions of the New Christians. In the case of Hernando del Pulgar, the royal chronicler, he could find a clear example of the influence of converso identity on fifteenth-century writings. These were, of course, also writings concerned with the Inquisition.⁷¹ The implications seem to have been that the beliefs in the

⁶⁸ L. Beltrán, "The author's author: Typography and Sex", in Giancarlo Maiorino (ed.), *The Picaresque*, Minneapolis 1996, 86–136.

⁶⁹ R. Surtz, "Sancta Lozana ora pro nobis. Hagiography and Parody in Delicado's 'La Lozana Andaluza'", in *Romanistisches Jahrbuch* 33 (1982), 292.

⁷⁰ Pamela Brakhage, *The Theology of La Lozana Andaluza*, Potomac 1986.

⁷¹ Cantera Burgos, *Francisco del Pulgar*, n. 3.

uniformity and inevitability of fifteenth-century theological legitimizations were against the evidence. Indeed, one of the most articulate, courtly Romance authors used the Andalusian conversas as an argument to formulate objections to Inquisitional theology. Leaving aside Castro's use of this research, one may point to Marquez Villanueva's reading of the *Lozana* in terms of its Andalusian and converso background.⁷² Angus McKay takes up the theme of Pulgar and Delicado, and, subsequent to Brakhage's thesis, investigates the theological aspects and implications. Both Pulgar and Delicado, according to him, are conversos, both write about Andalusia as different from other regions. Both concentrate on young Andalusian women and their persecution by the Inquisition. McKay believes that both have a theology where concepts of deeds versus intentionality play an important role. For McKay, one of the explanations has to do with the availability of certain views present in Talmudic texts.⁷³ Costa Fontes also writes about the theology of the work. In his view, the conversos, embittered by their situation, may be characterized as having a tendency to blasphemy. Examination of the text leads to assertions about possible interpretations of key passages in terms of blasphemy—against the Trinity in one publication and against the Virgin Mary in another.⁷⁴ Two visual puzzles stand out in the text. Both are related to the graphic innovations of the printing press. The one is the star and the other is the knot.⁷⁵ Neither has been satisfactorily explained. Is the latter a representation of the *tsitsit*, the former the Jewish symbol of the Star of David?

While the problematics of allegory as a reading mode may have been superseded, the case of the isolation of one knot of the *tsitsit* to identify the woodcut in the *Lozana* could be iconic of the isolation of phenomena from their cultural context. This is related to a persistent possibly systemic problem in the reading of conversos' texts. As mentioned above, the ethics of reading imply a certain respect for the "otherness" of medieval and Renaissance texts and much more so for

⁷² Fco Marquez Villanueva, "El mundo converso de la Lozana Andaluza", in *Archivo Hispalense* LVI (1973), 87–97.

⁷³ See n. 65.

⁷⁴ M. Costa Fontes "The Holy Trinity in La Lozana Andaluza", in *Hispanic Review* 62 (1994), 249–266; idem, "The Art of Sailing in La Lozana Andaluza", in *Hispanic Review* 66/4 (1998), 433–5; idem, "Antitrinitarianism and the Virgin Birth in La Lozana Andaluza", in *Hispania* 76/2 (1993), 197–203.

⁷⁵ The star and the knot are printed in the text of the last mamotreto where one can find the woodcut of the *nudo de Salomon*.

texts which concern conversos. Perhaps it is no coincidence that the Hebraist Cantera produced readings which differed from those of his predecessors. Indeed, the Hebraist's first reaction would be whether the Talmud can be used to produce "a" Jewish reading. Similarly, it would be difficult to concur with views which almost seem to claim a "petrified" lack of development in a case where the theology of *kawanah* (perhaps also *ta'ame ha-mišwot*) demands empirical research based on evidence. And here, what one cannot claim is that there is no post-Talmudic evidence on the subject of *intentio*. The same could be said about the "star" theory. Projecting symbols (e.g. the six-pointed star or *Magen David*), however popular in the twentieth century, onto sixteenth-century texts as if there had been no scholarly debate on the Star of David as a Jewish symbol in the sixteenth century is not really the ideal methodology to achieve minimal credibility. Was blasphemy an obsession of the conversos? Leaving aside the solid research on Old Christian (Castilian or Catalano-Aragonese) traditions of blasphemy, one may question the basic approach of projecting perspectives in which the Trinity and the Virgin are central to cultures where this is not necessarily the case. Finally, there is the emblematic critical *crux* of the *hormigos*. As will be recalled, when the heroine arrives in Rome the author attempts to characterize her and her milieu by constructing a scene of encounter in a house in Pozzo Bianco. Here she meets other women who speak Castilian. They try to assess each other at various levels. One of these is the question of origins: is she a conversa or not? One possibility to discover this was to look at her ways of cooking. Will she cook *hormigos* in water or in oil? Readers usually assume that this is a realistic reflection of the complex field of *kashrut*. Needless to say, no texts in Hebrew or Aramaic are adduced to support this assumption.⁷⁶ The various readings of the *Lozana Andaluza* point to its constant appeal and are useful, despite these crucial objections, in undermining the exclusivist reading of Menéndez y Pelayo. They have succeeded in revealing the richness of the text and the multiplicity of possible readings.

⁷⁶ See mamotretos VI–IX.

IX

One of the consequences of the marriage of Ferdinand and Isabella was the foregrounding of foreign policy, where the interests of Aragon and Castile were not identical. Recent research has shown that mentioning the motif of the Jews, the Judaizers and their expulsion was a factor in the articulation and rhetoric surrounding foreign policy from the establishment of the Inquisition and the expulsions.⁷⁷ Evidence for this might be gained from looking at the writings of diplomats. One such case, analyzed elsewhere, is the *Legatio Babylonica*, which describes the arguments of the ambassador of the Catholic Monarchs to the rulers of Egypt. In these arguments, the issue of the expulsion of the Jews from Spain is of some significance. An analysis of their rhetoric shows their dependence on the type of discourse that we find in the edicts of expulsion themselves.⁷⁸ While these are mainly or apparently legal texts and reports, it has recently been argued that there is nevertheless a certain literary factor. Through images of disease in both, this “literary” argument aligns Judaism, disease/leprosy and old legal ways of dealing with the lepers- i.e. expulsion.⁷⁹

The *Lozana* is a Spanish work concerned with Jews and conversos in Rome. More precisely, it centers on a diseased conversa. If seen from the perspective advanced here, it could be argued that it belongs partly within a genre of compositions written after the expulsion, in Spanish or for readers of Spanish or for Spanish readers, and which focus on the Jews of Rome (and Naples at times) rather than the many other destinations of the exiles.

X

In Alfonso de Zamora’s printed octavo on Hebrew Grammar, the *Introductiones artis grammaticae Hebraice* (Alcala 1526), we find an *Epistle* addressed to the Jews of Rome between the “Dedication” and the section on grammar.⁸⁰ It is written in Hebrew with an interlinear Latin

⁷⁷ See n. 61.

⁷⁸ Ibid.

⁷⁹ Ibid.

⁸⁰ Alfonso de Zamora, *Introductiones artis grammaticae Hebraice*, Alcala 1526. On Alfonso de Zamora see for example, Eleazar Gutwirth, “Edward Lee and Alfonso de Zamora”, in MEAH 37/8 (1988/9), 295–9; idem, “Conversions to Christianity in Late

translation and a kind of vocalization. The book itself is believed to be rare: the *Epistle* is not contained in the *Complutensian Bible*. So it seems to have appeared later (1526) than the Complutensian Polyglot Bible (1513–1517). The Castilian author's unpaginated *Epistle* is unambiguous in its destination. The Jews of Rome are mentioned in the title itself:

ʾIggeret she-shalah ha-meḥaber me-malkhut sefarad ʾel ha-yehudim ʾasher bi-medinat roma litfos ʾotam bi-meshuvatam.

It is divided into seven chapters. The first begins by reasserting that the Jews of Rome are the address of the Spaniard's work: *ʾanshe ḥayil kahal roma u-svivoteha ʾelekhem ʾishim ʾeqra*. This serves as a kind of introduction to the whole work. The second chapter argues for the Trinity. The third is concerned with Hebrew grammar. Alfonso is interested in showing that he has scholarly *auctoritas* because he has read the works of Rabbi Judah and Rabbi Jonah, R. David Kamhi, R. Moses Kamhi and "R. Benjamin bar R. Judah Ibn Ezra" (sic). This canon of grammatical works comes to an end in the thirteenth century. Two key terms appear here: *seder* and *bilbul*. The Jews have no *seder* (order). Their writings are characterized by *bilbul* (chaos, disorder) a term that is applied to Talmudic texts, for example. Partially echoing a tradition which if reconstructed could be traced back to at least Saadyah, Alfonso writes:

ʾein be-kol sifrehem ʾafilu seder ʾeḥad yashar she-yaskimu ha-talmidim ʾalaiw le-dabber leshonkhem be-seder ha-diqduq

and again:

ʾad hayom lo nimša ʾafilu talmid ʾeḥad she-yukhal w-yedaʿ le-dabber leshonkhem be-seder ha-diqduq

and again:

hem loʾagim ʾalekhem baʾavur she-ʾenkhem yodʿim le-dabber leshonkhem

The practice of Biblical allusion is seen by Alfonso as a consequence of ignorance rather than erudition and mastery of ancient sources. He writes: "you cannot speak your language unless you go to the twenty-four books to cite the verse". Alfonso then proceeds to cite two Biblical verses to illustrate his point.

Medieval Spain. An Alternative Explanation", in Daniel Carpi (ed.), *S. Simonsohn Jubilee Volume. Studies on the History of the Jews in the Middle Ages and Renaissance Period*, Tel Aviv 1993, 97–122.

For Alfonso, the works of the Hispano-Jewish grammarians of Hebrew were written without order and contain much superfluous matter. As a consequence, they are difficult to study. That is why Alfonso advises his correspondents to learn *al ha-hergel* (according to usage or custom). This notion of “usage” is significant because it lies at the core of sixteenth century linguistic theories of such influential contemporary linguists as Valdes, who advocates *uso* as the guiding principle in his *Diálogo de la lengua*.⁸¹ Midrashic and Aggadic passages are invoked in Chapter Six to ridicule the talmudic scholars.

In this text of 1526, about two years before the putative date of print of Delicado’s work, we find some features which may be of interest to *Lozana* readers. The first is the hybrid quality of the language: the use of Hebrew and Aramaic but also of Latin. Likewise, Alfonso’s book is marked by a practice of word for word translation: the so-called inter-linear translation has the Latin words from right to left and they correspond, of course, to the Hebrew word order rather than to the Latin. Yet the order of the pages runs from left to right. The direction of the text of the Latin translation contravenes the conventional movement of the eyes while the progression of the Hebrew text from page to page is similarly unconventional. The typography itself has not received the attention it deserves. It seems to have one main objective: to distance itself from that of peninsular Hebrew incunabula. Alfonso was perfectly conscious of the function of typography as an element in the construction of the text. He goes so far as to articulate the praises of the *meḥoqueq* in a particular way. The colophon dated Tuesday 1 May 1526 also mentions the printer Rodrigo de la Torre, the *metaqquen weshofet* of the University, the Archbishop of Toledo and Primate of Spain, Don Alfonso de Fonseca, as well as the help of Pedro Ciruelo.

Delicado’s concern with typography has been mentioned above. Similarly, the question of the language of Delicado’s *Lozana* is at the forefront of readings of the book. The question of the linguistic hybrid, consisting primarily of Italian and Castilian, is central. In his apologia at the end of the book, he asserts:

conformaba mi hablar al sonido de mis orejas qu’es la lengua materna y su comun hablar entre mujeres ... Y si dicen porque puse algunas palabras en italiano ... pues Tulio escribio en latin y dijo muchos vocablos griegos y con letras griegas.

⁸¹ On the significance of *uso*, see P.J. Smith, *Writing in the Margin*, Oxford 1988, 30 ff.

The question is crucial in various critical discussions.⁸² Alfonso repeats the problems that exist in representing system and structure in the composition of texts and in their arrangement. In various sections of the *Lozana*, we also find this metapoetic discourse, but it is particularly noticeable in the various marginal additions such as appendices or the dedication. This element is now viewed as particularly relevant to understanding Delicado's book. A composition on the theme of the division of the *Lozana* text into *mamotretos* is appended by Delicado to his work.

Evidence for a tradition of attacks on Midrashic and Aggadic passages can be found in Hispano-Jewish texts which preceded Alfonso de Zamora. In the fourteenth century, for example, the *Pardes rimmonim* aimed at combatting this type of invective. If we are to believe his assertions, Shem Tov ben Shaprut of Tudela was moved to engage in the composition of allegories of *aggadot* because "the fools laugh at the words of our Rabbis Blessed be their memory" when they hear the *Midrashim* and *Aggadot*. He was zealous against those who ridicule (*holelim*) the *midrashim* before the nations (*le'einey kol he-'amim*). The existent explanations of the kabbalists are useless: they cannot be taught to the masses let alone to the Gentiles (*kol she-khen la-'um-mot*).⁸³ Joshua Ha-Lorqi, on the other hand, attacked the Jews after his conversion for neglecting the *Aggadot*. He used these at Tortosa and the Jews indeed refused to accept his texts. In session 10, they argue that the *aggadot* are fabulous, fictive and not authentic; this is also their line of argument in sessions 13 and 14. In short, their argument is that *sunt sermocionalia*.⁸⁴

Of possible interest is Alfonso's selection of a few passages out of the immense sea of Aggadic literature. In one, the subject is the male penis: In his Chapter Six, Alfonso selects the passage on the organ of Rav Ploni which was nine *kavin*; *lamah himshiluhu be evro* is Alfonso's query. Anyone who has studied the linguistic analysis in Claude Allaigre's work on the *Lozana* will be on familiar territory.

For the finale of his *'Iggeret* to Rome, Alfonso chooses *Kabbalah*. The Seventh Chapter treats the field of *Kabbalah*. It may be recalled that in his so called *Index nominum* (which is in practice a Hebrew

⁸² M. Morreale, "Biseno de Frijolona: A propósito de una reciente edición de La Lozana Andaluza", in *BBMP* LV (1979), 323–342 and Allaigre, *La Lozana Andaluza*.

⁸³ Shem Tov ibn Shaprut, *Pardes Rimmonim*, Sabionetta 1554 fol. 2 recto.

⁸⁴ A. Pacios Lopez, *La disputa de Tortosa*, Madrid 1957, 100, 101.

Latin dictionary, or, perhaps, three Hebrew Latin dictionaries of proportions which are by no means negligible), Alfonso had included the term *Kabbalah* and translated *Kabbalah ma'asit* as "necromancy". He also deals with terms such as *tmurah*. He writes that "this is your wisdom and knowledge but the Gentiles laugh at you". He attacks *tmurah*, *notariqon*, *gymmatriah*. He spells the latter *gey matryah* (perhaps the "valley" or "depths" or "lowlands" of matronliness or femininity?) In any case, he refers to kabbalah as *hidot nashim*, "feminine riddles". The ambiguity which is usually seen as a characteristic of the *Lozana*, is present at different levels in Alfonso's 1526 text. Some have been pointed out above. But in a book about language, more precisely the language of the Bible, the most noticeable is the fundamental tension between two reading practices: the literal and the figurative. Alfonso attacks the Jews of Rome for being literal. According to his argument, their knowledge of Hebrew (therefore Scripture) is based on the grammarians which he lists. They lead to literal interpretations. In the case of Gersonides, they give rise to the moral sense. As has been mentioned above, however, in another chapter he ridicules the Midrash and the three hermeneutic techniques he regards as typical of *Kabbalah*.

XI

Apart from Delicado and Alfonso de Zamora, there is a third case of this possible genre after Alcyonius. It is also concerned with the Jews of Rome (and Naples, because of the connections of Rampin). This third case, I would argue, is the *Epístolas familiares* of Antonio de Guevara. Guevara is relevant for a number of reasons. I shall not deal with the question of converso origins, although it would seem that A. Redondo is one of the most competent authorities on Guevara.⁸⁵ He argued that *une angoisse réelle de converso* could be discerned in some of the remarks by the Bishop of Guadix and Mondoniedo on *limpieza de sangre*.⁸⁶ One of the more influential of his books was the *Epístolas familiares*. Unlike some other works of his, this one had an extensive editorial history. The case of the Antwerp edition of 1578 is instructive. Published *en casa de Pedro Bellerio en el escudero de Borgoña*, it

⁸⁵ A. Redondo, *Antonio de Guevara et l'Espagne de son temps*, Geneve 1976.

⁸⁶ Ibid 56.

inscribes itself in the framework of the sixteenth-century Spanish presence in Antwerp—and more precisely in that of the tradition of rich and high-quality production of books in Spanish in that town. The title page announces that his *Epístolas familiares* are written in the style of those of Marcus Aurelius because *el autor es el mismo*: the author is the same. This laconic remark in Spanish says it all and prepares us (as it did the sixteenth-century reader) for what follows.

A number of his *Epístolas familiares* are concerned with “Iudios, marranos” (see, for example, his letter to a secret friend in which he reprehends him and all those who use the words Moorish dogs, Jews and marranos to designate those who have converted to the faith of Christ, p. 323–328). Among these are various letters directed to Jews in Italy, particularly to Spanish Jews in Italy or at least to hispanophone Jews there. These *Epístolas*, (published in the early prints but absent in some twentieth-century ones), are concerned with such topics as the Trinity, the history of Hebrew (where he follows to some extent Alfonso de Zamora but precedes Alderete by claiming that Jews know no Hebrew), the story of the Septuagint (also the Letter of Aristeas). Thus, the *Segunda Parte* contains a “Very famous disputation which the author had with the Jews of Naples where he declares to them the high mysteries of the Trinity” (p. 281 ff). There is a “Dispute and reasoning by the author with the Jews of Rome where he declares two most notable authorities of Sacred Scripture” (p. 287). There is a further item in which the author follows up his intention and declares how the Hebrew language came into being and vanished (p. 291). In another passage Guevara expatiates on “how the Hebrews falsify Scripture” (pp. 297–302). They are undated but are placed after an epistle from 1540. In April 1536, Charles V was in Rome with a retinue which included Guevara. On 4 April 1536 they leave Rome. It is generally accepted that these epistles (like so much else in Guevara’s *oeuvre*) are fabrications. For Redondo,⁸⁷ Guevara may have seen a Synagogue in his Roman or Neapolitan travels and he may have conceived the idea of the composition of this work as a result. Or (pace Redondo) he may not. In the table of contents and the rubrics as well as the letters themselves, these epistles are presented as differing to some extent from the other epistolary items in the book. They are *disputas*: namely continuations or part of the dispute which began in Naples and whose

⁸⁷ Ibid 416.

description bears the date *de Roma a 25 March 1537* (p. 247). One composition is entitled: *Disputa muy famosa que el autor hizo con los judios de Napoles en la qual les declara los altos mysterios de la Trinidad*. It is printed after an epistle dated Valladolid, 26 January 1540. It begins: *honrados Rabis y obstinados Iudios*. It refers to *la ultima disputa que yo y vosotros honrados Rabis hezimos el sabado passado*.

Guevara makes some allusions to Rome which can be clarified in this context. Guevara, a member of the entourage of the head of the Imperial armies (p. 241 ff) affirms *quisiera darte una cuchillada o vna bofetada* [I would want to stab you (the Jew) with a knife or slap you in the face]. He constructs an opposition between his own meekness and the violence of the Jews of Rome. According to him, *me quisistes sacar los ojos y poner en mi las manos*. Guevara then develops the old polemical notion of the theological implications of power:

Mas ha ya mas de mil y quinientos anos que no teneys Rey a quien obedecer sacerdote a quien vos encomendar templo a do orar sacrificios que ofrecer profetas a quien creer ni aun ciudad a do os amparar.

Curiously, this paragraph seems to echo the Jewish liturgy (cf. *u-mipne hata'enu*). But its force derives from the relentless exploitation of the formula noun (1) + pronouns (2) + verbal infinitive (1), applied six times.

De manera que solo el nombre teneys de Iudios y la libertad de esclauos. No ay gente en el mundo por barbara que sea que no tenga algun lugar a do se acoja y algun caudillo que los defienda como lo tenian los Garamantas en Asia los Mastageras cabe la India y aun los Negros en Etiopia sino soys vosotros tristes cuytados que a do quiera soys cautivos.

This paragraph develops the notion of the “name of the nation”. It is a theme which reappears in Penso in the second half of the seventeenth century and has been studied elsewhere.⁸⁸ The notion of the “caudillo” is developed by means of the medieval staple of the *ars praedicandi*, the *amplificatio*. This *amplificatio* is itself dependent on a geographical list of *exotica*: Asia, India, Ethiopia. The literary development of geographical lists can be traced back to Petrarch’s *Africa*, although it is intensified in the sixteenth century.

There follows a paragraph whose theme is scholarship or access to languages:

⁸⁸ Eleazar Gutwirth “Penso’s Roots”, (Forthcoming).

Cinco meses ha que estoy aqui con vosotros disputando ... Y pues todos los Rabis y Iudios que aqui estays entendeys la lengua Latina, y Hespanola: y yo tambien entiendo la lengua Hebraica y italiana sera el caso que este mysterio de la Trinidad declare con palabras de latin y otras veces de romance: porque es la materia tan subida, que no abastaria vna lengua para declararla ... Materia muy sutil para solos los letrados. (p. 601)

The notion of opposing Latin to Romance, where the latter is inadequate and the former is *sutil*, had been frequently used in fifteenth-century texts written in Spain, perhaps particularly in Castile; but even then it was not new. It had already emerged in the works of the Infante Don Juan Manuel in the first half of the fourteenth century.⁸⁹

However, the question of Renaissance scholarship (cf. the Inquisitor Guevara's *yo tambien entiendo la lengua hebraica*) cannot be avoided. Key passages in the *Lozana* deal with the problem of the "appearance" of knowledge versus "real" knowledge: the rubric to mamotreto V is *Como se supo dar la manera para vivir que fue menester que usase audacia* pro sapientia. Elsewhere, in his Apologia, Delicado writes that women "know" that they are men's solace and recreation but they do not "know" the beginning of "wisdom" which is the fear of the Lord. Elsewhere (in mamotreto XLII), the *Lozana* asserts: *para ganar de comer tengo de decir que se mucho mas que no se* (In order to eat I have to pretend to know more than I do).

Critics have selected such passages and seen them as significant.⁹⁰ Indeed, Delicado's own education has been a matter of concern. We now take virtually for granted his citation or development of previous sources, his indefatigable search for vernacular adagia, his editorial role in the production of literary texts in the 1530s in Venice (which in their accuracy surpassed their peninsular counterparts), and his understanding of the main issues in the polemics surrounding the emergence of the national languages of Europe (Spanish *Bembismo*). But is it possible to relate this any further to certain areas of the history of Renaissance scholarship? Here we may wish to distinguish, in the spirit of Delicado,

⁸⁹ Don Juan Manuel, *El conde Lucanor*, edited with an Introduction by Jose Manuel Blecuá, Madrid 1971. Finished circa Monday, 12 June 1335, it draws attention to its Romance language rather than Latin. This has a didactic purpose; he writes in "romance para los legos et de non muy grand saber". Again in the fifth part of the book, where he narrates how people are born, he also points to the romance as the vehicle of the book and how this affects the contents of the book: "et porque este libro es fecho en romance", therefore women and other men can read it and therefore certain matters must not be mentioned.

⁹⁰ See McKay, *A Lost Generation*, and Allaire, *La Lozana Andaluza*.

between appearance and reality. In constructing his heroine's past, he claims in mamotreto V: *lo que no sabian se lo hacian enseñar de las judias* ... (what they did not know was taught to them by the Jewesses). But for a number of reasons, the practical reconstruction of real progress in such areas of Renaissance scholarship as Christian Hebraism has proved extremely difficult. Basic research on sources which might reveal the extent to which what seems progress in one author is really a derivative effect of another author's writings is one of the problems. It is frequently compounded by biographical lacunae. We are often in no position to deny the sixteenth-century Christian Hebraist's dependence on a Jewish, converso or convert teacher/*amanuensis*/secretary. Conversely, the Christian sources of Jewish texts are by no means always known. Reuchlin had developed the idea that the Expulsions of the Jews from Spain had benefited Europe by releasing its reservoir of scholarship on Hebrew and Aramaic texts.⁹¹ In other versions, this notion lived on in the European literature on travelling to the Orient.⁹²

The prominence of Flavius Mithridates (most of whose labors, like those of Heredia, are still in manuscript) in studies of Pico, or that of Alemanno are only small reminders that current research is only beginning to uncover the *mise en scene* of Renaissance scholarship.⁹³ In the particular case of Guevara, the Renaissance best-seller, centuries of scholarship have shown him to be a "forger" or perhaps a "fantasist" in the field of Greco-Roman antiquities. The cumulative weight of criticism has been such that there is by now a countertrend which aims to point to other aspects: that he was not always equivocal; that his work is in a medieval tradition of vernacular homiletics in the Romance languages whose rules of reading texts differ from those of scholarship; that his context in general is that of the Renaissance and that of Renaissance Epistles in particular; that his main critics are by no means paragons of scholarly honesty, transparency and truth. Nevertheless, the contrast with Greco-Roman antiquities could not be more pronounced: Alfonso's claims to Hebrew and Aramaic do not seem to have excited

⁹¹ See Gutwirth, *Reacciones*. (Supra n. 61)

⁹² Eleazar Gutwirth, "Language and Medicine in the Ottoman Empire", in J. Helm and A. Winkelmänn (eds.), *Religious Confession and the Sciences in the Sixteenth Century*, Leiden 2001.

⁹³ Eleazar Gutwirth, "The Politics of the Hyphen: Mediating Hispano-Jewish Cultures", in *Jewish Quarterly Review* 91 (2001), 395–409.

the same kind of sustained critical attention. In brief, like the *Lozana*, like Alfonso de Zamora, Antonio de Guevara claims *auctoritas*. Like the collaborator in the Complutensian project, his claims also extend to Aramaic and Hebrew scholarship:

Decisme Senor que os dixo haber visto en mi libreria un banco de libros viejos ... de los caldeos ... como Senor no tengo otra hacienda sino en los libros que he procurado y aun en diversos reinos buscado ... (*Epistolae*, I, 24)

You say, Sir, that you have been told that in my library there are ... books of the Chaldeans ... as I have no other estate but my books which I have obtained over the years and even searched various kingdoms for them ...

Much more explicit, lengthy and contradictory is his attempt to imply the same in his treatment of the history of the Hebrew language. What is clear is that after many centuries, the voluminous literature on Guevara fails to produce the kind of analysis of these claims that can be compared with their Roman counterparts.

Here we may wish to recall that his “famous” dispute in Naples (on a Saturday afternoon) was accompanied by a wager in which, if the bishop won, he would get Soman wine [it recalls mamotreto XLII and the exchange between Lozana and Rampin on wines (guarnacha, malvasia de Candia, corso, griego)]. If the Jew won, he would get *hojaldre Iudayca* (pp. 241–242). Guevara’s “Jewish puff-pastry”, no less than the wine, reminds the reader of Delicado’s procedures of characterization. Despite the lack of completeness in the identifications of the food items in the *Lozana Andaluza*, it is patently clear that gastronomy is one of the elements of characterization and verisimilitude in that text as it was in Cota’s earlier *Epitalamio burlesco*.⁹⁴ According to him, the polemic was carried out against a congregation which included *el gran Rabi Cucurri* (p. 241 ff). Among the most famous *antiguos doctores Hebreos* Guevara lists the following: Rabial Hazer; Mosen Abudach; Zimidi Sadoch (p. 293). He later lists such *principales glosadores* as Rabi Limudar; Rabi Ada, Rabi Iojade (p. 398). And he teaches us that *se llama en Hebreo Misna que quiere decir ley secreta* (p. 302). He adds a further list of exegetes to this example of Hebraic scholarship (p. 295); it includes Rabi Fatuel; Rabi Alduhac. But such claims are themselves related to historical trends. In 1540, the French translation

⁹⁴ “On the Background to Cota’s *Epitalamio Burlesco*”, in *Romanische Forschungen* 97, 1 (1985), 1–14.

of *L'orloge des princes* praised the House of Medici to whom the Hebrew tongue owes so much thanks to of the labors of Cosimo de Medici: he sought to purchase the books of the Turks and the Jews. His library is testimony to this, as are likewise the writings of Ange Politian, Beroalde, Sabellicque, Volaterane and many other sages.⁹⁵

Apart from the question of the Inquisitor's *audacia pro sapientia* and scholarship, there are other common points. This may be noted in another composition by Antonio de Guevara, entitled *Disputa y razonamiento del autor hecho con los Iudios de Roma en el qual se declaran dos muy notables autoridades de la sagrada escritura* (p. 605). He begins with an address: *Aljama honrada y nobles Iudios*, followed by the rhetorical framing:

yo quede de la disputa passada tan cansado de lo mucho que nos detuvimos y quede tan atronado de las voces que alli dimos ... en las escuelas do yo me crie y entre los maestros de quien yo aprendi no tenian por varon sabio al que vozeaba mucho sino al que probava bien ...

Guevara constructs a narrative frame—*yo quede de la disputa passada tan cansado de lo mucho que nos detuvimos* (the last time he debated with the Jews he was fatigued). The epistle presents itself not as a collection of arguments in the old tradition of the Judeo-Christian polemic but as the product of a narrative voice with a past and with affections. Its subject seems to be style: *como lo dize*. One main strategy is *dilatatio*. This usually means that he chooses a motif and develops it by antithesis and synonymia. The very length of the *dilatatio* is the ideal of this particular aesthetic. Style includes delivery—as in Quintilian—and the motif of the paragraphs is the “voice”: the noise of the Jews versus the reasonable tone of the bishop. One could interpret this within a tradition of assigning ethnic value to sounds. The *Libro de buen amor*, the literary masterpiece of the vernacular literature of fourteenth-century Castile, regarded specific instruments and certain types of music as appropriate for certain ethnic groups. In the *Cancionero de Baena* (late fourteenth century to mid-fifteenth century), we find a poem by Pero Ferus. In this composition, he had used the motif of the noises made by Jews in a similar fashion and contrasted them with the aural expectations of the Christians.⁹⁶ As always, the *Shevet*

⁹⁵ A. Redondo, *Antonio de Guevara*, 473.

⁹⁶ See E. Gutwirth, “Music and Identity in Fifteenth Century Spain”, in *Early Music History* 17 (1998), 161–181.

Yehudah presents us with a somewhat ambiguous text whose significance is revealed in conjunction with Hispanic texts and documents. In this case, it is a description of the Tortosa disputation in Hebrew. Ascribed to Bonastruc Desmaestre, it contains some lines in which the Jewish side is criticized for its lack of decorum and is accused of “shouting”.⁹⁷ At the same time, this Hebrew book includes a translation of an important passage in the Inquisitor Guevara’s oeuvre. Additional evidence is provided by Sebastian Horozco who is the author of a satire against a converso student of law, a text where he seems to conflate anti-legal and anti-converso motifs. For us he is of interest because the one quality which is selected for inclusion in the title or rubric is that the student is *bullicioso*.⁹⁸

In Naples in 1517, the *Propalladia* of Bartholome de Torres Naharro was published by the press of Ioan Pasqueto de Gallo *Con gratia y Preuilegio Papal y Real*. One of the non-dramatic works in that volume is the *Exclamation de nuestra señora Contra los Iudios*. Referring to the Jews, it introduces a line in which Mary describes the Jews as *ellos a bozes gritando*. This may suggest that the origins of the topos could possibly be traced to Mark 15:4; Luke 23:18; John 18:40 and Matthew 27:23.

In conclusion: the Inquisitor Guevara must be seen as lacking in fresh concepts; yet he balances this by his extraordinary and relentless pursuit of stylistic ideals. It is this basic characteristic which explains the European diffusion of his works in both original editions and in translations. His influence was so great that it is detected behind the English literary school of *euhuism*.⁹⁹ For us, the Inquisitor Antonio de Guevara could be a further example of the contacts of the culture of the imaginary, the law and theology in this particular area of the Spanish gaze upon the conversos and Jews of Rome. In this, the bishop and inquisitor was preceded by Alcyonius, Alfonso de Zamora and the *Lozana Andaluza*.

⁹⁷ On the *Shevet Yehudah*, see for example Eleazar Gutwirth, “The Expulsion of the Jews from Spain and Jewish Historiography”, in A. Rapoport (ed.), *Jewish History: Festschrift C. Abramsky*, London 1988, 141–161.

⁹⁸ K. Scholberg, *Algunos aspectos de la satira en el siglo XVI*, Berne 1979, chapter VII.

⁹⁹ For recent attention to the reception of Guevara in England, see Alan Stewart, *Close Readers*, Princeton 1997, 165–166.

TORTURED MEMORIES. JACOB ROSALES ALIAS
IMANUEL BOCARRO FRANCÊS: A LIFE FROM THE FILES OF
THE INQUISITION

Michael Studemund-Halévy
Sandra Neves Silva*
Hamburg and Lisbon

“Practicing Jews who believe in the Law of Moses are the physician Rosales, resident of Your Christian Majesty in Hamburg, and Ana Rosales, his wife.”¹ The informer Semuel Aboab alias Francisco Domingo de Guzmán, who gave detailed information to the Inquisition in Madrid between 1661 and 1662, was not the only informer providing us with data concerning the Lisbon Judaizer and later Hamburg New Jew² Dr. Jacob Rosales alias Imanuel Bocarro Francês.³ Between 1624

* A portion of the research for the present study was done at the National Library of Lisbon, the Institute for the History of the Jews in Germany, Hamburg, and at the National and University Library in Jerusalem. We wish to express our appreciation for the courtesy extended to us there and to thank our friends and colleagues for various helpful comments and suggestions. Finally, we benefited greatly from various contributions to the workshop “Elements of a New Approach to Writing (Jewish) Biographies” held on 9–12 July 2001 at the *Leopold-Zunz-Zentrum* in Lutherstadt Wittenberg. See the report in the biannual Newsletter of the European Association for Jewish Studies (*EJAS Newsletter*) 11 (October 2001), 31–36.

¹ “[...] que son Iudios Iudaizantes obserutes y creientes de la ley de Moyses el Dor Rosales, Residente por su Magd del rey nró señor en Amburgo = Ana Rosales su muger” (*Archivo Historico Nacional* [Madrid], Inq., lib. 1127, fol. 97–97”), hereafter AHN.

² We borrow the term “New Jew” for an ex-Marrano who has converted to Judaism from Yosef Kaplan, *Les Nouveaux-Juifs d'Amsterdam. Essais sur l'histoire sociale et intellectuelle du judaïsme séfardite du XVIIe siècle*, Paris 1999.

³ Semuel Aboab (alias Francisco Domingo de Guzmán), born around 1630 in Palestine, travelled after 1650 in northern Europe, where he made the acquaintance of more than 5,000 Sefardic Jews, perhaps in the shameful intention to denounce them to the Inquisition at some future time. Commenting on Aboab, Markus Schreiber notes that he had intended since the early 1650s to be baptized, lived in various Jewish communities and kept a careful written account on the members (Markus Schreiber, *Marranen in Madrid 1600–1670*, Wiesbaden 1994, 355). On his denunciation report, see also Michael Studemund-Halévy, *Biographisches Lexikon der Hamburger Sefarden*, Hamburg 2000, 80–83; Michael Studemund-Halévy, Jorun Poettering, “Étrangers Universels. Les Sépharades du Nord”, international conference “La Diaspora des Nouveaux Chrétiens d’Ori-

and 1662, this to date little known and highly gifted individual—who played an active role in the history of the Portuguese community in Hamburg as a physician, mathematician, astronomer, astrologer,⁴ resident of the Spanish crown and exponent of political messianism—was repeatedly denounced before the Inquisition courts in Goa, Lisbon and Madrid, especially by relatives and members of the Hamburg Marrano community.⁵ During this period, many members of the ramified family Bocarro Francês lived as pious Catholics, Judaizers or New Jews in

gine Portugaise” held on 30–31 October 2003 at the *Centre Culturel Calouste Gulbenkian* in Paris (forthcoming); David L. Graizbord, *Souls in Dispute. Converso Identities in Iberia and the Jewish Diaspora, 1580–1700*, Philadelphia 2004, 189.

⁴ Jacob Rosales accepted the possibility of transmutation and argued that the Philosopher’s Stone, “is a great medicine which can cure the severest diseases ... better than Avicenna and Galen”, see Michael Nevins, *Our Sephardic Medical Roots* (MS). On astrology in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, see Eugenio Garin, *O Zodiaco da Vida. A Polêmica sobre a Astrologia do Século XIV ao Século XVI*, Lisbon 1997; on astrology and alchemy in Portugal, see Yvette Centeno (ed.), *Ennoea ou a Aplicação do Entendimento sobre a Pedra Filosofal*, Lisbon 1987; on Jewish astrologists and alchemists, see Raphael Patai, *The Jewish Alchemists*, Princeton 1994; on Jewish alchemists and astrologists in Hamburg, see Michael Studemund-Halévy, “Es residiren in Hamburg Minister fremder Mächte—Sefardische Residenten in Hamburg”, in Rotraud Ries, J. Friedrich Battenberg (eds.), *Hoffjuden—Ökonomie und Interkulturalität. Die jüdische Wirtschaftselite im 18. Jahrhundert*, Hamburg 2002, 154–176; Francisco Moreno-Carvalho, *Benjamin Mussaphia* [MS].

⁵ At present three studies are in preparation that deal exclusively with the life and the work of Jacob Rosales. The Brazilian physician and historian Francisco Moreno Carvalho is writing an extensive dissertations on Rosales, and the Portuguese historian Sandra Neves Silva is examining the messianic aspects in the life and work of Rosales in her M.A. thesis. Though leaving much to be desired, the most successful effort to reconstruct the intricate life of Jacob Rosales was until recently the highly informative study by Hermann Kellenbenz, “Dr. Jakob Rosales”, in *Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte* 8 (1956), 345–354. On Rosales, see Kayserling, *Sephardim*, 209–211; Sousa Viterbo, “Medicos Poetas”, in *Archivos de Historia da Medicina Portuguesa* 2 (n.s.), (1911), 5–29; Israel S. Révah, “Une famille de ‘Nouveaux-Chrétiens’: Les Bocarro-Francês”, in *Revue des Études Juives* 116 (1957), 73–87; Pinharanda Gomes, *História da Filosofia Portuguesa, I., A Filosofia Hebraico-Portuguesa*, Porto 1981, 255; Herman Prins Salomon, *Saul Levi Mortera, Tratado da Lei de Moisés*, Braga 1988, LXXV–LXXIX; António José Saraiva, “Bocarro-Rosales and the Messianism of the Sixteenth Century”, in Yosef Kaplan et al. (eds.), *Menasseh ben Israel*, Leiden 1989, 240–243. An essential starting point are the pioneering studies of Francisco Moreno Carvalho: “Yacob Rosales: Medicine, Astrology, and Political Thought in the Works of a Seventeenth-Century Jewish-Portuguese Physician”, in *Korot* 10, (1993–1994), 143–156; idem, *Ya’aqov Rosales: Peraqim be-biografiah intelegu’alit shel rofe yehudi mi-mosa*, Jerusalem 1996 (mimeo); idem, “On the Boundaries of our Understanding: Manoel Bocarro Francês-Jacob Rosales and Sebastianism”, in Charles Meyers, Norman Simms (eds.), *Troubled Souls, Conversos, Crypto-Jews, and Other Confused Jewish Intellectuals from the Fourteenth to the Eighteenth Century*, Hamilton, New Zealand 2001, 65–75; idem, “A Newly Discovered Letter by Galileo Galilei: Contacts Between Galileo and Jacob Rosales, a Seventeenth-Century Jewish Scientist and Sebastianist”, in *Aleph* 2 (2001),

Lisbon, Madrid, Hamburg, Amsterdam, Leghorn, Turkey, Brazil and Portuguese India.⁶ We know very little about the Jewish background and the religious beliefs of Jacob Rosales and his widely ramified family, so that we depend completely on the information hidden in the Inquisitorial files.⁷

At least nine Inquisition reports (*denúncias*) furnish us with valuable details about the dramatic and adventurous life of Dr. Jacob Rosales and also open a small window onto the Jewish life of the community of ex-Marranos in Hamburg during the early period of this community, about which today little is known. Supplemented by data from the files of the Hamburg Senate and the Hamburg Lutheran community⁸ as well

59–91; idem, *Manoel Bocarro Francês, “Jacob Rosales”. Médico judeu-português: 1593–1662* (MS); Michael Studemund-Halévy, *Biographisches Lexikon der Hamburger Sefarden*, Hamburg 2000, 232–236; idem, “Jacob Rosales”, in Franklin Kopitzsch, Dirk Brietzke (eds.), *Hamburgische Biografie*, vol. 2, Hamburg 2003, 347–348; Reyes Bertolin, *Greek Influence in Jewish Spain* [Jacob Rosales, MS]; Sandra Neves Silva, “Criptojudaismo e Profetismo no Portugal de Seiscentos: O caso de Manoel Bocarro Francês alias Jacob Rosales (1588/93?–1662/68?)”, in *Estudos Orientais* 8 (2003), 169–183; eadem, *Criptojudaismo e Messianismo em Portugal no Século XVII: Vida e Obra de Manoel Bocarro Francês* (forthcoming).

⁶ The community of New Christians attached great importance to family ties, kinship relations and commercial enterprises under family protection. The “clan spirit” and the endogamous practice established networks of solidarity. Kinship bonds dominated political relations, and all pertinent obligations were derived from it. On this matter, see Daniel M. Swetschinski, “Kinship and Commerce: The Foundations of Portuguese Jewish Life in Seventeenth-Century Holland”, *Studia Rosenthaliana* 15 (1981), 58–74; Révah, “Une famille”, 73–87; Jaime Contreras, “Family and Patronage: The Judeo-Convert Minority in Spain”, Mary Elizabeth Perry, Anne J. Cruz, *Cultural Encounters. The Impact of the Inquisition in Spain and the New World*, Berkeley 1991, 127–145; Miriam Bodian, *The Hebrews of the Portuguese Nation. Conversos and Community in Early Modern Amsterdam*, Bloomington 1997, 5; Jorun Poettering, *Hamburger Sefarden im atlantischen Zuckerhandel des 17. Jahrhunderts* (MS, Hamburg 2003); Studemund-Halévy, Poettering, “Étrangers Universels”.

⁷ The history of the religious background and the religious beliefs of those New Christians has yet to be written (see David Gitlitz, *The Religion of the Crypto-Jews*, Philadelphia 1996 [a Spanish translation appeared in Salamanca under the title *Secreto y Engaño. La religión de los criptojudíos*]). Contrary to the view of scholars dealing with Marranos and New Christians, who assert the continuity of a fundamental “Jewishness” among the so-called “Judaizers”, others have tried to argue that it was a fiction fabricated by the inquisitors in their persecution of the New Christians. A summary illustrative of this problem can be found in António José Saraiva, *The Marrano Factory. The Portuguese Inquisition and Its New Christians 1536–1765*, Leiden 2001. “Nearly all of the New Christians Inquisitorial victims (some 40.000 so labeled between 1540 and 1765) were devout or run-of-the-mill Catholics whose Jewish ancestry, often partial, if not fictional, was their sole crime”, Herman Prins Salomon in Saraiva, *The Marrano Factory*, IX; David L. Graizbord, *Souls in Dispute*.

⁸ Jutta Braden, *Hamburger Judenpolitik im Zeitalter lutherischer Orthodoxie 1590–1710*, Hamburg 2001, has made these invaluable documents for the early history of the

as a small number of autobiographical documents, a portrait emerges of the life of a remarkable man: in Lisbon he came to be plagued with doubts about Catholicism, he left Portugal and relocated to Hamburg, where for over 20 years he played an important role in the Hamburg Portuguese *Gemeinde* as physician, resident and prolific writer:

1. António Bocarro denounces his brother before the Inquisition Court in Goa in 1624.⁹
2. António Nunes denounces him before the Inquisition Court in Lisbon in 1626.¹⁰
3. In 1641, his brother Gaspar Bocarro denounces him to the Inquisition Court in Lisbon.¹¹

Portuguese *Gemeinde* in Hamburg accessible to a broader public; eadem, "Luthertum, Sefardim und Handelsinteressen. Zur Judenpolitik des Hamburger Senats in der Zeit Glikls", in Monika Richarz (ed.), *Die Hamburger Kauffrau Glikl. Jüdische Existenz in der Frühen Neuzeit*, Hamburg 2001, 159–194.

⁹ Arquivo Nacional da Torre do Tombo (hereafter ANTT), Caderno 9 do Promotor da Inquisição de Lisboa, Culpas contra muitas pessoas tiradas do processo de Antonio bocarro christão nouo, fls. 436–446^v. The files were published by Pedro de Azevedo, "O Bocarro Francês e os Judeus de Cochim e Hamburgo", *Arquivo Histórico Português* 8 (1910–1912), 15–20, 185–198, 186–187. António Bocarro, whom C.R.Boxer mentions in the same breath with de Barros and Couto ("proves Bocarro to have been a worthy successor to Barros and Couto"), was born in 1594 in Abrantes, Boxer, "António Bocarro and the 'Livro do Estado da Índia Oriental'", in *Garcia de Orta, Revista da Junta das Missões Geográficas e de Investigações do Ultramar*, 1956, 203–219. From 1631 to 1643, he served as director of the State Archives in Goa and made a name for himself as an skilled explorer. Thus, for example, his description of the wells in the grotto city Elephanta in India are still worth reading today. He is also the author of an informative description of Portuguese India, *Decada 13 da historia da India*: (ed. Rodrigo José de Lima Felner, Lisbon 1876). See also João Ribeiro, *History of Ceilao, with a summary of de Barros, de Couto, Antonio Bocarro ...*, translated from the original Portuguese and *Sinhalas* by P.E.Pieris, Colombo 1909, and A.B. de Bragança Pereira, *Arquivo português oriental*, Bastorá 1936 (containing: António Bocarro, *Livro das plantas de tôdas das fortalezas, cidades e povoações do Estado da Índia Oriental*). Commenting on Bocarro, Révah quotes from the testimony of the "Old Christian" Diogo de Noronha that "o ditto Antonio Bocarro era muito estragado e de maa consciencia, e que, por pouco mais de nada, acusaria falsamente a todo o mundo, e que té a mae que o parira accusara," "Le retour au catholicisme d'Antonio Bocarro", *Coloquio*, Lisbon 1960, 58–60 [60].

¹⁰ ANTT, Inquisição de Lisboa, Processo no. 9454. See on this Azevedo, O Bocarro Francês, 18–19.

¹¹ ANTT, Inquisição de Lisboa, Processo no. 3020 (Gaspar Bocarro), fls. 3–3^v. Gaspar Bocarro Francês fled from Madrid to St. Jean de Luz, and later lived as an observant Jew in Hamburg, Amsterdam, Leiden, Padua, Leghorn and Florence. He lived in Hamburg under the name of Uziau Rosales ("por seu irmão Manuel Bocarro querer se

4. In 1644, Diogo de Lima denounces him before the Inquisition Court in Lisbon.¹²
5. In 1645, Manoel de Motta denounces him before the Inquisition Court in Lisbon.¹³
6. In 1646, his cousin Miguel Francês denounces him before the Inquisition Court in Lisbon.¹⁴
7. In 1650, he is denounced by João de Aguilã before the Inquisition Court in Lisbon.¹⁵

chamasse assim”) [ANTT, Inquisição de Lisboa, Processo no. 3020, f. 32^r, 5 de Novembro de 1641]. Gaspar Bocarro was only one of hundreds of Judeoconvertos who returned to Iberian territory throughout the 1600s. See on this Herman Prins Salomon, *Saul Levi Mortera, Tratado da Lei de Moisés*, Braga 1988, LXXV–LXXXIX. Gaspar Rosales alias “YZYAV ROSALES Portuguez” was the author of a poetical *encomium* in honor of the Portuguese ambassador in Amsterdam, Tristão de Mendonça Furtado: (1) *Panegyrico / ao Excetente Senhor Tristão de / Mendonça Furtado, digno Embaxador, em os E- / stados de Flandes pella Magestade Sereníssima dei / Rey Dom João IV de Portugal. Por Uziau Rozales Portuges. Em Amstradama / Impresso por mandado de Mosseh Belmonte, em caza de / Paulo Matheos a 2 de Mayo Anno 1641* [Biblioteca Nacional de Lisboa, Rés 96 V]; (2) *Panegyrico / Ao / Excelente / Senhor Tristam / de Mendonça (sic) Fvrtado, Digno / Embaxador em os Estados de Flandes pella / Magestade Sereníssima dei Rey Dom / loam IV. de Portugal. / Por Vzíav Rozales Portuguez*, Lisboa, 1641,4p [Biblioteca Nacional de Lisboa, L 1163 A]: “Gaspar Bocarro tinha feito hum panegírico que depois sahio impresso debaixo de hum nome de judeu, lhe parece era Esau ou Isac Rozalles, de que o ditto Gaspar Bocarro se sintio”, declaration of António Tavares de Sousa on 19 October 1641 [ANTT, Inquisição de Lisboa, Processo no. 3020], apud Herman Prins Salomon, *Saul Levi Mortera, Tratado da Lei de Moisés*, Braga 1988, LXXXIX, ft. 23; see also Alfonso Cassuto, “Seltene Bücher aus meiner Bibliothek”, in *Studia Rosenthaliana* 6, 2 (1972), 215–223 [here: 218]. Gaspar/Uziau Bocarro went back to Portugal in 1641, where he revealed himself to the *Sanctum Officium* and returned to Christianity. See Révah, “Une famille”, 78–86, 87; Elias Lipiner, *Os Baptizados em Pé. Estudos acerca da origem e da luta dos Cristãos-Novos em Portugal*, Lisbon 1998, 73; Prins Salomon, *Saul Levi Mortera*, LXXVIII–LXXIX; see also Pedro da Silva Germano, *La poésie en langue portugaise des juifs “Sefardim” d’ Amsterdam (XVIIe/XVIIIe siècles)*, unpublished doctoral dissertation, Paris 2004, 618–620.

¹² The files were published by Azevedo, “O Bocarro Francês”. On this informant, see Graizbord, *Souls in Dispute*, 137.

¹³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴ ANTT, Inquisição de Lisboa, Processo no. 7276, 15. 12. 1647: “Miguel Francês, filho de Paulo Francês e Beatriz Soares, ambos naturais de Abrantes e residentes em Hamburgo, de 35 anos de idade em 1646”, apud José Antônio Gonsalves de Mello, *Gente da Nação. Cristãos-novos e judeus em Pernambuco 1542–1654*, Recife 1996, 487. See Egon Wolff, Frieda Wolff, *Dicionário Biográfico VII. Processos de Inquisição de Lisboa referentes a pessoas nascidas ou residentes no Brasil e outros estudos*, Rio de Janeiro 1991–1992, 45; Alberto Dines et al. (eds.), *A fênix, ou, O eterno retorno: 460 anos da presença judaica em Pernambuco*, Brasília 2001; Anita Novinsky, *Inquisição: prisioneiros do Brasil*, Rio de Janeiro 2002, 162.

¹⁵ ANTT, Inquisição de Lisboa, Processo no. 7938 (João de Aguilã). On this informant, see Graizbord, *Souls in Dispute*, 91–92, 188; Hermann Prins Salomon, “Le Procès de

8. In 1658, Gregório de Pina denounces him before the Inquisition Court in Lisbon.¹⁶
9. In 1661, he is named by Semuel Aboab in his extensive denunciation of members of Marrano communities in northern Europe before the Inquisition Court in Madrid.¹⁷

Despite our extensive knowledge regarding the affluence and magnificence in which the Hamburg “Portuguese” lived in the first half of the seventeenth century,¹⁸ we know but little about their actual arrival in Hamburg, their decision to join the fold of the covenant of Abraham, the nature and practice of their Judaism. The Jewish religion not being allowed, the new immigrants from the Iberian peninsula were nominally Christians, or rather Catholics. Around 1600 or shortly afterwards, some of them started to practice their own religion again. Since the

l'inquisition Portugaise comme documents littéraires, ou du bon usage du fonds inquisitorial de la Torre do Tombo”, Estudos Portugueses. Homenagem a António José Saraiva, Lisbon 1990.

¹⁶ “tinha sido neste reino [Portugal] Judeo e o fora sempre”, ANTT, Inquisição de Lisboa, Caderno 35 do Promotor da Inquisição de Lisboa, Denúncia do Conego Gregório de Pina, fls. 351–354^v. The files were published in part by Pedro de Azevedo, “A Inquisição e alguns seiscentistas”, *Arquivo Historico Portuguez* 3 (1905), 460–465 [here: 463].

¹⁷ AHN (Madrid), Inq., lib. 1127, fols. 97–97^v. See also Schreiber, *Marranen*; Studemund-Halévy, *Lexikon*.

¹⁸ Abundant source and archival material for the first half of the seventeenth century is available, primarily due to the constant efforts and activities of historically-minded Isaac and Afonso Cassuto. For historical surveys of the Sefardi community of Hamburg during the seventeenth century, see especially Alfred Feilchenfeld, “Anfang und Blütezeit der Portugiesengemeinde in Hamburg”, in *Zeitschrift für Hamburgische Geschichte* 10 (1899), 199–240; Cecil Roth, “Neue Kunde von der Marranen-Gemeinde in Hamburg”, in *Zeitschrift für die Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland* 2, 3 (1930), 228–236; Hermann Kellenbenz, *Sephardim an der unteren Elbe*, Wiesbaden 1958; Michael Studemund-Halévy (ed.), *Die Sefarden in Hamburg. Zur Geschichte einer Minderheit*, vols. 1–2, Hamburg 1994–1997; idem, *Lexikon*; idem, “Die Hamburger Sefarden zur Zeit der Glikl”, in Monika Richarz (ed.), *Die Hamburger Kauffrau Glikl. Jüdische Existenz in der Frühen Neuzeit*, Hamburg 2001, 195–222; idem, “Es residiren in Hamburg Minister fremder Mächte—Sefardische Residenten in Hamburg”, in Rotraud Ries, J. Friedrich Battenberg (eds.), *Hofjuden—Ökonomie und Interkulturalität. Die jüdische Wirtschaftselite im 18. Jahrhundert*, Hamburg 2002, 154–176; idem, “Hamburgo torna-se judeu e português”, in *Estudos Orientais* 8 (2003), 185–197; Hiltrud Wallenborn, *Bekehrungseifer, Judenangst und Handelsinteresse: Amsterdam, Hamburg und London als Ziele sefardischer Migration im 17. Jahrhundert*, Hildesheim 2003. On the relationship between the Sefardi and the Ashkenazi communities in Hamburg with the municipal government and the Christian surroundings, valuable informations can be found in Joachim Whaley, *Religious Toleration and Social Change in Hamburg 1529–1819*, Cambridge 1985, 70 ff. (a German translation appeared in Hamburg in 1992 under the title *Religiöse Toleranz und sozialer Wandel in Hamburg 1529–1819*). See esp. Braden, *Judenpolitik*.

protocol books (*livros da nação*) and other *Gemeinde* archival materials (written before 1652) were destroyed in the Great Hamburg Fire of 1842, we must rely in many cases on the files of the Portuguese and Spanish Inquisition authorities. The *denúncias*, meticulously collected and evaluated by the Inquisition Courts in Lisbon and Madrid, contain valuable data on the initial period of the Hamburg community, its synagogues (*esnogas*), communal leaders (*senhores do Ma'amad, parnasim*), rabbis and teachers (*hahamim*) and (*rubissim*), schools, its role within the dominant Christian society and the religious rites of the ex-Marranos. The informers, whose motives frequently can only be a matter of speculation (but which were most probably not always religious), had as a rule been members of the communities for years. At the time of their denunciations, there were still relatives of the denounced individuals living in these communities. Though their detailed reports did not endanger these kin directly, they did pose a threat to their families in Iberia living there as Judaizers or pious Catholics. In their reports for the Inquisition, the informers repeatedly point to the circumstance that these former New Christians had renounced the true faith and, as “New Jews” had also identified themselves in public as Jews:

And in the synagogues mentioned they follow the rites and customs of the Jews. They appear openly as Jews. They enjoy respect and are known as Jews. They live in great freedom, as in Amsterdam, though less so, because they have no public synagogue. Their four synagogues are private, maintained in their homes.¹⁹

The number of forcibly baptized Jews of Portuguese or Spanish origin who began to arrive in Hamburg from the end of the sixteenth century as Catholics—and who a short time later began to live once again openly as Jews—increased steadily in the seventeenth century, so that Hamburg came to compete with Amsterdam for the honor of being known as the “Jerusalem of the North”. In 1646, the Hamburg Portuguese community counted some 800 members. According to the report of the infamous informer Semuel Aboab, at the end of 1652 the unitary Congregation *Kahal Kados Bet Israel*—formed on 3 Sep-

¹⁹ “Y en las dhas Synagogas haçian los ritos y çeremonias de Iudios y publicam[ente] se portaban y trataban como tales, y eran estimados, y reputados por Iudios, y viuen con tanta liuertad, como en Amsterdam, menos, el que no tienen synagoga publica, y las quatro, son particulares, que las tienen los sussodichos en su casas”, AHN (Madrid), Inq., lib. 1127, f. 100^r.

tember 1652 from the merger of the congregations *Talmud Tora*, *Keter Tora* and *Neve Salom*, and called in the protocols a “free general *Gemeinde*”—had a total of 1,212 persons.²⁰ This surprisingly large number, whose accuracy historians still have to corroborate, points up the extent to which Hamburg (in competition with the prosperous community in Amsterdam, at the time twice its size) had developed into an important Portuguese center, in part as a result of migration by numerous Portuguese from Glückstadt to Hamburg. In 1656, there were 116 tax-paying Jews; in 1663, over 120 families. By comparison, there were ca. 500 Portuguese in Amsterdam in 1610, a figure which had surged to some 3,000 by the end of that century; in 1680, the Portuguese community in London consisted of precisely 414 persons.

These “Portuguese” consciously played their “Iberian” card. They not only benefited from the circumstance that they were still always regarded as Portuguese and Spanish, which frequently made it easier for them to move in Christian circles, but made intentional use of that.²¹ They were the very first who succeeded in establishing Jewish communities in Hamburg and other towns between the Elbe River and the Baltic, i.e. in the Protestant lands of the North where permanent Jewish settlement had previously appeared impossible. The sense of solidarity and cohesion among Iberian Jews, who defined themselves less by religion and more in terms of ethnic and social criteria, was strengthened by an array of factors: trade with the Portuguese colonies in America and Asia, frequent travels to the “Lands of Idolatry” as Portugal and Spain were called, a pronounced endogamy oriented to economic interests, a high degree of social mobility and, quite significantly, their maintenance of Portuguese (and Spanish) as a common

²⁰ According to the testimony of Count Galeazzo Guadaldo Priorato, chamberlain of Queen Christina of Sweden, in 1663 approximately 120 Sefardi families lived in Hamburg, “Beschreibung von Hamburg im Jahre 1663”, in Henning Berkefeld (ed.), *Hamburg in alten und neuen Reisebeschreibungen*, Düsseldorf 1990, 40–53, see also Yosef Kaplan, “The Place of the Herem”, 169. On the number of Sefardi Jews in Amsterdam during the seventeenth century, see Yosef Kaplan, “The Portuguese community in seventeenth-century Amsterdam and the Ashkenazi world”, in J. Michman (ed.), *Dutch Jewish History 2*, Assen-Maastricht 1989, 23–45 [here: 29, 35]; Jonathan I. Israel, “Sephardic Immigration into the Dutch Republic”, in *Studia Rosenthaliana* 23 (1989), 45–53; idem, “Demografie en economische activiteit”, in J. C. H. Blom et al. (eds.), *Geschiedenis van de Joden in Nederland*, Amsterdam 1995, 111; Hubert P. H. Nustelling, “The Jews in the Republic of the United Provinces: Origin, numbers and dispersion”, in Jonathan I. Israel, Reinier Salvedra (eds.), *Dutch Jewry. Its History and Secular Culture, 1500–2000*, Leiden 2002, 43–62; Poettering, “Hamburger Sefarden”.

²¹ Studemund-Halévy, “Es residiren”.

linguistic and cultural bond. In the age of mercantilism, Portuguese merchants active in international trade played an important role, by dint of their education, capital assets and extensive international commercial contacts, in the economic upswing in Hamburg, Amsterdam and later London—a part far greater than their modest numbers might suggest.

Among these Portuguese, one occupational group—along with the wholesale merchants, bankers and maritime insurers—had a special significance, consciously shaping the image and self-esteem of Portuguese Jewry in Hamburg: the physicians. In the seventeenth century, there were numerous Portuguese-Jewish doctors in Amsterdam, Hamburg and Italy who had been born in Portugal or Spain and had later studied there, in Holland or Italy. Their biography was that of the *cristãos novos* (New Christians) who had grown up within a fictitious external Catholicism and, far removed from Iberia, had then found the path back into the fold of normative Judaism. As a result of their training in medicine and the natural sciences, they later had a strong impact on the Jewish thinking of their time.²² In the 1620s, there must have been so many Portuguese-Jewish distinguished physicians and medical greats already practicing in Hamburg that the physician, mathematician, astronomer and constant wanderer Yoseph Shlomo Delmedigo found it necessary to serve the community as *Ab Bet Din* (the head of the rabbinical court of the Sefardi Jews at Hamburg and in the environs of Amsterdam) and *Mashbir Bar* (“provider”, the spiritual leader of the Sefardi Jews of Hamburg and Amsterdam) rather than to continue his medical practice.²³ Among the best-known and most influential Portuguese-Jewish physicians—who also played an important role in Hamburg as community leaders, merchants, dignitaries, residents, writers and *Avisenschreiber* (scribes distributing copies of the latest political news to a list of paid subscribers)—were, for example, Rodrigo de Castro alias David Namias (1546–1627),²⁴ his oldest son

²² Harry Friedenwald, *The Jews and Medicine*, Baltimore 1944–1945, 2 vols.

²³ “Mashbir” can only refer to Joseph, as it is said, “And Joseph was the Governor over the land, and it was he ha-mashbir [that sold] to all the people of the land” (Gen. XLII, 6). Yoseph Shlomo Delmedigo, “Haqdamath ha-Magilah”, *Masref*, 5, apud Isaac Barzilay, *Yoseph Shlomo Delmedigo (Yashar of Candia)*, Leiden 1974, 76–77. According to the epitaph of his gravestone, Delmedigo was the head of the rabbinical court at Hamburg, Koppelman Lieben, *Gal-Ed, Grabinschriften des Prager israelitischen Friedhofs*, Prague 1856, 33–34.

²⁴ Rodrigo de Castro, born in Lisbon in 1550, acquired considerable fame as a physician in Lisbon before settling in Hamburg 1594, where he later returned to the Jewish faith. In 1596 he took a important part in dealing with the plague, he published a

Benedictus de Castro alias Baruch Namias (1597–1684)²⁵ and Benjamin Mussaphia (c. 1600/1606–1674),²⁶ whose reputes spread far beyond the confines of Hamburg.²⁷

tractate on this epidemic (*Tractatus brevis de natura et causis pestis*, Hamburg 1596). His reputation grew and he was called upon to treat kings, dukes and other persons of distinction. De Castro was schooled in Judaeo-Arabic medicine, which was far in advance of its time. He argued that plagues were communicated by extremely small organisms. He also won fame as a gynaecologist, practising Caesarean section with success rare indeed in those times. Among his patients were such personages as King Christian 5th of Denmark, the Landgrave of Hesse, the Archbishop of Bremen and many others of the high nobility. He died highly esteemed by Jews and Christians in 1627. On Rodrigo de Castro, see Meyer Kayserling, “Zur Geschichte der jüdischen Ärzte: Die Familie de Castro”, in *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums* 7 (1858), 393–396; 8 (1859), 161–170; 9 (1860), 92–98; 10 (1861), 38–40; Meyer Isler, “Zur ältesten Geschichte der Juden in Hamburg”, in *Zeitschrift des Vereins für Hamburgische Geschichte* 6 (1895), 461–479 [here: 467–476]; Feilchenfeld, “Anfang und Blütezeit”, 212–214; Kellenbenz, *Sephardim*, 325–330; Friedenwald, *Jews and Medicine*, 448–459 [“The Doctors de Castro”]; Yvonne David-Peyre, “Le Medicus Politicus de Rodrigo de Castro et la Musicothérapie”, in *Revue d'Histoire de la Médecine Hébraïque* 103 (1973), 69–74; 105, 133–137; David Ruderman, *Jewish Thought and Scientific Discovery in Early Modern Europe*, New Haven 1995, 294–299; Studemund-Halévy, *Lexikon*, 678–684; idem, “Rodrigo de Castro”, Kopitzsch/Brietzke, *Hamburgische Biografie*, vol. 1, 71–72.

²⁵ Benedictus de Castro, born in Hamburg in 1597, attended the gymnasium and studied at several universities; in 1621 he received a medical degree in Leiden with his dissertation *Disputatio medica de apoplexia* (Lugduni Batavorum: Ex officina Z. Smetii), a manuscript which appears to have been lost, see however Manfred Komorowski, *Bibliographisches Verzeichnis jüdischer Doktoren im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert*, München-London 1991, 33, no 1: Dr. med., 3. September 1624, Franeker! In 1622 Castro began to practice medicine in Hamburg, his reputation grew, and soon he achieved considerable success, assuming the position of physician to Queen Christina of Sweden in 1645. Baruch de Castro was the first Jew undisputedly known by name to set foot upon Swedish soil. Reduced to poverty in his old age, he died in 1684 in Hamburg. His tombstone is located next to the tombstones of his wife Jael and his father Rodrigo. On Benedictus de Castro, see Kayserling, “Zur Geschichte”; Friedenwald, *Jews and Medicine*, 448–459 [“The Doctors de Castro”]; David Ruderman, *Jewish Thought and Scientific Discovery in Early Modern Europe*, New Haven 1995, 299–308; Susanna Åkerman, “Johan Adler Salvius’ Questions to Baruch de Castro concerning ‘De tribus impostoribus’”, in Silvia Berti et al. (eds.), *Heterodoxy, Spinozism, and Free Thought in Early Eighteenth-Century Europe*, Dordrecht 1996, 397–423; Studemund-Halévy, *Lexikon*, 673–675; idem, “Baruch de Castro”, in Kopitzsch/Brietzke, *Hamburgische Biografie*, vol. 1, 70–71; idem, “Biographisches Lexikon. Addenda et Corrigenda”, in *Maajan* 67 (2003), 2191–2192.

²⁶ On Benjamin Mussaphia, see Studemund-Halévy, *Lexikon*, 660–662; idem, “Benjamin Mussaphia”, Kopitzsch/Brietzke, *Hamburgische Biografie*, vol. 1, 215–216; Francisco Moreno-Carvalho, *Benjamin Mussaphia* (MS).

²⁷ Rodrigo and Benedictus de Castro died in Hamburg. Their graves are located in the Portuguese cemetery at Königstrasse, see Studemund-Halévy, *Lexikon*, 673–675 (Baruch de Castro), 678–684 (David de Castro); idem, *Zerstört die Erinnerung nicht*, 134–135 (Baruch de Castro), 135–136 (David de Castro). Benjamin Mussaphia died in Amsterdam. His grave is in the Portuguese cemetery Ouderkerk near Amsterdam, see Studemund-Halévy, *Lexikon*, 660–662.

Also worthy examining in this context is Dr. Jacob Rosales, a many-sided, exceptionally gifted and controversial personality, a prolific author interested in astronomy, mathematics, medicine, alchemy, literature, politics, political astrology and Jewish apologetics and one of the best-known exponents of political messianism, whose alchemy and astronomy studies led him into prognostication. He was also an accomplished poet writing in at least three languages, Portuguese, Spanish and Latin.²⁸ Rosales was apparently better known abroad than in Portugal (*bem conhecido na nossa terra, e mais nas estranhas*),²⁹ was esteemed by Galileo Galilei as an astrologer (*Virum Admirandum, & doctissimum Astrologorum Principem*)³⁰ and, in his capacity as a royal Spanish resident in Hamburg, was many years in the service of the Habsburgs³¹—which for some members of the Hamburg Portuguese community was a matter of controversy. His name appears in the histories of the Sefardi communities in northern Europe, especially in Hamburg,³² and in chronicles of Leghorn.³³ He was a member of the Hamburg Portuguese community between 1631 and 1652, and one of its most striking figures. Shortly before his departure for Italy (after 1652), Rosales, who had isolated himself within the Portuguese community as a result of his pro-Spanish leanings and militant ideas, put his signature to the document establishing the Hamburg unitary

²⁸ Kenneth Brown (Calgary) is currently preparing an anthology of Sefardi poems in Latin, Portuguese and Spanish. See also Kenneth Brown, "El Parnaso sefardí y sus cancioneros, siglos 17–18", in Jules Whicker (ed.), *Actas del XII Congreso de la Asociación Internacional de Hispanistas*, Birmingham 1998, 60–69; idem, "Spanish, Portuguese, and Neo-Latin Written and/or Published by Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Sephardim from Hamburg and Frankfurt", in *Sefarad* 59, 1 (1999), 3–42; 60, 2 (2000), 227–254; 61, 1 (2001), 227–253; idem, "Genio y figura de seis poetas sefardíes de Amsterdam, Hamburgo y Livorno de los siglos XVII–XVIII", in Judit Taragona Borrás/Angel Sáenz-Badillos (eds.), *Jewish Studies in the Turn of the Twentieth Century*, vol. 2, Leiden, Cologne 1999, 469–477; idem, *The Sephardi Parnassus: Seventeenth and Eighteenth Century Spanish and Portuguese Language Poetic Chapbooks (Unitary and Facticious) Compiled in Amsterdam and Hamburg by the Sephardim* [MS].

²⁹ Diogo Barbosa Machado, *Bibliotheca Lusitana*, Coimbra 1741–1752 (4 vols), vol. 3, 197.

³⁰ On the relationship between Rosales and Galilei, see Moreno-Carvalho, "A Newly Discovered Letter".

³¹ On Rosales as resident, see Kellenbenz, "Rosales"; idem, *Sephardim*; Studemund-Halévy, "Es residiren", 20.

³² Kellenbenz, *Sephardim*, 33–35, 48, 43, 45 f., 56, 76, 133, 156 f., 177, 328, 338 ff., 347 f., 360, 470; Studemund-Halévy, *Lexikon*, 38, 159, 232–235.

³³ Renzo Toaff, *La Nazione Ebraica a Livorno e a Pisa, 1591–1700*, Florence 1990, 316, 384–385, 465.

congregation *Kahal Kados Bet Israel*.³⁴ In the domain of printing and literary production by Hamburg Sefardi Jews in the first half of the seventeenth century, Rosales earned a name particularly as the author of certain Latin *encomia* he contributed to the works by Sefardi authors from Hamburg and Amsterdam.³⁵

From New Christian to New Jew

Jacob Rosales was born in 1588³⁶ or 1593³⁷ in Lisbon³⁸ as Immanuel Bocarro Francês, son of the medical doctor Fernando/Fernão Bocarro³⁹ and Guiomar Nunes Francês.⁴⁰ This highly respected New

³⁴ Ben-Zvi Ornan-Pinkus, "The Portuguese Community of Hamburg in the XVIIth Century", in *East and Maghreb: Studies on the History of the Jews in the Orient and North Africa* 5 (1986), 91–17 (Hebrew). A German translation of this article may be found in Studemund-Halévy (ed.), *Sefarden*, vol. 1, 3–36. See also Michael Studemund-Halévy, "Dokumentation Kahal Kadosh Bet Israel", idem, *Sefarden*, vol. 1, 37–62.

³⁵ The works by these authors have been intensively investigated in recent years by the Canadian Hispanist Kenneth Brown (Brown 1999–2001).

³⁶ Barbosa Machado, *Bibliotheca Lusitana*, vol. 3, 196; Meyer Kayserling, *Bibliotheca Española-Portuguesa-Judaica*, Straßburg 1890, 96 (reprint New York 1971 [with a bibliography by the author, and by J. S. Silva Rosa with a bibliography of Kayserling's publications by M. Weisz]; Madrid 2000); idem, in *Jewish Encyclopedia* 10, 470; Toaff, *La Nazione Ebraica*, 384; Lionel Levy, *La Nation Juive Portugaise: Livourne, Amsterdam, Tunis, 1591–1951*, Paris 1999, 236.

³⁷ Kayserling, in *Jewish Encyclopedia* 10, 470.

³⁸ The biographical data follow the studies by Kellenbenz, "Rosales" and Moreno Carvalho, "Yaacov Rosales".

³⁹ The physician Fernão Bocarro, son of João Bocarro and Maria Fernandes, who was born in Estremoz and died before 1641 in Madrid, is in all likelihood the author of a "*Memorial de muita importancia para ver S. Magestade o Senhor Rey D. Filipe III, rey de Portugal em como se hão-de remediar as necessidades de Portugal e como se ha-de haver contra seus inimigos que molestão aquella coroa e os mais seus Reynos*," qtd. in Barbosa Machado, *Bibliotheca Lusitana*, vol. 2, 19; Maximiano Lemos, *Zacuto Lusitano. A sua vida e a sua obra*, Porto 1909; Révah, "Une famille", 74. Siblings of Fernão Bocarro: (a) Afonso Bocarro, was married to (1) Jerónima Maria and (2) Mecia Pinel. His daughter Brites Pinel married his cousin Jacob Rosales; (b) Andre Bocarro, died before 1641; (c) Gaspar Bocarro, lived 1641 in Madrid, he was the husband of Leonor Brandão; (d) Manuel Bocarro, husband of Margarida Brandão (sister of Leonor Brandão); (e) Maria Bocarro, died in Estremoz before 1641, wife of Rui Gonçalves Zagalo. See Révah, "Une famille", 75.

⁴⁰ Guiomar Nunes, born in Abrantes and died 1641 in Madrid, was the daughter of Manuel Francês and sister of Miguel Francês and Gracia Dias, apud Révah, "Une famille", 74. A nephew of Miguel Francês, Diogo Ribeiro, was arrested by the Inquisition in 1704 (ANTT, Processo no. 2096). On 24 January 1626, António Nunes declares the following before the Lisbon Inquisition Court: "disse que hoje por mandado desta meza fora com outros familiares a prender por culpas contra nossa sancta fee a Gracia dias de

Christian family, originally from Castalvi de Rosanes in Catalonia,⁴¹ boasted numerous physicians and court Jews since the fifteenth century.⁴² Among his siblings were João,⁴³ António,⁴⁴ Francisco,⁴⁵ Brites,⁴⁶

Sauzedo molher de Gomez dias Castanha e a Mor Franceza e a Brites Soares molheres de Miguel Frances e de Pero Frances christans nouas desta cidade e dando se lhe nas cazas a hum tempo não nas acharão se não nouas de serem fugidas de sabado proximo passado a noite e fazendo dilligencia pella ditta Gracia Dias que particularmente elle denunciante buscaua como lhe foi ordenado achou que ella se fora no dito sabado com Miguel Frances seu irmão pera casa de huas christans nouas moradoras a Sancta Justa hua das quaes se chama Maria de Crasto e dando lhe na caza, lhe disserão as dittas christans que he mai e duas filhas e hua moça pequena christã velha que a ditta Gracia Dias se recolhera na ditta caza no ditto sabbado a noite dizendo que seu marido matara hum homem que a recolhessem ali e que hai estiuera até o outro dia a noite" (ANTT, Inquisição de Lisboa, Processo no. 9454, qtd. in Azevedo, "Bocarro-Francês", 18–19; Beatriz Soares, ANTT, Inquisição de Lisboa, Processo no. 14775; see also Silva, "Criptojudaísmo", 179). The siblings of Guiomar Nunes: (a) Pero Francês (alias Isaac Francês), husband of Brites Soares, they lived in Hamburg where they returned to Judaism. Children: Manuel Francês (alias Mordechai Francês), husband of Ester Brandão, born in Hamburg, daughter of João Francês Brandão, born in Abrantes; Henrique Francês, died in Hamburg; the merchant Miguel Francês (alias David Francês), lived in France, Antwerp, Amsterdam, Hamburg and in Pernambuco in 1641 (Anita Novinsky, *Inquisição: prisioneiros do Brasil*, Rio de Janeiro, 2002, 162; Révah, "Une famille", 73–87); Cateirina Álvares (alias Ester Pimentel), wife of Afonso Dias Pimentel (alias Isaac Pimentel), they lived in Hamburg; (b) Miguel Francês (alias Daniel Francês), died before 1641 in Turkey, husband of Môr Francês, he lived in Lisbon, Rotterdam, Amsterdam, Hamburg and Turkey [see Révah, "Une famille", 76]. Children: Henrique Francês (alias Jacob Francês), born in Abrantes, husband of Brites Lopes, he lived in Hamburg and Leghorn; Pero Francês (alias Mose Francês), husband of his cousin Brites Lopes (alias Debora-Francês), born in Abrantes. He lived in Hamburg and later in Turkey [see Kellenbenz, *Sephardim*, 137, Ann. 93; Révah, "Une famille", 76]; João Francês (alias Isaac Francês), lived in Hamburg and later in Turkey [see Révah, "Une famille", 76]; Brites Lopes, wife of Manuel Henriques (son of Brites Nunes and João Francês), lived in Hamburg [see Kellenbenz, *Sephardim*, 176, ft. 188]; (c) Brites Nunes, died in Hamburg before 1641, wife of João Francês; (d) Gracias Dias de Salzedo, wife of Gomes Dias Castanho; (e) João Francês. On the family Bocarro-Francês see Révah, "Une famille", 74–77. See also Isafas Rosa Pereira, *A Inquisição em Portugal. Séculos XVI–XVII—Período Filipino*, Lisbon 1993, 127 [documento 141]: "a herdade da Vinagreira [...] esta vaga para o fisco porquanto a nomeação que Dona Luisa Fez na mulher de Fernão Bocarro foi bula por ela depois ser sentenciada à morte e a sua fazenda confiscada".

⁴¹ Levy, *La Nation Juive*, 236.

⁴² On his life and work, see Studemund-Halévy, *Lexikon*, 232–235.

⁴³ Révah, "Une famille", 77, 87. João Bocarro lived in Estremoz where he read in the Old Testament and professed openly the salmes: "hu Simão Mendez surgião christão nouo que se dizia ter o antreporro de hua casa cheo de liuros por onde ensinava e conuertia a lei de Moisés a todos os da nação que podia", Azevedo, "O Bocarro Francês", 188; Silva, "Criptojudaísmo", 173.

⁴⁴ See fns. 9, 52.

⁴⁵ The soldier Francisco Bocarro died in the Indies, see Révah, "Une famille", 77, 87.

⁴⁶ Brites Bocarro alias Rahel Rosales, born 1599 [?] in Estremoz, was married to the merchant António Gomes, son of Aires Gomes, in Estremoz; António Gomes was 1660

Maria,⁴⁷ Francisca,⁴⁸ Isabel⁴⁹ and Gaspar.⁵⁰ Of his brothers, António and Gaspar and other family members were denounced a number of times to the Inquisition authorities.⁵¹

arrested by the Inquisition in Evora (ANTT, Processo no. 2405). Brites Bocarro spent two years in Hamburg (1628–1629), she went later to Leghorn, see also Azevedo, “Bocarro-Francês”, 18, fn. 2; Kellenbenz, “Rosales”, 347; Révah, “Une famille”, 77–78, 87.

⁴⁷ Maria (alias Abigail?) Bocarro was the wife of the merchant and occasional poet Custódio Lobo da Costa, born in Lisbon and died in Leghorn before 1666 (?), see Révah, “Une famille”, 78, 87: “Custódio Lobo da Costa ... marié à une fulana Bocarro, marchand et poète, qui quitta le Portugal vers 1646 pour rejoindre la communauté juive de Hambourg”. Kayserling mentions the Portuguese conceptual poet Custódio Lobo alias Mose Jesurun Ribero alias Mose Jessurun Lobo who contributed a Spanish funerary poem for the martyr Abraham Nuñez Bernal, who died for his religious beliefs, to a collection of poems with the self-explanatory title: *Elogios, / que zelosos dedicaron / A LA, / Felice memoria de ABRAHM / NUNEZ BERNAL, / Que fue quemado vivo santifi- / cando el Nombre de su / Criador em Cordova a / 3 de Mayo 5415. / Pro meritis carcer, / Prolaude vincula dantur. / Virtus crimen habet / Gloria supplicium*, Amsterdam [1655.] 108–114 (Elegies dedicated by pious men to the happy memory of Abraham Nuñez Bernal, who was burned alive [a martyr], sanctifying the name of his Creator, in Cordova on 3 May 5415). Among other contributors from Hamburg we find Joseph Francês, Hamburg’s Camões [“Del Señor Joseph Francês de Hamburgo Soneto” (17)], about whom Miguel/Daniel (Levi) de Barrios would write: “Joseph Francês, armado de conceptos, / guardó de Pindo harmónicos preceptos”, see Brown, “Spanish, Portuguese, and Neo-Latin Poetry”, 1999, 13, 33; Studemund-Halévy, *Lexikon*, 442–444; idem, *Zerstört die Erinnerung nicht*, 138–139] and in Eliakim Castiel [“Del Señor Eliachim Castiel In honorem & gloriam Abrahami Nuñez Bernal (15)”, see Brown, “Spanish, Portuguese, and Neo Latin Poetry”, 1999, 32; Studemund-Halévy, *Lexikon*, 354, other contributors see Kayserling, *Sephardim*, 260, 354; idem, *Biblioteca*, 28, 43, 64; Harm den Boer, *La literatura hispano-portuguesa de los sefardíes de Amsterdam en su contexto histórico-social, siglos XVII y XVIII*, Amsterdam 1992, 397–398, Nr. 41. The martyrdom of three members of the Bernal family rocked the Portuguese communities in Amsterdam and Hamburg. The title of the collection does not indicate the material in honor of Isaac d’Almeida Bernal, who was only 17 years old when seized by the Inquisition and 22 when burned at the stake. See Kayserling, *Sephardim*, 262–263; idem, *Biblioteca*, 64; Miguel Levi de Barrios, *Relacion de los poetas y escritores de la nación judayca amstelodama*, Amsterdam 1682, reprinted in *Revue des Études Juives* 18 (1889), 281–289: “Custodio Lobo (alias Moseh Yesurun Ribero) hizo conceptuosas Poesias, y glosó admirablemente esta Redondilla: ‘Si es hija de Dios, porque / La Ley al Hombre da, quando / Sin Ley á la Ley fallando, / Niega la de vida fé.’” A Moise Jesurun Ribero died before 1666 in Leghorn, husband of Abigail (*Archivio della Comunità Israelitica di Livorno* [ACIL]), Testamenti, n. 139 (testamento di Abigail, vedova di Mose Iesurun Ribero), apud Cristina Galasso, *Alle Origine di una Comunità. Ebrei ed ebrei a Livorno nel Seicento*, Florence 2003, 129, ft. 29. A Abigal Ribeiro is listed in 1671 as a member of the *Hevra di Mohar ha-Betulot* (Toaff, *La Nazione Ebraica*, 465). See ft. 186.

⁴⁸ Francisca Bocarro was the wife of Andre de Oliveira, “letrado em leis”, see Révah, “Une famille”, 78, 87.

⁴⁹ Révah, “Une famille”, 78, 87.

⁵⁰ See fns. 11, 51, 53 and 128.

⁵¹ On the commercial activities of the Bocarro family, see J. Gentil da Silva, *Stratégie des Affaires à Lisbonne entre 1595 et 1607*, Paris 1956, 215 (Andre Bocarro),

We have a rich lode of detailed information on the crypto-Jewish tradition in the family Bocarro Francês as a result of the denunciation in 1624 of his brother António, a report which Israel S. Révah called one of the most disgusting in the history of the Portuguese Inquisition.⁵² On 28 February 1624, the learned and infamous António Bocarro denounced his brothers Gaspar and Imanuel before the Inquisition Tribunal in Goa accusing them of Judaizing practices.⁵³ From these charges he chose to exclude his brother Francisco, a soldier, since in António's eyes he was *muito bom christão* (a good Christian). He also recounted that several members of the family behaved openly as Jews, would read the Jewish Bible at home, awaited the imminent coming of the Messiah and believed in God's promise to his people.⁵⁴ He reported that his brother João was likewise a Jew, kept the commandments, would recite the psalms every morning, had a collection of Jewish books at home and instructed the members of the *Nação* in the Law of Moses.⁵⁵ He added that they not only openly identified as Jews but also mocked Catholicism and blasphemed the blessed saints.⁵⁶

185, 273, 352, 354 (Gaspar Bocarro), 299 (Manuel Bocarro). See also Révah, "Une famille", 86.

⁵² "Ce document est certainement un des plus ignobles qu'enregistrent les sinistres annales de l'Inquisition portugaise", Révah, "Le retour", 59.

⁵³ Azevedo, "Bocarro-Francês", 15.

⁵⁴ "auera onze ou doze annos em Lisboa segundo sua lembrança por hua ou duas vezes fora a casa de Miguel e Pero frances irmãos da maj delle confitente Guiomar Nunes que morauão na rua Noua e em hua casa daquellas explicara alguns lugares da Biblia que fallão da vinda do Messias e das promessas feitas aos iudeus e ouvião Gracia Dias irmã dos sobreditos Miguel Francês e Pero Francês e Mór Francesa molher do dito Miguel Francês e Britis Soares molher do dito Pero Francês e com esta occasião se declararão com elle confitente por iudias as sobreditas Gracia Dias, Mór Francesa e Britis Soares" (ANTT, Inquisição de Lisboa, Caderno 9 do Promotor da Inquisição de Lisboa, Culpas contra muitas pessoas tiradas do processo de Antonio bocarro christão nouo, fls. 436–446; Azevedo, "Bocarro-Francês", 189).

⁵⁵ "e tambem lhe parece que seu irmão João Bocarro mais velho era iudeu e andaua na Lei de Moisés [...] que o dito João Bocarro quando se leuantaua pella menhã resaua hus psalmos [...] que se dizia ter o antreforro de hua casa cheo de liuros por onde ensinava e conuertia a lei de Moisés a todos os da nação que podia" (ANTT, Inquisição de Lisboa, Caderno 9 do Promotor da Inquisição de Lisboa, Culpas contra muitas pessoas tiradas do processo de Antonio bocarro christão nouo, fls. 436–446; Azevedo, "Bocarro-Francês", 188).

⁵⁶ "e ambos dahi em diante se declarauão por iudeus e fallauão nas cousas da lei de Moises desdenhando das cousas da igreja catholica, zombando do vso das santas imagens, dizendo e repetindo por ellas o da escretura pedes habent et non ambulat, aures habent et non audiunt, e outras semelhantes blasfemias que tirauão de hu liuro de Lactantio Firmiano na parte onde reprova os idolos dos gentios acomodando o que contra

Imanuel, who attended the Colégio de Santo Antão—the first Jesuite College in Portugal—in Lisbon together with António, must have begun to have doubts about Christianity already at this juncture, because once when he showed his brother a Bible, he commented on the prophets with critical references to Christianity. The report also states that Imanuel used to meet with other members of the *Nação*, i.e. with New Christians. He also notes that his brother Imanuel had gone to Olivais in Lisbon with the declared intention of keeping Yom Kippur, accompanied by Fernão Gomes Pimentel (who later went to Flanders where his trail vanishes) and an apothecary from Coimbra named Custódio Gomez. During their journey they reportedly read passages from the Bible and discussed the imminent advent of the Messiah.⁵⁷

After successfully completing the Jesuit school, Imanuel Bocarro Francês followed family tradition and studied medicine. A document dated 1620 that officially identifies him as a physician states that he studied philosophy and medicine in Spain.⁵⁸ He completed his Bachelor's degree in Alcalá de Henares and his licentiate in Sigüenza, but it does not say where he completed his medical studies. The document also notes that its holder Rosales has sufficient knowledge to practice as a physician and that he has been in practice for more than 12 years.⁵⁹ By a rough calculation, he must therefore have passed his medical examination around 1608. But there is a possibility, too, that he received his doctorate in medicine in Montpellier.⁶⁰ He was examined in

elles dis ao uso das Santas imagens da igreja, e quando em quinta feira de endoenças, e pella Soman Santa se fazião os officios diuinos dizião ambos hu com outro do chelo morto, e do chelo viuo” (ANTT, Inquisição de Lisboa, Caderno 9 do Promotor da Inquisição de Lisboa, Culpas contra muitas pessoas tiradas do processo de Antonio bocarro christão nouo, fls. 436–446v); Azevedo, “Bocarro-Francês”, 186.

⁵⁷ “auera doze ou treze anos que por hua ou duas vezes elle confitente, e o dito Manuel Bocarro seu irmão e o sobredito Fernão Gomez Pimentel filho de Diogo Gomes, e segundo sua lembrança mais um Custodio Gomez christão nouo boticario natural de Coimbra que moraua em Lisboa ao Corpo Santo na botica das duas portas, forão todos os sobreditos em Lisboa aos olivaeis pera a parte do Grilo pera jejuarem aquelle dia que era o que chamão o jejum grande da saída do egipto que uem pello tempo da paschoa e levavão consigo hua biblia com que passauão o dia explicando alguas profecias que tratauão da vinda do Messias que esperavão” (ANTT, Inquisição de Lisboa, Caderno 9 do Promotor da Inquisição de Lisboa, Culpas contra muitas pessoas tiradas do processo de Antonio bocarro christão nouo, fls. 436–446v); Azevedo, “Bocarro-Francês”, 188; Silva, “Crip-tojuidismo”, 174.

⁵⁸ ANTT, Ementas, Livro 11; ANTT, Chancelaria de D. Filipe II, Doações, I, 43, f. 251. See also Lemos, *Zacuto Lusitano*, 96; Sousa Viterbo, “Médicos Poetas”, 21–22; Kellenbenz, “Rosales”, 347; Moreno-Carvalho, “Yaacov Rosales”, 146.

⁵⁹ Viterbo, “Médicos Poetas”, 21–22.

Coimbra in philosophy and medicine and certified there as a medical doctor.⁶¹ During his study in Spain, Rosales made the acquaintance of important crypto-Jews such as Isaac Cardoso, who called him a friend and astronomer,⁶² and the famous physician Zacutus Lusitanus.⁶³ In 1616, he took part in a literary competition in Spain; these poems were published a year later by Pedro de Herrera in his *Descripción de la Capilla*.⁶⁴ Rosales opened a medical practice in Lisbon and thanks to his excellence as a doctor, he soon could boast many patients, among them the duke Dom Teodosio of Bragança, the archbishop Dom Pedro Aleixo of Braga and the master of the Order of Santiago.⁶⁵

Rosales must have returned a year later to Portugal, because in 1619 he brought out his first book, a tractate on a comet that had blazed across the skies on 9 and 16 November 1618, entitled *Tratado dos Cometas que apareceram em Novembro passado de 1618* and dedicated to the Grand Inquisitor D. Fernão Martins de Mascarenhas.⁶⁶ This book was extensively refuted by Mendo Pacheco de Brito in his *Discurso em Dous Phaenomenos do Ano 1618*. Later he was in Spain once again, where in 1622 he treated Dom Bathazar de Zuñiga⁶⁷ and

⁶⁰ Barbosa Machado, *Bibliotheca Lusitana*, vol. 3, 196; Meyer Kayserling, *Biblioteca Española-Portuguesa-Judaica*, Straßburg 1890, 117. However, Kellenbenz's supposition ("Rosales", 347) that the second family name was selected on the basis of his years of study in France is incorrect, because his mother was a Nunes Francês. See also the Inquisition report of Miguel Francês (ANTT, Inquisição de Lisboa, Processo no. 7276).

⁶¹ Viterbo, "Médicos Poetas", 21–22.

⁶² "Duo erant nobis amici praestantissimi Astrologi. Unus erat Sylveira [...] Alter erat Bocarro", Isaac Cardoso, *Philosophia libera*, Venice 1673, 181. See also Moreno-Carvalho, "Yaacov Rosales", 147.

⁶³ Lemos, *Zacuto Lusitano*, 96–103.

⁶⁴ Pedro de Herrera, *Descripción de la Capilla* ..., Madrid 1617, liv. IV, fls. 117^v e 136^v–138, see also Viterbo, "Médicos Poetas", 14–15; Moreno-Carvalho, "Yaacov Rosales", 154; Sandra Neves Silva, *Jacob Rosales* (MS); Neves Silva, *Criptojudatismo e Messianismo em Portugal no Século XVII: Vida e Obra de Manoel Bocarro Francês* (forthcoming).

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 97.

⁶⁶ The complete title: *Tratado dos / cometas qve ap / pareceram em novem / bro passado de 1618. / Composto pello licenceado / Manvel Bocarro Frances, Medico, & Astrologo / natural desta cidade de Lisboa / Dirigido ao illvstrissimo senhor / Dom Fernão Martins Mascarenhas, Bispo & Inquisidor / Geral nestes Reynos & Senhorios de Portugal &. / Com todas as licenças necessarias. / Em Lisboa por Pedro Craesbeeck. Anno 1619 / 4o de 20 folhas numeradas só pela frente*. See also Kayserling, *Biblioteca Española-Portuguesa-Judaica*, 96; Lemos, *Zacutus Lusitano*, 97. Bocarro Francês reports that a bloody rain is said to have fallen for two hours, pouring into the ocean near the Portuguese seaport Setúbal (*Cometas*, p. 9^v, 14^v, 18^v and 20).

⁶⁷ Imanuel Bocarro Francês, *Anacephalaeoses*, Anotações, 28. See also Viterbo, "Médicos Poetas", 10–11.

presumably likewise made the acquaintance of Isaac Cardoso. Cardoso recalled that meeting years later: “Duo erant nobis amici praestantissimi Astrologi. Uno erat Sylveira . . . Alter erat Bocarro”.⁶⁸ In Zuñiga’s presence, he had discussions with an unidentified man from Naples about one of his favorite subjects: astrology, alchemy and the influence of the stars.⁶⁹

Immanuel Bocarro Francês must have gone back to Lisbon shortly thereafter, since in 1624 he published an astrological poem in four parts and 131 octaves, *Anacephaleoses da Monarchia Luzitana* (A Summary of the Lusitanian Monarchy), a work as learned as it was dry and boring, centering on the future of the Lusitanian monarchy, a work full of Bandarrian messianic overtones.⁷⁰ In a piquant gesture, he dedicated this poem—in which he expresses his admiration for the Portuguese poet Luis de Camões, whose style he attempts to imitate—to the Portuguese monarch Felipe III (i.e. Philip II of Spain). But he expressly stipulated that his dedication should be relayed via “his Portuguese councillor of state at the court in Madrid”. Quite understandably, some of these songs remained unpublished, since they had been dedicated to Duke Teodosio of Bragança, whom Immanuel regarded as the “restorer” of the old Portuguese state and the founder of the new one. The small

⁶⁸ Cardoso, *Philosophia libera*, 181. On Isaac Cardoso, see Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi, *From Spanish Court to Italian Ghetto*, New York 1971 (reprint, Seattle and London). A Spanish translation was published in 1989 in Madrid.

⁶⁹ Manoel Bocarro Francês, *Anacephaleoses*, fls. 3^v–4; Azevedo, *A Evolução do Sebastianismo*, 49; Viterbo, “Médicos Poetas”, 11. See also Moreno-Carvalho, “Yaacov Rosales”, 150. On Rosales as a messianist, see esp. Moreno Carvalho, “A Newly Discovered Letter”; Silva, “Criptojudaísmo”, 174–176; Manuel J. Gandra, *Jacob Hebreu Rosales, aliás Emanuel Bocarro Francês, Filósofo Hermético e Sebastianista do século XVII* (forthcoming).

⁷⁰ The exact full title: *Anacephaleoses da / Monarchia / Lvzitana. / Pello Doctor Manoel / Bocarro Frances, Medico, Philosopho, & / Mathematico Luzitano / Dirigidos ao Senhor / [Anno 1624] della el Rey N. Senhor / Com todas as Licenças necessarias. / Em Lisboa*. Por Antonio Aluarez. Bocarro Francês planned to publish his work in four parts: (1) Stado Astrológico; (2) Stado Régio, (3) Stado Titular and (4) Stado Heróico. In 1624, only Part I appeared, the others were burned or never published. The “Stado Astrológico” consists of three sections: (a) a dedication to King Philip of Spain and Portugal, (b) the poem itself and (c) a prose text dealing with his meeting with Don Baltazar de Zuñiga and their discussions about Aristotelian physics, etc. After the publication of this book, Rosales had to destroy some of his works and was imprisoned: “Esse foi o motivo para o incêndio de minha obra” [this was the reason for the burning of my work] (fol. 5); “me fizesse estar preso no Tronco mais de dous meses” [held me in the (prison) Tronco for more than two months] (fol. 14), apud Moreno-Carvalho, “A Newly Discovered Letter”, 67, ft. 19. See Hernani Cidade, *A Literatura Autonomista sob os Filipes*, Lisbon 1948, 207–218.

book bore a mythological nymph, handing over a shield with the Portuguese weapons: “Este restaura do Reino a perda / Levantando por si novo estandarte”.⁷¹ But the duke declines since the actual sovereign of the land is Philip II of Spain.

With this book, a volume into which numerous family traditions flowed,⁷² Bocarro Francês sought to prove, utilizing the methods of political astrology, that Portugal could anticipate a messianic future. To express this vision, he mobilized the concept of the “messianic kingdom”.⁷³ In so doing, he joined in the political-literary current that has been called “Sebastianism”.⁷⁴ He wrote his book at a time when

⁷¹ On this see A.E. Beau, *Die Entwicklung des portugiesischen Nationalbewußtseins*. Ibero-Amerikanische Studien des Ibero-Amerikanischen Instituts, Hamburg 1945, vol. 16, 68, 76, 78, 147 ff.

⁷² See Moreno Carvalho, “Yaacov Rosales”, 148. In a warning to the reader (*Advertencia ao leitor*), Bocarro Francês voices his dissatisfaction regarding many members of his family who had persecuted his father: “muytos bastardos ... os quais aniquilando a honra dos Bocarras tomarão ... ocasiões de perseguirem a meu Pay” (*Anacephaleoses*, fol. 4^v).

⁷³ Unfortunately, the study by Luís Miguel Carolino, “Cosmology and messianic expectations in Manuel Bocarro’s thought” (MS) was not available to the authors. See also Luís Miguel Carolino, *Agant Corpora Coelestia in Sublunarem Mundum annum?: Ciência, Astrologia e Sociedade em Portugal (1593–1755)*, unpublished doctoral dissertation, Universidade de Évora 2000.

⁷⁴ Christians and Jewish eschatological doctrines in beliefs, prophecies and the gift of prophecy concerning “the last days”, “the last Emperor” and “the last Empire” enjoyed a particularly flourishing tradition in the Iberian world (see Geraldine McKendrick/Angus MacKay, “Visionaries and Affective Spirituality during the First Half of the Sixteenth Century”, in Perry/Cruz, *Cultural Encounters*, 93–104). In Portugal as in Spain, conversos constituted a decisive factor in shaping millenarian patterns in introducing special tropes of converso messianism. On the very popular current of Sebastianism, which contained both elements of traditional Portuguese millenarianism and of Jewish messianism, see the classical studies by João Lúcio de Azevedo, *A Evolução do Sebastianismo*, Lisbon 1984 [Rosales: 139–146]; António Machado Pires, *D. Sebastião e O Encuberto*, Lisbon 1982 [Rosales: 150–151 and especially Chapter 4: “Profetismo hebraico, mito do Encoberto e futuro de Portugal: as Trovas do sapateiro Bandarra” (Jewish prophecy, the myth of the hidden one and the future of Portugal: the poems of Bandarra), 65–78]; José van den Besselaar, *O sebastianismo—História sumária*, Lisbon 1987 [Rosales: 90–92]. On Rosales as a devotee of Sebastianism, see Matt Goldish, “Patterns in Converso Messianism”, in Matt Goldish, Richard H. Popkin (eds.), *Millenarism and Messianism in Early Modern European Culture*, vol. 1: Jewish Messianism in the Early Modern World, Dordrecht 2001, 41–63 [here: 54–55, 58, 63]; Moreno Carvalho, “Yaacov Rosales”; idem, “A Newly Discovered Letter”. On Bandarra, see Adriano Vasco Rodrigues, Maria da Assunção Carqueja Rodrigues, “As Trovas do Bandarra. Suas influências Judaico-Cabalísticas na Mística da Paz Universal”, in *Revista de Ciências Históricas—Universidade Portucalense*, (1987), 202–221; Elias Lipiner, *Gonçalo Anes Bandarra e os Cristãos-Novos*, Trancoso 1996, provides a beautiful characterization, from which many of our insights are drawn. On the Sebastian myth see also D. João de Castro, *Discvrso da Vida do Rey Dom Sebastiam*, Lisbon 1994.

Portugal was under Spanish domination. The first three parts appeared in 1624, and many of the prophecies articulated there seem imprecise and vague. He maintained that Portugal would be the last and mightiest world empire, though leaving open the question whether that would be under Spanish or Portuguese rule. In his *Anacephalaeoses*, he tells the story of the unfortunate king Sebastian, who fought in North Africa against the Moors and was killed in 1578 in the battle of Alcácer-Quibir. As a consequence of this defeat, Portugal fell under Spanish rule (1580–1640). But many Portuguese did not accept that their king had been killed: they cherished the belief that he was still alive and would return some day as “hidden king” (*o rei encuberto*)⁷⁵; under him, Portugal would advance to lead the nations, reestablishing the kingdom in its former glory. With this book, Bocarro Francês revealed that he was a follower of the house of Bragança, declaring that a member of this house would some day be that “hidden king” Sebastian.⁷⁶ He refers to himself as a “prophet”, calling the Portuguese a “new chosen people” (*novo povo eleito*).⁷⁷ He terms himself the “hand on the clock that shows the hours” (*a mão de Relógio que aponta as horas*).⁷⁸ He names the year 1653 for the appearance of the monarchy and the “hidden king”, who will rule as sovereign over the world and vanquish the followers of Mohammed.⁷⁹ Twenty years later, in Hamburg, Rosales would give this old vision a new revised form and configuration.

⁷⁵ The intricate history of the “hidden kings” and of the numerous “poetical prophets” and “street prophets” has yet to be written, but there is ample evidence of their activity in Spain and in Portugal. For example, 1522, during the *Germania* revolt in the Valencian town of Játiva, a hermit appeared who described himself as “el rey encubierto”, evoking the medieval idea of the *pastor angelicus* or blessed redeemer who would come from the East, rescue the kingdom from its enemies, and forever defeat the Moors. On this important historical event, see Ricardo García Carcel, *Las germanias de Valencia*, Barcelona 1981, 132–138; Richard Kagan, “Politics, Prophecy, and the Inquisition in Late Sixteenth-Century Spain”, in Perry/Cruz, *Cultural Encounters*, 103–124 [here: 107].

⁷⁶ “Esto quarto fragmento mostra que há-de ser este Rei, que alguns chamam encuberto, não por estar, mas por então se descobrir com maior grandeza, e se alevantará esta Monarquia” (*Jardim Ameno*, códice 774 do Arquivo Nacional da Torre do Tombo). See also João Lúcio de Azevedo, *A Evolução do Sebastianismo*, Lisbon 1984: 142; António José Saraiva, “António Vieira, Menasseh ben Israel et le Cinquième Empire”, in *Studia Rosenthaliana* 6, 2 (1972), 24–57; idem, “Bocarro-Rosales”.

⁷⁷ See Ana Isabel Buescu, *Memória e Poder. Ensaio de História Cultural (Séculos XV–XVIII)*, Lisbon 2000, 18.

⁷⁸ *Luz Pequena Lunar e estellifera da Monarchia Lusitana*, fl. 100^v.

⁷⁹ *Anacephalaeoses da Monarchia Luzitana*, fl. 56. Rosales is also credited with having predicted the great earthquake in Lisbon of 1755: *Profesia de Manoel Bocarro Frances Médico Philózofo Mathemático Luzitano anno 1624*, MS 249, No. 69 (Biblioteca Nacional, Lisbon). See also Moreno-Carvalho, “On the Boundaries”, 75, ft. 28; idem, “A Newly Discovered Letter”.

The Spanish occupation forces, which recognized how explosive this text and the astrological forecasts were, ordered its first three parts burned immediately under the pretext that this document could encourage the duke of Bragança to declare himself king (“dizendo que provocava ao Duque de Bragança a ser Rei”) and would incite the population (“que incitava ao povo”). The Spanish authorities then had its author imprisoned. In a later auto-da-fé, the *Real Mesa Censoria* condemned and burned the poem and its supplement.⁸⁰ Shortly thereafter, Rosales recounted: “The Spaniards arrested me and claimed that my book served to incite the people against the king”.⁸¹ In his defense, Bocarro Francês argued that the duke had raised no claim to the throne and that all this derived solely from the imagination of the author and his poetic license (“o que o furor poético, e Divino e Astrológico me ditou”).⁸² The author’s arrest and the burning or destruction of the book may go back to a complaint formally lodged by two uncles, illegitimate brothers of the father.⁸³ Rosales then fled with the aid of Francisco de Mello to Rome, where he emerged as a professing Jew under the name Jacob Rosales and made the acquaintance of Galileo.⁸⁴ He would meet

⁸⁰ “porque os Castelhanis empidirão imprimiremçe com os outros” (*Jardim Ameno*, códice 774 da Torre do Tombo [this manuscript contains many Sebastianist texts, copied from many sources, including Rosales’s book]); *Luz Pequena Lunar e estellífera da Monarchia Lusitana*. Another manuscript of *Luz pequena* is in the General Library of Coimbra University: *Luz pequena lunar e estellífera Do Doutor Manoel Bocarro Francez Rosales. Explicação do seu primo Anacephaeoses impresso em Lix^a no anno de 1626. Sobre o Principe encuberto, Monarchia ally pronosticada, Referense os versos do 4^o Anacephaleosis porq os C. impedirão imprimiremçe c. os outros. Roma anno Cristi 1626*. See also Barbosa Machado, *Bibliotheca Lusitana*, vol. 3, 198; Lemos, *Zacutus Lusitanus*, 102; Azevedo, *A Evolução do Sebastianismo*, 142–145; Moreno Carvalho, “A Newly Discovered Letter”, 71–72. António Vieira quotes Rosales in his work *Egrégio Encoberto, Descoberto*, National Library Lisbon, Doc. 7211, apud Moreno-Carvalho, “On the Boundaries”, 75, ft. 29.

⁸¹ Edital da Real Meza Censoria, Lisbon, 9 December 1774. See Cecil Roth, *History of the Marranos*, 112; Kellenbenz, “Rosales”, 348; Moreno Carvalho, “A Newly Discovered Letter”, 71.

⁸² *Jardim Ameno*, códice 774 do Arquivo Nacional da Torre do Tombo, qtd. in Azevedo, *A Evolução do Sebastianismo*, 144.

⁸³ We should note that Jacob Rosales was never persecuted for his Marrano or Jewish beliefs. According to Cecil Roth, these uncles forced Bocarro Francês to flee, Cecil Roth, *A Life of Menasseh ben Israel*, Philadelphia 1934, 112–113; Kellenbenz, “Rosales”, 348.

⁸⁴ Writing on his relationship with Galilei, Bocarro Francês notes in the foreword to his *Fasciculus trium verarum propositionum*: “In tribus libris Foetus astrologici, Galilæus Galilæus, cui ipsos dedimus, Romæ anno 1626, typis excudi fecit”. And goes on: “Secundum commentariolum Excellentissimus in scientiis Galilæus Galilæus, Mathematicorum Coriphæus, Romæ anno 1626, typis dedit”, qtd. in Lemos, *Zacutus Lusitanus*, 98, fn. 2.

de Mello again later on in Hamburg and remain in constant touch with him in the future. In 1626 in Rome, he published the fourth part of his banned book *Anacephalaeoses*, together with notes which he brought out under the title *Luz Pequena Lunar*.⁸⁵ That same year, his brother António, plagued by his conscience, made his (in)famous accusatory statements before the Inquisition in Goa.

“Hungry for Freedom”⁸⁶ or Bocarro Francês becomes Rosales

Shortly after the appearance of this text, Imanuel Bocarro Francês left Rome and journeyed perhaps to Amsterdam, where he was to remain but for a short time. In Amsterdam or later in Hamburg he accepted the Jewish faith, taking the family name Rosales. He now began to call himself Jacob Rosales.⁸⁷ It is unconvincing to interpret this change of name as an act of caution, because in future he almost always made use of a double name.

⁸⁵ *Jardim Ameno*, códice 774 do Arquivo Nacional da Torre do Tombo. The book, which quotes some Jewish references, was reprinted in Rome in 1626: *Luz Pequena Lunar e estellifera da Monarchia Lusitana e Explicação do seu Primeiro Anacephaleosis impreço em Lisboa: o ano passado de 1624. Sobre o Príncipe Emcuberto e Monarchia alli prognosticada; Reference os 4 Anacephaleosis porque os Castellhanis empidirão imprimirem com os outros; o ano de 1626* (Small lunar and smaller light of the Portuguese monarchy: Explanation of the first Anacephaleoses printed in Lisbon 1624. On the Hidden Prince and monarchy prognosticated therein, referring to the verses of the 4th Anacephaleoses, because the Castillians forbade the printing of the others, Rome, 1626). Another manuscript is in the holding of the University Library of Coimbra (BGUC, Ms 393), apud Silva, “Criptojudaísmo”, 179. See also Barbosa Machado, *Bibliotheca Lusitana*, vol. 3, 196–198 [here: 198]; Lemos, *Zacutus Lusitanus*, 102; Azevedo, *Sebastianismo*, 142–145; Silva, “Criptojudaísmo”, 179–183.

⁸⁶ “Postquam autem ego, in has regiones, maioris libertatis avidis, perueni”, letter from Rosales to Duke August the Younger of Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel, 12 August 1644. This letter was found between the pages of a copy of his book *Regnum Astrorum Reformatum* (Hamburg: H. Werner: 1644), reprinted in Brown, “Spanish, Portuguese, and Neo-Latin”, 2001, 43–46. In this letter, Rosales explains how he was in the service of the king of Spain for 22 years as a teacher of mathematics to the king’s brother, and states his hope that now the prince would subsidize the publication of his next mathematical-astrological treaty, see Reyes Bertolin, *Greek Influence in Jewish Spain* [Jacob Rosales, MS]. On Sefardi printing in Hamburg, see especially Michael Studemund-Halévy, “Sephardscher Buchdruck in Hamburg”, in *Lusorama* 32 (1997), 85–101; 33 (1997), 41–72; idem, “Sephardische Bücher und Bibliotheken in Hamburg”, in *Menora* 8 (1997), 150–180; idem, “Zwischen Amsterdam und Hamburg. Sephardische Bücherschicksale im 17. Jahrhundert”, in Norbert Rehrmann (ed.), *Akten des 1. deutschen Sephardenkongresses, Bremen 1997* (Romania Judaica, Bd. 3), Tübingen 1999, 69–92; idem, “Codices Gentium”.

⁸⁷ Lemos, *Zacutus Lusitanus*, 99.

As he notes in his *Luz Pequena Lunar e estellífera da Monarchia Lusitana*, an ancestor by this name supposedly lived in Lisbon in the second half of the fifteenth century as kabbalist Spanish Jew who had resided in the house of the duke Dom Fernando of Bragança. The latter was an ancestor of the duke, whom the Portuguese king Dom João II had murdered. Using Kabbalistic methods, this earlier Rosales supposedly had discovered a secret meaning to his name. The name ROSALES, which has a mystical Hebrew meaning, contained the Hebrew letters BARZEL (iron) and ESH (fire). The secret signification of iron and fire was: “his name would become known through iron and fire”. And “his” refers to the man who would restore the noble house after Duke Fernando’s murder.⁸⁸ The family probably left Portugal after the expulsion decree of 1446 and went to North Africa. Around 1530 a Jacob Rosales was a merchant and defender of Portuguese interests in Morocco and bore the title “captain of Safim”.⁸⁹

In Amsterdam, Rosales made the acquaintance of the famous rabbi and printer Menasseh ben Israel and the equally renowned doctor Abraham Zacutus Lusitanus (1575–1642).⁹⁰ Significantly, it was this very

⁸⁸ “Na oitava 84, digo que traz em seu nome o ferro, e fogo ... o Autor deste prognóstico, ou vaticínio foi meu terceiro avô, em tempo de El-Rei D. João o 2o, chamado D.N. Rosales, e como era muito amigo dos Infantes, filhos do Infante D. Fernando, correu a mesma fortuna que eles, e depois da morte do Duque no ano de 1483, em Maio prognosticou que estando Portugal caído, um da casa, e sangue do Infante o havia de restituir” (*Jardim Ameno*, códice 774 do Arquivo Nacional da Torre do Tombo). See also Barbosa Machado, *Bibliotheca Lusitana*, vol. 3, 196–198 [here: 198]; Lemos, *Zacutus Lusitanus*, 102; Azevedo, *A Evolução do Sebastianismo*, 143; Jacqueline Hermann, *No Reino do Desejado, a construção do sebastianismo em Portugal séculos XVI e XVII*, São Paulo 1998; Moreno-Carvalho, “A Newly Discovered Letter”, 62–66; Silva, “Cripto-judaísmo”, 181–182.

⁸⁹ “Teve meu avo João Bocarro, filho de Antonio Bocarro, capitão que foy de Safim, a meu Pay so filho seu legitimo, e teve outros muytos bastardos, que nesta cidade [i.e. Lisbon] se fizerão muy ricos e tyranos, os quais aniquilando a honra dos Bocarro tomarão mercantis exercicios e ocasiões de perseguirem a meu Pay, porque são mais favorecidos amparados”, Imanuel Bocarro Frances, *Anacephaleoses da Monarchia Luzitana*, Lisbon 1624, fol. 4^v. See also Révah, “Une famille”, 74; Shalom Bar Asher, *Sefer Ha-taqqanot, yehudei sefarad u-portugal be-maroko (1492–1753)*, Jerusalem 1991, 16–17; David Corcos, “Yehudei maroko me-gerush sefarad ve’ad emša shel ha-me’ah ha-17”, in *Sefunot* 10 (1966), 104–105. On Sebastianism and its connection with the world of Portuguese New-Christians in Western Europe, see Moreno-Carvalho, “On the Boundaries of Our Understanding”; idem, “A Newly Discovered Letter”, 61–63.

⁹⁰ Abraham Zacutus Lusitanus, who was born in Lisbon in 1575, attended the universities of Salamanca, Coimbra and Sigüenza. According to a denunciation by one Salvador das Neves on 23 October 1637, he is believed to have settled in Amsterdam around 1625; there he purportedly converted to Judaism. (ANTT, Inquisição de Lisboa, Caderno 16 und 19 dos Promotor da Inquisição de Lisboa, fls. 5178–525, 175 [see Elias

Zacutus Lusitanus who in 1631 called on the Hamburg physician Benedictus (Baruch) de Castro to take action against the Christian detractors of Portuguese-Jewish physicians. Nor should it be forgotten that Menasseh ben Israel played a major role in the circles of Jewish messianists in Amsterdam. Before 1631, Rosales departed Amsterdam and soon settled in Hamburg. Later in a letter to Duke August the Younger of Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel, he declared that he had come to Hamburg “hungry for more freedom”.⁹¹

In Hamburg

Rosales must have left Italy either in 1629 or early in 1632. The first place he settled in was Hamburg.⁹² His first appearance in Hamburg

Lipiner, *Os baptizados em pé*, Lisbon 1998, 76)). The famous and prolific author on a wide range of subjects died on January 22, 1642 in Amsterdam and was buried in the Ouderkerk Cemetery, but the grave is no longer marked. On Abraham Zacutus Lusitanus see Lemos, *Zacuto*; Friedenwald, *Jews and Medicine*, vol. 1, 307–321; H. Szancer, “Introduction à la ‘Pharmacopoea elegantissima’ d’Abraham Zacutus Lusitanus”, in *Revue d’Histoire de la Pharmacie* 18 (1967), 509–514; Samuel S. Kottak, “Aperçu sur l’introduction à la pratique médicale (‘Introitus medici ad praxin’) de Zacutus Lusitanus (1575–1642)”, in *Revue d’Histoire de la Médecine Hébraïque* 33, 1 [132] (1980), 13–16; Aaron J. Feingold, “The marriage of science and ethics; three Jewish physicians of the Renaissance”, in Natalia Berger (ed.), *Jews and Medicine; Religion, Culture, Science*, Tel Aviv 1995, 89–111; Francisco Moreno-Carvalho, “Zacutus Lusitanus” (Hebrew), in *Madai ha-Yehudit* 36 (1995/1996), 147–159; idem, “Zacuto Lusitano e um Tratado de medicina dirigido ao Brasil”, in *Em nome da fé*, São Paulo 1999, 57–74.

⁹¹ Azevedo, “Bocarro Francês”, 186; Révah, “Le retour”, 58–60 [here: 58–59]. António Bocarro, who had left Portugal and tried in vain in Cochín to become a member of the Jewish community there, was overcome by depression and reported to the Inquisition Court in Goa about his Jewish past (which he had now overcome). See also Révah, “Une famille”, 73–89.

⁹² There is no evidence that Rosales lived for a time in Amsterdam, as maintained by G. A. Lindeboom, *Dutch Medical Biography: A Biographical Dictionary of Dutch Physicians and Surgeons, 1475–1975*, Amsterdam 1984, col. 1672–1673. Rosales had close connections to Menasseh ben Israel (“Don Jacob Rosales, Hebraei, Mathematici, Philosophi, & Medicinae Doctoris. Epos Noëtikon Epöz Sive Carmen intellectuale” [laudatory poem for Joh. Beverovicus]), in Menasseh ben Israel, *In Termino Vitae Liber Tres*, Amsterdam, 1639 [reprinted in Brown, “Spanish, Portuguese, and Neo-Latin”, 2001, 4–6]; “Panegyricus. In laudem eximi & praestantissimo sapientis, nobilisque viri, Menasseh Ben Israel”, in Menasseh ben Israel, *In Termino Liber Vitae Tres*, fol. N10^r [reprinted in Brown, “Spanish, Portuguese, and Neo-Latin”, 2001, 30–32]; and Zacuto Lusitano (Jacob Rosales, “D. Doctori / Zacuto Lusitano / Medicinae Phoenici / Doctor Rosales, Hamburgensis, Medicus, Philosophus & Mathematicus”), in Abraham Zacutus Lusitanus, *Historiarum, Liber Tertius*, Amsterdam 1637, ff. 6^v–7^r [reprinted in Brown, “Spanish, Portuguese, and Neo-Latin”, 2001, 4–6], “Doctoris Rosalis, Medici Hambur-

was in 1632. The first evidence on this new period in Rosales' turbulent life is of 1632, when he wrote a poem as a wedding gift für Isaac and Sara Abas. There is some indirect evidence that he had been in Hamburg since at least 1629, when Baruch Namias de Castro's, Queen Christinas' medical doctor during the time of her nervous disorder and later her medical adviser in Hamburg, wrote the *Flagellum Calumniantium* in defence of Jewish medical practice,⁹³ a forceful and direct

gensis celeberrimi, In Laudem, & aeternam famam Variae, reconditaeque lectionis viri, Zacuti Lusitani, Polyhistoris solertissimi. Ode Saphicum", in Abraham Zacutus Lusitanus, *Historiarum, Liber Quartus*, Amsterdam 1637 ff, 6'-7', this poem was not reprinted in later editions [reprinted now in Brown, "Spanish, Portuguese, and Neo-Latin", 2001, 7-12]; "Doctoris Jacob Rosalis, Hamburgensis, Medici Hebraei, Poculum Poëticum (poem written in the form of a goblet), in Zacutinas Laudes", in Abraham Zacutus Lusitanus, *Historiarum, Liber Quintus*, Amsterdam 1639 fol. 73 [reprinted in Brown, "Spanish, Portuguese, and Neo-Latin", 2001, 13] and the intellectual milieu of Amsterdam (see J.H. Copenhagen, *Menasseh ben Israel. A Bibliography*, Jerusalem 1990 [Nr. 431]). See also Moreno-Carvalho, "Yaacov Rosales", 154-156. "'The Epos Noeticon sive Carmen Intellectuale' is a long poem (340 verses) in which Rosales describes how all knowledge was given to men by God. In spite of the title, it is not sure whether Rosales had any knowledge of Greek, but certainly his Latin is outstanding. The poem is written in elegiac meter, the prosody is based in alternation of short and long syllables and with only small exceptions Rosales follows strictly the Classical Latin prosodic patterns. The poem is intended to defend the Jewish faith at a time of religious wars in Europe. Although he thinks that the Greeks were in error, he adopts Platonic ideas in explanation of the structure of the world and considers that through wisdom men achieve immortality, for this is a link with God and the time previous to the expulsion from paradise. The 'Carmen Intellectuale' is a very religious poem with a mention of God (simply Deus, or Omnipotens, Rector Poli, Tonans) at least once every ten lines. However, Rosales' ideas could hardly stand any trial of orthodoxy, either Christian or Jewish. From the epithets given to God we see how he continues medieval Judeo-Christian traditions as well as pagan ones. The tradition of religious poems follows a general tendency in baroque aesthetics and especially in Counter-reformation Spain, where many of the most important poets of the time wrote poems to God or about God, praising God's marvelous creation, asking for forgiveness of sins or declaring their love to God", apud Brown, "Spanish, Portuguese, and Neo-Latin Poetry", in *Sefarad* 59, 1 (1999) 1 40; Reyes Bertolin, "Greek influence".

⁹³ *TRATADO DA CALUMNIA, em o qual brevemente se mostraõ a natureza, causas e effeitos deste pernicioso vicio; e juntamente se apontaõ dous remedios delle*, Antwerpen 1629. A Latin version was published in Amsterdam (or Hamburg?) in 1631: *Flagellum calumniantium seu apologia In qua Anonymi cujusdam calumniae refutantur eiusdem mentiendi libido detegitur, Clarissimorum Lusitanorum Medicorum legitima methodus commendatur, empericorum inscitia ac temeritas tamquam perniciosa Republicae damnatur*, Amsterdam 1631 (The Scourge of Calumniators or Apology in which the malicious charges of an anonymous author are refuted, the lust for lying of this person is disclosed, and the legitimate method of the most famous Portuguese physicians is commended, while the ignorance and temerity of empiric quacks are condemned as injurious to the Commonwealth . . . by Philotheus Castellus). We owe a partial English translation to the famous linguist and romanist Yakov Malkiel [typescript New York 1940]. Castro

rebuttal to Joachim Curtius's venomous diatribe against Jewish physicians, emphasizing the priority in medicine. The first edition was published 1639 in Antwerp (in Portuguese), the second 1631 in Amsterdam (in Latin) under the pseudonym Philotheus Castellus (translation of his Portuguese name Benedictus de Castro into Latin).

A denunciation report dated April 20, 1646 contains information about his trip and arrival in Hamburg.⁹⁴ His cousin Miguel Francês states that he journeyed to Hamburg in 1626 via France and Belgium, going first to Bastide and then to Calais. On this trip, Rosales is reported to have functioned as a kind of religious teacher, instructing the group of travellers he was with in the teachings of Judaism ("doutrinas nas ceremonias e ritos da ditto ley de Moyes"): "In Hamburg Rosales taught the Law of Moses, elucidating the Scriptures according to the interpretation of the sages. He did this publicly in the synagogues as a preacher and also on the holidays (*feira da ley*) every fortnight".⁹⁵

Why did Rosales move to Hamburg? The Jewish community of Hamburg was young and small, having begrudgingly been given official recognition only in 1612. By 1617, a new agreement was concluded between the Portuguese community and the Senate according them the legal status of *Schutzverwandte*.⁹⁶ Rosales must have been known

wrote his *Flagellum* half a century after the famous apology *De Medico Hebraeo* of David de Pomis. On Baruch de Castro and his apology, see Friedenwald, *The Jews and Medicine*, vol. 1, 53–67; David Ruderman, *Science, Medicine, and Jewish Culture in Early Modern Europe*, Tel Aviv 1987 (Spiegel Lectures in European Jewish History, 7), 14 ff.; idem, *Jewish Thought and Scientific Discovery in Early Modern Europe*, 299–308. On Jewish and converso physicians in Portugal, see Alfredo Rasteiro, *Medicina Judaica Lusitana*, Século XVI, Coimbra 2000.

⁹⁴ "chegarão [Miguel Francês, primo de Rosales e mais alguns familiares] a Bastida primeiro lugar do Reyno de frança (...) caminhando do ditto lugar da Bastida para o de Callis (...) em companhia de (...)" (ANTT, Inquisição de Lisboa, Processo no. 7276, Sessão de 20 de Abril de 1646). On Rosales' many travels between various cities in Europe between 1645 and 1653, see Kellenbenz, "Rosales", 350–353.

⁹⁵ "Manoel Boccarro Doutor de medicina primo delle confitente Brittis pinel mulher do mesmo (...) [durante o percurso] todos doutrinava nas ceremonias e ritos da ditto ley de Moyses o ditto Doutor Manoel Boccarro em forma de predicante; todas as veses que acabão de comer, e em as mais ocasioens em que o trabalho da jornada daua lugar" (ANTT, Inquisição de Lisboa, Processo no. 7276, 15. 12. 1647 [Miguel Francês]).

⁹⁶ See J. Klefeker, *Sammlung der Hamburgischen Gesetze und Verfassungen in Bürger- und Kirchlichen ... Angelegenheiten und Geschäften samt historischen Einleitungen*, 2, Hamburg 1766, 312. 1617 was a crucial year for the Jews in Hamburg, when the dignitaries of the Portuguese Gemeinde considered leaving Hamburg. On the decision and its historical background, see Aron di Leone Leoni/Herman Prins Salomon, "La Nation Portugaise de Hambourg en 1617 d'après un document retrouvé", in Henry Méchoulan, Gérard Nahon (eds), *Mémorial I.-S. Révah. Études sur le marranisme, l'hétérodoxie juive et Spinoza*, Paris-Louvain 2001, 263–293.

that Hamburg was the site of intense and bitter rivalry and competition between Sefardic and Christians physicians, and that charges against Jewish doctors enjoyed tremendous longevity in Germany. Because of the importance of this rivalry, a brief presentation of this question is required here.⁹⁷

Given the large number of Jewish doctors practicing in the city, to endeavor to earn a livelihood as a physician in Hamburg was at best a risky proposition. And Rosales was probably also aware that since 1631, the Portuguese-Jewish doctors in Hamburg had been a target for the most vile criticism heaped on them by the Christian doctors in the town. Thus, for example, in 1631 Joachim Curtius (1585–1642), who had graduated in Basel in 1618, published his anonymous diatribe *Exhortatio celeberr. et excellentis ... dictata cur judei et agyptae a congressu et praxi medica arcendi sint et eliminandi* railing against Baruch de Castro and all Portuguese-Jewish doctors for their deceitfulness and trickery.⁹⁸ That same year, the lawyer and physician Ludwig von Hörnigk brought out in Strasburg his anti-Jewish tract *Medicaster Apella oder Juden Artzt*, a diatribe against medical impostors and charlatans, in which he accused the Jews of “Godlessness, animosity toward Christianity and charlatanism”,⁹⁹ 1638 he published in Frankfurt his book *Politia Medica Oder Beschreibung dessen was die Medici, so wohl ins gemein als auch verordnete Hof- Statt- Feldt- Hospital- und Pest-Medici, Apothecker, Materialisten, Wundtärtzt, Feldtscherer ... So dann endlichen: Die Patienten oder Krancke selbst zu thun, und was, auch wie sie in Obacht zu nehmen / ... zusammengetragen*. 1636 the physician Jakob Martini who may well have been prompted by Castro’s book, sought to demonstrate in his hateful text *Apella Medicaster Bullatus Oder Judenarzt* the peculiar relationship between Jewish physicians, Christian patients, and medicine.¹⁰⁰ The famous Jewish doctor

⁹⁷ On the contacts between Jewish physicians and Christians patients, see Robert Jütte, “Contacts at the Bedside: Jewish Physicians and Their Christians Patients”, in R. Po-chia Hsia, Hartmut Lehmann (eds.), *In and Out of the Ghetto: Jewish-Gentile Relations in Late Medieval and Early Modern Germany*, Cambridge 1995.

⁹⁸ John M. Efron, “Interminable Maligned: The Conventional Lies about Jewish Doctors”, in Elisheva Carlebach et al. (eds.), *Jewish History and Jewish Memory*, Hanover 1998, 296–310; idem, *Medicine and German Jews*, New Haven 2001.

⁹⁹ On Ludwig von Hörnigk, see Nicoline Hartzitz, *Der Judenarzt. Historische und sprachliche Untersuchungen zur Diskriminierung eines Berufsstands in der frühen Neuzeit*, Heidelberg 1994, 80–84; Efron, “Interminable Maligned”, 302–305.

¹⁰⁰ Hamburg 1636, 2nd ed., 1733; on Jakob Martini, see Hartzitz, *Der Judenarzt*, 76–80; Efron, *Medicine and the German Jews*, 58. See also Manfred Komorowski,

Abraham Zacutus Lusitanus (alias Manuel Álvares da Tavora or Francisco Nunes[?])¹⁰¹ then challenged his Hamburg associate Baruch de Castro to proceed publicly against the slanderer:

O, truly learned man, who is that jester who with so much petulance has fabricated his calumnies against the Jewish Portuguese physicians? [...] Are these physicians not truly honorable, reliable, learned, gentle, witty and urbane, (in short) do they not have every qualification required, and are they not exceedingly skillful and efficient in their medical practice [...] Why do you hesitate? Why do you tarry? Why this uncommon lethargy? Are you exhausted from inaction: where is your old ardor?¹⁰²

Jacob Rosales probably contributed one of the forewords to this book, under the pseudonym Philaetes Lusitanus, Doctor of Medicine and Philosophy of the University of Alcalá de Henares.¹⁰³

But perhaps the decisive factor in motivating his move to the city was only the fortunate circumstance that he had family relations there: resident in Hamburg was his cousin Mordechai Francês alias Manuel Francês,¹⁰⁴ who already as a child had accepted Judaism in Hamburg

Bio-bibliographisches Verzeichnis jüdischer Doktoren im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert, München 1991, 112.

¹⁰¹ See Révah, “Une famille”, 81–82; Moreno-Carvalho, “Zacuto Lusitano e um Tratado”, 58, fn. 1.

¹⁰² “none hi sunt Medici maxime veri, fidi, docti, suaves, lepidi, gratiosi, urbani omni virtute decorati, in facienda medicine dexterrimi”. This letter or preface from Dr. Abraham Zacutus Lusitanus opens Castro’s booklet, see David Ruderman, *Jewish Thought and Scientific Discovery in Early Modern Europe*, 299–308; Studemund-Halévy, *Lexikon*, 441–442. A detailed account of all of the abusive anti-Jewish charges and vilifications is to be found in Johann Jacob Schudt well-known book *Jüdische Merckwürdigkeiten*, Frankfurt, Leipzig 1714, vol. 6, chap. 23. Baruch de Castro contributed an enthusiastic letter dated 25 January 1629 to Zacuto’s *Medici & Philosophi præstantissimi, operum tomus primus, in quo De medicorum principum historia libri sex* [...] *Editio postrema, à mendis purgatissima* (Lyon 1649): “O felix ætas quæ tam ingeniosum nobis ingenuit, atque creavit virum, qualem te ex Lusitanis arvis exisse merito gloriamur [...] Vale, medicæ scholæ splendor et Gloria, et me, ut soles, ama”, apud Lemos, *Zacuto Lusitano*, 196, 384. Other members of Hamburg’s Portuguese community contributed letters and poems too: Rodrigo de Castro (medico hamburguez), Doutor Vega (medico hamburguez), Doutor Rosales (hamburguez, medico, philosopho e mathematico), apud Lemos, *Zacuto Lusitano*, 225–227, 384.

¹⁰³ Philaetes argues that physicians do not involve themselves with matters of conscience affecting the soul but only with bodily problems. He concludes by extolling the background and university education of Jewish physicians all over Europe (*Flagellum*, xii–xv). See Friedenwald, *Jews and Medicine*, vol. 1, 58; Ruderman, *Jewish Thought and Scientific Discovery in Early Modern Europe*, 303. Moreno-Carvalho, “A Newly Discovered Letter”, 63, fn. 5.

¹⁰⁴ Mordechai Francês alias Manuel Francês was the son of Pero Francês (alias Isaac Francês) and Brites Soares, born in Abrantes and daughter of João Francês Brandão and

and would later play an important role in the Hamburg Portuguese community.¹⁰⁵ Other relatives who went to Hamburg were Pero Francês (alias Isaac Francês) and his wife Brites Soares;¹⁰⁶ Henrique Francês;¹⁰⁷ Caterina Alvares (alias Ester Pimentel),¹⁰⁸ wife of Afonso Dias Pimentel;¹⁰⁹ Miguel Francês (alias Daniel Francês);¹¹⁰ Henrique Francês (alias Jacob Francês);¹¹¹ Pero Francês (alias Moses Francês);¹¹² João Francês (alias Isaac Francês);¹¹³ Brites Lopes, wife of Manuel Henriques;¹¹⁴ Brites Nunes, wife of João Francês,¹¹⁵ died before 1641 in Hamburg.¹¹⁶ At least eleven members of the family Bocarro Francês were buried at the Portuguese-Jewish cemetery at Königstraße in Hamburg-Altona.¹¹⁷

Ana Brandão. They left Lisbon and embraced Judaism in Hamburg. Mordechai Francês had three siblings: Henrique Francês, died in Hamburg; Miguel Francês (alias David Francês) who lived 1641 in Pernambuco, and Caterina Alvares (alias Ester Pimentel), wife of Afonso Dias Pimentel (see fns. 39, 106–107, 127). See Révah, “Une famille”, 75–76; Studemund-Halévy, *Lexikon*, 441–442.

¹⁰⁵ In 1657 he was elected the head of the Talmud Tora. He died in Hamburg in 1669. See also Studemund-Halévy, *Lexikon*, 444.

¹⁰⁶ Révah, “Une famille”, 76.

¹⁰⁷ Révah, “Une famille”, 76.

¹⁰⁸ Révah, “Une famille”, 76. One Ester Pimentel, wife of Isaac Pimentel (alias Afonso Dias Pimentel) died on 6 June 1667, in Hamburg, see Studemund-Halévy, *Lexikon*, 748–749. See fns. 104, 106, 109.

¹⁰⁹ Révah, “Une famille”, 76. Isaac Pimentel, who died on 10 October 1682 in Hamburg, was the husband of Ester Pimentel, see Kellenbenz, *Sephardim*, 346, 348; Studemund-Halévy, *Lexikon*, 748–749.

¹¹⁰ Révah, “Une famille”, 76.

¹¹¹ Ibid.

¹¹² Ibid.

¹¹³ Ibid.

¹¹⁴ Ibid.

¹¹⁵ Ibid.

¹¹⁶ One Sara Nunes (alias Brites Nunes [?]), died on 14 December 1633 in Hamburg, she was married to David Franco alias Simão Roiz Dias alias Simon Dirichsen alias [?] João Francês, see Studemund-Halévy, *Lexikon*, 444–445.

¹¹⁷ Little is known about the life of the numerous members of the Francês family in France, Holland, Italy and Turkey [see Révah, “Une famille”]. Further studies on the family Bocarro Francês, other extant documents from Lisbon, Hamburg and Leghorn, and epitaphic evidence from Hamburg cemetery should shed more light on Jacob Rosales’ life, and at least tentative identification of his siblings. The following members of the Francês family are buried in Hamburg’s first Portuguese Cemetery at Königstraße: Abraham Francês, 1635–1659, son of Joseph Frances [?], Studemund-Halévy, *Lexikon*, 440–441; Bemvenida Francês, ?–1686, daughter of Jacob Fidanque and wife of Joseph Francês, Studemund-Halévy, *Lexikon*, 441; Debora Francês, ?–1677, sister of Joseph Francês and Debora da Costa, Studemund-Halévy, *Lexikon*, 441; Ester Francês, ?–1655, wife of Isaac Francês, Studemund-Halévy, *Lexikon*, 441; Ester Francês, ?–1659, wife of Mordechai Francês, Studemund-Halévy, *Lexikon*, 441–442; Isaac Francês, ?–1644, husband of Ester Francês, Studemund-Halévy, *Lexikon*, 442; Joseph Francês, gifted poet (the

In Hamburg, Rosales refers to himself “citizen of Hamburg, Jewish doctor, philosopher, mathematician”.¹¹⁸ According to the sparse documentation, Jacob Rosales earned his living primarily by the practice of medicine, but also functioned as a provider of the latest news (*Avisens-schreiber*) for Spain and the Emperor in Vienna, like the physicians André/Daniel de Castro and Benjamin Mussaphia. And just as in the case of his colleague Benedictus/Baruch de Castro and Benjamin Musaphia, his circle of patients also included some high-ranking personalities, among them the Danish Crown Prince Christian and the empresses Leonore and Maria.¹¹⁹

Rosales took an active part in the life of the congregation and was elected to honorary offices. The *denúncias* also indicate that he served, at least in the 1630s, as a kind of religious teacher. Thus, his cousin Miguel Frances reported on 5 May 1646 before the Lisbon Inquisition Court that Rosales had instructed members of the community in Jewish rites and had preached publicly every fortnight in the synagogue as a *predicante*.¹²⁰ Rosales also assumed the function of *mohel* in Hamburg, as noted in a denunciation dated 18 January 1650: “The physician Dr. Rosales, New Christian, born in Lisbon, circumcisor”.¹²¹ We do not know whether he carried out circumcision on children of community members or only in the case of Marranos who had embraced Judaism in

“Camões of Hamburg”) and brother of Ester da Costa, ?–1681, Studemund-Halévy, *Lexikon*, 442–444 (see ft. 47); Josua Francês, son (?) of Jacob Rosales, ?–1652, Studemund-Halévy, *Lexikon*, 444; Mordechai Francês, husband of Ester Francês and cousin of Jacob Rosales, ?–1669, Studemund-Halévy, *Lexikon*, 444; Rahel Sara Francês, wife of Joseph Francês, ?–1663, Studemund-Halévy, *Lexikon*, 444–445. On the Portuguese cemetery on Königstraße, see Studemund-Halévy, *Lexikon*. For more details on the Jewish cemetery (epitaphs and biographical sketches) on Königstraße, see now Jürgen Faust, Michael Studemund-Halévy, *Betahaim*, Glückstadt 1997; Studemund-Halévy, *Lexikon*; Studemund-Halévy, Gaby Zürn, *Zerstört die Erinnerung nicht. Der Jüdische Friedhof Königstraße in Hamburg*, Hamburg 2002.

¹¹⁸ In vol. 1 of the collected works of Zacutus Lusitanus, qtd. in Lemos, *Zacutus Lusitanus*, 99.

¹¹⁹ Cecil Roth, *History of the Marranos*, New York 1924, 113. Kellenbenz, “Rosales”, 349, fn. 10.

¹²⁰ “Manoel Boccarro primo delle confitente natural desta cidade Doutor de Medicina o qual na ditta cidade de Amburgo ensinava as ceremonias da ley explicando os lugares da escritura conforme a interpretação dos sabios, publicamente nas sinagogas em forma de predicante assy nas festas da ley como de quise em quinze dias” (ANTT, Inquisição de Lisboa, Processo no. 7276 [Miguel Francês]).

¹²¹ “O Doutor Rosales medico, christão nouo, natural desta cidade de Lisboa, circuncidador”, ANTT, Inquisição de Lisboa, Processo no. 7938 (João de Aguila), fl. 18; see António Borges Coelho, *Inquisição de Évora. Dos primordios a 1668*, Lisboa 1987, vol. 1, 426 ff.

Hamburg. Yet the files of the Inquisition and sermons by Hamburg clergy indicate that circumcisions of proselytes repeatedly stirred up great trouble for the Jewish community. Thus, for example, the clergy complained to the municipal council that in the summer of 1652, the Portuguese had circumcised a young Christian boy against his will. When it turned out later that the boy was not Christian but that the Portuguese had nonetheless not been granted permission to circumcise him, to calm things down the *Gemeinde* declared that it was “sufficient for them to circumcise their own sons”.¹²² In order to prevent these “prohibited circumcisions”, the statutes of the congregation *Kahal Kados Bet Israel* (established 1652) expressly stated on 9 June 1653 (14 Sivan 5413) that non-Jews (probably referring exclusively to Old Christians) must not be circumscribed:

In consideration of the annoyance and unrest feared if circumcisions are carried out in this city on individuals who are not known to belong to the seed of Israel [*que não são da semente de Israel*], it is hereby declared that none, by penalty of *beracha*,¹²³ shall circumcise strangers or the children of strangers, no matter what the circumstances, without the express permission of the collegium. This prohibition is valid for this city and its territory. Any person violating this prohibition shall be punished by penalties deemed appropriate by the collegium, aside from the above indicated penalty of the *beracha*.¹²⁴

Reports about non-permissible circumcisions of Old Christians had a foundation in reality. That is attested not only by the files of the Inqui-

¹²² Staatsarchiv Hamburg (hereafter StAH), Senat, Cl. VII Lit. Hf No 5, Vol. 3a Fasc. 3, fol. 128–v–133.

¹²³ *Beracha*, literally “blessing”, a euphemism for *herem* (ban). This term was intended to stress that the members of the congregation were forbidden to talk with the delinquent, see Yosef Kaplan, “The Place of the *herem* in Sefardi Hamburg”, in idem, *An Alternative Path to Modernity*, Leiden 2000, 177 (An earlier version of the article may be found in Studemund-Halévy, *Sefarden*, vol. 1, 63–88). On excommunication in the Sefardi community of Amsterdam, see Yosef Kaplan, in “The Social Function of Herem”, in J. Michman (ed.), *Dutch Jewish History* 3, 1993, 103–115 (reprinted in Kaplan, *An Alternative Path*, 108–142). On the halakhic significance of excommunication, see S. Mandel, *Der Bann*, Brünn 1892; Gideon Libson, *Gezerta and Herem in the Gaonic and Early Medieval Periods*, PhD diss., The Hebrew University, Jerusalem 1979 (Hebrew). For example, we find the following sentence in the course of the proceedings regarding the Ashkenazi Wulf, on 17 Tevet 5428 (1 January 1668): “*Pedindo se lhe levantase a pena de Beracha de que ninguém falasse com ele*” (*Livro da Nação*, vol. 1, fol. 375), apud Kaplan, “The Place of Herem”, 177.

¹²⁴ *Livro da Nação* (Protocol Book) of 14 Sivan 5413 (9 June 1653), qtd. in Isaac Cassuto, “Aus dem Ältesten Protokollbuch der Portugiesisch-Jüdischen Gemeinde in Hamburg”, in *Jahrbuch der Jüdisch-Literarischen Gesellschaft*, 6 (1909), 30.

sition authorities and entries in the books of the congregations but especially by the moving autobiographies of many Portuguese. Thus, on 1 September 1665, the board accused community member Mordechai Chilão of having circumcised several strangers *guerim* (*pelegrinos*).¹²⁵ The files of the Venice Inquisition contain the following entry regarding a Portuguese Jew from Hamburg:

Diogo Rodriguez, brother of Rui Lopez, is married to a daughter of Jorge Pirez Brandão, who left Portugal due to his transgressions before the Sanctum Officium and fled to Hamburg, where he persuaded a Christian to convert to Judaism”.¹²⁶

A short time after his arrival in Hamburg, around 1631, Rosales was visited by his youngest brother Gaspar, who had just escaped the dungeons of the Inquisition.¹²⁷ Rosales convinced him to abandon Christianity and return to the Judaism of his forefathers and follow the Law of Moses. Gaspar, married to an Old Christian with whom he lived until 1641 in Portuguese India, now used the name Josua Bocarro. Their daughter was also married to an Old Christian. In October 1641, Gaspar Rosales testified to the Inquisitor Pedro de Castilho before the Lisbon Inquisition Court that many of his relatives were living in Lisbon, Madrid, Hamburg, Leghorn, Turkey, Pernambuco (Brazil) and in Portuguese India. This denunciation report contains a detailed description of Jewish life in Hamburg.¹²⁸ The brothers visit the synagogue together,

¹²⁵ *Livro da Nação* (Protocol Book) of 21 Elul 5425 (1 September 1665), according to Isaac Cassuto, “Aus dem Ältesten Protokollbuch der Portugiesisch-Jüdischen Gemeinde in Hamburg”, in *Jahrbuch der Jüdisch-Literarischen Gesellschaft* 10 (1913), 277. It cannot be determined whether *guerim* here refers only to Old Christians or just New Christians.

¹²⁶ “Diogo Rodriguez irmão de Rui Lopez é casado com huma filha de Jorge Pirez Brandão, que de Portugal veio fugido por culpas que lá tinha no Santo Officio pera Amburgo, persuadia a hum christão que se fizesse judeu” (Pier Cesare Ioly Zorattini, *Processi del S. Uffizio di Venezia contro ebrei e giudaizzanti. Appendici*, vol. 13, Florence 1997, 196–197). Jorge Pirez Brandão came to Hamburg in 1591, his son Pedro was living around 1605 in Venice. See Kellenbenz, *Sephardim*, 108, 205, 269.

¹²⁷ This brother Gaspar (alias Josias/Uziau) is also believed to be the author of a (lost) poem entitled *Bocarro*, about whose content we know nothing (“Yosiahu Rosales, hermano del Doctor Rosales, que fue Conde Palatino, compuso en octava rima los Anefaleucis que intitulo de Bocarro” [Miguel Levi de Barrios, *Relacion de los poetas y escritores de la nación judayca amstelodama*, Amsterdam 1682, 56; reprinted in *Revue des Études Juives* 18 (1889), 281–289]), Meyer Kayserling, *Sephardim. Romanische Poesie der Juden in Spanien*, Leipzig 1859, 211 (reprinted Hildesheim 1972). On Gaspar Bocarro alias Uziau Rosales, see fn. 11.

¹²⁸ Gaspar Bocarro was reconciled on 6 April 1642 in Lisbon (ANTT, Inquisição de Lisboa, Processo no. 3020 [Gaspar Bocarro], fl. 40). See also Herman Prins Salomon, *Saul Levi Mortera, Tratado da Lei de Moisés*, Braga 1988, LXXV and fn. 11.

though we are not informed which one, where Jacob introduces his brother to some of the members of the congregation. Mentioned by name are among others the prominent individuals Isaac Milano, Abraham Jessurun, Isaac Cabeção, Isaac Pimentel and Joseph Penso.¹²⁹

The *denúncia* then recounts that on this occasion he presented his brother with a Spanish translation of the psalms, perhaps a copy of the translation that David Abenatar Melo (alias Fernão Álvaro Melo),¹³⁰ likewise a member of the community, published in 1626 in Hamburg or Frankfurt/Main. The sermon was given by no less a sage than the Haham Abraham de Fonseca,¹³¹ who delivered a talk on a chapter of the “Old Testament”. On this occasion, Fonseca took a Hebrew book from the cabinet (*hekhal*).¹³² On 18 October 1641, he described details

¹²⁹ “dahy a dous dias o ditto seu irmão [Jacob Rosales] leuou a elle confitente a sinagoga dos iudeus onde costumão fazer suas ceremonias e na ditta sinagoga, estauão as pessoas seguintes: duarte Esteues de pina x. n. com nome de Izac Millano e lhe parece he natural da Cidade do Porto, cazado não sabe com quem, e que a molher he natural deste Reyno: Lopo Nunez x. n. que lhe parece ser natural de Abrantes, e se nomea lá per Abrahão Jéserum que será de idade de cincoenta e cinco annos cazado não sabe com quem: fernão Nunez x. n. que lhe parece he natural desta cidade homem Ruyuo, e baixo e se nomea per Izac Cabeção cazado com hua molher da Beyra, a quem não sabe o nome; e hum irmão deste a quem tambem não sabe o nome, e lá se chamaua Abrahão Ergas = Diogo Carlos x. n. natural desta cidade mercador de idade de sessenta annos, que lá se nomea por Jozeph Coem = Affonço Dias Pimentel Medico homem de quarenta annos groço e se nomea por Izac Pimentel não sabe donde hé natural mas hé deste Reyno: Diogo Nunes Veiga, irmão dos passarinhos que estão em sevilha não sabe donde he natural, e se nomea por Abrahão Israel Veiga = Estevão Roiz Penço x. n. natural de Elvas, segundo lhe parece de quarenta e quatro annos de idade moreno e magro, e se nomea por Joseph Penço e outras muitas pessoas de que elle confitente não hé lembrado” (ANTT, Inquisição de Lisboa, Processo no. 3020 [Gaspar Bocarro], fls. 3–3^v). See also Lipiner, *Os baptizados*, 73, and Studemund-Halévy, *Lexikon*.

¹³⁰ On David Abenatar Melo, see Herman Prins Salomon, *Portrait of a New Christian: Fernão Álvares Melo, 1569–1632*, Paris 1982; Studemund-Halévy, *Lexikon*, 167–168; idem, “Roteiro de uma vida. Fernão Alvares Melo alias David Abenatar Melo: Um poeta alentejano em Hamburg” (in print).

¹³¹ See Studemund-Halévy, *Lexikon*, 422–423.

¹³² “e assentandosee em hus bancos deu a elle confitente o ditto seu irmão [Jacob Rosales] hum liuro encadernado em pergaminho impresso que continha muitos psalmos de Daud os quais erão em lingua castelhana (...) mas nenhum dos psalmos tinha o verso de gloria Patri, e no mesmo liuro estauão outras orações, das quaes em particular não está lembrado, mas so o esta de que com ellas deprecauão a Deus do Ceo, e cada hua das dittas pessoas que presentes estavão tirarão outros liuros semelhantes, estando ally todos com as cabeças cubertas, se puzerão a rezar o que continhão os ditos liuros em vos alta, e dizendo todos a mesma couza iuntamente, e indo no meyo da reza hum Abrahão da fonseca natural desta Cidade a que elle não sabe outro nome que será de idade de quarenta annos barba muito comprida alto, e magro, de cor palida cazado não sabe com quem, e he filho de Henrique gomes mercador que foy nesta cidade, e o ditto Abrahão da fonseca, hé pregador da ley moysaica e disso uiue, se leuanto estando no meyo de todos

that provide us with a vivid picture of the religious customs in the early period of the Hamburg *Gemeinde*, about which little is known:

On the Sabbath, all gathered together as night fell, with Jacob Rosales as the head of the house ... From a cabinet he removed a small box, which resembled a container for marmelade [Havdalah spice box, *migdal b'sa-mim*], containing cloves, muscat nuts, pepper and ginger. He blessed the container using Hebrew words which he [Josua Rosales] cannot recall. Then he smelled it and gave the others to savor its fragrance. After that he placed it back in the cabinet and took out a glass filled with beer, which he also blessed. He took a sip and then gave all the others present the cup so that they might also partake of it. The Jews always do this on the Sabbath.¹³³

In Hamburg, Jacob Rosales, who became part of the circle of that other famous converso messianist, Menasseh ben Israel, also began again to compose poems of praise, mainly for the notables of the Hamburg and Amsterdam Portuguese community.

He was an ingenious and resourceful man, able to make his way in an ideologically, religiously and socially very changeable world. He wrote poetry in Spanish, Portuguese and Neo-Latin to expound his theories about the human and divine knowledge as well as in praise of his friends and colleagues. His poetry offers good examples of a newly created mythology “replete with fresh martyrs and heroes”. Rosales’ poems fall on the general tendencies of Spanish poems of his times, however, he tries to be original and create a new language that responds to the needs of his own community of Sephardim Jews, but also to the needs of the very

os que estauão na sinagoga e pregou em vos portugueza, persuadindoos, e exortandoos a obseruancia da ley de Moyses pera o que trazia algumas vezes passos do testamento uelho (...) e agora se lembra que quando o ditto Abrahão da fonseca acabou de pregar, foy a hum almairo que estaua em hua das paredes, e abrindoo tirou delle hum liuro em pergaminho, que era hu dos de Moysés escrito em hebraico e o amostrou ao pouo que prezente estaua e então fizerão todos hua cortezia com a cabeça” (ANTT, Inquisição de Lisboa, Processo no. 3020 [Gaspar Bocarro], fls. 3–3^v. [Sessão de 17 de Outubro de 1641, fls. 3^v–4^r]). See also José Antonio Gonsalves de Mello, *Gente da Nação. Cristãos-novos e judeus em Pernambuco 1542–1654*, Recife 1996, 487; Dines et al. (eds.), *A fênix*.

¹³³ “que nos sabbados todos que continuou a caza do ditto seu irmão elle como patrão della, á bocca da noite estando todos os da familia iuntos, (...) o ditto seu irmão tiraua de hu almario hua caixa afeiçao das de marmellada em que estaua cravos nos moscada, pimenta e gengibre e as benzia com huas palauras hebraicas de que não está lembrado, e depois de o ter feito, a cheiraua, e daua a cheirar a elle confitente, e aos mais que prezentes estauão e as recolhia no mesmo almairo donde tirou hu copo com cerueja, e com outras palauras de que em particular não está lembrado, benzeo a ditta cerueja, de que bebo, e depois de o ter feito, della deo aos que presentes estauão botando no chão a que cresceo” (ANTT, Inquisição de Lisboa, Processo no. 3020 [Gaspar Bocarro], fls. 9^v–10).

selected group of physicians and philosophers of which Rosales was member.¹³⁴

The first such poem, a narration, an extended *epithalamium* plus verse eclogue, we have knowledge of (and which appears to have been lost) was written on the occasion of the marriage of Isaac¹³⁵ and Sara Abas (*Brindis nupcial e Ecloga panegyrica representada dos Senhores Isach e Sara Abas*),¹³⁶ parents of the later famous scholar Semuel Abas, the catalogue of whose huge library, long lost, was recently rediscovered in Wolfenbüttel.¹³⁷ Two years later he composed two encomia for the *Grammatica Hebraica* (Hamburg 1633) of the famous rabbi, philologist and later messianist Mose de Gideon Abudiente (1610–1688).¹³⁸ He dedi-

¹³⁴ Apud Brown, "Spanish, Portuguese, and Neo-Latin Poetry", in *Sefarad* 59, 1 (1999), 140; Reyes Bertolin, "Greek influence".

¹³⁵ Isaac Abas alias Manoel Rodrigues Jorge ([?]-1.7.1645) was from a family of nobility. He wrote an *encomium* in Portuguese for the *Grammatica Hebraica* of Mose de Gideon Abudiente (Hamburg 1633, fol. 7; reprinted in Brown, "Spanish, Portuguese, and Neo-Latin Poetry", 1999, 27 [Nr. 5]). He is buried in the Portuguese cemetery on Königstraße (Studemund-Halévy, *Lexikon*, 159). Several of his children lived in Glückstadt, where they are buried in the Portuguese cemetery there: Ester Abas, daughter of Isaac Abas (died 10. Elul 5404); Rahel Abas, daughter of David Abendana (died 30. Sivan 5394); Hana Cahanet, wife of Joseph de Josua Abas (died 8. Kislev 5433). See Michael Studemund-Halévy, "Die portugiesisch-spanischen Grabinschriften in Norddeutschland: Glückstadt und Emden", in *Aschkenas* 7, 2 (1997), 389–439; idem, *Der Jüdische Friedhof in Glückstadt* (forthcoming).

¹³⁶ This *epithalamium* has yet to be located. See Kayserling, *Biblioteca*, 96: "Cette allégorie est précédée d'une sorte de dialogue allégorique de Yeosua Abendana". Kayserling probably was unfamiliar with this now lost text, but rather copied the title from Markus Roest's *Catalogue de la collection ... de livres et manuscrits hébreux, espagnols et portugais ... de la bibliothèque de Mr. Isaac da Costa*, Amsterdam 1861. See also Innocencio Francisco da Silva, *Diccionario Bibliographico Portuguez*, vol. 9 of the Supplement, Lisbon 1893, 140; Lemos, *Zacutus Lusitanus*, 102; Kellenbenz, "Rosales", 349; Brown, "Spanish, Portuguese, and Neo-Latin", 1999, 7, ft. 20; Studemund-Halévy, "Codices Gentium".

¹³⁷ On Semuel Abas, the son of Isaac Abas, and his famous library, see Michael Studemund-Halévy, *Lexikon*, 164–166; idem, "Codices Gentium", in Jaime Contreras, Bernardo García García (eds.), *Familia, Religión y Negocio. El sefardismo en las relaciones entre el mundo ibérico y los Países Bajos en la Edad Moderna*, Alcalá de Henares 2002, 287–319; Yosef Kaplan, "El perfil cultural de tres rabinos sefardíes a través del análisis de sus bibliotecas", in idem, 269–286 [here: 277–281].

¹³⁸ *Librum Ode*, fol. [3]. und *Epygramma*, fol. [3], reprinted in Brown, "Spanish, Portuguese, and Neo-Latin", 1999, 24–25. On the learned rabbi, philologist and prolific writer Mose Abudiente, see Zvi Malachi, "Moses Gideon Abudiente and His Literary Creation" (Hebrew), in *Pe'amim* 1 (1979), 67–75 (a French translation as appeared in Studemund-Halévy [ed.], *Die Sefarden in Hamburg*, vol. 1, 307–316); Studemund-Halévy, *Lexikon*, 228–238; idem, "Mose Abudiente", Kopitzsch/Brietzke, *Hamburgische Biografie*, vol. 2, Hamburg 2003, 16.

cated several poems to the renowned physician Abraham Zacutus Lusitanus,¹³⁹ and likewise one poem to Menasseh ben Israel.¹⁴⁰ He composed encomia in Latin for the Spanish ambassador at the Court, Francisco de Mello Count of Assumar,¹⁴¹ and for the Dordrecht doctor and

¹³⁹ "Clio in auctoris gloriam Carmina haec aeternitati deuouet", in Abraham Zacutus Lusitanus, *Historiarum: Liber Tertius*, Amsterdam 1637, ffr. 6^v–7^r. (reprinted in Brown, "Spanish, Portuguese, and Neo-Latin", 2001, 4–6); *Ode Sapphicum*, in Abraham Zacutus Lusitanus, *Historiarum: Liber Quartus*, Amsterdam 1637, ff. 5^v–63 (reprinted in Brown, "Spanish, Portuguese, and Neo-Latin", 2001, 7–11); *Poculum Poëticum*, in Abraham Zacutus Lusitanus, *Historiarum: Liber Quintus*, Amsterdam 1637, fol. 7^r (reprinted in Brown, "Spanish, Portuguese, and Neo-Latin", 2001, 12–14). Rosales major medical work was *Armatura medica: hoc est modo addiscendae medicinae per Zacutinas historias, earumque Praxin* which was published in the second volume of Abraham Zacutus' *Opera Omnia* (Lyon 1644). "The Sapphic Ode is composed in Sapphic meter, again following very strict metrical patterns. There are abundant references to Greek mythology with the intention to equate Zacutus to prominent Greek characters or even make clear that he has surpassed them. The poem starts and ends with an invocation to the Muse, Clio, and also ends with a kind of seal, the sphragis, of Greek lyric poetry. The poem uses a mythological background to express Zacutus' advances in medicine. Apparently, a new type of fever broke out and only Zacutus was able to avert it with his new approach. Rosales insists on the newness and that is why he describes Zacutus as Apollo, who was able to stop Phaeton from burning the earth. The topic of Phaeton was common in Baroque literature. There is a long poem on the theme by Juan de Tassis (1582–1622), contemporary of Rosales and well-known poet at the court of Spain, with whom Rosales might have been acquainted, as we can see in the correspondence of certain images and verses. What characterizes Rosales is that he uses the myths not just by themselves, but to contradict them using the personal experience, much like for instance Ovid in his *Tristia*. The mythological knowledge and background is necessary to present himself as a man of the times, however, Rosales is very conscious and defensive of his own culture. That is why he insists on the newness and new responses to the situations. As much as Rosales knows the poetic conventions and the myths, so Zacutus knows the traditional medicine: Galen, Celsus, Arabic physicians. But Zacutus is superior to all of them because he was able to solve the new challenge, so is Rosales superior to other poets, because in his poetry, he is able to unite the myths with reality. His poem is not a poem about how Phaeton endangered the earth, but how the fever was successfully healed by Zacutus. In Rosales' production in honor of his colleagues, there is a mixture between daily medical procedures and mythology, between practicality and culture. For instance, Rosales has a sonnet in which he praises Zacutus as the new Pelops and also because he can cure the pains of a constipation", apud Brown, "Spanish, Portuguese, and Neo-Latin Poetry", in *Sefarad* 59, 1 (1999), 1–40; Reyes Bertolin, "Greek influence".

¹⁴⁰ *Panegyricus in laudem eximii & praestantissimo Sapientis, nobilisque viri*, in Menasseh Ben Israel, *De Termino vitae Liber Tres*, Amsterdam 1639, Fol. N190^r, reprinted in Paul Felgenhauer, *Bonum nuncium Israel quod offertur populo Israel & Iudae in hisce temporibus novissimis, de Messia quod scilicet Redemptio Israelis ab omnibus iniquitatibus suis & liberatio a captivitate, & adventus Messiae gloriosus jam nunc proxime instent*, Amsterdam 1655, 108 (see Copenhagen, Menasseh ben Israel, Nr. 363), and reprinted in Brown, "Spanish, Portuguese, and Neo-Latin", 2001, 30–32.

¹⁴¹ *Gratulatio Astrologico-Politica, Francisco de Mello, Comiti de Assumar, Regis Hispanici Legato et Locum tenenti versibus heroicis scripta* [Hamburg], according to Kellenbenz "Rosales", 349, fn. 13.

professor Jan van Beverwick.¹⁴² Rosales distinguished himself as a Latinist in colloquia, among others with the theologian Johann Mochinger in Danzig.¹⁴³ A life-long bond of friendship united him with the above-mentioned Francisco de Mello,¹⁴⁴ whom he had known already in Portugal. They discussed political astrology, as we learn from Isaac Cardozo, who had met Rosales around 1622 in Spain:

Rosales, a respected man among the Hamburgers and Portuguese, about whom it is said that he predicted the new king and that they [the Portuguese] would be liberated from Spanish oppression. But he also predicted many things for the governor of Belgium Francisco de Mello, who had great trust in him—for example, the happy end of the battle in which he was vanquished by Prince Condé¹⁴⁵

After Portugal achieved independence in 1640 and a member of the house of Bragança became the new sovereign, Rosales in 1644 considered reprinting his book originally published in Lisbon in 1624 in order to prove that his predictions there had indeed come true. In the dedication to the new edition, he addressed all the princes and kings in Europe.¹⁴⁶ In the reprint, he included his original calculations regarding Portugal's return to independence.

Since he wanted to reach a larger readership, he prepared an edition in two languages (Portuguese and Latin). The new edition, with many changes in comparison with the first edition, shows him to be an author who desired to belong to and be identified with Jewish society, not the Christian world. The Hamburg edition consisted of 133 octaves, two

¹⁴² *Epos Noëtikon sive Carmen intellectuale de Vitæ termino; ad Joh. Beverovicium, Menasseh ben Israel, De Terminis Liber Tres*, Amsterdam 1639, N2^r–N9^v (reprinted in Brown, "Spanish, Portuguese, and Neo-Latin", 2001, 12–14); see also Kellenbenz, "Rosales", 349, fn. 14.

¹⁴³ Kellenbenz, "Rosales", 349, fn. 15.

¹⁴⁴ See *Jardim Ameno*, (código 774 do Arquivo Nacional da Torre do Tombo), see also João Lúcio de Azevedo, *A Evolução do Sebastianismo*, Lisbon 1984, 145.

¹⁴⁵ Rosales' friendship with Francisco de Mello dates from the time he was living in Portugal, see *Luz Pequena*, fl. 15, apud Moreno Carvalho, "On the Boundaries", 75, fr. 37. On Francisco de Mello see Barbosa Machado, *Bibliotheca Lusitana*, vol. 2, 199–200; Kellenbenz, "Rosales", 349.

¹⁴⁶ The full title: *Regnum Astrorum / Reformatum / Cujus Fundamentum / Cælestis Astronomiæ / Praxis / Tomus Primus. / Vbi omnium fiderum loca ex præstantissimis [...], / Auctore / Imanuele Bocarro Frances y Rosales / Medicinæ Doctore, Nobilis, ac Comite Palatino ... / Hamburgi / Ex Officina Typographica Henrici Vverneri [1644].* The title of Part II: *Status Astrologicus. / Anacephalæosis I. Monarchiæ / Lusitanæ. / Doctoris Immanuelis Bocarro Frances, / y Rosales / Olim 10. Mayi, Anni 1624. Ulyssipone, excusi Tractatus.* A copy of this rare book is in Wolfenbüttel. See also Lemos, *Zacutus Lusitanus*, 101.

more than the original Lisbon edition. In a new preface, the author informed his readership that the octaves dealing with alchemy had been omitted and the missing 20 octaves supplanted by new sections added in other parts of the book. He replaced the name of Christ five times. And in connection with the so-called miracle of Ourique, the battle where Christ makes an appearance to King Alfonso Henriques, the name of Christ had been replaced by expressions such as “the Holy one” or “heaven”.¹⁴⁷ That same year he was denounced in Lisbon by Diogo de Lima¹⁴⁸: “O Doctor Bocarro medico natural desta cidade que se chama Jacob Bocarro”.¹⁴⁹ A year later Manuel da Motta denounced him before the same Inquisition Court.¹⁵⁰

In the Service of the Habsburgs

In 1641, his only son, who must have been born in Lisbon around 1624, died at the age of 17, succumbing to a disease his father was unable to cure—or because of his preference for and trust in the stars, did not wish to cure.¹⁵¹ Isaac Cardoso comments:

And when his only son fell sick, the stars told him he would be healthy and enjoy long life. But his son died at the age of 17, because his father trusted more in the stars than in the mortal signs of danger and in [the healing power of] medicines.¹⁵²

It is not known why Rosales, who must have entered into the service of the Habsburgs around 1639, continued, in marked contrast with Jacob Curiel, to remain faithful to the Spanish side even after 1641. It is certain that on 17 June 1641, Rosales was honored by the Spanish ambassador of Emperor Ferdinand III for his contribution to economic and political cooperation between the German and Spanish branches of the Habsburgs by the bestowal on him of the Honor of the Palatine Count (*Hofpfalzgrafenwürde*)¹⁵³. On this occasion, another imperial

¹⁴⁷ António José Saraiva, “Bocarro-Rosales and the Messianism of the Sixteenth Century”, in Kaplan, Yosef et al., *Menasseh ben Israel*, Leiden 1989, 240–243.

¹⁴⁸ See also Studemund-Halévy, *Lexikon*, 79, and fn. 12.

¹⁴⁹ ANTT, Inquisição de Lisboa, Caderno 27 do Promotor da Inquisição de Lisboa, fl. 260, qtd. in Azevedo, “Bocarro-Francês”, 195. See likewise Cecil Roth, “Notes sur les Marranes de Livourne”, in *Revue des Études Juives* 91 (1931), 1–27.

¹⁵⁰ Azevedo, “Bocarro Francês”, 196.

¹⁵¹ The name of his son and the location of his grave are not known.

¹⁵² *Philosophia libera*, Venice 1673, 181. On his life and work, see Yerushalmi, *From Spanish Court*; Carvalho Moreno, “A Newly Discovered Letter”, 70.

document cleansed him of the “stain of Jewish origin”.¹⁵⁴ A further document confirmed his doctorate.¹⁵⁵ As a resident of the Spanish crown, Rosales found himself in constant opposition to the official residents of the Portuguese kings, such as the Curiels and the Teixeiras. Moreover, he lacked the immense personal assets and international business contacts which these wholesalers so abundantly possessed.¹⁵⁶ These cosmopolitan and polyglot residents, who served the kings and princes primarily as experienced international bankers, but also as sources for political news by subscription (*Avisenschreiber*), owned the most magnificent and palatial houses on the Alster and Elbe. Kings and princes resided there when on a visit to the city. Foreigners who came to Hamburg or Amsterdam¹⁵⁷ commented on the incredible luxury in which these Portuguese lived as though it were a matter of course. Thus, the mansion of Joseph Zecharia Cohen da Rocha, born in Porto, had a fountain from which wine reportedly gushed forth, an aviary and pleasure house in his garden as well as a huge gallery of paintings, a collection that was later auctioned and today must be regarded as lost.¹⁵⁸ In a description of the city in 1668, Kunrad von Hövelen lauded

¹⁵³ In the frontispiece of his book published in 1654 *Fasciculum trium verarum propositionum* Rosales proudly refers to himself as *conde palatino*. The Hofpfalzgrafenwürde (*Comites Palatini Caesarei*) was conferred *ad personam* or by *heritage* (appointment), in some cases this title was conferred to famous poets, see Graf Egbert Silva-Tarouca, “Großes und kleines Palatinat”, in *Genealogisches Handbuch des Adel*, vol. Band 16, XXXV ff. The certificate stating this title for Jacob Rosales has never been found.

¹⁵⁴ Information from the former Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv (HH u. StA) Wien, qtd. in Kellenbenz “Rosales”, 350. The *Deutscher Herold* 12 (1881), 103 gives Regensburg as the place and 1641 as the date of the document.

¹⁵⁵ Roth, *History of the Marranos*, 113; Kellenbenz, “Rosales”, 350.

¹⁵⁶ Ibid, 351.

¹⁵⁷ On the sumptuous life style of the Portuguese in Amsterdam and in Hamburg, see Yosef Kaplan, “Gente Politica: The Portuguese Jews of Amsterdam vis-à-vis Dutch Society”, in Chaya Brasz and Yosef Kaplan (eds.), *Dutch Jews as Perceived by Themselves and by Others. Proceedings of the Eighth International Symposium on the History of the Jews in the Netherlands*, Leiden 2001, 21–40 (a French translation of this article may be found in Kaplan, *Les Nouveaux-Juifs*, 121–147); Studemund-Halévy: “Es residiren”; idem, “Von Palästen, Kutschen und Afrikanern: Portugiesen im Hamburg des 17. Jahrhundert”, in *Lusorama* 50 (2002), 85–113.

¹⁵⁸ On Cohen da Rocha see Studemund-Halévy, *Lexikon*, 762–763; StAH, Reichskammergericht F 34, according to Hans-Konrad Stein-Stegemann, *Findbuch der Reichskammergerichtsakten im Staatsarchiv Hamburg*, Teil 1: Titelaufnahmen A-H, Hamburg 1993, 269–270. On the luxury in which the Hamburg Sefardim lived, see Studemund-Halévy: “Es residiren”; idem, “Von Palästen, Kutschen und Afrikanern: Portugiesen im Hamburg des 17. Jahrhundert”, in *Lusorama* 50 (2002), 85–113.

the magnificent mansion of the resident family Curiel on the Krayenkamp as an “earthly paradise”, and was excessive in his praise for the Teixeira’s regal mansion on the Alster.¹⁵⁹ It was in this house that Jacob Curiel (alias Duarte Nunes da Costa), called by the Portuguese consul Francisco Vanzeller in a report for the Portuguese Foreign Ministry the first representative or ambassador (consul) of his country in Hamburg,¹⁶⁰ spent his final years of life. And in 1714, the Hamburg preacher and chronicler Johann Jacob Schudt noted in his *Jüdische Merkwürdigkeiten* that Manoel Teixeira (alias Isaac Senior Teixeira, 1631–1705), like his father before him known more popularly by the sobriquet the “rich Jew”—and who as a resident of Queen Christina of Sweden enjoyed protection from the attacks of the city—resided “in a palace of great splendor. Great gentlemen paid him visits and engaged in entertaining diversions with him”.¹⁶¹ The extant blueprints and drawings of his Hamburg residence are impressive testimony to a grand and aristocratic style of life geared to the demands of social representation.¹⁶²

Sometimes these Hamburg residents were also the subject of talk and acrimony abroad. In the drama *L’Adieu des Français à la Suède ou la demission de la Grande Christina et le Portrait de la Reine Cri-*

¹⁵⁹ Kunrad von Hövelen, *Der Uhr-alten deutschen Grossen und des H. Röm. Reichs freien An-See- und Handel Stadt Hamburg*, Lübeck 1668, 65. Cf. likewise the description by Gregorio Leti (1683) of the Amsterdam residence of Jerónimo Nunes da Costa: “This house is the most comfortable and magnificent, at least here in the city. It has an incomparable garden. You could even say the house is like a royal court, because so many people come and go”, *Del teatro Britannico o vera historia dello stato, antico e presente [...] della Grande Brettagna*. Amsterdam 1683, vol. 2, 406. Gregorio Leti (1631–1701) was a seventeenth-century European writer of great popularity. His books of biographies, general histories and writings on the papacy were widely read and translated into many languages. He died in Amsterdam in 1701. See Jonathan I. Israel, “Gregorio Leti (1631–1701), and the Dutch Sephardi Elite at the Close of the Seventeenth Century”, in *Jewish History. Essays in Honour of Chimen Abramsky*, London 1988; F. Borgia, *Bibliografia delle opere di Gregorio Leti*, Milano 1981; Nati Krivatsy, *Bibliography of the Works of Gregorio Leti*, New Castle 1982.

¹⁶⁰ “O primeiro agente diplomático ou embaixador de Portugal, consta ter residido aqui em 1660, um certo Eduardo Nunes da Costa, porém nada de particular ou definitivo se pôde averiguar sobre elle”, Francisco Vanzeller, [Representantes de Portugal em Hamburgo], *Boletim da Sociedade de Geografia de Lisboa* 1880, 729.

¹⁶¹ Johann Jacob Schudt, *Jüdische Merckwürdigkeiten*, Frankfurt, Leipzig 1714, vol. 1, Book V, Ch. 8., 374.

¹⁶² Hofkammerarchiv Wien, RA 927/1–7 (Grund- und Aufrisse); Friedrich Battenberg, “Die jüdische Wirtschaftselite der Hoffaktoren und Residenten im Zeitalter des Merkantilismus—ein europaweites System?”, in *Aschkenas* 9, 1 (1999), 31–66 [here: 47].

stine¹⁶³ performed in Paris on 5 November 1665, the playwright Gillot Le Songeur (alias A. h. Saint-Maurice) criticized Queen Christina because of her “ridiculous” decision to choose the Jew Teixeira, an enemy of Christ, as her banker.¹⁶⁴ It is doubtful whether Rosales also had such a resplendent residence or even had the necessary funds for it. In any event, nothing is known. But it was the power of capital of this mercantilist elite which held a protecting hand over the community externally and within.

In Hamburg, Rosales espoused the official position of Spain on questions of military and political matters, quite in contrast with the majority in the *Gemeinde*. After Gabriel de Roy's death in 1645, he became the official representative of Balthasar von Walderode. Among his tasks was regulating the maritime traffic of the Hansa cities with the Spanish ports, and reporting any shippers and merchants who acted against this. It was particularly important to disrupt traffic with the Portuguese where possible. For these services, he was remunerated by the Spanish embassy and ambassador, the Duque de Terranova.¹⁶⁵ The Portuguese in Hamburg were in close contact with the now emergent Brazilian Company and provided Portugal with war material and rigging and supplies for their ships. After having been re-certified in July 1650 by the Spanish ambassador in Vienna, Count Lumières,¹⁶⁶ Rosales, determined to thwart this, offered his assistance: in 1651, he proposed to arrange to obtain two frigates for the Spanish which were already designated for delivery to the Portuguese king.¹⁶⁷ Rosales conferred on this deal with the Imperial Resident Plettenberg and also sought help from Count Lumières.¹⁶⁸ During the negotiations in Hamburg, intended to bring the long religious war to an end, Rosales func-

¹⁶³ *Recueil de quelques pieces curieuses, servant à l' esclaircissement de l'histoire de la vie de la reyne Christine* [Cologne 1668].

¹⁶⁴ Susanna Åkerman, *Queen Christina of Sweden and her Circle: The Transformation of a Seventeenth-Century Philosophical Libertine*, Leiden 1991, 310–311; idem: “Queen Christina of Sweden and Messianic Thought”, in David S. Katz, Jonathan I. Israel (eds.), *Sceptics, Millenarians and Jews*, Leiden 1990, 142–160.

¹⁶⁵ *Espagne sur les Affaires des Pays-Bas au XVIIe siècle etc. Précis de la correspondance de Philippe IV (1647–1665)*, Brüssel 1933, vol. 4, 140, according to Kellenbenz, “Rosales”, 350.

¹⁶⁶ Lumières an die Stadt Lübeck, Wien 27. 7. 1650, StA (State Archives) Lübeck, Hispanica III Vol. c Fasc. 1a, according to Kellenbenz, “Rosales”, 352, fn. 20.

¹⁶⁷ Kellenbenz, “Rosales”, 351.

¹⁶⁸ See Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv Wien, H S 942, according to Kellenbenz, “Rosales”, 352, fn. 21.

tioned for a time as an intermediary brokering between the imperial side and the Swedes. The Hansa cities hoped these negotiations would generate a new foundation in law for their trade with Spain and Portugal, in particular a renewed confirmation of their long-standing Hanseatic privileges. At the time, Rosales was regarded as an important figure not only by the Hamburg Senate but also in the eyes of the senates in Lübeck and Danzig. Even after conclusion of the trade agreement with Spain, they sought to ensure that he remained favorably inclined toward their interests.¹⁶⁹

In the Community

A short time later Rosales divorced his wife Judit Rosales (alias Brites [Ana?] Pinel), born in Lisbon and daughter of Alfonso Bocarro (uncle of Jacob Rosales), died before 1641, and Mecia Pinel, born in Setúbal.¹⁷⁰ This proved a welcome pretext for Johannes Müller, known for his anti-Jewish polemics, to attack Rosales, accusing him in 1649 of divorcing his wife.¹⁷¹ He also accused the Portuguese of incest and

¹⁶⁹ StA Lübeck, Hispanica IIIa, Vol. c Fasc. 1a betreffend Ministerresident Rosales 1638–1650. In 1649, Rosales was presented with a gift of 100 Hungarian ducats by the three Hanseatic cities Hamburg, Lübeck und Danzig, cf. Kellenbenz, “Rosales”, 352, fn. 19.

¹⁷⁰ Johannes Müller, in “Bedencken wegen Duldung der Juden”, Christian Ziegra, *Sammlung von Urkunden*, Teil 1, Hamburg 1764–1770, 98–114; StAH, Senat, Cl. VII Lit. Hf No. 5, vol. 4a, 5 April 1650, EPS; StAH, Ministerium, II2, AS. 55–57, 62–65; Jonathan I. Israel, *Radical Enlightenment. Philosophy and the Making of Modernity 1650–1750*, Oxford 2001, 61–62; Braden, *Judenpolitik*, 239. The protocol book makes mention a number of times of Levirate marriage or *yibum* (Isaac Cassuto, “Aus dem Ältesten Protokollbuch der Portugiesisch-Jüdischen Gemeinde in Hamburg”, in *Jahrbuch der Jüdisch-Literarischen Gesellschaft* 11 (1916), 68; 13 (1920), 60–61). For a Christian perspective on Levirate marriage, see Ziegra, *Sammlung von Urkunden*, Teil 1, 118. In order to prohibit Levirate marriage (an issue of some controversy) in the community, the *Ma'amad* (board) orders a document prepared on the eighteenth of Heshvan 5417 (5 November 1656); it has unfortunately not been preserved: “Since we desire to avoid the difficulties, complaints and law suits customarily associated with Levirate marriage (*o acunhador*), we would like to learn whether the Law allows us to issue a regulation (*escamá*) banning Levirate marriage, esp. with a woman who is beyond the suitable age for giving birth to progeny”. qtd. in Isaac Cassuto, “Aus dem Ältesten Protokollbuch der Portugiesisch-Jüdischen Gemeinde in Hamburg”, in *Jahrbuch der Jüdisch-Literarischen Gesellschaft* 7 (1910), 189. Biographical data on these persons can be found in Studemund-Halévy, *Lexikon*. It is not known where Ana Rosales died and is buried, see also Révah, “Une famille”, 74.

¹⁷¹ StAH, Senat, CL. VII Lit. Hf Nr. 5 Vol. 4a, Senatsprotokoll, 28. 6. 1648; Kellenbenz, *Sephardim*, 46; Whaley, *Religiöse Toleranz*, 92. On this incident, see Braden, *Judenpolitik*, 239 ff.

of issuing “divorce decrees whenever they so desired”. He likewise called for a prohibition on what he termed “Portuguese polygamy”.¹⁷²

In the summer of 1649, d’Andrade, a *Gemeinde* member, inflicted some damage to his house.¹⁷³ Rosales then appealed to the magistrate: it should indicate to the Portuguese community that he, “as a servant of His Catholic Majesty, should be shown proper respect”. He signed this supplication “Doctry Manuel Bocarro y Rosales”.¹⁷⁴ Suspicion for the act fell initially on Jacob Curiel, but despite their political differences, Rosales did not wish to cause any trouble for a man so highly respected in the community.

Mob violence against the Portuguese reached a sad high point that same year. When this agitation and violence became intolerable, the *Gemeinde* leaders—Dr. Jacob Rosales, Dr. Diogo Nunes Vega,¹⁷⁵ Gabriel Lopez, Andreas de Castro, Diogo Teixeira, Diogo Carlos,¹⁷⁶ Jacob Curiel and Duarte de Lima—protested to the Hamburg Senate about the “abominations of the common people” and “requested relief”.¹⁷⁷ Despite all the ill will and animosity, in 1652 Rosales signed the document establishing Congregation *Kahal Kados Bet Israel*,¹⁷⁸ and a short time later was even selected as *hatan Torah*. In settling the estate of the wealthy João da Rocha Pinto,¹⁷⁹ he functioned as a “belligerent guardian” of the widow, while Jacob Curiel was one of the two guardians appointed for the heirs of the deceased.¹⁸⁰

¹⁷² Braden, *Judenpolitik*, 239.

¹⁷³ Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv Wien, Reichskanzlei, Berichte aus Hamburg, 1646–1653, Bericht des kaiserlichen Residenten Plettenberg vom 20.8.1649.

¹⁷⁴ StAH, Senat, CI. VII Lit. Hf Nr. 5 Vol. 3a Fasc. 3, BVI. 18, 4. 6. 1649; Kellenbenz, “Rosales”, 352.

¹⁷⁵ See fns. 102 and 129.

¹⁷⁶ Alias Joseph Cohen Carlos alias Joaquim Carlos, see fn. 129; Studemund-Halévy, *Lexikon*, 342–343; StAH, Reichskammergericht L 60, according to Hans-Konrad Stein-Stegemann, *Findbuch der Reichskammergerichtsakten im Staatsarchiv Hamburg*, Teil 2: Titelaufnahmen J-R, Hamburg 1994, 659–660.

¹⁷⁷ StAH, Senat, CI. VII Lit. Hf Nr. 5 Vol. 3a Fasc. 3, BVI. 18, 4. 6. 1649.

¹⁷⁸ See Ornan-Pinkus, “Kahal Kadosh”.

¹⁷⁹ Studemund-Halévy, *Lexikon*, 762–763.

¹⁸⁰ StAH, Reichskammergericht F 34, according to Hans-Konrad Stein-Stegemann, *Findbuch der Reichskammergerichtsakten im Staatsarchiv Hamburg*, Teil 1: Titelaufnahmen A-H, Hamburg 1993, 269–270, see also Kellenbenz, “Rosales”, 353, fn. 24.

From Destitution to Leghorn: The Final Chapter

By the end of 1651 or early in 1652, the Hamburg period in Jacob Rosales' life drew to a close. After he ceased being paid by Spain or Vienna for services rendered and the general climate in town and in the community turned more and more hostile toward him, Rosales wrote in June 1652 to the Spanish state secretary Geronimo de la Torre that he was in dire straits: he was no longer able to pay his debts and would have to sell his house to avoid the disgrace that had befallen other princely ministers forcibly evicted from their homes by the Hamburg Senate. After 13 years of service, he was now leaving their employ destitute (*desnudo*). He stated that he intended to throw himself upon the mercy of the King or journey to Rome.¹⁸¹ Yet as it turned out, he would in fact do neither.

In 1653, Rosales decided to journey via Amsterdam (?) to Leghorn, where his sister Brites Bocarro (alias Rahel Rosales) and other kin lived.¹⁸² Here too he would later be denounced to the Holy Office (1658). In 1659, he met two Portuguese monks in Leghorn to whom he disclosed the fact that he was a Jew. Although he tempered that revelation by adding that all could find salvation, whether in the faith of Jesus or of Moses.¹⁸³ In 1660 he joined the *Hevra di Mohar ha-Betulot* in Leghorn.¹⁸⁴ Two years later, the ailing duchess Strozzi summoned him to her bedside in Florence. Then we lose track of Jacob Rosales alias Imanuel Bocarro Francês. In 1662, he and his wife Ana were denounced to the Spanish Inquisition as “creiente de la ley de Moyses” by the above-mentioned Semuel Aboab.¹⁸⁵ At the time he was over 70. He is believed to have died several years later in Leghorn, around 1668. His

¹⁸¹ Kellenbenz, “Rosales”, 353.

¹⁸² Henrique Francês and Maria Bocarro left Hamburg for Leghorn, see fns. 40, 46–47.

¹⁸³ “Gregório de Pina disse que viu em Livorno: ‘Doutor João Bocarro Rozales medico e Astrologo muito nomeado neste Reyno pello Liuro que fez do titulo de Anasaphaleuses e outros que imprimio e dedicou ao duque D. Theodosio (...) falou por duas vezes na rua co o dito Doutor Bocarro Rosales e elle lhe disse que era judeo e professaua a ley de Moyses, e tambem disse a elle testemunha que tinha para sy que os que seguião a ley de Cristo se saluauão tambem’” (ANTT, Inquisição de Lisboa, Caderno 35 do Promotor da Inquisição de Lisboa, Denúncia do Conego Gregório de Pina, fls. 351–354^v). The files were published in part by Azevedo, “A inquisição”, 462–463. See also Lemos, *Zacutus Lusitanus*, 109.

¹⁸⁴ Toaff, *La Nazione Ebreica*, 385, 465 [List of the members of the Brotherhood for Dowries for Young Maidens]. See fn. 47.

¹⁸⁵ AHN (Madrid), Inq., lib. 1127.

gravestone with the Hebrew epitaph he had composed for his own some years earlier has never been found.¹⁸⁶

¹⁸⁶ Kayserling, *Sephardim*, 210. Although Jacob Rosales lived but a few years in Leghorn, Toaff calls him one of the most celebrated residents of the city in the seventeenth century (“il Rosales può considerarsi uno dei più celebri abitanti di Livorno nel seicento”, *La Nazione Ebraica*, 385).

Part II

Sources

THE ARCHIVE OF THE ROMAN CONGREGATION FOR THE DOCTRINE OF THE FAITH (ACDF): AN INITIAL OVERVIEW OF ITS HOLDINGS AND SCHOLARSHIP TO DATE

Claus Arnold
Frankfurt am Main

“We have no fear of opening up the documents to the outside world”. With this statement in 1883, Pope Leo XIII justified the decision to open the Vatican Secret Archives.¹ That move sparked a veritable boom in historical research in Rome, where French, Prussian, Austrian, Belgian, Polish and other research institutes were established. Although there are no repetitions in history, it seems appropriate to evoke these events when considering our present topic: January 1998 saw the realization of a request Carlo Ginzburg had made back in 1979 in a letter to the then newly elected Pope John Paul II.² Ginzburg requested that the Archive of the Roman and Universal Inquisition eventually be opened to scholars. He was by no means the first to make such a request. Yet even Roman Catholic apologists, such as the historian Ludwig von Pastor, had repeatedly failed with similar attempts.³ In the course of the twentieth century, the congregation started to make exceptions for a few scholars, and in 1991 a “silent” opening took place: limited access was granted which some 70 scholars were able to make use of down to

¹ “Non abbiamo paura della pubblicità dei documenti”; see Oskar Köhler, “Die Auffassung von der Kirchengeschichte [unter Leo XIII.]”, in Hubert Jedin (ed.), *Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte*, vol. 6/2, Freiburg i. Br. 1973, 328–334, 331. On Leo’s understanding of church history as apologetic ecclesiology, see Bernhard Steinhauf, *Die Wahrheit der Geschichte. Zum Status katholischer Kirchengeschichtsschreibung am Vorabend des Modernismus* (Bamberger Theologische Studien 8), Bamberg 1999, 105–145. On the opening of the Vatican Archives, see *Il libro del Centenario. L’Archivio Segreto Vaticano a un secolo dalla sua apertura (1880/81–1980/81)*, Città del Vaticano 1982.

² Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger, “Le ragioni di un’apertura”, in *L’apertura degli archivi del Sant’Uffizio Romano* (Roma, 22 gennaio 1998) (Atti dei Convegni Lincei 142), Roma 1998, 181–189, 185. Cf. Herman H. Schwedt, “Das Archiv der römischen Inquisition und des Index”, in *Römische Quartalschrift* 93 (1998), 267–280, 279.

³ See Peter Godman, *Die Geheime Inquisition. Aus den verbotenen Archiven des Vatikans*, München 2001, 283–285.

1998.⁴ Though often enough, these “happy few” had to suffice with what the archivists provided them on their particular subject.

That situation improved after 1998 as more and more aids for tracking down material became available. This was relatively easy to facilitate, since over a long period and down to the present day, the *Congregazione per la Dottrina della Fede* has indeed “worked” with its archive, for example in connection with proceedings for beatification. As a result, tools for locating material had been developed for internal use. Now, after five years of intensive research work, we are on the verge of a qualitative leap in regard to evaluating the holdings of the archive. On the one hand, more and more studies dealing thematically with its holdings are appearing. Italian scholars are in the forefront of these efforts, and their investigations can link up with an impressive tradition of work that is based on the archives of local Inquisitions.⁵ They have already held three large scholarly conferences in Italy since 1998.⁶ Interest in the archives is growing elsewhere too. The research

⁴ Ratzinger, *Ragioni*, 186; Schwedt, *Archiv*, 275.—Resulting studies (chronologically): Walter Brandmüller, Egon J. Greipl (eds.), *Copernico, Galilei e la Chiesa. Fine della controversia* (1820). *Gli atti del Sant’Uffizio*, Firenze 1992; Massimo Firpo, Dario Marcatto, *Il processo inquisitoriale del Cardinal Giovanni Morone. Edizione critica*, vol. 6: *Appendice II: Summarium processus originalis Documenti* (Italia e Europa), Roma 1995; Pierre-Noël Mayaud, *La condamnation des livres coperniciens et sa revocation a la lumière des documents inédits des Congregations de l’Index et de l’Inquisition* (Miscellanea Historiae Pontificiae 64), Roma 1997; Gigliola Fragnito, *La Bibbia al rogo. La censura ecclesiastica e i volgarizzamenti della Scrittura* (1471–1605), Bologna 1997 [1998]; André F. von Gunten, Alejandro Cifres (eds.), *La validité des ordinations anglicanes: les documents de la commission préparatoire à la lettre “Apostolicae curae”*, vol. 1: *Les dossiers précédents* (Fontes archivi sancti officii Romani 1), Firenze 1997; Massimo Firpo, Dario Marcatto, *I processi inquisitoriali di Pietro Carnesecchi* (1557–1567). *Edizione critica*, 2 vol. (in 4) (Collectanea Archivi Vaticani 43, 48), Città del Vaticano 1998–2000; Hubert Wolf et. al., *Die Macht der Zensur. Heinrich Heine auf dem Index*, Düsseldorf 1998; Peter Godman, *From Poliziano to Machiavelli. Florentine Humanism in the High Renaissance*, Princeton 1998 [Appendix, 303–333: Machiavelli, the Inquisition, and the Index]; id., *The Saint as Censor. Robert Bellarmine between Inquisition and Index* (Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought 80), Leiden 2000.

⁵ Andrea del Col, Giovanna Paolin (eds.), *Inquisizione Romana nell’età moderna. Archivi, problemi di metodo e nuove ricerche. Atti del seminario internazionale Trieste, 18–20 maggio 1988* (Pubblicazioni degli Archivi di Stato, Saggi 19), Roma 1991; Andrea del Col, *L’Inquisizione nel patriarcato e diocesi di Aquileia 1557–1559* (Inquisizione e società. Fonti 1), Trieste 1998.

⁶ *L’apertura; L’Inquisizione e gli storici: un cantiere aperto. Tavola Rotonda nell’ambito della conferenza annuale della ricerca* (Roma, 24–25 giugno 1999) (Atti dei Convegni Lincei 162), Roma 2000; Andrea del Col, Giovanna Paolin (eds.), *L’inquisizione romana: metodologia delle fonti e storia istituzionale. Atti del seminario internazionale, Montereale Valcellina, 23–24 settembre 1999*, Trieste 2000.

project of Hubert Wolf financed by the the *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG)* (German Research Council)⁷ and carried out at the University of Münster, will provide historians and theologians not only with a full prosopography of the personnel of the congregations of the Inquisition and the Index,⁸ but also with an edition of their *bandi*, viz. their published decrees and with editions of exemplary cases.⁹ On the other hand, new inventory catalogues will soon be available which even for the newcomer will facilitate easy access to the archive's holdings.

The ACDF consists of three principal collections, subdivided into several series: the archival holdings of the Roman and Universal Inquisition (or Holy Office), the material relating to the Congregation of Index and the files of the local Inquisition tribunal of Siena. The archival material of the Holy Office or Sanctum Officium (S.O.) preserved in the ACDF consists of some 4 500 volumes dating from the establishment of the Roman Inquisition in 1542 onwards.

Users already have internal search tools of the Congregation at their disposal. These consist of two card catalogues. The *Vota Consultorum* provides information, arranged according to the first letter of the name of the consultors (i.e. the expert consultants of the Inquisition), about who provided opinions over the past 400 years for the Sanctum Officium, how many, and where these documents are located in the archives. This card catalogue is thus an important key for prosopographic studies dealing with individual consultors. The *Schedario indice*, by contrast, deals with the holdings of the Index Congregation, providing the names of the censored authors with corresponding archive call numbers. This facilitates relatively easy access to the material for all those interested in exploring a specific case of censorship. The *Schedario* is valuable also in another way: it indirectly reveals the authors whose works were deliberated on by the Index Congregation but not condemned. Helpful as the card catalogues are,

⁷ Cf. Hubert Wolf (ed.), *Inquisition, Index, Zensur. Wissenskulturen der Neuzeit im Widerstreit*, Paderborn 2001, ²2003; idem, "Kontrolle des Wissens. Zensur und Index der verbotenen Bücher", in *Theologische Revue* 99 (2003), 438–452. The project is presented on: <http://www.buchzensur.de/>.

⁸ See Herman H. Schwedt, "Die römischen Kongregationen der Inquisition und des Index: die Personen (16.–20. Jh.)", in Wolf (ed.), *Inquisition*, 89–101.

⁹ Hubert Wolf, *Johann Michael Sailer. Das postume Inquisitionsverfahren* (Römische Inquisition und Indexkongregation 2), Paderborn 2002; id., Dominik Burkard, Ulrich Muhlack (eds.), *Rankes "Päpste" auf dem Index* (Römische Inquisition und Indexkongregation 3), Paderborn 2003.

they do not always provide an answer to the researchers's questions. And especially in the case of the early period of the Index Congregation, it is indispensable to do one's own more comprehensive search in the archives. Not all censorship cases are properly ordered, due to the fact that the title of the work censored has not been given in complete and detailed form or has been mistakenly cited. It is always useful to examine carefully the tables of contents of the early volumes of the *Protocolli* of the Index, since these also mention cases of censorship which were lost, when the volumes were rebound, or which have been filed elsewhere.

The loss of archival material, both enormous and uneven, is a factor that needs to be taken into account when we draw conclusions from the extant holdings, particularly with regard to the Roman Inquisition (*Sanctum Officium*). Important articles on this topic have now been published by Francesco Beretta¹⁰ and the archive's director Alejandro Cifres.¹¹ These supplement the pioneering study by John Tedeschi¹². For various reasons, the holdings in this area suffer from numerous gaps and lacunae. First of all, over the centuries and their turmoil, many documents have been lost. In 1559, after the death of Pope Paul IV, the Roman population stormed the palace of the Inquisition on the Ripetta bank and numerous documents were carried off. When the French revolutionary troops marched into Rome in 1798, the Roman Inquisition itself destroyed numerous documents considered "delicate" in content. This was repeated again in 1848, 1860, 1870 and 1881 in similar fashion. Yet the greatest losses were suffered when the archive was "relocated" to Paris under Napoleon I and then "reduced" before its return after the Congress of Vienna. Some 1,000 volumes with proceedings of criminal trials from the series of the *Processi* were sold by

¹⁰ Francesco Beretta, "L'Archivio della Congregazione del Sant'Uffizio: bilancio provvisorio della storia e natura dei fondi d'antico regime", in del Col, Paolin (eds.), *L'Inquisizione romana*, 119–144.

¹¹ Alejandro Cifres, "Das Archiv des Sanctum Officium: alte und neue Ordnungsformen", in Wolf (ed.), *Inquisition*, 45–69. Cf. idem, "L'Archivio storico della Congregazione per la Dottrina della Fede", in *L'Apertura*, 73–84 [German version: "Das historische Archiv der Kongregation für die Glaubenslehre in Rom", in *Historische Zeitschrift* 268 (1999), 97–106].

¹² John Tedeschi, "Gli archivi dispersi dell'Inquisizione romana", in id., *Il giudice e l'eretico. Studi sull'Inquisizione romana*, Milano 1997, 35–46 [previously published as: "The Dispersed Archives of the Roman Inquisition", in idem, *The Prosecution of Heresy. Collected Studies on the Inquisition in Early Modern Italy*, Binghamton 1991, 23–45]; see also Schwedt, *Archiv*.

the papal agent to paper manufacturers in Paris.¹³ They were deemed of no theological value and their sale as waste paper was meant to reduce the costs for transporting the archive back to Italy.

Yet it is not only the substantial losses that make it difficult to work with the archive of the *Sanctum Officium*. Other complicating factors are the unsystematic way in which the archive was arranged over the years and the almost total lack of detailed inventories. In the first archive of the Inquisition set up outside the chancellery in 1593, the situation was relatively clear and simple. Beretta notes that there were three types of documents: 1. the *processi*, arranged according to the respective dioceses of the accused; 2. proceedings and inquiries from outside, arranged in accordance with the locality of the respective local inquisitors submitting inquiries; 3. a section consisting of miscellanea on theological problems, i.e. topics not dealt with in a *processo*. This order reflects the self-image which the Roman Inquisition had of itself as the highest tribunal of the Church, rather than the highest authority in doctrinal matters. The only real “series” of documents, which begins in 1548 and which has fortunately been preserved virtually in its entirety, are the *decreta* of the *Sanctum Officium*, i.e. the notarised protocols on the decisions taken at the weekly meetings of the Inquisition. These decrees are not verbatim records preserving every detail of the meetings, but represent rather a kind of minute book. They provide the only possible path for a quantifying approach to the work of the Roman Inquisition.

In the course of time and as the tasks of the *Sanctum Officium* changed, new series were formed from the miscellanea holdings, one example being the *Censura librorum* in the eighteenth century. The old volumes of miscellanea were disassembled and the materials rearranged anew: a procedure of dubious value in the eye of historiography. A glance at the various extant archive surveys reveals the progressive differentiation among the series.¹⁴ Unfortunately, this arrangement of the material was also destroyed. When French troops occupied the Vatican in 1851, the entire remaining holdings of the Inquisition archive were removed to the Apostolic Palace. The current

¹³ Cf. John Tedeschi, “Die Inquisitionsakten im Trinity-College Dublin”, in Wolf (ed.), *Inquisition*, 71–87 [Extended version: John Tedeschi, “Un fondo disperso dell’Archivio del Sant’Uffizio Romano: I documenti inquisitoriali del Trinity College di Dublino”, in del Col, Paolin, *L’Inquisizione romana*, 145–168].

¹⁴ See the synopsis in Cifres, *Ordnungsformen*, 68 f.

series used in the chancellery returned to the Palace of the Sanctum Officium in 1868. When the rest of the material was subsequently returned in 1901, the old series were not reconstructed, and the material was housed without any systematic arrangement in the so-called *Stanza Storica*. Down to the present day, this *Stanza Storica* contains most of the older historical material, including the former series *De Hebraeis*, a substantial part of which part has survived.¹⁵ A number of volumes from the *Stanza Storica* are relevant for questions of censorship. For as yet unclarified reasons, certain major theological censorship cases had ended up there, among them the cases of Sailer, Kuhn and Fleury, along with extensive rearguard battles in connection with the cases of Copernicus and Galilei in the nineteenth century.¹⁶ The holdings of the *Stanza Storica* are roughly described in a handlist available in the archive.

Yet book censorship was only a small portion of what the Holy Roman and Universal Inquisition busied themselves with. This institution was in fact responsible for questions of faith of all manner and every form of deviant behaviour and heresy. That included the so-called “dubbi” (doubts) regarding the doctrine and practice of the sacraments, religious and moral transgressions such as homosexuality, bigamy, superstition, and the (false) claim to holiness.¹⁷ And, of course,

¹⁵ See Marina Caffiero, “‘Il pianto di Rachele’. Ebrei, neofiti e giudaizzanti a Roma in età moderna”, in *L’Inquisizione e gli storici*, 307–328; David I. Kertzer, *The Popes against the Jews: the Vatican’s role in the rise of modern anti-semitism*, New York 2001 (German: *Die Päpste gegen die Juden: der Vatikan und die Entstehung des modernen Antisemitismus*, Berlin 2001), Stephan Wendehorst, “L’inquisizione Romana e gli ebrei: nuove prospettive delle ricerca”, in *Le inquisizioni cristiane e gli ebrei. Tavola rotonda nell’ambito della conferenza annuale della ricerca (Roma 20–21 Dicembre 2001)*, (Atti dei Convegni Lincei, 191), Roma: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, 2003, 51–63 and idem, “The Roman Inquisition, the Index and the Jews. Sources and perspectives for research”, in *Jewish History* 17: 1 (2003), 55–76 (with contributions by Claus Arnold, Antje Bräcker, Hanna Węgrzyniek and John Tedeschi).

¹⁶ See Wolf (ed.), *Sailer*; idem, *Ketzer oder Kirchenlehrer. Der Tübinger Theologe Johannes von Kuhn (1806–1887) in den kirchenpolitischen Auseinandersetzungen seiner Zeit* (Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Zeitgeschichte B 58), Mainz 1992; Brandmüller, Greipl (eds.), *Copernico, Galilei e la Chiesa*.

¹⁷ Such as the events in the Roman monastery Sant’ Ambrogio, in which the Jesuit Joseph Kleutgen (1811–1883), consultant of the Index Congregation and confessor in the monastery, was involved. After a trial before the Sanctum Officium, the monastery was dissolved and Kleutgen was sentenced to five years imprisonment in the cells of the Inquisition. But the Congregation and later on the Pope reduced the sentence. On this, see Konrad Deufel, *Kirche und Tradition. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der theologischen Wende im 19. Jahrhundert am Beispiel des kirchlich-theologischen Kampfprogramms Joseph Kleutgens. Darstellung und neue Quellen* (Beiträge zur Katholizis-

the actual trials against heretics, such as the proceedings against the apostolic protonotary Pietro Carneseccchi, beheaded and burned in Rome on 1 Oktober 1567.¹⁸ The self-administration of the wealthy Inquisition as a state within a state also plays a significant role. All these matters can be found in various special series of the archive: the *Materie Dottrinali* (M.D.), *Materie Criminali* (M.C.), *Materie Diverse* (M.D.), *Dubbi Matrimoniali* (D.M.), *Dubbi Diversi* (D.D.) and *Dubbi Varii* (D.V.).

In contrast to the early modern period and much of the nineteenth century, the documentation for the twentieth century is rich and well-ordered, and now accessible for the pontificate of Leo XIII., viz. until 1903. However, the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith has recently decided to open up the archive down to the end of the pontificate of Benedict XV (until 1922) in order to match the present limit restricting the use of the holdings on the *Archivio Segreto Vaticano*, but it appears difficult to prepare the archives properly for this decision. A special permission is needed to use the holdings of the *Sanctum Officium* after 1903, and the direction of the archive decides whether the holdings can be opened for use or must first be prepared by folioing, binding or restoring the documents. This practice may be justified in the light of the enormous quantitative increase in the holdings during the twentieth century and the problematic state of their order, stored as predominantly loose unfolioed documents in boxes. The decision by Pope John Paul II published on 15 February 2002 to give preference to the “German holdings” in opening the *Archivio segreto vaticano*—and to make the pontificate of Pius XI accessible already from 2003—has also had an effect on the ACDF, and first results have been presented.¹⁹

musforschung B.) München 1976, 56–63; Hubert Wolf, “Gustav Adolf zu Hohenlohe-Schillingsfürst. Kurienkardinal. Freiburger Erzbischofskandidat und Mäzen 1823–1896”, in Gerhard Taddey, Joachim Fischer (eds.), *Lebensbilder aus Baden-Württemberg* 18, Stuttgart 1994, 350–375, here 355. A comprehensive description and analysis of the case is being prepared at present in the department of Professor Hubert Wolf at the University of Münster, supported by the Gerda Henkel-Foundation.

¹⁸ Firpo, Marcatto, *Carneseccchi*.

¹⁹ Hubert Wolf, “Denn für Gottesmord gab’s in der Kurie kein Pardon. Lasset uns beten wie bisher: 1928 lehnte Pius XI. eine Reform der Karfreitagsfürbitte für die Juden ab”, in *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 17 April 2003; cf. idem, “Pro perfidis Judaeis”, in *Historische Zeitschrift* 2004 (forthcoming); idem, “Molto delicato. Antwort unwahrscheinlich: Die neu zugänglichen Akten zur Haltung des Heiligen Stuhls zum Nationalsozialismus”, in *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 12. März 2003; Peter Godman, *Der Vatikan und Hitler. Die geheimen Archive*, München 2004; Dominik Burkard, *Häresie und Mythos des 20. Jahrhunderts. Rosenbergs nationalsozialistische Weltanschauung vor*

By comparison, the situation in connection with the *Congregazione dell'Indice*, founded in 1571 and united once more with the Inquisition in 1917, appears to be almost ideal. Here there were no significant losses during the various relocations and removals. Gaps exist mainly for the first three decades, because the chronically underfinanced and understaffed Congregation managed to arrange its materials only with a certain delay.²⁰ The archive of the Index Congregation, which has thus been preserved virtually in its entirety is divided into the following series: The principal series are the *Diarii* (diaries), which consists of 24 volumes that are arranged in chronological order from 1571 to 1917. The *Diarii* are the secretary's protocols of the discussions held and the decisions made by the Congregation's cardinals and, prior to this, by its *consultores* in the *congregatio praeparatoria*. The series *Diarii* tell us a lot about the role of the secretary, who was—as the one and only “professional” clerk—at the heart of the Congregation's work. At least from the late eighteenth century on, he, together with the Cardinal Prefect, decided which denounced works were to be examined.²¹

The series *Protocolli* (protocols) is likewise arranged in chronological order and comprises 143 volumes. The *Protocolli* contain the official papers of the Congregation regarding thousands of cases. As a rule, especially for the period from 1664 on (though not for the first century of its existence), the following documents are present for each book indicted and investigated: secret expert opinion(s) written by relators or consultors, brief protocols of meetings with the votes cast by the consultors and cardinals; the “Relazione alla Santità di Nostro Signore”, in which the ruling and a short explanation for the decision were formulated to be presented to the Pope, who had final authority in decisions; a sketch or printing of the judgment decree as a poster in which the censorship decisions of a given session were enumerated. Correspondence, letters of denunciation, internal discussion papers and similar material are sometimes also found here.

dem Tribunal der Römischen Inquisition (Römische Inquisition und Indexkongregation 5), Paderborn 2004.

²⁰ For the Congregation's early history, cf. Fragnito, *Bibbia*; Godman, *Saint* and Vittorio Frajese, “La politica dell'Indice dal Tridentino al Clementino (1571–1596)”, in *Archivio italiano per la storia della pietà* 11 (1998), 269–356.

²¹ An exemplary case is Thomas Esser O.P., the Congregation's last secretary: cf. Claus Arnold, “Die Römische Indexkongregation und Alfred Loisy am Anfang der Modernismuskrisis (1893–1903). Mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von P. Thomas Esser O.P. und einem Gutachten von P. Louis Billot S.J.”, in *Römische Quartalschrift* 96 (2001), 290–332.

For the nineteenth century, the series *Atti e documenti* of altogether eight volumes supplements the *Protocolli*. They were formed thanks to the circumspect action of the Congregation's last secretary Fr. Thomas Esser O.P. (in office 1900–1917) from older miscellaneous material which should have been inserted in the *Protocolli* by his predecessors (one of whom did not even trouble to keep a *diario*). The so-called *Causes Célèbres* are documented in a series consisting of nine volumes. It contains extensive separate fascicles for voluminous Index cases such as Lamennais, Rosmini, Günther or the ever-popular topic of Bible translations. Finally, many of the books investigated by the Index Congregation are housed in the completely preserved library of the Congregation, in part with the marginal notes and underlinings of the respective censor. In order to deal adequately with a case, it is sometimes necessary to consult all the series.

The entire archive of the Index Congregation is accessible and, in fact, usable up to 1917. This is possible because the archive had already been brought into order by Thomas Esser. He also wrote a guide to its holdings, which is still in use and can be consulted by researchers in the archive. Furthermore, the Congregation for the Index did not deal with delicate matters concerning the *forum internum*, so no decisions had to be taken as to which holdings could be made accessible. The 328 volumes of the Index Congregation also have a card catalogue for easy access, which is arranged according to the censored authors.

The importance which the archive of the Index Congregation possesses for intellectual history cannot provide us with much consolation when we contemplate the pitiful state of the fragmentary material of the Inquisition. Moreover, the Index Congregation was the “least important” of the congregations, originally only a kind of ancillary commission of the Inquisition, the “*Suprema*”, the “highest” congregation. The latter did not hesitate to take over many of the more important and interesting cases of censorship. Fortunately, the theologically important series “*Censura librorum*” of the Sanctum Officium has been preserved, a fact which is certainly no accident. The series begins (nominally) in 1570 and was continued down to 1967²² and the abrogation of the Index *librorum prohibitorum* by Pope Paul VI. Due to the fact that

²² See Herman H. Schwedt, “Papst Paul VI. und die Aufhebung des römischen Index der verbotenen Bücher in den Jahren 1965–1966”, in *Papst Paul VI. Zur 100. Wiederkehr seines Geburtstages 1897–1997*. Vorträge des Studentages am 29. November 1997 in Aachen (Geschichte im Bistum Aachen, Beiheft 1), Neustadt a.d. Aisch 1999, 45–111.

to date this *fondo* has only been made accessible to scholars down to 1922, it is not possible to make informed statements about its actual scope. As a rule, the accessible volumes document 15 to 20 cases, and all documents dealing with a specific case are bound in a single fascicle. Yet other series important from the vantage of social history have been lost.

Social and cultural historians are thus faced with considerable difficulties and often have to content themselves with small “islands of material” in the *Stanza Storica*. Yet here too interesting discoveries can be made. Peter Schmidt (German Historical Institute, Rome) has located the remains of a series *Germania* as well as highly instructive material on mechanisms of control of German traders in Italy as introduced by the early modern Inquisition. Part of the “intercultural management” at that time was, for example, the phenomenon of Nuremberg merchants who lived a good and proper Protestant life at home while they maintained a second Catholic family in Italy, a kind of bicultural bigamy.²³ Since we will soon have a detailed inventory of the *Stanza Storica*, the prospects for new discoveries are excellent.

A true pearl in the ACDF, virtually unknown before 1998, is the *Fondo Siena*, the almost complete archive of the local Inquisition of Siena. This discovery constitutes an extraordinary enlargement of the known archival material of the approximately 40 Italian “local offices” of the Roman Inquisition. The Archbishop of Siena had presented the material in 1911 to the Sanctum Officium. It contains 225 bundles from the period between 1550 and 1782, bound in contemporary parchment, often between 20 and 30 cm. thick and including 85 volumes of *processi*.²⁴ A detailed catalogue is currently being prepared.

The ACDF thus provides substantial possibilities for research. Although its ongoing investigation cannot be compared with the race of the European states after the opening of the Vatican Secret Archives in

²³ Peter Schmidt, “Fernhandel und Römische Inquisition. ‘Interkulturelles Management’ im konfessionellen Zeitalter”, in Wolf, *Inquisition*, 105–120; id., *L’Inquisizione e gli stranieri*, in *L’Inquisizione romana*, 365–372. Cf. idem, “Et si conservi sana ...—Konfessionalisierung und Sprache in den Briefen der römischen Inquisition”, in Peter Burschel u. a. (Hg.), *Historische Anstöße. Festschrift für Wolfgang Reinhard zum 65. Geburtstag am 10. April 2002*, Berlin 2002, 131–151.

²⁴ See Schwedt, *Archiv*; on current research on the Fondo Siena, see Oscar di Simplicio, “Processi di stregoneria a Siena e nel suo antico stato: 1580c.–1721c. Ricerca in corso”, in *L’Inquisizione e gli storici*, 263–277; idem, *L’Inquisizione di Siena e le accuse di maleficio (1580 ca.–1721 ca.)*, in del Col, Paolin (eds.), *L’Inquisizione romana*, 257–272.

1881 to gain their piece of the rich cake, a noticeable “run” has nevertheless already commenced. Its direction may be characterized as follows. In keeping with the variety of the holdings, there is a broad spectrum of topics being explored in current research projects. The majority has a decidedly “Italian” stamp.²⁵ The preferred period for investigation is the second half of the sixteenth and early seventeenth century. On the basis of the archival material which has become accessible after the opening of the ACDF, questions that have long been topical are being (re)examined anew. On the one hand, it is now possible to supplement previous research on the local Italian Inquisition tribunals, with a focus on witchcraft, superstition and *santità affettata*²⁶ among other topics, by adding a Roman perspective, thus opening a new window on “Centre and Periphery” in their mutual dynamic interaction.²⁷ On the other, the major problem currently under investigation is the question of the impact of Inquisition and Index, as instruments of the Counter-reformation, on Italian culture.²⁸ (The theological implications of censorship have, oddly enough, been treated rather less prominently).²⁹ Gigliola Fragnito’s *La Bibbia al rogo* explores the history of the prohibition of vernacular Bible translations and its effects on relig-

²⁵ According to information supplied by the archivist of the Congregation, 203 researchers were given access to the archive down to 1999; of these, 113 were Italian, 15 German, 13 French and 12 American. Alejandro Cifres, “Lo stato attuale dell’archivio romano del Sant’Uffizio”, in *L’Inquisizione e gli storici*, 27–46, here 28.

²⁶ See, for example, Albrecht Burkardt, “Die Benandanti dell’Erba: Inquisition und Aberglaube am Beispiel des toskanischen Wilhelmskultes (16.–18. Jh.)”, in Wolf, *Inquisition*, 177–212; Adelisa Malena, “Inquisizione, ‘finte sante,’ ‘nuovi mistici.’ Ricerche sul Seicento”, in *L’Inquisizione e gli storici*, 289–306.—See also Rainer Decker, “Entstehung und Verbreitung der römischen Hexenprozeßinstruktion”, in Wolf (ed.), *Inquisition*, 159–175; idem, *Die Päpste und die Hexen. Aus den geheimen Akten der Inquisition*, Darmstadt 2003.

²⁷ See, for example, Guido dall’Olio, “I rapporti tra Roma e Bologna in materia di inquisizione. Note dai carteggi dell’Archivio della Congregazione per la Dottrina della Fede (1557–1571)”, in *L’Inquisizione e gli storici*, 147–158.

²⁸ See the now classic study by Antonio Rotondò, “La censura ecclesiastica e la cultura”, in *Storia d’Italia*, Vol. 5.1: I documenti 2, Torino 1973, 1397–1492. For a full bibliography, see John Tedeschi (ed.), James M. Lattis (coll.), *The Italian Reformation of the Sixteenth Century and the Diffusion of Renaissance Culture: A Bibliography of the Secondary Literature (Ca. 1750–1997)*. With an Historiographical Introduction by Massimo Firpo (Istituto di Studi Rinascimentali Ferrara: strumenti), Ferrara 2000.

²⁹ But cf. Claus Arnold, *Kirchliche Zensur und theologische Rezeption. Die postume Expurgation der Werke Cajetans und Contarinis und das theologische Profil der römischen Kongregationen von Inquisition und Index (1558–1601)*, Habilitationsschrift im Fach Mittlere und Neuere Kirchengeschichte, typewritten, Münster/W., Oktober 2002, 500 S. Forthcoming in the series “Römische Inquisition und Indexkongregation” (2005).

ious culture. The study also presents a first compendium of the history of the Index Congregation between 1571 and 1605.³⁰ In her subsequent work, she also addressed the question of the growing competition between the Sanctum Officium and the Index Congregation in questions of censorship, which culminated in serious conflict during the pontificate of Clement VIII, especially in regard to the prohibition of the Talmud. In order to exercise local control, the Index Congregation attempted to assure itself the assistance of the local bishops (and not the far less numerous local Inquisition tribunals). These efforts at emancipation also proved a failure. The Index Congregation, until its re-incorporation into the Inquisition in 1917, eked out a precarious existence (with few exceptions) as an auxiliary commission of the Inquisition.³¹ Although Fragnito, through the light she sheds on the shifting and non-uniform, indeed contradictory policy of censorship in Rome, destroys the myth of the well-oiled, almost totalitarian curial machinery of prohibition, her conclusion is similar to that of traditional research: precisely because there was no clear direction discernible in Roman censorship policy, it caused all the greater insecurity for and harm to Italian "culture". Ugo Baldini, director of a large-scale project on Church censorship and the natural sciences, has called into question this assessment, which at least in respect to the development of the modern sciences should be taken with a grain of salt. For, as the Inquisition and the Index Congregations proceeded quite consistently, for reasons of orthodoxy, against judicial astrology, naturalism and occultism, they contributed to disaggregating these elements from the traditional "natural sciences" and, thus, inevitably, if inadvertently,

³⁰ Fragnito, *Bibbia*.

³¹ Gigliola Fragnito, "The central and peripheral organization of censorship", in idem (ed.), *Church, Censorship and Culture in Early Modern Italy* (Cambridge Studies in Italian History and Culture), Cambridge 2001, 13–49. Idem, "L'applicazione dell'Indice dei libri proibiti di Clemente VIII", in *Archivio storico italiano* 159 (2001), 107–149; Idem, "Girolamo Savonarola e la censura ecclesiastica", in *Rivista di Storia e Letteratura religiosa* 35 (1999), 501–529; Idem, "'In questo vasto mare de libri prohibiti et sospesi tra tanti scogli di varietà et controversie': La censura ecclesiastica tra la fine del cinquecento e i primi del seicento", in Cristina Stango (ed.), *Censura ecclesiastica e cultura politica in Italia tra Cinquecento e Seicento: atti del Convegno, 5 marzo 1999/VI. Giornata Luigi Firpo, Florenz 2001*, 1–35; Idem, "Aspetti e problemi della censura espurgatoria", in *L'Inquisizione e gli storici*, 161–178; on censoring of the Talmud, see also Fausto Parente, "The Index, the Holy Office and the Condemnation of the Talmud and Publication of Clement VIII's Index", in Fragnito (ed.), *Church*, 163–193; Marina Caffiero, "I libri degli Ebrei. Censura e norme della revisione in una fonte inedita", in Stango (ed.), *Censura ecclesiastica*, 203–223.

helped to “modernize” them.³² Peter Godman’s work concentrates more on the paradoxical efforts, bordering on the surreal, of the Roman censors to arrive at a rational policy and less on the long-term consequences in and for cultural history. Coming from medieval studies, Godman views Church censorship and the mentality of the censor as a problem of *longue durée*.³³ He has illustrated its dialectics for the modern period in the figure of Robert Bellarmine. In Godman’s view, in the context of the Index Congregation at the turn of the sixteenth to seventeenth century, Bellarmine’s intellectual competence was more an exception than the rule.³⁴ A further and more “German” focus for inquiry is the history of theological censorship in the course of the “long” nineteenth century. Here too, one can build and draw on earlier studies, especially the work of Herman H. Schwedt, who as early as 1980 reconstructed the Roman proceedings against the Bonn theologian Georg Hermes “from the outside”, i.e. by utilizing documentation parallel to the holdings of the ACDF.³⁵ This thread in particular was picked up and pursued by Hubert Wolf, who completed a similar investigation on the case of Johannes von Kuhn,³⁶ and his pupils. These studies have attempted a differentiated assessment of the extent to which the Roman dicasteria of the Index and Inquisition Congregations were agents of Church centralization and ultramontanist, and later of antimodernism as well.³⁷

³² Ugo Baldini, “Die römischen Kongregationen der Inquisition und des Index und der naturwissenschaftliche Fortschritt im 16. bis 18. Jahrhundert: Anmerkungen zur Chronologie und zur Logik ihres Verhältnisses”, in Wolf (ed.), *Inquisition*, 229–278; idem, “The Roman Inquisition’s condemnation of Astrology: Antecedents, Reasons and Consequences”, in Fragnito (ed.), *Church*, 79–110; idem, “Le congregazioni romane dell’Inquisizione e dell’Indice e le Scienze, dal 1542 al 1615”, in *L’Inquisizione e gli storici*, 329–364.

³³ Peter Godman, *The Silent Masters. Latin Literature and Its Censors in the High Middle Ages*, Princeton 2000.

³⁴ Godman, *Saint*. The scholarly reception of the following more popularizing studies was in part critical: Godman, *Geheime Inquisition*; idem, with Jens Brandt, *Weltliteratur auf dem Index. Die geheimen Gutachten des Vatikans*, Berlin 2001.

³⁵ Herman H. Schwedt, *Das römische Urteil über Georg Hermes (1775–1831). Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Inquisition im 19. Jahrhundert* (Römische Quartalschrift, Supplementheft 37), Rom 1980.

³⁶ Hubert Wolf, *Ketzer oder Kirchenlehrer? Der Tübinger Theologe Johannes von Kuhn (1806–1887) in den kirchenpolitischen Auseinandersetzungen seiner Zeit* (Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Zeitgeschichte, Reihe B: Forschungen, Bd. 85), Mainz 1992.

³⁷ Wolf, *Sailer*. See also the special number: *Deutsche Index- und Inquisitionsfälle im langen 19. Jahrhundert (1789–1914): Römische Quartalschrift* 96: 3–4 (2001), with

The opening of the ACDF has given a powerful new impetus to inquiry on the Inquisition, while at the same time changing its contours. Seen from a merely quantitative perspective, the bulk of future research based on the archive most probably lies concentrated in the eighteenth, nineteenth and twentieth century. Alongside the history of the “victims”, there is now more emphasis on the history of the “perpetrators”; their mentality, (sometimes deficient) logic, internal discussions and conflicts can now be better elucidated. The Roman Inquisition has emerged from its anonymity. And this not only thanks to the fact that Hubert Wolf’s German Research Council project, building on the Schwedt collection, has identified hundreds of its associates, storing them in a data bank of the *dramatis personae*. We now can see the Inquisition as a “human” institution. And in this “humanising” perspective lies the irony of that so long-awaited opening of the archive of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith.

essays by Ulrich Muhlack (“Rankes Päpste auf dem Index”), Nobert Köster (“Der Fall Hirscher”), Elke Pahud de Mortanges (“Der Fall Frohschammer”), Hubert Wolf (“Der Fall Sailer”), Dominik Burkard (“I. Vatikanum und Index”), Claus Arnold (“Der Fall Loisy und die Rolle des Index-Sekretärs Esser”). See also Peter Walter, Hermann Joseph Reudenbach (eds.), *Bücherzensur—Kurie—Katholizismus und Moderne. FS Herman H. Schwedt* (Beiträge zur Kirchen- und Kulturgeschichte 10), Frankfurt am Main 2000; Karl Hausberger, *Herman Schell (1850–1906). Ein Theologenschicksal im Bannkreis der Modernismuskriese* (Quellen und Studien zur neueren Theologiegeschichte 3), Regensburg 1999; Johan Ickx, Gerard Casimir Ubaghs, “L’Indice e la Suprema Congregazione del Sant’Offizio”, in Luciano Malusa, Paolo de Luca (eds.), *Chiesa e pensiero cristiano nell’Ottocento: un dialogo difficile*, Genua 2001, 145–159. Francesco Beretta, “Dalla messa all’Indice di Lenormant all’Enciclica *Providentissimus Deus* (1887–1893): il Magistero Romano di fronte alla *Question biblique*,” in *L’Inquisizione e gli storici*, 245–260. Claus Arnold, “Lamentabili sane exitu (1907). Das Römische Lehramt und die Exegese Alfred Loisy”, in *Zeitschrift für Neuere Theologiegeschichte* 11 (2004), H. 1.

THE SERIES “STANZA STORICA” OF THE SANCTUM
OFFICIUM IN THE ARCHIVE OF THE CONGREGATION FOR
THE DOCTRINE OF THE FAITH AS A SOURCE FOR THE
HISTORY OF THE JEWS

Antje Bräcker
Trier*

Although technically the *Stanza Storica* (St.St.) is one of the several series into which the *fondo* of the *Sanctum Officium* (S.O.) in the Archive of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith is divided, it is rather a mixture of diverse documents pertaining to a whole range of activities of the Holy Office, including cases that cannot be subsumed under any of the existing series. In the *Stanza Storica* there is a separate series *Varia de Hebraeis*, apparently the remainder of a series of originally 54 volumes, and several volumes entitled *Varie sugli ebrei* scattered throughout the *Stanza Storica*. In addition there are numerous other volumes containing cases pertaining to Jews. Geographically the *Stanza Storica* focuses on the Papal States and Northern Italy. Chronologically the majority of cases date from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Few documents predate 1600, after 1900 there are none (or at least none that are accessible). In the 1820s there is an evident concentration of cases. The intention of the following pages is to survey the arguments brought before the Roman Inquisition. Of importance are less the topics themselves, many of which are familiar, but the promise of novel interpretation when the cases about to be mentioned here are studied in their entirety and evaluated in context.

Regulations issued for the ghettos from the seventeenth to the nineteenth century occupy center stage in the files of the *Stanza Storica*. One can distinguish periods when these rules were applied in a relatively lax manner and others when application was persistent. The inter-

* This contribution is the slightly revised version of a paper that has appeared under the title “The Stanza Storica” in Stephan Wendehorst, *The Roman Inquisition, the Index and the Jews. Sources and perspectives for research* (Jewish History 17:1), 2003, 61–65.

ventions of the Roman Inquisition were often prompted by complaints from the Christian population. Jewish traders and artisans were baldy accused of being simply too good. Posing a commercial threat to the Christians, the rationale went, they had to be confined within ghettos.¹ Jews were also accused of corrupting Christian morals and seducing Christian women.² There is also the occasional charge that Jews fomented “anarchy”, which, depending on the writer’s taste and inclination, referred to diverse political ideologies that differed from Catholic and monarchist principles. The changes between toleration and repression suggest that the treatment of the Jews was dependent on the checkered fate of the Papal States during the late eighteenth and nineteenth century.

When complaints reached the Roman Inquisition situation reports were requested from the concerned ecclesiastical authorities. These reports are contained in the archival files and cast a fascinating light on Jewish life in individual Italian cities.³ A first glance shows that there were appreciable differences between the situation of the Jews in different cities. Having been presented with a particular case, the Pope, as a rule, issued a decree imposing severe restrictions on Jewish life and aiming in particular at concentrating the Jews in the ghettos. Repressive measures against the Jewish community in toto or against individual groups are innumerable. The decrees imposed restrictions on trade, the wearing of a special badge, curfews and the like. With the Jewish communities making vehement protests, there was fierce controversy about the justification and effectiveness of such regulations at the time. In many instances, dispensations were granted, either for certain professions (traders, physicians)⁴ or for the entire population in emergency situations such as sickness and fire.⁵ The frequency of both dispensations and complaints that were brought before the Roman Inquisition gives rise to the question to what extent repressive measures were consistently enforced.

One effect of the Napoleonic era was to create pockets of Christian traders and artisans operating within the ghetto. This novelty has received little if any scholarly attention. Various attempts were made to

¹ ACDF, S. O., St. St. BB 2-d; St. St. BB 3-f; St. St. CC 1-a.

² ACDF, S. O., St. St. BB 2-d.

³ ACDF, S. O., St. St. BB 2-e, d.

⁴ ACDF, S. O., St. St. BB 3-o; St. St. TT 2-m, 5.

⁵ ACDF, S. O., St. St. BB 2-e; St. St. BB 2-f.

squash such settlements as is documented for several ghettos in 1826.⁶ Attached to the respective cases we can find highly detailed sketches of Christian workshops inside the ghetto walls (as well as of Jewish businesses located outside the ghettos).⁷ Responsible, as it was, for the supervision of the ghettos the Roman Inquisition, in 1847 and 1848, contemplated relocating the Roman ghetto because its Jewish residents had complained about the intolerable dampness and unhealthy air in the confined ghetto space.⁸ Beyond insights into the relations between Christians and Jews the files of the *Stanza Storica* on the ghettos provide a rich field for interdisciplinary research. Highly detailed lists of residents, taxes and the like illuminate the social history of Italian Jews. Architectural sketches and ground plans furnish an empirical basis for raising questions about the policies of ghetto construction.

Attempts to separate Jews from Christians were not restricted to spatial isolation. Jewish physicians and merchants in particular suffered from restrictions of their interaction with Christians. In Leghorn, in 1689, and Mantua around 1690, the Inquisition found it necessary to repeat the ban on Jewish doctors treating Christian patients.⁹ Whether a long absence of such prohibitions prior to that time is significant, suggesting a possible (temporary) decrease in the number of Jewish physicians, only further research will tell. A petition submitted at the end of the eighteenth century to the Roman Inquisition requested a dispensation from the obligation to be Catholic in order to be awarded a doctoral degree from the medical faculty of the university of Bologna.¹⁰ The rationale put forward was that admission of Jews to the doctorate in medicine could only bring honor to the university and its name, as the example of outstanding teachers of medicine at Padua demonstrated, where Jews regularly received medical degrees. It is not clear, however, whether the Bolognese petition was granted.

Christian and Jewish merchants were persistently embroiled in disputes. Jewish merchants complained about regulations imposed on the market in Carpentras.¹¹ They strongly opposed the obligation to wear a distinguishing sign on their clothing and to temporary measures to curb

⁶ ACDF, S. O., St. St. BB 3-e.

⁷ ACDF, S. O., St. St. BB 3-e.

⁸ ACDF, S. O., St. St. TT 2-n, 15.

⁹ ACDF, S. O., St. St. TT 2-m, 1, 28; St. St. CC 1-a.

¹⁰ ACDF, S. O., St. St. CC 5-q, 5.

¹¹ ACDF, S. O., St. St. BB 3-f

Jewish trade, such as nighttime curfews. Certain monopolies enjoyed by Jewish traders aroused the anger of Christian merchants on the other hand, for example the monopoly in the lucrative spice trade, but also concessions for the sale of tobacco and alcohol in Ferrara.¹² The idea that in certain areas of the economy Jewish monopolies benefitted all of society was one factor shaping the attitude of the Roman Inquisition towards Jewish commerce.¹³ Petitions, impressive for their length and detail, in which civic notables praised the impeccable comportment of individual Jewish merchants and repudiated charges that the Jews were in any manner a nuisance for the Christian population point in the same direction.¹⁴ On the other hand, however, Jews were accused of contributing to the decline in public morals on high holidays; in such cases, respectable Jewish merchants found themselves grouped together with prostitutes or Gypsies, as in the case of the festival of the *Madonna della Quercia* in Viterbo.¹⁵ There is evidence that the Roman Inquisition was asked to intervene by Jewish merchants, when they were harassed. For example, if they fell ill while traveling, they were constantly facing attempts to convert them.¹⁶ A further reason for complaint was the refusal of Christians to pay for goods they had purchased from Jews.¹⁷

The categorical ban on the employment of Christian servants in Jewish households proved to be unworkable in practice.¹⁸ Recurrent attempts to enforce the ban concerned in particular nannies and wet nurses. Involved, too, was a constant concern about illicit sexual relations between Christians and Jews.¹⁹ Reports on sexual relations between Jews and Christians are a frequent topic in the files of the *Stanza Storica*.²⁰ There was anxiety, too, for the fate of the mortal souls of these domestics, who were often required to work on Sundays.²¹ To hire Christian domestic servants involved serious risks for the Jewish employer. Former domestics, often years after leaving a family, sometimes claimed they had baptized a Jewish child.

¹² ACDF, S.O., St.St. CC 1-a.

¹³ ACDF, S.O., St.St. BB 2-d; St.St. TT 3-c, 2.

¹⁴ ACDF, S.O., St.St. CC 3-l; St.St. TT 3-e.

¹⁵ ACDF, S.O., St.St. BB 2-d.

¹⁶ ACDF, S.O., St.St. CC 5-q, 9.

¹⁷ ACDF, S.O., St.St. BB 2-d; St.St. CC 5-q, 7.

¹⁸ ACDF, S.O., St.St. TT 3-e, 5.

¹⁹ ACDF, S.O., St.St. CC 3-c; St.St. TT 3-e, 17.

²⁰ ACDF, S.O., St.St. CC 2-e.

²¹ ACDF, S.O., St.St. TT 3-c, 5. St.St. CC 1-b.

The so-called cases of *oblatio*, i.e. consecration of Jewish children (and rarely adults) to Christianity by converted relatives and these children's subsequent baptism probably caused many controversies. The volumes of the series *Dubbi sul battesimo* within the *Stanza Storica* contain hundreds of such notorious cases.²² The circumstances surrounding cases of *oblatio* differed. In contrast to the coercive baptism of Jewish children against their parents' will, the actors were often Jewish converts. Cases of obliterated adults were rare and appear to have been motivated primarily by fears of being mistreated by the Jewish community.²³ Far more frequent and problematic was the *oblatio* of children. Dramatic scenes played themselves out: Jewish children were abducted by force in order to be baptized or hidden from their converted parents for months in the ghetto to prevent their baptism.²⁴ The crux was that however unlawful was the baptism of a child without parental consent and however much those responsible for such involuntary or forced baptisms were threatened with punishment, should the baptism itself have been carried out in accordance with canonical regulations, it was sacramentally valid and led to the baptized child being separated from its family and raised as a Christian. Only in a single case did it prove possible, after lengthy diplomatic negotiations between France and the Papal See, to return the baptized child to its Jewish parents. There were also cases, where, despite baptism, Jewish parents raised the question of their rights to remain the guardians of a minor.

Particularly problematic were cases, where one parent (usually the father) converted, promising his children to the Church despite the refusal of the second parent. One convert's pregnant wife who refused to have her child baptized was forcibly abducted to the *Domus Conversorum* so as to prevent her from hiding her child after its birth.²⁵ In the case of children already born, highly questionable attempts were made to discover their own intentions.²⁶

The files concerning baptism also deal with Jews posing as Christians for economic advantage. They remained generally unchallenged

²² ACDF, S.O., St.St. D 2-e; St.St. CC 4-a, 15; ACDF, S.O., *Dubia circa baptismum*, 1618–1698, 540–554.

²³ ACDF, S.O., St.St. CC 3-d; St.St. CC 3-g.

²⁴ ACDF, S.O., St.St. CC 3-f; St.St. BB 3-f.

²⁵ ACDF, S.O., St.St. CC 3-f.

²⁶ ACDF, S.O., St.St. CC 4-a, 3; St.St. CC 4-a.

as long as they did not receive any of the sacraments.²⁷ Others went from town to town, expressed their desire to convert, received financial assistance and moved on to repeat the game. Such culprits were dealt with by the Roman Inquisition under the heading of *transmigratio animarum*.²⁸

Another issue, closely associated with conversion, that arose when only the husband converted was whether he might remarry, to a Christian woman. These men petitioned for divorce in accordance with the *Privilegium Paulinum*. The case of the French Jew Borach Levi achieved some notoriety in this respect.²⁹

The Roman Inquisition determined how many synagogues were appropriate for a Jewish community and how large they should be.³⁰ The requests by Jewish communities for building new synagogues or expanding existing ones often contain interesting addenda such as blueprints and lists of synagogue members.³¹ The Roman Inquisition also supervised Jewish graveyards, stipulating that Jewish gravestones could have no text other than the name of the deceased, year of birth and death.

In contrast to the censorship of books destined for Christian consumption, the censorship of Hebrew books seems to have been the exclusive prerogative of the Roman Inquisition. There are indications that at least for the Papal States during a certain period Hebrew books were censored annually.³² The *Norme per la revisione del libri composti dagli ebrei* that have survived from the eighteenth century stipulated that the examination be as objective as possible. A commission of nine experts, three of whom were Dominicans and two neophytes, all knowledgeable with respect to the content and language of the books, was charged with assessing the volumes that had been collected.³³ Publications were classified as: (a) books directly opposed to the Christian faith (especially Talmudic and rabbinical texts), (b) works that were ambiguous and thus in need of correction and (c) books acceptable as reading material in line with the regulations of the general indices of prohibited books.³⁴ In addition, there are long notes on indi-

²⁷ ACDF, S. O., St. St. CC 2-b.

²⁸ ACDF, S. O., St. St. CC 2-b.

²⁹ ACDF, S. O., St. St. MM 3-h.

³⁰ ACDF, S. O., St. St. D 2-e; St. St. UV 56, fol. 31–328.

³¹ ACDF, S. O., St. St. BB 1-a, 2f.–3.

³² ACDF, S. O., St. St. CC 2-a, 7.

³³ ACDF, S. O., St. St. BB 3-i.

³⁴ ACDF, S. O., St. St. CC 2-a, 8.

vidual books. Without exception, the indices of Hebrew books produced by the Roman Inquisition carefully enumerate the Hebrew titles examined.³⁵

Closely associated with the problem of censorship is that of magic. The *Stanza Storica* lists a number of books that promise to aid in locating hidden treasures and other objects through the use of magic formulae containing real or supposed Hebrew words and the invocation of Jewish spirits.³⁶ Christians wished to take advantage of these formulae, so too speak, which caused the Inquisition much frustration and also brought these Christians into conflict with that body. The files contain also evidence that Jews were accused of being magicians, or that Jews themselves accused other Jews of this crime.³⁷

Whereas the official ban on Jews to own real estate and the consequent legal and social problems are long known, the files of the *Stanza Storica* shed also light on inner-Jewish conflicts over rents. Poor Jews turned repeatedly to the Roman Inquisition accusing richer ghetto residents of charging exorbitant rents for apartments.³⁸

Although the Roman Inquisition dealt primarily with the Papal States and Northern Italy, the *Stanza Storica* also contains cases pertaining to the Iberian peninsula and the Portuguese and Spanish colonies, in particular cases concerning *Judaizantes* suspected of Jewish practice, if not apostasy.³⁹ A further set of cases contain the *Gravamina* submitted by "New Christians" to the Roman Inquisition regarding their treatment by local inquisitors, who are accused of severe manipulation in civil and criminal suits against Christians of Jewish ancestry⁴⁰. These inquisitors were also accused of treating as Jews plaintiffs whose families had been Christian for many generations, subjecting them to constant discrimination, and labelling them as Judaizers.⁴¹ Finally, the Roman Inquisition had to deal also with accusations of ritual murder, including one made against the background of the rise of the Frankist movement in Poland.⁴²

³⁵ ACDF, S.O., St.St. BB 3-i.

³⁶ ACDF, S.O., St.St. Q 4-o; St.St. B 2-g; St.St. P 3-w.

³⁷ ACDF, S.O., St.St. TT 2-m, 27; St.St. CC 2-b.

³⁸ ACDF, S.O., St.St. TT 3-d; ACDF, St.St. TT 3-f; ACDF, St.St. TT 3-h.

³⁹ Vgl. ACDF, S.O., St.St. BB 3-b,c,d; St.St. BB 5-f, 4; St.St. P 4-l.

⁴⁰ ACDF, S.O., St.St. BB 3-q; St.St. BB 5-f, 1.

⁴¹ ACDF, S.O., St.St. BB 3-q.

⁴² ACDF, S.O., St.St. TT 2-c,d; St.St. TT 2-m, 3; St.St. UV 61, fol.41-62.

The series *Stanza Storica* of the *fondo Sanctum Officium* in the ACDF is a veritable gold mine for research on a whole range of topics that are of interest to the student of Jewish history. Regardless of its obvious riches, a word of caution is in order. The checkered history and the unsystematic character of its holdings should warn the researcher that road is still a long one before general conclusions may be drawn from its files.

JEWS AND JUDAIZERS IN THE DISPERSED ARCHIVES OF THE ROMAN INQUISITION

John Tedeschi
Madison

For students of early modern religious history, few events have been more significant than the formal opening in January 1998 of the Archive of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, the former Holy Office.¹ Not only has it generated a flurry of scholarly activity based on its previously largely inaccessible holdings, but it has also led to renewed attention being paid to older, well known Italian collections.² My purpose here is to underscore that neglected Inquisitorial materials connected with the activities of the Roman Holy Office and its peripheral Italian tribunals also exist in foreign repositories. They have already provided useful information to students of the Reformation, witchcraft and censorship, among other issues. But they remain basically untapped sources on the question of Jews and Judaizers in the early modern period.

The two most significant of these dispersed collections are preserved respectively at Trinity College, Dublin and the Ecclesiastical Archives section of the General State Archives in Brussels. A third set of documents that originated in the archive of the Roman Inquisition is Cod. Lat. 8994, housed in the *Bibliothèque Nationale*, Paris. In spite of its great importance, it will not concern us here because it contains trials

¹ The event was celebrated at the Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei. See *L'apertura degli Archivi del Sant'Uffizio romano* (Roma, 22 gennaio 1998), (Atti dei Convegni Lincei, 142), Roma 1998. An Italian version of this paper has appeared in the proceedings of the *Tavola rotonda* sponsored by the Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei in Rome on 20–21 December 2001 on the subject, “Le Inquisizioni cristiane e gli ebrei”.

² Reports on some of the research in progress, focusing on the Holy Office Archive, have appeared in *L'Inquisizione e gli storici: Un cantiere aperto. Tavola rotonda nell'ambito della conferenza annuale della ricerca* (Roma, 24–25 giugno 1999), (Atti dei Convegni Lincei, 162), Roma 2000. Cf., especially, Mons. Alejandro Cifres, “Lo stato attuale dell'Archivio romano del Sant'Uffizio”, in *ibid.*, 27–34. The most recent of the Lincei's symposia devoted to current Inquisitorial research focused on the question of Jews (see note 1).

exclusively devoted to Frenchmen who sympathized with the Protestant Reformation. Jews and Judaism do not figure in the story.³

It is not necessary for me to go into detail on the provenance or general composition of the first of these collections, the Trinity materials. I have discussed these matters at some length in recent conferences, the proceedings of which are now available in print.⁴ Let it suffice to say that the Trinity documents are a part of the vast Vatican holdings, which included the entire archives of the Roman Inquisition and Index, transported to Paris by order of Napoleon I early in the nineteenth century. Although after his fall a large part of the archive was returned to Rome, the criminal documents were considered of lesser importance and were destroyed or sold as scrap paper in Paris. A not insignificant part of this material, consisting of sentences and extracts from trial documents, somehow eluded this cruel fate and by obscure means, after passing through various hands, were acquired by Trinity College at mid-century. The significance of the collection is unquestioned, as Delio Cantimori recognized immediately when he examined it personally in the summer of 1934. It represents virtually all that remains of the vast *fondo* of Roman Holy Office sentences, numbering many hundreds of volumes, recorded in the Archive's inventories drawn up in mid-eighteenth century.⁵

³ I first mentioned the research potential of the three collections in "La dispersione degli archivi della Inquisizione romana", in *Rivista di Storia e Letteratura Religiosa* 9 (1973), 298–312, several times reprinted. The most recent version, with fullest bibliography, appeared as "Gli archivi dispersi dell'Inquisizione romana", in my *Il giudice e l'eretico: Studi sull'Inquisizione romana*, Milano 1997, 35–46, originally published in English in *The Prosecution of Heresy: Collected Studies on the Inquisition in Early Modern Europe* (Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 78), Binghamton 1991.

⁴ See my "Un fondo disperso dell'Archivio del Sant'Uffizio romano: I documenti inquisitoriali del Trinity College di Dublino", in *L'Inquisizione e gli storici*, 413–28, and in expanded form as "I documenti inquisitoriali del Trinity College di Dublino provenienti dall'Archivio romano del Sant'Uffizio", in *L'Inquisizione romana: Metodologia delle fonti e storia istituzionale. Atti del seminario internazionale, Montecoreale Valcellina, 23 e 24 settembre 1999*. A cura di Andrea Del Col e Giovanna Paolin, (Inquisizione e Società, Quaderni, 1), Trieste, Montecoreale Valcellina 2000, 145–68. The German version of the shorter form, "Die Inquisitionsakten im Trinity-College, Dublin", appears in Hubert Wolf (ed.), *Inquisition, Index, Zensur: Wissenskulturen der Neuzeit im Widerstreit* (Römische Inquisition und Indexkongregation 1), Paderborn 2001, 71–87.

⁵ Archivio della Congregazione per la Dottrina della Fede (ACDF), St. St. P 1–a: "Inventarium voluminum, & scripturarum Archivii S. Officii 1745". The sentences are mentioned at fols. 61^v–62^r: "Due volumi di sentenze del S. Officio di Bologna del 1569. Cento trentasei volumi di sentenze extra urbem cominciando dal 1570 fino al 1741 ... Cento sessantatre volumi delle sentenze di Roma cominciando dal 1546 a tutto l'anno 1739". On the history of the Roman Holy Office Archive, see now Francesco Beretta,

The Trinity Inquisitorial documents are made up of two main series. The first consists of nineteen volumes of sentences, frequently accompanied by abjurations, promulgated by the Holy Office in Rome or contemporary copies of sentences issued by the local tribunals which had been forwarded to the Supreme Congregation for its scrutiny and approval. The inclusive dates range from 1564 to 1660.⁶

The second and larger series, composed of thirty-five volumes, contains extracts from trials conducted primarily before the peripheral courts and sent to Rome for the information and advice of the Cardinal Inquisitors. The dates here span the period from the second half of the sixteenth century to 1800, with the larger part of the materials commencing after 1625.⁷

I have examined only the five earliest codices of Trinity sentences (MSS 1224–1228). They encompass, with great gaps, the years from 1564 to 1603, with the bulk of the documents falling between 1580–1582. In these materials, consisting of some 550 sentences, many against more than one defendant, I have been able to identify a total of 13 cases, three of them against women, involving Christians suspected of apostasy to Judaism, of Jewish converts to Christianity suspected of returning to their former faith and of Jews accused of occult practices.

“L’Archivio della Congregazione del Sant’Uffizio: Bilancio provvisorio della storia e natura dei fondi d’antico regime”, in *L’Inquisizione romana: Metodologia delle fonti e storia istituzionale*, 119–44. The most complete surveys in print of the ACDF are Monsignor Alejandro Cifres’ “L’Archivio storico della Congregazione per la Dottrina della Fede”, in *L’apertura degli archivi del Sant’Uffizio romano*, 73–84, and idem., “Das Archiv der Glaubenskongregation: Alte und neue Ordnungsformen”, in Wolf (ed.), *Inquisition, Index, Zensur*, 45–69. By the same author, see also his “Lo stato attuale dell’Archivio romano del Sant’Uffizio” in *L’Inquisizione e gli storici*, 27–34. Cantimori reported his impressions on the Trinity materials in a letter written from Rome, dated simply “Novembre 1934”, to the Polish historian, Stanislaw Kot: “L’ultima settimana di Agosto fui a Dublino, dove trovai materiale ms. veramente ricco [...]. Vi sono [...] processi interessanti per la storia del movimento eretico in Italia; e poi cose del seicento e settecento”. I quote from my edition of *The Correspondence of Roland H. Bainton and Delio Cantimori 1932–1966: An Enduring Transatlantic Friendship Between Two Historians of Religious Toleration. With an Appendix of Documents* (Studi e Testi per la Storia della Tolleranza in Europa nei Secoli XVI–XVIII, 6), Firenze 2002, 81.

⁶ Shelf no. MSS. 1224–1242. They are described by T.K. Abbott, *Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin*, Dublin, London 1900 (reprint 1980), 243–61, and by M.L. Colker, *Trinity College Library Dublin: Descriptive Catalogue of the Mediaeval and Renaissance Latin Manuscripts*, 2 vols., Dublin 1991, 1230–32.

⁷ MSS 1243–1277. Cf. Abbott, *Catalogue*, 261–84; Colker, *Descriptive Catalogue*, 1233–1238.

Among the defendants in the sixteenth-century cases are a Neapolitan woman, Laura Raguante or Reguantes, who had converted to Judaism and for many years had ceased believing in the Catholic doctrines in which she had been nurtured, “indotta da altre donne judaizanti a credere che la legge antiqua fusse meglio de la nostra legge evangelica, et che quella salvava l’anima et l’evangelica non era bona”. Hers was an interesting instance of nicodemite behavior because, although over a period of three years she had ceased to confess herself or take communion, she continued regularly to attend Mass. In addition to the performance of salutary penances and the wearing of the penitential garment, the *habitello*, she was sentenced on 2 January 1580 to a *carcere perpetuo*, a punishment, as we know, that implied confinement of three years or less.⁸

Another case concerns a Carlo Ventura Mezzabarba, the name taken by Simone Levita at his baptism in 1578. After he refused repeated summons to present himself before the Holy Office to answer charges of having *ritornato alla satanica perfidia hebraica*, he was sentenced in absentia at Pavia on 5 April 1580 as an obdurate and pertinacious heretic, and ordered to be turned over to the secular arm *in statua*, to receive in effigy the punishment that could not be administered to him in person.⁹

A different type of offense, involving the cultivation of occult arts, is what brought the Jew identified only as Gioseffo Hebreo of Massa Lombarda, twenty-three years of age, before the Holy Office at Imola, where he was sentenced on 3 September 1580, accused of leading Christians to apostatize from the true faith and adhering to the Devil by teaching them magical practices. Among his willing pupils were *preti*,

⁸ MS 1225, fol. 1^r–4^r. Raguante’s abjuration is at fol. 5^r–6^r. She was prosecuted by the court of Annibale da Capua, Archbishop of Naples, as a recidivist who had already on a previous occasion been convicted of *heresia et apostasia dalla fede cattolica* (fol. 1^v). The trial is preserved in Naples in the Archivio Storico Diocesano, Fondo Sant’ Ufficio, Processi, 142/101A–1, where her name appears as Reguantes. The case is discussed by Luigi Amabile, *Il Santo Ufficio della Inquisizione in Napoli*, 2 vols., Città di Castello 1892, I, 319. I am indebted to Pierroberto Scaramella for these references.

⁹ MS 1225, fol. 160^r–163^r. From the testimony of many witnesses who had been called to depose in the case, it emerged that Mezzabarba had fled to Salonica *luogo habitato da pari tuoi membri diabolichi*. The case of Mezzabarba and of his older brother, Laudadio Levi, who was arrested by the Pavia Inquisition in spring 1579, accused of having tried to persuade the former to return to Judaism, is studied by Renata Segre, to whom I am indebted for the reference: “Gli ebrei lombardi nell’età spagnola. Storia di un’espulsione”, *Memorie dell’Accademia delle Scienze di Torino*, ser. 4, t. 8, n. 28 (1973), 53–54. The entire work consists of 149 pp.

frati et secolari interested in learning *qualche segreto ad amorem* described here in great detail, entailing the use of nails, rings, candles, powders, hair, semen and endless mysterious invocations. The court decreed that Gioseffo should be banished from the temporal state for ten years, subject to seven years of galley service if he failed to fulfill the term; and he was first to be publicly whipped through the streets of the town. If a minister of justice could not be found to administer the punishment, sitting in the stocks in the main square during the hours of the market could be substituted. Gioseffo promptly declared that he would appeal the sentence to the Supreme Congregation, but it is doubtful whether he was allowed to pursue this procedural remedy. Although his desire to lodge an appeal was to be duly entered in the trial records, the *consultori* called into the case to advise the Inquisitor recommended unanimously that the court proceed with the sentence as promulgated. They argued that the offender had duly confessed to the crime, and the punishment imposed was milder than what was called for by the gravity of the case.¹⁰

Other names in the Trinity records pertain to persons sentenced not by local courts but by the central tribunal in Rome in the course of the year 1582 for various forms of Judaizing activities, in one instance also involving magical practices, an increasing preoccupation for Inquisitors in the closing decades of the sixteenth century. Two cases only had Christians or recent converts to Christianity as principals: the first concerned a certain *Oratio, overo Giovanni, neofito romano*, son of the Jew Rubino Audon, arrested in Naples on suspicion that he was a Turkish spy. At his Roman trial he admitted that after being baptized he had renounced Christianity and traveled to Constantinople where he again lived as a Jew for a few years.¹¹ The second case

¹⁰ MS 1225, fol. 351^r–354^r. The punishment of the stocks was applied since a minister of justice to administer the whipping was not available. I do not find Gioseffo's case recorded in the recently published inventory of 742 Imola Inquisitorial trials celebrated between 1551 and 1699: Andrea Ferri (ed.), *L'Inquisizione romana in diocesi di Imola. Inventario del fondo inquisitoriale presso l'Archivio diocesano di Imola* (Pubblicazioni dell'Archivio Diocesano di Imola. Serie Inventari, 1), Diocesi di Imola 2001. Two of the proceedings involved Jews: *Zoila Hebraea, De superstitionibus*, 20 Sept. 1592 (n. 25), and *Camillus Haebreus, De inobedientia*, 28 Jan. 1620 (n. 399).

¹¹ MS 1227, fol. 11. The sentence imposing the performance of an abjuration and salutary penances is dated 26 January 1582. The court must have accepted Audon's explanation that at the end of a year he had repented of having *regiudaizato* but was prevented by his master in Constantinople, a Jewish merchant, from returning to Christianity.

concerns an Agnese Perroni of Taranto, "lightly suspected of apostasy to Judaism".¹² Of this small group tried by the supreme tribunal in Rome, all the defendants, with the exception of the Roman neophyte Audon, hailed from the Mezzogiorno, such places as Crotone, Catanzaro, Naples and, as we have just noted, Taranto.

Not surprisingly, pious considerations frequently were not paramount factors in these changes in religion, whether in the cases of Jews pressed to convert to Christianity or in the much rarer instances of Christians espousing Judaism. This is illustrated blatantly by the trial of the Spanish Catholic Christophoro Perpignano of Valencia, who was circumcised and apostatized to the Jewish faith. Having presented himself before the court *spontaneamente ... per confessare et ricevere assoluzione et penitentia del grande errore*, he tried to mitigate the seriousness of his crime by telling his judges that he had committed it not out of religious conviction but for the love of a woman, a Jewess named Sara whom he had married in Ferrara. In the course of the interrogations, perhaps to ingratiate himself with the court by reinforcing the absence of religious motivation in his conversion, he changed his story and now acknowledged that, *persuaso così da un portoghese*, he had espoused Judaism simply *per vedere di cavare qualche robbia dalle mani de' hebrei*. He was sentenced at Rome on 8 June 1566 to five years in the galleys because, along with his apostasy from the faith, he was also a bigamist, since he already had a wife in Spain.¹³

Similar opportunistic behavior is displayed in the case of Giovanni Gagliogo of Seville, sentenced on 19 February 1582, who claimed that he had converted to Judaism to ingratiate himself with his captor, the Duke of Nicosia, who was of that religion.¹⁴

Since the Abbott and Colker catalogues of Trinity manuscripts (cited in full at note 6) are rather summary in nature and merely provide highlights of the collections, only a meticulous first-hand examination of the documents themselves will determine how many other proceed-

¹² MS 1227, fol. 102, sentence dated 29 June 1582. Agnese's husband was the *portulano* of Taranto.

¹³ MS 1224, fol. 67^{r-v}. Most recently, the fortunes of Iberian Judaizers in Christian Europe have been meticulously probed in the symposium volume, *L'identità dissimulata. Giudaizzanti iberici nell'Europa cristiana dell'età moderna*, ed. by Pier Cesare Ioly Zorattini (Storia dell'Ebraismo in Italia. Studi e Testi, 20), Firenze 2000, but without reference to the Trinity College materials, and hence to this and the following "Spanish" case (Giovanni Gagliogo).

¹⁴ MS 1227, fol. 25.

ings involving Judaic matters are contained in the forty-nine volumes of sentences and trial records dating after 1603 that I have not personally seen. The two inventories suggest that such later pertinent materials can in fact be found among them. For example, they draw our attention to the 1694 Avignon proceedings concerning a certain Abram, who had purchased a house adjoining a Catholic church *contra constitutiones apostolicas*;¹⁵ to the substantial dossier produced by the case of Ancona Jews accused in 1711 in the separate disappearances of two Christian boys, charges promptly exposed as unfounded¹⁶; and to the several Mantuan and Modenese cases dating from 1717 to 1730 of apparent recidivism to Judaism on the part of recent converts to Christianity.¹⁷ To the best of my knowledge, the Trinity College documents have not been tapped to date by students of Judaic encounters with the Inquisition.

The second dispersed collection which I want to mention are the four volumes originally belonging to the Florentine Inquisition which mysteriously, at an unknown date, were removed from the archiepiscopal archive in Florence and made their way to Brussels, where they were purchased by the Royal library in 1878. They were recently transferred to the State Archives in the same city.¹⁸ Once thought to be all that had survived of the archive of the Florentine Inquisition, we now know, instead, thanks especially to the important researches of Adriano Prosperi, that it has been preserved virtually intact in the *Archivio Arcivescovile* in Florence.¹⁹

¹⁵ MS 1255, fol. 51; Abbott, *Catalogue*, 265.

¹⁶ MS 1260, fol. 325 ff.; Abbott, *Catalogue*, 268–69; Colker, *Descriptive Catalogue*, 1235, who gives a different and undoubtedly correct collation (fols. 27–106^v).

¹⁷ MS 1265, fol. 107; Abbott, *Catalogue*, 275.

¹⁸ See J. van den Gheyn, *Catalogue des Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique*, Bruxelles 1903, IV, 84–86 (MS II 290). When the volumes were transferred to the *Archives Générales du Royaume* (henceforth AGR), *Archives Ecclésiastiques*, they were given the new shelf number, 19283^{ter}. The disappearance of the four volumes from the Florentine archiepiscopal archive is briefly discussed by Antonio Favaro, but without shedding light on the event, in his extremely critical review (*Archivio Storico Italiano*, ser. 5, 42 [1908], 451–69) of Michele Cioni, *I documenti galileiani del S. Uffizio di Firenze*, Firenze 1908 (reprinted Firenze 1996 as a revival of the original series inaugurated by Cioni's volume, *Pubblicazioni dell'Archivio Arcivescovile di Firenze. Studi e Testi*, 1. Favaro's review is included as an "Appendix" to the reprinted edition. Cf. Tedeschi, *Il giudice e l'eretico* (217, note 21, for additional information and bibliography).

¹⁹ For a general description of the entire repository, see C. Calzolari, "L'Archivio Arcivescovile fiorentino", in *Rassegna Storica Toscana* 3 (1957), 127–81. A generic inventory of the Florentine archiepiscopal holdings, curiously, does not specifically

The Brussels materials consist of letters, grouped by subject and designated as “decrees” directed to the Inquisitor of Florence by the cardinals of the Roman Congregation, a few trials and numerous printed edicts. These documents range from the late sixteenth to the late eighteenth centuries. Before passing briefly to their Jewish interest, it may be useful to give a resumé of the contents.

The first of the four volumes is composed of general letters (*decreta*) from Rome to the Florentine Inquisitor dating from 1583 to 1609. Among various subjects, we find several involving the illicit recourse to magical practices, with members of religious orders among the most frequent practitioners of these clandestine arts.²⁰ Another sizable group of letters takes up the issue of offenders who had been sentenced to confinement in their homes and had petitioned to be “habilitated” to leave their domestic prisons so that they could resume their livelihood on the outside. The requests were invariably granted, subject to an increase in the *sicurtà* to be deposited with the Holy Office, and, where it was thought necessary, accompanied by the admonition that

record any Inquisitorial materials, although they may be concealed under such rubrics as *Atti criminali*, *Sacre Congregazioni*, *Lettere di Roma*, etc. See *Guida degli Archivi diocesani d'Italia. I*. A cura di Vincenzo Monachino, Emanuele Boaga, et al. (Ministero per i Beni Culturali e Ambientali. Quaderni della Rassegna degli Archivi di Stato, 61), Roma 1990, 157–161. Don Gilberto Aranci, the Archive's director, announced the imminent publication of the inventory of the *fondo Inquisizione* originally prepared by Mons. Calzolari for internal use. See *I documenti galileiani del S. Ufficio di Firenze*, p. 10 of the 1996 reprint. Of Prosperi's numerous studies based on Florentine materials, see, for example, his “Vicari dell'Inquisizione fiorentina alla metà del Seicento. Note d'archivio”, in *Annali dell'Istituto Storico-Italo-Germanico in Trento* 8 (1982), 275–304; “L'Inquisizione fiorentina al tempo di Galileo”, in *Novità celesti e crisi del sapere. Atti del convegno internazionale di studi galileiani*, supplement to the *Annali dell'Istituto e Museo di Storia della Scienza* (1983), 315–325; “L'Inquisizione fiorentina dopo il Concilio di Trento”, in *Annuario dell'Istituto storico italiano per l'Età Moderna e Contemporanea* 37–38 (1985–1986), 97–124.

²⁰ One of the cases concerns a convicted necromancer who tried to recant his testimony in an appeal to Rome, alleging that the confession had been extorted from him under torture. In a letter of 7 October 1588, Cardinal Santa Severina of the Roman Congregation ordered the Florentine Inquisitor to forward a copy of the trial for the perusal of the Cardinal Inquisitors: “Reverendo Padre, da Don Salvator Manni carcerato costì, et inquisito et confesso di haver acconcia la calamita, et dopo haverla data ad una meretrice, è venuto scritto per una sua lettera delli 24. del passato di essersi fatto reo di quello che non ha pensato mai, ne fatto in vita sua, et che ha confessato il falso per tormenti; et se bene questi miei Illustrissimi et Reverendissimi Signori Cardinali Generali Inquisitori non credono facilmente al detto Salvatore, nondimeno per conoscer meglio la verità, et se egli sia impenitente et inescusabile ... hanno ordinato ... ch'ella mandi a questo Sant'Officio la copia del processo ...”. (AGR, *Archives Ecclésiastiques* 19283^{ter}, II, fol. 19).

the paroled person must refrain from “offending” witnesses who had deposed against him, a tacit admission that the anonymity of prosecution witnesses required by Inquisitorial legal theory was in fact very difficult to guarantee in practice.²¹

The second volume also consists exclusively of letters from the Supreme Congregation in Rome to the Florentine Inquisitor, but here they are arranged strictly by subject: *Decreta torturae*, instructions from Rome enjoining whether and in what degree interrogations should be conducted under torture, but also roundly criticizing in some cases its inappropriate, or excessively severe application;²² *Decreta contra Anglos, Germanos et omnes Protestantes* (letters concerning foreigners at large accompanied by their *contrasegni*, detailed and often bizarre physical descriptions of the wanted person);²³ *Decreta contra Haebreos* (to which we shall return);²⁴ *Decreta contra libros*, letters concerned with questions of censorship and the Index of Prohibited books, including one dated 27 April 1596 informing the Florentine Inquisitor that the Talmud would now be wholly prohibited, whereas in the previous Index of Pius IV it still could be read and possessed after expurgation²⁵; and, the fifth and final grouping, *Decreta et institutiones ad ipsum S. Officium attinentia* a handful of letters inculcating general lessons and principles for the guidance of local Inquisitors, including such practical advice imparted by the Cardinal of Santa Severina in a letter dated 15 September 1590: since one of their own, the Cardinal of San

²¹ See, for example, AGR, *Archives Ecclésiastiques* 19283^{ter}, I, fol. 5: “Molto Reverendo Padre, E’ stato supplicato a nome di Cosmo Tornaboni per esser habilitato di poter uscir di casa. Vostra Reverentia l’habilitarà facendoli dar nova sicurtà di tener la città et suo distretto per carcere, et di non offendere li testimonii conforme al decreto che si manda qui incluso, la qual forma di decreto servirà in tutte le habilitationi che farà nella contra[da?] pisana ...”. (letter dated 10 July 1583).

²² Ibid., II, fol. 1–22. The most celebrated case of abusive practice which drew the ire of the Supreme Congregation had been initiated by the Vicar of the Bishop of Pistoia against three women, *povere peccatrici*, against whom *gli indicii ... sono assai leggieri e deboli* (fol. 6).

²³ Ibid., fol. 23–62. For an example, see my *Il giudice e l’eretico*, 221, note 51, and the Appendix below.

²⁴ AGR, *Archives Ecclésiastiques*, 19283^{ter}, II, fol. 64^r–112^v.

²⁵ Ibid., fol. 114–167. I have published these letters as “Florentine Documents for a History of the *Index of Prohibited Books*”, in Anthony Molho and John Tedeschi (eds.), *Renaissance Studies in Honor of Hans Baron*, Firenze 1971, 577–605; reprinted in *The Prosecution of Heresy*, 273–319, and in *Il giudice e l’eretico*, 161–79, 345–55. On the definitive prohibition of 1596, see Fausto Parente, “La Chiesa e il Talmud”, in Corrado Vivanti (ed.), *Storia d’Italia. Annali 11. Gli ebrei in Italia. I. Dall’Alto Medioevo all’età dei ghetti*, Torino 1996, 521–643, especially 598–612.

Marcello, a member of the Supreme Congregation of the Inquisition, had just been elected supreme pontiff in the person of Urban VII, a letter of congratulation to the new pope would be especially appropriate.²⁶

The third Brussels volume consists almost entirely of an inquest, begun in 1726 but which dragged on long after, conducted by the Florentine Inquisitor and other ecclesiastical authorities. The case involved Caterina Teresa Antinori, member of a Florentine patrician family, daughter of the senator, Amerigo Antinori. Thirty years old at the time, she was suspected of apostasy to Judaism because for over sixteen years, while a nun in the convent of San Martino in Florence, she had carried on a surreptitious relationship within the cloister walls with a clandestine visitor, a Jew by the name of Daniele Levi, a linen merchant, who came to his trysts with the nun *all'alba*, or *a sera avanzata* disguised as a priest, as a monk, or even as a woman²⁷. The relationship, it came out, had begun when she was only fourteen and before she had entered San Martino as a novice two years later, perhaps against her will. The affair came to light when Caterina presented herself spontaneously to confess her apostasy from the faith and to sign an abjuration (published below as an Appendix) which detailed the many ways in which Levi, who came to her four or five times during a year, had persuaded her to cease believing the cardinal doctrines of the Church. Because she professed herself to be truly repentant and, undoubtedly to avoid further scandal to her family, her punishment was an onerous cycle of salutary penances. Since the Jew Levi had long since disappeared from sight, and, in fact, the defendant presumed him to be dead, the chief concern of the authorities in the subsequent proceedings, which dragged on for several years and take up the bulk of

²⁶ AGR, *Archives Ecclésiastiques*, 19283^{ter}, II, fol. 169–197, including many empty pages. The letter is at fol. 171.

²⁷ During her interrogation, Caterina stated that her first meeting with Levi consisted of a purely commercial transaction: "... la prima volta che venne da me, come ho deposto, fu quando escii di Noviziato, lo mandai a chiamare che volevo comprar da esso della roba per mio servizio appartenente alla sua bottega, che era di merciaio" (AGR, *Archives Ecclésiastiques* 19283^{ter}, III, fol. 18^v). On the monastery of Camaldolese nuns, S. Martino alla Scala, also known as S. Martino delle Monache and S. Maria della Scala, which was situated in Florence on Via della Scala at the corner of via degli Orti Oricellari, see Osanna Fantozzi Micali and Piero Roselli, *La soppressione dei conventi a Firenze. Riuso e trasformazioni dal sec. XVIII in poi*, Firenze 2000, 210–211. The convent was suppressed in 1785, again in 1808 and definitively in 1866. It now serves as a tribunal for minors. I am grateful to Elissa Weaver for calling my attention to this work.

the volume, was to ferret out how he had obtained repeated access to the religious house and who had been the presumed lovers' accomplices within and without its premises. This is only the barest outline of a remarkable story that deserves closer scrutiny and a much fuller telling.²⁸

Finally, the fourth of the four Brussels volumes is composed primarily of a potpourri of fragmentary printed materials. Among the most important, in my estimation, are two sets of *ordini* published by the Holy Office in Rome in 1611 for the guidance of its peripheral tribunals. They are highly detailed instructions for the regulation of life in the establishments that sheltered the local Inquisitions, including the whole gamut of financial arrangements governing trials and the maintenance of prisoners.²⁹ Of equal interest, and perhaps more relevant to the subject at hand, is a long printed edict, to which we shall return shortly, containing the opinion of ecclesiastical authorities on the controversial issue of the baptism of Jewish children.³⁰

The Brussels documents are a rich source for Jewish history, especially for those areas of Tuscany under the jurisdiction of the Florentine Inquisition, and pertinent materials are encountered in each of the four volumes. They discuss litigation over loans and the feared relapse to Judaism of recent converts to the Catholic faith. There are numerous letters, for example, from the Roman tribunal urging the local Inquisitor to exert vigilance over neophytes suspected of wavering

²⁸ After I had written this paper, Prof. Michele Luzzati of the University of Pisa graciously informed me that his former student, Gina Chessa, had made a full transcription of Antinori's trial: "L'educazione negata. Clausura e mondo esterno nelle vicende di una monaca fiorentina nel secolo XVIII, Università degli Studi di Sassari, Facoltà di Magistero, relatore prof. Michele Luzzati, anno accademico 1992–1993". Dr. Chessa, in an unpublished paper presented at a symposium in Rome sponsored by the Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medioevo in October 1996, proposed an interesting hypothesis: although the cloth merchant Levi might have indeed existed, Antinori invented the story of the long clandestine liaison with him and his attempts to convert her to the Jewish faith to cover up her actual amorous transgressions in the convent of both a lesbian and heterosexual nature. The voluminous dossier takes up the entire third volume (cited in the note above), with the trial against the priest Ascanio Capponi, procurator of S. Martino and a suspect in the alleged repeated breach of the monastic walls, the principal component. The preliminary pages consist of Antinori's interrogations at the hands of the monastery's confessor, who was granted permission to conduct these proceedings by the Supreme Congregation of the Inquisition with a letter dated 14 September 1726 (fol. 3). For Antinori's abjuration, see the Appendix below.

²⁹ I have published them in "New Light on the Organization of the Roman Inquisition", in *Annali di Storia Moderna e Contemporanea* 2 (1996), 265–74.

³⁰ See below at note 39.

in their resolve to live as Christians, or of having actually returned to their former faith.³¹

The efforts of the Jewish community to hinder its members from becoming Christians were a constant preoccupation for the tribunal. The situation in Florence was especially difficult because there was no house of Catechumens in the city.³² A recurrent problem concerned where to temporarily place Jews who had expressed a desire to leave the ghetto and be instructed in the Catholic faith. Their old co-religionists would do their utmost to thwart their intentions.³³ The solutions debated might range from placing the putative converts in an honest Christian home (*in casa di qualche persona da bene et honorata*), with the relatives of the archbishop, or even monastic asylum, the last a remedy that was generally discouraged *per rispetti che si deve tenere de i monasteri*.³⁴

The letters reveal the extraordinary ends to which the Church was willing to go to achieve conversions, which included monetary payments and the liquidation of prospective converts' debts. An example of the practice is offered by the case of the Roman Jew Abram di Benedetto dalli Leuti. In a letter dated 1 August 1599, Cardinal Santa Severina of the Supreme Congregation informed the Florentine Inquisitor that dalli Leuti had declared that he wanted to become a Christian and also offered as converts his future wife and two of her brothers, all of whom lived in Florence. In return he had asked for money to bring them to Rome and to defray the cost of the wedding. The Cardinal had authorized the disbursement of the funds, which were to come from the Roman Congregation assigned to the governance of the catechumens and, in part, from the Florentine Inquisitor himself, to whom a letter of credit was being forwarded for this purpose. The Cardinal ordered this

³¹ See the Appendix below.

³² The first one was not established until 1636 by a Carmelite friar from Mantua, Alberto Leoni, who founded a Brotherhood composed of well-born Florentines for the purpose of converting Jews to the Church. See the sketch by Roberto G. Salvadori, *The Jews of Florence: From the Origins of the Community Up to the Present*, Firenze 2001, 44.

³³ As examples, see the cases of Jewish attempts to hinder the conversions reported by the Cardinal of Santa Severina to the Inquisitor of Florence in two letters, both dated 29 December 1601 (AGR, *Archives Ecclésiastiques* 19283^{ter}, II, fol. 85, 86), the first concerning the children of Abramo di Paliano, the second concerning a widow Chiara and her numerous offspring. Cf. Prosperi, "L'Inquisizione romana e gli Ebrei", in *L'Inquisizione e gli ebrei in Italia*. A cura di Michele Luzzati, Bari 1994, 117, note 65.

³⁴ AGR, *Archives Ecclésiastiques* 19283^{ter}, II, fol. 90^r–91^r, letter of the Cardinal of Santa Severina to the Inquisitor of Florence, 14 January 1583.

official to pay the money *con più segretezza che sia possibile per rispetto degli Ebrei*. Obviously, they did not want to create the suspicion that bribery had been used to achieve the conversions.³⁵ In a letter written not long after, the Cardinal informs the Florentine Inquisitor that the prospective bridegroom had absconded with the money and was suspected of having relapsed to Judaism.³⁶ This is not the only instance in these records where Jews, taking advantage of the Church's ardent desire to secure converts, successfully duped the Inquisition.³⁷

Nevertheless, in spite of the high priority accorded to the proselytization campaign, the documents turn up several cases where the Church resisted accepting the conversions of minor children, if parental accord was lacking.³⁸ This is exemplified, among others, by the well known case of Ester, widow of Simone Belforte, whose three children in 1696 had been taken from her by the Florentine Inquisitor when a Christian uncle had presented them to the Church. After she appealed, theologians both in Florence and Rome, citing a long series of papal, patristic and juridical pronouncements on the subject, expressed an opinion running to sixteen closely printed pages, dated at Rome, 10 November 1696, opposing the forced removal of Jewish children and their baptism without parental consent as repugnant to natural law: "La sentenza, che Pueri Haebraeorum non possint baptizzari invictis Parentibus è comunissima", and, again, "... filii Hebraeorum ad Ecclesia compelli non possunt, cum non sint eius subditi".³⁹

³⁵ Ibid, II, fol. 82^r.

³⁶ Ibid, II, fol. 84. The date is illegible due to the poor quality of the paper. Since Abramo had disappeared, the Florentine Inquisitor is asked to search for him "... perché oltre le informazioni che sono contra di lui in cotesta Inquisitione, se ne hanno delle altre qui non meno gravi, che sia apostata dalla Religione Christiana al Giudaismo".

³⁷ For an example of a much later case, see *ibid*, II, fol. 112^v, concerning a Jew from Constantinople, Giuseppe Abencabil, who had presented himself in Bologna professing his desire to become a Christian, but first hoped that he could be helped to liquidate some debts. After he received charity from a Theatine and other persons at the House of Catechumens who had been moved by his plea, he failed to show up for the required instruction in the Catholic faith and had not been seen since. The information is contained in a letter dated 12 November 1726 from the Inquisitor of Bologna to his counterpart in Florence, adding that Abencabil was a repeat offender who had presented himself to be baptized on other occasions, even in Rome.

³⁸ The issue is cogently discussed by Adriano Prosperi in his "L'Inquisizione romana e gli ebrei", 67–120, where he uses the Brussels documents. See also by the same author, on another aspect of Jewish-Papal relations, "Incontri rituali: il papa e gli ebrei", in Vivanti, *Storia d'Italia. Annali 11. Gli ebrei in Italia*, 494–520.

³⁹ AGR, *Archives Ecclésiastiques* 19283^{ter}, IV, fol. 43^r–50^r, one of the many printed documents contained in the aforementioned fourth volume. The pamphlet, entitled *Fletus*

Although most of the correspondence contained in the Brussels documents, as we have just noted, concerns questions connected to the conversion of Jews to the Catholic faith and often reflects a relatively benevolent attitude on the part of the Church to achieve this end, a substantial item in the collection addresses the issue of Jews themselves and strikes a notably different tone. It is entitled *Minuta d'Istruzione per il Padre Inquisitore di Firenze circa gli Abusi degl'Ebrei*. After a preamble stating that it had come to the attention of the Pope that Jews, especially those residing in Pisa and Livorno, did not live according to what had been prescribed for them in the apostolic constitutions and sacred canons (and these are recapitulated at great length), the document goes on to describe under five main headings their principal transgressions, which I can only summarily list here: 1. They do not wear the obligatory distinguishing sign on their clothing. 2. They employ Christian servants of both sexes. 3. They converse familiarly with Christians, including maiden girls (*zitelle*). Moreover, Christians mingle unlawfully with Jews, attending their feasts and celebrations, such as weddings, circumcisions and the like. 4. Jews raise epitaphs in their cemeteries. 5. Christians avail themselves of Jewish physicians and their medicines.⁴⁰

The document places the blame for the situation partly on the fact that since there was no true and proper ghetto in Livorno—only a loosely designated Jewish quarter—Jews and Christians lived in promiscuous proximity.⁴¹ The purpose of the regulations was to minimize

Rachel plorantis filios suos, is discussed by Renzo Toaff, *La nazione ebrea a Livorno e a Pisa* (Storia dell'Ebraismo in Italia. Studi e Testi, 9), Firenze 1990, 192 on the basis of another copy preserved in the Biblioteca Labronica, Livorno. Cf. A. Prosperi, "L'Inquisizione romana e gli ebrei", 91, 117, note 67 who reports on the text on the basis of the Brussels copy. But see, especially, Marina Caffiero, "'Il pianto di Rachele.' Ebrei, neofiti e giudaizzanti a Roma in età moderna", in *L'Inquisizione e gli storici: un cantiere aperto*, 307–328, at p. 321 for the Belforte case. The author points out that the *incipit* of the pamphlet, *Fletus Rachel*, recurs in many similar memorials of protest lodged by Jews with the Holy Office.

⁴⁰ AGR, *Archives Ecclésiastiques* 19283^{ter}, II, fol. 108^r–110^v. Cited also by Prosperi, "L'Inquisizione romana e gli ebrei", 116, note 51.

⁴¹ From the vast literature on the subject of the Livorno Jewish community, see Lucia Frattarelli Fischer, "Proprietà e insediamento ebraici a Livorno dalla fine del Cinquecento alla seconda metà del Settecento", in *Ebrei in Italia*, a cura di Sofia Boesch Gajano e Michele Luzzati, *Quaderni Storici*, n. 54, a. 18 (1983), 879–95; idem, "Cristiani nuovi e nuovi ebrei in Toscana fra Cinque e Seicento: Legittimazioni e percorsi individuali", in *L'identità dissimulata*, 99–149; Jean-Pierre Filippini, "La nazione ebrea di Livorno", in *Storia d'Italia. Annali* 11. *Gli ebrei in Italia*, 1045–1066; and Toaff, *La nazione ebrea*.

contacts between the two faiths and thereby reduce the danger of corruption to Christians, felt to be especially threatening in relations where Jews were in a position of authority, such as when they employed Christian domestics or served as physicians outside the confines of their own religion. Consequently, the Inquisitor was reminded that he could enlist the assistance of the archbishop and nuncio to redress these wrongs if the *ministri*, presumably a reference to lay authorities, should raise difficulties. We know that the Medici Grand-Dukes, pursuing the goal of creating a great maritime and commercial center in Livorno, had granted special privileges to Jews, Protestants and other minorities, and would resist ecclesiastical attempts to encroach on the tolerant climate that prevailed there. The document is undated. But since among the authorities cited in the *Minuta d'Istruzione* Cardinal Francesco Albizzi's *De inconstantia in iure admittenda*, published in 1683, is the last in time, the document had to have been written after that date and perhaps was a reflection of the harsher attitude toward his Jewish subjects nurtured by Cosimo III, whose long reign extended from 1670 to 1723. Commencing in July 1679, he promulgated a number of decrees intent precisely on reducing contacts between Christians and Jews in his dominions.⁴²

The transgressions by Jews or neophytes recorded in the Dublin and Brussels documents faithfully mirror the areas in which they were subject to Inquisitorial jurisdiction. As Eliseo Masini, Inquisitor of Genoa, wrote in his popular and authoritative legal manual, the *Sacro Arsenale* (1st ed. 1621), although Jews and other infidels were theoretically exempt from Inquisitorial law, a broad spectrum of offenses existed for which they could be tried and punished by the Holy Office. The most grievous were denial of the principal theological doctrine common to both religions, the belief in one omnipotent God, and blasphemy against the basic dogmas of the Church such as the Virginity of Mary and the divinity of Christ.⁴³ But Jews and Judaizers were liable for a host of other infractions that pertained to the Inquisitorial domain. We

⁴² See Prosperi, "L'Inquisizione romana e gli ebrei", 89; Salvadori, *The Jews of Florence*, 48–50, and, especially, Toaff, *La nazione ebrea*, 195.

⁴³ See Eliseo Masini, *Sacro Arsenale ovvero Pratica dell'Ufficio della Santa Inquisizione*, Bologna 1665, 29–31 (reprinted in the Appendix below). Masini's text is now available in a modern edition: *Il Manuale degli Inquisitori, ovvero Pratica dell'Ufficio della Santa Inquisizione*. Prefazione di Attilio Agnoletto, Milano 1990, where the Latin passages are translated into Italian. The discussion is much fuller in the *Tractatus de Officio Sanctissimae Inquisitionis et modo procedendi in causis Fidei*, Bologna 1668 (1st ed. 1636), 206–213, by Cesare Carena, a high official of the Cremona Inquisition.

have noted cases of apostasy, namely of old Christians abandoning their faith and neophytes relapsing into Judaism; of Jews accused of assisting in these changes of religion, or of hindering co-religionists professing a desire to become Christians; of Jews instructing Christians in the occult arts, accompanied by the possession of prohibited books; and the employment by Jews of Christians as servants, wet nurses and the like, obvious threats to their faith.

In those cases where the documents provided the information, we saw that these offenses were punished with penalties ranging from incarceration to salutary penances and the wearing of the penitential garment. Undoubtedly, the sanctions would be immeasurably more severe when the apostate could not be persuaded of his grievous error, or, as in the 1580 case noted earlier tried in absentia in Pavia against the neophyte Carlo Mezzabarba, the defendant refused the summons to appear. The influential sixteenth-century canonist, Jacopo Simancas, unambiguously states that if a baptized Jew returns to Judaic superstitions, or a Christian should adopt the Jewish faith, they could be turned over to the secular arm as relapsed and impenitent heretics, the two principal prerequisites that in Inquisitorial legal theory might lead to the stake.⁴⁴

The various items to which I have alluded in this paper are merely a sample of what the documents contain. My assignment has been simply to bring them to the attention of scholars, not to attempt to interpret them or to suggest their possible significance for the history of Judaism and Jewish-Christian relations. I leave that task to the specialists in the field and invite them to take up the challenge offered by these dispersed sources.

He prefaces his discussion with a brief diatribe against Jews, a disconcerting utterance for a legal authority: *Solummodo antequam horum Iudaeorum materiam pertractemus notandum est, quod in toto orbe terrarum non reperitur gens indignior, infamior, & abominabilior, quam gens Iudaeorum* (p. 206). On the general question of the Church's jurisdiction over Jews, see the list of canonical authorities who pronounced themselves on the subject compiled by Kenneth R. Stow, *Catholic Thought and Papal Jewry Policy 1555–1593*, New York 1977, especially 364–367.

⁴⁴ *De Catholicis Institutionibus Liber, ad praecavendas & extirpandas haereses admodum necessarius*, Roma 1575, 270: *Si vero Iudaeus baptizatus ad iudaicam superstitionem redierit, canis scilicet ad vomitum, aut Christianus aliquis ad ritus Iudaeorum transierit, puniri potest ab inquisitoribus tanquam aliquis alius haereticus, vel apostata. Et ad probandum hoc facinus, etiam Iudaeorum testimonium admittitur, quo legitime probato, relapsi et impenitentes regiis legibus igni traduntur*. The handing over of Jews for execution in extreme cases (*traditionis brachio saeculari*) is included by Cesare Carena among *Quibus poenis Iudaei, & alii Infideles puniantur* (*Tractatus de Officio Sanctissimae Inquisitionis*, 212).

Appendix

I. Abjuration of Caterina Teresa Antinori (AGR, Archives Ecclésiastiques 19283^{ter}, III, fol. 24^r–25^v).⁴⁵

Io [Suor?] Caterina Teresa figlia der Signor Amerigo Antinori, senatore e nobile fiorentino, dell'età mia d'anni trenta, monaca professa e corale nel Monastero di S. Martino della città di Firenze, costituita personalmente, e inginocchiata avanti di voi Molto Reverendo Signor Antonfrancesco Paletieri, Priore di Santa Lucia sul [...] di questa città medesima, e Confessore ordinario del Monastero prefato, avendo avanti i miei occhi i santi Evangelii, i quali tocco colle mie proprie mani, giuro che adesso credo e crederò sempre per l'avvenire coll'aiuto di Dio, tutto quello che tiene, crede, predica, e insegna la Santa Cattolica Apostolica Romana Chiesa.

Ma perchè dagli Eminentissimi Signori Cardinali della sacra Congregazione del S.to Offizio di Roma, per le bestemmie e azioni empie ed idegne da me proferite, e rispettivamente fatte, come consta nella mia spontanea comparsa, sono stata sentenziata rea di apostasia, cioè:

1. Che mi sono, per una confidenziale amicizia con un Ebreo, resa molto sospetta di apostasia, per aver dato retta alle di lui empie istanze, che sopra ciò mi faceva: e di più d'averle antecedente alla mia protesta, come dirò, promessa di farla, se non col cuore, almeno colla bocca.
2. Che ho, fino dal novembre del 1710 alla fede, in cui io ero nata rinunziato in tutti i modi a me possibile, ancora con giuramento estendendo questo fino a non escire da questa falsa credenza non ostante le persuasive che mi fossero state fatte da sacerdoti, ò da altre pie persone. Ho creduto, che quanto credevano i Cristiani era falsità e bugia, ed in modo particolare la Verginità di Maria Santissima ed i Sagramenti della Confessione e Comunione. Ho rinnovato queste empietà sempre a dispetto di chi m'avesse voluta distorre: onde per questo ho tenuto sempre celato il mio errore. Ho procurato di fare tutti gli affronti e disonori non solo a ciò che adorano e stimano i Cristiani, ma di più ancora all'immagine adorabile di Gesù Crocifisso, non credendolo per il vero Messia, e credevo che fosse per venire il nuovo, al quale mi sono raccomandata.

⁴⁵ See above at notes 27, 28.

3. Ho avuto intenzione di rinnovare tutte le cose suddette e cose simili rispettivamente a tutti i momenti, massime quando m'è occorso adattarmi agli usi sagri della Religione monastica, a ciò non darmi per scoperta.
4. Ho con obbligo anco di metter la mia vita propria, portata addosso una protesta da me scritta in confermazione di non credere se non à quanto era in quella notato.
5. Ho calpestato, bestemmiato, vomitato mille empietà, ho fatto mille insulti, in più volte rispettivamente alle Santissime immagini di Gesù Cristo e à quella della Santissima Vergine Madre Sua.
6. Ho creduto che la Santissima Vergine sia stata una donna infame e impura, e che Gesù Cristo sia stato un uomo vile.
7. Ho rotto la clausura per sette, ò otto passi; e per altrettanti sono stata causa, che la rompa anco l' Ebreo *ob malum finem*.
8. Ho portato una volta all'Ebreo l'Ostia consagrada, alla quale sono stata causa perchè lo potevo assolutamente prevedere, gli sii stati fatti molti empj e stomachevoli insulti, sì come due altre volte ho portato al medesimo Ebreo un'Ostia non consagrada, sapendo benissimo dagli antecedenti che cosa n'averebbe fatto, supponendola consagrada.
9. Ho ancora in odio dei Sacramenti della Penitenza ed Eucaristia, quando mi occorreva ricevergli, peccato.
10. Ho ancora in segno della mia apostasia portato al collo una palla di vetro.
11. Ho sottoscritto una carta, che non la potevo credere cosa buona, senza sapere il contenuto di essa.
12. Ho similmente per paura della morte acconsentito rispettivamente alle suddette empietà à beneplacito dell'Ebreo.
13. Ho nelle solennità maggiori della Vergine Santissima più oltraggiata la di Lei imagine.
14. Ne' giorni della Settimana Santa non ho creduto alle funzioni sagre, che faceva la Chiesa Universale per la morte di Gesù, e mi sono adattata à credere ciò che voleva l' Ebreo.
15. Ho mangiato ne' giorni proibiti carne scopertamente in faccia al sempre detto e nominato Ebreo.

Pertanto volendo io levare dalla mente de' Cristiani e fedeli di Gesù Cristo questa sì solenne e formale apostasia, nella quale sono incorsa, abiuro, maledico e detesto la detta apostasia, eresie ed errori, e generalmente ogni e qualunque altra eresia ed errore, che contradica

alla detta Santa, Cattolica, Apostolica Romana Chiesa. E giuro per l' avvenire, che non farò ne dirò mai più cosa per la quale si possa aver di me nemmeno un minimo sospetto. Ne meno averò pratica, ò conversazione non solo di Ebrei, ma di qualunque altra persona sospetta, e conoscendola per sospetta lo denunzierò ò all'Ordinario, ò all'Inquisitore.

Giuro anco e prometto di adempire ed osservare intieramente tutte le Penitenze che mi sono state o mi saranno dal Tribunale del S. Ufficio di Roma imposte. E contravvendo io ad alcuna di queste mie promesse, che Dio non voglia, mi sottoponga a tutte le pene e gastighi, che sono da Sacri Canoni, et altre Costituzioni sì generali, come particolari contro simili delinquenze imposte e promulgate. Così Iddio m'aiuti, e questi Suoi Sacrosanti Evangelii, che colle mie proprie mani tocco.

Io Caterina Teresa Antinori suddetta, ho abiurato, giurato, promesso e mi sono obligata come sopra in fede della verità ho⁴⁶ Io sottoscritto⁴⁷ di mia propria mano il presente foglio di mia abiura, recitata prima di parola in parola in questo Parlatorino questo dì 5 dicembre 1726.

II. Letter of the Cardinal of Santa Severina to the Inquisitor of Florence (Rome, 26 September 1591; AGR, Archives Ecclésiastiques 19283^{ter}, II, fol. 81).

Reverendo Padre,

Essendosi saputo, che un Hieronimo Cavello neofito, già Ebreo, sia partito di Roma nascosamente, lasciando la moglie; e dubitandosi per il modo della sua partita, ch' egli habbia fatto qualche cattivo pensiero di voler apostatare dalla Santa Fede Christiana, et andarsene tra infideli, si come un' altra volta fuggì; et è stato in Constantinopoli, donde ne' mesi passati si fece venire con salvo condotto, è parso bene, che anco Vostra Reverentia facci costì diligenza, se vi fusse capitato, ò capitasse, et capitandovi, facci opera di ritenerlo prigionie, et esaminarlo circa questa sua partita, e dopo darmene subito avviso, acciochè se le possa ordinare quel che haverà da fare.

Egli partì ieri XXV del presente, è huomo d' anni 35 in 40, piccolo di statura, di barba nera, che tira al castagno, poca, et pizzuta, con mostacci lunghetti, di bocca un poco storta, e di un'occhio più piccolo

⁴⁶ The text reads "o".

⁴⁷ The text reads "soprascritto".

dell'altro; con vestiti di color berettino, et con un pugnale imbrunito di nero senza spada. Et non mi occorendo altro, la saluto, et il Signore la conservi nella Sua santa gratia.

III. Eliseo Masini, Sacro Arsenale overo Prattica dell' Officio della Santa Inquisitione, Bologna, Ad istanza del Baglioni, 1665, 29–31.

Degli Hebrei, & Altri Infedeli

Benche i Giudei, gl' Idolatri, i Maomettani, e gl' Infedeli d' altre sette, non soggiacciano ordinariamente al giudizio della Santa Inquisitione, in molti casi nondimeno, i quali sono anche espressi nelle Bolle de' Sommi Pontefici, possono essere dal Santo Officio castigati.

I Giudei, se negassero quelle cose della Fede, le quali a noi Christiani, & a loro sono comuni, come, Iddio esser uno, eterno, onnipotente, creatore dell'universo, & altre simili.⁴⁸

Se invocassero, ò consultassero i Demoni, ò facessero loro sacrifici, suffumigi, orationi, & ossequio, per qual si voglia fine: e se insegnassero, ò inducessero altri a fare tali cose.

Se empientemente dicessero, che il Salvator nostro Giesù Christo fosse stato huomo puro, e non Dio, ò peccatore, e che la sua Santissima Madre non fosse stata Vergine, & altre simili bestemmie.

Se inducessero in qualsivoglia modo alcun Christiano a rinegare la Santa Fede.

Se impedissero alcun Hebreo, ò altro Infedele, che si volesse far Christiano, ò lo consigliassero, ò inducessero a non farsi.

Se facessero fuggire Neofiti, ò in ciò porrebbero alcun'aiuto, ò favore.

Se tenessero, occultassero, ò divulgassero libri Talmudici, & altri libri Giudaici dannati, ò prohibiti;⁴⁹ e similmente libri prohibiti a i Christiani; ò scritture magiche, & altri libri, ò scritti contenenti, ò tacitamente, o espressamente, heresie, o errori contro la sacra Scrittura del Vecchio Testamento, o contumelie, impietà, e bestemmie contro Dio, la Santissima Trinità, il Salvator nostro, la Christiana Fede, la Beatissima Vergine Maria, gli Angeli, Patriarchi, Profeti, Apostoli, & altri Santi di Dio, contro la Santissima Croce, i Sacramenti della Nuova legge, le sacre Imagini, la Santa Catolica Chiesa, la Sedia Apostolica, contro i fedeli, specialmente Vescovi, Sacerdoti, & altre persone Ecclesiastiche,

⁴⁸ Bolla di Gregorio XIII. *Antiquam Iudaeorum improbitas* [marginal note].

⁴⁹ Nella bolla di Clemente VIII: *Cum Hebraeorum malitia* [marginal note].

ò contro i Neofiti, che nuovamente sono convertiti alla Santa fede, ò che contenesse narrationi impudiche, & oscene.

Se beffassero i Christiani, e per disprezzo della passione di Nostro Signore nella Settimana santa, e specialmente nel Venerdì santo, o in altro tempo crucifigessero agnelli, pecore, ò altra cosa.⁵⁰

Se tenessero nudrici, o balie Christiane.

E similmente sono soggetti al Santo Officio in tutte le cose contenute sotto i capi de' Fautori d' Heretici, de' Maghi, & Incantatori, e degli Offensori del Santo Officio.

Gli altri Infedeli ancora possono esser castigati dal Santo Officio per li medesimi delitti rispettivamente.

⁵⁰ Gregorio XIII: nella Bolla sopradetta [marginal note].

Part III

Perspectives

THE ROMAN INQUISITION, THE INDEX AND THE JEWS: NEW PERSPECTIVES FOR RESEARCH

Stephan Wendehorst*
Leipzig

With the opening of the materials of the congregations of the Inquisition and Index stored in the archives of the *Congregazione per la Dottrina della Fede* (ACDF) to the professional public in 1998,¹ an important question arises: what is the significance of this archival material for research on Jewish history? After a brief survey of the state of research, this paper explores that question on the basis of preliminary investigations in the ACDF, moving on to sketch a viable agenda for future focused inquiry.

The newly accessible holdings of the ACDF have given stimulus to numerous publications,² including several volumes of conference pro-

* This is a revised version of a paper first presented on 31 May 2001 in an internal colloquium of the Simon Dubnow Institute for Jewish History and Culture at Leipzig University entitled "Inquisition, Index, Juden. Eine Projektvorstellung". An English version of this sketch entitled "The Roman Inquisition, the Index and the Jews. Tentative Thoughts on Further Research" was later presented at the workshop "The Roman Inquisition, the Index and the Jews. New Perspectives for Research?", 29 June to 1 July 2001, jointly organized by the Simon Dubnow Institute, the Chair of Medieval and Modern Church History, Catholic Theological Faculty, University of Münster and the Leopold Zunz Center for the Study of European Jewry, University of Halle-Wittenberg, and funded by the Fritz Thyssen Foundation. An Italian version "L'inquisizione Romana e gli ebrei. Nuove prospettive della ricerca" was presented at the conference of the Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei on the topic "Le Inquisizioni cristiane e gli ebrei" on 20 December 2001 in Rome and has been published in *Le inquisizioni cristiane e gli ebrei. Tavola rotonda nell'ambito della conferenza annuale della ricerca* (Roma 20–21 Dicembre 2001), (Atti dei Convegni Lincei, 191), Roma: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, 2003, 51–63. A German version "Die Römische Inquisition, der Index und die Juden—Neue Materialien und Perspektiven" has appeared in *Leipziger Beiträge zur Jüdischen Geschichte und Kultur* 1 (2003), 385–396.

¹ On the opening up of the archive, see Alejandro Cifres, "Lo stato attuale dell'archivio romano del Sant' Uffizio", in *L'Inquisizione e gli storici. Un cantiere aperto. Tavola rotonda nell'ambito della conferenza annuale della ricerca* (Roma, 24–25 giugno 1999) (Atti dei Convegni Lincei 162), Roma 2000, 51–63.

² See Walter Brandmüller, Egon J. Greipl (eds.), *Copernico, Galilei e la Chiesa. Fine della controversia (1820). Gli atti del Sant' Uffizio*, Florence 1992; Massimo Firpo,

ceedings³ and diverse research projects.⁴ Yet in marked contrast with other fields of inquiry, this open door to the ACDF has not resulted to date in much new publication on topics of Jewish interest nor has it sparked any larger-scale systematic investigations. Only a few isolated topics, in particular, censorship and forced baptisms, have been examined anew in the light of now accessible ACDF sources. Thus, we have a substantial study by Fausto Parente on expurgation of the Talmud between 1570 and 1596.⁵ Marina Caffiero has dealt with the censoring of Hebrew books and the problems of conversion.⁶ David Kertzer's controversial study on the role played by the Catholic Church in the

Dario Marcatto, *Il processo inquisitoriale del Cardinal Giovanni Morone. Edizione critica*, vol. 6, *Appendice II: Summarium processus originalis documenti (Italia e Europa)*, Roma 1995; Pierre Noël Mayaud, *La condamnation des livres coperniciens et sa révocation à la lumière des documents inédits des Congrégations de l'Index et de l'Inquisition* (Miscellanea Historiae Pontificiae 64), Roma 1997; Gigliola Fragnito, *La Bibbia al rogo. La censura ecclesiastica e i volgarizzamenti della Scrittura (1471–1605)*, Bologna 1997; André F. von Gunten, Alejandro Cifres (eds.), *La validité des ordinations anglicanes. Les documents de la commission préparatoire à la lettre "Apostolicae curae"*, vol. 1, *Les dossiers précédents* (Fontes archivi sancti officii Romani 1), Firenze 1997; Massimo Firpo, Dario Marcatto, *I processi inquisitoriali di Pietro Carnesecchi (1557–1567). Edizione critica*, vols. 1–2 (Collectanea Archivi Vaticani 43, 48), Città del Vaticano 1998–2000; Hubert Wolf, Wolfgang Schopf et al., *Die Macht der Zensur. Heinrich Heine auf dem Index*, Düsseldorf 1998; Peter Godman, *From Poliziano to Machiavelli. Florentine Humanism in the High Renaissance*, Princeton 1998; idem, *The Saint as Censor. Robert Bellarmine between Inquisition and Index* (Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought 80), Leiden 2000; idem, *Weltliteratur auf dem Index. Die geheimen Gutachten des Vatikans*, Berlin 2001; Hubert Wolf (ed.), *Johann Michael Sailer. Das postume Inquisitionsverfahren* (Römische Inquisition und Indexkongregation 2), Paderborn 2002.

³ *L'apertura degli archivi del Sant'Uffizio Romano (Roma, 22 gennaio 1998)* (Atti dei Convegni Lincei 142), Roma 1998; *L'Inquisizione e gli storici*; Andrea del Col, Giovanna Paolin (eds.), *L'inquisizione romana. Metodologia delle fonti e storia istituzionale. Atti del seminario internazionale, Montereale Valcellina (Pordenone), 23–24 settembre 1999*, Trieste 2000; Hubert Wolf (ed.), *Inquisition, Index, Zensur. Wissensskulturen der Neuzeit im Widerstreit* (Römische Inquisition und Indexkongregation 1), Paderborn 2001.

⁴ On the German Research Foundation project of Hubert Wolf, "Prosopographie des Personals von Inquisition und Index", see Herman H. Schwedt, "Die römischen Kongregationen der Inquisition und des Index: die Personen (16.–20. Jh.)", in Wolf, *Inquisition, Index, Zensur*, 89–101.

⁵ Fausto Parente, "The Index, the Holy Office, the condemnation of the Talmud and the publication of Clement VIII's Index", in Gigliola Fragnito, *Church, Censorship and Culture in Early Modern Italy*, Cambridge 2001, 163–193.

⁶ Marina Caffiero, "'Il Pianto di Rachele'. Ebrei, neofiti e giudaizzanti a Roma in età moderna", in *L'Inquisizione e gli storici*, 307–328; idem, "I libri degli ebrei. Censura e norme della revisione in una fonte inedita", in Cristina Stango (ed.), *Censura ecclesiastica e cultura politica in Italia*, Firenze 2001.

genesis of modern antisemitism is based in part on source materials from the ACDF.⁷ Aside from these studies, largely journal essays or conference papers, little use has been made of the now accessible documentary riches of the congregations of the Roman Inquisition and the Index, so that the contemporary state of research differs little from what it was before the ACDF was opened to scholarship.⁸

There still remain a slew of open questions regarding the roles of the Roman Inquisition and the Index Congregation within the total complex of ecclesiastical and worldly institutions in the Catholic world dealing with Jewish matters. Since the nineteenth century, researchers have had access to the extant materials of the great “national” inquisitions, the numerous local inquisitions and additional churchly and secular guardians of orthodoxy. Inquiry based on these archival sources sheds light on the breadth and variety of inquisitorial encroachment on and interference in Jewish lifeworlds, including intervention by the Roman Inquisition in local processes.⁹ Even if Jews and other non-Christians were theoretically outside the Inquisition’s jurisdiction, its tribunals repeatedly drew Jews into the litigation before them. There was a spectrum of occasions leading to indictment: the denial of central theological doctrines common to both Christians and Jews, blasphemous statements about Christian dogmas, magical practices, religious hybridity, conversion of Christians and the return by converted Jews to the fold of Judaism. Other reasons included violations of regulations laid down by the Roman Church to reduce social contacts between Christians and Jews, such as the prohibition for Jews to appear in public without a special badge on their clothing, the ban on living in the vicinity of churches or employing Christian domestic servants. And the

⁷ David Kertzer, *The Popes against the Jews. The Vatican’s Role in the Rise of Modern Anti-Semitism*, New York 2001.

⁸ On the state of research before the ACDF was opened up, see Adriano Prosperi, “L’Inquisizione romana e gli ebrei”, in Michele Luzzati (ed.), *L’Inquisizione e gli ebrei in Italia*, Roma and Bari 1994, 67–120.

⁹ See for example Brian Pullan, *The Jews of Europe and the Inquisition of Venice, 1550–1670*, Oxford 1983; Mauro Perani, “Documenti sui processi dell’Inquisizione contro gli ebrei di Bologna e sulla loro tassazione alla vigilia della prima espulsione (1567–1568)”, in Maria Giuseppina Muzzarelli (ed.), *Verso l’epilogo di una convivenza. Gli ebrei a Bologna nel xvi secolo*, Firenze 1996; John Tedeschi, William Monter, “Toward a Statistical Profile of the Italian Inquisitions, Sixteenth to Eighteenth Centuries”, in John Tedeschi, *The Prosecution of Heresy*, Binghampton 1991, 89–126; Pier Cesare Ioly Zorattini (ed.), *Processi del S. Uffizio di Venezia contro ebrei e giudaizzanti*, vols. 1–14, Florence 1980–1997.

prohibition for Christians to have social contacts with Jews, take part in their religious festivals or consult Jewish doctors. Since the points of contact and conflict with the Jewish world were thus largely already well known to scholars, the opening of the ACDF initially engendered few hopes that new problems and facts might be unearthed (though that is certainly also possible); rather, the newly accessible sources held out the possibility of generating fresh perspectives on the interpretation of fundamental questions and issues.

On the basis of preliminary surveys undertaken in the ACDF,¹⁰ the present paper sketches relevant fields of research and raises new questions for prospective further inquiry. Aside from the materials of the Siena Inquisition, involving preserved documentation from a local inquisitional court, the principal sources relevant for topics of Jewish interest are the series *Decreta*, *Censura librorum*, *Dubia circa baptismum*, *Dubia circa matrimonium*, *Dubia diversa* or *Dubia varia*, *Materiae diversae*, *Lettere degli Inquisitori* and *Stanza Storica* (*St. St.*) of the holdings of the Index Congregation or the Sanctum Officium (S.O.) and the series *Protocolli* and *Diari* of the materials of the Index Congregation (Index).¹¹ In assessing the importance of the ACDF documents for Jewish history, it would appear useful to distinguish two objects of investigation right from the outset. First, does this new archival data provide prospects for new knowledge and insights regarding the complex of relations between the Catholic Church and the Jews, distinguishing here between basic questions and individual special topics? Second, to what extent can these materials shed fresh light on aspects of Jewish history not directly connected with the interface between the Church and the Jews, such as the economic, social and demographic history of Italian Jewry or the networking between different Jewries in Europe over the centuries?

As a consequence of the opening up of the ACDF to scholars, new stimuli can be expected from at least three directions for research on the relations between the Catholic Church and the Jews. First, a revised interpretation of the role played by the Roman and Universal Inquisi-

¹⁰ In order to gain an overview of ACDF documents relevant for the history of the Jews, with an aim to present findings of this preliminary survey at the above-mentioned workshop at the University of Leipzig (see footnote 1), Antje Bräcker, Hanna Węgrzynek and Stephan Wendehorst carried out several weeks of research in the ACDF in the spring of 2001.

¹¹ For an exhaustive presentation of the relevant documents of the ACDF, see Antje Bräcker, "The ACDF as a Source for the History of the Jews", in this volume.

tion and the Index Congregation in the complex of relations between the Roman Church and the Jews. Second, a contribution to reconstructing the internal view of Jews among Catholics; and third, investigation of the relation between legal norms and legal practice. A revision of the role played by the Roman congregations of the Inquisition and Index in regard to Jewish matters should be undertaken in several salient respects. Three questions suggest themselves as a useful point of departure. What was the role of the Roman Inquisition within the total complex of the "Inquisition?" With what actors within and outside the Church did the Roman Inquisition and Index Congregation cooperate or compete? Finally, what was the relation between the Roman Inquisition and the Index Congregation?

Due to the lack of a uniform organizational structure, it is impossible to speak of a unitary entity, "the Inquisition". Despite the numerous differences between the various individual inquisitions, one may nonetheless wonder to what extent it is possible to postulate a uniform theoretical perspective on and practical approach toward the Jews, and what part the Roman Inquisition played in this connection. Since Rome's encroachments on local tradition are only visible in specific sites and settings, it has not been possible to provide any generalizing answers regarding the relation between Center and Periphery. How can local and Roman factors be properly weighted and assessed? To what extent did the Roman Inquisition furnish guidelines for decision-making? Or, to put the question the other way around, to what extent did regional factors play the key role in the case of decisions by local inquisition tribunals? Who seized the initiative when it came to Jewish matters? What territorial differences emerge in answering this question? Did the relation between initiative and reaction in regard to Center and Periphery change over the course of time? Can we ascribe the Roman Inquisition a centralizing, homogenizing role in respect to Jewish affairs in implementing uniform rules of court procedure and in regard to material law?

In order to be able to answer this question, we must explore the extent and manner in which handbooks composed by Roman Inquisition officials were utilized in trials involving Jews. We must examine the intensity with which information was exchanged between the various inquisition tribunals, the effectiveness of practical cooperation and the existence of stages and channels of appeal. Various examples of cooperation between several different inquisitions convey the impression of an efficient functioning organism, despite the lack of a

uniform organizational structure, one whose tentacles spread over the entire Catholic world.¹² Spying on Sephardic Jews in Amsterdam and Hamburg demonstrates that the influence of the Inquisition could also extend beyond this.¹³ An examination of the ACDF materials can also shed needed light on the radius of action of the Roman and Universal Inquisition as a court of appeal and supervisory authority: was it limited to Italy, in particular the Papal States and northern Italy, or did it do justice at least in part to the second (universalizing) half of its official designation? Initial preliminary studies have shown that so-called New Christians converted from Judaism to Christianity submitted complaints to the Roman Inquisition against decisions of the Portuguese Inquisition.¹⁴ Should it turn out that these were more than just isolated instances, this would be in direct conflict with the common wisdom of the current state of inquiry, which assumes that the Iberian inquisitions were largely quite autonomous.

In determining the place of the Roman Inquisition, it is necessary to consider not only its role within the differentiated set of relations between the various inquisitions, but also the increasingly more important part it played, beginning with the bull *Antiqua Judaeorum improbitas* issued in 1581, within the entire structure of the Catholic Church in respect to Jewish affairs. What was the influence of the Roman Inquisition in relation to other actors within the Church who dealt with questions pertaining to the Jews? What were the relations and relative strength of the Roman Inquisition on the one hand, and immediate papal influence, state secretariat, papal nuncios, local hierarchy, bishop's courts and secular rulers on the other? An important distinction here is between the relation of the Roman Inquisition to other central authorities of the Roman Church and their relations with local actors. These local actors had special if not exclusive powers in territories in which inquisitions in the early modern period either were unable to gain a foothold or were, if established, short-lived: e.g., the Holy Roman Empire, the Kingdom of France, the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and the Republic of Lucca. As in examining the relation

¹² Brian Pullan, *The Jews of Europe and the Inquisition of Venice 1550–1670*, Oxford 1983, 51–52.

¹³ Michael Studemund-Halévy and Sandra Neves da Silva, “Jacobo Rosales alias Imanuel Bocarro Francês. A Life from the Files of the Inquisition”, in this volume.

¹⁴ See, for example, Gravamina, “*Ricorso alla Santa Sede dei Cristiani di Sangue Ebreo (Cristiani Novi) contro l'inquisizione del Portogallo*”, 1674–1680, ACDF, S.O., St.St. CC 4–d.

between the Roman Inquisition and local inquisitions, here too we are faced with the key question: in affairs pertaining to the Jews, to what extent did the initiative stem from the Center, to what extent from the Periphery? In the case of the Index Congregation as well, the question presents itself: what was the character of cooperation, competition and determination of jurisdiction in regard to censorship by bishops, universities and secular rulers.¹⁵

One example pointing up the multiple presence of different ecclesiastical institutions and a jumble of authority in connection with Jewish matters is the censorship activity of the Roman Inquisition and the Index Congregation. A key distinction here is between Hebrew works, books written by Jews, and works by Christian authors on Jewish subjects. A brief sample probe has indicated that in contrast with books by Christian Hebraists, Hebrew works, aside from a few exceptions (the Talmud in particular), were not placed on the Index. Yet since numerous Hebrew books were indeed banned, it can be assumed that the Roman Inquisition played the decisive role in their censoring. This assumption is also supported by the lists composed by the Roman Inquisition containing extensive titles of works whose possession and reading was forbidden to Jews or permitted only after the requisite expurgation.¹⁶ Research must explore whether there was a functioning division of labor operating here, according to which the Roman Inquisition was responsible for control over the Jewish public sphere, the Index Congregation for supervision and monitoring of the Christian public sphere. Aside from the question of the boundaries of authority between the two congregations, it is also necessary to clarify the degree of effectiveness of the prohibitions they issued. How widely circulated were the lists of Hebrew books forbidden and in need of expurgation prepared by the Roman Inquisition? How and by whom were they implemented in practice?

Among the most promising prospects afforded by the ACDF's opening are those bound up with a perspective shift from an external view-

¹⁵ On the situation in the Holy Roman Empire, see, for example, Dominik Burkard, "Repression und Prävention. Die kirchliche Bücherzensur in Deutschland (16.–20. Jahrhundert)", in Wolf, *Inquisition, Index, Zensur*, 305–327; on the situation in Poland, see Hanna Węgrzynek, "Legislation of the Catholic Church in Poland and Hebrew Books", in this volume.

¹⁶ Marina Caffiero, "I libri degli ebrei. Censura e norme della revisione in una fonte inedita", in Cristina Stango (ed.), *Censura ecclesiastica e cultura politica in Italia*, Florence 2001; Antje Bräcker, "The ACDF as a Source".

point to an internal vantage. Here for the first time we have the possibility to investigate the processes of opinion formation and decision-making within the Roman Inquisition and Index congregations in regard to Jewish matters. A look at internal mechanisms can cast light on numerous aspects and problems that have to date been neglected or barely touched on in research: the perception of Jewish lifeworlds, the multilayered, complex structure of the spectrum of opinion, the priorities, motivations and biographical backgrounds of the actors and the proportion of Jewish-related matters in the total amount of materials dealt with by the two congregations. Previously the eye of research has largely been limited to the perspective of looking in from the outside. Though the interventions in the local trials by the Roman Inquisition can be partially reconstructed from the local sources, they can be approached only from the vantage of their final result. Largely hidden from view is the course of the processes of opinion formation *inside the Roman Inquisition* which led to these results. Analogously, the course of trials held by the Index Congregation generally did not become known on the outside; the outcome of the trial was known only in cases which had ended with a pronouncement of judgment.

This external perspective has served to project the notion of a uniform, almost monolithic attitude on the part of the Roman congregations of the Inquisition and Index. As a consequence, inquiry—utilizing trial documents, reports of meetings, expert opinions, transcripts of interrogations and appeals—must examine whether the picture was not indeed quite different: namely a panorama of diverse attitudes toward Jews that partially overlapped, in part diverged, and sometimes were even contradictory. Using local source materials from the ACDF and parallel local extant documentation, the spectrum of opinion can be investigated horizontally in terms of various regions and vertically along an axis of “high” culture vs. “folk” culture. What, for example, were the differing views in the eighteenth century on charges of ritual murder as espoused by a cardinal in Rome, a Sorbonne professor asked for an expert opinion and a local bishop or cleric in Poland?¹⁷ Examining the perception of Jewish lifeworlds aims not only at working out the multifaceted, many-layered character of the spectrum of opinion, but also seeks to reconstruct the channels of information flow, the intensity of perception, how close it is to reality, how much it is influ-

¹⁷ St.St. TT 2-d.

enced by stereotypes. What was the degree of information in the hands of the Roman Inquisition about internal changes within the Jewish world? How did the Roman Inquisition deal with contradictions that emerged between the ecclesiastical stereotypes of Jews and reality? Did the Inquisition have any genuine interest in acquiring solid knowledge about internal Jewish affairs? Are there identifiable fluctuations in answers to this question over time? Was the Inquisition of the seventeenth and eighteenth century more “realistic”, that of the nineteenth century more “ideological” in its evaluation of the Jews? Let’s look at a few concrete examples. What did the cardinals and advisors to the Roman Inquisition know about the Kabbala, Shabbetai Zevi or Frankism? How were the efforts for reform in Judaism that emerged from the end of the eighteenth century perceived and evaluated?

Seen through the internal prism, focus shifts almost automatically to the actors on stage. The internal perspective makes it possible to move from the viewpoint of the “victims” to that of the “perpetrators”, focusing the spotlight of inquiry on the personnel of the Roman congregations of the Inquisition and Index.¹⁸ Who dealt with Jewish materials in the congregations? What language skills did the cardinals and advisors possess who were appointed to deal with Jewish affairs? What role was played by converts? We are familiar with the names of some persons responsible for dealing with Jewish matters, such as Lorenzo Ganganelli, the later Pope Clement XIV, who gave an expert opinion to counter the accusations of ritual murder, or Giovanni Antonio Costanzi, a convert who worked in the eighteenth century on preparing lists of forbidden books. Yet it is still impossible to venture any general statements about this personnel.

This look behind the curtains of the Roman Inquisition and Index Congregation promises to shed light on the perception of Jewish life-worlds, the differing opinions in this regard and the individuals involved, also illuminating the priorities that shaped their behavior. What segments of the Jewish lifeworld were of especial interest to the two congregations? What special sub-segments did they focus on within these? What overall role and importance did Jewish topics assume for them within the broader course of business of the two congregations? An evaluation of the series *Decreta* in particular should furnish answers

¹⁸ On the cardinals, administrative staff and advisors of the Roman congregations of the Inquisition and Index, see Herman H. Schwedt, “Die römischen Kongregationen”, 89–101.

to these questions in respect to the Roman Inquisition. A systematic analysis of the minutes of meetings of the Roman Inquisition contained in this series permits research (a) to determine what percent of matters dealt with pertained to Jews and (b) to categorize these in terms of differing topics.¹⁹ The series *Diari* and *Protocolli* can be utilized for analogous quantifying studies of the activity of the Index Congregation.

The image of the attitude of the Catholic Church toward the Jews is shaped by the normative declarations of the councils and popes, the canons and apostolic constitutions.²⁰ On the one hand, the Roman Inquisition had the duty to uphold the normative laws; on the other, as a court it was obliged to apply them in practice and adjudication. What was the scope for freedom of action of the cardinals and advisors who participated in these proceedings? What was the basis on which they handed down their verdicts? To what extent was there anything like a uniform line which might have established itself? How did they react to changes in papal policy toward the Jews, such as under Paul IV, Clement XIV or Pius VI? The adjudication process of the Roman Inquisition can serve as a sensitive barometer for the constant balancing of the tensions between norms and concrete legal problems. The fate of the Talmud exemplifies such changing fortunes. According to the Index of 1596, its possession and study were totally prohibited for the Jews, while Pius IV previously had permitted both ownership and study after the requisite expurgation.²¹ Aside from a shift of perspective in basic questions, the opening of the ACDF also affords the possibility, armed with better documentary source material, for reexamining certain problem complexes. Inquiry can take a fresh look at central topics such as forced baptism, accusations of ritual murder, social segregation, monitoring (and protection) of the practice of the Jewish faith and censorship, pursuing their contours from the early modern period down into the nineteenth century.

¹⁹ For the study of selected volumes of the *Decreta* for Jewish matters and topics, see Hanna Węgrzynek, "Decreta, 1650–1653", unpublished paper, 2001.

²⁰ Kenneth Stow, *Catholic Thought and Papal Jewry Policy 1555–1593*, New York 1977; Shlomo Simonsohn, *The Apostolic See and the Jews*, vols. 1–8, Toronto 1988–1991.

²¹ Fausto Parente, "La Chiesa e il 'Talmud'. L'atteggiamento della Chiesa e del mondo cristiano nei confronti del 'Talmud' e degli altri scritti rabbinici, con particolare riguardo all'Italia tra XV e XVI secolo", in Corrado Vivanti (ed), *Storia d'Italia*, Bd. 11,1, *Gli ebrei in Italia. Dall'alto medioevo all'età dei ghetti*, Turino, 1996, 521–643.

A highly sensitive area in the relations between the Catholic Church and the Jews were baptisms of Jewish children carried out against the will of one or both parents. Even if the Roman Church repeatedly opposed the coercive baptism of Jewish children on principle, once they had been baptized, the Church released these children only in rare cases. Research has concentrated on Rome and on individual cases, such as the widow of Simone Belforte, who protested against her children's baptism in her *Fletus Rachel plorantis filios suos* or the famous case of Edgardo Mortara.²² The evaluation of the cases in the series *Dubia circa Baptismum* and *Stanza Storica* in the Sanctum Officium of the ACDF promises to open the way to substantial research contributions on this topic.²³ It is necessary to explore changes in the attitudes of the Catholic Church, already pointed out by the Venetian jurist Paolo Sarpi and to inquire into more fundamental underlying causes, possibly bound up with the upsurge in missionary activity in connection with European colonialism and overseas expansion.

In regard to the position of the Roman Inquisition on the charges of ritual murder, we have the expert opinion of Lorenzo Ganganelli. A main reason behind its genesis were the efforts by a delegation of Polish Jews to achieve an official repudiation of the legend of ritual murder so rampant in eighteenth-century Poland.²⁴ One may wonder whether there were other discussions within the Roman Inquisition and Index congregations on this topic.

Since the Catholic Church viewed Jews as a threat, it attempted to reduce social contacts between Christians and Jews. The ACDF materials allow scholars to explore to what extent such efforts for the

²² Cecil Roth, "Forced Baptisms in Italy", in *Jewish Quarterly Review* 27 (1936), 117–136; Renzo Toaff, *La nazione ebrea a Livorno e a Pisa* (Storia dell'Ebraismo in Italia. Studi e Testi 9), Firenze 1990, 192; Adriano Prosperi, "L'Inquisizione romana e gli ebrei", in Michele Luzzati (ed.), *L'Inquisizione e gli ebrei in Italia*, Roma, Bari 1994, 91, 117; David I. Kertzer, *The Kidnapping of Edgardo Mortara*, New York 1997; idem, *The Popes against the Jews*, 38–59.

²³ See, for example, B. ACDF, S.O., St.St. E 4-l; St.St. L 5-b; St.St. P 4-h; S.O., *Dubia circa Baptismum*, 1618–1698, fols. 115^r–165^v, 186^r–218^v, 219^r–253^v, 290^r–305^v, 308^r–365^v, 389^r–392^r, 395^r–399^v, 401^r–404^r, 505^r–518^r, 519^r–529^v, 540^r–554^r; *Dubia circa Baptismum*, 1700–1714, fols. 145^r–153^v, 275^r–312^v 667^v; for further examples, cf. Antje Bräcker, "The ACDF as a Source".

²⁴ Abraham Berliner, *Geschichte der Juden in Rom*, vol. 2, Frankfurt am Main 1893; Hermann Sternberg, *Geschichte der Juden unter den Piasten und Jagellonen*, Leipzig 1878; Simon Dubnow, *Weltgeschichte des jüdischen Volkes*, vol. 7, 151–156; on the decision by the Roman Inquisition, see ACDF, S.O., Decreta, 1758, fols. 6^r, 17^r, 19^r, 23^v–24^r; 1760, fol. 14; S.O. St.St. TT 2-m, fasc. 3.

social segregation of the Jews were actually indeed implemented and to what extent a wide gap had opened wish and reality.

The Roman Church claimed the right to preserve Jews in a kind of pristine state, a kind of *ur-Judaism*, believing that was a favorable prerequisite for the conversion of the Jews. Yet at the same time, it believed it was the duty of the Church to protect Jews and their freedom of religious practice. On the one hand, the Church criticized and combated deviant tendencies and new and later developments in Judaism, in particular the Talmud. On the other, the Roman Inquisition did not always rush to hand down a fundamental negative ruling when asked to decide on the establishment, re-establishment or expansion of synagogues.²⁵ The files of the ACDF promise to shed light on how the Roman Inquisition shaped what it regarded as a Jewish space that was legitimate.

Those same files will also prove a rich lode for studies on the censorship of Hebrew works, books by Jewish authors and exponents of Christian Hebraic scholarship.²⁶ That is not only true in the case of traditional foci of interest, such as the treatment of the Talmud. A key topic for inquiry is the position taken by the Roman Inquisition and Index on anti-Christian polemics, non-Orthodox Jewish writings, the Kabbala, Christian Hebraic studies and antisemitic writings. Did Rome react—and if so, how—to works such as Hartwig Wessely's *Worte der Wahrheit und des Friedens*, which was burned in Posen, Vilna and Lissa after the rabbis had accused it of being deficient in Orthodoxy? How were representatives of Christian Hebrew scholarship perceived, such as the Basel theologians Johannes Buxtorf sen. and jun., the Hamburg theologian Johann Christoph Wolf or Professor Johann Christoph Wagenseil in Altdorf,²⁷ all of whom had a genuine interest in better understanding Judaism, something which no longer could be presumed after the end of the eighteenth century. Finally, what was the attitude of the Inquisition and Index—which invested much energy in combating and suppressing magic—toward the Kabbala, and most especially its practical variant, which sought magical control over Nature?

²⁵ On a case near Antwerpen, see S.O., St.St. CC 1-b, in the Archdiocese Gnesen, see S.O., St.St. TT 2-d and in Carpentras, see S.O., St.St. TT 2-m, fasc. 2.

²⁶ ACDF, S.O., St.St. E 3-i.

²⁷ On the trial over Johann Christoph Wagenseil's *Tela ignea Satanae*, see ACDF, Index, Protocolli VV, fols. 235^r–240^v.

The source materials now accessible in the ACDF are not only of interest for investigating the web of relations between the Catholic Church and the Jews. They can also help to elucidate subfields in Jewish history that are not directly connected with interrelations between the Church and the Jews, such as the economic, social and demographic history of Italian Jewry or the networking between different Jewries in Europe.

Since the Roman Inquisition in the Papal States played a long-term central role as the competent authority for Jews, the ACDF files constitute an important source for the history of the Jews in these states, providing valuable information on the demographic, social and economic history of the Jews, internal Jewish conflicts and the re-establishment of the ghetto after the French intermezzo. These materials should also cast illuminating light on the extent to which the planned social segregation of the Jews in conjunction with the establishment of the ghetto was actually implemented in practice.²⁸

Not only do lawsuits adjudicated before the Roman Inquisition provide insight into internal conflicts within the Jewish communities, they also give us a window on renting practices and procedures in the ghetto and the living conditions of the Jewish population. The documents can furnish new knowledge and data on the demographic development and settlement structure among the Jews in the Papal States and, to a lesser extent, in northern Italy as well. Files connected with the expansion of synagogues contain interesting data for the history of architecture, art history as well as possibly even medieval and post-medieval archeology. The preserved lists of community members allow us to draw conclusions, for example, on changes in the Jewish population. Since Avignon belonged to the Papal States, the Roman Inquisition also intervened there.²⁹ Future investigation will show whether the documents preserved can provide new insights into the “juifs du Pape en France”, as René Moulinas dubbed this community.³⁰ The ACDF documents are likely to provide new knowledge not just on the history in the Papal States and Italy, but also regarding the existing networks between the

²⁸ On Christian settlement enclaves within and Jewish islands outside the ghetto, see Antje Bräcker, “The ACDF as a Source”.

²⁹ On a request for expansion of the synagogue in Carpentras, see ACDF, S.O., Decreta, 1760, fol. 188^r.

³⁰ René Moulinas, *Les juifs du Pape en France* (Franco-Judaica 10), Paris 1981; idem, “Conversions et baptêmes chez les Juifs d’Avignon et du comtat venaissin aux XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles”, in *Archives Juives* 12 (1976), 19–30.

various Jewish communities. The trial against a captain who smuggled Hebrew books on board his ship between Naples, Leghorn and Amsterdam is one case in point for how such connections can be reconstructed based on the files of the ACDF.³¹

Thus, the opening of documentation preserved in the Roman congregations of the Inquisition and Index would, in the light of this preliminary assessment, appear to offer manifold possibilities for future research. These source materials facilitate new perspectives on the relations between the Catholic Church and the Jews and additional fresh insights into diverse areas of Jewish history not directly connected with the reticulum of relations between the Roman Church and the Jews. Inquiry will also profit both from the density of the materials and the possibility to pursue new approaches in interpretation and the study of selected topics over a long time span from the sixteenth to the nineteenth century.

³¹ ACDF, S.O., St.St.CC 1-b.

THE POLITICS OF CONVERSION: JEWS AND INQUISITION LAW IN NINETEENTH-CENTURY ITALY

Ariella Lang
New York

In the memoirs that Cardinal Pacca penned in 1828, the former Vatican pro-Secretary of State recorded the story of a pontificate that survived a turbulent time of transition. At the beginning of Pope Pius VII's 23-year pontificate, which began in 1800 and encompassed Pacca's tenure, the pope had been interested in stabilizing the stormy relationship between the Papal States and Napoleonic France. The emperor appeared, at least initially, equally eager to maintain a close relationship with the Pope. The Pope was angered, however, by Napoleon's intimation that the security of the Papal States depended upon the Vatican's accommodation of Napoleon's demands regarding religious matters; he stated in no uncertain terms that he would not conflate temporal and spiritual issues. Napoleon's failed efforts to make the Pope accede to his wishes, and his general belief that the Vatican greatly limited his powers, led the French emperor to make good on his threats. In 1809, he invaded the Papal States. Pius VII immediately responded by excommunicating Napoleon, but this move did nothing to obstruct the emperor, who annexed the Papal States to his empire and ordered a general in his army to take the Pope prisoner. The Pope was supposedly carried out of Rome with no more than a *papetto*, equivalent to a ten cent coin, in his purse.¹ He was brought first to Avignon and later to Savona, and in February 1810, Napoleon imprisoned the Pope in Fontainebleau, where the conditions of his captivity were a good deal harsher than they had been. Here, exhausted, ill, and under enormous pressure, the Pope signed the draft of a concordat that Napoleon had helped write. The concordat largely satisfied the emperor's demands regarding the relationship between the Catholic Church and the French

¹ Anne Fremantle (ed.), *The Papal Encyclicals in Their Historical Context*, New York 1956, 120.

Empire, and Napoleon immediately declared the signed draft public and binding.

Papal supporters from France, Germany, and Italy received news of the concordat with shock and dismay, recorded Pacca:

Non può descriversi la sinistra impressione, e il pessimo effetto, che aveva prodotto la pubblicazione di questo Concordato ... i buoni Cattolici di Parigi ne furono inconsolabili ... Nel resto della Francia ... non vi si prestò fede ... Lo stesso accadde in Germania, ed in Italia.²

Most striking about Pacca's description was the reception of this news in the capital city of the Papal States—Rome:

In Roma poi fu la nuova del Concordato medesimo accolta tralle risate, ed i sibili, e molti nel sentirne gli articoli andavan ripetendo quella proposizione, che suol dirsi in Roma quando si crede una cosa, non solo falsa, ma impossibile ad accadere: *Se questo è vero, andiamo subito in Ghetto a farci Ebrei*.³

The concordat's demotion of papal powers was such that Roman Catholics expressed their surprise by aligning themselves with arguably the most oppressed—and certainly among the most controlled—communities in the country. “Let us go to the Ghetto”, and “make ourselves Jews” suggests that the restrictions invoked by this second concordat placed Catholics in an improbable, indeed unthinkable position—as impossible as imagining themselves as Jews.⁴

Pacca's anecdote of the commotion that news of the concordat brought to Rome describes, in essence, an inverted story of conversion. The inversion of the conversionary act, the transition from Catholic to Jew rather than vice versa, denotes the absurdity of the action, the maxim reflecting not simply a falsehood, but impossibility. According to the Cardinal, the saying was common in Rome. If the expression was indeed as popular as Pacca appeared to suggest, then the maxim reveals just how broadly the theme of conversion had entered the popular culture of nineteenth-century Rome. But even if Cardinal Pacca's claim was somewhat exaggerated, even if the saying was not as prevalent as

² Bartolomeo Cardinal Pacca, *Memorie storiche del ministero*, Roma 1830 (first ed. Roma 1828), 252–253.

³ Pacca, *Memorie storiche*, 253.

⁴ The motto picks up on a trope that had been circulating through literature for well over a century. For one example, see Andrew Marvell's well-known *To His Coy Mistress*, first published in 1680. H.M. Margoliouth (ed.), *The Poems and Letters of Andrew Marvell* (I), Oxford 1971³, 27.

he believed, his citation demonstrated the need within the Church hierarchy to perpetuate the government's vision of the status—both religious and political—of the Jewish community. That is, if this inverted story of conversion signified the ultimate impossibility, then by implication the traditional conversion story, the passage from Judaism to Catholicism, from Ghetto to the larger context of Rome, became an extremely plausible – indeed, acceptable—story.

Pacca's quotation was also significant because of its narrative value: while Jews made up a tiny percentage of the inhabitants of the Papal States, this reference reflected the dominance they perpetuated in the imagination of the general populace. Finally, Pacca's reference to the supposedly well known motto reflected the cardinal's own belief in the popularity of the expression. His use of and reference to the motto made it part of the "official" literature of the authorities of the Papal States. I use the term "official" here in relation to the fact that these are the stories of a political authority that wielded power over and, indeed, determined the rights and privileges of the inhabitants of the Papal States. The trials discussed below should be considered legal narratives in the same vein: they are the work of the Inquisition tribunal and its adherents, of Vatican clergyman and local church leaders. Officialdom, however, should not suggest that these narratives are static—quite the contrary: they respond to the pressures, threats, and issues that absorbed the powers of the Vatican at the time they occurred.⁵ These stories articulated the vision that the Vatican had of itself, both as a religious and temporal power, and of its relationship to other states in post-French Revolution Europe.

The three trials discussed here, although in some ways quite different from one another, have several points in common. First, they all center around the issue of coercive conversions from Judaism to Catholicism, and the problematic identity of religious minorities in the Papal States. The issue of conversion in this context is significant because it reflects a dynamic between representatives of the Church and the people living under the jurisdiction of the Papal States: between Church culture and the populace. Second, these trials provide a commentary on the tension produced by the Vatican enforcement of Inquisition law on the one hand, and the growing strength of secular law of

⁵ Patricia Wald, *Constituting Americans: Cultural Anxiety and Narrative Form*, Durham 1995, 2.

other governments on the peninsula on the other. Finally, these trials provide evidence of the unavoidable politicization of ecclesiastical policies. Beginning with the rigid ideology of the Restoration, the Vatican stance regarding these trials marks the roots of the development of a political voice for Catholic leadership on the peninsula. Indeed, the political nature of these trials makes them difficult to define as entirely ecclesiastical in nature. As we shall see, Vatican diplomacy and its concern with public opinion were both indicators of this phenomenon, and while these two political facets of modern states grew with the unification of Italy, they began in the decades succeeding the French Revolution.

The first trial I would like to explore is known as the Labani affair, which began in 1814 and ended in 1822.⁶ The events that led up to the Labani trial actually began ten years earlier, in 1804, when a 23-year-old, Jewish man by the name of Salvatore Tivoli presented himself at Rome's House of Catechumens and was baptized, taking the name Giuseppe Labani. According to Rome's baptismal registry, he was one of only 12 individuals to convert that year.⁷ Since conversion entailed cutting ties completely with the Jewish community, the rector of the Catechumens, Filippo Colonna, hired Tivoli as a cook until the young man could find accommodation and a job outside of the ghetto. About a year later, the rector awoke to discover that Tivoli had run away, having apparently changed his mind about converting. He could not, however, return to the Jewish community in Rome, since under Inquisition law apostasy was a crime for which one would be imprisoned. Thus Tivoli was forced to flee the Papal States altogether; he sailed to Turkey where he settled among the Jewish community of Adrianopolis.

With the annexation of Tuscany to the French Empire in 1808, Tivoli could finally return to one region of the Italian peninsula without fear of being arrested. He moved to the Tuscan city of Livorno that same year, where his family had been residing since shortly after his conversion. Not surprisingly, the rector of the Catechumens was both angered and dismayed at Tivoli's disappearance, and especially by the

⁶ A brief reference to this case can be found in Roberto Salvadori, *Ebrei toscani nel tempo del Risorgimento*, Firenze 1993. Since the publication of that work, however, the Vatican opened its Archivio del Sant'Uffizio, which contains further documentation on the case that has heretofore not been examined.

⁷ Archivio della Casa dei Catecumeni, Roma (from now on referred to as ACC). Catecumeni neofiti 181.

news that Tivoli had returned to Judaism and was living in nearby Livorno. Colonna, referring to Tivoli disparagingly as “l’apostato”,⁸ kept a record of the young man’s whereabouts in the hopes that he would return to Rome, where papal authorities could arrest and prosecute him. The rector would undoubtedly have liked to go to Livorno to arrest Tivoli, but the French invasion of the Papal States prevented him from doing so. When the Pope was carried off, the emperor also arrested and deported Rome’s clergymen, including Colonna, sending them to prison on the island of Corsica.

With the defeat of Napoleon in 1814, Colonna and other exiled clergymen, could finally return to Rome. A year later, at the Congress of Vienna, the powers that had defeated the French emperor agreed that the Papal States should be reinstated, with Pius VII again at the helm. Not surprisingly, when the Pope rejoined his followers in Rome, he was greatly disillusioned with liberalism. Recently freed ecclesiastical leaders surely had an equally sour taste in their mouths of the ideals vaunted by the French occupation. Rector Colonna, for one, immediately returned to his unfinished business, appearing more ardent than ever in his desire to reassert the power of papal Rome and bring Tivoli to justice.

To this end, Colonna set out for Livorno shortly after being freed. Upon his arrival in the city, however, he learned that Tivoli had married a woman that same year from the Livornese Jewish community. His wife, Rebecca “Ricca” dell’Astrologo, was eight months pregnant with the couple’s first child at the time of the rector’s arrival in Livorno. With this information, the rector’s plan changed: aside from Tivoli’s arrest and deportation to Rome, he sought the arrest of his wife and custody of the couple’s soon-to-be-born child, who, according to Inquisition law, should be raised as a Catholic. Colonna’s efforts were clearly supported by the Vatican, and by its representative in Livorno, Vice-Consul Gaetano Marchiò, who expressed great interest in the case, and in ensuring that the child be baptized. Indeed, the consul reported on the case regularly to his superior, none other than Cardinal

⁸ ACC, Roma. Catecumeni neofiti 181. Converts were very often referred to as converts even years after baptism as a means of ensuring their humility. The title even carried over to police reports, so that the police would know to keep particular watch of these individuals. This may have been another reason that Tivoli is constantly referred to as the Apostate. Ermanno Loevinson, “Gli israeliti della Stato Pontificio e la loro evoluzione politico sociale nel periodo del Risorgimento Italiano fino al 1849”, in *Rassegna Storica del Risorgimento* 4 (1929), 786.

Pacca, who declared that he had never heard of a case like this one. Because of the case's uniqueness, Pacca urged the Vatican to push hard for a favorable end to the story.⁹ The importance with which the Vatican viewed the case was further emphasized by its being one of very few post-Revolution baptisms that produced a full Inquisition trial. The trial, undoubtedly aided by Pacca's encouragement, ended successfully for the tribunal: the child was baptized without her mother's knowledge or permission, and subsequently brought to Rome's House of Catechumens.

While the story is not an uncommon one, there are several reasons for the attention it attracted among Vatican officials. One reason is undoubtedly anchored in the history of the period. At the beginning of his papacy, Pope Pius VII had been somewhat favorably disposed toward the New Order, but relations with France deteriorated when papal territory—like Tuscany—was incorporated into France. The resultant exile of ecclesiastical leaders such as Rector Colonna furthered the animosity between Napoleonic France and the Papal States, as did the concordat that the Pope signed at Fontainebleau. Yet another reason occurred when, six years after the annexation of Tuscany to the French empire—the development that allowed Tivoli to return to the peninsula—any person living in Tuscany belonging to the “*nazione ebraica*” was granted almost complete civil rights.¹⁰

In contrast, in the neighboring Papal States, Napoleon's defeat in 1814 and the subsequent return of papal lands to the Pope's control, had an opposite effect. Indeed, from the Church's perspective, the civil emancipation of Jews that the French Revolution brought about appeared to confirm beliefs in a connection between Jewish emancipation, masonry, the Revolution, and the general de-christianization of society. In response, the Pope pronounced an edict declaring a return to the laws of 1770 insofar as they pertained to the Jews. As a result of this edict, Jews were required to return to the ghetto. Once again they had to wear a distinguishing sign upon their clothing; they were prohibited from owning property or employing Christian servants; and they were

⁹ Archivio della Congregazione per la Dottrina della Fede (from now on referred to as ACDF); *Sanctum officium* (from now on referred to as S.O.), Stanza Storica (from now on referred to as St. St.), BB.2–c.

¹⁰ Tuscan Jews were still excluded from the military and some professions, but they were permitted to go to university, and to pursue studies in legal fields which had previously been off limits.

blocked from entering certain professions. Many Vatican supporters took pride in the fact that the edict was reinstated with no changes whatsoever. The original laws, they reasoned, were established well before the French Revolution, when the Church *non aveva sofferta alcuna crisi, e godeva felicemente della più perfetta tranquillità*.¹¹ As homage to an era when papal authority went unchallenged, and in the hopes of returning to such times, the conservative *zelanti* in the Vatican championed a revitalization of these laws.

Rome's House of Catechumens was hardly immune to the political environment surrounding it. During the second decade of the nineteenth century, the *Casa dei catecumeni* saw the greatest number of Jewish converts in over a decade, a number that more than doubled in the years immediately following the defeat of Napoleon. In 1814, for example, the baptismal registry at Rome's *Casa dei catecumeni* recorded nineteen baptisms, in contrast to four the year prior, and one the year prior to that. The next year, the book contains records of twenty baptisms, and in 1816 this number had doubled to 40 baptisms, all but two involving Jews.¹² Clearly, the enormous increase in baptisms within this short period was connected to the re-establishment of the Papal States after Napoleon's defeat in 1814: after the French emperor's defeat and Pius VII's return to Rome, Inquisition law was reinstated, and the Holy See set out to re-assert its religious and political power in the region. Undoubtedly, the papal government's need to prove its power after its exile under Napoleon also contributed to Vatican interest in the Labani affair, and to ecclesiastical efforts to arrest the Tivolis and gain custody of their child.

The new papal laws aimed at isolating the Jewish community, and the increase of Jewish conversions to Catholicism gives credence to the argument that in times of political upheaval, the Vatican looked upon Jews with suspicion, and acted against them with familiarly repressive legal action. By so doing, ecclesiastical leaders strove to separate the Jewish community from the Catholic one, or, where possible, to encourage conversion to Christianity. Isolation of the Jewish community involved careful legislation that gave legitimacy and power to the Vatican's Inquisition tribunal, just as conversion empowered the presence of Catholicism and the role of religious life within the Papal States.

¹¹ Archivio dello Stato di Firenze (from now on referred to as ASF), Presidenza del buongoverno 1814–1848. Affari Comuni. Parte Prima. Filza 14, n.488.

¹² ACC. Catecumeni neofiti 181.

Among the new restrictions were legal actions the Pope introduced to limit Jewish social and economic contacts with neighboring Christian communities. Jews and Christians were discouraged from socializing together; Christian servants, wet nurses and doctors were punished for working for or treating Jews, and Jews were punished for hiring them. Finally, ecclesiastical leaders, starting with Pius himself, initiated a policy of uncompromising intransigence with regard to the Papal State's neighbors. While in earlier centuries the balance of power between the Papal States and its secular neighbors had often led the Inquisition tribunal to bargain over the future of individual suspects,¹³ this flexibility ended after Napoleon's invasion. Drastic changes in the balance of power, and individuals' use of the ideals of the French Revolution to challenge the jurisdiction of Inquisition law, made papal representatives unwilling to practice any system of rapprochement.

The Labani affair provides numerous examples of these efforts. For instance, when papal consul Marchiò asked the Tuscan government to arrest the Tivoli couple, he also requested that a Jewish member of Livorno's police force, Abramo Jacob Marace, be dismissed. He went so far as to suggest that the reason the couple had been able to elude the police thus far was due to the fact that they were *troppo bene informati da qualche loro nazionale impiegato nella medesima* ...¹⁴ His argument that the Jewish man's presence compromised the integrity of the police force reflected the suspicion the consul felt towards the larger Jewish community, and his desire to discourage the integration of Jews and Catholics. Marchiò's use of the word "national", his claim that a Jewish policeman had greater allegiance to the Jewish community than to the larger community, all point to the consul's perception of the Jewish community as a separate entity. Despite Livorno's history of tolerating interaction between the Jewish and Catholic communities, the governor of Livorno complied, albeit reluctantly, with Marchiò's request.

These were not new tactics; the Church had been trying to keep the Jewish and Catholic communities separate for many years. Records at the Sant'Uffizio demonstrate that these efforts went on well into the 1850s, when Vatican officials were again considering closing the

¹³ For discussion of these negotiations, see Nicolas Davidson, "The Inquisition and the Italian Jews", in *Inquisition and Society in Early Modern Europe*, Stephen Haliczer (ed.), London 1987.

¹⁴ ASF, Presidenza del buongoverno, Filza 14, n. 488.

ghettos of the Papal States.¹⁵ Similarly, the Holy See went to great lengths to block Jews from joining the civil guard and police forces of various regions on the peninsula. And yet, with the Labani affair, the Vatican was faced with something of a diplomatic dilemma: they sought the arrest of two individuals and the custody of a child who resided outside papal territory. Worsening the problem was the couple's assertion that they were Tuscan subjects, and consequently owed no allegiance to Rome as Vatican officials claimed. Consul Marchiò, well aware of the challenges of seeking the Tivoli couple's arrest in Tuscany, warned the rector of Rome's Catechumens that without the support of the secular Tuscan government and its police forces, no arrests could be carried out. Thus Vatican officials were confronted with the territorial boundaries of Inquisition law, and the need to enlist the support of officials in a secular government.

The Vatican requests to the Tuscan government for the arrest of the Tivoli couple were repeated and aggressive, and clearly reflected papal displeasure at having to ask permission in a case that it viewed as a strictly internal, judicial matter. Because the couple had gone into hiding when they heard that the police was searching for them, Marchiò also requested the arrest of their immediate family members. Frustrated by the Tuscan government's slow response to issues that were deemed urgent by the Roman Inquisition, he went so far as to communicate the request directly to a member of Livorno's police force. The policeman he spoke with complied and arrested the family members immediately, prompting Marchiò to thank the Tuscan government. The police's actions, he wrote, made him feel *la forza dei rapporti amichevoli e religiosi che esistono fra le auguste persone del santo padre e del Re Ferdinando III*.¹⁶ With these words, Marchiò sent a clear message to the Tuscan government: by adhering to papal requests the Tuscany's government had found itself a friend and ally.

Marchiò's orders were remarkable because he so egregiously overstepped his powers as consul. Indeed, his actions angered numerous Tuscan officials, and heightened sympathy for the Jews whom he had targeted. One Tuscan official wrote the president and voiced concern that the consul had abused the power of the Church with his orders. He requested that the Tuscan president free the arrested individuals, warn-

¹⁵ ACDF, S. O., St. St. TT 2-n, fasc. 17.

¹⁶ ASF, Presidenza del buon governo, Filza 14, n. 488.

ing that their arrests threatened natural and civil law. Similarly, Livorno's governor Spannochi requested that the relatives be freed, writing to his superiors that the consul's zeal *nasce da volontà di mangiare questa povera gente*.¹⁷ Livorno's head of police addressed the President of Tuscany's Buon Governo with the same request, saying that the consul had subjected these individuals to torture by arresting them. In response, the Tuscan Gonfaloniere reported that the arresting police officer had been suspended due to his involvement in the affair, and that, until the Vatican could prove that the family members were indeed subjects of the papal states, they would not be arrested. The letters are striking because of their refusal to uphold the consul's actions. Ultimately, these leaders argued that the consul's orders were not merely a threat to the civil rights of a handful of Jews living in Livorno; rather, they represented a question of jurisdiction and the power of rule, and they flat out rejected the Inquisition leaders' attempted imposition on Tuscan sovereignty.

The consul's actions, and his belief that Tuscan leaders were not taking the Vatican's requests seriously, were indicative of the Vatican's new policy of intransigence. Rather than the interplay of both toleration and hostility on the part of the Inquisition tribunal as in past decades, Vatican officials like Marchiò now tried to wield their power without offering much compromise in return. Indeed, as we see here, Marchiò promised alliance and friendship with Tuscany in exchange for their quick action, but offered little relief from the political pressure he employed to achieve the arrests of the wanted suspects. Ironically enough, the Vatican's aggressive diplomacy, and its constant reminder to officials in other regions of the respect and deference owed Catholic leaders, paid off in certain ways. In the Tivoli case, Tivoli's wife Ricca gave birth two days after being arrested. The consul, in his desire to gain custody of the baby, placed mother and child under police supervision, and did everything he could to isolate them from support within the Jewish community. He tried to prohibit Jewish visitors, suggesting that they might try to poison the mother and child, or sneak the child out of the hospital. Once again, he accused the Jewish community of subversion, going so far as to argue that the child should be separated from her mother for fear that Ricca would kill her rather than permit her to be baptized. The accusation pointed to the use of numerous

¹⁷ ASF, Presidenza del buongoverno, Filza 14, n. 488.

stereotypes, some centuries old and others “modernized” for the new era, which suggested that Jews needed to be separated from Christians—and even from each other—because of the dangers they posed to the general community.

Nothing Consul Marchiò said, however, could convince the governor of Livorno to take the child away from her mother; such an action was a violation of Ricca’s civil rights under Tuscan law. Nonetheless, the governor acquiesced to the Vatican request that the child be baptized, stating that he found the Vatican’s arguments that the child be raised as a Catholic *giusto*. In his defense of this decision, the governor described Catholicism as *la nostra santa religione*,¹⁸ suggesting that his personal connection to Catholicism—a connection Vatican officials tried to exploit—was a factor as he ruled in the Church’s favor on a matter of religious identity. The challenge to parental authority and the rights of Tuscan subjects that custody involved was less easily resolved, and for the Tuscan government, the fact that the child had been baptized had no bearing on paternal definition. Baptism was a religious matter; to remove the child from Tuscan territory was a question of citizenship, and the Tuscan government was prepared to defend the baby’s rights to stay in Tuscany until the Vatican proved that her parents were papal subjects.

To prove this fact, the Roman Inquisition carried out a trial, in which witnesses—both Jews and Christians – attested to the fact that both individuals and their families were originally from Rome. Tuscan leaders welcomed the testimony, and six weeks after the child had been baptized, the Tuscan courts ruled on the case. As citizens of Tuscany who had been living in the region for over ten years, the Tuscan government found Tivoli’s wife and the arrested family members innocent of any crime. Salvatore Tivoli, however, who had come to Livorno in 1808, was not a beneficiary of the privileges accorded Livorno’s Jews that dated back to 1593. He was to be considered a Roman subject, which made his daughter, who had to follow her father’s regional allegiance, a subject of the Papal States as well.

The Tuscan government, torn between serving its citizens and maintaining good relations with its political and geographical neighbor, tried to find the middle road with this decision. Indeed, in a letter that the Tuscan president wrote the governor of Livorno, he expressed precisely these sentiments:

¹⁸ ACDF, S. O., St. St., BB2–c.

Mi viene imposto di concertarmi con V.E. perché si effettui questa separazione della figlia dalla madre con le maniere, e col mezzo di quelle persone che possono renderla meno sensibile al cuore della madre. Io adempio bene per la mia parte a questa superiore determinazione rimettendomi intieramente alla saviezza di V.E. sul tempo e pel modo di questa delicata operazione che combina in un caso difficile i riguardi della umanità coi diritti dei governi amici.¹⁹

The president sympathized with Ricca's plight, but he clearly did not wish to alienate his political neighbor either.

The diplomatic initiative that produced the Labani affair began with an attempt to punish an apostate Jew, the symbol of the heretic. And yet real interest in the case only appeared after the news that Tivoli was soon to be a father. While the Vatican continued to express interest in Tivoli's arrest, the main thrust of their diplomacy was to gain custody of the child. And this was not a singular case in that sense: of all the nineteenth century cases of baptism that remain in the *Sant'Uffizio*, the ones followed the most diligently, and the ones that actually went to trial, generally involved questions regarding the legitimacy of the baptisms of children. Vatican officials spoke openly of conversion as a means of salvation for the children in question, and surely religious ardor added to their persistence in these cases. I would submit that their actions had a political facet as well: as young people especially became enchanted with revolutionary ideals—a phenomenon narrated in numerous novels of the day—the Vatican felt increasing pressure to reverse this trend; to effectuate a new identity for and among young people that firmly established Catholic beliefs and ideals in a new generation.

Another case to which the Vatican devoted great time and energy, and the second trial I will discuss here, did not occur in Rome, but in the papal city of Ferrara. The case involved Giuseppe Manganetti, a Jewish resident of Ferrara's ghetto, which was home to a well-established and affluent Jewish community. In 1821, this father of three converted to Christianity. He brought his eldest son, aged eight, with him to Ferrara's local *Casa dei catecumeni*, but left the younger two children, aged three and two, at home. It became the Church's objective to gain custody of these children, and the difficulties that local papal officials encountered led to the involvement of the Inquisition tribunal and the rector of the central House of the Catechumens in Rome. The

¹⁹ ASF, Presidenza del buongoverno, Filza 14, n. 488.

papal police planned to go to Ferrara's Jewish school to remove Manganetti's two other children, and to Manganetti's father-in-law's home to collect the man's wife, who often spent the afternoon with her father. In and of itself, this course of action was already unusual. Generally, in order to ensure that they encountered no obstacles or resistance, these forces would call at houses late at night, or in the early hours of the morning. They changed their protocol at Manganetti's request: the new convert's wife was pregnant, and an unexpected knock in the middle of the night might make her lose the child she carried.

The plan did not go smoothly. The rector ordered two policemen to guard the entrance to Manganetti's father-in-law's house, in order to ensure that no one left the premises. He and one other policeman, accompanied by Ferrara's prison warden, Pietro Piccoli, then went to the school where the Manganetti children spent their afternoons. When the schoolteacher understood why the papal forces had arrived, she stalled them with arguments, denying that the children were present. Meanwhile, as news of the rector's presence quickly passed through the ghetto, a large crowd of Ferrarese Jews quickly gathered at the school; the situation got out of control. Piccoli became suspicious of one man in particular, who shouted to the schoolteacher in Hebrew. He confronted the man, and a struggle ensued: as Piccoli was thrown to the ground, the children were quickly whisked away.

Escaping from the tumult of the Jewish day school, Rector Tabacchi went to Manganetti's father-in-law's house, only to discover that Manganetti's wife, who generally spent her afternoons there, was nowhere to be found. Not only had the woman eluded the guards posted in front of the house—she managed to escape the ghetto altogether. Some reported that she sneaked out dressed as a man, while others maintained that she had assumed the identity of the wife of a prominent member of the community, and used that woman's passport to escape the confines of the ghetto and leave the Papal States. Either way, her escape was clearly the result of a message from Jewish community members who saw what occurred at her children's school. Similarly, the Jews gathering at the school improvised an escape for the children and foiled the policemen's plans by communicating with one another in Hebrew.²⁰ We do not know what was said, of course, and neither did Vatican officials, which was precisely the problem. But the fact that they used a

²⁰ ACDF, S.O., St.St. CC3–f.

private language to communicate amongst themselves, to plan and carry out acts that the Church could only view as subversive, underscores their difference, their non-belonging—from the Church's perspective—to a larger community.

Having failed to procure the family members, the rector immediately ordered the arrest of the schoolteacher and others who were present in the schoolroom and aided in the escape of the Manganetti children. In total, six of the Jews who had gathered at the school were arrested for their role in the fiasco. The Jews were accused of subverting natural and civil law, of teaching their community members to use force against the Church, and thus of violating the most sacred rights of the Church. While only six Jews were arrested, the criminal trial indicted the city's entire Jewish community, which, the *causa* claimed, *tende sostanzialmente a sovvertire le leggi naturali e civili a conculcare la vescovile autorità e giurisdizione, ed a violare i diritti più sacri e inalterabili della chiesa*.²¹ The distinction between believer and non-believer, between Christian and non-Christian, is clearly underscored in this text. The differentiation between the Italian-speaking Vatican forces and the Hebrew-speaking Jewish community members, the rector's description of his escape, and of the fracas that the Jews made, all compounded the anti-Jewish stereotypes that were already expressed quite openly in Church writings of the time. Indeed, some of this was evident in the writings surrounding the Labani affair, and more will be present in the discussion of the third trial of this study, the Mortara affair. From the Vatican perspective, the overt repudiation of the law of the land on the part of the Jewish community certainly lent credence to the oft espoused belief that the Jews were anti-Christian rabble-rousers.

The interest the case generated, and the urgency with which Church leaders viewed these issues was expressed openly in a letter that the Cardinal of Ferrara wrote the city's Father Inquisitor, wherein the cardinal complained of the excessive liberty and wealth of the city's Jews. They lacked respect for the law of the land, he wrote, and in the recent political turmoil following the French Revolution, they had sown the seeds of rebellion and revolution among the general populace. If the Holy See did not reign them in, he warned of the possibility of severe political upheaval within the Papal States, and, most threatening of all, of an attempt by the Jews to shut down the Inquisition tribunal.

²¹ ACDF, S. O., St. St. CC3–f.

The Jews, he wrote, *osano persino di ostentare pubblicamente, che faranno col denaro tacere tutti li Tribunali*.²² The Cardinal did not think that the papal police would ever find the children, but he encouraged following through with an Inquisition trial nonetheless. His reasoning reflects another ingredient in the growing politicization of the Catholic movement: public opinion. Even if the police returned empty-handed, he reasoned, the trial would produce great admiration for the Holy See among Catholic inhabitants of the Papal States, who would surely be scandalized by the affair. Thus the motivation for the trial was two-fold: to punish the Jews responsible for hiding the children, and to rally support among the people for the Church. The former rationale reflects the uncompromising stance of anti-Jewish papal policy in this period; the latter speaks of a calculated political move that responded to changes wrought by the new order.

In 1823, two years after the Vatican attempted to remove Manganetti's children from the Ferrara ghetto, papal police discovered that Manganetti's wife and children were residing with relatives in Mantova. The network of Italian Jewish communities had proven itself fundamental to the family's escape from Rome, but fleeing the Papal States did not provide absolute refuge. On 16 May 1823, the Papal alderman in Ferrara wrote the Father Inquisitor in Ferrara:

Sull'affare ebraico posso finora darle notizie consolantissime. La moglie ed i figli del Magnanetti non solo sono trovati, ma sono arrestati in Mantova dietro le nostre ricerche, e richieste. Io debbo molto all'opera del mio procuratore fiscale ...²³

The procurator had achieved what even the cardinal of Ferrara deemed impossible: the discovery of the Manganetti family members. A month later, the alderman again wrote, this time to announce triumphantly, *Gli ebrei sono nelle mie mani*. The success of the arrest was due to providence and the persistence of the official's fiscal procurator, who, wrote the ferrarese alderman, *ha avuto il coraggio di passare il Po, andare in Mantova, cercarli, trovarli, avanzare istanza per la loro recupera, che si è ottenuta* ...²⁴ The language with which the alderman depicted the procurator's travels clearly reflected the tension that existed between the Papal States and her neighbors: the trip from Rome to Mantova was

²² ACDF, S. O., St. St. CC3-f.

²³ ACDF, S. O., St. St. CC3-f.

²⁴ ACDF, S. O., St. St. CC3-f.

surely arduous, but the procurator's courage was what enabled the success of the voyage, the suggestion being that travel North of the Po—most likely due to shaky relations between the two governments—was dangerous.

The fact that the family was in another region appeared not to have caused problems for the Vatican this time. The Mantuan government allowed the children and their mother to be arrested, and they were all brought to Rome's House of Catechumens. The children were thereupon separated from their mother, who underwent hours of questioning in an attempt to ascertain who hid them. The children, reported the Cardinal with a note of satisfaction, *non sanno più cosa alcuna del giudaismo, sono sempre intorno al padre, già pregano, già sono al caso di comprendere quello che ogni altro comprende che sia della loro età*.²⁵ The double sword of conversion and isolation once again lent power to the laws and practices of Inquisition Rome.

As in the Labani affair, diplomatic relations did not produce the negotiations that they sometimes had in past eras; the reactionary attitude of the church, its need to demonstrate its power, legitimacy, and superiority, produced a policy of non-negotiation for transgressors of its law. What was perhaps most significant about the program of conversion and prosecution that the Inquisition tribunal pursued was the fact that it represented one of the Vatican responses to the political situation on the peninsula and in Christian Europe more generally. That is, entrenched in these legal cases were the beginnings of a political platform that the Vatican found itself forced to develop as a response to the advent of the nation-state and the threat to its temporal power. As we see in the trials discussed here, ecclesiastical leaders' aggressive policies were intended to shore up the Vatican's inquisitorial legal system and to counter the ideals of the new order. In addition, their newly expressed awareness of and concern for public opinion should be understood as a political element that the Holy See developed to gain the sympathy and support of the general public.

The Catholic culture that the Vatican advocated through its inquisitorial activities thus needs to be understood within the specific context of unifying Italy. That is, beyond the question of how to organize a cultural politics that would resonate in a rapidly changing country, the Church in Italy felt it necessary to develop a cultural initiative that

²⁵ ACDF, S. O., St. St. CC3-f.

corresponded with the conservative religious beliefs of many ecclesiastical leaders, and responded to the political fears of the Vatican. In sum, they sought a political and cultural program that would provide the stimulus for a return to a Christian Italian—indeed, European—cultural and social renewal. Restoration Italy was not only the context in which this effort took place; as Vatican leaders tried to respond to the political and religious upheaval brought about by the French Revolution, the trials and policies of this era provided the project with its point of departure.

At the time of the Labani and Manganetti trials, the unification movement in Italy was far from a political reality. However, the Catholic political voice that developed in this Age of Restoration represents the roots of a political culture that continued to evolve throughout the nineteenth century. The effect of the cultural politics that the Vatican initiated with the Labani affair can most clearly be seen by examining a third trial, one that occurred more than 40 years later, the well-known Mortara affair. Edgardo Mortara, who was at the epicenter of this ecclesiastical and political storm, was a young Jewish boy from the papal city of Bologna. In 1858, the papal police took Edgardo from his parents' home in Bologna and brought him to Rome's House of Catechumens on the grounds that a family servant had baptized him years before.²⁶ The family, supported by secular nationalists interested in limiting the Vatican's temporal power, constructed a case to present to the Pope in an attempt to get their son back. A central theme in their argument was that the Vatican had violated the paternal rights of the Mortara parents when they took the child. Vatican officials, who considered the case to be of an ecclesiastical nature, regarded these protests as meddlesome—proof that the post-revolution ideology was a threat to their authority.

The trial that resulted from the Mortara's attempts to regain custody of their son brought to a head the conflict between modern, secular ideology and religious law. Indeed, throughout the trial one sees many of the themes that were present in the trials discussed earlier: the Jews were associated with the liberalism and anarchy of the French Revolution, and as such a threat to Christian society. Some texts even argued that because Christian society was commensurate with civilized

²⁶ Here I discuss Vatican correspondence regarding the affair; for a detailed account of the story of Edgardo Mortara, see David Kertzer, *The Kidnapping of Edgardo Mortara*, New York 1997.

society, the Jews were a threat to civilization more generally. Like the two previous trials, the lengths to which Church leaders went to defend their decision, and prove their legitimacy were astounding. One reason for these measures may have been the small numbers of conversions occurring in the Papal States in this period. Rome's Casa dei Catecumeni archives record on average fewer than five baptisms a year after the revolution of 1848.²⁷ There were over a hundred cases brought before the tribunal because of questions regarding the legitimacy of the baptisms, but these cases pertained by and large to Protestants, and not to Jews.²⁸ The small number of conversions was indicative of a general societal trend toward secularization. Proving to the populace the legitimacy of Edgardo's baptism became a means to assert Vatican temporal power, and young Edgardo provided proof of Christian perseverance and renewal.

Thus Vatican officials, beginning with the Pope himself, used the Mortara case as an example that proved the legitimacy of the Church and the power of its law within the Papal States. Since the time of the Labani and Manganetti trials, numerous Catholic and secular newspapers had been established, adding to the politicization of the debate over the boy. *Civiltà Cattolica* and numerous other pro-papal newspapers in Italy and abroad depicted Edgardo's conversion as miraculous, and the young boy's Christian piety as nothing short of saintly. Of course, the anti-papal press had its own reports of the affair, accusing the papal police of kidnap, and the Vatican as having torn the boy from a loving family who was being denied its rights. Internal communications reflect Vatican leaders' awareness and concern for the politically charged nature of the case. Nuncios from around the world kept the cardinal Secretary of State Antonelli informed of the anti-papal articles published regarding the controversial affair. The secretary of state responded, sending personal notes to individual representatives or general notices to all, instructing them how to respond. For example, shortly after Edgardo was seized, a legate of the Papal Police in Bologna warned Antonelli of the critical articles being published in a French newspaper, and asked the Cardinal to consider forbidding sale of the periodical in the papal states. In his response, the Cardinal lauded the legate for his views, although he judged it imprudent for the Church to carry out such a drastic measure.

²⁷ ACC, Catecumeni neofiti 184.

²⁸ ACDF, S.O., St.St. n.s. 11.

These communiqués also expressed the desire to convey to the public an “official” version of Edgardo’s story, a move intended to simultaneously gain popular support and exert spin control as the case gained notoriety. To this end, the Catholic press and the Vatican often collaborated to counter the accusations put forth by liberal papers. In an extraordinary letter that again reflected the Vatican fear of the secular press, a papal representative sent an article that supported the Church’s actions to Cardinal Antonelli, and explained that he himself had written the article. However, he explained, he pretended to be a journalist rather than a member of the clergy when sending the piece to the newspaper in order to *evitare ogni sospetto di influenza della Corte Romana*.²⁹ Another article sent to Antonelli lauded the maidservant who performed the baptism as an honorable woman. An unsigned note scribbled on the article suggested that the Tribunal send the article to some journal for publication, but only with the assurance that Vatican advancement of the article remain secret. For his part, Cardinal Secretary of State Antonelli issued numerous directives to papal representatives across Europe regarding the case. In a letter to one papal representative, Antonelli included an article that he wished to appear in a Milanese, pro-papal newspaper. The article once again reflected the Vatican’s desire to ensure that newspapers published its point of view, and it demonstrated just how deeply involved Antonelli, one of the highest ranked of Vatican clergy, was in coordinating the official Vatican portrayal of the affair. These letters and articles, written and passed among Vatican officials, demonstrated the political platform and religious apology for the Church’s actions which had the effect of further politicizing the Catholic movement on the peninsula.

In addition to its press releases, the Catholic Church carefully established a jurisdictional basis to validate and effectuate their decision that Edgardo remain at the House of Catechumens. Repeatedly the Pope had to force canonical and Roman law to support his ruling, and this new course again revealed the Holy See’s desire to go beyond the rules defined and stimulated by Counter-Reformation Popes. In their plea for the return of their son, the Mortara parents used theological arguments to question the legitimacy of the baptism.³⁰ The tribunal dismissed the

²⁹ Archivio Segreto Vaticano (from now on referred to as ASV), *Segreteria di Stato, Epoca Moderna (1814–1922): Rubricelle e Protocolli*. [indice 1089]; Rubrica 66, anno 1864, fasc. 1.

³⁰ ASV, Archivio Particolare di Pio IX, Oggetti vari, indice 1132.

Mortaras' arguments, suggesting that Jews should not try to understand Church law and procedure. They argued that while these laws ruled the land, they were Catholic laws, and were thus not to be approached by so-called "infidels".³¹ Despite this dismissal, however, the Tribunal's written decision on the case went to great lengths to disprove each argument and state the Church position. The tribunal cited theologians and popes from earlier centuries to uphold Edgardo's baptism. Its use of both canonical and civil juridical frameworks, coupled with the Pope's support of these activities, strengthened the opinions and tendencies of the Church, and more specifically, the Inquisition tribunal. After Bologna broke away from the Papal States, and less than two years after Edgardo was taken to the Catechumens, the secular government revealed its disapproval for the power of its Inquisition official: the first person the new, secular courts of the region tried was the Father Inquisitor responsible for Edgardo's arrest.

The three trials enumerated above thus became a means to legitimize the conversions and to garner public support for the Catholic initiatives that produced them. As a result they not only provided a means for expressing prevailing Vatican political opinions of the time; they reflected the radicalization of the reactionary attitudes of a significant part of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. As instruments in this radicalization, the stories presented here provide an important contribution to the development of a political identity for the nation's Catholics, particularly because they became a means to reconfirm the hegemony of Catholic political identity in a rapidly secularizing world. The trials that these conversions generated thus became one of the first methods with which the Vatican ecclesiastical supporters became politically active, even if this political initiative was often framed in religious discourse.

³¹ ASV, Archivio Particolare di Pio IX, Oggetti vari, indice 1132.

THE GOOD FRIDAY SUPPLICATION FOR THE JEWS AND
THE ROMAN CURIA (1928–1975): A CASE EXAMPLE FOR
RESEARCH PROSPECTS FOR THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

Hubert Wolf
Münster

No genuflections for the Jews

“Oremus et pro perfidis Judaeis: ut Deus et Dominus noster auferat velamen de cordibus eorum; ut et ipsi agnoscant Jesum Christum, Dominum nostrum.”—This is the invitation to prayer for the eighth supplication in the liturgy of Good Friday in the Roman missal of Pius V. of 1570.¹ After the rubric comes the oration in which the “judaicam perfidiam” is given over to the mercifulness of God.

Evidently, a poor knowledge of Latin is not a deficiency confined only to our own times. Rather, it appears that even in past centuries, only few worshipers were able to fully comprehend the Latin Tridentine liturgy. Perhaps that is one reason why the German-Latin edition of the Roman Mass book of the Benedictine Anselm Schott became a bestseller that went through many printings.

In Schott’s translation of 1913, the corresponding supplication, translated from the German, reads: “Let us pray for the faithless Jews, that God, our Lord, shall lift the veil from their hearts, so that they may also come to know our Lord Jesus Christ.” In the following rubric, we can read the explanatory commentary: “Here the diacon does not utter the call for genuflection so as to avoid renewing the memory of the shame with which the Jews, by means of genuflection, mocked the Savior at this hour.” Then comes the text of the actual oration: “Allmighty and everlasting God, You who even include the faithless Jews in your mercy, hear our supplication which we bring to You for that people’s blindness: so that it may recognize and know the light of Your truth,

¹ Missale Romanum ex decreto sacrosancti Concilii Tridentini restitutum (...). Editio secunda juxta editionem typicam. Ratisbonae 1887, 152.

which is Christ, and be carried away from the clutch of his darknesses. By that same [Lord].”²

Year after year in all Roman Catholic churches throughout Christendom, this was the prayer in the so-called “Great Supplications” on Good Friday. Altogether the “Great Supplications” in the Good Friday liturgy in the Tridentine Missal contain nine intentions in prayer: for the Church, Pope, clergy, sovereign, applicants for baptism, all those in distress and danger, heretics, Jews and heathens.³ While in all other supplications the oration began with “let us pray—genuflect—arise” and a silent prayer, this formula and the genuflection were dropped from the supplication for Jews down to the liturgy reform of the Second Vatican Council, “so as not to rekindle the memory of the disgrace with which the Jews by genuflections mocked the savior around this hour.”⁴

Along with the absence of the introductory prayer, the formulations “pro perfidis Judaeis” (for the faithless Jews) and “judaicam perfidiam” (the perfidious Jews) were repeatedly criticized. Yet Rome consistently rejected a reformulation or fundamental reform of this supplication. After small changes in 1948 and 1955, John XXIII in 1959 introduced a significant turn when he eliminated the formulation “perfidis” in his first Good Friday liturgy as Pope.⁵ The missal of Paul VI in 1970 which was issued subsequent to the liturgical reforms of the Second Vaticanum finally brought a fundamental new version of the text, marked by great respect for the Jewish people.⁶ The modifications of 1948, 1955, 1959 and 1970 have been carefully registered and comprehensively studied by researchers in church and liturgy history.

In contrast with these changes in the liturgy, another decisive thrust in reform remains virtually unknown.⁷ In the interwar period, a phase when racist-motivated antisemitic agitation increased drastically in Germany and almost all other countries in Europe, there was also an attempt to introduce fundamental changes in the Good Friday Supplication for the Jews.

² Pius Bihlmeyer (ed.), *Das Meßbuch der heiligen Kirche lateinisch und deutsch mit liturgischen Erklärungen*, Freiburg im Breisgau ²⁵1923, 341.

³ See Wilm Sanders, “Die Karfreitagsfürbitten für die Juden vom Missale Pius’ V. zum Missale Pauls VI.,” in *Liturgisches Jahrbuch* 24 (1974), 240–248.

⁴ Ibid., 241.

⁵ Ibid., 244.

⁶ See Angelus Häussling, “Das Missale Pauls VI. Ein Zeugnis sucht Bezeugende”, in *Liturgisches Jahrbuch* 23 (1973), 143–158.

⁷ Marcel Poorthuis, Theo Salemink, *Op zoek naar de blauwe ruijter. Sophie van Leer. Een leven tussen avant-garde, jodendom en christendom (1892–1953)*, Nijmegen 2000.

The Early Partial Opening of the Vatican Archives

Until recently, the historical perception and examination of the correlation could only be viewed from the outside perspective. The inside perspective, the view of the discussions within the curia, however, was disguised. This, has fundamentally changed as a result of the surprising partial opening of the Vatican Archives.

Since 15 February 2003, documents from the pontificate of Pope Pius XI are accessible. The declaration of the Vatican Secret Archive and the Vatican State Secretariat note that in so doing, the Vatican is responding to requests by many scholars. This is indeed an unprecedented step for the Vatican. As a rule, it releases its archives to the scholarly public for the entire period of one or several pontificates. Up to now, only the documents down to 1922 were accessible. Even if the ordering and recording of documents from the pontificate of Pius XI is still not complete—this is expected to require three more years—researchers now have access to the holdings concerning Germany from the nunciatures of Berlin and Munich. The Vatican has also announced its intention to publish the extensive data on prisoners of war in World War II contained in the Vatican Secret Archive. In addition, it is noted that Pope John Paul II has expressed a wish for an early release of the documents on the relations between the Vatican and Germany from the period of Pius XII—i. e. 1939–1958—regarding this as a special priority, though no exact target date for this has been given. The reason for this unusual step given in the declaration is that the Pope has a special interest in new light on that particular period, encompassing World War II, the deportations of Jews and the tragedy of the Shoah. One factor, which undoubtedly also played a role in the background, is the failure of the joint Catholic-Jewish historians' commission appointed from 1998 to investigate the role of Pius XII in the war.

The Vatican has already released its archives to the scholarly public since January 1998. At that time, Pope John Paul II demanded to open the archives in the protective care of the "Congregazione per la Dottrina della Fede" (ACDF) to historical inquiry.⁸ In October that same

⁸ On the opening of the archive of the Congregazione per la Dottrina della Fede in January 1998, see *L'Apertura degli Archivi del Sant'Ufficio Romano* (Atti dei Convegni Lincei 142), Roma 1998; Joseph Kardinal Ratzinger, "Das Archiv der Glaubenskongregation. Überlegungen anlässlich seiner Öffnung 1998", in Hubert Wolf (ed.), *Inquisition*,

year, the Pope encouraged historians to pursue unprejudiced research and precise reconstruction, asserting: "The Catholic Magisterium cannot engage with full certainty in a moral act such as the request for forgiveness until it has acquired exact knowledge about the situation in those times." Intensive work in the ACDF has made it possible for the very first time to have a complete overview of all books pertaining to Judaica dealt with by the Index Congregation in the nineteenth and early twentieth century.⁹ This overview is the by-product of a large-

Index, Zensur. Wissenskulturen der Neuzeit im Widerstreit (Römische Inquisition und Indexkongregation 1), Paderborn 2001, 17–22.

⁹ First, most striking is the absence of books in Hebrew. Aside from a few exceptions, Jewish authors were spared being placed on the Index. Does it follow from this that in the eyes of the congregations, Judaism was not a particularly pressing problem? A list of the books discussed ordered by topics can provide a certain answer here. The predominant theme dealt with by the censors is clearly the historiography of ancient Israel, along with Biblical exegesis and philological works. Second, noteworthy is another fact. Beginning in the eighteenth century, more and more literary works dealing with Judaism and Jewish themes appeared in the files of the Index Congregation. These are often associated with the names of famous authors such as George Sand, Honore de Balzac and others. In this period and category, we also find the indexing of Eugene Sue's (in)famous *The Wandering Jew*: the topos of the "wandering Jew" and the related tradition-rich figure of Judas Iscariot are a popular theme in literary fiction. Correspondingly, they appear quite often in the files. As my associate Tobias Lagatz was able to demonstrate, the mythologem of the "wandering Jew" undergoes a reinterpretation in the nineteenth century, into the symbol of progress and a tragic starry-eyed idealist. Third, progress and world improvement are also a central focus in those books that portray Freemasonry as a movement drawing its inspiration from the wellspring of Jewish teaching and doctrine. Judaism appears in this connection as the basis of a religion of humanity, clearly differentiated from contemporary Christianity. Here too it seems obvious that the Catholic Magisterium felt it had to step in and take action. Moreover there are several authors dealing with diverse Jewish themes who came into conflict with the Roman censors. One was Francois Vercruyesse who, writing under the name of Joseph de Félicité had two of his books placed on the Index and is considered by some as a precursor of Zionism. His millenarian ideas are shared by an author, the Chilean Jesuit Manuel Lacunza, whose nom de plume Juan Josaphat Ben-Ezra sounds as though he had intended to style himself as Jewish. Another interesting figure vehemently discussed by his contemporaries was Pullido Fernandez, a professor at the University of Salamanca, who proposed that the expulsion edict of 1492 be rescinded. He argued that the resulting return of Jewish know-how and capital to Spain could then prove a boon to the Spanish state and its fundamental redevelopment. At the opposite end of the spectrum from such pragmatism are the mystical speculations of Fabre d'Olivet, who attempts to distill from Hebrew a primal language, inspired by God. There are many more such examples. Important to note is the fact that at least in the Index Congregation, there were but few cases that were directed immediately against Jews and Judaism. Rather, certain currents were condemned in which Jews and Judaism had some more fortuitous involvement. In the Index Congregation, there were only rarely judicial proceedings that dealt with Judaism as such. Nonetheless, on the basis of the varied array of topics in the books examined, it seems fruitful for inquiry to have a probing look at these documents as well.

scale research project at the University of Münster, which I am engaged in assisted by several co-workers.¹⁰ Its aim is to produce a comprehensive prosopographic compendium on all members, consultants, qualifiers and relators of the Inquisition and Index Congregation, providing reliable data on their biographical-cultural background and exact information on the activities of the decision-makers. In addition, a kind of inventory on Roman book censorship is currently being assembled, including in particular those cases no one is aware of because the texts involved were never actually forbidden.

The partial opening also revealed highly interesting documents from the years 1922–1939 in the archive of the Index Congregation and Inquisition. The 83 fascicles, which are now accessible to scholars, deal from a dogmatic viewpoint with the topics National Socialism, racism and other totalitarian ideologies of the twentieth century and stem from the series “Censura librorum” (book censorship) and “Rerum variarum” (diverse questions). An especially extensive “busta speciale” has the characteristic title “On Whether Racism, Nationalism, Totalitarianism and Communism Should or Should Not be Condemned by a Ceremonial Papal Act.” It mainly dealt with the examination of Hitler’s “Mein Kampf” as well as with the important writings by Stalin und Lenin.¹¹

There is also an extensive file on the attempt to introduce fundamental changes in the Good Friday Supplication for the Jews in the archives of the Holy Office.¹² The reform attempt of 1928 was initiated by the “Amici Israel” and its president, Abbot Benedict Gariador OSB.¹³ That

¹⁰ The project is a long-term initiative supported by the German Research Council (DFG). Information on the project and the data base now being created can be found at www.buchzensur.de.

¹¹ A detailed German version about this will appear in *Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte*, January 2005.

¹² See on this the file in the “Archivio della Congregazione per la Dottrina della Fede” (ACDF) encompassing four fascicles and 70 individual pieces from the series “Rerum variarum”, inventory number RV 1928 N° 2 “Il Comitato Centrale degli Amici d’Israel domanda che sia riformata la preghiera per gli Ebrei che si legge nella liturgia del Venerdì Santo”. Of the 70 individual documents, 57 have been made accessible to date. The others, dated after 1939, continued to fall under the ban. Yet their content, based on a short inventory of the file, has at best only an indirect connection with the topics of interest here.

¹³ According to a request of 2 January 1928, the concepts “perfidis” and “perfidiam” are to be eliminated because they had a certain “hateful” element which did not correspond to the original intention of the Church in connection with the prayer. In addition, in the supplication for the Jews and the other eight supplications, the formula “Oremus—Flectamus genua—Levate” should be reinserted; it was not until the sixteenth century that it was removed “ex sensu antisemitico”. ACDF, RV 1928 N° 2, Nr. 2, letter from Abbot Gariador and Asseldonk to Pius XI, 2 January 1928.

is especially interesting, since this reform did not only involve liturgical fine points: its authors, the Roman dicasteries involved, namely the Ritual Congregation and the Holy Office, and Pope Pius XI himself, expressly embedded it within the explosive context of “the Catholic Church and antisemitism”.¹⁴

The “Amici Israel”

The “Amici Israel” were an association of priests founded in Rome on 24 January 1926. Its president was the abbot Benedict Gariador OSB, its secretary Anton van Asseldonk. But the initiative for its founding did not stem from a priest, although only clerics could become members, but from a Jewish convert by the name of Sophie Franziska van Leer. She lived in Munich under the spiritual direction of Cardinal Michael Faulhaber, the most prominent German member of the Amici Israel. According to its “Status Operis”, it had a membership that included worldwide 19 cardinals, 278 (arch)bishops and some 3,000 priests.¹⁵

In the small brochure *Pax super Israel*¹⁶, which appeared with the imprimatur of the Roman vice-regent Giuseppe Palica, the Friends of Israel presented their program. The goal was Jewish-Catholic reconciliation. The members of this association were to dedicate themselves with special “affection” to the people of Israel. Along with prayer for Israel, a principal aim was to awaken understanding for the Jews and their religion, especially through official proclamations of the Church. On the other hand, it was to be made easier for Jews to convert to Catholicism by abandoning elements in Catholic liturgy which sounded hostile to the Jews. Based on the Holy Scriptures, the Amici stressed:

¹⁴ On the Good Friday supplication and its impact on antisemitism, see also Urs Altermatt, *Katholizismus und Antisemitismus. Mentalitäten, Kontinuitäten, Ambivalenzen. Zur Kulturgeschichte der Schweiz 1918–1940*, Frauenfeld, Stuttgart, Wien 1999.

¹⁵ Figures according to the “Status Operis”, comprising two A4-size pages, issued by the committee of Amici Israel in the spring of 1928, registered in the files of the Holy Office; ACDF, RV 1928 N° 2, Nr. 22. In its first year of existence, the Amici Israel already counted 18 cardinals, 200 (arch)bishops and 2,000 priests as members; Marcel Poorthuis, Theo Salemink, *Op zoek naar de blauwe ruijter. Sophie van Leer. Een leven tussen avant-garde, jodendom en christendom (1892–1953)*, Nijmegen 2000, 267.

¹⁶ See the programmatic statement *Pax super Israel*, Rom 1927/28. The small volume can be found in ACDF, RV 1928 N° 2, Nr. 16/2 along with the summary of a document which an associate of the Holy Office prepared for the consultations of the Congregation; ACDF, RV 1928 N° 2, Nr. 17.

1. The primacy of Divine Love for Israel; 2. The exalted sign of this love in Christ's incarnation and mission; 3. The continuance of this love, even more its intensification in the fact of the death of Christ; 4. The proof of this love in the behavior and acts of the apostles. All members of the Amici had to refrain from any general criticism of the Jews, as expressed in formulations such as "their only God is money". They could no longer speak of the Jews as a "people of the murderers of God", the "impossibility of Jewish conversion", the "unbelievable tales about Jews, especially the so-called ritual murder". Every form of antisemitism had to be scrupulously avoided. Rather, it was to be struggled against and rooted out.

The Amici received special support from Cardinal Faulhaber, who facilitated a link with the Ludwig-Missionsverein in Munich.¹⁷ Faulhaber, as a former professor for exegesis of the Old Testament in the Catholic Theological Faculty of the Imperial University Strassburg, was naturally especially familiar with Jewish topics. This is why he promised Asseldonk not only to publicize the association by distributing more than 100 copies of *Pax super Israel*, and also let it be known that in his training of clerics, he would stress the Old Testament more, and warn the priests in his diocese to avoid frivolous antisemitic allusions and overtones in their sermons.

In the framework of the Munich Homiletic Course of October 1927, the cardinal fulfilled this promise. His theses were immediately summarized by the Amici Israel and distributed in leaflet form around the world. As a historically-minded Old Testament scholar, he warned the priests at the pulpit: if you take the admonitions of the prophets, uttered in a very particular historical situation, and then attempt to apply this criticism to the people of Israel today and to the Jews in general, all you will do is to provoke "Pharisaism" among the audience of believers. He stressed that the Church had taken over decisive elements from the Old Covenant, such as the decalogue, the psalms and the Messianic prophecies, and that "we as Christians owe it a debt of gratitude". It was really much too easy, Faulhaber emphasized, to preach "Dominum crucifixerunt Judaei"! in a sermon. It should not be forgotten, he argued, that the Lamb of God took upon itself not only the sins of the whole world, but also of our own people. Alluding to Romans 9–11, Faulhaber reminded readers it is a fact of revelation that

¹⁷ See on this Archepiscopal Archive, Munich, Faulhaber papers 6482.

Israel will be saved and redeemed. There is great significance in the fact that Christ, at the hour of redemption, revealed himself to the world as the King of the Jews. Cardinal Faulhaber refers specifically to the Amici Israel and their mission: this is why “we are preparing this hour of grace through prayer. To this end, we are dedicated to disseminating the writings of the Amici Israel.”¹⁸

In the context of these efforts, Abbot Gariador asked Pope Pius XI on 2 January 1928 to eliminate the words “perfidis” and “perfidiam” in the Good Friday Supplication for the Jews, because they harbored a connotation of “something hateful and hated”. This was not in keeping with the original intention of the Church in this prayer. In addition, he asked that the formula “Oremus—Flectamus genua—Levate” be included in the supplication for the Jews and the other eight supplications. This formula had been removed at a quite late stage, in the sixteenth century, for antisemitic reasons (“ex sensu antisemitico”). He included a corresponding supplication sheet.¹⁹

Pius XI passed this request on to the competent congregation, which in turn sent it on to its Liturgical Commission. Ildefons Schuster OSB, Abbot of the Benedictine monastery St. Paul Outside the Walls and since 1914 consultant for the Liturgical Commission,²⁰ was given the task of dealing with this matter.

The Memorandum of Himmelreich and Asseldonk—The Yes of the Ritual Congregation

The files of the Ritual Congregation, a copy of which was deposited with the Holy Office, contain a detailed memorandum of the Amici Israel which supports the proposal for reform with historical arguments.²¹

¹⁸ Joh. B. Schauer (ed.), *Der homiletische Kurs in München 1927. Vorträge und Verhandlungen*, München 1927.

¹⁹ ACDF, RV 1928 N° 2, Nr. 2, letter from Abbot Gariador and Asseldonk to Pius XI, 2 January 1928.

²⁰ Ildefons Schuster (1880–1954), abbot of the Benedictine monastery St. Paul Outside the Walls, since 1914 consultant for the Liturgical Commission of the Ritual Congregation. Ennio Apeciti, *Ciò che conta è amare. Vita del beato Cardinale Alfredo Ildefonso Schuster*, Milano [Centro Ambrosiano] 1996; Giorgio Basadonna, *Cardinal Schuster. Un monaco vescovo nella dinamica Milano* (Testimoni di ieri e di oggi 18), Milano [Paoline] 1996.

²¹ ACDF, RV 1928 N° 2, Nr. 6, Promemoria explicative, 5 pp. Typescript, registered by the Holy Office, 27 January 1928.

This memorandum deals in discriminating detail with the two controversial elements of the Good Friday supplication which, “when incorrectly explained, appear to imbue the entire supplication with a false meaning.” Initially, it deals with the concept “perfidus”. The authors concede that this formulation, “so harsh to our ears”, has been contained in all liturgical codices, from the oldest period down to the present. Hence, there is no basis in liturgical history which might support a reform. So the argument shifts to the field of philology: “perhaps this expression, so harsh to our own ears, did not have this grating edge of severity when first formulated.” According to the *Lexicon Totius Latinitatis*, “perfidiosus” differs from “perfidus” as “ebriosus” differs from “ebrio,” i.e. “given to drink” vs. “intoxicated”. “[...] ‘Perfidus’ is a person who violates his faith several times, while ‘perfidiosus’ is an individual who lacks all faith. In line with this explanation, we must “conclude that the denotation of this concept underwent substantial change, because the word ‘perfidus’, a loan word in almost all modern languages, appears to express to a certain extent a total depravity.”

The authors then conclude:

It appears improbable that the Mother Ecclesia wished to accord such a caustic meaning to this concept when they introduced it to the Holy Liturgy. Yet it is clear from current experience that when Christians seek arguments on behalf of antisemitism, they almost always cite this formulation first. And because the Church did not intend such severity, and the supplication has taken on its severe connotation only because of the shift in meaning of the concepts “perfidus” and “perfidia”, it is our emphatic wish that these concepts be either totally abandoned or altered for the better.

A possible solution proposed was to replace “perfidiam Judaicam” by “plebem Judaicam”.

Then the memorandum turns to the missing formula “Oremus—Flectamus genua—Levate”, originally contained in all the Good Friday supplications, including that for the Jews. Since the Carolingian period, a change had been crystallizing here, but its reasons are not completely clear. The formula did not disappear definitively until the Tridentine Missal of 1570.

Since that time, liturgists have been attempting to fathom the mysterious reason for the difference between the supplication for the Jews and the other Good Friday supplications, stating that in the night of the Passion, the Jews had dealt shamefully with the Lord Jesus, mocking him by genuflection. And because of this mockery, Christians were admonished

not to perform genuflection in the prayer for the Jews. But this contradicts the truth of the Gospels. There is no way the Jews can be accused of having mocked Jesus that night by a scornful act of genuflection. That is reported solely by the Roman soldiers guarding Jesus in his dungeon.

In a letter to the secretary of the Ritual Congregation Angelo Mariani dated 16 January 1928 the abbot Schuster fulfilled his role as consulting expert with Spartan brevity. He seconded without reservation the arguments of the memorandum, adding his own “modest viewpoint”, the wish for a reworking of the text of the Good Friday supplication. The historical and philological arguments advanced by the *Amici Israel* had evidently been persuasive, totally convincing this liturgical expert. Four days later, on 20 January 1928, he returned to this matter in a further letter to Mariani. “The tripartite proposal regarding the replacement of the word ‘perfidis’, the ‘Oremus’ and genuflection seems to me fully justified by the classical tradition of Roman liturgy. Basically, it is a matter of eliminating a late and superstitious custom.”²²

In a summary with the heading “Variazioni”, the Liturgical Commission listed once more the important facts in liturgical history pertaining to this matter:²³

1. The concept “perfidiam” is contained in all missals and prayer books.

2. The genuflection was not eliminated until the ninth century, initially in non-Roman liturgies.

3. The “Oremus” began to be gradually eliminated in part from the second half of the thirteenth century. But it is contained in the Paris and Venice missals of the sixteenth and seventeenth century, the last example of which is an edition of 1676.

On 18 January 1928, the Liturgical Commission of the Ritual Congregation²⁴ decided to follow the reform suggestion of the *Amici Israel* and to change the Good Friday supplication accordingly.

²² ACDF, RV 1928 N° 2, Nr. 9.

²³ ACDF, RV 1928 N° 2, Nr. 8, *Variazioni*, sent as Appendix 2 by the Ritual congregation to the Holy Office and registered there on 27 January.

²⁴ On the Ritual Congregation, see Niccolò del Re, *La Curia Romana. Lineamenti storico-giuridici*, Città del Vaticano ⁴1998, 332–337.

The Expert Opinion of Sales—The No of the Holy Office

Yet before publishing the liturgical reform, the Ritual Congregation had to obtain the consent of the Holy Office.²⁵ There the tables would subsequently be turned both for the projected reform—and for the association of the Amici Israel. The drama began to unfold when the person appointed to prepare the necessary expert opinion was not some mere consultant or other, but the eminent papal court theologian Marco Sales OP, who belonged to the Suprema ex officio and was considered the spokesman of the Holy Father in the Congregation.

As usual, the expert initially proceeded to summarize the previous course of the case for the consultants and cardinals.²⁶ Sales commented on the initiative by Amici Israel and the memorandum, reproduced the decision by the Ritual Congregation including the old and new revised prayer texts, and then laid out his own views.

In a dogmatic-doctrinal perspective, the Dominican felt obliged to conclude that “nihil obstat” in the way of the desired reform: “If the question under consideration is viewed solely from the vantage of doctrine and faith (sotto l’aspetto dottrinale e della fede), there can be no objection.”

But already in the second sentence of his expert opinion, Sales retreated to another plane, that of “convenienza”: if one asks about the utility of the reform, “I am of the modest opinion that there is none.” The Dominican gives the following principal reasons:

1. In his eyes, the Amici Israel are a “cosa privata”. “It would be an endless process were one to start changing the time-honored sacred liturgy, which goes back to the classical era, by altering it to conform to the simple request coming from one or another private association.”

2. He points emphatically to the philological considerations in the memorandum, namely the distinction between “perfidus” and “perfidiosus”. He is certain that “‘perfide’ generally denotes an individual who breaks his word or an agreement that has been concluded”, especially when some behavior has become habitual. “But that is precisely what God accuses the Jews of in Scripture.” To support his position, Sales cites three passages from the Old Testament, and concludes: „It is

²⁵ ACDF, RV 1928 N° 2, Nr. 1, the secretary of the Ritual Congregation Mariani to the assessor of the Holy Office, Nicolo Canali, 25 January 1928.

²⁶ The expert opinion is preserved in two identical versions, one handwritten and the other a typescript; ACDF, RV 1928 N° 2, Nr. 15. The following according to this.

clear that only the Jews had a pact with God and a covenant. And that it was only the Jews who continually violated this pact, and only they continue to do so. So it should come as no surprise that consequently they are labeled as ‘perfidi’, and that the expression ‘perfidia Iudaica’ is used to distinguish them from the heathens.“

3. The papal court theologian does not recognize the liturgical-historical distinctions of the Ritual Congregation regarding the removal of the genuflection and “Oremus” and the inclusion of “perfidis” and “perfida”. Without any differentiation whatsoever, he tersely notes that all three elements in the liturgy of Holy Week go back to a “respected and honored antiquity” (rispettabile antichità), and are thus not readily amenable to reform.

4. Finally, the Jews had expressly accepted responsibility for the crucifixion of Christ, inter alia in the formulation in Matthew (27:25), “his blood be upon us and upon our children.” For that reason, Sales saw no plausible basis why the change proposed by the Amici should be accepted.

Consequently, Sales, in “profound obsequiousness”, as the closing formula of a consultants’ opinion of the Holy Office phrased it at the time, concluded: “Nihil esse innovandum”—nothing should be altered.

The Inquisition deals with the Amici Israel

However, things for the Amici took a turn for the worse: their request for a reform of the Good Friday supplication and the passing on of this matter from the Ritual Congregation to the Holy Office brought the priests’ association itself to the special attention of the highest guardians of the Catholic faith. Of course, any measures against the Amici were an extremely delicate matter, given the membership of cardinals and bishops in their eminent ranks.

A printed invitation to the second anniversary of the founding of their association sent to members triggered a major confrontation with the Amici. While consultations regarding the Good Friday supplication were still in progress, the secretary of the Holy Office, Cardinal Merry del Val, himself a member of the Amici, was also sent such an invitation.

The integrationalist cardinal appears to have originally regarded the Amici Israel as a pious fraternity exclusively devoted to praying for the conversion of the Jews to Christianity. The proposal for

liturgical reform and the pro-Zionist program of the planned annual meeting piqued his anger against the organization. Probably in response to his initiative, the Roman vicariate proceeded to prohibit the annual meaning. At the same time, the cardinal initiated an investigation of the 67–page brochure *Pax super Israel*, from which a list of incorrect and “bad-sounding” statements was excerpted.²⁷

On this basis, in their session on 27 February 1928, the consultants of the Holy Office, following the opinion of Sales, rejected not only the reform of the Good Friday supplication, but after examining a list of supposedly heretical statements in the brochure *Pax super Israel*, they demanded that the association be dissolved.²⁸

The cardinals dealt with this topic in the Wednesday session (Feria IV) on 7 March 1928. No less eminent a figure than Cardinal State Secretary Merry de Val presented a detailed ruling.²⁹ His opinion had three sections.

Initially, he pointed to the reform proposal of the “so-called [‘così detti’] friends of Israel” as “totally unacceptable, yes even absurd”. The Good Friday supplication was a particularly ancient rite of the Church which simply could not be broached as a topic for discussion. The liturgy has been “inspired and sanctified” over centuries, expressing the disgust for the treason and rebellion of the Chosen People, faithless murders of God (“popolo eletto fedifrago e deicida”). In the eyes of the secretary of the Holy Office, the entire body of teachings of Scripture and the doctrine of the Church fathers on the Jews is mirrored and concentrated in liturgy. He views the scene in the passion in Matthew as a summary of these teachings: when Pilate is prepared to release Jesus but the Jews demand the release of Barrabas, and as Pilate washes his hands in innocence, the entire people calls out: “His blood be upon us and upon our children”(Matt. 27:25).

For the individual Jewish believer, there was always a door open to convert to Catholicism. But the Good Friday supplication was not about him. It was about the “ever stubborn Jewish people, burdened with the curse because as a people it was fundamentally prepared to accept responsibility for having shed the blood of the most Holy of Holies.” There are definite perceptible allusions here to a racist

²⁷ ACDF, RV 1928 N° 2, Nr. 16/2.

²⁸ ACDF, RV 1928 N° 2, Nr. 19, Consultors assembly, Feria II^a, 27 February 1928.

²⁹ ACDF, RV 1928 N° 2, Nr. 20, votum of the Cardinal Secretary Merry del Val for the Cardinal Plenary Feria IV^a, 7 March 1928. The following from there.

motivation underlying the interpretation. These would become more pronounced when the matter of present-day “ebraismo” was considered. Comments by the Apostle Paul in the Letter to the Romans on Israel’s disobedience, culminating in the quote from Isaiah “All day long I stretched out my hands to a disobedient and contentious people” (Rom. 10:21), form the point of departure for Merry del Val’s argumentation: “That day is still with us. Hebrewism with all its sects inspired by the Talmud is still opposed in a perfidious fashion to Christianity. And today after the War, it is rising up more than ever before, attempting to rebuild the Kingdom of Israel, in opposition to Christ and His Church.”

Then the secretary directs a rhetorical question to the Amici Israel, interrogating their optimistic analysis of the present, according to which signs were increasing for an immediate change in Israel’s ways. He asks: “where is this purported beginning of repentance of the Jewish people”? And answers: “I don’t wish that the Amici Israel stumble unawares into the trap concocted by the same Jews who everywhere are busy penetrating into modern society, attempting by all possible means to confound the memory of their history, exploiting the trusting nature of the Christians.” In regard to the reform initiative, Merry del Val concludes that he is totally against any change in or elimination of the Good Friday prayer and its associated ritual. He thus responds to the request of the Ritual Congregation with an emphatic “negative et amplius”.

The object of the secondary part of the votum is the association itself. Merry del Val considers its principles and views as objectionable and scandalous (“riprovevole e dannosa”). In his eyes, “this association belongs more or less in the framework of interfaith cooperation and religious indifference.” Here he invokes two decisive anti-modernist buzz words. In the following section, the cardinal attacks the fundamental principles of the Amici Israel as formulated in their brochure *Pax super Israel*. “They assert that the apostles did not call the Jewish people ‘murderers of God’, while Peter publicly stated: ‘The author of life you put to death, but God raised him from the dead; of this we are witnesses’ (Acts 3:15). One mustn’t speak of the ritual crimes perpetrated by Jewish sects, of their union with Freemasonry, or of their usury, which they practice on a grand scale against the Christians, and so on and so forth.” Yet in his view, all this is abundantly evident. Merry del Val’s formulations here bear clearly recognizable antisemitic features.

The Cardinal Secretary of the Holy Office subsequently argued that the *Amici Israel* be dissolved or limited to a simple prayer association for the conversion of the Jews. He further demanded that previous instructions to the members be retracted and the brochure *Pax super Israel* be withdrawn from circulation.

In the closing third section of his opinion, the expert of the Ritual Congregation, Abbot Schuster, also came under fire, a discursive move that was probably also relatively rare in the practice of the Holy Office. Merry del Val endorsed the need for a “grave admonition” of the Benedictine Schuster, “because he was prepared, goaded to the extreme, to eliminate the supposed element of ‘superstition’ from a ritual of the Holy Church.”

In their decision of 7 March 1928, still in the absence of the Pope, the cardinals of the Suprema Congregatio largely followed the ruling of the assembly of consultors and the Cardinal Secretary Merry de Val:

1. Any reform of the Good Friday supplication is rejected; a corresponding instruction is issued for the Ritual Congregation;
2. The *Amici Israel* should be dissolved or at least demoted to the level of a simple community of prayer. In addition, steps must be taken to withdraw the dangerous brochures of the “Friends” from circulation;
3. The authors of the petition, namely Abbot Gariador OSB, Kreuzherr van Asseldonk and Pater Letus Himmelreich OFM as well as Abbot Schuster should be summoned to the Holy Office and officially admonished.³⁰

The Final Word of Pope Pius XI

In the customary audience for the assessor of the Holy Office the following day, Pope Pius XI dealt in detail with the topic, because without his agreement, no decision of the Holy Office on the matter would be legally binding. In contrast with the otherwise generally laconic reports on such papal audiences, the protocol in this case is quite extensive.

The protocol of the audience with the Pope held the following day shows how actively involved Pius XI was in this matter, which is not surprising given the prominence of many members of the

³⁰ ACDF, RV 1928 N° 2, Nr. 21, protocol of the session of the Cardinal’s Congregation, Feria IV^a, 7 March 1928.

Amici Israel.³¹ “His Holiness took a personal interest in the entire question, listened attentively to the reading of the opinion of the Cardinal Secretary and himself examined the incriminated opusculum of the committee.” During the audience, Pius XI stated that this was a grave question which touched on matters of faith, and had to be corrected. For that reason, he was in fundamental agreement with the resolution proposed by the plenum of cardinals from the previous day. However, he added numerous points to make its formulation more precise; these significantly amplified and intensified the judgment:

1. Pius XI was not content with a mere withdrawal of the request by the Amici Israel of a reform of the Good Friday supplication—a possibility which the proposal by the cardinals of the Holy Office evidently held out as option. Rather, its request was to be expressly rejected and repudiated by the Church (“non solum est recipienda, sed reprobanda”). Any change in liturgical practice was rejected. It was the wish of the Pope that this decision be communicated immediately (“senza ritardo”) to the Ritual Congregation, which was favorably disposed toward the reform proposal.

2. In regard to the committee of the Amici Israel, “the Holy Father, after due consideration and taking into account the alarming, mistaken and dangerous turn which the committee in its deliberations has taken in this matter [...] has decided to disband this body.” Pius XI was especially upset about the revamping of the prayer fraternity for the conversion of the Jews into a group active in church politics, and which had “strayed onto false terrain”. But it was completely clear to him that his decisions would provoke negative reactions in the public, exposing the Holy See to charges of antisemitism. For that reason, Pius XI desired a decree that was very carefully formulated. It was to express the fact that the Catholic Church had always rejected any form of antisemitism and “had always prayed for the conversion of the Jews. But that it could not in any case countenance anything in contradiction with the universal liturgical tradition and the doctrines of the Church”, even if they sprang from “a holy and praiseworthy intention”. Accordingly, the Pope ordered the dissolution of the entire organization of the Amici Israel and a ban on the distribution of all its literature. After publication of the decree, the presidium of the Holy Office was to be convened.

³¹ ACDF, RV 1928 N° 2, Nr. 21^{bis}, protocol of the audience of the assessor with the Pope, 8 March 1928. The following from there.

3. The Pope was especially angered by the behavior of Abbot Schuster, who was also to be summoned to the Holy Office and admonished. Schuster was to justify his behavior regarding the expert opinion which he had submitted to the Ritual Congregation in writing “in such a serious form, insulting to the Church”.

4. Finally, the Pope stated that he was “shaken” and “impressed” by the view articulated by Cardinal Secretary Merry del Val that the Jews themselves had a hand in the establishment of the *Amici Israel*, and that the entire movement was “under the covert influence of those same Jews”.

In the following days, the Pope interfered repeatedly in the editing of the decree, demanding new drafts again and again. Two reasons were probably decisive for this behavior: 1. The disbanding of the association affected some 19 cardinals, almost 300 bishops and 3,000 priests; 2. The main reason there was so much struggle over and care in the wording of the text of the decree was to avoid the impression that the disbanding of the *Amici Israel*, the repudiation of its principles and writings and the rejection of a reform of the Good Friday supplication for the Jews were due to antisemitic motives. This is especially clear from a prefatory remark to the Italian draft of the decree which was available to the cardinals of the Holy Office for their consultations on 14 March 1928, in which it is stated: “La motivazione del Decreto è basata”—in the view of the Congregation—“sulla necessità di prevenire nei riguardi della S. Sede l'accusa di ‘antisemitismo’.” For that reason, a draft version was amended to include formulations meant to document the consistent support of the Church for the Jews over the course of their history.³²

The Dissolution Decree

Finally, the dissolution decree appeared dated 25 March 1928 in the “*Acta Apostolicae Sedis*”.³³ Significantly, the “*Decretum de consociatione vulgo ‘Amici Israel’ abolenda*” does not mention the real reason, or better the underlying cause behind the decision by the Holy Office to deal with the *Amici Israel*. There is no mention of its proposal for

³² ACDF, RV 1928 N° 2, Nr. 25, Italian version of the decree for the session on 14 March 1928.

³³ *Acta Apostolicae Sedes* 1928, 103 f.

reforming the Good Friday supplication for the Jews nor of the explicit rejection of this initiative by the Roman Inquisition and the Pope. Neither the believers nor the bishops could learn from the “*Commentarium officiale*”, the official paper of the Holy See,³⁴ that another Roman dicasterium, the Ritual Congregation and its Liturgical Commission, had clearly voiced their support for the proposal by the *Amici Israel*.

After the decree explicitly acknowledges the laudable aspect of the association, the apologia that follows contains a fundamental statement: for the first time, the doctrinal office of the Church rejects modern antisemitism. “The Catholic Church has become accustomed to praying for the Jewish people, to which Divine Promise was vouchsafed until the coming of Christ, and this despite its later blindness, indeed precisely because of this blindness. Moved by this love, the Apostolic See has protected this people against unjustified persecution. And just as it repudiates all envy and animosity among the nations, it despises all the more so any hatred of the people once chosen by God, which today is generally termed ‘antisemitism’.”

As the Good Friday supplication does not expressly appear in the text of the decree, and as the *Secretum Sancti Officii* was responsible for such deliberations, this so highly significant initiative in liturgical history has remained to date virtually unknown to researchers. The terse reference in the decree that the *Amici Israel* also espouse views in contradiction with Catholic liturgy remains so general that the actual thrust and intent of this criticism is unclear. Apparently both the Holy Office and the Pope were chary to name names.

It would probably have been difficult if not indeed impossible to explain convincingly to the public why the Catholic Church had always championed the Jewish people and repudiated all forms of antisemitism, as the decree explicitly states, but then was not prepared to eliminate formulations from the Catholic Good Friday liturgy which sounded antisemitic—even after the Ritual Congregation had deemed that to be a liturgically correct and defensible position and the expert of the Holy Office, through the Papal court theologian, had declared this unproblematic in the light of Church dogma.

³⁴ On the “*Acta Apostolicae Sedes*”, see the article by K. Hilgenreiner, in *LThK*¹ 1, 70 f.

The Differing Interpretations of the Decree in Public Opinion

The incident did however have a public postlude. The decree was given differing interpretations in public opinion. In an article in the *Jewish World* of 16 April 1928, the dissolution decree was sharply attacked. The Holy Office and Pius XI, who was presented with the article in his audience on 3 May 1928, evidently felt directly attacked by its content and tone. It was decided to send this edition of the *Jewish World* to Pater Enrico Rosa SJ, editor of the periodical *Civiltà Cattolica*.

Pater Rosa was to publish a refutation of the attacks in the article in a corresponding article in his periodical,³⁵ which at that time was the “mouthpiece of an intransigent ultramontanism”.³⁶ He fulfilled this request by the Holy Office and the Pope in a 10–page essay entitled “Il pericolo Giudaico e gli ‘Amici d’Israele’” in the May issue of *Civiltà*.³⁷ This article on the dissolution decree appeared, as the now accessible documents in the archive of the Index Congregation prove, at the very least with the approval of Pius XI, if not perhaps even as an official commentary. Pater Rosa made an almost classic distinction between two types of antisemitism: the “un-Christian type of antisemitism” and the “healthy assessment of the potential danger the Jews represent”. The decree expressly condemns racist antisemitism, which is nourished by “partisan political reasons or passions ... or material interests”. Yet the Church, Rosa stresses, should also protect itself “with the same enthusiasm from the other extreme, no less dangerous and in view of the semblance of goodness, more seductive”, an extreme which the Amici Israel had fallen prey to.

Yet it was stressed that the “danger emanating from the Jews” should not be underestimated. Since their emancipation, the Jews had become “bold and powerful”, they dominated vast sectors of the economy. In trade, industry and finance, they even had achieved “dictatorial power”, and had been able to establish their “hegemony in many sectors of public life”. In addition, Rosa levels a broad incriminating generalization at the Jews, accusing them of being the veritable

³⁵ ACDF, RV 1928 N° 2, Nr. 48. A copy of the periodical is enclosed there.

³⁶ Giacomo Martina, Art. “Civiltà Cattolica”, in LThK³ 2, 1208. On this biweekly periodical of the Italian Jesuits which took a position against liberalism and expressed loyalty to the Pope precisely at the time the Syllabus was published, see also L. Koch, Art. “La Civiltà Cattolica”, in LThK¹ 2, 973.

³⁷ Enrico Rosa, “Il pericolo Giudaico e gli ‘Amici d’Israele’”, in *Civiltà Cattolica* 1928, Vol. 2, 335–344. The following from there.

wire-pullers behind all revolutions in the modern period. As the actual heads of occult sects, they were drafting plans for world domination. Here then the specter is conjured of a theory of a Jewish-Freemason-Bolshevik world conspiracy.

For the Jesuit Rosa, the decree for dissolution of the association clearly condemns racist antisemitism. Yet his own arguments regarding the “Jewish danger” could easily stem from the writings of the racist antisemites of his day. To that extent, the boundaries are blurred here between the “dangerous” modern form of biological antisemitism and the “good” form of Christian antisemitism.

The Struggle for a New Formulation of the Good Friday Supplication

However, Rosa’s interpretations and the decree on dissolution would be overtaken by the forward march of history. What Pius XI rejected in 1928 was implemented 30 years later in 1959 by his successor John XXIII during the Good Friday liturgy in St. Peter’s, and passed on as a directive for the world Church the following year. In the prayer’s introduction, the word ‘perfidis’ was eliminated. In the oration, “judaicam perfidiam” was replaced by the simple word “judaeos”, thus adopting the exact wording of the *Amici* for the prayer. But at that time, the Good Friday supplication still contained a prayer for the conversion of the Jews. The decisive breakthrough in relations between Jews and Catholics did not come until the Second Vatican Council and the new missal of 1970.

The supplication for the Jewish people comes in sixth place between the supplications for the unity of Christendom and the prayer for all those who do not believe in Christ. The high opinion of the Jews becomes clear in the new formulation of the Good Friday supplication, valid down to the present day. It reads:

Let us also pray for the Jews to whom God, our Lord, first spoke his word. May he preserve them in faithfulness to His covenant and in love for His name. So that that may reach the goal to which his guidance would lead them. Bend your knees—silence—rise up. Almighty and eternal God, you gave Abraham and his children Your promise. Hear the prayer of Your Church for the people which you chose first as your possession: give so that it might come to the fullness of redemption. We supplicate You through Christ, our Lord.³⁸

³⁸ Messbuch. Die Feier der heiligen Messe. Für die Bistümer des deutschen Sprachgebietes. Teil I: Die Sonn- und Feiertage deutsch und lateinisch. Die Karwoche deutsch. Einsiedeln 1975, [48].

In the Holy Year 2000, in his great Confession of Guilt and Supplication for Forgiveness, Pope John Paul II asked for forgiveness for the sins which many Catholics committed “against the People of the Covenant and the benedictions”. The Pope had in mind here the “sufferings [...] inflicted on the people of Israel in history”.³⁹ Perhaps he was also thinking in this historical context of the Good Friday supplication in the missal of 1570 and the failed reforms of 1928.

Conclusion

The request for forgiveness by the Pope underscores once again just how problematic the relation between Catholicism and Judaism has been down through the centuries. The opening of the archive of the Roman Inquisition in 1998 and the early opening of central holdings of the pontificate of Pius XI in 2003 permit a new approach, founded on primary sources, to this entire complex. To be fixated here on the (supposed) “silence” of Pius XII and the Holocaust is unproductive in terms of the broader picture. Rather, it is necessary to explore the “longue durée” of this relation down through history.

The 1928 reform initiative for the Good Friday Supplication for the Jews as described here, virtually unknown to date, is part of the first fruits of research into the new source materials opened up by Pope John Paul. It does not claim to provide a final and definitive answer to the questions raised. But it can highlight important insights for the broader topic as a whole:

First, the general criticism voiced by Daniel Goldhagen that the Catholics and Catholic Church were antisemitic is shown to be untenable in this light.⁴⁰ The *Amici Israel* and their program prove quite the opposite: they reflect a philosemitism or a mode of anti-antisemitism. The exploration and evaluation of the files will doubtless shed new light on other expressly pro-Jewish groups and personalities in the Church and curia.

³⁹ “Verzeihen ist Voraussetzung zur Versöhnung. Inständiges Gebet und besinnliche Stille”, in *Osservatore Romano* (German edition), No. 11, 17 March 2000.

⁴⁰ Daniel Goldhagen, *A Moral Reckoning. The Role of the Catholic Church in the Holocaust and Its Unfulfilled Duty of Repair*, London 2002.

Second, racially based antisemitism was clearly condemned in doctrinal terms in the decree disbanding the Amici. That was followed in 1934 by the indexing of the National Socialist programmatic text by Alfred Rosenberg, *Der Mythos des 20. Jahrhunderts*. The 1937 encyclical "With Burning Anxiety" ("Mit brennender Sorge") contains formulations that can also be interpreted in this direction. To date we still cannot answer the question why Pius XI ordered a ban on Hitler's *Mein Kampf* and the preparation of a "Syllabus errorum" against racism, nationalism and fascism, but was reluctant to publish the finished text in 1937. Nor can we determine why the anti-racism encyclical of 1938 likewise was never published.

Third, Catholic authors constantly refer to the exonerating circumstance that the Pope and curia had been obliged to take the political situation, concordat partners and the legitimate political authorities into careful consideration, and were for that reason forced to pursue a cautious and tactical approach. This argument cannot apply to the reform of the Good Friday supplication in 1928. What after all was solely and exclusively under the authority of the Catholic Church if not indeed its own liturgy? In this connection, there was no need to take third parties into account. It would have been possible here to speak out, making a decisive statement against antisemitism. By their behavior, the Holy Office and ultimately Pope Pius XI missed a historic chance. A reform of the Good Friday supplication for the Jews would have been a more unambiguous signal repudiating antisemitism than its condemnation in the decree on disbanding the Amici Israel. A worldwide change in Roman Catholic liturgy would perhaps have had more of an effect than any anti-racist encyclical or papal proclamation against antisemitism.

Fourth, in contemporary theological handbooks and in historical research, a distinction is made between racist antisemitism, doctrinally banned by the Church, and a legitimate form of ecclesiastic anti-Judaism. This distinction is also present in the internal documents of the Holy Office and in the officious commentary on the decree of dissolution in the periodical *Civiltà Cattolica*. However, formulations by Cardinal Merry del Val and Pater Rosa are ominously reminiscent of corresponding blanket criticisms of the Jews in Nazi propagandistic speeches, so that the distinction between "evil" antisemitism and "good" anti-Judaism is ultimately difficult to uphold. The transitions between the two appear to have been quite fluid.

Fifth, perhaps it is necessary to inquire in a more fundamental way into the function of antisemitism and anti-Judaism in the Roman curia.

The pronouncements by Merry del Val and Pater Rosa would appear at first glance to support the much-discussed thesis of Olaf Blaschke, who views antisemitism as a structural distinctive feature of Catholicism.⁴¹ But a closer look reveals that the specifically curial brand of anti-semitism represents only a facet in the fundamental positioning of Catholics or an influential, tone-setting group within the Catholic community vis-à-vis modernity. Merry del Val subsumes the efforts of the Amici Israel under the concepts of “interconfessional relations” and systematic “indifference”, in which he, as a leading anti-modernist under Pius X, was in fundamental struggle against—not only against the Christian labor unions in Germany, but the entire panoply of liberalism in the modern period. The school of thought we are dealing with here is the intransigent, ultramontane, anti-modern Catholicism which rose to a position of prominence in the Church from the nineteenth century, and was not overcome until the Second Vatican Council and its impact. Yet this school of thought does not represent the Catholic Church as such, but rather only a party within it. The events around the Amici Israel point up the extent to which, already in 1928, the power of this school of thought was in decline even inside the Roman curia and could only be secured by means of severe disciplinary measures. Over the middle term, the future belonged to those pursuing a more conciliatory tack, which included the Amici Israel.

Sixth, the textual development of the Good Friday supplication from 1928 to 1970 indicates just how fundamental the change has been in the relation between the Catholic Church and Judaism. The Holocaust was likely the principal catalyst in this dynamic process. If the Tridentine Missal had offered the “faithless Jews” only one possibility, that of conversion, the Amici Israel wished for their part to facilitate a “transpassio” from the Kingdom of the Father to the Kingdom of the Son. The missal of 1970 goes a significant step further, according the “people of the Old Covenant” their own independent path to salvation.

⁴¹ Olaf Blaschke, *Katholizismus und Antisemitismus im deutschen Kaiserreich* (Kritische Studien zur Geschichtswissenschaft 120), Göttingen 1997.

INDEX OF NAMES

- Aboab, Semuel 107, 112f., 150
 Agobard of Lyons 3–6
 Aguila, João de 111
 Ahumada, Diego de 28, 30
 Albizzi, Francesco 191
 Alcyonius, Petrus 89, 99, 106
 Alexander II 7
 Alexander VI 90
 Alfonso de Fonseca 97
 Alfonso de Ulloa 88
 Alfonso de Valladolid 82
 Alfonso de Zamora 82, 95, 98–100, 104, 106
 Antonelli, Giacomo 232f.
 Apollinaire, Guillaume 90
 Aquario, Mattia 29f., 33
 Arnaldo de Villanova 82
 Artom, Isaac 16
 Asseldonk, Gerardus Adrianus van 240f., 249
 Azcona, Tarsicio de 77f.
- Baer, Fritz 75f., 82
 Baldini, Ugo 166
 Balzac, Honoré de 238
 Bartolucci, G. 28
 Bastide 132
 Bellarmine, Robert 19f., 22, 31–34, 85, 167
 Benayahu, Meir 50, 52
 Benedict XIII 10, 82
 Benedict XIV 15
 Benedict XV 161
 Ben-Ezra, Juan Josaphat s. Lacunza, Manuel
 Berceo, Gonzalo de 13, 73
 Beretta, Francesco 158f.
 Bergenroth, Gustav Adolph 78
 Berliner, Abraham 20
 Blaschke, Olaf 257
 Bocarro, António 110, 121
- Bocarro, Fernando 118
 Bocarro, Gaspar 110, 138
 Bocarro, Manuel 149
 Bonfil, Robert 55
 Bonjorn, Bonet 84
 Boughner, Daniel 88
 Brakhage, Pamela 92f.
 Burchard of Worms 7
 Buxtorf, Johannes jun. 212
 Buxtorf, Johannes sen. 212
- Caffiero, Marina 202
 Cantera Burgos, Francisco 84, 92
 Cantimori, Delio 178
 Cardoso, Isaac 123f., 143f.
 Carpzov, Johann Benedict 83
 Castro, Benedictus de 116, 130–134, 136
 Castro, Rodrigo de 115
 Charles V, Roman Emperor 79, 100
 Chastel, Andre 85
 Christina, Queen of Sweden 146f.
 Chrysostom 5
 Cifres, Alejandro 158
 Clement IV 11
 Clement VII 92
 Clement VIII 20, 40f., 60, 64, 166
 Clement XIV 15, 209f.
 Colonna, Filippo 218–220
 Constabile, Paolo 31
 Costa, Duarte Nues da s. Curiel Jacob
 Costanzi, Giovanni Antonio 209
 Croce, Benedetto 90
 Curiel, Jacob 144, 146, 149
 Curtius, Joachim 132f.
- Delahaye, Hubert 16
 Delicado, Francisco 71f., 80, 90–93, 97–99, 102, 104

- Delmedigo, Yoseph Shlomo 115
 Deyermund, Allen David 84
 Diz, A. M. 73, 105
 Döllinger, Ignaz 16
 Dreyfus, Alfred 16

 Egidio da Viterbo 86, 92
 Emicho of Flonheim 12
 Enrique IV 77
 Esser, Thomas 163
 Eustachio, Giovanni Paolo 28, 30, 41
 Eymerich, Nicholas 11

 Fabri, Sisto 24, 31
 Farinelli, Arturo 88
 Faulhaber, Michael 240–242
 Ferdinand of Aragon 95, 144, 223
 Fernandez, Pullido 238
 Fieschi, Sinibaldo 9
 Fioghi de Monte Savino, Marco Fabiano 28
 Fiorentino, Adamantio 29
 Foley, Augusta 91
 Fonseca, Abraham de 139
 Font, Dov 85
 Fontes, Costa 93
 Fragnito, Gigliola 22, 165f.
 Francês, Miguel 111, 132, 135f.
 Franguello, Laurenzio 24
 Fumagalli, Pier Francesco 83

 Galilei, Galileo 117, 160
 Gamrat, Piotr 61
 Garcia y Garcia, Antonio 72
 Gariador, Benedict 239f., 242, 249
 Gaztámbide, G. 76
 Gerhard of Mainz 3
 Gerosolimitano, Domenico 41, 45f.
 Ginzburg, Carlo 72, 155
 Godman, Peter 167
 Goldhagen, Daniel 255
 Goldschmidt, Daniel 53f.
 Gomes Pimentel, Fernão 122
 Gomez, Custódio 122
 Gregory the Great 3, 5–7
 Gregory XIII 15, 19f., 22, 29, 33
 Gregory XVI 16

 Grendler, Paul 35
 Guevara, Antonio de 99–106
 Guldon, Zenon 59
 Guzmán, Francisco Domingo de s. Aboab, Semuel

 Halicz, Asher 61
 Halicz, Eliakim 61
 Halicz, François 61
 Halkin, François 16
 Ha-Lorqi, Joshua 84, 98
 Hermes, Georg 167
 Herrera, Pedro de 123
 Himmelreich, Letus 249
 Hitler, Adolf 17, 239, 256
 Hörnigk, Ludwig von 133
 Hrabanus Maurus 4
 Humbert of Romans 8f.

 Innocent III 3f., 8f.
 Innocent IV 9f.
 Innocent VIII 60
 Isabella of Castile 78, 95
 Israel, Menasseh ben 129f., 140, 142, 248
 Ivo of Chartres 7

 Jeronimo de Santa Fe 82
 John Paul II 17, 155, 161, 237, 255
 John XXII 11
 John XXIII 236, 254
 Joseph de Félicité s. Vercruyesse, Francois
 Juan el Viejo de Toledo 82
 Juderias, Julian 74
 Julius II 90
 Julius III 40

 Kalik, Judith 59
 Kertzer, David 202
 Kimhi, David 24f., 33
 Kobielski, Franciszek 66
 Kowalski, Waldemar 59
 Kuhn, Johannes von 160, 167

 Labani, Giuseppe 218–226, 228, 230–232
 Lacunza, Manuel 238

- Lenin, Wladimir Iljitsch 239
 Leo X 38, 60, 90
 Leo XIII 16, 155, 161
 Levi, Borach 174
 Lima, Diogo de 111, 144
 Llorente, Juan Antonio 73
 Lopez, Diego 29, 138
 Lusitanus, Abraham Zacutus 123,
 129f., 134, 142
 Lusitanus, Amatus 85
 Lusitanus, Philaletes 134
 Luzzatto, S. D. 52

 Maciejowski, Bernard 60, 62
 Malkiel, M. R. Lida de 88
 Manganetti, Giuseppe 226–229,
 231f.
 Marace, Abramo Jacob 222
 Marchiò, Gaetano 219, 222–225
 Mariani, Angelo 244
 Marino da Brescia, Marco 22, 29
 Marinus, Marcus 32
 Marti, Ramon 12, 21, 34, 81f.
 Martin IV 10f.
 McKay, Angus 91, 93
 Mello, Francisco de 127f., 142f.
 Menahem haRofe di Nola, Elia ben s.
 Eustachio, Giovanni Paolo
 Menéndez y Pelayo, Marcelino 74,
 81, 90f., 94
 Merry del Val, Raffaele 246,
 248f., 251, 256f.
 Mithridates, Flavius 103
 Modena, Renato de 41
 Mortara, Edgardo 15, 211, 228,
 231–234
 Motta, Manoel de 111, 144
 Müller, Johannes 148
 Mussaphia, Benjamin 116, 136

 Nahman, Moses ben 11
 Namias, Baruch s. Castro, Benedictus
 de
 Namias, David s. Castro, Rodrigo
 de
 Napoleon I 158, 170, 178, 215,
 219f.
 Nicholas III 10, 15, 81

 Nirenberg, David 72
 Nogent, Guibert de 13
 Norcia, Paolo da 28
 Nunes, António 110, 135, 149

 Oleśnicki, Mikolaj 63
 d'Olivet, Fabre 238

 Pablo of Burgos 82, 84
 Pacca, Bartolomeo 215–217, 220
 Palica, Giuseppe 240
 Parente, Fausto 28, 202
 Pastor, Ludwig von 155
 Paul 4f., 13–15, 92, 248
 Paul IV 10, 14f., 21, 158, 210
 Paul VI 163, 236
 Pedro IV of Aragon 11
 Peter the Venerable 13
 Pidal, Menéndez 84, 87
 Pilarczyk, Krzysztof 59
 Pina, Gregório de 112
 Pius IV 60, 64, 185, 210
 Pius V 15, 22, 28
 Pius VI 210
 Pius VII 215, 219–222
 Pius X 257
 Pius XI 15, 161, 237, 240, 242,
 249f., 253–256
 Pius XII 17, 237, 255
 Ponte, Oldradus da 10, 14
 Porges, N. 28
 Pulgar, Hernando del 72, 84, 92f.

 Quesada, Ladero 78

 Radziwiłł, Mikolaj Krzysztof 67
 Rashi 85
 Ratzinger, Joseph 17
 Ravid, Benjamin 55
 Raymond of Penafort 9
 Redondo, A. 100
 Regino of Prüm 5, 7
 Reuchlin 103
 Révah, Israel S. 121
 Ríos, Amador de los 81
 Rosa, Enrico 253f., 256f.
 Rose, Constance 88, 257
 Rosenberg, Alfred 256

- Rossi, Azariah de 45
 Rotondò, Antonio 35
- Sacerdote, Gustavo 16, 19f., 22,
 25–28, 101
 Sales, Marco 245–247
 Sand, George 238
 Santoro di Santa Severina,
 Giulio 20–24, 27, 30, 32–34
 Sarpi, Paolo 211
 Schaefer, Ernst Hermann
 Johann 74–76
 Schmidt, Peter 164
 Schott, Anselm 235
 Schuster, Ildefons 242, 244, 249,
 251
 Schwedt, Hermann 167f.
 Sebastian, King of Portugal 106,
 126
 Secret, François 82
 Sirleto, Guglielmo 20f., 23f., 34
 Sixtus IV 12, 14, 31
 Stalin, Joseph 239
 Stefan Batory 63
 Subirat, Ramón Martí de 81
 Sue, Eugene 238
 Surtz, Ronald 92
 Szyszkowski, Marcin 62–64
- Tavora, Manuel Álvares da s.
 Lusitanus, Abraham Zacutus
 Tedeschi, John 86f., 158
- Teixeira, Manoel 146f.
 Thomas Aquinas 8
 Tivoli, Salvatore s. Labani,
 Giuseppe
 Tucker, Hugo 88f.
- Urban II 12
 Urban VII 186
 Urban VIII 15
- Vacandard, Elphege 16
 Vercruyesse, François 238
 Vernet, Felix 16
 Villanueva, Márquez 84, 91, 93
 Vivas, Shmuel s. Gerosolimitano,
 Domenico
- Wagenseil, Johann Christoph 212
 Werner of Oberwesel 13
 Wessely, Hartwig 212
 Wibert III 12
 Witelisz, Jakub 63f.
 Władysław IV 64
 Wolf, Hubert 157, 167f.
 Wolf, Johann Christoph 212
- Yafe, Zvi Kalonymus 61–64
 Yagel, Camillo 41
- Zunz, Leopold 52
 Zygmunt II August, King of
 Poland 63

INDEX OF PLACES

- Adrianopolis 218
 Alcalá de Henares 122, 134
 Altdorf 212
 Altona 135
 Amsterdam 65, 109, 113–115,
 118, 128–130, 132, 140, 145,
 150, 206, 214
 Ancona 11, 183
 Andalusia 72, 90, 93
 Antwerp 99, 132
 Aragon 9, 73, 76, 95
 Asia 101, 114
 Avignon 11, 183, 215

 Barcelona 11, 78
 Basel 133, 212
 Berkeley 83
 Berlin 237
 Bologna 29, 231, 234
 Brazil 109, 138
 Brussels 177, 183f., 186f., 190f.

 Calais 132
 Carmona 90
 Carpentras 171
 Castalvi de Rosanes 119
 Castile 73, 95, 102, 105
 Catanzaro 182
 Coimbra 122f.
 Constantinople 181
 Cordoba 28, 78, 90
 Corsica 219
 Council of Trent 29, 60f., 67
 Cremona 40
 Crotone 182
 Cuenca 78

 Danzig 143, 148
 Deutschbrod s. Polna
 Dordrecht 142
 Dublin 177, 191
 Dubno 69

 Ethiopia 101

 Ferrara 89, 172, 182, 226–229
 Flanders 122
 Florence 29, 150, 183f., 186,
 188f., 193
 Fontainebleau 215, 220
 France 16, 73, 104, 132, 155,
 158f., 173f., 206, 213, 215f., 218–
 221, 232
 Frankfurt/Main 133

 Genoa 191
 Germany 133, 216, 236f., 257
 Glückstadt 114
 Goa 108, 110, 121, 128
 Granada 90

 Hamburg 107–110, 112–118, 126,
 128, 130–141, 143, 145–150, 206
 Holy Roman Empire 206

 Iberia 38, 86, 112–115, 175, 206
 Imola 180
 India 101, 109, 138
 Israel 59
 Istanbul 41
 Italy 41f., 52, 65, 83, 86–89, 100,
 115, 117, 130, 159, 164, 169,
 175, 206, 213, 216, 218, 230–232

 Jerusalem 17, 41, 113

 Kamieniec 66f.
 Kiev 66
 Korzec 69
 Kraków 60–65, 68

 Leghorn 109, 117, 138, 150, 171,
 190f., 214, 218f., 222–225
 Leipzig 83

- Limoges 16
 Lipari 90
 Lisbon 107–113, 118, 122–124,
 129, 136, 138, 143f., 148
 Lissa 212
 Livorno s. Leghorn
 Logroño 78
 London 114
 Lublin 61–65, 68
 Lucca 206
 Luck 66
 Lvov 60f., 67

 Madison 83
 Madrid 74, 83, 86, 107–109,
 112f., 124, 138
 Mallorca 78
 Mantua 41, 171, 183, 229f.
 Milan 41
 Modena 183
 Monferrato 41
 Montpellier 122
 Munich 237, 240f.

 Naples 29, 95, 99f., 104, 106, 124,
 180–182, 214

 Ostróg 69
 Ottoman Empire 41

 Padua 171
 Paris 9, 11, 73, 82, 147, 158f.,
 177f., 244
 Pavia 180, 192
 Pernambuco 138
 Podolia 66f.
 Poland 59–61, 63–65, 67f., 175,
 208, 211
 Polish-Lithuanian Common-
 wealth 59, 67–69, 206
 Polna 16
 Portugal 110, 114f., 123, 125f.,
 129, 138, 143, 147f.
 Posen 60f., 212
 Pultusk 62

 Rome 11, 14, 19, 21f., 24, 29, 41,
 71–73, 78, 80, 87, 90, 92, 94–96,
 99–101, 106, 127f., 150, 155,
 158, 161, 166, 178f., 181f., 184f.,
 187–189, 195, 205, 208, 211f.,
 215–221, 223, 225f., 229–232,
 236, 240

 Safed 41
 Salamanca 28, 238
 Sambor 69
 Savona 215
 Segovia 78f.
 Setúbal 148
 Seville 75, 78, 182
 Sigüenza 28, 122
 Simancas 74
 Sławuta 69
 Sokal 69
 Spain 7, 12, 71, 73, 75, 77f., 82–
 84, 86–89, 91, 95, 97, 102f.,
 114f., 122f., 136, 143, 147f., 150,
 182, 238
 Strassburg 241
 Szklów 69

 Taranto 182
 Tartaków 69
 Toledo 77f., 97
 Tortosa 82, 98, 106
 Trent 12, 40, 60–62
 Turkey 109, 138, 218
 Tuscany 187, 218, 220, 223–225

 Valencia 78, 86, 182
 Valladolid 78, 85, 101
 Valreas 9
 Vienna 136, 147, 150, 158, 219
 Vilna 212
 Viterbo 172
 Volhynia 66f.

 Xeres 90

 Zamość 60
 Żółkiew 69

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

- Ab Bet Din 115
Acta Apostolicae Sedis 251
aku"m 47f.
'aleinu leshabeah 51
 Amici Israel 239–242, 244–253,
 255–257
 Analecta Bollandiana 16
Antiqua Judaeorum improbitas 15,
 206
auto da fé 86
 Avisenschreiber 115, 136, 145
 Avodah Zarah 48
- Bavel 47
bilbul 96
birkat ha-minim 50
 Blood libel 9, 12, 14f.
 Bollandists 13, 16
 Bolshevik 254
 Bomberg Bible 24
 Bomberg printing house 63
 Brześć Bible 68
- Canons 3–5, 7, 190, 210
Caritas 9f., 14
Casa dei catecumeni e neofiti 19,
 173, 218, 220f., 226, 230f., 233
Civiltà Cattolica 16, 232, 253, 256
Collegio dei neofiti 28, 41
Constitutio pro iudaeis 9
 Corpus Christi 13
 Council of Carthage (417–419) 5
 Crusades 7, 12
- Decretals of Gregory IX 3, 8f.
Decretum Gratiani 3, 6f.
 Dominicans 8f., 12, 29, 81, 86,
 174, 245
Domus Conversum s. Casa
catecumeni e neofiti
- Ecumenical Council of Lyons 8
 Edom 46f., 49
elilim 47
epikoros 47
Etsi doctoris 10
 Eucharist 4f., 8, 13
- Frankists 67
 Franciscans 10, 12, 86
 Freemasonry 74, 254
 French Revolution 217f., 220–222,
 228, 231
- Gentile 6, 46–49, 98f.
- Hardenheim edition 53
hormigos 94
 House of Catechumens s. *Casa*
catecumeni e neofiti
- Index Expurgatorius* 20, 22, 25,
 27, 33, 45
Inter multiples 60
Inter sollicitudines 60
 Israel 24, 45, 113, 118, 137, 149,
 238, 240–242, 248, 255
- Jesuits 16, 62, 122, 238, 254
- kashrut* 94
kawanah 94
- Lateran Council, Fourth (1215) 4,
 6, 8
 Lateran Council, Fifth (1512–
 1517) 38, 60
Libellus ad Leonem Decem 14
Licet ab Initio 86
- Magister Sacri Palatii* 19f., 22–25,
 30–34

- Mahzor* 33, 50–54
malshinim 50f.
meḥoqeq 97
 Mendicants 9, 11
meshumad 46, 49f.
metaqeqen we-shofet 97
 Milagros of the Virgin 13
minim 47, 50
Misericordia 9, 14

Nova Lex 9

oblatio 173

 Pentateuch 32
piyyutim 50, 52f.
Portae Iustitiae 32
Portae Lucis 32
 Print revolution 35
Privilegium Paulinum 174
Pugio Fidei 12, 81f., 84

 Reconquista 7
 Ritual murder 12–14, 16, 175,
 208–211, 241

 Sack of Rome 85, 90
Scechina 85f.
 Sebastianism 125
seder 96
Sefer Ha-Zikkuk 45f., 48f.
Selihot 53
Shulhan Arukh 45
Sicut iudaeis non 8–10
 Soncino 49, 51f.

 Talmud 9, 11f., 29, 34, 39f., 46,
 59–67, 80f., 94, 166, 185, 202,
 207, 210, 212, 248
 Tortosa Disputation 82
tsitsit 93
Turbato corde 11

 Vatican Council, Second 236
 Visigothic Kingdom 6

 Wandering Jew 238
 Western Wall 17

zelanti 221
Zohar 32

CONTRIBUTORS

CLAUS ARNOLD is professor for Ecclesiastical History at the Catholic Theological Faculty of the Johann-Wolfgang-Goethe University in Frankfurt-on-Main. His work explores the responses of the Roman Catholic Church to modernism, Reform Catholicism and censorship. His publications include *Katholizismus als Kulturmacht. Der Freiburger Theologe Joseph Sauer (1872–1949) und das Erbe des Franz Xaver Kraus*, Paderborn 1999; “Die postume Expurgation der Werke Cajetans und Contarinis und das theologische Profil der römischen Kongregationen von Index und Inquisition (1571–1600)”, in Hubert Wolf (ed.), *Inquisition, Index, Zensur. Wissenskulturen der Neuzeit im Widerstreit* (Römische Inquisition und Indexkongregation 1), Paderborn 2001, 293–304; and “Lamentabili sane exitu (1907). Das Römische Lehramt und die Exegese Alfred Loisy”, in *Zeitschrift für Neuere Theologieggeschichte* 11 (2004), 24–51. He is co-author (together with Hubert Wolf) of *Der Rheinische Reformkreis. Dokumente zu Modernismus und Reformkatholizismus in Deutschland 1942–1955*, vols. 1–2, Paderborn 2001.

PIET VAN BOXEL is fellow and librarian of the Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies. His main area of research is sixteenth century Italy, in particular the relationship between Jews and Christians in the Papal States. He is currently working on the conversion of Elia Corcos, the Ius Hazakah of the Jews in the Roman Ghetto and the practice of dowry. He is author of “Dowry and the conversion of the Jews in sixteenth-century Rome: competition between the church and the Jewish community”, in Trevor Dean and K.J.P. Lowe (eds.), *Marriage in Italy 1300–1650*, Cambridge, 1998, 116–127; “Robert Bellarmine. Christian hebraist and censor”, in Chr. Ligota and J.L. Quantin (eds.), *Essays in the History of scholarship*, Cambridge University Press, forthcoming and of *Censorship under Pope Gregory XIII. A study of six manuscripts in the Vatican Library*, forthcoming. Also in preparation is the publication of two autographs of Robert Bellarmine, his Latin translation of selected passages from Rashi’s commentary on the Pentateuch and his notes on the Book of Genesis.

ANTJE BRÄCKER is research assistant at the chair for medieval and modern ecclesiastical history of the Catholic Theological Faculty of Trier University. Her main areas of interest are Basque nationalism and the Congregations of the Inquisition and the Index. The topic of her dissertation, which she completed in 2003 is *Taufstreit, Wahlkampf, Bücherverbot. Der baskische Nationalismus und der Vatikan, dargestellt am Beispiel des Indexfalles "Zabala"*.

ELEAZAR GUTWIRTH is professor of Jewish history at the University of Tel Aviv. His publications include *Social Tensions within Fifteenth-Century Hispano-Jewish Communities*, London 1978; "The Expulsions from Spain and Jewish Historiography", in A. Rapaport-Albert and S. Zipperstein (eds.), *Jewish History: Essays in Honour of Chimen Abramsky*, London 1988, 144–161; and "Towards Expulsion: 1391–1492", in Eli Kedourie (ed.), *Spain and the Jews: The Sephardi Experience 1492 and After*, London 1992. He is editor of *Ten Centuries of Hispano-Jewish Culture*, Cambridge 1992.

ARIELLA LANG received her Ph.D. in Italian Studies at Columbia University. The title of her dissertation is "The Politics of Conversion on Risorgimento Italy, 1814–1864." Her recent publications include "The Politics and Poetics of Vatican Holocaust Discourse", in *Judaism* 52:3–4 (2003), 216–224; "Carlo Altoviti and 'Ntoni Malavoglia: Rewriting the Italian in Nineteenth Century Italy", in *Rivista di Studi Italiani* (forthcoming); "The Sounds of Silence: Words of Exile and Liberation in Ungaretti's Desert", in *Rivista di Letterature Moderne e Compare* 53:3 (2000), 323–336; "Reason as Revenge: Primo Levi and Writing-the-Holocaust", in *Symposium* 52:4 (1999), 255–268. She is assistant editor of *The Vatican and the Holocaust: A Preliminary Report*. Submitted to The Holy See's Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews and the International Jewish Committee for Interreligious Consultations by the International Catholic-Jewish Historical Commission October, 2000.

SANDRA NEVES SILVA is currently completing her master thesis at the Department of History at Lisbon University on the messianic aspects in the life and work of the Portuguese physician, astronomer and court Jew Jacob Rosales: *Criptojudaismo e Messianismo em Portugal no Século XVII: Vida e Obra de Manoel Bocarro Francês*. On this topic she has published "Criptojudaismo e Profetismo no Portugal de Seiscentos: O caso de Manoel Bocarro Francês alias Jacob Rosales (1588/93?–1662/68?)", in *Estudos Orientais* 8 (2003), 169–183.

AMNON RAZ-KRAKOTZKIN is senior lecturer in the department of Jewish history of the Ben-Gurion University. His work focuses both on early modern Christian-Jewish discourse and on Zionist historical consciousness. He is the author of *The Censor, the Editor and the Text: Catholic Censorship and Hebrew Literature in the Sixteenth Century*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, forthcoming; *Exile et Binationalisme*, Paris: La fabrique, forthcoming; "The Return to the History of Redemption (Or, What is the 'History' to Which the 'Return' in the Phrase 'The Jewish Return to History' Refers)", in S.N.Eisenstadt and M.Lissak (eds.), *Zionism and the Return to History: A Reappraisal*, Jerusalem 1998, 249–279 (Hebrew); "Censorship, Editing and the Rise of Modern Jewish Consciousness: The Catholic Church and Hebrew Literature in the 16th Century", in Allison Courdet, Jeffery Shoulson (eds.), *Hebraica Veritas*, Philadelphia 2004; "Zionist Return to the West and the Mizrahi Jewish Perspective", in I.Kalmar, D.Pensler (eds.), *Orientalism and the Jews*, University of New England Press, forthcoming; "Exile Within Sovereignty: a critique of the concept 'Negation of Exile' in Israeli Culture", in *Theory and Criticism* 4 (1993), 23–53 and 5 (1994), 114–132 (Hebrew); "'Without Regard for External Considerations': The Question of Christianity in Scholem and Baer's Writings", in *Jewish Studies* 38 (1998), 73–96 (Hebrew); "A National Colonial Theology: Religion, Orientalism and the construction of the Secular in Zionist discourse", in *Tel Aviver Jahrbuch für Deutsche Geschichte* 30 (2002), 304–318.

KENNETH STOW is professor of Jewish History at the University of Haifa and editor of the periodical *Jewish History*. His work explores the history of the Jews in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. His publications include: *Catholic Thought and Papal Jewry Policy, 1555–1593*, New York 1977; *Taxation, Community and State: The Jews and the Fiscal Foundations of the Early Modern Papal State*, Stuttgart 1982; *The 1007 Anonymous and Papal Sovereignty: Jewish Perceptions of the Papacy and Papal Policy in the Middle Ages* (Hebrew Union College Annual Supplements, 4), Cincinnati 1984; *Alienated Minority: The Jews of Medieval Latin Europe*, Cambridge, Mass. 1992, revised paperback version 1994, Hebrew version, Jerusalem 1997; *The Jews in Rome*, vols. 1–2, Leiden 1995–1997; *Theatre of Acculturation. The Roman Ghetto in the Sixteenth Century*, Seattle 2001; "Marriages are Made in Heaven: Marriage and the Individual in the Roman Jewish Ghetto", in *Renaissance Quarterly* 48 (1995), 452–91; "The Church

and the Jews in the Thirteenth Century”, in David Abulafia (ed.), *New Cambridge Medieval History* (The Thirteenth Century), vol. 5, 204–220; “Conversion, Apostasy, and Apprehensiveness: Emicho of Flonheim and the Fear of Jews in the Twelfth Century”, in *Speculum*, 76 (2001), 211–33; “The New Fashioned From the Old: Parallels in Public and Learned Memory and Practice in Sixteenth Century Jewish Rome”, in *Memory and Identity. The Jews of Italy*, ed. B.D. Cooperman and B. Garvin, 2001. He is co-author (with Anna Foa) of “Gli ebrei di Roma”, in *Storia d’Italia*, Annali vol. XIV, ed. A. Prosperi and L. Fiorani, Turin 2000, and of “The Jewish Community in the Renaissance”, *Encyclopedia of the Renaissance*, ed. Paul Grendler, Scribners’: New York 1999.

MICHAEL STUEMUND-HALÉVY is lecturer for Judeospanish and Sephardic History at the universities of Hamburg and Cologne. He has published extensively on Jewish and Iberian language and history. His books include *Language and Psychiatry*, Bern 1975; *Bibliographie zur Geschichte der Juden in Hamburg*, Munich/New York 1994; *Biographisches Lexikon der Hamburger Sefarden*, Hamburg 2000 and *Ladino Kerido Mio*, Hamburg 2003. He is co-author of *Betahaim*, Glückstadt 1997 and of *Zerstört die Erinnerung nicht. Der Jüdische Friedhof Königstrasse in Hamburg*, Hamburg 2000. He is editor of *Die Sefarden in Hamburg. Zur Geschichte einer Minderheit*, vols. 1–2, Hamburg 1994–1997.

JOHN TEDESCHI has been director of the Centre for Renaissance Studies at the Newberry Library, Chicago and adjunct professor, Dept. of History, University of Illinois at Chicago, and subsequently curator of Special Collections, University of Wisconsin at Madison. He has served as president of the Society for Reformation Research, the Sixteenth Century Studies Conference and the Academic Advisory Committee for the Archive of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, as a member of the Executive Board of the Renaissance Society of America, and as a member of the Editorial Committees of *Index des Livres Interdits* (Sherbrooke and Geneva); *Studi e Testi per la Storia Religiosa del Cinquecento* (Florence); and *Corpus Reformatorum Italicorum* (Florence & Chicago). His work focuses on the Roman Inquisition and the Italian Reformation. His books include *Italian Reformation Studies*, Florence 1965; *The Prosecution of Heresy: Collected Studies on the Inquisition in Early Modern Italy*, Binghampton, translated into Italian and revised as *Il giudice e l’eretico*, Milan 1997; *The*

Italian Reformation of the Sixteenth Century and the Diffusion of Renaissance Culture: a Bibliography of the Secondary Literature, Modena 2000; and *The Correspondence of Roland H. Bainton and Delio Cantimori, 1932–1966. An Enduring Transatlantic Friendship between two Historians of Religious Toleration*, Florence 2002. He is co-author (together with Anthony Molho) of *Renaissance Studies in Honor of Hans Baron*, De Kalb 1971; (together with Gustav Henningssen) of *The Inquisition in Early Modern Europe: Studies on Sources and Methods*, De Kalb 1986. He is translator (together with Anne Tedeschi) of several books and articles from the Italian, among them: Carlo Ginzburg, *The Cheese and the Worms. The Cosmos of a Sixteenth – Century Miller*, Baltimore 1980.

HANNA WĘGRZYNEK is assistant professor at the Jewish Historical Institute in Warsaw. Her work focuses on Jewish history in medieval and modern Poland, particularly on Jewish – Christian relations. Her publications include *Czarna legenda Żydów. Procesy o rzekome mordy rytualne w dawnej Polsce* [The Jewish “Black Legend”. Blood Libel Trials in Old Poland], Warsaw 1995; a report on the representation of Jews in Polish history textbooks entitled *The Treatment of Jewish Themes in Polish Schools*, New York 1998; “The 16th century testimonies about Purim festivities”, in *Polin*, 15 (2002), 85–90; “Deputacje Żydów do Stolicy Apostolskiej w drugiej połowie XVIII w.” [Deputations of Polish Jews to the Holy See in the 18th century], in *Kwartalnik Historii Żydów – Jewish History Quarterly*, 3 (2001); “Blood Libel Accusations in Old Poland (mid-16th – mid-17th centuries)”, in *Proceedings of the Twelfth World Congress of Jewish Studies, Division B – History of the Jewish People*, Jerusalem 2000; “Konflikty pomiędzy katolikami i protestantami a wzajemne relacje pomiędzy chrześcijanami a żydami w Polsce w XVI i XVII w.” [The impact of Catholic – Protestant conflict on Jewish – Christian relations, the case of 16th century Poland], in *Żydzi i judaizm we współczesnych badaniach polskich* [The Jews and Judaism in the Contemporary Researches], vol. 2, Kraków 2000; “Accusation of Host Profanation against Jews in Poland”, in *Europa. Revue Européenne d’Histoire – European Review of History*, 1993; “On the History of the Jews of Przemyśl”, in *Gal-Ed* 12 (1991). She is co-author (together with Alina Cała and Gabriela Zalewska) of *Historia i kultura Żydów polskich. Słownik* [Dictionary. History and Culture of Polish Jews], Warsaw 2000.

STEPHAN WENDEHORST is senior research fellow at the Simon-Dubnow-Institute for Jewish History and Culture at Leipzig University. He is a member of the editorial board of *Jewish History and Culture*. His main areas of research are imperial, trans-national and corporate institutions and cultures and the legal history of the Jews in the early modern period. His publications include "Imperial Spaces as Jewish Spaces. The Holy Roman Empire, the Emperor and the Jews in the Early Modern Period", in *Simon-Dubnow-Institute Yearbook* 2 (2003), 436–475; and "L'inquisizione Romana e gli ebrei: nuove prospettive de la ricerca", in *Le inquisizioni cristiane e gli ebrei. Tavola rotonda nell'ambito della conferenza annuale della ricerca* (Atti dei Convegni Lincei, 191), Rome 2003, 51–63; he is co-author (together with S. Ehrenpreis and A. Gotzmann) of "Von den Rechtsnormen zur Rechtspraxis. Ein neuer Zugang zur Rechtsgeschichte der Juden im Heiligen Römischen Reich?", in *Aschkenas* 11:1 (2001), 39–58, and co-editor (together with A. Baumann, P. Oestmann and S. Westphal) of *Reichs-personal. Funktionsträger für Kaiser und Reich*, Cologne 2003.

HUBERT WOLF is professor for Medieval and Modern Ecclesiastical History at the Faculty of Catholic Theology of the University of Münster. In 2003 he was awarded the *Leibniz-Prize* of the *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft* (German Research Council) and in 2004 the *Communicator-Prize* of the *Stifterverband für die deutsche Wissenschaft*. He is a member of the *Kommission für Zeitgeschichte*, the Academic Advisory Committee for the Archive of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith and the Academic Advisory Committee of the German Historical Institute in Rome. His main areas of research are the Roman Congregations of the Inquisition and the Index, the *Germania Sacra*, papal ceremonial and the relations between the Roman Catholic Church and National Socialism in the light of the sources that are currently being released by the Vatican. His publications include *Ketzer oder Kirchenlehrer? Der Tübinger Theologe Johannes Ev. Kuhn (1806–1887) in den kirchenpolitischen Auseinandersetzungen seiner Zeit*, Mainz 1992; "Tribunal für einen Toten. Der posthume Inquisitionsprozess gegen Johann Michael Sailer (1751–1832)", in *Römische Quartalschrift* 96 (2001), 221–239; *Johann Michael Sailer. Das posthume Inquisitionsverfahren* (Römische Inquisition und Indexkongregation 2), Paderborn 2002. *Ranke's "Päpste" auf dem Index* (Römische Inquisition und Indexkongregation 3), Paderborn 2003; "Kirchen- und Religionsgeschichte", in Michael Maurer (ed.), *Aufriss der Histori-*

schen Wissenschaften, vol. 3: Sektoren, Stuttgart 2004, 271–338. He is editor of *Die Macht der Zensur. Heinrich Heine auf dem Index*, Düsseldorf 1998; and of *Inquisition – Index – Zensur. Wissenskulturen der Neuzeit im Widerstreit* (Römische Inquisition und Indexkongregation 1), 2nd ed., Paderborn 2003.

STUDIES IN EUROPEAN JUDAISM

ISSN 1568-5004

1. J. Helm & A. Winkelmann, *Religious Confessions and the Sciences in the Sixteenth Century*. 2001. ISBN 90 04 12045 9
2. A. Gotzmann, *Eigenheit und Einheit*. Modernisierungsdiskurse des deutschen Judentums der Emanzipationszeit. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12371 7
3. S. Rauschenbach, *Josef Albo (um 1380-1444)*. Jüdische Philosophie und christliche Kontroverstheologie in der Frühen Neuzeit. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12485 3
4. H. Wiedebach & A. Winkelmann, *Chajim H. Steinthal*. Sprachwissenschaftler und Philosoph im 19. Jahrhundert. Linguist and Philosopher in the 19th Century. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12645 7
5. K. Krabbenhoft, (Tr.), *Abraham Cohen de Herrera: Gate of Heaven*. Translated from the Spanish with Introduction and Notes. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12253 2
6. M. Morgenstern, *From Frankfurt to Jerusalem*. Isaac Breuer and the History of the Secession Dispute in Modern Jewish Orthodoxy. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12838 7
7. G. Veltri & A. Winkelmann, *An der Schwelle zur Moderne*. Juden in der Renaissance. 2003. ISBN 90 04 12979 0
8. C. Kasper-Holtkotte, *Im Westen Neues*. Migration und ihre Folgen: deutsche Juden als Pioniere jüdischen Lebens in Belgien, 18./19. Jahrhundert. 2003. ISBN 90 04 13109 4
9. S. Wendehorst (ed.), *The Roman Inquisition, the Index and the Jews*. Contexts, Sources and Perspectives. 2004. ISBN 90 04 14069 7
10. C. Wiese, *Challenging Colonial Discourse*. Jewish Studies and Protestant Theology in Wilhelmine Germany. 2004. ISBN 90 04 11962 0
11. G. Veltri and G. Necker (hrsg.), *Gottes Sprache in der philologischen Werkstatt*. Hebraistik vom 15. bis zum 19. Jahrhundert. 2004. ISBN 90 04 14312 2